UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

## VOLUME 104—PART 1

JANUARY 7, 1958, TO JANUARY 30, 1958

(PAGES 1 TO 1414)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1958

J
11
.R
v.104
pt.1



# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85TH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 104—PART 1

JANUARY 7, 1958 TO JANUARY 30, 1958
(PAGES 1 TO 1810)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1958

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA


# Congressional Record

United States of America — PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION


## SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1958

The 7th day of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 290, 85th Congress, 1st session, for the meeting of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the stillness of this hushed moment, in this solemn hour of national counsel and decisions, we would bow before Thee, with contrite hearts and supplication, knowing, as we search our own hearts, that in this time of tumult and tribulation our direst need is of Thee, and that we are lost without Thee.

In these clamorous times, when all mankind are facing the blessing or the curse, may the leadership of this dear land of our hope and prayer rise to greatness of vision and action, to meet the most crucial challenge since the Liberty Bell first rang out its glad tidings, as the precious things we hold nearest our hearts are now threatened by malignant forces which have not Thee in awe.

Give Thy servants, the few out of the many who for the Nation speak and think and act here, to see clearly that our salvation will be found, not by wailing about the things we might have done, but by the mighty things we here highly resolve to do today for the tomorrows. In the furnace of Thy refining fire, burn away the last vestige of our easy complacency. Show us, even if Thou must startle us, that there can be no gains without pains. Purge our outlook of all defeatism and despair, and, above all, of the perilous fallacy that the final victory of Thy truth which makes men free depends on the massing of material might alone.

May our America with her allies mobilize shining ideals and regnant principles which will march under the banners of mercy and help to all peoples of the earth struggling to be free and yearning for a righteous peace, for the coming of Thy kingdom fast binding all mankind.

We lift our living Nation a single sword to Thee.

We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Goldwater | Morse |
| Allott | Gore | Mundt |
| Anderson | Green | Murray |
| Barrett | Hayden | Neely |
| Beall | Hennings | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hickenlooper | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Hill | Pastore |
| Bricker | Holland | Payne |
| Bush | Hruska | Potter |
| Butler | Humphrey | Proxmire |
| Byrd | Ives | Purtell |
| Capehart | Jackson | Revercomb |
| Carlson | Javits | Robertson |
| Carroll | Jenner | Russell |
| Case, S. Dak. | Johnson, Tex. | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Schoeppel |
| Church | Kefauver | Scott |
| Clark | Kennedy | Smathers |
| Cooper | Knowland | Smith, Maine |
| Cotton | Kuchel | Smith, N. J. |
| Curtis | Langer | Sparkman |
| Dirksen | Lausche | Stennis |
| Douglas | Long | Symington |
| Dworshak | Magnuson | Talmadge |
| Eastland | Malone | Thurmond |
| Ellender | Mansfield | Thye |
| Ervin | Martin, Iowa | Wiley |
| Flanders | McClellan | Williams |
| Frear | McNamara | Yarborough |
| Fulbright | Monroney | Young |

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

---

### LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

*Alabama.*—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

*Arizona.*—Carl Hayden and Barry Goldwater.

*Arkansas.*—John L. McClellan and J. W. Fulbright.

*California.*—William F. Knowland and Thomas H. Kuchel.

*Colorado.*—Gordon Allott and John A. Carroll.

*Connecticut.*—Prescott Bush and William A. Purtell.

*Delaware.*—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear, Jr.

*Florida.*—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

*Georgia.*—Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge.

*Idaho.*—Henry C. Dworshak and Frank Church.

*Illinois.*—Paul H. Douglas and Everett McKinley Dirksen.

*Indiana.*—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

*Iowa.*—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Thos. E. Martin.

*Kansas.*—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson.

*Kentucky.*—John S. Cooper and Thruston B. Morton.

*Louisiana.*—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

*Maine.*—Margaret Chase Smith and Frederick G. Payne.

*Maryland.*—John Marshall Butler and J. Glenn Beall.

*Massachusetts.*—Leverett Saltonstall and John F. Kennedy.

*Michigan.*—Charles E. Potter and Pat McNamara.

*Minnesota.*—Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

*Mississippi.*—James O. Eastland and John Stennis.

*Missouri.*—Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., and Stuart Symington.

*Montana.*—James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield.

*Nebraska.*—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

*Nevada.*—George W. Malone and Alan Bible.

*New Hampshire.*—Styles Bridges and Norris Cotton.

*New Jersey.*—H. Alexander Smith and Clifford P. Case.

*New Mexico.*—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

*New York.*—Irving M. Ives and Jacob K. Javits.

*North Carolina.*—Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and W. Kerr Scott.

*North Dakota.*—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

*Ohio.*—John W. Bricker and Frank J. Lausche.

*Oklahoma.*—Robert S. Kerr and A. S. Mike Monroney.

*Oregon.*—Wayne Morse and Richard L. Neuberger.

*Pennsylvania.*—Edward Martin and Joseph S. Clark.

*Rhode Island.*—Theodore Francis Green and John O. Pastore.

*South Carolina.*—Olin D. Johnston and Strom Thurmond.

*South Dakota.*—Karl E. Mundt and Francis Case.

*Tennessee.*—Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore.

*Texas.*—Lyndon B. Johnson and Ralph W. Yarborough.

*Utah.*—Arthur V. Watkins and Wallace F. Bennett.

*Vermont.*—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

*Virginia.*—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

*Washington.*—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

*West Virginia.*—Matthew M. Neely and Chapman Revercomb.

*Wisconsin.*—Alexander Wiley and William E. Proxmire.

*Wyoming.*—Frank A. Barrett and Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

### SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

The VICE PRESIDENT. While the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] was sworn in, by unanimous consent, during the previous session, the official certificate of his election was not received until after the sine die adjournment on August 30, 1957.

For the purpose of completing the record, the Chair lays before the Senate the certificate, which is in the form suggested by the Senate; and, without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD and placed on file.

The certificate is as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 27th day of August 1957 WILLIAM PROXMIRE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wisconsin a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the residue of the unexpired term of 6 years, ending on the 3d day of January A. D. 1959.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the capitol, in the city of Madison, this 5th day of September, in the year of our Lord 1957.

[SEAL] VERNON W. THOMSON,
*Governor.*

By the Governor:
ROBERT C. ZIMMERMAN,
*Secretary of State.*

### NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 204), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved,* That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

### NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 205), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

### HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 206), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved,* That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

### ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 9, 1958.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1958

This being the day fixed by Public Law 290, 85th Congress, enacted pursuant to the 20th amendment to the Constitution, for the meeting of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives of the 85th Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are entering upon this 2d session of the 85th Congress, commending and committing ourselves humbly and trustfully to the light and leading of Thy divine spirit.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, and all our chosen Representatives may be richly endowed with wisdom as they strive to safeguard our freedom and make this Nation the kind of a democracy which Thou hast intended and ordained it to be.

Help us to see and understand more clearly the relation of our material and spiritual resources to our responsibilities and may our plans and purposes include and embrace not only the intensive needs of our own beloved country, but the extensive opportunities for service to all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace, who hath taught us to pray:

*Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.*

Amen.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 204

*Resolved,* That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 205

*Resolved,* That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

### RESIGNATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations as Members of Congress:

OCTOBER 8, 1957.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you, sir, that I have submitted to the secretary of state of the State of New York my resignation as Representative in Congress from the 37th District of New York State, effective as of December 1, 1957, in order to assume the position and responsibilities of the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

With the expression of my highest esteem, I am,

Most sincerely yours,
STERLING COLE,
*Director General.*

JANUARY 2, 1958.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my office as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Fourth District of Pennsylvania, effective January 5, 1958.

With great respect, your obedient servant,
EARL CHUDOFF.

Copy sent certified mail to the Honorable George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Beckworth | Cannon |
| Abernethy | Belcher | Carnahan |
| Adair | Bennett, Fla. | Carrigg |
| Addonizio | Bennett, Mich. | Cederberg |
| Albert | Bentley | Celler |
| Alexander | Berry | Chamberlain |
| Alger | Blitch | Chenoweth |
| Allen, Calif. | Boggs | Chiperfield |
| Allen, Ill. | Boland | Christopher |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Bolling | Church |
| | Bolton | Clark |
| Anderson, Mont. | Bonner | Clevenger |
| | Bosch | Coad |
| Andrews | Bow | Coffin |
| Anfuso | Boykin | Collier |
| Arends | Boyle | Colmer |
| Ashley | Bray | Cooley |
| Ashmore | Breeding | Corbett |
| Aspinall | Brooks, La. | Coudert |
| Auchincloss | Brooks, Tex. | Cramer |
| Avery | Broomfield | Cretella |
| Ayres | Brown, Ga. | Cunningham, Iowa |
| Bailey | Brown, Mo. | |
| Baker | Brown, Ohio | Cunningham, Nebr. |
| Baldwin | Brownson | |
| Barden | Broyhill | Curtin |
| Baring | Budge | Curtis, Mass. |
| Barrett | Burleson | Curtis, Mo. |
| Bass, N. H. | Bush | Dague |
| Bass, Tenn. | Byrd | Davis, Ga. |
| Bates | Byrne, Ill. | Davis, Tenn. |
| Baumhart | Byrne, Pa. | Dawson, Ill. |
| Beamer | Byrnes, Wis. | Dawson, Utah |
| Becker | Canfield | Delaney |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dellay | Kean | Prouty |
| Dempsey | Kearney | Rabaut |
| Dennison | Kearns | Radwan |
| Denton | Keating | Rains |
| Derounian | Kee | Ray |
| Devereux | Keeney | Reece, Tenn. |
| Diggs | Kelly | Reed |
| Dingell | Keogh | Rees, Kans. |
| Dixon | Kilburn | Reuss |
| Dollinger | Kilday | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Donohue | Kilgore | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Dooley | Kirwan | Richlman |
| Dorn, N. Y. | Kitchin | Riley |
| Dorn, S. C. | Klucsynski | Robeson, Va. |
| Dowdy | Knox | Robsion, Ky. |
| Doyle | Knutson | Rodino |
| Durham | Krueger | Rogers, Colo. |
| Dwyer | Laird | Rogers, Fla. |
| Eberharter | Landrum | Rogers, Mass. |
| Edmondson | Lane | Rogers, Tex. |
| Elliott | Lankford | Rooney |
| Evins | Latham | Roosevelt |
| Fallon | LeCompte | Rutherford |
| Farbstein | Lennon | Sadlak |
| Fascell | Lesinski | Santangelo |
| Feighan | Lipscomb | St. George |
| Fenton | Long | Saund |
| Fino | Loser | Saylor |
| Fisher | McCarthy | Schenck |
| Flood | McCormack | Scherer |
| Flynt | McCulloch | Schwengel |
| Fogarty | McDonough | Scott, N. C. |
| Forand | McFall | Scott, Pa. |
| Ford | McGovern | Scrivner |
| Forrester | McGregor | Scudder |
| Fountain | McIntire | Seely-Brown |
| Frazier | McIntosh | Selden |
| Frelinghuysen | McMillan | Sheehan |
| Friedel | McVey | Sheppard |
| Fulton | Macdonald | Shuford |
| Garmatz | Machrowicz | Sieminski |
| Gary | Mack, Ill. | Sikes |
| Gathings | Mack, Wash. | Siler |
| Gavin | Madden | Simpson, Ill. |
| George | Magnuson | Simpson, Pa. |
| Gordon | Mahon | Smith, Calif. |
| Granahan | Mailliard | Smith, Kans. |
| Grant | Marshall | Smith, Miss. |
| Gray | Martin | Smith, Va. |
| Green, Oreg. | Mason | Smith, Wis. |
| Griffin | Matthews | Spence |
| Griffiths | May | Springer |
| Gross | Meader | Staggers |
| Gubser | Merrow | Stauffer |
| Hagen | Metcalf | Steed |
| Hale | Michel | Sullivan |
| Haley | Miller, Calif. | Taber |
| Halleck | Miller, Md. | Talle |
| Harden | Miller, Nebr. | Taylor |
| Hardy | Miller, N. Y. | Teague, Calif. |
| Harris | Mills | Teague, Tex. |
| Harrison, Nebr. | Minshall | Teller |
| Harrison, Va. | Montoya | Tewes |
| Harvey | Moore | Thompson, La. |
| Haskell | Morano | Thompson, N. J. |
| Hays, Ark. | Morgan | Thompson, Tex. |
| Hays, Ohio | Morris | Thomson, Wyo. |
| Healey | Morrison | Thornberry |
| Hébert | Moss | Tollefson |
| Hemphill | Moulder | Trimble |
| Henderson | Multer | Tuck |
| Herlong | Mumma | Udall |
| Heselton | Murray | Ullman |
| Hess | Natcher | Utt |
| Hiestand | Neal | Vanik |
| Hill | Nicholson | Van Pelt |
| Hillings | Nimtz | Van Zandt |
| Hoeven | Norblad | Vinson |
| Hoffman | Norrell | Vorys |
| Holifield | O'Brien, Ill. | Vursell |
| Holland | O'Brien, N. Y. | Wainwright |
| Holmes | O'Hara, Ill. | Weaver |
| Holt | O'Hara, Minn. | Westland |
| Holtzman | O'Konski | Wharton |
| Horan | O'Neill | Whitener |
| Hosmer | Osmers | Whitten |
| Huddleston | Ostertag | Widnall |
| Hull | Passman | Wier |
| Hyde | Patman | Wigglesworth |
| Ikard | Patterson | Williams, Miss. |
| Jackson | Pelly | Willis |
| James | Perkins | Wilson, Calif. |
| Jarman | Pfost | Wilson, Ind. |
| Jenkins | Philbin | Winstead |
| Jennings | Pilcher | Withrow |
| Jensen | Pillion | Wright |
| Johansen | Poage | Yates |
| Johnson | Poff | Young |
| Jonas | Polk | Younger |
| Jones, Ala. | Porter | Zablocki |
| Jones, Mo. | Powell | Zelenko |
| Judd | Preston | |
| Karsten | Price | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 402 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

DECEMBER 11, 1957.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law for the Honorable MILTON W. GLENN as a Representative-elect to the 85th Congress from the 2d Congressional District of New Jersey, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable T. Millet Hand, has been received from the secretary of state of New Jersey, and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk, United States House of Representatives.*

DECEMBER 11, 1957.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law for the Honorable JOHN A. LAFORE, JR., as a Representative-elect to the 85th Congress from the 13th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Samuel K. McConnell, has been received from the secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk, United States House of Representatives.*

JANUARY 4, 1958.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law for the Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI as a Representative-elect to the 85th Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable James B. Bowler, has been received from the secretary of the State of Illinois, and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk, United States House of Representatives.*

## SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Messrs. GLENN, LAFORE, and LIBONATI appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 417) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT.

## NOTIFICATION OF SENATE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 418) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

## DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 419) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

## WITHDRAWAL FROM NATO MEETING

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

OCTOBER 17, 1957.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with deep regret that I advise you that circumstances beyond my control prevent my attending the NATO meetings scheduled for November 1957. I had looked forward to the wonderful experience and am sorry that it is not possible for me to attend.

Again thanking you for your kindness in the matter, and with kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
ISIDORE DOLLINGER,
*Member of Congress.*

## RESIGNATION OF MINORITY CLERK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Minority Clerk:

OCTOBER 28, 1957.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I herewith submit my resignation as Minority Clerk, United States House of Representatives, effective at the close of business October 31, 1957.

Respectfully,
LYLE O. SNADER.

## APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the order of the House of August 30, 1957, empowering him to accept resignations and to

appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did, on October 22, 1957, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 689, 84th Congress, appoint as a member of the United States group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the gentleman from New York [Mr. HEALEY] to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER].

And on November 21, 1957, pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, appoint as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

And on December 6, 1957, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-305, appoint as members of the Civil War Centennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. TUCK, of Virginia; Mr. COFFIN, of Maine; Mr. SMITH of Kansas; and Mr. SCHWENGEL, of Iowa.

## ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 420) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 12:30 o'clock p. m., January 9, 1958, to a joint session of the two Houses.

## JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 231) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 9, 1958, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

## AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, January 9, 1958, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 116. An act to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 264. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 304. An act to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 324. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 430. An act to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern district of Tennessee, the middle district of Tennessee, and the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 452. An act for the relief of Julia Sliwinska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 472. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 573. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Mrs. Walter E. von Kalinowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 697. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 781. An act for the relief of Michele Niro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1060. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1208. An act for the relief of Ludwik Abramski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1224. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1287. An act for the relief of Heinz August Schwarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1359. An act for the relief of Frenz Hehn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1403. An act for the relief of Michael James Bolger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1480. An act for the relief of Martha A. McDermott Stothard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1543. An act for the relief of Dorene I. Fast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1562. An act for the relief of Winifred C. Lydick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1600. An act for the relief of the C-L Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Linton Seymour Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1714. An act for the relief of Roma H. Sellers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2230. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Charlotte Rudland Dansie Association; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2533. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease space for Federal agencies for periods not exceeding 15 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 2700. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2701. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2702. An act to make permanent the temporary judgeship for the district of Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2703. An act to provide for the redistricting of the judicial district of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2714. An act to provide for the appointment of district judge for the district of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2747. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2773. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2790. An act to provide for a circuit judgeship for the eighth circuit, and for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2832. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio and one additional district judge for the southern district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2840. An act to create a new and separate judicial district in California and to create a new division for the northern district in said State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2864. An act to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the district courts for the southern and eastern districts of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. RAINS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. PASSMAN (at the request of Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana), for an indefinite time, on account of illness.

To Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota), on account of illness.

To Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

## THE LATE JERE COOPER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the sudden passing of our esteemed colleague, JERE COOPER, on December 18 last. On December 4, he suffered what was thought to be a mild heart attack. Under fine professional care, and with his complete cooperation, it was thought that he was recovering. So his death came as a great shock to his family and his many friends throughout the country.

His sudden death ended a 29-year career in the House of Representatives which he held in such deep affection. Representative COOPER was born in Dyersburg, Tenn., in 1893, and had worked since he was 12 years of age. By his own efforts he attended Cumberland University in our State, and was graduated with a bachelor of laws degree. He had a private law practice in Dyersburg, Tenn., and was city attorney for 8 years. During this time he enlisted in the State National Guard, was commissioned in 1917 and served with the 119th Infantry Regiment through its campaigns in France and Belgium during World War I.

He left the Army as a captain in 1919, and returned to his law practice. He first entered statewide politics when he managed the successful senatorial campaign for the late Lawrence Tyson, who had been his commanding officer during the war. He ran for the House when the incumbent decided to run for the Senate. He won the nomination over four Democratic rivals, and served continuously until his death.

Assigned first to the Committee on Flood Control, and later to the Elections and Veterans' Affairs Committees, he soon found himself a deep student of the National Government. When a Democratic vacancy occurred on the Ways and Means Committee in 1932, he was selected over several Members who were his senior.

He became chairman of that powerful committee in January 1955. He was chairman also of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Some years ago he summed up his understanding of tax matters in a very few words. He said:

My philosophy on taxes is very simple. I believe the 16th amendment to the Constitution means just what it says, which, in effect, is that Congress shall have the authority to levy and collect taxes on income from whatever source derived. I think everyone should pay a fair share to the support of the Government.

Those of us who were closest to JERE COOPER recognized how quietly and yet so beautifully he carried his deep sorrows. In 1930 he married the former Mary Rankley, of Campbellsburg, Ky. She died 5 years later. Their only child, Jere, Jr., died in 1951 at the age of 16. Young Jere was being reared in the home of his aunt in Dyersburg. He was a bright youngster, and appeared to be in splendid health, but was mysteriously stricken in the middle of the night and passed away without his father being able to be with him in the last hours. It was just that sudden.

JERE is survived by a brother and three sisters.

All of us knew him as a man of unquestionable integrity. He was fully dedicated to his public office. He was loyal to his friends. He had an abiding and deep devotion and loyalty for our beloved Speaker, but he shared a quiet and almost reverent friendship and relationship with the Members of this House, regardless of political affiliations. He did not care for the commonly known social side of life, but he did love people. We shall remember him as one of the outstanding presiding officers in this body. He was called upon to preside over the Committee of the Whole on many occasions. When the debate promised to be lengthy, the issues highly controversial, and the importance of a cool, intelligent, and fair presiding officer was needed, JERE COOPER was called.

Indeed, this House has lost one of its finest Members, all of us a true friend, and the Nation one of its most useful legislators.

To his family we extend our love, and as a part of these humble yet sincere remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal which so ably expresses the feelings of the great Midsouth section of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRAZIER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

### REPRESENTATIVE JERE COOPER

The passing of Representative JERE COOPER, of Dyersburg, leaves this State and Nation bereaved.

He was of the soil. He went to work even before he was in his teens in order to acquire a basic education. He worked to pay his way through law school. When his country needed him, he volunteered to put on its uniform and went off to war.

Public service appealed to him and he began his long and honorable career in one of the best of elemental political schools—municipal government. From there he went on to the legislature and then to Congress. He was first elected to the House in 1928 and for three decades his constituents returned him to a seat which he occupied with dignity, with honesty, and with fearlessness.

Some of the elements of his background, some of his characteristics, and certainly many of his outlooks were remindful of the late Cordell Hull. The form of the two molds had much similarity and it is not unusual that the Congressional record of JERE COOPER was one of vigorous support of causes to which Cordell Hull was devoted, notably that of the reciprocal trade program.

He was a consistent and outspoken champion of TVA, of practical flood control and navigational programs, and of sound and realistic agricultural practices.

He was chairman of the very powerful Ways and Means Committee and he exercised that responsibility with wisdom and discretion.

He had the respect of the whole House without regard to party affiliation. He did not commit himself lightly, but when he did the word was the bond.

One magazine writer once described him as the "loneliest man in Washington." Actually, he was more shy than retiring. He had known great grief and the memories from which it stemmed were held dear and sacred.

The loneliness stopped there, for no man could be lonely who could live honestly with himself, his ideals, and the very evident love and devotion of his neighbors and friends. The bounds of those are the bounds of the State and country he served so well.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a brief but sincere tribute to our late departed friend, JERE COOPER, and join with our new dean of the Tennessee delegation, CLIFFORD DAVIS, in paying tribute to him.

Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our beloved friend, JERE COOPER, the State of Tennessee has lost one of her most distinguished sons, and the Nation one of its most effective statesmen, and we in this body have lost a highly esteemed colleague and leader. Words are sometimes inadequate to express either the personal sorrow we feel at his passing or to pay adequate tribute to his achievements and to the influence his life and personality exerted on the history of our Nation during the almost 30 years of his service in this Chamber. Simplicity and humility were the core of his personality.

JERE COOPER was not one to seek the dramatic spotlight or to seek headlines. His forte was not in belligerent aggressiveness but rather in a quiet, unemotional, logical appeal to reason. I have known no Member of this House who had a more considerate and conscientious regard for his colleagues and their problems; and no Member who was more generous with his friendships and his wise counsel and more willing to help any Member of this body and the newcomers to these Halls than JERE COOPER. He was dependable—and always on the job, attentive to duty, and a faithful public servant.

He rose from humble beginnings to great heights as chairman and ranking member of the great Committee on Ways and Means and a position high in the councils of his party. As the dean of the Tennessee delegation in the House, he provided wise and effective leadership of the delegation on behalf of the entire State; but always with a broad perspective and a statesmanlike lack of provincialism. He was a man who fought for the things he believed in without belligerence and with tolerance for those who differed with him. There was an unswerving devotion manifest in his life to the high principles which motivated his thinking and philosophy. The people of Tennessee and the Nation can be grateful to him for a dedicated life of public service. He championed the cause of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Cordell Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and tax revision with fairness

and justice to all. These among other great legislative acts will stand as monuments to JERE COOPER's public service.

It was my privilege to have known JERE COOPER for many years prior to coming to Congress. I well recall that the very first meeting of the Democratic caucus I attended prior to the opening of the 80th Congress was presided over by our late friend. He was renowned as one of the best presiding officers in our ranks and our great Speaker has attested to this by calling upon him frequently to serve as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and Speaker pro tempore. JERE COOPER was one of the most able parliamentarians of the House and a skilled presiding officer. He was a great chairman of the powerful and important Committee on Ways and Means. He exercised the powers and prerogatives of chairman of his committee with scrupulous fairness and a high degree of statesmanship.

He was born in Dyer County, Tenn., in 1893; educated in the public schools of our State, and received a law degree from Tennessee's famed law school of Cumberland University at Lebanon in the district which I have the honor to represent. A lawyer by profession he practiced law until the outbreak of World War I. He served during the First World War in the American Expeditionary Forces, being discharged as captain. The high regard of his comrades was demonstrated shortly after the war when he was elected State commander of the American Legion in Tennessee. The late General Tyson, who had commanded the Tennessee regiment during that war, when undertaking his successful campaign for the Senate of the United States chose the young veteran JERE COOPER to serve as his campaign manager.

In 1929 the people of his district elected him to serve in Congress and, as we all know, he served continuously ever since—for 15 consecutive terms.

I shall miss him particularly, for I valued his counsel and advice and, above all, his warm friendship. And so will thousands of his friends and constituents. As a member of the official delegation I attended his funeral in Dyersburg, Tenn., along with several other Members of the House. Even those of us who knew his capacity for making friends and keeping them were astonished by the outpouring of his friends and neighbors at these sad final rites for our friend and colleague. In fact, it became necessary to install a public address system outside the church so that the many who could not find room inside the church could hear the beautiful tribute paid him by the minister.

The legacy JERE COOPER left us is a precious one and one which all of us can profit from if we but remember the example of his career. True to ideals and friends, dedicated to service, his memory will live on in the highest traditions of statesmanship in the history of his district, State, and Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this justly deserved tribute to the memory of a distinguished Member of this body, JERE COOPER.

The span of years during which it was his privilege to serve the Nation, as it has been my privilege, have been difficult years—at one time years of economic hardship, at other times, years of war, and more lately years of peace beset with heavy problems for all of us.

My earliest recollection of JERE COOPER go back to the time when I was a freshman member of the minority party and he was, in my eyes at least, a veteran of the opposition.

There came a time when mine was the responsibility of majority leadership and JERE COOPER was the highly respected ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

But whether the ball was in our hands—on this side of the aisle—or otherwise, I want to say this about my experience in working with JERE COOPER:

When he took a position, when he declared a course of action on any matter before us, when he gave his word on any issue, large or small, we knew exactly where he stood.

Others today have borne witness to the many qualities of our departed colleague; his high competence, his knowledge of the parliamentary process, his loyalty, and his energy.

For these he earned the admiration and respect of all of us.

But I will always remember JERE COOPER primarily as a man of complete good faith, and as I look ahead to the work before us in this new session I am deeply sorry that we have lost his services to the House and, above all, to the Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], his immediate successor as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to pay my respects to the memory of our departed colleague, my very close personal friend of many years, the beloved and respected chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, JERE COOPER.

JERE COOPER's death came as a great shock to all of us, and we have all been deeply grieved. I believe I can say that I was as close to JERE as any Member of the House and hence the shock to me was all the greater because of the close personal friendship which he and I enjoyed over the years, and due to our very close and harmonious work together on the Committee on Ways and Means. I have lost a true and valued friend; the Nation has lost a true and valued statesman.

There will be many who will speak of the outstanding attributes of JERE COOPER as a statesman and as a patriot, and I could do so at great length and with deepest sincerity. However, in view of our close personal friendship, I would like to direct my brief remarks to some of his more outstanding personal characteristics at this time. JERE was a man of great integrity. His word was indeed his bond and nothing more was ever needed from him. He did not have to give his word twice—once was enough, because he never gave it lightly or without careful prior thought. His word carried great weight with his colleagues. I speak of this aspect of his character first because from among his many sterling attributes I believe it would be one of the most salient of all. As I have indicated, JERE never lightly gave his word, assumed a position, or conveyed an impression, but when he did come to a conclusion or take a position he would stand like the Rock of Gibraltar against those who sought to oppose that point of view and he was formidable in carrying forward that position with his colleagues.

JERE was a man of great dignity. Those of us who have worked with him closely over the years and have observed his demeanor in committee, on the floor of the House of Representatives, and during the hours when the Congress or the committee was not in session have always been impressed with this quality. I have heard many new Members of this great body, who have observed his activities on the floor for the first time, comment about this outstanding attribute. There have been many times when all of us have watched him at his accustomed place on the floor of the House carefully thinking through the points made by his colleagues with respect to legislation pending before the House and giving deep thought to the manner in which these proposals would affect the many thousands of Americans throughout the Nation.

JERE COOPER was a man of great humility and modesty. While he possessed an extremely keen and analytical mind which was capable of going to the crux of a complex problem and stating it in simple terms which all could understand, he always did this in a modest and unassuming way. Thus, while he possessed this great quality of humility which has been found in our outstanding leaders down through the years, he was, at the same time, tough and courageous. He was a man of strong will and could not be swayed, once he had carefully come to a conclusion based upon all of the facts available, by the pressures to which we are all subject from time to time in connection with various proposals advanced for our consideration.

Another outstanding attribute which I cannot fail to mention was his innate sense of fairness. Many, many times I have heard him make the statement, both in committee and on the floor of this House, that such-and-such a proposal which was then being pressed upon us was simply unfair. I believe that it is this basic and highly developed sense of fairness which in great measure contributed to his outstanding leadership as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, because we all know, and particularly those of us privileged to sit on the committee, that the legislation with which we deal, including taxes, tariffs, and social-security measures, affects the lives of each and every American, no matter what their station in life may be. Thus it is that I speak of this quality of fairness which is so necessary for persons who are assigned to pass initially

on these great and important categories of legislation.

JERE COOPER was said to be a lonely man. I do not believe he was lonely, because no man who has the deep respect and admiration of his colleagues in this body and of the host of close personal friends throughout the country and in his congressional district as did JERE COOPER could in fact be lonely. He was a devout Christian gentleman who had been put to great personal tests during his lifetime, including the untimely and sad loss of his dear wife only a few years after their marriage and the sudden and tragic loss of his only son just a few years ago. He sought and received great strength through his devotion to Christian principles and to his duties as a representative of his district and of his Nation. He took his responsibilities seriously, and his Christian courage and outstanding leadership will serve as a source of inspiration to all of us in the days and years to come.

We all feel a deep sense of personal loss, and the magnitude of my loss through his death certainly cannot be adequately expressed in these few words.

I join with all my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of this outstanding Christian gentleman, patriot, and statesman, and in extending to members of his family our deepest sympathy and condolence.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, the convening of this 2d session of the 85th Congress is marked with a sadness that transcends in significance other aspects of this historic day. The sadness arises from the fact that this is the time designated to pay tribute in the House of Representatives to the revered memory of a noble statesman, a valorous patriot, and selfless public servant—the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Dyersburg, Tenn. As these expressions are made today in praise of his accomplishments and in honor of his memory, there is no one present in this hallowed Chamber who has not sustained a profound loss with the untimely passing of our beloved colleague on December 18, 1957.

For those of us who were particularly privileged to serve with Mr. COOPER as his colleagues on the House Committee on Ways and Means and under his distinguished chairmanship of that great committee, the magnitude of our loss has been enhanced by the closeness of our association. With his passing it is to the inspiration of his memory that we must look for guidance in meeting the problems and responsibilities confronting us today and with respect to the future. His example and the rich knowledge that is ours from our cherished association with him will serve to strengthen the character, wisdom, and courage that we bring to the performance of our duties.

I have been honored to serve in the United States House of Representatives with Mr. COOPER for almost three decades and we have been colleagues together on the House Committee on Ways and Means for almost that same length of time. In that period Mr. COOPER'S every act and his every statement exemplified the virtues of integrity, principle, and honor that he possessed in such unmatched abundance. In the rewarding period of our association together JERE COOPER was more than my honored colleague, he was my beloved friend.

The mortal remains of Mr. COOPER have returned for interment to his beloved Dyersburg, Tenn., so as to finally rest among the friends and constituents that he served so well. To us remains his memory and I submit to my colleagues that by virtue of that memory and its inspiration we are better men. That the Honorable JERE COOPER has passed from our presence will not prevent us from thinking of him often and seeking his guidance as we deal with the great issues confronting our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this morning at 9:30 Mr. COOPER'S colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means met in executive session and unanimously adopted a resolution testifying to the sorrow of his committee colleagues over Mr. COOPER'S passing and testifying also to the outstanding record of public service achieved by this noble statesman. At the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means I include that resolution as a part of my remarks at this point.

Whereas the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Dyersburg, Tenn., Representative of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee, served with eminent distinction and great patriotism as a Member of the United States House of Representatives continuously since March 1929, as a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means continuously since July 1932, in addition to other important capacities, and as the chairman of said House Committee on Ways and Means continuously since January 1955; and

Whereas the Honorable JERE COOPER served his Nation with valor in time of war as a commissioned officer in the American Expeditionary Forces, participating with great bravery in engagements with the enemy in France and Belgium; and

Whereas in both peace and war the Honorable JERE COOPER acquitted his duties and responsibilities to the citizens of his State of Tennessee and to the citizens of his Nation with statesmanship, courage, wisdom, and foresight so as to render his public service an inspiring example to his colleagues in the United States Congress, to his countrymen, and to the causes of peace and freedom in behalf of all men: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the membership of the House Committee on Ways and Means assembled,* That said committee membership express its profound sorrow over the untimely passing of their beloved chairman on December 18, 1957, and that the Committee on Ways and Means when it adjourn today shall adjourn in reverence to his memory; and be it further

*Resolved by the membership of the House Committee on Ways and Means assembled,* That a copy of this aforestated resolution be sent to the beloved family of our late distinguished colleague and chairman, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Dyersburg, Tenn.

Approved and adopted this 7th day of January 1958, by the unanimous vote of the membership of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Attest:

WILBUR D. MILLS,
*Member of Congress.*
DANIEL A. REED,
*Member of Congress.*

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will insert in the RECORD a copy of a statement I released following Mr. COOPER'S death:

It is with profound sorrow that I express my most heartfelt condolence to the beloved friends and neighbors—the constituents of a great American, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee. His untimely death is a tragic loss to our Nation. I share with his fine people the cherished privilege of his friendship. That Mr. COOPER has passed bodily from our midst is according to God's divine will that is determined for reasons not always within our understanding. It is within our understanding that his virtues of patriotism, integrity, and great wisdom are examples to each of us and they should inspire us to seek to emulate the standard he has set. It is perhaps not to be expected we will equal his attainments but it is to be expected we will honor his memory by working with his same selflessness and vigor in behalf of the American ideals for which he so resolutely stood.

For almost three decades I have been honored to serve in the United States House of Representatives with Mr. COOPER and for only shortly less time than that we have been colleagues together on the House Committee on Ways and Means. In this rewarding period our friendship has been continually enriched and my respect for his character and ability has been increasingly enhanced. In conflict and in peace, in periods of hope and in moments of despair, JERE COOPER rendered stalwart service in devotion to his country, in allegiance to its rich traditions, and in confidence of its bountiful future.

As Mr. COOPER has abided by the honored tenets initially established by those immortal Americans, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, so has he added the example of his own illustrious public service as an inspiration and a guide to those he left to carry on.

His beloved State of Tennessee and his Nation that he served so well justifiably pause in sadness to honor his distinguished memory.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, the favorable action unanimously taken by the membership of the House in honoring my colleague and new chairman, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, is an action that I am confident will always reflect great credit on the considered judgment of this august body. This House will soon undertake to eulogize our beloved former chairman, the Honorable JERE COOPER. The necessity for the orderly conduct of governmental affairs has required that we promptly designate his successor as chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means. It is not in a sense of forgetting the illustrious memory of Mr. COOPER that I make this statement of commendation to the House with respect to the designation of Mr. MILLS as his successor. Indeed, I am confident that to Mr. COOPER will properly go much of the credit for the outstanding record that Mr. MILLS will achieve as chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS is a distinguished and selfless public servant who has demonstrated great ability, capacity for leadership, and courage in judgment in the conduct of the Nation's legislative affairs. I take this opportunity to pledge to him my wholehearted support and to express confidence that his already great contribution to the welfare of our Nation

will be immeasurably enhanced in the years ahead.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I know that there is little that one can add to the magnificent tributes which have already been paid our late distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JERE COOPER. I think, however, that each of us creates an impression of himself as he goes through life, and the one great impression that I have of my great chairman is the word that has been used so often here this afternoon, "integrity." JERE COOPER was the essence, the quintessence, of honesty. Occasionally one might disagree with him, but one never questioned his motives. It made no difference from whence pressures came, JERE COOPER stood literally like the Rock of Gibraltar once he was convinced that his course was right and proper and in the interest of his country.

This great devotion to our country was one that inspired all of his colleagues.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, several years ago when JERE COOPER had substantial opposition back in his home district. A younger man was giving him a strong race. But, at the time there was heavy legislation scheduled here both in the Committee on Ways and Means and in this Chamber, and JERE COOPER, in traditional fashion, and characteristic of his devotion to his country and to his position, refused to leave this Chamber and go back home and protect his own interest.

He was a great legislator. He bore ably the responsibilities of drafting tax legislation which, as all of you know, is one of the grave, difficult problems which confront all of us in the House of Representatives where all tax legislation must originate under our Constitution.

He handled social-security legislation admirably. I recall that never did he get very far away from the people in handling these major issues. I remember with amusement and with pleasure how he would refer to some humble citizen back in his own district when some major legislative matter was up. For instance, when we were discussing coverage for the self-employed, he would invariably talk about his barber back in Dyersburg whose employees were covered, but the barber was not.

He was one of the great advocates of the Cordell Hull tradition of trade agreements legislation and made a tremendous contribution to that landmark of American friendship throughout the world.

He presided for many years with great dignity as chairman of the Democratic caucus and he was a parliamentarian without peer.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have lost one of our great leaders, one of our great Members. And I say this in all sincerity, that he died as he would have chosen to die, as a Member of this body, deep in its love and deep in the love of his fellow Members.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve here with JERE COOPER during all the time he served. I want to say today, as I have listened to the remarks of the various Congressmen concerning JERE COOPER, that I should like to be able to send back to his people, to his relatives, the information of the high esteem in which he was held here in this Congress. They have a right to be proud of him and his achievements.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that have been so eloquently stated by those who have preceded me in eulogizing our beloved late colleague, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Dyersburg, are indeed deserved tribute to a great American and I believe demonstrates in part at least the extent to which he will be so sorely missed by those of us who remain to carry on the responsibilities of governmental affairs. I have been privileged to know and to serve with JERE COOPER for a long time. During this period I valued his friendship and admired his professional ability as a legislator and as a leader. You may be assured that the rich memories of those years will always be cherished by me.

Mr. COOPER played a vital role in the development of legislation affecting such important legislative subjects as taxation, social security, tariffs, and veterans' affairs. In addition to performing valiant service with respect to these national issues Mr. COOPER was also effective in bringing about the adoption of legislative measures beneficial to his State of Tennessee and to his home constituency.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, few men in our world's history have lived lives that became symbols; the life of JERE COOPER was symbolic of statesmanship, astuteness, precision and complete greatness. His was a life that will long be remembered as one of absolute dedication. I doubt if there have been many men who have served in this great body whose full time was more completely devoted to his work than was JERE COOPER'S.

Although I had known Mr. COOPER personally for only the period of time that I had served with him here in the Congress, I had heard and read of him since I was a small boy. I learned after knowing him that all of the tributes I had heard paid him in Tennessee were true and factual. I feel that through association with JERE COOPER I have been privileged to attend a great school of legislative statesmanship. His work in the Congress will long be remembered by his colleagues and will forever be studied by posterity.

JERE COOPER'S untimely and unexpected passing leaves us with saddened hearts; however, a great amount of condolence can come from knowing that his life was one well spent. I join with my colleagues and friends in the House of Representatives in extending my sympathy during their grief to his family and to his professional staff that I know loved him so well.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, with a heart full of sadness I join my colleagues in this humble tribute to a great man, a great statesman, a great patriot, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee.

His untimely passing was a great shock to all of us and has left a void that will be hard to fill, not only in the United States Congress, but also in the Committee on Ways and Means where he was a guiding light to all of us, as well as a leader that we were happy to follow.

He was a real patriot and his every action was motivated by a desire to do what was best for our country and its people.

To know JERE COOPER was to love him. He was a kind man and gave his all for his fellow man.

We shall miss him and never forget that this world is better because JERE lived.

To his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy and pray God that He give them strength in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the first regular term our dear friend JERE COOPER was elected to was my first regular term in this body. I preceded him by about 3 months because I was elected to fill an unexpired term, but as far as the regular terms are concerned JERE COOPER and I entered this body together and we served in this body throughout the years until his very unfortunate death.

For 8 of the 10 years that I served on the Committee on Ways and Means, JERE COOPER was also a member of that committee. I served on that committee from 1930 to 1940, when I was elected majority leader and resigned from the committee. JERE COOPER was elected to the committee in 1932.

Our associations were most cordial and most pleasant. Between us there developed a very strong, permanent, and lasting friendship. I may say, also, that he and Mrs. Cooper, who was a wonderful girl, lived in the Hotel Washington, where Mrs. McCormack and I have lived since I have been a Member of Congress. Mrs. McCormack and the late Mrs. Cooper and also JERE COOPER as the years went by became very close personal friends. We knew his dear boy, who has been referred to by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] and others. It was really a tragedy in his life when his son died. Mrs. Cooper was one of the finest ladies anyone could ever meet in the journey of life. JERE'S whole life was wrapped up in her and his fine son. When one said he had a sad life, it was not sad from the angle of public service or in view of his host of friends and admirers but it was sad from the angle of the catastrophes that happened to him during his own lifetime in the death of his dear wife and the death of his dear son.

JERE COOPER was everything that my colleague said about him. Above all, he was one who could disagree with others

without being disagreeable. In my opinion, he was one of the greatest statesmen in the entire history of our country. The spirit of JERE COOPER, his influence, what he stood for, those fine, deep, noble things, are what impressed us and caused our deep respect and admiration for him.

I was in Boston when I heard of his death. Mrs. McCormack and I were deeply grieved. His loss is a personal loss to us. His death is a great loss not only to our country and to the State of Tennessee, his district, and the Tennessee delegation in this body and the other body, but also to all of our colleagues.

To his brothers and sisters I extend in their sorrow the profound sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself. A gap has been left in the House that is going to be most difficult to fill. Those of us who have known JERE COOPER will always remember him as long as we live.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER].

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I return to the Congress today with a feeling of deep personal loss. The Creator of us all has taken from our midst a warm personal friend of many years' standing.

In the passing of Congressman JERE COOPER the Congress of the United States has lost one of its outstanding Members. My own State of Tennessee has lost one of it leading statesmen. He was a great American who labored in the House of Representatives for more than 29 years. He had won the confidence and respect of the American people by his steadfast adherence to duty.

As the chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means he rendered a service to this Nation that will stand as a monument to his memory.

His passing has a terrific personal impact on me. Shortly after I came to the Congress, JERE COOPER put his hand upon my shoulder and offered to assist me in my new endeavor in any way that he could. I accepted his offer and thereafter he became my trusted friend in the many and varied problems confronting a new Member of the Congress of the United States.

He was forthright and honorable. He was loyal to his God, his church, State, family and friends. He was a dedicated legislator. He will be sorely missed in the House of Representatives.

I shall always cherish the memory of JERE COOPER.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join my colleagues and the many friends of the late JERE COOPER to express my respect to his memory. It was my privilege to attend the funeral services for JERE COOPER in the town that he loved so well, Dyersburg, Tenn. There I saw the many evidences of love and respect which his neighbors had for him. I have heard today from those who knew JERE COOPER many expressions reminding us of the fine characteristics which were so dear to us and which we all loved in JERE COOPER. But I shall always remember best the very simple but effective way in which his minister, Reverend Cross, described him at the funeral service. He described JERE COOPER simply as an "unselfish, devoted Christian statesman." Those are simple words, but JERE COOPER loved simplicity and it is as an unselfish, devoted Christian statesman that we in the entire country will remember JERE COOPER. I offer my sympathy to his family and I sincerely hope that the indelible mark which he has left in this Chamber will always remain with us to guide us in the work for our country.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point the remarks made by the Reverend Cross on the occasion to which our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] has just referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EULOGY DELIVERED BY THE REVEREND ERNEST O. CROSS, CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, DYERSBURG, TENN.

The Holy Bible, the Word of God, reveals unto us that God is a Sovereign Ruler of all life, that He is all wise, all good, and all powerful. No true believer would question these attributes of God at any season, and yet there are times in the circumstances of life that our limited human understanding may not fully grasp the meaning of God as He is related to our circumstance. Perhaps many times in the last few hours since this community and the State and Nation heard the tragic words of the passing of the Honorable JERE COOPER, many minds have entertained the question, "Why did this have to happen?" In the words of an early American, who wrote of the crisis of his time, "These are days that try men's souls." Perhaps never before was there a greater need of unselfish dedicated Christian statesmen than this hour. And so we might be inclined to wonder if God is all wise and good, why could He not have spared one so needed in this very serious day?

I would not be so presumptuous as to attempt to solve this problem or answer this question other than to offer the words of the apostle when he said, "All things work together for good to those who love the Lord," and I believe that is true. Or we might say as Jesus said to Simon one time, "That which I do thou knowest not now but thou shalt understand hereafter." Maybe the Master said to His servant the other evening, "You've labored long and well." "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joys of thy Lord." Maybe in His all wise decision God has felt that He could bring into focus the pattern of statesmanship that we found in this departed servant that shall multiply his principles again and again in those that shall come after him.

Across the Nation, these days, have come many, many tributes from all levels of life from those who appreciated this great man. There are present in this sanctuary this afternoon those who knew him well as coworkers in the affairs of the State. Many could rise and more perfectly eulogize this gracious life than I today. There are members of this devoted family, this very closely knit family, who have exchanged tender words of love concerning his good and kind and sincere life. If they could express themselves they could paint a lovely picture of his life. I would not compete with these beautiful tributes, I would not attempt to add to them, such gracious words that have already been framed. But I would like to speak briefly of him in another way. I speak of him today as a churchman, a Christian, a man of God, and in this realm he held his highest office.

It would not be difficult today to find in the language of God's word some statement that is very appropriate for such a memorial service as this. It might be said as was spoken of Enoch, "He walked with God; and he was not; for God took him." We might say as of Barnabas, "He was a good man," with emphasis upon the good, "full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." We might say as Paul admonished Timothy, that he endured hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. But I found this expression that seemed to come back again and again to my mind in thinking of this hour, when David spoke of his loss in the passing of his servant Abner, "And the king said unto his servants, 'know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?' And I am this day weak, though anointed king." And I say again that surely there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel. He was a prince in this vicinity of his Israel. He was a champion in many ways. He was not only a veteran of foreign wars and a veteran of national and international conflicts, he was a veteran of personal trials in his own experience in life. A little more than a decade ago he returned home to face one of the greatest sorrows of his life, the loss of his companion. Sunday morning, February 4, 1951, he answered a telephone call to break his heart, that his young and brilliant 17-year-old son had suddenly passed away. I stood by his side in part of that hour of grief; I saw the strength of a great man undaunted by the grief of that occasion. A great man because he had a great God and a great source of strength by which to stand. He was a prince abroad as well as at home. Some months ago, one labeled him as "the loneliness man in Washington." That statement might be questioned. He may have lived a solitary life, but I doubt that he was the loneliest man, for he was surrounded with interests and devotions of many people that well filled his life. He did not participate in the gaiety of social festivities as some others may have participated but he believed in the seriousness of his responsibility and he found greater pleasure in serving than in being served by any society. He fulfilled the words of the Master who said, "But he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that does serve." In this area of service he found the fullness of life.

Yes, a prince is fallen this day in Israel and it is altogether fitting that the last service be held at this altar. For this is the scene of his great spiritual devotion. It was at this place that he learned to pray and believe in God and know his word. It was at this altar where he renewed his strength day after day of worship. Every opportunity that he had when home, Sunday morning he was here in this sanctuary, for here he found renewal of strength to meet the responsibilities of his day. It has been commonly known that not a day passed, wherever he was, but what he was found sometime on his knees, somewhere within the Word of God finding counsel for the major decisions that rested upon him.

From this side of life a prince has fallen but from the eternal side of life we may more correctly say that a prince has risen. For his term of office did not expire December 18, 1957, but rather his work shall follow him on and on. The convictions, the principles, the ideals, the hopes, the vision of his life shall be reenacted again and

again in the decisions, in the courage, in the loyalty of those who shall come after him. The name of JERE COOPER shall not be immortalized upon some granite slab but rather in the hearts of men and women, young people, rich and poor, weak and strong, whose lives were touched by his dedicated influence. The name of JERE COOPER shall be a symbol of good government that shall bring shame upon selfish and indiscreet leadership and shall inspire good men to be better men and to make of this country a land of peace and justice for which he spent the greater part of his life to achieve. So Mr. COOPER we could say to you today, that your life has not been in vain but we shall keep on holding up the ideals that you cherished, that the time may come when there shall be "peace on earth good will toward men." So in that upper and better Kingdom, where there is perfect government today, a statesman has been promoted. He has been rewarded with the rejoining of loved ones who have preceded him in death.

Yes, this district has lost a statesman, our Nation a leader, our church a dedicated official, the family a beloved brother, but heaven has gained a good life, a consecrated believer in the Sovereign Ruler of all life. A prince has fallen here but has risen over there.

"When sorrow comes, as come it must,
In God a man must put his trust.
There is no power in mortal speech
The anguish of his soul to reach,
No voice, however sweet and low,
Can comfort him or ease the blow.
He cannot from his fellow men
Take strength that will sustain him then.
With all that kindly hands will do,
And all that love may offer, too,
He must believe throughout the test
That God has willed it for the best.
We realize how helpless then
Are all the gifts of mortal men.
No words which we have power to say
Can take the sting of grief away—
That Power which marks the sparrow's fall
Must comfort and sustain us all.
When sorrow comes, as come it must,
In God a man must place his trust.
With all the wealth which he may own,
He cannot meet the test alone,
And only he may stand serene
Who has a faith on which to lean."

—*Edgar A. Guest.*

Our Blessed Heavenly Father, may Thine arms enfold these whose hearts are hurt and may the light of Thy countenance mark the path that our feet shall tread, and may we be true to faith committed to us and when we shall have found the end of our journey may it be said of us that we stood as a prince of Israel. May we hear the words of the Master spoken to us, "Well done good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make you ruler of many things; enter thou into the joys of thy Lord." Bless the entire area affected in the passing of this loved one in the name of the Holy Comforter even the Lord Jesus Christ, we most humbly pray.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects to the memory of JERE COOPER. To me he was a Congressman's Congressman, and I do not know how to characterize him better than that. When I first came here, JERE COOPER approached me and offered to assist me. I found that you could always go to him. No matter how busy he was, he had time to counsel with you and to help you. Like my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ], I, too, had the privilege of going to Dyersburg to attend his funeral. The respect in which he was held and the homage paid him by the people of that community was evident on that occasion. I want to join with my colleagues in offering my sincere sympathy to his sister and brothers.

Representative government has lost a great champion. We have lost an able statesman.

I pray that God send us another humble, competent leader to replace him.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable JERE COOPER takes from this body one of our most beloved and respected Members. I have served in the House with JERE since 1932, and we served side by side on the Committee on Ways and Means for many years. His death came as a great shock to me and I share the deep grief of all of us over his loss. We have lost an admired and respected colleague; the Nation has lost a statesman.

JERE was an outstanding chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. He was diligent in carrying out his duties; he was modest and unassuming but at the same time strong and courageous in fighting for those causes which he believed to be right; he was a highly able advocate on the floor of this House; and he was above all a Christian gentleman of the highest integrity.

I can say with no reservations whatsoever that JERE'S colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means and in the House took great strength and inspiration from his leadership. We always paid very close attention when he spoke because he had a faculty for getting right to the nub of an issue in simple terms.

JERE COOPER was a man of the highest integrity and honesty. His word could be relied upon absolutely. He was a man of great dignity and fairness. I have never known him to be unfair to any Member or individual.

I have lost one of my best friends; the Nation has lost a great leader. I join in extending deepest sympathy to the members of JERE'S family.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I join with the other Members in paying tribute to our departed colleague, JERE COOPER. It has been my privilege since being a Member of this House to know Mr. COOPER. We recognize that he has been an outstanding leader and factor in establishing legislation that has gone through this House in the last 25 years.

When I first came to Congress it was my privilege to discuss with Mr. COOPER many things. Often it was necessary for me to contact him in relation to constituent's matters. I always found him fair and decent and kind.

It was also my privilege to attend the services at Dyersburg, Tenn. It was there reflected by those who knew him best, the respect and honor and the distinction that he enjoyed in his own territory.

I join with the other Members in extending my sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the members of the Tennessee delegation and the Congress and the members of the great Committee on Ways and Means in paying tribute to this distinguished statesman from Tennessee, the late JERE COOPER.

It has been my lot in the years I have been a Member of this House to be one of those who bitterly opposed the position of the distinguished Tennessean on matters relating to our trade policies. I have engaged in some bitter floor fights with the gentleman from Tennessee over the renewal of our trade agreement. I was very much impressed by the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], in commenting on the sense of fairness of Mr. COOPER. In all of these fights in meetings of committees, and in the fights on this floor over the renewal of our trade policies, I, too, have been impressed with his fairness. He was a strong and virile fighter for the things in which he believed.

I desire to express my appreciation of the work of the distinguished gentleman as a Member of Congress and as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The things that he has accomplished will long be remembered.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I rise today to join with my colleagues in the House in their tributes to our friend and colleague, JERE COOPER. As dean of the delegation from Tennessee he was a tower of strength. He was a great leader for all of us. He advised us freely, but only when we requested his advice, because JERE COOPER did not give advice freely. I know that he truly believed in the old maxim that "unasked for advice is seldom heeded." But when we sought his counsel and his advice he gave it willingly and freely.

I have known JERE since World War I. I knew him in his youth, and I knew him after he came to the Congress, and after I came here.

It has been said at times that he was a lonely man. I do not believe that JERE was lonely. He was not a gregarious person, but he was a most congenial companion. He was a great student and he loved to work on the great problems which confronted the House of Representatives. He was a great legislator, a great leader, and in my humble belief

one of the greatest statesmen that ever graced this body.

We in Tennessee have lost a great leader and a good friend; the House of Representatives has lost a great statesman, a great parliamentarian, and the Nation has lost a leader and a statesman. Much time will pass before our grief and sense of loss is alleviated, but he will never be replaced in our hearts. Tennessee and the Nation have lost a fine public servant, and we all mourn his passing.

I extend to his family and his constituents and friends in Tennessee my deepest sympathy upon the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow I learned of the passing of my beloved and esteemed friend JERE COOPER. I join with every Member of the Congress, and every person who knew JERE as we knew him here in saying that the things JERE did were done from a great kindly heart.

JERE COOPER, in my opinion, was one of the grandest, noblest, most honorable gentlemen who has ever graced the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. I had many fine visits with JERE about legislation. He was always considerate; he always gave of his valuable time to counsel with me as he did with the rest of his colleagues.

I am sure the Honorable JERE COOPER of Tennessee will go down in history as one of the great statesmen of his time, and I pray that his enlightened leadership will be emulated over and over again by all of us who believe in this great, and good, and blessed Nation of ours.

JERE COOPER had much to do in bringing about the economic condition of this Nation; he played a great part in the raising of revenue. He was fair and just; he always thought first about those who could not help themselves. I knew JERE COOPER's heartbeat; I knew his high ideals, as you, my colleagues, knew them.

America can ill afford to lose men like JERE COOPER.

God rest his soul.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from Iowa and now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I knew JERE COOPER personally longer than any Member of this body. JERE and I were reared within 45 miles of one another, his home being in Dyersburg and mine in Jackson, and we were about the same age. I knew JERE COOPER back in his college days before World War I.

We became friends at that time and our friendship increased in warmth and respect over the years. I regarded JERE COOPER as one of of my closest and most dependable friends. He was the soul of honor and sincerity. His word was his bond. I never heard anyone question the integrity of JERE COOPER.

He was the dean of the Tennessee delegation. He was a great soldier in World War I. After World War I he returned to his home in Dyersburg and became city attorney. His first entry into statewide politics was with the late United States Senator, Lawrence D. Tyson, when he managed his State campaign. JERE COOPER was elected to the House in 1928, succeeding a great legislator and outstanding statesman, Hon. Finis J. Garrett.

We will miss JERE COOPER. We will be deprived of his counsel and his wisdom. He was sincere, he was free from petty politics or guile of any kind. The Tennessee delegation will feel keenly his loss, as will the House of Representatives and the entire Congress in losing his able, outstanding services.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his three sisters and his brother. May I say in conclusion that JERE COOPER was a great statesman. He was truly an honored, respected leader in the House. He was one of the finest presiding officers I ever knew and he was a wise, experienced parliamentarian. Our Nation can ill afford at this time to lose a statesman of the caliber of JERE COOPER.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, all of us were shocked and saddened by the untimely passing of the great and beloved chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I join in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family.

JERE COOPER was one of the first people I met when I came to Congress. He was a devoted and effective public servant and served his constituency in a most capable manner. When he became chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means he assumed the heavy responsibilities of that position with dignity, confidence, and ability. These qualities inspired in those of us who were privileged to serve under him an assurance that here was a man on whom we could rely. As a presiding officer he was eminently fair, as you who have observed him functioning as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House and upon occasion as Acting Speaker, will attest.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has lost one of its most distinguished Members, the people of his district in Tennessee have lost a most able Representative and all of us have lost a valued friend.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate my remarks with those of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] and the Members of this House who have paid tribute to this splendid son of the State of Tennessee, the late JERE COOPER.

I hesitated to join my voice in paying tribute to this great man because of my brief service in this body and because of the presence of many Members of this House who knew and worked with JERE COOPER so much longer than I. But I rise today, having known JERE COOPER since I was a little boy. I have known him always as a man of great sincerity, a man of great courage, a man of great integrity. My father and he were as close as brothers. They sat together on the Committee on Ways and Means and they fought together for fair and equitable taxes for the people of this country. These two men sat on this committee during the years when the present-day tax laws of this country were formulated.

It is these tax laws which manifest the fairness, the wisdom, and the integrity of JERE COOPER. The lasting friendship and respect of the Congress and people of this country will stand as a memorial to this great son of the State of Tennessee. I feel a great personal loss in the knowledge that JERE COOPER will no longer sit in the Congress of the United States. Each Member of this House feels that same loss, and yet the personal loss which we, his colleagues and friends, feel for this wonderful man is very small when we consider the loss which the country and the State of Tennessee feel at the passing of JERE COOPER.

I want to extend to his staff, to his devoted friend and secretary, Miss Hope Hart, to his brother and sisters, my own deep sympathy, the sympathy of my family and the sympathy of my mother who with my dad knew and respected JERE COOPER for the fine man he was. All of us, who respected and loved him, will pray to the good Lord that the soul of JERE COOPER will find everlasting peace in the arms of the God he loved and served here on earth.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] I want to express my deepest sorrow at the passing of all that could pass in this world of JERE COOPER. I sympathize so deeply with the great State of Tennessee and the great southern section of our country in their loss of their most illustrious son. I sympathize so deeply with my colleagues in the House in our loss and I sympathize so deeply in the Nation's loss. I cannot picture the House of Representatives without JERE COOPER. The history of his life is the life of an American boy grown and developed into greatness. I believe Judge DAVIS said that he started to work at 12 years of age, and I believe that work has never ceased. I hope he now from his labor is resting in God's mercy and in God's protection. I can see him now in the fight for the sort of taxation he wished. I can see him presiding over the House, as he did so many times, and I know of his granting my own wish to speak for a minute or two when members of his own committee and others sought time. I remember his tremendous ability as a legislator, his courtesy, his great dignity, and his quiet humor. In every sense of the word a true gentleman, he always seemed calm and unruffled. He never spoke of his losses and his own unhappiness, but he had a great sympathy for everyone else who was in trouble whether in a personal way or whether it was trouble in the district or in the Nation. I only wish that JERE COOPER could be with us today to help guide us

in the days to come when we are fighting the most serious cold war we have ever fought. He would give to us honest and wise counsel and the strength of a great character and the courage of a lion. My deepest sympathy goes to his family and to his State.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know JERE COOPER for almost as long as I have been in Washington and during the past 3 years I was especially fortunate to have been able to serve with him on the Committee on Ways and Means.

While his untimely passing is a great loss to the people of his district as well as the Congress and our Nation, it is also a great personal loss to me. He was a man of many talents and virtues. Soldier, lawyer, leader of men, statesman, and Congressman extraordinary describe JERE COOPER. We shall miss his leadership in the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the House of Representatives, but we shall also miss him as a friend whose cardinal virtue was that of kindness.

JERE COOPER lived by the Golden Rule every day of his life. His kindness to everyone came from his heart. He was one who did not criticize others but, instead, sought to look for their good qualities. He was never too busy to lend a helping hand to all who appealed to him. He had a sincere interest in the welfare of others for kindness dominated his whole life. Like a host of others, I shall always remember and cherish his many kindnesses to me over the years.

To his brother and sisters and other members of the family of my friend JERE COOPER, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and services of the late JERE COOPER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, we have all lost a great friend in the passing of JERE COOPER. He was a man of impeccable character, of great ability and devotion to duty.

The world is better for his having passed this way.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with heartfelt and profound sadness that I rise to pay tribute to the cherished memory of my beloved departed colleague and esteemed late chairman, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee.

As one who was privileged to be closely associated with him over a rather considerable period, I can authoritatively state that Mr. COOPER was an extremely worthwhile friend, a noble public servant, and a patriotic statesman. He served well his constituents from his great State of Tennessee but he served equally well his fellow countrymen from every State in the Union. Mr. COOPER brought to his duties a conscientious energy and a farsighted wisdom that produced in him outstanding qualities of leadership.

There can be no doubt that the untimely passing of Mr. COOPER from our midst has increased the burdens that must be borne by those of us who remain. Similarly there can be no doubt that because we have been enriched by his friendship and inspired by his leadership, we will be better qualified to cope with those added burdens. The honored memory of this distinguished citizen of Dyersburg will long remain as an inspiration and an example to aid us in dealing with the issues confronting our Nation.

I am saddened by the loss of Mr. COOPER's friendship but I am grateful for having once possessed it. His leadership will be missed but those on whom responsibility of leadership devolve will be better leaders because of his example. The greatness of our Nation was strengthened by Mr. COOPER's contribution to its achievement. The greatness of the future of our Nation will be enlarged if we will follow the ideals and principles for which Mr. COOPER stood.

We extend to Mr. COOPER's family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join my colleagues in mourning the passing of our dear friend JERE COOPER, of Tennessee. His untimely death came as a tremendous shock to me; as it did to everyone, I know; and it is still difficult to realize that he will not be with us during this session of Congress.

I deem it a great privilege to have known JERE COOPER for many years, and to have served on the same committee with him ever since I was appointed to the Committee on Ways and Means in 1943, and under his chairmanship since the opening of the 84th Congress. I can say without reservation that I know of no Member of Congress who was more diligent or more hard working than the Congressman from the 10th District of Tennessee. He seldom missed a rollcall in the House and he was always in attendance at committee meetings.

His penchant for hard work was nothing recent—it had always been one of his prime characteristics, and was undoubtedly one of the assets that carried him through the many hardships he had to face. He had not come from a wealthy family and had been forced to make his own way since the age of 12. Despite all his financial difficulties he managed to complete high school and go on to obtain his law degree at Cumberland University in Lebanon, Tenn.

Unfortunately, the story of his personal life is not a completely happy one—it contained considerable sadness. His marriage, which began happily in 1930, ended tragically less than 5 years later when his wife died suddenly of pneumonia.

Filled with sorrow over the loss of his wife, his one consolation was his little son, Jere, Jr., who was then only a baby. During the following years he divided his efforts between his work in Congress, and seeing to the needs of his son, who was a quiet studious boy, well liked by his classmates, and a source of great pride to his father. When he was 14, he made his first trip to Washington, which apparently remained in his memory as one of the greatest experiences of his life.

Then came the tragic developments of February 1951. While his father was with Jere, Jr., in their home in Dyersburg, Tenn., the boy went to sleep one evening only to awake during the night with nausea and convulsions. He died a few hours later, and the source of the trouble was never known. The second tragedy left Mr. COOPER without any close family life, and forced him more than ever to devote his interest and energy to his work in Washington.

JERE COOPER was a good man, and a kindly man. In a complex world he was one of the few people I have known who was able to maintain a simple set of values to which he rigorously adhered. We shall miss him greatly, both in the committee and in the House.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, JERE COOPER was not an easy man to know well but it was easy for anyone to recognize that he was a man of sterling character and of great ability. He was a dependable man of intense feelings, with definite convictions, and was not afraid to stand up for them. As a presiding officer he had few equals and, because of his thorough knowledge of the rules of parliamentary procedure, there were no situations he could not resolve. There was much personal sorrow in his life which he met with calm fortitude, commanding the sympathetic admiration of everyone. He was very brave.

I always had the greatest admiration for JERE COOPER and I shall miss him as indeed will everyone he came in contact with. The House of Representatives has lost a stalwart Member who contributed much and whose passing has left a great void. I extend my deepest sympathy to all his family and friends in this hour of their bereavement.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, JERE COOPER was my friend, my chairman, and my immediate neighbor sharing adjoining offices. Our association was friendly and our respective staffs were friendly.

From personal knowledge, I know the truth of the compliments and respect expressed on the floor today. I join in these sentiments. He was at all times "the gentleman from the Eighth District of Tennessee."

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has suffered a great loss in the death of JERE COOPER. All of us have lost a friend. But this applies particularly to those of us who were so closely associated with him on the Ways and Means Committee.

Duty with him always came first. He was naturally primarily concerned with his work on the Ways and Means Committee, but in spite of his arduous duties as chairman he never neglected the work of the Congress as a whole.

We all remember his constant attendance on the floor where he kept himself fully informed of what was going on in matters which did not concern his committee. When he was requested by the Speaker, as he was so often, to preside over difficult sessions of the House, no one was a better presiding officer.

Coming from a district where he had had little opportunity to study financial matters, he made it a point when he was

chosen for the Ways and Means Committee to make a deep study of the matters which came before it. Over the years he became a thorough expert on all details of taxation.

Though a strong partisan JERE when presiding was always fair to both sides of the aisle—on the floor as well as in committee.

He never broke his word to any Member.

We will miss him greatly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved, as I am sure all his colleagues were, at the news of the passing of Congressman COOPER. We have lost a valued friend, a great legislator, and a great chairman of a great committee of this House. He will be sorely missed. I join in paying tribute to him and his memory.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker. I was deeply grieved when I learned just a few days before Christmas of the untimely passing of my dear friend and colleague, the Honorable JERE COOPER.

His death brought sadness to me at Christmastime.

Congressman COOPER was Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member, and since I have had the honor of being connected with that committee I had occasion to become much better acquainted with the distinguished chairman and I had grown to love and respect him more and more. He was also dean of the Tennessee delegation.

In serving on the committee and on the floor of this body with Congressman COOPER, I knew—even at times when I differed with him on the issues—that he was sincere and conscientious and that he would fight until the bitter end to win his point of view. He served the people of his district and the people of the entire Nation ably and faithfully for more than 30 years as a Member of the United States Congress. He was, indeed, a great American statesman, a man of honor and of deep convictions. We all shall miss him.

I extend to his relatives and thousands of friends my heartfelt sympathy in the loss of a dear friend and a great leader.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that we are never so preoccupied with our own affairs that we cannot pause to admire the working of a great mind, and it was thus that I often found myself standing in open admiration of that great statesman, JERE COOPER, whose death has come at a time when we can ill afford to lose the benefit of his wisdom and the steadying influence of his firm hand.

Like the Master he has gone to meet, JERE COOPER was not unacquainted with grief, and to be close to him was to sense that his inward burden was most heavy. And yet, despite his seeming loneliness, he invariably rose to splendid heights when he was called upon to preside over this body, and the fact that he was designated to fill the Speaker's chair on so many occasions attested to the recognition of his ability as a parliamentarian and presiding officer.

It has always been heartening for me to realize that we never separate as parties when it comes to the evaluation of a Member who has been taken from us, and I know that we shall all join in lamenting the passing of this distinguished legislator whose memory will be kept forever green in the hearts of those who have been privileged to call him friend.

Mr. LANE. Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, passed away the week before Christmas.

For almost 30 years he was a Member of this House and at the time of his death was chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee.

In this responsible post and as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, he became an outstanding parliamentarian. Through the years his colleagues placed complete confidence in his judgment and in his integrity.

For JERE COOPER was a gentleman all the way.

In the heat of legislative battles, when partisan viewpoints and personalities tended toward extremes, the wise counsels and patient manner of Representative COOPER restored reason and dignity to the legislative process, such was the high respect in which he was held by all.

Like so many of the Members of this House, he came from a humble family, and learned at an early age the virtues of hard work. In the tradition of our classless society, he won recognition by his own efforts and developed the talents which were to serve his constituents and the Nation with distinction.

Lawyer, veteran, and churchworker, he lived every moment of his journey through life as one who never forgot his responsibilities to his country and to God.

JERE COOPER, the man from Tennessee, has left us for life eternal, but as with all men that we are privileged to know and admire, the memory of his fine human qualities will ever be a part of us.

His was the grace of quiet leadership that was dedicated to the best interests of a free people.

JERE COOPER has gone, but the years of work and friendship that we shared with him are an experience that we shall always treasure.

For he strengthened our faith in democratic institutions and in the ability of representative government to overcome any challenge from any quarter. May his example continue to inspire us as we face the stern tasks ahead.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that all of us read of the untimely death of JERE COOPER. It can be truthfully said he was a man without an enemy. A man of great ability, an expert in the field of tax and tariff legislation, and chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee, he commanded an important place in the House of Representatives. He will be sorely missed in the eventful days ahead.

As a parliamentarian, he possessed unusual skill and few men presided as gracefully as he. In my many years of close association with JERE COOPER, I never heard him utter an unkind word or criticism of another Member.

Men of the caliber of JERE COOPER gave a powerful strength to the Congress. Tennessee has lost a fine American and a great legislator in his death. My deepest sympathy is extended to his family in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tributes being paid to JERE COOPER. He was a statesman of the old southern school. The dignity of his bearing was an example for all of us. The integrity of his positions on the issues before the Congress was an even more important example. It is a privilege to have served in the House of Representatives with him.

I include as part of my remarks a very fitting tribute paid him in the Memphis Commercial-Appeal by Morris Cunningham, the Washington correspondent for that paper:

MIDSOUTH WILL FEEL LOSS IN DEATH OF JERE COOPER, AN EFFICIENT LAWMAKER—IN HIS QUIET WAY REPRESENTATIVE FROM DYERSBURG HAD BECOME AN IMPORTANT LEADER AND POWER IN CONGRESS

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, January 4.—The death of Representative JERE COOPER was a distinct loss to the interests of the Midsouth.

His passing, in Bethesda Naval Hospital December 18, will be felt in many legislative, governmental, and political fields in the forthcoming session of Congress.

In his quiet, unassuming way, Mr. COOPER had become one of the leaders of Congress, a man known for his high degree of personal integrity. His views, as a consequence, always commanded respectful attention.

Never an accomplished speaker, his effectiveness in floor debates flowed from the obvious sincerity of his statements. This same quality served him equally well in the leadership councils to which he increasingly was invited.

Yet it was characteristic of Mr. COOPER that despite his steadily rising station and increasing responsibilities he never lost sight of the interests of his constituents.

No striver for national or international renown, no seeker of headlines, his interests were those of his district, his State, his region, and his country, in about that order.

His favorite newspaper was not the New York Times or any of the other big eastern papers so popular with the politically ambitious, but the Dyersburg State Gazette, which he faithfully read and kept stacked in his office.

FOUGHT FOR SOUTH'S WAY OF LIFE

With dignity and logic, he fought through the years for the Tennessee Valley Authority, for flood control, for cotton legislation, and for preserving the South's way of life.

The House's sixth-ranking Democrat, and chairman of the taxwriting House Ways and Means Committee, he was saddled with terribly complicated chores.

Foremost among them was the task of keeping the tax laws equitable and adequate for the Nation's needs. Many men understandably would have shrunk from such exacting demands, but by working unbelievably long hours Mr. COOPER handled them as well as his other duties.

For a great many years he had occupied the same single room in the unpretentious Washington hotel when he was in Washington, which was most of the year.

A familiar sight to the room clerks was Mr. COOPER coming in from the Capitol after dark with a stack of papers and books to be studied during the night.

His power and influence, as well as his dignity and excellent manners, made him one of Washington's most attractive figures socially, but only rarely would he accept one of the social invitations that cascaded upon him.

The glitter of Washington's international society held no attraction. The few invitations he accepted were related to his district or region. These included the occasional dinners and luncheons of the Tennessee Society in Washington, the annual dinner of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, and a few others.

LOST BOTH HIS WIFE AND SON

He enjoyed cigarettes, but was a resolute tectotaler in respect to anything alcoholic.

On behalf of Gov. Frank Clement, of Tennessee, I once persuaded him to attend a National Press Club party to present an honorary Tennessee colonelship to Tony Vaccaro, formerly of Memphis, who was retiring as president of the club.

Mr. COOPER's remarks were appropriately humorous and were well received. He seemed to be enjoying himself, but soon afterward he left, explaining that his nightly chores were waiting.

Because of his retiring nature and disinterest in personal publicity, Mr. COOPER was a poor news source. As a result, the important role he played in Congress was not well publicized.

An article by Sidney Shalett in the Saturday Evening Post, January 8, 1955, described him as the loneliest man in Washington.

A warm, friendly analysis, the article stressed the death of Mr. COOPER's wife in 1935, only 5 years after their marriage, and the subsequent death in 1951 of Jere, Jr., 16, their only child.

Mr. COOPER undoubtedly brooded over both of these tragedies and they accounted for a great part of his seeming shyness and almost superhuman work schedule.

His talents, his dignity and logic, and his capacity for work will be missed.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing profound sadness and a deep sense of loss over the untimely death of my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, JERE COOPER.

JERE was, as has been so eloquently pointed out by my colleagues today, a Christian gentleman in the highest sense of the word. He was a man of great courage in the face of personal adversity; he was a legislator and statesman of outstanding ability; and he was one who possessed those personal attributes of character which we all admire and respect.

JERE COOPER was a man of sound judgment and possessed a deep understanding and knowledge of the operations of our Government and in particular the processes of this great legislative body. We have all observed him many times when he was sitting in the chair and the precise and careful manner in which he presided, with dignity and consideration for all, regardless of the point of view being at that time espoused by individual Members.

He served his district and his Nation with distinction, and as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means he devoted all of his energies and all of his waking hours to his heavy responsibilities and duties. He was a gentleman of strong will and great integrity. At the same time, as has also been so eloquently pointed out by my colleagues, he was a man of great modesty and unassuming in his personal demeanor.

His death was a shock to all of us, and I add my voice to those who have so fittingly paid tribute to him today. I extend my deepest condolences and sympathy to members of his family. The Christian example of his leadership will serve as an inspiration to all of us.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion to return to the Congress following a recess to find that death has taken a colleague with whom one has served for many years. It was with a sad heart that I learned of the death of the Honorable JERE COOPER, but a few short weeks before he would have begun his 30th year of service to the people of his native State of Tennessee—and to the people of the Nation—in the House of Representatives.

All of us here in the House will miss him as a person, with his inherent kindness and friendly interest. And we shall all miss him as a colleague who had a great understanding of the rules of the House. We shall miss his ability in presiding, whether it was in the committee which he so ably chairmaned, or in the House itself. The House will not be quite the same without this dedicated man's devotion to the programs and interests of the people, and without that fairness which was always present in his relationships with his colleagues.

When one reflects on the death of a valued colleague there arises the question of why this man, who could have given many more years of service to his Nation, was taken. But we do not question the will of God, and we are reassured when we remember that JERE COOPER was a deeply religious man, devoted to Christian principles. He lived a life full of service to his fellow man, and he leaves a lasting example of public service as a beacon to light the paths of those to follow.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we shall miss this man as a great chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. We shall miss this man as an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. And we shall miss him as a man among men.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my words of praise for JERE COOPER. When I first came to the Congress, he was one of the first men that I met and it seemed that our paths crossed on many occasions.

It was an early discovery that we both belonged to the same college fraternity. There were many other common interests which I hope I was privileged to share with this respected colleague of ours. I was impressed that he was ever attentive to his duties in the Congress and always conscious of the responsibilities that his years of service and his position in the House of Representatives imposed upon him.

This is one of the marks of true statesmenship which could be an example to many others.

Another outstanding characteristic of JERE COOPER was the fact that he believed in those principles that had made this country great, and he was not one to foresake those principles for some of the many untried and false theories which unfortunately are being presented to all of us by certain groups.

Furthermore, he was exemplary in the fact that he did not speak often but when he spoke, all Members listened.

In pointing out these characteristics, I wish to include an editorial from the Fort Wayne Journal Gazette under date of December 20, 1957:

PASSING OF JERE COOPER

Many American citizens may not be conscious of ever having read or heard the name of JERE COOPER, yet he was one of the most powerful men in our National Government.

COOPER, who was Congressman from the Eighth Tennessee District, died Wednesday night at the Bethesda Naval Hospital.

He was chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee which handles tax legislation. This is one of the most responsible jobs in Congress.

Despite his power, COOPER did not get many headlines. He was modest and retiring and a bachelor. He gave most of his time and attention to his important duties.

The man who is in line to succeed COOPER as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is Representative WILBUR MILLS of the Second Arkansas District. MILLS is 48 years of age and a graduate of Harvard Law School. He is a conservative Democrat and brings to his new position a vast amount of experience, having been a Member of Congress since 1939.

It might be said in passing that the officeholders who make the most noise do not always wield the most power.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join in and endorse the statements which have been made by my colleagues.

Anything that might here be said by me would not adequately express my respect for the ability, integrity, and public service which was in this body rendered by our departed colleague, JERE COOPER.

Departing, no man could leave behind him greater reason for the admiration for a record of service than that made by our colleague.

Always faithful to the trust reposed in him by his people; neither he nor his friends have any cause to regret either the manner or the degree in which he performed his duty.

He left a record which all may seek to equal—few, if any, will ever excell.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, JERE COOPER and I first came to Congress at the same time. Serving here with him over the past 30 years has been, for me, a rich and rewarding experience. I grieve for his loss deeply and personally; this body will miss him, the country will miss him.

We are indebted to a generous province that we have had among us such a great patriot, blessed with extraordinary talents and dedicated to the service of his country. With these talents, and in his allotted time, JERE COOPER has built a monument of service and good accomplishments far higher than any monument we could build to him. This monument will live and endure. His accomplishments will continue to serve the good of mankind, and his service will continue to inspire other men and women to great and good accomplishments.

Mr. DOYLE. Upon my entrance upon my duties as a Member of this great legislative body, about 11 years ago, I was immediately attracted to the evident fairness, soundness, sincerity, and ability of JERE COOPER in his every debate upon the floor or when he presided as Acting Speaker or Chairman of the Committee as a Whole. I also noted his cordial attitude toward Members who spoke with

him. Therefore, I promptly began to submit some of my problems as a freshman Member to him. I always found him approachable and generous with his time and talent.

I suppose in about a dozen instances during these six terms I sought and relied upon his suggestions in answer to my questions. His able, sincere, Christian statesmanship and behavior appealed to me from the start.

The last subject I discussed with him, and about which I sought his mature judgment, was that of less than honorable discharges from the Military Establishments. He again freely gave me cordial hearing for a few minutes and then pleased me much by his telling me of some of the cases of lads who had received less than honorable discharges of one type or another; he greatly encouraged me and was truly helpful in the passage by the House of that bill.

When I read in the Washington paper a short time ago of his illness I naturally rushed to him at the hospital a short Christmas greeting and message of good will for his speedy and complete recovery. I am so thankful he received it a few days before his untimely death. And then I received from his loyal secretary the following letter:

MY DEAR FRIEND: Your Christmas greeting card was received in this office just before the death of our beloved Congressman, the Honorable JERE COOPER.

Mr. COOPER always enjoyed his Christmas cards and took great pleasure in answering each one with a personal letter. I visited him at the hospital just a few hours before he died and took the unanswered cards and letters that had come in up to that day. He had me read each one of them to him and then asked me to acknowledge them and bring them back for his signature. He was in good spirits and talked about returning to his office in a few weeks. That was my last visit with him. His sudden death, with its shock and grief to his office staff, has delayed this message until today.

If you care to correspond with this office during the next month about any service we may be able to render, you may send a letter to the address given below.

With my wish for the blessings of good health, peace, and happiness in the coming New Year, I am,

Sincerely your friend,

HOPE HART, *Secretary.*

Mrs. Doyle and I extend to his family our sincere and understanding sympathy. Even though he has passed on to his just reward and is no longer personally present daily in our midst, I know you will agree with me when I say of his life amongst us that it was a timely example of the power which a sincere, honest, upright, able, and dedicated life is certain to generate and perpetuate.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the untimely passing of my good friend and beloved colleague, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Dyersburg, Tenn.

JERE was first elected to the 71st Congress and served continuously in this body until the time of his death at the Bethesda Naval Hospital on December 18 last.

As chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives he served with great honor and distinction. He was a fine American, one whose first thought was of his country and of the people he represented in the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Tennessee. JERE commanded the respect and admiration of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He was always kind, just, and humble in his dealings with his fellow men and was, in my opinion, a gentleman of the old school.

I have lost a true and dear friend, and I shall for the rest of my life have a very warm recollection of JERE COOPER.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, in joining with my colleagues of the House of Representatives in the final tribute to a highly respected and dearly beloved colleague, I am extremely conscious of the fact that without exception the Members of this House are generously kind and graciously courteous to freshmen Members. At least, I have found this to be so.

No one was kinder, more gracious, nor more helpful than the outstanding and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the esteemed and respected gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable JERE COOPER. Though occupied with onerous and most responsible duties as chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means—a subject in which he was extremely knowledgable—JERE COOPER always had time for a friendly and encouraging word, sound advice on a problem, or a helping hand for those in need.

I had not known that JERE COOPER was ill. Following my return from Hawaii and from committee activities after the adjournment of Congress, I picked up the paper on December 17, 1957, and noticed an item reporting that Chairman COOPER was ill and in the hospital. I am most grateful that instead of turning toward home that same evening, I continued on to the hospital on the off chance that I might be able to see him. At his insistence, I did see him and we talked briefly. His spirits were high, he looked well and he was confident of the future, for he asked me to come back when I could stay longer.

The next evening I heard a radio broadcast announcing that he had passed on. I thank, from the bottom of my heart, the Almighty who guides our steps that I had had this last opportunity.

For JERE COOPER had done me great honor. Typical of his kindness, he had invited me to sit with him one day in the dining room for lunch. This was a Saturday afternoon and late. I did not get to lunch the next Saturday. The following Monday on the floor, Chairman COOPER asked where I had been on Saturday. As a result, we regularly had lunch together on Saturdays. I was thus afforded an opportunity of knowing the true breadth and greatness of as dedicated a servant of the people as has ever served the people of his district and of the State.

It is customary that we speak well of the dead. The Members and Delegates in the House speak well of their colleagues. None of the tribute, none of the praise, none of the accolade accorded JERE COOPER are exaggerated in the slightest. JERE COOPER deserves every bit of praise, every bit of honor and every tribute, and more, for he was a Christian who practiced his faith in his daily life.

To his surviving family and to his constituents I express my deepest sympathy. And, as I reflected on my loss, the loss of the country, and the mystery of the hereafter, I was reminded of the poem we all know:

Abou Ben Adhem, may his tribe increase
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace
And saw within the moonlight in his room,
Making it rich, and like a lily in bloom,
An angel writing in a book of gold.
Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
and to the presence in the room, he said,
"What writest thou?"
The vision raised its head, and with a look
made of all sweet accord, answered,
"The names of those who love the Lord."
"And is mine one" said Abou
"Nay, not so," replied the angel.
Abou spoke more low, but cheerily still; and said,
"I pray thee then, write me as one who loves his fellow men."
The angel wrote, and vanished.
The next night it came again with great wakening light,
And showed names whom Lord of God had blessed,
And, lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest.

I am sure that the name of JERE COOPER was mighty high on the list.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and deeply touched by the sad news of the sudden, untimely passing of our distinguished friend and beloved colleague, the Honorable JERE COOPER. Congressman COOPER was one of the great men of the House, and one of the great Americans of our time. He exemplified, in his personal and official life, the most cherished attributes of the dedicated statesman, and the most gracious and impressive qualities of a noble Christian gentleman.

JERE COOPER commanded the respect, admiration, and affection of every Member of the House. His career was typically American. By hard work, outstanding ability, perseverance, and courage, he rose steadily in life until he achieved one of the highest positions in the Congress of the United States. His contributions to our Nation were truly noteworthy and historic.

JERE COOPER was a modest and self-effacing man, devoid of bombast and hypocrisy, devoted to his family and friends and to his work.

A painstaking, brilliant student of government, particularly questions of taxation and revenue, and one of the greatest parliamentarians in the history of the House, he was resolute of purpose, dedicated in his Americanism, and indomitable in his ceaseless striving for the betterment of the American Government and the American people.

JERE COOPER was a man of many diverse interests, and his versatility and flexibility of mind enabled him to master the most intricate problems of statescraft. In his personal relationships, he was kindly, amiable, and thoughtful of others, invariably willing to hold out the hand of valued counsel and helpfulness to those who sought, in his alert, well-informed mind and rich experience, some solution to their problems.

Manifestly, the House can never adequately fill the void which his sorrowful demise has left in our official and personal lives. He was so distinctly a rare individual, and so devotedly a true champion of the House and of his country—stalwart, strong, and inspiring, noble of purpose, warm in his friendships, loved by family and friends, consecrated in the best sense to the fulfillment of America's noblest destiny that indeed we shall never look upon his like again.

In the House, in his district, in his State, and in the Nation, a giant oak has fallen, and we join in sorrowful tribute to his memory in mourning the great loss which his family, his constituency, and the Nation has suffered in the passing of this great, loyal son of the Volunteer State.

It is with a full heart indeed that I join with Members of the House in expressing my sympathy and condolences to his bereaved family. May the good Lord in His kindness and mercy lighten their heavy burden of sorrow, and may our noble friend, JERE COOPER, find lasting and abiding peace in his eternal home.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with others in paying tribute to the memory of the late JERE COOPER, the distinguished and able chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means.

When I was first elected to Congress a number of years ago, I soon made the acquaintance of JERE COOPER, and it was not long before I discovered that he was a tower of strength in the House of Representatives. JERE COOPER was a man of tremendous energy and great ability. His devotion and dedication to duty were outstanding. I am glad that we live in a country that can produce men of the stature of the late Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. We honor ourselves today when we pay tribute to the memory of our departed colleague.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on the walls of the Ways and Means Committee hearing room are found oil paintings of former distinguished Members of this House who during the past 100 years have been chairmen of that great and important committee. An oil painting of JERE COOPER hangs there to show that he belongs to that galaxy of distinguished statesmen. In my humble opinion the name of JERE COOPER ranks very near the top of that roster.

JERE COOPER should be characterized as having been a perfectionist. Whatever activity or responsibility he undertook, whether presiding over the deliberations of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, presiding over the deliberations of the Ways and Means Committee, or standing in the well of the House to explain the intricacies of a complicated tax bill that was before the House for consideration and action, JERE COOPER could be said to be perfection itself. He was undoubtedly one of the most able, one of the best qualified, one of the most efficient Members of this House during the past quarter of a century.

In his attitude toward legislation, in his calm, logical, judicial manner of tackling knotty legislative matters, JERE COOPER reminded me of our former colleague, Fred Vinson, who afterward became Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. If JERE COOPER had been permitted to follow in the footsteps of Fred Vinson, he would undoubtedly have added grace and dignity to that Court, performed the duties of that office with great credit to himself, and with satisfaction to the majority of the American people, located in all sections of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, moments such as these call for words of solace, of hope, of encouragement. My sentiments are best expressed in the words of an unknown poet who wrote a short poem entitled "There Is No Death." I offer it to you as an expression of my feelings at this time:

THERE IS NO DEATH

There is no death! the stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death! the dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death! although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are born from our embracing arms.

Although with bowed and breaking heart,
With sable garb and silent tread
We bear their senseless dust to earth,
And say that they are dead.

They are not dead! they have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Tho' disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here and love us yet:
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

And we, his colleagues, will not forget JERE COOPER.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without mentioning the kindness which I received as a new Member of Congress last year from the Honorable JERE COOPER who had the patience and took the time to give me much useful advice in connection with my efforts to serve my constituents.

From time to time last year, when problems arose in my office dealing with matters before the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. COOPER could always be counted upon to provide invaluable guidance, and I shall always appreciate that help.

I was impressed by the unceasing efforts he put forward as a Member of Congress. His constituents were most fortunate in having him as their Representative. I feel he gave his life to them and to his country.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join our colleagues from Tennessee in paying a word of tribute to one of the great men of this House. JERE COOPER was a skilled and finished legislator and parliamentarian in every sense of the term. He presided over his committee and over this House while in the Committee of the Whole with rare distinction. He presented legislation from the Committee on Ways and Means with great thoroughness and force.

He was a kind and helpful colleague and friend, ever willing to extend a hand to a younger Member of the House. Time and again I have been the recipient of his generous assistance. JERE COOPER was a man of courage and determination. He was not quick to form opinions but he was steadfast in his convictions. He was one of the great legislators of our time.

We will all miss him sorely in the arduous days ahead. I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the Honorable JERE COOPER, whose untimely passing came as a great shock to us all. As the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, he served our Nation well. He will long be remembered for his untiring efforts to make our tax laws more equitable for all our citizens. JERE COOPER's great ability, his sincerity and courage brought admiration and respect from all who served with him in this body. It was a great privilege and honor to have known him as a friend.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest of heartfelt sadness that I join with the distinguished members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and the entire delegation of the great State of Tennessee in expressing my sorrow over the untimely passing of one of America's leading statesmen and my esteemed friend, JERE COOPER.

The Congress and the Nation, in my estimation, have lost one of the ablest leaders to have appeared on our scene for many long years. JERE COOPER was a man possessed of genuineness and of exceptional vision, of kindness and wisdom. His contributions to his country and to his friends will surely serve as a monument to his memory outlasting the most permanent of man-made shrines.

When I arrived in Washington to take my place as a Member of this body, I sought out JERE COOPER for advice and guidance and friendship. He gave to me unstintingly, without hesitation. I shall long remember his generosity, his keenness of mind and farsightedness.

Mr. Speaker, I mourn the passing of JERE COOPER, who, in my opinion, was one of the greatest statesmen of our time.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House has sustained an irreparable loss in the death of the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee. For a period of 29 years JERE COOPER served his country in a diligent and conscientious manner. As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means his responsibilities were manifold, but never during his tenure as a Representative did he neglect the problems of his constituents. And somehow in addition to all his other obligations he found time to manifest a true interest in his neighboring State of Kentucky.

JERE COOPER will long be missed, for such ability as he possessed is not soon replaced. It was, indeed, a privilege to witness his presentation of the bills reported from the Committee on Ways and Means. He was a master of many sub-

jects, and his lucid descriptions of the bills were enlightening to all.

To appreciate fully the character of this man, one must know that he experienced profound sorrow in the death of his wife and only son. Transcending his suffering, however, was JERE COOPER'S faith in God and devotion to duty. These intrinsic qualities brought to him not only the respect and admiration of his colleagues but the abiding affection of his constituents.

JERE COOPER'S innumerable achievements have won him the gratitude of his district, his State, and the Congress of the United States. As a personal friend I would like to extend my very deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the South has produced many outstanding statesmen for whom it has held justifiable pride. One of these who held a place of unquestioned leadership was our late, honored, and beloved colleague, JERE COOPER, of Tennessee. His contributions to public life were manifold. Now we are saddened by his absence. Those of us who had the pleasure of serving with him will long remember the outstanding faith and devotion which JERE COOPER gave to his constituents, his State, and his Nation. I join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest regrets at his passing. No one who knew him can fail to realize the magnitude of our loss.

JERE COOPER was outstanding in all that he did. Particularly, however, will he be remembered for his untiring service and contributions as chairman of the important Ways and Means Committee where he presided with dignity, honor, and integrity.

From the time that I first came to Congress, I held him in highest esteem and benefited from his counsel. I never failed to be impressed by the splendid manner in which he conducted himself in his work as a Member of Congress. By his presence here he added substantially to the standing of the Congress and to the soundness of its deliberations.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the new Members of the 85th Congress, I learned to hold the late Mr. COOPER in the high esteem and regard I witnessed on every hand from the other and older Members of Congress. He was a dedicated legislator, and any man might well model his devotion to his Congressional duties to the pattern set by this great gentleman from Tennessee.

Few of us remember any session, or part of a legislative day, in the first year of the 85th Congress, that Mr. COOPER was not present on the floor, listening intently to the procedure. I always felt that he had a magnificent grasp of procedure and frequently went over to him for explanation of some parliamentary maneuver. He always had time for us, and made us feel that he was interested in everything we did or said.

It would indeed be hard to measure his contribution to his country. I shall not attempt to do so. I am aware most vividly of the personal contribution he made in the lives and thinking of new Congressmen.

I will always think of him as a great and kindly man, devoted patriot, and exemplary American.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed Member, JERE COOPER.

There was a dignity to JERE COOPER that immediately brought him to my attention when, several years ago, I first took my seat in Congress.

There was an aura of courtesy about him that colored his speech and his actions and made him all the more effective in his work here.

There was a confirming sense of sincerity in his work that made you listen and think when he was speaking whether you were in agreement or not.

We shall miss him sorely, for he added to this body those things we need to make this House of Representatives what it should be to this Nation and the world.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deepest sorrow that I rise at the first of this new session to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of my good friend and chairman, JERE COOPER.

Others have spoken at length on his qualities as a statesman and as an individual. I concur fully with what has been said and can only add that, no matter how hard we may try to give expression to our deep feeling of loss over his death, we all find that words are inadequate.

JERE COOPER brought to bear on his heavy duties and responsibilities dedicated principles and moral values which will always stand as an example to his colleagues. His sense of fairness, his unquestioned integrity and his quiet dignity were attributes of character which set JERE COOPER apart from the rank and file and which distinguished him as one whose actions were worthy of emulation by his friends and colleagues.

He presided over the Committee on Ways and Means and over the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, with precision and high professional ability. He was a Christian gentleman who was kind, considerate, and thoughtful with respect to feelings of others. He gave helpful advice and counsel to a host of new Members of this great legislative body. I treasured his friendship highly and in his passing I have lost a close friend. The Nation, at a time when it can ill afford it, has lost a great legislator and statesman.

To the members of his family, I extend deepest sympathy.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, in the untimely passing of JERE COOPER the Nation, the great Volunteer State of Tennessee, and the Congress of the United States lost a valuable public servant, and the people of all walks of life lost a great champion.

I have the honor to represent the Kentucky district immediately adjacent to the Eighth District of Tennessee which he has so ably represented for many years and, therefore, on the borderlines of Kentucky and Tennessee we have enjoyed many mutual friends—for the division line is a phantom line so far as friendships are concerned. We have had common problems in representing our constituency, and it has been a source of genuine satisfaction to work with him throughout these years.

Mr. Speaker, in my service in Congress and as a member of the great committee over which he so ably presided as chairman, I have never known a man more dedicated to duty than JERE COOPER. To JERE COOPER his responsibility to his country, to his State and his district always came first. He gave his service to his country in uniform and later in public life, and I think it might appropriately be said that he gave his life for his country and died in line of duty.

Shortly before his passing I had the great privilege of being with him in Tennessee at a meeting called to further the interests of west Tennessee and west Kentucky, at which time he was, as usual, endeavoring to be of service to his constituency. JERE COOPER has left a challenge to others to carry on for the benefit of humanity and has left virtues long to exist, carved on the tablets of love and memory.

In his passing the Nation has lost a great statesman, his family a devoted brother, and I a good friend. I know how that with his great faith, his Christian spirit, so evident in life, he is enjoying the reward for a life well spent on this earth.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the State of Tennessee and all America lost a valuable public servant when JERE COOPER passed away on December 18, 1957. I feel my personal loss deeply. He was too valuable a friend and legislator to lose.

JERE COOPER not only knew his government, but he had a great faith in our way of life. His life was dedicated to its preservation and its betterment.

His death has taken from the House of Representatives a tireless and extremely capable expert in the field of taxation. His expert judgment, ceaseless efforts, and devotion to his duties as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means stand as a memorial to him.

There is one thing we can never forget about JERE COOPER, and that was his constant demonstration of the results of hard work and complete devotion to duty. From the time he was 12 years of age he made his own way in the world. He never complained but looked toward a goal and attained it.

JERE COOPER'S services to his nation included distinguished efforts on the field of battle in World War I and devoted service to the American Legion on local, State, and national levels.

When our late colleague presided over highly controversial sessions of the House, he commanded respect and praise from both sides of the aisle. He was a loyal Democrat but first of all he was a loyal American. It was a privilege to know him. Time will continue to reveal JERE COOPER'S contributions to this Nation in many areas, but particularly in the fields of economic and political growth.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of JERE COOPER in expressing my sorrow at his untimely passing.

I subscribe to every tribute which has been paid him here today. JERE COOPER represented the finest as a man and as a

statesman. He was able, industrious, sincere, and courageous.

His death is a great loss to the Nation, and his record here will always be a challenge to all.

I join in expressing my sincere sympathy to his relatives and friends.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal loss that I pay my humble tribute to the memory of our late colleague, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee.

We have lost a great statesman, a wonderful friend, and a distinguished colleague. It seems strange indeed to attend sessions of the House and find that JERE COOPER is no longer here. He was a great inspiration to those of us who were privileged to serve with him in the House, and his wise counsel and good advice will be sorely missed. Congressman COOPER will be long remembered for his many wonderful qualities.

My sympathy goes out especially to his family and Congressional staff in their great loss.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for his staff and his family and the Tennessee delegation, I wish to express our very deep and sincere appreciation for the moments in which so many beautiful tributes have been expressed.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 421

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JERE COOPER, a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

---

## THE LATE HONORABLE HENDERSON LANHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the sudden and tragic death of a distinguished Georgian, the late HENDERSON LOVELACE LANHAM.

Mr. LANHAM was killed instantly on November 10 when his car collided with a train in Rome, Ga., as he was proceeding to address a parent-teachers' association meeting at a nearby school.

I know of no Member of the House more devoted to his constituents, his district, and his State, than the late HENDERSON LANHAM.

Born in Rome, Ga., in 1888, and educated in the public schools of Rome and the Piedmont Institute at Rockmart, Ga., Mr. LANHAM was the recipient of a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Georgia, as well as a bachelor of laws degree from the same university.

Mr. LANHAM also had a master of arts degree from the Harvard University Graduate School.

He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa and Delta Theta Phi law fraternity.

HENDERSON LANHAM had a long and distinguished record as a public servant. He served as chairman of the Board of Education of the city of Rome, and later as a member of the house of representatives in the Georgia General Assembly. He was also solicitor general for the Rome judicial circuit, and was elected to the 80th Congress, and each succeeding Congress.

In his early career in the Congress he served as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and was one of the architects of the foreign aid program. He recognized the necessity for the maintenance of a strong free world and was convinced of the urgency of a properly executed foreign aid program.

He became a member of the Appropriations Committee in the 84th Congress and an outstanding member of the Subcommittees on Health, Education, and Welfare, and, because of his outstanding contributions on the Foreign Affairs Committee, a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

HENDERSON LANHAM was a man of integrity, sincerity, and brilliance. He never hesitated to do what he thought was right, regardless of the consequences. He was as outspoken in his views on maintaining a strong national defense. He had the courage of his convictions and never hesitated to express those convictions.

HENDERSON LANHAM was also a devout man—a man who practiced the teachings of Christ, and who lived by the Golden Rule.

The Nation can ill afford to lose men of his stature in these troubled times. His devoted friends and colleagues from the Georgia delegation paid their last respects to an outstanding American citizen when they attended Mr. LANHAM's funeral in Rome, Ga. The chairman of his Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, the distinguished Member from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], represented the Appropriations Committee.

To his family, his countless friends, and constitutents, I extend my deepest sympathy. HENDERSON LANHAM faithfully served his State and his Nation; he was true to his friends, and true to his Christian principles.

He earned the epitaph "Christian statesman." It is an honor to which many aspire, but few attain.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks editorials that appeared in various Georgia newspapers concerning the tragic death of the late HENDERSON LANHAM.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRESTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. The Atlanta Journal in an editorial written just after the death of Mr. LANHAM said:

Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, of Rome, for 11 years brought the Georgia delegation in Congress a special quota of intellect and political courage not easily found, or replaced, in politics.

Mr. LANHAM was that rare personality who wore a Phi Beta Kappa key lightly enough to bore no one, much less the voters of his Seventh District. And yet he wore it seriously enough to keep himself intellectually aggressive throughout a long and busy political career.

He was, in fact, a man who was as much at home with books as with people and politics, and it speaks loads for him that he was as favored a speaker on college campuses as he was on the stump for election to the Georgia General Assembly or to Congress.

Mr. LANHAM was a liberal, politically. This placed him often at odds with members of the Georgia delegation, or at least votewise, for his fellow congressmen admired him personally and respected his courage in voting always what he believed best for his State and his district.

The Cedartown Standard carried the following article written by Fields Whatley:

Many things man shall never understand. The tragic death of HENDERSON LANHAM emphasizes again the strange decrees that providence so often issues. Another link in the golden chain of friendship has been broken, and only God knows the answer.

Our friend did not live nor think in petty terms. Nor did he make fine things small and beautiful things unattractive. He saw truth clearly, placing spiritual and mental values on the highest plateau of service to his fellow man.

Quiet and modest, he held the lifelong respect of thousands of admirers. A constant effort on his part to put nobler purposes into the lives of his constituents helped sow the seed of Christianity among his followers:

Man, with all his faults, is God's masterpiece. His existence on the shores of time is very brief. Life begets death, but God brings resurrection. Death is a solemn moment to a friend—a sacred moment to the family.

As a river gets deeper as it nears the sea, so such a life as our friend gets deeper and richer and mellower as it approaches eternity. After all has been said, service to a fellow man is the greatest of all virtues.

The memory of HENDERSON LANHAM, as the days come and go, will be an unending reminder of a life quietly and unselfishly lived. Truly, his years were well spent. Words spoken in accents soft, attest the admiration and love of his friends.

Harold Davis, writing in the Atlanta Journal, said:

The death of HENDERSON LANHAM of Rome removes from the scene Georgia's most liberal and most intellectual Congressman.

From his seat on the House Appropriations Committee, the Rome solon fought effectively for the programs that were close to his heart—ideals which the ultra conservative called New Deal but which he felt were necessary for the well-being of the little man.

LANHAM was an intellectual by any standards. He was a Phi Beta Kappa who seldom wore his key. The walls of his office were lined with books—mostly read and digested. And his appetite for good music was deep indeed.

In his apartment in the Methodist Building, a stone's throw from the Capitol, he had a fine high-fidelity set and a comprehensive library of classical records. The machine was seldom silent when he was at home.

LANHAM wore his intellectual achievements lightly and with modesty; he never felt called upon to apologize for them, even though they are not usually political assets.

In tribute to Congressman LANHAM, the Atlanta Constitution said:

Eleven years ago a stately, scholarly Rome lawyer, HENDERSON LANHAM, left the home and the rose garden which was his hobby and went to Washington as Representative from Georgia's Seventh District.

Judge LANHAM gave his district no reason to regret the trust it had placed in him. He established himself as a legislator of dili-

gence, intelligence, integrity, and independence.

He asked no favors, he dodged no issues, he rarely missed a rollcall.

He was loyal to party, yet he could and did rise above the partisan and the section to vote on a measure according to what he considered the national interest.

Georgians are grieved at the passing of this man who was appreciated and respected by his constituents and loved by those who knew him intimately.

The mourning goes well beyond the confines of a Congressional district and a State.

The Nation has lost a public servant for whom the motivation was the greatest good to the greatest number.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all of Georgia was grieved and saddened by the tragic death of HENDERSON LANHAM on November 10, 1957, in a traincar collision in his hometown of Rome, Ga., on his way to address a parent-teachers' association meeting. His death was a grievous blow and loss not only to Georgia and the Southland, but to the entire Nation.

HENDERSON LANHAM was loved and respected by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. His 10 years of service in the House and his membership on the House Appropriations Committee gained for him both respect and influence in the House. He was an independent thinker and a man of profound learning and integrity. He was also a lover of nature and of music.

The Seventh District of Georgia elected him to Congress six times, and he was rewarded with worthy and important committee assignments by the House, where he served so well and capably.

In 1957, HENDERSON LANHAM received the American Vocational Association's distinguished service citation, the second Georgian to be so honored. In 51 years only 6 Americans have been given this worthy award.

Georgia and the Nation have lost a valuable public servant and friend whose life was spent in the lofty motivation of the greatest good for the greatest number. His fine character, his gentle manner, and the steadfastness of his convictions will always live in the memory of those whose lives he touched. HENDERSON will be missed greatly by his colleagues in the House where he served so well and so long. He was my friend, and I grieve for his loss with his loved ones.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, in this great land of America, most men are God-fearing Christians. Occasionally one man ranks among men as a true paragon of Christian living. HENDERSON LANHAM was such a man.

He was fearless—afraid of nothing but to do wrong; he was courageous—requiring only his own clear conscience to sustain him; he was wise for he searched for truth; he was sympathetic for he understood the simple and the complex; he was forceful—yet always gentle.

Standing in his study off the living room of his home in Rome, Ga., one could see his love of everything good: flowers, music, history, law, people, and above all his love and belief in God. Open on his desk, where shortly before his tragic death, he was in characteristic study, was an essay by one of the great ministers entitled "The Assurance of Immortality."

And, so he died as he lived, with thoughts only of good. No finer public servant, no one more dedicated to the ideals of democracy has lived with us. Certainly among all who knew him he "shall not perish but have everlasting life."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep sadness that I ask recognition on this first day of this new session of Congress to pay a tribute to our departed colleague, HENDERSON LANHAM. Throughout the 11 years that I served with him in this House, I felt closer to him than to the average Member of the Congress. We were elected to this body at the same time in 1946, and we took the oath of office together in January of 1947. I had known HENDERSON LANHAM at home in Georgia, prior to that time. He had made a distinguished record of public service there, as the dean of our delegation has already pointed out. He had demonstrated through his service in the Georgia House of Representatives, as an official of the city of Rome and the county of Floyd, and as prosecuting attorney of his judicial circuit, that he was a man of integrity; that he was a man who practiced truth, honor, and honesty. He had demonstrated that he was a man of courage and that he would stand, regardless of consequences, for those things in which he believed. He was a man of gentleness by nature. While he could be courageous and enter with all the force that was in him into any battle in which he was engaged, he possessed the attributes of gentleness, and he knew the finer and sweeter things of life. He has left us here in the Georgia delegation and in the Congress a fine example to follow. It is with much sadness and with profound sorrow that I join with my colleagues from Georgia and others in the House of Representatives in expressing this tribute to him. I extend to his family, his daughter, and his grandchildren, of whom he was so fond and whom he loved so well, my deepest sympathy in this time of sorrow.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve for several terms on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the gentleman from Georgia, our greatly beloved colleague and friend, HENDERSON LANHAM. There I came to know not only the scholarliness of his mind and the diligence with which he studied all questions, but also the fair and judicious way in which he arrived at decisions so that they would be in the interest first of all of our country. I want to join in paying tribute to him as a good personal friend and as a fine gentleman and outstanding patriot.

Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled today to give one illustration of the quality of HENDERSON LANHAM. It is an instance which, I think, has never been publicly discussed previously. It was on a Saturday morning in April 1953, when Congressional leaders of both Houses and both parties and ranking members of the affected committees were called down to the Department of State for a major consultation on the policy that we should adopt in Korea, where the Communists had just assumed a conciliatory pose—but without any real evidence of actual change—in order to get out of the bad hole that they were in at that time. I was present as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific, and Mr. LANHAM as the ranking minority member.

The Communists had previously been completely adamant in rejecting any reasonable proposal, even by a sympathetic government like India. But now their forces were in trouble in Korea. The Communist regime in China was overextended and in trouble there. It wanted to end the fighting in Korea, where it could not win, to shift to Vietnam where the prospects were more favorable. Furthermore, Stalin had just died and they were in trouble in Russia. They needed a breathing spell in which to settle the power struggle to determine his successor in the hierarchy in the Kremlin. They feared they were in trouble in Washington where a new administration had just taken charge with its first act in foreign policy a stronger stand against the Communists in China. They knew the power of the United States and they knew what the new general in the White House could do to them if he chose to. Obviously they wanted us to abandon the strong position which was getting results, and go back to the sort of soft, weak policy which has always failed. Naturally the Communists resorted to their usual trickery. They reversed themselves on the Indian proposal. They said, "We are for peace. We are against bloodshed. We will let your prisoners out, agree not to arm North Korea," and so on—the same sort of tempting offers they are making again today on a world scale.

Our authorities laid before us the situation. If we refused to fall for the bait, until there was some real evidence of sincerity, we would be called warmongers. It might expand hostilities. More Americans might lose their lives. If we went along, perhaps we could get our boys out. Perhaps there was a genuine change in Communist objectives. Maybe we could get a settlement in Korea and a step toward peaceful coexistence of some real sort. Anybody can see how great the temptation was to go along—in faith and hope.

On the other hand were some hard facts: We had nothing but words from the Communists—the same old words that had always been deceitful in the past; changes in Communist objectives are not possible until they give up communism; the tactic of negotiating had always been a means, not of ending a

war, but of winning it—and the fruits of victory.

After some discussion, they polled the Members present from the House and Senate and representatives of the other administrative agencies, the Pentagon, and so on. All except four went along with the course of accepting the Communist proposals, which involved letting up our pressure on them. HENDERSON LANHAM was one who said, "I dissent." The other three were our committee chairman, DICK RICHARDS, of South Carolina; the Senator from California, [Mr. KNOWLAND]; and myself. The rest believed it might be a way toward real peace and agreed we should try it. We believed it would not lead to peace, but to larger and more dangerous conflict later. And next time we might not be able to win. In my judgment, our country lost another chance to get peace in the Pacific that morning. Chances had been lost on previous somewhat similar occasions. But here was a chance to retrieve the situation by standing firm until there were Communist deeds to match their words.

I report all of this only to show the character of HENDERSON LANHAM, his clear head and his courage. Without hesitation he refused to be party to any soft position which might be hailed as leading to peace but which he felt would be appeasement, and he knew that appeasement of this kind of a cruel and ruthless enemy has never led and cannot lead to peace—unless it be the peace of enslavement.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great personal loss to me that this dear friend has been taken from us so suddenly and tragically, but those who have known him have been enriched thereby and will long carry the memory of him in their hearts. The members of his family in their sorrow will have the knowledge down through the years that their loved one was indeed a prince among men, a man of high character, deep patriotism, great unselfishness, and unswerving fidelity.

I join in expressing sympathy to them.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, our late distinguished colleague, Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM, was undoubtedly one of the most respected Members of this august body. That fact is eloquent testimony of his tremendous ability and uncompromising integrity and complete loyalty.

One of the outstanding, and probably one of the best characteristics of this body, is that no Member of this body wins the respect of this Congress because of his past laurels or achievements.

It has to be won here. That is as it should be. My good friend would not have had it any other way. He won the affection and confidence of this body as few were privileged to do. He won it because he represented the heartbeats of America and humanity. He was an outstanding counselor, a great lawyer, and an exceptional Congressman. Additionally, he was a cultured gentleman and as devoted friend as I ever knew. He was a meek man, a kindly man, a patient man; yet he was utterly determined on an issue of principle. He fought clean, but he fought hard for all legislation that would make our people happier and our Nation stronger.

I attended the funeral of our friend. It was a benediction to see the warmth and affection that all of his constituents so justly and deservedly held for him. Undoubtedly he was a family man to a degree that few of us attain. His love for his only daughter, a most remarkable woman in her own right, for his splendid niece and other members of his family, and his delightful grandchildren, was a thing of beauty and a pattern for all of us.

He was a genuine Christian, completely devoted to his church. As he humbly walked with us, Mr. Speaker, so he is now walking humbly and abiding with our God. Sure, we will all miss him, Mr. Speaker, but it is a great truth, that every one of us knows where we may find him.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deepest sorrow that I join the dean of our delegation and my other colleagues in paying a well-deserved, though inadequate, tribute to our late beloved colleague, Honorable HENDERSON LANHAM, late a Representative of the Seventh District of the State of Georgia.

Judge LANHAM, as he was affectionately known to those of us who served with him, and indeed to the rank and file of the citizens of the Seventh District of Georgia, was a man of great and indeed unusual ability; he was a man of the greatest strength of character; he was a man who symbolized the meaning of the word "integrity." He was a man who knew not the meaning of the word "fear." He was one of the most courageous individuals I have ever known. Once he became convinced of the rightness of his position he could not be changed by any force whatsoever.

He was a devout Christian and a devoted member of his church. He was a kind man to those with whom he came in daily contact. He was a man who meant much to the life of his community, the city in which he lived. It can truthfully be said, as was said of him, as he was laid to rest in that community, that the lives of the people who came in contact with him were made the better because of HENDERSON LANHAM having lived.

He meant a great deal to me personally from the time I first came to serve in this great body. I considered him my warm friend, my counselor, and my adviser. I never called upon him for advice or counsel but that he responded gently, kindly, sincerely, and thoughtfully. I shall miss him very much. His place will be difficult to fill in this Chamber and in the hearts and minds of those of us who knew him and loved him.

Mr. Speaker, I join with those who have preceded me today in extending our profound and heartfelt sympathy and condolence to the members of his family whom he loved so well.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH].

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to speak of the wonderful memory I have of the late HENDERSON LANHAM, our beloved colleague from the Seventh Congressional District of Georgia. He has been extolled already in words that beautifully describe the great life he lived. He was a man of integrity, kind, and of gentle spirit; a man of great intellect, culture, and charm. But I remember him most for his warm friendliness and the graciousness with which he shared his great political experience and wisdom with me when I first came here as a Member. I had known Mr. LANHAM casually before that time, but when I came to the Congress, I was privileged to know him well, as he labored with great distinction to strengthen and advance the form of constitutional government for the citizens of his district, State, and Nation.

While he could speak with a gentle cultured voice, the tones of which were as soft as the shadows made by the branches of the giant trees that stood on the spacious lawn of his lovely Georgia home, he could also use his tremendous intellect to enlighten his colleagues on subjects of the greatest depth. The logic he used in doing so was as strong as the giant rocks and mighty rivers that are such a characteristic part of the beautiful hills in the Georgia district that he served. I saw his home for the first time when I went to attend his funeral. The gracious atmosphere made me realize how much I had missed by not having visited him there while he lived.

The true measure of a man is the devotion paid to him by his friends and his family. HENDERSON LANHAM was a wealthy man when thought of in the terms of tributes paid him by his own family, neighbors, and friends. There I met in person for the first time those members of his family of whom I had heard him speak so many times; his lovely daughter and her fine husband, his darling grandchildren, and his niece and her husband. When I saw them, I knew why he had spoken of them so endearingly in his conversation every day.

The bulwark of his life was his great religious belief. The influence of the church to which he had remained completely loyal throughout his life was evident in all that I saw in his home.

We have lost a friend and a great man. We extend sympathy to all those who share in this loss. But it is wonderful to have known a man who developed all the great attributes with which he was divinely endowed.

The rose garden he cultivated, the beautiful camellia bushes, the sasanquas he had cut and brought into the house the day before he went away, love of music and great books, a loving family, friends, and neighbors, and the opportunity to serve his fellowman; nothing seemed to have been overlooked that would give a man's life great meaning.

His life was completely filled. God has blessed few men so much, and few there are who are able to receive such blessings.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my beloved friend, HENDERSON LANHAM, came as perhaps a greater shock to me than some others because it had been my good fortune to know him for many years. Throughout these years we have maintained a warm friendship which gave me a wonderful opportunity to fully appreciate his real worth as a man. He possessed all of those fine qualities which combine to make the ideal citizen, the outstanding Congressman, and the perfect father. A brilliant student, a man of culture who had great appreciation for the aesthetic, he took from life many joys ofttimes missed by those of less stature. His brilliant record of public service in his State represents the highest and best that can be achieved in this field. Completely fearless and independent in his thinking, he never failed to fight for equity and justice when the occasion arose. Courageous at all times, he was a dangerous adversary in any debate. His record of service in the General Assembly of Georgia will long be remembered for his outstanding accomplishments. Here in the House of Representatives he was admired and respected by every sitting Member. Not once during his 11 years of service did he do or say anything that smacked of demagoguery. Always sincere, he impressed his colleagues with the sound logic of his argument. This body will truly miss HENDERSON LANHAM, and I join the membership in paying muchly deserved tribute to him, and to his fine family I again express my deep sorrow and sympathy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Congressman LANHAM was one of my legislative neighbors in the House of Representatives for almost 11 years.

HENDERSON was a scholarly friend who is no longer with us.

Although he was an eloquent spokesman for the new South in its period of greatest economic growth, he was also the bearer of a proud heritage; that of old southern culture and charm.

I was a Yankee—at least by geography, if not by heredity—and he was the scion of an old Georgia family. Much of the textile industry that Massachusetts was losing Georgia was gaining. Although there was competition between us on this score, and serious as far as we, the losers, were concerned, it never separated our friendship.

HENDERSON LANHAM was too big a man for pettiness in any form. I think he saw that greater future in which our country would be united as never before. And he was true to that faith with all the resources of his fine mind and generous spirit.

He was an able and dedicated member of the Appropriations Committee, where his intellectual capacity served the Nation with a high degree of efficiency that will be hard to duplicate.

Every civil servant of the Federal Government mourns his passing because he thoroughly understood the need of improved working conditions and better salaries for career personnel upon whom the Government depends for its essential operations.

Death has taken from this House one of the best of Representatives. Representative LANHAM has gone to dwell in eternal happiness.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this opportunity pass without humbly paying my word of tribute to our departed colleague, the Honorable HENDERSON LANHAM from Georgia. I think it is peculiarly appropriate today when we have great problems to resolve that by a ceremony such as this we once again take cognizance of the fact that America's greatness is founded on eternal spiritual values of life. The greatness of our country in the past and today and in the future will be because we have men and women of the character of HENDERSON LANHAM. I did not know him as well, of course, as his colleagues from Georgia, but I had the opportunity these past 5 years of knowing something of this great man and of being associated with him rather intimately many times.

As has been said, he was a gentleman of even temperament, of judicial character, and of an integrity beyond question. I knew him best as we associated together in our weekly prayer meetings that many of you attend each Thursday. There I knew him as an humble man, as one who would not dare to presume of a professional piety, and yet as one who had an abiding faith in the God who created him and in the God whom he worshiped. And I think as well as any man in the House that he lived according to that deep faith.

I am conscious of the immortal words of that great poet, William Cullen Bryant, who said:

So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

I am confident that HENDERSON LANHAM lived that kind of life and that he approached his eternal reward in that spirit of abiding faith.

I join my colleagues from Georgia in expressing to his loved ones my deepest sympathy on his untimely passing.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked when I read one afternoon in my hometown newspaper in Oklahoma of the tragic and untimely death of my good friend, HENDERSON LANHAM.

Congressman LANHAM and I came to this House together 11 years ago. We became friends at that time and our friendship grew over the years.

I served with Congressman LANHAM on the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. This was a difficult assignment. The committee was subject to tremendous pressures from many sources. In all its activities Congressman LANHAM was calm, steadfast, courageous. He was a fine scholar and skillful legislator. His contributions to our work were outstanding.

Judge LANHAM was a Christian gentleman with rare attributes of character. He combined at one time a gentle and kindly soul with a stanch and courageous will.

He was an outstanding, valued Member of this House. I shall miss him sorely. I extend to his loved ones my deepest personal sympathy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to join the Georgia delegation in the Congress in paying tribute to an outstanding liberal statesman of the South—the late HENDERSON LANHAM. Judge LANHAM, as he was familiarly known by his colleagues, came to the Congress at about the same time I began my service in this distinguished body. As a liberal, I was soon attracted to this Georgia gentleman by his intense desire to serve the interests of the average American.

Judge LANHAM was the first among his colleagues south of the Mason-Dixon Line to realize that changing conditions in the South made necessary changed thinking if he were to serve the best interests of the South in an economic way. Mr. LANHAM realized that the South's major industry and the processing of this cotton through textile mills would be injured by the approval of this Congress of the new Japanese trade agreements and he soon became a leader among a fast growing group of southern Representatives who realized that they had been voting more or less blindly for a trade policy that was destroying their southern economy.

Judge LANHAM also had a deep interest in the welfare of the boys and girls of the Nation. He was active in the support of legislation that would benefit our youth.

Few men in the Congress had a greater acquaintanceship than did Judge LANHAM with his colleagues. They, like myself, held this distinguished Georgian in high esteem as a courtly gentleman, a courageous fighter for what he considered right.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. ROBESON.]

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in tribute to my longtime friend and colleague, HENDERSON LANHAM. My friendship with HENDERSON LANHAM goes back over 50 years when we were college boys together at the university at Athens, Ga.

It was one of my happy experiences when I came here in 1950 to renew that

friendship and to learn that he had continued over these years in his manner of living, in his studious, careful, and firm approach to what he thought was right. He was a friendly man and I enjoyed visiting with him and seeing him.

I shall miss him personally and we shall miss his service here.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when I read of the tragic, unfortunate death of our late friend, HENDERSON LANHAM, I was in Boston. It was indeed sad news to me. When he took the journey into the great beyond I lost a close, a dear, and a valued friend.

HENDERSON LANHAM was a typical American, one who believed in the American way of life, one who had an intense love of the Constitution of the United States and all of its provisions, and everything it stands for—in letter, in meaning, in spirit, and in its traditions.

Various Members have referred to his fine, kindly, sweet disposition and I concur in those expressions. I can see him now, with that fine, sweet, philosophical look on his face, coming up the middle aisle, or engaged in conversation with some of our colleagues and oftentimes with me.

HENDERSON LANHAM had a philosophy of life that was an inspiration to all who knew him too follow. He had an understanding mind. He did not react to small or mean or narrow impulses. His understanding mind looked forward, and in his association with his fellow human beings he thoroughly respected them when he and they disagreed. He was a man who had profound respect, as I said, for the fundamentals of our Government as expressed in the Constitution of the United States.

I feel keenly the loss of HENDERSON LANHAM because in his death a close personal friend has left me. Friendships of that kind leave their imprint when they are separated by death, but the memory of those friends who have taken the journey into the great beyond always is an inspiration to us, and treasured by us. HENDERSON LANHAM was one of those friends.

I join my friends from Georgia in their expression of sorrow at the passing of HENDERSON LANHAM. I extend my deep sympathy to my colleagues of the Georgia delegation and the people of the State of Georgia and the district he so ably represented. To the loved ones he left behind I extend my profound sympathy in their sorrow.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, during my first term, circumstances were such that I came to know the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LANHAM, quite well early in the first year, 1955. Time moved along and it was my privilege, and I considered it one of the great privileges of my life, to become better acquainted with him.

To his colleagues from Georgia and to all America I say that here was a real statesman, here was an intelligent servant of the people, a man of unquestioned integrity, one of the most charitable and kindly men I have ever had the privilege of knowing. To a junior Member on the minority side or to any Member of the House he was always ready to give of his expert counsel and advice and if the cause was basically right, to lend a helping hand. Certainly that is what it takes to make a real man, a big man, and to make a real country and a big country. He has made a big contribution to that. It is the hope of many of us that sometime we shall be able to emulate the fine pattern he has set.

I extend my sympathy, and I know the sympathy of the Members on this side of the House, to his loved ones, and also to the people of his district, for he was truly an outstanding representative not only of them but of America. All America has lost an able and dedicated public servant. We all grieve his loss, and extend our most sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of the late HENDERSON LANHAM.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a heavy heart that I learned on the afternoon of November 10, 1957, of the unfortunate passing of my dear friend and colleague, HENDERSON LOVELACE LANHAM. I knew him intimately and affectionately for many years. As fellow members of the Georgia Senate my work brought me in frequent and constant contact with him. I always found him to be fair in his dealings with his fellow man and a gentleman of the highest principles. It was only natural when I came to Congress in 1953 that I availed myself of his friendly advice and wise counsel. He was more than perfunctorily friendly and helpful—he went far beyond the call of an ordinary friendship and was most helpful to me. It would take hours to tell of the many great deeds of public service performed by HENDERSON LANHAM. He has done many great things for the people of his native Georgia during his many years of public service. I knew HENDERSON LANHAM long before either of us came to Congress and I can say to you today that I never met a more pleasant and dedicated man. He was a loyal American, a true Christian gentleman. It is recorded that "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." HENDERSON LANHAM was that type of man. HENDERSON had just left a little country church where he had taught Sunday School and was on his way to the schoolhouse located in his hometown, Rome, Ga., where he was to meet with and speak to a group of palsied children at the moment his automobile was struck by a train. I know that his spirits were high and that he was happy at that moment for he dearly loved the church and little children. I personally shall miss him, and I join in extending to his loved ones my deepest sympathy in this hour of their bereavement.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, HENDERSON LANHAM was a real man. He had ability, he had character. His good soul shone out, he radiated good will. He made our world better.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy hearts that we are brought face to face with the irreparable losses visited upon this body during the period of recess, and certainly the passing of Judge LANHAM must be recalled as one of the severest blows we have sustained.

HENDERSON LANHAM was a man of brilliant attainments; and to those who became intimately acquainted with him, he constantly revealed that courtesy and kindness which are the hallmarks of a southern gentleman. HENDERSON LANHAM and I separated widely on many political issues, but invariably we found ourselves traveling side by side in support of those things which are vital to the prosperity and security of our Nation. The strongest tie that bound us together, however, was the realization of our mutual inadequacy, and it was as seekers after divine guidance that we found ourselves at the breakfast table with the House prayer group each Thursday morning.

The judge has gone on to his reward, and we must turn back to the duties which devolve upon us in this uncertain world. We shall, however, take strength from our years of association with him, and we feel that we are a bit more competent to meet the test than we would have been had we not been privileged to call this distinguished citizen our loyal friend.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we have lost an outstanding legislator in the tragic death of HENDERSON LANHAM. He was zealously devoted to the welfare of our country but full of human understanding of the problems of all of us. He will be greatly missed.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress some 9 years ago, one of the first Members from the southern part of the United States with whom I became acquainted was the Honorable HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia, who had come to the House with the beginning of the 80th session. In the years which followed, my first impression—which was most favorable—of HENDERSON LANHAM was confirmed. In a quiet, effective manner, he never stopped working industriously and conscientiously for those programs and projects which he believed best served the interests of the Nation and the district whose people he was honored to represent. Having come to know and respect him over the years, it was a distressing shock to read of his tragic death.

The House has lost one of its keen intellects with the death of HENDERSON LANHAM. It has also lost a Member who thoroughly understood, and was devoted to committee work—but who, at the same time, demonstrated a willingness to take the floor in a most critical and constructive manner whenever he thought it necessary to do so.

HENDERSON LANHAM came to the House with a wide background of legislative and legal experience, and with a record of service to his community. In his years in Congress this was a contributing

factor to the outstanding service he rendered to his State and to his country.

Mr. Speaker, it will be most difficult to replace a man of the outstanding ability, the industry, the fairness and the sterling character of the late Honorable HENDERSON LANHAM.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with others in speaking of the life and work of the late HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia. It was my privilege and honor to serve with him on the House Committee on Appropriations. On the committee and in the House he showed himself to be a man of very great capability. He had a warm heart and an outstanding mind. His devotion to duty was never questioned. We are going to miss the wise counsel of HENDERSON LANHAM during this session of Congress.

I join my colleagues in extending sympathy to his family and in paying tribute to the memory of our departed colleague and friend.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it was a rare privilege I had for a couple of years in my third term in this great legislative body to serve on the Special Lobby Investigating Committee of the House, of which committee HENDERSON LANHAM was a member. It was commonly known as the Buchanan committee. I know we also continue to miss Frank Buchanan who was the distinguished chairman of that committee and who has also passed on. On that committee also were Representatives BROWN, Ohio; HALLECK, Indiana; and O'HARA of Minnesota. The fairness, energy, and anxiousness of my colleague, Congressman LANHAM, on that difficult committee work was quickly recognized by me. It was by all of us and his ingenuity and resourcefulness in approaching the study and actual committee hearings were an inspiration to me.

Subsequent to that 2 years day-to-day work with him on the same House committee, I naturally continued to visit with him and confer with him on very frequent occasions from that time until his very unfortunate and untimely death by accident. I know I am not the only Member of this House who quickly recognized his voice on the floor of this legislative body as speaking out for sound, patriotic methods and means of national unity and soundness and achievements for the American people. I shall miss him very much indeed and I shall always remember and appreciate how earnestly and firmly he helped me in my study of and my working on the subject of less-than-honorable discharges. He told me of his experiences as a distinguished judge in his native State of Georgia and I readily recognized his kind attitude toward all people who had problems which had to be solved. A huge heart for humanity, a great heart and a sound patriotism with vigilance for all that was fair and square and a real regard for the opinions of men that might differ with him. This is my brief appraisal of my distinguished colleague who in my humble judgment has left a very large void in our ranks. Mrs. Doyle and I extend our understanding sympathy to his family.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have been saddened by the untimely death of our beloved colleague, HENDERSON LANHAM. I enjoyed the privilege of serving in the Congress with this outstanding Georgia statesman from the time he was first elected. In more recent years, I have been very closely associated with him as a member of the House Appropriations Committee. Therefore, I share the great grief which has come to his loved ones and I am intimately acquainted with the loss which his death brings to his own State of Georgia and to the Nation.

Since his election to the House of Representatives in 1946 our devoted colleague served with distinction, honor, and dignity. His courtesy, his friendliness and his devotion to his duty stamped him as outstanding and will cause him to be greatly missed by those of us who had the pleasure of knowing him and working with him through the years.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and character of the late Honorable HENDERSON L. LANHAM, of Georgia, who met such a tragic accidental death on November 10 last.

I had the pleasure of serving with HENDERSON in this body and on the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years, and always found him to be a capable and extremely hard working Member. He was respected and held in high esteem by his colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle. His passing is a great loss to the people of his district, his State, and the Nation. It is indeed a great tragedy that his successful legislative career has been terminated.

His dear ones have my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege during the 1st session of the 85th Congress to be blessed with the friendship of the Honorable HENDERSON LOVELACE LANHAM, a true son of the South—scholarly, temperate, courteous, generous with his praise, sparing—exceedingly so—with his criticism.

Though fully occupied with his many duties on behalf of his constituents and the people of the United States, as are other Members of the Congress, the very well liked and highly respected gentleman from Georgia found time to honor me with several long conversations. Included in these conversations—some of which were in the nature of counsel and advice by a most able and knowledgeable legislator—was the subject of Hawaii and the hopes and aspirations of her people.

I can recall that we talked over the thorough and impartial investigation made into the Hawaiian situation in 1893 by the outstandingly distinguished Georgian, the Honorable James H. Blount, a former Member of the House of Representatives.

I can also recall that as a result of our conversation, I was assured of the good will and assistance of the able gentleman from Georgia in my efforts on behalf of Hawaii and her rightful aspirations.

Hawaii has lost a friend whose assistance would have been invaluable. I have lost a counselor whose guidance and advice I valued tremendously.

In the passing of HENDERSON LOVELACE LANHAM, America has lost a statesman who exemplified the finest traditions of a southern gentleman. To his family and his constituents I express my deepest sympathy. May his soul rest in peace with the Almighty he served so faithfully.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is not given to us to understand the pattern of life. When we adjourned at the close of the first session the beloved gentlemen from Tennessee and Georgia, Mr. COOPER and Mr. LANHAM, seemed in the full bloom of lives of rich usefulness, and with none was the thought that never again were we to be permitted to meet with them in human form. There is a void in this Chamber as we convene today for the second session, and the sadness of that void is felt by every Member.

Their memory will remain with us as long as we are here, and the course of history as it is affected by what is done in this greatest legislative body in the world and in the generations as yet unborn will speak their influence. JERE COOPER and HENDERSON LANHAM have taught us how to live with our fellow men and with our God. They were statesmen of uncompromising integrity. They possessed the great personal quality of humility. Humility always is the attribute of the person of strength of mind and of heart. Strength of character needs no pretense upon which to buttress its claim for recognition.

The distinguished dean of the Illinois delegation, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, has spoken from the font of a warm affection of the chairman of the great Ways and Means Committee with whom so long and so closely he was associated. For him, for my other Democratic colleagues from Illinois and for myself may I bring a very sincere tribute to the memory of the sweet and dedicated son of Georgia whose passing has brought to us a deep personal grief. It was not many months ago when in a memorable debate on an issue attended with territorial differences that HENDERSON LANHAM'S time had expired and no more time was available unless surrendered by one who previously had received a time allotment. TOM O'BRIEN turned to me and suggested that while we were on the opposite side of the debate that I give my time to the gentleman from Georgia, remarking "He is one of the nicest and fairest men in the Congress." I was of course happy to do as our beloved dean suggested, not only because it was his desire but also because during all my association with HENDERSON LANHAM I had found practiced by him in all his relations with his colleagues those qualities of patience, fairness, consideration, and human understanding that characterize the man who walks with his conscience and in humiliation in the presence he senses of his God. He was a gentle friend, a statesman of great ability, and a public servitor of dedication. Our deepest sympathy goes to the bereaved family and to the people of Georgia and the district HENDERSON LANHAM so brilliantly represented and with such devotion in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have been greatly saddened by the tragic passing of the Honorable HENDERSON LANHAM. We have lost an outstanding Member of the House and a distinguished American who steadfastly devoted himself to the type of liberal programs benefiting the greatest number of our people. HENDERSON LANHAM was a man of integrity and principle, with a quiet dignity that commanded the respect of all who knew him. He will be sorely missed in the crucial days ahead.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, among the new and happy friendships I was privileged to make in 1957 was that of Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM. We always called him Judge as a mark of respect, and he had a magnificent judicial approach to all legislative affairs. He not only understood the law, but he would always fight vehemently to protect it. His courtesy and patience were his greatest virtues. He walked and spoke softly, but he carried a big stick. He was generous with his time and his advice and like any great judge on the bench, impartial in his deliberations and decisions.

We of South Carolina feel a great loss in the passing of our Georgia friend and colleague. He was an inspiring example to all of us of the true southern gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to our late departed colleague and esteemed friend, the Honorable HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia.

It was my good fortune and privilege to come to the Congress at the same time HENDERSON LANHAM was first elected to the Congress. We soon became fast friends and our friendship remained throughout our years of service together.

We served together as members of the Committee on Appropriations and my life has been enriched by my association with him and our friendship. I enjoyed his quiet, good humor and admired his courage and manly qualities. He was devoted to his district, his State, and Nation, and while representing his district and the South, he was not provincial in his outlook but took the broader, national point of view. He was a Christian gentleman a warm friend and an able and devoted legislator. The State of Georgia has lost a great son, this Congress an esteemed colleague, and the Nation a dedicated statesman.

I join with my colleagues in extending an expression of sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who for many years served on the same committee with HENDERSON LANHAM I want to add my tribute to his memory.

HENDERSON had a relish for life, a zest for work and a great love for his Nation.

He was diligent in his committee work and never shirked those responsibilities for leadership which came his way.

HENDERSON was a fine man to work with. He had a keen sense of humor and an insight into the problems which came before him.

He was not provincial in his approach to problems that were so national in scope as those things connected with health, education, and labor where he labored tirelessly.

All of us who were privileged to call him "Friend" shall miss him.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, like all Members of the House, I was shocked and deeply grieved over the tragic death of our friend and colleague, HENDERSON LANHAM.

Congressman LANHAM and myself represented adjoining districts; his in Georgia and mine in Tennessee. The people we had the honor to represent came from the same section and had the same interests, so it was natural that we conferred with each other frequently in regard to legislation affecting our respective areas. He was always most helpful. He was dedicated to the service of his people.

I had known HENDERSON LANHAM for many years. He was an outstanding lawyer and a fine public servant; he had the respect of his colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle. In his passing the House has lost a valuable Member and we who served with him have lost a friend. He was a fine Christian gentleman.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, HENDERSON L. LANHAM was one of the most conscientious and capable legislators to have been sent to the House from Georgia, which has produced so many vigorous public servants in the United States Congress.

Mr. LANHAM represented the Seventh District of Georgia with distinction. The tragic accident which caused his death deeply saddened the citizens of Georgia and his many friends throughout our Nation.

Born in Rome, Ga., in 1888, HENDERSON LANHAM early in life proved his worth. He was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Georgia, received his law degree from Georgia in 1911, and the master of arts degree from Harvard University in 1912. Subsequently he entered the practice of law in Rome, Ga., and began a distinguished career of public service, which continued until his death. His qualifications were recognized and rewarded by his return to Congress on six consecutive elections. His Congressional career included service on the Public Works, Government Operations, Foreign Affairs, and Appropriations Committees of the House.

From the beginning of his public career he exhibited a grasp of the intricate and vital problems of government. He said what he believed. Mr. LANHAM once said of himself, "I am a progressive without being radical." He also once said that his greatest regret upon being elected was that he would have to leave his rose garden.

He brought to the United States Congress a fine mind, a high devotion to responsibility, and a friendliness which have produced a sharp sense of loss among his colleagues.

I had frequent contact with Mr. LANHAM at the weekly Congressional prayer breakfast. I knew him intimately and regarded him as one of my best friends and personally feel a great loss in his passing. I wish to extend to his family my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my other colleagues in paying tribute to Judge HENDERSON LANHAM. His tragic passing has saddened us all and his presence, guidance, and wise counsel will be greatly missed during the days that are before us.

I was fortunate in that our offices were next door to each other so that I had an opportunity to see and talk with Judge LANHAM many times and enjoy a close association with him and benefit from his advice and counsel. My father was a classmate of Judge LANHAM's at the University of Georgia, so that before I came to Congress I had had the privilege of knowing and respecting him, as my father did before me, and to admire him for his many outstanding qualities and fine character.

He was a man of strong convictions, ever ready to speak those convictions. He had a broad outlook on life, but was entirely devoted to his own district and State. A man of integrity and principle, Judge LANHAM had a quiet dignity that brought him recognition and respect in all places.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of meeting and knowing Judge LANHAM's daughter and fine grandchildren, to whom he was greatly devoted. To them he has left a fine heritage and a knowledge that he lived a great life to the fullest, with a calm and deep abiding faith in the future beyond. To them I would like to express my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

We have all lost a great American. He will be sorely missed in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I regret sincerely that fate has made it necessary for me to express my deep sorrow upon the occasion of the passing of Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia. All too frequently we find that we have neglected the opportunity to praise one of our associates while he lived—so that he could appreciate the respect in which we hold him. Then we are faced with the sad prospect of reciting his virtues after he has gone on to his eternal reward. The only midgeon of happiness I can feel at this moment lies in the fact that I have taken advantage of opportunities which permitted me to tell you, my colleagues, of the valued assistance I have received from Representative LANHAM in our work with the Appropriations Committee.

Congressman LANHAM has been a member of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, of which subcommittee I have the honor to be chairman.

HENDERSON LANHAM was an able lawyer, and has also served on the board of education of his native city of Rome, Ga. I frequently had occasion to discuss with him the legal aspects of some of the activities of agencies with which we were concerned. He was an excellent adviser on the relationship between the United States Office of Education and local school boards. He was patient but insistent in his inquiries during com-

mittee hearings. He was well-informed and earned the respect of his colleagues on the committee as well as representatives of the departments who came before us seeking funds for their activities.

I shall miss him greatly. I know all of us shall miss him. To his bereaved widow and daughter I offer my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to HENDERSON LANHAM, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Since I had the good fortune to work directly with him on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations, I became well acquainted with HENDERSON LANHAM. I knew him to be a dedicated, conscientious man, anxious to fulfill his duties as a public servant. I also know that HENDERSON LANHAM diligently worked to familiarize himself with every facet of foreign operations because he was the type person who wanted to do well in all things undertaken. The high caliber and output of his work proved that his 11 years in Congress were fruitful years.

Moreover, HENDERSON LANHAM was a gentleman of the old school—quiet, kind, courteous. The suddenness of his death was a severe blow to all who knew him. His innate goodness won our affection and his industriousness our admiration. Because he was a sensitive man who possessed an abundance of tact, his friends were legion. This friendly man who held the respect and confidence of so many people will long be grieved by his colleagues. The people of Georgia in placing their public trust in HENDERSON LANHAM have contributed more to the legislative history of the United States than they can possibly realize.

I wish to join with my colleagues in extending my sincere sympathy to the members of HENDERSON LANHAM'S family.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I join his many friends in paying tribute to our beloved colleague whose unfortunate and untimely death occurred during the recess of the Congress. Mr. LANHAM was an outstanding legislator. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. He had a keen and penetrating mind. He possessed an uncanny faculty for asking questions which would elicit the true facts concerning the subject under discussion from witnesses appearing before our committee. He was an able debater.

HENDERSON LANHAM served his district, State, and Nation well, and his presence will be sorely missed on the floor of this House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with HENDERSON LANHAM. He was a thorough gentleman, a kind and patient man of real convictions, a true friend, and an outstanding representative of his district and Nation. We shall miss him and join with our colleagues in the fine tributes paid him here today.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of this body were as shocked as I by the tragic and untimely passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HENDERSON L. LANHAM, of Georgia, in November. A Member of this House for 11 years, Congressman LANHAM was highly respected for his grasp of legislative proceedings and deeply loved by all those who knew him.

I am sure many of you consider the death of HENDERSON LANHAM as a personal loss, as I most assuredly do. Congressman LANHAM and I had occasion to work together several times, including our joint efforts to secure development of the Coosa-Alabama River, which flows from the Seventh Georgia District—which Congressman LANHAM represented so diligently—through the Fourth Alabama District—which I am privileged to represent—in its course toward the Gulf of Mexico. The people of the Coosa Valley, as well as the entire State of Alabama, will feel the vacuum created by the passing of our colleague from Rome, Ga.

May I respectfully add my sincere sympathy and condolences to the bereaved family of the late HENDERSON LOVELACE LANHAM.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to have inserted an editorial which appeared November 13, 1957, in the Anniston (Ala.) Star, and one which appeared in the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution.

The editorials follow:

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star of November 13, 1957]

ROME'S LOSS IS SHARED

The Anniston area lost a tried and true friend when Congressman HENDERSON L. LANHAM, 69, was killed in a train-automobile collision Sunday at a crossing in Rome, Ga., where he had lived all his life.

In the period from 1918 to 1946, he had served in various public offices of a more or less local nature. He was at different times chairman of the city board of education in Rome, Floyd County representative in the Georgia General Assembly, and solicitor-general of the Rome judicial circuit.

But with his election to the Congress in 1946, he was able to make his influence felt beyond Georgia's boundaries, and it was the very good fortune of the people of this part of Alabama that his constituents saw fit to keep him in the House of Representatives for the remainder of his life.

For he was effective not only in routine Congressional duties, but also as an advocate of worthwhile legislation of a regional and national character.

He took his place in the forefront of the 100-year fight to harness the Coosa River for electric power, flood control, recreational advantages, industrial and agricultural water supply, and the relatively cheap water transportation that he recognized as feasible all the way from his native city through northeast Alabama and on to Montgomery and Mobile.

At long last, there is the prospect of cashing in within the foreseeable future on some of the Coosa's vast potentialities, and to the late Congressman LANHAM is due a large share of the credit for what's been accomplished.

Let it also be said to his everlasting credit that he never permitted himself to be counted among those ill-advised Congressmen who in the last decade have embraced at various times the notion that national security could be bought as a counter bargain. Representative LANHAM fought tirelessly for appropriations adequate to the needs and responsibilities of our Military Establishment.

It is true that Georgia's Seventh Congressional District is separated from Alabama's Fourth and Fifth by a State boundary, but this never was a barrier to full cooperation on the part of Congressmen LANHAM, ROBERTS, and RAINS in the interest of Coosa Valley progress.

In a very real sense, northeast Alabama shares northwest Georgia's loss in the tragic accident Sunday that claimed Representative LANHAM'S life.

---

[From the Atlanta Constitution]

A VALUABLE PUBLIC SERVANT LOST

Eleven years ago a stately, scholarly Rome lawyer, HENDERSON LANHAM, left the home and the rose garden which was his hobby and went to Washington as Representative from Georgia's Seventh District.

To earn that right he had defeated an able man, Malcolm Tarver, of Dalton.

Judge LANHAM gave his district no reason to regret the trust it had placed in him. He established himself as a legislator of diligence, intelligence, integrity and independence.

He asked no favors, he dodged no issues, he rarely missed a rollcall.

He was loyal to party, yet he could and did rise above the partisan and the section to vote on a measure according to what he considered the national interest.

The Seventh District elected him to Congress six times. The House rewarded him with worthy committee appointments.

This year he became the second Georgian—Senator George was the other—to receive the American Vocational Association's distinguished service citation. In 51 years only 6 Americans have been so honored.

HENDERSON LANHAM had earned such respect in the district that younger men eyeing the seat in Congress and making exploratory remarks always have prefaced them with "if Judge LANHAM decides not to run."

Judge LANHAM will not be a candidate for Congress in 1958. He died Sunday afternoon, victim of a railroad crossing accident.

Georgians are grieved at the passing of this man who was appreciated and respected by his constituents and loved by those who knew him intimately.

The mourning goes well beyond the confines of a Congressional District and a State.

The Nation has lost a public servant for whom the motivation was the greatest good to the greatest number.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 422) as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HENDERSON L. LANHAM, Representative from the State of Georgia.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the deceased Members who have been eulogized today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 8, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The following executive communications were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 85th Congress, 1st session, pursuant to Public Law 85–167, and House Resolution 415:

1182. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on audit of Washington, D. C., Central

Office, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) and the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53) (H. Doc. No. 281); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed, pursuant to House Resolution 415, 85th Congress.

1183. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 24, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Humboldt Bay (Buhne Point), Calif., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 282); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations, pursuant to Public Law 85-167, approved August 26, 1957.

1184. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1956, 1955, and 1954 (H. Doc. No. 283); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed, pursuant to House Resolution 415, 85th Congress.

1185. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Federal Facilities Corporation, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the period July 1, 1955, through January 31, 1957, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 284); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed, pursuant to House Resolution 415, 85th Congress.

1186. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 11, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Chartiers Creek at Washington, Pa., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 15, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 286); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations, pursuant to Public Law 85-167, approved August 26, 1957.

1187. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 20, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Hull Creek, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 287); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration, pursuant to Public Law 85-167, approved August 26, 1957.

1188. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 3, 1957, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of San Dieguito River, San Diego County, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 288); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration, pursuant to Public Law 85-167, approved August 26, 1957.

1189. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 289); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed, pursuant to House Resolution 415, 85th Congress.

1190. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 513 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1513), and the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 292); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed, pursuant to House Resolution 415, 85th Congress.

1191. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 293); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed, pursuant to House Resolution 415, 85th Congress.

[*Submitted January 7, 1958*]

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1192. A letter from the Clerk, United States House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, pursuant to the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 274); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1193. A letter from the Clerk, United States House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957, both inclusive, pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs 102, 103, 104, and 111 of title 2 of the Code of Laws of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

1194. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Virgin Islands Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 294); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1195. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, United States Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) and submitted in accordance with provisions of Public Law 128, 85th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1196. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board), covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6 of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 269); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1197. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting correspondence stating there have been no significant developments to report for the month of July relating to the program with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1198. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting correspondence stating there have been no significant developments to report for the month of August relating to the program with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1199. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting correspondence stating there have been no significant developments to report for the month of September relating to the program with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1200. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting correspondence stating there have been no significant developments to report for the month of October relating to the program with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1201. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting correspondence stating there have been no significant developments to report for the month of November relating to the program with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1202. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant easements for rights-of-way over national-forest lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1203. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1204. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222; 16 U. S. C. 715b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1205. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting correspondence that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees" for the fiscal year 1958 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, as required by section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1206. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for veterans" for the fiscal year 1958 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1207. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting correspondence that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Inpatient care" for the fiscal year 1958 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, as required by section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1208. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting correspondence that the appropriation to the Department of State for "International contingencies" for the

fiscal year 1958 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, as required by section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1209. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting correspondence that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Forest protection and utilization, Forest Service," for the fiscal year 1958 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, as required by section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1210. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions" for the fiscal year 1958 had been apportioned on that date on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1211. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting several reports covering violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 (i) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1212. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a report concerning a case where an error in the classification of charges caused an overobligation of the amount apportioned for acquisition of assets in the Bureau of Standards working capital fund, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 15 of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-34; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1213. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting correspondence certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Chowchilla Water District, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1214. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting correspondence certifying that adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Terra Bella Irrigation District, California, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1215. A letter from the Secretary of Labor transmitting a report of a violation of section 3679 (h) of the Revised Statutes, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 (i) (2) of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1216. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the certified report of the balances of appropriations under the control of the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1957, as required by section 1311 (b) of Public Law 663, approved August 26, 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1217. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of certain violations of subsection (h) occurring at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Bronx, N. Y., in compliance with section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665 (1) (2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1218. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting correspondence reporting violations pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665 (1) (2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1219. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting correspondence showing an overobligation in the Atomic Energy Commission allotment account on June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1220. A letter from the budget officer, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting copies of Standard Form 143 for the period ending September 30, 1957, for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, pursuant to section 53C of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-34, dated July 25, 1957; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1221. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation Administration, transmitting a report of a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes which occurred in a fund under the control of the agency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1222. A letter from the Director of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual Statistical Supplement to the Stockpile Report for the period January to June 1957, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1223. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the semiannual report entitled, "Research and Development Procurement Experimental Action Report," covering the period January 1, 1957, to June 30, 1957, pursuant to section IV of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1224. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, listing individual procurement actions negotiated under the authority of sections 2304 (a) (11) and 2304 (a) (16) of title 10, United States Code, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1957, pursuant to title 10, United States Code 2304 (e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1225. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, as relates to the Uniform Code of Military Justice"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1226. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison Department of the Air Force, transmitting the quarterly report of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1958 (September 30, 1957), pursuant to section 8031 (c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1227. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report showing the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 201 (c), Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1228. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on September 30, 1957, in compliance with section 201 (c), Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1229. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a permanent professor of physical education at the United States Military Academy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1230. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the procedure for ordering certain members of the Reserve components to active duty and the requirements for physical examination of members of the Reserve components"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1231. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting the report on the Department of the Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period January 1 to June 30, 1957, in accordance with provisions of section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1232. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting the semiannual report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records for the period January 1 through June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 220, 82d Congress, approved October 25, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1233. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of GSA operations in the production of abaca during the fiscal year 1957, submitted in accordance with section 7 of the Abaca Production Act of 1950, Public Law 683, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1234. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report showing the amount of money credited to the helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom during the preceding fiscal year, and the unexpended and unobligated balances on hand in such fund as of the end of such fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Amendatory Helium Act, approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885; 50 U. S. C. 164); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1235. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend sections 4355 (h), 6968 (h), and 9355 (h) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the Boards of Visitors to the United States Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1236. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy transmitting a report of the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of this report, pursuant to Public Law 301, approved February 10, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1237. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy transmitting a proposal of the Department of the Navy to give five radio transmitters determined to be obsolete and surplus property to the New Hampshire Aeronautics Commission at Concord, N. H., in compliance with title 10, United States Code, section 7545; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1238. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces) transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal section 6018 of title 10, United States Code, requiring the Secretary of the Navy to determine that the employment of officers of the Regular Navy on shore duty is required by the public interest; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1239. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Department of the Navy, transmitting the 10th semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1957, as required in title 10, United States Code, section 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1240. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the 26th quarterly report on property acquisitions for the quarter ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to subsection 201

(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1241. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the 25th quarterly report on the Federal contributions program for the quarter ending September 30, 1957, pursuant to subsection 201 (1) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1242. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a copy of the annual reports of officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, together with a report of audit by Haskins and Sells, certified public accountants, for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 630, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1243. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report pursuant to section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1244. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 41st quarterly report on export control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1245. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1956, pursuant to section 333 of the United States Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1246. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1247. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract procurement actions with small and large business firms for work in the United States, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1248. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract procurement actions with small and large business firms for work in the United States, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1249. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract procurement actions with small and large concerns for work in the United States, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1250. A letter from the president, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the 12 months ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1251. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of the Small Business Administration for the 6-month period January 1 through June 30, 1957, adjusted as of July 31, pursuant to section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1252. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the eighth semiannual report of the Small Business Administration covering operations between January 1 and June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended (Public Law 163); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1253. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Chairman, National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee, transmitting the third annual report of the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program, covering the activities of the National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee and its regional subcommittees from August 2, 1954, the date of its authorization in title VI of the Housing Act of 1954, to March 31, 1957; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1254. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the Housing Authority of the City of Atlanta, Ga., 1956, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, pursuant to the Housing Act of 1954, approved August 2, 1954 (42 U. S. C. 1435); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1255. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the Nashville Housing Authority, Nashville, Tenn., 1956, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, pursuant to the Housing Act of 1954, approved August 2, 1954 (42 U. S. C. 1435); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1256. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the Oak Ridge, Tenn., appraisal office, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, December 1956, regarding the appraisal of commercial properties in Oak Ridge, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1257. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the Oak Ridge, Tenn., appraisal office, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, December 1956, regarding residential property appraisals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1258. A letter from the Director, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting a report of lands acquired by the Commission during the fiscal year 1957 for the development of parks, etc., in nearby Maryland and Virginia, pursuant to section 4 of the act of Congress of June 6, 1924 (renumbered sec. 13 of Public Law 592, approved July 19, 1952); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1259. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1260. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the report of accomplishments during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and its plans for the coming year, pursuant to section 15 of Public Law 592, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1261. A letter from the Chairman, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, transmitting the final report of the Committee pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 813, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1262. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1263. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 18th Semiannual Report on the International Educational Exchange Program of the Department of State, July 1 to December 31, 1956, pursuant to section 1008, Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1264. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting the eighth semiannual report, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, for the period of January 1 to June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1265. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting a letter from the Davao Junior Chamber of Commerce, Davao City, Philippines, requesting continuance of the operation of the USIS center in Davao which serves the entire island of Mindanao; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1266. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the sixth semiannual report as of June 30, 1957, pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1240; 50 U. S. C. App. 2001–2016), as amended, and of section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 12; 22 U. S. C. 1621–1627), as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1267. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a restoration report in connection with the restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the act of July 25, 1956 (31 U. S. C. 701–708), in accordance with Budget Bureau Circular No. A–23, dated June 21, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1268. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts, in accordance with Budget Bureau Circular No. A–23, dated June 21, 1957, under the act of July 25, 1956 (31 U. S. C. 701–708, to the transfer appropriation account 12–2162700(29)–Government and Relief in Occupied Areas, Army (Transfer to Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service), 1956; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1269. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report for restoration of the balance withdrawn from the appropriation, "Export control." Bureau of Foreign Commerce, pursuant to section (2), Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1270. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the reports for restoration of balances withdrawn from the appropriation, "Operation and regulation," Civil Aeronautics Administration, and "Consolidated working fund," Civil Aeronautics Administration, pursuant to section (2), Public Law 798, 84th Congress, approved July 25, 1956; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1271. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report for restoration of balances withdrawn from an allocation to the National Bureau of Standards out of the appropriation "Ordnance and facilities, Navy, 1953," pursuant to section (2), Public Law 798, 84th Congress, approved July 25, 1956; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1272. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of surplus property disposed of during the past year by the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, pursuant to the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and authority delegated by the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, and in accordance with section 404 (d), Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1273. A letter from the Administrator General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1274. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on contracts negotiated under section 302 (c) (10) during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1957. During the period January 1 through June 30, this authority was used by the Departments of Agriculture, the Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Post Office, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1275. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations under section 203 (j); and all real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions under section 203 (k) of that act, for the calendar quarter, July 1 through September 30, 1957, pursuant to section 203 (o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1276. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of restoration of funds to pay a Missouri Pacific Railroad invoice settled by the General Accounting Office, payable from the appropriation, "Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority, Department of the Interior, 1945," the balance of which was transferred to "Payment of certified claims" account at the close of fiscal year 1947, in accordance with the Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-23, dated June 21, 1957, under the act of July 25, 1956 (31 U. S. C. 701-708); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1277. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report requesting restoration of balances under the 1954 appropriation of this agency resulting from an order on mandate of the District Court for the District of Columbia, pursuant to the Circular A-23, issued by the Director of the Budget on June 21, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1278. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting copies of requests for the restoration of unobligated balances to two appropriation accounts of the Department of State, pursuant to subsection (a) (2), Public Law 798, 84th Congress, 2d session, issued by the Bureau of the Budget in Circular No. A-23, dated June 21, 1957, and as shown on the Department of State's report under section 1311, Public Law 663, as of June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1279. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports of the Bureau of Accounts covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, pursuant to section 1 (a) (2), Public Law 798, 84th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1280. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1957, for account of the Pershing Hall memorial fund, pursuant to the act of Congress, approved June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426, sec. 3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1281. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the Office of the Treasurer of the United States, covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, pursuant to section 1 (a) (2), Public Law 798, 84th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1282. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report to the Secretary of the Army on the procurement of Energa grenades by the Ordnance Procurement Center, United States Army, Europe, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67), and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, as amended by the act of October 31, 1951 (41 U. S. C. 153 (c)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1283. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1928 (22 U. S. C. 278a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1284. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report concerning the limited utilization of progress payments in connection with offshore procurement contracts awarded by the Ordnance Procurement Center, Sandhofen, Germany, during fiscal years 1952 through 1955; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1285. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in the lower Colorado River Basin for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1286. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS), Department of the Navy, principally for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, pursuant to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1287. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the review of the administration of Government-owned property in possession of Defense contractors, pursuant to provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 65), and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, as amended by the act of October 31, 1951 (41 U. S. C. 153 (c)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1288. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on review of duplication of Government activities and related facilities in the Canal Zone, December 1956; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1289. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, in the Central Valley Basin, Calif., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1290. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the review of Department of the Air Force facilities contract AF 33(038)-16864 with Curtiss-Wright Corp., Wright aeronautical division, Wood Ridge, N. J., pursuant to provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67), and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, as amended by the act of October 31, 1951 (41 U. S. C. 153 (c)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1291. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Navy industrial fund, Marine Corps clothing and equipment factory, Philadelphia, Pa., for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956, pursuant to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1292. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Army industrial fund, Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Chemical Corps, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1955, pursuant to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1293. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the national school-lunch program and the special milk program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1294. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Bureau of Narcotics, Treasury Department, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1295. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the general supply fund, General Services Administration, for the 2-year period ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the provisions of section 109 (e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 630g (e)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1296. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1946 (38 U. S. C. 13F) (H. Doc. No. 296); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1297. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the Federal voting-assistance program from August 9, 1955, to July 1, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 296, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

1298. A letter from the Librarian of Congress and Chairman, the Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, transmitting the annual report of the affairs of the Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 246, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

1299. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the Federal Explosives Act (55 Stat. 863)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Report of the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board of January 31, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 341, 84th Congress; also a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 632), relating to the rehabilitation and preservation of historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1301. A letter from the Federal representative, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of

the Interior, transmitting a report on the negotiations leading up to the signing of the Klamath River Basin compact, pursuant to Public Law 316, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 613); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1302. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have finally been concluded with respect to *Red Lake Band, et al., Plaintiffs* v. *United States, Defendant* (docket No. 18–Q), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1303. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have finally been concluded with respect to *Hannahville Indian Community, Wilson, Mich., Forest County Potawatomi Community, Crandon, Wis., et al., Plaintiffs* v. *United States of America, Defendant* (docket No. 29–F), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1304. A letter from the secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, transmitting a report by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States for the calendar year 1956, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 408, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1305. A letter from the representative, Bear River Compact Commission, transmitting a correction to the report submitted August 14, 1957, and listed as executive communication No. 1139; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1306. A letter from the United States Antarctic projects officer, transmitting the report of the officer in charge, United States Antarctic programs, for the fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1307. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1308. A letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the following claim, *The Chickasaw Nation, Petitioner, v. The United States, Defendant* (docket No. 267), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1309. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report regarding Indians of the Wind River Reservation, the results of a survey and reclassification of the lands of the Wind River irrigation project, and the adequacy of the contribution of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes to the cost of administering the reservation, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 794, 84th Congress (70 Stat. 642); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1310. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the second report of the Attorney General pertaining to consenting to the renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, pursuant to Public Law 185, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1311. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual financial report on the commissary activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration outside the continental United States, pursuant to Public Law 390, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1312. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission for the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to section 4 (k) of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1313. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting two reports on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases for the months of June and July 1957, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1314. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of August 31, 1957, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1315. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1957, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1316. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of October 31, 1957, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1317. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the required information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 4 (d) of the Federal Power Act, approved August 26, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1318. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of two newly issued publications entitled "Major Natural Gas Pipe Lines Map, Dated June 30, 1957," and "Typical Residential Electric Bills, Cities of 2,500 Population or More, 1957"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1319. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of two newly issued publications entitled "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1956" and "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1956 Supplement"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1320. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a set of the newly issued maps entitled "Principal Electric Utility Generating Stations and Transmission Lines, 1957; together with plant and ownership list; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1321. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the Report of the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in Washington, D. C., September 18–20, 1957, pursuant to provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 331. (H. Doc. No. 297); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1322. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid under section 2672 by the Department of the Air Force, for the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1323. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of amounts paid or received under section 9802, 9803, or 9804, by the Department of the Air Force, for the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to section 9805, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1324. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to section 2732 (f), title 10, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1325. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill for the relief of Felix Garcia"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1326. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of the Western Union Telegraph Co. against the United States, pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 413, 31 U. S. C. 236); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1327. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on tort claims paid by GSA during the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to title 28, section 2673, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1328. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1329. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of receipts and expenditures in connection with the administration of the act for the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U. S. C. 1343); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1330. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1331. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1332. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1333. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1334. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1335. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, De-

partment of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1336. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copy of the annual report of all settlements made under the authority of section 2732, property loss incident to service; members of Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps and civilian employees, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2732 (f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1337. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "For the relief of James R. Martin and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1338. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a report of the claims paid by the Post Office Department, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act during the fiscal year 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1339. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing the payment to the American Export Lines, Inc., River and First Streets, Hoboken, N. J., in full settlement for damage to the steamship *Herman Melville*, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 646 (b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1340. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of a report listing the tort claims approved for payment in the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1341. A letter from the Deputy General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting copy of the annual report of the Atomic Energy Commission of claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the period from July 1, 1956, through June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 2673, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1342. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting two certified copies of the court's opinion rendered November 6, 1957, in the case of *Willard Gleeson, Individually and as President and Principal Owner of Broadcasting Corporation of America, and Its Stock* v. *The United States*, Congressional 4-53, pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509, title 28, United States Code, and to House Resolution 284, 83d Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1343. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion rendered December 4, 1957, in the case of the *Erie Railroad Company and Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company* v. *The United States*, No. Congressional 3-56, sections 1492 and 2509, title 28, United States Code, pursuant to House Resolution 402, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1344. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the United States Court of Claims, together with a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims, for the year ended October 5, 1957, pursuant to provisions of section 791 (c), title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1345. A letter from the corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor, USA., Inc., transmitting a report for the period July 26 to September 30, 1957, pursuant to section 14 (b) of congressional charter, Public Law 224, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1346. A letter from the national commandant, Marine Corps League, transmitting a report to the Congress for the fiscal year 1957, pursuant to charter granted in 1937; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1347. A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting a report of audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to sections 15 (a) and 16, Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1348. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities under title XII, Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, as of September 30, 1957, to provide war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, in accordance with section 1211 of this act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1349. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of this Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from July 1 through September 30, 1957, in accordance with section 13 of that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1350. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act applicable to certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1351. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 14 (c) of the act of August 9, 1955 (6 U. S. C. 14); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1352. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 36th Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1353. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940, as amended, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters so as to change the method by which the apportionment of the total cost is made"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1354. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the operation and maintenance of certain flood-control projects by local interests"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1355. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 4, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Dutch Creek, Scott and Yell Counties, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted July 25, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1356. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 21, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach-erosion-control study of area 10, Thames River to Niantic Bay, Conn., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. 334); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1357. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 20, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash. (south jetty), requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 16, 1954; to the Committee on Public Works.

1358. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 12, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Coosa River and tributaries at and in vicinity of Rome, Ga., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1359. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 13, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a letter report on Dogy and Clear Creeks, Osage County, Okla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1360. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 18, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Arkansas River, Levee District No. 1, Conway County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 26, 1957; to the Committee on Public Works.

1361. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 27, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Spring Creek, Yell County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted July 25, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1362. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 11, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Arkansas River and tributaries at and in vicinity of Hannaberry Lake area, Arkansas, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted December 8, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1363. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 26, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Oneida Creek and tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1364. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 27, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Palarm Creek, Pulaski and Faulkner Counties, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted June 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1365. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 19, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a letter report on Allegheny River at Coudersport, Pa., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control,

House of Representatives, adopted July 5, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1366. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 3, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on Moreau River, S. Dak., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1367. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 2, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Coal Creek, Okla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1368. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 13, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Boston Harbor, Mystic South Channel, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 15, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works.

1369. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 14, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Lost Creek at Seneca, Mo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted November 15, 1945, and authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

1370. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 27, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on White River between Newport and Augusta, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 17, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

1371. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 27, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Spadra Creek, Johnson County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted January 28, 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

1372. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 29, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a report on East Pass Channel from Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, and the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 18 and April 21, 1953, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

1373. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 31, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Portneuf River and Marsh Creek, Idaho, requested by the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted July 23, 1946, and July 27, 1946, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

1374. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 19, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Winooski River, Vt., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted June 20, 1940; to the Committee on Public Works.

1375. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 24th annual report covering the activities of the TVA during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Public Works.

1376. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the seventh annual report of the Subversive Activities Control Board, pursuant to section 12 (c) of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, Public Law 831, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1377. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including the period ending October 31, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 47, 66th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1378. A letter from the Secretary of Defense transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1379. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting the second annual report of the Renegotiation Board, 1957, pursuant to section 114, Public Law 870, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1380. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded and an agreement entered into with the Government of Mexico providing for the sale of yellow corn on October 23, 1957, pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), and in accordance with Public Law 128, 85th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1381. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded and a supplemental agreement entered into with the Government of the Polish People's Republic, pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Congress, and in accordance with Public Law 128, 85th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1382. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for "Salaries and expenses" for the fiscal year 1958, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental or deficiency appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1383. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for servicemen's indemnities, for the fiscal year 1958, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1384. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that certain appropriations to the Department of Labor for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, for the fiscal year 1958, have been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to subsection (e) (1) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1385. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that certain appropriations to the Canal Zone Government for operating expenses, for the fiscal year 1958, have been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental appropriation, pursuant to subsection (e) (1) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1386. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for maintenance and operation of supply depots for the fiscal year 1958, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental or deficiency appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1387. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting relative to reporting that the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for inpatient care for the fiscal year 1958 has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1388. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a request to withdraw its support for H. R. 3041, "To further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1389. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the United States Air Force flying pay report as of August 31, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1390. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report setting forth the financial condition of working capital funds of the Department of Defense at June 30, 1956, and the results of their operation for the year then ended, pursuant to section 405 (c) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1391. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report for the calendar year ending December 31, 1957, covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense, pursuant to Public Law 1028, 84th Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1392. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to provide for the temporary promotion of ensigns of the Navy and of second lieutenants of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1393. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the 27th report on property acquisitions, for the quarter ending September 30, 1957, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1394. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract procurement awards to small and large business firms for work in the United States, pursuant to section 6, Public Law 268, 84th Congress, which amended section 211 of the Small Business Act of 1953; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1395. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the activities of the Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, in the Columbia River Basin for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1396. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report for partial restoration of the balance withdrawn from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Business and Defense Services Administration", pursuant to section (2), Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1397. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of 2 disposal transactions of foreign excess personal property during the calendar year 1957, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1398. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects as required by section 6 of the act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105). Also copy of the statement, "Hydrologic Bases for Financial Studies, Colorado River Storage Project," revised December 1957, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 485, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1399. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed additional authority for the fiscal year 1958 for the Department of Defense in the amount of $1,370,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 298); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1400. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 299); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1401. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 261); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1402. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting an estimate of the cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in each State and the District of Columbia prepared for the purpose of apportioning Interstate System funds authorized for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, 1961, and 1962, pursuant to Public Law 627, 84th Congress (H. Doc. No. 300); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1403. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting data regarding reimbursement for certain highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with the several State highway departments, pursuant to section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (H. Doc. No. 301); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1404. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting certain plans for works of improvement, pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 1005), and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1405. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the stockpiling program for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1406. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a special report for consideration in connection with the semiannual reports, respecting payment of claims based on corrections of military records, which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury are required to make to Congress under section 207 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 191a (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1407. A letter from the president, the Federal Bar Association, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the Federal Bar Association, pursuant to Public Law 662, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1408. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1957; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1409. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 264), and the general provisions of section 114 of the act of September 12, 1950 (31 U. S. C. 66b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1410. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 43d Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1411. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting the audit report of March 31, 1957, of the Reserve Officers Association, pursuant to Public Law 595, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1412. A letter from the past president, Conference of State Societies, Inc., transmitting a copy of an audit report on the conference of State Societies, Inc., for the period June 1, 1956, to August 24, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1413. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1414. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1415. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river-basin plans, for flood control, irrigation, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1416. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 71st annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1417. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a statement of the compromise settlements effected during the year 1957, pursuant to Public Law 673, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

The following reports were filed subsequent to the adjournment of the 85th Congress, 1st session:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to House Resolution 99, pertaining to the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on case study of a procurement by the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to House Resolution 56, 85th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on interlocking directors and officials of 135 large financial companies of the United States pursuant to House Resolution 56, 85th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9610. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Science Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 9611. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, to provide for the coordination and integration of policies and procedures with respect to Federal programs in the fields of science and technology; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 9612. A bill to prohibit the President from calling out the National Guard and from using Federal troops in the enforcement of State laws and Federal court orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9613. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee To Study the Problems Relating to the Navigation, Use, and Control of Outer Space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 9614. A bill to extend and expand the authority of Public Law 480, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 9615. A bill to amend section 1331 of title 10 of the United States Code to authorize retired pay for certain individuals who were reservists before August 16, 1945, and who performed active duty during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 9616. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 9617. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians for certain ceded lands embraced within and otherwise required in connection with the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9618. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for furnishing surplus dairy products to the Coast Guard, the Coast Guard Academy, and the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 9619. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Congressional Award for Scientific Achievement to be granted to certain individuals in recognition of their outstanding contributions to scientific endeavors; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 9620. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to assistance for the maintenance and operation of schools in federally impacted areas, to extend its effectiveness for 2 additional years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 9621. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital at Topeka, Kans., the Colmery-O'Neil Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 9622. A bill to provide for engineering, location, and site planning studies to determine the feasibility of abandonment by the Department of the Army of a portion of Camp Stoneman, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9623. A bill to provide a 2-year extension of the program of financial assistance in the operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Law 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9624. A bill to provide that the rates of compensation of officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall hereafter be fixed and adjusted by wage boards on the basis of prevailing rates and practices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 9625. A bill to amend the act of September 11, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 9626. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 9627. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Alaska to the city of Ketchikan, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9628. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of cost-of-living allowances received by certain caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 9629. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to prohibit the granting of authority to broadcast subscription television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 9630. A bill relating to the deduction for income-tax purposes of contributions to the United States for use in providing scholarships for students of science; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9631. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in commerce of toys or children's apparel, children's furniture, or children's oral utensils which are made in whole or in part of a toxic or flammable substance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 9632. A bill to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on crude and calcined bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9633. A bill to permit a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 and is disabled, or whose spouse has attained the age of 65 and is disabled, to deduct up to $20,000 of medical expenses incurred in any year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9634. A bill to expedite the utilization of television facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 9635. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national program of science scholarships, and to provide for the establishment of a program of loans to educational institutions to aid in providing adequate science facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 9636. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9637. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9638. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 9639. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 9640. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9641. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COAD:

H. R. 9642. A bill to provide minimum price support levels for whole milk and butterfat during the 2-year period beginning April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 9643. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the deferment of certain schoolteachers and persons studying to become schoolteachers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9644. A bill to provide cost-of-living increases in the compensation of postal employees in localities of 500,000 population or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9645. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. R. 9646. A bill to provide a gradual increase, from $600 to $1,200 over a 4-year period, in the additional personal income-tax exemptions allowed a taxpayer and his spouse by reason of their attainment of age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 9647. A bill prohibiting the interstate transportation of minors less than 16 years of age for employment purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9648. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide a fine for violations of section 6 of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9649. A bill to permit visitors from abroad to bring a limited amount of gifts into the United States free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 9650. A bill to provide minimum price-support levels for whole milk and butterfat during the 2-year period beginning April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9651. A bill to replace the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense with one Chief of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9652. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to institute for the United States a civil action for preventive relief whenever any acts have been committed which would give rise to a cause of action under section 1980 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 9653. A bill to provide that the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River shall hereafter be known and designated as the Walter F. George lock and dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 9654. A bill to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the steamship *United States;* to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 9655. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Oregon State Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair to be held at Portland, Oreg., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9656. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 9657. A bill to provide for assisting the States in the improvement and control of certain areas adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 9658. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9659. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 9660. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of certain involuntary conversions of real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9661. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of amounts realized on the disposition of certain restricted stock options to the grantor corporation on the liquidation of such corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 9662. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and

Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 9663. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act so as to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from treating propaganda advertising, lobbying, and other political expenditures as operating expenses in computing rates and charges by licensees and public utilities; to require licensees and public utilities to report such expenditures; and to require the Commission to investigate and report upon such expenditures by licensees and public utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9664. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that expenditures by public utilities for propaganda advertising, lobbying, and other political purposes shall not be allowed as deductions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 9665. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for certain judicial review of administrative removals and suspensions of Federal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9666. A bill to further secure and protect the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9667. A bill to prohibit the use of the National Guard to obstruct the enforcement of any Federal law or any order of a Federal court; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9668. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Outer Space; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 9669. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit interstate commerce in stilettos and switchblade and gravity knives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9670. A bill to authorize the furnishing of Gold Star lapel buttons to widows, parents, and next of kin of persons who lost or lose their lives as the result of injury or disease incurred or aggravated in the armed services of the United States in time of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 9671. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide that the burial allowance payable thereunder shall be increased to $250; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9672. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Academy of Science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 9673. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide the conditions under which retired pay may be paid in the case of retired officers dropped from the rolls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 9674. A bill to provide for the mandatory price support through March 31, 1960, for milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products; to maintain the productive capacity of our dairy-farming industry; to promote the orderly marketing of an adequate national supply of milk and dairy products; to encourage increased domestic consumption of dairy products in the interest of the national health and security; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 9675. A bill to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 9676. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9677. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 9678. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, so as to clarify the authority of the States and Territories with respect to certain cases within the purview of such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9679. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9680. A bill to establish the price for the marketing year ending March 31, 1959, and to provide a method of computing parity prices for manufacturing milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 9681. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9682. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 9683. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal income tax exemptions from $600 to $700, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9684. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 9685. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Science Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 9686. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 9687. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. R. 9688. A bill to provide minimum price-support levels for whole milk and butterfat during the 2-year period beginning April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 9689. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 9690. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 9691. A bill to amend section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9692. A bill to provide for a scholarship program to aid in maintaining and strengthening United States leadership in certain fields of science and technology; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 9693. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Fair and Exposition, to be held in July 1959, at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. R. 9694. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at an obsolescent canalized waterway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 9695. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 9696. A bill to support the price of milk for manufacturing purposes at not less than $3.50 per hundredweight; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 9697. A bill to provide a tax incentive for the employment of older workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 9698. A bill to amend section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that the allowance for transportation of house trailers upon permanent change of station by members of a uniformed service shall be increased to not more than 34 cents per mile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9699. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 by providing that for the marketing year ending March 31, 1959, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes shall be supported at not less than $3.50 per 100 pounds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 9700. A bill to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 9701. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9702. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9703. A bill to provide for an elective Governor and an elective Lieutenant Governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9704. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 9705. A bill to eliminate discrimination and segregation in the National Guard and Air National Guard, and to prohibit the use of the National Guard and the Air National Guard to aid or abet the violation of Federal law; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9706. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9707. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 9708. A bill to exchange certain lands in the city of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 9709. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 9710. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to increase to $250 the amount payable on account of the burial and funeral expenses of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 9711. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9712. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Armed Forces Science Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9713. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Patriot's Day, with a likeness of Paul Revere on such stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 9714. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9715. A bill to recognize waiver of benefits payable under a private or public retirement plan for the purpose of meeting annual income limitations for disability or death pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9716. A bill to remove the 1-year limitation on payment of accrued benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9717. A bill to provide that veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while hospitalized; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9718. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and children of World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 9719. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the veterans guaranteed home loan program for 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9720. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 9721. A bill to amend section 1482 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the payment of transportation expenses of certain survivors of deceased servicemen to attend group burials in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 9722. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide a court to which appeals may be taken from the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9723. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide additional pay for members of the uniformed services who serve in Antarctica; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9724. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to persons who serve or have served as members of a United States expedition in Antarctica continuously for a period of more than 30 days; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 9725. A bill to establish a national program of scholarships to be awarded annually by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to students in certain fields of science; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 9726. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall not sever service connection of any veteran's disability when he has been in receipt of compensation for 10 or more years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9727. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to provide that disaster loans to cover economic injury may be made to small-business concerns in a duly designated disaster area without regard to the nature of the disaster; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 9728. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 9729. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 9730. A bill to stabilize and "freeze" as of January 1, 1958, the Veterans' Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945 edition, and the extensions thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 9731. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 9732. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to provide allowance for summer fallow practices in determining acreage allotment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 9733. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and rights-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the county of Teton, Wyo.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 9734. A bill to regulate the importation of tuna; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 9735. A bill to include as creditable service for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act certain unused sick leave to the credit of an employee; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9736. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more equitable tax treatment for wage earners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 9737. A bill to provide for the acquisition by the United States of tribal lands of the Klamath Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9738. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in the said city of Macon containing 5.39 acres, more or less; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9739. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 9740. A bill to provide that the United States shall hold certain land in trust for members of the Makah Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9741. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 9742. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow disabled individuals a deduction with respect to the depreciation on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9743. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a single woman can qualify for admission to a low-rent housing project and the age at which a woman can qualify her family for admission to a project designed specifically for elderly families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H. R. 9744. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 9745. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 9746. A bill to amend section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code to limit the use of the Armed Forces to enforce Federal laws or the orders of Federal courts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9747. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the calling of the National Guard into Federal service except in time of war or invasion or upon the request of a State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 9748. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to permit actions to recover damages for personal injuries sustained in an automobile accident to be brought in the judicial district in which such accident occurred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution to provide for the annual issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the birth of Jesus Christ in the true spirit of Christmas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 465. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. J. Res. 467. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. J. Res. 468. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Mr. KEARNEY:

H. J. Res. 469. Joint resolution creating a commission to assist in the celebration of the 350th anniversary of the exploration of the Hudson River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 470. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 471. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. J. Res. 473. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from discriminating on the basis of residence in taxing income; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 474. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. J. Res. 475. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 476. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize Congress to limit the power of courts of the United States to determine that statutes of the United States or of any State are repugnant to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 477. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. J. Res. 478. Joint resolution creating a Commission to assist in the celebration of the 350th anniversary of the exploration of the Hudson River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution providing that the United States mission to the United Nations shall take such steps as might be necessary to have each day's session in the United Nations opened with a prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 233. Concurrent resolution favoring Congressional recognition of the National Railroad Museum to be located at Green Bay, Wis.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 423. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact measures tending to cause the withdrawal of Federal military forces from the occupation of Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorials of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging a constitutional amendment permitting school integration optional on a State basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to recommending immediate consideration of a substantial reduction of the combined normal and surtax rates on personal income; tax relief for small corporations; reduction of estate and gift taxes; and reduction in the expenditures being made by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution relative to the imposition and collection of taxes on income by the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to transmitting an amendment to an interstate civil defense and mutual aid compact between the States of Ohio and Indiana; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting passage of H. R. 7574 and S. 2014, to alleviate the present problems of the Armed Forces in retaining adequate personnel for the defense of our Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to advising the President of the United States that the Legislature of the State of Texas requests that he desist and refrain from sending Federal troops into Texas and interfering with the constitutional right of the State of Texas regarding its schools; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States recommending an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the electoral college system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, recommending an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to preserving the individual States as States, rather than as political subdivisions of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting legislation pertaining to the requirements for appointment as Justice or Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that the personal Federal income-tax exemption be increased from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to petroleum imports from Canada, and stating that they shall be exempt in determining the ratio of imports of crude oil and residual fuel oil to domestic production of crude oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9749. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary D'Agostino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9750. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Teodora Cassano Di Bari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9751. A bill for the relief of Maria Cusumano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 9752. A bill for the relief of Taka Motoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 9753. A bill for the relief of Dionysius Gorgatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 9754. A bill for the relief of John Favia (also known as John J. Curry); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 9755. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Alaska to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9756. A bill for the relief of Gerald K. Edwards, Lawrence R. Hitchcock, Thomas J. Davey, and Gerald H. Donnelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 9757. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Giardino Marchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 9758. A bill for the relief of James Hung-Shung Sung and his wife, Elizabeth Sung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9759. A bill for the relief of Ilpyong John Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9760. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vivien Lee Loh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 9761. A bill for the relief of Tara Miah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9762. A bill for the relief of Janis Silins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 9763. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 9764. A bill for the relief of Eva Bromberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 9765. A bill for the relief of Mr. Marion S. Symms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 9766. A bill for the relief of Angela Marchese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 9767. A bill for the relief of Anka Kostic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 9768. A bill for the relief of Gunars Dambe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H. R. 9769. A bill for the relief of Jean Pierre Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9770. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louis (Georgette) Mezei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9771. A bill for the relief of Miss Kyriakitsa (Koula) S. Psofidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9772. A bill for the relief of William C. Hutto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9773. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lourene O. Estes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 9774. A bill for the relief of Kirkor Devecioglu (also known as Kirkor Devejian) and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 9775. A bill for the relief of William J. McGarry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 9776. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Aurora Cabral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9777. A bill for the relief of Miss Vincenzina Viliani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. R. 9778. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Monteroso Cutri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 9779. A bill for the relief of Nadia Baki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 9780. A bill to provide that William P. O'Brien shall be admitted to and treated in a Veterans' Administration hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 9781. A bill for the relief of Lewis W. Hunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 9782. A bill for the relief of Arthur Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES:

H. R. 9783. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Henry Oscar (Olga McCurdy) Ramsey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9784. A bill for the relief of Vincent Madziar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEENEY:

H. R. 9785. A bill for the relief of Dionysia A. (Pseftis) Viahos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9786. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caterlina Cancino Zimmermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 9787. A bill for the relief of Edward Y. Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 9788. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Augestad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9789. A bill for the relief of Amile Hatem and Linda Hatem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9790. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Nartatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9791. A bill for the relief of Angela D'Agata Nicolosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 9792. A bill to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Southern Pacific Co. to James Giono; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 9793. A bill for the relief of Lee Kuhn Wui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 9794. A bill for the relief of Samuel Ismach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 9795. A bill for the relief of Issa Morcos Issa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. R. 9796. A bill for the relief of Matsuyo Ishida Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 9797. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Moraitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 9798. A bill for the relief of Biaggio D'Alessandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9799. A bill for the relief of Sister Theodorine (Johanna Hendrina Huberta Janssen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9800. A bill for the relief of Azat Serkis Belgin, Sofik Yevkine Belgin, Nadya Ayla Belgin, Karmen Silva Belgin Ketil, and Vahe Ketil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 9801. A bill for the relief of Philomena Branch (Fumiko Ikeda); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 9802. A bill for the relief of Marcelino, Adelaida, Medardo, and Manuel Rocamora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 9803. A bill for the relief of Hsienhsiung Ko, also known as James Ko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 9804. A bill for the relief of Mack Hernandez (also known as Macario Hernandez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 9805. A bill for the relief of Fredric John Leise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9806. A bill for the relief of Edward Zecha, Mrs. Tjung Seng Nio Zecha, Walter Zecha, and Hettie Zecha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9807. A bill for the relief of Ali H. Kabra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9808. A bill for the relief of E. L. Terry, W. A. Ward, and G. S. Maness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 9809. A bill for the relief of Bruno Beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 9810. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9811. A bill for the relief of Rosa Jakubowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

## PETITIONS, ETC.

**Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:**

340. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the general secretary, the Universalist Church of America, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Universalist Church of America requesting the repeal of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

341. Also, petition of the president, Texas Society Sons of the American Revolution, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of Senate bill 2798 and House bills 9271 and 9359, regarding national headquarters location in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

342. Also, petition of the president, Board of City Development, Stamford, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that they be placed on record as urging immediate curtailment of the foreign imports of crude oil and its products into this country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

343. Also, petition of the president, California Association of Airport Executives, Inc., relative to endorsing a resolution adopted by the American Association of Airport Executives at its annual convention at Houston, Tex., May 8, 1957, relating to Federal funds for storage hangars either by Federal grant or by Federal loan from the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

344. Also, petition of the executive secretary, League of Alaskan Cities, Palmer, Alaska, petitioning consideration of certain resolutions adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities at is recent convention at Anchorage, Alaska, which would benefit the Territory of Alaska, and calling for action on these resolutions on the national level; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

345. Also, petition of Sam C. Hanna, Rochester, N. Y., requesting the establishment of a code of procedure for the Constitutional Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

346. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Charlottesville, Va., relative to stating a grievance against the Department of the Air Force for treatment received, and for not granting reemployment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

347. Also, petition of Yoshi C. Takano, New York, N. Y., relative to a grievance regarding the matter of crime of embezzlement of income returned check by the district director of internal revenue on his governmental business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

348. Also, petition of the recording secretary, St. Louis Post Office Clerks' Union of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, St. Louis, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to pocket veto by the President of the postal pay increase bill; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

349. Also, petition of the city clerk, Racine, Wis., requesting that the Grass River lock in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence Seaway be designated as the "Wiley-Dondero lock" as a fitting tribute to these two Congressional leaders for their contributions in making the St. Lawrence Seaway project a reality; to the Committee on Public Works.

350. Also, petition of executive director, the American Institute of Architects, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of the American Institute of Architects past presidents' centennial resolution on the development of the National Capital; to the Committee on Public Works.

351. Also, petition of Alexander Meiklejohn, Berkeley, Calif., relative to a grievance pertaining to a House resolution of 1938, which created and authorized a Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

352. Also, petition of H. B. Crow, president, Kiwanis Club, Mendota, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of the bills H. R. 6452 and H. R. 9119, providing for a realistic tax-reduction program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

## QUARTERLY REPORT

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1957 were received after July 20, 1957, too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, P. O. Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $470. E. (9) $598.59.

---

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $6,909.89.

---

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,760.34. E. (9) $9,760.34.

---

A. The American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $9,642.44. E. (9) $20,347.93.

---

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $6,635.80.

---

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $503.41.

---

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,243.79.

---

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Room 502, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $10,956.50.

---

A. The Association for the Best Use of Florida Lands, Inc., 614 Aledo Avenue, Coral Gables, Fla.
E. (9) $1,334.17.

---

A. W. T. Beeks, 1111 Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. S. B. Dahl Agency, 1121 Fairview North, Seattle, Wash.

---

A. Beghtol, Mason, Knudson & Dickeson, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

---

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Mr. George L. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

---

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1306 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $735.53.

---

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,571.25. E. (9) $2,571.25.

---

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,063.15. E. (9) $3,063.15.

---

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,657.81.

---

A. Roland Boyd, 202 Central National Bank Building, McKinney, Tex.
B. Hub Hill, 2121 North Field Street, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $846.80.

---

A. Roland Boyd, 202 Central National Bank Building, McKinney, Tex.
B. North Texas Municipal Water District, Wylie, Tex.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $260.07.

---

A. Roland Boyd, 202 Central National Bank Building, McKinney, Tex.
B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

---

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim-Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $482.

---

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e. V. Contrescarpe 46, Bremen, Germany.
E. (9) $1,100.87.

---

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $512.50. E. (9) $64.15.

---

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Mrs. Rollin Brown, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union, Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $4,019.28. E. (9) $4,507.

---

A. Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $7,214.95.

---

A. Carretta and Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
E. (9) $448.29.

---

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

---

A. Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,501.21. E. (9) $5,902.

---

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,323.29. E. (9) $2,323.29.

---

A. Clay L. Cochran, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $57.50.

---

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $184.47.

---

A. Communications Workers of America, 1208 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,192,064.65. E. (9) $5,634.40.

---

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

---

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

---

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers' Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

---

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $217.

---

A. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 173 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $633.29. E. (9) $408.81.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $329,065.86 E. (9) $1.25.

A. John W. Cross, 920 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Deutsche Amerikakohlen-Transportgesellschaft, M. B. H., 17 Grabenstrasse, Dusseldorf, Germany.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $910.22.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $75.51.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 5863 Chevy Chase Parkway, Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carriers Conference, American Trucking Association, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $111.30.

A. John W. Edelman, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,150.51. E. (9) $535.19.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,550. E. (9) $251.90.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $515.50. E. (9) $16.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, Route 2, Vienna, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wood, King, and Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $290.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $1,314.96.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,537.72.

A. Clyde L. Flynn, Jr., Elizabethtown, Ill.
B. Independent Fluorspar Producers Assn., Rosiclare, Ill.
D. (6) $4,855. E. (9) $5,525.48.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $1,334.99.

A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $496.88. E. (9) $496.88.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Leo Goodman, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America.
D. (6) $1,241.

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of Postmasters of the United States, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $200.

A. Carl O. Gustafson, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3,774.51.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $574.03.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96. E. (9) $85.90.

A. Robert E. Harper, National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. William B. Henderson, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Parcel Post Association, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,125. E. (9) $6,528.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $158.06.

A. Jake D. Hill, 1005 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S. C.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S. C.
E. (9) $227.62.

A. L. S. Hitchner, Associations Building, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, Associations Building, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Richard C. Holmquist, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,032.81. E. (9) $364.50.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,169.71. E. (9) $2,169.71.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $125.55.

A. Ray L. Hulick, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $515.50. E. (9) $20.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $1,049.85. E. (9) $1,846.92.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,100. E. (9) $7,046.91.

A. International Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $227.07.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $1,388.47.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wallace M. Jopling, People's Hardware Building, Lake City, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $450.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,873.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Room 1022, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. King and Noble, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributor, 30 East Cedar Street, Chicago, Ill., et al.
E. (9) $528.33.

A. Thomas R. Kingsley, corner 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Movers Conference of America, corner 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150.

A. J. M. DeW. (Jack) Kyle II, Post Office Box 1520, Washington, D. C.
B. Dav-Philians Social Security Organization, Inc., Super Market Building, Rizal Avenue, Manila, Republic of the Philippines.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $564.81.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 301, Washington, D. C.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

---

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,388.61. E. (9) $904.84.

---

A. William D. McAdams, 1200 South Courthouse Road, Arlington, Va.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000.

---

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $503.41.

---

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $140.08.

---

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $90.42.

---

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers' Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. MacLeish, Sprey, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $576.92.

---

A. Harry B. Madsen, 1559 North McKinley Road, Lake Forest, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,575. E. (9) $581.50.

---

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Marks & Trowbridge, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.
E. (9) $795.90.

---

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1908 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,344.

---

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1908 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $675.

---

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $1,875.

---

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., and Deerfield Academy, Deerfield, Mass.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $43.60.

---

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $532.90.

---

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $579.70.

---

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Datchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $379.85. E. (9) $379.85.

---

A. Moot, Sprague, Marcy & Gulick, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.
B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,401.52.

---

A. Movers Conference of America, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $277.70. E. (9) $277.70.

---

A. Andrew P. Murphy, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $121.80.

---

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Association of Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Field Officers, 402 Fourth Avenue, New Kensington, Pa.
D. (6) $1,410.95. E. (9) $406.48.

---

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $29,820.31. E. (9) $18,415.01.

---

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $43,150.74. E. (9) $29,814.37.

---

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 307 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,694.40. E. (9) $1,650.

---

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $4,200.

---

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $25,210. E. (9) $19,378.41.

---

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, in care of A. B. Baker, the Medical School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $5,000.

---

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,151.12. E. (9) $2,255.57.

---

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,082.90. E. (9) $5,451.40.

---

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,631.90. E. (9) $2,450.16.

---

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $829.20.

---

A. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,150.

---

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $17,285. E. (9) $12,066.83.

---

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $520.22. E. (9) $610.

---

A. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $18,458.50. E. (9) $7,571.32.

---

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,741.20. E. (9) $8,435.65.

---

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $3,187.34. E. (9) $2,403.28.

---

A. John W. Nerlinger, Jr., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $87.66.

---

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $19.

---

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $572.59. E. (9) $1,187.49.

---

A. L. M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

---

A. Charles A. Parker, room 714, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $286.85. E. (9) $28.35.

---

A. The Patent Office Society, Box 685, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $325.

---

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, Room 301, Bond Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N. J.
D. (3) $2,538.42. E. (9) $1,771.24.

A. Philco Corporation, Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Kenneth M. Plaisted, 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 315, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 315, Milwaukee, Wis.
D. (6) $98.25. E. (9) $115.91.

A. Rufus G. Poole, Suite 1219, Simms Building, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
B. American Potash & Chemical Corp., Trona, Calif., et al.

A. Homer V. Prater, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,997.66.

A. Mrs. R. I. C. Prout, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Room 607, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $12,499.97. E. (9) $5,672.16.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 792, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $48. E. (9) $58.99.

A. Otis M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,357.15.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Grower's Association of California, 2201 F Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
E. (9) $144.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Theron Jennings Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96. E. (9) $27.20.

A. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $5.93.

A. Beecher Foulke Russell, Eastover, New Wilmington, Pa.
D. (6) $201. E. (9) $203.

A. Ira Saks, 1505 Rockwell Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $125.12.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Mercantile Exchange, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $1,647.67.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers' Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $93.02.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $405.04.

A. Paul Sifton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America.
D. (6) $1,740. E. (9) $1,150.43.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr., 16 West Moreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $4,818.89.

A. Lucius S. Smith 3d, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,400. E. (9) $305.30.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,059.35.

A. William D. Snow, 970 Spitzer Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $310.20.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Room 812, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $99. E. (9) $1,314.56.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $3,539.62. E. (9) $3,959.67.

A. Samuel Spencer and Frank J. Whalen, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Edward Martin Hinsberger, care of R. M. Franke, 55 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Samuel Spencer and Frank J. Whalen, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Josefa Kusiak, 4814 Dexter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $252. E. (9) $2.

A. Mrs. Ada B. Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $87.53. E. (9) $87.53.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 629 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Texas Committee of Correspondence, Post Office Box 912, Austin, Tex.

A. Clarence D. Todd, 1625 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carrier Conference, American Trucking Assoication, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. The Townsend Plan, Inc., and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,370.95.

A. Upper Colorado River Grass Roots, Inc., Grand Junction, Colo.
E. (9) $905.99.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Nickel Co., Inc., 67 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $12,000. E. (9) $351.45.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $37.20.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $157.57.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $26,437.77. E. (9) $2,409.56.

---

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $463.64.

---

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,770. E. (9) $1,770.

---

A. Wilkinson Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $3.70.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $30.48.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
E. (9) $33.68.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Reservation, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $55.42.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $6.05.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

---

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,333.33. E. (9) $34.12.

---

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Harley Z. Wooden, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The International Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $50.

## QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1957:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

**REPORT**

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

| P | QUARTER | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2d | 3d | 4th |
| (Mark one square only) | | | | |

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description; (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution; (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

**AFFIDAVIT**

[Omitted in printing]

**PAGE 1**

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this Report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

*Receipts* (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

*Loans Received*

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

| *Amount* | *Name and Address of Contributor* |
|---|---|
| | (*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____) |
| $1,500.00 | John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y. |
| $1,785.00 | The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill. |
| $3,285.00 | TOTAL |

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

*Expenditures* (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")

10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

*Loans Made to Others*

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

| *Amount* | *Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose* |
|---|---|
| $1,750.00 | 7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill." |
| $2,400.00 | 7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month. |
| $4,150.00 | TOTAL |

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $152.60.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $6.25.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Room 906, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U. S. Government, 900 F. Street NW., Room 906, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,625.45. E. (9) $62.75.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,294.39. E. (9) $12,212.92.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,024.75. E. (9) $4,024.75.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Room 418, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Room 418, Silver Spring, Md.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Nill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,080. E. (9) $268.45.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $925. E. (9) $289.15.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $7,243.44. E. (9) $7,243.44.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,081.40. E. (9) $6,081.40.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $26,749. E. (9) $26,749.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $37,244.12.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $169,263.65. E. (9) $9,292.72.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $140.25.

A. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162,766.92.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,679.98.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $392.22. E. (9) $313.97.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $12,783.73.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $8,188.42. E. (9) $3,220.20.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., in care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,546.33. E. (9) $5,686.77.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $457.54. E. (9) $457.54.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Parents' Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $12,191.56. E. (9) $2,590.51.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $13,080. E. (9) $8,471.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $42,224.68. E. (9) $9,520.65.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,772.26. E. (9) $1,772.26.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $9.12.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $4,403.52.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $7,963.99.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,647.75. E. (9) $1,471.84.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Room 400, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,310. E. (9) $1,182.23.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,249.99.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $136. E. (9) $271.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,574.82.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Simon & Schuster, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $4.02.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Room 502, 1400 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users.
D. (6) $1,145. E. (9) $11,934.45.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,152.03. E. (9) $11,152.03.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,076.96. E. (9) $2,076.96.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,107.57. E. (9) $3,107.57.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $14.48.

A. George P. Baker, 16 Eliot Street, Cambridge, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,584.70. E. (9) $626.98.

A. J. H. Ballew, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. N. C. Banfield, 110 Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.
B. Klukwan Iron Ore Corp., 110 Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.
D. (6) $4,559.46.

---

A. Hartman Barber, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $743.06.

---

A. James M. Barnes and Thurman Hill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

---

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,000.

---

A. William J. Barnhard, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Plywood Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N. Y.; American Association of Hardwood Plywood Users, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $176.27.

---

A. Irvin L. Barney, Room 303, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

---

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American National Theatre and Academy, 1545 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $84.94.

---

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $2,000.

---

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $99.92.

---

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Concert Managers, 30 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
E. (9) $6.59.

---

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

---

A. Beghtol, Mason, Knudson & Dickeson, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $73.48.



A. Bert Bell, One Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Football League, One Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $3,262.26.

---

A. George L. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $350.

---

A. Adm. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,692.30.

---

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,685.50.

---

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

---

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25.

---

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,302. E. (9) $426.

---

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,498.

---

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $110.

---

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

---

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

---

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $487.50.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

---

A. Thomas D. Blake, 4664 Reservoir Road, Washington, D. C.
B. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
E. (9) $13.57.

---

A. Mrs. Paul Blanchard, 408 A Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice Educational Organization.
D. (6) $80. E. (9) $30.

---

A. Blum, Lindsey & Powell, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $143.74.

---

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Investment Cos., 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,666.67. E. (9) $133.65.

---

A. John J. Boland, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $435.

---

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $390.

---

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,045.40.

---

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $205.45.

---

A. Boston & Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $74.

---

A. G. Stewart Boswell, Room 502 Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $0.92.

---

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Wallace M. Bradley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

---

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $1,407.30.

---

A. William A. Bresnahan, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $525.

---

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $562.59.

---

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

---

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $4,751.31. E. (9) $4,751.31.

---

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $512.50. E. (9) $8.

---

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. C. R. Brown, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,723.

---

A. J. D. Brown, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150.

---

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $545. E. (9) $121.89.

---

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $926.25. E. (9) $899.88.

---

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15.90.

---

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Room 502, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $168.75.

---

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $48.75.

---

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350.

---

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. John J. Burke, 1062 West Platinum, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $250.

---

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $835.19. E. (9) $385.54.

---

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $83.44.

---

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Mica Industry Tariff Committee, care of S. A. Montague, Spruce Pine Mica Co., Spruce Pine, N. C.
D. (6) $1,620.45. E. (9) $615.08.

---

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers' Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,874.99.

---

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $3.55.

---

A. C. G. Caffrey, Suite 504, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $31.

---

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 410 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 304 Empire State Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $1,700.

---

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers' Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $383.45.

---

A. Campaign for the 48 States, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,966.77. E. (9) $29,306.36.

---

A. Carl C. Campbell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $22.73.

---

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,538.48. E. (9) $253.84.

---

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union, Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $2,221.80. E. (9) $2,710.

---

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

---

A. John T. Carlton, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

---

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

---

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, 744 Pennsylvania Building, Canton, Ohio, and Washington, D. C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,200.

---

A. Clarence B. Carter, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

---

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

---

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation.

---

A. Larry Cates, 1143 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,814.06.

---

A. Francis R. Cawley, Room 1005, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,281. E. (9) $146.91.

---

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Colodets & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

---

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Great Eastern Shipping Co., Ltd., 14 Jamshedji Tata Road, Bombay, India.
D. (6) $600.

---

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

---

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,446.39. E. (9) $3,964.87.

---

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $190.75.

---

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $3,230.

---

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.
D. (6) $48.51. E. (9) $102.16.

---

A. Herman Clott, 711 14th Street NW., Room 600, Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, 412 Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,540.50. E. (9) $693.42.

---

A. Clay L. Cochran, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $38.20.

---

A. Clarence F. Cochrell, 501 Patrick Street, Portsmouth, Va.
B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $228.63.

---

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $76.55.

---

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Room 600, Washington, D. C.
B. Detroit Atlantic Navigation Corp., 3050 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $62.63.

---

A. Don C. Collins, Kit Carson, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

---

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.
E. (9) $5,244.49.

---

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $180.69.

---

A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $325.

---

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

---

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $7,894.01.

---

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

---

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $40.60.

---

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

---

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Raymond A. Cook, Gulf Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $619.47.

---

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

---

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Council of Life Underwriters, Room 1005, 208 South La Salle Street Building, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fountain Pen & Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc., 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Wilmera Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $175.

---

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $134.81.

---

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

---

A. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,670. E. (9) $11,064.85.

---

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $15.10.

---

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago & North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $19.45.

---

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, T. H.

---

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $38.33.

---

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Nickel Co., Inc., 67 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

---

A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $766.34.

---

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $70,840.79. E. (9) $575.

---

A. John W. Cross, 920 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Deutsche Amerikakohlen-Transportgesellschaft, M. B. H. (American German Coal Transport Co.), 17 Grabenstrasse, Dusseldorf, Germany.

---

A. Arthur J. Cunningham, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,842.53.

---

A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Vincenzo Buttaro, 84 Nelson Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., and Miss Domencia Buttaro, via Zuccarino No. 76, Mola di Bari, Province of Bari, Italy, daughter of Vincenzo Buttaro.
E. (9) $41.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Dr. Kuo York Chynn, 165 West 91st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $103.

---

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National License Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $675.

---

A. Louis S. Damiani, Post Office Box 54, Gatun, C. Z.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, AFL-CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $1,330. E. (9) $1,380.

---

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,062.50. E. (9) $17.75.

---

A. Paul J. Daugherty, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $700.

---

A. Bertram G. Davis, in care of the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,710.

---

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.

---

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000.

---

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, N. Y.
E. (9) $327.65.

---

A. Joseph B. Davis, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $74.20.

---

A. Opal D. David, 718 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee on the Fair Labor Standards Act of the National Consumers League, 348 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $21.80.

---

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Donald S. Dawson and Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250.22.

---

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Mary S. Deuel (Mrs. Wallace R.), 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Philip M. DeVany, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

---

A. R. T. DeVay, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,300.

---

A. George J. Dietz, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $27.48.

---

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,686.25. E. (9) $61.25.

---

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $2,535.60. E. (9) $135.60.

---

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $4,980.

---

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $3,125.

---

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $13,757.94. E. (9) $17,816.36.

---

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $22,339.32.

---

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,125.

---

A. Rufus G. Poole, Suite 1219, Simms Building, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
B. Domestic Potash Industry.
E. (9) $300.

---

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $462.50. E. (9) $45.41.

---

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $280.72.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,625.01.

---

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

---

A. C. L. Dorson, Room 906, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, Room 906, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,612.65. E. (9) $229.

---

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Holton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
B. The Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Holton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $225.

---

A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $3,300.

---

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

---

A. J. R. Dunkerley, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $340.

---

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., Room 502 Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis 12, Tenn.
D. (6) $232.50. E. (9) $3.70.

---

A. Stephen F. Dunn, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. William E. Dunn, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.
E. (9) $142.45.

---

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Monsanto Chemical Co., World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1,515.75.

---

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,913.08. E. (9) $777.91.

---

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $64.55. E. (9) $31.39.

---

A. Berman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

---

A. Harold Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $500.

---

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, Homer Building, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Otis H. Ellis, Suite 1128, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Suite 525, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,000.

---

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $230.

---

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1300 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

---

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,437.50.

---

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

---

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $98.37.

---

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,067.50. E. (9) $150.86.

---

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $24.50.

---

A. Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $1,186. E. (9) $501.90.

---

A. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $28,154.65. E. (9) $15,891.16.

---

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $150.

---

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $3,750.

---

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League of the U. S. A., New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.
D. (6) $5,850.

---

A. Financial General Corp., 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

---

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

---

A. First United Corp., 80 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $399.

---

A. Joel H. Fisher, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Civil Aviation Medical Association, 150 East 71st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $78.

---

A. John B. Fisher, Suite 1112, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Coal Shipping, Inc., 17 State Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750.

---

A. John B. Fisher, Suite 1112, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bangor & Aroostook Railroad, 84 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine.
D. (6) $3,750.

---

A. John B. Fisher, Suite 1112, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. C. R. Sprague & Son Co., 10 Post Office Square, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $2,500.

---

A. B. T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $305.

---

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $14.82.

---

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $470.79.

---

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $2,015.23.

---

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,398.75.

---

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $10,186.25. E. (9) $7,345.80.

---

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,350.

---

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

---

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $40.87.

---

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $64.15.

---

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bulova Watch Co., Inc., Bulova Park, Flushing, N. Y.
D. (6) $280. E. (9) $2.75.

---

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. L. S. Franklin 2309 Pinecraft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
E. (9) $535.

---

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $468.72.

---

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $427.66.

---

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,124.

---

A. James G. Frechette, Keshena, Shawano County, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

---

A. Walter Freedman, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Patchogue-Plymouth Corp., 261 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $10.45.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,750.

---

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,176.56. E. (9) $5,450.73.

---

A. George Milan Fuller, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America.

---

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

---

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $102.59.

---

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,450.

---

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10.

---

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $644.45.

---

A. Gus F. Geissler, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

---

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

---

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

---

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,102.50. E. (9) $202.78.

---

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $618.44.

---

A. Leif Gilstad, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Transportation Association of America.

---

A. Henry W. Goodall, 28 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $1,875.

---

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162.49. E. (9) $6.

---

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street Building NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500.

---

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

---

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,084. E. (9) $6,397.

---

A. Government Relations Committee, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. James L. Grahl, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $77.

---

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $67.68.

---

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $20,017.40. E. (9) $15,720.33.

---

A. Robert A. Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $158.48.

---

A. Robert A. Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $201.90.

---

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $442.50. E. (9) $24.75.

---

A. Richard D. Green, 515 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Editorial Association, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $715. E. (9) $959.92.

---

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $5.63.

---

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

---

A. Warren Griffiths, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $705.13. E. (9) $1.

---

A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

---

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,519.96. E. (9) $240.26.

---

A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,669.98. E. (9) $301.58.

---

A. Carl O. Gustafson, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $12,800.13.

---

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $566.88. E. (9) $495.29.

---

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $442.42.

---

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $331.53.

---

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $6.87.

---

A. Radford Hall, 601 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $222.20.

---

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,875.12. E. (9) $459.94.

---

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $8,740.31.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96. E. (9) $150.94.

A. Herbert E. Harris, II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $666.66. E. (9) $14.03.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $51.63.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,011.25.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Institute, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,599.99. E. (9) $5,723.77.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. U. S. Plywood Corp., 55 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $83.30.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $153.93.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, Suite 801, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $46.80.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $83.30.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $71.25.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $216.25.

A. John I. Heise, Jr., 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings & Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Chas. H. Heltzel, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $605. E. (9) $605.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,892.42. E. (9) $767.42.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $71.25.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $56.15. E. (9) $56.15.

A. Clinton M. Hester, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $1,085.68.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $42.11.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $55.38.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $196.88.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,699.97. E. (9) $449.97.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, Room 204, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $3,200.

A. Winfield M. Homer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $327.65.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald E. Horton.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. Cline House, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,725.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N. Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $306.58.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Harold K. Howe, 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,058.50.

A. Harold K. Howe, 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, Route 4, Box 235, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., Route 4, Box 235, Annapolis, Md.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.
E. (9) $227.92.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $275.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $1,749.75. E. (9) $1,413.71.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,680.72.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $23,374.58. E. (9) $5,200.

A. John L. Ingoldsby, Jr., 201 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Commerciale Antoine Vloeberghs, S. A., 209 Avenue D'Italie, Anvers, Belgium.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $5,340.76.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2,510.75.

A. International Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $165.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $2.76.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $932.94.

A. William Jackman, 234 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,875.

A. Nelson P. Jackson, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.
E. (9) $30.

A. Robert C. Jackson, suite 504, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $1,925. E. (9) $179.25.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $375.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,487.50. E. (9) $54.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participations Industrialles et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Merianstr 19, Basle, Switzerland.

A. Peter D. Joers, Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,250.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1206 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben Lee Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,696.32. E. (9) $271.69.

A. W. D. Johnson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, ORC&B Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Cullen B. Jones, Jr., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $256.66.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $126.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $8.50.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 705 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $757.80.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $340.50.

A. Max M. Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lipschultz, Altman, Geraghty & Mulally, Esqs., 530 Minnesota Building, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,873.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William Edward Kelly, 9532 Justine Drive, Falls Church, Va.
B. The Mosaic Tile Co., Zanesville, Ohio.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. (Miss) Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $10.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $340.28.

A. William J. Kennard, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $97.38.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $282.56.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1606 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $91.72.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Room 1022, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,694.88. E. (9) $2,840.70.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,275. E. (9) $275.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,294.70. E. (9) $1,384.96.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $221.25. E. (9) $71.38.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1,317.86.

A. Ludlow King, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. King & Noble, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $462.40.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $7.55.

A. Thomas R. Kingsley, Corner 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Movers Conference of America, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $62.50.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers' Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,442.27. E. (9) $55.30.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Klukwan Iron Ore Corp., 110 Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.
E. (9) $4,559.46.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,052.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $30.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $12.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,540.76. E. (9) $4,952.

A. Frank W. Kuehl, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $30.05.

A. Catherine G. Kuhne, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,097.49. E. (9) $6,333.91.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Russell A. Langdon, 20th Street at New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 20th Street at New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $249.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 718 Insurance Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $78.87.

A. J. Austin Latimer, Suite 1138, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. John Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $755. E. (9) $225.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $320.75. E. (9) $5.60.

A. Randall J. Le Boeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $70.77.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $4,103.22.

A. James R. Lee, 605 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $186.25.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $56. E. (9) $527.53.

A. Legislative Council, National Anti-Dumping Committee, Inc., 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $38. E. (9) $39.89.

A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $5,185.95.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,269.50. E. (9) $7,269.50.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $714.87.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11.41.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $69.69.

A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $554.16. E. (9) $185.65.

A. Arthur Y. Lloyd, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P. O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $24.88.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $325.

A. Charles E. Lofgren, 20th Street at New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 20th Street at New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Leonard Lopez, Room 303, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,749.93. E. (9) $15.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $660. E. (9) $264.50.

A. Harold O. Lovre, Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lowenstein, Pitcher, Spence, Hotchkiss, Amann & Parr, 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Emmco Insurance Co., South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic of Panama, Panama, Panama.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Marian Diane Delphine Sachs, Beekman Hotel, New York, N. Y., and Arthur Sachs, care of Moses & Singer, 29 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $14.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,962.50. E. (9) $25.80.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
D. (6) $900.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John A. McCart, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,761.90.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $686.60. E. (9) $208.48.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,628.54. E. (9) $453.95.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $500.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert P. McElroy, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $85.25.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $520.84. E. (9) $1,125.19.

A. A. J. McFarland.
B. Christian Amendment Movement.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $250.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. James H. McKenzie, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,335.01.

A. J. V. McLaughlin, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $685.46. E. (9) $321.30.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,047. E. (9) $53.60.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $425.

A. Joseph P. McSparron, 320 North Hopkins Street, Sayre, Pa.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $356.25. E. (9) $337.50.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc. Development Fund (Legislative), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,550. E. (9) $37.89.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Brothers, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. John O. Macfarlen, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,181.25. E. (9) $281.33.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. W. Bruce Macnames, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $925.50. E. (9) $291.43.

A. James B. Madaris, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,750.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $359.32.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. John H. Mahoney, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $160.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $210.45.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $2,375.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,625.78. E. (9) $43.85.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) $952.

A. John J. Marr, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $200.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $444.91.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112-18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $327.40. E. (9) $23.50.

---

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. A. & H. Shillman Co., Inc., 106 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $16.29.

---

A. Mike M. Masaoka, suite 1217, Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $75.

---

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,345. E. (9) $374.

---

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Pittsburgh Coal Exchange and Mechanical Contractors Association of Pittsburgh, Inc., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

---

A. P. H. Mathews, 926 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,808.76. E. (9) $313.75.

---

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $77.66.

---

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
E. (9) $2,725.

---

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $92.60.

---

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L and N Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $520.59.

---

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $316.27.

---

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,239.76.

---

A. Louis J. Michot, Jr., 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $101.

---

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

---

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

---

A. Military Survivors, Inc., Route 4, Box 235, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $97. E. (9) $399.87.

---

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., and Deerfield Academy, Deerfield, Mass.
D. (6) $1,439.34.

---

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,220. E. (9) $75.47.

---

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plan, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $48.73.

---

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

---

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,250.

---

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

---

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,837. E. (9) $298.22.

---

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Composers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $130.09.

---

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

---

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

---

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

---

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $64.44.

---

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000.

---

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,568.42.

---

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc.

---

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $12.50.

---

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $423.72.

---

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $151.72.

---

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Maryland Railroad Association, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500.

---

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,249.98.

---

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $29.11.

---

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brewers' Association of America, 188 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.

---

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lewis, Field, DeGoff and Stein, Penthouse, DeYoung Building, San Francisco, Calif.

---

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Salyer Water District, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.

---

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. West Coast Pipeline Co., Mercantile Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

---

A. Giles Morrow, Suite 610, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,374.99. E. (9) $36.75.

A. H. S. Mosebrook, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Harold G. Mosier, 6109 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,756. E. (9) $347.25.

---

A. William J. Mougey, General Motors Corp., Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

---

A. Movers Conference of America, Corner 16th and P Streets, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $257.70. E. (9) $257.70.

---

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

---

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

---

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

---

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

---

A. Paul A. Nagle, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

---

A. Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $12,025. E. (9) $9,397.96.

---

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,365.46. E. (9) $1,365.46.

---

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. National Association of Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Field Officers, 402 Fourth Avenue, New Kensington, Pa.
D. (6) $433.10. E. (9) $498.16.

---

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $14,081.25. E. (9) $10.80.

---

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $76.40. E. (9) $9,986.60.

---

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,160. E. (9) $5,407.53.

---

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $456,410.65. E. (9) $19,530.36.

---

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $42.50. E. (9) $42.50.

---

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,090.30. E. (9) $1,239.76.

---

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,500. E. (9) $6,676.09.

---

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,180. E. (9) $1,180.

---

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $535.97. E. (9) $672.75.

---

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $20,121.33. E. (9) $682.50.

---

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Box 337, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $28.88. E. (9) $122.47.

---

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,826.56.

---

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $353,193.65. E. (9) $2,235.50.

---

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Committee of Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,996. E. (9) $923.72.

---

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, Room 601, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $598. E. (9) $26.41.

---

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

---

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,640.98. E. (9) $3,640.98.

---

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $266.13.

---

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $269.50. E. (9) $269.50.

---

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $99.14. E. (9) $604.80.

---

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,420.09. E. (9) $2,071.38.

---

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,001.94. E. (9) $954.21.

---

A. National Electrical Contractors' Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $203.09. E. (9) $203.09.

---

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100,772.54. E. (9) $10,431.16.

---

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $149,691.90. E. (9) $27,132.60.

---

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $18,626.18. E. (9) $16,702.49.

---

A. National Independent Meatpackers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $702.64. E. (9) $2,013.56.

---

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,011.25.

---

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $819.10. E. (9) $284.52.

---

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,026.59. E. (9) $1,026.59.

---

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Room 403, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,830.58. E. (9) $8,830.58.

---

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $5,261.99.

---

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1026 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,767.95. E. (9) $7,015.75.

---

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,090.97. E. (9) $1,000.

---

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $760.93.

---

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $37,765.50. E. (9) $3,062.66.

A. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $60.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $5,690. E. (9) $2,944.90.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,333.32. E. (9) $3,292.54.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturing Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $14.60.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $317.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $4,085.85.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. George S. Newcomer, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Henry G. Nolda, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,692.34. E. (9) $5.15.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 603 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $393.75. E. (9) $27.96.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $321.61.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $135.25.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,079.30.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,649.85.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Connor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers' Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $312.50.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $204.10.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $161.05.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $107.88.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Renault, Inc., 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $57.27.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Fibres Institute and Wool Stock Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $24.95.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $618.44.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $34.68. E. (9) $3.80.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert Oliver, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,3270. E. (9) $11.20.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $12.50.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,972.07.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $544.36.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
E. (9) $467.41.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,365.39. E. (9) $18.32.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,625.01.

A. Edward F. Padberg, 1323 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $269.54.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 356, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. L. M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control & Conservation Association, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
D. (6) $833.33.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 605 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $950.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $337.50. E. (9) $30.

A. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 540 West 58th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,480. E. (9) $1,485.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.. and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert T. Patton, 1008 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Shell Oil Co., 1008 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $101.11. E. (9) $50.84.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $194.43.

---

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Albert A. Payne, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,916.66. E. (9) $105.15.

---

A. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

---

A. Francis E. Perkins, 21 School Street, Concord, N. H.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $2,525. E. (9) $97.53.

---

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $214.99.

---

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Peoples Lobby, Inc.

---

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $26.72.

---

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $250.

---

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $249.31.

---

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $25.76.

---

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $54.26.

---

A. Piper & Marbury, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $2.31.

---

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 220–221 Lubbock National Building, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $2,796.48. E. (9) $3,050.

---

A. Kenneth M. Plaisted, 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

---

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,757.50.

A. Rufus G. Poole, Suite 1219, Simms Building, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
D. (6) $300.

---

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $12.21.

---

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Homer V. Prater, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,712.28.

---

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,800.

---

A. Herman P. Pressler, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $2,514.76.

---

A. Allen I. Pretzman, 150 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 150 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $2.90.

---

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City.

---

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 304 Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

---

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

---

A. Alexander Purdon, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $231.01.

---

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
E. (9) $466.23.

---

A. Alex Radin, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240.

---

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $6. E. (9) $8.51.

---

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas M. Raysor, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

---

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,099.99. E. (9) $5,099.99.

---

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $575.

---

A. Thomas E. Rhodes, 219 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sigfried Olsen, 1 Drumm Street, San Francisco, Calif.

---

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500.02. E. (9) $85.69.

---

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $75.

---

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $39,162.65.

---

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $19,896.78. E. (9) $12,181.75.

---

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $675.

---

A. Theron Jennings Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

---

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

---

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $382.91.

---

A. John J. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages.

---

A. Hugo J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $1,015.21.

A. E. W. Rising, Suite 323, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $532.04.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $72.20.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $1,702.49.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $70.50.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $127.05.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 801, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,213.50.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Ruddick, 738 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $197.49.

A. Beecher F. Russell, Eastover, New Wilmington, Pa.
D. (6) $914.76. E. (9) $797.34.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,375.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $226.35.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,249.91. E. (9) $60.

A. Ira Saks, 1370 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $452.38.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, P. O. Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.
E. (9) $102.98.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $287.60.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers' Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washintgon, D. C.
E. (9) $12.37.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 211 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington (D. C.) Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 211 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $323.20.

A. C. E. Schwab, Box 29, Kellogg, Idaho.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,100. E. (9) $5,900.

A. Stephen M. Schwebel, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Denbel Realty & Construction Co., Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $9.

A. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $280.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $31.45.

A. Leo Seybold, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $79.60.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $983.25. E. (9) $231.82.

A. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Plywood Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N. Y.; American Association of Hardwood Plywood Users, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,519.50.

A. James R. Sharp, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Plywood Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N. Y.; American Association of Hardwood Plywood Users, Washington, D. C.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $580.45.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., and Airport Operators' Council, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,249.99. E. (9) $61.74.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $137.50.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,081.51.

A. W. Lee Shield, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $107.70. E. (9) $8.75.

A. Richard C. Shipman.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $624. S. (9) $138.70.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,550.86.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $7.75.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, Post Office Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.
E. (9) $269.99.

---

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $133.88.

---

A. T. W. Smiley, 1150 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $773.06.

---

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 566 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr., 16 West Moreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $7,457.21.

---

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,660. E. (9) $1,124.90.

---

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $154.86.

---

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $3,962.

---

A. Wallace M. Smith, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

---

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,211.56. E. (9) $2.50.

---

A. J. D. Snyder, 1150 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $62.66.

---

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. J. Taylor Soop, 401 Third Street NW., Room 312, Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,122.24.

---

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $68.42.

---

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $16,224.56. E. (9) $24,119.94.

---

A. W. W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $1,257.38.

---

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

---

A. Samuel Spencer and Frank J. Whalen, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Edward Martin Hinsberger, care of R. M. Franke, 55 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,637.67.

---

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

---

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

---

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F. Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Room 901, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

---

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 401 Third Street NW., Room 312, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $120.

---

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif.
D. (6) $4,000.

---

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. N. R. Caine & Co., 40 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $181.59.

---

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

---

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,312.50. E. (9) $1.

---

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,579.40. E. (9) $13,526.74.

---

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,450.

---

A. Erskine Stewart, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $4.80.

---

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,033.

---

A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

---

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,250.

---

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $50.25.

---

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,153.85.

---

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

---

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,000.

---

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.

---

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

---

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

---

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

---

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 231 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $93.99.

---

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. J. E. Sturrock, Box 2084 Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Box 2084 Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $905.56.

---

A. Joseph Monroe Sullivan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $90.24.

---

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $115. E. (9) $58.90.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $210.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th Street, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $10,125. E. (9) $6,941.30.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $521.81.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Solano County, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $211.45.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $138.88.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Harry L. Towe, 241 Main Street, Hackensack, N. J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $454.63.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $118.55.

A. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $44.35.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $19.25.



A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co. et al., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, International Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, Post Office Box 601, Balboa, C. Z.
E. (9) $93.92.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $1,505.50

A. United States Citizens' Association, Canal Zone, Box 354, Balboa, C. Z.
D. (6) $2,682.85. E. (9) $1,708.04.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $13,947.91.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $16.95.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $41.92. E. (9) $3.

A. Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., 44 G Street NE., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,256.66.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Nickel Co., Inc., 67 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $610.56.

A. Woollen H. Walshe, 2800 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $346.50. E. (9) $62.67.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $478.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,875.

A. Charles A. Washer, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $591.55. E. (9) $1,951.05.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, Room 1610, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
E. (9) $672.16.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hilary Waukau, Box 82, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

A. Lloyd W. Weaver, Room 303, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. William E. Webb, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,880.40. E. (9) $367.04.

A. E. E. Webster, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 1250 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,952.93.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.96. E. (9) $386.57.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $626.72.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association, 2201 F Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) $73.25. E. (9) $7,019.61.

A. Robert V. Westfall, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Montana Power Co., Electric Building, Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $8.19.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Don White, box 337, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., box 337, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $3,249.99. E. (9) $266.53.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $88.95.

A. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,249.98.

---

A. Roger J. Whiteford, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Marian Diane Delphine Sachs, Beckman Hotel, New York, N. Y.; and Arthur Sachs, in care of Moses & Singer, 29 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $182.27.

---

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

---

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Warren E. Whyte, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (6) $34.90.

---

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $953.40.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $1.

---

A. Wilkinson, Chagun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $1.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oregon.
E. (9) $2.59.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Reservation, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $139.52.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

---

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $2.20.

---

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

---

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,200. E. (9) $218.55.

---

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
D. (6) $116.13. E. (9) $116.13.

---

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $872.31.

---

A. John J. Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,249.98.

---

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $905.50.

---

A. W. F. Wimberly, 873 Spring Street NW., Atlanta, Ga.
B. The Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,624. E. (9) $924.

---

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $4,125.

---

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1716 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Signal Oil and Gas Co., 811 West 7th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

---

A. Frank K. Wooley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,662.50. E. (9) $89.50.

---

A. Wood, King and Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

A. Harley Z. Wooden.
B. Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $50.

---

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of the Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex. et al.
D. (6) $6,460.29. E. (9) $1,146.81.

---

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,045.72. E. (9) $3,295.73.

---

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

---

A. Robert D. Yeomans, West 2301 Pacific Avenue, C 10, Spokane, Wash.
B. The Washington Water Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $135.49.

---

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. A.

---

A. J. Banks Young, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $975.

---

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America.

## REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1957:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

| P | QUARTER | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2d | 3d | 4th |
| (Mark one square only) | | | | |

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the ground are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. American National Livestock Auction Association, V. F. W. Building, Broadway at 34th, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Mica Industry Tariff Committee, Spruce Pine, N. C.

A. Ralph E. Casey, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Camara Minera de Mexico, Gante 15, Mexico, D. F., Mexico.

A. Raymond A. Cook, Gulf Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The New Jersey Zinc Co., 160 Front Street, New York, N. Y.

A. William J. Culbertson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Counsel Associates, Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Dwight Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

A. Milton C. Grace, 1109 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Rohner & Gehring, Hintere Zollamtsstrasse 1, Vienna III, Austria, and Oesterreichischer Lloyd, Herrengasse 14, Vienna, Austria.

A. Robert A. Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. William Jackman, 234 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobile Oil Co., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Legislative Council, National Anti-Dumping Committee, Inc., 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Livestock Market Council, V. F. W. Building, Broadway at 34th, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Robert S. McClelland, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Metropolitan Businessmen's Association, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Good Samaritan Hospital, West Palm Beach, Fla.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The New York Hospital, New York, N. Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. St. Luke's Hospital, Amsterdam Avenue and 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. St. Mary's Hospital, West Palm Beach, Fla.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of William R. Semans, 806 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. John B. Stetson University, DeLand, Fla.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of James G. Van Horn, care of Detroit Wabeek Bank & Trust Co., Detroit, Mich.

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., Suite 2700, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Box 337, Fairfax, Va.

A. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., Suite 2700, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Irving R. M. Panzer, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Charles Neuman de Vegvar, Round Hill Road, Greenwich, Conn.

A. Francis E. Perkins, 21 School Street, Concord, N. H.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.

A. Rufus G. Poole, Suite 1219, Simms Building, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
B. The Domestic Potash Industry.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas M. Raysor, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School for Deaconesses and Missionaries, 1140 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.

A. Fred B. Rhodes, Jr., 412 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United California Gun Dealers Association, 386 West Green Street, Pasadena, Calif.

A. Beecher F. Russell, Eastover, New Wilmington, Pa.

A. Beecher Foulke Russell, Eastover, New Wilmington, Pa.

A. C. T. "Ted" Sanders, VFW Building, Broadway at 34th, Kansas City, Mo.
B. American National Livestock Auction Association, VFW Building, Broadway at 34th, Kansas City, Mo.

A. John L. Schroeder, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Metropolitan Businessmen's Association, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lucius S. Smith III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ben Blumenthal, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Don Welch, Jr., Post Office Box 231, Madill, Okla.
B. Oklahoma Railways Committee.

A. Carroll M. White, 1721 De Sales Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Electronic Industries Association, 1721 De Sales Street, Washington, D. C.

A. Don White, Post Office Box 337, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Post Office Box 337, Fairfax, Va.

A. Yates & Kiak, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, Thy gracious providence is our shield in the stillness of the night and our strength in the struggles of each new day.

We rejoice that in times of great crisis and confusion we may avail ourselves of the companionship and counsel of our blessed Lord.

Help us to appreciate more fully our need of accepting the Master's overtures of friendship if, during these days, we would be impervious to any despondent and hysterical tempers of mind and heart.

Grant that the Members of Congress may be men and women of faith and courage who know how to meet every mountain of difficulty without fear or frustration.

May nothing ever undermine our trust in the conquering and invincible power of truth and righteousness.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday for today and next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

---

## THE LATE AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the death of our beloved colleague, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY. "GUS," as he was familiarly known by all of us and by the thousands of people whom he had the honor to represent for so long, was born on the 9th of July in 1883 in the State of Pennsylvania, which he loved so dearly. Gus was educated at the United States Military Academy. He was not graduated because he developed an athletic heart and he was retired while still a member of the Academy. He then engaged in various business activities and during his later years was the owner and operator of large coal-mining interests. He was serving his ninth term as a Member of this body. I am sure all of you will agree with me that here he made a great contribution to the welfare of the little man.

Gus was an enlightened employer, deeply concerned with the welfare of his employees. He was also a great believer in education as a means of ultimate elimination of evils that have beset this great Republic and the world.

In his 18 years of service in the Congress he put those beliefs into action. He gained wide recognition for his championship of mine-safety legislation and of other measures for the protection of the workingman and for improvement of our educational system.

His devoted service to community, State, and Nation will long remain a monument to his memory.

Gus will be missed. He was a family man. He had a large family. As a matter of fact, the last conversation I had with him was concerning some of the problems that he had, and how proud he was of all his children.

To them I extend my condolences, and I am sure that in his memory all of us can proceed with the work to which he was dedicated.

During his service here Gus was selected by two administrations to serve as a delegate to the International Labor Convention in Geneva. He made his mark there, and that great organization has departed from some of the things that brought criticism to it, largely because of his activity.

I include the following statement and editorials:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL, NOVEMBER 21, 1957

I was shocked and saddened by the death of Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY. He has given the people of his State and the Nation loyal and effective representation in the Congress of the United States for 17 years.

As Secretary of Labor, I have particularly appreciated the support which he has given to programs we have recommended to help promote the welfare of working people of the Nation. His service as a Congressional adviser to ILO conferences was also extremely valuable.

Congressman KELLEY will be missed greatly by the millions of Americans for whom he labored with such dedication and effectiveness.

---

[From the United Mine Workers Journal of December 1, 1957]

REPRESENTATIVE AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, 74

Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, one of the UMWA's best friends on Capitol Hill, died of cancer on November 21 in Suburban Hospital, Bethesda, Md. He was 74. Representative KELLEY, a coal operator, represented Pennsylvania's 21st Congressional District (Westmoreland County) near Pittsburgh. He was serving his ninth term in the House of Representatives at the time of his death.

In a telegram to his widow, Mrs. Augustine B. Kelley, of Chevy Chase, Md., the resident international officers of the UMWA—President John L. Lewis, Vice President Thomas Kennedy and Secretary-Treasurer John Owens—said:

"We have just learned of the untimely passing of your distinguished husband, with whom we had the pleasure of associating frequently down through the years. As a result of our many dealings with Congressman KELLEY, we could not help but recognize his tremendous traits of honesty, integrity, capability, and dependability. Unquestionably he contributed his illustrious talents at all times to serve his country and fellow man. His record as a Congressman brought about much beneficial legislation for the well-being of the people of our country, and recognition of his outstanding ability can best be ascertained by the important committee posts he held plus the fact that he served as an adviser at several International Labor Organization conferences. We fully realize what a terrific experience this shock has been to you and the members of your family, and on behalf of the United Mine Workers of America, wherein your husband enjoyed outstanding friendship, we express our sincere condolence in your hour of grief."

Representative KELLEY had a virtually 100-percent perfect voting record in favor of legislation of interest to the UMWA and organized labor in general. He will be remembered by UMWA members principally for the valiant fight he carried on for mine safety legislation, a fight that ended finally in victory in 1952 with the passage of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act—the first Federal mine-safety law with "teeth" in it. Mr. KELLEY and former Representative Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Republican, Pennsylvania, were the leaders for their respective political parties in this successful battle.

A liberal northern Democrat, Mr. KELLEY had been in the vanguard of many Capitol Hill battles in behalf of legislation to benefit working people. In the last session of Congress he and Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, Democrat, of West Virginia, sparkplugged the hard-fought battle for effective Federal-aid-to-education legislation which was scuttled by the White House.

Mr. KELLEY was the No. 2 Democrat on the important House Committee on Education and Labor. He also served on the Joint Economic Committee, which annually reviews the President's budget and economic report to the Nation.

A resident of Greensburg, Pa., Mr. KELLEY was owner and president of the Mammoth Coal & Coke Co.

During his 17 years in the House he always was active in behalf of liberal labor legislation. Five times since the end of World War II Presidents Truman and Eisenhower had selected him as House delegate to the ILO, a tripartite agency of the United Nations.

Recently he had headed a House subcommittee studying legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage.

Mr. KELLEY always had been actively opposed to the Taft-Hartley law.

He led the 1945 investigation of the distribution of artificial limbs among amputees. His subcommittee had the Justice Department conduct an investigation that led to several convictions in the industry for violation of antitrust laws. Mr. KELLEY also was active in behalf of a federally operated, nationwide employment service after World War II.

Mr. KELLEY attended the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., for a time and took an active interest in Army athletics and West Point activities. He had to resign from the Academy because of a heart murmur. He was a member of the Board of Visitors for the Academy in 1955 and 1956.

Mr. KELLEY, known as "GUS" to his multitude of friends, was a quiet man with a keen sense of humor. He was frequently aroused to bitter criticism of the Eisenhower administration and of such conservatives as the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

Born in New Baltimore, Somerset County, Pa., on July 9, 1883, Mr. KELLEY was a small child when his family moved to Greensburg. His formal education began there at St. Benedict's grade school where each of his own nine children later were to attend.

Mr. KELLEY was the oldest of nine children. In his boyhood he assisted his parents financially by selling newspapers in Greensburg. He was a graduate and football letterman of Greensburg High School.

Forty years after having to leave West Point—a bitter disappointment—Mr. KELLEY received a measure of consolation when he attended graduation ceremonies at West Point for the class that included his son, Paul. Five of his six sons were in the armed services during World War II, the youngest son being too young for military duty at the time.

Mr. KELLEY began his business career in 1905 as a clerk with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. He later worked in a similar capacity with the H. C. Frick Coke Co. and became the firm's youngest superintendent. Later he was associated with the Hillman Coal and Coke Co. and after that operated his own mining properties.

Mr. KELLEY married Ellen Marie Bates of Scottsdale, Pa., in 1913. He had always been active in community affairs. He was an organizer of the Greensburg St. Vincent de Paul Society, a trustee of Seton Hill College and, for a time, a member of the Greensburg Board of Education.

Mr. KELLEY, after leaving West Point, studied engineering and business administration through correspondence school courses. He was an avid reader and was regarded as a leading authority on the Civil War.

The Pennsylvania Representative belonged to the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, the American Mining Congress, the Pittsburgh Athletic Association, the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the John Carroll Society.

In addition to Mrs. Kelley, he is survived by 6 sons and 3 daughters. He also is survived by 36 grandchildren and 2 sisters and 5 brothers.

A solemn mass of requiem was offered November 23 in the Cathedral of the Most Holy Sacrament in Greensburg. The body was returned to Washington for another requiem mass November 25 at the Church of the Little Flower. Burial was in Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Va.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLEY WAS GUEST OF 1952 CONVENTION

The late Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY was a guest of honor at the 1952 International Convention of the UMWA in

Cincinnati. Introduced by Vice President Thomas Kennedy, Mr. KELLEY, in a few remarks, summed up the type of liberal, prolabor thinking that was his trademark in Congress.

He blasted reactionaries in Government and told, briefly, of his part in getting Federal mine safety legislation passed even though he said it was impossible to get as good a bill through Congress as he had hoped.

In honor of the Congressman, President John L. Lewis said in part: "He contributed his full strength and influence to the enactment of the kind of (mine safety) bill which the United Mine Workers of America hoped for. Day and night he and his associates worked during those long months. He knows coal mines and he understands coal mines and AUGUSTINE KELLEY is a great deal of a man in his own right aside from being a Member of Congress. He believes in rendering service to the people. He stands for the welfare of all Americans and the future of America will be assured and its grandeur will continue to grow as long as we can have public servants of the high type and sterling character of Congressman KELLEY."

---

[From the Postal Record for January 1958]

AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

Letter carriers of the United States lost a very good friend when Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY of the 21st District of Pennsylvania died in Suburban Hospital in Washington, D. C.

Congressman KELLEY had a 100 percent record on postal legislation. He signed the discharge petition in the last session of Congress. His service in the Congress started in the 77th Congress and he was reelected every term since that time. During this entire period he consistently supported all legislation of benefit to workers.

Congressman KELLEY is survived by his wife and nine children. The National Association of Letter Carriers extends its most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Kelley and the family.

---

[From the Retail Clerks International Advocate (Retail Clerks Union), January 1958]

CONGRESSMAN KELLEY DIES—AUTHORED MINIMUM WAGE BILL

With the passing of Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY (Democrat, of Pennsylvania), who died November 20 at the Bethesda, Md., Suburban Hospital at the age of 74, the RCIA and its sponsored Active Ballot Club has lost a friend.

Congressman KELLEY represented Pennsylvania's 21st District (near Pittsburgh) from 1941. He was the second-ranking Democrat on the House Education and Labor Committee and also served on the Joint Economic Committee. He was a leader in the fight for Federal school construction aid, and sponsored school bills in 1956 and 1957. Representative KELLEY headed the House Subcommittee on Labor Standards, which in 1957 held extended hearings on extension of the minimum-wage law. In this position he was a leader in the fight for the extension of the Federal wage and hour provisions to retail store employees. KELLEY introduced the RCIA-sponsored bill, H. R. 4791, in the first session of this Congress.

His death left the House lineup at 231 Democrats, 201 Republicans, and 3 vacancies.

At the time of KELLEY'S death, field hearings on his bill were under way on the west coast. Hearing the sad news, Acting Chairman JAMES A. ROOSEVELT declared a short afternoon recess.

Congressman ROOSEVELT reconvened the hearings stating that early passage of the legislation would be the best possible memorial to KELLEY.

[From the Greensburg (Pa.) Tribune-Review of November 22, 1957]

CONGRESSMAN KELLEY

By his constituents in Westmoreland County Congressman AUGUSTINE B. "GUS" KELLEY will be widely mourned following his death at noon Wednesday in Suburban Hospital, Bethesda, Md.

Mr. KELLEY underwent a serious operation last September and had been inactive Governmentwise while recuperating at his home. He suffered a fall there and apparently complications resulted which caused his death a few days after his hospital admittance.

The Congressman served 18 years in Washington. Just the day before he died his family had announced he would not seek another term because of his health. His current term would have expired at the close of 1958.

Never one to hide his "light under a bushel," Mr. KELLEY gave a good account of his stewardship for the people of Westmoreland County in Washington. Because of his length of service he ranked high on several important Congressional committees and displayed forceful appeals for his convictions in legislative enactments, especially since his seniority provided him with some solid ground upon which to operate.

Congressman KELLEY was in the forefront of educational and labor legislation in his late terms in Congress. In his Federal aid for school plans, introduced into the last two sessions, he barely lost out after a long fight.

In administering the affairs of his constituents in the National Capital, Congressman KELLEY was very much and always on the job, irrespective of whom the recipient might be or the request sought. His reputation, politically and otherwise, was impeccable.

Congressman KELLEY also earned the respect of his colleagues in the House for his integrity and his attention to his Congressional duties. Inasmuch as he always was a Democrat and won handily in his reelection contests in this county, it was natural that when the Eisenhower administration came into power, he became increasingly critical of several of its policies, especially after President Eisenhower won his second term, when Democrats nationally joined in the chorus of complaint.

This partisanship on the national scene was to be expected. Nevertheless, the people of Westmoreland County have lost a hard-working and able Congressman.

---

[From the New Kensington (Pa.) Daily Dispatch of November 20, 1957]

KIDNEY AILMENT FATAL TO KELLEY—CONGRESSMAN DIES AT NOON IN WASHINGTON

Congressman AUGUSTINE BERNARD KELLEY died at noon today in Suburban Hospital, Bethesda, Md., where he had been on the "very critical" list overnight.

KELLEY, Westmoreland County's United States Representative in Washington since 1940, was given last rites Tuesday night. The 74-year-old legislator underwent serious surgery in September and complicated his recovery last week when he injured himself in a fall at his home here.

Governor Leader will now call for a special election to fill KELLEY'S seat which ends in January 1959.

(Greensburg political circles immediately speculated that one of his sons, Regis or Hilary, would try to succeed their dad.)

His doctors said he was suffering from a serious kidney condition. Doctors permitted him to converse with members of his family near the bedside shortly before death.

His home was in Greensburg where one of his sons, Regis or J. Hilary, is regarded as likely to attempt to succeed his father.

Representative KELLEY was a leader in the fight for Federal aid for school construction.

Although KELLEY'S age has been reported as high as 84, the Congressional Directory, official biographical information source for Representatives, lists his birthplace as New Baltimore, Pa., on July 9, 1883, which makes him 74.

KELLEY, once a cadet of the United States Military Academy at West Point, has served on many education and labor committees in Washington and has been a consistent critic of President Eisenhower's policies and attitudes. Reporters considered him extremely quotable.

He has always easily won election in this 21st Congressional District.

Before entering Congress, he held interests in several coal mining operations and the directory still describes him as a coal operator.

If it is necessary to call a special election, candidates would be nominated by the county's Democratic and Republican executive committees.

Congress reconvenes in January.

---

[From the Washington Daily News of November 22, 1957]

A voice that cried out for years in a wilderness of apathy and misconception has been stilled with the death of AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, United States Representative from Pennsylvania's 21st District.

Westmoreland County has lost an able Representative in Congress but, more seriously, the Nation has been deprived of a champion of the cause of education. Representative KELLEY was the author of a Democratic school-construction-aid proposal which, combined with an Eisenhower administration measure, resulted in a compromise bill that failed to pass Congress by only a few votes in August. Representative KELLEY had been fighting for his proposal long before the last session.

This newspaper differed with Congressman KELLEY'S flat-grant approach for Federal aid to build badly needed public school classrooms. But no one could doubt his sincerity, his deep conviction that the important thing was not how it was done but that it be done. When the showdown came and the Kelley bill was dead, he was actively supporting the compromise legislation that combined both his and President Eisenhower's ideas. Unlike some Congressmen, his never was a selfish pride of authorship but a deep desire to accomplish the purpose and overcome a need.

Representative KELLEY'S views on education have been presented and supported on several occasions by this newspaper. Only a few days before his death, he responded to our questions about his reaction to the Russian scientific breakthrough into space with these words:

"Scientific leadership should take precedence over every other material challenge in this battle for survival. * * * If American youth is deprived of the necessary facilities at the lower level, the disparity between the United States and Russian science and engineering strength will leave this country progressively further behind."

Mr. KELLEY'S reason and vision will be missed in the next session of Congress when the issue of aid to education comes up again. But it is to be hoped that his cause this time will prevail.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star of November 23, 1957]

REPRESENTATIVE KELLEY, AUTHOR OF SCHOOL AID BILL

Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, died yesterday in Suburban Hospital. He was 74.

His widow, Mrs. Elia Marie Kelley, attributed death to cancer.

Mr. KELLEY recently suffered a fall at his home, 5330 Kenwood Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md. He underwent surgery last September.

SON MAY SEEK SEAT

His family had announced in Greensburg, Pa., Tuesday night that Mr. KELLEY had decided not to seek reelection to a 10th term. The family said two of his sons, Regis and J. Hilary Kelley, were considering the possibility that one of them might run for their father's seat.

Mr. KELLEY, second-ranking Democrat on the House Education and Labor Committee, was the author of a controversial Federal aid-to-education bill that died in the 84th Congress and still is pending in the 85th.

First elected to Congress in 1940, he would have completed his ninth term next January.

A native of New Baltimore, Pa., Mr. KELLEY attended parochial and public grade schools, Greensburg (Pa.) High School, and the United States Military Academy.

He left the Academy because of poor health and took correspondence courses in mining engineering and business administration. Entering the mining field as a clerk, he advanced to superintendent of mines and later acquired the Mammoth Coal & Coke Co., which he owned at his death.

AUTHOR OF EDUCATION BILL

He served on the Greensburg Board of Education in 1935 and 1936 and was a member of the scale committee of the Western Pennsylvania Coal Operators Association from 1935 to 1939. He was a delegate to the International Labor Organization conference in Montreal in 1946 and to the ILO conferences in Geneva in 1947, 1950, and 1951.

Mr. KELLEY'S aid-to-education bill was the focal point of a bitter House fight in 1955 when Representative POWELL, Democrat of New York, introduced an amendment to ban funds for segregated schools. The House adopted the amendment over President Eisenhower's objections, and then killed the bill.

During the 1956 campaign Mr. POWELL swung his support to Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. KELLEY said he was "puzzled" by the President's acceptance of the POWELL endorsement.

The Kelley bill died in 1956 after it bogged down in a dispute between its Democratic backers, who wanted funds allocated on the basis of school-age populations, and Republicans, who held out for distribution on the basis of need.

SOUGHT AMENDMENT REPEAL

Last December Mr. KELLEY called for a drive to repeal the anti-third-term constitutional amendment, calling it a "Republican device for posthumous dishonor of the great Franklin D. Roosevelt."

Mr. KELLEY was a member of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, the Association of Graduates of the United States Military Academy, the Army Athletic Association, the Army and Navy Club, the Pittsburgh Athletic Association, the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the John Carroll Society.

He headed a House Labor subcommittee on aid to the physically handicapped from 1944 to 1946 and later served on the advisory committee on prosthetic devices for the Veterans' Administration. He was on the board of visitors of the Military Academy in 1955 and 1956.

Survivors besides his widow include nine children.

Mr. KELLEY'S body was taken last night to his hometown of Greensburg, Pa., where it will be at the Cramer funeral home through tomorrow.

Mass will be said at the Blessed Sacrament Cathedral in Greensburg at 10:30 a. m. Saturday. The body will be returned to Washington for another mass Monday morning at the Church of the Little Flower, with burial in Arlington Cemetery. The time has not yet been set.

---

[From the IUE AFL–CIO News of November 25, 1957]

HE WAS LABOR'S FRIEND

A career devoted to the good of mankind came to an end November 20, when United States Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, Pennsylvania, died of cancer.

GUS KELLEY, though an employer himself, was an ardent fighter for the rights of the working man. He sponsored the school construction aid bill last year which failed of passage in the House by a handful of votes when the Administration made no last minute drive to secure the 4 or 5 votes needed.

He devoted countless hours to bettering the lives and chances of work for the physically handicapped.

One had only to walk through the streets of his hometown, Greensburg, Pa., with GUS KELLEY to realize the admiration and affection his constituents had for him in Pennsylvania's 21st District, which is in the Pittsburgh area. Many of those constituents are IUE members at Local 601, Westinghouse, East Pittsburgh.

In a letter to GUS KELLEY'S widow, IUE President Carey declared: "Representative KELLEY was a rare figure in the political scene in this country, an employer who knew the problems and aspirations of the workers and who sought with every power and strength at his command to secure the solution of these problems * * *. In this, our hour of loss, we breathe a prayer of thanks that a man such as GUS KELLEY was able for so many years to serve us in the Halls of Congress."

Paul Carmichael, president of local 601, said of KELLEY: "GUS KELLEY'S door was always open to any of our members with problems involving the Congressman. Our loss is great. Gone from us is a friend who would be virtually impossible to replace."

Just a few short weeks before he died in Suburban Hospital, Bethesda, Md. (just outside of Washington), GUS KELLEY gave what might be called his credo in the field of labor relations.

Of the attempts to secure so-called right-to-work laws, Representative KELLEY asserted:

"These laws are harmful to industry as well as labor. Union security embodies a basic principle of justice; namely, that those who receive benefits must contribute their share of the cost."

GUS KELLEY was a native of Somerset County, Pa. His family moved to Greensburg when he was a small child. His formal education began there at St. Benedict's Grade School, which each of his nine children later attended. He himself was the eldest of nine children and worked as a newsboy to aid his family.

After an outstanding scholastic and athletic career at Greensburg High School, he was appointed to West Point, but had to leave after some time because of an athletic heart. Ironically, he lived to be 74.

He was bitterly disappointed by having to leave the Point, but that disappointment was eased in later years when he watched his son, Paul, graduate there.

After West Point, GUS KELLEY went to work for the Pennsylvania Railroad as a clerk. He then transferred to the H. C. Frick Coke Co. and thus began a career which later made him owner of a coal mine.

It is indicative also of GUS KELLEY'S career that, despite the fact he was a mine owner, he always had the support of the United Mine Workers when he ran for his House seat. In all, he served 16 years and, of course, since its foundation, had the full indorsement of IUE.

Representative KELLEY was the second-ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, where he was able to press his education, labor, and physically handicapped bills.

He was named by President Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower as a United States delegate to the International Labor Organization.

In addition to his wife, the former Ellen Marie Bates, whom he married in 1913, his survivors include these children: Augustine Regis, Richard D., James R., Mrs. Henry Brown, Jr., Mrs. Roland Leisy, Mrs. Robert Schellenberg, Robert V., J. Hilary and Capt. Paul A. (six of the sons served in World War II; the seventh was too young), these brothers and sisters: Sister Marie Marcella, OSB, Rosaline, Mark, Ephraim, Demetrius, Ralph, and Vincent, and 36 grandchildren.

After a funeral mass in Greensburg, GUS KELLEY was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery. Many trade-unionists, physically handicapped, and schoolchildren attended the rites.

---

[From the Greensburg (Pa.) Tribune-Review of November 26, 1957]

CONGRESSMAN KELLEY BURIED WITH MILITARY HONORS—INTERMENT MADE IN ARLINGTON

WASHINGTON, November 25.—Under graying skies, Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, was buried with military honors in Arlington National Cemetery today.

KELLEY, 74, once a West Point cadet, died Wednesday. He had served in the House of Representatives continuously since 1940.

Msgr. Henry F. Graebenstein conducted the brief graveside services. Earlier, a solemn requiem mass was sung for KELLEY in the Church of the Little Flower.

Six soldiers in Army green carried the flag-covered casket from the hearse to the grave. They held an American flag over the casket as the services were conducted, then presented the flag to the widow, Mrs. Ella Marie Bates Kelley.

A widow and nine grown children sat under a canopy.

KELLEY was laid to rest on a hillside overlooking Washington and the Potomic River. Nearby are the final resting places of famed military men, including Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vanderberg, Gen. Charles P. Summerall, and Gen. Payton C. Marsh.

KELLEY could not stay at West Point, resigning when it was found he had a slight heart murmur. He always maintained an interest in the Military Academy and served on its Board of Visitors in 1955–56.

Besides his widow, he is survived by six sons and three daughters.

Members of Congress attending the cemetery services included Representatives RHODES, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; EBERHARTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky; POWELL, of New York; JOHNSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin; BAILEY of West Virginia; and Delegate BURNS, Democrat, of Hawaii. Ralph Roberts, Clerk; Zeake Johnson, Miller, Doorkeeper, represented the House staff.

---

[From Labor, Washington, D. C., of November 30, 1957]

KELLEY, AN EMPLOYER WHO FOUGHT FOR WORKERS, DIES

"A coal-mine operator who has made plenty of money, but who fights 7 days a week for the workers, war veterans and plain people." That's how Labor once described Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, Pennsylvania, who died this week of cancer in a hospital near Washington, at the age of 74.

KELLEY entered the House in 1940 and was serving his 9th term as representative of Pennsylvania's 21st District. Each time he ran for reelection, he received the ardent support of the rail unions and all organized

labor. He earned that support by his outstanding record.

Gus was not "born with a silver spoon in his mouth." His father was a mechanic, his mother a seamstress, and they had eight children. He became a cadet at West Point, but a year or two later had to withdraw because of a heart condition. Entering the mining business as a clerk, he rose to mine superintendent and acquired the Mammoth Coal Co. in Pennsylvania.

SPONSORED SCHOOL BILLS

Among other local public service KELLEY was a member of the Greensburg Board of Education. This experience undoubtedly helps explain his devoted interest in educational legislation later as a Member of the House. He was the chief sponsor of the Federal aid to school construction bills which were defeated by narrow margins in the past two sessions of Congress. For the defeat this year, KELLEY blamed President Eisenhower, who had expressed favor for such legislation, but spoke no word for it when the showdown came.

One of KELLEY'S greatest services in the House was as chairman of a committee that investigated the industry which makes prosthetic devices—such as artificial limbs—which were particularly important to the thousands of veterans crippled in World War II.

As a result of a monopolistic price-fixing combine in this industry, there had been no improvements in such devices for many years, and their cost was sky high. KELLEY blew the roof off that shocking situation, secured several convictions for violation of the antitrust laws, and won for veterans and others improved products at lower prices.

FOUGHT FOR WORKERS

KELLEY was a member of the influential Senate-House Economic Committee. As the second-ranking member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, he fought such antilabor legislation as the Taft-Hartley Act, battled for improvement and extension of minimum wage protection, and in general championed the cause of workers and their unions. They will sorely miss him in the House.

As an example of the wide recognition and high honors which came to KELLEY, Presidents Truman and Eisenhower five times selected him as House delegate to the International Labor Organization conferences at Geneva, Switzerland.

KELLEY is survived by his widow, 9 children, and 36 grandchildren. After funeral services in Greensburg, his body was returned to Washington for burial in Arlington National Cemetery.

---

OUR TRIBUTE TO GUS

[From the Journal, Jeannette, Pa., of November 22, 1957]

This is your editor's personal tribute to our late Congressman A. B. "GUS" KELLEY.

I had intended to print here the formal obituary details about Congressman KELLEY but because I knew Gus since he became a Member of Congress I thought the best tribute I could pay to him would be to relate the following instances which, in my opinion, made him a good Congressman—and a good friend.

First of all Gus endeavored to furnish me news in advance of its general publication because we were a weekly paper. You can imagine the thrill we received a couple of years ago after putting the Journal "to bed" late one Thursday night with a story by Gus we drove to Washington on a visit for the weekend only to pick up a copy of that Sunday's Washington Post and Times-Herald and read the same story several days later.

Another thing we admired about Gus was that he never decided he, as a Congressman, knew more than the people who sent him to Washington. He voted invariably on all issues as the majority of his constituents would have done.

One time, during the war, a soldier's wife wasn't getting any information whatsoever about her husband, somewhere in Europe. We contacted Gus with the details. In 2 weeks time a Jeannette soldier's wife was happy again.

And then there was a soldier's mother who came to us. Her son wanted to marry a girl in England where he was stationed. We wrote to Gus for help on this matter and in a short time he did an enthusiastic and thorough redtape cutting job. Result a happy soldier, his bride, his mother.

Now and then, as we had time, and as Gus had time, there were the informal chats in his office. We'd discuss the events of the moment. Perhaps Gus had a political appointment coming up and he would ask my opinion. Or, if I had a problem that needed an outside opinion I knew that Gus was always willing to help.

Perhaps for myself, perhaps for some one else I needed some information obtainable in Washington. A letter or note to Congressman KELLEY and in a couple of days it would be on our desk. Yes, even a hotel reservation in crowded Washington on a crowded weekend—a phone call to Gus and we had it.

Yes, I say Westmoreland County lost a good Congressman on Wednesday. I lost a good friend.

---

[From the New Kensington Daily Dispatch of November 21, 1957]

REPRESENTATIVE KELLEY DIED SAYING PRAYERS—FAMILY AT BEDSIDE

(By Maurice Boehl)

WASHINGTON.—Congressman AUGUSTINE BERNARD KELLEY died at noon Wednesday while saying his prayers at Suburban Hospital in Bethesda, Md.

The passing of the 74-year-old Westmoreland County Democrat, a champion of labor and education, was attributed to cancer of the kidneys. He died peacefully with members of his family at his bedside. He was able to recognize and converse with them until his death, although under sedation.

Among the members of his family at his side were his youngest son, James Reeves; son-in-law, Col. "Hank" Leisy, husband of daughter, Therese; and son, Jay Hilary's wife, Kate. Two other sons, Richard B. and Augustine Regis, and a son-in-law, Henry Brown, Jr., husband of daughter, Marcella, had left the hospital temporarily to attend mass. The family kept a watch around the clock at the Congressman's room.

The suddenness of his death was a shock to KELLEY'S legion of friends in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere.

The 17-year House veteran had been recuperating at his home from an operation last September, but was dictating letters and handling office matters by phone, and was believed on his way to recovery.

Sunday, November 10, he took a fall at his home, but seemed to suffer no ill effects.

Tuesday, the 12th, his doctor returned him to the hospital for closer observation and a blood transfusion to help build up his strength. A son, Capt. Paul Kelley, who happened to have the same rare blood type as the father, was in Washington on business and was the donor. During that week, the Congressman had two more transfusions. His doctor explained he had been trying to do too much too soon. He was also kept on a soft diet and did not need intravenous feeding until Tuesday.

It was not until Tuesday afternoon that his condition became critical. From then he became progressively weaker but was of sound mind until the very end. The last rites of the Catholic church were administered the day before his death.

The Congressman's family returned with his body to his home at Greensburg where he will lie in state today and Friday. A high mass of requiem will be sung at the Cathedral of His Excellency, Bishop Hugh Lamb of the diocese of Greensburg.

Burial for the former West Pointer will be with full military honors at the Arlington Cemetery in Washington on Monday.

Messages of sorrow and condolence have been pouring into the Congressman's home and office all afternoon.

Senator JOE CLARK sent word through his office here expressing his shock and deep regret at the loss of a really able Congressman. KELLEY, he said, was "particularly able in the fields of labor and more recently in education. If we had the Kelley (education aid) bill on the books now we would be much better off rather than struggling with inadequate facilities to educate our children."

Chairman Paul Butler of the Democratic National Committee wired Mrs. Kelley: "We are deeply saddened at the untimely passing of your beloved husband whose services to our party and to our country will be sorely missed. Congressman KELLEY'S many outstanding contributions toward a better world, including his determined and courageous fight for education in behalf of American children, will long be remembered."

Secretary of Health, Education, and Labor Marion Folsom also expressed his regrets.

---

[From the New Kensington Daily Dispatch of November 21, 1957]

"GUS" COMES HOME—REQUIEM MASS AT CATHEDRAL SATURDAY, GREENSBURG

Congressman GUS KELLEY came back to his hometown today to lie in state. His body, killed by cancer, is at the Cramer funeral home here. Viewing will begin at 7 tonight. A solemn requiem high mass will be sung for him Saturday morning in the Blessed Sacrament Cathedral at 10:30.

A West Pointer, he will be buried in Arlington National Cemetery in Washington on Monday.

The sharp foe of the Eisenhower administration was conversant to the end. He died Wednesday while saying a prayer, with members of his family at his bedside.

KELLEY had represented Westmoreland County in Congress since 1941 and was acclaimed for his sometimes lonely role as an impassioned friend of positive thinking on public education and labor unionism.

The eldest of nine children, AUGUSTINE BERNARD KELLEY was born in New Baltimore, Somerset County, on July 9, 1883. When a child, he and his family moved to Greensburg, where he attended St. Benedict's school, as did his nine children.

A graduate of Greensburg High School, where he earned his letter in football, KELLEY capped his determination for a military career by being appointed to West Point.

But after some time at the Academy, KELLEY was ruled out on the ground he had an athletic heart.

Bitterly disappointed by his forced resignation from West Point, KELLEY partially erased his personal anguish when he sat in the stands and watched one of his sons, Paul, receive his second lieutenant's commission from the Academy.

He took pride in the fact that five of his six sons served in World War II. The sixth was too young to serve.

Survivors include his wife, the former Ellen Marie Bates, of Scottsdale; 6 sons and 3 daughters—Augustine Regis, Richard B., James R., Mrs. Henry B. Brown, Jr., Mrs. Roland H. Leisy, and Mrs. Robert W. Schellenberg—all of the Washington, D. C., area; Robert V., of Bluefield, W. Va.; Jay Hilary, of Greensburg; and Captain Paul, stationed at Fort Sheridan, Ill., and 36 grandchildren.

His brothers are Mark, Ephraim, and Demetrius, of Greensburg; Ralph of Detroit,

and Vincent of New York City, and his sisters are Rosaline, of Greensburg, and Sister Marie Marcella, O. S. B., Pittsburgh.

After his medical discharge from the Point, KELLEY began clerking for the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1905. It took little time for him to make a connection with the prospering H. R. Frick Coke Co. At a young age he became the firm's superintendent.

He was later associated with the Hillman Coal & Coke Co. in addition to managing his own coal properties. When elected to Congress in 1940, KELLEY was president of the Basin By-Product Coal Co. When death overtook him, he was president of the Mammouth Coal & Coke Co.

As head of this firm, KELLEY paid close attention to its operations during World War II when coal was needed with voracity by the war effort. One night in 1942, during a snowstorm, he drove his car to Greensburg to attend to a production detail and managed to get back to Washington in time for the following day's session of Congress.

He was a high-ranking member of the House Committee on Labor and Education, one of the most important and tumultous assignments in Congress. His reputation in the field of labor relations was international.

KELLEY was a self-appointed outcast from Washington's social life. He preferred his wife, his home, and his books to the capital's handshake and cocktail league.

Introducer of numerous progressive bills during his career on the Hill, KELLEY's brightest, yet saddest, moment came when his measure to appropriate $1,500,000,000 for public school construction was defeated by a mere 9 votes.

For that defeat, KELLEY laid the wrath and wit of his tongue upon President Eisenhower. He blamed Ike for not influencing an adequate number of Republicans to vote in favor of the measure.

The Congressman will long be remembered by disabled veterans for the battles he waged in behalf of their benefits and pensions. At his deadline, he was in the midst of struggling for an improvement in the employment conditions of the physically handicapped.

The Kelley family requests that in lieu of flowers expressions should be made for the repose of the dead or donations be sent to a favorite charity.

---

[From the Steubenville Register of November 29, 1957]

LATE CONGRESSMAN SPOKE TO DIOCESAN MEN ON TWO OCCASIONS

(By Rev. Francis F. Brown)

GUS KELLEY'S death was more than the end of life for a great legislator. It marked the passing of one who stood heroically for Catholic family life and other Christian ideals.

Testimony to his stature, amid a world of pagan values, are the 9 children and 36 grandchildren (all under 10 years of age), as well as the impact his 17 years in the United States House of Representatives have left on his colleagues and, in turn, on the American populace.

Six weeks ago, en route home from a visit to Europe, this writer stayed overnight, as he had done many times previously, in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Augustine B. Kelley just outside of the Nation's Capital. An episode of the following morning can perhaps illustrate better than any other the faith of this outstanding public figure.

FATIMA NOVENA

It was the Feast of Our Lady of Fatima. Gus, who in recent years assisted at daily mass had not been to mass since his operation in late September. Because his wife Ella, and each of the children were making in his behalf a novena that was to end on that day, he insisted that he would go to mass in the convent of Little Flower Parish.

He arose in the early hours, with the aid of his wife, dressed, and finally surrendered to the fact that he did not have the strength. By the time the forenoon had passed, however, Gus KELLEY summoned one of his sons and asked that he be driven to the late mass at Little Flower. It was to be the final mass at which he assisted.

Mr. KELLEY was not a stranger to the church in the Steubenville diocese. In 1950 he came here to address a Catholic congress on industrial problems, and 2 years later was called upon to speak to the first meeting of the diocesan men's retreat league.

Long before he went to Washington from Pennsylvania's 21st Congressional District in Greensburg, he had been asked by the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference to address groups from the Atlantic to the Rockies. For nearly 50 years associated with management, he was well known as a dear friend of the laboring man and of unions. He was the ranking Democrat on the House Education and Labor Committee.

Fearless in his dealings with the Legislature, he even criticized President Eisenhower the past summer when the Federal aid to education bill he sponsored failed to pass the House. He said that the Chief Executive could have effected its passage by a word of encouragement.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION

When NCWC's family life bureau began during World War II to select a "Catholic Mother of the Year," it chose Mrs. Kelley, who had five sons serving simultaneously in the armed services. Six of their children were educated at the Catholic University of America and another at Trinity College. One, like his father, is an alumnus of West Point.

Mr. KELLEY was already 57 when he entered the field of politics. One of his Congressional colleagues, attempting to sum up his contribution to the National Government, touched on two outstanding marks of his sterling character:

"In all our deliberations, he was always on the side of better education for children and better working conditions for the employed."

One of the newspaper accounts of the Congressman's death carried in the headline that he had died saying his prayers. To be exact, it was aspirations like, "My Jesus, mercy," that he uttered until his final breath.

The only semblance of a eulogy in the sermon of his pastor, Msgr. Alphonse G. Mihm, in Greensburg's Most Blessed Sacrament Cathedral was this:

"You always knew when Gus was in town. Inconspicuously he and his wife would appear each day at the communion rail from a quiet corner of the church. No greater eulogy could be given a man than to say of him, 'He was a daily communicant.'"

---

[From the Latrobe Bulletin of November 23, 1957]

NATION BIDS KELLEY FAREWELL—COUNTY MOURNS AT RITE

GREENSBURG.—The Nation he loved so well and the county he represented in the Congress as their Representative for 17 years paid final tribute to Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY here this morning.

Following a solemn requiem mass conducted at 10:30 a. m. in Blessed Sacrament Catholic Cathedral, he was given into the care of his country and escorted to Washington where he will rest in Arlington National Cemetery beginning Monday.

A second mass is to be sung Monday in the Church of the Little Flower, Washington, just prior to interment across the Potomac on the Virginia side where the country's distinguished and heroic lie.

Official tribute was paid by the United States by a delegation from the House of Representatives, men he worked with over the years, old friends. They were selected by the Speaker of the House and were:

Representatives James G. Fulton, Herman P. Eberharter, Richard Simpson, Leon Gavin, Carroll Kearns, William Barrett, all of Pennsylvania, and Michael J. Kirwan, of Ohio, and Zeake Johnson, House sergeant at arms.

The passing of Mr. KELLEY, known as a rugged Democrat, has caused widespread sorrow in Westworeland County, among those of his opposition party as well as among his loyal supporters.

A SIMPLE MAN

"The man for whom the church prayers are given today would not want a great eulogy because he was a simple man," Msgr. Alphonse G. Mihm, rector of the cathedral and arch priest of the Mass, said in a special funeral sermon.

Continuing, he said in part:

"His fruit is in his service to his fellow men and his country, a country which he has served with honesty and integrity for many years.

"Just as his roots were firmly set in his Catholic faith, so he made sure that those of his children should be so set, and that not only by principle but especially by example, the greatest teacher of them all.

"And one fact remains that we feel is paramount to all others: We always knew when Gus was in town, because he was every day of the time at daily mass and communion."

During the mass, which was attended by approximately 600 persons, Bishop Carroll, auxiliary bishop of Pittsburgh, assisted in the sanctuary.

The mass, attended by approximately 600 persons, was in charge of the Most Reverend Hugh L. Lamb, D. D., bishop of the Diocese of Greensburg, who acted as celebrant.

ONE THOUSAND AT FUNERAL HOME

Bishop Lamb also was assisted in the mass by Rev. William G. Ryan, president of Seton Hill College, and the Reverend Nicola Fusco, of New Kensington, deacons of honor; the Reverend Joseph Pernatozzi, of Youngwood, deacon; the Reverend Francis F. Brown, of Steubenville, Ohio, subdeacon; the Reverend Norbert Gaughan and the Reverend William Gavron, of Greensburg, masters of ceremonies.

Bishop Carroll, auxiliary bishop of Pittsburgh, assisted in the sanctuary. His chaplains were Father Albanese, of Greensburg, and the Reverend Edmund Cuneo, director of public relations at St. Vincent College.

An estimated 1,000 persons visited the funeral home yesterday to pay their respects. The throngs of mourners going to the site caused several traffic jams on North Main Street.

David Lawrence, mayor of Pittsburgh, was among a number of out-of-town visitors.

During separate special services last evening, members of the Cathedral Holy Name Society and Knights of Columbus Council 1480 recited the rosary. Members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Westmoreland County also attended in a body to pay their respects.

---

[From the Greensburg (Pa.) Tribune-Review of November 23, 1957]

FUNERAL SERVICES HERE THIS MORNING FOR CONGRESSMAN KELLEY—HUNDREDS PAY RESPECTS ON FRIDAY—MAYOR LAWRENCE AMONG VISITORS AT FUNERAL HOME

An estimated 1,000 persons visited Cramer's Funeral Home here on North Main Street Friday to pay their respects to the late Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY.

Several hundred more, including a group of Congressmen from Washington, D. C., are expected to be received at the funeral home this morning between 8:30 and 9:45 o'clock.

Removal will then be made to the Blessed Sacrament Cathedral where Bishop Hugh L.

Lamb will celebrate a pontifical mass at 10:30 o'clock.

SPECIAL SERMON

A special funeral sermon will be delivered by Msgr. Alphonse G. Mihm, rector of the cathedral.

Following services here, Congressman KELLEY's body will be sent to Washington, D. C., for additional services and interment Monday morning in the Arlington National Cemetery with full military honors.

Among prominent out-of-town visitors at the funeral home here Friday was Mayor David Lawrence, of Pittsburgh.

Throngs of mourners going to the funeral home all day long created several traffic jams on North Main Street yesterday. On some occasions, a city policeman was stationed at the Tunnel Street corner to direct traffic.

Special services were held at the funeral home last night by three separate groups. The Cathedral Holy Name Society and the Knights of Columbus Council 1480 both recited the rosary and the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Westmoreland County also attended in a body to pay respects.

Assisting Bishop Lamb in the pontifical mass at 10:30 o'clock this morning will be: Msgr. Alphonse G. Mihm, arch priest; Rev. William G. Ryan, president of Seton Hill, and Rev. Nicola Fusco, of New Kensington, deacons of honor; Rev. Joseph Fernatozzi, of Youngwood, deacon; Rev. Francis F. Brown, of Steubenville, Ohio, subdeacon; Rev. Norbert Gaughan and Rev. William Gavron, of Greensburg, masters of ceremonies.

---

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.,
*Washington, D. C., December 21, 1957.*

The untimely death of AUGUSTINE BERNARD KELLEY removed from the ranks of House Members a great friend and devoted helper of all handicapped people.

I have been personally acquainted with GUS KELLEY nearly since the day he came to Congress, and can avouch that he gave of his time and effort, freely, to all programs to help the underdog.

His death is a great loss to the Congress, to his district and State, and to the 50 million physically handicapped of America, for whom he campaigned ceaselessly during his entire Congressional career.

As my friend and coworker, I shall miss him, and I say, most humbly, "O Lord, a great champion of the underprivileged has come before You. I know You will weigh him by what he did, for his fellow men, while on earth."

PAUL A. STRACHAN,
*President.*

---

[From the Pittsburgh Catholic of November 28, 1957]

FEDERAL AID CHAMPION, REPRESENTATIVE KELLEY, DIES

Requiem masses at Bethesda, Md., and Greensburg were sung for Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, 74, who died recently of cancer at Suburban Hospital, Bethesda.

Bishop Hugh L. Lamb, of Greensburg, celebrated the requiem mass sung for Mr. KELLEY at Blessed Sacrament Cathedral, Greensburg. Auxiliary Bishop Coleman F. Carroll, of Pittsburgh, longtime friend of the Kelley family, assisted in the sanctuary.

DAILY AT COMMUNION

Msgr. Alphonse G. Mihm, rector of the Greensburg Cathedral, preached the sermon. Monsignor Mihm commented that he always knew when the Congressman was in town because he might be seen every morning "coming up from some inconspicuous corner of the church to the communion rail."

Mr. KELLEY, a champion of Federal aid to education, was serving his ninth term as Representative of Pennsylvania's 21st District (Westmoreland County).

In recent years Mr. KELLEY sponsored several bills in Congress for Federal aid to education. He was the author of a bill which would have provided $1.5 billion for school construction over a 5-year period. It was defeated by only five votes in the House last summer.

CATHOLIC MOTHER OF 1944

A native of New Baltimore, Pa., he was the father of 6 sons and 3 daughters, who survive. His widow, Ella Marie Bates, of Scottdale, was selected Catholic Mother of the Year in 1944 by the National Catholic Conference on Family Life.

Mr. KELLEY was admitted to West Point in 1904. Released because of a heart ailment, he went on to become one of the few West Point men ever to serve in Congress. During his 17 years in the House, he was active in labor legislation and an active opponent of the Taft-Hartley labor law.

He headed a House subcommittee which is holding hearings on a proposal to increase minimum wages. From 1944 to 1946 Mr. KELLEY headed the House Labor Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped. He was five times named House delegate to the International Labor Organization Conference.

SURVIVORS OF MR. KELLEY

Mr. KELLEY is survived by his widow, Ella Bates Kelley; his sons, Augustine R., of Greensburg and Bethesda; Hilary, of Greensburg; Captain Paul, of Fort Sheridan, Ill.; Richard, of Bethesda, a member of the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Robert, of Bluefield, W. Va.; James R., of Arlington, Va.; Mrs. Marcella Brown, Mrs. Teresa Leisy, and Mrs. Kathleen Schellenberg, all of Bethesda.

Burial was in Arlington National Cemetery.

---

[From the Vandergrift News of November 21, 1957]

KELLEY'S BODY RETURNS HOME TO GREENSBURG—WESTMORELAND'S VETERAN CONGRESSMAN MAKES LAST TRIP FROM CAPITAL

GUS KELLEY came home for the last time today.

The body of Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democratic Congressman from Westmoreland County, severe Eisenhower administration foe and for 17 years Representative in Congress from the county, arrived in Greensburg today from Washington.

KELLEY, a coal-mine operator and leader in the fight for Federal school-aid education, died of cancer Wednesday in Suburban Hospital at Bethesda, Md. He was 74.

KELLEY, a rugged Democrat who never shirked a fight, was the author of two school-construction bills defeated by the House during the past 2 years, the latest measure only by a margin of 2.

He was a leader of the progressive northern wing of House Democrats.

As second ranking Democrat on the House Education and Labor Committee, he was regarded as one of the top House experts on the field of education. He also served on the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee.

WILL LIE IN STATE

KELLEY's body will lie in state today and Friday at the Cramer Funeral Home in Greensburg. A solemn requiem Mass will be sung Saturday morning at Blessed Sacrament Catholic Cathedral here. The Congressman will be buried Monday in Arlington National Cemetery in Washington.

KELLEY was first elected to Congress from the 21st Pennsylvania District in November 1940, and was reelected to successive terms.

He was a delegate to the International Labor Organization Conference at Montreal in 1946, and in 1950 and 1951. He was the Congressional adviser to the ILO Conference at Geneva last year.

He was a member of the scale committee of the Coal Operators Association of Western Pennsylvania from 1935 to 1939.

KELLEY was operator of the Mammoth Coal & Coke Co., Greensburg, Pa., and was listed as a coal-mine operator in the Congressional Directory.

ENTERED HOSPITAL NOVEMBER 12

KELLEY, father of 9 children, entered the hospital November 12 because his physician felt he had been too active while convalescing from a major operation in September.

He subsequently developed a serious kidney ailment. Before his death, he received the last rites of the Catholic Church. His office subsequently said the direct cause of KELLEY's death was cancer.

KELLEY was born in New Baltimore, Pa., July 9, 1883. He attended elementary and high schools in Greensburg and was a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y.

KELLEY's death left the House with three vacancies, all Democrats and all resulting from recent deaths. The lineup now stands at 231 Democrats and 201 Republicans. One of the Republicans, Representative W. STERLING COLE, of New York, is stepping out December 1 to become Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The Pennsylvania Elections Bureau said that under State law Gov. George M. Leader must issue a writ for a special election for a successor to KELLEY within 10 days from date of death. His successor will serve until January 3, 1959.

Leader could set the election at any time but probably will set it for the primary, May 20, 1958, to save local election costs. KELLEY's successor would serve until January 3, 1959, when all Congress terms expire.

KELLEY married Ella Marie Bates, of Scottdale, Pa., in 1913. They had 6 sons and 3 daughters. The sons are, A. Regis, Bethesda, Md.; Dr. J. Hilary, Greensburg, Pa.; Richard B., Washington; Robert V. Bluefield, W. Va.; James R., Arlington, Va., and Capt. Paul A., Fort Sheridan, Ill.

The daughters are Mrs. Robert M. Schellenberg, Mrs. Henry B. Brown, Jr., and Mrs. H. R. Leisy, all of Bethesda, Md.

---

TRAFFIC JAMMED AS CROWDS PAY KELLEY RESPECT—EFFORTS OF SPECIAL POLICE FAIL TO CLEAR WAY AT FUNERAL HOME

Crowds so great that they caused traffic jams despite the efforts of special traffic policemen yesterday paid their last respects to Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY at Cramer Funeral Home, Greensburg.

More than 1,000 persons passed through the funeral home last night.

Several hundred more, including a group of fellow Congressmen, were received this morning from 8:30 to 9:45.

MASS CELEBRATED

The body was removed from the funeral home at that time and taken to Blessed Sacrament Cathedral where Bishop L. Lamb celebrated a pontifical high mass at 10:30.

The special funeral sermon for the veteran Westmoreland County Congressman was delivered by Msgr. Alphonse G. Mihm, rector of the cathedral.

BURIAL MONDAY

Following the services the body was taken from the cathedral and started on the journey back to Washington where for 17 years Representative KELLEY served the residents of Westmoreland County.

Additional services and burial are planned on Monday morning in Arlington National Cemetery where the former West Point student will be buried with full military honors.

LAWRENCE VISITS

Among the prominent out-of-town visitors who paid their respects yesterday was Mayor

David L. Lawrence of Pittsburgh, recognized leader of the Pennsylvania Democratic Party, which KELLEY had served so long.

The throngs of mourners going into the funeral home yesterday created several traffic jams on the county seat's North Main Street despite the fact that a city policeman was stationed at the Tunnel Street corner in an effort to keep traffic flowing.

Special services were held at the funeral home last night by three separate groups. The Cathedral Holy Name Society and the Knights of Columbus Council 1480 both recited the Rosary and the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Westmoreland County attended in a body.

Representative KELLEY died on Wednesday of this week in Bethesda Suburban Hospital of cancer.

---

[From the Valley Daily News of November 21, 1957]

REPRESENTATIVE KELLEY MASS SET ON SATURDAY

Hundreds of his constituents and colleagues in politics will pay last respects to Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY in Greensburg tonight and tomorrow.

The 74-year-old Democratic leader, in his 17th year as a Representative from the 21st District, Westmoreland County, died of cancer yesterday around noon.

Death came in Suburban Hospital, Bethesda, Md.

A requiem high mass will be sung Saturday in Blessed Sacrament, Roman Catholic Cathedral in Greensburg. The body will be returned to Washington, D. C., for another mass and burial in Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. KELLEY underwent a prostate operation in September. He had appeared to rally but last week doctors insisted he return to the hospital saying he had been overdoing his apparent recovery.

LAST RITES TUESDAY

He reentered the hospital November 12 and was given last rites of the Catholic Church Tuesday night.

The legislator became a leader among the progressive, northern wing of the Democratic Party in the House—a wing which hadn't much to say about developments in legislation in the last 5 or 6 years.

Members of his family said yesterday that the legislator would not be a candidate for a 10th term. Speculation is that one of his sons may choose to seek the office.

He was author of the Federal aid to education bills in the 84th and 85th Congresses, and it was a bitter disappointment to him when they failed enactment.

When the bill failed to pass the House last summer by a margin of only a few votes, KELLEY expressed disappointment that President Eisenhower had not made a point of pushing this legislation.

HANDICAP WEEK SPONSOR

He was sponsor of legislation which established National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week as an annual observance following an intensive committee investigation undertaken by Congress in this field under KELLEY'S chairmanship.

He was in the forefront of the fight for fair labor-management legislation and for other measures to maintain and expand a prosperous American economy under conditions of full employment.

He was a leader in the House Democratic fights against the Taft-Hartley Act in the 80th Congress and had sponsored legislation since then to repeal Taft-Hartley in favor of a restored Wagner Act.

The Coal Mines Safety Act, which cut mine fatalities to a new low, was drafted by a House Labor Subcommittee under KELLEY'S chairmanship.

KELLEY, from Pennsylvania's 21st District, was the second ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Throughout his 17-year Congressional career he had concentrated on labor and education affairs.

He also was a member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, which reviews the President's budget.

TWO VACANCIES

KELLEY'S death means that Pennsylvania Democrats will have two vacancies in their ranks in the House. Representative EARL CHUDOFF was elected a municipal judge in Philadelphia on November 5 and will resign his House seat on January 3.

The division in the Pennsylvania delegation has stood at 17 Republicans and 13 Democrats. It will now be 17-11.

KELLEY'S family consists of 6 sons, 5 of whom served in the Armed Forces in World War II—the sixth being too young—and 3 daughters.

KELLEY was the operator of the Mammoth, Pa., Coal & Coke Co.

LIFELONG COUNTY RESIDENT

Born at New Baltimore, Pa., July 9, 1883, he attended parochial and public grade schools and Greensburg High School. He first worked in the coal industry as an office boy. In his late twenties he was a foreman for a coal company and later started his own firm.

Earlier this year KELLEY headed a House Subcommittee on Labor Standards which conducted intensive hearings on legislation to increase the minimum wage throughout the country.

KELLEY was also a delegate to five International Labor Organization conferences in Europe and in Canada.

KELLEY was first elected to Congress on November 5, 1940.

He married Miss Ella Marie Bates of Scottdale in 1913.

It was the start of a family life that brought enjoyment to the Congressman amid the hustle and bustle of business in the Capital.

An Associated Press story from Washington in 1954 said that KELLEY would bet a diaper against a teething ring he's champion grandfather of Congress.

Occasion was the birth of his 24th grandchild.

Besides his widow, he leaves 6 sons, A. Regis, Robert V., James R., Richard B., Paul A., and J. Hilary, and 3 daughters, Mrs. Henry (Marcella) Brown, Jr., Mrs. Robert W. (Kathleen) Schellenberg, and Mrs. Roland H. (Therese) Leisy.

KELLEY enjoyed the distinction of having more sons in the Armed Forces than any other Member of Congress. Five of his boys were in uniform during World War II. The sixth was too young.

Mrs. Kelley was named American Catholic Mother in 1944.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has lost one of its best representatives in the Congress; the Committee on Education and Labor has lost a hard-working member, and I have lost a friend.

GUS KELLEY, as he was known to all, was one of the "doer" kind. He was quiet, unassuming, and humble. He accomplished much without fanfare.

He worried considerably about the lack of physical facilities to further the education of our children. One of his greatest ambitions was to correct the lack of necessary schoolrooms. He spent many hours studying this problem and felt very deeply the defeat of the bill to use Federal aid in building the necessary schools in all 48 States. The schools of America have lost one of their best friends.

Mr. KELLEY'S whole life was dedicated and devoted to his family. His family life was one that could be used as an example to others; he was happy, contented, devoted, and religious.

I shall never forget the words expressed at his funeral mass by the priest when he said, and I quote "I always knew when GUS KELLEY was in the district as he would be at the communion rail every morning."

His religious beliefs were deep in his heart and in his soul. His religion was not an outward showing. His worship of his God was done in a quiet and humble way.

Congressman KELLEY contributed much in his legislative work to secure for those who toil better wages and better working conditions. The miners of Westmoreland County looked to him as a champion of their cause although he, himself, was a mineowner. The working conditions and wages of the workers in the mills and factories of Pennsylvania benefited much by his support in humane and social legislation.

I believe that the true GUS KELLEY could be expressed in a few words, as follows: He was a true Christian who followed the teaching of his Divine Master. He was a true friend to all.

Mrs. Holland and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kelley and her wonderful family. They should find much happiness in knowing that GUS KELLEY contributed much in making America a better place in which to live, and in addition he met all the requirements of a good husband and a good father.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to have the privilege of speaking in memory of a distinguished statesman, AUGUSTINE KELLEY. I served with him on the Committee on Labor for 11 years. I learned to know his family and of his deep affection for them.

I want to say publicly that the Congress of the United States never had a more devoted man to serve his Nation and his community than GUS KELLEY. He was so humble; that was why he was great. I want to say further that his home folks in Greensburg were certainly aware of what a fine person he was. I attended the funeral of our late colleague in November and could see at firsthand the love and affection that the home folks had for him. All of us here can learn a fine lesson from this great statesman and good friend.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that all the Members of the House shared my grief and sadness at the passing of our beloved colleague, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY. Words are inadequate to express my deep sense of personal loss.

Gus, as he was familiarly known to all of his friends, represented the 26th District of Pennsylvania, which adjoins the district which I represent. Gus and I worked together on many problems of mutual interest to both our districts. We talked together, voted together, and oftimes argued together, for over 13 years. I valued his friendship very much and I feel that my life was enriched by my association with him.

Gus was an outstanding Member of this body. He served on the important Education and Labor Committee. He served with great ability and courage. As a member of this committee, he never failed in his strong support for Federal aid to education and a fair deal for labor. He was also vitally concerned with the problems of handicapped persons. The intensity of his convictions and the spirit with which he gave his best to every cause he championed will long be remembered by all of us.

Gus was deeply loved and respected by the people of his district and represented them ably. In his passing, not only our State, but the Nation, has lost an able and conscientious legislator. I have lost a close, personal friend, whom I shall miss very much.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow, Ella Marie, and to the other members of his fine family.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, our beloved colleague from Pennsylvania, has answered his last rollcall on this earth.

His untimely passing shocked all of us. We shall miss his pleasant face and his wise counsel and remember him as a genial and hard-working Member of this great body.

Gus, as he was affectionately known to all of us, was a quiet but effective Congressman. Although he was endowed with an abundance of worldly goods, his heart always was full of consideration for those less fortunate than himself. He devoted himself to improving the lot of the workingman and to providing adequate educational facilities for the younger generation who, as he often said, will be tomorrow's leaders.

Gus has left his mark in the Congress, in his State, and in the hearts of the people.

To his family, I extend my sincere sympathy in their hour of sorrow and to you, my colleagues, I say—I am proud to have numbered Gus KELLEY as a close friend.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the members of the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress and the members of the Committee on Education and Labor in paying tribute to an outstanding American statesman, the late AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY.

When I came to Congress some 12 years ago, Mr. KELLEY had already established an enviable reputation on the Committee on Education and Labor. A community of interests grew up between Mr. KELLEY and myself because of our mutual efforts to do something worth while for the average man, particularly in the field of labor, and in taking care of our boys and girls. For this reason our friendship was very close indeed.

I remember him, too, for his activities in behalf of rehabilitation legislation that cleared through our committee, and also his leadership in connection with important mining legislation to insure greater safety in the operation of our mines.

Words fail me to express my deep sense of loss. I knew no one better than I knew AUGUSTINE KELLEY, and I doubt if I had the confidence of any other Member of Congress to a greater extent than I had the confidence of our late friend.

Mrs. Kelley is in the galleries today. I wish to extend to her and to the late Congressman's fine family of nine children my heartfelt sympathy. They can view the future with the knowledge that their father was an outstanding legislator and a truly great American.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of the 21st District of Pennsylvania, was an outstanding Member of Congress, and one whose passing we in the Pennsylvania delegation deeply mourn. Gus KELLEY was first elected to the House of Representatives in November 1940, and ever since then—until his passing a few months ago—he has served with distinction and with conscientious devotion.

This is a better country because of the work which Congressman KELLEY has performed as a Member of the House of Representatives. Undoubtedly, his greatest mark as a Member of Congress was made in his work as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor on problems affecting the physically handicapped. I would say that Congressman KELLEY was regarded by those of our citizens who are handicapped by reason of physical disability as one of the greatest friends they ever had in public life. He was notable for his sympathy to the needs and the problems of those who suffer from any physical impairment.

In addition to sympathy for the problems of others he brought to his task in Congress outstanding ability for cutting through redtape, for getting to the heart of any problems, for plowing through verbiage—getting the fact; and, as a result, his subcommittee performed really remarkable service to the disabled persons of our country.

Congressman KELLEY's district, which consisted of Westmoreland County, Pa., adjoined Allegheny County which I have the honor to represent. We were neighbors, and we were friends. His beautiful family life was a source of great pride to him and one in which all of his friends also took pride. Congressman KELLEY had a large family of nine, fine children, and a wife of whom he was also deeply proud. Through the many years of their marriage their romance continued to live, and it was really inspiring to see Congressman and Mrs. Kelley at social affairs, or traveling together, or doing together any of the things in which they found so much mutual pleasure. I considered it a great privilege to know Congressman KELLEY well and to consider him a close personal friend.

In conclusion, I would like to add a word about the record of Congressman KELLEY. He was a businessman and a successful businessman. He was in the coal business. He was proud of the fact that the United Mine Workers union considered him a fast friend of the coal miner. In his case there was no conflict between labor and management. He believed in fair wages for his employees and for all wage earners, and he practiced what he preached. He was a liberal in the true sense of the word. As a Member of Congress—as a legislator—he similarly believed in voting for those things which were best for the great majority of the people. He saw no conflict between the things that were good for labor and the things that were good for business, for he believed, passionately, that business prospered and that our country prospered only as the people—the men and women who work for a living—were able to earn for their work sufficient income to enable them to be purchasers and consumers of the things they worked to produce.

This was the philosophy of Franklin D. Roosevelt and of Harry S. Truman, and it was the philosophy also of AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY of the 21st District of Pennsylvania, an outstanding public servant, who had a full life and a fine life, and who has left this world for a reward in heaven we know shall be his because he certainly earned it as a result of a career of service to others.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this moment pass without associating myself with all of the fine tributes that have been paid to AUGUSTINE KELLEY. It was my privilege and pleasure to be a member of the committee upon which both Congressman KELLEY and myself served, the Committee on Education and Labor.

I think my enrichment from service with Congressman KELLEY warrants me in pointing out that with all of the controversial legislation that came before that committee, never during my 10 years' experience with that committee did I ever see Congressman KELLEY lose his composure. He was most tolerant and most sympathetic and it certainly behooved those of us who sometimes lost a little of our patience and our feeling of frustration to watch Congressman KELLEY in action at the top ranks of that committee.

I was shocked when I received the news at my home in Minneapolis of his passing.

I want to join with all of the Members here in paying tribute to a great man, and to his wife and to his children I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add a word of tribute to the memory of GUS KELLEY. For quite a number of years Mr. KELLEY and his family lived in the same apartment building in which Mrs. Brown and I reside. In fact, he was a close neighbor of ours.

Mr. KELLEY was a wonderful family man, as well as a fine Christian gentleman. He raised a large and a splendid family to whom I extend my sympathy in the great loss which has been theirs, as well as the Nation's.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on one election night in 1944 I received late in the evening two telephone calls, among others. One was from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] who has had the good taste to present these ceremonies today on behalf of our feeling for Mr. KELLEY. The other telephone call came a few minutes later from GUS KELLEY in his hometown of Pennsylvania, both of these fine friends of mine. Both calls congratulated me on my first election to this House. Of course, both of these gentlemen have been friends of mine all of these years and they always will be remembered by me.

Mr. Speaker, knowing GUS as long as I did and for as many years as I did, even before his telephone call that day, he would be the first to admonish us not to be too prolific or too flowery in our expressions of feeling about him. We all know that he was that sort of man. However, Mr. Speaker, we as his friends and colleagues during all of these years have some rights of our own to say the things that we are saying today. I think first of GUS KELLEY'S devotion to his sense of duty. He found out early in his career, and day after day thereafter, that the performance of a duty merely presented him as a reward with another duty to perform.

So, all through his life that chain reaction of duty, and performance of duty, and his devotion to it, was a hallmark of his record and career and repute at home and here.

Mr. Speaker, there are weak men who speak of their rights, and they speak interminably of their rights, but strong men, while they say very little about it, think of their responsibilities, and GUS KELLEY, as a good American, always knew of his bill of rights, but he always thought deeply of his bill of responsibilities. And I think of his great integrity. Without that we do not have very much. Without that, Mr. Speaker, we have nothing at all, as a matter of fact. We know that if you asked GUS KELLEY to do something, a little thing or a great thing, or to do it for us or with us, if he said he would do something, he would do it, and that was all there was to it. That was the end of that. You could depend on him. He was a man of not only kindliness but seriousness. I often think of a gentleman as a man who will not do an unkind thing to another person, and that certainly was a clear definition of GUS KELLEY as a gentleman. I never heard back home or here of his even saying anything unkind, let alone doing anything unkind to another person; never, but never. You all know that, I am sure.

There are many things I could add, Mr. Speaker, but knowing what he has done in his hometown and our great State, and in the years he served here with us, in his district and in this Nation, his great service on the Committee on Education and Labor for the working people and for the people of America generally, that if every man, woman, and child who benefited from GUS KELLEY'S public service to this country would bring one blossom to his grave, he would sleep eternally in a great bower of beautiful floral memory.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was many miles away in South America when I received the news of the passing of GUS KELLEY. It was a sad hour and a sad day and a sad week for me, because GUS was one of my oldest and dearest friends. We came to this body together in 1941, and for many years we were neighbors together in the Old House Office Building. Day in and day out we visited together, discussed one another's problems, and shared in one another's joys and pleasures.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that can be said and have been said about GUS KELLEY, but one thought and one word comes to my mind particularly. I remember a year or so ago reading a piece in a magazine about a distinguished American who had been just halfway successful. Someone was trying to analyze why he had not quite made the top rung. The writer, in analyzing this man's character, said that he lacked one great essential, and that essential he described as compassion. Well, if there was one quality which GUS KELLEY had and which was so eminent about him, it was his quality of compassion and understanding. I think that is what accounted for the fact that he was a very successful businessman and yet at the same time was one of the great friends of organized labor, trusted by both business and labor. I think that accounts for the fact that he gave so much of his time to working out the problems facing the miners, the men who have to work, to toil beneath the ground without the benefit of the sun. I think that is why he interested himself in the problems of the schoolchildren and worked for a school bill. And I think that is why all of us who knew him loved him.

There were so many things dear about our colleague. I am sure many of the Members got to know his fine family. Mrs. Kelley, GUS KELLEY'S wife, is one of the loveliest ladies Mrs. Boggs and I know. They have nine children. Imagine what a magnificent heritage to leave—nine fine, magnificent children. I used to tease GUS. I used to say to him, "Gus you have got to have at least 81 grandchildren." And now and then I would stop him and say, "Gus, how many grandchildren do you have now?" And he would have to stop and count up. I think the last time I asked him it was something like 35. And they are all wonderful, magnificent young Americans, with a great heritage from a great father, and a great grandfather, a man who loved his country, loved the House of Representatives where he served magnificently, loved his God and died in His grace.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the memory of an American statesman in whose life history is an inspiration for young and old alike, for present generations and for those to follow. AUGUSTINE BERNARD KELLEY was a devoted husband and father, a successful businessman, and a dedicated Member of Congress.

A native of Pennsylvania, AUGUSTINE KELLEY served as an example to all youngsters when, as a small boy, he assisted his parents financially by selling newspapers on the streets of downtown Greensburg. His efforts not only reflected a deep love and attachment for his mother and father, and for his brothers and sisters, but also provided an important foundation for the determined and industrious attitude that, in maturity, was to play so important a part in his economic and political careers.

Although he was an outstanding athlete in high school, the young man carried on his scholastic work with the same diligence and persistence that marked his other endeavors. He won an appointment to the United States Military Academy, but his ambition to be a career officer was ended abruptly 1 year later when he was forced to leave West Point because of an athletic heart. This turn of events was a source of shock and disappointment to Cadet KELLEY, but he remained an ardent admirer and friend of such classmates as Generals Patton, Bonesteel, and other illustrious members of the United States Army.

Forty years after his departure from the Point, Congressman KELLEY received a measure of consolation when he attended graduation services at the academy for his son, Paul, now a captain stationed at Fort Sheridan, Ill. Congressman KELLEY took special pride in the fact that 5 of his 6 sons were in the Armed Forces during World War II. The sixth was too young for military service at the time.

Another unforgettable event in our departed colleague's life took place when his wife, the former Ella Marie Bates, of Scottdale, Pa., was named Catholic Mother of the Year 1944.

I was fortunate in being a neighbor of Congressman KELLEY in the Old House Office Building, in addition to serving a Congressional district bordering the area he represented. I found in him the sincerity and warmth that won friendship and respect in his Westmoreland County, in Washington, D. C., and everywhere else in his wide acquaintanceship. His friends were legion, for his work in Congress took him to meetings throughout

this country, in Panama and Puerto Rico, in Canada, and in Europe

Congressman KELLEY was a scholar. His insatiable desire for learning flamed within him in later years in the same degree as when he was at Greensburg High School and West Point. As a young man he studied engineering and other subjects through correspondence courses. He was an authority on the Civil War and a Shakespearean expert. Even before his election to Congress in 1940, Mr. KELLEY was in demand as a speaker on coal industry operations and economy, and on labor matters.

I need not recite the record of Congressman KELLEY in the House of Representatives, but I should like to remind my colleagues of his work as chairman of a subcommittee during the closing months of World War II. Dissatisfied with prospects of rehabilitation that faced veterans who lost limbs in battle, he took personal charge of the Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped. He held a series of meetings in the East and Midwest, during which victims of action during the great world conflict and victims of industrial accidents were given an opportunity to appear. The hearings included testimony from medical authorities and rehabilitation officials in all phases of the physically handicapped field.

The outcome was an intensified effort in the direction of better prosthetic devices for those who lost arms or legs, plus increased employment of the physically handicapped by Federal and State Governments. Since becoming a Member of the House of Representatives, I, too, have spent considerable time in the problems of our handicapped people, and I can well appreciate the satisfaction that Congressman KELLEY received from his successful work in their behalf.

In the past 9 years I have had the opportunity of getting acquainted with Congressman KELLEY'S sons and his daughters, as well as with Mrs. Kelley. To them I offer my sincere condolences, but I know that they will forever be happy in the thought that the man God took from our midst last November 20 contributed so very much to his country and to his fellowmen.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the recent untimely death of GUS KELLEY, of the 21st District of Pennsylvania, distressed all who had known him. To those who had known him well and had shared his friendship, death carried with it a sense of deep personal loss.

I first knew Gus while I was a member of the legislature in Harrisburg; and when I came here as a Member of Congress, I consulted with him on various pieces of legislation. In his gentle way, he always guided me with regard to legislation for the welfare of the people of our State.

He was a firm believer in God, a respecter of all men, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. The Nation regrets the loss of a great liberal. He had qualities of mind and heart which made him an exceptionally effective Member of Congress and public servant.

Pennsylvania will realize his loss, especially the people of his district who respected him highly and loved him, and I will always cherish my fondest memories of the happy experiences that I enjoyed from my association with GUS KELLEY here in Washington.

It is my earnest prayer that God will be good to him and grant him eternal rest.

To his lovely widow and fine family, I join their many friends in offering my most sincere sympathy in their great personal loss.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the late Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, was one of the truly noble Members of this House. His philosophy of life was exemplified by his gentlemanly manner and his many and effective efforts to make this a better country. I regarded him as a close friend and a valued adviser, and I shall miss his wise counsel and deep understanding of human values.

To his widow, his children, and his many grandchildren I extend my heartfelt sympathy. To them also I extend my congratulations on the heritage those children and grandchildren have been fortunate to receive, for they will always know a deep sense of pride in the accomplishments of this fine man and outstanding public servant.

Congressman KELLEY was instrumental in fashioning the foundation on which so much of our social-welfare legislation today is based. His work on the problems of the physically handicapped serves as a great monument to him and has helped immeasurably in making the American dream and the American promise more meaningful to millions of our citizens who can take a useful role in life despite physical handicaps because of the efforts of Congressman KELLEY and others in the Congress who worked with him on these great objectives.

He built a good life, a fine life, and out of his work and his devotion to the public interest he has helped to make untold others happier people. In the literal sense, he was a good man.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I was away on official business when I learned of the passing of Congressman KELLEY, and it was, indeed, a profound shock. Death is a shock at any time, but it is doubly so when it comes so unexpectedly.

GUS KELLEY was more than a colleague from Pennsylvania. I knew him as a sincere friend—a gentleman who, although on the opposite side of the aisle, was always ready to cooperate wherever he thought the cause was just or wherever the action would benefit our country and our State.

In particular, I discussed with Congressman KELLEY many problems which were of mutual concern to us, because Gus came from a great bituminous-coal-producing area and I from the heart of the anthracite-producing region of Pennsylvania. We shared each other's problems, and when I had any requests in behalf of our mineworkers and their families, as well as the rank and file of labor in particular, GUS KELLEY, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee of the House, was always ready to cooperate and support any legislation which would benefit the workingman, particularly the mineworker. Likewise, he stood at all times ready to cooperate where the legislation would benefit the mining industry, and, as a coal operator himself, he was held in the highest regard both by management and labor. And, of course, when Gus was interested in appropriations to carry out the provisions of any labor legislation in which he was interested, it was my pleasure and privilege to cooperate wherever possible as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

GUS KELLEY also had an intense interest in helping his unfortunate brothers, as was attested to by his many activities as a member of the House Labor Subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped, and the Advisory Committee on Prosthetic Devices for the Veterans' Administration.

Congressman KELLEY, as a former member of the board of education in his home community of Greensburg, Pa., also took a leading part in sponsoring and supporting legislation and other activities in the many programs for Federal aid to education. In this field he had an intense interest in military education as evidenced by his services on the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

Yes, Congressman KELLEY was a great humanitarian, who served his country well and with distinction, and very ably represented the people of his particular Congressional district and the great State of Pennsylvania. His memory will long be cherished by countless friends in all walks of life.

A fine Christian gentleman GUS KELLEY reared a wonderful family, and to his widow and loved ones goes my heartfelt sympathy. I know their cross is heavy and their loss is great, but I know they will find some consolation in the fact that he will be happy in that heavenly home in which we all some day hope to dwell. I pray the good Lord will give them the strength and fortitude to carry on in the days ahead, and to help keep the KELLEY name a fine symbol of Americanism and good neighborliness it has stood for in so many years of life and progress in his home area, and in the Nation's Capital where it can be truthfully said of our good brother and colleague, "well done thy good and faithful servant."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our friend and colleague, GUS KELLEY, is a severe loss to the people of Pennsylvania and the Nation. It is a great personal loss to those of us who were closely associated with him here and who valued his friendship.

GUS KELLEY was thoroughly dedicated to liberal humanitarian principles. He courageously championed legislation to benefit all Americans. His long record of able and conscientious service in the House of Representatives won for him the respect of all who knew him.

His fight to provide adequate school classrooms for the children of America will long be remembered. The importance of the Kelley bill and the urgent need for expanded educational opportunities for our youth has now been more fully recognized, since the launching of the Russian satellite has dramatized our scientific educational shortcomings.

GUS KELLEY was a remarkable man in many respects. He possessed great vision and courage. His deep sense of social justice made him acutely aware of the needs and aspirations of his fellow citizens. His devotion to duty, his sincerity of purpose, and his outstanding legislative ability made it possible for him to successfully lead his colleagues in the fight against injustice. His passing leaves a gap in liberal ranks that will be difficult to fill.

To his widow and family I join with my colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy on the loss of a beloved husband and father.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of personal loss that I join the delegation from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and members of the Committee on Education and Labor in paying tribute to our departed colleague, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY. A former Member of this House whom we lost recently by his resignation from this body was also from the State of Pennsylvania. He was the ranking member on the Republican side of the Committee on Education and Labor. I am sure that if Sam McConnell were here today he would want to say something concerning the passing of AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, whom he liked so much and with whom he worked so hard over the years. I know that the days he spent with him at the International Labor Organization Convention in Geneva and the hours which he spent in working with him on the Committee on Education and Labor of the House meant much to Mr. McConnell. Mr. KELLEY was not only a great statesman, a leader, and a fine Member of the House, but he had that very rare quality of being a good friend. Many of us who are younger Members of the House and who came to know him through our committee work can attest to that. I am certainly going to miss him very much. I am sure the Committee on Education and Labor will be a much poorer committee until we can in some way fill the vacancies created by the loss of these two great citizens from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—one by resignation and the other by being called to his Maker.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the Members of the Pennsylvania delegation and our other colleagues in expressing my sorrow and sadness at the passing of GUS KELLEY. In every sense of the word, he was a gentleman and a scholar. He was a true friend and a great patriot. I want to say to his fine and splendid family whom he leaves behind that we all feel very deeply for them in this dark hour of their life.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the distinguished majority leader, the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to adequately express my thoughts on this occasion in relation to my very close and beloved friend, GUS KELLEY. Between GUS KELLEY and me there existed a friendship which was one of the most treasured I have ever possessed and a friendship which brought us very close together in life—a friendship that will always leave a sweet memory of him in my mind through the remaining days of my life.

GUS KELLEY was a man of deep faith, a man who lived in accordance with the deep faith that he possessed, a man who exemplified as effectively as anyone humanly can the two great commandments of God—love of God and love of neighbor, which means love of his fellow man. It can be truly said of GUS KELLEY that he was a people's Congressman or, as my good friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALTER, so well said, he always had "the welfare of the little man at heart." GUS KELLEY knew the significance of the family life in the life of a nation and in the life of society. He knew that a strong family life meant a strong society and a strong Government; he knew that a weak family life meant a weak society and a weak Government. His years of service in public life, particularly in this body, were dedicated to not only preserving and strengthening the family life of America, because he knew by doing that he was not only carrying out the faith that he so strongly believed in, but he was making a stronger America. This is exemplified by the many bills which he introduced and supported, which have been referred to by my other colleagues and to which I will not refer to at this time.

GUS KELLEY is not dead. Physically he is dead, but his spirit lives on. The spirit of GUS KELLEY is the spirit of faith, the spirit of idealism, the spirit of good deeds, the spirit of a good man. While the candle of life may die, the light from that candle that existed during his lifetime will always carry on, because the spirit of GUS KELLEY is there.

I join with my colleagues in extending my sympathy to the people of his district, to the Pennsylvania delegation in both branches of the Congress, and particularly to that sweet wife of his, and through her, to her loved ones, her children and her grandchildren. As other colleagues of mine have well said, they inherit from their father and their grandfather a memory and heritage which will go on from generation to generation as long as any descendants of GUS KELLEY live. A family heritage and a family trait.

I know that the great life that GUS KELLEY led, the countless persons who are happier because he lived, the fact that America is a stronger America because he lived and served in this body, will bring great consolation to Mrs. Kelley and her loved ones, and help to soften the shock and tragedy of his death.

To Mrs. Kelley and her loved ones I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the Pennsylvania delegation in extending tribute to our former colleague, GUS KELLEY.

He was one of the first Members of Congress with whom I became acquainted when I came to Congress in 1943, and that friendship has continued during the intervening years. I served as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee with him during the 80th Congress. Then I had the opportunity to more intimately observe his great ability, his keen devotion to duty, and his sincere desire to do right and justice to every person and group who came to him personally or had legislative contacts with that committee.

I firmly believe that GUS KELLEY as long as he served with this body possessed the admiration, friendship, and respect of every Member on both sides of the aisle. Although he was a foremost sponsor of legislation in behalf of labor, minority groups, and the common man, he was a coal operator and businessman for many years. As an employer of labor, he possessed a high sense of duty and fairness toward his own employees and all persons and groups who asked and fought for better wages, working conditions, and living standards. He will be remembered for his stanch support and advocacy of legislation which would enable many more millions in this country to enjoy many of the better things in life, including security for the American home, both present and future, than existed before his coming to this legislative body.

His district, State, and this Nation have suffered a great loss by reason of his passing. Men of the GUS KELLEY type are not easily replaced. He was a great American and his friends will long mourn his passing.

I wish to extend to his wife and children my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, GUS KELLEY came from a large family, and, in his turn, he fathered a larger one.

As grandfather of the year, he symbolized the loving husband and father, the good provider, and the man who learned from his family circle those lessons that helped him to become a wise and humane legislator.

He had the balanced judgment of the poor boy who became a successful businessman. He knew human nature as well as he knew the interplay of economic forces and he was convinced that

the greatest resource of our Nation is its people.

Guided by this practical philosophy, he devoted himself to those measures that would encourage and promote the greatest good for all.

We remember how he gave himself unsparingly as leader of the fight to enact Federal aid for school construction. Although these bills were defeated by slim margins in the past two sessions of Congress, we know that he will be vindicated and, perhaps, sooner than most people think. For the lost leadership of the United States may be traced, in part, to the neglect of our educational system, which GUS KELLEY was determined to overcome. He will be sorely missed because he had the pioneering vision that this Nation needs for survival in the age of space. He was a real American because he understood that the dynamics of freedom are not intended for exploitation by the few, but must inure to the progress of all. He sensed that, in the intellectual field, we were doing too little—and too late.

How right he was—and is.

The body of Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, who served nine terms as Representative of Pennsylvania's 21st District, was interred in Arlington National Cemetery, near to the heart of our Nation's Government that he loved and served so well.

I am sure that his spirit will help to guide us in this year of fateful decision to achieve the great awakening that is so urgently needed if freedom is to live.

For GUS KELLEY had the faith that leads to action.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend and revise their remarks and to include in their remarks extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I feel a deep sense of personal loss at the death of the Honorable AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania. In addition to being one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, AUGUSTINE KELLEY was a personal friend with whom it was my privilege to spend many hours of discussion in the closing months of the 1st session of this Congress—just a few weeks before his passing. As a personal friend I found him to be a man of the highest ideals, a man of the finest Christian principles, a man who sincerely cared about his fellow man. After all, when death finally comes, it is the intangibles of the spirit—rather than material possessions and material accomplishments—which are the most abiding legacies a man leaves to the world, and by which he is eventually judged. AUGUSTINE KELLEY left a better world in which to live because he for a little time was a physical part of it, and his beautiful spirit continues to abide with us.

In his 17 years of service in the House, AUGUSTINE KELLEY brought to this forum a rare understanding of the problems of labor as well as management. His splendid record of accomplishment and service on the House Committee on Education and Labor is testimony to that understanding. All of his colleagues will bear witness to his fearlessness in presenting, in a most effective way, his position on the problems which faced the House.

His was a lifelong interest in the problems of education and labor, and an understanding of humanity. His understanding of the problems of all three will be sorely missed in the House of Representatives.

Also, I shall miss him as a friend.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have known the family of Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY for nearly 30 years and I join with the members of his large and close-knit family in a personal sense of loss as a result of his death. No Member of Congress enjoyed a finer reputation for hard work and devotion to the public interest.

My husband always considered Congressman KELLEY not only a close friend but an outstanding legislator. When I came to Congress last year, and had many occasions to consult with Congressman KELLEY on legislation before his committee, I learned at firsthand the broad scope of his knowledge of national affairs and awareness of the problems which faced the men and women and children of our country.

His bereaved family can be proud of the contributions which Congressman KELLEY made to public life in this country. Human problems never failed to concern him and he was always ready to do whatever he could for others.

The people of Westmoreland County, Pa., have lost a great friend. So, too, have all of us who knew Congressman KELLEY. And so, too, have all Americans interested in good government and in liberal causes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, we will miss terribly our good friend AUGUSTINE KELLEY. He was a man of the people, and he was for the people. To his loved ones I express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the absence of GUS KELLEY from this Chamber leaves a vacancy which will be hard to fill. Congressman KELLEY's death marks the passing of one of the finest friends that the schoolchildren of this country have ever had. The school construction bill which bore his name was the tremendous and laudable effort of a great man on behalf of America's future.

GUS KELLEY and I served together in the Democratic whip organization. No member of that organization ever did his work more thoroughly or with greater punctuality than Congressman KELLEY. No Member of the House ever worked more faithfully in the interests of his country. He was a good man, a kind man, whose ability was matched by his broad vision. He has served his day and generation with unusual distinction and with great credit to this House and to his constituents.

I extend my deepest personal sympathy to his loved ones in the hour of their bereavement.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the untimely passing of AUGUSTINE KELLEY this Congress has suffered the loss of one of its most distinguished Members, and the Pennsylvania delegation has returned to this session to mourn the absence from our midst of one of the Keystone State's stalwart sons.

Some people are born into this world possessed of the happy faculty of inspiring confidence by their very presence, and such a man was GUS KELLEY. Speaking firmly but quietly, he made an excellent impression on the floor of this House; and the calmness which invariably possessed him lent force and conviction to his utterances. His constituents were most fortunate in having a man of his caliber to represent them, and the exacting responsibilities accompanying his position as ranking committee member did not cause him to ignore the individual concerns of the people who had elected him.

Above all else, however, AUGUSTINE KELLEY must always be remembered as a great family man; and, as is right and proper, his loving wife and their nine children occupied the central place in his life. Suffice it to say that he has bequeathed to them a rich heritage, and theirs is an enviable pride in a life that was lived so fully for his fellow men. That he died secure in the faith is their great comfort in this sad hour when we join with them in mournful contemplation of his departure from this earthly scene.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, for a new Member or Delegate the number of Members of the House of Representatives poses a most serious problem in getting acquainted. I am told that sometimes a matter of several sessions goes by before one can know all the Members by name and face. This I believe.

I was extremely fortunate to have had the opportunity of knowing the distinguished and outstanding ranking majority member of the Committee on Labor and Education, the Honorable AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY. This came about because my office was in the same corridor with his. In our goings to and fro, we would meet and have time to get acquainted.

AUGUSTINE KELLEY was a man of conviction, of belief and certainty and of a strong faith, as well as a man who had the courage to stand by his convictions without being disagreeable to those who held opposing views.

A dedicated American who provided in his life as a husband, a father, and as a Member of Congress, as well as in his profession, an example that was an honor and a credit to his God and to his country.

While I have lost a friend, I am happy that at least I had the opportunity to know him and to obtain from him inspiration. I express to his family my prayers that God may comfort them and that they may have inspiration from his example.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our esteemed colleague and friend, Congressman AUGUSTINE KELLEY, of Pennsylvania. I have appreciated all

the splendid remarks made concerning Mr. KELLEY by those who have preceded me and I certainly concur in what my colleagues have said. I admired him greatly and enjoyed and appreciated his warm personality and friendship.

It was my privilege to serve with him as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, by appointment by Speaker RAYBURN. We flew together to New York in visiting the Academy. Congressman KELLEY attended the United States Military Academy and took a strong position for maintaining our Nation's military strength. He was an able legislator, devoted to his country.

He will be greatly missed and I wish to extend to the members of his family an expression of my sympathy in the great loss which they have sustained.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I join in paying respect to the cherished memory of our departed colleague and friend, the late Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania.

Congressman KELLEY, whom we all called GUS, represented Pennsylvania's 21st District, near Pittsburgh, and was serving his 9th term in the House. At the time of his passing he was second-ranking Democrat on the House Labor and Education Committee as well as a member of the Joint Economic Committee. He sponsored several bills in recent years for Federal aid to school construction, and during all his 17 years here was very active and effective in progressive labor legislation.

Serving with GUS KELLEY in this body has been a rich and rewarding experience. I always found him to be a man of sterling character, tremendous energy, and unusual ability. He was a beloved gentleman possessed of great courage and determination, always steadfast in his convictions. In my opinion he was one of the truly outstanding national legislators of our time and we shall surely miss him in the difficult days ahead.

To his widow, children, and grandchildren I extend my deepest sympathy in their sorrow.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, the late GUS KELLEY. His splendid record in the Congress speaks for itself and the contributions he has made to the important work of this body have been outstanding. The skill and faithful service which he brought to the Joint Economic Committee will long be remembered by all who served with him. Personally, and on behalf of the members of the Joint Economic Committee, I want to express our gratitude for the opportunity of knowing and working with this fine man.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues from Pennsylvania and others who have paid tribute to our departed Member, AUGUSTINE KELLEY. I was indeed saddened when I learned of his passing.

Mr. KELLEY and I came to Congress together. It was a real privilege to have him as a friend, and I greatly enjoyed our association over the years. Both of us represented coal-producing districts which gave us something in common.

He had a genial personality and always had a friendly greeting. He had the happy faculty of making friends, and keeping them.

I considered Mr. KELLEY one of the outstanding Members of this House. His passing is a great loss, not alone to his district, but to the entire Nation. My life is richer for having known this outstanding statesman and patriot.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Kelley, and the other members of the family.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn of the sudden passing of my very good friend and colleague, GUS KELLEY, on November 20, 1957. To his wife and children, I extend my deepest heartfelt sympathies.

To me GUS KELLEY was more than just a man and a Member of Congress. He was a great humanitarian who always found the time to help those in need. He ably represented his district and was held in the highest esteem by his constituents and multitude of friends.

He will be sadly missed by all of us assembled here today, but his memory and his deeds will long survive him.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to believe that our warmhearted, genial, great friend, GUS KELLEY, has gone to his eternal rest.

News of his passing came to me somewhat like a bolt from the blue because I had no intimation that he was seriously ill. I was truly stunned and was profoundly moved to learn of his demise because since the time I first came to Congress he was my esteemed and beloved friend and neighbor.

His office was located across the hall from my own and we frequently visited with each other. I sometimes had the great privilege of meeting with him in his office in the presence of some of his wonderful family, who were all so very, very dear to him.

He was extremely proud of his gracious wife and his lovely children and to a very great extent drew real inspiration from them and was helped immeasurably in his public work by their help and cooperation. His intense devotion to his family was one of the most appealing and admirable facets in the life of this great American, who devoted so many years to the service of his constituency, his fellow citizens, and his country.

GUS KELLEY had a long, honored, and most successful career in business and in the public service. He was born in his beloved Pennsylvania and educated in the parochial and public schools and high school of Greensburg in that great State. He attended the United States Military Academy at West Point. He was married to Miss Ella Marie Bates, also a proud Pennsylvanian, and was the father of nine wonderful children, who throughout his life were his greatest joy and pride.

Possessed of a lively, penetrating mind, a beaming warmhearted personality, and a dynamic enterprising spirit, early in life he earned and won recognition in the business and civic affairs of his State. As the years advanced, he was bound to make a deep impression on his business associates and members of the business community and he was chosen for several very important posts in the professional and business life of community, State, and Nation.

He was a devoted and enthusiastic West Pointer and held life membership in the Association of Graduates of the United States Military Academy. True to his great heritage and lineage of which he was so proud he was a member of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. GUS KELLEY was a devout and humble man deeply attached to his religious beliefs. He was not given to vanity or self-exaltation and shunned pretense, sham, and hypocrisy. His life, like his character, was built on the firm pillars of truth, sincerity, and justice.

When GUS KELLEY was elected to Congress in 1940, this body was honored by the presence and membership of one of the really great, conscientious, dedicated public servants of our era. He was repeatedly reelected by overwhelming margins, so great was the faith, confidence, and gratitude of his constituents and so high its approval of his splendid qualifications and his superlative contributions.

During his tenure in Congress, he was vitally interested in the great questions of our day and he worked assiduously and unselfishly to try to find proper solutions to truly perplexing, seemingly insoluble, problems that came before the Congress in such volume and rapid succession during World War II and the postwar years.

GUS KELLEY always stood on principle and conviction and courageously worked and fought for his firm beliefs as to what was best for the American people, and especially for the inarticulate groups unable to plead their own case in the Halls of Congress. In GUS KELLEY these people had an able, vigorous advocate, and an unfailing, courageous champion.

He never let them down. His great humanitarian soul was moved and prompted by the plight of the unfortunate, the handicapped, the sick, the underprivileged and all those unable to help themselves. In his committee work and in the House and in many official conferences in this Nation and abroad, GUS KELLEY relentlessly pursued the high goals he had set to lighten the burden of these afflicted groups and bring to them, not only sympathy, solace, and comfort, but also the tangible material aid and assistance that they so desperately needed to enable them to meet the ordinary, decent needs of their existence.

He did more than that—he moved with rare ability and unswerving purpose to bring these unfortunate people some genuine ray of hope and faith that everything possible was being done to assist them in their distress, to alleviate the condition from which they were suffering, and to bring them into a brighter day in which dire want would be banished and their basic human needs for succor, care, and assistance and every possible relief from pain, handicap, and suffering would be adequately fulfilled.

The laboring people and the workers of district, State, and Nation, as well as the unfortunate and the handicapped,

owe GUS KELLEY a great debt of gratitude for his unselfish devotion to their cause. Certainly there has never been a man in the House, who has been a more sincere, conscientious, vigorous advocate of the rights and the needs of the working classes than GUS KELLEY. He knew the problems of working men and women, because he had been a workingman himself, and he well understood the difficulties, the disappointments, the obstacles, the sufferings, that working people must sometimes undergo.

It was this unquenchable spark of fundamental social justice that brilliantly illumined the philosophy and political endeavors of this noble son of Pennsylvania, who gave so much of himself, his talents, of his abilities, and of his personal means to serve the cause of the common people of America.

GUS KELLEY was a devoted husband, a proud, loving father, and a real, loyal friend. In fact, I think that loyalty was one of the outstanding traits of his character. He was kind and generous beyond measure, and he was gracious and considerate to everyone he encountered in his personal relationships. There was a warmth, quiet humor, and wholeheartedness to his personality that everyone who encountered GUS KELLEY recognized and that his friends could never forget, because to those of us who knew him well these things were but the outward manifestation of his genuineness, his sincerity, his spiritual depth.

Such a man as GUS KELLEY will have a lasting place in our hearts, and his memory will long endure in this House, where he rendered such outstanding, distinguished service to his district, his State, and our Nation. No one can ever precisely take his place with us and we mourn him with the poignant feeling that not only a great friend but a great soul has departed from our midst.

To his gracious wife and lovely family, I again extend my most sincere and heartfelt sympathy for the truly great measure of their loss and the irreparable, untimely, and lamentable passing of their loved one. I humbly and prayerfully beseech the great Creator to bless and comfort them in their bereavement and give them strength, courage, and faith to accept their heavy burden of sorrow with that sense of true Christian resignation which can ameliorate sorrow and console the deep anguish of those who have sustained such a grievous sadness.

In his long, illustrious life, GUS KELLEY epitomized highest ideals and great deeds. May the good Lord and the angelic hosts give him eternal peace and rest in his heavenly home.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise to pay my respects to the memory of our departed colleague, AUGUSTINE KELLEY. I have known GUS, as he was affectionately called by his friends, since he first took his seat in this great legislative body in 1941, and I have treasured his friendship down through the years. His death came as a great shock to me. The Nation has lost, through his passing, a great and courageous legislator, and I have lost a friend.

GUS KELLEY brought to bear, in his activities as a Representative of his district and his Nation, high ability, sincerity, and integrity. He had the courage of his convictions and never hesitated to express those convictions. He was a God-fearing man who took his heavy duties and responsibilities seriously and always sought to do what was right. The Nation can ill afford to lose men of his ability and attributes of character in these troubled times.

GUS KELLEY was a kind and helpful colleague who was always willing to counsel with and advise Members who sought his counsel. He was steadfast in his convictions and his principles.

To the countless friends of GUS KELLEY and to the members of his family, I extend sincere sympathy and condolences. His example will remain an inspiration to us all.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying high tribute to our departed friend and Member AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY.

One of the finest qualities that any Member of the Congress can have is the attribute of being forever constructive. I think it grows out of the yearnings and the experiences that we have prior to coming here. We see things that ought to be done to better the present and to enhance the future in which our children and our children's children will live.

I really think this fits the deeds and the character of our departed friend and neighbor, GUS KELLEY. He was constructive—he never tore down. He was a builder and his record is replete with solid examples of his labor.

GUS KELLEY, father, friend, employer, legislator, by every standard was a great American.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere personal regret that we in Congress learn of the death of an experienced associate, Congressman AUGUSTINE KELLEY, of Greensburg, Pa., representing Westmoreland County which constitutes the 21st Congressional District. I remember GUS KELLEY, not only as an outstanding Member of Congress but as a personal friend through the years who has represented an industrial, mining, and farm district in western Pennsylvania near my own district in Allegheny County and Pittsburgh. He served well not only the people of his own district in the Greensburg and Westmoreland areas, but the people of Pennsylvania, and the whole United States of America. He was far sighted and friendly in assisting newer Congressmen, and I have not forgotten his friendship to me when I first came to Congress.

We in western Pennsylvania remember him for his constant interest in the physically handicapped among us, and as a member of the Labor and Education Committee of the House of Representatives. GUS KELLEY performed his duties with the same warm hearted approach. I remember his keen interest in his family and in younger people, especially his work for the assistance of our disabled veterans through the development of prosthetic devices.

In closing, might I add that GUS KELLEY to me was the type of person who is best described as a good friend and a good citizen. He will be long remembered by many of us who have served with him in the Congress and have worked with him on many of his fine projects of assistance to our less fortunate people.

Mrs. Ella M. Kelley, his wife, as well as his loyal family, will long be proud of the accomplishments of GUS KELLEY and the many warm friendships which he has held for so many years with loyalty and devotion.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my other colleagues in expressing my grief at the passing of our good friend AUGUSTINE KELLEY. It was a privilege to know him and to serve in the Congress with him. He has rendered a great service to our Nation and has at all times placed the welfare of the country above all other interests. He has set for us a fine example of an American statesman devoted to his country and to his fine family. It has been a privilege to know one of his sons, Jim, and I would like to express to him and to the other members of his fine family, my heartfelt sympathy in the passing of a great American.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that we record the passing of our very good friend and colleague, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY. Of GUS, as we all knew him, it can be said that he was one of Pennsylvania's outstanding Representatives in Congress.

He was a humble man who had a kindness of heart and the highest concept of citizenship. In all his actions he moved with such ease and courtesy that it may be said without exaggeration that wherever he moved he seemed to radiate vitality and friendship. He was always calm and strong and self-confident; never an unwise act or a word spoken in haste or ill-considered. He seemed to have that wider and greater gift, the power of understanding and sympathizing with people whatever their difficulties might have been. Always glad to see one, courteous to everybody, he will be long remembered for his kind deeds. He respected in others the qualities he possessed himself, sincerity of conviction and frankness of expression.

His lines of friendship encircled friends of all elements of our social life. He was a man who contributed much to the civic, social, and spiritual life of the area in which he lived and the district and State which he represented. GUS was a man with goodness of soul and kindness of heart and a man who rejoiced mightily when any act or deed of his added to the enrichment of our lives.

I cannot attempt to grasp or sum up the aggregate of his service in public life in a few words, and it is needless.

His life comprised a term of some years and produced a performance which, I might say, genuinely has been by his toil and stimulated by his love for his State and Nation—a record that won for him the great commendation and respect of all our people.

He was a firm believer in our American way of life. His great faith in the principles and ideals of government was

not the outcome of any vigorous enthusiasm but the deep-rooted growth of many years.

In all things it can be said that he was a great American. His one great ambition in life was to hand on to posterity and the generation of tomorrow a greater and finer America than was handed to him.

Gus will be greatly missed by his colleagues and by the people he was proud and honored to represent. So today we mourn his loss and extend to his family our deepest heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is only on occasions such as this that we fully appreciate the paucity of words in our language to express adequately the sentiments we feel. The passing of one who has come to own a very important place in our hearts always brings sorrow, although we strive to console ourselves with the knowledge that his going was in the divine pattern of the Creator of all mankind.

I experience a peculiar personal loss in the death of GUS KELLEY. We were elected to this great assembly on the same day, November 5, 1940. In those early days of our membership in this body we frequently discussed our problems and exchanged ideas which I hope were mutually advantageous. I know I came to rely a great deal on GUS KELLEY's calm appraisal of situations which in 1940 and 1941 and even later often bordered on the area which might easily produce panic.

Our experiences in committee assignments were to a considerable extent parallel so that we frequently had occasion to discuss measures designed for the betterment of our country's economy, and the safeguarding of the well-being of her citizens.

Congressman KELLEY strove valiantly to accomplish some manner of Federal consideration for the physically handicapped. In this field of health care one saw the true measure of the man. He suffered visibly whenever he talked with those unfortunate Americans who had suffered some impairment of their physical structure. In the field of education he was preeminent. Despite all the vicissitudes which have attended attempts to enlist the interest of the Federal Government in the plight of our schools, GUS KELLEY never lost hope. It is to the everlasting credit of this man that he, almost alone, was able to bring to this floor the most forward-looking piece of Federal-aid-to-education legislation that the Congress has ever seen. That it failed of enactment was a tragedy which hurt Gus a great deal, but for which he was by no stretch of the imagination responsible.

The welfare of all the people of his district and all America was ever foremost in his mind. He was always examining legislative proposals; seeking out those which would produce the greatest good for the greatest number.

In the field of labor legislation GUS KELLEY had no peer. His was not the maudlin attention to so-called labor votes which is frequently charged against men seeking public office. GUS KELLEY believed in the dignity of man; he respected the laboring man; he was determined that the laboring man would get that which is his due in Christian justice. And let it be repeated over and over again—GUS KELLEY practiced what he preached.

All of us shall miss GUS KELLEY. He made a lasting impression on this body. To the lovely Mrs. Augustine B. Kelley I extend my heartfelt sympathy. To his wonderful family, which was always his pride, I express my deep sorrow. I can only hope that they will always strive to emulate his great virtues. From fame's eternal camping ground may he serve as an inspiration, at once to his family and friends, and to us who were fortunate enough to be his colleagues; an inspiration always to respect the finer and the nobler things of life.

May the Lord have mercy on his soul.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely doubt that it is possible to bestow a greater accolade on any Member of Congress than to say, "He practices what he preaches." Such a tribute must be paid to the memory of AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY who departed from our ranks just before the last session of the 85th Congress convened.

In this body we have frequently heard labor subjected to heated and vicious criticisms. By the same token we have heard management lambasted from pillar to post. We have sat in this Chamber day after day and listened to pious protestations of the rights of labor and the rights of management. We have debated and enacted legislation aimed at eliminating so-called abuses, abolishing excuses for attack and counterattack, one against the other. On almost every occasion we, all of us, were definitely and almost irrevocably committed to one side or the other—to labor forever, or to management, may it always prevail.

Yet during all those hours and days and weeks, there sat in the midst of us one truly great representative of both management and labor. He was in truth a laborer. He knew what a hard day's work was. He knew what it means to raise a family—nine wonderful children—all educated to be good Americans. All those things he knew from personal experience. Yet, at the same time he was a businessman who knew what it means to make a set of books balance; knew what it means to meet economic and political crises, changing conditions at home and abroad which affected his business future. He was an employer of men who saw to it that his men were fairly and honorably treated. He was interested in their families—and the well-being of their families—so that his workers would be better producers for his business endeavor.

GUS KELLEY was a miner and a mine operator. He sweated out many a tough period with his people, with the banks, with Government officials who influenced to some extent his mining operations. Yet he was never heard to wimper or ask for special consideration.

GUS KELLEY never had any labor troubles. His laborers liked him and his method of operation. They knew he had their interest at heart.

GUS KELLEY never experienced any mining disaster in his operations because he just would not let one occur. He took whatever steps were necessary to safeguard the lives and health of his men.

GUS KELLEY never had any difficulties with his associates on the management side of the bargaining table. They knew Gus was a man foursquare whose interests were inextricably interwoven with those who worked for him and with him.

GUS KELLEY was a man among men. He was a proud man; he was an honorable man. He was, in truth, an Irish Catholic gentleman. His dear wife and all his children and grandchildren will miss him for a long, long time. But I think they can take great comfort in the knowledge that we, his former colleagues, knew that GUS KELLEY helped to make this weary old world a little better for his having passed through.

Lord, rest his soul.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the moving and heartfelt tributes which have been given to our late colleague, the Honorable AUGUSTINE KELLEY, by his fellow Members and associates are lasting memorials to the affection and respect in which he was so widely held.

To some, who like myself did not have the privilege of knowing him as long as those whose public service has extended further back in years, it is difficult not to seem less eloquent and less full of the depth of our feelings. Nevertheless, the loss of a dear friend cannot be measured merely by the length of the friendship. GUS KELLEY was not only a great personal friend in the usual ways, but his willingness—almost eagerness—to give wise counsel and direction to those who called upon his wisdom and experience was invaluable to me as a young Congressman, and to many of my contemporaries.

As many have said, he was not a man who spoke lightly, but his pronouncements when given were to be relied upon and followed. He had a quiet sense of humor and a degree of unruffled patience which gave great confidence to his leadership. You felt that he would know the answer to the most difficult of problems, and true, he always did.

As a Presiding Officer, he was always eminently fair, whether in agreement or disagreement with those who appeared before him.

He has left a vacancy impossible to fill in exactly the same manner, and he has created a niche in the hearts of all who knew him which will always remain and which will be an inspiration to press forward with the sense of public service which he so sincerely filled.

To all of his family, Mrs. Roosevelt and I wish to extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow and earnest regret that I join my colleagues in noting the passing of an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. The late Honorable AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY and I came to Congress together. Through nine terms I had the pleasure of serving with him. Throughout the years our former colleague distinguished himself as an able, conscientious, and energetic Representative of the people of Pennsylvania. I know that words cannot relieve the great

loss that has been experienced by his loved ones and friends, but I sincerely hope that this sorrow will be lessened with the thought that Gus built here by his work a lasting monument as a true friend of mankind.

GUS KELLEY will be remembered by everyone as a champion for better education and he will be remembered for his constant and vigilant fight for the workingman. Gus left a wonderful family and I extend my sincere regrets to each of them and to the constituents who loved and trusted him so much.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune as a freshman Member of Congress to serve an apprenticeship under our departed colleague, GUS KELLEY. Gus was a wise counselor, and he exercised a fatherly influence over the new members on his committee, who instinctively turned to him for guidance.

GUS KELLEY justifiably took quiet pride in the Kelley school construction bill which would have provided better schools for thousands of our young people. It was quite fitting, I thought, that this excellent piece of legislation should bear his name. Gus played a strong role in laying the groundwork for school aid, and when one day soon the Kelley idea reaches its fulfillment it will be a tribute to his leadership in this vital field.

Gus had the gentle touch. He was a real friend who kindled warmth in his associates.

Truly we might say with the poet: "None knew him but to love him."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on November 23, 1957, I attended the funeral of our late colleague and friend, GUS KELLEY, in Pittsburgh, Pa.

A pontifical requiem high Mass was offered by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Hugh Lamb, Bishop of Greensburg, Pa., at the Blessed Sacrament Cathedral.

The eulogy was delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor Alphonse Mihm, rector of the Cathedral and one of Mr. KELLEY's dearest friends.

With your permission, I would like to offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the entire eulogy, which follows, because to me it was one of the most impressive I have ever heard:

THE LATE GUS KELLEY

Blessed is the man who hath not walked in the counsel of the ungodly. He shall be like a tree which is planted near the running waters which shall bring forth its fruit in due season. And his leaf shall not fall off, and all whatsoever he shall do shall prosper.

A common heritage of man is death; it is the great leveler, because it comes without distinction to rich and poor, famous and unknown, good and bad. None can escape it, no matter who they might be, nor where they are. Death, the separation of the soul from the body, can be a fearsome thing, because after it, comes the judgment which God passes on every human soul. And if a man so lived that he needs to fear the judgment, it is really a fearsome thing. But it need not be. The Imitation of Christ tells us that "happy is the man who thinks often on death, because he will never sin." And we know that St. Paul yearned to be dissolved from this life and to be with Christ. In all deaths there is a degree of sadness because of the parting that it causes, but in the case of a good man this sorrow is tempered.

Among the many images under which the good man is described in Holy Scriptures, perhaps there is none more vivid, more beautiful and more touching than that which represents him as some favored and thriving tree in the garden of God's planting. Scripture puts it: "He shall be like a tree which is planted near the running waters, which shall bring forth its fruit in due season. And his leaf shall not fall off; and all whatever he shall do shall prosper." The good man is the man of faith, living and growing along the waters of faith, with his roots struck deep in that faith. It sustains him, it strengthens him. The soul of the good man, like the tree of God's planting, grows gradually, silently, without observation; and in proportion as it rises aloft, so do its roots, with still less observation, strike deep into the earth. Year after year it grows and bears fruit. Nor is that fruit ever lost: it neither withers upon the branches nor decays upon the ground. Angels unseen gather crop after crop from the unswerved never-failing parents, and carefully store them up in heavenly treasure houses.

The fruit of the life of a good man may be in great deeds, but more than often it is in small things; the orderly dispensing of good to others who come within his influence, morning and evening, day after day, a blossoming and bearing of fruit in the house of God, and then a blessed death in the presence of his brethren.

The man for whom the church prays here today in the august sacrifice of the Mass would not want a great eulogy, because he was a simple good man. His fruit is in the service of his fellow man and of his country, a country which he served with distinction, with honesty and integrity for many years. More than that, his fruit for eternity is in his private life. Just as his roots were firmly set in his Catholic faith, so he made sure that those of his nine children should be so set, and that not only by principle and precept, but by the greatest teacher of all—good example. And one fact remains that we feel is paramount to all others: We always knew when Gus was in town, because he was every day of the time at daily Mass and communion. Quietly and unobtrusively he would be on the side aisle, with his good wife at his side, and then to come up humbly and devoutly to receive his Eucharistic Lord.

He believed in the words of Christ: "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever and the bread that I will give is My flesh for the life of the world." These are the words of God, of Him who is the way and the truth and the life. Here in the Holy Eucharist there is the strength, and he got the strength to lead the kind of a life that God wants lived. And there can be no greater epitaph in any life than to say: "He was a daily communicant."

To his bereaved family and especially to his wife, we offer our deepest sympathy. But we know and they know that in this death there is but a rebirth to a better life, one for which the deceased certainly sent ahead much good fruit for his mansion in eternity. May his soul rest in peace. Amen.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY.

In 1951, it was my happy privilege to become associated with GUS KELLEY as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor. As a ranking member of the committee, for many years, he was the sponsor and champion of legislation to provide opportunities and secure justice for the American workingman, for the handicapped, and for America's schoolchildren.

I believe GUS KELLEY reached the summit of his career of public service when he sponsored, first in 1956, and then again in 1957, a bill to provide more and better classrooms for America's schoolchildren. The Kelley bill did not pass, but it illustrated the magnificent depth and compassion of the spirit of its author.

Our departed friend carved for himself a fine record in this House. It is a record that will live long as a testimony to his love for people, and his understanding and willingness to grapple with the complex problems that beset the fields of education and labor.

The influence of GUS KELLEY for good will live forever.

Mrs. Kelley, his children, and grandchildren, and all his friends share a wonderful heritage.

His quiet devotion to the ideals in which he believed won the admiration of all who knew him. I shall sorely miss him in the days ahead.

What was his creed?
I do not know his creed; I only know
That here below, he walked the common road
And lifted many a load, lightened the task,
Brightened the day for others toiling on a weary way:
This, his only need; I do not know his creed.

What was his creed? I never heard him speak
Of visions rapturous, of Alpine peak
Of doctrine, dogma, new or old:
But this I know, he was forever bold
To stand alone, to face the challenge of each day,
And live the truth, so far as he could see—
The truth that evermore makes free.

His creed? I care not what his creed;
Enough that never yielded he to greed,
But served a brother in his daily need;
Plucked many a thorn and planted many a flower;
Glorified the service of each hour;
Had faith in God, himself, and fellow-man;
Perchance he never thought in terms of creed;
I only know he lived a life, indeed.

—*H. N. Fifer.*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the death of our colleague, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY. I am sure all of us feel a sense of deep personal loss. Mr. KELLEY was, I am proud to say, my friend. He was never too busy to give advice and counsel.

GUS KELLEY exemplified the best traditions of this great legislative body. He was always mindful of his great responsibility to the people he so ably represented, and to the Nation as a whole. He was conscientious, hard-working, and a man of unusual vision and deep spiritual strength. He will be sorely missed, not only by his wonderful family and by those of us who served with him here in the House and were fortunate enough to be his personal friends, but by the millions of physically handicapped people, the wage earners and schoolchildren for whom he fought so diligently and long and so successfully as a Member of this House.

Congressman KELLEY will not be soon forgotten, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper

items concerning our late colleague, Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY:

[From the New York Times of November 21, 1957]

AUGUSTINE KELLEY, OF HOUSE, WAS 74—PENNSYLVANIA DEMOCRAT DIES—AUTHOR OF LEGISLATION FOR UNITED STATES AID TO SCHOOLS

WASHINGTON, November 20.—Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, died today in Suburban Hospital in nearby Bethesda, Md. He was 74 years old.

Mr. KELLEY was recognized as a leading Congressional expert on labor and education legislation. He was second-ranking Democrat on the House Education and Labor Committee and was the author of Federal-aid-to-education bills defeated in the House this year and last.

The legislator underwent surgery in the Bethesda hospital in September. Last week, he was returned there when, according to his office, physicians said he was "rushing his recovery too fast."

Earlier today, his physician, Dr. Charles J. Savarese, said Mr. KELLEY was suffering from uremia. The doctor did not disclose the full diagnosis, but Mrs. Ella Marie Kelley, the Congressman's widow, attributed death to cancer.

Mr. KELLEY'S death leaves the House with three vacancies, all Democrats and all resulting from recent deaths. There are now 231 Democrats and 201 Republicans.

The Congressman represented Westmoreland County, near Pittsburgh, for 16 years. His family had announced at his home in Greensburg last night that because of his illness Mr. KELLEY would not seek reelection for a 10th term in 1958.

Mr. KELLEY'S aid-to-education bill became the subject of a bitter House fight in 1956, when Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat of New York, introduced an amendment to bar Federal funds for segregated schools. The House adopted the amendment over President Eisenhower's objections, and then defeated the bill.

The Kelley measure came to naught again this year when it was caught in a controversy between Democrats who wanted Federal school money allocated to States on a basis of school-age populations, and Republicans who said it should be distributed on the basis of need.

ATTENDED WEST POINT

Mr. KELLEY was born on July 9, 1883, in New Baltimore, Pa., but spent most of his life as a resident of Greensburg. He graduated from Greensburg High School and attended the United States Military Academy for 2 years. He left the Academy because of poor health and took correspondence courses in mining engineering and business administration.

Entering the mining business as a clerk, Mr. KELLEY advanced to superintendent of mines, and later acquired the Mammoth Coal & Coke Co., which he owned at his death. His first interests in schools as a public official came as a member of the Greensburg Board of Education in 1935–36.

Mr. KELLEY won his first election to Congress in 1940. In addition to his activities in behalf of school legislation, he served as a United States delegate to four conferences of the International Labor Organization—in Montreal in 1946 and in Geneva in 1947, 1950, and 1951.

In addition to his widow, Mr. KELLEY leaves nine children, all of Greensburg. Two sons, Regis and J. Hillary Kelley, were said by the family last night to be considering running for their father's seat.

[From the West Virginian, Fairmont, W. Va., November 21, 1957]

REPRESENTATIVE AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY TO BE BURIED IN ARLINGTON

GREENSBURG, PA.—The body of Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, severe Eisenhower administration foe and for 17 years a Pennsylvania Congressman, arrived home today from Washington.

KELLEY, a coal mine operator and leader in the fight for Federal school aid legislation, died of cancer Wednesday in Suburban Hospital at Bethesda, Md. He was 74.

KELLEY, a rugged Democrat who never shirked a fight, was the author of 2 school-construction bills defeated by the House during the past 2 years, the latest measure only by a margin of 2.

He was a leader of the progressive northern wing of House Democrats.

As second ranking Democrat on the House Education and Labor Committee, he was regarded as one of the top House experts in the field of education. He also served on the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee.

WILL LIE IN STATE

KELLEY'S body will lie in state today and Friday at the Cramer Funeral Home in Greensburg. A solemn requiem mass will be sung Saturday morning at Blessed Sacrament Catholic Cathedral here. The Congressman will be buried Monday in Arlington National Cemetery in Washington.

KELLEY was first elected to Congress from the 21st Pennsylvania District in November 1940, and was reelected to successive terms.

He was a delegate to the International Labor Organization Conference at Montreal in 1946, and at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1947, 1950, and 1951. He was the Congressional adviser to the ILO conference at Geneva last year.

He was a member of the scale committee of the Coal Operators Association of Western Pennsylvania from 1935 to 1939.

KELLEY was operator of the Mammoth Coal & Coke Co., Greensburg, Pa., and was listed as a coal-mine operator in the Congressional Directory.

ENTERED HOSPITAL NOVEMBER 12

KELLEY, father of nine children, entered the hospital November 12 because his physician felt he had been too active while convalescing from a major operation in September.

He subsequently developed a serious kidney ailment. Before his death, he received the last rites of the Catholic Church. His office subsequently said the direct cause of KELLEY'S death was cancer.

KELLEY was born in New Baltimore, Pa., July 9, 1883. He attended elementary and high schools in Greensburg and attended the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y.

KELLEY'S death left the House with three vacancies, all Democrats and all resulting from recent deaths. The lineup now stands at 231 Democrats and 201 Republicans. One of the Republicans, Representative W. Sterling Cole, of New York, is stepping out December 1 to become Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

MUST ACT IN 10 DAYS

The Pennsylvania Elections Bureau said that under State law, Gov. George M. Leader must issue a writ for a special election for a successor to KELLEY within 10 days from date of death. His successor will serve until January 3, 1959.

Leader could set the election at any time but probably will set it for the primary, May 20, 1958, to save local election costs. KELLEY'S successor would serve until January 3, 1959, when all Congress terms expire.

KELLEY married Ella Marie Bates, of Scottdale, Pa., in 1913. They had six sons and three daughters. The sons are A. Regis, Bethesda, Md.; Dr. J. Hilary, Greensburg, Pa.; Richard B., Washington; Robert V., Bluefield, W. Va.; James R., Arlington, Va., and Capt. Paul A., Fort Sheridan, Ill.

The daughters are Mrs. Robert M. Schellenberg, Mrs. Henry B. Brown, Jr., and Mrs. H. R. Leisy, all of Bethesda, Md.

---

[From the Shreveport Times of November 21, 1957]

REPRESENTATIVE KELLEY DIES AT 74 FROM CANCER

WASHINGTON, November 20.—Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, died at Suburban Hospital, Bethesda, Md., today, of cancer. He was 74.

His office said the Congressman died at noon, eastern standard time. Arrangements are being made for burial at Arlington National Cemetery.

KELLEY underwent an operation in September for prostate difficulties. He returned to the hospital last weekend and was thought to be suffering from a kidney ailment. Doctors said he had been rushing his recovery too fast. His office pointed out that he had been conducting subcommittee hearings on minimum wages throughout the Nation during the Congressional recess.

The Pennsylvania Democrat was serving his 9th term in the House, representing Pennsylvania's 21st Congressional District. He first was elected to Congress in 1940.

KELLEY was an owner of a coal and coke company for many years before running for Congress and was active in western Pennsylvania coal operators' affairs.

A cadet of the United States Military Academy at West Point, he took an interest in Army athletics and West Point activities.

A liberal Democrat, KELLEY sponsored and led the unsuccessful fight last year for legislation to start a program of Federal aid for school construction. He also was active in international labor organization affairs.

Born July 9, 1883, in New Baltimore, Pa., he moved to Greensburg where he attended grade and high schools and where he has lived ever since.

KELLEY is survived by his widow and nine children.

---

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of November 21, 1957]

REPRESENTATIVE A. B. KELLEY IS DEAD AT 74

WASHINGTON, November 20.—Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a leader in the fight for Federal school-aid legislation and a veteran of 16 years in the House, died today at Suburban Hospital. He was 74. His widow attributed death to cancer.

Representative KELLEY entered the hospital in nearby Bethesda, Md., on November 12 because his physician felt he had been too active while convalescing from a major operation in September. He subsequently developed a serious kidney ailment. Before his death, he received the last rites of the Catholic Church.

AUTHOR OF TWO SCHOOL BILLS

Representative KELLEY, the father of nine children, was the author of two school-construction bills defeated by the House during the last 2 years, the latest measure only by a margin of five votes.

As second-ranking Democrat on the House Education and Labor Committee, he was regarded as one of the top House experts on the field of education. He also served on the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee.

A resident of Greensburg, Pa., he had represented Westmoreland County near Pittsburgh since 1941. While in the House, he served as a delegate or adviser at five international labor conferences.

ATTENDED WEST POINT

Owner of the Mammoth, Pa., Coal & Coke Co., before coming to Congress, he was active

in the coal-mining industry of his native State.

He was born in New Baltimore, Pa., on July 9, 1883, but spent most of his life in Greensburg. As a young man, he attended West Point for 2 years, but was forced to withdraw because of a heart ailment.

A stocky, broad-shouldered man who appeared far younger than his 74 years, Representative KELLEY was regarded by his colleagues as a hard-working legislator whose soft voice and quick sense of humor calmed many a heated exchange at committee meetings.

He married Ella Marie Bates, of Scottdale, Pa., in 1913. They had six sons and three daughters.

---

## RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 424

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, a representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## WILL ONE-MAN CONTROL SOLVE THE MILITARY PROBLEM?

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the roots of the armed services—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps—are deep in American tradition and understanding, but they are not so deep but that they could be uprooted by a powerful misguided military monarch.

Today as we analyze our military leaders as individuals, we see that their service tradition, their teachings, their training and their composite experiences are all blended into their professional knowledge and judgment. Rarely does any leader mature beyond favoritism to his own background. This includes our military as well as our political leaders.

For example, few soldiers in world history have understood the role of the sea and sailors. Few sailors have fully comprehended the potential of underseas warfare. For centuries, the mine and the submarine were viewed by naval leaders as a threat to surface control. Why should a world naval power busy itself in contriving a weapon which, if successful, would deprive it of the very objective which it wished to attain—surface supremacy.

In the past few years, new organization of the Defense Department has been offered up as a panacea for any and every ill that has beset it. It is the supposed answer to better weapons systems, more knowledge of technical matters, and so forth. Reorganization is merely to reshuffle the cards and make the ace of spades supreme over all. Reorganization is no antidote to man's inborn inclination to support and promote that which he knows best. I personally wish this were not so. I wish I could support reorganization and greater unification as a solution to our military problems. The defense organization we have today is basically unsound. We do not need greater unification. The fact is we may be a little topheavy with civilian supervision of strictly technical military matters today. We do not need another layer of authority on top, either civilian or military, nor do we need one-man control to shackle creative thought and ideas.

There is a crying need for our military leaders to be given more freedom to deal with the realistic threat which confronts our Nation. This seems to be a time when recrimination and viewing with alarm is the order of the day. This gets us nowhere. After the first person views with alarm, the second person must view with greater alarm. It tends after awhile to insulate the mind from the problem.

If we are honest with ourselves, we know our limitations as individuals. We know the more power we concentrate in one man the greater the chance of error.

Would one-man military control have guaranteed that the United States send the first satellite aloft? I think not. On the other hand, we may have sent the first satellite into space and lost the ability to counter our myriad forms of threat to our security. Let us resolve in the new year to concentrate on the military problem. That problem, simply stated, is the development of superior weapons systems and people—soldiers, sailors, airmen, and missile men—that will be capable of meeting all threats, regardless of time, location, and circumstance.

Today, much of our military brainpower is tied up in either trying to gain power or to retain a certain measure of independence of thought. I, personally, am becoming suspect of people who perpetually promote reorganization at the expense of technical achievement. We have reorganized enough. It is time our military people were given the opportunity to concentrate on the military problem.

---

## KEEP AMERICA STRONG AT HOME

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a series of bills affecting the present social security system of our country. It is this system, which, in large part, has made us the most powerful free nation. If we are to stay free of communism this is a lead we cannot afford to lose. In the dramatic effort to strengthen our national defenses in a missile age, let us not forget we must have something worth defending. Keep America strong at home is my theme.

BACKGROUND AND COST OF LIVING

At its inception, the Social Security Act was seen to be a program designed for the relief of the destitute, and of those whose incomes fell below subsistence levels. Its first aim was to meet the emergency situation created by the depression in which older workers were totally unable to secure employment. More than that, however, Congress realized that the economic crisis of that time represented an ever-present threat to the working force of the future, when a deflationary period could repeat the ills of the thirties. It was clear then, as it is now, that this kind of emergency demands effective machinery for public assistance to protect those who for reason of age or circumstance are unemployable. Further than that, however, the desperate straits of those times gave birth to a philosophy of social welfare, embodied in the old-age and survivors insurance program. That philosophy was spelled out in the report of the President's Committee on Economic Security in 1937, 2 years after the Social Security Act became law:

> The effect of destitution and dependency is enormously expensive not only in the cost of actual assistance rendered by governments, private charity, and the generosity of relatives and friends but also in the psychological results of the loss of self-respect and the constant fear of insecurity. Therefore, recognizing both the tangible and the intangible values of an earned retirement income, the principal countries of Europe have provided that worker, employer, and state shall contribute toward a fund for old-age annuities. In one sense this merely represents the diversion of funds from channels of charitable assistance or public relief to channels of insurance against the hazards of dependency. This step would be justified from the standpoint of sound economic policy even if the net cost of the program were far in excess of the future relief which it replaces, for the quality of self-respect and the relative freedom from fear of old age engendered by old-age insurance have a dollar-and-cents value to worker, employer, and government alike. In view of the fact that the health, morale, and standard of living of the wage earner have definitely improved under social insurance wherever it has been in force, it is easy to understand the great development of social insurance institutions in the civilized world today.

In the intervening years, five major amendments to the Social Security Act have been evidence of the effort to keep pace with changing economic and social factors. They have indicated an ever-increasing appreciation of government responsibility for the well-being of those citizens who have earned the right through their work productivity to freedom from the fear of destitution or dependency in their later years.

Unfortunately however, these amendments, worthy in the main though they have been, have failed to anticipate the needs and the rights of the beneficiaries of the OASI program and have actually reflected no more than partial remedy for situations of need that far preexisted each amendment. Moreover, our concepts of social welfare have undergone progressive changes during the last 20 years. No longer do we feel that it is enough to preserve our elder citizens

from the inhumanities of the almshouse, of public charity or from dependence on the generosity of their children. A greater awareness of the inherent dignity and deserved self-respect of these members of the community exists today than ever before. New practices in science and medicine as well as a better understanding of the problems of the aging have brought new concepts of the potential for productivity and usefulness that exists in this group of citizens.

It is indeed encouraging to find in the House now an appreciation of the necessity for radical reappraisal of the social-security program. Congressman FORAND has gone far toward enunciating a forthright approach to the problems of the aged, and his comprehensive bill to raise benefits and add hospitalization insurance merits the wholehearted support that I for one, am happy to give it. The day is long overdue for us to act in behalf of the ever-increasing numbers of the aged, not in a manner after the fact of their need, but with legislation that will not only rectify the inadequacies of the act, but also prevent future inadequacies from occurring.

The inevitable solution to the constantly growing problem of a cost of living that has completely outstripped the dollar value of benefits is to return to the original attitude of the act, again from the report of the Committee on Economic Security, which said, "insurance benefits can be ample for a comfortable existence, bearing some relation to wage standards."

A continued rigid system of benefits will only make necessary further periodic Congressional agonizing over the need to raise benefits, always coming, as has been true in the past, years after the need for increases has been painfully felt by beneficiaries. By relating benefits to the cost of living, as I have done in two of my bills, the gap between the need and the action to correct the need will be automatically closed.

These bills will effect benefits by providing a relationship between the Consumer Price Index and the amount of benefits. Specifically, benefits would be increased 3 percent for every increase of three points in the index. The new figure would then be in force during the period in which any part of the three point advance was maintained, and only subject to readjustment at such time as the index dropped three full points. This would achieve the desired effect of maintaining the dollar value of benefits, but would not impose unrealistic administrative demands upon the Social Security Administration.

A second bill will raise the wage base significantly, thereby making available to the resources of the program a tax on higher incomes than is now possible. Again, a cost of living figure would apply, in that the wage base would be adjusted in the same manner as would benefits, by $500 whenever the Consumer Price Index fluctuated a full 5 points.

LIMIT ON EARNING POWER

Fully as important as the question of adequate benefits is that of the grave situation created by the earning limit that is now imposed upon beneficiaries of social security.

This provision as it stands today acts as a depressant to incentive by its restrictive nature. Worse than this, however, is the two-pronged oppressive effect that the earning limit exerts on social-security beneficiaries. First, by making virtually impossible the opportunity for supplementing benefits which have failed woefully to keep pace with increased living costs, and second, in forcing submarginal living conditions on countless older citizens who have the desire and the ability to supplement their income from social security, thereby undermining their morale, their sense of personal worth, and their self-respect in the community in which they live. There is not one Member, I am sure, who has not received innumerable letters that tell this story:

We want to be treated as any citizen should * * * we ask to be allowed to work if we are able to and if we want to. None of us could do hard labor or keep a job for long, and we ask that our check not be reduced, because we cannot hold a job for long.

Can you see your way to help us regain our citizenship and our respect for ourselves in public.

I'll fight to the last breath of life for the right to earn enough to live on. I know it is my right and privilege to do so, and in a free country as ours is supposed to be no one has the right to take that privilege away from me.

What are oldsters to do? You see, we get just as hungry, and need clothing the same as you.

It was far from the intent of the framers of the Social Security Act to impart to recipients of the program the sense of loss of dignity that is so amply illustrated by these excerpts. We are dealing not with a system of grants to the needy, but with a program of insurance, in which the Government guarantees eventual benefits to those who have contributed to the program. As a wholly contributory system, it can only be considered truly an insurance program, in which a needs test of the severity of the current earning limit is wholly out of place. While some limit might justifiably be imposed on individuals who are able to earn a significant wage after retirement in order to provide a decent standard of living for those who are less able to provide for themselves, the earning limit of $1,200 now in force is not only unrealistic, it is inhumane. My bill, will raise the limit to $5,000, will provide incentive toward employment, and will restore to those individuals who are capable and desirous of continued productivity, their rightful sense of usefulness and self-respect.

REALISTIC DISABILITY

The question of the operation of the disability insurance program is given a careful examination in a single bill that will effect what I believe to be vitally needed reforms.

In the brief time that the amendment has been in force, a need for revision and adjustment has been amply demonstrated. The requirement for eligibility is so rigid, that few who have a well justified need for disability insurance are able to qualify. Not only is the definition of eligibility unnecessarily stringent, it continues to be interpreted in a sense that is narrow to the point of being unjust and without true relation to the intent of Congress. Although some relaxation of strict interpretation has taken place, the definition itself prevents many whom I believe to have a right to disability insurance from receiving it.

In my bill two provisions would remedy this ill. First, the following new definition of disability would replace the one now operating:

The term disability means inability of any individual, by reason of medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to be permanent or of long continued and indefinite duration, to engage in substantial gainful activity which is the same or similar to the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such impairment.

Second, a section would be added providing that an individual shall be conclusively presumed to have furnished such proof of disability if he furnished to the Secretary a formal declaration of his permanent and total disability, made by any Federal or State agency, which is still in effect and on the basis of which such agency is paying or has paid such individual monetary benefits for permanent and total disability.

Without opening disability insurance to those who are not truly in need of it, these definitions would assure coverage to any who are disabled to the extent of being unable to pursue a course of employment that is reasonably within the area of suitability. Far too often, a worker who is totally disabled for the purposes of his job is forced into frequently menial employment foreign to his talent, training, or experience because he has retained some small capability that automatically eliminates him from consideration for insurance payments. Justice, if not enlightened employment practice, demands that this situation be relieved.

Additionally, I believe that those workers over 50 years should be eligible for disability insurance if they are either fully or currently insured. This provision in my bill would justify any small additional cost by insuring workers against the threat of years of privation should they become disabled.

WIDOWS, MOTHERS, AND RETIRED WOMEN

With respect to benefits for women, several revisions in the Social Security Act are necessary. It is my strong feeling that the actuarial reduction in benefits to women who are insured at the age of 62 is without justification. The same reasoning which inspired a lower age of eligibility for women seems to me to negate the system of paying reduced benefits to those women who elect them at 62. Once the decision has been made to accept reduced benefits between the ages of 62 and 65, that decision cannot be rescinded, and the benefit rate must hold throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary. Benefits ought, as they are, to be made available to women at 62, but they should be full and not reduced benefits.

An additional problem exists in the case of a mother who has been receiving survivors insurance benefits so that she might support her growing children.

Now her benefits are cut off when her youngest child becomes 18. Frequently this occurs when the mother, because of her age, is virtually unemployable. She must, however, somehow manage to exist until such time as she becomes eligible for survivors insurance benefits in her own right. It is just such a circumstance as this which forces women to accept benefits at 62, even though those benefits are less than they would be if it were possible for her to wait until she became 65 to apply for them. I would amend the act to provide that women who are 50 years of age or older when their youngest child becomes 18 would have benefits continued.

A similar difficulty is presented by the plight of the widow whose husband had been receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits for himself and his wife, and who, when her husband dies, must suddenly adjust to an income that is cut in half. Such a reduction comes at a time in the life of older people when adjustment is not easy. It is not too much to provide that widows of insured workers live out their lives among the surroundings that are familiar to them; to protect them from the necessity for severe adjustment of their living standard or circumstance, by providing the same benefit to them for those few years that had been payable to the husband during his lifetime.

Further, a bonus-incentive factor would be added to the act with respect to those individuals who continue to work after retirement age. At the time when they apply for a computation of their primary insurance amount, a 1-percent increment would be added to the benefit figure for each year after retirement that they worked. This would act as an incentive to continued productivity for those workers who are able to carry on employment, and would also provide an automatic increase in benefits for those whose wages during the period after retirement were too low to increase their benefits through the operation of the benefit formula.

Finally, coverage would be extended to physicians to complete the coverage of professional groups.

With these changes, our social-security system will regain its strength and vitality. There are other approaches now in use in other countries such as Scandinavia which deserve further study. But, in the meantime, if these changes are substantially adopted, the words "freedom from fear and want" will again be given great meaning in the American scene.

## TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL TAXPAYERS, INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 7, I introduced H. R. 9683, proposing tax relief for millions of small taxpayers of the Nation, individual and corporate.

I recognize that world conditions will, in all probability, require increased spending for our defense and that this spending must be paid for by increased revenues. However, my proposals, if enacted in entirety, will not result in any loss of money to the Treasury, for while giving tax relief where it is most sorely needed, that is, to the small taxpayer, my bill would, by reducing or restricting several of the loopholes and special privileges now in the tax laws, bring in additional billions of dollars.

The first provision of my bill would increase personal exemptions from $600 to $700. Although this may result in a tax saving, the loss to the Treasury would be offset by several other factors, mostly by enactment of my other proposals. It would further be offset through increased spending by the taxpayers who would be putting the money back into circulation, thereby stimulating business and increasing profits. As a side issue, the stimulation of business would provide more jobs and help alleviate the current grave unemployment situation.

If, however, Congress decides not to enact the other provisions of my bill and the loss from the increased personal exemption would be too great, I suggest that the increase be deferred until such time as conditions are more favorable.

Secondly, the bill would repeal the rapid depreciation allowance granted companies by the 1954 amendments to the Internal Revenue Code. The increased income from enactment of this section would more than offset the loss resulting from the increased personal exemptions.

At the present time a group of American corporations operating in Central and South America are granted a 14 percentage point differential in payment of taxes. Thus, while corporations in general pay a 52-percent rate, the Western Hemisphere trade corporations pay only 38 percent. I propose to repeal the special concession to those corporations. It is estimated that repeal of the exemption would add approximately $150 million to our internal-revenue income.

Today when one corporation receives dividends from another, 85 percent of those dividends are tax exempt. Thus, corporations report only 15 percent of their dividend receipts. I propose to eliminate the 85-percent exemption of intercorporate dividends and to make such dividends taxable in full. Excepted from this provision would be certain public utilities.

Under present law an individual receiving dividends from corporations has an exemption on the first $50 of dividends and may also reduce his tax by 4 percent of the dividends in excess of $50. I would let the $50 exemption stand but propose to remove the 4-percent credit. Such amendment would bring in an increased revenue of about $400 million.

Oil and gas companies in our country are allowed a tax credit of 27½ percent for depletion allowances. I propose to reduce that percentage to 15 percent, bringing in additional revenues of over $500 million.

Finally, I propose to reduce the rate of income tax on small corporations and to raise the rate on large companies. This would be done by establishing a normal rate of only 22 percent, instead of 30 percent as at present, and then installing a graduated schedule of surtax rates ranging from 10 to 53 percent instead of a flat 22 percent as at present. Healthy and vigorous small businesses are needed in our country if we are to preserve a healthy and competitive structure in our economy. Capital markets are virtually closed to small businesses which can neither borrow money nor sell stock. Their only recourse is to reinvest profits already made. They cannot do that if Uncle Sam takes such a large share of the profits. Further, the rate structure for corporations should more closely resemble the progression currently present in the individual income tax.

Because of world conditions we will all be called upon to make sacrifices to preserve and protect our American way of life. In all fairness the special interests and big business should join in the sacrifice for our national security and give up the tax loopholes by which they escape their just share of taxation. If companies such as the Superior Oil Company of California which is reported to have paid no income tax at all in 1953 and 1954 because of depletion allowances and exemptions, though it showed net incomes in excess of $10 million and $12.5 million, would join the rest of us in helping to pay for our national defense, we would have sufficient funds to insure a strong national defense without undue burden on any one special group of taxpayers. Those companies have just as much at stake as the individual taxpayer. They should at this time be willing to pay their fair share for our security.

## PROPOSALS TO INCREASE THE SALARIES OF POSTAL AND CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 7, I introduced H. R. 9684 to increase the salaries of the classified workers in the Federal Government. I have also in the final stages of preparation a bill to increase the salaries of postal employees but because of certain necessary last minute changes this bill is not ready for introduction today.

Need for this legislation is as great if not greater than when it was as originally proposed last year. The cost of living has continued to spiral upward and these Federal workers are still finding it difficult to maintain a decent standard of living on their current salaries which have not kept pace with prevailing local wage scales. As a result the Federal Government is still losing trained and competent personnel to private industry, a situation which is exceedingly grave in the light of world conditions. Our Federal employees are not second-rate citizens, they deserve to be paid fair salaries that are in keeping with those in private industry. Additionally in view of the current economic recession the increased salaries will put more money into circulation, thereby stimulating

business. As business picks up, more jobs will become available and the unemployment situation will be somewhat alleviated. I shall exert every effort to see that favorable action is taken on these proposals early in the session.

Under my bill for the classified employees, the salaries will be increased by 11 percent, retroactive to September 1, 1957, plus $50 for each point the Consumer Price Index has risen since September 1, 1957, and date of enactment of my bill. The postal bill will include the same cost of living compensation, in addition to the increases I shall propose for the various grades.

That attached article emphasizes the importance of a proper salary increase for our Federal employees:

[From the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of December 29, 1957]

TEEN-AGE POLL: TEENERS COOL TO UNCLE SAM'S PAY SCALES, JOB RESTRICTIONS

(By Eugene Gilbert)

The Nation's largest employer soon may have trouble finding recruits to fill its jobs.

"Who wants to work for the Government?" asks 16-year-old Betty Tutten of Fort Lauderdale, Fla. "There's no future in it."

An overwhelming majority of the teen-agers in the country seem to agree with her. Less than 4 percent of the young people we contacted in a nationwide survey said they would like to work for the Government. Some 45 percent said they had never given it the slightest thought, and the rest wanted no part of it.

Why? What's wrong with working for the Federal, State, or city government?

Time was when almost everybody was looking for a civil service position.

When the great waves of immigration were sweeping over this country in the late 19th century and still later in the mass unemployment of the great depression in the thirties, Government jobs were avidly sought and highly prized.

ONCE A PRIVILEGE

Young people setting out in life thronged by thousands to civil-service examinations. Sometimes riots resulted. To be a policeman, a letter carrier, or a grade 1 clerk, in those days, was to be a person of no little stature in the neighborhood. "He works for the government," people would say approvingly, even enviously.

In an era of chronic unemployment, lingering breadlines and sweatshop labor conditions, government employees could look forward to steady weekly paychecks—often quite handsome under the circumstances—paid vacations, an 8-hour day, extensive retirement benefits, and humane working conditions.

Most of all, the government offered job security.

The government still offers job security; and, as our recent surveys have demonstrated, young people are still vitally interested in security.

But a majority of young people are not interested in government jobs.

WHY THE CHANGE?

What has brought about this change in attitude toward working for the government? The problem gripped us, as it no doubt already grips civil-service policy planners. In attempting to find out why the Nation's teen-agers shy away from government work, we got an inkling of what they are looking for in the whole field of employment, private and public.

First, we asked what they liked about government jobs, what was the greatest attraction?

Security, that elusive treasure hunted so desperately for generations by the great army of the unemployed, still shone as brightly as ever. It ranked in first place among the advantages of working for the government with nearly 40 percent of both boys and girls interviewed.

Next came prestige and self-satisfaction, as sanctioned by 26 percent of the boys and 16 percent of the girls.

Fair and equal opportunities for advancement appealed to 16 percent of the boys and 11 percent of the girls. Pension benefits were cited by less than 5 percent of the young people, and good wages drew a response of only 1 percent.

Even more revealing were the teen-aged broadsides leveled against working for the Government.

What are the drawbacks? we asked.

LOW WAGES THE RUB

They had no hesitancy telling us.

"Low wages," "not much chance for advancement," "no outlet for drive or different ideas," "little recognition for so much aggravation"—these are only a sample of the comments, but they echo the majority.

More than 54 percent of the boys and 45 percent of the girls listed low wages as the major drawback of government employment.

The government pay scale, once a heavy inducement, holds little attraction for today's high school students, who soon will be heading out to hunt for jobs.

Young people also seemed troubled by government security requirements and Hatch Act provisions against political activity in civil-service jobs.

To 29 percent of the boys and 31 percent of the girls, working for the government meant surrendering to certain restrictions on self-expression.

Less than 4 percent thought the government's education and experience requirements were too high and less than 2 percent worried about advancement opportunities.

NO PUBLICITY

But a surprising number of youngsters—23 percent of the boys and 27 percent of the girls—said one reason they never gave a thought to working for the government is that they seldom heard about government job opportunities.

"We just don't hear much about it," said 15-year-old Allan Herbert, of Gary, Ind.

With the exception of security, the tangibles and intangibles that once attracted people to work for the government are now regarded by teen-agers as drawbacks. They no longer regard a Federal, State, or city worker as well paid, self-satisfied, and a person of prestige in the community.

---

## THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1920

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to correct an inequity created by the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. I do not believe this inequity was contemplated in that act, but has had such a result in these times of expanding industry.

The Bowater Southern Paper Corp. is a domestic corporation. However, this company is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Bowater Corporation of North America, Ltd., a Canadian corporation which is wholly owned by the Bowater Paper Corp., Ltd., a British corporation.

The purpose of this bill is to allow this new industry which has come into the South, and which is giving employment, increasing the value of the land, helping industry, and promoting prosperity, a chance to use the water facilities of this country on a competitive basis with other organizations.

I do not think the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 contemplated this inequity, but unless this legislation is effected Canadian paper mills will have a distinct transportation advantage over these mills in Tennessee, South Carolina, and other places in the United States. You will notice that this legislation limits the transportation between points in the United States, and further limits the proposal to those corporations where 90 percent of the employees are citizens and residents of the United States, and a majority of the officers are citizens and residents of this country.

I offer this bill to encourage industry.

We are glad to have new industry in our part of the country and we want to do everything we can to encourage industrial development.

We have the desire, as new industry is welcomed with open arms. We have the climate, the water, the productive land, and, finest of all, a people able, ready, and willing to work and produce.

We seek this legislation to promote and help industry in this Nation.

---

## STABILIZATION OF THE MARKET SUPPLY AND PRICE OF FARM-PRODUCED FEED GRAINS AND LIVESTOCK

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to stabilize the market supply and price of farm-produced feed grains and livestock to insure the continuous ample volume of meat products for consumers and to provide equitable opportunity for farm producers to achieve income parity, to provide means of meeting natural farm production disasters, and for other purposes.

Feed grains and livestock are an important source of the Nation's total supply of food for domestic use and export. They are marketed on nationwide markets, and substantial quantities thereof, in both raw and processed form, move in interstate and foreign commerce. There are recurring shortages and surpluses in feed grains and livestock products which impair the income and financial stability of farm producers; sometimes create unnecessarily high prices to consumers for essential foods; cause disorderly marketing, economic strife, and congestion in storage, transportation, processing, and other handling facilities and thereby adversely affect farm credit, disorganize and disrupt the farm economy and the general economy of the United States,

impinge on the general welfare, impair the national security, and burden interstate and foreign commerce. The production and marketing of feed grains and livestock and their products is affected with a public interest, directly affects the welfare and security of the Nation, and is attended with substantial and far-reaching consequences to interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in agriculture is so serious that it is obvious that the Congress must take some action not only for corn, but for other commodities and products.

Since last spring, a number of the commodity producer groups have been meeting to seek to work out an acceptable overall program. I am informed that recommendations will soon be submitted for an overall feed grain program which will include corn and other feed grains. This is a desirable approach.

The bill which I am introducing is not a full and final answer. I have introduced it in the hope that some of the proposals included in it will be considered by the Agriculture Committee, and in the hope that this committee will be moved to take early action in effecting a basic revision and improvement of the agricultural program.

On the Senate side, my colleague Senator HUMPHREY is working on a total feed grain program with representatives of the commodity groups. He intends to sponsor comprehensive legislation in the Senate.

My colleague, Representative LESTER JOHNSON of Wisconsin, has introduced legislation which would postpone the drastic reduction in dairy price supports recently announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. I urge the committee to take early action on this proposal and on other limited proposals which can be quickly considered by the Congress in order to restrict the discretionary power now residing in the Secretary of Agriculture, and then to proceed to a thorough examination and revision of the basic farm legislation.

## SOIL BANK ACREAGE RESERVE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last summer Congress, disturbed by payments by Secretary Benson under the soil-bank acreage reserve of hundreds of thousands of dollars to individual producers, put a limit of $3,000 that could be paid "to any one producer." Our purpose was to restrict acreage-reserve benefits to the family-sized farmer, the man who needs the help. Yesterday Secretary Benson announced that he will drop the acreage reserve entirely this year. His stated reason for dropping the whole acreage-reserve program is this $3,000 limitation. Big-business farm corporations are apparently not interested in the $3,000-a-producer chickenfeed that Congress has provided. In other words, Secretary Benson is saying that if Congress will not let him ladle out taxpayers' dollars to the large corporation farms, he will not have any acreage reserve at all. He is saying to Congress, "If you won't help my big-business farmer, I won't help your family-sized farmer." This is a sorry answer to the crying needs of America's family farmer.

## THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, with the convening of Congress, I introduced two bills. The first would prohibit the President from calling the National Guard into the Federal service, except in time of war, threat of invasion, or when requested by the State governor or State legislature. The second would prohibit the use of Federal troops to enforce Federal court orders and State laws.

This legislation comes as a result of the disgraceful action of this administration in calling out the National Guard of Arkansas and in ordering 1,200 battle-ready paratroopers of the 101st Airborne Division into Little Rock, Ark., to force the integration of 9 Negro children at Central High School in that city.

Unless a repetition of that action is prevented, we have witnessed the beginning of the end of our cherished form of government. Unless similar action on the part of those in authority in the executive branch can be eliminated, once and for all in the future, the rights of the several States to be sovereign, as guaranteed by the Constitution, will be no more. The result will certainly be that we will have come to a federalized form of government.

This Nation has been treated to the unpleasant spectacle of Federal authority interfering in State affairs to the extent of calling into Federal service 9,800 members of the Arkansas Army National Guard, including all units and members of the Air National Guard.

Shortly after my return to Washington, I called upon the Department of the Army to furnish me with copies of all orders emanating from the national level to the National Guard of the State of Arkansas and to Federal military units. Believe me when I say it is a sad commentary to read. We find on September 24 the President issued Executive Order No. 10730 authorizing the Secretary of Defense to mobilize the National Guard of Arkansas and to use such of the Armed Forces as he deemed necessary; and on the same day a military commander was appointed to enforce Federal authority in the Little Rock area. Logistic and administrative support was assigned to the Fourth Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; and it is also interesting to note that information copies of these messages were sent to the commanding general, United States Continental Army Command, Fort Monroe, Va.; commanding general, Fourth Army, Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; commanding general, Third Army, Fort McPherson, Ga.; commanding general, 18th Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, N. C., as well as to the Federal unit designated to be utilized at Little Rock, 101st Airborne Division, Fort Campbell, Ky. It, therefore, becomes apparent that more than one Federal military unit was being alerted.

On the same day, under the authority of the Executive order, the Secretary of Defense directed the call of the Arkansas National Guard into the Federal service, and the Governor of Arkansas was so notified by the Secretary of the Army. The reason given the Governor in this message was "to enforce the laws of the Union and to enforce any orders of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, for the removal of obstacles of justice in the State of Arkansas with respect to matters relating to enrollment and attendance at public schools in the Little Rock School District."

On September 30, 1957, the commanding general of "occupied Arkansas" was advised by his superiors that he was authorized to utilize National Guard units to take over the "full security mission in the Central High School area during the daylight hours." However—and, Mr. Speaker, this is important—the order further said "you will hold at all times one Regular Army rifle company in the high-school gymnasium as a task-force reserve. This force should have available appropriate weapons."

So in only a little more than 100 hours after the great crisis arose it was so well in hand that the assignment to keep the peace could be entrusted to local National Guard forces.

But, mark you, no chances were being taken—one Regular Army rifle company was to be quartered in the gymnasium armed with appropriate weapons.

Mr. Speaker, before coming to Congress I spent 16 years as an administrator in the public-school system in Mississippi, 9 years of these as an active teacher. As a former educator, I find the action of the Federal Government in this instance to be incredulous. I have always believed that teachers were able to discipline their own students and if they were unable to do so, they should be replaced. The thought of stationing Regular Army troops, fully armed and equipped, inside a school building is abhorrent to my sense of dignity as a man and a teacher.

But ordering battle-tested paratroopers to Little Rock did not satisfy the Army Chief of Staff, General Maxwell Taylor. On September 25, he sent the following message to the Commanding General, Continental Army Command:

1. As a precautionary measure in event troops are required in situations similar to that now current in Little Rock, Ark., CSUSA (Chief of Staff, United States Army) desires that you organize TFs (task forces) of 1,000-1,200 strength in 82d AB, 3d Inf, 1st Inf and 1st Armd Divs. In addition you should determine availability of MP (military police) units for this type duty.

2. Above units should initiate promptly suitable training programs under FM 19–15 and prepare plans for both air and motor movement.

3. This confirms our telephone conversation this date on same subject.

On September 26, this order was canceled.

Now note that carefully, the Chief of Staff ordered to be organized 1,000- to 1,200-man task forces in 4 Regular military units. Also military police units were to be made available. The Chief of Staff was holding himself ready to dispatch task forces to any point within any sovereign State if the present administration even suspected that situations similar to Little Rock existed.

Mr. Speaker, are we aware of what is happening to our citizens and our form of government?

Do we realize that the Federal Government has taken upon itself to be ready to send Federal troops into any State upon any pretext?

Does such a situation sound like it could happen in America?

Does not sending armed troops against private citizens, with drawn bayonets sound more like Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, or even Communist Russia?

It is true that they burned books in Nazi Germany, but has any Member of this House heard of schoolchildren in those countries, while living under a dictatorship, or schoolchildren of any other country being herded from classroom to classroom at bayonet point?

We sing of the home of the free and the land of the brave. Where is the home of the free when helmeted, combat-ready, heavily booted, fully armed paratroopers stand on guard in the corridors of a public school designed to teach children ranging from 12 to 17 years of age?

I believe the time has come to put legislative handcuffs on those who would use the military against the citizens of a sovereign State on any trumped-up charge. These men in authority who would do such must be persuasively convinced that the framers of the Constitution meant for the military to be servants of the people—not their masters.

## EXTENSION OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT (PUBLIC LAW 480)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, many proposals were being advanced to cope with the mounting accumulation of farm products. In the hearings that followed in the House Agriculture Committee there was general agreement that several different approaches should be taken to facilitate use of the surpluses in a positive manner. Therefore, in mid-1954 the Congress enacted, with strong support in both Chambers, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, now more commonly referred to as Public Law 480.

The act provided for a fourfold program for the utilization of surpluses. Title I authorized sales for foreign currencies to friendly countries in addition to their usual purchases for dollars. Title II authorized the use of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to meet famine and other emergency situations abroad. Title III emphasized and broadened, first, the previously authorized section 416 program for donation of CCC stocks to schoolchildren and the needy in this country and to American private relief agencies such as CARE for use in feeding needy persons abroad; and, second, the program for bartering CCC surpluses for strategic and other materials. These programs have been of great value to our farmers through the expanded outlets that they have provided for surplus products, but, in addition, they have made a great contribution in helping to improve living standards for large numbers of people throughout the world.

During the first 3 years of these programs, actual shipments made under them have totaled about $3 billion. Stated another way, a little more than one-quarter of total United States agricultural exports during the last 3 years were made under these programs. We all appreciate, I am sure, that the accelerated disposals undertaken under Public Law 480 has been one of the major factors responsible for the gratifying increases in total agricultural exports. Foreign shipments increased in value about 70 percent from 1953–54 to 1956–57, and in 1956–57 farm product exports were valued at $4.7 billion, by far the highest total in our history.

The title III authority providing for donations through American relief agencies and barter does not carry any expiration date. However, the foreign currency sales authority under title I and the authority to meet emergency conditions abroad under title II are now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1958. Yesterday I introduced a bill—H. R. 9614—which will provide for an extension of these two titles until June 30, 1959. My bill will increase the title I authorization by an additional $1.5 billion which will bring the cumulative authorization to $5.5 billion. No increase is needed in the title II authorization since sufficient balances are available from the current $800 million authorization to carry the program for another year.

I think our farmers can take pride in these programs which permit us to share our abundance with our friends in the rest of the world. There can be no better way of demonstrating our good will or our desire to help people achieve a better standard of living. How fortunate we are to be able to use our farm products in this manner. Certainly, the contrast between the abundance produced under our system and the scarcities and high prices prevailing under the Communist agricultural system, give us strength in our relations with the free world.

The principal activity under the Public Law 480 program has taken place under title I. Thus far, agreements have been signed with 35 countries for the movement of commodities valued at $3.3 billion. Included in agreements signed to date are 500 million bushels of wheat, 100 million bushels of feed grains, 25 million bags of rice, 2.8 million bales of cotton, 160 million pounds of tobacco, 1.8 million pounds of fats and oils—primarily soybean and cottonseed oil—150 million pounds of dairy products, and large amounts of other commodities.

And these items are being shipped abroad in large volume. For example, last year when exports totaled $4.7 billion, which incidentally represents roughly 1 acre out of 5 of our cropland, title I accounted for almost one-fifth of these exports. Wheat exports last year totaled almost 550 million bushels and title I was responsible for shipments of about 200 million bushels of this amount. Incidentally, these record exports enabled a cut in the surplus carryover wheat by about 125 million bushels.

Last year, cotton exports of 7.6 million bales were the highest in many years, and as a result it was possible to reduce surplus stocks by over 3 million bales. Incidentally, title I shipments last year were about 1.4 million bales.

Shipments of edible oils last year were at a record level of over 1.2 billion pounds. This was especially good news to soybean producers and again title I accounted for almost half of the total exports.

Title II has been extremely useful in giving the executive branch flexible authority to meet unforeseen situations abroad so that we can come promptly to the aid of people in distress. For example, this authority has been used to feed Hungarian refugees following the revolt against Communist oppression last year. It has been used to make wheat available to the people in Morocco who suffered as a result of a prolonged drought.

As you know, last year it took us many months to consider extension of this law. It is of paramount importance that the extension be provided as early as possible during the current session in order to continue these programs without interruption. It is my understanding that the remaining balance of $700 million in the title I authorization will be committed by January or February. Therefore, I would hope that the extension could be authorized no later than February or March.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of continuation of these programs. They have been of great benefit to us at home and abroad. I sincerely hope that my bill will have the early attention of both Houses of Congress and that speedy approval will be forthcoming.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FARM TO OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all of us recognize that a strong domestic economy is essential to the welfare of our people and to the defense of the Nation. Each major segment of our economy bears an important relationship to the economic conditions which prevail throughout the country, and agriculture is the most basic segment of the economy in times of peace or in times of emergency.

We have learned through the experience of recessions and depressions that the conditions which prevail on the farm are ultimately reflected in the entire national economy. It is the raw materials of the farms which start the wheels of industry, and the purchasing power from these farm commodity sales which so closely relate to the production levels which may be maintained by industry.

Although in recent years hundreds of thousands of people have moved from our rural areas to towns and cities, the fewer remaining farmers have employed more efficient methods to bring about increased productivity. The purchasers and consumers of farm products have shared in the resulting benefits.

Since there has been a trend for large number of farmers to move to towns and cities in recent years, as well as determined local efforts to achieve a properly balanced agricultural and industrial program, in my opinion the Government should not engage in any program which seeks to move our farmers off of the land. Such a program would be a negative approach which would bring about problems rather than provide solutions. The suggested program also appears to be based entirely upon temporary monetary considerations with inadequate regard to the values this country derives from those who are reared close to the soil. In the place of these Government sponsored actions which tend to discourage and confuse our farmers, we should substitute a positive program based upon a determination to find new uses for our farm products, to recover our lost foreign markets, and to encourage local areas in their efforts to achieve a properly diversified program within these areas.

Our agricultural pursuits cannot be isolated from the other major segments of our economy which have profited from their greater efforts in scientific research. I have no doubt that similar scientific efforts to find new uses for agricultural products could achieve similar results. The nature of farming is such that its problems are of a long range nature, and increases in production must be anticipated far in advance. Agricultural planning for the future cannot be based upon conditions which exist today, but must be based upon population growth and other conditions which may exist in the years ahead.

The farmer is required to operate in an economy in which he must pay higher prices because of subsidies paid to manufacturers and shippers, the increased wage and operating costs, and the higher prices which result from tariffs. The farmer has operated in a subsidized business economy, and payments to the farmer by the Government have served only to bring the farmer a part of his fair share of income and cannot be considered a subsidy. This is true because the income of the farmer remains behind the income of other groups. The farmers have been caught in a cost-price squeeze as a result of the high cost of the farm supplies they purchase as compared with the low prices they receive for farm commodities. This condition is now bringing about a noticeable sales loss in related industries. The means must be found to eliminate the inequities which are resulting from this cost-price squeeze.

I wish to again state that it is imperative that greater use be made of the laws which have been passed to aid in the sale of agricultural products. The tools which the Congress has provided, through the passage of these laws, must be fully and effectively utilized. It is my belief that a combination of American salesmanship and full utilization of existing laws would bring about more effective results in the disposal of agricultural products. A more optimistic approach to farming through the encouragement of scientific development to find new uses, the encouragement of a proper balance between agriculture and industry in local areas, the recovery of lost foreign markets, the utilization of existing laws and American salesmanship, and the fullest cooperation of the State Department would eliminate the necessity for suggested programs to move the farmers off of the land. I hope that the Congress will soon pass adequate measures to aid the farmer in his present dilemma.

---

## THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, this second session of the 85th Congress meets in a tense atmosphere of inspired propaganda to consider vital defense problems. Two committees which attracted little attention when they were organized or during their deliberations have now advised the country as to just what must be done if we are to maintain our military stature.

We, in the Congress, are not exactly sure what one of these committees said since their findings have been leaked to us drop by drop by columnists chosen to see top secret documents denied to the people's elected Representatives.

Events of the last week have suggested one obvious course of legislative action which has not yet received full consideration. Surely in a time of planned panic we must consider every possible reform in the Department of Defense. In the Pentagon rests the responsibility for spending so much money, not to mention responsibility for our national defense which sometimes seems a secondary consideration.

This crash proposal in which I have no pride of authorship is simple, quick, and sure. It will necessitate legislation which would simultaneously promote every member of the Army, Navy, and Air Force on active duty to the grade, rank, and pay of a full four-star general. That is right—every man on active duty a four-star general.

This will immediately produce peace in the Pentagon. There will be no more interservice rivalry because every man will have reached his goal—top money and top grade.

For the first time every single member of the military will be free to concentrate entirely on the goal of strengthening our country without worrying about his date of rank. The ultimate goals of the Cordiner report will be realized. Every private will really be happier now when the four-star general receives an $8,000 a year pay raise to $28,000 a year—because now every private will be a four-star general.

No military man will ever again be tempted to take his cannons and go home because of a shortage of stars.

This will guarantee complete equality in the armed services, an objective which even the Russians and Chinese have never achieved.

No longer will industry be able to tempt capable officers to leave the military, where plans are made, for the factory where weapons are produced. Military pay ranging from $26,626 to $28,606 a year will take care of that.

With this pay scale almost everyone in industry will be clamoring to get in the armed services. The draft can be abolished. Full employment can be guaranteed. Industry's profits on cost plus contracts will be boosted as industrialists raise salaries all the way around using the taxpayers' defense contract money to bid against the taxpayers' military salary money for the same engineers and scientists who are the center of controversy today.

---

## EXPRESSION OF THANKS

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this brief occasion to express my sincere gratitude to the many Members of the House of Representatives who sent me words of encouragement during my forced absence last summer. The many greetings of every kind provided me the best possible tonic.

It seemed unbelievable to me that any coronary difficulties should beset me. True, I had sympathized with many of my friends who had suffered this experience, but I had no premonition that it would happen to me. But it did, and it came with almost no warning.

The story of my recovery merely indicates another of the miracles of modern medicine and present-day development of science. It may be true that my

attack was a comparatively light one, but to me it seemed to be the worst possible at the time. Now that I have recovered and even feel in better health than B. C.—before coronary—I want to pass on advice that so kindly and graciously was given to me.

Live fully but carefully. Do not worry, watch your diet, and consecrate yourself to your family, to your community, to your Nation, and to your God. These and other lessons are the priceless possessions I have gathered from friends who were so kind and thoughtful while I was recuperating.

God has been good to all of us. For these blessings, let us respond with faith, hope and charity for all.

## OUR TAXPAYERS DESERVE A BREAK

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the United States has a population of 172 million people, a yearly Federal taxload of $73 billion, and a Federal debt of $273 billion. This makes an average yearly Federal taxload for every man, woman, and child in the United States of $424 and an average debt load of $1,587 per person.

The whole of Europe—leaving out Russia—has a population of 411 million, a total yearly taxload of $47 billion, and a total debt load of $117 billion. This makes an average yearly taxload for every man, woman, and child in Europe of $11, and an average debt load of $285 per person.

Europe's total taxload of $47 billion is less than two-thirds of our $73 billion taxload, and her total debt load of $117 billion is less than one-half of our total debt of $273 billion; yet we continue to hand out billions each year to Europe in so-called foreign aid. Is it not past time to give our taxpayers a break?

During the past 10 years Congress has given away to our so-called allies over $45 billion in foreign aid. If this immense amount had been spent in building up our own national defense the United States could have been made absolutely impregnable—not even Russia would dare to look cross at us.

Mr. Speaker, today most European countries have balanced budgets. England, France, and Western Germany have balanced budgets. Our European neighbors produce more goods of every kind than they produced in prewar days. They do it because of the rebuilt factories and modern machinery we have furnished them at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Today Europe has a $14 billion favorable balance of trade—a greater dollar balance to buy American goods with than she has ever had in her entire history. Mr. Dulles, under questioning before the Ways and Means Committee, acknowledged this fact. Yet we continue to pour out foreign aid—American taxpayers' dollars—to further bolster the economy of European nations. Every dollar of foreign aid we provide, whether economic or military aid, is a dollar less for the European taxpayer to pay.

American foreign aid today is being used to balance European budgets, to reduce European taxes, and to reduce European national debts. Does this make sense? Foreign aid today is a fraud. It should be cut off entirely.

Congress should do two things:

First. Adopt the Hoover recommendations and thereby save yearly some $5 or $6 billion; and

Second. Stop giving away $4 to $5 billion each year in foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, we would then save $10 billion each year which could mean a $5 billion tax cut; a $3 billion payment upon the national debt; and in addition have $2 billion extra to spend for real national defense, if it is needed.

Mr. Speaker, why not give our overburdened taxpayers a break, and at the same time build up our own national defense?

## CONGRATULATIONS, MR. SPEAKER

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, another year has rolled by and, thank God, SAM RAYBURN is hale and hearty, prepared for whatever lies before us. This is indeed reassuring and it is with a grateful heart that I wish him many happy returns of the day.

We need men of his type more than ever in this time of perplexity, men whose patriotism is beyond question, and whose determination to protect our country is as resolute as ever.

May we enjoy many more years of his virile service and may he be blessed with the strength and vision which comes from above in meeting the duties and responsibilities of his great office. God bless you always, Mr. SAM, our Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly pleased at the remarks made by my friend from New Jersey. I join him and approve what he has said about our distinguished and beloved Speaker. I have characterized SAM RAYBURN as "the man with the heart of gold" on so many occasions; and certainly he is a "man with a heart of gold." Friendship transcends party affiliations. Every one of us has entertained for our beloved friend, the Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, not only a deep feeling of respect but an equally deep feeling of friendship. Being of the opposite political party from that of my friend of New Jersey, I want to express my appreciation in the gentleman's initiating the remarks he made today.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I was born in 1900. And so, I am a bit unhappy when January 1 rolls around each year because I suddenly realize that I am a year older. But then I discover that on January 6 we come to the birthday of our great Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. That is a happier occasion for me, because I have a chance to congratulate him again and to say to him once more, as I have through the years, that he is a fine American, a great guy whom I am proud to call my friend.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentleman.

## EMPLOYMENT OF OLDER WORKERS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, with the growth of the system of unemployment, accident, sickness, death, and retirement benefits for employees constantly expanding, the tendency has been for industry to refuse to employ older workers and to terminate the employment of older workers when a reduction in force becomes necessary. A worker who loses his job after the age of 45 finds it almost impossible to obtain employment with a new firm, even though his training, experience, skill, and productive capacity may be at the peak of proficiency. At the age of 45 a worker's financial load is probably higher than ever before. At that age, his children are in the midst of their higher educational careers, and many promising young students in the scientific and professional fields are compelled to abandon college because their parents have lost their jobs. This is a loss not alone to the worker and his children but to America where the deficit in science graduate students is already alarming.

The problem is just as important with reference to workers who are approaching their 60th birthday. They are too young to retire and too old to find a new job. Yet, they may be burdened with mortgages on their homes, heavy hospital and medical expenses, and other obligations peculiar to our elder citizens.

This is an acute national problem which becomes more critical every day and one which is not easily solved by Government. The Congress has no constitutional power to compel employers to hire older workers or to retain older workers in their employ. Even if Congress had the constitutional power, a compulsory statute would be offensive to our sense of economic freedom and violative of the principles of the free-enterprise system. Moreover, such a compulsory statute could not be properly

policed and enforced without expanding the ranks of the Federal bureaucracy and without the expenditure of vast sums of money.

Accordingly, the only possible solution to the problem is an incentive program to encourage employers voluntarily to employ and retain in employment older workers. I have today introduced a bill providing for a voluntary tax-incentive program. Under that bill, an employer would be allowed to deduct as a business expense not only the gross salary or other compensation paid to an employee but an additional 2 percent thereof for every employee between the ages of 45 and 50, 3 percent for every employee between the ages of 50 and 55, 4 percent for every employee between the ages of 55 and 60, and 5 percent for every employee over the age of 60.

The passage of this bill would mean an initial loss of revenue, an estimate of which I am now trying to obtain. However, it must be borne in mind that this loss would be substantially offset by the tax revenue received from the salaries and wages paid to these older employees who otherwise might not have any earnings subject to taxation. Moreover, there would be a correspondent reduction of unemployment benefits consumed and the load on the State and local welfare rolls would be lightened.

It might be argued that a policy encouraging the employment of older people would reduce the job availability of younger workers. Such an argument is antithetical to modern, enlightened, progressive economic laws. Our modern economic history proves that the more people we have working, the more we produce; the more we produce, the more we transport and sell; the more we sell, the cheaper the price; the cheaper the price, the more we consume; the more we consume, the greater the demand; the greater the demand, the more we need to produce; the more we need to produce, the more jobs we have available. Our Nation depends for its prosperity upon an expanding economy, and any policy, governmental or otherwise, which has as its purpose a decrease in job availability for our older workers will stagnate our expansion and thus, in the long run, injure the younger worker as well. More jobs for everyone, regardless of age, must be our continuing policy.

We as a Nation have, over the years, depended for our growth upon the wisdom, training, and acquired skills that come only with age and experience. Some of our most revolutionary inventions and some of the greatest contributions to our economic, cultural, and scientific life in America have come from men and women of advanced years in both humble and exalted positions. This reservoir of wisdom and skills is one of America's greatest assets and one in which we have a great investment. We must, by every appropriate means, protect that investment and use that asset to advance our national interests.

## CONDITIONS IN HUNGARY CALL FOR ACTION BY UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, reliable reports have recently appeared in the press to the effect that the greatest hero of the Hungarian revolution, Gen. Pal Maleter, and his fellow officers, Gen. Istvan Kovacs, Col. Sandor Kopacsy and others will shortly be put on secret trial and face certain death sentences. According to a report from Yugoslavia, one of the leaders, Laszlo Kovacy, has already been tried, sentenced and executed.

It will be recalled that General Maleter and his fellow officers were trapped and arrested by the Soviet army when they negotiated with the Soviet delegation in their capacity as official representatives of the Imre Nagy government recognized by the Soviet Union. This was carried out in complete disregard of all rules of international law.

Other reports tell of the current trials of Msgr. Egon Turcsanyi, secretary of Cardinal Mindszenty, and 15 priests between the ages of 20 and 28, as well as those of 18 workers from the steel plant located on Csepel Island. It is expected that Imre Nagy, the Communist who served as Prime Minister during Hungary's few days of freedom in 1956, will also face trial soon.

Mr. Speaker, an appeal for a humanitarian trial from the United Nations Special Committee on Hungary has already been rejected by the chief public prosecutor of the puppet Hungarian regime with the following words:

> Tolerance and understanding will be shown only to those who were misled by our enemies.

If there was ever a time for the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to take action, that time has certainly arrived. The United Nations, which found itself powerless to prevent or to remedy Soviet aggression in Hungary, has the strongest obligation to appeal to the conscience of the entire world so that the lives of these heroes of the ruthlessly crushed Hungarian freedom fight and victims of Soviet treachery are spared and their liberty restored.

---

## ADDRESS BY COMDR. DONALD J. RYAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a letter and address by Donald J. Ryan, commander, Belmont (Mass.) Post, No. 165, of the American Legion.

BELMONT, MASS., *September 11, 1957.*

Hon. Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
*Committee on Veterans' Affairs,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR Mrs. ROGERS: Enclosed please find a copy of my recent address which was delivered at the joint installation of officers of Belmont Post, No. 165, American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, on Monday evening, September 9, 1957, at the Belmont High School and which you had then requested to be forwarded to you.

Indeed it is an honor that you have asked for my little talk and I sincerely thank you for being so kind to me.

As you already know, you are always welcome here in Belmont and your appearance here made our installation the best ever.

We, of Belmont Post, No. 165, American Legion, thank you for coming.

Don't hesitate to drop in to see us whenever you are in Belmont.

Thank you again for the honor which you have bestowed upon me here in my home town.

Very truly yours,

DONALD J. RYAN,
*Commander, Belmont Post, No. 165.*

---

ADDRESS GIVEN BY COMDR. DONALD J. RYAN, BELMONT (MASS.) POST, NO. 165, AMERICAN LEGION, DELIVERED AT POST INSTALLATION, SEPTEMBER 9, 1957

Distinguished guests, national, department, and county officers, comrades and friends, our program this evening opened and will close with public prayer—that is the custom in our land; it is more than a custom: indeed, it is the source of our strength.

In our Nation's history our people have acknowledged the authority of God and our dependence on Him; gratefully have they thanked Him for His blessings and invoked His divine guidance. We have believed that our Nation is built on faith in Almighty God and that our rights are given us by the Creator Himself. We have held as the richest and most valuable of our legacies our freedom of religion.

Where we have succeeded as a nation we have honored the sacred trust in God; where we have faltered we have failed it.

America is not immortal and there are signs in American life of deterioration in things of the spirit. When we think of how home life has disintegrated, how parental responsibility is being shamefully shirked, how shockingly juvenile delinquency has incredibly increased, we can look into our hearts and ask ourselves if the fruit of hard American planting is not beginning to decay.

Our first defense must be spiritual. We, as American Legionnaires, must intensify our youth program, our Americanism program, our "back to God" movement, all of which emphasize religious and moral values and give our Nation's youth a vital interest in the things which brought our country to greatness.

It is my hope that our American Legionnaires will lead the way back to God, will set the example for the youth of this Nation, will in the sanctuary of their own homes honor and bless their God, will provide religious instruction to their children and not send their children to church or synagogue but take them. I hope that American Legion posts will devote more effort this year to the spiritual needs of their communities and to work for the youth of their communities. Certainly there is no finer community service.

The training of youth and the preparation of our young Americans to take up tomorrow's responsibilities is the concern of the American Legion.

We believe that there should be renewed emphasis in our schools in the teaching of American history. There is enough drama and adventure in the life story of this Nation to fire the enthusiasm of the most in-

different youngster. Our youth must be trained to accept the responsibilities as well as the rights of citizenship. In vain have we sacrificed American blood in the maelstrom of war unless we instill in our youth the spirit of building and preserving the American heritage. Not only must we keep subversion out of our schools, but we must generate in our youth a spirit of positive Americanism.

Self-discipline and self-reliance, the ideals of loyalty, honesty, personal responsibility to God and fellow man must be woven into their character.

We must teach them the spirit of service. The historic question that Americans have asked themselves has been, "How can I serve?" Today the first question in many minds is, "How can I avoid serving?"

Here is a challenge to the American Legion to muster its forces, to instill into our youth the spirit of service to God and for country. The American veteran traditionally has been interested in youth and from its earliest history our American Legion has carried a vigorous program of child welfare. We have sponsored Boy Scouts, oratorical contests, junior baseball, Boys' State, and Boys' Nation. We have reached out to lend a helping hand to the orphaned; we have interested ourselves in providing scholarships for deserving boys and girls. All these have written a glorious record.

With the realization that our young people will be tomorrow's leaders of America, I feel that we must expand our community service and place the strength of our membership in a crusade to help solve the problems of modern youth. We have done much; we can do much more. I know of no better way to preserve our American heritage than by teaching youth to love and be willing to serve America.

We ourselves, as American Legionnaires, must set the pace. Before them we must place our own example of unselfish citizenship. They must see in us, not just old soldiers, sailors, and marines who once sacrificed for America in war, but citizens now willing to work for our community, our State, our Nation in time of peace. We must interest ourselves in the problems of our day, stand guard over our heritage, exercise our right to vote, and provide vigorous and untiring leadership. Our country has a just right to our love and unwavering loyalty. As citizens, we are pledged to allegiance to these United States. There can be no divided allegiance. We cannot serve two masters. We are dedicated to this Nation under God. We must be willing to live for, work for, pray for, and, if necessary, die for our country.

Our Nation's freedom is never permanently secured. It must be defended by each succeeding generation. Its price ever remains eternal vigilance.

Americans must not be lulled to sleep by indifference now by the prospect of peaceful coexistence with the communistic world. How can there be peaceful coexistence with men whose charted course is the destruction of our American ideals.

Yes, we want peace, but peace with freedom and justice. We of the American Legion, veterans of two world wars and the Korean conflict, who have seen the blood of our buddies, the soil of many continents, and the waters of the seas of the world, we who have known the cost of war in the dead, the disabled, the widowed and the orphaned, we want peace and we pray that our children and the children of tomorrow will be spared the scourge of war.

But peace cannot be preserved simply by wishful thinking, it must be worked for and prayed for. The spirit of war still hovers over a jittery world. We Legionnaires are especially challenged to put into action the principles and ideals of our American Legion preamble. To do that we must preserve throughout our land the good name and glorious traditions of our organization, we must build good public relations and we must enlist every eligible veteran into our ranks.

The body of the American Legion is its membership; its heart is its program of dedicated service. Without that heart vigorously pumping its life blood into constructive projects, the American Legion post will quickly weaken and die. Find a post with a wide and intensified program, manned by legionnaires who not only recite the legion's preamble, but live it and you will find a post respected in its community, loved for its contribution to the public welfare, and gaining in strength and membership.

Humbly we pray that God will bless the officers and members of the American Legion, our homes, the citizens of this State and of our Nation that we may walk united, one people under God, dedicated to the cause of freedom and justice.

In closing I'd like to quote the words of our department adjutant who says we should—

Smile because there is an American Legion,
For God and country, to serve and dare,
That's why I'm a Legionnaire.

To make my community a better place,
And meet my neighbor, face to face.
To help distressed comrades their cross to bear,
That's why I'm a Legionnaire.

To face with courage the coming day,
And teach my children how to pray,
To make my flag a symbol rare,
That's why I'm a Legionnaire.

And when the Great Commander calls,
And taps are sounded for each and all,
Lest we forget to breathe a prayer,
And thank the Lord, I'm a Legionnaire.

Thank you.

---

## REMARKS BY REAR ADM. JOHN A. SNACKENBERG

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter and address of Rear Adm. John A. Snackenberg upon the occasion of the presentation of First Naval District Efficiency Award at Lowell, Mass., on November 18, 1957:

THE COMMANDANT,
FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT,
*Boston, Mass., November 19, 1957.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
*Member of Congress,*
*Lowell, Mass.*

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I enclose herewith a copy of my remarks made last night to Naval Reserve Surface Division 1–18. It was kind of you to comment favorably upon them, and at the risk of speaking too long, I had to take advantage of the opportunity to emphasize to the young people present the unchangeable goal of Soviet Russia and the importance of our Navy in maintaining world peace.

It was a great pleasure to see you again and to speak with you. I hope that our next meeting may again be under equally pleasant circumstances.

With my kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

J. A. SNACKENBERG,
*Rear Admiral, United States Navy.*

REMARKS BY REAR ADM. JOHN A. SNACKENBERG, UNITED STATES NAVY, UPON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT EFFICIENCY AWARD, 1957, TO NAVAL RESERVE SURFACE DIVISION 1–18 (L), LOWELL, MASS., NOVEMBER 18, 1957, PRINCETON INN, DRACUT, MASS.

Mr. Toastmaster, reverend clergy, Mrs. Rogers, distinguished guests, officers, and men of Naval Reserve Surface Division 1–18, it is to me a particular pleasure to return to Lowell for the third time and to participate with you in the presentation of the award for outstanding progress and performance in the Naval Reserve Surface Division training program to Division 1–18.

You have every reason to be proud of your accomplishment, and I am most happy to offer to you my sincerest congratulations. I cannot let the opportunity pass without commenting upon the wholehearted support which the community of Lowell has always extended to our local Naval Reserve activity, and I wish to express to the civic leaders here tonight the deep appreciation of the Navy and myself as commandant of the First Naval District.

An occasion such as this would not be complete without the presence of your beloved representative, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, whose keen and sustained interest in veterans' affairs she has backed with her powerful legislative support. The Navy shares with the people of Lowell the high regard in which she is held.

It is appropriate that my remarks tonight should make mention of the world situation which now is alarming and disturbing to us in the United States. Supposedly at peace, we are constantly alerted by our national leaders as to the possibility of war and the necessity for powerful armed forces that must be ready for instant retaliation against an aggressor.

As a nation, we don't like being disturbed with talk of war in time of peace. Historically, cessation of hostilities has always meant to us ridding ourselves of thoughts of war, complete absorption in peaceful pursuits, and rapid disarmament. Two years after the War of the Revolution, our last naval vessel was sold and our Navy lapsed. At the close of the Civil War in 1865, the United States possessed the world's most powerful navy in ships built or building. By the end of 1873, our Navy in personnel and active ships was smaller than that of practically every other world power. When World War I terminated, the United States once again had, built or building, the first Navy in the world. The year 1930 saw us below Great Britain and probably inferior to Japan. At the end of World War II, for the third time in less than 100 years, we stood at the top in naval might. As Fletcher Pratt, well-known writer on naval subjects, said: "The specific genius of western peoples is to profit by experience." Thus, we did not put our Navy completely in mothballs in 1945, and possessed a modest amount of readiness for the emergency of 1950 in Korea.

Knowing the will to peace and business of the average American, our national leaders feel it their duty to keep us from being lulled into apathy; for, we know, as a people we are only too prone to interpret foreign acts of self-interest which happen to coincide with ours as the advent of permanent world peace.

These warnings affect individuals differently. Some think them a cry of "wolf" which can be sounded so often that its effect is lost; others think them a routine clamor from the military around budget time for funds that may or may not be needed and they resent the martial excitement of an annual Paul Revere's Ride; still others are very deeply disturbed and don't know just what to think.

It is not surprising that the average citizen has a difficult time making for himself

an evaluation of all the statements in the press and in formulating an estimate of the international situation. I do not pretend to be able to do this either, but there are some historical facts, some specialized knowledge common to those of my profession, and a little philosophy that have helped me, and I hope that my thinking along these lines may be of interest to you tonight.

To start with, we know that Russia and, in various degrees, her satellites form the opposition to our kind of democracy. Russia's objective is unmistakably set forth in many places. A short quotation from Lenin should settle this point. He said: "Either the Soviet Government triumphs in every advanced country in the world or the most reactionary imperialism triumphs, the most savage imperialism, which is throttling the small and feeble nationalities and reinstating reaction all over the world—Anglo-American imperialism which has perfectly mastered the art of using the form of a democratic republic. One or the other, there is no middle course."

Remember that we couldn't believe Hitler's program as given in his book Mein Kampf, but it proved to be a pretty reliable blueprint in the end. The Communist, of all people, lives by the book. Deviation from the book or the party line is the road to liquidation. General Zhukov is the most recent example of this. Russia's objective is clear. It is world domination by communism and the language is both tough and uncompromising.

Mr. Khrushchev sees communism triumphant throughout the world and has stated that victory can be obtained through peaceful coexistence. Thus he contradicts the precepts of Lenin who could not visualize Communist victory without violence, and he also contradicts himself because, following the first Geneva Summit Conference, Khrushchev said, "Anybody who takes our smile for withdrawal from the teachings of Karl Marx or Lenin is making a mistake. Those who expect this will have to wait until Easter Sunday falls on Monday."

These statements are confusing from our point of view. We expect from our Government a reasonable consistency, a regard for truth, and a recognition that others have a right to their opinions, and we have an awareness that negotiations may result in compromise. Let us realize that since Communist ends justify to them the employment of any means, we can expect in dealing with their Government no consistency, no regard for truth, no recognition of our opinions, and certainly no voluntary attitude of compromise. As P. E. Moseley tells us: "Coexistence in our minds not only means 'existing together at the same time' but the idea of 'together' has a peaceful implication as most of us wishfully think. Peaceful coexistence the way we envision it might be a workable compromise. Peaceful coexistence the way Mr. Khrushchev envisions it might not be possible in his eyes unless we cease all opposition to the desires of Russia."

I think we must for our own safety be convinced that world domination by communism remains Russia's objective and that the conflicting statements issuing from the Kremlin are no more than indications to us that the means to that end have altered temporarily. It is well established, in fact, that Russia possesses a large navy, a very large army, a powerful air force, and has made great advances in the military applications of atomic energy and space travel. She, therefore, is on the road to possessing the military means to achieve her ends. This is the alternative to peaceful coexistence which only involves economic penetration, infiltration into government, arousing social unrest, and committing overt acts short of hot war.

It is rather frightening at first to realize that we confront a powerful, dynamic nation with an inflexible aggressive ambition to impose its will upon us, led by men who by our standards are unscrupulous, unmoral, and conscienceless. We are inclined to think that such a situation has never existed in the world before, and some people grasp at the idea of perpetuating peace through the possession of a superweapon and a capability of waging a push-button war.

We must, however, keep our feet on the ground. What one man has made, another can duplicate or even improve upon. Thus, we really face the age-old situation wherein man has found it necessary to match weapon with weapon, and capability with capability.

There is, of course, an enormous difference in the weapons of today. Arnold Toynbee says: "The invention of atomic weapons looks as if it may have obliterated formerly valid differences between soldier and civilian, front and rear, victor and vanquished. If so, then our present period would be unique in seeing the historic institution of war turned into something new and different—mass suicide. We have already coined a new word 'genocide' to describe this new possibility." History, however, gives a strong indication that human beings are profoundly impressed by something that threatens their existence as a race and they, up to now, have avoided recourse to weapons with that potentiality.

It is no secret that our armament comprises ultimate weapons, together with weapons of more limited capacity. Such also is the armament of every major power in the world.

One might ask why we bother to equip ourselves with conventional weapons of limited capability. A quick answer is that ultimate weapons are in short supply, which might well be true but which, I believe, is not a complete answer. No nation desires to engage in a war in which there is no victory possible. Every nation knows that disagreements are highly probable, and that recourse may be had to arms—but all, I am of the opinion, hope that the use of ultimate weapons can be avoided.

People perhaps feel somewhat like Ole who, during prohibition, presented a liquor prescription to be filled. The druggist said: "Ole, all I have is some 'Old Crow.' Will that do?" Ole reached for the prescription. "No," he said. I don't want to fly; I just want to jump around a little."

The mechanism of the United Nations, the Truman Doctrine, the Korean truce, the protection of Formosa, and the Eisenhower Doctrine all testify to the earnest desire of responsible nations to restrict international disagreements to the jumping around category. Each successful attempt in this direction gives the peoples of the world more hope of permanent peace, and more conviction that the weapons of genocide offer no solutions to their difficulties.

It is this realization, and the knowledge that our country is looked to for leadership and assistance, that requires us today to be militarily strong in all categories and to have available to us means of persuasion appropriate to the occasion. Consequently, we plan our current military needs in the light of possible opponents and situations as we deem the need to exist. The knowledge that our arsenal is in being, ready for instant use against an aggressor, will, as it has in the past, constitute the great deterrent.

The ultimatum posed by international communism, along with the threat of the use of ultimate weapons is very serious but I believe that despite ultimatums and ultimate weapons, our convictions will prevail if we show we are ready to defend them.

I suggest that to keep the peace the best means this country possesses lies in our versatile and mobile present-day Navy which has been accurately described as the precision instrument of our country's diplomacy. This has been recognized from the earliest days of our existence as a Nation. Our second President, John Adams, has passed on to us words that are as true today as when they were spoken in 1802. He said: "The counsel Themistocles gave to Athens, Pompey to Rome, Cromwell to England, Dewitt to Holland, and Colbert to France, I have always given, and shall continue to give to my countrymen; that, as the great questions of commerce and power between nations and empires must be decided by a military marine, and war and peace are determined at sea—all reasonable encouragement should be given to a navy. The trident of Neptune is the sceptre of the world."

## RETURN TO THE OLD SYSTEM OF USING THE TELEPHONE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to pay a great tribute to the telephone operators at the Capitol. So far as my own district is concerned, many times they have saved my people a great deal of money in contracts; many times they have saved human life by their help and by their great cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we could go back to our old system of using the telephone. I spend hours being transferred to other offices. I have to have with me a schedule of the different telephone numbers. I find, trying to call the departments long distance, that I cannot be transferred from one office to another office in the same department. So, I must put another long-distance call to the department again. It is very expensive; valuable time is consumed, and is very unsatisfactory, I believe, to everybody.

## JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON OUTER SPACE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Outer Space.

This joint committee, modeled closely along the lines of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, would be composed of nine Members of each House. No more than five from each House could be of the same political party. Like the Atomic Energy Committee, the chairmanship would alternate between the House and Senate with each Congress.

The outer space group would be authorized to make "continuing studies of the use and control of outer space." Specifically, it would be authorized to oversee the following five areas:

First. The research, development, production, and other activities of any department or agency of the Government, or of any private agency, conducting activities relating to outer space, including such activities relating to rockets, missiles, and earth satellites.

Second. International relations and agreements concerning outer space.

Third. Security standards and safeguards with respect to outer-space activities.

Fourth. The control and dissemination of information concerning outer-space activities.

Fifth. The protection of health and promotion of safety in connection with research, development, and production activities relating to outer space.

Space, missile, and rocket problems—and our whole defense posture—must be the first concern of this session of Congress. In one specific, Congress must augment its committee alinement to help ease and encourage America's entrance into the space age.

Missiles, rockets, and satellites are not only the number one order of business today—they are also going to be of vital importance for years to come. The splendid record of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is a good precedent for a Joint Committee on Outer Space. The new joint committee can act as an effective and constructive watchdog over our immediate outer space military plans, and can also in the future deal with the potentially knotty problems of outer space control, jurisdiction, and use.

If Congress is to cooperate fully and completely in America's efforts to maintain dominance in the space age, it is essential that we have a group constantly studying developments in these fields. It would not only keep Congress and the American people informed of progress in outer-space work, but would provide the necessary expertise for formulating legislation and policies in this complex area.

At the same time, it is imperative that Congress act to create a Cabinet post of Secretary of Research and Development. Operating from such a powerful position, he could promote coordination and cooperation among all groups dedicated to scientific progress, not only as to projects undertaken but as to the hiring of precious personnel. His inherent prestige could help lift basic scientific research above the secondary level, not only for defense purposes, but in the long run to raise our standard of living. He could promote the friendly, responsive, and understanding atmosphere in which science can flourish. Only an America where science is encouraged and fully supported can survive in the space age.

The immediate, number one problem of Congress is to provide the Nation with the wherewithal, the understanding, and the cooperation necessary to stay ahead of the Russians in the military and scientific fields. But at the same time, we must keep an eye on the long run, and must lay the foundations now upon which future scientific advances can be built.

A Joint Committee on Outer Space and a Secretary of Research and Development are musts, not only for the long haul, but for the immediate speedup of our science programs. I am confident the American people and Congress are prepared to take these significant steps so essential to our adjustment to the space age and to our survival as a free Nation.

## NATIONAL LOTTERY ONLY HOPE FOR TAX CUT

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we are assured that the new budget, the highest peacetime spending program in the Nation's history, will be in balance, we must recognize the fact that the defense needs of this Nation will not permit a tax reduction now. As a matter of fact, I seriously doubt any future tax relief in view of the necessity for additional defense outlays to meet Russia's challenge.

I am certain that the American people understand and realize the present dangerous threat to our national security and the urgent need for the expenditure of additional billions of dollars to speed up and expand our missile program.

However, I am not so certain that the hard-pressed wage earners in this country can appreciate the continued resistance of this Congress to a national lottery—the only avenue left open which could and would lighten the unconscionable tax burden now shouldered by our taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure that our American workers, who spend nearly one-third of their working day to pay their taxes, understand the continued stubbornness and reluctance of this Congress to accept a national lottery as the only normal thing left which could and would brighten their hopes for a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, the recent Trendex poll taken in every section of this land and of people in every income bracket should be sufficient proof that most of the people favor a national lottery as a means to reduce taxes.

The present crisis demands that we become realistic. If the honorable Members of this Congress would banish hypocrisy, remove the blinders and open their eyes to this painless and voluntary form of taxation, they will find an additional $10 billion a year coming into the United States Treasury which can very well provide a tax cut for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that without this proposed additional source of revenue, all present and future hope for tax relief will be shattered. And while I agree that our national security must have first priority, I also feel that tax relief is needed to provide a stimulus for American initiative and enterprise. Without that, our Nation's economy and our American standard of living will suffer irreparable damage.

Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayers want and need tax relief now and it is up to us to demonstrate the kind of courage that will make this tax-cut dream a reality. A national lottery is the only answer—the only hope.

## DRIVER EDUCATION PAYS

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, a significant evidence that driver education pays was revealed to the Utah Auto Dealers' Association by Vaughn L. Hall, director of health, physical education, and recreation of the Utah Department of Public Instruction. While thanking the automobile dealers for providing the cars, Mr. Hall said:

> At the present time we are operating 67 automobiles in 60 high schools. We now have a little more than 6,000 of our 12,000 eligible high-school students enrolled in driver-education classes. This is approximately a 550-percent increase over last year's program.
>
> Using the formula on the costs of fatal accidents which has been developed by the National Safety Council and widely accepted—and using the conclusions of research on the effect of driver training on driving records of students who have had the course in contrast to those who have not—we have calculated (rather conservatively) that each car utilized fully each year means the saving of 2 lives and $50,000 in economic loss. There are many different ways of stating the cost of accidents and the effect of driver education. However, this is merely an attempt to reduce these statistics to an individual appeal to each auto dealer to cooperate with schools in the program.

## RÉSUMÉ OF 12TH GATT SESSION

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the 12th session of the contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—usually referred to as GATT—as a Congressional adviser to the United States delegation, together with the Honorable FRANK KARSTEN, of Missouri.

I was impressed by the spirit of international cooperation and good will that animated the session which was held from October 17 to November 30, 1957. It is my belief that strong United States support of such collective economic efforts as the GATT and the European common market represents one of the positive steps we can take to strengthen and maintain our world leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was set up in 1947, largely on the initiative of the United States. The United States is a very active participant in the GATT, which has as its goal the reduction of trade restrictions and the stimulation of sound international commerce. The United States takes part in the GATT under the authority granted to the President in the Trade Agreements Act. The 37 countries which have signed—Ghana and Malaya both adhered in their own right this year after achieving independence

within the British Commonwealth—and which account for about 85 percent of world trade, meet at annual sessions to deal with the problems that come up in carrying out the agreement. These sessions ordinarily meet in Geneva, Switzerland, in the fall of each year. This year's session, the 12th since 1947, took place in Geneva from October 17 to November 30.

The main problem on the agenda this year was the European common market. This is a plan worked out by six European countries—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg—to set up a sort of United States of Europe in economic matters. The six countries will, over a period of 15 years, drop all the tariffs and other trade restrictions they now have between each other. It will mean a unified market of about 160 million consumers.

The United States has supported this development not only because we believe that the economic strengthening of Europe will have important political results. If it succeeds in its goal of raising living standards in Europe, the common-market area can be expected to buy more goods from the United States and other countries. At the same time, some countries which now sell to Europe are concerned that this new development may put them in a poorer competitive position. The fact that tariffs inside the area will be eliminated entirely, and a common tariff will be applied against outside countries will certainly change the competitive situation to some degree. But the GATT rules require that the new common tariff against the outside not be generally higher than the tariff rates of the six countries which were in effect before. The common-market plan also includes the overseas territories of the six European countries on a special basis, and this, too, has given cause for concern. At this GATT session all these problems were very carefully examined, and it was decided that there will be continuing study of the common-market developments in order to safeguard the interests of the United States and other countries outside the area.

Another matter regularly considered at GATT sessions which is very important to the United States is the progress being made in getting rid of the import quotas used by countries like Great Britain, the Netherlands, Sweden, Italy, and others under the GATT provision which permits such import quotas when a country is short of dollar exchange. To enable these countries to make sure that the limited dollars available will be used for the goods that will help to end their dollar problem, the GATT permits quotas. But these quotas are permitted under the GATT only so long as the country is short of foreign exchange. The GATT carries on regular discussions to see if each country applying such quotas is doing so in accordance with the GATT rules. This year, for example, it was agreed that Germany had earned so much foreign exchange through its economic recovery that it should no longer use quotas. The Germans came in with a program for eliminating some of their quotas but the other countries did not think they went far enough and recommended that the German Government reconsider and come up with an additional program. A number of other countries have also improved their foreign exchange situation and, accordingly, announced a reduction in the list of goods under quotas, especially from the United States.

The GATT countries each year receive a report on trends in world commodity trade, because of the large share of world trade this represents, and certain countries are largely dependent on trade in a few commodities. The discussion of this report gave most attention to the failure of the trade in basic foodstuffs and raw materials to expand as rapidly as that of other goods. The GATT countries recognized the importance of this and the related problems of agricultural protection and the instability of world commodity markets, and decided to have them studied by a panel of internationally recognized experts. The experts will examine the available facts relating to these problems and their implications but will not draw any conclusions or make recommendations about the various national trade policies and programs that are involved.

The United States program of gradually feeding its Government-held agricultural surpluses into the world market, with a minimum of disruption to normal trade, was another subject of great interest at the session. Our policy has been to report fully on this program to the GATT countries, and to stand ready to explain how in running the program we do our best to protect normal commercial trade. While some countries said that our orderly release of supplies damages their trade, the countries that have been able to buy our surplus grain and cotton at world prices on easy terms spoke up about the benefits of the surplus disposal program. The countries that sell these same commodities in world trade want us to give them more notice and opportunity to consult regarding specific disposal agreements.

The GATT is just what its title indicates—a general agreement—and the writing up of general trade rules dealt inadequately with a number of special cases. These have been taken care of by waivers from the rules in specific instances under certain carefully spelled-out conditions. This has been done in a number of cases, many of which are of little trade importance. In most cases the countries which have received waivers must submit reports at the annual meetings for consideration by the assembled delegations. At the session just ended the European Coal and Steel Community reported on the progress in achieving a six-country common market for coal, coke, and iron and steel. This project is almost completed, and on February 10, 1958, this special common market will have a single tariff system. The United States has a waiver for its section 22 actions and gave a complete and detailed report on the operation of these agricultural trade controls. Belgium reported on the progress it is making under the terms of its waiver to reduce and eliminate its import quotas on certain agricultural items. The special problem of easing the transition from a protected market to a competitive one was discussed, and it was decided to permit for one more year applications for the use of special waiver provisions for this purpose.

The GATT countries also granted France and Germany permission to apply special preferences to their trade with the Saar, which in effect will be part of the customs and monetary territory of both countries until the end of 1959.

The tariff aspect of the GATT was displayed at the recent meeting by work on the tariffs of Finland, Brazil, Cuba, and New Zealand. Finland devalued its currency last summer, and was granted permission to raise its specific customs duties enough to offset the devaluation. Brazil and Cuba have revised their tariffs, which were drawn up more than 50 years ago. The various problems involved in the changes in classification, nomenclature, rates of duty, and adjustment of tariff concessions granted to the other GATT countries, were discussed in preparation for negotiations so that the new tariffs can be put into effect without interfering with trade, and without upsetting the balance of existing tariff concessions. New Zealand is also revising its tariff, and similar work will have to be done with respect to the new New Zealand tariff during 1958.

Customs tariffs are lengthy, complicated documents, and their technical language can conceal policies which can affect a whole branch of industry or trade. The GATT makes possible a systematic and orderly examination of the problems and interests involved in a tariff revision, and gives all the countries concerned the chance to make themselves heard. Just from the standpoint of the time and money that is saved by having negotiations take place between the countries concerned simultaneously at a central place, the GATT procedures are of great advantage. Even more important, of course, are the advantages gained through the GATT in terms of agreement concerning the interpretation of language and the application of accepted rules, and keeping as short as possible the length of time during which importers and exporters do not know what rates of duty will apply.

The GATT has special rules for countries which are less developed, permitting them to give exceptional protection to infant industries under certain conditions. A country desiring to take advantage of these rules must apply to all the GATT countries, submitting a plan and justification of the proposed protective measures. Ceylon applied for and was granted permission to protect certain industries, but in a way that leaves American trade interests largely unharmed.

Another job of the GATT meetings is to consider complaints that are made about actions or policies of GATT countries which other member nations consider to be inconsistent with the GATT provisions. One of the items that came up under this heading this year involved an increase in duty on long-playing records by Greece. The Greeks had agreed in the GATT not to raise their duty on

phonograph records, but they argued that long-playing records really were different, for customs purposes, from the heavier and cheaper 78 revolutions per minute records. During the session the Germans announced that the Greeks had agreed to limit the duty on long-playing records to 36 percent, which compares favorably with the rate on 78 revolutions per minute records. The United States is the second biggest exporter of long-playing records to Greece, so this result benefits our phonograph record industry and export trade.

Sweden and Denmark entered a complaint about our recent escape-clause action raising the duty on spring clothespins, claiming that our action was inconsistent with the GATT rules. These countries will now discuss the action directly with us, but if no settlement is reached they may have it considered by the GATT Intersessional Committee.

The Norwegians proposed that the GATT countries draw up GATT amendments to control cartel activities in the international trade field. The delegations decided that material on cartels and antitrust legislation should be collected and studied by the GATT Intersessional Committee, perhaps to be placed on the agenda of the 1958 session.

At a special part of the session, from October 28 to 30, at which most of the GATT countries were represented by ministers of trade, or their high-level equivalent, it was the unanimous view that the GATT is essential to the progress and prosperity of the free world. The ministers agreed that every effort must be made to strengthen this agreement, particularly by bringing the Organization for Trade Cooperation into effect. Since the United States is the leading trading country in the world and must sign the OTC agreement before the organization can be set up, most countries are looking to the United States to provide the leadership. At this session of the Congress the Trade Agreements Act will be up for renewal and the OTC for approval. The President has urged that both the Trade Agreements Act and authorization to join OTC be passed in the enlightened self-interest of the United States, and has indicated that authority to enter into trade agreements should be granted for a further 5-year period, with adequate but carefully safeguarded authority further to reduce United States tariffs.

The work accomplished at the session was convincing evidence of the usefulness and effectiveness of the GATT in furthering our ideals of the greatest possible volume of trade flowing through the world markets with a minimum of bureaucratic or arbitrary obstacles. At the same time, the crowded agenda of the session made it difficult to give all of the matters discussed the full measure of attention they deserved. The delay in settling some of the problems, and postponement of other problems until the next session which will not take place until another year has passed, are defects in the way matters are now dealt with in the GATT. This would be remedied by the OTC. The development of the last few months have proved that economic, scientific, and technical matters are as important as military alliances for the security of the United States. As the major trading nation in the world, our policy will determine the success or failure of the GATT.

## HON. SAM RAYBURN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, beyond question, though I have no authority to speak for anyone other than myself, it is a matter of common knowledge in the House that all Republicans wish to join wholeheartedly in everything commendatory that has been said here with reference to our Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, either on the present occasion or on the many other occasions when those who know him best have praised him so highly, congratulated him not only upon his birthday, but on other occasions—and they have been many—on his work, when his efforts were so outstanding.

All admire him. Republicans perhaps regret that he is not a Texas Republican. That would be helpful to us from a political standpoint. Undoubtedly, it would be helpful to the State of Texas.

In addition to what has been said with reference to his recent birthday, it is my desire to congratulate him upon his two recent appearances upon television. Beyond question, those who saw and heard him undoubtedly not only enjoyed what he had to say, but were greatly pleased to have the privilege which many do not have of at least seeing him on TV and listening to his voice. It is my hope, as we may be sure it is the hope of many, many others, that he will more often appear upon TV and give the people generally the benefit as well as the privilege of knowing him—at least to a certain extent—as he really is, a charming personality.

We are all familiar with the long-established rule, universally applied in the courts, that every individual charged with an offense has the right to be confronted by the accusing witnesses. That rule is founded in commonsense, was found necessary to make secure the liberties of the individual citizen. It is cited here, not because an audience or anyone looking or listening in is charged with any misconduct, but only to show that the people have long recognized the fact—and it is a fact—that only by seeing and hearing an individual who is giving information or advice can one fully and accurately judge the weight which should be given to the statements to which the public is listening.

It is doubtful if there is a Member of this House who will not admit that when he hears and sees an individual make a statement or an argument, he is in a far better position to judge the weight that should be given to that statement than he would be when he merely reads what has been said.

This is especially true in the case of the Speaker, whose personality, whose sincerity and charm are so apparent.

To a lesser extent, the same argument applies to the question of the televising of Congressional hearings.

If the people can hear and see as well as read the statements of witnesses, interrogators, and participants in congressional hearings, they will get a far more accurate knowledge of what committees are doing.

## CREATION OF A COAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 1st session of the 85th Congress I introduced H. R. 9593, which is designed to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal through the creation of a Coal Research and Development Commission.

The recommendation for such a Commission has come from the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, whose Coal Research Subcommittee made a detailed study of the subject in 1956 and 1957. The report of the subcommittee is replete with evidence of the need for a commission to formulate and execute an overall research program for the coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, during the recess of this Congress additional testimony for favorable action on my bill has been building up in coal communities of the country. I refer you particularly to both the bituminous and anthracite regions of Pennsylvania, where an already depressed economy has become even more gloomy because of decreased demand for coal.

I have continually impressed upon the House the need for legislation to stimulate industrial and business activity in the surplus labor areas of this country. My bills to provide for economic assistance to these areas will, I hope, be enacted into law during 1958.

Meanwhile, new vigor can be injected into our coal communities through the medium of the type of commission which I propose. It would, in effect, give our coal-producing regions a greater opportunity for lifting themselves out of the economic doldrums that have persisted for the greater part of the period following the conclusion of World War II. While there is no question about the need for a distressed-area program for the present and the immediate future, over the long range a research and development plan for the coal industry would lessen the burden placed on Federal and State budgets as provided in my bill.

Now, let us take a look at the current situation in Pennsylvania's coal industry. While final figures are not yet available, there is no disputing the fact that Pennsylvania's bituminous-coal production in

1957 failed by 2 or 3 million tons to reach the level of the preceding year. A deficit of as much as 5 million tons will likely appear in reports of anthracite production, and I might point out that such a loss in hard-coal output is a more severe economic blow, because its total rate of production amounts to only about one quarter of that which comes from Pennsylvania's bituminous-coal mines.

One of the obvious reasons for restricted demand for our coals is the unabated waves of residual oil that sweep into our east-coast markets. For almost a decade I have been insisting that a law is needed to check this unfair competitive practice, and we who represent coal States have enjoyed a measure of consolation in the administration's voluntary program for ebbing the flow of crude oil and products from alien petroleum fields and refineries. The assurance required for safeguarding the domestic-fuel producer and our American workmen cannot be guaranteed, however, until a legislative barrier is set up. I take this opportunity of placing Congress on notice that I, for one, will not be content with our foreign-trade policies until a definite quota is applied to the imports of residual oil.

Wherever corrective steps may be taken in this regard by the 85th Congress, the necessity for a coal-research commission will remain. The fuel upon which America's economy and security of the generations ahead depend must be ready for immediate delivery when called upon. The research program which I recommend will not only assist in increasing coal production and coal utilization, but will also provide for improvement in transportation methods. Teams of railroad management and labor have indicated accord in the approach undertaken in H. R. 9593, as have the great industrial fuel consumers of our Nation.

Members of the House and Senate have here an opportunity to erect a monument to the progressive attitude of the 85th Congress. Enactment of this bill into law will symbolize the determination of this legislative body in guaranteeing the availability of energy resources for this period of international crisis and for the years and centuries beyond our own lifetime.

[From the office of Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.]

WASHINGTON, January 8.—Congress today was urged to establish a research program for the coal industry as soon as possible. In a statement prepared for delivery in the House of Representatives, Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT said that a law creating a Research and Development Commission is essential to the economic health of coal-producing States and to an assured supply of energy in the future.

Recalling his efforts to bring about depressed area legislation at previous sessions of Congress, the Pennsylvania Representative said that the need has not lessened but that "meanwhile new vigor can be injected into coal communities" through his proposed research program as provided for by his bill, H. R. 9593.

"It would, in effect, give our coal-producing regions a greater opportunity for lifting themselves out of the economic doldrums that have persisted for the greater part of the dozen and one years since the conclusion of World War II," Congressman VAN ZANDT declared. "While there is no question about the need for a distressed area program for the present and the immediate future, over the long-range a research and development plan for the coal industry would lessen the burden placed on Federal and State budgets as provided in my bill."

Congressman VAN ZANDT pointed out to his colleagues that Pennsylvania's bituminous and anthracite output for 1957 decreased from the preceding year. He charged that one of the obvious reasons for restricted demand for coal is the unabated waves of residual oil that sweep into the east coast markets.

Congressman VAN ZANDT said that coal States have enjoyed a measure of consolation in the administration's voluntary program for checking oil imports. He added, however, that the assurance required for safeguarding domestic fuel producers and the American worker cannot be guaranteed until a legislative barrier is set up.

In concluding his remarks to the House, Congressman VAN ZANDT stated:

"Members of the House and Senate have here an opportunity to erect a monument to the progressive attitude of the 85th Congress. Enactment of this bill will symbolize the determination of this legislative body in guaranteeing the availability of energy resources for this period of international crisis and for the years and centuries beyond our own lifetime."

## VETERANS' HOUSING

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns. It is my hope that this bill can be given early consideration by the Congress since a rebirth of a GI home-loan program is urgently needed in this country.

It is not necessary that any detailed discussion of the provisions of this bill be had at this time since it is identical to H. R. 4602 as it was approved by the Congress in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, except for necessary technical changes in dates.

This bill would raise the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500. It would also authorize the issuance of advance financing commitments to a builder or sponsor in a housing credit shortage area upon the payment by such a builder or sponsor of a nonrefundable commitment fee to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, which fee shall not in any event exceed 2 percent of the funds reserved for such builder or sponsor.

It further permits the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to exempt new construction from the subdivision and land-planning requirements as prescribed by section 504 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This provision has the very practical effect of permitting the building of homes in keeping with the area in which they are located and eliminates the present requirement that a builder, building in a rural area, must pave streets, install curbs and gutters in front of the house when such practices are not generally followed in the particular community or area involved.

There was great disappointment when the President vetoed H. R. 4602. This disappointment was experienced by those of us who felt that something must be done to eliminate the discriminatory practical results of the veterans' home-loan program in the past. The record shows that the veterans in the small towns and rural areas have not received the same benefit from the Servicemen's Readjustment Act that has been experienced by their counterparts in larger centers of population. The veterans themselves and the homebuilding industry, as well as the economy of our Nation, have been deprived of the benefits which would naturally have flown from this legislation had it not been vetoed.

All economic reports seem to indicate that there is a great need for the revival of this veterans' home-loan program, with the very realistic interest rate of 4½ percent upon such loans.

In reoffering this bill I do so with the confidence that we can give it prompt consideration and bring about its ultimate and final enactment.

## THE CREATION OF A NATIONAL SCIENCE COUNCIL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to create a National Science Council. The bill is an amendment to the National Security Act, and is intended to provide for the coordination and integration of policies and procedures regarding Federal programs in the fields of science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, I have become convinced that our lag in certain scientific developments stems, not from lack of high-grade scientists, or funds, or materials or facilities but rather from inadequate management and organization of the resources available.

This bill will place a highly qualified council in the Executive Office of the President to be the chief adviser of the President and the National Security Council on scientific and technological matters which affect our national security.

The Council, appointed by the President and approved by the Senate, would establish priorities for the carrying out of vital scientific and technological projects and programs essential to our security.

The Council would have the responsibility, under the President, to make the maximum use of materials, funds, facilities and personnel in the execution of programs. It would be able to transfer

these essential human and physical resources as circumstances require without regard to agency structures and procedures.

The Council will also have the duty of providing means to collect abstract, analyze, translate, and disseminate scientific and technical information from all sources, foreign and domestic.

The Council would also keep in close contact with institutions of higher education to insure that our base of learning is adequate to our security needs.

The Council will make semiannual reports to the President and to the Houses of Congress.

It is my firm belief, Mr. Speaker, that legislation such as I am introducing must be enacted at an early date if we are not to lag behind in the vital field of scientific and technological development which is our first line of security.

## CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which at this time is not only necessary but urgent. It covers one part of last year's civil-rights bill which did not become law.

My bill provides that the Attorney General may institute, for the United States, a civil action for preventive relief whenever a person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices as part of a conspiracy which would result in injuring another person or depriving him of the rights or privileges of a citizen of the United States, or of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the law.

The district courts of the United States are authorized to exercise their jurisdiction over such proceedings without the prior exhaustion by the aggrieved party of administrative or other remedies provided by Federal or State law.

This bill creates no new civil rights, but merely provides a new remedy for the enforcement of the civil rights with which our Constitution has already endowed every citizen regardless of race, creed, or color.

The only remedy which our present law affords an individual whose civil rights have been violated or denied, is a private suit for damages or for equitable relief.

A civil-rights case is not really a private suit between private individuals. It is, to say the least, a proceeding in which the public has a vital interest. By passing the Civil Rights Act of 1957, we admitted that a private suit was an inadequate remedy for the enforcement of voting rights. We cannot select one civil right, such as voting, and provide a method for protecting this right, while at the same time ignoring every other civil right.

My bill only seeks to extend to other civil rights the same protection we have just provided for voting rights. Unless we enact this legislation, our very failure to do so will weaken the judicial opinions already rendered by the Supreme Court and by other Federal courts with regard to other civil rights; and this, at a time when not only the whole country but the entire world is waiting to see what this Congress will do.

## ONE CHIEF OF STAFF—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to replace the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense with one Chief of Staff.

The reason for my action is that there has been altogether too much competition between the services and too little working together for the good of the country.

There has been constant bickering between the services as to which service shall perform what mission.

For example, we now have four Air Forces, an Army Air Force, a Navy Air Force, the United States Air Force, and the Marine Air Force. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines all maintain an engineering service. Supply is a huge mess.

Each service is madly racing with the other services to see who shall control and use the missiles which we are finally beginning to develop to an operative stage.

Services compete with each other for land use. The different services are utilizing a number of different items of military equipment where they could utilize one piece of equipment in common. The services are stockpiling materiel without regard for each other and often without regard for their real need. There have been instances where one service has been declaring land and materiel surplus and disposing of it at cut-rate prices while that same service or another service was going out to acquire similar tracts of land or the same item.

The present service structure is confusion compounded. Something must be done for the safety of the country and to guarantee that our defense dollar gives us real defense at the lowest possible cost.

It is my hope that the appointment of one Chief of Staff instead of a number of Chiefs of Staff to run the services in a workmanlike, intelligent, and vigorous manner will be a long first step in the right direction.

## RULES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. After consultation with the majority and minority leaders concerning the problem of the great jam that exists every time the Chief Executive comes into this Chamber, I want to announce that the door immediately opposite the Speaker's rostrum will be open tomorrow as well as the two doors immediately to the left and to the right and none other; and that no one will be allowed the privilege of the floor who does not under the law and custom have the privilege of the floor. We hope everyone will obey the rules and not bring anyone on the floor who does not have the privilege of the floor. I hope all Members will help me to enforce that rule.

## WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide for a White House Conference on Aging to be held in 1958. By reason of our antiquated practice of measuring human competence in terms of the number of birthdays a person has had, this country is depriving itself of the services of hundreds of thousands of mature people whose experience and skills are probably at a higher level than at any previous time in their lives. Millions of others of the older people who really built our Nation are probably beyond the period of full-time gainful employment, yet are capable of making significant contributions to our economy and community life if we will but give them the opportunity. Instead, a majority of them are being shelved and ignored and being allowed to deteriorate for lack of restorative health services, useful activity, and decent housing.

During the past 10 years we have heard a great deal of talk about this matter of aging. Surveys have been made by the dozen, books have been written by the score, and hundreds of committees have been set up in the Federal Government, in the States, and in communities throughout the land. Yet what has been accomplished? Here and there it is true that some promising programs have gotten under way. But, by and large, our greatest output has been words.

Now it is time for action. The purpose of my bill is to set action into motion. It calls for a national meeting of the best brains we have working on these problems of aging. The surveys and the studies which have been made as well as the many workshops and conferences which have been held throughout the country have provided much of the background we need for action. Now, I strongly urge that these people be brought together so that they can come to agreement on what should be done and how to proceed.

The Congress has done a great deal in the past to provide income security and health facilities and other programs to help older people and I am sure we shall have to do more. Yet I firmly believe that the major part of the responsibility will always lie and must always lie with the States and the community. For this reason, my bill provides that every State shall have the opportunity to call its own conference on aging prior to

the White House Conference on Aging. In this way, each State will have an opportunity to convene its leaders to determine what their own needs are and to bring their considered conclusions and recommendations to the national forum.

I consider it essential that we make rapid progress in the employment of older workers, in providing decent housing that older people can afford, in education and training, in improving their incomes, and in research on chronic disease and the aging process. I should like to spell out a little what I mean for I believe these matters to be of the utmost importance.

Let me begin with the matter of employment and compulsory retirement policies. Right now, we have serious shortages of scientists, mathematicians, technicians, teachers, and persons in other critical occupations. Moreover, the Department of Labor has estimated that by 1965 there will be 10 million more jobs to be filled than there were in 1955. And the Department of Labor states further, that fully 5 million of these jobs will have to be filled by persons of middle age and beyond. Yet we continue the absurd practice in many places of refusing to hire workers who have passed the age of 40 or 45 and the further shortsighted policy of forcing qualified workers to retire at a fixed age such as 65 or 68 merely because it is easier to administer a retirement plan on this basis. I fail to see how anyone can justify the practice of forcing qualified scientists, teachers, and college and university professors to retire at a time when we are frantically searching for ways in which to train more people for precisely these same occupations.

It has been estimated that there may be as many as 1,500,000 unemployed men between 40 and 65 years of age, and from 500,000 to 1,000,000 men 65 years of age and over who would return to full-time employment if they had the opportunity. There may well be from 2 million to 3 million women who could go to work. Admittedly, many of these men and women are not trained in the occupations in which shortages are most critical. Yet, we know now that most older workers give highly satisfactory performance and that they can be trained for occupations in which their services are needed.

In view of these circumstances and of others I could mention, I believe it is not only important but of the utmost urgency that there be held a White House Conference on Aging in order to pool the knowledge of those who do have experience in training and employing middle-aged and older workers and in administering flexible retirement plans and to determine what additional measures should be undertaken to reverse the present trend toward shelving older workers when their services are so greatly needed. I cannot understand why it is that when we have extended the length of life and presumably the period of physical vigor and health, the proportion of persons over the age of 65 who are at work should continue to decline. Yet this is precisely what has been happening over the past decade. I believe we should find out why.

I am greatly concerned about the question of economic security of our retired people and their dependents and survivors. The number of heartbreaking letters I receive every day tell of the plight of our older citizens who find it impossible to stretch their incomes and pensions to meet the increased cost of living and growing inflation. A brief glance at our cost of living only 10 years ago would explain why this is such a difficult problem. I am fully aware that the Congress has made provision—through the old-age and survivors insurance program, public assistance, railroad retirement, the civil service retirement system, pensions for military personnel and veterans—for retirement income for the majority of older persons no longer working. And I know, that in many cases, these incomes are being supplemented with pensions from former employers and by personal savings. Despite these advances, Mr. Speaker, study after study has shown that two-thirds of our older people are trying to scrape along on incomes of less than $1,000 a year. A recent nationwide study from the University of California compared the amount of income received by older persons with careful estimates of the cost of living. The conclusion reached by the California scientists is that almost one-half of our older couples and about three-fourths of our older individuals do not have enough income to live at a minimum standard of health and decency.

In October, I participated in some hearings which were held as part of a survey of Rhode Island's programs on aging. This study directed by the special staff on aging in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare brought together the leaders in aging from that Department, the Department of Labor, Veterans' Administration, Federal Housing Administration, and the Small Business Administration. A report of their findings and recommendations will be available by the end of this month and will serve as a useful document and an excellent example of Federal, State, and local cooperation.

During these meetings I was appalled to learn that many of the retired workers and widows in my own State do not have enough income to pay for maintenance and special assessments on their homes, for medical care, or even, in some cases, for transportation to attend religious services and recreation centers. We are living in an economy of abundance; the output of our total productive machine is greater than that of any other country in the world. I feel that we have a clear obligation to bring together the experts along with representatives of the older population itself to obtain the benefit of their thoughts and advice on how we can remedy the financial situation I have described.

It is not possible to explore the whole field of health at this time, but I do wish to point out that something like three-fifths of our older people are suffering from one and often two or more long-term illnesses and that many of these are in desperate need of medical care. Poor health accounts for more than one-half of the retirements from work today. At the same time these seems to be a rising opinion among medical people and gerontologists that much of the current disability and deterioration among older people is totally unnecessary. It was recently reported to me, for example, that in one of our midwestern States the mental hospitals are sheltering 5,000 older people who are there merely because their communities have neglected them.

I am told in some countries with an older population similar to ours, not a single hospital has been built since the end of the war. There are even empty beds in their mental hospitals. What is the explanation for this amazingly contrasting situation? Why are we in this country asking for huge appropriations to build more mental hospitals for our older people? Some have indicated that special hospital services, nursing care, physical and occupational therapy, housekeeping help, and even hot meals are being provided to older people in their own homes.

This is another area that could be explored by a White House Conference on Aging. My emphasis thus far has been on the financial aspects of hospitalization and medical care, but beyond these there are very important humanitarian considerations. Longer years of living will be nothing more than added years of misery if they are to be spent in sickness and in progressive decline in a mental hospital. Our older citizens want to be healthy and they want to remain in their own homes and communities. We cannot go on putting them out of sight in any convenient storage place.

There are some highly significant developments in the rehabilitation and restoration of older people in Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, and in other States. The experience these places are having can and should be shared with other professional and lay people in the State conferences and in the White House Conference on Aging called for in the bill I am introducing.

Much of the progress we hope will be made in improving the health and other circumstances of older people depends upon further research. A good deal of research is being done—on medical problems and the aging process, on methods of rehabilitation, on the psychological and sociological factors in aging, on the characteristics of older workers, and on other problems. I believe my colleagues will agree that it is important to bring some of these research workers together in a White House Conference on Aging and ask them to suggest how we may speed up the progress of research, for I believe that the increase in the number of older people and in their problems is outstripping the discovery of knowledge and the development of programs of action.

Now I should like to return to the important matter of housing. In 1952, we made an intensive study of the housing circumstances and needs among the older people of Rhode Island. One of the tragic conclusions reached by the Study Commission was that 33 percent of our older people are without central

heating in their homes and that 27 percent are forced to live in housing that is grossly substandard in other respects. More than one-fourth of Rhode Island's older population are living in homes that are dilapidated or without elemental sanitary facilities.

Among those who are trying to live on public assistance, the situation is almost twice as bad for some 53 percent of these were found in dilapidated housing or lacking the basic sanitary facilities. And let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that we as a society are fostering this kind of living. Every time a public assistance grant is made to cover the rent of an older person living in a dilapidated or unsanitary dwelling we are subsidizing the continued existence of that dwelling.

The picture I have been describing is that of my own State of Rhode Island. I wish that I could assure my colleagues here in the House that the older people in their own districts are living more comfortably. I cannot do so. The figures that I have cited for my own State parallel very closely those reported by the Bureau of the Census for the country as a whole. Decent housing for our senior citizens is a nationwide need.

Yet, I have not presented the total housing problem by any means. What I have described is merely the physical characteristics of the places our older people are forced to call their homes. I have said nothing about the tremendous loneliness and isolation of large proportions of our aged couples and particularly of the millions of older people who are widowed or who were never married.

During recent years there have been significant experiments in the development of both community and institutional housing for older people. No systematic studies have been undertaken, as far as I know, on the extent to which these various kinds of housing and living arrangements are meeting the needs of the older people who are living in them. I consider it to be of first importance that the people who are having the experience with this housing should be brought together to share with others the knowledge they are gaining and to make recommendations for broad programs of action.

Earlier I spoke about our wasteful policies regarding the utilization of middle-aged and older workers and I believe this matter is of utmost importance. At the same time we must recognize that the majority of our older people will have to look elsewhere for their principal satisfactions of living.

Some 60 percent, or about 4 million, of our older men and 90 percent, or about 7 million, of our older women are not working and are not likely to work again unless it is in some form of part-time employment. These people, all past the age of 65, by and large, have ended their work careers. These 11 million men and women and a good many more below the age of 65 represent the achievement of longer life; they are people whose lives have been extended beyond the period in which they made their principal contributions to society. It is they who helped build the country and to whom we owe a great deal.

The tragedy is that we have not found new ways in which they can be useful and enjoy the satisfactions of belonging and self-sufficiency. Our tendency has been to set them aside and to ignore them when we should have been providing new opportunities through which they could be useful. We have, in short, created longer life and more years in retirement without making them self-sufficient and meaningful years.

This, Mr. Speaker, represents to me the great tragedy of aging. Social isolation, lonesomeness, and inactivity lead to physical and mental deterioration and dependency. Unless we do something about it, I am convinced that we shall have an enormous amount of physical and mental breakdown which will fill our hospitals and old-age homes to overflowing and a growing population of embittered older people.

The most hopeful aspect of this situation is that older people themselves, for the most part, do want to be active and useful. In a few places where evening schools and libraries are providing special programs for them, older people are taking advantage of them. Activity centers are being set up around the country and are doing a thriving business in education, arts and crafts, and recreation—all of which are keeping older people healthy and happy. Here and there the older citizens have created work opportunities for themselves. Several cities report that older people have organized themselves and offered their services as voluntary contributions to their communities.

These are all good signs but we know too little about them and their spread is altogether too slow. A White House Conference on Aging could bring together those who are providing these opportunities, together with the experts on aging and representative older people. From them we should rightfully expect clear conclusions and recommendations as to the lines of action which offer promise of making the later years worthwhile for all of our older people.

I should like also to mention the need for trained personnel to work in many different capacities with our older people. Old age is a special period of life and there is general agreement that special training is required for those who are going to work with the aging and aged. This is true in the health services, in employment counseling, in adult education and recreation, and in the administration of institutions which minister to the needs of the elderly.

Let me give you one example, Mr. Speaker. There are about 25,000 homes for the aged and nursing homes in the United States and they are housing more than 500,000 older people. Yet, to the best of my knowledge, there is not one bona fide training program in the country through which the administrators of these homes can receive adequate preparation for their jobs. Perhaps I should remind my colleagues here in the House that many of us have relatives and that all of us have constituents living in these institutions for the aged, and, even further, that many of us may find ourselves in one of them before we are done with life.

Mr. Speaker, I submit it is very important that we bring together in a White House Conference on Aging those who are competent to develop the specifications for the training programs required and to develop recommendations as to where and how they may best be provided.

Within these few minutes I think I have made out a case for asking the President to call a national conference on aging. It is 8 years since the first conference on aging was held. Considerable experience has been gained in the interval and many additional organizations and individuals have entered the field of aging. I am certain there would be great value in providing them opportunity to come together, first in their own States and then in a national forum, to take stock of where we are and where we should be going. The first conference on aging stimulated a good deal of activity. A White House conference would stimulate more, and it cannot come too quickly.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island for introducing this bill to provide for a White House Conference on Aging in 1958. His proposal has great merit and he is to be commended for generating interest and feeling in this important matter.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY, is one of the best informed Members of this body on the problems of aging citizens in the fields of health and welfare. His long experience as a committee member has given him a thorough knowledge in these matters. He has been singled out and honored many times by great American health and medical organizations for the time and effort he has expended in the field of health, education, and welfare.

The gentleman from Rhode Island, [Mr. FOGARTY] has pointed out that the problems of our senior citizens are manifold. One of them is the housing problem. In the last session I filed a bill, H. R. 4084, to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a program for the housing of elderly persons of low income. The States cannot solve this problem alone. In my own State of Massachusetts the housing for the aged program is completely a State proposition, but there is a need for many more housing units than the State can provide. An adequate number of decent, safe, sanitary housing units for low-income elderly persons is a challenging problem that increases with the years as the number of our senior citizens grows.

I certainly hope that the Banking and Currency Committee will give serious consideration to my housing for the elderly bill and that this problem be given serious study by a White House Conference on Aging as proposed by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY. His suggestion for such a conference on aging is an excellent one. We must amass the thinking, suggestions, and experience of people who are now working in the health and welfare fields all over the country. Only in this way can we get to the crux of the problems facing elderly citizens. By means of such a conference we can merge the best ideas into a well-integrated program to assist in solving the difficult problems that our elderly citizens are now faced with.

## FEDERAL AID FOR STATE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY ROADS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to continue in fiscal years 1960 and 1961 the long-established programs of Federal aid for State primary and secondary roads and their urban extensions, as well as Federal funds for the so-called public-land roads.

This is the regular biennial authorization measure for this purpose. The bill itself is relatively simple in scope and does not seek to deal with the more complex and controversial subjects associated with Federal aid for the vast Interstate Highway System.

The bill includes no departures from established policy.

It recognizes the declaration of intent of the House as expressed in the last highway bill as it passed the House in April 1956.

Here are the words:

> Recognizing it to be in the national interest to foster and accelerate the construction of a safe and efficient system of Federal aid highways in each State, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress progressively to increase the annual sums herein authorized, for construction of projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions thereof in urban areas, by amounts which in each succeeding year shall provide an increase over the total amounts authorized for each immediately preceding year of not less than $25 million, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and continuing such progression in each of the succeeding fiscal years, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

In accordance with this expression of the House, and also in accordance with action on authorizations taken in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, my bill provides that the Federal aid for these systems be increased from the present level of $875 million to $900 million in 1960; and a further similar acceleration in 1961, increasing the total authorization to $925 million for that fiscal year.

This is a mild upward adjustment in the exact amount suggested by the House in the Highway Act of 1956. I trust it will encounter no serious objections.

The entire purpose of the bill itself is to continue the equal matching of Federal and State funds to produce improved rural roads and city streets which are part of the designated Federal-aid systems. Most all of the work is done under the competitive contract method and a very high proportion of the funds expended, often over 90 percent, goes into actual construction, exclusive of advance engineering and right-of-way.

I need not emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the importance of modern-designed roads and streets to human safety. I would like, however, to underscore the essentiality of primary, secondary, and urban highways as feeders to the national defense expressways which we are now building across the country. Those mighty arteries will lose much of their utility and strategic value if they are not interconnected with a web of adequate primary and secondary roads. Economically, the construction provided by the so-called ABC roads is the soundest that can be found in the field of public works. The projects are scattered through practically every city, county, and village in the United States. Nearly $1,800 million in Federal and State money is invested each year and it goes into the right places for maximum contribution to the Nation's economy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will move quickly through committee channels and have the early consideration of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland, whom I consider to be an outstanding authority in the Congress on the subject he has discussed, not confining him to that subject, but particularly on the subject he has discussed. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the method of allocation of mileage under the existing highway system.

In the last allocation of twenty-one-hundred-and-some-odd miles all New England got was 10 miles. Other States got very few miles. Does the gentleman's committee intend to look into that?

Mr. FALLON. I may say to our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, that a report has come to my desk today from the Secretary of Commerce explaining just how the mileage was allocated. I took a very hurried glance at it in order to get an idea of what it was. I am not sure that I understand the report, but it is the plan of our committee to invite the Secretary of Commerce to come before us in the very near future and ask him to go further into a detailed explanation of just what he means in the statement sent us today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I too received a letter from the Secretary of Commerce. I must say it was most difficult for me to understand his letter to me.

May I ask our friend if he will permit representatives of the several States of the Union who desire to do so to appear before his committee and testify?

Mr. FALLON. As always, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, we would be very happy to.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that also includes Members of Congress.

Mr. FALLON. And the Members of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to notify my friend that I will be glad to be there, because I am wholly dissatisfied with the allocation that was made.

I think a number of States have been discriminated against. This opens up the whole question of whether or not we should continue the present allocation under law or whether another one should be put in operation. I am satisfied now, however, with the statement of my good friend from Maryland. My primary purpose, however, was to compliment him for the bill he has introduced and for the remarks he has made.

Mr. FALLON. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended 1 minute to answer a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his fine statement and also join my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in requesting more mileage for Massachusetts. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts and the other Members of the House from Massachusetts are anxious to have more miles allocated to our great Commonwealth.

In connection with this great highway program it is startling to realize that we do not have even a cold war against death and injury on the highways today. I suggest that Members lay the groundwork for a hot war against unnecessary death on the highway. Just look at the figures. They are startling. We fight against having war between nations, but we are not fighting against one of the greatest killers in our own country today: accidents on our highways. I know the gentleman is interested in that.

Mr. FALLON. I agree with the distinguished lady from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Our country's most precious possession is its youth, yet that segment of our country's wealth, our youth, is the place where the greatest toll is taken by accidents of this character. We must make a real effort to check these shocking deaths on our highways.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. DIES (at the request of Mr. DOWDY) indefinitely on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FOGARTY, for 20 minutes today.

Mr. FALLON, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. HOFFMAN, for 5 minutes today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas (at the request of Mr. REUSS).

Mr. CELLER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BREEDING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VINSON in reference to a statement made on January 5 relating to the Joint Chiefs of Staff system.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. KILDAY and to include an address.

Mr. LANE on ex-Representative George D. O'Brien.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

Mr. KEATING in two instances.

Mr. MACK of Washington and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the memory of our departed colleague, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 9, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1418. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the 27th report on property acquisitions for the quarter ending September 30, 1957, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1419. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the number of officers in the Coast Guard above the rank of lieutenant commander who are authorized to receive flight pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1420. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report pertaining to the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, pursuant to Public Law 692, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1421. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1422. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (29 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1423. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1424. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1957; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 9812. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to discontinue the acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 9813. A bill to impose a duty on the importation of residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H. R. 9814. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1938 to allow acreage planted to the 1958 crop of winter wheat in excess of wheat acreage allotments to be considered in establishing such allotments for the future; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 9815. A bill to impose a duty on the importation of residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9816. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to transfer natural gas from the free list to the dutiable list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 9817. A bill relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9818. A bill to provide for the procurement of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 9819. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to allow acreage planted to the 1958 crop of winter wheat in excess of wheat acreage allotments to be considered in establishing such allotments for the future; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 9820. A bill to prohibit the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of switchblade knives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 9821. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 9822. A bill to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States before December 31, 1958, to be planned and conducted by the Special Staff on Aging of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other agencies of that Department and of other Departments and Agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 9823. A bill to amend the War Orphan's Educational Assistance Act of 1956 to provide educational benefits thereunder to the children of members of the United States Navy who were killed while on convoy duty in 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H. R. 9824. A bill to authorize the preparation of a roll of members of the Quapaw Tribe and to provide for per capita distribution of funds arising from a certain judgment in favor of such tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 9825. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H. R. 9826. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 9827. A bill establishing within the Library of Congress a translation bureau for the purpose of translating into English and indexing articles of a scientific nature appearing in foreign journals and periodicals received in the Library; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 9828. A bill to stabilize the market supply and price of farm-produced feed grains and livestock to insure the continuous ample volume of meat products for consumers and to provide equitable opportunity for farm producers to achieve income parity, to provide means of meeting natural farm production disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 9829. A bill to provide that certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees without regard to the existing limitations upon the time within which such a modification may be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 9830. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 9831. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9832. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that a bona fide resident of a State may not be denied assistance under the applicable State plan solely because of his failure to complete a minimum period of residence in such State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 9833. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9834. A bill to increase the amount of an individual's earnings which may be counted as the basis for his benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9835. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9836. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide more liberal terms and conditions for entitlement to disability insurance benefits (and the disability freeze) thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9837. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of the widow's insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9838. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9839. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9840. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide increased benefits for individuals who postpone their retirement and continue in covered employment or self-employment after attaining retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9841. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow under retirement age may continue to receive mother's insurance benefits in certain cases even though none of the children of her deceased husband are any longer entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9842. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $5,000 a year the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 9843. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the deferment of college students enrolled in science courses, and to provide that such students may satisfy their military obligation by employment in certain defense industries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9844. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code (relating to copyrights) to provide for the selective deposit of sound recordings of copyrighted works in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9845. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the charitable contributions made by a corporation which may be allowed as a deduction where all or part of such contributions are made to educational institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 9846. A bill to amend section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that the adoption of a child shall not terminate his entitlement to a child's insurance annuity thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9847. A bill to establish a Commission on Outer Space for the purpose of promoting the development and use of rockets, missiles, satellites, and spaceships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9848. A bill to provide for a National Capital Center of the Performing Arts which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on part of the land in the District of Columbia made available for the Smithsonian Gallery of Art; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. J. Res. 481. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 482. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 483. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. J. Res. 484. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 485. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. J. Res. 486. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. J. Res. 487. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 425. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 9849. A bill for the relief of Tsui Yung Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 9850. A bill for the relief of Theodore Psychos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 9851. A bill for the relief of Tsuyako Ikeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 9852. A bill for the relief of Palomar Memorial Hospital and the San Diego County Blood Bank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 9853. A bill for the relief of Toshio Yuzawa Hill; to the Committeee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 9854. A bill for the relief of Roma H. Sellers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

353. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Wellsboro (Pa.) Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, opposing any amendment to the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952 which would weaken the basic provisions thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

354. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Federation of District Boards of Education urging that Public Laws 874 and 815 be renewed in order to continue Federal school aid to impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Hon. F. Edward Hébert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, last night at the stroke of midnight, a record of length of service was set in the First Congressional District of Louisiana. I do think, Mr. Speaker, that amid the many problems facing us at the opening of this session of Congress, it is well to pause and recognize such accomplishments by men who have over the years gained experience by solving complexities of other days that will enable them to utilize their knowledge in guiding our Nation through the perilous times of the future.

My good friend and colleague, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, today has broken the record of length of service in Congress from his district previously held by the late Honorable Adolph Meyer, who served in this body from 1891 through 1908. HÉBERT holds high position on the Armed Services Committee and is chairman of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services, whose accomplishments during the past year we have seen. He left the city desk of the New Orleans States in 1941, thinking that he would be back in 2 years "a better newspaperman for my Washington contacts." Fate ruled otherwise, however, and instead, he was to

make a better Congressman because of his newspaper experience.

Aside from the brilliant service afforded by my colleague to his district, the State of Louisiana and our Nation, F. EDWARD HÉBERT has amassed such a galaxy of friends among his colleagues and others in high Government circles that his continued service will no doubt prove the wisdom of his constituency in allowing him to invest these many years in their service.

I am sure that I speak for the entire Louisiana delegation, Mr. Speaker, in wishing EDDIE and his lovely wife the fullest measure of success and happiness in the years ahead. We all look forward to serving with him for many more productive years.

Louisiana is a State rich in history, and especially has the First District of Louisiana contributed to the development of our Nation through the services of many illustrious Members of the Congress. The name of F. EDWARD HÉBERT will stand shoulder high in the roster of his predecessors, whom I enumerate for the record:

1805–09, Daniel Clark (Territorial representative).
1809–11, Julien de Lallande Poydras (Territorial representative).
1811–13, vacant; Senators Allen Bowie Magruder and Eligius Fromentin accorded privileges of House floor.
1813–18, Thomas Bolling Robertson.
1818–21, Thomas Butler.
1821–23, Josiah Stoddard Johnston.
1823–29, Edward Livingston.
1829–34, Edward Douglass White.
1834–39, Henry Johnson.
1839–43, Edward Douglass White.
1843–45, John Slidell.
1846–51, Emile La Sere.
1851–53, Louis St. Martin.
1853–55, William Dunbar.
1855–59, George Eustis, Jr.
1859–61, John Edward Bouligny.
1861–63, Benjamin Franklin Flanders seated in 1863 by wartime resolution.
1863–65, vacant; credentials presented by M. F. Bonzano, A. P. Field, W. D. Mann, T. M. Welles, and Robert W. Taliaferro but their claims were not finally disposed of.
1865–67, vacant; credentials presented by Jacob Barker, Robert C. Wickliffe, Louis St. Martin, John E. King, and John Ray and referred to the Committee on Reconstruction; no further action taken.
1867–75, Jacob Hale Sypher.
1875, Effingham Lawrence.
1875–83, Randall Lee Gibson.
1883–85, Carleton Hunt.
1885–87, Louis St. Martin.
1887–91, Theodore Stark Wilkinson.
1891–1908, Adolph Meyer.
1908–19, Albert Estopinal.
1919–31, James O'Connor.
1931–41, Joachim Octave Fernandez.
1941– , F. Edward Hébert.

## Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a resolution which would create a Hudson-Champlain Commission to celebrate the 350th anniversary of the exploration of the Hudson River.

Our country's very beginnings go back to a small number of intrepid explorers who piloted their small sailing craft across the Atlantic to expand man's knowledge of the New World. One of those explorers, Henry Hudson, an Englishman sailing under the flag of the Netherlands in 1609 went beyond New York Harbor to find one of this country's most important rivers, a river bearing his name, which forms part of the boundary between the great States of New Jersey and New York.

In the same year of 1609 the gallant soldier, Samuel de Champlain, sailing in the service of France, discovered Lake Champlain which forms part of the boundary line between the States of Vermont and New York. Since these two voyages were the beginning of settlements whose influence on our culture, law, and commerce extended through generations to the present day, and since the settlements thus founded became a link joining the old world with the new, I feel and I am sure all will agree, that it is only fitting to celebrate the Hudson-Champlain discoveries in order that we may rekindle in our present generation a respect and reverence for this country's keystone beginnings.

In 1959 New York State will celebrate the 350th anniversary of the voyages of Hudson and Champlain. Gov. Averell Harriman has already appointed a civic committee to promote this celebration. The newspapers throughout the State have been generous in their coverage of this forthcoming event.

On well-considered advice I am asking members of the New York State delegation in Congress as well as members of the New Jersey and Vermont delegations each to sponsor a resolution in this session, calling for the Hudson-Champlain Commission. The aim of such simultaneous action is to demonstrate to the Congress the unanimity which exists at the State level. Further, the provisions of the resolution are drawn to insure its bipartisan character.

## What the People Want, They Generally Get

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are anxiously looking toward this session of Congress to help in solving many perplexing problems which are giving every deep thinking American cause for concern today.

They are fearful that because this is an election year for Congressmen that politics might play too great a part in what is said and done here. I hope and pray that such will not be the case, for certainly the welfare of our people can not, and must not, be toyed with nor taken lightly by their public servant; the stakes are far too high. Of course, we will, as always in this land of the free, have our honest differences, that is good, but we cannot afford to let petty politics govern our actions. Let us give prayerful thought to all our doings, that this Nation, under God, may remain the most blessed land on earth. Let us heartily welcome the wishes, advice and council of every good American, remembering always, that what the people want they generally get. That being true, the best politics is in doing the right as God gives us the power to see the right.

In closing, let me say, Mr. Speaker, and I am happy and proud to say it, that, after being a Member of this honorable body for the past 19 sessions of Congress, and knowing the heartbeats of most all my colleagues, I have no doubt but that they will rise to their responsibilities as worthy servants of the people by passing such laws as will best guarantee the happiness of all the people and the preservation of our cherished liberties.

Please God, help us.

## Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Founding of St. Casimir's Parish, Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the year 1957 marked the 75th anniversary of the founding of St. Casimir's Parish in the city of Detroit.

The 15th District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, and our city of Detroit have many churches, but none is more loved by the people of our city than St. Casimir's.

The idea of a Polish parish was first originated and set forth before the archdiocesan director of Detroit, Bishop Borgess, in the year 1882. Shortly after, 6 lots were purchased at 23d and Myrtle and permission was granted by the bishop to build a combination church and school. The Reverend Paul Gutowski was appointed its first pastor, and his flock consisted of only 70 families.

In April of 1883 the first mass in the new church was offered and the church was blessed by the vicar general of the diocese of Detroit. By 1885 the parish had so flourished that additional space was needed to house the Sisters who had previously used the school as their convent. A new foundation was laid in 1889 and construction was started on a new church which would accommodate the rapidly growing parish as the old edifice had proved inadequate for the needs of the people. In 1893 St. Casimir's celebrated its 10th anniversary and its nearly completed growth was a reflection of the love which the parishioners had for their church.

This is the church and school which my own father attended in his boyhood.

It was his often expressed thought that it was the training and good example given by the priests and Sisters of this parish that contributed so much in his rise to the Congress of the United States.

This wonderful old parish has continued to grow in the hearts and affections of the people of Detroit. Its present pastor, my good friend and likewise a friend of my dad, Rev. Edward Maisel, has served his parishioners since January 17, 1920.

St. Casimir's former parishioners return to the parish from time to time and many of them were present when this wonderful parish celebrated its 75th anniversary this year.

St. Casimir's has given many young men and women to the service of God. Nine priests and forty-five Sisters have come from this parish. One of its sons rose to the rank of bishop, a high honor to this dear and wonderful parish. During the last war 510 young men entered the armed service and 23 gave their lives in the service of their beloved country.

This parish has a fine and splendid history. Its diamond anniversary is a source of much joy to those who have known and loved St. Casimir's for the great good which it has brought forth through the work of its priests, Sisters, and parishioners.

## Ex-Representative George D. O'Brien, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Hon. George D. O'Brien was a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the 75th to the 83d Congress, with the one exception of the 80th.

During that time he rose to the position of chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

From the wide knowledge he gained in that capacity, he became the understanding friend, and stanch advocate of better pay and working conditions, for all Federal employees.

At one time he served as operations director of the Government Employees' Council, AFL.

After leaving Congress, he became a member of the legal staff of the District of Columbia.

Last fall he complained of feeling ill and left his work early. He died of a heart attack while on the streetcar, heading for home.

The former Representative from Detroit, Mich., is fondly remembered by his colleagues for his Irish charm, his great and generous heart, and his devotion to the United States which he regarded as the hope of the world.

Another familiar face has departed from our ranks, leaving us with the solace of pleasant memories.

Thinking of him we realize how good and true is the judgment of the people in the men and women they select to represent them at Washington. And it reinforces our faith in the future of our free, and responsible, society.

At full strength, there are 435 Members of this House. But there is present also, though unseen, the thousands of Members who have passed on. Men like George D. O'Brien are with us in spirit, guiding us in ways that are immortal.

To his wife and five children we offer our sympathy, and our thanks for the privilege of knowing him during his exemplary journey through this life.

## Can Federal Gifts Buy Better Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Folsom's proposals to stimulate the Nation's education program are reminiscent of the WPA days of the New Deal era. Their implementation would introduce wholesale featherbedding into the field of education with little chance of developing dedicated research students who are animated by a desire to discover new fields of knowledge. Education is not a purchasable commodity. It is achieved only through incentive, diligence, continued effort, and sometimes self-denial. Education is the reward for the individual effort expended in its attainment.

This program is a short-range expedient designed to correct a situation growing out of a long-range period of neglect—failure to require a knowledge of fundamentals in the elementary grades and in high schools. Future science teachers and research workers will increase in numbers only in proportion to the degree with which basic sciences are required in the public schools' curriculums.

There is little incentive to pursue higher education in any branch of study until one develops a desire through exposure to the subject. High school students introduced to scientific subjects will develop researchers and teachers.

The first step in the right direction—and that is the recognized function of Secretary Folsom's department—would be to persuade the State educational systems to establish courses in languages and basic sciences as a requirement for high-school graduation. By this means exceptional students will begin to find themselves and will upon entering college continue their assigned work with confidence.

This long-range plan to bring our education system up to the needs of the times will require no financial obligation of the Federal Government.

That the need exists and that something must be done to prepare more scientists, engineers, and teachers to keep abreast of the atomic age there can be no doubt. That attempts to correct our dilemma by handing out dollars to basically unprepared high-school graduates cannot hope to meet with large-scale success is evident on its face.

In view of our unprecedented national debt and the urgency for an unpredictable expenditure of funds for the Nation's defense, it would seem inadvisable to inaugurate a billion-dollar program to further endanger our fiscal structure if any reasonable alternative is available.

I believe there is an alternative—one that will appeal to the commonsense of every boy or girl who wants an education and is willing to assume the responsibility for its attainment—one that will eliminate the ne'er-do-wells who, with no fixed objective, would be happy to enjoy campus association at no personal expense.

The alternative is a revolving student loan fund—a means whereby an ambitious student can assume the responsibility of furthering his education on his own, with the provision that the loan would be subject to repayment on completion of education and after his earnings begin. The cost of a loan program would be small as compared to Secretary Folsom's plan. The student would prize his education in the knowledge he had earned it. He would have learned the value of money, developed traits of strong character, and acquired the ability to contribute to the welfare of society and his country.

The problem of developing teachers, like that of preparing students for higher learning, will be solved in proportion to the extent they become interested in the study of sciences and the liberal arts when more emphasis is placed on these subjects as requirements for high-school graduation.

Parents financially able to educate their children should bear its cost, not subsidized by Government. Youths who are ambitious but not financially able to pursue higher education, should be encouraged in a manner as not to dilute their dignity nor weaken their self-reliance.

A student loan program can be easily administered through existing authority. It will aid only those who need help and deserve it. It will discourage further bureaucratic invasion in the field of education. It will serve the purpose of recruiting dedicated leaders in the field of education, trained by habit to meet difficult problems with confidence.

## Hon. Sam McConnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to express my regret that Sam McConnell, of Pennsylvania, is no longer a Member of the Congress. Mr. McConnell came here midterm in the 78th Congress. In the 79th Congress we both

served together on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It was there that I first came to realize his fine quality as a legislator.

In the following Congress he went to the Committee on Education and Labor of which he served as chairman in the 83d and as ranking minority member in the 84th and first session of the 85th Congresses. I consider his service on this committee outstanding. He presented highly controversial legislation with the utmost fairness and always with great clarity and distinction. His service was particularly valuable in discussing the President's aid to education program in 1956 and 1957. I believe that Mr. McConnell was one of our most useful Members and I lament his decision to leave the House though I fully realize and respect the considerations that induced him to make it.

My good wishes go to Mr. McConnell in any work that he may undertake.

---

## Results of Paris NATO Conference Confirm Prior Position of Democrats Which the Press Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the results of the Paris NATO Conference last month—December 1957—confirm as sound the prior position taken by many Democratic Members of this House.

Though our views were largely ignored by the press of our country they were considered news abroad.

I include here the text of the letter to the President under date of Friday, November 22, 1957; the press announcement of Monday, November 25; the telegram of December 11 to the President, and the press release regarding it dated December 12, 1957.

You will be interested to know, I think, that Mr. Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President, replied to the letter of November 22; while Mr. Bryce N. Harlow, administrative assistant to the President, replied to the telegram. This is, I think, a very interesting and revealing fact about the division of labor at the White House these days, and so I am including the replies I have received. While I have not checked into the matter I would guess that my colleagues received similar replies.

NOVEMBER 22, 1957.

THE PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We the undersigned Members of Congress have noted with approval the several proposals your administration has made in the wake of Sputnik I and II to strengthen the defensive position of the United States and the entire North Atlantic area. We regret that forthright action along these lines was not taken before the recent dramatic evidences of Soviet might forced it upon us. Nevertheless, we stand ready to support bold and imaginative leadership, which is now so clearly called for.

Your appeal for a pooling of NATO scientific resources, your announcement that you will ask Congress for authority to share atomic secrets with our allies, the proposal to create a NATO stockpile of atomic weapons, and the proposal to establish bases for intermediate-range missiles in NATO countries to offset the Soviet intercontinental missile—all these measures for strengthening our common defense are a necessary and appropriate response to the new and dangerous phase of the nuclear age into which mankind has moved. But they alone are not enough. We believe these efforts to shore up our defenses should be accompanied by the following measures designed to relax tension and mitigate hostility as well as to increase our strength:

1. We propose a simultaneous and substantial strengthening of NATO's conventional, nonatomic defenses. A wider sharing of atomic secrets, a NATO stockpile of atomic weapons, and missile bases in Western Europe increase the chances that any slip, by either side, will immediately burgeon into nuclear war. Although we must take the precaution of reinforcing our NATO troops with nuclear weapons, there is a constant danger of overreliance on H-bombs, missiles, and the other weapons in the arsenal of massive retaliation. At the same time we must provide the conventional means for throwing back a nonatomic attack without raising the conflict to the atomic level. It is only by a dramatic strengthening of conventional troops that we can destroy the assumption that any slip at all in Europe is the signal for all-out war.

2. We propose a new effort, in full consultation with all our NATO allies, to discuss with the Soviet Union the horrors of, and the alternatives to, pushbutton, nuclear warfare. The chances that such discussion will succeed may not be great but in view of the horrors of nuclear devastation who would say that renewed discussion is not worth the effort? At least, such a new effort will demonstrate our yearning for peace and the fact that our efforts to strengthen our common defenses spring from a genuine desire for security and freedom. At most, realistic discussions could result in relaxing the tensions which divide the Soviet Union from the West and provide a foundation for grappling with the problem of German unification, the disengagement of troops in middle Europe, and eventually the freedom of the captive Communist nations.

Whether we discuss these matters with the Soviet Union in a high level conference, such as was recently suggested by Mr. Khrushchev, or through traditional diplomatic channels, we will have a greater chance of success if we enter these discussions from a position of strength. A strong common defense in Europe will enhance our posture for these discussions and at the same time help to deter Soviet aggression and enable us to defend ourselves if we are attacked. We cannot afford to enter discussions with the Russians unless we have the united strength of the North Atlantic alliance behind us. To obtain this unity we must overcome the doubts about our desire for peace aroused by the rigidity of your foreign policy and its tendency to antagonize our friends by its moralistic preachments.

3. We propose the development within NATO of new means to coordinate the foreign policies of its members on issues vital to the peace and security of the entire North Atlantic area. A coordinated political and diplomatic approach is needed both in Europe and the Middle East.

A united position on the problem of German reunification, for example, would strengthen the alliance as a whole. In the Middle East, the Suez crisis last fall especially highlighted the weakness and disunity into which NATO had been allowed to drift. If Britain, France, and the United States had 2 years ago worked out a coordinated economic and political strategy to deal with the complex problems of rising nationalism and economic underdevelopment in the Mediterranean world, the tragedy of the Suez crisis never would have occurred.

The successful foreign policy anticipates crisis rather than merely reacting to one that is already upon us. It is in the coordination with the NATO allies of our economic, political, and diplomatic policies that the greatest opportunity for anticipating crisis lies.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
LEE METCALF,
HENRY S. REUSS,
GEORGE M. RHODES,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*Members of Congress.*

---

NOVEMBER 25, 1957.

In a letter to the President it was made public today six Democratic Members of the Congress joined with the Democratic Advisory Council in seeking to have the administration develop a greater sense of urgency in meeting the crisis caused by the Russian satellite breakthrough.

The Congressmen called for a strengthening of NATO's conventional, nonatomic defenses. They told the President "it is only by a dramatic strengthening of conventional troops that we can destroy the assumption that any slip at all in Europe is the signal for all-out war."

Signing the letter were Representatives EUGENE J. MCCARTHY (Minnesota), who has just returned from the Third NATO Parliamentary Conference, LEE METCALF (Montana), HENRY S. REUSS (Wisconsin), GEORGE M. RHODES (Pennsylvania), JAMES ROOSEVELT (California), and FRANK THOMPSON, JR. (New Jersey).

A second point made by the six Congressmen in their letter was that "We cannot afford to enter discussions with the Russians unless we have the united strength of the North Atlantic alliance behind us. To obtain this unity we must overcome the doubts about our desire for peace aroused by the rigidity of your foreign policy and its tendency to antagonize our friends by its moralistic preachments."

The six Congressmen proposed that a new effort be made to talk with top Soviet leaders and they asked, in view of the horrors of pushbutton, nuclear warfare who would say that renewed discussion is not worth the effort?

The letter was prompted by the NATO meeting next month and presented the President with the views of a number of Democratic Congressmen who have a higher record of support for the President's foreign policy than many members of his own party.

A third recommendation was the development within NATO of a coordinated political and diplomatic approach in Europe and the Middle East. The six signers noted that the successful foreign policy anticipates crisis rather than merely reacting to one that is already upon us.

In closing the Congressmen observed, "If Britain, France, and the United States had 2 years ago worked out a coordinated economic and political strategy to deal with the complex problems of rising nationalism and economic underdevelopment in the Mediterranean world, the tragedy of the Suez crisis would never have occurred."

---

DECEMBER 12, 1957.—Twenty-eight Democratic House Members yesterday wired President Eisenhower urging that NATO be expanded to give fullest consideration to—

1. Establishing better coordination of foreign policy among the NATO member countries;

2. Establishing improved machinery for executing decisions;

3. Discussing mutual financial, commercial, and industrial programs for improving the economic health as well as increasing the military security of the member countries;

4. Possible solutions to relieve basic tensions in the Middle East—the principal area of East-West conflict—with a view to developing a constructive pattern for dealing with similar areas where political and economic unrest provide a highroad for communism.

The 28 Democrats told the President "while we are keenly aware of the urgency of the military situation we emphasize that atomic bombs deter only atomic bombs, and we dare not continue to neglect the less dramatic but equally important factors which could have been so effectively exploited to defeat Soviet advances in recent years."

They assured the President that he would "find unwavering support for a program which proposes the broadest initiative. Piecemeal solutions will fail to inspire the confidence and the energy required to restore the full capacities of the alliance. Only by pooling the political genius, the spirit, and the determination of the democracies of the West, as well as our arms and our fighting power, can the counteroffensive begin."

The text of the telegram has been circulated for signature among a group of House Members during the past few days during which time Britain has presented basic proposals to NATO to start the evolution of that organization from a primarily military organization into one with many aspects of a scientific, economic, and political commonwealth. West Germany has announced it wants to discuss proposals for joint research and political consultations. Italy has urged the United States to join West Europe in a Mid-East fund with contributions based on a Marshall plan formula. And Governor Stevenson's NATO proposals lie in this general direction also.

The text of the telegram to the President and the list of 28 signers follows:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the eve of the NATO conference the undersigned Members of Congress are deeply concerned with the course which our delegation will follow at the Paris conference and the leadership which the United States will afford. We are indeed gratified that you are personally able to attend since the initiative provided by the United States representatives is clearly yours.

"We urge that you expand the NATO agenda to embrace more than matters of military and scientific cooperation. While we are keenly aware of the urgency of the military situation we emphasize that atomic bombs deter only atomic bombs, and we dare not continue to neglect the less dramatic but equally important factors which could have been so effectively exploited to defeat Soviet advances in recent years. Therefore, it is our conviction that the NATO agenda must be broadened to give the fullest consideration to—

"1. Establishing better coordination of foreign policy among the NATO member countries;

"2. Establishing improved machinery for executing decisions;

"3. Discussing mutual financial, commercial, and industrial programs for improving the economic health as well as increasing the military security of the member countries;

"4. Possible solutions to relieve basic tensions in the Middle East—the principal area of East-West conflict—with a view to developing a constructive pattern for dealing with similar areas where political and economic unrest provide a highroad for communism.

"Mr. President, we feel that you will find unwavering support for a program which proposes the broadest initiative. Piecemeal solutions will fail to inspire the confidence and the energy required to restore the full capabilities of the alliance. Only by pooling the political genius, the spirit, and the determination of the democracies of the West, as well as our arms and our fighting power, can the counteroffensive begin.

"Respectfully yours,

"HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, LEROY H. ANDERSON, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, WAYNE N. ASPINALL, CHARLES A. BOYLE, EMANUEL CELLER, CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., JOHN D. DINGELL, HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, CLAIR ENGLE, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, LESTER HOLTZMAN, ELMER J. HOLLAND, COYA KNUTSON, CECIL R. KING, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, LEE METCALF, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, CHARLES O. PORTER, LOUIS C. RABAUT, HENRY S. REUSS, GEORGE M. RHODES, PETER W. RODINO, Jr., FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., AL ULLMAN."

---

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, November 29, 1957.*

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The President appreciated your and your colleagues' November 22 letter urging various actions in respect to NATO and the Soviet Union. He asked me to respond that these matters, fundamental as they are to the conduct of the Nation's foreign relations, have had and will continue to have close attention, and that your suggestions in respect to them will also be considered. It was thoughtful of you to advise the President of your convictions on these important matters.

Sincerely,

SHERMAN ADAMS,
*The Assistant to the President.*

---

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, December 12, 1957.*

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The President has asked me to thank you sincerely for your and your colleagues' telegrams urging his consideration of certain items for the agenda of the NATO meeting that go beyond strictly military and scientific areas. He requested me to assure you that your suggestions will be carefully considered, and that he appreciates your thoughtfulness in making your views on these important matters available to him.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
*Administrative Assistant to the President.*

---

## Fellowships and Scholarships for Scientific Study

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1956, I introduced a bill, H. R. 11330, which provided for $10 million a year to be made available to the Secretary of Defense to be spent on fellowships and scholarships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions of higher education. Such selections were to be made on the basis of ability.

I am reintroducing the same bill but providing for $20 million to be spent in this same way.

This will make available somewhere upward of five-thousand-odd fellowships and graduate scholarships in these most important sciences. They will be given in both basic research and in research which is necessary to immediate defense problems.

This bill will have the effect of doing two things. First, it will furnish a new hard core of science graduates in fields where we presently are particularly short of skilled personnel. It will furnish a tremendous amount of new knowledge and incentive in fields which are today going begging. Research in fields close to our defense problem will be stimulated. Basic fundamental research will receive a tremendous assist under this program.

A large part of the study and research conducted will be done at American universities where those directing it will have access to some of the best men in their fields. Our universities will benefit immensely. Our Government will in this way purchase the facilities, services, and assistance of the best minds in the respective fields at only a small fraction of the real cost.

There is ample precedent for the proposals contained in this bill. Its forerunners are the National Science Foundation, Fulbright scholarships, and the research provisions of the Atomic Energy Act.

It is hardly necessary to go into the real reason for this bill.

In my statement of May 21, 1956, I set forth how Russia is outproducing America in engineers, technicians, and scientists. These are the people who will keep our peacetime economy growing and expanding, but they are even more vital to victory in the ideological war which we are now waging. They are indispensable to a pushbutton war fought with rockets and thermonuclear weapons.

To show the Kremlin's plan I again quote what Nikita S. Khrushchev had to say on this subject:

> We don't have to fight. Let us have peaceful competition and we will show you where the truth lies. * * * Victory is ours.

However, Russia will fight if we become too weak.

For example, the Soviet Union from 1928 to 1953 turned out 150,000 more engineers than the United States. America and Russia each have about 520,000 graduate engineers available. The Soviet Union has about 300,000 in engineering schools to 194,000 for the United States. The Soviet Union graduated 53,000 engineers in 1954 to 23,000 for the United States, or over twice as many engineers and scientists that year as the United States.

The Soviet Union's rate of increase in training of scientists and engineers is about 35 percent a year, while America's rate of increase in the number of scientists, technicians, and engineers is going to be under 5 percent a year.

Even more striking is the fact that the Soviet Union has all of its 520,000 engineers at work as engineers, while in the United States only some 360,000 of our 520,000 who are qualified are working as engineers.

China's rate of increase in the number of its engineers is 200 percent in less than 5 years. In America we will increase the number of our engineers to only 900,000 while Russia will have 1.2 million in 5 years. In my 1956 statement I said:

> We read constantly that Russia's ability to produce the intercontinental ballistic missile surpasses our own. We recently discovered to our surprise that Russia's air force is equal to our own in quality and superior in numbers in all types of aircraft.

Russia's ultimate plan is no different than it ever was: Complete and total domination of the world as described in the works of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. This does not necessarily mean by military victory but by economic, ideological or technical triumph. Witness the tremendous blow to American prestige suffered by the United States at the time of Sputniks I and II.

The passage of this bill is absolutely necessary to survival of this country. I hope it will receive early and favorable consideration.

---

## Bill Providing Graduated Income Tax for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill today which would provide tax revision for all small business conerns whose net income does not exceed $100,000. To accomplish this purpose, the bill employs a graduated or progressive tax policy, with the tax rate starting at 5 percent on the first $5,000 of net income and increasing in seven graduated stages for successive income brackets, with a top rate of 55 percent on all net income over $100,000. The bill is similar to one introduced by Senator SPARKMAN, for himself, and Senators HILL, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, NEUBERGER, KENNEDY, and MORSE.

The present tax laws favor big business and operate to the disadvantage of small firms. Small business has been caught in a triple squeeze of disproportionate taxes, credit shortage, and monopoly. As this country gears its defenses to the requirements of the missile age, past experience cautions us not to underestimate the significant part that our millions of independent small businessmen can play in the overall effort. Added to this, the present slump in business activity increases the necessity of providing tax relief to this vital segment of our economy and thus ensuring expanded productivity and enhanced economic opportunity.

The bill provides that the corporation whose income is $100,000 would pay about 17 percent less than under present rates; the corporation with a taxable income of $25,000 would pay 40 percent less; and corporations with an income of $5,000 would receive a tax cut of some 83 percent. This $5,000 category embraces about 47 percent of all corporations reporting net income.

Small companies have traditionally financed expansion by plowing back earnings. As the law stands today, after surrendering 50 percent of his profits over $25,000, the small-business man has proportionately far less than the big company to invest in research, cost-cutting equipment, and plant expansion. For most growing companies there comes a point at which they have run out of available owner savings and the funds of friends and relatives. Yet these firms are unable to tap the money markets for the credit that is available to their larger competitors. Small business in these straits has no choice but to place primary reliance on retained earnings which form its only reasonable source of new capital. The tax relief provided under the new bill would make possible the internal financing vitally necessary for the small business segment of our economy.

---

## Prohibition of Interstate Commerce in Stilettos and Switchblade and Gravity Knives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to prohibit the interstate commerce in stilettos and switchblade and gravity knives. This is one important way in which the Federal Government can help localities combat juvenile delinquency.

Under terms of the bill, the knowing manufacture, importation, or transportation of stilettos or switchblade or gravity knives would be punishable by fines of not more than $2,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. The sale or offer for sale of such knives with the knowledge they were carried in interstate commerce or imported from a foreign country would subject the seller to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. In the case of sales or offers to youths under 18, the penalty would be not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Specifically exempted under this bill would be common carriers and freight forwarders who inadvertently ship such knives and those who deal with such articles in connection with their use by the Armed Forces.

The recent rash of teen-age crimes and violence in various sections of the country emphasizes once again the magnitude of the challenge of juvenile delinquency. Increasingly, we hear demands that the Federal Government should take a more active role in coping with these problems.

Unfortunately, there are few areas in which the National Government can legitimately assist local groups in combating youthful terrorism. However, by helping to curb the sale and availability of the stiletto and switchblade and gravity knife—through the proper exercise of its power over interstate commerce—the Government can play a decisive role in depriving teen-age hoodlums of their favorite weapon.

Statistics indicate that in the last 5 years, 5 million of these insidious tools have been sold in this country. Their cheap price—95 cents to $1.29—brings them readily within the buying range of our younger people, and as a result they have become standard equipment with teen-age gangs.

When you consider that 43 percent of the total robberies in the United States last year were by people under 21 years of age, or that last year in New York City 40 percent of the felonious assaults were perpetrated by those under 16, the importance of juvenile crime cannot be discounted. In many of these cases, the switchblade or gravity knife was the chief weapon.

These lethal, vicious weapons can be concealed in the palm of the hand and then, by pressing a button or by a quick flick of the wrist, the blade can be suddenly extended toward the victim. There are practically no useful purposes for the switchblade or gravity knife—and none whatsoever for the deadly stiletto which has no cutting edge, only a sharp, dangerous point. Clearly, the few useful purposes for these articles are insignificant compared to the obvious criminal use to which they are put in most cases. Their presence should be stamped off the face of our Nation as soon as possible.

It is true that 12 States, including New York, have enacted laws in an attempt to curb the sale and possession of these weapons. Already Congress has banned them in the District of Columbia. But through nuances in design and by advertising and sale through the mails, these local laws are today being effectively circumvented. When local laws cannot effectively cope with a problem, the Federal Government is required to take up the slack. By vigorous application of the powers granted by this bill, the Federal power over interstate commerce can end this influx of stilettos and switchblade and gravity knives.

This proposal has the strong approval of local law enforcement officials all over the country who are, after all, in the best position to evaluate the need.

By prohibiting the interstate transportation and sale of stilettos and switchblade and gravity knives, we will at least be depriving teen-age gangs of their favorite weapon. Though this is by no means an answer to the deep challenges of juvenile delinquency, it is one way in which the effectiveness of youthful terrorists can be blunted.

I hope Congress will give speedy consideration to this measure.

## Annuities of Retired Federal Employees Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an address which I delivered on December 14, 1957, before the William E. Kelly Retired Postal Employees Association, Inc., in Brooklyn. I discussed the need for an increase in the annuities of retired Federal employees, as advocated in the bill, H. R. 607, which was considered by the subcommittee headed by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable GRACIE PFOST, during the last session.

The text of my address is as follows:

I would like to observe at the start, now that we are coming into the holiday season, that this will hardly be a bountiful Christmas time for our nearly one-quarter million retired Federal employees. We have not heard so much about it since Congress recessed, but the squeeze is on these people even more than ever. I can readily understand how their approach to the season of good will may be with a jaundiced eye—seeing not so much the spirit of giving but the fact of rising costs taking away from them everything they hold dear.

Before we get down to serious business, I certainly want to express my thanks for being invited here and commend the officers and members of the William E. Kelly Retired Postal Employees Association for the fine arrangements they have made. Yours is a really worthwhile endeavor. Informed interest and support for our retired employees could not be more sorely needed than it is right now. I predict that your efforts, and those of your association, will be crowned with success at the next session of this Congress.

When I accepted your invitation to meet with you, I was especially gratified at your expression of interest in my views concerning retirement legislation. The short but conclusive answer would be that my views are your views. Our retired employees surely have earned a generous increase in their annuities. It would be unfair—in fact, completely illogical and inhuman—to brook any further delay in recognizing their plight in terms of putting the comparatively small additional amounts in their pockets that they need to maintain a decent standard of living.

It is all very well to prate of budget limitations and fiscal affairs. But I submit that while these matters have their place, it is ill fitting for the greatest Government of the wealthiest Nation the world has ever known to have its loyal retired public servants going about with threadbare backs, holes in their shoes, and often with unfilled stomachs.

Our civil-service retirement system is not a financial institution. It is not a bank or business or an investment trust that must show a profit or whose books must balance between assets and liabilities. It was established with the single objective of providing adequate annuity incomes for Federal employees who completed their allotted span of public service and are entitled to look forward to spending their last years in reasonable comfort. These people do not ask for luxuries. They merely want what the annuity system promised them—adequate annuities for which they are willing to pay and have paid while working, to hold body and soul together and live in dignity among their fellow men.

Our retired employees and their dependents are suffering more severe hardships than any other income group because of the pressures of inflation. I say this without detracting in any way from the urgent need for salary increases for active Federal employees. Every organization of active postal employees is working hand in hand with you and other retirees to gain your needed annuity increases. But as to the retirees' problem, the cost of living now has reached a record high for the 14th consecutive month.

This hurts the retired employee more than any other person. A larger share of his income must go for medical expenses and care. Medical studies show that from one-tenth to one-third of those over 65 are ill a good deal of the time and have twice as many disabling illnesses as those between the ages of 50 and 64. These illnesses average twice as long.

Also, having small incomes, a much larger share of the retirees' incomes must go for bare subsistence and for clothing than is the case with active employees. The result is that the limited income of the retired person is far overcommitted in order for him to have the necessities of life.

There are those in Washington, on the other hand, who tell us that the civil-service retirement fund is overcommitted. Even if that should be true, I still maintain that we must approach this problem through the heart and soul, and not with cold statistics. When faced with the choice of a big balance in the retirement fund versus our obligation to the retirees—or, to put it more bluntly, money versus people—I choose the people. To me, the welfare and happiness of the people who have given a lifetime of loyal service to their Nation is more important.

The civil-service retirement fund is backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government and its tremendous assets. In my judgment, every public official, from the President on down, is charged with the absolute moral obligation of seeing that our retired employees receive due annuities, taking into account cost-of-living increases and all other factors in our economy.

Since we are getting down to brass tacks, I should like to ask those in the present administration, who thus far have frustrated efforts to grant annuity increases, why they have defaulted on their moral and legal duty to make the Government's contribution to the retirement fund. It was always understood that the Government would match its employees' contributions to this fund. I grant this was not spelled out in the original law, but nevertheless this was the understanding.

Up to 1952 there was some delinquency in Government payments into the fund. However, substantial amounts were contributed each year. In fiscal 1952 and preceding years, for example, the amount was upward of $300 million each year, but in 1953 with the new team it dropped to about $35 million—or about 10 percent. The next year it was even less.

But even that does not show the full extent of the lack of consideration for our retirees on the part of the administration. The new Civil Service Retirement Act, passed in 1956, contained two specific provisions designed to strengthen the financing of the retirement fund. I have no hesitancy in saying these provisions were largely directed toward removing the constant argument against increasing annuities because of the lack of money in the fund. The first provision now requires every department and agency by law to match its employees' retirement contributions. This is a payroll cost, so there can be no more of the falling down on this much of the Government's share as occurred beginning in 1953.

The second requires the Civil Service Commission each year to include in its budget the amount over and above the combined employees and Government payroll contribution, which is required to keep the retirement fund on an even keel and prevent any further increase in the deficit. Accordingly, the Commission did submit in its first budget under the new retirement law an estimate of about $200 million that should be paid into the fund out of the generous revenues of the Treasury. Somewhere between that time and the time the budget was submitted by the President to the Congress, this retirement fund item was stricken in its entirety.

I can see through this small-bore strategy. It sacrified our retirees to the golden image of a politically desired favorable budget presentation.

I could cite many other efforts to impede annuity increases, and I am sure you can do the same. But we must recognize this will not profit us. The immediate and urgent problem is, Where do we stand now, and what can we do now?

Earlier I predicted you would have an annuity increase in the next session. This I say because of the tremendous interest and support for such an increase among Members of Congress. Over 150 annuity increase bills have been introduced in the House alone. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on which I served for a number of years, overrode its chairman and other members who opposed this legislation and held hearings on these bills. Every known delaying tactic had to be met and overcome, and it was a major accomplishment. I want to pay my respects here and now to the chairman of the subcommittee which held the hearings, Representative GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho. She did a magnificent job for all of us who supported her. The subcommittee reported a generous but richly deserved annuity increase bill, H. R. 607. It was watered down considerably by the full committee, due to the strong opposition of certain members backed by threats of a veto and opposition of the administration. The committee bill, however, does provide at least some part of the increase needed. It gives larger proportionate increases to annuitants with the smaller annuities. Without going into detail, I can also predict that certain unduly restrictive provisions of the committee bill (amendments forced into it when the full committee considered) will be stricken when it reaches the floor. They are not only unfair to annuitants but are unworkable in practice. This will leave a cleaner and better bill.

H. R. 607 will have to be granted a rule by the House Rules Committee to reach the floor for a vote by the House. I have joined a great many of my colleagues in support of this bill and will do everything possible to press for early action. I am fully aware that each day and each week and each month that goes by without material relief adds greatly to the already intolerable burden of our retired employees.

They are not the cause of inflation. They are the victims. They should no longer be forced to bear more than their share of the load.

Have we forgotten so soon the recent flare-up over the increase in the price of steel, which is a basic factor in our economy? The President's suggestion for a tremendous steel price increase was adopted immediately by the steel industry. Other industries followed suit.

There is where the vicious circle exists and where it was started rolling. The upward spiral in the cost of living stems from that source. The culprit is to be found among certain greedy and selfish interests which seek greater profits, not among those who

seek a reasonable pay increase for an adequate livelihood or an adjustment in their retirement annuity.

You can look only to the Congress for relief. The administration has demonstrated it is deaf to your pleas. The Congress has not failed you in the past, although sometimes it has been a long, hard struggle to overcome what must be recognized as very strong opposition. We do not intend to fail you again in the present need.

## The Tale of Two Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, millions of words have been written about Little Rock, Ark., since that city was chosen by the Federal Government to force integration of the races even at bayonet point. Every press service has rushed its top correspondents into the area, and people who know even little of their own nation have heard the name of Little Rock.

How many have heard of another community in Arkansas named Wynne? Wynne is not as large a city as Little Rock. It is not the capital of the State and it is not the industrial community that is Little Rock.

But any person who would understand Little Rock should know about Wynne and the things that are happening there. For Wynne, a tranquil city, illustrates best the Southland that is rarely pictured in the Nation's press.

Throughout the South there has been an awakening. Industry and business have come and continue to locate there. Balancing the rural economies of the area are modern factories and processing plants. Wynne, Ark., located in the cotton and rice belt of eastern Arkansas, wants its share, and the citizens organized to work to secure a better balance of their economy.

Citizens of Wynne have been meeting regularly to plan their programs for progress. The mayor and the city council have reexamined their municipal situation, and the civic organizations have discussed their needs, their advantages and disadvantages. Out of such discussions came the desire to create an industrial development corporation to work with the State's industrial commission, and Don Joyner was elected president of the unit.

Their first task was to raise locally $50,000 to finance the industrial program. Another longtime civic leader, Mr. Whit Shaver, was assigned the task of raising the money.

To acquaint the entire citizenship with the program and what was needed, the fund-raising drive was begun on October 31 with a banquet to which were invited the citizens of Wynne and various State leaders in industrialization. Principal speaker was the president of the Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce. Mayor Harold Falls, of Wynne, was the master of ceremonies, and the scene was set in the Progressive Club building.

After the various speakers had outlined the situation, Mr. Whit Shaver called on the citizens to join in the movement and to assist in raising by donations the needed $50,000. The response was heartening. One real-estate agency immediately contributed $1,000. This was quickly matched by two of the outstanding attorneys of Wynne. One after another of the citizens of Wynne rose to make his contribution, and in a short time more than $16,000 had been pledged.

It was at this point that the whole story of Wynne and the Southland was revealed. For to the rostrum came one Cora Williams, a citizen of Wynne, who has earned her living for years in preparing the meals served at the Progressive Club for the various civic luncheons and meetings. This colored woman, equal to the occasion and proud of her community, came forward with her own contribution—$50; $50 to help build a better community.

In the immediate expression of Mr. Whit Shaver, it was "the biggest donation of them all." For in Wynne, as in other communities of the South, the citizens, white and colored, have developed a close friendship and a desire to work together in their own way to build and develop their land and their communities.

In her own simple but wonderful way, Cora Williams' contribution tells the true story of the understanding that exists between the races in the Deep South. This incident is a true picture, not a distorted one, that is painted so many times by some who do not know the situation that really exists.

Cora Williams gave her hard-earned dollars to build her community, and her $50 will be well spent.

The tale of two cities—Wynne and Little Rock. Millions of Americans have heard the story of Little Rock. Would that those millions could also know the story of Wynne.

As Whit Shaver said, it was the biggest donation of them all.

## The Most Reverend Howard J. Carroll, D. D., Bishop of the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on January 2, the Most Reverend Howard Joseph Carroll, D. D., was consecrated as bishop of the Altoona-Johnstown Catholic Diocese. We welcome this learned man and spiritual head of the 150,000 Catholics in Pennsylvania's 8 counties which his diocese will comprise.

Bishop Carroll was born in Pittsburgh, the son of the late William and Margaret Carroll. He is one of three sons, all of whom are priests. A brother, the Most Reverend Coleman F. Carroll, is auxiliary bishop of Pittsburgh. Another brother, the late Msgr. Walter S. Carroll, was attached to the Papal Secretariat of State in the Vatican City at the time of his death in 1950.

Bishop Carroll came to Washington as assistant general secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in 1938. He was named general secretary in 1944. He has been active on national boards of the United Service Organizations and last year was named by President Eisenhower to a people-to-people peace board. The French Government has made him a Chevalier of the Order of the Legion of Honor.

It was my great pleasure to attend the consecration elevating Bishop Carroll to the episcopacy at St. Matthew's Cathedral last week. In testimony of the occasion, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the concluding remarks of Archbishop Patrick J. O'Boyle in his sermon:

And for you, Bishop Carroll, all present pray in the words of St. Paul: "May God, the Author of Peace, who has raised our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, that great Shepherd, whose flock was bought with the blood of an eternal covenant, grant you every capacity for good, to do His will. May He carry out in you the design He sees best, through Jesus Christ, to whom glory belongs throughout all ages."

## The Late Walter Lynch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much saddened by the death of Hon. Walter Lynch, a former Member of the House of Representatives. When I became a Member of the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress, one of the first Democrats to speak to me was Walter Lynch, and I will always remember his genial and cordial greeting which put me at ease. During the succeeding years we got to know each other pretty well and when he left Congress I missed his wise counsel and friendliness more than I can say. He was a genial man who made friends easily and he was beloved by many. As a Congressman he was punctilious in his duties to his constituency, he was brilliant in his thorough study of the work before him, and he was an honest, straightforward thinker in whom people had trust. All his active life he sought to be of service to others and was loyal to his convictions and to his high standard of conduct.

Such a man is bound to be missed by many, but the imprint of his character, his ability, and his warm heart will linger long. I feel happy that I had the privilege of calling Walter Lynch my friend and I am sad in the realization

that he is no longer with us. My warmest and most sincere sympathy go forth to his widow and sons who are blessed for having had such a husband and father.

## Federal Employees Pay Increase Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, 1957, immediately after the President had so callously vetoed the Federal classified employees pay raise bill, H. R. 2462, and the postal field service pay increase bill, H. R. 2474, I promised to reintroduce those 2 bills at the beginning of the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

The pocket veto of these two bills brought about serious demoralization in the Government service. Government employees who were badly underpaid and suffering from inflation's impact on their salaries continued to move out of Government employment. A turnover rate of 25 percent a year in Government is not uncommon, with the best of Government employees leaving Government for bigger salaries with industry. The cost of training and recruiting competent Government employees is about $3,000 apiece according to the Hoover Commission. Add to this turnover expense the untold cost of inefficiency and slowdown in Government service for want of adequately trained personnel, and the resulting total is staggering.

In Detroit, Mich., the situation has been so bad that there has been a turnover of 5,000 persons the last 10 years in the Detroit Post Office. The total complement of this office is 6,500 persons.

In 1956 alone the turnover in Detroit totaled 600 people, half of whom were career employees with service from 2 to 20 years. The plight of postal employees and other Government employees is particularly severe. Many maintain a part-time job to supplement scanty Government pay scales. Many have wives working to supplement family income to give a decent living standard. For comparison in wage scales it is possible to work as a sweeper in Detroit plants for $2 an hour. However, the entrance wage in postal service is only $1.82 an hour.

When you consider that Government employees are expected to bear the utmost responsibility it becomes apparent that the Government is extremely hard put to secure people commensurate with the responsibilities of Federal employment. Recently the Bureau of Labor Statistics pointed out that it was necessary to maintain a take-home pay of $4,464 for a family of four to live comfortably. My postal pay raise bill would provide postal employees with the necessary take-home pay to live in this manner. When you consider that most postal employees are in the lower classification group of the Federal Government and do not receive many periodical raises, it becomes clear that the only way that most postal employees can achieve a decent wage is by having Congress adjust wages from time to time so as to be commensurate with the amount required to live decently.

My other bill will offer similar relief to white-collar workers, most of whom are in substantially the same pay grades as postal employees.

Two contentions of the President at the time of his veto should be demolished and can be done so in just a few words. The President maintained that these two bills were inflationary in nature. This is not so. They merely reflect a serious inflationary condition which is already striking at these Federal employees. The first bill gives Federal classified employees a raise of about 11 percent. The other bill gives a flat raise of $546 a year to postal field service employees. The total cost of the bill raising postal salaries would be about $275 million a year. The bill raising classified civil service employees would cost about $500 million. It must be noted that 20 percent of this total of about $800 million a year, or about $160 million, would return to Uncle Sam in the form of increased personal income taxes. These two bills total about 1 percent of the last $71.8 billion budget and about the same relationship to the bigger $74 billion budget projected by Mr. Eisenhower. The other contention of the President that these bills would materially accentuate existing disparities in pay scales is equally without merit. Wages of the very high grade Government employees, about whom the President showed so much concern, have traditionally been taken care of by bills applying to them alone. If this contention of the President had had any merit, he need not have vetoed these bills last year, but could have offered a bill for relief of higher classification Government workers during this session.

At no time has any Government official said that it would not be justified to raise salaries of Federal employees. The only testimony by the administration against these bills was that the raises would be disproportionate to salary scales offered in several State capitals. The State capitals picked were, of course, small towns and located in low-wage areas, which just goes to show that you can prove anything statistically if you take the right base or base period. The President's contention that the last Federal pay raise has not yet been eaten up by inflation is equally invalid. Again, the President played a statistical trick. The base period taken to prove his contention was so short as to make his figures mathematically correct but morally and ethically wrong. What the President should have done is to have gone back to July 1, 1947, when we would have found that today's Federal employee with a net annual salary at that date of $2,397 would now have a deficiency of $639.12 in real purchasing at the present net salary for the same grade.

The New York Times recently had this to say about the pay scale for Federal employees and I wholeheartedly agree with it:

> We expect of these Government employees a supreme loyalty and self-discipline not demanded in private employ. They are forbidden by law to strike. We should see that they are generously treated in return.

This is true. Moreover, simple justice demands that we pay Federal employees a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. Good sense demands that we pay enough to get good employees and not to drive the competent, able, and devoted Federal employees to seek other means of livelihood. The cost of that sort of practice is too much for the Government to bear. We can afford to pay decent wages.

## A Crash Program for Peace: Cultural and Technical Exchanges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have long argued that cultural and technical exchanges which can implement imaginative diplomacy, offer one of the major solutions to the present stalemate, and Paris NATO results confirm my views.

Strong and imaginative leadership by the President and the Cabinet could greatly enhance the prospects for peace but this has been lacking.

The NATO meeting has ended and not at all on the note sounded by Secretary Dulles in Paris and in Life magazine. Our soundest friends and allies in Europe have proved singularly unenthusiastic about our concentration on armaments, conventional and atomic, to the utter exclusion of the other aspects of the normal, peaceful intercourse among nations. America's leadership in the period since World War II has been based as much on challenging ideas as on its great power and dynamic economy. Unfortunately, these challenging ideas, which led to the United Nations and the Marshall plan, were noticeably lacking at this latest NATO meeting. It is to be hoped that quiet diplomacy may find a way of easing tensions and this could lead to an early meeting between East and West.

In a speech at a dinner given by the United Nations Association and the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, Lester B. Pearson, 1957 Nobel Peace Prize winner and former Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, said last week that the United States should make a move to open "serious and far-reaching consultations" with the Soviet Union based on recognition of a mutual interest in avoiding extinction. This seems to be a pretty convincing reason for consulting.

In a recent sermon, Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, the outstanding Methodist clergyman, summed up what European

peoples and the leaders of Europe at the NATO meeting apparently had in mind:

The seeds of peace and war grow in the minds of men, and we should not discount the force of public opinion even in dictatorships. Let us have more meetings of mind with the Russians. If we see no hope in meeting with the Kremlin political crowd, let us try meeting with the scientists, the physicians, the artists, and the religious leaders of Russia.

There are a number of things that might be done in Washington to increase contacts between the East and West at this time. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in a speech at the National Press Club in Washington last week, proposed the creation of a scrupulously nonpartisan planning board to formulate programs in all fields of competition with the Soviet Union. This has always seemed to me to be a pretty sound idea. In a speech to the National Music Council, meeting in New York City on December 18, I called for the establishment of a high-level strategy board on cultural and technical exchanges. I said such a board should be made up of such leading Americans as Sol Hurok, concert manager, Eric Johnston, head of the Motion Picture Association, and top scientists like Dr. Detlev Bronk, president of the National Academy of Sciences and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. The strategy board should help actively in the negotiation of such exchanges and must have greater powers than the existing Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange at the State Department.

Dr. Bronk was quoted in Life magazine, December 16, 1957, as saying:

Unless we have a far greater fund of new scientific knowledge and are making discoveries at a much more rapid rate than the Russians, which I do not believe, we should endeavor to learn from them. If people are friends we will wish to know what they know and are discovering; if people are our enemies we desperately need to know what they know and think.

Competitive coexistence in the field of cultural and technical exchanges can do more than any other single step to construct the defenses of peace in the minds of men. We can look forward with some confidence, I think, to the months ahead when European leaders, at least, will explore this matter on which depends the lives of ourselves and our children even if our own administration fails to cooperate.

I include here an article by the noted industrialist, Paul Hoffman, which appeared in the January 21, 1958, issue of Look magazine.

I am pleased to note that Mr. Hoffman has called for a program of cultural and scientific exchanges, also:

A CRASH PROGRAM FOR PEACE

(By Paul Hoffman)

The launching of mankind's first satellite into space should have been an occasion for universal rejoicing as a great human triumph. Instead, the Western World reacted with alarm and dismay. For it became obvious at that moment that the Russians have it in their power to wipe out tens of millions of us at a blow and reduce our cities to radioactive rubble. And though we have the power to retaliate, with equal or greater destructiveness, the consequences of such a war would be utter disaster.

No wonder we are alarmed: We live in a stalemate of mutual terror that must at all costs be preserved by military and scientific exertion; for no one can deny that the world requires an American capacity for terror to counterbalance the Russian terror.

But the notion that this stalemate resembles peace or brings us any nearer peace is absurd.

No American satellite carrying two dogs instead of one; no missile hissing 10,000 miles through space instead of 5,000 miles; no new bomb capable of wiping out 40 million rather than 20 million people will give us or our children any security against disaster. Producing bigger and better arms than the Russians will never be a lasting solution to the greatest crisis in history. What mankind needs is real peace, not stalemate.

By real peace, I mean simply a state of world civilization in which problems continue to exist among nations, but in which the nations agree to solve these problems in an orderly way, without the explosive tensions that have been so active and hovering a threat since World War II. This kind of peace will not just happen—it must be waged and striven for. It will require efforts at least as great and possibly greater than those of our scientists and engineers grappling with the complex problems of exotic fuels, reentry and gravitational trajectories.

Up to now, the biggest obstacle to real peace has been the attitude of the Soviet Union's leadership—a leadership that, for its own ends, persistently and aggressively has sought to exploit all of the problems left over and created by World War II. For what has developed in Russia in the past 40 years is a novel kind of society, expanding technologically, but governed by a bureaucracy whose basic motive is power. This Russian power bureaucracy is a closed oligarchy of men who distrust everyone—even each other. They are strangely uninformed about the Free World. They apply to foreign affairs their own domestic habits of unceasing struggle for power. And as world conditions change, they see in each change only an opportunity to increase their own power.

In all of 12 years of negotiation with them, we have been able to achieve only marginal agreements. There is no evidence that we can accomplish anything more—at present. Yet, to move toward peace, we must eventually have more fruitful conversations with them. Our problem, therefore, is to bring to bear on them—to engineer—new influences that will make such conversations possible.

I believe that there are already several influences or forces that we can rely on and encourage.

The first exists inside Russia. The very success of the Soviet Union in mastering a complex industrial system, its haste in training hundreds of thousands of teachers, scientists, engineers, and administrators, have created a new class of men in Russia, outside and apart from the power bureaucracy—but dominated by it. These men are our potential allies, whether they realize it or not, because they want what we want too—tranquillity to pursue their careers and improve their standard of living. Above all, because they are intelligent, they crave dignity; and since dignity comes only with freedom, a conflict of interest must always exist between them and the power bureaucracy. These new men in Russia are growing rapidly in number and prestige. Our problem is to get to them and, through them, to their masters.

There are also influences outside Russia that can affect the Soviet leaders. The support of the heads of satellite nations and neutral nations is a matter of deep concern to the members of the power bureaucracy in their endless jockeying for power and prestige at home. Even though we cannot get to the power bureaucrats directly, we can and should try to get to them through the Nehrus, Titos, Maos, and Gomulkas with whom they are in frequent contact.

Finally, there is the contagion of freedom.

Over the past 10 years, we have shortsightedly behaved as if communism were the most contagious of ideas, a disease of the mind against which we must quarantine ourselves. We have experimented with a vast assortment of devices—fingerprinting of visitors, cumbersome security procedures, postal censorship, visa and immigration regulations—that can only be described as fantastic. These are apparently based on the strange notion that our ideals cannot compete with those of communism.

The truth is, however, that events of recent years have proved freedom to be an infinitely more explosive ideal than communism. The East Berlin riots of 1953, the Poznan uprising and the bloody Hungarian revolt of 1956 showed that the ideal of freedom flourishes even in the caverns of Communist dictatorship.

It is against this background of stalemate and hope that we must now shape the strategy by which Russia's leaders can be persuaded to talk seriously about real peace. It is a rugged task and it will require substantial expenditures. But we cannot waste a day to get started on what we might well call a crash program for peace. Our defense effort since World War II—an absolutely indispensable effort—has cost us $443 billion; during the next 5 years, we may be required to spend another $40 billion annually on defense. Surely we can afford to invest at least $2 billion annually on a peace program that could make vast arms expenditures unnecessary for all time.

Our lines of action should be clear enough:

1. Our Government must take so clear and vigorous a stand in favor of peace that the whole world will know we threaten no one.

2. We should make it as plain as possible that we accept the right of other people to choose their own form of government, no matter how detestable it may seem to us; conversely, that we have no desire to force our ideology or our economic system on any other nation, that we genuinely subscribe to a policy of live and let live.

3. Our President should use the United Nations as a forum, to report to the people of the world on what we mean by peace and to challenge the Russians to do the same.

4. In the light of the new weapons—ours as well as theirs—we should take a new look at our entrenched military positions and see if any can be yielded without harm to our safety. We should invite the Russians to do likewise.

5. We should expand our technical assistance and economic aid to the developing nations, among them the 22 nations that have won their independence during and since the end of World War II. The quicker these nations become strong, the quicker the Russian leaders will realize that attempts to communize them will fail.

6. We should give our moral support to the program for promoting economic unity in Western Europe, which will help assure its continued prosperity. A Western Europe in which people are not only living happier lives in freedom, but also making a much better living than those in satellite countries, is our best assurance that the people there will continue to resist Russian domination.

Having clarified our stand, we can then tackle the problem of mobilizing all our communications resources to get the message across to the neutral nations, the satellite countries and, finally, the growing executive groups in China and Russia. This means making communications between us and the

people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains as free and easy as possible. For it should be obvious that the more Russians, Chinese and other presently insulated people see America, the better they will understand us.

Therefore, to spread the contagion of freedom, we should:

Revise our visa regulations with a view to stimulating rather than restricting contact between the Communist world and our own.

Offer at least 2,000 scholarships a year in our universities to students from the Communist world and another 2,000 to students of the new non-Communist nations of Asia and Africa.

Arrange for scientific and cultural congresses to be held in our country with visiting scientists and artists from the Soviet world.

Meet the hunger for information in the Soviet world by a planned program of publication in the Russian language of books and periodicals that their own censorship prevents them from reading. In 1956, 548,000 Russians went to other countries on business and as tourists; they would find these books and periodicals on foreign newsstands.

Immediately increase the size and scope of the American information program abroad. The entire budget of our USIA informational activities abroad from June 1957, to July 1958, was only $95 million. By contrast, it is estimated that the last Youth Festival cost the Russians $100 million.

Finance whatever research is necessary to prevent the jamming of our broadcasts beyond the Iron Curtain.

Offer the Russians equal time on the Voice of America or Radio Free Europe to answer our questions or try to refute our statements.

Our immediate objective is to reach the groups within and without the Soviet Union who can influence their leadership. But we must continue our policy of creating a larger, more closely knit world community.

This requires an unrelenting effort to make the United Nations the sounding board of our ideas; it means that, as far as practicable, we must channel our technical assistance and economic aid through the United Nations; it means we must continue our efforts to break down the barrier between East and West.

But it means more than that, for we wish to create a community of world interests in which all people may join. Any number of new projects serving this end, large or small, come to mind:

We might help finance ourselves, or invite the Russians to join us in financing, the completion of the new All-India Institute of Medical Sciences, at present delayed for lack of funds.

We might do something as small and homely as building a hostelry in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia, simply to offer shelter to the many scholars and scientists of the United Nations who are there to help that nation develop its resources.

We might do something as technical and germinal as the launching of a series of small international organizations, including the Russians, to work in common on the frontiers of nature and technology—to make a coordinated research attack, for instance, on incurable diseases.

We might do something as broad and diffuse as financing the teaching of English all over the world as a highway for our ideas to travel.

No such set of suggestions as those in this article can pretend to be a blueprint for waging peace. For this, our Government ultimately, soon rather than late, must set up some kind of a supreme council of peace, with the same authority as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to consider and carry out all the ideas the fertile American imagination can dream up.

What I have tried to stress here is that we must pursue peace actively—with boldness, imagination, and dedication. The alternative is stalemate. And stalemate—let's face it—means the end of our way of life.

---

## Postal Rates

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a statement by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN. Senator HAYDEN testified recently before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service concerning the need for increases in postal rates.

Senator HAYDEN is to be commended for his forthright approach to the problem of adequate postal rates for the users of the mail.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARL HAYDEN, DEMOCRAT, OF ARIZONA, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, AT THE POSTAL RATE HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, UNITED STATES SENATE, DECEMBER 12, 1957

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I asked permission to appear before your committee today to seek relief from an intolerable burden that has been imposed upon the members of my committee each year since 1945 which was the last year when the revenues received by the Post Office Department exceeded its expenditures. I have been a Member of Congress for 45 years. During the first 34 years of my service in the House and Senate, the average annual deficit of the Post Office Department was less than $40 million. Beginning in 1946 the total postal deficit has now reached the enormous sum of over $5 billion, or an average of over $450 million a year. I shall include in the record a table showing the deficit for each year.

That $5 billion was all borrowed money. If the Post Office Department revenues had been kept in pace with its expenditures during the past 12 years, the annual interest cost on that sum of money at 3 percent, amounting to $150 million, would have been saved to the American taxpayers during the present fiscal year.

Along with other Senators and Congressmen, I attended a conference at the White House on the third of this month where we were briefed on what will have to be done if our Nation is to prevail in its resistance to worldwide communism. We were told that, among other costs, the Department of Defense must have at least $2 billion over and above the appropriations now available to it. The only way to obtain that large sum of money is to borrow it from the American people.

This raises the question of exceeding the national debt limit which is now $275 billion. I telephoned to the Treasury Department yesterday and was told that last Friday it was announced that the national debt amounted to a little over $274,000 million and from now until next March, when the revenues will increase, it is estimated that the Treasury will be within a few hundred million of the $275 billion debt limit.

If the Post Office Department had been paying its own way for the past 12 years instead of a debt of over $5 billion, there would today be at least that amount of a margin below the $275 billion debt limit. Evidently, consideration will now have to be given to that limit if the United States is to continue to be in a position either to prevent or to win a war with Soviet dominated communism.

You may remember, Mr. Chairman, that last spring the House Committee on Appropriations was greatly disturbed by the size of the deficiency appropriations asked for by the Post Office Department and refused to provide for all of the money that was requested. My committee concurred in the action taken by the House of Representatives, but when the postal authorities clearly demonstrated that essential services to large numbers of the American people could not be maintained unless more money was provided Congress was compelled to make the necessary sums available.

I am here today, Mr. Chairman, to urge your committee to relieve the members of my committee and the members of the House Committee on Appropriations from having to recommend appropriation of money which they know is not available in the Treasury, and which will have to be borrowed from some source, in order to pay the continuously increasing cost of carrying on the work of the Post Office Department. Due to the increase in the work to be performed by the Post Office Department, there is sure to be a request for more money next spring to carry it on.

If every other civilized country in the world can make its postal service pay its own way, why cannot our Government do it? Other nations not only recover the cost of such services but make a profit from it. The British Post Office pays £5 million annually to the treasury in lieu of taxes. I am sure that you will be interested in a recent news dispatch from London, which reads:

"The British Post Office today reported its first postal deficiency in 35 years. Postmaster General Marples blamed the shortage of £3,086,938 ($8,643,428) to staff pay raises during the year, totaling £4.7 million ($13,160,000). Postal and telephone charges were recently increased to offset the pay grants."

Our own Congress has enacted six postal pay increases since 1946 which have added more than $1.3 billion to annual postal costs. I well remember that the amount of the appropriations to pay the Post Office Department deficit made early in 1947 was almost the exact amount of the cost of the 1946 pay raise.

All told, the Post Office Department has faced cost increases of 110 percent since 1946, including increases in railway mail pay and general increases in the prices paid for other services and supplies. In contrast, the rate increases passed by Congress have brought in additional revenues amounting to little more than one-fifth of the additional cost of wages alone. The 3-cent rate in effect today is the same as that established in 1932.

I am firmly convinced that it is the obvious duty of your committee to pick up the slack. The Post Office Department cannot in good conscience be operated year after year in a way that adds large sums of money to the national debt. I am informed that other nations have faced up to this need so why cannot we do it?

I should like to submit for the record a table prepared at my request by the Post Office Department showing a list of letter mail rates now charged by 29 foreign nations ranging from 4.0 cents to 10.9 cents. The table shows that France, for example, charges 5.7 cents for letter mail. Belgium charges 5 cents, as does Canada on the first ounce of its nonlocal mail. These countries

charge higher rates for their letter mail even though their wage scales for postal workers are far below those in effect in the United States.

I am encouraged by the fact that your committee is holding hearings with a view to increasing mail rates. I can think of no single action which the Congress could take which would contribute more toward a balanced budget in this fiscal year 1959 or which would receive more widespread public support than the virtual elimination of the present huge postal losses. At a time when pressure is mounting to increase defense spending, we can no longer afford to continue to heavily subsidize users of the mails. It is high time that those who benefit from mail services pay proper rates for what they receive.

My sincere hope is that your committee will report an adequate bill so that the Senate may take prompt action to put the Post Office Department on a sound financial basis which will undoubtedly lead to improved service. This will end an economic travesty whereby American taxpayers pay for postal losses that will soon approximate a billion dollars a year. We must do away with the prevailing postal subsidies so when appropriations are made for expenditures by the Post Office Department we will know that money from its own earnings is in the Treasury to pay its bills.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for listening to me and hope that what I have said will be helpful to your committee.

*Postal deficits since 1946*

| Year: | *Millions of dollars* |
|---|---|
| 1946 | 129.1 |
| 1947 | 205.7 |
| 1948 | 276.8 |
| 1949 | 577.5 |
| 1950 | 545.5 |
| 1951 | 564.6 |
| 1952 | 719.5 |
| 1953 | 650.4 |
| 1954 | 399.1 |
| 1955 | 362.7 |
| 1956 | 464.0 |
| 1957 | 521.9 |
| Total | 5,416.8 |

*Changes in domestic postage rates of 29 foreign nations since January 1953*

| Country | Old rate [1] | New rate [1] |
|---|---|---|
| | *Cents* | *Cents* |
| Belgium | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Canada | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Denmark | 3.6 | 4.3 |
| Dominican Republic | 3.0 | 7.0 |
| Ecuador | 1.3 | 5.3 |
| Finland | 7.3 | 10.9 |
| France | 4.3 | 5.7 |
| Guadeloupe | 4.3 | 5.7 |
| Martinique | 4.3 | 5.7 |
| French Guiana | 4.3 | 5.7 |
| French Equatorial Africa | 2.8 | 5.7 |
| French Somaliland | 2.3 | 7.0 |
| Reunion | 4.6 | 5.7 |
| Madagascar | 3.4 | 6.8 |
| New Caledonia | 3.1 | 4.7 |
| French Cameroons | 4.0 | 8.5 |
| French Togoland | 1.7 | 8.5 |
| Greece | 4.6 | 6.5 |
| Guatemala | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| Indonesia | 2.6 | 4.4 |
| Iceland | 6.1 | 10.7 |
| Israel | 1.1 | 5.6 |
| Jordan | 2.8 | 4.2 |
| Morocco | 2.9 | 5.8 |
| Sweden | 4.8 | 5.8 |
| Tunis | 4.3 | 5.8 |
| Turkey | 5.4 | 7.1 |
| Yugoslavia | 1.0 | 4.9 |
| Uruguay | 3.7 | 5.3 |

[1] Rates listed are for the 1st unit of weight for nonlocal mail. Foreign money converted at exchange rates in effect Dec. 1, 1957, in the table of equivalents published by the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

## Address by Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York, at the American Nobel Anniversary Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by me at the American Nobel anniversary dinner, in New York City, January 11, 1958:

I address this distinguished group of individuals who, in many distinct areas, have underscored the wondrous gift of mind and heart given to man. I have used the word "wondrous" as the most apt in the literally hundreds of adjectives I have considered and rejected. Is it because most of us have put away the sense of wonder that we have lost our way in a grating world of international rivalries, of clashing hates and prejudices, of poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy? For all is not best in this best of all possible worlds.

"Wonder" is a word compounded of and by the inquiring mind, the search, examination not only of facts but of self, the recognition that the making of a choice is an unavoidable responsibility. All these and more reside in wonder. Complacency, smugness, self-righteousness, can find no habitat in the heart and mind which constantly asks "Why?"

We in the United States are presently being pushed to the border of hysteria with the advent of sputniks. National vanity, as distinguished from pride, and national fear are mixed together to send us into hasty improvisations and makeshift planning. If the East and West, in deadly embrace, are not to annihilate each other, one or the other must unclinch. It matters not who unclasps first. May I quote one of our honored speakers here this evening—the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, of Canada. He said recently, "The grim fact is that we prepare for war like precocious giants and for peace like retarded pigmies." "What I plead for," he added, "is not a spectacular meeting of a Big Two or a Big Three or a Big Four at the summit, where the footing is precarious and the winds blow hard, but for a frank, serious and complete exchange of views—especially between Moscow and Washington—through diplomatic and political channels." Perhaps some of the answer lies in following Mr. Pearson's advice. Mayhap both East and West would then unclinch together. The lack of emphasis on basic research, the dearth of scientists, the interservice rivalry we are so frantically discussing today, are not conditions we never before suspected. We have talked about these deficiencies for over a decade. We knew that the Soviet Union, as had we, had set itself high technological goals to be translated into satellites and missiles. Why, therefore, are we now reacting with shock and hysteria? Obviously, the reason must be in the nature of self-excuse because we were comfortable in our inertia and complacency. We failed to wonder.

I say that the Western World is on the verge of an even greater tragedy. I have no doubt that the free world will succeed in matching Soviet technological strength. We who can put fins on automobiles can put them successfully on missiles. We, too, shall place a satellite in orbit. I have no doubt that the sudden emphasis on training in science will produce more scientists. But after that, what? Is our thinking to be perpetuation of hates, translated into matching and outmatching the possession of weapons of destruction? Is this generation, and the generations to come, to live in the climate of fear and rivalry? Are our incentives to be fashioned to outhate and outrival?

That we must have strength as a deterrent I do not question. I have no quarrel with the concept that science and scientific thinking must go forward. But I ask, "Toward what end?" How hard and clear is our national thinking on the political and social frontiers? Are we saying that war is the only answer? If we are, then let us be honest about it, for we seem to be providing no other answers.

Just now there is danger in this country that we may be panicked into a deification of science and scientists. Of what avail if all our emphasis were placed on the training of scientists without men of learning, scope, and humanity to make the policy that puts to use the ingenuity of science? Science, basic and applied, yes. But, also history, diplomacy, geopolitics, languages, philosophy, demography, geography, political science. What we really must have in the interests of world peace is a balance between emphasis on science and emphasis on the humanities. Nor are these emphases by any means mutually exclusive. I repeat, scientists as such do not and should not make policy, and policy is what we sadly lack today. Good policy is born out of knowledge and the ability to correlate and the ability to know what is or what is not important.

We are confronted with the flaring up of nationalism in the underdeveloped countries of the world. We are confronted with regional animosities we refuse to face squarely. We have recently found a new political formula; namely, that of partition, partitions which carry in their wake the misery of the refugee and the smouldering emotions of revenge. We look aside and wistfully wish that, like the goblins of old in a shadowed bedroom, they will disappear if we do not look.

Another step, as we know, toward finding the answers, is to ask the questions. We are not asking them. There are those who will say, "One step at a time." But how can we take any step if we do not know what road we wish to travel?

We are now being asked to embark on a crash program on the training of scientists. Good—but only so good as far as it goes. I assert, however, most vigorously, that it does not go far enough. And by "it," I mean education for a free citizen. For education of a free citizen does not only demand objectivity in the marshaling of facts, but must as well deal with the subtleties of objectivity in appreciation of literature, music, the visual arts, the humanities. It encompasses self-appraisal along with appraisal of the world around us.

In my 34 years' experience as a legislator, I have found that one of our largest failures in education has been the failure to teach and to learn how to listen. We are miserably prepared in this age of advertising and propaganda to keep our own integrity. Nor do I say that this is our own tragic lack, but the major lack in the world today. The world today is subjected to blandishments of every kind, from the virtues of a toothpaste to the virtues of a political system. We, the people of the world, have developed too little immunity to the cajolery, the bluster, the flattery. Were it not so, we would not today be engaged in the battle of semantics that separates people from people. We have not learned how to extract the core of the truth from the husk in which it is embedded. Herein have we failed, and just

so long as that failure continues, just so long do we court the ultimate disaster.

I am not in a mood of optimism, nor do I feel it necessary in this company to make any pretense that I am. The urgency is upon us now, whether we like it or not, to ask why, in a world so rich in resources, rich in imagination, rich in potential, in a world that can launch manmade satellites, erect cathedrals of awesome beauty, find in the earth and the air and in the seas incomparable wealth—why, in a world like this, do we face today the threat of total annihilation? It makes no sense.

I therefore plead, if there is time, let us at least begin again with the young, permitting them to keep their sense of wonder, to learn the disciplines that come with self-knowledge, and with the knowledge of the wondrous world of arts and sciences which is for the asking—if only we permit them to ask.

Let us acknowledge the world is sick with self-righteousness and self-pity and ask ourselves, "Why must this be?" Is the answer world government? If so, so be it. Is there an answer in a United Nations where all governments belong, and a United Nations to restrain the evils of aggression? If so, so be it. Is nationalism itself, in a world of intercontinental missiles and hydrogen bombs, a concept no longer valid? Is it the unevenly divided world of have and have-nots? Or is it the war within each man himself which, as the first step, needs must be controlled?

These are some of the questions modern man must face and must answer. Questions, mayhap, you can help answer.

## Winter Wheat Overseeding Penalty Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation of a remedial nature designed to exempt 1957 winter wheat planters from suffering under the overseeding penalty provisions of our present agricultural laws.

Congress approved, in 1957, a farm measure which freed 30-acre wheat producers from farm law penalty payments on wheat grown exclusively for use as feed or seed on the farm. Subsequently, Secretary of Agriculture Benson's Department, on the basis of that legislation, ruled that wheat producers were liable, as penalty for overseeding, to reductions of base acreage allotments. Thus, the wheat farmer finds himself faced with the possibility of double punishment: penalty fines should he decide to sell the product of his overseeding and reductions of his base acreage allotments.

The Agriculture Department's interpretation of the penalty provisions of the law may or may not be correct. But, as a matter of simple justice and fairness, I cannot imagine that Secretary Benson means to punish winter wheat farmers for overseeding when they had no knowledge of the law or of its possible penalties until after they had completed their planting procedure.

The law in question was passed by the Congress on August 26, 1957, signed by the President 2 days later, but no word of the new restrictions contained in the law arrived in the Kansas State ASC—Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation—office until September 25. Some county offices received no notice until almost November.

Meanwhile, winter wheat planting operations were completed. Winter wheat operators in my area begin planting as early as August 15. Under the revised law, there simply was not sufficient time for the farmer to realize that he could be doubly penalized for overseeding.

To illustrate the case in point, the Lamar (Kans.) Daily News, on December 14, 1957, describing a discussion of the wheatgrowers' overseeding problems by Fred M. Betz, Sr., of Lamar, states:

> He [Betz] told of one Lincoln County farmer who had had four successive failures, and who had always been in compliance and now felt he should overseed because of the crop prospects. Ordinary procedure in the past has been that overseeding could be allowed to compensate for prior crop failures, or that penalties could be paid, but without affecting the grower's allotment. There is not time under the revised law, and the farmers throughout the drought find themselves facing a threat of loss of allotment because they are in violation of a law which they knew nothing about until almost two and a half months after they had planted.

Certainly, an inequity of this magnitude is deserving of immediate attention and correction.

## California Attorney's Comments on Presidential Disability Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the most important legal question facing our country is: How can we provide the Federal Government with uninterrupted leadership in the event of physical disability of the President? President Eisenhower has urged early action by the Congress to meet this problem.

Recently, I sent a questionnaire to the members of the California bar soliciting views on this important issue. A great volume of replies has been received. I believe the opinions of my fellow lawyers in California would be beneficial to the Congress and to my colleagues who serve with me on the Committee on the Judiciary which has jurisdiction in this field. In my letter, I outlined four basic proposals now before the Congress and requested any additional views. I have already advised the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], of the following results of my survey:

First. Finding of disability and removal of the President by action of the Cabinet—12 percent.

Second. Finding of disability and removal of the President by a commission headed by the Chief Justice of the United States and composed of representatives of the legislative and judicial branches of Government—48 percent.

Third. Finding of disability and removal of the President by Congressional action similar to existing impeachment process—12 percent.

Fourth. Finding of disability by the Vice President and assumption by him of the Office of President—2 percent.

Some California attorneys did not support any of the four proposals outlined in my letter. Many urged that a medical commission be established headed by the Surgeon General or the president of the American Medical Association to conduct periodical physical examinations. The lawyers proposing this idea urged that such a commission be authorized to certify the Vice President as the Chief of State if it should find that the President's physical condition would not allow him to carry out the duties of his office.

Others urged that the Supreme Court review medical evidence of the President's condition and issue an order directing the Vice President to assume the Office of President if the Court felt that the President could not carry on.

Mr. CELLER has advised me that the opinions of the California attorneys will be made available to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary to assist in their deliberations. I am most grateful to my colleagues in the California bar for giving Congress the benefit of their advice on this problem.

## Address by Senator Harry F. Byrd Before the National Association of Manufacturers, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, Thursday, December 5, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on December 5, 1957, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, senior United States Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia, delivered an able address before the National Association of Manufacturers at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following complete text of Senator BYRD's address:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1957

You have given me the privilege of meeting with the National Association of Manufacturers many times before. It has been my pleasure to cooperate with this great organization of businessmen in your fine work for progressive, economical, and sound government.

I appreciate this invitation more than ever, because we are in a situation of vital

concern to every one in this Nation. All of us know the tremendous events which have occurred, one after the other, in the past 3 months, since Congress adjourned.

Within a week I have conferred with the Secretary of the Treasury on the fiscal situation, attended a 3-day session of Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on the military situation, and participated in a 5-hour White House conference with President Eisenhower on the legislative situation.

I am pleased to report that the President looked well and took a vigorous part in the discussion of the vital matters before us.

These meetings were all enlightening, and conditions were explained with the utmost frankness. Much of what we were told was classified, but I can say that never in my long experience as a United States Senator have I received so much disappointing information in such a short time.

From all of the bad news there is one encouraging fact. Sputnik has shaken us out of our complacency. Our great country will now move forward, I believe, as rapidly as possible to regain the ground we have lost.

It is not my purpose to be an alarmist, but I know you want me to state my convictions with respect to the conditions confronting us. We are now actually engaged in the most colossal struggle in world history. I do not use this language extravagantly.

Facing the facts, we realize the people of the United States are in a deadly and unrelenting conflict with the Russian Goliath. The struggle is not one of probability. We are in it now, and have been since World War II, but, in recent weeks the situation has worsened.

We are in a truly earth-shaking battle of the giants. And we are attacked on many fronts—military supremacy, economic advantage, fiscal stability, and ideological, if not human, survival.

We cannot have military supremacy, our form of free government, or our way of life without fiscal and economic stability. In our system, freedom, democracy and competitive enterprise are the sources of our strength. Defeat on any of these battlegrounds would be disastrous.

In its totalitarian system, Russia's strength lies in armed force behind a dictator's decree.

At the moment it is conceded that we do not have superiority in the fields of ballistic missiles and satellites. This must be regained. A world leader can never afford to be second best. Our prestige must be regained in a manner assuring survival of our system and ourselves and the free people of the world.

A week ago the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee completed its first series of hearings on our military deficiencies. Under the able leadership of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the hearings were nonpolitical, constructive and objective.

The committee has already developed startling and shocking facts. But by this purpose we are taking legislative steps to point the way to things which must be done to provide the best security possible in this troubled world.

Gen. James H. Doolittle, one of our most respected military authorities, was among the witnesses before the Armed Services Committee. He testified that Russia surpasses this country in tremendously important elements of warfare, notably in the field of rockets, missiles and satellites. He said Russia is working longer hours than we are for military supremacy.

General Doolittle predicted the cold war might last 100 years. He urged us to prepare ourselves accordingly.

As I listened to the hard facts of General Doolittle's testimony, which were fortified by other witnesses in open and closed sessions of the committee, I attempted to evaluate conditions in Russia and those in the United States and then compare them.

The alternatives to real war are now disarmament or cold war. Disarmament based on sound guaranties of our security does not seem likely at the moment, as much as it is desired. Assuming a continuing cold war here are some of the fundamental differences in our starting points:

Russia is a totalitarian country. The state controls all economic, business and social activities. It commands the behavior of its people in their daily lives. It arbitrarily fixes their wages. Their standard of living, at this time, appears to be of little concern. As between domestic-civilian niceties and militaristic development, there is no question. Trade is no great problem. It exploits its satellite nations and allies. Government deficits are of no important consequence. Russian currency is valuable only within the country or the nations under her domination. It is manipulated by the rulers in the Kremlin.

In the United States we have democracy. We have a competitive enterprise system offering the opportunity to start at the bottom and rise to the top, if we possess the ability and the energy to do so. We have individual freedoms never so much enjoyed in all history. We have business incentive with the right to retain our earnings less taxes. We have the highest living standards ever known to man. We give economic aid to our allies and, at the same time, carry the burden of their defense. We are obligated to the free world to maintain the integrity of the American dollar. If confidence in our money is impaired, our international trade will be destroyed, and the chain of economic strength in the free world will be broken beyond repair. We must have outside markets for our production.

In short, these are some of the differences between a totalitarian country and a free nation. The Russians dispose of domestic-civilian problems by decree, even to the point of extinction, if necessary. Freedom is the source of our strength. In a cold war, under a barrage of propaganda, Russia has a great advantage, as the launching of sputniks proved.

In the present situation, we may be sure the Russian leaders will try to wring every possible diplomatic concession, and more, from us and our allies. The propaganda advantage of the sputniks will not be the least of their weapons.

If the missile crisis forces us to spend more in one direction, we must find ways to spend less in other directions. The Communist view that we can be made to destroy ourselves fiscally and economically stands more clearly before us than ever before. We must not and shall not allow ourselves to be enslaved by our own extravagances.

We must recognize that we have two fronts to maintain—one military, and the other economic. We must be superior in both.

We cannot afford nonessentials in military programs, nonessentials in foreign aid, or nonessentials in Government civilian activties.

It is certain that our military expenditures will be increased in rocketry and ballistic missile fields. How shall we meet the requirement? Shall we resort again to deficit financing, with increased debt, and set off another seige of volatile inflation? Shall we increase taxes? Or, shall we wipe out the nonessential and obsolete activities in the military and all down the line of Government spending?

You have asked me to discuss sound economy in Government. I say to you, there can be no security in the free world without fiscal stability in the United States.

If soundly directed, I believe we can regain unchallenged military supremacy, including superiority in ballistic missiles, rockets, satellites, etc., within the limits of the country's economy.

But we cannot forget that our dollars are worth 49 cents by the 1939 index; we have had record deficit financing for a quarter of a century; our Federal debt is near its peak; and taxes are near their alltime high.

Deficit financing during the past 25 years has increased the Federal debt by $250 billion to a total of $275 billion and, paralleling this course, the cost of living has doubled.

The interest on our $275 billion debt is costing us nearly $8 billion a year. This is 11 percent of the total Federal revenue. The debt is largely in short-term securities and as they are refinanced the cost increases. If the current rates were applied to the whole debt, interest would total $11 billion, or more than 15 percent of Federal revenue.

Certainly, neither our total governmental expenditures nor our total taxes can be further increased without weakening our economy in inflation, and by dangerously stimulating deterrents to increased national production.

It will be of interest to look at the total tax take from the American people each year.

The Federal Government collects $70.6 billion in taxes for general revenue purposes. In addition $12.1 billion is collected for social security, highways and unemployment programs. Tax collections by States total $15 billion, and local taxation takes another $15 billion. The grand total of taxes paid annually out of the earnings of people is the astronomical figure of $112.7 billion. This is exclusive of more than $13 billion in revenue collected from nontax sources—Federal, State, and local.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I have thought for some time that a tax burden of this magnitude long continued has dangerous potentialities for our future economic welfare. We all know that taxes are more easily paid in times of prosperity than in times of recession, even though the recession may be a minor one.

An increase in Federal taxation would result in serious repercussions. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, of which I will be chairman in January, has an execellent staff of tax experts, headed by Mr. Colin F. Stam who is one of the outstanding taxmen in the country. Mr. Stam, after careful and continuing analysis of tax returns, reports to me that he would not know where to raise even $1 billion additional in any bracket or area without grave consequences.

I have just received from Mr. Stam his latest revenue estimate for the current fiscal year. It indicates that for the first half of 1957 the tax revenue was on a level about equal to that of the full year 1956. But third-quarter profits are less, and so will be those for the fourth quarter.

Mr. Stam estimates that Federal tax revenue will be $1.3 billion less than the estimate published by the Bureau of the Budget in its October midyear review.

This will mean that the estimated surplus of $1.5 billion will be reduced to $200 million, assuming expenditures are not increased.

An increase in total expenditures will certainly result in a deficit for the year ending next June 30.

Former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey testified before the Senate Finance Committee last July that even a minor recession in our prosperity—even to the high level of 1955—would result in a $12 billion deficit at the rate of Federal spending he anticipated at that time. This shows the thin ice on which we are skating.

These are the reasons why it is so essential for us to retrench in all nonessential domestic civilian and foreign activities, and review military weapons, techniques and practices for elimination of the obsolete and

reduction in the obsolescent. I was encouraged by the President's statement at the Tuesday conference to the effect that he was insisting upon this very kind of review in the military, as a means of offsetting necessary expenditures in the missile programs.

I do not advocate tax reduction at the expense of a balanced budget. I do not say it is wise to cut taxes at the expense of increased expenditures in vital ballistic missile procurement for defense. I firmly believe a sound tax reduction would be a stimulant to business improvement. While I cannot say I am optimistic under present conditions, stern enough reduction in Federal expenditures could produce justification for tax-reduction consideration.

The fact is that nonessential Federal expenditures require nonessential Federal taxation.

I am not at this time recommending any specific reduction in rates or any particular tax-reduction program. But as a matter of information, I can give you some samples of what tax reductions cost in terms of reduced revenue, and therefore in terms of reduced expenditures:

It would cost $2.8 billion to increase personal income-tax exemptions $100, from $600 to $700.

It would cost another $1 billion to give relief from the more burdensome Federal excise taxes.

It would cost another $1 billion to give relief to the heavily burdened middle-income bracket group.

It would cost $225 million to reduce high income-bracket rates to 65 percent.

It would cost almost another $1 billion to give a 2-percent reduction in corporate taxes.

As you can see from these samples, it would cost, in terms of reduced revenue, $6 billion or more to give a moderate general overall tax reduction which is so badly needed in this country. And this does not count relief in so-called hardship areas, such as small business. And neither does it provide for any reduction in the terrible Federal debt.

An organization like yours, which analyzes Federal expenditures, knows they can and should be cut. You know that constructive reduction can and should be made. The National Association of Manufacturers did a tremendous job last year as a part of the grassroots demand for a reduction in appropriations. The appropriation reductions were unprecedented. Unfortunately, the administration did not reduce expenditures in the same proportion.

I urge continuation of this intelligent and effective campaign. We must not be discouraged. We have made an important stride toward economy when people back home demand that expenditures be reduced.

An economical Federal Government is now much more important that ever before in history. There must be more economy in all areas—military, foreign aid, and domestic civilian.

Since 1954 we have increased domestic-civilian expenditures 50 percent, from $19 billion to $29 billion.

I have been in the Senate 25 years. In 1934 there were 23 programs through which the Federal Government made grants to States and payments to individuals, and the expenditures through these programs totaled $1.8 billion. In 1956, these programs, still including roads, numbered 76, and the cost was more than $5 billion.

It was fortunate that Congress, last session, defeated the proposal to grant Federal aid for public school construction. It would have opened wide a new Pandora box for spending that should be financed by State and local governments.

There are more than 500 expenditure accounts in the Federal budget for strictly domestic programs and activities. You and I know reductions can and should be made in every one of them.

I like and applaud the action recently taken by the Governor of Connecticut, who announced he would reduce all Connecticut State expenditures by 10 percent, except fixed charges.

Since World War II we have spent approximately $40 billion in foreign economic aid and $20 billion in military aid to foreign governments. The situation confronting us is just as serious for the nations that are participating in these programs as it is for us. They, too, must make some sacrifice.

When we talk about expenditures for stockpile and defense production, we all know how these programs have been exploited.

In the 4 years since the Korean war ended in the summer of 1953, we have spent nearly $11 billion in these programs. We should look more searchingly at the need for some of the materials we are buying in this program.

In all of the recent inquiry into the activities of the military departments, no responsible official of the Government has contended that sufficient funds have not been made available by Congress.

Actually, there is probably more waste in the military agencies than in any other area of the Federal Government. The military, itself, must understand that we can no longer tolerate Federal extravagance as usual.

You have only to read the U. S. News & World Report, one of the Nation's most reputable magazines, to be reminded of what I mean. It found a Pentagon chart showing 90 listings of operating units, officials, boards, and committees in the chain of authority in the missiles field.

Under such conditions, no wonder we are lagging behind in this range of vital defense.

I am not one who, as the President said in Oklahoma, would "sacrifice security worshiping a balanced budget." My long record supporting funds for necessary and efficient defense speaks for itself.

Of course, I have always supported a balanced budget short of war, just as the President did in his campaigns of 1952 and 1956. I do not worship a balanced budget at the expense of any essential military program, but I am preaching a budget balanced by elimination of nonessential expenditures.

The White House and the Bureau of the Budget at the moment are struggling with next year's Federal budget to be presented by the President in January. They need all the assistance you can give in an effort to get expenditures under control.

With unexpended balances in old appropriations still totaling approximately $70 billion, limiting nonessential expenditures in order that we may finance the necessities within the statutory debt ceiling is an extremely difficult task.

The Congress could make a great contribution in this effort if it would write a limitation on expenditures from both old and new money into every item in the appropriation bills enacted in the coming year.

This is one of the principal provisions in the so-called single appropriation bill which I have been advocating 10 years and which has already been passed by the Senate three times; but not by the House.

Deficit financing and increased taxes, short of war, should be used only as a means of last resort, even for funding necessary military expenditures. But admittedly this requires wise planning, and efficient and alert performance in the armed services and foreign aid, plus limitation of domestic-civilian expenditures to necessary amounts in proper and essential areas.

In my judgment this requires a soul-searching inventory of our strength and weakness; an honest appraisal of what is essential and what is nonessential; and perhaps a whole new pattern of policy—and this should not be limited to research, development and production of missiles.

I am not indulging in partisan, political discussion here. I am not talking in terms of some political overturn in some future election. I am talking in terms of what we need now—with tools at hand.

We need immediately to put first things first.

We need quick recovery of acknowledged superiority in development of new weapons, and unquestioned efficiency in our Military Establishment—on the part of both those in uniform and civilians. And we need quick recovery of our prestige among our allies and the position of strength required as a deterrent to war.

We need to fortify our fiscal solvency which is the life blood of the free world. And we need to stabilize our economy upon which our production capacity depends.

In the Senate Finance Committee, which considers legislation on taxes and tariff, customs and veterans, and public assistance and social security, renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be one of the most controversial proposals before us.

This legislation probably will be accompanied by the equally controversial proposals for the General Agreement on Tarriffs and Trade, and the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

In conclusion, preliminary to broaden action, to meet the situation before us we need immediately:

1. To rechart our defense expenditures on the basis of a reevaluation of the relative priorities of present and developing methods of warfare;

2. Without impairing our defense, to eliminate obsolete weapons, methods, and techniques, and wasteful practices which exist in many Defense Department activities;

3. To eliminate extravagance in foreign aid, and put more emphasis on military assistance, while reducing economic aid; and

4. To squeeze every nonessential dollar out of domestic-civilian programs.

Our military danger is great, no doubt; but further to imperil our national security, by impairment of our fiscal stability and loss of confidence in our Government, would be overwhelming.

---

## Our Military Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, since the Russians launched their satellite, the American people have been seized by a critical feeling that something must be done about our Military Establishment. They do not know what must be done, but are positive that something must be done.

There have been press statements, interviews, testimony, and what not, giving the views of individuals and groups of what should be done.

Now, suddenly, rumors of the existence of the Gaither report come to light; even more suddenly the Rockefeller committee report is issued.

Practically all of the pronouncements and reports stress two things: First, more money, and second, reorganization of the military departments to secure centralization. This centralization is stated variously as a czar of some char-

acter; a single military adviser to the Secretary of Defense—or the President—a consolidation of the military services and other vague and incompleted thoughts.

Actually the effect of all of these proposals is the creation of a single Chief of Staff and a single General Staff.

The American people and Congress will provide all of the money necessary. As a matter of fact, ample money has already been made available by Congress. It should be evident to all that the availability of unlimited money will not, of itself, cure our present difficulty.

Admittedly, some action must be taken to secure a more efficient defense establishment. It would, however, be catastrophic if this country were by hysteria rushed into the Prussian general staff system. That type of staff is implicit in most of the proposals which have been made, and it is the specific recommendation of the Rockefeller Committee. True, it is not so designated in the report. However, anyone who knows what constitutes the Prussian system recognizes it immediately. One of the greatest evils of the Prussian system was the professional general staff corps whose members stayed in it through their service. They became the military supers and junkers. They took Germany into two World Wars and lost them both.

The Rockefeller report would take all one-star officers from their separate services for the remainder of their careers and place them in the Department of Defense. This would create a more powerful general staff than any Prussian ever dreamed of accomplishing.

How does it happen that prominent names are found on these reports? There are several reasons. Among them, first, there are still those who admire the Prussian system, thinking that the individuals in Germany, not the system, were at fault; second, a good many more people are talking about our present problems than understand them; third, there are not a great many people in the United States who understand what constituted the Prussian system, even though they are convinced the system was bad; fourth, there are those who are willing to accept any suggestion during their present fright; and, fifth, there are people in positions of varying degrees of responsibility for the present condition who now blame the system to exonerate themselves.

Of course, action must be taken to improve the present organization of the Military Establishment. I have no doubt but that Congress will take action. There are a number of things which can be done. For instance, it should strengthen the Joint Chiefs of Staff and permit decisions by a majority vote. Those decisions would then go to the Secretary of Defense and, inevitably, to the President for final decision.

Our system of government is firmly planted on civilian control of the military. I pray to God it will always continue to be so. That means one thing and one thing only, the President is and must remain the Commander in Chief of the armed services. Of course, the President must have a strong Secretary of Defense, or other statutory officer, to supervise the Military Establishment. But, if we are to continue a civilian democratic government in the United States, the President, elected by the people, must carry the final responsibility.

---

## Bill Introduced To Strengthen Dairy Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed, to say the least, with the recent announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture of his intentions to reduce dairy price supports to the lowest possible level authorized by present law. In my judgment, the Secretary is once more heading in the wrong direction by lowering price supports when he should by all means be raising them.

Dairy farmers are just as much entitled to a fair return on their capital investments as any other businessmen in our Nation. They are also just as much entitled to a fair wage for their labors as any union worker in Detroit or any teamster driving a truck on our highways. Farmers are not second-class citizens and they have every right and reason to expect the administrators of our farm programs to do all that is possible to help them receive their fair share of the national economy.

If, as is evident, those responsible for the administration of our farm laws are determined to administer them at minimum levels, then it becomes the responsibility of the Congress to step in and take appropriate action. That is why I have joined in the introduction of a bill to halt the proposed reduction in dairy price supports announced by Secretary Benson. It is a simple bill which merely restates the 75- to 90-percent range of price supports on milk, butterfat, and other dairy products and provides that for the marketing year ending March 31, 1959, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes shall be supported at not less than $3.50 per hundredweight.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time in my more than 19 years in the Congress that I have ever offered or sponsored a measure supporting farm commodity prices at less than 90 percent of parity. Personally, I think that should be the minimum level for all our basic storables, but the dairy industry itself through its national representatives asked for this legislation. I am more than happy to cooperate with them in the effort to correct the mistake contemplated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The dairy industry is working diligently to develop self-help programs and various commodity groups as well as farm organizations are in the process of bringing before the Congress their recommendations for new farm legislation. Since it is too much to hope that the Congress would complete action on any of these new measures before the lower dairy supports go into effect, it is imperative that we approve without delay a measure along the lines of the bill I have introduced.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the great Committee on Agriculture will act with dispatch on this proposal and bring a bill before the House which we can pass before our dairy farmers suffer any more loss. This is a serious problem and time is of the essence.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the contents of my bill which is to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended:

The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at not less than 75 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price therefor using a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive: *Provided*, That for the marketing year ending March 31, 1959, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes shall be supported at not less than $3.50 per hundredweight."

---

## Congress Donated Government-Owned Land for Memorial to Senator Taft—It Must Not Do Less for the National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Congress in its wisdom provided a site on the United States Capitol Grounds just west of the Senate Office Building for a 115-foot bell tower memorial to the late Senator Robert Taft. This land was donated by the Congress.

It is my considered belief that the Congress cannot do less than this for the National Cultural Center.

I need not review for this body, I think, the long struggle for such a National Cultural Center. Suffice it to say that on August 8, 1957, this body defeated by a vote of 2 to 1 the proposal that the center be located in the so-called Foggy Bottom area near the Lincoln Memorial.

The Cultural Center should be located on one of several available Government-owned sites. Good sites are available only a short distance from the Foggy Bottom area, and the Government donated sites for the Mellon and Freer Galleries of Art and the 115-foot bell tower memorial to the late Senator Robert Taft.

I have developed a compromise bill to meet the objections voiced in the House of Representatives on August 8, 1957. No one spoke against a National Cultural

Center in that debate. Everyone was for a National Cultural Center in the Nation's Capital. The opponents of the site selected by the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission insisted they were just as dedicated to the concept of such a Center as the proponents of the site chosen by the Auditorium Commission. They insisted, however, that, "We can still have the Center, and quicker, on one of several available Government-owned sites." I agree with them. Among the opponents of the Foggy Bottom site were the Washington Board of Trade and the Federal city council. My bill is really quite simple, and is based in part on the recommendations of my good friend Robert Dowling, president of the Congressionally chartered American National Theater and Academy and a member of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission.

My bill provides, first, that the Federal Government donate a choice site for the Cultural Center in the same way it donated land for the Mellon and Freer Art Galleries, and the 115-foot bell tower memorial to the late Senator Robert Taft. Secondly, it gives the National Cultural Center the same status in the Federal Government as the Mellon Gallery. The Mellon Gallery is a branch of the Smithsonian Institution. Thirdly, it provides that the National Cultural Center shall be built with funds raised by voluntary contributions. Here my hope is that the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation, which recently contributed $2,500,000 apiece to the New York City's new Cultural Center will do at least as much for the National Capital and that other foundations and business leaders will join in this. The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are directed to solicit subscriptions, gifts, and bequests of moneys, securities, and other property of any character whatsoever, for the purpose of constructing, furnishing, equipping, and presenting programs at the Center. Fourthly, my bill provides for a permanent Commission very similar to the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission to be appointed by the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to work with the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution in carrying out its functions regarding the National Cultural Center.

I am pleased to say that broad support has developed for my measure from such national organizations as the National Federation of Music Clubs, the National Music Council, the American Federation of Musicians, the Music Educators National Conference, the Associated Actors and Artists of America, the National Opera Association, the American Guild of Musical Artists, the National Recreation Association, the American Recreation Society, the American Educational Theater Association, and the Democratic Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee.

My bill will provide a cultural center similar, in a number of ways, to the $205 million Lincoln Square Center of the Performing Arts in New York City. It is worth noting, too, I think, that this administration is making a tremendous contribution to New York City's new art center. On December 25, 1957, the New York Times reported that—

New York got a $27,331,325 Christmas gift from the Federal Government yesterday that will brighten this city through the years ahead.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency approved a contribution of that amount toward slum clearance in the Lincoln Square area, where a $205 million redevelopment is to take place.

The announcement of the Federal grant was made here by Walter S. Fried, regional administrator of the Agency, and in Washington by Commissioner Richard L. Steiner, head of its Urban Renewal Administration.

Recently the London Economist, on December 21, 1957, editorialized with regard to the New York City art center that—

It is to be regretted that this imaginative undertaking is not in the American city where the performing arts most need better housing—in the National Capital, Washington, D. C.

All European cities, even small ones compared to Washington, D. C., have much better cultural facilities than our own Capital City.

The Soviet Embassy played host the other evening to a group of newsmen, diplomats, and others, for a showing of a new Russian film on Moscow, the capital of the U. S. S. R. Reporting on this film in the Washington Post of January 12, 1958, Robert C. Albrook, former clerk of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, said—

Where Moscow boasts dozens of educational institutions which attract students from all over European and Asiatic Russia and other lands, Washington lacks even a public university and balks at providing its few private institutions with adequate and attractive campuses * * * although housing and educational institutions are perhaps the most striking signs of Moscow's evolution to Communist world capital status, much of the old has been retained and embellished to give the city flavor and charm. Dozens of theaters, opera houses, music halls, art galleries, museums, enormous libraries and other cultural facilities of the kind so badly needed in Washington enrich the fabric of the new Moscow.

I include here an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald, and an article from Labor's Daily which will be of interest to you, in this connection. The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 12, 1958]

LET'S GET TO WORK ON THE AUDITORIUM

(By Richard L. Coe)

I've gotten so I don't give a hang whether other countries, including Scandinavian monarchies and Soviet republics, have national theaters for the performing arts.

I don't think all that has much to do with us.

But I am concerned about what happens in the United States and its wonderful contempt of the performing art. Now that Congress is back, it's time we cut out the yack and started doing something.

We've got a lot to be proud of in our artists, as anyone knows who saw Ed Murrow's telecast on Marian Anderson. We've got fine actors, directors, technicians, a couple of first-rate ballet and opera companies, scores of fine symphonies and choral groups.

Most of these outfits can't play in the Capital of the United States because there is nowhere to put 'em. Oh, sure, the managers use Constitution Hall for lack of anywhere else and the public keeps going there for inadequately staged events and then wonders what's so hot about the attractions. The Capitol is a corking fine film house and the National Theater is a private enterprise frequently booked solid by each season's start.

As things stand, our Auditorium Commission got hog-tied last Congressional session when some folks put the spoke in a wheel that seemed headed for getting land in Foggy Bottom for an ambitious project.

That's water over the dam. Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Republican, of New Jersey, is once more on the ball with a bill that would place an auditorium on the Mall opposite the National Gallery of Art.

This goes in line with what happened last session. Then opponents of the Foggy Bottom site insisted that they were for such an auditorium but that they were for having the center—and quicker—on one of several available Government-owned sites. THOMPSON'S bill answers that restriction because that Mall site was set apart by Congress in 1938 for a national art center.

How about cost?

Robert W. Dowling of the Auditorium Commission put it this way to Representative THOMPSON:

"There are two conditions. First, that the National Cultural Center be given the same status in the Government as the National Gallery of Art, a branch of the Smithsonian Institution.

"Second, that the Government donate the land for the center."

If these things are done, Dowling says he will see to it that money is raised for the center, as much as $30 to $40 million, from individuals, foundations, and groups. Dowling's a big man in finance and can be trusted.

Dowling, by the way, is against including a convention hall in the plans, thinks it should be confined to two theaters for the performing arts.

Now, what chance has all this got in good hard politics? Despite his dogged earnest efforts, Representative THOMPSON still is a fairly junior Member of Congress. He regrets that his New Jersey colleague, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, is withdrawing from the Senate but seems to have had some hopeful support from Minnesota's HUMPHREY. There are others of his weightier seniors who seem interested.

This is not enough. It's about time the board of trade quit giving only lip service to a plan that could bring what all boards of trade want into their city—money. Only the other day its visitors bureau was boasting that tourists spent $300 million here in 1957, which was $25 million more than tourists spent in 1956. With a fine building of two halls at reasonable rentals there could be real self-interest if the board of trade would get to work and not confine itself to a half dozen yack-yack luncheons a year.

And the administration could also get off its cozy little fence. Here again, lip service is all we've had, with no real leadership.

A good instance of the administration's complete disinterest in the performing arts was highlighted and widely remarked upon by the White House dinner to Queen Elizabeth. Not one great American artist was in that invited company, loaded with financiers and military.

And our failings in cultural awareness were even more highlighted by Secretary Dulles shortly after the Russians sent up their first sputnik. He then stated that the Russians had spent all their energy on this project and had neglected other realms. That is sheer bunk as a look at Russia's wide cultural activities prove. Is the Secretary of

State so unaware of some of his own Department's activities?

But, as I say, I'm not concerned here with what other countries have created through the years. We are reasonably new to such an idea as a Government-owned auditorium, though local governments, so dear to the administration, have come to take municipally owned auditoriums as a matter of course.

Nor am I, at the moment, concerned with how the unions would want to move in, how some managers would want to make killings on auditorium bookings, and how some members of Congress wouldn't want to have a play by X or an opera by Y performed on Government property.

What I am concerned with is that we have creative performing artists of the first rank and audiences thirsty for something other than advertising-ridden TV. I am concerned with the fact that to have values for the present and the future we must ever be reminded of the best of the past.

This—and some more tourists' millions—is why the board of trade, the administration, and the Congress should drop the lip-service bit and challenge Dowling's assertion that, given the land, he'll get the money.

---

[From Labor's Daily of January 11, 1958]

FAMED ACTOR SUGGESTS UNITED STATES ESTABLISH MINISTER OF ARTS

(By Sanford Gottlieb)

WASHINGTON.—The United States should have a Minister of Arts, says Edward G. Robinson, the veteran actor whose personal painting collection has become as famous as his movie portrayal of Little Caesar.

"We have matured enough as a nation to recognize the arts officially," Robinson asserts. There is already as much interest in cultural activities within the United States as there is in Europe, he declares, pointing to the crowds which flock to the art galleries and museums of our big cities. Theaters, he admits, are less frequented, largely because of television and the other distractions of a rich land.

It is his belief, shared by many other personalities in the entertainment world, that a Minister of Arts would spread public appreciation and enjoyment of drama, music, painting, sculpture, the dance, and other forms of expression. Most European countries have a top civil servant in charge of cultural affairs usually in the ministry of education.

While no Minister of Arts appears in the offing in the United States, a piece of legislation just introduced in Congress would make the first official step in the direction of recognition. Sponsored by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, of Minnesota) and Representative FRANK THOMPSON (Democrat, of New Jersey), the bill would establish a national center of performing arts in the Capital. The center would permit outstanding performers, both American and foreign, to have what amounts to a national audience, since provision would be made for television and radio coverage of the programs.

BRANCH OF SMITHSONIAN

Under the Humphrey-Thompson bill, the center would be a branch of the Smithsonian Institution, run by the Smithsonian's regents with the advice of a commission of 20 leaders from the art world. Five would be appointed by the President, five by the Vice President, five by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and five serving ex officio.

"If the commissioners are prudently selected and politics is kept out, we can have something quite wonderful," comments Edward G. Robinson. "Our greatest resource is people. We will be more richly endowed when we teach them the arts," he explains.

After 25 years in Hollywood, Robinson returned to his native New York to appear on Broadway in Paddy Chayefsky's "Middle of the Night." Following two seasons in New York, the play is now on a national tour. Robinson, no stranger to the stage, appeared in 40 plays before going into the movies.

In "Middle of the Night" he portrays a middle-aged widower whose need for the reassurance of continued love leads to an affair with his much younger employee. The mutual dependence of two lonely people, a theme which has run through all of Chayefsky's writings since the TV broadcast of "Marty" catapulted him to fame, triumphs over the self-doubts of the widower and family pressures from both sides. It is a fine vehicle for Robinson's sensitive acting.

GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED TOURS

The star of "Middle of the Night," asked if he would be willing to go abroad on a Government-sponsored tour, replied that he is willing if the Government makes the request. "Art is a great catalyst which knows no boundaries," he says. "It can help bring the world closer together. Nothing is more universal."

This same thought was expressed recently with a slightly different emphasis by Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, who told a New York audience: "I want to use art to help the human race avoid committing suicide." FULBRIGHT and Representative FRANK THOMPSON will cosponsor a bill in the present session of Congress, creating a permanent post in the State Department to coordinate the now scattered cultural exchange programs. With minor changes, this bill may receive State Department backing before Congress.

Edward G. Robinson, who agrees that we are facing the greatest crisis in history, believes American faith in democracy is so strong that it cannot be hurt by exposure to other ideologies. Cultural exchange can only help make the system more dynamic, he feels. And while building up our military posture, Robinson adds, we must also make sure that education is taken more seriously.

In his view this means wiping out the present contempt for the well-educated man and establishing ever-wider opportunities for people to develop their capacities to the fullest.

---

## Columbia River Power Dams and Bonneville Power Administration Proving Good Investment for the American People

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the hydroelectric power dams which the Federal Government has built on the Columbia River and its tributaries during the past 25 years are proving a good investment for the American people.

The power that these dams have provided has created new industries and supplied multitudes of new jobs. Because of these dams, industries which use this power are making more money. Also, their employees have larger incomes. Both are paying more income taxes into the Federal Treasury. Year after year it becomes more and more evident that the power installations in these dams will have cost the Federal Government nothing. Power sales from these dams are returning and will continue to return to the Federal Government all of the money plus interest which the Federal Government has invested in these great projects and in the network of Bonneville powerlines that distributes the electrical energy to consuming markets.

Our Federal Government has invested almost $3 billion in dams and powerlines in the Columbia River Valley and the Pacific Northwest since construction of the first dam was started there about 25 years ago.

Of this about $3 billion Federal capital investment, more than one-sixth—$512,476,000—already has been returned to the Federal Government from profits of power sales.

In the early years, when the first dams were just starting or when there were few power producing dams, the annual payments of power profits into the Federal Treasury, of course, were small. Year after year, however, as more dams were completed and more generators came into the powerlines, payments to the Federal Government increased. These annual payments will continue to increase. Eventually, before too many years, the Federal Government will have received back from power profits all of the money, plus interest on that money, advanced to construct these projects. The dams on the Columbia and its tributaries and the powerlines to distribute the power will have cost the taxpayers of the Nation nothing. The Federal Government, in effect, merely will have advanced its credit to create one of the greatest energy producing, job building, and prosperity sustaining works of man.

Total Federal investment in Columbia River and its tributaries dams and in powerlines and substations as of June 30, 1957, was $2,961,000,000—in round figures, $3 billion.

All of this expenditure was not chargeable to power. The Government's books show that $348 million is chargeable to reclamation and irrigation, part of which is being paid back by sales of water, and that $95 million is chargeable to flood control and $97 million to navigation.

Opponents of Columbia River development sometimes have said, in effect, "Of course the power phases will pay because so much of the cost of the dams is charged to navigation and flood control." The figures do not indicate this is true. The total charge to navigation and flood control on the Columbia projects is less than $200 million which is only about 6 percent of the total $3 billion cost of all projects.

The Bonneville Dam was the first of the big power dams built. The cost of this dam charged to power was $92,807,824 of which Bonneville power profits already have returned to the Federal Treasury $58,632,463 plus interest or about 65 percent of the original investment.

The charges on the Grand Coulee Dam for power phases of the development are $328,359,449 of which $138,099,499 plus interest has been returned to the Treasury from power sales profits. Power

profits have paid off 42 percent of the Federal investment on the Grand Coulee Dam.

Before many more years, total revenues for the sale of Bonneville hydroelectric power will be sufficient to pay all of the cost of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration and will have paid the principal and interest on the money heretofore advanced to build these great payroll and prosperity creating projects. When that time comes the Federal Government will be returned not only its capital investment with interest but also actually will be making a profit on its investment.

## A Solvent Government Is Our Best National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is plain to see by listening and reading that spokesmen for most every segment of the American people are insisting that Congress appropriate more money this year than ever before for their own respective activities. They say of course that economy is necessary, but that theirs is different and must be treated as such. Far too often during the past 25 years such requests have been honored with great outlays of dollars from the people's United States Treasury to the end that Federal taxes are bearing too heavily on all our people.

It was once said by a person in high authority that it mattered little what the Federal debt was, because we owed it to ourselves. Remember? Some Americans were naive enough to believe it then, but I wonder what they think now when they pay their Federal tax bills. The great Communist Lenin once said, "We will force Uncle Sam to spend himself into bankruptcy, then we will take him over," and unless we stop unnecessary and wasteful spending Lenin's prediction will surely come true.

Mr. Speaker, I have not and I shall not be a party to doing that which will make Lenin's prophecy come true. I pray to God a majority of my colleagues will take that pledge with me. Many have already done so. We must not lose our heads over sputnik, nor listen to the clarion call from the unthinking liberals. Congress must and will appropriate sufficient funds for more than adequate defense, but certainly we will demand 100 cents worth of defense for every dollar spent. If it is necessary to consolidate defense authority and commands, which I believe is necessary, then it must be done by legislation, if that is the only way it can be accomplished. Not only to save money, but also to strengthen our defenses and striking power if war should be brought upon us.

Our President is a great military leader, and, like most every American, I have great faith and confidence in his ability to chart the course which will be followed by the military from the private in the rear ranks to the guided-missiles program, to develop here such a strong defense that no nation on earth, or group of nations, would dare attack us by land, sea, or air, combined, with an offensive force so strong that should an enemy be foolish enough to attack us our superior firepower would stop them in short notice. God give our President guidance in the great responsibility which is his; yes, and yours and mine regardless of who we are or where we live in this blessed land of ours.

There are hundreds of places where money can be saved by the thousands, millions, and billions of dollars in total, and without hurting, but to the contrary helping our economy over both the short and long pull. You ask where can such savings be made and where additional revenues should be collected.

The Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate will require the top officials in every department, agency, bureau, board, and commission of the Federal Government to come before the respective subcommittees of appropriations, and justify, or try to justify, their budget requests for funds. Always by constant questioning and by demanding honest, straightforward answers from them, we can finally determine pretty closely their justified needs for funds. By so doing, and knowing the sentiments of a majority of the members of that committee, especially since the people they represent are demanding economy in Government wherever economies can be made, therefore, I feel confident now that the Congress will not appropriate more money than was appropriated in the last session of Congress, even though we appropriate more money for the military.

In fact, I am hoping it will be possible to keep spending low enough, with Federal income high enough to justify at least an additional $100 per person in Federal income-tax exemptions. Such tax relief, although relatively small, would help everybody, especially folks with large families. History records that such tax relief has been a quick stimulant to our entire economy, and that always Federal revenues promptly increase by the amount of the total tax reduction or more, due to the increased spending which, when spent for family needs, those dollars pyramid themselves more than four times over in national income from whence a large proportion of Federal revenue is derived. The budget requests for every agency of Government will shortly be received by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, which, under the Constitution, must first act on all appropriation requests. In due time, after I have had time to make a thorough study of the budget requests, I will then be in a position to express my views as to where I feel certain savings can be made specifically, and I shall then act and vote accordingly.

Look, if you will, to every nation around the world where the people's government has imposed unbearable taxes on their people, and there you will find disloyalty, strife, and uncontrolled inflation, unstable governments, cold war and rebellion, now and all down through recorded history. It must not happen here, and it will not happen here if we spend for government within the ability of the people to pay and still remain solvent themselves.

Let us be mindful of the fact that to insure 100 percent loyalty of a people, their government must be clean, honest, and fair to them by not imposing such heavy taxes; that the payment of same takes from them their ability to properly care for themselves and their families.

A solvent government is our best national defense.

## United States Science Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill—H. R. 9610—which provides for the establishment of a United States Science Academy by the Federal Government and administered along similar lines as the United States Military Academy at West Point, the Naval Academy at Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy at Denver.

The new Academy is to be set up under the Department of Defense, just as are the aforementioned three military academies, but the military atmosphere of this institution should logically be limited. The purpose of the Science Academy, as defined in my bill, shall be "to train selected men and women, to be known as cadets, in the field of science or engineering for service as officers or employees of the United States." Specifically, this institution is to prepare young people for scientific careers devoted primarily to the security and safety of our country.

As a result of recent developments in the fields of rockets, missiles, and space-traveling satellites, science and scientific research have assumed a most important position in the minds of men. It is not difficult to foresee that in the near future the soldier-scientist will play a significant role. The nation which will take early steps to prepare itself with a sufficiently large contingent of soldier-scientists will find itself in a much safer and securer position for any eventuality that may arise.

The idea of a Science Academy did not come to me suddenly, nor is it of very recent origin. Back in 1955 and 1956, when I was a member of the American delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris, I was privileged to attend secret briefings given by Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther and Gen. Lauris

Norstad. I came away from these meetings considerably disturbed by the news that Russia was getting ahead of us in the field of scientific research. It was then that I began to give serious thought to the need for training scientists and engineers for our Armed Forces as an added measure of security.

After I began to study this matter more closely, my first shock was to discover that Russia was outproducing us in the training of scientists and engineers, and that science and mathematics are given primary emphasis in its educational system. These are by now well-known facts which have in recent months been substantiated from many quarters. There is no need for us further to belabor this point. Similarly, there is no longer any need for us to stress the importance of stepping up science education. This, too, is a matter of general acknowledgment.

The major problem facing us today is: What is the best way to obtain the necessary number of qualified scientists in the interest of the Nation? Shall it be through the establishment of special scholarships and funds? Shall it be through direct aid to existing schools and universities to expand their facilities? Shall it be through the establishment of new scientific institutions? Or shall it be through a combination of these and many other ways?

Much as we do not like to fall behind Russia in this matter, we must however be cautious not to emulate her methods. We need not copy Russia's totalitarian methods of regimenting education and science. We must establish what our needs are, and how best and in the swiftest possible time we can fulfill these needs. It is my view that we can probably adopt most or all of the suggestions made in meeting our scientific needs. There is no contradiction between my suggestion to establish a Science Academy and the proposals to set up scholarships, aid the universities, and so forth. It is not a question of one proposal instead of another, but one proposal in addition to another.

Before I go further, let me summarize the contents of my bill. It is comprised of 10 sections as follows:

Sections 1 and 2 refer to the act setting up the United States Science Academy under the Department of Defense and its purpose, namely, to train cadets in science and engineering for the United States.

Section 3 empowers the Secretary of Defense to determine the permanent location of the Academy within the borders of the United States, after a commission of five men has made a study of possible sites.

Section 4 provides for the use of temporary facilities for the Academy so it can begin early operations.

Section 5 establishes eligibility for admission to the Academy, namely, those between 17 and 25 years of age and successfully passing an examination prescribed by the National Science Foundation indicating that the candidate is qualified. In addition to the total number of cadets authorized to be appointed, 12 cadets may be personally selected by the President for appointment upon recommendation of the National Science Foundation.

Section 6 provides for the admission to the Academy of a limited number of foreign students from friendly countries, not more than three from any one country, provided they can pass a strict security check. Upon graduation they cannot be appointed as officers of the United States but must return to serve their own country.

Section 7 provides that, upon graduation, all cadets will be required to serve a minimum of 5 years as officer-scientist with any branch of the United States Armed Forces or as a civilian employee of the United States in the field of science or engineering.

Sections 8, 9, and 10 deal with the nominations of candidates for the Academy by Senators and Representatives, annual competitive examinations, filling of vacancies by States on a basis proportional to the representation in Congress, distribution of appointments of cadets after graduation, and the application of similar provisions of law which pertain to the existing military academies.

I also want to emphasize some additional points. The course of study is to be distributed over a 4-year period. Unlike the other academies, physical requirements in the Science Academy are to be minimized. In this instance, we are more interested in brain than in brawn. For this reason, it is my view that the general atmosphere at the Science Academy should not be overmilitarized. Emphasis is to be placed on the cadet's development and knowledge in the field of science, not on his military standing or service. As in the case of the other academies, the cadets at the Science Academy are to receive a free education, pay, housing, medical care, and other emoluments, and shall be subject to similar regulations of discipline, attendance, and so forth.

I have no specific site in mind as a possible location for the Science Academy. Personally, I would prefer to see a site selected in an area which provides ample space for buildings, laboratories, and other needed grounds for an institution of this sort. Perhaps the most logical choice would be in an area which is not too close to any large city, an area which has not yet been built up and around which we can in time build a science city with major research facilities and housing accommodations for students, faculty, scholars, and researchers, and those serving their needs. We have done that at our atomic research centers, why not in this venture, too?

There is no way of estimating at the present time the cost of establishing a Science Academy, but Congress can appropriate certain sums for acquisition of land, construction of buildings and laboratories, and other needs until the institution is ready to begin functioning, then a set sum can be designated annually on the basis of experience gathered from the other academies. Although this will require many millions of dollars, it will be a worthwhile investment for the benefit of our country and it will not be any more expensive than providing funds for existing schools to expand their present facilities.

It is to be noted also that women are to be admitted as cadets. A coeducational academy is quite a departure from the existing military institutions. The fact remains, however, that we do have women in all branches of our Armed Forces who are performing a great service to our country. But even more important is the fact that American women provide an important and almost untapped potential of scientific manpower which should not be disregarded. I am informed that women constitute a very large proportion of the scientists in Russia. In our country we have practically discouraged women from entering this field.

As for the admission of students from friendly foreign countries, it is quite evident that this proposal is designed to help cement stronger ties with our allies, as well as to encourage them to develop the best scientific brains and utmost cooperation with us.

Obviously, an institution of this sort must be established only under Government auspices for reasons of security, national needs, financing, and attracting the best qualified students. It must also be provided with the finest scientific laboratories and the top scientists in the country should be invited to teach at the Science Academy. Such an institution would arouse a great deal of interest among high-school students throughout the country and would inspire many of them to seek a career in science. It would give these young people, showing scientific ability and aptitude, an opportunity to receive the finest and most promising education, prestige, and dignity, and a wonderful career.

It has been asked: What can the United States Science Academy accomplish or contribute that existing schools and universities could not do? In what ways would it differ?

First and foremost, it would assure our Armed Forces and the civilian branches of the Government with a definite, dependable, and steady number of highly trained scientist-officers. These people would remain in Government service, either in a military or civilian capacity, for at least 5 years. This is how the Nation would benefit for providing them with a free education and a career. Graduates of private schools are under no compulsion to serve in the Armed Forces or in civilian public posts, but choose to go into private industry. When we need men of this caliber, we have to resort to the draft.

Second, the Nation would derive a great advantage in the fact that this institution and the men and women being trained there could be geared in the direction of national security. It would concentrate not only on scientific training, but also on research, problems of defense, effects of atomic radiation on human life and on food, and other related subjects.

Third, a United States Science Academy would provide a great incentive for our youth to strive to become science cadets and pursue a career in science or engineering. It will provide a free education and the best possible opportunities for the development of one's scientific talents. Many of our high-school graduates never go on to college for the simple reason that they cannot afford it. As far as the Science Academy is concerned, money will not be a factor in recruiting a science cadet. In fact, many bright students who might otherwise not have given thought of pursuing a higher education would now be afforded such an opportunity at the Science Academy.

Fourth, it is felt by many people today that our colleges and universities are failing to do an adequate job of training scientists and engineers on whom this country must rely in the future. Consequently, much needs to be done to strengthen our present system of science education. One of the tasks which the United States Science Academy can undertake would be to help solve the problem of science teachers and science teaching in our senior and junior high schools. Many of our young people in these schools make their vocational and professional choices at this early stage. A United States Science Academy could be most helpful in training more people who are specifically skilled in the art of communicating interest in science, in studying the problem of communicating science to young people, and in increasing the status and prestige of science teachers. In this role it would be a unique institution, for no other institution of higher learning in the United States centers its interest on this very important need.

Fifth, the Science Academy would prepare scientifically trained and competent people with a broad knowledge of the humanities for participation in governmental functions of a civilian nature. Many of our officials in Government service today have little or no scientific training in higher mathematics, physics, electronics, and so forth. How can they adequately assume scientific responsibilities which may be required in their civilian posts?

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the establishment of a United States Science Academy would have a great impact on the welfare and the security of our country, it would promote the training of scientists, it would be most helpful in arousing a profound respect for science and science teachers, and it would help develop the art of communicating interest in science to young people.

The new academy will not only add strength to all our other existing military institutions, but together they will make America more secure and help to promote peace in the world.

The country needs such an institution. The urgency of the times in which we live requires it. I am sure that my colleagues in this House are well aware of it. I therefore urge you to take early action on my bill so that the United States Science Academy can begin to function in September of this year.

## Armistice Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an address delivered by me on November 11, 1957, on the occasion of the Armistice Day exercises, including parade, conducted by the Tritown Veterans Day committee of the towns of Rockland, Whitman, and Abington, Mass., and conducted in the town of Rockland.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans, I appreciate the invitation enabling me to participate with you in the splendid exercises and parade on this day, which is not only one of commemoration, but one of dedication.

These are days to view conditions realistically and objectively, and to speak with candor and courage in the national interest of our country.

It is also the time for our Government to take our people in its confidence. We all realize that at particular times there are some things that cannot be made public because the potential enemy would benefit, but the American people should be kept as fully informed as the national interest of our country will permit.

You sense that information that can properly be given to our people has not been given.

Even as a Member of Congress, and as majority leader of one of the branches of Congress, I have no more information than what you and I have read in the newspapers.

The giving to our people of as full information as possible is of vital importance. Thank God, we are citizens of our beloved country—a democracy. It is our duty to keep it such.

An important factor in our Government is public opinion. It has been stated that of greater influence at times than a President, Members of Congress, governor, or any public official, is public opinion and its influence.

Sound public opinion is helpful—emotional public opinion is usually harmful. A sound public opinion can only be formed when the facts and the conditions are known.

We must face the fact that the world of today and tomorrow is a different one than existed only 12 to 15 years ago.

Whether we like it or not, the world of only a few years ago is as if it is a lost civilization with the one that confront us. For descriptive purposes we could call the world of today the nuclear era.

We can only get a glimps of it today, but all of us sense its potentialities for good or evil, for progress, or destruction. We must do the best we can, and it is only with as much information as possible that as individual citizens we can help form a sound public opinion.

For our primary duty is to preserve our country as it is for ourselves and for future generations of Americans.

The American people naturally want to hear what is good for our country, but we can also accept information that causes us to alert ourselves. In other words, if necessary, we can take the bad with the good.

For the people of America are warriors, fighters, not quitters. For example, under no conditions would we submit to a Communist peace. For we know that such a peace means loss of country and liberty, conquest, enslavement, persecution, imprisonment, and death.

The American people are aware of the evil mind and intent of those in control in the Kremlin.

In 1933, in his inaugural message, delivered in the depths of the last depression when despondency generally existed, Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "The only thing to fear is fear itself."

If we do the right things, if our leadership establishes and follow correct policies, if our people are informed, and sound public opinions created, there is nothing we need fear today except fear itself.

While you and I and other Americans do not like to see the Communists lead us in any activity, the fact that they have projected into the outer space satellites, should not cause us to become gripped by fear and, as a result, create a panicky state of mind.

We must reluctantly admit that what they have done is a major accomplishment.

Out of it might flow some good because the feeling of smugness and complacency we have had for the past 2 years has not been healthy. And the reason for this smugness and complacency is not the people's fault. There have been too many men in high position who have been telling our people that everything is all right.

And now the people know that much of what has been told them was not correct—based on hope—hope that the Kremlin would be good.

Anyone in authority knows, or ought to know, that the world-killer minds in the Kremlin—as was Lenin and Stalin—are still bent on world revolution and world domination.

This means that as long as whoever dominates in the Kremlin adheres to dialectic or doctrinaire communism—world revolution and domination—that we must be constantly on our guard and strong—and that we cannot be second best to communism.

For the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is power and strength, militarily and otherwise, greater than they possess themselves.

Public opinion, formed in recognition of this fact, would be important.

For it could be dangerous for us to base our national defense on budgetary considerations alone. That is a calculated risk as an American that I do not want to see my country take.

Another thought of mine that influences me as an American and as a legislator, "If we are going to err in judgment, it is better to err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness."

For we must realize we are confronted by evil minds bent in world domination, to destroy by any means all peoples and countries who do not agree with them, or submit to them.

Until there is a complete repudiation of world domination, until they allow nations to live in peace in accordance with their own culture and the freely expressed will of their people, we, and the peoples of other nations who want independence and freedom, must constantly be on our guard.

We know, or ought to know, that while those in the Kremlin from time to time, as expediency calls for, change their tactics, such as peaceful coexistence, they have not changed their intent of world domination and conquest.

As long as such intent exists, America must be strong, and it is better to stand for strength than, for budgetary reasons, take a chance on weakness.

For the ability of our diplomats to obtain our national objectives—understanding and

peace among nations—depends in the main upon our military strength.

For strength is the only language the world killers in the Kremlin understand and appreciate.

The knowledge that Communist Russia has got the jump on us in sending satellites into the outer space should make us determined to catch up—go ahead—not only in this field of science, but in all other fields.

What they have done should not be laughed or sneered off, as some in very high positions have done. Such statements do a disservice to our country and to our people.

On the other hand, hysterical statements based on fear does a disservice to our people and our country.

The only thing to fear is fear itself.

However, those responsible and in positions of leadership must assume with vision and courage the leadership necessary for our national interest. And that leadership must originate in the executive branch of Government, and with the President himself.

For under our form of government he is the sole repository of our foreign policy. He is also Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and in a period of emergency, such as we are undergoing, as Commander in Chief he possesses great reserve powers. If he needs additional power, Congress will respond, as we did on the Formosa Resolution and on the Middle East Resolution.

The President under his reserve powers in an emergency as Commander in Chief has the power to do everything stated in those resolutions, but he wanted to show the world unity between the legislative and executive branches, and the Congress passed both resolutions.

I might say that many of us are gravely concerned about the 200,000 reduction in our military manpower, and oppose this reduction.

We are seeking disarmament and yet making a marked unilateral reduction of our Armed Forces. The Kremlin simply say "we do not have to reduce our forces, America is voluntarily reducing its forces." Furthermore, to them that is treated as a sign of weakness. We are also wiping away one of our areas of negotiation.

And you sense, as well as I do, that the reduction as well as the reduction in other services, is due to budgetary consideration. This to me is too great a calculated risk to take when we know that the leaders of atheistic communism are bent on world domination in the hope they can take over country after country until America is alone in the world.

So it is vitally important that we be strong militarily—and powerfully so. That we be first in everything—and where we are not—that we quickly equal or better the position of Communist Russia.

For we cannot negotiate with the present leaders of the Soviet Union on a moral plane—they deny and fight God's word through you and I who believe—we cannot negotiate or deal with them on a plane of idealism—because they have no ideals. There is one level we can deal or negotiate with them on, and that is the law of self-preservation. In their hate and lust, they can deny everything, but they cannot deny the law of self-preservation applies to the Soviet Union and its people as well as to other nations and their peoples.

And the one deterrent against a sneak attack by them against the United States or any other nation is the knowledge that we have the power to destroy them—have them commit suicide—before they, so to speak, murder us.

We have the brains, we have the facilities, we have the necessary money. We must coordinate these activities eliminating jealousies, interservice and otherwise, clashes of personalities and bottlenecks of all kinds.

There are dedicated men in the field of science, the military, in business and in public life who as long as 4 years ago realized our great capabilities, but that we were getting the minimum rather than maximum results.

The Congress as far back as 1953 recognized something was wrong. At my suggestion in 1954, a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee conducted hearings for months. President Killian, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, among many others appeared and testified.

I sat in with the committee on its hearings.

If the recommendations of the committee had been heeded then by the Defense Department and the President, the present situation would not probably exist. In any event, we would have been much better off than we are.

However, we must face the present and the future.

You know as well as I do that in recent years the entire art of warfare has been completely transformed. This has, as the committee in August of 1954 said in its report, "come through the application of science and technology to weapons and their uses." The committee also said, "It is evident that the safety of our country will depend on maintaining a strong military posture for many years to come. A primary factor of modern military superiority is technology. This means that the Nation is faced with keeping under way a mobilized research and diversement program which goes all out to maintain our military superiority.

The significance is that Congress was aware nearly 4 years ago of a condition existing that in the natural interest of our country required quick action to solve.

Russian satellites have brought action. The appointment of President Killian is an excellent one. He is one of the great administrators of our country—a dedicated American.

But the President will have to go all out in supporting him and his Advisory Committee. The President cannot let interservice jealousies or rivalries interfere with President Killian effectively carrying out policies and projects in the field of science, basic and applied, in our national interest. Neither can he let anyone in position of power throw up bottlenecks, or to interfere with Mr. Killian's continued direct contact with the President.

Furthermore, his appointment as Special Assistant to the President for Research and Development, important as it is—if the President actively supports him—is only an interim one.

The importance of research and development in the life of our Nation, and in combating and frustrating the Kremlin, is such that an independent body or council on a high level, directly under the President and accountable to him, independent of but cooperating with the military, is necessary for our present and future national interest.

This will require legislation setting forth its status, its duties and responsibilities, with its members confirmed by the United States Senate. It should be on the level of the National Security Council.

We know that Assistants to the President for this or that purpose come and go. They exist only at the will of the President. While belated, there is no question of the President's sincerity and good faith in appointing President Killian. But the President is a human being like all of us. He is subject to influences from other angles. Furthermore, the President can only give him such powers and authority as he possesses himself. The power and authority of a board or council is established by law, with permanence of existence, the power to consider long-range policy, as well as short-range, is far different from one who exists by the will and the sufferance of the President.

The important thing is that a board, council, or department, I will not argue which, should be established by law, possessing freedom of thought and action and cooperating with other departments and agencies in our national interest. It should be directly under the President, who could then coordinate its policies and activities with other defense or foreign policy departments.

There must be a clear legislative mandate concurred in by the President. There must be power and authority to act—not for a temporary period—but for a long-range period.

There should be clear authority, as well as responsibility, in the vitally important field of research and development, which includes our missile program.

It is of grave importance that the Soviet Union does not get a decided advantage over us in weapons or means of destruction.

We have the brains and the know-how; we have the facilities and the money; the bottleneck in the past has been in the main among management—survival of branches of the Defense Department, interservice rivalries and jealousies—good Americans, but clashes of ambitions and personalities.

All of these must be subordinated to the national interest of their country.

And in connection with this you and other Americans can render invaluable assistance, by molding a strong public opinion demanding, in the field of military research and development, the establishment of a permanent board, council, or department, directly under and responsible only to the President, working in close cooperation with the Congress and its appropriate committees, possessing the power and authority to act for the best interest of our country.

I have every confidence the Congress will do its part. As we recognized the situation nearly 4 years ago, so do the Members of the Congress realize the necessity and importance for appropriate action at this time.

And as Americans, it is your right, it is your duty, to demand that appropirate action be taken so that the concern of today will not become the fear of tomorrow, and that by clear thinking and courageous leadership the concern that Americans feel today will be removed and supplanted by a feeling of confidence.

So far as I am concerned, I shall do everything within my power to see the attainment of this essential objective.

---

## The Joint Chiefs of Staff System

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONG. RECORD, I include remarks I made on Sunday, January 5, with regard to the Joint Chiefs of Staff system:

Until recently I thought the word "sputnik" was the Russian word for satellite. But it appears now that the word "sputnik" has an English synonym known as hysteria.

Because the Soviet Union was able to launch an earth-circling satellite ahead of our efforts, a scapegoat must be found. And the scapegoat that looms on the horizon now is the system under which our Joint Chiefs of Staff operate.

There is no difficult or complicated reason behind the Soviet Union's success or our failure to be first in launching the first satellite—it boils down to a simple matter of concentration of efforts. None of us fully realized the psychological effect of being first in the orbit.

Had we begun our program sooner, had we concentrated on the program at an earlier date, I have no doubt that we would have launched the first earth-circling satellite. But because we did not do this, the alarmists tell us that the Joint Chiefs of Staff system must be responsible and, therefore, we should adopt a super-Prussian-type supreme general staff above or in place of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; or, in the alternative, we must completely reorganize the Department of Defense.

The alarmists have added another phrase to the vocabulary of derogatory terms—"interservice rivalry." We have heard a great deal about interservice rivalry and interservice competition. Yet I have not seen demonstrated one single example of interservice rivalry with a deleterious effect upon our war efforts.

That there is interservice competition is not only true, but should be encouraged. We encourage competition in all phases of American life because through competition we produce better products. The same thing is true in our armed services. Rivalry connotes stooping to the level of conniving—the deliberate attempt on the part of one service to keep information from another service. I have seen no example of interservice rivalry that has been established before any committee of the Congress.

Nevertheless, the alarmists want to blame interservice rivalry for our failure to launch an earth-circling satellite, or to have in operational use an intercontinental ballistics missile. These alarmists infer that since we do not have an earth-circling satellite, or an intercontinental ballistics missile in production, the Army has been keeping secrets from the Navy, the Air Force has been denying access of its information to the Army, the Navy has refused to cooperate with the Coast Guard, the Air Force wants to swallow the Army's missile program, and the Army wants control of the whole missile program.

These, I presume, must be their conclusions. And yet no testimony has revealed a single instance in support of these inferences.

Since 1947 I have seen the Department of Defense grow from a small organization of some 450 employees, originally established to act as a board of directors for the Military Establishment to the point where today it is now a fifth service. It has grown from a planning organization, a supervisory organization, to an operational organization. Those who seek efficiency and savings in our National Military Establishment would do well to look at the Department of Defense as a department which is superimposed above the three military departments.

If the Department of Defense is to be reorganized, then I, for one, will strongly advocate that each of the Secretaries of the three military departments be restored a large measure of the authority and control they once possessed prior to the establishment of the Department of Defense, perhaps to the extent of putting them back in the Cabinet. In that way we may well eliminate some unnecessary duplication that now exists.

Today we see well-meaning, intelligent leaders of American Government advocating a single military commander at the head of the Nation's Armed Forces, or a general staff organization with a single chief; or in the alternative, a sweeping reorganization of the whole Defense Department.

It has been charged that the present system under which the Joint Chiefs of Staff serve in the dual role of military planners and commanders of individual services is unrealistic and unworkable. I presume, therefore, that such critics of the present system advocate that a supreme staff be constituted with the sole responsibility of planning and no responsibility whatsoever for the execution of those plans. I know of no better way to commit national suicide.

Separate the authority of planning from the responsibility of execution and the net result is no responsibility whatsoever. Eliminate the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or impose a super staff above the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and we will have more duplication and chaos complete. We won't be first with any new weapon.

Give one man the responsibility for making all of the military decisions of the Nation, including the selection and utilization of weapons, the assignment of functions and missions, and the authority to determine the manpower required to fulfill those missions, and we will have imposed upon that single staff chief a task so fantastic in contemplation as to defy man's imagination.

It is perhaps fortunate for the Nation that at this stage of the game several proposals have been put forth by those who are convinced that our present system of military planning is inadequate. Perhaps each of these proposals will serve to offset the other. I can think of no faster way to bring about chaos, uncertainty, and hasty, ill-advised decisions, than to attempt at this time to revise our Joint Chiefs of Staff organization and to put a one-man super chief or a super Prussian staff in charge of all military planning.

We have in our Nation today four separate services—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. These 4 services are responsible to 3 military Secretaries; and all of them in turn are subject to the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense is responsible solely to the President of the United States. These four services have statutory functions, or missions, that have been well established. These four services exist to protect the United States of America from defeat in armed conflict. The Army is responsible for land operations on a sustained basis; the Navy is responsible for naval operations, including submarine warfare, maintaining the sea lanes, and naval air war; the Air Force is, unquestionably, at this point in our history, our first line of defense in thermonuclear war for it possesses the power of retaliation of sufficient size to deter aggression; the Marine Corps continues as our combat-ready amphibious force, small in size but capable of rapid movement to troubled areas. Each of these services requires a different type of weapons system to fulfill their assigned functions. Each must be capable of fighting the type of war for which they have been particularly trained.

These four services exist because we face the possibility of conventional war, naval war, air war, missile war, nuclear war, limited wars of different types, and variations of all of the preceding types of wars. Place all of these services under one supreme Prussian general staff, or one superstaff, or one superchief of staff, and eventually we will have an armed force that will be a jack of all trades and master of none.

Put a naval officer in supreme military command of our Armed Forces, and human nature being what it is, naval warfare will become the modus operandi of all four services. Place an airman in control of all of the services and eventually all four services will find themselves concentrating almost exclusively on air warfare. Place an Army officer in charge of all of our services, and eventually sustained land operations will receive the greatest amount of defense expenditures. But under our present system where each service is represented on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, where planning is done on a four-service basis, and where each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after agreeing upon the plan, must return to his own service and be responsible for the execution of that plan and we have concentrated responsibility and authority.

Divide that responsibility, as some advocate, and we will have chaos.

Let each of the services develop their own weapons system, in spite of the fact that by so doing they are competing with each other. They are competing for weapons that will make them the best in their business. They are competing just like American industry is competing to produce better products. If competition in business and industry has made America great, I see no reason to believe that coordinated competition is not just as healthy for our armed services. What is wrong with one service trying to improve upon a weapons system developed by another service? Was it a sin for the Navy to insist, back in the 1930's, that an air-cooled airplane engine was superior to the liquid-cooled engine advocated by the Army Air Corps? Who was the loser when both engines were developed? Those who would like to delve into history will find the answer in the skies above the sea in the Pacific when the air-cooled Navy engine was able to liquidate the Japanese Air Force. Had the Navy been forced by one supreme staff commander to adopt the liquid-cooled engine, the history of the war in the Pacific, as well as in Europe, in World War II would have been completely different.

Who among our citizens today has the capability, the capacity, the foresight, yes, the luck, to say which missile is the best in competition with another similar missile? Would it not be better to develop two or three missiles independent of each other but with a complete interchange of ideas in order that we may not only have a good missile, but that we may have the best missile.

Centralization of power, centralization of responsibility, centralization of decision, are catchwords that have eye-appeal, but in my opinion, dangerous results. If centralization was as effective as those who advocate its adoption would have us believe, then industry would be moving toward that goal, rather than its present trend of decentralization.

The same arguments for concentration of military authority in a supreme staff could be used to argue that we could get quicker decisions in Government by abolishing the 48 States, eliminating both Houses of Congress, and the Supreme Court, and placing all authority in a Super Executive.

That there should be an overall planning staff is obvious, but to strip that planning staff, known as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of the individual responsibilities of its members for the proper execution of its plans, is completely absurd. But it is equally absurd to ask any one man, or any one supreme general staff to be responsible not only for the planning, but for the execution of plans that involve the complexities of the four separate services.

As any individual knows who has any faint knowledge of the armed services, being familiar with the operations of one service is a gargantuan undertaking in itself. To impose the complexities of all four services in one military command is to invite chaos and destruction. There is, of course, the possibility that one military command, responsible for one type of warfare, could function properly, if there is anyone in America with sufficient clairvoyance to be able to predict for the next 50 years the type of war, or wars, that will be fought, the manpower that will be required, the weapons that will be utilized, the materiel that will be needed, and where those wars will be fought. If such a man could be found, a staff could be created which would have one assigned mission, or one assigned function—that of fighting one particular type of war. All efforts would be concentrated on that type of war. But since

we are a nonaggressive nation, it is just barely possible that potential enemies might be mean enough to initiate a different kind of war.

Our response to that type of war would have to be confined solely to that type of defense for which we were prepared. And if that type of defense were a hydrogen war, then the smallest type of conflict could lead to an all-out war of annihilation; or in the alternative, we would stand by, powerless to act, for fear of initiating an all-out war of annihilation.

So long as we remain a nonaggressive nation, we have no choice but to be prepared at all times for conventional wars, nuclear wars, limited wars, all-out nuclear wars, all-out conventional wars, limited naval wars, all-out naval wars, limited air wars, all-out air wars, missile wars, space wars, weather wars, and psychological wars.

Show me the one individual capable of making all of the decisions involved in these possibilities.

In the final analysis, the basic concept of the Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot be criticised as inferior or inadequate. We must not forget that the Joint Chiefs of Staff system won the greatest war in world history.

The German Government lost the war under the supreme general-staff system; the very system, or something comparable to it, we are now being urged to adopt.

And I refuse to be stampeded into precipitous and dangerous changes merely because a Soviet-built satellite is circling the earth.

I do not underestimate the scientific achievement of sputnik, but I will not subscribe to the theory that a proven system of military planning must be placed on the altar as a scapegoat offering because we weren't the first in the orbit.

## The Brooks Proposal for a National Science Scholarship Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the past 100 days we in the United States have been living with knowledge of a fact that is singularly unique in the recent history of our country. The fact is simply this: The leadership of the United States in scientific development has been seriously challenged by the most powerful country in the Communist bloc of nations. We are now engaged in a full-scale race for technological superiority of the world.

This fact is hard for us to accept. We have enjoyed technological superiority in the world during the lifetime of every Member serving in the House of Representatives today. And the people of America have used this superiority and knowledge to provide for our people the finest standard of living that civilization has ever produced. However, the fact that our superiority has been challenged is a naked reality nonetheless.

If a nation basically friendly to the principles of democracy had challenged us in scientific development, I feel sure that all free people in the world would have been pleased at the progress of another free nation. This progress would have strengthened the cause of freedom and we all could share in the benefits of these new technical achievements. This, as we already know, is not the case. This dramatic challenge was issued by a country with a government which feeds on despotism and will employ any means at its disposal to displace democratic freedom by Communist domination.

A powerful nation, unfriendly to democratic freedom and opportunities, can be expected to use its technological superiority to work against, rather than to work for, free people and the sacred rights of each individual human being. And so in our race for technological superiority in the world, we see clearly that our stake in this race is the very survival of Democracy itself. There is no prize for second place.

We believe there is more strength and lasting power in freedom and opportunity and respect for the individual person than there is in despotism and dictatorship. I believe we have proved this principle in times of both peace and war. Democracy is not weak. But when we find our leadership challenged in a race for survival we are sternly reminded that the enemies of democracy are not weak either. And this is a time when we must reexamine the efforts and resources we are devoting to survival.

We have resources which are not being used to their fullest extent and we know that with these resources better utilized our efforts in scientific development could be increased tremendously. The diagnosis of our present precarious position would seem to be that we have not used our freedom and opportunities as well as we might have.

The most important resource we have in our free Nation is talented young men and women. Perhaps the most important shortcoming we have let survive in America lies in our not offering sufficient encouragement for each individual young man and woman to develop his own God-given capabilities to their maximum extent.

This race for technological superiority has been called a war of the classrooms by Communist leaders and they boast they shall win this war. This is indeed a war of the classrooms; however, I believe that freedom to inquire and to think and to create is a superior climate for education than the climate of unnecessary regimentation if our young people are realistically encouraged to exercise that freedom.

In a great deal of study of the educational opportunities in my own Congressional district and over the Nation, one of the most disturbing facts I have reviewed is an estimate that fewer than half of the top 25 percent of high-school graduates are obtaining the higher education needed for full development of their individual capabilities. It is also estimated that each year more than 100,000 high-school graduates capable of doing well in college do not attend college because of financial hardship.

College training is not essential to a useful and full life in our country, but no one can deny that a person's contribution in life could be made significantly greater if he has had the opportunity to develop further his native abilities through continued education after high school. And no one can deny that in this race for technological development, college training is essential for our scientists, our engineers, our technicians, and our teachers of these subjects who will be leading our Nation in this race a few years from now.

Figures comparing the educational programs of the Soviet Union with our own give us a further clue as to why the Communists apparently have overtaken us in vital areas of scientific achievement. The Soviet Union is estimated to have 266,000 engineering students enrolled at this time. In the United States, 156,000 students are enrolled in engineering courses. In 1955, 67,000 scientists and 59,000 engineers were graduated from Soviet institutions of higher learning. The United States produced 36,400 scientists and 22,600 engineers from our colleges and universities in 1955.

Basic to the shortage of college-trained scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and technicians is the problem of sufficient preparation for more work in these fields in our secondary schools. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that only 2 of every 10 high-school graduates have taken physics, only 3 of 10 have taken chemistry, only 3 of 10 have taken more advanced math than elementary algebra, and slightly more than 1 of 10 has taken solid geometry or trigonometry.

In the Soviet Union it is reported every graduate of their 10-year school has studied mathematics up to and including trigonometry; every graduate has studied 4 years of chemistry; every graduate has studied 5 years of physics; and, also included in the Soviet curriculum is 6 years of study in a foreign language.

These comparisons must not be taken as a wholesale criticism of our local school boards, our colleges, and our teachers. We do not need unconstructive and unfair criticism of our school systems and the dedicated people who work in them. The shortage of teachers in scientific and engineering fields alone both in our secondary schools and in our colleges has reached the point of a national emergency.

There are approximately 25,000 high schools in the United States. In 1956 204 persons graduated from college prepared to teach physics. Only about 100 of these graduates actually entered teaching. Five hundred and twenty-one graduated prepared to teach chemistry. Only about 250 actually entered teaching. Twenty-five hundred and forty-four graduated prepared to teach mathematics. Only about 1,700 actually entered teaching.

It is difficult to estimate the number of additional science and mathematics teachers needed in our secondary schools. However, a recent survey estimated that only one-half of our high schools offered courses in chemistry, about one-half offered courses in physics, and about one-half offered solid geometry and trigonometry. The paucity

of qualified science and mathematics teachers is believed to be a prime cause of the complete absence of these courses in many schools and a basic reason that only a small fraction of students take these courses even when they are offered.

There is no single cure-all solution which will place the United States back in undisputed first place in the technological race for survival. But one factor in any solution is clearly apparent. To regain the lead in our race for survival and to retain that lead are going to call for the best efforts of every part of our society. Educators, businessmen, labor leaders, industrialists along with political and military leaders are all going to have to make a significant contribution. In this way I believe we can demonstrate that an accelerated program of science education can be developed in our country without destroying or endangering any of the democratic freedoms we are working to preserve.

In order immediately to begin a constructive program toward training more interested and qualified young people in scientific fields, I am introducing in the House of Representatives today a bill entitled the National Science Scholarship Act.

My proposal would provide a 6-year scholarship program for 20,000 new students each year who are qualified to work toward a bachelor's degree in the field of science, mathematics and engineering. Special encouragement is included in the bill to students who select required education courses as their minor subjects or elective courses so they will be qualified to enter the teaching field upon graduation.

Interested high-school students over the Nation would take a uniform aptitude test. Then State educational agencies would provide for final award of scholarships to students making outstanding grades on the examination. The State agency would also consider the student's ability to finance his own college education without scholarship aid. The 20,000 scholarships would be divided among the several States and Territories in proportion to the total number of high-school graduates in each State or Territory the preceding year.

Once awarded a scholarship by the State, the student would be free to select his own college or university from an approved list of accredited institutions. Each student would be awarded an amount not to exceed $1,700 per calendar year to meet payments of tuition and fees required by the institution and to be applied to his living expenses and books.

To help the colleges and universities meet the additional need for laboratories, equipment and other facilities to provide adequate training for National Science Scholarship students, my proposal would also include provision for extension of the college loan program administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to include these facilities. The appropriation, of course, would be considered in the annual budget for the HHFA by appropriate Congressional committees.

Scholarships and the loan program will not in themselves guarantee the United States technological superiority in the world. But I believe these two areas are excellent ones in which the Congress can add impetus to a practical program to strengthen our forces in the war of the classroom without weakening our traditional concepts of local control of education.

Neither will a scholarship program in itself immediately solve all the challenges presented in offering our young Americans an opportunity to develop their own abilities to the greatest possible extent. Our efforts to assure the United States of technological superiority in the world are going to require the cooperation and coordination of every part of our democracy. Working together with this serious goal in mind, I believe the job can be done.

---

## Salute to Italy on the 10th Anniversary of Her Republican Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today has been set aside by the Italian Government for official celebration of Italy's republican constitution. It is, therefore, a day of deep significance for all of us. I am pleased and proud to take this opportunity to extend congratulations and best wishes to our Italian friends.

Actually, it was a little over 10 years ago that Italy, for the first time in the exercise of popular sovereignty, gave herself a fundamental law. By means of this single important stroke, Italy signified her intention to become associated with the free nations of the world on an equal footing. And in this way, Italy was making a vital contribution to the peace of the world.

Clearly, the adoption of the republican constitution was a great landmark in the history of Italy. Today as that landmark recedes in our memory, and as it takes its rightful place in the history of world democracy, we are in a better position to ascertain and assess its true significance to the Italian people. With the advantage of 10 years' experience and hindsight one is certainly justified in stating that the republican constitution, with all its liberal, democratic, and progressive features, has been a distinct blessing to the people of Italy.

As the result of World War II Italy's governmental machinery needed drastic overhauling, and whatever government there was, was in disrepute. The welcome end of the Fascist dictatorship had left a political vacuum, and the people of Italy had become masters of their own destiny. In June of 1946 they were given the choice of retaining their old monarchical form of government, or of adopting another form. In the general elections they decided, once and for all, and by an overwhelming majority, to do away with the monarchy and create an Italian republic. This, one might say was the beginning of the republican constitution, although its adoption and implementation did not take effect until January of 1948.

The framers of that constitution were thoroughly inspired with the spirit of the age, and, what is perhaps more important, they were attuned to the temper of the Italian people. The instrument they drafted is a liberal and progressive document, including broad guaranties of human rights, and providing for universal adult suffrage. For a full decade it has been in force, and judging by Italy's social, economic, political, and educational progress, it has served her magnificently.

Today Italy is a prosperous, highly industrialized and progressive republic, one of the largest not only in Europe but in the whole world. Since the end of the last war she has made great advances in nearly all phases of human endeavor. And it is no exaggeration to say that much credit goes to the historic document, the Republican Constitution of 1948, which provided the governmental framework that guaranteed full and free interplay for all Italian talent.

At the same time, we should not overlook or minimize the decisive role played in postwar Italy by moderate, judicious, wise and patriotic leaders—a band of able men who patiently and painstakingly led Italy from destitution and dictatorship to prosperity and democracy. In spite of ever-present Communist threats, from within and from without, Italy successfully met all dangers.

In due time she was admitted to the United Nations, and she was a charter member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the pillar of the European defense system.

Because of the long-standing close, friendly ties between America and Italy, this occasion is of particular significance to us. Though geographical distance has prevented great masses of the two peoples from knowing each other intimately, and even though at times governmental acts have discouraged close acquaintanceship, yet close ties have always existed.

In this country this bond was first exhibited almost a hundred years ago when Italy was striving to create a free and united nation. In that successful national struggle the sympathies of the Government as well as of the people of this country were with the Italian people. After attaining their freedom and unity, we watched them grow strong and powerful, and we applauded and enjoyed ways in which creative and constructive Italian genius redeemed some of the glories of Rome.

During the First World War Italians fought side by side with us in Europe in defense of democracy. Then came the unhappy interlude of Fascist dictatorship. For more than 2 decades the fate and destiny of Italians were subject to the whims and wiles of an adventurer who was certainly no credit to Italy. Even then the people of this country kept their faith in Italy and its people.

We were grieved to see Italians forced to fight on the side of our enemies in

the last war, yet when the people of Italy rid themselves of their unwanted dictator and put an end to the dictatorship, it was natural and fitting that we joined in postwar efforts to get them back on their feet.

Through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Marshall plan, mutual-security aid, civilian supplies, agricultural commodities, and military hardware, we helped to contribute to Italy's remarkable recovery. By means of this assistance the American people expressed their friendship and heartfelt sympathy for a people who had suffered much. We thus affirmed our faith in the future of Italy, acknowledged our indebtedness to that noble land for its many contributions to world progress and culture, and expressed—in some small way—our obligation for the many fine Italians who have made their mark in America.

On this 10th anniversary of Italy's Republican Constitution, we can be glad and proud that we were able to extend a helping hand to these people with whom we have so many common ties. We can rejoice in the magnificent manner in which Italy has come back. And we can be confident that, acting within the guidelines of her Constitution, Italy will continue to play a vital role in the activities of the free world.

---

## Statement of Representative Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in Opposition to Pay Television

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 1958*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in opposition to pay television:

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished committee in opposition to pay-as-you-see television and any tendency of the Federal Communications Commission, directly or indirectly to encourage it, and incidentally to urge prompt and favorable consideration of my bill, H. R. 586—a bill "to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in the home." The one purpose of this bill is to keep faith with the American people for, basically, it is they who own the airwaves that are used in broadcasting television programs. From the beginning of television we have constantly encouraged the people to believe that the cost of their receiving equipment is also the full price of their admission to all programs broadcast over those airwaves.

Present proposals to preempt certain channels for television at a price, and to block the people's access to programs broadcast over those channels unless the fee is paid, seem to me to involve a wanton impairment of the rights of the public in the spectrum. Such action will turn the substantial cost of a TV set into a mere downpayment to be followed by lifetime installment charges for the privilege of enjoying a public resource. Yet it is clear that, unless Congress takes prompt and explicit action, the Federal Communications Commission will shortly authorize widespread broadcasts of pay television on an experimental basis as a prelude to regular subscription TV assignments. Such authorization will threaten the very existence of free program reception upon which millions of Americans have come to depend. The foreseeable result is a television system in which we will all be paying for much the same TV fare which now comes to us without cost. The Commission's apparent determination to proceed quickly, unless Congress forbids, has placed upon us as legislators the responsibility to act without delay.

H. R. 586 would meet that responsibility by amending the Federal Communications Act to make clear that the FCC shall not authorize or permit any television station to impose a toll, fee, subscription, or any other charge, direct or indirect, on the general public for the privilege of viewing television programs at home. The bill would make it unlawful for television stations to make such a charge or to scramble or encode their programs in such a way as to prevent the public from viewing them unless a fee is paid.

I have studied the current proposals to curtail the rights of the public in the television spectrum from a variety of viewpoints—that of a Member of Congress, concerned with administration of a public trust in a precious and limited natural resource; that of chairman of our House Antitrust Subcommittee, which recently reported on restrictive practices leading to concentration of control in the television broadcasting industry; that of a lawyer, interested in the ostensible statutory basis upon which the proposed tests are attempted to be justified; and last but not least, that of a member of the television audience, deeply interested in any proposal that will stimulate program improvement.

Careful study has convinced me that conversion of any segment of the spectrum to the service of toll television will only increase viewers' costs and broadcasters' profits, and this without producing any long-term improvement in programs. It will, I fear, contribute to still greater concentration of industry control in the same hands as at present—those of the networks—and will obscure the need for, and further delay, much-needed industry reforms. Moreover, the profit potential of these new techniques is such that their introduction may result in the ultimate disappearance of advertising-supported, free-to-the-viewer programing, as we know it. Indeed, mere experimentation in these techniques may start a trend that will be impossible to control. For these reasons, and others which I shall detail, I believe that prompt enactment of H. R. 586, or legislation of similar import, is vital to the survival of our system of free television program reception.

Proponents of pay television present a most alluring but deceptive picture. In the new technique they not only see added financial resources for the broadcasting industry, but, more important, they promise supplemental and superior programing to suit divergent tastes. No reason, they say, why enlightened minorities should not now have programs of their own choosing; no reason, either, why the two systems should not exist side by side. Let those who like things as they are continue to tune in on existing free programs, they say, and let those who are willing to pay enjoy the superior fare that will be served up to them for a fee. These enthusiastic supporters of restricted viewing insist that subscription programing need not withdraw any substantial amount of facilities or of talent from their service in free television. By way of special bait, the long-suffering prospective subscriber is invited to drool at the prospect of quality programs with no commercials. With all these supposed advantages, the advocates of pay TV conclude, the sporting and democratic thing to do is to permit trials in which the people may themselves select the method of broadcasting that best suits their tastes.

If it were possible for me to believe in this television heaven, I would not, of course, be opposed to the projected experiments. The pity is that upon closer scrutiny the elements of this most attractive picture dissolve and disappear. As I shall demonstrate, the objectives envisioned by the advocates of subscription television simply cannot be achieved.

Of course it is true that pay television would result in added financial revenues for broadcasting. The vast, untapped, television viewing audience is a veritable gold mine for exploitation by way of direct charges. Modest charges to a relatively restricted group of subscribers can produce tremendous revenues.

But it is quite another thing to assert, nor does it follow, that because pay TV would collect new revenues it would produce better shows. The inventions in pay TV that are being promoted have nothing to do with program production. They comprise devices for scrambling and unscrambling programs, restricting the viewer, monitoring his viewing time, and calculating his bill. Absence of these devices has not hampered the development of television shows, nor will their presence produce program improvement. Actually, there is no present dearth of programing resources, whether financial, technical, or artistic. Present-day television can produce superlative programs, and sometimes does. All that is needed is producer confidence in the validity of the public taste.

Those who look to pay TV for programs of greater intellectual content or artistic merit are, I fear, doomed to disappointment. Pay TV cannot be expected to devote itself extensively to artistic or intellectual programs. Under pay TV, as at present, the pressure will be to cater to a mass market for maximum profit—to appeal to as many viewers as possible, in order to take in more dollars. That means appeal to and conformity with the lowest denominators of public intelligence and desire. That appeal now exists in free TV and is the root of much evil. Mass appeal is generally true in all areas of the entertainment field. Nor is there reason to believe that there will be total freedom from commercials. What is there to prevent a franchise holder from selling commercial time? The president of a leading national advertising firm has flatly stated that there is no reason why television should not receive income both from commercial interests and from the viewing public. At first, no doubt, advertising would be kept out of subscription TV programs, but as acceptance of the new technique is achieved it is inevitable that commercials will be introduced for the extra revenue they will produce.

It is thus extremely unlikely that pay TV will produce either of the objectives by which it is attempted to be justified—that is program improvement and freedom from commercials.

Let me make it clear, though, that the objection to pay television goes much deeper than this. The objection is based on the fact that experimentation with pay TV threatens to start a chain reaction which cannot be controlled and which may end by destroying free television. For the assumption that free and pay television can coexist is open to the gravest question.

In the first place, the success of initial experiments will create demand for entry

into the new field which it will be difficult to resist. Station after station and program after program would be withdrawn from free TV service to the service of toll TV. An example of the way in which talent will be inexorably drawn to the subscription technique may be found in the sports field. Games of the Los Angeles Dodgers and the San Francisco Giants apparently will be unavailable for free TV, beginning next year, since broadcasting rights are being sold to toll TV interests which propose to use a closed wire system. This, although pay TV is not yet even a reality. As sports events begin to be broadcast over pay TV, they will cease to be available to free TV. Even the radio reporting of sports events may be stopped in order to protect the market for pay TV broadcasts.

I Love Lucy and Ed Sullivan's Show could not long remain free. The enticements and blandishments of stupendous compensation would not be resisted. Pay TV would capture such programs in a thrice. Most other good programs would follow suit. Thus, turnstile TV would soon siphon off the best talents and most attractive shows and leave free TV a barren waste.

This pressure of profitability must eventually leave its mark even upon those interests like the networks who, up to now, have opposed pay TV. Suppose, for example, that an unaffiliated UHF station is permitted to experiment with pay television, and that the experiments prove profitable. Local network affiliates would be impelled to protect their positions by applying for the same privilege. At this point the networks would become directly involved. In sheer defense of the vast concentration of skills, facilities, and talent under their control, the networks would eventually have to abandon their opposition and to enter the field in order to protect their investments and their positions of dominance in the industry. This is no idle prediction. The president of each of the two major networks has conceded as much.

In these circumstances, it is nonsense to speak of the projected tests as the submission of questions of public preference to the people for their choice. There can be no widespread plebiscite among viewers. Programs will be offered if enough viewers are found who are willing to pay. This need not be millions of viewers. The great majority, however, will have been deprived of their free access to station and program without an opportunity to register their choice, thus resulting in a division of the television audience based upon ability and willingness to pay.

Nor is it realistic to think that the proposed experiments can be turned on and off at will. Experimentation in such a dynamic field as television has long demonstrated that the point of no return may lie dangerously close to the threshold of experiment. If trials are conducted on a base broad enough to produce meaningful results, their success tends to generate vested interests and irresistible pressures. Thus, what is projected as a test all too frequently turns into an irrevocable commitment. Mistakes are peculiarly costly and all but irremediable.

A notable instance of this tendency of an experiment or expedient to become jelled as irreversible practice is the Commission's action in 1952, when it authorized UHF broadcasting intermixed in VHF saturated areas. By forcing the UHF operators who had no established receiver-set circulation to compete with well-established VHF stations the Commission made it virtually impossible for the new method of broadcasting to survive. Although the Commission soon recognized its error, it has not yet solved the problem that was created. The obvious explanation of the Commission's long failure to provide an effective remedy is that it desired to avoid hurting the profitable established VHF stations with which it was impossible for the UHF stations to compete.

I mention this not to belabor past errors of the Commission, but because it contains a clear warning against improvident experimentation with subscription television. Such experimentation may open the door to a plague of consequences that may prove virtually impossible to correct. Stations whose programs the viewing audience is accustomed to watch may be blacked out for those who cannot spare the price; the best of existing free programs may be preempted by pay TV; the trend noted by the Antitrust Subcommittee, toward monopolization of talent, may be accelerated, and the television audience will be divided along economic lines.

In this way a method of broadcasting will be inaugurated that may well destroy free television as we know it. For, if these experiments prove financially successful, those concerns which have carried out the tests will have a compelling and wholly proper interest in recouping their outlay of risk capital. In addition, those elements of the industry, including the networks, which have not been directly involved in the trials, will have an equally proper and compelling interest in protecting their existing investments—an interest which must inevitably drive them into the new field as applicants. What is more, it is difficult to perceive upon what basis the Federal Communications Commission could deny them entry.

It is easy to see where all this will lead. Profitability will dictate the extension of the experiments. Pay television will enter ever wider areas. The networks are more than likely to end up by supplying the programming for pay TV as they do at present in free TV. With a dominant industry position and vast resources the networks have produced only the present level of program quality in free television. What reason is there to suppose that they will be moved to improve that level in subscription television? Chances are that the programming will be pretty much the same, but with this difference: it will be more profitable to present and more expensive to receive. Meanwhile, free television will have been relegated to a secondary, economically impossible position. This turn of events, if it is allowed to occur, would most shabbily serve the public, in whose sole interest the FCC is authorized to grant broadcast licenses.

In addition to the foregoing considerations, there are substantial antitrust reasons why the television broadcasting industry should not be subject to the stresses and strains of experimentation on pay TV at this time. One of the principal conclusions of our Antitrust Subcommittee's report of last June on the television broadcasting industry is that the achievement of a truly nationwide and competitive television broadcasting system has been and is being frustrated by restrictive practices on the part of the networks and others, which tend toward concentration of power in the hands of the network organizations.

The subcommittee made detailed and extensive recommendations for the prompt removal of these obstacles to the normal development of this vital medium. Yet, the task of putting television's house in order is still far from completed. Indeed, the Commission's own network study staff, under the leadership of Dean Roscoe Barrow, last fall submitted a voluminous report to the Commission, including hundreds of pages of analysis of this very subject. Significantly, the Commission's own experts on its network study staff independently reached conclusions concerning restrictive practices in the television broadcasting industry, very similar to the findings previously arrived at by the Antitrust Subcommittee. Prompt implementation of this report by the Commission is essential. It may take many more months. Before this is accomplished, it seems most unwise to subject the industry to tests of techniques which must have profound influence on the economic structure of the entire industry and must necessarily aggravate this very problem of concentration. For unless ways are found to prevent increases in existing network dominance in the industry, the networks bid fair to end with similar concentration of power and influence in the techniques that will be ushered in by successful trials of pay TV. It is this concentration that prevents originality and encourages sameness in programing today. At least until the present obstacles to the healthy development of free television have been removed, there is no room for experimentation that carries with it a threat to the very existence of free program reception.

The grave dangers involved in the proposed tests and the abrupt departure they would mark from existing practice in both radio and television lead naturally to the question whether these tests can lawfully be authorized by the FCC under existing law. A number of circumstances tend to indicate the absence of any such authority. The Communications Act does not, of course, expressly authorize pay television. As the Commission concedes, it was not possible when the legislation was enacted to foresee all possible developments in the use of the radio spectrum. On the other hand, an underlying purpose of the act is regulation that will make communications systems "available, so far as possible, to all the people." If Congress, in enacting the Communications Act had for a moment contemplated that the public would be required to pay a fee for access to programs broadcast over the publicly owned frequencies, it would certainly have made provision for the filing of tariffs and the regulation of rates, as it did in the case of telephone and telegraph companies. The fact that Congress made no such provision is, to me, persuasive evidence that Congress did not have any such restriction on program reception in mind. As a consequence of the fact that Congress has never directly faced the question whether the airwaves should be diverted to the service of toll programing, the tests which are under contemplation would introduce a method of spectrum exploitation for which no clue of approval nor any framework of regulation has been provided. The Commission has frankly acknowledged its difficulties in attempting to classify the proposed new service under the existing law. It just doesn't fit.

For these reasons, I have urged that the risks involved in the proposed trials are of such magnitude, and the existence of the Commission's authority to embark on them is so questionable, that the Commission would be wise to refer the entire policy question to Congress, which has ultimate responsibility.

Last October, nevertheless, the FCC issued a report in which it apparently has reached the conclusion that the Communications Act sufficiently authorizes the Commission to conduct trials of subscription TV and in which it found that it would be in the public interest to exercise that power. The report invited applications from television stations and others for authorization to conduct trial subscription television operations on a limited basis. Although the Commission stated that it had not authorized or finally committed itself to the authorization of pay television on a trial or regular basis, and although it stated that no final action would be taken on any application before March 1, the entire tenor of the report serves notice that the Commission majority is imbued with determination to authorize trial demonstrations of pay TV. Unless Congress intervenes, the entire policy issue will be rendered moot.

According to the dissenting Commissioner, moreover, both the proponents and opponents

of subscription television before the Commission urged that test demonstrations are not necessary or useful, because no trial on a limited basis can disclose the ultimate effects of pay television. I believe that the true character of the proposed trials stands thus revealed. In the guise of a search for the true public interest, the tests will merely provide a demonstration of the profitability of subscription television. Once that has been established, the fat will be in the fire. By indirection, without a hearing, and without Congressional approval, the Commission will have taken the very step it now says it is too early to evaluate. Later hearings will merely reflect the new set of conditions which the tests have ushered in. They will disclose that a highly profitable technique has been inaugurated under FCC approval, and a new concept of the public interest will have been fashioned, as the result of the Commission's ostensible inquiry.

In the light of these developments, Congress should act promptly to clarify its intention. I repeat that authority of the FCC to institute pay television broadcasting on channels used by free television is extremely dubious, but I am confident that the Commission will refrain from taking any final action, in authorizing the proposed tests, long enough to enable Congress to act.

The question has been raised, and I want to make it clear once more, that the objective of my bill is to prohibit the use of the spectrum for restricted broadcasting. It is true that some, but by no means all, of the problems that I have raised apply also to so-called closed circuit or wire toll television, such as has been tested in Oklahoma, with results that are none too sanguine. The principal difference, of course, is that closed circuit transmission does not involve the radio frequency channels, but utilizes point-to-point communication by wire. Hence it does not involve the withdrawal of any part of the airwaves, or of broadcast stations from the free broadcasting service.

The need for Federal regulation of closed circuit TV has not yet been demonstrated, but it is entirely possible that such need will arise. The time may come when it will be neither feasible nor fair to subject on-the-air television to express Federal regulation, while exempting the closed circuit. Should that time come, the reach of the Commerce clause amply empowers Congress to provide needed regulation.

Meanwhile, I urge that Congress promptly clarify its purpose that the precious television spectrum shall not be withdrawn from service of all the people. I trust that Congressional power will always be used to the full extent necessary to assure the public of the fullest enjoyment of its natural resources.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 1958

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, by whose good providence we are the sharers of the rich and costly privileges which are our heritage in this dear land where shines freedom's holy light: Climbing the world's great altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee, out of the depths of our need of a wisdom greater than our own, we beseech, lead Kindly Light, lead Thou us on.

Endue with the spirit of understanding all to whom in these baffling days is entrusted the responsibility of government, as the watchmen upon the ramparts survey with faith and hope the state of the Nation and of the world. As with moral wrath we see vile treacheries which today foul the earth, give us that personal integrity, a pure heart and clean hands, which will make us fit to be the defenders of the high things which dignify and glorify the lives of all Thy children. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 7, 1958, was dispensed with.

## ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

CLIFFORD P. CASE, a Senator from the State of New Jersey; ROBERT S. KERR, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma; and THRUSTON B. MORTON, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, appeared in their seats today.

## NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND advanced in the center aisle; and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas said: Mr. President, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate, to join with a similar committee on the part of the House, to notify the President that a quorum was present and that we were prepared to receive any messages from him, has communicated with the President; and the President has informed us that he will appear before a joint session today. Therefore, I should like to inform Senators that it is expected that the Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for such joint session at 12:10 p. m. The President will address the joint session at 12:30.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Jere Cooper, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Henderson L. Lanham, late a Representative from the State of Georgia, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Augustine B. Kelley, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 231) providing for a joint session of Congress on Thursday, January 9, 1958, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 231, providing for a joint session; and when that is done, I request immediate action upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 231), which was read, as follows

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 9, 1958, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

## MEETING OF THE PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE DURING THE SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet today, during the session of the Senate.

## NOTICE OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Friday, January 17, and probably Saturday, January 18, if necessary, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will meet in special session in order to hear the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson. I make this announcement after consulting with members of the committee.

## SENATE SESSION FOLLOWING THE JOINT SESSION—CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that at the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate will return to its Chamber and will resume business; and there will be a

morning hour, for the introduction of bills, the presentation of petitions and memorials, and the transaction of other business, including any statements which Senators may desire to make.

Mr. PRESIDENT, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Fulbright | McNamara |
| Allott | Goldwater | Monroney |
| Anderson | Gore | Morse |
| Barrett | Green | Morton |
| Beall | Hayden | Mundt |
| Bennett | Hennings | Murray |
| Bible | Hickenlooper | Pastore |
| Bricker | Hill | Payne |
| Bush | Holland | Potter |
| Butler | Hruska | Proxmire |
| Byrd | Humphrey | Purtell |
| Capehart | Ives | Revercomb |
| Carlson | Jackson | Robertson |
| Carroll | Javits | Russell |
| Case, N. J. | Jenner | Saltonstall |
| Case, S. Dak. | Johnson, Tex. | Schoeppel |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Scott |
| Church | Kefauver | Smathers |
| Clark | Kennedy | Smith, Maine |
| Cooper | Kerr | Smith, N. J. |
| Cotton | Knowland | Sparkman |
| Curtis | Kuchel | Stennis |
| Dirksen | Langer | Symington |
| Douglas | Lausche | Talmadge |
| Dworshak | Long | Thurmond |
| Eastland | Magnuson | Thye |
| Ellender | Malone | Wiley |
| Ervin | Mansfield | Williams |
| Flanders | Martin, Iowa | Yarborough |
| Frear | McClellan | Young |

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

## PROCEDURE DURING THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I should like to observe that normally it is customary for the Presiding Officer to recognize the majority leader and then the minority leader. When the Senate returns to its Chamber, for the introduction of bills and the making of statements, I believe that the Members of the Senate realize that it would be fair to all Members if the Presiding Officer would recognize one Member from the majority, and then one from the minority, and alternate between them, for the purpose of recognizing Senators who wish to introduce bills. I do not wish to be presumptuous, but I do wish to suggest a procedure that would be agreeable to the majority and the minority leaders. If it is agreeable to the Vice President, Senators should be on notice—so they will understand—that that is the procedure to be followed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the procedure which will be followed by the Chair.

## JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to assemble in joint session to hear the message of the President of the United States.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint session to hear the address to be delivered by the President of the United States of America.

(For the address delivered by the President, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint session of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes, p. m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

## APPOINTMENTS SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 30, 1957,

The VICE PRESIDENT, subsequent to the sine die adjournment, made appointments to the following commissions, conference, and association, authorized by law or resolution of the Senate:

To the Civil War Centennial Commission, created by the act of September 7, 1957: Mr. ANDERSON; Mr. O'MAHONEY; Mr. BRICKER; and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania.

To the United States group of the Third North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference in Paris, created by the act of July 11, 1956: Mr. GREEN, chairman; Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. JAVITS.

To attend the general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in New Delhi, India, in December 1957, pursuant to Senate Resolution 177, agreed to August 26, 1957: Mr. MORSE, chairman; Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. MORTON.

To the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, established by the act of September 2, 1957: Mr. JENNER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Pursuant to the authority for appointment granted in House Concurrent Resolution 172, Mr. NEELY, as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. BEALL as members on the part of the Senate of the joint Congressional committee to investigate matters pertaining to the growth and expansion of the District of Columbia and its metropolitan area.

## ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 20, 1957,

Mr. SMATHERS, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report (No. 1170) on small-business participation in Government procurement, 1957, entitled "Government Procurement Policies," on December 30, 1957, which was printed.

## REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802 (a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the 10th Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 25, 1957.*

## REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith the 12th Semiannual Report on the Operations of the Mutual Security Program for the period January 1 through June 30, 1957.

During this time we have seen repeated evidence of the need for, and the results attained from, each of the major elements of our Free World partnership for mutual security. Through our contribution toward strong defense, we help make military attack less likely. Through programs of economic development and technical cooperation, we help the people in less developed areas of the free world to improve their living standards. Through emergency programs, undertaken to relieve human misery resulting from disaster, we live up to the best in our heritage of concern for our fellowman.

The mutual security program carried out in concert with other free nations, remains a vital and proven instrument for advancing the security and economic progress both of our own Nation and of our partners in the Free World.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 23, 1957.*

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the business of the Senate for the remainder of today be confined to the transaction of routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say by way of explanation that this means that the unfinished business will not be laid before the Senate at 2 o'clock. Therefore Senators may proceed with the transaction of routine business, such as the introduction of bills and the making of statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT AND REPRESENTATIVE HOMER THORNBERRY OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if my colleagues will indulge me briefly, I should like to make a statement.

There is one occasion in any man's life—even in the life of an officeholder—when any hint of partisanship should go by the board. It is an occasion which belongs peculiarly and uniquely to the individual involved. I refer to a man's birthday.

Today, January 9, happens to be the birthday of two men with whom I have relationships which, although each is different from the other, are in both cases pleasant.

One of these men is a former Member of the House and a former Member of the Senate, our distinguished Vice President, RICHARD NIXON.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

To him—and I mean it most sincerely—I say, "Happy birthday, Mr. President; many, many happy returns of the day. May there be many more happy birthdays." [Applause.]

The other man to whose birthday I wish to invite attention is an able and popular Member of the House, one of the best friends I have in the world, and my own Representative in Congress. I refer to Representative HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas. I send my warm wishes to HOMER for the happiest birthday he has ever known, and with them the hope that he will know many, many more birthdays, each better than the preceding one. [Applause.]

As I am sure Senators know, that great Texan and great American, our beloved Speaker of the House, the honorable SAM RAYBURN, observed his birthday on Monday. It was my privilege on that day to extend to him in person my felicitations.

I thank my colleagues for their indulgence.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this is one occasion which crosses party lines. On behalf of myself as minority leader—and I am sure that all other Members of the Senate, without regard to partisanship, wish to join—I am happy to join my colleague across the aisle, the majority leader, in wishing a very happy birthday to the Vice President.

I have had a long and pleasant association with him over a great number of years, since he first came to the House, and subsequently was my colleague in the Senate. He took the oath once as Senator and twice as Vice President of the United States, after assuming the obligations of that high office.

I know that all Senators on this side of the aisle and on the other side will wish for the Vice President many future happy returns of the day. [Applause.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, all I wish to say is amen to what has been said by the majority leader and the minority leader. [Applause.]

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### REPORTS ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there had been no significant developments to report for the months of July and September 1957, relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there had been no significant developments to report for the months of August and October 1957, relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there had been no significant developments to report for the month of November 1957, relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE AND OTHER ANIMAL DISEASES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT ON AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE POLISH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to an agreement amending the Surplus Agricultural Commodities Agreement of June 7, 1957, between the United States and the Polish People's Republic (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT ON AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND UNITED MEXICAN STATES

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to an agreement entered into with the Government of Mexico, providing for the sale of yellow corn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### RIGHTS-OF-WAY OVER NATIONAL FOREST LANDS AND OTHER LANDS UNDER JURISDICTION OF FOREST SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant easements for rights-of-way over national forest lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering operations of that Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT ON PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF LOANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans as of January 3, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT ON AGREEMENTS UNDER TITLE I, AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, under date of January 8, 1958 (with acompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 74)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, president of the National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

### LUMP-SUM APPROPRIATION FOR CREDITING POSTAL REVENUES

A letter from the Assistant Postmaster General, requesting a lump-sum appropriation in the amount of $2,259,000 be made to the Post Office Department for crediting postal revenues, for the fiscal year 1958, relating to franked mail by Members of Congress and others, and penalty mail of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

### REPORT ON BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER CONTROL OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the balances of appropriations under the control of that Administration, as of June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

### REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of appropriations in that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Two letters from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of appropriations in that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in that Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, the overobligation of an appropriation in that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

### Reports on Reapportionment of Appropriations

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration entitled "Servicemen's Indemnities" for the fiscal year 1958 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of State for "International contingencies" for the fiscal year 1958 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated September 27, 1957, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Inpatient care" for the fiscal year 1958 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated December 19, 1957, referring to his letter of September 27, 1957, in which he reported that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Inpatient care" for the fiscal year 1958 has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, referring to his letter of July 30, 1957, in which he reported that the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for "compensation and pensions" for the fiscal year 1958 had been apportioned on that date on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Canal Zone Government for operating expenses, for the fiscal year 1958, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, for the fiscal year 1958, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, for the fiscal year 1958, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for "Salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1958, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental or deficiency appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for veterans," for the fiscal year 1958, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Forest protection and utilization, Forest Service," for the fiscal year 1958, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

### Report on Judgments Rendered by United States Court of Claims

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all judgments rendered by that Court, for the year ended October 5, 1957 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

### Reports on Individual Military Procurement Actions

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, confidential reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, listing individual procurement actions for the period January 1 to June 30, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Statistical Supplement to Stockpile Report

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential statistical supplement to the stockpile report, for the period January to June 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Report on Research and Development Procurement Experimental Action

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Experimental Action Report," covering the period from January 1, 1957, to June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Report on Working Capital Funds of Department of Defense

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on working capital funds of that Department, dated June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Permanent Professor of Physical Education, United States Military Academy

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a permanent professor of physical education at the United States Military Academy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Reports on Number of Officers on Duty With Department of the Army and Army General Staff

Two letters from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the number of commissioned officers and warrant officers assigned to headquarters agencies of the Department of the Army, as of June 30, 1957, and September 30, 1957 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Report on Research and Development Contracts

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department listing research and development contracts awarded during the period January 1, 1957, to June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Procedure for Ordering Certain Members of Reserve Components to Active Duty

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the procedure for ordering certain members of the Reserve components to active duty and the requirements for physical examination of members of the Reserve components (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Temporary Promotion of Ensigns of the Navy and Second Lieutenants of the Marine Corps

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the temporary promotion of ensigns of the Navy and second lieutenants of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Report on Flight Pay, Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, the monthly flight pay of officers of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, paid during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, December 13, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Report on Research and Development Procurement Actions, Department of the Navy

A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department covering research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, during the period January 1 through June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Boards of Visitors to United States Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 4355 (h), 6968 (h), and 9355 (h) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the Boards of Visitors to the United States Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Employment of Naval Officers on Shore Duty

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces),

transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 6018 of title 10, United States Code, requiring the Secretary of the Navy to determine that the employment of officers of the Regular Navy on shore duty is required by the public interest (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF RADIO TRANSMITTERS TO NEW HAMPSHIRE AERONAUTICS COMMISSION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Department of the Navy proposes to transfer five radio transmitters to the New Hampshire Aeronautics Commission at Concord, N. H.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, as relates to the Uniform Code of Military Justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICIALS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of September 30, 1957, there was an aggregate of 2,676 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE FLYING PAY

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of officers, lieutenant colonel and above, by grade and age, receiving flying pay on August 31, 1957, together with the monthly amount of such pay, during the period March 1, 1957 through August 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, informing the Senate that the Department of Defense had decided to withdraw its support of H. R. 3041, to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1957, for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON HELIUM PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, the amount of money credited to and disbursements made from the helium production fund, and the unexpended and unobligated balance on hand in such fund, as of June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions, for the quarter ending June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the Federal contributions program, relating to that Administration, for the quarter ended September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS ESTABLISHED IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense under the authority of Public Law 1028, 84th Congress, as amended, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, for the period January 1, 1957, through June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPECIAL REPORT ON CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORD OF THE LATE CAPT. DONALD FOSTER WHITE, UNITED STATES NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, on the correction of the military record of the late Capt. Donald Foster White, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Administration, for the quarter ended September 30, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control for the third quarter, fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF OPERATIONS UNDER DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on operations under the Defense Production Act of 1950, dated November 8, 1957, relating to the tungsten industry and voluntary agreements and programs (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH SMALL AND LARGE BUSINESS FIRMS FOR WORK IN THE UNITED STATES

Two letters from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with small and large concerns for work in the United States for the months of July 1957, July 1956, and fiscal year 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting two reports on military prime contracts with small and large concerns for work in the United States for the first 2 months of fiscal year 1958, and for the first quarter of fiscal year 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority for the quarter ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the president, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that bank as of the close of business June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation for the calendar year 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON VOLUNTARY HOME MORTGAGE CREDIT PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Chairman, National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program, dated April 1, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS OF PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on estimated obligations of principal activities of the Small Business Administration, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1957, adjusted as of July 31 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1955

A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITIONS BY NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Director, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land acquisitions by that Commission for the fiscal year 1957, for the development of the park, parkway and playground system of the National Capital (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT OF CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES, INC.

A letter from the past president of the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that conference for the period June 1, 1956, to August 24, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company, for the year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF RENEGOTIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, legislative commission, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of that Legion, for the period ended October 31, 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the International Educational Exchange Program for the first 6 months of fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPUBLIC OF ICELAND

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period January 1, to June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the period ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposition of surplus property during the past year by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposition of certain foreign excess property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PERSONAL PROPERTY MADE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, for the period July 1 through September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS FOR RESTORATION OF BALANCES WITHDRAWN FROM APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the restoration of the balance withdrawn from the appropriation "Export control," Bureau of Foreign Commerce (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the restoration of unobligated balances to two appropriation accounts of the Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts entitled "12M1105-State and Private Forestry Cooperation, Forest Service, Prior Years", and "12-2162700(29)-Government and Relief in Occupied Areas, Army (Transfer to Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service), 1956" (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of balances withdrawn from the appropriation entitled "Salaries and Expenses" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the restoration of balances withdrawn from the account entitled "War Agency Liquidation, Interior" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the restoration of balances withdrawn from an allocation to the National Bureau of Standards out of the appropriation "Ordnance and Facilities, Navy, 1953" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of balances withdrawn from the appropriation "Operation and Regulation", Civil Aeronautics Administration, and "Consolidated Working Fund", Civil Aeronautics Administration (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for partial restoration of the balance withdrawn from the appropriation "Salaries and Expenses", Business and Defense Services Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of certain funds to the Chief of Engineers (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ABACA-FIBER OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law a report on abaca-fiber operations, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for research and development purposes, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, RELATING TO LEASING OF FEDERAL BUILDING SITES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Washington, D. C., Central Office, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy, dated September 5, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1956, 1955, and 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Lower Colorado River Basin, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Facilities Corporation, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the period July 1, 1955, through January 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, an audit report on the Columbia River Basin water resources development program, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Narcotics, Treasury Department, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the national school lunch program and special school milk program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Navy industrial fund, Marine Corps clothing and equipment factory, Philadelphia Marine Corps supply activity, Department of the Navy, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1955 and 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the general supply fund, General Services Administration, for the period July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Army industrial fund, Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Chemical Corps, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Department of the Air Force, Facilities Contract AF 33 (038)-16864, with Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Wright Aeronautical Division, Wood-Ridge, New Jersey (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Central Valley Basin, Calif., water resources development program, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and Corps of Engineers (civil functions), Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report on Review of the Oak Ridge, Tenn., Appraisal Office

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of the Oak Ridge, Tenn., Appraisal Office, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated December 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report on Review of the Nashville Housing Authority, Nashville, Tenn.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of the Nashville Housing Authority, Nashville, Tenn., 1956, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report on Review of the Housing Authority of the City of Atlanta, Ga.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of the Housing Authority of the City of Atlanta, Ga., 1956, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report on Procurement of Energa Grenades

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the procurement of energa grenades by the Ordnance Procurement Center, United States Army, Europe (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report on Examination of Military Assistance Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the military assistance program, Department of Defense, dated March 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report on Review of Duplication of Government Activities and Related Facilities, Canal Zone

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of the duplication of Government activities and related facilities in the Canal Zone, dated December 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report on Review of Administration of Government-Owned Property in Certain Cases

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a review of the administration of Government-owned property in possession of defense contractors, dated December 3, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report on Use of Progress Payments in Offshore Procurement Contracts

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of progress payments in offshore procurement contracts awarded by the Ordnance Procurement Center, United States Army, Europe, dated September 12, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report of Attorney General on Renewal of Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas

A letter from the Attorney General, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report consenting to the renewal of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas, as of September 1, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### Report on Plan of Rehabilitation for Harlingen Division, Lower Rio Grande Rehabilitation Project, Texas

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Plan of Rehabilitation for Harlingen Division, Lower Rio Grande Rehabilitation Project, Texas, dated February 1956, together with an application for loan to the Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 of Harlingen, Tex. (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### Report of New York City National Shrines Advisory Board—Rehabilitation and Preservation of Historic Properties

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of New York City National Shrines Advisory Board, dated January 31, 1957, and a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 632), relating to the rehabilitation and preservation of historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### Report on Outer Continental Shelf Lands

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipts and expenditures by that Department in connection with the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U. S. C., sec. 1343); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### Report on Klamath River Basin Compact

A letter from the Federal representative, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Coulee Dam, Wash., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report, dated August 28, 1957, on the negotiations leading up to the signing of the Klamath River Basin compact (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### Cancellation of Certain Charges Existing as Debts Due the United States by Individual Indians and Tribes of Indians

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of

Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, TERRA BELLA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Terra Bella Irrigation District, California, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, CHOWCHILLA WATER DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Chowchilla Water District, California, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL EXPLOSIVES ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the Federal Explosives Act (55 Stat. 863) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings in the claim of the *Red Lake Band, et al., plaintiffs*, v. *United States, defendant*, had been finally concluded (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings in the claim of *Hannahville Indian Community, Wilson, Michigan, Forest County Potawatomi Community, Crandon, Wisconsin, et al., plaintiffs*, v. *United States of America, defendant*, had been finally concluded (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings in the claim of *The Chickasaw Nation, petitioner*, v. *The United States, defendant*, had been finally concluded (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON STATUS OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ADEQUACY OF AUTHORITY TO PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF MINORS AND INCOMPETENT INDIANS OF WIND RIVER RESERVATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the adequacy of his authority to protect the interests of minors and incompetent Indians of the Wind River Reservation, and the adequacy of the contribution of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period July 1, 1957, through September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROVISION OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE AND MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that Department in providing war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON COMMISSARY ACTIVITIES, CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial report on the commissary activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration outside the continental United States, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Four letters from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, for the period June 1, 1957, to October 31, 1957 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON LICENSED HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a set of the newly issued maps entitled "Principal Electric Utility Generating Stations and Transmission Lines, 1957" (with accompanying maps); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the publications entitled "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1956" and "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1956 Supplement" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the publications entitled "Major Natural Gas Pipe Lines Map, dated June 30, 1957," and "Typical Residential Electric Bills, 1957" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON TORT CLAIMS PAID

A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department, during the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Deputy General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Commission, during the period July 1, 1956, through June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Administration, during the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., September 18–20, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY EVACUATED UNDER MILITARY ORDERS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the adjudications rendered during the year 1957, of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry evacuated under military orders, showing the name and address of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, if any, the amount paid, if any, and a brief synopsis of the facts in the case and the reason for the adjudication (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMIRALTY CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims paid by that Department under the Admiralty Claims Act, during the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM FOR DAMAGE TO STEAMSHIP "HERMAN MELVILLE"

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the payment of $3,411 to the American Export Lines, Inc., Hoboken, N. J., in full settlement of a claim for damage to the steamship *Herman Melville;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JAMES R. MARTIN AND OTHERS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management), Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of James R. Martin and others (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FELIX GARCIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Felix Garcia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by that Department under the Military Personnel Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAIM OF WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH CO. AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Western Union Telegraph Co. against the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR

A letter from the corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that corporation, for the period July 26, 1957, to September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAIM OF S. A. HEALY CO. v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the opinion of that court in the claim of *S. A. Healy Co.* v. *The United States,* rendered on December 4, 1957 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND REPORT OF SONS OF UNION VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR

A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Trenton, N. J., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit of the books of and a report of the activities of that organization, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that association, dated March 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders issued granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D. C., signed by the president, secretary, and treasurer, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that association, as of September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

A letter from the Chairman, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, the final report of that Committee (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DR. RAYMOND A. VONDERLEHR

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON BONDING OF GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the bonding of Government officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act applicable to certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON ESTIMATED COST OF COMPLETING THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the estimated cost of completing the national system of interstate and defense highways in each State and the District of Columbia prepared for the purpose of apportioning Interstate System funds authorized for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, 1961, and 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT RELATING TO REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN HIGHWAYS IN NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to reimbursement for certain highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, for the period between August 2, 1947, and June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter, signed by the Chairman and members of the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, Wilson Dam, Ala., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS BY LOCAL INTERESTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the operation and maintenance of certain flood control projects by local interests (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

ALTERATION OF CERTAIN BRIDGES OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 21, 1940, as amended, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable water so as to change the method by which the apportionment of total cost is made (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF PROJECTS IN CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans, for flood control, irrigation, and other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal voting assistance program, for the period August 9, 1955, to July 1, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF PERMANENT COMMITTEE FOR THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

A letter from the Librarian of Congress and Chairman of the Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that committee, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures for the period July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Concurrent Resolution 23

"Whereas the Military Establishment of the United States is desperately in need of a means for attracting and retaining persons with scientific, professional, combat leadership, and management skills necessary to maintain a deterrent power for peace during these times of advancing technology and threat of aggression; and

"Whereas the Armed Forces do not presently have the means to compete for trained personnel urgently needed for the defense of this country, and a significant factor in their inability to do so is the inadequacy of the present compensation practices now in use; and

"Whereas the proposed changes in the military pay structure are based on merit rather than longevity, will bring military pay more in line with the pay standards of industry and will offer greater reenlistment incentive for highly trained personnel; and

"Whereas the program of the Cordiner Committee, while making possible at least a 15-percent improvement in the combat capability of the United States Armed Forces, would result in savings and gains up to $5 billion a year by 1962 or sooner in the cost of national defense; and

"Whereas the Senate Committee on Armed Services has held one hearing on the Cordiner proposals, and it is of the utmost necessity that immediate hearings be held in order to report out this legislation as quickly as possible: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas (the Senate concurring)*, That the Legislature of the State of Texas urges the immediate adoption of Senate bill No. 2014 and House of Representatives bill No. 7574 to alleviate the present problems of the Armed Forces in retaining adequate personnel for the defense of our Nation; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state transmit certified copies of this resolution to each of the Houses of Congress and to Texas Representatives and Senators in Congress.

"BEN RAMSEY,
"*President of the Senate.*
"WAGGONER CARR,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Memorial 19–X

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to enact measures tending to cause the withdrawal of Federal military forces from the occupation of Little Rock, Ark., and prevent the further intrusion by Federal military troops on the constitutional rights of the sovereign States of the Union, by withholding of appropriations and public funds from such troops while so engaged, thereby guaranteeing the sovereign States freedom from military rule as contemplated by the first four articles to the Constitution

"Whereas the Legislature of Florida, during the 1957 legislative session, through Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 72, unequivocally expressed a firm and determined resolution to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the fundamental principles, embodied in our basic law, by which the liberty of the people and the sovereignty of the States, in their proper spheres, have long been protected and assured; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Florida doth hereby express a firm belief that the recent action of the President of the United States, in inflicting military rule upon the sovereign State of Arkansas, is a far more serious threat to the security of the Nation and our constitutional form of government than any possible threat from abroad; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Florida lately did explicitly and peremptorily assert that it viewed the powers of the Federal Government as resulting solely from the compact to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument creating that compact, which compact carefully expressed the limited powers of the President of the United States; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Florida did assert most clearly that the powers of the Federal Government, including those of the President, are valid only to the extent that such powers have been enumerated in the compact to which the various States assented originally and to which the States have assented in subsequent amendments validly adopted and ratified; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Florida did consider that the very nature of this basic compact, apparent upon its face, is that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to surrender certain of their sovereign rights, but only certain of these sovereign rights, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and that all powers not delegated to the United States, including the President thereof, by the Constitution, or prohibited by it to the States, have been reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people; and

"Whereas the several sovereign States have at no time surrendered to the Federal Government their right under the 10th amendment to the Constitution to exercise their discretion in the regulation of matters of strictly local concern; and

"Whereas the sovereign States, in ratifying the 14th amendment to the Constitution, did not agree that the power to regulate matters of local concern be prohibited to them thereby; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Florida emphatically denies that the President of the United States had the right which he asserted recently to peremptorily use Federal troops in the sovereign State of Arkansas to compel the enforcement of a questionable judicial edict requiring the enforced integration of the public schools therein; and

"Whereas the threats and coercive measures of the Federal military troops occupying the sovereign State of Arkansas constitute a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the President and the Federal Government to prohibit to the States certain rights and powers never surrendered by them; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, without the request, consent, and in the absence of the Governor, ordered Federal troops to occupy a portion of the sovereign State of Arkansas, and such troops through the exercise of brute force and with the high-handed tactics reminiscent of Hitler's storm troopers declared their intention to rule the citizenry therein, and thereby proceeded to maliciously and unnecessarily enjoin the inherent and inalienable rights and powers of the citizens thereof; and

"Whereas the immediate military leader of such troops, arrogantly and with impunity and with the implied acquiescence of the President of the United States, entered the public schools of Arkansas and thrust his views upon the minds of the children therein, thereby indelibly impressing upon the minds and hearts of such children the imprint of fascism and military arrogance; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, in ordering Federal military troops to occupy Little Rock, Ark., cited as authority for such act a clearly unconstitutional law which was created by a vengeful Reconstruction Congress to give dictatorial powers to the President of the United States; and

"Whereas even if such law were constitutional its provisions were improperly invoked by the President in that no Federal law was being breached; and

"Whereas the Federal military forces occupying Little Rock, Ark., under the express order of the President of the United States are not in nature or fact a posse comitatus authorized by Federal law to assist a Federal marshal in enforcement of a Federal law; and

"Whereas the President was without authority and jurisdiction to invoke Federal military rule in the sovereign State of Arkansas because (1) the Governor of Arkansas did not provide the requisite request for military assistance, (2) a state of insurrection, rebellion, or need to repel an invasion, did not exist, (3) no Federal law existed upon which a violation was predicated; and

"Whereas if the President of the United States had had jurisdiction and authority to invoke Federal military rule in the sovereign State of Arkansas, he was powerless to interfere with the operation of the public schools therein because the Constitution of the United States does not confer upon the President, or the Federal Government, any power or authority over such schools or over the subject of education, jurisdiction over these matters being reserved to the States, nor did the States by the 14th amendment authorize any interference on the part of the President or any other department of the Federal Government with the operation by the States of such public schools as they might in their discretion see fit to establish and operate; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, by his recent action invoking military rule in the sovereign State of Arkansas, announced his power to adjudge State laws ineffectual and inoperative on the basis of his opinion of such laws as tested by the existing climate of political expediency; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, by federalizing the State militia of Arkansas, rendered the Governor thereof powerless to employ such agency of State government for the protection of the inhabitants thereof should an emergency arise within the State requiring their use; and

"Whereas if the President of the United States is permitted to exercise the power to determine the method of enforcing a Federal decree, and thereby to invoke military rule because of the inconvenience attendant in the proper use of constitutional processes, the States will have been destroyed; and the indestructible union of indestructible States established by the Constitution of the United States will have ceased to exist, and in its stead the President will have created, without jurisdiction or authority from the people, a dictator form of government, possessing total, unrestricted power; and

"Whereas it is clear that the President of the United States has deliberately resolved to disobey the Constitution of the United States and to flout and defy the supreme law of the land. The duty and responsibility of protecting life, property, and the priceless possession of freedom rests with each government of each individual State of the Union, as to all those within their respective territorial limits. The State alone has this responsibility; and

"Whereas it is clearly evident to the Legislature of Florida that the President of the

United States, by his action, in the sovereign State of Arkansas, and his general intent as inadvertently disclosed by the Pentagon to occupy Southern States with military forces, is deserving of the censure of the Congress; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Florida asserts that whenever the President of the United States engages in the deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to him, the States who are parties to the compact have the right to expect and require that the Congress of the United States exercise the powers granted by the compact to arrest the progress of the evil, and maintain the constitutional guaranties of the several sovereign States under the 10th amendment to the United States Constitution; and

"Whereas a failure on the part of the Congress thus to assert its authority in this regard would be construed as acquiescence in the surrender thereof; and that such submissive acquiescence to the seizure of one right by the President would in the end lead to the surrender of all rights, and inevitably to the consolidation of all functions of government under one separate dictatorial head, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to:

"(1) withhold all funds and appropriations from any Federal military forces directed to occupy any sovereign State without the express approval of the governor therein, and

"(2) enact legislation designed to assure the several sovereign States freedom from Federal military control, and

"(3) enact an appropriate measure censuring the President of the United States for his deliberate interference with the constitutional guarantees of the citizens of Little Rock, Ark., and admonishing the President to recognize the Congress of the United States as the legally proper branch of the Government charged with the responsibility of furnishing direction in matters relating to civil rights as contemplated by the language of section 2 of the 14th amendment that 'The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation'; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this Memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate; to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; and to each of the Congressional delegations in the United States Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"A memorial requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper

*"To the President, Congress, and the Departments of State and Interior of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The mining of copper is one of Arizona's chief industries, an industry so great that in point of copper production Arizona leads all of the States of the United States, and, in fact, is responsible for approximately 50 percent of all copper mined in the Nation.

"The copper-mining industry gives employment to many thousands of miners, artisans, mechanics, and craftsmen, whose welfare and prosperity is in very large measure dependent upon this major activity; indeed, the economic welfare of the State is vitally affected by the status of the mining industry.

"There are, in addition to the properties now being worked, great areas and bodies of copper ore in the State which are susceptible of development, to the enrichment of the State and the Nation.

"Should the price of copper be allowed to be determined by foreign countries with low wage standards and high-grade deposits, the result would be a general shutdown of our mines, and a consequent deterioration of the industry both by the heavy damage to the mines and disbandonment of working organizations.

"Should the Nation suddenly be caught without the foreign supply, and should atomic warfare break out overnight, as indeed may well be the case, the copper shortage and the disbandonment of the skilled labor and management so necessary to produce copper might well mean the ultimate defeat of our Armed Forces.

"The possibility of the collapse of the copper-mining industry is not a remote circumstance since, with the high cost of labor, increased taxes, higher freight rates and other cost handicaps, domestic producers cannot stay in business competition with the low-wage production from foreign countries.

"It is therefore of major importance, not only from the standpoint of simple economics, but from the standpoint of survival, that the price of copper be maintained on a basis which will insure an active industry with normal production, fair profits, steady employment and a good standard of living for workers in the industry, and from which would result a continuation of the benefits which accrue to the national security and the State's economy by reason of the industry.

"This can only be insured through the medium of an adequate import tax on raw copper to equalize the difference between the cost of producing the metal in this country and in the copper-producing countries of South America, Africa, and elsewhere.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the members of the Senate of the State of Arizona, the members of the House of Representatives concurring, urgently request:

"1. That a 4-cent-per-pound tariff be reinstated on all foreign copper.

"2. That the peril point per pound of copper produced be set at 32 cents and the 4-cent-per-pound tariff be maintained until such time as the price of copper reaches or exceeds 32 cents."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 15

"Whereas tax relief at the Federal, State, and local level is a major objective of all economy-minded members of all legislative bodies dealing with taxation; and

"Whereas the cost of living has risen during the last 10 years to place an added burden on all Texas families; and

"Whereas section VII of the Democratic platform declaring the financial policy of the Democratic Party is as follows:

" 'Section VII. Financial policy:

" 'Tax adjustment: A fully expanding economy can yield enough tax revenues to meet the inescapable obligations of Government, balance the Federal budget, and lighten the tax burden. The immediate need is to correct the inequities in the tax structure which reflect the Republican determination to favor the few at the expense of the many. We favor realistic tax adjustments, giving first consideration to small independent business and the small individual taxpayer. Lower income families need tax relief; only a Democratic victory will assure this. We favor an increase in the present personal-tax exemption of $600 to a minimum of $800': Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the House of Representatives and the Senate of the 55th Legislature does urge the Texas delegation to the United States Congress to support the increase in the personal exemption from Federal income tax from $600 to $800; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all the members of the Texas delegation to the Congress of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to the President and Vice President of the United States.

"BEN RAMSEY,
*"President of the Senate.*
"WAGGONER CARR,
*"Speaker of the House."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Resolution 56

"Whereas the gulf coast is the only coastal area of the United States without an offshore weather station, and there is a proven need for more adequate weather information in this area, as evidenced by the awesome property damage and loss of life caused recently by hurricane Audrey; and

"Whereas a floating ocean weather station could provide adequate warning of the formation of the severe storms which are characteristic of the area, and thereby contribute toward a minimization of loss of life and property damage in connection with future storms: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama (both Houses thereof concurring),* That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and petitioned to provide for the establishment of a floating weather station in the Gulf of Mexico, in order to give adequate protection to life and property in an area subject at any time to devastation by the severe storms which generally form in the central and western portions of the said gulf; be it further

*"Resolved,* That the clerk of the House transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the governor of each State bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the President of the United States Senate, and to each member of the Alabama delegation in the United States Congress.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives of Alabama, July 9, 1957.

"Concurred in and adopted by the Senate, September 3, 1957.

"Approved by the Governor, September 5, 1957."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Memorial 64–X

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America urging them to submit a constitutional amendment permitting school integration optional on a State basis

"Whereas there exists a divergence of opinion among a wide segment of United States citizens as to the constitutionality of the May 17, 1954, decree of the United States Supreme Court, holding the doctrine of separate but equal schools unconstitutional; and

"Whereas the area of human relationship between the races is of such vital importance to all the citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas it is imperative that this issue be resolved in a peaceful manner within our constitutional framework so that threatened resistance, riots and bloodshed be prevented; and

"Whereas the continued use of military forces can only heighten the possibility of conflict between these forces and the citizenry and also between the races, and

"Whereas the people of these United States can resolve this issue through their representation in the United States Congress and

the respective State legislatures: Therefore be it

*"Resolved,* That the Florida Legislature herewith petitions the Congress of these United States to draft and submit a suitable constitutional amendment allowing the resolving of the school integration issue on a State option basis; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted forthwith by the Chief Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate of the State of Florida to the President of the United States, members of the United States Supreme Court, and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each of the Congressional delegation in the United States Congress, and to each of the governors, secretaries of state, and attorneys general of the several States; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal of both the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida, and sufficient copies thereof be furnished to the press."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 40

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution relative to the imposition and collection of taxes on income by the States

"Whereas until in recent years, the imposition by the States of taxes upon intangibles was historically and traditionally limited to residents because the situs of intangibles was deemed to be that of the place of residence of the taxpayer; and

"Whereas following the adoption of the 16th article of the amendments to the Federal Constitution in 1913, it was generally assumed that income taxes would be imposed by the Government of the United States and that this field of taxation would be tacitly allocated to the Federal Government; and

"Whereas at later dates, income taxes were imposed by a number of the States and in most of these the income tax was imposed upon nonresidents as well as upon residents and, in the case of the nonresidents, the tax was imposed in respect to both earned and unearned income derived from sources within the State imposing the tax; and

"Whereas the right to impose such taxes upon nonresidents was sustained by the United States Supreme Court provided there was no discrimination against the nonresidents; and

"Whereas although generally the exemptions granted to a resident applied also to nonresidents, there are many instances where exemptions favoring residents and not allowed to nonresidents have been sustained by the courts; and

"Whereas the reciprocal provisions contained in certain State income tax laws are of some benefit to the nonresidents, nevertheless, there remain many inequities due to the taxation of nonresidents under State income-tax laws; and

"Whereas it appears that the only way to prevent these inequities and to avoid the undue hardship resulting from the imposition State income taxes upon nonresidents is by an amendment to the Federal Constitution; and

"Whereas although bills have been introduced in the Legislature of the State of New Jersey proposing a State income tax, no such tax has been imposed in the State of New Jersey and the general view has been against the imposition of an income tax in this State, and there also has been an ever-increasing demand for action to alleviate the burden imposed upon residents of the State of New Jersey by income taxes levied by other States and, particularly, by neighboring States because the residents of this State pay the income taxes imposed by the Federal Government and the taxes imposed by the State of New Jersey and by its political subdivisions, and they should not also be required to pay income taxes to States in respect to which they are nonresidents: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (General Assembly concurring)*—

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution by adding a new article to the amendments by which the several States would have no power to impose and collect taxes on income from whatever source derived except in respect to residents of the State imposing the tax.

"2. The proposed amendment would be substantially in the following language:

" 'ARTICLE XXIII. POWER TO IMPOSE TAXES ON INCOMES BY THE STATES

" 'The several States shall have no power to impose and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived except in respect to residents of the State imposing the tax.'

"3. The secretary of the senate is directed to transmit properly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution to the respective presiding officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to each of the Senators and to all of the Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress.

"ALBERT MCCAY,
*"President of the Senate.*
"HENRY H. PATTERSON,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*
"ELDEN MILLS,
*"Speaker of the General Assembly.*

Attest:

"WILLIAM J. KOHM,
*"Clerk of the General Assembly."*

Three resolutions adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Anchorage, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for authorized mental-health facilities, for the construction of all authorized small-boat basin and rivers and harbors projects in Alaska, and the construction of useful public works in Alaskan communities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted at the general assembly of the Universalist Church, Atlantic City, N. J., relating to conscientious objectors and the selective-service law; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the triregional meeting for regions 4, 5, and 6, Texas Junior Chamber of Commerce, Colorado City, Tex., favoring the enactment of legislation to revise the existing pay structure in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Greenbush Junior Chamber of Commerce, East Greenbush, N. Y., relating to the development of intercontinental ballistics missiles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Joint Legislative Committee, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La., relating to the use of Federal troops at Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Deputy Director, Civil Defense Corps, Adjutant General's Department, State of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, transmitting an amendment to the interstate compact existing between the States of Ohio and Indiana (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Republican Women's Club of Sacramento, Calif., favoring a reduction of Government expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Milford Chamber of Commerce, Milford, Ohio, relating to governmental expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the County Supervisors' Association of California, Sacramento, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for additional appropriations for the planting of national-forest lands, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of Philip M. Haley, of Lancaster, Pa., relating to the cutback in flying time of pilots; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of Elizabeth McCarthy, of Miami, Fla., relating to her residence in a Government housing project in Miami, Fla.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Texas Society, Sons of the American Revolution, Inc., Baytown, Tex., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2798 and House bills 9271 and 9359, providing for the occupancy of certain property in the District of Columbia as national headquarters by the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from General Pearsall Post, No. 2028, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Wood, Wis., signed by John J. Carey, Quartermaster, relating to the increase in service-connected disability cases; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Local Union No. 1269, United Mine Workers of America, Bakerton, Pa., relating to a revision of the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Douglas, Ariz., Chamber of Commerce, favoring the maintenance of an adequate tariff rate on copper; to the Committee on Finance.

Two resolutions adopted by the 16th Annual Conference of the Italian-American Labor Council, at New York City, N. Y., relating to the Atlantic Alliance, and the protection of Hungarian people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The memorial of Jack A. Keesan, of Dorchester, Mass., remonstrating against the so-called Middle-East doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, by request, a resolution adopted by the Guatemalan Congress, expressing its thanks for the resolution of the Senate relating to the death of the late President Carlos Castillo Armas of Guatemala; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted at the General Assembly of The Universalist Church of America, Atlantic City, N. J., relating to the United Nations, and the cessation of the testing of hydrogen bombs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Davao Junior Chamber of Commerce, Davao City, Philippine Islands, favoring the retention of the United States Information Service in Davao; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus, at Chicago, Ill., favoring the withdrawal of recognition to certain foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a "Freedom Rally" of United States citizens of Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Ukrainian, Czechoslovakian, Rumanian, and Hungarian descent, of southern California, relating to the condemnation of Soviet Russia as an aggressor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Long Island General Assembly, Fourth Degree (Patriotic), Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the withdrawal of United States recognition now granted Communist governments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Anchorage, Alaska, favoring payment in lieu of taxes and assessments on federally owned property, and favoring an extension of the Alaska Public Works Act

to June 30, 1964; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Alaska Moose Association, Sitka, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the construction of an airport at Sitka, Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the American Association of Airport Executives, Houston, Tex., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the advancement of civil aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Dillingham, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce, relating to the protection of salmon resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by District No. 4, Department of Ohio, the American Legion, Hamilton, Ohio, protesting any attempt to weaken, destroy or repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the Universalist Church of America, at Atlantic City, N. J., favoring the repeal of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Two resolutions adopted by the 58th National Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kansas City, Mo., endorsing the report of the Commission on Government Security, and the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars on communism and courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Tulio A. Vazquez, Rio Piedras, P. R., relating to segregation, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Northern Division, California Federation of Republican Women, at Ross, California, relating to recent decisions of the Supreme Court, and the restoration of the balance of power in the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by a convention of District Grand Lodge, No. 3, B'nai B'rith, Philadelphia, Pa., relating to immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by a convention of District Grand Lodge, No. 3, B'nai B'rith, Philadelphia, Pa., relating to expellees of Egypt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Alaska Moose Association, Sitka, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal that part of the so-called Walter-McCarran Act relating to United States citizens residing in Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the fourth district, Department of Louisiana, the American Legion, at Shreveport, La., relating to the use of Federal troops in Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the 16th annual conference of the Italian-American Labor Council, at New York City, N. Y., relating to national quotas under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, from L. Brennan, of New York City, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide national segregation of races; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Ohio Bell, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Ophelia Beard, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Cornelia Dabney Tucker, of Charleston, S. C., relating to the filling of vacancies in the United States Supreme Court and certain State courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of William Ricklin, of Denver, Colo., relating to the welfare of the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Edward Leo Douglas and Mrs. Charlotte B. Douglas, of Galveston, Tex., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Alaska Moose Association, Sitka, Alaska, favoring the construction and operation of a mental institution in Alaska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Universalist Church of America, Atlantic City, N. J., relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the wages and hours law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of J. Martin Bailey, of New York, N. Y., praying for the repeal of restricted provisions relating to the form of publishers' bills, receipts, and orders for subscriptions enclosed in publications mailed at second-class rates of postage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Orange County, Sacramento, Calif., favoring the designation of Orange County, Calif., as one of the "standard metropolitan areas" of the Nation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Costa Mesa, Calif., Junior Chamber of Commerce, relating to the designation of Orange County, Calif., as one of the "standard metropolitan areas" of the Nation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the League of Alaskan Cities, Anchorage, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to include Alaska in the national system of State and defense highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Alaska Moose Association, Sitka, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the development of a marine highway from Prince Rupert to southeastern Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Racine, Wis., favoring the designation of the Grass River lock in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence Seaway as the Wiley-Dondero lock; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the city of Covina, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to improve the San Dimas Wash, in the county of Los Angeles, to control flood hazards; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Small Craft Harbors Commission, San Diego, Calif., relating to engineering planning for the Santa Cruz Harbor, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Montana Municipal League, favoring the enactment of legislation to continue in force the provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act until 1961; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the American Institute of Architects, Washington, D. C., relating to the development of the National Capital; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter in the nature of a petition, from Rhawnhurst-Castor Memorial Post, No. 754, the American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Council, Sons and Daughters of Hawaii, Hilo, T. H., relating to statehood for Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Alaska Moose Association, Sitka, Alaska, favoring the enactment of legislation granting statehood to Alaska; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. JAVITS:

A resolution adopted by the American Sociological Society, Washington, D. C., relating to the broadening and expansion of the National Science Foundation's Fellowship Programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Oswego County, N. Y., Bar Association, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1165, providing additional pay and promotion for members of the legal profession serving with the armed services in a legal capacity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the New York State Convention of Universalists, New York City, requesting the Congress to investigate thoroughly all demands of school building programs, offering assistance only to the most needy; and that Federal funds be allotted only to schools which are conducted in conformity with the Supreme Court decision on integration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by Oneonta Aerie 1260 Fraternal Order of Eagles, Oneonta, N. Y., favoring the elimination of discrimination in employment against workers over 40 years of age; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition, signed by Catherine Grace Gallaway, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the return of America's fighting men captured and unaccounted for by the enemy in the war in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## BRIG. GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI—RESOLUTION

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, and the Delaware division of the Polish American Congress, commemorating the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

We, Americans of Polish descent, are assembled at the Pulaski Place, this 13th day of October A. D. 1957, under the auspices of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, and of the Delaware division of the Polish American Congress. On this 178th anniversary to commemorate the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who gave his valor, courage, and his life to the American cause for liberty and independence.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski did not sacrifice his life in vain, as our founders have given a new order to the world based upon the principle that all rights came from God and were vested in the individual, that governments among men derived their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that the importance of each person is over and above the importance of the state.

Further, the apathy, indifference, and neglect of the individual responsibility has opened the way to well financed selfish minoirties, pressure groups, and unscrupulous political machines dominating our governmental systems, which are responsible for the present situation of confusion, tension, discontent, and discord throughout our country. This in turn endangers our unity, creating differences among the American people, who are being exploited by the Communists and their followers to lose faith in

our Constitution, Bill of Rights, in our institutions, and in the essential wisdom of freemen.

Whereas we who are assembled this day are greatly concerned with the American Bar Committee's report, that the 15 pro-Communist Supreme Court decisions have advanced 5 of the 9 Communist objectives in the advancement of communism in America; and

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities reported that more than 200 organizations of independent citizens have been dealing in political subversion clandestinely directed by a nationwide apparatus of Communist agents, menacing the entire security system of the United States, and demanding to destroy all immigration laws; and

Whereas when ambitious, wild, and lawless political leaders and governmental officials are interested only in vote of existing pressure groups to keep or to get power, that nation is doomed to destruction; and

Whereas the authority for the decision of the Supreme Court was a complete contradiction of the Constitution. As its authority for this decision it cited among others, a Swedish Socialist who has nothing but contempt for our Constitution; and

Whereas the deadliest enemies of nations are not foreign foes: they always dwell within their borders. Any person, or organization, no matter under what excuse, what guise, what temporary expedient is used, takes power, responsibility, and authority from the people and places it in the hands of a centralized government, that person or organization is an enemy of our American way of life.

Therefore, we, Americans of Polish descent assembled this day to honor and to pay respect to the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski on this 178th anniversary of his death pledge to become more vigilant in guarding our priceless heritage, the Government under the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights for which Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and died: Therefore be it further

*Resolved*, That we understand our Nation's freedom as they understood it when the Declaration of Independence was signed, with freedom of speech, freedom to worship as one chooses, freedom to work, freedom to make a choice, freedom to succeed or fail, and freedom to enjoy the fruits of one's labor: Therefore be it further

*Resolved*, That to remain silent in the face of present dangers is to enhance communism. If we are to survive as a free people we must rekindle the national spirit and reject the ideology of collectivism, the welfare state, and all forms of world government. We must determine to stop all encroachment on our right to govern ourselves, serving notice on our Federal Government that the privilege they have received to serve was delegated to be used for the welfare and the best interest of the American people and not of the pressure groups: Therefore be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Delaware's representatives in the United States Congress, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Governor of the State of Delaware, and the mayor of the city of Wilmington.

## FLOOD-CONTROL AND WATER-CONSERVATION PROJECT, RUM RIVER, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the date of November 27, 1957, I received a letter from the Milaca Chamber of Commerce of Minnesota joining in a resolution adopted by that chamber of commerce relating to the Rum River flood-control and water-conservation project.

I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution made a part of the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILACA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Milaca, Minn., November 25, 1957.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Senator, Minneapolis, Minn.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At the regular meeting of the Milaca Chamber of Commerce, held November 18, 1957, at 6:30 p. m., the following resolution was duly passed.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the County Board of Mille Lacs County, Minn., and the Village Council of the Village of Milaca, Mille Lacs County, Minn., have at their last regular meetings passed resolutions urging further study and survey of the Rum River flood-control and water-conservation project to include the so-called upper-dam area: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Milaca Chamber of Commerce concur and support said resolutions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, Whereas the main industries of the village of Milaca is food processing, and it is very essential that the village have adequate water supply, so we urge your support of said project."

Yours truly,

GRANT MAGNUSON, *Secretary*.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 2912. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2913. A bill to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2914. A bill to extend and enlarge the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2915. A bill to preserve the family farm; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2916. A bill to provide for grants to the States to assist them to increase the salaries of teachers of science in secondary schools and in providing necessary equipment to be used in connection with the instruction of scientific subjects in such schools; and

S. 2917. A bill to promote the general welfare of the United States by providing for a program of scholarships for college undergraduate and graduate level education, to be administered by the Commissioner of Education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2918. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to authorize disaster loans to small business concerns suffering substantial economic injury as a result of excessive rainfall; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2919. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for retired employees of air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. THYE):

S. 2920. A bill to provide for small business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 2921. A bill to enable the Federal intermediate credit banks to limit endorsers' liability on loans in disaster areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2922. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Bank of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2923. A bill making an appropriation for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. THYE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2924. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2925. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to require labor organizations to give their members an opportunity to vote on certain matters by secret ballot;

S. 2926. A bill to amend section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to prohibit certain payments to labor organizations by agents of employers or by labor relations experts, advisers, or consultants retained or engaged by employers;

S. 2927. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to carry on picketing under certain conditions for organizational purposes or for the purpose of forcing an employer to recognize such labor organization as the representative of his employees; and

S. 2928. A bill to amend sections 9 (f) and (g) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to impose criminal penalties for failure by labor organizations to file information required by such sections, and to authorize the Secretary of Labor to make public the information filed under such sections; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 2929. A bill for the relief of Leslie Tse-Chiu Kuo and Shu-Hua King Kuo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 2930. A bill to establish a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2931. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act in order to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to pay for certain inspections made under such act, and to authorize the processing of inspected and noninspected poultry and poultry products in the same establishments prior to January 1, 1959; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2932. A bill for the relief of Louie Kit Chun (Mrs. Lee Kai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2933. A bill to extend the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission and to increase its authorization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2934. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2935. A bill for the relief of Mary Louise Shields Wilkinson; and

S. 2936. A bill for the relief of Feofania Bankevitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2937. A bill to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the soil bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 2938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income exemption for an individual who is a student at an educational institution above the secondary level; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2939. A bill amending section 105 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize additional appropriations for construction of roads on public lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2940. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Choy; and

S. 2941. A bill for the relief of John Favia (John J. Curry); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2942. A bill for the relief of Constance Dayton;

S. 2943. A bill for the relief of Letitia Oiteanu; and

S. 2944. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Matsuhara and her minor child, Kerry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2945. A bill to exempt the Manager-Custodian of the Japan Locker Fund from certain dual-compensation restrictions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2946. A bill for the relief of Jamshed Burjorji Fracis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2947. A bill for the relief of Inge Gobel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2948. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Fair and Exposition, to be held at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 2949. A bill for the relief of Miss Suzanne Sennott; and

S. 2950. A bill for the relief of Peter Liszczynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2951. A bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2952. A bill to preserve and to establish a comprehensive full parity farm income improvement and protection program, to expand domestic consumption and exports of American farm commodities, to enable farmers to keep market supplies of farm commodities in reasonable balance with augmented demand therefor, to establish a yardstick family farm credit program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2953. A bill for the relief of Charles Bernstein;

S. 2954. A bill for the relief of Virginia de Bellisen-Durban; and

S. 2955. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 2956. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to promote scientific education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr THURMOND:

S. 2957. A bill to advance the national security and welfare and to promote the progress of science by the establishment of a United States Science Academy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2958. A bill to impose certain residence requirements for appointment to the position of rural mail carrier; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 2959. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, so as to permit the making of loans to small business concerns which have suffered substantial economic injury because of certain disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2960. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act in order to limit the amount payable to any producer in any one year for participation in the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2961. A bill to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act in order to limit the interest rate applicable to each unit of a storage project and each participating project constructed pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make provision for the Congress to determine the inability of the President of the United States to discharge the powers and duties of his office; and

S. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to establish a committee to determine the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of a full scale demonstration plant for the production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## CENTENNIAL OF DISCOVERY OF SILVER IN NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas June 8, 1959, marks the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States at the Comstock Lode, Virginia City, State of Nevada; and

Whereas the prodigious production of the silver mines in the State of Nevada during the heighth of the Comstock Lode helped materially to save the Union; and

Whereas the continued production of such mines made it possible for the United States to resume specie payment, thereby securing the credit of the Union: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress extends greetings and felicitations to the citizens of the State of Nevada, and particularly to the Nevada Centennial Committee, upon the occasion of their commemorative celebration of the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States. The Congress joins with the people of the United States in expressing appreciation of the great contribution by the citizens of the State of Nevada in preserving the Union.

## PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON EARTH SATELLITES AND THE PROBLEMS OF OUTER SPACE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution providing for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Earth Satellites and the Problems of Outer Space. A companion resolution has been submitted in the House of Representatives by Representative JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 53) establishing the Joint Committee on Earth Satellites and the Problems of Outer Space, submitted by Mr. JAVITS, was received and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the development of successful earth satellites and high altitude rockets capable of supersonic speeds by remote control is a reality, and the problems of outer space and the many ramifications of this area have opened a new field whose impact on our civilization shows tremendous capabilities for good or for ill; and

Whereas the necessity is apparent for the United States to maintain leadership in

developing outer space so that the tremendous gains to come in this field may be advances for peace; and

Whereas freedom of navigation in outer space is as vital as freedom of the seas; and

Whereas claims may be made and questions of international law arise as to rights in outer space and to celestial bodies; and

Whereas for the protection of the general welfare and security of the United States and the free world there is need for a joint and continuing comprehensive study and Congressional oversight in these fields: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Earth Satellites and the Problems of Outer Space.

SEC. 2. Authority and duties: The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the various Government departments, services, and commissions, and of private and international agencies relating to the development, use, and control of earth satellites and similar mechanisms, and shall make continuing studies of the problems of outer space and conditions beyond present human navigational air limits and claims to celestial bodies therein. The Department of Defense shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all matters within the Department of Defense relating to the fields of earth satellites and outer space. Any Government agency shall furnish any information requested by the joint committee with respect to the activities or responsibilities of that agency in the field of earth satellites and outer space. All bills, resolutions, or other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives, relating primarily to the development, use, or control of the earth satellites and outer space shall be referred to the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Membership: The joint committee shall be composed of seven members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four members shall be members of the same political party. The members of the joint committee who are members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House of Representatives, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are referred to the joint committee, or are otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 4. Chairman and vacancies: The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress, and the chairman shall be selected by the members from the House entitled to the chairmanship. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman, by the members from that House.

Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

SEC. 5. Powers: The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however*, That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

In carrying out its duties under this act, the joint committee or any authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee, or by any member designated by him or by the joint committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes as amended, shall apply in case of any failure of any witnesses to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives from funds appropriated for the joint committee, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

SEC. 6. Staff and assistance: The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

Members of the joint committee, and its employees and consulants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

The cost of stenographic services shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for the reporting the hearings of standing committees of the House of Representatives. The cost of stenographic service to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee.

SEC. 7. Classification of information: The joint committee may classify information originating within the committee in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch for classifying restricted data or defense information.

SEC. 8. Records: The joint committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the joint committee and shall be kept in the offices of the joint committee or other places as the joint committee may direct under such security as the joint committee shall determine in the interests of the common defense and security.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, such a committee would parallel the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which we have found it desirable to create, and would be a proper vehicle for providing the necessary bridge between Congress and the Executive on matters affecting outer space and earth satellites.

The space age is here. The world has been catapulted into the space age by the challenge of the Russian earth satellites and our determination to meet their efforts.

A new field has been opened up whose impact on our civilization shows tremendous capabilities for good or evil, for progress or annihilation. It is essential that the United States get and keep leadership in developing outer space so that the tremendous gains possible in this area may be gains for peace, and that our satellite, when launched, may be a symbol of peace and a star of hope.

Mr. President, I emphasize the fact that that is not an exclusivist position for us to take, but that we must do it with all humility in association with our allies, in regional organizations, and in the United Nations, as well as with all other free peoples, in our determination to make our great reserves serve all mankind.

The best interests of the United States and the Free World now require joint and continuing Congressional study in the problems of outer space, and Congressional oversight of the plans and programs upon which our national survival may depend.

Our Preparedness Subcommittee is to be complimented for the objectivity and the vigor with which it is proceeding at the present time in approaching this problem.

Before conflicts in jurisdiction among legislative committees arise on the numerous bills introduced on these matters, it will be best to settle this question by establishing a joint committee.

This measure for a joint committee calls for the appointment by the Vice President of 7 Members of the Senate, and for 7 from the House of Representatives, to be named by the Speaker of the House. In each instance, not more than four shall be members of the same political party.

It is planned that the joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the various Government departments, services, and commissions, and of private and international agencies relating to the development, use, and control of earth satellites and similar mechanisms, and shall make continuing studies of the problems of outer space. The Department of Defense would be called upon by the proposed resolution to keep the joint committee fully informed with respect to all matters within the Department relating to earth satellites and outer space. The legislation also would call on any Government agency to furnish information requested by the joint committee with respect to the activities or responsibilities of that particular agency in the field of earth satellites and outer space.

---

## INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 207), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $104,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS UNDER JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 208), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the Federal employee group life insurance program by the Civil Service Commission;

(2) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(3) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) postal policy, (b) research and development, and (c) postal rates.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. THYE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 209), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and Senate Resolution 272, 81st Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANT FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 210), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

## AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO CONCERNING MOBILE RADIO TRANSMITTING STATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for almost 5 years now the United States and Canada have been permitting mobile radio transmitting stations licensed by the Government of one country to operate more or less freely in the other's territory. This arrangement was concluded by an exchange of notes signed at Washington on March 9 and 17, 1953, and it permits "ham" operators to operate in either Canada or the United States on a reciprocal basis.

About 2 years ago I was asked by a number of American amateur radio operators, or "hams," to discuss with the State Department and the Federal Communications Commission the possibility of coming to some similar agreement of reciprocity with our neighbor to the south, Mexico.

I did take this matter up with both the Department and the Commission, and after a rather extended exchange of letters and conversation I have frankly become discouraged that any initiative would be shown by the executive department, without an official expression of interest from the Congress.

It is my strong feeling that Mexican and American "hams" should be permitted to operate in each other's country, just as we have more or less mutual privileges for Canadian and American "hams."

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit a resolution which resolves that it is the sense of the Senate that the President enter into negotiations with the Government of Mexico in an effort to establish an agreement permitting reciprocity for American and Mexican "ham" operators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 211) submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States should take such steps as may be necessary to enter into negotiations with the Government of Mexico in an effort to establish an agreement under which certain mobile radio transmitting stations licensed by the United States Government or the Mexican Government could be carried from the territory in which they are licensed into the territory of the other country without being removed from the vehicles in which such equipment is installed and without being sealed to prevent transmission.

## SMALL-BUSINESS DISASTER LOANS IN CERTAIN AREAS—LIMITATION OF ENDORSERS' LIABILITY ON CERTAIN LOANS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and I are today introducing two bills to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Small Business Act for the purpose of providing a comprehensive program of relief to alleviate the drastic disaster situation that now exists in the agricultural economy of the lower Mississippi Valley and other areas of the United States due to excessive rainfall and other inclement weather conditions.

The proposed amendment to the Federal Farm Loan Act would authorize a $200 million fund to be made available within the Farm Credit Administration for disaster relief loans in agricultural areas declared such due to excessive rainfall, drought, hurricane and wind damage, excessive cold, and other acts of God.

The amendment is designed to give immediate relief to farmers and their suppliers who have suffered severe financial loss and reverses due to crop failure. It proposes that the $200 million be made available through the intermediate credit banks to production credit associations, cooperatives, banks, and private

lending institutions throughout the present and future disaster areas. Under the plan, borrowers who have been unable to meet the obligations incurred in producing the 1957 crop will be given an opportunity to go to their lending agency and arrange for a special loan for a 3- to 5-year period to immediately liquidate the debts they now owe and cannot pay which were incurred in the production of the 1957 crop. It is intended that this special type loan will be entirely divorced from the production loan that will be necessary for the 1958 farm operation.

The widespread nature of the present disaster requires a program far more extensive than that provided for under the Farmers Home Administration. The bill supplements—and not supplants—the function of the FHA in disaster relief. It will also supplement the companion amendment we are now introducing.

This companion amendment would amend the Small Business Act to enable the Small Business Administration to make certain emergency loans in disaster areas where farm implement dealers, fuel oil suppliers, seed, feed, and chemical dealers, and others are caught with large unpaid balances for supplies and services upon which credit was given to farmers during the past year. The present Small Business Act now provides for such assistance. However, it is limited to areas proclaimed disaster because of hurricane and drought and does not cover disasters proclaimed by reason of excessive rainfall or other conditions, such as have occurred in many areas of the United States in 1957.

Mr. President, 1957 was one of the most disastrous years in certain areas of the United States that has occurred since 1930. The lower Mississippi Valley was particularly hard hit on both sides of the river from Cairo to New Orleans. Excessive rainfall started at the beginning of harvest and has continued up until the present time. Farmers in this area are totally unable to gather their crops, one of the biggest crops that they had ever made. Cotton, beans, corn, everything was affected. The producers were simply unable to get into their fields from September up until now to gather and place in the bins not only one of the greatest crops that the area had ever made but the most expensive crops. Estimates of damage range from $300 million to $500 million in the lower Mississippi Valley.

These staggering losses today represent a severe strain on the farm credit machinery that has serviced this area. Our present farm-credit machinery, as presently administered, is wholly inadequate to cope with a disaster of this magnitude.

Everyone knows that many commercial banks have long since ceased to make agricultural loans and that the field of agriculture credit has been relegated for the past quarter century to agencies operating under the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for a few moments, before I conclude my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Mississippi, and I shall not elaborate on his comments or engage in a lengthy discussion with respect to the merits of the proposed legislation.

First, I ask unanimous consent that, at the end of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, there may be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Department of Agriculture, dated December 10, 1957, which is in answer to my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture dated November 29, 1957. I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have before me 3 articles, 1 published in the Arkansas Democrat, and 2 published in the Arkansas Gazette. These articles describe very vividly and adequately, I believe, the conditions which exist in my State and demonstrate quite clearly, in my opinion, the reasons for the enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] should be commended for his leadership in developing the proposed legislation, and I shall see to it that when the proposed amendment to the Small Business Act comes before the Committee on Banking and Currency it will receive prompt attention and action. I know that the Senate will cooperate in making available to our part of the country this very important and desperately needed legislation. I know of nothing which is more important to the welfare of our area than the bills the Senator from Mississippi is introducing. I thank him. I ask unanimous consent that the three articles which I mentioned be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks. One article, published in the Arkansas Democrat of November 26, 1957, is entitled "State Farmers Count Crop Loss in Millions." The first article published in the Arkansas Gazette on November 14, 1957, is entitled "Dreams of Farmers Shattered by Rain"; the other article, published on December 13, 1957, is entitled "Weather-Battered Eastern Arkansas Faces Lean Year."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for his assurance that he will immediately proceed to consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Tennessee for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I must object. I would object regardless of whether the request came from this side of the aisle or from the other side. My objection is based on the previous statement made by the distinguished majority leader, which was concurred in by the Senate, that on this opening day, when many Senators wish to introduce bills and transact other morning business, Senators be recognized alternately from each side of the aisle.

Mr. EASTLAND. These remarks all deal with the same bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand. However, there are many Senators waiting who wish to introduce bills. If we follow the procedure outlined by the majority leader earlier today I believe we will expedite business and we will not get into any problems on this subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it will be recalled that back in the 1930's when we had the great nationwide drought of that year, Congress did little or nothing to counter the downward trend in agricultural income. We wholly failed to realize the significance of the disaster that had stricken American agriculture and nothing was done to shore up farm credit until it was too late—1931 and 1932 followed with their trend of credit chaos and bankruptcies until the national income had shrunk to such proportions that it could hardly maintain the national debt. At that time our farm credit machinery was revamped and no longer were the American farmers dependent entirely upon commercial channels for agricultural credit. Production credit associations were authorized throughout the entire farming area of the Nation and these associations became the credit sources to maintain and sustain American agriculture.

Other emergency steps were taken under the Farm Credit Administration to help in that emergency. The Federal Farm Mortgage Act was passed, seed loans were authorized, Federal Land Bank Commissioner Loans were created and all of these newly created devices proved useful in the rehabilitation of farm credit. As credit in the farming community was reestablished many of these devices were allowed to lapse and the entire burden of farm credit was turned over to the Production Credit Association. The system has worked well when taken together with the disaster loan powers of the Farmers Home Administration.

Farm credit generally became so stabilized under the coordinating program developed by the Farm Credit Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Act that we entered into a new and unprecedented era of agricultural solidarity. During this period agricultural technology developed at a most rapid pace. Machinery entirely supplanted the mule and animals in soil cultivation. Chemicals began to play a larger and larger part in successful agricultural production. The stabilization of agricultural credit was on such solid ground that implement dealers, oil jobbers, seed and feed, fertilizer and chemical dealers and many other small businesses that operated to supply the basic needs and requirements of farm operations were able to supply a great portion of the credit and services for these operations

outside of the actual production loan made to finance the operation of the individual farmer. This is particularly true in the time period from the maturity of a crop until it is harvested and in the bin or barn. Farm implements and machinery, replacement parts and repairs now constitute a large portion of the individual capital investment on any farming operation large or small. This is entirely credit operation. Likewise, tractor fuels and combine fuels are largely financed outside of the production loans. This class of small independent merchants who supply these services to the farmers are today in equally as bad a shape as are the farmers themselves because of the current disaster. Some method of relief must be devised to aid and assist both them and the farmers involved.

Under the present setup, when a disaster in a farming area is proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Farmers Home Administration is authorized to make production loans to farmers who have been hard hit by the disaster and cannot receive credit from production credit associations or commercial banks. In this contingency the Farmers Home Administration will make production loans for the next year's crop. These loans, though, do not contemplate helping the farmers pay their past due obligations, but these past due obligations, including unpaid notes on farm machinery secured by lien, and interest payment, and so forth, are compelled to be set aside through standby agreements and the farmer's creditors are forced to wait another year for payment.

Under ordinary circumstances, while hardships were created, on the whole this plan worked reasonably well notwithstanding the complaints from the business community in the agricultural area.

However, 1957 proved to be a year that was not an ordinary disaster year. In previous years the disasters when proclaimed were usually limited to very small areas or were found to be in areas of very low-cost agricultural production. Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven was not this type disaster. The disaster was widespread and hit at the very heart of high cost agriculture production, that is, the lower Mississippi Valley, Florida, and many other areas of the country. In Mississippi alone 59 counties out of 82 have been declared disaster areas; 400,000 people in Mississippi are on commodity relief. In Arkansas 51 counties were declared disaster areas and commodity relief is being extended in that State. Southeast Missouri, west Tennessee, and Louisiana are similarly affected; in fact, the entire lower Mississippi Valley from Cairo south on both sides of the river and large areas of the southeastern part of the United States together with large areas in Texas. We hear of adverse weather in Florida where freezes destroyed the citrus crop; there was destruction of the peanut crop in Georgia; wet corn in Minnesota and Illinois and many other adverse conditions in agricultural areas.

The staggering effects of this disaster are revealed in the Department of Agriculture cotton estimate reports. In August the cotton crop in the United States was estimated at about 13 million bales. By this time the ginners report should have confirmed this very accurate forecast of the Department of Agriculture. However, the ginners report revealed a prospective shortage of about 2½ million bales of cotton and this shortage is largely limited to the lower Mississippi Valley plus other portions of the southeastern part of the United States and some areas in Texas.

In fact, the December ginners report as of December 13 states that Mississippi, Arkansas, and Missouri were running 1,188,000 bales below the September estimate and this is cotton alone, not counting the proportionate losses in other farm crops. A grassroots meeting held at Stoneville, Miss., with the Mississippi Delta Council acting as host with representatives from Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas present, it was estimated that the farmers in these areas lack 40 percent of paying their production loans plus farm liens and necessary open accounts owing to concerns furnishing agricultural services.

Another of the tragic aspects of this situation is the effect that these losses have on business supplying agriculture. Farmers in this area are unable to pay their implement notes, they are unable to pay their chemical bills, they are unable to pay their fertilizer accounts or pay for their tractor fuel. I hold in my hand letters which I have received from tractor fuel dealers, fertilizer and chemical dealers and implement dealers in the area proclaimed a disaster area by the Department of Agriculture. Most of these dealers state that they cannot carry on next year. Some of them state very frankly that their business will be forced to close except by the sufferance of their creditors.

The proposed amendment to the Small Business Act is designed to give immediate relief to this type of small business operation.

Small business loans, as helpful as they might prove to be, are not the answer to the collapse of agricultural credit. The disaster loan program has heretofore operated well in limited situations. It must be supplemented for this present major disaster and possible future catastrophes. What is called for is second mortgage refinancing over a period of years in such a fashion as not to impede established systems of credit.

If enacted, the proposed amendment to the Farm Loan Act will fulfill this need. The $200 million authorization is not an appropriation and will come from assets now available to the intermediate credit bank. What the amendment proposes is simply this: It will give to the Farm Credit Administration the authority to make loans through the intermediate credit banks to production credit associations and other lending agencies of a character and nature that are not now permitted by law. Let me give an illustration as to how the plan would work. Through crop failures an individual farmer is now confronted with a net operating loss of $10,000 on his 1957 operation. Furthermore, he does not have the money to pay taxes that are now due. He must obtain a loan to produce his 1958 crop; yet he is behind on the payments for his tractors and machinery, owes large bills for fuel oil, poison, machinery repairs and numerous open accounts for groceries, drugs, and other essentials that formed an integral part of his 1957 operation. Under this proposed amendment he can now go to his lending agency and arrange for his 1958 production loan. In addition to this loan the lender will carefully examine the obligations carried over from the 1957 crop in a supplemental loan covering a period of from 3 to 5 years. The money will then be made available for him to pay off the numerous tractors included in the 1957 deficit.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Honorable P. F. Williams, Clarksdale, Miss., a member of the National Advisory Committee of the Farm Credit Administration written to Gov. R. B. Tootell, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. A similar story is told by all production credit associations in the affected area. I likewise ask to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter which has been written by Senator FULBRIGHT and me to Governor Tootell.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 19, 1957.

Mr. R. B. TOOTEL,
*Governor, Farm Credit Administration,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR BOB: I have had two conversations with Mr. Courtney Pace, executive secretary to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, with reference to conditions prevailing in the Mississippi Delta, Arkansas Delta, Louisiana Delta, and Missouri Delta. In addition to the plan which Senator EASTLAND first started we have had a number of Senators and Representatives from Mississippi, Arkansas, and Missouri to suggest similar plans.

Personally I cannot see how the production credit associations are going to finance the farmers in the shape they are in financially now. The farmers have land payments to make, taxes, implement notes to meet, poison from last year's crop to pay for; in fact, the farmers have innumerable obligations to meet, and the production credit associations simply cannot lend them enough money to meet their debts and money with which to produce a crop in 1958.

I have discussed this proposition with a number of large producers, also discussed the matter with production credit associations. I am told that either the old Federal mortgage loan or the Federal land bank commissioners loan can be reactivated at once, and they can put out second-mortgage money which will enable the farmers to pay the 1957 debts and then get money from the production credit associations with which to produce a crop in 1958.

Implement dealers have not got the money to carry over the debts until 1958. The banks have not got the money to carry the debts over for the farmers. The production credit associations have not got the money to carry over the debts simply because the farmers have not got the security to put up to pay their debts. I will thank you kindly if you will look into this matter and see what can be done.

I talked to Mr. Pace yesterday afternoon, and he tells me that certainly the National Advisory Committee knows something of the seriousness of this proposition in the States of Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, Louisiana,

and east Texas. Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi; Mr. SMITH, Congressman from Mississippi, who lives in Greenwood, Miss.; and other Mississippi Congressmen are very anxious to have the advisory committee take this matter up in January with you, your board, and the Congress.

If you should want to investigate the facts, I would certainly be delighted to have you come to Clarksdale or send somebody to Clarksdale, and we will help you in any way.

Frankly, something has got to be done and done quickly.

Sincerely,

P. F. WILLIAMS,
*Member, National Advisory Committee, Fifth District.*

---

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
*December 20, 1957.*

The Honorable R. B. TOOTEL,
*Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR GOVERNOR TOOTEL: We are in receipt of a copy of a letter addressed to you by Hon. P. F. Williams, member of the National Advisory Committee of the Fifth District of the Farm Credit Administration. The letter outlines the inadequacies of the present farm credit machinery in the disaster areas proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture for Missouri, west Tennessee, Arkansas, and Mississippi. Probably other States now or will soon have similar problems.

As of this time, the Secretary of Agriculture has proclaimed 50 counties in Mississippi, 52 counties in Arkansas, several counties in Missouri and west Tennessee as disaster areas. Incessant rain during the harvest season has rendered it impossible for the farmers in these areas to meet their obligations.

In Mr. Williams' letter he states "I cannot see how the production credit associations are going to finance the farmers in the shape they are in financially now. The farmers have land payments to make, taxes, implement notes to meet, poison from last year's crops to pay for. In fact the farmers have innumerable obligations to meet, and the production credit associations simply cannot lend them enough money to meet their debts and money with which to produce a crop in 1958." He then suggested the reactivation of the former Federal mortgage loan program or the Federal land bank commissioners loan program so that farmers will have available second-mortgage and chattel refinancing over a period of years to enable them to pay 1957 debts.

We concur in the observations made in Mr. Williams' letter to you. We have realized the seriousness of this condition for some time and we also feel that the present credit machinery is inadequate.

Disaster loan officials are reluctant to make loans to refinance existing obligations. However, this is the crux of the problem which confronts the people in these areas.

The situation is very bad. However, it is not so bad that it cannot be handled by a realistic appraisal of the magnitude of the task coupled with the realization that the primary need is adequate credit over a sufficient length of time to enable the obligations and losses to be liquidated.

Mr. Williams suggested a meeting of the Advisory Committee of the Farm Credit Board and we concur that some action along this line would be very helpful.

Early in January we will propose an amendment to the Small Business Act to enable the Small Business Administration to extend its disaster loan program to areas where disasters occur because of excess rainfall, as well as drought and hurricanes. We realize, of course, that this is not the answer to the entire credit problem, but believe it will be helpful. The farm economy in our areas has been stricken to such an extent that the business community, which directly and indirectly depends upon agriculture, is also suffering. Small business loans are necessary to finance inventories accumulating because of lack of sales to farmers, and because of uncollected accounts.

Early in January we expect to have hearings on this amendment and we are suggesting to some of the agriculture, credit and business leaders in the affected areas that this might be an appropriate time to ask some persons who are acquainted with conditions in the area to come to Washington for a discussion of this matter with their representatives in Congress and officials of the executive agencies involved. We believe such a meeting would be helpful in pointing out the extent of the disaster and bringing forth suggestions as to how our credit machinery can be shaped to meet the immediate need.

We hope you and your advisers will be available to participate in these discussions at that time. In the meantime we hope that your agency will give careful and urgent consideration as to what can be done, either by regulation or amendment to existing law, to help the people in these areas. Prompt action is necessary, for, as you know, the 1958 planting season must be arranged for in the next few weeks.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND.
J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and I have suggested that the importance of this question would, in our opinion, justify business and credit leaders coming to Washington to meet with their representatives in Congress and to appear before such committees as may seem appropriate and discuss this whole subject in a roundtable form with the administrative agencies involved, which would be the Small Business Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Farm Credit Administration, looking forward to whatever steps are necessary to take to meet the emergency character of the declaration of disaster as presented by the Secretary of Agriculture. Undoubtedly many Senators and Congressmen who are not immediately affected at this time will be tremendously interested in this entire subject matter. We have suggested January 21 as a target date for such a conference.

The two presently proposed amendments will give to the conference a sound base for a thorough discussion of the situation. Copies will be distributed to each Member of the Senate. Their suggestions, advice, and criticisms between now and the convening date of this conference will be appreciated, as well as their participation in the conference itself.

I believe that Senators who have heretofore introduced legislation on subjects similar to this will find in these two proposed amendments the complete answer to every problem with which they were confronted at the time of the introduction of their bills, and this proposed procedure is far simpler than the procedures that have heretofore been suggested.

Mr. President, we urge the immediate passage of these amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. 2920. A bill to provide for small business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall; and

S. 2921. A bill to enable the Federal intermediate credit banks to limit endorsers' liability on loans in disaster areas.

EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, December 10, 1957.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: We were glad to get your letter of November 29, 1957, and to have your appraisal of the distress caused among Arkansas farmers because of excessive rains over the past month. Your letter confirms information that has been made available to us from other sources.

We have tried to alleviate the difficulties faced by Arkansas farmers because of the excessive rain. On May 29, the President designated flooded areas in Arkansas as major disaster under Public Law 875. On August 19 he amended this designation to include additional areas. We sent one of our most able fieldmen, Mr. James Cross, into Arkansas. He gave us a report indicating the extent of the disaster. On June 20, the Commodity Credit Corporation made available surplus stocks of feed grain without cost to eligible Arkansas farmers for the purpose of maintaining their distressed livestock in Lafayette, Little River, Hempstead, and Miller Counties.

Under Public Law 38, 26 counties have been designated by the Secretary as eligible for emergency credit. Nineteen counties have been designated for agricultural conservation practices. Two hundred and ninety thousand dollars has been sent into the State as a contribution to restore flood-damaged lands. We are now reviewing this program so as to make further contributions for restoring flood-damaged areas after January 1.

As of June 1, 1957, 178,443 family units were receiving donated surplus commodities from the Department of Agriculture. These commodities are still available to those in need.

It is noted that you believe that emergency credit policies should be reviewed with the end in view of granting emergency loans for refinancing existing debts. Farmers Home Administration is only one of many credit institutions serving Arkansas farmers. We have inquired as to deposits in Arkansas banks and find that, while deposits are down, the banks are still in a strong position.

In addition, production credit associations operate in your State and the Farm Credit Administration advises us that they are able with very few exceptions to take care of their regular customers and are willing and able to serve new ones. In short, there is no shortage of loanable funds in the area served by the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of St. Louis.

The Department has two statutory authorities which may be used to assist farmers with loans falling in the general category of production and intermediate-type credit. These statutory authorities will be used to the fullest extent possible in assisting Arkansas farmers as a result of the losses that have occurred there. The policies under which these loans are made are based upon the provisions in the statutes and understandings that have been reached with Congress concerning the use of such au-

thorities. These two types of loans are explained below:

Operating loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act are made to eligible farmers for such items as seed, fertilizer, gas and oil, machinery repair, other farm needs and living expenses. These loans are also made for the purchase of livestock, farm machinery, and the refinancing of debts on livestock and farm machinery. These loans are made from appropriated funds. The county offices of the Farmers Home Administration are now processing loans to farmers for the purposes indicated above as applications therefor are approved by the local county committees.

Emergency loans under Public Law 38 are now available in 25 counties in Arkansas which have been designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. These loans are available for farm operating costs and living expenses. However, the operating budgets made up in connection with these loans may include interest to other creditors for loans secured by liens on farm machinery and loans secured by real estate liens on the farm. These loans are not available for the refinancing of debts. These emergency loans are made from a revolving fund established by Congress when Public Law 38 was enacted in 1949. The Department's policy of not making loans from this revolving fund for the refinancing of debts to other creditors has been a long-standing policy of the Department. This policy has been discussed at many hearings before Congressional committees participated in by Department officials.

It has been our experience that the use of both authorities described herein will enable the Department to satisfactorily meet the credit needs in these emergency areas.

The Department of Agriculture stands ready through the Farmers Home Administration to assist with emergency credit in the financing of eligible farmers for production of next year's crops. It is particularly alert to assist farmers who have suffered from disasters beyond their control but wish to continue their operations. It is ready to help with the conservation practices in restoring land damaged by excessive rains and floods. If there is a need for feed grain to maintain basic breeding herds, these supplies may be made available. In addition, the Department of Agriculture can, as it has done heretofore, make surplus foods available to needy persons.

It is not the intention of the Department of Agriculture to hide behind technicalities in reviewing requests for assistance on receipt of reports from our State disaster committee. Action to alleviate distress among Arkansas farmers will be taken in a sympathetic and understanding manner. We will give prompt consideration to all requests from the Arkansas State Disaster Committee to the full extent intended by the appropriate statutes. This includes assistance in the purchase of feed grain, assistance in the rehabilitation of flood-damaged lands, emergency credit, and making available surplus foods.

It is to be regretted that more farmers who suffered such severe losses could not avail themselves of the protection provided by the Department's Federal crop insurance program or hedge against loss by taking advantage of the soil bank program. By use of these programs a farmer can protect himself against disastrous losses and it is suggested that these protections be considered in planning next year's farm operations.

Again let me assure you of our desire to be helpful in serving the farmers of Arkansas who find themselves in difficulty.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
*Under Secretary.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
*November 29, 1957.*

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I should like to call your attention to the critical situation facing Arkansas farmers brought about by the cumulative effects of adverse weather this year.

As you know, Arkansas and other States in the West and Southwest had until this year suffered through several years of serious drought. The drought forced many farmers to abandon or sell their farms and seek work in the cities. Countless others were left in an almost impossible financial situation. Much of the distress suffered by farmers in Arkansas could have been alleviated by prompt and sympathetic assistance under the disaster programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. For example, Arkansas farmers suffering from last year's drought were not made eligible for hay and grain assistance under Public Law 875 until February of this year and then only 8 counties were designated. This was only a fraction of the counties pleading for relief, and the aid given was much too late to save many farmers from ruin. A more sympathetic attitude toward the problems of the disaster stricken farmers by Department personnel would have prevented much distress.

Most farmers were optimistic over prospects this year and hoped for fairly normal weather conditions. However, a late freeze destroyed much of the fruit crops. Extensive heavy rains during the planting season prevented many farmers from planting their crops until early summer and newly planted crops on thousands of acres were washed out by flooding. Some farmers planted their crops as many as three times before achieving success. Despite these adverse effects, indications this fall pointed to good crops, considering the acreage under cultivation. Two weeks of torrential rain this month have completely changed this picture and the farmers are in serious difficulty again.

The State has already received rainfall of 66.43 inches this year—more than any year since 1884. As of November 19, the rainfall for November already measures 9.24 inches. This has had disastrous effects on crops now being harvested. Thousands of acres of good cotton are lying completely under water, and if any cotton is to be salvaged from this land it will be of very poor quality. The cotton crop harvest was far behind normal schedule, due to the late planting and other factors. Much of the crop was still in the fields when the rains came. Reports of crop damage are incomplete at this time, but losses will undoubtedly run into many millions. In Jefferson County alone the county agent estimates that the cotton crop losses will be at least $3 million. Similar losses can be expected for all cotton-producing counties in eastern Arkansas and the lowlands of the Southwest. Great losses will also be incurred in the rice, soybean, sorghum, and lespedeza crops. The farmers of Arkansas are in need of all possible assistance from the Department of Agriculture to help in recovering from this catastrophe.

Twenty-five counties in Arkansas are currently eligible for emergency loans under the provisions of Public Law 38. Many counties most seriously affected by the recent rains are not included in this authorization. It is apparent that many more counties should be authorized for emergency loans. I understand that additional action is needed to make the already designated counties eligible for aid for losses from recent flooding since the current authorization relates only to losses suffered earlier this year. I hope this authorization will be made promptly and that the other counties which were afflicted by recent rains will be added to the eligible list.

I realize that the current Department policy does not favor granting emergency loans for refinancing existing indebtedness. I believe this policy should be reviewed. One of the greatest needs of the farmers is for refinancing debts to prevent foreclosures on their land and chattels as well as preventing additional strains on an already overburdened farm credit situation. The current credit needs of the farmers cannot be met with "production" loans. Therefore, I urge that you give careful and considerate attention to making available emergency-type loans for refinancing purposes.

The farmers in Arkansas have suffered tremendous losses in recent years through no fault of their own. They are normally conditioned to accepting setbacks by nature, as are farmers everywhere. However, they have a right to expect the Department of Agriculture to make available without delay in emergency conditions the disaster relief which Congress has authorized. It is difficult to tell at this stage what additional assistance Arkansas farmers will need other than emergency credit. In all probability, feed and grain relief under Public Law 875 will be needed in some sections. Many areas will need authorization for land rehabilitation practices under the agriculture conservation program. I hope that the Department will take a positive attitude toward relieving the plight of the affected farmers and will not hide behind technicalities in refusing requests for assistance. The Department will, of course, receive official reports from the State disaster committee on needs for various types of aid. I urge that these reports be acted upon promptly so that the farmers can receive the relief to which they are entitled.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

---

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Arkansas Democrat of November 26, 1957]

WEATHER TO BLAME: STATE FARMERS COUNT CROP LOSS IN MILLIONS

(By Clifton Wells)

The weather has dealt Arkansas' delta cotton farmers a body blow.

"Some of them are out of business right now and don't know it," said one eastern Arkansas observer.

While it is the delta farmers who have felt the brunt of periodic rains and an early freeze, growers in all sections of the State are suffering. And the impact of reduced farm income already is being felt by many segments of business.

Farmers with reduced production and crops of poor quality which will bring lower prices, will have fewer dollars to spend. Many may not be able to repay loans they received last spring.

The Agricultural Department said that on October 1, the cash income of Arkansas farmers was down $85 million from last year.

Harold F. Ohlendorf, Osceola, president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, described the situation as critical. He said it could get worse.

Neither Ohlendorf nor Government officials would estimate the total damage wrought by the weather or what the ultimate loss might be. But they agreed that it already is in the millions of dollars.

The weather threw its first punch last spring.

Rains caused widespread flooding from surface water and rivers. Thousands of acres along rivers and creeks throughout the State were inundated and surface water covered

much acreage in northeast Arkansas, destroying just planted crops.

Farmers replanted—some of them two or three times.

Through the summer more rain hampered cultivation and spraying operations, despite a plush growing season.

In October still maturing crops—delayed because of the late planting—were caught by an early freeze.

Then came more rain, again pushing rivers and creeks out of their banks and preventing harvest. Machines and laborers were idled as the rainfall either ruined or lowered the grade of stands still in the soaked fields.

By November 1 last year, 1,257,047 bales of cotton had been ginned in Arkansas. The Census Bureau said that prior to the same date this year only 644,577 bales had been ginned—a reduction of nearly 50 percent.

During the first three-quarters of 1956, the Agriculture Department said, Arkansas farmers received $343,262,000 for their products. During the same period of 1957 the cash income was only $258,135,000.

The Arkansas farmer—now faced with a smaller than normal crop and one of low quality—began the year with fewer acres on which to plant cotton.

The State's allotment for 1957 was 1,416,809 acres compared to 1,424,511 the previous year. In addition, about 186,000 acres were placed in the soil bank, a program under which the Government tries to reduce surpluses by discouraging planting.

Flooding prevented many acres from being planted.

The crop loss in Jefferson County alone recently was estimated at $3 million—a figure based on normal production.

Ashley County Agent D. M. Vaught estimated the cotton loss at $500,000. The loss to all crops in Randolph County was placed at $1 million by the Agriculture Department.

In Craighead County, the county agent, Herbert Russell, said Craighead farmers would be lucky to get 50,000 bales of cotton this year. He said Craighead produced 77,000 bales a year ago.

The loss in farm income already is being felt.

Amos David, Caraway, a butane-gas dealer, reported about 25 percent more delinquent accounts than last year. A lot of the delinquents, he said, are customers who normally would take advantage of 30-day discounts.

An implement dealer in northeast Arkansas said his business was off 20 percent and delinquent accounts up 40 percent.

The east Arkansan, who said many small farmers were already out of business but didn't know it, said, "They'll find out next spring when they try to get their furnish."

---

[From the Arkansas Gazette of November 14, 1957]

DREAMS OF FARMERS SHATTERED BY RAIN

(By Leland DuVall)

The dreams of Arkansas farmers are turning to nightmares in the wake of rainstorms and generally adverse weather.

After struggling through one of the most difficult and expensive spring planting seasons in recent years, farmers emerged with what promised to be a fair to good crop. The freeze and excessive rains have changed the picture.

Even before the latest storms, the Arkansas cotton crop prospects had declined sharply. The latest estimate, based on conditions as of November 1, placed the crop 10 percent below the October report.

But this is by no means the biggest loss. Farmers probably will feel their sharpest pains from loss of grade. The market spread is unusually wide this year and there is a good chance that it will increase more.

Little Rock buyers said yesterday that the price spread from the Middling grade upward was not particularly wide but from the Middling grade down the market slips sharply. One buyer said yesterday that the spread was about $20 a bale between Middling cotton with a staple Low Middling with the same staple.

PER POUND SPREAD

Stated in price, this would mean that if Middling cotton of the specified length were selling at 36.5 cents a pound, the same staple length in Strict Low Middling would bring only 32.5 cents. Another buyer said Strict Low Spotted cotton of this staple length would bring no more than 24 cents. There were reports that some cotton was sold at 17 cents.

When this rain stops and the cotton is finally picked, there is a good chance that the grade will be down to the point that the selling price will range between 19 and 25 cents, one buyer said.

The weather was responsible for part of the loss of anticipated production. The crop was planted considerably later than usual but there appeared to be a good chance that it would overcome the handicap and make a normal or better crop. Cool, damp weather late in the growing season slowed the maturity rate so that the bolls that were set did not fill out as rapidly as they would have done in hot weather.

DEFOLIATION DIFFICULT

Defoliation, where it was tried, was difficult and this slowed the harvest of the early cotton.

"There has been little opportunity to use the mechanical pickers," said William E. Woodall, extension cotton specialist. "I have seen some of the machines at work and they were doing a poor job. The farmers had no choice, since they were faced with the alternative of losing the whole crop or gathering what they could."

He said that in fields where the tires of the picker slipped or skidded, the efficiency of the machine declined rapidly because of the altered ratio between the picking drums and the movement through the field.

OTHER CROPS

Rice farmers are facing similar problems. Harry W. Wellhausen, extension agronomist, said much of the early rice had been harvested but the late crop was threatened by high water. Farmers are faced with higher costs because the harvest will be slow.

Losses of grain sorghum are expected to be heavy.

Soybeans present a slightly different problem. Wellhausen said most of the beans were mature when the frost came and there was little danger of shattering.

But short days and wet ground will keep the moisture content of the beans high and this will interfere with the storage. Wellhausen said beans could be stored safely if they had less than 14 percent moisture. Above that level losses will occur. The alternative is to harvest the beans when the moisture content is high, then dry them to the safe level.

But this is expensive.

The tragedy of the whole thing is that the circumstances are completely out of the hands of the farmer and the troubles were caused by factors over which they had no control.

---

[From the Arkansas Gazette of December 13, 1957]

WEATHER-BATTERED EASTERN ARKANSAS FACES LEAN YEAR

(By Bill Lewis)

PARKIN, December 12.—Man and the elements combined this year to deal farmers of the rich St. Francis River lands of this area a blow that, for some of them, may well prove to spell financial ruin.

Spring floods delayed planting or required replanting, in some cases as often as three times. This in turn caused late-maturing crops that were severely damaged by an early frost.

Then the rains came again and while the water has greatly subsided, thousands of acres of dirty cotton, milo grain sorghum, and other crops lie unharvested in still soggy fields.

The situation has reached the point where field hands, whose employers are unable to continue carrying them financially, plod through the wet fields in weather so cold that it normally would keep them indoors, picking the ragged cotton tatters that remain, earning enough to keep eating.

A week, two at the most, will wind that up, and one large-scale farmer said the only prospect for relief for the hands after then would be surplus commodities, distributed by county judges.

Cross County people are accustomed to floods—the seasonal ones that result from high water in the Mississippi River. The flooding, in fact, is largely responsible for the richness of their soil. But in the past, these have occurred before the planting season and after harvesting, and the first killing frost hasn't come so early.

Rainfall for the county normally averages about 50 inches. By this week, 73.922 inches of rain had hit Cross County itself, and as much or more had fallen in the areas to the north drained by the St. Francis.

Years ago, the St. Francis, which squeezes between Crowley's Ridge on the west and a high bank on the east to the southwest of Parkin, could easily handle the excessive rains that fell in southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas. The excess water meandered through the gullies, taking its normal lazy time.

Now, an elaborate system of drainage ditches making up the Little River drainage system in southeast Missouri speeds the excess water down the tributaries that feed into the St. Francis and a manmade leveed ditch now called St. Francis Bay. The river and the bay meet at a point just above the river's "tight squeeze" at Parkin, bringing more water than the well-confined riverbed can possibly handle. The water simply backs up, overflowing roads, fields, and the foundation of houses.

ONLY $3 MILLION

The Corps of Engineers has started a project for opening up the bottleneck by ditches from the Mississippi River northward to the Parkin area, but this is expected to cost some $55 million and the corps now is getting only about $3 million a year for the work.

Farmers of the area are in agreement that this is the only solution to the problem of flooding caused by excessive rains and they press their cause for more funds for the engineers at every opportunity. They concede that their chances for speeding the work aren't too bright at the moment, in view of recent Congressional talk of the increased cost of a missiles program to match Russia's Sputniks seem remote to them in their present difficulties.

Cotton is, of course, the principal crop and moneymaker, with rice next, soybeans third, and milo fourth. Despite the adverse weather, rice planters have fared better than the cotton farmers, but in a county where the entire economy is pegged to agriculture, losses in any crops are felt by just about everybody.

GRADE LOSS GREAT

Troy S. Jennings, the Cross County extension service agent, has estimated that for cotton and rice, production costs for this year's crops were 25 percent greater than normal and that on cotton crops alone farmers will lose $600,000 to the downgrading of cotton quality and $125,000 for the acreage not planted. The loss on rice from these two causes will run about $285,000, soybeans $200,000, and milo $65,000.

Cotton that normally would sell for 36 to 37 cents a pound will be downgraded to 21 to 25 cents. And the amount of even this poor quality of cotton that can be harvested has been reduced in many instances to one-fourth of the estimated crop.

Miles McPeek, statistician with the Department of Agriculture, estimates this year's cotton crop for the entire State will amount to 985,000 bales, 31 percent less than last year's crop, and 32 percent below the 10-year average. Early sales have been at slightly improved prices but he expressed the opinion that prices would drop even more than 31 percent when the damaged cotton reaches the market.

Added to the excessive and early frost was an unusually cool and moist fall that retarded the opening of the cotton bolls.

J. E. Hollan, Jr., of Levesque, who operates a general store and gin for about 1,800 acres of cotton farmland, said he normally could expect to gin at least a bale per acre.

"The first overflow took 25 percent," Hollan said. "We lost another 25 percent from frost damage in October and another 25 percent in the November flood. So far we've ginned 597 bales on better than 1,800 acres of land, and that's about all we'll get this year."

BUILT LEVEES

One of Hollan's neighbors, John H. Johnson, built levees around about 1,000 acres of his cotton and milo land, which borders on Crowley's Ridge, installed lift pumps and saved his crop. But pumping and levee work are expensive and even impractical for the lower lying areas of the county.

Morris Smith, Jr., of W. M. Smith & Sons, one of the larger farms of Cross County, said 700 acres of their farm had been under water for 5 months of this year—4 in the spring and 1 in the fall—and the chances are much of that land will be inundated for the rest of this year.

The high water blocked a gravel road normally used to transport cotton to the gin, and instead of 6 miles, Smith had to haul the harvested cotton 45 miles.

Smith is a director of the St. Francis Levee Board which is promoting the Corps of Engineers project. The project is federally financed. He said the project, if completed now, would lower the St. Francis River 8 feet.

The Smith farm also breeds Angus cattle and ponies and operates its own gin.

MAY BREAK EVEN

The large operators—those who have subsidiary interests in addition to farming—may manage to break even this year, or at least suffer losses small enough to allow them to continue.

The others, those who rent their lands and borrow money to make crops, won't fare so well.

A typical example of the latter is a young man with a wife and two children who had wisely placed enough of his rented farm in the soil-bank program to repay his crop loan. He was confident he would make enough to pay rent on the land and provide his family with a livelihood. His crop was a failure and he was forced to take a teaching job to support his family.

One of the major operators, who owns 4,000 of the richest acres of the county, commented that he would gladly accept a $75,000 loss this year—if he could then rest assured his losses wouldn't exceed that figure.

E. D. McKnight, who has a farm under lease, operates the St. Francis Pedigreed Seed Co. and has other farming interests, voiced cautious optimism that those who were honest in their work and who have really tried will be able to get more credit for a crop next year.

Even if they do, it will take them 3 to 5 years to recover from this year's setback, McKnight said. "You used to be able to make it back in a year, but the margin's too close now," McKnight said. "Sometimes it's just best to give up and turn to something else."

OTHERS FEEL PINCH

Others feel the pinch. A Parkin farm equipment dealer who sold $18,000 worth of equipment last year has sold just a little more than $2,000 worth this year. Power cutoffs are far more numerous this year than normally, and some grocery stores are just barely staying open.

The oldtimers of the area agree that the combination of disasters this year are unprecedented in their lifetimes.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I am happy to join with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and other of my colleagues in the sponsorship of these bills, which are of such vital immediate importance to the farmers, the small-business men, and the economy of Mississippi, Arkansas, and parts of Missouri and Tennessee, and which may affect many other parts of the Nation as well.

Speaking of Tennessee, I have been sorely concerned during trips I have made this past fall through west Tennessee—the cotton-growing part of the State.

There, as in Mississippi and the other States of the Midsouth, excessive rainfall did tremendous damage to last year's crop. The farmers are now caught in a squeeze: They can borrow money to put in next year's crop, but under existing laws they cannot borrow to pay what they owe on last year's crop. The small-business men are in a difficult plight because of the same natural disaster: The farmers cannot pay their last year's bills and they have not been able to buy, so inventories are stacking up.

In trying to arrive at some worthwhile suggestion for helping in this situation, I had considered proposing something of the RFC type, but the bills we are introducing today are, in my opinion, far preferable to the tentative solution I had considered, because they have the advantage of working through existing agencies. Therefore, the help can be applied rapidly, which is what is needed.

One of our bills authorizes a $200 million fund to be made available to the Farm Credit Administration for disaster relief loans in agricultural areas declared as such due to excessive rainfall, drought, hurricane, and wind damage, excessive cold, and other acts of God. Under this plan borrowers from production credit associations who have been unable to meet their obligations will be permitted to arrange for a special loan over a 3- to 5-year period. Thus, the money will be a loan only, not a gift.

The other amendment we are introducing enables the Small Business Administration to make emergency loans in disaster areas to the small businesses which are caught with large unpaid balances on supplies and services upon which credit was given to farmers during the past year.

The proposed legislation is most necessary in order that some measure of relief may be afforded the merchants, farmers, dealers, banks, and lending institutions of the Midsouth. I hope it can be acted upon with reasonable dispatch.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the southeast section of Missouri, as well as in other States along the reaches of the Mississippi River, excessive rainfall in recent months has caused disastrous floods.

In addition to the damage from the floodwaters, thousands of acres of crops, matured and ready to be harvested, were damaged or destroyed.

In the boot heel area of my State, where the average annual rainfall is less than 40 inches, over 100 inches of rain have been reported.

Cotton production, according to the USDA's 1957 Missouri crop report, is just 40 percent of the 1956 level. There are some fifty to sixty thousand people without either food or adequate funds to purchase it. Bank deposits in this area are down 25 percent from last year.

Conditions are extremely critical. Immediate action is needed to lessen the burden on the people affected—not only in Missouri, but in the other States as well.

At the present time surplus food stocks of flour, cornmeal, rice, and some milk products are being distributed through the Missouri Department of Welfare.

Some credit assistance, in the form of emergency crop production loans on the 1958 plantings, is available through Farmers Home Administration.

Additional credit must be provided to prevent mortgage foreclosures and to help the farmers and the small-business men serving them through the rehabilitation period.

For this reason I am joining with Senator EASTLAND and several other colleagues in introducing two bills to help meet this need.

One of these bills would amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to make available $200 million for emergency loans in disaster areas through the Federal intermediate credit banks and the production credit associations. This money would be used for refinancing present indebtedness.

The other legislation would amend the Small Business Act of 1953, authorizing the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans in flood emergency areas as declared by the Secretary of Agriculture.

These two pieces of legislation represent efforts to improve the loan programs currently in effect for disaster areas such as those in southeast Missouri. They would apply not only to the present areas declared disaster, but also in the future to other areas that may be affected.

Prompt and favorable consideration of these bills is very important.

---

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORT ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to protect America's dairy industry from liquidation. I urge its priority consideration by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as emergency legislation which must be enacted into law prior to April 1.

I am introducing the proposal on behalf of myself and a group of colleagues deeply concerned about the plight of dairy farmers, including Senators MANSFIELD, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, MORSE, HENNINGS, KEFAUVER, LANGER, PROXMIRE, MAGNUSON, SCOTT, CHURCH, THYE, KERR, SYMINGTON, JACKSON, MUNDT, POTTER, WILEY, and YOUNG.

In essence, this bill is designed to keep America and Americans strong. The bill immediately reverses the decision—the pre-Christmas decision—made by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, to lower the support level for manufacturing milk an additional 8 percent. The bill as introduced would assure all of us that chaos will not be the lot of the dairy farmer and, therefore, of the consumer. We are proposing in this bill a modest increase in the support level of manufacturing milk of some 7.7 percent from the present level. When you realize that the dairy farmer's cost of doing business has risen appreciably since 1954, this suggested increase is little enough.

Members of the Senate are aware, I am sure, of my lack of confidence in the ability or the intention of the Secretary of Agriculture to do anything for the American farmer: I have every confidence in his ability and intention to do anything and everything he can to the American farmer. Mr. Benson's abilities along this line are no more amply or cruelly demonstrated than in his announcement of December 18—1 week to the day before Christmas—which, if permitted to become effective, will remove from the pockets of the American dairy farmer $250 million. This on the pretext—and history from 1954 to the present will show that it is nothing but a pretext—that such action would, in the Secretary's opinion reduce production and increase consumption. Mr. President, it is high time that we, as the elected representatives of the American people, do everything we can to stop the Secretary of Agriculture's economic liquidation of the American dairy farmer.

I am as aware today, as I was some years ago when I made my first charge against Mr. Benson, of the seriousness of those charges. I am more convinced today that these charges can be sustained on evidence published by the Secretary's own Department of Agriculture. One need only refer to the official publication of the United States Department of Agriculture titled "Dairy Situation" to secure support for the indictment.

Information in that publication clearly shows a convincing rebuttal of Mr. Benson's so-called economic theories of readjustment for dairying.

For 5 years Mr. Benson has been telling the people of America and the world that dairy farmers were pricing themselves out of the market. In a completely unprincipled appeal to nonagricultural segments of our country the Secretary has attempted to defend his flexing of the American dairy farmers with the argument that lower prices to those farmers will reduce production and increase consumption of milk and its products. Neither of these objectives has been attained under Mr. Benson's policies. On the contrary milk production has increased an average of 1.6 billion pounds each year since 1954 when Mr. Benson started his downgrading of the American dairy farmers and the per capita consumption of milk and its products has remained about the same.

In summary, therefore, Mr. Benson's dairy program has lowered the economic status of the American dairy producers and has actually increased the milk bill to consumers.

I cannot believe that the American consumer would subscribe to Mr. Benson's theories knowing that the application of such theories has meant an hourly wage for our dairy farmers of about 50 cents. I do not believe that American consumers will subscribe to Mr. Benson's economic theories when they realize that the application of those theories has brought about a reduction in the purchasing power of the American dairy farmer by some $600 million each year since 1954 and this reduction will reach some $850 million if the recent decision by Mr. Benson is permitted to stand. All this with no reduction in milk prices to the consumer.

My indictment of Mr. Benson, his theories and his programs, as they affect dairy farmers and consumers, must go further. Mr. Benson talks out of both sides of his mouth. In support of this I submit the Secretary's public statements and actions of December 18, 1957. On the morning of that date Mr. Benson held a national conference on food donations. This conference was publicized by Mr. Benson with the announcement to the conference participants that "I know that you share my interest in the most constructive use of our abundance with which we have been so richly blessed."

During the conference, Mr. Benson described the effectiveness of our abundant food production in winning and holding friends in foreign countries, as well as increasing the nutritional level of many vulnerable segments of our own population. Mr. Benson left the room in which this conference was held and walked to his own office some 200 feet away to hold a press conference during which these very blessings of an abundant production of milk and dairy products became an evil to be dealt with ruthlessly.

I suggest we have seen in Mr. Benson as the Secretary of Agriculture the most blatant "two-face-ism." Members of the United States Senate are well aware of the role our abundant food and fiber production has played as a tool in our programs to win and hold the confidence of our friends in foreign nations. The Secretary has recognized this. But now he would penalize those who helped shape this tool.

The error of Mr. Benson's ways as Secretary of Agriculture can only be mended by the Congress—this we must do before he scraps our agricultural production plant.

Mr. President, I ask that my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with a statement I issued at the time of Secretary Benson's announcement of plans to reduce dairy income.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2924) to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on dairy products, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at not less than 75 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price therefor using a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 80-month period July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive: *Provided*, That for the marketing year ending March 31, 1959, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes shall be supported at not less than $3.50 per hundredweight."

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE BENSON'S DAIRY INCOME REDUCTION ORDER

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has again lowered the boom on our dairy farmers. He announced today that price supports for milk and butterfat will be set at 75 percent of parity. Mr. Benson did not say what kind of parity he has in mind. Presumably he will continue to use the current "tricky parity equivalent" formula for manufacturing milk which keeps going lower and lower.

Based upon estimates for next year, the new support price for the marketing year starting April 1, 1958, will be around $3 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 55.6 cents per pound for butterfat as compared to this year's $3.25 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 58.6 cents per pound for butterfat.

This unjustified and irresponsible action by Mr. Benson makes it imperative that the Congress give immediate consideration in January to legislation to bolster dairy farmers' income. This legislation must, as a minimum, provide for (1) mandatory use of a stabilized parity equivalent formula for manufacturing milk and (2) a price support of not less than $3.50 per hundredweight. This $3.50 level represents a modest increase over the present $3.25 of about 7½ percent or less than a 50 percent recovery of the drastic drop by Mr. Benson in 1954 when he cut dairy price supports from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent.

I propose to use every possible honorable means to reverse the direction taken by Mr. Benson and give our dairy farmers some encouragement instead of constantly putting roadblocks in their way. Early in January last year I introduced a bill in the Senate which would give our dairy farmers assurance of a stabilized income for milk and butterfat. It is all the more imperative that this proposed legislation be adopted.

The unconscionable action taken by Mr. Benson is not necessarily the limit of his intentions to make matters even more difficult for our dairy farmers. There is evidence that the Secretary is unhappy over the fact that the law prevents his dropping dairy price supports below 75 percent of parity. It is clear that Mr. Benson has not learned the lesson that reducing price supports will not result in decreased production. Decreased production will result only from disastrously low prices.

Dairy farmers are beyond the point of being shocked by Mr. Benson's actions and they should not be surprised if he requests

the Congress to amend the existing law so as to permit him to lower dairy price supports to 60 percent of parity. He has made known that he intends to submit proposed legislation to give him authority to drop price supports on some of the basic agriculture commodities from the present minimum of 75 percent to 60 percent. Mr. Benson may have some notion of including dairy products in the group to be cut. If so, the Secretary will know the real meaning of righteous wrath of our dairy farmers and the producers of other agricultural commodities.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and a number of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 as it relates to dairy price supports.

This bill would have the effect of maintaining dairy price supports for the next marketing year at approximately the present level.

On December 23, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that he was cutting the level of price support on dairy products from 83 percent of parity to 75 percent—the minimum allowed by law. This price cut should be prevented.

Dairy farmers, along with all of our farmers, are already in serious economic trouble. They have been caught in a vicious cost-price squeeze.

Since 1952, total net farm income after inventory adjustments has declined 23 percent. Per capita income of farm people, $903 in 1956, is just 45 percent of the per capita income of nonfarm people.

Since 1952, about 4 million farm people have been forced from their homes and farms, including many thousand dairy operators.

The reasons for this latest action, reducing farm income, as given by the Secretary of Agriculture in his December 23 press conference, are inadequate.

He said the lower price supports would provide less incentive for excessive production. This has been his theory for many years and it has not worked.

Several thousand Missouri farmers told me last fall that they have only one choice in the face of such a price cut—if they want to avoid bankruptcy, they must increase production. A dairy farmer with heavy investment in cows and equipment simply cannot switch crops.

Another reason given for the drastic cut in price-support level was that it will be reflected in lower retail prices of one-half cent a quart for fluid milk. Many informed observers do not believe this will take place.

Even if it does, is there any justice in the Secretary of Agriculture reducing support prices for the farmers by 10 percent in order to reduce retail prices 2 percent?

Dairy products accounted for 13 percent of my State's total cash farm receipts in 1956. With a total production of 4.2 billion pounds, Missouri ranked tenth in the Nation as a dairy State.

Secretary Benson's recent action in reducing the dairy support level will cost the farmers of Missouri over $9 million, and the farmers of the Nation some $200 million a year.

In view of the already seriously depressed economic condition facing these farmers, this policy is not tenable.

Therefore, I urge favorable consideration and prompt enactment of this bill.

## PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO CORRECT IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference four bills designed to help correct abuses disclosed by the investigations thus far of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

One of these bills would insure democracy in labor organizations. Another would prevent misappropriation and misuse of union funds. The third would eliminate abuses resulting from so-called stranger picketing. The fourth would extend criminal liability for certain unfair labor practices to middlemen retained by employers in labor disputes, as well as to employers and representatives of employees.

These four bills, in conjunction with previously introduced measures to require the registration and reporting of pension and welfare funds, and to eliminate the jurisdictional no man's land between State and national labor relations agencies, constitute a constructive and reasonable legislative program, corrective rather than punitive in its intent.

I ask unanimous consent that explanations of the four new bills, and the texts of the bills, be incorporated in my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and explanations will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. IVES, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, together with the explanations, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2925

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 8 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and," and by inserting at the end of such subsection a new paragraph as follows:

"(7) To take a vote in any manner other than by secret ballot in the election of officers or in any other matter to be determined by a vote of all or a part of the membership (except for such minor incidental or routine matters as may be exempted from this paragraph by regulations of the Board."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 10 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end of subsection (1) the following: "or section 8 (b) (7)."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(m) No complaint shall issue against a labor organization under subsection (b) in the case of an unfair labor practice under paragraph (7) of section 8 (b) except upon a charge filed by a member of such labor organization. In any such case in which the Board determines that the labor organization has been guilty of an unfair labor practice, its order may include a provision declaring the election or other vote or votes in which such unfair labor practice occurred to be void and directing the labor organization to cease and desist from giving effect to such election or vote."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 2925 is as follows:

DEMOCRACY IN LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Throughout the select committee hearings it has been obvious that many of the evils within unions have been caused by lack of rank and file participation in the unions' internal affairs. This has been due in part to the fact that too many rank and file members are concerned only with contracts and other results of collective bargaining, but have left the running of their unions entirely to the professionals. However, there are no legal remedies in the Federal statutes which could assure individual union members of their right to a vote by secret ballot on important issues.

I have, therefore, drafted an amendment which would make it an unfair labor practice to take a vote in any manner other than by secret ballot in the election of officers or any other matter to be determined by vote of all or part of the membership of a labor organization, except for such minor incidental or routine matters as may be exempted by regulations of the NLRB.

Such a charge could be brought only by an employee or group of employees in the labor organization. Furthermore, the NLRB, in its discretion, could seek a preliminary restraining order in Federal court enjoining such action as would result from the vote in question until a final Board determination had been issued deciding whether the labor organization in question was guilty of an unfair labor practice. If found guilty, the union could then be directed by the court to cease and desist from giving effect to the election or vote in question, such election or vote being declared void.

S. 2926

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That subsections (a) and (b) of section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any employer, any agent of such employer, or any person retained or engaged by such employer as a labor relations expert, adviser, or consultant or for the purpose of dealing or negotiating with any of his employees who are employed in an industry affecting commerce or with any labor organization representing or seeking to represent or organize such employees—

"(1) to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver, directly or indirectly, any money or other thing of value to such labor organization or to any officer or representative thereof; or

"(2) to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver, directly or indirectly, any money or other thing of value to any employee or group or committee of employees of such employer who are employed in an industry affecting commerce for the purpose of (A) encouraging or discouraging or in any way influencing any such employee or employees in the exercise of their right to self-organization or the selection of a representative, or (B) causing or enabling such employee, group, or committee to encourage or discourage or in any way influence other employees of such employer who are employed in an industry affecting commerce in the exercise of any such right.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to receive or accept or agree to receive or accept, directly or indirectly, any payment or delivery of money or other thing of value prohibited by subsection (a)."

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of such section is amended by striking out "misdemeanor" and inserting in lieu thereof "felony", and

by striking out "1 year" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 years."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 2926 is as follows:

THE MIDDLEMAN PROBLEM

Recent select committee hearings have shown how many employers were able to thwart the right of their employees to organize, or to prevent certain unions from becoming the collective bargaining agent for their employees in favor of friendlier labor organizations, by retaining the services of a middleman. Under the present act, it is unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver any money or other thing of value to any representative of his employees and for such a representative to receive or agree to receive the same.

But it is most doubtful that the existing law would in any way incriminate the agents of such an employer or independent contractors, including so-called labor-management consultants retained by such an employer, even though the employer himself were in violation of section 302, which contains criminal sanctions.

I have therefore drafted a proposed amendment which is designed to extend to such agents or independent contractors the criminal sanctions already applicable to employers. Moreover, a further amendment would change the violation from a misdemeanor to a felony, and increase the maximum imprisonment from 1 year to 5 years.

With respect to the payment or agreement to pay or deliver money or any other thing of value to any employee or group or committee of employees by an employer or his agent, to encourage or discourage in any way their right to self-organization or such rights of any other employees, it should be noted that such an action is already an unfair labor practice under section 8 (a) (2) and (3) of the Taft-Hartley Act, but it is not under existing law a criminal offense. The proposed amendment would make such an action a crime subject to the criminal provisions contained in section 302.

---

S. 2927

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 8 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and", and by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"(7) to carry on picketing on or about the premises of any employer either for organizational purposes or for the purpose of forcing or requiring such employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if (A) another labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under section 9 (c) within the preceding 12-month period, (B) an election has been held under section 9 (c) within the preceding 12-month period and no labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees, or (C) a petition has been filed under section 9 (c) (1) (A) by another labor organization or under section 9 (c) (1) (B) by such employer, and such petition is pending before the Board."

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 2927 is as follows:

ELIMINATING ABUSES BY "STRANGER" PICKETING

The select committee hearings have furnished examples, as in the case of the garment industry in New York City, of how outsiders or strangers have thrown a picket line around a place of business as part of an extortion scheme which victimizes the employers and provides the employees with no benefits from the labor organizations technically representing them.

Under present law, organizational picketing by a rival labor organization, after another labor organization has been certified for the purposes of representation by the National Labor Relations Board, is an unfair labor practice. A majority of the NLRB held recently that organizational picketing by a labor organization immediately following its defeat in a representation election conducted by the NLRB is also an unfair labor practice; the outcome of the case is uncertain, since it will be appealed through the courts.

I have therefore drafted proposed legislation which would make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to engage in picketing for the purposes of organization or recognition when (1) a representation petition filed by another union is pending before the NLRB, (2) a representation petition has been filed by an employer and is pending before the NLRB, and (3) during a period of 1 year following the defeat of a labor organization or organizations in a representation election conducted by the NLRB.

Moreover, with respect to petitions filed by employers for a representation election, picketing shall be construed to be a claim of representation on the part of the union conducting the picketing and the election shall proceed.

---

S. 2928

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That sections 9 (f) and (g) of the National Labor Relations Act are amended to read as follows:

"(f) Every labor organization which represents employees in an industry affecting commerce shall—

"(A) File with the Secretary of Labor, within 60 days after the date of enactment of the National Labor Relations Act Amendments of 1958 or the date on which such labor organization commences the representation of such employees, whichever is later, copies of its constitution and bylaws and a report, in such form as the Secretary shall prescribe showing—

"(1) the name of such labor organization and the address of its principal place of business;

"(2) the names, titles, and compensation and allowances of its three principal officers and of any of its other officers or agents whose aggregate compensation and allowances for the preceding year exceeded $5,000, and the amount of the compensation and allowances paid to each such officer or agent during such year;

"(3) the manner in which the officers and agents referred to in clause (2) were elected, appointed, or otherwise selected;

"(4) the initiation fee or fees which new members are required to pay on becoming members of such labor organization;

"(5) the regular dues or fees which members are required to pay in order to remain members in good standing of such labor organization;

"(6) a detailed statement of, or reference to provisions of its constitution and bylaws showing the procedure followed with respect to, (a) qualification for or restrictions on membership, (b) election of officers and stewards, (c) calling of regular and special meetings, (d) levying of assessments, (e) imposition of fines, (f) authorization for bargaining demands, (g) ratification of contract terms, (h) authorization for strikes, (i) authorization for disbursement of union funds, (j) audit of union financial transactions, (k) participation in insurance or other benefit plans, and (l) expulsion of members and the grounds therefor.

"(B) File with the Secretary of Labor, not later than 60 days after the close of each of its fiscal years, reports in such form as the Secretary shall prescribe bringing up to date the information specified in paragraph (A).

"(C) File with the Secretary of Labor not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the National Labor Relations Act Amendments of 1958 or the date on which such labor organization commences the representation of such employees, whichever is later, and within 60 days after the close of each of its fiscal years thereafter a report in such form as the Secretary shall prescribe showing its receipts and the sources thereof, and its disbursements and the purposes for which made, during its last fiscal year, and its total assets and liabilities as of the end of such year.

"(D) Furnish to each member of such labor organization a copy of each report required to be filed with the Secretary under paragraph (C).

"(g) (1) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, and no labor organization shall be eligible for certification under this section as the representative of any employees unless it shows that it and any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit, has complied with the provisions of subsection (f).

"(2) Any labor organization required to file reports under subsection (f) which fails to file any such report or which knowingly and with intent to deceive the Secretary of Labor or any other person has filed a report containing false information or omitting information required by such section, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $50,000. Any violation of this provision by a labor organization shall be deemed also to be a violation thereof by the individual officers or agents of such labor organization who shall have authorized, ordered, or done any of the acts constituting in whole or in part such violation and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(3) The Secretary of Labor shall examine all reports filed under subsection (f) and any case in which he has reason to believe that any labor organization required to file reports under subsection (f) has failed to file any such report or that any such labor organization knowingly and with intent to deceive the Secretary or any other person has filed a report containing false information or omitting information required by such subsection, the Secretary is authorized to conduct an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether such labor organization has violated the provisions of this subsection. For the purposes of such investigation the Secretary shall have the same powers as are conferred upon the Board by section 11. If, after such investigation, the Secretary is of the opinion that such violation has occurred he shall bring the facts with respect thereto to the attention of the Attorney General.

"(4) The Secretary of Labor shall make all reports filed under subsection (f) available for public inspection."

SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the National Labor Relations Act Amendments of 1958.

The explanation accompanying Senate bill 2928 is as follows:

PREVENTING MISAPPROPRIATION OF UNION FUNDS

While present law requires unions to file financial and other reports with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary contends he has no authority to make these reports public and no funds or authority to determine whether the reports are true or com-

plete; furthermore there are no criminal penalties for failure to comply with the filing requirements. The inadequacy of the present filing requirements helped to make it possible for union funds to be misappropriated and misused in such spectacular fashion as the Select Committee hearings have disclosed.

I have therefore drafted an amendment to the filing requirements section which provides that the Secretary of Labor may make the union financial and other reports public, and provides criminal penalties for failure to file as required. Under this amendment, all labor organizations, regardless of whether they utilize the services of the National Labor Relations Board, would be subject to a fine up to $50,000 for failure to file such reports, or knowingly, or with intent to deceive the Secretary of Labor, or any other person, file reports containing false information or omitting information. Such violations would also be deemed a violation by the individual officers or agents of the union who shall have authorized, ordered, or done any of the acts constituting, in whole or in part, such violation, and they shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Moreover, the Secretary of Labor will be required to examine all such reports and bring any cases of suspected non-compliance to the attention of the Attorney General.

## CONDITION OF THE AMERICAN MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have before me a release from the Department of the Interior quoting its Secretary, Mr. Fred Seaton, and evaluating the mineral production of our Nation during the past year. In glowing terms the report states that mineral output attained a record value of $18.3 billion in 1957, for a gain of three-fourths billion dollars over 1956. At first glance it would seem that the mineral industry of our country is doing fine and that the mines of our country must be working overtime to achieve such startling results.

As I had recently returned from my State, Nevada, and the West, and had seen firsthand the deplorable condition of the mineral industry, there was something about this impressive production record that did not ring exactly true. While I do not believe that Mr. Seaton or the administration would deliberately mislead the public, the report certainly does just that because it gives the impression that all is well so far as the mineral industry is concerned.

Almost the entire dollar increase can be attributed to the rise in the price and production of petroleum occasioned by the closing of the Suez Canal and to the fact that almost $75 million in uranium production is taken into consideration for the first time.

Instead of such a glowing report, the administration should have made public the true condition of the American mining industry today. They should have pointed out that most of the mines in the country are closed or their production curtailed until they are practically on a standby basis. It should have been pointed out that during the past year the production of metals decreased 11.6 percent, and that these metals are essential for defense purposes and for building component parts of missiles, jets, and other necessary tools of war. The administration should have pointed out that if an emergency comes and our mines are closed, we shall be dependent only on overseas sources for critical raw materials, and these overseas sources are undependable at best.

They should also have made public that at no time in recent history has the entire mining industry of our country been in such a precarious position, that at no time in recent history has our country been so likely to become entirely dependent on domestic sources for strategic and critical minerals, and that these sources have been closing almost daily.

The administration promised more than 3 years ago to present to Congress a long-range mineral program which would be designed to create a strong and stable mining industry. After 2 years of stalling, the administration presented a program which was without a doubt one of the most inadequate proposals ever to see the light of day. Instead of coming out with a program to help the industry, the letdown, after waiting 2 years, did what our enemies have been trying to do for decades; it collapsed what was left of our domestic mining industry.

For the purpose of the record, during the past 2 years, 719 of the 720 tungsten mines operating in this country closed, and tungsten is one of the most vital metals used in the products of defense and war. During 1957, gold production dropped to a total value of $62 million, the lowest since 1945. Domestic chrome production decreased 5 percent. 1957 copper production dropped 5 percent from 1956, while during the same time imports from foreign sources increased 6 percent. I might add that this reflects the entire year's production and doesn't truly reflect the present state of the domestic copper industry. During the last half of 1957, copper prices slipped from 36 cents a pound to 27 cents and caused the closing of many of our domestic copper mines.

The lead-zinc industry of this country has hit a new low. Because of the great influx of cheaply produced foreign metals, the world price was forced lower and lower until all of our domestic mines were hurt seriously, many of them being forced to close.

I could cite further examples of how our domestic mining has suffered because of inaction or confusion on the part of the administration. Because of the same inaction and confusion, we are behind in the missiles race and are frantically seeking ways to make up for lost time. Let us not again be guilty of inaction in the minerals field and, if a crisis comes, be totally unprepared as we were, twice, when emergencies arose in the past 15 years. Let us not again have to fly tungsten ore from Korea for use in our factories. Let us not again have to depend almost solely on foreign sources for strategic and critical minerals because our mines are closed and cannot be put in shape to produce on immediate notice.

As a Nevada editor recently said, "If the administration has decided to let the mining industry of our country die, they should let the people know about it—and stop mouthing platitudes."

Experts seem to feel that the next war, if it ever comes— and I hope and pray it does not, will last at most only a few short years. Let us be ready with the tools and raw materials when they are needed. If we do not take the proper steps at this time, it will soon be too late.

In talking to mining men in my State and throughout the country, I have found that it is the general consensus that legislation allowing a free market for gold will do more to stimulate the entire mining industry than any other factor. Gold is a byproduct of many of the other metals, and the ability of the mining companies to dispose of this byproduct at a higher price will tend to stimulate the production of the other minerals and metals. I am therefore introducing for the consideration of Congress a bill that will remove restrictions on the sale of gold by producers and others. This is the first of a series of bills I intend to introduce, for myself and in conjunction with other Senators, which are designed to aid our ailing mining industry.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill and ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2951) to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## FULL PARITY FARM INCOME IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to preserve and to establish a comprehensive full parity farm income improvement and protection program, to expand American farm commodities, to enable farmers to keep market supplies of farm commodities in reasonable balance with augmented demand therefor, to establish a yardstick family farm credit program, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me describing the provisions of the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2952) to preserve and to establish a comprehensive full parity farm income improvement and protection program, to expand domestic consumption and exports of American farm commodities, to enable farmers to keep market supplies of farm commodities in reasonable balance with augmented demand therefor, to establish a yardstick family farm credit program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture

and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act shall be known as the "Agricultural Act of 1958."

FINDINGS

SEC. 1. The Congress finds that—

(a) food and clothing supplies per person in many families in the United States and in many areas of the world are far below the minimum required for healthful living;

(b) it is now possible to accurately determine by scientific nutrition, dietetic, and other research the national and world shortages in these basic needs;

(c) failure of food supplies to attain this basic adequate allotment, and of fiber supplies to attain equivalent standards for clothing, undermines the maintenance of health, efficiency, and morale of the American people and the people of friendly nations;

(d) supplies of food and fiber products available from time to time should be efficiently distributed among the various sections of the Nation and friendly nations among persons in all income groups;

(e) the development of more adequate reserves of farm products would provide essential safeguards against shortages resulting from natural causes, such as drought, flood, and pestilence; from breakdowns in distribution; and from inflation, insurrection, and war;

(f) the assurance of adequate food and clothing supplies would be an important step toward strengthening democracy throughout the world and creating the economic foundations and atmosphere of hope and confidence necessary for world peace and an effective roadblock to the inroads of communism;

(g) it is essential to the national security and the general welfare that production and consumption of farm products be maintained at a high level in the United States as a means of maintaining a healthy population and a strong, productive economy, and to buttress the Nation's foreign policy;

(h) in many friendly nations more rapid economic development is blocked by the inability of populations to divert time and energy of children or adults from day-to-day labor in subsistence production of food and fiber, resulting in a lack of general and technical education and elementary capital improvements, such as roads, canals, bridges, school facilities, and the like; United States farm products could be used to break the cycle of poverty in these nations by freeing children and adults from the necessity of unrelieved labor for bare subsistence, to enable them to attend and teach schools and to construct basic capital improvements.

(i) both the foreign and domestic markets for American farm products have historically been characterized by fluctuations and recurrent depressions;

(j) the maintenance of a healthy and prosperous agriculture on the family farm pattern is essential to the preservation and improvement of democracy in America;

(k) the prices and income received by American farm families have been declining and threaten to decline still further; each such decline brings with it the threat of reduced farm purchasing power and purchases, reduced demand for industrial products used on the farm and by farm families, and a resulting enforced reduction of industrial employment;

(l) American farms and farm families are fully capable of producing efficiently a greater abundance of food and fiber products, while at the same time conserving and improving the Nation's farm soil and water resources;

(m) this great productive ability of American farmers and farm families should be put fully to work in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people;

(n) since the earliest days of the Republic the family farm pattern of American agriculture has been considered as essential to a strong democracy and the policy of the Nation has been to favor the establishment and preservation of family owned and family operated farms. A large number of prosperous farm families on family farms is a strong balancing force within the Nation against the political and social extremes of economic class warfare;

(o) family farms make up the great bulk of all American farms; the traditional pattern is one where the farm or ranch provides the main source of income for the farm family and the operator and his family manage the farm, arrange for its financing, own or hold with secure tenure the land and other capital, participate regularly in work on the farm and supply most of the labor needed to operate the farm;

(p) on the family farm, the economic functions of capital ownership, of arranging for financial needs, of managing the productive enterprise, and of working are performed by the farm operator and his family, thus avoiding controversy and tension along economic class lines;

(q) the family farm pattern of agriculture is the basis of agricultural progress and good community life; it builds in farm family members attitudes of self-reliance, social responsibility, individual initiative, tolerance, and self-government—the attitudes that make for a sound democracy and the human qualities that have done so much to make this Nation great; the family farm is the most efficient production unit in agriculture; family farms build strong social communities; and the family farm builds strong families; and

(r) the Nation's family farms are democracy's answer to Soviet collective farming; unrest in many parts of the world today results from insecure and inequitable farmland tenure creating hopelessness among those who work the soil, making the man easy prey for communism's glittering false lines; the restless peasants of the world can find the ray of hope they seek in the American pattern of family farming and family farm ownership that enables the Nation's farmers to farm efficiently, conserve soil and water resources, participate fully in civic, community, and public affairs, and perform a vital role in making our system of government operate.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the policy of Congress that the United States should take appropriate action to insure that—

(a) the means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet and sufficient clothing for an adequate standard of clothing will be placed, so far as possible, within the reach of every person in the Nation;

(b) the food and fiber products produced on American farms and not needed for fully adequate domestic consumption will be put to work to implement United States foreign policy through facilitating (1) the elimination of the threat of starvation and famine, and (2) more rapid economic development that will expand markets and increase consumer purchasing power in friendly nations, (3) the inauguration of universal public general and vocational education systems in friendly nations not now having them, and (4) increases in the security and income-earning capacities of farm families in friendly nations;

(c) adequate safety reserves of farm commodities and/or food and fiber products will be developed and maintained;

(d) extreme price fluctuations in the international market for farm products will be prevented and production will be kept expanding; and

(e) the family-farm pattern of American agriculture is preserved and encouraged by programs and policies that will provide greater economic opportunity for families on presently low income farms, and discourage the further development of industrial-type agricultural production; and to provide the opportunity for economically adequate family farms to earn enough income from the sale of products to provide for family living standards equivalent to that earned in other occupations, cover cash operating costs, replace used-up machinery and equipment, repay operating loans and interest, return the capital investment (through rent or principal and interest payments on real estate mortgages), pay taxes and conserve the soil and water resources of the farm through adaption and implementation of policies that will fulfill the following family farmers' bill of rights:

(1) The right to full equality of economic opportunity.

(2) The right for improved standards of rural living.

(3) The right of reasonable protection against natural hazards.

(4) The right to extend agricultural free enterprise through cooperative action.

(5) The right to public cooperation and assistance in saving the soil.

(6) The right to preserve the social and human values of family farming.

(7) The right to decent land tenure which would encourage the desirable goal of farm ownership.

(8) The right to a democratic voice in his own farm program.

(9) The right to benefits of an expanding world trade.

(10) The right to a long-term program of food storage to encourage abundance.

(11) The right to assurance that land reclamation development will result in establishment of new independent family-operated farms, not factories in the field.

TITLE I—DAIRY PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT OF 1958

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Dairy Products Marketing Act of 1958."

SEC. 102. It is recognized that dairy products are strategic commodities essential to the health, welfare, and security of the Nation and that the desired domestic production and consumption of such dairy products is hindered by the depressing effects of low prices to the producers, by wide fluctuations in supply and price to the consumer, and by impaired purchasing power of the consumer.

SEC. 103. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security and in promotion of the general economic welfare, to provide mandatory protection of returns to producers at not less than 80 percent nor more than 100 percent of the parity income equivalent price on milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products for the marketing years ending August 31, 1959, and August 31, 1960, in order to maintain the productive capacity of the dairy farming industry, and to provide orderly marketing of an adequate national supply of milk and dairy products.

SEC. 104. For the purpose of this act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture, "Department" means the Department of Agriculture, and "Advisory Committee" means the Federal Dairy Advisory Committee.

(b) "Commodity Credit Corporation" means and shall include the Commodity Credit Corporation as now or hereinafter constituted and any successor or other Federal agency authorized to perform similar functions.

(c) The term "milk producer" means an individual, partnership, joint stock company corporation, association, trust, estate, or any other business entity engaged in the production of milk for sale or consumption

elsewhere than on the dairy farm at which it is produced.

(d) The terms "milk", "butterfat", and "dairy products" mean bovine milk and butterfat, respectively, including any classification, type and grade thereof and such products manufactured wholly or in part of both or either as may be designated by the Department.

(e) The term "marketing year" means the 12-month period beginning September 1 of each year.

(f) The term "milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products" means all milk, except fluid whole milk, skim milk, or buttermilk.

(g) The term "first processor or handler" means (1) any person or firm engaged in purchasing milk from a milk producer for processing or distribution, (2) any association of milk producers receiving milk from milk producers for processing or distribution, and (3) any milk producer holding a license or permit issued by Federal, State, or local agencies authorizing such milk producer to buy milk from other producers and to sell milk or dairy products directly to consumers.

SEC. 105. The Secretary of Agriculture shall, through the National Farm Income Stabilization Corporation, protect the returns of producers of milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products to the producers thereof.

The producer's returns shall be protected at such level as the Secretary of Agriculture determines will give the necessary incentive to accomplish the declared objectives of this act, but, in no case, shall be less than 80 percent nor more than 100 percent of the parity income equivalent price except that the Secretary of Agriculture may increase the level of protection to producers' returns at any time that it may appear to him that the production may fall below the desirable national level.

The protection to producers' return shall be on sales of whole milk, or of whole milk equivalent of butterfat sold, that is used in manufactured dairy products in the 2 marketing years hereinafter specified.

SEC. 106. When it appears to the Secretary of Agriculture, that the open market price for a marketing year will average below 80 percent of the parity income equivalent price, he shall require, as a condition of protection of producers' returns during the following marketing year, that farmers comply with such marketing quotas as may be established for each individual dairy farm.

A production base shall be established for each farm, which base shall be the average production of milk for the preceding 3-year period.

The marketing quota for each farm shall be calculated by deducting 3 percent from the production base for each 5 percent which the estimated average open market price is below 80 percent of the parity income equivalent price.

For new producers wishing to establish a production base at a time when marketing quotas are in effect, the Secretary shall permit such producers to market milk without restriction, but shall authorize protection to such producers' returns on only 50 percent of deliveries made by such new producers. After a 3-year production history has been established, such new producer shall be assigned a production base and marketing quota based on his production history.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the Secretary shall determine a minimum marketing quota for milk which may be marketed without disqualifying the producer thereof from eligibility for parity income deficiency payments as provided in section 111 of this act, taking into account the amount of milk and its products normally used for home consumption per family, the minimum volume of production required to operate an efficient family unit, the total volume of all farm commodities normally produced on such farm, and the effect of such exemption on the overall operations of the milk marketing quota program and other quota programs.

SEC. 107. In addition to any other tax or duty imposed by law, there shall be imposed, under such regulations as the Commissioner of Customs shall prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, a tax upon manufactured dairy products imported or brought into the United States as follows:

On all manufactured dairy products at a rate of not less than 10 percent and not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem, according to the following schedule:

If the national average price received on all milk wholesale for a given quarter is equal to 80 or more percent of the parity income equivalent price, the levy shall be 10 percent in the following calendar quarter; if the national average price received is 72 percent of the parity income equivalent price, the levy shall be 20 percent; if the national average price received is 64 percent of the parity income equivalent price, the levy shall be 30 percent; if the national average price received is 56 percent of the parity income equivalent price, the levy shall be 40 percent; if the national average price received is 48 or less percent of the parity income equivalent price, the levy shall be 50 percent. The national average parity income equivalent price for a given quarter and the resulting necessary import levy for the quarter ahead shall be certified by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Commissioner of Customs. The proceeds of the import levy shall be paid to the Treasurer of the United States and deposited to the account of the Secretary of Agriculture and shall be used by him to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditures under this act.

SEC. 108. For the purpose of further reimbursing the National Farm Income Stabilization Corporation for any expenditures made by it under this act, there shall be levied on all milk and butterfat sold a processing tax at a rate of not more than 10 cents per hundredweight of whole milk or more than 2½ cents per pound of butterfat, which shall be paid to the Treasurer of the United States by the first purchaser from the producer and deposited to the account of the Secretary of Agriculture. The processing tax shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Treasurer of the United States.

The intent of this section shall be that the processing tax shall be paid by the first processor or handler, as defined by this act, and shall not be deducted from the price which would normally be paid to the milk producer.

SEC. 109. There is hereby established, in the Department of Agriculture, a Federal Dairy Advisory Committee, which shall meet annually on the first Monday of December, and at other times at the call of the chairman of the advisory committee, to confer upon the status of the program and to make recommendations for its improvement to the Secretary and to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

The Federal Dairy Advisory Committee shall consist of 15 members to be appointed by the President of the United States from a list of nominees submitted by milk producers in a manner hereinafter provided.

Only persons who are milk producers, or who are officers or full-time employees of organizations of dairy producers which meet the requirements of the Capper-Volstead Act (7 U. S. C., sec. 201–292) or who are officers or full-time employees of federations or marketing agencies in common owned and controlled by such organizations of dairy producers, shall be eligible to serve on such committee. Not more than 3 of the 15 members shall be persons who are not engaged in farming as milk producers.

In order to secure proper regional representation on the advisory committee, the United States shall be divided into 15 districts to be designated by the Secretary, giving consideration to geographical representation and to the importance of dairying in each area.

Each district shall be entitled to one member on the advisory committee. The milk producers in each district shall by ballot select three nominees for the place on the advisory committee to be filled from their district.

The Secretary shall conduct all elections for the selections of such nominees, prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary, and certify the nominees to the President.

The term of appointment for members of the advisory committee shall be for two marketing years.

The advisory committee shall on or before March 15 of each year make recommendations to the Secretary and to the appropriate committees of the Congress regarding operations of the program and any matters having a bearing on the dairy price situation, including, but not limited to the economic position of dairy farmers, trends in the consumption of milk and dairy products, and development of a realistic parity equivalent for manufacturing milk.

SEC. 110. A parity income deficiency payment shall be paid to each individual producer and shall be such as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be sufficient, when added to the State average net price received by producers, to give the producer a total return equal to not less than 80 percent nor more than 100 percent of the parity income equivalent price.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe a uniform report form which shall be furnished monthly by the purchaser to the producer showing the volume of milk and butterfat delivered to be used for manufacturing purposes. The producer shall file this report with his county agricultural stabilization committee.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall calculate the monthly average net price received for milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products received in each State, using the price at the point of first sale out of the producer's hands.

The intent of this section shall be that the State monthly average net price as computed by the Secretary shall be the net price received by the farmer for milk or butterfat.

SEC. 111. A milk producer, as defined in this act, shall be eligible to receive parity income deficiency payments up to a limit of $3,000 in any one marketing year. If any individual has an interest in more than one dairy farm or operation, his total payment on all operations in any marketing year may not exceed an absolute limit of $3,000.

If a milk producer sells milk under the terms of a Federal milk-market order, he shall be eligible for a payment on surplus milk diverted into manufactured dairy products.

SEC. 112. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to administer purchases on the Federal Government's account of manufactured dairy products including, but not restricted to, butter, American, Swiss and other foreign-type cheeses, dried milk, and canned, condensed, concentrated, and evaporated milk for the school lunch program, public institutional use, the removal from commercial markets of temporary seasonal surpluses occurring at seasons of peak production, and so as to ensure the maintenance of a reasonable relationship, in accordance with historical relationship during period of normal market supplies, between the market prices during such seasons of temporary surplus of the various types and forms of manufactured dairy products.

SEC. 113. Any surplus accumulated prior to the effective date of this Act, shall be set aside from normal marketing channels and may be used only for school lunch distribution, augmenting diets in the Armed Forces and Veterans' Administration facilities, public institutional use, and relief within the United States and abroad. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to rotate such stocks so as to avoid losses from spoilage.

SEC. 114. The effective date of this act shall be September 1, 1958. Prior to July 15, 1958, and prior to the July 15 preceding the beginning of any marketing year for which marketing quotas have been proclaimed, the Secretary shall conduct a nationwide referendum of milk producers to determine whether a majority of those voting approve the provisions of this act. If a majority of those voting do not approve, this act shall not be placed into effect for the ensuing marketing year, and the price support operations of the Secretary under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to milk and dairy products shall remain in effect.

The Secretary shall conduct the referendum, prescribing such rules and regulations as may be necessary. Only milk producers shall be eligible to vote. Any milk producer, as defined in this act, shall have only one vote and shall vote as an individual, rather than as a business entity.

The ballot shall be in the following form:

United States Department of Agriculture

OFFICIAL BALLOT

National Referendum of Milk Producers

Mark this square if you favor—

☐ Continuation of a dairy price support program, utilizing deficiency payments at 80 to 100 percent of the income parity equivalent price of parity, as provided in the Dairy Products Marketing Act of 1958.

Mark this square if you favor—

☐ Return to price support under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949. (Support of 75 percent to 90 percent of the parity price by Secretary of Agriculture, through Government purchases, storage, and diversion.)

SEC. 115. The price support operations of the Secretary under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to milk and dairy products shall be suspended during any marketing years during which this act shall be in effect.

TITLE II. FARM INCOME IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION

SEC. 201. This title shall be known as the "Full Parity Family Farm Income Act."

SEC. 202. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 2 is amended by striking out the words "parity prices for such commodities" and by inserting after the words "parity of income" and before the word "and" the following: "parity income equivalent prices."

(b) Subsection 301 (a) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) (A) 'Parity farm family net income' shall be that net family income from farming that will provide the farm operator and his family with a standard of living equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupation and shall be determined for any year by dividing average per person income of the nonfarm population for the next preceding year into the average per person income of the farm population for the next preceding year; and dividing the result into the total realized farm operators' net income for the next preceding year.

"(B) 'Parity farm gross income' for any year shall be determined by adding parity farm family net income for the next preceding year, to the farm production expenses for the next preceding year, to be adjusted for change in the index of prices of farm production items that farmers buy, wages paid to hired farm labor, interest on farm indebtedness secured by farm real estate, and taxes on farm real estate."

(c) Subsection 301 (a) (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) (A) 'Parity income equivalent price' of any agricultural commodity as of any date shall be determined by multiplying the income parity adjustment factor for the year including such date by the average of the prices received by farmers for such commodity, at such times as the Secretary may select during each year of the 10-year period ending on the 31st of December last before such date, or during each marketing season beginning in such period if the Secretary determines use of a calendar year basis to be impracticable.

"(B) The 'farm income parity adjustment factor' for any year shall be determined by dividing the parity farm gross income for such year by the average of the realized farm gross income in each year of the 10-year period ending on the 31st of December last before such year.

"(C) The prices, indexes, income, and production expenses figures provided for in subsection 301 (a) (1) and (2), and the data used in computing them, shall be determined by the Secretary, whose determination shall be final.

"(D) 'Parity' as applied to income from any agricultural commodity shall be that gross income that bears the same relationship to parity farm gross income for such year as the average gross income from such commodity for the preceding 10 calendar years bears to the average total realized farm gross income for such 10 calendar years."

SEC. 203. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make available through loans, purchases, parity-income deficiency payments, or other methods, farm income protection to cooperating producers, for any agricultural commodity other than milk and butterfat and their products, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for that year and if producers affected by this section have not disapproved the Secretary's proclamation of the national conservation acreage reserve and farm all-commodity marketing quota, at a level not in excess of the parity income equivalent price of the commodity nor less than 60 percent of the parity income equivalent price of the commodity: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized, upon the recommendation of such action by the National Farm Income Stabilization Board, established by this act, upon petition to it of a substantial number of representative producers of any farm commodity and after public hearing held by the Board after public notice of date of hearing at least 3 weeks prior to the hearing, and dependent upon adoption of such recommendation by a two-thirds majority of the members of such Board, to make a downward adjustment of not more than 15 percent in the level of farm income protection for such commodity provided to the producers thereof: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not be placed into operation with respect to any commodity until after a referendum of producers of such commodity has been held by the Secretary of Agriculture to determine by majority vote whether such producers prefer the program established by this section in substitution for whatever program may then be in effect for such commodity: *And provided further*, That the eligibility of any producer to obtain farm income protection for any commodity provided under this section shall be limited to the proportional part of the sales of such commodity by such producer that is equal to the ratio that the volume of total sales of typical family-operated farms bears for any crop or marketing year, as determined by the Secretary upon affirmative recommendation by two-thirds vote for each type-of-farming area by the National Farm Income Stabilization Board in the type-of-farming area, to the total sales of all farm commodities by the producer. Farm income protection may be made available to noncooperators at such levels, not in excess of the level of protection to cooperators, as the Secretary, upon recommendation by two-thirds vote by the National Farm Income Stabilization Board, determines will facilitate the effective operation of the program."

SEC. 204. The Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 507 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Except following a public hearing in the State or county affected and based upon the findings thereof, the Board and the Secretary shall utilize the State and county farmer committees established pursuant to section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to carry out the provisions of the Crop Insurance Act."

(b) Section 560 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of the other subsections of this section, (1) crop insurance shall be provided in any county with respect to any crop if written applications therefor are filed covering at least 200 or one-third, whichever is smaller, of the producers normally producing such commodity, except that such application may be refused on basis of the findings of a public hearing in such county that the premium cost of such insurance would exceed the value of the program to eligible producers; (2) premiums charged shall be based on actuarial risks covered by the policies calculated with 50 percent of the weight on county or type-of-farming area experience and 50 percent of the weight on statewide records and experience and shall not include any charge for administrative and experimental costs of the program. Notwithstanding the other provision of this subsection the annual premium charged on any policy shall not exceed 28 percent of 75 percent of the indemnity coverage of such policy. Appropriation by Congress to the corporation is hereby authorized in such amounts annually as may be required to equal the excess of indemnities paid over premiums collected in any year in any area designated by the President to warrant assistance of the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), as amended."

SEC. 205. Section 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Alternative methods of computation of net earnings from self-employment available to farmers: In the case of any trade or business which is carried on by an individual who reports his income on a cash receipts and disbursement basis, and in which, if it were carried on exclusively by employees, the major portion of the services would constitute agricultural labor as defined in section 3121 (g) if the net earnings derived from such trade or business by such individual for any taxable year which ends during the period commencing January 1, 1955, and ending December 31, 1958, is less than the amount of the net earnings derived from such trade or business by such individual for any taxable year which ended during the period commencing January 1, 1950, and ending December 31, 1954, the net earnings derived from such trade or business by such individual shall, at option of such individual, be

deemed, for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section and section 211 (a) of the Social Security Act, to be equal to—

"(1) the net earnings derived from such trade or business by such individual for such taxable year if the average net earnings realized by such individual per unit or production from such trade or business were equal to the average net earnings realized per unit of production of the same commodity or item in the area in which such trade or business is located for any one of the taxable years which ended in the period commencing January 1, 1950, and ending December 31, 1954.

"No individual shall utilize any one taxable year during the period commencing January 1, 1951, and ending December 31, 1954, more than once for the purpose of computation of his net earnings from self-employment under the provisions of this subsection.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SECURITY AND SAFETY RESERVE OF FOOD, FIBER, AND BIOLOGICAL OILS

SEC. 301. The Administrator of Defense Mobilization is authorized and directed to establish a security reserve and stockpile of food, fiber, and biological oil commodities and products thereof, in appropriately dispersed storage, and insulated from effect upon farm commodity markets, of a volume of such commodities and products thereof adequate to provide for the national safety and security against the hazards of natural disasters, insect pests and diseases, and disruptions of the peace, as determined by the President of the United States upon advice of the National Security Council and the Defense Mobilization Administrator.

TITLE IV—FARMER PROCESSING AND MARKETING LOANS

SEC. 401. Section 34 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized and directed to make available, through the National Farm Income Stabilization Corporation, (i) loans to existing and newly organized farmer-owned cooperatives and other farmer-owned business associations with 1,000 or more farmer members who are unable to obtain loans for such purposes from private sources on similar terms, for the purpose of financing the purchase or construction of structures and other facilities for the assembly, processing, marketing, and storage of farm commodities and the products thereof in amounts up to a maximum of 100 percent of the cost thereof at an interest rate not to exceed the average cost to the Federal Government of interest on marketable securities and subject to such other terms as the Federal Farm Income Stabilization Board may recommend and as may be approved by the Secretary; (ii) to extend, without charge, and upon request of such groups of farmers, technical advisory and other service assistance required to encourage and facilitate the establishment of farmer-owned and farmer-controlled business enterprises to assemble, process, store, and market farm commodities and products thereof."

TITLE V—DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION EXPANSION

*Purposes*

SEC. 501. (a) (1) It is hereby declared to be in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people that the supplies of food available from time to time for domestic consumption be efficiently distributed among the various sections of the Nation and among persons in the various income groups, and that the means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet be placed insofar as possible within the reach of every person in the Nation. It is further declared to be essential to the national security and the general welfare that production and consumption of agricultural products be maintained at a high level as a means of maintaining a healthy population and a strong, productive economy. It is further declared that the operation of the national food-allotment plan, as provided in this act, is a desirable and effective method of accomplishing the purposes hereinabove set forth.

(2) It is further declared that nothing in this act shall be construed as intending or justifying the payment of inadequate wages or the lowering of standards of public assistance.

*Definitions*

(b) As used in this section—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) The term "household," subject to such further definition as the Secretary may specify, shall mean a domestic unit consisting of one or more persons occupying a common home or noncommercial, nonpenal institution and for whom food is customarily purchased in common. Households shall be classified for the purposes of this act according to number of members and monthly income.

(3) The term "basic food allotment" shall mean the amounts of food per person per week required to provide adequate nutritional value as determined by the Secretary.

The Secretary may add to or delete commodities listed, or may change quantities in the several categories if he deems such changes necessary or appropriate to provide an adequate diet in view of new research in nutrition, and may increase the basic food allotment for those individuals or groups who are in need of special nutritional supplements.

(4) The term "food-allotment coupon" shall mean a coupon, stamp, token, or other medium of exchange issued to an eligible recipient pursuant to the provisions of this section.

(5) The term "household income" shall mean the total amount of money received by all persons in a household and available to pay the ordinary expenses of the household, less—

(A) such portions of the amount received by such persons from any public agency as assistance payments on the basis of individual needs as the Secretary may, after consultation with the appropriate State or local welfare agency, deem it advisable to exclude in the interest of maintenance of standards of public assistance; and

(B) such portions of the amounts received by such persons, other than the head of the household or his spouse, as the Secretary may deem it equitable to exclude in computing the income of such household.

*Establishment of the food-allotment program*

(c) (1) The Secretary shall establish and administer a national food-allotment program in accordance with the provisions of this section, and shall make rules and regulations for the conduct thereof. Under such program the Secretary may issue to households applying therefor food-allotment coupons, as hereinafter set forth, which shall be transferable by the recipent thereof to mercantile establishments registered in accordance with the provisions of this section in exchange for food at the prices currently prevailing in the establishment of the transferee, and shall be redeemable at face value upon presentation to the Treasury by any authorized transferee thereof.

(2) The Secretary shall determine at least semiannually the prevailing retail cost of the basic food allotment for households within each size classification, taking into consideration the purchasing practices of families with low income. If he deems it necessary, the Secretary, in determining the prevailing cost of the basic food allotments, may provide for regional differentials and differentials by size and type of community.

(3) The face value of the food-allotment coupons which may be sold to any household shall be not greater than the prevailing retail cost of the basic food allotment of such household less the prevailing retail cost of—

(A) the food produced and consumed by such household or which, in the opinion of the Secretary, should be produced by such household for household consumption; and

(B) to the extent that the Secretary determines that such deduction is consistent with the purposes of the program, the food consumed by members of such household in meals eaten outside of such household.

*Prices to be charged for coupons*

(d) (1) The Secretary shall from time to time determine the prices to be charged to various households for food-allotment coupons, other than free coupons issued under the provisions of subsection (3) of this section, and shall establish such prices at levels that will effectuate the purposes of this section. Such price shall be not less than 25 percent of the face value of the coupons and shall be so fixed that the cost of the coupons required to purchase the basic food allotment for a household shall not be more than 40 percent of the household income or 25 percent of the face value of the coupons, whichever may be the greater.

(2) If the Secretary finds such action necessary to assure the realization of the purposes of the program, he may require any unemployed male member of the household applying for food-allotment coupons, who is between the ages of 16 and 65 and is not attending school or disabled, to submit (A) a certificate from a public employment office that he is registered for work, and (B) an affirmation that he has not within the past 6 weeks refused suitable work.

(3) In order that the increased food consumption resulting from the administration of this Act may be concentrated, insofar as practicable, upon those foods which are in surplus, or upon those foods which are most needed in diets, the Secretary may (A) require that each household to whom food-allotment coupons are issued use not more than 33⅓ percent in face value of such coupons to buy specifically designated foods, or to buy any one or more of a group of foods, or (B) include with food-allotment coupons sold other such coupons which from time to time may be used in exchange for specifically designated foods. The aggregate value of free coupons issued shall be not more than 10 percent of the aggregate value of coupons sold in the preceding 6-month period or estimated as likely to be sold in the current 6-month period. The Secretary may vary the value of the free coupons issued to households of differing income and composition, according to the same criteria used in fixing the purchase price of coupons sold.

(4) If the Secretary finds that the funds available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of this act are insufficient to meet the cost of providing food-allotment coupons representing the prevailing retail cost of the basic food allotment for all households expected to participate in the program, he may make such adjustments in the program as he finds necessary to secure maximum participation among households with low per capita income, or he may limit the program to specific areas.

*Discriminations prohibited*

(e) There shall be no discrimination against any household with respect to eligibility, classification, participation, or issuance or utilization of food-allotment coupons under the provisions of this section by reason of race, religious creed, national origin, citizenship, political affiliations or beliefs, occupation, employment, or other tests, except as provided for in this act and as may be necessary to insure general fairness and equity in the application of this act.

*Information to be furnished by applicants*

(f) (1) Each applicant for food-allotment coupons shall furnish such information with respect to the size and income of the household of which he is a member as may be required by the Secretary to determine the value of food-allotment coupons to which such household is entitled and the price to be paid for such coupons.

(2) The Secretary shall establish appropriate procedures for appealing from the determination of the value of the coupons issuable to a household and the prices chargeable for them.

(3) The value of the coupons to which each participating household is entitled shall be redetermined and certified at least twice in each 12-month period in accordance with rules and regulations issued by the Secretary.

*Issuance and limitation on use*

(g) Food-allotment coupons shall be issued in such denominations as the Secretary shall determine. The Secretary, or his designated issuing agents, shall issue coupons in such manner, and at such times and places, as the Secretary may determine, taking into consideration efficiency of administration and the convenience of those entitled to receive such coupons.

*Redemption of food-allotment coupons*

(h) (1) The Secretary shall provide for redemption, through the cooperation of the Treasury Department, the General Accounting Office, and banking institutions throughout the Nation, of food-allotment coupons exchanged for food. He shall designate banking institutions to accept such coupons from sellers of food retail and wholesale. Institutions so designated shall pay at time of presentation in cash or by credit to a demand deposit the full value of all such coupons presented to them, except any amount which the Secretary in any particular instance directs the institution to withhold.

(2) The banking institutions accepting food-allotment coupons as provided in subsection (1) of this section may present to the Secretary, or such other agency, including the Treasury Department, as the Secretary may designate, evidence of the deposit with them of coupons from persons authorized to redeem such coupons, together with appropriate vouchers. Such evidence of deposit and vouchers shall be considered complete documentation for payment and payments may be made thereon. Food-allotment coupons so redeemed may be reissued or delivered for reissuance by the banking institutions under regulations of the Secretary.

(3) The Secretary may advance money to banking institutions, where such action appears necessary, to provide funds for the redemption of food-allotment coupons. Such advances shall be accounted for by such banking institution or institutions not less often than once monthly.

(4) The Secretary may contract to pay banking institutions designated to receive food-allotment coupons a charge determined by the Secretary to be reasonable for the services rendered in acting as such depositories.

(5) Funds derived from the sale of food-allotment coupons shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of this section and may be deposited to the credit of any appropriation provided for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section or may be deposited directly with banking institutions as advanced moneys pursuant to subsection (h) (3) of this section.

*Registration of food dealers*

(i) The Secretary shall provide by regulation a simple method for the registration of mercantile establishments selling food at wholesale or retail which desire to be authorized to receive food-allotment coupons in exchange for food. Such registration shall constitute a privilege to receive food-allotment coupons, which privilege shall be enjoyed until suspended or revoked by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this section and the rules and regulations prescribed by him.

*Council on nutrition*

(j) The Secretary shall provide for the appointment of a Council on Nutrition to advise on nutritional aspects of the food-allotment program.

(k) (1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(2) The Secretary shall have authority to make such expenditures, not exceeding 5 percent of the funds appropriated for the purposes of this section, as he may deem necessary for the administration and enforcement of this section.

(3) For the purpose of this section, the Secretary is authorized—

(A) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture; to establish regional and local offices; to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals and to delegate to them functions under this section; and to allocate or transfer funds to, or otherwise to pay or to reimburse, such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

(B) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

(C) to employ in the District of Columbia and elsewhere such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this act.

(4) The Secretary may exercise any power, duty, or discretion vested in him under this act, through such person or persons as he may designate.

(5) The Secretary may conduct such economic studies as he deems necessary to the efficient and equitable administration of this section.

(6) The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the purchase (for the purposes of this section) of services rendered by banking institutions or by agencies.

(7) The Secretary may, from time to time, issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

*Educational program*

(l) As a part of the food-allotment plan, the Secretary shall provide, in cooperation with existing agencies of the Federal, State or local governments, or private persons or groups, an educational program for improving the buying habits, food-utilization techniques, and food-preservation methods of the participants in the food-allotment plan.

*Reports to Congress*

(m) The Secretary shall render semi-annual reports to Congress describing the operations of the food-allotment plan, including the following: Number of eligibles and participants by the various classes of households established; the reasons for any nonparticipation by eligibles; effect of the food-allotment plan on the expenditure habits of participants; extent to which the plan increases purchases of foods of various types and other kinds of goods and services, for the various classes of households; benefits derived from the plan for the different types and groups of food sellers, wholesalers, processors, and producers; extent of improper use if any of food-allotment coupons; the amount and type of administrative expenditures incurred; and the effectiveness of alternative arrangements, procedures, and methods of administration used in carrying out the program.

*Territorial applicability*

(n) The provisions of this section shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

*Separability provision*

(o) If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this section and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

*Short title*

(p) This section may be cited as the "National Food Allotment Act."

SEC. 502. Section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to strike out the words "until December 31, 1958." wherever they appear in that section.

SEC. 503. The National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

*"Milk program*

"SEC. 12. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $250 million in any fiscal year, as may be necessary to provide milk for schoolchildren in accordance with this section. The funds appropriated for any fiscal year for carrying out this section, less not to exceed 5 percent thereof hereby made available to the Secretary for his administrative expenses, shall be apportioned and paid to the States and to nonprofit private schools as provided in sections 4, 7, and 10 of this act, except that the matching requirements of sections 7 and 10 shall not apply. Such funds shall be used to provide at least two half-pints of milk per day to each child attending public schools and nonprofit private schools in the States, except that if the funds available are not sufficient to provide two half-pints for each child, first priority shall be given to children in grades 1 through 6, second priority to children in grades 7 through 9, and third priority to children in the higher grades.

"(b) Funds paid to a State under this section shall be disbursed by the State educational agency, in accordance with agreements, approved by the Secretary, between such agency and the schools in the State. Such disbursements shall be made only for the purpose of reimbursing a school for the cost of obtaining milk for consumption by children attending the school, and for its administrative costs in connection therewith. Such milk shall be served without charge to such children.

"(c) The program authorized by this section shall be considered to be a part of the school-lunch program for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of section 11 of this Act."

TITLE VI—EXPANSION OF FARM EXPORTS

SEC. 601. The President is authorized to explore with friendly nations and encourage the establishment of an international food and fiber reserve bank under the auspices of the United Nations and related specialized international organizations for the purpose of acquiring, storing, donating, and selling in appropriate countries raw and processed farm products and other raw materials, exclusive of minerals, with a view to their use in (1) preventing extreme price fluctuations in the international market in these commodities; (2) preventing famine and starvation; (3) helping absorb temporary market surpluses of farm products and other raw materials (exclusive of minerals); (4) economic and social development programs formulated in cooperation with other appropriate international agencies,

utilizing such commodities directly or the currencies for which they may be sold.

Participation by the United States in such an international food and fiber reserve bank shall be contingent upon statutory authorization or treaty approval, as may be appropriate.

SEC. 602. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

(a) In subsection 103 (b) by inserting after the word "title" and before "which" the following: "after June 30, 1958," by striking out the words "Commodity Credit" and inserting "Federal Farm Income Stabilization", and by striking out "$3,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,500,000,000".

(b) By adding to section 104 a new subsection (k) as follows:

"(k) Establishment of universal free systems of general and vocational education in nations not now having such an education system; and construction and operation of basic capital improvements such as roads, bridges, canals, irrigation systems, water and soil-conservation facilities, reforestation, dams, hydroelectric systems, and others."

(c) By inserting in section 109 the words "June 30, 1960" in lieu of the words "June 30, 1958".

(d) By inserting in section 203 after the parenthesis in the first sentence the following: "in any one calendar year".

(e) Insert in section 204 the words "June 30, 1960" in lieu of the words "June 30, 1958".

TITLE VII—BALANCING MARKET SUPPLY WITH DEMAND

SEC. 701. (a) Section 101 of the Soil Bank Act shall be amended to read as follows: "This section may be cited as the 'All-Commodity Farm Market Sharing and Conservation Acreage Reserve Act.' "

(b) Section 103 (a) of the Soil Bank Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized and directed upon recommendation adopted by two-thirds vote of the National Farm Income Stabilization Board to determine and proclaim, prior to November 15 of each year, a national all-commodity farm marketing quota and a national conservation acreage reserve for the succeeding crop year.

"(A) The national conservation acreage reserve for any crop year shall be a number of acres equal to the number of acres, if any, by which—

"(I) the sum of (i) the total number of acres determined by the Secretary to have been used within the continental United States for the commercial production of agricultural commodities during the crop year immediately preceding the year for which the national conservation acreage reserve is being determined, (ii) the number of acres within the continental United States which were diverted from their normal use during such year by reason of the operation of acreage allotments and marketing quotas, and (iii) acreage placed in the conservation reserve under subtitle B hereof, exceeds

"(II) the total number of acres determined by the Secretary to be needed for the commercial production within the continental United States of sufficient quantities of all agricultural commodities and to maintain adequate safety reserves to meet emergency needs for such commodities as proclaimed by the Secretary as being equivalent to the national all-commodity farm marketing quota, as defined in subsection (B).

"(B) (1) The national all-commodity farm marketing quota for any crop year shall be total value of all farm commodities, as the Secretary may determine can be sold by farmers for average national prices received by farmers of not less than 80 percent nor more than 100 percent of parity income equivalent prices in such crop year, calculated on the assumption that the number of unemployed in such year be not greater than 3 percent of the total civilian labor force.

"(2) The national all-commodity farm marketing quota and national conservation acreage reserve shall be allocated among the several States in such manner that the conservation acreage reserve of any such State shall be the number of acres which bears the same ratio to the national conservation acreage reserve, and the State all-commodity farm marketing quota shall bear the same ratio to the national all-commodity farm marketing quota as (A) the total number of acres determined by the Secretary to have been used within such State for the commercial production of agricultural commodities during the year immediately preceding the year for which the State all-commodity farm marketing quota and conservation acreage reserve is being determined, bears to (B) the total number of acres determined by the Secretary to have been used within the continental United States for the commercial production of agricultural commodities during such year.

"(3) The all-commodity farm marketing quota and conservation acreage reserve of each State shall be allocated among the several counties in such State in such manner that the conservation acreage reserve of any such county shall be the number of acres which bears the same ratio to the State conservation acreage reserve, and the county all-commodity farm marketing quota shall bear the same ratio to the State all-commodity farm marketing quota, as (A) the total number of acres determined by the Secretary to have been used within such county for the commercial production of agricultural commodities during the year immediately preceding the year for which the county conservation acreage reserve is being determined, bears to (B) the total number of acres determined by the Secretary to have been used within the State for the commercial production of agricultural commodities during such year.

"(4) The conservation acreage reserve and the all-commodity farm marketing quota of any county shall be allocated among the several farms within such county in such manner that the conservation acreage reserve of any farm shall be a number of acres which bears the same ratio to the county conservation acreage reserve and the individual all-commodity farm marketing quota shall bear the same ratio to the county all-commodity farm marketing quota, as (A) the total number of acres determined by the Secretary to have been used on such farm for the commercial production of agricultural commodities during the year immediately preceding the year for which the farm acreage reserve is being determined, bears to (B) the total number of acres determined by the Secretary to have been used in such county for the commercial production of agricultural commodities during such year.

"(5) To the extent that any farm, county, or State does not utilize its entire conservation-acreage reserve or its entire all-commodity farm marketing quota in any year, such unused marketing quota or reserve acreage shall be made available, for that year only, to other States, counties, and farms which have indicated a desire to obtain a greater quota or reserve than their initial allocation for that year.

"(6) The National Farm Income Stabilization Board shall cause to be issued to the operator of each farm a farm market quota certificate bearing on its face the volume of sales at parity income equivalent prices of farm commodities permitted under the certificate. Each such operator who sells farm commodities shall obtain for each sale, from the county farmer committee, a quota certificate of sale or an overquota certificate of sale for such commodities, which shall accompany the commodity through the channels of trade within the United States. Each such producer shall be issued quota certificates of sale by the county committee free of charge up to the remaining total volume for the crop year of sales shown on the face of the farm market quota certificate of such producer for such year. The committee shall enter upon the face of the farm market quota certificate the value of each such quota certificate of sale that has been issued. Each such producer shall also be issued such overquota certificate of sale by the committee as he may require for the sale of farm commodities over and above the volume shown on the face of the farm market quota certificate for such operator upon the payment of a farm-income stabilization fee equal to the total of the number of units of each commodity covered in such overquota certificates of sale multiplied by 50 percent of the parity income equivalent price per unit of each such commodity. The Secretary shall confiscate all farm commodities and products discovered in ownership other than that of the farmer who produced them if they cannot be accounted for by quota certificates of sale or overquota certificates of sale in the hands of the owner thereof.

"(7) The Secretary is authorized to enter into annual agreements with individual farm operators under which the operator agrees to put into effect on the specified number of acres in addition to those already covered by contract under subtitle B of this act in the conservation-acreage reserve for his farm such soil and water conservation and improvement uses and practices as may be specified by the Secretary, for purposes of conserving and improving the soil, water, range, timber, wildlife, and hunting, fishing, and recreational resources, and the Secretary agrees, to the extent that appropriations allow, to pay to such operator an acreage-rental payment with respect to each such acre not to exceed the land and capital carrying charges, plus necessary annual land treatments, plus the net income earnable on such land by a typical family-operated farm at parity income equivalent prices, as determined by the Secretary, for the area in which the farm is located, of the commodities which the Secretary determines would be produced on such acre were it used for commercial production during the crop year for which the contract is made: *Provided*, That the Secretary, before prescribing the practices which individual farm operators may put into practice on the conservation-acreage reserve, shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior, and the State committee established under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938 shall consult with the State agency having jurisdiction over matters relating to conservation of wildlife, such consultation to include consideration of the effect of proposed and recommended practices upon wildlife, conservation, and hunting, fishing, and recreational uses.

"(8) The determination for the purposes of this subsection of the amount of any acreage rental payment shall be made by the local committee established under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1938, as amended, in accordance with standards promulgated by the county committee established under such section. Each such county committee shall determine and proclaim, for the purposes of this section, the typical ratio of net income to gross income for each agricultural commodity commercially produced within the county. The determination of the county committee with respect to such typical ratio of net income to gross income shall be final unless disapproved by the Secretary after public hearing held in the county after due notice.

"(9) The Secretary is authorized (1) to provide, in any contract entered into under

this section, for a right of entry on the farm with respect to which such contract is entered into for the purpose of measuring the acreage in commercial production and ascertaining that grasslands and other resources included within the conservation acreage reserve are not being used for commercial production of livestock or milk, or products thereof, and (2) to require that the farm operator certify under oath or affirmation that no acres included within the conservation acreage reserve have been utilized for commercial production during the period covered by the contract.

"(10) No farm operator shall be eligible for any price-support loans, purchase contracts, or payments unless there is in effect with respect to his farm a contract entered into under this section.

"(11) Whenever any contract entered into under this section requires the institution or continuance of soil or water conservation or improvement uses and practices on any farm, the Secretary shall reimburse the operator of such farm for costs incurred in providing such uses and practices by making a conservation incentive payment to such operator equal to 80 per centum of such costs plus an additional 1 per centum of such costs for each percentage point by which net income from farm operations is less than 100 per centum or parity.

"(12) The maximum amount of any acreage rental payment under subsection 7 with respect to any farm operator for any year shall be $7,500, and the maximum amount of any conservation incentive payment under section 6 with respect to any such unit for any year shall be $2,500.

"(13) The Secretary is authorized and directed, upon recommendation of the National Farm Income Stabilization Board, to adjust the allocation of the national conservation reserve and the national farm marketing quota to the several States and to authorize State and county committees upon application, approved by the Board, to adjust the allocation of State quotas to counties and of county quotas to farms by not more than 10 per centum to take account of trends in production patterns, the needs of good land use and soil and water conservation and other factors cited in section 102 and 104. Such recommendation or approval shall be made upon two-thirds majority vote of the members of the Board and only after a public hearing following due public notice of the date of the hearing.

"(14) The words 'acreage reserve' wherever they occur in this subtitle are amended to read 'Conservation acreage reserve'.

"(15) The conservation acreage reserve shall include but not be limited to any acreage devoted to the conservation acreage reserve program authorized under subtitle B of this title. The conservation acreage reserve program may include such terms and conditions in addition to those specified herein, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds on the reserve acreage, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this title. Before any producer is entitled to receive compensation for participating in the conservation acreage reserve program, he must first enter into a contract with the Secretary, which contract, in addition to such other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, shall contain provisions by which such producer shall agree—

"(A) in the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm, and that such violation is of such substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, to forfeit all rights to payment or grants under the contract, or to refund to the United States all payments and grants received by him thereunder; and

"(B) in the event the Secretary determines that the producer has knowingly sold farm commodities for which he has no quota certificates of sale or overquota certificates of sale, the contract with such producer shall be terminated."

(c) Section 104 of the Soil Bank Act is amended to read as follows:

"The allocation of the national all-commodity farm marketing quota and of the national conservation acreage reserve shall be administered in such manner as is reasonably calculated to achieve the purposes of this title and give the farm operators a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in the programs provided by this Act and the Full Parity Farm Family Income Act within the limitations provided in section 103, taking into consideration their commodity marketing quotas, the supply and demand conditions for different classes, grades, and qualities of the several commodities, the relative dependence of the farmers of an area, county, or State upon one or a few crops or other commodity specialization, and such other factors, as the Secretary deems appropriate upon recommendation of the National Farm Income Stabilization Board."

SEC. 702. The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, reenacting, amending, and supplementing the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection 2 (1) is amended by striking the words "parity prices" and substituting therefor the words "parity income equivalent prices" and by striking the following "section 301 (a) (1)" and substituting therefor the following "section 301 (a) (2) (A)."

(b) Subsection 8 (c) (2) is amended by inserting after the word "soybeans" the following: "other field crops, Irish potatoes, farm forestry products, cattle, hogs, lambs, milk for manufacturing, butterfat and cream, eggs, and poultry."

SEC. 703. (a) In order to assure the orderly marketing of an adequate national supply of hogs, pork products, and cattle and beef products, to encourage the increased domestic consumption of pork, beef, and pork and beef products, to maintain the productive capacity of our hog and cattle farming industry, and to avoid the feeding of hogs and cattle to less desirable weights, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, whenever he finds (1) that the annual pig crop for any year will exceed the average pig crop for the 10 preceding years, or the number of cattle on hand in any year will exceed the average number of cattle on hand for the preceding 10 years, or (2) that the national average price received by farmers for hogs or cattle is less than 80 percent of the parity income equivalent price therefor, to make incentive payments to hog and cattle producers to encourage the marketing of hogs and cattle for slaughter at not to exceed specified optimum live weights to be determined by the Secretary as appropriate to accomplish the purpose of this section.

(b) The amounts of incentive payments under this act shall be established by the Secretary at such level, not less than $1, or more than $3 per hundredweight, as he determines is necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. No producer shall be eligible to receive incentive payments under this section totaling in excess of $2,500 in any calendar year.

(c) Every purchaser of hogs and cattle for slaughter shall supply to the producer of such hogs or cattle a ticket, in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary, showing the number of hogs and cattle sold in weight classes of the respective specified optimum live weights or less, and the total weight of the hogs or cattle sold. Such producer shall make application for the payment of the incentive benefits under this act by filing the ticket received by him from the buyer with the county committee for his county appointed under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

(d) Payments shall not be made under this section after December 31, 1960.

(e) The Secretary is authorized to use any funds of the National Farm Income Stabilization Corporation, and any funds appropriated by section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress (49 Stat. 774; U. S. C. 612c), as amended, in making payments provided by this section.

(f) For the purpose of further reimbursing the National Farm Income Stabilization Corporation for any expenditures made by it under this section, there shall be levied on all hogs, pork, and pork products and on all cattle, calves, beef, veal, and products thereof a processing tax at a rate to be determined by the National Farm Income Stabilization Board as appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section but not to exceed 50 cents per hundredweight live weight or live weight equivalent, which shall be paid to the Treasurer of the United States by the first purchaser from the producer and deposited to the account of the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 704. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following part VII to subtitle B, marketing quotas:

"PART VII. MARKETING QUOTAS FOR OTHER AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"SEC. 360. (a) The agricultural commodities covered by this part comprise (1) field crops (other than those covered by other parts of this title), including corn, both inside and outside the commercial corn-producing area, barley, oats, rye, grain sorghum, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, and grass seeds; (2) vegetables, including potatoes, cabbage and tomatoes; (3) fruits, including citrus fruits, dried fruits and deciduous fruits; (4) tree nuts, including English walnuts and pecans; (5) livestock, including hogs, cattle, and lambs; (6) poultry, including chickens and turkeys; (7) eggs, hops, honeybees, and gum naval stores, or any regional or market classification of any farm commodity covered by this part. The inclusion in each group of specific farm commodities shall not be taken as a limitation on farm commodities otherwise falling within such group.

*"National single-commodity marketing quotas*

"(b) Whenever a marketing agreement or order under provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937, as amended, is not in effect for any such farm commodity and whenever the Secretary determines that the total supply of such farm commodity for the next marketing year will, in the absence of a single-commodity marketing quota program, likely exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by such an amount as will make a single-commodity marketing quota program necessary to effectuate the declared policy of this act and that the operation of such a program will be administratively practicable, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and shall proclaim a national single-commodity marketing quota which shall be in effect for such commodity. Any national single-commodity marketing quota proclaimed under this section shall be subject to a referendum held pursuant to subsection 360 (i). The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national single-commodity quota in terms of the quantity required, together with (1) the estimated carryover at the beginning of the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed, and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year, to make available a normal

supply, defined for purposes of this section as the volume of marketings which the Secretary determines, upon recommendation of the Federal Farm Income Stabilization Board, will move through normal channels of trade during such marketing year, assuming conditions of less than 3 percent of the civilian labor force unemployed, at an average price received by farmers of not less than 80 per centum nor more than 100 per centum of the parity income equivalent price. The proclamation of a national commodity marketing quota for any agricultural commodity which is planted annually shall be made not less than 60 days prior to the beginning of the normal planting season, and in the case of any other commodity, not less than 90 days prior to the beginning of the marketing year. The national single-commodity marketing quota for any farm commodity may be made applicable to a crop or to a marketing year.

*"Apportionments of national single-commodity marketing quota*

"(c) (1) The national single-commodity marketing quota for any farm commodity established pursuant to the provisions of subsection 360 (b), less the portion set aside for purpose of paragraph (4) of this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary, upon advice and recommendation of the National Farm Income Stabilization Board, among the several States on the basis of the total marketings or production (in terms of acreage, production units or commodity units) of such commodity in each State during such representative period as the Secretary may determine, on the basis of recommendation of the National Farm Income Stabilization Board, with such adjustments as are deemed necessary for abnormal conditions, for trends in production or marketing, and consideration of relative dependence of different areas upon one or a few crops or commodities.

"(2) The Secretary shall provide for the allotment of the single-commodity marketing quota for any State for any farm commodity among the farms in the State on which such commodity has been produced in any year of a representative period of not more than five years, as determined by the Secretary. Such allotment shall be made in such manner and in such amounts as to provide a fair and equitable distribution of the marketing quota for any State among such farms in the State taking into consideration one or more of the following factors: Past marketings or production of the commodity, abnormal conditions affecting production; land, labor, and equipment available for the production and marketing of the commodity; rotation fallow practices; soil and other physical factors affecting the production of the commodity; and the factors listed in subsection (c) (1) hereof.

"(3) If the Secretary determines that such action will facilitate the effective administration of the provisions of this section, the commodity marketing quota for any State may be apportioned among the counties therein on the basis of the provisions of subsection (1) of this subsection for apportioning the national single-commodity marketing quota among the States, and the single-commodity marketing quota so established for the counties shall be apportioned among the farms in the county on the basis of provisions of subsection (2) of this subsection.

"(4) Not more than 5 percent of the national single-commodity marketing quota for any farm commodity shall be apportioned among farms on which producers will produce such commodity but for which single-commodity marketing quotas were not established pursuant to subsection (2) or (3) of this subsection.

"(d) Whenever farm single-commodity marketing quotas are in effect for any farm commodity under provisions of this section, the farm marketing excess of such commodity or the marketing of such commodity in excess of the individual farm commodity marketing quota shall be subject to the payment of a farm income stabilization fee at a rate per unit of the commodity so marketed equal to 50 per centum of the parity income equivalent price of such commodity at the beginning of the second month prior to the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity.

*"Minimum commodity marketing quotas for individual farm*

"(e) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the Secretary shall determine for any all-commodity marketing quota and single-commodity marketing quota a uniform amount of marketings per farm which may be marketed free of payments of the fees provided in subsection (d) of this section and subsection 501 (c) (6) of this act taking into consideration the amount of such commodities normally used for home consumption per family, the minimum volume of production required to operate an efficient family unit, and the effect of such exemption on other quota programs.

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall arrange to adjust the all-commodity farm marketing goal specified in section 501 of this act, and the single-commodity marketing goal and the dairy commodities marketing goal specified in section 106 of this act of individual farms in accordance with the following schedule:

| "Percentage that the total marketing goals and quota for the farm for all commodities for which quota programs are in effect is of the national average per farm total of such goals and quotas: | *Percentage increase in marketing goal of such farm* |
|---|---|
| Not more than 20 | 50 |
| More than 20 but not more than 40 | 45 |
| More than 40 but not more than 60 | 40 |
| More than 60 but not more than 80 | 35 |
| More than 80 but not more than 100 | 30 |
| More than 100 but not more than 134 | 25 |
| More than 134 but not more than 167 | 20 |
| More than 167 but not more than 200 | 10 |
| More than 200 | 5 |

In making the adjustments provided by this subsection the Secretary shall so apportion the national commodity marketing quota and the national farm marketing quota and so calculate the milk-marketing quota for each dairy farm that the total of adjusted individual farm commodity marketing goals for any farm commodity and of milk-marketing quotas and the individual farm all-commodity marketing quota will equal the national single-commodity quota proclaimed by him pursuant to subsection (b) of this section for such commodity and the national all-commodity farm marketing quota, proclaimed by him pursuant to subsection 103 (a) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, respectively, and the total of individual farm milk-marketing quotas as calculated under section 106 of this Act.

*"Referendum*

"(g) The Secretary shall conduct a referendum of farmers to determine whether they favor or oppose a national single-commodity marketing quota program proclaimed under this section, by not later than sixty days after issuance of the proclamation. The persons eligible to vote in the referendum shall be farmers engaged in the production of the commodity in the year in which the referendum is held, or the next preceding year. If more than one-third of the farmers voting in the referendum oppose the quota, such quota shall become ineffective upon proclamation of the results of the referendum. The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within thirty days after the date of such referendum."

TITLE VIII—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 801. For purposes of the provisions of title II of this act, the word "cooperator," with respect to any commodity, shall mean a producer of such commodity who is in full compliance with any program established for such commodity under provisions of title VII.

SEC. 802. Subsection 408 (h) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "determined" in the first sentence the following: "assuming that the number of unemployed workers in such year be less than 3 per centum of the total civilian labor force."

TITLE IX—FAMILY FARM CREDIT

SEC. 901. This title may be cited as the "Family Farm Yardstick Credit Act."

SEC. 902. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence of such subsection.

(b) Subsection (b) (2) of section 3 of such act is amended by striking out "5 per centum," and inserting in lieu thereof "3 per centum".

(c) Section 5 of such act is amended by striking out "$50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000,000"; and by striking out "June 30, 1947," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

(d) Subsection (a) of section 11 of such act is amended by striking out "$25,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000,000".

(e) Subsection (c) of section 12 of such act is amended by—

(1) striking out in paragraph (4) "4 per centum," and inserting in lieu thereof "3 per centum"; and

(2) by striking out paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) loans insured under the provisions of this section shall not be in excess of the amount certified by the appropriate county committee to be the fair and reasonable value of the farm;".

(f) Subsections (d) and (e) of section 12 of such act are repealed.

SEC. 903. (a) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 21 of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) No loans shall be made under this section for the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program. No initial loan to any one borrower under this section shall exceed $25,000 and no further loan may be made under this section to a borrower so long as the total amount outstanding, including accrued interest, taxes, and other obligations properly chargeable to the account of the borrower, exceeds $40,000.

"(c) The rate of interest on loans made under the provisions of this title shall not exceed 3 percent per annum."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 21 of such act is repealed.

SEC. 904. (a) Subsection (b) of section 42 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "$5" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15."

(b) Section 44 of such act is amended by striking out in subsection (b) "5 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 percent."

SEC. 905. The act of August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x), is amended—

(1) by striking out in the first sentence "for a period of 4 years from July 14, 1953, loans for $2,500 or more" and inserting in lieu thereof "loans";

(2) by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Loans to such producers and feeders may

also be made under this subsection for the purpose of refinancing any existing indebtedness incurred for purposes for which loans may be made under this subsection";

(3) by striking out in the third sentence "3 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 years";

(4) by striking out the fourth and fifth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Loans made under the provisions of this subsection shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum and shall be made on such other terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe"; and

(5) by adding at the end of subsection (c) a new sentence as follows: "The Secretary is authorized to make advances of Commodity Credit Corporation owned wheat and feed grains to farmers and stockmen, who are unable to obtain loans from other sources on such terms and conditions as they could reasonably be expected to meet, for the purpose of furnishing the feed needed by such farmers and stockmen to preserve a breeding stock of cattle, hogs, work stock, and poultry. Such advances shall be repayable in kind or money within a period of 3 years and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum."

SEC. 906. The act entitled "An act to provide emergency credit," approved August 31, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 999), is amended—

(1) by striking out the first section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary is authorized to make emergency loans for any agricultural purposes and for refinancing existing indebtedness to farmers and stockmen when there is a need for such credit which cannot be met from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, the Farmers' Home Administration under its regular programs or under the act of April 6, 1949, or other responsible sources,";

(2) by striking out clauses (2) and (3) of section 2;

(3) by striking out in clause (4) of section 2 the words "for such area or areas"; and

(4) by renumbering clauses (4) and (5) of section 2 as clauses (2) and (3), respectively.

SEC. 907. The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new titles:

"TITLE V—RURAL ADJUSTMENT CREDIT

"SEC. 60. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make loans to encourage, assist, and provide a sounder system of credit in rural areas to ameliorate the effects of the agricultural recession and adverse agricultural situations caused by conditions beyond control of the farmers and stockmen.

*"Purpose of loans*

"SEC. 61. Loans made under the provisions of this title shall be made for the purpose of—

"(1) refinancing, consolidating, renewing, or extending all or part of the existing debts of eligible farmers, stockmen, farm partnerships, grazing associations, and irrigation companies and to the owners of farm-related small business in rural areas;

"(2) assisting eligible farmers and stockmen, with special emphasis on family-sized farms and smaller than family-sized farms, to acquire additional land if the acquisition of such additional land—

"(A) will improve the economic status of the farmers or stockmen;

"(B) will aid in a planned program for preventing erosion;

"(C) is for the purpose of retiring land from its present use to a more suitable use;

"(D) will facilitate the improvement of farmland through soil or water conserving or drainage facilities, structures, or practices;

"(E) will facilitate the improvement of farm-soil fertility, establishment of improved permanent pasture, sustained-yield afforestation or reforestation, or other erosion preventatives, and other similar or related measures; or

"(F) will fulfill any other agricultural purpose consistent with the overall purposes of this title;

"(3) financing or refinancing general farm operating and subsistence expenses; and

"(4) assisting eligible farmers and stockmen to purchase stock in irrigation companies or grazing associations.

*"Limitations on loans*

"SEC. 62. Loans made directly by the Secretary under the provisions of this title, and loans made by private credit sources and insured under provisions of this title, which are secured only by chattel liens shall be repayable within the normal useful life of the chattels or within 15 years, whichever period of time is the shorter. In the case of an individual farmer or stockman no loan so secured shall be for an amount in excess of $50,000 and in the case of grazing association or irrigation company no loan so secured shall be for an amount in excess of $1 million. Loans made or insured under the provisions of this title and secured by real estate shall be repayable in not more than 40 years and shall not be for an amount in excess of $50,000 in the case of an individual farmer or stockman, or more than $1 million in the case of a grazing association or irrigation company. Direct or insured loans made to any farm partnership of two or more farmers or stockmen shall not exceed the total amount all such farmers and stockmen would be entitled to receive as individual farmers or stockmen under the provisions of this title. In the case of any farm-related small business, no loan secured by chattel lien only shall be made for an amount in excess of $250,000, and no loan secured by real estate shall be made for an amount in excess of $1 million. The rate of interest on direct or insured loans provided for under the provisions of this title shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

*"Persons eligible*

"SEC. 63. (a) Loans made directly by the Secretary under the provisions of this title, and loans made by private credit sources and insured under the provisions of this title, shall be made only to established farmers and capable beginning farmers, part-time farmers, stockmen, whether tenants or owners, farm partnerships, grazing associations, irrigation companies, and to owners of farm-related small businesses in rural areas—

"(1) who are unable to repay their existing indebtedness in accordance with present repayment schedules;

"(2) who are unable to secure financing through private or cooperative sources on terms and conditions which they could reasonably be expected to meet and the rejection of such credit was not due to the lack of repayment ability under normal conditions, or to the character or lack of managerial capacity of the applicant;

"(3) who are certified by the appropriate county committee in accordance with subsection (a) (3) of section 44 of this act;

"(4) with respect to whom the appropriate county committee certifies and the Secretary finds there is a reasonable expectation that, with the assistance provided hereunder and other resources available to such applicants, they will be able to repay the loans and continue their farming or ranching operations or their business operations; and

"(5) who have total principal indebtedness not in excess of the normal market value of their farms or ranches or businesses and the market value of their chattels, which have security value, less the outstanding balance of any liens not refinanced hereunder.

*"Provisions with respect to insured loans*

"SEC. 64. To effectuate the program provided for in this title the Secretary is authorized to make commitments to insure loans made by private credit sources to eligible farmers, stockmen, farm partnerships, grazing associations, irrigation companies, and farm-related small businesses in rural areas. To qualify for such insurance, loans shall be made upon such terms and conditions not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

"SEC. 65. Any loan insured under the provisions of this title shall be an obligation guaranteed by the United States as to principal and interest and incontestable, except for fraud or misrepresentation of which the holder has actual knowledge.

"SEC. 66. The aggregate amount of principal obligations on loans insured under the provisions of this title shall not exceed $300 million in any one fiscal year.

"SEC. 67. (a) The Secretary shall require that all loans insured under the provisions of this title shall be administered and serviced by him.

"(b) Any loan insured under the provisions of this title shall be made subject to the right of the Secretary to purchase such loan, whether or not in default, on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to purchase loans, which could have been made under the provisions of this title, from banks, or other credit institutions in areas where the Secretary determines that additional funds and terms of loans are necessary to improve rural credit sources, such loans to be referred to the Farmers' Home Administration by the credit institutions within the designated area. The amount advanced against such loans shall not exceed the value of the security as determined by the representative of the Secretary and shall not exceed the maximum amounts set out in this title. Loans obtained directly from the bank or credit institution can upon request by the borrower be renewed, extended, or amended in line with the terms established in this title.

*"General provisions*

"SEC. 68. The Secretary shall require loans to be repaid as provided in subsection (c) of section 44 of this act if he determines that the borrower is able to obtain a loan from a production credit association, Federal land bank, or other responsible cooperative or private credit source at rates and terms which the borrower can reasonably be expected to meet.

"SEC. 69. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall utilize the insurance fund established by section 11 of this act. Notes and security acquired by the Secretary for loans insured under this title shall become a part of such fund. The notes may be held in the fund and collected according to their terms, or may be sold and, if necessary, reinsured. All proceeds from such collections, including the liquidation of security, and sales of notes shall become a part of such fund.

"SEC. 70. The provision of section 51 of this act shall be applicable to this title, and the Secretary may utilize the insurance fund for the payment of taxes, insurance, prior liens, foreclosure expenses, and any other expenses incident to action taken by the Secretary under such section. The provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of section 13 of title I of this act shall be applicable to this title also.

*"Rules and regulations*

"SEC. 71. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

*"Appropriations*

"SEC. 72. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE VI—FAMILY FARM DEVELOPMENT ACT

"This title shall be known as the Family Farm Development Act of 1957.

*"Findings and policy*

"SEC. 81. The low incomes, poor living standards, and insufficient economic opportunity for efficient employment of their full capacity of a large part of the rural population denies the Nation the benefit or greater productivity in agriculture and in local rural manufacturing and service industries, slows down national economic growth, and reduces standards of living. The Congress recognizes that rural poverty and low rural productivity can and must be remedied in order to bring the Nation up to maximum strength and that, through this example of strengthening democracy at home by providing additional opportunities to low-income rural groups, democracy in other parts of the world also will be strengthened. It is the policy of the Congress to provide practical assistance to low-income rural families who desire to increase their productivity, income, and standard of living.

*"Determination of low-income counties*

"SEC. 82. The President is authorized to determine from time to time, from the latest official statistics available to him, the counties or areas of the United States, not exceeding 500 in number at any one time, having the largest low-income farm population and to inaugurate and maintain in such counties a program to effectuate the purposes and policy of this title.

*"Eligibility*

"SEC. 83. (a) The President through existing agencies of the Federal Government may render special assistance to low-income families or single persons living in rural areas who apply for such assistance if (1) the applicant is recommended by the appropriate county committee (established under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act); (2) such county committee finds that the applicant, with the assistance provided for herein, will develop a farm and home management or family employment plan for increasing his productivity and income; and that the applicant has a reasonable chance to succeed.

"(b) In exploring the most feasible and practicable methods for increasing his productivity and income the applicant, with the assistance of the appropriate county committee, will determine whether the cause of low income is due to physical handicaps of the family; the lack of available credit to make needed shifts in farming methods and employment of labor resources of the family; the practice of inefficient farming methods or practices; lack of practicable diversification in the farming operation; lack of sufficient land; lack of outside employment opportunities to fully utilize the labor of the family in ways that enable it to earn an adequate return at least equal to the established national minimum wage. To assist in the analysis of the needs and in developing the plans with families, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make available to the families and the county committees the services of the local and State offices of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture to provide the advice of technicians in such fields as soil conservation, and supervised agricultural credit for agricultural production and for farm enlargement and development. The advice and assistance of other Federal agencies shall be made available, and the cooperation of State and local agencies, including the State agricultural extension services and the State employment service, and the cooperation of private individuals and organizations shall also be solicited.

*"Developing economically adequate full-time and part-time farmers*

"SEC. 84. In case of eligible applicants who wish to remain on the farm now occupied or to become established on another farm in the area, either on a full-time farming basis or in conjunction with off-farm employment of one or more members of the family, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to provide the following services through the county committees:

"(a) Employ such full-time employees as may be required to carry on the purposes of this title.

"(b) Make a complete analysis of the farm and farm operations and supplemental employment opportunities to determine the most promising ways by which family income and productivity in combination with whatever off-farm employment may be planned can be raised to an adequate level. After completion of such a farm and home plan, the Secretary through the county committee shall render every assistance possible to the applicant and his family in putting the new program into effect, including technical assistance on improved farm and home practices, and assistance in obtaining credit needed from private, cooperative, or governmental sources to put these practices into effect.

"(c) To effectuate the purpose of this title, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon such conditions as he shall prescribe, to insure and make loans for periods not to exceed 25 years, and at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent per annum for the purpose of financing the enlargement and development of owner-operated family-type farms by (1) the acquisition of additional land, (2) the establishment of improved pastures and sustained yield woodlots, (3) the construction of adequate farm buildings and structures (including drainage facilities, irrigation facilities, and other facilities for the use, conservation, and improvement of soil and water), and (4) such other related farm improvements as will increase the income-producing ability of the farm unit to a more nearly fully adequate family farm.

"(d) (1) To make or to insure 3-to 15-year loans at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent per annum advanced by production credit associations and by private lenders for non-real-estate capital investment purposes; (2) to make loans up to 50 years at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent per annum to eligible applicants to acquire and manage on a sustained-yield basis additional forest or cutover land; (3) to make loans for periods up to 10 years at a rate of interest not to exceed 4 percent per annum to enable an eligible applicant to acquire needed logging equipment; (4) to make loans of not more than 5 years at a rate of interest not to exceed 4 percent per annum to eligible applicants to purchase capital stock of and pay membership fees to existing or new supply, service, or marketing cooperatives, including timber marketing and processing cooperatives; and (5) to make loans to refinance existing indebtedness incurred for any of the above purposes on terms and conditions applicable to loans for such purposes: *Provided*, That creditors will enter into voluntary agreements to make needed adjustments of outstanding indebtedness to realistic income possibilities of the collateral for the existing mortgage or mortgages: *Provided, further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a variable repayment schedule for all the foregoing types of loans such that the repayment of interest and principal in any single year shall bear a reasonable relationship to the income of the participating family in that year.

*"Part- and full-time off-farm employment*

SEC. 85. Whenever the family determines to seek part-time or full-time farm or nonfarm employment off the farm, the problem shall be presented to the nearest farm labor placement center of the State employment service cooperating with the Department of Labor. Information concerning farm labor opportunities also shall be made available to the family by the State and County Committees.

*"Vocational education*

"SEC. 86. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide a program of adult vocational training in the low-income counties designated, pursuant to section 82, both in farm and home management and in such other farm and nonfarm activities as the family plans of eligible applicants indicate are needed to maximize family income and productivity of family labor within the area.

*"Industrial dispersion*

"SEC. 87. To provide for the national defense, to promote interstate commerce, and to improve the general welfare by assisting in the sound economic growth and development of the county, it is the policy of the Congress to encourage and stimulate the establishment of new, or the expansion of existing, private industrial, commercial, or service enterprises in widely dispersed rural areas as may be required to reduce vulnerability to modern war risks, and in which, over an extended period of time, because of the number of underemployed persons in rural areas with excessively low incomes, the number of existing industrial, commercial, or service enterprises and the available markets and resources there are reasonable prospects for successful operation of additional private enterprises which would more fully utilize available manpower in rural areas. To effectuate this policy of industry dispersal, the departments and establishments in the executive branch of the Government shall be utilized and coordinated to—

"(a) provide technical aid and assistance to, and consult and cooperate with, farmers, businessmen, workers, cooperatives, civic organizations, clubs, and committees, community study and planning groups, and local and State governmental agencies;

"(b) prepare and distribute technical, defense, and economic information and opportunities in and necessities of private enterprise in various industries and areas in order to aid individuals, business firms, civic organizations, and local units of Government in developing new or expanded industries best suited to local conditions, and the requirements of civil defense;

"(c) assist new or expanding industries in finding adequate private financing through local capital or otherwise, and where such financing is found to be unavailable, extend Government loans or guaranties under existing authority; and

"(d) use all appropriate means and authority to encourage and stimulate the maximum expansion in private employment and private enterprises consistent with the needs for national defense, with a sound, growing national economy, and with the necessities of civilian defense.

*"Appropriation*

"SEC. 88. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 89. (a) No provision contained in this act or in any of the following acts shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make charges against either the borrower or lender for the insuring or servicing of loans insured by the Secretary under the provisions of such acts: (1) The

Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1001); (2) the act of August 28, 1937, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a–1) and the act entitled "An act to provide emergency credit," approved August 31, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 999). Any expenses incurred for the insuring and servicing of such loans shall be borne by the United States.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any such charges accrued prior to the date of enactment of this section."

*Debt adjustment*

SEC. 908. The Secretary shall arrange to assist borrowers under any of the provisions of this act in the voluntary adjustment of their existing indebtedness with creditors directly in cooperation with State, Territorial, and local agencies and committees engaged in such debt adjustment.

*Variable repayment*

SEC. 909. The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish, with respect to all loans authorized by this act, variable repayment plans with payments adjusted, without regard to previous excess payments, to the net earnings and ability of the borrower to pay from year to year.

TITLE X—AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND INDUSTRIAL UTILIZATION ACT

SEC. 1001. The Congress of the United States hereby makes the following declarations and findings concerning the development of new and improved uses for farm products, for new crops to replace those now in surplus, and the disposal of surplus commodities owned by the Government:

(a) Farms in the United States have a capacity to produce more farm products than can be marketed at prices that will return sufficient incomes to farmers to maintain an efficient and progressive agricultural industry.

(b) A prosperous agriculture will contribute immensely to national welfare by efficient production of needed food, feed, and fiber by provision of raw materials for the transportation and processing industries, by purchases of production supplies, and by its contribution to maintenance of a balanced and high level national economy.

(c) National defense and security interests of the United States require protection of agricultural resources against deterioration and the maintenance of high productive capacity in order to meet possible emergency needs of the United States and other friendly nations.

(d) Basic research in agricultural products and their uses is essential in any long-range program of benefit to agriculture.

(e) Research programs to develop new and improved uses for farm products and new farm products have potentialities for providing outlets for a larger volume of farm production and greater stability of the prices of farm commodities.

(f) Public and private research agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, the land-grant colleges, other universities and research institutions, as well as private firms, can and should be utilized for an all-out attack on development of new and improved uses, and new and extended markets and outlets for farm products and byproducts. Research, pilot plant, development and trial commercialization work and corollary economic and related studies should be devoted to the expansion of industrial uses for agricultural commodities in surplus, and to any food and feed uses and replacement crops that can make substantial contributions toward the solution of the surplus problem. Facilities should be established as needed to permit adequate experimentation and testing, and production and market development, of promising new uses and new products.

(g) Development of new and improved uses of farm products and new farm products and new and extended markets and outlets for farm products and byproducts will enlarge income opportunities for farmers. It also will reduce Government costs for acquisition, storage, and ultimate disposition of commodities now in surplus.

(h) Disposition of a portion of the surplus stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation through industrial channels for new or by-product uses, so that the carryover of any commodity beyond the needs of the Nation can be reduced, will have a stabilizing effect on the market prices for farm commodities.

*Purposes*

SEC. 1002. The purposes of this act are to establish a Board whose duties shall be to coordinate and expedite efforts to develop, through research, new industrial uses, and increased use under existing processes, of agricultural products; to develop new replacement crops; and to reduce the stocks of commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

*Board created*

SEC. 1003. A Board is hereby created and established within the United States Department of Agriculture to be known as the Agricultural Research and Industrial Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board), which shall be composed of 5 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. Members of the Board shall be appointed for a period of 4 years, their terms to run concurrently. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman. The power of removal for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office shall be vested in the President. Any vacancy occurring during a 4-year term may be filled in the same manner as an original appointment, but only for the unexpired term thereof.

*Salaries, employees, etc.*

SEC. 1004. Members of the Board shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per day. The Board is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of a director, and such other technical, legal, and other clerical employees or consultants on a salary, retainer or per diem basis as it may deem necessary: *Provided, however,* That the annual compensation of anyone so employed shall not exceed $17,500 and the per diem allowance shall not exceed $75 per day: *And provided further,* That wherever possible, in the judgment of the Board, employees of the Board shall be part of the classified civil service, and shall enter the service under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Board and by the Civil Service Commission. Members of the Board and employees thereof shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling and other expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

*Powers and duties of the Board*

SEC. 1005. The Board shall have power and authority, within the limits of the funds herein made available to it, to coordinate and expedite activities toward research, pilot-plant development, trial commercialization and industrial uses with Federal and State Governments, educational institutions, private research organizations, trade associations, individuals and industrial corporations in expanding the industrial utilization of the products of farm and forest and the development of new crops. In the discharge of these duties the Board is empowered to:

(a) Make use of the facilities of the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce and other Federal departments and agencies, land-grant institutions, and experiment stations;

(b) Contract with State government agencies, State and other universities and colleges, nonprofit or profitmaking research organizations, and private corporations, including agreements to share costs;

(c) Contract with foreign individuals, organizations, institutions of learning, or private corporations where payment can be made in foreign currency accumulated under Public Law No. 480, 83d Congress, 2d session. The Board is hereby authorized to utilize such foreign currencies: *Provided, however,* That the authority to enter into such contracts shall be exercised only with the approval of the Secretary of State, to the end that such authority shall be exercised in such manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States;

(d) Provide research grants, student fellowships, scholarships, and similar aids, where deemed appropriate by the Board: *Provided,* That any such funds shall be so allocated as to strengthen graduate training in each of the four major agricultural regions;

(e) Enter into appropriate contracts for development of research results into trial commercial scale operations;

(f) Extend suitable incentives to farmers or to industry to hasten the establishment of a new crop or of a new industrial use, where such appear likely to lead to durable additional markets;

(g) Grant agricultural development certificates for the amortization of new facilities, for tax purposes, on the basis of 60 months from the date of completion of a facility in such cases as the Board deems advisable and necessary for the discharge of its duties, particularly with regard to equipment and facilities for harvesting, storing, and processing of new crops and with regard to research, development, and trial commercialization facilities for industrial utilization of the products of farm and forest. Such agricultural development certificates of rapid amortization may be issued at any time during the existence of the Board and shall otherwise be governed by the provisions of law governing emergency facilities contained in section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the provisions of law governing the amortization of grain-storage facilities contained in section 169 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

(h) Direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to make delivery of any of its stocks of commodities to agencies of the Government, persons, or corporations designated by the Board where such stocks are to be used for (A) research, (B) pilot-plant operation, (C) trial commercialization, (D) export of manufactured products, or (E) new or by-product uses. The Commodity Credit Corporation, with respect to commodities thus requisitioned by the Board, shall pay necessary handling and delivery charges to the destination directed by the Board. Such sums of money as the Board shall receive, if any, on such transfers of commodities, shall be turned over to the Commodity Credit Corporation;

(i) Take title to any property acquired by transfer from another Government agency pursuant to this act or other legislative authority, or otherwise, and to make contracts or leases for the private operation of any such properties or facilities;

(j) Publicize and make available from time to time information as to the Board's activities, any discoveries through research, and applications thereof, new crops, and the development of commercial uses of the products of farm and forest;

(k) Provide in all contracts for the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the Board to enter into any contractual or other arrangement incon-

sistent with any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents;

(l) Establish appropriate advisory committees to assist in effectuating specific research programs and to compensate members thereof on a per diem basis in addition to allowing traveling and subsistence expenses;

(m) Prescribe such rules and regulations as the Board deems necessary governing operations under this act.

*Limitation upon Board powers*

SEC. 1006. The Board shall not directly conduct research, operate plants or processes or otherwise engage in business but shall use primarily the facilities of the Agricultural Research Service.

*Transfer of Government plants*

SEC. 1007. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the General Services Administration is authorized and directed to transfer to the Board the Government-owned alcohol-producing facility at Omaha, Nebr., known as Plancor No. 1608, for use in the program authorized by this act.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Facilities Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer to the Board the alcohol-butadiene plant at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor No. 1207, for use in the program authorized by this act.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Government agency holding any Government-owned facility useful in the program authorized by this act is authorized to transfer such facility to the Board, for use in the program, if requested to do so by the Board, provided such transfer has the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(d) The Board is authorized to exercise, with respect to the facilities transferred under this section, all the authority vested in the agencies which so transferred such facilities. At the time of such transfer, funds and personnel related to the operation or administration of such facilities shall, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, also be transferred to the Board.

*Appropriations*

SEC. 1008. There is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, an amount equal to 15 percent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. Such funds shall be available to the Board to provide for its operation and the expenditures and incentives herein authorized. The sums appropriated herein shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this section until expended; but any excess of the amount remaining unexpended at the end of any fiscal year over $150 million shall, in the same manner as though it had been appropriated for the Board for such fiscal year, be subject to the provisions of section 3690 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 712) and section 5 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes."

*Annual report*

SEC. 1009. The Board shall make an annual report to the Congress as soon as practicable after the 1st day of January in each year.

*Disposition of President's Commission files*

SEC. 1010. All files and records of the bipartisan Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, created by section 209 of Public Law No. 540, 84th Congress, shall, upon the termination of its activities be turned over to the Board.

TITLE XI—NATIONAL FARM INCOME STABILIZATION BOARD AND FARMER COMMITTEES

SEC. 1101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby redesignated as the National Farm Income Stabilization Corporation, and Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be known as the National Farm Income Stabilization Board. Wherever the words "Commodity Credit Corporation" or "Commodity Credit Corporation Board of Directors" appears in any law, the words are hereby amended to read "National Farm Income Stabilization Corporation" and "National Farm Income Stabilization Board," respectively.

SEC. 1102. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the National Farm Income Stabilization Board shall be composed of 6 officials of the United States Department of Agriculture appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and 5 members elected from their own number by the farmer-elected members of the State farmer committees provided in subsection 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Acreage Allotment Act as amended.

SEC. 1103. Section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the 4th to the 17th sentences, inclusive, thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In carrying out in the continental United States the provisions of this section, the crop-insurance program, acre-allotment and farm-marketing-quota programs, and all other acreage-allotment and farm-marketing-quota programs, and all other farm programs dealing in individual farms, and all farm programs established by the Agricultural Act of 1958 except those specifically assigned to the National Dairy Advisory Committee under title I of this act, the Secretary is directed to utilize the services of the National Farm Income Stabilization Board and of local, county, and State farmer committees selected as follows:

"(1) Local committees. The Secretary shall designate local administrative areas as units for administration of the programs described above. No such local area shall include more than the geographic area served by a common farm trading center. Farmers within such local area shall elect annually by secret ballot from among their number a local committee of three members for such area, together with first and second alternate members who shall serve in that order in the absence of committee members. Election of local committee members and alternates for any year shall be conducted by the local committee serving at the time of such election. Public notice of such election shall be given by such local committee at least 2 weeks prior to the date of such election. Candidates for election shall be selected only by a nomination from the floor. The local committee shall elect from its members a chairman and a vice chairman. The local committee shall select a secretary.

"(2) County Committees: The county committee shall consist of three members. There shall also be first and second alternate members who shall serve in that order in the absence of committee members. The chairman of the local committees (or vice chairman in the absence of chairman) shall, in a county nominating convention nominate annually one or more farmers within the county for each position on the county committee and for each position of alternate members of the county committee. The nominating convention shall be called by the county committee then serving, which shall give the chairman of each local committee at least 2 weeks' notice of the date of such convention. The county committee then serving shall, immediately following such convention; give public notice of the names of the persons nominated at such convention and of the time and place fixed for the election, which shall be held not earlier than 15 days following such notice. Such election shall be by secret ballot and shall be conducted by such committee either by mail or at one or more public polling places. Each farmer in the county shall be entitled to vote at such election, and may vote for up to five of any of the nominees named by the nominating convention or of any other candidates if he desires by writing in and voting for their names. The votes shall be counted by the county committee conducting the election. Unless such count is made in the presence of a representative of the State committee, the ballots shall be preserved for such period as the Secretary, by regulation, may prescribe. The committee conducting the election shall certify the results of the election to the State committee. The three candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected as committee members; the candidate receiving the next highest number of votes shall be declared elected as first alternate; the candidate receiving the next highest number of votes shall be declared elected as second alternate. The county committee shall elect from its members a chairman and a vice chairman. The county committee shall select a secretary. In any county in which there is only one local committee the local committee shall also be the county committee.

"(3) Provisions Applicable to Local and County Committees: Special elections for the purpose of filling vacancies not filled by alternate members, occurring at least 60 days prior to the time for holding annual election, in the membership of a local or county committee shall be held as expeditiously as possible, and shall be held in the same manner and subject to the same restrictions as annual elections, except that only 5 days' notice of the nominating convention shall be required. The State committee may, if it deems necessary, appoint temporary committee members to serve pending any such special election, or to fill vacancies occurring less than 60 days prior to an annual election. County and local committees authorized by this section shall be administratively responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture, through the National Farm Income Stabilization Board, for the conduct of farm programs assigned to them. Any work of a county or local committee may, at the discretion of such committee, be performed by members of such committee, or may be performed under the supervision of the committee by persons employed by the committee, except that, if the State committee with the approval of the majority of the county committees in the State so prescribes, responsibility for day-to-day operations and employment and supervision of field and office personnel shall be delegated to a county office manager employed by and responsible to the county committee.

"(4) State committees: In each State there shall be a State committee for the State composed of five farmers who are legal residents of the State and who have had previous service on county or local committees established under this section. Three members shall be elected from their own number by the members of the county committees at an election to be held on a date or within a period of time fixed by the Secretary which will afford full opportunity for participation therein by all county committee members: *Provided*, That such date or period of time shall fall between July 1, and December 31 each year. Such elected members shall take office on the first day of the month next after his election and shall serve for 12 months or until a successor has been elected and qualified. Such elected members shall be subject to removal by the Secretary only for cause. The other two members of such committee shall be appointed by, and serve

at the pleasure of, the Secretary, one of whom shall be designated as chairman.

"(5) Removal of local and county committee members: The State committee may remove a local or county committee member from office, but only by majority vote after furnishing such member with a statement of the charges against him, advising him of his rights, and giving him an opportunity for a fair hearing at which a representative of the Secretary shall be present. The State committee shall cause a transcript of the proceedings at any such hearing to be made and a copy thereof to be furnished to such member. Pending such hearing, the State committee may by majority vote suspend such member, but no such suspension shall exceed 30 days unless such hearing is delayed at the request of such member. Such member may appeal from the decision of the State committee to the Deputy Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service, or such other officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture as the Secretary may designate. All pertinent and material evidence may be presented at such appeal.

"(6) Regulations: The Secretary shall make such regulations as are necessary relating to the selection and exercise of the functions of the respective committees, and to the administration through the committees, of such programs."

SEC. 804. Section 503 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after the word "county" the words "or local."

The statement presented by Mr. PROXMIRE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE

This bill would promptly restore farmers' returns to the full parity levels that prevailed in 1952. It provides for a commodity-by-commodity approach to the problems of all agricultural producers.

The farm income protection programs provided for in this bill can be carried out on a substantially self-financing basis. There will be little or no need for subsidies to farmers.

It would establish a National Farm Income Stabilization Board, including a strong representation of actual farmers, which would exercise broad powers in the administration of all farm programs. It would create the most thoroughly and genuinely farmer-run farm programs in history.

This bill would use the method of farm income deficiency payments made directly to farmers, with a ceiling on payments set to fit the independent family-sized farm, in order to give direct and effective protection to family farm operators. These payments would be financed in essentially the same manner as under the program for wool producers established in 1954, through an allocation of customs receipts and a tax on processors of farm commodities.

It includes provisions for greatly expanding the consumption of farm commodities in domestic and foreign markets and for industrial uses. It provides for extending the school-lunch and school-milk programs to all schoolchildren in the United States, a food-stamp plan for low-income families, and better diets for persons in welfare institutions, Veterans' Administration facilities, and the Armed Forces. It also provides for using farm commodities to help finance foreign military and economic aid programs, and for aggressive research to develop new industrial uses for farm products.

This bill would discard the present parity-price formula, and substitute a more realistic parity of income standard which will measure returns to farmers according to the incomes received by nonfarm people.

To achieve the objective of improved returns to farmers without requiring enormous subsidies to farmers, this bill combines two mutually reinforcing principles:

1. It provides for methods whereby farm programs can be substantially self-financing; and

2. It authorizes farmers to establish and administer effective programs for adjusting their marketings in accordance with the law of supply and demand, essentially in the same way that other major industries do.

In my opinion, there is no realistic and feasible way to achieve fair incomes for farm people other than by utilizing these basic principles.

These principles, applied by both public and private means, are commonly practiced throughout the major part of our economy.

This bill would provide for a variety of adjustment programs, tailored to fit the special needs of the various farm commodities.

Producers of commodities suffering from severe price difficulties would be authorized to apply marketing quotas to adjust their sales to the volume that is needed and wanted by the economy. Milk and other single-commodity marketing quotas could be applied only with the approval of the farmers themselves, voting in a referendum of all producers of the commodity.

Provisions in the present farm laws for marketing agreements and marketing orders would be made available to producers of an increased number of farm commodities. Livestock producers could utilize a self-financing plan of incentive payments for marketing at lighter, more desirable weights.

A voluntary marketing adjustment and conservation acreage reserve program would be provided for helping to balance overall agricultural supplies with demand, to supplement and to reinforce the various single-commodity programs established by the producers.

Most of these programs would be entirely voluntary. Others, depending upon the market characteristics of the commodity, would utilize the same control provisions as are provided in present farm laws. Producers of any commodity, if they prefer, could retain the program provided for their commodity under present laws.

Because of the uniquely vital importance of food supplies to the Nation, I have provided for ironclad protection of the interests of consumers in this bill.

It would provide for fully adequate national safety and security reserves of storable farm commodities.

It would prohibit the use of farm programs to raise the incomes of farmers any higher than the average income of nonfarm people.

It would also prohibit the use of farm programs to reduce farm production below a point that will be fully adequate to meet all of the Nation's needs for adequate diets and reserves. It would provide for the automatic operation of farm income deficiency payments to act along with other economic stabilizers such as unemployment insurance, in order to subsidize the full consumption of food throughout the economy whenever unemployment exceeds 3 percent of the labor force.

The provisions of my farm bill have been worked out after consultation with representatives of many farm organizations and careful study of their proposals. I have tried to combine the best features of all, to achieve the kind of farm program that farmers themselves want, with strong protections for the interests of taxpayers, consumers, and the national economy.

This bill incorporates the pledges that I made to the voters of Wisconsin in my campaign last summer. I consider that my special election victory, in which I received 70 percent of the votes of Wisconsin farmers, constitutes both a mandate and an obligation to sponsor and to fight for the kind of self-financing, farmer-run, full-parity farm program that this bill provides.

Together with other Senators of both parties, I am cosponsoring and supporting emergency Congressional action to prevent the disastrous cut in dairy farmers' incomes that the Secretary of Agriculture has ordered to take effect next April 1. But this can be regarded as nothing but a short-term stopgap.

Farmers must have a program that will give them true prosperity along with the rest of the economy. Taxpayers must be spared from the enormous waste and exorbitant costs of the present farm programs.

## AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to promote scientific education by amending the Vocational Education Act of 1946. I should like to call attention to the fact that this measure is not a hasty move, pulled together in a panic over Sputniks I and II.

It is the same bill which was introduced by Senator KERR, for himself, Senator MCNAMARA, and myself, in the 84th Congress, in an attempt to help head off the shortcomings in the field of scientific education before they became so acute. The bill was sent to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for a recommendation, which was never forthcoming. In support of more serious consideration of this bill by this Congress, and to emphasize the fact that it is 2 years or more overdue, I want to quote from my own testimony on its behalf before the Senate Appropriations Committee in 1956, as follows:

The vocational education program has produced such astounding results since its initiation that I am convinced that a program along similar lines to promote scientific education would be equally effective.

All of you are familiar with the repeated warnings that this country is being outstripped in the scientific manpower race. Industry alone has 50,000 jobs going begging. You have seen the full-page and half-page newspaper ads for technical and scientific jobs. Every year recruiting teams for United States industry raid campuses, put budding engineers under contract, pay their expenses until graduation, even put them on the payroll, and promise them everything but the hand of the boss's daughter in marriage, in order to be assured of their services.

The reason we do not have enough young scientists graduating from college is simply because we do not have enough entering. In order to increase this number we must turn to the source of every kind of talent we need—the secondary schools.

Not enough of our secondary schools can provide the facilities essential to encourage students and prepare them for further scientific training in order to supply our scientific manpower needs. I believe that we can and should establish a program to further scientific education along the same lines as our vocational agriculture, home economics, trades and industry, and distributive occupations programs. This could be done within the framework of the existing law, and to that end Senators KERR and MCNAMARA and

I have introduced a bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to set aside $10 million annually for education in the various fields of science, including mathematics. I think it deserves the most serious consideration of Congress, and I sincerely hope it will be adopted. It will constitute real progress in our race for 20th century technical supremacy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2956) to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 in order to promote scientific education, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MCNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

---

## UNITED STATES SCIENCE ACADEMY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which proposes to establish a United States Science Academy which embraces a Library of Science.

The purpose of this bill is twofold. First, it would be a step toward furnishing the United States with a sufficient number of scientists to meet the increasing demands of research and technological developments. Second, it would create a central filing point and clearinghouse of scientific data, including foreign publications.

My bill would place the science academy under the Department of Defense because of the vital role the academy would play in our national defense and security programs, and because an academy of science for purposes of defense under the Defense Department would be constitutional while there is doubt as to the constitutionality of other proposals for the Federal Government to enter the field of education. The proposed science academy would differ from the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies in the following respects:

First. It would have facilities to permit graduate study up to the doctorate and postdoctorate levels.

Second. It would have authority to engage in basic research.

Third. It would have a vast library where scientific data could be translated, coordinated, and made available for scientific research and study.

Fourth. Selection of students would be based solely on merit without Congressional recommendations or appointments.

My proposal would require the students entering the academy to commit themselves to undertake a period of scientific service as designated by the Department of Defense similar to the postgraduate service now required by the service academies.

The science academy, in my opinion, would be better designed to meet the need for additional scientific education than the various scholarship proposals, for the reason that the existing facilities for scientific education are now operating at maximum capacity with no dearth of students, and my scientific-academy proposal meets the need for additional facilities, as well as increased incentive for exceptionally able students. As previously stated, a science academy established for the purpose of providing for the national defense is a constitutional means of meeting a recognized need in this field while there is considerable doubt as to the constitutionality of other proposals for the Federal Government to enter into educational activities.

In planning this proposal, I have obtained a study from the Library of Congress on the constitutionality of a science academy. I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the study printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PROPOSED SCIENCE DEPARTMENT AND ACADEMY

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
*Washington, D. C., November 19, 1957.*

To: Hon. STROM THURMOND.
(Attention: Mr. Dent.)
From: American Law Division.
Subject: Constitutionality of proposed Science Department and Academy.

This is in response to your question as to the constitutionality of a proposed National Academy of Science under a Department of Science.

A definite answer is not possible except in terms of particulars. The constitutionality of such a step could depend on the method adopted. Nevertheless, though many more methods can be imagined than would be profitable to discuss, it is hoped that the following comments will shed light on the main features of the problem.

1. The express powers of Congress are enumerated in Article I, section 8, of the United States Constitution. In addition, Congress is considered to derive certain "implied" powers from the final ("necessary and proper") clause of the same section. Under the doctrine of enumerated powers, the courts have repeatedly said that Congress can exercise only such powers as the Constitution grants it. (E. g., *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (17 U. S. 316, 405 (1819)).)

In the course of time, however, this doctrine has been supplemented by the view that certain Federal powers are neither set forth by the Constitution nor delegated by the States.

"The broad statement that the Federal Government can exercise no powers except those specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and such implied powers as are necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, is categorically true only in respect of our internal affairs. In that field, the primary purpose of the Constitution was to carve from the general mass of legislative powers then possessed by the States such portions as it was thought desirable to vest in the Federal Government, leaving those not included in the enumeration still in the States. * * * That this doctrine applies only to powers which the States had, is self-evident. And since the States severally never possessed international powers, such powers could not have been carved from the mass of State powers but obviously were transmitted to the United States from some other source. * * * A political society cannot endure without a supreme will somewhere. Sovereignty is never held in suspense. When, therefore, the external sovereignty of Great Britain in respect of the Colonies ceased, it immediately passed to the Union. * * * It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality." (*U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation* (299 U. S. 304, 315, 316–317, 318 (1936)).)

2. Science is mentioned only once, in the grants of legislative power, and then with respect to copyrights and patents. There is, thus, no general grant of power for the advancement of science.

3. It might be supposed that the taxing-spending power is broad enough to authorize a Science Academy and a Department of Science. The first clause of article I, section 8, provides:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

It is considered, however, that this clause creates the power to tax, and nothing more. Paying the debts and providing for the common defense and general welfare are merely the purposes for which the taxing power may be exercised; they are not substantive powers in themselves. (See President Monroe's Message to Congress of May 4, 1822, in Messages of the Presidents, vol. 2, pp. 162–164. Jefferson's Correspondence, vol. 4, pp. 524, 525.)

4. The most plausible basis for a Science Academy and a Department of Science is the war powers of Congress, supplemented by the "necessary and proper" clause. By "war powers" is meant a group of granted powers and stipulated purposes, especially the following:

(a) Preamble: "provide for the common defense."

(b) Article I, section 8: "provide for the common defense," "To declare war," "To raise and support armies," "To provide and maintain a Navy."

The invocation of these express powers of Congress might be strengthened by pointing to the "inherent" international powers of the National Government.

5. Conclusions: (a) It is considered too obvious for discussion that Congress could authorize a National Science Academy established and functioning in roughly the same way as the academies now maintained by the Armed Forces.

(b) There is substantial doubt whether Congress could, without a constitutional amendment, establish either a Department of Science or a National Science Academy which bore no reasonably close relation to the Defense Establishment. As the foregoing discussion has indicated, such actions do not appear to be authorized by any of the constitutional grants of legislative powers, with the possible exception of the war powers provisions in connection with the "necessary and proper" clause.

(c) The constitutionality of a proposed National Science Academy would evidently depend on the particulars of its organization and operation, and especially on its relation to the Defense Establishment.

For purposes of illustration, a supporting argument might run as follows:

(i) Congress has power to provide for the national defense.

(ii) Research and development (of certain kinds) are necessary to the national defense.

(iii) Scientific education (of certain kinds) is necessary to such research and development.

(iv) A National Science Academy is necessary to such education.

A similar argument could readily be constructed in support of a Science Department.

The weak link in these arguments is the relation of a Science Department or Academy to the national defense, in the context of the "necessary and proper" clause. The Supreme Court has said that "necessary

and proper" measures "include all appropriate means which are conducive or adapted to the end to be accomplished, and which in the judgment of Congress will most advantageously effect it." (*Legal Tender Case* (110 U. S. 421, 440 (1884)).)

Even on such a liberal interpretation, however, it may be thought that the relation of a Science Department or Academy to the national defense is too remote or attenuated to be "necessary and proper."

SPENCER M. BERESFORD.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee, where I hope it will receive early and serious consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2957) to advance the national security and welfare and to promote the progress of science by the establishment of a United States Science Academy, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953, RELATING TO LOANS TO CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to extend the disaster loan program of the Small Business Administration. Under its provisions, areas or counties which have been affected by excessive rainfall, heavy insect infestations, and other natural disasters would become eligible for these loans. These business loans would be an additional remedy, supplementing the disaster relief available under the disaster loan and commodity programs of the Department of Agriculture. If adopted, it would permit the Small Business Administration to make loans to private business enterprises showing substantial economic injury resulting from adverse agricultural conditions.

During the past year, a great part of the entire Southeast has suffered a serious crop failure. Department of Agriculture cotton production estimates for Texas, Oklahoma, and all States east have been revised downward 1,645,000 bales or over 16 percent since September 1, 1957. During this same period, the cotton loss for Mississippi alone has amounted to over 390,000 bales or roughly one-fourth of this total reduction. Reports coming from some Mississippi counties indicate that the cotton crop has been reduced by as much as 50 percent and that boll rot, insect damage, and grade deterioration have greatly reduced market value of the remaining half. Soy beans, corn, and other crops have also suffered greatly in the unfavorable weather conditions.

The Secretary of Agriculture has already declared 387 counties in the Cotton Belt alone as disaster areas and has authorized emergency loans to assist farmers in financing the 1958 crop. In Mississippi, 60 counties have been declared eligible for disaster loans. These loans would give some assistance to farmers, but the Farmers Home Administration loans cannot be used to pay existing debts.

The 1957 agricultural income loss has had serious impacts on our farmers, processors, merchants, bankers, and the local economy in general. Many farmers have had a complete crop failure and therefore are not in a position to pay existing debts. As a result, this collapse has placed the local processors and other businessmen who supply farmers in a most critical position. These local businessmen face the same credit problem that confronts the farmer. Local credit is already largely extended.

In agricultural areas we have many merchants whose main customers are farmers, tenants, and others who depend on the crops for their livelihoods. Collections during the past crop year were low, and unless these merchants receive help through the disaster-loan program many of them will be forced to close down. This is a most critical situation, and the need for extending the disaster-loan program to small businesses who furnish farmers and cannot obtain the necessary credit from local lending agencies cannot be overemphasized.

The Small Business Act authorizes disaster loans to small businesses who can show substantial evidence of economic injury resulting from drought conditions. The act also authorizes general disaster loans to business concerns who have suffered tangible property loss as a result of floods or other catastrophes. However, the act does not authorize disaster loans to areas seriously affected by heavy rainfall and other natural causes. Excessive rainfall results in the same economic injury as drought conditions, and a provision should be included in the act to cover this serious problem. Other natural disasters should be anticipated and included in an amendment of this act.

The amendment which I now offer extends the disaster loans to small businesses who can show substantial economic injury resulting from excessive rainfall, heavy insect infestations, and other natural causes in areas which the President of the United States or the Secretary of Agriculture has declared major disaster areas. These conditions are identical with the requirements for FHA disaster loans.

These Small Business Administration disaster loans will be used solely to provide relief for injury directly attributed to these conditions. Loans may be used to provide ordinary working capital to replenish normal inventory and to pay financial obligations which the borrower would have been able to meet had it not been for the loss of revenue resulting from these adverse conditions. Interest on these loans would be 3 percent and the term of the loan, based on borrowers' ability to pay, cannot exceed 20 years. Local banks would be eligible to participate in this loan program or the Small Business Administration could make direct loans.

Mr. President, the need for credit in agricultural areas and especially in my State is critical, and I hope that this bill will receive immediate attention and support in the Senate.

I send the bill to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2959) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, so as to permit the making of loans to small business concerns which have suffered substantial economic injury because of certain disasters, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 207 (b) (1) of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended (15 U. S. C. 636), is amended to read as follows:

"(1) to make loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) as the Administration may determine to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophes, including necessary or appropriate loans to any small business concern located in an area affected by any such flood or other catastrophe if the Administration determines that the small business concern has suffered a substantial economic injury as a result of such flood or other catastrophe, and the President has determined under the act entitled 'An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes,' approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C., secs. 1855-1855g), that such flood or other catastrophe is a major disaster, or the Secretary of Agriculture has found under the act entitled 'An act to abolish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, and transfer its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make disaster loans, and for other purposes,' approved April 6, 1949, as amended (12 U. S. C., secs. 1148a-1—1148a-3), that such flood or other catastrophe constitutes a production or economic disaster in such area: *Provided*, That no such loan including renewals and extensions thereof may be made for a period or periods exceeding 20 years: *And provided further*, That the interest rate on the Administration's share of loans made under this paragraph shall not exceed 3 percent per annum."

## AMENDMENT OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT ACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act in order to limit the interest rate applicable to the power units of the reclamation storage projects authorized by this act. The need for such a limit was covered by a speech I made to the National Reclamation Association at Phoenix last November.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2961) to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act in order to limit the interest rate applicable to each unit of a storage project and each participating project constructed pursuant to such act, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO INABILITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO PERFORM HIS DUTIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce two joint resolutions for appropriate reference. The resolutions propose an amendment to the Constitution, on a different kind of basis, the first to authorize Congress to determine the inability of the President of the United States to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Another joint resolution would establish a committee to determine the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

I wish to announce that some time in the latter part of this month the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on these joint resolutions and on a number of other resolutions and proposals which are pending before that subcommittee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make provision for the Congress to determine the inability of the President of the United States to discharge the powers and duties of his office; and

S. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to establish a committee to determine the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

## CONSTRUCTION OF PLANT FOR PRODUCTION FROM SEA OR OTHER SALINE WATERS, WATER SUITABLE FOR BENEFICIAL CONSUMPTIVE USES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, our civilization is increasingly dependent upon an ample supply of fresh water. One of our large industrial firms has made a study of our use of fresh water in this country, and has come up with the rather astonishing estimate that more than 1,000 gallons of fresh water are required daily for every man, woman, and child in the United States. This figure is rising every day, just as our population rises.

Obviously, each of us does not drink that much water every day. We consume only about 40 gallons of drinking water per day per person, according to official Government studies; and we do not actually drink all of that.

The remainder of our huge daily consumption of fresh water goes into the making of steel and other industrial products, into the food and textile industries, into the chemical industry, and into the production of the food we eat.

Fortunately the United States was blessed by nature with a large supply of clean fresh water. The immense industrial and agricultural wealth of the country has been a direct result of our fortunate water supply.

But even such a continent as North America does not have uniform water distribution. There are desert areas and areas which, although water is plentiful, are blighted by the fact that the water is brackish or otherwise unfit for drinking or for irrigation. So the demand for water in these areas is never met; use does not increase, because men and industries have located elsewhere.

For centuries men have sought ways to convert the unlimited waters of the seas into fresh water. The Dead Sea is an example of unusable water in an arid land. In our own country we have similar areas where salt and other minerals make water unusable.

Ways have been devised to de-salt sea water and to remove objectionable elements from brackish water, but almost without exception they have been too expensive for use on anything but a very limited scale.

Recognizing that the United States is rapidly outgrowing its water supply—despite conscientious efforts to store and use all available natural supplies—the Congress voted in 1952 to set up funds for a special study. This study has been conducted by the Office of Saline Water Research, in the Department of the Interior. In the ensuing years, several methods have been examined for converting sea water and other water to beneficial use. Some of these methods have shown promise; others have not. Meanwhile the need for fresh water has not diminished.

Until the past few months, a number of our southwestern cities were in acute need of water. Dallas, for example, was almost desperate for any new source of water with which to keep up pressure in its water mains and thus protect against disastrous fires. Nature has since relieved the emergency. However, the next drought period will find the water shortage returning with perhaps even greater severity.

Also to be considered is the growing awareness today that the United States is in a technological battle for its very life. We cannot continue to assume that we shall have adequate manpower and materials to be diverted to a search for water when we are, at last, confronted with an overwhelming need. The time is at hand for us to utilize the study efforts of this program. It is true that we have not yet perfected a sure-fire process, or one which will produce water at a budget price. Likewise, we have not tested our best processes in any large way, regardless of cost. We have, however, managed to spend rather considerable sums.

Mr. President, I believe that we now must do in the saline water research program what we did in the atomic energy program, namely, we must select 3 or 4 of our most promising processes, as they stand today, and then build from them at least one large-scale demonstration plant. At the going cost rate of $10 million, such a plant will be relatively cheap to build, and may possibly be the best investment we ever made.

Another factor, from my viewpoint, is the decided attractiveness of this program to nations in the Middle East. A contribution to the water supply in that part of the world might be of vastly greater long-range importance than the arming of the various nations with atomic weapons. The Middle East is a place where demonstration plants might be set up, although I do not minimize the need in this country. Let me state what happened when Egypt seized the Suez Canal. An American-made portable ionic-membrane saline water conversion plant was captured by Egyptian authorities in Cairo, where it had been unloaded for trans-shipment to another Middle East nation. Egyptian technicians quickly recognied the value of such a plant to the Egyptian Army. Inquiries which were made led to contacts by the Egyptian Government with the manufacturer of the plant—Ionics, Inc., of Boston. Egypt offered to pay for the plant, although it might have kept it without paying. After brief negotiations, Egypt paid for the plant, and ordered a second one. It is now on its way.

I cite this incident to illustrate my point that wars can be laid aside, policies neutralized, and bargains made when water is at stake. With this program, we could bring water to the Middle East. We could rebuild some of our sagging esteem in that part of the world; we could insure that in this area at least we would have our sputniks abreast the Russians', and we could do our own economy a priceless good turn.

This is no idle possibility. Great strides are being made in saline-water conversion by the Governments of the Netherlands and South Africa. In view of the interest and competency of the Soviet Union, we must assume that the Russians are working on this problem, too.

So, I say, Mr. President, that the saline-water-research program needs a boost. It needs an opportunity to prove itself. For that reason, I am introducing a joint resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of a full-scale demonstration plant for the production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328), as amended, and in accordance with this joint resolution, provide for the construction of a full-scale demonstration plant for the production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive

uses, through the utilization of the ionic-membrane process, or one of the three most promising saline-water conversion processes currently under study in the Department of the Interior. A decision with respect to the process to be utilized in such plant shall be made by the Secretary within 6 months after the date of approval of this joint resolution, and the construction of such plant shall proceed as rapidly thereafter as is practicable.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $10 million, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

## FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958—AMENDMENT

Mr. THYE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the first supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THYE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1789) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 (title II of Public Law 163, 83d Cong.), as amended, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address by Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury, at the dedication of the Sam Rayburn Memorial Library in Bonham, Tex.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Transcript of Meet the Press program participated in by him on January 5, 1958.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

Address, World Affairs, delivered by him before the Western Grain and Feed Association, in Des Moines, Iowa, on November 25, 1957.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Address entitled "We Must Catch Up," delivered by him before Washington Bankers Association, Spokane, Wash., October 10, 1957.

Statement by him, dated January 6, 1958, on Polaris atomic submarine program.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Article entitled "Meet Senator TALMADGE," written by Harold L. Varney, and published in the American Mercury magazine for February 1958.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. NEUBERGER):

Editorial entitled "Timely Credit Action," published in the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian of November 16, 1957.

Editorial entitled "Families Wrecked by Alcoholism," published in a recent edition of the Catholic Sentinel.

News article concerning Portland Area Council of Boy Scouts and G. H. Oberteuffer in the Portland Sunday Journal of December 29, 1957.

## MAINTENANCE OF COMPETITIVE CAPITALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on December 11, 1957, it was my pleasure to address the Merchant Club of Baltimore, Md.

My remarks were directed at the problem of maintaining competitive capitalism in the United States. We depend on American industry today to provide the materiel for our national defense. We must also convince the underdeveloped nations that our society based on competitive capitalism is the desirable model for their own economic advancement.

With this end in view, I discussed some of the problems which confront the Senate in connection with the problem of strengthening and improving the operation of our antitrust statutes during the current session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my address to the Merchant Club of Baltimore be incorporated in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE—SPEECH BY SENATOR JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, WEDNESDAY CLUB, MERCHANT CLUB, BALTIMORE, MD., DECEMBER 11, 1957

It is indeed a pleasure to meet with this distinguished gathering of Baltimore's business and professional leaders.

Russia's success in launching missiles into outer space requires a reappraisal of many of our national policies. However, this does not call for hysteria. The time has come when we must recognize the fundamental strengths inherent in the American way of life and use them to our utmost potential.

We are in a contest of ideologies. We believe that man can advance his material well-being without sacrificing his freedom. We believe in the God-given right of individuals to develop their capacities as free men. Our adversaries believe that man exists for the state. Nikita Khrushchev boasted that our grandchildren would live under socialism. It is our task not only to insure the survival of our Nation in a physical sense, but also to preserve a free society. Thereby we will guarantee that Khrushchev's statement will never become a reality.

The strengthening of our defenses places responsibilities on both Government and private enterprise. The executive branch is constantly evaluating the capabilities and intentions of our adversaries, our allies, and the uncommitted nations. From these assessments, programs are developed to produce offensive and defensive forces which will deter aggression and enhance the peace of the world. The Congress reviews the plans prepared by the Executive, makes modifications, authorizes their execution, and then appropriates the necessary funds. We look toward private enterprise to undertake fundamental research, to develop weapons, and to produce them.

May I remind you that our industrial strength lies not only in the facilities to produce planes, ships, rockets, tanks, and guns, but also in the industries producing chemicals, petroleum, steel, aluminum, magnesium, and other nonferrous metals, as well as the transportation and communication facilities to tie our economy together.

In World War II the Manhattan district was charged with the development of the atomic bomb. Some believe that this Government group was solely responsible for its production. Nothing could be further from the truth. Government officials made the decision to embark on this project, and they coordinated its progress. However, private enterprise built the Oak Ridge diffusion plant and the Hanford plutonium plant. These were the critical elements in making atomic energy a potent force.

Industry through its support of research activities for peaceful purposes already had teams of trained scientists and engineers. Their numbers were expanded by drawing on our technical schools and universities to do this job. It is obvious that large firms supporting great technical centers are a vital national asset today.

Private enterprise must play an additional role in maintaining our defenses. We require a sound and ever-expanding economy if we are to preserve fiscal stability and avoid budgetary deficits while undertaking the added military burdens we must now assume. Our economy also generates the tax revenues necessary to finance Government programs. Profits provide the incentive and impetus for expansion.

The peace of the world requires the economic development of underdeveloped countries. Not too many years ago the United States was an underdeveloped country. We achieved our present industrial strength through competitive capitalism and not through any form of socialism. Hence, when we encourage other nations to create an investment climate conducive to the flow of private American capital to their economies, we are contributing to the peace and economic advancement of the rest of the world. Such investment carries with it the "know-how" and the personnel to operate what I believe is the most effective technical assistance program.

I am sure we all recognize that our private enterprise system has these three great responsibilities: the development and production of materiel for the armed services, the financing through taxes of Government programs, and the primary responsibility for foreign investment. Any activity which tends to undermine the confidence our people place in a dynamic and expanding capitalism is a great disservice to humanity.

For many months I have been disturbed that some of our Congressional committees have approached our economic problems in a manner designed to gain temporary political advantage. There have been recurrent attacks on bigness, which some politicians have attempted to make synonymous with monopoly. In more peaceful times, perhaps we could afford these political luxuries. Today the masters of the Kremlin read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the hearings of Congressional committees. Exaggerated statements disparaging our business leaders and our system of competitive enterprise are played back by our adversaries in debates before the United Nations. The Soviets use them to discourage the new countries of Asia and Africa from welcoming private American capital. They believe if they can deter or ridicule American investment, these countries will not progress and may turn toward Russia for help.

I am a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Our committee has a Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which I am not a member. However, I have certain responsibilities not only as a Senator but as a member of the full committee for the activities of our subcommittees. I have studied its hearings throughout the past year with great concern. They illustrate practices we must discontinue if we are to preserve national unity and respect for our institutions abroad. Let me review them briefly.

Following the closing of the Suez Canal last winter, the Federal Government and

our oil companies made every effort through a gigantic oil lift to maintain the economy of Western Europe. During this period this subcommittee indulged in a series of hearings which placed these companies and our Government officials in the worst possible light. The Congress was then debating the Mid-East resolution to grant President Eisenhower authority to use United States troops to preserve peace in this area and to grant additional economic assistance. Yet this subcommittee was undermining the position of American oil companies operating in the Middle East by their partisan attacks.

Following these hearings, the subcommittee investigated the pricing policies of the steel industry. This is not a subject unexplored by Congressional committees. Steel prices were the subject of an intensive review by the Joint Economic Committee in 1949, and by a House Antitrust Subcommittee in 1950. It is significant that these earlier hearings were suspended when we entered the Korean war. Every responsible legislator knew that the large steel producers were an essential ingredient to our effort in that conflict. The 1957 hearings of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee produced no additional information. They covered the same ground. They discussed corporate profits and executives' salaries in a manner which will provide wonderful grist for Communist propaganda mills.

Please let no one misunderstand my position. I am opposed to monopoly—so much so that I have publicly stated that I would support legislation to have our antitrust laws apply to all segments of our economy. I would even make them apply to unions which were granted exemptions for many of their activities by the passage of the Clayton Act in 1914. Certainly labor unions with millions of members, and controlling the investment of many billions of dollars through welfare funds, are in a position to exert monopoly powers.

I believe that the antitrust laws have made this country strong. They have given us the competitive society upon which our future rests. I do not believe that bigness and monopoly are synonymous. The Congress, during the 67 years since the Sherman Act was placed on the books, has never adopted legislation making bigness a crime. Repeated decisions of the United States Supreme Court have also stated that bigness per se is not a violation of the antitrust laws. I am interested in strengthening these laws so as to preserve a vigorous competitive society. We cannot operate in the world of today without big business.

Price fixing is one practice which the courts, the Attorney General, and the Congress have long agreed is condemned by the antitrust laws.

Last fall, Walter Reuther, the president of the United Automobile Workers, proposed that the three leading automobile producers reduce the average wholesale price of their 1958 models by $100 per car. While he demanded that the manufacturers make a specific reduction in the selling price of their product, he did not propose any reduction in wages. All that he offered was a vague promise that if they complied, he might reduce his subsequent demands.

Mr. Reuther's latest proposal followed a series of earlier steps he initiated to secure participation by the unions and the Government in the determination of industry's wage and pricing policies. Obviously such practices are not compatible with a competitive economy. Prices must be determined by the forces of competition in free markets.

You can imagine my surprise when I recently learned that our subcommittee, charged with perfecting the antitrust laws, suggested procedures which would make the subcommittee itself an instrument for their violation.

On November 7, Senator KEFAUVER, its chairman, addressed an identical letter to the presidents of General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and the United Automobile Workers. It contained this amazing statement:

"Members of the subcommittee unanimously decided that, although Mr. Reuther's offer to the automobile companies was rather vague and indefinite, the opportunity should not be passed without having Mr. Reuther and the Big Three manufacturers of automobiles brought together, with the hope of arriving at a better understanding of the issues involved in a firm hold-the-line wage-and-price formula."

The letter to each of the presidents also said:

"To this same hearing there will be invited simultaneously Mr. Walter Reuther, as well as representatives of the three companies. The first witness to be heard will be Mr. Reuther. It is my hope that at this hearing there can be developed a better understanding of the problems involved in a formula for holding the wage and price line in the automobile industry."

Gentlemen, the mere suggestion that the pricing policies of these competitors should follow a common formula shows a complete lack of understanding of the philosophy underlying our antitrust statutes.

While Senator KEFAUVER implied that this procedure had the unanimous approval of this subcommittee, I noted with equal interest a telegram addressed to him by Senator DIRKSEN, a member of the subcommittee, which was released on November 8. Senator DIRKSEN said:

"The committee would be in a highly embarrassing position if it undertook price-fixing or price understanding at the committee table, even by discussion, and in addition, such so-called simultaneous hearing could prove even more of an embarrassment if a bargaining controversy should develop at some later time over wages and benefits between management and labor and the committee record was used in such a proceeding.

"This would be clearly beyond the scope of the committee."

I am in hearty accord with this position.

I also understand that the manufacturers were asked to produce detailed cost, price, and profit data. The disclosure of what has always been regarded as confidential information to competitors around this subcommittee conference table would be the first step in destroying competitive capitalism in this country. It is unfortunate that the Senator from Tennessee has wittingly or unwittingly fostered this major objective of Walter Reuther.

These hearings have now been postponed because of conflicting investigations until January 28. Before that date I hope that the full committee, of which I am a member, will have an opportunity to take the necessary action to prevent such abuse of the legitimate investigatory power of its antimonopoly subcommittee.

For many months I have endeavored to understand the apparent antibusiness bias of this subcommittee. I believe I have found the answer. Its chief economist is Dr. John M. Blair. In 1938 he was the author of a book entitled "Seeds of Destruction." The theme suggested by this title was that capitalism contained within itself the seeds for its own ultimate destruction. Dr. Blair outlined four axioms which you and I regard as essential to the survival of capitalism.

He devoted 358 pages to showing that capitalism had not and could not meet them. He suggested three possible corrective techniques. They were: First, to raise our labor costs; second, to lower our prices; and third, to redistribute the national income. Mr. Reuther is now recommending precisely these same corrective techniques.

On the last page of this book Dr. Blair said:

"We have gone at length into the axioms which capitalism has violated, into the aggravating trends which seemingly have made it inevitable for capitalism to violate the axioms, and into the corrective techniques which offer slight hope that capitalism can be made to function in accordance with the axioms."

Dr. Blair concludes with this fantasy: "The result as a whole cannot be interpreted as anything but a none-too-happy picture of capitalism."

Now let us examine Dr. Blair's four axioms against the record of the performance of our economy since 1938 when his book was published.

His first axiom stated that: "Capitalism must not cast out of employment a progressively increasing number of workers nor lower the relative wages of those employed." In 1938, when the New Deal philosophy was at its height, the civilian labor force consisted of 54.6 million people. The unemployed accounted for 10.3 million or 19 percent of the total. In 1956, the civilian labor force had grown to 67.5 million people. There were 2.6 million unemployed or 3.8 percent of the total. Our economy had created 20.7 million additional jobs in 18 years. This was accomplished by the investment of billions of dollars. It does not appear as though our form of capitalism has been casting people out of work.

Let us examine the relative wages of those employed. There were inflationary price increases during this period as reflected by an increase in the Consumer Price Index of 93 percent. However, the average gross weekly earnings in all manufacturing during this same 18-year period increased 260 percent.

These statistics from Government sources effectively dispose of Dr. Blair's second axiom, namely, that capitalism must not progressively raise prices without correspondingly raising wages.

His third axiom stated that "capitalism must not distribute a large portion of its income to the upper income groups." In 1938 net interest payments and dividends accounted for 11.5 percent of the national income. In 1956 they accounted for only 7 percent of the national income. Let me add that these payments today are received by millions of individuals who are not usually regarded as in the upper income groups.

Dr. Blair's last axiom stated that "capitalism must be ever-expanding." The total gross national product measured in dollars of constant value, thus compensating for the inflation during this 18-year period, increased by 127 percent. I would say that this indicates that we enjoy an ever-expanding economy.

I accept Dr. Blair's axioms. Capitalism has met and is still meeting his challenge.

Before quoting from Dr. Blair's book written so many years ago, I wanted to make sure that his apparent bias against big business had not been altered as his judgment and maturity increased. Accordingly, I have examined many of his more recent writings. They convince me that he still believes that our industrial society as it is presently organized contains the seeds for its eventual collapse. I am frank to say that I do not share this belief. His position as the chief economist of the subcommittee accounts for the unusual character of these proceedings.

Curiously, the Journal of Commerce in an editorial on August 5 last described Senator KEFAUVER's opening statement as "verbatim the same recipe prescribed by Dr. John M.

Blair in his 1938 book, Seeds of Destruction, and, as late as 1949, in a paper on dissolution delivered before the Economic Workshop at the University of Minnesota."

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have a responsibility which I shall discharge to force a reexamination of the staff and the procedures of this important subcommittee. It has been given a serious task to perform. The antitrust laws are a charter for American economic freedom. Their intelligent evolution to meet the demands of a modern industrial society requires unemotional, unprejudiced, factual analysis by Congressional committees. There is no place for attacks on business firms, large or small. We should only be concerned with promoting fair and vigorous competition. By no stretch of the imagination should this committee be used as a forum for collective bargaining negotiations, nor should it harass the executive branch of the Government in the discharge of its functions.

In a short span of 12 years, since the end of World War II, Russia traversed the path from a primitive economy to a great industrial state. The Soviets are not going to destroy their industries and atomize them. They may urge us to do so through the misuse of our antitrust laws, but it would be naive to suppose that they are not going to continue the expansion of their industrial strength. I believe we can enjoy the high standards of living and the military strength which our economy, integrating large and small enterprises through free markets, makes possible. We can do this without regimentation and without losing opportunities for the individual.

It is conceivable that the present cold war could last for many years. Our security rests upon American industry—its research facilities and its organizational skills. Its capacity to perform difficult technological tasks are an essential element to our survival. Private enterprise is in the front line in today's ideological battle. As we are about to convene in Congress, I hope that all Members will make sure that their words and deeds contribute to the strength and security of our country.

---

## CHALLENGING PAPER ON EDUCATION, STRATEGY, AND FOURTH DIMENSIONAL WARFARE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on December 6, 1957, 1 day before the 16th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, Dr. Frank R. Barnett presented a challenging paper to the 62d Congress of American Industry conducted in New York under the auspices of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Dr. Barnett is director of research for the Richardson foundation. He is a Rhodes scholar and was formerly a professor at Wabash College.

He is peculiarly qualified to review the advance of the Russians since World War II. During that conflict he served as a Russian interpreter with the 69th Infantry Division, the first American unit which met the Red army on the Elbe River in April 1945. After the German surrender, he served as a military government official in Berlin where he had a unique opportunity to observe Russian tactics. He later revisited Berlin during the period when that beleaguered city was supported by the American airlift.

Dr. Barnett focuses our attention on the propaganda value the Russians have received from Sputnik. I endorse his thesis that American private enterprise must assume new responsibilities in this difficult period. It must continue to develop and sell the products which have given us our high standard of living and in addition foster an understanding and appreciation of the economic and political system which has made these benefits possible.

I found Dr. Barnett's address so stimulating that I believe it should be brought to the attention of my colleagues. Accordingly, I am asking permission to include it as an extension of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION, STRATEGY, AND FOURTH DIMENSIONAL WARFARE—AN ADDRESS BY FRANK ROCKWELL BARNETT

Tomorrow is the anniversary of an event that permanently changed the lives, fortunes and future of every man in this room. Beyond that, Pearl Harbor radically revised American axioms about world geography and power politics. In a handful of minutes, Japanese dive bombers not only sank our Pacific Fleet; they also torpedoed unreal assumptions about the technical capacity of foreigners and the use of trade or good will as effective means of deterring aggression.

We had thought that east was east and west was west. We learned the hard way that 20th century America is cheek by jowl with the Orient, that the Burma Road intersects with Main Street, that Tokyo and Berlin—and now Moscow and Peiping—are closer to New York than Philadelphia was to Boston at the time of the American Revolution.

These lessons were derived from the bombing of December 7, 1941. But on December 6, 1941, America was already at war, even though we didn't know it; for while it takes two to keep the peace, it takes only one to make a war. So, as America slept, the carriers of Imperial Japan were converging on Hawaii. The bombs had been loaded, the pilots briefed, the mission assigned. On December 7 the tragic climax was revealed to everyone; but the fateful first act had been playing, with the curtain closed, throughout the day and night of December 6.

Today is another December 6. Again we are at war. Our failure to recognize that fact does not affect the designs of the Kremlin. Again, it is an enemy—not ourselves—who has decided to involve the United States in conflict. Again our own good intentions are beside the point. And again there is danger our country may drowse through the afternoon of its December 6, through a night of no return, into another kind of Pearl Harbor, where the hour and the place, and the weapons and the rules, and the cost and the sacrifice are all determined by factors outside our control.

Only this time, the odds are much heavier against America than on that other December 6, 16 years ago. What if, in 1941, the power of Japan had already swallowed two-fifths of the earth? What if Japanese scientists had in some respects surpassed our own? What if Tokyo had dominated a billion people whose labor could be coerced to the cause of conquest? What if her fifth column had penetrated every country in the world, including the United States? What if Japan had had vast natural resources, abundant water power, access to oil, no need to import steel or coal? And what if Japanese submarines and bombers, armed with atomic weapons, had been based as close as Alaska, Mexico, Canada, Catalina, Nantucket, Key West and Bermuda? The equivalent of this nightmare supposition has come to pass since 1945, with the Soviet conquest of space and the invention of guided missiles—with the manpower of China and the resources of Eastern Europe feeding the Communist war machine—and with India, the wealth of Indonesia and the oil-rich Middle East only three assassinations and a few street fights removed from the grasp of the Kremlin.

In short, an Asiatic conqueror stands on our frontier. Owing to science, the Atlantic Ocean is no wider than the Rio Grande. Owing to technology, the Pacific is no broader than Lake Michigan; and the wastelands of the north can be bridged in a few hours' flight. We Americans are face to face with the descendants of Genghis Khan.

Indeed, television brings Mr. Khrushchev into millions of American living rooms to lecture on the glories and inevitable triumphs of world socialism. When a Soviet leader denounces Wall Street monopolies and the NAM, his message is transmitted free of charge on the front pages of American newspapers and contributes to the general climate of opinion in this country.

Khrushchev & Co. are no longer a rude barbarian horde. They are disciplined in science and well armed with engineering. They are schooled in economics and political theory. They speak many languages. They have learned to use education, literature, art, trade and even religion as weapons of subversion. Above all, they are superbly trained in the conduct of symbol warfare—in conquest by communication and warfare by words.

That is why we must talk about management's responsibility for national security. In the past, wars were chiefly shooting matches, and businessmen naturally left defense problems in the hands of America's soldiers. Today, the front is everywhere. Certain intangibles can literally wash out the material foundations of defense. If the world climate of opinion is mobilized against us by propaganda, we will lose markets, airbases, and access to strategic raw materials. If, here at home, we lose the will to sacrifice or cynically disregard our spiritual traditions, our physical wealth will not safeguard American civilization. Today, national defense begins at the level of domestic political morality, the quality of citizenship training for our youth, and the reputation of American business growth both here and abroad. These intangibles are the clear responsibility of private citizens.

Ancient Carthage, with its luxury standard of living, refused to make minimum sacrifices to support Hannibal and did not survive. Cato's relentless chant "Carthage must be destroyed" did not awaken the indolent Africans from their preoccupation with business as usual. They couldn't believe that Cato, like Khrushchev, meant what he threatened. Similarly, Rome itself, entertained with bread and circuses and arrogant in its splendor, did not survive the onslaught of the Vandals and Visigoths. The technical skill that built her roads and aqueducts, the know-how of her administrators, the glory of her law—none of these assets saved an effete and overcivilized Rome.

Nor did Rome's gross national product protect her. The Visigoths had no gross national product whatsoever—only weapons and willpower. These dismal comments on Carthage and Rome could be repeated for other proud civilizations. Many times in the past, nations with high standards of living have been pushed to the grave by nations with low standards of dying.

History teaches us that when a people put indulgence before discipline, worship welfare and discourage risk taking, they are likely soon to be forced into bankruptcy by a more vital competition. Especially if they no longer believe in themselves. For nearly 25 years this country has been confused by a cult of doubt. Too many Americans suffer an odd guilt complex about their own way of life. Meanwhile the missionaries and conquistadors of the Communist church militant

advance Marxism as the one truth faith—and they are willing to die for their belief. That is why the battles of the cold war are fought on our side of the Iron Curtain and at the Kremlin initiative. That is why trying to contain communism with a "Maginot line" of dollars and diplomacy is bound to fail. We forget that no status quo power has ever checked the thrust of a dynamic barbarian, for even if the defense is 90 percent successful on every occasion, a civilization can be driven to its doom 10 yards at a time.

In 1945, America enjoyed absolute air-atomic supremacy. In less than a decade, Russia has broken our monopoly in nuclear weapons, beaten us into space, produced jet aircraft and tested guided missiles. A system once contemptuously called the ox-cart economy has built the world's second largest navy, graduates more than twice as many engineers as America, and, by ruthlessly disregarding the claims of its consumers, is out-producing us in heavy machine tools, the basic equipment of war.

But the greatest threat to our civilization may not stem from Soviet guided missiles or engineering or atomic weapons. We have brilliant scientists, able generals and inventive industrialists who doubtless can safeguard national security on the technological front. It is in the realm of fourth dimensional warfare—or psychosocial combat—that we are hopelessly outclassed. We know a lot about the tricks and techniques of mass persuasion, but we have not yet applied that knowledge to the main challenge of our time—how to beat communism without fighting a hot war.

We use advertising skills and the hidden persuaders to change consumer taste in salad dressing. We use high-powered public relations to boost the box-office appeal of a rock-and-roll cowboy. The Soviets exploit Pavlov, propaganda and group dynamics to overthrow empires and condition the masses to become addicts of socialism. They use psychology to win the world.

Propaganda has always been a tool of the conqueror. In the age of radio, television and mass literacy, however, political warfare has become a primary weapon. The Communists, like the Nazis before them, use the strategy of terror to frighten the West into inaction, to promote class warfare and thus divide and conquer, to encourage neutrals to ride the Soviet wave of the future. The danger of the Russian sputnik is not just that it means Moscow can probably put a missile on New York or, in the near future, aim atomic guns at Pittsburgh and Detroit from a platform in outer space. Sputnik is a symbol of successful socialism.

All over the world, intellectuals and politicians—already half in love with Marx—are saying: "If socialism can do such wonderful things in science, why not give it another chance with business? If communism is efficient in the laboratory, let's try it in our factories. If Marxism can plan a sputnik and build so many splendid schools of engineering, we must have social planning and social engineering for every part of our society. Capitalism is obsolete." Despite the record of American enterprise, millions of people—including some in this country—will believe that propaganda. Why? Because very few Americans can articulate what it is we really stand for. We perform, but performance is not enough in an age of mass mediums. The Communists capture the slogans, manipulate the symbols, pervert the communications. The facts are on our side; but facts don't necessarily move men to action. More often, men are motivated by theories, by hopes and hatreds, by envy, fear or inspiration. The Communists have done their homework in the human subconscious. From superstitions and buried emotions and bedrock beliefs, they have mixed the weapons of fourth dimensional warfare.

They have put this knowledge to practical use. With blackmail and infiltration, they captured Czechoslovakia without firing a shot. That meant they got the Skoda Works intact. For 30 years Moscow trained many oriental Communists in its academies of political warfare. The alumni are today the rulers of Red China, the overlords of North Korea, the leaders of the Communist thrust into Southeast Asia. No Russian soldiers died to score these victories. In recent months, communism has won elections in India, Indonesia and South America. It has penetrated Syria and Egypt. It is growing like a weed in the fertile fields of Africa. It controls powerful party machines in France and Italy. Communist political strategy, in short, is not an ivory tower experiment. It pays Moscow huge dividends in real estate, military bases, raw materials, manpower—and continuous trouble for the United States.

These things don't happen by accident. Communism is not just an idea; it is a power technique. Behind the Iron Curtain, there are more than 100 schools and colleges of propaganda and subversion. Many Russians get a first-class education in math, physics, and foreign languages. But other Russians—and selected recruits from Asia, Africa, and Latin America—receive professional training in conflict management and psychological tactics. We have the Harvard School of Business; they have the Lenin Institute of Political Warfare, for politics is the chief business of communism.

It is imperative, of course, for this Nation to win the contest of science, electronics and military hardware. Otherwise, the Soviets will blackmail us into surrender. But we cannot guarantee our security by simply catching up or staying ahead in science. After all, we were ahead of them for 35 years when, in spite of our technological superiority, they scored victories by irregular methods. We must create a shield of science to ward off a hot war; but we must also learn to make stronger moves on the ideological, political and economic squares of the cold war chessboard.

To do that, we must raise the standards and improve the quality of education in economics and philosophy, American history, political science and foreign languages—as well as in science and engineering. And we must not be afraid of competition in the classroom, for young America in the next two decades is going to face the most ruthless competition the world has ever known.

American business cannot afford to be a mere spectator at this match for the future of mankind. The managers of Soviet society are all committed to agitation and politics. They are conflict minded. You can't do business with Moscow, because Communists are not businessmen or statesmen. They are professional revolutionaries. Their foreign aid personnel are commandos; their artists are propagandists; their diplomats are spies; their economy is based on the cost accounting of the battlefield, where every resource is squandered in order to defeat the enemy. Since Communists have a combat mentality, you can't reason with them. If we don't want to fight them—or surrender—we must learn to beat them in the precincts of the Middle East, in the lobbies of the United Nations, in our own classrooms and pulpits, and before the court of world opinion. Our own managers dare not be aloof to this challenge.

The Communist Party, through the apparatus of total government, can mobilize the total resources of the Sino-Soviet Empire. Our limited government, by definition, cannot and should not compete with Moscow across the board. If it did, Washington would have to regulate business, control the press, police our schools and regiment our voluntary agencies. This means that, unless private institutions take over many areas of nonmilitary defense, the ubiquitous thrust of Communist conflict management will be unchecked at crucial points.

Why should business be asked to serve? Primarily, because our economic system is the crux of the whole struggle—and because, in a sense, this is the business society. Each year, a very high percentage of our college graduates are recruited by business. Although there are extremely able men in other walks of life, our greatest reservoirs of inventive talent, drive, organizational vitality and brainpower lie in the world of industry, commerce, and finance. Yet, with certain notable exceptions, business leadership has not taken full responsibility for safeguarding the moral, intellectual, and political framework which insures its opportunities to make the economic system pay off for all America.

This Republic was founded, of course, by bankers and lawyers, businessmen and a general. The frontier was civilized by business leaders who took an active part in the citizenship function. Today, however, many business leaders regard politics as beneath their dignity. Unfortunately, American civilization can be crippled—and even destroyed—by concepts which lead first to changes in the climate of opinion and, ultimately, to the hard facts of power politics.

If the business society is destroyed outright, or simply withered by politics and propaganda, business leadership has only itself to blame. After all, every great corporation has more than enough surplus to allow some of its best brains to stop thinking about production and sales and start thinking about national defense, citizenship education, foreign policy and economic philosophy. One way for business to attack these complex problems systematically—and with sophistication—would be to build an academy of industrial statesmanship. This would be, in effect, the equivalent of the Harvard School of Advanced Management in the area of public affairs, national defense, citizenship training, and the theology of American-style capitalism. Its purpose would be to produce articulate champions of freedom who could compete with the lobbyists for Marx in the never-ending battle to condition the climate of opinion.

Another place to improve the machinery of ideological defense might be with the lever of corporate philanthropy. American business now gives to good causes more than $500 million a year. Perhaps 5 percent of that total should be used to pay a cultural life-insurance premium on America, in the light of Khrushchev's boast that our grandchildren will live in a Soviet Socialist America. Recent events suggest at least three more questions about private philanthropy:

1. If the Soviet challenge is not to result in eventual Federal control of our schools, must not business give even more generously to improve the quality of American education?

2. Cannot business get much more for its charitable dollar by applying the same professional standards to giving away money that it does to making it in the first place?

3. Should not industry begin to reappraise its pattern of giving—shifting some investments from the portfolio of community welfare to the portfolio of national survival, allocating priorities, evaluating results and, in general, managing corporate largesse with the same discrimination and purpose that mark other phases of business operations?

Ultimately, it may be desirable—even necessary—for great corporations to appoint a vice president of public affairs to spend full time on these matters. A waste of talent? At the beginning of the century, certain firms refused to adopt advertising. They perished. Now, most firms are hospitable

to the subtler meanings of public relations. But beyond orthodox public relations lies the arena of public affairs in which the fate of American civilization may well be decided in the next decade.

American businessmen have been trained to cope with one kind of competition. As that term is defined with a small letter "c," it refers to corporation B which, by increasing its own sales, may slightly reduce corporation A's margin of profit. That kind of contest can be continued. But, as we have seen, there is a new kind of competition abroad in the world today. This form of competition, spelled in all caps, is designed to destroy—utterly and for all time—the moral and legal framework of the civilization which undergirds the free enterprise system. If Genghis Khan & Co. win this competitive struggle, there will be no second chance for the business society. The contest will be foreclosed by the secret police.

One word more. The ultimate weapon is neither science nor politics nor psychological warfare. The ultimate weapon is human courage—and faith in certain unalterable moral laws. Unfortunately, some people have forgotten the true meaning of America. We are already half afraid of the honorable word "revolution," although we are the true revolutionaries. It was an American revolution that gave the world its finest revolutionary ideal—the notion that government is the servant, not the master, of the people. The Communists, who call us reactionary, have turned society back to the days of the Pharaohs. The monuments to Socialist progress erected in the U. S. S. R.—like the pyramids of ancient Egypt—have been built with slave labor.

On the other hand, we Americans have developed the most flexible, continually progressing society known to man. Our so-called masses already enjoy luxuries undreamed of in other parts of the world. Our unique type of capitalism—almost as different from European cartel-capitalism as it is from socialism—produces more welfare and more social justice than Communist functionaries would even dare to imagine. But beyond that is the fact that we are truly free men. We have plenty and freedom, together. We must not let this remarkable experiment in human liberty and opportunity perish from want of courage, or lack of sophistication, or failure to meet the problem with the ablest human resources at our disposal. That is why these questions of education, strategy, and fourth dimensional warfare urgently require the attention of this audience.

The task may seem enormous; but the stakes are even higher. And let us remember that great events are always determined by minorities. Forty years ago communism was confined to a rented room in Zurich, the brains of Lenin and the ambition of a few other outcasts. Less than 100 men made the American Revolution. For a time the whole future of this Nation was carried in the will and heart of a lonely man who walked the winter lines at Valley Forge persuading his ragged countrymen not to quit and go home. There is more than enough talent in this one room to change the course of history. But time is impartial. In politics and war, as in business, time is only on that side which knows how to use it.

## A SINGLE CHIEF OF STAFF FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, sometimes in a crisis there is a failure to put first things first. Sometimes in a crisis there is the tendency to look for quick and easy solutions. Sometimes in a crisis in our frantic search for the achievement of security we overlook the basic need for analysis—the need to determine the cause of the malady before prescribing the cure.

That is why I feel that the lead editorial of the Washington Post, issue of January 4, 1958, should be read by every Member of Congress. It expounds incisive and calm logic at a time when incisive and calm logic is so desperately needed. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### PANACEA IN THE PENTAGON

From the assortment of comments on Capitol Hill endorsing the concept of a single Chief of Staff, it is evident that such a change will receive new attention as a solution to the controversies in the Pentagon. This newspaper is in no way horrified at the thought of a single Chief of Staff directing all of the armed services; in some ways it might be an improvement. We wonder, however, whether some of the advocacy does not arise for the wrong reasons.

Leaving aside the rivalries and jealousies that are pandemic among the services, the real cause of controversy is sincere and fundamental differences in viewpoint about objectives. What is the strategic assumption under which the United States is arming? Is it that the country may have to fight a war of annihilation through to the bitter end? Is it that by maintaining the capacity for instant retaliation the United States can deter major war in the first place? Is every armed conflict automatically to be a war of missiles and nuclear weapons, or is there a place for conventional means in coping with "brush fires"? Is there any disposition to seek to limit any war that may be forced upon the country and to fight it for limited objectives?

These are essential questions, and there is no very clear answer to them. Instead, the reaction to the Soviet sputniks and intercontinental missile has been one of attempting to ride all horses at once. Military programs are confused because there is no agreement on precise purposes. The definition of these purposes is as much a political as a military issue, and there can be no very satisfactory resolution of the controversies until more fundamental decisions are made.

As important as a definition of national military doctrine is a new and comprehensive review of roles and missions of the armed services. The services are still operating more or less within the outlines of the 1948 Key West agreement. New weapons, and changes abroad, may have invalidated these assignments. Because the Military Establishment is now in transition to missiles and not all of the possibilities and implications can be foreseen, it may not be possible to limit new missions exactly. But certainly an overhaul would be desirable to get away from parochialism and make the best integrated use of weapons systems.

Certainly more genuine unification is called for. The Navy, which fought unification at first and then became a reluctant dragon, was so busy trying to get into the strategic act that it neglected the Soviet submarine threat. The Air Force was so intent on massiveness that it rode roughshod over all thought of limited war. The Army had plenty of traditionalists preparing for the last war. Unified direction under a consistent strategic doctrine could minimize at least some of these divergences.

It would be desirable, too, to reorganize the present Joint Chiefs of Staff. Strategic planners ought, as has been suggested by several studies, to be divorced from operating responsibilities in the individual services; they ought, at the same time, to retain superior rank so as to make their authority effective. Moreover, they ought to become officers of the United States rather than of any one service. There is much to commend the idea of a general staff under this sort of system.

If, at that point, the designation of a single chief of staff appeared logical, the question ought to be faced. But other more basic steps ought to be taken first, and the appointment of a single chief ought not to be proposed in the notion that it somehow would be a cure for controversy. Up to the point of decision, at least, controversy stemming from differing beliefs is healthy. A single chief of staff might be able to carry out decisions more effectively, but the laying of the bases for sound decisions calls for more than flat rule.

## STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE—COMMENTS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think the President of the United States today made one of the most impressive speeches of his career. It was temperate in tone, it was optimistic, and it made little effort to cover up the deficienies in our military situation which have grown up in the past 5 years. I believe that all Americans will respond to the President's call to action.

Most impressive is the expression by the President of the peaceful intentions of Americans, his emphasis on economic aid and improved world trade, improved people-to-people contacts, and his vigorous call for disarmament. I hope the speech will now be followed by day-to-day leadership on the part of President Eisenhower to give effect to the points he made. I hope also that Secretary Dulles, who in the past has frustrated some of the President's hopes for peaceful solutions to the world's problems, as he did after the meeting at Geneva, will now carry out the President's program, so far as it lies within his power.

If the President now can unite his party in support of these farsighted programs of trade, aid, security, and peace, then I shall feel much better about the future of America and the world.

The forceful plea for peace, if followed and implemented, will win back many friends we have lost through vacillation and lack of policy.

## REFORM OF CHAOTIC TAX STRUCTURES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Congress and the Nation, as has just been stated, have welcomed the President's comprehensive and constructive state of the Union message this afternoon. Someone said, coming back from the House, that it might be a good thing if Congress simply followed that message, passed the appropriation bills, and then adjourned. I do not know but that that is a sort of pearl of good advice. As is universally recognized, this is one of the most important of such messages delivered by a Chief Executive of our country in this century.

The Nation is gratified by the leadership which the President has, once again, demonstrated.

### THE CONTINUING TAX PROBLEM

Inevitably, of course, the thinking of many of our citizens turns to the contin-

uing serious problem of taxes in our economy.

As the President has rightly indicated, the American people are ready, willing, and eager to continue to bear the financial burdens involved in the present increased missile and related programs.

Our people recognize the necessity of continued adequate revenue to the United States Treasury to keep the budget in balance.

At the same time, I believe the people request that the Congress not merely fold its hands, that the Congress instead take some affirmative action this year on the tax front.

We cannot legislate a reduction of taxes.

USE CURRENT YEAR TO STUDY TAX REFORM

The very least we can do, however, is to make a comprehensive study of taxes. Let us use our time constructively, and not allow months to pass without laying the foundations for long-range reform.

That is why I am urging again today a goal which I urged almost at this very time last year. I am urging the enactment of the bill for a Hoover-style tax-reform commission, which I introduced with 22 of my colleagues on February 7, 1957.

This bill, S. 769, is, in my judgment, the only kind of fundamental tax action which we may be able to take in this 2d session of the 85th Congress.

I do not doubt that this year we can enact various limited tax measures. We may and should close some of the existing tax loopholes and remedy a few of the most glaring inequities.

But it is agreed by almost everyone that, within the next 7 months, it will be physically impossible to attempt a comprehensive and broad-scale revision of the whole sprawling tax system. And so, at the very minimum, the very least that we can do is to give the green light for the setting up of some kind of a tax commission—a commission similar to the one which others and I recommended, not only last year, but over a period of many years.

Nothing less than a top-to-bottom analysis of every kind of tax will suffice.

I am sure that many of my colleagues have read, with deep interest, the series of tax exposé articles now being carried in the Washington Daily News, under the able byline of Mr. Jack Steele.

OUR TERRIBLE TAX MESS

This series is a graphic, alarming documentation of the tax mess that we are in.

It is a mess, because in a time of national crisis, literally billions of dollars in potential taxes are being evaded and lost to the Treasury.

It is a mess because huge tax burdens are not falling upon those who can best carry those burdens.

It is a mess because it is a confusing patchwork, with amendments having been added helter-skelter on to amendments, with resulting increased confusion and uncertainty.

TRIBUTE TO TAX-WRITING COMMITTEES

I make all of these observations with all due respect to the tax-writing Members of the Congress.

None of us who has served here can fail to appreciate the fact that there is no harder working group of men in the United States Congress than the Members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

To straighten out our uncoordinated tax mess, however, will require more than their devoted labors.

EIGHTEEN MONTHS OF INTENSE STUDY NECESSARY

It will require no less than an 18 months' impartial study of a high-level commission, consisting of leading Members of Congress and outstanding individuals of private life.

Only such a top-level review by a group of leading citizens whom the Nation would respect could possibly lead to fundamental reform in our tax system.

That is why I urge that S. 769 be enacted.

SENATOR WILEY'S PREVIOUS COMMENTS ON S. 769

I respectfully commend to my colleagues the observations which I have previously made on this subject.

They may be found in the following issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: On February 7, of last year, on page 1660; on February 18, beginning on page 2114; on February 25, beginning on page 2514; on March 1, beginning on page 2857; on March 8, beginning on page 3340.

At that time, I pointed out how a great group of American private citizens had endorsed the Wiley bill for a Hoover-style tax commission.

LIST OF BUSINESS-ENDORSERS OF PRINCIPLE OF S. 769

I had written to them, inviting their views on the subject. They had responded, almost to the man, praising the general concept of the bill.

I am sure that, had similar letters been addressed to outstanding labor leaders, to the representatives of women's organizations, veterans groups, and others, virtually unanimously favorable results would likewise have been secured.

The fact of the matter is that these American businessmen in particular, great leaders, who, individually as citizens, and whose businesses carry a major burden of Federal taxes, feel that the time is long overdue for a high-level look-see at the tax structure.

I hope that the series of Scripps-Howard articles will signal a start of renewed public and press demand for this commission-type legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of some of these leading businessmen be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL LIST OF BUSINESS LEADERS WHO HAVE ENDORSED WILEY TAX COMMISSION BILL, S. 769

Mr. C. M. White, chairman of the board, Republic Steel Corp.

Mr. H. H. Curtice, president, General Motors Corp.

Mr. W. Alton Jones, chairman of the board, Cities Service Co., Inc.

Mr. C. G. Mortimer, president, General Foods Corp.

Mr. John F. D. Rohrbach, president, Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.

Mr. Eugene Holman, chairman, Standard Oil Co.

Mr. L. F. Long, president, the Cudahy Packing Co.

Mr. Joseph H. Wright, vice president, Illinois Central Railroad.

Mr. L. K. Lindahl, chairman of the board, the Udylite Corp.

Mr. Charles E. Frohman, president, Hinde & Dauch Paper Co.

Mr. W. G. Vollmer, president, Texas & Pacific Railway Co.

Mr. B. B. Jennings, chairman of the board, Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc.

Mr. J. P. Kiley, president, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Corp.

Mr. T. Russ Hill, Ward Industries Corp.

Mr. Cloud Wampler, chairman of the board, Carrier Corp.

Mr. Arthur B. Goetze, president, Western Electric Co., Inc.

Mr. S. M. Kennedy, president, Consolidated Foods Corp.

Mr. P. W. Hires, president, The Charles E. Hires Co.

Mr. Kenneth H. Redmond, president, United Fruit Co.

Mr. Augustus C. Long, chairman of the board, The Texas Co.

Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America.

Mr. Claude S. Lawson, president, U. S. Pipe & Foundry Co.

Mr. George S. Young, president, The Columbia Gas System, Inc.

Mr. Herbert J. Yates, president, Republic Productions, Inc.

Mr. Roger M. Blough, chairman, United States Steel Corp.

Mr. L. L. Colbert, president, Chrysler Corp.

Mr. Thomas A. Printon, chairman of the board, Nopco Chemical Co., Inc.

Mr. Henry Ford, president, Ford Motor Co.

Mr. E. G. Grace, chairman, Bethlehem Steel Co., Inc.

Mr. Endicott R. Lovell, president, Calumet & Hecla, Inc.

Mr. P. W. Paul, president, McCrory Stores Corp.

Mr. Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., chairman, The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

Mr. John E. Reeves, president, Reeves Bros., Inc.

Mr. Conrad N. Hilton, president, Hilton Hotels Corp.

Mr. Warren W. Brown, president, Monon Railroad.

Mr. William T. Faricy, president, Association of American Railroads.

Mr. William M. Allen, president, Boeing Airplane Co.

Mr. Walter P. Marshall, president, Western Union Telegraph Co.

Mr. Arthur K. Atkinson, president, Wabash Railroad Co.

Mr. Charles Ward, president, Brown & Bigelow.

Mr. Fred C. Foy, president, Koppers Co., Inc.

Mr. R. A. Hummel.

Mr. E. S. Evans, Jr., president, Evans Products Co.

Mr. Sherman P. Voorhees, executive director, Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. William A. Hughes.

Mr. Frederick E. Hines, vice president, finance and tax counsel, Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.

Mr. William Jackman, president, Investors League, Inc.

---

## FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this year will mark the first half-century milestone in the history of one of the great institutions of American and of international

journalism. I refer to that remarkable publication known as the Christian Science Monitor.

I have been pleased to receive word, along with my colleagues, that in the fall the Monitor will publish a 50th anniversary edition.

Likewise, there will be issued this year an important anniversary book by the Monitor's distinguished editor, Mr. Erwin Canham, under the auspices of Houghton-Mifflin Co.

Mr. President, the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are full of tributes which have been paid to the American press; and rightly so. It is outstanding among the free press of the world. And in turn, there are certain American papers which have traditionally stood out from all others.

The Monitor is certainly one such publication.

WHAT IS A GREAT NEWSPAPER?

Invariably, it is named by newspapermen as one of America's 10 best newspapers.

What makes a good newspaper? What makes a great newspaper?

Opinions may vary, but let me suggest a few standards, all of which the Monitor certainly fulfills:

First. A staff of outstanding competence, skilled in journalism, dedicated to the truth, and given the opportunity, to pursue and disseminate knowledge.

Second. An editorial policy which speaks boldly with courage, with honesty, with frankness on moral, political, economic, and scientific questions.

Third. A top-to-bottom recognition that the mission of a newspaper is creative to bring out the best that is in man, rather than to play upon some of the baser characteristics of man.

Fourth. An eagerness to serve the public interest rather than merely to achieve a healthy profit statement at the end of the year.

A newspaper is a business, but a paper would be a poor newspaper, indeed, if its sole function were considered the mere making of money.

Let me say, incidentally, that I am well aware that few businesses in America have been harder hit by rising costs than have newspapers. The price of newsprint goes up and up, as do the costs of printing, of personnel, distribution, and everything else that goes into the preparation and distribution of each daily paper.

Therefore, I pay special honor to the many newspapers which, like the Monitor, while still adhering to sound business practices, nonetheless indulge in the so-called luxury of the most complete coverage possible of the news.

Fifth. It should be a source of inspiration, as well as knowledge; character building, as well as informative.

POSITIVE APPROACH TO THE NEWS

Needless to say, perhaps the most distinguishing of all characteristics of The Monitor is its emphasis on the good and constructive that are within man. A reader would look in vain in all the pages of all the issues of the Monitor if he wanted to find headlines or stories of scandal and filth and social decay.

The Monitor wisely recognizes that the real news which is occurring in the world is to be found, not in the 1 percent or 5 percent of bulletins which represent crime and sin, but in the 95 percent or 99 percent of incoming stories which depict good and honesty and uplift. By looking for the good, it finds the good, advances the good, and multiplies the good.

No one need be a member of the Christian Science faith to find great profit and interest in the Monitor. Young and old find food for thought and enlightenment in its pages. Its columns are read enthusiastically throughout the world, by individuals of every conceivable circumstance, creed, and nationality. They find in the Monitor news of man's constructive efforts for world peace and prosperity.

The Monitor is, of course, a special credit to the institution which publishes it, to the city in which it is printed and edited, and to the country whose priceless heritage of freedom it fosters.

But it is also a credit to man—to man in the Creator's image, who reflects integrity, courage, justice, decency, and loyalty.

I extend my sincerest congratulations to this outstanding publication. May its next 50 years be even more successful than its first 50. It is a shining light in the firmament of journalism at home and abroad. May that light grow ever stronger in the decades ahead.

## THE DANGEROUS NATURAL GAS BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the great battles of 1958 is the continuing battle against inflation.

The continuing rise in the cost of living places in jeopardy every single citizen of the United States.

Every wage earner is hurt, but especially, every individual living on a fixed income, every retired citizen, every pensioner.

Under these circumstances, if Congress is to hold the line against inflation, it must not approve any legislation which would contribute to the spiraling of the cost-of-living index.

Regrettably, there now faces the House of Representatives—and soon, no doubt, the Senate—a dangerous bill which constitutes, in my judgment, the most inflationary single measure conceivable.

It is a bill which could do more to send prices skyrocketing than any single bill within the past 10 years. I refer to the bill which, to all intents and purposes, exempts from Federal Power Commission control the rates charged by the natural gas industry.

Supporters of this bill, H. R. 8525, have attempted to clothe it with enough legal gobbledygook to give the impression that it continues Federal controls.

The fact of the matter is that it emasculates all controls.

The fact is that, if this bill is enacted, it will mean that 30 million gas consumers may expect increased rates, commencing February 1, March 1, April 1, or whenever the bill is enacted. Five hundred million dollars more will be paid by consumers each year.

HOUSEWIVES SHOULD REBEL AGAINST BILL

There will be virtually no limit on gas rates' ceiling, because the gas industry will be able to charge virtually what the traffic will bear. It will charge the going market price, which means as high a price as it can possibly manipulate.

I want to urge that housewives and industrial consumers of this Nation rise in righteous indignation against this unfair bill.

I want to urge them to contact every single Member of the House of Representatives; to urge that this bill be defeated when it is brought to the floor, presumably later this month.

EIGHT GAS STATES VERSUS FORTY CONSUMING STATES

I want to urge people of the 48 States to ask this question: "Why should any Representative or Senator from a gas-consuming State vote for a bill that is solely for the benefit of a handful of interests in a few gas-producing States?"

There are no more than eight or so basic gas-producing States. Why should these 8 States get the arbitrary right to trample on the well-being of 40 other States? Is that fair? Is that democratic? Is that majority rule?

EVEN CONSUMERS IN PRODUCING STATES HURT BY H. R. 8525

For that matter, the consumers of Texas, itself, or of Oklahoma, Louisiana, or any other producing State, will be just as much harmed by this bill, as will the consumers of Wisconsin, and other consuming States.

I send to the desk now two items which tell the story of this bill.

EDITORIAL SPOTLIGHTS PUBLIC APATHY

The first, an editorial from the December 4, 1957, issue of the Stevens Point, Wis., Journal is entitled "Gas Lobby Busy While the Public Drowses."

The editorial points up some of the facts which I, personally, have made against this bill.

The second is an excellent analysis which was made in the Milwaukee Public Library regarding the harmful impact of this bill.

SALUTE TO MAYORS' COMMITTEE AGAINST GAS BILL

The analysis has come to me from one of the foremost fighters against this gas bill. I refer to the distinguished mayor of Milwaukee, the Honorable Frank Zeidler, vice chairman of the United States Mayors' Committee on Natural Gas Legislation. Despite the fact that Mayor Zeidler is busy with many municipal functions, he has given unstinting labor to opposition to this bill.

The same may be said of such colleagues as the disinguished Mayor Richardson Dilworth, of Philadelphia, secretary of the mayors committee; the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, of New York, chairman of the committee; and some other mayors of leading cities across the Nation. I ask that unanimous consent be given that these two items be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Stevens Point (Wis.) Journal of December 4, 1957]

GAS LOBBY BUSY WHILE THE PUBLIC DROWSES

Senator ALEX WILEY has made a new appeal to "stop the dangerous gas bill." He is referring to proposed legislation that would exempt gas producers from effective Federal regulation. Similar legislation was defeated in the past only by presidential vetoes.

Now, WILEY reports, the pro-price increase forces are gathering and expect to hit early and hard to drive the measure through Congress. Reportedly, he says, the gas bill is being used as "bait" for vote-trading to get greater support for other special interest legislation.

This is a pending matter that certainly should interest gas consumers, since they are the ones who will pay directly for any resulting price or rate increases. Yet Senator WILEY stresses in his current newsletter that there has been almost no activity on behalf of the public. And he issues this blunt warning:

"If consumers are to be protected from skyrocketing of gas rates, we need to stir up grassroots protests. This means that folks not only in Wisconsin but throughout the Nation, must contact their Representatives and Senators to urge them to vote against the gas bill. The time to act is now—not after the bill is passed. Four hundred thousand Wisconsin consumers of natural gas are directly involved. If you don't want to pay higher rates the 1st of every month, then contact and write your friends in our State and in other States against the gas lobby."

Here we have an old story repeated again. Time after time taxpayers complain loudly about higher taxes—after they have been voted and levied. Many don't bother to register their opposition when it might be effective. If people don't bother on a local level about things that affect their pocketbooks, they are likely to be less concerned when the decisions are made away from home.

The fight to do away with Federal regulation of natural gas has been going on for years. There is every indication that the gas interests are headed for victory this time.

Stevens Point has a stake in the outcome, as it is destined to be served by natural gas, sooner or later. The local utility, as the distributor of the gas, will be helpless to keep prices down if they are raised at the wellhead.

The gas lobby never gives up. It is a sad commentary on the attitude of the public that all too often it becomes indifferent on vital issues, of which Federal regulation of natural gas is one.

---

UNITED STATES MAYORS' COMMITTEE ON NATURAL GAS LEGISLATION

*Washington, D. C., January 9, 1958.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Early in 1958, the issue of adequate Federal regulation of natural gas producers will again be placed before the Congress.

This issue, if unfavorably decided for gas consumers, will cost the gas consumers of the Nation upward of $500 million a year. Most of these consumers live in the cities and incorporated areas, and they will have to pay the bill.

Historically, the mayors and municipal law officers and State public service commissions have fought the attempts of gas producers (and oil companies) to escape Federal regulation. A Supreme Court decision in June 1954, placed the producing companies under regulation, but they are seeking again and again by an act of Congress to escape regulation in the public interest, by the Federal Power Commission.

They are now seeking to pass bill H. R. 8525 which will make FPC regulation of little protection to the consumer. As the history of the natural gas regulation problem is most complicated, there is attached a short summary of that history as it pertains to regulation of producers.

Knowing of your personal interest and concern regarding this matter I hope very much you will find it possible to call this document to the attention of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Yours very truly,

FRANK P. ZEIDLER,
*Mayor of Milwaukee, Vice Chairman, United States Mayors' Committee on Natural Gas Legislation.*

Chairman: Robert W. Wagner, mayor of New York City; Secretary: Richardson Dilworth, mayor of Philadelphia; vice chairmen: Will E. Nicholson, mayor of Denver; Ben West, mayor of Nashville; Frank P. Zeidler, mayor of Milwaukee.

---

A REPORT ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO NATURAL GAS ACT AS SET FORTH IN H. R. 8525

(Prepared by Peter J. McCormick, Milwaukee Public Library)

The new Harris bill, H. R. 8525, to amend the Natural Gas Act will be before the coming session of Congress. This bill was introduced at the last session on July 5, 1957 and reported out by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on July 9 by a 15 to 13 vote. It was shelved for that session by a decision made and announced on August 13 by Speaker RAYBURN.

During the last session of Congress, a number of bills were introduced which sought to exempt or drastically curb FPC (Federal Power Commission) control over natural gas sales to pipeline companies. The Harris-O'Hara bills (H. R. 6790 and 6791), companion bills, were the principal measures. Hearings were held by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during May and June. After these hearings, it was decided to introduce H. R. 8525, which is termed in Congressional parlance, "a clean bill". It is essentially the Harris-O'Hara bills with section rearrangement and with certain amendments. H. R. 8525 was returned to the House accompanied by House Report 837 which analyzes the bill and outlines majority and minority views.

BACKGROUND DATA

H. R. 8525 is but the latest of many attempts to eliminate or to drastically curb FPC control over prices paid at the wellhead for natural gas sold to interstate pipelines. The following is a résumé of significant facts and action taken to date.

IMPORTANCE AND GROWTH OF NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY

Since 1948, the natural gasline companies have been engaged in a tremendous expansion program and now practically cover the entire Nation. Continued and uninterrupted growth is forecast through the next 10 years, reflecting population increase, anticipated economic expansion, increased use of gas for industrial and residential purposes, and extension of pipelines into new areas. In 1945 natural gas supplied 13 percent of the country's total energy needs; today it supplies approximately 26 percent and this is expected to rise to 29 percent by 1960.

Natural gas consumption in 1956 increased to 10,275,000,000 thousand cubic feet over 9,405,351,000 thousand cubic feet in 1955. The 1956 consumption rate was 1.56 times that of 1950. Two-thirds of 1956 consumption was for commercial or industrial purposes and one-third, residential.

Because of the higher rates, the residential classification is the major single contributor to revenues of natural gas companies. For the country as a whole, in 1956, residential sales made up 56 percent of the revenue while constituting only 33 percent of sales volume.

In 1956 there were 27,300,000 residential customers of natural gas in the United States, with 56 percent of these using gas for home heating. By 1965, the American Gas Association anticipates 35,530,000 natural gas customers with 75 percent heating homes by gas.

TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF NATURAL GAS

The natural gas industry can be grouped into three major classifications—production, interstate transmission, and local distribution.

Local distributing companies are utilities subject to regulation by State utility commissions, and in some instances, by municipal or local agencies.

Interstate transmission is by pipeline companies. Since enactment of the Natural Gas Act of 1938, supervision and regulatory control of these companies has been vested in the FPC. The general policy of the FPC is to allow pipeline companies to earn 6 percent on net utility plant, after Federal income taxes, and rate approvals have been based on the conventional rate base approach.

PRODUCTION OF NATURAL GAS

Because of the close production relationship between gas and oil, all leading petroleum companies hold extensive reserves of natural gas, and have been increasingly interested in the production and sale of natural gas. While there are about 5,000 independent natural gas producers, major oil companies are reported to hold natural gas reserves approaching 60 percent of the United States total. A National Municipal Law Officers' Association study shows that 85 percent of the gas sold via interstate pipelines is supplied by 100 producers—mostly big oil companies, either from their own resources or by gathering from other producers. Originally, natural gas had very little value and in many instances was burned at the wellhead. The great demand that has grown up, chiefly because of facilities for long distance transmission, has made it one of the chief resources of revenue for many of the oil companies, since 60 percent of natural gas produced comes from oil wells.

Until the Supreme Court decision in the Phillips case, June 7, 1954, the FPC held it had no jurisdiction over independent producers, and, hence, the prices they charged at the wellhead for gas sold to pipeline companies. However, the FPC did exercise control over the value placed on gas produced by integrated pipeline companies—those engaged in production as well as transmission of natural gas.

The price of natural gas at the wellhead has been steadily advancing during the postwar years. In 1945 the average price of wellhead gas was 4.9 cents per thousand cubic feet; in 1948, 6.5 cents; 1953, 8.3 cents; and in 1956, 11.5 cents. Furthermore, producers are now asking FPC approval for new contracts calling for 21 cents or higher, and have placed valuations on gas reserves as high as 40 cents per thousand cubic feet.

Contributing factors to this steady rise have been the lack of FPC controls until 1954, intense competition among pipeline companies to tie up reserves and the stipulated step-ups provided in escalator and other clauses which were included in producer sales contracts.

There has been a widespread policy of setting up escalator clauses in long-term

sales contracts to pipelines, providing for regular increases in the field or wellhead price every 5 years or so, and protecting the producer in the event of new excise or other taxes levied at the wellhead. A majority of the contracts also contained favored Nation clauses providing pipeline companies would pay the supplier a price equal to the highest price received by any other producer in the area. Thus, an increase by one producer automatically sets off price increases for nearby producers.[1]

Gas purchase cost is the major single expense item of pipeline companies and amounted to about 50 percent of their revenues in 1956. All increases, of course, are ultimately borne by the consumer. For northern cities, the cost of gas at the wellhead averages out to about 10 percent of the consumer rate.

REGULATION OF INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS BY THE FPC

As mentioned previously, the Federal Power Commission, until the Supreme Court decision of June 1954, did not exercise jurisdiction over independent producers. By majority vote on several occasions, the Commission refused to take this jurisdiction, contending that the provision in the Natural Gas Act excluding "production and gathering of natural gas," exempted independent producers. There were, however, members of the Commission who differed in this interpretation. In 1948 an investigation was started to determine whether the Phillips Petroleum Co. was a natural gas company under the meaning of the act. The investigation was terminated by the Commission in August 1951, with a majority holding that although Phillips was engaged in the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale, the sales were part of production and gathering to which the Commission's jurisdiction did not extend.

The State of Wisconsin and its Public Service Commission, the city of Milwaukee, and various municipalities of Michigan and Missouri, appealed the decision of the FPC to the United States Court of Appeals which ruled in their favor. Phillips appealed to the United States Supreme Court and on June 7, 1954, a decision was handed down against Phillips, in which the majority opinion concluded:

"We believe that the legislative history indicates a Congressional intent to give the Commission jurisdiction over the rates of all wholesalers of natural gas in interstate commerce, whether by pipeline company or not, and whether occurring before, during, or after transmission by an interstate pipeline company."

Immediately after the Supreme Court decision, the FPC temporarily froze field prices of natural gas and ordered an estimated 4,100 producers to file sale contracts in effect, and to apply for certificates.

On December 7, 1954, the FPC issued order 174B which, among other things, condemned certain types of escalator and "most favored nation" clauses. The order does not outlaw these clauses but such clauses per se will not be accepted as evidence to support certificate applications or proposed rate changes.

On January 11, 1955, the FPC held a hearing at which all interested parties were invited to present views and recommendations. David Searles, one of the chief representatives of the producers, recommended that the FPC in setting gas rates for the natural gas producers, should accept contracts made at arm's length between producers and pipeline companies as prima facie evidence that the rates covered in such contracts are just and reasonable. Representatives of public utilities commissions in general favored a rate base method of regulation, but the Illinois commission favored a commodity value concept. Eastern utility companies on the whole looked with favor on a commodity value base. A case by case investigation, beginning with the major purchasers of interstate gas, was urged by William E. Torkelson, speaking for the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. This commission appears to favor a cost-of-service rate base. Small producers supplying less than 1 billion cubic feet per year could file proof of cost or accept the average price paid producers in the same area.[2]

Since the Phillips decision the FPC has been proceeding on a case-to-case basis deciding each case on the evidence and facts presented in formal hearings. It is the contention of the FPC that inasmuch as the regulation of independent producer rates is a new and vastly complicated undertaking, any predetermined standards arbitrarily fixed without the aid of clarifying legislation would, in all probability, require substantial revision at a later date, thereby leading to confusion and instability.[3]

At the present time the Commission is confronted with a considerable backlog of pending and suspended cases.

CONGRESSIONAL ATTEMPTS TO AMEND THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Even prior to the Phillips' decision, efforts were made in Congress to eliminate or curtail FPC control over producer sales. A bill to this effect was introduced in the 80th Congress, passed in the House, but not approved by the Senate.

In 1950, the Kerr bill was passed by the 81st Congress. This bill specifically exempted independent producers, including Phillips Petroleum, from FPC regulations. The measure was vetoed by President Truman and its supporters failed to override the veto. In his veto message President Truman stated: "There is a clear possibility that competition will not be effective, at least in some cases, in holding prices to reasonable levels. Accordingly, to remove the authority to regulate (producers) as the bill would do, does not seem to be wise public policy."

Several bills with similar intent were introduced in the 84th Congress in 1955. Impetus to this type of legislation was provided by a report of the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policies, which recommended that the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, and processing of natural gas prior to its integration into an interstate transmission line. Approval to this type of legislation was also given by FPC.

After Senate and House hearings, Congress passed the Harris-Fulbright bill, but it was vetoed by President Eisenhower on February 17, 1956.[4] In his message, the President stated that he favored the objectives of the bill but emphasized that any new legislation, in addition to furthering the long-term interests of consumers in plentiful supplies of gas, should include specific language protecting customers in their right to fair prices.

Hearings on the above bill indicated considerable opposition to its provisions, not only by consumer groups and State utility commissions, but also by many pipeline companies and gas distributing companies. In order to present a more united front, representatives of various segments of the natural-gas industry production, transmission, and distribution, met and drew up a general declaration of principles which future legislation should follow. This meeting of minds met with FPC and administrative approval and became the basis for the Harris and O'Hara bills introduced in 1957. Unfortunately, representatives of consumer groups were not consulted at these meetings.

The Harris and O'Hara companion bills, H. R. 6790 and 6791, were the principal bills for amending the Natural Gas Act introduced in early 1957. As mentioned previously, hearings were held on these and a clean bill, H. R. 8525, was reported back to the House with a 15 to 13 committee vote of approval. It is this bill that will be considered by the House and Senate in the next session.

The bill is reported to have administration backing and has been substantially endorsed by the FPC.

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF H. R. 8525

*1. Exempts producers from public utility regulation*

The present law is modified by the bill so that transportation and sales in connection with the processing and gathering of natural gas in or within the vicinity of the producing field or fields will no longer be subject to the public-utility type regulation provided for by the present provisions of the act. Producers would no longer be required to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity, or to file rate schedules in order to sell gas to interstate lines.

*2. Restricts FPC control over producer sales*

The FPC would still retain control over producer sale contracts but in a more restricted sense. Such sales are divided into new producer contracts and existing producer contracts, depending on whether they were entered into after or prior to enactment of this legislation. FPC control over new contracts is more inclusive than that provided for existing contracts. The FPC has no jurisdiction over prices provided for by a definite pricing clause in existing producer contracts, but any future amendments to an existing producer contract, is subject to regulation as a new contract.

With respect to pricing clauses in contracts, the bill makes a classification between definite and indefinite pricing clauses. A definite pricing is any provision which sets forth in terms of a specific price per unit, the prices to be paid and includes the initial price, any increase in the initial price by specific amounts at definite future dates, and tax reimbursement clauses. Other pricing clauses are termed indefinite and may be either proper or objectionable. The bill specifically terms as objectionable, two party favored nation, third party favored nation, better market or price determination, and spiral escalator clauses. Such clauses are not to be included in any new producer contract or in any amendment to an existing contract. (A ruling somewhat similar to this already has been made by the FPC under existing law.) Clauses of this type in existing contracts are not voided but are subject to FPC regulatory procedure. Every new producer contract must be filed with FPC by the pipeline company purchaser within a designated period, and notice given by publication and mail.

Objections may be filed by interested parties on one or more of the following grounds:

1. The contract results in a price which exceeds the reasonable market price;

2. the contract contains a prohibited indefinite pricing clause or an indefinite clause contrary to public policy;

3. the duration of a producer contract is shortened.

The FPC may also initiate proceedings on any of these grounds. If any of the objec-

[1] See article by James R. Durfee in Public Utilities, January 20, 1955, for clauses in the contract entered into by Phillips Petroleum Co. and the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co.

[2] Information in this paragraph is based on a news article appearing in Gas, February 1955, p. 130 plus.

[3] Information obtained from H. Rept. 837 of 85th Cong., 2d sess.

[4] A contributing cause to this veto was the charge that unfair and illegal lobbying was done in support of the measure.

tions are sustained by the FPC, the new producer contract becomes null and void, or if it is an amendment to an existing producer contract, the amendment becomes null and void. If approved, any definite pricing provisions held valid are removed from regulation, but the FPC retains jurisdiction over indefinite pricing provisions.

With respect to indefinite pricing clauses which operate to increase prices, whether in new or existing contracts, the procedure is similar to that of a new contract. The FPC determines the reasonable market price.

Although this bill does permit the Commission to void price increases resulting from indefinite pricing clauses in existing producer contracts, jurisdiction over definite price increase clauses in existing producer contracts, is denied even though the definite price increases go above reasonable market prices.

Also, sales by a producer to a gathering company, which transports natural gas to a processing plant, is exempted from regulation by this bill, although the sales after completion of processing are covered.

*3. Sets up a reasonable market price formula for determining producer prices*

The bill directs the FPC to determine the reasonable market price of the natural gas at the point of delivery to the pipelines. In determining producer prices, natural gas is to be considered a commodity and the FPC is not to consider costs or use the public utility concept in arriving at this price. In determining price, the FPC is required to consider:

(a) whether the price as determined by it will assure to consumers of natural gas a continuing adequate supply thereof;

(b) whether the contract price was arrived at competitively and in arm's-length bargaining;

(c) the reasonableness of all the provisions of the contract as they relate to prices under a definite pricing clause;

(d) the quality of the natural gas being purchased;

(e) conditions of delivery.

In addition, the current level of field prices under other contracts in the same field or in other fields which contain terms and provisions generally comparable to those of the contract under review, shall be considered.

Finally the bill states:

"The reasonable market price is not necessarily the price of the last sale, the highest price, the lowest price, the weighted highest price, the average field price, or other price arrived at by the mechanical application of a single criterion. Instead, it is a price which the Commission, exercising its judgment and discretion in weighing, among other things directly relevant to the issue, all factors enumerated above, determines is the reasonable market price."

The bill, thereby, substitutes reasonable market price for the presently prescribed just and reasonable standard for determining the reasonableness of producer prices. It eliminates cost of production which has been basic under the just and reasonable standard.

This reasonable market price standard would not only apply to the gas purchased by pipeline companies from independent producers, but also to the gas which they or their affiliates produce. In respect to gas owned by pipeline companies or their affiliates, the present policy of FPC is to allow a price greater than that determined under the public utility concept, in order to stimulate exploration and development of their own reserves. This has been upheld by the courts providing that the starting point for this additional allowance is the cost-plus-fair-return formula on the allowance is reasonable.

ARGUMENTS ADVANCED FOR AND AGAINST H. R. 8525 AND SIMILAR BILLS

In general supporters of the bill state that there is no basic difference between the producer of natural gas and the producer of oil, coal, livestock, lumber, and other commodities.[5] They contend that utility regulation of producer gas will lead to Federal controls of oil and eventually rigid control of the entire petroleum industry. There has been some modification of this stand as shown by the fact that some FPC control over price is provided in H. R. 8525.

Those opposing contend that there is no free market at the production level, no full interplay of the forces of supply and demand. Pipeline companies, in many instances, cannot move freely in an open competitive market in search of lower prices. They are largely bound to one or a very limited number of suppliers by the physical location of their pipeline and by long-term contracts entered into when there was a limited amount of natural gas available for distribution.

REGARDING REASONABLE MARKET PRICE VERSUS RATE-BASE METHOD

Those advocating the reasonable market price formula contend that costs incurred by the producer should not be given consideration. That doing so would result in varying prices for the same gas in the same field and would result in a hodgepodge of prices. It is further contended that in many instances costs are impossible to determine and fixing costs is a cumbersome and time consuming operation. They point to the backload of FPC cases as evidence of this.

(In committee hearings on the bill the FPC has advocated that the bill should make cost a permissive but not a mandatory factor in determining costs.)[6]

Opponents of the bill contend that no definite criteria are established in the bill for determining a reasonable market price, and that eliminating cost as a determining factor deprives the FPC of any quantitative measure in determining reasonableness of rates. While agreeing that costs may not be ascertainable in all instances, they point out that cost figures are available and have been used by oil and gas companies that have appeared before Congressional committees and cited increased costs to justify higher prices for crude oil.

They further contend that the reasonable market price concept will run into as many legal or court difficulties as the present fair value concept and will prove unworkable.[7] On the other hand, the utility rate concept is well established, has proved to be equitable and can be modified to reflect factors other than costs.

With respect to the volume of work of the FPC, it is pointed out that use of the reasonable market price formula will substantially add to the FPC workload rather than diminish it. As a method of expediting FPC cases, it is advocated that emphasis should be placed in establishing prices of the largest independent producers under the present formula and the present just and reasonable standard.

Opponents of the bill pointed up the provision in the bill that requires the reasonable market price formula also be applied to gas produced by the pipeline companies and their affiliates. They point up the fact that consumers through FPC established rates have already paid for the exploration and development costs of the reserves of these integrated pipeline companies, and that revaluing these reserves would be an unwarranted burden on the consumers. Moreover, in bargaining with independent producers, it would be to the advantage of pipeline companies owning reserves to keep up the producer price and thereby enhance the value of their own reserves. Under a ruling by the United States Supreme Court in October 1956, the FPC obtained this right to determine a fair field price for company produced gas, giving due consideration to the original cost of production method but the higher rates resulting must not be any higher than required to maintain the production end of the business.

RE NATURAL GAS RESERVES

One of the chief arguments advanced for H. R. 8525 and similar legislation has been the need for additional incentives for further exploration and development of gas reserves.

Under the present law, the FPC has the authority to grant rate increases needed to encourage exploration and development, but must show the reasonableness of such allowances.

It should be pointed out that from 55 to 60 percent of the natural gas sold to transmission lines is obtained from oil wells and that exploration and development of these wells were primarily intended for obtaining additional petroleum reserves. Furthermore, producers are allowed a 27½ percent depletion Federal tax allowance which is specifically intended to encourage such exploration and development.

There is no evidence that the Phillips' decision (1954) has discouraged exploration and development of natural gas reserves. According to testimony at the 1957 House committee hearings, gas well completions have actually increased. In 1954, 3,974 gas wells were completed and 4,275 in 1956. Natural gas production shows a similar trend.[8]

Standard & Poor's Investment Advisory Service of July 4, 1957, reports:

"As has been the experience of the oil industry, new discoveries, development and exploration, have consistently tended to increase estimates of natural gas reserves, despite the pronounced rise in production. The American Gas Association and American Petroleum Institute jointly estimated proven recoverable reserves in the United States at over 237 trillion cubic feet at December 31, 1956. Based on indicated net withdrawal of 10.9 trillion cubic feet in 1956, these proven reserves indicate a life of 21 years. Moreover, new discoveries and revisions of previous estimates of recoverable reserves through extension of known fields, indicate that the Nation's natural gas reserves are more than adequate to satisfy demands for many more years."[9]

Williard F. Stanley, president of Corporate Services, Inc., in the Harris-O'Hara Bill—Boon or Bonanza, Public Utilities Fortnightly, October 10, 1957, questions—

"Why is it necessary in order to induce drilling of a new well or development of a new gas field, to provide for increasing the price of gas produced from old, presently existing wells already drilled? The extension of the bill to cover these existing wells, as to which there can be no need of inducement, would seem an unnecessary and regrettable bonanza for the benefit of the owners of those existing gas wells (who may or may not be the owners of new wells), at the expense of the gas-consuming public (and, indirectly of the electric-consuming public) throughout the Nation."

---

[5] See "Natural Gas Regulation From the Producer Viewpoint" by George W. Hazlitt, Public Utilities Fortnightly, Sept. 26, 1957, pp. 494–500.

[6] This stand has also been taken, but not insisted upon, by the Eisenhower administration.

[7] See Current Problems in National Gas Regulation—A Consumer Viewpoint by William E. Torkelson, Public Utilities Fortnightly, Sept. 26, 1957, pp. 482–487.

[8] Hearings, pp. 1324 and 1331.

[9] Standard & Poor's Industrial Surveys—Utilities—Gas, July 4, 1957, p. U33.

REGARDING CURTAILMENT OF NATURAL GAS SUPPLIES TO INTERSTATE PIPELINES

Opponents of FPC regulation have warned that such regulation would discourage sales of natural gas to pipeline companies. This has been one of the major threats of the petroleum companies. Producers of gas in some cases have preferred to use natural gas, or gas found in association with crude oil, for repressuring of oil pools, rather than contract for sale to others at present prices. Moreover, some companies, such as Phillips, are using an increasing amount of natural gas from their reserves in chemical operations. Prices realized for natural gas on that basis may reach 4 or 5 times the amount realizable from direct sales to pipelines.

While there has been some curtailment of natural gas commitments to pipelines, it is doubtful that substantial quantities of natural gas would be converted to other uses, particularly if FPC sets fair and reasonable rates. Some leading natural gas transmission companies believe that the fair value formula, together with Phillips' decision, will tend to encourage their segment of the industry to take over natural-gas fields and to intensively engage in exploration and development programs.

REGARDING INCREASED CONSUMER PRICES

Marshall C. Howard, University of Massachusetts, states:

"Since there is no one going open-market price, a market-value determined price would have to rely on reference to several prices in the field as a guide, through, for example, an average (perhaps weighted) field price. Such reference price making would tend to be inflationary. First, price might be expected to cover the full costs of the higher cost, less lucky speculation producers whose output is still in demand in the market at such a price. Second, prices will tend to be drawn upward whenever new higher prices are granted; for, except where such price making is applied only to a minor part of the total supply, prices become based on each other in a circular fashion. By the same token, however, prices might become stabilized after an initial period of adjustment, with any higher prices being justified only on the basis of new, large volume, and higher cost production. But the Federal Power Commission would be presented only with requests for approval of price increases; lower prices, conceivable under the rate-base method, would be unlikely to occur."

There appears to be a general agreement as to the rise in consumer gas prices if H. R. 8525 is enacted but no consensus as to the probable amount.

Producers have been anxious to have the producer price reach a competitive level with other fuels and it is for this reason they stress the commodity aspects of gas. At present prices of other fuels, natural gas at the wellhead would be at a competitive level at about 20 cents per thousand cubic feet.[10]

If the average price at the wellhead was to increase by 8 cents, that is, go from 12 cents (present approximate price) to 20 cents per thousand cubic feet, this would mean an annual cost to consumers of $520 million. A 10-cent increase would be $650 million. These are based on the 1956 natural gas consumption and would be much higher if based on projected consumption. This is a conservative estimate as it does not include additional cost, which would be bound to occur as the gas went from pipeline to local utility to customer. It also does not take into account the added consumer cost for electricity in areas where natural gas is used for generating electric power. And finally, it does not point up the spiralling effect increases in gas would have on other fuels.

A study by the St. Louis Post Dispatch in 1957 estimated the annual increase as between $500 million and $900 million. The minority report on bill H. R. 8525 estimated on increases in consumer prices of $1 billion per year and that a field price increase averaging 15 cents would mean a boost of $30 billion in the value of natural gas reserves.[11]

[10] Regulation and the Price of Natural Gas, by Marshall C. Howard, The Southern Economic Journal, October 1956, p. 148.

[11] H. Rept. 837, 85th Cong., 1st sess.

## THE PRICE OF GOLD—LETTER FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter relative to the price of gold over a period of years since 1933. The letter was received by me from the Library of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
*Washington, D. C., January 3, 1958.*

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: This is in response to your request for information about the world price situation of gold in free markets from the time when the United States repriced gold.

The gold prices we have been able to locate do not meet all of your requirements. Some of the prices are official prices, when no other market except a clandestine market was operating; with one exception they are available for part but not all of the period; and some of the prices are convertible into dollars only at artificial exchange rates.

The price of gold in 400-ounce bars, 99½ percent fine, in London has averaged as follows (in shillings and pence):

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1933 | 126 | |
| 1934 | 137 | 6.8 |
| 1935 | 142 | 0.98 |
| 1936 | 140 | 3.45 |
| 1937 | 140 | 8.8 |
| 1938 | 142 | 6.7 |
| 1939 | 154 | 4.7 |
| 1940–44 | 168.0 | |
| 1945–48 | 172.3 | |
| 1949–53 | 248 | |
| | (from Sept.) | |
| 1954 | 249 | |
| 1955 | 250–51 | |

Black-market prices at end of June each year were: 1948, $47; 1949, $49.75; 1950, $41.50; 1951, $40.75; 1952, $39.50; 1953, $37.20.

Gold bars in Switzerland in June of each year were bought and sold at $42.50 per ounce in 1948, $44.50 in 1949, $40.50 in 1950, $40.25 in 1951, $37.40 in 1952, $36.55 in 1953, $35.10 in 1954, $35.05 in 1955, $35.03 in 1956. Prices in 1941–43 increased from about $35.50 to slightly below $36.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH, *Director.*

## TRANSPORTATION OF FISH OVER BROWNLEE DAM SITE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, a report has been compiled by the Idaho Fish and Game Department on the number of fish transported over the Brownlee Dam site last fall.

This report is significant, as it reveals the efforts being made to devise a means of bypassing dams with fish runs, and it emphasizes the fact that the Middle Snake River has a greater migration of fish than was expected.

This report indicates that real progress is being made, through cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and private interests toward solving the problem of anadromous fish runs endangered by construction of dams. Since power will be needed in ever-increasing amounts for years to come, it is gratifying to know that this program has been set up and is functioning successfully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEAVY RUN OF STEELHEAD, FALL CHINOOK COUNTED THROUGH BROWNLEE TRANSPORT SYSTEM

The central Snake River's portion of this year's record runs of anadromous fish finished with a fall migration of around 2,000 steelhead trout and more than 14,000 Chinook salmon, the Idaho Fish and Game Department said today.

Forrest Hauck, fishery research superior, said the fall run of Chinook is figured from August 10 when bright, fresh fish began entering the trap at Brownlee. From this trap, fish were transported around the construction area by truck and released some 3 miles above the trapping point. Chinook taken in the trap were in good condition until October 15 when numbers dwindled and the remaining fish showed more of the marks of the last stages of the run, Hauck added.

During the peak of the run, the fish came so fast that the two transport trucks furnished by the Idaho Power Co. were unable to keep them from piling up in the trap, Hauck reported. A third truck was used for a time, and the department recommended that adequate standby equipment be furnished for peak periods in the future.

Hauck said present plans call for transportation of upstream migrants past Oxbow when the river is closed for construction there next year. Brownlee is expected to start impoundment during the 1958 spring runoff, and provision for downstream fish passage will be needed at that time, he added.

Since the fate of these fish runs is of concern to Oregon and Washington, as well as Idaho, the studies in connection with the three Snake River dams have been handled on a cooperative basis, Hauck pointed out. The sports and commercial fishery agencies of Washington and Oregon, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Idaho Fish and Game Department, and the Idaho Power Co. have cooperated.

He said the power company allotted $250,000 for studies to determine what to do about the fishery resources. However, most of the work done so far has had to go into developing temporary facilities for handling upstream migrants, a part of the construction phase and a separate operation.

"Permanent fish passage facilities for both upstream and downstream fish migrations were recommended by the Idaho Fish and Game Department from the start of negotiations in 1956," Hauck said. "Sportsmen and the department have a right to expect the construction agency to make every effort to maintain fish and wildlife resources that may be affected by their projects." He said good success so far has been obtained in cooperative work in connection with two northern Idaho dams, and the department hopes for equal consideration in the Snake River project engineering.

The transport system has worked fairly well so far, Hauck reported. "Reports that

the trucks were hauling nongame fish caused the department some embarrassment on several occasions," he said. "The facts are these: If a load of fish contained even one steelhead or chinook spawner, the load was ordered transported undisturbed, as separation of the species was almost certain to result in injury to the spawn-laden game fish. If a load contained no game fish, it was not transported, but was dumped in a hole on shore as a matter of efficiency." He pointed out that the nongame species already inhabit the river above the dam, so that addition of the fish involved would be "like adding another drop to a bucket that is already full of water," and of no effect. However, the loss of a single spawner would be an instant reduction of the threatened resource that the system was set up to preserve.

Hauck said 308 chinook salmon and 5 steelhead trout were removed from the trap for experimental purposes, to test various phases of the work. The spawn was taken from a few to be hatched under observation, but most of these fish were tagged and released. The results of these tests will be announced by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, but it was interesting to note that 50 percent of the experimental releases reentered the trap within 48 hours.

Tagging records show that a number of the transported fish also dropped back downstream and reentered the trap a second time. The number of double runs of this type was computed at about 2 percent. Fish that passed through uncounted during periods when the barrier and trap were not in operation were estimated as making up for any double counting due to returns, however.

## THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had not intended to make any statement about the President's state of the Union message until I listened to some of my colleagues laud it. I think at least a respectful dissent should be filed in the RECORD. I want to say that, in my judgment, it was a sermon delivered at the wake of the Eisenhower administration. Between its lines was a confession of 5 years of failure on the part of the Eisenhower administration to meet the foreign-policy needs of this country.

I am glad the President at least discovered the problem of the malaria mosquito. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that under the Truman point 4 program we had appropriated great sums of money for the eradication of the malaria mosquito. Under the policies of this administration of placing the dollar above human values, there have been drastic cuts from time to time in funds needed for a much expanded point 4 program.

I was very much disappointed in the President's discussion of expected specific proposals to meet our foreign-policy needs. I thought we were going to get eight specific points of action for the alleviation of our foreign-policy crisis. However, the President's eight-point program consisted for the most part of glittering generalities. I want to say I was particularly disappointed in his discussion of the great issue that faces the people of the world, that of disarmament. It is about time we implemented the disarmament need. The President got right up to the line, then stopped. We cannot have disarmament without negotiation. The United States Government needs to stop following a course of action in which it would dictate the terms under which it will negotiate. The situation is so serious, in my judgment, that we ought to draw the Russians out, on the basis of public discussions, and disclose to the world that it is Russia and not the United States that is refusing to face up to the disarmament need.

I think it is particularly pertinent to point out that we need to return to the Vandenberg belief that a permanent system of peace will never be established until the nations of the world resort to international justice through law. Throughout the Vandenberg historic speeches on world peace that tenet was reiterated time and time again on the floor of the Senate. I recommend it to President Dwight D. Eisenhower. But not a word in his state of the Union message was there by way of reference to this great need of resorting to a system of international justice through law for a solution of the problems that threaten the peace of the world. I want to say respectfully the speech was probably suitable for a high school oratorical contest, but it did not come to grips with the reality of the great threat to peace facing the world.

My great fear is that if we continue to emphasize the military approach and the military hysteria that I fear is gripping the American public, we are going to end up with war. Armament races always end in war. This time war will mean the destruction not only of nations but a large part of civilization itself.

Therefore, Mr. President, as one who listened to the speech, I file this respectful dissent. I think it failed to come to grips with the great need of the hour, which is advancing the cause of peace in the world.

## STOCKHOLDERS MEETING OF FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the outstanding annual farm meetings of the Nation is the stockholders meeting of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, Minn. Alltime records were broken at this year's 20th annual stockholders meeting of this great midwestern cooperative on December 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press commenting upon this farm convention.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GTA CONVENTION AS A ST. PAUL PATTERN

In this expansive period of many things setting new records as being bigger and better than ever before, there is no crystal ball to tell whether the apex still lies ahead in St. Paul's great farm conventions. We rather suspect that it does. If so, we are glad. And so will be the merchants of this city for whom the convention season and the Christmas shopping season through a happy coincidence arrive together.

As concerns the history of such conventions up to date, the one just concluded by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association brushed all records into the discard. Tuesday night's dinner crowd of close to 7,000 was remarkable by any standards that have ever been set in any place at any time. With anything less than the most skilled preparation and execution, an attempt to serve dinners to so many could easily result in a grand breakdown. But the feat here Tuesday night was performed swiftly and smoothly, without a hitch. The Hotel St. Paul is to be congratulated on this achievement. So is the GTA.

This city, its officials and businesses welcome the great farm conventions to St. Paul. We are glad to provide a forum for their discussions pro and con of the farm issues of the day. Their visits here seem a good thing all around. For us, their presence and the business they bring point up a realization of the interdependence of farm and city, a realization that should be at least as healthy for city people as for farmers. And our latchstring will always be out for these farm conventions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, highlight of the convention was its annual banquet, at which 7,000 farmers dined together at the St. Paul Auditorium. Some idea of the mammoth task of serving that great assemblage of Midwest farm people is given by a news story from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED POUNDS OF MEAT—THOUSANDS DINE AT GTA DINNER

Mom may have slaved for hours over a hot stove on Thanksgiving Day. But it was never like this.

They served dinner in the St. Paul Auditorium Tuesday night, and the guest list ran close to 7,000.

The dinner was prepared in all the kitchens of the Hotel St. Paul and served about three blocks away. Three trucks were kept running back and forth for about 18 hours before the meal.

Even though the service was buffet style, there were 220 waitresses on the job, pouring coffee, guiding the diners, cleaning tables, and doing other chores.

On the menu were 2,700 pounds of hot baked ham and roast beef, number of cold meats, baked and hashed-brown potatoes, corn, fruit cuts, rolls, butter, coleslaw, and multiple relishes.

Members of the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association ate the dinner in a crowded hall, but they didn't see all the work that went on behind the scenes.

More than 65 hotel employees in the chef's department alone were engaged in the preparation. They started preliminary work at noon Monday and began to cook at 10 p. m. Monday for the Tuesday evening feast.

Two crews rode the trucks as they hauled the food from oven to auditorium in warming carts or cooling carts, or whatever device was needed to keep the prepared dinner as it should be.

All ovens in all of the hotel's kitchens were utilized.

Some employees from the Hotel Lowry were borrowed for the time, and scores of extras were hired.

But the job had been done in previous years, although for slightly smaller crowds. And now it's just a big job well organized, said Joseph Yankovec, the chef.

As he spoke the clatter of pots and dishes rang through the main kitchen of the hotel. They were the thousands of dirty ones that had been trucked back and now were being washed by a crew of 27.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to address this great assemblage, an honor I have had every year for the last 5 years. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAY TO PEACE: BREAD OR GUNS?

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, at annual banquet of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., December 10, 1957)

It's always inspiring to stand before this great assemblage of farm people. It renews one's faith in the real strength of our democracy—the people themselves.

Each of the last 5 years, it has been my privilege to be guest speaker for your annual GTA banquet. I'm proud of your friendship and trust.

Each year, since 1953, I've endeavored to speak to you frankly and from my heart. I want to do that again tonight, sharing with you some of my observations and reactions to trends and events on the national and international scene that concern all of us.

These are somber times, calling for serious and thoughtful reflection.

Our national survival is at stake, and in danger.

Within the past few months, American strength and American prestige have received blow after blow. We are in trouble.

Faced with the gravest dangers we have ever known, our foreign policy is in a state of confusion and disarray.

The entire free world is crying out desperately for leadership—and we have been found wanting. We are ineffective, uncertain, floundering. We are virtually leaderless ourselves, offering little hope and encouragement to others looking toward us for guidance in the struggle for freedom's survival.

Yet maintenance of peace is our most urgent business, in an age when war could mean annihilation.

It is for that reason I feel impelled tonight to divert your attention from some of our domestic problems, as serious as they are, to take a broader look at where we are today—and where we're going.

Events of recent weeks have given America a rude awakening. They belie the administration's repeated bland assurances that we were "far ahead of the Soviets." Understandably, our self-assurance and self-satisfaction have been shaken.

We have been compelled to face some humiliating facts about Soviet Russia's advances—and our own failures and shortcomings.

The shock has been greater, because of the extent to which the American people have been lulled to sleep by a lack of candor in high places.

It has been a disservice to our Nation's welfare for the political hucksters to shut their eyes and blindly chant "Peace and prosperity"—when the world about them is a tinderkeg of tensions, troubles, and conflicts, and our own domestic economy is dangerously out of balance—inflated and deflated at the same time, and failing to keep pace even with Russia in expanded productivity.

We can no longer afford the luxury of complacency—or sloganeering lullabyes.

But there is no need, either, for panic or hysteria.

Rather, it is a time for soul-searching, dedication, and determination.

Out of our national humiliation must come a national awakening. Out of honest appraisal of our own shortcomings must arise a new and strengthened will to win in the face of any challenge, a determination that can only succeed if it is based upon high moral purpose for all humanity, rather than just material self-interest. As the great Greek Pericles once said, "I am more worried about our own faults than about the plans of our enemies."

We need first of all to know and understand the nature of the menace we face.

We need secondly to know and understand all the resources at our command, and then put our own house in order so as to make the most of the advantages we have.

We need next to chart a course that is morally right in our own eyes as well as in the eyes of millions before whom democracy as we know it is still on trial; a course that is in accord with our own heritage and tradition of human justice, compassion, equality, and respect for the individual dignity. It must be a course that depicts our image to the rest of the world as we really are, instead of what others would make us appear.

We need finally to fully mobilize all of our energies, our talents, our intelligence, and our fortunes behind the task of keeping our Nation on the course we have charted, doing what we are convinced is right as we see the right, under God, no matter what course others may pursue.

Only then can we be masters of our own destiny.

In Soviet communism, we confront an adversary whose aim is domination of the world—if not by war, then by all means short of war.

Soviet Russia may not try to blow the world to bits. Instead, it has shrewdly embarked on a campaign to conquer the world bit by bit—operation nibble.

Yes, far more than missiles or the race for outer space is involved in the serious challenge we now face. It is time we realized that, in effect, the Soviet is already waging an all-out war on the United States and the rest of the free world—a new kind of all-out war that may continue without a shot being fired. It is economic warfare, cultural warfare, scientific warfare, political warfare, and propaganda warfare.

Nikita Khrushchev has thrown down the gantlet across the board. He boasts that the Soviet will be supreme in nuclear power, in consumer goods production, in cultural activities, in agricultural production, in education, and in international trade.

They are challenging us in every field—and the new nations of Asia and Africa, representing the great uncommitted weight of the world's manpower and resources, are watching intensely the onrushing Soviet drive. They see a strident and confident Soviet Russia—and an indecisive and faltering United States.

We are locked in a struggle which will demand every resource of our intelligence and our spirit. We are in a one-game world series, and we cannot afford to lose any more innings. It's a winner-take-all showdown contest between the Soviet's state capitalism, and our private capitalism; between its collective enterprise, and our free enterprise.

We cannot escape the challenge, nor should we want to. It must be met with faith and determination, not with fear and frustrations. We must decide to compete—and win—in every area of challenge. We must compete all the way, not with one hand tied behind our backs. We must compete with the greatest mobilization of our resources, our talents, and our national will that we have ever known. We must face such competition with our eyes open, knowing that our way of life is at stake.

We must now prove that a free society offers more hope for the fulfillment of humanity's aspirations than the disciplined state of a totalitarian dictatorship.

It's a two-man race, and coming in second in any area of endeavor will be last.

Quite frankly, the scoreboard hasn't looked good for several years.

But the truth is we haven't really been willing to face the facts until the Soviet startled us with sputnik's breakthrough into outer space.

No amount of effort by the administration to pooh-pooh the great scientific breakthrough into space—comparable to splitting the atom and harnessing atomic energy—could obscure the Soviet success, advertising to the world that the United States had lost its scientific leadership.

If it achieved nothing more, sputnik compelled the American people to look realistically at what else was happening in the showdown struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of Soviet imperialism.

On the military front, the successful firing of the first Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile was followed by our own Navy's disclosure that the Soviet Union had also perfected a 1,500-mile missile which jeopardized every overseas United States base within range.

On the trade front, Russia has aggressively pursued and concluded far more trade agreements with other countries than we have been able to do—and made an everexpanding number of countries dependent upon it as a source of supply.

On the cultural front, it has brought far more exchange students to Russia from all over the world than we have brought to the United States.

On the educational front, it is training far more engineers and scientists than we are producing in the United States—and responsible educators in our country are now conceding that Russia is doing a superb job on all-around education.

On the propaganda front, the extent of Russia's operations throughout the world makes the United States look like a little country weekly compared with the combined forces of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune and the St. Paul Pioneer-Press.

Now, my purpose is not to be unduly alarming; I'm just trying to give you a sober and realistic appraisal of the scope of the challenge we face. We must talk frankly with each other, because it is a sad truth that too often the present administration has not been candid with the American people.

Our danger now is that we may be tempted to swing too violently from one extreme to another—to compensate for our complacency, by plunging headlong into putting all our chips on weapons of destruction.

We'd better remember that the Soviet challenge is their system against ours—in every field, not just military power.

As urgent as it is for our country to catch up with, and surpass, the Soviet in missiles and satellites, it would be tragic indeed if we let our sudden belated concern blind us to the advantages we still hold—and lead us into neglecting still other areas of competition.

Our assets far exceed our shortcomings, for it is not on military might alone that the outcome of this struggle hinges—and make no mistake about it, the United States and its allies have military strength. But we have much more, as well.

In a world that is desperately in need of capital, we have the greatest capital resource of all. In a world where people are anxious for the blessings of better "know how" and technology, we are richly endowed with such blessings born out of the progress of our free society. In a world where tyranny and cynicism are widespread, we have freedom and idealism. In a world where the majority of people are ill housed, ill fed, and ill clad, we are privileged to have an abundance of food and fiber, and the knowledge of achievement for health and shelter.

We have these tremendous assets at our command; the test will be the extent to which we are willing to dedicate them to

humanity—the price we are willing to pay for peace, and the preservation of freedom.

Our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to establish our independence. Can we offer less to preserve it?

Gathered in this great hall tonight are producers of what may really be one of the greatest assets our country has in its all-out competition with Soviet Russia—a force for freedom more far-reaching than any military weapon.

Food is the common denominator of international life. Man must eat to survive. Armies are helpless without food.

I wish every farmer who has been told he must drastically cut down his production could have walked with me through the Palestine refugee camps in Lebanon, the orphanages in Greece, or among the masses of unemployed huddled in shanty towns in Spain. I wish you could have seen with me the young hands outstretched for food, and heard the appeals for milk from haggard, worried mothers.

Bread, not guns, may well decide mankind's future destiny.

In areas of Africa and Asia, as well as other parts of the world, food means far more to vast millions of people today than any space satellite in the sky.

A breakthrough in the conquest of hunger could be more significant in the cold war than the conquest of outer space.

Thanks to you farm people, and others like you, the United States is in a far better position than Russia to lead the world toward the conquest of hunger and want.

The Soviet has its sputniks—but it hasn't our abundance of food and fiber.

Our much-abused abundance is a tremendously vital asset to our international relations, if we have the vision and determination to use it wisely for humanity.

Yet it also can be turned to a devastating disadvantage, if Russia can point to us as the greedy rich man living on the hill, unwilling to be concerned about those in the valley of poverty surrounding us even while we complain of having too much of everything.

Khrushchev seems to understand the vital role food and fiber can occupy in the struggle for the mind of man—and he has embarked the Soviet Union on the task of trying to outproduce us. He has served notice, publicly, that he intends to make Russia the world's leading supplier of food.

Regrettably, the American people have been led to think our abundance and ability to produce in abundance is some shameful millstone around our necks—instead of perhaps one of the greatest advantages we hold on the world scene.

From the President on down, no one high in our Government has seemed to realize what a potential force for freedom we have in the very thing many have complained so loudly about—our food abundance.

Every move to make greater use of food and fiber to bolster ties with underdeveloped areas of the world has had to be forced upon this administration.

They are too timid, and too unimaginative. They are hesitant when they should be bold. They cannot seem to look over the horizon into the future.

That's why I have proposed creation of a new Peace Food Administrator role at the White House level, to provide more aggressive leadership toward use of our Nation's abundance of food as a force for freedom in the world.

It took sputnik to awaken us fully to our failure to make the best use of our own scientific brains and knowhow. Let us pray it doesn't take the loss of some vital area of the world such as India to awaken us fully to the urgency of waging peace just as aggressively as we would wage war—and using more wisely the resources in our hands to win that peace. And food, dollars, and technical assistance, plus friendly association, can give India the chance it needs to be a powerful Asian neighbor on freedom's side.

Just as the President has belatedly named a "science czar" at the White House level to eliminate confusion and give some sense of urgency to our scientific progress in defense, we need the same kind of post for someone with vision of what our food can mean to the world, and someone with the ability and boldness to end buck passing and conflict between many agencies of Government involved one way or another in food use abroad.

During the war, we created a new post of War Food Administrator, entirely independent of the Secretary of Agriculture, because we fully recognize the importance of food to victory. In our current struggle for a secure peace in the world, it is no less important to have somewhere in our Government a top-level official whose full responsibility should be more effective use of our abundance of food and fiber, in the Nation's interests, as a vital arm of our foreign policy.

We in this country do not know what it means to have to choose between a necessary rate of investment, and enough to eat. We must do what we can to help ease that choice for others, before it is too late.

In a world where millions lack enough to eat, we should be humbly thankful that we are blessed with abundance—and we should be wise enough to use that abundance more constructively and more imaginatively for the sake of humanity.

Perhaps that is the real choice we as a nation must now make—the course that offers the most hope toward the peace we seek.

We have the opportunity of waging peace constructively and positively through trying to serve mankind, rather than destructively and negatively through sheer dependence on military might.

Certainly we must remain militarily strong for our own protection. It would be sheer folly not to keep pace with the Soviet, even in creation of weapons that could destroy us all. But it would be greater folly, indeed, to believe that such a weapons race is the eventual road to peace, or that ever more powerful weapons of destruction can ever fully achieve the security we seek.

The tragic truth is that there is no real security in the race to produce weapons of mass destruction that in themselves create insecurity in the hearts and minds of everyone.

All that our shield of strength can do is to provide us with more time—time to regain the world's confidence by asserting our leadership as we really are—a compassionate people, not a military people; a peace-loving people, not aggressors.

For too long America's foreign policy has been based on fear, rather than hope. To be strong we must be true to ourselves.

We're out of character, as Americans, when we try to frighten others by bluff and bluster. We're not fooling the Soviet, and we're just confusing our friends.

Hope, not fear, must be our message to the world.

Moral justification, not expediency, must be our guiding l'ght.

Our foreign policy is weakened and limited, to the degree that we forget, or fail to apply, the yardstick of our own democratic experience to the complex and intricate problems of the world in which we live. Nor will we enhance freedom, by aping the enemies of freedom. Democracy and free institutions are not made more secure by utilising totalitarian techniques.

We must be ourselves, all of us—and act as a nation in the image of what is really in our hearts.

Our history, our heritage, our experience in self-government, yes, our own revolution, are in fact the sources of our strength.

We have acted as if we were afraid of revolutions in Asia and Africa.

The greatest hope we can hold out to millions of people in Asia and Africa—people who now represent the ultimate balance of power—is our own dramatic story of American independence.

We need to join with the spirit of independent nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries, and remind these people that we too are the children of self-determination, of revolution, and of a will to freedom and independence.

It is our message of brotherhood and human equality that is our reservoir of good will. It is time we walk more confidently before the world in that image, with the full stature and strength of our history—and our present capacities as a people, materially, intellectully, and morally.

But it will take deeds, not just words, to convey that image to the world—and restore us to the moral leadership so urgently needed in the world of today.

We must put our own house in order, and not be blind to our own shortcomings.

We must wipe out forever the shameful social blight of racial discrimination as at Little Rock, as well as the unjust economic blight of depressed agricultural income threatening to relegate farm people to less than full equality of opportunity in our society.

We must practice what we preach about economic justice and compassion, at home as well as abroad.

We must revise our immigration laws, and set new standards of morality in government, business, and labor. We must show democracy's concern for the least of those in our midst, if we expect to convince others throughout the world of our concern for all humanity.

We must properly care for our own aged, needy, and underprivileged.

We must greatly expand and improve the educational opportunities we offer our young people, not alone to produce more scientists we need but also to better prepare more of our future citizens as missionaries of peace in every walk of life.

We must keep our own economy fully employed and fully productive to support a rising standard of living as well as adequate programs of defense and foreign policy—and then we must be willing to accept in our hearts that our obligation to humanity doesn't end at our own shores.

We must make much greater use of our economic strength to help other free nations develop themselves, and bring the blessings of freedom to their eager and impatient peoples.

We must not limit the effectiveness of our economic development funds by attaching military or political conditions humiliating to the new nations, or by trying to shape them in the image of the United States. We must recognize that their independent development, in forms suitable to their people, their circumstances, and their resources, is in our interest as well as in theirs.

We must respect the neutrality of newborn nations. These neutrals are not pro-Communist; they are pro-themselves. As long as nations remain free, as long as they work for themselves and build their own economies, they are barriers to Communist penetration, strengthening the forces of freedom in the world.

We need to step up our own point 4 program, at the same time we continue to work through the U. N. and help expand the U. N. technical assistance. No program has been more rewarding or has greater promise for a comparatively small investment.

The experience of the farm cooperative movement can be a tremendous asset for American foreign policy, in many of the underdeveloped areas of the world. Land reform programs are fortified and strengthened when they are blended with the farm cooperative. GTA represents a reservoir or pool of managerial talent and practical experience in cooperative marketing that is needed in such countries as far away as Egypt, India, Japan, Iran, and Formosa.

We must authorize a dramatic expansion of student exchanges, along with the exchange of technicians, professional people, farmers, labor, businessmen, journalists, and others engaged in public communications—from all over the world. Only by really knowing each other can we learn to live together in peace. We have everything to gain from such exchanges.

We need to reassert our leadership toward disarmament, in practical ways. But while we work and plan for disarmament, we must keep our defenses strong and commensurate with our farflung commitments. Ironically, a strong defense is also one of the prerequisites to the negotiation of any disarmament agreement; for the Soviet Union will see little incentive to negotiate an agreement if they believe that time and the budget will reduce our defenses unilaterally wtihout concessions on their part.

No one wants to see budgets and taxes higher than they need be; but if $38 billion cannot be stretched with good management to pay for research and development, missiles, airpower, and the armed forces required by our international commitments, then it is better that the budget be increased than that we should thin our defenses to the danger point, or—what is equally dangerous—leave ourselves with no effective force but massive retaliation.

If we had no weapons but the ultimate weapons of total annihilation, for use only under the ultimate provocation, we can be sure our adversaries will construe this as a weakness and take advantage of it. Yet, this is exactly the direction we have been taking.

We must manage to convey to the world the sincerity of our passion for peace, and for control and reduction of arms as a means of diminishing the danger of war.

Ours is a nation more of compassion than cruelty.

Ours is a people more of generosity than of selfishness.

Ours is a tradition more of faith than fear.

This, then, must be our path to peace.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before adjourning the annual stockholders' meeting a number of important resolutions were adopted by the farmer stockholders. I ask unanimous consent that this series of resolutions, adopted by the convention attended by over 7,000 farm delegates, be printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues from throughout the Midwest and other farm areas of the country.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT 20TH ANNUAL STOCKHOLDERS MEETING OF FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN., DECEMBER 9, 10, AND 11, 1957

INTRODUCTION

This is the 20th annual convention of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

We look with pride at the accomplishments, the growth and development of our organization in a period of only two decades.

From humble beginnings, this cooperative has developed into an institution of outstanding service, strength, and influence. It is of first-rate usefulness and value to farmers of the Central Northwest and the Nation.

Our pride in accomplishments to date in no way should blind us to the problems, the difficulties, and the challenge ahead. It is with a deep sense of things remaining to be done that your resolutions committee presents the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION 1. THE FARMERS UNION PROGRAM

Falling farm prices and steadily increasing production costs have created a depression among a growing number of family farmers.

The situation requires unity and concentration on developing and winning support for programs that will help family farmers achieve real bargaining power with parity income as the steadfast objective.

We believe that the National Farmers Union and the State organizations represent our chief hope in arresting the farm depression trend. They are embarked upon programs of education and legislation that continues to deserve our united and enthusiastic support.

RESOLUTION 2. PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAMS

There is a widespread lack of understanding and appreciation of the economic problem of family farmers among other segments of society today. This is partly because the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar continues to decline and opponents of farm programs have exaggerated the cost of farm programs to the taxpayer.

We therefore urge increased emphasis on a public relations program which will get the truth to other groups. The facts must be brought out and communicated effectively.

We commend the work of the Farmers Union Press Association in coordinating the information programs of GTA and the national and State Farmers Union organizations in their important field.

RESOLUTION 3. THE GTA FARM FAMILY SURVEY

We urge continuation of the GTA farm family survey. This statistical report and analysis is supplying basic information on the changes in farm income and costs that assist greatly in understanding and evaluating the trends that are rapidly changing the pattern of family farming in this region.

RESOLUTION 4. SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Every citizen has a stake in preserving and protecting the Nation's soil and water resources. The Soil Conservation Service has proven to be of outstanding value in advancing this objective. We believe it should continue as an independent Federal agency, with adequate funds to insure rapid progress in conservation and a halt in wastage of this irreplaceable asset.

RESOLUTION 5. GRAIN SANITATION

Continued emphasis is required by farmers, elevators, and transportation carriers in keeping grain clean and reducing waste. Cooperation with the educational programs of the Federal and State extension services is proving effective.

RESOLUTION 6. THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF GRAIN COOPERATIVES

GTA is proud to be associated with 23 other regional cooperatives marketing grain, oilseeds, and related commodities in the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

We believe it is of the utmost importance to producers everywhere to increase, strengthen and enlarge cooperative activity in marketing in this area and other areas.

Service has been greatly improved, margins reduced, and facilities for handling and storage expanded by these institutions owned and controlled by farmers. The benefits of cooperative marketing should be available to every producer.

RESOLUTION 7. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY TOLLS

We approve the progress being made by the Governments of Canada and the United States in bringing the St. Lawrence Seaway into being.

It will be a mistake, however, if the benefits of this improvement are kept from full realization by excessive toll charges on ships transporting grain and other cargo for use overseas.

In principle, we favor toll-free passage of ships as the best solution to the problem and urge Members of Congress to amend existing law to achieve this.

RESOLUTION 8. INTEREST RATES AND FARM CREDIT

Action taken by the Federal Government has advanced interest rates unduly This has greatly increased the cost of Federal indebtedness and has set in motion a series of chain reactions which have greatly increased interest rates to farmers and other citizens.

Present-day farming requires an increasingly large capital investment. Long-term credit at reasonable interest rates is impossible to obtain for young men and their families entering agriculture currently. We believe this is not to the best interest of this Nation.

RESOLUTION 9. GRAIN EXPORTS

We urge the continuation and expansion of the law (Public Law 480) under which farm exports have been increased.

An annual appropriation of at least $2 billion for this purpose is well justified in making available surpluses of food and fiber to needy people in other lands.

RESOLUTION 10. DISPOSITION OF SAVINGS

The management of GTA is authorized by the Board of Directors to pay in cash 20 percent of the current fiscal year's savings. In addition, stock in GTA is redeemed in full when a patron retires from farming. We urge continuation of this program.

RESOLUTION 12. TRANSPORTATION AND FACILITIES

The expansion of GTA's truck unloading and rail and barge loading facilities at St. Paul has proven of great value to patrons of our cooperatives.

It has become obvious that truck transportation of grain is expanding rapidly. This presents many grave problems. Further expansion of truck transportation is inevitable in view of the inaction by railroads in adjusting their rate structure and service to meet their competition.

Higher railroad rates are steadily forming more truck transportation of grain and oilseeds and we commend GTA's board of directors and management for the awareness of this development and the prompt steps to provide facilities.

RESOLUTION 13. PUBLICATIONS

We believe that the GTA publication program is invaluable in providing information to members of GTA.

We urge continuation of the GTA Digest and the Farmers Union Herald and commend their editors for their zeal and energy in keeping us informed. The GTA radio program which reaches the homes of all members is also a valuable aid in maintaining an awareness of economic and political developments important to our business as farmers.

RESOLUTION 14. NATIONAL FARM POLICY

The current flexible support price program has proved to be a failure. It has not measured up to the prospectus of its chief advocates, including Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

It has failed to advance the objective of Congress since 1938—the goal of full parity income for farmers. It has not advanced one iota, but has instead retarded the objective stated by President Eisenhower on January 9, 1956, of encouraging the preservation of the commercial family farm.

Secretary Benson has indicated that he will propose amendments to the flexible support price act to lower the minimum level of supports of basic commodities from 75 to 60 percent. He proposes to eliminate corn acreage allotments leaving the support level to his own discretion.

He desires to change further the flexible formula under which support levels are determined to prevent small, automatic advances in minimum support levels when carryovers are reduced.

These and nearly every proposal he has made will lower farm prices and farm income unless rejected by Congress. We believe that Congress should reject these proposals and enact instead legislation to strengthen farm prices and income as an essential step in maintaining a healthy national economy.

RESOLUTION 15. TV PROGRAMING

A resolution of the board of directors of the association relating to a proposed TV program was presented to the meeting, following which it was unanimously:

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors and management of the association are hereby authorized and directed to expend not to exceed $500,000 per annum for not more than 3 years for a TV program designed to enlarge the business of the association and increase the value of services rendered by it to its members and patrons, all in line with the recommendations of the board of directors of the association this day presented to this meeting."

It is intended by this resolution to give to management discretion in respect to the character of the TV program, the amount to be expended upon it within the annual limit above stated, and through this means increase the volume of business done by the association and the effectiveness of the services rendered by it to its members and patrons.

RESOLUTION 16. APPRECIATION AND THANKS

Once again St. Paul, its citizens and officials, have been most hospitable to GTA's annual convention. For this, we desire to express our sincere thanks and appreciation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the success of this great convention, as well as the progress of this tremendous marketing organization, is a tribute to the vigorous and effective leadership of a great American who has dedicated his life to farm families of the Midwest. He is M. W. "Bill" Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. Few men in this generation have waged a more continuing or more effective fight in behalf of agriculture. His constructive influence has meant much to the economy of the Midwest. I could not call attention to the great GTA Convention without paying this deserved tribute to the moving spirit of that splendid organization.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota in what he has had to say about "Bill" Thatcher, who has not only been a good friend of the farmers of the Midwest, but also a good friend, a wise adviser, and a great counselor to the farmers who live along the northern rim of the States as far west as Montana. We think a good deal of him in Montana. I am delighted to join with the Senator from Minnesota in extending my commendation to "Bill" Thatcher.

## RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF COOPERATIVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Minnesota is proud of its cooperatives. Few States in the Union have a more effective cooperative movement than Minnesota.

The 12th annual meeting of the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives was held in St. Paul on October 28 and 29. A number of resolutions were adopted pertaining to issues which will come before the Congress.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some of the resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives that directly pertain to national legislation.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS, 12TH ANNUAL MEETING, MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF COOPERATIVES, HOTEL LOWRY, ST. PAUL, OCTOBER 28, 29, 1957

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas there continues to exist strong organized pressure groups that are making every effort to use taxation, especially the taxing of patronage refunds, as a weapon to weaken and destroy our cooperatives; and

Whereas the fact is that consumer and farmer cooperatives now pay their taxes on a basis of full equality with all other taxpayers: Be it therefore

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives continue its work in the field of legislation to oppose laws which would tend to be discriminatory toward cooperatives, and to continue its work in the field of public relations and education to inform the general public of the facts regarding cooperative taxation.

RESOLUTION 6

Whereas cost of money has risen over 260 percent in the past 2 years and this increase is placing an added burden on public housing, school building, farmers, and small-business men by increasing the rate of interest; and

Whereas the tight-money policies that the national administration is sponsoring and recommending and applying in an effort to control inflation; and

Whereas figures show that the inflation has increased rather than been controlled under this policy: Be it therefore

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives support legislation that would bring the facts about tight money to the public namely by supporting a bipartisan committee of Senators and Congressmen to make a thorough investigation of the Federal Reserve Board's tight-money policy.

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas after extensive hearings of all interested groups the Congress of the United States enacted into law the Farm Credit Act of 1956; and

Whereas said Farm Credit Act provided for a revolving fund for the benefit of the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank in an amount concluded necessary for the proper functioning of such banks in the interest of their farmer users: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives does hereby go on record as opposed to any legislation changing or modifying the above revolving fund as presently provided for in the Farm Credit Act of 1956: Be it further

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives does also go on record as opposed to any legislation not approved by the Farm Credit Administration with respect to increased and further control by the Bureau of the Budget over the budgets of the intermediate credit banks and the Bank for cooperatives.

RESOLUTION 8

Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult and cumbersome to administer REA loans: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives favors reestablishment of the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Federal Government as it was originally set up in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

RESOLUTION 9

Whereas we see a large amount of misleading and, in some cases, outright untruthful advertising sponsored on a national basis, by certain private electric power companies and directed against electric cooperatives, municipally owned electric utilities and the Federal public-power program: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives favors Congressional investigation to ascertain if expenditures made for such advertising may be legally reported as operating expense for (1) the purpose of fixing electric consumer rates; and (2) as legitimate deductions for Federal income-tax purposes.

RESOLUTION 10

Whereas the Rural Electrification Act was enacted to make it possible for cooperatives, and others, to bring central station electric service to the rural areas of the Nation where, due to low population density, investor-owned utilities could not, or would not, make the required investments; and

Whereas a low rate of interest was, and still is, necessary to make such investments economically feasible; and

Whereas rural electrification cooperatives have, and will continue to make great contributions to the economic, as well as the social welfare of the Nation as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives is opposed to any change in governmental policies whereby the rate of interest applicable to rural electrification and telephone loans would be increased.

RESOLUTION 12

Whereas development of atomic power in the field of power generation, especially of relatively small reactors adaptable to such electric and municipal power generation has been unduly and seriously delayed; and

Whereas such development is of prime importance to cooperatives and to cooperators and to municipalities in particular, and to the Nation in general; and

Whereas Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn., has been negotiating for more than 2 years to bring about the construction of a nuclear powerplant of 22,000 kilowatt capacity, and is ready and willing to cooperate in such development to the fullest possible extent: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives reaffirm its support of the proposed nuclear power development at Elk River; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we urge the Atomic Energy Commission to expedite construction of the Elk River project so that the Nation may have the benefit of the scientific knowledge that will result from such research.

RESOLUTION 13

Whereas the economic position of the dairy farmer has steadily declined during the past 10 years; and

Whereas the present chaotic price condition at resale level is further aggravating this condition: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives make a thorough study of

this serious problem and be on the alert for any legislation affecting dairy producers, lending its support to any measure which would benefit dairy farmers.

RESOLUTION 14

Whereas the 3 percent transportation tax is a special wartime tax, the proceeds of which are not used for road-construction purposes; and

Whereas it creates additional pyramiding costs to the farmer and consumer using transportation: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives support the repeal of this tax.

RESOLUTION 26

Whereas the economic position of the farmer in Minnesota has steadily declined in the last few years and continues to do so in a rising general economy: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives study this serious problem facing the farmer and support legislation which will strengthen the position of the farmer in our expanding economy.

## BRUSSELS WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill and commented at the time that I wished to make a short statement concerning it.

Three months from now the United States can expect to suffer another major psychological defeat at the hands of the Soviet Union. It will be another one of those defeats for which we have had ample advance warning, and where we have come up with a response both too little and too late.

At the moment, there is still something we can do to blunt the impact of this defeat provided we move quickly. Nevertheless, no matter what we do now, the overall constructive opportunity will fall far short of what this country is capable of doing, far short of what we should have done.

I am referring to the Brussels World's Fair, which is scheduled to open on April 17 and to last for 6 months, until October 19, 1958. This will be the first time in 19 years that mankind has looked at itself in a great universal exposition. Fifty nations, 7 international agencies, private and public organizations of 6 continents are joining together to create the first World's Fair of the atomic era. The exhibition will cover 500 acres in the Heysel Park, 4 miles from the center of Brussels.

This fair is explicitly not a trade fair. It is a world's fair with a special theme. As the Executive Director of the Office of the Commissioner General for the Brussels Fair, Mr. Thurston J. Davies, wrote to me on February 27, 1957:

> The Belgians have adopted as a theme for the exhibition the phrase "A world view—a new humanism." In all planning for the exhibition, the Belgians are trying to develop a picture of man and his development as an individual within a technological era; in brief, the exhibition is devoted to cultural and human values. Industrial participation within the exhibition will be limited to the displays of the products and industrial methods which tie in with this theme of man's cultural advancement.
>
> The United States program which is now under development must adhere to the theme established by the Belgians. There will be no industrial participation per se within the American national pavilion, except where industrial products serve to illustrate the story of America that we will tell.

Mr. Robert Warner, coordinator of the United States building exhibits for the Brussels Fair, elaborated this point in a letter to me dated July 15, 1957:

> We feel very strongly that we should try and develop a theme we finally worked out for the pavilion, the story of a restless, dynamic people who are far more interested in the creating and making of things than they are in the things themselves. Having spent a considerable part of the last few years working in foreign lands, I personally feel that the most important job we have to do in this pavilion is to show the rest of the world what we are like, what makes us tick. Most foreigners whom I have met, and I have met a great many, think of us as intensely materialistic, a people chained to gadgets and a people without culture. They are always surprised to learn that more of our people attend symphony concerts than attend baseball games, that we have more museums and libraries than any country in the world, and that these are used by a very large percentage of our people.
>
> We have set ourselves no easy task in trying to show what we are like. If we are successful, I believe this United States pavilion can make a tremendous contribution to a better understanding abroad of our land and people.

Consequently, and I believe correctly, Mr. President, the American exhibit is designed to be scrupulously selective to concentrate on the high points of the American way of life and cultural achievements instead of a vast array of economic and industrial resources.

From time to time, Mr. President, the American public has been given a rather optimistic glimpse of the Brussels Fair and our plans for it. Because of the significance of this kind of material, and as an example of this kind of foretaste of the total World's Fair program, I ask unanimous consent that the text of an article entitled "World's Fair: Brussels 1958," which appeared in Newsweek magazine on April 1, 1957, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD'S FAIR: BRUSSELS, 1958

At some 30 different sites in Brussels, 2,000 workmen were making the dirt fly in a $400 million face-lifting operation. By day, pedestrians walked over artificial wooden sidewalks which workers removed at night. Throughout Belgium, roads were being built and rivers spanned to handle an estimated 50-percent increase in motor and rail traffic. After 9 years of preparation and planning, work was well advanced on the first World's Fair of the atomic era.

With more than 50 million visitors expected during the fair's 6-month duration, from April 17 to October 17, 1958, Belgium's 8.5 million citizens were busily preparing for their role as hosts to the world. Foreign-language schools reported record enrollment as thousands of volunteer interpreters sharpened their accents and vocabularies. Two hundred multi-lingual fair hostesses were being selected from more than 2,000 candidates; their rigorous training course would include manners and morals, art and history, and above all—hospitality. A nationwide courtesy campaign was being dramatized by pamphlets, radio broadcasts, cartoons, and posters calling for 8 million fair employees.

To handle the vast influx of World's Fair visitors, the Belgians have set up a special nonprofit organization called Logexpo. With the most advanced American electronic and telecommunications equipment at its disposal, Logexpo is ready to find room and board for an estimated daily average of 175,000 fairgoers, and for as many as 700,000 on peak days during July and August.

Logexpo already had reservations for 110,000 nights, and expected to book one-half of all existing and planned space by the end of 1957. Choice accommodations were being prepared only 2 miles from the fairgrounds, where the government was putting up the world's largest motel. This Pentagon for motorists will have 2,000 double rooms (4,000 twin beds), and will charge $5 per day including continental breakfast. Another 500-room motel was going up nearby, and space had been cleared for a trailer camp and a tent city for 17,000.

Copter shuttle: Universities and youth hostels will take in foreign students. Hotels along the North Sea coast will accommodate 36,000 visitors, and provide free transportation to the fairgrounds. Several shipping companies have plans for bringing tourists into the port of Antwerp, where they will get room and board afloat. Logexpo will take over 3,000 hotel rooms, contract for 8,000 more in private homes, and provide lodgings from $1 to $6 a day. Sabena (Belgian airlines) will shuttle visitors back and forth by helicopter from France, Germany, and Holland.

The Belgians were making sure that no one would be turned away or even unduly delayed in transit to the fairgrounds in Brussels' suburban Heysel Park. Special railroad coaches will carry up to 10,000 people an hour from special parking lots in Brussels. Gleaming new, 50-mile-an-hour trolley cars and buses will leave every few seconds from the capital's center, to whisk 75 percent of all visitors to Heysel Park in less than 20 minutes, at the rate of 60,000 an hour.

There was no doubt that the vast majority of visitors would find the trip worth while. Fifty-one of the world's nations, from San Marino to the United States and Soviet Russia were planning to show everything from isotopes to prima ballerinas, the whole thing lit up by an atomic-power plant. Seven international organizations, headed by the United Nations, would also take part in this vast balance sheet of man's achievements and hopes. At an overall cost of half a billion dollars, the Brussels World's Fair might well turn out to be what its planners proclaim—"The greatest world event of 1958."

ATOMS FOR PEACE

The World's Fair theme, the search for a new humanism for the atomic era, is symbolized by the exhibition's most spectacular piece of architecture, the $20 million, 360-foot steel-and-plexiglass structure known as the Atomium.

Designed by a Brussels engineer named André Waterkeyn, the Atomium is already sprouting up like some giant bloom from the center of the fairgrounds. Its nine spheres, each 59 feet across and connected by tubular passageways, represent the nine atoms of an elementary crystal of iron, magnified 160 billion times. In the daytime, their light aluminum casing is designed to give off a dazzling reflection of sky, sun, and clouds; at night, lights moving around the spheres will imitate the rotation of electrons, while powerful searchlights trained on the structure from below give it an ever-changing effect.

The New York World's Fair's trylon and perisphere contained no exhibits. In the Atomium, tourists may slake their thirst for knowledge on what many Belgians expect to be the fair's most important series of displays, on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Russia, West Germany, and France have each rented an entire two-floor sphere (for $44,000), and Belgium has reserved another for its own atomic show. As Newsweek went to press, the United States had not yet decided whether to take one of the spheres, or to house its exhibit in the Atomium's ground floor pavilion, which had been offered to the United States by the Belgium fair authorities.[1]

To get from sphere to sphere, each of which can accommodate 250 people at one time, you take an escalator through one of the tubes. One-way traffic is the rule throughout the structure: Visitors enter through the ground-floor pavilion, and exit by the three pylons on which the Atomium rests. Fair goers whose quest for atomic knowledge is exceeded by their yearning for food, drink, and rest can take Europe's fastest elevator from the ground to the topmost sphere, where haute cuisine is accented by a panoramic view of the fair and the city of Brussels lying beyond on a hill.

THE NATIONS

With budgets ranging from Lichtenstein's $15,000 to Russia's $50 million, every country was seeking to make architectural history, and to put its best foot forward in the competition for prestige and good will.

Fair architects were buzzing excitedly over the French pavilion, which promises to be the boldest and most advanced in design and technique. A glass house whose whole structure rests on a unique base in the form of a crystal, it is counterbalanced by a towering, canted arrow of steel. More than half its space is earmarked for cultural exhibits including modern French paintings, art books, and the work of French artisans and handicrafters.

With the fattest budget of all, Russia has designed a gigantic rectangular parthenon built around a statue of Lenin. The plans include a 1,500-seat theater and a restaurant. The Russians are building their pavilion in the U. S. S. R., to be transported in sections (1,500 tons of steel structure, 200 tons of aluminum, 16,000 square meters of mirrors) to Heysel Park, where several hundred Russian technicians are on hand to assemble it. (The Soviet Embassy in Brussels has already rented two dormitories to house the Russian workmen.) The frugal Russians plan to dismantle their pavilion and cart it back home afterwards to serve as a main hall in Moscow's permanent agricultural fair.

Manpower shortage: The Belgians have no objection to Russia's—or any country's—importation of manpower to build the exhibits. Belgium has full employment and has been obliged to import large numbers of Italian and North African workers for its own building projects at the fair. Other nations bringing in their own workmen include Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the Netherlands. Fair officials have created a special housing project for 1,500 foreign laborers, who will get room and board for $2 per day.

The United States pavilion, a crystal and gold palace 340 feet in diameter and 95 feet high, is the largest circular building in the world without any interior columns. Designed by Edward D. Stone, whose architectural credits include New York's Museum of Modern Art and the American Embassy in New Delhi, it is expected to cost an economical $5 million, and will include a 1,000-seat circular theater. A striking feature of the United States building is its "bicycle wheel" suspension roof, made of plastic and attached to an inner metallic rim with high-tension steel cables. The United States pavilion is being built by Belgian firms.

[1] Through a misunderstanding, Britain did not apply for a sphere in the Atomium, plans to present its atoms-for-peace exhibit in its national pavilion.

Walking around the United States pavilion (whose main entrance faces Russia's), visitors may see the towering spire of the Vatican building for which Catholics in 47 countries have been asked to contribute. This is the first time the Holy See is taking part in an international exhibition.

Little is known at this stage about what tourists may find in the national pavilions. World's Fair secretary-general Everarts de Velp, one of the fair's earliest boosters and chief planners, has urged all nations to show not what they make, but what they are, and this has led to certain complications. Russian officials were upset when told they could not display airplanes, tractors, and machinery around their pavilion, because all open space was to be devoted to gardens. "They just couldn't understand how statues could be preferred to tractors," a Belgian observer commented. The Russians, however, will devote one large hall in their pavilion to heavy industry, another to machinery and precision instruments.

World portrait: Most foreign participants have agreed, though, to gear their national exhibitions to the general theme of "A world view—A new humanism" and to present only those products that help to portray the life, work, and culture of the nation. West Germany (whose 6½-acre fair site is one of the 6 largest) plans 8 different pavilions linked by glass tunnels, to show a vast panorama of German life.

The theme of the Dutch exhibit is "water, friend, and foe." Their displays will show the Netherlands' centuries-old struggle against the sea. Great Britain's Crystalline Hall is designed to reflect British tradition and pageantry, and the exportable merits of British Jaguars, football, and, above all, nuclear know-how. The Austrians have decided to point up their position as a "bridge" between two worlds. From Japan's wood, paper, and bamboo pavilion, blending modern and ancient design, visitors can look out on an oriental garden. Israel plans to present a balance sheet of its birth as a nation and conquest of the desert. Morocco will provide a touch of exoticism with its Thousand and One Nights palace.

National rivalries: Fair officials have had to double as diplomats in several instances, as for example when six Arab States appointed a joint Egyptian commissioner general with a joint budget and demanded a joint display. A compromise was reached under which separate national exhibits by Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen were permitted to band together under one Arab roof. But precautions were taken to locate this particular pavilion in a "safe" position in a corner of the foreign section. Similarly, Israel's pavilion was discreetly tucked away near the Red Cross and Salvation Army.

Although the Belgians are trying to soft-pedal national rivalries, the fact is that the international competition is building up fast and furiously. The leading contestants for World's Fair honors are, of course, the United States and Russia. "We have no intention of engaging in unseemly contests while a guest in another country," said Howard S. Cullman, United States Commissioner General, in a recent statement. But he went on to note that since the Communist nations were certainly going to use the fair as a platform for propaganda and persuasion, "the free countries [must] utilize every facility at their disposal to emphasize the importance of the freedom they possess."

How America can match Russia at the fair while spending less thn one-third of the Soviet outlay is a question that Cullman hopes to solve by mobilizing the "40 best minds" in the United States. Russia has asked to participate in every single activity at the fair. When the Belgian commissioner general, Baron Moens de Fernig, went to Russia last June to discuss plans, he was astonished by the warmth and enthusiasm of his reception. "There seemed," he said, "to be no more Iron Curtain." The Russians also assured him that there would be "significant numbers" of Russian tourists at the fair, in addition to the small army of technicians and engineers.

Bolshoi and Kabuki: The clash of ideologies may be observed primarily on the battlefield of culture. "National days" have been set aside to honor each nation, and on these occasions the heaviest artillery of international culture will be wheeled into position. Russia plans to bring in its famous Bolshoi Ballet, and assorted Soviet artists who have proved themselves on world tour. Present United States plans call for the Philadelphia Orchestra to perform for 3 days, beginning July 3; and the theater in the United States pavilion, equipped with all lighting and staging apparatus, is a sure bet for New York's City Center Ballet and perhaps one or more of Broadway's hit musicals. Other big cultural guns include France's Comédie Française and the Paris Opéra: Austria's Vienna Philharmonic as well as the celebrated Spanish Riding School of Vienna; Italy's La Scala Opera; West Germany's Berlin Philharmonic (and "Mozart by Candlelight" evening concerts in the open space around its pavilion). On Japan's national day, visitors will be treated to fireworks, Kabuki theater, and a performance by a 50-actor Tokyo troupe.

Nations are not officially rated on the successes they score on national days. But keen competition should attend at the film, theater, and music festivals for which prizes and awards have been selected. The nations of the world will also compete with military bands, barbershop quartets, and choir singing.

Most of the participating countries wanted more space than they received, but are now revising their plans for budgetary reasons.[2] Some are having trouble persuading private enterprise to contribute, as they have to tell businessmen that their wares will be shown in a national context, and not for sales. The United States, Canada, and all the Soviet-bloc countries are not inviting private enterprise participation, but some United States firms (notably Singer, IBM, and Kodak) have asked for and received space in an international building of the Belgian section.

THE HOST

Amid all the hubbub, the imperturbable Belgians maintained a diplomatic calm. For them it was a relatively old story: Of the 29 World's Fairs held since the first—London's Crystal Palace Exposition of 1851—nine have taken place in Belgium. (France has put on 6; the United States, 5.)

In addition to their role as host to the world, the Belgians were planning a 112-acre display of industry, science, arts, and folkways—some 250 activities in all—seen from a solely Belgian aspect.

The Belgians are very firm on one point: Brussels 1958 is in no sense a trade fair. Thus Belgium's associated exhibitors will present their products in the context of the general industrial grouping into which they fall. The metallurgy and steel products exhibit, for example, takes in everything from raw materials to the finished manufactured articles, so as to tell the story of this industry. Several halls that started as Belgian national exhibits have, under this system, turned into international displays: Belgian transport, for example, is featuring General Motors automobiles, since most of the General Motors models sold in Belgium are assembled locally.

A whole separate section of the fair is devoted to the Belgian Congo, with seven different halls showing that colony's progress

[2] India, Bulgaria, and Rumania have dropped out altogether for financial reasons.

in trade and agriculture, its culture and folklore, and its natural flora and fauna. Visitors to the Congo section will walk in a tropical garden, whose floor is artificially heated so that African trees and flowers may grow. In the African fauna pavilion, a series of displays will show the animals of the Congo in accurate replicas of their natural settings. Museum-weary tourists in the Belgian section can visit a miniature zoo, in which cageless birds are kept from flying off by a patented system employing powerful lights. They can also stroll through an elaborate reconstruction of Brussels as it appeared in 1900.

Among the major fair activities being arranged by Belgium for international participation, the Science and Fine Arts sections will command special attention from the visitor.

Science firsts: The International Science Hall, covering 2½ acres in the Belgian section, will gather the latest scientific techniques and theories developed throughout the world. These have been divided into four classes, corresponding to the fundamental bases of modern science: The atom (atomic physics); the molecule (chemistry); the crystal (solid state physics); and the living cell (biology). Nations will not be identified with their contributions to these exhibits.

One embarrassing moment occurred during a meeting of scientists when nations taking part in the International Science exhibit were asked to contribute displays in the fields they had pioneered. As each scientific discovery was mentioned, from penicillin to cyclotrons, Soviet delegates staked their claim to Russian "firsts."

Entering the Science Hall visitors will go first to a 600-seat auditorium, for the showing of a half-hour scientific film in alternate English, Spanish, French, or Dutch versions. After this, they can return to the main hall to watch experiments and demonstrations of the information presented in the film.

The two large art exhibitions being organized in conjunction with the Brussels fair are not to be held within the fairgrounds, but in the Albertine Library, a new building now under construction in the heart of Brussels. The first exhibition (April 18 to July 21) will show contemporary painting and sculpture, covering the first half of the 20th century; for the second (August 8 to November 2) entitled "Man and Art," world masterpieces from the Stone Age to the present day are being selected by an international committee from museums and collections throughout the world.

During the fair, visitors to the art shows may carry portable radios in order to hear a running commentary on the exhibitions in their own language. A highlight of the Man and Art show: The largest collection of Flemish paintings ever assembled under one roof.

Belgian budget: To help finance Belgium's $280 million stake in these and many other World's Fair projects, the government has issued bonds for a $22.5 million state loan (which was entirely subscribed in a single morning). It has also given the exhibition backers priority call on the proceeds of the "Colonial Lottery"—an officially financed charity project for the Belgian Congo. The government itself is putting in about $200 million, and will probably have to increase this sum later. This financing is independent of the $600 million the government is already spending on roadbuilding and civic improvement.

Out of its investment, the Belgian Government expects to recoup 25 percent in taxes, in addition to 16 cents out of every dollar spent by foreign tourists in Belgium. Since visitors would spend an estimated $200 million during the fair's 6 months, while foreign nations would spend about $750 million to present exhibits worth another $750 million, the Belgians were optimistic. "Even if we broke even," said one official, "it would be worth it. But in both short- and long-range benefits, we stand to gain."

AMUSEMENTS

Belgium's high-minded fair planners concede that the average visitor may not want to spend all his time contemplating nuclear wonders. And to please every taste (within reason), there will be generous quota of entertainment and creature comforts generally associated with big-time fairs.

Attractions planned for the World's Fair amusement park range all the way from a space ship (giving the "sensation of rocket flight") to a spelunkers' paradise with the latest in cave-crawling and underground exploration facilities. Also featured: A children's park, complete with babysitters and play equipment for 600 moppets aged 3 to 12.

American showman Billy Rose made a special trip to Brussels to propose that the fair's amusements include an aquacade. (Rose's aquacade was one of the leading moneymakers at the 1939 New York World's Fair.) But Baron Moens de Fernig, the Belgian commissioner general, considers an aquacade a "most unlikely" prospect. Brussels 1958 will have its own unique water display: A 550-yard "water staircase" down the main avenue of the fair, fitted with lights and mirrors to create the impression that water flows in whatever direction the visitor walks.

Admission to the fair has been fixed at $0.60 (30 Belgian francs). Entering by the main gate, the visitor will probably head first for the reception hall. There he will find language drawing rooms, with English-, German-, French-, and Spanish-speaking experts to guide and counsel him. From there, he may decide to take one of the specially designed, rubber-wheeled trains for a preliminary 2½-mile tour of the fairgrounds.

The fair's total area has been limited to 450 acres, to keep it on a human scale. According to Moens de Fernig, this was the suggestion of Grover Whalen, New York World's Fair president, who found from experience that the 1939 Flushing Meadow exposition's 1,000 acres were more than the human frame could comfortably bear.

To reduce fair fatigue, exhibits and pavilions will be interspersed with gardens, refreshment centers, and places to sit down. The Belgians have put aside 2 million plants in 45 greenhouses, for eventual transplanting in Heysel Park.

"No vulgarity will be tolerated," says fair official Gen. Etienne Baele, "and pubs will not exceed 50 percent of the total number of (refreshment) stands." Belgium's Parliament still is studying various bills that would modify the 1919 Vandervelde law prohibiting the sale of liquor in public bars. Gourmets will have many opportunities to appease their yen for new taste sensations, from Moroccan couscous to Soviet caviar snacks. At least a score of countries have announced plans to operate national restaurants, including the United States which will feature typical American food such as hamburgers, waffles, chicken-in-basket, and milkshakes.

But the refreshments and the merrymaking will be only frosting on the cake. "What Brussels 1958 can best do is to open a window on the world," said World's Fair Sec. Gen. Everarts de Velp. Using man as the measure, this is precisely what the 1958 Brussels Universal and International Exhibition hopes to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But all is not well, Mr. President, in the American plans for the Brussels Fair. For some time, those of us who have been closely watching the situation have been seriously disturbed, by the initial delays in programing, by the size of the appropriation figures requested by the State Department, and by the unfortunate failure of the Congress to appropriate even the small amount requested.

Some of us have voiced our concern from time to time in private correspondence, in consultations with the State Department, in committee hearings, and on the Senate floor. As the coauthor with Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, of Public Law 860, 84th Congress, the so-called International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, I have had a special interest in developments of the Brussels Fair since their inception.

Mr. President, the initial delay itself was serious. The Belgians extended invitations to the United States and to almost 50 other nations in mid-1954. It was not until 2 years later, 1956, that the State Department bestirred itself and got around to requesting appropriations. Even at that time, Mr. President, we had had concrete evidence that the Soviet Union was moving ahead full steam in areas of cultural competition. Soviet exhibits in trade fairs had already put us on notice that we could expect a major effort from behind the Iron Curtain in connection with the Brussels World's Fair.

But the State Department, Mr. President, has never talked in terms of more than a minimal effort. Congress has never been asked to appropriate more than $15 million as our total financial effort for the Brussels Fair. I am proud to say that the Senate of the United States on four separate occasions has given the State Department all that it has asked in connection with this exposition.

The figures contained in the supplemental appropriation bill, 1958, Senate Report No. 980, 85th Congress, 1st session, to accompany H. R. 9131, would have brought the total appropriation within striking distance of the $15 million range. The explanation and breakdown of the additional amounts recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee in the report, page 21, indicate clearly that the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee understand the magnitude of this challenge.

That the leadership of the Senate was equally concerned, and on a bipartisan basis, about the Brussels Fair appropriation was obvious from earlier comments on this subject made on the Senate floor on May 29, 1957, in the debate on the conference report on State, Justice, Judiciary, and related agencies. At that time the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] said:

> The Senate retreated from its position by * * * $1,990,000 on the Brussels Fair. I regret the retreat from the Senate position on the Brussels Fair. * * * I think the exhibition should be first class, or not be presented at all. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 6, pp. 7950–7951.)

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] agreed wholeheartedly with the majority

leader on this issue in the ensuing debate.

It is noteworthy, too, Mr. President, that the original $15 million range of United States expenditure was also tacitly accepted by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. When my bill, S. 3116 of the 84th Congress, was amended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee to authorize the United States participation in the Brussels Fair, House of Representatives Report No. 2509 said:

The committee adopted an amendment authorizing the United States to participate in the Brussels Universal and International Exhibition which is to be held in Brussels in 1958. * * * It is estimated that the cost will be of the magnitude of $15 million.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the total appropriations to date amount to only $12,345,000. Of this amount, $545,000 goes for Belgian taxes and insurance costs, fully understood by the Appropriations Committee. This leaves an operational budget at the moment of $11,800,000.

As a general rule of thumb, the cost allotted to the construction of a pavilion for such an international exhibit has been figured by our authorities to come to one-third of the cost of the project. On the basis of a $15 million anticipated program, the pavilion contract was let at a figure in the range of $5 million. With the reduced total appropriation, however, our pavilion and the adjacent auditorium and theater in Brussels are now going to cost approximately one-half of the currently available funds. The deficiency at the moment falls squarely on the performing arts where, instead of the first-rate presentation we should all like to see, we have a situation which, in the language of State Department understatement, "leaves much to be desired."

Indeed, in answer to an inquiry of mine last month relating to our current budgetary situation, the official at the State Department in charge of the Washington office of the Commissioner General for the Brussels World's Fair said the situation "could be calamitous."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter to me, dated December 6, 1957, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE
COMMISSIONER GENERAL,
BRUSSELS UNIVERSAL AND
INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, 1958,
*Washington, December 16, 1957.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Your letter of December 6 to Congressional Liaison, Department of State, relating to the budget for United States participation at the Brussels World's Fair next year, has been referred to this Office for reply.

United States participation in the Brussels World's Fair was based on an estimated cost of $15 million from the time of the acceptance by the United States of the invitation from the Belgian Government to participate in the fair. Up to now Congress has appropriated a total of $12,345,000 for United States participation, including an item of $545,000 for mandatory Belgian taxes and insurance costs. This leaves an actual operating budget of $11,800,000.

Approximately half of the currently available funds will go into the cost of construction of the United States pavilion and its adjacent auditorium-theater.

The drastically reduced budget, in the opinion of the United States Commissioner General for the Brussels Fair, could be calamitous, particularly in view of the reported expenditures of the U. S. S. R. whose site on the fairgrounds will adjoin that of the United States. The reduced budget has forced a curtailment in the projected United States program which, instead of being a first-rate presentation by this country, will leave much to be desired.

We can assure you, Senator, that within our limited budget we are making every endeavor to do the best job possible.

The Senate has consistently supported a first-rate participation by the United States and has always approved, without a single dissenting vote, the funds considered adequate for a first-rate show, but somehow or other the project has always suffered in conference committees.

It is the intention of the United States Commissioner General at the present time to seek a supplemental appropriation from the next session of Congress. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with you in detail if you so desire.

With high regard,
Sincerely yours,

GERSON H. LUSH,
*Director, Washington Office.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the sorry details of the present situation are at least as calamitous as the State Department letter points out, and as State Department officials have confirmed when personally contacted by my staff. Many of the alarming details have already been published.

One such article entitled "Sputnik Debacle Looms in Cultural Field" appeared in Labor's Daily on Wednesday, December 18, 1957.

Mr. President, this article began:

America's tottering world prestige is in for another jolting blow in 1958 unless Congress provides badly needed funds for international cultural activities. Site of the predicted debacle is Brussels, where a giant World's Fair, involving 57 nations, will open next April 17.

The United States will be represented by a $6 million pavilion. But next door to it will be a giant Soviet pavilion whose attractions may make American culture look sick. The impact of this on the East-West cultural competition may equal that of sputnik in the scientific race.

The same article concluded:

According to competent observers, it has become late in the game for America to win the cultural cold war. However, the war is not yet lost. No, wait till Brussels.

Mr. President, from various sources it appears to me that the American challenge at the Brussels Fair now looks something like this:

The Soviet Union, according to conservative estimates, will spend at least $60 million to impress the 35 million spectators due to visit Brussels. From what we know about Soviet plans, there will be scarcely a creditable Soviet theater group, ballet artist, musician, singer, dancer or acrobat left in the Soviet Union if his services can be used in Brussels.

A brief look at some of the presentations which we know will be available in the Soviet pavilion shows clearly enough that the Soviet program is being designed to appeal to everyone, from sophisticated critics to wide-eyed children.

The Bolshoi Ballet will be there. The Moscow circus will be there. So will the Moisseyev Ensemble, the Moscow Art Theater, the Svetchnikov Chorale, world famous artists like violinist David Oistrakh, and singers and dancers from all the Soviet Republics.

Soviet representatives apparently intend to issue a newspaper called Sputnik three times a week. It is rumored that the Kremlin has already contracted for $1 million worth of printing in Belgium in connection with the fair.

In addition, the Eastern European countries will be represented by Czechoslovakia and Hungary. It may be said on good authority that Czechoslovakia itself may spend as much as $25 million for its attractions.

Now, let us look at the counterattractions which the United States intends to offer. We have an excellent pavilion impressively designed and nearing completion. But I have already mentioned that the reduction in our overall appropriation figures means that the pavilion will cost proportionately more than had been expected. The brunt of the cuts will have to be borne by the cultural programs themselves.

At the moment, funds are available for 15 weeks of performances of one kind or another in the American auditorium. There is a possibility that that auditorium will remain closed and dark for the 11 remaining weeks of the fair.

There is now a likelihood that such talent as our violinists Isaac Stern and Yehudi Menuhin; such singers as William Warfield and Harry Belafonte, and the Philadelphia Orchestra will put in appearances in Brussels. But budget cuts have probably ruled out the appearance of top jazz talent and other features. Even some of those attractions just mentioned are coming on a shoestring basis—an orchestra already in Europe will come to Brussels for a few days, or an American artist has decided to contribute his fee to help bail out our Government from its financial predicament.

Originally planners on the United States Committee for the Brussels Fair hoped to have funds for 250 bilingual American youths to be hired as usher-guides, thus promoting people-to-people contact. It was intended to have these youngsters on duty 13 hours a day, 7 days a week. Present funds permit only 140 usher-guides, including 40 Belgians. The 13-hour day has been reduced in present plans to an 8-hour day.

The 100 American youths are to be sponsored by the respective American States and will receive some financial assistance from the States. They will agree to work for the small sum of $150 per month. Even so, the present budget pinch only allows a program of the magnitude I have just described.

A scientific exhibit which we originally intended to have at Brussels was to have cost $840,000. The budget cuts have forced a reduction to $500,000. We originally intended to have scientific exhibits not only inside the American

pavilion but in the International Science Hall, a separate building. Inadequate funds have forced us to decline allocated space for these exhibits, and the Soviet Union has promptly picked up the exhibition space which we have rejected.

The United States Commissioner General for the Brussels Fair, Mr. Howard S. Cullman, recently stated:

> Our performing arts and exhibit plans in all fields, particularly science, have been seriously hampered. We have done our best to remedy the situation on all points through soliciting and securing the cooperation of industry, but we are still a long way from having the funds we need for the kind of exhibit that ought to represent the United States at this extremely crucial time in world history.

Mr. President, this is an incredible state of affairs, all the more incredible because it is so unnecessary. I have said earlier that I think we should be operating at a magnitude of expenditure far in excess of the $15 million range which the State Department originally proposed. But the least we can do at this point is to provide the minimum supplementary appropriation needed if the $15 million program is to be carried out.

After exploring every fiscal nook and cranny for a source of new funds, and considering certain private and business assistance, a figure of $2,054,000 has been cleared as a supplementary budgetary request by the Bureau of the Budget. This basic minimum amount can be broken down into the following categories:

| | |
|---|---|
| For additional science exhibits | $160,000 |
| For community theater and college drama | 375,000 |
| For United States bilingual usher guides | 669,000 |
| For color TV and science exhibits inside pavilion | 250,000 |
| For pavilion map and souvenir guidebooks | 600,000 |
| Total supplemental appropriation | 2,054,000 |

It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the Department of State is prepared to justify each of these items in depth before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. It is imperative we lose no more time.

Mr. President, earlier today I submitted a bill relating to this subject. I ask that the bill be printed along with my remarks at this point in the RECORD, in the hope that the presentation of this information to the Senate will arouse enough interest in this body to give the United States of America at least a 50–50 chance at the Brussels Fair.

The bill, if enacted, will enable us to participate in the Brussels Fair at least as effectively as last minute planning permits. Compared to the staggering sums for defense expenditures which this session of Congress is considering, the amount called for is but a pittance. Small though the appropriation requested really is, it is nevertheless critical in a symbolic and practical sense. I urge the Congress to act with speed to save us from further embarrassment at Brussels.

I think it is nothing short of an outrage and disgrace that the richest nation on the face of the earth shows up at a world fair as if it were a beggar—as if we were paupers—while the Soviet Union proceeds to win another great psychological victory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill referred to will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

S. 2923

A bill making an appropriation for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amount of $2,054,000 to be used for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958, as authorized in paragraph (3) of section 3 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956. The amount appropriated by this act shall be in addition to any other amounts appropriated for such participation and shall remain available until expended.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to add my voice to that of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota in making comment with regard to the psychological and cultural defeat we are apt to suffer at the Brussels Fair if prompt measures are not taken by the State Department to substantially increase the present niggardly appropriations. I understand the difficulties involved in getting the Philadelphia Orchestra, with Isaac Stern, over there. All sorts of sacrifices have been made by that distinguished orchestra in order to make it possible for them to appear.

I happen to know that the funds made available for theatrical production are entirely inadequate. As the distintinguished Senator from Minnesota stated, the United States pavilion may remain dark. We may suffer a serious cultural and intellectual setback if the State Department does not move very promptly, indeed, and if this body does not accept immediately the recommendation just made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], a prominent member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I should think that this is a matter important enough to be brought to the attention of that committee.

I know the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is also a member of that splendid committee.

I feel strongly, indeed, that the whole tone of the President's message today requires that we give the Brussels Fair our strongest and heartiest approbation. In fact, personally, I found it to be a splendid speech. We are back in the same old category of simply words and no deeds. I hope we will see prompt action, before we suffer another humiliating defeat.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the material I have presented to the Senate, some of which I asked to have printed in the RECORD and did not read, there is evidence that the Soviet Union has asked for and received space we have given up.

In fact, we have given up scientific exhibition space, on the ground that we cannot afford to use it.

It is about time for the Congress of the United States to do its job, and appropriate the money which is necessary. It is time for the State Department to take affirmative, vigorous action. We must be willing to stand up, be counted, ask for and provide the funds which are necessary.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. I thought the President's speech was filled with the expression of lofty ideals. However, again I must say, in all respect, that such ideals become nothing more than rhetoric unless they are backed here by performance and deeds. If the United States of America cannot afford $15 million to participate in one of the world's greatest expositions, and the Soviet Union can spend $60 million, we had better throw in the sponge now and save what little we have.

We are unwilling to face up to the fact that the Soviet Union is playing for keeps. The most important line in the President's speech was to the effect that the Soviet Union has declared war on us. I have said so from one end of the country to the other. We did not have to wait for the President to say it. Khrushchev said it on the Face the Nation program last summer.

The trouble is that not enough Americans are willing to recognize that the Soviet Union has declared war on us. It is a different kind of war than we are familiar with, but a war that can be devastating, and, in fact, catastrophic.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join with the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Pennsylvania in what they had to say about the Brussels Fair. I understand that the Philadelphia Orchestra, the great violinist, Isaac Stern, and other outstanding American musical organizations and individuals, have been invited to participate. The a capella choir of Flathead County, Mont., has also been invited, but there are no funds which would enable them to travel that far.

I think it would be a good thing to ask a group of high-school boys and girls from the Far West, from the Rocky Mountain area, to participate. I think they would do this country proud in competition with the Bolshoi Ballet, the folk dancers, violinists, singers, and all the other accouterments which the Soviet Union will have at the Brussels Fair.

So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, this project is "big time" with them. The Soviet Union will make hay. I think we should wake up to our responsibilities, and that in addition to sending groups and individuals from the eastern seaboard, we should send the a capella choir from Flathead County, Mont. They would be more than a counterpoise to the high-toned organizations which the Soviet Union is determined to send.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Montana. I thoroughly agree with him.

Sometime later this month I intend to comment upon the great contribution recently made by Marion Anderson, the celebrated artist, in a special telecast over the Columbia Broadcasting System. It illustrates the impact of a cultural program such as we are discussing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I concur very heartily in the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, which has been so ably seconded by other Senators, to the effect that the exhibit of the United States of America at the great Brussels Fair should not be handicapped or curtailed by inadequate funds, as is now the case.

I am rarely heard to speak in defense of the State Department. It may be that the State Department has never asked for as much as it should have asked in this matter. On that question I am not competent to express an opinion. However, I feel that the RECORD should clearly show that the Congress itself has been derelict in responding to the requests made to it very urgently by the State Department for an appropriation for our exhibit at the Brussels Fair. The Senator from Florida was one of those who thought the entire amount requested should have been granted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was very active in that behalf. The Senator will recall that there were differences of opinion, both in the Appropriations Committee and on the floor, and that when we reached the stage of conference, we suffered a still further loss.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think this is the time to try to fix responsibility for what has happened in the past. I am grateful to the Senator from Minnesota for raising the question. I hope the Congress will speedily repair, insofar as it can, its dereliction, by rapidly passing the appropriation now requested as a supplemental item, to make it possible for our Nation to participate in the Brussels Fair in an adequate and creditable manner. I believe that by so doing we shall well serve the interests of the United States and of the free people of the world.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida. Let us follow the example which he set in the committee. If we do so, I believe there will be no problem. Congress must fulfill its responsibility.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in what they have had to say with respect to the Brussels Fair, although that is not the purpose for which I sought the floor.

Mr. Cullman, to whom the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has referred, is a very distinguished New Yorker. In the words of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, he has been up on Capitol Hill fighting the battle tooth and nail, and will continue to do so.

I do not believe that the State Department deserves major criticism. It has sent to us its requests for money. But, as the Senator from Florida has truly said, with typical fairness, the dereliction has been here. However, bygones will not help us at all. The thing to do now is to react as we should.

I very much hope that the determination being shown here today will persist, and that all of us who have friends in the other body will talk with them, which will help materially in righting this very serious disadvantage to the United States.

I join with the Senator from Florida in praise of our friend from Minnesota for raising this question at the opening gun. It certainly deserves to be raised. This is one of the first remedies which we need to apply, in the new spirit described today by the President of the United States, namely, a determination to do rather than to make lofty protestations.

---

## THE PLIGHT OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many bills dealing with agriculture will be introduced during this session of Congress.

I wish to make a very brief statement relating to my impression of them. Some of us are determined to make sure that farm people are not neglected.

In this period of mounting crisis in agriculture, I take encouragement from a recently organized movement on the part of farmers themselves through which proposals of and by farmers can be brought to the attention of the United States Congress.

This organization, known as the National Conference of Commodity Organizations, is made up exclusively of organizations representing the viewpoint of agricultural producers.

The movement grew out of an awareness on the part of many agricultural leaders both in and out of Congress that our agricultural policies could become meaningless for the lack of unity within the ranks of agriculture. A strong stimulus was given to the origination of the idea more than 1 year ago, when our esteemed and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry called on the national farm groups to unite in the interest of a prosperous American agriculture. It is regrettable but the record shows that apparently irreconcilable differences between so-called general farm organizations made unity highly improbable.

The situation was further aggravated by the classic argument on the best way to develop agricultural legislation. Farm organizations are split in their opinion as to whether the overall general umbrella-type farm legislation is more effective and appropriate or whether the commodity-by-commodity approach is wiser.

Member organizations in the National Conference of Commodity Organizations support the commodity-by-commodity approach. But recognize that no one commodity group can "go it alone." As a result, they are working together, for each other as well as for themselves, and are willing to support a general farm bill as long as it is tailored to needs and desires of individual commodities. The conference is fortunate in having as members those people nationally recognized as being the best informed and having complete knowledge of the production, processing, and marketing of their respective commodities.

I think it is extremely fortunate that the Congress of the United States will have available to it during this session of the Congress the counsel and the proposals from the organizations making up the National Conference of Commodity Organizations.

Since the first meeting of the conference, in May 1957, through the subsequent three meetings of the groups, several things stand out that impress me very much. In the first place, the deliberations by the conference begin from the grassroots. Second, the interest shown by each commodity representative in the conference in the problems facing producers of the various commodities. Third, the newspaper accounts of the conference meetings, which show a genuine and sincere interest on the parts of the participants to arrive at sound proposals to improve our agricultural economy and maintain adequate supplies of food and fiber to meet the needs of the household and industrial consumers.

The approach to be followed by the National Conference of Commodity Organizations in bringing various proposals before the Congress was discussed and agreed to during the meeting of the conference in December in Kansas City, Mo. The conference has already asked for informal meetings with the House and Senate Agriculture Committees to explore solutions to the farm problems with them and seek their counsel. Proposals for various commodities, including corn, milk, poultry, livestock, peanuts, and others, have been completed or will be completed within a very short time.

Here we have tangible evidence of a house united—one that has firm underpinnings in the soil of America. There is every possibility and probability of sound, constructive legislation coming out of the work of the National Conference of Commodity Organizations. I propose to work closely with the representatives of this organization in the development of needed legislation.

I firmly believe that an informal meeting early in this session of the Congress between the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and representatives of the conference could be most helpful to all of us. I understand that such a meeting has been scheduled for next Tuesday with the House Committee on Agriculture.

I understand that the conference will have available within a short time specific proposals covering corn, feed grains, cotton, and several other commodities. These proposals will be based on the deliberations of the conference over the past 7 months and will represent the thinking of people with a vast background of knowledge on these individual commodities. The confidence growing

out of this knowledge plus the announced intention of the conference membership to seek counsel from appropriate committees of Congress, encourage me in my belief that we will have an opportunity this year to join the various forces in agriculture and come up with a degree of unity from which much can be accomplished. This approach can do much more. It can provide a real service to Congressional committees by bringing before these committees producer-supported solutions to our agricultural problems. I look forward to the opportunity of reviewing these proposals on such commodities as corn, feed grains, and dairy, and will welcome this opportunity to see how these proposals can be geared to our food and fiber program.

## THE GREAT POTENTIAL FOR MANKIND

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of the address delivered by General Sarnoff, chairman of the board of directors, Radio Corporation of America, delivered at the Time-Life, Stanford International Conference, held at San Francisco last October.

At the conference, leaders in commerce, industry, and finance from the principal nations of the free world—more or less following the pattern of our own Rockefeller report—discussed solutions to the Communist economic challenge and the challenges imposed by its dramatic technological progress, which was brought to our attention again when the President spoke this morning. It is a challenge which, I may say with pardonable pride, I have consistently called to the attention of Congress ever since my earliest days in the House of Representatives, back in 1947 and 1948. General Sarnoff sums up the goal we seek as a desire to increase the material well-being of all mankind in an atmosphere of expanding freedom.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE GREAT POTENTIAL FOR MANKIND

Distinguished speakers, ladies, and gentlemen, the theme of our session this afternoon—The Great Potential for Mankind—is so pertinent to the major dilemmas of this crucial and historic period that I consider it a privilege to have been asked to participate. Your own presence here is convincing evidence that you are keenly aware of the problems of our times and dedicated to the search for viable solutions.

The economic questions that we have gathered to discuss are inextricably linked with the political, military, social, and ideological issues posed by the Communist challenge to the basic human values of our civilization. Economic pressures and changes, related to the amazing progress of science and technology in the last few generations, have swelled the tides of unrest today inundating many parts of the world.

The problems involved do not lend themselves to easy analysis or glib solutions. But the very fact that they are being given earnest study by people like yourselves—leaders of the free world's business, financial, and educational institutions—gives strong hope for progress.

All of us are indebted to Time-Life International and the Stanford Research Institute for their public-spirited initiative in sponsoring a conference of the scope and significance of this one. A special word of commendation is in order, I think, for the conference chairman, our good friend Harry Luce. He deserves our thanks for the characteristically energetic leadership he has brought to this effort, and for the masterful manner in which he set out the broad objectives of this conference in his luncheon remarks.

At our session this afternoon, we are going to attempt an assessment of the Free World's economic potentials. We will try to outline the needs and the goals for industrial production during the next several decades. This is an imposing assignment, indeed, because it demands that we project ourselves into the future with all the hazards and uncertainties that such an exercise implies. Yet the difficulties of the task give us no justification for withdrawing our intelligence from contemplating the future. Our own generation is responsible for passing on to the next one the potentials for continued and expanded well-being. It is our clear responsibility, therefore, to plan ahead to meet those requirements that now can be foreseen.

#### THE OVERRIDING FACT: TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS

In evaluating the economic potentials of the Free World—in the solemn dedication that it shall remain free—we might well be guided by the advice of the wise and eminent elder statesman, Bernard M. Baruch. In his recently published autobiography, Mr. Baruch lists three indispensable conditions for success in any venture.

"First," he says, "one must get the facts of a situation or problem.

"Second, one must form a judgment as to what those facts portend.

"Third, one must act in time—before it is too late."

The overriding fact of the next several decades, it seems to me, will be technological progress on a scale unparalleled in all our previous history. Just 10 days ago, we saw a fateful forerunner of this technological future in the launching, by Soviet Russia, of the first manmade satellite—an epochal event that pointed up both the promise and the peril of the years ahead.

Because of the prospects for technological progress, it is my best judgment that the possibilities for achieving the economic goals we seek are truly enormous. These goals have been stated many times and in many ways. But they can be summed up quite simply: We want to increase the material well-being of all mankind in an atmosphere of expanding freedom. In attaining this objective, technology can be a decisive factor. For economic growth comes through change, and change depends on scientific discovery and its practical application.

Just as many of today's basic inventions were discernible in the great awakening of science in the 18th and 19th centuries, so today, in our research laboratories, we can see the shape of things to come—technological marvels that promise new forms of energy, new controls and new materials for the future. Never before in history have two such prodigious forces as atomics and electronics unfolded simultaneously. It is a portent of amazing changes ahead that will overshadow even the dramatic advances of the last 50 years. The new types of energy released by the atom and controlled by the electron have already altered the character of everyday life, and they give promise of revolutionizing our lives even more drastically in the decades to come.

Technology, the common hoard of man's tools and techniques, had appropriately been called our primary resource. Without it, all other resources would be economically stagnant. With it, all other resources can achieve startling new dimensions of usefulness.

Let us consider, for a moment, the prospective impact of technological innovation, first on our material resources, and then on our human resources.

#### TECHNOLOGY AND OUR MATERIAL RESOURCES

We have heard disquieting admonitions that mankind is using up its precious stock of raw materials at an alarming rate. Yet even as these resources are being consumed, new and better ones are becoming available through increased knowledge and improved technology.

The scientific creativity that produced the awesome atomic and hydrogen bombs can also give the world all that it needs in the way of energy. It will, in time, be possible for us to extract atomic fuel from relatively inexpensive materials, making nuclear power both plentiful and economical. The significance of this becomes obvious when we realize that a single pound of uranium is capable of releasing more energy than 1,500 tons of coal. In the not-too-distant future, the atom will supply the power for most of our oceangoing ships, our airplanes, and even trains and factories. It will light, heat, and cool houses, and run our television sets and home appliances.

Through advances in technology, the energy of the sun's rays also will eventually be harnessed to serve man's economic needs. The solar energy reaching the earth in a single day is equal to that released by 2 million wartime atomic bombs, and now we are learning how to channel it to our uses. This form of energy should prove especially important to the underdeveloped tropical regions where solar power is superabundant, but where countries cannot afford adequate fuel and power of the existing types.

At the same time, our improving technology will give the world a vast array of new materials to meet almost any specifications that man can envisage. New plastics, ceramics, lubricants, and categories of substances yet unnamed will become available for personal and industrial uses.

#### TECHNOLOGY AND OUR HUMAN RESOURCES

A beneficient impact of technology can also be expected on our human resources. For one thing, man's life span will be further extended and his productive years increased by vital progress in preventive medicine, diagnosis, and treatment of human ills. Two thousand years ago, the average baby born in the city of Rome had a life expectancy of scarcely 20 years. Today, a baby born in this city of San Francisco can look forward to a life expectancy of 70 years. In a few more decades, the normal life span of an individual will approach the century mark, taking some of the force out of Dr. Albert Einstein's complaint that "the trouble with civilization is that we don't live long enough to make use of our experiences."

New methods and new techniques will greatly expand man's food resources, thus helping to eliminate the ghastly specter of famine in many parts of the world. New scientific advances will open the way to an era of relative economic abundance, freeing more and more people from the numbing pressures of poverty and thereby, no less important, canceling out a main cause of social discontent and disorder.

One of the most far-reaching of our new technological developments will be automation—the use of self-operating machines with electronic devices that check the product automatically and adjust the machine as required. We have so far seen only the beginnings in this field. Automation promises to free man at work from drab routine and to give him ever broader scope for the exercise of his highest skills. It promises more jobs calling for those human attributes, such as imagination and judgment, that technology can never duplicate. The result is bound to be a massive upgrading of man's skills and his joy in labor.

#### OPPORTUNITY OR DISASTER?

These, then, are a few indications of the great potential for mankind. They offer the

exhilarating prospect of wider industrialization, higher standards of living, and a more satisfying life for all mankind. As Sir Winston Churchill has so aptly phrased it, "Modern science is standing on tiptoe, ready to open the doors to a golden age."

Yet we must be ever mindful that the triumphs of science and technology I have touched upon can be wiped out by forces of destruction. Our times have been called times of continuing crisis. The word "crisis" in Chinese is a combination of two symbols. One is the symbol of "opportunity." The other is the symbol of "disaster." It is for mankind to decide which of these will be our destiny.

The possibilities of science offer the human race the chance to achieve a finer destiny. What we need most is a determination, rooted in spiritual faith, to apply our new knowledge and techniques to peaceful pursuits. The answer to the question, "Will science make this a better world in which to live?" lies not with science and technology as such, but rather with each one of us as responsible individuals.

One of our prime responsibilities is to keep informed. For if we are to make wise choices, we must—as Mr. Baruch has suggested—get the facts, form judgments about them, and then act before it is too late. To give us the facts about the free world's economic potientials and to help us arrive at sound judgments, we have with us today three of the Nation's foremost social scientists. The first will analyze world population trends over the next several decades. The second will discuss the rising per capita demands for goods and services throughout the world. The third will deal with the implications of these two factors—rising population and rising demands—for world industrial production.

What we are presenting, in effect, is a basic equation of economics—rising population plus rising demands equal rising production.

## THE DEBATE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I am sending to the desk be printed in the body of the RECORD. This is a statement which I issued on August 30, 1957, too late to appear in the body of the RECORD; therefore, I make the request at this time that it be printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

In view of remarks made on the floor of the Senate today (August 30, 1957), and later amended to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by Senator LONG, of Louisiana, I feel that it is necessary for me to issue a statement.

I want to review briefly the course of events which led to my extended speech in the Senate on Wednesday and Thursday (August 28 and 29, 1957).

At the final caucus of the southern Senators on Saturday, August 24 (1957), it was generally agreed that an organized extended debate would not be held. However, it was also agreed that each Senator was on his own to oppose the bill as best he could. From the beginning, I made up my mind that it was my duty to oppose the bill strongly. Last weekend (August 24) I prepared an address from the material I had been assembling for a long time, although I still had not decided how long I would speak.

After further consideration of the so-called civil-rights bill and the compromise proposed by the House, I came to the conclusion that I should make a long speech against the bill. Also, I came to the conclusion that further consideration should be given to the question of whether organized extended debate should be conducted by the southern Senators.

When I arrived at this latter conclusion on Wednesday (August 28), I went to Senator RUSSELL'S office and told him that I planned to make a long speech and suggested that he call the southern Senators into session again to consider the advisability of an organized effort. Senator RUSSELL stated that if a majority of the southern Senators requested him to do so, he would call them back for another caucus, but, that in lieu of such requests, he would not call another caucus in view of the previous understanding on Saturday (August 24) that each Senator would follow his own course.

## THE MALLORY CASE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on January 6, 1958, the editors of the Washington Evening Star published an editorial which deserves the attention of the Senate and the entire American public. It is entitled "Lock Your Doors," and this is what it has to say:

The police are on the prowl again—looking for one Andrew R. Mallory. They would like to hear from anyone who knows where he is.

Mallory, for the benefit of those with short memories, was released from jail last June after the Supreme Court reversed his conviction on a rape charge. He was guilty—no doubt of that. But the Court said that the police had not arraigned him (formally charged him) soon enough after his arrest. The effect of this Court action was to invalidate his uncoerced confession and other corroborating evidence. So Mallory, who had been sentenced to death, had to be turned loose.

Now the police are hunting again for Mallory. He is wanted for housebreaking and assaulting the daughter of a woman who had befriended him. And this within 6 months after his release from jail.

The real point, it seems to us, is that the law, as it has been interpreted by the courts, is too heavily weighted on the side of the criminal. The public, or society, or whatever descriptive term one may care to use, is entitled to some consideration, too. As matters stand, the public is not getting it. We do not know whether Mallory should be in jail or in a mental institution. But one thing is certain—he ought not to be roaming the streets of this city. And as long as he and others like him are on the loose it would be well to keep the doors locked.

This is not one of those hopeless situations. It can be remedied. But the remedy will have to come from Congress. We hope the returning legislators will take the time and trouble to spell out the law of prompt arraignment in terms that are unmistakably clear—clear enough, at least—to keep Mallory and those like him off the streets of Washington.

Mr. President, I made two statements on the floor of the Senate last year after the Mallory decision was handed down. I made those statements, as I make this one today, in an effort to call attention to the need for reversal of this and other recent rulings by the Supreme Court. These rulings have resulted in substituting the views of sociologists for established law, providing greater protection for Communists and Communist sympathizers and convicted felons, and adding a post mortem codicil to a decedent's last will and testament as was done in the Girard College case.

The vital choice we face in this country today is that of judicial limitation or judicial tyranny. The history of limited governmental powers is one of liberty. The history of unlimited governmental powers is one of tyranny. I hope that the Members of the Senate and the House will aline themselves before it is too late with the principles of constitutional government, which provide for a Government of limited powers.

## STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE—COMMENTS BY SENATOR MARTIN OF IOWA

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, in his message today President Eisenhower outlined a program by which Congress can help guide the Nation through troubled times, domestically as well as internationally. Domestically, the President's program will help to maintain a stable economy and, at the same time, care for the essential welfare needs of the people. Internationally, it will maintain our national defenses at an adequate level but will avoid the hysterical excesses being preached by some who seek to make a political issue of those defenses.

President Eisenhower today inspired many prolonged expressions of appreciation and approval by Members of Congress in the joint session.

With the loyal and united cooperation of Congress, we can look forward to continued peace and prosperity.

## PAYEES RECEIVING $50,000 OR MORE UNDER THE 1957 ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD a report received from the Department of Agriculture on December 19, 1957, in which are listed 67 payees who received $50,000 or more under the 1957 acreage reserve program.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D. C., December 19, 1957.*

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: We are enclosing a preliminary tabulation of payees receiving large payments under the 1957 acreage reserve program as requested in your letters of July 22, 1957, and December 11, 1957. Your letters requested data pertaining to payments of $10,000 or more. It appears that there will be about 3,500 of such cases, many of which operate farms in other States.

We are now engaged in correspondence with such other States in an effort to obtain the total payments received by each payee anywhere in the United States. It may be several weeks before the correspondence with all affected State and county offices can be completed and the results incorporated in a final list.

Therefore, the attached list is transmitted so that you may have the data on a preliminary basis for the 67 payees who apparently earned $50,000 or more. We will transmit the final list as soon as possible.

TRUE D. MORSE,
*Under Secretary.*

*Preliminary list of payees receiving 1957 soil bank acreage reserve compensation in excess of $50,000*[1]

| Name and address | Compensation | Reserve acres | Commodity |
|---|---|---|---|
| Garvey Farms, Colby, Kans. | $278,187.38 | 22,778.0 | Wheat. |
| Harris Ranches, Post Office Box 7, Sahaurita, Ariz. | 209,701.80 | 1,666.0 | Cotton. |
| Ray Flanagan, Red Top, Calif. | 138,122.20 | 1,629.2 | Cotton and rice. |
| Tierra Prieta Ranch, Box 988, Eloy, Ariz. | 135,107.45 | 991.8 | Cotton. |
| Sutter Basin Corp., Ltd., Robbins, Calif. | 128,442.88 | 1,990.7 | Wheat and rice. |
| Westlake Farms, Star Route, Stratford, Calif. | 125,942.60 | 1,293.9 | Cotton. |
| Robert Pelletier, 1224 Mount Lowe Dr., Bakersfield, Calif. | 124,378.80 | 797.3 | Do. |
| J. H. Williams, Route 1, Box 77, Natchitoches, La. | 120,088.50 | 1,682.5 | Do. |
| Crews Farm, Box 352, Pecos, Tex. | 107,200.00 | 800.0 | Do. |
| Vista Del Llano Farms, Route 1, Box 23, Firebaugh, Calif. | 103,411.02 | 1,986.0 | Wheat. |
| J. W. Baughman, Liberal, Kans. | 102,357.21 | 40,863.5 | Do. |
| Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles, Calif. | 97,209.00 | 3,086.0 | Do. |
| Estrella Land & Cattle Co., Box 37, Glendale, Ariz. | 96,706.50 | 586.1 | Cotton. |
| Hammonds Ranch, Inc., Routes 1 and 2, Box 130, Firebaugh, Calif. | 95,535.64 | 928.4 | Wheat and cotton. |
| J. W. B. Farms and John Baughman estate, Liberal, Kans. | 89,522.03 | 2,279.2 | Wheat. |
| Moser Ranch, Route 5, DeKalb, Tex. | 87,094.32 | 905.5 | Cotton and wheat. |
| Duncan Bros., Post Office Box 645, Alvin, Tex. | 85,953.11 | 1,099.9 | Rice. |
| Sherrell and La Follette, 807 First National Bank Bldg., Phoenix, Ariz. | 84,103.40 | 532.3 | Cotton. |
| Newhall Land & Farming Co., Post Office Box 95, Firebaugh, Calif. | 83,903.50 | 870.5 | Cotton and rice. |
| John W. Baughman Farms Co., Liberal Kans. | 80,074.58 | 32,698.5 | Wheat. |
| Sunset Ranches, Inc., Route 2, Box 23, Chandler, Ariz. | 79,155.50 | 545.9 | Cotton. |
| Porter & Wentz, Box 870, Brownsville, Tex. | 75,576.37 | 3,199.0 | Do. |
| Farmers Investment Co., Route 1, Box 138, Eloy, Ariz. | 74,573.50 | 514.3 | Do. |
| American Christian Institute, Post Office Box 4096, Phoenix, Ariz. | 73,088.40 | 553.7 | Do. |
| Mississippi State Penitentiary, Parchman, Miss. | 71,000.00 | 1,000.0 | Do. |
| Eddie J. Carpenter and Patricio Brijalba, 2020 Washington, Pecos, Tex. | 70,500.60 | 443.4 | Do. |
| J. Ernest Bertrand, Oakley, Kans. | 70,337.70 | 3,914.0 | Wheat. |
| Martin Hereford, Inc., Madras, Oreg. | 69,757.16 | 2,486.0 | Do. |
| Stanley and McDaniel, 2202 West McDowell, Phoenix, Ariz. | 69,300.00 | 420.0 | Do. |
| O. L. Garmon, Jr., Route 1, Mark, Miss. | 67,097.40 | 763.7 | Do. |
| Geo. B. Franklin & Son, Holly Ridge, La. | 67,040.33 | 957.7 | Do. |
| Raymond Thomas, Inc., Box G, Five Points, Calif. | 66,839.50 | 395.5 | Do. |
| Glen H. Shay, Route 1, Eloy, Ariz. | 66,640.60 | 421.2 | Do. |
| Chui Chiuchu Ranches, Inc., Box E, Casa Grande, Ariz. | $65,465.40 | 867.9 | Cotton. |
| Progresso Farms, 1302 Park, Pecos, Tex. | 65,408.00 | 448.0 | Do. |
| S. A. Camp Farms Co., Box 242, Rupert, Idaho. | 64,886.02 | 1,700.6 | Wheat. |
| Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson, Ark. | 64,851.10 | 820.1 | Cotton. |
| Floyd N. Smith Co., 2100 West McDowell, Phoenix, Ariz. | 64,350.00 | 390.0 | Do. |
| J. T. Fargason & Son, Lyon, Miss. | 63,900.00 | 730.7 | Cotton and rice. |
| Peres, Nickel & Pfitzer, 619 Washington, Los Banos, Calif. | 62,998.80 | 792.8 | Rice and cotton. |
| Paul M. Brophy, Box 686, Casa Grande, Ariz. | 62,104.80 | 466.4 | Cotton. |
| Winters Farm, Box 8, Verhalen Station, Pecos, Tex. | 61,833.60 | 361.6 | Do. |
| Waddell Ranch Co., Waddell, Ariz. | 60,885.00 | 369.0 | Do. |
| Broadview Farms, Route 2, Box 37, Firebaugh, Calif. | 60,681.00 | 537.0 | Do. |
| Flader Land Co., 3975 York St., Denver, Colo. | 60,008.13 | 3,017.0 | Wheat. |
| Dan Seligman, Shaw, Miss. | 59,992.80 | 804.8 | Cotton and rice. |
| J. L. Hodges, Box 846, Buckeye, Ariz. | 59,925.00 | 399.5 | Cotton. |
| Chandler Co., Stockton Hotel, Fort Stockton, Tex. | 59,783.60 | 405.5 | Do. |
| Rio Grande Care, McAllen, Tex. | 59,642.52 | 1,333.2 | Do. |
| Clark & Roberts, 1514 Morris, Pecos, Tex. | 57,533.70 | 376.6 | Do. |
| Bing K. Wong, Box 277, Marana, Ariz. | 56,700.00 | 450.0 | Do. |
| Bi-County Farms, Box 550, Prosser, Wash. | 56,519.64 | 2,611.3 | Wheat. |
| Delmar Durrett, Box 1081, Amarillo, Tex. | 55,974.61 | 4,482.1 | Do. |
| Allen & Ritch, Route 1, Lyon, Miss. | 55,354.40 | 628.4 | Cotton. |
| William E. Glotz, Box 85, Tranquillity, Calif. | 55,073.20 | 480.9 | Cotton and rice. |
| Thomas L. Moran, Hartley Route, Dumas, Tex. | 54,655.83 | 5,146.5 | Wheat. |
| Layton Knaggs, Box 970, Woodland, Calif. | 54,388.47 | 788.2 | Rice. |
| W. M. and A. B. Nickey, 355 Goodwyn, Memphis, Tenn. | 53,905.00 | 527.5 | Cotton. |
| Warren N. Moore, Box 207, Alvin, Tex. | 53,580.40 | 923.8 | Rice. |
| The Garin Co., Post Office Box 245, Firebaugh, Calif. | 53,500.92 | 699.0 | Wheat and cotton. |
| Bentley Johnston, DeKalb, Tex. | 53,100.00 | 590.0 | Cotton. |
| W. J. Asmussen, Agar, S. Dak. | 52,807.57 | 3,355.0 | Wheat. |
| B. F. Younger, Sr., Box 1176, Buckeye, Ariz. | 52,503.00 | 350.0 | Cotton. |
| Rodfern Ranches, Box 305, Dos Palos, Calif. | 51,480.50 | 829.0 | Rice and wheat. |
| Dale Steele, Ford, Kans. | 51,180.42 | 2,549.7 | Wheat. |
| R. J. Roesling Co., 244 California St., San Francisco, Calif. | 51,024.50 | 389.5 | Cotton. |
| Tom Moore, Navasota, Tex. | 50,426.60 | 767.0 | Do. |

[1] This list may be altered somewhat when cross checking across State and county lines is completed.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESSES AND PARLIAMENTS OF NATO COUNTRIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we in the United States Senate have the great honor of being visited today by Members of a number of Congresses and Parliaments of NATO countries.

A number of Senators present in the Chamber today, including the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and myself, were present in Paris and had the great privilege of attending the meetings of the NATO parliamentary association.

We feel that the person-to-person contacts by Members of Parliaments and Congresses of the NATO nations can do much to strengthen and unify the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We feel also that visitations, back and forth, by Members of the Parliaments and Congresses of the 15 NATO nations will result in a greater understanding and appreciation of our common aims and our mutual problems.

On this day, when President Eisenhower in his excellent state of the Union message has placed so much emphasis upon the importance of NATO, it is, therefore, very significant that we should have with us this distinguished group of parliamentarians, whom I should like to introduce to the Members of the Senate at this time:

Hon. Eric A. Winkler, of Canada, Member of Parliament.

Hon. Carl Langseth, Permanent Undersecretary, Danish Ministry of Defense.

Hon. A. C. Normann, of Denmark, Member of Parliament.

Dr. Franz Engst, Staff Assistant to the Bundestag Defense Committee, German Federal Republic.

Hon. Jacques de Menditte, Senator from France.

Hon. Jean Seitlinger, Member of the French Chamber of Deputies.

Hon. Fridjon Thordarson, of Iceland, Member of Parliament.

Hon. Giuseppe Sibille, Senator of the Italian Republic.

Hon. R. Gresham Cooke, C. B. E., of the United Kingdom, Member of Parliament. [Applause.]

I wish to explain to the members of these parliamentary bodies who are present with us today that ordinarily the Senate Chamber is crowded with Members of the Senate. However, today is one of the first days of the session, and at this time only routine business is being transacted. I hope our guests will understand why not all the Members of the Senate are now present. I assure our guests that if information regarding their attendance had been sent out, all Senators would have been here to express to them a very warm welcome.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague, who has so graciously welcomed our guests.

For the information of the Senate, I should like to say that our colleague has undertaken a great responsibility for the NATO parliamentarians, as chairman of their political committee. With others, I look for very outstanding results from his work.

Our colleagues from Canada, France, Great Britain, Italy, Iceland, the German Federal Republic, and Denmark are most felicitously here, for—as I said to them when we had our very pleasant luncheon in one of the most beautiful rooms of the Capitol, the Old Supreme Court Chamber, and I should like to repeat the statement publicly at this time, here in the Senate—as they travel in our country, I believe they will find that the challenge we have faced and are facing—namely, the mortal danger to our

joint survival, from the Soviet Union, with its emphasis on science in terms of destruction, rather than life—will engrain in the minds of the American people a tremendous appreciation for their alliances, and particularly the most important alliance, the NATO alliance. I hope that our colleagues from other lands in the NATO alliance will watch with care for those indications, which I am sure they will find.

I also hope that when they return to their homelands, they will join us—knowing that we shall be expressing them here—in the expression of the sentiments of mutual strength and cooperation, which are the most effective answer to the challenge we face.

I may say to them, also, that although we constantly emphasize the challenge, we are at one with our President in the recognition that this is not the answer of life, but is only a current emergency; that the answer of life is to be found in the cultural and economic cooperation for the development of a finer, more moral, more ethical life for all of us, your peoples and the people of our own country, and that we are very conscious of that total human responsibility, and are even more determined to play our full share in the role of strength with which providence and the genius of our people have endowed us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). On behalf of the United States Senate, it is a great privilege to welcome these distinguished gentlemen to the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, before requesting unanimous consent for the taking of a 5-minute recess, in order that other Members of the Senate personally may meet our distinguished guests, I wish to point out that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I suggested that half of them sit on the Republican side of the aisle—and of course that is a very difficult thing to do [laughter]—and that the other half sit on the Democratic side of the aisle. We suggested that in order to show that insofar as our friendship with NATO and our support of NATO are concerned, there is no party line dividing us, either in the United States or in the United States Senate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. For the reasons which have been stated by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to our distinguished guests, the leader of the minority in the Senate, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], is not now in the Chamber. Because I happen to be occupying his seat, I welcome these gentlemen, on behalf of the minority, to this Chamber.

I know that today all of us are conscious of the ties which bind our country to the countries they represent. At present all of us are much concerned about matters of security. I believe it is a good thing that our distinguished guests, whose energies and efforts have also been directed toward economic, social, and cultural associations, are with us at this time, because in the long run those will be the best basis for our understanding and our friendship.

Many of those of us who are citizens of the United States are descendants of persons who lived in the countries represented by our distinguished guests of today, and we have drawn upon them for our institutions, our ideals, and our traditions. We hope that our associations in the future will be enlarged and will be more fruitful and more helpful to all of us who hold common traditions and ideals.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there be a 5-minute recess, in order to enable the Members of the Senate to greet our distinguished guests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will now stand in recess for 5 minutes.

Accordingly, at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess until 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m., when it reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair).

## FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a very interesting letter from a constituent in Arizona. It is rather amusing. I should like to read it, so that my colleagues might understand the amusing situation farmers can get themselves in today. The letter reads:

DEAR MR. SENATOR: My friend Bordeaux over in Pima County received a $1,000 check from the Government this year for not raising hogs. So I am going into the not-raising-hog-business next year. What I want to know is, in your opinion, what is the best kind of farm not to raise hogs on and the best kind of hogs not to raise? I would prefer not to raise razorbacks, but, if that is not a good breed not to raise, I will just as gladly not raise any Berkshires or Durocs.

The hardest work in this business is going to be in keeping an inventory of how many hogs I haven't raised. My friend Bordeaux is very joyful about the future of this business. He has been raising hogs for more than 20 years and the best he ever made was $400 until this year, when he got $1,000 for not raising hogs. If I can get $1,000 for not raising 50 hogs then I will get $2,000 for not raising 100 hogs.

I plan to operate on a small scale at first, holding myself down to about 4,000 hogs, which means I will have $80,000. Now, another thing: These hogs I will not raise will not eat 100,000 bushels of corn. I understand that you also pay farmers for not raising corn. So will you pay me anything for not raising 100,000 bushels of corn not to feed the hogs I am not raising? I want to get started as soon as possible as this seems to be a good time of the year for not raising hogs.

OCTAVE BROUSSARD.

P. S. Can I raise 10 or 12 hogs on the side while I am in the no-raising-hog-business—just enough to get a few sides of bacon to eat?

## THE CORDINER REPORT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this morning we listened to the President's state of the Union address. I was very pleased to hear him say that, in his opinion, one of the necessary things to do in this session of Congress was to create an incentive pay plan for the personnel of our military services. The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and I have a bill in the Senate that will put into effect the proposals of the Cordiner report.

If the Senate will indulge me for a few moments, I should like to make a statement I have prepared on this subject.

Without question to my mind, the most serious problem this Congress will be called upon to face during the coming months is that of our national security.

In a sense, it is a mistake to refer to this as one problem, in the singular, because it is actually a complex of many very difficult problems. Broadly speaking, I believe that these problems of national security can be subdivided under four major headings:

The first of these relates to our overall philosophy of the use of military power as an instrument of national policy and includes such difficult problems as the administrative structure of our Defense Establishment, the roles and missions of the services, and similar questions basic to the kind of military forces we believe we should maintain for national survival and national well-being in the world today.

The other problem areas relate to and depend upon the answers at which we arrive in this first category. They are: The kind of weapons that we should acquire to implement our basic military philosophy; the kind of personnel that we will need in our Military Establishment to operate and maintain these weapons; and, finally, the degree and the kind of the innovations we must make in the civilian sector of the body politic in order to establish the firm intellectual and industrial foundation necessary to the implementation of our national objectives.

I believe that all of us are aware in some degree of these very difficult and crucial problems.

Unfortunately, I also believe that reaching a general agreement on solutions to these problems is going to prove time-consuming and difficult. I therefore believe that we shall be wise if we devote our efforts initially to those areas of the problem where there already exist a substantial consensus and meeting of minds.

One such segment is certainly the question of the retention of military personnel. This subject has been exhaustively covered in the study prepared by the Committee headed up by Mr. Ralph Cordiner. I believe that most of us are by now fairly familiar with the broad conclusions reached by that Committee, and I shall therefore attempt no more than a brief summary of them here.

The basic conclusion of the Committee is that it is absurdly unrealistic and grotesquely uneconomic to compensate military personnel on the basis of the length of time they spend in the service rather than on the basis of the contribution that they make to the service. No arrangement could be more expressly calculated to result in the indefinite retention of marginal personnel and the

mass exodus of precisely those people who have cost the most to train and who represent the highest investment of personnel dollars.

From this simple proposition, with which I do not believe there can be any serious disagreement, the Committee evolved a number of sweeping recommendations. Of these, I believe that the two most important are the recommendation that service personnel be paid primarily on the basis of their skills rather than upon length of service; and the principle, borne out by all economic experience, that monetary incentives operate most effectively at the top rather than at the bottom of the career ladder. The young man entering a profession is concerned not so much with his starting pay but with what he can expect to be paid in 10 or 15 years' time, if he works hard and progresses normally. If the answer to this question is not attractive nor commensurate with his aptitudes, he will not choose such a profession for a career.

I believe that these principles are basic to any consideration of remuneration for military personnel. I believe that the Cordiner recommendations are excellently designed to alleviate the problems that we all know to exist in the personnel structure of our Armed Forces, and I believe that there is sufficient unanimity of opinion in the Congress to enact these recommendations into law. Finally, I believe that we should do so without delay, because it is only by taking constructive action in those areas in which we are in substantial agreement that we can reduce our problem to manageable size and isolate those issues which elicit profound differences of opinion and for which we must nevertheless urgently seek wise solutions in the weeks and months ahead.

For those of my colleagues who may wish to inform themselves further on the Cordiner proposals, I strongly recommend the article entitled "An Economist's View of the Cordiner Recommendations," appearing in the current issue of Air Force magazine, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ECONOMIST'S VIEW OF THE CORDINER RECOMMENDATIONS

(By Alain C. Enthoven)

The recommendations of the Department of Defense Advisory Committee on military pay, headed by Ralph J. Cordiner of General Electric, will again be under consideration by a special Senate Armed Services Subcommittee when Congress reconvenes.

Let's look at the proposals from the point of view of the taxpaying citizens whose interests are best served by an economically or efficiently managed Military Establishment. From their standpoint, one criterion for military pay is of predominant importance: within any given military budget, salary scales should be chosen in such a way as to create maximum effectiveness in the military services. With this criterion, salary levels may be judged too high if more is being paid than is necessary for particular skills, and they may be judged to low if not enough is being offered to attract men whose services are needed. In other words, what do the Cordiner proposals do to solve the military's most pressing problem—recruitment and retention, in a competitive economy, of qualified technical personnel?

Pay, of course, is not the only factor affecting the retention. Patriotism and a desire to serve, a sense of purpose and belonging, and a feeling of pride in membership in an outstanding organization are of great importance. In the words of the Cordiner report, "Without basic patriotism on the part of its members there can be no Armed Forces." But these considerations should not be permitted to cloud the fact that salaries are important. Other professions have their moral compensations, too (consider, for example, teaching and medicine), and even the most devoted of military men have families to feed, clothe, and educate. The fact is that unlike patriotism and devotion, pay can be increased substantially by legislative action. This is unquestionable.

But the matter of pay does give rise to many misconceptions. For example, the services have queried enlisted men who have decided not to reenlist, in an attempt to determine the various factors affecting their decision. The men are asked to rank a list of factors in order of importance. Plans to go to school, dislike of military life, and dislike of station assignments typically are ranked ahead of pay. From this it has mistakenly been concluded that pay is not an important cause of the reenlistment problem and that we must look elsewhere for a solution. Although other factors may be important to enlisted men, pay can be used to offset them. Although there is very little that can be done to make military life more palatable to a man who dislikes it, there are simple and obvious ways of increasing his pay.

This is related to another frequent misconception. The fact that some men leave the service even though they can earn no more than their military pay in civilian life is often used as evidence that pay is irrelevant. This notion is wrong, too. It is based upon the incorrect assumption that given equal income, most men would prefer the military to civilian life. Actually, considering the added demands and inconveniences of military life, it would not be at all surprising to find it necessary to offer many men more pay than they could earn as civilians in order to retain them. This is particularly true now that such large standing forces must be maintained.

A third fact which needs emphasis is that salary differentials already exist. The pilot is paid more than the crew chief. The first lieutenant with 14 years of service receives over half again as much pay as the beginning first lieutenant. In fact, he receives substantially more than do some captains. Bomber pilots receive more than their classmates who remain on the ground. This fact demolishes any argument over salary differentials, since they already exist and there is no question of abolishing them. The real issue is to whom should the higher salaries be paid.

And the key to the question is the fact that there are differences in supply and demand conditions in different categories of manpower. The average first-term reenlistment rate for airmen in the highly technical specialties is about 26 percent, falling as low as 14 percent for weather specialists. On the other hand, the comparable rate for nontechnical airmen in general is 40 percent; for air police, 46 percent. The wide difference persists despite the already superior advancement opportunities open to the technicians within the Air Force, but it is not surprising. Highly technical personnel are in heavy demand by industry, and those who leave the service can look forward to large increases in their incomes. For nontechnical airmen, there is less assurance that they will be able to improve their lot by leaving the service. The services would like to see the positions of the reenlistment rates reversed. Because of the large initial investment in training, the optimum reenlistment rate for technicians is high, whereas in the nontechnical areas, high turnover means a younger force which costs less to maintain.

From the supply and demand standpoint the most important objective is obvious. Our goal should be to maximize the combat effectiveness of the services as fighting forces, within the limitations of the budget.

In general, the services or the Defense Department can decide whether the payroll is being divided in the most effective way by making conceptual experiments of the following sort: Suppose that slightly less were offered for the services of men in one category. Then fewer of those men would remain in the service, and the overall effectiveness of the service would decline. Suppose that the money saved were offered to attract more men in another category. If the increase in effectiveness which is contributed by these additional men exceeds the decrease resulting from the loss of men in the first category, then the experiment indicates that the overall effectiveness of the service could be improved at no extra cost. Hence, the budget has previously not been divided in the most efficient way. If, on the other hand, repeated experiments of this sort indicate that no such improvement is possible, then it is safe to conclude that the personnel budget has been divided in such a way as to maximize overall effectiveness.

Notice the comparison. We think in terms of only the few men who would be lost because of a small pay cut in one category and the few who would be gained by a small pay increase in another. We consider the contribution toward our objective made by those last few men in the first category, and we relate it to the cost of retaining them or the savings from releasing them. Then we evaluate the improvement in the overall effectiveness of the service which would result from hiring a few more men in the second category, and we relate it to the cost of buying their services.

Finally, if the contribution of the extra men in the second category is greater in proportion to the cost of hiring them than is the contribution of the last few men in the first category in relation to the cost of hiring them, then we decide to go ahead and reallocate the money accordingly. When improvements of this sort are no longer possible, then it must be the case that the contribution of the last man hired in each category is proportional to the cost of hiring him, and we have achieved an optimum pattern of salary differentials. Responsibility, devotion to duty, and experience are only relevant insofar as they influence the contribution of each individual to overall military capability.

This analysis and the facts outlined earlier lend strong support to the proposals for differential pay. When there are large differences in supply and demand in different categories, it is wasteful to pay the same salary scales across the board. But this is what the present pay system forces the services to do. Any SAC commander would welcome the opportunity to trade some of his nontechnical enlisted men for some electronics specialists, and rightly so. But the present pay system denies him the only method available for doing this in a free country: He isn't allowed to offer the technician more money.

Differentials are only a part of the military pay problem. It is clear that it would be possible to achieve a greater level of military effectiveness by a more rational allocation of the present total payroll. There is also strong evidence to indicate that major improvements in combat capability could be obtained at no extra cost by spending more on personnel and less on other things. In

other words, the present balance between manpower and equipment is wasteful. If a million dollars now being spent on equipment were spent on personnel instead, we would have a more powerful defense force. And this would be true for many millions of dollars. In the words of General LeMay, "You must have bases and people to properly utilize the equipment. By and large we are not doing that now. We are not operating the equipment we have in as efficient a manner as we could."

An excellent illustration of this point emerged in the testimony of Brig. Gen. Horace Wade before the Symington committee. In 1955 the overall reenlistment rate for airmen who maintain SAC aircraft was 25 percent. With this force, SAC was able, on the average, to keep 65 percent of its bombers in commission. SAC has estimated that if the reenlistment rate were increased to 65 percent, it could keep 80 percent of its bombers in commission. This would be a 20 percent increase in the effective number of SAC aircraft. In terms of the 33 wings of B–47's in SAC, it would represent an increase of more than 6½ wings.

These calculations illustrate an important fact. If we take the number of bombers in commission, instead of the total number of bombers, as our measure of real military power, then we have two methods available for strengthening SAC: spending more on personnel and spending more on bombers. By spending more on personnel, we could raise the reenlistment rate in SAC to 65 percent and the bombers in commission to 80 percent, thereby increasing the strength of SAC by 6½ wings. This would cost millions of dollars. Alternately, we could buy 6½ wings of new aircraft and train the personnel to man them. This would cost billions of dollars. Yet the two policies would add the same amount to the combat effectiveness of SAC.

The remarkable fact is that today we are spending the billions for bombers instead of the millions for personnel.

Many such instances of waste could be prevented by more enlightened personnel policies. All of the services are experiencing a serious shortage of officers in the 4 to 14 years' service bracket and a surplus of junior obligated officers with 3 years or less of service. It should be clear that an improvement in the attractiveness of the middle years in the officer's career and an increased amount of selectivity in the commissioning of junior officers would improve the overall effectiveness of the corps. Too much money is being spent on the recruiting and training of junior officers and not enough is being spent on inducing them (with better pay) to remain in the service. As a result, a great deal of valuable talent and experience is lost to the services.

The experience of all of the services with men completing their first enlistment in fiscal 1956 provides another illustration. The men in this category trained in various aspects of electronics reenlisted at the rate of 13 percent, 20 percent below the optimum rate from the point of view of a balanced force (once the force has been built up). On the other hand, the first termers in supporting services reenlisted at a rate of 2 percent above the optimum rate. Supporting services include vehicle drivers, military police, and food service. It should be clear that it would improve the quality of the Armed Forces if the personnel budget were reallocated with less being paid to the men in the supporting services and more to the men in electronics.

As previously stated, the Air Force values the services of one bombing system repairman at $15,000 per year. Assume that at the end of their first enlistment, more of this kind of technician were to reenlist in the grade of airman first class. Over the next 4 years of their enlistment, each would receive an annual base pay averaging about $2,500, or a total of $10,000 in wages. To support each man for 4 years, it costs the Air Force an additional $10,000. For wages and support of each man, allow $20,000. But each man is worth $15,000 a year, or $60,000 for 4 years. Subtract $20,000 from $60,000 and you see that there is a difference of $40,000. This is the amount the Air Force gains with each reenlistment. By giving each technician, such as bombing system repairman, a reenlistment bonus considerably less than $40,000, the Air Force would be able to realize a large part of these potential savings.

A frequent objection to differential pay and to special reenlistment bonuses for technicians is that they would create a morale problem, but, as we know, differentials already do exist between the earnings of men of the same rank of the same age, and of the same length of service. Yet they have not destroyed the morale of the services. Nor is there any reason to think that a system of pay increases rewarding superior performance would cause any net decrease in service morale. On the contrary, it would tend to improve the morale of just the men the Nation should want to reward.

Furthermore, in evaluating the justice of his earnings, the sergeant who repairs radar is as likely to make comparisons with the earnings of civilian electronics experts as he is with the earnings of, say, a man with equal length of service who is a cook.

Finally, a reasonable interpretation of the "morale problem" would be that it is changes in salary levels favoring different people and not differences in the levels themselves which might cause a temporary morale problem. If this is correct, then once the new salary pattern is well established, there is no more reason to think that the morale of men in "soft skills" will suffer because they earn less than men in "hard skills" than because they earn less than bomber pilots.

An objection to higher military salaries in general was raised by the Bureau of the Budget in rejecting the Cordiner recommendations. The Bureau claimed that higher salaries would increase total Federal expenditures, thereby promoting inflation. The reasoning is naive. Higher pay would cost more if we were to fail to take advantage of its benefits. The important point is that the total defense budget could be reduced with no loss in combat capability if we would take advantage of the higher personnel retention rates and reduce the training establishment.

We could have a more powerful Air Force with fewer men and fewer aircraft if the men we had were more experienced and if, as a result, more of the aircraft were combat ready. The mistake of the Budget Bureau is to confuse aribtrary budget cutting with real economizing. Genuine economy in the Defense Establishment means the achievement of maximum combat capability or military worth at a stated budget level. The Budget Bureau has failed to distinguish between combat-ready aircraft and total aircraft and between fully trained manpower and total manpower.

One of the implications of the Cordiner proposals deserves special comment. Since the end of World War II, our Armed Forces have included large numbers of amateurs. Most of the young men entering since the war were either drafted or were induced to join by the presence of the draft. The majority of them have no intention of making the service a career. The very low first-term reenlistment rates are ample evidence of this. The fact that so many members of the services regard their membership as temporary and against their wills inevitably has a corrosive effect on morale in general. This amateurism conflicts with the mission of our Military Establishment as protector of the free world. Our national responsibilities are heavy, and they will be with us for many years. A task of such gravity and duration is not well performed by an amateur organization.

Furthermore, military technology is becoming more and more complex. Even the infantry uses radar now. The day of the amateur soldier, sailor, or airman is drawing to a close. Patriotism and enthusiasm are not substitutes for technical competence. In these circumstances, we need a truly professional Military Establishment which will operate with long-run military superiority at low cost as its goal. The Cordiner Committee has proposed a system of rational salary scales that are competitive with industry and which are designed to attract and hold a professional military force. If the United States is to maintain its military superiority in the long run at a reasonable cost, its reforms are essential.

Whether or not we might wish it otherwise, the services have serious competition for manpower. This competition is not a bad thing. On the contrary, competition has a logic of its own. It compels the efficient use of resources. If the price of technicians and executives is rising, it is because the demand for their services is increasing. This is a sign for all employers of these men to use them more sparingly. The appropriate behavior in a competitive situation is efficient behavior.

---

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 13, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, whom we reverently worship and adore as the light of all that is true and the strength of all that is good, inspire us during this day with a splendor of faith and fortitude which nothing can ever eclipse or extinguish.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of this legislative body may be abundantly blessed with the sustaining and strengthening ministry of Thy spirit as they endeavor to find the most efficient and effective ways and means of defending and maintaining our heritage of freedom.

Grant that with all our plans and efforts to enlarge and expand our material resources we may never fail to see that it is our highest wisdom to cultivate a greater confidence in those moral and spiritual resources which Thou hast placed at our disposal.

May the ethic of good will and love, of justice and righteousness, of brotherhood and friendship, be the foundation stone upon which we are seeking to

build our Republic, a better world and an enduring civilization.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on Thursday, January 9, 1958.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

## JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 231 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the United States Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN; and the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. MILLS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of committee of escort the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON; the Senator from Arizona, Mr. HAYDEN; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND; and the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

## THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 251)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the 85th Congress, my fellow citizens, it is again my high privilege to extend personal greetings to the Members of the 85th Congress. Moreover, Mrs. Eisenhower would like to join me in wishing to you and your families a bright and prosperous New Year. [Applause, the Members rising.]

And because of the felicitous situation that the birth anniversaries of our Speaker and our Vice President occur this same week, I know all of us will join in wishing to both happy birthday. [Applause, the Members rising.]

My friends, honest men differ in their appraisal of America's material and intellectual strength, and the dangers that confront us. But all know these dangers are real.

The purpose of this message is to outline the measures that can give the American people a confidence—just as real—in their own security.

I am not here to justify the past, gloss over the problems of the present, or propose easy solutions for the future.

I am here to state what I believe to be right and what I believe to be wrong; and to propose action for correcting what I think wrong. [Applause.]

I

There are two tasks confronting us that so far outweigh all others that I shall devote this year's message entirely to them.

The first is to insure our safety through strength. [Applause.]

As to our strength I have repeatedly voiced this conviction: We now have a broadly based and efficient defensive strength including a great deterrent power, which is, for the present, our best guaranty against war; but, unless we act wisely and promptly, we could lose that capacity to deter attack or defend ourselves.

My profoundest conviction is that the American people will say, as one man: No matter what the exertions or the sacrifices, we shall maintain that necessary strength! [Applause.]

But we could make no more tragic mistake than merely to concentrate on military strength. [Applause.]

For if we did only this, the future would hold nothing for the world but an Age of Terror.

And so our second task is to do the constructive work of building a genuine peace. [Applause.] We must never become so preoccupied with our desire for military strength that we neglect those areas of economic development, trade, diplomacy, education, ideas and principles where the foundations of real peace must be laid. [Applause.]

II

The threat to our safety, and to the hope of a peaceful world, can be simply stated. It is Communist imperialism.

This threat is not something imagined by critics of the Soviets. Soviet spokesmen, from the beginning, have publicly and frequently declared their aim to expand their power, one way or another, throughout the world.

The threat has become increasingly serious as this expansionist aim has been reinforced by an advancing industrial, military and scientific establishment.

But what makes the Soviet threat unique in history is its all-inclusiveness. Every human activity is pressed into service as a weapon of expansion. Trade, economic development, military power, arts, science, education, the whole world of ideas—all are harnessed to this same chariot of expansion.

The Soviets are, in short, waging total cold war.

The only answer to a regime that wages total cold war is to wage total peace. [Applause.]

This means bringing to bear every asset of our personal and national lives upon the task of building the conditions in which security and peace can grow.

III

Among our assets, let us first briefly glance at our military power.

Military power serves the cause of security by making prohibitive the cost of any aggressive attack.

It serves the cause of peace by holding up a shield behind which the patient constructive work of peace can go on.

But it can serve neither cause if we make either of two mistakes. The one would be to overestimate our strength, and thus neglect crucially important actions in the period just ahead. The other would be to underestimate our strength. Thereby we might be tempted to become irresolute in our foreign relations, to dishearten our friends, and to lose our national poise and perspective in approaching the complex problems ahead.

Any orderly balance sheet of military strength must be in two parts. The first is the position as of today. The second is the position in the period ahead.

As of today, our defensive shield comprehends a vast complex of ground, sea, and air units, superbly equipped and strategically deployed around the world. The most powerful deterrent to war in the world today lies in the retaliatory power of our Strategic Air Command and the aircraft of our Navy. They present to any potential attacker who would unleash war upon the world the prospect of virtual annihilation of his own country.

Even if we assume a surprise attack on our bases, with a marked reduction in our striking power, our bombers would immediately be on their way in sufficient

strength to accomplish this mission of retaliation. Every informed government knows this. It is no secret.

Since the Korean armistice, the American people have spent $225 billion in maintaining and strengthening this overall defensive shield.

This is the position as of today.

Now, as to the period ahead: Every part of our Military Establishment must and will be equipped to do its defensive job with the most modern weapons and methods. But it is particularly important to our planning that we make a candid estimate of the effect of long-range ballistic missiles on the present deterrent power I have described.

At this moment, the consensus of opinion is that we are probably somewhat behind the Soviets in some areas of long-range ballistic missile development. But it is my conviction, based on close study of all relevant intelligence, with the best information that scientists can bring to me, that if we make the necessary effort, we will have the missiles, in the needed quantity and in time, to sustain and strengthen the deterrent power of our increasingly efficient bombers. [Applause.] One encouraging fact evidencing this ability is the rate of progress we have achieved since we began to concentrate on these missiles.

The intermediate ballistic missiles, Thor and Jupiter, have already been ordered into production. The parallel progress in the intercontinental ballistic missile effort will be advanced by new plans for acceleration. The development of the submarine-based Polaris missile system has progressed so well that its future procurement schedules are being moved forward markedly.

When it is remembered that our country has concentrated on the development of ballistic missiles for only about a third as long as the Soviets, these achievements show a rate of progress that speaks for itself. [Applause.] Only a brief time back, we were spending at the rate of only about $1 million a year on long range ballistic missiles. In 1957 we spent more than $1 billion on the Atlas, Titan, Thor, Jupiter, and Polaris programs. This is a rate of increase of 1,000 times.

But I repeat, gratifying though this rate of progress is, we must still do more.

Our real problem, then, is not our strength today; it is rather the vital necessity of action today to insure our strength tomorrow.

What I have just said applies to our strength as a single country. But we are not alone. I have returned from the recent NATO meeting with renewed conviction that, because we are a part of a worldwide community of free and peaceful nations, our own security is immeasurably increased. [Applause.]

By contrast, the Soviet Union has surrounded itself with captive and sullen nations. Like a crack in the crust of an uneasily sleeping volcano, the Hungarian uprising revealed the depth and intensity of the patriotic longing for liberty that still burns within these countries. [Applause.]

The world thinks of us as a country which is strong, but which will never start a war. The world also thinks of us as a land which has never enslaved anyone and which is animated by humane ideals. This friendship, based on common ideals, is one of our greatest sources of strength.

It cements into a cohesive security arrangement the aggregate of the spiritual, military, and economic strength of all those nations which, with us, are allied by treaties and agreements.

Up to this point I have talked almost solely about our military strength to deter a possible future war.

I now want to talk about the strength we need to win a different kind of a war—one that has already been launched against us.

It is the intensive economic offensive that has been mounted by the Communist imperialists against free nations.

The Communist imperialist regimes have for some time been largely frustrated in their attempts at expansion based directly on force. As a result, they have begun to concentrate heavily on economic penetration, particularly of newly developing countries, as a preliminary to political domination.

This nonmilitary drive, if underestimated, could defeat the free world regardless of our military strength. This danger is all the greater precisely because many of us fail or refuse to recognize it. Thus, some people may be tempted to finance our extra military effort by cutting economic assistance. But at the very time when the economic threat is assuming menacing proportions, to fail to strengthen our own effort would be nothing less than reckless folly. [Applause.]

Admittedly, most of us did not anticipate the intensity of the psychological impact upon the world of the launching of the first earth satellite. Let us not make the same kind of mistake in another field, by failing to anticipate the much more serious impact of the Soviet economic offensive.

As with our military potential, our economic assets are more than equal to the task. Our independent farmers produce an abundance of food and fiber. Our free workers are versatile, intelligent, and hard working. Our businessmen are imaginative and resourceful. The productivity, the adaptability of the American economy is the solid foundation stone of our whole security structure.

We have just concluded another prosperous year. Our output was once more the greatest in the Nation's history. In the latter part of the year, some decline in employment and output occurred, following the exceptionally rapid expansion of recent years. In a free economy, reflecting as it does the independent judgments of millions of people, growth typically moves forward unevenly. But the basic forces of growth remain unimpaired. There are solid grounds for confidence that economic growth will be resumed without an extended interruption. [Applause.] Moreover, the Federal Government, constantly alert to signs of weakening in any part of our economy, always stands ready, with its full power, to take any appropriate further action to promote renewed business expansion.

If our history teaches us anything, it is this lesson: So far as the economic potential of our Nation is concerned, the believers in the future of America have always been the realists. [Applause.]

I count myself as one of this company.

Our long-range problem, then, is not the stamina of our enormous engine of production. Our problem is to make sure that we use these vast economic forces confidently and creatively, not only in direct military defense efforts, but likewise in our foreign policy, through such activities as mutual economic aid and foreign trade.

In much the same way, we have tremendous potential resources on other nonmilitary fronts to help in countering the Soviet threat: Education, science, research, and, not least, the ideas and principles by which we live. And in all these cases the task ahead is to bring these resources more sharply to bear upon the new tasks of security and peace in a swiftly changing world.

IV

There are many items in the administration's program, of a kind frequently included in a state of the Union message. They will be the subjects of later messages to the Congress. Today I speak only about matters bearing directly upon our security and peace.

I now place before you an outline of action designed to focus our resources upon the two tasks of security and peace.

In this special category I list eight items requiring prompt action. They are not merely desirable. They are imperative.

1

DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

The first need is to assure ourselves that military organization facilitates rather than hinders the functioning of the Military Establishment in maintaining the security of the Nation. [Applause.]

Since World War II, the purpose of achieving maximum organizational efficiency in a modern Defense Establishment has several times occasioned action by the Congress and by the Executive.

The advent of revolutionary new devices, bringing with them the problem of overall continental defense, creates new difficulties, reminiscent of those attending the advent of the airplane more than a half century ago.

Some of the important new weapons which technology has produced do not fit into any existing service pattern. They cut across all services, involve all services, and transcend all services, at every stage from development to operation. In some instances they defy classification according to branch of service.

Unfortunately, the uncertainties resulting from such a situation, and the jurisdictional disputes attending upon it, tend to bewilder and confuse the public and create the impression that service differences are damaging the national interest.

Let us by all means proudly remember that the members of the Armed Forces give their basic allegiance solely to the United States. [Applause.] Of that fact all of us are certain. But pride of service and mistaken zeal in promoting particular doctrine has more than once occasioned the kind of difficulty of which I have just spoken.

I am not attempting today to pass judgment on the charge of harmful service rivalries. But one thing is sure. Whatever they are, America wants them stopped. [Applause.]

Recently I have had under special study, with the intimate association of Secretary McElroy, the never-ending problem of efficient organization, complicated as it is by new weapons. Soon my own conclusions will be finalized. I shall promptly take such Executive action as is necessary and, in a separate message, I shall present appropriate recommendations to the Congress.

Meanwhile, without anticipating the detailed form that a reorganization should take, I can state its main lines in terms of objectives:

A major purpose of military organization is to achieve real unity in the Defense Establishment in all the principal features of military activity. Of all these, one of the most important to our Nation's security is strategic planning and direction. This work must be done under unified direction.

The Defense Establishment must plan for a better integration of its defensive resources, particularly with respect to the newer weapons now building and under development. These obviously require full coordination in their development, production, and use. Good organization can help assure such coordination.

In recognition of the need for single control in some of our most advanced development projects, the Secretary of Defense has already decided to concentrate into one organization all the antimissile and satellite technology undertaken within the Department of Defense.

Another requirement of military organization is a clear subordination of the military services to duly constituted civilian authority. [Applause.] This control must be real; not merely on the surface.

Next there must be assurance that an excessive number of compartments in organization will not create costly and confusing compartments in our scientific and industrial effort.

Finally, to end interservice disputes requires clear organization and decisive central direction, supported by the unstinted cooperation of every individual in the Defense Establishment, civilian and military.

2

ACCELERATED DEFENSE EFFORT

The second major action item is the acceleration of the defense effort in particular areas affected by the fast pace of scientific and technological advance.

Some of the points at which improved and increased effort are most essential are these:

We must have sure warning in case of any attack. The improvement of warning equipment is becoming increasingly important as we approach the period when long-range missiles will come into use.

We must protect and disperse our striking forces and increase their readiness for instant reaction. This means more base facilities and more standby crews.

We must maintain deterrent retaliatory power. This means, among other things, stepped-up, long-range missile programs; accelerated programs for other effective missile systems; and, for some years, more advanced aircraft.

We must maintain freedom of the seas. This means nuclear submarines and cruisers; improved antisubmarine weapons; missile ships; and the like.

We must maintain all necessary types of mobile forces to deal with local conflicts, should there be need. This means further improvements in equipment, mobility, tactics, and firepower.

Through increases in pay and incentive, we must maintain in the Armed Forces the skilled manpower modern military forces require. [Applause.]

We must be forward looking in our research and development to anticipate and achieve the unimagined weapons of the future.

With these and other improvements, we intend to assure that our vigilance, power, and technical excellence keep abreast of any realistic threat we face.

3

MUTUAL AID

Third. We must continue to strengthen our mutual-security efforts.

Most people now realize that our programs of military aid and defense support are an integral part of our own defense effort. If the foundations of the free world structure were progressively allowed to crumble under the pressure of Communist imperialism, the entire house of freedom would be in danger of collapse.

As for the mutual economic assistance program, the benefit to us is threefold: First, the countries receiving this aid become bulwarks against Communist encroachment as their military defenses and economies are strengthened. Nations that are conscious of a steady improvement in their industry, education, health, and standard of living are not apt to fall prey to the blandishments of Communist imperialists; second, these countries are helped to reach the point where mutually profitable trade can expand between them and us; third, the mutual confidence that comes from working together on constructive projects creates an atmosphere in which real understanding and peace can flourish.

To help bring these multiple benefits, our economic aid effort should be made more effective.

In proposals for future economic aid, I am stressing a greater use of repayable loans, through the development loan fund, through funds generated by sale of surplus farm products, and through the Export-Import Bank.

While some increase in Government funds will be required, it remains our objective to encourage shifting to the use of private capital sources as rapidly as possible. [Applause.]

One great obstacle to the economic aid program in the past has been, not a rational argument against it on the merits, but a catchword—"giveaway program."

The fact is that no investment we make in our own security and peace can pay us greater dividends than necessary amounts of economic aid to friendly nations.

This is no giveaway.

Let us stick to facts.

We cannot afford to have one of our most essential security programs shot down with a slogan. [Applause.]

4

MUTUAL TRADE

Fourth. Both in our national interest, and in the interest of world peace, we must have a 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act with broadened authority to negotiate. [Applause.]

World trade supports a significant segment of American industry and agriculture. It provides employment for 4½ million American workers. It helps supply our ever-increasing demand for raw materials. It provides the opportunity for American free enterprise to develop on a worldwide scale. It strengthens our friends and increases their desire to be friends. World trade helps to lay the groundwork for peace by making all free nations of the world stronger and more self-reliant.

America is today the world's greatest trading nation. If we use this great asset wisely to meet the expanding demands of the world, we shall not only provide future opportunities for our own business, agriculture, and labor, but in the process strengthen our security posture and other prospects for a prosperous, hormonious world. [Applause.]

As President McKinley said, as long ago as 1901:

> Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. * * * The period of exclusiveness is past.

[Applause.]

5

SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION WITH OUR ALLIES

Fifth. It is of the highest importance that the Congress enact the necessary legislation to enable us to exchange appropriate scientific and technical information with friendly countries as part of our effort to achieve effective scientific cooperation.

It is wasteful in the extreme for friendly allies to consume talent and money in solving problems that their friends have already solved—all because of artificial barriers to sharing. We cannot afford to cut ourselves off from the brilliant talents and minds of scientists in friendly countries. The task ahead will be hard enough without handcuffs of our own making.

The groundwork for this kind of cooperation has already been laid in discussions among NATO countries. Promptness in following through with legislation will be the best possible evidence of American unity of purpose in cooperating with our friends. [Applause.]

5

EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Sixth. In the area of education and research, I recommend a balanced program to improve our resources, involving an investment of about a billion dollars over a 4-year period. This involves new activities by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare designed principally to encourage improved teaching quality and student opportunities in the interests of national security. It also provides a fivefold increase in sums available to the National Science Foundation for its special activities in stimulating and improving science education.

Scrupulous attention has been paid to maintaining local control of educational policy, spurring the maximum amount of local effort, and to avoiding undue stress on the physical sciences at the expense of other branches of learning. [Applause.]

In the field of research, I am asking for substantial increases in basic research funds, including a doubling of the funds available to the National Science Foundation for this purpose. [Applause.]

But Federal action can do only a part of the job. In both education and research, redoubled exertions will be necessary on the part of all Americans if we are to rise to the demands of our times. This means hard work on the part of State and local governments, private industry, schools and colleges, private organizations and foundations, teachers, parents, and—perhaps most important of all—the student himself, with his bag of books and his homework.

With this kind of all-inclusive campaign, I have no doubt that we can create the intellectual capital we need for the years ahead, invest it in the right places—and do all this, not as regimented pawns, but as free men and women. [Applause.]

7

SPENDING AND SAVING

Seventh. To provide for this extra effort for security, we must apply stern tests of priority to other expenditures, both military and civilian.

This extra effort involves, most immediately, the need for a supplemental defense appropriation of $1.3 billion for fiscal year 1958.

In the 1959 budget, increased expenditures for missiles, nuclear ships, atomic energy, research and development, science and education, a special contingency fund to deal with possible new technological discoveries, and increases in pay and incentives to obtain and retain competent manpower add up to a total increase over the comparable figures in the 1957 budget of about $4 billion.

I believe that, in spite of these necessary increases, we should strive to finance the 1959 security effort out of expected revenues. [Applause.] While we now believe that expected revenues and expenditures will roughly balance, our real purpose will be to achieve adequate security, but always with the utmost regard for efficiency and careful management.

This purpose will require the cooperation of Congress in making careful analysis of estimates presented, reducing expenditure on less essential military programs and installations, postponing some new civilian programs, transferring some to the States, and curtailing or eliminating others.

Such related matters as the national debt ceiling and tax revenues will be dealt with in later messages.

8

WORKS OF PEACE

My last call for action is not primarily addressed to the Congress and people of the United States. Rather, it is a message from the people of the United States to all other peoples, especially those of the Soviet Union.

This is the spirit of what we Americans would like to say:

"In the last analysis, there is only one solution to the grim problems that lie ahead. The world must stop the present plunge toward more and more destructive weapons of war, and turn the corner that will start our steps firmly on the path toward lasting peace.

"Our greatest hope for success lies in a universal fact: the people of the world, as people, have always wanted peace and want peace now. [Applause.]

"The problem, then, is to find a way of translating this universal desire into action.

"This will require more than words of peace. It requires works of peace."

Now, may I try to give you some concrete examples of the kind of works of peace that might make a beginning in the new direction.

For a start our people should learn to know each other better. Recent negotiations in Washington have provided a basis in principle for greater freedom of communication and exchange of people. I urge the Soviet Government to cooperate in turning principle into practice by prompt and tangible actions that will break down the unnatural barriers that have blocked the flow of thought and understanding between our peoples. [Applause.]

Another kind of work of peace is cooperation on projects of human welfare. For example, we now have it within our power to eradicate from the face of the earth that age-old scourge of mankind: malaria. We are embarking with other nations in an all-out 5-year campaign to blot out this curse forever. We invite the Soviets to join with us in this great work of humanity. [Applause.]

Indeed, we would be willing to pool our efforts with the Soviets in other campaigns against the diseases that are the common enemy of all mortals—such as cancer and heart disease. [Applause.]

If people can get together on such projects, is it not possible that we could then go on to a full-scale cooperative program of science for peace?

A program of science for peace might provide a means of funneling into one place the results of research from scientists everywhere and from there making it available to all parts of the world.

There is almost no limit to the human betterment that could result from such cooperation. Hunger and disease could increasingly be driven from the earth. The age-old dream of a good life for all could, at long last, be translated into reality. [Applause.]

But of all the works of peace, none is more needed now than a real first step toward disarmament. [Applause.]

Last August the United Nations General Assembly, by an overwhelming vote, approved a disarmament plan that we and our allies sincerely believed to be fair and practical. The Soviets have rejected both the plan and the negotiating procedure set up by the United Nations. As a result, negotiation on this supremely important issue is now at a standstill.

But the world cannot afford to stand still on disarmament. [Applause.] We must never give up the search for a basis of agreement.

Our allies from time to time develop differing ideas on how to proceed. We must concert these convictions among ourselves. Thereafter, any reasonable proposal that holds promise for disarmament and reduction of tension must be heard, discussed, and, if possible, negotiated. [Applause.]

There is one indispensable condition. A disarmament proposal, to hold real promise, must at the minimum have one feature: reliable means to insure compliance by all. It takes actions and demonstrated integrity on both sides to create and sustain confidence. And confidence in a genuine disarmament agreement is vital, not only to the signers of the agreement, but also to the millions of people all over the world who are weary of tensions and armaments.

I say once more, to all peoples, that we will always go the extra mile with anyone on earth if it will bring us nearer a genuine peace. [Applause.]

CONCLUSION

These, then, are the ways in which we must funnel our energies more efficiently into the task of advancing security and peace.

These actions demand and expect two things of the American people: sacrifice, and a high degree of understanding. For sacrifice to be effective it must be intelligent. Sacrifice must be made for the right purpose and in the right place—even if that place happens to come close to home.

After all, it is no good demanding sacrifice in general terms one day, and the next day, for local reasons, opposing the elimination of some unneeded Federal facility. [Applause.]

It is pointless to condemn Federal spending in general, and the next moment condemn just as strongly an effort to reduce the particular Federal grant that touches one's own interest.

And it makes no sense whatever to spend additional billions on military strength to deter a potential danger, and then, by cutting aid and trade programs, let the world succumb to a present danger in economic guise. [Applause.]

My friends of the Congress: The world is waiting to see how wisely and decisively a free representative government can and will now act.

I believe that this Congress possesses and will display the wisdom promptly to do its part in translating into law the

actions demanded by our Nation's interests. But, to make law effective, our kind of government needs the full voluntary support of millions of Americans for these actions.

I am fully confident that the response of the Congress and of the American people will make this time of test a time of honor. Mankind then will see more clearly than ever that the future belongs, not to the concept of the regimented atheistic state, but to the people—the God-fearing, peace-loving people of all the world. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m. the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

## JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 2:30 p. m.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2:30 p. m.

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen will state it.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the circuit court of the county of Arlington in the Commonwealth of Virginia to testify on Monday, January 13, 1958, at 10 a. m. in the case of the Commonwealth of Virginia against Marjorie Young Taylor. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA.

To the SHERIFF OF THE COUNTY OF ARLINGTON, *Greetings:*

We command you, that you summon Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL, 2551 North Vermont Street, Arlington, Va., to appear before the judge of our circuit court of the county of Arlington at the courthouse thereof, the 13th day of January 1958, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify and the truth to say on behalf of the defendant in a certain matter of controversy in our said court before the said judge depending and undetermined between Commonwealth of Virginia, plaintiff, and Marjorie Young Taylor, defendant. And have then there this writ,

Witness, H. Bruce Green, clerk of our said court, at the courthouse, 7th the day of January 1958, and in the 182d year of the Commonwealth.

H. BRUCE GREEN, *Clerk.*

## POSTAL SALARIES

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill providing for the adjustment of the basic salaries of postal field service employees on a regional basis in accordance with prevailing wage rates.

The determination is left to the Postmaster General through a wage board or any other method of determining the wage rates which best serves the purpose.

It is my firm conviction that adequate pay will never be granted to the high living cost areas under our present system of setting a nationwide scale of pay.

It is also my firm conviction that the determination of wage rates by the Congress only results in making a political football out of the process and that the Congress does not have either the means or the facilities for adequately determining the wage rates in the various regions, either for the postal employees or for the classified civil service employees.

## THE LATE CLAUDE U. STONE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound and unfeigned sorrow that I announce the recent passing of Judge Claude U. Stone, 78, former Congressman and onetime editor and publisher of the Peoria Star. He died November 13, 1957, in Peoria, Ill.

He had a long public career which began with election as superintendent of schools for Peoria County in 1902. He served in that office until 1910 when he was elected to Congress and continued to serve in the House of Representatives until 1917.

Upon completion of his third term in Congress, he was appointed Peoria postmaster by President Woodrow Wilson, who was his personal friend. After 3 years as postmaster, he resigned in October 1920, to practice law. He was associated with the firm of McGrath, Stone, Daily, & Michel which had offices in Peoria and Chicago.

In 1925, Judge Stone received the appointment of master in chancery from the three circuit judges of Peoria, Judges Joseph E. Daily, now member of the Illinois Supreme Court, T. N. Green, and John M. Niehaus. He served the next 16 years in that office, finally resigning to devote all of his time to the affairs of the Peoria Star.

From his boyhood in Menard County, where he was born near Middletown, May 11, 1879, he was interested in the Indians who had once roamed over the surrounding country. Later, he started an American Indian archaeology collection which he developed throughout his lifetime to outstanding quality.

He was elected president of the Illinois State Archaeological Society October 26, 1947, in Springfield. He was charter member of the society and previously had served as a director, treasurer, and vice president. He also served the Illinois State Academy of Science as a vice president and the Peoria Academy of Science as president. He was a member of numerous State archaeological societies beside the Society for American Archaeology.

Judge Stone was raised on the family farm and attended a one-room country school. His education was continued at Western Normal College at Bushnell, Ill. Afterward he studied law at the University of Michigan and at George Washington University.

At the age of 17, he became teacher of the Bee Grove rural school in Menard County and taught there for 1 year. After attending Western Normal, he took a position as principal of Brimfield public schools and served there for 2 years. He continued his work in education as county superintendent of schools. Later, he was awarded a master's degree at the age of 76 from Bradley University in June 1955.

He was a veteran of the Spanish-American War, having enlisted at Springfield. He went to Cuba with the American troops and served from May 1898 to May 1899. Also, as a young man, he taught a Sunday school class and

joined the Second Presbyterian Church in Peoria in 1902.

Judge Stone's membership in Masonic organizations covered half a century. His other affiliations included: Veterans of Foreign Wars; American Bar Association, Peoria; State, national and Mississippi Valley historical societies; Civil War Round Table of America; Bradley University Alumni Association; and two honorary fraternities, Phi Delta Kappa and Phi Alpha Theta.

He married Alma Poppen April 2, 1925. They had one son, Claude U. Stone, Jr. of Peoria. Besides Mrs. Stone and their son, he leaves a daughter, Mrs. Shielagh Day of Morton, Ill., 2 brothers, 2 sisters, and 2 grandchildren.

Judge Stone's philosophy of life is expressed in a statement which he made a part of his will.

It has been my belief always—

He wrote—

that the finest inheritance a man can give to his heirs is the legacy of a good name. If my son and daughter try to do right, as I have, I shall be content.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Stone lived a long and fruitful life. Even though he was elected to Congress as a Democrat, he turned to the Republican Party in recent years as being more representative of his thinking. As a matter of fact, I am proud to say he was one of my most ardent supporters for which I shall always be grateful. I will miss him greatly, and our entire Peoria community suffers great loss in his passing.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MULTER, Mr. MACDONALD, and Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PORTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. HESELTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. CARNAHAN.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 13, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.



## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1425. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the transfer of title to certain land at Sand Island, T. H., to the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1426. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1427. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and improvements thereon located within the area of New York Avenue and F Street and 17th and 18th Streets NW., in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1428. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, together with the reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5, located respectively at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle, pursuant to Public Law 566, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1429. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, located in Clatsop County, Oreg., as a national monument, pursuant to Public Law 590, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 9855. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 9856. A bill to extend the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission and to increase its authorization; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 9857. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 9858. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 9859. A bill to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the National Wool Act for 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 9860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the deduction allowed a taxpayer for the expenses of providing for the care of certain dependents, and to allow such deduction without regard to the taxpayer's income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 9861. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 9862. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9863. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9864. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 9865. A bill to extend the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission and to increase its authorization; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 9866. A bill to make an additional appropriation for the Hills Creek Dam, Willamette River Basin, Oreg., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 9867. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 9868. A bill to extend the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission and to increase its authorization; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 9869. A bill to compute wheat acreage allotments on the basis of allotted acres; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 9870. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 9871. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price supports on dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 9872. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the basic salaries of postal field service employees on a regional basis in accordance with prevailing wage rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COAD:

H. R. 9873. A bill to establish a national emergency food storage and distribution program for the purpose of transforming Government-owned agricultural commodities into edible storables in order to provide subsistence for large numbers of the population of the United States who would be destitute in the event of a national or regional emergency or disaster; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 9874. A bill to extend the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission and to increase its authorization; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9875. A bill to provide for the removal of the naval magazine at Port Chicago, Calif., to a site on Willapa Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 9876. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 9877. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. J. Res. 488. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 489. Joint resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Earth Satellites and the Problems of Outer Space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 234. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the staff consultation entitled "The Communist Mind"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the staff consultations entitled "The Ideological Fallacies of Communism"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 426. Resolution authorizing funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas memorializing the United States Congress to immediately adopt Senate bill 2014 and House bill 7574 to alleviate the present problems of the Armed Forces in retaining adequate personnel for the defense of our Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 9878. A bill for the relief of Dora Thelma Andree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9879. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sode Hatta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9880. A bill for the relief of Lilia Pandarsoan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9881. A bill for the relief of Mitsuo Arita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 9882. A bill to authorize the expenditure of certain moneys for war rehabilitation work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 9883. A bill for the relief of Nels Lund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLAY:

H. R. 9884. A bill for the relief of the Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 9885. A bill for the relief of Frank A. Gyescek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9886. A bill for the relief of Louis DeStout; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 9887. A bill for the relief of John Flamos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 9888. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Lazzaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 9889. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward R. Wortman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9890. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmela B. Iacovino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 9891. A bill for the relief of G. B. Grubb and W. B. Shartzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 9892. A bill for the relief of Dr. Te Yong Lou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

355. Mr. MACK of Illinois presented a petition in support of standard time legislation which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## High Interest Rates and the Oregon Lumber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. MIKE MANSFIELD**
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by him and an editorial from the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER ON HIGH INTEREST RATES AND THE OREGON LUMBER INDUSTRY

The State of Oregon has been desperately crippled economically by the so-called hard-money program and its adverse impact on housing. Relaxation of this policy is essential to Oregon's business revival, and some of us have been urging such a change in the management of our currency for the past 2 years.

On November 16, 1957, the Oregonian of Portland published an effective editorial entitled "Timely Credit Action." Motivation for the editorial was the lowering of the Federal Reserve discount rate at certain district banks from 3½ percent to 3 percent, a most mild and gingerly relaxation, indeed.

I should like to call special attention to one key sentence in the Oregonian's editorial. This is the sentence:

"The wood products industry of the Northwest is a prime example of an industry depressed by a building slowdown caused by high interest and diminished credit."

This one sentence epitomizes in a nutshell what has happened to Oregon's lumber economy due to the tight-money policies of the Republican national administration. Housing is the cream of the lumber market. When housing is down, lumber is down. Housing is an industry mainly reliant on credit. When credit is dried up or made scarce at the source, housing suffers accordingly—ergo, lumber likewise suffers.

[From the Portland Oregonian of November 16, 1957]

TIMELY CREDIT ACTION

The Federal Reserve Board, administrator of the Federal Reserve System of 12 Reserve banks and their 24 branches, and of all national banks and 1,800 State banks which are members, is supposed to be above politics. Operating in its fiscal tower, the Board attempts to immunize itself from the piteous wails of politicians that its policies are ruining industries and making fat cats out of lenders.

The Federal Reserve System, in the words of William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, does what it can "at all times, to assure monetary and credit conditions that will foster high levels of business and employment, maintain the stability of the dollar, and promote sustainable growth in the economy," thus to "make a substantial contribution to raising the standards of the people as a whole."

In line with this, the Federal Reserve Board has been battling inflation on the credit front. In the past 3 years, it has raised the discount rate—the interest rate the Federal Reserve banks charge their member banks for loans—7 times.

Now, the Board has announced reduction of the discount rate at 4 of its 12 district banks from 3½ to 3 percent—a reduction which may be expected to reach the other 8 banks soon. The reason given: "It is recognition that inflation, at least temporarily, has ceased to be the dominant factor in the economy. * * * The inflationary pressure has cooled."

The assault on the Eisenhower administration's tight-money policy—a policy most influenced by the Federal Reserve System's fight to curb inflation— has emphasized for some time that there are soft spots in the economy. The wood-products industry of the Northwest is a prime example of an industry depressed by a building slowdown caused by high interest and diminished credit.

Thus, reversal of the interest trend under Federal Reserve policy should, in time, be reflected in easier credit, more building and stimulation of lumber sales. It should, that is, unless even this small relaxation of interest rates results in another upsurge of inflation. This seems doubtful—and is, at least, a risk which should be taken in view of the slowdown in the national economy and considerable unemployment.

Whether or not the political attacks on the Eisenhower administration echoed in the board room of the Federal Reserve System, the reduced interest order is welcome. The national economy is closely geared to liberal credit, and it is not only the politicians who believe that credit has been too severely restricted for the past 6 months.

## Dedication of Sam Rayburn Memorial Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most inspiring occasions of this past fall was the dedication of the Sam Rayburn Memorial Library in Bonham, Tex.

To that occasion came the leading figures of this country—without regard to partisan divisions. All of them joined in paying tribute to a great public servant.

One of those who was present was Mr. RAYBURN'S fellow Texan, Robert B. Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Anderson delivered a speech in keeping with the high occasion, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As the President himself noted earlier today, this is the week of SAM RAYBURN'S birthday. We all join in wishing him many more happy birthdays in the years that lie ahead.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY TREASURY SECRETARY ROBERT B. ANDERSON AT DEDICATION OF THE SAM RAYBURN MEMORIAL LIBRARY, BONHAM, TEX., OCTOBER 9, 1957

Out of the yesterdays, out of the life of SAM RAYBURN, we come to the present moment. We dedicate a library inspired by him; erected not for glorification but consecrated to stimulate and satisfy man's intellectual thirst for learning in the tomorrows. We would not be content and look backward; we would labor and look forward—for of such is the life of RAYBURN.

It is a proud moment. We are honored who are privileged to pay tribute to a personal friend and an outstanding American. He needs no monument. He is part and parcel of our generation. He has given his life in service to his country. His historic stewardship as Speaker of the House longer than any man before him attests to the genesis of fairness that is an essential ingredient of government by and for the people. His true memorial will abide in their hearts.

It is altogether fitting that the site of this citadel of history and progress should be in Bonham. The Speaker is rooted here in the rich black soil of Fannin County. Here he gained his strength and put on the mantle of simplicity and humility. Here he is part of the people—the cornerstone of his faith.

The affection, the confidence, and the respect of his neighbors are responsible for his 44 years in Congress. How appropriate that this library will be largely devoted to improving our knowledge and understanding of the Congress of the United States.

There the art of self-government is raised to one of its highest expressions. In this forum is heard the voice of the two great political parties of our time.

Oftentimes the debates may seem to lack specific direction, yet out of the crucible of discussion come the intellectual alloys of our collective thinking. These materials, utilized by the growing genius of the architects of our Government, become the pilings and pillars of the edifice of our political thinking. Upon this scaffolding will be laid the solid stones of our national decision.

Those of us who now and in the future behold the completed structure will know that, all unseen, it is supported by the perdurable framework created by the political artisans of our age, exemplified by men like SAM RAYBURN.

In a deeper sense, however, no building of national life is ever completed. The time never comes when we can say our work is done. No generation can claim the privilege of dwelling in the house of its father without accepting the responsibility of preserving and extending it for the generation to come.

But we dedicate today a house of books, of written records. How important they are to the past, the present, and the future. In 1835 Alexis de Tocqueville in Democracy in America wrote:

"The authority which public men possess in America is so brief and they are so soon commingled with the ever changing population of the country that the acts of a community frequently leave fewer traces than events in a private family. The public administration is, so to speak, oral and traditional. But little is committed to writing, and that little is soon wafted away forever, like the leaves of the sibyl, by the smallest breeze.

"The only historical remains in the United States are the newspapers; if a number be wanting, the chain of time is broken and the present is severed from the past. I am convinced that in 50 years it will be more difficult to collect authentic documents concerning the social condition of the Americans at the present day than it is to find remains of the administration of France during the Middle Ages; and if the United States were ever invaded by barbarians, it would be necessary to have recourse to the history of other nations in order to learn anything of the people who now inhabit them."

No book or record is an end unto itself. They must make the past useful to the present—the contemporary challenging to the future. Few ideas are new but old ideas are adaptable. That which was once regarded as imagination may find reality in a new day.

Experiences, when recorded, do not wear out. Mental creativeness, once inscribed, does not exhaust itself. In new fabrics of time they are constantly reappearing, guiding, directing—slowly but inscrutably moving each new age toward man's enlightenment and betterment of man.

In this use of books certain currents of optimism are discernible. I will mention only two. The first of these is the insistent belief that the present can be improved upon. No era need be happenstance. Here is evidence of man's faith that as an individual he can discern and use things of value about him. He persists in believing that his lone personal thoughts and meditation are worth recording. His experiences are spared condemnation as transitory and assume an air of deathless value. Yesterday, today, and tomorrow are coalesced into a oneness by the reposition of man's records.

A second discernible current of human optimism gleaned from libraries is the age-old belief that as a community man can best govern himself. Here is the root of our Constitution. This faith in our collective judgment is the basic support of our Congress—that magnificent instrument of our courageous resolve to be a government of law by people. Here we seek to keep the balance between the well-being of the many and the imperative creative need of the individual for the fullest freedom. Here is need for inherent fairness. Political parties contend and debate, but over the long run the distillations of combined judgments have proven sound. As our problems grow more and more complex the people of our Nation sense it and the Members of our deliberative bodies rise to the demands.

Not all the world is free. There are some nations whose leaders scorn the individual and the competence of communities to govern by the rule of law. They stifle freedom, curtail observation and meditation. They enforce totalitarianism and regimentation. They also burn books. They forbid the recordings of free thought. They prostitute history. They do not dedicate libraries of unfettered expression.

The role of records in man's affairs could go on interminably. They are one of our most palpable links with immortality. As such, they keep before us always the sobering realization that our decisions and our actions of the fleeting present are tomorrow's record of how we laid a restraining hand on man's march to a better condition, or gave him impetus.

Our separate books may be no more than records of the things that describe an individualistic pattern or thought experience. But brought together as the libraries of free men our books, like great citizens, transcend themselves. They become a part of what unites us. As libraries our books become like a twisted skein of many colored threads. In such a skein it may be next to impossible to trace the course or importance of any one thread. But dominant colors can be easily distinguished. So also can the main directions that those dominant strands follow.

Our libraries serve us in the same manner. From their massed records, and just because they preserve so much that is so different of man's thoughts, decisions and actions, we can see clearly a few main attributes and main directions.

Thus, we are enabled to find and assess our enduring characteristics. We are reassured that, whether slowly or in haste, at given times the human race has moved, in the main, steadily from disorganization toward organization, from scarcity toward plenty, from brutishness toward perception and appreciation, from ignorance toward knowledge and from knowledge toward wisdom, from fear toward security, from ceaseless tribal war toward ceaseless efforts to achieve peace.

Our libraries assure us man has a sense of direction, a lasting, dependable sense we may all safely take, as individuals and as nations, to guide our own conduct.

This is an important occasion. Most of what I have said relates to the library we dedicate.

But what of the man whose name it carries?

You, his neighbors, know his virtues well. He has the deep personal feeling for friendship. No friend is ever cast aside because it might be expedient. He has earned the respect of his associates in Government regardless of party.

When he speaks in Congress—which is rarely—the word passes quickly and every seat is filled. You expect him to speak plainly. He does. He is a master of simplicity and directness.

In every sense SAM RAYBURN is most unusual in his profession. He stands in the national spotlight representing courage and strength, character and patriotism—the type of rugged individualist with vision who has built the State and the United States to a pinnacle of world leadership.

It was Rudyard Kipling who spoke of one who could "walk with kings nor lose the common touch." Such a man we honor today.

SAM RAYBURN has always been close to the roots of his greatness. He is deeply close to his family, his friends, and his home. You haven't been around SAM RAYBURN very long, anywhere he might be, if you haven't heard

him talk about Bonham, his devoted friends in the old Fourth District, and Flag Springs, his home as a boy.

Not long ago, at a Texas dinner in Washington, Speaker RAYBURN said:

"We are all just slightly removed from Flag Springs. We all just missed being a tenant farmer or a hired hand or something. I just missed being a tenant farmer by a gnat's heel. But somebody was kind to me in my youth. Yes; I have come a long way from Flag Springs. But, then, I don't feel that I have ever been very far away from Flag Springs, either."

SAM RAYBURN is in the business of politics. In that business, issues and partisan differences breed differences of opinion. But although there may be those who differ with SAM RAYBURN on political issues, there are none who question his fairness or devotion to principle.

I remember an occasion a number of years ago when Speaker RAYBURN had passed the mark of holding the office of Speaker of the House longer than anyone previously in history.

On the occasion marking this record tenure as Speaker of the House, his Republican counterpart, House Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, rose from his chair.

"No man," his political adversary said, "could achieve such an unusual distinction unless he was a man of fine character, of extraordinary ability, great fairness, and a parliamentarian par excellence.

"Those are virtues which we have in our Speaker. In this hour of confusion—of uncertainty—we have a man who has the courage, we have a man who has the firmness to do that which is right, to the end that our country may emerge a better country."

If there is anything that is bipartisan in Washington it is a uniform respect and appreciation for SAM RAYBURN.

Speaker RAYBURN has risen above the things that divide us to the things that unite us in the same way that a library does, by combining in himself a keen awareness of the main currents of human effort and aspirations. In so doing, he has entered the small company of men who are recognizable landmarks along humanity's high roads, the men who have in themselves been keepers of humanity's sense of direction.

Mr. Speaker, here among your closest friends America salutes you.

We are grateful for the life you have so abundantly lived among us.

Any effort of mine to reduce to expression your contributions to our way of life and government would be to distort by simplicity that which is the imponderable measure of a man of history in the lives of all generations who feel the impact of his influence.

May it suffice here to say only that what you have been, what you have done, what you are, belong forever to the edifice of our society—to the inspiration of our Nation.

This building, bearing your name, we commend to the use of man—SAM RAYBURN we enshrine in the hearts of his countrymen.

---

LETTER READ BY TREASURY SECRETARY ROBERT B. ANDERSON AT DEDICATION OF THE SAM RAYBURN MEMORIAL LIBRARY, BONHAM, TEX., OCTOBER 9, 1957.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, October 7, 1957.*

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Bonham, Tex.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is a pleasure to join your friends in the dedication of the SAM RAYBURN Memorial Library.

There are few citizens who can equal your knowledge of the House of Representatives, and none who has occupied the position of leadership of that body as long as you have. It is fitting, therefore, that this library stand as a lasting reminder of your guiding spirit and rich experience in that great institution of self-government.

My congratulations to you on this occasion that does honor to all the citizens of our land.

With warm regard,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

---

## Who's Confused?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I mailed on January 10 to the Secretary of Defense:

Hon. NEIL H. MCELROY,
*Secretary of Defense,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to call your attention to certain Defense Department public relations policies and respectfully suggest that you consider appropriate changes.

On December 30, 1957, I made available to the press copies of a letter I had written to my colleague, CARL T. DURHAM, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Two of my statements were based on what I was told not long before by your Assistant Secretary (Atomic Energy), Herbert B. Loper, and by the vice commander in chief of SAC, Lt. Gen. Francis H. Griswold. Those statements were not only challenged by the Defense Department, but they were scoffed at (according to the press) and I was said to have been confused.

Although I had carefully established my facts before my press conference on December 30, I checked later with both General Loper and General Griswold. They substantiated what I had said and I now ask for:

1. A retraction and an apology from the Defense Department, and

2. That the DOD widely and explicitly make known the facts regarding the two points under discussion; namely, that an accidental or unauthorized nuclear explosion is probable, not merely possible, and that SAC planes do not in normal routine training or ferrying operations carry nuclear weapons which could be armed by the crew without landing.

I also believe that the DOD public relations program should explain to the Nation and to the world the abundant safeguards taken to prevent an unauthorized or accidental explosion and to prevent the misinterpretation of such an explosion as a precursor of an all-out war.

Let me explain in more detail what the DOD should retract and why I think I deserve an apology.

First, let me say that no question of security has ever been raised on these particular matters and that I explicitly raised this point with both General Loper and General Griswold.

News services quoted both the DOD and General Loper as saying that "the possibility of a nuclear explosion was 1 in 3 billion," a figure General Loper used in our conversations both before and after the news stories but only to apply to an accident resulting from mechanical failure or inadvertence. He admitted to me that human frailties, such as drunkenness, misguided idealism, mental breakdown, and treason, would substantially change that proportion and that, all things considered, an accidental or unauthorized explosion was probable.

I recognize the communication difficulties inherent in the use of words such as "possible" and "probable." The word "likely" is better.

DOD agrees, in fact, that such an explosion is likely, not a remote possibility, so why doesn't DOD say so instead of issuing a misleading and unresponsive statement which confuses the issue raised by my statement that an accidental or unauthorized explosion is probable?

Now, let me detail the second point on which I believe DOD public relations policy is similarly evasive and unresponsive.

Do our SAC planes in fact carry nuclear weapons which can be armed without landing? Do we, in other words, delegate to a single crew the power to decide the fate of the world? General Griswold told me very explicitly on December 5, 1957, that we do not. Our planes carry the bombs, he said, but they will not be armed until word is received from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President.

Although General Griswold said this fact was not classified and that he personally believed it should be made more widely known, apparently some persons in the Pentagon want our citizens and the people in Britain, France, the U. S. S. R., and the rest of the world to believe that our planes are ready to drop their terrible bombs as they fly patrols all over the globe. This, in my opinion, makes us look trigger-happy and irresponsible.

We'd do better to trumpet the truth and show the world that we are alert and ready, yes, but taking all reasonable precautions against any one crew making a fatefully wrong decision.

I don't mind the DOD disagreeing with me. I do mind it muddying up the waters in connection with very clear information I have received from high Defense officials on important and unclassified matters. Far more important than my personal feelings, however, is my belief that DOD's public relations policy with respect to our handling of nuclear weapons should be more frank and positive with regard to the dangers and safeguards related to their use.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
*Member of Congress.*

---

## H. R. 9882

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 I introduced H. R. 9882, a bill to fulfill the continuing trust responsibility of the Government growing out of an agreement entered into during World War II. This agreement involves $1,407,976.96 which was earned by civilian public-service workers doing work of national importance as provided under the draft law in lieu of military service. The money was to have been paid over to the National Service Board for Religious Objectors, the official non-Government liaison agency between the Selective Service System and 47 religious denominations, for war rehabilitation work.

Because the Comptroller General felt that this could not be done without enabling legislation by the Congress the fund was deposited in the United States Treasury where it remains in trust for the National Service Board for Religious Objectors. The money appropriated by this bill will be used for foreign rehabilitation and refugee relief and resettlement programs in accordance with the original agreement.

In order to insure adequate controlling of the programing of the money, the bill further provides that disbursement of the money would be made upon approval of the Director of Selective Service, and that in making this approval, the Director of Selective Service will have available the counsel of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, which is a Government agency in the International Cooperation Administration. I earnestly invite the attention of the membership of the House to this legislation which will complete an agreement which should not be permitted to continue unresolved.

## Problems of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address and a statement concerning the problem of defense, which were made by me during the adjournment of Congress.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### WE MUST CATCH UP

(Address by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, member, Senate Armed Services Committee, chairman, Military Applications Subcommittee, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and chairman, special NATO Parliamentary Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel, delivered before the dinner meeting of Washington Bankers Association, Ridpath Hotel, Spokane, Wash., October 10, 1957)

This is a week of shame and danger for America.

The Soviet Union, not the United States, has made man's first step into outer space.

Month after month, our newspapers and magazines have been filled with Government-inspired stories of progress in our American earth satellite program. And now, victory in the race for the step to the stars has gone to the Soviets.

The direct military significance of this first satellite is not great. Rather, it is a symbol—a symbol of enormous American complacency and enormous Soviet military and scientific progress.

Getting this first satellite into the air was a stunning technical achievement. This achievement should be taken as an ominous military warning, and an equally ominous scientific warning.

The question is not whether we are losing the race for the ICBM. We are losing it. We are behind and we are falling further and further behind. The problem is not how to stay ahead: it is how to catch up.

Consider the record: We were 4 years ahead of the Soviets in achieving the atomic bomb. The race for the hydrogen bomb was a virtual tie. Now, we are behind in the race for the ultimate weapon—the ICBM. For the first time, our country is losing a scientific and engineering race which we were determined to win.

The question is not whether we are also losing the race for overall scientific supremacy. We are losing it and we will continue to fall further and further behind unless something is immediately done.

Ten years ago, there was no question where the best scientists in the world could be found—here in the United States. Now each time Sputnik I passes over our cities we are reminded of Soviet scientific capacity. Dr. Edward Teller, the father of the H-bomb, has flatly stated he believes that 10 years from now the best scientists in the world will be found in Russia.

In this 20th century, military supremacy depends on technological supremacy, and technological supremacy depends in turn on scientific supremacy.

A continuation of today's trend will certainly mean that the Soviets will soon be first in science.

A continuation of today's trend will certainly mean that the Soviets will also be first in military power.

The true tragedy is that we are now voluntarily abdicating world leadership to the Soviet Union. There is no real reason why we should be losing the scientific and military race, as we are now losing it.

We are now the most advanced industrial nation in the world; the Soviets are barely one generation into the industrial age. The American people have a more abundant life than any other nation in the world; the Soviet people do not have the most elementary material comforts. We have the enormous advantage of freedom; the Soviets work under the ironhanded dictator.

Here in America we can keep world military and scientific leadership without making any serious material sacrifices.

This is no time for partisan charges and countercharges. This is no time for wringing our hands over past errors.

The question is not what we did or did not do in the past. The question is what should we do now.

The starting point must be humility. There should be an end to the amused talk about how we were not surprised by the earth satellite, and to the ridiculous statements that anybody can throw a hunk of iron into the air.

It is time for all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, to wake up, to stop quarreling, and to start acting.

1. We should stop our boasting about American prowess in the missile field. So far, we have been doing almost all the talking, and the Soviets have been doing most of the acting.

2. We need an Admiral Rickover of ballistic missiles. To date, our missiles program, divided between the three services, has really been run by coordinating committees. No one man has been given the complete authority and the complete responsibility needed to get the job done.

The only postwar military development program in which we are now clearly ahead of the Soviets, naval nuclear propulsion, shows what can be done when one man is given the authority needed to force through a major developmental job, and then let alone to do it.

Almost 2 years have passed since I urged that our entire ballistic missile program be put under one top-level man. We still do not have that man.

3. We should immediately restore the budgetary cutbacks on the production side of our ICBM program. It is simply nonsense to say that more money will not speed our program. It will.

4. The President and the incoming Secretary of Defense should immediately assume personal responsibility for making sure our ballistic missile effort is speeded up. This is a life and death matter for our country and the Free World, and it should be so treated at the highest levels of our Government. Critical decisions must not be left to subordinates.

5. We should immediately restore the budgetary cuts for manned bombers, and then raise our production goals still further. In the ballistic missile field our own progress has been slower than expected, whereas Soviet progress has been faster than expected. This being the case, it is simply absurd to slow down bomber procurement as well.

6. We should immediately establish a major program to achieve submarine-launched intermediate range ballistic missiles. Our present program is little more than a token effort. An intermediate range ballistic missile launched from a nuclear submarine would have the same target coverage as an ICBM. These sea-based launching platforms would be almost impossible to find and destroy. We could tremendously increase our military deterrent power by getting this capability at an early date.

7. We should immediately abolish the arbitrary spending ceiling. We are the richest country in the world. We can easily afford the military and scientific effort required to keep the peace. I have always been opposed to unnecessary Government spending, but I have been more opposed to the philosophy that says we cannot afford an adequate national defense.

8. We should immediately start rebuilding the strength of our conventional Armed Forces. Every Soviet stride forward in weapons of mass destruction increases the probability of brush-fire wars. Particularly when the Russians are ahead of us in ballistic missiles, all the talk about massive retaliation is so much massive nonsense.

9. We should immediately step up our output of scientists and engineers and do everything possible to encourage more of our talented young people to embark on scientific careers. Over the long run, our failure to do this may prove our real military and technological Achilles heel.

10. We should immediately take steps to strengthen the bonds between us and our allies. More than ever it is now apparent we need their help and they need ours. In particular, the United States should initiate in NATO a bold program to help train and utilize the best talents of the entire NATO community in solving the common scientific problems.

### STATEMENT ON POLARIS-ATOMIC SUBMARINE PROGRAM

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, member, Senate Armed Services Committee, chairman, Military Applications Subcommittee, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy)

I have been deeply disturbed by recent official statements suggesting that the Navy's sea-launched ballistic missiles program is at last moving full speed ahead.

This is simply not so.

It is true that there have been important scientific breakthroughs on Polaris—the solid-propellant intermediate range missile which can be fired from a nuclear submarine.

However, a few laboratory-model Polaris missiles will by themselves contribute almost nothing to our deterrent strength. Polaris will not be a real weapon until it is married to its launching platform—a nuclear submarine which can safely travel within striking distance of enemy targets. And this weapons system—the missile plus

its launching platform—will in turn not really add to our defensive strength until we have produced operations weapons in large numbers and distributed them to our Armed Forces.

Side by side with this effort we should also be going all-out to cope with the threat posed by these underwater weapons in Soviet hands.

Here are just a few of the areas where we now lag:

1. Our present program for building an undersea satellite fleet is one more case of too little and too late. The exact number of these weapons systems we now plan to build is classified. I can flatly state, however, that the American people would be dismayed and bewildered if this figure was made public. It is shockingly small.

I am confident that the Soviet goal is to produce hundreds of these undersea satellites.

Yet our own program does not even begin to meet our true needs.

I recommend that we build at least 100 missile-launching submarines at the earliest possible date. This is a minimum number—a starting point.

2. Once we test fire our first Polaris missile, it is imperative that a large quantity of these weapons be wedded to launching platforms and allotted to our armed services as quickly as possible. In other words, we face three problems—the problem of developing an effective missile and launching platform, the problem of mass producing this weapons system, and the problem of military planning for its employment within our defensive forces. All three problems must be tackled in parallel.

But, today, we have scarcely begun to tackle the problems of mass production and military planning.

At the rate we are now going, we will have our first missile long before we can mass produce it or use it effectively.

We must cut down our lead time.

I recommend that we now accelerate our planning for mass production and military use of the undersea satellite.

3. Our research and development program for ballistic seapower is not now organized to get the job done as quickly as possible.

One person, Admiral Raborn, is now in effective charge of the Polaris missile. He reports directly to the Secretary of the Navy. But the job of keeping the missile on schedule keeps him busy around the clock.

The result is that no one person is actually in charge of the launching platform—the submarine hull, the propulsion machinery, and the nuclear powerplant. Responsibility for the platform is in fact now divided among several different groups in the Navy, with no one person really in command.

I recommend that one person immediately be given complete authority and responsibility for the launching platform, and that he also report directly to the Secretary of the Navy.

4. As surely as night follows day, we are now heading for a bitter service fight on the question of the role of ballistic seapower in our overall defense policy. Every revolutionary weapon—from the crossbow to the airplane—has always been resisted by the military diehards. The undersea satellite is no exception.

Let us be frank. Billions of dollars will be required for this program. Partisans of other weapons systems will, of course, resist these expenditures. We may concede their sincerity, but we cannot count on their objectivity.

The place of the undersea satellite in our defensive forces is simply too important for the future of the free world to be decided by bargaining and logrolling within and between the three services.

I recommend, as I have repeatedly recommended in the past, that the President and the Secretary of Defense immediately give this problem their personal and continuing attention, so that it will be resolved on the basis of the national interest, not service interests.

5. We are not doing nearly enough to develop our defense against Soviet ballistic seapower. The day is inevitably coming—and it will be sooner than most of us think—when Moscow will possess large numbers of nuclear submarines armed with 1,500-mile missiles.

Once such a ship leaves its home port the best and surest way to destroy it is with another nuclear submarine. Our Navy is now developing such an antisubmarine vessel—a hunter-killer submarine specifically designed to locate, track, and destroy hostile submarines.

Yet our present plans call for exactly one hunter-killer submarine to be operational in 1960.

Picture it: Today, right now, the Soviet underwater fleet already includes more than 500 vessels. Three years from now we will have precisely one killer-submarine arrayed against the entire might of the Soviet Navy. We will have one such up-to-date ship available for patroling the millions of square miles of the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Arctic oceans.

I recommend that we drastically revise upward our programs for producing these hunter-killer submarines.

---

## Science in National Security

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message today, the President demonstrated again his marked qualities as a great leader.

He gave to all Americans reasons for confidence, courage, and rededication to the ideals of their country.

He gave to all the free people of the world reasons for renewed hope and rededication to the cause of an enduring peace.

He gave to each of us, as Members of Congress, a challenge which will be a supreme test.

In our consideration of this message and of the specific measures to implement it, he made two previous reports to the people of America which should be available with the text of his state of the Union message.

The first was the speech he made here in Washington on November 7, as follows:

My subject tonight is science in national security.

Originally this talk was to be part of one I intended to make in Oklahoma City next week. However, I found that I could not possibly deal with this subject in just one address. So tonight I shall concentrate on the most immediate aspects of this question of the relationship of science to the defense of our country.

Let me tell you plainly what I am going to do in this talk and those to follow.

I am going to lay the facts before you—the rough with the smooth. Some of these security facts are reassuring; others are not—they are sternly demanding. Some require that we resolutely continue lines of action now well begun. Others require new action, and still others new dimensions of effort. After putting these facts and requirements before you, I shall propose a program of action—a program that will demand the energetic support of not just the Government but every American, if we are to make it successful.

First, some facts about our present security posture. It is one of great strength, but by no means should this assurance satisfy any of us. Our defenses must be adequate not just today, but tomorrow and in all the years to come, until under the safety of these defenses, we shall have secured a durable and just peace for all the world.

As of now, the United States is strong. Our Nation has today, and has had for some years, enough power in its strategic retaliatory forces to bring near annihilation to the warmaking capabilities of any other country.

This position of present strength did not come about by accident. The Korean war had the effect of greatly expanding our peacetime defense forces. As we began the partial demobilization of these forces we undertook also an accelerated program of modernization.

As a first step, scientific surveys were instituted soon after the Korean armistice. The result was a decision to give a New Look to the Defense Establishment, depending for increased efficiency more upon modern science and less upon mere numbers of men.

In succeeding years there has been an across-the-board program to bring all units of our defense into line with the possibilities of modern technology. There has been, also, a high level of expenditure on research and development for defense—now running in the aggregate at something over $5 billion a year.

Later, scientific surveys focused attention and emphasis on long-range ballistic missiles. Development on this item got into high gear more than 2 years ago. We have since been spending a billion dollars a year on this item alone.

Before discussing some of the things we urgently need to do, I would like to give you a few samples of the things that have been done in recent years by our military forces, scientists, and engineers to put current scientific discovery at the service of your defense.

In our diversified family of missiles, we have weapons adapted to every kind of distance, launching, and use. There are now 28 different types either in operation or under development.

All combat vessels of the Navy built since 1955 have guided missiles in place of, or to supplement, guns. The Navy has in both oceans, submarines which can rise to the surface and launch, in a matter of minutes, a missile carrying a nuclear warhead, and submerge immediately—while the missile is guided to a target hundreds of miles away.

The Navy possesses an atomic depth bomb.

Since Korea, both the Army's and Navy's antiaircraft guns have been largely replaced by surface-to-air missiles. All of our new interceptor aircraft are armed with air-to-air missiles.

Many of the traditional functions of the Army's artillery and support aircraft have been taken over by guided missiles. For example, we have already produced, in various distance ranges, hundreds of Matador, Honest John, and Corporal missiles. To give you some idea of what this means in terms of explosive power: Four battalions of Corporal missiles alone are equivalent in firepower to all the artillery used in World War II.

Some of these missiles have their own built-in mechanisms for seeking out and destroying a target many miles away. Thus, the other day, a Bomarc missile, by itself, sought out a fast-moving, unmanned air-

plane 45 miles at sea and actually met it head on.

Except for a dwindling number of B–36's, there is hardly an airplane in the combat units of the Air Force that was in them even as late as the Korean conflict. The B–52 jet bomber, supported by its jet tankers, is standard in our Strategic Air Command. Again, to show you what this means in terms of power: One B–52 can carry as much destructive capacity as was delivered by all the bombers in all the years of World War II combined. But the B–52 will, in turn, be succeeded by the B–58, a supersonic bomber.

Atomic submarines have been developed. One ran almost 16 days without surfacing; another cruised under the polar ice cap for over 5 days.

A number of huge naval carriers are in operation, supplied with the most powerful nuclear weapons and bombers of great range to deliver them. Construction has started which will produce a carrier to be driven by atomic power.

Since 1956 we have developed nuclear explosives with radioactive fallout of less than 4 percent of the fallout of previous large weapons. This has obvious importance in developing nuclear defenses for use over our own territory.

In numbers, our stock of nuclear weapons is so large and so rapidly growing that we are able safely to disperse it to positions assuring its instant availability against attack, and still keep strong reserves. Our scientists assure me that we are well ahead of the Soviets in the nuclear field, both in quantity and in quality. We intend to stay ahead.

We have already shown that we can, with the precision to make it a useful military weapon, fire a large ballistic missile well over a thousand miles. Our ballistic missiles have had successful flights to as much as 3,500 miles. An intercontinental missile is required, and we have some of them in an advanced state of development. But, because of our many forward positions, for us an intermediate-range missile is for some purposes as good as an intercontinental one.

A different kind of missile, the air-breathing Snark, recently traveled over a guided course for 5,000 miles and was accurately placed on target.

We have fired three rockets to heights between 2,000 and 4,000 miles, and have received back much valuable information about outer space.

One difficult obstacle on the way to producing a useful long-range weapon is that of bringing a missile back from outer space without its burning up like a meteor because of friction with the earth's atmosphere.

Our scientists and engineers have solved that problem. This object here in my office is an experimental missile—a nose cone. It has been hundreds of miles to outer space and back. Here it is, completely intact.

These illustrations—which are, of course, only a small sample of our scientists' accomplishments—I give you merely to show that our strength is not static but is constantly moving forward with technological improvement.

Long-range ballistic missiles, as they exist today, do not cancel the destructive and deterrent power of our Strategic Air Force.

The Soviet launching of earth satellites is an achievement of the first importance, and the scientists who brought it about deserve full credit and recognition. Already, useful new facts on outer space have been produced, and more are on the way, as new satellites with added instruments are launched.

Earth satellites, in themselves, have no direct present effect upon the Nation's security. However, there is real military significance to these launchings, which I have previously mentioned publicly. Their current military significance lies in the advanced techniques and the competence in military technology they imply, evidenced, for example, by the powerful propulsion equipment necessarily used.

But in the main, the Soviets continue to concentrate on the development of war-making weapons and supporting industries. This, as well as their political attitude in all international affairs, serves to warn us that Soviet expansionist aims have not changed. The world has not forgotten the Soviet military invasions of such countries as Finland and Poland, their support of the war in Korea, or their use of force in their ruthless suppression of Hungarian freedom.

Eternal vigilance and increased free world military power, backed by our combined economic and spiritual strength, provide the only answer to this threat until the Soviet leaders themselves cease to consume their resources in warlike and expansionist purposes and turn them to the well-being of their own peoples.

We frankly recognize that the Soviets are building up types of power that could, if we were attacked, damage us seriously. This is because no defensive system today can possibly be airtight in preventing all breakthroughs of planes and weapons.

To aid in protecting against this, we in partnership with Canada, have long been constructing a continental defense system reaching from far out in the Pacific around the northern edge of this continent and across the Atlantic approaches. This is a complex system of early warning radars, communication lines, electronic computers, supersonic aircraft, and ground-to-air missiles, some with atomic warheads. This organization and equipment is under constant improvement; emphasis on this improvement must be increased.

In addition to retaliatory and continental defense forces, we and our allies maintain strong ground and naval units in strategic areas of the world. In the strength and readiness of all these varied kinds of power—retaliatory, defensive, and local—properly distributed and supported, lies the real deterrent to the outbreak of war. This fact brings home to all of us the tremendous importance to this country of our allies. Not only do they maintain large military forces as part of our combined security, but they provide vital bases and areas that permit the effective deployment of all our forces for defense.

It is my conviction, supported by trusted scientific and military advisers, that, although the Soviets are quite likely ahead in some missile and special areas, and are obviously ahead of us in satellite development, as of today the overall military strength of the free world is distinctly greater than that of the Communist countries.

We must see to it that whatever advantages they have, are temporary only.

The next question is: How about the future?

I must say to you, in all gravity, that in spite of both the present overall strength and the forward momentum of our defense, it is entirely possible that in the years ahead we could fall behind. I repeat: we could fall behind, unless we now face up to certain pressing requirements and set out to meet them at once.

I address myself to this problem knowing that for every American it surmounts any division among us of whatever kind. It reminds us once again that we are not partisans of any kind, we are Americans. We will close ranks as Americans, and get on with the job to be done.

According to my scientific friends, one of our greatest and most glaring deficiencies is the failure of us in this country to give high enough priority to scientific education and to the place of science in our national life.

Of course, these scientists properly assume that we shall continue to acquire the most modern weapons in adequate numbers as fast as they are produced; but their conviction does expose one great future danger that no amount of money or resources currently devoted to it can meet. Education requires time, incentive, and skilled teachers.

They believe that a second critical need is that of giving higher priority, both public and private, to basic research.

As to these long-range requirements, I shall have something to say next week.

Tonight I shall discuss two other factors, on which prompt action is possible.

The first is the tragic failure to secure the great benefits that would flow from mutual sharing of appropriate scientific information and effort among friendly countries.

Most great scientific advances of the world have been the product of free international exchange of ideas. There is hardly a nation that has not made some significant contribution to modern science.

There instantly comes to mind the contribution of Britain to jet propulsion, radar, infrared rays; Germany to rocketry, X-rays and sulfa drugs; Italy to wireless telegraphy; France to radioactivity; and Japan to magnetics.

In the free world, we all have a lot to give and a lot to gain in security through the pooling of scientific effort. Why should we deny to our friends information that we are sure the Soviets already have? Information our friends could use toward our mutual security.

Why, for want of the fullest practicable sharing, should we waste American research funds and talent struggling with technological problems already mastered by our friends?

Here is a way in which, at no cost, we can dramatically and quickly magnify the scientific resources at the disposal of the free world.

The second immediate requirement is that of greater concentration of effort and improved arrangements within the Government in the fields of science, technology, and missiles—including the continuing requirement for the closest kind of executive-legislative cooperation.

As to action: I report the following items to you tonight.

The first thing I have done is to make sure that the very best thought and advice that the scientific community can supply, heretofore provided to me on an informal basis, is now fully organized and formalized so that no gap can occur. The purpose is to make it possible for me, personally, whenever there appears to be any unnecessary delay in our development system, to act promptly and decisively.

To that end, I have created the office of Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. This man, who will be aided by a staff of scientists and a strong advisory group of outstanding experts reporting to him and to me, will have the active responsibility of helping me follow through on the program that I am partially outlining tonight and next week.

I am glad to be able to tell you that this position has been accepted by Dr. James R. Killian, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a man who enjoys my confidence, and the confidence of his colleagues in the scientific and engineering world, and in the Government.

Through him, I intend to be assured that the entire program is carried forward in closely integrated fashion, and that such things as alleged interservice competition or insufficient use of overtime shall not be allowed to create even the suspicion of harm to our scientific and development program. Moreover, Dr. Killian will see to it that those projects which experts judge have the highest potential shall advance with the utmost possible speed. He will make sure that our best talent and the full necessary resources are applied on certain high-priority top-secret items that, for security reasons, I know you will not expect me to enumerate.

In looking to Dr. Killian to discharge these responsibilities, I expect him to draw upon the full abilities of the scientists and engineers of our country.

Second. In the Defense Department is an official, directly responsible to the Secretary, in charge of missile development. I have directed that the Secretary make certain that the Guided Missile Director is clothed with all the authority that the Secretary himself possesses in this field, so that no administrative or interservice block can occur. Dr. Killian will, of course, work intimately with this official.

Third. The Secretary of Defense and I have agreed that any new missile or related program hereafter originated will, whenever practicable, be put under a single manager and administered without regard to the separate services.

Fourth. There will be laid before the Congress proposed legislation to remove legal barriers to the exchange of appropriate technological information with friendly countries.

Fifth. If the necessary authority is granted, I shall support, along the lines of the agreement reached with Prime Minister Macmillan, a scientific committee organized within NATO to carry on an enlarged Atlantic effort in research. Similar action in SEATO and comparable organizations will be studied. And, to help carry out these measures of mutual effort, the Secretary of State will appoint a science adviser to himself and science attachés in appropriate places abroad.

At any point in any of these actions where additional legal authority proves necessary, that authority will be asked of Congress at the outset of its next session. These matters will be discussed in my forthcoming bipartisan meeting with the leaders of Congress. They will be requested to consider every feasible step to hasten needed legislative action.

These, my friends, are the most immediate steps that are under way in scientific areas as they bear upon security.

Even in two talks I cannot, by any means, cover the entire subject of defense, but only selected questions of pressing and current importance. Accordingly, I am not at this time even alluding to a number of key items bearing strongly on defense, such as mutual aid and civil defense. Likewise I have not dwelt upon the urgent need for greater dispersal in the Strategic Air Command, or for providing all the means that will enable airplanes to take off in the shortest possible time after receipt of warning.

In this whole effort it is important to see that nothing is wasted on nonessentials. Defense today is expensive, and growing more so. We cannot afford waste.

It misses the whole point to say that we must now increase our expenditures of all kinds of military hardware and defense—as, for example, to heed demands recently made that we restore all personnel cuts made in the Armed Forces.

Certainly, we need to feel a high sense of urgency. But this does not mean that we should mount our charger and try to ride off in all directions at once.

We must clearly identify the exact and critical needs that have to be met. We must then apply our resources at that point as fully as the need demands. This means selectivity in national expenditures of all kinds. We cannot, on an unlimited scale, have both what we must have and what we would like to have.

We can have both a sound defense, and the sound economy on which it rests if we set our priorities and stick to them and if each of us is ready to carry his own share of the burden.

In conclusion, although for tonight's purposes I stress the influence of science on defense, I am not forgetting that there is much more to science than its function in strengthening our defense, and much more to our defense than the part played by science. The peaceful contributions of science—to healing, to enriching life, to freeing the spirit—these are the most important products of the conquest of nature's secrets. And the spiritual powers of a nation—its underlying religious faith, its self-reliance, its capacity for intelligent sacrifice—these are the most important stones in any defense structure.

Above all, let me say for all to hear that, so far as we are concerned, the amassing of military might never has been, and never will be, devoted to any other than defense and the preservation of a just peace.

What the world needs today even more than a giant leap into outer space, is a giant step toward peace. Time and again we have demonstrated our eagerness to take such a step. As a start in this direction, I urge the Soviets now to aline themselves with the practical and workable disarmament proposals, approved yesterday by a large majority in the United Nations.

Never shall we cease to hope and work for the coming of the day when enduring peace will take these military burdens from the back of mankind, and when the scientist can give his full attention, not to human destruction, but to human happiness and fulfillment.

---

## Meet the Press Program Participated in by Senator Knowland

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the transcript of the Meet the Press program on which I appeared on Sunday evening, January 5.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET THE PRESS, PRODUCED BY LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK, JANUARY 5, 1958

(Moderator, Ned Brooks. Guest, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican of California. Panel, Jack Bell, Associated Press; James Reston, New York Times; Robert Hartmann, Los Angeles Times; and Lawrence E. Spivak.)

ANNOUNCER. Our guest, ladies and gentlemen, is Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican leader in the Senate, and a member of two of the most powerful Senate committees. He will run for Governor of California this year.

In just a moment, Senator KNOWLAND will meet the press.

Now Meet the Press, the prize-winning program produced by Lawrence E. Spivak. Ready for this spontaneous unrehearsed conference are four of America's top reporters. Please remember, their questions do not necessarily reflect their point of view. It is their way of getting behind the headlines.

Here is the moderator of Meet the Press, Mr. Ned Brooks.

Mr. BROOKS. And welcome once again to Meet the Press.

The new session of Congress opens this week against a background of momentous problems at home and abroad. On Thursday, President Eisenhower will present the administration's legislative program.

Our guest on Meet the Press is Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California. As a Republican Senate leader, he will play an important part in shaping the legislative results of the new session. In prospect are some fiery debates on the military budget with its accent on missiles, on foreign policy, highlighted by the question of new peace negotiations with Russia.

Senator KNOWLAND is a member of three major committees, Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Atomic Energy.

This being election year, the new session will have sharp overtones of the battle for control of Congress. Senator KNOWLAND will be winding up his Senate career. He will be a candidate for governor of California. It is a campaign which may have important reactions on the presidential race of 1960.

And now seated around the press table ready to interview Senator KNOWLAND are Jack Bell, of the Associated Press; James Reston, of the New York Times; Robert Hartmann, of the Los Angeles Times; and Lawrence E. Spivak, our regular member of the Meet the Press panel.

Now, Senator KNOWLAND, if you are ready we will start the questions with Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator KNOWLAND, you published a Republican Achievement Report of the 84th Congress and in it you said this, and I quote: "Under Republican leadership there has been developed the largest and most powerful Armed Force this Nation has ever maintained in peacetime, and for the first time in our history, United States defense is geared for stability over a long period of time. It is ready for whatever might come."

Would you make that statement today?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes; I think we have the largest peacetime force in the Nation's history, but a military force is not something that can be put into an icebox, so to speak. You have to constantly keep up with new developments and I think that we need to accentuate further our missile program.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, do you think that today we are ready for whatever might come?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes; I do. I think the Strategic Air Command is ready for whatever may come. I think that the United States Navy is ready for whatever may come. I think our Army is ready for whatever may come. I think that we need to augment our forces in being with the latest type of weapons but I don't believe this is the time to sell America short.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, most of the experts who have testified recently before the Senate committees suggest very strongly that we are not ready, that in fact the United States has lost supremacy in the military field.

Am I to understand that you don't believe any of that testimony?

Senator KNOWLAND. No; I did not say that. I think certainly in the satellite orbiting the earth, the Soviet Union gained a supremacy over us. I think in the missile field, they may have a slight lead in the long-range missiles and if we permitted them to continue to have that lead for a period of years, I think we would place our country in jeopardy, but as of today, I think we have with our atomic weapons, with our Strategic Air Command, with our Navy and our military forces—after all, the American people have appropriated and have made available to the Defense Department of this country over $300 billion since the close of World War II and we have a considerable amount of hardware as a result of those funds.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, you say we are behind in the satellites, we are behind in long-range missiles, and we are evidently behind in short-range ballistic missiles. We seem to be behind, from the testimony, on long-range bombers. There has been evidence that we are behind on submarines. The

Soviet Union has a larger armed force than we have.

Just where are we either equal to or ahead?

Senator KNOWLAND. I think in the various types of atomic weapons among other things.

Mr. SPIVAK. Like what, Senator?

Senator KNOWLAND. Like all types of atomic weapons. I think we have in supply, in being, a larger supply of atomic weapons than the Soviet Union; I think we have the means of delivering them.

Mr. HARTMANN. Senator, after the Paris NATO Conference, the President promised our allies that he would ask Congress when it reconvened to amend the atomic energy law to permit sharing of certain nuclear weapons data with our NATO allies.

Will you vote to give this discretionary authority to the President or do you believe that Congress should still keep some check on this type of material?

Senator KNOWLAND. I think the Congress will want to know precisely what is proposed to be done, but I think there are fields in the atomic activities that we can share with our allies. After all, prior to World War II, during World War II, we worked very closely with Great Britain and with Canada in this field, I think to a mutually advantageous course of action.

Mr. HARTMANN. In connection with these atomic weapons and their wider use beyond the three powers that now possess them, in the past I believe you have insisted we should remain free to act without foreign vetoes over our ability to take decisions, even to the extent of going to war, that are in our national interests.

Now, how would you deal with this rising demand on the part of the British and other NATO allies for a say, or veto in fact, in any decision involving the use of nuclear weapons?

Senator KNOWLAND. I would very much oppose a veto by any other nation on our Strategic Air Command, for example. I think this would be detrimental to the security of this Nation and detrimental to a free world of free men.

It is entirely possible and it may be from their point of view and ours, too, logical that a particular nation will not want planes to take off from their bases without a mutual agreement, but I do suggest that there ought to be agreed understandings in advance because if the British Government has to call a cabinet meeting or a meeting of the British Parliament before they can give their approval, a good deal of Europe could be overrun.

Mr. HARTMANN. Do you think there is any practical military advantage in putting nuclear-missile bases, and so forth, in countries where they are not now located, if we are going to get the consent of that government before we can fire the missile?

Senator KNOWLAND. I think that is one thing that our Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Defense Department and the President of the United States will very carefully have to weigh. It is quite possible that most of those countries will be prepared in advance to undertake to give their approval under a certain given set of circumstances.

Now, one thing I think we all must keep in mind, despite Soviet propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding, this Nation is not going to commit an act of aggressive warfare. We will only act in the interests of preserving the freedom of the world and in protection against Soviet aggression. And certainly if an act of aggression takes place against Western Germany, against any of the nations in the NATO Alliance, it seems to me the other nations should face up realistically to it that we can't have a debating society to determine whether or not we will react to such an act of aggression. And I am not in favor of giving them a veto so that our Strategic Air Command would be immobilized while they were debating the issue in Parliament or in any of the parliaments.

Mr. RESTON. Senator KNOWLAND, do we not now have an agreement with the British whereby those Strategic Air Command planes cannot actually take off from their bases without the approval of the British Cabinet?

Senator KNOWLAND. I think that there is an understanding that apparently was mentioned by Mr. Macmillan, but that does not cover the entire Strategic Air Command. If it covers anything it only covers those that are based on the British Isles.

Mr. RESTON. You are not objecting to that?

Senator KNOWLAND. No; I think if that is one of the requisites, but I don't think we should put all our eggs in one basket under those circumstances and I don't want the British Government either, of today or the one that might succeed it, to be in a position to veto the taking off of Strategic Air Command bombers from other areas of Europe, or North Africa.

Mr. RESTON. Senator, let me ask you about reaction in the country so far as you have seen it after your long trip through California. What do you estimate the feeling of the people to be to the world developments of the past few months? Is it surprise or anger or disappointment, or what is it?

Senator KNOWLAND. I think that it is a combination of factors. I think there has certainly been great concern, I think there has been a feeling of what we might almost call hurt pride, that some nation might get ahead of this country in any field of development in the technological field.

I think there has been some anger, but I also think there has been a good deal of old-fashioned American determination to face up to the facts and to cure the facts and put ourselves in a first-rate position in all fields.

Mr. RESTON. What do you think the political implications are of that feeling in the country so far as your party is concerned?

Senator KNOWLAND. I think as of the immediate time the party has been hurt somewhat on the facts that the public now knows, but I think when all the facts are developed and I think when the administration and the Government moves ahead and we no longer are in a position where they have an earth satellite orbiting and we do not, and when our missile program moves ahead, I think the country will react depending on the facts that exist in November 1958 rather than as they existed in December of 1957.

Mr. BELL. Senator, as of now you are taking on two man-sized jobs. One of them is running for Governor of California and the other one is——

Senator KNOWLAND. That is quite a job, I might say, too, Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. I can characterize it as a man-sized job. I think it is. And your other job is managing the President's legislative program in the Senate as the majority leader.

Which one of those jobs has priority?

Senator KNOWLAND. The job as majority leader of the Senate has priority. As a matter of fact, I do not expect to get out to California except for a very brief period of time, perhaps during the Easter recess, or perhaps over some week-end periods, until Congress adjourns, which I believe will be about the 30th of July, which actually will be after the California primary which comes on the third of June.

But I anticipate being there all of August, all of September, and all of October, up to the November election.

Mr. BELL. With these two jobs on your hands, Senator, when you get up to make a speech in the Senate, which particular job will you be representing there? Will it possibly be a combination of both? Will you be talking to the people of California as well as to the people in the Senate?

Senator KNOWLAND. No; I will be talking as a Senator of the United States with an interest not only in California but an interest in the entire Nation.

Mr. BELL. Well, now, do you think in that connection the fact that you have announced that you will not seek reelection will weaken any influence you may have with Republican Members of the Senate? Won't they be inclined to say, "Well, BILL KNOWLAND is on his way out, why should I take his advice?"

Senator KNOWLAND. No; I think not. They are always free to take the advice of anyone they want to, or to leave it, and that goes for anyone, but I shall continue to the best of my ability to give the best advice I can, based on 13 years of service here in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BELL. Did you ever find one of them who would take your advice?

Senator KNOWLAND. I think a few of them have at times.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, to continue along the lines of Mr. Bell's question, just why do you want to continue as leader in view of the fact that you are voluntarily leaving the Senate?

Senator KNOWLAND. Because I have attempted to fulfill the contracts I have entered into in the past. I was elected by my Republican colleagues to succeed the late Senator Taft in the job of party leader, and I feel that I have a responsibility to carry out that job until my term has expired.

Mr. SPIVAK. Don't you think it might be better for the party if a new leader took over while you were still there and you could guide him?

Senator KNOWLAND. I rather doubt that, to throw the party into a situation of selecting a new floor leader, a new minority leader at this time in the middle of the session, would be in the best interests of the party.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator Taft chose you as the leader—at least he designated you, designated the fact that he wanted you.

Do you have the job of choosing a leader when you leave?

Senator KNOWLAND. That decision will be made by the Congress elected in November 1958, and I feel the Republicans now in the Senate and those who will be in the Senate when the new Congress reconvenes are qualified to make that selection.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, in the last Congress you fought pretty strongly for a budget cut, isn't that right?

Senator KNOWLAND. I believe there was a necessity to have some budget reductions.

Mr. SPIVAK. Now this year the budget is certain to be a great deal higher. Will you again fight to cut it?

Senator KNOWLAND. I will in any place where I feel the budget can be properly cut, yes.

Mr. SPIVAK. I am talking about an overall picture. I believe last time you fought for a cut of about $3 billion or $5 billion.

Senator KNOWLAND. $3 billion.

Mr. SPIVAK. Now this year it is going to be a great deal higher. Are you still going to fight for an overall cut?

Senator KNOWLAND. I am going to support any reductions that I think can be made without detriment to the defense of the country and detriment to our activities which we continue to have to carry out.

I don't believe that the need for additional defense should be a wide-open avenue for everybody to come in under the tent of getting additional appropriations.

I think it is important that we maintain a solvent Federal Government. I think it is no less important now than it has been heretofore that we maintain a solvent Government.

Mr. SPIVAK. Last year, though, you were concerned with the size of the overall budget before you got into details. This year the budget is going to be considerably higher. Are you again concerned with the size?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes, I am concerned with the size because I think it would be

a great mistake for our country to get into another period of 20 years of deficit financing, and running up the national debt maybe another $100 billion, with deficit financing.

I think the overall size of the budget is of importance, to be sure that we can keep it balanced.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do you disagree, then, with President Eisenhower's most recent statement in which he said "Our people will not sacrifice security to worship a balanced budget"?

Senator KNOWLAND. No; I don't think we have to sacrifice the security of this country to have a balanced budget. We are going to have a budget presumably in the neighborhood of from $73 billion to $74 billion, something in that general area.

Of that amount, approximately $39½ or $40 billion may represent the defense part of it. I think that is a very substantial sum of money in both categories.

Mr. HARTMANN. Senator, during the time you have represented California in the Senate, which is more than 12 years, you have been a consistent supporter of projects of flood control, reclamation, irrigation, river and harbor projects that would benefit your State.

Senator KNOWLAND. I have been interested in them that would benefit the country. I have not only been interested in them in relation to California.

Mr. HARTMANN. Now we hear that the Bureau of the Budget has sharply cut back those programs in order to make more room for defense spending without unbalancing the budget.

Do you think this is a proper alternative?

Senator KNOWLAND. I don't agree that is what the facts are. According to some of the newspaper reports, they are going to take a second look at so-called new starts. This doesn't mean that they will not go ahead and maybe at a faster rate and actually a more economic rate, of the projects which are now under construction.

Mr. RESTON. Senator, what is your position about the foreign aid request of the administration this time? Will you want to cut it again, as you did last year?

Senator KNOWLAND. I think it will depend on what the details of the foreign-aid program are. I have supported the foreign-aid program in the past. I believe in the military phases of it and I believe that there is justification for some economic aid.

I have opposed under the Truman administration, and I oppose under this administration, sending hundreds of millions and in fact over a total of a billion and a half to Marshal Tito. I think if we had spent that money on missiles both under the Truman administration and under the Eisenhower administration, our country's defenses would be better off today than they may be.

Mr. RESTON. Is your position in this next session likely to be the same as in the last, in opposition to aid to Tito and aid to Poland as well?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes; I have not changed my views. I don't believe that the money of the American people should be taken to finance Communist regimes abroad. Either economically or militarily.

Mr. RESTON. And you have drawn no distinction between Poland and Yugoslavia in this matter?

Senator KNOWLAND. No; I do not draw any distinction. As a matter of fact, Mr. Tito's government has given aid and support to practically every foreign policy of the Soviet Union and they have just repeated it recently.

Mr. RESTON. What is your philosophy then, Senator, when you are in a position as the spokesman for the administration and the administration favors such programs? When you opposed them in the Senate?

Senator KNOWLAND. I did not surrender my conscience when I became the Republican leader of the Senate any more than Senator Taft did, or Senator Barkley did when he resigned at one time and was reelected by the Democrats in the Senate, because he also had a responsibility to represent the Senators who elected him.

I happen to believe that we have three great coordinate and coequal branches of the Government of the United States. I do not believe the Congress is subordinate to the Executive, be he a Democrat or a Republican, and I do not intend as far as I can have anything to say about it, to make the Congress of the United States subordinant to any Executive, Republican or Democrat. I think that a leader has to have a good batting average and I think while I have been the leader in the Senate I have had one. In the last session my percentage of support was 93 percent. There was no Senator with a higher percentage of support of the administration and only one who equaled it.

That was Senator DIRKSEN.

Mr. RESTON. What do you do about the practical problem, though, when a bill of that kind comes up, do you turn that over to someone else to argue the administration's case, or how do you deal with it?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes; that would be done.

In the first place I have never misrepresented the views of the administration at our Republican conferences or our Republican Policy Committee. I give them as close and as factual a report as is possible, what the President's views are, what his interests are and the fact that he has a deep interest in that particular bill.

On most of them I am in a position to go along. In the few I have not been able to I tell them that for certain reasons which at least appeal to me and my conscientious convictions, I am not able to go along with it. In that case I would ask either our ranking member of the committee to take it on, or someone else in the leadership hierarchy to take it on and I see nothing inconsistent with that position because as I say I have a responsibility to my colleagues in the Senate as well as the administration.

Mr. BELL. Senator, last August when you reported on the record of Congress, you said "As Republicans, we are proud of the continuing prosperity of the country."

That was in August. In January, as a Republican, are you as proud of the continuing prosperity, or is it continuing?

Senator KNOWLAND. We have had some economic dislocations. There is no question about that. But I don't believe, again, that the American people should sell our country short.

I think that 1958 will turn out to be as good and perhaps a better year than 1957. I don't happen to subscribe to those who for political or for other purposes are preaching the doctrine of gloom and doom.

This country when we were much weaker than we are today, stood up against the mightiest empire of its time and I don't think this is any time to sell America short.

Mr. BELL. Well, Senator, you don't have to be a doomer or a gloomer to know that freightcar loadings are off, steel production is off, unemployment is increasing. A number of these very vital factors show that the economy is in a down dip.

Now is Congress going to do anything about this? Is the administration going to do anything about it, or is it just going to be let slide?

Senator KNOWLAND. No, I think the administration will do something about it. I think the fact that our defense spending may step up in and of itself will give a considerable stimulus to business activity.

Mr. BELL. Well, is this a new Republican method of pump-priming then to spend it on defense?

Senator KNOWLAND. No, I would not say that because we certainly are not going to let the other resources of the country go by default. We are still going to carry on flood control and reclamation and harbor development work in the country. We still have our highway program.

Mr. BELL. It is the same kind of pump-priming, though, that you condemned.

Senator KNOWLAND. I don't quite agree.

Mr. BROOKS. I am sorry, I am going to have to interrupt. I see that our time is up.

Thank you very much, Senator KNOWLAND, for being with us.

And now here is our announcer.

ANNOUNCER. Goodby Senator KNOWLAND and Meet the Press.

---

## Effects of Alcoholism on Family Relationships and Stability

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by him and an editorial from the Catholic Sentinel, of Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER ON EFFECTS OF ALCOHOLISM ON FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND STABILITY

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thoughtful and effective editorial from the Catholic Sentinel, of Portland, Oreg., entitled "Families Wrecked by Alcoholism."

This editorial cogently and movingly emphasizes how acute alcoholism can wreck and permanently impair sound and healthful family relationships. I approve of the editorial, because it stresses a theme of hope when it points out that "no one is willing to write off the frightfully large number of alcoholics in the United States as a dead loss."

All of us must work for the reformation and rehabilitation of these unfortunate people, as the editorial from the Sentinel rightfully declares. The Catholic Sentinel is published by the archdiocese of Portland in Oregon, of which the Most Reverend Edward D. Howard is the archbishop.

---

[From the Catholic Sentinel of Portland, Oreg.]

FAMILIES WRECKED BY ALCOHOLISM

In New York City, the most acute social problem is that of the city's 123,000 dependent children which, it is maintained, is very largely due to alcoholism. Statistics prove that one of every four families appealing to the city for assistance do so because the father is an alcoholic.

That 50 million persons in the United States use alcoholic beverages, that of these 3 million drink to excess and 750,000 are chronic alcoholics, who have the gravest need for assistance, was contained in a statement publicized in an eastern city nearly a decade ago.

Penologists, judges, clergymen, psychiatrists, editors and others were members of a committee which recommended State institutional care for chronic alcoholics, in an effort to treat and rehabilitate them.

TREATED LIKE CRIMINALS

Although varied and spasmodic efforts have been made during the past century, these have all failed to accomplish their purpose; one reason given for this failure was that the patients were treated more like criminals than like sick persons, in need of intelligent and sympathetic assistance.

The alcoholics problem has always been a baffling one. The organization known as Alcoholics Anonymous can point to some really worth while if not extraordinary results of their treatment of the problem.

TEMPERANCE EFFORTS FADED

However, one thing obviously evident is that while it may indeed be extremely difficult to effect a cure for those who have already gone the whole way, potential alcoholic wrecks can be saved if practical and timely precautions are taken. Prior to the unhappy passage of the 18th amendment, there were temperance societies in nearly every Catholic parish; in the large cities these commanded much attention and cooperation. Children were taught the evils of liquor and were influenced to take the pledge until they became 21. Imagine the beneficial effects which would now follow, did our teenagers of the present time have such a pledge and, for the greater part at least, fulfill it. What a vast amount of excessive drinking, crime, immorality would then be avoided. As far as Catholics are concerned, the influence of the home, of parish societies, the church, all these cooperate in bringing about the desirable result; that is, training youths in habits of temperance.

TOTAL ABSTINENCE

Consequently while no one is willing to write off the frightfully large number of alcoholics in the United States as a dead loss, while we all hopefully and prayerfully look forward to some solution of a problem of such great magnitude—this is no reasonable excuse for failing to endeavor to educate our youth; this does not mean to be moderate drinkers, which often is heresy of a pronounced type, but to adopt total abstinence as their standard. Mortification, self-denial, is one of the fundamental teachings of Christianity; the Divine Founder Himself warned His followers, "unless you do penance you will all likewise perish." This, together with the picture of broken homes, wrecked futures, ruined bodies and lost souls should be sufficiently striking and graphic to influence even the youth of today. Instead of being abashed and fearing to admit that they are total abstainers, our youth should take a justifiable pride in raising their heads and proudly saying: "No, thanks; I do not care for the poison."

## The President's Message—A Call to Sacrifice and Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the history of this great country of ours gives recurrent proof that whenever there is need her people rise to heights of sacrifice and action. The President's speech today calls upon us all to submerge ourselves once again in the country's need. I am sure those listening over the air waves rejoiced to hear him say:

I am not here to justify the past, gloss over the problems of the present, or propose easy solutions for the future.

I am here to state what I believe to be right and what I believe to be wrong; and to propose action for correcting what I think wrong.

It was good to hear him say:

My profoundest conviction is that the American people will say, as one man: No matter what the exertions or sacrifices, we shall maintain that necessary strength.

His brief picture of our military strength was gratifying, particularly because he made no secret of the fact that we must exert ourselves in all directions. It is the vital necessity of action today to insure our strength of tomorrow.

His emphasis upon the economic offensive launched by the Soviet Union is more than timely. Many of us have seen in our travels the encroachments made by this offensive against free nations. Once it is in the open here and we are all challenged as we were this morning, we can move into this area with courage and intelligent determination.

Again, as we sat in the House Chamber and listened, we found a very real relief in the strong emphasis he put upon the defense reorganization and accelerated defense effort.

At every point it was clear that the President trusts the people of this country, and expects an intelligent reaction to the program he submitted in eight categories, the details of which will come to us in other messages.

Particularly was I struck by the sentence, "Most people now realize that our programs of military aid and defense support are an integral part of our own defense effort."

To us in Ohio, it was particularly good to hear him quote President McKinley in the words he spoke in 1901, "Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. The period of exclusiveness is past," and from there he spoke with deep understanding and feeling of the need of scientific cooperation with our allies.

I was particularly struck that in the category of education and research he emphasized the need of a balanced program. Particularly heartening were his words:

Scrupulous attention has been paid to maintaining local control of educational policy, spurring the maximum amount of local effort, and to avoiding undue stress on the physical sciences at the expense of other branches of learning.

He made no secret of the increases necessary, though he noted his hope that even with these our budget might be balanced.

True to himself and to his firm conviction that the United States must hold high the torch of peace, the eighth category was devoted to this subject:

Our greatest hope for success lies in a universal fact: the people of the world, as people, have always wanted peace and want peace now.

The problem, then, is to find a way of translating this universal desire into action.

This will require more than words of peace. It requires works of peace.

Some of his concluding words bear repeating:

These actions demand and expect two things of the American people: sacrifice, and a high degree of understanding. For sacrifice to be effective it must be intelligent. Sacrifice must be made for the right purpose and in the right place—even if that place happens to come close to home.

My friends of the Congress: the world is waiting to see how wisely and decisively a free representative government will now act.

I believe that this Congress possesses and will display the wisdom promptly to do its part in translating into law the actions demanded by our Nation's interests. But, to make law effective, our kind of government needs the full voluntary support of millions of Americans for these actions.

I am fully confident that the response of the Congress and of the American people will make this time of test a time of honor. Mankind then will see more clearly than ever that the future belongs, not to the concept of the regimented atheistic state, but to the people—the God-fearing, peace-loving people of all the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is with humility and humbleness of heart that I say very simply, we are fortunate that in these days a leader has been raised up, and I pray with you that he may be given wisdom, increasing understanding, unfaltering courage, and that we, the people of the United States, may follow joyously behind him.

## World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, it was my privilege to address the Western Grain & Feed Association in Des Moines, Iowa, on November 25, 1957. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD AFFAIRS

(Address by Senator THOS. E. MARTIN, Western Grain & Feed Association, Des Moines, Iowa, November 25, 1957)

It is with a feeling of great responsibility that I appear on your program today to discuss world affairs at this critical period. Your invitation to participate in this meeting was accepted last August.

There have been many challenging developments in our international relations since the Congress adjourned. I shall enumerate a few of the more significant ones. Soviet Russia fostered an artificial crisis involving Turkey and Syria as the General Assembly of the United Nations convened in New York. They launched two satellites into outer space, the sputnik and the muttnik. Within the Kremlin the game of Russian roulette continues with the demotion of Marshal Zhukov.

My service in Washington began in 1939, the year the Germans invaded Poland. World Affairs have dictated Congressional attitudes on domestic matters ever since. They determine the level of our Federal budget, the tax burdens of our people, and our freedom to operate our own economy.

Accordingly, I welcome this opportunity to review some of these more recent developments in a broader perspective and to suggest the course of action we should follow.

The conduct of foreign policy by any government requires an assessment of the aims and objectives of all other nations. Such an assessment must necessarily include an appraisal of each nation's capabilities in terms of available military and economic power to achieve its goals. Some countries are allied with us, and their probable position on any issue can be predicted with reasonable certainty. Other governments consistently pursue objectives which we regard with disfavor. There is a third group consisting of the many new nations in Asia and Africa who gained their independence since the end of World War II. They are generally intensely nationalistic. Economically underdeveloped, and uncommitted to either side in the cold war. They survey the positions taken by the two major power groupings, the nations of the free world alliance and the countries behind the Iron Curtain. They seek answers to the question uppermost in their minds, "where can we find future security and assistance for our economic development?"

The foreign office of every nation, including our own State Department, are now reassessing the world scene. Russia's development of an earth satellite may have no immediate military significance but we must not discount its tremendous propaganda value in winning the loyalties of the uncommitted nations.

In my opinion, Soviet scientific progress is our great challenge. I am confident that we can show the world that a free people can produce military strength as well as the economic goods desired by its citizens, without infringing on individual liberties and freedoms.

Regardless of public statements to the contrary, Kremlin policymakers know that no United States administration could ever take us into an offensive war. Our people want peace and have no interest in foreign conquests. We are willing to make any necessary sacrifices to maintain our security and the freedom of others who are willing to join us in assuming the burdens of defending our way of life.

Many years before I came to Congress I taught military science and tactics at the University of Iowa. Throughout World War II, I served on the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives. During this period I closely followed the military achievements of Marshal Zhukov. With the assistance of Marshal Sokolovsky, his chief of staff, he administered the first major defeat to the Nazis on the eastern front. He saved Moscow and later Stalingrad. It was Zhukov who led the Russian forces into Berlin. The present NATO commander of all ground forces between Switzerland and the Baltics is a West German, Lieutenant General Speidel. He was once chief of staff to General Rommel and fought the allied forces on both the east and west fronts during World War II. He has publicly stated that he considers Zhukov one of the three most brilliant leaders he opposed in that conflict. The others are Generals Bradley and Patton.

The demotion of Marshal Zhukov is a cause for considerable concern. He was a military hero and the idol of many Russians. Earlier this year the Russian propaganda magazine, U. S. S. R., printed in English for distribution in the United States, eulogized him. Incidentally, this magazine is distributed here in accordance with an agreement permitting us to distribute a magazine printed in Russian within the Soviet Union depicting life in the United States on a reciprocal basis. I believe our actions present a more consistent story to the Russians than they have given to us.

Marshal Zhukov, as a soldier, knows the capabilities of our military forces. President Eisenhower and Marshal Zhukov had a feeling of mutual respect for each other's abilities. Zhukov is just as tough as any other Russian, and he ruthlessly crushed the Hungarian freedom fighters a year ago, but he appreciated the dangers to human survival on this planet of a nuclear war. I know that as long as he was in command of the Russian military establishment, it would have been quite difficult to secure his consent for a military adventure which might start world war III. He exerted his influence within the Communist presidium to convince the party leadership that nuclear weapons were so dangerous that no nation could survive a general conflict.

The displacement of Zhukov also supplanted Marshal Sokolovsky. The appointment of the new Defense Minister, Marshal Malinovsky, who is assisted by Marshal Konev, elevates a pair who hate everything we stand for. Konev has been in charge of the Warsaw pact forces, Russia's anti-NATO group. Malinovsky was chief of all Soviet forces in the Far East, and played a leading part in Soviet machinations supporting the North Koreans throughout the unhappy period of the Korean war.

Zhukov's removal concentrates power in the hands of one man, Nikita Khrushchev. He, too, may desire peace and hopes to avoid war. Yet, it is far more difficult to predict the actions of a government dominated by one man than to forecast the actions of the millions of peaceloving people in our country who ultimately determine this Nations' policies.

The instability of the present Russian Government is only too apparent as we look back and account for those in positions of authority who have left the scene since the death of Stalin. His successors used Zhukov to curb Beria's secret police, and then executed Beria. After this, Malenkov, the Premier, was demoted. Next, Molotov, Kaganovich, and Shepilov, last year's Foreign Minister and former editor of Pravda, disappeared. Now we witness the demotion of Zhukov. We cannot help but wonder who will be next.

The policies of such a government are completely unpredictable. When its leaders have vast economic resources and able scientists at their disposal, they may easily develop delusions of grandeur. The history books are filled with tragic tales of human suffering caused by such men as Genghis Khan, Napoleon—and in our own generation: The Kaiser, Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, and Stalin. The New York Times expert on Russia, Harrison E. Salisbury, expressed my sentiments in the editorial page of his paper on November 10. This is how he views the present Russian scene:

"But the earth satellites are not the source of the gravest concern. The true threat really springs from the fatal flaw in the Soviet system itself—its almost unbelievable political primitivism, once again revealed in the crisis over the dismissal of Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov as Defense Minister.

"When the stone-age Soviet political structure is harnessed to 21st century technology a combination is created that is calculated to frighten even the most sanguine.

"It is a little like seeing a 300-horsepower automobile speed down a crowded highway while 3 men in the front seat fight for the wheel and 2 in the rear seat poise ready to plunge a dagger into the back of the man who wins the front-seat struggle.

"The problem that confronts the world is not simply that of producing a faster automobile, a rocket that will fly farther, or a missile that will blow a bigger hunk off the earth's surface than any the Russians create.

"The problem is much more difficult. It is to try to prevent a Soviet internal political crisis from burning into a world disaster."

During the Truman administration our policy toward Russia was based on a theory of containment, developed by Ambassador Kennan. It was supposed to keep Russia from expanding by building up internal pressures and thus further a change in Soviet policy. Mr. Salisbury shows that this was an illusion. In the same editorial from which I just quoted, he said:

"Nor will 'roll-back' or 'liberation' fill today's needs. A creative new policy will have to be evolved, taking into account not alone the newly exposed strength of the Soviet Union but also its chronic and dangerous internal weaknesses.

"These weaknesses are largely political. They stem from two sources—Russian history and tradition and Communist Party theory and practice.

"In combination they add up to one thing. The Soviet Union has no viable structure of government. It is ruled today essentially as it was in the time of Ivan the Great. Today's Soviet state is not quite so advanced a governmental structure as was that of France under Louis XIV or England in the time of Charles I.

"There exists in the Soviet Union today no constitutional means for the transfer of power from one man to another, no method whereby the authority of one man may be legally constituted, no mechanism that enables one leader to supplant another peacefully.

"The law of the jungle is the only law that prevails within the Kremlin. Intrigue, plots, counter-plots, the eternal struggle of ambitious men for power—this was the Russian tradition long before Lenin and his Communists seized power in 1917. Forty years of Communist rule have done nothing to supplant the old Russian tradition of tyranny.

"Indeed, the conspiratorial quasi-military form of the Communist Party acts almost as a guaranty that a permanent struggle for power will rage at the heart of the Soviet state.

"It means that at the core of Soviet power there exists a flaw that at any time might have lethal consequences. There is the possibility that any moment an ambitious Soviet politician, locked in a fight for personal supremacy, may provoke a foreign crisis to serve his own political ends.

"Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that precisely this tactic lay behind the Syrian crisis and that the whole recent Middle East flareup had its origin somewhere in the political maneuvering of Nikita S. Khrushchev and Marshal Zhukov."

All our citizens must be aware of the potential hazards implicit in the downgrading of Zhukov. The acceptance of his demotion by the Russian people shows that they are still at the mercy of propaganda supplied by the ruling clique, whoever they may be.

Marshal Zhukov was charged with an attempt to rewrite the history of World War II and to take credit for the achievements of others in the liberation of Russia. I am sure that Russian history books now will be appropriately rewritten so as to minimize Marshal Zhukov's military accomplishments. Stalin started the process of rewriting history, and these revisions have continued ever since. I sometimes wonder how Russian children learn their history. The past changes with the present and the future.

We have been educated in a country where freedom of speech and of the press is the inherent constitutional right of every individual. Therefore, most of us find it difficult to understand how the Russian people can accept the myth of Stalin as the savior of mankind one day and shortly after his death learn that he was a tyrant

without losing faith in their self-appointed leaders.

A year ago the United Nations General Assembly concentrated its attention on the difficulties in the Middle East which originated with Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal. It condemned Soviet brutality in Hungary. Again, 82 nations are now meeting in New York for the 12th session of the General Assembly. The Suez Canal is reopened, but the issue of its nationalization has not been resolved. Oil from the Middle East is once more flowing to Western Europe. An uneasy peace has been maintained in the Middle East. Hungary is still under the Communist yoke. Hungary's tragic suffering, however, has disillusioned many potential Communist adherents. The U. N. General Assembly has once again condemned Russian interference in Hungary.

Last spring the Congress supported President Eisenhower's promise that we would provide military assistance for any nation in the Middle East threatened with invasion or the loss of its freedom by attack from any country under the control of international communism. Congress also authorized the use of additional funds for economic assistance to countries in the Middle East. Our efforts have contributed to an uneasy peace.

For the moment the tensions between Syria and Turkey have been eased. This is a danger spot of tremendous importance to all of us as Turkey has a common border with Russia, and is a member of the NATO alliance. If Russia should attack Turkey to support Syria, it would be extremely serious. President Eisenhower made our position very clear. His leadership was largely responsible for Syria's withdrawing the Turkish-Syrian dispute from the General Assembly's agenda. Recent statements by Khrushchev clearly show that the Russians continue to fish in troubled waters. I hope that the Syrian crisis is now permanently behind us, but we may expect other synthetic crises in the future.

Next month President Eisenhower will go to Paris to strengthen the NATO alliance. He is in a unique position to contribute to this effort because of his long service as commander of the NATO forces before he returned to the United States to assume the duties we have thrust upon him.

Our principal allies, Britain and France, have not yet recovered from the effects of last year's Suez crisis. France experienced a series of Cabinet crises and its military and economic strength have been sapped by its inability to bring peace in Algeria. The British economy, too, has been sorely strained. Prime Minister Macmillan is making every effort to support the forces of freedom without destroying Britain's economic structure.

President Eisenhower's participation in this NATO Conference will provide leadership for the free world at this historic meeting. It may make it possible for free nations to combine their efforts better. This could be accomplished by integrating the military programs of NATO, SEATO, and the signers of the Baghdad Pact. President Eisenhower also is seeking to develop a cooperative effort so that the free world may better pool its scientific resources.

In response to the announcement of President Eisenhower's decision to go to Paris, Russia demanded a new summit conference. At a special session of the supreme Soviet to honor the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, Nikita Khrushchev again called for a high-level meeting of representatives of capitalist and Socialist countries so as to reach an agreement on excluding war as a means of solving political questions. In appraising this request, we naturally look back at the developments since President Eisenhower went to Geneva in the summer of 1955. The Russian representation at that conference included Molotov and Zhukov. They are no longer in power and have been repudiated, not by the Russian people, but by those now in control of the Communist Party. With whom can we meet? What assurance do we have that they will be in a position to carry out any commitments they may make?

The heads of state at the summit conference in 1955 agreed on the need for the reunification of Germany with free elections. A meeting of foreign ministers followed the summit conference. Secretary Dulles and other western diplomats met with Mr. Molotov, and we all know what happened. Exactly nothing.

I would certainly look askance at another summit conference until I know that the Russians are truly interested in working for peace. They must first achieve sufficient internal harmony within their own regime so that our leaders know that commitments made will be implemented in the future.

The world's most urgent need is an agreement to adopt practical and workable disarmament proposals. For many months we participated in the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in an effort to reach an acceptable plan which would provide security to both the Russians and the western allies. This fall the Russians withdrew from these discussions. The United Nations General Assembly, now meeting in New York, by an overwhelming majority adopted a resolution calling for the resumption of negotiations by the five-nation disarmament subcommittee. In my judgment the resumption of these negotiations, rather than a new dramatic summit conference will do much to assure the peace of the world.

President Eisenhower, in his address to the Nation on November 7, expressed my views when he said:

"What the world needs today even more than a giant leap into outer space is a giant step toward peace. Time and again we have demonstrated our eagerness to take such a step. As a start in this direction, I urge the Soviets now to aline themselves with the practical and workable disarmament proposals, approved yesterday by a large majority in the United Nations."

Russia's sudden decision to boycott future sessions of the disarmament conferences leads me to the conclusion that they are on the verge of additional important scientific developments. She believes these will give her greater leverage at subsequent disarmament meetings.

Admiral Strauss, the Chairman of our Atomic Energy Commission, recently discussed Russia's rejection of the United States proposal advanced by Baruch to ban the use of atomic weapons in the United Nations Security Council in the late 1940's. He believed this decision was based on the fact that, at that time, they had already made considerable progress in the development of the atomic bomb. Admiral Strauss, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission under President Truman, was responsible for developing the monitoring system which enabled us to detect the first atomic explosion within Soviet Russia.

What is the real significance to America of sputnik and "muttnik." It lies in the fact that although we have contributed great scientific and engineering advances to mankind, we have foolishly underestimated Russian scientific capabilities. We assumed that their developments were the result of exploiting captured German scientists. Nothing could be further from the truth, although the Russians benefitted from their contributions.

The first scientific attempt to understand the elements and to indicate their atom structure was made by a Russian scientist, Mendeleef, in 1869. He gave the world the periodic table, the tool to begin our study of the atom. In aeronautics we are indebted to Igor Sikorsky (who fled to this country after the Bolshevik revolution) for his contributions in the development of the helicopter. They are proof of Russia's scientific brilliance.

We must remember also the policy of Russia as set out in the last will of Peter the Great, written in 1725, as follows:

"Endeavor, by every possible means, to bring in, from the neighboring civilized countries of Europe, officers in times of war, and learned men in times of peace, thus giving the Russian people the advantages enjoyed by other countries, without allowing them to lose any of their own self-respect."

The taking into Russia of the German scientists, following World War II, and making use of their skills no doubt helped Russia expedite her program for advancement in the sciences and in the development of her satellite and defense programs.

Again let me quote from Mr. Salisbury, who for many years has closely observed the Russian scene for the New York Times:

"The present technology is founded on Russian tradition. Russia's scientific history is as brilliant as any in Europe. Czarist Russia heavily subsidized pure science, research, and technology. Communist Russia inherited this tradition and superimposed one of its own.

"From the start, science, education, and technical advancement was the heart of the Communist program. So it was laid down by Lenin and so it was carried on by Stalin. Stalin broadened the scientific-technical program started by Lenin.

"Like his predecessors Ivan and Peter, Stalin was perfectly willing to pay any price in human sacrifice for industrial and technical achievement. The cost was enormous. But he got results.

"In large measure today's earth satellites are a monument to Stalin and his single-minded determination."

Any dictatorship can concentrate its available resources on a few limited products and achieve startling results. Our approach to the satellite program has been to cooperate in the advancement of science through participation in the International Geophysical Year, a scientific program sponsored by a meeting of the International Council of Scientific Unions held in Rome in October 1954. As President Eisenhower stated:

"Our satellite program has never been conducted as a race with other nations. Rather, it has been carefully scheduled as part of the scientific work of the International Geophysical Year.

"The United States satellite program has been designed from its inception for maximum results in scientific research. The scheduling of this program has been described to, and closely coordinated with, the International Geophysical Year scientists of all countries. As a result of passing full information on our project to the scientists of the world, immediate tracking of the United States satellite will be possible, and the world's scientists will know at once its orbit and the appropriate times for observation."

In spite of the fact that we have disclosed our progress to all other countries and have furnished them with complete information, the Russians did not give us the code to the signals transmitted by sputnik.

I never subscribed to a once popular theory that the Russians were incapable of making great scientific contributions, nor do I now join those who deprecate our own scientific achievements. When did Russia achieve its apparent lead over the United States in the field of rocketry? Dr. Werner von Braun, a German, who developed the V-2 rocket, and who is now a United States citizen and Director of the Development Operations Division of the Army's Redstone Arsenal, should know. In reply to the question, "How do you account for the U. S. S. R.'s apparent ability

to outstrip the United States in reaching into space?" he said:

"The main reason is that the United States had no ballistic-missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. * * * Thus, our present dilemma is not due to the fact that we are not working hard enough now, but that we did not work hard enough during the first 6 to 10 years after the war."

When the Congress reconvenes in January, many Members will propose vast new spending programs. It is my conviction that this is not the answer to our problem, and I am happy that I am supported in this view by Dr. von Braun. He was asked specifically whether money was a factor in the development of missiles and satellites at this time and whether more money was needed. He believes that we could, of course, use more money for fundamental research, but we do not have to adopt a great new spending program. We need knowledge, which cannot be bought in a hurry. Dr. von Braun said:

"I believe that, by and large, our five key ballistic-missile programs could not be speeded up appreciably by increases in funds. All these programs were subjected to some cutbacks a few months ago; but if the original budget figures are reinstated, it is my belief that much more money could not be intelligently spent on their development.

"In many fields we are virtually scraping the bottom of the reservoir of knowledge, and the efforts to refill that reservoir with adequate research funds have been limited.

"We don't need excessive amounts of extra money—we certainly don't have to double our present missile budget. But some additional funds for basic and applied research and developments for future growth potential would help tremendously in the long run."

The last Congress, which was under the control of the Democrat Party, refused to appropriate all the funds President Eisenhower requested for the Defense Department. I hope they will now give the President what he needs, but that they will not force unnecessary and unwanted billions of new appropriations upon him.

The great challenge from Russia's scientific advances is in the field of education. We have thousands of talented boys and girls in our country who could make great contributions as engineers and scientists. They are unable to follow scientific careers because they are inadequately prepared in mathematics and science in many of our high schools. To maintain our supremacy in the intellectual contest with the Russians requires a reexamination of the curriculum in all of our secondary schools. An engineering education cannot be secured from one of our great institutes of technology unless a mastery of mathematics, physics, and chemistry has first been achieved in high school.

The President, the Congress, and those charged with education at every level of government must meet Russia's bid for supremacy in technology. It represents, in my judgment, the real significance of sputnik and muttnik.

We should not be surprised at Russia's scientific achievements. A study published by the National Science Foundation in 1955, entitled, "Soviet Professional Manpower," was a warning to our educators. It showed that in recent years we were graduating approximately 24,000 engineers with bachelor's degrees, while Russia was graduating more than 50,000.

While our educators were concerned with progressive education and the deemphasis of grades for scholastic achievement, the Russians focused their attention on the improvement of educational standards.

The National Science Foundation's study included this significant statement on Russian secondary education:

"From 1931 to 1934 various decrees were issued which embodied this educational policy in specific terms, such, for example, as the establishment of regular class instruction, home assignments, required attendance, regular composition of class contingents, individual grading, restored authority of the teacher, etc. These measures were all aimed at raising the standards of learning and tightening discipline."

The curriculum in Russia's secondary schools provides a foundation for advanced scientific education in colleges and technical schools. The study of the National Science Foundation also said:

"It is important to stress that on several counts the Soviet curriculum is substantially different from that in American schools. Among the general education subjects, foreign language and geography are emphasized to a much greater extent than in this country. Mathematics and science courses are stressed extensively, especially in the upper grades, where almost 41 percent of all instruction time is devoted to these subjects. It is difficult to make a meaningful comparison of the time devoted to science and mathematics courses in the Soviet Union with the American curriculum because of the wide variation in the amount of time devoted to science and mathematics courses by American high schools. This becomes even more significant when it is considered that Soviet 10-year schools do not offer any optional or elective courses, which are usual in American secondary education. Despite the variations in the time allocated to science in American high schools, it is obvious that in most instances it is substantially less than in the Soviet case. In addition, because of the elective system, only a small portion of all students in American high schools ever take courses in science and mathematics at all. Of course the great concentration on science instruction in the Soviet Union may be at the expense of what many of our educators would consider essential subjects for a balanced general education. However great the latter sacrifice may be, the fact remains that the Soviet educational system offers much more than our own in the teaching of science at the secondary-school level."

A few weeks ago the United States Office of Education released the results of a 2-year study entitled "Education in the U. S. S. R." It clearly shows that the Russians have gained their present strength through their approach to the education of youth. This report stated that:

"The Soviet school child gets a much heavier program than his counterpart in the United States. He goes to school 6 days a week, has a rigid course of studies, and is under constant pressure to excel. Instead of the leisurely pace of American schools, there is a continuous drive for top performance.

"More attention is paid to the gifted child. He is singled out at an early age and given special instruction. Though many American schools have classes for superior children, in the Soviet Union there is a definite attempt to find gifted children, especially those with a scientific bent, and encourage them to work at full capacity.

"School teachers and college professors are the elite of Soviet society. They are encouraged to improve their professional status by attending conferences, reading academic journals and continuing with their studies. There is no teacher shortage in the Soviet Union. In the United States the shortage is serious."

Our first task is to improve the teaching of science and mathematics in our secondary schools. Russia has 350,000 trained teachers devoting their efforts to these fields, while we have only 140,000 in our Nation's high schools. This gap must be closed.

President Eisenhower has refocused our emphasis on science and technology. His appointment of Dr. Killian, the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as special assistant to the President for science and technology will have a far-reaching effect. No individual has done as much to further the training of scientists and engineers. Dr. Killian will enlist the support of able assistants, and the United States will meet this new challenge in an area in which we are naturally proficient.

My concern at this critical moment is to preserve the fundamental values of western civilization, our way of life, while developing the strength to defend freedom everywhere. The concepts of a free enterprise economy are inherent in the system of government laid down by our forefathers in the Constitution of the United States. For many years it has been attacked by Socialists around the world and by those within our own country who do not appreciate that political freedom is closely linked with economic freedom.

The underdeveloped countries are seeking to transform their economies in a matter of a few years from primitive agricultural societies to industrial nations. In this short time they hope to achieve what it has taken the United States more than a century and one-half to accomplish. They are impressed with Russia's great scientific and industrial developments in a period of 40 years. A swift passage from feudalism to scientific preeminence is an impressive record for any underdeveloped people.

How will we meet this challenge? For many years we have offered foreign-grant aid for technical assistance programs to other countries. They involve the expenditure of public funds. The President and most of us in Congress believe that we have no authority under the Constitution to expend your money unless it advances the welfare and security of the American people.

For a number of years a proposal has been under consideration by the United Nations to establish a development fund to be known as SUNFED. These initials stand for a special United Nations fund for economic development. Its sponsors believe that it should make low interest loans or supply free gifts to assist the industrialization of underdeveloped nations. Such a fund would assist both Communist and non-Communist countries. Those conducting the program would be drawn from all member nations which necessarily includes the Communist bloc. Under this proposal we would be using our resources to finance the work of Communist technicians in underdeveloped countries. I believe it is utterly unrealistic and not in the best interests of either the American people or the citizens of the underdeveloped nations. It has been supported in this country by Adlai Stevenson and by Walter Reuther. Mr. Reuther, in fact, has suggested that we pledge 2 percent of our gross national product to such a fund for a period of at least 25 years. This would in effect mean a contribution of at least $200 billion over this period.

Last summer the SUNFED proposal was on the agenda of the United Nations Economic and Social Council session at Geneva. The United States representative, Dr. Neil Jacoby, an eminent economist and former member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisors, expressed my sentiments when he said:

"We now have before us the final and supplementary reports of the Ad Hoc Committee on SUNFED. * * * A majority of nations whose replies were analyzed in the reports of the Ad Hoc Committee support the establishment of SUNFED in principle. We have noted, however, extremely few promises of financial support. Of those that have been made, many are conditional upon the participation of the major industrial countries. Even if these promises of support were fulfilled, what would they amount to in the aggregate? The prospect is that the assets of the fund would consist of a few

million dollars in the form of a heterogeneous assortment of currencies, and, possibly, some contributions in goods and services. Is it reasonable that a new international financing agency, charged with gigantic tasks, should be established with such pitifully meager resources? Can we pass lightly over all that is being done by private investors, by international lending agencies, and by the United States and other countries through bilateral programs to direct billions of dollars into economic development? In view of the vast scale of present international development financing, how can it be maintained that the establishment of a Lilliputian SUNFED is the nostrum which will obliterate poverty among millions of people in large parts of the world? So to believe, is surely to turn from reality to magic.

"It has been said that, if the United Nations should fail to proceed immediately to the establishment of SUNFED, its authority with the peoples of the world would suffer and its moral credit would be threatened with exhaustion. In our considered judgment, Mr. President, it is the adoption of the resolution now before us that would have this effect. To set up a SUNFED at this time with so little prospect of appreciable financial support, with so many issues unresolved relating to the purposes it should serve and the manner in which it should operate, would be to doom it to failure from the outset. The distinguished representative of the Netherlands has ventured the opinion that, if such an institution were established at this time, other countries including my own, without whose contributions SUNFED would lack resources to undertake a significant volume of operations, would soon become participants. Speaking for my own country, Mr. President, I see nothing to warrant this opinion. Indeed, if I correctly assess the temper of the American people and of our Congress, action to create SUNFED now without United States participation would more probably deter than attract subsequent participation."

In spite of our statement, the United Nations Economic and Social Council voted to recommend to the General Assembly that it proceed with the establishment of SUNFED. There were only three votes cast in opposition to this program: Those of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada. The General Assembly is now debating this difficult issue.

Congressman JUDD, a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, is the member of the United States delegation to the United Nations responsible for our position on this item. He has recommended that the General Assembly establish a new $100 million technical assistance and economic development program to be financed by voluntary contributions. So that such a program can be established on a reasonable basis, the United States is recommending that it be given further study and be presented to the General Assembly next year.

If such a program is adopted, it would first become effective in 1959. Under existing legislation, the United States will not assume more than one-third of the cost of any United Nations assistance programs in 1959. Accordingly, this plan will provide an opportunity to see whether other countries are willing to match a United States contribution which would be limited to $33.3 million. If other nations will not supply the remaining $66.6 million, then it is idle to discuss further grandiose schemes such as SUNFED.

In a statement made in New York, Representative JUDD explained that the United States had consistently opposed SUNFED because "adequate funds were not available, the basic requirements for capital improvements were often missing, and it raised false hope while diverting attention from fundamentals. If we cannot agree on the United States proposal, how could we possibly reach agreements on SUNFED?"

The last session of the Congress authorized the establishment of our own United States development fund under the direction of the State Department. As the burdens of defense increase, the American people will expect the Congress to curtail other governmental programs so that at long last there may be some prospect of tax reduction for all our people.

I believe that we can effect economies without endangering the welfare of our friends. In fact, far more resources can be channeled to underdeveloped countries through the investment of private capital than can ever be secured through Congressional appropriations. Dr. Jacoby in his statement to the Economic and Social Council, from which I have already quoted, said:

"First, economic growth is a complex process involving people, as well as bricks, mortar, and machinery. Standards of living which have for centuries stagnated at low levels cannot be substantially raised simply by improving and multiplying the physical instruments of production. There must be accompanying changes in the institutions, the attitudes, the habits and customs of people which remove impediments to economic progress. By far the most valuable capital of any advanced country is the knowledge and skills of its citizens. When a less developed country increases these capacities of its citizens, it is making important economic progress, even though its progress is of a type that is not currently reflected in a production index. For this reason, current production indexes undoubtedly exaggerate the gap between the true rates of progress being made by less and more developed countries.

"Second, the primary responsibility for achieving economic development inescapably rests with the developing countries themselves. The policies of their Governments, and the energies and abilities of their peoples, are the factors upon which progress mainly depends.

"Third, economic progress can be accelerated if self-help is supplemented by outside help. Where most people live at subsistence level, a country has little margin of income for saving and capital formation. Without some inflow of capital from abroad, economic development may remain intolerably slow. Failure to appropriate the human and social aspects of the development process, however, often leads to exaggerated expectations of the rate at which such countries can absorb foreign capital and put it to constructive use. As economic development proceeds, however, both potential domestic savings and the capacity to use imported capital increase. Capital from abroad has hastened the development of many countries, including my own, which not so long ago were relatively undeveloped. This capital was almost entirely private in character. We in the United States have no doubt that, for reasons our representatives have stated many times in this council, private investment is the kind of development financing which is most valuable and effective.

"I wish to refer briefly to private financing of economic development.. The net direct investment by American business enterprises in other countries during 1956 was $2.6 billion—twice as large as during 1955. My delegation regards this as a major contribution to world economic development, and something more than a trickle. We dissent from views expressed during this debate, to the effect that this figure means little because much of the investment was made in one country—Canada—or in one industry—petroleum. The correct inference to be drawn from these facts is that United States private investment flows rapidly to industries experiencing a rising world demand for their products, and to countries which provide a hospitable climate for risk-taking enterprise. There is little that the government of a free economy can properly do to induce its nation to invest abroad or to channel investment along particular lines. This is largely a matter within the control of the people and the government of the capital-importing country."

Last month Vice President NIXON in San Francisco said that private investment abroad should be tripled in the next 10 years as foreign aid is decreased. He urged strengthening the economic sections of our embassies, a reduction of corporate taxes on the profits from foreign investment as soon as feasible, together with deferment of taxation on foreign income and profits until they return to the United States as dividends. He also suggested channeling "more of our Government financial operations abroad through private investment and enterprises." This will be accomplished under the extension of Public Law 480, which permits lending at least 25 percent of the foreign currency paid for United States agricultural surplus in any country to United States businesses operating there. The extension of Public Law 480 assists American farmers and grain dealers while furthering our foreign policy objectives.

Vice President NIXON is well aware that there is only so much our Government can do. I support the advice he gave to countries seeking capital. He said, "It can treat foreign capital as something between a public enemy and a necessary evil, or it can make the kind of rules under which private capital can do its best work.

I know that private-enterprise concepts can be applied in other countries and that they will raise living standards as they have here. We have no time to lose.

Carlos Romulo, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, recently said:

"The struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union is going to depend on the evolution of new countries in Asia and Africa.

"I do not think it is too much of an oversimplification to say the major problem of our time is a problem essentially for Americans—the problem of creating and setting up channels of production, world development, and trade on a basis rooted in mutual respect and equality of status. I say this is a problem for Americans because it is the United States that stands primarily for the promise of an alternative to a new dark age of Communist totalitarianism."

Every one of us, whether as a member of the Government or in our private capacities, must constantly show our foreign friends the true virtues of our economic system and how it can benefit them if they will provide a hospitable investment climate.

During recent years I have been concerned with another development in our international affairs of particular concern to you. There are some who believe that the problem of establishing stable market prices for basic raw materials throughout the world can best be approached by a series of commodity agreements.

A few years ago there was a proposal before the United Nations Economic and Social Council, which I vigorously opposed, to establish parity between all manufactured goods and all raw materials on a worldwide basis. It included the establishment of a commission on international commodity trade whose terms of reference charged it with the task of establishing just and equable price relationships on a worldwide basis. This was an impossible task. The United States has refused to participate in the work of this commission. It is the only commission within the United Nations which we do not support.

This fall the American republics met in Buenos Aires to survey the possibilities for economic cooperation in this hemisphere.

Again, proposals were placed before the conference to proceed with stabilization schemes by government edict. I was delighted that our Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Roy Rubottom, vigorously opposed them. Let me quote from his statement which I completely endorse:

"A subject on which there tends to be a common position among the Latin American countries is that relating to 'terms of trade,' and to the proposal that international commodity agreements be used to help maintain a favorable relationship between prices of the commodities they export and the prices of the products which they import. This is understandable in view of the fact that economic conditions in most of the Latin American countries are influenced to a large degree by the conditions under which a relatively few of their commodities are sold in international trade. For example, Bolivia is highly dependent on tin; Chile on nitrate and copper; Brazil, Equador, Colombia, El Salvador, and Guatemala on coffee; Urugua on meat and wool; Venezuela on petroleum; Mexico and Peru on lead and zinc; and Argentina upon wheat and meat.

"The state of the export trade in these few commodities has a large effect upon employment and economic activity generally within these countries. Representatives of such countries have often pointed out that the prices of their raw materials fluctuate widely in relation to the prices of the products they import.

"Among the measures most often mentioned for attempting to stabilize such commodity prices are intergovernmental commodity agreements. While the United States fully recognizes that many countries rely heavily upon exports of primary products and do face special problems in the form of relatively wide fluctuations in the world market prices for some of their major products, it does not believe that the cure is to be found in mechanisms for international price support or stabilization. In the view of the United States, there is too strong a probability that such a cure would be at least as harmful as the disease. In general, it is the conviction of the United States that maximum reliance upon competitive forces in free markets will best promote international price relationships conducive to optimum allocation of economic resources and advancement of economic welfare.

"It is sometimes alleged that the United States position on this matter is inconsistent with its programs which are aimed at supporting the prices of United States agricultural products in relation to the prices of products which United States farmers buy. It may be noted, however, in partial reply, that the experience which the United States has had with attempting to support agricultural prices domestically, instead of being a recommendation for an international price-support system, indicates strongly that such a system would, in all probability, be unwieldy and unworkable."

No discussion of world affairs would be complete without reference to the establishment of the European economic community, which includes a common market and a program for the peaceful development of atomic energy.

In my judgment this is a great step forward, as it will permit Western Europeans to enjoy the technological advantages which come with mass production and distribution. However, the establishment of a free trade area which may include Britain, the countries of Western Europe, and perhaps their overseas colonies could discriminate against American exporters. There are many who believe it is a violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The Congress at its next session will be asked to extend the trade agreements program and to authorize United States participation in the proposed organization for trade cooperation. In the light of these new developments, we should not take these steps without first reexamining existing agreements, including GATT, which were negotiated prior to the formation of the European Economic Community.

In the brief time available to me, I have endeavored to cover recent developments in both military and economic areas. As a Member of the House of Representatives, it was my privilege to serve on both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Ways and Means. As a Member of the United States Senate, I have been concerned with all issues of foreign policy. As you realize, the Senate must approve all treaties and confirm all nominations.

My day-to-day activities over a period of 19 years in these fields reinforce my conviction that we live under the only economic and political system which can provide the economic strength for the defense of the free world. Fortunately, it is also the only system which preserves freedom and human dignity.

We have the responsibility to show that we can impose self-discipline on ourselves so as to outthink and outproduce our adversaries. Each of you can start this task with the education of your children on the blessings that we enjoy as American citizens and by guiding them to seek knowledge which will make us strong.

---

## Burma Celebrates 10th Anniversary of Independence, January 4, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, I announced that I would address from the floor of Congress each one of the participating countries, with the exception of the two Communist ones, Red China and North Vietnam, on the occasion of their independence celebrations. On January 4, 1958, Burma celebrated her 10th anniversary of independence. In recognition of this event, I wish to extend warm greetings to the people of Burma, Prime Minister U Ba Swe, and His Excellency U Win, Ambassador of Burma.

At various times in precolonial days, Burmese kingdoms extended well beyond the present borders. Although conquered eventually by a mighty power, the Burmese people continued their opposition. Demands for self-government persisted and reforms were introduced. But the reforms were not adequate to meet the political and economic situation of the times. Burma was therefore in a state of great unrest and agitation when World War II engulfed her.

The Burmese people possess the eternal qualities of self-reliance and resourcefulness. In Burma, character, courage, and self-reliance rank with national and individual honor—and the Burmese possess all of these qualities in abundance. Only a people of stern fiber could have overcome the discouraging obstacles which Burma faced after the Second World War.

Burma recognized that a new-found independence carries responsibilities as well as nationalistic prerogatives. Like a number of other countries, Burma had suffered enormous destruction. Her transportation system, industry, and economy were virtually shattered. The Government faced a succession of crises with disorders and insurrections in every region of the country, often fomented by the Communists. Burma appears to find her natural inclination to be anti-Communist and feels a continuing consciousness of the presence to the north of a potentially hostile force which could overwhelm her from anywhere along a 1,000-mile common border with Red China.

In the words of former Prime Minister U Nu:

> What we had to deal with basically was not just an armed rebellion, but with underlying evils that had crept into our society and with the resulting psychological attitudes of large numbers of people.
>
> This called for nothing less than a comprehensive program of nation building that involved religion, ethics, politics, health, education, and economic and social betterment.
>
> I am firmly convinced that a major contribution to the restoration of stability in Burma was brought about by the fact that we in the Government stuck to the ways and procedures of democracy throughout. Fundamental freedoms and human rights were assured at all times.
>
> All these measures have combined to bring home to the people the meaning of independence.

The progress in Burma since those early terrible days is a heartening and inspiring saga of determination, of courageous leadership, and of hard work. Free Burma is a young nation which has reason to be thankful for her achievement of freedom and for the many other accomplishments that stand to the credit of her people.

---

## Report by Congressman Edwin B. Dooley, 26th District, New York, on His Inspection of Federal Highways, Harbors, Flood Areas, and Federal Buildings in Certain Sections of the United States and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the following report as one of a delegation of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on Public Works. The inspection covered a period from October 22 to November 20. Permission was requested and granted to reproduce the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Nothing herein should be regarded as representing the official viewpoint of the committee. The findings in this report

reflect my personal conclusions after studying the sites specified.

The official report of the committee, which I shall endorse, will be forthcoming at a later date.

My reason for accepting membership on the committee was twofold. First, I wanted to fulfill my obligations as a member of one of the most important committees of the House of Representatives by studying firsthand those projects for which Government money has been appropriated, or for which formal requests for funds have been made.

The second reason was equally important. I wanted to ascertain if the desire for statehood for Hawaii was founded on a valid basis. My conclusion is stated in the addendum to this report.

The entire inspection trip was made in close collaboration with the United States Army Corps of Engineers. This important segment of the Armed Forces proved constantly that it is performing with intelligence and dispatch a difficult function of public service which has been and will continue to be of invaluable benefit to the well-being of our country.

The itinerary was as follows:

October 17–18: Illinois road project (AASHO).

October 23: U. S. 101, San Francisco, Coyote Dam, Russian River projects.

October 24: U. S. 40 to Carquinez Bridge, Vallejo, Benicia and Martinez; public hearing at Martinez on Federal highway bill and related matters; Walnut Creek.

October 25: Stockton, Calif.; flood-control problems and island levees; meeting at port of Stockton.

October 28: Los Angeles; study of Santa Ana and San Diego Freeways; inspection of San Diego Harbor with United States engineers; meeting with San Diego Chamber of Commerce.

October 29: Inspection of State highways in San Diego area as far as Mexican border; inspection of United States customs and immigration buildings at San Ysidro; meeting at Tia Juana sponsored by United States customs officials.

October 30: Inspection of Riverside, Colton, and San Bernardino Freeways, and Riverside Board of Trade.

October 31: Inspection with United States engineers of Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors; inspection of highways en route; meetings with members of Los Angeles Metropolitan Traffic Association, Automobile Club of Southern California, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissions, and Metropolitan Transportation Engineering Board.

November 1: Inspection of highways en route to Paso Robles via Castaic, Ventura, and Santa Barbara; meeting at Santa Barbara with chamber of commerce.

November 2: Inspection of highways at Salinas, Monterey, and Santa Cruz; meeting at Monterey with local business executives.

November 4: Boarded S. S. *Matsonia* for Hawaii.

November 9: Arrived at Hawaii.

November 9–19: Inspections and formal hearings on islands of Oahu, Hawaii, Kauai, Maui, and Molokai; inspection of navigation projects at Honolulu Harbor, Kahului Harbor and Breakwater, Hilo, Kalepolepo Harbor; inspection of flood projects at Iao Stream, Wailua River; inspection of Wailua Channel improvements, intraterritorial highways on Oahu, Hawaii, and Maui; beach erosion, Federal building at Wailuku, Maui, T. H.

FINDINGS

The Illinois road project being conducted at Ottawa, Ill., under the supervision of the American Association of State Highway Officials and the State of Illinois Road Commission is potentially of such far reaching consequence that it would take chapters to do the subject justice.

The enterprise is designed to study road building from all aspects and is implemented by ingenious devices which will ascertain with mathematical precision the centrifugal tire pull of heavy vehicles, the wear and tear caused by surface friction, the contraction and expansion of bridge supports, and so forth. These devices, a number of which were indigenous to the project, have been invented by the engineers of AASHO in collaboration with staff members of the Illinois Highway Department.

The project is being conducted in collaboration with the United States Army to ascertain certain fatigue factors.

With us on this inspection was Bertram Tallamy, the Federal Highway Administrator, who was most favorably impressed with the entire conduct of the project. The results of the undertaking are being awaited with interest not only by highway officials of our own country but by those of other areas throughout the world.

PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM

The overall program of the Public Works Committee pertaining to the development of our Federal interstate highway systems, the improvement and development of harbors, the elimination and control of floods in affected areas, and the construction and maintenance of Federal buildings is meritorious and far reaching, and deserves the continued support of the Congress of the United States.

Impressive results of the impact of the Defense Highway Act of 1956 on the economy of a given area was apparent in the State of California where intrastate freeways constructed with the aid of the 90 to 10 percent formula of Federal highway funds have been markedly affected. Areas hitherto devoid of commercial, social, and industrial development have appeared along the freeways. Needed routes of transport for areas where the ratio of persons per car is as low as 2.5 have proven incentives to the building of homes and the establishment of industries.

The same pattern holds for other States. The Defense Highway Act for interstate highways will eventually link virtually every capital city of our Nation and give incentive to our mobility and our economy. It is contemplated that 50,000 miles of interstate highways will eventually provide mediums of transportation for the swift and efficient movement of urban populations or military forces.

Never in world history has any construction program approached in dimensions or expenditures the highway program as envisioned under the Federal Defense Highway Act of 1956. By the time it is completed more than $50 billion will have been expended. Motorists will have easy access to cities far removed from their homes. Commerce and industry will be favorably affected. Our social habits will experience transformations. Our Nation will advance in many directions via wheels.

HAWAII

In cooperation with the Pacific division of the Army Corps of Engineers—Brig. Gen. Ellsworth I. Davis—a thorough investigation of Hawaii's roads, rivers and harbors, flood conditions, and Federal buildings was undertaken. The Corps of Engineers acting through the offices of Lt. Col. McGlachlin Hatch provided splendid cooperation at all times.

Roads and harbors were studied at Honolulu, Oahu, Hilo, Hawaii, Maalaea, Maui, Kahului, Kaunakakai, Molokai, Nawiliii, and Kauai. Flood problems were surveyed at sites at Oahu, Maui, and Hawaii.

My conclusions after studying the roads and harbors may best be summed up in one word—inadequate. Hawaii's islands are handicapped by inadequate roads and by harbors too small and dangerous for the amount of traffic they are required to handle.

Only on Oahu are the roads as modern as they should be, and that is due to the fact that Honolulu is a modern city with a good government and an active chamber of commerce. But even on Oahu, roads are not sufficient in number or design to provide ready access for the military and citizens to certain parts of the island.

On the island of Hawaii, the roads—intraterritorial—are inadequate. The same is true on the other islands. However, around Wailuku on Maui, there are some excellent highways.

Hawaii does not participate in the Federal Defense Highway Act, and consequently the Federal contribution to its intraterritorial roads is on the customary 50–50 basis which prevails in the intrastate highways on the mainland. Were Hawaii included in the act, like any of the 48 States it would receive contributions on the 90–10 percent formula basis. This would prove a boon to Hawaii's highway program. With the Federal Government paying 90 cents on the dollar, Hawaii could advance its road building program rapidly.

Because of climatic conditions and the substance of the terrain, road building in most areas of the islands is less expensive than on the mainland. Tunneling, however, as through the Pali Pass on Oahu—$9 million—is an expensive operation.

It is the conviction of the writer that Hawaii, even though a Territory and not contiguous to the mainland, should—by a special amendment—have been included in the Defense Highway Act of 1956 and thus permitted to benefit by its provisions.

There are heavy concentrations of Air Force, Army, Navy and Marine personnel and materiel on the Island of Oahu, yet insufficient roads on that island hamper facile movement of military personnel.

To claim we should provide adequate roads only on the mainland is specious. The defense of the people of Hawaii is equally important to defense of people on the mainland.

The islands of Hawaii are in the Pacific Ocean, 2,200 miles from our Pacific coast. They lack harbors, despite their hundreds of miles of coastline. So small and dangerous are several of their main sheltered anchorages that when the wind reaches a velocity of 25 miles or more large ships cannot venture within the bounds of the seawall, but must remain outside. This is particularly true at Hilo, where there is a dangerous surge of the sea, and at Kahului Harbor at Maui.

By providing adequate harbors at Honolulu, Hilo, Kaunakakai—Molokai—and Kahului, and enhancing the small boat harbor at Maulaea, the potential of commerce would be immeasurably increased, and the danger to large vessels decreased.

The Public Works Committee has authorized construction work and improvements in certain harbors of Hawaii, but more and larger projects are in order.

The percentage increase in pleasure boating indicated in the last 5 years on the mainland has not been reflected in Hawaiian waters, due to the absence of sufficient sheltered anchorages. The rugged shoreline of the islands offers few places of refuge from sudden storms.

In order to offset this situation the people of Hawaii have voted to pool the refunds on marine gasoline and earmark the same for the development of planned boating harbors.

Floods take place on certain areas of the islands when sudden storms on the mountains pour torrents into low-lying villages. At Iao in Maui, at the confluence of two streams, the turbulent waters have raised havoc with the homes of hundreds of residents. At Kihii the water rolls over thousands of areas to flood the roads.

There is nothing unique about Hawaii's floods, but they are severe enough to warrant Federal aid in surmounting them. In Los Angeles, for example, where a great city has been plagued by flash floods from the mountains, huge culverts have been constructed to speed the water to the sea. Similar devices might be erected in modified form in the affected areas of Hawaii, when the threat of inundation to large segments of the population is imminent.

BUILDINGS

The federally owned building which the committee visited at Wailuku, Maui, is in a sad state of repair. Termites and dry rot have wrought destruction to the interior and the appearance is one of shameful neglect. The building should be replaced.

The post office on the island is also too small for the demands placed upon it. Consideration should be given to construction of a new Federal building on the federally owned lot on Maui, to house both the post office and the Government offices of the Internal Revenue Department.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hawaiian Islands are an integral part of the United States and should be given the same consideration as the separate States of the Union.

Consideration should be given to the enactment of an amendment to the Federal Highway Act of 1956 to include Hawaii on the same basis as a State, in order that it shall have the advantage of the provisions of the act.

Authorization for expansion of the harbor of Hawaii for reasons of safety and the development of commerce, is in order.

Impetus should be given to a road construction program for the islands.

Consideration should be given to the granting of a Federal subsidy for a ferry system from island to island—with adequate ferry slips being provided by the Federal Government so as to permit automobiles to be transported from island to island.

Incentive should be given to pleasure boating by the development of several small harbors like Maalaea on the island of Maui.

Flood-control projects should be undertaken on a greater scale at Maui.

The Federal buildings at Wailuku, Maui, should be replaced with a modern edifice.

ADDENDUM

The Hawaiian Islands constitute an invaluable bulwark of American strength in the Pacific Ocean. They constitute a bastion of democracy in a Polynesian setting. They provide a haven for our fleet and our Air Force where most needed.

The people of the islands, despite their differing origins—34 percent are Japanese—are intensely pro-American and Americans. During World War II there was no act of sabotage on the islands, even though the population is heterogeneous. When the Nisei battalion, which had won distinction for unusual heroism on the battlefields of Europe, was being formed a call went out for 1,500 men. No less than 9,000 responded.

Hawaii is ready for statehood. Its population is over 500,000. Its Territorial government is fashioned along the same lines as our county and town governments. The desire of the residents—as shown in a referendum less than a decade ago—is to gain recognition as a State.

The main obstacle to statehood is the fact that Hawaii is not contiguous to any other State of the Union. Yet in point of time and communication it is closer to Washington than was California at the time of its admission as a State.

To deny Hawaii statehood because it is an island segment or because of rumors that some of its citizens are ultra-liberal is shortsighted. We need Hawaii as a State and time will prove the validity of that viewpoint.

## Portland Area Council of Boy Scouts and G. H. Oberteuffer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I ask uanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by him and an article from the Portland Sunday Journal of December 29, 1957.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER ON PORTLAND AREA COUNCIL OF BOY SCOUTS AND G. H. OBERTEUFFER

Few organizations contribute so greatly to our Nation's future as the Boy Scouts of America. The Portland Area Council of the Scouts has been outstanding in the land, in terms of achievement and performance. I saw this for myself when I attended the vast Boy Scout Jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa., in the summer of 1957. One conspicuous reason for the fine record of the Portland Area Council has been its able executive, George Herman Oberteuffer, who has occupied that position since 1925.

On January 1, 1958, Mr. Oberteuffer was succeeded by Guy Miller of Eugene, Oreg. The Portland Sunday Journal of December 29, 1957, published a comprehensive story of Mr. Oberteuffer's distinguished career in scouting, under the byline of Miss Betty Ann Rettenmier. Title of this biographical article was "Retiring 'Obie' Leaves Mark on Portland-Area Scouting."

I know that many of my colleagues are interested in Boy Scouts, because they share my interest in conservation of natural resources, which is one of the cardinal principles of the scout organization. For this reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Rettenmier's tribute to George H. Oberteuffer be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of December 29, 1957]

RETIRING "OBIE" LEAVES MARK ON PORTLAND AREA SCOUTING—EXECUTIVE SERVES 40 YEARS

(By Betty Ann Rettenmier)

"If I were doing an article on Obie's retirement, I'd begin in a satirical way," said a long-time volunteer Boy Scout worker.

"I'd say first that Obie did not personally lay all of the rails for the Oregon Trunk Railway when he was a young man. He did not own the wild horse of the reef of the well-known campfire story he tells. He was not present when the sailing ship *Struan* was wrecked near Camp Meriwether—all Boy Scout legends to the contrary. You know how he personalizes every story he tells."

The Scouter was talking about his friend, George Herman Oberteuffer, Boy Scouts of America executive of Portland area council since 1925.

Another of Obie's good friends, a former assistant, Guy Miller, of Eugene, will take his place behind the big desk in Boy Scout headquarters after January 1.

Obie, a tall, handsome horseman with broad shoulders, shrewd, gray eyes, a warm handshake, and a sense of humor to match, is not a retiring personality. His firm hold on the reins of a job in a profession noted for the policy of transfer for advancement

has made him unusual in the eyes of many professional Scouters throughout the country.

He has had many chances for higher pay in Scouting posts elsewhere, including executiveship of four of the largest councils in large eastern metropolitan cities. But as he once told job interviewers, in explaining his preference for the Northwest, "Please show me three things—a horse, a mountain, and a tree."

Obie's 40-year influence on the youth and adults of the Northwest cannot be measured. Statistically speaking, there were 2,061 boys and leaders registered with the Boy Scouts when he came to Portland in 1925. Total registration now is about 42,000.

One of the council's first summer camps, acquired after Obie came to Portland, was Meriwether, near Tillamook. Boys vied Tom Sawyer fashion for the honor of saddling Obie's horse, Skipper, and for other camp chores. Obie, his wife, the former Mildred Healy, daughter Georgie Ann, now Mrs. David Crockatt of Salem, and son Bill, spent most of 17 summers there.

The Council has grown from Multnomah County and part of Columbia County to its present 15,000 square miles, comprising 15 counties in Oregon and Washington. There now are 18 professional staff men and an office force of 15 to administer the Scouting program and direct training of volunteer leaders.

Scouting in his beloved Northwest has become much more imaginative under Obie's leadership than the cartoon type assistance of little ladies across the street and burning of fingers at camp fires. Portland area scouts can climb mountains, go on 100-mile horseback rides, travel by canoe down the Willamette, go winter camping in the snow, plant trees in the Tillamook burn, help in rescues and go scouting in Europe and the Far East.

There also are swim and first aid meets, the annual drive to collect for the Goodwill Industries, craft shows, circuses and the individual skill requirements which help a boy to be more resourceful.

Besides Meriwether, summer campers of today have a choice between Spirit Lake, Camp Baldwin on Mount Hood slopes, Camp Clark on the Meriwether Reservation and Camp Cooper near the Coast Range summit in Tillamook county.

There also is a Nanitch Point mountain lodge, Camp Millard in Clackamas County for weekend campers, a new Portland office building under erection, and a training center in the architectural style of a small timberline lodge on Mount Scott, where Obie rode his favorite horse as a boy.

"I hate to think that Obie will be retiring," recently wrote Kenneth A. Wells, one of Obie's first assistants in Portland and now national director of the Boy Scouts' research service in New Brunswick, N. J. "I know it is inevitable, he said, "but for me he is somewhat the eternal youth.

"My experiences with Obie were the richest ones of my life, and it is extremely difficult to put into words even a fragment of a proper expression of my feelings.

"I have always felt that he was a man with a most profound respect for the worth and dignity of others. His sense of what is right and just grows from his deep faith in all human beings.

"I have felt that he always and everlastingly sought for the truth without ever expecting to find it. I am sure that his personal hurt at a friend's failure was much keener than his personal pleasure at a friend's success.

"By my standards, he is one of the most deeply religious of men. I suppose if I were to try to phrase it in one sentence, I would have to say, 'He is the finest man I have ever known.'"

Obie, dubbed by many "the best friend a boy ever had," is in his best wisecracking form at staff meetings when his team sets goals, plans activities and training sessions and works on the highly detailed "keep-it-simple-make-it-fun" program of leadership and character-building for boys.

Here's a sample of his advice on getting along with the approximately 12,000 adult volunteers, "Tell 'em plainly what you think. Then smile."

The "aura" of Obie, the ability to inspire others to help boys and to make the growing up years memorable, has been compared to that of a well-known evangelist. And to Obie, as one of the custodians of a great idea, his profession has many of the elements of a childrens crusade. As Obie puts it, a successful Boy Scout executive is a cross between a preacher, college president and a little boy playing Indian.

It all began at McMinnville one evening in 1916, when Obie, then principal of the high school, was approached by three boys to head a scout troop, now No. 233. After several hours of persuasion, Obie consented. The trio left at midnight.

Obie caught the vision of Scouting during two summers as a camp counselor near Spokane and became a B. S. A. executive in 1918. First assignment was Spokane, where he remained until promoted to regional executive in 1924. He came to Portland the following year as council executive.

Says Wells: "He made numerous, rather drastic changes in the local council organization and I remember distinctly that a group of us who were then considered older Boy Scouts held a rather formal debate at one of the Portland schools, probably Sunnyside. I was the principal debater on the question, 'Resolved: That the changes being made by the new Scout executive are not desirable.' I took the affirmative side, namely that they were not desirable. As I remember it, my side won the debate."

Portland was a natural homing point for the Oberteuffers, and the new job meant less travel away from home. Obie's father, W. G. Oberteuffer, had moved his family there when Obie was 3 years old from Washington, D. C., to accept an office in the Army Quartermaster department. Obie went through Portland schools, then worked his way through the University of Oregon. His B. A. degree was in education, after a switch from pre-med.

While at Oregon he boarded with a sister, Mrs. E. R. Moller, now of Hood River, his freshman year, and lived at the Beta Theta Pi house for the rest of his college career.

A brother, Dr. Delbert Oberteuffer, chairman of the physical education department at Ohio State University, shares Obie's love of the out-of-doors. They once hiked from seaside to Portland and operated a scout camp near Spokane together.

Two other brothers, Robert K. and William G., live in California.

Obie was the first man in the Boy Scout movement to thumbs-down military style camping, with tents in rows and morning exercises. He changed it to informal groups of boys at a number of campsites.

From the time son Bill was a small boy "hiking" with Obie to Wahtum Lake, riding in a packsack on his father's shoulders, he also has been an outdoorsman. Bill, Georgie and Obie had many riding and hiking trips along the Pacific Crest trail during family activity years. In 1937, Obie accompanied his son and a group of scouts on horseback to Chico, Calif., part of the 1,300 mile way from Mt. Hood to Tijuana. In 1953, Obie hiked with Bill and his wife Margaret for 250 miles along the John Muir trail in California.

It was Bill, however, who introduced his father to trout fishing, deer hunting and mountain climbing. Obie climbed his first and only major peak at 50 with Bill and Margaret, experienced mountaineers, as guides. Bill and Margaret, incidentally, share another of Obie's enthusiasms. Both are Portland high school teachers.

Some of Obie's honors are a surprise when mentioned to his family because "he never talked about them at home." The "boss executive" is a member of the Clackamas County sheriff's posse, was on the national board of the Camp Fire Girls, president of the Oregon Social Workers and vice president of the Pacific Coast Camp Directors Association. He also has been president and master of the fox hunt of the Lake Oswego Hunt Club. Obie also was one of two organizers of the Boys and Girls Council, which was the forerunner of the group work and recreation division of the Council of Social Agencies.

When one of Portland's most active public figures retires, he has plans. One of them, broached to a field man on his staff, goes like this: "Say, how about a horse trek next summer to Crater Lake? I'll sign on as wrangler for $6 a day and grub."

---

## Meet Senator Talmadge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able and informative article entitled "Meet Senator TALMADGE," published in the February 1958 edition of the American Mercury magazine. The article deals with the life and service of my distinguished colleague.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET SENATOR TALMADGE, THE NEW VOICE OF THE SOUTH

(By Harold Lord Varney)

An energetic and forceful new national spokesman for constitutional government and States rights has emerged, HERMAN TALMADGE, the junior Senator from Georgia. His emergence was chronicled recently by no less a respected statesman than Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, of TEXAS, who said:

"HERMAN TALMADGE fooled a lot of people by turning out to be a student of government, a convincing speaker and not a hellraiser as some of the critics had billed him. I don't know of a freshman Senator who ever got off to a finer start. He and RUSSELL (Georgia's senior Senator, RICHARD B. RUSSELL) did the South and their State a great service by acting in the civil-rights debate to prevent the voting of cloture. If they hadn't acted as they did against a doomed filibuster, the Senate would have passed a stronger and more restrictive bill, such as had already passed the House."

During his first year in the Senate, TALMADGE worked hard to earn recognition as a diligent researcher, a committee enthusiast and, above all, a champion of States rights and local self-government.

He did such a good job fighting the civil-rights bill, foreign giveaway programs and other evils, he has earned the role of spokesman for Americans seeking to stop Federal waste and intervention in local governmental affairs.

There are others to help, but TALMADGE excels at standing on his own feet and defending State and local government—and regional beliefs—before the vocal onslaughts

of the pseudoliberals. He has acquired in a short span of 44 years a store of political know-how, wisdom, and experience possessed by few men after a lifetime of public service. Such qualities make his opinions on public affairs, government administration, and political strategy respected, by people who know him best.

TALMADGE learned so quickly in the Senate that he received this tribute from LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, the Senate Democratic leader: "He has made a great impression on this body since he came here. He has served only a few months but he has already demonstrated that he is one of the most diligent and one of the best Senators in the Senate. We particularly appreciate the very fine relationship we have with him and the very efficient way he presides over the Senate."

Old-time Capitol observers say that never before in their experience have they seen a freshman Senator become a seasoned and effective statesman so quickly as TALMADGE has done.

From that day in July, 1953, when TALMADGE forecast the now too-real blunders of the Federal Government in a speech before the National Retail Hardware Association, in Miami, he became a spokesman for those who oppose present trends in Washington.

His first blast at national politics included a sharp blow at foreign aid: "We are fast coming to the realization that we can't buy lasting friendship from other nations," he warned. "Even the most foolhardy must now realize that there is a limit as to how much we can drain our national resources. We can no longer engage in a cat-and-mouse game with the Soviets, letting that regime force us to assume the role of the mouse." He called for an end to confusion and fear, urged a return to the fundamental American principles "of Washington, or Jefferson, or Monroe, or Jackson—or Teddy Roosevelt."

In this same Miami speech, 4 years ago, he said, "We should work in this country for strong, compact, Armed Forces with the best equipment available. Against the Communist hordes, we cannot expect to win victories with numbers of men alone." The statement was prophetic, as has been proved by the recent claims that Russia has outstripped the United States in the missiles race and in other fields of scientific progress.

Shortly after leaving the Governor's office in January of 1955, HERMAN TALMADGE was invited to address a joint session of the Alabama Legislature. It was in this neighboring State that he reaffirmed and consolidated his long-expressed and often-stated views on constitutional history, constitutional government, and the reserved rights of the States and the people. One is impressed today in reading these two addresses by their significance and foresight in spite of the fact that one of them was delivered 4½ years ago and the other was made nearly 3 years ago. Had the policies suggested at that time by Senator TALMADGE been the policies of our Republic, the national economy would be in far better condition today and our defense posture would have been much more secure.

To reach his stature as a spokesman for the masses, TALMADGE had as demanding a school as ever existed—Georgia politics. Born on a south Georgia farm to Eugene Talmadge and his wife, lovingly known as Miss Mitt, HERMAN EUGENE TALMADGE got early, practical experience.

When the younger TALMADGE was 15, his father—then State agriculture commissioner—moved his family to Atlanta from the farm near McRae. The boy began assimilating his political wisdom by listening to talk in the house.

Entering the University of Georgia, young TALMADGE soon became a leader on the campus. After he earned his degree in law, his father adjudged him a good enough politician to manage the elder's unsuccessful campaign for the Senate in 1938 and, later, his campaign for governer in 1940 when the father-and-son team won.

Soon after this HERMAN was commissioned as an ensign in the Navy, where he served for 52 months during World War II. During a leave before Pearl Harbor, he married attractive, blonde Betty Shingler, the daughter of a pioneer Georgia family. The first of two sons was born while he served overseas. Friends he made in the Navy still call on him at his white-columned farm home at Lovejoy and in Washington.

TALMADGE returned to Georgia in time for the 1946 gubernatorial campaign which he managed for his father.

He drafted that campaign's platform for his father, a sharp departure from the traditional Talmadge stand. Instead of confining his platform largely to an economy plank—the Talmadge custom in the past—the 1946 platform called for many new and expanded State services, including far-reaching new roadbuilding and an unprecedented educational program.

The story goes that the elder Talmadge called HERMAN into his office when he read the platform and asked, "You're taking me a little bit fast, aren't you, son?"

"With the overwhelming odds against us," young HERMAN said, "we have got to move fast to win this election." The platform was used and the elder Talmadge won again—the fourth time he had been elected governor. No man before or since has been so continuously reelected.

Eugene Talmadge died a few days before he was to have taken office. The Talmadge lawyers took the position that there had been a failure of election. Acting, however, under what appeared to be a clearcut provision of the 1945 State constitution—which seemingly authorized the general assembly to elect under such circumstances—the general assembly proceeded to elect HERMAN governor. But a majority of the Georgia Supreme Court, in a 5–2 decision, took a different view and ruled that incumbent Governor Ellis Arnall held over and that upon his resignation, proffered to take effect at the qualification of Lieutenant Governor M. E. Thompson, the executive authority then devolved upon the latter as Acting Governor, until the next general election, at which time a governor could be elected by the people.

Despite the bitter feud preceding the ruling, HERMAN TALMADGE moved his family out of the Governor's mansion within an hour after the court spoke. While the belongings were being removed, his mother had only this smiling comment for a reporter: "We'll be back!"

The road back began the next day. TALMADGE hammered away at the incumbent administration until he was elected overwhelmingly in 1948. He had been active in politics for 20 years, but this was his first elective public office.

The rest is history. TALMADGE was reelected governor in 1950. A majority of the State's daily newspapers had opposed both elections, but by the next year they began to praise him. When he ran for the Senate seat of retiring Senator, Walter F. George, in 1956, virtually every newspaper in the State endorsed his candidacy. He carried every one of Georgia's 159 counties.

At 44, TALMADGE is rapidly increasing in national popularity. Reporters have noted that he is one of the top Congressional mail receivers. Georgia groups ask him to make more speeches than he can deliver, but he still arranges 60 to 70 during the year.

One of the principal pledges TALMADGE made to the people of Georgia during his campaigns for election as Governor and, later, as Senator was that he would carry their fight for States rights and constitutional government to the people of the whole Nation. He has done that, primarily through the medium of television.

The Senator began earning a reputation on nationwide television interviews in 1952. He received 12,000 letters after appearing on a televised show just prior to the 1952 Democratic National Convention while trying to win the presidential nomination for Senator RUSSELL. The best of those letters are bound into volumes and stored in his library at Lovejoy. He has appeared on many different nationwide programs, making as many as four appearances on some.

Never declining an invitation to joust with reporters or critics, TALMADGE regards TV interviews as one of the most effective mediums for expressing the thoughts of public servants.

"It has been of invaluable assistance in allowing me to talk right to the people," he says. TALMADGE was quick to see that TV has changed the whole technique of effective political campaigns.

His relationships with the working press have been uniformly cordial and productive. Reporters who have covered him say: "Senator TALMADGE is honest with us and cooperative in every way. If you ask him a loaded question, he gives a full and frank reply right off. He knows we have deadlines to make and doesn't keep us waiting for hours on end. We appreciate the fact that he is available and takes us into his confidence."

The TALMADGE seen on the Senate floor in dark grey suit and somber tie resembles not at all the TALMADGE seen in Army fatigues and heavy workshoes on his Lovejoy farm. There is, however, the same tough fiber, the same incisive action, the same ability to analyze elections and national issues. He makes no pretense that he prefers legislative duty. He would rather be the executive officer. The time-consuming legislative functions conflict with his great energy. Nevertheless, he asked for the Senate job, winning an unprecedented majority in all Georgia's 159 counties in his race.

Left-wing columnists and magazines have long tried to smear him. Nationally syndicated columnist, Robert S. Allen said that "it was pretty generally anticipated that he would roar into town and 'run amuck,' so to speak; hootin' and tootin' and storming around all over the place * * *". But he has completely confounded them, just as he has very highly gratified a lot of other people who were hoping he would do exactly as he has done—conduct himself like a gentleman and an upstanding and conscientious public servant.

Even the principal political columnist and reporter for the Washington Post and Times Herald, Robert C. Albright, credited TALMADGE with "confounding some of his liberal critics." They were amazed, said Albright, because TALMADGE "chose as his maiden speech, not civil rights, but the nonsectional issue of President Eisenhower's Middle East Resolution."

This serves to emphasize that good Senators are interested in the Nation, not just the section from which they are elected. His first speech drew acclaim from Senators with divergent views. TALMADGE voted against the resolution as being too late to be useful and because it was coupled to foreign aid "giveaways" which he opposes.

Still, the columnists and analysts are building up new pressures against him. TALMADGE shrugs it off and continues to detail the rights of individuals as opposed to Federal regulation.

He visualizes the frequently heard declaration that a southerner cannot be elected President as "a self-serving fiction fostered by political opportunists" who manipulate minority votes in States where such blocs represent the balance of political power. "Their anti-South hate campaign is the sop they toss to their minorities," he says, "as their admission ticket to the banquet table of political success." Claiming that minorities in other sections should worry about

their own plight, he declares the real reason Southern leadership is unacceptable to the political bosses and to the party manipulators is "because of Southern belief in and adherence to fundamental constitutional government as established and practiced by the Founding Fathers of this Nation."

Because he is a lifelong Democrat—but not the same breed as HUMPHREY or DOUGLAS—TALMADGE pleads for the Democratic Party to accept "the greatest opportunity ever afforded any political party in the history of our Nation," and hopes to see his party gain greater national prestige.

His blueprint is simple: Get new leadership, develop new concepts based on observing constitutional guaranties rather than violating them, work out a new philosophy of world leadership and speak for all the people.

The American people, TALMADGE believes, are weary of bearing the burdens of a National Government which has ceased to be their servant, of tolerating regimentation from a sprawling bureaucracy which has ceased to be responsive to their will, of countenancing the extravagances of global planners who have no concern for the welfare of the people here at home; and of listening to the empty promises of false prophets who cry peace when there is no peace and plenty when there is no plenty.

TALMADGE is fully aware of the conflicts ahead in this second session of the 85th Congress. "Every action will have political overtones," he declares.

Senators already are offering many bills to gag Senate debate in that last home of completely free American speech. TALMADGE warns that if such a bill reaches the Senate floor, "A determined filibuster undoubtedly would ensue."

Thus, for the second time in this Congress, Senators have a fight on their hands to preserve unlimited debate. At the last session, conservative members wisely tracked down and killed the most vicious portions of the civil rights bill rather than engage in a futile filibuster which undoubtedly would have brought on a rule allowing debate to be cut off by a simple majority vote, rather than the two-thirds of the total membership now needed. This retained the good will of independent Senators from regions outside the South and cooled off hotheads intent on changing the cloture rule.

Both RUSSELL and TALMADGE won uniform praise for the high level of debate maintained in the bitter fight. The Atlanta Constitution commenting editorially said: "The fact that he (RUSSELL) and Senator TALMADGE were able to delete the vicious section III of the bill * * * was indeed a magnificent victory against overwhelming odds."

Meanwhile, the Atlanta Journal termed the action of both Senators "Victory with Honor," commending both of them for keeping their heads: "They did not sacrifice the section they represent for political opportunism. Commonsense and cool reason saved the field. Earlier victories were preserved. The South won its important points and has strength to fight another day."

In his memorable speech laying bare the dangers of the civil rights bill, TALMADGE expressed a wish as to how history will record the day. Said he, "I, for one, wish history to record that I stood in defense of the rights and liberties of the American people and the sacred Constitution of the American Republic."

Speaking recently in south Georgia, TALMADGE cautioned against any form of racial violence. He is hopeful that wiser heads on the national scene will come to the realization that if this great divisive issue is ever to be resolved it will be settled peacably and voluntarily by responsible leaders within the framework of laws and conditions as they exist in the States directly concerned and affected.

In his first year, TALMADGE quoted such different works on government as The Federalist Papers, obscure laws dating back to Reconstruction, and current national magazines and newspapers. These references point up an important factor in TALMADGE's value as a Senator. He researches any subject completely before he speaks. His staff is constantly busy checking facts.

He engaged Kenneth Turner, an experienced Washington newspaper correspondent, as his administrative assistant when he went to the Capitol. William Burson, a diligent reporter with outstanding wire-service experience, became his executive assistant. Walter Brooks, longtime aid, assists TALMADGE in research and in maintaining his Atlanta office to help his constituents. These three, plus a fine secretarial staff are constantly busy letting the folks back home know.

In keeping with his determination not to lose touch with the people of Georgia, TALMADGE began writing a series of weekly newspaper columns which he distributes to all the papers in his State and is making biweekly filmed television reports on his activities in the Senate.

Perhaps one of the most thorough investigative jobs he and his staff have done is on foreign aid—TALMADGE opposes any gifts which are not reasonably related to the defense of the United States. In his Senate speech on the subject, he made that point abundantly clear while citing several ridiculous examples of how the United States had spent $40 billion in economic aid overseas. His speech brought forth howls of anguish from the bureaucrats in the administration. Next day, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, sought to refute some of the TALMADGE charges. Within the short space of 5 minutes TALMADGE was on his feet citing chapter and verse of substantiating data. He read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copious authority from House and Senate committee findings, International Cooperation Administration reports, national magazines, newspaper and wire-service articles, and from other reliable sources.

Nothing further was heard from Senator GREEN.

As for the effects his foreign-aid views might have on national security, Senator TALMADGE feels: "A militarily impregnable America and an economically invincible America are the world's best and only hopes for peace. If we are to perpetuate our blood-won birthright for ourselves and for our posterity, the welfare of the American people and the solvency, safety, security, and sovereignty of our own country must be our primary concern. It is mine and I shall so vote."

TALMADGE credits Georgia's senior Senator, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, with much of his early Senate success. At a recent appreciation day for RUSSELL in his hometown, Winder, TALMADGE said: "Had Senator RUSSELL been my own father, he could not have been more kind, considerate, and helpful than he was during my first year of service in the Senate."

RUSSELL, himself a former governor, has praised the junior Senator repeatedly. "In my time no man has ever come into the Senate, taken over and handled so ably such difficult assignments, normally given to veterans, as has HERMAN TALMADGE." Many State organizations have applauded them as the best senatorial team in the United States.

HERMAN TALMADGE is a man of the people. He's down to earth. Speaking on the hustings in his senatorial campaign, he promised that, if elected Senator, "I will keep both feet firmly planted on Georgia ground." Thus he immunized himself against an illness commonly known as Potomac fever.

An Atlanta lawyer who went through college with the Senator and has closely observed him since told the writer that in all his business and legal experience in a practice that takes him in many countries, he had never seen anyone with a keener, more incisive mind.

"What does TALMADGE stand for?" you may ask.

The best answer to that question can be found in his Senate campaign platform. He favors curbing jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and minimum qualifications for Federal jurists. He is stanch in upholding State sovereignty and the free enterprise system. He opposes Federal meddling in purely local affairs.

A farmer himself, with a good understanding of agricultural problems, he favors rigid farm-price supports at 90 percent of parity and other legislation designed to aid the farmer achieve a fair share of the national income. He attacks Benson farm policies as "planned depression."

As for national defense, he opposes cuts but would give emphasis to the development of airpower, guided missiles, atomic and other new weapons. He speaks out for strong National Guard and Ready Reserve programs.

He supports a realistic foreign policy based upon the application of practical experience and commonsense. He advocates the Bricker amendment to safeguard the people against "treaty law" and takes a dim view of the status-of-forces agreements which subject American servicemen and their wives to harsh and unusual punishment under foreign laws and in foreign courts.

He accepts the dual responsibility of feeding hungry people and providing every possible means for our military defense. He asks elimination of purely economic foreign aid and demands a careful scrutiny of each military assistance project to insure that taxpayers get something in return for their money. Above all, he demands that the Federal Government cease doing for foreign nations what it does not or is unwilling to do for the people here at home.

Though supporting a favorable balance of trade, he insists that American workers and American industry be protected against cutthroat competition of foreign goods made by slave-wage labor.

In the field of fiscal affairs he calls for a systematic beginning on debt reduction, an end to deficit spending, better budgetary control, a reduction in Federal income tax rates and a halt to further encroachment by the Federal Government on the revenue sources of State and local governments.

And, as a jealous guardian of the rights of the people, TALMADGE stands at the forefront in the fight to preserve the hard-won gains which working men and women have earned in the last quarter century. He seeks a further strengthening of legislation governing public welfare assistance and veterans' benefits to make them more equitable and serviceable to the people.

That is his philosophy—simple, forthright, American. You don't have to guess where he stands on any issue. Anybody who wants to know his opinion on any current subject can find out simply by asking him.

A third party is one of the most controversial subjects in his home State today, but he will declare his outlook on the possibility: Both major parties are seeking the minority votes in other sections of the country and are striving with each other to see who can conduct the most punitive campaign against the South. This action may ultimately drive the Southern States into forming a third party for their own self protection.

TALMADGE opened his campaign for the Senate seat with a plea to the voters for a practically unanimous mandate to go to Congress as their champion in the fight for the restoration of constitutional government. When he got there he opened his civil-rights

speech with this statement: "Mr. President, as I rise to address myself to this bill I can say with full sincerity and in good conscience that I speak for the rank and file of Georgians of every color, race, faith, and national origin."

He wasn't boasting. More than 4 out of every 5 Georgia voters had asked him to speak for them.

---

The emergence of an important new national figure in Washington is always an event. When that man combines, as in the case of HERMAN TALMADGE, political incorruptibility and first-rate brains, the debut becomes a direction marker.

It has long been one of the paradoxes of American politics that, although States rights has all the logic and the force of American tradition, Federal bureaucracy has the most plausible and effective debaters. TALMADGE'S coming to Washington will do much to redress that disbalance. The Nation will hear much of the Georgia newcomer during the disturbed period ahead of us.

Sixty million Americans who live in the Southern States or who share southern viewpoints are today in deep need of articulate, outspoken leadership. Northern mass-circulation magazines and TV and radio networks seem deliberately engaged in building up opportunistic southerners who do not speak for actual southern viewpoints, as the voice of the South. This is spreading confusion and misinformation.

For this reason the appearance of such a refreshing figure as HERMAN TALMADGE on the national stage is a fact for rejoicing. In his first year in the Senate he has shown promise of a great career in Washington. Unfrightened by the smearpots, unaffected by the temptations of the Madison Avenue liberal publicists, TALMADGE goes his way calmly in the Senate, fighting for his convictions as he sees them. America has need of such men.

---

## Security in the Scientific Age

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the second report to the people of America by the President, to which I have referred previously, was made at Oklahoma City on November 13, as follows:

First I want to extend my thanks to the people of Oklahoma for this chance to share in celebrating the 50th anniversary of Oklahoma's statehood. Born in the Lone Star State to your south, and reared in the Sunflower State just to the north, I have tonight a fine feeling of coming home again.

Last week I spoke of science in security; this evening I speak of security in a somewhat wider context.

We live in one of the great ages in the story of mankind.

For millions of people science has removed the burden of backbreaking toil.

For other millions the hope of a good life is being translated into definite promise.

In this wonderful age, we Americans have a special responsibility. We were given a fresh continent and opportunity to work out a modern dream of how men should work together, live together, and govern themselves.

Drawing on all the cultures of the past, and on the rapid growth of science, we worked out a way in which every person can be his own strong competitive self, and at the same time be a dedicated member of a harmonious community.

This week the Soviets are celebrating the 40th anniversary of their revolution. These four decades have seen them change from an agricultural to an industrial nation. We know of their rigorous educational system and their technological achievements.

But we see all this happening under a political philosophy that postpones again and again the promise to each man that he will be allowed to be himself, and to enjoy, according to his own desires, the fruits of his own toil.

We have long had evidence, recently very dramatic evidence, that even under such a system it is possible to produce some remarkable materialistic achievements. When such competence in things material is at the service of leaders who have so little regard for things human, and who command the power of an empire, there is danger ahead for free men everywhere. That, my friends, is the reason why the American people have been so aroused about the earth satellites.

#### WILL MEET CHALLENGE

Of course, free men are meeting and will meet this challenge.

Up to a point, this must be done on the Communists' own terms—outmatching them in military power, general technological advance, and specialized education and research.

But this is not all the story. The real strength with which the self-governing democracies have met the tests of history is something denied to dictatorships.

It is found in the quality of our life, the vigor of our ideals, and the ever-astonishing capacity of free men for voluntary heroism, sacrifice, and accomplishment when the chips are down.

This is the weapon which has meant eventual downfall for every dictator who has made the familiar mistake of thinking all democracies were soft.

It would be a grave error not to take this kind of threat literally. This theme has been Communist doctrine for 100 years.

You will recall that there was once a dictator named Hitler who also said he would bury us. He wrote a long, dull book telling precisely how he was going to do it. Not enough people took him at his word.

We shall not make that mistake again.

International communism has demonstrated repeatedly that its leaders are quite willing to launch aggression by violence upon the territory and people of other countries. They are even more ready to expand by propaganda and subversion, economic penetration and exploitation or by a combination of all three methods.

The free world must be alert to all.

Our military defenses have been largely reshaped over the years since World War II. I assure you, as I did last week, that for the conditions existing today they are both efficient and adequate. But if they are to remain so for the future, their design and power must keep pace with the increasing capabilities that science gives to both an aggressor and a defender. They must continue to perform four main tasks:

1. As a primary deterrent to war, maintain a nuclear retaliatory power of such capacity as to convince the Soviets that any attack on us and our Allies would result, regardless of damage to us, in their own nation's destruction.

2. In cooperation with our allies, provide a force structure so flexible that it can cope quickly with any form of aggression against the free world.

3. Keep our home defenses in a high state of efficiency.

4. Have the reserve strength to meet unforeseen emergency demands.

To provide this kind of defense requires tax money—lots of it. During the last 5 fiscal years we have spent $211 billion on our security—an average of over $42 billion a year—including our own armed services, mutual military aid, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

In my judgment, the Armed Forces and their scientific associates have, on the whole, used this money wisely and well.

Much of it has gone and is going into better and more powerful weapons.

A single B–52 bomber costs $8 million. The B–52 wing costs four times as much as the B–36 wing it replaces.

The Nike missile, which has largely replaced antiaircraft artillery, costs three times as much per battalion.

A new submarine costs $42.5 million—10 times the cost of a World War II submarine.

And so on, for our entire arsenal of weapons.

For some years increasing attention has been focused on the invention, development, and testing of even more advanced weapons for future use. The Defense Department has been spending over $5 billion a year on this kind of research and development.

There has been much discussion lately about whether Soviet technological breakthroughs in particular areas may have suddenly exposed us to immediate increased danger.

#### SOVIET COMPETENCE

As I pointed out last week, this is not the case. But these accomplishments have provided us all with renewed evidence of Soviet competence in science and techniques important to modern warfare. We must, and do, regard this as a time for another critical reexamination of our entire defense position.

The sputniks have inspired a wide variety of suggestions, ranging from acceleration of missile programs, to shooting a rocket around the moon, to an indiscriminate increase in every kind of military and scientific expenditure.

Commonsense demands that we put first things first.

The first of all firsts is our Nation's security.

Over the next 3 weeks I shall be personally making our annual review, with military and civilian authorities, of our national security activities for the coming year. Then, I shall meet the legislative leaders of Congress from both Houses and both parties, for conferences on policies, actions and expenditures.

In the meantime, I ask your sober consideration of some of the actions to which we must give our most urgent attention.

Today a principal deterrent to war is the retaliatory nuclear power of our Strategic Air Command and our Navy. We are adding missile power to these arms and to the Army as rapidly as possible. But it will be some time before either we or the Soviet forces will have a long-range missile capability equal to even a small fraction of the total destructive power of our present bomber force.

To continue, over the years just ahead, to maintain the Strategic Air Command in a state of maximum safety, strength and alert, as new kinds of threats develop, will entail additional costs.

This means accelerating the dispersal of Strategic Air Command to additional bases. This work, which has been going forward for some years, ought now to be speeded up.

Also, with missiles and faster bombers, warning times will grow shorter. Therefore, we have been providing facilities for quicker response to emergency alarm. This, too, should be speeded up—through standby combat crews, more runways, more fueling stations and more housing.

To achieve maximum possible warning of a future attack we must carry on additional improvements throughout our warning line that are now scientifically feasible.

Another need is to develop an active missile defense against missiles. This item is undergoing intensive research and development.

To maintain and increase retaliatory power, we shall be adding long-range missiles, both land and ship based, to our security forces. The technicians tell me that development of the long-range ballistic missile cannot be markedly accelerated by expenditure of more money. We are now spending more than $1 billion a year on their research and testing. But, of course, where needed, additional sums will be provided. Moreover, it is clear that production, deployment, and installation of missiles over the period ahead will be costly.

The military services are underpaid. We must be fair with them. Justice demands this, but also compelling is the factor of efficiency in our defense forces. We cannot obtain and retain the necessary level of technical proficiency unless officers and men, in sufficient numbers, will make the armed services their careers.

SATELLITE PROJECT

Now, let's turn briefly to our satellite projects:

It appears logical that, confronted with the essential requirements I have indicated for defense, we must adopt a clear formula to guide us in deciding what satellite and outer-space activity to undertake.

Certainly there should be two tests in the formula.

If the project is designed for scientific purposes, its size and cost must be tailored to the scientific job it is going to do.

If the project has some ultimate defense value, its urgency for this purpose is to be judged in comparison with the probable value of competing defense projects.

We intend to carry forward our programs in a way that will do credit to our scientific tradition and insure our security over the years ahead. This, again, will involve substantial costs.

Now, all these new costs, which in the aggregate will reach a very considerable figure, must be added to our current annual expenditures for security. There is no immediate prospect for any marked reduction in these recurring costs. Consequently, the first thing is to search for other places to cut expenditures.

We must once more go over military expenditures with redoubled determination to save every dime that can possibly be saved. We must make sure that we have no needless duplication or obsolete programs or facilities.

The answer does not lie in any misguided attempt to eliminate conventional forces and rely solely on retaliation. This course would be completely self-defeating.

And, most emphatically, the answer does not lie in cutting mutual defense funds overseas—another important part of our Nation's security. We are linked with 42 countries by military assistance agreements. We could not possibly station our troops all over the world to prevent the overflow of communism. It is much more economical and vastly more effective to follow and strengthen our system of collective security.

The same applies to economic aid. This kind of assistance helps others keep free of dependence upon Soviet help, which too often is the prelude to Soviet domination. It shows the free world's ability to develop its resources and increase its living standards. It helps allied economies support needed military units and remain sturdy partners in this worldwide struggle.

In the Federal Government's civilian activities, we shall have to make some tough choices.

Some programs, while desirable, are not absolutely essential. In this I have reached a clear conclusion. While some savings may still be squeezed out through the wringer method, savings of the kind we need can come about only through cutting out or deferring entire categories of activity. This will be one of the hardest and most distasteful tasks that the coming session of Congress must face.

By whatever amount savings fail to equal the additional costs of security, our total expenditures will go up. Our people will rightly demand it. They will not sacrifice security worshipping a balanced budget. But we do not forget, either, that over the long term a balanced budget is one indispensable aid in keeping our economy and therefore our total security strong.

MORE THAN MONEY, SECURITY

Now there is much more to the matter of security than spending money. There are also such things as the professional competence of our military leaders, the soundness and productivity of our economy, and above all, the spiritual strength of our Nation.

One thing that money cannot buy is time. Frequently time is a more valuable coin than is money.

It takes time for a tree to grow, for an idea to become an accomplishment, for a student to become a scientist.

Time is a big factor in two longer term problems: Strengthening our scientific education and our basic research.

The Soviet Union now has—in the combined category of scientists and engineers—a greater number than the United States. And the Soviets are producing graduates in these fields at a much faster rate.

Recent studies of the educational standards of the Soviet Union show that this gain in quantity can no longer be considered offset by lack of quality.

This trend is disturbing. Indeed, according to my scientific advisers, this is for the American people the most critical problem of all.

The Federal Government can deal with only part of this difficulty, but it must do its part. The task is a cooperative one.

Federal, State and local governments, and our entire citizenry must all do their share.

We should, among other things, have a system of nationwide testing of high school students; a system of incentives for high-aptitude students to pursue scientific or professional studies; a program to stimulate good-quality teaching of mathematics and science; provision of more laboratory facilities; and measures, including fellowships, to increase the output of qualified teachers.

The biggest part of the task is in the hands of you, as citizens. This is National Education Week. No matter how good your school is—and we have many excellent ones—I wish that every school board and every PTA would this week and this year make one single project their special order of business: to scrutinize your schools' curriculum and standards to see whether they meet the stern demands of the era we are entering.

As you do, remember that when a Russian graduates from high school he has had 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 1 year of astronomy, 5 years of biology, 10 years of mathematics through trigonometry, and 5 years of a foreign language.

You know, I think that many of us have been a little slow in realizing that it is possible for almost everybody to share in science and engineering as an adventure. If we start early enough in school with mathematics, and chemistry, and physics, and botany, and if our teachers can make our young pupils see the real satisfaction in working at science, then our young people, even if they do not become scientists or engineers, will experience a real excitement out of growing America.

Young people now in college must be equipped to live in the age of intercontinental ballistic missiles. However, what will then be needed is not just engineers and scientists, but a people who will keep their heads and, in every field, leaders who can meet intricate human problems with wisdom and courage. In short, we shall need not only Einsteins, but Washingtons, and Emersons.

Another long-term concern is for even greater concentration on basic research—that is, the kind that unlocks the secrets of nature and prepares the way for such great breakthroughs as atomic fission, electronics, and antibiotics.

At present, our basic research, compared with any other country's, is considerably greater in quantity and certainly equal in quality.

The world will witness future discoveries even more startling than the discovery of nuclear fission. Will we be the ones to make them?

WISE INVESTMENT NEEDED

Here again, money cannot do everything. You cannot say to a research worker, "Your salary is tripled; now produce three times as many basic discoveries."

But wise investment in such facilities as laboratories and high-energy accelerators can greatly increase the efficiency of our scientists.

The Government is stepping up its basic research programs. But, with 70 percent of research expenditure, the biggest share of the job is in the hands of industry and private organizations.

Right here in Oklahoma you have established a superb mechanism for the mobilization of needed resources to strengthen our pursuit of basic scientific knowledge. It is the frontier of science foundation. You have reason to be proud of it. I hope other States will follow your example.

One final word. The goal we seek is peace with justice. This can come to our Nation only as it comes to all. The world's hope is that the Soviets will cooperate with all the rest of us in achieving this goal. Our defense effort, large as it is, goes only far enough to deter and defeat attack.

We will never be an aggressor. We want adequate security. We want no more than adequacy. We will accept nothing less.

It has always been my faith that eventual triumph of decency and freedom in this world is inevitable.

But, as a wise American once observed, it takes a lot of hard work and sacrifice by a lot of people to bring about the inevitable.

---

## Submerged Oil Land Profits Urged for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which provides a fund of more than $6 billion of nontax revenue for educational purposes. The bill amends Public Law 212, 83d Congress, which gave the Federal Government jurisdiction over the submerged oil properties along the coasts of the Gulf of Mexico and of the Pacific. My bill provides that all money received by the United States Government from the lease of these oil lands are to be used as grants-in-aid for education.

I have been advised by the Department of the Interior that already $338,531,728 has accrued to the Federal Treasury from the development of the offshore oil lands. This includes the amounts paid for drilling rights, rents, and royalties. I understand that $1 million is now coming in every month and the Department of the Interior is predicting that the revenues will eventually exceed $6 billion. This $338 million that has already come into the Treasury and the revenues that will follow should be earmarked and used to support elementary, secondary, and higher education in this country.

I want to emphasize that the money would be provided by revenue from the Nation's undersea oil and gas found in our offshore deposits and not from our already burdened taxpayers. The money would be used for financial relief for our elementary and secondary schools; to provide for more and better paid and better trained teachers, and to build desperately needed classrooms. The bill is also designed to relieve financial difficulties of our colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools, scientific and technological schools, and research institutions with scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. The measure provides not only for scientific, engineering, and mathematical training, but also training in the humanities.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would create an Advisory Council on Education for National Security to draw a plan for the allocation of the educational grants. This Advisory Council would be composed of 12 persons appointed by the President with regard to their experience in the relationship of education to national defense and national security. Six of the members of the Council must be from the fields of education and research in the natural and social sciences. The Council would be required to allocate grants to meet not only the immediate but also long-range requirements of education relating to national defense and national security.

I am sure that every Member of Congress is conscious of the fact that our education system today faces the greatest crisis in history. The measures which we have taken to meet this crisis have not been adequate. Our schools are certainly inadequate in number and are suffering from progressive dilapidation. The school population is increasing at an overwhelming rate. Our elementary grades are filled to overflowing and the war babies are now overrunning our high schools.

We all know that our underpaid teachers are leaving their professions by the thousands for employment that will enable them to maintain themselves and their families in accordance with reasonable living standards. Because of the low prospective salaries, few people are in training to become teachers. We must prevent this exodus. It seems to me that there are at least two essential conditions for attracting and holding able teachers. First, the prestige and status of teaching must be comparable to other professions in the eyes of the community, the teachers themselves, and the able young people who are choosing careers. Secondly, the salary structure must be high enough and flexible enough to compete effectively with other fields bidding for quality manpower. Teaching must be made a financially comfortable profession. My proposal if enacted into law would give our teachers the recognition and financial security they deserve.

We are likewise facing a critical situation in the field of higher education. Almost twice as many babies were born in the United States in 1956 as in 1936. Yet these born in the late thirties are already straining our post-high-school educational resources to the limit of capacity. In the next 15 years the number of young people between the ages of 18 and 24 will rise by more than 10 million. The percent of high-school graduates entering college is steadily increasing. Enrollments in colleges and universities have increased from 1.1 million in 1930 to nearly 3.2 million in 1956. By 1970 enrollments in institutions of higher education are expected to double, and may go higher. Nearly all of our colleges are in financial trouble. This is occurring when the Nation's future strength and security demands the training of more scientific and professional manpower—more scientists, more engineers, more physicists, more chemists, more doctors, more business and professional leaders, more agriculturists, and more skilled workers. This condition must be changed. My bill would meet this challenge without imposing one additional dollar on the tax burden of our already heavily taxed citizens or on our heavily taxed communities in the 48 States.

This whole idea of dedicating Federal land resources to the support of education is one of the oldest and wisest of our national policies. As you know, the ordinances of 1783 and 1787, the Morrill Act of 1862, and other laws, taken together, have dedicated millions of acres of public lands for the establishment and operation of educational institutions, at all levels. And the Nation has derived immense benefits from these Federal land grants for educational purposes.

Mr. Speaker, our main objective is to build a world in which all men may live together in peace. But, if we are to build the peace, we must first be able to survive. We know that our ability to survive in this era of aggression rests upon our ability to marshal superior brainpower against the brawn of overwhelming numbers. And our edge is slipping away as our education system falls further and further behind in the quality and quantity of its product while Russia is pushing her educational efforts to unprecedented heights. One field in which this is clearly apparent is that of the training of engineers and scientists. Russia's victory in the race into space confirms this fact.

With these facts in mind I do hope the Congress will enact my bill into law at the earliest possible moment, as I feel that the nontax revenues from the development of the resources of our outer Continental Shelf can contribute importantly to meeting the needs of American education and to building the strength and security of our Nation. I am firmly convinced that the development of every American boy and girl to the fullest extent of his or her capabilities will add overwhelmingly to the strength of our democracy.

---

## Correcting the Inequities in Our Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 9, 1958*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today it was my privilege to appear before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of legislation which I have introduced and which I believe will help remove the blatant inequities in our tax structure. Following is my testimony before the committee in support of my bill:

Mr. MILLS. The first witness this morning is our friend, the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, a Member of Congress from New York. Mr. MULTER, although we know you quite well and favorably, for the purposes of the record will you please give your name and your address and the capacity in which you appear.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am ABRAHAM J. MULTER, a Member of the House of Representatives from the 13th District of New York.

I appear this morning as a Member of the House who is very much interested in the legislation you are considering, and I would like to address you briefly in support of several bills I have introduced on the subject. Before I conclude, however, I would like to indicate generally my support of bills that have been introduced by other Members.

Mr. Chairman, will you permit me to take a moment to extend my hearty congratulations to the new chairman of this committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, and to extend to him my very best wishes for what I know will be an extension of his very able and distinguished service. At the same time permit me to echo the beautiful sentiments that he and our other colleagues expressed upon the grievous loss that all of us sustained by the death of our very good friend and colleague, the Honorable Jere Cooper.

I welcome this opportunity to discuss before your committee various proposals for revising the internal-revenue laws. These proposals are presented in the interest of helping your committee achieve its goal of revising the tax laws in order to obtain a revenue system which is fairer and more equitable.

I have a prepared statement, copies of which have been submitted to your clerk for distribution among the members. If you believe it will save time, I will submit the statement for your record and then briefly summarize each of the proposals that I have advocated in my formal statement.

Mr. MILLS. Without objection, your statement will appear in the record at this point.

(The statement is as follows:)

"STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, JANUARY 9, 1958

"Mr. Chairman and members of the distinguished House Ways and Means Committee, before proceeding with my statement, permit me to take a moment to extend my very hearty congratulations to the new chairman of this committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, and to extend to him my very best wishes for what I know will be an extension of his very able and distinguished service.

"At the same time, permit me to echo the beautiful sentiments that he and our other colleagues expressed upon the grievous loss we all have sustained by the death of our very good friend and colleague, the Honorable Jere Cooper.

"I welcome this opportunity to discuss before your committee various proposals for revising the internal revenue laws. These proposals are presented in the interest of helping your committee achieve its goal of revising the tax laws in order to obtain a revenue system which is fairer and more equitable. I will discuss separately each of my proposals, and conclude with a brief summary of them.

*"Removal of tax exemption of interest on certain local bonds, H. R. 801*

"In connection with tax-exempt municipal bonds, let me turn to a section of our tax laws which has led to abuse by certain local governments. The practice to which I refer is that the local governments issuing tax-exempt municipal revenue bonds, which are used to finance building of industrial plants, and which do not pledge the full faith and credit of the issuing authority for the payment of principal and interest.

"Although the principle of State sovereignty may be sufficient justification to allow tax exemption of State and local bonds, I believe the practice of some of these governments is perverting this principle. The exemption is unfair to private business which must provide its own capital, its own tax-paying plant, etc., in competition with a plant provided by government which can make up its losses through taxation and is exempt from local taxes. The widespread use of this device to attract relocation of industry from other States into their own local areas could result in the deterioration or destruction of established industrial areas.

"On several earlier occasions the State and local governments have gotten into financial difficulty by attempting to promote industry in this way. Such a difficulty was experienced as a result of the post-Civil War subsidies to railroads financed through State and local bonds. Another was the experience of municipalities in loaning credit for real estate development in the 1920's. Default on such bonds dangerously impairs the credit of municipalities concerned.

"Permit me to make clear that my bill does not seek to take away tax exemption from all State and local bonds. It is directed only against bonds issued in connection with private enterprise which is privately owned and which is not secured by the general credit of the issuing governmental unit. Today, many localities are issuing bonds for private purposes without pledging governmental credit in connection therewith. The only obligation of the locality in connection with those bonds is to pay to the bondholders principal and interest only as, if, and when the principal and interest is paid to the locality by the private enterprise. This is an evasion, if not an actual perversion, of the intent of the law.

*"Liberalization of the deduction for child-care expenses, H. R. 802*

"When the tax laws were completely revised in 1954, some recognition was given the working women and working widowers who incurred expenses for the care of a child while working. That liberalization of the law allows the working parent to deduct up to $600 a year for child-care expenses if they are incurred to allow the parent to work. Expenses in excess of $600 are not allowed. This limitation is imposed regardless of the number of dependents for whom the child care is furnished. A widow who has 3 children under 12 years of age is limited to a deduction of only $11.54 a week. In many cases that may only amount to one-third of the cost of caring for the children. Even worse is the fact that an $11.54 deduction will amount to a tax saving of less than $3 a week. I propose that the limitation to the deduction be more realistically set at $2,500 or 50 percent of the working parent's income from salaries or wages or from a trade or business, whichever is less.

*"Tax-exemption of compensation of Armed Forces serving outside the United States, H. R. 803*

"Many of our young men are making great sacrifices by protecting our military interests outside the continental United States. They are separated from their families for extended periods of time while they serve their country. Some recognition should be given them by exempting part of their income from taxation. Specifically, I propose that up to $2,000 of compensation received by members of the United States Armed Forces for services performed outside the United States should be exempt from taxation.

"It doesn't seem fair when we consider that a civilian employed by private industry who works overseas pays no Federal income tax on his salary, up to $20,000 a year, if he remains in that foreign country for a period of 17 months out of 18; but a member of the Armed Forces, whose earnings are usually much less than civilians employed overseas, must pay tax on his income. I realize that for part of the time since 1950 compensation to the Armed Forces in a combat zone was tax-exempt. This bill would extend this principle to all overseas service of the Armed Forces.

*"Exclusion of interest on veterans loans bearing no more than 3½ percent interest, H. R. 804*

"It is a generally known fact that the veteran home-loan program has been on a decline for some time. Few people would quarrel with the statement that a basic reason for this decline is that lenders are not willing to loan at the rate of 4½ percent interest. In many cases lenders' margin of profit on loans at this rate would be too low to maintain a sound financial business.

"If we are going to assure the veterans that they will be able to derive the benefits which were designed for them through legislation which set up the home-loan guaranty program, we must provide to the financial institution some incentive to lend money to veterans at a low rate of interest. An incentive could be created by allowing tax-exemption to the lenders on the interest earned on these loans. However, with this liberal treatment of the interest, I believe that we should expect many financial institutions to lend at 3½ percent interest and still make an adequate profit on operations. Therefore, I would restrict the tax exemption to loans which bear interest at a rate which does not exceed 3½ percent.

"This bill is identical in form to that which was introduced by our very distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. KEOGH, who is also an able and active member of this important committee.

*"Restrictions on markings, etc., on mail to taxpayers, H. R. 805*

"This proposal, which I shall now outline, will not affect the revenues of the Government nor change our basic tax structure, but will assure the taxpayer that the personal nature of his income or tax liability will not be violated through correspondence sent to the taxpayer by the Government. My proposal specifically provides that communications relating to the income tax which are mailed to the taxpayer shall not bear on the outer covering any markings which would disclose information concerning the taxpayer's income or tax liability. This will eliminate, for example, any possibility of duplicating our experience several years ago in regard to the income tax returns mailed to the taxpayers. These returns were mailed in a package which bore various colored stripes on the outside. These colors indicated generally the income level of the taxpayer. Although this was innocently done by the Internal Revenue Service for processing control purposes, it shows how certain undesirable features can creep into our tax system inadvertently. This is the type of occurrence that my proposal will prevent in the future.

"The fact that the Internal Revenue Service has discontinued this obnoxious practice should not deter you from writing into the tax law the prohibition contemplated by my bill. It has been done once, it may be done again, and the Congress should make certain that there will be no repetition.

*"Statement of transportation charge and tax to be furnished by the seller of property to the purchaser, H. R. 806*

"This proposal for tax revision is concerned with transactions in which the seller of property collects from the purchaser charges for transportation of the property and the tax thereon. In such a case I propose that the Internal Revenue Code be revised so as to require the seller to furnish the purchaser a statement showing the amount of transportation charges subject to the transportation tax and also the amount of tax imposed. Special provisions should be made to enable the buyer of the property to collect treble damages if the seller charges him more than the actual transportation costs plus tax. The Federal Government may sue for treble amount plus $500 costs if the buyer does not do so within 2 years.

*"Exemption of pension payments received by retired United States Government employees, H. R. 807*

"It has long been believed that most people should retire at 65 years of age. However, every day more and more people eligible for retirement refuse to quit because they find that their pension will be inadequate to live on. Especially is this true for the Government employee who finds that his small annuity is further reduced by income taxes.

"Anyone who retires on a pension or annuity of $3,000, $4,000, or $5,000 will usually be forced to live on an income considerably less than his former income. Steadily rising living costs and the depreciation of the dollar will make life in the late years of life an even more unpleasant prospect. Therefore, the Government should not place further obstacles in the way by taxing the small income of these people during the declining years of their lives when their expenses are especially high. Rather, the Government should encourage its people to retire and take steps to insure financial independence in their old age. Exemption of Government employees' pension payments from the income tax will provide a long step in the right direction.

"I do not urge here that the Congress should restore to all annuitants the same purchasing power they once had, but it can and should allow them the same tax benefits that it allows others who draw pensions from the Federal Treasury. For example, pensions paid under the railroad-retirement and social-security programs are exempt from all Federal income taxes. As an illustration of how this discriminates against the retired Federal Government employee, I call

attention to the fact that while a retired railway worker enjoys this tax relief for his pension, the retired railway postal employee who may have worked right beside him, enjoys no such relief. This discrimination cannot be justified. Therefore, my proposal is introduced to promote equity where there is need for it.

*"Tax deduction for certain educational expenditures, H. R. 808*

"In recent months we have been hearing increasingly alarming discussions of our failure to compete with the Soviets in the training of scientists and engineers. Not only do we face a continuing shortage in these fields, but we face possible deterioration of education in other fields, including the humanities and the teaching profession—fields which a cultured country like ours cannot neglect. This crisis calls for an improvement in the financial condition of our educational system.

"At the present time, over half of the qualified high-school graduates are not enrolling in college. Although various reasons contribute to the failure of some of these high-school graduates to enter college, the majority of them are held back by a lack of funds.

"Most parents, unless they are in a very high income class, know only too well the financial drain and burden of the cost of sending their children to college. The average cost of sending a child to college today is estimated at about $1,500 a year. This means that an expenditure of about $6,000 is necessary to provide one child a 4-year college education. Still worse, the taxpayer must earmark an even greater amount of gross earnings for this purpose, because this $6,000 must come from income after taxes. How then can we expect parents to send their children to school when we realize that the average family income is only about $5,000 a year? Some of these parents of average family income may be able to save, through self-sacrifice, enough in a lifetime to send one child through college, but how about the parent who has more than one child?

"That is why I believe we should allow a deduction to parents for educational expenses incurred, in excess of the $600 personal exemption (or the $800 as I propose in my bill, H. R. 809), for children they are sending to a college or university. That certainly is not giving a taxpayer something for nothing, but rather extending a helping hand to some parent who is trying to give his child an education to enable him to compete in the world and to contribute his share to our advancement of knowledge, whether it be in the sciences, in business, or in teaching.

"For the average taxpayer who earns $5,000 and spends $1,500 a year on his son's college education, the Treasury would lose $180 for the year if personal exemptions remain at $600 and only $140 if the personal exemptions are raised to $800. This temporary loss in revenue will be more than offset by taxation of higher earnings of the child later in life and by the enhanced contribution he or she will make to our scientific and cultural advancement.

*"Increase in personal exemptions, H. R. 809*

"An increase in the present $600 deduction allowed for personal exemptions would add considerably to the degree of fairness and equity of our tax system. The Federal income tax has long been recognized as potentially the fairest tax to impose, because with its progressivity features the burden of taxes is placed in accordance with the taxpayer's financial ability to pay the taxes. However, when personal exemptions are so low that the burden of taxation falls upon persons whose incomes are below a level capable of supporting a minimum standard of living, the tax ceases to be fairly imposed.

"The results of a survey conducted about 6 years ago by the United States Department of Labor showed that an urban family of 4 required from $3,812 to $4,454 to maintain an adequate standard of living. With an increased cost of living since that time, that income must be considered inadequate today. Nevertheless, our income tax begins to operate on incomes far below these levels. For example, before the family of 4 reaches an income of $75 a week the Government takes a cut. In fact, this family, with average deductions, pays the Government $222 a year in income taxes. A tax structure which imposes such a burden on a family with less than $4,000 a year income certainly is not in accordance with financial capacity.

"The situation is even more acute when we realize that the same family must pay a proportion of his income in other Federal, State, and local taxes.

"Besides benefiting the low-income groups the increase in personal exemptions will have a beneficial effect on the Government and the general economy. By releasing millions of low-income taxpayers from the tax rolls, administrative work in the Internal Revenue Service will be reduced and a number of employees who would otherwise process these returns will be able to devote more time to the returns based on the large incomes.

"The general economy will be benefited because a large part of the tax savings to individuals will go into the hands of the income groups who spend virtually all of their income. This additional spending by these groups will stimulate the economy generally and help those segments of the economy which are burdened by excess inventories—thereby alleviating one of the prime causes of a recession or depression. With the present slackening in the economy, this stimulation would unquestionably be timely.

"The argument that millions of Americans will no longer feel that they have a personal interest in their country's Government unless they pay a tax dissolves in the light of realism. The American people are profoundly patriotic. They are aware of the purpose of their Government, the needs of their Government, and that neither can be fulfilled without tax money. Furthermore, even with such a waiver of income-tax payments to the Federal Government, they will still be bearing their share of other taxes levied on all levels. For the great majority of these people, this will mean more than just a removal from the tax rolls. It will be an opportunity to acquire a few more of the necessities of life.

"As a final point, I wish to state that we must not consider the savings to the individuals as a result of this increase in personal exemptions as an equivalent loss in revenue to the Treasury. As a result of additional spending created by these savings to individuals, more business and jobs will be created, thereby increasing the base on which the existing taxes can be imposed. This will prove beneficial to the Treasury.

*"Tax-exemption of interest on series E bonds, H. R. 2481*

"In the face of a decline in individuals' holdings of series E bonds largely as a result of a high rate of redemption of the bonds, the Congress increased the interest rates on series E bonds in April 1957. The new interest rate on the bonds held to maturity was raised to 3¼ percent. Now, contrast that yield with the nearly 4-percent rate on large blocks of refunding issues of United States marketable securities last year (1957). Or contrast it with the 4½-percent yield on prime corporate bonds. Furthermore, the interest rate on these series E bonds is less than that on many of the State and local bonds, on which the interest is tax exempt. The average interest yield of a representative group of tax-exempt State and local bonds in November 1957 was about 3¾ percent. Savings in many of the savings and loan associations are earning 4 percent interest and more.

"We cannot expect that the sales of series E bonds will be able to compete with other tax-exempt bonds yielding as much or more than the series E bonds, or with other Government securities yielding in many cases 4 percent, or with other higher yielding forms of investment or saving. We must give some incentive to potential purchasers of these bonds if we expect them to hold on to the bonds. One very effective way to do this would be to allow the taxpayer a tax exemption on the interest earned on the bonds.

"I would suggest, however, that if the bonds are redeemed prior to maturity date, the interest would be taxable. This would reduce the high rate of redemption of series E bonds and save the Treasury Department millions of dollars through reduction of clerical work and costs of printing the bonds and through reduced payments to the banks for their handling costs.

"The members of this committee may recall that when you were considering legislation on this subject, I testified urging a higher interest rate on series E bonds than was advocated by the Secretary of the Treasury. This committee in its judgment followed the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"I am in the unhappy position of being able to say to you today, 'I told you so.' I predicted that the increase of interest rate advocated by the Secretary of the Treasury would not increase the sale of E-bonds and would not be a sufficient incentive to cause the holders of those bonds to retain them rather than cash them in. At that time, the redemption of E-bonds was exceeding the amount of sales. Since the increase in the interest rate, the situation has gotten worse and today the redemption of E-bonds is far greater, both in aggregate amount and in percentage, than it was prior to the increase of rates, and it is even far greater today than it was then, in relation to the sale of E-bonds.

"The one thing all economists agree upon is that savings are the greatest bulwark against inflation. Historically, Government savings bonds always paid an interest rate higher than otherwise available to the prospective saver. That was the incentive which caused millions of Americans to put their money into savings bonds and to leave it there. If we expect the American people to resume that type of saving, the Congress must give them the incentive. In my opinion, one of the best means of accomplishing that purpose is to grant tax exemption to those earnings, if the bonds are held until maturity.

*"Tax relief for small business, H. R. 5631*

"My final suggestion might easily be considered the most important.

"In the light of the current rate of failures of small business and the general slump in our economy, there is great urgency that the inequitable burden of taxation presently levied on small businesses be mitigated.

"This conclusion emerges from studies conducted by the Small Business Committees of both Houses of Congress. I am certain that the experience of the members of this committee is no different from that of the members of the House Small Business Committee on which it has been my pleasure to serve for many years. Our committee has received considerable testimony on this subject. We have been in every part of the country. The cry is persistent and gets stronger and stronger for this relief. The testimony indicating its requirement is overwhelming.

"On November 22, 1957, our committee met in executive session in Washington and again considered this important subject. There was almost a full attendance at that meeting and after we arrived at our decision the absentees were contacted and they, too, agreed to our determination. I can

therefore say to this committee that it was, and I believe it still is, the unanimous opinion of the House Small Business Committee that this Congress enact legislation granting tax relief to small business.

"It was further agreed at that time that we would try to work out a bill which every member of the committee would support, taking as a basis for our consideration H. R. 5631, introduced by the ranking minority member of our committee, the Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL, of Colorado. The final draft of that bill has not yet been submitted. I, for one, and I believe most, if not all, of my Democratic colleagues on that committee are prepared to support Mr. HILL's bill, H. R. 5631, and urge its enactment. The Hill bill went a little further than the recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee. If we can't get the Hill bill, then I urge as a minimum the recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee. It is unimportant whose recommendations we take or follow. What is important is that small business looks to us for relief, without which it cannot survive.

"This tax relief will not only right an unfair tax structure, it will reinvigorate competition and strengthen our free enterprise system. It constitutes one positive step in halting the present trend toward giantism in our economy.

*"Summary*

"In conclusion I would like to summarize the various proposals I have made here today in the interest of a more equitable income-tax structure for the American taxpayers:

"1. Deny exemption to interest on State and local bonds issued in connection with acquisition, etc., of property which is operated by a nonpublic enterprise if the obligation is not secured by the general credit of the governmental unit issuing it. H. R. 801.

"2. Liberalize the tax deduction allowed a woman or a widower for the care of dependent children to enable the parent to work. The present limitation of $600 deduction should be increased to $2,500 or 50 percent of the income of the taxpayer, whichever is lower. H. R. 802.

"3. Exempt from taxation the first $2,000 of compensation received by members of the United States Armed Forces for active services performed outside the continental United States. H. R. 803.

"4. Exclude from gross income the interest on veterans loans on which the interest does not exceed 3½ percent. H. R. 804.

"5. Prohibit any markings, etc., on communications relating to income tax which are mailed to a taxpayer which disclose information concerning the income or tax liability of the taxpayer. H. R. 805.

"6. Require seller of property to furnish purchaser a statement of transportation charge and tax sought to be collected by seller. H. R. 806.

"7. Exempt from income tax, the retirement, annuity, and pension payments by the United States Government to its employees. H. R. 807.

"8. Allow a deduction by the taxpayer for expenses incurred on behalf of a dependent for educational expenses while attending a college or university. The expenses should be deductible to the extent they exceed the personal exemption allowed the taxpayer on behalf of the dependent. H. R. 808.

"9. Increase from $600 to $800 the personal exemptions allowed the taxpayer for himself, his spouse, and dependents. H. R. 809.

"10. Exclude from taxable income the interest on all series E bonds held to maturity. H. R. 2481.

"11. Grant tax relief to small business in order to minimize his tax burdens and give him a fairer opportunity to compete with big business. H. R. 5631.

"Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before your committee and give you my views on this important legislation."

Mr. MULTER. The bills that I refer to, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, are not necessarily in the order of their importance but for convenience in the order in which they have been introduced and numbered consecutively by bill number.

The first of these bills is H. R. 801. That bill seeks to deny exemption to interest on State and local bonds issued in connection with the acquisition of property which is operated for a nonpublic purpose by a nonpublic enterprise. It is limited to those instances where the credit of the State or municipality is not pledged for the payment of the principal or the interest.

I know this committee has considered this problem once before, and on representations that it was likely to interfere with the issuance of bonds of public authorities, that provision was eliminated from the bill that was being considered at that time.

I would like to make clear that this bill is not intended to affect any public purpose, or any authority, agency, State, or locality. It is intended solely to eliminate the tax exemption feature of a bond, which is issued as a bond in form only, of a municipality or locality, and which is not actually a bond for municipal purposes.

There are many instances throughout the country where bonds are being issued presumably guaranteed by the municipality and thus get tax exemption. The obligation of the municipality is limited to collecting and paying whatever it may receive. In other words, they will bring a commercial enterprise into the community and in order to bring the enterprise in they will underwrite the bond of the private enterprise, but only to the extent of undertaking to be the collector of the amortization and interest as, if and when the private enterprise may earn it and pay it to the municipality, and then they pay it over to the bondholders. That is an evasion of the intent of the law, I think, rather than in accordance with the intent of Congress.

Mr. FORAND. I believe what you are referring to are these cases where some of the States have been luring some of our textile plants out of New England.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORAND. And I understand your problem and I agree with you.

Mr. MULTER. It is happening throughout the country where industry is lured into a community and the general public is given the idea that they are buying a municipal bond, when, in fact, they are buying nothing but a bond which provides that if and when something is paid to the municipality, it will be paid over to the bondholder.

The second of the bills I will refer to is H. R. 802. There I seek to liberalize the tax deduction allowed a woman or a widower for the care of dependent children, money spent in order to enable the parent to work. Now, you have already covered that by granting a $600 deduction by present law. I seek to increase that.

Mr. REED. May I ask a question there? I was going to interrupt a little earlier when you were speaking about your industries moving from the North to the South. It will not be long before they will be luring the industries from the South into the foreign countries, on account of the labor differentials and many other advantages. I just want to bring that in, because just as sure as I sit here that will be done.

Mr. MULTER. What you say, sir, is true.

I think the second of the bills I referred to needs no further explanation. I urge that the $600 deduction now allowed to a widow or widower where they must bring in help to take care of small children, minor children, while they seek a livelihood for themselves and the children, should be increased so as to be made a realistic sum more commensurate with what they must actually pay. I believe you will all agree it is impossible to employ a caretaker for children for $600 a year. That deduction is hardly enough to take care of the item which must be paid out by the widow or widower who must work to support and maintain the home for himself or herself and their children.

The third of my bills is 803, and there I seek to grant exemption from taxation for the first $2,000 of compensation received by members of the Armed Forces while serving abroad. I think that you will agree that it is quite unfair that a businessman can go abroad and if he stays abroad for 17 out of 18 months, his earnings outside of the country are tax exempt, while the member of the Armed Forces, who we send and who has no choice as to where he will go, does not have that same advantage. The advantage to the businessman is limited to $20,000. My bill is much more modest. It exempts only the first $2,000.

H. R. 804 seeks to exclude from gross income the interest on veterans' loans on which the interest does not exceed 3½ percent. Our very distinguished colleague [Mr. KEOGH] joined me in introducing that bill in the last Congress, and we introduced it again in this Congress. The purpose is to give an incentive to mortgage lenders to make more loans to the veterans. The loss in revenue will be very small.

If we enact a bill such as this, the veteran will get the benefit of a 3½ percent interest mortgage, and a lender will make it because the income of that 3½ percent would be tax exempt. Now, I do not suggest that if the veterans' mortgage bears 4 or 4½ or more percent that you then exempt the first 3½ percent. I say if he makes a 3½ percent mortgage, then that income should be tax exempt. The lenders can thrive with that net income, and at the same time we can bring back into the mortgage market a goodly sum that is needed. The veterans, more than anyone else, are suffering by lack of mortgage money, by being deprived of the opportunity to buy homes.

This, I think, would go a long way toward bringing more money into the mortgage market for veterans, and it would not cost the Government much money.

Next is 805. You might think that is no longer necessary. It would prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from placing any markings on envelopes addressed to taxpayers. You will remember that entirely in good faith 2 years ago, the Internal Revenue Service put markings on the envelopes which indicated what the average income of the taxpayer was who was receiving that communication from the department. There was quite a rumpus raised by Members of the House and of the Senate and the Internal Revenue Service stopped doing that. Because they stopped doing it, does not mean that somebody in the future in the same department may not come up with that bright idea again. So I say let us be sure that there is no repetition of that and write into the internal-revenue law a provision prohibiting any such markings on any communication from the department to the taxpayer which would indicate anything about the contents of the envelope or the nature of his income or the amount thereof.

H. R. 806. I believe, you have considered at a prior hearing. That concerns the transportation tax. This bill would require anyone seeking to collect the transportation tax to give a statement thereof to the person from whom they collect that transportation tax. As you probably know, today the railroads will collect the tax in some instances, but in many instances the burden is on the seller of the goods to collect the tax and remit it to the Government, and as often

as not, they make a charge in excess of the tax to be paid and retain the difference.

This bill would require them to deliver a statement of the charge of the tax to be collected to the person from whom they are collecting it. If they don't pay that tax to the Government, or don't pay the whole tax, it provides a remedy by which either the taxpayer or the Government can collect the difference, with a penalty, so as to stop this practice where they are charging the public sums that are not actually taxes but collecting it as though it were a tax and not paying it to the Federal Government.

H. R. 807 would exempt from income tax the retirement annuity and pension payment by the United States Government to its employees. We have this situation today: A man who is in the railroad retirement system, when he retires, receives his annuities and pension money free of tax, but the man working side by side as an employee of the Post Office Department in the Railway Mail Service doing almost the same kind of work, when he retires, because he is in the United States Government pension system, his pension is subject to tax. I think that inequity should be removed by granting him the same kind of tax exemption as we do to the others.

H. R. 808 would allow a deduction by the taxpayer for expenses incurred on behalf of a dependent for educational expenses while attending a college or university. The expenses, I say, should be deductible to the extent that they exceed the personal exemption now allowed the taxpayer on behalf of the dependent.

As you know, we now allow them $600. I am sure all of you have had the experience and have the knowledge that you could not send a boy or girl to college today for $600 a year. The Library of Congress tells me the average is $1,500 a year. From my own experience, it is closer to $2,500 a year. I think that you will agree that this tax deduction should be made more realistic and should be a sum more equal to the amount that is required to be paid. If we do that, I think we can make possible the financial aid that these boys and girls need in order to be able to attend our colleges and universities.

H. R. 809 would increase the personal tax exemptions of all of our taxpayers from $600 to $800. I don't think that I need to elaborate upon that. A tax deduction if it is possible at all, I think, ought to start with increasing the personal exemptions of all of our taxpayers. That will apply to them all, rich and poor alike.

H. R. 2481 would exclude from taxable income the interest on all series E bonds held to maturity. I am sure the members of this distinguished committee will remember that when the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before it last year, in support of authority to increase the interest rate on E-bonds, I, too, appeared. I said to you then that the increase in rate which he was advocating was not realistic; that it would not bring about the desired result of getting more people to buy and to hold their E-bonds.

The history since has shown that he was wrong and I was right, I am sorry to say. At that time E-bonds were being cashed in to a much larger extent than E-bonds were being sold. Despite the slight increase of the interest rate on the E-bonds, the amount of redemption has continued to increase and in comparison to the sales of E-bonds, it has far exceeded the amount that we are selling. Most economists agree that the strongest bulwark against inflation is savings, and savings that will be put away and kept in the savings accounts—the purpose of the E-bond is just that. It is to get the man or woman to put his or her money into savings and retain them there for 10 years or more.

Mr. MASON. What rate of interest do you suggest?

Mr. MULTER. I am suggesting that we do not increase the interest rate but that we give tax exemption to the interest earned, provided that the bond is retained until maturity. I think that would be a great incentive to these people to hold their bonds and to buy more of them. Traditionally, our E-bonds always paid a larger rate of interest than savings accounts and other bonds. That was done in order to give the taxpayer or the citizen an incentive to put his money into these bonds and keep it there.

Today your E-bond is paying less than other bonds, less than Government bonds, less than tax-exempt bonds, and less than one can get from savings accounts. There are savings and loan associations and savings banks throughout the country that are paying 4 and 4½ percent interest, and the money can be withdrawn at any time on demand. Why should an American citizen put his money into an E-bond and immobilize it for 10 years, and then get the 3¼ percent, when he can put it into a bank and hold it there or take it out at any time he wants to, with 4 or 4½ percent interest as it accrues?

If we give them this additional incentive, I think there will be more bonds sold and more bonds will be retained.

Now finally, and this might very well be the most important part of my presentation, that is the granting of tax relief to small business. You have already heard much on the subject. The House Small Business Committee, wherever they go in this country and whenever they conduct a public hearing, no matter what the announced subject may be, one or more persons representing small business will come before the committee and say, "The only way you can help us is to give us tax relief."

I believe it is the unanimous opinion of the Small Business Committees of both Houses of Congress that we must do something for small business by way of tax relief.

On November 22 of 1957, we had an executive session of the House Small Business Committee and at that time it was unanimously agreed—those few that were absent subsequently indicated their agreement, too—that we should urge upon the Congress the enactment of a bill granting tax relief to small business. At that time we had before us H. R. 5631 which had been introduced by the ranking minority member of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]. We agreed we would take his bill as the basis for our discussions, and try to come up with a bill which would meet the approval of all of the Members.

The bill, I think, is just about ready for submission to us and will be introduced within the next few days. Whether it is that bill or the Hill bill, or any other bill, I urge as strongly as I can, as vigorously as I can, that some such legislation be brought forth by this committee. Whether you take the Hill bill which goes slightly further than the recommendation of the President's Cabinet Committee, or you take the recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee or some modification of that, I urge you as strongly as I can that we should bring forth a bill which will grant tax relief of some measure that will help the small-business man of this country.

I have said many times, I think, to this committee, that I have no pride of authorship in any of the bills that I have introduced or that I have supported. I am sure that after these hearings are concluded, this committee will bring forth a composite bill which will be the best thinking of this committee on the subject. I do hope that in that bill you will cover many of the things I have urged upon you today, and more particularly do not overlook, please, tax relief for small business.

I should not conclude without saying a word in favor of the bill that has been before you so many times, introduced by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEOGH] which would postpone the payment of taxes on those moneys which an individual earns and puts into an annuity which he buys for himself, having in mind the self-employed, the man in business for himself, and the professional man, who does not have the privilege or the benefit of building up a pension account or a pension fund so as to enable him to retire. All that bill seeks is merely to postpone the taxation for a time so they can build up a fund on which they, too, can retire in their later years.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity of being here. If I can answer any questions, I will be glad to do so.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. EBERHARTER has a question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. MULTER, you spoke of many propositions with respect to taxes. All of them have a very great appeal, and the one I particularly want to mention is the one referring to bonds. However, every other proposition you mentioned would result in depletion of revenues. They all have appeal, but do you think that this is the proper time for the Congress to deplete revenues?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. EBERHARTER, I sincerely urge that this is the time to do it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. What do you say there?

Mr. MULTER. This is the time to do it. I am not fearful that the cuts urged will cause a loss of revenue which will not be offset by additional revenues. You must bear in mind that most of these tax cuts will put additional money in the hands of those taxpayers who spend almost every dollar they earn. You take the man or woman who is earning, whether out of his own business or because of employment, up to $5,000 a year. He spends every dollar he gets for the necessities of life. If you give him a little more money, by the tax savings of a few hundred dollars a year, that money is not going to stay with him. It is going to go right back into the economy. Every dollar that he spends will turn over as many as 10 times.

When he buys wearing apparel and when he buys food, or even when he buys some of the luxuries, the man who gets it does not keep it. It goes right back into the economy again.

If ever we need a stimulus to our economy, it is today, when all of the signs seem to be pointing toward a holding back of consumer buying. This is the time to stimulate that, and get these excess inventories moving into trade so that we then can produce more.

I think every one of these tax cuts that I have recommended will put more money into the market so that the ultimate end will be a greater gross national product and a greater gross national income. As that goes up, and as the overall income goes up in every segment of the economy, we have a larger base on which to collect the tax. When we get through with it, while I cannot give you any figures, because none are available—this is something we can know about only by testing it. I am sure that we will gain at least as much as we lose. If we do have some small loss of revenue it is going to be made up by the overall economy being made more firm and more prosperous. I think that is also important.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is a very logical and persuasive argument, Mr. MULTER. I wish that you could convince the Department of the Treasury as to the soundness of your views on this, because they take the opposite view. We have never been able to convince them of the other side of the question as you have presented it. Thank you very much.

Mr. MULTER. May I just make this observation with reference to that: The very strength

of our American system of government is the division of powers, and if this Legislature and this committee does not follow too closely the recommendations of the Treasury Department in that respect then we will be better off. Their desire is to build up more revenues and take in more. It is your duty and it is our duty as the Members of Congress to make sure that we are going to continue to move forward. Let us lead for a change instead of following the Treasury Department.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. KEOGH has a question.

Mr. KEOGH. I have no question to put to my distinguished colleague, but I would be remiss were I not to commend him for his obviously studied and comprehensive legislative program, and to say to him again, and in public, that it is a source of continuing comfort to me, and I am sure to the other colleagues of ours from New York, to know that his very broad and mature judgment and experience are always generously available to us in the solving and facing of our legislative problems. I commend those fortunate people in that part of Brooklyn from which Mr. MULTER comes.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you very much.

Mr. MILLS. Are there any further questions?

Mr. MULTER, we appreciate your coming to the committee and discussing the several bills that you have introduced, and referred to the committee, giving us the benefit of your advice and recommendations on the bills. We appreciate it very much. Thank you very much.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 1958

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, hallowed be Thy name. In this historic Chamber, with its cloud of witnesses out of the past, with the anxious gaze of vast hosts under all skies fixed upon this forum in the anguished present; before our human voices are lifted we would first of all listen to Thee; as we beseech, speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth. It is our kinship with Thee, our God, which lifts us out of our poor, petty selfhood to be heirs of Thy eternal kingdom.

By national and global tasks too difficult for us, we are driven unto Thee for strength to face what must be faced if freedom is to live, and for wisdom to rightly interpret the signs of these trying times. May these spokesmen for the people, serving in the ministry of public affairs, by their dedication strengthen the cause of our free land and of our common humanity, and so help to build the city of God on the ruined wastes of this disturbed and disordered world. We ask it in that Name whose is the kingdom and the power of the glory. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 9, 1958, was dispensed with.

### ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

ARTHUR V. WATKINS, a Senator from the State of Utah, appeared in his seat today.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet today, during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Thursday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour, during which Senators may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills, and transact other routine business, statements be subject to a 3-minute limitation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### CALL OF THE CALENDAR AND CONSIDERATION OF THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, pursuant to rule VII, be dispensed with, and that the unfinished business not be laid before the Senate for consideration today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to announce that at the conclusion of the usual routine business today, we plan to have a period for memorial services for the late Senator Kenneth McKellar and Representative Jere Cooper. All Senators should be on notice that at the conclusion of the routine business today, when bills are introduced and petitions and other matters are submitted there will be such a memorial period.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PLANS FOR CERTAIN WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, in the States of Alabama, Colorado, North Carolina, and Texas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligations of appropriations in that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN INSTALLATIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1957 (with an accompanynig report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, AIR FORCE, AND COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of officers receiving flight pay in the Army, Air Force, and Coast Guard, during the 6-month period preceding January 6, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Administration, for the quarter ending September 30, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D. C., transmitting; pursuant to law, his report on the operations of that Department, for the fiscal year 1957

(with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from the president, Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Baltimore, Md., reporting, pursuant to law, on the earnings and expenses of that company, for the calendar year 1957; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LAND IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and improvements thereon located within the area of New York Avenue and F Street and 17th and 18th Streets NW., in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO CAREY, OHIO

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the act of July 2, 1956, concerning the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND IN HAWAII

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of title to certain land at Sand Island, T. H., to the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON FORT CLATSOP SITE, OREGON

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INDEMNITY PROTECTION FOR NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.), to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powered merchant ship (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UNDERTAKE CERTAIN ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities at the request of public or private parties at the expense of the requesting party, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ISSUANCE OF DEALERS' AIRCRAFT REGISTRATION CERTIFICATES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of November 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

VALUATIONS OF PROPERTIES OF CERTAIN CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of final valuations of properties of certain carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF POSTAL STATIONS AND BRANCH POST OFFICES

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (29 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ANNUAL AUDIT OF BRIDGE COMMISSIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Edward F. Gerving, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the foreign policy of the Nation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the executive council of the Puerto Rico Free Federation of Labor, San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Ketchikan (Alaska) Chamber of Commerce, relating to the Japanese fisheries situation in the North Pacific area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of David H. Johnson, of Draper, Utah, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the third annual convention seminar, Washington, D. C., of the American Society for Industrial Security, relating to the report of the Commission on Government Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Medical and Dental Association, Virginia Beach, Va., reaffirming its loyalty to the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a memorial, from the Verdugo Hills Republican Woman's Club of Sunland and Tujunga, of Tujunga, Calif., signed by Grace Goodfellow, legislative chairman, remonstrating against Federal aid to schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Newport Harbor Chamber of Commerce, at Newport Beach, Calif., favoring the recognition of Orange County, Calif., as a metropolitan area; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Brea, Calif., favoring the recognition of Orange County, Calif., as a metropolitan area; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PRICE SUPPORTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS — RESOLUTIONS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the first bill to be introduced in the Senate in this session of the Congress was the bill (S. 2912) to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on dairy products, which was cosponsored by Senators CASE of South Dakota, HUMPHREY, IVES, MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, WILEY, and YOUNG. My colleagues, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] have asked that they may join in sponsoring this proposal to maintain the economic status of our Nation's dairy farmers. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that their names be included on any subsequent printing of S. 2912.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I also ask that a resolution which I have received from the Blackduck Civic and Commerce Association of Blackduck, Minn., be printed in the RECORD, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration in support of S. 2912.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the dairy industry is one of the major industries in the Blackduck area and in Minnesota; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture advocates the lowering of price supports on dairy products from 82 to 75 percent which is the basic minimum; and

Whereas the economic effect on the Blackduck area would mean the loss of approximately $29,000 per year income to the farmers and the business places on Main Street; and

Whereas the family farmers were in drastic need of financial aid prior to the lowering of dairy price supports: *Therefore* be it

*Resolved*, That the Blackduck Civic and Commerce Association urge corrective legislation be enacted to at least maintain the 82 percent support for dairy products; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to United States Senator EDWARD J. THYE, United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and our Representatives in Congress and others interested.

The above resolution was presented by the agriculture committee of the Blackduck

Civic and Commerce Association and, upon being put to vote, was unanimously carried.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the members of the Fargo-Moorhead-Fergus Falls Milk Producers Association recently adopted certain resolutions at their annual meeting calling for action on proprosals which would be beneficial to our Nation's agriculture. The first of these resolutions is substantially the same as the provisions of my dairy price-support bill in that it calls for the use of the parity equivalent formula for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period from July 1946 through December 1948. I ask consent that a letter which I received from Mr. Kenneth Wenstrom, the secretary of the Fargo-Moorhead-Fergus Falls Milk Producers Association, be printed at this point in the RECORD and be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FERGUS FALLS, MINN., *January 6, 1958.*

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR THYE: The following resolutions were passed at the annual meeting of the Fargo-Moorhead-Fergus Milk Producers Association. I hope that you will work for the enactment of these resolutions.

1. We urge that the present support program be restored from 75 percent of parity to 90 percent of parity, using the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30 months' period from July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive, and maintained in effect until such a time as the dairy farmers can provide an effective self-help program.

2. We urge the expansion of the Agricultural Trade Development and Extension Act, Law No. 480, to enable the dairy industry of the United States to gain a foothold in marketing in foreign countries.

3. We strongly oppose the 3 percent special Federal wartime tax on transportation paid by farmers for hauling their milk into the processing plants, and urge Members of Congress to work toward a repeal.

4. We recommend that a thorough investigation be made by Congress with regard to some of the policies and philosophies of the Department of Agriculture. It is our opinion that some of the policies laid down by those heading the Department have been detrimental to the welfare of the farmer.

5. We urge that Congress investigate the cost of carrying on the agricultural programs in order to determine what portion of it should be charged to the defense, which would include agricultural products given away to foreign countries who are considered our friends, and the portion that can be charged directly to losses in handling surpluses.

6. We urge that the available funds derived from percentages of custom receipts and used under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act be used principally for perishable, nonbasic, agricultural products including milk and butterfat and their products.

Yours respectfully,

KENNETH WENSTROM,
*Secretary, Fargo-Moorhead-Fergus Falls Milk Producers Association.*

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have also received a resolution adopted by the Beltrami County Board of Commissioners supporting my stand on dairy price supports. I ask that this resolution also be printed at this point in my remarks and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING CORRECTIVE LEGISLATION TO MAINTAIN PRESENT PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Whereas the United States Commissioner of Agriculture advocates the lowering of price supports on dairy products from 82 percent to 75 percent, which is the basic minimum; and

Whereas Beltrami County, Minn., is one of the counties in this area that derives much of its income through the dairy industry; and

Whereas the lowering of the dairy price supports will affect the family farmers throughout the area: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the County Board of Commissioners of Beltrami County urge corrective legislation be enacted to maintain the present price supports on dairy products; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to United States Senator EDWARD J. THYE, and to United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and also to our Representatives in Congress.

## RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a number of resolutions which were adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in its region 6 conference held at Minneapolis, Minn. I hope my colleagues will find these resolutions edifying and also sufficiently persuasive to get their support.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

HARD MONEY AND HIGH INTEREST RATES

Whereas for several years, the Federal Reserve System and the United States Treasury have collaborated on a so-called hard-money policy which has resulted in a restriction of credit and very high interest rates; and

Whereas while farm income since 1952 has fallen by 30 percent while income from interest has risen 40 percent; and

Whereas the enemies of the rural electrification program are using the high level of interest rates as justification for raising REA interest rates; and

Whereas an increase in our interest rate would be a destructive blow to our systems and to rural people; and

Whereas the only justification for high interest rates is that they are a device for controlling inflation; and

Whereas existing credit restrictions and high interest rates are inflationary, destructive to small business and farmers, consumers, homebuilders and purchasers, schools and hospitals and have increased the Federal interest burden by $1.4 billion a year, and have in many other ways been bad for the public welfare: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we do not believe in reliance upon high interest rates alone as an anti-inflation device; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we favor a thorough investigation by the Congress of the whole problem of hard money, credit restriction, and high interest rates and that until such an investigation has revealed the impact of high interest rates on inflation control and the welfare of farmers, working people, and small- and medium-sized business, we are opposed to any increase in the REA interest rate; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we are vigorously opposed to the Hiestand-Capehart bills to increase REA interest rates which were introduced at the request of President Eisenhower.

REORGANIZATION OF REA

Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a Congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper Congressional committees and other interested groups; and

Whereas in June 1957 the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of $500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we urge that as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January that a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act.

PREFERENCE CLAUSE

Whereas for 50 years the preference clauses in Federal power laws, giving preference to nonprofit and cooperative electric systems have been an important influence in assuring the continuation of a healthy degree of competition in this vital industry; and

Whereas over 300 of the rural electric systems are dependent upon the preference clause to protect them in their right to secure power from Federal projects: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we reaffirm our strong support for the preference rights of nonprofit, consumer-owned electric systems and express our unalterable opposition to any repeal, watering down or evasion of preference; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we endorse the construction of Federal, self-liquidating transmission lines wherever they are necessary to firm up power, assure low-cost delivery of the power to the load centers of our systems, or are necessary in any way to protect the preference rights of our systems.

FEDERAL CAPITAL BUDGET

Whereas the present Federal budgeting and accounting system is confusing and misleading; and

Whereas the people have a right to know which expenditures are expenses and which are repayable as wealth creating investments; and

Whereas a businesslike system of budgeting and accounting is particularly important to REA and the Federal power program: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the Congress to enact a Federal capital budget system of budgeting and accounting; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we particularly urge those Members of the Congress who cry loudly for economy in Government to further public understanding by helping to pass such legislation.

PROPAGANDA ADVERTISING OF COMMERCIAL POWER COMPANIES

Whereas the power companies have been spending vast amounts for years on propaganda advertising designed to cripple or destroy the rural electrification and Federal power programs, and have compelled the electric consumer to pay the cost of such propaganda: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we favor the passage of legislation which would (1) ban dishonest advertising by power companies under the fair trade laws; (2) amend the Federal Power Act to forbid the deduction of costs of propaganda as an expense chargeable to electric consumers, and (3) amend the Internal Revenue Act to forbid deduction of the costs of propaganda by power companies as an expense in computing corporation income taxes.

---

HELLS CANYON

Whereas the Senate has passed a bill authorizing a high Federal Hells Canyon Dam to provide low-cost power by the full and comprehensive development of the Snake River; and

Whereas the House Interior Committee has refused to permit the House of Representatives to vote on the Senate bill; and

Whereas failure of the House to pass S. 555 would leave the Idaho Power Co. free to waste almost half of the power potential and produce high-cost power, thereby not only sacrificing much of the value of this river for flood control and power but preclude the economic development of rich phosphate deposits, and jeopardize the salmon industry by destroying spawning grounds: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we reaffirm our support of the full, comprehensive development of the Nation's rivers, and urge the House committee and the House to pass S. 555; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress amend the Federal Power Act to forever prohibit the Federal Power Commission from issuing any license to any corporation for the development of any hydro site unless such corporation is pledged to full and comprehensive development in accord with the river plans of the appropriate Federal planning agencies.

---

TRIMBLE BILL

Whereas the new rate schedule for the SPA filed with the Federal Power Commission by the Department of the Interior has been approved; and

Whereas the rate for wholesale power charged by SPA to the rural systems and municipalities in the SPA area has consequently been increased by 27.5 percent; and

Whereas this rate increase is justified by and based upon an unrealistic cost allocation formula which saddles the power consumers with a disproportionate and inequitable proportion of the project costs; and

Whereas H. R. 7362 (better known as the Trimble bill) will reassert the control of the Congress over national water resources and accelerate the conservation and development thereof: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That, upon recommendation by the Advisory Committee on Power for the Southwest the Trimble bill, subject to an amendment requested by the National Reclamation Association to be drawn and offered by Congressman CLAIR ENGLE of California, be diligently and forcefully pushed for passage in the next session of Congress.

---

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FINANCE PLAN

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority is and long will be the sole source of power for a large region of the United States inhabited by 5 million people whose right it is to be assured of a power supply adequate to their growing demand; and

Whereas, additionally, TVA has been required to furnish a great block of power—now amounting to 57 percent of its entire production—to be used by the Federal Government for the development and manufacture of material for the defense of the country; and

Whereas the people of the TVA region and the consumers of TVA power have up to now in good faith invested $775 million in their own distribution systems for TVA power, and in TVA itself, and are regularly repaying all Federal investment in TVA power facilities, as the law required, within 40 years; and

Whereas it clearly may be foreseen that unless new power capacity for TVA is begun promptly, the rise of demand in the valley will break through the supply of power by 1960, if not before; and

Whereas the need to schedule construction of new TVA capacity is more urgent this year than last, and has grown more urgent day by day, and threatens to impose a ceiling upon the economic progress of the region; and

Whereas the TVA Board has recommended that Congress allow it to meet this need by instituting a sound bond-financing plan which would supplement funds provided by Congress; and

Whereas it is the plain duty of TVA to provide adequate power in the Valley, thus it is the responsibility of Congress to enable it to do so: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we again urge Congress to approve at the next session, legislation which would implement the financing plan in the form originally recommended by the TVA Board, such legislation to be similar to the Jones bill as approved by the House Public Works Committee.

---

FUNDS FOR JOB TRAINING AND SAFETY PROGRAMS

Whereas the job training and safety training programs must rely upon sound educational practices for effectiveness; and

Whereas vocational education has cooperated in the job training and safety training programs by providing personnel to direct sound educational practices; and

Whereas there is need to continue and further develop the job training and safety training programs to train rural electrification workers in new techniques and safety practices; and

Whereas the job training and safety training instructor staff in many States is not adequate to meet the present needs for training; and

Whereas the continued success of the job training and safety training programs is dependent upon adequate Federal appropriations to the States to stimulate and assist them in conducting the programs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we express to Congress our appreciation for appropriating the full amount for fiscal 1958 as authorized by the George-Barden Act of 1946; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we request Congress to appropriate for fiscal year 1959 the full amount authorized for vocational education under existing laws; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we request Congress to amend the George-Barden Act of 1946 to authorize an increase in appropriation to be used by the States in further promotion and expansion of the vocational education programs that have been initiated but not fully developed; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we request Congress to enact into law legislation that will authorize appropriations to develop area vocational programs to serve areas that are not now being served by all phases of vocational education; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we request Congress to appropriate for fiscal year 1959 such sums as can be used by the States on a matching basis to develop area vocational programs.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the Russians have achieved a humiliating triumph over the United States by launching sputnik; and

Whereas this Nation cannot afford to encounter a similar Russian triumph in the field of atomic energy: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we urge Congress to launch a crash program on atomic energy and that the Elk River Cooperative reactor be started as quickly as possible as a part of this program.

---

ENDORSEMENT OF TRADITIONAL FEDERAL POWER PROGRAM

*Be it resolved*, That we endorse the traditional Federal power program, including multiple-purpose dams, preference and transmission lines, a program which has done so much to enrich the Nation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we advise our Representatives and Senators in Congress from this region that there is a close and vital connection between the Federal power program and the rural electrification program.

---

PREVENT WINDFALL PROFITS TO POWER COMPANIES

Whereas there is no justification for permitting windfall profits to private power companies resulting from accelerated and/or liberalized depreciation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we endorse passage of the Magnuson bill (S. 2113) and the Ullman bill (H. R. 7692).

---

GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas the demands for increased power supply for the rural electric systems pose a continuing problem for the rural electric systems; and

Whereas the cost of power to the systems has always been favorably influenced by our right and opportunity to generate and transmit our own power where this would result in lower costs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the REA Administrator to continue to lend funds for generation and transmission when such loans are feasible and will result in savings for our members; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Congress be urged to continue to provide adequate funds for this purpose.

---

COMMENDING THE REA ADMINISTRATOR

Whereas David Hamil has demonstrated his sincere belief in the rural electrification program as established by law; and

Whereas he has announced and followed policies which have earned the commendation and support of the many REA borrowers: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we commend Mr. Hamil on his policies and his administration of REA.

---

DEFERRAL PERIOD ON TELEPHONE LOANS

Whereas the declining agricultural economy tends to make it most difficult for telephone borrowers in rural areas to obtain maximum usage and income in a short period of time; and

Whereas the electric borrowers have for a long time enjoyed a 5-year period of deferment in their amortization schedule: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we respectfully request the Administrator of REA to extend the same benefits of a 5-year deferment period to all telephone borrowers, both in the future and retroactively, by amendment to the loan contract, to those who have loans existing at the present time.

---

MISSOURI BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the Federal Government has completed certain hydroelectric installations and has others in various stages of construction on the main stem of the Missouri River; and

Whereas revenue from the sale of power from all the power installations in the Missouri River Basin project is expected to repay about 89 percent of the total reimbursable investment of the project; and

Whereas vast quantities of water from the Missouri River Basin project have been released in the interest of free-flowing navigation to the detriment of the supply of firm power; and

Whereas construction of dams and locks on the Missouri River would make better use of the water of the river and provide an adequate navigation channel, much additional flood control and water-conservation capacity, substantially increased quantities of firm power from the hydroelectric plants, and improve the ability of power to repay the reimbursable investment of the project: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the delegates of region VI urgently request that adequate funds and proper authority be made available by the United States Congress in fiscal year 1959 for studies and surveys of costs for construction of dams and locks on the main stem of the Missouri River from Yankton, S. Dak., to St. Louis, Mo., and for determination of benefits which would accrue from such construction; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress be requested to authorize representation by the preference customers in the States receiving this power on the reservoir-control center of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee; and be it further

*Resolved*, That control of this entire system be placed under a single agency, in the interest of greater overall efficiency and better use of the water resources of this area.

---

NATIONAL ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

Whereas public-opinion surveys show that REA cooperatives are rapidly losing ground in public esteem and support; and

Whereas private power companies' national advertising program in all the major United States magazines is probably responsible for a large part of this loss, as well as for a large buildup in favor of the power companies; and

Whereas a large-scale national advertising program requires a large amount of money, as well as organization and preparation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the national annual meeting at Dallas to approve a national advertising program for "co-op way" and member education in national magazines, and that the NRECA executive committee at its November meeting request the national member and public-relations committee to make a study of ways and means and make a report and recommendations to the annual meeting at Dallas.

---

## TREATISE ON COOPERATIVES AND THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Consumers Cooperative Association of Kansas City, Mo., which is a large cooperative, held its annual convention in Kansas City early last December. Howard A. Cowden is president of this organization and has been for many years. Delegates from 10 States gathered for the annual meeting and, of course, the farm problem was the topic uttermost in the discussions.

Earlier in the year Mr. Cowden wrote a very splendid treatise entitled "What Course for American Agriculture?" In this he discusses very frankly the cost-price squeeze on agriculture and states in his opinion it is one of the most pressing issues of our time. He does make a most interesting analysis of the problem and as it was the topic for discussion at the convention, I ask unanimous consent that the treatise written by Mr. Cowden be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the treatise was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVES AND THE FARM PROBLEM

Another year has passed without appreciable improvement in the general farm situation. The parity ratio stood at 81 in mid-November and will, in all likelihood, remain unchanged through December. This means that agriculture continued in 1957 to subsidize the prosperity of other segments of the national economy. Through lower prices for what they sell, farmers contribute to the profits of processors and distributors. At the same time, through increased prices paid for supplies required in farm production, farmers contribute to the profits of the industries from which these supplies come and to the welfare of the millions of persons employed in those industries.

This continued disparity is responsible for countless cases of individual hardship. It explains the steady decline in number of full-time farmers. It has, in all likelihood, contributed to the growing pools of unemployed in some of our larger cities. It has, without question, reduced farm buying power and helped bring on the so-called business recession about which we are getting the first cautious reports.

There is a growing uneasiness in many quarters over the future of some of our price-support programs. For one thing, they have not enabled agriculture to hold its own with the rest of the economy. For another, they have not convinced the consumer that Federal aid to farmers means lower prices at the supermarket. Finally, all our Federal farm programs are jeopardized by current pressure for increased defense expenditures. Already there are proposals in Washington that farm programs be pulled out of the Federal budget to make room for new satellites and guided missiles.

The price support programs have been of inestimable value to farmers. Yet we must face the fact that they become more and more difficult to maintain as agriculture becomes less and less important to the election of Members of Congress. While defending the support programs and what they have done, we must look for something to take their place.

Farmers and nonfarmers in the last few months have become increasingly alert to the need for more emphasis on self-help programs for agriculture. The only truly effective self-help agencies we have are our cooperatives.

Through cooperatives, farmers can build economic strength and improve their bargaining power. While our cooperatives are not large enough yet to match the power of big business and big labor, they must be developed with such a goal in mind. We must either have strong cooperatives in this country or surrender to the concept of an agriculture dominated by corporate industry and giant commercial farms—an agriculture from which the traditional family farm would all but disappear.

If our cooperatives are to realize their full potential, they must have help and encouragement at the national level. It is the declared wish of this meeting, therefore, that our National Government create a more favorable climate than now exists for the development of cooperatives. We think it should be the declared national policy that our Government should encourage cooperatives to the extent of direct assistance in their organization and development.

## RESOLUTION OF KANSAS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas recently adopted a resolution urging approval of the Jenkins-Keogh bill which embodies in substance a recommendation allowing an income tax deduction to a person with self-employment income for a part of his income put into a retirement fund.

As I have received a large number of letters from citizens in Kansas and other States in regard to this matter, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Bar Association of the State of Kansas on April 16, 1954, at its annual meeting adopted a resolution recommending the adoption of legislation authorizing and permitting lawyers and professional men to establish pension and retirement funds and to deduct from current income for income-tax purposes contributions put into such funds; and

Whereas on January 3, 1957, in the first session of the 85th Congress, H. R. 9 and 10, the Jenkins-Keogh bill which embodies in substance this recommendation by allowing an income-tax deduction to a person with self-employment income for a part of his income put into a retirement fund, such being limited to an annual deduction of 10 percent of the annual net earnings from self-employment up to $5,000; and

Whereas the taxation committee of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas recommends that the executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas take appropriate action to the end that the position of the association in recommending the adoption of legislation designed to accomplish a revision of the Internal Revenue Code similar to the proposed Jenkins-Keogh bills now pending: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas*, That the Bar Association of the State of Kansas respectfully again requests and urges the Congress of the United States to adopt as an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code the Jenkins-Keogh bills; be it further

*Resolved*, That the executive secretary of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and to the Kansas delegation in the Senate and the House of the Congress of the United States.

The above resolution was unanimously adopted by the executive council of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas at a regular meeting duly called and held in Topeka, Kans., on December 21, 1957.

---

## INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO THE COMMON DEFENSE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 212), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of

the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Common defense generally;

(2) The War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) The Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) Soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) Selective service;

(7) Size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) Forts, arsenals, military reservations, and Navy yards;

(9) Ammunition depots;

(10) Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves;

(12) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS AND CONSULTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1171)

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 213), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Works or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2962. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chi Tien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2963. A bill for the relief of Miss Myra J. Gabbidon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2964. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact between the State of Connecticut and the State of Massachusetts relating to flood control; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2965. A bill for the relief of Taeko Takamura Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2966. A bill to provide for the payment of a pension to widows and children of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict on the same basis as widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2967. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Science Academy, a program of scientific scholarships, and the encouragement of the study of mathematics and science by assisting the States in providing science education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2968. A bill for the relief of Cecil Howell Blackburn Bullard and Belle Blackburn Bullard; and

S. 2969. A bill for the relief of Ben Chassin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2970. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence so as to safeguard individual rights without hampering effective and intelligent law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 2971. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to permit unused portions of funds appropriated for carrying out the conservation reserve program to be used for other conservation purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2972. A bill for the relief of C. D. Goff; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 2973. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a fishery extension service in the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior for the purpose of carrying out cooperative fishery extension work with the States, Territories, and possessions; and

S. 2974. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2975. A bill to authorize the modification of the project for the Rio Grande Basin in order to provide for the completion of the middle Rio Grande portion of such project; and

S. 2976. A bill to provide for a Federal contribution toward the cost of the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Canadian River by the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2977. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to allow acreage planted to the 1958 crop of winter wheat in excess of wheat-acreage allotments to be considered in establishing such allotments for the future; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2978. A bill to establish a program of educational assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States after January 31, 1955; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2979. A bill for the relief of Mary M. Browne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 2980. A bill to amend section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to postpone for 1 year the effective date of certain provisions thereof eliminating credit for acreage history purposes of wheat acreage in excess of the farm acreage allotment; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2981. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Paca; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2982. A bill for the relief of Kalliope Giamnias;

S. 2983. A bill for the relief of Bernabe Miranda, Manuel Miranda and Anastacio Miranda; and

S. 2984. A bill for the relief of Taka Motoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BEALL:

S. 2985. A bill for the relief of Elsie Chu; and

S. 2986. A bill for the relief of Humer Gyorgy Huvos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S 2987. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, relating to price support for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2988. A bill for the relief of Elita Krasts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2989. A bill for the relief of Salvador Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2990. A bill to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 2991. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy to convey a portion of Fort Adams, Newport, R. I., to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2992. A bill to make certain assistance by a State, municipality, or other public body eligible as local grants-in-aid under section 110 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2993. A bill to expand the opportunities of small businesses to participate in and to derive the benefits from research and development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 2994. A bill to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States before December 31, 1958, to be planned and conducted by the Special Staff on Aging of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other agencies of that Department and of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 2995. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2996. A bill to permit certain additional services to count for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2997. A bill for the relief of Leobardo Castaneda Vargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of a reservation of timber rights from a patent issued to Ivan H. McCormack; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL AVIATION UNDER CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as a member of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and as successor to Senator McCarran, who is known to many as the father of civil aviation, I thought it most appropriate that the Congress of the United States should recognize the 20th anniversary of civil aviation under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. I am, therefore, submitting for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution expressing continued support, by the Congress of the United States, of all phases of our civil aviation, on this 20th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54) was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas the late Senator Pat McCarran, of Nevada, and Congressman Clarence Lea, of California, sponsored legislation for the regulation and promotion of civil aeronautics; and

Whereas this legislation became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and established as being in the public interest:

"(a) The encouragement and development of an air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense;

"(b) The regulation of air transportation in such manner as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of, assure the highest degree of safety in, and foster sound economic conditions in, such transportation, and to improve the relations between, and coordinate transportation by, air carriers;

"(c) The promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices;

"(d) Competition to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of an air transportation system properly adapted to the needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense;

"(e) The regulation of air commerce in such manner as to best promote its development and safety; and

"(f) The encouragement and development of civil aeronautics"; and

Whereas these 20 years have marked the unparalleled growth of civil aviation in the United States and witnessed the development of the world's largest and finest air transportation system; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration, together with our aircraft industry, our air transportation companies, our private fliers, and other aviation interests, have been primarily responsible for the orderly development of civil aviation in accordance with policies established by the Congress, leading to the world's outstanding system of civil airways and civil airports, and civil aviation; and

Whereas American civil aviation is on the threshold of new frontiers of travel, comfort, and safety as they prepare for the transition of our air transport fleets from piston-engined to jet-powered aircraft; and

Whereas current war plans of the military continue to place great reliance on our air carrier industry; and

Whereas American leadership in aviation must be maintained; and

Whereas the launching of Russian civil jet service has serious national defense and international prestige implications for the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States, on this 20th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, reaffirms its support of the policies set forth therein; commends the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration for their sound stewardship of the act and its objectives; and urges adherence to policies which will enable civil aviation to solve its present economic and technical problems and assure the public of the benefits of a strong air transport system and civil aviation industry.

## CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL RAILROAD MUSEUM, GREEN BAY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Whereas the American railroad has been of incalculable importance to the growth and development of our Nation in time of peace and a major factor in her defense in time of war; and

Whereas there has been established at Green Bay, Wis., the National Railroad Museum whose purpose is to afford recognition in perpetuity to the role of the American railroad in our Nation's early history by preserving the railroad rolling stock and other memorabilia of the age of steam; and

Whereas the city of Green Bay has donated a site for the buildings and exhibits to be erected as part of the National Railroad Museum, and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, an official State agency, has undertaken the responsibility of developing and operating the National Railroad Museum; and

Whereas there has been donated or pledged to the National Railroad Museum early and rare steam locomotives, other rolling stock, printed material, photographs, broadsides, and ephemera, including the Carl R. Gray, Jr., collection, thus insuring its place as a center for the preservation of significant physical evidence of American railroading's early history; and

Whereas the National Railroad Museum, as an educational institution of major significance to all Americans in its portrayal of the development of the American railroad and the lives of the inventors, managers, investors, and workers who created the ties of steel that bind our country together, is of national interest: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress hereby recognizes the National Railroad Museum as a memorial to the individuals who built and ran our early American railroads and as a fitting and valuable institution for the collection and preservation of the memorabilia of the age of steam locomotion.

## RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were reported or submitted, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. Res. 212. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the common defense; reported from the Committee on Armed Services; referred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See resolution printed in full in Senate proceedings of today, under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. Res. 213. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make certain expenditures and employ additional assistants and consultants; reported from the Committee on Public Works; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See resolution printed in full, when reported by Mr. CHAVEZ, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS UNDER JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, for himself and Mr. CAPEHART, submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 214), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $70,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. TALMADGE) submitted Resolution 215, relating to the death of the late Representative Henderson L. Lanham, of Georgia, which was considered and agreed to.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. RUSSELL, which appears under a separate hearing.)

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania and Mr. CLARK):

S. Res. 216. Resolution relating to the death of the late Representative Augustine B. Kelley, of Pennsylvania; considered and agreed to.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BIBLE, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. GORE):

S. Res. 217. Resolution relating to the death of the late Representative Jere Cooper, of Tennessee; considered and agreed to.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. GORE):

S. Res. 218. Resolution relating to the death of former Senator Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee; considered and agreed to.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. Res. 219. Resolution relating to the death of the late Representative Russell W. Keeney, of Illinois, which was considered and agreed to.

## AMENDMENT OF SOIL BANK ACT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would strengthen the agricultural conservation program and encourage conservation practices by utilizing the unused part of the soil conservation reserve funds.

We owe a great debt to future generations to wisely preserve and improve land productivity. We must meet this challenge.

We have about 1,444,000,000 acres on which to produce agricultural crops and livestock. For every person in the United States there are only about 3 acres of cropland and slightly over 6 acres of grazing land. As population increases, the average acres per capita will naturally decrease. Present estimates indicate that population in the United States will be 228 million by 1975 and 335 million by the year 2000.

The Soil Conservation Service estimates that over 282 million acres of land in the United States are severely eroded, 776 million acres moderately eroded, and 700 million acres slightly eroded. This certainly emphasizes the seriousness of this problem and the need for taking a new look at our long-range planning.

We must conserve, reclaim, and rebuild to fulfill the trust we have to provide for future generations.

Declining farm prices combined with sharp acreage reductions over the past few years have resulted in lower farm income and a depressed agricultural economy. One of the most serious problems has been, and continues to be, idle and eroded acres.

Despite great progress made in soil conservation, there remain millions of acres of land in the United States that have been permitted to wash away and become unproductive. These idle acres must be improved and made productive. Our pastures and woodlands must be improved and protected.

The conservation reserve phase of the soil bank must be modified to more adequately cope with conservation needs. This phase of the soil bank is a more constructive measure for it is an investment for the future and will provide long-range and lasting benefits to each individual participating. This phase of the program, however, must reach more farms and especially our small- and family-sized farmers.

It now appears that only 85,290 farms in the United States participated in the 1957 program, and that only about one-third of the funds allocated for the conservation reserve will be used. In the case of Mississippi, 1,544 contracts were signed, an average of less than 19 farms per county. Less than one-sixth of the funds allocated to Mississippi were used.

Thus, the existing program reaches only a fraction of our idle and unproductive acres. A redirected conservation reserve can put these acres to work through tree planting, pasture improvement, and other conservation measures. There is a great opportunity in growing trees for supplementing farm income. The unexpended portion of conservation reserve funds could be put to no better use than improving forest stands and establishing other conservation practices on idle acres taken out of production prior to passage of the 1956 soil bank program. According to a recent study by the Forest Service, there are 60,339,000 acres of land in the United States in need of reforestation, with over 4.3 million acres in Mississippi alone. Most of this land is not now eligible for soil bank participation. Improvement of this land through tree planting would be of lasting benefit.

The unused portion of funds allocated to the States for the conservation reserve should be used to put our idle acres into production. The bill which I introduce would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the unused portion of the conservation reserve funds for this purpose. Under my bill, the Government would share in the original cost of establishing approved conservation practices, but no rental payments would be authorized.

We must develop a formidable, forward looking and broader conservation program built around the needs of the future. We must have an expanded and better-financed, long-range program which will assure lasting benefits.

I hope this legislation will be favorably considered at the earliest possible date. It merits the full support of every Member of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2971) to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to permit unused portions of funds appropriated for carrying out the conservation reserve program to be used for other conservation purposes, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 120 of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Any part of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section for carrying out the conservation reserve program during the fiscal year 1958 or any subsequent year which are not used for such purpose in the State to which they are allocated, shall be available for use in such State in accordance with regulations of the Secretary for making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers carrying out practices designed to effectuate the agricultural conservation policy set forth in section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended."

## PROPOSED FISHERY EXTENSION SERVICE IN FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize a Federal fishery extension service. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement which I have prepared on this subject may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2973) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a fishery extension service in the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior for the purpose of carrying out

cooperative fishery extension work with the States, Territories, and possessions, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. PAYNE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Today I am introducing a bill to create a fishery extension service patterned closely after the Agricultural Extension Service which has been of such tremendous assistance to our Nation's farmers. Fishermen have, of course, frequently been called farmers of the sea, and the fishing industry is in a great many ways closely analogous to agriculture.

Fishing is one of the oldest and proudest industries of our Nation. In fact this country was really pioneered by fishermen who were followed by the colonists. From that early day to this fish have been, and properly so, a cornerstone of the American diet, and the industry has been an important segment of our national economy. To give some idea of the size of the commercial fishing industry to the State of Maine alone, 283 million pounds of fish and shellfish, valued at $16,855,000 were landed in 1954, the latest year for which complete statistics are readily available. In that same year nearly 3 million cases of sardines were packed, while almost 22 million pounds of lobsters valued at $8 million were trapped in Maine waters.

In spite of its importance, the American fishing industry today is severely depressed and faces the most critical problems of its entire history. The other major fish producing nations of the world have undertaken a wide variety of forms of assistance for their fishermen while in this country we have tended to let the industry go almost totally unheeded. This in itself has had a very adverse effect which has been compounded by the fact that the costs of producing fish in foreign countries are far less than those of our fishermen. The result is obvious—American fishermen under present conditions simply cannot compete with imports of low cost foreign fish.

In recent years there have been several attempts to adjust the tariff rates in order to help the domestic fishing industry but these have all met with failure. The only alternative is the development of a program of assistance designed to help the industry to improve its knowledge and technology to the point where it can compete. The first step in this program was taken with the passage by the 84th Congress of the bill which I introduced to authorize a program of fishery education and training in colleges, secondary schools, and vocational schools. In time this should offer a real benefit to the industry by making available specially trained personnel.

The bill I am introducing today is a logical followup to the fishery education act and is urgently needed by the industry. The benefits of an extension service are too well known to warrant reviewing them here. Obviously, the vast majority of our commerical fishermen cannot take time out to go to school. The alternative is to bring up to date information and modern techniques direct to them.

It is my hope that early hearings will be scheduled on this bill by the Senate Commerce Committee so that the Congress will be able to complete action this year. I feel very strongly that we must work rapidly to assist the fishing industry in every way possible, or we will soon find ourselves dependent on foreign countries for fishery products.

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT, RELATING TO EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the Federal Airport Act for a period of 4 years beyond the present expiration date. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement which I have prepared on this subject may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2974) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. PAYNE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The Federal Airport Act was first enacted in 1946 to assist in the development of airport facilities to meet the rapidly growing needs of American aviation. In 1955 the act was substantially amended and the program of assistance was greatly expanded. The 1955 act provided for the expenditure of $63 million a year for fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959. As the law now stands the airport program will expire on July 1, 1959.

There can be no doubt that the airport program has provided its value many times over and much progress has been made in bringing the Nation's airports up to the present-day needs of aviation. But this is far from adequate since aviation in this country has mushroomed in the past 10 years and shows promise of an even greater rate of growth in the next 10. As a matter of fact civil aviation today is facing what will amount to a revolution—the advent of civil jet aircraft—within 1 or 2 years. At that point the airports of this country will be woefully inadequate unless action is taken now to prepare them for the jet air age.

The Federal Airport Program is, of course, a grant-in-aid type of program and is set up on a 50–50 matching basis. Although the present authorization will not expire until next year, I am hopeful that the Congress will approve a 4-year extension this year in order to aid States and local communities in maintaining an orderly sequence of planning and also to facilitate the appropriation process by not having to act on the airport program twice in the first 6 months of next year.

## PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF RIO GRANDE BASIN PROJECT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the purpose of supplementing the authorization for the middle Rio Grande project in New Mexico, with reference to which I have a short statement which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2975) to authorize the modification of the project for the Rio Grande Basin in order to provide for the completion of the middle Rio Grande portion of such project, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. CHAVEZ is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

The bill which I am introducing is for the purpose of supplementing the authorization for the Middle Rio Grande Project in New Mexico, as authorized in the Flood Control Acts of 1948 and 1950, Public Law 858, 80th Congress, and Public Law 516, 81st Congress, respectively.

The present authorization provides for the construction of two flood-control dams on tributaries of the Rio Grande, channelization of the river and levee construction through the highly developed Middle Rio Grande Valley in Central New Mexico. The present authorization does not provide for the construction of a dam and reservoir on the main stem of the Rio Grande which has always been recognized as essential to the full protection of the Rio Grande Valley from floods and sediment encroachment.

We have been making good progress on the construction authorized. One dam has been completed and work has been started on the second dam. A large amount of channelization has also been completed and as a result of this, many thousand acre-feet of water have been salvaged which would otherwise have been lost to this drought ridden area. Some of the authorized levee work has been completed; however, there is considerable work yet to be done on this phase of the protective works. In general, the levees have been constructed to a size and height required if all three flood control dams are completed; therefore, in order for the job to be completed in accordance with the best engineering plans, it is necessary that we have the main-stem storage authorized and constructed. I am hopeful that we can obtain early action on the bill which I am introducing so that the Middle Rio Grande Valley can have the flood protection which is needed and which was anticipated when the initial authorizations were made.

## PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DAM AND RESERVOIR ON CANADIAN RIVER, N. MEX.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a Federal contribution toward the cost of the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Canadian River by the State of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2976) to provide for a Federal contribution toward the cost of the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Canadian River by the State of New Mexico, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement, presented by Mr. CHAVEZ, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

The State of New Mexico is entitled to Canadian River waters originating below Conchas Dam which now flow out of the State unused and the State is working on plans for a dam and reservoir to utilize these waters.

The plan of the State of New Mexico contemplates the construction of a reservoir which would enable the State to use their

water for municipal, industrial, and irrigation purposes. In addition, this project would provide flood control, recreational, and fish and wildlife and other such benefits which would be regional and national in nature. Because of these benefits there should be a Federal contribution to the cost of this project.

The bill which I am introducing would authorize and direct Federal agencies to make studies and determine the extent to which monetary contributions should be made by the Federal Government towards the construction of this project. This bill also authorizes the appropriation of the monetary contribution which shall be agreed upon between the appropriate Federal agency and the State of New Mexico and approved by the President.

## PROGRAM OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a program of educational assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States after January 31, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2978) to establish a program of educational assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces of the United States after January 31, 1955, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS—SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This act may be cited as the "Veterans Educational Act of 1958."

*Findings and declaration of purpose*

SEC. 102. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the national interest and the national security of the United States require the fullest development of the talent of its young men and women; and that to this end it is essential to reduce to a minimum the loss of highly qualified young men and women, because of lack of financial means, to attend educational institutions. It is therefore the purpose of this act to assist young men and women to further their education by establishing a program of assistance. It is the purpose of this law to extend the educational assistance provisions of the GI bill of rights to all veterans discharged (under conditions other than dishonorable) after January 31, 1955, both volunteers and draftees.

SEC. 103. (a) Section 201 (1) of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (38 U. S. C. 911) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term 'basic service period' means the period beginning on June 27, 1950, and ending on the day before the date of termination of military service by a discharge other than dishonorable under the laws of the United States, except that with respect to a person in the active service in the Armed Forces on such day, such term means the period beginning on June 27, 1950, and ending on the date of the person's first discharge or release from such service after such day."

(b) Section 201 (2) (A) of such act is amended by striking out "January 31, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "the day before the date of termination of military service by a discharge other than dishonorable under the laws of the United States."

(c) Section 212 (a) of such act (38 U. S. C. 917) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; except that an eligible veteran who first entered active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, and who was discharged or released from such service prior to the date of enactment of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1957 shall be entitled to initiate a program of education and training under this title at any time within 3 years after the date of enactment of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1957."

(d) Section 212 (c) of such act is amended by striking out "February 1, 1955" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "the date of termination of military service by a discharge other than dishonorable under the laws of the United States."

(e) Section 213 of such act (38 U. S. C. 918) is amended by striking out ", and in no event shall education or training be afforded under this title after January 31, 1965."

SEC. 104. This act shall apply to all persons who served for a period of 90 days or more in the Armed Forces of the United States and who were by a discharge other than dishonorable separated from the service after January 31, 1955. This act applies to veterans who volunteered or were drafted.

*Appropriations authorized*

SEC. 105. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for the payments authorized in this act.

The statement, presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

January 31, 1955, was the termination date of certain rights under the GI bill, and persons who entered the military service after that date were denied the educational benefits enjoyed by veterans in previous years.

Surveys made in the United States indicate that about half of the high school students with college aptitudes do not attend college, due largely to financial inability to attend. This Nation is losing the service of many bright youths who might be engineers, scientists, or leaders in other fields, if they were properly trained. This Nation cannot afford this loss of the undeveloped talents of such a large number of the youth of this country.

It has been the policy of this Government since the second inaugural address of President Abraham Lincoln in 1865 to care, in varying degree, for the veterans of our wars. The education of the veterans of the present cold war is a matter of pressing national concern. These young people who take 2, 3, or 4 years out of their lives to man our defense stations in the Arctic wastes, or serve in the Libyan Desert, or in a thousand other places of hardship, form the shield that is protecting the Nation in these vital days of decision.

A proper national regard for the welfare of these service men and women, and a proper consideration for the survival of our free institutions, compel us to furnish educational opportunities to these youths. This would partially compensate for the time they took out of their school years to serve in our defense installations.

After our young men and young women have given unstintingly of their service to their country, visualize for a moment what happens to so many of them. You've seen this happen to your friends down the street, your next door neighbors, or perhaps in your own family. Picture the young soldier returning home with his honorable discharge. He left home a boy and came home a man, and therein lies the trouble. He's not generally sufficiently trained or educated to earn a living in a man's world. Conditions at home have changed. Younger brothers and sisters require the family income for day-to-day living. He cannot or will not call on his folks to support him—to spend the meager family savings on his education. And, these days, the chances are that the family's savings are meager because statistics show that the majority of American families have no savings or less than $500 savings in the bank.

The direct result of this military cycle is that interrupted education is not resumed. The young veteran returns not to higher schooling, but to a lifetime of unskilled and semiskilled work. I propose to reverse this trend. I seek to extend to all of our young men and young women, who serve their country honorably, the opportunity to attend college.

Mr. President, I have prepared a bill to extend the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights to all veterans, volunteers as well as draftees, men and women, who served at least 90 days, whose service terminated after January 31, 1955. These rights would not extend to anyone who received a dishonorable discharge.

This bill would terminate January 31, 1965.

## AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 so that hereafter section 1 of the plan will no longer apply to the Rural Electrification Administration.

The bill provides for the transfer to the Administrator of REA all functions which were transferred from the Administrator to the Secretary of Agriculture under this reorganization plan.

Refusal of the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with a Senate committee seeking to look into his handling of the REA led to my decision to introduce this legislation.

Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations is vested with authority over legislation relating to reorganizations in the executive branch, and further has the duty of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

In carrying out this function, the committee established a permanent Subcommittee on Reorganization to which it has delegated the responsibility of processing reorganization proposals and of evaluating the effects of reorganizations of the executive branch.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, it is my duty to follow closely all efforts and actions which attempt or do reorganize the existing structure and functioning of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, for example, in this case, any changes which have taken place, or are contemplated under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

In keeping with this duty, I learned during the summer of the last session of Congress, that what appears to be a rather drastic change in the structure, and functioning and delegation of responsibility had taken place in the De-

partment of Agriculture, without any consultation with our committee. This change involves the functioning of the Rural Electrification Administration, and what up until recently used to be the autonomous functioning of the REA Administrator.

Previously, on August 20, 1957, I explored this matter at great length on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I need not at this time repeat in detail what I reported to you at that time. It will be sufficient, I believe, at this time, to merely summarize what I discussed at that time.

In testifying before the Subcommittee on Reorganization in 1953 in reference to the then-proposed Reorganization Plan No. 2, Mr. Benson assured the committee, the Congress, and general public, that it was his intention to consult with Members of the Congress, with the farming organizations, and other interested groups, in accordance with the intent of section 4 (b) of the Reorganization Plan, regarding any proposed major redistribution of functions within the Department of Agriculture, and that interested individuals and associations would be afforded appropriate opportunity to place before the Department of Agriculture their views with respect to any proposed redistribution of functions. In his testimony the Secretary stated that "it is contemplated that full publicity would be given to the matter through press releases and through direct notification to major farm organizations. It would also be our purpose to advise and consult with appropriate committees of Congress and leaders in agriculture."

The Congress, in voting on this reorganization plan, accepted the words of the Secretary in good faith. But, Mr. President, the Secretary has violated this faith.

He has done it in this way. He has undermined the authority of the REA Administrator—authority, I remind you, which has been granted by the Congress—to be sole judge in determining whether or not a loan to a rural electric cooperative can and should be made.

As Mr. Benson related in a press conference, David Hamil, REA Administrator, now must get clearance from his office to make loans of $500,000 or more. In a newspaper report—which has since been verified by the Secretary—of this conference, it was reported that Benson said that Kenneth Scott, Director of Agricultural Credit Service, per instructions issued by the Secretary, told Hamil that he must discuss with the Director of Agricultural Credit any loans of a half million or more before they are made. And, added to this, Mr. President, I have been reliably informed by one Mr. D'Ewart of Montana that it really is not Mr. Scott who passes on these loans. You all will recall Mr. D'Ewart as being a former Member of the House of Representatives and as an unsuccessful applicant, subsequent to his service in the House of Representatives, before the Senate for a position in the Department of the Interior. You will also recall that while serving in the House, Mr. D'Ewart compiled what one would consider anything but an enviable record in favor of REA legislation. And this is the man, I repeat, a man who does not favor the rural electrification program, who has reportedly been put in charge of passing on REA loan applications.

As I related to this body in August 1957, I submit that in all fairness this action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, as he has stated it in his own words, is in contradiction to and in violation of the assurances given to the Subcommittee on Reorganization and the assurances given to the Senate in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. The report made in connection with this plan is replete with statements to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture would give ample advance notice to all concerned within and without the Congress when any move was made to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

What is the real purpose of this change ordered by Secretary Benson? I think we are entitled to know if it is an attempt to remove one of the most vital, if not the most vital, competitive weapons which the rural electric cooperatives have at their disposal. Namely, the right of the rural electric systems to generate and transmit their own power where it is to their advantage. Apparently involved in this issue which I have been discussing is what used to be at least the nonpolitical, nonpartisan administration of this vital REA generating and transmission loan program. Now, we have a case of an apparently conscientious Administrator being put into a straitjacket—removed of one of the most important authorities which has been granted by the Congress—by the utilization of a Government reorganization designed to promote, not sabotage, efficiency.

I believe my previous statements on this matter on the Senate floor have made it clear that I was not seeking to jump to conclusions. I was seeking, as part of my duty as a subcomittee chairman, to ascertain the facts. Charges about this REA reorganization were publicly printed by the national magazine of the rural electric cooperatives. I felt we, in the Senate, were entitled to an explanation.

As the records will show, subsequent to finding out about the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration, on August 5, 1957, I wrote the Secretary informing him that it was my intent to hold hearings on this matter so that the Congress may have firsthand information on the change in policy which has been made. I offered the Secretary several alternative dates, and went so far as to invite him to appear at any convenient time before Congress recessed. I was informed that the Secretary was out of town, that he could not appear on any of the specific dates I had mentioned, that the Secretary did not know when he could appear.

Subsequent to this I received, on August 12, a letter from True D. Morse, then Acting Secretary, in which he completely ignored the charges that have been made and, further, made no reference to my formal request for the Secretary of Agriculture's appearance before the subcommittee in connection with this matter.

Furthermore, Mr. Morse ignored completely, and in my opinion that is significant, the fact that it is the Secretary of Agriculture who is responsible for the Department of Agriculture for any basic changes in policy, such as the reported change affecting the Rural Electrification Administration, and for any accounting to the Congress for any such changes made.

Referring again to the testimony given in 1953 on Reorganization Plan No. 2, the Secretary of Agriculture specifically stated that he, and he alone, shall be responsible for reorganization plans and developments, and that he, and he alone, would feel under obligation to consult the interested parties and the Congress when such matters were under consideration.

And I might add, more than parenthetically, it was this same Secretary of Agriculture who in 1953 said to the Subcommittee on Reorganization that he contemplated no major changes in the administration of the Rural Electrification Administration program; and that if any major changes were contemplated, he would be the first to consult with the Congress before making such a change, and that if the Congress disapproved of any proposed changes, he was certain such changes would not be made.

I could go on, Mr. President, but to save the time of the Senate allow me to refer all those interested to what I had to say on this matter on August 29, 1957.

Further correspondence was received from the Secretary's office and replied to by me. In fact one such reply to subsequent requests by me to the Secretary to appear before the subcommittee was actually answered by the Secretary. It was hand delivered to my office on August 30, 1957, and if my memory serves me right this was the day Congress adjourned. It arrived at my office at 4:45 p. m., and again, if my memory serves me right, this was several minutes after the 1st session of the 85th Congress had adjourned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed at this point in my discussion.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D. C., August 30, 1957.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have carefully considered your further letter of August 22, 1957, about the questions you have raised concerning the rumored changes in the lending policy of the Rural Electrification Administration.

These questions were also discussed in Mr. Morse's letter to you of August 9 and my letter of August 20. Substantially the same questions were raised during my press conference of August 20. A transcript of that portion of the press conference which includes my answers regarding REA was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21, by Senator MORTON.

In both the letters and the press conference I have pointed out that there has been no reorganization of REA. The request to Mr. Hamil that he consult or discuss with the Director of Agricultural Credit Services

applications for loans over $500,000, has not curtailed his authority for final approval on those loans. This action was taken in view of the record volume of applications for REA loans and the many complex problems which have arisen in the administration of that program due to population shifts, increased costs of equipment, machinery and labor, and an increasing demand for more electric current for both farm and nonfarm use.

The changing character of the Nation's countryside is having a marked effect on the territory and electric service requirements of many REA borrowers. City people are moving to the country and building homes. Industry is locating in suburban and rural areas. The REA service territories are losing a good bit of their rural traits. About half of their revenue comes from farm service and the remaining half from nonfarm residences, commercial, and miscellaneous services.

The increasing demand for electric power throughout the country is reflected in constantly increasing demands for REA loans to provided needed facilities. REA loan approvals are keeping pace with this trend as shown by the following table:

| Fiscal year: | *Loans approved during year* |
|---|---|
| 1952 | $165,758,731 |
| 1953 | 164,972,662 |
| 1954 | 167,104,100 |
| 1955 | 167,530,430 |
| 1956 | 189,804,800 |
| 1957 | 300,461,514 |

The request of Mr. Scott to Mr. Hamil that he be given a chance to review the applications for the loans in question was completely compatible with my testimony on Reorganization Plan No. 2. It is in line with the legal authority which exists in the basic law, in the reorganization plan, and in the public notices with respect to that plan which were published in the Federal Register in 1953 and 1954.

In my colloquy with you in the hearings on the reorganization plan held on May 18, 1953, 83d Congress, 1st session, at page 169, you asked whether it was my intention "to leave the REA pretty much as an autonomous organization."

I replied as follows:

"Certainly I do not have in mind weakening the service which REA is rendering. I think it is very essential, and I do feel that we have selected a good man to help it, and he will be given a pretty free hand, I am sure. But if we have in mind any major changes, certainly we would want to consult with the Congress before we took such steps, because I know there is a very wide interest in that agency, probably as much as in almost any other agency in the Department."

The requirement that these applications be reviewed by the Director of Agricultural Credit Services does not weaken the service which the agency was created by Congress to render. It was not a major change either in policy or in organization. It was not a transfer or an abolition of a function. The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make that request of an agency head under his supervision and direction, including REA, existed even before the reorganization plan of 1953 was approved.

REA was created as an independent agency of the Government by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U. S. C. 901, 914). Section 1 of the act provided that all of the Administration's powers would be exercised by an Administrator. However, that section was substantially modified by section 5 of President Roosevelt's Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 (5 U. S. C., p. 125), which transferred REA and its functions and activities to the Department of Agriculture and provided that such functions and activities "shall be administered in that Department by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture."

It appears that in 1944 a question arose about the making of allotments as required by the act. The Department took the position, with the full legal approval of its Solicitor, that the Secretary's duty to supervise and direct the activities of REA not only permitted him to approve the allotments but made it his duty to do so if desirable for the proper operation of the program.

This conclusion was based on decisions of the courts, notably *Knight* v. *United States Land Association* (142 U. S. 161), and the decision of the Comptroller General (19 C. G. 400). In the Knight case the Supreme Court concluded that the words "direction and supervision" are synonymous with the word "control" and import broad powers including the power to initiate, guide, superintend, manage, rule, review, notify, and overrule.

In that case the court was construing words directing the Commissioner of the General Land Office to perform certain functions "under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior." The court said that the words under discussion are an expression of the power of the Secretary to supervise and control the extensive operations of the land department and then quoted with approval the statement of the Secretary of Interior, as follows:

"The statute in placing the whole business of the Department under the supervision of the Secretary invests him with authority to review, reverse, amend, annul, or affirm all proceedings in the Department."

See also *Orchard* v. *Alexander* (157 U. S. 372 (1895)); *Cameron* v. *United States* (252 U. S. 450, 460 (1920)); and *West* v. *Standard Oil Company* (278 U. S. 200, 220 (1929)).

State court decisions also follow this rule. They have held that the terms connote a power to superintend generally together with the incidental authority to regulate and control. *Vantongeren* v. *Heffernan et al.* (5 Dak. 180, 38 N. W. 52 (1888)); *State ex rel. Board of Transportation* v. *Fremont, E. & M. V. R. Co.* (22 Neb. 313, 35 N. W. 118 (1887)).

The courts apparently do not distinguish between phrases using the word "general" with "direction and supervision" from those where the word "general" is not used. See *Great Northern Railway Company* v. *Snohomish County* (93 Pac. 924 (Wash. 1906)).

This conclusion with respect to the Secretary's authority over the Rural Electrification Administration Administrator followed the policy determination of the Department reached in early 1940 in connection with the transfer of the Farm Credit Administration to this Department to be "administered in such Department under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture." The Comptroller General in 19 Comp. Gen. 400 said:

"Consequently the Farm Credit Administration must be regarded as no longer an independent agency but as an agency within the Department of Agriculture and under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. * * * there would appear to be no authority under existing law for the effecting of such a transfer of authority and responsibility as would amount to a restoration of the Farm Credit Administration to its former status 'an autonomous Federal agency.'"

It seems clear therefore that the request that the Rural Electrification Administrator review certain loans with the Director of Agricultural Credit Services is not the exercise of new authority vested in me by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. Moreover, it is a step which is well within the information given to the Congress and the public at the time Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 was presented, approved, and made effective.

The Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration is not only requested to discuss major loan problems with the Director of Agricultural Credit Services, but the law requires that all special livestock loans over $50,000 must be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture because of the major problems involved.

Soon after I became Secretary of Agriculture, I alined the agencies of the Department into major groups, each group to report to me through designated officials of the Department. During the Senate hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 2, I furnished and there was included in the hearings two charts showing the organization of the Department effective January 21, 1953, and as amended March 10, 1953. The January 21 chart shows the Farm Credit Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration grouped under agricultural credit and that these agencies are to report through the head of that group. The March 10 chart shows substantially the same arrangement (pp. 142 and 144, hearings before the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, on Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 and Senate Resolution 100 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2, 1953, May 12, 13, and 18, 1953 (other references to hearings contained in this letter are to hearings before this subcommittee)).

By Secretary's memorandum 1320, dated January 21, 1953, all employees of the Department were advised that "agency and office heads within each group will report to their respective group head. * * * The Secretary and the Under Secretary meeting jointly with the major group heads and the Solicitor will consider matters of policy determination and long-range planning. * * * This organizational arrangement will make possible closer coordination of related activities and will centralize responsibility for consideration and determination of operating problems and other matters requiring departmental attention within each group." A copy of this memorandum was furnished the subcommittee and appears in the hearings at pages 140–141.

As you are aware, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all of the functions of the heads of the agencies with which it dealt, including REA. However, on August 28, 1953, I issued, and there was published in the Federal Register of that date (18 F. R. 5155), a delegation to each Assistant Secretary and to the Director of Agricultural Credit Services the authority to exercise general direction and supervision over the agencies of the Department designated in such delegation. The delegation also provides that nothing therein shall "preclude the Secretary of Agriculture from exercising any of the powers and functions or from performing any of the duties herein conferred."

This was implemented by Secretary's memorandum 1320, supplement 2, dated September 18, 1953, which directed the agencies of the Department to report to designated Assistant Secretaries or, in the case of the agencies grouped under Agricultural Credit Services to report to the Director. This was in line with my delegation of August 28, 1953.

On October 13, 1953, my office issued a press release outlining a proposed reorganization of the Department to which was attached an announcement of intention to reorganize and a chart showing the Rural Electrification Administration grouped with other agencies under Agricultural Credit, under an assistant to the Secretary, under the Secretary. (The Office of Assistant to the Secretary in Charge of Agricultural Credit is now known as the Director of Agricultural Credit Services.)

The assignment of functions to the agencies under the reorganization plan was pub-

lished in the Federal Register for January 6, 1954 (19 F. R. 74). Among other things this assignment provides:

"No delegation or authorization prescribed in this document shall preclude the Secretary from exercising any of the powers or functions or from performing any of the duties conferred herein and any such delegation or authorization is subject at all times to withdrawal or amendment by the Secretary. No delegation or authorization prescribed in this document shall preclude the exercise of any delegation or authorization otherwise provided to the Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, Administrative Assistant Secretary, or Assistant to the Secretary for Agricultural Credit, or to the staff agencies as provided in section 112 hereof. * * * The head of each agency (1) will maintain close working relationships with the officer to whom he reports, (2) will keep him advised with respect to major problems and developments, and (3) will discuss with him proposed action involving major policy questions or other important considerations or questions, including matters involving relationships with other agencies of this Department, other Federal agencies, or other governmental or private organizations or groups."

I hope these comments answer the questions you have raised regarding any reported recent reorganization or major policy change in REA.

In your letter of August 22 you assign as one reason for the proposed hearing the necessity of this Department providing the Congress with its official position on any proposed changes in the policy of the agency which are contrary to the intent of the Congress. We, of course, would not initiate any changes which are contrary to the intent of Congress and we would be the first to suggest, as required by the reorganization plan, that we discuss with the Congress any major changes proposed to take effect in the future.

In these circumstances, there would be no information we could give in the proposed hearing which has not heretofore been given in previous letters, the press conference of which you have a transcript, or in this reply.

I know you will give careful consideration to the additional information about the working arrangements we have with regard to REA and the legal and administrative justification for them that I have pointed out in this letter.

After you have had a chance to study this communication it would be most helpful if you would let me know if there are any procedures or policies being followed by the Department in the REA loan program with which you do not agree.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
*Secretary.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. This letter, Mr. President, is a masterful piece of workmanship. It is an impressive letter, and a superficial reading would indicate that Secretary Benson has adequately proved that he has made no changes. Analysis of this lengthy and impressive letter, however, leads me to conclude in the opposite.

Mr. Benson adamantly holds to his position that there has been no reorganization of REA. Mr. Benson continues to argue, to use his own words, that "the request to Mr. Hamil that he consult or discuss with the Director of Agricultural Credit Services applications for loans over $500,000 has not curtailed his authority for final approval on those loans." Note the careful choice of words, Mr. President—"request," "consult or discuss." In my humble opinion, I feel that Mr. Hamil now has about as much authority or independent discretion to make up his own mind as I would if my banker told me I would have to take out the bank's insurance policy if I wished to borrow money to purchase a car. That is to say, I can either take the insurance policy or do without the loan. Mr. Hamil, in my opinion, is in the same position. He can submit all such loans to Mr. Scott or, if not, resign from his position.

The point I am trying to make is this, Mr. President: The Secretary of Agriculture has violated his trust. He, in my opinion, has set himself up as administrator and legislator. He has, in effect, usurped the powers and prerogatives of the Congress. In 1953, Mr. President, we took the Secretary at his word. He was to consult with the Congress before he took any steps to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. He has not done this. No fair-minded person could agree with the Secretary. By his action he has removed the autonomous status of the REA Administrator. And to me, Mr. President, this constitutes a major change, the Secretary's argument to the contrary notwithstanding.

And, furthermore, the Secretary has flouted the will of the Congress by, in my opinion, refusing to appear before a Congressional committee.

By his actions, Mr. President, I feel morally obligated to attempt to correct a situation which, as I have mentioned, could establish a dangerous precedent, and which, in this specific instance, could well lead to the beginning of the end of the rural electrification program.

I have consistently supported the reorganization proposals of the past, under this administration and the last administration. I supported Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, admittedly with some misgivings, but did so in view of the personal assurances given our committee by Secretary Benson.

In view of those assurances being broken, I feel under no obligation to continue any support for that reorganization plan insofar as it applies to REA. The bill I have introduced would restore REA to its original status within the Department of Agriculture that it had when established and held until the reorganization authority was given to Secretary Benson on the basis of his pledge not to use it without consulting with our committee.

Perhaps Secretary Benson could have avoided this legislation if he had been willing to come before my committee for the hearings I requested. Perhaps now, if he is anxious to retain his authority, he will find time to come.

I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted at a meeting of region IV at Toledo, Ohio, on September 17, 1957, may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be received and printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2990) to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The resolution, presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

REORGANIZATION OF REA

Whereas the original REA Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a Congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper Congressional committees and other interested groups; and

Whereas in June 1957 the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of $500,000 or more be reviewed by persons outside REA: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we are vigorously opposed to any reorganization of REA; we are absolutely opposed to this recent action by Secretary Benson which threatens to make REA a partisan political agency; and be it further

*Resolved*, That as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January that a bill be introduced and passed exempting REA from the Reorganization Act of 1953 and that this same bill stipulate that REA is to be reestablished as it was prior to the passage of the Reorganization Act.

---

## SMALL BUSINESS RESEARCH AND REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to expand the opportunities of small businesses to participate in and to derive the benefits from research and development.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2993) to expand the opportunities of small businesses to participate in and to derive the benefits from research and development, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the bill there be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement explaining the bill. The purpose of the bill is to expand the opportunities of small business to participate in and to derive the benefits from research and development.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

The growth and progress of industry and commerce in the United States has been, to a very considerable extent, the result of research and development. Research in the fields of electronics, chemistry, physics and other sciences has yielded principles which have been further developed and applied to reveal the new world we see around us. The patent system, the land-grant colleges and universities, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Bureau of Standards, the Naval Research Institute, and the National Science Foundation indicate the importance which the Federal Government has always placed upon the increase and diffusion of knowledge

among men and the application of this knowledge to useful arts and sciences for the benefit of the Nation at large.

Basic and applied research and the development of useful applications of the principles which are discovered are going on at a remarkably high rate today. We can expect that the current research and development work will result in even greater changes in the world of tomorrow.

According to a survey made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the National Science Foundation, on the research and development work performed in 1953, the total of this research and development work amounted to more than $5 billion during that year. Of this, programs financed by industry amounted to about $2.3 billion, and programs carried on or financed by the Federal Government amounted to almost $2 billion.

In its sixth report on Federal funds for science, the National Science Foundation estimated that the Federal research and development budget for fiscal 1958 would involve expenditures of $3.3 billion, and Business Week for September 21, 1957, estimated the total spending on research in 1957 at $10 billion.

Much of this research and development work will produce commercially valuable products and processes, which will benefit those concerns able to produce and sell them. Unfortunately for the free competitive enterprise system and in the long run for the national economy, a disproportionate share of the research and development is being done by large concerns, while the small concerns are able to do proportionately little research and development work. The National Science Foundation report on science and engineering in American industry in 1953 shows that only 8.3 percent of manufacturing companies with 8 to 99 employees engage in research and development and only 22.4 percent of manufacturing companies with 100 to 499 employees do so, while 94.3 percent of concerns with 5,000 or more employees carry on research and development. The same report shows that manufacturing concerns with less than 500 employees, which have about 35 percent of manufacturing employment, employ only 20 percent of the total scientists and engineers and account for only about 11 percent of the amount spent on research and development. Concerns with 5,000 or more employees, however, which have about 40 percent of manufacturing employment, employ more than 60 percent of the scientists and engineers and account for almost 75 percent of the research and development expenditures by industry.

The vast amounts spent by the Federal Government on research and development also go overwhelmingly to large firms. The Defense Department, which in 1956 accounted for $1.9 billion of the total Federal expenditure of $2.7 billion, reported only about 6 percent of its research and development contracts were with small business firms in fiscal 1956. The Atomic Energy Commission, which had the next largest research and development program, awarded only 1 percent of its research and development contracts to small business in fiscal 1953, 1954, and 1955.

The advantages to a concern performing this Government research are considerable. In addition to the assured profit on the contract itself, the concern will receive the inside track on substantial procurement contracts which may result from the research. It will also have advance knowledge and probably extra information about new commercial products which may be developed from the research. It will have built up a staff of scientific personnel familiar with the research and be in the best position to develop commercial applications. And in many cases it will be able to obtain patents, subject, in the case of research for the Department of Defense, only to a license to the Government, leaving commercial exploitation up to the concern. Under these conditions small business concerns must necessarily fall rapidly behind in the competitive race for new products and new processes.

In my judgment, three things can be done which will help to keep small business in the race and will thereby strengthen the free competitive enterprise system and the national economy.

In the first place, every effort should be made to see that small business concerns have a chance to obtain Government research and development contracts. I realize that this cannot be done in every case. In some instances only the large concern can do the research or may be interested in doing the research. Nevertheless, I believe that a vigorous effort should be made to award as many research and development contracts to small businesses as possible. This will be of direct benefit to the small business concerns and to the economy as a whole.

In the second place, every effort should be made to make available to small business concerns the benefits and results of all of the research and development work done by the Government or at Government expense. If the Goverment pays for research and pays a price which will yield the concern doing the research a profit, it would seem difficult to justify adding to that profit the right to all the commercial benefits of an invention derived from that research, paid for by the taxpayers, including small business concerns.

In the third place, I believe that arrangements should be made to enable small-business concerns to get together to carry on research and development programs, with an exemption from the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act. Research and development projects are often extremely expensive and the results do not always pay off at once in measurable profits. A single small-business concern may not have the financial resources to carry on over a period the kind of research and development work which would give it an equal opportunity to compete in a new fast-developing market with its giant competitor. However, a group of small-business concerns might each be able to devote a fraction of the cost of the research and development contracts and produce something which would benefit not only the small-business concerns involved but also the consuming public and the national economy.

This would not be inconsistent with the basic purposes of the antitrust laws and Federal Trade Commission Act. Rather, by increasing the opportunity of small-business concerns, it would promote and strengthen the free competitive enterprise system and the national economy as well.

In order to carry out these objectives, I have prepared a bill which will give to the Small Business Administration the duty and authority to pursue these three objectives in the interest of small businesses. Other Government agencies which have activities in this field will be called upon to cooperate with the Small Business Administration in pursuing these objectives.

This bill will not eliminate the need for other relief for small-business concerns, such as tax revisions and measures to provide access to credit. It will, however, serve to reduce substantially one of the handicaps under which small businesses now suffer, and to place them in a more nearly equal position with big businesses in the competitive race for the future. In my judgment, this will be a substantial benefit to the economy of the Nation.

## PROBLEMS OF OLDER MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, among the problems of social welfare which require further attention and solution in our country, many—perhaps the majority—are problems affecting particularly our older men and women. Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, who has been a leader in the Congress in all matters of social welfare and humanitarian concerns of our society, has proposed a very constructive step to accelerate our coming to grips with these problems of the aged in America. Representative FOGARTY has introduced in the House of Representatives a bill, H. R. 9822, which provides for the calling of a White House Conference on Aging patterned upon the recent White House Conference on problems of education. I consider it a privilege today to introduce in the Senate a companion bill to H. R. 9822, so that both Houses of Congress will have the opportunity at the same time to consider this worthwhile proposal.

Representative FOGARTY points out, and the findings in the first section of his bill declare, that older people face, to a far greater extent than is typical of the population as a whole, problems of health, housing, and financial costs of maintaining a decent standard of living. Beyond all this, there is a basic question of maintaining a constructive and meaningful role in today's society at an age when men and women are expected to retire from employment. This particular aspect of the problem, that of finding jobs after 40, has especially interested me as being one of the potential sources of real and unnecessary tragedy to many families. It should be one important topic to be taken up at the proposed White House Conference on Aging.

Representative FOGARTY's bill contemplates the holding of preliminary conferences in the several States prior to the convening of the national White House Conference, as was done in the field of education, in recognition of the very large responsibility which must rest on State and local authorities for the policies and services required to meet the needs of aging people.

I am pleased to announce that the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has kindly consented to be a cosponsor of this measure in the Senate.

To facilitate study of the bill by Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2994) to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States before December 31, 1958, to be planned and conducted by the special staff on aging of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other agencies of that Department and of other depart-

ments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER [for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER], was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "White House Conference on Aging Act."

TITLE I—NEED FOR LEGISLATION; DECLARATION OF POLICY; DEFINITIONS

*Need for legislation*

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the public interest requires the enactment of legislation to formulate recommendations for immediate action in improving and developing programs to permit the country to take advantage of the experience and skills of the older persons in our population, to create conditions which will better enable them to meet their needs, and to further research on aging because—

(1) the number of persons 45 years of age and older in our population has increased from approximately 13½ million in 1900 to 49½ million in 1957, and the number 65 years of age and over from approximately 3 million in 1900 to almost 15 million at the present time, and is expected to reach 21 million by 1975; and

(2) outmoded practices in the employment and compulsory premature retirement of middle-aged and older persons are depriving the economy of their much needed experience, skill, and energy, and simultaneously, depriving many middle-aged and older persons of opportunity for gainful employment and an adequate standard of living; and

(3) many older persons do not have adequate financial resources to maintain themselves and their families as independent and self-respecting members of their communities, to obtain the medical and rehabilitation services required to permit them to function as healthy, useful members of society, and to permit them to enjoy the normal, human, social contacts; and

(4) our failure to provide adequate housing for elderly persons at costs which can be met by them is perpetuating slum conditions in many of our cities and smaller communities and is forcing many older persons to live under conditions in which they cannot maintain decency and health, or continue to participate in the organized life of the community; and

(5) the lack of suitable facilities and opportunities in which middle-aged persons can learn how to prepare for the later years of life, learn new vocational skills, and develop and pursue avocational and recreational interests is driving many of our older persons into retirement shock, premature physical and mental deterioration, and loneliness and isolation and is filling up our mental institutions and general hospitals and causing an unnecessary drain on our health manpower; and

(6) in order to prevent the additional years of life, given to us by our scientific development and abundant economy, from becoming a prolonged period of dying, we must step up research on the physical, psychological, and sociological factors in aging and in diseases common among middle-aged and older persons; and

(7) we may expect average length of life and the number of older people to increase still further, we must proceed with all possible speed to correct these conditions and to create a social, economic, and health climate which will permit our middle-aged and older people to continue to lead proud and independent lives which will restore and rehabilitate many of them to useful and dignified positions among their neighbors; which will enhance the vigor and vitality of the communities and of our total economy; and which will prevent further aggravation of their problems with resulting increased social, financial, and medical burdens.

*Declaration of policy*

SEC. 102. (a) While the primary responsibility for meeting the challenge and problems of aging is that of the States and communities, all levels of government are involved and must necessarily share responsibility; and it is therefore the policy of the Congress that the Federal Government shall work jointly with the States and their citizens, to develop recommendations and plans for action, consistent with subsection (b) of this section, which will serve the purposes of—

(1) assuring middle-aged and older persons equal opportunity with others to engage in gainful employment which they are capable of performing, thereby gaining for our economy the benefits of their skills, experience, and productive capacities; and

(2) enabling retired persons to enjoy incomes sufficient for health and for participation in family and community life as self-respecting citizens; and

(3) providing housing suited to the needs of older persons and at prices they can afford to pay; and

(4) assisting middle-aged and older persons to make the preparation, develop skills and interests, and find social contacts which will make the gift of added years of life a period of reward and satisfaction and avoid unnecessary social costs of premature deterioration and disability; and

(5) stepping up research designed to relieve old age of its burdens of sickness, mental breakdown, and social ostracism.

(b) It is further declared to be the policy of Congress that in all programs developed there should be emphasis upon the right and obligation of older persons to free choice and self-help in planning their own futures.

*Definitions*

SEC. 103. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(2) The term "Special Staff on Aging" means the coordinating and information service unit which operates within the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(3) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

TITLE II—WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

SEC. 201. (a) A White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States in order to develop recommendations for further research and action in the field of aging, which will further the policies set forth in section 102 of this act, shall be planned and conducted under the direction of the Special Staff on Aging which shall have the cooperation and assistance of such other units of that Department and of other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate.

(b) For the purpose of arriving at facts and recommendations concerning the utilization of skills, experience, and energies and the improvement of the conditions of our older people, the conference shall bring together representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, professional and lay people who are working in the field of aging, and of the general public including older persons themselves.

(c) A final report of the White House Conference on Aging shall be submitted to the President not later than 90 days following the date on which the conference was called and the findings and recommendations included therein shall be immediately made available to the public.

*Grants*

SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby authorized to be paid to each State which shall submit an application for funds for the exclusive use in planning and conducting a State conference on aging prior to and for the purpose of developing facts and recommendations and preparing a report of the findings for presentation to the White House Conference on Aging, and in defraying costs incident to the State's delegates attending the White House Conference on Aging, a sum to be determined by the Secretary, but not more than $50,000; such sums to be paid only from funds specifically appropriated for this purpose.

(b) Payments shall be made by the Secretary to an officer designated by the governor of the State to receive such payment and to assume responsibility for organizing and conducting the State conference.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

*Administration*

SEC. 301. In administering this act, the Special Staff on Aging shall:

(1) Request the cooperation and assistance of such other agencies of that Department and of other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate in carrying out the provisions of the act;

(2) Render all reasonable assistance to the States in enabling them to organize and conduct conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging;

(3) Prepare and make available background materials for the use of delegates to the White House Conference as it may deem necessary and shall prepare and distribute such report or reports of the Conference as may be indicated; and

(4) In carrying out the provisions of this act, engage such additional personnel as may be necessary (without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act) within the amount of the funds appropriated for this purpose.

*Advisory committees*

SEC. 302. The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish an Advisory Committee to the White House Conference on Aging composed of professional and public members, and, as necessary, to establish technical advisory committees to advise and assist in planning and conducting the Conference. Appointed members of such committees, while attending conferences or meetings of their committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary or Special Staff on Aging, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 401. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress determines to be necessary for the administration of this act.

---

## AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for 1 year the GI home loan program and to make available additional funds for the direct lending program.

This is virtually the same bill passed overwhelmingly by both Houses of the Congress during the last session, but vetoed by the President on the ground that its enactment would be inflationary.

The passage of time has proved in the field of housing, as it has in other fields, that the Congress has had the foresight and the leadership so sadly lacking by the Executive. Nowhere is this more telling than on the question of the GI housing program.

I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated at this point in the RECORD some remarks I made at the time of the Presidential veto, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill being introduced today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the remarks and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2995) to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN for himself and Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The remarks and section-by-section analysis, presented by Mr. SPARKMAN, are as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN AT THE TIME OF THE VETO OF H. R. 4602

The existing situation, characterized by high interest rates and a scarcity of mortgage money, has denied to many veterans the right to purchase a home. The bill which the Congress sent to the President would not only have provided more Federal money for direct loans to veterans but also would have extended the time during which veterans could have obtained both direct loans and guaranteed loans. By refusing to extend this date, we will find that a substantial number of veterans may no longer be able to avail themselves of either the VA guaranteed home-loan program or the direct home-loan program.

The administration's attempts to combat inflation have been confined almost solely to increasing interest rates. As the cost of borrowing money went up, more and more veterans found that they could not borrow money or that the house of their choice was too expensive. The President's action reflects a continuing disregard for human needs and a further attempt to protect the high profits brought about by the administration's tight-money policy. It is inconceivable that this bill would have created any additional inflationary pressures, particularly in an industry in which the productive capacity has fallen approximately 20 percent within the last year. The President's action in vetoing this bill will require the Congress to take further action on this same subject during the next session of Congress.

---

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: Amends section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, by revising and extending the entire section in order to—

1. Define direct-loan areas as rural areas and small cities and towns not near large metropolitan areas. (Existing law does not contain geographical limitations.)

2. Make the interest rate on direct loans vary according to any changes in the interest rate on guaranteed loans. (Existing law contains a ceiling of 4½ percent interest rate on direct loans.)

3. Increase the maximum mortgage amount under the direct-loan program from $10,000 to $13,500.

4. Authorize the VA Administrator to reserve direct-loan funds for 3 months under commitments to builders for a 2-percent fee. Private lenders would receive the commitment fee, if such lenders purchase these loans within 60 days following VA disbursement. The VA would make construction advances up to an amount equal to cost of land, plus 80 percent of value of improvements.

5. Extend the direct-loan program by 1 year and 25 days to July 25, 1959.

6. Require VA to begin immediate processing of all direct-loan applications, such processing to run concurrently with a 20-day period allowed for Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program action.

Section 2: Amends section 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to make available approximately $200 million for the direct-loan program until July 25, 1959 (the termination date proposed in sec. 1 of the bill).

Section 3 (technical): Amends section 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, relating to the date on which the VA guaranty of home loans made by supervised lenders become effective.

Section 4: Amends sections 500 and 507 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the loan guaranty program by 1 year to July 25, 1959.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am vitally interested in any measure in behalf of the veterans of this country. We would not have a country if it were not for the veterans.

I am strongly in favor of the bill which has just been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], of which I am coauthor.

First, this is an emergency matter, in my view, and I urge the Committee on Banking and Currency to report the bill as promptly as possible, so that our veterans can obtain this very badly needed housing.

Second, by reason of the Chief Executive's veto of the bill in 1957, we have already lost the opportunity to construct 20,000 housing units for our veterans in small towns and rural areas, where the need for housing was amply demonstrated in the testimony taken last year.

Third, there is no need to hold further hearings on this matter. What was true when Congress passed the bill in the last session is still true, except more so.

Fourth and finally, Mr. President, I believe that the remarks which I made when the bill was considered last year have been amply borne out by subsequent events, and I ask unanimous consent to have those remarks printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR THURMOND ON VETERANS' HOUSING AT 1957 SESSION

Mr. President, this amendment to the committee amendment is the first of a series of amendments which I intend to offer to H. R. 4602, for the purpose of extending the home loan guaranty program for World War II veterans for a period of 1 year from July 25, 1958, its present expiration date. The direct home loan program is extended for a like period by the other amendments. In the event my first amendment prevails, the other amendments to which I have referred should be adopted to effectuate the extensions.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a situation concerning our World War II veterans which now exists and which is becoming more aggravated each day. I refer to the inability of our World War II veterans to obtain loans for the purchase of homes, under the liberal downpayment and maturity provisions and at the 4½ percent interest rate now prescribed by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. As Senators are aware, under Public Law 898, 84th Congress, enacted August 1, 1956, the right of World War II veterans to use their home loan guaranty entitlements will expire on July 25, 1958.

In a hearing before my subcommittee on June 3, 1957, it was clearly indicated that there are many World War II veterans who intended to use their loan guaranty entitlements by July 25, 1958. Unfortunately, due to the tight money market, it has become quite clear that a large number of these veterans will not be able to use their entitlements by July 1958, and that the program will phase out more rapidly than was anticipated by the Congress.

One of the reasons for this situation is that the lenders have been charging unconscionable discounts to builders and sellers. I understand these discounts have been increasing during the past year, so that at present they range up to 9 and 10 points in some parts of the country. Under the law, these discounts cannot be passed along to the veteran, at least openly. However, the builders and sellers are reluctant to absorb the discounts, and commonsense tells us that it is the veteran home purchaser who ultimately suffers from this situation. Yet, without the discounts, the lenders refuse to make loans at 4½ percent.

That this has caused serious harm to the guaranty-loan program there can be no doubt. Very little loan activity exists today, although a large number of veterans were expected to exercise their loan-entitlement rights this year and through 1958. In fact, and in answer to a specific question propounded at the hearings of my subcommittee, it was stated by the Veterans' Administration that, as of January 1957, it expected from 850,000 to 900,000 World War II veterans to use their loan entitlements, or declare their intention to use them, by having applications filed by July 1958.

The VA's assumption was based on three premises:

First, that builders would, if construction and permanent mortgage money was available in reasonably plentiful supply, build at prices to meet the needs of the average-income veteran.

Second, that the demand for capital money by industry and others would have lessened by the middle or fall of this year and free funds for mortgage investment.

Third, that the funds from the amortization of principal or prepayment of loans and the payment in full of loans on the $100 billion outstanding mortgage debt as of December 1956, would represent a tidy sum of some $11½ billion or $12 billion for investment in new mortgages.

In connection with the last point, I have been informed by reliable sources that those institutions which invest primarily in mortgages may this fall be looking for mortgages if our present rate of housing starts declines and the general apathy of the buying public persists. I have heard reports that those vet-

erans who now own homes, and have not used their entitlements and desire to purchase new homes, are either confronted with the inability to finance the sale of their old homes, particularly if the sale is to another veteran or are unable to finance the new homes with GI loans at 4½ percent. In the latter case, the builder or seller will refuse to pay the unconscionable discounts I previously mentioned.

There are many more facets to this mortgage-financing picture which have affected our World War II veterans. However, I am informed that the hard-money policy of the administration, which has been aired by my colleagues in the several committees and on the floors of both Houses of the Congress, has proved to be one of the deterrents to the use of guaranty entitlements by our veterans.

A review of the testimony of witnesses before the House Veterans' Affairs and the House Banking and Currency Committees advocating an increase in the GI interest rate to 5 percent shows that no assurances were given that the increase in the rate would assure plentiful money for GI loans. There was no indication that loans at 5 percent would be made at par. Discounts would prevail to a lesser degree, maybe, but it was, and now is, evident that discounts would still be in the picture. This is borne out by the marketing of FHA loans, which now bear 5 percent interest, but which are, nevertheless, selling at substantial discounts in most areas of the country.

We are told by the authorities in this field that there are some straws in the wind of an easing in the supply of mortgage funds. In addition, the provisions of the bill, H. R. 4602, which we are now considering, is bound to have some impact on the capital market. It is my view that we should observe the consequences of these actions and the trend in the supply of mortgage funds, rather than contribute to the interest rate spiral by rushing headlong into an increase in the GI loan rate. However, it would be manifestly unfair to World War II veterans to allow their loan entitlements to expire while we are awaiting the outcome of this situation.

Therefore, I am offering an amendment which will afford World War II veterans additional time within which to make use of their loan entitlements. This extension would allow the program to run until July 25, 1959, with an added year for processing. The direct-loan program would be extended for a like period, to take care of our veterans living in rural areas, when private capital is not available.

I do not want to belabor the point by discussing all of the economic problems resulting from lack of mortgage funds; but if we are to help the veterans who intended to use their GI entitlements by July 1958 and who currently and in the foreseeable future will be precluded from doing so, because of factors over which they have no control, a proposal such as this is no more than fair and equitable.

Finally, I point out that the loan-guaranty program is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that every member of this committee has joined as a cosponsor of the amendment. Also a cosponsor is the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has been so greatly interested in housing, and who, over the years, has done work of particular excellence in connection with the veterans' housing program. The junior Senator from Alabama is the father of the program of direct loans to veterans. This program, in my judgment, is one of the most farsighted, beneficent programs ever provided by Congress. It fills a yawning gap in the overall mortgage situation by providing Government loans to veterans located in rural areas, which do not normally attract private capital.

## TIMBER RIGHTS IN OREGON-CALIFORNIA LANDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and myself, a joint resolution to resolve a problem which the Department of the Interior says can be corrected only by legislation.

This proposal is designed to authorize the removal of a reservation of timber rights set forth in a patent issued to one Ivan H. McCormack pursuant to an act of August 23, 1935. We are offering the bill because we are satisfied that the timber reservation is of no value to the Federal Government. It stands as a cloud on the title, however, and in fairness and equity ought to be removed.

At this time I wish to make a few remarks which are pertinent and which I believe will help in making the legislative record.

By a special act passed in 1935 the Government conveyed title to about 120 acres of Oregon and California lands to a citizen of Oregon, reserving to the United States the rights to the timber on 80 of these acres. In return, this person conveyed to the Government another 120-acre tract which had been patented to him earlier from the Oregon and California grant lands. There was also contained in the 1935 act provision for a refund of $200 paid by this person for the lands he was conveying to the Government and the crediting of the balance, $100, to the purchase price of the lands being conveyed. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this act be included in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the text of chapter 633, 74th Congress, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue to Ivan H. McCormack, of Alsea, Oreg., a patent for the northeast quarter southwest quarter and the north half southeast quarter section 31, township 14 south, range 8 west of the Willamette meridian, Oregon: *Provided*, That said McCormack shall reconvey to the United States the west half northeast quarter and the southeast quarter northeast quarter of said section 31: *Provided further*, That the patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of the timber on the northeast quarter southwest quarter and the northwest quarter southeast quarter of said section 31, which timber shall remain subject to sale, and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to the "Oregon and California land-grant fund" in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 218).

SEC. 2. That of $300 paid by McCormack prior to the issuance to him on April 12, 1927, of a patent for the west half northeast quarter and the southeast quarter northeast quarter of said section 31, $200 shall be repaid to him under the provisions of the act of March 26, 1908 (35 Stat. L. 48), and $100 shall be credited as payment on the purchase price of the northeast quarter southeast quarter of said section 31.

Approved, August 23, 1935.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in 1935 the Oregon and California lands were subject to sale. Thus, the transaction was in effect an exchange of lands and apparently in the interests of the Government and the person with whom it dealt.

An act of June 9, 1916—39th United States Statutes at Large, page 218—did contain certain restrictions on the sale of Oregon and California lands. For example, when there was over 300,000 board-feet of timber on a 40-acre subdivision the land was put in class 2—timberlands. These lands could not be sold until the merchantable timber was first removed by the Government. Then they became class 3 lands that were subject to disposal by sale. I add, parenthetically, that class 1 lands were reserved to the Government as power sites.

In effect, therefore, the law required the sale of timber separately from the land.

In the case of the special act of 1935 the exchange was made in conformance with the then existing law and since the exchange involved a request to grant lands then partly covered with timber, it was reserved.

Subsequently the Department removed the timber from the land. However, it now takes the position that the timber reservation still exists. It seems to me that this conclusion involves a debatable construction of the law. I think it can be argued persuasively that the reservation ran only to the timber then on the land. Obviously, if the owner of the surface in this case chose to farm it or put it in orchards, no timber would ever be grown again. In another case timber might again be grown by the landowner. In still a third case the land might be farmed or pastured for 40 years and then revert to timber either through planting or nature. It might even be planted to trees under the farm program. I do not believe that in these hypothetical cases the Government would have any claim to timber subsequently grown on the land. It is also pertinent to remember that the Government in this case not only granted lands but received an equal acreage. No collateral timber reservations were made.

Thus, while I do not wholly concur in the position taken by the Department, I think that the Congress must act on the matter.

I do not know how many special acts of this nature were passed in bygone years, but I would be hopeful that the legislative record would make it clear that if any other timber reservations such as this exist, they expired when the timber then on the land was cut.

I do not believe it has been the general policy of the Government in this sort of case to reserve timber rights beyond those applying to the timber then on the land. To do otherwise would in effect deny beneficial use of the land and the benefit of title to the private person.

In my judgment the Congress has too many pressing problems before it to expect it to consider numerous problems of this type. We should be able to expect that the departments of our Government could apply equitable remedies and not burden us with so much special legislation. To that end I hope that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will announce a general policy in this matter so that we will not have to lift each reservation of this type by passing separate special acts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the point resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 136) to provide for the removal of a reservation of timber rights from a patent issued to Ivan H. McCormack, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the act of August 23, 1935, authorized the conveyance of certain land in Oregon to Ivan H. McCormack; and

Whereas the patent conveying such land contained a reservation to the United States of the timber on such land; and

Whereas a field inspection by the Department of the Interior has revealed that no merchantable timber remains on such land: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That the first section of the act entitled "An act for the relief of Ivan H. McCormack," approved August 23, 1935 (49 Stat. 2163), is amended by striking out ": *Provided further*, That the patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of the timber on the northeast quarter southwest quarter and the northwest quarter southeast quarter of said section 31, which timber shall remain subject to sale, and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to the Oregon and California land-grant fund, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. 218)."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall execute and deliver to Clarence A. Sapp and Pearl E. Sapp, of Pilomath, Oreg., an appropriate written instrument which will effect with respect to the land conveyed under such act the amendment made by the first section of this act.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address by him commemorating ratification of the Bill of Rights, broadcast by American Broadcasting Co. December 15, 1957.

Guest column by him entitled "What's Behind the Drive To Recognize Red China?" written for Cobina Wright's column.

By Mr. WILEY:

News release, letter from him to the Attorney General, and news article entitled "'Oil for Education' Proposal Seen as School Aid Hope," published in Labor's Daily of January 3, 1958, all relating to submerged oil lands.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Excerpts from proceedings of the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at Chicago, Ill., on December 11, 1957, when the 1957 Award for Distinguished and Meritorious Service in the Interest of Organized Agriculture was presented to Senator EASTLAND.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SUNDRY NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the following nominations:

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Gerard C. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Malaya.

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

Robert McClintock, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

Charles W. Yost, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Manager of the Development Loan Fund in the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State.

Christopher H. Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of Maryland, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Director of the United States Information Agency.

Notice is given that the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule, will give consideration to these nominations.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM P. ROGERS TO BE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, January 22, 1958, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, upon the nomination of William P. Rogers, of Maryland, to be Attorney General.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 100, 133, AND 134, PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE INABILITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO DISCHARGE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF HIS OFFICE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, January 23, 1958, at 10 a. m. in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolutions 100, 133, and 134, proposals to amend the Constitution of the United States, relating to the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Any person desiring to be heard, or to submit a statement of views pertinent to the subject matter under consideration should, prior to January 20, 1958, contact the subcommittee counsel in order that necessary arrangements may be made.

The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]; the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]; and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held within the next 10 days in room 301, Senate Office Building, on S. 2918, S. 2920, and S. 2959. These bills would amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to authorize disaster loans for small businesses in areas affected by excessive rainfall and other natural disasters.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, Room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY THE FEDERAL PAY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have a very brief announcement to make at this time. I desire to announce that the Federal Pay Subcommittee, of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, will meet at 10 o'clock on

January 15, to consider amendments to the two bills presently on the Senate calendar; I refer to the bills which deal with upward revision of postal pay and upward revision of the pay of the classified workers of the Government.

Today, many persons throughout this country, if not nearly all the citizens of the United States, are concerned over the quality and caliber of the people who serve our Federal Government during one of the great crises and emergencies of American history. I firmly believe that we cannot expect people of education, talent, idealism, and high caliber generally to serve the United States Government if the levels of pay furnished them by that Government are not commensurate with the talents and skills which these people have to offer. This is elemental logic and justice. Therefore, our subcommittee, one of whose members is the present distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. PROXMIRE], will meet on Wednesday of this week, to consider amendments to the bills presently on the Senate calendar, in the hope that we can perfect and improve them and then have them before the full Senate at a very early hour. This is our goal.

---

## TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE IN THE SENATE OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is my happy privilege to call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that on yesterday my distinguished senior colleague, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, completed 25 years of service in the United States Senate.

Perhaps no man in the history of the Senate has made a greater contribution to all phases of the Nation's life than has Senator RUSSELL.

Certainly no Senator has ever done more to enhance the position and prestige of the Senate than he.

He has been steadfast in championing orderly procedure in the Senate.

He has been diligent in defending the Senate's role as the protector of the liberties of the American people.

He has been vigorous in upholding the principles of constitutional government.

He has been in the forefront of those who have labored to perfect an adequate establishment in times of both war and peace.

He has been outspoken in his efforts to secure for the farmers of America their proportionate share of the national income.

He has been indefatigable in his support of all programs to provide a better life for Americans today and a better America for the citizens of tomorrow.

He has pursued his tireless and unselfish course of service to his fellow man with quiet dignity and unassuming modesty. The fame which has rightly and deservedly come to him has sought him and not he it.

It has been said that he is a "Senator's Senator." With that I agree, and add he is also an "American's Senator."

Georgians are proud of Senator RUSSELL, and are proud that the rest of the Nation shares their pride.

Georgians remember him as a great governor.

Georgians love him as a great Senator.

Georgians cherish him as the personification of their beliefs and aspirations.

It is out of a great depth of affection and with boundless personal admiration that I speak for our fellow Georgians in saying to him on the occasion of his entering his second quarter century of service to his State and Nation in the Senate:

"Thank you, Senator RUSSELL, for all you have done, and Godspeed in all you are destined to do."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Georgia has very appropriately and properly invited the attention of the Senate to an anniversary of very great importance. To one of the most highly respected Members of our body today's session will recall many fond memories.

This is a fortunate country when it can produce men like RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia. I know of no man with a finer mind, no better parliamentarian, and no man who has a heart and soul more dedicated to the service of his country. RICHARD RUSSELL is a quiet man and a gentleman. He is not given, Mr. President, to harsh judgments or to hasty conclusions, but he is a tower of strength, and when it comes to preserving the institutions of this country DICK RUSSELL has a soul of marble.

Georgia is a State which has contributed many great men to the service of the United States. It is a State in which public service is a long and honorable tradition, handed down from father to son. But when the final chapter is written there will be no name in the book which will stand above that of this great statesman, DICK RUSSELL.

He has been my friend and he has been the friend, I think, of almost every Member of this body. Even more important, Mr. President, DICK RUSSELL is the friend of American ideals, and on this important anniversary we wish him well, and trust that there may be many happy returns to this gentleman, this legislator, this statesman of whom the Senate is so proud.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would not wish this opportunity to pass without joining with my colleague, the majority leader, and others in paying tribute to Senator DICK RUSSELL on the 25th anniversary of his service as a Senator.

It was my privilege some years ago to serve on the Committee on Armed Services under his chairmanship. I have had a long and close association with him as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which is now so ably presided over by our President pro tempore, the present occupant of the chair.

I know of no Member of the Senate who is more devoted to his duties as the representative of a great State, or more interested in the problems which arise in the committee of which he is chairman, as well as upon other committees on which he serves, than our colleague the senior Senator from Georgia.

I fervently hope that for many years into the future Senator RICHARD RUSSELL will continue to render to the people of his State and the people of his Nation the great service which he has rendered in the past, not only as a Member of this body, but as Governor of his own State.

I know that I speak for all the Members on this side of the aisle when I say that, without regard to partisanship, we have a deep appreciation of his outstanding public service.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I would not want this opportunity to pass without joining my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American and a great Member of this body, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

It has been a source of great gratification to me, during the brief period I have served in this body, to be able to call DICK RUSSELL a friend, and be considered a friend of his.

Like the other Members of this body, I hope that his service will continue for many years to come, because it is of great and lasting benefit to this country, as well as to the people of his own State.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to whom reference has been made by the distinguished majority leader.

This is now the beginning of my 10th year of service in this body. No Member of the Senate has made a greater contribution, from the standpoint of the example he has afforded, the high ideals for which he has fought, and the statesmanlike record he has made, than the distinguished Senator from Georgia. He has been a great inspiration and a help to me, and I am happy to pay tribute to him, and to express the hope that this country may continue to have the benefit of his wise counsel, his noble ideas, and his courageous heart.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Georgia on the observance of the 25th anniversary of his service in the Senate.

The senior Senator from Georgia is an intelligent, wise, and well-versed man. What has greatly impressed me about him is that he always takes the time to advise with and to give his less well-informed colleagues the benefit of his knowledge and experience.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues, the majority leader, the minority leader, and others, in complimenting my good friend, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, for his quarter of a century service in the Senate of the United States, and for the excellent work he has done in preserving the American system of constitutional government.

He is a fighter, understands the working rules of the Senate, and I can wish for nothing of more value to the United States of America than another quarter of a century of service in this august body for my friend and colleague DICK RUSSELL.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who have been paying tribute to the services of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I have been a delegate to every Democratic National Convention since 1924,

every 4 years. Every time I attend one of those conventions I am told that "the Democrats cannot elect a candidate from below the Mason and Dixon line."

Let me say to the Senate and to the world that we could elect DICK RUSSELL President of the United States if we were only given the opportunity; and, believe me, there would be no apologies whatsoever necessary when he was through with the Presidency.

I am so "sold" on his sincerity of purpose, his patriotism, and his Americanism, that I would be willing to vote for him, just as I would vote for any other Democrat who might be nominated.

I know that there are good men in Texas, in Georgia, in Arizona, and all over the United States. The question I wish to ask is: Are we a United States of America, or a United States of North-of-the-Mason-Dixon line?

I congratulate the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to identify myself with the experssions of the leadership on both sides of the aisle and other Senators who have spoken in tribute to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [DICK RUSSELL], and his 25 years of service in the Senate. I have been a Member of the Senate 14 years, and during all those 14 years I have had the great privilege of working with DICK RUSSELL and of getting to know him. I have served with him on special assignments. In that connection I recall particularly his able handling and the leadership he gave all of us in the famous General MacArthur hearings a few years ago, when both the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services sat jointly to consider the whole problem involving General MacArthur.

I have been very close to DICK RUSSELL on other assignments. We were especially close together in our affection for the late Walter George, from his State. I had the privilege of traveling with DICK RUSSELL to the funeral of Walter George last year and meeting, with him, some of the wonderful people of Georgia at that time.

Mr. President, I wish to express my deep affection for DICK RUSSELL, and I hope that he will remain in the Senate for many years, continuing his outstanding service.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to add my word of appreciation to the many expressions of Senators congratulating our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. My acquaintance with him has not been for a very long time. However, I was acquainted with his father 20 years ago, when his father and I were delegates to the American Law Institute in Washington. The Senator's father, the distinguished Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia, made great contributions which were of great assistance in the formulation of the basic policies of that great institution.

Even before that, my family was acquainted with the Russell family. Many of Senator RUSSELL's cousins and other relatives live in Texas. Some of them are in the educational field, some serving in the capacity of superintendents of schools.

When I was a boy I used to hear about Gordon Russell, who was United States district judge for the eastern district of Texas. He served as county judge of Van Zandt County, and the county line ran within 1 mile of my home.

My father knew Judge Gordon Russell well, and it was he who induced my father to send me to law school. Gordon Russell served in the 57th and succeeding Congresses. Therefore, our acquaintance in Texas with the Russell family goes back a good many years.

For all of the reasons I have stated I wish to express my appreciation to Senator RUSSELL and to his family, and to several generations of them.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I too wish to join in the tributes that are being paid to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. I have not served with him in the Senate for a very great length of time, but I am thoroughly familiar with his keen knowledge of our problems both domestic and international.

If the farmers ever had a friend in the Congress of the United States, particularly in the Senate, it is DICK RUSSELL. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, he has always brought the appropriation to the floor of the Senate with one thought in mind, and that is the improvement of the farmer's position in our American economy.

I have said on several occasions that the United States Senate and the country is fortunate to have the benefit of DICK RUSSELL's keen insight to the needs of our Nation. His integrity, his character and his sincerity are unquestioned.

I therefore wish to express my appreciation for his splendid service and hope that it will be continued for years to come.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rather like the idea of eulogizing a colleague in the Senate while he is still with us, instead of waiting until after he is gone or until he decides to retire.

I certainly wish to join in the felicitations which are being extended to Senator RUSSELL on the occasion of his silver anniversary as a Member of the United States Senate. He is a man of a silvery tongue who has a heart of gold, and it is therefore fitting to extend congratulations on his silver anniversary.

DICK RUSSELL serves as chairman of an agricultural subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member. I have had an intimate opportunity to observe his steadfast battle in the interest of the American farmer.

However, above and beyond that, I have watched him for almost 10 years in the Senate battling for American ideals and constitutional concepts.

DICK RUSSELL is a man against whom I have been arrayed on occasion. That has happened in certain debates on the floor. I have found him to be a hard-hitting adversary, but always a fair opponent.

I am always happier when I am on his side. He is always a tower of strength, and it is a pleasant experience to be fighting with him.

In line with the suggestion made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], a few years ago some friends in the South entered DICK RUSSELL's name in the Democratic presidential primary. For what reason I will never know, some of his friends came to me and asked me if I would be willing to write a little piece in behalf of DICK RUSSELL. I knew that it was not his silver anniversary, and I asked them what the occasion was. They said, "DICK RUSSELL will be a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President. What do you think of his presidential possibilities?"

I then did something that I had never done before in my life—although I do not say that I would not do it again—and I wrote a statement in which I said that DICK RUSSELL would make a great President of the United States.

I believe then, as I believe now, that he would make a great President of the United States, and I listed the reasons why I thought so; and even though I am a Republican, I felt I could appropriately serve in a body of Congress with DICK RUSSELL as President.

Unfortunately, the Democrats did not nominate DICK RUSSELL. Perhaps the Senator from New Mexico can settle that matter at the next convention. Happily, Mr. President, a Republican was elected President in that year, and we were saved anyhow. [Laughter.]

It is unfortunate, indeed, that a dividing line, which should have been forgotten long ago, should deny men in the South of the caliber of RICHARD RUSSELL an opportunity, which should be theirs, to run for President.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, one of the greatest experiences of my service in the Senate, as it has also been of other Senators, has been the privilege of associating with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. He has been an inspiration to many of us in the Senate. During our service here he has always been a model of senatorial conduct. This Nation has benefited in great measure because men like Senator RUSSELL have served in the Senate. A great many of us have had occasion to serve with him through the years; also, we have had the opportunity to judge him as a man, and to appreciate the wisdom of his statesmanship.

Speaking as one Senator, I can say that there have been many occasions when, to my personal knowledge, my vote has been influenced by his eloquence on the floor and by the wisdom with which he spoke. I have never yet had occasion to regret such a decision.

It has been a wonderful opportunity, and a great honor, to have the privilege of seeing him serve here. I join with my colleagues in congratulating him upon his 25 years of service.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I was an admirer of Senator RUSSELL before I came to the Senate 12 years ago. While serving as the Governor of my State, I was privileged to learn of the record of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Being vitally interested in agriculture, I had always admired the stand which the distinguished Senator from Georgia had taken on agricultural questions. During my service in the Senate, I have been privileged to serve for a number of years on the Committee on Appropriations, and there I have experienced directly the impact of the able and fair manner in which the Senator from Georgia acts as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations. I have admired his ability, his fairness, and his judicial as well as legislative ability.

It is a pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the man on this, the silver anniversary of his service in the United States Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I join with my many other colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to Senator DICK RUSSELL, of Georgia, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of his entrance into the Senate.

It seems to me that this Senator, a great son of a great father, has brought to the Senate, as the Senate has been fortunate to receive throughout its history, the background, experience, character, and talents which not only richly reward the Senate, but help to make it the outstanding legislative body of the world, because men like DICK RUSSELL have chosen to serve here and have stayed on the job.

Usually we think of DICK RUSSELL in connection with the spectacular achievements, accomplishments, and decisions which have been made in the past. We think of him in connection with the multibillion dollar defense activities of our country, which, through World War II and the post-World War II period, and now in our time of emergency, have found DICK RUSSELL with his firm hand on the helm, steering us through the troubled waters, but bringing commonsense and good judgment to our great military activities.

I, too, like to think of those great achievements; but more particularly I like to think of his great service in trying to preserve the family-sized farm. He has afforded great leadership in the matter of restoring the family-sized farm to its rightful position in the national scheme of things.

I like to think of DICK RUSSELL as having turned the tide against the erosion of our topsoil. I like to think of his pioneering and the vigorous fight he has always made to insure that soil conservation funds shall be forthcoming in order to save the most precious resource of all, the topsoil of our land.

As we fly over the country today and observe from a small airplane the ground which is below us, we know that DICK RUSSELL's hand has been at work to provide the sinews for the battle against land devastation through erosion.

I like to think of him as a great believer in helping not only the water resource development by means of the huge dams for hydroelectric power and flood control, but also as being one of the first men who assisted in providing upstream flood control, extending up the tributaries and the small creeks. The value of such flood control has been not only to eliminate the disaster of great floods but also to lengthen the life of our huge dams.

DICK RUSSELL is the friend of every Senator. He is the helper of anyone who has problems, when he knows those problems exist. We are all better for having DICK RUSSELL as a colleague in the United States Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not at this time join with my colleagues in expressing the high regard I feel for Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, at the beginning of his 26th year of service in the Senate of the United States.

As so many other Senators have pointed out, no one has been more interested in the welfare of our agricultural economy than has the senior Senator from Georgia. No one has been more interested in making certain that we have a good, sound, solid defense structure down through the years than has the senior Senator from Georgia. He is a man who has understanding in his outlook. He has been wise in his counsel and good in his advice to many of us who have had need of his services from time to time.

I express the hope that DICK RUSSELL will be with us for another 25 years, at least, because the contributions he has made to the welfare of his country and the Free World will be long remembered. He is the epitome of what many of us in this body would like to be.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to congratulate Senator RUSSELL on the 25th anniversary of his service in this body. I can add very little to what has been said regarding his service, in appreciation for the help he has given us as individuals, and for the contributions he has made to the United States generally.

I have been a Member of the Senate but a short time, but during that time I have learned to respect and appreciate the counsel which Senator RUSSELL has given to me on occasion, and to recognize the gentleman that he is, even in bitter debate on opposite sides of questions.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to join the Members of the Senate who today on the floor of the Senate have paid tribute to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of his service in this body.

I particularly wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. The Senator from Michigan called attention to the characteristic courtesy and kindness which Senator RUSSELL always shows to new Members of the Senate, who, upon their arrival here, are inexperienced and untried and unfamiliar with the routine and with many aspects of senatorial tasks.

As Senator MCNAMARA has, I have always found Senator RUSSELL patient and kind. I came to the Senate at the same time when Senator MCNAMARA did, approximately 3 years ago. Therefore, he and I are what often are called junior Members of the Senate. I feel that Senator RUSSELL has been of much assistance and great cooperation to those of us who have a great deal to learn in this Chamber. I wish to join in congratulating and thanking him for that assistance and kindness. It is deeply appreciated by us, and we desire Senator RUSSELL to be aware of that fact on this eventful occasion.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Senator RUSSELL has served in this body for a quarter of a century, and he has served ably, faithfully, and well.

I knew Senator RUSSELL when I was Governor of South Carolina, and also prior to that time. He is held in high esteem by the people of my State.

In the fall of 1957, I was invited to attend the homecoming celebration for the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, held in his home city of Winder, Ga. One did not have to be there very long to observe the high esteem and respect and admiration of the people of his home city and of his home State of Georgia for him.

Senator RUSSELL has been a leader in agriculture in this Nation. The farmers all over this country have looked to him for guidance, for advice, and for counsel and help. He has served as, and has been a tower of strength as, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. Nothing is more important to this Nation and to its survival than the national defense. Senator RUSSELL's wise counsel and advice have been of great help to the Nation in time of war and in time of peace. I do not know of any man who would have served more ably than has he in this important position, which means so much to our country.

On other occasions I have said that Senator RUSSELL is a great patriot, a great American, and would make a great President of this country. At this time I am pleased to pay tribute to this fine citizen, this great Senator, and this great American.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL is 1 of 13 children born to a brilliant father and a brilliant, charming, and beautiful mother. A quarter of a century in this body, Mr. President, is a landmark of achievement for any person. It is particularly so for the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], because his achievement of that mark has been characterized by a quality of service from which not only his State but the entire United States and the welfare of the world have benefited.

References have been made to his service to the farmer, to his service to the defense of the country, to his service to the Senate, and to his colleagues. I concur in the sentiments expressed in all those regards and others.

However, Mr. President, in addition to the quality of the service he has rendered, the quality of the man appeals to me. Patient and tolerant, able and determined, cautious but bold, Senator RUSSELL has been a leader among men in a body in which membership is difficult of attainment. The pleasure of the personal association which I have enjoyed with this distinguished Senator is something which I will always cherish.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is with personal pleasure and official pride that I extend my felicitations and congratulations to Senator RICHARD RUSSELL upon the attainment of the 25th anniversary of his service as a United States Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Cheaper by the Baker's Dozen," which was published in Collier's magazine on September 2, 1950. The article is about the mother of Senator RUSSELL and his distinguished brothers and sisters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEAPER BY THE BAKER'S DOZEN

(By James C. Derieux)

Ina Dillard Russell, the youngest of 13 children and herself the mother of 13, is a frail little lady of 82 who must spend most of her time in bed. But her mind is merry, her heart gay, and the colors of her sunset are as bright as the flowers she loves. All her children are grown now, and doing well. There no longer is need for her to make the rounds on blustery nights to be sure they are covered; no need to sew by the light of an oil lamp until past midnight to stay abreast of their needs for rompers and blouses and shirts and skirts and underthings. The day when seven of them had whooping cough at the same time is far away and long ago, remembered only as one of the inevitable adventures and one of the victories along the road of family life.

Last May 11 the town of Winder, Ga., near which Mrs. Russell lives, declared a holiday in her honor. Twelve of her children (all but the Army officer, who was on foreign duty), most of her 33 grandchildren, several of her 7 great-grandchildren, uncensused nephews, nieces, cousins, HERMAN TALMADGE, the Governor of her State, and thousands of others, were on hand to celebrate the choice of this great woman as Georgia's Mother of the Year. It was a wonderful day of speeches, receptions, a parade with floats representing the careers of her sons, and handsome presents of silver. When the day was over, she still was smiling as her anxious children stood around and urged her to rest.

"I'm rested," she said. "I'm having a wonderful time. I did not know my neighbors cared for me like this. I never was able to do anything much for them, except maybe take care of them when they needed me. I had to give so much time to my own children that I never could do all I wanted to do for others. But I have loved them, and it is so good to know that they love me."

The children, to whom she gave so much of her time before her health broke, have rewarded her efforts and her faith.

Her oldest son, RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, named for her father, is now in the United States Senate. Before that he had been Georgia's youngest Governor. Her second son, Robert, is a justice of the United States Court of Appeals, which is next highest to the Supreme Court. Walter is a major in the United States Army. William is a farmer and manager of the old home place. Fielding is head of the English department at the Georgia Teachers College, Statesboro. (William and Fielding are twins.) Edward is pastor of the Trinity Presbyterian Church in Montgomery, Ala.; and Alex is a doctor with a general practice in and around Winder, a small county seat between Athens and Atlanta.

The six daughters all have had a turn at schoolteaching. Mary is Mrs. S. Gordon Green, of Alexandria, Va., whose husband is an inventor and small-arms expert employed by the United States Department of Defense; Ina, an attorney, is Mrs. J. K. Stacy, of Washington, D. C., whose husband is an official of Colonial Airlines; Marguerite is Mrs. James H. Bowden, of Atlanta, wife of an officer in the Federal Reserve bank there; Harriet is Mrs. S. Ralph Sharpton, of Falls Church, Va., whose husband is with the Maritime Administration; Patience is Mrs. Hugh Peterson, of Ailey, Ga., and Washington, D. C., whose husband was for 12 years a Member of the Congress and is now in private practice as an attorney; and Carolyn, the youngest of the 13, is Mrs. Raymond L. Nelson, wife of the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Stuttgart, Ark.

The Senator, his brother William and William's capable wife, live at the Russell home, a big white house amidst a grove of pecans, mimosas and numerous flowering shrubs. Robert and Alex live within a few hundred yards in handsome homes of their own. Grandson Bob and his family live in "Newlywed Cottage" on the home place, where a number of other young couples in the family have lived while getting underway. All the children, wherever they may be, come home whenever they can to be with the great lady who made the family what it is. She is never lonely. Evenings, now if there is no special family gathering, she enjoys television, including the wrestling matches. "I don't approve of wrestlers," she says. "They seem to be so rough. But I will look at them."

The father of this notable family, Richard Brevard Russell, was himself a distinguished man, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia at the time of his death in 1938. But for many years he served on lower benches, and at much less pay than the $7,000 a year he drew in his final years. His family did most of its growing up while he was drawing three or four thousand a year. For a time, when seven of his children were in college, he left the bench, practiced law privately until he paid his debts, then went back to his robes.

The old judge took little part in the details of rearing his family. His wife was the genius in that field. Usually she had a cook to help, but not always. For a stretch of time she prepared all the meals herself in order to save money and apply it to the building of what is now the family homestead. The judge ordered groceries at wholesale in Atlanta for his own family and for other families living on his cotton farm. His wife kept the accounts, and the old daybook shows some interesting notations. For example, it discloses that in the spring of 1912 she personally made 184 garments. Another spring she began to count the buttonholes, but gave up at 190 when something happened to divert her attention.

Through these busy years of sewing, cleaning, cooking, managing, she occasionally found time to hold school classes in her own home. Robert and several of the other children got their primary-school training from their mother.

On Sunday afternoons she played the piano as her family gathered around and sang hymns. Every child had to know the shorter catechism and at the Sunday gatherings each one was called on to recite verses from the Bible. Both the mother and the old judge were generous in praise, and as generous as they could be in other rewards for the children who did best.

Today Senator RUSSELL remembers that, as a child, he did not know mothers had to sleep. His own was up and busy when he went to bed and again when he awoke in the morning. If he became cold in the night, she covered him. If he was sick, she was beside him. "I was nearly 10 years old," he says, "before I saw her asleep. I still recall how shocked I was."

All through the growing-up years Mrs. Russell wrote frequently to children who were away at school, or at work; and many of these letters have been treasured and kept. They are good, long reports on events around the home, with nice touches that doubtless stirred nostalgic memories, or stimulated determination. To a child who was wavering about something she wrote: "We can stand a great deal in this world and stand it well if we have enough grit in our gizzards. You must decide for yourself."

And to one of her sons who had gone away for the first time: "How I do want to see you, but how proud I am that you are sticking it out and not coming home."

To a daughter: "As you know, in growing flowers I never have hothouse plants. I love the kind that can stand anything that comes along. And I love to think of my '13 varieties' growing and thriving and sending out fragrance, beautifying the world * * *."

She thought of her family as a cooperating unit. Many of her letters began: "I have a plan to lay before you," or "What do you think of this?"

In her efforts to have each child develop according to his own gifts and desires, she avoided giving specific directions, but there were many broad hints and principles, such as:

"Take good care of your little sister, but don't worry her with too much watching. * * * My child, cultivate a sweet disposition and practice kindness and gentleness in all things. If you do, you will give genuine pleasure to all you are thrown with. Study and be smart, too. * * * Do your part. * * * Just make others happy and you will be happy. * * * Make people love you. * * * I must say goodby now and make the fires for it is getting cold. * * * I am constantly thinking of my darling children. * * * You have been a fortunate girl, born with a good little body, a fair amount of good looks and a bright mind. Also you found a fond father and a loving mother awaiting you. You young people can't realize how much you are loved. * * * You must have a place to fill or you would not have been sent into this world. * * * Now don't say 'poor Mams' to me. I do have such a good time. * * *"

To a daughter who had written home that she was blue: "And how much exercise on the hoof do you take per day? Walk, walk. There is nothing like it. And your complexion will stay good and you will not be so fat either, when you grow older. Drink, drink water. * * *"

And to one who had said she was so tired of being poor: "Oh, my child, that hurts me. You are not poor, unless it is in your soul and heart. * * *"

As the children grew up and had children of their own, Mrs. Russell continued to write to them, her letters characterized by the same affirmative attitude toward life. Whenever word came of a new grandchild, she responded with as much enthusiasm as if there had been none before. "We are overjoyed," she wrote Mrs. Bowden when a son was born. "We are thrilled. * * * You should have seen Doscia (the cook) when I told her. She picked up a chair and went running around the dining-room table, said she had to hug somebody and as I was seated she hugged my head and I hugged her legs. Daddy was so happy, and Rob and Sybil (Rob's wife), Carolyn and Dick. * * * It's a great privilege we women have to bring forth human beings. I'm proud and thankful for all of mine."

Notwithstanding all the children, the innumerable visitors, the difficulties of living in a house without central heat, where many fires had to be made every winter day, and where all cooking was done on a wood-burning stove, life in the Russell home was orderly. Every older child was responsible for a younger one. The three oldest were girls, and to this day they point with

pride to one brother or another, and say, "You know, he's my boy. I raised him."

IN A SPIRIT OF HELPFULNESS

As older sisters or brothers finished college and began working, they sent money home to younger members of the family to help them along with their schooling. All but one have college degrees. Household tasks were passed down the line, too; the milking from Dick to Bob to Walter and so on to Alex, who was stuck with it because there was no boy younger than he.

Mother Russell set the example for her children by her own strict attention even to the little proprieties. No sloppy—or casual—dressing was allowed at breakfast, or at any meal. Even when she did her own cooking she "fixed up" before coming to the table. The children were required to be punctual, or lose out on whatever was taking place. When, in their reading, they came to words they did not understand, she insisted they make notes of them and look them up before the day was done.

"I made them mind, too," says Mother Russell. "I had to. My goodness, how could I raise 13 if they didn't mind."

In the course of their schooling several of the children lived with relatives in the places where their schools were located, but each time Mrs. Russell sent one off to a sister or an aunt, she told her to "send him back the first time he disobeys."

Judge Russell commuted by train to Atlanta, about 50 miles away, much of the time he was on the bench, and always on the afternoons that he was coming home, whether on the vestibule to Winder or the local to his own flag stop of Russell, the children were bathed and freshly dressed to greet him. He was the honored member of the family. He sat on his wife's right at meals. He always made a nice talk at the table whenever the family was celebrating a birthday; and every year he stood before the Christmas tree and spoke of the meaning of the holiday before distributing the gifts.

Mrs. Russell did not hold back from switching her boys when she thought they needed it. William teases her now by relating that they had plenty of blackberries but no peaches when he was a child because of his mother's demand for peach twigs. But she had other disciplinary methods. A child might be required to sit utterly still and quiet in the clothes closet for half an hour or an hour, depending on the gravity of the crime. Once she taught Fielding, her teacher son, a lesson when he left his tricycle in the hall near the backdoor. She said nothing about it until dark, but neither did she move it. Then without making a light she told Fielding to go close that door. He started, but fell whammy over his own tricycle.

The Senator, when a small boy, was exceedingly fond of sausage, and often said he never did get enough. After a number of such comments, his mother asked him how much sausage would be enough, and he said he wanted a pound all to himself at one meal. At the next meal he was given a pound and directed to eat all of it. About halfway through he began to weaken, but his mother urged him on until he could stand no more.

Rob made a similar slip about wanting a dozen bananas at a sitting, and Mary, forgetting the experiences of her brothers, said she wanted a whole fried chicken. Mrs. Russell rocks back and forth in bed as she laughs at these disciplinary adventures of long ago. Daily around her bedside there is merry talk of the ways she managed to bring up all of her children. All the Russells are good and lively talkers.

The daughters tease her by insisting she always sides with the men against the women, regardless of the merits of a case, and they tell a story to illustrate what they mean. Once an enraged tenant on the Russell place struck his wife with a kerosene lamp, shattering the glass and spilling the oil. Mrs. Russell heard of the argument and went to the tenant's home to see what she might do. The woman was not badly hurt, and after some minor attentions Mrs. Russell admonished her: "You should not have made your husband mad enough to do a thing like that."

Incidentally, the daughters say their mother invariably sides with their husbands even against them, and she cheerfully declares, "Well, the men usually are right."

The doors of the white frame house that is the Russell home have always been open to guests, strangers or not. Visiting preachers more often than not had their Sunday dinners there. Every summer there were house parties when sons or daughters had their school friends in for a week or two. The family jokes now about how their mother could always find more hominy grits for the big pot, and somehow thin the gravy so it would go around; and William, the family's chief jester, says they had signals to indicate the state of the food supply. When someone said, "F-H-B," that meant "family hold back." All of which Mrs. Russell denies, but greatly enjoys.

A HOBO AS OVERNIGHT GUEST

In the first quarter of this century, when hobos and tramps were numerous, the children were convinced that mysterious markings on local railroad water tanks guided itinerants straight to their door. Mrs. Russell gave each one food, and talked with him about his family, and whether or not he ever went to church. Once she horrified her daughters by inviting a hobo to spend the night. They protested, "Mother, you aren't going to let that bum stay here."

"I certainly am," she said calmly.

So the hobo spent the night, went on his way refreshed and with the knowledge, if he had any moral perception left, that at least one person still had faith in him, and hoped he would do better.

She told these knights of the crossties, as she told her own children, that every person born into this world is here for a useful purpose; and she thinks it is possible that some of them may have done better after a visit to her home. "Who knows?"

Deeply religious herself, Mrs. Russell often prayed that one of her sons would enter the ministry, but she did not urge any one of them to take that course. "I never tried to influence any of my children to do any particular kind of work," she says. "I just taught each one to find why he is here, and to do the very best he can." So, when Henry Edward Russell became a minister, the decision was his, but the deepest delight was hers. "Edward will be ordained into the ministry tonight," she wrote to an absent child. "It is as thrilling to me as Dick's inauguration as governor."

Another of her great thrills, she says, was when her twins, William and Fielding, were born. "That was the proudest moment of my life up to that time."

Mrs. Russell was born at Farm Hill, Ga., February 18, 1868, and was teaching school at Athens when she met her husband. She will tell you now that her life from that time on has been peaceful, even calm, and "Oh, so happy!"

She recalls only a few occasions when she was terrified. Once was when Dick had pneumonia. Another was when she thought she had cancer and wondered what would happen to her little children. The time when Mary swallowed her Sunday school penny, when the horse bit Dick, and Marguerite had to run a mile for the doctor, are but incidents. Of course, such things, like measles, happen in any large family.

Even the summer of 1911, when her husband, the old judge, ran against Hoke Smith and Joe Brown for governor, seems now to have been a peaceful season. She says she did not have time to help her husband much, except by writing several hundred letters, because so many of the children were small then; and that she was not disappointed, except for him, when he was defeated. "I didn't want to take all my little girls to the capitol in Atlanta in gingham aprons," she explains.

The smaller children were eagerly interested in that political contest. When they heard their father was in a race with Hoke Smith, a rather rotund man, and Joe Brown, who was frail and small, they imagined it a foot race, maybe right down the big road in front of home, and they were sure their father would win because he had such long legs.

That race did not come off the way they hoped it would, but they saw the judge win many other foot races with the morning train to Atlanta. The Seaboard Railroad runs perhaps a hundred yards in front of the Russell home, and to accommodate its frequent and distinguished passenger, a flag stop was made where his lane crossed the rails. There was no agent, and the only way to know when the train was coming was to see it or hear it. So, each morning when the judge was going away a child would be posted at the track to look a mile down the line to a big curve.

When the locomotive came charging in sight the sentry would yell, "Train around the curve!" and the assistant sentry would make a dash for the house to warn papa to hurry. Mrs. Russell would look him over to see that he had on all his clothes; Laura or somebody would have a cup of coffee at the front door which he would grab and drink, then light out full speed for the station where 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 excited, dancing, waving children flagged the train down.

The judge was a devoted and indulgent father, and an adoring husband with the happy habit of expressing his feelings. A letter he wrote to Mrs. Russell after they had been married 30 years begins, "My precious little sweetheart," and ends "With a sense of love and gratitude that is overpowering, I can only say God bless you, idol of my heart." His rare ability to express his affection in words is a characteristic of many members of the Russell family. They are a deeply and articulately devoted family.

The old judge never realized either of his great ambitions—to be Governor of Georgia, or United States Senator, but he lived to swear in 33-year-old DICK as governor in 1931, and see him take his seat in the United States Senate in 1933. He and Mrs. Russell lived with DICK, who was and still is unmarried, in the governor's mansion in Atlanta. She was confident at the end of the first year there that her boy was a good governor, but she wanted to be positive beyond any possibility of doubt. So, she went to the one man whose unbiased judgment she trusted completely—her husband and DICK's father.

"I knew he would know," she says, "and I knew he could not tell anything but the truth. When I asked him about DICK he thought a while in silence, to be sure of his answer. Then he said, 'Honey, I have studied the history of Georgia, and I tell you positively that DICK is the best governor this State ever had.' I was so glad to know that, but not surprised."

On the afternoon of December 3, 1938, the old judge, then 77 years old, returned to his home, tired. He said he believed he would lie down a while, and Mrs. Russell went to get some letters just in from several of their children to read to him. But she never finished the letters, for the judge seemed to have fallen asleep. When she went to him, she saw that he had "gone away."

All the children were absent that afternoon, and when they heard the news they feared for their mother. But when they

reached home they found her composed—and it was she who comforted them. Her religious faith, that had stood so many other tests, stood this one, too.

She is confident that she and the judge will be reunited, and to one of her sons she has confided that, when she gets there, she hopes to be given the task of caring for babies.

Her faith is absolute and affirmative. There is not a gloomy note in the song of her heart, and rarely if ever a gloomy thought in her mind. To be alive is to her a great privilege; to see the dawn of each day a new and nice adventure.

"Somebody gave me one of those black bands to lie over my eyes and shut out the morning light," she says, "but I never used it. Shut out the dawn? What for? It means another day to get something done."

So, this great lady looks both to the future and the past at 82, and finds both pleasing. She is watched over now by her children, even as she watched over them. The ties that bind them to her are stronger by far than apron strings. They are the ties of admiration, obligation, and love.

Her son, Judge Russell, summed up her influence over her children like this: "She never gave us a chance to fail."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, despite the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia is marking the completion of a quarter of a century of service in this body, he is not an old man. As a matter of fact, he has scarcely attained maturity in years. This is because he was a little boy when he came to the Senate. [Laughter.]

I think the senior Senator from Georgia combines in the rarest degree the qualities which make a great statesman and a great Senator. He is industrious, intelligent, intellectually honest, and courageous. He does not mind hard work. As a consequence, he is industrious in informing himself as to the public issues of the day. Since he is so highly intelligent, the conclusions to which he comes are intelligent conclusions. Furthermore, since he is absolutely honest intellectually, the conclusions to which he comes are intellectually honest conclusions. And since he is possessed of political and moral courage of the highest order, he always has the courage to stand and fight for the conclusions at which he arrives.

I have frequently said that if I had the power to select a President for the United States of America, my selection would be the senior Senator from Georgia.

I should like to say, in closing, that despite his great attainments, his great public record, and his outstanding public service, what I love most about DICK RUSSELL is the fact that he exhibits, to a more remarkable degree than any person I know, the humility of greatness.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be able to join with my colleagues today in paying a very much deserved and highly earned tribute and word of respect to one of our most esteemed colleagues, the senior Senator from Georgia [RICHARD RUSSELL].

So many things have been said about this gentleman today that I suppose he himself must wonder what else anyone could add. I do not attempt to be original. I attempt only to give a personal evaluation of the man—of his character and of his public service. It has not been my good fortune, as it has been of other Senators, to have known Senator RUSSELL 20 or 25 years, or to have lived in his State, or to have known his family. But I can say that all I have ever heard has been good, and all I have ever known of him has indicated that he is a good and true man.

Senator RUSSELL has been a useful and hardworking United States Senator, but, more than that, he knows what are his objectives and the ideals for which he stands, and he pursues them with vigor, with scholarship, and with determination.

The senior Senator from Georgia is not only a gentleman, but he is also a gentleman of good taste, of intellectual attainment, and of fine scholarship. I should like to underscore the latter remark, because Senator RUSSELL digs deeply into research, and his arguments, whether one agrees with them or not, are always well stated, cogent, logical, and persuasive.

I have heard it said many times that Senator RUSSELL is the spokesman for the South. There is not any doubt in my mind that he is the South's most eloquent and powerful spokesman. But more than that, Senator RUSSELL is our spokesman in a great many issues that come before us. He is not only a great southerner, but he is a great American. He is a patriot, and not only a patriot by word and by mention, but by deed, as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as a worker in the United States Senate, in the field that leads to national security.

Many times I have said to my intimates and to the Senator's colleagues that without Senator RUSSELL's work and his voice, I would indeed be deeply worried over the security of our Nation. He has great responsibility today, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. But of one thing we can be sure—his responsibilities will be honorably fulfilled.

Senator RUSSELL is also a great friend of the leader of our Senate and of the majority, a friend who does not always give "yes" as his reply, but one who gives counsel and one who gives, on occasion, an admonition. I know this, and I know it to be true, and I think it is fair to say that many times the advocacy of the senior Senator from Georgia has had a very powerful and meaningful influence upon the leadership of the Senate, not only on one person, but on those who are committee chairmen and members of the policy committee.

Those of us who are younger in the service of the Senate than is the Senator from Georgia have always marveled at his knowledge of parliamentary law and the rules of the Senate. Some of us on occasion have not only wondered about it, but, let me say, have been overwhelmed, in every sense of the word, by that knowledge. I might say one does not obtain knowledge of the rules of the Senate by surface attention. It requires thoughtful attention, study, and research that goes back into the history of the precedents of the United States Senate.

From all that has been said, one might assume that we always agree on every issue. That, of course, is not true. I wish to say that one of the great virtues of the Senate of the United States is that one has a right to dissent, and to dissent freely and without fear of intimidation. Senator RUSSELL can disagree with one without being disagreeable, and it is a joy and a challenge to debate with him, because one always learns, sometimes at the expense of his own defeat, but one always has the experience of enlightenment in those discussions with the senior Senator from Georgia.

Finally, I wish to point out, as others have properly done, that the Senator from Georgia is indeed a champion of agriculture and what we call the family farm. It is not just agricultural economics that interests the Senator, but it is the farm family and its relation in the American agricultural community. It has been my pleasure to join with him many times in support of his advocacy and his programs in the field of soil conservation.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that men and women who are interested in conservation of our great natural resources are generally the same ones who are interested in conservation and development of our human resources. The Senator has a warm heart for American farmers, and he has demonstrated a great mind in his knowledge and understanding of agricultural economics.

The same could be said in terms of our independent business enterprise. These are not just frivolous or generalized statements about the Senator from Georgia. These areas of the American economy are close to his heart. He comes from a small town, and I think he understands the intimacy of living which is so much a part of our agricultural and small town communities.

Mr. President, we are fortunate in having such a powerful advocate in our body. It has been a joy and a privilege for me to share in his fellowship and to also share in his admonitions and suggestions, and to be a friend. That I hope I may always be, because it is a privilege to be so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Arizona, there is nothing I can add to what has been said very eloquently and forcefully about the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], but I should certainly be remiss in my duty to my conscience, and I also feel to the citizens of my State, if I did not speak what I feel to be the general feelings of the people of Arizona regarding Senator RICHARD RUSSELL. They realize all the fine things that have been said about him.

Mr. President, in this day and age when our Constitution has had too little attention, in this day and age when there is a tendency by some groups in this country to belittle and attempt to get around our Constitution and the meaning of the Founding Fathers in writing our great founding papers, RICHARD RUSSELL stands as a bulwark against those enemies of that Constitution and our other papers.

Mr. President, I should like to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia on behalf of myself and for the

people of Arizona for his having taken such a constantly strong stand in defense of the oath he took when he became a Senator that he would support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Would that there were more Americans within our boundaries today who had as deep and fervent a love for the Constitution and all its meaning as Senator RUSSELL has.

In addition to my pride in calling him a friend, I think I have equal pride in calling him an American.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to a Member of the United States Senate, one who will go down in history as one of its all-time great men.

Senator RUSSELL possesses all the qualities necessary, in my opinion, of a great statesman. He is a brilliant man. He is a great student. He is a hard worker. He has an unusually fine personality.

In the nearly 13 years that I have had the privilege of serving in the Senate I know of no one who has enjoyed a wider and closer friendship than has the senior Senator from Georgia. Few Members have attained a position of such high respect in this body, both as a statesman and as a friend of good judgment.

I have served with Senator RUSSELL on the Committee on Appropriations for more than 12 years. I have sat with him in foreign countries when important matters were discussed with the top leaders of these nations. Always, in my mind, he displayed a keen knowledge of the subject under discussion, and always showed good judgment.

During my service in the Senate there have been four Members of the Senate who have stood out above all others. Of course, there are many fine Members in the Senate, but these four have stood out above all others. They are the late Senator Vandenberg and the late Senator Taft from this side of the aisle. Then there was the late Senator George of Georgia. Those three Senators have now passed on to their reward.

We have with us today, fortunately, one of the great men of our time. I went so far, some years ago, as to say that if the Democrats had had sense enough to nominate him for President of the United States, I would have supported him. I did not say that lightly; I said it because I meant it from the bottom of my heart. If we could always have as a candidate for President of the United States or for the United States Senate, or any other high position, someone who possessed all the qualifications of the senior Senator from Georgia, partisan politics, to me, should never be a barrier.

So, in my humble and inadequate way, I am happy to pay my respects to one of the greatest men who ever served in this body.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege to be able to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the 25 years of outstanding statesmanship performed in the Senate by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I served with the Senator from Georgia for 8 years on the Armed Services Committee, where he made a record of great distinction in furthering the security and defense needs of our Republic.

I am proud to be able to report to the Senate today that I do not recall a single instance in those 8 years, on any issue of any consequence whatsoever, in which I did not find myself following the leadership of the Senator from Georgia and voting with him in committee.

There is a political myth in this country which I am sure, in due course of time—perhaps in the not far distant future—will be exploded. I refer to the political myth that no one from the South can be elected President of the United States.

I think the highest tribute I could pay the Senator from Georgia is to say that in my opinion, for some years past the senior Senator from Georgia would have been an exceptionally well qualified President of the United States, and would have served his country in the White House with great statesmanship and distinction.

Having said that, I think I have expressed as well as I can the exceptionally high regard in which I hold the Senator from Georgia. I wish for him many, many more years of service in the Senate, because this body and this country need the statesmanship of the Senator from Georgia.

If I were to be asked to give my definition of statesmanship, I would give it by outlining three criteria: Give me a man of high intelligence; give me a man with the courage of his convictions; give me a man dedicated to the constitutional system of America, and I will give you a statesman. On the basis of that definition I give to the country today the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to say just a few words about our colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I have been a Member of the Senate slightly more than half as long as he has.

The occasion of his 25th anniversary is a very appropriate time to pay tribute to him. I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my colleagues, and add 1 or 2 comments of my own.

I had the honor and privilege, as a delegate from my State, to vote for Senator RUSSELL as the presidential nominee of my party at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia in 1948 and again at Chicago in 1952. I thought then and I think now, and with greater conviction, that he would have made a very fine President. He has all the qualifications for a leader in the political field.

It is a great tragedy to me, as I think it is a tragedy for the Nation, that the regional prejudices which exist in this country have, as a practical matter, made it almost impossible for any southerner to be considered for the Presidency. I think that had Senator RUSSELL come from any large State in either the North or the West, he would undoubtedly have been nominated, and, I think, elected.

Senator RUSSELL has an unusual store of knowledge about governmental affairs. I know of no other man, either in or out of this body, who has a more thorough understanding of the background legislation which affects our agriculture, our armed services, and even, one might say, the appropriations, which, in a sense, comprise all the Government. Senator RUSSELL has served so long on the Committee on Appropriations that he knows more about the whole Government than anyone else I have ever known.

I often think, when I consider the troubles in which we find ourselves in this country, that we have in the past made a fetish of having amateurs at many of the top places in the Government. We have gone too far in having in policy-making positions persons who have had no previous experience in any government.

I consider Senator RUSSELL to be a professional. He started many years ago, before he came to the United States Senate, in his own State legislature, as has already been stated. I shall not recall his whole career, but I shall merely say that here is a man who, in the best sense of the word, is a professional in governmental affairs, of whom we have entirely too few in this country. There are many of us—and I would include myself among them—who have had too little experience in government, in all the intricacies that enter into the vast and complex system of government under which we live today. I predict that unless we do something about developing more people with the professional approach, with a thorough knowledge of all the aspects of the government, such as Senator RUSSELL has, we shall have even more difficult times in the future.

I simply wish to say that in my opinion we have been extremely fortunate in having at least one man like Senator RUSSELL in the Senate. I know that his contribution to the daily work of the Senate is very great indeed. Unfortunately, from the country's point of view, that kind of work does not receive headlines, and too few people know what his contribution is. Unless one is here to observe at first hand the difficulties which confront anyone in trying to develop a progressive and intelligent program for the whole country, one never knows what it is that enters into the successful accomplishment of these projects.

So I sincerely hope the whole country will take great heed of the importance of having in public office people of the high caliber of Senator RUSSELL, and that they will see to it that they elect more of them in the future.

I end my remarks by congratulating the people of Georgia upon having the good sense to elect and to keep here a man who has rendered such great service to the United States.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I rise to add my voice to the many fine tributes which already have been paid to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

It was just 25 years ago that I came to work on the floor of the Senate as a deputy assigned from the office of the Sergeant at Arms. At that time Senator RUSSELL was just commencing his very illustrious service in this great deliberative body. I met him at that time, for the first time, some 25 years ago. Then it was, that his friendliness and helpfulness to one working on an attaché basis first impressed me.

I next met DICK RUSSELL in 1952, in Nevada, when it became apparent that the overwhelming choice of the people of the State of Nevada was that in the senior Senator from Georgia we had a leader who should be elected President of the United States. As a delegate to the Chicago convention in 1952, it was my honor and pleasure to go along with the Nevada delegation in supporting Senator RUSSELL. I felt convinced then, and I am even more firmly convinced now, that had our move been successful, he would have been a great American President.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is fitting that those of us who represent Nevada—coming from a silver State, and on the occasion of a silver anniversary—on this particular 25th anniversary pay our respects to this great man, this great Senator, and this great statesman from the State of Georgia. We wish him well on this occasion, and we know that his continued service in the Senate of the United States not only will enrich the history of our country, but also will add to the soundness and the saneness of our American way of life.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished Members of the United States Senate and certainly the Senate's most capable parliamentarian, today marks his 25th year of service in the United States Senate.

It is indeed a singular achievement for any man to be elected to the United States Senate, but it is an outstanding personal as well as political achievement for a man to serve in this distinguished body for a quarter of a century.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL has been graced with the unshakable trust of the people of his State, and he has endeared himself to all the people of the South. Certainly his abilities have gained him a healthy respect of lawmakers and citizens from all parts of the Nation, regardless of their personal beliefs on various questions that may come before the country.

As a neighbor of his from South Carolina, and as a colleague in the Senate, I wish to extend to RICHARD RUSSELL the heartiest of congratulations on his 25th anniversary of service to his people, and I hope he will have many more years of service in the Senate, where he is so badly needed by his State and Nation in our troubled times.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a Rhode Island schoolboy learns to have an affection for the State of Georgia. His own Revolutionary heroes, like Gen. Nathanael Greene, have fought in defense of Georgia and that State has been generous to the Rhode Island soldier. A Rhode Island Governor learns to have admiration for the State of Georgia because the beautiful State capitol is fashioned from equally beautiful Georgia marble.

When that Rhode Island schoolboy who has also been Governor of Rhode Island comes to this Senate of the United States he soon learns to place his affection and his appreciation in the personality of a son of Georgia—now the senior Senator from the Peach State, or as she has often been called, the Empire State of the South.

RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL comes naturally by those gifts which endear him to his colleagues and to the country. His legal genius may be traced to a father who rose to be chief justice of the State of Georgia.

But let us give gratitude to the qualities of his mother whose 13 children have distinguished themselves—and their parents—in ministry and medicine, in law and learning, in the arts of war and the agriculture of peace.

The merits of Senator RUSSELL have been best judged by those who know him best. For the silver years of his service in this Senate are but a continuation of the confidence that his neighbors have reposed in him since his early days as a lawyer with long service in the legislative halls of his native State before Georgia called him to the chair of governor before he was 34 years of age. Georgia likes to remember a story of a 9-year-old boy whose father saw to it that the boy spend a night in the governor's mansion of Georgia. The boy declared that he wanted to return to that mansion as governor; and RICHARD RUSSELL is the boy whose dream came true.

The life story of RICHARD RUSSELL is an inspiration to all youth and his life's labors are a gratification to all America and to the world.

There could be no pause more pleasant in the proceedings of the Senate than to pay honor to our colleague on the occasion of 25 years of eminent service to his State and to the United States. A man of character who can define and defend the Constitution, a parliamentarian of unbounded skill, an advocate of great power, an adversary that one respects even when one differs, this gentleman and scholar of Georgia gives dimension and distinction to the responsibilities of this great deliberative body. We never fail to learn something more from him. We never fail to love something more about him.

May the years be many and kind to this man of character and courage, RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it makes me feel very humble to have men whom I hold in such high regard, and for whom I have so much affection, stand upon the floor of the Senate and pay such high tribute to my efforts here over the past quarter of a century.

The people of my State have honored me beyond my deserts, over almost a lifetime spent in the public service, since I was old enough to be a member of the lower house of the General Assembly of Georgia.

I am very grateful for the experience that has been mine of serving in this great body over the most thrilling 25 years of human history. Conditions change, and the problems which confronted the first Congress in which I served are not acute today, except in fringe areas of our Nation. They related almost entirely to our internal economy. Today, the great problems which confront us are international, as we move into the space age. I am indeed fortunate that I have been permitted to serve here and to be associated with the leading men of the 48 States of this great Union of ours, as we have wrestled with so many vital problems.

There has been a tremendous change in the Senate of the United States since I first became a Member. When I came here in January 1933, we were in the midst of a great depression, and men were groping in darkness, trying to deal with it. We did not have the mass of legislation that we have today, and Sentors could really undertake to study and analyze each bill in that period before the grim necessities of the day brought every citizen of the United States in direct contact with his Federal Government.

It has been my good fortune to enjoy 25 years of thrilling association with great issues and with great men. In times when all of us often have feelings of great frustration in our service here, the greatest remuneration we could have is the feeling that sometimes we can contribute in some small degree to some cause which will make life a little better for people somewhere. It is a high privilege indeed to be associated with my colleagues of this body. This association is of course the finest compensation that we enjoy.

In my opinion, no higher distinction can come to any American citizen than to bear the title and assume the responsibilities of a Senator of the United States.

So long as we each strive to measure up to our responsibilities, the Senate will endure as the bulwark of constitutional government and the protector of the individual rights and liberties of those we serve.

Mr. President, the English language is replete with descriptive and expressive words; and when we have not been able to find them in the old mother tongue, we have borrowed very freely from the Latin languages and, indeed, from the Germanic. We have a rich store of words which enable us to express thoughts. But we have never developed any superlative for "thank you."

So, Mr. President, all I can say to all my colleagues, with a heart that is full of affection and respect for each and every one, is "thank you."

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. RUSSELL W. KEENEY, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

## "YEARS OF CRISIS" AND "PROJECTION, 1958"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the end of each year, the Columbia Broadcasting System presents a program known as years of crisis. For the ninth year in a row, this function has been performed by the many qualified overseas correspondents of the Columbia Broad-

casting System. This year, for the first time, the National Broadcasting Corp. has broadcast a somewhat similar program known as Projection, 1958.

It is interesting to note that the leaders in these discussions, Mr. Edward Murrow and Mr. Chet Huntley, are from the State of Washington and the State of Montana, respectively. Both of them are outstanding commentators and news evaluators, and I believe it is an honor to the Northwest that it has been able to produce men of this character. Because of the extreme importance, frankness, and validity of the news expressed, I ask unanimous consent that both the Years of Crisis program of the Columbia Broadcasting system and the Projection, 1958 program of the National Broadcasting Corp. be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the programs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YEARS OF CRISIS

ANNOUNCER. CBS News invites you to spend the next hour with Edward R. Murrow and eight members of broadcasting's most distinguished staff of news correspondents. This is the ninth edition of Years of Crisis for which CBS News has once again called in its correspondents from the important news centers of the world. Here now is Edward R. Murrow.

Mr. MURROW. Each year for 9 years, CBS correspondents have come home at about this time to try to cast up a sort of national balance sheet. Not even we have always been right. We sat around here a couple of years ago discussing whether the title of this program, Years of Crisis, was really appropriate. Well, this year it may be inadequate, because we certainly have no shortage of crisis. However, we will now attempt to unleash a not-too-agonized reappraisal of where we stand as the new year is about to begin. Welcome home, gentlemen. I suggest that, first of all, you answer for me a very simple question briefly as possible, and that is, what in your area happened that was basic, that was pivotal, in the course of the last year. Let's start with Howard K. Smith, who was for 10 years our chief European correspondent, and is now stationed in Washington. Howard.

Mr. SMITH. Well, in Europe in 1957, I'm afraid that neutralism became a doctrine with a future.

Mr. MURROW. David Schoenbrun, based on Paris, spends a lot of time in North Africa.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. I think the initiative in NATO passed out of America's hands into the hands of our allies.

Mr. MURROW. Alex Kendrick, from London.

Mr. KENDRICK. In Britain, Ed, we look like the second-class power that we have been saying the British look like.

Mr. MURROW. Winston Burdett, based on Rome, spends a lot of time in the Middle East.

Mr. BURDETT. In the Middle East, the Eisenhower doctrine collided with the Khrushchev doctrine.

Mr. MURROW. Ernie Leiser, from West Germany.

Mr. LEISER. In mid-Europe, Ed, this was the year that the Soviets put a couple of satellites up into orbit and pulled the rest of their satellites back into orbit.

Mr. MURROW. Pete Kalischer, based on Tokyo, just back from a trip through southeast Asia.

Mr. KALISCHER. In 1957, Ed, was the year that Asian astrologers cast their horoscopes by the light of two Russian moons.

Mr. MURROW. Dan Schorr, from Moscow.

Mr. SCHORR. In Russia, Ed, I think this was the year when a dangerous inferiority complex was replaced by a possibly more dangerous superiority complex.

Mr. MURROW. Eric Severeid, chief of our Washington bureau.

Mr. SEVAREID. Ed, I think this year Americans lost considerable faith both in their fighting apparatus and in their high command.

Mr. MURROW. Well, gentlemen, this is not a very optimistic opening, I would say, but let's examine now a little—how did it happen, how did we get ourselves in this fix? Schoenbrun.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. The world's balance of power changed very drastically this year. Russia outflanked us in the Middle East, outproduced us militarily, and our country, unfortunately, became vulnerable to atomic attack.

Now, as all of you gentlemen know, this situation is very different from that which existed when NATO was first created back in 1949 and it might be worthwhile looking backwards a little briefly to find out how we got here. Back then, we had an atomic monopoly and America was the invulnerable fortress of democracy, living pretty safely behind our wide ocean moats. Then everything began to change at about that time. We had a highly successful foreign policy, the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan, the Russians couldn't attack us, they didn't dare attack our allies because of fear of instant atomic retaliation and I think we probably just fell asleep. We woke up pretty rapidly however, Ed. In the fall of 1949, the Soviets exploded an atom bomb, in 1953—a hydrogen bomb, and then this year for the first time our once safe moats can now be spanned by missiles and our skies by sputniks. That whole situation was so very different—today for example—that American leadership of NATO, which was once willingly given to us in return for our protection, has now been challenged.

Mr. MURROW. How'd we lose it?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Well, probably we lost it because we thought that a balanced budget was more important than a balance of power—and a direct result of that was I think one of the most significant facts of this postwar era. President Eisenhower went to Paris as the first American statesman seeking security for our country, instead of offering it to our allies. We went there, Ed, you were with me in Paris, we went there to arm, to get missile bases. We were told instead to parley with the Russians. Now, East-West talks were not on the agenda of the NATO conference, not at least in the American plan. It was forced upon us. We did not lead; we were led. Why did this happen? Well, I think we changed or failed to change with a changing world. And I think the man who told us why it happened was President Eisenhower himself at that same conference. He said we've been guilty of false habits of thought. We thought that the free system was inherently stronger at all times, and in all fields, to the Communist system. We thought we didn't have to work or pay for freedom. Gentlemen, I would suggest that this is what it's brought us to, the brink of the gravest threat to our freedom in our history.

Mr. MURROW. Winston Burdett, how do you think we got into this fix?

Mr. BURDETT. Well, Ed, I think that if the past year has proven anything in my area, the Middle East, it is that something was fundamentaly wrong somewhere in our mid-East policy. The Eisenhower doctrine has not worked out. We went ahead on the promise that we could set up some kind of American protectorate over the Middle East by military names, that we could make anti-Communist allies of the Arab States and in this way exclude the Russians from the area. We proposed to extend the cold war to the Arab world and we ignored both the inherent weakness of the Arab States and the emotional backfire of Arab nationalism. We asked the Arabs to line up on our side, against the Russians, and in effect, we told them that they could get economic aid from us if they did. And this antagonized them. And in practice, we convinced them that our only desire was to dominate them instead of letting the Russians dominate them. In practice, I think we made one fatal mistake. We failed to keep calm in a crisis. When the Syrian leftwing regime took over our 6th Fleet sailed out on ostentatious maneuvers. A special envoy from Washington flew out on an emergency mission. And this proved to the Arabs that we were more alarmed by what happened in Syria than they were and they took this as a sign of fear and weakness. They took it also as attempted interference in their affairs—and even friendly Arab Governments had to come out and disavow us publicly on the ground that what happened in Syria was Syria's business. It's true of course that we face many psychological handicaps in the Arab world that the Russians don't have to face. Israel is the overriding issue of Arab nationalism and the Arabs look on us as Israel's champion. The word "imperialist" which both the Arabs and the Russians pin on us, still has a high emotional content in that part of the world. But for this reason, I think, we can't go on underestimating the Arab capacity for violent emotional reactions. Our handling of the Syrian crisis, certainly, convinced the Syrians that their deal with Russia was a great victory for Arab nationalism and independence and a great defeat for noisy Western diplomacy.

Mr. MURROW. From Pete Kalischer, as viewed from the Far East, how do we look?

Mr. KALISCHER. Well, when we lost our military preeminence, Ed, our bases there became more of a liability than an asset. We're not a member of the family in Asia, we're an alien Occidental Nation and our leadership there has always been based primarily on power. We beat the Japanese, Asia's first team, during World War II, we kept an edge, a military edge, thereafter, and then we lost our atomic monopoly. And the first big crack came, in our military reputation, when we didn't win the Korean war decisively. This enormously enhanced Red China's reputation and it put us in the position of not knowing exactly what to do. We didn't lick 'em, we didn't join 'em, and we certainly pretended more or less that they weren't there. Now, this was supposed to isolate our—isolate Red China from the rest of the non-Communist world, but actually, all it did was isolate us. It made the American eagle look like an ostrich. Now, Asians are perfectly willing to go along with an eccentric eagle, as long as it is an eagle and it can lick anything in the sky. But when the sputniks went up, the Asians decided that our military leadership had vanished.

Mr. MURROW. What did it feel like working in the Far East when you were not permitted to go to Communist China?

Mr. KALISCHER. Well, sir, pretty much like a fool. I mean we sat there and watched our colleagues from Australia and Britain and Canada and Japan go in and out and we kept our noses pressed to the window.

Mr. MURROW. All right; let's find out from Dan Schorr what the view is from Moscow. Dan.

Mr. SCHORR. The view, Ed, from the top of the Kremlin, where I spent so much time in the past year, has been somewhat dim and clouded though one thing has become clear. The sputnik which has been mentioned before was a symbol, a very great symbol although not the complete sum of what happened in Russia's dealings with the world this year. The sputnik and of course the missile that made it possible to launch these two sputniks, changed the power balance between Russia and the

United States, if not actually then at least in their own minds, but had effects elsewhere as well. It had an effect on their control of the satellites. At the Kremlin Communist summit conference last month, the sputnik was used as a symbol to cow the satellites and get them back into orbit, as Ernie Leiser mentioned. That they in effect, hitched their wagon to this satellite up in the sky and used it to cow their earthbound satellites. And there're other effects in other areas. To the uncommitted nations they took this satellite and said "we are now the country to come to for aid, not the United States." And even internally it had very important effects, because in a—in a country like Russia, which had two purges in the past year, and where Khrushchev's regime had a great many other troubles. He was able to use the sputnik as a great attention distractor. He was able to tell the people "don't look down here where we have troubles with crops, with our industrial reorganization, and one thing or another, look up there in the sky and see our great achievements."

Mr. MURROW. Dan, did the sputniks distract attention from Marshal Zhukov's removal?

Mr. SCHORR. Well, in the first place, there was considerably less attention given to Zhukov's removal in Russia than in the United States. But the second sputnik, coming as it did the day after Zhukov's complete ouster, completely erased any idea of Zhukov from the minds of the Russians even if they were disposed to discuss anything quite as dangerous as that. In effect, what Khrushchev has begun practicing is something that we might call sputnikmanship and he's practiced it very successfully. That was Russia this past year.

Mr. MURROW. Well, Eric Sevareid, as viewed from Washington, how do we find ourselves in this position and posture?

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, Ed, we all get obsessed with government and I'm not willing to blame government for everything that goes wrong in a free democratic representative type of society. But we have to begin with government policy. It seems to me that we've seen over the years here a kind of a gradual, almost unconscious substitution of the word for the deed. Now, we have made rather binding verbal commitments all over this globe without really providing the flexible military policy that would make them good in a pinch. I think we've suffered from a paralysis, at the base, a paralysis of both our military structure and organization and our strategic thinking by reason of the Dulles massive retaliation doctrine wedded to the Wilson-Humphrey economy-first policy. I think people have quite obviously been lulled almost asleep over the years with endless assurances of peace and prosperity and a normalcy which we shall certainly not see in our generation. The strange thing is that the Government seems to have lulled itself with the same kind of wishful nonthinking. After all, it was just this spring that the President was assuring us—and I'm sure he believed this quite sincerely—that NATO had never been stronger, and this summer—that we could have a perfectly adequate defense for the $38-billion ceiling. It was just this August that Secretary Wilson actually reduced the moneys for missile development. And all this in the teeth of what seems to most of us to have been very apparent intelligence information available to them as to everybody else. I have a feeling there has been a response here not to objective facts enough but too much to subjective illusions. For example, that public opinion and the supply of money in this country are fixed ceilings under which—determine really what Government does instead of the other way around. And maybe more than just a technological lag, maybe a considerable breakdown, at least for a time, in—in the great art of leading a great people.

Mr. MURROW. Well, gentlemen, we certainly have not a problem but a whole covey or clutch of problems. Let's see if we can define at least 1 or 2 of them. Alex Kendrick, you've spent the last 2 or 3 months studying the whole missile and weapons programs, just how serious is our technological lag?

Mr. KENDRICK. Well, it is serious, Ed, as Dan Schorr made it quite plain. The two Soviet sputniks were not accidental, they were planned that way. They show that in science and technology and perhaps even in their educational system, which backs up science and technology, the Russians are our equal in some respects and perhaps even ahead of us. Of course, in military terms—everybody should know by now—the two Soviet sputniks mean that the Russians can send a ballistic missile 5,000 miles from their country to our country in less than a half hour. They can put a hydrogen warhead on this missile and it can cause widespread death and destruction. Now, it's true that they can't do this accurately enough yet—and our experts tell us that the Soviet ICBM is not yet operational. But the potential is there. And strategy is measured in terms of potential. And, strategically, possession of the ICBM by the Russians would cancel out our strategic advantage, that is, our advantage up to this point, our long-distance Air Force, SAC. Now, it's true that the Russians have a long-distance air force too, their SAC, but with our warning system and our defense system we would have some protection against an attack by their long-distance air force. If they attacked us with missiles we wouldn't have that protection. Now, it's also true that the missiles—without a defense—we can retaliate with SAC still. We can build up intercontinental missiles the way they are doing and the way we are doing and we may also be able to develop antimissile missiles. But this doesn't remove that potential I was talking about, the potential that they have of making a direct strike against our cities.

Mr. MURROW. Isn't it true also, Alex, that they lead us in intermediate-range missiles?

Mr. KENDRICK. Yes, they do—in two respects, because they are also building submarines which will be able to fire missiles and these submarines can come rather close to our shores and they can bring American cities under attack from short-range distances rather than from long-range distances.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Well, Alex, they can also cancel out with their ICBM's our European bases——

Mr. KENDRICK. Well, exactly—what Ed said—they are ahead of us in intermediate-range missiles as well, and this gives them the potential of attacking the cities of western Europe, the cities of our allies, as well as our own cities.

Mr. SCHOENBURN. That's what made them so nervous at the Paris summit conference and so reluctant to give us launching pads in Europe itself.

Mr. KENDRICK. Our allies you mean.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Yes.

Mr. MURROW. Well, now, gentlemen, we went to Paris hoping that we could get permission from our allies to plant these intermediate-range missiles on their territory, but they seemed to be somewhat reluctant. Leiser, as viewed from Germany, what do you think our chances are of getting permission to place these missiles on the Continent?

Mr. LEISER. I'm not so sure we will, Ed. We, of course, extracted in Paris an agreement in principle to put those bases on the Continent, but actually in practice a good many of our allies only were willing to have those bases on somebody else's part of the Continent. The West German newspapers for example have been busily printing maps to show that it really doesn't make much sense to have the bases on German soil. They say that the only additional area brought into target range is a slice of tundra some place northeast of Leningrad. The idea seems to be "put the bases in Turkey or in Greece," anyplace but on our soil. Well, of course, this is quite a change from a couple of years ago when our allies were clamoring that we were depriving them of the modern weapons that they needed to protect their territories. Now for the first time we went to Paris and we asked them to accept the missiles or at least give us the real estate to put them on in order to help protect American soil. And, actually, there's another very remarkable change of scene from my point of view, the man who seemed to focus the reluctance to accept the missiles was old Konrad Adenauer, who up to now has been our most obedient ally, I think you might say——

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Unquestioning.

Mr. LEISER. Who has—spy (laughter)—anyhow, he certainly has been a rock of support for the Dulles doctrine of positions of strength. Well, at this meeting, the Europeans and particularly the Germans felt that he was the leader of opposition to Dulles. In fact, in Bonn after the Paris conference, the joke was that the German national anthem should be changed from "Deutschland Ueber Alles" to "Deutschland Ueber Dulles."

Mr. MURROW. Well, it's true that Adenauer led the procession demanding new parleys with the Russians but he was almost trampled by our other allies who were equally eager.

Howard Smith, one of the great advantages of being a chief correspondent is that you can wander anywhere you like and you've been doing that for the past 10 years, why don't you sum up now the political repercussions of sputnik?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I think the problem that sputnik creates for us outside our own borders has to be divided into two, the uncommitted world—about two-thirds of the world, and the western allied nations. To take the uncommitted countries first, we've always suffered from an advantage in dealing with them because Russia has no history in Asia and Africa and the Middle East while the western white men does. Until recently most of these peoples were subjects of western empires and so their resentment and suspicion are fresh and sharp and so * * * and also they don't distinguish between Europeans, who live in Europe, and Europeans, who over the centuries have emigrated and call themselves Americans. We're all the same to them. So in any competition for their favor we're like a mile runner who's forced to start every race a quarter mile behind the Russian opponent. Well, now, since sputnik I think our disadvantage has become greater because the main material aspiration of these people is to industrialize their countries rapidly and here they see the * * * to them, hopeful image of a country, Russia, almost as underdeveloped as they were a short while ago, is today able to beat the most advanced western white nation at putting an earth satellite into orbit. This is just bound to make them more receptive to approaches from the Russians and less receptive to approaches from us.

Mr. MURROW. One of our major miscalculations, wasn't it, was that we assumed that a backward people could not skip whole generations or centuries in technological development and progress?

Mr. SMITH. I think the floor is littered with fragments of that il—— [laughter]. Well, now, in the——

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Howard, wouldn't you agree that the Cairo conference this week is a particular example of Russia's political and economic appeal to the uncommitted

nations, that they now can at least promise to export aid and technology to those——

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely. I think it's a perfect example of the way they're trying to exploit sputnik. But now, about the Western European allied countries, the problem's somewhat different. They're not so interested in the sputnik as they are in the mighty missile that put a half-ton sputnik in the air. As Alex Kendrick said, that implies that Russia is now ahead of us in a new field of weapons whereby the Russians can destroy Western Europe much more efficiently than ever before and America is less able to protect Europe than ever before. This is almost found to induce them to start thinking in terms of possibly becoming neutral in this battle, and I think that desire is increased by the fact that the Russians have, or will soon have, this intercontinental missile whereby they can hit America directly without even going over Western Europe. This is bound to bring about the thought in Western Europe that perhaps they might keep out of the next war and just leave it to the two giants. So I think the whole thing creates a trend toward neutrali——

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Known as the —— of defense.

Mr. MURROW. Yes.

Mr. LEISER. Well, Ed, I think that right now it makes them want to negotiate, not necessarily to keep out, but to find some way to negotiate out of the dilemma that they feel that they're in.

Mr. MURROW. Well, Mr. Sevareid, since we're talking about allies—and having allies is a relatively new experience for us—they represent a problem, too, don't they?

Mr. SEVAREID. Yes; I'm afraid Howard has stolen a little of my proposed thunder here, but [laughter] we talk all the time and the press is full of talk about the allied crisis of confidence in us. You can turn this around, too. There are a lot of worried people in Washington about their confidence in Europe. Lots of Asians who used to criticize us for concentrating too much on military power now criticize us for not concentrating enough and letting the Russians get ahead of us. There are Europeans who seem to want a double-standard alliance, one that will protect them and also give them an out if necessary. The words in the alliance, if they read it, say, in effect, one for all and all for one. We have not yet sought it out; some of them are.

Mr. MURROW. Well, gentlemen, let's look briefly at the immediate and crucial hazards that confront us, the things that represent an immediate danger. Kendrick.

Mr. KENDRICK. Ed, from the military point of view, the hazards are very simple. They are the hazards of sudden death and with no place to hide. Because even though it is fantastic to conceive of such a thing, a surprise attack by the Russians cannot be ruled out by our military planners. Every military man must have that as one of the possibilities on his drafting board. The possibility of adventurism, let us say, in the Kremlin, may not be a political factor but it certainly must be reckoned as a military factor or a possible military factor. Then there's the second type of sudden death, let us say accidental death. Somebody will push the wrong button and put us into war. And then there's the possibility that one of our allies might inadvertently or advertently start a scrape somewhere that would involve us in war. Those are the hazards that we face.

Mr. MURROW. Dan Schorr, what's the immediate danger as viewed from Moscow?

Mr. SCHORR. Well, I would tend to discount the immediate danger of any calculated surprise attack that Alex mentioned, but I go along with him on the possibility of adventurism in Russia, but only under certain conditions. Looking at it from the Soviet internal point of view, I think there is a possibility of adventurism arising if the squeeze is put too heavily on the present Khrushchev regime, if they're put into the kind of a corner where they feel it necessary to take certain chances as a diversion. I think one small example of that was the trumped up crisis over Syria and Turkey, which happened to come around a time they were having trouble over Marshal Zhukov. I think that kind of danger does exist and perhaps we might have to do something about it.

Mr. MURROW. Sevareid, what's the immediate danger as you view it from Washington?

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, I think the great thing is that this Government may not have grasped and may not help the people to grasp the full implications of this profound crisis, which is going to go on for a long time. I think there is another specific thing, Ed, relating to economics. I don't know if there'll be an economic depression in this country at all but we could do things that would produce overseas some of the effects of a depression, that is—and that concerns this new Congress more than the administration. We might even put up some tariffs. We may considerably cut the amount and scope of foreign-aid spending and technical help, and so on. This could have rather serious effects and this would split the present foreign policy down the middle. There was one witness, Ed, at a House subcommittee last week on this subject who said if we do this, this is like asking one Siamese twin to play the Moonlight Sonata on a ukulele while the other does a jailhouse rock with Marilyn Monroe. You can't—you can't do it that way.

Mr. MURROW. Mr. Kalischer, what's the immediate hazard viewed from the Far East?

Mr. KALISCHER. The immediate hazard, of course, is the accidental war, the adventurism which might occur say in the Formosa Straits or in a divided Korea. But I think really the great hazard is the fact that we'll lose the uncommitted nations like Japan and India to communism. If we do we could lose the whole shooting match with a whimper not a bang. India would tip the scales, I think, out of sheer numbers, 360 million people, Japan, because it's got the biggest industrial complex in the Far East, and when you've got that tied up with Siberia and China you have a very formidable complex indeed. And Japan is particularly vulnerable because it's in an export-or-die race for survival. If we raise tariffs, if we cut down Japan's free world market through a recession, Japan must look elsewhere for trade. And I say that we very possibly we can create the biggest ringtailed economic and political crisis in Japan by creating that kind of a crisis.

Mr. MURROW. Mr. Leiser, what's the view in Germany?

Mr. LEISER. Well, Japan's not the only place, Ed, where a depression could bring catastrophe. The Germans are seriously worried about a danger of a depression and they think that the principal likely source of that danger might be the United States. A depression here would infect all of the European economies. The democracy in West Germany has been growing surprisingly strongly in the * * * with its roots in the fertile soil of prosperity. But if the economy went bust, I think that all threats about the future of democracy in West Germany would have to be off.

Mr. MURROW. Mr. Schoenbrun, what is your view on the immediate hazard?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. I see two ahead, Ed. One we saw at the Paris Conference together, that is, the state of leadership of the Western World is extremely precarious. The health of the American President, of course, is a principal cause of concern. As for the German Chancellor, he's, I think, 82 years old next week, and the 38-year-old French Premier is not likely to grow old in office. If there were a change of regime in France and Germany that could wreck NATO and such a crisis indeed is ahead in 1958. France is facing in the Algerian war a crisis that could bring about a right- or a left-wing coup d'etat. Now, gentlemen, don't hold me to this. I don't say it's going to happen. For the first time, however, it is possible. And that's the second hazard, the war in Algeria, which is spreading its flames throughout North Africa and which might well provoke an anti-Christian, anti-Western bloc from the Dardanelles to Gibraltar.

Mr. MURROW. And, Mr. Burdett, as viewed from the Middle East, what's the immediate hazard to us?

Mr. BURDETT. Well, there are immediate hazards, Ed, at almost every step that we take there. One Western diplomat in Jordan told me recently that the two worst calamities he could imagine happening would be the death of King Hussein and a revival of the Arab-Israeli dispute over the Gulf of Aqaba. Hussein alone holds Jordan together and his death would bring down the pro-Western government of that country. Now, nobody knows when or whether the Egyptians or the Saudi Arabians are going to try to close the Aqaba Gulf of Israel. But we do know that neither Nasser nor King Saud has forgotten that issue. If they revive it we will be caught again right in the middle of an Arab-Israeli dispute. There's always the hazard of new outbreaks on the borders of Israel. If there is serious trouble, even trouble short of war, on the Israeli border with Jordan, it will not be long before Jordan slides into chaos. Hussein would find it politically impossible to keep the Syrian Army from rushing to his aid in the name of Arab unity. And in that event it seems certain that the Syrians would not get out again. Finally, there's the danger that if Jordan falls, Amman will then become the base of operations for the Egyptians and the Syrians against their next target, Iraq.

Mr. MURROW. Not a very pleasing prospect, is it? Howard Smith, what's the immediate hazard as you view it?

Mr. SMITH. Well, with some reluctance, I must recall that before we got into the sputnik cloud we were suffering from a black eye called Little Rock. The ugly photographs of white mobs beating up Negroes appeared on the front page of almost every newspaper on earth and I don't think the press abroad was very fair to us. I don't think they noted the fact that in fact we've made a great deal of progress on this problem and I think we still are. They just noticed that the mob did this. And in a world which we have to court for our own survival and a world which is two-thirds colored, I don't think we can afford any more Little Rocks.

Mr. MURROW. Well, gentlemen, we've drawn up something of a list of our liabilities and a rather formidable one it is, too, which certainly leaves no room for complacency, but after all our posture is not prone, we have very considerable assets and I think it might be useful at this point to try to total up a few of the assets. Why don't you start, Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. I think that one of our liabilities is still our greatest asset, and that is NATO. NATO is still the richest, strongest, voluntary coalition of free nations in the world and that's an enormous asset if we can hold it. NATO conducts some two-thirds of the world's trade. Its mines produce more coal than the rest of the world together. Its furnaces pour more steel. Unfortunately, the rest of the world, the Communist world, is using more and more of its steel to build schools. And, for example, although Russia has half as much steel as the United States it's turning out twice as many scientists. That's very real danger to us. I think that our basic health is sound.

I think our assets are very great. The problem is how do we make the best use of them.

Mr. MURROW. Kalischer.

Mr. KALISCHER. Well, I think Japan, the innate conservatism of Japan in Asia is one of our biggest assets, because they've got a high standard of living, which we helped them get, and they want to keep it. Surprisingly enough, our big asset in India is Prime Minister Nehru. Now, Americans often feel that Nehru is splitting hairs when the Indians should be out splitting logs. But he is a working democrat who wants to make a modified form of socialism work. I think we have an asset in South Vietnam, which is a little country, but symbolically 22 Vietnamese offered to man the first American space rocket once we got it up. And, finally, I think we've got an asset in the fact that China, Red China, is feeling the pinch of paying for the Soviet technical aid program.

Mr. MURROW. Winston Burdett, what are our assets as viewed in the Middle East?

Mr. BURDETT. Well, Ed, I think we have one big immediate asset in the Middle East, the United Nations, and that means two things: the personal diplomacy of Dag Hammarskjold and the United Nations emergency force, which stands guard at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba and in the Gaza strip. I think that very few people realized last month that for a few days at least, we were at the edge of something very deep during the latest border dispute between Israel and Jordan. Dag Hammarskjold flew out there himself and by what diplomats on the scene thought must have been some kind of wizardry, he cleared up the trouble. He's an invaluable asset. Also, there's very little attention given to the job done by the U. N. Emergency Force. A year ago, I remember, the Israelis were saying that the U. N. would be powerless in Gaza, it would not be able, they predicted, it would be unable to curb Egyptian raids across the border into Israel. And many diplomats and many correspondents, including me, were almost equally pessimistic. So, I think it's worth recording, a year later, that we were wrong and that the U. N. force has been worth every dollar that's been spent on it.

Mr. MURROW. Of course, it doesn't have enough dollars for its support at the moment because some nations have refused to pay their appropriations. Dan Schorr, as viewed from Moscow, what assets do we have?

Mr. SCHORR. I think, Ed, the greatest asset that we have in Russia is the growing desire of the Soviet people for something that I would call normalcy except that it's not normal, at least for some kind of a decent or better life anyway. Forty years after the revolution, I think the flames of fanaticism have damped down and the people are just in a state where they want something a little better and a little relaxation. I think they would like to be as we are accused of being—complacent. They'd like their chance at complacency too. I think this represents a pressure on the regime. It's one of the reasons why Khrushchev feels somewhat overcommitted in his promises of aid to uncommitted countries, his promises of aid to the satellites. I think he's been forced to promise some aid to his own people as well. And that represents a pressure for reduction of the arms burden. It doesn't operate as directly as it would in this country. The seat of power remains in the Kremlin, they're awfully far from the people, but indirectly it's increasing. And one of the reasons it's increasing is that the people aren't so numb or dumb any more. There's been a lot of education. And the education that it's taken to make sputniks has also produced a lot of thinking. And as the people think they aren't pushed around quite so easily any more. You feel it. You feel it as you travel through Russia.

Mr. MURROW. Are you suggesting that there might be a revolution of the sputnik makers sometime?

Mr. SCHORR. Well, I don't want to play with the word revolution, I wouldn't want to suggest that this—Russia is going to go up in flames of revolution or counter-revolution very soon. I think in the terms which you mean it, revolution as a kind of a mental and spiritual revolution—yes, I think that the sputnik makers don't like the Communist gobbledygook, I think they will rebel in their own way in time.

Mr. MURROW. Leiser, what are our assets as viewed from Germany?

Mr. LEISER. Well, in central Europe, Ed, a very strong asset is a Germany—at least a West Germany that for the first time in this century is not seeking military or political adventure. The Russians may, as Dan has just said, be looking for a better life—the West Germans have got it and they want to keep it. They have a standard of living that is now beginning to approximate ours and they like it. They have an economic way of life that is now beginning to approximate ours and they like it. They are not in a mood to tinker recklessly with events.

Mr. MURROW. Kendrick, what are our assets as viewed from London?

Mr. KENDRICK. From missile land.

Mr. MURROW. Missile land, all right.

Mr. KENDRICK. I'm with Dave Schoenbrun in believing that a liability and even a hazard can also be an asset. Now, missile warfare is still in the future and potentially Soviet missile might could cancel out our SAC force, but right now, we still possess the power of deterrents. We have airbases at home and overseas, we have allies, we have a long distance air force, we have carrier fleets—and all these, I think serve to remind the Russians, that whatever war may do to us, it would be suicidal for them. Now, this is a grim and a most horrible asset, but it's still an asset even though it may only be temporary.

Mr. MURROW. Dan Schorr, is there much widespread fear of war in the Soviet Union, would you say?

Mr. SCHORR. There is a great deal of fear of war in the Soviet Union. It goes up and down. It reached a new peak just around the time of the Turkish-Syrian crisis. Ah, they are constantly being told that the Russian Government doesn't want war but constantly being told also that we do, and they always interpret that in terms of the intentions of their own government.

Mr. MURROW. Eric Sevareid, why don't you sum up our assets as viewed from Washington.

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, Ed, we—since time and space are coequal, so the scientists tell us, that with the loss of the protecting oceans we have lost the asset of time, but that's about all, I think. This country is by no means a pushover. We have everything else if we use it. We've got the greatest industrial plant in the world and the greatest industrial leaders. We have a wonderful pool of scientists and engineers if their energies are channeled. We have unlimited money though we act as though we're almost broke half the time and I think we have a world record of generosity and good will toward other parts of the world and of nonaggression, that honest men cannot really doubt. We have a President that people will still most willingly follow—if he can summon the personal strength and the personal will to give them the lead. We have a great deal.

Mr. MURROW. Well, gentlemen, we have now at least tried to lay out in general terms our liabilities and our assets. Now, let's go to the simple problem, something must be done. What should we do? Kendrick?

Mr. KENDRICK. Ed, I think the first thing to do, and I don't mean the only thing, but the first thing to do is to catch up with the Russians in missiles. This may not change the fact that the Russians still have or will have the ability to bring our cities under their missiles, but it might at least give us a stalemate in this field of intercontinental missiles and certainly it would do much to restore our confidence and our psychology of leadership. And even though we started 5 years behind the Russians in the big missiles, a lot of people here believe that we can catch up with them in 2 or 2½ years, provided, of course, they don't step up their pace too much.

Now, another thing we must do is remember that a missile's test is also a test of nerves and we should not magnify the natural misfires and normal failures that you get in testing. Thirdly, I think we should lift the veil of atomic secrecy that still exists between this country and our allies, because only in this way can we further, instead of hinder, nuclear progress; and anyway we don't have secrets from the Russians.

But, most of all, I think that we have to change the climate in this country. I think we have to stop being anti-intellectual, we've go to recognize that an egg—that an egghead—may be a better investment than a blockhead. However, I wouldn't put all our eggheads in one basket [laughter], a basket of science. I think they should be spread around in the general field of education.

MURROW. Dan Schorr, what do you think we must do?

Mr. SCHORR. Well, I've been listening to Alex Kendrick, and I'll admit that I'm somewhat depressed. Not so much by what he has said, as by the emphasis that it seems to indicate. Of course, we have to try (voice in background: And your lucky) [laughter], although, I don't know, maybe before these missiles start to fly it would be luckier to be in Moscow. Of course, we have to try to catch up with Russia in the field of missiles—that sort of goes almost without saying—but even if we do, and I assume we can in proper time, I'm not quite sure where that leaves us and I think that it omits one opportunity that there is to find some kind of a better and more real solution than just catching up and then keeping pace in means of destruction. You remember a year ago we discussed just after the Hungarian rebellion, the possibilities that existed then for some kind of a deal with Russia to use a crude term. They seemed to be ready then for disengagement and had offered us some kind of a zone—deneutralized zone—in Europe extending 500 miles both sides of the Elbe. They were then off balance and I think the terms for such a deal were pretty good.

Now, they've subdued Hungary again, now they have their sputniks up in the sky and the terms are less good, but I still think there are possibilities for dealing with the Russians and for getting some kind of disengagement in Central Europe. The reason I think so, that the pressures are still strong in Russia. I think they need very badly disarmament agreement, I think this was indicated by the way only this past week Khrushchev announced a cut in the armed forces manpower based on nothing more substantial then NATO's statement that we didn't want to use force—a statement that NATO had made many, many times before. I would like to see those opportunities explored. If not, I don't know what's going to happen. But even after we've explored these opportunities and assuming—which I do not assume, that we could get some kind of disengagement, then we really go in for the long haul race—the big competitive coexistence and there it seems to me, we have to catch up with Russia, in those fields of science and education where at the moment they are ahead. And there, I just want to make one brief remark based on observations recently in talking to the Soviet professors

and science students. Coming home, it seems to me that many Americans put too much emphasis on the price tag attached to catching up with Russia in science, and it seems to me from dealing with them, looking at and listening to Soviet scientists, that their money—the compensation that they get, how well off they are personally isn't the main point. The main point for them is they have the laboratories and the facilities and the opportunity to do the kind of work they love to do and that this work is valued in their society.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. And they have a status in their society.

Mr. SCHORR. Yes; it is status—a sense of—of role of function which everybody values, partly this is I think, because science is a kind of a holy word in a Communist state, but I think science can be a holy enough word here—even while preserving other holy things.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. You'd say they were pro-egghead in other words?

Mr. SCHORR. Yes, they are pro-egghead.

Mr. SMITH. I've heard it said, that part of the incentive to being a scientist in Russia is the disincentive of being anything else in Russia. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHORR. There is some truth in that, but I don't think it tells the whole story.

Mr. MURROW. Mr. Smith, what do you think we must do and urgently?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I am certainly in agreement with those who think that our diplomacy ought to be much more affirmative where it has been negative and should be more supple where it's been rigid. In fact, I don't think we're going to keep our alliance with us unless it becomes more affirmative and supple, but having said that I would like to agree with Alex Kendrick that our top priority has to be making those new weapons. In respect to getting a disarmament agreement I've covered almost every disarmament conference there has been and I think it's going to be extremely difficult without those weapons. This is a very complicated thought—can I pursue it a little bit.

Mr. MURROW. Please do.

Mr. SMITH. The thing that most disarmament talks run up against and stop at is the fact that Russia has one built-in advantage over us. She—she can launch a surprise attack on us whereas we cannot launch a surprise attack on Russia. Russia can keep secret all the movements it takes to prepare a surprise attack but we can't. They would read about movements in all our newspapers and hear it on the radio and possibly see a little of it on television, so it's very hard for us to do it. Now, any disarmament agreement requires a good degree of inspection of each country to make sure the agreement is being kept, and if Russia agreed to that she could no longer launch these surprise attacks. She could lose her greatest advantage.

Mr. SCHORR. If I could interrupt you for one minute here, I think as long as we concentrate on this question of inspection, the possibility of a disarmament agreement is going to be very slim indeed. The kind of inspection we want is a kind of inspection that the Russians won't let Russians do in their own country and with the underground launching pads and—and the missiles on submarines, it does seem to me that this question of inspection is getting a bit outdated.

Mr. MURROW. Well, then, you are saying that there is no real chance.

Mr. SCHORR. I—what the Russians want is a lot of things, which I don't hope that we will give them, but I do think the approach to the problem instead of an overall disarmament agreement with inspection is, instead of trying to decide to avoid surprise attacks in a clinch, is to try and break out of the clinch—to try to disengage, to try to——

Mr. SEVAREID. It takes two to try to break out of a clinch.

Mr. SCHORR. Yes. (Several speaking simultaneously.)

Mr. KALISCHER. Once you have inspection, Dan, how do you know that any agreement is going to be kept?

Mr. SCHORR. You can start with a partial agreement in an area of Europe where you can inspect, but an overall disarmament agreement with inspection in Russia is just unpalatable to that regime as long as it is Communist and I'm afraid it's going to remain Communist for still a little time.

Mr. MURROW. Leiser, what—what do you think we ought to do as viewed from Germany?

Mr. LEISER. Well, Ed, our European allies emphatically think that we should start to negotiate and start now. Their attitude seems to be, don't just stand there—say something. Well, if we're to say anything and find out what the Russians real answers are, I think that we're going to have to say it quietly behind closed doors, using the techniques of old-fashioned diplomacy. I think we've had enough of summit meetings, beating of the propaganda drums and the clinking of the martini glasses. I think perhaps an example offers itself in what happened when Russia's Malik and America's Jessup got together and settled the Berlin blockade—an agreement by the way that has stuck——

Mr. KENDRICK. What do you mean that the Russians wanted to settle the Berlin blockade, how do you know that they really want to engage in disengagement?

Mr. LEISER. I don't. I think we won't find out until we try.

Mr. KENDRICK. Well, they proposed it. (Several speaking simultaneously.)

Mr. LEISER. We can only find out by negotiating.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Alex, you used to be in Vienna and the Russians disengaged from Austria.

Mr. KENDRICK. That's true.

Mr. MURROW. Go ahead Ernie.

Mr. LEISER. Well, I was going to say, that the—the technique of negotiation must be the old-fashioned diplomatic kind. The substance of negotiation I think, must start modestly. We start small, we don't try and settle all the issues that divide us—perhaps we take one on disengagement, a small issue—a relatively small issue, we discuss the possibility of our withdrawing our troops or at least our atomic weapons to the Rhine and find out how far the Soviets are prepared to withdraw their weapons. I suggest that this is an area in which the Russians might be willing to permit inspection.

Mr. MURROW. Well, Winston, what do you think we must do immediately, what is the urgent thing we must accomplish in the Middle East—if we can?

Mr. BURDETT. Ed, I think that first priority in the Middle East must go to achieving or at any rate trying to achieve a settlement of the biggest single problem—the Arab-Israeli conflict. There will be profound instability in the Middle East as long as that conflict goes on and as long as there is this instability there will be no rest in the cold war between the Russians and ourselves in the area.

Mr. MURROW. How do you think it could be settled?

Mr. BURDETT. Well, we cannot get that settlement certainly without doing some unpopular things. I think it will take time and that a year will not be enough. But certainly we will get nowhere if we go on treating this as the untouchable problem, we've got to make a start and a try. The end purpose of any settlement of course, must be to get full Arab recognition that Israel is here to stay. But the Israelis, I think, must face up to the fact that they bear a major responsibility for the 927,000 Arab refugees. They have to make an unconditional offer to take the refugees back. Now I do not believe that such an offer would cost Israel a great deal, the refugees—like other Arabs have come to realize—especially since the Israeli invasion of Egypt that Israel is strong and cannot be wiped out. I think that only a small portion of them—even those who owned property in Palestine would want to return to Israel in order to become second-class Israeli citizens. Most of them would probably accept compensation which will have to be provided and would be willing to seek a new life elsewhere.

Mr. KENDRICK. May I ask you something? Why don't the Arab States take back the Arab refugees since they're the ones who caused them to be refugees in the first place.

Mr. BURDETT. Whether they caused them to be refugees in the first place, Alex, is a matter of great historical dispute. I think myself, that the Arabs and the Israeli's share a responsibility there. They do not take them back for a political reason. Namely, to perpetuate their grievances against Israel and thereby to perpetuate their argument against them.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. All right Winson, why don't these Arab States use some of their billions and billions of dollars of oil money to do something about taking care of Arab refugees? Why does Israel have to put up all the money?

Mr. BURDETT. Well, it's true that King Saud is a billionaire, but he's a broke billionaire. He's always running out of funds.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. You should be so broke. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURDETT. But I think secondly as part of a general settlement, Israel must give up land—not a great deal of land, but enough to return to Arab rule the Arab villages and farms along the borders and also to end the absurdity of Arab communities being split down the middle by a demarcation line.

Mr. MURROW. Don't you think that any Israeli Government that accepted that proposal would be out of office in 24 hours?

Mr. BURDETT. No; I believe the opposite, Ed, I believe that such territorial concessions are a political necessity. I believe that no Arab Government could risk a settlement that did not involve such concessions. I believe that an Israeli Government could. There would be a crisis in Israel, the government might fall, but I don't believe that this would affect the ultimate stability of government itself in Israel, whereas, I believe it would follow—it would lead to a—a series of breakdowns in the Arab States.

Mr. KENDRICK. Well, Winston, you're saying—you're saying the same thing that Dan says, that it only takes one to unclinch.

Mr. BURDETT. There is a difference—there is a great difference. Ah, the Arabs are asking various things of the Israeli's, various relatively small practical concessions. I think they would settle. For Israel is asking only one thing of the Arabs, and that is, peace on her borders and full Arab recognition. This, she would have to get out of any settlement. She could not be asked to make these sacrifices in order to get an impermanent settlement and in order for this settlement to be accepted as permanent, there would have to be absolute guaranties of Arab-Israeli borders, in the first instance by the United States and certainly also by the United Nations. Now, I don't wish to imply, I think it would be absurd and dishonest to imply that there are no political risks involved in seeking a settlement of this kind. I think there are risks, there are great risks, for example, badly handled, this whole project could set off new dissensions among the Arab States, each of which is only too ready to jump on its neighbor with accusations of sellout to Israel. I think also, that there would be stiff resistance and possibly serious political repercussions in Israel itself.

I think though, that Israel could stand up to those repercussions, and the essential political fact here, is that the United States is the only country in a position to bring pressure and to induce the Israeli's to give up some of their fixed old emotional positions.

Mr. MURROW. Of course, the Russians are also in a position to encourage the Arabs in their ambition to wipe Israel off the map.

Mr. BURDETT. This is true, and all the more reason it seems to me that we should try to meet this problem before the Russians try to exploit it.

Mr. MURROW. Mr. Kalischer, what do you think we should do in the Far East?

Mr. KALISCHER. Well, we've got to do something that I think is a thousand times harder than the crash missiles program. We've got to revamp our thinking entirely in regard to about half the world's population, maybe more, the semicolonial and colonial and former colonial peoples. While we're staring hypnotized at Russia across Western Europe, we're being outflanked in Asia, in Africa, even in the South Pacific. Now, the present Afro-Asian Conference is a sort of thing that points this up. The Indonesians have a dispute with the Dutch. They asked us to mediate—we refused, now, they're getting the sort of support that they want from the Communist countries.

Mr. SCHORR. Not yet. They just asked for it.

Mr. KALISCHER. Well, they've asked for it, but you—well, they've gotten moral support and this is exactly what President Sukarno said to a visiting Congressman in Jakarta (interrupted). No, but President Sukarno asked our Congressman SAUND, he said, "I don't just want American military and economic aid, I want American political aid," and that, is what he is getting from the Communist countries. We've also got to do something else. We've also got to admit that our China policy is bankrupt. I don't think there is a general in the Pentagon who honestly believes that Chiang Kai-shek has a China mandarin's chance of fighting his way back to the mainland or that he'd be able to remain on Formosa unless we kept him there. I don't think there is a diplomat in the Far East that thinks that our policy of nonrecognition in 7 years of economic sanctions is going to bring down the Communist government. I think we've got to admit that we've got to do what our major allies in Europe and Asia have admitted and do—and that is, recognize the Peking regime for what it is—the unfriendly, but existing government of mainland China. We should recognize the Chiang regime for what it is, the friendly and existing government of Formosa, and then I think, possibly we might try something rather unorthodox like offering farm products aid to Red China the next time there is flood or famine. They—if they accepted, it would mean that Russia could not or would not help, if they refused, it would mean that they would have to explain this to their own people. In either case, we'd get out from behind this wall we're building around China which is really a wall we're building around ourselves.

Mr. MURROW. Schoenbrun, what do you think is urgent to be accomplished?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Well, I think we might begin by trying to correct those false habits of thought that the President talked about. If our free system is not inherently stronger than the Communist system, then it follows logically that we must work harder, pay more taxes, and have more respect for learning. I think too, we should give up some of our own self-deluding myths, for example, the illusion that Russia is going to come unstuffed because of internal pressures. Dan Schorr has told us that Russia is likely to evolve, but no revolution in sight. If that's so, we've got to start living with the idea that Russia is going to be around for a very long time, that the competition is not going to end, it's going to grow more intense. I think that's why our allies have asked us to negotiate. Not necessarily a global settlement, Ed, personally, I don't believe that disarmament can be brought about over night. I am more inclined to agree with those of my colleagues who said that we ought to try to have a series of disentanglements at the pressure points, in the Middle East, in middle Europe, in any specific area or on any specific issue, where we can seek the chances of agreements through normal diplomatic channels. And, finally, Ed, if I may say so very briefly, I think we've got to be true to our own faith. We cannot support colonial powers without weakening the moral posture of what we call the Free World. And, when Mr. Dulles tells the American people as he did recently, that our ties of friendship with Spain are symbolic of the links in the Free World, I think he's misusing the words "free world." Let us by all means have alliances with Spain and with Yugoslavia, let's admit, however, that they are alliances of mutual self-interest—not of mutual ideology, let's not misabuse and abuse that precious word, "freedom." President Eisenhower said that this is a time for greatness. I would suggest it is also a time for facing up to the full truth.

Mr. MURROW. Eric Sevareid, what do you think we must do?

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, Ed, to put it very briefly, I am assuming that a control of space over this—I am assuming that the world leadership and the very fundamental scientific revolution is at stake—a revolution is going to change man's life enormously. Therefore, I believe, so far as this country is concerned, we have to try to go all out. I think there will have to be, whether we like it or not, some Government hand directly on the economy. I think we must get some better control of our dwindling natural resources, some better control of our rather scattered and somewhat misused scientists and engineers. Surely, we've got to get at this shockingly delayed problem of an obsolescent educational system. We may even need a bigger army for more flexible military policy around the world. If all this means higher taxes, then so be it. I think most of us would rather be broke than dead, though sometimes the Government seems to have some doubts about it.

Mr. MURROW. Well, gentlemen, would any of you like to sum up this discussion. [Laughter.]

Mr. SEVAREID. Would you?

Mr. MURROW. Well, I'll try and, if you have disagreement at any point, by all means speak up.

It seems to me there are certain things upon which you gentlemen are in complete agreement. First of all, you all agree that our lack of leadership is showing. That some of our illusions have been shattered and that many of our allies have become disillusioned. You agree that our allies are determined (1) to talk with the Russians, and (2) perhaps to do business with them. That they are not impressed with our belief, widely held, that the Russians are going to collapse from internal pressure. You also appear to believe that if we persist in our self-righteous, inflexible policy, matching bomb with bomb, missile with missile, threat with threat, that then, within measurable course, we in this country may find ourselves merely a great continental island off the coast of Kamchatka with the rest of the world either united against us or wholly indifferent to our fate. It seems that you also agree that we must somehow disenthrall ourselves and learn not only to think anew, but act anew, and I have also the impression that none of you believe that death in defense of a balanced budget is a proper way for free men to die. You all seem to feel that the President posed the question properly in Paris when he said, "What will we pay in freedom for freedom?" but that he has not yet made much progress in answering that question. You've cast up what I would call a rather ominous balance sheet; yet somehow I find your discourse rather optimistic. None of you suggests that humans, having devised a method of destroying humanity will now proceed to use it. None of you mention the phrase "preventive war." Several of you stressed the fact that the free world is richly endowed with men, metal, machines, and money, and that what is required is a call to sacrifice, which, according to Sevareid, would be promptly answered by the people in this country. Dan Schorr certainly made it abundantly clear that the Russians have their own problems frequently well concealed, but they are certainly not 9 feet tall. Most of you, I have the feeling, although you didn't say it, have rather the sense that this is the best of all possible times to be alive, because never before have the stakes been so high. Never before have the actions and decisions of this country been so important. And I think you also—most of you—had the feeling that if we spend too much time debating the past we may lose the future.

Thank you very much, gentlemen, and good health and good news. Good night and good luck.

---

PROJECTION 1958

ANNOUNCER. As we approach the close of the midcentury's most pregnant year—a year that has seen man begin to move out of the confines of his world—NBC News, mindful of the extraordinary significance of recent events, calls together, for the first time in its history, its news correspondents from abroad and here at home to bring you—against the reflection of 1957—their Projection 1958.

First, twice a Peabody Award winner for news: Chet Huntley.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Good evening. Perhaps never before at the dawn of a new year has there been such an urgent need to know: What are the basic facts of today that may help shape our tomorrows? What appear to be the trends in the making? What deductions, founded on trained observations, might with reason be called projections of the year ahead? Well, NBC News asked these questions of its full roster of correspondents—300 alert newsmen reporting to the network from 75 countries abroad and here at home, embracing the entire globe. We wish it were possible to bring all of these men back, and have them sit and chat with you informally in your living room. Since that's obviously impractical, we have sought to do the next best thing.

From their posts in distant news centers of the world and here in this country, we have brought together 12 key correspondents reporting on the most sensitive areas in the news today. They will answer questions that perhaps you yourself might like to put to them.

And as with any guests who enter your home, their opinions may be different from your own. But there is, of course, no obligation to agree with them. The hope is that the facts they report will help you make up your own mind.

Now, most of these newsmen are familiar to most of you—their voices, if not their faces.

From his base in London, where he is NBC's senior European correspondent, author and longtime news observer in many capitals of the world—Joseph C. Harsch.

Here from Moscow, to which he went after covering the Korean war for NBC News—Irving R. Levine.

From Paris, where he once studied at the Sorbonne, and for 20 years a member of NBC's news-gathering staff in Washington, the head of our Paris bureau—Leif Eid.

From Vienna, representing NBC News in Eastern Europe, NBC's former White House correspondent—Frank Bourgholtzer.

Next, from Egypt, the youngest member of the NBC foreign news staff, yet a veteran of the Suez crisis—Welles Hangen, NBC in Cairo.

From his headquarters in Rome, to which he went after years in London, NBC's correspondent in the Mediterranean area—Edwin Newman.

And from Tokyo, the one who traveled the farthest to get here, former editor and publisher in the Far East, NBC's James Robinson.

Now to our domestic staff. From Washington, my NBC News and 1956 conventions and election partner, David Brinkley, Good evening, David.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Good evening, Chet.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Next, one whose penetrating analysis of the news from Washington has often won him distinction, now editor of NBC's Sunday afternoon interview program, Look Here—Martin Agronsky.

From Washington, too, the network's former World War II Pacific correspondent, and once head of NBC's news bureaus in Paris and Germany—Robert McCormick.

And from NBC in Chicago, the newsman whose reports from Little Rock gained national distinction—John Chancellor.

Well, gentlemen, suppose we turn our attention to the major event of 1957, the first launching of a satellite into space by the Russians, which permeates every aspect of our national and international existence. Joe, suppose you bring its implication into focus.

"MAGINOT LINE"

Mr. HARSCH. I'll try, Chet. May I start by submitting to you that the year 1957 will have to go down as the second since the last war in which our pride was humbled, our complacency checked, and our estimate of the outside world corrected. The other bad year was 1949. We had entered it, if you remember, complacent—again—behind the "Maginot line" of our monopoly in atomic weapons. And that summer communism captured China, and Russia got her first atomic bomb.

During this year of 1957, this story was in large measure repeated. We entered the year complacent behind our new "Maginot line" of presumed superiority in technical skill. This, we told ourselves comfortably, was the American century. And then first one and then a second sputnik began circling methodically over our heads—and we tried quickly to match it with our own. We sent up Vanguard, and it fizzled. We had been beaten in the area where we were supposed to be strongest.

The laughter in Russia was raucous and triumphant. Among our allies it was muffled by anxiety, sympathy, and shared embarrassment. But the whole world laughed or grinned. We—the mighty, the omniscient, the all-confident—had been humbled. Psychologically, it was another Pearl Harbor. It challenges the adequacy of our military preparedness, our educational system, and our foreign policy. It challenges our capacity to estimate our opponent accurately. It leaves us facing the question, Chet, whether we have the will, the wisdom, and the maturity to recover from the year 1957—at least as well as we did, in fact, recover from the year 1949.

MISSILES AND REALISM

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, Joe, you've stated the basic theme of what I should think would be the remainder of this discussion and against which it's likely to develop. First, and most important, of course, are sputnik's military implications. Now, Irving, do the Russians themselves see any changes in their military position?

Mr. LEVINE. Well, certainly, Chet, Russia's leaders realize it takes more than two sputniks to tip the military balance of power. Shortly before I left Moscow, Premier Bulganin told me and other correspondents at an Embassy party that now it's America's turn to put up a satellite. This seems to recognize that before long the United States can be expected to develop a dependable rocket. Russia's leaders are realists—they know that their monopoly on intercontinental-ballistic missiles will acquire a decisive military significance only when they have a stockpile. Until that grim day, America will be able to devastate Russia from its overseas bases, and by the time Russia does acquire a military stockpile of missiles the United States should have its own rocket arsenal—at least let's hope so. Soviet propaganda ignores this possibility and is sputnik-boasting in order to try to inject futility into the American alliance and, most of all, to try to convince Russians that only communism can produce sputniks.

Well—many Russians are convinced. But other ordinary Russians with whom I've spoken see other problems on the ground—such as the housing shortage, which is so severe that sometimes as many as six people in a family live in a single room. Of course, Russians are proud of the accomplishment. But on the day that the first sputnik was launched, I saw very few Russians gazing into the sky, while there was a great crowd of Russians in front of my hotel staring with great envy at an American Ford. Well, I know one Russian who laughs every time he reads of talk of Soviet space travel to places like Venus. He knows that he isn't permitted to travel even to Vienna.

And then there's another Russian, Chet, who told me this story. It seems that when the beep-beep of the Soviet sputnik was decoded it was found to be crying, "I'll burn up and I'll break up but I won't come back to Russia."

BEEP-BEEP

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, that brings us to the next question, namely, What is that beep-beep saying to our military men, David?

Mr. BRINKLEY. Well, of course, our first response is to spend more time and money on our own weapons. This is the obvious and natural response, growing out of the instinct for survival. There is no doubt at all that we'll get the weapons. They'll be late but they'll be here because they have to be. That's our first response, and the easy one, because all it takes is time and money. The second one is more difficult. We learned in 1957 that while we are the richest country in the world we are not necessarily the brainiest. President Eisenhower, in Paris, said that while our free-enterprise system is fine, it does not necessarily come in, every time, first with the best. Well, we may not like to believe that, but there is no arguing with the Russian scientific-intellectual achievement that we cannot match.

Sputnik is both a work of mechanics and of a high order of intellect. Mechanics we have in plenty. On intellect we have not enough and we don't think highly enough of what we do have. So in 1957 we were shown that we need more money. And in 1957 and later we will be forced to realize that we will need all of the brainpower we can find and all the education we can get—and a new national respect for the intellectual, regardless of what his personal income may be. The first response, again, is easy. But the second is not because it requires us to look at ourselves critically and to see if we have not spent too many years putting the wrong values on the wrong things.

WHAT IT WILL COST

Mr. HUNTLEY. There's certainly no question about our being concerned, David. But to do what everyone is demanding that we do is going to cost money and it's going to seriously affect the size and breakdown of our national budget, and the status of our own pocketbooks.

Mr. BRINKLEY. I certainly think so, Chet.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, Bob, you've been watching the economic aspects of all this. Just how astronomic will it go?

Mr. MCCORMICK. Chet, I don't think there is any way in the world we could possibly meet all the money demands that have been stirred up by sputnik. Just consider a moment. The National Education Association has come out with a program that would cost $5 billion a year after 5 years. The program for atomic bomb shelters is figured to cost $20 billion. Then the supersecret Gaither report, we now learn, has essential recommendations that they figure will cost $8 billion—and probably much more, as a matter of fact. Then, there's the question of training scientists—and more and better laboratories—and more experimental missiles—and nuclear submarines—and everything else you can think of. As a matter of fact, nobody knows what, really, they cost. But one Washington guess is, it might be $50 billion a year. Now, $50 billion plus the $72 billion we're spending now come out to $122 billion, that's almost half of the public debt that we'd be spending every 12 months. Now, obviously, some or many of these requests are going to be refused. But it's almost certain we won't have a "feelable" tax cut next year. We might even get a Federal sales tax. And austerity is not the answer; austerity may be a result but austerity by itself cannot save money or make money—and money is what we need if we're going to stay in business.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, so much then for United States reaction brought on by the Soviet penetration of outer space. But what about its effect on the rest of the world? Now, you fellows from overseas have personally noted these developments on the scene. Suppose we start with a report from France. Leif?

OLD STORY FOR FRANCE

Mr. EID. Well, Chet, there certainly was no panic in France. You know, the Frenchman has lived with threats and aggression for a long, long time—three invasions in less than a century. He was a little ashamed of us for being panicked into a miserable Vanguard failure. But the Frenchman also spotted something new. For the first time the United States, itself, is definitely front line, and the Russians need not follow that bloody country's old path through Europe to get at their principal enemy. Now, or in the future, Soviet missiles can arch over Europe on their way to America and, for the present at least, we need Europe more than Europe needs us.

I've had this spelled out very carefully by men at the Quai d'Orsay. But I'm convinced that was French bargaining. I've heard no suggestion of French neutralism, but they have some bones to pick with us—old bones—and they know that we need France for the key to the defense of Europe. They know we need missile launching ramps in France and they'll agree—but for a price: military, political and probably economic.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Leif, we could probably do worse than remember that one line—France will have some old bones to pick with us. Frank, Eastern Europe is your beat. How have the satellite nations responded to sputnik?

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. First, there are the people, Chet. I've talked to lots of them. In Warsaw, a couple of weeks ago, a friend said to me: "Ignore it, because we don't count on a war. If war comes, we will be destroyed. So we just don't admit the possibility."

SPUTNIK IS STRENGTH

But I think most people in Eastern Europe do feel that now is certainly not a time to deny the Russians no matter what they may ask. Now, militarily, the Polish Government, joined by the Czechs and backed by the

others, is pushing a plan for a nonatomic arms area in central Europe. This is really a proposal to keep the lead in the ICBM's that the Russians have by denying us the bases for intermediate-range missiles. There's one other problem—that of whether the Russians can rely on the satellite armies. I think in 1958 they can rely on them much more than if sputnik had been American.

Mr. HUNTLEY. We will get back to you in a moment, Frank. Now, Welles Hangen, did you find that sputnik had any important repercussions in the Middle East?

Mr. HANGEN. Sputnik caught the eye—and the imagination—of many Middle Easterners. They've been scanning the heavens for a long time looking for signs of who's winning the cold war. Many of them said: "This is it. The West isn't all powerful. Russia, once as backward as we are today, is now in the lead." And you know how Arabs are impressed by strength. To them sputnik is strength. Nasser and the Communists, of course, made the most of it in their propaganda to exalt Moscow and ridicule America. But even pro-Western Arabs are asking nowadays: How can the Baghdad Pact stop Russia with Russian moons hurtling over Middle Eastern countries in a few seconds. What use is it for America to give recoilless rifles to Jordan and jeeps to Lebanon when a warlike sputnik can annihilate Jerusalem and Beirut? Many of them think that's a symbol of the decline of the West in their region: Britain and France pulling out, Russia offering aid to its Afro-Asian brothers in Cairo, earthbound America trying to catch up.

Mr. HUNTLEY. What you say was all there this past week in Cairo at the Afro-Asian Conference. What about the reactions you observed in the Far East, Jim Robinson?

NEUTRALISM LOOKS GOOD

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, initially, Chet, sputnik gave most Asians a big laugh. But now these countries are weighing future policies based around those things in the sky. It's not that the Soviet Union's reputation has been enhanced so much as that neutralism has never looked so good to so many people. Japan is the key of our defense structure in the Far East. United States intelligence in Tokyo has told me that we no longer can depend on Japan in case of a war. And the other day in Thailand, one of the policy-makers there said: "Well, I'm sorry, but you can't count on us." Sputnik is responsible for this trend of Asian nations stepping off the United States bandwagon.

Mr. HUNTLEY. How do they respond to sputnik in your area, Ed Newman?

Mr. NEWMAN. Chet, I'm that happy singing fellow who knows that in a couple of places sputnik made no difference at all. One is Israel, which still wants any protection the United States may offer. The other is Turkey. The Turks live much too close to Russia to worry about things that travel for thousands of miles before they hit. But if you want to talk about the difference sputnik did make, it seems to me that maybe the biggest was this: it foreshadowed the day President Eisenhower's open-skies proposal will take effect without any legislative or executive action by any government.

We—and the Russians—will be sending up satellites equipped with cameras and they'll photograph everything imaginable, and you can see what the effects will be on types of weapons produced, and where they're sited and how they are camouflaged, and so on. It's a curious development, I think. The West wants disarmament with inspection. Russia argues for disarmament without inspection. What we're going to have is inspection without disarmament.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, Ed, it seems to me you've rather adroitly taken us from a concern with armament to a concern with disarmament, only a few weeks ago as hot a subject, I suppose, as there was on the international agenda. What happened, Joe?

LONG-RANGE ROCKETS

Mr. HARSCH. Well, Chet, the sputnik has certainly completely changed the disarmament problem for 1958. The rockets that launched the sputniks were long in range. The Russians claim they were intercontinental. The long, long disarmament talks in London last summer all had as their main purpose an attempt to freeze the arms race before we and the Russians moved into the age of the long-range missiles. It's too late to freeze it because we're there now. So the experts have had to start all over again and try to figure out new formulas for limiting the costs and the dangers of the arms race.

If there are more talks in 1958 under the label of disarmament, of course, it will be a misnomer. They'll serve—they can only serve—as a sort of vehicle for diplomatic exchanges. Real disarmament still lies down at the end—the far end—of the rainbow.

FIELD DAY FOR PRESS

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, no doubt here about this conclusion, sad as it may be. Now, let's move from sputnik's impact on our defense to its effects on our foreign policy. Here, too, abroad, the papers have been enjoying a field day at the expense of the United States—as we can see from these foreign cartoons brought back by you fellows. In the arms race pictured by the London Daily Express you'll note the American flag is on the wheel chair. A Vienna Communist paper takes a crack at disorganized NATO at sea with the sardonic comment, "Splendid progress in the coordination of the common effort." A French cartoonist sees Dulles as a lurid belly dancer seeking to entice the leaders of the Middle East, while the Egyptians picture him here as a duck. (His vacation retreat is on Duck Island.) And here he's hatching all sorts of conspiracies. And beginning with this cartoon supposedly representing him at the age of five, it shows him gradually blossoming into a devil—no less—complete with horns. Now, invariably, I notice most of the bitter cartoons—and even the vulgar ones—seem to tear Secretary of State Dulles apart while bypassing Mr. Eisenhower. Martin, what's the significance of that, and what's the outlook on our foreign policy for the coming year?

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, Chet, there are two reasons why Mr. Dulles gets the brunt of the editorial and cartoon criticism. First, there is the way that he has taken to himself the phrasing and the formulating of our foreign policy. It's becoming known as his foreign policy rather than the President's really. He's the front man. There's a penalty for that, Chet, and he's incurring it. And, second, more than usual, there's a discrepancy about what Mr. Dulles says that our policy is and how he actually conducts it. He sounds ready, for example, to go it alone one day and then he tries to put the Western Alliance back together again the next. He strides briskly to the brink of war in one declaration and he rejects war as a solution to anything in the next.

BRINK OF WAR

Naturally, all of this makes for uncertainty and for confusion as to where he really stands. And it inevitably opens him up to criticism for what he says rather than for what he does. As for where his policy leads in the year ahead, Chet, I think the great immediate question is whether Mr. Dulles will insist that his policy of negotiating only from a position of strength must preclude our dealing now with Russia. Our European allies want us to arm but they insist as much that we display the olive branch as prominently on the one hand as nuclear weapons on the other. Mr. Dulles seems reluctant to parley. Britain's Macmillan says: "We arm to parley. Let Mr. Dulles walk or appear to walk on the brink of war." We must expect that our allies will take over the lead—really—in negotiating the peace. Chet, we can only hope that Mr. Dulles' ways are right.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Now, Leif, bearing in mind what Martin has said and also the fact that you had a big NATO meeting in France, a couple of weeks ago—what's your feeling about all this?

Mr. EID. Chet, I'm sure you noticed one thing about that big NATO summit meeting, and that was a sort of gang-up of Continental Europeans to force Mr. Dulles to recognize the idea that NATO should be more than just a military alliance. They insist that it be broadly political too, covering in some way any ally's interest anywhere in the world. Mr. Dulles insists on America's right to go it alone or act alone outside the NATO area anywhere.

Now, this wasn't any challenge to America's leadership but some of the Europeans do deny that all diplomatic wisdom resides in Washington. The implications of the European ideas are very broad but what brought it up immediately was the arms-to-Tunisia issue, which was the latest flareup on the colonial question. The French don't deny the need for colonial reform. What they do deny is that independence is the only way to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and they think that anti-colonialist talk and policy only opens up a lot of new, unstable and uneconomic nations to Communist domination. They tell me that if the French are forced out tomorrow, it will be Algeria first—the next day all of North Africa. And then with the Communists on the Atlantic, the flank of Europe will be turned.

VANTAGE POINT IN MOSCOW

Mr. HUNTLEY. Irving, how does American foreign policy look to someone who's been sitting in Russia the past few years?

Mr. LEVINE. Well, I think the Soviet censors will probably change that to "lying" in Russia—at least that's what they say most American correspondents do there. To get to your question: Often it is difficult to see just what American foreign policy toward Russia is. American diplomats I've spoken to admit that it's mostly negative containment to resist Soviet expansion. Well, of course, that's essential, but is it enough? Once we spoke about liberation of Russia's satellites, but that turned out to be a mere impractical election slogan when we failed to intervene in the Hungarian revolt.

As seen from Moscow, Chet, it would seem that there can be positive objectives, beside the objective of overthrowing; for example, exchanges of Americans and Russians. Certainly, the more we crack Russia's shell of isolation, the greater chance there is of changing the structure inside. Shouldn't we explore the possibilities of exploiting Communist China's economic dependence on Russia? I think it can be argued that Russia has a more natural enemy in Communist China than in the United States. And might it not be profitable for us to reexamine our attitude of automatic rejection. Something need not necessarily be bad simply because Russia suggests it—and that includes conferences.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, Irv, what do you think are the prospects if this policy of yours is pursued?

HEADACHES FOR RUSSIA

Mr. LEVINE. Well, Chet, fortunately Russia has at least as many headaches as we do—Titoism; a drop in production due to Khrushchev's drastic reorganization of industry; the problem of how to produce both sputniks and shoes; how to satisfy the ever-growing yearning for freedom in the post-Stalin era without inviting self-destruction of communism. And this Soviet dilemma—this series of Soviet dilemmas—may produce promising opportunities for the United

States if only the American policy is agile in 1958.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Then, Irving——

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Irving and Chet—if the gentleman from Moscow will yield the floor?

Mr. HUNTLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. There's another side to what Irving's been saying. Incidentally, we know you are not "lying" in Moscow.

Mr. LEVINE. Thank you, Frank.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. We have been helping two Communist countries, Tito's in Yugoslavia, and Gomulka's in Poland. There's a gag going around that perhaps Tito should have been allowed to go back to Khrushchev because they deserve each other so well. But this is only a flip way of stating the basic thesis which is that no matter how independent they may be, they continue to be Communists. Under them, the people may live better with aid. But the regimes—the Communist regimes—are perpetuated. Well, now, having made this argument, Chet, I think I should take the other side and say that under our present American policy I would think the welfare of the people should win out on the question of aid because, as we showed in Budapest, where we're concerned these Communist regimes will be perpetuated.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, Frank, let's see how Welles Hangen feels about this, reviewing our same foreign policy at work in the Middle East? Welles, with the Eisenhower doctrine at work in your area—which is not true of Frank's area—how does our foreign policy look from Cairo?

Mr. HANGEN. Well, Chet, we all know the Eisenhower doctrine has won ground to some degree in the Middle East—but, unfortunately, not many hearts. Some 10 Middle Eastern countries have taken up the doctrine's promises of economic and political help, but most of these countries—or at least their rulers—were already committed to the United States in one form or another. King Saud, for example, has an oil income of $300 million a year in Saudi Arabia. Naturally, he doesn't like Communists. The Eisenhower doctrine helps us to help people like Saud. But it does not tackle what most Middle Easterners consider their real problems—feudalism, Israel, and disunity.

One Arab said to me: "We're a sick people—frustrated—living in mud huts—just emerging from centuries of foreign oppression. When you talk about communism, you're only speaking of symptoms and not causes."

ARABS SUSPICIOUS

Then, in Arab eyes, let's admit any American policy is suspected of pro-Israel bias. The Arabs also suspect the Eisenhower doctrine is just another Western trick to keep them divided. One young Iraqi went so far as to say: "We would rather have unity under a demogogue like Nasser than what we have today, even if all our rulers were perfect—and they are not." The immediate outlook is for more Soviet influence in this area and not less. Perhaps in the long run we'll be able to stop Russia's inroads. But, immediately, the prospect is for Soviet influence—except in countries like Turkey that have bitter experience with Moscow. I think you will agree with that, Ed.

Mr. NEWMAN. Yes; I'd agree with that, Welles, but unlike the Russians the Turks do like us. And that is easily the most remarkable statement that will be made on this program today. Now, it's true that we supported and stood by Turkey when she was having her trouble with Syria and Russia. And it's true that Secretary Dulles said precisely the right thing to make the Russians turn the pressure off. But it goes deeper than this. It may be argued, I think, that Turkey is the most faithful ally we have. She stands between the Russians and the Arab world. She keeps a big and determined army in the field. And now, she can hardly wait to take our medium-range missiles. Now Welles said that the Arabs think we're too friendly to Israel. And, as you might suspect, Israel thinks we're not. Prime Minister Ben-Gurion told me, only a week ago, that he wants an American guaranty. I think, though, he knows he's not going to get it. That is why he's made his diplomatic approach to West Germany. He's really trying to get into NATO through the back door.

Mr. HUNTLEY. That's a new thought. Well, we've touched the United States, Europe, the Middle East on foreign policy. Now Jim, what's the outlook for the success or failure of this foreign policy in Asia?

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, our foreign policy in the Far East is highlighted by what it avoids—recognition of Red China. There is increasing insistence by our Asian allies that we, the United States, must officially admit and act on the fact that Communist China is a going concern; that Washington policymakers can't continue airily dismissing 640 million Chinese as a passing phase, or acting on the assumption that revolt or war will soon topple the Peiping Government. These views just aren't valid in Asia any longer.

GIFTS VERSUS LOANS

While we're building a tremendous bureaucracy to give away money in Asia, the Communists are making hardheaded business loans. The result of this is that even our closest Asian allies are threatening to go over to the Communist camp if we stop this dole. And you know, Chet, there are growing numbers of Asians thinking of us Americans as the belligerents—for the American voices heard in the Far East today are mostly our admirals and generals, all giving fist-shaking speeches. In contrast, the Communists are tiptoeing through the Far East in ballet slippers singing gentle songs of peace.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Now, the phrase "foreign aid" has been invoked in a couple of ways. Bob, is the trend of reduced foreign aid of last year going to be pursued in Congress in 1958?

Mr. MCCORMICK. No, Chet; I think it'll go up because it's practically the only way we found to win allies and influence neutrals. And President Eisenhower has said that it's essential. But there's another danger—the revival of pressures for higher protective tariffs. Most foreign countries still buy more from us than they sell us and we've made up some of the deficit with our foreign aid. Obviously, if tariffs were raised, the amounts other countries sell us would be sharply reduced. Then, if foreign aid were eliminated, the trade deficits would be simply more than a great many of these countries could stand. They'd turn to Russia for help, literally, to keep from falling apart.

EFFECTS OF SLUMP

Incidentally, if our business slump should become much more serious, we might have considerable trouble with our program of helping to finance the manufacture of arms abroad because, already, a few businessmen and industrialists are complaining that we shouldn't give armaments contracts to foreign countries when our own industrial production is running at about 80 percent of capacity. But actually, one of the big fights will be over the question of whether foreign aid should be strictly military, whether it should be straight economic assistance, or whether it should be technical help—an expansion of President Truman's old point 4 program.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, I should think then that we might agree here that the continuation of our foreign aid—whatever the form it may take—is essential. But now, what are some of our other fundamental policy problems?

Mr. NEWMAN. Well, you know, Chet, if you would run an essay contest for American reporters and ask "What is right with John Foster Dulles?" you would not get a very spirited entry. But I think we must be fair. We must admit that Dulles has to conduct an extremely difficult foreign policy. You know we hold together an alliance that includes old friends and traditional enemies. We try to remain on good terms with all of our allies, with their former colonies and with their present colonies that really don't want to be colonies any more. We try to keep a balance between the Arabs and Israel. We try to crumble Russia's empire a bit without provoking open war. We have to judge at all times what changes in Russia are in policy or merely in tactics. None of this is easy. All of it is extremely risky.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You know, Chet, I think Ed makes a point that really deserves expansion. I think we can say—and I say this without sarcasm—that our hearts are pure. I suppose you have to make the additional observation that nice guys sometimes finish last. But the fact is, I think, that all of the criticism that we've addressed to our foreign policy is directed, really, at the methods, not at the goals. I think a few kind words can be said for Mr. Eisenhower on this score. After all, no one would doubt the sincerity of our dedication to peace. Certainly, we deserve credit for rejecting completely the thesis of a preventive war. We've never attempted to use our power for our own material aggrandizement. Certainly, we've adhered completely to the generous American tradition of helping those countries who really aren't in a position to help themselves. Chet, I think all of these things matter, really, and I do not feel that our foreign-policy custodians have treated them in such a way that they've not suffered at their hands.

FREEDOM FROM FEAR

Mr. HUNTLEY. Good, Martin. Well, Joe, do you suppose I could get you to put a tentative period to this foreign policy discussion?

Mr. HARSCH. I don't know if this is a period, Chet, but in addition to what's been said, I think we should remember that foreign policy is two things: It is what a country wants and it is a means toward those ends. In any appraisal of foreign policy such as we attempt here, we have to remember that no country in history ever got all that it would like to have. I suppose our major purpose in foreign policy now is to achieve freedom from fear of Russia. We haven't achieved it. I don't suppose we ever actually will achieve it. And during this past year there was even some slippage—let's put that down as one of my London-acquired understatements. But we cannot expect to be winning all the time. And curiously enough, Chet, in one respect sputnik was a good thing. Friendliness toward Americans improved greatly. Humility is a more attractive quality than complacency. And insofar as we acquire a larger measure of the grace of humility out of the year 1957, we are going to find friendlier allies—and allies more ready to cooperate with us in the year 1958.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Now, so far we've explored America's military status and our foreign policy. There's no doubt that in the coming year our policy abroad is going to be seriously affected by—and perhaps be at the mercy of—politics at home. What do you think is going to happen, David? Is it an aroused Congress that's going to return to Washington?

MORE MONEY FOR ARMS

Mr. BRINKLEY. I think it is, Chet. Of course Congress is not in session until the 7th of January but the Members are always more or less around, talking, making speeches and turning out statements on mimeograph machines. I think we already know pretty well that the Members are aroused. Many of them think that in these last few difficult months we have not had the leadership—and we are not likely to get it in 1958.

The Congress, whatever its faults, is a sensitive, responsive, political organism—sometimes too much so. Sometimes it is even nervous and jumpy. So it seems likely that Congress will be preoccupied with weapons, that it might overreact and that it might also be determined to apply—itself—the leadership that so many Members think we are not getting from the White House. In its preoccupation with weapons, we cannot at all be certain that Congress will deal with causes as well as effects. It certainly will insist that more money be spent on weapons. And in spite of some high-sounding statement about "Let's keep politics out of this," it just is not possible in this country to keep politics out of any national issue. So, politics there will be, laying blame either where it is due or somewhere reasonably close.

NEED FOR LEADERSHIP

But these are all effects, and Congress just isn't equipped to deal with the causes—including our national lack of interest in basic research, the failure on the part of the military to organize effectively a science program, and the years we have lost because of these failures in the past. This kind of thing calls for leadership and effective administration; it does not call for the passing of more laws and the voting of more money.

Three months ago I might have thought—I did think—this would be a civil rights-Little Rock session of Congress. But I think the best guess now is that it'll be a rockets and missiles session of Congress with civil rights in a very slow second place, Chet.

Mr. HUNTLEY. If I'm not mistaken, that's the first time we've heard that phrase "Little Rock." It was due to come sooner or later. John Chancellor, you covered the Little Rock story. Next to Russia's satellite, perhaps no other story in 1957 won such widespread attention. Do you agree with David that its political significance has been eclipsed by sputnik?

Mr. CHANCELLOR. There isn't any question about it, but I think the Little Rock story isn't over. There may be more Little Rocks. When school resumes in Little Rock in January some force will have to be at the school to keep order. There's a group of teen-agers within the school—white children—who have promised reprisals against Negroes when the troops leave. The troops are expected to leave in January and possibly be replaced by Federal marshals. And there's the hope that sometime this year the local police department in Little Rock will be able to guarantee the safety of the Negro kids. They can't do it now because Little Rock has a personnel problem. They have to hire a city manager, and until they do, the town is being run by a city board of moderate citizens who are so frightened of the school situation that they're not going to be able to do anything about it. So we can look for the local police to take over their own troubles. Now, if Federal forces stay at the school until June, that means Governor Faubus will have a strong issue in his campaign—his predicted campaign for reelection. The idea of Federal troops in a southern city is deeply damaging to southern pride. There is one other thing we ought to remember about Little Rock—that a racial fight of that bitterness corrodes and destroys and paralyzes the normal channels of community leadership in the southern town, drives the moderates underground, threatens them with boycott and ostracizes many in the community. This paralysis, I'm afraid, is going to repeat itself all through the South.

WORLD REACTION

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, John, if what you imply proves out the possibility of additional Little Rocks in the Deep South, then I suppose we can expect to see more cartoons like these that appeared in the foreign press This one is a Japanese reaction to the events that unfolded around Central High School. The French Communist cartoon is captioned "School Begins Again at Little Rock." And this Russian effort, well, I don't think any caption is necessary for this one. But I'd like to check just a few of you briefly on what you observed to be the reaction of the respective areas. Starting with you, Leif.

Mr. ED. Well, in France, Chet, they blame President Eisenhower for being too late—for ever allowing the rioting to happen. They said he let Governor Faubus damage the prestige of the Presidency, thereby hurting the entire western cause by giving the Communists a wonderful chance for propaganda among the uncommitted peoples.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Frank?

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. A personal reaction, Chet. I happened to be in Bulgaria—a country where the Central Government makes the rules as to how the people behave toward one another. The police and, when necessary, the troops carry them out. Well, it was clear to me in Bulgaria that the troops were enforcing law and order. But then the Russians claimed they were enforcing law and order in Budapest last fall. The similarities seem to me frightening. The small example—the law being enforced—could have been an order for—instead of against—segregation.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Jim?

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, as you know, Chet, most Asians have felt and winced under the white heel of Western colonialism. So it's easy to project themselves into the role of the Negro in this country. It's needless to say where Asian sympathies lie, but it is necessary to warn repeatedly that Asian opinion of us is formed around Little Rocks.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Welles?

Mr. HANGEN. Middle Eastern people are color-conscious too, Chet. I remember—and so do the Egyptians—those latrines the British used to mark "Whites Only"—and the others marked "Native." It's easy for Middle Easterners who don't know the United States to equate us with British and French colonialism—to believe Communist propaganda about racial atrocities in this country. You know how emotional the Arabs are. Eisenhower-doctrine aid doesn't count for much in the world if they think you don't regard them as equivalent human beings.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Irving?

SIT TIGHT, TALK TOUGH

Mr. LEVINE. I can remember during Little Rock, Chet, the Russian student, a friend who is very skeptical about communism, expressing astonishment that the Voice of America and Radio Moscow were telling pretty much the same story. This disgusted him. And I think he may care less now about reshaping Russia because he's become convinced by Little Rock that there is oppression in America, too. But I think more important than that is the effect on the Soviet leaders. They've come to believe from things like Little Rock that they can sit tight and talk tough and make no concessions because class struggles such as Little Rock will cause America to decay from within.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Ed?

Mr. NEWMAN. Chet, I think the part of the world where this story had the greatest effect was in "Black Africa." I think it's also a fair question to ask: What if it did? One answer is that Black Africa is a vast source of materials and manpower still largely untapped. It is a vast market and it has strategic value. Also, from my observation, it is one part of the world where the Russians have not yet begun to work in earnest but where they very soon will. So, if you like, you can regard it as a sort of incidental stake in the civil-rights struggle.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. A lot of regrettable nonsense has been said about Little Rock. The Government of the United States guaranteed with force the orders of one of its Federal courts. These orders might have involved taxes, they might have involved public power; they happened to involve human beings with dark skins. What President Eisenhower did at Little Rock was not so much to guarantee the rights of dark-skinned Americans. But he made sure—as he had to—that the courts of this country were not mocked.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Thank you, John. Well, aside from Little Rock, there are certainly going to be other factors at work in this country—and some of them surely will affect the outcome of the 1958 elections. What are the possibilities there, David?

Mr. BRINKLEY. Well, I think—or know—we'll have all the old political factors plus several new ones. Here's an example of one of the new ones. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the Senate Democratic leader and a responsible Government official, said about 3 weeks ago that unless we get to work there is a serious danger that Russia will get to the moon before we do. Well, if he had said that, say, 3 months ago, we'd all have thought he was having a little joke. As it was, he said it and nobody cracked a smile. So I think in 1958 we will have that political issue discussed to the point where I suspect some campaign speeches will sound like science lectures.

PLATFORM PROMISES

We probably will have some platform promises to do something to help education—some of these promises coming from politicians who in the past have felt education should help itself. There will be some attempt to help pay for new weapons by cutting down on Government subsidies to various groups. Well, this will bring great loud cries of pain and anguish—and no cuts. Finally, the '58 elections will be a time for and an excuse for the 1960 Presidential candidates to fly around the country making speeches and being seen. Well, for the Republicans there's absolutely nobody in sight, to my knowledge, but NIXON. For the Democrats there are several—Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who is avoiding the subject and hanging back; Senator KENNEDY, who is not, but who may be getting himself oversold too soon. Then there are Governors Meyner and Leader and several others not too well known now—but then whoever heard of Adlai Stevenson before 1951? But, as far as the '58 elections for Congress, well, President Eisenhower seems to be one of the very few Republicans nowadays who can win—but he's not running.

HOW TO CUT BUDGET?

Mr. MCCORMICK. You know, David, when you talk politics you always come to the question of money. One of the things Congress knows but won't admit is that the budget cannot be cut without cutting defense. If you eliminate national defense and security, and interest on the public debt, veterans' benefits, farm subsidies, grants to States, and all those other charges required by law, we spend only 13 cents out of every Federal dollar for what might be called normal operation. And if, in addition, you take out all the services given agriculture, and veterans, and if you eliminate the postal service completely, and the civilian functions of the Defense Department, you have only about 3 or 4 cents out of every dollar that could be cut. So, as usual, there'll be much whooping and hollering about cutting the budget, but what cuts are made will be fairly trivial—and they'll later be quietly restored, as is our custom. There may however be a big fight over the legal limit on the debt ceiling—it's $275 billion now and we're pushing it—so it probably will be raised after another scrap.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Granted, the budget will be a problem for the present. But I wonder—will the fact that Ike cannot run again deprive him of any power during this coming year? How do you see that, Martin?

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, Chet, I do think it's been really sidestepping the underlying problem of the presidency to ascribe too great an importance to the new constitutional amendment that prevents Mr. Eisenhower from seeking a third term. The fact is that he is still one of our best-loved Presidents, and there's universal sympathy for the physical impairment that he's incurred through his three illnesses, the real problem that centers on Mr. Eisenhower is the growing concern about his capacity to conduct the office of the presidency. There's a good indicator of that: whereas there was overwhelming national concern after his first two illnesses that he should continue as President; after his cerebral attack there was widespread talk of the feasibility of his resignation.

STRONG MAN PRESIDENT

It is a curious thing that though we Americans invariably decry and constitutionally protect ourselves against the single strong-man government, we want—especially in time of crisis—a strong man President. Now, even the President's most dedicated supporters wouldn't contend that he's been that. And I think there must be added to the fact that his health has forced him to be a part-time President the additional fact that Mr. Eisenhower repeatedly demonstrates reluctance to use to the full the great powers of his office. The bitter problem, really, Chet, that then results is how—when the full exercise of presidential power and leadership by a strong full-time President is demanded by the contemporary crisis—can that demand be fulfilled?

Mr. HUNTLEY. Well, you've all described some provocative observations on where the trend of 1957 might lead us. Now, I should like to have you conduct us just a bit into the future. And I suppose, in short, what I'm asking each of you for here is a single "Projection 1958." Irving, let's start with you.

Mr. LEVINE. Well, 1958 in Russia will not likely see Soviet settlements on major issues. There may be a third sputnik, weighing a full ton. Perhaps a shot at the moon. Probably new Stalinist repressions by Nikita Khrushchev to try to stay in power. But some diplomats think his chances are only 50–50 of surviving 1958 in power.

Mr. EM. Unless things get worse in North Africa than they are, 1958 should see the beginning of a great oil rush in the Sahara Desert. The French already have discovered oil. Now, they're calling in American, British, and Dutch oil interests for quick exploitation. If they succeed they may break the grip of the Middle East on Europe's throat, and Nasser and company would become considerably more reasonable.

HOTTEST THEATER

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. All the Red regimes from Poland to Bulgaria will consolidate their positions in 1958. The word has come from Moscow to tighten up and that's what they'll do. That means fewer concessions for the people, rougher police control and greater fidelity to Moscow.

Mr. HANGEN. The Middle East will continue to be the hottest theater in the cold war. The Russians will keep coming, with propaganda, arms, ballerinas, technicians and smiles. America will get more deeply involved too. In Syria, I foresee a right-wing coup, or else the country will go left beyond the point of no return. Jordan is in the western camp today but one bullet properly aimed at King Hussein can send it the other way. In Palestine, no war and no peace—a kind of scoreless tie between good and evil.

Mr. NEWMAN. Next spring, Italy will have a general election. The Communists will not win it. They will not make appreciable gains—without sputnik, they would have lost ground.

Mr. ROBINSON. In 1958 Red China will assume a more Titolike role. There will be more turbulence in Malaya and Indonesia. There will be increased awareness that we Americans aren't responsible for all the troubles in Asia.

Mr. BRINKLEY. In 1958 we will compete with Russia not only for military but also for intellectual leadership. And this is a field where we're not accustomed to competing. We will buy the weapons we need, and wonder how to get the educated brainpower we need. And finally, Congress will face issues so new and complex that the old-fashioned—or model A—viewing-with-alarm will not be enough.

Mr. AGRONSKY. In 1958 the Democrats will continue to blame the world crisis on the Republicans and Mr. Eisenhower and the Republicans will continue to blame it on Mr. Truman. The world crisis will continue and, I'm happy to predict, so will peace. And finally, there will be a tremendous increase in the importance of the man who by the provisions of our Constitution lives one single heartbeat from the Presidency—RICHARD MILHOUS NIXON.

UNITED STATES SCIENCE AT ISSUE

Mr. MCCORMICK. Well, the Democrats have pressed hard on the most specific issue they've had yet—our lag in military science. But the scientists may come up with something so spectacular they will kill it as an issue. Our economy will sag until about the middle of the year when our new spending takes hold. Our foreign position will get worse and the Democrats are going to win the Congressional election.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Well, I'm going to predict that before it gets any better it will get a lot worse in the South in the desegregation of American schools. Out of 2 million Negro schoolchildren in 10 Southern States today, 109 are registered in racially mixed classes. In 1958 this figure will have to increase and we will learn then that Little Rock was just the top of the iceberg.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Joe Harsch, you started us off—and I wonder if you'll give us your studied conclusion?

Mr. HARSCH. I don't know that there is one, Chet, but let's try. At the grave risk of sounding like John Foster Dulles, I do think we can end this on a moderately hopeful note. True, things look fairly bad from our point of view right now. But there's the Russian point of view right now, too. Her long-term prospects are far less bright. Western Europe is pulling together—if slowly. To Russia's south the United States has moved in to contest her advance and we are challenging her. On her back side is China, growing stronger every day and showing some signs of independence. This year, China did disagree with Moscow over treatment of Poland.

Now, the year ahead is, of course, Chet, going to be a tense and a dangerous one. The Kremlin right now is confident and brash, less ready to negotiate, more willing to brandish its new weapons. But down underneath the surface of all this the relations between the great powers are changing, as they always do.

AREAS OF AGREEMENT

We and the Russians appear to be at odds on every front but there are two fronts where I think we're less at odds than we were before. They officially disagree with our China policy but do you believe—I don't—that Russians really object to a policy on our part which restrains the day when the Russians will have at their back a China three times more populous and industrialized than they are, and armed with atomic weapons. Then, there's Germany. On the surface we disagree. Actually, France and Britain are less and less unhappy about the Russian policy of holding Germany separated. And we, while we preach reunification of Germany, we preach it by words and we do nothing about deeds. I'm sure that unity, the surface of next year's strains and dangers, the underlying changes between nations—will go on in the direction of diminishing differences. We've had a bad year. Yes, Chet; we know what it is now to be the laughing stock of the whole world. But we can come out of it wiser and stronger in friendships and alliances—except that we probably never will again be the one only great power in the world.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Gentlemen, I thank you. And to all of you a good new year.

---

## BIRTH ANNIVERSARY OF CARL A. LOEFFLER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is always a particularly happy occasion when a birthday is celebrated. On yesterday Carl A. Loeffler celebrated the 85th anniversary of his birth.

My colleagues will recall that Carl Loeffler served as Secretary of the Senate for the 80th Congress. When he retired in January 1949, he had completed 60 years of loyal and faithful service to this body.

Appointed as a page in 1889 from the State of Pennsylvania, he continued to serve in close relationship with the Republican Members of the Senate until his retirement.

I know I speak the sentiments of the entire membership of the Senate when I say to Mr. Loeffler that we extend to him our warmest congratulations and good wishes, and express sincere hope that he may continue to enjoy the good health and happiness which have been his for so many years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I yield to my friend the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished minority leader certainly speaks for me in expressing these sentiments about Mr. Loeffler.

Mr. Loeffler left the Senate as I entered it; but I had been privileged to know him, and had been an observer of his activities in his Senate position for many years before I became a Member of the Senate.

I know of no finer public servant or better man. It was my privilege and pleasure to congratulate him when he returned to the Senate a few days ago, to meet a number of his friends here.

I thank the distinguished Senator from California for the statement he has made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to thank the majority leader for his comments. I know he speaks for all of us on a bipartisan basis in wishing for Mr. Loeffler many years of continued happiness and good health.

---

## PRAYERS FOR THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, each year the Lutheran Church of the Reformation usually conducts a special service on the Sunday after the Congress convenes. In the bulletin of yesterday's service in that church there were printed three prayers, as they were read in

the Church of the Reformation on yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that these three prayers—one for the President of the United States, one for the Members of Congress, and one for a world at peace—be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYERS

FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Almighty God, graciously regard, we humbly beseech Thee, Thy servant, the President of the United States. Give to his body the strength of Thy divine healing; endue his mind with the wisdom of Thy divine guidance; and uphold his spirit with the power and presence of Thy Holy Spirit, that under his leadership and direction, the people of this Nation may take renewed courage, and work more resolutely for the establishing and maintaining of a better world; through Jesus Christ, our Lord:

FOR THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

O Merciful and Mighty Father, who holdest in Thy hand all the might of man, and of whom is all rule and authority in the kingdoms of the world, grant that "In God We Trust" may be engraved not only upon our coins but in our hearts, and that we may be in reality one Nation under God. Be daily present with each of our Representatives and Senators that in all of their action and legislation they may be graciously delivered from any narrowly partisan or selfish interests and that under their wise governance, the people of this land may be guarded and directed in righteousness, unity and service. Bless their homes and families and may they know the secret joys of lives consecrated to the service of their country; through Jesus Christ, our Lord:

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE

Guide, we beseech Thee, O Lord, all the nations of the world into the way of justice and truth, and establish among them that peace which is the fruit of righteousness, that they may become the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour; keep Thy children from the cruelties of war and lead all nations in the way of peace. Teach us to put away all bitterness and misunderstanding, that we, with all our brethren, may draw together as one comity of peoples, and dwell evermore in the fellowship of the Prince of Peace:

O Lord, enkindle in every heart such a passionate love for peace, that we may all, through Thy divine help, remove the obstacles, both individually and nationally, that make peace impossible.

May Thy kingdom come, and Thy will be done on earth, and in us, as it is in Heaven. Amen.

---

## PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, immediately following President Eisenhower's state of the Union message to the joint session last Thursday, Mr. C. Wilson Harder, the president of the National Federation of Independent Business sent a congratulatory telegram to the President. In order to save the time of reading the message, which consists of a page and a quarter, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Harder's telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congratulations on your stirring state of the Union message. On behalf our nationwide independent business and professional men membership, we are happy over your acknowledgment that our productivity is the source of our strength, and that Government stands ready to promote renewed business expansions. We hope this indicates your administration will recommend and follow through strong on legislative and administrative programs which it has promised for sounder independent business welfare.

Steps toward tax revision, more effective antitrust enforcement for broader and freer opportunities through fair competition, a stronger and permanent Small Business Administration, reductions in Federal redtape and competition are necessary to weld together dangerous fissures appearing in our small business structure, which is an admitted backbone of our economy.

Your stress on the need for fighting Communist imperialism is important. But one of the most effective and constructive ways of doing this is to insure continued freedom of opportunity for small, independent business. We must remember that Communists themselves have admitted that their totalitarian systems cannot survive where a strong, healthy, free-opportunity small business system thrives.

C. WILSON HARDER,
*President, National Federation of Independent Business.*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the day following the President's state of the Union message the New York Herald Tribune contained an editorial, entitled "A Great Speech," which I think was so effective and so much to the point that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 10, 1958]

A GREAT SPEECH

In his state of the Union speech, the President attained his finest hour.

It was the buoyant and confident Eisenhower of old who stood before the crowded Chamber and the packed galleries, rousing them again and again to thunderous ovations.

They had been thirsting for action and for leadership.

Now the man twice chosen as our leader arose, with bold and imaginative programs of action on two main tasks—safety through strength for building a genuine peace.

This was his message: We are not in present danger because our deterrent power is still adequate: our greatest danger is that it will fall behind. No matter what the cost to keep it up the American people will say as one man * * *. We shall maintain that necessary strength.

Some 37 times the applause thundered up at his words. Time and again he had to pause, raise his hand and smilingly wait for silence enough to continue.

The applause came from both sides of the aisles and from the galleries in about equal measure. Not in many years—even in the solemn wartime years of Franklin D. Roosevelt—had a President commanded so much bipartisan enthusiasm.

The reasons for this enthusiasm are clear:

The President's program provides a vigorous response to every single aspect of the Soviet challenge—and takes new initiatives as well.

It does not confine itself to a mere strengthening of our defense posture. It does not assume a race of missiles madness is sufficient to the problem. "We could make no more tragic mistake than merely to concentrate on military strength. For if we only did this the future would hold nothing but an age of terror."

It gives equal importance to the necessity of waging total peace.

It recognizes our menace for what it is—the expansionist aims of Communist imperialism. But it does not stop with a mere sterile denunciation of the threat.

Instead it holds out the hand of friendship to the Soviet peoples. It invites them not only to far greater exchanges of peoples and culture and information, it invites them also to join us now in joint science for peace programs to eradicate cancer and heart disease and in an existing international program to stamp out malaria.

This was the great strength of the President's speech. Even while proposing additional arms it pointed to the essential madness of a continued arms race—"the world must stop the present plunge toward more and more destructive weapons of war and turn the corner that will start our steps firmly on the path toward lasting peace."

In his specific, eight-point program the President tackled all the major areas of the problems now confronting us, and in each case offered specific proposals to meet them. Here are the problems and his answers:

SERVICE RIVALRIES AND CONFUSION

"America wants them stopped." He is making a special study of efficient reorganization, will soon present a specific program in a special message. Its object: real unity, particularly unified direction of strategic planning and control, single control in some of our most advanced development projects (e. g., lumping antimissiles and satellites).

STRENGTHENING AND ACCELERATING DEFENSE

Improvements of sure warning equipment. More bases and greater dispersal for our striking forces, stepped-up long-range missile programs, mobile forces to deal with local conflicts, more advanced aircraft; nuclear submarines and cruisers, improved antisubmarine weapons and missile ships to protect freedom of the seas. Approving the ideas of the Cordiner Report, he advocates increases in military pay and incentives. More emphasis on research and development.

MUTUAL AID

The President was at his most effective in stressing the absolute necessity of meeting the Soviets on their new front of expanded economic warfare. The Soviet threat is unique because of its all inclusiveness. Every human activity is pressed into service * * * trade, economic development, military power, arts, science, education. * * * The Soviets are waging total cold war. * * * Our only answer is to wage total peace. Communist imperialism, frustrated at expansion based directly on force, has begun to concentrate heavily on economic penetration. * * * This nonmilitary drive, if underestimated, could defeat the free world regardless of our military strength. Action: An increase in mutual-aid funds, stressing greater use of repayable loans, private capital. Attacking the catchword abuse of mutual aid as a giveaway, the President snapped: "We cannot afford to have one of our most essential security programs shot down with a slogan."

MUTUAL TRADE

Demanding a 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act and broader authority to negotiate, he said freer trade helps lay the groundwork for peace by making all free nations of the world stronger and more self-reliant. Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON led the applause when the Presi-

dent quoted McKinley: "Isolation is no longer possible or desirable."

SWAPPING SCIENTIFIC SECRETS WITH OUR ALLIES

"It is wasteful * * * for friendly allies to consume talent and money in solving problems that their friends have already solved. * * * The task ahead will be hard enough without handcuffs of our own making." Action: Legislation for such exchanges.

EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Federal scholarships at a rate of $250 million a year. A fivefold increase in sums for the National Science Foundation to stimulate and improve science education. A doubling of the funds for research purposes by the Foundation. A balanced education program, preserving local control.

SPENDING AND SAVING

An immediate $1.3 billion increase in defense. Next year, a bigger increase for missiles, nuclear ships, atomic energy, research and development, increases in pay and incentives. Nevertheless, economy in other areas will seek to keep these expenditures in balance with income.

WORKS AND PEACE

The President's imaginative proposal for United States-Soviet projects on science for peace. Also to offer to negotiate any reasonable proposal for disarmament which has reliable means to insure compliance by all.

The effect of the President's great speech was inspiring and created the needed confidence and unity of purpose both in Congress and in the people.

The old soldier who hates war drew his loudest and longest applause in restating his own dedication: "I say once more to all people, that we will always go the extra mile with anyone on earth if it will bring us nearer a genuine peace."

With this fitting motto, America will now go forward, in unity, in strength, in resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared in the New York Herald Tribune a column by Roscoe Drummond entitled "The President's Unexpected Applause." The article concerns the whole question of dealing with Soviet Russia, and I think it is well worth our consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 12, 1958]

THE PRESIDENT'S UNEXPECTED APPLAUSE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—If Congressional response to the President's state of the Union message is a good gage of public opinion—and I believe it is—then the American people are far more eager to press negotiations with the Soviets than Secretary Dulles and some others in the administration have believed.

There were two evidences of this attitude in the reactions of the Members of Congress as they listened to Mr. Eisenhower's words.

There were more applause breaks in response to the President's emphasis upon the need to wage the peace than to anything else he had to say.

The largest and most sustained applause came toward the end of the address when the President declared that Americans "will always go the extra mile with anyone on earth if it will bring us nearer a genuine peace."

At a time when the most visible threat comes from the out-thrusting advances in Soviet weapons, at a time when the demand for missiles and more missiles gets support almost without asking, it was significant that the most spontaneous interruptions came when the President warned against "the tragic mistake of merely concentrating on military strength."

His appeal that the "world cannot stand still on disarmament" despite the standstill of present negotiations, his invitation to the Soviets to join the United States in a common global campaign against malaria—these and others like them touched a most responsive chord on Capitol Hill.

This does not mean that the American people want peace at any price or want agreement at any cost.

But it does mean, I think, that the American people want negotiations with the Soviets, however tenuous the prospects of getting anywhere, and are not going to be satisfied with the position that because negotiations are not likely to be productive, they shouldn't be started at any level and at any point they can be started.

I happen to believe that Secretary Dulles is absolutely right in his judgment that the Soviets, under present circumstances, have no intention whatsoever to accept any agreement that reduces any tension of the cold war except at the disadvantage of the Free World.

But the United States cannot safely stand in a position of grooved inflexibility. There is good reason to believe that the President does not intend to do so.

There are sound reasons to prepare ourselves to negotiate earnestly—with our eyes wide open.

The American people will find mounting defense spending and unabated taxes tolerable only as they are convinced that the United States is energetically and resourcefully doing everything it can to find some way to stop the endless and, perhaps catastrophic, piling up of the weapons of mass suicide. And that goes double for our NATO allies.

Furthermore, even if it is true that the Soviets have no present wish to settle any dispute under equally measured concessions, it isn't good enough to accept this state of affairs as though nothing ever could be done about it.

Obviously the Soviets aren't going to let up trying to subvert the soft areas of the free world as long as there is any good prospect that they can succeed at it.

Everything we can do to strengthen the free world economically and politically reduces the prospect of Soviet penetration and may well induce the Soviets to come to negotiate productively.

We have got to do more than we have been doing to show to the world that we are putting fair proposals upon the Soviets. We have got to get off the defensive.

There are dangers to negotiating when the Soviets want to use negotiations only as a means of propaganda. Moscow is constantly trying to separate us from our allies (by means of bilateral talks) and to separate our allies from us. That must be avoided.

But there are dangers to not negotiating, and the time may well be at hand when these are the greater dangers.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR MUTUAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the compelling arguments advanced by President Eisenhower in requesting a $3.9 billion appropriation for our mutual-security program in his budget message delivered today.

I should particularly like to stress the President's plea that "it is critically necessary to carry forward our development loans, technical assistance, and other special types of assistance" if our military assistance and defense support phases of the program are not to be in vain.

In his state of the Union address last week, the President outlined the grim significance of the Soviet's intensive economic offensive against the free nations. In the days to come, as we consider the budget proposals designed to meet the Communist imperialist threat, let us remember President Eisenhower's warning that "it makes no sense whatever to spend additional billions on military strength to deter a potential danger, and then, by cutting aid and trade programs, let the world succumb to a present danger in economic guise."

Let us not allow this warning to go unheeded. At the outset I should like to state my wholehearted support for the President's budget request for mutual security, and I invite my colleagues to join me.

Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

## THE BRUSSELS FAIR

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, among the many aspects of our total peace effort, United States participation at international trade fairs is exceedingly important. One of the largest such fairs to be held this year will be the World's Fair at Brussels, and it began to look for a while that once again, as so often in the past, our participation would be too little and too late. Of an estimated $15 million requested originally as the amount necessary to enable us to portray adequately our cultural wealth, Congress has thus far appropriated only $12,345,000.

The distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has announced that he is planning to press for an additional appropriation in the national interest of over $2 million for this very sound purpose. I commend the able Senator on his fine response to the effort to promote greater communication and understanding among the peoples of the world, and I want to assure him of my support and cooperation in this great work.

By request, as a part of my remarks I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial and an article from the Washington Post of today, January 13, 1958; an editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 8, 1958; and an editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of Sunday, January 11, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THYE ASKS MORE FUNDS FOR USE AT BRUSSELS FAIR

Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, yesterday urged speedy action to provide an additional $2.5 million to support American participation in the 1958 Brussels International Exposition.

THYE said he has carried his appeal to the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Democratic and Republican leadership in the House and Senate.

At the end of the last session of Congress, the request for additional funds was reduced from $2,889,000 to $545,000. THYE noted that the Soviet Union will spend approximately $60 million for its participation, while the total United States expenditure has been estimated at $15 million.

### FAIR WARNING

It will be a grand moment when the Brussels World's Fair opens on April 17. Some 35 million tourists are expected to visit Belgium before the October closing of the first global exposition since the New York World's Fair 19 years ago. But will it be a grand moment for the United States? Or will this country's cultural contribution—like the Project Vanguard—sputter and sag?

Unhappily, the omens are not hopeful. Irving Kolodin, the distinguished music critic, finds that the planned American musical contribution is narrow and unrepresentative and that some of our proudest talents (Marian Anderson, for example) are destined to the sidelines. In the field of drama, American players will compete on a pinch-penny budget with the Moscow Art Theater, Old Vic, Kabuki Players, and Comedie Francaise. Strangest of all, a handsome American pavilion will be understaffed; funds may not be sufficient to keep the pavilion open on a 13-hour-a-day basis 7 days a week.

If this country has chosen to participate, manifestly it should not be represented in a tacky, helter-skelter manner. This is why Senator THYE has appealed to the leadership of Congress for an additional $2.5 million to enhance American participation. Surely the request is reasonable. When Congress authorized United States participation in 1956, the original plans called for a $15 million budget. But the operating amount was pared to $11.6 million, and much of this was eaten up by rising construction costs. (Russia, incidentally, is spending an estimated $60 million on the fair.)

Whether or not the money already voted has been used wisely in every respect, a practical problem exists. Prompt Congressional action can still save this country from what may otherwise be a washout.

### SOUND INVESTMENT

Senator EDWARD J. THYE, who became convinced of the value of American participation in foreign fairs during a tour abroad a few years ago, is going to ask Congress for an additional $2,500,000 for United States participation in the Brussels fair this year. We think it will be a good if modest investment.

Present plans indicate that the United States will have some excellent cultural representation at the fair: The Philadelphia Orchestra with Eugene Ormandy conducting and Isaac Stern as soloist; the Ballet Theater with Nora Kaye as leading ballerina; the Rodgers and Hammerstein musical, Carousel; and The Glass Menagerie starring Helen Hayes.

However, there is concern that the United States will not have a broad enough representation on the cultural front. The additional appropriation sought by Senator THYE would finance additional performing artists in various fields, including a youth orchestra, a university theater group, and a college choral group. The funds also enable the United States pavilion to remain open on a 13-hour day 7 days a week, and would pay for additional booklets and brochures for distribution to fair visitors.

Even with the additional funds THYE seeks, the United States will spend only a small fraction of the $60 million that it is estimated Russia will invest in the Brussels Fair. Obviously, we do not need to match the Soviet spending, but we should make certain we have an exhibit that is representative of American culture as well as American accomplishments in commercial fields.

### FUNDS FOR FAIR

The Brussels World's Fair, the largest of its kind in Western Europe since World War II, will give this country an opportunity to match or even surpass the skilled cold war propaganda efforts of the Russians.

But this rare opportunity can go down the drain if Congress persists in the shortsighted policy of whittling down the funds originally allocated for participation by the United States in the Brussels Fair which opens April 17.

How important the Communists regard the Brussels Fair as a propaganda showcase is evidenced by the fact that they are spending $60 million for their exhibits. This is four times the amount we set aside at the beginning. Now this $15 million figure has been trimmed down to $12,345,000.

Howard S. Cullman, New York businessman and civic leader, who is serving without pay as United States of America Commissioner General to the Brussels Fair, feels $2,500,000 of the deleted funds should be restored in order to insure a first-rate exhibit of the American way of life.

In Cullman's hands, we can be sure every dollar appropriated by Congress for the Brussels Fair will be put to the best possible use. As it is, he will have a difficult time to make a single American dollar do the work of every $4 which the Russians have.

As Congress reconvenes, we are happy to note support developing among the Senators to give Commissioner Cullman the additional funds he needs. We believe every dollar spent abroad should be carefully weighed and scrutinized but this is an expenditure that has much more importance than some others which Congress has seen fit to sanction.

## YANKTON, S. DAK.—ALL-AMERICAN CITY OF 1957

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Yankton, S. Dak., may stand with pride among the thousands of cities which form the backbone of this land of courage and enterprise. Yankton, S. Dak., recently was chosen to stand beside 10 other cities that have earned the distinction of all-American city for 1957. This salute by the jury of distinguished American citizens under the sponsorship of the National Municipal League and the editors of Look magazine is well deserved by Yankton.

Yankton stands as the oldest settlement in the Dakota Territory, having had her beginnings as a city in 1858–59, just a century ago, and consequently she holds claim to a colorful and historical past. It was here at the fork of the James River and the Missouri River in 1804 that Lewis and Clark, the great explorers, set up their winter camp. At that time the first formal council was held with the Big Sioux Nation, and Captain Meriwether Lewis wrapped an Indian babe in the American flag; the babe grew up to be Chief Struck-by-the-Ree who was important in developing friendly relations between the whites and the Sioux for so many years following. It was from here that General Custer later debarked for his last trip into the Big Horn area from which he never returned. It was here that the early settlers took shelter from the great Indian uprising of 1862, and it was here that law first came to the Dakota Territory with the conviction and hanging of Jack McCall. It was Yankton that provided a point of debarkation for the settlers and a port for the river boats that came to supply the westward development.

Yankton was selected as the first capital of the Dakota Territory, and is known today as the Mother City of the Dakotas.

Yankton has preserved her pioneer spirit and has continued to advance, and has grown and bloomed with an attitude of Christian well-being and of brotherhood. In the interest of improvement, and by virtue of a series of committees staffed by energetic citizens, a spearhead of action effected a program of beautification and of construction. They now have completed a $150,000 swimming pool, they have removed a large area of substandard housing, and they have placed more than $1½ million worth of new school facilities into operation. They should be complimented upon their retention of the efficient nine-man commission, city-manager form of government which they have had since 1955.

Yankton estimates its current population at approximately 10,500. It has a very stable basic economy that is well balanced between agriculture and manufacturing. There are over 80 industries, varying in their operations, and including: machine tools, trees, steel scaffolding, sheet metal, seeds, egg crates, sash and door construction, and poultry and meat processing.

More than 17 church spires rise above the silhouette of the residences of Yankton reflecting the Christian spirit of this wealthy community. Yankton truly deserves this tribute which has been paid to her.

## PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON REVIEW OF FLOOD CONTROL ON RUM RIVER, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on January 8 I addressed a letter to the Public Works Committee, transmitting a suggested committee resolution which would request the Corps of Engineers to review flood control on the Rum River in Minnesota.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this suggested resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION SUGGESTED TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS BY SENATOR EDWARD J. THYE, OF MINNESOTA, JANUARY 8, 1958

*Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate,* That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act approved June 13, 1902, be and is hereby requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 16, 1938, on Rum River, Minn., submitted to Congress on January 12, 1939, and other reports with a view to determining whether any modification of the recommendations contained therein is advisable at this time in the interest of flood control.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, 3 years ago, in March of 1955, I made a similar request to the Committee on Public Works in view of the fact that at that time there was no authority under which the Corps of Engineers could investigate the need for flood control improvements on the Rum River between Princeton and Isanti. As a result of my request at that time and the aid of my good colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the committee resolution was adopted, authorizing the survey of flood control needs on that section of the river.

The survey resulting from that resolution indicates that the survey should be extended to the upper Rum River but I have been informed by the Office of the Chief of Engineers that present authority for flood control surveys does not extend the length of the river. It is for this reason that I have asked that the Public Works Committee extend the authority of the Corps of Engineers.

It was in the last session of Congress that I asked approval by the Appropriations Committee of funds for final survey work based on the existing authorization. It would seem at this point that if further flood control on the upper reaches of the Rum River is justified, it would be proper that the authority of the Corps of Engineers be extended as a followup on survey work which has already been done.

## LET US BUILD SCHOOLS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, this year as never before there is tremendous public concern over the state of American education. I believe that our educational system—with the possible exception of our defense readiness—is the paramount domestic issue facing us. But preparing our defenses is at best a negative issue, making ready for something which may or may not happen. This of course we must do to guarantee our preservation.

However, nothing could be more positive or progressive than to improve and modernize the means of educating our children.

The new awareness, that our education machinery is in a shabby state of disrepair, is welcome, even though the reasons for bringing about this awareness may not be so welcome.

It seems to me that America in recent years has fallen into the sad state of being on the defensive in too many fields, both in world affairs and on the domestic front. Education is a prime example. Rather than meeting the challenge forthrightly years ago, we now have a new education crisis, pyramided atop the old ones that were never solved.

Unfortunately, too many are now looking at the education lag solely in the narrow field of science. This is shortsightedness and even dangerous.

The President, who waited until 1955 to tell Congress that he had any interest in education, has now endorsed a $1 billion, 4-year program, which leans heavily to scientific aid, and totally ignores the vital need of school construction.

By now it is obvious that what the President says or proposes in regard to education programs is of little importance. His record over the past 2 years on the subject demonstrates that he will not fight for even the little he proposes.

However, what is disappointing is that Mr. Marion Folsom, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, once an advocate of Federal aid for school construction, has permitted himself to be steered away from this objective. Both the President and Secretary Folsom should give at least a casual glance at the findings of another Government agency.

The other day the Census Bureau said there are now 29 million children in elementary schools, an increase of 5.7 million over 1952. And in the high schools there are 9 million students, an increase of 1.8 million in the same 5-year period.

In addition to the attempts to keep up with this increase in school population our States face the great task of replacing inadequate or antiquated schools.

Certainly we need more scientists in this modern world. But do we simply tap a student on the shoulder and say: "Here's a scholarship. Be a scientist"? No. We must start with our raw material, the children now in our elementary and high schools and the ones who will be there next year and the year after.

Only by a broad program of educational responsibility shall we produce the scientists and the members of trades, professions, and other vocations we need in America.

It should be basic with us to attack a problem at its roots, not by trying to prune the foliage. At the root of our problem is not only the need for adequate facilities. We must pay attention to our teachers, and must assure these dedicated people living wages.

These, I believe, are areas of legitimate Federal concern. This year must be the year for action—action on the basic issue of school construction.

## POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture is currently completing the regulations to spell out the details of the Poultry and Poultry Products Inspection Act, which Congress passed and the President signed last year.

Hearings were held in many cities throughout the country on the regulations the Department has proposed. In December, the Department accepted written comments on them.

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO, a labor union which has among its members more than 30,000 poultry workers, has asked the Department for more detailed provisions for the protection of poultry workers' health. Specifically, it suggests inclusion of some of the points of the Model Poultry Sanitation Code published in 1955 as a guide for legislation by States, counties, and cities. This code was developed by a committee of representatives of the Federal, State, and local public-health services and of the poultry industry, working closely with officials of the Department of Agriculture and Food and Drug Administration.

I know that the officials of the Department of Agriculture share the deep concern for the protection of poultry workers against infections and other illnesses transmitted by poultry. I sincerely hope that they will be able to include in the regulations the sanitation provisions for the protection of poultry workers from the model code which the Federal Government has previously recommended to cities, counties, and States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the Department of Agriculture by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen outlining certain recommendations relating to the implementation of the Poultry and Poultry Products Inspection Act, which was passed in the 1st session of the 85th Congress. It was my privilege to handle the legislation in the Senate, and to report it both for the Senate and the conference committee. I hope these recommendations will be given the most careful attention by the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS
AND BUTCHER WORKMEN
OF NORTH AMERICA, AFL–CIO,
*Chicago, Ill., December 20, 1957.*

Re: Proposed regulations governing the inspection of poultry and poultry products.

Mr. HERMON MILLER,
*Director of the Poultry Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. MILLER: We are submitting herein the viewpoint of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO, with respect to the proposed regulations governing the inspection of poultry and poultry products, as published in the Federal Register of November 22, 1957.

Generally speaking, we believe that an excellent job was done in drafting the proposed regulations, especially with respect to those portions dealing with the inspection of poultry. However, it is our considered opinion that the proposed regulations are entirely inadequate with respect to the protection of the workers in the poultry plants in that they fail to specify the necessary facilities for the protection of the workers' health. A healthy worker is essential for safe, wholesome food products.

The legislative history of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (71 Stat. 441, 21 U. S. C. 451, et seq.) shows conclusively that Congress had two purposes in mind in enacting this legislation: (1) The protection of the consumer, to assure him of a clean, wholesome, disease-free product; and (2) the protection of the persons working within the poultry establishments.

That Congress had the second purpose set forth above in mind as well as the first purpose, is shown clearly by the following excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thus, when S. 1747 was being considered by the Senate on April 8, 1957, Senator ELLENDER stated as follows in explaining the bill:

"Processing plants would be required to conform as to premises, facilities, equipment, and operations with sanitary regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 4, p. 5228.)

• • • • •

"In addition, there was testimony to the effect that those who work in the slaughterhouses may catch diseases by handling diseased poultry. For their protection, also, this provision for ante mortem inspection has been included in the bill." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 4, p. 5232.)

Senator TALMADGE corroborated Senator ELLENDER, stating (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 4, p. 5233.)

"I should like to say to my distinguished friend from West Virginia that when we drafted the bill we were trying to keep in mind a piece of legislation that would be fair to the consumers and provide for them adequate and nutritious meat. We tried, also, to keep in mind the processors and not place on them undue hardships or burdens in their efforts to process poultry and make it available to consumers. We tried, also, to keep in mind employees who work in plants and handle birds which may be diseased.

* * * * *

"With reference to ante mortem inspection, sometimes, though not often, flocks of birds become diseased. I believe in recent years there have been instances of poultry becoming affected with the disease called psittacosis that has adversely affected the consumer, and, I believe, in some cases, employees in the plants affected."

Both Senators ELLENDER and TALMADGE were on the committee which considered and drafted S. 1747 and served on the conference committee with the House, which approved the final version of S. 1747, as enacted by Congress.

Similar statements appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with the consideration by the House of H. R. 6814, which was passed by the House on July 9, 1957. (The conference committee adopted many of the provisions of H. R. 6814 and inserted them in the final version of S. 1747.)

Thus, in the July 9, 1957, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 8, page 11118, Congressman ANFUSO, in his discussion of the diseased poultry being processed in some of the plants in the United States, stated:

"These conditions exist in some processing plants throughout the country. They are a danger to the consumer, to the workers in the plant, and to the overwhelming majority of processors."

And in the same issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11146, Congressman ZABLOCKI stated:

"The enactment of this measure is vital to the health of the American people.

"Most immediately, an effective, compulsory poultry inspection program is necessary to minimize the health dangers which face thousands of poultry workers in many plants. These dangers, which range from bothersome skin rashes and infections to killing psittacosis, have been recognized a long time ago by poultry workers and their organizations. It is to the credit of these organizations that they have consistently and energetically advocated the enactment of legislation to protect poultry workers against health hazards and to safeguard public health."

It is, therefore, evident that Congress intended that the legislation protect, not only the consumer, but also the workers in the poultry-processing establishments.

The proposed regulations have given this protection to only one class of workers, namely, the Government inspectors. Thus, section 81.33 (f) reads as follows:

"Inspector's office: Office space, including, but not being limited to furnishings, light, heat, and janitor service, shall be provided rent free in the official establishments for the use of Government personnel for official purposes. The room or space set apart for this purpose must meet the approval of the inspection service and be conveniently located, properly ventilated, and provided with lockers or cabinets suitable for the protection and storage of supplies and with facilities suitable for inspectors to change clothing."

No such provisions appear in the regulations requiring lockers and dressing rooms for the rest of the persons working in the processing plant, although there is an implication (but only an implication) in section 81.14 (d) that dressing rooms must be provided. This section reads in part as follows:

"The official establishment shall include employees' toilet and dressing rooms."

We believe that the Department of Agriculture has overlooked the fact that the United States Government has already approved standards for poultry-processing plants in the model Poultry Sanitation Code published by the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education and entitled "Poultry Ordinance, 1955 Edition" (publication No. 444). This code, which was developed jointly by the Public Health Service, United States Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Defense, and poultry-industry representatives, has been recommended by the United States Government for adoption by States, counties, and cities, and, we are informed, has been adopted by numerous States, counties, and cities. The preface to the Poultry Ordinance sets forth that it was developed as a guide to sanitation standards for poultry and poultry products and to encourage uniformity in poultry-sanitation regulations throughout the United States. It sets forth further that "the ordinance embodies the best information available at the present time on sanitary practices applicable to the commercial processing, distribution, and sale of poultry," and that the "sanitation requirements contained in the ordinance are substantially equivalent to the current regulations of the United States Department of Agriculture."

Section 18 of the Poultry Ordinance deals with plumbing and related facilities. Subsection (b) provides in part as follows:

"The following requirements shall be met and the meeting of such requirements shall be deemed to be compliance with this section.

* * * * *

"(8) Employee toilet facilities, adequate for the use of all employees during peak periods of operation, shall be provided in convenient locations in the establishment. Toilet rooms and fixtures shall be kept clean and in good repair. A supply of toilet tissue shall be provided in toilet rooms at all times.

"(9) An adequate number of lavatory facilities shall be located in or adjacent to each employee toilet and dressing room and at such other places in the establishment as may be necessary for the convenient washing of hands by employees engaged in the conduct of poultry-processing operation: *Provided*, That no utensil, or equipment, washing vats, or water-flushed trough shall be substituted for lavatory facilities.

"(10) Each lavatory facility shall be provided with warm water (at least 100° F.), either from a controlled-temperature source with a maximum temperature of 115° F. or from a mixing or combination valve. The use of steam-mixing valves shall be prohibited.

"(11) Control valves on lavatories used by employees before beginning or while engaging in the conduct of poultry-processing operations shall be operated by means of foot pedals, knee or elbow pressure, or other approved means, which in all cases shall be other than by hand.

"(12) Soap or other detergent, made available through the use of a dispenser, and individual paper or cloth sanitary towels shall be provided at each lavatory: *Provided*, That the health authority may approve other, equally effective, sanitary means for the drying of hands. The use of a common towel shall be prohibited.

"(13) Containers constructed of impervious material shall be provided near lavatories for the disposal of used towels.

"(14) Drinking-water facilities of a sanitary type shall be provided in the establishment, and shall be so located as to be convenient for use by employees."

Section 25 of the poultry ordinance deals with cleanliness of personnel. It reads as follows:

"(a) Persons who engage in poultry-processing operations, or in duties during which they contact poultry-processing equipment or utensils, and persons who contact poultry or poultry products during storage or sales operations, shall wear clean, washable garments, keep their hands clean, and conform to hygienic practices during all periods of such duties. Adequate facilities shall be provided in poultry-processing establishments for the storage of employee's clothing.

"(b) The following requirements shall be met, and the meeting of such requirements shall be deemed to be compliance with this section.

"(1) Persons who engage in poultry-processing operations, or in the performance of duties where they contact poultry-processing equipment or utensils or poultry or poultry products, shall, while thus engaged, wear clean, washable, outer garments, such as uniforms, coats, aprons, or coveralls, and shall wear caps, hairnets, or headbands.

"(2) Persons who contact poultry or poultry products, containers, or packaging materials therefor, or poultry-processing equipment or utensils, shall keep their hands and fingernails clean, and shall conform to all other hygienic practices while on duty. Such persons shall wash their hands thoroughly before starting to work and before returning to work after changing garments, eating, drinking bottled beverages, smoking, visiting the toilet, or soiling their hands in any way. The use of tobacco in any form shall be prohibited in rooms where poultry or poultry products are processed.

"(3) Signs directing employees to 'wash hands' shall be conspicuously posted in employees' toilet and dressing rooms in poultry-processing establishments.

"(4) Adequate lockers, or facilities in dressing rooms, shall be provided in poultry-processing establishments for the storage of employees' clothing. Such lockers and rooms shall be kept in a clean and orderly condition. Clothing shall not be stored in processing rooms.

"(5) Hampers shall be provided in poultry-processing establishments for temporary storage of soiled linens, coats, aprons, and other items of employee clothing. Soiled clothing and any personal items not used by employees in the performance of their duties shall not be placed on window ledges, on tops of lockers, or in similar locations."

Nearly all of the requirements set forth above relating to toilet rooms, dressing rooms, lunchrooms, clothes storage, et cetera, have either not been covered at all in the proposed regulations, or have been inadequately covered.

Our concern over proper employee facilities is supported by many public health organizations, one of the more recent being the American Public Health Association. In an article published in the October Journal, volume 47, the American Public Health Association has endorsed proper facilities for poultry processing employees as an integral part of any poultry processing inspection law needed to protect the health of the worker, and needed to assure proper preparation of a product, safe and wholesome for the consumer.

If you will examine into the background of Poultry Ordinance, 1955 Edition, you will find that the chief reason for the preparation of the model ordinance was the great variety of poultry legislation in existence in the various cities, counties and States which

acted as trade barriers. To insure uniformity, therefore, the proposed regulations should be amended to conform with the provisions of the Poultry Ordinance, 1955 Edition set forth above.

A number of times during the recent public hearings held by the Agricultural Marketing Service in connection with the formulation of the proposed regulations, the question was asked as to why the proposed regulations were less stringent than the law in effect in many States, counties and cities. The reply given was that if State regulations were more stringent, then the State regulations would be followed. This is a novel viewpoint for a Federal agency to take, for in the past, the Federal Government has always led the way and set the standards in all regulatory functions. It is well known that without Federal compulsion and guidance, many States would not have enacted social and regulatory legislation in effect today. This is well illustrated by the history of unemployment compensation in the United States. Before the Social Security Act was enacted by Congress in August 1935, only one State had enacted an unemployment compensation law. However, due to the Federal unemployment tax and the offset credit allowed to employers in States which had approved unemployment compensation laws, by the end of 1937, all 48 States had enacted unemployment compensation acts.

On the other hand, you will find that where the Federal Government has failed to take action, the States and local governments have moved very slowly. Thus, in the field of disability insurance, only four States have as of this date enacted temporary disability insurance acts. This is due to the fact that there is no Federal law in existence compelling the States to act, and no model Federal law for them to follow. Furthermore, there is no uniformity of any kind among the four State laws which have been enacted.

Thus, we believe it essential for the Federal Government to lead the way with respect to setting high standards for the regulation of the poultry industry. Where such high standards have already been promulgated by the Federal Government in Poultry Ordinance—1955, and where the Federal Government has recommended to the States, counties, and municipalities that they adopt these high standards, it would be ridiculous for another arm of the Federal Government at this time to promulgate regulations containing lower standards than those recommended for the States, counties, and municipalities.

A hasty study of some of the State laws reveals many States have concerned themselves with employee facilities in food establishments. For example, in Vermont the law provides that food establishments must be constructed, maintained and operated with strict regard for health of employees and purity of food produced; in Kentucky, the law provides that food establishments shall be conducted with strict regard to influence of such conditions upon health of those employed; upon purity and wholesomeness of food produced; and in Massachusetts the law sets forth that if bakery is found unfit for production or handling of food or dangerous to health of employees, department of public health or local board may order it closed.

Our concern for the protection of the health of the workers in the poultry establishments is borne out by the latest United States Department of Labor release showing work injury rates in 1956 in poultry and small-game dressing and packing at an all-time high—nearly three times the average of all industries.

We, therefore, request that you amend sections 81.33 and 81.37 of the proposed regulations to conform with the requirements for employees' facilities contained in sections 18 and 25 of Poultry Ordinance, 1955 edition, as set forth above.

Very truly yours,

S. W. BARKER,
*Director, Poultry Department.*

## THE BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the budget message is being read in the other body. I ask unanimous consent that when it is laid before the Senate its reading be dispensed with, and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the budget message, and, without objection, its reading will be dispensed with and it will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See H. Doc. No. 266 in today's proceedings of the House.)

## OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ADJACENT TO INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the position of the outdoor advertising industry in Arizona regarding Federal regulation of outdoor advertising adjacent to the Interstate and Defense System of Highways.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSITION OF THE OUTDOOR ADVERTISING INDUSTRY IN ARIZONA REGARDING FEDERAL REGULATION OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ADJACENT TO THE INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS

We, members of the standardized outdoor advertising industry, locate our advertising displays only on privately owned land zoned for commercial and industrial uses. If the local government has not yet actually zoned privately owned land, we build our displays only where other business exists or is permitted. In addition, the standardized outdoor advertising industry adheres to a strict code of operations wherein its members will not maintain any display in a scenic area regardless of zoning even if other business structures are allowed by local ordinance.

Our industry has no intention of exploiting the Federal Interstate and Defense System of Highways, as it has been emotionally accused by some critics. Our displays will be located on private land zoned by local authorities for other business uses. Much of the private property bordering the 41,000 miles of the system is unsuitable for business purposes and will be used for agriculture. In the so-called public land States, almost 87 percent of the total land area is Government owned where no advertising display will be erected.

Our position with respect to the Interstate and Defense System of Highways is as follows:

1. We are unalterably opposed to Federal regulation and control of standardized outdoor advertising. We have four reasons for taking this position. First, we believe that regulation and control is exclusively a matter of local interest and concern. Second, the Federal-aid highway legislation has always been limited to construction, and advertising in no way relates to highway construction. Third, we have received exceptionally well qualified legal opinion which raises doubts as to the constitutionality of such Federal regulation and control, and regardless of our personal desires we could not support legislation of doubtful constitutionality. And fourth, we oppose Federal regulation and control of business in general.

2. We oppose any Federal, State, or local regulation which would discriminate against outdoor advertising among other legitimate businesses.

3. Any regulation of outdoor advertising should recognize outdoor advertising as a legitimate business use of land, as it is recognized by planning and zoning authorities.

4. We will continue to support local regulations that permit outdoor advertising in all areas zoned or presently used for business, commercial or industrial purposes, or which subsequently may become business, commercial, or industrial areas.

5. We recommend that zoning authorities in the States who wish to protect areas of unusual scenic beauty along the right-of-way of the Interstate Highway System take steps to define such areas, from which all business, commercial, or industrial uses of land might be excluded. The States know much more about their historic spots and their areas of natural beauty than does the Federal Government or the Bureau of Public Roads. The States now have authority to enact any regulatory legislation which they desire or decide they need. Legislation for Federal control would not only preempt and usurp this right, but would assume that the States are unaware or unconcerned about their own resources.

There is no need nor reason for Federal controls of outdoor advertising when State and local governments have the authority to enforce regulatory and zoning ordinances. Proposed Federal controls seek to carve out for discriminatory regulations only one use of private land, namely, signs, while showing no concern for other land uses. The proponents of Federal legislation apparently are immune to unsightly factories, junk yards, open mining operations, storage yards, slaughtering houses, and other objectionable commercial and industrial uses. Our advertising displays are designed by outstanding engineers—the advertising copy executed by renowned artists—both the structures and surrounding land area maintained regularly for neatness.

## DEATH OF RUSSELL W. KEENEY, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is with regret that I announce the untimely passing of Representative RUSSELL KEENEY, of the 14th District of Illinois, who died Saturday night at the naval hospital. His was a rather untimely death. He has served only one-half of 1 term. Interestingly enough, he succeeded in the House his law partner, who died in February of 1956.

RUSSELL KEENEY was a topflight lawyer. He served as State's attorney, as probate judge, and as circuit judge in the district where he lived. So his death is very untimely, and brings to an end what had all the promise of a very brilliant career.

At some future time I shall address myself to other tributes. I felt that I should make the announcement now, and later today I shall submit a formal resolution concerning his death.

## THE LATE HONORABLE AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLARK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] regarding the death of Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLARK

The words already spoken by Members of the other body and the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania in tribute to the memory of Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, have already made abundantly clear the esteem in which he was held by his colleagues, and the affection all who knew him felt for this beloved public servant. Editorials and statements in the Pennsylvania and national press, in labor and religious journals, from members of the executive branch and distinguished citizens have told the story of his long and fruitful public career. We owe him much. All of us are the better for it that GUS KELLEY served as a Member of the House of Representatives for 18 years. All of us have suffered a real loss with his death.

Even before I became a member of the Pennsylvania delegation in Washington it was my privilege to know GUS KELLEY personally and my pleasure to work with him on programs which were vital to our State and the Nation. This was a signal honor, and I feel I have lost a friend as well as a fellow worker on behalf of those programs we both believed in.

Congressman KELLEY, over the years, made many contributions to our national welfare. His splendid work in the field of labor and employee legislation, and his services as Congressional adviser to ILO are especially well known. But he is perhaps best known for a piece of work that unfortunately remains unfinished—through no fault of his own. What came to be known to millions as the Kelley education bill is to my mind the high point of GUS KELLEY's dedication to the public weal, and its defeat in the House of Representatives by so close a margin in the first session of this Congress was his saddest day. America can at no time afford to be without men like GUS KELLEY; we can afford it now least of all.

As we eulogize GUS KELLEY now—as we think of his life's work, his splendid record as an employer, his devotion to his family and to his church—I hope we will especially realize that there is something we can do that GUS KELLEY, I feel sure, would have wanted us to do. I hope we will pick up where death took it from him, the work on behalf of a national education program which GUS KELLEY had in recent years been striving so hard to accomplish. This, it seems to me, would be a fitting memorial for him, the very best way we could say of the career of this great citizen of Pennsylvania and of America, "well done."

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS—THE ADMINISTRATION'S PHRASEOLOGICAL APPROACH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a column published in this morning's New York Times, written by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, dealing with our foreign relations problems.

I particularly recommend a reading of the column because I believe Mr. Sulzberger points our very clearly the need for us to proceed with negotiations on the whole subject of disarmament.

In the near future I shall make a major speech on the subject, setting forth some of my views, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on the foreign relations problems of our country. They will be at some variance with the program being followed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, which latter program, in my judgment, will not improve the foreign relations of the United States, but which, unless we stop the Dulles policies, will inevitably result in war.

In spite of the high-sounding phraseology of the President and the Secretary of State, war will be the inevitable result.

I wish to summarize my criticism of the foreign policy of the President and the Secretary of State by saying that we will not win the peace by a phraseological approach to foreign policy. The time has come for America to demonstrate by action that she is ready to bring to an end this mad race of armaments. It is a mad race that I believe is stirring up a hysteria in this country, with the result that many people are greatly confused as to just where America is going in foreign affairs.

I say from this desk today, Mr. President, unless we bring to an end the phraseological approach to foreign policy of President Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles, the end will be inevitable war, which will result in the destruction of both Russia and the United States so far as their being world powers are concerned. Then Asia, in the next epoch of history, will take over.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO RESUME TALKS WITH MOSCOW

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

LONDON, January 12.—The United States has belatedly begun its own diplomatic offensive to counter Moscow's persistently skillful initiative. The first venture in our effort to regain some momentum was President Eisenhower's Congressional message. The second is contained in our reply to Bulganin's Christmas note.

The President, at last, has shaken himself free from a deluding slogan. He recognizes the primary menace as that of Communist imperialism, not international communism. We are not participating in a holy alliance engaged in ideological warfare but in resistance to all aggression, direct or indirect.

Eisenhower says somewhat vaguely that we must "wage total peace." What is this? How is it to be waged? Not by joining the Russians in a fight against malaria. This may appeal to the Chief Executive's romantic nature. But it is tangential to the problem.

The President's speech emphasized need to strengthen our defenses. At the same time it expressed willingness to talk with our opponents. His reply to Bulganin will close no door to such approaches, although it is scarcely sanguine about chances of success.

The main point of this far too tardy but well drafted paper is that established machinery for negotiation is stalled because of what has proved to be an unworkable United Nations apparatus. Specifically, he would have the Russians join with us in efforts to eliminate the restrictive Security Council veto, which has rendered mute what should be the conscience of the world.

U. N.'S FUTURE AN ISSUE

This is a valid point. Some day something must be done. Either the wheels of U. N. must again be made to turn, or we will have to cease basing our own policy so heavily upon that rusting organization. Nevertheless, it is not easy to imagine that Moscow is willing at this time to discuss the question. Should we therefore delay examination of other subjects? No.

We cannot continue to make excuses for not negotiating, and thus allow the Kremlin to proclaim unchallenged a desire to reach peaceful settlement. Indeed, thanks to our cumbersome methods, Bulganin has already publicized another dramatic idea before we have even answered its predecessor.

Eisenhower says he is prepared to go the extra mile if it will bring genuine settlement nearer. It was high time to make this clear. Our allies were clamoring for such a move while Dulles seemed obstinately to lag behind.

Should there be another summit conference, as both Bulganin and Gaillard suggest? How many nations merit representation? What is a fair proportion between Communist, anti-Communist, and neutral participants? Or should initial surveys be made bilaterally by only the two superpowers?

Despite Dulles' curious efforts to obscure the fact, it is our policy to meet again with the Soviets. We are not holding back until our missile program assumes shape. We reckon we are strong enough to treat now without fear of being bullied. The diplomatic value of new defense measures will only become ascendant 2 or 3 years hence. We are even prepared to take the initiative in seeking new talks.

MEETING TO DISCUSS WHAT?

But what can we discuss with any hope of progress? Not the Russian plea to recognize Europe's status quo. This would mean retaining an ideological curtain between the Elbe and the Adriatic, perpetuating a partitioned Germany. And certainly not the scarcely veiled attempt to oust us from our NATO bases and military dispositions.

The heart of the matter remains disarmament. It can only be partially approached at present. But we are not only willing again to attack the question, we are even willing to take certain risks if a start can be made along this immensely difficult road.

There is room for joint scrutiny of several aspects. We are not wholly averse to Soviet efforts to limit membership in the atomic weapons club; that is to say, to discourage other nations apart from Britain from manufacturing such arms if Moscow pledges to keep Communist fabrication within Soviet borders.

We are by no means opposed to some limitations on conventional forces if we can ever get precise and confirmable figures from the U. S. S. R. on the size of its present establishment. Above all, we are prepared once more to explore the chances of establishing an initial inspection system, no matter how limited. We believe the Russians will never accept the degree of controls we regard as an essential minimum. But we can lose nothing by reexamining the question.

Another negotiation is therefore indicated. But how can we get off the dead center of existing diplomatic doldrums? The evident answer is to revive the moribund but not defunct Council of Foreign Ministers. That would be a useful beginning. Without concession from either side, the Big Four could bargain over the shape and methods of an eventually more purposeful parley.

## SUPPORT PRICES ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD a letter dated

December 30 addressed to me by the Farmers Cooperative Creamery of McMinnville, Oreg. The statement contained in this letter expresses the point of view of a good many dairy farmers in my State with respect to the unwarranted action of Secretary Benson in reducing dairy price supports.

Mr. President, that is one reason, I may say to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], why I was proud to join him the other day in the introduction of his bill dealing with the whole dairy problem.

It is protests such as these from dairymen throughout the State of Oregon which lead me to believe that we are on the right track in supporting the bill (S. 2924) introduced by the Senator from Minnesota, and of which I am a cosponsor.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS COOPERATIVE CREAMERY,
*McMinnville, Oreg., December 30, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: We are greatly concerned with the Secretary of Agriculture's recent announcement that support prices on dairy products will be reduced on April 1, 1958. Our dairy people are just existing at the present prices.

We realize that the support program is a real problem; however, we feel that it is just not fair to lower the support prices on dairy products when so many other things are supported by the Government.

We note by our records that our producers received the same for their butterfat this past year as they received in 1945, or 12 years ago, and they received 23 cents a pound butterfat less than they received in 1948. We believe that we will be forced to give further wage increases, which squeezes the producer just that much more.

We understand that there may be two legislative proposals in the next session relative to support prices on dairy products. One of these is to raise milk support prices and the other is to propose the National Milk Producers Federation parity equivalent formula. We are favorable to both proposals.

Dairying is one of the leading industries of our area and makes a substantial contribution to the economy of our community.

Our people would be interested in your views on the lowering of support prices.

Sincerely yours,

DELTON S. RUSSELL,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

## THE BRUCELLOSIS ERADICATION PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in our deliberations upon the many problems that will confront the Senate in the months ahead, there will be those who, because of an earnest concern over our military status, will counsel us to cut to the bone all Federal expenditures not directly tied to the Armed Forces or our international commitments. We will do well, however, before accepting and acting upon such counsel, to weigh with great care the effect of funds curtailment upon domestic programs.

One such program, Mr. President, I cite to you this morning as an example of public money well spent in the public interest. I refer to the Federal and State cooperative brucellosis eradication program. As a farmer who breeds Devon cattle, I can attest from personal knowledge the importance to our farmers of maintaining that program at the highest level of efficiency. Bang's disease in cattle has an importance that transcends the economic difficulty to the farmer. Together with bovine tuberculosis, it stands as a threat to the health of human beings. To reduce that threat by a cooperative Federal-State attack, financed to the extent necessary by Federal funds, is, in my judgment, in the public interest.

Recently I read a copy of a communication dated December 20, 1957, signed by Lawrence Geraghty, president of the Oregon Dairymen's Association, Corvallis, Oreg., setting forth the association's Resolution No. 5—Federal appropriations for brucellosis control. In order that my colleagues in the Senate may have the benefit of the views of this representative group of Oregon dairymen on the subject, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be set forth in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is danger that because of military preparedness hysteria, Federal appropriations for brucellosis control may be drastically reduced, and since the present level of Federal funds for this program are necessary for its survival in Oregon: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Oregon Dairymen's Association urge our Congressional delegation to see that Federal funds are sustained so that the excellent progress made in the elimination of this disease is not lost and our whole livestock industry put in jeopardy; and further be it

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressional delegates, all State legislators, the Governor, and State newspapers.

## THE ADMINISTRATION VENDETTA AGAINST JOHN DAY DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in regard to the President's budget, based upon a press release which I have just issued.

The President's 1959 budget continues the administration's vendetta against comprehensive resource development in the Pacific Northwest. The amount requested for construction of John Day Dam is a fraction of what is required for maximum progress on this great multipurpose dam.

Everyone knows that the Columbia Basin region faces a major power shortage in the years ahead. The low cost power from a John Day is indispensable in averting that shortage. Yet the Republican administration, by its budget proposal, continues the indefensible policy of stretching out the planning and construction of the million kilowatt dam. This budget continues the policy of starving Federal multipurpose development in an attempt to force its bankrupt partnership policy upon the people of the region who have repeatedly rejected it at the polls.

Let me advise the President of the United States that they will reject it again in 1958 and 1960. I assure him today that we shall make the administration's policy an issue in those two campaigns. The President of the United States has given away the heritage of future generations of Americans in their natural resources; and the senior Senator from Oregon does not propose to let the President of the United States continue to give it away to private monopolies in this country.

In his state of the Union message the other day the President commented on the giveaway phase, and he said, "Let us face the facts." I say to the President of the United States, "Why do you not face the facts in regard to the unconscionable giveaway program which has characterized your administration under two Secretaries of the Interior, McKay and Seaton, in regard to the natural resources of the people of this country?"

I say to the President of the United States, "You will have to answer to the people of the Pacific Northwest in 1958 and 1960 by way of accountability for the unconscionable course of action you have followed in scuttling the natural resource heritage of the American people in full river basin development. Now you send to the Congress another budget message in which, once again, you participate in a budget request representing underdevelopment of the river basins of this country."

I am glad to join issue with the President of the United States on this question, because I am satisfied that the people of the country will be with me once they have the facts with regard to the need of protecting the water resources of America.

I point out to the President that he had better study his history, and recognize that no civilization can climb on falling water tables. The fact is that the program followed by Dwight D. Eisenhower in the field of river basin development is resulting in falling water tables in large sections of the great West. The time has come to stop it; and the best way to stop it is to increase the budget, so as to give the people of the country maximum development of flood control and the electrical energy potential of the Columbia River Basin and other river basin areas of the country.

Concluding my comment on the press release I wish to point out that Oregon and Washington have a major unemployment problem. In my State there is the highest unemployment rate in America today. In my State there is the highest bankruptcy rate in America today, due in no small measure to the unwise economic policies of the Eisenhower administration, particularly in the field of natural resources development and in the field of the hard and tight money policy of the administration, which has resulted in closing one lumber mill after another in the State of Oregon.

Let anyone go to the State of Oregon if he wishes clear proof of what is happening as a result of the policy of this administration in selling out the economic interests of this country to big business. The situation will grow worse under the administration's policies. Our defense potential will suffer from the impending power shortage. I am confident

that the people of Oregon and its neighboring States, regardless of party, will condemn the administration's short-sighted policy at John Day Dam.

I serve notice that at the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment to the appropriation bill, when it comes before the Senate, seeking an adequate amount of money for John Day Dam, so that we can proceed with the maximum development of electric power from that dam, for both the economic and defense needs of the American people in these critical times.

---

## DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think we all have cause for moderate reassurance in the reply which the President has at last sent to Premier Bulganin's letter of December 10. The Eisenhower letter's moderate tone is praiseworthy. The stress on disarmament involved more than words, because it included some new proposals for separate discussion rather than a mere reiteration of the old, inseparable disarmament package. The possibility that the letter may lead to new diplomatic conversations on the whole range of United States-Soviet differences is to be welcomed.

Mr. President, I was pleased to read in the New York Times this morning that the President's letter is supposed to be mainly the product of Secretary of State Dulles' pen. I hope this is true, because the letter is more encouraging than Mr. Dulles usually is on such matters. It is important at this stage of world affairs that Presidential letters and messages really amount to a consensus of Government opinion, rather than merely the opinions of the Presidential speechwriters. Only if these documents reflect the views and determination of the President's subordinates at the operation level will the messages themselves be fruitful.

Because of the great importance attached to the Bulganin-Eisenhower exchange, I wish to bring the Senate's attention to three articles and an editorial of particular value which have appeared in our Nation's newspapers.

The first appeared in yesterday's Washington Post. It is written by Chalmers Roberts. The second is an editorial entitled, "Reply to Bulganin," published in this morning's Washington Post. The third is a news story in the New York Times of January 13, written by Dana Schmidt. The fourth is a column in the New York Times written by C. L. Sulzberger.

I ask unanimous consent that each of these articles be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 12, 1958]

### EAST-WEST JOCKEYING ONLY BEGUN

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Seldom, if ever, on a single day have the two giants of today's world declared their respective positions as did President Eisenhower and Premier Bulganin on Thursday in their discussions of American and Soviet policy.

Yet the listener-reader can be pardoned if he felt a bit confused by next morning as to where the Big Two really stand on the major issues which divide the globe. For the simple fact is that neither the President in his state of the Union address nor Bulganin in his latest round of diplomatic-propaganda notes spoke with complete frankness.

Stripping away the cover words on both sides, the two positions can be stated this way:

The United States, that is, the Eisenhower administration, wants to get its military house in better condition before another round of negotiation with the Russians. It knows that our North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies, however, are attracted by the idea of talks with Moscow before any irrevocable commitment to spread nuclear weapons across Continental Europe from Britain to Russia. Hence the partly open door to negotiation, with the hope that the Soviets won't be able, with the help of our NATO allies, to pry it wide open until American defenses are in order.

The Soviet Union, with Bulganin the mouthpiece for Nikita Khrushchev and company, doubtless want to keep American nuclear weapons as far away as possible, especially to keep them out of West Germany. Probably it would like some surcease from the costly arms race; almost certainly it is willing to see the general East-West balance remain in Europe, but with less possibility of conflict, while the Communist orbit makes gains in the Middle East, Asia, and Africa, areas of greater free world weakness.

#### A COMMON FEAR

These two brief summaries are not, of course, the whole picture from either side. But what Mr. Eisenhower and Premier Bulganin did say testifies to their validity—the Eisenhower reference to the "all inclusiveness" of the "Communist imperialism" threat and his stress on Communist economic penetration; the Bulganin talk of a European nonagression pact; of the dangers of missiles in Britain and on the Continent; of the necessity of ending nuclear tests and banning the use of nuclear weapons; of the European "atom free zone" idea.

Both sides share the fear of a nuclear holocaust. Both sides know that the arms race continues unabated—and today the Kremlin knows that very likely the United States really will make a major effort to make good its missile deficiencies.

Each side is convinced that its way of life is the last, best hope of man; each fears the inroads of the other; each denies any effort to force its system on unwilling peoples. These things were not said directly last week by either the President or Bulganin, but they were implicit.

What, then, are the possibilities for coexistence, assuming that total war can be avoided?

#### CAN'T STALL TOO LONG

The outlook is for a period of jockeying which will end up with some sort of East-West conference, perhaps later this year. Each side will have to throw overboard some of the excess baggage to reach agreement, as has been the case before all the other postwar conferences.

Dispatches from Western Europe indicate that Europeans are not now questioning whether there will be another conference but ask only when and about what. The administration here knows in its heart that it can stall only so long; that European pressures skillfully played upon by the Soviets will force a conference without American leadership if Washington says nay too long. Some administration officials say that the launching of the first American sputnik could make agreement on a conference much easier here.

But the question of when to meet is far simpler than what to do when the United States and the Soviet Union do meet.

#### DISENGAGEMENT AT LEAST

The last major go round concerned disarmament on the thesis accepted here and elsewhere in the West that the Hungarian revolution had frozen, through Kremlin fright, the Soviet position in Europe. This still is a prevailing theory, but increasing numbers of diplomats both here and in Western Europe are coming round to the idea that perhaps some half measures may be possible, measures which relates to disarmament but which more properly should be called disengagement.

The vast interest in Western Europe shown in the December series of BBC lectures by George F. Kennan, the former State Department official, is indicative of this interest. This is not to say that there is any general agreement on his exact prescriptions but that there is a wide belief that he is right when he says that the only hope for Eastern Europe, for moving toward German reunification and for lessening East-West tensions lies in getting the Red army to return home from East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and the other satellites.

And there is agreement, too, that the West would have to pay a price. Much of the current argument is over that price and over what any price should be paid for.

This is why there has been so much detailed searching of the December, and now the January, mass of Bulganin letters and the concomitant Khrushchev speeches—a search for clues to Soviet policy. What has been found?

There is one idea only which could be described as new, though it is in fact a variant on old ideas. This is the proposal first put forward by Communist Poland at the United Nations October 2 to create an atom free zone consisting of West Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia, Communist East Germany, in which nuclear weapons would be neither manufactured nor stationed. As the map with this article shows, this area is the core of two of the European inspection zone proposals, one by the Soviets, the other by the United States, which were put forward at the London disarmament talks last spring.

The atom (or nuclear) free zone proposal was brushed aside when the Poles first put it forward. But the Kremlin formally endorsed it in the Bulganin letters in December and the idea was reiterated in last week's letters as one of the topics for a proposed summit conference.

Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki told the London Sunday Times a week ago that Poland had sought more modest solutions than those which failed at the London talks; that adoption of the plan could open the way to other disarmament measure; that it could facilitate German reunification but that the Poles do not foresee the plan as a prelude to a withdrawal of conventional forces from the area. That, he added, could become the subject of a separate agreement, first of all between the great powers. Finally, Rapacki said that Poland has some ideas on control measures for such a plan and that the London control proposals will be helpful on that issue.

From this and from other available information and hints, it appears that the nuclear free zone as viewed in Moscow—and Moscow, not Warsaw, will of course be controlling—has some very definite limitations. It is a device to keep American nuclear weapons out of West Germany, first of all. And very likely it is a Soviet device to avoid having to make nuclear weapons available in some form to the satellites if America distributes them in Continental Western Europe. After all, it must give the Kremlin pause to think of what might have happened if nuclear weapons had been in the hands of the Hungarian Army in October 1956.

The Soviets would naturally like to see the American Army return home and probably

would risk trouble in the satellites by withdrawing the Red Army if the United States would strike that bargain. But the chances of such a move are indeed slim today.

French Premier Felix Gaillard, in a recent interview with U. S. News & World Report, flatly opposed the nuclear zone plan as a very dangerous idea because any nuclear disarmament of Europe would remove the American forces. * * * It would mean 1 mile of Soviet withdrawal to the east for 7 miles of American withdrawal to the West.

A realization of this attitude, which of course is the Washington attitude, perhaps accounts for Rapacki's cautious words on the troop withdrawal issue.

But Bulganin last week spoke again of thinning out troops on both sides of the line which divides Germany. This has attraction in London, which has been trying to cut its forces in West Germany despite NATO insistence that it cut no more.

On this issue, as on the nuclear free zone idea, a major obstacle is Soviet reluctance to grant the total inspection and control demanded by the West. Mr. Eisenhower termed this inspection the one indispensable condition of any arms agreement. However, it might not be so difficult in non-Soviet territory as it has proved to be when Russia itself was concerned.

Perhaps the rock on which the Polish plan will founder is the issue of German reunification, though the ultimate answer here lies with West Germany.

The latest Bulganin messages show an absolutely rigid position on German reunification: The West Germans must give in and negotiate directly with the East German Communist regime, which they so far have refused even to recognize as a government; they must form a vague sort of federation; they must insure no loss of the social changes in East Germany, meaning at a minimum the economic socialization. And "free elections" has disappeared entirely from the Moscow lexicon in speaking of German reunification.

Enough has been said so far to show the immense complications of any new negotiations on European political issues between East and West. And yet it will not be easy for the Eisenhower administration to escape such negotiations.

The difficulties may be immense, but the December NATO meeting in Paris demonstrated massive European determination to have a try at negotiation. The politicians on each side can expect warnings from their military leaders of the risks involved. NATO would collapse if there was a move leading to Germany's withdrawal, it is said here. And in Moscow, if some Washington readings are correct, the Red army marshals would not be happy to give up their advanced land positions despite the arrival of the nuclear age.

President Eisenhower got a lot of cheers last Thursday when he spoke of waging total peace. But in the comments, there were passing few who pointed out that he had failed to come to grips with the issue of negotiating with the Kremlin. A good many Americans, in and out of both the executive and the Congress, figure that the United States had better do some work on its military posture before sitting down at a conference table.

The West certainly wants to avoid the age of terror of which the President spoke. It would like to turn the corner, as he put it, on the path toward lasting peace. And Americans, as a Nation, indeed will always go the extra mile toward peace. Yet the problem remains how to find a way of translating this universal desire (for peace) into action.

At the moment the two major powers are far apart. But America's allies are bringing more pressure on Washington, and showing more leadership of their own, than at any time since the end of World War II. And on the Communist side, quasi-independent Poland, trapped in the vise between Russia and Germany, has put forward a proposal which merits examination and which cannot be brushed aside as merely a stooge operation for Moscow.

The new year did not dawn bright with many hopes. But it is almost certain to see a long East-West jockeying for position and then, in the end, another try at the conference table. At the moment that is the best that can be said for 1958's prospects. But it is something.

---

[From the Washington Post of January 13, 1958]

REPLY TO BULGANIN

President Eisenhower has replied to Prime Minister Bulganin with a sweep of argument and of constructive proposals that may astonish some of his countrymen as well as the Kremlin. The most dramatic item in his substantial list of offers is a proposal that outer space be controlled for peaceful purposes. Both the Soviet Union and the United States, the President noted, "are now using outer space for the testing of missiles designed for military purposes. The time to stop," he insisted, "is now."

The effect of the Eisenhower proposal would be to stop the missile race. Undoubtedly, the suggestion would be more appealing to the Russians if the United States were ahead in that race. But this country is on the eve of a broad stepup in its missile program. If Russia responds with a redoubling of her efforts, still greater exertions in the United States may be expected, and the end result will be a stupendous investment in means of destruction that will further intensify the pall of peril under which mankind now lives. Every consideration of humanity, of world peace, and coexistence thus calls for serious negotiations on this momentous issue.

The President's various proposals were coupled with a conditional acceptance of Mr. Bulganin's plea for a summit conference. His condition is that the complex matters to be discussed at such a conference should be worked on in advance by diplomats and foreign ministers so that the heads of state could determine in advance whether a top-level meeting would hold good hope of advancing the cause of peace and justice in the world. If the end to be sought is agreement rather than the broadcast of propaganda, some advance spadework would seem to be imperative. Instead of closing the door, the President has opened it to negotiations on a practical basis. In this, of course, he has support of the NATO allies.

The President replied in kind to Mr. Bulganin's propaganda thrusts, effectively puncturing many Kremlin pretensions. In our opinion, however, this part of the letter might well have been abbreviated or left out entirely. What is important at this critical juncture is exploration of every possibility of easing tensions and halting the arms race. The President should also have avoided reiteration of the charge that Moscow broke faith in regard to the reunification of Germany. His proposal for discussion of the status of the Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe, however justified by intrinsic merit, will likewise be regarded as inflammatory. If there is to be any agreement between the East and West, it will have to begin with less delicate issues on which there is some chance of reaching an understanding.

The important thing is that the President has offered constructive suggestions that will have a strong appeal for peace-seeking peoples. His plea for space control was buttressed by a proposal to end "the now unrestrained production of nuclear weapons"; for an end of nuclear-weapon testing as part of the production controls; for building up the authority of the United Nations and curtailed use of the big-power veto in the Security Council.

Though some of these proposals are not new, we wish the President had outlined his entire peace program, before he received Mr. Bulganin's letter. Indeed, his offers would have been far more effective if they had come before the launching of the sputniks. But past omissions can be minimized only by present performance. In this document the Government has taken a constructive and positive course. There is enough meat in the present proposals to enable the diplomats and foreign ministers to formulate an agenda for a summit conference if there is any disposition to seek peaceful settlements as distinguished from propaganda maneuvers.

---

[From the New York Times of January 12, 1958]

NOTE TO BULGANIN—PRESIDENT SAYS TALKS MUST BE PREPARED AT LOWER LEVEL

(By Dana Adams Schmidt)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—President Eisenhower told Premier Bulganin today that he was ready to meet him in a top-level conference if it had been prepared at lower levels in a way offering "good hope" for the advancement of "peace and justice."

While agreeing with the Soviet leader's remarks, made in his December 10 letter, on the value of personal contacts at the top, the President cautioned that such a meeting, if ill-prepared or exploited for propaganda, could bring "disillusionment, dejection, and increased distrust."

In his letter of reply to Moscow, President Eisenhower suggested strengthening the U. N. by an agreement between the United States and the Soviet not to use the veto so that efforts of the Security Council to work out peaceful solutions of disputes would not be frustrated.

CHALLENGE ON GERMANY

The President challenged the Soviet Union to restore confidence in the pledged word by living up to its promises to reunify Germany through free elections and to give East European nations freedom to choose their own forms of government.

The pledge on Germany was made at the first East-West heads-of-government meeting in Geneva in July 1955. The pledge of freedom for Eastern Europe was made at the Yalta Conference in 1945.

At the head of proposals in his message looking toward disarmament, the President put an agreement to use outer space only for peaceful purposes. Recalling that in 1948 the Soviet Union rejected United States offers to renounce making atomic bombs, he wrote:

"The nations of the world face today another choice perhaps even more momentous than that of 1948. That relates to the use of outer space. Let us this time, and in time, make the right choice, the peaceful choice."

WARNING ON WEAPONS

The President warned that new weapons using outer space would greatly increase "the capacity of the human race to destroy itself."

As part of a program to end the production of nuclear weapons, President Eisenhower suggested a cessation in nuclear tests, "not just for 2 or 3 years, but indefinitely."

The President made two important shifts of emphasis in restating United States disarmament proposals.

First, he reiterated the standing proposal for halting the production of nuclear weapons and for beginning the transfer of fissionable material in existing weapons stocks to peaceful purposes. He then offered Moscow this new inducement:

"Since our existing weapons stocks are doubtless larger than yours, we would expect to make a greater transfer than you

to peaceful purpose stocks. I should be glad to receive your suggestion as to what you consider to be an equitable ratio in this respect."

Second, General Eisenhower reiterated that inspection and control were an essential part of all phases of disarmament and could be usefully studied by technical groups. He continued:

"These technical studies could, if you wish, be undertaken without commitment as to ultimate acceptance, or as to the interdependence of the propositions involved."

Hitherto the United States had said it was ready to start technical studies only after the Soviet Union had accepted inspection and control. Furthermore, it had insisted that all phases of disarmament were inextricably linked.

If the Soviet Union insists on continuing the accumulation of nuclear weapons, the President said, it would be better also to continue tests to devise weapons that can be more accurately confined to military objectives, that are of defensive value and that eliminate the dangers of fallout, which could destroy vast segments of human life.

The United States Ambassador in Moscow, Llewellyn E. Thompson Jr., sent the letter to the Kremlin by messenger at noon today, Moscow time. The next steps in diplomatic preparation of a heads-of-government meeting presumably will be handled by the Ambassador.

The 4,000-word document, mainly a product of Secretary of State Dulles' pen, was coordinated at meetings in Paris last week with replies to Premier Bulganin by 14 other members of the Atlantic Alliance. The other replies are expected to follow that of President Eisenhower in the next few days.

ARMS CALLED KEY ISSUE

The President's letter called disarmament "the most important problem which faces the world today."

Discussing Premier Bulganin's December 10 proposals, he declared that he had found them to be "unfortunately inexact or incomplete in their meaning and inadequate as a program for productive negotiations for peace."

As the framework for a possible meeting with Soviet and other heads of government, President Eisenhower indicated answers to eight proposals made by the Soviet leader, and made a series of his own.

Some observers believed that the reference to "attendance as appropriate of leaders of other states" left the door open to the possibility of a bilateral United States—Soviet meeting.

The President answered the first four of Premier Bulganin's proposals by telling him that the United Nations Charter already provided the answers to the problems raised. They were as follows:

Respect for the independence of the countries of the Near and Middle East and renunciation of the use of force in settlement of their problems require no special agreements in view of the charter.

A nonaggression agreement to be submitted to the Atlantic Alliance and Warsaw Pact members would offer nothing not included in the United Nations Charter's provisions against aggression.

A suggested ban on the use of nuclear weapons is not needed in view of the charter's ban on the use of any weapons against the territorial integrity or independence of any state.

A proclamation of an intention to develop relations of friendship and peaceful cooperation is taken care of in the charter.

CONCRETE STEPS NEEDED

What is needed, the President said, is not another proclamation but concrete steps to achieve such relations. The proclamation of the Soviet Communist Party last November in support of the triumph of communism throughout the world by every means not excluding violence together with slanderous references to the United States would seem to make professions of friendship futile, he added.

"This declaration makes clear where responsibility for the cold war lies," the President said.

Discussing other proposals made by Marshal Bulganin, the President said:

The United States hopes that current negotiations to broaden scientific, cultural and athletic contacts will succeed in spite of the fact that the Soviet Union rejected such proposals in 1955.

Normal trade relations urged by the Soviet Union are much to be desired.

The halting of nuclear weapons tests would not go to the heart of the problem, nor would setting up a denuclearized area in Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia meet the real problem, since modern weapons know no geographical limits. A real solution of the menace of nuclear weapons lies only in ending their production, the President maintained.

The Soviet proposals on Germany offer no means of ending the division of that country; a solution would provide reunification and recognize the link between political solutions.

---

[From the New York Times of January 13, 1958]

HOW TO RESUME TALKS WITH MOSCOW

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

LONDON, January 12.—The United States has belatedly begun its own diplomatic offensive to counter Moscow's persistently skillful initiative. The first venture in our effort to regain some momentum was President Eisenhower's Congressional message. The second is contained in our reply to Bulganin's Christmas note.

The President, at last, has shaken himself free from a deluding slogan. He recognizes the primary menace as that of Communist imperialism, not international communism. We are not participating in a holy alliance engaged in ideological warfare but in resistance to all aggression, direct or indirect.

Eisenhower says somewhat vaguely that we must wage total peace. What is this? How is it to be waged? Not by joining the Russians in a fight against malaria. This may appeal to the Chief Executive's romantic nature. But it is tangential to the problem.

The President's speech emphasized need to strengthen our defenses. At the same time it expressed willingness to talk with our opponents. His reply to Bulganin will close no door to such approaches, although it is scarcely sanguine about chances of success.

The main point of this far too tardy but well drafted paper is that established machinery for negotiation is stalled because of what has proved to be an unworkable United Nations apparatus. Specifically, he would have the Russians join with us in efforts to eliminate the restrictive Security Council veto, which has rendered mute what should be the conscience of the world.

U. N.'S FUTURE AN ISSUE

This is a valid point. Someday something must be done. Either the wheels of U. N. must again be made to turn, or we will have to cease basing our own policy so heavily upon that rusting organization. Nevertheless, it is not easy to imagine that Moscow is willing at this time to discuss the question. Should we therefore delay examination of other subjects? No.

We cannot continue to make excuses for not negotiating, and thus allow the Kremlin to proclaim unchallenged a desire to reach peaceful settlement. Indeed, thanks to our cumbersome methods, Bulganin has already publicized another dramatic idea before we have even answered its predecessor.

Eisenhower says he is prepared to "go the extra mile" if it will bring genuine settlement nearer. It was high time to make this clear. Our allies were clamoring for such a move while Dulles seemed obstinately to lag behind.

Should there be another summit conference, as both Bulganin and Gaillard suggest? How many nations merit representation? What is a fair proportion between Communist, anti-Communist, and neutral participants? Or should initial surveys be made bilaterally by only the two superpowers?

Despite Dulles' curious efforts to obscure the fact, it is our policy to meet again with the Soviets. We are not holding back until our missile program assumes shape. We reckon we are strong enough to treat now without fear of being bullied. The diplomatic value of new defense measures will only become ascendant 2 or 3 years hence. We are even prepared to take the initiative in seeking new talks.

MEETING TO DISCUSS WHAT?

But what can we discuss with any hope of progress? Not the Russian plea to recognize Europe's status quo. This would mean retaining an ideological curtain between the Elbe and the Adriatic, perpetuating a partitioned Germany. And certainly not the scarcely veiled attempt to oust us from our NATO bases and military dispositions.

The heart of the matter remains disarmament. It can only be partially approached at present. But we are not only willing again to attack the question, we are even willing to take certain risks if a start can be made along this immensely difficult road.

There is room for joint scrutiny of several aspects. We are not wholly averse to Soviet efforts to limit membership in the atomic weapons club; that is to say, to discourage other nations apart from Britain from manufacturing such arms if Moscow pledges to keep Communist fabrication within Soviet borders.

We are by no means opposed to some limitations on conventional forces if we can ever get precise and confirmable figures from the U. S. S. R. on the size of its present establishment. Above all, we are prepared once more to explore the chances of establishing an initial inspection system, no matter how limited. We believe the Russians will never accept the degree of controls we regard as an essential minimum. But we can lose nothing by reexamining the question.

Another negotiation is therefore indicated. But how can we get off the dead center of existing diplomatic doldrums? The evident answer is to revive the moribund but not defunct Council of Foreign Ministers. This would be a useful beginning. Without concession from either side, the Big Four could bargain over the shape and methods of an eventually more purposeful parley.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the dramatic aspects of the President's letter was his proposal that outer space be controlled for peaceful purposes. This is a subject closely related to the disarmament negotiations, which, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Arms Control, I have followed with particular interest.

---

## PROBLEMS OF THE NUCLEAR AGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, entitled "We Are Facing a Danger Unlike Any Danger That Has Ever Existed." This is an excellent and well-reasoned statement of the problems facing us as Americans in the nuclear age.

I believe many people should read it and ponder its contents. The National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy was created in the summer of 1957. Its membership includes a distinguished list of Americans, including, as cochairman, Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, and Clarence Pickett, executive secretary emeritus of the American Friends Service Committee. In its statement of purpose the committee asserts:

The inadequacy of the present response by national governments to international problems and the recognized ability of these governments to wage nuclear war which could end in mutual annihilation, prompted the formation of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

The purpose of this ad hoc committee is to develop public support for a boldly conceived and executed policy which will lead mankind away from nuclear war and toward world peace with justice. To this end we propose:

1. Immediate cessation of nuclear tests by all countries, including our own, through a United Nations agreement.

2. International control of missiles and outerspace satellites through the United Nations.

3. The support and reinforcement of all agencies concerned with upholding and strengthening the United Nations as an instrument of effective world law.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE FACING A DANGER UNLIKE ANY DANGER THAT HAS EVER EXISTED

A deep uneasiness exists inside Americans as we look out on the world.

It is not that we have suddenly become unsure of ourselves in a world in which the Soviet Union has dramatically laid claim to scientific supremacy.

Nor that the same propulsion device that can send a manmade satellite into outer space can send a missile carrying a hydrogen bomb across the ocean in 18 minutes.

Nor is the uneasiness only the result of headlines that tell of trouble between Turkey and Syria and a war that could not be limited to the Middle East.

The uneasiness that exists inside Americans has to do with the fact that we are not living up to our moral capacity in the world.

We have been living half a life. We have been developing our appetites, but we have been starving our purposes. We have been concerned with bigger incomes, bigger television screens, and bigger cars—but not with the big ideas on which our lives and freedoms depend.

We are facing a danger unlike any danger that has ever existed. In our possession and in the possession of the Russians are more than enough nuclear explosives to put an end to the life of man on earth.

Our uneasiness is the result of the fact that our approach to the danger is unequal to the danger. Our response to the challenge of today's world seems out of joint. The slogans and arguments that belong to the world of competitive national sovereignties—a world of plot and counterplot—no longer fit the world of today or tomorrow.

Just in front of us opens a grand human adventure into outer space. But within us and all around us is the need to make this world whole before we set out for other ones. We can earn the right to explore other planets only as we make this one safe and fit for human habitation.

The sovereignty of the human community comes before all others—before the sovereignty of groups, tribes, or nations. In that community, man has natural rights. He has the right to live and to grow, to breathe unpoisoned air, to work on uncontaminated soil. He has the right to his sacred nature.

If what nations are doing has the effect of destroying these natural rights, whether by upsetting the delicate balances on which life depends, or fouling the air, or devitalizing the land, or tampering with the genetic integrity of man himself; then it becomes necessary for people to restrain and tame the nations.

Indeed, the test of a nation's right to survive today is measured not by the size of its bombs or the range of its missiles, but by the size and range of its concern for the human community as a whole.

There can be no true security for America unless we can exert leadership in these terms, unless we become advocates of a grand design that is directed to the large cause of human destiny.

There can be no true security for America unless we can establish and keep vital connections with the world's people, unless there is some moral grandeur to our purposes, unless what we do is directed to the cause of human life and the free man.

There is much that America has said to the world. But the world is still waiting for us to say and do the things that will in deed and in truth represent our greatest strength.

What are these things?

First, as it concerns the peace, America can say that we pledge ourselves to the cause of peace with justice on earth, and that there is no sacrifice that we are not prepared to make, nothing we will not do to create such a just peace for all peoples;

That we are prepared to support the concept of a United Nations with adequate authority under law to prevent aggression, adequate authority to compel and enforce disarmament, adequate authority to settle disputes among nations according to principles of justice.

Next, as it concerns nuclear weapons, America can say that the earth is too small for intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear bombs, and that the first order of business for the world is to bring both under control;

That the development of satellites or rocket stations and the exploration of outer space must be carried on in the interests of the entire human community through a pooling of world science.

As it concerns nuclear testing, America can say that because of the grave unanswered questions with respect to nuclear test explosions—especially as it concerns the contamination of air and water and food, and the injury to man himself—we are calling upon all nations to suspend such explosions at once;

That while the abolition of testing will not by itself solve the problem of peace or the problem of armaments, it enables the world to eliminate immediately at least one real and specific danger. Also, that the abolition of testing gives us a place to begin on the larger question of armaments control, for the problems in monitoring such tests are relatively uncomplicated.

As it concerns our connections to the rest of mankind, America can say that none of the differences separating the governments of the world are as important as the membership of all peoples in the human family;

That the big challenge of the age is to develop the concept of a higher loyalty—loyalty by man to the human community;

That the greatest era of human history on earth is within reach of all mankind, that there is no area that cannot be made fertile or habitable, no disease that cannot be fought, no scarcity that cannot be conquered;

That all that is required for this is to redirect our energies, rediscover our moral strength, redefine our purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the near future, I intend to review the whole subject of disarmament and related issues, many of which have a bearing on the letter which the President has sent to Soviet Premier Bulganin and on the position taken by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. At that time I shall express my own views in greater detail.

Meanwhile, we should all welcome the President's letter as a concrete indication that our official policy is not adverse to negotiations. We must always be prepared to negotiate. We must not permit the U. S. S. R. to usurp our role of peacemaker. The important question at the moment is, What are the issues on which we should negotiate? Where will the negotiations be most profitable and productive? I have some ideas on these matters, too, Mr. President, which I shall shortly lay before the Senate.

## MISS MARIAN ANDERSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the splendid service performed for her country by the great and talented American singer and artist, Miss Marian Anderson, in her recent tour through Asia.

It was my privilege to see the Columbia Broadcasting System's special telecast at year's end produced by Mr. Edward R. Murrow and his "See It Now" group, which documented Miss Anderson's tour.

Miss Anderson's magnificent voice, her quiet dignity, her great faith and wisdom carried a message throughout the nations of Asia that will echo throughout that vast region for many years.

As Miss Anderson said, she was representing "not only her people"—that is, the Negro people of America—but also her country, her Nation. She did, indeed, represent our Nation in a way which must make every American, North and South, deeply proud.

Miss Anderson's triumphant tour was perhaps the most effective of the programs which have been set up and sponsored by our Department of State since Congress passed the International Cultural Act of 1956.

As a coauthor of the act with Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, I wish to compliment the Department of State, the Columbia Broadcasting Co., and, above all, Miss Anderson. I have urged the State Department and the United States Information Agency to make the broadest possible use of this message throughout all of Asia.

I cite this great success to my colleagues as an example of what can be done in the field of international cultural exchange to strengthen America's stature in the world with a very small expenditure indeed.

## PROPOSED FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS IN SCIENCE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a thoughtful and effective editorial entitled "Bring Back GI Bill?" which appeared in the

Coquille Valley Sentinel of Coquille, Oreg., on November 7, 1957. This editorial, written by Ralph P. Stuller, publisher of the Coquille Valley Sentinel, emphasizes the challenge posed by Soviet technological advances to our entire educational system. Mr. Stuller has underscored the fact that restoration of the GI bill would help to send to college thousands of young Americans with brains, courage, and idealism.

I also endorse Mr. Stuller's view that we should set up a system of Federal scholarships based on merit to see to it that no matter the financial position of a youngster if he was the rich clay needed for molding into top grade people he would be educated.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Coquille Valley Sentinel of November 7, 1957]

BRING BACK GI BILL?

Suggestion of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER that the GI bill—allowed to die by President Eisenhower on January 31, 1955—be reactivated will be backed by thoughtful people across the Nation who are seriously disturbed by the current trend toward downgrading scientific and liberal education in this country.

The deemphasis on the integrity of the human mind has been an unmet challenge to many people who felt that the Soviet's rise in intellectual work would eventually pose a real problem for us.

Senator NEUBERGER in his Washington column this week calls attention to the waste of human material. A waste we can ill afford in this day and age of the cold war and the two huge blocs of the West and the East in mortal competition.

There is no one who does not know of at least a half dozen brilliant youngsters in his community who through no fault of their own cannot take advantage of the higher educational facilities of the State.

We would go even further than Senator NEUBERGER. We would set up a system of Federal scholarships based on merit to see to it that no matter the financial position of a youngster if he was the rich clay needed for molding into top grade people he would be educated.

---

## INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR., OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on January 11, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., was inaugurated in Richmond as Governor of Virginia.

On that occasion the Governor made a very notable and brilliant address dealing with the basic principles of our representative democracy.

I ask permission to insert this address in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR., GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, members of the general assembly, my fellow Virginians, It is with a sense of profound humility that I express to the people of Virginia my gratitude for the high honor they have conferred upon me. To stand here, on the steps of the building Jefferson built, close by a room where Marshall once presided; to take an oath in a long succession that began with Henry in the year of our Republic's birth; to address a general assembly that numbers among its former members the architects of our country's formation—all this is to sense deeply the history and the greatness of Virginia. We are, all of us, stewards of this inheritance, charged with conserving the best of a magnificent past, and charged also with bringing a new vision to the problems of our own time.

These contemporary problems are difficult problems; they are none of them easy.

As citizens of the United States, we must acknowledge soberly the global dangers that confront us, and bring to the defense of the Nation, without reservation, every ounce of loyalty, devotion, and courage that is within us. To those undertakings that are properly Federal in their character, we owe our obedience and support; this allegiance must be given with our whole hearts.

Yet we are citizens not only of the United States, but of Virginia also. Ours is a union of federated States, bound together by a compact to which the States alone are parties, and the strength of this Union lies in the nature of the Union. I think the phrase "States rights" is much abused; what we are speaking of, more often than not, is of State powers, and what we should be equally concerned with, in the years that lie immediately ahead, is with State responsibilities.

With your permission, I would confine myself today to some few observations on these issues of surpassing importance—the sovereignty of States, the security of a Nation—with particular reference to the problems of our public schools, and to the challenge that awaits our entire system of education in the light of the Russians' ominous moon. Without implying any invidious equations, I might remark that the matters with which I am here concerned stem from two revolving bodies: Sputnik, and the Supreme Court of the United States. Certain obvious similarities might be reviewed, but I resist the temptation.

By confining this address so narrowly, I do not mean to suggest that many other subjects are not of real importance to Virginians at this time. I am much concerned, for example, with the urgent need for economic development in Virginia, and will transmit a special message to the assembly on this topic. I have several recommendations in the field of highway safety which I hope will find favor with the assembly. There is much that might be said on this occasion of our natural resources, our penal institutions, our mental hospitals, our State sanatoriums, and public health programs. These I put regretfully aside for another day.

Yet, I would not want even to begin my principal remarks without expressing deserved tribute to the devoted and able leadership of Gov. Thomas Bahnson Stanley, whose firmness, patience, and fortitude have characterised Virginia these past 4 years.

Permit me to speak to you briefly on what seem to me certain great political principles of this Republic, and of their application to the perplexing problems so close at hand.

This Republic, as I have said, is a union of federated States. That is what it was in the beginning; that is what it is now, and the passage of 170 years, the adoption of various amendments to our basic compact, the waging of a tragic Civil War, have not altered this original structure of a Nation. If the constitutional position asserted by the Southern States is to be understood abroad in the land, these plain and unequivocal facts of history must be understood. They do not seem to me so complex.

In the beginning were the sovereign States—the free and independent States described by Jefferson in the document cherished by Americans everywhere—the States that voluntarily formed themselves into a limited union, the better to resist the mightiest power of the 18th century. As separate States, united for certain purposes only, they waged that war and won it; and still as separate States, they sent delegates to Philadelphia who there embarked upon the task of creating a more perfect union.

Out of their deliberations came the Constitution which remains the supreme law of the land to this day. It was, and is, a magnificent work of statecraft, a towering example of political design. I think of the Constitution sometimes as I think of a great bridge, soaring above the passing river of everyday life, a thing of strength, a thing of beauty. Resting upon solid foundations of political principle, the Constitution lifts its exposed beams and girders to the sky. It is a bridge that will bear any weight, any strain, now and forever, so long as its basic structure is left unimpaired.

In fashioning this sturdy charter, the great men who once walked upon this very hill were conscious of many considerations. The convictions that influenced them are familiar to us in Virginia—they are part of the very air we breathe—yet they scarcely can be recalled too often. The first is that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; men do not derive their rights from government—the rights of man are not subject to alienation in this fashion. Secondly, they recognized that there is a tyranny of the majority, and from this despotism free men, and free States, must ever be protected. For a third, they knew that government must ever be tied down, as Jefferson phrased it, by the chains of a Constitution, lest even the most limited government exceed its powers and usurp the freedom of the people.

These considerations were among the elemental provisions written into the Constitution, and these were not paper provisions, designed like bunting for adornment only. These were the bones and sinews of the political body thus brought into being. There was a reason for the composition of the Senate, and a reason for the seemingly cumbersome provisions for the election of a President, and a reason for the language of Article V requiring the concurrence of a full three-fourths of the States for amendment of the basic law. And these reasons rested in the diversity of the ratifying States, in the certainty that government is most susceptible to popular control when it is closest home, and in the conviction—born of bitter experience under Great Britain—that despotism could be restrained only by checks and balances upon a Central Government.

Out of these desires and feelings and forebodings the Constitution was formed. The States, sovereign entities, created from the reservoir of their own sovereignty a central government, and conveyed upon it a unique sovereignty not paralleled elsewhere in the world. To their common government, the States delegated (not surrendered, but merely delegated) certain of their own powers; and by mutual consent, they prohibited unto themselves, through plain words and phrases, the exercise of certain other powers; and, finally, with meticulous care and providential foresight, they wrote into the basic law two express reservations. One of these went to the rights of men: the enduring liberties of the people were never to be construed away. The other went to the powers of States: these residuary powers, neither delegated by the Constitution to the Central Government, nor denied by the Constitution to the States, were to be ever reserved to the States, respectively.

These careful provisions, demanded by Virginia in her very act of ratification, were intended to foreclose pressures for strained and capricious construction of the Constitution. It was thought that in this fashion the organic law would be rendered immune to the gravitations of political expediency, and to the engraftment of personal and so-

ciological predilections by judicial legislation. It was confidently believed that chains had in fact been placed securely upon the newly created Central Government, and that the instrument would remain responsive only to the expressed will of the people acting in their respective States.

Today, we face an ever-deepening constitutional crisis. Its scope and devastating effect are not limited to any particular States or to any single region. New Hampshire and Pennsylvania are told they may not inquire, as States, into possible subversion. Nebraska is told she may not protect a citizen from the tyranny of compulsory unionism. New Mexico and California are told they cannot fix qualifications for practice at the bar. Illinois is rebuked in her State rules of appellate procedure. Michigan is prevented from ousting two local officials charged with crime. New York is told she cannot fire a professor who refused to answer certain questions under oath, lest truthful answers tend to incriminate him. Oregon is inhibited in the regulation of nonnavigable waters within her own borders. In the teeth of history and in contempt of long-established constitutionally sanctioned law, the Southern States are advised that an amendment of 1868 really was intended to prohibit to them the power to operate racially separate schools. This was discovered 86 years after the amendment was ratified.

With the soothing assurance that this is all for our own good, our judicial surgeons have prescribed a massive political bloodletting, and it is not the South only that is being leeched—it is the whole body of the Republic. Weakened by this cynical phlebotomy, enervated by sweet anesthetic, the States gradually are declining to the insignificant role of dependent Federal satellites—mere municipal provinces of Washington, suburbs of the Capital. They are being drained of the vitality that has contributed so greatly to the Nation's strength, and the pity is that an apathetic people lie indifferent to the enveloping evil.

I do not think the people of Virginia are indifferent. They have not exhibited indifference these past 3 years. They have exhibited, on the contrary, by their own expression at the polls and through their representatives in the assembly and in constitutional convention, not a willingness to surrender to usurped authority, but a determination to resist. That determination must not falter now.

On November 5, 1957, the people of Virginia, with overwhelming voice, gave expression to their profound conviction that principle cannot be compromised, and that rights and powers cannot be abandoned, without forsaking every hope for their revival and reestablishment. I interpret and I accept that expression as a mandate to the general assembly and the chief executive to defend and preserve the inherent powers of Virginia's sovereign statehood.

I shall exercise every honorable means at my command in the observance of that mandate and in the execution of that trust.

I call upon the General Assembly, with the utmost confidence in the loyalty and devotion of that body to the fundamental precepts of our constitutional system of government, to stand firm with unwavering unity of purpose and high resolve against every assault upon the sovereign integrity of this Commonwealth. Against these massive attacks we must marshall a massive resistance.

It will be said that I am here referring only to the maintenance of a resolute defense against the catastrophe that threatens to overwhelm our public schools. I would not have the policy so limited. The importance and gravity of this crisis far transcend considerations of race and public education. Nor is my concern only for the integrity of the States; it is for the integrity of the Union also, and for the security and well-being of our whole people. For I say to you with all the earnestness at my command that the potential of this Republic to resist external aggression and the capacity of our Central Government to preserve domestic tranquillity evolves from and depends upon the continuing integrity of its structural components.

Virginia has a high responsibility, I believe, to contribute in whatever way we can toward the preservation of this constitutional structure. I therefore recommend that the General Assembly give thorough consideration to the establishment of an appropriate commission to work with the chief executive in cooperation with our sister States to the end that the several States may be restored to their proper dignity, and defended in the exercise of their nondelegated and reserved powers under the Constitution of the United States.

From these general comments, I must turn now to the specific problem which troubles us so sorely at this time.

I state now, without reservation, as I have so often stated: I am dedicated to the cause of public education in Virginia. I want to see every child possessing the capacity and will to learn afforded the best educational opportunities this Commonwealth can provide, irrespective of race or color. As I want to emphasize somewhat later, the processes of sound education that have been important in the past seem to me imperative now. The well-being of the State, the security of the Nation, even the survival of western civilization, depend to a large degree upon the education of the coming generation. In guiding our children along this urgent path, our public schools, in the familiar image, are like lamps; I deplore the very thought that even one of these should ever be dimmed or extinguished, however briefly. I am determined to do everything within my power to promote and to sustain an efficient, progressive, and well-functioning system of public free schools throughout Virginia.

Yet in approaching this critical matter, we must face certain facts of life squarely. Moderation may be, indeed, the noblest gift of heaven, but it is stark reality that confronts us here on earth. The people of Virginia, I believe, are overwhelmingly in favor of sound public education; and the people of Virginia, I believe, are overwhelmingly against racial integration of the public schools. These two convictions are mutually exclusive. The society in which we live demands that education reflect a spirit of progress and advancement. On a racially mixed basis, progress and advancement are utterly impossible in the public schools of Virginia today.

No public school system can survive when it is isolated from the loyalty, confidence and support of a large segment of the people whose tax dollars are its only source of material support. Yet consideration of public finance are possibly the least of the vital factors here, though many local governing bodies, irrespective of State appropriations, would not provide funds for the operation of racially mixed schools. Beyond the tangible matter of tax dollars are the countless intangible factors of community pride, individual choice, age-old customs, and deep political conviction. Thousands upon thousands of Virginia parents simply would not send their children to racially integrated schools; they have made this clear in every way it is possible for them to do so. By an act of the special session of the assembly, no child may be compelled to attend such a school; but even if this were not so, it would be absolute folly for the State to attempt such a compulsion. The result of forced integration would be half-schools or quarter-schools or no schools, struggling for survival in communities torn by dissension. There could be no education, not in any meaningful sense of the word, under these circumstances.

This is a somber picture, but I believe it is not overdrawn. I am convinced that there is not one political subdivision in Virginia where racially mixed schools can be conducted without such serious and irretrievable loss and danger to the cause of public education as to render the attempt, even on an experimental basis, all but futile. The agonizing study I have given this problem over a period of many months has persuaded me that so far as a State system of public education is concerned, integration anywhere means destruction everywhere. And to paraphrase a great statesman, I say to you simply that I have not been elected governor to preside over the liquidation of Virginia's schools.

Any concept of merely defying usurped authority is submerged beneath the importance and necessity of saving our public free schools from destruction. With fierce devotion, with relentless and uncompromising determination, we shall fight to prevent this tragic end. In honor, good conscience, and decent discharge of our inescapable obligation to Virginia and her children, we can do no less.

I call upon the people and their representatives in the General Assembly to support me in sustaining this cause which my convictions persuade me to be morally just and right, and indispensable to the happiness, prosperity, and culture of our people.

There are those who would have me recommend specific and detailed proposals for dealing with the complex problem confronting us. A number of suggestions have been pressed upon me in the nature of a "compromise," but I find no area of compromise that might be usefully explored. To compromise means to integrate. It is said that integration might be held to a little integration, or to what is called token integration. It is urged that each locality should be left free to decide for itself.

But the objections here are two in number: First, I cannot conceive such a thing as a little integration any more than I can conceive a small avalanche or a modest holocaust, and I am confirmed in this skeptical view by the plain—indeed, the blatant—statements of minority spokesmen. They have been armed out of political expediency with inordinate power to force their will upon the majority. They are indifferent to appeals for moderation. They are determined to substitute chaos for order, and to impose upon the people of both races, heedless of the bitter consequences, an intimate and personal association for which neither race is prepared. No plan would be acceptable to them except that which would open wide the door to complete amalgamation, with its consequent destruction of every semblance of hope for maintenance of an efficient and orderly system of public free schools.

Second, so long as ours is a system of State public schools, financed in large part by State funds, administered by a State agency under a State superintendent of public instruction, there must be one State policy in this regard. Section 140 of our State Constitution prohibits the teaching of white and Negro children in the same classroom anywhere in Virginia; and while I am told this has been voided by action of the Supreme Court of the United States, I know it has not been voided by any action of the whole people of Virginia. Legally, section 140 may not exist; but as an expression of statewide policy, satisfactory to the people of this State for a period of more than 80 years, section 140 remains a useful guide.

The difficulty in all these compromise suggestions, in brief, is that they are premised upon the voluntary acceptance of some unknown degree of integration everywhere in Virginia. To sanction any plan which

would legalize the mixing of races in our schools would violate the clear and unmistakable mandate of the people to which I earlier referred. This I cannot do.

Virginia has no alternative but to seek to maintain a position of flexibility so as to meet to the best advantage, in the light of conditions then existing, any situation which may arise. She must utilize every honorable means through the adaptation of her sovereign power and governmental machinery to prevent that which will destroy her public school system. We ought not to rely upon [illegible]y Maginot Lines. For my own part, I am not dissatisfied with the defenses erected by the assembly 15 months ago, but I will not hesitate to convene the assembly in extraordinary session whenever the public interest may so require.

One measure, however, I do recommend for immediate adoption. The preservation of public peace and good order is historically and constitutionally a State function and not a Federal function. This function I do not propose to yield. Nothing could be more provocative of civil strife and unrest, nor more conducive to racial tension and violence, than the patrolling of public-school property by Armed Forces of the United States. No public school can function at the point of a bayonet.

Therefore, I recommend to the consideration of the General Assembly the enactment of a law expressly authorizing the governor to order the suspension of the operation of any public school whenever and wherever military forces may be employed by Federal authority to police its operation.

I cannot leave this lamentable subject without one further word. I am keenly conscious that, as Governor of Virginia, I am governor for all the people of Virginia, white and Negro alike. To the Negro people I would say this: I cannot agree to any program of integration of the schools, for the overriding constitutional and social reasons I have attempted to set forth; yet I would express my profound hope that in the months ahead we may explore other areas of mutual concern, involving State services, with greater hope for resolving divisive issues in a spirit of unity and good will. I pledge my unremitting efforts, also, toward the end that educational opportunities, though separate, will be fully equal, and I call upon all our citizens who desire an effective and efficient system of education, available to all our children, to lend their aid and cooperation in this vital undertaking.

Permit me, now, to move on to a happier theme. I have treated the critical matter of integration at such length because the first imperative, in my own view, is simply to preserve our public-school system. The second aim, to which we must devote ourselves with equal energy, resourcefulness, and sacrifice, lies in the improvement of our entire educational offering.

There is so much that we can do. And, imbued with a sense of renewed dedication, let us agree that there is so much we will do.

The literary fund, one of the great assets of this State, must be brought to a higher level of usefulness as a convenient source of loans for local school construction and improvements. While public revenues, which are not unlimited, must be fairly distributed among many essential public services, I urge the General Assembly to appropriate a substantial part of the general fund surplus to the literary fund. It is my earnest hope that it may be possible for this appropriation to approximate the sum of $15 million. The demands of our pupil load are in excess of the adequacy of facilities, and will continue to rise at a rapid rate. These demands impose an obligation which must be discharged. This is our obligation, as Virginians. It certainly is not the obligation of the Congress of the United States. Our own localities should be encouraged to assume their full part of this responsibility, but should be aided by the State in every feasible and practical manner.

The present interest rate on literary fund loans is 3½ percent. This imposes an undue burden on the localities, and should be substantially reduced.

I advocate modification of school construction regulations, with more autonomy and its attendant responsibility at the local level. In spending public funds on school buildings, frugality must be the watchword, substance the goal, with dispensable frills and appendages eliminated.

Important though new buildings are, the efficacy of our public school system depends in largest measure upon the competency and adequacy of our teaching forces. In character and dedication this force excels. In numbers it is inadequate. This inadequacy makes it as imperative to recruit new teachers as it is vital to retain those who now compose the profession. Neither of these objectives may be attained without adequate compensation. The necessities of life, the right to a measure of security, the luring attractions of other fields of high and honorable endeavor and the dictates of simple justice and right demand that our teachers be paid better salaries. This is a matter of primary importance. I, therefore, urge the General Assembly to appropriate funds sufficient to assure substantial increases in teacher salaries.

The adequacy of school buildings and the sufficiency of teacher salaries are only two of the elements that must be provided for. There is a third: As never before, we must concern ourselves, thoughtfully and critically, with a reappraisal of what is taught.

It is a shopworn phrase, I know, to say that we live in a perilous time, and a great challenge lies before us. We have heard the admonition so many times that peril has lost its meaning, and challenge has lost its cutting edge. Yet the awesome, chilling truth is that our peril is indeed great: Russia has already demonstrated her power to deliver a major instantaneous attack; it would be folly to treat as mere sham the threat of her masters to bury us. If the Soviet Union continues unchallenged in her preeminence in the field of science, she can win the cold war over any length of time she chooses.

We are familiar with Wellington's famed remark that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton; we must see to it that the mastery of space is not won in the Communist schools of Moscow. Russia attained her superiority in scientific achievement through her classrooms. We must meet the challenge to survival through ours. The demands of long-range technology, not merely in terms of our happiness and security but in the terms of survival itself, can be met only through properly educated men and women.

The common defense and general welfare are responsibilities of the Federal Government. Education remains one of the most important functions of State and local government. The direction and control of the classroom is a prerogative of the State. The State, therefore, controls the source of supply of advanced scientists needed for the present and future defense of the country, as well as for the broader programs of this competitive industrial age.

The rights pertaining to State sovereignty, about which we are so deeply concerned, are invested with corresponding responsibilities. Failure of the State properly to bear these responsibilities creates a vacuum and invites the exercise of invading Federal authority. Failure of the State to exercise its rights, in time of need, is tantamount to their abandonment. The greatest and most sincere demonstration, economically, politically and socially, which can be made at this time for the retention of our rights, would be a major assumption of State responsibility in the field of education in the present national crisis.

I urge the General Assembly and the people of Virginia to join with me in finding bold and imaginative ways in which we of Virginia may rise to this challenge. In this regard, I recommend to the earnest and urgent consideration of the assembly the excellent report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council relating to the education of scientists and other specialists. This report was prepared before Russia's convincing demonstration of superiority. These later developments impose a high degree of urgency that the recommendations be promptly implemented, and that they be deemed a minimum program for improving the quantity and quality of our education of scientists and engineers.

Let me emphasize that last comment if I may: Virginia ought not ever to be contented with merely a minimum program. We must never lag in preserving and cultivating Virginia's capacity for leadership among the States of the Union. We should never be content to rest upon past glories; these should merely inspire us to future achievements. With determination, with vision, and with a willingness to work hard, Virginia rightfully may aspire to a position of leadership in the natural and physical sciences, just as Virginia long ago carved bold new roads in the field of political science. Yet I would caution, in this regard, that a renewed emphasis upon training in science must never be imposed at the neglect of equal emphasis upon training in the humanities. It has been aptly said that the preservation of western civilization demands of our educators two things: the development of scientists who can build a more deadly weapon, and the development of statesmen who can prevent its being used.

There are many other matters of vital importance to the progress and welfare of Virginia that I would like to discuss with you. To do so at this time would involve further trespass upon your kindness and patience.

I wish to express to the legislature my supreme pleasure for the high privilege and opportunity of working and cooperating with them in a spirit of mutual good will, confidence, and respect. It has been my good fortune in recent years to have served with them in an advisory capacity. My respect and admiration for their assiduous attention to duty and their profound loyalty and devotion to Virginia are a deep source of encouragement and inspiration to me as I assume this high office.

With immovable faith in the efficacy of prayer; with full recognition of my own limitations; with firm trust in Almighty God; humbly invoking His guidance of my will and purpose, and in supreme reliance upon Him for wisdom and strength, I dedicate all that I am, and pray to be, to the service of the people of Virginia. With my whole heart, I pray to merit their confidence as we walk with firm step and high resolve into the days which lie ahead.

---

## EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AND THE FREE WORLD ALLIANCE

**Mr. NEUBERGER.** Mr. President, if we are to have a community of freedom-loving nations, there must be trade and commerce among those nations. Such trade has been promoted and advanced by the reciprocal-trade agreements, which were begun in 1934 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Happily, the basic spirit of these agreements has been continued by President Harry S Truman and President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In 1955 it was my privilege to support President Eisenhower's request for a 3-year extension of the trade program, which has helped to increase our ocean commerce and our economic ties with other free nations. Eastern Oregon grain growers are particularly aware of these overseas benefits.

On January 1, 1958, the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., published a forthright editorial urging extension of the reciprocal-trade program after its expiration in June of this year. The editors of the Oregonian also pertinently took the administration to task for proposed plans to broaden "escape clause" features of the trade agreements to the point where the entire program could be reduced to a nullity.

We of the Senate soon will be called upon to debate and determine this crucial issue, and so I ask unanimous consent that the Oregonian editorial of January 1, 1958, entitled "Hole in Trade Policy," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLE IN TRADE POLICY

Advocates of a liberal foreign-trade policy, an important element in America's approach to its allies, are expressing concern over escape-clause provisions in the administration's reciprocal-trade program announced in mid-December.

In a joint statement issued by the Departments of State and Commerce, it was revealed that the Executive will seek from Congress a 5-year extension of Presidential authority to adjust tariff rates on a reciprocal basis. So far, so good. But the announcement also disclosed a significant relaxation in the official attitude on the escape clause which permits the Tariff Commission to recommend and the President to approve increases in particular tariffs as a safeguard to certain domestic industries.

The present reciprocal trade law permits such increases to a maximum of 50 percent above the rates of July 1, 1945. The new proposal would change the base date to July 1, 1934, when tariff rates were generally much higher.

"European dissatisfaction with American trade policies," writes Brendan M. Jones in the New York Times, "has been concerned mainly with uncertainties arising from escape-clause actions. The basis for invoking the clause to oppose imports has been steadily broadened under protectionist pressure. This has made for marked instability in a field where long-term development is essential." He points out that the common-market grouping of six Western European nations, which becomes effective January 1, will make more necessary than ever a freer, rather than a more protective, trade policy. Free-trade supporters, he adds, may actually oppose the administration's free-trade program because of the escape-clause change.

President Eisenhower has rejected the bulk of escape-clause petitions under the current law, but he has approved increases in tariffs on such important imports as watches and bicycles.

There are no longer clear-cut party lines on the tariff issue. Congressional Democrats have grown more protectionist minded as the South has grown in industrial activity. And many Republicans in the North have been influenced by the dependence on world markets by such vast enterprises as the automobile and appliance manufacturers. In the last Senate struggle on the reciprocal trade program, in 1955, Oregon's Democratic Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER went down the line for the Eisenhower program, whereas his colleague, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, opposed it at some points, although he voted for the final bill. All Pacific coast Senators, Democrats and Republicans, joined in the favorable action on the 3-year act.

The division is by economic rather than partisan interest. Oregon berry and nut growers have determinedly opposed trade concessions, which have weakened their domestic markets. But Oregon's wheat growers depend, in good measure, on foreign trade. Should the former gain their ends, the latter would certainly suffer.

An escape clause is an essential part of the reciprocal trade program, as a safeguard against real hardship. But it could be the destruction of the program itself if overdone. Reciprocity is by definition a process of give and take. Those who fancy they are required to give too much must come to understand that reciprocal trade negotiations are an essential economic tool serving the overall interest of the United States and its allies—an overriding interest even for those whose industries give in the form of tariff concessions.

## THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1959

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have just issued with respect to the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1959.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD IN COMMENTING ON THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1959.

The new $74 billion Federal budget—highest in peacetime history—estimates that tax revenue will increase by $2 billion, or 3 percent, over receipts for the current year.

In addition, $700 million of revenue from postal-rate increases not yet approved by Congress is used to achieve a balance.

In view of the present declining business cycle, I believe a drop in tax revenue is more likely than an increase, as the Federal Government is mainly dependent on income taxes which fluctuate with business conditions.

In making these estimates of increased revenue, the administration should have taken warning from the fact that as late as October it was overestimating revenue for the current year, ending June 30, by $1.1 billion. Now, in January, it concedes that its $1.5 billion surplus will be changed to a $400 million deficit by the end of the year in June.

I call the new fiscal program for the coming year reckless. It is likely to lead to substantial deficit spending with all of its evil consequences.

Since 1940 the purchasing power of our dollar has dropped more than 51 percent, and deficit financing has been the principal inflationary factor.

Under conditions facing us now, it is more imperative than ever before to maintain the soundest possible conditions in Federal fiscal policy.

In view of the continuing necessity to increase essential expenditures for missiles, satellites, etc., to assure a balanced budget and a sound economy for the coming year and the future, it is absolutely necessary to cut nonessential expenditures in all areas—military, civilian, and foreign aid.

In this respect the President's new budget leaves much to be desired. There is a general pay raise of more than $1 billion; there are new grant programs for schools, slum clearance, and civilian defense; there is new authority to spend directly out of the debt for housing, Export-Import Bank, and TVA; and so forth.

Actually, expenditures for strictly domestic-civilian activities, exclusive of national security, foreign aid and international affairs, are estimated at the highest figure in history. In this new budget they total more than $30 billion, including highways, postal deficit, and FNMA. As compared with $19.1 billion in the first Eisenhower budget of 1954, this is an increase of 58 percent. It is $1.4 billion more than current year expenditure estimates.

This is an area which certainly should be reduced substantially.

## THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the President's budget message emphasizes again the necessity for approving a TVA self-financing plan. This is the second year in which his budget has contemplated large construction expenditures out of revenue-bond funds, and in which the appropriations for TVA have been negligible.

I am all for putting the TVA on a self-financing basis, but we cannot exist much longer neither fish nor fowl—neither receiving appropriations, nor authorized by law to finance ourselves.

We in the valley, therefore, will expect the President to help us pass the self-financing bill. A good self-financing bill was passed by the Senate last year, but we shall need the administration's help in the House if such a measure is to be enacted.

## THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE HENDERSON L. LANHAM, OF GEORGIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives, which was read:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HENDERSON L. LANHAM, a Representative from the State of Georgia.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 215) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HENDERSON L. LANHAM, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the State of Georgia and the Nation sustained a great loss on November 10, 1957, with the tragic death of the Honorable HENDERSON L. LANHAM, the Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM was on his way to address an educational meeting when, while crossing a railroad track, he was unfortunately struck by a switch engine, and was instantly killed.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to know HENDERSON LANHAM intimately for almost 30 years. He and I served together in the General Assembly of my State of Georgia in 1927. He was truly a dedicated public servant.

I have often heard the old expression, referring to someone, that "he was a scholar and a gentleman." That expression truly fitted HENDERSON LANHAM.

He was a retiring man. He was modest almost to the point of timidity in some of the social relations of life; but in the public arena, Mr. President, HENDERSON LANHAM defended his convictions and the principles in which he believed with the courage of a lion. He was a man of unblemished character, a devoted father, and a helpful friend. He spent the greater part of his life in the service of his State and Nation.

HENDERSON LANHAM will be missed in the Halls of Congress. He will be missed by the people of his State and district. His passing is a loss to the Nation. I mourn him as a personal friend who has crossed over to the Great Beyond.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson once observed that "when a man assumes a public trust, he should consider himself as public property"; and Caroline Norton once wrote that "they serve God well who serve his creatures."

No man ever followed those worthy philosophies more conscientiously and unselfishly than did the late HENDERSON L. LANHAM, Congressman from the Seventh District of Georgia, whose unfortunate and untimely death last November saddened all Georgians.

Representative LANHAM devoted all of his adult life to the service of his fellowman—as chairman of his city school board, as representative of his county in the general assembly of Georgia, as solicitor general of his judicial circuit, and as Representative of his district in Congress for 6 terms.

And he died as he lived; for, at the time of the tragic collision between his car and a railroad switch engine, he was enroute to speak to a gathering of his constituents.

His undeviating dedication to his duty and responsibility as a public servant earned for HENDERSON LOVELACE LANHAM the respect, admiration, and love of all who knew him.

He was respected for his deep convictions and unimpeachable integrity.

He was admired for his great wisdom and recognized scholarship.

He was loved for his genuine humanity and heartfelt concern for others.

He was a man of forthrightness and vision who believed in and espoused the fundamentals of constitutional government and who sought progress for all within their framework. He once summed up his philosophy of Government in the statement, "I am a progressive without being radical."

His dedication, brilliance, foresight, and courage are attributes greatly needed in positions of leadership in these perilous times. He will be sorely missed.

In the death of HENDERSON LANHAM the Seventh Congressional District of Georgia has lost an able public servant.

The State of Georgia has lost one of its most illustrious sons.

The Nation has lost one of its most capable lawmakers.

And I have lost a warm and valued personal friend.

His example will long inspire those who follow in his footsteps and stand as a model to those who would fulfill the true vocation of man as defined by Tolstoi—"to serve other people."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on proceeding to the consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to.

## DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FROXMIRE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], both of whom are unavoidably absent, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 216), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on proceeding to the consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to.

## ABSENCES FROM DUTY OF UNITED STATES AMBASSADORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statistical table furnished by the State Department indicating the absences from duty of the United States Ambassadors, both career and noncareer. Since that time I have made a subsequent statement indicating that there was an error insofar as the duty of Ambassador Wiley Buchanan was concerned.

On that occasion the table furnished by the State Department indicated that Ambassador John Davis Lodge had been absent from his post in Madrid for 143 days for reasons other than official duty or illness. These alleged absences covered a 2-year period. I have found out since that Ambassador Lodge during the 2 years in question was absent from his post 127 days; and of these 127 days, 24 days were vacation, as vacation is counted for all Foreign Service personnel other than chiefs of mission. The act of July 2, 1953, 67th United States Statutes at Large, page 137, amended the Leave Act effective July 5, 1953, to exempt from the act chiefs of mission (1 F. S. M. 111) and career ambassadors. Of these 24 days' vacation, 16 days were taken in 1955 and 8 in 1956. The State Department states that this record of vacations compares favorably with the vacations taken by Foreign Service personnel. Indeed, it is considerably lower than the average home leave for career people which averages about 45 days—work days—vacation every 2 years. This is about twice the vacation time away from post which Lodge took during 1955 and 1956.

The balance of the 127 days during which Lodge was absent from his post in 1955 and 1956, or 103 days, is divided as follows: 29 days active naval duty, 58 days official consultations in Washington and elsewhere. This includes accompanying the Spanish Foreign Minister on his trip to the United States in 1956, going to Paris on confer with Secretary of State Dulles, going to Paris to attend a Conference of American Chiefs of Mission in Western Europe, at which Secretary Dulles spoke.

Sixteen days of weekends and holidays, which are not counted as vacation for Foreign Service personnel.

To recapitulate, Ambassador Lodge was absent from his post in Madrid for 127 days during 1955 and 1956 for the following reasons: 24 days, vacation; 29 days, active naval duty; 58 days official consultations in Washington and elsewhere; 16 days, weekends and holidays not counted as vacation by Foreign Service personnel; 127 days, total.

Mr. President, I want to state that, in my opinion, John Davis Lodge is performing a most distinguished service as the Ambassador of the United States to Spain. I wish to state also that I have in my possession a letter from Deputy Under Secretary of State Loy Henderson which corroborates the information I have already given and which expresses the regret that the State Department had issued the earlier misleading figures.

It is my hope that this statement will clarify the record of Ambassador Lodge and put it in true perspective. If I have in any way, as a result of inserting in the RECORD the statistical tables furnished me by the State Department, done a disservice to Ambassador Lodge or created the wrong impression I want to take this means to apologize and state to the Senate my high personal regard

for him, and to say that we are fortunate to have in Madrid a man of the caliber of John Lodge, who has conducted himself with dignity and honor and has interested himself in the betterment of United States-Spanish relations. He is an asset to our country in a most difficult post and he represents us with honor, distinction and ability.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the Senator from Montana for correcting the RECORD. What the Senator has stated about the distinguished Ambassador to Spain, who, of course, comes from my State of Connecticut, is something with which I am sure everyone who knows of the work the Ambassador has done would agree. He is an outstanding Ambassador and certainly a credit to our State Department. We in the State of Connecticut are extremely proud of him, and we are glad to see the Senator from Montana recognizes these outstanding qualities, also.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

---

## PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is generally conceded that the Office of President of the United States is one of the most—if not the most—important offices in the Free World. In addition to the awesome responsibilities originally conferred by the Constitution upon the President, practice and precedent have increased both the powers and the responsibilities of this office so that the occupant of that office now possesses tremendous influence not only in domestic but also in international affairs. Anything which affects an institution as important as this is, therefore, a matter of grave concern to the people of the United States and certainly to their elected representatives.

The recent illness of the President, telescoped as it was upon two prior illnesses, has served to focus attention again upon the exercise of the powers and duties of this extremely important office during periods when the President may be incapacitated. While there might have been some question of propriety in mentioning this subject at one time, the President's commendable initiative in submitting a constitutional amendment on the matter has served to dispel that concern. The President, in conference with Congressional leaders and publicly, has strongly urged that Congress act to clear up this area of doubt in our Constitution. The concern today is not, and should not be, obscured by the personalities of those who temporarily occupy the Offices of President and Vice President. The question which must constantly be uppermost in all minds in the consideration of this subject is the question of the successful operation of democratic institutions and their survival at all times, but particularly in time of peril.

The Constitution, of course, provides that in the event of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office "the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

It is difficult to know what the authors of the Constitution intended by the term "inability" since inability or disability was never defined and was mentioned only once in the debates of the Constitutional Convention. According to Madison's notes, Mr. Dickinson expressed the thought that the section under discussion was too vague and wanted to know the extent of the term "disability" and who was to be the judge of it. So far as is known, no one answered the questions and there was no further discussion bearing upon this point.

The questions asked by Mr. Dickinson at the Constitutional Convention might not now be so important had it not been for the precedent established by Vice President John Tyler who, when he assumed the office of President in 1841 after the death of President Harrison, took the oath of President and contended that he was in fact the President and not Acting President of the United States. This contention rests upon an interpretation that the words "the same" have reference of the Office of the Presidency, as distinguished from the powers and duties of the office. The precedent established by Vice President Tyler has since been confirmed six times, by Fillmore, Johnson, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Truman, and is, therefore, well established by custom. The practice, however, of a Vice President assuming the office of President, rather than assuming the powers and duties of the office, has served to inject doubt concerning the power of a temporarily disabled President to resume the powers and duties of his office upon recovery from his disability after having relinquished such powers and duties to the Vice President. As a matter of fact, the doubt so created has been afforded such weight that in two instances in the history of the United States, Vice Presidents have refused to assume the powers and duties of the Office of President of the United States, although the situation, in retrospect, would certainly seem to have warranted such action.

In 1881, for example, during the 80 days of President Garfield's fatal illness, he performed but one single act—the signing of an extradition paper. The Cabinet at one time met and discussed the inability question. All agreed upon the desirability of Vice President Arthur's acting as President during President Garfield's illness; but 4 of the 7 Cabinet members, including the Attorney General, thought that the powers and duties of the office could not temporarily devolve upon the Vice President. As a result, the Cabinet decided that they would not advise the President to encourage the Vice President to act as President, since it might be construed that they were asking the President to vacate his office for the remainder of his term.

The second instance in which the Nation stood in peril for lack of resolution of this question occurred during the administration of President Woodrow Wilson. President Wilson's illness was of a more prolonged duration than that of President Garfield, lasting from September 25, 1919, until almost the end of his term in March of 1921. During this period, because of his inability, 28 acts of Congress became law without the President's signature. The President did not meet with his Cabinet for 8 months. The British Ambassador spent 4 months in Washington without being received by the President. Leaders in the Senate sought to discuss the terms of the Versailles Treaty with the President, but were refused permission to see him by the President's physician. The affairs of Government were largely disposed of by decisions of the President's wife, his aides in the White House, and certain members of his Cabinet. The Cabinet considered asking the Vice President to act as President, but the White House contingent fought the move. A prominent Cabinet member, Secretary of State Lansing, who approached the President's secretary with a suggestion of this nature, was rebuked and later forced to submit his resignation upon the recovery of the President.

Even from the vantage point of historical perspective, no one can accurately assess today just what damage was done to the United States and the world by this impasse. The League of Nations was then up in the air. Many today believe that greater United States participation could have so changed the international climate that World War II might have been averted. The League was President Wilson's brain child. Had he been succeeded by Vice President Marshall, who then would have borne the responsibility for decision and leadership, would the outcome have been different?

No one really knows—no one can really say. All we do know is that such a period of inaction in today's world might be even more costly, and thus it is well that we pay heed to the maxim that the wise prepare, while others postpone. The lessons of the past, combined with the concern of the present, have impelled me to explore the adequacy of the Constitution and the laws of the United States respecting this question and, in my judgment, they are in need of repair.

When these matters were previously considered by the Congress, solution was rendered impossible by the failure of those who desired a solution to agree upon the mechanism of that solution. Some have contended that the problem ought to be dealt with by act of Congress. Others have felt that a constitutional amendment was necessary. All seem to have recognized that a critical question to be resolved is, By whom shall the inability be determined? At present the Constitution seems to place the determination of inability in the hands of the Vice President, who must,

of necessity, act at his peril. He must depend, of course, upon popular acceptance of his decision and he must face the possibility that the legality of his assumption of the powers and duties of the office may be challenged in the courts of the United States. As former Senator Lyman Trumbull, of Illinois, pointed out in a symposium printed in the North American Review in November 1881, just a few months after President Garfield was fatally wounded—

> Any Vice President who should assume those duties in a doubtful case, when the exigency did not unmistakably require it, would be treated as a usurper by all patriotic citizens.

POSSIBLE COURT TESTS

The Vice President must also reckon with the fact that in any court test the Constitution may be interpreted in such a way as to prevent the resumption of the powers and duties of the Presidency by the President himself upon recovery. This has, in the two instances cited, proved to be such an obstacle that the Vice Presidents of the United States have refused to accept the powers and duties of the office, although had they done so, history could not have been critical of them.

The role of the Vice President as the sole constitutional agent for the determination of the question of Presidential inability has been criticized, since the Vice President is, in a very real sense, a party in interest. This has led to suggestions that his discretion should be conditioned upon, or replaced by, a determination by, first, the Supreme Court; second, the Congress; third, the Cabinet; or fourth, a Presidential commission.

In 1920, Representative Fess, of Ohio, proposed a constitutional amendment which would have utilized the services of the Supreme Court, the Congress, the Cabinet, and the Vice President. He proposed that disability be determined by the Supreme Court when authorized by concurrent resolution of Congress. If Congress was not in session, the Vice President was authorized to call Congress into special session for the purpose of considering such a resolution upon recommendation of the Cabinet.

Currently, there are proposals before the House of Representatives which would make the Supreme Court, the Cabinet, or a Presidential commission the agency for determining or recommending Presidential inability. The proposal which the administration has indicated it favors, casts the Cabinet in the decisive role. At the outset of this session, there were only two proposals on this subject pending in the Senate. One is proposed as a constitutional amendment and the other as a straight bill.

Senator FULBRIGHT has submitted a proposed constitutional amendment which would provide that the Supreme Court, by majority vote, could determine the question of Presidential capacity to serve, after the passage of a concurrent resolution by the Congress stating that the Congress believed the President unable to perform the powers and duties of his office. Under the proposal of the junior Senator from Arkansas, the same procedure would have to be followed in order for the President to resume his constitutional functions.

Senator PAYNE has introduced proposed legislation which would permit the Chief Justice, after receiving notification from the Vice President that the Vice President believed the President incapacitated, to impanel a board of from 3 to 5 medical specialists from civilian life. Each specialist would examine the President and, if all concurred that the President was physically unable to perform his duties, the Chief Justice would so notify the Congress in writing and the Vice President would assume the powers and duties of the Presidency. His amendment reflects the view of those who believe that Congress now has the constitutional power to legislate in this field.

Last Thursday I introduced two additional proposals, which were in due course referred to the Committee on the Judiciary where the Fulbright and Payne proposals were already pending. I submitted these two proposals, not in anywise to prejudice consideration of the two pending proposals, but rather to lay before the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary alternative procedures for consideration. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I am aware of the need for a thorough and dispassionate study of this whole area of the law. It seemed to me that a submission of these proposals would contribute to such consideration. Of the two proposals which I have submitted, one would merely confer upon the Congress authority to prescribe by law the procedure for determining the inability of the President of the United States and the question of his fitness to resume the powers and duties of that office. This proposal has the benefit of brevity, which most persons are willing to concede is a commendable consideration in the drafting of constitutional amendments.

The other amendment, however, is more detailed. This amendment would create a commission or committee composed of the heads of the executive departments of the Government of the United States and the majority and minority leaders of both Houses. The commission would be chaired by the Chief Justice of the United States, who would have no vote in the proceedings. It could be called into session by either the Vice President or upon written application of six of the members of the commission, addressed to the Chief Justice. The commission would call for such medical and other testimony as it desired and would be required to determine the question: Is the President able to discharge the powers and duties of his office? If a majority of the commission found that he was not able to perform the duties of his office, such powers and duties would then devolve upon the Vice President, who would continue to assume those powers and duties until the commission determined that the President was able to resume the powers and duties of his office.

The subcommittee, therefore, will have before it what I believe are four basic approaches to a solution of this problem, namely:

First. A simple amendment, granting Congress the authority to provide the detailed solution by statute, which is more easily changed or adjusted to meet future contingencies, but which by that very fact also lacks the stability of constitutional amendment.

Second. A constitutional amendment, conferring the power of decision in the matter upon the Supreme Court, following reference of the question to the Court by Congress.

Third. A constitutional amendment setting up a commission which includes representatives of all three branches of Government, but which admittedly is weighted in favor of the executive branch.

Fourth. A statutory approach.

I have not undertaken to discuss the issue of whether remedial legislation in this field must take the form of a constitutional amendment or may be accomplished by a simple statute. The former Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, has endorsed the view that the change should be made by constitutional amendment. Certainly such a method would present no opportunity for challenge at some future critical period on constitutional grounds. On the other hand, a statute on the subject might invite such a challenge which could serve as a severe hindrance to essential action. I expect, however, that this question will be fully explored at hearings which, as chairman of the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have scheduled to begin on January 23, 1958. I have discussed this problem and make this announcement at this time not by way of suggesting that the subcommittee intends to consider this important subject in haste, but rather to alert those who are interested and knowledgeable on this subject that the subcommittee desires and intends to take information and testimony looking to a solution of what is surely a difficult and vexatious problem. Whether, after the subcommittee has completed this initial task it will prove more able to reach agreement on a solution than its predecessors have been, I cannot predict. I would suggest, that if we are not willing, in the light of our present knowledge, to undertake such a task, we will deserve the condemnation of those who must live with the uncertainties which our inaction will have served to perpetuate.

I hope that any Senators or citizens who have any suggestions, ideas, or proposals in this connection will see that they are sent to the Judiciary subcommittee.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JERE COOPER, OF TENNESSEE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 421) from the House of Representatives, which was read:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JERE COOPER, a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GORE] and myself, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 217) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JERE COOPER, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during the period of adjournment of the Congress, Tennessee and the Nation lost a dedicated public servant in the death of Representative JERE COOPER, of Dyersburg.

For 29 years Representative COOPER served in the House and through seniority and ability he rose to become chairman of the Ways and Means Committee which, as we all know, is the tax-raising committee in Congress. This is an exacting and difficult position. JERE COOPER served it well. It is a position in which one is constantly badgered by the pressures of special interests but he kept the national interest uppermost.

In that position he applied his own personal trait of thrift for even back in his boyhood days he had the reputation of saving odd bits, such as string, nails, and paper. He did what he could to conserve the funds of the United States. Representative COOPER was known as a man of political courage. He was a strong and consistent supporter of the reciprocal trade policy fathered by another Tennessean, the late Cordell Hull. One of his last official acts was to write a strong letter of protest criticizing a proposal to ask Congress to boost tariffs on lead and zinc. This took political courage, for there are strong interests on the other side in his home State.

Representative COOPER gained a reputation in Dyersburg as a working youngster, and he kept up that pace throughout his entire career. A veteran of World War I, he was first elected to the House in 1927 and was in his 15th consecutive term at the time of his death. He will be greatly missed on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the late Honorable JERE COOPER was a man apart. Introspective and studious, he was sometimes regarded as alone or aloof. This, in my opinion, was never his intent or desire. Through a long association I found him warmhearted, compassionate, understanding. He was not only understanding of the foibles and problems of his close friends, but he had a true understanding of the sentiments and aspirations of those in the average walks of life. Through a long Congressional career his service was dedicated to the public welfare, as he understood it.

His understanding of public welfare was a broad one—so broad that it reached far beyond the boundaries of the Congressional district he was honored to represent, and in which representation he honored that district. Broader than his State, his was truly a national outlook.

Even more than that, as my senior colleague has said, he took broad positions of enlightened self-interest for America. On questions of foreign policy he was a leader for an enlightened economic foreign policy. He was a man truly worthy of the title "United States Congressman." His every sentiment was identified with the national welfare. His every aspiration was to serve ably, correctly, and nobly.

Mr. President, at the time I was elected to Congress, JERE COOPER had been a Member of the House for 10 years. I went to him for advice, for guidance, and for help. He gave all of them to me, literally taking personal responsibility in guiding my early years in Congress in responsible paths. I was grateful to him, and we enjoyed a warm friendship. I admired him. I loved him as a colleague and as a friend.

Congress has lost a great Member, the country has lost a Representative of truly national proportions. I join my distinguished colleague in the authorship of the resolution and in extending to the members of his family and to his many—yes, his legion of—friends the deepest sympathy and condolences upon the passing of this great American.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the State of Tennessee and our Nation lost another devoted public servant when the Honorable JERE COOPER, a Member of the House of Representatives in every Congress since the Seventy-first, was called from among us by a Higher Being.

JERE COOPER served in Congress during a long period of far-reaching changes in our country and in the world. He participated actively in the making of many of these changes. He was a forward-looking man, a man of vision, a patriotic man who worked hard for the people of his district and for Americans generally.

As chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee during the latter years of his service in Congress, Representative COOPER occupied a position of great power. He used that position to advance the general good.

It was my personal privilege to serve with JERE COOPER during my years in the House. I know at firsthand of his devotion to the public welfare, and I miss him as a colleague and as a friend.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it was in 1935, when I began my service in the House of Representatives, that I first met and learned to know JERE COOPER. As Members of that body, we became friends, and at the beginning of my third term in the House, I was elected as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee. At that time it was under the very able leadership of an outstanding American, a great patriot, the Honorable Robert Doughton, of North Carolina. Next to him on the committee was JERE COOPER, of Tennessee.

It was my privilege to serve on that committee for 8 years, and therefore I had an opportunity not only to be associated with JERE COOPER, but I learned to know him as a man of integrity, sincerity, and great ability.

Others have spoken of his great statesmanship, with which I am in thorough accord, and others have dwelled at length on his great integrity. I want to speak of him as a personal friend.

As you knew JERE COOPER, you could not help but learn to admire him for his sincerity and his integrity. It can be truly said that his word was his bond. When he made a commitment, you never had any fears that the decision might be something else, no matter when final action took place. I think it can be honestly stated that he never gave his word lightly; but, once given, that was it.

He possessed a keen and analytical mind which was capable of analyzing the most complex problems, and those of us who have had the privilege of serving on the House Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee can readily appreciate how complex and how difficult are some of the tax problems that confront the members of those committees.

JERE did not arrive at hasty decisions or make snap judgments. He explored every phase of the pending problem and I am personally going to miss his leadership in the field of taxation. Not only that, this Congress and the country are going to miss it, because he was an outstanding authority.

Another trait of JERE COOPER's that I want to mention was his fairness. He had some very definite views and never hesitated to express them, but during my many years of acquaintance with him, he never made a disparaging remark about those who had different views and different ideas on the same matter.

I know of no field in the legislative processes in which integrity, sincerity, and fairness are more vital than in the fields of taxes, tariff, and social security—measures which affect the lives of each American citizen.

I say again, JERE COOPER will be sorely missed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, JERE COOPER was my friend. For 10 years I served on the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, where Representative COOPER served so long and with such great distinction.

It has been said, so many times that it has become almost trite, that JERE COOPER knew tax legislation, and knew it very thoroughly. This is indeed true.

Congress and our country will miss the devoted service which he gave to the Government. He was thorough in his work. He was dedicated. As has been stated, in dealing with his colleagues he

was always fair. He had his own viewpoints about taxation, but he was consistent. He held in high respect the opinions on tax legislation of those with whom he worked, including those with whom he disagreed.

He possessed a fine and noble character, and he was a great patriot.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about JERE COOPER. When I first came to the House of Representatives in January 1937, I came to know JERE COOPER. He was the zone chairman on the Ways and Means Committee for the State of Alabama, as well as the State of Tennessee, and perhaps other territory. It was to him that I made application for committee assignments at that time. I came to know him, to know him well, to like him, to admire him greatly. He was a clear thinker, a forceful advocate of things in which he believed, and an effective legislator.

As chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, a position to which he came when former Representative Bob Doughton retired from the House of Representatives, he became, naturally, one of the most powerful Members of the Congress of the United States, and by virtue of that office, one of the most powerful men in the Nation, certainly as one affecting our tax laws and the economic conditions. JERE COOPER worked hard at the job.

I was shocked when I learned that he had had an attack. I inquired about him from time to time. I was pleased when I learned he was making progress. But how greatly shocked I was the next day to get the sad news that he had passed away.

JERE COOPER was a good man and a good citizen. After all, Mr. President, I do not know of any better tribute that can be paid to a man after he has gone than to have those who knew him say he was a good citizen.

JERE COOPER was a fine, able, effective legislator; and I join with my colleagues in the many tributes which have been paid to him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in tribute to JERE COOPER.

I was elected to the 72d Congress in the year 1930. The Democrats then had a majority of one. Incidentally, there was held a special election up in northern Michigan, and a Democrat was elected. He constituted the majority.

It was that Congress which elected John Garner as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In order to have committee assignments, it was necessary to have a caucus. The caucus was presided over by the late John McDuffie, from Alabama, who was later a judge of the United States court. He had a terrible time with that bunch of Democrats feeling their power, being in the majority.

I recall vividly that when it came to the question of assigning Members to the different committees I voted for JERE COOPER to become a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. I have not had to apologize since. He did his job well. He carried on as only a sincere, devoted, dedicated Representative should. I am glad to pay this tribute to my late friend, to my good friend, JERE COOPER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 217) was unanimously agreed to.

---

## THE LATE SENATOR KENNETH McKELLAR, OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GORE] and myself, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Kenneth McKellar, formerly a Senator from the State of Tennessee and President pro tempore of the Senate.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, since this body adjourned last August it was my sad experience to attend the last rites of one of our former colleagues who served here for many years. Senator Kenneth D. McKellar died in Memphis, his home city, on October 25, 1957.

Senator McKellar will long be remembered as one of the most powerful and forceful men to serve in the Senate. For nearly 40 years he was in the thick of any legislative battle. He played an important role in the enactment of a variety of important laws in his 5 years in the House and more than 35 years in the Senate.

He often told the story of how he began in 1912 to plug for the first Federal aid to highways bill because he had discovered 2 years earlier how hard it was to drive an automobile from one section of the United States to the other. He planned a motor trip to New England in 1910 but found he had to ship his automobile from Tennessee to Washington before he could start driving north.

Senator McKellar credited the appearance of the German submarine *Deutchland* off the coast in 1916 with helping him to get the first highway appropriation. The United States was not yet at war with Germany, and the submarine was paying a friendly call. But Mr. McKellar argued that if in time of war submarines attacked the coast, the existing highway system would prove inadequate to move defense materials from one point to another. The argument is said to have been convincing to President Wilson.

Senator McKellar is also credited with bringing the first airmail service into existence.

Senator McKellar was for many years chairman of the Appropriations Committee. When President Roosevelt died in the spring of 1945 and Vice President Truman went to the White House, Senator McKellar acted as President of the Senate during the period of Democratic control.

He will long be remembered in Tennessee. His great efforts and the power of his position on the Appropriations Committee were exerted for the benefit of Tennessee. Many worthwhile improvements in Tennessee attest to his efforts in behalf of our State. Among them is the Tennessee Valley Authority.

He maintained over many years a dominant political position in our State, and he could count many devoted friends among our fellow citizens. He will long be remembered as one of the most colorful and powerful men to serve in the Senate during a period when the United States was emerging as the world's dominant democracy.

Even those who disagreed with him respected the tenacity and the vigor with which he fought for that in which he believed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the late Honorable Kenneth D. McKellar rendered a record of public service which few persons can or will equal. The material landmarks of that service are many and are extremely useful to the people not only of his State, which he loved, but of the entire United States. The character and duration of his service itself was a landmark, extending, as my senior colleague [Mr. KEFAUVER] has said, over an almost unprecedented period of time.

His was a service which was never touched with the flame of scandal; a service which was never marred with greed for profit. His was an honorable career in the highest sense of the term and the word.

Few men could claim the loyalty—the intense loyalty—of so many people. Few men could claim the enjoyment of a greater number of devoted personal and political friends. He served them and his State long and ably.

A time came when the people whom he served so loyally decided that with the inexorable march of time and circumstance a younger man should succeed to the burdens of the position. In the contest, in which I was a participant, there was no bitterness or vilification, there was no recrimination, either during the battle or afterward. The contest was vigorous but clean. Senator McKellar, so I am told, confided to friends that he was willing to submit the decision to the people whom he loved, and accept their verdict. That he did.

As today the Senate considers this resolution, the Members of this body who had the privilege of serving with the late Senator McKellar can reflect upon the many acts which he performed, upon the moments of personal triumphs. His triumphs were for the people. To him, public service was a high calling. He was devoted to public service. He gave his life to public service. Few men have served so effectively or so long.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who served for a number of years on the Appropriations Committee under the late Senator McKellar of Tennessee, I wish to add a brief word to the statements which already have been made about him.

I found Senator McKellar to be a very courteous and very generous chairman; when he recognized a member of either the majority or minority on the committee, he always insisted that that member

have the privilege of expressing himself fully and frankly. In the deliberations of the committee I found him always willing to listen to the views of a member from another section of the country, as expressing the problems of that section.

I respected him as a friend, and I liked him. He was always a partisan on certain partisan questions; but on questions of appropriations and on questions regarding where money could best be spent for the benefit of the country as a whole, he was open to reason and was very conscientious and very understanding.

Like many other Senators who served under Senator McKellar, I wish to take this brief opportunity to pay my respects to him and to his memory.

Mr. President, I should like to state that I left the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in charge of a committee of which I was a sitting member. He asked me to state that he wishes to join at the first possible opportunity in presenting his tribute to the late Senator McKellar, but that his duties in the committee prevent his doing so at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the passing last year of Senator Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee, the Nation lost a man who, prior to his retirement from the Senate in 1953, had made a lasting imprint on the history of the United States.

The late Senator from Tennessee, after serving three terms in the House of Representatives, was elected six times to the United States Senate.

He served with distinction as President pro tempore of the Senate.

He was acting chairman and chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee during the period when the United States was engaged in the greatest and most costly war ever fought.

To Kenneth McKellar, the Senate Chamber was home. He loved the Senate. In all the honors that came to him and in the face of the crushing burden of responsibility that was placed on him, he never neglected to look out for the interests of the people of the State he represented in the Senate. He was always on the job for Tennessee.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I had the privilege of serving with Senator Kenneth McKellar during 20 of his more than 40 years in the Congress of the United States—36 of them in the Senate.

The longer I worked with him, the more I admired his courage and independence, and the more I respected the keenness of his mind, which was characterized by a fine edge and penetrating power. I have been deeply distressed by his death.

I learned to respect Senator McKellar through early association with him on the Senate Rules Committee. I learned to appreciate his loyalty by observing his great assistance to my late colleague, Senator Carter Glass, when he was chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I knew him intimately as he sat here directly in front of me on the Senate floor.

He had his critics, but the substance of their criticism was that he was a man of blunt frankness, without sham or subterfuge.

I learned to know Senator McKellar as a man who never mistook shadow for substance. He was a man who imitated no one. In him was nothing of false originality, nothing of false grandeur, and nothing of false genius. I never knew him to exaggerate an expression or play to the galleries. He was not a man who attempted to assume either character or characteristics which were not his own.

He was a man of tremendous native force, who lived and worked by his own resources. His center of gravity lay in his patriotic devotion to this country and his Tennessee constituency. His actions were motivated and controlled by a constancy of duty, and by nature he tended to subordinate himself to his objectives. He was unalterably addicted to hard work, honesty, and duty.

The monuments to his tireless work in Congress are all about, many of them in the form of tangible accomplishments, for this and other generations to see.

His record of six consecutive elections to the Senate, after serving first in the House of Representatives, stands to date as an unsurpassed symbol of esteem in which he was held by those he represented.

His, indeed, was a life used up in the service of his country, his State, and his constituents. I am sure that was the way Senator McKellar wanted it, and therein was great patriotic contribution to others which deserved to be of great satisfaction unto himself.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, after having served in the Senate for a number of years with the late Senator McKellar, I wish to add my word of deep affection and respect for him. I personally came to know Senator McKellar well. I did not have the privilege of serving on a committee with him; but all of us who knew him came to feel that he was an institution in the Senate. He was one of the Members who served for a very long period of time, and he was one who always could be relied upon to sponsor and support the very best of legislation.

I wish to add this word to the words of other Senators who have spoken to honor the service of Senator McKellar. I desire to express my deep affection for Senator McKellar, and to express my deep sympathy to his family at his passing last year.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it may seem strange to the senior Members of the Senate that the junior Senator from New Hampshire would request time to join in the tributes to the late Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, because I did not have the privilege of serving in this body with him. But, strangely enough, my acquaintance and friendship with Senator McKellar have perhaps been longer than those of many of the senior Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, there are a number of Members of the Senate who, in days gone by, had the privilege of serving the Senate as attachés. On March 1, 1925, nearly 33 years ago, when just out of college, I came here and began my service as one of the clerks of the old Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I came under the patronage of Senator Moses, of New Hampshire, who was chairman of that committee; and Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, was then the ranking Democratic member of the committee. I served as clerk of a special subcommittee on post roads, of which those two Senators were members, along with certain Members of the House of Representatives. The subcommittee held hearings in various parts of the country. For 4 years I worked for Senator Kenneth McKellar.

I think some of the present Members of the Senate may well bear in mind that in the years to come, when we are gone and when the memory of our service here has been faded by time, we shall live longest in the minds of the younger men with whom we are associated—the men in our offices and those who serve us so well on the floor of the Senate.

I came to be very fond of Senator Kenneth McKellar. My association with him was made closer by another fact, namely, that during the time of my service, I fell in love with a girl who was one of his secretaries. I married her. She was a Tennesseean. She was a Democrat, as Senator McKellar was a great Democrat. We have been married for 30 years. It took me a long time to get her to vote Republican, because of the influence of her younger days.

The Senator from Tennessee referred to the fact that Senator McKellar liked to travel by automobile, and that he failed to reach New England. However, he did come to New England several times in later years, and I had the privilege of having him as a guest in my home on two different occasions in New Hampshire.

It was a source of sorrow to me that I did not come to the Senate until just after he ceased to be a Member, because it would have been a great privilege to me to have said that I had served with him even briefly after the years that I worked for him on committee.

Senator McKellar was a man of terrific energy and an intense, burning zeal. He was always forthright. He was always fervent. He was often fiery in his approach to questions in the Senate and in the committee. He was warmhearted, impulsive, generous, kindly. He had all the virtues, as he doubtless had some of the faults, of a very intense personality.

I deem it a privilege, 30 years after having worked for him in an intimate capacity on one of the committees of the Senate, to join with distinguished Members who have paused to pay tribute to a man who served in this body so long, who loved it so much, and who was so dedicated to its traditions and its history.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in the Senate in saying just a word in tribute to the late Senator McKellar. Senator McKellar came from the State of Alabama originally. He grew up in a small town in south central Alabama, went to school at the University of Alabama, and even though after graduation from there he set up his residence in the neighboring State of Tennessee, he always retained a very active interest in Alabama. I may say that we were very

proud of being able to claim him as a native son.

It was my pleasure to get to know Senator McKellar quite well both during my service in the House of Representatives and also during my service here in the Senate. We had many interests in common, but there was one in particular, the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has meant so much to our area.

Senator McKellar was a diligent, effective worker in the Senate of the United States. He was a good citizen in every sense of the word. He will long be missed, and I am glad I had the opportunity to say just these words of tribute to him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, Senator McKellar was a very good friend of mine. I can say that because I used to be a clerk in the Senate from 1916 to 1920, when he was new in the Senate. He and John K. Shields were the Senators from Tennessee at the time.

Mr. President, when one is an employee of the Senate, he knows his place, and he looks up to Senators. Sometimes he may think he knows more than a Senator. Notwithstanding that, I admired Senator McKellar very much. I liked his persistence. As a matter of fact, when I came to the Senate I remember that the present secretary for the minority was a page. After I came to the Senate I said to Senator McKellar on one occasion, "Senator, you know, when you snap your finger I still jump." And I generally did.

I admired Senator McKellar for his persistence, for his interest in the United States, and particularly for his interest in the State of Tennessee and in the South.

I know on one occasion I was deeply interested in the construction of a dam right outside of Knoxville. I was on my way back from New Mexico by automobile, and it appeared that the Committee on Appropriations was evenly divided as to that particular item in the appropriation. He even had the United States marshal looking for me at Fort Smith. Eventually, at 2 o'clock in the morning, he got hold of me on the telephone at the Albert Pike Hotel in Little Rock, Ark. He said, "CHAVEZ, you have to come. Send me a wire now that you will be in favor of this dam." He said, "You can break the tie."

I sent him the wire, but he was not satisfied with that. He said, "Telephone to the committee tomorrow." So I did that. He certainly was a worker for Tennessee, and he was a good Member of the United States Senate.

I am very glad to pay my personal tribute to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, one of the first calls I made upon arriving in Washington to take my seat in the Senate was on the then senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator McKellar. My colleague had been unavoidably detained, and I went to the dean of the Senate to ask him to present me for the taking of my oath.

He was warm and gracious in his response and there began that day a friendship which grew warmer through the years and which I shall always cherish because to Kenneth McKellar friendship was a living and tangible reality, not a mere play on words. In countless ways both politically and personally he gave many of us his devotion in the years that followed.

He was a man of fierce loyalties and with tremendous courage. In his long service in the Senate and in the House of Representatives he had acquired an intimate knowledge of our Government and there were few who could match his skill and wisdom as a legislator. He fought with vigor against what he considered bad for the Nation and he strove with equal fervor for the program he believed necessary for progress and for the prosperity of our people. Those of us who served with him here knew him as a resourceful and powerful adversary in any cause he chose to champion.

Kenneth McKellar never forgot the people who sent him here. The farmer and the laboring man, the poor and afflicted, the widow and orphan and their interests were the compelling and motivating force behind all that he did. Where the rights and the aspirations of the lowly were concerned he stood squarely and immovably on their side.

Personally, I shall miss him as a friend; his wise counsel and affection I shall always remember and treasure as among the great privileges of my life.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, more perhaps than any other Member of the Senate, I feel deeply touched at the memorial ceremony in the Senate today. It affects me in a deeply personal way.

Senator McKellar was not only my colleague, but I can truly say he was one of the best friends the Senator from Mississippi ever had.

I was a very young man when I was elected to the Senate. Before I was sworn in, Senator McKellar, at his own invitation, asked me to come to Memphis and confer with him. I gladly spent a great deal of time in Senator McKellar's office. He did everything to pave my way into the Senate. When I got to Washington I found that very desirable committee selections had already been made for me.

After these years of experience in the Senate and looking back, I can see how extremely fortunate I was to have had such a sponsor. After I began my tenure of duty as a Senator I was never out from under his wing.

To me, Senator McKellar's most outstanding characteristic was loyalty—unswerving and undeviating—loyalty to his friends, loyalty to his people in Tennessee, and loyalty to the causes and issues he believed in and espoused. He coupled with this loyalty the highest degree of independence, determination, and courage. He was a friend to be proud of; a foe to be feared.

Senator McKellar was an indefatigable worker and a man of great and consummate ability. He was possessed with a rugged honesty and a great tenacity of purpose.

His life and accomplishments are indelibly inscribed in living and perpetual monuments spread throughout the length and breadth of Tennessee. No man had any more to do with the conception and development of the great Tennessee Valley project than did Senator McKellar. In every town and in every village and throughout the countryside there are living memorials to his achievements—the Federal Highway System, not only in Tennessee but throughout the Nation; the Great Smoky Mountains National Park; and numerous projects too varied to mention in these brief remarks.

At the time of his retirement from the Senate he had served longer in this body than any other man in American history. He could not have done this had he not had behind him the people of his great State in almost unanimity. The very length of his service bespeaks how practical he was—how close to earth—how close to his people and how he became the exponent of a State and the mouthpiece of the people of one of the most diverse political States in the Union; how he kept the various factions in his State, geographical, political, and ideological, together—a narrow State that stretched from the Father of Waters through the Appalachian highlands almost to the Atlantic Ocean—mountains, prairies, plains; parts old in history and hoary in legend—other parts of his State bustling and new.

The city to which he migrated, when a boy, was a burly river port. Steamboats were giving way to rail. The automobile was just emerging. Other sections of his State were old as the original colonies; different in tradition, different in outlook; and yet, under the political genius of Kenneth McKellar, all were welded into one.

He was as strong in Chattanooga and Knoxville as he was in Memphis. It has been said of him that he was as strong with the Republicans as he was with the Democrats. It was the touch of his political finger that knew the pulse. It was through political genius that he could represent such a State for such a length of time.

In his later years, Senator McKellar was a great man for reminiscences. I was fortunate enough to hear him recount many of his memories. I heard him tell about how when he was a young lawyer in Memphis he was on the first automobile trip from Memphis to Boston—a pioneering feat with an automobile in those days. While he was away from home on this trip he was selected to become the Democratic nominee for Congress from that district. He went on to election and thereafter there was never any serious impediment placed in his political career. His tenure dated from the League of Nations through the United Nations. It dated from World War I through World War II. Once he told me that he was a Wilsonian Democrat. He denied that he was ever a New Deal Democrat. I joshed and replied to him that he was a southern Democrat.

His sense of honor and propriety was high. Among the legends that grew up about him was that he possessed, in common with many other legendary figures of this body, an eruptive temper, but from my observations and things that I have heard about him, he was a Vesuvius that never erupted unless he felt that his sense of honor or propriety had been infringed.

For a long period in his senatorial tenure it can be said without contradiction that he was probably the most powerful single Senator in this august Chamber. No individual ever exercised power less for his own personal aggrandizement and more for his people and his country than did Senator McKellar. He was truly a dedicated and devoted public servant. For those of us who knew him well it was but to love and admire him. We mourn his passing; yet he lived a long, full, complete, and satisfying life and his epitaphs are written in contributions to the progress and development of his great State and country.

The resolution (S. Res. 218) was considered and unanimously agreed to.

---

## THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND OF THE FUTURE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last summer Gen. Thomas S. Power became Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command.

He has a brilliant and distinguished military record. He had been commander in chief of the Research and Development Command for 3 years, and was stationed in Baltimore in that capacity when he was called upon to assume charge of the Strategic Air Command. In doing so he succeeded Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, now Vice Chief of Air Force, and for 8 years the signally successful commander in chief of Strategic Air Command in its most formative years.

General Power had served as General LeMay's deputy commander of SAC. Hence, his assumption of duty as its commander in chief was like coming home for him.

I express and share the general, widespread confidence that General Power will competently lead the Strategic Air Command in such a fashion as to retain for it the outstanding position of being the greatest single deterrent to world war III, a position accorded it by many authorities.

On September 19 of last year, 2 weeks before Sputnik I was launched, the new chief of SAC was honor guest of a public-affairs luncheon of the Chamber of Commerce of Omaha, Nebr., near which SAC headquarters are located. He gave a talk on that occasion on the Strategic Air Command of the Future.

It was a meaningful message. It cited the background against which SAC was originally conceived and created. It also set forth clearly its mission and the methods by which same are being and will be accomplished.

Prior to the spring of 1946 when SAC was created, enough of our thoughtful national leaders, to get a job done, became convinced of the proven determination of the Soviet dictators to achieve their goals of an all-Communist world under their undisputed domination at any cost and by any means. Of course, the United States was their only major obstacle, and an obstacle that every effort would be exerted to eliminate.

SAC was conceived of as an effective means to meet that threat by building an ability to defeat any aggression, but more preferably building up an agency to discourage aggression from occurring in the first place.

Thus it was that SAC was assigned the mission of being prepared to conduct strategic air operations on a global basis so that, in the event of sudden aggression, SAC could immediately mount simultaneous nuclear attacks designed to destroy the vital elements of the aggressor's warmaking capacity to the extent that he would no longer have the will nor the ability to wage war.

Since shortly after its organization, SAC has had that capability and readiness to achieve its mission. It has it today, and I am confident it will possess it as time goes on. What is more important, however, is that the Soviets are well aware of this capability and readiness.

SAC's mission today is the same as it was when organized.

Its means and manner of accomplishing this mission are different, however, today than they were originally, or even 5 years ago. SAC is not and never was inflexibly tied exclusively to presently known, proven and operational weapons. Of course it must rely on such weapons for accomplishment of its mission on a day-by-day basis, because it is a force-in-being, with a present, daily, and even hourly readiness to achieve.

However, its strength is not based on any particular weapon system but on an organization of well-trained and experienced men who are provided with the global communications network, the strategic intelligence, the logistic support, and the innumerable other tools required for the effective operation of any strategic weapon system, regardless of its complexity and radical features.

Hence it is that SAC must constantly keep itself fully informed as to technological trends and developments which might affect its operations. It must, moreover, insure that advanced strategic weapons are developed so as to meet its specific requirement. It follows that it should also initiate early steps to integrate these weapon systems into its inventory as rapidly as they become operational.

These and other basic considerations were set out in General Power's speech. The Strategic Air Command has none of the failings of the concept of the ill-fated Maginot line. It never will have any of those failings if the essence of the considerations set out in General Power's speech are carefully heeded and if they are woven into and become a part of our national defense policy.

After General Power's speech was delivered, I asked permission to have it inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He furnished me with a copy for that purpose and gave his consent. However, the speech was given on September 19, 2 full weeks before Sputnik I was launched by the Russians. It occurred to me that there might be some fashion in which General Power should like to alter or supplement his remarks, in view of the launching of an earth satellite. I wrote him accordingly.

Under date of December 17 he answered my inquiry in which he flatly stated that none of the events which had occurred subsequent to his making the speech in any way altered the concepts guiding SAC's present and future operations as he discussed them in that Omaha Chamber of Commerce talk.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks the text of General Power's talk and also the text of his December 17 letter to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the address and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK BY GEN. THOMAS S. POWER, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND, AT THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS LUNCHEON OF THE OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, OMAHA, NEBR., SEPTEMBER 19, 1957

Mr. LeMar, Mr. Svoboda, Senator Hruska, Mayor Rosenblatt, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, to speak of the future, as I intended to do today, is always a risky business. To be sure, it is quite a temptation and even a challenge to speculate about the supermissiles, superplanes, and other superweapons which we might have tomorrow. But it is one thing for science fiction writers and comic-strip artists to give their imagination free rein for the sake of entertainment, and another thing to let fantasy and wishful thinking govern the strategic planning for the continued security of our Nation.

In order to predict the future of the Strategic Air Command with an acceptable measure of realism, we must take a sophisticated look at three distinctive areas and at the impact which changes in these areas could have on SAC's mission and operations. The three areas are: the international situation, advances in military technology, and ensuing changes in the techniques of aerial warfare.

SAC was established some 11 years ago in order to cope with international problems which our victory in World War II had failed to resolve. The Axis Powers had just been defeated; the Soviet Union was our ally. But while the threat posed by the Nazis and the Japanese nationalists had been effectively eliminated, not even the most optimistic Americans in responsible positions could fail to recognize the ever mounting threat of Communist aggression.

The doctrines and avowed goals of the Communist philosophy were well known. Equally well known was the proven determination of the Soviet dictators to achieve their goals of an all-Communist world under their undisputed domination at any cost and by any means. The United States, stronger than ever at the end of World War II, was their only major obstacle. It, therefore, stood to reason that the Soviets would make every effort to eliminate that obstacle at some propitious time. To protect ourselves against this contingency, we had to be prepared to meet it and, preferably, prevent aggression altogether by discouraging it through an overpowering posture of strength.

This was the background for the establishment of SAC in the spring of 1946. It was assigned the mission of being prepared to conduct strategic air operations on a global basis so that, in the event of sudden aggression, SAC could immediately mount simultaneous nuclear attacks designed to destroy the vital elements of the aggressor's warmaking capacity to the extent that he would no longer have the will nor ability to wage war. It is well known to the Soviets that SAC is capable and ready to do just that, and I am convinced that this deterrent has been an important factor in preventing world war III to this date.

The international situation which led to the organization of SAC is essentially the same today as it was 11 years ago. The causes which are responsible for these conditions have not changed in the past 40 years and are not liable to change in the foreseeable future. But because of forces such as SAC, these conditions have not exploded into total war. Therefore, it is mandatory that SAC must be prepared to successfully counter any attack and, thereby, deter aggression as effectively in the years to come as it can today and could for the past 11 years.

But while SAC's mission will remain the same, there will continue to be changes in the factors which affect the manner of accomplishing that mission. During the past decade, the Soviets have made an all-out effort to attain qualitative superiority in weapons and have made considerable strides in most fields of military technology. It is my considered opinion that, in spite of their efforts, we have been able to maintain the overall lead in this race and that we are in the position to maintain it indefinitely.

We must make sure, however, that our margin of technological superiority, translated into superior operational capability, is large enough to constitute as effective a deterrent in the future as it has been in the past. For the measure of deterrence is not what we think will deter the Soviets or any other potential aggressor but what, in their opinion, would demand too high a price for too little assurance of victory.

This brings me to the second area which we must investigate in trying to predict SAC's future—advances in technology. Today's military planners can no longer confine their analyses to matters of strategy and tactics but must recognize that the increasing potency and versatility of the tools of warfare have had and will continue to have a profound impact on the fundamental character and scope of war.

The task of today's military planner is greatly aggravated by the fact that it is no longer possible to make assumptions concerning future technological advances on the basis of extrapolation, that is, by arbitrarily extending the curve of past progress into the future. To illustrate this point—if someone would have tried only 20 years ago to predict our present problems of aerial warfare, he would have probably thought in terms of vast formations of propeller-driven bombers, carrying huge loads of TNT. To be realistic, he could anticipate only reasonable improvements in the aircraft and weapons then in existence or under development, but he could not possibly anticipate the availability of jet-powered bombers and nuclear weapons, and the tremendous changes they have wrought on aerial strategy.

Thus, we must avoid the fateful error of taking it for granted that tomorrow's weapons will be just improvements of today's weapons, and that advances in technology will result merely in advances of current techniques. We have witnessed many examples of the fallacy of this philosophy during the past few decades. Jet and rocket engines, nuclear weapons, radar—these are but a few of the more spectacular miracles of science which have radically changed both offensive and defensive strategy and tactics, practically overnight.

The unknown factor in our planning, therefore, is not the rate of progress in the future but what is known as the technological breakthrough, a revolutionary new phenomenon or technique which has a profound impact on a major field of military technology. A case in point is the so-called thermonuclear breakthrough in 1952 which established the practicability of high-yield nuclear weapons of relatively small size and weight. As a result, it suddenly became feasible to accelerate the development of long-range ballistic missiles which had been lagging for lack of a small warhead of sufficient yield to make such weapons practical.

The conclusion to be drawn from these considerations is that SAC cannot afford to be static and inexorably tied to presently known weapons and concepts. Instead, it must be as dynamic as the era in which we are living and maintain its organization flexible enough to be readily adaptable to the results of any unexpected technological breakthrough which would yield some radically new weapon or technique of strategic aerial warfare.

Since SAC is a force-in-being, it must concentrate all of its efforts toward the accomplishment of its assigned mission on a day-to-day basis. This means that its equipment must be proven and operational, that is, ready for instantaneous and effective use whenever the need arises. At the same time, however, SAC must also keep its eye on the future and keep itself fully informed as to technological trends and new developments which might affect its operations. In this manner, SAC cannot only insure that advanced strategic weapon systems are developed so as to meet its specific requirements, but can also initiate early steps to integrate these weapon systems into its inventory as rapidly as they become operational.

And here lies the answer to the unknown factor of the impact of future technological breakthroughs. Even though such breakthroughs may be entirely unexpected, their reduction to operational weapon systems takes enough time to prepare for their smooth integration into as flexible an organization as SAC has been able to develop. SAC's strength is not based on any particular weapon system but on an organization of well trained and experienced men who are provided with the global communications network, the strategic intelligence, the logistic support, and the innumerable other tools required for the effective operation of any strategic weapon system, regardless of its complexity and radical features.

Our planning for the future is further aggravated by the fact that the Soviets can plan or change programs and schedules so as to suit their purposes best, secure in the knowledge that they face no aggression by the United States. For our part, we must not only try to anticipate and prepare for their every move but cannot afford to make any mistakes since our planning may well be a matter of national survival.

Modern science comes to our aid in considering the vast number of conditions that might arise as a result of any type of aggressive action on the part of the Soviets. Using electronic computers, we conduct war games in which we express such factors as type and size of attack, timing, rate of recovery, and many others in mathematical terms which we can vary at will. In this way, we can establish the parameters for our defensive posture so as to meet the greatest number of eventualities at the least cost to us.

The results of our war gaming exercises have borne out our contention that the decisive phase of the next war—if and when it should come—would be very short, and that it will be won by the side which manages to win the initial airpower battle. In order to improve their chances of a quick, decisive victory in that battle, the Soviets would undoubtedly make the best possible use of their principal advantage in taking the initiative, namely, surprise. For this reason, we can probably expect only what we call tactical warning of their intentions—the information that hostile action has been taken against one of our units or facilities, or that Soviet bombers have taken off on what has definitely been ascertained to be an attack against the United States. Such a tactical warning would give SAC only a few hours to launch the bombers based in this country and even less time to launch those based overseas.

I spoke advisedly of bombers rather than missiles because, if an attack should take place today or in the very immediate future, the initial exchange of air strikes would feature almost entirely manned bombers. Just as SAC cannot afford to use equipment that is not fully proven and operational, so the Soviets would not start a war with weapons which are not dependable enough to insure, in their minds, the complete success of their initial strike.

There has been much public speculation about the Soviets' announcement that they have successfully flown long-range ballistic missiles. But our tests with long-range missiles, though not always spectacular from the public's point of view, have been quite successful, too. Since our missiles—and, undoubtedly, those of the Soviets—are test vehicles, indications are that the Soviets and we are in a neck-and-neck race for the development of long-range ballistic missiles, capable of carrying high-yield nuclear warheads, but that neither side has, so far, achieved an operational capability in this field. This, however, is no reason for complacency because, if the Soviets should succeed even momentarily in attaining operational capability which would negate our own mission capability, then the deterrent to general war would be gone.

We should expect little, if any, strategic warning of an impending missile attack. In fact, the Soviets' claim of possessing successful ballistic missiles could well constitute the only strategic warning we will ever get. And the tactical warning, on the basis of which we would initiate counteraction, would be reduced to a mere fraction of an hour—perhaps 15 minutes or even less.

These are some of the major factors which must govern our planning for the SAC of the future. Since my return to SAC last July, I have been given many detailed briefings by my staff at the headquarters and have visited numerous SAC bases in this country and abroad. I was deeply gratified to ascertain that SAC has achieved the highest state of combat readiness in its 11-year history. Our task for the future is to attain even higher plateaus of combat readiness, without any gaps in our relative strength-in-being, and continuously to improve our effectiveness so that it progresses at the same rate as the enemy threat.

While we must remain flexible enough to cope with any unforeseen contingencies that may arise in the future, we must also deal effectively with those contingencies which we can anticipate with sufficient assurance to warrant immediate and aggressive action. For instance, we consider it highly probable that SAC will have to carry the brunt of an aggressor's initial offensive, since any delay in immobilizing SAC's retaliatory forces would result in unacceptable damage to the enemy. For this reason, we must be fully prepared to prevent large-scale sabotage attempts immediately preceding an attack against this country and designed to keep SAC's forces pinned down. We must be equally prepared to protect these forces against a massive surprise attack so they will retain sufficient retaliatory capability to make such an attack too risky for the enemy.

There are several ways by which we are achieving this purpose. The first entails so-called hardening of our bases and launching sites, that is, the provision of some measure of protection against crippling damage by bombs and missiles. However, hardening of bases is expensive and can reach the point where it affects combat readiness and reaction time.

A more effective means of protecting SAC's overall combat capability is the dispersal method. Present plans call for dispersing our B–52's over a number of bases

in this country so that there will be not more than one squadron at each base.

The advantages of dispersal are that it expands the enemy's target system, increases the number of targets that pose a threat to him, increases the speed of launching our alert force, and minimizes the effect of an enemy strike. Its main disadvantage is that it is, essentially, a defensive measure and cannot, by itself, win a war.

Although base-hardening and dispersal provide us with some degree of protection, our main reliance is on SAC's alert system. Under this system, SAC maintains a percentage of its aircraft and crews as well as of support personnel and equipment on a continuous alert status, ready to launch a counterattack at a moment's notice. Alert crews always stay and even sleep near their planes; new construction shortens taxiing and expedites takeoff sequence; pilots know their targets, navigators their route.

Thus, a sizable portion of SAC's striking force will be in the air within minutes after receipt of the tactical warning. And needless to say, a similar alert system will be adapted to the launching of missiles once they become operational and an integral part of SAC's weapons inventory.

The principal value of the alert system lies in the fact that it insures the preservation of at least some degree of strike capability even after an unexpected and devastating attack. The size of that part of SAC's strike force, which cannot be destroyed in such an attack, and the potential damage which this force could inflict on an enemy are among the most decisive factors an aggressor would have to weigh before launching an attack, be it with bombers, missiles or both.

It must, therefore, be our endeavor to continuously increase the percentage of SAC's force on alert status, and to do so within the limits of our resources in skilled manpower and materiel. This will be one of our most challenging tasks in the months and years ahead.

Today, SAC's striking force includes the B-52 and B-47, both excellent jet bombers equipped with the most advanced electronic navigation and bombing aids. Our C-97 aerial tankers are being augmented by KC-135 jet tankers which will further improve the performance of our bombers. As new and still more advanced strategic weapon systems now under development become operational, they will give increasing power and swiftness to SAC's mailed fist. And, in the not too distant future, long-range missiles will be added in gradually increasing quantities, not to replace but to supplement our manned bombers.

However, with every advancement in our weapon systems, the Soviets can be expected to make similar advancements, judging from the rapid progress they have made toward challenging our technological superiority. Unless we do our utmost to preserve our still existing lead, the Soviets could conceivably succeed in closing the gap and, ultimately, surpass us.

I am hopeful that this will never happen because our Nation has the capability, the resources and the determination to retain its technological supremacy indefinitely. If we exploit our technical advances by reflecting them effectively and rapidly in our operational equipment, and if we have always enough of that equipment, SAC can remain the best equipped long-range striking force in the world.

But qualitative superiority in materiel is not enough. We must also retain qualitative superiority in men because, just as in any other trade and profession, even the best tools are of little use unless there are men to handle them expertly. That is why SAC must have a sufficient number of experienced, professional personnel to make the most effective use of the superior weapons we now possess. And as our weapon systems continue to grow more and more complex, we will need commensurately more professionals, more skills and more training for the operation and maintenance of this equipment if we are to benefit from the technological advance it represents.

To cope with all these problems, and to do so with the least impact on our national economy, that is the grave responsibility which we must discharge successfully in order to preserve the protective and deterrent might of the "SAC of the future."

---

DECEMBER 17, 1957.

Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
*Omaha, Nebr.*

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: In reply to your letter of December 11, I was very pleased to learn of your intention to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the talk which I presented at the Omaha Chamber of Commerce luncheon on September 19, 1957.

I also appreciate your kind offer to make alterations or supplemental remarks to the talk prior to its insertion, and I have carefully reviewed it in this light. It is my considered opinion that neither the launching of satellites by the Soviets nor any of the subsequent events that have taken place since I presented my talk have, in any way, altered the concepts guiding SAC's present and future operations as I discussed them.

In fact, it appears that recent events have served to support my contention that, in order to keep up with the Soviets' all-out effort and steady progress toward attaining qualitative superiority in weapons, we cannot afford to rely on the mere improvement of existing weapons and techniques but must do our utmost to rapidly achieve an operational capability in highly advanced strategic weapon systems, such as ballistic missiles.

Since I presented my talk, SAC has taken further steps in implementing its gradual conversion to a mixed missile-bomber force which, as I explained, is our present goal. Sites for SAC's first missile division are being constructed in California and Wyoming. A large launching site for the jet-powered SNARK, which will be our first intercontinental missile until we can phase in the ICBM, will be built in Maine and operated by SAC's first missile squadron which was recently activated under our Eighth Air Force.

The vital need for a potent deterrent to aggression, as represented by the Strategic Air Command, is the same today as it has been for the past decade and will be for the foreseeable future. Notwithstanding any progress the Soviets have made or may make in the future, I reiterate my confidence that SAC can maintain its deterrent margin by growing with the threat because its strength is not based on any specific weapon but on an organization of highly skilled professionals which is flexible enough to be adaptable to any new weapon system or technique, no matter how revolutionary.

The continued validity of these considerations cannot be emphasized too strongly. For this reason, I am grateful to you for the opportunity of making my remarks of last September available to members of the Congress and of thereby stressing the fact that, while the factors affecting SAC's operations are bound to change, there can be no change in the principles guiding these operations.

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. POWER,
*General, USAF, Commander in Chief.*

---

## RETURN TO GERMAN AND JAPANESE CITIZENS OF PRIVATE PROPERTY SEIZED DURING AND AFTER WORLD WAR II UNDER THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have discussed, on the floor of the Senate, the return to German and Japanese citizens of private property seized during and after World War II under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The return of such property at an early date is urged.

First, because it is right and just. The sacredness of private property has a deep moral foundation.

Second, such return is in keeping with our historic policy. American precedents for such return go back almost 150 years.

Third, such a return would subserve our national interest in restoring our prestige standing in the eyes of the world. It would increase the sanctity of investments abroad of all nations including those of Americans.

Our refusal to return this alien property endangers the development of world markets by setting up an unfortunate precedent upon which other countries may rely in seizing foreign-owned property within their own borders.

A year and a half ago on this floor, I suggested that "the United States cannot long continue an anomalous policy of supporting confiscation at home and condemning it abroad. Even when the inconsistency of such action does not prove troublesome momentarily, it threatens to plague this Nation and its citizens in the future."

Within recent weeks, the fears thus expressed have materialized in the seizure of private property in Indonesia. The noted journalist, David Lawrence, in one of his articles a couple of weeks ago, drew attention to the fact that "there has not been a single protest from the major powers of the world against what is probably the handiwork of the Communists," and he concluded by stating that "certainly the time has come to champion the principle of simple honesty in international affairs as against the stealing of private property, coupled with brazen demands to extort political concessions from a foreign government as the price of recovering the stolen property."

I request unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the article by David Lawrence, in its entirety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha World Herald of December 27, 1957]

ANTICOLONIAL POLICY BEARS GRIM HARVEST IN INDONESIA

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Organized brigandage in Indonesia—the theft of private property and an attempt to use the loot as blackmail against a foreign government—has hardly a parallel in international crime.

For several days the news dispatches have told of the confiscation of the property of Dutch citizens who live in Indonesia—formerly the Dutch East Indies.

But there has not been a single protest from the major powers of the world against what is probably the handiwork of the Communists.

Indonesia is the creature of the United States and its allies who helped the island empire achieve independence from Dutch rule in 1949.

The cry of "colonialism" had been raised, and the Department of State, under the Truman administration, did everything it could to bring about the separation of the Dutch from the island possessions where, during many hundred years, Holland's investors had aided in the development of such resources as rubber and petroleum.

BLACKMAIL

Confiscation of the property of foreigners is nothing new in the world, but in international law the precedents require that adequate compensation be made to the lawful owners.

In this case not only has no such provision for payment been made, but the Indonesian Government is threatening not to pay at all unless the Dutch investors bring pressure to bear on their own government to relinquish possession of another colony—Dutch New Guinea—thousands of miles away.

The government at The Hague can do little except to urge the democracies of the world to take a good look at the fruits of their anticolonial policies.

IS RED RULE BETTER?

All the important trade and business activities and all the communications between the various islands in the Indonesian group have been carried on heretofore by Dutch citizens.

To uproot all this suddenly is to bring a crisis to the little nation that must cause the governments of the world, especially the United States, to wonder if a continuation of enlightened colonialism, such as the Dutch furnished, would not have been much better for the average inhabitant of this colonial area than Red rule is today under a puppet government which obeys Moscow's agents.

THE TIME HAS COME

In recent weeks the anti-Communist sentiment inside Indonesia has been rising, and it is important for the non-Communist countries not to become entangled in the internal situation there.

But certainly the time has come to champion the principle of simple honesty in international affairs as against the stealing of private property, coupled with brazen demands to extort political concessions from a foreign government as the price of recovering the stolen property.

It makes many observers wonder whether the same thing isn't likely to happen in Algeria, where French interests have built up a big colony only to find themselves being forced out by a nationalist movement fanned to a frenzy by Communist intrigue.

Mr. HRUSKA. Whatever reason other major powers may have for not protesting the seizure of properties in Indonesia, it should be quite clear why the United States should hesitate to speak up in view of its own dereliction, in failing to follow American precedents of long standing in returning property of aliens seized during wartime.

Last July, President Eisenhower recognized the importance of this subject. He declared "In order to reflect the historic American policy of maintaining the sanctity of private property even in wartime, the administration intends as a matter of priority to submit to Congress, early in the coming session, a supplementary plan for the payment in full of all legitimate war claims of Americans against Germany, and as an act of grace, an equitable monetary return to former owners of vested assets."

Several bills are now pending in this Congress on the subject but they lag. It is hoped that the President's promised supplementary plan will be forthcoming soon and that it will result in an impetus which will bring prompt legislative action.

Mr. President, the nature and elements of this entire situation were the subject of an article by O. K. Armstrong, a former Member of Congress, in this month's issue of the Christian Herald. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Herald of January 1958]

DOES AMERICA RESPECT OTHER PEOPLE'S PROPERTY?

(By O. K. Armstrong)

"Does not your Constitution provide that no property shall be taken from citizens without due process of law and without just compensation?" asked a professor at Bonn University, Germany, last summer, while I was meeting on the campus with members of International Christian Leadership, an organization devoted to making more effective the Christian witness in public affairs.

"Yes, Doctor, the Constitution of the United States provides just that," I answered. "But, unfortunately, in the fever of war, human rights are often ignored."

The professor's next comment was not so easily answered. "World War II ended more than 12 years ago." He was polite and smiling as we talked, but he was expressing the deep hurt felt by many thousands of German and Japanese citizens because their property, or that of their relatives and friends, was seized by the United States Government as a war measure and has never been returned.

Alien enemy property it is called, even though the war was finished half a generation ago and we in America are trying almost desperately to make friends and influence people to our way of life in the former enemy lands.

That particular German professor is devoting the rest of his life to training young men to be future leaders of a democratic, peaceful Germany. Yet, about $1,500 worth of property, left to his relative by another relative who emigrated to the United States 50 years ago, has been seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

About $390,808,000 worth of such property was vested by the Office of Alien Property (OAP) under the Department of Justice during the war or since the war ended. Suddenly, without notice, without trial, and with no opportunity for defense, German and Japanese citizens were stripped of all they owned in the United States. There were about 34,000 vestings, affecting more than 300,000 direct and indirect owners. Today that property has increased in value to an estimated $629,701,000.

We are not talking about public property—that which was owned by the governments with which we were at war from 1941 to 1945. It is understood that such property is open to seizure as an enemy asset. Our concern is with private property. A good point can be made for vesting—temporarily—the private property of citizens of nations with which another country is at war, in order to prevent its use during war. But there is nothing democratic, just, or fair in permanent confiscation of private property after the fighting has ceased and the people are trying to bind up their wounds.

Some of the property was in holdings of large corporations, as I. G. Farbenindustrie and the Stinnes Corp. But the vast majority of people involved each had investments or other property in the United States valued at less than $10,000, including household furnishings, jewelry, books, radios, cameras, clothing, and even dolls and toy ukeleles. There were around 50,000 patents, 650,000 copyrights and trademarks, and 36 million feet of motion-picture film.

According to the OAP, there were 469 large and small businesses taken, ranging all the way from interests in oil wells to an orange grove of a Japanese family. There were 1,300 pieces of real estate and thousands of holdings and small investments in stocks and bonds.

About $88 million, or more than 20 percent of the total amount, is known as estate and trust properties. This type of property is not alien at all, much less enemy. It was owned by American citizens, and was left to heirs or assigns in one of the enemy countries. For example, there was the American businessman who left $25,000 to be divided among five relatives in Germany. The American Government still holds it.

Several of the properties were owned by American veterans of German or Japanese descent, honorably discharged from the service. If such veterans passed away—even from battle wounds—any relative they might have in Japan or Germany are barred from receiving most of their legacies. Even social security and death benefits have been confiscated by Alien Property.

Most tragic in their absurdity are the amounts seized by OAP which were gifts or legacies to charitable causes. For example: John Meierdierks of San Francisco left $500 for the poor and needy of the Heitberg Home in Hanover. Marie Schreiner of Luzerne County, Pa., left $500 for a village kindergarten in Friestatt, Baden. Julius Zehnstner of Madison County, Wis., left $7,000 to the University of Marburg for its medical school. All these legacies were seized.

Henry Baumann of Chicago left part of his estate to the pastor and organist of the oldest church in Erligheim, Wurtemberg. That part of the estate was confiscated.

Even the dead must be treated as enemies. The alien property sleuths discovered that Pauline Jacobs of the Bronx had left $200 for the upkeep of her parents' grave at Bad Duerkheim, and they seized that along with all other such bequests.

The late Alfred Leutz, former member of the State senate of North Dakota, married a German girl shortly before World War II began. When he passed away, his estate, valued at about $50,000, was confiscated by OAP. Now his impoverished daughter Gretel, studying to be a nurse, is working her way through medical school.

A Japanese family, sharing in the proceeds of a fruit grove in California, found the returns from the investment seized by OAP. The patent rights of an outstanding Japanese inventor in Tokyo, whose electronic products are used in many of our military and civilian planes, were confiscated.

Thousands of such cases can be cited. What brought about this tragic situation? We must go back to October 1917, when the Trading With the Enemy Act was passed. Its purpose was to vest and hold in trusteeship the property of Germans and prevent its use to aid the enemy in war. It was never the intent of Congress that this property would be confiscated, and 80 percent was returned to the owners, 20 percent being reserved for later payment.

With World War II a new concept entered—that of economic warfare, whereby leaders in our Government, along with those of our allies, decided upon a policy of crippling permanently the economic strength of both Germany and Japan, so that they would not only be defeated in war but would never again have the potential to make war. Germany, especially, was to be made a "pastoral" country. From this grew the unjust and war-breeding stripping away of territories, dismantling of plants that could be used for

peacetime production, and confiscation of private property.

It seems fantastic today that such policies could ever have been considered seriously as the basis for future peace on earth, good will toward men. Much of the harsh and vengeful program was abandoned years ago, but private property was being seized as late as 1953, and no provision has been made for return to the owners. By a clever legislative move in 1948, vested property was tied in with the payment of certain war claims of United States citizens against Germany and Japan. Under this War Claims Act, money from the sale of assets of vested property can be used to pay claims for the detention and ill treatment of prisoners of war, and for loss of property by members of certain religious groups. The act was backed to the hilt by officials of Alien Property, and by major veterans' organizations.

Thus far, around $250 million worth of the seized properties has been expended in the war claims. About $60 million have been used for expenses of the OAP, which now employs 300 persons with an annual payroll of more than $3 million.

"We have to enforce the law as Congress wrote it," officials of Alien Property always explain, when questioned about such rank injustices as I have given. Yet these same officials have appeared, time after time, before committees of Congress, protesting against any change in the law that would return the seized property.

Principal efforts in Congress to provide for return or just compensation to the owners have been made by two influential members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN (Republican) of Illinois and OLIN D. JOHNSTON (Democrat) of South Carolina. Both these statesmen, and many others I have interviewed on the matter, declare that they will again sponsor legislation for this purpose in the forthcoming session of Congress.

President Eisenhower recognized the importance of this move when on last July 31, after a visit by Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of the Republic of Germany, he declared:

"In order to reflect the historic American policy of maintaining the sanctity of private property even in war time, the administration intends as a matter of priority to submit to Congress, early in the coming session, a supplementary plan for the payment in full of all legitimate war claims of Americans against Germany, and as an act of grace, an equitable monetary return to former owners of vested assets."

There are three compelling reasons why the American people should with a united voice back the President and our Congressional leaders in sponsoring the long-delayed legislation to provide that private property seized as a war measure is returned:

First, it is a legal obligation.

In the Bill of Rights, Article V, is something besides the "fifth amendment" which protects a person against self-incrimination. There are these words: "No person * * * shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

That statement has been a solid stone in the foundation of civil liberties and personal rights since the amendments were adopted. Without it, an arbitrary government, or even a despotic official of the government, could take property on a whim without payment to the owner. And that is precisely what will have been done to the owners of property seized in war unless due return or just compensation is made.

"But the United States Constitution does not apply to nationals of other countries!" is given as excuse for this confiscation. While that is technically true, actually the standard of legality in our relation with neighbor peoples has always been to apply the same rules to them as we hold sacred for ourselves.

Even if human rights under our Constitution did not apply to "foreigners," there is a solemn treaty obligation. In 1907, the United States, England, France, Germany, Russia and many other big powers signed a treaty, agreeing that no reparations (payments by defeated countries to pay for destruction of war) would be levied except under the express terms of a treaty of peace. When our Government takes part in the confiscation of property for reparations, without agreement and without compensation, it breaks that treaty. Actually, there is no legal basis for the confiscation of private property as the result of war, except under the concept of "to the victors belong the spoils"!

The very basis for our international relations is the good faith which we extend to our neighbors and which they in turn extend to us. When treaty obligations are broken and powerful nations discriminate against the weaker, we head back down the dark road of "might makes right."

Those who want the problem of vested property justly and finally removed can hope that in any bills submitted to Congress, the President's words "as an act of grace" will be changed to a more forthright "as an act of justice."

Second, return of vested property is morally right.

It is a historical fact that confiscation of former enemies' properties has always been looked upon by the United States people and Government as contrary to their moral principles.

At the close of the Revolutionary War, property of English Tories that had been seized was returned, and this practice was consistently followed through all our wars down through World War I. Speaking for the return of German properties in 1923, a Member of Congress from Texas, the present Speaker SAM RAYBURN, summed up the matter in these words:

"The most savage doctrine ever announced by any people anywhere was that private property should be taken for the satisfaction of a public obligation."

Following the seizure of the Suez Canal by Colonel Nasser of Egypt, this dictator announced he would compensate the canal owners. When Britain and France attacked Egypt and a state of war existed, Nasser vested the British and French claims for compensation of the canal property, declaring that he was merely following the lead of the United States in our Trading With the Enemy Act.

In the minds of all the people of Germany and Japan are the personal memories, or the stories of relatives and friends, of how the Communist regimes seized public and private property indiscriminately, during and after the war. We of the free world protest that there is a great and fundamental difference between us and the Communists in our respect for both life and private property. Yet our confiscation of property as reparations is precisely the same as that of the Soviets.

During the time that the Communists had fastened their cruel blockade upon Berlin, a Philadelphia attorney found an unexpected $300 in an account which he was managing for a German client. The German citizen told his attorney to spend the money for CARE packages for the starving people of Berlin. The lawyer checked with Alien Property before sending it, and was ordered to turn this amount over to the account of the Attorney General for seizure. At the same time, all other agencies of the Government were urging the American people to show by our aid to the Berlin airlift how we differed from Communists.

"Why should a few people—such as orphans—be punished by confiscation of property to pay a supposed obligation of a whole people?" asks Gustav Gedat, member of the German Bundestag and stanch friend of the United States. In Herr Gedat's district in the Black Forest is an orphans' home. A citizen of Pennsylvania left the home $1,000, which was seized by Alien Property before the orphans could get it. Dr. Harry W. Pfund, professor of German at Haverford College and an American citizen, has been trying in vain to have the money released. At each Christmas time he takes up a collection to send these orphans, to make up for the money they did not get. In Christmas, 1956, his donations came from people of churches in 30 States.

The policy of confiscating from a few just because their property can be seized as reparations, which should be the obligation of a government, is morally indefensible.

Third, return of vested property is economically and politically desirable.

From a practical business standpoint, the United States has much to gain in practicing the Golden Rule with respect to our treatment of the property rights of our neighbors, whether former "enemies" or not. Consider the economic stake which our citizens hold in foreign lands: On last August 26 the Department of Commerce announced that close to $40 billion are invested by United States citizens in projects overseas, and that they receive $3,400 million a year from these investments. A policy of discrimination against such property, to say nothing of confiscation, would be a serious matter.

The Soviet regimes are stepping up their economic and political campaigns to win the people of Germany and Japan away from the free world and into the orbit of Communist control. By psychological warfare, by promises and by boasts of superior military power, they seek to make themselves the friends and the United States the enemy of these peoples.

We in America are countering with our program of information and good will. But in the face of such programs, we deny rights to a group of citizens in these countries so widely scattered as to infect their whole nations with irritation and ill will. They ponder the absurdity of such examples as this:

A young man from Germany, now a student at Harvard University, was left $2,500 under the will of an American citizen. The student was a mere child during the war, and could not by any stretch of imagination be considered an enemy alien. He is being educated at the expense of the American taxpayers—while OAP holds the money he could use to pay his own way.

There is the obvious political discrimination whereby the vested property of citizens in Italy and the countries of eastern Europe with which we were at war was promptly returned, while that of Japan and Germany is not.

Return of vested property has been endorsed by numerous organizations and public-spirited leaders. The Methodist Woman's Division of Christian Service has urged the step as evidence of our faith in our system of property rights and in observance of American international legal practice.

The forthcoming session of Congress presents an opportunity for people of good will to correct an injustice and to prove anew our faith in moral principles.

---

## DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE RUSSELL W. KEENEY OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 427) from the House of Representatives, which was read:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. RUSSELL W. KEENEY, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

*Resolved*, That a committee of 24 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, pursuant to the resolution received from the House of Representatives, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 219) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. RUSSELL W. KEENEY, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. DIRKSEN as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

## ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representatives and the late former Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Thursday, January 16, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13, 1958:

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Gerard C. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Malaya.

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

Robert McClintock, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

Charles W. Yost, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

Robert M. McKinney, of New Mexico, to be the representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Manager of the Development Loan Fund in the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State.

Christopher H. Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of Maryland, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

Julian B. Baird, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

Tom B. Coughran, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

A. Gilmore Flues, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Dr. Paul Darwin Foote, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Maj. Gen. Gerald E. Galloway, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

Col. John S. Harnett, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

William P. Rogers, of Maryland, to be Attorney General.

Lawrence Edward Walsh, of New York, to be Deputy Attorney General.

W. Wilson White, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Malcolm R. Wilkey, of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Leonard Page Moore, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, Second Circuit.

Edwin M. Stanley, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the middle district of North Carolina.

William B. Butler, of Texas, to be United States Attorney for the southern district of Texas for a term of 4 years.

Clark W. Gregory, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan for a term of 4 years.

Edward L. McCarthy, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island for a term of 4 years.

Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

Royce Aller Hardy, Jr., of Nevada, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Newell Brown, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Director of the United States Information Agency.

Sumner G. Whittier, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Arnold R. Jones, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1966.

Frank James Welch, of Kentucky, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring May 18, 1960.

Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years.

Bernard L. Flanagan, of Vermont, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the unexpired term of 4 years from March 1, 1957, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1962.

Tom B. Coughran, of California, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

Harold A. Kertz, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1959.

John S. Patterson, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

John A. Hannah, of Michigan, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

John S. Battle, of Virginia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

Doyle Elam Carlton, of Florida, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, of Indiana, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

Robert G. Storey, of Texas, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Thomas John Hall Trapnell, O16782, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr., O18662, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Transportation, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

*To be major generals*

Brig. Gen. Charles Richard Hutchison, O16796, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Alva Revista Fitch, O18113, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Greene Calloway, O17690, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Edward Hoy, O18556, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

*Maj. Gen. George W. Mundy, 358A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8036, title 10 of the United States Code.

### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 8298 and 8299, title 10, United States Code. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

*Nurse Corps*

Fallon, Margaret M., 21911W.
Krah, Katherine C., 21912W.
Miller, Mary V., 21920W.
Pritchard, Winifred M., 21921W.
Jezek, Josephine, 21922W.
Price, Violet I., 21923W.
Stanton, Clare E., 21926W.
Bendetti, Rose M., 21929W.
McNamara, Mary E., 21931W.
Bell, Mildred A., 21934W.
Welch, Eleanor, 21935W.
Miller, Kathryn, 21937W.
Berman, Helen E., 21938W.
Reams, Anne D., 21939W.
Johnson, Esther M., 21940W.
Moritz, Elizabeth S., 21942W.
Hill, Priscilla C., 20908W.
Zack, Emily E., 21944W.
Gravis, Lillian A., 21945W.
Taylor, Esther E., 21948W.
Tosi, Laura L., 20978W.
Johnson, Martha L., 21950W.
Alfred, Anna M., 20916W.
Vizard, Margaret, 21951W.
Johnson, Katherine E., 20979W.
Valentine, Frances J., 21952W.
Harrison, Karolyna J., 21953W.
Godard, Joyce, 21955W.
Carmine, Flora G., 21957W.
DuPont, Aileen A., 21958W.
Hilbus, Emily E., 21959W.
King, Vera D., 21960W.
Hackford, Louise M., 20922W.
Ammons, Muriel, 21961W.
Christy, E. Lynne, 21995W.
Mattonen, Edna S., 21963W.
Lamar, Mildred I., 20981W.
Conerly, Cora E., 21964W.
Murphy, Elizabeth A., 21966W.
Conners, Rita V., 21047W.
Palm, Jamie F., 20927W.
Ordway, Evelyn R., 21090W.
Kegerreis, Virginia H., 21049W.
Davis, Opal G., 21970W.
Bacior, Rosalie, 20930W.
Meyer, Dorothy L., 20931W.
McPherson, Ruth V., 21050W.
Jelinek, Agnes C., 20933W.
Hebert, Helen P., 21052W.
Peace, Mildred M., 21092W.
Crow, Lillie U., 20935W.
Remington, Margaret E., 21973W.
Gondek, Louise B., 21054W.
Menge, Dorothy M., 21974W.
Chupka, Helen A., 21976W.
Cooley, Hazel V., 20955W.
Bachman, Alberta M., 21028W.
McDonald, Marguerite E., 21977W.
Becker, Josephine M., 21978W.
Clark, Leota H., 21095W.
Eissner, Caroline A., 21030W.
Snyder, Myrna A., 21031W.
Steuart, Mary P., 20942W.
Bush, Vera N., 21032W.
Wyatt, Mary V., 20986W.
Webster, Amy R., 21980W.
Moyes, Kathryn A., 21981W.
Smith, Katherine A., 20944W.
Zibell, Mabel M., 21982W.
Hierstein, Martha J., 21984W.
Biegen, Clarice H., 20997W.
Ragsdale, Lulu M., 20998W.
Brandes, Edith, 21985W.
Bailey, Nellie J., 21986W.
Cochran, Eleanor B., 21988W.
Bailey, Doris L., 21097W.
Bradford, Betsy, 20953W.
Facuna, Bessie, 20956A.
Combs, Florence B., 20957W.
Wakeland, Mabel L., 21990W.
Seaman, Lucile A., 21141W.
Laucks, Colatine D., 21098W.
Soule, Frances A., 21142W.
Dennis, Jewell, 21057W.
Simpson, Katherine G., 21100W.
Crowe, Paula B., 22463W.
Wendt, Irene M., 21058W.
Weissbeck, Helen O., 21993W.
McGaffigan, Mary R., 20958W.
Grazin, Ann E., 21035W.
Grinevich, Matilda D., 21996W.
Ostmann, Gertrude M., 21036W.
Egan, Claire P., 20961W.
Castleberry, Mildred E., 21997W.
Szyper, Virginia T., 21060W.
Chism, Grace H., 20999W.
Burk, Lottie B., 20963W.
Dyer, Eleanor K., 21102W.
Seekins, Marjorie E., 20965W.
Moles, Mary A., 21103W.
Respini, Ellen M., 21104W.
Hovland, Otelia A., 21001W.
Jacobs, Florence S., 21105W.
Davidson, Gertrude G., 20967W.
Nordstrom, Norma B., 21002W.
Pace, Lora J., 21063W.
Sanders, Winnie B., 22000W.
Wheeler, Eva J., 22002W.
Dunsmore, Elizabeth M., 21161W.
Burke, Menia, 20990W.
Stein, Charlotte M., 22003W.
Essex, Angelena I., 21111W.
McCloskey, Blanche A., 22004W.
Taylor, Bernice V., 21112W.
Romanofski, Eleanor F., 20991W.
McNulty, Margaret J., 20971W.
Ott, Esta C., 21113W.
Hellen, Geraldine E., 22007W.
Ulrich, Otillia M., 21038W.
Powell, Gussie L., 22010W.
Spisak, Mary F., 21067W.
Stephens, Ruth E., 21006W.
Katich, Mildred C., 21116W.
Moran, Esther J., 21117W.
Carle, Martha, 21145W.
Wiley, Irene, 23577W.
Bosshard, Ann, 21070W.
McGinnis, Madeline B., 22012W.
Gunning, Edith J., 22014W.
Bernick, Eleanor E., 22018W.
Graham, Viola, 22019W.
Bean, Catherine B., 21119W.
Fornora, Josephine E., 22020W.
Vandiver, Mary E., 22021W.
Christison, Dorothy J., 22022W.
Hodgson, Maralee R., 21120W.
Flynn, Margaret C., 21121W.
Britton, Bernice E., 22023W.
Kruger, Ruth A., 21122W.
Hays, Helen M., 21009W.
Lang, Mildred D., 21148W.
Rydzewski, Helen A., 21171W.
Hovatter, Velma A., 21042W.
Cook, Ruby, 21010W.
Lewis, Helen B., 22027W.
Erdmann, Marjorie B., 21162W.
Miller, Isabelle A., 22029W.
Maher, Alice Z., 22035W.
Chandler, Etta, 22034W.
Albert, Janice A., 22037W.
Ragin, Alice M., 22039W.
Blount, Janice M., 22040W.
Mooneyham, Dorothy E., 21149W.
Soppa, Eleanore M., 21125W.
Arrington, Agnes M., 25743W.
Beasley, Eloise D., 21076W.
Jones, Inez L., 21164W.
Gregg, Anne M., 22043W.
Fahrenkopf, Bernadette K., 25751W.
Davidson, Emma M., 25752W.
Deegan, Florence I., 21014W.
Staudt, Valeska B., 21151W.
Miller, Idabelle, 22044W.
Beakes, Marjorie E., 22045W.
Sutton, Mary L., 21128W.
Spohn, Edith E., 21080W.
Leeper, Marion E., 22048W.
Webb, Bertha E., 21081W.
Gersoma, Vivian M., 21082W.
Visnovsky, Helen M., 21043W.
Cigagna, Valarie P., 21083W.
Schadt, Sophia M., 21130W.
Carson, Barbara H., 22052W.
Enigh, Ona M., 22054W.
Hoefly, Ethel A., 22055W.
Loyd, Eddie R., 21131W.
Anton, Juliet M. D., 22056W.
Walters, Alice M., 21084W.
Russell, Georgeann E., 21132W.
Vsetula, Josephine M., 21177W.
O'Neill, Mary C., 21017W.
Merritt, Olive J. B., 21133W.
Falkenhagen, Irene C., 22063W.
Coats, Ada L., 21403W.
Shefuo, Rose M., 22065W.
O'Donnell, Regina C., 21019W.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

*Line of the Air Force*

Burns, Samuel T., 3d, 31477A.
Brown, Larry H., 31478A.
Falletti, Joseph L., 31482A.
Mannion, James J., 31480A.
Comolli, Dennis J., 31481A.
Gaucher, Robert J., 31483A.
Links, Gordon R., 31479A.
Humphreys, William C., 31485A.
Hewnila, Herbert W., 31484A.
Kestner, David G., 31486A.
Miller, Louis, T., 31487A.
Gilliland, James E., 31488A.
Cannon, Lloyd J., Jr., 31491A.
Lavoie, Paul E., 31489A.
Sacher, John R., 31490A.
Kreiser, Guy W., 31492A.
Rentschler, James F., 31494A.
Hale, Richard C., 31493A.
Roberts, John C., 31496A.
Mannino, Philip J., 31495A.
Connelly, Thomas L., 31497A.
Hawkes, James D., 31498A.
Smith, Gilbert D., 3d, 31500A.
Vivona, Alexander A., Jr., 31503A.
Kreider, Robert J., 31499A.
Merritt, John, 31501A.
Fernandez, Manuel L., 31502A.
Hudson, Fred S., 31504A.
Reading, John R., Jr., 31505A.
MacKenzie, James S., Jr., 31506A.
Debnam, Thomas F., Jr., 31507A.
Pillman, Theodore R., Jr., 31509A.
Bowden, Leonard W., 31510A.
Kelly, Fred E., 31508A.
Guiling, John M., 31511A.
Peters, Edward W., Jr., 31513A.
Wotring, John T., 31514A.
Kimball, Merl D., Jr., 31512A.
Malinverni, Albert, 31515A.
Lyon, John E., 31517A.
Haney, John B., 31516A.
Crawford, Van Leroy, Jr., 31519A.
Baker, Jax A., 31518A.
Burgess, Thomas K., 31520A.
Gaffney, John T., 31521A.
McAlister, Walter E., 31522A.
Dahlfors, Theodore E., 31523A.
Owens, Roger L., 31525A.
Johnson, Robert D., 31524A.
Fauser, Rodney H., 31527A.
Mandeville, Dean K., 31526A.
Patton, Orin C., 31528A.
Weaver, Ralph W., Jr., 31529A.
Goldstein, Richard S., 31533A.
Musick, Victor H., 31535A.
Fanning, Francis R., 31532A.
Noone, Richard F., 31530A.
Hunter, Harold M., 31534A.
Fuchs, Donald L., 31531A.
Marlowe, William R., Jr., 31536A.
Cottrell, Samuel S., 31537A.
Snyder, Joel J., 31538A.
Gillespie, Charley P., 31540A.
Bloodworth, James O., 3d, 31541A.
Trachte, Byron W., 31543A.
Arias, Vincent, Jr., 31548A.
Lewis, Frank W., Jr., 31547A.
Raymer, Lester C., 31539A.
Merkel, Richard E., 31544A.
Burke, Walter J., Jr., 31546A.
Timmons, Lloyd S., Jr., 31545A.
Saylor, Kenneth W., Jr., 31542A.
Griffiths, John D., 31549A.
Gerrow, Irv R., 31552A.
Shepherd, Thomas G., 31557A.
Stewart, Francis E., 31553A.
Bolles, Richard B., 31551A.
Lundquist, David A., 31560A.
Vandenack, Thomas R., 31561A.
Dalton, Russell A., 31555A.
Eisele, Ronald C., 31556A.
Stubbs, John F., 31558A.

Burris, John W., 31559A.
Barrett, John L., Jr., 31550A.
Caudell, Colven E., Jr., 31554A.
Heine, Theodore C., Jr., 31562A.
Sevison, Jack R., 31563A.
Ries, John C., Jr., 31564A.
Bratcher, Wayne R., 31565A.
Windrath, Donald C., 31570A.
Minett, Cyril W., 31567A.
Pishvanov, Nicholas A., 31568A.
Pearis, Samuel P., 4th, 31566A.
Watson, Paul W., Jr., 31569A.
Horrell, Reginald S., 31594A.
Main, Lee E., 31581A.
Richardson, Jerre B., 31587A.
Schwartz, James R., 31596A.
Purdy, William S., Jr., 31593A.
Geralds, Robert A., 31577A.
Wright, Gordon L., 31590A.
Pfeiffer, Joseph C., Jr., 31585A.
Sullivan, Floyd A., 31588A.
Forster, Richard A., 31576A.
Colbath, Thomas N., 31574A.
Brown, Curtiss E., 31572A.
Randall, Robert E., 31586A.
Moraveck, George F., 31584A.
Keith, Robert S., 31580A.
Camacho, Raymond, 31591A.
Hutton, Harold S., 31579A.
Medley, James T., 31583A.
Riggert, Melvin E., 31592A.
Woodring, Joe L., 31589A.
Camp, William A., 31573A.
Hutchinson, Donald H., 31578A.
Ruthrauff, Donald W., 31595A.
Dorsett, Ralph, 31575A.
McKenzie, Jimmie A., 31582A.
Alm, David C., 31571A.
Hazelwood, Donald J., 31605A.
Younts, James R., 31600A.
Tyler, Joseph R., 31598A.
Rardin, Theodore A., 31607A.
Schweitzer, James A., 31599A.
Geer, George M., 31604A.
Smith, William D., 31603A.
Winters, Richard A., 31609A.
Robison, Darwin L., 31606A.
Dietrich, Clay, Jr., 31602A.
McGael, Donal P. L., 31601A.
Krause, Albert S., Jr., 31597A.
Bills, Walter B., 31612A.
Derridinger, Richard K., 31613A.
Burnett, Chester E., 31610A.
Thompson, Richard M., 31608A.
Myers, Allen L., Jr., 31615A.
Manfredi, Harold D., 31611A.
Bonadies, Alphonse G., 31614A.
Hutchinson, William C., 31616A.
Light, Paul E., 31617A.
Sloan, George H., 31618A.
Vickrey, Luster A., Jr., 31620A.
McLeod, Gordon E., 31619A.
Hansen, Paul J., Jr., 31623A.
Purves, Dean L., 31621A.
Carr, William H., 31622A.
Hull, George G., 31624A.
Gardner, Melvin S., 31625A.
Popovich, Michael T., 28975A.
Alavarez, Ariel, 31626A.
Chapel, Kieran O., 31627A.
Hill, Ernest C., Jr., 31628A.
Drawbaugh, Robert E., 31629A.
Boden, Warren W., 31633A.
Chappell, Richard G., 31632A.
Winters, Edgar J., 31634A.
Handcock, Robert B., 31630A.
Justeson, George R., 31631A.
Boulware, Robert H., 31639A.
Hargreaves, John J., 31635A.
Shaeffer, John E., 31640A.
Wilson, Glen H., 31641A.
Lein, Larry L., 31638A.
Glen, Dwight P., 31637A.
Jemison, Jamie L., 31636A.
Propst, Robert W., 31642A.
Trudell, Ronald D., 31643A.
Mahoney, George F., 31644A.
Kustelski, Thomas A., 31646A.
Johnson, William D., 31648A.
Damon, Edward R., 31645A.
Cooney, Charles T., Jr., 31649A.
Newcombe, Charles B., 31653A.
Schoolfield, Scott M., 31650A.
Welch, John F., 31651A.
Short, Donald L., 31659A.
Kinkel, Charles H., 31658A.
Smith, Melvin R., 31660A.
Paxson, Norman T., 31654A.
Harpster, Milton H., 31657A.
Dillard, James R., 31652A.
Hagood, Lindell M., 31656A.
Graham, Gary G., 31655A.
Rousseau, Robert G., 31661A.
Billion, William E., 31662A.
Hosman, Stuart B., 31663A.
Thornton, William L., 31664A.
Reed, Lester W., Jr., 31666A.
Tidwell, Marion F., 31665A.
Barnes, Edward G., 31668A.
Wootton, Wayne F., 31673A.
Pyatt, Robert C., 31671A.
Kelly, Vernon B., Jr., 31669A.
Green, Warren G., 31670A.
Cox, Gene A., 31667A.
Smith, Roger M., 31672A.
Thomas, Charles D., Jr., 31675A.
Nasypany, Raymond, 31674A.
McCartney, Robert R., 31676A.
Murphy, Stuart T., 31677A.
Birmingham, John M., 31679A.
Burt, David N., 31678A.
McCollam, George W., 31680A.
Carlton, William M., Jr., 31682A.
Alexander, David M., 31681A.
Stanford, Jesse E., 31685A.
Smith, Robert A., 31686A.
Palisch, Herbert T., 31683A.
Bush, George H., 31684A.
McNeil, Dale E., 31687A.
Harz, Donald K., 31688A.
Biersack, Elmer R., 31689A.
Coulter, Herschel E., Jr., 31690A.
Odland, Robert B., 31691A.
Davis, Jerry G., 31696A.
Egbertson, Charles B., 31712A.
McGuire, Richard L., 31692A.
Thompson, William D., 31698A.
Mulch, LeRoy, R., 31714A.
Burpee, Richard A., 31704A.
Voelker, Robert G., 31706A.
Grange, John T., 31707A.
Belcher, John T., 31695A.
Kelley, Robert L., 31708A.
Barlow, Wesley J., 31701A.
Schwartz, Harold, 31693A.
Sargologos, Nicholas, Jr., 31715A.
Arata, Paul F., 3d, 31694A.
Smith, Thomas D., 3d, 31709A.
Cobb, Kenny D., 31703A.
Bayless, Thomas H., 31702A.
Steen, Joe R., 31710A.
Swanson, James O., 31711A.
Bowen, Kenneth R., 31699A.
Haning, James R., 31713A.
Fletcher, Carl C., Jr., 31705A.
Gilliland, Jack E., Jr., 31697A.
Hoover, Richard L., 31700A.
Robson, Donald E., 31716A.
Harrison, Gerald D., 31717A.
Linton, John D., Jr., 31718A.
Perren, Gerald J., 31726A.
Mellott, Lester R., Jr., 31725A.
Stoll, Harry J., 31728A.
Ingram, Ralph W., 31722A.
Lennon, William E., Jr., 31723A.
Bird, DeVaughn, 31720A.
Clarke, James E., 31721A.
Allen, David H., 31719A.
McCright, Gerald D., 31724A.
Springston, Theodore, Jr., 31727A.
Haile, Allen C., 31731A.
Peterson, Kenneth L., 31729A.
Strain, Robert B., 31730A.
Timpko, Charles M., Jr., 31732A.
Bryce, Thomas C., 31733A.
Reed, Guy A., Jr., 31734A.
Secanti, Richard M., 31735A.
Saunders, William W., 31736A.
Walker, Stuart D., 31737A.
Whitehouse, Larry V., 31738A.
Champlin, James L., 31739A.
Bartholomew, David B., 31741A.
Pettyjohn, Jimmy C., 31743A.
Atkinson, Rowland R., Jr., 31746A.
Sherrier, Richard J., 31748A.
Anderson, Milton W., 31742A.
Jackman, Thomas W., 31745A.
Green, Wade L., 31740A.
Pekarek, Bert E., 31744A.
O'Banion, Glenn A., 31747A.
Tilley, Tommy A., 31749A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956):

*To be majors*

Hershell L. Abbott, AO431369.
Albert D. Aberson, AO665263.
Jacob P. Accola, AO433143.
John B. Adams, AO1104880.
Paul E. Adams, AO660225.
Harold F. Adkins, AO692250.
Jack D. Agnew, AO562708.
Roy M. Ahalt, Jr., AO885123.
Elisha G. Akin, Jr., AO295866.
Sam W. Alderson, AO507084.
Ernest W. Alexander, Jr., AO522137.
Theodore M. Alexander, AO1035641.
Charles D. Allen, AO691346.
Charles H. Allen, Jr., AO697977.
Charles T. Allen, Jr., AO366702.
Leroy E. Allen, AO1103492.
Robert W. Allen, AO686961.
Wilfred H. Allen, Jr., AO808224.
Roy W. Amick, AO579971.
Edwin R. Anders, AO664364.
Leslie E. Andersen, AO798078.
Paul C. Andersen, AO1551783.
Bernard I. Anderson, AO742648.
Charles C. Anderson, Jr., AO663346.
Gene C. Anderson, AO1281965.
George L. Anderson, AO410744.
Howard W. Anderson, Jr., AO755621.
Ingvar E. Anderson, AO752973.
John G. M. Anderson, AO735493.
Norman C. Anderson, AO726730.
Reid J. Anderson, AO495448.
Richard C. Anderson, AO391316.
Robert C. Anderson, AO461695.
William F. Anderson, AO820636.
Donald P. Andre, AO559010.
Donald R. Angell, AO423811.
Crystal L. Andress, AO677958.
Harold D. Anglin, AO800805.
Warren R. Annear, AO675527.
Harry R. Arcularius, AO865203.
Bertrand J. Arents, AO675528.
Edgar R. Armagost, AO532988.
John W. Arnette, AO564387.
Edison F. Arnold, AO438505.
George M. Arnold, AO795168.
Elwood D. Arp, AO731788.
William K. Ashby, AO386419.
Archie B. Ashcraft, Jr., AO797946.
Vincent H. Ashmore, AO1640185.
Gust Askounis, AO413054.
Kenneth L. Atchley, AO365656.
John W. Atherton, AO580639.
Billy N. Atteberry, AO675812.
Thomas T. Auberry, Jr., AO812208.
George E. Austin, AO865365.
William E. Awtrey, Jr., AO423251.
Albert S. Babinec, AO737701.
Charles E. Bach, AO863430.
Felix R. Bailey, AO726182.
Walter H. Bailey, Jr., AO725241.
Robert W. Bailie, AO755497.
Homer A. Baker, Jr., AO660613.
Ogden Z. Baker, AO1583906.
Raymond H. Baker, AO427583.
Joseph L. Baldwin, AO797805.
Oscar F. Baldwin, Jr., AO730336.
Robert C. Baldwin, AO701856.
John M. Bane, AO660617.
Harry V. Bankard, AO801169.
Patrick A. Barbati, AO677219.
Charles N. Barchard, AO819941.
Paul F. Bard, AO1581506.

Selwyn J. Barefoot, AO421945.
Charles A. Baril, AO354351.
Buford W. Barker, AO663461.
John R. Barnett, AO431021.
Harry W. Barrett, AO797716.
Paul C. Barrett, AO562470.
John G. Barry, Jr., AO789960.
Michael A. Barry, AO1553397.
John W. Baska, AO495200.
Edward J. Bartlett, AO692262.
Robert D. Baskerville, Jr., AO815053.
Kennedy I. Bass, AO1051476.
Lee H. Batsel, AO676724.
Warren Baulch, AO532990.
Ralph R. Bayer, AO917312.
Graham C. Beachum, AO791665.
Willard J. Beahan, AO559579.
Henry E. Beal, Jr., AO740344.
Paul Beard, AO424349.
Albert R. Beaty, AO800810.
Paul S. Bechtel, AO376571.
Dwight S. Beckham, AO692644.
William P. Beecham, AO730339.
Frank J. Behan, AO821145.
James E. Beitzel, AO796765.
Paul P. Belchyk, AO579803.
Leonard F. Beldowicz, AO1587834.
Joe H. Beler, AO562500.
John F. Belew, AO567258.
Walter W. Bell, AO796480.
George J. Benedict, AO540870.
Robert E. Benefiel, AO820204.
Charles J. Bennett, AO866679.
Eugene J. Benoit, AO752035.
Henry D. Bentley, AO816975.
Robert I. Benton, AO576868.
Joseph A. Berger, AO434069.
Samuel D. Berman, AO442340.
Erskine G. Berry, Jr., AO406531.
Donald F. Berschel, AO1114364.
Darrell A. Beschen, AO707647.
Aaron Z. Bessant, AO440969.
Albert G. Betette, AO791648.
Howard E. Bettis, AO696314.
McFate E. Beveridge, AO396358.
John D. Bice, AO420569.
Robert F. B. Bicher, Jr., AO682279.
Lawrence T. Biehunko, AO535923.
Donald E. Billings, AO670339.
Henry T. Bingham, AO945037.
Donald D. Bird, AO573948.
Everett L. Bird, AO685259.
Joseph M. Bird, AO432162.
Otis S. Birdsall, AO905833.
William J. Birmele, AO560636.
James R. Blackburn, AO433454.
Jack A. Blacker, AO736955.
Harry B. Blacksten, AO1637030.
Guy N. Blair, AO857231.
John H. Blodgett, AO1635591.
Arthur L. Blondin, AO812359.
Eugene A. Blue, AO562562.
Roy B. Bluhm, Jr., AO688233.
John H. Blumenstock, AO705103.
Herbert O. Boelter, AO859784.
James H. Bogert, AO789442.
Nelson L. Bomba, AO433277.
Henry D. Booher, AO579816.
Sydnor J. Borden, AO428757.
James H. Borgens, AO562581.
Frank H. Bouldin, Jr., AO707650.
Winston E. Boutelle, AO727617.
Kenneth G. Bowen, Jr., AO750935.
Charles J. Bowers, AO442337.
Joseph S. Bowers, Jr., AO567308.
Kent G. Bowlan, AO669666.
Temple Bowling, AO659796.
William H. Bowman, Jr., AO692462.
Fred B. Bown, AO487629.
Kenneth C. Boyce, AO796954.
Earl W. Boyd, AO682139.
Hugh F. Boyd, Jr., AO 889694.
Edwin H. Boyers, AO424239.
Arthur A. Brackett, AO559618.
Edward I. Braddock, AO496341.
Marion E. Bradshaw, AO791640.
Dudley V. Brand, AO503333.
Charles A. Brandt, AO564885.
Louis A. Brecknock, AO564897.
Tracy S. Breed, AO812931.
William A. Breese, AO562608.
Louis H. Breininger, AO760771.
John J. Brennan, Jr., AO404232.
James O. Brent, AO731446.
John E. Bridge, AO855851.
Edward E. Briesemeister, AO664731.
Gifford M. Briggs, AO742057.
E. V. Brindley, Jr., AO1697851.
Cecil V. Broadaway, AO432804.
Donald W. Brookie, AO736971.
Richard C. Brookins, AO422898.
Rex L. Brouillard, AO1636390.
Eddie J. Broussard, Jr., AO659653.
Chester L. Brown, AO669447.
Dale L. Brown, AO731556.
David R. Brown, AO676734.
Frederick I. Brown, Jr., AO571111.
James W. Brown, AO664127.
Marshall C. Brown, Jr., AO419214.
Milton M. Brown, AO741584.
Noble E. Brown, AO686977.
George A. Browning III, AO685315.
Arnold C. Brunner, AO613466.
Louie K. Brunner, AO692856.
Frank T. Bryan, AO660029.
Guy L. Bryson, AO724514.
Anton F. Buchert, AO675668.
Ralph J. Buck, AO564933.
Robert S. Buckley, AO806207.
David Buckspan, AO559645.
Kenneth G. Buglass, AO661075.
Daniel H. Bull, AO649746.
William C. Bumm, AO682785.
Claude N. Burcky, AO417245.
Archie G. Burdette, AO666398.
Phillip N. Burgandine, AO1595899.
Samuel C. Burgess, AO500906.
John R. Burget, AO691717.
Leonard F. Burke, AO670824.
William H. Burkett, AO673085.
Charles E. Burnette, AO692947.
Ernest T. Burnett, AO724694.
Raymond Burns, Jr., AO664373.
Robert E. Busch, AO818591.
Frank S. Buzard, AO514751.
Frank C. Buzze, AO810466.
Charles F. Byars, AO432043.
Jess L. Bynum, AO675476.
Milton W. Byrn, AO804109.
Warren M. F. Cables, AO433650.
James J. Cadden, AO807895.
John S. Caldwell, Jr., AO362352.
Lorenzo Caliendo, AO683963.
William K. Callam, AO696056.
Alfonso Camarena, AO737536.
Frederick A. Campbell, Jr., AO704632.
Warren G. Campbell, AO750534.
James L. Cannell, AO560740.
Peter G. Canner, AO432444.
Harry E. Cannon, AO790511.
John P. Carah, AO340467.
Max R. Carey, AO417004.
Charles P. Carliey, AO758039.
William P. Carlyon, AO790512.
Charles C. Carmichael, AO746289.
Reed H. Carney, AO662626.
Noel Carpenter, AO659246.
Joseph H. Carpentier, AO436760.
James B. Carraway, AO790014.
Wilbur C. Carraway, AO673774.
Wallace J. Carrington, AO1645129.
George B. Carroll, AO754787.
Kenneth R. Carson, AO682005.
Luther D. Carson, AO757696.
Harold W. Carter, AO675552.
Jeo J. Casagrande, AO675986.
James L. Caselli, AO413570.
Armando Caseria, AO854151.
Edgar P. Cason, AO816235.
Edward G. Cassidy, AO574177.
Harry L. Castleman, Jr., AO560764.
John J. Caulfield, AO338270.
Everett L. Cavell, AO442353.
Charles J. Cesky, AO796084.
Ralph F. Chaffee, AO659871.
Wayne C. Chambers, AO698517.
Gerald S. Chapman, AO1686506.
Merlin L. Chardi, AO742285.
John R. Chasteen, AO1035941.
Paul Chenchar, Jr., AO667249.
Henry W. Cherrington, AO805757.
Merdy E. Cherry, AO681981.
John E. Child, AO424407.
James Childs, AO565037.
Steward J. Chisholm, AO674282.
Summer Cho, AO391814.
Henry L. Choate, AO667944.
Richard I. Choate, AO376357.
Winton Christner, AO536845.
Clayton E. Christy, AO674151.
Anthony J. Cieri, AO790517.
Roland H. Cipolla, AO1103100.
Edward R. Clark, AO465864.
John F. Clark, AO815588.
Leon R. Clark, AO425160.
Norman R. Clark, AO662118.
Ovie D. Clark, AO443506.
Tom S. Clark, AO659082.
Galloway H. Clary, AO574222.
Benjamin H. Clayton, AO679044.
Raymond L. Clellen, AO1581064.
Harry W. Clement, AO682979.
Francis A. Cloaninger, AO813857.
John F. Clyde, AO485348.
Mitchell A. Cobeaga, AO401371.
Theodore S. Coberly, AO685246.
Roy J. Coggin, AO798976.
Eldon N. Colby, AO740749.
Dick T. Cole, AO687108.
Alphonse J. Coleman, AO805005.
Ned I. Colia, AO392436.
George L. Colley, AO649026.
Buford E. Collings, Jr., AO807694.
Rupert P. Collins, AO666875.
Sidney E. Colthorpe, AO801060.
Cornelius J. Comber, AO523469.
Dean D. Conard, AO407035.
William R. Conger, AO801834.
Keith Conley, AO662886.
Milton M. Connell, Jr., AO660036.
John T. Connelly, AO814870.
Lawrence D. Connolly, AO431656.
Miles A. Connor, AO347376.
James F. Conti, AO1105352.
John W. Cook, AO560821.
Raymond K. Cooke, AO733830.
Elmer D. Coon, AO754072.
Merle M. Coons, AO737733.
Richard N. Cordell, AO727182.
William M. Corder, AO820722.
Eugene F. Coriell, AO304965.
James T. Corn, AO764976.
August D. Corsalini, AO1168210.
Joseph D. Cortez, AO446829.
Ward E. Cory, AO426686.
Stanley Cottage, AO420870.
Martin E. Cotton, AO798255.
James F. Couch, AO1549245.
Lewis E. Courson, AO745049.
James A. Coventry, AO678616.
Harold F. Coverdale, AO659260.
Wayne L. Covert, AO1698889.
John L. Covey, AO392565.
George O. Cowan, AO815656.
John L. Cowsert, AO535142.
Jack R. Cox, AO741480.
Rufus A. Cox, Jr., AO812054.
Robert O. Crabtree, AO669457.
Charles D. Craig, Jr., AO509897.
Robert N. Crain, AO668316.
William M. Crampton, AO1699409.
Samuel C. Cravens, AO432340.
Franklin A. Crawford, AO427269.
Wayne S. Crawford, Jr., AO807698.
James R. Cray, AO683411.
Floyd R. Creasman, AO450263.
Jeremiah Creedon, AO760793.
David L. Crenshaw, AO565116.
Lawrence T. Crepeau, AO747219.
Victor J. Crepeau, AO524480.
Thomas J. Cribbs, AO1299999.
William C. Cridland, AO735175.
David S. Crist, AO315792.
Warney L. Crosby, AO540267.
Robert P. Crow, AO565126.
Leon L. Crowder, Jr., AO1554345.
Robert B. Crowley, AO559071.
Glenn Crum, AO812762.
Leroy A. Crum, AO567801.
John C. Cummins, AO807235.
John J. Cunningham, AO577711.
David C. Currie, AO499866.
Deane G. Curry, AO818630.

John E. Curtis, AO725953.
Henry R. Cushman, Jr., AO1295517.
Richard N. Cutter, AO738765.
Robert N. Cyzmoure, AO706143.
William E. Daggitt, AO660115.
Arvid E. Dahlberg, AO560862.
William L. Dalton, AO1308928.
John P. Daly, Jr., AO809327.
William J. Daly, Jr., AO733839.
Charles L. Daniel, AO724714.
Enoch L. Daniell, Jr., AO705339.
Jerrold K. Davidson, AO702152.
Claude C. Davis, AO749207.
Nelson J. Davis, AO820680.
Richard W. Davis, AO675482.
Robert J. Davis, AO703557.
Woodard E. Davis, Jr., AO747991.
Robert E. Dawson, AO432186.
Joseph D. Day, AO688994.
Earl R. Dayton, AO1641986.
Frank R. Dean, AO681281.
Hubert N. Dean, AO1317277.
Ivan E. Dean, AO747765.
John J. Dean, AO738110.
Ralph H. Dearey, AO696689.
Charles G. Dearing, Jr., AO1553797.
Harry F. DeArment, AO567862.
Velfort J. DeArmond, Jr., AO664540.
Richard H. Decker, AO724761.
James V. DeCoster, AO751106.
Benjamin F. DeHaan, AO696223.
John E. Dulap, AO667260.
Hector J. DeLeo, AO752395.
Anthony M. DelGiorno, AO866689.
Anthony S. Dellamonico, AO2046509.
Claude A. DeLorenzo, AO873726.
Joseph R. Deluca, AO567877.
Charles W. Denning, AO381241.
Velpeau C. Denton, AO389622.
Frederick A. DePalma, AO866296.
Joseph J. DeRaad, AO902042.
Louis J. DeSandro, AO433484.
Frank DeTroy, Jr., AO1294441.
Philip R. Deubler, AO388730.
Edward N. Deutsch, AO567892.
Henry J. Deutschendorf, AO748375.
Pasquale L. DeVasto, AO567894.
Robert W. Devenish, AO759193.
John M. Devereaux, AO384516.
Charles J. Dewey, AO563165.
Robert I. DeWitt, AO795712.
Arthur A. DeYoung, AO740145.
Andrew Di Antonio, AO1000225.
Charles E. Dickey, AO432622.
Melvin N. Dickey, AO667670.
Thomas P. Dickey, AO429370.
Jack D. Dieckman, AO483434.
Richard C. Dineen, AO737024.
Mario Di Silvestro, AO567913.
Rogest W. Dively, AO560920.
Robert W. Doenges, AO437390.
Marion F. Dombrowski, AO688806.
I. B. Jack Donalson, AO424927.
Robert M. Donnell, AO867994.
William E. Donnelly, AO571485.
Clarence A. Dooley, AO792817.
Alfred A. Dorow, AO801440.
Don E. Dossey, AO669461.
Carl E. Doughman, AO571493.
Robert F. Douglas, AO1036126.
James R. Douglass, AO731365.
Richard B. Douglass, AO696442.
Robert Dow, AO424255.
Donald W. Dower, AO730882.
Alfred C. Dowlearn III, AO666159.
James R. Dowless, AO583739.
John C. Downey, AO698678.
Wilbur R. Downie, AO695589.
Elijah M. Downing, AO807715.
Richard J. Downs, AO816073.
Jesse M. Doyle, AO1106692.
Karl E. Dreller, AO863694.
Arthur L. Dressler, AO565231.
John C. Drew, AO886053.
Robert C. Dubose, AO574456.
Frank H. Duby, AO672778.
Robert O. Duckworth, AO392990.
David J. Duff, AO1945566.
Orlo F. Duker, AO729829.
Neal B. Dunbar, Jr., AO440337.
Bruce G. Duncan, AO1280032.
Joseph A. Duncan, AO666254.
Hendricks M. Dunlap, AO751109.
Ronald E. Dunlap, AO743429.
James M. Dunn, AO579912.
Charles G. Dupont, AO800211.
Robert F. Durbin, AO793909.
Alger E. Durell, AO762288.
Edward H. Dvorak, AO531497.
Edward R. Dvorak, AO583747.
Clifford H. Dwinell, AO351702.
Eugene H. Dyke, AO794540.
George T. Dwyre, AO818506.
Thomas E. Dye, AO524328.
Blan P. Dysart, Jr., AO888809.
Tom F. Eakins, AO1000555.
Fred T. Eanes, Jr., AO696073.
Pat H. Earhart, AO760604.
Joe E. Earll, Jr., AO417690.
Sidney P. Easley, AO726205.
William P. Eaton, AO873452.
William H. Eckles, AO816647.
Merle A. Ehorn, AO751285.
Albert Ehrlich, AO873451.
Roy E. Eidson, AO704471.
Charles V. Eld, AO430997.
William Elias, AO669462.
Cicero J. Ellen, AO792566.
Bertrum E. Ellingson, AO529013.
Charles M. Elliott, AO749503.
Gober O. Elliott, AO388733.
John W. Elliott, AO398617.
Frederick D. Ellis, AO522799.
John W. Emig, AO696447.
Arthur T. Ensley, AO808395.
Donald H. Erickson, AO805424.
John T. Ertler, AO747655.
Gordon D. Estabrook, AO431778.
Edward H. Esteri, AO1646733.
Carl A. Estes, AO810340.
Winston M. Estes, AO562957.
Harold E. Etheridge, AO799359.
George G. Evans, Jr., AO1575959.
Lawrence W. Evans, AO397717.
William H. Evans, AO724401.
William S. Evans, AO342604.
Arthur Eve, Jr., AO1587955.
John W. Everhart, AO470297.
Haywood R. Faison, Jr., AO402693.
Edward R. Fallon, Jr., AO411467.
Jack N. Fancher, AO724914.
George C. Farr, AO429060.
Ned W. Farr, Jr., AO789697.
Raymond A. Farrell, AO811875.
William Faulk, Jr., AO1000359.
Dwight L. Faulkner, AO525078.
John W. Feeney, AO701744.
Albert Feldman, AO1994904.
Albert J. Feldt, AO687572.
Blaine J. Felt, AO433824.
Bill G. Fendall, AO391977.
Francis W. Fender, AO745238.
Joseph J. Feore, AO818567.
Victor J. Ferrari, AO670054.
James P. Ferrell, AO417950.
Donald M. Ferris, AO707676.
Kenneth B. Fess, AO737386.
Joseph R. Fetsko, AO808982.
Gene E. Fisher, AO735767.
Roy L. Fisher, AO662034.
Raymond A. Fitjar, AO362005.
Paul A. Fitzgerald, AO761718.
Earl J. Fitzsimmons, AO704914.
Dominic V. Fiacco, AO687024.
Donald F. Flaherty, AO563008.
Alma R. Flake, AO755911.
Robert C. Flanders, AO405790.
Joseph F. Fleming, AO728267.
John F. Fletcher, AO348426.
Louis D. Foglia, AO571661.
John B. Folan, AO428485.
Ross M. Fountain, AO671336.
Harold L. Fox, AO661742.
John A. Franco, AO739082.
Charles H. Franks, AO561037.
John E. Fredericks, Jr., AO564364.
Lucius L. Free, AO428963.
George A. Freed, AO504099.
Gerrit D. Fremouw, AO919103.
Johnson L. French, Jr., AO700913.
Reginald W. French, AO736176.
Ardelle W. Frenk, AO733301.
Raymond J. Frese, AO311883.
Darral J. Freund, AO430989.
Robert K. Friedli, AO742574.
Aloys W. Fuessel, Jr., AO678227.
Jacob F. Fullilove, AO726365.
James H. Fulmer, AO793242.
Kenneth H. Fultz, AO673531.
Frank G. Furrie, AO795037.
Jerome S. Gabig, AO1580973.
John Gagliard, AO751298.
John P. Ford, AO755079.
Perry C. Ford, AO725425.
Walter V. Ford, AO683430.
William W. Forehand, AO670473.
Benjamin A. Foreman, AO696352.
Birdene E. Forrest, AO561027.
Vernon E. Forseth, AO701588.
Alvin R. Fortney, AO660556.
Martin A. Foster, Jr., AO733862.
Stephen A. Gajan, AO438248.
Winfred H. Gallienne, AO404048.
Robert E. Gardner, AO729333.
Warner F. Gardner, AO428926.
Frank Gargan, Jr., AO1595517.
Charles V. Garino, AO795588.
Harold C. Garner, AO666927.
Phillip W. Garris, AO854038.
Vermont Garrison, AO886027.
Mario A. Garuti, AO729159.
Charles T. Garvin, AO1704172.
Joseph A. Gascoigne, AO737767.
Lawrence W. Gassman, AO759364.
Dillard Gay, Jr., AO668924.
Paul X. Geary, Jr., AO448975.
Eugene W. Geniesse, Jr., AO943699.
Daniel T. George, AO1102255.
Ellis P. George, AO617197.
Robert E. Georges, AO666164.
Thomas M. Gerbing, AO1635924.
James A. Gerwick, AO1699273.
Kevork Ghourdjian, AO412649.
Richard J. Gibney, AO818512.
William J. Gibson, AO414747.
James F. Gill, AO568294.
Richard M. Gill, AO418904.
Leonard V. Gillespie, AO563101.
Paul T. Gilliatt, AO446918.
Oscar G. Gillon, Jr., AO421594.
John W. Gilluly, AO792583.
John P. Gloeckler, AO861663.
Colon H. Glover, Jr., AO413612.
Cephas Q. Godsey, AO673541.
Johnie R. Godwin, AO697628.
Conrad W. Goetsch, AO752848.
Pat E. Goforth, AO561104.
Francis R. Goldsberry, AO755924.
William H. Good, AO805905.
Richard A. Goodell, AO407884.
Wallace C. Goodrich, Jr., AO793247.
Robert G. Goodson, AO542796.
Dave Gordon, AO1287341.
Robert M. Gorham, AO667694.
William B. Goris, AO730255.
Kenneth B. Gorton, AO796479.
Jack B. Goudy, AO659116.
Carl J. Grabher, AO807362.
George T. Grammas, AO429941.
Bayard V. Grant, AO1642913.
Lawrence H. Grant, AO728201.
Richard A. Grant, AO669706.
Richard L. Gray, AO339238.
William E. Gray, AO803141.
William L. Gray, AO399519.
John W. Graybill, AO429639.
Nathan G. Greathouse, AO499536.
Charles A. Green, AO855404.
Clifford N. Green, AO2044542.
Dexter M. Green, AO739771.
Milton C. Green, AO747786.
William H. Greenhalgh, Jr., AO1696876.
William Greenwood, AO579960.
Walker B. Greer, AO666030.
Walter A. Gremban, AO425135.
Armand I. Grenadier, AO401394.
Richard E. Grey, AO672948.
Claude K. Griffin, AO798285.
Joseph H. Griffith, Jr., AO789558.
Frederick M. Griggs, AO818857.
Kenneth E. Grine, AO568412.
Edward D. Griswold, AO792585.
George L. Grubbs, AO820002.

Donald C. Gruber, AO577783.
Kenneth F. Grunewald, AO393112.
William A. Gunter, AO428493.
George A. Guy, AO865481.
John F. Haaheim, AO704837.
Perry W. Hadden, AO804654.
Frederick J. Hagerty, AO818146.
Allan A. Hakola, AO747012.
Jimmie W. Hale, AO662555.
Edward N. Hall, AO434506.
William P. Hall, AO670117.
Edward J. Haller, AO698916.
Frank N. Halm, AO760730.
Robert S. Hamill, AO727718.
John F. Hamilton, AO574861.
Walter S. Hammond, AO412963.
Harry C. Hancock, AO818759.
Quentin L. Hancock, AO683687.
Stanley I. Hand, AO397368.
William E. Hanes, AO431427.
Max E. Hanna, AO670534.
Joseph E. Hannah, AO681282.
William E. Hannan, AO681283.
Carleton V. Hansen, AO730110.
James L. Harcrow, AO431874.
Paul E. Harden, AO724930.
Fred P. Hardy, AO726901.
John F. Hargraves, AO1824613.
Cecil F. Harper, AO520421.
Thomas Harrell, AO483499.
Homer F. Harrington, AO728651.
William M. Harrington, AO425140.
Floyd D. Harris, AO724931.
George W. E. Harris, AO807432.
Lloyd M. Harris, AO945326.
Robert L. Harris, AO532503.
William R. Harry, AO515626.
Ernest J. Hart, AO568513.
Bernard F. Hartnett, AO681580.
Albert S. Harwell, Jr., AO670900.
Albert D. Hatcher, Jr., AO434951.
Andrew Haughom, AO424433.
James J. Hausman, AO437122.
Galen M. Haven, AO487425.
William R. Hawkins, AO1299562.
George A. Hawa, AO1639147.
Dean E. Hayden, AO568534.
James J. Hayes, AO420792.
Lloyd R. Hayes, AO1104828.
Elbert D. Hayford, Jr., AO818151.
Frank W. Hayslip, AO691256.
John C. Healey, AO329510.
Daniel C. Heath, AO756394.
Thomas F. Heiser, AO581814.
John R. Hellon, AO1555401.
Richard H. Helmick, AO746940.
Homer H. Helton, AO728276.
Norman B. Hemingway, AO1312765.
Thomas W. Henderson, AO686471.
William T. Henderson, Jr., AO1634873.
Andrew J. Hendrick, AO422478.
Howard F. Hendricks, AO754505.
Harry C. Henry, AO659708.
Raymond J. Herdzina, AO463849.
Larry P. Hergenreder, AO697859.
Harry H. Herrmann, AO806678.
Walter N. Hess, AO686851.
Henry E. Hester, AO808994.
George Hewitt, AO575059.
James E. Hickey, AO1576121.
David M. Hill, AO675064.
Louis D. Hill, AO1589900.
Ray M. Hilliard, AO430812.
David A. Himes, AO690068.
Frank O. Hinckley, AO736002.
Russell E. Hodge, AO684867.
Edward F. Hodges, AO740424.
Frank R. Hodges, AO433371.
Robert T. Hof, AO1633015.
Leonard C. Hoffmann, AO427733.
Roy B. Hogg, AO794232.
Jose L. Holguin, AO728388.
Mark F. Holland, AO520195.
Francis V. Hooven, Jr., AO811385.
Michael C. Horgan, AO809148.
John T. Horrocks, AO670742.
Harold W. Hosack, AO691754.
Robert J. Hoss, AO397397.
Robert L. Houghten, AO425168.
Walter G. House, AO447063.
Harold W. Houston, AO407769.
Blake P. Howard, AO640063.
John B. Howard, AO433372.
Eugene S. Howell, AO705693.
Selah H. Howell, AO790344.
Willis J. Hubert, AO650896.
Hans G. Huettig, AO812267.
Phil Hughes, AO399528.
Harson B. Hughes, AO704206.
James E. Hughes, AO857555.
John L. Hughes, AO812431.
Jonathan S. Hughes, AO684004.
William M. Hughs, AO681094.
Robert J. Huliar, AO413014.
Truman P. Hume, AO676060.
Jerry J. Hunt, AO664011.
Theodore Hunt, Jr., AO756592.
Jack C. Hunter, AO802394.
Toy B. Husband, AO728872.
Robert H. Huston, AO424375.
Ray Hutchins, AO692012.
Joseph G. Hutchison, AO737117.
Harry D. Immel, Jr., AO1112777.
Jack H. Ingham, AO763817.
Robert D. Inghram, AO421774.
Stanford M. Ingram, AO758455.
Chester C. Ishmael, AO678271.
Robert W. Iverson, AO523209.
Arthur J. W. Jackson, AO572137.
Duard Y. Jackson, AO809617.
T. J. Jackson, Jr., AO424485.
George A. Jacobi, AO738163.
Ernst E. Jahnke, AO735592.
Daniel James, Jr., AO809244.
Robert H. James, AO810885.
William W. James, AO860510.
Lowell R. Jameson, AO431771.
Wallace J. Jarman, AO755566.
Donald L. Jeffers, AO760166.
Roland R. Jehl, AO523462.
James D. Jelley, AO733655.
Russell H. Jenkins, AO735082.
Clayton E. Jensen, AO856902.
Edward O. Jess, AO856903.
George L. Jesse, AO432780.
Paul D. Jessop, AO745691.
Clayton J. Johnson, AO684527.
Clyde J. Johnson, AO662560.
Earl L. Johnson, AO424271.
Francis E. Johnson, AO738701.
Kenneth L. Johnson, AO733316.
Lionel F. Johnson, AO680912.
Louis M. Johnson, AO806691.
Raymond P. Johnson, AO675229.
Richard O. Johnson, AO433689.
Robert D. Johnston, AO857042.
Charles C. Jones, AO803016.
David A. Jones, AO735595.
Donald A. Jones, AO764687.
Frank C. Jones, AO861443.
Harry H. Jones, AO675132.
Milton J. Jones, AO680031.
Oliver K. Jones, AO420912.
Harold S. Julin, AO807854.
Eugene J. Justen, AO815915.
William P. Kahley, AO417967.
William J. Karp, AO673580.
Willard E. Karschnick, AO431443.
Theodore Katz, AO670755.
Milton M. Kaufmann, AO559087.
Harrison E. Kee, Jr., AO407888.
George J. Keely, AO796399.
August N. Keller, AO532907.
John B. Kelley, AO575176.
Benjamin F. Kelly, AO355615.
Ridgely D. Kemp, AO678642.
James L. Kendall, Jr. AO 807575.
Joseph J. Kennedy, AO1708837.
Robert L. Kennedy, AO671448.
George J. Kenney, AO575184.
Elbert S. Kerstetter, AO686322.
Marvin E. Key, Jr., AO807234.
Bertram A. Kibler, Jr., AO664896.
John B. Kidd, AO398625.
Frederick J. Kienle, AO728162.
Richard D. Klick, AO423434.
Roddie L. Kile, AO572263.
Melvin J. Killian, AO1310457.
Walter D. Kilroy, AO730925.
Norris R. Kincaid, AO855777.
Alfred N. King, AO812440.
Charles W. King, AO418133.
Donald B. King, AO700734.
Walter S. King, AO818488.
Ralph E. Kirchoff, AO433699.
Norbert W. Kirk, AO435688.
George A. Kirsch, AO429426.
Ralph L. Kitchens, AO697564.
Ivon F. Klohe, AO728886.
Harold W. Klopp, AO860600.
Benjamin B. Klose, AO412943.
Frederick J. Knorre, Jr., AO371962.
James M. Knotts, AO802578.
James P. Knox, AO414837.
Adolph K. Koeck, AO438668.
Carl J. Koehler, AO1646799.
Henry C. Koelbl, AO565884.
Raymond L. Kolman, AO819919.
Joseph J. Kolodzey, AO434262.
Alexander Kouts, AO572312.
Robert E. Kraus, AO732021.
Norman A. Kriehn, AO435083.
Harry E. Krig, AO820515.
Harold E. Krout, AO726789.
Howard F. Kurtz, AO1583240.
Erwin G. Labbe, AO675083.
William H. Lacey, AO536637.
Roy E. Ladd, AO805500.
Joseph J. Lahargoue, AO804180.
Lawrence G. Lahren, AO861068.
Robert K. Lakin, AO684356.
Raymond E. Lambert, AO561464.
Robert F. Lamison, AO817466.
Carey J. Land, AO817050.
Jack D. Lander, AO732940.
John F. Landry, AO791945.
William J. Landsperger, AO580902.
Thomas W. Lane, AO439298.
William F. Lane, Sr., AO1585753.
George E. Langdon, AO401895.
Edward P. Langebartel, AO754434.
John J. LaRoche, AO399539.
Jack A. Larson, AO676586.
James L. Lassandro, AO671454.
Donovan W. Laurie, AO320373.
Ernest A. LaValley, Jr., AO791764.
Louis Lawrence, AO391336.
Harold B. Lawson, AO377853.
Homer W. Lear, AO425012.
Charles A. LeClair, AO806975.
Richard G. Ledig II, AO1703839.
John W. Lee, AO408097.
Maurice E. Lee, Jr., AO665056.
Robert E. Lee, AO428936.
George LeGrand, AO676304.
Robert E. Lehnherr, AO754845.
Ralph Lemes, AO560037.
Harry D. Lemly, AO764356.
Ray F. Lemoine, AO743459.
John J. Lenihan, AO799197.
Carl H. Leo, AO750631.
Albert M. Lester, Jr., AO850241.
J. B. L. Levesque, AO532263.
Howard M. Levine, AO563634.
Richard A. Levy, AO800196.
Frank L. Lewis, AO742490.
Patrick B. Lewis, AO2044880.
Rone H. Lewis, AO660371.
Thomas H. Lewis IV, AO856252.
Charles V. Liebscher, AO1104956.
Edward M. Lightfoot, AO325807.
Vernon P. Ligon, Jr., AO745428.
Cecil N. Liles, AO662281.
Frank R. Lindberg, AO655439.
John M. Lindsay, AO649081.
Louis P. Lindsay, AO428684.
Gerald Linscheid, AO432077.
Mike Lipcsak, Jr., AO572422.
Fort W. Lipe, AO661508.
Oliver W. Little, AO446009.
Robert P. Locke, AO431894.
Bernard D. Locker, AO1114622.
Warren L. Lockhart, AO665060.
Stanley M. Lockie, AO724630.
Willis R. Loehr, AO432310.
Harry R. Logan, Jr., AO791700.
John L. Lombardo, AO1644536.
Walter J. Loncsak, AO1593037.
John D. Long, AO660165.
Earl Longacre, Jr., AO417174.
Donald K. Longer, AO1012691.
Carl W. Longren, AO863238.
Donald J. Longtain, AO821857.

Victor N. Looney, AO425016.
Eugene F. Lott, AO686092.
Angus E. Lovan, AO764126.
David E. Love, AO798318.
Albert P. Lovelady, AO520946.
Philip M. Loveless, Jr., AO743042.
Stanley R. Lovell, AO668016.
Jerome G. Lowe, AO806280.
Julius C. Lowell, AO412523.
Robert O. Loyd, AO756276.
Truman Lucas, AO529220.
Gene A. Lucchesi, AO751374.
Fred W. Lucterhand, AO580080.
Carl J. Luksic, AO732289.
Victor Lumovich, AO749167.
Gilmore J. P. Lundquist, AO396524.
Henry E. Lutkenhouse, AO807656.
David M. Lynch, AO349853.
Moncure N. Lyon, Jr., AO660769.
James Macefield, AO757010.
David F. MacGhee, AO790271.
John A. MacIsaac, AO432007.
Charles C. Mack, AO791319.
Matthew M. Mack, AO749276.
Alexander S. MacKenzie, AO671987.
Charles W. Macks, AO572542.
Norman A. MacLean, AO705739.
Louis N. Macomber, AO416318.
Joe Maddalena, Jr., AO724454.
Fabrian L. Magee, AO380557.
Stanley T. Major, AO753904.
Bernard A. Makowski, AO526285.
Ernest Malnassy, AO1100213.
Robert F. Maloney, AO687612.
James C. Manatt, AO500929.
William H. Maney, Jr., AO1100662.
Harry A. Mann, AO812840.
William J. Manning, AO572503.
Joseph G. Manyo, AO429671.
Leonard P. Marchese, AO748714.
Charles V. Marginean, AO661523.
Peter J. Markham, AO125591.
Henry J. Markiel, AO792852.
James A. Marr, AO800250.
Paul J. Mascot, AO724793.
James E. Mason, AO748717.
John R. Mason, AO363548.
Erwin F. Matelski, AO411647.
Marsden W. Mattatall, AO748440.
Richard T. Mattingly, AO740859.
Conrad E. Mattson, AO758830.
Ernest B. Mauck, AO664426.
Earl P. Maxwell, AO677090.
Sidney R. Maxwell, AO754289.
Archie S. Mayes, AO1100220.
Lawrence P. Mayland, AO432964.
Robert F. Maynard, AO863923.
Francis L. Mayo, AO1312849.
Jesse L. Mayo, AO790086.
Lawrence F. McAdams, AO580946.
Richard G. McAuliffe, AO428438.
Madison M. McBrayer, AO793135.
John J. McCabe, Jr., AO569181.
David D. McCall, AO412731.
Andrew J. McCambridge, AO580948.
Frank J. McCarthy, AO396176.
John P. McCarthy, AO1646399.
Roderick E. McCaskill, AO793944.
Charles J. McClain, AO681549.
William E. McClean, AO1575453.
John R. McCombs, AO442529.
George W. McCorkle, AO809015.
Arthur McCrea, AO1288926.
Frank E. McCreary, Jr., AO880754.
Jack H. McCreery, AO427256.
John C. McCurnin, AO299162.
Michael A. McCuskey, AO733684.
Robert W. McDermott, AO675090.
Allen K. McDonald, AO738207.
James M. McDonald, AO436523.
Joseph B. McDonald, AO286202.
Samuel A. McDowell, Jr., AO563713.
Perry B. McElroy, AO725515.
James B. McFadyen, AO563717.
John O. McFalls, Jr., AO789334.
Archie M. McFarland, AO389651.
James M. McFarland, AO438005.
Benton W. McGinnis, AO561591.
James M. McGovern, AO764569.
Laurence P. McIntosh, AO441813.
Harry D. McIntyre, AO681928.
Claud L. McIver, Jr., AO684017.
William A. McKean, AO521259.
Lloyd R. McKeehen, AO794435.
Daniel L. McKeever, AO561600.
Leland McKelvey, AO868323.
Sheppard A. McKenzie, Jr., AO439670.
James E. McKinley, AO526050.
Claude G. McKinney, Jr., AO429835.
Isaac H. McKinney, AO813934.
Richard G. McKittrick, AO735627.
Billy A. McLeod, AO669766.
Charles R. McMahan, AO736285.
Byron E. McMahon, AO433872.
Charles J. McManaman, AO700951.
Lyle E. McMichael, AO696501.
Francis M. McMunigle, AO811705.
Maurice E. McNabb, AO575483.
Gerald M. McNulty, AO886006.
David P. McQuillan, AO793139.
Herbert W. McQuown, AO730565.
Robert T. McWilliams, AO812109.
Thomas R. Meador, Jr., AO682214.
James E. Mechling, AO726010.
John R. Meeks, AO888499.
Roland C. Meeks, AO726060.
William L. Meis, AO890272.
Richard G. Mendrop, AO660781.
Robert C. Meppen, AO410683.
Raymond G. Messer, AO426408.
Edward W. Metzger, Jr., AO569382.
Herman A. Meyer, AO737826.
Joseph S. Michalowski, AO794562.
Edward D. Michelson, AO756649.
Harry F. Mickey, AO687614.
William F. Middledorf, AO672844.
Wilson A. Miles, AO580388.
Cecil D. Miller, AO867865.
Harold M. Miller, AO729042.
James Miller, AO442213.
John F. Miller, AO673916.
Louie Miller, Jr., AO561692.
Luther J. Miller, AO686939.
Max R. Miller, AO433566.
Vernon H. Miller, AO1548971.
Charles M. Mills, AO500559.
Frederick M. Millsap, AO666571.
Robert T. Minett, AO659749.
Silas J. Minton, AO908054.
George C. Mitchell, AO661534.
J. C. Mitchell, AO726449.
Stanley P. Mitchell, AO569436.
William E. Mitchell, AO569437.
Robert H. Mizelle, AO331877.
Michael F. Moffitt, AO674848.
Raymond J. Mokszanowski, AO566228.
Frank Moll, Jr., AO669601.
Edward O. Monaghan, AO733697.
Thomas J. Money, AO563862.
Witold B. Monkiewicz, AO441030.
Ralph E. Monroe, AO436442.
Robert D. Montagne, AO417836.
Beverly O. Montgomery, AO909900.
James W. Montgomery, AO569448.
John T. Moore, AO526091.
William P. Moore, AO874388.
Chester D. Moorhead, AO1116314.
Mark T. Mooty, AO431301.
Charles K. Moran, AO789791.
William J. Moran, Jr., AO752011.
Luther W. Morefield, Jr., AO421287.
Dante V. Morel, AO423399.
Arthur L. Moreland, AO747466.
Robert Moreman, AO757243.
Charles W. Morgan, AO724465.
Grover G. Morgan, Jr., AO584558.
Walter K. Morgan, AO661536.
Marion C. Morphew, Jr., AO678900.
David D. Morris, AO433328.
Frank G. Morris, Jr., AO511253.
George W. Morris, AO700312.
Thomas E. Morris, Jr., AO441244.
Harold C. Morrison, AO737206.
Maurice Morrison, AO2044716.
Elmer M. Morse, AO427610.
Oscar L. Morse, AO429842.
Raymond J. Morse, AO325772.
Nelson B. Moseley, AO810926.
Walter S. Moseley, AO753402.
George H. Moss III, AO804966.
Aubrey C. Moulton, Jr., AO734375.
George W. Moxon, AO420108.
Jacob D. Muehleisen, AO1592462.
John F. Mullaney, AO434998.
Frank J. Muller, AO744335.
John L. Mulligan, AO687957.
Weldon O. Murchison, AO271274.
Bernard L. Murphy, Jr., AO857659.
John A. Murphy, AO764399.
Joseph J. Murphy, AO800665.
Francis W. Murray, AO673400.
James R. Murray, AO569525.
Joseph D. Murray, AO1010956.
Manus F. Murtha, Jr., AO752536.
Duncan C. Myers, AO790703.
Roland W. Myers, AO374316.
Jack Nabors, AO888653.
Stacy D. Naftel, AO1698924.
Tom L. Nash, Jr., AO316700.
Henry F. R. Nau, AO422639.
Albert C. Naum, AO660387.
Elza W. Nave, AO561755.
Jack S. Neal, AO739046.
Robert F. Neeley, AO1575025.
James M. Neff, AO745735.
Leo M. Neff, AO730153.
Francis W. Nelson, AO703780.
James E. Nelson, AO738722.
Leslie D. Nelson, AO752230.
Lyles B. Nelson, AO753810.
William H. Nelson, AO667540.
Elmer M. Neville, AO1293999.
Robert G. Newbern, AO664641.
Vincent A. Newland, AO725340.
Forrest D. Newman, AO865136.
Weldon D. Newquist, AO1698905.
Fitzroy Newsum, AO409854.
Ben H. Nicholls, AO797885.
William H. Nichols, AO679100.
Victor L. Nielsen, AO802061.
Jerry W. Noble, AO861591.
Frederick J. Noel, Jr., AO413363.
John J. Nolan, AO679770.
Robert A. Nolan, AO812123.
Ursel C. Nolte, AO742345.
Joe R. Norman, AO854399.
Carol R. Northcutt, AO675939.
Howard B. Norton, AO1699271.
Ross D. Norton, AO569608.
Howard L. Norwood, Jr., AO862682.
Rodney Nudenberg, AO420806.
William F. Nuding, Jr., AO736309.
Philip R. Obley, AO429891.
Edward J. O'Brien, AO791483.
James E. O'Brien, AO566338.
James V. O'Brien, AO793526.
Raymond C. O'Brien, Jr., AO560622.
John C. O'Connor, AO814387.
Joseph J. O'Connor, AO663085.
Eugene B. O'Donnell, AO1010758.
Henly M. Ogburn, Jr., AO672395.
Charles L. Ogg, AO390814.
Harold J. O'Grady, AO669777.
Truman O'Keefe, AO1110695.
Frank W. Olsen, AO1555259.
Harold A. Olson, AO569642.
Robert C. Olson, AO666803.
Ward T. Olsson, AO724970.
Edward J. Ontko, AO675941.
Thomas P. O'Reilly, AO688647.
Robert E. Orem, AO794854.
Gorden J. O'Rourke, AO668624.
Wayne P. Orr, AO670962.
Robert B. Orton, AO860528.
Robert R. Osborn, AO436640.
John A. Osburn, AO796188.
Carl A. Ousley, AO406582.
George F. Owen, AO661544.
Robert C. Owen, AO433888.
Edwin B. Owens, AO462391.
Robert C. Owens, AO764769.
Clifford G. Page, AO759720.
Ladislaus J. Pagozalski, AO1638212.
Andrew R. Pandolfo, AO1314185.
Gus J. Pappas, AO1103346.
Harry R. Park, AO794679.
Frederick L. Parker, Jr., AO1166345.
Harold A. Parker, AO735104.
Henry L. Parker, AO438568.
Merton L. Parks, AO843469.
Edgar M. Parmentier, AO700757.
William W. Parramore, Jr., AO804724.

Wyly Parsons, AO389172.
James A. Partridge, AO736024.
Victor Pasetti, AO810097.
Joseph A. Patalive, AO396935.
Robert C. Patrick, AO432641.
John E. Patterson, AO663171.
Neill T. Patterson, AO789591.
Arthur W. Paul, AO790580.
Benjamin Paul, AO1641655.
Myron C. Paul, AO432008.
William Paule, AO428556.
John R. Paulman, AO1105089.
Pete Pavlica, AO750445.
William J. Pawlowski, AO698475.
George N. Payne, AO729893.
Hugh A. Payne, AO695765.
William H. Pearson, AO442966.
William R. Pearson, AO662365.
Milford V. Peck, AO1041627.
Thomas E. Peddy, AO425099.
James C. Peek, AO668628.
Robert T. Pell, AO421664.
Joseph Pellegrini, AO732656.
Joseph J. Pellegrini, AO560211.
Joseph M. Pelter, AO669612.
John D. Pendergrass, AO765307.
Dale J. Perkins, AO731415.
Robert F. Perkins, AO375126.
Earl M. Peronto, AO1580155.
Donald J. Perry, AO733972.
Donald L. Perry, AO429847.
Marshall F. Perry, AO739576.
William W. Perry, AO724818.
Richard E. Petersen, AO802216.
Clayton L. Peterson, AO425043.
Dale E. Pettibon, AO569751.
John F. Phelps, AO763721.
Charles L. Phillips, Jr., AO429850.
Charles S. Phillips, Jr., AO806900.
John T. Phillips, AO763331.
Norman P. Phillips, AO818420.
William T. Phillips, AO749698.
Homer J. Phoenix, AO793834.
Michael J. Piatnitza, AO417415.
Alfred L. Pierce, AO1105107.
Joseph J. Pietrucha, AO800039.
Norman W. Pinney, Jr., AO416122.
Charles M. Piper, AO569776.
Max L. Piper, AO306537.
Joel F. Pitchford, AO742890.
Alfred W. Platz, AO794865.
Gerhardt H. Platz, AO790481.
Horace A. Plummer, AO760487.
Marvin K. Plunkett, AO1105112.
Reuben Podonsky, AO811962.
Garland W. Poehler, AO564050.
Raymond A. Poerschke, AO819161.
William K. Pope, AO758057.
James B. Porter, AO1101997.
John G. Porter, AO807302.
William G. Porter, AO431506.
Cletus J. Pottebaum, AO1035976.
George B. Potter, AO436533.
Nolen L. Potter, AO667103.
Richard E. Potter, AO660897.
Albert S. Pouliot, AO441817.
William A. Pouncey, AO1696673.
Lawrence R. Poundstone, AO314125.
Charles E. Powell, AO406544.
Charles F. Powell, AO688842.
Ellsworth A. Powell, AO419229.
Robert L. Powers, AO730164.
Charles J. Pratt, AO791852.
James L. Price, AO750453.
Joseph B. Price, AO328477.
Teller S. Price, AO730959.
Amadeo A. Primavera, AO564077.
William H. Prince, AO517726.
Robert V. Prouty, AO430616.
Roger C. Pryor, AO416344.
Harry P. Psomas, AO1288296.
Vincent Puglisi, AO724069.
James S. Purdum, AO584055.
Gerald L. Purkey, AO1035982.
Melvin E. Qualls, AO581717.
William W. Quinn, AO317522.
Meko M. Radomski, AO564092.
Frank S. Raggio, AO737241.
Lewis D. Raines, AO790713.
Robert C. Rainier, AO472643.
Arthur C. Raley, AO582919.
James J. Randazzo, AO352761.
Hobart R. Rankin, AO888737.
Augustin J. Rapisardi, AO438650.
Emilio P. Ratti, AO663941.
George R. Rausch, AO799252.
Donald E. Rauscher, AO743279.
Udell R. Rawlings, AO664656.
James A. Ray, AO789268.
Norman W. Ray, AO667757.
Raymond R. Ray, AO730606.
Walter J. Raynor, AO795469.
Cyril J. Reap, AO401403.
Walter L. Records, AO724476.
Bynum H. Redford, AO915659.
Charles K. Reed, AO873331.
Emile L. Reed, Jr., AO566498.
Howard E. Reed, AO1000653.
Lawrence B. Reed, AO414774.
Merlin L. Reed, AO701162.
Ernest W. Rees, AO675623.
Robert F. Regan, AO737471.
Richard S. Reid, AO877210.
Charles Z. Renegar, Jr., AO862694.
Robert M. Renneisen, AO659591.
David Rennie, AO726469.
John Repola, AO685840.
Stanley S. Resnick, AO726017.
Robert L. Reusche, AO757279.
Daniel Reuther, Jr., AO582299.
Kenneth J. Revoir, AO793442.
James W. Reynolds, AO680713.
William L. Reynolds, AO442573.
Franklin G. Rhoades, AO676650.
Winston P. Rice, AO671769.
David A. Rich, AO790291.
Jack Richardson, AO686666.
William Richardson, AO1576557.
James D. Rigley, Jr., AO811441.
Harold D. Rigney, AO796195.
Robert B. Riley, AO431159.
Edward H. Risher, AO815556.
Robil W. Roberts, AO661236.
Hugh B. Robertson, Jr., AO678329.
Oliver V. Robichaud, AO791336.
Charles C. Robinson, AO1636549.
Fellie F. Robinson, AO429853.
James D. Robinson, AO798581.
Michael F. Robinson, AO668532.
Richard S. Robinson, AO1010531.
Stanley E. Rodby, AO1634269.
Alexander G. Rodriguez, AO434005.
Richard O. Roeder, AO650012.
Donald K. Rogers, AO442571.
Ellard T. Rogers, AO566565.
John H. Rogers, AO763741.
Max W. Rogers, AO412972.
John F. Rohloff, AO583502.
Robert S. Rohrkaste, AO692825.
Albert O. Rondel, AO735820.
Gerard W. Rooney, AO750694.
Denis R. Rose, AO666355.
Edward M. Rosentreter, AO564171.
Marcello J. Rossano, AO1031019.
Harry L. Rothman, AO705052.
Albert P. Rotola, AO1580253.
Charles W. Roush, AO390150.
Samuel W. Routch, AO764468.
Morris Rozner, AO804881.
Edward M. Rubich, AO683067.
Gerald D. Runyard, AO753033.
Demetrius H. Russell, AO874442.
Irving J. Russell, AO875233.
Walter J. Russell, Jr., AO744636.
Charles W. Ryan, AO672443.
John A. Ryan, Jr., AO1851380.
Joseph A. Ryan, AO424166.
William A. Ryan, Jr., AO812665.
Karol F. Rybos, AO745188.
Joseph F. Sage, AO746617.
George D. Samson, AO795833.
John A. Sanda, AO802191.
Victor L. Sandacz, AO758634.
Howard A. Sandberg, AO693951.
Dwaine A. Sandborn, AO815770.
Frank R. Sander, AO807059.
Ardeene E. Sanders, AO428855.
James O. Sanders, AO513518.
Max Sansing, AO420071.
Richard A. Sansing, AO431533.
Virgal E. Sansing, AO686773.
Kenneth J. Sarchet, AO742021.
Jack S. Sargent, AO747900.
Gerard A. Sartori, AO582354.
George W. Satterfield, Jr., AO673812.
Dean H. Satterlee, AO1699492.
Hugh H. Saum, Jr., AO348901.
John F. Saunders, Jr., AO2035902.
Dale E. Savidge, AO757041.
Robert E. Saxon, AO739513.
Stanley Q. Schamber, AO352917.
Stanley R. Scarborough, AO342712.
Calvin D. Schapira, AO680088.
Byron L. Schatzley, AO741314.
Robert F. Schirmer, AO388637.
Samuel C. Schlitzkus, AO728113.
Ralph F. Schmidt, AO424551.
Hugh L. Schmitt, AO701417.
Daniel L. Schmucker, AO798894.
Ralph H. Schneck, AO726832.
Jack J. Schneider, AO669509.
Charles T. Schoolfield, AO791509.
George G. Schutt, Jr., AO703525.
Frank P. Scott, AO802192.
James L. Scott, AO813788.
Robert G. Scott, AO667000.
Thomas H. Scott, AO687639.
J. Keith Scrivner, AO429983.
Raymond J. Sealy, AO665127.
Merrill H. Seaman, AO1644762.
Ralph A. Secor, AO745954.
Alfred Segal, AO789819.
William F. Seith, AO798592.
Edwin A. Seitz, AO529649.
James B. Selkregg, AO735825.
Rupert L. Selman, AO421651.
Joseph J. Semanek, AO437803.
David V. Severen, AO743107.
George W. Shackelford, AO379479.
Earl A. Shaefer, AO442566.
Frank H. Shepard, AO1592596.
Arthur C. Shepherd, AO671700.
Brooks L. Sheppard, AO650265.
Ira H. Shick, AO813597.
Howard G. Shidal, AO427773.
Alex Showalter, AO705823.
Herbert C. Showers, AO813792.
Leroy T. Shuler, AO796037.
Seymour Shwiller, AO856814.
John H. Sidenberg, AO1285128.
Keith P. Siegfreid, AO1703783.
Thomas Sime, Jr., AO413340.
Keith E. Sims, AO732386.
Thomas J. Sims, AO755767.
John W. Singleton, AO431170.
Arnold Sipes, AO799265.
Jack H. Sisson, AO738040.
Joseph L. Skeldon, AO406037.
George B. Skinner, AO431343.
Otis O. Skubal, AO803111.
Hugh C. Slater, AO737281.
Charles W. Slaughter, AO436542.
Clark S. Smith, AO670322.
Douglas T. Smith, AO559407.
Francis H. Smith, AO419333.
Garland J. Smith, AO424143.
James A. Smith, AO564324.
Justus W. Smith, AO860634.
Larkin B. Smith, Jr., AO664835.
Norman H. Smith, AO791346.
Oscar L. Smith, AO690730.
Russell L. Smith, AO378882.
Walter A. Smith, Jr., AO401249.
William L. Smith, AO682914.
Michael Smolen, AO817119.
Joseph B. Smolenski, AO683160.
James W. Snead, AO674528.
Allen W. Snook, AO433920.
Wallace S. Snyder, AO573430.
Robert W. Soderberg, AO394709.
Harold W. Sohrweide, AO680530.
Willie H. Sonntag, AO725369.
Frank H. Spain, AO790184.
John S. Sparks, Jr., AO438547
Worth M. Speed, AO691419.
Arthur E. Speer, AO662308.
Harry B. Spence, AO328020.
Ross E. Spence, AO801786.
Charles A. Spiesse, AO689392.
Malcolm C. Sponenbergh, AO430862.
Albert B. Sporer, Jr., AO796445.
Carl B. Stackhouse, AO733483.
John H. Statts, AO792321.

Cecil V. Steed, AO524952.
James L. Steele, AO342142.
Einar H. Steelnack, Jr., AO1322599.
George J. Steiger, AO749348.
Paul W. Stephens, AO365202.
Robert D. Stephens, AO1101677.
Roger J. Sterr, AO677608.
Charles J. Stevens, AO409907.
Corbin D. Stevens, AO790101.
Joel C. Stevenson, AO764940.
James P. Stewart, AO378942.
William L. Still, AO856150.
Leonard Stockus, AO1545059.
Arthur C. Stone, Jr., AO418181.
Stephen A. Stone, Jr., AO427290.
Charles W. Stoner, AO1550932.
Thad S. Strange, AO335464.
Robert M. Strickland, AO807074.
Glassell S. Stringfellow, Jr., AO416361.
Robert C. Stroot, AO1634377.
Cornelius D. Sullivan, AO649285.
James F. Sullivan, Jr., AO768773.
John H. Sullivan, Jr., AO745214.
Arnell R. Sult, Jr., AO861122.
Clifford C. Summers, AO390187.
John C. Summers, AO438091.
Victor F. Summers, AO865296.
Robert J. Sunde, AO799091.
Everett C. Sunderman, AO725550.
Eugene L. Surowiec, AO694272.
Frederic C. Swan, Sr., AO581265.
Robert B. Swedberg, AO740305.
Daniel J. Sweeney, AO420809.
David M. Sweeney, AO806936.
James B. Swindal, AO668158.
Jerome M. Swope, AO1589532.
Frank V. Sylvester, AO799093.
Adrien A. G. Talbot, AO791160.
Clark A. Tate, AO431065.
Carl E. Taylor, AO421783.
Cecil P. Taylor, Jr., AO794993.
John F. Taylor, AO431571.
Robert L. Taylor, AO541836.
Ralph K. Terry, AO817786.
Vernon P. Terry, Jr., AO584148.
Allen Thomas, AO672710.
Harold P. G. H. Thomas, AO573571.
William W. Thomas, AO494790.
B. M. Thompson, AO566907.
Dick W. Thompson, Jr., AO431315.
John C. Thompson, AO737671.
Robert L. Thompson, AO428526.
William R. Thorstenson, AO764332.
Richard R. Thuma, Jr., AO1107180.
Eugene Tiddy, AO803496.
Samuel A. Tidwell, Jr., AO726504.
Frank R. Tiller, Jr., AO674818.
Bascom E. Tillotson, Jr., AO668369.
William F. Tilson III, AO739132.
George R. Tips, AO579475.
Clyde B. Tiroux, AO688878.
Normand H. Traverso, AO755459.
Duane C. Treeman, AO416362.
Frederick J. Trenck, AO671620.
Stephen J. Trpcic, AO755131.
Carvil A. Trudeau, AO607062.
Charles H. Trueblood, AO579498.
Carlyle L. Truesdell, AO410617.
August F. Truffer, AO576530.
Hugh O. Tucker, AO805366.
Houston N. Tuel, AO533842.
Shale L. Tulin, AO1037756.
Levin P. Tull, AO573622.
Noel E. Turner, AO725010.
Walter C. Turnier, AO808773.
Edward F. Tyminski, AO413052.
Elmer N. Tyndall, AO676177.
Eugene F. Tyree, AO1576754.
Arnold C. Ulriksen, AO676834.
F. E. Umphress, Jr., AO751856.
George Ureke, AO806751.
Charles E. Van Bibber, AO667879.
Wilmer A. Van Blaricum, AO612512.
Robert C. Van Buskirk, AO1845531.
Chester L. Van Etten, AO663442.
Jack P. Van Tuil, AO559425.
John W. Vaughan, Jr., AO738508.
Richard E. Vaughn, AO695993.
Clarence P. Veatch, AO705644.
Salvatore J. Veneziano, AO432849.
Curtis P. Vester, Jr., AO750487.
Edward J. Vilchek, AO700823.
Dean A. Voight, AO562359.
Robert O. Voight, AO737678.
Earl W. Von Kaenel, AO667123.
Valley J. Voyles, AO819354.
Joseph H. Wack, AO856852.
William W. Wacker, AO467130.
Walter B. Waclawski, AO667605.
Merle A. Wagaman, AO1105244.
Sylvester J. Wagasky, AO1643417.
James Wagner, AO746526.
Herbert Waldman, AO396205.
Jackson S. Wallace, AO428887.
Ralph G. Wallace, AO726861.
James J. Walsh, AO755472.
Donald W. Wanty, AO564560.
Harry B. Ward, AO764131.
John W. Ward, Jr., AO730679.
Keith L. Warner, AO392594.
Arthur L. Warren, Jr., AO866180.
Keith L. Warren, AO677901.
John H. Washington, AO425230.
Olen L. Waters, AO672728.
Doyce L. Watkins, AO759127.
James A. Watson, AO1552204.
Warren K. Watson, AO364932.
Arthur M. Watts, AO664095.
Bernard W. Watts, AO765424.
Robert H. Wayland, Jr., AO564578.
Frank L. Weatherbee, AO432152.
Ernest L. Webb, Jr., AO559429.
Louis A. Webber, AO541187.
Charles G. Weber, AO803115.
John A. Weeks, Jr., AO742805.
Albert C. Weidenbusch, AO702093.
Leonard N. Weigner, AO800979.
Francis H. Weiland, AO1550526.
James H. Weiner, AO346837.
Richard A. Weir, AO811160.
Eugene E. Welch, AO2044667.
Robert G. Welch, AO799710.
John H. Wells, Jr., AO579625.
Robert L. Wells, AO1578025.
Thomas G. A. Welsh, AO737684.
Eugene C. Wernette, AO533309.
James P. West, AO1634456.
Lloyd A. West, AO428595.
Robert W. West, AO567059.
Charles E. Westbrook, AO433620.
Eria O. Westbrook, AO429199.
Robert E. Whaley, AO431075.
Glenn M. Wheeler, AO1573980.
Ray W. Whipple, AO663683.
Edwin J. White, Jr., AO735041.
Jon E. White, AO436024.
Richard J. White, AO397593.
Ross D. White, AO692589.
Robert S. Whitehead III, AO664706.
Francis G. Wholley, AO814470.
Vernon E. Wickman, AO660602.
Charles R. Wilcox, AO1636824.
Carol E. Wildman, AO671721.
Jesse H. Wildt, AO1575273.
Edward R. Wiley, AO677021.
James F. Wiley, AO434199.
Henry M. Wilkerson, AO726958.
Joe T. Wilkerson, AO1172719.
Linus A. Wilkins, AO579659.
Jimmy E. Wilkinson, AO759142.
Herman B. Wille, AO583612.
Earl T. Williams, AO514220.
George M. Williams, AO881071.
James F. Williams, AO1699342.
Thomas J. Williams, AO691200.
Arthur Williamson, AO742544.
Louis O. Williamson, AO816021.
Houser C. Wilson, AO427783.
James B. Wilson, AO797944.
James R. Wilson, AO428431.
Lee V. Wilson, AO753576.
Raymond E. Wilson, AO1036803.
Jackson L. Winchester, AO749409.
Daniel C. Wines, Jr., AO732794.
Ambrose J. Winter, AO1574563.
Joe E. Wisdom, AO509338.
John W. Wise, AO733391.
Edwin S. Wittbrodt, AO1574182.
August L. Woeltz, AO665487.
William Wolfendon, AO661060.
Herman C. Wood, AO2038395.
John B. Wood, Jr., AO814477.
Theodore S. Wood, AO665878.
George K. Woods, AO1321979.
Edgar F. Woodward, Jr., AO791530.
Valin R. Woodward, AO418089.
Ray E. Woolridge, AO582619.
Virgil Woolum, AO573824.
William H. Worley, AO816743.
Rowland H. Worrell, Jr., AO401923.
Joseph A. Worthington, AO725564.
John P. Wright, AO659066.
Roy P. Wright, AO573831.
Robert J. Yentz, AO534945.
Banta M. York, AO703971.
John C. York, AO567159.
Arthur Yorra, AO581372.
Harry H. Young, Jr., AO854589.
Joseph J. Young, AO726101.
Kenneth A. Young, AO662218.
Pete H. Young, Jr., AO756785.
William A. Young, AO814481.
Joe Zager, Jr., AO790300.
Adam F. Zalonka, AO403044.
Joseph L. Zeller, AO421790.
Bert R. Zerr, AO810098.
Adolph E. Zimmer, AO408888.
John A. Zimmermann, AO697467.

*To be captains*

Edgar L. Abbott, AO562666.
Fred Abbott, Jr., AO674091.
John K. Abbott, AO2078159.
John R. Abbott, AO881084.
William H. Abbott, AO929760.
Dunstan Abel, AO728150.
John J. Abele, AO625525.
George E. Abernathy, AO421939.
Edward G. Aberseld, AO702737.
Warren G. Abolt, AO699605.
Edwards Abrams, Jr., AO842655.
Harold R. Abrams, AO708238.
Emanuel M. Abramson, AO1640137.
Charles N. Acheson, AO579786.
Jack E. Acker, AO2064497.
William J. Acker, AO2059917.
Ralph S. Ackerly, AO1846549.
Donald G. Ackerman, AO1640159.
Benny E. Acock, AO590532.
Onorio Acquaviva, AO2024528.
Donald A. Adair, AO714588.
Toby W. Adair, Jr., AO2092612.
Donald A. Adam, AO1909543.
Victor W. Adamek, AO684213.
Bernard H. Adams, AO1165960.
Clinton S. Adams, AO430814.
Donald F. Adams, AO862305.
Gerald M. Adams, AO2044632.
John F. Adams, AO1908294.
Kenneth D. Adams, AO801235.
Michael E. Adams, AO791272.
Richard E. Adams, AO773976.
Robert G. Adams, AO2071423.
Roy W. Adams, AO822337.
Theodore R. Adams, AO1699355.
William Adams, AO757440.
William D. Adams, AO2100264.
William E. Adams, AO1843801.
William F. Adams, AO668583.
William L. Adams, AO707813.
William V. Adams, AO504234.
Thomas D. Adcock, AO2063771.
Walter M. Adcock, AO783163.
William L. Adden, AO829606.
Hoyt E. Addison, AO1910367.
Noel D. Addy, AO1999576.
Glenn E. Aden, AO712744.
Warren F. Aderholt, AO719240.
George M. Adkins, AO388862.
Marsene E. Adkisson, AO783163.
Clifford J. Agenbroad, AO761524.
Barnett R. Agins, AO672847.
Corrado J. Agilietti, AO739445.
William D. Agnew, Jr., AO717007.
Adolph Aguilar, AO2008915.
Edward J. Ahern, Jr., AO839027.
Robert H. Ahlborn, AO636666.
Burkhardt C. Ahlf, AO590516.
Harry P. Ahlstedt, AO1996108.
Herman C. Ahrens, Jr., AO773512.
Edward J. Ainsley, AO472308.
William W. Aird, AO880866.
Francis L. Aires, AO2005918.

Charles P. Aitken, AO2039269.
Charles E. Akard, AO2070228.
Gustav J. Akerland, AO726966.
Charles H. Akers, AO865869.
John A. Akin, AO705487.
Edgar H. Albers, Jr., AO798252.
Victor M. Albert, AO1030075.
Ralph D. Albertazzie, AO819038.
Henry K. Albrecht, AO1905270.
Donald J. Albright, AO745780.
Mack E. Albright, AO2060210.
Fred W. Alcott, AO889343.
Cleo D. Aldredge, AO812376.
Allen R. Aldrich, AO936729.
Ellis J. Alexander, AO2059884.
George J. Alexander, AO828642.
Jack D. Alexander, AO725836.
Martin E. Alexander, AO684820.
Richard L. Alexander, AO765213.
Robert C. Alexander, AO820691.
Thomas D. Alexander, AO2085649.
William Alexander, AO685144.
William J. Alexander, AO750009.
Frank B. Alford, Jr., AO887661.
Joe L. Alford, AO1911531.
Antolin Algorri, Jr., AO719865.
James B. Allan, AO728953.
Edward T. Allard, Jr., AO736608.
Thomas L. Allard, AO2093429.
William F. Allbright, AO726727.
Roy J. Alldritt, AO745258.
Joy G. Alleman, AO753318.
Bert P. Allen, AO751234.
Bryant R. Allen, AO671843.
Delmont C. Allen, AO843251.
Frederick J. Allen, AO433772.
Guy T. Allen, AO1000902.
Harry G. Allen, Jr. AO820694.
Jack K. Allen, AO2025035.
James J. Allen, AO2043149.
John L. Allen, AO698250.
Joseph B. Allen, AO704272.
Marvin L. Allen, AO523433.
Milton E. Allen, AO782114.
Paul D. Allen, AO2071091.
Ronald G. Allen, AO574458.
Russell L. Allen, AO1854655.
Kenneth E. Allery, AO2067999.
Fred C. Alley, AO2086633.
Max P. Alley, AO753585.
Vernon L. Allgood, AO1907349.
Herbert E. Allison, AO1864050.
John H. Allison, AO2074308.
Philip J. Allison, AO2092849.
Russell R. Allison, AO772249.
Hillard C. Alloway, AO736827.
William G. Alloway, AO807106.
Lloyd A. Allsop, AO2071504.
Ross C. Alm, AO2092851.
Guy C. Almes, AO2102061.
Robert M. Almes, AO842657.
John S. Almon, AO2086741.
Sam L. Almon, AO790773.
Julius H. Almond, Jr., AO673296.
Joseph D. Along, AO854946.
Joseph H. Alotto, AO1575673.
Maurice E. Alston, Sr., AO1178398.
Lawrence J. Altemose, AO547176.
James R. Alter, AO2063325.
Henry C. Althaus, AO801450.
Fred J. Altiere, AO661264.
Robert D. Altman, AO867190.
Noel S. Alton, AO729594.
Henry A. Alverson, AO560307.
Richard C. Alverson, AO336766.
James P. Amaral, AO817342.
Charles Amato, AO2087492.
David E. Ambrose, AO810788.
Earle H. Ambrose, AO2090437.
Edwin C. Ambrosen, AO421569.
Harry C. Ambrosia, AO839929.
Billy T. Amend, AO713990.
Ernest M. Amerine, AO1908851.
Umberto M. Amerio, AO1910686.
Roy W. Amerman, AO692630.
James R. Ames, AO1324309.
Melvin S. Ames, AO786695.
Thomas E. Ames, AO585920.
Kenneth B. Amesbury, AO781157.
John W. Amidon, AO1908984.
Clarence A. Amos, AO589906.
Arne Andersen, AO785736.
Chris E. Andersen, AO854875.
Christian R. Andersen, AO692942.
Howard J. Andersen, AO694294.
Byron W. Anderson, AO753588.
Carroll R. Anderson, AO571816.
Charles R. Anderson, AO590870.
Donald F. Anderson, AO820931.
Donald L. Anderson, AO803742.
Duane S. Anderson, AO763890.
Earl Anderson, AO1911777.
Earl W. Anderson, AO834719.
Elmer E. Anderson, AO590226.
Franklin L. Anderson, AO2036090.
Guveren M. Anderson, AO434350.
Harold L. Anderson, AO2084183.
Hugh B. Anderson, Jr., AO726545.
James E. Anderson, AO2074162.
James R. Anderson, AO880662.
James W. Anderson, AO870625.
John B. Anderson, AO441164.
John D. Anderson, AO856648.
John L. Anderson, AO753589.
John P. Anderson, AO826354.
John W. Anderson, AO758749.
Lawrence A. Anderson, Jr., AO1650040.
Marion R. Anderson, AO546154.
Marvin J. Anderson, AO857922.
Mont R. Anderson, AO1115471.
Roy Anderson, AO720109.
Roy L. Anderson, Jr., AO729694.
Ted E. Anderson, AO2094778.
Thomas J. Anderson, AO720111.
William A. Anderson, AO715432.
William C. Anderson, AO869185.
Willis S. Anderson, AO707206.
Lloyd M. Andes, AO766383.
Daniel Andre, AO878432.
Homer J. Andre, AO429745.
Allan K. Andreason, AO1911627.
Joseph P. Andrecheck, AO813828.
John H. Andrew, AO783680.
Sam H. Andrew, Jr., AO2033577.
Charles P. Andrews, Jr., AO832321.
Jack G. Andrews, AO2084756.
William R. Andrews, AO1847536.
Charles A. Andrus, Jr., AO669944.
Robert E. Andrus, AO770548.
Angel J. Angel, AO1636930.
Ellis W. Angelus, AO2082823.
Harry E. Angenendt, AO803925.
John C. Angus, AO820191.
Robert Angus, AO446311.
Ross J. Anken, AO575145.
Edwin C. Annis, AO747705.
Mathew J. Ansbro, AO709110.
Robert J. Anspach, AO802968.
Gerald B. Antflink, AO829133.
Henry S. Anthony, Jr., AO2079981.
Bruno J. Antonietti, AO566455.
Charles F. Apgar, AO2099086.
William C. Apgar, AO693726.
Kenneth J. Appel, AO936592.
John J. Apple, AO736063.
Nicholas Arabinko, AO792552.
Albert F. Arant, AO812913.
Lester L. Arasmith, AO702740.
William C. Arbogast, AO575173.
Harold O. Arbogust, AO429511.
Harold L. Archer, AO726547.
Roy E. Archer, AO740066.
William E. Archer, AO669154.
Rennie Archibald III, AO2023999.
Lawrence W. Archibald, AO1001945.
James H. Ard, AO781763.
William G. Ard, AO566629.
Louis G. Ardoin, AO2077154.
Richard L. Argent, AO572071.
Marion L. Argo, AO1910688.
Coburn G. Arledge, AO813107.
William M. Armer, AO744821.
Willis L. Armer, AO1101216.
Thomas H. Armistead, Jr., AO809299.
Victor Armistead, AO789976.
Ben L. Armstrong, AO826595.
Clement H. Armstrong, AO748315.
Clyde W. Armstrong, AO825077.
Donald N. Armstrong, AO429900.
Harry L. Armstrong, AO751236.
Lloyd R. Armstrong, AO665266.
Richard C. Armstrong, AO758403.
Richard K. Armstrong, AO1908297.
Robert B. Armstrong, AO821193.
George C. Arnberg, Jr., AO714594.
Milton A. Arneson, AO1909449.
Harry L. Arnett, Jr., AO709726.
Cloyd L. Arney, AO857342.
David H. Arno, AO671481.
Carl G. Arnold, AO363438.
Franklin B. Arnold, AO575355.
George F. Arnold, AO818805.
Harry C. Arnold, AO545296.
Hendrick J. Arnold, AO387276.
Lacy H. Arnold, AO793614.
Robert C. Arnold, AO738805.
Tommy R. Arnold, Jr., AO784661.
William M. Arnold, AO692258.
Walter H. Arnstein, AO811307.
Eusebio Arriaga, AO744572.
Harry B. Arrington, AO796941.
James F. Arsenault, AO584220.
Chester H. Asay, AO1019809.
Joseph L. Asbury, Jr., AO442075.
Richard W. Asbury, AO801346.
Curtis E. Ash, AO926050.
William O. Ash, AO731920.
George A. Ashbridge, AO1846890.
Ralph H. Ashby, AO788688.
Maurice I. Ashland, AO523431.
William G. Ashley, AO855707.
Benjamin H. Ashmore, AO671483.
Jehu D. Ashmore, AO1910690.
Donald H. Asire, AO767075.
Worthing Aslett, AO771266.
Robert M. Atchley, AO2069518.
Edwin L. Atkins, AO1594688.
Robert L. Atkins, AO1911252.
Walter J. Atkins, AO392731.
James W. Atkinson, AO2085260.
Marion H. Atkinson, AO826597.
Richard H. Atkinson, AO1894569.
Terry Aton, AO668296.
Wilferd R. Atterbury, AO1634975.
Clark L. Aubel, AO837764.
Charles E. Aulbach, AO672015.
David H. Auld, Jr., AO1908989.
Clyde E. Ault, AO761671.
William H. Ault, AO2062952.
Robert M. Auman, AO2060759.
Edward H. Aune, AO2095498.
Cortland P. Auser, AO1634212.
Carl B. Ausfahl, AO685358.
Elbert H. Austin, AO684668.
Harold R. Austin, AO2095499.
Herbert W. Austin, AO1911135.
Louis C. Austin, Jr., AO432410.
Warren F. Austin, AO401464.
Warren G. Austin, AO935946.
William F. Austin, AO828290.
William J. Auth, AO823785.
John B. Averett, AO575913.
Richard H. Avery, AO2044708.
Sherwood T. Avery, AO1540420.
Robert F. Avis, AO731921.
Thomas P. Awbrey, AO2071094.
Robert W. Awe, AO2057242.
Max M. Axelsen, AO758513.
Harold G. Axmacher, Jr., AO826837.
Richard C. Axt, AO843370.
Melvin K. Ayau, AO2088393.
James W. Ayers, AO706334.
Clark Aylsworth, AO732486.
Warren R. Aylsworth, AO673298.
Austin C. Ayotte, AO759550.
Mario S. Azzolina, AO564720.
Theodore J. Baader, AO1908490.
James F. Babcock, AO590342.
Willam T. Babel, AO1852285.
George F. Babits, AO429342.
Leon H. Babler, AO750164.
George F. Babyak, AO2069203.
Hal D. Bachman, AO876507.
Stewart M. Bachtelle, AO725931.
Doyle R. Back, AO1909553.
Van N. Backman, AO729302.
Edwin D. Bacon, Jr., AO836957.
George W. Bacon, AO429514.
Thomas R. Bacon, AO1695455.
William P. Bacon, AO854610.
Vernon E. Baden, AO774468.
Paul R. Badger, AO789434.
John N. Badgett, Jr., AO805884.

Donald W. Bagby, AO754309.
James M. Bagley, Jr., AO789644.
Bob P. Bagnall, AO2082195.
Donald Bagnard, AO2063330.
Richard W. Bagnard, AO730210.
Lester M. Bahr, AO772807.
Joseph F. Baier, Jr., AO827123.
Marion M. Baier, AO691559.
Bernard L. Bailey, AO740023.
Bruce E. Bailey, AO710217.
Carl E. Bailey, Jr., AO415414.
Cecil D. Bailey, AO711906.
Clarence E. Bailey, AO702743.
Edward D. Bailey, AO1911463.
Edwin L. Bailey, Jr., AO811206.
Frank D. Bailey, AO773279.
Gayle Bailey, AO832553.
Iris W. Bailey, AO2093436.
Jack L. Bailey, AO837859.
James W. Bailey, AO829615.
John H. Bailey, AO650043.
Kenneth P. Bailey, AO779754.
Myrl K. Bailey, AO745579.
Robert L. Bailey, Jr., AO2005902.
Stanley L. Bailey, AO819184.
Wallis T. Bailey, AO870046.
William K. Bailey, AO836073.
William M. Bailey, Jr., AO1908959.
James Bain, AO1700392.
Nolin R. Baird, AO743926.
Ralph B. Baird, Jr., AO1699407.
Alfred C. Baker, Jr., AO820196.
Bert L. Baker, AO1634316.
Charles E. Baker, AO2062956.
Charles M. Baker, AO2092616.
Dwight R. Baker, Jr., AO2076499.
Elmer W. Baker, Jr., AO751697.
Forest E. Baker, AO782119.
Gerald C. Baker, AO816204.
John H. Baker, Jr., AO1039364.
Lester H. Baker, AO1820866.
Lovell E. Baker, Jr., AO2059030.
Park R. Baker, AO1908298.
Richard D. Baker, AO2080370.
Samuel E. Baker, AO935632.
Thomas H. Baker, AO1824966.
Walter H. Baker, Jr., AO793714.
William E. Baker, AO673212.
William F. Baker, AO829616.
William J. Baker, Jr., AO590371.
William O. Baker, AO2079590.
Joseph C. Balasik, AO829617.
William J. Baldridge, AO722437.
Ernest A. Baldwin, AO761535.
Richard F. Baldwin, AO2098627.
William A. Baldwin, AO710876.
William L. Baldwin, AO580939.
Warren J. Bale, AO723556.
Clarence C. Ball, Jr., AO840214.
Derrell M. Ball, AO806466.
Francis W. Ball, AO1903047.
Harry C. Ball, AO731248.
Robert O. Ball, Jr., AO802696.
William E. Ball, II., AO746271.
James F. Ballard, AO2101018.
Wallace B. Ballard, AO707505.
Chester K. Ballengee, AO807265.
Monte Ballew, Jr., AO2067634.
Wilson L. Ballew, AO2036138.
David B. Ballou, AO2063955.
James E. Ballweg, AO792790.
William J. Bally, Jr., AO931977.
William D. Balser, AO806775.
William J. Baltrusaitis, AO728810.
Daniel N. Balzano, AO796761.
Edward A. Bamber, AO714004.
Alfred Bandini, Jr., AO776496.
Thomas V. Banfield, AO745032.
Raymond M. Bank, AO810457.
Ernest S. Banks, AO2083112.
Parley F. Banks, AO1855279.
Robert K. Banks, AO736070.
Richard J. Bannan, AO706779.
Joseph A. Baran, AO2080321.
John Barbato, AO1904444.
Bud Barbee, AO726183.
Martin W. Barbena, AO1911628.
Alden F. Barber, AO795885.
Donald C. Barber, AO2012643.
Frank H. Barber, AO517085.
William E. Barber, AO667914.
Charles C. Barbera, AO2036286.
William G. Barbour, AO770927.
Merle M. Bare, AO836602.
Herman E. Barfield, AO576767.
Richard D. Barger, AO567195.
Jerome E. Barieau, AO738068.
Clyde E. Barker, AO732490.
Frank H. Barker, AO782123.
George C. Barker, AO1856794.
Harrison H. Barker, Jr., AO576793.
Herbert R. Barker, AO935412.
Paul W. Barker, AO727382.
Max L. Barker, AO759239.
Richard M. Barkley, AO691032.
Harley T. Barlow, AO742827.
Van Ness H. Barnard, AO781167.
Victor R. Barnard, AO591620.
John F. Barnes, AO710881.
Levi A. Barnes, AO734173.
Merrill E. Barnes, AO770515.
Richard B. Barnes, AO758406.
Robert A. Barnes, AO680384.
Robert W. Barnes, AO1894873.
Rufus E. Barnes, Jr., AO739238.
Wilbur E. Barnes, AO767728.
Charles W. Barnett, AO1699469.
James G. Barnett, AO862977.
Russell D. Barney, AO760533.
Charles E. Barnhill, AO1849057.
James W. Barnhill, AO796944.
Loy J. Barnhill, AO2037311.
James S. Barnwell, Jr., AO2093832.
Robert L. Baron, AO590915.
Roy A. Barousse, AO1856025.
Ellis L. Barr, AO2100560.
Harold E. Barr, AO580991.
Alfred E. Barrett, AO590229.
Donald E. Barrett, AO669162.
Francis E. Barrett, AO818810.
Franklin Barrett, AO865364.
John F. Barrett, AO690907.
Joseph M. Barrett, AO674923.
Lewis R. Barrett, Jr., AO718992.
Richard E. Barrett, AO1907436.
Robert L. Barrett, AO1910692.
Wilfred D. Barrett, AO2080480.
Thomas P. Barron, AO753973.
James F. Barrow, AO944372.
Ruffin C. Barrow, AO354102.
Sterling E. Barrow, AO676202.
Earl J. Barrows, AO1852140.
Malcolm C. Barrows, AO2084706.
Frank E. Barry, AO1911071.
Henry A. Barry, AO1908985.
Joseph A. Barry, AO1910424.
George K. Barsom, Jr., EO1908398.
John J. Barta, AO681000.
Stephen D. Bartell, AO726620.
Charles E. Bartels, AO1908023.
Edwin Bartenstein, AO695852.
Jack E. Barth, AO562474.
George J. Barthel, Jr., AO590329.
Robert R. Bartholomew, AO2024044.
Holly W. Bartlett, AO738333.
Paul V. Bartlett, AO576831.
Thayer E. Bartlett, AO350952.
William H. Bartlett, Jr., AO801726.
George S. Bartley, AO671726.
John M. Bartley, AO1910211.
Martin H. Bartling, AO863976.
Raphael H. Barto, AO934883.
Frank Bartolomei, AO692527.
Bernard H. Barton, AO2102020.
Hugh H. Barton, AO448809.
James R. Barton, AO673112.
Marshall M. Barton, AO2056333.
William B. Barton, AO2044698.
Dewitt H. Barwick, AO1909558.
Johnnie M. Basco, AO784279.
John W. Bash, AO830804.
Bernie S. Bass, AO789286.
Pat H. Bass, AO777085.
Roy B. Bassett, AO675308.
Edmond W. Bastek, AO567222.
Robert E. Batcheldor, AO590715.
Cecil E. Bateman, AO757415.
William N. Bateman, AO700688.
Edgar A. Bates, Jr., AO649139.
Edwin B. Bates, Jr., AO878921.
Paul J. Bates, AO815320.
Joseph H. Batorski, AO2076503.
Ivan M. Battelle, AO2092618.
Byron E. Battershell, AO588253.
Alfred E. Baucom, AO769648.
Donald L. Bauer, AO1911390.
George M. Bauer, AO826848.
James H. Bauer, AO590331.
William Baugh, AO763037.
Sheldon D. Baum, AO773283.
Lee S. Baumann, AO934451.
Theodore E. Baumann, AO662527.
Thor P. Baumgardner, AO583643.
Jack E. Baumgartner, AO684676.
Thomas G. Baxter, AO787595.
Walter L. Baxter, Jr., AO822798.
Melvin W. Baylor, AO711915.
Fred O. Beach, AO2000388.
William J. Beach, AO806780.
Frederick R. Beal, AO724582.
Thomas N. Beall, AO886814.
Albert L. Beals, AO762064.
John B. Beam, AO683945.
James E. Bean, AO706339.
Tarleton S. Bean, Jr., AO463885.
William S. Bean, AO420836.
Walter O. Beane, Jr., AO431238.
Vernon C. Beard, AO746975.
Orville D. Beardsley, AO831012.
Harold L. Beasley, AO1911190.
Charles F. Beatie, Jr., AO1115184.
Clifford M. Beaton, AO1651262.
Ralph M. Beaton, AO1910136.
James B. Beattie, AO698822.
Charles R. Beatty, AO801985.
Herman S. Beaty, AO2095501.
Charles R. Beaumont, Jr., AO463886.
Lee C. Beaumont, Jr., AO570961.
Edward C. Beauregard, AO806387.
George W. Beaver, AO888485.
Homer E. Beaver, AO2064164.
Donald F. Becher, AO497828.
Harold Beck, AO857802.
Jennings B. Beck, AO673453.
Thomas A. Beck, AO1909452.
William J. Beck, AO429904.
Clarence E. Becker, AO434408.
Edgar J. Becker, AO731795.
Jack K. Becker, AO842002.
William R. Becker, AO2079678.
James V. Beckett, AO453548.
Ross A. Beckham, Jr., AO838734.
Samuel R. Beckley, AO432031.
William B. Becklund, AO696540.
Alfred A. Beckner, Jr., AO675310.
Luther L. Beddingfield, Jr., AO709256.
Charles H. Bedell, AO567251.
William I. Bedell, AO1581023.
John W. Bedenbaugh, AO836701.
Harold A. Bedient, AO660233.
Everist L. Bednors, AO822352.
Fredrick A. Beebe, AO1908876.
Harold W. Beech, AO1910137.
Charles N. Beecham, AO687282.
Philip H. Beegle, AO698823.
Frederick W. Beekman, AO2051046.
Robert A. Beeman, AO674550.
Milton E. Beers, AO752173.
Kenneth W. Beese, AO1581025.
Ellwood H. Beeson, AO428998.
William W. Beeson, Jr., AO560611.
William J. Beez, AO835123.
Douglas J. Beggerly, AO787756.
Burriss N. Begley, AO2099186.
Joseph F. Behan, AO800312.
Kenneth L. Behnken, AO2098452.
Rae A. Behrens, AO790893.
Samuel Behrens, AO906023.
Harry G. Beierlein, AO2091761.
Elmer H. Beinkemper, AO1696891.
Fred R. Belcher, AO689128.
Ben Bell, AO683523.
Donald F. Bell, AO889025.
Elbridge T. Bell, AO933759.
Jack W. Bell, AO1854591.
John C. Bell, Jr., AO363412.
John O. Bell, AO941618.
Lloyd E. Bell, AO1908821.
Robert J. Bell, AO930591.
Waller D. Bell, AO559024.
William I. Bell, AO667232.
Woodrow M. Bell, AO363320.

William R. Bellamy, AO560616.
Edmond R. Bellemare, AO2057849.
Harold A. Belles, AO2073018.
Richard M. Bellows, AO688900.
Reuben R. Belongia, AO856963.
Ritchie H. Belser, Jr., AO812085.
Robert E. Bemiss, AO567262.
Eugene D. Bench, Jr., AO697533.
Guy D. Bender, AO834935.
Thomas L. Bender, Jr., AO945118.
Andrew S. Benedict, AO936225.
James E. Benedict III, AO365950.
John C. Benedict, AO2059210.
Warren V. Benedict, AO2068559.
Dean F. Bengston, AO786030.
Henry J. Benit, AO870150.
James W. Benner, AO936599.
Raymond T. Bennert, AO562510.
Benjamin E. Bennett, AO1907543.
Ernest J. Bennett, AO755165.
Gayle M. Bennett, AO576864.
George E. Bennett, AO699113.
Robert E. Bennett, AO787016.
Roy C. Bennett, Jr., AO837883.
Samuel L. Bennett, AO855883.
Sidney Bennett, AO514995.
William A. Bennett, AO2055530.
William F. Bennett, AO2100269.
Lewis R. Bennington, AO2092620.
Edward Benschine, Jr., AO824373.
Clyde S. Bensey, AO426221.
Bradford L. Benson, AO815639.
Clyde M. Benson, AO710413.
Hollis A. Benson, Jr., AO590512.
Richard E. Benson, AO720427.
George N. Bentley, AO591623.
Ernest L. Benton, AO2088699.
Raphael Bentschner, AO674107.
Tommy Benwell, AO684245.
Cornelius P. Berbec, AO857349.
Edwin C. Berg, AO764181.
Maurice A. Berg, AO733591.
Robert A. Berg, AO684246.
Loyd D. Berger, AO756154.
Craig W. Bergin, AO1911137.
Lloyd H. Bergman, AO1644272.
Clyde R. Bergwin, AO803758.
Joseph J. Berher, AO1910362.
William E. Berkebile, Jr., AO839915.
Nephi Berkenpas, AO519836.
Allen W. Berkman, AO313557.
Martin Berkovitz, AO2060766.
John J. Berman, AO559593.
LaVerne L. Berneburg, AO936815.
Benjamin P. Berner, AO2076358.
Oscar A. Bernhoff, AO2062629.
Joseph P. L. Bernier, AO588931.
Carl G. Berquist, AO751631.
Charles H. Berry, AO1555173.
Clarence K. Berry, AO943725.
Jack W. Berry, AO862755.
James P. Berry, AO2071518.
John J. Berry, AO696738.
Arthur P. Bertanzetti, AO693450.
Oscar A. Berthold, AO1553953.
Alfred Bertin, AO2069918.
Arthur R. Bertoia, AO744827.
Eldon S. Beseler, AO745799.
Bob Besett, AO674112.
Joseph F. Bessler, AO537599.
Cortland L. Bessom, AO889205.
Glen R. Best, AO570997.
Warren E. Best, AO700694.
John L. Bethune, Jr., AO795345.
Stephen L. Bettinger, AO816037.
William E. Bettis, AO1846602.
Howard M. Betts, AO429751.
Jacob E. Beville, AO794054.
Ulmont U. Beville, Jr., AO833261.
Richard A. Bewerse, AO878073.
Frank J. Bianco, Jr., AO567308.
Harry L. Bibb, AO813302.
Philip J. Bicak, AO722461.
Ralph E. Bickerton, AO763916.
Gerold E. Bickley, AO803760.
Fred O. Biddle, AO736832.
William G. Biely, AO819475.
Mitchell Bienko, AO1849688.
Samuel Bier, AO1822229.
Henry G. Bierbaum, AO837621.
William E. Bifford, AO782133.
Mac A. Bigelow, AO810803.
Ralph J. Bigelow, AO2063782.
Robert O. Bigelow, AO798420.
Louis G. Bigge, AO2061597.
Jack C. Biggs, AO1855010.
John E. Biggs, AO2093973.
Eugene J. Bijold, AO1581526.
William L. Billar, AO762452.
Donald M. Billick, AO768420.
Joe T. Billman, AO841023.
Gene Bills, AO787389.
Hiram P. Bilyeu, AO2079682.
Edward L. Binn, AO759404.
Edwin M. Binder, AO587039.
Maynard Y. Binge, AO680392.
John J. Binkley, AO2092496.
William L. Binney, AO576885.
Raffaele F. Biondi, AO702000.
Claude M. Bird, AO942533.
John A. Bird, AO731354.
Robert F. Bird, AO1909455.
David D. Birdsell, AO722463.
Fred L. Birdwell, AO756409.
Robert K. Birkland, AO2012793.
Frank E. Birtciel, AO746027.
Harry E. Bisher, AO730348.
Charles W. Bishop, AO522720.
Edward G. Bishop, AO763918.
Lloyd R. Bishop, AO683949.
Louis W. Bishop, AO802239.
Robert M. Bishop, AO836562.
Eugene P. Bissell, AO696049.
George L. Bissett, AO719875.
John H. Bissette, AO801664.
Kenneth Bixler, AO1573049.
Walter A. Bjerkelund, AO1691545.
Robert H. Bjorklund, AO788313.
Donald C. Black, Jr., AO862369.
Eugene E. Black, AO590779.
Harlan K. Black, AO2091017.
Paul A. Black, AO379097.
Reece B. Black, AO2076977.
Vincent A. Black, AO406225.
William E. Black, AO650432.
Denny R. Blackburn, AO744235.
William R. Blackburn, AO1314093.
Ralph C. Blackwell, AO1908622.
Herman Bladergroen, AO831904.
Joseph P. Blades, AO590482.
Robert F. Blaess, AO2060976.
Jay M. Blaine, Jr., AO687978.
Emerson B. Blair, AO855248.
George N. Blair, Jr., AO2065035.
James H. Blair, AO720141.
Roland J. Blair, AO819736.
Philip J. Blais, AO826075.
Harry K. Blake, AO789866.
Jack A. Blakely, AO932859.
Lewis R. Blakeney, AO736094.
Doyle D. Blan, AO1653812.
Keller J. Blanchard, AO1695536.
Lionel D. Blanchard, AO2064800.
George W. Blank, AO2064801.
Raymond M. Blankenbecler, AO692756.
William J. Blankinship, AO1903025.
Auty O. Blanton, Jr., AO818501.
Clarence F. Blanton, AO708357.
Dwight W. Blanton, AO871636.
Eugene T. Blanton, AO869885.
Clarence E. Blanz, Jr., AO705900.
Robert E. Blauw, AO432036.
Monroe E. Blaylock, AO1911959.
Ernest E. Bleakley, AO855969.
Tadeusz Blecharczyk, AO803181.
Albert A. Bleifuss, AO567337.
Robert Blickenstaff, AO715129.
Gerald B. Bliss, AO786035.
Edward F. Block, Jr., AO787891.
Richard T. Blomberg, Jr., AO768992.
Gordon L. Blood, AO587045.
John P. Bloom, AO453299.
James M. Blow, AO1904231.
James D. Blue, AO1910569.
Arthur S. Blum, Jr., AO396361.
Edward H. Blum, Jr., AO1633081.
Julius M. Blum, AO583065.
John F. Blumer, AO794285.
John S. Blyth, AO2044635.
E. C. Blythe, AO659034.
John J. Blythe, AO799318.
Robert L. Bobbett, AO823286.
Leonard R. Bock, AO791378.
Victor E. Bocquin, AO814639.
Dale P. Boden, AO875947.
Willard D. Bodine, AO872068.
Thomas R. Bogan, AO829928.
Woodrow W. Bogle, AO425837.
Leonard E. Bogusz, AO1543044.
Edward E. Bohe, AO1846896.
Elroy A. Bohn, AO820678.
Frank L. Bohn, AO798242.
Harold O. Bohn, AO2079826.
Robert E. Bohne, AO2044879.
Edward S. Bohnhoff, AO590931.
Wilbur C. Bohnhoff, AO789510.
Eugene L. Boillotat, AO733135.
Richard P. Boisvert, AO781186.
Thompson S. Boland, AO433123.
Bob Bolin, AO2101429.
Laurel E. Boline, AO805738.
Billy F. Boling, AO1910508.
William O. Bolinger, AO740353.
Raymond M. Boll, AO806394.
Russell W. Bollinger, AO941895.
Walter L. Bollinger, AO659092.
Ralph Bolnick, AO810807.
Leslie J. Bolstridge, AO855970.
Charles F. Bolton, AO742120.
Howard F. Bolton, AO1998593.
Joseph C. Bond, AO2070337.
Oscar L. Bond, Jr., AO2033367.
George W. Bone, Jr., AO742409.
Vernon F. Bone, AO437106.
Bernard O. Bonin, AO2015290.
Charles A. Bonney, Jr., AO1909046.
John C. Bontempo, AO831098.
Barry L. Bonwit, AO1911467.
John W. Booher, AO813306.
James R. Boone, AO2038713.
Joseph B. Booth, AO860097.
Harry P. Borcherding, AO2081873.
Robert E. Borden, AO1903186.
William H. Bordner, AO779336.
Robert O. Borgert, AO762625.
Thomas J. Borgstrom, AO822363.
John N. Borini, AO866747.
Glenn O. Borman, AO2093837.
James Borovilos, AO1995833.
Edward F. Borsare, AO829809.
Evo E. Borsari, AO798991.
Lawrence E. Bortness, AO691874.
Frank L. Bosch, AO877471.
Charles F. Boster, AO728053.
Bernard G. Boston, AO722811.
Willard J. Boston, Jr., AO791638.
Sherwin W. Boswell, AO701712.
Joe F. Bosworth, III, AO840462.
Wilbur B. Botzong, AO873021.
William J. Boudreaux, AO820882.
John M. Boughner, Jr., AO1845395.
William S. Boughton, AO2092780.
Richard J. Bouldin, AO930387.
Lee E. Bounds, AO841028.
Malcolm S. Bounds, Sr., AO826094.
Robert A. Bourcy, AO2058972.
Edward J. Bourg, AO789660.
Donald W. Bourke, AO1699230.
Arthur D. Bourque, AO885409.
William A. Boutwell, AO2073586.
Arthur O. Bouvier, Jr., AO795897.
Donovan K. Bowe, AO2070608.
Myron A. Bowen, AO935190.
Robert W. Bowen, AO567395.
Roy M. Bowen, AO1642946.
Archie F. Bower, Jr., AO803767.
John A. B. Bower, AO573995.
Charles L. Bowers, Jr., AO2068579.
John H. Bowers, AO683395.
Lowell D. Bowers, AO542597.
Richard M. Bowles, AO2093839.
Rosewell P. Bowles, Jr., AO1282405.
Carl A. Bowley, AO2075099.
Aaron J. Bowman, AO780846.
Jack L. Bowman, AO773549.
John H. Bowman, AO663987.
Patrick Bowman, AO728333.
Robert L. Bowman, AO416674.
Kenneth D. Bowser, AO2093951.
Norman L. Box, AO763051.
Harris S. Boyce, AO697538.
James T. Boyce, AO944655.
Robert E. Boyce, AO2060922.

Billie B. Boyd, Jr., AO1846612.
Charles W. Boyd, AO2083124.
Claude H. Boyd, Jr., AO876292.
Everett E. Boyd, AO684206.
Harwell L. Boyd, Jr., AO464797.
John H. Boyd, AO1287465.
John S. Boyd, AO840766.
Robert F. Boyd, AO945912.
Roy J. Boyd, AO1847005.
Stanley M. Boyd, AO731933.
Clair H. Boyden, AO672314.
John D. Boyette, AO1909000.
Dennis O. Boyle, AO2092865.
Joseph M. Boyle, AO590232.
Howard H. Boyles, Jr., AO535776.
John B. Boynton, AO731934.
Cyril T. Boys, AO801239.
John W. Bozeman, Jr., AO782092.
Dale A. Bozman, AO936544.
Vincent J. Bracci, AO712370.
O. C. Bracewell, AO 1909054.
Peter P. Bracke, AO1332226.
Paul J. Brackney, AO779340.
John P. Braddy, AO1909062.
Joseph E. Bradford, AO754875.
Fredrick G. Bradley, AO889888.
Richard W. Bradley, AO738080.
Cecil C. Bradshaw, AO935175.
Robert D. Bradshaw, AO2089536.
Aubrey L. Brady, AO891896.
Francis R. Brady, AO680167.
John C. Brady, AO2078917.
William A. Brady, AO564879.
Charles F. Braithwaite III, AO760550
Walter H. Brambir, AO576953.
Robert Branch, Sr., AO2075634.
Bryan W. Brand, Jr., AO2217093.
Harry E. Brandes, AO774501.
Durward Brandon. AO945914.
Jack J. Brandon, AO429752.
Robert L. Brandt, AO774928.
Kenneth R. Brangwin, AO687181.
James P. Braniff, AO709279.
George W. Brann, AO1850775.
Charles E. Brannan, AO682779.
Edward L. Brant, AO710436.
Marvin E. Brantley, AO1908501.
Wesley C. Brashear, AO447023.
Harold E. Brashears, AO2074925.
Emmett L. Brasseux, AO1000088.
Keith D. Bratton, AO742123.
Alvin J. Brauckman, AO7659020.
James A. Braun, AO1585929.
Joseph M. Braun, AO943447.
Louis D. Braun, AO766847.
Robert R. Braun, AO768933.
Bennie A. Bray, AO1910510.
John W. Bray, AO1851186.
Mell P. Bray, AO574018.
Charles V. Breakfield, AO2069629.
Robert L. Breeding, AO1847907.
John W. Breehl, AO441111.
Jesse V. Breighner, AO2056772.
Clayton C. Breitenstein, AO780508.
Emil K. Brenckman, AO2060666.
George E. Brenholtz, Jr., AO800506.
James H. Brennan, AO1905516.
Irving H. Breslauer, AO708135.
Milo W. Bresley, AO1846621.
Robert A. Brett, AO564900.
Harry E. Brewer, AO2032313.
James C. Brewer, AO2100773.
Martin M. Brewer, AO719879.
Orse Brewer, Jr., AO1703142.
Roy M. Brewer, Jr., AO2092507.
William C. Brewer, AO775771.
William M. Brewer, AO567453.
Zane G. Brewer, AO806578.
Randa M. Brewis, AO829931.
Ernest J. Brewster, AO863945.
James A. Brewton, AO837108.
Nicholas D. Brewton, AO843314.
Troy T. Brickman, AO1847580.
Charles F. Bridge, AO2058691.
Benjamin E. Bridges, AO794622.
Lawrence L. Bridges, AO1847876.
Wilbur A. Bridges, AO790787.
Earl E. Briggs, AO2078072.
Frank H. Briggs, AO1854659.
Herbert F. Briggs, AO2089713.
John A. Briggs, AO426361.
Josephus A. Briggs, Jr., AO2061601.
Robert A. Briggs, AO1649454.
Bruce B. Bright, AO797781.
William A. Bright, Jr., AO770560.
William M. Bright, AO433464.
James L. Briley, AO826373.
Glenn L. Brill, AO781197.
Raymond E. Brim, AO730358.
Robert E. Brinckmann, AO1911139.
Chester G. Briner, AO751250.
James N. Brink, AO740357.
Elmo Brinson, AO806756.
Francis J. Briscoe, AO585968.
Robert J. Briscoe, AO2071107.
Clarence D. Bristol, Jr., AO928391.
Harry H. Bristol, Jr., AO816042.
Toon L. Britt, AO927842.
Joseph F. Brittain, AO590339.
William D. Brittian, AO805571.
Charles G. Britton, AO835955.
Charles L. Britton, AO763477.
Raymond P. Britton, AO815821.
Robert B. Britton, AO748341.
Warner A. Britton, AO834363.
Roy D. Broadway, AO1908299.
Walter A. Brocato, AO2102022.
Michael J. Brochmann, AO730072.
Francis J. Brock, AO705901.
George W. Brock, AO861789.
James E. Brock, AO788628.
Walker J. Brock, AO715136.
Woodrow W. Brock, AO876464.
David H. Brockett, AO1701459.
Louis M. Brockly, AO762526.
Fred A. Brockway, AO703183.
John C. Brockway, AO699791.
Leslie W. Brockwell, AO758414.
Ross B. Brode, AO1849575.
Stanley R. Brodecki, AO929307.
Richard H. Broderick, AO680600.
William P. Broderick, AO800098.
Bernard B. Brodien, AO571094.
Kenneth L. Broga, AO2080641.
John J. Brokenik, AO936479.
William C. Brookbank, AO2056044.
Albert L. Brooks, AO840672.
Eugene F. Brooks, AO765463.
Glenn L. Brooks, AO576983.
Harold C. Brooks, AO808944.
Herbert V. Brooks, AO2079264.
John P. Brooks, AO433792.
Joseph E. Brooks, AO811537.
Walter J. Brooks, AO2092867.
William L. Brooks, AO1635627.
John A. Broshek, AO1041512.
Louis A. Bross, Jr., AO1912025.
Charles B. Brotbeck, AO2076374.
Walter F. Brothers, AO861036.
Robert H. Brough, AO708852.
George M. Brouteas, AO428655.
Albert W. Brow, AO837891.
Bennett P. Browder, Jr., AO662532.
James M. Brower, AO769382.
Walter L. Brower, AO743401.
Bill Brown, AO829153.
Byron K. Brown, AO402591.
Calvin W. Brown, AO670084.
Carl J. Brown, AO2080642.
Chester Brown, AO397420.
Clyde W. Brown, Jr., AO2068831.
Conrad M. Brown, AO696506.
Cortez C. Brown, AO778709.
David A. Brown, AO757156.
Earl W. Brown, AO2077181.
Earle P. Brown, AO2079972.
Edward L. Brown, AO681326.
Edward W. Brown, AO735519.
Edwin E. Brown, AO875554.
Eldridge W. Brown, AO525555.
Elton D. Brown, AO418657.
Elzie C. Brown, Jr., AO784851.
Eugene F. Brown, AO2098927.
Everett C. Brown, AO947485.
Frank B. Brown, AO2092510.
George R. Brown, AO2056660.
Gerald S. Brown, AO526288.
Gordon S. Brown, AO681015.
Harry F. Brown, AO567479.
Howard C. Brown, AO2082366.
J. Richard Brown, AO2073553.
Jack E. Brown, AO785092.
James A. Brown, AO582656.
James F. Brown, AO811540.
James H. Brown, AO1909002.
James M. Brown, AO1846901.
John B. Brown, AO667240.
John C. Brown, AO696202.
John C. Brown, AO798959.
John I. Brown III, AO885358.
John J. Brown, AO936964.
John R. Q. Brown, AO797963.
Joseph D. Brown, AO2091649.
Keith E. Brown, AO1857900.
Kenneth Brown, AO757688.
Lawrence E. Brown, AO2066800.
Leonard H. Brown, AO433346.
Lewis E. Brown, AO549250.
Ralph O. Brown, AO784391.
Ralph W. Brown, AO782148.
Richard A. Brown, AO1910486.
Richard F. Brown, AO769709.
Richard L. Brown, AO721340.
Robert D. Brown, AO2044889.
Robert F. Brown, AO782149.
Robert H. Brown, AO417895.
Robert J. Brown, AO1911140.
Robert M. Brown, AO2084746.
Robert W. Brown, AO854097.
Ronald L. Brown, AO1854439.
Royal A. Brown, Jr., AO1856828.
Russell F. Brown, Jr., AO2095809.
Russell J. Brown, AO2090443.
Stacy E. Brown, AO428969.
Van E. Brown, AO2063561.
Vincent E. Brown, AO756952.
Walter H. Brown, AO925826.
William Brown, AO2044806.
William F. Brown, AO708919.
William Y. Brown, AO863072.
James H. Browning, AO680846.
Francis L. Brownlee, AO574070.
Kenneth D. Broyhill, AO2075034.
Lewis W. Bruce, AO1909958.
Walter S. Bruce, AO1908884.
Robert R. Bruckner, AO1909601.
Walter M. Brudzinski, AO820216.
LeRoy A. Brufiat, AO2062435.
Stephen M. Brulinski, AO818823.
Evan R. Bruner, AO737533.
William T. Brunette, AO590992.
Bertram G. Brunner, AO2092512.
Vincent W. Bruns, AO2092513.
Morris C. Brunton, AO1863418.
Richard E. Bruss, AO1911141.
William L. Bryan, Jr., AO736975.
Charles S. Bryant, AO744240.
Earl L. Bryant, AO786889.
Harold T. Bryant, AO944228.
Jack Bryant, AO1910215.
Norman Bryant, AO727621.
Robert L. Bryant, Jr., AO2056040.
Stanley N. Bryant, AO857233.
Paul W. Bryder, AO722997.
Raymond C. Brymer, AO758415.
Frank J. Bubb, Jr., AO760774.
James E. Bubb, AO2077716.
Joseph Buben, AO834738.
Allen E. Buchanan, AO430780.
William J. Buchanan, AO1910702.
Donald G. Buchholz, AO2072106.
Wendell R. Buck, AO818585.
William D. Buck, AO878155.
Richard K. Buckland, AO748150.
John L. Buckles, AO702006.
Harold D. Buckley, AO666863.
James W. Buckley, Jr., AO842783.
Paul J. Buckley, AO746036.
Roger Budd, Jr., AO818586.
Frederick L. Bueker, AO724889.
Marvin G. Buel, AO824405.
Frank A. Buettner, AO583089.
Richard L. Bugal, AO842186.
Bernard Bugg, AO791558.
Raoul Bugg, AO867041.
Alton C. Buie, AO709081.
John H. Buie, AO424902.
Norman E. Buihner, AO2059969.
Charles C. Bulger, AO514746.
William W. Bull, Jr., AO674133.
Wilmer E. Bullard, AO560712.
Herbert H. Bullock, AO824066.
Charles W. Bulow, AO2083379.

Charles L. Bunch, AO574089.
Melvin E. Bunch, AO790046.
Paul S. Bundick, AO675410.
Wendell D. Bundy, AO724890.
Carl Burak, AO751253.
George E. Burch, AO520489.
Loyd C. Burcham, AO669190.
William E. Burcham, AO871876.
James E. Burchfield, AO589769.
Theodore A. Burda, AO724195.
George R. Burden, AO814645.
William E. Burgen, AO2068591.
Miles E. Burgenheim, AO936229.
Earl W. Burger, AO581468.
Joseph M. Burger, AO588284.
Robert J. Burger, AO374297.
Benjamin F. Burgess, AO730857.
Eugene H. Burgess, AO1911905.
Leon M. Burgess, AO2065896.
Lester P. Burgess, Jr., AO1842320.
Raymond U. Burgess, Jr., AO2050202.
Arthur R. Burke, AO564948.
Emerson F. Burke, AO1851079.
Garland W. Burke, AO1702974.
Patrick J. Burke, AO837112.
Wesley A. Burke, AO868374.
Howard R. Burkett, AO937968.
Raymond L. Burkey, AO1911703.
James E. Burkhalter, AO1865677.
William V. Burkhalter, AO2092246.
Francis J. Burkhardt, AO838058.
John W. Burkhart, AO836238.
Morris C. Burkhart, AO819502.
Henry Burkle, AO580588.
Edward L. Burkley, AO1911541.
Robert L. Burleson, Jr., AO690764.
Colin R. Burlingame, AO590554.
William G. Burlingame, AO808222.
John R. Burman, AO661187.
Arthur G. Burnes, AO863230.
Albert F. Burnett, AO757692.
Clifford H. Burnett, AO787608.
Jack B. Burnett, AO767736.
Kenneth K. Burnett, AO704827.
Wesley J. Burnett, AO1581745.
Morris Burney, AO699126.
Robert E. Burnham, AO446077.
Ruel D. Burnham, AO699127.
Charles V. Burns, AO396374.
Erit L. Burns, AO939591.
Harry L. Burns, AO1865447.
Julius F. Burns, AO718234.
Leigh R. Burns, AO938546.
Richard F. Burns, AO1909827.
Warren L. Burns, AO874200.
Basil B. Burnstad, AO727850.
Harry R. Burrell, AO367765.
Rupert H. Burris, AO590564.
Wiley E. Burris, AO686538.
George S. Burson, AO710656.
Robert L. Burt, AO746931.
Waldo F. Burt, AO567524.
Edward C. Burtenshaw, AO388119.
Allie B. Burton, Jr., AO714370.
Emmett B. Burton, AO2045240.
Eugene L. Burton, AO1911193.
James E. Burton, AO549453.
John C. Burton, AO401381.
Marcellus W. Burton, AO881248.
Roy J. Burton, AO2078433.
Thornton A. Burwell, AO835140.
Anthony J. Busalacchi, AO809524.
Raymond J. Buseman, AO2080099.
William J. Bush, AO818103.
Richard B. Bushong, AO686980.
Charles P. Busick, AO1909961.
David H. Buss, AO815826.
Leo A. Buss, AO2041085.
Arthur W. Busse, AO2056549.
Robert M. Bussjaeger, AO1863347.
Budd H. Butcher, AO2100272.
James T. Butcher, AO715140.
Chessie W. Butler, AO661936.
Dee J. Butler, AO761871.
Eugene H. Butler, AO714371.
Francis T. Butler, AO562658.
Heber M. Butler, AO557929.
Kerwin O. Butler, AO669985.
Thurman B. Butler, AO2079995.
Franklin T. Buttermore, AO789077.
Edgar E. Butterworth, AO854861.
George D. Buttery, AO2073832.
Thomas W. Buttery, AO772279.
Richard F. Button, AO524166.
Wallace C. Buttrey, AO751723.
Edward H. Butts, Jr., AO835142.
Jack N. Butts, AO699895.
Roy E. Butts, AO2099925.
Isaac N. Byerley, Jr., AO1850147.
Robert T. Byerley, AO692761.
Herbert L. Byers, AO1908405.
William Byers, AO1182077.
Harold L. Bynum, AO771292.
Rolin A. Bynum, AO819447.
Wallace G. Byram, AO702343.
Lloyd B. Byrd, AO785981.
Bernard C. Byrne, AO836453.
Joseph K. Byrne, AO437193.
Glen A. Byrns, AO809095.
Robert M. Byrom, AO1911789.
James J. Byron, AO834070.
William J. Cady, AO2023158.
Robert G. Caesar, AO840674.
Joseph R. Cafarella, AO793224.
Aloysius A. Caffrey, AO1846634.
Lawrence J. Cahill, AO861636.
Paul J. Cahill, AO640342.
Charles I. Cain, AO2066970.
Earl W. Cain, AO863081.
Earl R. Cairl, AO796078.
Robert L. Calder, AO580595.
Charles E. Caldwell, AO818334.
Clyde S. Caldwell, AO1862568.
Daniel E. Caldwell, AO842188.
James O. Caldwell, AO678603.
John W. Caldwell III, AO838061.
Fred H. Calfee, AO690925.
Joseph A. Calhoon, AO1903903.
Harold C. Calkins, AO745290.
Clair R. Call, AO936135.
Lowell E. Call, AO2093845.
Frederick H. Calladine, AO1910704.
Charles Callahan, AO589952.
Daniel H. Callahan, AO793060.
Joseph H. Callahan, AO571174.
Stanley M. Callan, AO2094458.
Charles W. Callanan, AO670352.
William E. Callanan, AO874572.
John L. Camara, AO678604.
Carl C. Cameron, AO377185.
Donald Cameron, AO720169.
John J. Cameron, AO947186.
Joseph E. Cameron, AO757768.
Robert J. Cameron, AO2082979.
William Cameron III, AO939080.
William S. Cameron, AO2088883.
Frank G. Camidge, AO1911543.
Donald W. Camp, AO1636765.
Kenneth B. Camp, AO2079595.
Richard N. Campany, AO750533.
Claude P. Campbell, AO864805.
Donald L. Campbell, AO872418.
Donald W. Campbell, AO2081891.
Douglas L. Campbell, AO2071537.
Ernest E. Campell, AO640911.
Harvey H. Campbell, AO1897747.
Jack O. Campbell, AO756481.
James M. Campbell, AO883964.
John C. Campbell, AO440973.
John K. Campbell, AO840777.
John R. Campbell, AO723577.
Judson B. Campbell, Jr., AO723285.
Lawrence G. Campbell, AO814024.
Lloyd N. Campbell, AO698516.
Milton A. Campbell, AO421038.
Oliver F. Campbell, AO798745.
Richard J. Campbell, AO795698.
Robert H. Campbell, AO831125.
Robert W. Campbell, AO748906.
Thomas J. Campbell, AO836692.
William F. Campbell, AO795197.
William T. Campbell, Jr., AO803553.
Thomas H. Canady, Jr., AO817636.
Louis Candelaria, AO868904.
Harry G. Canham, AO702234.
James P. Cann, AO724289.
Robert E. Cann, AO670354.
Robert P. Cannava, AO827598.
William B. Canning, AO665521.
Edgar A. Cannon, AO752468.
James W. Cannon, Jr., AO761035.
Wilbur J. Cannon, AO466368.
Carl R. Cannop, AO747737.
Roger A. Cantin, AO2067775.
Jack H. Capers, AO742842.
Theodore J. Cappellucci, AO2068600.
Robert S. Capps, AO806402.
Thomas C. Capraro, AO669992.
Dominick J. Caramia, AO2084794.
James E. Carberry, Jr., AO825409.
Billie E. Card, AO2080873.
Boyd E. Card, AO2029011.
Edward R. Card, Jr., AO564987.
Jack E. Cardwell, AO734190.
Henry S. Carey, Jr., AO835146.
Richard J. Carey, AO574151.
Richard S. Carey, AO1849961.
Robert E. Carey, AO787613.
Robert L. Carey, AO729314.
William D. Carey, AO698655.
Harris B. Cargill, AO735744.
Jack S. Carichoff, AO1911908.
Melvin A. Carle, AO806043.
Myron L. Carleton, AO812375.
Raymond E. Carleton, AO429013.
Joseph G. Carley, Jr., AO676743.
Michael J. Carlin, AO1863472.
Jason J. Carlisle, AO758308.
Joe L. Carlisle, AO800828.
John B. Carlock, Jr., AO941686.
Carl R. Carlsen, AO303074.
Paul A. Carlsen, AO1909895.
Carl R. Carlson, AO680403.
Kenneth R. Carlson, AO868272.
Laverne S. Carlson, AO787896.
Robert J. Carlson, AO754065.
Charles G. Carlyle, AO822376.
Edwin E. Carmell, AO677658.
Eugene H. Carmichael, AO581488.
Gordon P. Carmichael, AO2092519.
Ben H. Carnell, AO1909345.
Gilbert J. Carney, AO1794908.
William L. Carney, AO783910.
Hiram C. Caroom, AO667221.
Earle T. Carothers, Jr., AO726569.
Richard P. Carothers, AO2009491.
Thomas B. Carpenter, Jr., AO2068265.
Morris E. Carper, AO670357.
Walter E. Carper, AO816232.
Charles C. Carr, AO786061.
John C. Carrillo, AO703447.
Robert M. Carringer, AO809319.
William H. Carrington, AO935490.
Arthur B. Carroll, AO760244.
Don E. Carroll, AO503845.
Robert L. Carroll, AO778034.
Sterling P. Carroll, AO819960.
George C. Carruthers, AO669995.
Anthony H. Carson, AO668048.
Frederick B. Carson, AO412736.
Leonard K. Carson, AO742 962.
Robert K. Carson, AO862074.
Arthur D. Carter, AO810822.
Calvin O. Carter, AO1904802.
Duffey A. Carter, AO685228.
George M. Carter, AO1556556.
Jack E. Carter, AO426790.
Leo Carter, AO675477.
Marvin H. Carter, AO793696.
Morris A. Carter, Jr., AO589831.
Olin B. Carter, AO724518.
Ray I. Carter, AO815280.
Robert I. Carter, AO571216.
Virgil W. Carter, AO811013.
Wallace H. Carter, AO1909009.
Lewis E. Cartwright, AO791387.
William J. Cartwright, Jr., AO826300.
Douglas F. Carty, AO571218.
Marion F. Caruthers, AO406477.
Allen W. Carver, Sr., AO803554.
Marvin E. Carver, AO686226.
Jose F. Casaus, AO935810.
Richmond B. Case, AO860012.
Rodolph Case, AO936728.
Paul N. Caselton, AO741235.
Guy Casey, Jr., AO803835.
Maurice F. Casey, AO735047.
Thomas B. Casey, Jr., AO678519.
Melvin G. Cash, AO796305.
Fred R. Casoli, AO2044327.
Joseph W. Cassidy, AO934627.
John F. Cassil, AO562695.
Wesley J. Castanedo, Jr., AO714018.

Nick J. Caste, AO2066212.
Woodie O. Castleberry, AO440694.
Dayton C. Castro, Jr., AO432619.
Manuel C. Castro, AO791903.
Roger W. Caswell, AO763948.
Robert M. Catching, AO765929.
Keanon B. Cates, AO1850966.
Howard R. Catlin, AO690929.
James O. Caton, AO876826.
Ward J. Cattron, AO759184.
Everett C. Caudel, AO778036.
David W. Caudle, Jr., AO2101215.
Kenneth D. Caughron, AO2070945.
Thomas J. Caulfield, Jr., AO1850533.
John R. Cavanaugh, AO863035.
Robert J. Cavendish, AO803148.
Charles E. Cavin, AO945412.
Jamie N. Caviness, AO583106.
Cecil B. Cayton, AO477198.
Floyd M. Cecil, AO662878.
Arnold J. Celick, AO875968.
Paul R. Ceman, AO672031.
Louis C. Cerny, AO686229.
Warren E. Cerrone, AO794636.
Joseph M. Cesario, AO797466.
Arthur R. Chadbourne, Jr., AO836017.
Junius W. Chadwick, Jr., AO771868.
Wincell R. Chady, AO376706.
Willie L. Chaffin, AO1334824.
Albert E. Chalker, Jr., AO2101610.
Robert T. Chalmers, AO798437.
James S. Chamberlain, AO716060.
Ertel S. Chamberlin, AO733819.
Lloyd W. Chamberlin, Jr., AO795909.
Charles E. Chambers, AO805395.
William F. Chambless, Jr., AO692370.
William H. Champion, AO839351.
Fredric F. Champlin, AO743409.
Clarence L. Chance, AO2079286.
Charles B. Chandler, Jr., AO741965.
Farish C. Chandler, Jr., AO722277.
John L. Chandler, AO680174.
Reuben V. Chandler, AO809925.
Richard E. Chandler, AO720787.
Vernon L. Chandler, AO424429.
Francis C. Chaney II, AO731024.
Hugh F. Chaney, AO2089391.
Lester E. Chaney, AO1854888.
Newton C. Chaney, Jr., AO2092646.
Robert L. Chapin, AO691566.
Edwin G. Chaplin, AO1911399.
Charles V. Chapman, Jr., AO548227.
Harold E. Chapman, AO1903777.
Jack W. Chapman, AO565028.
Leonard L. Chapman, AO1692877.
Lewis T. Chapman, AO732159.
William E. Chapman, AO841536.
Ernest C. Chappelle, Jr., AO711587.
Homer R. Charlton, Jr., AO590872.
William H. Charlton, AO1855823.
Kenneth L. Charpilloz, AO740061.
Fred C. Chase, AO560778.
Levi R. Chase, AO426365.
Lewis D. Chase, AO544018.
John W. Chastain, AO764224.
Richard C. Chatfield, Jr., AO1911400.
Frank H. Chattin, AO2091562.
Jerry L. Chealander, AO778039.
John D. Cheek, AO789686.
Charles T. Cheever, AO699981.
Clair W. Chellberg, AO734535.
Millard W. Chenault, AO815835.
LaVerne L. Cheney, AO427521.
William B. Cheney, Jr., AO625570.
Richard P. Chenot, AO762259.
George R. Chester, AO719009.
Harold B. Chew, AO571248.
Buster T. Chidester, AO1846780.
James E. Chikar, AO811014.
David C. Childers, AO782165.
Robert D. Childre, AO1909121.
Robert W. Childs, AO672756.
Jacob N. Chorak, AO738093.
Gordon Choy, Jr., AO881251.
Keith D. Christeberg, AO1908829.
Sam D. Chrisco, AO683402.
Everett L. Chrisman, AO398604.
James E. Christensen, AO425574.
William G. Christensen, AO1684160.
Harold K. Christian, AO420412.
Harrison G. Christian, AO450824.
James W. Christian, AO670504.
Paul R. Christian, AO708905.
William E. Christian, AO936995.
William S. Christian, Jr., AO1909694.
Joseph Christiano, AO889864.
Edward W. Christiansen, Jr., AO2064839.
Harold M. Christiansen, AO1909564.
William C. Christianson, AO772289.
William J. Christie, AO738095.
James L. Christopulos, AO523054.
Theodore Christos, AO1911546.
Charles R. Christy, AO929147.
Thomas A. Chrones, AO2089696.
George H. Chronis, AO2088269.
Richard J. Chrysler, AO795357.
Myron J. Chrzastek, AO590498.
Frank C. Church, AO433474.
James F. Church, AO875573.
Joseph C. Ciarcia, AO591102.
Bert G. Cibulka, AO577136.
John E. Ciccolella, AO1045050.
Anthony P. Cimino, AO713633.
Charles E. Clague, Jr., AO690548.
Orville W. Clancy, AO2077201.
Robert E. Clapper, AO1580549.
Allen C. Clark, AO802252.
Carlton H. Clark, AO401368.
Charles R. Clark, AO803774.
Charles V. Clark, AO565046.
Clarence B. Clark, AO1996139.
Donald M. Clark, AO567663.
Edward P. Clark, AO396379.
Ernest G. Clark, Jr., AO581511.
Francis B. Clark, AO735747.
Fred A. Clark, Jr., AO698661.
Frederick W. Clark, AO865410.
Howard W. Clark, AO793226.
Jack H. Clark, AO2066630.
Jack W. Clark, AO822134.
James B. Clark, AO590652.
James B. Clark, AO786708.
James B. Clark, AO2061622.
James H. Clark, AO934827.
James M. Clark, AO2059225.
John J. Clark, AO886579.
Joseph L. Clark, AO837650.
Kenneth A. Clark, AO800835.
Leonard H. Clark, AO402342.
Loren D. Clark, AO819251.
Norman H. Clark, AO684276.
Raymond S. Clark, AO834385.
Reese W. Clark, AO520636.
Victor E. Clark, Jr., AO562726.
William G. Clark, AO567672.
William J. Clark, AO717383.
William T. Clark, AO2057250.
Howard D. Clarke, AO1909247.
William A. Clarke, AO793069.
William K. Clarke, AO713125.
Raymond E. Clarkson, AO1702941.
Barney H. Clary, AO669867.
James C. Clary, AO855636.
Raymond E. Clay, AO1855081.
Gordon Claypoole, AO671888.
Paul E. Clays, AO930635.
Howard G. Clayville, AO767495.
Darrell R. Clearwater, AO723288.
William J. Cleary, AO589409.
Robert J. Clees, AO693108.
John E. Clegg, AO763954.
James H. Clem, AO589812.
Donald J. Clemens, AO1910216.
Leonard L. Clement, AO567681.
Walker E. Clements, AO733145.
Billy Clemmons, AO711950.
Fred Clemovitz, AO749528.
Carl C. Clendenin, AO1996225.
Bernard J. Cler, AO834583.
Howard R. Cleveland, AO723009.
Richard P. Clevenger, AO942008.
Charles D. Clift, Jr., AO679998.
William H. Clift, AO2085385.
Dempsey B. Clinard, Jr., AO1911146.
Alfred P. Cline, AO2015256.
John R. Cline, AO577151.
William J. Cline, AO661451.
Robert M. Clinkscale, AO2101704.
Thomas C. Clodfelter, Jr., AO793396.
Lester A. Cloud, Jr., AO741136.
Leland U. Clough, AO929398.
Leland F. Clouse, AO1849453.
Donald Clow, AO666240.
Charles O. Coates, Jr., AO719262.
Oliver M. Coats, AO2100483.
Allan J. Cobb, AO676749.
Robert H. Cobbs, AO2089050.
Robert Cocherell, Jr., AO2068611.
Edward A. Cochran, AO2086481.
Robert W. Cochran, AO560798.
William F. Cochran, AO741966.
Chester W. Cockman, AO751267.
Alford R. Cockrell, AO946780.
Samuel W. Cocks, AO796093.
Walter E. Coddington, AO659953.
Harold B. Coffee, AO837249.
Richard J. Coffee, AO370958.
John B. Coffey, AO757465.
Joseph L. Coffey, AO688419.
Robert R. Coffey, AO2023865.
Orman M. Coffin, AO770520.
Robert A. Coffin, AO2062988.
Eugene J. Cogan, AO1035707.
Clement R. Coggin, AO937980.
Jack V. Coghlan, Jr., AO2030336.
Marx Cohen, Jr., AO723948.
George V. Cohlmia, AO759794.
Murray E. Cohn, AO796492.
Kenneth H. Cohrs, AO571304.
Norris W. Coiner, AO1850220.
Elliott Coldwater, AO861530.
Alton B. Cole, AO748577.
Alvah N. Cole, Jr., AO948998.
Charles H. Cole, AO1106065.
Courtland T. Cole, AO811340.
Ernest A. Cole, AO804932.
John S. Cole, Jr., AO767497.
Vernon J. Cole, AO2077738.
Victor J. Cole, AO1908641.
Arthur M. Coleman, AO700864.
James A. Coleman, AO712084.
James W. Coleman, AO660459.
Richard L. Coleman, AO2024534.
Robert D. Coleman, AO1549913.
Thomas R. Coleman, AO691480.
William R. Coleman, AO558856.
William T. Coleman, Jr., AO801322.
David Colet, AO690073.
Clifford T. Collett, AO587681.
William E. Collette, AO468304.
James R. Colley, AO779793.
James L. Collier, AO940656.
Rodney P. Collier, AO2075039.
Oscar E. Collings, AO774417.
Billy C. Collins, AO935191.
Charles A. Collins, AO2066974.
James A. Collins, AO1848890.
James M. Collins, Jr., AO1909568.
James P. Collins, AO697395.
John D. Collins, Jr., AO799340.
John J. Collins, AO1860210.
John R. Collins, Jr., AO2084802.
John W. Collins, AO562748.
Richard F. Collins, AO2098643.
Richard G. Collins, AO1911971.
Robert S. Collins, AO928293.
Robert W. Collins, AO886285.
Thomas G. Collins, AO770183.
Thomas J. Collins, Jr., AO867749.
William F. Collins, AO528289.
William J. Collins, AO495449.
Seymour I. Colman, AO649316.
Joseph J. Columbro, AO691958.
James B. Coman, Jr., AO697083.
Ulysse A. Comeau, AO685544.
Thomas P. Comer, AO1852156.
Charles V. Comerford, AO818617.
Milton S. Compton, Jr., AO860099.
William J. Compton, Jr., AO2099569.
Lonnell T. Comstock, AO2086484.
William G. Comstock, AO705905.
William P. Comstock, AO426367.
Charles L. Cone, AO1907480.
Lafayette W. Cone, AO938919.
Norris C. Cone, AO1637218.
Arthur B. Conelly, AO854025.
Ernest R. Cones, AO743817.
Harold E. Confer, AO2083385.
Louis C. Confer, AO538760.
Merlin L. Conklin, AO664978.
Theodore H. Conklin, AO801247.
Gail D. Conlee, AO867551.
Douglas C. Conley, AO2056190.

Thomas J. Connair, Jr., AO567725.
Robert F. Connaway, AO689302.
Daniel W. Connelly, AO1586501.
David W. Connelly, AO677446.
Hubert A. Connelly, AO574269.
John P. Conner, AO690373.
George L. Connor, AO660037.
James J. Connor, Jr., AO676753.
John H. Connor, AO809816.
Maurice E. Connor, AO1550988.
Arthur F. Connors, AO2015122.
Charles J. Connors, Jr., AO818620.
John A. Connors, AO408480.
James E. Conover, AO720189.
Charles M. Conrad, AO577186.
Robert I. Conrey, AO2078457.
Stephen Constant, AO682301.
Frank W. Contestable, AO1909020.
James T. Conway, AO590665.
Robert C. Conway, AO1909122.
Charles T. Cook, AO837896.
David A. Cook, AO432474.
Emmerson C. Cook, AO688738.
Frederick F. Cook, AO574280.
Harold L. Cook, AO869586.
Henry E. Cook, AO2102006.
James L. Cook, Jr., AO1908517.
John C. Cook, AO741138.
Kelly F. Cook, AO928659.
Norman W. Cook, AO690191.
Olen C. Cook, AO413042.
Robert A. Cook, Jr., AO1903197.
William J. Cook, AO671288.
William L. Cook, AO832105.
William R. Cook, AO770187.
Charles T. Cooke, AO813662.
Isaac T. Cooke, AO838151.
Morris H. Cooke, AO560825.
Robert R. Cooke, Jr., AO438490.
Gipson R. Cooley, AO800326.
James F. Cooley, AO1909261.
Willis M. Cooley, AO671506.
Merle G. Coombs, AO574285.
Robert P. Coombs, AO2090932.
William R. Coon, Jr., AO650212.
John F. Coonan, AO432132.
Leon J. Cooning, Jr., AO717626.
Bueford C. Cooper, AO779103.
Edwin H. Cooper, AO810319.
Howard M. Cooper, AO589878.
John D. Cooper, Jr., AO698814.
Leo L. Cooper, AO749955.
Philip L. Cooper, AO749381.
Robert W. Cooper, AO928152.
Stanley Cooper, AO577199.
Richard M. Coose, AO725684.
Bert F. Copeland, AO683409.
Gordon E. Copeland, AO1003208.
Guy W. Copeland, AO2086223.
Joe H. Copeland, AO932578.
Harold L. Copenhaver, AO1850056.
Melvin C. Copley, AO2038697.
Harry J. Copsey, AO734199.
Ralph P. Corbell, AO2087126.
Frank W. Corbett, AO839188.
William D. Corbin, AO863482.
Allen L. Cordray, AO679373.
Alexander E. Corey, AO705553.
James N. Corgill, Jr., AO737734.
Jack C. Corken, AO2075120.
John G. Corley II, AO2062771.
John W. Corley, AO780873.
Jack D. Cornett, AO816632.
John P. Cornett, AO1853757.
Earl M. Cornette, AO567752.
Vaughn L. Cornish, AO834586.
Andrew J. Corra, AO2063225.
Nicholas A. Corrao, AO2078460.
Vincent E. Corroppoli, AO2090733.
Lawrence J. Corsa, Jr., AO889335.
Donald M. Corson, Jr., AO2076563.
Robert O. Corson, AO585445.
Russell G. Corvey, AO2076828.
John P. Cosco, AO670019.
Benny L. Costello, AO1995840.
Elmer P. Costello, AO567758.
John J. Costello, AO565098.
Marion L. Costello, AO2094994.
Richard D. J. Costello, AO779375.
Henry L. Costenbader, AO864882.
Ralph K. Costenbader, AO756089.
Billie R. Cothern, AO829654.
Harold R. Cothran, AO841910.
John F. Cotters, AO785479.
William O. Cottingham, Jr., AO802020.
Ronald M. Cottrill, AO819968.
Clarence M. Couch, AO2080658.
Philippe Coudert, Jr., AO747983.
John A. Coughlin, AO1908306.
John M. Coulter, AO430789.
Richard R. Coulter, AO439501.
Burl E. Coursey, AO1909899.
David H. Courtney, AO711832.
Richard D. Courtney, AO930689.
James T. Cousin, AO387627.
Richard D. Cousins, AO839079.
Albert R. Couture, AO2065727.
Robert W. Covarrubias, AO730710.
Robert B. Covert, AO704463.
Angelo G. Covi, AO482729.
Curtis C. Covington, AO1847050.
James C. Covington, AO660552.
William M. Cowan, AO809106.
Charles M. Coward, Jr., AO1910558.
Allan B. Cowart, AO2044330.
Claude A. Cowart, AO785763.
George N. Cowden, AO689303.
Harold E. Cowdin, AO966148.
Robert J. Cowin, AO577226.
Gene G. Cowles, AO769396.
Charlie C. Cox, AO742296.
Dyson W. Cox, AO429364.
George P. Cox, AO2061480.
Joe C. Cox, AO667952.
Lynwood C. Cox, AO667393.
Rex E. Cox, AO502317.
William M. Cox, AO676510.
Cecil D. Crabb, Jr., AO1911556.
Robert G. Crabb, AO943475.
Roger A. Crabbs, AO1863578.
Carson E. Crabtree, AO1998213.
Louis W. Cracken, AO2037320.
Leroy J. Craft, AO590238.
Earl W. Craig, AO764244.
Teddie O. Craig, Jr., AO739733.
Ernest Craigwell, Jr., AO1908519.
Richard J. Crain, AO2087515.
Franklin C. Crain, AO422532.
James B. Crain, AO419234.
Victor E. Cram, Jr., AO390910.
Clyde C. Cramer, AO434498.
Thomas L. Cramer, AO841911.
Charles L. Crane, AO1584722.
Dean C. Crane, AO943093.
Edward J. Crane, AO795914.
Jean M. Crane, AO806807.
Arthur H. Cranman, AO789759.
Donald E. Craven, AO709508.
David W. Craw, AO747752.
Cecil C. Crawford, AO733614.
Gale E. Crawford, AO763960.
Milton N. Crawford, AO825114.
Robert E. Crawford, AO872200.
Tom H. Crawford, AO660635.
Charles E. Crecelius, AO710899.
Ray T. Creech, AO1908308.
Leon V. Creed, AO2075589.
John P. Creel, Jr., AO831544.
Daniel J. Crepeau, AO811572.
Edward B. Crevonis, AO2074342.
Roger G. Crewse, AO775812.
Antonio T. Criscuolo, AO2072116.
Johnnie P. Crisp, AO1911150.
Donald L. Crist, Jr., AO672571.
Augustine B. Cristiani, AO745050.
James M. Criswell, AO2087417.
Howard T. Critchlow, Jr., AO340250.
Frank W. Crites, Jr., AO813863.
Tom A. Crockett, Jr., AO525089.
William H. Croft, AO926539.
George S. Crognale, AO2062377.
Charles J. Croker, AO756384.
James H. Cromer, AO944878.
Frank D. Crook, AO679051.
Lonnie H. Crook, AO432329.
Mervyn T. Crosnicker, AO567795.
Carl S. Cross, AO2085929.
Earle G. Cross, Jr., AO866237.
Floyd E. Cross, AO806635.
Houston C. Cross, AO1850351.
Horace A. Crosswell, AO426688.
Ben F. Crouch, AO1909023.
Robert K. Crouch, AO838392.
William R. Croucher, AO798259.
Earl S. Crow, Jr., AO778068.
Olin W. Crow, AO2055964.
Jess W. Crowder, AO761567.
Lucien G. Crowder, Jr., AO684948.
Hugh W. Crowe, AO832109.
John M. Crowe, AO867919.
Donald J. Crowley, AO703459.
Edward J. Crowley, AO746699.
Jerry N. Crowley, Jr., AO406708.
Robert E. Crowley, AO429026.
Roy R. Croy, Jr., AO713959.
Harry J. Crozier, AO690194.
James R. Crumley, AO806808.
John R. Crumpiar, AO445720.
Silas M. Crutchfield, Jr., AO659876.
Richard D. Crysler, AO1107885.
Felix R. Csoross, AO1909265.
William R. Cubbins, AO750347.
Richard V. Cude, AO692537.
Arthur E. Culbertson, AO706485.
Richard N. Culbertson, AO806228.
Frank A. Culen, AO525511.
Ray W. Cullen, AO674475.
Robert I. Cullen, AO820234.
Raymond F. Culley, AO805582.
Edward P. Cullivan, AO1910221.
Robert F. Cullom, AO828385.
Gordon P. Culver, AO706141.
Robert S. Cumberledge, AO2091918.
Ronald Cumming, AO757163.
James W. Cummings, AO758269.
Sheppard C. Cummings, AO713935.
Chester A. Cummins, AO591109.
Clinton O. Cummins, AO2076568.
Grayson L. Cummins, AO1855766.
Carl E. Cunningham, AO577264.
Clifton J. Cunningham, AO1798249.
Donald W. Cunningham, AO429613.
George A. Cunningham, AO818230.
James J. Cunningham, AO861645.
James M. Cunningham, AO787899.
John W. Cunningham, AO750071.
Louis W. Cunningham, AO438486.
Robert T. Cunningham, AO803347.
William A. Cunningham, AO770194.
William F. Cunningham, AO2059746.
Francis T. Cuno, AO747948.
Roy A. Cuny, AO590690.
Stephen D. Cuomo, AO574324.
Louis E. Curdes, AO733836.
Harold F. J. Curley, Jr., AO1579527.
Robert L. Curnow, AO676362.
James R. Curran, AO750348.
Jay E. Currie, AO943320.
Donald R. Currier, AO755175.
Wendell Currier, AO1696700.
Clarence G. Curry, Jr., AO590504.
Robert F. Curry, AO2058424.
Donald L. Curtis, AO692766.
Donald R. Curtis, AO2068533.
John P. Curtis, AO807163.
Philip E. Curtis, AO386725.
Paul H. Curtner, Jr., AO581555.
Wilson J. Cushing, AO673221.
John K. Custer, Jr., AO571397.
Samuel A. Custer, AO860757.
Anthony Cvitanovich, AO826392.
Chester G. R. Czepyha, AO1854020.
Edmond J. Dabrowski, AO574333.
Lester A. Daggett, AO838747.
Ronald E. Daggett, AO1552262.
Stanley A. Daggett, AO732180.
John C. Dahl, Jr., AO2064228.
Perry J. Dahl, AO748923.
Raymond H. Dahl, AO774561.
Walter E. Dahlem, Jr., AO741886.
Cole M. Dailey, AO754893.
Warren Dailey, AO741590.
Clarence G. Daleke, AO579837.
Alvin D. Dalke, AO699651.
Alvin H. Dallas, AO2066823.
Harry G. Dallas, AO747223.
Harry J. Dalton, Jr., AO1855826.
Donald R. D'Amico, AO1909571.
Marcel F. D'Amico, AO2027730.
Thomas E. Dance, AO782194.
Natal V. D'Andrea, AO2060751.
Dennis D. Daniel, AO565149.
Ralph A. Daniel, AO751639.

William T. Daniel, AO833953.
Leo Danielian, AO760261.
Courtney R. Daniels, AO741973.
Francis M. Daniels, AO717758.
John W. Daniels, AO2018851.
Leonard J. Daniels, AO666248.
Lloyd E. Daniels, AO758424.
William L. Daniels, AO726754.
Carlos E. Dannacher, AO661720.
Edward J. D'Arcy, AO768018.
William E. Darden, Jr., AO815095.
Harry M. Darmstandler, AO737015.
Vyrle W. Darnold, AO750551.
Roy R. Darrah, AO2099667.
George R. Darrow, AO2044713.
Kenneth K. Daubin, AO2046420.
Edward W. Daugherty, AO2030275.
Louis H. Daugherty, AO701905.
Ralph B. Daughty, AO832356.
Albert Dauth, AO588330.
Daniel W. Davenport, AO2073352.
Grady F. Davenport, Jr., AO1683362.
Harry E. Davenport, AO558524.
John E. Davenport, AO720805.
Richard W. Davenport, AO825709.
Calvin G. Davey, AO838724.
Dale C. David, AO937419.
Lester T. David, AO495478.
Norman T. David, AO571413.
Harold E. Davidson, AO2064874.
Bill M. Davies, AO678184.
Benjamin W. Davis, AO861939.
Blair J. Davis, AO2061646.
Carl F. Davis, AO855492.
Cecil E. Davis, AO788166.
Charles C. Davis, AO555455.
Charles R. Davis, AO571417.
Charles S. Davis, AO560877.
Donald C. Davis, AO875824.
Donald M. Davis, AO1909269.
Dougall M. Davis, AO836588.
Douglas J. Davis, AO751640.
Edward W. Davis, AO887266.
Forrest L. Davis, AO721035.
Frank H. Davis, AO673495.
Frank R. Davis, AO562835.
Glen E. Davis, AO707771.
Harlan H. Davis, AO940015.
Harold L. Davis, Jr., AO896221.
Harold N. Davis, AO590700.
Howard A. Davis, AO680186.
J. E. Davis, AO2059002.
James R. Davis, AO2078468.
John B. Davis, AO780537.
John G. Davis, AO664982.
Joseph N. Davis, Jr., AO839454.
Lawrence L. Davis, AO2064539.
Monta J. Davis, AO2063004.
Oliver R. Davis, AO1581650.
Raymond D. Davis, AO757516.
Robert J. Davis, AO567849.
Robert J. Davis, AO751814.
Robert M. Davis, AO582702.
Shadrach E. Davis, AO565166.
William S. Davis, AO813125.
Clark E. Davison, AO587702.
Fred Davison, AO760798.
Frederick P. Davison, AO770596.
Henry O. Davison, AO1591084.
Ralph S. Davison, AO808001.
Richard L. Davisson, AO789763.
George A. Dawes, AO1849529.
James R. Dawley, AO2001646.
Kenneth L. Dawson, AO672040.
Leland W. Dawson, AO668211.
Martin J. Dawson, AO779807.
Arthur W. Day, AO832589.
Richard D. Day, AO411942.
William A. Day, AO782709.
Donald D. Deafenbaugh, AO2006343.
John C. Dean, AO727861.
Orien G. Dean, Jr., AO559726.
William H. Deane, AO776423.
John R. Dear, AO681348.
Moody E. Deaton, AO2092537.
Jean O. W. DeBellefeuille, AO590358.
Randolph F. DeBenedictis, AO1041328.
Robert M. DeBord, AO413578.
Henson R. DeBruler, AO445788.
William R. DeCastro, AO1643990.
Jason H. Decker, Jr., AO771334.
Leroy J. Decuir, AO697399.
John B. Dee, Jr., AO857020.
Charles R. Deegan, AO811402.
Grover C. Deen, AO692664.
Thomas W. Deering, AO672041.
Lloyd F. Deets, AO937178.
Stanley DeFau, AO1910311.
Louis F. DeFelice, AO687817.
Bryce D. Deffendall, AO 722000.
Bryce D. Deffendall, AO722000.
Anthony H. DeFrancisco, AO946892.
Roy A. DeGaugh, AO752527.
Guido J. DeGenaro, AO936717.
Henry DeGraaf, AO763521.
Ernest G. DeGraw, AO2064883.
Joseph J. DeJonghe, AO516888.
Louis A. Delaney, Jr., AO565178.
Dominic V. Delise, AO2101708.
Peter J. Dell'Andrea, AO2079314.
John R. Delmore, AO781811.
William C. Delony, AO2074188.
Howard J. Delozier, AO884109.
Harold J. DeLuca, AO863911.
Joseph J. W. Demes, AO722705.
John W. Demidovich, AO590885.
Dwight Deming, AO675325.
Walter G. Demond, AO2075597.
Russell D. DeMont, AO666252.
Harold C. Demoody, AO682822.
Alexander R. DeMotta, AO589414.
William E. Dempsey, AO501913.
William J. Dempsey, AO1865515.
William H. Dendle, Jr., AO1894649.
Raymond J. Dengler, AO2065733.
Dale R. Deniston, AO442330.
Edward G. Denkler, Jr., AO1637286.
James R. Dennett, AO1903856.
Robert C. Dennison, AO702774.
Donald A. Denny, AO1696710.
James J. Denovo, AO777446.
Howard W. Densford, AO806812.
Robert G. Denson, AO815658.
Eugene H. Dent, AO431261.
Edward P. Denton, AO423801.
Jack N. Denton, AO2082393.
Thomas A. DePaolis, AO804797.
Alfred R. Deptula, AO871004.
Steven L. Depyssler, AO2040791.
Robert C. DeRaud, AO1903005.
Royce C. Derby, AO935299.
Joseph F. DeRienzo, AO2068627.
Roy L. DeRose, AO659509.
Boyd D. Derrick, AO816261.
William H. Derrington, AO590508.
Guido R. DeSabatino, AO1911748.
Sherwin G. Desens, AO665765.
Jasper V. DeSimone, AO1579558.
Thomas J. DeSipin, AO861533.
James N. Deskin, Sr., AO787126.
John M. Desloge, AO350104.
James A. Desmond, AO560906.
Charles R. DeSpain, Jr., AO1854332.
William M. DeTemple, AO2056074.
Jack L. DeTour, AO765939.
Frank M. Detrick, AO675829.
Hal A. Detrick, AO693453.
John W. Detrick, AO664984.
Franz H. Dettmer, AO689970.
John R. Devitt, AO674570.
George N. DeVoe, AO2068191.
Edward C. Dewey, AO1911473.
George E. Dewey, AO808003.
Robert L. Dewhurst, AO706816.
William P. DeWitt, AO556596.
James G. DeWolf, AO411947.
Roger E. Deyhle, AO815287.
James E. Deyo, AO1059429.
Gerald C. Dial, AO839191.
Robert M. Dibble, AO2069340.
Walter E. Dibble, AO465234.
Albert N. Dichiara, AO889872.
John W. Dickens, AO1065447.
Aaron E. Dickerson, AO697997.
Philip A. Dickey, Jr., AO577365.
Harold C. Dicks, AO589550.
Norman R. Dicks, AO441067.
Harry H. Dickson, AO857381.
Willis K. Dickson, AO693014.
Dwaine D. Dieck, AO1911914.
Allen J. Diefendorf, AO1995989.
Carl W. Diehl, Jr., AO659275.
John H. Diehl, Jr., AO427313.
John R. Diepenbrock, AO781246.
Frederick A. Dierksmeier AO716837.
Glenn E. Dietz, AO770205.
Alphonse J. Digris, AO695480.
Wildo F. DiIulio, AO1996894.
Kenneth Dill, AO577834.
William N. Dillard, AO936550.
Arthur F. Dillensnyder, AO690384.
Riley N. Dilley, AO782402.
Leonard T. Dillon, AO2096944.
Louis H. Dillon, AO821465.
Orvis L. Dillon, AO1856494.
James K. Dils, AO574405.
Dennis J. Dineen, AO739456.
John W. Dinsmoor, AO1911474.
Felix C. DiPalma, AO2085398.
Phil M. DiPiero, AO432698.
William J. Disalvatore, AO2001321.
Alexander J. DiSanto, AO2066100.
Durer Diahman, AO2073491.
Jerry W. Dismuke, AO423921.
John D. Dittmar, AO730711.
Karl K. Dittmer, AO676759.
Robert W. Dix, AO664876.
Joseph R. Dixey, AO802538.
Billy V. Dixon, AO1908646.
Jack R. Dixon, AO530114.
James V. Dixon, AO778091.
William G. Dixon, AO706367.
Lewis A. Doan, AO686550.
Gordon L. Dobbs, AO780544.
James C. Dobbs, AO750352.
Dale A. Dobson, AO737551.
Robert E. Dobyns, AO591119.
Bernard J. Doctor, AO706148.
Glen A. Dodd, AO667264.
William G. Dodd, AO714673.
Joseph B. Dodds, AO781249.
Richard O. Dodds, AO760599.
William J. Dodds, AO567920.
Douglas A. Dodge, AO763836.
Raymond W. Dodge, AO712386.
Clyde L. Dodgen, AO706711.
Leo H. Dodson, AO2094471.
Marvis W. Dodson, AO582717.
William W. Doe, Jr., AO589646.
Melvin L. Doesken, AO745318.
Albert M. Doherty, AO836261.
Eddie Doherty, AO709528.
Daniel T. Dolan, AO808391.
Winston R. Dole, AO2085941.
Warren G. Dolen, AO2095738.
James W. Dollar, AO2085942.
John T. Dollard, Jr., AO775830.
Joseph A. Dombrowski, AO2077294.
William H. Domke, AO1683349.
Paul J. Donahoe, AO802539.
Joseph P. Donahue, AO500592.
Howard W. Donaldson, AO574427.
Douglas C. Donalson, AO683981.
Woodrow W. Donnell, AO724395.
James F. Donnelly, AO826953.
Thomas J. Donnelly, AO2089472.
John A. Donovan, AO706038.
Joseph I. Donovan, AO809140.
Paul D. Dooley, AO826894.
Norman C. D. Dooly, AO721042.
Calvin S. Dopp, AO683122.
Robert F. Dorbacker, AO698422.
Herman Dorfman, AO434784.
Harold K. Dorgan, AO663136.
John H. Dorger, AO707025.
Oswald Doria, AO1640899.
Joseph L. Dornstadter, AO590702.
Walter H. Dorrer, AO936517.
Garland W. Dorries, AO672773.
Herman J. Dosenbach, AO2075141.
Cecil J. Dotson, AO675181.
Harold C. Dotson, AO2088050.
Richard A. Dotson, AO939816.
Richard T. Dotterer, AO838245.
Erceal V. Doty, AO782712.
William D. Doty, AO1911793.
Jack B. Dougherty, AO776252.
John Dougherty, AO673506.
Richard G. Dougherty, AO405508.
Herbert H. Doughty, AO681621.
Orville L. Doughty, AO2056204.
Tommy L. Douglas, AO590703.
Wilson D. Douglas, AO821366.

Thomas D. N. Douthit, AO780545.
Robert H. Dowd, AO814881.
Glenn H. Dowler, AO943888.
George T. Dowling, AO1903007.
William J. Dowling, AO577398.
Charles O. Downe, AO678624.
Charles P. Downer, AO390687.
William B. Downey, AO932004.
Hollis R. Downing, AO673335.
Walter C. Downing, AO776846.
Donald G. Downs, AO866691.
Eldon W. Downs, AO567939.
Richard A. Dowse, AO779399.
Frank H. Doyal, AO1854597.
Clarence H. Doyle, Jr., AO663761.
Donald R. Doyle, AO936337.
Hugh J. Doyle, Jr., AO2099303.
Mitchell Dozet, AO779117.
Warren E. Drack, AO584328.
Robert G. Drackert, AO2006188.
Nikola J. Dragash, AO364610.
Donald D. Drage, AO2067050.
Stanley W. Dragnich, AO391774.
Clarence H. Drake, AO429622.
Francis R. Drake, AO800209.
Norman S. Drake, AO870608.
Paul F. Drake, AO861428.
Robert C. Drebelbis, AO737030.
Edwin K. Dreger, AO873317.
George E. Dreier, AO590513.
Charles F. Dreifke, AO887284.
Abraham J. Dreiseszun, AO659010.
John J. Dreker, Jr., AO785485.
John W. Drenguis, AO362431.
Ben E. Drenth, AO553533.
Adrian E. Drew, AO801678.
Howard T. Dries, AO687934.
Marshall L. Drinon, AO574453.
James J. Driscoll, AO666253.
Jess W. Driskell, AO2092544.
John W. Druary, AO786718.
Allan F. Duckrey, AO689140.
Speight P. Drummond, AO1911834.
Donald D. Duame, AO562894.
Francis E. Dubisher, AO1699047.
Boris N. Dubson, AO2087258.
John B. DuCote, AO722018.
Carl O. Dudding, Jr., AO711159.
Walter E. Duden, AO675569.
Andrew S. Dudley, AO2061652.
Philip T. Duesberry, AO2098484.
Robert T. Duff, AO928519.
William F. Duffendack, AO703715.
William J. Duffey, AO1911979.
Bernard J. Duffy, AO560933.
Russell T. Dugan, AO2002193.
William T. Dugard, AO1849100.
Jack E. Dugas, AO2079319.
John G. Duke, AO1591101.
Harold W. Dukett, AO840746.
Billy F. Dula, AO1911559.
Arthur A. Dulaney, Jr., AO559752.
John W. Dulin, AO2058434.
William E. Dulion, AO426944.
Philip A. du Mais, AO865295.
Earl A. Dumas, AO584334.
Lewis H. Dunagan, AO737744.
Paul E. Dunaway, AO711618.
Robert S. Dunbar, AO810844.
Thomas O. Dunbar, AO726887.
Ray E. Duncan, AO718588.
William G. Duncan, AO495339.
Charles I. Dunham, AO886101.
Robert W. Dunham, AO2062781.
Richard G. Dunkin, AO690789.
Kenneth Dunks, Jr., AO781532.
Austin F. Dunlap, AO422849.
Elmer N. Dunlap, AO687239.
Hugh E. Dunlap, AO688179.
Jack R. Dunlap, AO700357.
Thomas J. Dunlap, Jr., AO2061900.
Wesley W. Dunlap, AO730884.
Carl W. Dunn, AO828208.
Charles B. Dunn, AO590514.
Edward W. Dunn, AO590183.
Frederick L. Dunn, AO813679.
Laverne C. Dunn, AO1863795.
Robert J. Dunn, AO662031.
Hal H. Dunning, AO763529.
Leslie L. Dunning, AO715385.
Raymond R. Dupell, AO686419.
Forrest R. Dupont, AO936272.
Norman R. Dupont, AO861759.
Robert W. Dupras, AO2076593.
Norman C. Duquette, AO439034.
Paul E. Duquette, AO889814.
Gerald E. Durbin, AO677941.
Lee J. Durbin, AO2071328.
Richard F. Durbin, AO1848366.
Allen C. Durgin, AO763531.
Harry R. Durgin, AO1903200.
Ernest J. Durham, AO803358.
James P. Durham, AO590891.
John O. Durham, AO784130.
Kenneth Durham, AO795369.
Francis M. Durkin, AO1862442.
Francis J. Dutko, AO677942.
Dutton C. Dutton, AO662763.
John B. Duvall, AO1903074.
Dirk Duys, AO841916.
Gerald L. Dwyer, AO832120.
Charles P. Dye, AO590893.
Donald E. Dye, AO939604.
Rufus Dye, Jr., AO758780.
William H. Dye, Jr., AO806972.
Kenneth A. Dyer, AO724604.
Laurence S. Dyer, AO567977.
Marion A. Dykes, Sr., AO2071135.
Carl J. Dykman, AO841549.
Howard N. Dyste, AO649476.
Eugene Z. Dziejowski, AO884701.
Anthony P. Dzierski, AO932038.
Robert H. Eads, AO787791.
Lindsey G. Eakes, AO781259.
Albert E. Eardensohn, AO934748.
Charles A. Earhart, AO863951.
Guy C. Earle, AO391548.
James W. Early, AO745326.
Frank Easley, AO688248.
David B. Easson, AO889638.
Lloyd A. Easterling, AO832598.
David B. Eastham, AO665540.
Donald M. Eastling, AO728614.
Read C. Easton, AO2078484.
Jack B. Eatman, AO579918.
Alfred P. Eaton, AO429379.
Howard F. Eaton, AO1999299.
Jack H. Eaton, Jr., AO828123.
Frank F. Eberhardt, AO708426.
Robert T. Ebey, AO2075790.
Harry J. Ebling, AO817182.
William E. Ebner, AO685298.
William Eborall, AO1858102.
William H. Echert, AO879480.
Barney F. Echols, Jr., AO565263.
Philip L. Eckenroth, AO560952.
Chester E. Eckerman, AO1703082.
Robert K. Eckert, AO744126.
Malcolm M. Eckhardt, AO384820.
Peter Economy, AO866784.
David J. Eddleman, AO873746.
William B. Edelman, AO583178.
Eugene T. Eden, AO1550583.
John E. Eder, Jr., AO807397.
Arthur A. Edgarian, AO668909.
Willis A. Edgcomb, AO717406.
Flavil R. Edgin, AO815673.
James E. Edmonds, AO1909470.
Chad B. Edmondson, AO1999422.
James L. Edmonson, AO863893.
William H. Edmunds, AO671910.
William T. Edson, AO1908649.
Asa B. Edwards, AO752611.
David P. Edwards, AO756519.
David W. Edwards, AO743768.
Harry L. Edwards, AO869684.
Harry M. Edwards, AO795452.
Jack J. Edwards, AO670107.
James E. Edwards, AO834981.
Robert W. Edwards, AO835882.
Thomas P. Edwards, Jr., AO1909278.
W. C. Edwards, Jr., AO718087.
Wesley W. Egan, AO791406.
Harold H. Egbert, AO754897.
Howard D. Egbert, AO793214.
Howard O. Egge, AO718088.
Glenn I. Eggleston, Jr., AO813681.
Ogden C. Eggleston, AO2055769.
Telford S. Eggleston, Jr., AO589845.
Howard L. Ehart, AO571565.
William G. Ehart, AO659683.
Leo J. Ehmann, AO1909034.
Robert F. Ehrhardt, AO675328.
Herbert C. Ehrich, Jr., AO780901.
William C. Ehrman, AO780234.
Ralph S. Eichenberger, AO779404.
John J. Eickholt, AO783934.
John E. Eilenberg, AO812961.
Elmer L. Eilers, AO711621.
Ewald F. W. Eisemann, AO2072960.
Charles K. Eisen, AO762088.
William E. Eisenhart, AO2044712.
Charles L. Ekblad, AO1903202.
Roderick A. Ekert, AO1642831.
William A. Elbracht, AO754482.
John Elchak, Jr., AO2055532.
Carl W. Elder, AO854161.
Damon C. Elder, AO803956.
Wayne T. Elder, AO2057741.
Henry T. Eldridge, AO863445.
William W. Eldridge, AO820245.
John Elefterin, AO577461.
Clarence S. Elkin, AO2068838.
Lauren N. Elkin, Jr., AO1847043.
Wayne S. Elkin, AO1910725.
Marshall J. Ellet, AO659044.
James S. Elliot, AO2033602.
Felix E. Elliott, Jr., AO2069364.
Kenneth R. Elliott, AO709545.
Ralph H. Elliott, AO699802.
Robert A. Elliott, AO790535.
Robert F. Elliott, AO406724.
William M. Elliott, AO811185.
Edward Ellis, AO819983.
Henry B. Ellis, AO1853260.
Kenneth R. Ellis, AO2094836.
Leonard L. Ellis, Jr., AO2078082.
Richard H. Ellis, AO789153.
Stanley H. Ellis, AO755901.
William F. Ellis, AO938274.
Wood Ellis, AO682831.
Charles E. Ellison, AO799150.
Paul R. Ellison, AO686728.
Thomas W. Ellison, AO750186.
William E. Ellison, AO2066646.
Robert I. Elsworth, AO760808.
Harry H. Elmendorf, AO669692.
Ralph L. Elmendorf, AO873749.
Angelo F. Elmo, AO696841.
Maurice Elstun, AO660978.
Albert M. Elton, AO398685.
Harold R. Elton, AO826405.
Merlin S. Eltzroth, AO812783.
George C. Elvey, AO742985.
Bruce M. Elvin, AO1858322.
James J. Ely, AO746573.
Norman J. Elzey, AO1909281.
Charles K. Emerick, AO943265.
Russell C. Emerson, AO1847000.
Ross J. Emery, AO2080599.
Robert M. Emminger, AO2076169.
Roland W. Empey, AO739262.
Frederick S. Emrich, AO1573184.
Billy D. Emrick, AO1909471.
Mike Encinias, AO670860.
Frank I. Endres, AO751287.
Richard W. Engbaum, AO664161.
Henry J. Engel, AO742987.
Franklin A. Engelhardt, AO1910223.
Daniel L. Englander, AO586075.
Clifton G. Engle, AO1847038.
Forrest W. Engle, AO721361.
George W. Engle, AO1905343.
Henry H. English, AO940188.
Lysle R. English, AO1911643.
Wallace E. English, AO591128.
Joe B. Enloe, AO686310.
Stanford A. Ensberg, AO726761.
Harry G. Entwistle, AO694213.
Hugh L. Enyart, AO591129.
John W. Enyart, AO2087627.
Lewis M. Epperson, AO2087440.
Robert H. Erbe, AO2076602.
Hal E. Ercanbrack, Jr., AO406726.
George P. Eremea, AO1911089.
Arthur J. Ericksen, AO867928.
Burdette W. Erickson, AO562954.
Harry R. Erickson, AO440334.
Richard B. Erickson, AO749715.
Robert E. Erickson, AO743324.
Dan R. Erie, AO875180.
Mitchell P. Erkelens, AO2080268.
Herbert W. Ernst, AO581636.

John C. Ernst, AO2070960.
Delbert J. Ervin, AO740091.
James L. Ervin, AO1847036.
Leon S. Ervin, AO1910224.
Alan F. Erwin, AO377069.
Elmer J. Erwin, Jr., AO664164.
Otis H. Erwin, AO829962.
Arthur E. Eschenbach, AO790170.
Curtis L. Eskew, AO1910503.
James W. Eskridge, AO2088295.
John T. Eskridge, AO719293.
Bowers W. Espy, AO565301.
Earl B. Esaing, AO560981.
Charles E. Estes, Jr., AO699997.
Edmond E. Estes, AO856585.
James P. Estes, AO2076604.
Edwin E. Estey, AO795924.
Ralph L. Ethridge, AO778104.
Bernhard M. Ettenson, AO362483.
Ben H. Eubanks, Jr., AO785489.
James W. Eubanks, AO2079567.
John W. Eubanks, Jr., AO841823.
Troy J. Eudy, Jr., AO1580908.
William A. Evalenko, AO820977.
Albert J. Evans, AO942573.
Clifford V. Evans, Jr., AO659963.
Donald L. Evans, AO707518.
Frank S. Evans, AO926765.
Frank T. Evans, AO798269.
George C. Evans, AO741977.
George W. Evans, AO672784.
Gerald K. Evans, Jr., AO1911237.
Herbert W. Evans, AO1911238.
James D. Evans, AO1294639.
John Evans, AO2058440.
John N. Evans, Jr., AO814277.
Joseph B. Evans, AO2078774.
Kelvin E. Evans, AO770611.
Marion T. Evans, AO925939.
Michael J. Evans, Jr., AO590708.
Paul S. Evans, AO697625.
Ralph C. Evans, Jr., AO807400.
Richard F. Evans, AO775842.
Richard L. Evans, AO689753.
Thomas M. Evans, AO718598.
Thomas W. Evans, AO2064900.
William L. Evans, AO783733.
Henry C. Evatt, AO2093696.
Wilbur R. Everett, Jr., AO435678.
Alfred C. Evers, AO739265.
Stanley L. Evers, AO821246.
Ernest O. Ewan, AO389915.
Marvin F. Ewing, AO583197.
Monte Eydenberg, Jr., AO798993.
Thomas L. Eyres, AO695638.
Alfred W. Faahs, AO791407.
Eugene M. Faber, AO836062.
Henry L. Fabiani, AO826123.
James E. Fahnauer, AO1909578.
Warren J. Fair, AO837671.
David W. Fairbairn, AO768048.
James W. Faircloth, Jr., AO2077775.
Charles M. Fake, AO1911798.
Patrick M. Fallon, AO2077776.
Ivan B. Fanning, AO783177.
George F. Faour, AO731043.
Clark E. Farar, AO536807.
Marvin B. D. Farar, AO574558.
James G. Farley, AO784319.
Julius S. Farley, AO762994.
Allan W. Farlow, AO665393.
Francis A. Farmer, Jr., AO388401.
Glenn M. Farmer, AO431617.
Howard L. Farmer, Jr., AO2067688.
Alvin L. Farnham, AO2093858.
Arthur E. Farnham, Jr., AO820979.
John F. Farnham, AO1851665.
Dale H. Farnsworth, AO1910110.
Douglas B. Farnsworth, Jr., AO1911799.
Robert A. Farnsworth, Jr., AO1856951.
Leonard R. Farnung, Jr., AO2060690.
John H. Farrar, AO742991.
Robert M. Farrell, AO930972.
Curtis N. Farris, AO767173.
J. D. Farris, Jr., AO1855982.
Prentice H. Farris, AO1909263.
Frank Farthing, AO747384.
John H. Faughn, AO629444.
Vincent P. Faulise, AO2005835.
Don E. Faulkner, AO1850201.
Robert E. Fawver, AO830111.
John H. Fay, AO714052.
Walter P. Fay, Jr., AO559779.
Cabell J. Fearn, AO868345.
Ronald C. Feavel, AO2072131.
Dean R. Feeney, AO833062.
Vincent G. Feeney, AO855386.
Ralph S. Feezel, AO925940.
Jean P. Feigenbaum, AO1297701.
Leon J. Felch, AO811356.
Ralph W. Felger, AO436697.
Edward T. Fels, Jr., AO663883.
Donald R. Feltey, AO590525.
George B. Fendle, AO574574.
William E. Fennell, Jr., AO590247.
Melvyn Fenton, AO857956.
Jack B. Fergerson, AO571624.
Donald H. Ferguson, AO781825.
James C. Ferguson, AO725277.
Scotty O. Ferguson, AO1910226.
Robert C. Fern, AO744367.
Anthony J. Ferranti, AO571630.
Thomas G. Ferrara, AO1911644.
Ralph J. Ferree, AO433366.
William F. Ferreira, AO843130.
Jack G. Ferrell, AO462831.
James R. Ferrell, AO668433.
Bruce Ferrier, AO823826.
Jerry H. Ferrier, AO772955.
John T. Ferris, Jr., AO834598.
Neil R. Ferryman, AO741597.
William V. Fertig, AO719609.
Herbert F. Fette, AO2091518.
Russell T. Feuerhan, AO2044541.
Karl T. Feuerriegel, AO762299.
Ronald L. Fick, AO1549469.
Robert E. Fiebig, AO1337831.
Joseph J. Fiederer, AO869974.
Arthur C. Fiedler, AO808668.
Donald L. Field, AO756528.
Harry W. Field, AO740391.
Joseph E. Fields, Jr., AO822937.
Walter W. Fiene, AO559095.
Vito J. Fierro, AO828398.
Reginald D. Fifer, Jr., AO869353.
Roger B. Files, AO363540.
Eugene A. Filipowicz, AO836951.
Peter J. Filorimo, AO802735.
J. P. Finch, AO1908417.
Chelsie R. Fincher, AO1584210.
Charles W. Fink, AO768050.
Garvie S. Fink, AO2094845.
John B. Fink, AO823052.
George D. Finkbiner, AO811054.
David H. Finley, AO747244.
Robert H. Finley, AO2085274.
Lawrence R. Finn, AO754089.
Robert J. Finnegan, AO587159.
Frank R. Finnern, AO2079950.
Arthur T. Finney, AO1909580.
William L. Finnie, AO650802.
John A. Fiorillo, AO808528.
Harold E. Fischer, AO2204120.
John C. Fischer, AO670725.
Frank A. Fish, AO767179.
Bert Fisher, AO1907626.
Clarence W. Fisher, AO705571.
Harry C. Fisher, AO738366.
James B. Fisher, AO432166.
John A. Fisher, AO841440.
Martin A. Fisher, AO840186.
Oliver L. Fisher, AO2058450.
Paul H. Fisher, AO865460.
Robert K. Fisher, AO944432.
Robert O. Fisher, AO730018.
Samuel N. Fisher, AO787635.
Thomas A. Fisher, AO788175.
Vernon W. Fisher, AO732528.
William P. Fisher, AO2059018.
Kenneth H. Fisler, AO939614.
Ben L. Fithian, AO780912.
Elwood A. Fitz, AO817648.
Daniel A. Fitzgerald, AO967340.
Leo A. Fitzgerald, Jr., AO589990.
Robert S. Fitzgerald, AO817188.
Steve Fitzhugh, AO2095005.
George R. Fitzpatrick, AO554938.
Marquis A. Fjelsted, AO812965.
Richard N. Fiss, AO686624.
John B. Flagg, AO832374.
Walter L. Flagg, AO811878.
Robert M. Flaharty, AO2057138.
Joseph E. Flaherty, AO684959.
Felix F. Flaitz, AO2078201.
Donald V. Flanders, AO715104.
Edward J. Flanders, AO804316.
William J. Flaugher, AO2076072.
Thomas A. Fleck, Jr., AO2058762.
Thomas A. Fleek, AO412743.
Herbert L. Fleischer, AO568149.
David Fleming, AO590718.
George B. Fleming, AO553815.
Glenn E. Fleming, AO854800.
Herbert M. Fleming, AO887871.
Paul F. Fleming, AO823552.
Avon L. Fletcher, AO1549471.
Donald E. Fletcher, AO937273.
Garland W. Fletcher, AO591133.
Glenn A. Fletcher, AO2083408.
James D. Fletcher, AO677698.
John B. Fletcher, Jr., AO1695414.
Robert W. Fletcher, AO673222.
Westwood H. Fletcher, Jr., AO797662.
Narvel C. Flexner, AO927689.
Dale J. Flinders, AO871175.
Graham J. Fling, Jr., AO832380.
Ralph M. Flinn, AO1911982.
Robert P. Flinn, AO808026.
Cecil R. Flint, AO426942.
Justin A. Flint, AO591134.
Edward B. Flora, AO2027103.
Leo Florick, AO577567.
Carl T. Floto, Jr., AO671335.
Dale L. Flowers, AO2081428.
Doyle W. Flowers, AO1909581.
Idus R. Flowers, AO675190.
James W. Flowers, AO784700.
Leo H. Flowers, AO728847.
William W. Floyd, AO942437.
Eugene L. Fluharty, AO721685.
Raymond P. Flusche, AO440077.
Alfred I. Flynn, AO730437.
Neil C. Flynn, AO2259684.
George H. Fogarty, AO862238.
Erik W. Foged, AO2089479.
Clarence H. Fogg, Jr., AO651027.
James M. Fogle, AO808669.
Clarence I. Fogler, Jr., AO697409.
John C. Foley, AO831522.
Matthew J. Foley, AO676367.
Percy R. Follis, AO389945.
William E. Folmar, AO796681.
Fred R. Fonck, AO836257.
Charles E. Fontanella, AO1641292.
Benjamin M. Forbes, Jr., AO1856057.
Thomas R. Forbes, AO859995.
Clyde W. Ford, AO666912.
Donald F. Ford, AO549644.
Erle L. Ford, AO753785.
Jerry R. Ford, AO2061919.
Lester W. Ford, AO765403.
Thomas S. Ford, AO761070.
Joseph T. Fordham, AO820160.
Finis E. Foreman, AO752113.
James R. Foreman, AO2071457.
Francis W. Formolo, AO1863924.
Glenn L. Fornes, AO939418.
Elbridge C. Forrest, AO696565.
James E. Forrest, AO2099972.
William R. Forrey, AO2069672.
Philip G. Forsell, AO698001.
Thomas H. Forsythe, AO2102050.
Norman J. Fortier, AO796119.
Edmond L. Fortin, AO574612.
Clifford J. Foss, AO673348.
Warren Foss, AO1908898.
Bradley R. Foster, AO1850090.
Byron V. Foster, AO1909906.
Cecil G. Foster, AO2084256.
Charles C. Foster, Jr., AO701089.
Charles T. Foster, AO856588.
Everett E. Foster, AO678224.
Harold N. Foster, AO861660.
Jerald D. Foster, AO2070809.
John C. Foster, AO385396.
Leo J. Foster, Jr., AO388659.
Richard R. Foster, AO462255.
Thomas G. Foster, AO546432.
Leslie E. Fosterman, AO713160.
Marvin E. Fouche, AO836102.
Oliver C. Fought, AO938575.
William L. Fountain, AO2070892.
Richard H. Fouquette, AO1003524.

Neil O. Fouts, AO2057271.
Sidney L. Fouts, AO421960.
William Fowkes, AO773605.
Bernard H. Fowle, AO688429.
Creston J. Fowler, AO838874.
Felix C. Fowler, AO675334.
John H. Fowler, Jr., AO2063266.
Lawrence A. Fowler, AO706049.
Russell M. Fowler, AO799745.
Wesley E. Fowler, Jr., AO1907775.
William A. Fowler, AO804142.
Carlos L. Fox, AO784416.
Edward Fox, AO2009813.
Martin H. Fox, AO1911800.
Ray H. Fox, AO860593.
Thomas R. Fox, AO1908654.
Ellis E. Frady, AO558287.
Victor J. Fraley, AO781543.
Charles B. Fralick, AO2026643.
Stanley E. France, AO699809.
Richard G. Francey, AO713387.
Charles E. Francis, AO821685.
Robert L. Francis, AO563032.
George W. Francisco, AO565367.
Robert U. Franken, AO777640.
Merton J. Frankie, AO589912.
Dewey R. Franklin, AO756094.
Graydon E. Franklin, AO812407.
R. C. Franklin, Jr., AO423798.
Warren R. Franscioni, AO490200.
Donald F. Franz, AO673136.
David I. Frazer, AO1909838.
Richard E. Frazer, AO939410.
Euell Frazier, AO2058768.
Foster F. Frazier, AO2009154.
Rufus J. Frazier, AO2023495.
Thomas J. Freaney, Jr., AO789310.
Matthew J. Freda, AO793501.
James J. Fredericks, AO1540512.
Douglas C. Frederickson, AO533305.
Robert R. Fredette, AO733865.
Russell Fredrickson, AO767183.
H. Bruce Fredrics, AO1857309.
Troit D. Freeland, AO760613.
Eugene H. Freeman, AO806426.
George P. Freeman, Jr., AO687832.
Richard M. Freeman, AO784418.
Karl A. Freese, AO706514.
A. Lee French, Jr., AO417308.
Gerald M. French, AO685246.
Lafayette French, AO423929.
Walter J. French, AO583023.
Willis M. French, AO768502.
Charles H. Freudenthal, AO660341.
Arthur C. Frey, AO675197.
George A. Frey, AO721688.
Joseph L. Frey, AO1847237.
William A. Fricks, AO588785.
Paul S. Friedrich, Jr., AO1909289.
Milton E. Friend, AO709329.
Robert W. Friend, AO313446.
Edward F. Fries, AO884192.
Bob R. Frisby, AO1856091.
Curtis P. Fritsch, Jr., AO380524.
John E. Fritz, AO2059266.
Henry D. Fritzen, AO719619.
Gerald F. Fritzson, AO1585372.
Leonard R. Froebe, AO701748.
Emil Froehlich, Jr., AO694059.
Paul L. Froman, AO1054242.
Roy E. Fromm, AO1909290.
Keith I. Frost, AO663606.
Rufus R. Frost, AO1998138.
Robert L. Fruth, AO2070352.
David M. Fry, AO757976.
Kenneth L. Fry, AO684717.
Loyal W. Fry, AO557026.
Wesley L. Fry, Jr., AO828141.
Woodrow W. Fry, AO748173.
Robert G. Frye, AO1591135.
Royce W. Fudge, AO626649.
Milton Fuerst, AO766060.
Robert I. Fuerst, AO1905808.
Edwin C. Fulgham, AO807713.
Byron W. Fuller, AO1911481.
Henry C. Fuller, Jr., AO807179.
Robert W. Fuller, AO316566.
Walter T. Fuller, AO864590.
Charles H. Fullerton, AO933637.
Fay D. Fulton, AO774102.
Fitzhugh L. Fulton, Jr., AO839752.
Robert J. Fulton, AO1911985.
Thomas L. Fulton, Jr., AO1857404.
Richard B. Fulwider, AO937148.
Charles M. Funk, AO861946.
Donald J. Funk, AO2068083.
Donald O. Funk, AO775309.
Harry M. Funk, AO712792.
John C. Funk, AO819993
Robert W. Funke, AO431961.
Robert P. Fuqua, AO434474.
Gerald G. Furbish, AO831665.
Leo T. Furlow, AO869405.
Richard H. Furr, AO742862.
William W. Furr, AO811884.
John H. Gabbert, AO937069.
Robert Gaberman, AO591339.
Joseph A. Gabriel, AO734446.
Joseph H. Gaffney, AO738771.
Robert D. Gafford, AO860058.
William F. Gafford, AO796365.
James L. Gagnier, AO563065.
Lawrence Gagnon, AO749221.
Leo J. Gagnon, Jr., AO944947.
Frank J. Gago, AO486769.
James D. Gahagan, AO590249.
George Gaines, Jr., AO672789.
William H. Gaines, Jr., AO1864057.
Vincent J. Galasso, AO684661.
Edmund T. Galbraith, AO1911986.
John C. Galgan, Jr., AO2067841.
Vaughn H. Gallacher, AO1857874.
Gilbert G. Gallagher, AO2064029.
Raymond T. Gallagher, AO734331.
Walter J. Gallagher, AO744842.
William J. Gallarda, AO766865.
Elijah N. Gallaway, AO929813.
William R. Galle, AO727330.
Neil E. Gallier, AO826133.
Thomas H. Galligan, AO755316.
James D. Galloway, AO865036.
Robert D. Galloway, AO1850704.
William A. Galloway, AO428927.
Kenneth W. Gallup, AO398694.
John R. Galt, AO799158.
Robert Galt, Jr., AO812969.
Edward A. Galvin, AO2001868.
Marcus W. Galyean, AO800343.
Hershel E. Galyon, AO807349.
Burrel B. Gambel, AO725711.
Leslie E. Gamble, AO537840.
Joseph Gambucci, AO812569.
Samuel J. Ganci, AO818362.
William J. Gannon, AO1637480.
Charles R. Gant, AO727981.
John R. Garberson, AO954626.
John R. Garces, Jr., AO867689.
Eladio A. Garcia, AO876601.
Jan Garcia, AO565404.
Richard Garcia, AO754332.
Samuel A. Gard, AO861056.
Dearl D. Gardner, AO1852702.
Devern Gardner, AO841829.
Edwin I. Gardner, AO689954.
Edwin R. Gardner, Jr., AO1853503.
Richard B. Gardner, AO427325.
Robert D. Gardner, AO771377.
Robert G. Gardner, AO726636.
Jack C. Garland, AO789899.
Carlton F. Garlock, AO1010376.
Frederic R. Garlock, AO649189.
Bob M. Garner, AO530308.
Donald E. Garner, AO740398.
Vernon W. Garner, AO828146.
Aldo E. Garoni, AO1574048.
Clifford E. Garrett, AO2095387.
Gill M. Garrett, AO1910459.
John S. Garrett, AO2089912.
Paul E. Garrett, AO713393.
Richard C. Garrett, AO746082.
Warren H. Garrett, AO936520.
Norman F. Garrigus, AO862079.
Edward L. Garrison, AO675755.
Ralph R. Garrison, AO2094186.
Robert F. Garrison, AO1556421.
William B. Garvey, AO773613.
John G. Garvin, AO664881.
Thomas P. Garvin, AO2091168.
Anthony J. Gasbarre, AO815878.
Frank C. Gass, Jr., AO787665.
Halsell O. Gassert, AO2077649.
Charles C. Gatchell, AO673140.
Albert E. Gates, Jr., AO433502.
Paul N. Gates, AO940738.
William J. Gates, AO590906.
Charles F. Gatewood, AO2068649.
Jack E. Gatewood, AO839510.
William C. Gatschet, AO1909141.
Eugene W. Gauch, Jr., AO935075.
Edmond P. Gaudin, AO1908657.
Richard A. Gaudamith, AO756536.
Robert H. Gaughan, AO433504.
George W. Gaumond, AO436353.
Bernard C. Gaus, AO1909585.
Adelbert G. Gauthier, AO876017.
John P. Gauthier, AO891252.
Robert E. Gautney, AO722300.
Thomas W. Gavey, AO725713.
Herbert J. Gavin, AO742863.
Darrel L. Gawthorpe, AO778121.
Allan R. Gay, AO2077142.
Wyatte J. Gay, AO791414.
Hyko Gayikian, AO1847366.
Benjamin B. Gayle, Jr., AO790074.
James J. Gearhart, AO836977.
Melvin W. Gebhardt, AO781833.
Wilfred R. Gebhart, AO704476.
Lyle A. Geer, AO1909294.
Raymond E. Geer, AO734228.
William C. Geer, AO537548.
Fredrick R. Geier, AO1853933.
Floyd J. Geiger, AO1910158.
Helmuth X. Geiger, AO1911646.
Joel A. Geister, AO440856.
Anthony Gekakis, AO806054.
Walter N. Geller, AO2101153.
Charles J. Gemmell, AO522700.
Robert P. Gemmill, AO2063924.
John H. Gentry, AO565417.
William T. Gentry, AO787494.
Garold Genung, AO759798.
Alexander P. George, AO1909295.
Clarence D. George, AO711990.
Edsel L. George, AO826137.
Jack L. George, AO792580.
James M. George, AO774110.
Richard S. George, AO780568.
William G. George, AO548892.
William F. Georgi, AO793100.
Raymond F. Gerfen, AO783414.
Paul E. Gerhart, AO695231.
George W. Gering, Jr., AO788023.
Joseph German, AO811525.
Ernest Germano, AO555010.
John H. Germeraad, AO437433.
Richard A. Gerrity, AO792334.
Glendon E. Gerry, AO558335.
Robert Gerry, AO719915.
John W. Gerwig, AO684721.
James E. Geurtz, AO695648.
Errico G. Giannarelli, AO1320036.
Flourenz L. Giannarelli, AO583791.
John S. Gibbens, AO930982.
Charles E. Gibbs, AO1911014.
James R. Gibbs, AO689957.
Boyd E. Gibson, AO1909586.
Charles V. Gibson, AO590724.
Fred W. Gibson, AO676322.
George B. Gibson, AO2061804.
John S. Gibson, AO366451.
Lawrence S. Gibson, Jr., AO711991.
Millard L. Gibson, AO761074.
Robert E. Gibson, AO942600.
Winfield S. Gibson, AO760617.
Thaddeus P. J. Gicewicz, AO715768.
Frank L. Giddings, AO2100430.
William G. Giel, AO869406.
Earl R. Gieseman, Jr., AO790333.
Kenneth G. Gieser, AO190230.
Franklin H. Gietzel, AO2092674.
Jack A. Gifford, AO571777.
Lewis F. Gifford, Jr., AO2007318.
John P. Gilbert, AO585581.
Reginald G. M. Gilbert, AO2056235.
Robert N. Gilbert, AO792250.
William D. Gilbert, AO1855735.
Guy G. Gilchrist, Jr., AO565430.
Robert C. Gilchrist, AO743442.
Garland E. Giles, AO834788.
Nathan L. Giles, AO842405.
Richard S. Giles, AO798123.
Klein C. Gilhousen, AO1863114.
Albert A. Gill, AO855285.

John L. Gill, AO732717.
John L. Gill, Jr., AO2073905.
Rolland T. Gill, AO732832.
James H. Gillard, AO1903207.
Clarence Gilles, Jr., AO1908659.
Harold W. Gillespie, Jr., AO1996324.
Stuart E. Gillespie, AO426560.
Harry R. Gillett, AO391056.
William D. Gillett, AO1847534.
James E. Gilliam, Jr., AO755321.
Robert B. Gillick, AO784711.
Thomas C. Gilligan, AO590130.
Billy I. Gilliland, AO2071154.
Mallon A. Gillis, AO745352.
Clyde L. Gilman, AO1865300.
Walter H. Gilman, AO842508.
Harold P. Gilmer, AO793312.
William R. Gilmore, AO1909587.
Arlo E. Gilpatrick, AO426940.
Richard P. Gingland, AO856458.
Fred G. Ginther, AO568299.
Adelbert L. Gionet, AO836702.
Winfield S. Gippert, AO696765.
Francis J. Girard, AO2058465.
William C. Girard, AO824231.
Joseph L. Giraudo, Jr., AO2089096.
Donald E. Girton, AO1908372.
John F. Giuli, AO1282397.
Robert B. Given, AO773621.
Carl J. Gjelhaug, AO829459.
Donald K. Gladding, AO2009046.
Joseph W. Glass, AO686461.
Richard T. Glass, AO718822.
Wilbur A. Glass, AO574741.
Alden G. Glauch, AO758985.
John W. Gledhill, Jr., AO806434.
Robert E. Glen, AO795938.
Harry S. Glendenning, AO2068026.
Arthur J. Glenn, AO737070.
Norman, J. Glenn, AO798483.
Paul M. Glenn, AO790827.
Robert C. Glenn, AO2073838.
William R. Glenn, Jr., AO797306.
James L. Glessner, Jr., AO590725.
Lester Glew, AO568311.
Kenneth B. Glover, AO936543.
John F. Goan, AO1856820.
Frank N. Gobell, AO2058780.
Charles D. Goble, AO831153.
George J. Goddard, AO862389.
Glen Goddard, AO725282.
Robert K. Goddard, AO2060973.
John C. Godfrey, AO721701.
John C. Godsey, Jr., AO414330.
Curtis B. Godwin, AO664124.
Robert T. Goetz, AO2059499.
Leroy R. Goff, Jr., AO805200.
Wilbur Goff, AO673358.
Leon L. Gohmert, AO583797.
Harry R. Gohsler, AO824473.
Milton J. Golart, AO681647.
Lester B. Goldberg, AO563118.
James K. Golden, AO808034.
Sam Goldenberg, Jr., AO1549718.
Sam Goldman, AO854040.
Sidney A. Goldman, AO854170.
Alan E. Goldsmith, AO2075185.
Leon D. Goldsmith, AO865472.
Clayton J. Golightly, AO1903367.
Robert W. Golley, AO866924.
Anthony A. Gomes, AO876726.
Louis A. Gomes, AO870069.
Lucas J. Gomolak, AO819796.
Frank J. Gonshor, AO578831.
Gilbert F. Gonzales, AO769801.
Phillip R. Gonzales, AO765188.
Santiago Gonzales, AO837688.
Henry K. Good, AO777952.
James O. Good, Jr., AO568332.
Richard A. Good, AO2092675.
Earl S. Goodale, AO1825342.
George G. Goodale, AO1554900.
Bernice L. Goode, AO2086519.
Raymond T. Goode, AO842020.
John R. Goodlett, AO2076626.
Jack L. Goodman, AO670883.
James E. Goodman, AO787136.
John S. Goodman, AO1550805.
Joseph N. Goodman, AO534315.
Richard M. Goodman, AO720245.
William F. Goodner, AO2071156.
David H. Goodnough, AO1909589.
Walter R. Goodrich, Jr., AO1044529.
Howard P. Goodson, AO666165.
Dwayne E. Goodwin, AO715770.
Jack E. Goodwin, AO811625.
Norman E. Goodwin, AO579956.
John A. Goolsby, Jr., AO699088.
Robert J. Goon, AO2041013.
Albert H. Goot, AO864230.
Byfield D. Gordon, AO671004.
Dale C. Gordon, AO1910231.
David T. Gordon, AO650521.
James T. Gordon, Jr., AO1683396.
Kenneth F. Gordon, AO2086520.
Lawrence T. Gordon, AO433182.
Otis Gordon, Jr., AO1910232.
Richard Gordon, AO828413.
Arthur F. Gorham, AO1852630.
Walter P. Gorham, AO830206.
Phillip C. Gormley, AO944637.
Malcolm E. Gosdin, AO940863.
James L. Goss, AO390102.
James R. Gotcher, Jr., AO563139.
Russell B. Gottenborg, AO751597.
Eugene Gottesman, AO762690.
Raymond Gottner, AO830448.
Dovre Gottschalk, AO2057146.
Alvin A. Gottsleben, AO2073624.
Maurice W. Gouchoe, AO577726.
Theodore G. Goude, AO786543.
Richard M. Gough, AO1857905.
Avolette R. Gould, Jr., AO1909910.
George P. Gould, AO433673.
Max E. Gould, AO1649793.
Edward P. Gowanlock, AO1855720.
Edward H. Graalfs, AO392077.
Thomas C. Grabfelder, Jr., AO948287.
Edgar A. Grabhorn, AO703238.
Jerome Grabowski, AO842212.
Donald L. Graff, AO577730.
Charles D. Gragg, AO1864024.
Eugene W. Graham, Jr., AO787910.
Harry O. Graham, AO2071579.
Howard E. Graham, AO869695.
James H. Graham, AO1642911.
Monroe W. Graham, AO523470.
Edwin W. Gramkow, AO1852939.
Nicholas Grammas, AO 1909044.
William J. Gramprie, AO777651.
James B. Granberry, AO668934.
Walter Grande, AO820583.
Robert E. Grandon, AO1910318.
Roy C. Grandstaff, Jr., AO1905838.
Lloyd O. Granger, AO1851880.
Arnljot J. Granheim, AO784376.
Ethan A. Grant, AO763840.
Gartley Grant, AO710367.
Harold E. Grant, AO747395.
Jasper E. Grantham, AO590042.
James M. Graves, AO2009137.
Sanford L. Graves, AO816295.
Carl M. Gray, AO782728.
Charles D. Gray, AO864811.
Clayton F. Gray, AO437330.
James L. Gray, AO784428.
Robin W. Gray, AO2060190.
John A. Graziano, AO747955.
Albert B. Green, AO571837.
Boren L. Green, AO684318.
Cecil E. Green, AO437119.
Lowell B. Green, AO705933.
Milton A. Green, AO662778.
Paul L. Green, AO835417.
Robert T. Green, AO767197.
Roger N. Green, AO862391.
Sydney Green, Jr., AO1552884.
Thayne C. Green, AO709128.
William F. Green, AO794322.
William M. Green, AO361887.
Lawrence J. Greenberg, AO591469.
Bernard Greene, AO785102.
Edgar M. Greene, Jr., AO590189.
Harry W. Greene, AO796992.
Howard R. Greene, Jr., AO662043.
James D. Greene, AO2081963.
James W. Greene, AO1903718.
John K. Greene, AO757143.
Vernon C. Greene, AO568394.
William D. Greenfield, AO872440.
Alvin E. Greenhorn, AO440629.
Francis W. Greenough, AO691864.
Paul V. Greenwade, Jr., AO676761.
Guiher G. Greenwood, AO929312.
Leslie J. Greenwood, AO775332.
John B. Greer, Jr., AO872337.
Orson P. Greer, Jr., AO663897.
Tony M. Greget, AO780936.
Noah B. Gregg, AO590538.
Robert D. Gregg, AO825842.
Robert D. S. Gregor, AO2011428.
Billy J. Gregory, AO2071582.
Donald H. Gregory, AO774126.
George T. Gregory, AO741259.
Newman S. Gregory, AO590250.
Stewart M. Gregory, AO678856.
William J. Gregory, AO659810.
William N. Gremillion, AO706929.
Harold E. Grenard, AO590002.
Bruno J. Grenci, AO1101849.
Clyde W. Gress, AO2085416.
David M. Grey, AO1849079.
Lee A. Gridley, AO587797.
Orville E. Grieder, AO2095843.
Edward H. Griemsmann, AO1908662.
Robert E. Grierson, AO659118.
Donald E. Griesheimer, AO738378.
Floyd L. Griesinger, AO737567.
Charles T. Griffes, AO713949.
Arthur W. Griffin, AO1820856.
Benjamin W. Griffin, AO561149.
David H. Griffin, AO788187.
Frederick J. Griffin, AO860988.
LaVerne H. Griffin, AO1903208.
Lee R. Griffin, AO2024610.
Lewis E. Griffin, AO841930.
Richard E. Griffin, AO2061933.
Thomas E. Griffin, AO494578.
Warren E. Griffin, AO674366.
Carl T. Griffith, AO2101313.
Clarence W. Griffith, AO2094493.
James A. Griffith, AO568408.
James M. Griffith, AO734338.
Paul A. Griffith, AO834793.
Rolla E. Griffith, AO763168.
Sherwood B. Griffith, AO801457.
Weston F. Griffith, AO1633908.
Charles E. Griffiths, Jr., AO694146.
Daniel D. Grimes, AO731290.
Frederick W. Grindle, Jr., AO753346.
Ernest W. Grindstaff, AO936460.
William R. Griner, Jr., AO794002.
James L. Grisham, Jr., AO589373.
William H. Grisham, AO1909979.
Woodie R. Grisham, AO590539.
Thomas R. Grissom, AO825369.
Raymond M. Griswold, AO710922.
Walter L. Griswold, Jr., AO705579.
George H. Grits, AO861400.
Kenneth J. Gritzmacher, AO439791.
Thomas O. Groce, AO842272.
Ray M. Grooms, AO823505.
Lawrence B. Gross, AO2059279.
Guy W. Grosse, AO840815.
Theodore G. Grossholz, AO590727.
Harold W. Grossman, AO568425.
Ralph F. Grossman, AO697024.
Gerard M. Grosso, AO818544.
Vernon H. Groth, AO2091526.
Robert F. Grove, AO2057283.
Alonzo W. Groves, AO546765.
Everett G. Groves, AO877962.
Frank S. Groves, AO664393.
John W. Grow, Jr., AO671008.
Andy J. Grubaugh, AO760619.
Richard T. Gruber, AO1908902.
Tommy W. Grundy, AO589558.
Joseph S. Grutsch, AO565518.
Curtiss H. Gruye, AO689232.
Joseph T. Guastella, AO2086670.
Philip A. Guay, AO827644.
Chester J. Guelker, AO2069224.
Maurice P. Guichet, AO2077147.
Wayne J. Guidry, AO2043019.
Benjamin F. Guiles, AO805614.
Louis J. Guintini, AO710687.
Ralph C. Guisinger, AO753511.
Tom W. Gulledge, AO660058.
Herbert L. Gunderson, AO784432.
William T. Gunderson, AO584997.
Hugh C. Gundry, AO418886.
William E. Gunn, AO589958.
William F. Gunn, AO2062802.

Kenneth I. Gunnarson, AO740174.
John W. Gunvordahl, AO936863.
George O. Guss, AO935775.
Marshall G. Gustafson, AO2062185.
Nore C. T. Gustafson, AO1909301.
George Gustin, AO702271.
William H. Gutches, AO825623.
Harold E. Guthrie, AO840585.
Price E. Guthrie, AO1951217.
William J. Gutos, AO932863.
Edwin F. Gutt, AO1848364.
Ray I. Guttenfelder, AO2077821.
Edgar W. Guy, AO835467.
Theodore W. Guy, AO1911304.
Tarlton A. Guyote, AO590389.
Frank N. Guzzetta, AO1847802.
Joseph M. Gwiasdon, AO700451.
Allen F. Gwinnett, AO1633916.
Robert W. Gwynn, AO1704106.
Allen P. Gyving, AO2056387.
Ralph D. Haaf, AO886622.
George B. Haag, Jr., AO794403.
Alvin H. Haas, AO744129.
Arthur D. Haas, AO2057616.
William F. Haas, AO713739.
Joseph F. Haase, AO1280935.
Walter L. Haaser, AO713422.
Dale F. Haberman, AO748971.
John T. Habit, AO1847654.
Marvin E. Hachmeister, AO590912.
Harold L. Hadden, AO932048.
Harold D. Hadder, AO1910236.
Arnold J. Haden, AO870240.
Jack J. Haek, AO437427.
Herbert L. Haesecke, AO740796.
Howard O. Hafey, AO590542.
Alvin G. Hagen, AO938954.
Carl J. Hagen, AO770254.
Earle Q. Hagen, AO747011.
Frederick B. Hagerman, AO728644.
Gerald J. Hagerman, AO432274.
James P. Hagerstrom, AO727447.
John D. Hagerty III, AO2021018.
Leo J. Hagerty, AO789710.
Stanley K. Haggerty, AO587208.
Walter E. Haggerty, AO2090359.
Robert J. Haggstrom, AO559867.
Elbert J. Hagin, AO856304.
John E. Hagood, AO1048385.
Mark H. Hahney, AO840685.
Thomas O. Haig, AO880945.
James K. Hailey, AO2061094.
Franklyn W. Haines, AO728645.
Willard R. Haines, AO798988.
Robert Hairston III, AO2065981.
Grover T. Halbrooks, AO832390.
Leonard A. Haldeman, AO637312.
Homer G. Hale, Jr., AO692490.
Leland A. Hale, Jr., AO589882.
Philip R. Hale, AO700452.
Robert V. Hale, AO744703.
Billy J. Hall, AO2061937.
Charles M. Hall, AO588970.
Clarence Hall, Jr., AO409691.
Clarence M. Hall, AO2081965.
Donald E. Hall, AO1909302.
Donald M. Hall, AO775878.
Duane A. Hall, AO611992.
Elton L. Hall, AO1863799.
Harold B. Hall, AO752850.
Harold R. Hall, AO880573.
Jack T. Hall, AO947190.
James K. Hall, AO1908422.
James M. Hall, Jr., AO684325.
James W. Hall, AO638882.
James W. Hall, AO1910380.
Jerry S. Hall, AO1586632.
Joseph F. Hall, AO764002.
Richard C. Hall, AO714405.
Robert K. Hall, AO585555.
Robert R. Hall, AO749234.
Walter W. Hall, Jr., AO1909048.
Joseph A. Hallis, Jr., AO812585.
George R. Halliwell, AO733882.
Kenneth H. Hallmark, AO785802.
James R. Halloran, AO2057280.
William A. Halonen, AO1850971.
Robert P. Halpenny, AO2095845.
John W. Halsey, AO1852462.
Howard L. Halstead, AO783966.
Warren W. Halstead, AO684728.
Gene G. Halvorsen, AO2060504.
Braxton S. Hamblen, AO580795.
Iceal E. Hambleton, AO2086524.
Keith O. Hamby, AO803192.
Joseph L. Hamel, AO876320.
Robert B. Hamel, AO2085742.
Redick M. Hamer, AO744275.
Colin C. Hamilton, Jr., AO812253.
Donald D. Hamilton, AO1908839.
Gerald T. Hamilton, AO704537.
Jack M. Hamilton, AO664583.
James A. Hamilton, Jr., AO2056958.
James W. Hamilton, AO937192.
Leonard A. Hamilton, AO1909303.
Marvin Hamilton, AO2024580.
Marvin C. Hamilton, AO577812.
Ralph W. Hamilton, AO689960.
Renaldo J. Hamilton, AO1865303.
Robert R. Hamilton, AO856716.
Robert S. Hamilton, AO2071591.
Westley H. Hamilton, AO779857.
William A. Hamilton, AO681072.
Horace C. Hamlin, AO1533797.
Paul A. Hamlin, AO732465.
John D. Hamm, AO2093708.
William A. Hamm, AO767208.
Charles E. Hammack, AO843224.
Wayne Hammack, AO563205.
Allen W. Hammann, AO761086.
Edson G. Hammer, AO861670.
John Hammerer, AO591348.
Charles C. Hammon, AO737082.
Harold D. Hammond, AO2009177.
Albert P. Hamner, AO563209.
Winford E. Hamner, AO736517.
John J. Hamparian, AO932459.
James P. Hampshire, Jr., AO2032001.
John P. Hampshire III, AO842682.
Robert L. Hampson, AO943935.
Dixie C. Hampton, AO934673.
John B. Hampton, Jr., AO574868.
John D. Hampton, AO718948.
Luther L. Hampton, Jr., AO2095142.
Carl S. Hancock, AO2099679.
Clarence B. Hand, AO437423.
Nicholas G. Handgis, AO681854.
Byron E. Haner, AO1853699.
David J. Haney, AO2054090.
George W. Haney, AO2080460.
Russell K. Haney, AO774142.
Herbert R. Hanisee, AO943114.
John F. Hanley, AO586134.
John J. Hanley, AO806981.
John E. Hanlin, AO837814.
Alfred J. Hamlon, Jr., AO393114.
Harry S. Hanna, Jr., AO2095397.
Theodore M. Hanna, AO1907475.
Frederic A. Hannah, Jr., AO1910382.
Maurice M. Hannah, AO2029161.
Nicholas Hannibal, Jr., AO2091750.
August Hanniball III, AO831169.
Robert R. Hannum, AO445642.
Dale E. Hansel, AO669574.
Gordon B. Hansen, AO586681.
Harold E. Hansen, AO772968.
Ivan J. Hansen, AO738383.
John R. Hansen, AO790130.
Norman J. Hansen, AO747793.
Ralph W. Hansen, AO840187.
Raymond A. Hansen, AO1056735.
Richard J. Hansen, AO775880.
Robert W. Hansen, AO693773.
Robin Hansen, AO730473.
Gilman E. Hanson, AO2096043.
Harold E. Hanson, AO767211.
Herbert L. Hanson, AO788727.
Ingebrigt B. Hanson, AO806671.
Lewis C. Hanson, AO933537.
Robert G. Happel, AO733648.
Michael J. Harak, AO588800.
William R. Harbison, AO2058176.
Kenneth E. Harbst, AO2100825.
William R. Hardebeck, AO2069078.
Ernest R. Harden III, AO2066526.
Max L. Harder, AO781295.
Robert L. Hardie, AO536844.
Garland Hardin, AO668000.
Vernon R. Hardisty, AO1909032.
Gerald N. Hardtke, AO776195.
Alan H. Hardy, AO2101795.
Richard T. Hardy, AO1909715.
Richard A. Hargarten, AO2076899.
Fred R. Hargitt, AO2074977.
Paul Harhi, AO1910598.
Frederick C. Haring, AO808049.
George E. Haripar, AO580801.
George F. Harkins, AO1035011.
Henry H. Harlan, AO784719.
William E. Harlan, AO2070025.
Ronald L. Harless, Jr., AO1911098.
Dwight L. Harley, AO361199.
Ernest G. Harley, Jr., AO944498.
Carlos B. Harmon, AO2082693.
Frank F. Harmon, Jr., AO467433.
James L. Harmon, AO711666.
Russell A. Harmon, Jr., AO833330.
Gene L. Harn, AO660749.
Edward D. Harney, AO681077.
Harrison M. Harp, Jr., AO1699186.
Everette L. Harper, AO825852.
Oron E. Harper, AO552166.
Donald E. Harrawood, AO2081449.
Gerald N. Harrell, AO590920.
Marion I. Harrigan, AO559886.
Russell E. Harriger, AO757192.
Robert L. Harriman, Jr., AO1554199.
Henry A. Harrington, AO926138.
Purcell S. Harrington, AO442511.
Robert H. Harrington, AO767539.
Robert L. Harrington, AO2076446.
William J. Harrington, AO1167887.
Arthur F. Harris, AO745372.
Chester D. Harris, AO1856532.
Claude E. Harris, Jr., AO690216.
Donald E. Harris, AO1857310.
Earl M. Harris, AO1851245.
Everett W. Harris, AO1911561.
Harry C. Harris, Jr., AO941886.
Howard F. Harris, AO409229.
Irvin J. Harris, AO830852.
James M. Harris, AO574888.
James P. Harris, Jr., AO830853.
John C. Harris, AO1702878.
John R. Harris, AO1995856.
John W. Harris, AO2070828.
Joseph W. Harris, AO2083420.
Julius L. Harris, AO591351.
Kenneth G. Harris, AO927668.
Marmaduke M. Harris, AO1911418.
Merlin M. Harris, AO2093619.
Robert G. Harris, AO561212.
Robert M. Harris, Jr., AO936161.
Roger I. Harris, AO769433.
Samuel C. Harris, AO804157.
Theodore R. Harris, AO782261.
Wesley V. Harris, AO590922.
Charles B. Harrison, Jr., AO1909478.
Charles E. Harrison, AO836452.
Jack U. Harrison, AO817020.
Kenneth E. Harrison, AO2066346.
Philip P. Harrison, AO788192.
Robert E. Harrison, AO824157.
William B. Harrison, AO862282.
John V. Harrop, AO811607.
Arthur S. Harry, AO775884.
Glenn R. Harry, AO784151.
Gene Hart, AO765272.
Harlow D. Hart, Sr., AO787501.
Joseph A. Hart, AO1853694.
Max E. Hart, Jr., AO1642160.
Melville D. Hart, Jr., AO590924.
Paul F. Hart, AO568515.
William K. Hart, AO431431.
William M. Hart, AO788193.
Harold W. Hartel, AO2101163.
Edmund K. Hartenberger, Jr., AO839860.
Robert D. Harter, AO2076483.
Robert E. Harter, AO1911562.
Alfred L. Hartig, Jr., AO583827.
John L. Hartig, AO757820.
Lawrence E. Hartle, AO779447.
Eugene L. Hartlein, AO561223.
James R. Hartley, AO936953.
John R. Hartley, AO766884.
William S. Hartley, AO837695.
William G. Hartling, Jr., AO1909082.
Dwight W. Hartman, AO803812.
Joseph E. Hartman, AO2090193.
William C. Hartman, Jr., AO2092397.
Ernest F. Hartmann, AO820490.
Glenn H. Hartmann, AO2025002.
Richard H. Hartmann, AO1910507.

Vincent C. Hartnett, AO760459.
Clyde A. Hartshorn, AO2059164.
Norris E. Hartwell, Jr., AO729166.
Harold E. Hartwig, AO1903313.
Paul F. Hartz, AO766517.
Bernard E. Harvey, AO936002.
Denzal T. Harvey, AO571965.
Edward S. Harvey, Jr., AO764990.
William H. Harvey, AO694767.
Garn H. Harward, AO782526.
Ray D. Harwood, AO860547.
Carleton R. Hasbrook, AO838257.
Arthur M. Haskins, Jr., AO591161.
William A. Haskins, AO821272.
Jack C. Haslanger, AO747263.
Frank M. Hassett, Jr., AO740186.
Lee E. Hassig, AO499339.
Douglas H. Hassing, AO738699.
Owen C. Hassler, AO805820.
Billy D. Hasty, AO687250.
William L. Hasty, AO752119.
Donald C. Hatch, AO2092688.
Leon F. Hatcher, Jr., AO671652.
William D. Hatcher, AO1998946.
Morris R. Hatfield, AO2001275.
Lloyd J. Hathaway, AO723077.
Wesley C. Hathaway, AO706172.
Edwin Hatt, Jr., AO927936.
Thomas L. Hauer, AO783556.
Adelbert G. Haueter, AO1850387.
Lloyd F. Haug, AO699818.
Paul E. Haug, Jr., AO571969.
Percy H. Haug, AO747795.
Arthur H. Hauk, AO752995.
Raymond L. Haupt, AO1909717.
Harry F. Hauser, AO1909846.
Robert E. Haven, AO880562.
George P. Haviland, AO790225.
Donald D. Hawkins, AO766520.
Edward D. Hawkins, AO753881.
Herman L. Hawkins, AO2033147.
John D. Hawkins, Jr., AO2088033.
Kent R. Hawkins, AO1849683.
Lloyd O. Hawkins, AO940993.
William C. Hawkins, AO813153.
Francis O. Hawley, AO590927.
William D. Hawley, AO1863322.
Arthur E. Hawn, AO1903211.
Elwood B. Haworth, AO1862492.
Gordon C. Haworth, AO659890.
Howard N. Haworth, AO426054.
Thomas W. Hawthorne, AO1856601.
Lorimer W. Hay-Chapman, AO836983.
Guy Hayden, Jr., AO870707.
David J. Hayes, AO807434.
Harry A. Hayes, Jr., AO675589.
Homer E. Hayes, AO815331.
John E. Hayes, AO1853922.
Louis W. Hayes, AO740647.
Thomas G. Hayes, AO867304.
William R. Hayes, AO807436.
Richard Haymond, AO812258.
Albert L. Haynes, AO649646.
Baylor R. Haynes, AO777668.
Charles H. Haynes, Jr., AO790236.
John H. Haynes, AO2002183.
Joseph V. Haynes, AO1327838.
Carroll K. Hays, AO827202.
Harry E. Hays, AO724532.
Johnny M. Hays, AO1908545.
Ralph M. Hays, AO2095753.
John H. Hazel, AO533306.
Robert F. Hazeleaf, AO1851537.
Robert J. Hazle, AO760839.
Herbert M. Hazzard, AO721397.
Robert F. Hazzard, AO807731.
Vernon L. Head, AO421087.
Bradford C. Healy, AO811608.
Harold M. Heany, AO938177.
John M. Heard, AO687426.
Lyman B. Heard, Jr., AO807912.
Malcolm W. Heard, AO431879.
Johnnie L. Hearn, AO1591793.
Dave C. Hearrell, Jr., AO727453.
Franklin A. Heasley, AO859841.
Carl T. Heath, Jr., AO800231.
Floyd T. Heath, AO1911755.
John G. Heath, AO764012.
Marvin W. Heath, AO660751.
Ober M. Heath, AO1281750.
Paul Heath, AO729069.
Joe E. Heatherly, AO659707.
George L. Heaton, AO372938.
James P. Hebert, AO755686.
Kenneth G. Hebert, AO789247.
Edward C. Heckman, Jr., AO796139.
James E. Heckman, AO1910239.
Elton E. Hector, AO1849180.
George G. Hedblom, AO725153.
Oliver P. Hedgepeth, AO1857362.
Eddie C. Hedges, AO675700.
Harry T. Hedges, AO555029.
Walter N. Hedges, AO720709.
Ronald E. Hedrick, AO2075977.
Carman H. Heflion, AO933614.
Felder F. Heflin, AO1002645.
Joseph P. Hegarty, AO1903881.
Edward A. Hegner, Jr., AO2039358.
James C. Hehmann, AO1911919.
Raymond F. Heidtke, AO826431.
John D. Heimel, AO1062381.
Julian C. Heine, AO868389.
Robert S. Heiser, AO738150.
William J. Heiser, AO749634.
John J. Heisl, AO744845.
Robert H. Helfrich, AO829019.
Adam S. Heller, AO589854.
Donald E. Heller, AO1860053.
Kenneth E. Heller, AO798296.
Edward M. Helm, AO733887.
Carl E. Helms, AO725871.
Elmer T. Helms, AO759236.
John W. Helms, AO888713.
Fred X. Hemm, AO1909306.
Robert V. Hemm, AO466319.
George M. Hemmer, AO1909794.
Guy F. Henage, AO699758.
Kelcy E. Henard, AO930768.
Bruce R. Henderson, AO673162.
Donovan E. Henderson, AO945081.
Fred H. Henderson, Jr., AO799565.
Joseph C. Henderson, AO795054.
Paul R. Henderson, Jr., AO835011.
Robert A. Henderson, AO559913.
Stanley W. Henderson, AO368788.
William A. Henderson, AO777472.
William H. Henderson, AO2087260.
William L. Henderson, AO585571.
William R. Henderson, AO2089226.
Robert V. Hendon, AO839067.
Curtis M. Hendrick, AO2066766.
Ernest L. Hendricks, Jr., AO724312.
Junior Hendricks, AO683446.
Kenneth W. Hendricks, AO1851291.
Wayne J. Hendricks, AO728866.
George D. Hendrix, AO760305.
Alva D. Henehan, AO774153.
Robert R. Henkle, AO2081815.
Frank O. Henley, AO590393.
Floyd J. Henman, AO2074417.
Edward J. Hennegan, AO757385.
Merwin D. Hennings, AO696697.
Wesley L. Hennis, AO769623.
James D. Hepler, AO800353.
George R. Henriet, AO750169.
Bradley C. Henry, AO675701.
Harold F. Henry, Jr., AO807438.
Jerome R. Henry, AO1850543.
Leon A. Hensel, AO769125.
James M. Henson, AO711073.
John W. Hepfer, AO814312.
John M. Hepperle, AO589919.
Harold S. Heppler, AO806446.
Gerald K. Herbeck, AO2083224.
Clay E. Herbst, Jr., AO1301758.
Joseph W. Herbst, AO685609.
Gilbert D. Hereth, AO781849.
Richard G. Herman, AO1911563.
Robert F. Herman, AO1908425.
Robert L. Herman, AO746109.
Clifford E. Hermann, AO685120.
Oscar H. Hermann, AO678861.
Gordon C. Hermanson, AO732842.
Donald W. Hern, AO1796618.
Edward Hernandez, AO701756.
Mario M. Hernandez, AO889452.
Burkhead M. Herndon, AO790635.
Herbert H. Herndon, AO862395.
Blaine A. Herren, AO557790.
Rudolfo L. Herrera, AO590194.
Lorenzo H. Herring, Jr., AO1853618.
Charles Herrington, AO714087.
James R. Herrington, Jr., AO666037.
Nolan E. Herrington, AO2093712.
Charles W. Herron, AO1909720.
Frank C. Herron, AO659125.
Marion L. Hershberger, AO764993.
Albert P. Herzenberg, AO568603.
Carrelton R. Hess, AO1640548.
Dean E. Hess, AO792400.
Glenn L. Hess, AO828319.
Marvin J. Hess, AO590932.
Raymond E. Hess, Jr., AO763189.
Robert M. Hess, AO761814.
Roland L. Hess, AO696369.
Warren C. Hess, AO794661.
William A. Hess, AO574957.
Arthur W. Hesse, AO877380.
Edward H. Hesse, Jr., AO669291.
Henry F. X. Hession, AO587829.
Roosevelt Hestle, Jr., AO1911099.
Melvin H. Hetrick, AO1849369.
William T. Heun, Jr., AO1700393.
George M. Heuser, AO2095652.
Norton M. Hewit, AO820814.
William W. Hewitt, AO773646.
Caspar J. Hexberg, AO731297.
Gerald T. Heyboer, AO2057153.
Richard M. Heyman, Jr., AO750590.
William H. Hezlep, Jr., AO1636818.
Calvin V. Hiatt, AO837318.
Rodney A. Hibler, AO550108.
Alan L. Hichew, AO2087775.
Franklin J. Hickman, AO428275.
Ivan L. Hickman, AO740419.
Claude L. Hicks, Jr., AO1910604.
Herman J. Hicks, AO869705.
James F. Hicks, AO790135.
Jimmy Hicks, AO834611.
John L. Hicks, AO2200531.
Joseph W. Hicks, Jr., AO1906009.
Robert D. Hicks, AO435379.
John H. Hickson, AO668239.
William W. Higbee, AO854175.
Sherman R. Higdon, AO668452.
Paul G. Higginbotham, AO1909156.
Alfred H. Higgins, Jr., AO453488.
Waldron T. Higgins, AO1594234.
Thompson N. Highfill, AO740810.
Robert L. Highsmith, AO737786.
Forrest E. Hight, AO764994.
Loyd W. Hightower, Jr., AO746343.
Durston N. Hildebrand, AO703255.
Oliver F. Hildebrandt, AO2015210.
Clinton E. Hileman, AO2089916.
John T. Hileman, AO806680.
Lawrence R. Hileman, AO2088064.
James H. Hiley, AO520113.
Myrrel Hilger, AO2061492.
Alvis B. Hill, AO397656.
Charles J. Hill, AO838659.
Daniel M. Hill, AO761590.
Donn P. Hill, AO763599.
John C. Hill, Jr., AO857854.
John L. Hill, AO770277.
John T. Hill, AO2064561.
Keith H. Hill, AO1909599.
Michael V. Hill, AO868048.
Robert L. Hill, AO2089107.
Wilford T. Hill, AO722315.
James D. Hiller, AO2044784.
Orven T. Hillestad, AO719947.
Dwight N. Hillis, AO2070836.
James A. Hillis, AO668948.
Charles R. Hillman, AO809805.
Arville W. Hills, AO737952.
Willard K. Hillyer, AO1858139.
Richard A. Hilty, AO2086533.
Lawrence H. Himel, Jr., AO1903028.
Kearn H. Hinchman, AO1684218.
Raymond W. Hinck, AO827806.
John W. Hinds, AO778468.
John A. Hindsley, AO2066534.
Leonard D. Hine, AO690421.
Larry A. Hines, AO670909.
Frank E. Hinkle, AO677739.
John C. Hinkle, AO866527.
Quintis L. Hinkley, AO2077117.
Milton L. Hinshaw, AO2061948.
Richard H. Hintermeier, AO709997.
Elwood H. Hintz, AO574978.
Frederick E. Hintz, AO799773.
Gilbert W. Hintz, AO1909852.

Robert R. Hippler, AO1851591.
Robert A. Hiron, AO275522.
Herbert Hirr, AO590394.
Alan H. Hissem, AO690423.
James W. Hitchcock, AO427127.
William A. Hitchcock, AO740195.
William H. Hitchcock, AO677740.
Harold L. Hitchens, AO947279.
Howard B. Hitchens, Jr., AO2077668.
Walter M. Hively, AO739952.
Jack L. Hixson, AO1903330.
John E. Hixson, AO662932.
Thomas F. Hoade, AO829991.
Earl A. Hoag, AO714412.
Joseph A. Hobart, AO860934.
Clayton B. Hobbs, AO759004.
Donald W. Hobbs, AO1645665.
Russell L. Hobbs, AO2077032.
Robert L. Hobgood, AO397574.
Claude I. Hobson, AO2083760.
Billy S. Hockaday, AO823858.
James E. Hodge, AO809146.
William S. Hodge, AO668453.
Bobby E. Hodges, AO798506.
Hugh L. Hodges, Jr., AO763601.
Robert L. Hodges, AO1911020.
Samuel L. Hodges, AO676797.
Walter G. Hodges, AO1908911.
Frederick T. Hodgkins, AO1911345.
Robert I. Hodgson, AO722078.
Robert I. Hodson, AO433685.
William B. Hoelscher, AO712009.
Edward V. Hoersch, AO591359.
George J. Hoerter, AO713443.
Leo D. Hofelich, AO779464.
Charles E. Hoffman, AO801619.
Charles W. Hoffman, AO431221.
George E. Hoffman, AO561285.
Harold S. Hoffman, AO741176.
John N. Hoffman, Jr., AO671019.
Philip A. Hoffman, AO797533.
Robert G. Hoffman, AO862345.
Samuel B. Hoffman, AO932269.
Henry Hoffs, AO787814.
Dick M. Hofman, AO577939.
Robert J. Hogan, AO676800.
William H. Hogan, AO2058480.
Jerry F. Hogue, AO781854.
John E. Hoh, AO936868.
Marvin C. Hohenshelt, AO802389.
Roy L. Holiman, AO1583123.
Albert L. Holcomb, AO930076.
Jasper C. Holcomb, AO706867.
James M. Holden, AO876559.
James R. Holden, AO721752.
Irwin K. Holdener, AO769352.
William R. Holgate, AO 812994.
Albert E. Holl, AO838325.
Edward M. Hollacher, AO2080845.
Andrew B. Holladay, AO1849039.
John S. Holladay, AO2098603.
Robert L. Holladay, Jr., AO841566.
Charles R. Holland, Jr., AO2042983.
Daniel J. Holland, AO871811.
Henry T. Holland, AO2075546.
Johnnie J. Holland, AO804165.
Paul A. Holland, AO1911306.
Ralph T. Holland, AO441843.
Lauren B. Hollenbeck, AO2087957.
John C. Holley, AO1911994.
Iri R. Hollingsworth, Jr., AO2090060.
William H. Hollingsworth, Jr., AO1907510.
George K. Hollingworth, Jr., AO753356.
Raymond H. Hollis, AO568662.
Arnold N. Hollon, AO717793.
Arthur E. Holloway, AO1855665.
Clarence R. Holloway, Jr., AO789316.
David T. Holloway, AO2087333.
Kenneth M. Holloway, AO668582.
Leo D. Holloway, Jr., AO723617.
Walker L. Holloway, AO735587.
Willard D. Holloway, AO1909480.
Claude M. Hollyfield, AO771410.
Richard W. Holm, AO1908676.
John Holman, AO686853.
Durward L. Holmes, AO861674.
Frank A. Holmes, AO1909915.
Robert E. Holmes, AO863349.
Hardy L. Holt, AO1583125.
William H. Holt, AO729859.
Arthur E. Holton, AO1016717.
Jack G. Holtz, AO705124.
Lorenz P. Holtz, AO1576140.
Merrill L. Holtz, AO780599.
Robert J. Holtzhauser, AO753518.
Earl W. Holtzscheiter, AO839972.
Donald F. Holzschuh, AO829479.
William F. Homen, AO1038009.
George E. Homich, AO427570.
Delbert Honchul, AO587842.
James D. Hood, AO860731.
Walter P. Hooker, Jr., AO1640569.
Ewart C. Hooper, AO807443.
Harley R. Hooper, AO739435.
Rex M. Hoopes, AO1908549.
Henry H. Hoopman, AO769829.
Thomas A. Hooss, AO1908550.
Alton D. Hoover, AO561302.
Herbert G. Hoover, AO860935.
Jack D. Hoover, AO888636.
Richard A. Hope, AO561303.
James H. Hopkins, AO788361.
James R. Hopkins, AO537489.
Julian P. Hopkins, AO864154.
Robert L. Hopkins, AO670546.
Theodore L. Hopkins, AO805624.
William N. Hopkins, AO2064055.
William F. Hopman, AO710697.
William E. Hoppa, AO832408.
George W. Hoppe, AO753665.
Harold O. Hoppe, AO678267.
Thomas E. Hopper, AO2071984.
Tassanilla Hopson, AO2085525.
Michael L. Hoptay, AO690426.
David P. Hopwood, AO780958.
Thomas F. Horan, AO1908551.
Clifford J. Horkans, AO2101236.
William Horn, Jr., AO835578.
William S. Hornbake, AO941312.
Carl G. Hornbuckle, AO805466.
John R. Horne, AO568681.
Lewis C. Horne, AO1911022.
Wickliff H. Horne, AO792268.
Willie M. Horne, AO559944.
Robert M. Horning, AO860597.
Carl E. Hornor, AO832145.
Harold Horowitz, AO758175.
William C. Horstman, AO720254.
James F. Horton, AO1908680.
Malcus S. Horton, AO885996.
Woodrow W. Horton, AO2081343.
William J. Horvat, AO577973.
Raymond L. Horvath, AO936190.
Ted A. Hosack, AO2094322.
Bowen I. Hosford, AO563350.
Alfred E. Hoshor, AO2082601.
Cyril J. Hoskinson, Jr., AO534504.
Richard M. Hosler, AO331091.
William W. Hosler, Jr., AO563352.
John E. Hostettler, Jr., AO753519.
Nick L. Hotti, AO390743.
Bobbie E. Houchin, AO577975.
Leroy T. Houck, AO1911996.
Rodney Houck, AO577976.
Stanley G. Houghtby, AO1908914.
Charles J. Houlihan, AO2068095.
James A. Houlihan, AO585587.
Charles D. House, AO673378.
Frank O. House, AO589887.
Kermit B. Housel, AO2059520.
Raymond E. Houseman, AO568696.
Carl L. Houston, AO797536.
Grover C. Houston, Jr., AO934830.
John W. Houston, AO793774.
William J. Houston, Jr., AO826967.
Elson I. Howard, AO719657.
Frederick E. Howard, AO421880.
Jack P. Howard, AO786196.
Murray Howard, AO561049.
Robert T. Howard, AO1855948.
Albert R. Howarth, AO589922.
James G. Howcroft, AO876577.
Gordon E. Howell, AO1847716.
John B. Howell, AO2101356.
Martin L. Howell, Jr., AO559949.
Morris S. Howell, AO761948.
Murrell M. Howell, AO933535.
Philip R. Howell, AO1909310.
Doyle D. Hower, AO565701.
William A. Howington, AO1856603.
Elmer D. Howk, AO572084.
Jack W. Howland, AO701102.
Keith E. Hoye, AO2022959.
Richard G. Hoyer, AO558855.
Harold F. Hoyle, AO721906.
Leon J. Hoyle, AO1908916.
Robert W. Hoyle, AO763204.
Marlin K. Hoyt, AO2081981.
Ralph A. Hoyt, AO817219.
Richard L. Hoyt, AO940316.
George M. Hrebec, AO665027.
Edmund W. Hubard, Jr., AO770906.
Carl J. Hubbard, Jr., AO806684.
Cecil A. Hubbard, AO726169.
Charles H. Hubbard, AO838102.
Glenn A. Hubbard, AO748656.
Richard J. Hubbard, AO709087.
Robert S. Hubbard, AO839521.
Van D. Hubbard, AO523790.
Robert E. Hubbes, AO2070651.
Rudolph J. Hubka, AO2096224.
James T. Huckabay, AO666941.
Leo L. Huckabay, AO677279.
Allen C. Huckleberry, Jr., AO2092137.
Andrew M. Hudak, AO590560.
Thomas B. Huddleston, Jr., AO577997.
Harold Hudgins, Jr., AO802300.
Sydney C. Hudiburgh, AO425371.
Charles T. Hudson, AO820663.
Donald W. Hudson, AO872296.
Truett Hudson, AO674675.
Wilford H. Hudson, Jr., AO565707.
Will M. Hudson, AO829698.
George W. Hueckstedt, AO2091817.
Allan W. Huet, AO542908.
Clyde W. Huether, AO803208.
Robert E. Huey, AO1911851.
Donald Y. Huff, AO734695.
Wesley E. Huff, AO780603.
Frank M. Huffer, Jr., AO520580.
Roy E. Huffman, AO590736.
Wallace E. Huffman, AO2087165.
John H. Hug, AO738159.
Edward C. Huggs, AO429042.
Allen M. Hughes, AO937410.
Eugene Hughes, AO2089236.
Jack A. Hughes, AO2016139.
Jack L. Hughes, AO427296.
James L. Hughes, AO1911422.
James M. Hughes, AO568722.
Joe B. Hughes, AO2060029.
Leonard A. Hughes, Jr., AO1909311.
Robert B. Hughes, AO487205.
William R. Hughes, Jr., AO709584.
Harvey E. Huitt, AO1639203.
Charles E. Hulett, AO2095968.
Harry E. Hull, AO1595587.
Junior G. Hull, AO730123.
Moylan C. Hull, Jr., AO837322.
Richard F. Hull, AO741566.
Marion M. Hulsey, AO792270.
Joseph R. Hume, AO1911101.
Karl R. Hume, AO590737.
Ray S. Humiston, AO559954.
Marion P. Humkey, AO831196.
Samuel S. Humphrey, AO2082209.
Edwin C. Humphreys, Jr., AO669409.
Daniel E. Humphries, AO1909159.
Howard L. Hundemer, AO565716.
Tyler B. Huneycutt, Jr., AO429411.
Harold U. Hunsberger, AO681422.
Bruce E. Hunt, AO661320.
Challen P. Hunt, AO741908.
Donald E. Hunt, AO666293.
Elbert J. Hunt, AO749174.
John H. Hunt, AO429047.
John L. Hunt, AO565718.
Maurice E. Hunt, AO1848256.
Merwyn A. Hunt, AO728487.
Norman G. Hunt, AO1852705.
Ralph M. Hunt, AO409260.
Samuel R. Hunt, AO2081462.
Thomas N. Hunt, Jr., AO759609.
William T. Hunt, Jr., AO749248.
Albert R. Hunter, Jr., AO826663.
Charles M. Hunter, Jr., AO797542.
Charles W. Hunter, AO1910432.
Douglas S. Hunter, AO813464.
Gordon M. Hunter, AO841209.
Guy N. Hunter, AO582792.
Henry Hunter, Jr., AO741982.
Jack W. Hunter, AO758814.

James F. Hunter, AO757489.
William J. Hunter, Jr., AO888825.
Dwight Huntsman, AO1911852.
Robert D. Hupp, AO889580.
Wallis V. Hurlbutt, AO721419.
Joseph W. Hurley, AO568741.
William T. Hurley, AO820502.
Vern W. Hurst, AO719664.
William G. Hurst, AO687124.
William P. Hurter, AO2037676.
Elgin L. Husbbeck, AO719950.
Harold J. Husten, AO715372.
Forrest G. Hutchings, Jr., AO2077312.
Hartley F. Hutchins, AO431360.
Stanley A. Hutchins, AO710474.
William A. Hutchins, AO1903699.
John J. Hutchinson, AO780607.
Raymond P. Hutchinson, AO823446.
Robert B. Hutchinson, AO406298.
John L. Hutchison, AO722093.
William C. Hutchison, AO803013.
William C. Hutchison, Jr., AO1847057.
Alexander Hutnyak, AO1013673.
Robert A. Hutto, AO804168.
John L. Hutyra, AO1904598.
Robert J. Hux, AO1911568.
Robert E. Huyser, AO2070987.
Bland B. Hyatt, Jr., AO776664.
Bayard W. Hyde, AO758871.
Ralph J. Hyde, AO2080463.
Arthur W. Hyland, AO856725.
Gerald E. Hynan, AO441233.
Kermit C. Hyndt, AO432249.
Floyd R. Hyson, AO872116.
John W. Hyson, AO816168.
James W. Hysung, Jr., AO817837.
Andrew C. Iaderosa, AO685474.
James O. Icenhour, AO3074223.
Robert P. Idise, AO729445.
Vincent J. Imbornone, AO2063425.
Gaylord L. Indvik, AO587793.
Dent B. Ingram, AO876786.
Kenneth E. Ingram, AO580735.
Thomas P. Ingrassia, AO1908841.
Arthur N. Inman, AO725613.
Benjamin F. Inman, AO691509.
Robert J. Intermont, AO857709.
Roy E. Ireland, AO710118.
Howard C. Irish, AO329701.
John G. Ironmonger, AO1850099.
Audley M. Irvine, AO784000.
John C. Irving, AO530369.
Walter W. Irwin, AO697030.
William Irwin, AO587858.
Kenneth W. Isaac, AO679527.
George G. Isenhower, AO434113.
Thomas H. Isley, AO728248.
Isaac S. Israel, AO860439.
Orson A. Israelsen, AO890227.
Martin Iverson, AO853135.
Charles D. Jack, AO672622.
Eugene B. Jack, AO766273.
Leonard A. Jackley, AO665080.
Alvin J. Jackson, AO736225.
Bush M. Jackson, Jr., AO2066147.
Craig L. Jackson, AO660153.
Dale E. Jackson, AO1903090.
Donald A. Jackson, AO636991.
Donald H. Jackson, AO742483.
Eugene M. Jackson, AO549181.
Francis E. Jackson, AO1909909.
Gene W. Jackson, AO817358.
James L. Jackson, AO858824.
John C. Jackson, AO585596.
Lawrence Jackson, Jr., AO936849.
Leslie S. Jackson, AO2063685.
Malden M. Jackson, AO729866.
Marvin H. Jackson, AO2064307.
Milburn D. Jackson, AO672359.
Ottie B. Jackson, AO665662.
Ralph Jackson, AO516402.
Robert L. Jackson, AO720359.
Robert T. Jackson, AO690263.
Roy H. Jackson, AO782749.
Urban B. Jackson, AO1699028.
Ervin W. Jacob, AO1703843.
Albert Jacobs, AO734237.
Carrol F. Jacobs, AO1848035.
Robert T. Jacobsen, AO1552768.
Roy E. Jacobsen, AO1683415.
Charles A. Jacobson, AO734700.
Hilding L. Jacobson, Jr., AO465333.
Kenneth A. Jacobson, AO934027.
Harvey T. Jacolick, AO865988.
Charles J. Jacot, AO835651.
Paul D. Jacques, AO836465.
Robert M. Jaffray, AO867888.
William B. Jakeway, AO580068.
Charles M. James, AO934117.
Claude James, Jr., AO828179.
Donald R. James, AO1909724.
George T. James, Jr., AO719667.
Harold L. James, AO656299.
Harry E. James, AO635075.
Herbert W. James, AO826977.
James W. James, AO1908683.
John W. James, AO1853322.
Richard A. James, AO675226.
Robert L. James, AO523520.
Roy P. James, AO544187.
William C. Janensch, AO1051613.
Alfred P. Janson, AO719062.
Alfred M. Janssen, AO2066432.
Jack January, Jr., AO771039.
Chester W. Janus, AO417563.
Victor F. Janus, AO590742.
Arthur A. Jaques, AO760125.
Edmund J. Jarmek, AO2090763.
James R. Jarrell III, AO696698.
Stanley J. Jarrett, AO1852319.
James E. Jarvis, AO1903011.
John Javornisky, Jr., AO561362.
Frank S. Jasen, AO876606.
Robert H. Jaudon, AO868064.
Jack V. Jean, AO744714.
Grover S. Jeane, AO795457.
Bill F. Jeanes, AO2024574.
James K. Jee, AO2065749.
John L. Jeff, AO805476.
Thomas F. Jeffers, AO698015.
William H. Jefferson, AO885560.
James C. Jeffery, AO761595.
Seymour Jeffery, AO668731.
Derrell B. Jeffords, AO2094874.
Alfred R. Jeffreys, AO820669.
Clark L. Jeffries, AO633911.
Donald W. Jeffries, AO782293.
Jess E. Jeffries, AO844594.
Benjamin M. Jenkins, AO795400.
Burton P. Jenkins, Jr., AO813903.
Charles H. Jenkins, AO828442.
Charles H. Jenkins, AO1910385.
Edward D. Jenkins, AO712574.
Forrest S. Jenkins, AO831206.
Harold V. H. Jenkins, AO1911245.
Robert L. Jenkins, AO781875.
William D. Jenkins, AO2015482.
Paul M. Jenks, Jr., AO722097.
Theron L. Jenne, AO591177.
Bruce C. Jenney, AO578058.
George P. D. Jennings, AO781323.
George H. Jennings, Jr., AO805477.
George R. Jennings, AO1543078.
Robert G. Jennings, AO590668.
Edward B. Jennison, AO2078563.
John C. Jennison, Jr., AO438670.
Donald A. Jensen, AO591364.
John S. Jensen, AO769630.
Milton J. Jensen, AO1840388.
Nils B. Jensen, AO719670.
Robert F. Jensen, AO568792.
Sherwood G. Jensen, AO738165.
Stanton R. Jensen, AO830469.
Sidney W. Jenson, AO782267.
Theodore A. Jenson, AO785922.
John H. Jent, AO767528.
James W. Jeremiah, AO1911998.
Max O. Jesperson, AO763621.
William B. Jester, Jr., AO794823.
John L. Jett, AO794419.
Murray V. Jett, AO782294.
Donald M. Jewell, AO1910434.
Felix H. Jewell, Jr., AO2064404.
Eugene P. Jewett, AO868676.
James A. Jimenez, AO689050.
Edward J. Jinx, Jr., AO767255.
James E. Johan, AO883698.
Alf H. Johanson, AO681187.
Louis A. Johnagin, AO894068.
William E. John, AO1851890.
Charles W. Johns, AO815404.
Harry S. Johns, AO726203.
Henry E. Johns, AO2066541.
Albert W. Johnson, AO954735.
Alexander K. Johnson, AO572161.
Charles I. Johnson, AO552902.
Charles R. Johnson, AO767821.
Charles T. Johnson, AO887895.
Dale A. Johnson, AO438056.
David M. Johnson, AO1853755.
Dewey W. Johnson, AO731379.
Donald E. Johnson, AO2071176.
Earl E. Johnson, AO877757.
Edward E. Johnson, AO738170.
Ellwood E. Johnson, AO823662.
Francis E. Johnson, AO1909990.
Frank S. Johnson, AO721914.
Fred M. Johnson, AO529221.
George Johnson, AO2068319.
Glenn M. Johnson, AO932665.
Gunnar Johnson, AO835761.
Harlie B. Johnson, AO839661.
Harold F. Johnson, AO2067599.
Harold L. Johnson, AO2063844.
Henry L. Johnson, AO927028.
Hubert O. Johnson, Jr., AO409639.
Ivan D. Johnson, AO2066365.
James L. Johnson, Jr., AO1909602.
Joseph A. Johnson, AO590743.
Kenneth Johnson, AO839123.
Kenneth V. Johnson, AO668302.
Lawrence J. Johnson, AO1851270.
LeRoy J. Johnson, AO732261.
Lucian M. Johnson, AO2068679.
Luverne S. Johnson, AO724772.
Magnus P. Johnson, AO756602.
Mark R. Johnson, AO855307.
Marvin M. Johnson, AO836470.
Maurice E. Johnson, AO2094878.
Michael J. Johnson, AO2066045.
Olin H. Johnson, AO1039701.
Ralph E. Johnson, AO732004.
Ralph H. Johnson, AO661163.
Ralph W. Johnson, AO740209.
Raymond A. Johnson, AO761439.
Robert A. Johnson, AO684744.
Robert B. Johnson, AO636664.
Robert E. Johnson, AO832666.
Robert E. Johnson, Jr., AO2061429.
Robert L. Johnson, AO719716.
Robert P. Johnson, AO2015196.
Roger F. Johnson, AO690226.
Roy E. Johnson, AO763626.
Sidney L. Johnson, AO590609.
Stanley C. Johnson, AO663430.
Stanley J. Johnson, AO690106.
Thomas R. Johnson, Jr., AO668840.
Wallace A. Johnson, AO810668.
Walter D. Johnson, Jr., AO823604.
Walter E. Johnson, AO719670.
Walter S. Johnson, AO691995.
Wendell C. Johnson, AO2058401.
William C. Johnson, AO662569.
Wilson W. Johnson, AO668608.
Keith L. Johnston, AO807734.
Robert H. Johnston, AO2069097.
Edward R. Jolley, AO764324.
Alvan C. Jones, Jr., AO2062132.
Charles T. Jones, AO708930.
Clifford W. Jones, AO821061.
Dale L. Jones, AO1900709.
David M. Jones, AO826991.
Edward F. Jones, Jr., AO835886.
Edward L. Jones, AO2061472.
Edwin G. Jones, AO585602.
Finch M. Jones, AO523148.
Floyd E. Jones, AO1589094.
Francis E. Jones, AO1904522.
Francis L. Jones, AO802464.
Fred H. Jones, AO852061.
Gene W. Jones, AO769752.
Glendon P. Jones, AO672121.
Harold L. Jones, AO767929.
Henry A. Jones, AO716161.
Herbert W. Jones, AO693276.
Howard W. Jones, AO683444.
Jack R. Jones, AO2075072.
John A. Jones, Jr., AO760329.
John F. Jones, AO590971.
John H. Jones, AO590967.
John J. Jones, AO715228.
John L. Jones, AO770681.
John P. Jones, Jr., AO658717.

John S. Jones, Jr., AO415455.
John T. Jones, AO821500.
John W. Jones, AO795969.
Kenneth L. Jones, AO2076323.
Kenneth T. Jones, AO805063.
Lawrence W. Jones, AO1850466.
Leo L. Jones. AO823606.
Marvin J. Jones, AO855658.
Muller L. Jones, Jr., AO2076306.
Murray O. Jones, AO589858.
Paul E. Jones, AO2056974.
Paul G. Jones, AO756573.
Ralph R. Jones, AO2074226.
Ralph W. Jones, AO661843.
Reese T. Jones, AO762781.
Richard A. Jones, AO722106.
Robert C. Jones, AO1903096.
Robert D. Jones AO1687986.
Robert P. Jones, Jr., AO684743.
Thomas J. Jones, AO1908686.
Thomas J. Jones, AO2096192.
Thomas R. Jones, AO2080291.
Vern L. Jones, AO819678.
Whitcomb O. Jones, AO2076386.
William H. Jones, AO731073.
William L. Jones, AO865991.
William M. Jones, AO2060806.
William T. Jones, AO663275.
Clyde D. Jordan, AO692493.
Herbert A. Jordan, AO2045253.
Octavio Jordan, AO775381.
Verna H. Jordan, AO429154.
Elmer A. Jorgensen, AO676585.
Raymond A. Jorgenson, Jr., AO660760.
Francis L. Jory, AO2074920.
Bertram C. Joseph, AO314117.
Charles W. Joseph, Jr., AO1909725.
James S. Joska, AO1650595.
Lional S. Jourdan, Jr., AO872347.
Joseph J. Jowers, AO572204.
Thomas O. Jowers, AO822185.
Wilfred N. Joyal, AO692162.
Robert A. Joyce, AO568836.
Robert J. Joyce, AO1852207.
William A. Joyce, AO759690.
William R. Joyner, AO789112.
Cecil B. Juanarena, AO774180.
James A. Judge, Jr., AO825644.
Thomas A. Judge, Jr., AO2066551.
Frank C. Judia, AO2059791.
Earl W. Judy, AO1854232.
William A. Juhrs, AO697282.
Julius E. Julich, AO940066.
Jimmy J. Jumper, AO2080072.
Bertram V. Jungemann, AO767825.
Ben Juskie, AO663621.
Charles A. Justinak, AO488769.
Willie N. Kacharos, AO550775.
Stanley A. Kachel, AO2082957.
George Kaden, AO572218.
Louis C. Kading, AO1909490.
Robert E. Kaempfer, AO407102.
James J. Kahl, AO2054035.
Frederic J. Kahn, AO1686409.
David S. Kahne, AO713963.
Erwin J. Kaidy, AO764139.
Henry A. Kaiser, AO934993.
Howard H. Kaiser, AO731193.
Mack J. Kalahar, AO2085180.
Robert D. Kalb, AO427498.
George C. Kalebaugh, AO728675.
Charles S. Kaler, AO778497.
Russel R. Kalessa, AO808686.
John C. Kaliher, AO667301.
Stuart R. Kalmus, AO760194.
Alfred M. Kamajian, AO758701.
Henry J. Kamaras, AO703635.
Edward J. Kaminski, AO669480.
Raymond J. Kaminski, AO588459.
James J. Kane, AO704214.
John J. Kane, AO622186.
Robert W. Kane, AO2062822.
Woolsey M. Kane, AO856250.
Ralph W. Kanten, AO784013.
John C. Kanzler, AO1904680.
Robert W. Kapfhamer, AO928521.
John D. Kaplan, AO2095152.
Ernest J. Kappe, AO750170.
Joseph U. Karaffa, AO1911346.
Joseph J. Karbin, AO935055.
Stephen F. Karlowitch, AO1911572.
Joseph Karol, AO804805.
Milton R. Kartun, AO2008885.
Clarion W. Karvonen, AO701768.
Mike Kasarda, AO1998623.
John C. Kasper, AO2000349.
Donald F. Kasselman, AO835486.
Richard J. Kastigar, AO591181.
Nicholas J. Kasun, Jr., AO660066.
Joseph B. Kata, AO2086679.
Otto F. Kattwinkel, AO871223.
Richard S. Kauffman, AO1909163.
Avery Kay, AO694879.
Charles J. Kay, Jr., AO691450.
Ira M. Kay, AO565816.
Ted Kaye, AO563479.
Donald D. Kaynor, AO698297.
Patrick D. Keach, AO779885.
Harold L. Keathley, AO747428.
Merlyn R. Keay, AO760862.
Frank L. Kebelman, Jr., AO797676.
Lawrence Keefe, AO824501.
Albert T. Keeler, AO819113.
John A. Keeler, AO788783.
John W. Keeler, AO811919.
Russell S. Keen, AO763222.
Alan W. Keenen, AO1909323.
Ralph H. Keeney, AO805290.
George F. Keeper, AO689780.
Tom E. Keeter, AO678278.
George B. Keezell, AO587876.
Thomas L. Keheley, AO797327.
Raymond H. Kehl, AO735794.
Richard C. Kehrer, AO683717.
John R. Keiper, Jr., AO1910614.
Kenneth J. Keiser, AO1863805.
Leslie D. Keiser, AO747275.
Clifford N. Keith, AO740212.
Clyde K. Keith, AO2067006.
Herbert W. Keith, AO444527.
Jack L. Keith, AO935508.
James A. Keith, AO861376.
Dale L. Kellam, AO2101642.
Victor Kellan, AO1634949.
Gerard F. Kelleher, AO673584.
Blanton S. Keller, AO682655.
Chester N. Keller, AO767561.
David L. Keller, AO887674.
Edgar W. Keller, AO660369.
George R. Keller, AO687328.
Leonard Keller, AO1578695.
Robert C. Keller, AO2058619.
William C. Kellerman, Jr., AO661775.
Dwayne E. Kelley, AO2101740.
Edmund E. Kelley, AO1574890.
Emerson R. Kelley, AO2095762.
George M. Kelley, AO1910511.
Glenard L. Kelley, AO929899.
Gordon L. Kelley, AO424969.
Raymond H. Kelley, AO1904869.
William A. Kelley, Jr., AO866221.
Joseph R. Kelliher, AO427746.
Sanford B. Kellogg, Jr., AO675851.
Byron D. Kelly, AO746367.
Edward J. Kelly, AO889976.
Edward T. Kelly, AO826194.
Howerth E. Kelly, AO580980.
James D. Kelly, AO830012.
James M. Kelly, AO813284.
John D. Kelly, AO696230.
John F. Kelly, AO685079.
John K. Kelly, Jr., AO930110.
John R. Kelly, Jr., AO821724.
John S. Kelly, AO773146.
John V. Kelly, Jr., AO733661.
Linden Kelly, AO2063847.
Maulsby J. Kelly, AO1855706.
Michael J. Kelly, Jr., AO799788.
Milton T. Kelly, Jr., AO2059312.
Myron E. Kelly, AO775925.
Raymond R. Kelly, AO2058497.
Robert H. Kelly, AO1551654.
Robert J. Kelly, AO945113.
Thomas G. Kelly, Jr., AO417157.
Joseph P. Kelsey, AO677049.
Bruce G. Keltz, AO749585.
Shelton D. Kem, AO401819.
Charles L. Kemp, AO2029211.
Eugene A. Kemp, AO2080715.
John N. Kemp, AO590949.
Salvadore W. Kemp, Jr., AO590578.
William L. Kempffer, AO675853.
Robert P. Kemske, AO715550.
James S. Kendall, AO1911924.
Robert L. Kendall, AO407942.
Thomas C. Kendall, AO731879.
Edward Kendrex, AO1908440.
Claud D. Kendrick, AO690666.
Franklin C. Kendziora, AO682879.
John T. Keneally, AO825901.
James H. Kenna, AO2056611.
Donald E. Kennedy, AO1684220.
Harvey M. Kennedy, Jr., AO665043.
Jack H. Kennedy, Jr., AO728090.
Jack M. Kennedy, AO1822149.
James E. Kennedy, AO2009064.
James S. Kennedy, AO2043144.
James V. Kennedy, AO841271.
Joe W. Kennedy, AO744609.
John C. Kennedy, AO706532.
John E. Kennedy, AO716464.
Joseph A. Kennedy, AO826683.
Joseph R. Kennedy, AO863097.
Robert L. Kennedy, AO717446.
William E. Kennedy, AO517001.
William N. Kennedy, AO2070583.
Paul E. Kenney, AO1300340.
Joe T. Kennington, AO1696664.
John C. Kennon, AO1911249.
Edward W. Kenny, Jr., AO2063848.
Richard M. Kenny, AO754431.
Eugene E. Kent, AO323487.
Frederick P. Kent, AO927095.
James D. Kent, AO568891.
James H. Kent, AO763637.
James L. Kent, AO390176.
James L. Kent, AO803215.
Richard D. Kent, AO792997.
Kenneth E. Kentner, AO782755.
Theodore A. Kentroti, AO768967.
Curtis R. Keogh, AO1702945.
Donald L. Keplinger, AO518683.
William C. Kepner, AO2091170.
Frank S. Kerchner, AO805637.
Leo Kerin, AO857429.
William J. Kermes, AO496075.
Charles E. Kern, AO591183.
Charles A. Kerr, AO563503.
Erbert L. Kerr, AO838773.
Robert C. Kerr, AO729180.
Robert L. Kerr, AO679890.
Warren L. Kesner, AO781595.
Frederick W. Kettenacker, AO673857.
Eugene F. Keutzer, AO2076649.
William E Kevan, AO520609.
John W. Key, Jr., AO2073389.
Sydney E. Key, AO775391.
Gordon F. Keyes, AO393145.
Carmon L. Keyser, AO2070587.
Harold R. Keyt, AO703637.
Kenneth N. Keyte, AO1634026.
Elbert L. Kidd, AO776570.
Arthur W. Kidder, Jr., AO760195.
William T. Kidder, Jr., AO2092572.
Joseph A. Kiely, Jr., AO1596081.
Donald D. Kienholz, AO740456.
Rodney T. Kienlen, AO706199.
Leonard F. Kier, AO1847914.
Floyd B. Kifer, AO679891.
Hobert L. Kiger, AO2086395.
Robert H. Kilby, AO565850.
Donald K. Kilgore, AO761119.
Henry G. Killian, Jr., AO719367.
James T. Kilkelly, AO756992.
Harold J. Killian, AO796838.
Hugh P. Killingsworth, AO670931.
Harry W. Kilpack, AO725163.
Paul R. Kilmain, AO738643.
Billy J. Kilpatrick, AO590580.
Lewelr L. Kilpatrick, AO409749.
Robert J. Kilpatrick, AO1909856.
Woodrow W. Kilpatrick, AO2101419.
Richard D. Kimball, AO661329.
Stanley J. Kimball, AO583882.
William T. Kimberlin, AO868018.
Perry E. Kimerer, AO661941.
Nelson W. Kimmey, AO615500.
Clinton L. Kimsey, AO668087.
John C. Kincaid, AO777409.
Warren R. Kincaid, Jr., AO2068850.
Austin J. King, AO783783.
Clark M. King, AO703638.
Daniel C. King, AO532706.

Darryl L. King, AO1963218.
George W. King, AO1908844.
Haldane King, AO614819.
Harold R. King, AO829237.
James E. King, AO555832.
James F. King, Jr., AO1856346.
James J. King, AO1842260.
James L. King, AO928151.
John T. King, AO728668.
Marion A. King, AO706937.
Paul W. King, AO649659.
Raymond A. King, AO1910748.
Raymond J. King, Jr., AO614089.
Thomas H. King, AO583328.
Thomas K. King, AO749722.
Tommy O. King, AO786763.
Reubin L. Kingdom, Jr., AO767278.
Martin E. Kinna, AO734569.
Oliver C. Kinsey, AO455982.
Robert W. Kinney, AO630246.
George C. Kinser, Jr., AO824649.
Lyle G. Kinser, AO3073149.
Joseph J. Kiolbassa, AO2080774.
Richard J. Kipp, AO2060529.
Robert D. Kirby, AO568820.
Robert M. Kirby, AO572981.
Thomas M. Kirk, AO656957.
Donald J. Kirkaldie, AO665129.
Elmer L. Kirkendall, AO856643.
Henry O. Kirkland, Jr., AO935942.
Roy E. Kirkland, AO706200.
Arthur R. Kirkpatrick, AO572283.
Norbert W. Kirkpatrick, AO697205.
Robert F. Kirkpatrick, AO583338.
Robert J. Kirkpatrick, AO1003271.
Robert A. Kirsch, AO769053.
Eugene S. Kirschenbaum, AO836880.
Jack Kirschenbaum, AO1633347.
Thomas E. Kirwan, AO745114.
Oscar J. Kiser, AO1596699.
Alexander J. Kisselburgh, Jr., AO429956.
Richard B. Kissinger, AO823629.
Donald R. Klang, AO835491.
Eldon A. Klapal, AO811490.
David B. Klarer, AO1646321.
Walter L. Klatt, Jr., AO785832.
Raymond L. Klebaum, AO1910245.
Gerald J. Klecker, AO720062.
Carl P. Klein, Jr., AO2030084.
Max Klein, AO783346.
Raymond W. Klein, AO1850652.
Robert Klein, AO650427.
Walter J. Klein, AO405804.
William J. Klein, Jr., AO673589.
Charles G. Kleinschmidt, AO587888.
Donald I. Kline, AO803831.
Russel H. Kline, AO707704.
Robert J. Klingensmith, Jr., AO821505.
Arthur J. Klingon, AO585064.
William H. Klinker, Jr., AO769473.
Charles R. Klinkert, AO765474.
Gilbert P. Klippel, AO691925.
Charles E. Klobassa, AO1911307.
Frederick H. Klopper, AO690451.
Frank P. Klotz, AO2062136.
Lewis E. Klotzbach, AO1896036.
Leon V. Kluttz, AO1857363.
Nicholas Klymyshyn, AO667939.
Rex R. Knaak, AO1909730.
Gaylord A. Knapp, AO925913.
Waldo G. Knapp, Jr., AO857086.
William A. Knapp, AO590010.
William C. Knapp, AO735977.
Henry E. Knebel, AO591373.
George J. Knego, AO2075230.
Arthur S. Knies, AO640696.
Samuel K. Kniffen, AO936530.
Artemus R. Knight, AO855427.
Bernard R. Knight, AO2079750.
Clarence B. Knight, AO867064.
Harold D. Knight, AO572299.
William K. Knight, AO714940.
William R. Knight, AO661850.
William A. Knights, AO1904811.
William C. Knipscher, AO728185.
George E. Knobel, AO2075425.
William S. Knowles, AO711700.
Harold B. Knowlton, AO561436.
James B. Knox, AO544091.
Merton B. Knox, AO749001.
William D. Knox, AO1962651.
Harold P. Knutty, AO836460.
Olin F. Koch, AO2074584.
Zygmunt K. Kochanek, AO807239.
John J. Koehler, AO1908335.
John B. Koelle, AO664822.
Chester P. Koesse, AO1011165.
Norman R. Kohn, AO834455.
Hollis H. Kohr, AO1543044.
James R. Kolb, Jr., AO807857.
Walter M. Koller, AO927189.
Alvin F. Kolz, AO836122.
Henry E. Komodowski, AO1910514.
Nick Komous, AO740461.
Walter J. Konantz, AO824655.
Carlton J. Koncz, AO835666.
Edward P. Kondziolka, AO723377.
Jane R. H. Kong, AO677386.
Harold F. Konvalinka, AO744854.
John D. Koones, AO470986.
George A. Kopcho, AO692415.
Walter J. Koral, AO660162.
Frederick W. Korbitz, Jr., AO863491.
Warren J. Korinek, AO2087792.
Leonard D. Korman, AO1108817.
Albert W. Kosko, AO580082.
Raymond Kosmatka, AO886468.
Theophil D. Kosmicki, AO2076856.
John G. Koudsi, AO1909332.
Edward L. Kough, AO835222.
Charles A. Kovacs, AO690197.
William M. Kovalick, AO748685.
Robert C. Kownsar, AO2067985.
Felix Kozaczka, AO694254.
Paul Kozelka, AO657977.
Gustav A. Kraft, AO665899.
John W. Krager, AO788652.
James J. Krajicek, Jr., AO775933.
Arlington C. Krajnik, AO936541.
Eddie C. Kraker, AO432763.
John C. Kramer, AO2076659.
Richard G. Kramer, AO666558.
Roy A. Kramer, AO1574917.
Evans Kranidas, AO1851362.
James H. Krannichfeld, AO730533.
Robert C. Kraus, AO1911425.
Erbie H. Krause, AO672218.
Paul Krause, AO911670.
Henry Krawiec, AO1695428.
George W. Kreamer, AO825201.
Ivan J. Kreft, AO789930.
Sherman L. Kreisher, Jr., AO563560.
Duane J. Krell, AO1908460.
Gordon C. Krentz, AO572320.
William C. Kreps, AO1899395.
Cletus C. Kresge, AO927515.
Ralph I. Kretzer, AO712844.
Arthur W. Krick, AO580265.
Harvey P. Kridler, AO779896.
Philip R. Krieg, AO781342.
Kenneth A. Krig, AO720271.
James L. Krimm, AO822476.
Lemuel A. Krisle, AO773698.
Darrell R. Kroll, AO1867554.
Frederick B. Krom, Jr., AO500576.
Alvin H. Kronbetter, AO1849501.
Jack L. Krout, AO837721.
LeRoy W. Krueger, AO590586.
Kenneth Kruse, AO789317.
Lester W. Krushat, AO1908557.
Charles A. Kubler, AO575260.
Edward A. Kucinski, AO927650.
Wesley L. Kuder, AO675378.
Donald O. Kuehn, AO1909167.
Robert J. Kuehn, AO434413.
Thomas E. Kuenning, AO429662.
Frank G. Kuestner, AO1795925.
Fred E. Kuhlengel, AO1909072.
William T. Kuhlman, AO771729.
Ralph A. Kuhlmann, AO697139.
Byron G. Kuhn, AO580411.
Charles M. Kuhn, AO580750.
Coleman D. Kuhn, AO429432.
George C. Kuhner, Jr., AO702453.
Joseph A. Kulenguski, AO2068852.
Arthur C. Kullin, AO749006.
Vernon M. Kummel, AO880042.
John R. Kummer, AO1809609.
William A. Kunde, AO1851416.
Merle L. Kuns, AO2067010.
Virgil W. Kuns, AO2073968.
Frank E. Kupec, AO747026.
Larry L. Kurtz, AO2068897.
Melvin F. Kurtz, AO827682.
Kenneth R. Kurtzman, AO2001968.
George E. Kusch, AO817699.
Robert P. Kutarnia, AO1664511.
Hubert A. Kutsch, AO709407.
Frederick M. Kuykendall, Jr., AO753689.
Graham G. Kyle, AO664618.
Marcus R. Kyser, AO765097.
William Laabs, AO708211.
Henry E. Laakman, AO659982.
Howard L. LaBeau, Jr., AO1903221.
Howard J. LaBrens, AO735402.
Earl E. LaClair, AO1289751.
Howell B. Lacy, AO1903308.
Leland E. Lacy, Jr., AO2065907.
Martin W. Lacy, AO761447.
Herbert W. Ladd, Jr., AO433703.
Robert E. Ladd, AO731313.
Vincent H. LaFetra, Jr., AO1908336.
Frank P. Leffler, AO813526.
James L. LaForge, Jr., AO559326.
Lewis W. LaGro, AO787672.
William J. Lake, AO786304.
Willis M. Lake, AO932716.
Lyndon F. Lakeman, AO818587.
Robert C. Laliberte, AO660065.
Robert W. Lally, AO589926.
Claude D. Lamb, AO2065781.
Franklin D. Lamb, AO438241.
George M. Lamb, AO730537.
James A. Lamb, AO1037115.
Thomas J. Lamb, AO726583.
Ernest P. Lambert, AO663628.
Joseph L. Lambert, AO575279.
Robert A. Lamberton, Jr., AO836135.
Robert T. Lambertson, AO732029.
Frank P. Lamborn, AO563583.
Charles W. Lame, AO680249.
Eric B. Lammert, AO2087661.
Ralph Lamond, Jr., AO854834.
Joseph F. Lamper, AO1294954.
Larry L. Lampp, AO744611.
Eugene B. Lancaster, AO706422.
Roy A. Lancaster, AO837850.
Roberts L. Lander, AO364189.
Brian R. Landergan, AO2066570.
Edgar B. Landers, AO807250.
Malcolm L. Landess, AO710468.
Harry C. Landis, AO624659.
William H. Landis, AO827465.
William W. Landrum, AO838901.
Chester H. Lane, Jr., AO590753.
Fred A. Lane, Jr., AO2101467.
John C. Lane, AO2073519.
Orren H. Lane, AO426154.
Otha D. Lane, AO2073668.
P. B. Lane, AO2076254.
Alfred E. Lang, Jr., AO1909335.
Delmar C. Lang, AO580356.
George A. Lang, AO581994.
Thomas P. Lang, AO799799.
John M. Langan, AO761788.
Robert B. Langdon, AO739807.
Frederick C. Lange, Jr., AO1852600.
Frederick A. Langille, AO825207.
William K. Langner, AO1906337.
William E. Langston, AO587294.
Colan R. Lanier, AO718679.
Bernard D. Lanois, AO933385.
John A. Lantz, AO2092409.
Oren A. LaPlante, AO2001570.
James W. Lapp, AO747131.
Charles J. Lapping III, AO687139.
Sherwood F. Lapping, AO2060817.
John S. Lappo, AO930402.
John LaRe, AO668432.
Jack A. Larkin, AO1702884.
Joseph W. Larkin, AO2065845.
William J. Larkin, AO726266.
William T. Larkin, AO791124.
John T. Larkins, AO663294.
Edward L. Larner, AO1050850.
Alvin B. LaRocco, AO1857854.
James N. LaRoche, AO563560.
Jack M. Larrabee, AO736258.
Bruno M. Larsen, AO826217.
Packard Larsen, AO2088287.
Gail W. Larson, AO2044962.
Irwin R. Larson, AO749973.
James D. Larson, AO2063642.

Louis E. Larson, AO700235.
Richard L. Larson, AO675496.
Robert D. Larson, AO811097.
Campbell E. Larsson, AO569052.
Richard H. LaRue, AO2024024.
Louis W. LaSalle, AO804002.
William H. Laseter, AO894143.
Grover C. Lash, Jr., AO786296.
Ernest L. Laske, AO2079383.
Sherrod B. Lassiter, AO590753.
John A. Last, AO684750.
Guy J. Lateano, AO722923.
Leonard H. Latham, AO1909860.
Carleton B. Latimer, AO715244.
Lloyd O. Latta, Jr., AO1849878.
Philip F. Laub, AO687382.
Albert J. Lauer, AO2095765.
Arthur W. Laughton, AO1908461.
Jon W. Launderville, AO792720.
Charles A. Laustrup, AO2080724.
William R. Lauterbach, AO1059174.
Jonathan P. Laverick, AO886601.
Vernon B. Lawhon, Jr., AO2090850.
Billy Lawrence, AO721797.
Keith L. Lawrence AO936470.
Tom C. Lawson, AO817468.
Jack H. Lawton, AO887775.
James B. Lawton, AO691102.
Frederick W. Lay, AO735405.
Archie H. Layman, AO572368.
Harvey G. Layman, AO691767.
Otis L. Layne, AO590414.
Joseph E. Leadingham, AO584443.
Charles R. Learnard, AO947369.
Albert S. Learned, AO753687.
Daniel J. Leary, Jr., AO1851791.
John P. Leary, AO2074045.
James W. Leatherbee, AO1910251.
Wilbur L. Leatherwood, AO2082795.
Max V. Leavitt, AO674687.
Leslie R. Leavoy, AO830020.
Albert J. Lecce, AO735804.
August H. Lechner, Jr., AO808434.
Atha L. LeCroix, AO839117.
Harold F. Ledgerwood, Jr., AO886316.
Dwight A. Lee, AO2086262.
Fitzhugh Lee, Jr., AO774885.
Frank Lee, AO835320.
George R. Lee, AO557051.
Hansel E. Lee, AO713666.
James M. Lee, AO1166539.
James W. Lee, AO818395.
John M. Lee, AO1854281.
Leo J. Lee, AO590587.
Robert L. Lee, AO748695.
Stanley G. Y. Lee, AO821303.
William W. Leesburg, AO829511.
Albert Leferink, Jr., AO2015039.
Wilbur H. Leff, AO705720.
George V. Leffler, AO2043762.
Roy B. Lefstad, AO868351.
John B. Leftwich, AO400380.
Clinton C. Legg, AO2056024.
Robert W. Legg, AO663388.
William P. Lehman, AO1558586.
Denis J. Lehn, AO721452.
George T. Lehrman, AO1903839.
Louis L. Leibel, AO575329.
Arthur R. Leibrock, AO835782.
Claude C. Leighty, AO675085.
George A. Leiser, AO730142.
Jack C. Leishman, AO755579.
Marvin R. Leitzel, AO1910168.
Harvey K. Leland, AO2068855.
Alphonse J. LeMaire, Jr., AO664621.
Richard F. Lemanski, AO800904.
Richard B. LeMar, AO561496.
Bennie F. Lemoine, AO792845.
Charles F. Lemons, AO714720.
Roy D. Lemons, AO1855637.
Thomas R. Lenhart, AO691275.
Clement J. Lenhoff, AO806998.
Edward F. Lennon, AO569073.
J. Warren Lentz, AO889962.
Frank Lenyo, AO2079570.
Fred T. Lenz, AO1848259.
Lawrence L. Leon, AO1283631.
Edwin P. Leonard, AO2078818.
William E. Leone, AO665058.
Guy L. Leopard, AO749854.
Donald G. LePard, AO803844.
Ralph A. Lerch, AO887013.
Robert J. Lerner, AO1903225.
Joseph V. LeRoy, AO2099208.
Paul E. Leske, AO799808.
Ralph I. Leslie, AO755369.
Ray R. Lester, AO737158.
William H. Lesueur, AO1912002.
Ned M. Letts, AO789726.
John A. Leveritt, AO742434.
Arnold F. Levine, AO561502.
Frank L. Levings, AO920581.
Martin C. Levisen, AO707394.
Hilliard Levy, AO679761.
Irwin J. Levy, AO590760.
Joseph E. Levy, AO649227.
William Levy, AO813986.
Harold S. Lew, AO710973.
William Lew, AO780639.
Charles E. Lewallen, AO540363.
Carl D. Lewis, AO785837.
Clarence W. Lewis, Jr., AO785898.
David Lewis, AO2040814.
Elroy M. Lewis, AO822211.
Francis E. Lewis II, AO766573.
Ivey J. Lewis, AO2079873.
Jack L. Lewis, AO764913.
Leslie M. Lewis, AO735613.
Myron P. Lewis, Jr., AO663389.
Richmond R. Lewis, AO1704113.
Robert L. Lewis, AO784737.
Willard H. Lewis, Jr., AO754523.
William D. Lewis, AO665925.
William M. Lewis, AO691369.
Harry C. Leyser III, AO796707.
Donald E. Libby, AO2038957.
Edward E. Libby, AO2092706.
Frank C. Libuse, AO660862.
Kenneth F. Lidie, AO1905319.
John J. Liebentritt, Jr., AO2037341.
Bernard Lieber, AO868070.
Arnold J. Liechti, Jr., AO1908435.
Gordon C. Lien, AO755584.
Maurice L. Lien, AO2078819.
Delbert B. Ligon, AO706503.
William C. Ligon, AO1999013.
Bobby C. Liles, AO590971.
Joe B. Lilius, AO590972.
Weymer E. Liljedahl, AO723385.
William H. Lillie, Jr., AO789332.
Albert J. Lilly, AO2101450.
Bobby J. Lilly, AO767837.
John P. Lillywhite, AO1641514.
Philip C. Limbacher, AO561513.
Paul J. Limm, AO723118.
Ettore T. Limotti, AO2044347.
Arthur G. Limpantsis, AO1909735.
Robert C. Lind, AO768866.
Earl L. Lindberg, AO575365.
Kenneth F. Lindberg, AO799034.
Edward M. Lindbloom, AO753225.
Norbert U. Linder, AO693690.
Keith J. Lindsay, AO859956.
James B. Lindsey, AO764363.
James T. Lindsey, AO591194.
Paul N. Lindsey, AO1171649.
Leslie G. Ling, AO708504.
John E. Link, AO681864.
Walter J. Linke, AO702170.
Russell E. Linkous, AO702256.
Arthur J. Linn, Jr., AO842897.
John S. Linn, AO1703842.
Wilfrid A. Linn, AO590761.
Earl E. Linthicum, AO2066154.
Adolf H. Lion, AO685387.
Fred R. Lionberger, AO1908436.
Edward T. Lipford, AO1848264.
Robert A. Lipp, AO445511.
Alfred E. Lipsey, AO1002669.
Robert E. Listou, AO769498.
Bill D. Little, AO1909078.
Clarence O. Little, Jr., AO2024828.
Rodger W. Little, AO2058223.
Lloyd F. Littlе, AO563657.
Richard E. Littlе, AO1909736.
Samuel J. Littlе, Jr., AO664024.
Don W. Littlejohn, AO783591.
Arthur L. Littman, AO775066.
James E. Litz, AO569124.
Donald R. Livengood, Jr., AO751371.
Joseph H. Livernash, Jr., AO782310.
Ross D. Livesay, AO713498.
Dale W. Livingston, AO2075242.
Ira L. Livingston, AO590589.
Noyes B. Livingston, Jr., AO673397.
Charles D. Livingstone, AO1648716.
Matthew E. Loar, AO2085782.
Philip A. Lock, AO775435.
Edward W. Locke, AO809825.
James R. Locke, AO1845765.
Archie S. Lockee, AO935781.
H. M. Locker, AO437974.
William C. Lockett, Jr., AO1908031.
Charles L. Lockhart, AO725502.
John B. Lockhart, Jr., AO1909340.
William J. Lockney, AO830489.
Robert M. Loeffler, AO936842.
Marshall J. Loftus, AO2074707.
James H. Logan, Jr., AO689476.
John J. Logan, AO836141.
Lloyd R. Logan, Jr., AO857185.
Charles Logdon, AO2070282.
James C. Loggins, AO2000350.
Frank J. Logwin, AO1289931.
Thane S. Lohr, AO590763.
Cyriaque J. Loisel, AO817395.
Everit B. Lomax, AO389738.
Douglas W. Londeree, AO1549534.
Atwood E. Long, Jr., AO569139.
Byron E. Long, AO1043405.
Chester H. Long, AO563664.
Francis J. Long, AO2085553.
George W. Long, AO2069796.
Harry F. Long, AO720884.
Jesse P. Long, AO794551.
Mahlon H. Long, Jr., AO673237.
Stanford C. Long, AO691397.
William E. Long, AO1903110.
William F. Long, AO448233.
William M. Long, AO407087.
John D. Longhill, AO2078601.
Robert A. Longmire, AO2063654.
Hugh W. Longmoor, AO677804.
Vito Longo, AO1911580.
Charles B. Longshore, AO718693.
Thorne W. Longsworth, AO713823.
John K. Lonsdale, AO744074.
Thomas D. Looke, AO670400.
Mahlon D. Loomer, AO784034.
Donald O. Loomis, AO708509.
Richard T. Looms, AO700634.
Forrest K. Looney, AO566023.
Raymond E. Loos, AO580937.
Elden A. Lorah, AO590975.
Alden F. Lord, AO801024.
Howard F. Lorenz, AO792616.
Phillip N. Loring, AO793644.
Primo P. Losi, AO734940.
Benjamin Losiewics, AO714724.
Wayne L. Lough, AO779173.
William V. Love, AO668983.
Glenn R. Loveall, AO834839.
William C. Loveless, AO434458.
Richard B. Lowell, Jr., AO582039.
John M. Lovett, AO823651.
Silvain A. Lovinfosse, AO816127.
Samuel D. Loving, AO697883.
Robert B. Lovingfoss, AO559216.
Louie E. Lovitt, AO1909616.
David S. Low, AO775951.
James K. Lowder, AO1702918.
Robert Z. Lowe, AO1847009.
Jack M. Lowery, AO835990.
Wallace E. Lowman, AO825467.
John E. Lowrey, AO2064284.
Edward C. Lowry, AO569160.
Lawrence E. Lowry, AO2064614.
Thomas J. Lowry, Jr., AO485935.
Charles F. Loyd, AO1910255.
Robert N. Loyd, AO445726.
Howard E. Luber, AO840267.
Marvin Lubner, AO416488.
Edward W. Luby, AO2100962.
Robert G. Lucadello, AO2075874.
Charles W. Lucas, AO799595.
Frank C. Lucas, AO688673.
Rio G. Lucas, AO753693.
Robert E. Lucas, AO807474.
William J. Lucas, AO2062517.
Richard R. Luce, AO1643077.
James R. Lucid, AO1650206.
Roger B. Ludeman, AO421778.

Harold K. Ludlow, AO783594.
Maurice F. Ludwig, AO926368.
William H. Ludwig, AO1855420.
Herman E. Luebbert, AO426793.
Christian J. Luecke, AO1291662.
Thomas T. Luginbyhl, AO766302.
Claude A. Luke, Jr., AO1995991.
Clifton G. Lumbley, AO1039480.
David R. Lumley, AO705728.
James P. Lumpkin, AO1909617.
Howard L. Lund, AO2093042.
Ralph G. Lund, AO825469.
Berlie L. Lunde, AO1895247.
Manford H. Lunde, AO1550855.
Thomas J. Lunn, AO666762.
James E. Lunsford, AO2083534.
Frederick A. Lupton, Jr., AO441019.
James A. Luque, AO920141.
Joseph G. Luther, AO2033568.
Lloyd C. Luthy, AO814361.
Roger F. Luttmann, AO749593.
Paul Lutz, AO749442.
William A. Lyell, AO933569.
George B. Lyle, AO1909079.
William H. Lyle, Jr., AO526155.
Luther W. Lyles, AO841734.
Donald T. Lynch, AO1908566.
George R. Lynn, AO590766.
Raymond H. Lynn, AO421263.
Samuel H. Lyons, AO773727.
Howard E. Lysaker, AO876091.
William E. Lytell, AO1905656.
Milton E. Lytle, AO2056808.
Harvey G. Maahs, AO664421.
Eddie H. Maas, AO780997.
Thomas H. Maass, AO1110631.
Fred W. Maberry, Jr., AO840269.
Carroll S. Mabie, AO2093043.
William P. Mabry, AO944517.
William R. Mabry, Jr., AO769503.
Pat R. Macarelli, AO2065088.
Arthur MacArthur, AO557827.
Brice E. Macartney, AO1166774.
Donald MacDonald, AO627704.
Nelson J. MacDonald, AO887830.
Robert A. MacDonough, AO2062249.
Alexander MacElhaney, Jr., AO587950.
George B. Macfie, AO1636301.
James H. Macia, Jr., AO419330.
Lincoln C. MacKay, AO705738.
James A. MacKenzie, AO814103.
William S. MacKenzie, AO575508.
Francis J. Mackey, AO2068704.
Francis M. Mackie, AO800142.
Seymour MacKoff, AO590602.
Donald J. MacLellan, AO790369.
Thomas D. MacMillan, AO1909175.
William L. MacMurdy, AO2073166.
Ernest L. MacQuarrie, AO1908699.
Frederic G. MacQuesten, Jr., AO572479.
Albert Macsata, AO830035.
Robert J. MacVittie, AO888806.
Charles T. Madaris, Jr., AO787310.
George W. Madden, AO590272.
Joseph M. Madden, AO818715.
William P. Madden, AO2058083.
Gerald M. Maddux, AO561625.
Ervin A. Madera, AO591204.
Francis B. Mael, AO864829.
Vernon E. Magee, AO2080039.
Norman P. Magers, Jr., AO572483.
Gayland W. Magness, AO589928.
Vincent L. Magnuson, AO2078616.
John V. Mahan, AO1591277.
Richard F. Mahaney, AO589665.
Harvey W. Maher, AO707714.
John L. Maher, AO417709.
John L. Maher, AO810693.
Lester L. Mahon, AO889754.
Harless D. Mahone, AO2091957.
Francis R. Mahoney, AO821642.
John C. Mahoney, AO2036197.
Joseph P. Mahoney, AO782929.
Herbert A. Mailander, AO515766.
Richard W. Mainzer, AO563758.
William B. Malan, AO785118.
Ralph R. Malanga, AO817716.
Morris Malin, AO432596.
Robert V. Mallonee, AO876882.
Grover D. Malone, AO2076675.
Roy W. Malone, AO672835.
Wallace R. Malone, AO718707.
Clement M. Maloney, AO936896.
Raymond A. Maloney, AO726056.
Stanley M. Mamlock, AO712022.
Albert A. Manchester, AO933262.
John R. Mancus, AO572496.
Robert Mand, AO733676.
Manuel P. Mandaleris, AO583384.
James R. Mandell, AO1910393.
James B. Mandeville, AO830036.
William Manelos, AO703882.
Charles V. Manes, AO575530.
Alfred P. Mankin, AO664631.
Richard E. Manley, AO2074509.
Frank W. Mann, Jr., AO414808.
H. C. Mann, AO665702.
James H. Mann, AO711748.
John H. Mann, AO817243.
Max S. Mann, AO826241.
Olin Mann, AO440536.
Clarence G. Manning, AO832768.
Francis L. Manning, AO667325.
Robert J. Manning, AO830037.
William V. Manning, AO566137.
William C. Mannix, AO757233.
Lawrence C. Manns, AO2082286.
Edwin A. Manos, AO569292.
Robert A. Mansell, Jr., AO808861.
John Mansfield, AO680470.
Wiley G. Mansfield, AO738203.
Hansard W. Manton, AO2079212.
Walter L. Mapes, Jr., AO2062846.
James H. Marable, AO1692737.
James E. Maraist, AO808440.
James Marantos, AO863017.
Robert B. Marble, AO689873.
William C. March, AO711750.
John C. Marcotte, AO811947.
Woodrow C. Marcus, AO375602.
Albert J. Mariconda, AO783600.
Laddie Marin, AO534836.
Melvin L. Mariner, AO739318.
Obrad Marinkovich, AO2080915.
Louis E. Marion, AO716493.
Sherwood A. Mark, AO924516.
Ernest C. Marker, AO786147.
Richard D. Markham, AO715264.
Israel B. Markowitz, AO1304419.
Donald M. Marks, AO1848345.
Orlin H. Markussen, AO741995.
Joseph F. Marling, AO2094222.
Donald E. Marquette, AO589971.
William C. Marr, AO797865.
Thomas J. Marren, AO790975.
Paul A. Marriott, AO741996.
Paul J. Marrkand, AO685084.
Donald W. Marsey, AO759639.
Bernard R. Marsh, AO763683.
Donald C. Marsh, AO563781.
Halbert G. Marsh, AO830502.
Howard E. Marsh, AO582864.
Robert D. Marsh, AO678076.
Robert H. Marsh, AO1848325.
William A. Marsh, AO590426.
Alexander F. Marshall, AO678442.
Donald B. Marshall, AO1862696.
Donald W. Marshall, AO693145.
George E. Marshall, AO2001490.
James W. Marshall, AO1911860.
Joseph F. Marshall, AO2062751.
Marland O. Marshall, AO885403.
William D. Marsland, Jr., AO871245.
Albert D. Martin, AO665074.
Carl E. Martin, AO804012.
Charles H. Martin, AO2067165.
Claude L. Martin, AO590770.
Clifford G. Martin, AO1909061.
Daniel J. Martin, AO2090600.
Donald E. Martin, AO873297.
Donald J. Martin, AO668725.
Fred R. Martin, AO773739.
Gerald L. Martin, AO620790.
Harry D. Martin, AO2046652.
James B. Martin, AO888836.
James C. Martin, AO792343.
James J. Martin, AO783601.
James P. Martin, AO601074.
Jerry N. Martin, AO1551264.
John L. Martin, AO763687.
Joseph P. Martin, AO2063077.
Lawrence H. Martin, AO1046551.
Lee R. Martin, AO578524.
Leroy E. Martin, AO1912004.
Matthew R. Martin, AO666059.
Noel Q. Martin, AO2075052.
Raymond L. Martin, AO804701.
Reese S. Martin, AO834845.
Richard M. Martin, AO926498.
Richard R. Martin, AO1910474.
Robert E. Martin, AO728296.
Samuel A. Martin, Jr., AO814719.
Whitfield A. Martin, AO486052.
Wilfred W. Martin, AO832647.
William M. Martin, AO805949.
William R. Martin, AO787683.
Emil J. Martina, AO803417.
Cesar J. Martinez, AO719124.
Louis Martinich, Jr., AO708521.
Arnold N. Martinsen, AO864128.
Robert Martz, AO392586.
Forrest J. Marvel, AO830504.
George C. Marvin, AO792855.
Albert B. Marx, AO794554.
John D. Mash, AO781003.
Arno R. Mason, AO2102056.
Floyd H. Mason, AO413234.
George H. Mason, AO825926.
Merle F. Mason, AO690892.
Raigh Mason, AO765410.
Robert C. Mason, AO2092420.
Thomas M. Mason, AO590984.
Jack E. Mass, AO830043.
Harold Massey, AO665840.
Wilton C. Massey, AO841356.
Gerald W. Massy III, AO744622.
James M. Masterson, AO433877.
John S. Masterson, AO566154.
William Masyn, AO813405.
Hugh M. Matheson, AO784043.
Milton N. Matheson, AO2090137.
Donell Mathews, AO590096.
Hughie E. Mathews, AO2033008.
Robert G. Mathews, AO814720.
Tracy B. Mathewson III, AO2094904.
Wesley W. Mathias, AO715568.
Harry L. Matthew, AO675795.
Norman W. Matthews, AO1911256.
William P. Matthews, AO936248.
James F. Mattingly, Jr., AO842058.
John R. Mattingly, AO699693.
John B. Mattioli, AO2091460.
Rudolph G. Matteon, AO2100862.
Andrew Matyas, AO824156.
Jerome R. Mau, AO700304.
John F. Mauck, AO833364.
William R. Maugans, AO588533.
Paul W. Maul, AO1863445.
Frederick A. Maurer, AO807015.
Harold L. Maurer, AO583396.
Robert E. Mauser, AO2059567.
Arthur B. Maxey, Jr., AO434133.
Philip H. Maxey, AO1911586.
Arthur Maxfield, AO590427.
Lewis E. Maxson, AO2070906.
DeWayne J. Maxwell, AO694171.
Harry L. Maxwell, AO936092.
James E. Maxwell, AO693872.
James E. Maxwell, AO2068246.
John G. Maxwell, AO774242.
Joseph B. Maxwell, AO2084365.
Neil D. Maxwell, AO888498.
John B. May, AO432334.
John C. May, AO789339.
Robert L. Mayer, AO722736.
Sidney E. Mayfield, Jr., AO551593.
Ernest M. Maygarden, AO796560.
Edward S. Maykut, AO866040.
David A. Mayo, Jr., AO563810.
Harold T. Mayo, AO680473.
Lewis C. Mayo, Jr., AO872626.
Forrest D. Mays, AO887052.
Richard D. Mays, AO2083755.
James R. Mayward, AO861501.
Richard E. Mazurowski, AO695947.
Louis M. McAdory, AO831571.
Robert E. McAdow, AO590772.
Howard C. McAfee, Jr., AO785946.
Ray H. McAlister, AO669349.
Robert R. McAnaw, AO712114.
Thomas J. McArdle, AO589160.
Paul G. McArthur, AO659742.
Joseph C. McAuliffe, AO822038.

Gordon D. McBain, Jr., AO727856.
Charles C. McBride, Jr., AO741207.
Robert W. McBride, AO2101094.
Thomas J. McBride, AO759474.
Clinton L. McBroome, AO806478.
Raplee Y. McBurney, AO2101698.
Earl L. McCabe, AO790373.
John T. McCabe, AO856923.
Wallace B. McCafferty, AO837837.
George A. McCaffrey, AO559237.
Clint B. McCain, Jr., AO789067.
William M. McCain, AO401560.
Charles D. McCall, AO2071643.
Craig C. McCall, AO815737.
James L. McCall, AO2062836.
Robert N. McCall, AO685948.
William C. McCamy, AO2096230.
Robert B. McCanlis, AO827240.
Edward L. McCann, AO835504.
John G. McCann, AO431028.
John P. McCann, AO758024.
Daniel F. McCarthy, AO2087323.
Frederic C. McCarthy, AO1585847.
George F. McCarthy, AO838781.
John W. McCarthy, AO2101451.
Edward G. McCartney, AO1863277.
Charles D. McCarty, AO856925.
Richard E. McCarty, AO765512.
Benjamin C. McCary, Jr., AO394146.
Robert A. McCauley, AO813035.
Robert N. McChesney, AO1911498.
Clyde F. McClain, AO696786.
Charles W. McClean, AO763003.
John P. McCleary, AO867328.
Dewey S. McClellan, AO433867.
James W. McClellan, AO701124.
Clifton A. McClelland, AO328190.
Dennis E. McClendon, AO2046673.
Jack R. McClenny, AO2091962.
James L. McClinton, AO559251.
Charles L. McCloskey, Jr., AO1692884.
Dean F. McCloskey, AO786429.
Earl M. McCloy, AO566054.
Alexander L. McClung, AO673410.
John D. McClung, Jr., AO2092430.
Garland J. McClure, AO1908935.
Robert D. McCluskey, AO705406.
Ward L. McCombs, AO760476.
Arthur F. McConnell, Jr., AO2093636.
Sheldon L. McConnell, AO774247.
Howard L. McCool, AO2077895.
John C. McCormick, AO931849.
John R. McCormick, AO825668.
Karl D. McCormick, AO837500.
Robert S. McCormick, AO1903229.
Thomas W. McCormick, AO749282.
Arlie E. McCoy, AO582850.
Daniel J. McCoy, AO872953.
Franklin E. McCoy, AO808870.
J. B. Leroy McCoy, AO765024.
Robert L. McCracken, AO832839.
Dee G. McCrary, AO2061828.
Peter H. McCravy, AO1857289.
Gearald D. McCrea, AO2088938.
Harry A. McCreary, AO2070292.
Joseph A. McCrum, Jr., AO744538.
Robert G. McCulloch, AO533176.
Donald T. McCullough, AO668477.
James R. McCullough, AO841222.
Noah L. McCullough, Jr., AO1855896.
Raymond L. McCullough, AO686001.
Arthur McCurdy, AO734334.
David F. McCurrach, Jr., AO741613.
Milton L. McCurry, AO790378.
Eugene R. McCutchan, AO764061.
Claude C. McCutcheon, AO664627.
James D. McCutcheon, Jr., AO1910629.
Joseph E. McDade, AO672637.
David C. McDaniel, AO703282.
Harvey W. McDaniel, AO810704.
Jack D. McDaniel, AO2072813.
Juell H. McDaniel, AO757787.
Ralph E. McDaniel, AO450994.
William W. McDannel, AO738206.
Robert F. McDermott, AO1038063.
Bendel W. McDonald, AO1908707.
Claudie L. McDonald, AO2099410.
Donald J. McDonald, AO677815.
Edward M. McDonald, AO812621.
James L. McDonald, AO668478.
Jay L. McDonald, AO1909501.
Layton W. McDonald, Jr., AO814513.
Robert J. McDonald, AO841360.
Shuford W. McDonald, AO572585.
Walter B. McDonald, AO823659.
William A. McDonald, AO857248.
William G. McDonald, AO778880.
Edward J. McDonnell, AO806098.
Michael C. McDonnell, AO689877.
Samuel W. McDonnell, AO806099.
James P. McDonough, Jr., AO811700.
Clifton W. McDowell, AO1186160.
Eurfryn W. McDowell, AO733939.
Gildas D. McDowell, AO766587.
Robert E. McDowell, AO690675.
John N. McEachern, Jr., AO1909996.
Lawrence J. McEachern, AO806286.
Edward F. McElroy, AO2074714.
Eugene J. McElroy, AO557696.
Theodore N. McElroy, AO2091048.
John T. McElveen, AO714474.
Keith F. McElwain, AO2071645.
Warren H. McEntire, AO1851411.
Dale R. McEwen, AO816690.
Milton E. McEwen, AO2076952.
John A. McFadden, Jr., AO841735.
Wesley E. McFadden, AO934913.
James W. McFarland, AO578427.
Kenton D. McFarland, AO727910.
Robert J. McFarland, AO578428.
Bernard A. McGaffigan, AO686956.
James H. McGahee, AO670770.
John F. McGauhey, AO859959.
William L. McGeary, AO1911355.
James L. McGee, AO804203.
Morris W. McGee, AO563718.
Robert E. McGee, Jr., AO2077898.
Stanley P. McGee, Jr., AO949801.
William A. McGilpin, Jr., AO824679.
Lyle E. McGilvra, AO671463.
Loyd R. McGilvray, AO580955.
Keith R. McGinnis, AO666407.
William R. McGinnis, AO2066004.
Robert P. McGinty, AO798537.
Francis J. McGovern, AO2033011.
Thomas L. McGovern, Jr., AO2075261.
James H. McGrath, AO1908709.
Clinton C. McGraw, AO864832.
Warner R. McGraw, AO887159.
Darrell E. McGuffey, AO733685.
Frank J. McGuinness, AO789928.
Allen G. McGuire, AO1995864.
Eugene McGuire, AO822831.
Harold J. A. McGuire, AO839333.
James McGuire, AO674314.
William J. McGuire, Jr., AO1862453.
Joseph M. McHale, AO532295.
James O. McHan, AO558651.
Aloysius P. McHugh, AO808300.
Burt H. McIntosh, AO1588157.
Fred McIntosh, AO869864.
Frederick B. McIntosh, AO740234.
Philip W. McIntosh, AO1912006.
Walter N. McJilton, AO2022871.
Robert J. McKaig, AO701620.
Eugene E. McKain, AO820796.
James H. McKamy, AO2044965.
William D. McKane, AO2062245.
Gerald L. McKay, AO2079883.
James E. McKay, AO683562.
Harvey F. McKean, AO2034641.
Bonnie G. McKee, Jr., AO934532.
Charles W. McKee, AO590424.
Knox B. McKee, Jr., AO767706.
Morris McKee, Jr., AO566096.
Ralph A. McKee, Jr., AO1910173.
Robert D. McKee, AO678889.
Robert J. McKee, AO2087263.
Francis B. McKeever, Jr., AO588828.
Moses J. McKeithan, AO786598.
John J. McKenna, AO938409.
Michael J. McKenna, AO1053252.
Lawrence E. McKenney, AO695938.
Richard W. McKenzie, AO1908710.
Patrick J. McKeon, AO698025.
William C. McKinley, Jr., AO1910760.
Elwyn G. McKinney, AO795799.
Eugene D. McKinney, AO868073.
Ewing J. W. McKinney, AO663758.
Victor M. McKinney, AO729204.
John P. McKinnon, AO543344.
Alexander McKinny, AO670948.
Ray F. McKissack, AO590271.
Fred J. McKnight, AO821047.
Charles E. McKusick, AO2060739.
Herbert W. McLain, AO780669.
Roy W. McLain, AO1910256.
William S. McLain, AO512656.
Frank L. McLanathan, AO566100.
Eugene C. McLaughlin, AO667737.
Jean W. McLaughlin, AO941935.
Richard M. McLaughlin, AO834555.
Harlan E. McLean, AO2063074.
Johnny C. McLean, AO796413.
John W. McLendon, AO800015.
James R. McLeod, AO814370.
Roger L. McMacken, AO768874.
Joseph T. McMahon, AO1859605.
Thomas H. McMahon, AO1039785.
Ira H. S. McMann, AO314510.
Kenneth L. McMannus, AO745720.
Leonard M. McManus, AO407108.
Julian A. McMichael, Jr., AO814517.
Marion W. McMichael, AO1862888.
Edward H. McMillan, Jr., AO857872.
William E. McMillan, Jr., AO796009.
Charles L. McMillin, AO659387.
James A. McMullen, AO536853.
Robert B. McMullen, AO2084582.
Chester C. McMullin, AO2063662.
Johnnie T. McNair, AO812457.
Malcolm A. McNall, Jr., AO789385.
Joseph R. McNamara, AO1042110.
Robert J. McNeil, AO1911768.
Travis R. McNeil, AO2094529.
Donald D. McNelly, AO2101729.
James H. McNevin, AO2091461.
Kenneth W. McNiven, AO1911259.
John R. McNown, AO569255.
Charles E. McPhee, AO563743.
Lloyd L. McQuay, AO670404.
Sebron A. McQueen, Jr., AO743061.
John E. McRae, AO1848305.
Jack O. McReynolds, AO433874.
William A. D. McRobbie, AO674900.
Charles W. McShan, Jr., AO704962.
Edward C. McSorley, Jr., AO733686.
Glen L. McSparran, AO811108.
Noble J. McSwane, AO2086068.
Guy P. McSweeney, AO1857213.
William C. McTaggart, Jr., AO2065317.
Daniel J. McVicar, AO808109.
Ralph W. McWhirter, Jr., AO580097.
Benjamin A. Mead, AO724634.
Donald J. Meade, AO826723.
Walter R. Meade, AO578554.
Merten L. Meader, AO784903.
Harwood F. Means, AO727038.
Harold L. Mechling, AO1314815.
Everett J. Mederios, AO582124.
Oscar Medlin, Jr., AO1856186.
Percy C. Medlock, AO2030340.
William H. Mee, AO736018.
William J. Meeboer, AO858037.
Thomas F. Meehan, AO796010.
Donald C. Meek, AO2069313.
Clarence V. Mehlhoff, AO569362.
George E. Meier, Jr., AO379469.
Henry C. Meier, AO779533.
Stanley R. Meierding, AO935777.
William A. Meikle, AO690341.
Milton A. Meiklejohn, AO761152.
Eugene E. Meiners, AO561669.
Joseph W. Mejaski, AO820297.
Horton J. M. Melaro, AO538745.
John Meleky, Jr., AO2090513.
Edward A. Melerovich, AO2082626.
Emidio A. Melo, Jr., AO1908849.
Albert L. Melton, AO1911591.
Robert E. Melton, AO584530.
Robert L. Melville, AO828733.
Ross P. Mendell, Jr., AO686003.
Keith S. Mendenhall, AO836147.
Gilbert J. Meneley, AO775472.
Donald J. Mercer, AO939038.
Frank Mercer, AO828386.
Thomas A. Mercer, AO2098854.
Paul J. Mercier, AO781014.
William T. Meredith, AO889072.
Anthony L. Merlo, AO861166.
Warren F. Merrey, AO580111.
Andrew J. Merrick, Jr., AO1910258.
Frank B. Merrill, AO2071198.

Orrin S. Merrill, AO823433.
John E. Merriman, AO740868.
Jack Merritt, Jr., AO694926.
Charles F. Merz, AO1852680.
Joseph T. Meserow, AO419873.
Russell L. Messelt, AO337186.
Marion J. Messenger, AO669768.
Robert R. Messenger, AO839334.
James T. Messer, AO675443.
Clyde L. Messinger, AO2087679.
James D. Metcalf, AO935470.
Joseph R. Metivier, AO825672.
George R. Mettey, AO2026660.
Donald J. Metzker, AO1847789.
Robert J. Metzroth, AO784827.
Gerald R. Meunier, AO1310619.
Neil F. Meurlin, AO1596142.
Paul S. Meuser, AO466665.
John Mewha, AO733948.
Herman J. Meyen, AO1576385.
Hubert B. Meyer, AO887011.
Joel L. Meyer, AO854364.
Phil H. Meyer, AO859860.
Richard J. Meyer, AO2067075.
Rodney J. Meyer, AO751178.
Harvey F. Meyerpeter, AO1848341.
Donald C. Meyers, AO825228.
Harold B. Meyers, AO372940.
John D. Meyers, AO733949.
Kenneth F. Meyers, AO841228.
Florence S. Michael, Jr., AO793427.
Donald R. Michaelis, AO2030227.
Douglas D. Michaels, AO863393.
David E. Michel, AO699222.
Donald A. Michela, AO822227.
Irving E. Michell, AO1575468.
Harry E. Michelson, Jr., AO442976.
Robert C. Mickelsen, AO764385.
Martin C. Mickelson, AO2056450.
William J. Middleton, AO818293.
Kenneth A. Midkiff, AO726806.
George C. Mielenz, Jr., AO2080425.
Andrew P. Mihalik, AO580387.
Jack A. Mikkelsen, AO671391.
Oscar E. Milam, AO683091.
Bennett L. Milana, AO2081140.
Robert K. Milbrath, AO934555.
Irwin F. Miles, AO2056082.
William J. Miles, AO769890.
Paul J. Milian, AO825485.
Ward M. Millar, AO766614.
Howard W. Millard, AO427461.
Allen T. Miller, AO729354.
Arthur Miller, AO2064626.
Arthur G. Miller, AO837847.
Avery J. Miller, AO869616.
Charles E. Miller, AO811723.
Charles R. Miller, AO740101.
Chester E. Miller, AO787746.
Clayton Miller, AO782323.
Clement K. Miller, AO789194.
Daniel J. Miller, AO2069195.
David E. Miller, AO563835.
Don E. Miller, AO1908346.
Donald D. Miller, AO2088600.
Donald E. Miller, AO2094908.
Edward H. Miller, AO1289116.
Edward W. Miller, AO815743.
Ernest C. Miller, AO649681.
Frederick C. Miller, AO818725.
George H. Miller, AO687335.
Hale L. Miller, AO2065596.
Harold L. Miller, AO775477.
Harry Miller, Jr., AO670586.
James R. Miller, AO726281.
James W. Miller, AO2087821.
Jerome L. Miller, AO690144.
John F. Miller, Jr., AO1911040.
John F. Miller, Jr., AO788821.
John M. Miller, AO811232.
John P. Miller, AO861221.
John V. B. Miller, AO1910761.
Joseph E. Miller, Jr., AO659834.
Lawrence H. Miller, AO877398.
LeRoy H. Miller, AO807025.
Loman E. Miller, AO668111.
Martin L. Miller, AO466666.
Max R. Miller, AO759383.
Noble A. Miller, AO2073850.
Noel F. Miller, Jr., AO572669.
Ray E. Miller, AO696125.
Richard A. Miller, AO811713.
Richard K. Miller, AO2100869.
Robert A. Miller, Jr., AO1696903.
Robert B. Miller, AO697733.
Robert E. Miller, AO663932.
Stanley W. Miller, AO697156.
Thomas E. Miller, AO825942.
Victor B. Miller, AO1912009.
Wallace E. Miller, AO737829.
Wendell D. Miller, AO1702950.
William F. Miller, AO2100179.
William J. Miller, AO1999017.
James F. Millerick, AO733695.
Malcolm J. Milligan, AO661014.
Charles F. Mills, AO789734.
Donald C. Mills, AO1178898.
Joseph E. Mills, AO740103.
Warren N. Mills, AO2067872.
Charles W. Milne, AO768882.
Barney J. Milner, AO696858.
John C. Milner, AO753153.
George T. Milonas, AO572682.
Galen M. Milsap, AO732957.
John W. Mims, AO424385.
Delmar R. Mineard, AO548015.
William D. Miner, AO793946.
Ross S. Minge, AO704036.
Connally W. Minner, AO560130.
Anthony D. Minnick, Jr., AO673417.
Harold E. Minnick, AO2045122.
Charles B. Minor, AO719129.
William T. Minor, AO503187.
Thomas G. Minow, AO817064.
Billy M. Minter, AO1909357.
Garland A. Minton, AO443377.
Joseph F. Misenko, AO815951.
Donald W. Mishler, AO737614.
Ralph W. Mistrot, AO761986.
Charles W. Mitchell, AO2099316.
Harold E. Mitchell, AO1847150.
Horace J. Mitchell, Jr., AO945008.
James B. Mitchell, AO2092318.
James C. Mitchell, AO742510.
James T. Mitchell, AO687888.
John O. Mitchell, AO2072839.
Loren C. Mitchell, AO550113.
Orville L. Mitchell, AO731631.
Phil K. Mitchell, AO1858044.
Ralph B. Mitchell, AO560131.
Robert V. Mitchell, Sr., AO679920.
Ross H. Mitchell, AO888732.
William J. Mitchell, AO933577.
Randolph L. Mitton, AO716511.
Charles D. Mixon, AO2095885.
Edwin B. Mixon, AO809025.
Robert C. Mize, Jr., AO782592.
Dudley L. Mizer, AO375444.
Guy H. Moates, AO710846.
Edward S. Modica, AO2030299.
Jack Modica, Jr., AO2009898.
Kenneth L. Moe, AO2069315.
Homer N. Moebius, AO559248.
Fabian G. Moeller, AO767322.
Robert A. Moen, AO2089116.
John S. Moffatt, AO860395.
John H. Mohn, AO404173.
Dean B. Mohr, AO1638098.
Grover Mohr, AO649390.
Joseph Mohr, Jr., AO1996121.
William D. Mol, AO1911670.
Sergio C. Molano, AO533679.
David T. Mold, AO350969.
Frank Molesworth, AO361370.
William E. Molett, AO662357.
Emil A. Molkentine, AO2063215.
Reid L. Molleston, AO1796986.
Robert L. Mollwitz, AO1854752.
Alexander A. Molnar, AO826481.
George Molnar, AO797362.
Frank I. Monahan, Jr., AO886141.
Antonio K. Mondigo, AO946482.
Raymond A. Monge, AO2062264.
Gerard W. Monier, AO1856445.
Henry C. Monjar, AO876331.
Louis Monroe, AO1864170.
Harry B. Monsell, AO2057662.
Louis A. Montalvo, AO2073191.
Rowan M. Monteith, Jr., AO671063.
Jack E. Montgomery, AO1850008.
Jess E. Montgomery, AO822052.
Robert S. Montgomery, Jr., AO1909999.
William C. Montgomery, AO1904239.
Eduardo M. Montoya, AO729478.
James H. Montrose, AO755994.
Hall A. Moody, Jr., AO765513.
Horace E. Moody, AO2056176.
William P. Moody, AO566235.
Hollis R. Moomaw, AO724463.
Donald B. Moon, AO566237.
Howard E. Moon, AO732752.
James H. Moon, AO665089.
Alvin G. Moore, AO2026619.
Charles P. Moore, AO697155.
Clarence L. Moore, Jr., AO1859939.
Columbus L. Moore, AO830888.
Courtland C. Moore, AO784059.
Dana T. Moore II, AO1908940.
Edward R. Moore, Jr., AO810714.
Edwin L. Moore, AO675267.
Elbert L. Moore, Jr., AO408328.
Forrest N. Moore, Jr., AO700311.
Homer L. Moore, AO790021.
Howard T. Moore, AO775968.
Jack W. Moore, AO816143.
James A. Moore, AO424386.
James E. Moore, AO1119985.
James R. Moore, AO2087563.
Jay W. Moore, AO814730.
John H. Moore, Jr., AO800024.
Lawrence Moore, Jr., AO590785.
Marvin F. Moore, AO2099015.
Maury K. Moore, AO677107.
Rexford L. Moore, AO942811.
Robert A. Moore, AO760652.
Robert H. Moore, AO2077044.
Stephen E. Moore, AO957911.
Thomas J. Moore, Jr., AO542771.
William G. Moore, Jr., AO418054.
William L. Moore, Jr., AO1911309.
William M. Moore, AO1910174.
Harris L. Moorhead, AO780682.
Rex K. Moorhead, AO873309.
Allan L. Moran, AO1997938.
Sheridan J. Moran, AO722595.
William M. Moran, AO812117.
John Morasch, AO752070.
George Morauske, AO839242.
Karl T. A. Moravek, AO1863279.
William M. Moreau, AO452772.
Alvin G. Moreland, AO2062856.
William Moreland, Jr., AO572719.
John M. Morello, AO803431.
Bernard E. Morgan, AO705761.
Edward F. Morgan, AO696112.
James D. Morgan, AO819929.
James H. Morgan, AO2066159.
John P. Morgan, Jr., AO2030329.
Marshall F. Morgan, AO808705.
Thomas J. Morgan, AO582155.
Tilford H. Morgan, AO439876.
Chester W. Morin, AO1996045.
Ernest N. Morin, AO704038.
Angelo A. Morinello, AO1911503.
Fred A. Morley, AO814944.
Donald W Morrell, AO934832.
Franklin H. Morrell, AO754372.
Charles W. Morris, AO757245.
Dryden E. Morris, AO2087979.
Edward D. Morris, AO672388.
Grady Morris, AO721496.
Herbert R. Morris, Jr., AO591003.
Jesse G. Morris, AO824696.
John T. Morris, AO2072509.
Joseph Morris, AO2087199.
Randolph S. Morris, AO877472.
Thomas H. Morris, Jr., AO680490.
Thomas L. Morris, AO525994.
Thomas W. Morris, AO2057665.
Richard J. Morrisey, AO752822.
Allan L. Morrison, AO721840.
Charles M. Morrison, AO759648.
Herbert K. Morrison, AO684381.
John C. Morrison, AO2074239.
John G. Morrison, AO2066378.
Merle E. Morrison, AO680264.
Robert A. Morrison, AO804212.
Robert B. Morrison, AO787531.
Robert J. Morrison, AO1911353.
Samuel M. Morrison, AO760430.
William D. Morrison, AO833964.
Gerald R. Morrissey, AO1908719.
James C. Morissey, AO583987.

Harold O. Morrisson, AO2061250.
Bernard G. Morrow, AO746400.
Edward E. Morrow, AO1909806.
Jacob A. Morrow, AO701788.
James H. Morrow, AO767857.
John F. Morrow, AO2073193.
Robert W. Morrow, AO302442.
Stanley A. Morrow, AO1340307.
Albert L. Morse, AO837512.
John H. I. Morse, AO815954.
Wyndham G. Mortimer, AO590789.
Albert L. Morton, AO780686.
Noble L. Morton, Jr., AO670414.
Oakley K. Morton II, AO385561.
William R. Morton, AO738217.
John E. Morwood, AO437807.
Mark L. Moseley, AO794280.
James F. Moser, AO746401.
Willie R. Moser, AO533367.
Edwin J. Moses, AO660181.
Edward H. Mosher, AO2074068.
John F. Mosher, AO771102.
Howard W. Moshier, AO1855159.
Andrew P. Mosier, AO868765.
Arlett G. Mosier, Jr., AO763304.
Perley L. Mosier, AO2099109.
Robert L. Mosley, AO765041.
Charles L. Moss, AO737618.
Nicholas J. Mosteiro, AO684621.
James H. Moulder, AO1167549.
Sanford M. Moulder, Jr., AO946360.
Ralph R. Moulton, AO461001.
George K. Mount, AO750665.
Russell D. Moye, AO841235.
Richard A. Moyer, AO2071207.
Curtis N. Mozley, AO778903.
Delbert L. Mueller, AO935382.
Frank J. Mueller, AO923653.
Frederick W. Mueller, AO460581.
Kenneth E. Mueller, AO771494.
Robert P. Mueller, AO797366.
Rudy W. Mueller, AO766636.
George W. Muhlbach, AO2100383.
Cecil N. Muirhead, Jr., AO841590.
Arthur G. Mulanax, AO889168.
Dennis Muldoon, AO2088947.
John D. Muldoon, AO944183.
John J. Muldoon, AO721842.
Harry E. Mulholland, AO1908942.
Winfield G. Mulkins, AO590792.
John R. Mullady, AO688455.
Robert W. Mulledy, AO940998.
Evrette J. Mullen, Jr., AO417712.
Milton H. Muller, AO869429.
David G. Mullison, Jr., AO802059.
Jack L. Mumma, AO1645232.
Marvin E. Mumme, AO515136.
Herbert A. Munday, AO673865.
George E. Mundorf, AO838683.
Joseph R. Mundorff, AO590793.
Harold B. Munkvold, AO835514.
William H. Munn, AO793523.
Robert M. Munson, AO433882.
Seth S. Murdoch, AO2076693.
William C. Murdoch, Jr., AO582170.
Kenneth R. Murgatroyd, AO757248.
Arthur B. Murphy, AO795287.
Eugene C. Murphy, AO686115.
Jack A. Murphy, AO413482.
James F. Murphy, AO678744.
James P. Murphy, AO855110.
James S. Murphy, AO828489.
John J. Murphy, AO805958.
John R. Murphy, Jr., AO589258.
Miles J. Murphy, AO748746.
Martin H. Murphy, AO1908343.
Paul J. Murphy, AO745473.
Raymond J. Murphy, AO696128.
Robert B. Murphy, AO798157.
Robert J. Murphy, AO866537.
Roland W. Murphy, AO771959.
Walter S. Murphy, AO669093.
Warren G. Murphy, AO695334.
William J. Murphy, AO584561.
Richard J. Murra, AO575729.
Bryant A. Murray, Jr., AO2082567.
John R. Murray, AO1908577.
Leonard P. Murray, AO697053.
Raymond K. Murray, AO583992.
Robert H. Murray, AO495876.
Robert P. Murray, AO742344.
Roscoe Murray, Jr., AO431972.
Thomas M. Murray, Jr., AO2032919.
Richard C. Mursch, AO1908235.
Joseph J. Murtaugh, AO710596.
Edward Murzyn, AO731092.
Anthony E. Musella, AO744854.
Wayne Musgrove, AO765046.
George H. Musket, AO759493.
Everett P. Musselman, AO749292.
Andrew L. Myers, AO1903124.
Clem B. Myers, AO810197.
David E. Myers, AO1635151.
Earl M. Myers, AO936850.
Edward J. Myers, AO527765.
Harold E. Myers, AO863302.
Howard S. Myers, Jr., AO2067177.
James B. Myers, AO693937.
John E. Myers, AO741678.
Luther R. Myers, Jr., AO1053744.
Raleigh B. Myers, Jr., AO817725.
Robert E. Myers, AO779951.
Robert G. Myers, AO684390.
Roy E. R. Myers, AO807771.
Stewart E. Myers, AO816145.
Wilbur D. Myers, AO590615.
William B. Myers, Jr., AO816720.
William W. Myers, AO684031.
Irvin A. Myhra, AO2076329.
John H. Mykicz, AO1903120.
Robert D. Myles, AO1911721.
Meredith H. Mynhier, AO1854513.
Marion R. Nadler, AO874906.
Mark L. Nagel, AO664042.
Marvin E. Nagel, AO929875.
Roy F. Nahodil, AO796580.
George M. Nakis, AO699841.
Richard A. Naldrett, AO666268.
James D. Naler, AO700518.
James D. Nally, AO827916.
Howard M. Namur, AO726668.
Jack Nankervis, AO671683.
Billy T. Napier, AO837515.
Anthony C. Naranjo, AO1911936.
James E. Narem, AO2100674.
Edward J. Nash, AO842437.
Frank B. Nash, AO583390.
Gerald W. Nash, AO686585.
Harry M. Nash, AO2075907.
Merle W. Nash, AO769527.
Raymond F. Nash, Jr., AO714565.
Vincent E. Nash, AO659479.
William M. Nash, AO802185.
Joseph W. Navarre, AO535134.
Joe M. Naylor, AO808710.
William C. Naylor, AO434142.
Perry W. Neal, AO711090.
Thad M. Neal, AO782335.
Windell W. Neal, AO2068076.
John F. Nealon, AO427614.
Charles F. Nedbal, AO2085452.
John H. Neff, AO805961.
Daniel B. Nehf, AO2082730.
Nelson L. Neil, AO940400.
Stephen R. Nelley, Jr., AO1911722.
William J. Nelligan, AO2098865.
Louis B. Nelsen, AO827501.
Raymond Z. Nelsen, Jr., AO434528.
Alfred J. Nelson, AO937033.
Allen S. Nelson, AO719403.
Benjamin G. Nelson, AO383658.
Charles N. Nelson, AO1849349.
Edward D. Nelson, AO799837.
George J. Nelson, AO775988.
Gordon P. Nelson, AO1179552.
Harlan E. Nelson, AO704717.
John A. Nelson, AO767337.
Josey H. Nelson, AO1044628.
Michael S. Nelson, AO449377.
Omer C. Nelson, AO835516.
Palmer A. Nelson, AO737838.
Robert D. Nelson, AO787178.
Stanley A. Nelson, AO566306.
William H. Nelson, AO396301.
Charles A. Neri, AO673872.
Anthony J. Nesavich, AO928288.
Evan R. Nesbit, AO684762.
David D. Nesler, AO878196.
Daniel J. Neuman, AO745158.
Irving Neuwirth, AO559279.
James P. Nevill, AO1909626.
William J. Neville, AO757021.
Russell A. New, AO760896.
William N. New, AO886197.
Warner E. Newby, AO440127.
John H. Newcomb, AO746738.
Wallace B. Newell, AO809855.
Lou K. Newfield, Jr., AO761170.
Walter F. Newgreen, AO698593.
Morris H. Newhouse, AO811721.
John R. Newkirk, AO1013288.
Edward C. Newman, AO684396.
Gerald A. Newman, AO2091841.
William A. Newman, AO790026.
Bert Newmark, AO668745.
Theodore J. Newnam, AO572809.
Ben M. D. Newsom, AO2064987.
Charlie L. Newsom, Jr., AO590797.
James C. Newsome, AO1796675.
William J. Newton, AO767860.
William M. Newton, AO818000.
Charles B. Nichols, AO1908578.
Dudley N. Nichols, AO1909867.
Irwin A. Nichols, AO686658.
Merle B. Nichols, AO730579.
Roland A. Nichols, AO590617.
William L. Nichols, AO516970.
Alvie H. Nicholson, AO827257.
John K. Nicholson, AO481254.
Merrill S. Nicholson, AO1862296.
Robert W. Nicholson, AO1290462.
Laurence M. Nickerson, AO764762.
Robert K. Nickerson, AO868129.
Willard E. Nickum, AO524544.
Robert A. Nicol, AO887543.
Thomas E. Nicol, AO2072066.
Marion C. Nicolai, AO2067178.
Robert W. Nicoll, AO834863.
Terry J. Nidiffer, AO437254.
Eugene J. Niedenthal, AO2100875.
Joseph M. Niehaus, AO700037.
William C. Nielson, AO2081166.
Rudolph P. Niemiec, AO932620.
Glenn M. Niewald, AO1910334.
George W. Nightingale, AO791027.
Arthur Nikas, AO584001.
Aaron L. Niles, Jr., AO798020.
Lawrence E. Nix, AO1909090.
Alva E. Nixon, AO431481.
Francis H. Nixon, AO1911432.
Robert O. Nixon, AO694694.
Manford C. Njust, AO841750.
Richard B. Noah, AO745478.
John P. Nobel, AO828494.
Harry F. Noble, Jr., AO831980.
Paskell Nobles, AO2064636.
Frank M. Nocera, AO1577633.
Edward R. Noha, AO417444.
James C. Nolan III, AO1904353.
John D. Nolan, AO769912.
Michael J. Nolan, AO2033643.
Cregg P. Nolen, Jr., AO2057878.
John Nolli, AO943186.
William A. Nolte, Jr., AO735637.
Abraham Nooger, AO566328.
Guy H. Nooney, AO2062753.
Willys O. Nord, AO803038.
Thomas B. Nordan, AO569600.
Arthur J. Norden, AO1820900.
Maurice E. Nordlund, AO742009.
Ernest O. Nordquist, AO2060836.
Paul R. Nordstrom, AO2071034.
David A. Nordyke, Jr., AO770743.
Carol D. Norris, AO934947.
Harold S. Norris, AO762519.
Joseph W. Norris, AO694018.
William C. Norris, AO1908579.
William J. Norris, AO748761.
Arval C. Norsworthy, AO785866.
Herbert A. Northcutt, AO2094535.
Clarence E. Northey, Jr., AO2088182.
Marvin O. Northrup, AO823764.
Jim B. Norton, AO1577637.
John W. Norton, AO701950.
Robert A. Norvell, AO777782.
Ross M. Norwood, AO692908.
John D. Noss, AO691013.
James O. Nostdal, AO708936.
Joseph A. Novak, AO673923.
Frank J. Novi, AO2057772.
Edmund E. Novotny, AO794351.
James S. Novy, AO736308.

Myron E. Now, AO786612.
Leon J. Nowak, Jr., AO1702893.
Donald B. Nowakoski, AO560167.
Glen T. Noyes, AO767342.
Troy A. Nuckols, AO589013.
John F. Nuding, AO2086454.
Harry C. Nuessle, AO659019.
William A. Nugen, AO2085875.
William J. Nugent, AO2068443.
Victor L. Nunenkamp, AO742254.
Arthur R. Nunes, AO2088485.
Harold E. Nunes, Jr., AO820813.
Donald G. Nunn, AO569613.
Kirby A. Nunn, AO701630.
Lloyd B. Nunn, Jr., AO699716.
Johnson A. Nye, Jr., AO440947.
Gordon B. Nyhous, AO988707.
Edward S. Nyland, AO2060070.
William H. Oakley, AO807499.
Gerald E. Oaks, AO792345.
Marvin A. Oaks, AO766039.
Elmer R. Oates, AO651198.
Stanley J. Obarski, AO729880.
John R. Oberschmid, AO833108.
Robert E. Oberschmid, AO700528.
Charles O. O'Bier, AO2015411.
John A. O'Brien, AO706435.
Joseph F. O'Brien, AO550186.
Joseph T. O'Brien, AO1100271.
Paul E. O'Brien, AO702481.
Russell C. O'Brien, AO2078650.
Frederick M. O'Connor, AO790450.
John T. O'Connor, AO2098868.
Theodore J. O'Connor, AO566340.
Thomas F. X. O'Connor, AO832859.
Ivan E. O'Dell, AO700210.
Jack C. O'Dell, AO699086.
Paul H. O'Dell, AO535553.
Phillip S. Odom, Jr., AO2094597.
Charles F. O'Donnell, AO443375.
Robert A. O'Donnell, AO727113.
David D. Odor, AO805283.
Camillo C. O'Dorisio, AO1576451.
Donald H. Offerman, AO663548.
Gabriel D. Ofiesh, AO692333.
Charles B. Ogle, AO680690.
Oscar B. Ogletree, Jr., AO2068727.
Adam B. O'Guin, Jr., AO775509.
Allen G. Ogus, AO672869.
Bert Ogus, AO747473.
Richard N. O'Hagan, AO833199.
Joseph J. O'Hara, Jr., AO703964.
Vincent M. O'Hara, AO734590.
Dorne P. Ohlemacher, AO670221.
John F. Ohlinger, AO424289.
Clifton P. Ohman, AO1704116.
Duane F. Ohmann, AO2092439.
Roman H. Ohnemus, AO765054.
LeRoy L. Ohrt, AO2030230.
Richard T. Old, Jr., AO781977.
Gregory H. Oldenburgh, AO556631.
Richard T. Oldham, AO729046.
James P. O'Leary, AO664907.
Richard J. O'Leary, AO1903240.
Sidney R. Olin, Jr., AO2075291.
Harold R. Olinger, AO752298.
James S. Olive, AO938895.
Caleb G. Oliver, AO555886.
Hugh R. Oliver, AO2063090.
Jeptha D. Oliver, Jr., AO775512.
Roland B. Oliver, Jr., AO1908944.
Paul F. Olivier, AO717687.
William J. Olk, AO2034960.
Clarence E. Olsen, AO1863281.
Jack R. Olsen, AO1854885.
Leo F. Olsen, Jr., AO1333514.
Matthias C. Olsen, AO741686.
Robert J. Olshaskie, AO2085747.
Edward J. Olson, AO727651.
Floyd M. Olson, AO755232.
Robert W. Olson, AO2072853.
Wendell D. Olson, AO748225.
Patrick J. O'Malley, AO1311326.
Patrick R. O'Malley, AO826372.
Frank Oncay, Jr., AO2076651.
John E. O'Neal, AO2066381.
Ray C. O'Neal, AO973633.
Robert O'Neil, AO761617.
Fitzhugh L. O'Neill, Jr., AO823979.
James F. O'Neill, AO2060075.
James R. O'Neill, AO2092588.
William W. O'Neill, Jr., AO431488.
Lester E. Oonk, AO703647.
Robert J. Oostdyke, AO590436.
Basil C. Opalenik, AO2069390.
Owen R. Opdahl, AO429679.
David H. E. Opfer, AO937910.
Chester N. Oranges, AO749511.
Robert R. Orcutt, AO874929.
Joe Orell, AO2022849.
John C. Orliski, AO823926.
Edward E. Ormsby, AO2074077.
Thomas O'Rourke, AO2087984.
Clarence W. Orr, AO838132.
Donald E. Orr, AO1903122.
Lemuel R. Orr, AO766659.
Alvin J. Ortagus, AO690804.
Willard R. Ortenburger, AO557438.
Donald M. Orth, AO2080919.
James E. Orth, AO2083643.
Paul R. Orth, AO738712.
Peter S. Orth, AO822527.
Robert L. Orton, AO810207.
Walter T. Osborn, AO698903.
Charles B. Osborne, Jr., AO2070693.
James W. Osborne, AO563966.
Theodore L. Osborne, AO856617.
John C. Osburn, AO750253.
Paul V. Osburn, AO682228.
Francis J. Oser, AO433577.
Peter C. Osterhus, AO814745.
George S. Ostrowski, AO1849226.
David G. O'Sullivan, AO807777.
Sam L. Osver, AO2056144.
Louis A. Oswald, AO1855963.
Ted R. Otey, AO2067860.
Joseph P. O'Toole, AO828750.
Forrest E. Ott, AO2080549.
Gerald A. Ottem, AO859670.
Charles F. Otto, AO426466.
Lyle B. Otto, AO1911357.
Raymond H. Ottomann, AO672999.
Landon F. Overbey, Jr., AO1911598.
Robert J. Overcash, AO441012.
Ralph W. Overmoe, AO560194.
Milton B. Overstreet, AO2056192.
Robert G. Overstreet, AO1014255.
Thomas L. Overton, AO799057.
John B. Owen, Jr., AO706631.
Orin K. Owen, AO787189.
Roy W. Owen, Jr., AO778027.
William V. Owen, AO672400.
Calvin C. Owens, AO664644.
Grant R. Owens, AO1843438.
Harold B. Owens, AO1909193.
Harold K. Owens, AO740120.
Howard G. Owens, AO2093540.
Hugh S. Owens, AO555975.
Jacob L. Owens, AO927918.
Jack H. Owens, AO581054.
James Owens, AO442816.
Kenneth A. Owens, AO2100881.
Laurence E. Owens, AO560197.
Merlin R. Owens, AO829692.
Raymond E. Owens, AO560198.
Walter D. Owings, AO535911.
Elbert H. Ownbey, AO676104.
Dan D. Oxley, AO760377.
James E. Oxley, AO2085834.
Elburn R. Oxner, AO669905.
John D. Pace, AO729050.
Thomas G. Pagano, AO804865.
Charles C. Page, AO2100522.
Richard E. Page, Jr., AO680068.
Robert T. Page, AO871567.
Jack L. Pageler, AO856784.
Gerald J. Pagliero, AO673877.
Lester C. Pagliuso, AO429862.
Augustus H. Paine, AO800160.
John L. Paladino, AO2080252.
Peter C. Palazzolo, AO932196.
David S. Pallister, AO793826.
Donald O. Pallone, AO836798.
Daniel J. Palmer, AO791624.
Edmund J. Palmer, AO2077413.
Gordon B. Palmer, AO862271.
Harold F. Palmer, AO784526.
John S. Palmer, AO2001328.
Paul H. Palmer, AO2080296.
Samuel S. Palmer, AO835819.
William R. Palmer, AO729052.
Walter P. Paluch, Jr., AO1909513.
Joseph N. Pamplin, AO684686.
Jack W. Panabaker, AO1849951.
J. R. Pannell, AO778929.
Harold A. Pantel, AO872261.
Leon F. Papazian, AO672025.
Fred H. Pape, AO670811.
Jacob B. Paperman, AO2083982.
Antonio S. Pappas, AO832863.
George A. Pappas, Jr., AO563978.
Eugene M. Paquette, AO886241.
Howard M. Paquin, AO660001.
Alfred A. Paradise, AO685017.
Jim L. Parham, AO486164.
George E. Paris, Jr., AO791486.
Norman W. Parish, AO590622.
Paris D. Park, Jr., AO932197.
Richard E. Park, AO810209.
Armand J. Parker, AO1908951.
Carl U. Parker, AO673936.
Charles W. Parker, AO788828.
John C. Parker, AO1909196.
John M. Parker, AO839133.
Wilbur B. Parker, AO660677.
Warren O. Parkerson, AO2027472.
George B. Parkes, AO739574.
Lester R. Parks, AO1907372.
Deane S. Parmelee, Jr., AO672914.
Howard E. Parot, AO802188.
C. T. Parrish, AO704047.
Glen D. Parrish, AO2067339.
William H. Parrott, AO424127.
Thomas B. Parry, AO862661.
Paul J. Parsons, AO558116.
Henry L. Partridge, AO700655.
Lloyd R. Partridge, AO753721.
Lee M. Paschall, AO1286345.
Robert C. Pasco, AO572918.
Michael Pashkevich, AO784935.
Robert E. Pasho, AO885274.
Robert P. Pasqualicchio, AO699160.
Frank J. Passarello, AO1911266.
Paul F. Patch, AO661550.
Ernest W. Pate, AO379227.
John Pate, AO710159.
David Paterson, Jr., AO678915.
Harold L. Patrick, AO675618.
J. M. Patrick, AO529444.
James T. Patrick, AO2066384.
John P. Patten, AO1039504.
Kenneth Patten, AO717690.
Louis I. Pattenaude, AO662062.
George A. Patterson, AO827937.
George B. Patterson, AO466387.
Glendon E. Patterson, AO2062031.
James L. Patterson, AO2059583.
Nicky D. Patterson, Jr., AO428697.
Paul H. Patterson, AO1903297.
William L. Patterson, AO1853691.
William R. Patterson, AO758217.
John D. Pattison, AO701634.
Clifford P. Patton, AO401040.
William M. Patton, AO2036961.
George R. Paul, AO1858127.
Kenneth I. Paul, AO1999595.
Warren R. Paul, AO709613.
Alexander B. Pauleuc, AO840130.
Homer D. Pauley, AO1902808.
Charlie D. Pauling, AO1909754.
John G. Paulsick, AO794857.
Gerald F. Paulson, AO803445.
Wilmot E. Y. Paxton, AO491500.
Peter Paylan, AO669610.
Earl S. Payne, AO2088347.
Gilbert L. Payne, AO756896.
Robert D. Payne, AO582224.
Robert R. Payne, AO1589432.
William G. Payne, AO563996.
Harold J. Payton, AO585174.
Louis G. Pazel, AO1911434.
Max A. Pea, AO675658.
Cloyd E. Peacock, AO2056201.
Charles E. Pear, AO936385.
Cloyd T. Pearce, AO552972.
Perry O. Pearce, AO669874.
Thomas J. Pearce, Jr., AO933569.
James D. Pearson, AO801304.
James M. Pearson, AO796971.
Peter J. Pearson, AO815382.
Thomas S. Pearson, AO784067.
Wesley D. Pearson, AO886012.
Charles M. Pease, AO754975.

Harold L. Peasley, AO582225.
Donald L. Peck, AO663090.
J. Loren Peck, AO1695542.
Joe S. Peck, AO394599.
Robert C. Peck, AO867952.
Waldo W. Peck, AO839336.
Wallace H. Pedé, AO2074535.
Carl A. Peden, AO1911872.
Myron E. Pedersen, AO740542.
John D. Pedrick, AO828758.
Milton L. Peek, AO591021.
David H. Peery, AO2095998.
Richard E. Pegg, AO1912012.
Kenneth C. Peiffer, AO2074536.
Cyr P. Pelletier, AO1911045.
John J. Pelszynski, AO764777.
Louis A. Pendergrass, AO722145.
Alton A. Pendleton, AO2080608.
Grady R. Pendleton, Jr., AO1644655.
Guymon Penix, AO899848.
James W. Penn, AO739203.
William H. Penn, AO868590.
Charles E. Pennington, AO1692830.
Jon P. Pensyl, AO826491.
James L. Pentz, Jr., AO1911873.
William R. Penzien, AO821073.
Ross E. Percifield, AO1909755.
Hillary Perdue, AO2080221.
Woodrow W. Perdue, AO2074764.
Rudolph Perez, AO945964.
Alfred H. D. Perkins III, AO803261.
Billy J. Perkins, AO1911874.
Robert K. Perkins, AO2083356.
Roland L. Perkins, AO809186.
Rowan M. Perkins, AO887119.
William R. Perkins, AO795622.
Julian E. Perkinson, AO1289791.
William R. Perks, AO695603.
Walter H. Perris, AO2059588.
John A. Perrone, AO659836.
Aubrey S. Perry, AO673941.
Edwin B. Perry, AO760668.
Emil F. Perry, AO796023.
Gales P. Perry, AO800586.
George E. Perry, Jr., AO353677.
Harold H. Perry, Jr., AO591225.
Jack R. Perry, AO575876.
John B. Perry, AO674849.
Norman F. Perry, AO820049.
Robert E. Perry, AO748462.
Charles L. F. Perryman, AO365860.
Charles Persin, Jr., AO878326.
Wilson M. Petefish, AO1903126.
Joseph A. Peterburs, AO830526.
Claude W. Peters, AO2100885.
Herman Peters, AO748775.
John L. Peters, AO792736.
Walter V. Peters, Jr., AO453279.
William R. Peters, AO2067035.
Carl G. Peterschmidt, AO781985.
Albert C. Petersen, AO564017.
Charles H. Peterson, AO824861.
Christian F. Peterson, AO797893.
Dean H. Peterson, AO785876.
Denis O. Peterson, AO2063695.
Donald J. Peterson, AO2076722.
Elmer L. Peterson, AO590810.
Harry E. Peterson, AO662595.
John E. Peterson, AO695604.
John H. Peterson, Jr., AO766676.
John P. Peterson, AO775115.
Lloyd M. Peterson, AO591402.
Maurice D. Peterson, AO712901.
Melvin V. Peterson, AO1287939.
Richard Peterson, AO1910534.
Robert C. Peterson, AO730293.
Robert D. Peterson, AO779989.
Warren H. Peterson, AO755412.
John N. Pettersen, AO745740.
Joe D. Pettigrew, AO719495.
Reginald Petty, AO2088493.
Fulton C. Petway, AO2094354.
Paul Petyo, Jr., AO681473.
Edward L. Petzoldt, AO2077402.
Mario E. Peyrot, AO1909200.
Frank A. Pfeffer, AO712308.
Albert B. Pfeiffer, Jr., AO2092166.
Rheuna B. Pfeiffer, AO2065180.
Walter F. Pfeiffer, AO2065182.
Robert A. Pflegl, AO818217.
Dorsey L. Phares, AO590207.
Allan J. Phaup, Jr., AO581087.
James Phelan, AO1692748.
Donald L. Phelps, AO435000.
Ralph E. Phelps, AO584595.
Ralph M. Phelps, Jr., AO1039546.
Allen C. Phenis, AO403823.
Willis D. Philip, Jr., AO1848483.
Carter H. Phillips, AO672189.
Frank V. Phillips, AO749049.
Henry P. Phillips, AO769925.
Howard R. Phillips, AO1576501.
Jack R. Phillips, AO775714.
John H. Phillips, AO1850443.
Ray Phillips, Jr., AO710502.
William J. Phillips, AO813220.
Claude W. Phinisey, AO789264.
Joseph C. Pica, AO673883.
James M. Pickard, AO700060.
Walter M. Pickard, AO745933.
Rudolph R. Picarelli, AO1587537.
William W. Pickavance, AO711800.
Creel A. Pickel, AO801901.
Edward E. Pickel, AO1910774.
James L. Picken, AO660300.
Paul E. Picket, AO1165933.
Maurice W. Pickett, AO2102123.
Davis P. Pickle, AO2083303.
George W. Pierce, AO1909377.
Heywood W. Pierce, AO569767.
James A. Pierce, AO591230.
Jimmie Pierce, AO1858417.
Selden H. Pile, AO929113.
Frank R. Pimentel, AO794162.
Norman T. Pineau, Jr., AO1848481.
George I. Pinjuv, AO786330.
Joe K. Pinkston, AO1683327.
Robert H. Pinney, AO745170.
Boyce H. Pinson, AO809415.
George C. Pinyerd, AO735653.
Jean B. Pitner, AO686490.
Richard E. Pitsch, AO1052919.
Thomas F. Pitt, AO1823346.
James W. Pittaway, AO668132.
Don D. Pittman, AO2087690.
Galen H. Pittman, AO815224.
Raymond W. Pittman, AO762868.
Thomas L. Pittman, AO747479.
Samuel E. Pizzo, AO2056292.
Wayne T. Plant, AO1699571.
Edward A. Planta, AO674628.
Bernice E. Pleasant, AO662172.
William J. Pliska, AO1853013.
Robert F. Plomb, AO701157.
Donald T. Plotnik, AO1909520.
William M. Plowden, AO424291.
George R. Podwolsky, AO819602.
Robert L. Poehlein, AO2085836.
Edward H. Poff, AO820819.
Robert W. Poindexter, AO2057016.
Edward V. Polhamus, AO874951.
Saul Poliner, AO1576507.
Lewis B. Polk, Jr., AO739496.
Rayfield C. Pollack, AO2039139.
Thomas B. Pollard, Jr., AO672193.
Donald Pollock, AO715319.
John F. Pollock, AO1850981.
Leon O. Pollock, AO841967.
Warren H. Polson, AO696800.
William K. Poltrock, AO2099796.
Burritt H. Pond, AO2099527.
Roy L. Ponthier, AO663708.
James P. Pool, AO551599.
Lawrence W. Pool, AO666576.
Robert W. Pool, AO708843.
Sam J. Pool, AO683496.
Charles D. Poole, AO823767.
Charles T. Poole, Jr., AO1862266.
James G. Poole, AO1855221.
Allen J. Poor, AO718747.
James E. Poore, AO3001798.
Harry Popeney, AO765064.
Nicholas Popovich, AO1909382.
Russell A. Popp, AO869730.
Andrew R. Porreco, AO839626.
Charles J. Portaluppi, AO801638.
Norman S. Portenoy, AO793954.
Charles E. Porter, Jr., AO815542.
Clarence E. Porter, AO572989.
Cloyd L. Porter, AO781043.
Curtis J. Porter, AO1863329.
James R. Porter, AO806516.
John A. Porter, AO705417.
Keith W. Porter, AO704975.
LeRoy C. Porter, Jr., AO769931.
Paul V. Porter, AO561852.
William T. Porter, Jr., AO590626.
Richard L. Portillo, AO902064.
Alexander R. Posniak, AO1691456.
Gale V. Posselt, AO2068330.
Edwin A. Post, AO735446.
Francis B. Postelle, AO360252.
James F. Postlewaite III, AO745934.
Evan A. Poston, AO761760.
Lawrence R. Pote, AO679939.
James R. Pottenger, AO661558.
Byron L. Potter, Jr., AO663556.
Davis B. Potter, AO827274.
Frederick F. Potter, AO1308864.
Ralph W. Potter, AO797386.
William D. Potter, AO940433.
William H. Potter, AO2060845.
Leonard H. Potterbaum, AO820323.
John P. Potthoff, AO768218.
Wayne H. Pottorff, AO589983.
James E. Potts, AO586863.
Robert H. Potts, AO1910340.
Stanley R. Potts, AO659395.
Joseph J. Pounder, Jr., AO2066595.
Rex L. Poutre, AO742891.
Adrian E. Powell, AO2023991.
Edgar N. Powell, AO943902.
Elmer M. Powell, AO815546.
Harold B. Powell, AO1905772.
Harold L. Powell, AO900361.
John F. Powell, AO2081188.
Kenneth V. Powell, AO732355.
Lucion N. Powell, AO339768.
Robert E. Powell, AO590627.
Roger F. Powell, AO441872.
Roy B. Powell, AO807046.
Thomas H. Powell, AO432119.
Wade N. Powell, AO936928.
Jack E. Powers, AO2091986.
MacArthur Powers, AO884149.
Robert J. Powers, AO1849628.
Thomas E. Powers, Jr., AO673626.
Herbert M. Poynter, AO1911359.
Gonzalo R. Pozos, AO590815.
James F. Prather, AO801902.
Audley G. Pratt, AO799855.
Clinton E. Pratt, AO2082108.
Robert A. Preciado, AO1908957.
Robert A. Preciado, AO581103.
William R. Prentis, Jr., AO840852.
Calvin M. Preston, AO785306.
Charles F. Preston, AO842543.
Ernest A. Preston, AO934690.
James E. Preston, AO588600.
Rollin K. Preston, AO696139.
Thomas J. R. Preston, Jr., AO2067753.
Stanley B. Prestwich, AO537570.
Herbert L. Prevost, AO763823.
Jules A. Prevost, AO920822.
James T. Pribil, AO695085.
Clifford D. Price, AO1856097.
Earl Price, Jr., AO784950.
George H. Price, AO697167.
James L. Price, AO2080858.
Thomas J. Price, AO666347.
Fleetwood Pride, Jr., AO839797.
James M. Priest, AO590224.
Raymond Priest, Jr., AO778251.
Billy R. Prim, AO2092334.
Charles L. Prince, AO1848129.
Oscar C. Prince, AO1850980.
Tony Prince, Jr., AO431157.
William G. Prince, AO783627.
Richard C. Prior, AO2088503.
Rinaldo N. Procario, AO757557.
Gerald E. Proctor, AO701643.
William H. Proctor, AO789595.
John K. Prong, Jr., AO935381.
Dale S. Proper, AO566464.
Arthur Prosser, Jr., AO1056200.
Alvin E. Prothero, AO2086186.
Manuel A. Protos, AO738886.
Harry W. Protzeller, AO740553.
Leslie R. Prout, Jr., AO942606.
Richard E. Prouty, AO704977.
James A. Provan, AO789596.
Juan J. Provencio, AO680504.
Murphy A. Pruett, AO681188.

Edward S. Prunko, AO573020.
George A. Prussing, AO560244.
Theodore R. Pryor, AO823515.
Donald L. Puckett, AO1903131.
Floyd J. Pugh, AO699726.
Homer H. Pugh, AO665114.
Robert F. Pugh, Jr., AO1908854.
Glen L. Pugmire, AO674399.
Frank J. Pulli, AO1851867.
Jack R. Pulliam, AO1908585.
Charles H. Purcell, AO810564.
Edward W. Purdy, AO808732.
Robert F. Purdy, AO2101947.
Walter H. Purdy, AO2074779.
Robert L. Purtzer, AO1855096.
Frank R. Purvis, AO778556.
Silas W. Purvis, Jr., AO712217.
Bernard Pusin, AO911648.
Charles W. Putman, AO759505.
Charles E. Putnam, Jr., AO869780.
Harry H. Putnam, Jr., AO747139.
Joseph W. Putnam, AO2062546.
William R. Pyle, AO753730.
Wayne M. Pyles, AO705796.
Wade S. Quick, Jr., AO1340492.
Richard S. Quiggins, AO753731.
Edward S. Quigley, AO1847361.
Richard M. Quimby, Jr., AO703314.
Bernard W. Quinn, AO824215.
William J. Quinn, AO1908958.
Daniel H. Quirk, AO2062295.
Edward J. Quirk, Jr., AO842761.
Gustave Quiroga, AO1855718.
Quentin W. Raaz, AO676646.
Clinton H. Rabbitt, AO802457.
Carlos J. Rabby, Jr., AO803458.
Duncan W. Rabey, Jr., AO830925.
Clarence W. Rabourn, AO767644.
Billy M. Raby, AO590447.
James H. Raddin, Sr., AO437043.
Gerald C. Rademaker, AO2101950.
Norman I. Radin, AO802884.
John Radzieta, AO2043158.
Robert E. Rae, AO868659.
Alexander N. Raeburn, AO1696908.
Alexander Raffy, Jr., AO750093.
Stephen R. Ragar, AO546184.
Joseph B. Raggio, AO765315.
Joseph H. Ragolia, AO580427.
William B. Ragon, AO2083306.
Pellegrino Rais, Jr., AO2082305.
Francis J. Raidt, AO756021.
Harold E. Raleigh, AO1852923.
Sebastian J. Rall, AO1846563.
Walter J. Ralph, AO691915.
Gilbert R. Ralston, Jr., AO815388.
Joseph S. Rambo, Jr., AO738728.
Kenneth Ramey, AO2023240.
Weldon O. Ramey, AO1855688.
Charles E. Ramsey, Jr., AO441818.
Hilton B. Ramsey, AO722154.
Ralder E. Ramstad, AO893699.
Alexander Rand, AO929510.
Lawrence E. Randall, AO824878.
Allan C. Randle, AO734836.
Charles G. Randle, AO688363.
Raymond Rank, Jr., AO753548.
Allan P. Rankin, AO428568.
Robert E. Rankin, AO2064161.
Thomas L. Rankin, AO1909206.
Alfred S. Ransel, AO443373.
Robert H. Ransley, AO785884.
George Ransom, AO2060366.
Jerald J. Ransom, AO2015152.
Herbert J. Rapley, AO1699526.
John P. Rasch, Jr., AO2093232.
Joe R. Rasco, AO569875.
Louis W. Rase, AO1302667.
Thomas W. Rash, AO683496.
Harold M. Rasmussen, AO700066.
Kenneth C. Rasmussen, AO753304.
William C. Ratcliffe, AO581114.
James T. Rathbun, AO703284.
Robert S. Ratliff, AO561872.
Richard W. Ravich, AO666818.
Forrest L. Rauscher, AO832002.
Richard H. Rauschkolb, AO1851570.
Gordon D. Rausin, AO1910778.
Ralph R. Ravenburg, AO361807.
Ray C. Rawlston, AO822544.
Donald E. Ray, AO839411.
Lyman F. T. Ray, AO2084002.
Everette W. Rayburn, AO942587.
Joseph N. Raymond, AO412201.
Parks M. Rea, AO782360.
Allan D. Read, AO560257.
Charles C. Read, Jr., AO2057208.
Charles M. Read, AO428569.
John A. Reading, Jr., AO876942.
Ned A. Reading, AO694946.
Clifford H. Readout, AO1694212.
Thomas M. Reagan, AO1863716.
Charles E. Reames, AO576009.
Harry R. Rearick, AO700767.
Purcell A. Reary, AO2100346.
Garland L. Reasor, AO679315.
Grover O. Reat, AO660903.
George E. Reavell, AO435526.
Carl T. Rebentisch, AO304397.
Thomas R. Reber, AO398087.
William T. Reck, AO838930.
Wilson H. Rector, AO1865676.
Leonard B. Redd, AO659329.
Harry W. Redding, AO818935.
John A. Reding, AO437583.
Charles H. Redwine, AO867583.
Richard L. Reeb, AO863307.
Charles N. Reece, AO788392.
George G. Reed, Jr., AO1540417.
George M. Reed, AO586350.
Hovey G. Reed, AO590104.
Junior B. Reed, AO788393.
Leon Reed, AO709643.
Melvin H. Reed, AO688649.
Norman F. Reed, AO744556.
Orville A. Reed, Jr., AO1865258.
Robert L. Reed, AO1553537.
Stanley H. Reed, AO764456.
Thomas B. Reed, AO1911275.
Walter S. Reed, Jr., AO1852088.
William K. Reed, AO820574.
Eugene P. Reeder, AO591408.
Herbert B. Reeder, AO1001446.
Richard C. Reeder, AO1909636.
Walton B. Reedy, AO1318083.
William B. Reedy, AO1910643.
Donald E. Reel, AO673271.
John C. Rees, AO705427.
Ernest R. Reese, Sr., AO1911877.
Gordon M. Reese, Jr., AO832901.
Harold E. Reese, AO863869.
Alvin L. Reeser, AO1910273.
William E. Reeter, AO690252.
Alton P. Reeves, AO712423.
Donald A. Reeves, AO1849629.
John T. Reeves, AO784956.
Merritt A. Reeves, AO418696.
Roy B. Reeves, Jr., AO742524.
Sims H. Reeves, AO591036.
Frank M. Regan, AO591037.
Walter J. Regehr, AO1848492.
Claude E. Register, AO591038.
Ralph R. Regnier, AO812143.
Herman F. Reheis, AO561884.
Bernard F. Rehkopf, AO1904501.
Joe J. Reichel, AO1850200.
Henry J. Reichenbach, AO794693.
Harold E. Reichenberg, AO432435.
Joseph J. Reichert, AO693235.
Billie D. Reid, AO633673.
George E. Reid, AO887003.
James F. Reid, AO725197.
Joe W. Reid, AO807515.
Robert R. Reid, Jr., AO946856.
Salvie L. Reid, AO576024.
William E. Reid, AO738464.
Wilmer E. Reid, AO786460.
Roland J. Reidy, AO1852278.
Bernard Reilley, AO949519.
Colin C. Reilly, AO767050.
Eward H. Reilly, AO556921.
John F. Reilly, AO2079101.
Martin J. Reilly, Jr., AO889161.
Harry S. Reinert, Jr., AO2094364.
Charles W. Reinhard, AO673095.
Edwin D. Reinhardt, AO818022.
Arthur S. Reinhart, AO414860.
David E. Reinhart, AO2065013.
Paul W. Reinowski, AO730608.
Leonard L. Reinsmith, Jr., AO789505.
Matt H. Reiser, AO569897.
William J. Reisinger, AO2084403.
Glenn C. Reiter, Jr., AO823685.
John D. Reitz, AO1904621.
David C. Relly, AO781050.
Lincoln D. Relyea, AO425674.
Theobold G. Remaklus, AO730168.
Rudolph L. Renker, AO412551.
William O. Rennhack, AO678768.
Harvey W. Reno, AO581126.
Victor R. T. Rentschler, AO701165.
William J. Reslie, AO812145.
Fred B. Retter, Jr., AO1854653.
William O. Rettig, AO1903135.
Russel J. Revel, AO937150.
Doyle F. Reynolds, AO533030.
Harold D. Reynolds, AO770410.
Robert H. Reynolds, AO546237.
Robert R. Reynolds, AO775556.
William E. Reynolds, AO716878.
Orville C. Rex, AO1911317.
Walter J. Reznicek, Jr., AO700661.
Emmett E. Rhoades, AO362784.
Maynard R. Rhoades, AO672671.
John M. Rhoads, AO1905086.
Harry T. Rhode, AO665117.
Dowe S. Rhodes, AO414241.
John R. Rhodes, Jr., AO812146.
Thomas W. Rhodes, AO1850327.
Elbert F. Rhudy, AO564124.
John B. Riach, AO936053.
Blaine H. Riano, AO785426.
Lionel L. Riave, AO569917.
Everest E. Riccioni, AO771533.
Edward P. Rice, AO748794.
Henry R. Rice, AO670254.
Franklin C. Rice, AO2079481.
Harry F. Rice, AO784875.
John G. Rice, AO800049.
John P. Rice, Jr., AO2023246.
Phillip F. Rice, AO1855461.
Robert E. Rice, AO757282.
Thomas J. Rice, Jr., AO934990.
Warren H. Rice, AO766694.
William C. Rice, AO2056641.
William H. Rice, Jr., AO591040.
Charles L. Richards, AO590449.
Frederick W. Richards, AO696597.
Harry L. Richards, AO862610.
James B. Richards, Jr., AO2057025.
James O. Richards, AO2093918.
Maxwell J. Richards, AO1907399.
Paul M. Richards, AO661028.
Rollo C. Richards, AO1905233.
Arnold L. Richardson, AO670614.
Cecil B. Richardson, AO765317.
Charles W. Richardson, AO1850508.
Edgar L. Richardson, AO734977.
Harry W. Richardson, AO871835.
James M. Richardson, AO535147.
Jesse C. Richardson, AO1904328.
Lewis H. Richardson, AO678089.
Rupert S. Richardson, AO2102010.
Thomas R. Richardson, Jr., AO2086013.
Vernon E. Richardson, AO831802.
William G. Richardson, AO400211.
Wilbert H. Richars, AO1855607.
Chester A. Richman, AO730819.
Gerald F. Richter, AO733726.
Henry T. Rickert, Jr., AO1995058.
George G. Rickett, AO806729.
Stanton M. Rickey, AO690991.
Albert C. Ricks, Jr., AO787583.
Keith D. Ricks, AO776051.
William J. Ricks, Jr., AO2058549.
Manuel S. Rico, AO1104364.
Andrew M. Riddle, AO886298.
Hulburt H. Rider, AO678325.
David W. Ridgley, AO1692758.
Clifton S. Ridgway, AO590058.
George E. Ridler, AO810027.
James F. Ridley, Jr., AO2007621.
David W. Riead, AO786463.
John K. Riedel, AO590059.
Norbert H. Riegel, AO807516.
Lewis E. Riggle, AO708101.
Charles E. Riggs, Jr., AO1113012.
Frank H. Riggs, AO931351.
Robert E. Riha, AO805335.
Lawrence Rijnovan, AO927083.
James W. Riley, AO865138.
John D. Riley, AO775563.
Philip O. Rinehart, AO2090049.

Howard D. Ringley, AO576059.
Armand C. Riopelle, AO579009.
Warren J. Riopelle, AO734005.
Leonard I. Rippa, AO1910781.
Thomas R. Risher III, AO630269.
Leonard H. Ritchard, AO561907.
Alfred C. Ritchason, AO784959.
Emerson W. Ritchie, AO771803.
Nelson C. Ritchie, AO796734.
William A. Ritchie, AO439644.
Elgin B. Rittenberry, AO424390.
Elvador E. Ritter, AO710763.
Delwyn F. Ritzdorf, AO742781.
Thomas H. Rivenbark, AO934954.
Robert W. Rivers, AO687906.
Teofilo J. Rivers, AO1906041.
James M. Rives, AO786255.
Paul A. Rix, AO730297.
David L. Robb, AO776053.
Francis J. Robb, AO932817.
William T. Roberds, AO1316922.
Arval J. Roberson, AO745510.
John F. Roberson, AO937679.
Arthur W. Roberts, AO927779.
Cecil H. Roberts, AO1848561.
Guy L. Roberts, Jr., AO636165.
Harley P. Roberts, AO1909389.
Joseph B. Roberts, Jr., AO576068.
Lawrence D. Roberts, AO756707.
Lionel W. Roberts, AO700984.
Raynor H. Roberts, AO740276.
Samuel B. Roberts, Jr., AO2086296.
William M. Roberts, Jr., AO678461.
William T. Roberts, AO667562.
William W. Roberts, AO561917.
Alexander Robertson, AO688846.
Francis C. Robertson, AO649847.
George M. Robertson, AO344182.
Howard N. Robertson, AO833816.
Owen R. Robertson, AO668220.
Robert D. Robertson, AO1906962.
Vernon M. Robertson, AO816590.
James R. Robinette, AO668140.
Edward L. Robinson, AO837051.
Edward P. Robinson, AO819415.
George A. Robinson, AO417105.
Jackson L. Robinson, AO590633.
John R. Robinson, AO860112.
Lorin E. Robinson, AO756324.
Noel K. Robinson, AO768243.
Robert C. Robinson, AO674983.
Robert C. Robinson, AO2078689.
Robert M. Robinson, AO538823.
William E. Robinson, AO776187.
Herbert W. Robson, AO689896.
Walter M. Robson, AO807311.
Philip A. Roccaforte, AO937073.
William L. Roche, AO1853636.
William M. Roche, AO583500.
Joseph B. Rochelle, Jr., AO1897761.
John W. Rockafellow, Jr., AO2092458.
Gene E. Rockey, AO947148.
Dwain A. Rockie, AO896316.
John D. Rockie, AO881322.
Charles L. Rockwood, AO412817.
William P. Rockwood, AO450352.
Wilbur C. Roddey, AO807312.
William T. Rodenbach, AO835063.
Wilson P. Roderick, AO729241.
Allen R. Rodgers, AO704543.
Jaffus M. Rodgers, AO790037.
Frank R. Rodrigues, AO1864040.
Victor H. Roeder, AO759727.
Nelson A. Roeller, AO564156.
Carl J. Roeser, AO428610.
Louis J. Roffinoli, AO935478.
Aubrey E. Rogers, AO976728.
Charles F. Rogers, AO429654.
Charles R. Rogers, Jr., AO1857156.
James E. Rogers, AO591239.
John G. Rogers, AO822547.
Joseph W. Rogers, AO785987.
Norman C. Rogers, AO689092.
Robert G. Rogers, AO1910006.
William J. Rogers, AO745514.
Joseph G. Rogillio, AO2077490.
Francis J. Rohan, AO1849573.
Arthur J. Rohde, AO2065186.
Frederick H. Rohde, AO766955.
Donald J. Rohlinger, AO940212.
Glenn E. Rohrer, AO543670.

Walter J. Rolefson, AO784962.
Lloyd R. Rolen, AO591044.
Franklin T. Roll, AO685218.
Stanley A. Rollag, AO795642.
Kenneth M. Rollings, AO825998.
Albert M. Romanick, AO590452.
Charles Romanick, AO591413.
Joseph F. Romano, AO2090906.
Albert W. Romeo, AO2060202.
James E. Romero, Jr., AO807519.
Robert F. Ronca, AO2027248.
Robert H. Rood, AO704260.
Earl J. Rookey, AO751085.
Laurence J. Rooney, AO780013.
James R. Root, AO1549056.
Clarence H. Roper, AO696777.
Willard L. Roper, AO505369.
George H. Ropp, Jr., AO797910.
Clyde H. Roquemore, AO1908743.
Hector A. Rosa, AO422549.
John W. Rosanbalm, AO1909526.
James G. Rosati, AO876343.
Alvin S. Rose, AO729504.
Andrew Rose, Jr., AO870782.
Boone Rose, Jr., AO731667.
Charles L. Rose, AO687211.
Jesse L. Rose, AO2056830.
John S. Rose, AO428960.
Joseph C. Rose, Jr., AO822814.
Robert W. Rose, AO829560.
John W. Rosenberry, AO467749.
Alvin J. Rosengren, AO1045229.
John J. Rosenow, AO2008963.
Anello P. Ross, AO855620.
Donald D. Ross, AO864498.
Harlan P. Ross III, AO692078.
Herbert E. Ross, AO421322.
Joseph G. Ross, AO800595.
Lawrence S. Ross, AO664823.
Leon D. Ross, AO2099798.
Ralph R. Ross, AO753247.
Walter F. Ross, Jr., AO674951.
William D. Ross, AO855539.
Edward J. Rosser, AO779611.
Robert H. Rostamo, AO1847260.
Jerome R. Roth, AO691810.
Robert P. Rothrock, AO724479.
Ian D. Rothwell, AO2082755.
Gerald D. Rotter, AO726077.
Leon M. Rottman, AO874438.
Carl W. Rottmann, Jr., AO837202.
Maurice P. Rountree, AO2099327.
James L. Rouse, AO426699.
Richard R. Rouse, AO735669.
Clyde B. Routt, AO2070705.
Richard A. Rowden, Jr., AO2091236.
Robert W. Rowden, AO878190.
Earle J. Rowdon, AO2078293.
Charles E. Rowe, AO937817.
Gordon V. Rowland, AO1548542.
A. J. Roy, AO936606.
John D. Roy, Jr., AO812202.
Romie R. Royse, AO693238.
Thomas W. Ruark, AO820584.
Morris B. Rubenstein, AO1856629.
Frank J. Rubino, AO406055.
Robert C. Ruby, AO754206.
Carl L. Rucker, AO865614.
Emmett Rucker, Jr., AO677577.
Joe B. Ruckman, AO1823778.
Bernard T. Rudden, Jr., AO2099878.
Warren N. Ruddy, AO2044855.
Paul W. Rudloff, AO1995823.
Richard H. Rudolph, AO737260.
John Rudovsky, AO2038691.
Wilbert H. Ruenheck, AO370654.
Howard C. Ruff, AO561954.
Bennie J. Ruffatto, AO930599.
Frederick C. Ruge, AO2102082.
Charles H. Ruley, AO426092.
Robert L. Rund, AO762951.
Maurice A. Rundquist, AO590638.
Garrett S. Runey, AO744762.
Jack E. Runyan, AO669505.
John V. Ruppersburg, AO905681.
Willard W. Rush, AO704061.
Robert A. Rushworth, AO2071247.
Billie W. Russell, AO1856508.
Charles R. Russell, AO864878.
Donald B. Russell, AO814139.
Duane E. Russell, AO937690.

Franklin J. Russell, Jr., AO611752.
Harry C. Russell, Sr., AO688911.
John L. Russell, AO733993.
Murle F. Russell, AO576127.
William H. Russell, AO775569.
Richard B. Russey, AO2002189.
Tom M. Rust, AO2069584.
Cecil Ruth, AO1574134.
Lawrence C. Rutherford, Jr., AO2085210.
Robert S. Rutherford, AO2066391.
James V. Ruzic, AO2101576.
Zacheus W. Ryall, Jr., AO1909210.
Donald F. Ryan, AO1321444.
Elliott J. Ryan, AO945319.
Fred J. Ryan, AO835272.
James G. Ryan, Jr., AO573224.
James W. Ryan, AO720575.
John J. Ryan, AO2084644.
John P. Ryan, AO706254.
John W. Ryan, AO750255.
Michael O. Ryan, AO941615.
William B. Ryan, AO1903255.
Carl K. Ryhal, AO863958.
Angelo J. Sabino, AO1851808.
Roland E. Sabourin, AO680724.
Felix Sachanen, AO552579.
John H. Sackman, AO1910190.
Max Sacks, AO674073.
Louis C. Sadek, AO531240.
Thomas M. Sadler, AO1909643.
Frank W. Sage, AO718148.
Harman R. Sage, AO2082126.
Hubert P. Sage, AO1852677.
Commodore H. Sagely, AO1032309.
Albert Sager, Jr., AO877720.
William F. Sager, AO623549.
Albert L. Sagert, AO940217.
Matteo A. Salemi, AO860333.
Robert L. Salisbury, AO1909643.
George M. Sallas, AO1035360.
Dean E. Salmeier, AO817856.
Truman D. Salyer, AO665722.
Ko S. Sameshima, AO937930.
Willis A. Sammons, AO935503.
Charles R. Samms, AO743511.
Reuben A. Sample, AO518123.
Arliegh J. Sampson, AO2085847.
William W. Sams, AO725363.
George T. Sander, AO1909612.
Donald W. Sanders, AO2059360.
Henry G. Sanders, AO576157.
Lowell L. Sanders, AO1860497.
Ray H. Sanders, AO715006.
Russell P. Sanders, Jr., AO729178.
Walter W. Sanders, AO873338.
Robert W. Sanderson, AO870210.
Edward E. Sandin, AO8075462.
David W. Sandlin, AO1910476.
John V. Sandoval, AO1909527.
Ben F. Sands, Jr., AO1910280.
William H. Sands, AO579122.
Glen M. Sanford, AO838934.
James B. Sanford, AO769951.
John L. Sanford, AO804513.
James W. Sanges, AO434027.
John C. Sanichas, AO729245.
Max J. Sanny, AO424549.
James C. Sansing, AO798890.
Richard D. Santure, AO2061057.
Joseph Sara, AO573247.
Joseph D. Sardonia, AO866249.
Everett E. Sargent, Jr., AO734512.
Eldon L. Sasser, AO590643.
Joseph Satriano, AO1643310.
Francis N. Satterlee, AO761349.
Jack L. Saulsbury, AO737863.
Bo Saunders, AO383242.
Ralph S. Saunders, AO1995697.
Theodore R. Saunders, AO746941.
William F. Saunders, AO546143.
Richard G. Sauner, AO1854422.
Richard H. Saurer, AO2099228.
Robert A. Sausville, AO797614.
Russell E. Sauvage, AO361980.
John P. Savage, AO807789.
Walter G. Savage, AO692716.
Louis J. Savino, AO884159.
Robert D. Sawin, AO672449.
Ernest L. Sawyer, Jr., AO2053870.
Julian D. Sawyer, AO1909528.
John P. Saxton, AO607318.

Fred D. Sayer, AO859883.
Bill K. Sayers, AO674074.
Robert O. Sayers, AO2089310.
Stanley B. Sayles, AO826779.
Julien B. Saylor, AO680144.
Andrew L. Scally, AO1335476.
Eric J. Scanlan, AO1108296.
James J. Scanlon, AO699743.
Vincent T. Scarano, AO2098791.
William E. Scarboro, AO817109.
Harrison G. Scaroni, Jr., AO726825.
Jacob R. Schad, AO420647.
George J. Schaefer, AO2067362.
Raymond P. Schaefer, AO560309.
Roman N. Schaefer, AO2033369.
Lawrence M. Schaeffer, AO678471.
Seymour M. Schafer, AO667435.
Richard G. Schaller, AO2067427.
Robert A. Schamber, AO786823.
Frederick L. Schanberger, AO804976.
Richard M. Schankel, AO1995791.
Merrill E. Scharmen, AO692892.
Clarence A. Schauberger, AO539342.
Roy E. Schauer, AO817857.
William A. Schauer, Jr., AO1911682.
Henry F. Scheer, AO703400.
Martin Scheinkman, AO794882.
Arthur R. Schell, AO756412.
Rudolph M. Schellhammer, AO588085.
Abe Schestopol, AO789099.
Francis J. Scheuring, AO2080441.
Edward A. Schickling, AO936626.
Francis C. Schiess, AO832500.
Adolph C. Schilke, Jr., AO582365.
James O. Schiller, AO2088966.
Frank K. Schilling, AO341818.
Hallman W. Schindler, AO711028.
Charles W. Schisler, Jr., AO591244.
Robert A. Schlegel, AO1911512.
Joseph R. Schlenker, AO2067419.
John G. Schlogl, AO798893.
Robert W. Schmeling, AO689373.
Arthur J. Schmidt, AO2066599.
Chester H. Schmidt, AO782799.
Norman Schmidt, AO1852653.
Edward J. Schmitt, AO591049.
John G. Schmitt, Jr., AO1908591.
William B. Schnase, AO2024558.
Arthur A. Schnebelen, Jr., AO940424.
Albert G. Schneider, Jr., AO733999.
George J. Schneider, AO709669.
Jimmy L. Schneider, AO1908448.
Ralph Z. Schneider, AO672880.
William L. Schneider, AO830551.
William J. Schneiderhan, AO678335.
Donald W. Schoen, AO721533.
James H. Schoenberger, AO942110.
Robert L. Schoenborn, AO818438.
Leroy J. Schoenemann, AO2057422.
Dale P. Schoenfeld, AO784969.
James A. Schofield, AO833424.
Nicholas J. Scholz, AO667355.
Gerhard L. Schopen, AO1910443.
Egon Schottleutner, AO937056.
Harry J. Schow, AO590646.
John S. Schrader, AO779235.
James O. Schreck, AO660916.
Frank Schreiber, AO529673.
Ralph E. Schreiber, AO942954.
Joseph B. Schreiner, AO825301.
Robert E. Schricker, AO742787.
David A. Schroll, AO778584.
Robert C. Schrom, AO1045245.
Fred R. Schu, AO664455.
Myrle N. Schuder, AO2032005.
Robert J. Schueler, AO935028.
Carl A. Schuett, AO684063.
Robert C. Schuh, AO935951.
James W. Schuler, AO763748.
Charles M. Schultz, AO1909214.
Dwight E. Schultz, AO504096.
Robert L. Schultz, AO1909937.
Paul R. Schulz, AO730299.
Richard G. Schulz, AO2090788.
Harry W. Schurr, AO1909645.
Harry T. Schussler, AO680089.
Vincent L. Schutt, AO878329.
June V. Schutte, AO2095205.
Lawrence E. Schutte, AO433157.
Joseph C. Schwaab, Jr., AO738891.
Samuel G. Schwab, AO770803.
Warren H. Schwab, AO814989.
John L. Schwanger, AO1862874.
Joel Schwartz, AO564249.
Charles R. Schwarzrock, AO2074617.
James A. Schwarzrock, AO727269.
Robert G. Schwein, AO757044.
Dean C. Schweitzer, AO1552166.
Dean F. Schwendeman, AO677589.
Kenneth G. Scilley, AO773498.
Benjamin A. Scott, Jr., AO2059616.
Carlos R. Scott, AO1854518.
Clark S. Scott, AO1854926.
Elgin W. Scott, Jr., AO407139.
George E. Scott, AO865622.
James E. Scott, AO676660.
John R. Scott, AO682245.
Lewis B. Scott, AO576215.
Milton J. Scott, AO2076775.
Ralph Scott, AO936011.
Richard E. Scott, AO426963.
Robert R. Scott, AO833821.
Robert T. Scott, AO1909396.
Roy G. Scott, AO725209.
William H. Scott, Jr., AO1911683.
Charles B. Screws, AO533596.
Herbert F. Scribner, AO1910650.
William W. Scroggins, Jr., AO540913.
William J. Scull, AO1319251.
John D. Seaberg, AO460148.
Robert H. Seabolt, AO585794.
James E. Seale, AO793180.
Myron E. Seals, AO1863461.
Jack R. Searle, AO712920.
Joseph W. Searle, AO819418.
Phillip F Sears, AO936519.
Everett W. Seath, AO 17569.
Richard W. Seay, AO2102086.
William L. Sebring, AO819884.
Milo L. Seccomb, Jr., AO426431.
James M. Sedberry, Jr., AO424136.
Robert A. Sedgwick, AO396319.
Carl R. Sedore, AO384160.
Theodore W. Sedvert, AO732380.
Richard H. Seebers, AO775586.
Howard L. Seeley, AO836740.
Ralph T. Seeman, AO806140.
Henry C. Segal, AO712680.
Robert B. Segers, AO939456.
William E. Seil, AO2000345.
John Seiler, AO1324653.
John W. Self, AO1857131.
Melvin L. Self, AO440142.
Frederick P. Selin, AO559375.
Martin Selinfreund, AO762956.
William R. Sell, AO861099.
Benjamin F. Sellars, Jr., AO941247.
Claude J. Sellers, AO1592040.
Cloyd W. Sellers, AO736661.
Ronald E. Sellers, Jr., AO860537.
Roland W. Sellis, AO3o9754.
Hyman M. Selmanovitz, AO557798.
William C. Selsor III, AO801397.
Thomas R. Semans, AO1909101.
Percy M. Semingson, AO799263.
Henry J. Sencer, AO814419.
Oscar L. Senft, AO739632.
Walter P. Senio, AO682727.
Edwin A. Senkbeil, AO666837.
William R. Senn, AO775588.
Lee R. Senter, AO427666.
Lewis B. Senter, AO831597.
Harold N. Serage, AO2082314.
Giuseppe Serangeli, AO810957.
Charles Sergeant, AO768262.
Theodore Severn, AO805130.
John R. Seversen, AO2078304.
Martin R. Serviss, AO1321448.
Charles J. Servocky, AO818444.
John H. Seward, AO686281.
Ralph H. Sewell, AO693509.
Jack E. Sexson, AO1855139.
Charles W. Sexton, Jr., AO781072.
Richard W. Sexton, AO828795.
Delbert E Seyboldt, AO758641.
Harold L. Seyvertsen, AO553909.
Edward Shabsin, AO828552.
Charles B. Shackleford, AO709834.
Henry S. Shackelford, AO1036729.
William A. Shackelford, AO758734.
George G. Shackley, AO411849.
Ralph E. Shadwell, Jr., AO562019.
Charles E. Shallenberger, AO2069399.
Austin L. Shamblin, AO870467.
Billy R. Shanahan, AO938322.
Roger T. Shanahan, AO391849.
Robert E. Shank, AO862804.
Charles E. Shannon, AO1910193.
Richard L. Shannon, AO2079122.
Aaron Shapiro, AO1284590.
Alvin M. Shapiro, AO811452.
Harry T. Sharkey, Jr., AO777254.
Howard C. Sharkey, AO734005.
Homer W. Sharp, AO2062060.
James R. Sharp, AO1908593.
Joseph Sharp, AO1309853.
Paul E. Sharp, AO2060107.
Paul H. Sharp, AO720022.
Savell L. Sharp, AO424137.
Wayne G. Sharples, AO2084741.
Leslie H. Sharpless, AO781688.
Jack B. Shattuck, AO562031.
Royden R. Shaulis, Jr., AO591053.
James N. Shaver, Jr., AO926654.
Charles W. Shaw, AO750049.
Chester A. Shaw, Jr., AO778272.
Donald N. Shaw, AO888679.
Norman E. Shaw, AO710330.
Norman L. Shaw, AO2071721.
Robert C. Shaw, AO760493.
Stockton B. Shaw, AO429984.
William S. Shaw, AO573337.
Francis S. Shay, AO589985.
Alfred P. Shea, AO650680.
Donald B. Shea, AO836844.
Richard H. Shea, AO680521.
Dean V. Sheaffer, AO1910793.
Kenneth A. Shealy, AO1911684.
Cornelius D. Shearin, AO586395.
Paul F. Sheehan, AO940553.
James D. Sheeley, AO859932.
Robert J. Sheeran, AO959014.
Wilford H. Sheldon, AO684419.
Bernard L. Shelton, AO1638497.
Donald L. Shelton, AO674805.
William T. Shelton, AO764805.
John T. Shemwell, AO813455.
Thomas J. Shepherd, AO580455.
William F. Shepherd, Jr., AO828556.
Harry A. Sheppard, AO804559.
James C. Sheppard, AO668653.
Walter L. Sheppard, Jr., AO584117.
William R. Sheppard, AO822289.
Patrick O. Shere, AO1639638.
Robert E. Sheridan, AO2090162.
Robert H. Sheridan, AO1577841.
Woodrow P. Sheridan, AO566696.
William H. Sherlock, AO2085018.
Charles C. Sherman, AO806154.
Irwin Sherman, AO800279.
Paul Shernisky, AO800410.
Walter J. Sherrell, AO525002.
Alvan C. Sherrill, Jr., AO840530.
Herbert L. Sherrill, AO839153.
LeRoy E. Sherrill, AO764935.
Stanley W. Sherry, AO930616.
Leavitt A. Shertzer, Jr., AO722800.
Omar F. Sherwood, AO2082221.
Daniel C. Shiderly, AO770443.
Charles H. Shiff, Jr., AO812499.
Elden Z. Shimmin, AO727785.
Robert O. Shimp, AO740571.
Thomas W. Shinault, AO837986.
Homer R. Shinn, AO668654.
Lawrence W. Shinnick, AO590654.
Warren C. Shipp, AO666839.
John J. Shippey, AO945970.
Wallace F. Shirey, AO588105.
Gene W. Shockley, AO763755.
William E. Shockley, AO591057.
Gerald C. Shogren, AO2086123.
Melvin D. Sholl, AO711254.
Kenneth L. Shook, AO700555.
Marshall B. Shore, AO730304.
Byron C. Short, AO2095588.
James F. Short, AO570228.
Vere Short, AO931191.
David W. Shoup, AO1908370.
Robert E. Showalter, AO792642.
Gerald R. Shrawder, AO406375.
Frederick F. Shriner, AO758087.
John D. Shriver, AO816166.
Harry L. Shryock, Jr., AO435708.

Irving A. Shulkin, AO573355.
William M. Shultz, AO764478.
Bradford P. Shuman, AO570926.
James H. Shumard, AO830343.
Paul R. Shuttleworth, AO684786.
Thomas F. Siano, AO591248.
Jimmie L. Sibley, AO664459.
John R. Sibrel, AO591240.
Marshall H. Siddall, AO712735.
James L. Sidle, AO670449.
Nicholas Sidovar, AO823998.
Edward G. Siebold, AO659918.
Ervin E. Sieczyneki, AO1908760.
Prentiss R. Sieg, AO762010.
Frederick G. Siegrist, Jr., AO655044.
Lloyd W. Sielbeck, AO837061.
Henry V. Sienkiewicz, AO2083310.
Henry E. Sievers, AO712685.
Donald A. Siewert, AO2061604.
Billy B. Sifford, AO1911881.
Robert V. Sigl, AO2080141.
Paul F. Siglin, AO720374.
Isiah Sigman, AO343613.
Clayton Sillivan, AO591059.
James H. Sills, AO1911611.
Anthony Silva, AO2088096.
John L. Silva, AO657890.
Kenneth L. Simensen, AO743099.
William T. Simmerman, AO630424.
Robert E. Simmon, AO762661.
Charles L. Simmons, Jr., AO665352.
Coy J. Simmons, AO590656.
Don E. Simmons, AO2060177.
James R. Simmons, AO722629.
John M. Simmons, AO816167.
Joseph H. Simmons, AO835335.
Richard R. Simmons, AO588113.
James W. Simms, AO377667.
Harry M. Simon, AO930083.
James S. Simon, Jr., AO720942.
Norbert L. Simon, AO1911368.
Thomas Simone, AO2095312.
Jack Simonton, AO769572.
Charles E. Simpson, AO667111.
Claus R. Simpson, AO669626.
Edgar H. Simpson, AO591060.
Henry E. Simpson, Jr., AO2089314.
James T. Simpson, AO1911052.
Lawrence R. Simpson, AO2072896.
Coy A. Sims, AO2061131.
Dorman W. Sims, AO659921.
Jesse W. Sims, AO871043.
Joe Sims, AO786645.
Alvers I. Singleton, AO861718.
James L. Singleton, AO683076.
Robert M. Sinsabaugh, AO2079127.
Erwin R. Sipes, AO666740.
Oscar A. Sipple, Jr., AO712316.
John G. Siran, AO940247.
George J. Sisley, AO672730.
John D. Sisson, AO706042.
Saul Sitzer, AO944382.
William J. Sitzmann, Jr., AO839420.
Fred W. Sixt, AO667524.
Edgar O. Skaggs, AO826538.
Edward W. Skaggs, Jr., AO1909403.
John E. Skaggs, Jr., AO744782.
Norman K. Skau, AO777257.
Warren E. Skeels, AO770453.
Henry B. Skeen, AO824952.
Eddie L. Skelton, AO2057038.
Charles A. Skidmore, Jr., AO941631.
Thomas N. Skiles, AO1911053.
Dean F. Skinner, AO1910545.
Elton A. Skinner, AO1286550.
William B. Skinner, AO927035.
William E. Skinner, AO1910009.
Paul E. Skogerson, AO733741.
Robert E. Skoog, AO1909222.
Arthur W. Skoyles, AO698294.
Vladimir W. Skuby, AO2060119.
Donald S. Slacum, AO703116.
Ted E. Slanker, AO763372.
Harry E. Slater, AO835949.
James M. Slaughter, AO1695515.
John A. Slaughter, Jr., AO413545.
Thomas J. Slaybaugh, AO793023.
John Sleeper, Jr., AO562064.
Warren C. Sleeper, AO465455.
Dale E. Slessman, AO570285.
Robert P. O. Sletten, AO660923.
Robert F. Slezak, AO759100.
Melvin F. Slicker, AO839278.
Floyd E. Slipp, AO674643.
Frank K. Sloan, AO763374.
Roy O. Sloan, Jr., AO823470.
Walter B. Sloan, AO721871.
George E. Slouka, AO657504.
George H. Slover, AO691593.
Paul F. Slowiak, AO1552590.
Robert S. Sluter, AO2060401.
William Small, AO702972.
Curtis L. Smart, AO2008890.
Robert C. Smart, AO590628.
Roy H. Smart, AO704078.
Renwick W. Smedberg, AO428865.
Joseph F. Smejkal, AO689383.
Richard J. Smigielski, AO1540497.
Orville L. Smiley, AO782389.
Leonard F. Smisson, AO747509.
Alvin E. Smith, AO980776.
Arthur F. Smith, AO766737.
Bernard C. Smith, AO735464.
Bobbie L. Smith, AO1908596.
Boyce M. Smith, AO2072543.
Britton C. Smith, AO1908764.
Cecil L. Smith, AO2095591.
Charles A. Smith, AO1908765.
Charles M. Smith, AO583542.
Charles M. Smith, AO734380.
Charles M. Smith, Jr., AO683159.
Clarence R. Smith, AO525125.
Clyde O. Smith, Jr., AO758651.
Daniel C. Smith, AO946948.
David L. Smith, AO1849123.
Delbert E. Smith, AO861461.
Donald F. Smith, AO1637868.
Donald R. Smith, AO705149.
Emory D. Smith, AO731539.
Eugene G. Smith, AO1908860.
Floyd W. Smith, AO797922.
Forrest L. Smith, AO672471.
Francis E. Smith, AO795844.
Francis P. Smith, Jr., AO747348.
Francis S. Smith, AO474194.
Fred H. Smith, Jr., AO590830.
Frederick L. Smith, AO810053.
Gilbert A. Smith, Jr., AO531543.
Gilbert E. Smith, AO1856859.
Gordon D. Smith, AO776092.
Grant R. Smith, AO727567.
Harding E. Smith, Sr., AO2075715.
Harry F. Smith, AO873093.
Henry L. Smith, AO2012742.
Henry R. Smith, AO613797.
Howard A. Smith, Jr., AO926698.
Jack H. Smith, AO590631.
Jack M. Smith, AO1908598.
Jack R. Smith, AO589986.
James C. Smith, AO743657.
James D. Smith, AO836513.
James E. Smith, AO681197.
James E. Smith, AO744097.
James E. Smith, AO590458.
James F. Smith, AO636159.
James F. Smith, AO1848624.
James S. Smith, AO662188.
James W. Smith, AO675876.
James W. Smith, AO552377.
John B. Smith, AO756340.
John D. Smith, AO2073822.
John J. Smith, AO799662.
John R. Smith, AO775606.
Kendall P. Smith, AO785524.
Kenneth S. Smith, AO705157.
Lambertus P. Smith, AO684128.
Leo E. Smith, AO666606.
Luther E. Smith, Jr., AO3056042.
Milford T. Smith, AO784585.
Morris E. Smith, AO2083360.
Myron G. Smith, AO775609.
Newman T. Smith, AO651895.
Obie A. Smith, AO942566.
Paul A. Smith, AO483966.
Paul E. Smith, AO2060697.
Philip F. Smith, AO668604.
Philip H. Smith, AO1911280.
Richard C. Smith, AO2082691.
Richard E. Smith, AO746660.
Robert Smith, AO834048.
Robert C. Smith, AO424756.
Robert C. Smith, AO733742.
Robert E. Smith, AO685116.
Robert L. Smith, AO678343.
Robert L. Smith, Jr., AO591255.
Robert N. Smith, AO1864167.
Robert W. Smith, AO734619.
Roy W. Smith, AO2099770.
Samuel R. Smith, AO778982.
Samuel R. Smith, AO406487.
Stanley C. Smith, AO761631.
Ted W. Smith, AO2094056.
Theron A. Smith, AO706257.
Thomas C. Smith, AO1908509.
Thomas H. Smith, AO755198.
Todd A. Smith, AO1848627.
Truett B. Smith, AO705636.
William C. Smith, Jr., AO1911328.
William E. Smith, AO808753.
William H. Smith, AO2074609.
William L. Smith, AO1909776.
William R. Smith, AO2056485.
William R. Smith, AO721548.
Winston S. Smith, AO877460.
Harris E. Smithcors, AO667061.
William A. Smitherman, AO701657.
Ray T. Smittle, Jr., AO1909405.
Daniel B. Smoak, AO926354.
Alfred R. Smorto, AO717280.
William Smukler, AO1903036.
Raymond E. Smythe, AO734015.
William E. Snead, AO533032.
John L. Sneed, AO626720.
William C. Sneed, Jr., AO2070393.
Forrest C. Snell, AO691258.
Rollins C. Snelling, AO431586.
Benjamin W. Snider, AO1540516.
William R. Snipes, AO782802.
Bartley A. Snodgrass, AO533213.
Keo L. Snook, AO766745.
Robert R. Snook, AO2038399.
Charles A. Snow, Jr., AO1846787.
Daniel W. Snow, AO390264.
Harry E. Snow, AO1574530.
Harold S. Snow, AO756723.
John E. Snow, AO636354.
Russell H. Snow, AO709181.
Hiram M. Snowden, AO1696701.
Franklyn C. Snyder, AO763761.
John W. Snyder, AO784583.
Rex L. Snyder, AO2083481.
Richard D. Snyder, AO1903148.
Robert W. Snyder, Jr., AO406837.
William S. Snyder, AO1911452.
Raymond A. Sofsky, AO812164.
Frederick V. Sohle, Jr., AO429986.
John M. Soler, AO815609.
Roland X. Solis, AO1911217.
Charles S. Soloski, AO742259.
William R. Soltesz, AO765335.
John R. Soltow, AO636357.
Eugene M. Sommerich, AO750706.
Marcello J. Sommovigo, AO680585.
Clarence H. Sonderman, Jr., AO773501.
Leonard O. Soutiere, AO821794.
George F. Soniak, AO686862.
Eugene P. Sonnenberg, AO1842456.
Gerald Sonnenschein, AO1268640.
Floyd A. Sooy, AO564342.
Seymour S. Sopkin, AO1691835.
Robert F. Sorensen, AO800420.
Maurice E. Sorenson, AO663796.
Donald M. Sorlie, AO713962.
Leo G. Sorrell, AO590834.
Juan B. Sotomayor, AO591066.
George E. Soucie, AO793601.
Ralph J. Soucy, AO791347.
Richard W. Southern, AO590658.
Leonard O. Soutiere, AO621794.
Lloyd K. Soverin, AO676344.
Jesse D. Sowell, AO804750.
Robert G. Sowers, AO1909227.
Robert F. Spaduzzi, AO503312.
DeWitt S. Spain, AO416911.
John H. Spalding, AO2059633.
John R. Spalding, Jr., AO2077966.
Lloyd R. Spangler, AO551726.
Walter D. Spann, AO564350.
Clinton W. Sparks, AO2099716.
Robert D. Sparks, AO1909406.
J. Elwood Spaulding, AO1909228.
John P. Spaulding, AO729257.
Marshall N. Spear, AO876351.

Donald W. Spearel, AO1903150.
Clifford R. Spears, AO2094939.
Roland E. Speckman, AO812323.
Milton N. Spector, AO829771.
Homer H. Speer, Jr., AO1856075.
Henry O. Speicher, AO1550922.
Anthony A. Speier, Jr., AO1683356.
Oscar C. Speight, Jr., AO1910657.
Martin A. Speiser, AO791514.
Edward V. Spellman, AO564357.
Jack L. Spence, AO752952.
Harold S. Spencer, AO2076767.
Robert E. Spencer, AO1044109.
Robert H. Spencer, AO866129.
William R. Spencer, AO465459.
Maurice A. Spenny, AO867960.
Harold H. Sperber, AO737492.
Harry C. Sperry, AO820092.
Laurence S. Spicer, AO719453.
James A. Spiger, AO728759.
Charles A. Spitzbarth, AO680327.
Troy G. Sponaugle, AO2071258.
Wayne M. Spray, AO1586218.
Arnold F. Sprecher, AO1909532.
Raymond W. Sprenger, AO2062897.
Jesse W. Spring, AO631834.
Arthur L. Sprott, AO1865554.
Ralph A. Spurrier, AO719785.
Clayton K. Squier, AO1911687.
Aaron C. Staats, AO669524.
Pearl W. Stacy, AO590835.
Melvin R. Stahl, AO1909409.
Roy D. Stahl, Jr., AO685868.
Milton C. Stahmer, AO2095797.
Raymond M. Staley, AO733484.
Herbert D. Stallings, Jr., AO709844.
James B. Stallings, AO815410.
Arnold E. Stamler, AO697690.
Raymond H. Stan, AO793452.
Russell R. Stanbro, AO2085219.
Floyd E. Standage, AO754299.
Willard H. Stanfield, AO1909777.
Howard L. Stanfill, AO1911370.
Floyd B. Stanford, AO1848692.
Thomas W. Stanford, Jr., AO2079966.
James W. Stanley, AO783856.
Paul P. Stanley, AO438094.
Darrell D. Stansberry, AO2084445.
Wilmer L. Stapel, AO792649.
Robert H. Stapleton, AO702857.
Forrest C. Stark, AO2029239.
Robert T. Starke, AO862101.
William A. Starker, AO429988.
Albert Starnes, AO804756.
Fred W. Starr, AO1309108.
John W. Starr, Jr., AO1299957.
Kenneth O. Starr, AO777263.
Joseph W. Staziak, AO2046464.
Paul P. Stassi, AO558033.
John Stastny, AO2078320.
William E. Statham, AO1909877.
John A. Statz, AO579338.
Raymond W. Staudte, AO745533.
Duncan R. St. Clair II, AO1911776.
Donald E. St. Clare, AO763387.
James A. St. Croix, AO520504.
James K. Steele, AO591069.
John M. Steen, AO776491.
John G. Stefanik, AO2077523.
Randall L. Steffens, AO1909651.
Jack A. Steffensen, AO566812.
Orange D. Steffey, Jr., AO1850064.
Leon W. Steffy, Jr., AO696972.
Harold M. Steifman, AO588895.
Allan T. Stein, AO2058279.
Eldred N. Stein, AO2072544.
Milton Stein, AO434546.
Jacob Steinberg, AO857685.
Floyd D. Steiner, AO689681.
Harold A. Steiner, AO758878.
Frank C. Steinke, AO1858446.
Keith R. Stemen, AO1910548.
Charles D. Stemmler, Jr., AO933776.
Stephen Stepanian, AO2033368.
Joseph W. Stephan, AO839997.
Leonard P. Stephan, AO724569.
James G. Stephanidis, AO559369.
Clarence Stephens, Jr., AO582461.
Edward W. Stephens, AO758097.
Homer Q. Stephens, AO784823.
Jesse B. Stephens, AO798174.
Joel L. Stephens, AO711503.
Howard H. Stephenson, AO810759.
Orlando W. Stephenson, Jr., AO358843.
Ira M. Stepp, AO665951.
Eugene B. Sterling, AO796040.
Raymond N. Sterling, AO687778.
Nathan Stern, AO564397.
Kurt E. Sterner, AO763390.
Bernard H. Stevens, AO936907.
Charles W. Stevens, Jr., AO811461.
Michael Stevens, AO2073422.
Everett E. Stevenson, AO2057827.
Emmett F. Stewart, AO936604.
Ernest Stewart, AO855207.
James C. Stewart, AO397528.
James S. Stewart, AO811790.
Jimmie J. Stewart, AO1910195.
John W. Stewart, AO682735.
Loyal P. Stewart, AO1551527.
Martin V. Stewart, AO700564.
Peter J. Stewart, AO799669.
Rodney T. Stewart, AO743292.
William P. Stewart, AO1171783.
Victor G. Stianchi, AO780756.
Cyril C. Stidd, AO741946.
Omer L. Stikeleather, AO1853643.
Joseph E. Stiles, Jr., AO2066898.
George J. Stinchcomb, AO805871.
Roger W. Stinchcomb, Jr., AO421137.
Robert M. Stine, AO737687.
Donald L. Stinson, AO1903698.
Guren E. Stinson, Jr., AO773860.
Paul Stinson, AO675641.
Robert C. Stippich, AO2099433.
Ernest J. Stirman, AO1911454.
Carl N. Stitzel, AO385941.
James M. Stitzel, AO2252986.
Drew T. St. John, Jr., AO1550704.
Herman St. John, AO2092747.
Henry J. Stocker, AO2009536.
Frank R. Stockton, AO928124.
Lloyd Stockton, AO759734.
John H. Stockwell, AO2096095.
Loren A. Stoddard, AO428873.
Moreau Z. Stoddard, AO660528.
Walter S. Stoker, AO712245.
Clyde B. Stokes, AO687716.
Jone C. Stokes, AO579376.
Quentin C. Stokes, AO717287.
Edwin D. Stoltz, AO1910014.
John J. Stolz, AO802194.
Carl E. Stone, AO1911285.
Charles A. Stone, AO2083320.
John W. Stone, AO705842.
Leonard S. Stone, AO757140.
Odell E. Stone, AO828582.
Robert J. Stone, AO715638.
Robert N. Stone, AO817782.
Wilbur G. Stone, AO842773.
David R. Stopher, AO659406.
Freeman D. Storm, AO800962.
William N. Storms, AO795663.
John T. Storrs, AO664841.
James C. Stotts, AO2046678.
Roy D. Stoufer, AO836515.
Byford H. Stout, AO2234319.
Richard G. Stout, AO529228.
Robert G. Stout, AO2005875.
Robert W. Stout, AO2061532.
Buford E. Stovall, AO782394.
Dorsey L. Stover, AO1999681.
Lawrence P. Stover, AO662107.
George W. Stowbridge, AO2068882.
Raymond A. Strada, AO739527.
Hubert W. Strahan, AO669628.
Danley E. Straight, AO710526.
Sterling J. Strate, AO365855.
Charles W. Strecker, AO843397.
Bunyan D. Strickland, Jr., AO835290.
Joseph M. Strickland, AO724089.
Randall W. Strickland, AO1911516.
Razzie R. Strickland, Jr., AO2086193.
Malcolm M. Stricklin, AO421641.
Claude J. Stringer, AO761775.
John V. Stroble, AO2076772.
Edwin W. Strom, AO740123.
Francis E. Strom, AO742796.
Claris W. Stroman, AO690502.
Warren C. Stromberg, AO1911949.
Kenneth Stromnes, AO878099.
Curtis T. Strong, Jr., AO719860.
James M. Strong II, AO722764.
Roy W. Stroud, AO667207.
Delbert H. Strube, AO1850092.
Jackson R. Stryker, AO442302.
John P. Stuart, AO1903516.
Rex D. Stubblefield, AO590663.
Carl W. Stucki, AO785916.
Joseph W. Studak, Jr., AO936436.
Walter E. Stueck, AO756739.
Martin Stuk, AO564426.
Harry T. Stultz, Jr., AO852399.
Louis C. Stumbaugh, AO530085.
Arnold L. Sturgeon, AO1910660.
Norman H. Stutzer, AO739228.
Joseph C. Styger, AO412417.
Woodland M. Styron, AO789354.
Clarence H. Suber, Jr., AO425577.
Robert J. Subr, AO1909231.
Junior A. Succow, AO2071741.
Alonzo L. Sudduth, AO2083815.
George H. Sudikatus, AO775638.
Leonard R. Sugerman, AO876718.
Donald E. Sullivan, AO796449.
Donald E. Sullivan, AO942003.
George E. Sullivan, AO799676.
Glenn R. Sullivan, AO832511.
James F. Sullivan, AO797094.
James T. Sullivan, AO828588.
John H. Sullivan, AO2065645.
John J. Sullivan, AO2066402.
Leonard V. Sullivan, AO775639.
Mervin R. Sullivan, AO725002.
Michael W. Sullivan, AO426516.
Whitney B. Sullivan, AO692746.
Harry D. Sultzer, Jr., AO1911324.
Deane W. Summers, AO936153.
Thomas L. Summers, AO804065.
Clinton D. Summersill, AO1909533.
Thomas M. Sumner, AO782396.
Andrew T. Sundborg, Jr., AO854379.
James F. Sunderman, AO537095.
Oscar J. Sundstrom, AO1633588.
John W. Surprise, Jr., AO668665.
Maurice D. Surratt, AO748835.
Ira M. Sussky, AO406057.
Philip B. Sussmann, AO862442.
Edward A. Sutherland, AO693905.
Warren G. Sutterfield, AO675297.
Robert A. Sutterly, AO590464.
Philip L. Suttler, Jr., AO975594.
James O. Sutton, Jr., AO590312.
John H. Sutton, AO437049.
John R. Sutton, AO935664.
Robert C. Sutton, Jr., AO754229.
Philip Svetz, AO2033013.
John Svoboda, AO2094942.
Clyde W. Swadley, Jr., AO782397.
Roy W. Swafford, Jr., AO664474.
William G. Swaim, Jr., AO1910802.
Charles A. Swain, AO672898.
James N. Swain, Jr., AO813253.
Charles G. Swan, Jr., AO704327.
Harry C. Swan, AO353964.
Harold L. Swanagon, AO699911.
Rudy L. V. Swanajer, AO932617.
Arthur K. Swanson, AO436799.
Hannis M. Swanson, AO772563.
Thomas R. Swanson, Jr., AO1062557.
Gene R. Swant, AO854289.
Robert T. Swanton, AO936405.
Robert C. Swearingen, AO570461.
Edwin F. Sweeney, AO792652.
Francis J. Sweeney, Jr., AO414128.
Robert M. Sweet, AO1910349.
Robert V. Sweet, AO1167660.
Richard W. Sweetnam, AO827754.
Ned N. Sweitzer, AO570465.
Carol M. Swenson, AO735692.
Irwin C. Swett, AO759524.
Kenneth L. Swift, AO773867.
Lowell J. Swift, AO586944.
Mayland D. Swift, AO559353.
William J. Swigart, AO2061077.
Freddie L. Swihart, AO775641.
Daniel F. Swindall, AO697934.
Elro M. Swindle, Jr., AO719460.
Norris R. Swindle, AO815781.
Harold E. Swinney, AO581270.
Louis R. Switzer, AO826797.
Douglas L. Sworn, AO807077.

Philip M. Sybenga, AO868244.
Eugene Sydlowski, AO716811.
Robert R. Syester, AO835085.
Bernard J. Szczutkowski, Jr., AO711813.
Charles L. Tabor, AO778291.
Angus B. Taff, AO713909.
Harold A. Taff, AO792175.
Thomas E. Tager, AO1012327.
Hugh B. Tagert, AO576451.
Louis L. Talbot, AO1644242.
William L. Talbott, Jr., AO1910015.
Orval H. Tandy, AO2092362.
Alfred A. Tappen, AO1311703.
Francis D. Tappin, AO590840.
Robert I. Tarlin, AO1852240.
Joe F. Tarpley, AO723252.
George P. Tarr, Jr., AO666466.
Harry J. Task, AO734156.
Bill Tarter, AO708119.
Lee B. Tate, AO2064120.
Howard B. Tate, AO719461.
Lawrence H. Tate, AO509712.
Ralph H. Tate, Jr., AO796452.
Otto S. Tauer, AO699472.
Bobby R. Taylor, AO497282.
Clyde M. Taylor, AO818457.
Clyde V. Taylor, AO573544.
Cordy L. Taylor, AO787361.
Dewey F. Taylor, AO934253.
Earl Taylor, AO815782.
Howard C. Taylor, AO783648.
Jack H. Taylor, AO573546.
Jack H. Taylor, AO573547.
James W. Taylor, AO2088820.
James W. Taylor, AO1857575.
John A. Taylor, AO711562.
John C. Taylor, AO2062347.
John L. Taylor, AO1911690.
John M. Taylor, AO814785.
John M. Taylor, AO754688.
Joseph D. Taylor, AO589787.
LeRoy J. Taylor, AO703666.
Odis F. Taylor, AO881483.
Richard J. Taylor, AO434177.
Robert C. Taylor, AO659412.
Robert H. Taylor, AO693244.
Robert N. Taylor, AO564452.
Ryan E. Taylor, AO708960.
Thomas J. Taylor, AO2068141.
William E. Taylor, AO590841.
William J. D. Taylor, AO753567.
William P. Taylor, AO755047.
James J. Teachnor, AO713245.
Raymond A. Tearnan, AO659605.
Charles W. Teater, AO2008936.
Marvin F. Teel, AO787872.
Donald G. Tempel, AO1911779.
Rone B. Tempest, Jr., AO375018.
Richard R. Temple, AO753458.
Floyd A. Templeton, AO2074915.
Albert E. Templin, AO564458.
Kinne S. Terrell, AO760684.
Bobby E. Terry, AO1904382.
Hollis Terry, AO702179.
Maurice W. Terry, AO1691683.
Robert H. Teske, AO396980.
William M. Tesla, AO398533.
Jimmie L. Tetirick, AO570504.
William B. Tetrault, AO2094272.
Elder E. C. Tetzlaff, AO1908454.
Charles E. Thacker, Jr., AO687166.
Jack H. Thacker, AO442082.
Max G. Thaete, AO683611.
Lawrence Thalken, AO2061571.
Barney H. Thames, Jr., AO1698908.
William F. Thaxton, AO570508.
George I. Theis, AO2026732.
Joseph E. Thiaville, AO884212.
Roger R. Thibeau, AO822138.
Edward J. Thielen, AO684912.
William C. Thielen, AO840450.
Urban F. Thinnes, AO788673.
Arthur J. Thomas, Jr., AO1692676.
Charles A. Thomas, AO668288.
Charles P. Thomas, AO717295.
Clarence A. Thomas, AO2100468.
Clarence W. Thomas, AO1903158.
David F. Thomas, AO779667.
David W. Thomas, AO780080.
Edward C. Thomas, AO589268.
Eugene C. Thomas, AO754447.
George H. Thomas, AO2076780.
Glenn V. Thomas, AO840161.
James E. Thomas, Jr., AO699026.
James M. Thomas, AO796913.
John R. Thomas, AO535017.
John W. Thomas, AO582505.
Joseph T. Thomas, AO836038.
Kenneth L. Thomas, AO699475.
Ned Thomas, AO835722.
Richard F. Thomas, AO661893.
Thomas E. Thomas, AO1910808.
Vernon C. Thomas, AO781709.
William H. Thomas, AO2077664.
William W. Thomas, AO800073.
Albert L. Thompson, AO690871.
Arby J. Thompson, AO1903762.
Charles D. Thompson, AO764831.
Clay E. Thompson, Jr., AO434181.
Dennis H. Thompson, AO764509.
Donald P. Thompson, AO829338.
Doyle P. Thompson, AO1903265.
Earl A. Thompson, AO822980.
Earl D. Thompson, AO775200.
Earl L. Thompson, AO1903037.
Fred E. Thompson, Jr., AO728769.
George R. Thompson, Jr., AO718457.
Herbert C. Thompson, AO927774.
Ivan B. Thompson, AO562200.
Jack E. Thompson, AO1907743.
Jack W. Thompson, AO2095319.
James E. Thompson, Jr., AO1903159.
John D. Thompson, AO810767.
Joseph C. Thompson, Jr., AO804898.
Kermit C. Thompson, AO1858218.
Leslie S. Thompson, Jr., AO445493.
Louis B. Thompson, AO740380.
Paul D. Thompson, AO822141.
Richard G. Thompson, AO674018.
Robert C. Thompson, AO872062.
Robert J. Thompson, AO827320.
Robert J. Thompson, AO321691.
Robert W. Thompson, AO867468.
Roderick D. Thompson, AO824780.
Templeton A. Thompson, AO2093579.
Thomas D. Thompson, AO736415.
Warren C. Thompson, AO579461.
William M. Thompson, AO771212.
John G. Thomsen, AO2082163.
Cecil M. Thomson, Jr., AO787212.
David L. Thomson, AO1911831.
John Thomson, AO700821.
Howard A. Thornhill, AO723209.
Billie E. Thornton, AO590468.
Ellison E. Thornton, AO2102069.
John M. Thornton, AO2061308.
Robert O. Thornton, AO1038137.
James M. Thorson, AO687092.
Walter F. Threlkeld, AO826800.
Robert J. Thurber, AO1911055.
George D. Thurman, AO678977.
John A. Thurman, AO872747.
Nelson D. Thurman, Jr., AO713247.
Charles J. Thurn, AO576496.
Harold A. W. Tibbs, AO757052.
Andrew W. Tice, AO792178.
Jack E. Tice, AO1580418.
Otis K. Tichenor, AO2065656.
William E. Tickel, Jr., AO1911519.
Lloyd B. Tidd, AO799099.
August Tieman, AO759774.
Melvin E. Tiemann, AO732784.
Harry J. Tiernan, AO570533.
William C. Tiernan, AO942863.
Eugene F. Tighe, Jr., AO2036998.
Earl M. Tigner, AO763787.
Clayton E. Tillapaugh, AO792079.
Wesley M. Tillis, AO1910016.
Beacher M. Tillman, AO815786.
James E. Tilton, AO824587.
Neel Tilton, AO688483.
Walter B. Timberlake, Jr., AO1849678.
Albert R. Timm, AO564478.
Jack L. Timmins, AO729516.
Kenneth N. Tindle, AO785232.
Edward E. Tinker, AO743543.
Frank Tinney, AO560412.
Jack R. Tinney, AO382727.
Donald L. Tippie, AO1848061.
Don A. Tippin, AO840318.
Frank P. Tipton, AO564479.
Kenneth C. E. Titmus, AO570541.
Walter H. Titorchook, AO782409.
Jay D. Titus, AO731116.
Lowell E. Titus, AO735472.
Robert D. Toburen, AO772899.
Leo O. Todd, AO928996.
Walter S. Todd, AO2099840.
William H. Todd, AO828639.
Dalphy E. Tolbert, AO1108370.
Joseph S. Tolbert, AO820102.
Lester C. Tolbert, AO818243.
Raymond W. Tolbert, AO684578.
Robert A. Tolhurst, AO737497.
James E. Tollefson, AO938921.
Lewis A. Tollman, AO703410.
Hunter Tom, AO872725.
Dante H. Tomasini, AO823737.
Whitney N. Tomlin, AO1912021.
James H. Tomlinson, AO668160.
Kenneth W. Tompkins, AO942356.
Raymond A. Tondreau, AO663334.
Otto L. Toney, Jr., AO2061447.
Frank J. Toolan, AO425873.
Robert H. Toombs, AO803066.
James Toomey, Jr., AO822854.
Thomas A. Toon, Jr., AO760925.
Robert J. Toothman, AO795514.
John M. Torbet, AO1855364.
Rudolph Torres, AO936598.
Victor Torres, AO519301.
William A. Tosh, AO2094132.
George O. Totten, Jr., AO815429.
Austin J. Totterdell, Jr., AO693909.
Robert H. Touby, AO887100.
Thomas J. Townley, AO734034.
Donley P. Townsend, AO699479.
Duane Townsend, AO676828.
Elbert T. Townsend, AO790189.
Jack H. Townsend, AO2077490.
James C. Townsend, AO706088.
Joseph B. Townsend, AO802805.
Loren R. Townsend, AO1911290.
Harold J. Trabue, AO1910664.
Norman D. Trachsel, AO1639738.
John C. Tracey, Jr., AO692977.
Donald J. Tracy, AO719471.
James C. Trammell, AO936400.
Lansford E. Trapp, AO433153.
Robert E. Trapp, AO2034985.
Medford J. Travers, AO1909658.
Robert S. Traylor, AO839430.
William H. Traynor, AO1903418.
Raymond H. Traywick, AO711567.
Laval D. Tremblay, AO825715.
Roger J. Tremblay, AO945133.
Clyde B. Trent, Jr., AO2082901.
Harold T. Trentman, AO2087345.
Joseph B. Tretola, AO1848641.
Harry A. Trevarthen, AO573609.
Ernest J. Trexler, AO426480.
Fred A. Treyz, AO834914.
William J. Trice, AO1691663.
Frank Trickel, AO871855.
William B. Trigg, AO441048.
William J. Trigg, AO365076.
Donald D. Trimble, AO2064457.
Earl L. Trimble, Jr., AO773884.
Robert J. Trimble, Jr., AO576524.
Ernest E. Triplett, AO784616.
Anthony Tripoli, AO566942.
Homer A. Tripp, AO799103.
Howard G. Tripp, AO591076.
Philip H. Tritschler, AO1848996.
Henry Triwush, AO708590.
William A. Trotter, AO927913.
Duane H. Troup, AO777270.
Ralph W. Trousdale, AO725229.
Thaddeus A. Troy, AO673003.
Harrison A. Truck, AO580236.
Holger R. Trukken, AO1649651.
Kenneth M. Trumble, AO590673.
George D. Trusty, AO782658.
William H. Truxal, AO579502.
Nick J. Tsacrios, AO679959.
Bruno F. Tschannen, AO371603.
Vassilias P. Tsufis, AO1911694.
Leo W. Tubay, AO1909946.
Elmer L. Tuck, AO560423.
George R. Tuck, AO552180.
John R. Tuck, AO826803.
Sterling L. Tuck, AO677615.
Carl E. Tucker, AO564504.

Kiefer G. Tucker, Jr., AO1909423.
Leland C. Tucker, AO433935.
Riggs M. Tucker, AO750893.
Clifton C. Tulloh, AO2079532.
John B. Tullos, Jr., AO1696899.
Dermot M. Tully, AO794592.
George H. Tully, AO942046.
Robert J. Tully, AO694981.
David A. Tunno, AO1848279.
Wilfred N. Turcotte, AO659419.
Albert N. Turner, AO1856898.
Arthur R. Turner, AO578627.
Charles D. Turner, AO874488.
Claude W. Turner, AO781113.
Gordon L. Turner, AO2068801.
John L. Turner, AO1908387.
John M. Turner, AO428985.
Joseph M. Turner, AO438227.
Leonard P. Turner, AO807110.
Richard P. Turner, AO677166.
Sidney F. Turner, AO781714.
Willard J. Turner, AO777871.
William J. Turner, AO660422.
William L. Turner, AO725231.
William S. Turner, AO719803.
Charles E. Turnipseed, AO2033576.
Veto C. Turrin, AO876611.
Thomas J. Tutko, AO1904956.
John J. Tutsock, AO566954.
Harold E. Tuttle, AO828177.
Rob N. Tuttle, AO1911619.
Robert J. Tuttle, AO2074876.
William J. Tuxworth, AO722768.
Duane C. Tway, AO437388.
Robert M. Twiford, AO580276.
Donald J. Twombly, AO827324.
Thomas L. Twyford, AO673437.
Alfred W. Tyler, AO432421.
Joseph J. Tyler, AO839432.
Ralph L. Tyler, AO1856458.
Russell R. Tyler, AO680545.
Guy Tyree, AO2090713.
Earle E. Tyson, AO755203.
Earl W. Udick, AO434575.
Lawrence F. Uebel, AO753463.
Raymond J. Uhrich, AO1696898.
Walter E. Ulbricht, AO685894.
Charles E. Ulirey, AO720414.
Alexander Ulreich, Jr., AO825835.
Paul T. Ulrich, AO436423.
William A. Ulrich, AO2068498.
Richard L. Umble, AO576556.
Rudolph Umminger, AO1910200.
Robert C. Umphress, AO2093943.
Harold W. Underhill, Jr., AO386760.
William C. Unversagt, AO930374.
Alvis G. Upchurch, AO1908604.
Wallace C. Upson, AO677168.
John S. Urankar, AO717303.
Norman Urban, AO2090987.
Samuel B. Urton, AO2093255.
Joe C. Vaden, AO808324.
Woodrow W. Vaden, AO837230.
Robert C. Vadnais, AO717152.
Charles N. Valentine, AO784360.
George B. Valentine, AO867792.
Gerald W. Valentine, AO582310.
Arthur W. Vanaman, Jr., AO590217.
James F. Van Ausdal, AO724097.
Jacob J. Van Berkum, AO410571.
Irving A. Van Brunt, AO856846.
Peter B. Van Brussel, Jr., AO1909659.
George L. Van Buskirk, AO529700.
Cyrus B. Vance, AO417723.
John G. Vance, AO701033.
Oliver W. Vance, Jr., AO1910418.
Arthur T. Van Cura, AO754448.
Gerrit R. Vande Lune, AO776451.
Vivian S. Van Derhei, AO2057056.
Paul C. Vanderhoek, AO735126.
Everett B. Vandiver, AO707565.
George R. Van Dyke, AO683350.
Gerald J. Vanek, AO1644864.
James S. Van Epps, AO760687.
Amos E. Van Fleet, AO2063117.
Harold C. Van Hise, Jr., AO1863527.
Ben A. Van Horn, AO754391.
Philip J. Van Houten, AO523515.
Henry Van Kesteren, AO806554.
David F. Van Matre, AO774826.
Vern F. Van Noppen, AO1909241.
Neil D. Van Reenen, AO1903166.
John F. Van Vleck, AO768321.
Franklin D. Van Wart, AO870702.
Joseph J. Vanya, AO1649410.
Glen V. Van Zee, AO720625.
John M. Vargo, AO2085052.
Ben H. Varner, AO806752.
Thomas S. Varney, AO744807.
Harry B. Vaughan, AO694201.
Harry R. Vautherot, AO947639.
Warren E. Veale, AO809775.
Edward P. Veiluva, AO682924.
Theodore M. Velde, AO413678.
Merwin G. Velders, AO562251.
Samuel W. Venable, AO692529.
Armand D. Venezia, AO706988.
George G. Ven John, AO681941.
Ben L. Verhusen, AO564531.
Sheldon L. Vernon, AO688139.
Russell A. Ver Nooy, AO824295.
Russell A. Verploegh, AO741638.
Boss E. Vest, AO801921.
Clifford L. Vest, AO1004254.
Alan R. Vette, AO842102.
Emerson W. Vetter, AO864372.
James C. Via, AO776150.
Carl R. Vice, AO407384.
A. J. Vickers, AO2092844.
David W. Victor, AO432684.
Leonard P. Vik, AO835848.
Gordon W. Vikan, AO676836.
Victor J. Villone, AO857763.
John H. Vinny, Jr., AO2099274.
John H. Vincent, AO689415.
William H. Viney, AO734578.
Theodore C. Vining, AO860972.
Lunsford W. Vinson, Jr., AO2086521.
Herman W. Visscher, AO496093.
Robert D. Vodicka, AO789582.
David A. Vogel, AO942267.
Richard A. Vogel, AO1903038.
David S. Vogels, Jr., AO2068500.
John J. Dogl, AO827550.
George W. Vogle, AO686702.
William J. Vogt, AO888890.
Clifford J. Voith, AO724098.
Mele Vojvodich, Jr., AO1911218.
James P. Volk, AO1909425.
John C. Volz, AO429150.
Howard J. Von Elling, AO584171.
Paul R. Von Ins, AO737506.
Robert A. Von Kaenel, AO1910670.
William G. Von Platen, AO767920.
Walter G. Vornbrock, Jr., AO560440.
Howard A. Vosper, AO556896.
John B. Voss, AO843165.
William R. Voss, AO582297.
Virgil L. Votaw, AO733750.
George R. Vovrick, AO2068804.
Robert L. Voyles, AO1908870.
Frank S. Vrablick, AO2078337.
Robert C. Vrastil, AO2062913.
Robert A. Vrilakas, AO740604.
Arthur T. Waaland, AO709031.
George Wacker, AO760414.
Joseph K. Waddell, Jr., AO2067431.
Irving L. Wadlington, AO431163.
Robert E. Wadsworth, AO1909428.
Harold H. Waehler, AO2083239.
Raymond R. Wagener, AO872491.
Horace Q. Waggoner, AO694102.
James W. Waggoner, AO564543.
William Waggy, Jr., AO865680.
Isaac C. Wagner, AO727813.
Michael Wagner, AO1635453.
Raymond J. Wagner, AO590946.
Arthur E. Wagoner, AO798704.
Thomas W. Wahab, AO513129.
Charles N. Wahl, AO2067043.
Eugene A. Wahl, AO421961.
John K. Waite, AO734766.
Clifford H. Wakefield, AO588909.
William R. J. Wakefield, Jr., AO786667.
Bertram E. Wakeley, AO791029.
Oliver M. Walcott, AO707440.
Joseph P. Walden, AO758662.
Edward L. Waldon, AO810839.
Clyde E. Waldron, AO1852995.
Elmer G. Wale, AO668679.
Colin J. Walker, AO795155.
Eldon C. Walker, AO886736.
Everett G. Walker, AO704250.
Henry M. C. Walker, Jr., AO1909662.
Herbert L. Walker, Jr., AO1907735.
Howard E. Walker, AO430683.
Hugh E. Walker, AO2077524.
Hugh R. Walker, AO727686.
Ira E. Walker, AO2101855.
James D. Walker, AO585875.
Joe M. Walker, AO1999387.
Joel W. Walker, AO1848591.
John A. Walker, Jr., AO1046678.
John E. Walker, AO1995717.
Leonard N. Walker, AO823206.
Lyle H. Walker, AO733752.
Ralph E. Walker, AO573677.
Robert H. Walker, AO842856.
Robert S. Walker, Jr., AO660844.
Van S. Walker, AO795105.
William L. Walker, AO407825.
Edward J. Wall, AO591332.
Frank A. Wall, AO580492.
James B. Wall, AO673839.
Dorsey C. Wallace, AO2089153.
Harold W. Wallace, Jr., AO945320.
Ingvar A. Wallace, AO2033177.
John F. Wallace, AO1860260.
John S. Wallace, AO448652.
Dock O. Waller, Jr., AO437291.
Jack T. Waller, AO2081797.
Jay R. Waller, AO947178.
Harry W. Wallick, AO810778.
George S. Wallingford, AO2089304.
Roy S. Walser, AO750778.
Charles J. Walsh, AO837579.
William J. Walsh, AO802497.
Charles L. Walters, AO761218.
Frederick B. Walters, AO2033092.
Hiram A. Walters, AO2074271.
LeRoy Walters, AO1824105.
Robert E. Walters, AO799899.
Joseph D. Walther, AO2069400.
Robert W. Walton, AO767922.
Raymond D. Wampler, AO861606.
Roy W. Wampler, AO1909245.
Howard H. Wandel, AO1850746.
Sherman P. Wants, AO863470.
Dale B. Ward, AO435917.
David M. Ward, AO779026.
Sidney J. Ward, Jr., AO2074273.
William L. Ward, AO804082.
Arthur F. Warden, AO729683.
Murray L. Warden, AO1703595.
Stacy B. Warden, AO672514.
Gordon F. Ware, AO784252.
Joseph C. Ware, Jr., AO426708.
Reuben M. Ware, AO765170.
Samuel D. Wareham, Jr., AO694517.
Joel T. Wareing, AO676186.
J. D. Warlick, AO2038403.
James P. Warndorf, AO427822.
Leo A. Warneck, AO576620.
George E. Warner, AO523126.
James B. Warner, AO677922.
Willis L. Warner, AO517805.
Frank H. Warren, AO758664.
George M. Warren, AO2099055.
John J. Warren, AO2033240.
Harry T. Warwick, AO704778.
Elmer F. Wasche, AO2080246.
Douzer E. Washmon, AO685899.
Raymond Waski, AO2057474.
Harold B. Wasserman, AO2096245.
William R. Wassner, AO860018.
Jack W. Waters, AO5010?2.
Charles T. Watkins, Jr., AO782075.
Horace M. Watkins, AO795528.
James H. Watkins, AO524508.
James R. Watkins, AO666387.
James R. Watkins, AO590170.
Ray M. Watkins, AO685745.
William L. Watkins, AO822573.
Elbert E. Watson, AO589636.
Robert F. Watson, AO775669.
Thomas J. Watson, AO707570.
Wayne B. Watson, AO669547.
Donald D. Watt, AO836864.
Blanchard K. Watts, AO661255.
James A. Watts, AO742220.
John H. Watts, AO747928.
Wayland M. Watts, Jr., AO2070569.
Raymond J. Wautelet, AO800792.

Eugene L. Waxman, AO1591515.
Thomas Z. Way, AO947400.
Eugene C. Wayman, AO729391.
Alvin D. Weaver, AO573710.
Arthur D. Weaver, AO784366.
Horace A. Weaver, AO2095800.
Richard E. Weaver, AO744150.
Robert T. Weaver, AO826327.
Wilton G. Weaver, AO590472.
George F. Weber, AO936369.
Howard S. Weber, Jr., AO1857153.
Joseph H. Weber, AO680555.
Louis W. Weber, AO705652.
Richard G. Weber, AO691198.
Marcell E. Webb, AO820379.
Francis L. Webre, AO1559634.
Jack A. Webster, AO666477.
Kenneth D. Webster, AO2071411.
Jerome E. Wechter, AO1911623.
George F. Weddell, AO570696.
Freeman J. Weedman, AO2070570.
Donald C. Weeks, AO579602.
James L. Weeks, AO570698.
Joseph H. Weeks, AO787880.
Thomas J. Weeks, Jr., AO774381.
Kenneth B. Wegener, AO815026.
Roy A. Wegener, AO674494.
Willis B. Wegener, AO815356.
George W. Wegman, AO694202.
Dewey N. Weiford, Jr., AO829353.
George R. Weinbrenner, AO375016.
Paul G. Weingand, AO703855.
Urban J. Weinheimer, AO1909950.
Melvin Weinstein, AO564591.
Arthur J. W. Weir, Jr., AO520769.
Richard H. Weir, AO807369.
Thomas D. Weir, Jr., AO2060625.
Irwin B. Weisbarth, AO799289.
Gerald P. Weisman, AO748295.
Walter L. Weitner, AO660601.
Fred S. Welch, Jr., AO721563.
Gordon M. Welch, AO688223.
James P. Welch, AO581336.
Stanley H. Welch, AO800620.
Wayne K. Weld, AO736739.
Willis R. Weld, AO753466.
Robert W. Welles, AO796744.
Cecil M. Wells, AO2071763.
Eugene O. Wells, AO2087246.
Harold E. Wells, AO834230.
Herman D. Wells, AO841636.
Howard W. Wells, AO665476.
Norman M. Wells, Jr., AO754256.
Walter Wells, AO579626.
William D. Wells, AO1903170.
William G. Wells, Jr., AO875496.
Francis W. Welsh, AO877194.
Harold G. Wendell, AO840173.
Warren W. Wendt, AO1847286.
Frank J. Wentz, Jr., AO886640.
Robert F. Wenrick, AO796248.
LeRoy A. Wenstrom, AO683361.
John D. Werlich, AO423975.
Paul D. Werner, AO746491.
Arthur E. Wesighan, AO1555153.
Carl H. Wessel, AO1910673.
John A. Wessel, AO731712.
Donald V. West, AO763434.
LeRoy West, AO786672.
James C. Westall, Jr., AO799691.
Leslie J. Westberg, AO696985.
Luther J. Westbrook, AO465466.
Marvin J. Westerfield, AO2084486.
Clarence R. Westfall, AO537225.
Edward F. Westlake, Jr., AO562326.
Robert L. Weston, AO765370.
Robert D. Westover, AO833644.
Allen P. Wetmore, AO1911891.
Charles F. Weydert, AO948325.
Carl E. Weyland, AO865734.
John E. Wezowics, AO747534.
Cecil H. Whaley, AO726531.
Douglas E. Whatley, AO2063900.
Andy C. Wheatley, AO1638772.
Carl R. Wheaton, AO1903323.
Harry P. Wheaton, Jr., AO884156.
Jack W. Wheeler, AO697463.
Richard K. Wheeler, AO2061092.
Henry L. Wheelhouse, AO523125.
Thomas A. Whelan, AO1822755.
Charles P. Whistler, AO665490.
Raymond N. Whitaker, AO815795.
Alton E. White, AO465467.
Charles J. White, AO858027.
David B. White, AO720678.
Dean R. White, AO2087249.
Donald S. White, AO1903172.
Douglas N. White, AO765371.
Jack E. White, AO838715.
James M. White, AO743879.
Richard J. White, AO2063734.
Robert H. White, AO1852953.
Thomas J. White, AO436550.
Thomas S. White, AO564612.
Walter A. White, AO752163.
William B. White, AO747536.
Zane W. White, AO936601.
Asa S. Whitehead, AO829906.
John L. Whitehead, Jr., AO838035.
Trusty M. Whitehead, AO827562.
Wendell H. Whitehouse, AO696826.
Charles L. Whitenack, Jr., AO530251.
John J. Whiteside, AO712967.
Bob L. Whitfield, AO2068507.
John H. Whiting, AO820620.
George A. Whitley, AO719188.
John L. Whitlock, Jr., AO562344.
Elliott H. Whitman, AO2085067.
Merrill J. Whitman, AO856567.
Charles E. Whitten, AO815081.
Oscar D. Whitten, AO757351.
Charles J. Whittenberg, AO742808.
Edward A. Wick, AO737510.
Irving B. Wicker, Jr., AO591282.
Donald W. Wickler, AO713261.
Russel A. Wickman, AO757352.
Robert K. Widdicombe, Jr., AO1182034.
Walter F. Widman, AO812025.
Theodore L. Wiebold, AO1910420.
Carl J. Wiederanders, AO881070.
Kenneth R. Wiederhold, AO2092606.
Joseph A. Wientjes, AO582592.
Clifford A. Wiggers, AO683621.
Edsel D. Wiggins, AO1903173.
William D. Wight, AO944636.
Erskine Wigley, AO2083336.
Thomas A. Wilber, AO591449.
Andrew R. Wilcox, AO1909632.
Floyd J. Wilcox, AO770054.
Paul A. Wilcox, AO1911698.
Samuel E. Wilcox, AO2061095.
Lawrence D. Wilde, Jr., AO776169.
Thomas L. Wilder, AO867223.
Arthur Wiles, Jr., AO2089001.
Daniel R. Wiley, AO2032346.
Thomas J. Wiley, Jr., AO738525.
Harold D. Wilker, AO717548.
Harry T. Wilkes, AO557549.
Perry R. Wilkes, Jr., AO867030.
Alfred J. Wilkins, AO787576.
Max P. Wilkins, AO573759.
Carl E. Wilkinson, AO1699254.
Stanley Wilkinson, Jr., AO822873.
Warren D. Wilkinson, AO1692764.
William A. Wilkinson, AO933972.
Allen F. Will, AO582595.
Leon L. Willahan, AO2091625.
Robert H. Willard, AO861118.
Kenneth W. Willes, AO707589.
Charles E. Williams, Jr., AO899597.
Charles H. Williams, AO709879.
Charles J. Williams, AO732692.
Clyde B. Williams, AO940069.
Clyde W. Williams, AO801231.
David O. Williams, Jr., AO2070412.
Dean H. Williams, Jr., AO793212.
Edward J. Williams, AO591285.
Freeman J. Williams, AO1908786.
Harley R. Williams, AO2069411.
Harry E. Williams, AO524482.
Harry J. Williams, AO763439.
James A. Williams, AO1909113.
James M. Williams, AO2218502.
Jasper P. Williams, AO784819.
Joe J. Williams, Jr., AO675651.
John A. Williams, Jr., AO2205158.
John B. Williams, AO1643456.
Julian T. Williams, AO948092.
Leonard E. Williams, AO682930.
LeRoy A. Williams, AO857797.
Louis B. Williams, Jr., AO704640.
Nathan W. Williams, AO787741.
Norman F. Williams, AO803327.
Perry O. Williams, AO591090.
Richard M. Williams, AO412415.
Robert L. Williams, AO687792.
Russell A. Williams, AO567102.
Walter J. Williams, AO674918.
Warren H. Williams, AO680570.
William A. Williams, Jr., AO664933.
William F. Williams, AO743554.
Boyd D. Williamson, AO1911892.
Clifford B. Williamson, AO365626.
James M. Williamson, AO787873.
John P. Williamson, Jr., AO1111985.
Lynwood M. Williamson, AO573776.
William R. Williamson, AO1702906.
James F. Williford, AO1912046.
Thomas P. Willing, AO714807.
Arthur P. Willingham, AO564645.
J. Vern Willis, AO443031.
Richard G. Willis, AO791656.
Alton Willms, AO2059430.
David J. Willoughby, AO2095250.
Lynn R. Wills, AO820868.
Richard E. Willsie, AO737918.
Dean W. Willson, AO781732.
Scott E. Willson, AO2092976.
James W. Wilman, AO827112.
Joe C. Wilmeth, AO690877.
Charles R. Wilson, AO813629.
David S. Wilson, AO1296957.
Dugald E. Wilson, Jr., AO813630.
Frank E. Wilson, AO2058098.
Frederick L. Wilson, AO834079.
George S. Wilson, AO662518.
Henry L. Wilson, AO801713.
Jack E. Wilson, AO818259.
John H. Wilson, AO708232.
Keith G. Wilson, AO728144.
Lowell D. Wilson, AO773928.
Marion P. Wilson, AO759673.
Ray H. Wilson, AO935666.
Robert M. Wilson, AO449612.
Rudolph A. Wilson, AO1910315.
Samuel G. Wilson, AO854389.
Thomas E. Wilson, AO567116.
Thomas H. Wilson, Jr., AO573791.
Wallace E. S. Wilson, AO1858957.
William C. Wilson, Jr., AO709212.
William M. Wilson, AO2077996.
LeRoy M. Wilsted, AO749949.
Harold K. Wimberley, AO834235.
Stanley K. Winchester, AO1582273.
Robert A. Windoffer, AO700349.
Perry P. Winemiller, AO401281.
Robert L. Wing, AO667625.
Ray D. Wingert, AO387035.
Thomas G. Wininger, AO704790.
Albert P. Winkleman, AO669825.
Julius S. Winkler, AO1848699.
Ralph E. Winkler, AO1863970.
David W. Winn, AO672543.
George C. Winn, AO591092.
Alan M. Winner, AO794085.
John M. Winskie, AO1911330.
Robert C. Winslow, AO684591.
William E. Winsor, AO666231.
William J. Winsor, AO762062.
Bertram D. Winston, AO1852848.
Wesley A. Winston, AO870597.
Cleo V. Winter, AO1683568.
Frank Winter, AO830601.
James H. Winterhalter, AO869764.
Earl E. Winters, AO729287.
John M. Winters, AO1855107.
Lloyd E. Wintersole, AO936167.
James W. Wirth, AO749660.
Charles W. Wise, AO1848811.
Harold C. Wise, AO1894398.
Irven D. Wise, AO942917.
John Q. Wise, AO1909440.
Lowell L. Wiseman, AO782090.
Clifton E. Wiswall, AO2033652.
Francis M. Witchey, AO937548.
Clarence D. Witt, AO560488.
Gerald D. Witt, AO559450.
Harry A. Witt, AO2044607.
James R. Witt, AO725830.
Glennon H. Wittbrodt, AO754266.
Henry F. Wittneben, AO1806924.
Bruce D. Witwer, AO876151.
Robert B. Witzel, AO795550.

Arden C. Wiseman, AO2038871.
Emanuel H. Woff, AO419920.
Charles B. Woford, AO720656.
Casimir A. Wojnar, AO2093099.
David J. Wolbrette, AO513121.
Carlton J. Wolf, AO688529.
Edgar P. Wolf, AO686299.
Frederick C. Wolf, AO580314.
Horace G. Wolf, AO813631.
Kenneth Wolf, AO1348902.
Ray D. Wolf, AO435597.
Robert E. Wolf, AO1321857.
Ernest R. Wolfe, AO801972.
Richard B. Wolfersperger, AO2067410.
William H. Wolfgong, Jr., AO941674.
Clarence E. Wolgemuth, AO760425.
Charles T. Wolter, AO783810.
James Womack, AO841017.
Charles J. B. Wood, AO2082926.
Crispin M. Wood, AO662215.
David E. Wood, AO628619.
Douglas R. Wood, AO711819.
George D. Wood, AO854530.
Horace E. Wood, AO864019.
Lionel E. Wood, AO740323.
Randall C. Wood, AO836538.
Richard A. Wood, AO711292.
Robert S. Wood, AO840178.
Rodney J. Wood, AO929450.
Sam H. Wood, AO888804.
William L. Wood, Jr., AO438060.
William M. Wood, AO749171.
William R. Wood, AO494777.
William S. Wood, AO834330.
James T. Woodall, Jr., AO734660.
Robert F. Woodall, Jr., AO826820.
Orville W. Woodland, AO2061099.
John C. Woodley, AO879436.
James B. Woodruff, AO868689.
William C. Woodrum, AO729288.
Charles D. Woods, AO1318115.
Gilbert N. Woods, AO856961.
Harold B. Woods, AO705199.
Leo T. Woods, AO673662.
William E. Woodside, AO803099.
Fred P. Woodson, AO564868.
Richard C. Woodson, AO1904479.
John C. Woodward II, AO2066427.
Robert A. Woodward, AO545829.
John J. Woodyard, AO841654.
Steven G. Wool, AO1910816.
Albert F. Wooten, AO765867.
Clyde W. Wooten, AO363603.
Victor G. Work, AO783879.
Clarence H. Worley, AO732245.
Delmar A. Worms, AO716567.
Robert L. Worrall, AO814619.
William C. Worrell, AO1909444.
Willis R. Worth, AO1578067.
Everett M. Worthington, AO727090.
Lorne R. Worthy, AO2076810.
Henry M. Wozniak, AO2088661.
Donald B. Wren, AO738326.
DeVere M. Wright, AO789633.
Edward C. Wright, AO804543.
Harold B. Wright, AO564678.
Jerome D. Wright, AO661686.
John E. Wright, AO728147.
Joseph Wright, AO932697.
Louis A. Wright, AO431698.
Robert F. Wright, Jr., AO802636.
Robert W. Wright, AO808210.
Thomas A. Wright, AO2057487.
William E. Wright, AO873387.
Jack H. Wrinkle, AO788294.
Earl G. Wulff, Jr., AO728799.
John H. Wunderlich, AO1799926.
Frank P. Wurschinger, AO2078745.
George F. Wurzbacher, AO495450.
J. R. Wyatt, AO573836.
Warren G. Wycoff, AO766823.
Rankin D. Wyman, AO2102040.
Joseph A. Wynecoop, AO589044.
Norris S. Wynne, AO2094771.
Thomas E. Wynne, AO567140.
Charles R. Wyrosdick, AO541667.
Curtis C. Wyrtzen, Jr., AO1906396.
Philip V. Yaggy, AO567145.
Joseph G. Yahle, AO834706.
Sidney M. Yahn, AO1910129.
Wallace D. Yancey, AO708990.
John F. Yarbrough, Jr., AO1287606.
Bernard J. Yates, AO691096.
Cale B. Yates, Jr., AO2065207.
Charles E. Yates, Jr., AO1998929.
Murray M. Yates, AO777283.
Robert H. Yaw, AO2060753.
James F. Yealy, AO821584.
Donald R. Yeaman, AO771864.
Francis A. Yeandel, AO1115860.
Robert K. Yeck, AO666745.
David J. Yedlicka, AO1851773.
William E. Yinger, AO818793.
Francis Yohannan, AO1683407.
Verus A. Yon, AO2091502.
Leonard C. Yonaites, AO854236.
George Yoo, Jr., AO801932.
Charles J. York, AO806574.
Garland A. York, AO754573.
John K. York, AO869036.
Kenneth T. York, AO1848914.
Robert J. York, AO1639845.
Warren C. Yost, AO1553582.
William T. Yost, AO808639.
Arthur P. Young, AO883090.
Berry H. Young, Jr., AO715915.
Bruce O. Young, AO2078325.
Charles A. Young, AO799474.
Charles G. Young, Jr., AO864438.
Douglas J. Young, AO1911625.
Edward P. Young, AO776183.
Elbert D. Young, Jr., AO738327.
Elton C. Young, AO525124.
Elton F. Young, Jr., AO437060.
Frank J. Young, AO562996.
George W. Young, AO737926.
Harold A. Young, AO772243.
Jack D. Young, AO713932.
James A. Young, AO1340336.
Kendall S. Young, AO410664.
Lawrence J. Young, AO621586.
LeRoy A. Young, AO2062933.
Marvin Young, AO785229.
Nolan F. Young, AO864017.
Raymond D. Young, AO771206.
Robert E. Young, Jr., AO2056557.
Samuel R. Young, AO351868.
Wallace W. Young, AO778649.
William E. Young, AO759334.
William R. Young, AO570894.
Winton S. Youngblood, AO426712.
Dale J. Younger, AO2051763.
Raymond C. Younger, AO720659.
Jack M. Youngs, AO2062931.
William E. Younk, AO770389.
Robert D. Yunag, AO2099724.
George A. Zahn, AO374325.
Alexander J. Zalewski, AO631852.
Louis W. Zanolli, AO2075771.
Leonard E. Zapinski, AO753480.
John Zarlengo, AO433954.
Laurence A. Zastrow, AO1903466.
Orrin G. Zebarth, AO806197.
Francis H. C. Zeck, AO516842.
Richard J. Zehler, AO784654.
John M. Zemitis, AO573866.
John F. P. Zengel, AO429149.
Bernie E. Zettl, AO822989.
Karl H. Zickrick, Jr., AO787377.
Harry D. Ziegler, AO722200.
Richard L. Zielke, AO689638.
Sam Ziff, AO564699.
Adrian K. Zigrang, AO579755.
Arnold E. Zimmer, AO791782.
Charles E. Zimmer, AO814622.
Norbert A. Zimmer, AO1911383.
Clarence Zimmerman, AO1864160.
Henry W. Zimmerman, AO786139.
Richard C. Zimmerman, AO1353602.
William F. Zimmerman, AO811524.
Clarence W. Zinkgraf, AO2017939.
Frank L. Zirilli, AO564703.
Edward F. Zmuda, AO943141.
Daniel J. Zoerb, AO798309.
Michael Zop, AO567166.
Sam Zorich, AO726541.
John C. Zotz, AO799536.
Joseph E. Zurro, AO1848092.
William J. Zwartjes, AO679454.

*To be first lieutenants*

Doyce L. Aaron, AO2239616.
Alvin D. Aaronson, AO2216324.
Richard W. Abbott, AO3023379.
John T. Abell, AO2206257.
Robert L. Abernathy, AO2222021.
Kenneth L. Ablett, AO2226783.
Curtis E. Ackerlind, Jr., AO1861318.
Virgil F. Ackfeld, AO2222583.
Aaron Adams, AO2226420.
Bob R. Adams, AO2228985.
Coy G. Adams, AO2233722.
Glenn D. Adams, AO2215297.
Harry C. Adams, AO3009211.
Jarvis M. Adams III, AO3006092.
Jimmie R. Adams, AO3024600.
John A. Adams, AO3033992.
Richard E. Adams, AO2204815.
Robert L. Adams, AO3011514.
James M. Addison, AO3021431.
Henry S. Addor, AO1847384.
Howard A. Agosta, AO2217412.
Richard H. Ailes, AO834339.
Wilbur R. Ainslie, AO1854654.
Harry R. Akers, Jr., AO3007325.
James P. Albritton, AO2246486.
Troy G. Alcorn, AO2245433.
Kenneth W. Alderman, AO2229105.
Billie G. Aldridge, AO2251159.
Frank G. Alexander, AO3021012.
James A. Alford, AO3004524.
Uriel B. Alford, Jr., AO2225902.
Vincent F. Alisouskas, AO3006458.
Philip R. Alker, AO2206006.
Gordon D. Alldredge, AO3024565.
Alvin Allen, AO827348.
Lawrence C. Allen, Jr., AO3035074.
Marion S. Allen, AO2222366.
Preston H. Allen, AO1864413.
Robert K. Allen, AO2217543.
Wayne M. Allen, AO1856110.
John M. Allison, AO2217223.
William B. Allison, AO2222606.
Guy M. Allphin, AO2063949.
Perry L. Allred, Jr., AO2219712.
Lemoyne E. Almquist, AO820695.
William R. Altimus, AO2224317.
Robert H. Ameling, AO2205356.
James L. Amerine, AO2226022.
Paul W. Amodt, AO2091637.
Floyd A. Amundson, AO2225734.
Roger E. Andersen, AO2221947.
Stanley A. Andersen, AO3024867.
Edwin P. Anderson, Jr., AO1860726.
George B. Anderson, AO2226978.
Hugh P. Anderson, AO3006494.
James S. Anderson, AO1853337.
James T. Anderson, AO2216154.
Marlan G. Anderson, AO3021152.
Phillip E. Anderson, AO3005401.
Raymond E. Anderson, AO2225442.
Richard L. Anderson, AO2249710.
Robert D. Anderson, AO2223601.
Robert W. Anderson, AO1861409.
William D. Anderson, AO2207871.
William G. Anderson, Jr., AO2205242.
Frank R. Anderton, Jr., AO2223813.
Donald L. Andres, AO2215480.
Nils C. Andresen, AO2229665.
John J. Andrews, AO3009705.
Ivan D. Appleby, AO3004318.
Francis L. Applegate, AO1865429.
Henry Arbeeny, AO3025346.
Kern A. Archer, AO2226785.
Robert G. Archibald, AO2207259.
Bernard Ardisana, AO1904548.
James E. Arendell, AO823238.
David Arey, AO2215766.
Owen R. Armbruster, AO2216207.
Claude E. Armstead, AO3019976.
Donald C. Armstrong, Jr., AO2227806.
Dwight F. Armstrong, AO1853076.
Elmer L. Armstrong, AO2227565.
Larry D. Armstrong, AO3004989.
Robert F. Arndt, AO2226236.
Ned D. Arnold, AO2251698.
William J. Arrowood, AO1850521.
Harold F. Arthur, AO2207305.
Raymond W. Arthurs, AO3023572.
Wolf D. Ascher, AO3007148.
Rolland S. Ash, AO2227481.

Arthur N. Askew, AO2216589.
Donald R. Askew, AO2247474.
William L. Askew, AO2222994.
Robert Assaneikis, AO2352941.
Sam E. Asseff, AO3019102.
Samuel Athens, AO2216261.
Harold C. Atkinson, AO2002489.
Robert M. Atkinson, AO2239717.
Alfred L. Atwell, AO2223118.
Andre AuBuchon, AO3016818.
Eugene G. Auen, AO2247782.
John C. Augsburger, Jr., AO2223697.
Charles A. Augustine, AO2218293.
Arnold D. Austin, AO2065226.
John W. Austin, AO1907890.
Henry W. Averitt, AO636555.
Harry I. Axelrod, AO2239385.
David L. Aycock, AO2228640.
Ralph S. Azinger, AO2226790.
John D. Babinski, AO3013976.
John A. Bac, AO786023.
Leo R. Bacchieri, AO3015484.
Alexander D. Bache, AO2204957.
Augustus O. Bacon, AO2101838.
Joseph L. Bagby, AO2218243.
William D. Baggett, AO2225006.
Arthur E. Bailey, Jr., AO2206483.
Clentis W. Bailey, AO2254935.
James R. Baines, AO1860510.
Billy W. Baker, AO2223019.
Coleman L. Baker, AO2234697.
Henry P. Baker, AO1846568.
Jack L. Baker, AO3006732.
Jack T. Baker, AO3008320.
Jay E. Baker, AO3024695.
Merton W. Baker, AO715684.
Paul R. Baker, AO3022151.
Robert L. Baker, AO2219445.
Vincent P. Bakies, AO3006838.
Eugene F. Baldwin, Jr., AO2222906.
Floyd E. Bales, Jr., AO2225005.
John E. Bales, AO3014287.
Robert L. Ball, AO2223550.
O'Dean E. Ballmes, AO2224768.
Lloyd W. Ballou, AO2224693.
Frederick M. Baltz, AO3014000.
Bruce H. Barber, AO2232770.
Douglas Barber, AO2230830.
Paul A. Barber, AO3021065.
Richard W. Barber, AO2223020.
Robert J. Barberie, AO2225727.
Charles J. Barbero, AO3014937.
Richard D. Bard, AO3023473.
Edward E. Bardnell, AO765591.
Harold A. Barfknecht, AO3025008.
Charles D. Barker, AO3004749.
Kendall S. Barker, AO820197.
Fred D. Barnes, AO2226425.
James C. Barnes, AO2224191.
Oswald E. Barnes, AO2221978.
Richard E. Barnes, AO3004590.
Earl S. Barnett III, AO2245139.
Herbert C. Barnhart, AO633902.
Robert H. Barr, AO775753.
John O. Barrett, AO3015573.
Ralph W. Barrett, AO2219115.
Douglas R. Barron, AO2222795.
Ralph E. Barrows, AO3030172.
William D. Barry, AO2217018.
John H. Bartholome, AO1861367.
Jack R. Bartlett, AO2226962.
Robert L. Base, AO3007250.
Joe G. Basquez, AO2209683.
Williamson G. Bass, AO1855089.
Havard M. Bauer, AO3003473.
William J. Bauer, AO2224040.
Budd E. Baumgardner, AO1907507.
Karl R. Baumwell, AO2219726.
Ovid L. Bayless, AO3014286.
Leslie A. Baylis, AO2237749.
Arthur M. Bayly, AO1861368.
Wintford L. Bazzell, AO2215431.
Ralph A. Beaton III, AO2245777.
Bernard L. Beatty, AO2217702.
Joseph A. Beatty, AO3025513.
Robert A. Beaumolell, AO2219727.
Shirley D. Beavers, AO2245493.
Thelton D. Beck, AO3004057.
Thomas T. Becker, Jr., AO3004762.
Lynn H. Becklin, AO3005591.
Jack P. Becku, AO1854497.
Wayne K. Beckwith, AO2207431.
Richard L. Beebe, AO2225648.
Wallace E. Beebe, AO2079247.
Rhoderick J. Beery, AO782457.
Armand H. Beford, AO715690.
Frank R. Beigbeder, AO2220068.
Donald E. Beitsch, AO2217561.
Clarence E. Belima, AO3003929.
Frederick D. Belknap, AO2247290.
J. Fredric Bell, AO2251294.
Robert K. Bell, AO3018968.
William H. Bell, AO1855243.
Richard E. Bellamy, AO3024707.
Howard D. Below, AO3023474.
Ronald A. Bena, AO2235504.
Hubert L. Bender, AO1846868.
Harry H. Bendorf, AO2215602.
Bruce S. Benefield, AO2216903.
George D. Benjamin, AO2230194.
Carmi I. Bennett, AO3021666.
Marshall G. Bennett, AO2087377.
William B. Bennett, AO2080627.
James H. Bennington, AO3012780.
Vernell C. Benson, AO3025256.
Stephen J. Bepko, AO1856768.
George W. Beran, AO2225678.
Orville J. Beranek, AO2232776.
Ronald A. Berday, AO2222664.
William H. Bergmann, AO3010589.
John A. Berlette, AO2222910.
Leonard J. Berman, AO3003632.
Louis A. Bernabo, AO2247403.
Kirby A. Bernich, AO2232025.
Charles W. Berry, AO3021209.
Eugene Berry, AO2219123.
Richard D. Besley, AO3014966.
Glenn A. Bethany, AO2207954.
Boyce D. Beverly, AO2030623.
Joseph E. Beyke, AO2220949.
Charles C. Biast, AO2252953.
Walter J. Biggs, Jr., AO2217056.
Ronald A. Bigonese, AO2224805.
Thomas P. Bigwood, AO3005630.
Robert C. Binderim, AO2215820.
John F. Bird, AO782135.
Thomas W. C. Birge, AO2219659.
Manley P. Bishop, AO2224512.
Evert R. Bissell, AO3005550.
Schuyler Bissell, AO3004744.
Fred A. Bissinger, AO3011973.
Howard A. Bittner, AO1853269.
Walter E. Bjorneby, AO3026332.
Byron E. Black, AO3015158.
Doyce R. Black, AO1856127.
George T. Black, Jr., AO2240660.
Odell S. Black, AO3004183.
Edmund B. Blackler, AO3017692.
James E. Blake, AO3004562.
Marlin R. Blake, AO3005209.
Roy J. Blakeley, AO2246001.
Robert L. Blanchard, AO1861410.
Henry J. Blankenship, AO3009160.
Dale L. Blann, AO2249257.
Paul H. Blinkinsop, AO2222105.
Gerald A. Block, AO2251111.
Clarence D. Blocker, AO3007262.
Clifford E. Bloemendaal, AO2229970.
Paul J. Blomquist, AO2223479.
Richard E. Bloom, AO2226755.
John E. Blount, Jr., AO3004496.
Harry D. Blout, AO3010211.
Patrick H. Blue, AO3004494.
Henry W. Boardman, AO3020674.
Wilson J. Boaz, AO2220451.
Max G. Bodenhausen, AO3009124.
Joe E. Bodkin, AO2226026.
Hulbert L. Boettcher, AO2232277.
Richard L. Bofenkamp, AO3011366.
Lawrence D. Bogar, AO2234247.
Bernard J. Bogoslofski, AO3004247.
Samuel H. Bohine, AO2218616.
Robert F. Bohern, AO2251170.
George Boldi, AO755924.
William H. Bollinger, AO2236051.
Vernon G. Bonar, AO2220958.
Roman J. Boncsek, Jr., AO2088578.
Robert M. Bond, AO2225449.
James R. Bones, AO3019794.
Eugene A. Bonfiglio, AO3009284.
Larry D. Bonham, AO3006198.
Francis L. Bonnar, Jr., AO1865069.
John W. Bonnec, AO2215617.
Bertram E. Bonkout, Jr., AO2235641.
Peter M. Boor, AO3022983.
Richard W. Booth, AO2204800.
Robert J. Booth, AO673981.
J. Donald Boran, AO3020428.
Carl I. Borgersen, AO2220976.
Louis H. Borgman, AO2227783.
Robert L. Borland, AO2237278.
Donald E. Bortle, AO2225450.
Robert J. Bosler, AO2219437.
Alvin L. Bosworth, AO2230944.
Donald H. Bott, AO2205358.
Vernon K. Bouchee, AO1860963.
Carlton F. Boudreau, AO3022916.
Carl L. Bougher, AO658671.
William P. Bowden, AO2206639.
Joseph A. Bowen, Jr., AO3025232.
Ben D. Bowles, AO3005987.
Billy F. Bowles, AO2245020.
George A. Bowles, Jr., AO2250254.
William B. Bowles, AO2249479.
Robert A. Bowlin, AO2222062.
George P. Bowman, Jr., AO2246697.
Jack P. Bowman, AO3012330.
Lloyd D. Bowman, Jr., AO2219131.
John R. Boyd, AO2216934.
Robert J. Boyd, AO2247296.
Ronald J. Boyer, AO2206972.
Luke H. Boykin, Jr., AO3003019.
Vernon M. Boykin, AO2235860.
Melvin E. Boyles, AO3034401.
Robert J. Bradbury, AO2204820.
Andrew J. Bradley, AO2222110.
Preston E. Bradley, AO2244980.
Roland G. Bradley, AO2224141.
William C. Bradley, AO841902.
Buddy M. Bradshaw, AO2245779.
Mack L. Bradshaw, AO2222916.
Robert L. Brammer, AO3007796.
Harold P. Branch, AO2227866.
James R. Brandeberry, AO3017150.
Clifford E. Brandon, AO961227.
David D. Brandt, Jr., AO3019677.
John S. Brandt, AO2222665.
Eugene L. Brantley, AO2207791.
Joseph S. Bravenec, Jr., AO2226986.
Floyd J. Brazile, AO3013099.
Lacy W. Breckenridge, AO2249729.
Ralph E. Breden, AO1864589.
Joseph H. Breeden, AO2228125.
Fred E. Brehm, AO3007797.
Albert W. Breihan, Jr., AO2235578.
Charles E. Breithaupt, AO941714.
Eugene A. Brennan, AO1860535.
Harold J. Brennen, AO335594.
Douglas D. Brenner, AO2229916.
George E. Breton, AO2247906.
Walter R. Brett, AO2245910.
Robert F. Brew, AO2224183.
Harry L. Brewer, AO3006495.
Richard D. Brewer, AO2245740.
Edward S. Bridges, AO2247877.
Morris F. Briggs, AO2216724.
Anthony J. Brill, AO3005240.
John L. Brindle, Jr., AO704880.
Dale W. Brink, AO786044.
George S. Bristol, AO2248460.
Henry C. Bristol, Jr., AO2215872.
William F. Brockman, AO3007798.
James F. Brooks, AO2235591.
John R. Brooks, AO2238316.
Oscar T. Brooks, Jr., AO2224996.
Thomas E. Brooks, Jr., AO2244886.
Wallace R. Brooks, AO2243975.
Lees Broome, AO1857379.
John D. Brougher, AO2209037.
Buddy L. Brown, AO2226582.
Charles N. Brown, AO3017350.
Chester L. Brown, AO786048.
Donald E. Brown, AO3024286.
Eric C. Brown, AO1861819.
George R. Brown, AO2236485.
Harry L. Brown, AO2226434.
James R. Brown, AO3011731.
Jasper C. Brown, AO2204538.
John C. Brown, AO2224023.
Lee M. Brown, AO2231860.
Robert E. Brown, AO777109.
Robert L. Brown, Jr., AO3004972.
Robert M. Brown, AO3021371.

Sam S. Brown, Jr., AO3037022.
Sheldon L. Brown, AO2208230.
Stanford E. Brown, AO2253617.
Thomas E. Brown, AO3014098.
Harold H. Brownfield, AO2217562.
John W. Browning, AO828940.
Charles R. Brownlee, AO3023406.
Alfons L. Brox, AO2236170.
Eugene O. Bruce, AO943464.
Harlan L. Bruha, AO3007286.
Irvin W. Bruneau, AO2254904.
Victor J. Brunelli, AO2220059.
Charles C. Bruner, AO2224187.
Willis J. Bruns, AO3005340.
William A. Bryan, Jr., AO2222423.
William G. Bryan, AO3006496.
Charles L. Bryant, AO2223676.
Edward H. Bryant, Jr., AO929762.
Ray H. Bryant, AO3036536.
William P. Bryant, AO2219148.
Theodore B. Brydges, AO822042.
Albert F. Bryniarski, Jr., AO2218375.
James N. Buchanan, AO2224873.
Tilman K. Bucher, AO2228730.
Jack L. Buckingham, AO3019138.
Rene J. Buckley, AO2235169.
Gerle L. Buckner, AO2208331.
Curtis E. Budd, Jr., AO3006772.
John R. Budner, AO2222706.
Robert E. Buhrow, AO2224065.
George M. Bull, AO3017132.
Herbert R. Bull, AO1860965.
Joseph W. Bullers, Jr., AO2248259.
Fulton G. Bulloch, Jr., AO2245265.
Robert D. Bunce, AO3024692.
Robert A. Bunker, AO2217314.
Harry M. Bunting, AO2208629.
Joseph O. Bunting, Jr., AO2205278.
John R. Burch, AO2218852.
William P. Burch, AO2245742.
John W. Burdan, Jr., AO2222997.
Richard F. Burdett, AO3010663.
Gerald E. Burgener, AO2225064.
Ray M. Burgess, AO2228129.
Richard K. Burkard, AO2226228.
Leo R. Burke, AO1864618.
William E. Burke, AO3018267.
Forrest H. Burleson, AO3018100.
James R. Burnett, AO1998810.
Laurence R. Burnham, AO2229458.
Donald R. Burns, AO2219449.
Eugene F. Burns, AO933490.
Robert J. Burns, AO3022452.
Harold E. Burcker, AO2225666.
Francis A. Burrell, AO836575.
Samuel F. Burton, AO2236909.
William D. Burwell, AO2087017.
Richard J. Busch, AO3024215.
David A. Bush, AO2216999.
Warren E. Bushey, AO937967.
Robert H. Buss, AO935059.
Gerald O. Buster, AO2205387.
Richard J. Bustin, AO2223121.
Myron M. Butch, AO3006678.
Clinton C. Butler, AO2251260.
Donald R. Butler, AO3011114.
Robert A. Butler, AO2222998.
Oliver L. Butner, Jr., AO2092517.
Charles E. Butt, AO3018021.
Robert A. Butterfield, AO3035272.
Eugene C. Buttyan, AO3005129.
William J. Butz, AO2069659.
Mark K. Buxton, Jr., AO3007291.
Harry J. Byer, AO2222424.
John P. Bynum, AO3022716.
Joseph H. Byrne, AO836719.
Robert J. Cabaniss, AO2232636.
Jose Caceres, AO3022950.
Richard R. Cadena, AO3023262.
John E. Cadou, AO2237977.
William J. Caffery, AO3005487.
James D. Cagle, AO1846810.
Morris C. Caillouet, AO1856028.
Lloyd N. Cain, AO2237231.
Robert W. Cain, AO815070.
Weston M. Cain, Jr., AO3016447.
Walter F. Caldwell, AO2249108.
Caryl W. Calhoun, AO2219749.
Willis D. Calicott, AO2228252.
Verdell A. Call, AO2229191.
Drury Callahan, AO2222534.
Arthur W. Callaway, AO2226651.
James S. Cameron, AO3018688.
Raymond C. Cameron, AO1864900.
Robert L. Cameron, AO1864621.
Thomas B. Cameron, Jr., AO2023211.
Allen M. Campbell, AO2205408.
Charles C. Campbell, AO3007294.
Billy C. Campbell, AO2227086.
James W. Campbell, AO2226770.
Leon T. Campbell, AO2230800.
Louis D. Campbell, AO2238456.
Robert T. Campbell, AO2232794.
William C. Campbell, Jr., AO2093114.
Robert Campello, Jr., AO2249989.
Louis W. Cantelou, Jr., AO3031236.
George K. Cantrell, AO2075362.
John W. Caple, AO2215302.
Nunzio Cappadona, AO3011957.
Charles E. Cappelli, AO2273195.
James F. Carden, AO2227729.
John B. Carey, AO2222137.
Martin J. Carl, AO3025731.
Virgil V. Carlsen, AO3021981.
Ray W. Carlson, AO2230457.
Walter G. Carlson, AO3004886.
Douglas W. Carmichael, AO2222803.
John C. Carmichael, AO2223828.
Kenneth R. Carnahan, AO2064518.
Edward W. Carnes, AO3020257.
James R. Carnes, AO3036197.
Donald L. Carns, AO3004187.
Raymond E. Carpenter, Jr., AO3023185.
George L. Carr, AO2237402.
James L. Carr, AO2223246.
Robert J. Carr, AO2207213.
Virgil H. Carr, Jr., AO2206886.
Leo J. Carrigan, Jr., AO3010149.
Robert L. Carrigan, AO3019950.
John H Carroll, AO2208009.
Jesse W. Carson, AO2254728.
Buddy V. Carter, AO3005010.
Lorne E. Carter, AO3017612.
Mark L. Carter, AO2225581.
Paul D. Carter, AO2220475.
Glenn A. Carus, AO2222535.
Richard C. Carver, AO2205394.
Jesse Casaus, AO2061217.
Charles W. Case, AO2206793.
James M. Casey, AO2217329.
Eugene G. Cash, AO3034764.
Gerald A. Cashman, AO3020647.
Robert L. Cass, AO2222312.
Thomas J. Cassedy, AO2001410.
Joseph M. Cassinotti, Jr., AO2219160.
Valentino Castellina, AO715715.
Harry B. Casterlin, Jr., AO2222178.
Floyd D. Castleman, AO2223981.
Joseph R. Cates, AO2206730.
James L. Cation, AO767492.
Frank S. Catlin, AO2233020.
Walter L. Catron, Jr., AO2228163.
Joseph F. Cattorini, AO3012435.
Ted W. Caudle, AO787475.
Robert D. Caudry, AO3005669.
John R. Cavanaugh, AO3033802.
Robert T. Cavanaugh, AO3021869.
James F. Cavenee, AO2216727.
Kenneth L. Caviness, AO2224822.
Court B. Chaffee, AO2227483.
Leon H. Chaffee, AO2252925.
Steve S. Chag, AO2078443.
Frederick W. Chalmers, AO3018813.
Alton E. Chamberlin, AO2092873.
Billie L. Chambers, AO3005090.
Canty P. Chambers, Jr., AO2231020.
Benjamin H. Chamness, Jr., AO2230033.
Billy J. Chancellor, AO3022006.
Paul V. Chancey, AO2231444.
Hubert E. Chaney, AO779787.
Stanley W. Chaplin, AO2207753.
James N. Chapman, Jr., AO3006295.
Ray E. Chapman, AO2218859.
Donald J. Chase, AO2204583.
Charles I. Chastain, AO2099968.
William W. Cheney, AO2215364.
Fred V. Cherry, AO2225916.
Robert L. Chick, Jr., AO2216082.
Urnie W. Chiles, Jr., AO2228250.
Herbert H. Q. Ching, AO2230112.
Joseph B. Chiodo, Jr., AO3006096.
Richard A. Chipman, AO3015270.
Richard K. Chisholm, AO3022769.
Silver C. Chisum, AO2236083.
Henry D. Chiu, AO2253452.
Donald D. Christofferson, AO2234828.
Edwynn J. Christophersen, AO3034693.
Manuel Chu, AO3006641.
Harold N. Church, AO1865849.
Kenneth L. Church, AO3022345.
Stephen A. Church, AO2220081.
Richard M. Churchill, AO2215256.
Edward J. Cihak, AO2227261.
Anthony R. Cillo, AO2246901.
Vincent Cinquemani, AO3022230.
Daniel P. Cirelli, AO2247205.
Gary D. Clairmont, AO3014659.
Charles C. Clanton, Jr., AO2231075.
John N. Clapp, AO3034034.
William P. Clappin, AO3023288.
William J. Clark III, AO3004988.
William L. Clark, AO2236809.
Peter P. Claussen, AO2216010.
Paul S. Cleland, Jr., AO2222313.
William J. Clem, AO1860916.
Harold R. Clement, AO2216587.
Charles E. Clifton, AO764230.
Theodore Cline, Jr., AO1908514.
Dean E. Cling, AO2223449.
Louis J. Cloutier, AO1858632.
Bruce A. Clymer, AO2208917.
Donald O. Coakley, AO2225740.
J. C. Coats, AO811018.
Richard L. Cobb, AO3006037.
Truman E. Cobb, AO2236217.
Harry L. Coburn, AO2219464.
Joseph V. Cocchiarella, AO3024927.
Elbert D. Cockes, AO2205246.
Robert K. J. Cockrum, AO2216359.
John C. Coe, Jr., AO3036144.
Grange S. Coffin, Jr., AO2236055.
John M. Coggins, AO2220490.
John D. Colbrunn, AO2223024.
Edward H. Cole, Jr., AO3025313.
Richard R. Cole, AO2094992.
John L. Coleman, AO2224324.
Louis H. Coleman, AO2235934.
Paul R. Coleman, AO2224876.
Willard H. Colley, AO2225161.
George M. Collins, AO2216554.
Jeremiah J. Collins, AO3005739.
Richard D. Collins, AO2229182.
Richard O. Collins, AO2095103.
Wesley B. Collins, AO3034097.
James E. Colson, AO2222345.
Thomas E. Colvin, AO3014710.
David E. Combs, AO2227466.
John R. Comerford, Jr., AO2232032.
Harold C. Compton, AO2223369.
Richard W. Condrey, AO3023443.
Ralph Cone, AO2249348.
Ralph A. Cone, AO1865106.
Lawrence W. Confer, AO1857795.
Thomas F. Conley III, AO3010780.
Henry L. Conn, AO2205693.
Doral G. Conner, AO2234250.
Luther E. Connon, AO3014898.
Arthur H. Connor, AO3004577.
Donald F. Connors, AO2232724.
John S. Connors, AO3026051.
Robert W. Conors, AO3037365.
Robert B. Conroy, AO2237947.
Thomas E. Convery, AO2233621.
James E. Conway, AO3036184.
Julius Conway, Jr., AO2249302.
Lawrence D. Conway, Jr., AO3009889.
Charles W. Cook, AO2235058.
Jack A. Cook, AO2225163.
James A. Cook, AO2088717.
James R. Cook, AO2225458.
Jetty R. Cook, AO1850961.
Roy V. Cook, AO2221999.
William H. Cook, AO3018620.
Carroll R. Cooley, AO2208478.
William H. Coon, AO3005892.
Donald E. Coons, AO2238345.
Charles D. Cooper, AO2204950.
Fred M. Cooper, AO2209238.
Melvin G. Cooper, AO2254674.
Charles L. Copeland, AO2245345.
Robert N. Copeland, AO1865899.
Charles A. Coppedge, AO3014576.
Harry S. Copperthite, Jr., AO3006408.

Joseph H. Coppinger, Jr., AO2252690.
Edward T. Coppock, AO1948081.
Ray H. Copus, AO2297245.
Richard W. Corsine, AO2227038.
Robert M. Corbett, AO3008882.
John V. Corbisiero, AO2227809.
James E. Corcoran, AO2256891.
Joseph V. Corcoran, AO3006804.
Lawrence A. Corcoran, Jr., AO2023237.
Robert A. Cord, AO1903868.
Michael L. Corey, AO2222026.
Eugene F. Corkery, AO1858660.
Joseph R. Corneiller, AO3017306.
Kenneth K. Cornwell, Jr., AO3012797.
Harry A. Cortese, AO2231785.
Claude L. Cortner, Jr., AO2220246.
Richard L. Cerya, AO2251198.
William R. Cosgrove, AO3010491.
Clifton G. Cosper, AO2227109.
James H. Cosper, AO2232252.
Charles V. Costantino, AO2223925.
Richard E. Cotten, AO3034681.
Louis H. Cotton, Jr., AO3023560.
Charles R. Cottrell, Jr., AO2223737.
Paul F. Cottrell, AO2226035.
Charles W. Couch, AO3021887.
Darrell V. Couch, AO2234551.
Donald E. Couchigian, AO2227964.
Thomas H. Cougill, AO2209651.
James M. Counce, AO2216941.
Donald D. Courvillion, AO3005373.
Richard E. Covault, AO1946882.
James K. Covert, AO3025821.
Lowell D. Covington, AO3012395.
Norris S. Cowan, AO1857424.
David A. Cowden, AO3004283.
Robert O. Cowden, AO2222711.
Kenneth R. Cowser, AO3018850.
Billy F. Cox, AO2215949.
James L. Cox, AO3016283.
Malcolm A. Cox, AO3004934.
William F. Cox, AO3016162.
Ellis L. Cozine, AO1797481.
Richard M. Crader, AO3025050.
Daniel F. Craft, AO3027150.
Jack D. Craft, AO2224227.
John D. Cragin, AO2245169.
Edward P. Craig, Jr., AO2222712.
Leo L. Craig, Jr., AO3024575.
Samuel C. Craig, AO1998118.
Thomas J. Craig, AO2217540.
Deryl L. Cram, AO2207162.
Clifford B. Crandall, AO2215345.
Paul H. Crandall, AO2297916.
Robert J. Cranshaw, Jr., AO2226135.
William I. Crain, AO2235754.
Paul U. Craver, AO2256922.
Archibald M. Crawford, Jr., AO2232084.
Lawrence V. Crawford, AO3030574.
Tyson H. Cremmer, AO2256000.
Virgil Cresch, AO2223128.
Richard E. Crego, AO3008573.
Arthur F. Creighton, Jr., AO2247917.
Albert H. Crews, Jr., AO2223263.
Glen T. Crews, AO3000265.
Vance N. Cribb, AO3024410.
Edward A. Crimp, AO2227869.
Neal S. Crist, AO2223239.
Alan F. Crites, AO778685.
Charles R. Crittenden, Jr., AO2216764.
Hobart N. Crocker, Jr., AO2219760.
Dana B. Crossack, AO3025574.
Jack J. Crosser, AO2224000.
Jack O. Crosier, AO2231116.
Kenneth R. Crosley, AO3012217.
Avery A. Crosby, Jr., AO2225165.
Carleton G. Cross, AO2247918.
Ernest J. Cross, Jr., AO2224195.
Robert R. Cross, AO3026635.
William B. Cross, AO788915.
Neal P. Crossen, AO3006334.
William B. Crow, AO2219760.
Roscoe E. Crowder, AO2227779.
Schuyler T. Crowell, AO2227161.
Claude L. Crowley, AO2221035.
Michael S. Cruit, AO2236409.
James J. Crumbliss, AO887255.
William R. Crusse, AO2222375.
Robert E. Cruis, AO2209962.
Jack G. Cude, Jr., AO2234644.
George E. Cullen, Jr., AO2218161.
Joseph F. Cullen, AO782705.
Gerald R. Cummings, AO2236774.
John A. Cunningham, AO3023876.
John E. Cunningham, AO2227082.
Orpha R. Cunningham, AO2231105.
Eugene E. Curran, AO2247069.
Vincent E. Currier, AO3024661.
Lynn Currin, AO2228070.
Roylee D. Curry, AO2246012.
Billy R. Curtis, AO2236849.
Douglas L. Curtis, AO3026813.
Thomas J. Curtis, AO3027787.
Daniel P. Custis, Jr., AO3026883.
Dale E. Cutler, AO2227854.
Donald B. Cutler, AO2208479.
John B. Cutler, AO3024885.
Louis P. Cyr, AO2218162.
Jesse R. Dague, AO3029605.
Donald L. Dahler, AO2224775.
Joseph G. Daigle, AO771905.
Paul J. Daily, AO1857967.
Ralston B. Daily, AO2216219.
Walter M. Dale, AO3024601.
Robert F. Daley, AO2222346.
Donald B. Dalton, AO2223738.
Delfino V. D'Ambrosio, AO2223531.
Richard E. Damon, AO3005374.
Thomas D. Damon, AO2251149.
Rudy I. Danbom, AO2223615.
Paul F. Danforth, AO2243002.
Herman B. Daniels, Jr., AO2230500.
Lionel A. Danis, AO3023781.
Robert J. Dannacher, AO3024153.
Frank Dannals, AO2252915.
Edwin A. Dannewitz, AO2235671.
William G. Daoust, AO3012460.
Harry L. Darby, AO3015728.
John C. Darby, Jr., AO2215456.
Robert J. Darby, AO2232496.
Robert F. Darsien, Jr., AO3004980.
Fredrick B. Dargie, AO3036758.
Thomas G. Daring, AO3029608.
Jack L. Darrow, AO782275.
Leonard W. Dasbach, AO3025957.
Burton T. Datson, AO2231112.
Gordon V. Daugherty, AO2224150.
Robert G. Daugherty, Jr., AO2225108.
Robert L. Daugherty, AO2250002.
Richard C. Davenport, AO3004131.
Donald A. David, AO740584.
Leonard J. Davidek, AO3024989.
Morris L. Davidson, AO2062475.
Albert D. Davies, AO3004467.
Charles T. Davis, AO1849214.
Daryl M. Davis, AO3026527.
Glenn R. Davis, AO3006945.
Grady E. Davis, Jr., AO3007238.
Jake C. Davis, AO2223256.
James P. Davis, AO2220908.
John S. Davis, AO2217134.
John W. Davis, AO3025211.
John W. Davis, Jr., AO2235975.
Paul M. Davis, AO2223214.
Robert L. Davis, AO2245278.
Robert V. Davis, AO3015218.
Ted A. Davis, AO3025808.
Thurman C. Davis, Jr., AO2223114.
William M. Davis III, AO3019110.
Cassius N. Dawson, AO719277.
Clyde D. Dawson, AO2225939.
Daniel L. Dawson, AO3024765.
Owen L. Dawson, Jr., AO2247143.
Devon Day, AO1861336.
Richard L. Day, AO3013234.
Robert F. Day, AO3012804.
William E. Day, AO2236163.
George W. Dayhoff, Jr., AO2227942.
Kenneth S. Dean, AO1858223.
Robert V. Dean, AO3004459.
Robert C. de Armond, AO1859987.
Emmett G. DeAview III, AO2226021.
Ignazio R. DeBellis, AO1859811.
Harold J. Debenham, AO1854696.
William C. Debus, AO3016985.
Dwayne Z. Decker, AO3025977.
Jason O. Decker, AO2236019.
Loren E. Decker, AO2236729.
George P. Dedes, AO3004654.
Robert W. Dees, AO2235789.
Philip J. Degnan, Jr., AO2207216.
Edward W. DeHeart, AO2227107.
Paul A. Dehmer, Jr., AO2211463.
Coy J. Deich, AO2236905.
Robert V. DeJong, AO3026257.
Robert E. C. Delaney, AO3024638.
William F. Delaney, AO2250292.
Timothy J. Delanty, AO2219774.
Pierre L. Delcambre, AO3026810.
Philip J. De Leo, AO2206639.
Manuel de Leon, Jr., AO2239905.
Dwight B. Dellinger, AO3027067.
Jerry J. DeLuca, AO2235642.
William D. Del Valle, AO2210791.
Riley D. DeMasie, AO2235438.
George F. Dembow, Jr., AO2204777.
Robert A. Dempsey, AO2206764.
William F. Dempsey, AO3023062.
Jack D. Denardo, AO2233033.
Mack W. Dennard, AO3011019.
Norman B. Dennis, Jr., AO3022328.
Jack E. Dennison, AO2247691.
Troy J. Dent, AO3005582.
Carroll E. Deschaines, AO3026833.
John R. Desjardins, AO2207526.
Armand J. Desmarais, AO2237849.
Michael A. DeSousa, AO3009936.
Christopher P. Dessauer, AO2238776.
Barry N. Detwiler, AO3006038.
Larry S. DeVall, AO3012806.
James C. Dever, Jr., AO2204730.
Paul F. Dewasme, AO3010076.
Hubert S. Diamond, AO2215233.
Hugh W. Dibble, AO4020963.
Richard G. Dickerson, AO2223618.
Guy E. Dickey, AO2217236.
William R. Dickey, AO3026829.
Keith R. Dickie, AO2226542.
Sidney H. Dickinson, AO2228286.
James A. Dickson, AO2235776.
Paul A. Dickson, AO2228371.
Peter T. DiCroce, AO3021694.
James A. Diddle, AO2223894.
William B. Diedrich, AO2206294.
John P. Diener, AO2245768.
William E. Diener, AO2219179.
Burnell R. Dietrich, AO2215489.
William E. Dieline, AO2229686.
James M. Dillard, Jr., AO3023816.
Louis S. Dillard, Jr., AO3023000.
Somerville E. Dillon, AO3023235.
Homer G. Dillow, AO3023922.
Hubert M. Dimmery, AO2230762.
Robert A. Dineen, Jr., AO3024853.
Hubert R. Dingus, AO778427.
William M. Dinkins, AO2231120.
Walter L. Dinsmore, AO3026661.
Richard A. Dinwiddie, AO3021522.
Lynnford E. Disbrow, AO3021927.
Robert A. Ditch, AO2236956.
John P. Diuguid, AO2205250.
James E. Divan, AO2235690.
Harold F. Dixon, AO2236612.
James C. Dixon, AO3025622.
Charles M. Dodd, Jr., AO2216875.
Randell D. Dodd, AO2229931.
Thomas J. Dodd, AO2205168.
Ward K. Dodge, AO2216730.
Carl E. Dodson, AO2227937.
Eugene J. Doerr, AO2237794.
Gerald L. Doherty, AO3011414.
Robert M. Donahue, AO3025160.
Henry S. Donaldson, Jr., AO1854292.
Joseph W. Donnelly, AO788336.
John Donoghue, AO3024553.
John A. Donoho, AO2219482.
Donald J. Donohue, AO3007340.
Harold A. Donovan, AO2206664.
Robert C. Donstad, AO2229734.
David M. Dooley, AO3016234.
Russell J. Doose, AO3016072.
John J. Doran, Jr., AO3026927.
Martin S. Doria, AO2229114.
Richard M. Dorsey, AO3011123.
Clifford O. Doss, AO2249155.
Floyd L. Doss, AO2235761.
Andrew J. Dougherty, AO2226830.
Charles B. Dougherty, AO1964115.
Russel J. Dougherty, Jr., AO2246836.
John W. Douglas, AO2230523.
Robert N. Douglass, AO2229994.
William G. Dourte, Jr., AO3022156.
Ralph N. Dove, AO1857998.

Arthur J. Dover, AO2218164.
James R. Dover, AO3010318.
Donald A. Dowler, AO3008217.
Billie M. Downer, AO2224331.
Leo H. Downer, AO2235751.
John C. Downey, AO2228175.
John E. Downey, AO2238276.
Lewis F. Downey, Jr., AO3023806.
Paul I. Downey, Jr., AO3005409.
Dean S. Downing, AO2225762.
John C. Downing, AO3012809.
Morgan A. Downing, AO3010078.
Robert L. Downing, AO3004666.
Robert B. Downs, AO2222813.
James W. Doyle, Jr., AO3018576.
Wilbur A. Drake, AO827628.
Charles M. Dray, AO3015282.
Denis J. Driscoll, AO3013826.
Kiem D. Drozdowski, AO1863068.
Walter D. Druen, Jr., AO2222541.
William P. Drugan, AO3006836.
Robert H. Dubberly, AO2224382.
James W. Dubbert, AO3007346.
Clarence R. DuBose, Jr., AO2231072.
Albert C. Duc, AO2215662.
James E. Dudley, Jr., AO2245751.
Walter G. Duer, AO2233311.
Thomas O. Duff, AO2234498.
Walter N. Duffett, AO3015526.
Ned G. Duffield, AO3024778.
Edmund M. Duffley, AO3019333.
Thomas W. Dugan, AO3036721.
Richard J. Duggan, AO3035519.
Max Duggins, AO2251156.
George G. Duke, AO3023062.
Robert G. Duke, AO2207826.
Roy M. Duke, Jr., AO3007348.
Dan E. Dulaney, AO1847021.
Billy J. Dulin, AO2222602.
Richard K. Dumbauld, AO2210085.
Baxter T. Duncan, AO1847020.
Dean D. Duncan, AO3015937.
Dean D. Duncan, AO2221068.
Kenneth W. Duncan, AO2228669.
Lloyd R. Duncan, AO3007854.
Wayland E. Duncan, AO3008578.
Robert K. Dundas, AO3018657.
Thomas G. Dungan, AO2223986.
James G. Dunham, AO3035690.
Ralph W. Dunham, AO2226544.
Ned R. Dunkin, AO3011309.
Willis S. Dunks, AO933331.
Kenneth D. Dunlap, AO2248702.
Robert W. Dunn, AO3010601.
Richard B. Durant, Jr., AO3034626.
Gene R. Durden, AO2224332.
Thomas A. Durek, AO3003923.
Lawrence B. Durga, AO934625.
Jackie D. Durham, AO2225013.
James V. Durham, AO2235558.
Leonard E. Durham, AO1858641.
William S. Durham III, AO2227418.
Robert E. Durrant, AO3025960.
Harold A. Dushame, Jr., AO2220121.
William R. Dybvad, AO2216810.
Leslie R. Dyer, Jr., AO714677.
Roger J. Dyer, AO2217142.
Walter L. Dyer, AO2236107.
Wayne E. Eades, AO3013473.
Charles E. Eager, AO2205922.
Jack D. Earle, AO3035624.
Lyle P. Earney, AO685453.
James L. Eason, AO2220122.
Wesley D. East, AO720819.
Glenn G. Eaton, AO3012345.
Richard J. Ebel, AO3005300.
Howard V. Eberans, AO774067.
Milton J. Eberle, AO3023783.
LeRoy A. Ebert, AO2210748.
Arnold E. Ebneter, AO3025318.
Chester L. Eby, AO2227192.
George W. Eckrich, Jr., AO1903898.
John C. Eddy, AO3008459.
John O. Edelblute, AO3034627.
Richard B. Edelen, AO2225551.
Charles O. Edgar, AO3034580.
Gordon C. Edgar, AO2216371.
Robert E. Edge, AO2226545.
Harold L. Edwards, AO2207436.
Kenneth W. Edwards, AO2220533.
Lowell R. Edwards, AO3004402.
Paul W. Edwards, AO3007858.
William O. Edwards, AO2084689.
William T. Edwards, AO3016165.
John R. Effinger, AO1860540.
Earl A. Ehrenberg, AO3034878.
George L. Ehrhardt, AO2205309.
Richard S. Ehrler, AO838081.
Elmer R. Ehrlich, AO2205197.
Charles F. Eichbaum, AO2233400.
Jacob M. Eicher, AO2222668.
James H. Eischeid, AO2220124.
Lester E. Eklund, AO2226037.
David M. Eknes, AO2215367.
Frank I. Elam, AO3007861.
Philip C. Elden, AO3011562.
Robert C. Ellanson, AO2222179.
Charles Eller, AO1849048.
Frank Elliott, AO2229192.
John M. Elliott, AO2252952.
Melvin C. Elliott, AO3037320.
Wayne K. Elliott, AO2238146.
James A. Ellis, AO2075856.
John Ellis, AO3012611.
Norman L. Ellis, AO837669.
Arthur R. Ellisen, AO3022985.
Edward T. Elmendorf, Jr., AO2222815.
Watt D. Elrod, AO2205336.
William C. Elrod, AO1905761.
Arnold A. Elsbernd, AO2250996.
Stanley W. Elsea, AO3021052.
Calvin W. Elton, Jr., AO1861330.
Donald L. Elwood, AO2225462.
George E. Ely, AO719292.
Frank J. Emma, AO2210639.
Melvin B. Emmons, AO2222000.
James W. Empey, AO754606.
Leland C. Endsley, AO2216062.
Thomas M. Enfield, Jr., AO2224649.
Louis E. Engelbrecht, AO2216375.
Erich C. Engelhard, AO3015891.
John K. England, Jr., AO1856233.
Leonard B. England, Jr., AO2223565.
Alan B. Engle, AO2222140.
Charles W. Englehart, AO2204452.
Herman C. Engles, AO2251027.
Robert L. Engleson, AO1849534.
George E. English, AO2235189.
Paul W. Enouen, AO3025319.
Harry R. Ensey, AO2206979.
William L. Entsminger, AO2215174.
Lee M. Epperson, AO2215782.
Richard I. Erb, AO2228513.
Hans J. Erdmann, AO3025056.
Donn W. Erickson, AO2251222.
Frederick P. Erickson, AO2229850.
Richard R. Erickson, AO3021696.
Robert A. Erickson, AO3026270.
Robert C. Erickson, AO2251113.
Richard H. Ericson, AO2226833.
Keith A. Erikson, AO2238470.
Lester A. Erikson, AO701742.
Kenneth E. Ertel, AO2225678.
Richard Eskridge, AO2225016.
James E. Esping, AO2091929.
Billy J. Espy, AO2215783.
Samuel J. Estey, AO2227378.
Joseph R. Ethier, AO2228374.
Walter Ethridge, AO2245026.
Francis W. Ethun, AO3007868.
David K. S. Eum, AO2230116.
John R. Evanko, AO3006683.
Bethel Q. Evans II, AO3015987.
John R. Evans, AO2225830.
Norman D. Evans, AO2221953.
Roy G. Evans, AO3037762.
Wallace R. Evans, AO1863797.
Walter E. Evans, AO2236108.
Robert D. Eve, AO3035626.
Earl E. Evens, AO3006855.
Loren D. Evenson, AO3025737.
Mervin L. Evenson, AO2227734.
Ronald H. Everett, AO1849886.
Edmund B. Everette, AO3003776.
Leon E. Everhart, AO2224924.
Franklin R. Ewan, AO3035983.
Lawrence J. Eyre, AO3026056.
Frank P. Fabro, Jr., AO1863866.
Greynold M. Fagan, AO2231539.
Joseph M. Fahey, Jr., AO2226017.
Don R. Fair, AO2205016.
Robert B. Fair, AO937669.
Nathaniel B. Fairfax, AO1854343.
Frank D. Falcetti, AO2208015.
Edward J. Fallon, AO3007866.
Donald R. Fanslow, AO2206086.
John A. Fant, AO3003101.
Ledio Fanucchi, AO2204698.
Raymond P. Faranda, AO2234262.
Robert E. Farish, Jr., AO3011634.
Darrell Farmer, AO2222721.
Wayne L. Farmer, AO3022403.
William W. Farmer, AO3020697.
Hoyt Q. Farquhar, AO1864496.
Joseph L. Farr, AO2229184.
Richard L. Farr, AO3013510.
William H. Farr, AO3006862.
Loren C. Farwell, AO2235404.
Chester A. Fassett, AO3008339.
William R. Faulkner, AO2226448.
Joe Favatella, Jr., AO2251134.
John V. Fay, Jr., AO2215410.
Richard S. Feiden, AO1904364.
Joel J. Feigenbaum, AO2219495.
Bernard C. Feigley, AO2251381.
Carl Feistamel, AO3023446.
Joseph E. Felber, AO2216021.
Alfred A. Feldman, AO2208401.
Daniel T. Felix, AO2224925.
Walter J. Felker, Jr., AO825134.
Francis J. Feneley, AO3025401.
Klas K. Fenell, AO2228602.
William E. Fenton, AO3034146.
Earl Ferari, AO3019926.
Adelbert D. Ferdinand, AO3007870.
Alonzo L. Ferguson, AO2248158.
Ben T. Ferguson, Jr., AO931583.
Merton W. Ferguson, AO2218206.
Paul F. Ferguson, AO2255803.
William C. Ferguson, AO2222510.
William R. Ferguson, AO2226300.
Herbert C. Ferlmann, AO2234037.
Vincent L. Ferrara, AO558112.
Charles W. Ferrell, AO3035558.
Robert J. Ferrian, AO2224406.
Kendrick E. Ferriell, AO838663.
Don R. Ferriolo, AO2217783.
Delmore L. Fessenden, AO2062162.
James J. Fetzer, AO942175.
Rudolph E. Fiedor, AO1864944.
Burton M. Field, AO2216107.
Harry N. Fields, AO2226192.
William H. Fields, AO3006866.
Leonard A. Fierman, AO3032301.
James I. Fike, AO1855024.
Tommy J. Fike, AO3005677.
Michael G. Filliman, AO2223454.
Edwin D. Finch, AO3004035.
Eugene S. Finkelstein, AO3031931.
James F. Finkle, AO3007374.
Arthur P. Finlay, AO2227536.
Charles J. Finley, AO2233254.
Charles C. Finnegan, Jr., AO2236821.
Theodore J. Finnegan, AO817186.
Benny H. Fioritto, AO3010416.
James R. Firebaugh, Jr., AO1866110.
Edmund W. Fischbeck, Jr., AO3034514.
Gordon S. Fish, AO1850975.
Bernard F. Fisher, AO1861332.
Bill F. Fisher, AO3014847.
Donald G. Fisher, AO3036285.
Donald P. Fisher, AO2220545.
Emory L. Fisher, AO2206378.
Thomas J. Fitzgerald, AO3005743.
Thomas M. Fitzgerald, AO3004939.
Clark S. Fitzhugh, Jr., AO2206899.
Reynold E. Fitzsimmons, AO2224333.
Warren F. Flaherty, AO1860429.
William A. Flaherty, AO2223191.
Philip M. Flammer, AO3002519.
Fred J. Flanders, AO2222722.
Edwin G. Flanigen, AO3025402.
William E. Flanigin, AO2224199.
Bluford B. Fleek, AO3034008.
Ralph E. Fleischman, AO2223084.
John G. Fleming, Jr., AO780914.
William G. Flemming, AO2223190.
Vernon L. Flesner, AO1857074.
Harry P. Fletcher, AO3025213.
John L. Fletcher, AO1863980.
Marshall H. Fletcher, AO2222229.
Charles W. Flippo, AO2246706.
Harold C. Flynn, AO2222616.

John T. Flynn, AO3006198.
Russell S. Flynn, Jr., AO3021109.
James W. Foister, Jr., AO3026392.
Paul J. Foley, AO3036905.
Charles R. Folger, AO2026236.
Wilkinson R. Folk, AO3008342.
David I. Folkman, Jr., AO3018645.
Herbert E. Follansbee, Jr., AO2247926.
Elmer K. Follis, Jr., AO2223455.
John H. Fondren, AO2246225.
William I. Font, AO3037660.
Lawrence J. Fontaine, AO3036078.
Henry J. Ford, AO2224595.
John D. Ford, AO3008580.
Russell K. Ford, AO2230264.
Paul E. Fortin, AO3014716.
Joseph J. Foster III, AO2250276.
Robert M. Foster, AO2234609.
Robert P. Foster, Jr., AO2224075.
John F. Fowler, AO2227117.
Kenneth C. Fowler, AO3035985.
Amos O. Fox, AO2245757.
Arthur L. Fox, AO2219504.
Roger P. Fox, AO2218670.
Loren J. Fox, AO3024843.
Robert S. Fox, AO2205002.
Roland R. Fox, AO3025161.
Richard L. Frailey, AO2228709.
Donald L. Fraiser, AO2225020.
George E. Frakes, AO2209888.
George A. Fraley, AO2245402.
Hubert V. Frame, AO2064929.
Frederick W. Francis, Jr., AO2249743.
John E. Francis, AO2229342.
John J. Francisco, AO3015943.
Lawrence R. Francisco, AO3021218.
Frederick W. Francke III, AO3012059.
Charles E. Franklin, Jr., AO3037240.
Frederick C. Franklin, AO2220553.
Robert J. Franklin, AO6[illegible]8689.
Wallace H. Franklin, AO3013106.
Willard E. Franklin, AO2093698.
Billy J. Frazelle, AO2236109.
Edward H. Frazier, AO1649053.
Wendell V. Frazier, AO1850341.
Henry L. Frederick, AO2230496.
Charles L. Frederiksen, AO2251123.
Darrell E. Freeland, AO3035277.
Earl M. Freeman, Jr., AO2232642.
George R. Freeman, AO2220554.
William T. French, Jr., AO3037429.
Dean H. Frey, AO2251063.
Richard L. Fritts, AO2246917.
Charles M. Fronzuto, AO2252641.
Romain C. Fruge, Jr., AO1865681.
Alan C. Fuhrman, AO2237498.
Delbert D. Fuhrman, AO2250859.
Donald W. Fulcher, AO2231716.
Martin C. Fulcher, AO2225081.
Dan D. Fulgham, AO2223212.
James R. Fuller, AO3023447.
James R. Fuller, AO3034389.
Jerry G. Fuller, AO2204341.
John R. Fullerton, AO2231092.
Carl F. Funk, AO3025282.
Horace R. Furlough, AO3025454.
Thomas E. Furrey, Jr., AO2228732.
Burton B. Gale, AO3014671.
John H. Gale, Jr., AO3016223.
George B. Gallagher, AO3008344.
Edward F. Gallardo, AO3034631.
John W. Gallion, AO2222379.
Inman G. Gallogly, AO1859016.
Albert C. Gamache, Jr., AO2012634.
Thomas O. Gamble, Jr., AO2222202.
Paul E. Gammage, AO3011005.
Robert D. Gammell, AO2219805.
Joseph R. Gannon, AO3006885.
Roland J. Gannon, AO639575.
Richard B. Gantt III, AO2222725.
Harry D. Garber, Jr., AO2245931.
Miguel A. Garcia, AO1853465.
Chester E. Gardner, AO2249879.
Gayle B. Gardner, AO2222318.
Gilbert D. Gardner, AO3011222.
James L. Gardner, Jr., AO2215785.
John S. Gardner, AO2226759.
Robert E. Gardner, AO2229467.
Carmelo M. Gargano, AO2252866.
Walter L. Garner, Jr., AO2221099.
Roland R. Garren, AO2222776.
Kenneth E. Garrett, AO1847350.
James A. Garriott, AO3005964.
John A. Garstka, AO3005623.
Hugo P. Gartman, AO1854711.
Thomas J. Garvey, AO1851945.
Philip C. Gast, AO2238370.
Alfred M. Gathercoal, AO1911987.
Philip M. Gaudet, AO2208405.
Donald F. Gaylor, AO3012619.
Frank E. Gaylord, AO1857974.
Garland G. Gee, AO2227197.
William Geffen, AO2229004.
Edward F. Gehrke, AO2217809.
Harry J. Geller, AO2245933.
Charles J. Gelveles, AO2225464.
William B. Gemmill, AO776894.
Monroe J. Gensert, Jr., AO2245628.
Jack C. Gentry, AO2208239.
Jack W. Gentry, AO3005039.
Harold E. George, AO2224517.
Ralph U. George, AO779844.
Donald L. Gephart, AO3024588.
Norman R. Gerlich, Jr., AO3015176.
Richard P. Geron, Jr., AO3022131.
Theodore C. Gesling, Jr., AO2227681.
Louis J. Gex, AO931842.
Macey J. Giannini, AO3006002.
Theodore Giannobile, AO2205398.
Leroy E. Gibbons, Jr., AO2227650.
William J. Gibbons, AO2225174.
John A. Gibbs, Jr., AO1849105.
Richard F. Gibbs, AO2229386.
Charles R. Gibson, AO3011024.
Donald R. Gibson, AO3017573.
Doyle G. Gibson, AO2232646.
Gerald R. Gibson, AO2223266.
Richard E. Gibson, AO2250921.
Richard T. Gibson, AO2226257.
John W. Gieker, AO678024.
Roderick G. Giffin, AO2226305.
Robert N. Gifford, AO1904989.
Jack A. Giglio, AO3016341.
Daniel F. Gilbert, AO2218894.
Thomas M. Gilbert, Jr., AO2231893.
George C. Gilbreath, AO1865115.
Dougald W. Gilchrist, AO3022878.
Ivie V. Giles, AO1850261.
Raymond R. Gilkey, AO3014020.
John C. Gill, AO2226456.
Howard M. Gilliland, AO1853412.
William B. Gilmore, AO2222876.
James D. Gilmour, AO2204812.
Harvey D. Gilsean, AO3021674.
Norman R. Gindrat, Jr., AO818661.
Roy J. Ginder, AO3004957.
Robert W. Ginn, AO3010610.
Donald E. Giovannetti, AO3014972.
Donald J. Giroir, AO3024555.
Larry V. Girton, AO2237237.
Alton C. Givens, AO3006616.
James F. Glasscock, AO3007388.
Anthony P. Glavan, AO2251533.
Hal T. Glaze, AO3023224.
Clarence D. Glenn, Jr., AO836259.
Ervin L. Glenn, AO2215786.
Sidney A. Glenn, AO938613.
Richard M. Glogowski, AO3005620.
Daniel S. Glowa, AO3018033.
Robert S. Goad, AO3006304.
William K. Gobble, AO3006891.
Neil M. Gobrecht, AO823566.
Woodruff W. Goble, AO827133.
Sheldon I. Godkin, AO3024675.
Chester Godsy, AO3023785.
Ira S. Godwin, AO2236110.
Jerry L. Godwin, AO3026283.
Raymond F. Goelz, AO2232885.
Alan D. Goerner, AO2221111.
Edward D. Goetze, AO2204358.
Clarence B. Goldacker, AO2252630.
Kenneth D. Gomes, AO3009756.
David N. Gooch, AO2224041.
Jimmy L. Goode, AO3026453.
Charles E. Goodwin, AO3005277.
Walter E. Goodwin, AO2223274.
Tadeusz S. Gorczyca, AO2226123.
John W. Gordon, AO3004474.
Robert E. Gordon, AO2205021.
Sol Gordon, AO2206094.
Tommy W. Gordon, AO2244888.
William S. Gordon, AO3025404.
Robert E. Gorman, AO2228036.
Thomas W. Gorman, AO2232195.
Thomas F. Gorton, AO2221114.
Robert M. Gottuso, AO2252733.
Donald R. Gould, AO3006895.
Richard V. Gould, AO1861227.
Warren N. Gourley, AO2253627.
Perrin W. Gower, Jr., AO2224928.
Fred L. Graber, AO1849924.
Robert H. Gracey, Jr., AO3020113.
Charles W. Grady, Jr., AO2227344.
Kenneth A. Graeb, AO675693.
Edwin A. Graeter, Jr., AO3017106.
Neal F. Graham, AO2071581.
Russell A. Graham, AO2071890.
Hal W. Grainger, AO2224741.
Richard G. Grammer, AO3007898.
John F. Grant, AO2249478.
Robert R. Grant, AO839178.
John B. Grasser, AO2232114.
Bruce A. Grassfield, AO2208328.
Roger J. Grassl, AO3005916.
Lawrence D. Graves, Jr., AO2225598.
Ralph C. Graves, Jr., AO2227352.
Bobby V. Gray, AO3008464.
Donald E. Gray, AO2225835.
Donald F. Gray, AO2244764.
Edmund W. Gray, AO2230958.
Eugene A. Gray, AO2225239.
Richard W. Gray, AO2249751.
Robert L. Gray, AO2227788.
Roger C. Gray, AO2246712.
Lawrence E. Grayson, AO2254684.
Raymond C. Grazier, AO2226310.
James R. Greek, AO3015527.
Billy J. Green, AO523924.
Charles O. Green, AO3017886.
Robert E. Green, AO2223843.
Robert E. Green, Jr., AO3013933.
Roy D. Green, AO715192.
William W. Green, AO2226459.
Lester Greenwood, AO3008349.
Donald B. Gregg, AO2228030.
Bernard L. Gregory, AO3012963.
Jack W. Gregory, AO2216879.
Robert F. Gregory, AO1848791.
William B. Gregory, AO3025216.
John C. Greve, Jr., AO3026285.
Reinhold J. Greve, AO3010083.
William J. Grewe, AO3032004.
Donald M. Griffin, AO942724.
Elbert L. Griffin, AO2227876.
Herman E. Griffin, AO2225026.
Jon N. Griffin, AO2215789.
William E. Griffin, AO3024710.
Walter E. Griffing, AO2245758.
George G. Griffith, Jr., AO3005195.
Richard H. Griset, AO3004891.
Frederick C. Griswold, AO837308.
Daniel F. Grob, AO2228383.
Thaddeus R. Gronkiewicz, AO2209693.
Thomas H. Grooms, AO2223001.
Albert B. Gross, AO825158.
Stanley C. Gross, AO1907455.
Milton J. Grosz, AO2091809.
Richard G. Grote, AO3009495.
Kenneth C. Groves, AO2244659.
Allen C. Grubbs, AO2247883.
George R. Grube, AO2233318.
Paul J. Gruber, AO1859649.
Frank C. Gryska, AO2057615.
Dolphus E. Guillotte, Jr., AO3008465.
Robert J. Guinee, AO2246643.
Thomas M. Gunnels, AO3006103.
David J. Gunster, AO2234594.
Gerald C. Gustafson, AO3022049.
David W. Gustin, AO3023312.
Richard D. Guzman, AO708147.
Thomas W. Gwinn, Jr., AO1860700.
James L. Hackett, AO2227149.
Richard S. Hackett, AO2233998.
William A. Hackley, AO1854347.
Robie Hackworth, AO3004145.
Frank L. Hada, AO3024138.
Gordon J. Haffeman, AO2224336.
Elmer I. Hagloch, AO2211255.
Donald M. Hagood, AO1861248.
Alonzo F. Haines II, AO2246775.
John S. Haisty, AO2225036.
Thomas R. Hale, AO1850306.

Charles J. Hall, AO1864670.
Curry W. Hall, AO3011025.
Don H. Hall, AO2225408.
James G. Hall, AO3026241.
Robert E. Hall, AO2217227.
Vaughan W. Hall, AO2245936.
Ralph W. Halla, AO2234003.
Melvin E. Hallett, AO3004069.
Carl G. Hallin, AO2233913.
John F. Halton, Jr., AO3023886.
Eugene A. Hamby, AO2223271.
Tyler W. Hamby, Jr., AO2244601.
LeLand D. Hamilton, Jr., AO2227878.
Nelson R. Hamilton, AO3022589.
William J. Hamilton, AO2225601.
John R. Hamm, AO2090458.
Felton L. Hammond, AO2224779.
Robert A. Hammond, AO2219822.
Harold N. Hampton, AO3007908.
Asa P. Hamrick, Jr., AO2235672.
Robert A. Hancock, AO3034632.
Arthur E. Handel, AO2060506.
Ivan D. Hankins, AO2224667.
John G. Hanks, AO3025584.
Albert E. Hanneman, AO3022436.
Philip R. Hanneman, AO3023494.
Russell A. Hannen, AO3011499.
Joseph F. Hansard, Jr., AO3022309.
Charles M. Hansen, AO2220578.
Phyll A. Hansen, AO3026290.
George B. Hanson, AO2231792.
Jack D. Hardee, AO3006175.
William J. Hardenburger, AO2223137.
Lynn B. Harding, AO2218915.
Alton D. Hardy, AO2226674.
Dal T. Hardy, AO3002479.
James A. Hargrove, Jr., AO3018403.
Charles A. Harkness III, AO2220579.
Edgar F. Harlin, Jr., AO2244891.
Robert L. Harmon, AO941857.
Verlin R. Harmon, AO2217452.
Robert A. Harner, AO2250531.
John P. Harnett, AO2216166.
Buddy G. Harp, AO2225702.
Gene G. Harral, AO2204359.
Charles W. Harrill, AO3013566.
William W. Harrington, AO2223694.
Alton R. Harris, AO3004196.
Carlyle S. Harris, AO3022380.
Dana H. Harris, Jr., AO1865165.
Edward C. Harris, AO2228217.
John J. Harris, AO3005071.
Ralph M. Harris, AO2215499.
Richard H. Harris, Jr., AO3007918.
William M. Harris IV, AO941666.
Bogue P. Harrison, AO2223749.
Douglas A. Harrison, Jr., AO2229998.
Michael H. Harrison, Jr., AO2228674.
Francis P. Harrold, AO2090679.
Kenneth V. Harstad, AO3035642.
George E. Hart, AO3023313.
James T. Hart, AO2231607.
Terry P. Hart, AO3006552.
Milton G. Hartenhower, Jr., AO2226693.
Joseph M. Harter, AO3025220.
Richard Hartford, AO2228035.
Charles R. Hartig, AO2234657.
Holmes L. Hartley, AO2211118.
Howard K. Hartley, AO2221932.
Edgar C. Hartmann, Jr., AO3024701.
James C. Hartney, AO944605.
Robert D. Hartwig, AO2223847.
Billy G. Hartzell, AO3004654.
Victor L. Hartzler, AO3034373.
Lawrence Hasbrouck, AO3011911.
Charles T. Hassett, AO2251803.
James R. Hassler, AO3005467.
Robert W. Hastings, AO3024696.
Charles E. Hatcher, AO781303.
Wayne L. Hatcher, AO2063829.
James S. Hatlestad, AO3006922.
Billy W. Hatley, AO3013749.
Walter L. Haug, AO2236025.
Charles H. Hausenfleck, AO3020629.
Robert J. Hayer, AO2228458.
Cornelius A. Hayes, AO2226761.
Harold G. Hayes, AO2236198.
Ralph W. Haymaker, AO2225470.
Hal H. Haynes, Jr., AO2226842.
Archie Hays, Jr., AO2235845.
Theodore C. Hays, AO2216645.
William R. Healey, AO2250630.
Michael J. Healy, AO1859593.
Thomas F. Healy, Jr., AO2236675.
Ernest F. Hearon, Jr., AO1849171.
Wallis T. Hearon, AO2215796.
Robert E. Heath, AO3025122.
Bennie L. Heathman, AO3020906.
Thomas E. Hebel, AO2219226.
Earl J. Heberling, AO1868317.
Paul E. Hebert, AO2222483.
Floyd M. Heck, AO934363.
William S. Heckendorn, AO3024351.
Guy L. Hecker, Jr., AO2205074.
Merritt E. Hedden, AO3020026.
Thomas L. Hedge, AO2332044.
Donald J. Hedges, AO2221933.
John D. Hedges, AO843383.
Ronald E. Hedges, AO3023683.
Donald L. Hafley, AO586806.
Richard F. Hegewald, AO3023226.
Martin J. Hegland, AO3218922.
Dan H. Hegler, Jr., AO2223192.
Warren B. Hehir, AO2230270.
Phil H. Heidelk, AO2208345.
Howard H. Heikens, AO3036892.
Charles K. Heim, AO3006647.
Robert G. Heinz, AO3023598.
Robert E. Held, AO823071.
Eric N. Hellberg, AO3025972.
Glen A. Hellenga, AO2229644.
Augustin H. Heller, AO3035504.
Thomas A. Helmick, AO2255830.
Robert V. Hemphill, AO3024622.
Lewis H. Hendelman, AO3023097.
Dan K. Henderson, AO3018988.
James D. Henderson, AO801869.
James E. Henderson, AO3010835.
Marlin D. Henderson, AO2248747.
Ray T. Henderson, AO3022707.
Thomas E. Henderson, AO3018083.
Warren L. Henderson, AO2223639.
George M. Hendricks, Jr., AO2236429.
David A. Hengel, AO2265257.
Clarence D. Henington, AO2220172.
Francis B. Henkel, AO2226677.
Paul A. Henkel, AO2228391.
Victor C. Henkell, AO2216407.
Sam G. Henley, AO2219834.
Robert E. Hennessey, AO2216955.
John E. Hennessy, AO2222362.
Donald A. Henning, AO1849150.
M. Arlie Hennings, AO1847818.
Robert S. Hensley, AO2227574.
Richard G. Hepworth, AO3006322.
Robert T. Herbst, AO2237762.
Kenneth J. Herhold, AO2226174.
Donald W. Herman, AO2222329.
Roger H. Herman, AO3023136.
Robert Hermann, AO2224459.
Elmer E. Herron, AO724753.
John C. Herther, AO3016090.
Kaye H. Herzer, AO3013621.
Fred W. Hessman, Jr., AO2222439.
Joyce B. Hester, Jr., AO1850736.
Oma H. Hester, Jr., AO2077301.
Edward J. Hettinger, AO2208017.
Howard S. Hevern, AO1851801.
Richard F. Heylmun, Jr., AO2208055.
William V. D. Hickerson, AO1860764.
Thomas J. Hickman, AO1906407.
Ben F. Hicks, AO2065914.
James L. Hicks, Jr., AO2221902.
Frederic C. Hiebert, AO2217401.
John D. Hiers, AO2215669.
Fred J. Higgason, AO3024074.
John E. Higgins, AO3022679.
Eugene R. Highfield, AO2237429.
Tsutomu Hikido, AO2228906.
Harry J. Hilgert, AO2215721.
Arthur S. Hill, AO766994.
Ben C. Hill, Jr., AO2220666.
Vernon G. Hill, AO1848701.
Watt G. Hill, Jr., AO831543.
Robert T. Hillerud, AO2227205.
Jean C. Hillery, AO2225031.
Donald W. Hillman, AO3004692.
Chester B. Hincewicz, AO2249266.
James F. Hines, Jr., AO3036803.
James M. Hines, AO3002922.
Edward N. Hinman, AO2233142.
Akira Hino, AO3009760.
Robert S. Hinshaw, AO3007432.
Thomas M. Hirsch, AO3012360.
James E. Hiteshew, AO3022418.
Gerald L. Hitt, AO3032354.
Morris A. Hitt, AO2057155.
Wallace A. Hoback, AO2226043.
Leigh A. Hochreich, AO1856941.
Charles H. Hodgdon, AO3002923.
Jack C. Hodge, AO3022772.
James L. Hodge, AO3016073.
Louis D. Hodges, AO2219535.
Willis M. Hodges, AO1907862.
Robert L. Hodgkins, AO2065766.
Lothar O. Hoeft, AO3014946.
John B. Hoek, AO2206286.
William E. Hoff, AO3006933.
Richard H. Hoffman, AO1849677.
Arthur P. Hofmann, AO3022050.
Daniel E. Hogan, AO3013838.
Eugene S. Hogan, AO2234845.
Robert C. Hogan, AO2209655.
Donald T. Hogg, AO2205423.
William R. Hoke, AO2226536.
Roy L. Holbrook, Jr., AO2225180.
Charles W. Holcomb, AO3005874.
John M. Holland, AO2087306.
David I. Hollenbaugh, AO2218462.
Carol L. Holley, AO2219587.
Keaver Holley III, AO3007030.
Wallace D. Hollinger, AO3034359.
John B. Holmberg, AO2234362.
Donald L. Holmes, AO676390.
Paul E. Holmes, AO2223753.
Russell M. Holst, AO3006936.
Harold J. Holt, AO934114.
Jack H. Holt, AO2230654.
David H. Holtan, AO3005216.
George F. Holtgrewe, Jr., AO1695406.
James J. O. Holtkamp, AO3023450.
August A. Holubeck, AO2206508.
John K. Honnold, AO2223283.
Vincent C. Hooper, AO835014.
Leon E. Hooten, Jr., AO3006038.
Robert J. Hoover, AO1853703.
Thomas R. Hoover, AO710473.
Charles E. Hopkins, AO2224885.
Thomas G. Hopkins, AO3015882.
Donald R. Horak, AO3006940.
Charles F. Hornbuckle, Jr., AO2071169.
Alan K. Horne, AO3011677.
Elmer A. Horne, AO2222260.
Kenneth E. Horne, AO3015686.
Richard G. Horne, AO2229553.
Terrell E. Horne, AO1865616.
John W. Horner, AO2066999.
Charles S. Horton, AO3023117.
James J. Horton, AO2230769.
Thomas L. Hosch, AO2227707.
William D. Hosking, AO3026294.
Dannie R. Hoskins, AO3013116.
Thomas R. Hoskins, AO1864179.
Joseph L. Hotard III, AO1864546.
Charles R. Hotze, Jr., AO728621.
Robert F. Houck, AO2223458.
Rodney E. Houghton, AO1861129.
John H. Hourigan, AO2226046.
Clent Houston, AO2225034.
John P. Houston, AO3005095.
William E. Houston, AO2207539.
Brown G. Howard III, AO3021933.
Franklin D. Howard, AO3036323.
Lee R. Howard, AO2244771.
Ernest L. Howell, AO2227210.
James Howell, AO2244676.
Kelly P. Howell, AO2225118.
Leonard R. Howell, Jr., AO2075203.
William C. Howell, AO1860745.
Orville J. Howells, AO786116.
Louis M. Howie, AO2232823.
Eben R. Hubbard, AO1863201.
Frederick P. Huber, AO2228225.
David H. Hubin, AO2222665.
David M. Hudack, AO1860972.
Robert D. Hudson, AO2225941.
Berlin B. Huffman, AO2065689.
James P. Huffman, Jr., AO2216282.
William P. Huggins, Jr., AO745897.
Edward J. Hughes, AO2245761.
George A. Hughes, Jr., AO2222703.
Jerry L. Hughes, AO2056699.
Paul F. Hughes, AO941166.

Thomas S. Hujar, Jr., AO2223275.
Gerald W. Hummel, AO2075984.
John B. Humphreys, AO787815.
John A. Humphries, Jr., AO2232563.
Ray A. Hunder, AO2207471.
Thomas O. Hunsicker, AO781582.
Eldon W. Hunt, AO779470.
Jack W. Hunt, AO2227708.
Warren J. Hunt, AO2223851.
Harold A. Hunter, AO2228740.
Ronald E. Hunter, AO3005446.
John J. Hurley, AO2226848.
Richard K. Hurliman, AO2228048.
Albert L. Huskey, AO3024697.
Shelby V. Hutchins, AO3031388.
Clarence K. Hutchinson, AO3024623.
Myles R. Hutchinson, AO2249678.
William K. Hutchinson, AO2218702.
Charles L. Hutchison, AO3018282.
Lawton H. Hutchison, AO942582.
Robert L. Hutsell, AO3022922.
Glenn K. Hutton, AO2231189.
Stanley R. Hutton, AO2227154.
Garold A. Hyde, AO2227793.
William H. Hyde, AO1864627.
Charles L. Hyland, AO2205286.
Olin W. Ince, AO3034296.
LuVerne E. Indorf, AO2092921.
Robert H. Inghram, AO3023665.
Gardner C. Ingmire, AO668588.
Gerald R. Ingwerson, AO3043861.
Robert L. Inman, AO2221170.
Walter L. Innis, AO2234104.
Andrew P. Iosue, AO2217892.
Curtis P. Ireland, AO3016735.
Ernest L. Irish, AO3007445.
Challen W. Irvine, AO3004698.
William E. Irvine, AO1862961.
Allan C. Isaacson, AO3025462.
Elvin D. Isgrig, AO3015504.
Loraine R. Ivins, AO2225035.
William N. Jackomis, AO3019880.
Collins Jackson, AO1857431.
Donald W. Jackson, Jr., AO2226048.
Edwin L. Jackson, AO3004847.
Leland H. Jackson, AO2216113.
Linwood S. Jackson, AO840555.
Robert F. Jacobs, AO2216530.
Lindor, A. Jacobsen, AO1903890.
Robert E. Jacobsen, AO720516.
Roger G. Jacobsen, AO3009376.
Martin P. Jacobson, AO819595.
Edwin R. Jacobus, AO2233987.
Harry Jaffers, AO2228946.
Paul W. James, AO2224217.
George H. Janczewski, AO2216731.
Algin T. Jarvis, AO3023480.
Curtis N. Jasper, AO2079740.
Charles R. Jeffery, AO2218704.
Joyful J. Jenkins, AO2235566.
Marvin H. Jenkins, AO2249092.
Robert G. Jenks, AO2222619.
Hyrum C. Jensen, AO1861340.
Jarvis H. Jensen, AO2229912.
Lawrence R. Jensen, AO3006618.
Marvin E. Jensen, AO2222069.
Richard B. Jensen, AO1860998.
Phil G. Jenson, AO3006956.
Wendell W. Jernigan, AO3007942.
Robert C. Jessup, AO2224744.
Philip Jeter, Jr., AO2229237.
Gerald V. Jewell, AO2228397.
Samuel G. Jewell, AO2231721.
Frank I. Jimenez, AO3012842.
Roland A. Jobin, AO3022273.
John H. Johannes, AO3023341.
Dale A. Johnson, AO2224934.
Dewey E. Johnson, AO2206208.
Donald S. Johnson, AO2230000.
Duane E. Johnson, AO2227356.
Earl E. Johnson, Jr., AO3017028.
Edwin C. Johnson, AO3024758.
Elven A. Johnson, Jr., AO2216813.
Gerald O. Johnson, AO3020741.
Harold P. Johnson, AO3010339.
Isiah Johnson, AO2246401.
James O. Johnson, AO2222548.
Jerry M. Johnson, AO3023052.
Larry R. Johnson, AO1860941.
Norris A. Johnson, AO1858496.
Richard E. Johnson, AO1861418.
Stanley C. Johnson, AO2225241.
Stanley M. Johnson, AO934636.
Veskel E. Johnson, AO2216594.
William O. Johnson, AO932424.
Kenneth R. Johnston, AO3013985.
Robert A. Johnston, Jr., AO2217884.
Robert F. Johnston II, AO2223217.
Robert M. Johnston, AO1857183.
Robert L. Jondahl, AO2234832.
Billy J. Jones, AO2221179.
Clyde S. Jones, Jr., AO2240220.
George E. Jones III, AO2208056.
George H. Jones, AO2221910.
Harley D. Jones, AO3022522.
Kilby L. Jones, AO3021466.
Lem C. Jones, AO3017279.
Louis F. Jones, AO2236249.
Oscar E. Jones, AO1907590.
Philip A. Jones, AO3022419.
Richard S. Jones, AO3003642.
Robert E. Jones, AO3014034.
Robert H. Jones, AO3006588.
Robert W. Jones, AO3013001.
Rufus W. Jones, Jr., AO3021802.
Thatcher D. Jones, AO3006965.
Thermon O. Jones, AO2226805.
Thomas D. Jones, AO788208.
William J. Jones, AO1860686.
Roy K. Jonkers, AO2247156.
Norman L. Jonson, AO2230219.
Herbert R. Jordan, AO3016058.
George E. Joseph, AO2226849.
John P. Joyce, AO1860770.
Roy Jude, AO1854992.
Raymond A. Jungers, AO1861379.
George S. Kacir, AO1865048.
Edward A. Kacmarcik, AO2253501.
Walter Kaczaral, AO3024724.
Albert J. Kaehn, Jr., AO2252699.
Leo A. Kahanek, AO3016333.
Raymond W. Kahl, Jr., AO3006202.
Fabian F. Kalapach, AO1859482.
Vernon E. Kalt, AO2219548.
Gerald E. Kamins, AO2205559.
Herbert H. Kamm, AO3023093.
James L. Kane, AO2234952.
Robert M. Kane, AO737591.
Stuart E. Kane, Jr., AO945949.
Clifford D. Kannely, AO3025911.
Raymond B. Kanyok, AO3007460.
James A. Kapitzke, AO2208449.
Robert J. Kapke, AO3017137.
Harold L. Kaplan, AO2253051.
James J. Karch, AO2226399.
Albert R. Kardoskee, AO2215242.
Edward Karolczyk, AO2205867.
Carl F. Karst, AO3021063.
Wayne H. Karstetter, AO2098992.
Paul Kasarda, Jr., AO2250198.
Robert E. Kaseman, AO823614.
Martin W. Kasischke, AO3022330.
Wilbur V. Kaven, AO689779.
Francis H. Kawamoto, AO1857528.
Robert L. Kay, AO3006970.
Alvin Kayloe, AO2234542.
Charles J. Kazilek, Jr., AO3022201.
Murray E. Keel, AO2218949.
Billie R. Keeler, AO3016495.
Wilbur L. Keeling, AO3036418.
John J. Keenan, Jr., AO2232209.
Thomas A. Keenan, AO2222204.
John R. Keeton, AO2228141.
Charles J. Keller, AO3024162.
Ronald T. Keller, AO3008485.
Thomas D. Keller, AO2234688.
Robert B. Kelley, AO1850783.
Richard F. Kelsay, AO3023316.
Emory N. Kemler, Jr., AO2206740.
Delbert H. Kendall, AO2227359.
John F. Kennard, AO3014780.
Bruce F. Kennedy, AO3014352.
Kenneth H. Kennedy, AO2244850.
Francis B. Kennelly, AO2206999.
Howard P. Kenney, Jr., AO3015858.
Thomas E. Kenney, AO2090226.
Thomas F. Kenney, Jr., AO3010157.
Roy H. Kephart, AO709803.
Norman R. Kergaard, AO2251595.
Bernard M. Kerin, AO2220642.
Charles W. Kern, AO2228056.
John H. Kerslake, AO3005253.
George J. Kertess, AO2222050.
John J. Kerwin, AO763638.
Robert C. Kessinger, AO3034074.
Raymond R. Keys, AO2219858.
Edward I. Kicklighter, AO3034020.
Norman A. Kidd, AO3026062.
David B. Kidder, AO928023.
Robert C. Kiel, AO3006974.
James B. Killebrew, AO1864541.
Jack A. Kimball, AO3004893.
Jack E. Kimbrough, AO3004419.
Jerry J. Kincl, AO721780.
Charles H. King, Jr., AO713775.
James B. King, AO2224887.
John R. King, AO3012597.
Oliver F. King, AO3021803.
Richard K. King, AO3019862.
Robert L. King, AO3022331.
Samuel O. King, AO2221191.
Thomas J. King, Jr., AO2224161.
William H. Kinghorn, AO2101358.
Raymond F. Kingston, AO2223070.
Danny G. Kinker, AO3023927.
John J. R. Kinney, AO2218139.
Edgar O. Kinnier, Jr., AO3022523.
Ferdinand M. Kinnier, AO2222737.
Bobby A. Kirby, AO3024266.
Gilbert O. Kirchoff, AO2249125.
Lawrence R. Kirchoff, AO3011428.
Eugene J. Kirk, AO3035435.
Don T. Kirkham, AO708693.
Ottis L. Kirkpatrick, AO2245175.
William F. Kirlin, AO1847443.
Jack Kiser, AO2226390.
Donald N. Kittrell, AO2217689.
Ralph T. Kivette, AO2236187.
William H. Klaerner, Jr., AO3020730.
Melvin Klegman, AO2217280.
Kenneth E. Klein, AO2227655.
Charles P. Kleinsmith, Jr., AO2225785.
Donald M. Klemm, AO2227676.
Warren J. Klemz, AO2086857.
Martin D. Klena, AO2218331.
Louis A. Klenkel, AO3025912.
John R. Klepinger, AO2247717.
William O. Klepinger, AO2247718.
Harrison H. Klinck, AO3023148.
Richard D. Kline, AO3004205.
Robert E. Kline, AO3004480.
William F. Kline, Jr., AO1864261.
Charles E. Klug, AO3033627.
Stanley Kmiecik, Jr., AO3009361.
Leslie E. Knapp, AO773694.
Charles D. Knight, AO3009265.
Dean A. Knight, AO804907.
Roy A. Knight, Jr., AO3007472.
Robert M. Knightly, AO3015646.
Robert P. Knopf, AO2233193.
Edward M. Knox, Jr., AO1857459.
Gene M. Knudson, AO3035387.
John R. Knudson, AO3022587.
Edwin E. Koch, AO1852150.
Clifford L. Kochheiser, AO2228401.
Paul F. Koeltzow, AO3007474.
Edward J. Koen, AO2220210.
Charles R. Koepke, AO3023366.
John W. Kohler, AO3023095.
Nanao Kojima, AO3009772.
Thaddeus B. Kolassa, AO3006983.
John W. Komula, AO3014830.
Joseph G. Kondracki, AO2224292.
James D. Kopotic, AO3009433.
Donald Koretz, AO3018192.
William J. Kormos, AO2232988.
Roland W. Korte, AO3035436.
Douglas J. Kosan, AO2206222.
Charles E. Koski, AO3013848.
John E. Kosnick, AO1861207.
James A. Kostan, AO3034885.
Emil J. Kotalik, AO3005173.
Clarence Kough, Jr., AO3019024.
Otto L. Kovar, Jr., AO3021637.
Andrew L. Kowalski, AO2220653.
Thomas F. Kozak, AO2223863.
Paul L. Kozel, AO2205566.
Elfred H. Kramer, AO3021990.
Francis J. Kramer, Jr., AO3021911.
Richard D. Kramer, AO2207641.
Raymond L. Krasovich, AO2224293.
Gordon J. Krautkramer, AO2227627.
Henry C. Kreide, AO3015540.

David L. Kreigh, AO2245297.
Edwin M. Krejci, AO3025650.
Donald A. Krider, AO2251136.
George R. Krieg, AO2249198.
James F. Krill, AO3020432.
John L. Krill, AO3036749.
Tearle B. Kring, AO3004514.
William J. Kriz, AO2228179.
Robert M. Krone, AO2229174.
Robert M. Kronebusch, AO3004482.
Ewald G. Kruggel, AO2222008.
Wilfred L. Krull, AO3005832.
Romain F. Krzmarzick, AO3015549.
Sidney J. Kubesch, AO2222449.
Emil M. Kuebler, AO3012433.
Kenneth L. Kuhlmann, AO2222149.
Donald L. Kuhnsman, AO877841.
Wallace A. Kulczyk, Jr., AO3004632.
Leonard L. Kunko, AO3024238.
Lloyd S. Kurth, Jr., AO3021851.
Ralph L. Kuster, Jr., AO3036084.
George Kyer, Jr., AO3017966.
Donald L. Kyger, AO1848254.
Demos T. Kyrazis, AO3004719.
Leo J. LaBrosse, AO2230522.
Joseph C. Lach, Jr., AO2222740.
Gerald O. Lachner, AO2214904.
Lester L. Lackey, AO3016005.
Wesley D. Lacy, AO2208305.
Eugene Ladin, AO1859991.
Carl R. Laffoon, AO3013945.
Alfred J. Lagrou, Jr., AO787673.
Harry K. L. Lai, AO2230129.
Gwayne E. Lair, AO3007961.
Fred L. Laird, Jr., AO2218954.
Herbert W. Laird, AO3004242.
Donald W. Lajeunesse, AO3034530.
Knox C. Lake, AO2225038.
William H. Lake, AO2230812.
Lash H. Laker, AO1861419.
John S. LaMarr, AO2226477.
Charles G. Lamb, Jr., AO2226699.
Marvin H. Lamb, AO2217524.
Merton E. Lamb, AO3023995.
Kenneth J. Lamberton, AO2208517.
Billy J. Landers, AO2221210.
James L. Landers, AO2246449.
Vergil K. Landers, AO2082613.
William G. Landess, AO3019687.
Billie F. Lands, AO1864916.
Frederick D. Lane, AO2253762.
Rowan J. Lane, AO2233921.
George W. Lang, AO1861208.
Billy G. Langhofer, AO2223088.
Derwent Langley, Jr., AO3019832.
Leslie I. Lanham, AO2230849.
Donald L. Lanoue, AO2227461.
Charles K. Lansdale, AO3023231.
Clifford C. LaPlante, AO2218958.
Thomas J. Lapos, AO3004814.
Michael Lappas, AO2231910.
Bernard A. Larger, AO2233505.
Charles J. Larkin, AO1865205.
Leonard W. Larkin, Jr., AO1859462.
Michael K. Larock, AO827688.
Francis A. Larrouy, AO3024725.
Robert A. Larsh, AO3022246.
Doyle E. Larson, AO3005663.
Leonard L. Larson, Jr., AO3030801.
Morris B. Larson, AO3030129.
Richard A. Larson, AO2225788.
Buford D. Lary, AO3020742.
Peter E. Lasota, AO3036958.
William S. Lassiter, AO3023302.
Lloyd D. Lassmann, AO3007485.
Richard C. Lathrop, AO822491.
Robert D. Lathrop, Sr., AO3007486.
James T. Latimer, AO3013762.
Loring K. Latimer, AO3036419.
Robert J. Latina, AO2219870.
John C. Lauderbach, Jr., AO2208501.
Noble B. Laughrun, AO1856582.
Robert H. Laurine, AO3023885.
Robert J. Lavallee, AO2227123.
John J. Lavin, AO3011837.
Alexander Lavish, AO2232475.
Ralph Law, AO2248604.
Arden W. Lawrence, Jr., AO2240297.
Byron H. Lawrence, AO2250652.
John M. Lawrence, Jr., AO2206517.
Norton J. Lawrence, AO2216122.
Richard C. Lawrence, AO3018528.
Grover N. Lawson, AO3006654.
William L. Lawter, AO2221217.
James R. Lawver, AO2247620.
Eugene E. Layer, AO840512.
Roy O. W. Layton, AO3023188.
Robert E. Lea, AO2228462.
Robert E. Lea, Jr., AO3023971.
Howard W. Leaf, AO2208843.
Cornelius M. Leahy, AO941098.
Roy D. Leak, AO3021560.
Adelbert D. Leavell, Jr., AO783124.
Donald E. Le Brun, AO2230867.
Alvin J. Lebsack, AO945250.
Jay B. Ledbetter, Jr., AO3006504.
Ben P. Lee, AO3004720.
Kenneth H. Lee, AO3005973.
Richard C. Lee, AO2225947.
Robert E. Lee, AO2205341.
Robert H. Lee, AO2231774.
Samuel M. Lee, AO2205207.
Neil M. Leeper, AO2234943.
Cecil E. Lefevers, AO2225613.
Theodore R. Legako, AO3023136.
Harold D. Leggett, AO3004764.
Wilbur P. Leggett, AO2226328.
Donald E. Lehr, AO2218468.
Richard F. Leisman, AO3014227.
William L. Leitch, AO3004485.
Marvin E. Lemaster, AO937184.
Robert R. Lemersal, AO3010260.
Richard L. Leming, AO2217200.
John E. Lemire, AO3022010.
Herbert M. Lemke, AO1904001.
Robert M. Lemmen, AO3011523.
Salvatore R. Lemole, AO2255638.
Lewis C. Lemon, AO2235634.
Seymour B. Lenz, AO3006906.
Robert L. Leonard, AO3024473.
James I. Leslie, Jr., AO3014391.
William D. Lessard, AO1861094.
Douglas R. Letnes, AO2206744.
Edward Levell, Jr., AO3004050.
Louis L. Levy, AO2229197.
Charles L. Lewis, AO3007978.
Charles P. Lewis, AO3006999.
Dan E. Lewis, AO2237436.
Edgar M. Lewis, AO3023454.
J. C. Lewis, AO2224081.
James P. Lewis, AO3037258.
Leroy C. Lewis, AO1850747.
Richard L. Lewis, AO3020773.
Ronald F. Lewis, AO3035776.
Russell S. Lewis, AO2225948.
Thomas H. Lewter, AO3024502.
Dallas M. Liddle, AO2230401.
Mark N. Liethen, AO3006393.
Keyolan G. Light, AO2204425.
Gerald W. Lightner, AO524311.
Morgan E. Lilly, AO3005283.
Allen G. Lincoln, AO2238403.
John L. Lind, AO2219264.
Sidney A. Lindberg, AO3007497.
Robert H. Lindeman, AO3012659.
William E. Lindeman, AO2224002.
Joseph C. Linder, AO2205802.
Herbert W. Lindner, Jr., AO3036151.
Marvin N. Lindsey, AO3002858.
Joe G. Lineberger, AO3013003.
Edward W. Lingel, AO2228679.
Robert D. Lingerfeldt, Jr., AO3012751.
Harvey C. Lingle, AO1861264.
Robert D. Linnon, AO2059318.
Grover N. Lipe, AO2221227.
John A. Lippincott, AO2235464.
Paul R. Lippincott, AO2227171.
Edward G. Lipsey, AO2227469.
Joseph R. Litteken, AO3018305.
David S. Litten, AO2249772.
Lee R. Little, AO3037295.
Dell W. Littlefield, AO3004359.
Delbert W. Litton, AO3019596.
Robert E. Lix, AO3012374.
Louis Llera, AO2233270.
Lemuel G. Lloyd, Jr., AO2221230.
William H. Lloyd, AO3035408.
Benjamin O. Lobitz, AO2227987.
Stanley W. Lochocki, Jr., AO3035388.
Paul F. Lockary, AO3036190.
David M. Lockhart, AO3025914.
Franklin D. Lockhart, AO3004421.
Fred H. Loemker, AO2218469.
Charles J. Logan, AO3012375.
Donald E. Logan, AO1858682.
Virgil D. Loken, AO2222623.
Elon Long, AO1861566.
James D. Long, AO1848260.
Robert B. Long, AO3004486.
Robert C. Long, AO2216898.
Edwin R. Longman, AO2206518.
Ervin P. Looney, AO3008496.
Ralph L. Looney, AO3006013.
Joseph R. Loper, AO2246247.
Carl A. LoSasso, AO2238035.
Joseph A. Loscalzo, AO941549.
Donald G. Lotermoser, AO2227222.
Joseph S. Lother, Jr., AO3006135.
Edward W. Lottich, AO941099.
Cyril C. Lota, Jr., AO944962.
Joseph S. Loucks, AO3007503.
Ervin L. Lovdahl, AO3006261.
George W. Love, AO1909615.
Dewey K. K. Lowe, AO768145.
Herbert C. Lowe, AO1859105.
Richard W. Lowe, AO2231332.
Douglas W. Lowell, AO3015640.
Thomas E. Lucas, AO2215195.
Guenther E. Luckenbach, AO927955.
Ruel M. Luckingham, Jr., AO2221938.
Charles Ludwig, AO2226474.
Mark E. Luedtke, AO2206745.
Donald D. Luenemberg, AO2204594.
Harold J. Luhn, AO2224226.
Carlton L. Luhrmann, AO2211267.
Joseph L. Lukasik, AO3005833.
Donald L. Lumadue, AO2219888.
Edgebert R. Luna, Jr., AO2204443.
Michael A. Luna, AO2229080.
Norman P. Luna, AO3018767.
Hollis Lunsford, AO2231725.
Jack A. Luse, AO3026243.
Elmer J. Lutz, AO3037522.
Bruce R. Lyle, AO3036672.
Thomas L. Lyne, Jr., AO3006205.
Sam R. Lyons, AO2223504.
Charles A. Lysaght, AO2215506.
Lowell C. Lytle, AO2226055.
John Macdecy, Jr., AO1848330.
John G. MacDonald, AO1851894.
Robert A. MacDonald, AO3022409.
Robert W. MacDonald, AO2217775.
Thomas M. MacGlothlin, Jr., AO2215601.
Joe H. Machetta, AO2227174.
Charles A. MacIvor, AO3014181.
Blaine L. Mack, AO767302.
Thomas J. Mack, AO3005149.
Arnold G. MacKeen, AO1849684.
John E. Mackey, AO940981.
Robert F. Macko, AO2234940.
George W. MacPherson, AO2226900.
Raymond B. MacQueen, AO2226923.
Richard D. MacQuiston, AO2206520.
Harold E. Macumber, AO2204989.
Thomas D. Madigan, AO2253744.
Robert H. Madison, AO2229865.
James N. Madsen, AO2230048.
Melville A. Madsen, AO2244952.
Arlie Maggart, Jr., AO3022524.
Clyde E. Mahaffee, Jr., AO942318.
Carvel E. Mahaffey, Jr., AO2223505.
John K. Maher, AO2226965.
Richard W. Maher, AO2220690.
William S. Mahler, AO2206561.
Arthur R. Mahon, AO3007511.
Henry M. Maine, AO2226989.
Leland E. Maines, Jr., AO1854262.
Louis F. Makowski, AO3034949.
Robert C. Mali, Jr., AO3033979.
Herbert L. Mallard, AO788573.
William C. Malone, AO2218966.
Douglas H. Maloney, AO2205641.
Robert F. Mance, AO2224165.
John P. Mande, AO3008365.
Stanley A. Mandler, AO3024475.
Donald K. Mangels, AO1863761.
Gordon W. Manges, AO3005021.
John E. Manias, Jr., AO2208976.
Frank W. Mann, AO2217776.
Harry G. Mann, AO3023997.
Walter E. Mann, Jr., AO1908820.
Joseph T. Manning, AO2223046.
Richard E. Manning, AO2223624.

Robert H. Manning, AO1856555.
William H. Manning, AO2250441.
Victor A. Maola, AO3005753.
Maurice J. Marchello, AO2227611.
Bruce R. Marcus, AO3015378.
Hugo E. Marek, AO2225043.
Raymond A. Marin, AO2220684.
Thomas D. Mariner, AO3005309.
Ralph H. Marionneaux, AO3022164.
Leon G. Mark, AO2220244.
Ronald H. Markarian, AO3002830.
John B. Marks, Jr., AO2219274.
Orland E. Marks, AO2029145.
Robert C. Marks, AO3019348.
James F. Marnell, AO3023725.
David J. Marquis, AO3013857.
William S. Marriott, AO3008981.
Maurice A. Marrs, Jr., AO1907749.
Henry G. Marshall, AO3008499.
Jack E. Marshall, AO2215619.
James H. Marshall, AO4038485.
Donald W. Martin, AO3005975.
Francis M. Martin, AO3008368.
George D. Martin, AO3017035.
Hubert R. Martin, AO3005958.
John K. Martin, AO3006622.
Kenneth C. Martin, AO3025596.
Kenneth H. Martin, AO2249992.
Lyal A. Martin, AO773740.
Ralph D. Martin, AO941392.
Richard A. Martin, AO3008369.
Richard E. Martin, AO773183.
V. W. Martin, Jr., AO2223289.
Victor E. Martin, AO3006234.
Patrick A. Martinelli, AO2206834.
Ernest J. Martini, AO2204965.
John D. Martinie, AO2237550.
Earl R. Marziuf, AO2222235.
Andrew F. Mason, Jr., AO2205080.
Dwight E. Mason, AO2228657.
Francis V. W. Mason II, AO2248232.
William D. Mason, AO3022334.
Gerald B. Massey, AO1853270.
Guy R. Massey, AO2215924.
James W. Massey, AO2246480.
Wayne G. Mathern, AO3014544.
Donald E. Mathers, AO2208246.
Carl W. Mathews, Jr., AO3007020.
Charles L. Mathews, AO2215935.
James W. Mathews, AO2221962.
Roger J. Mathiasen, AO3034854.
Glenn M. Mathis, Jr., AO589472.
Leander R. Mathwig, AO2224008.
Marcus M. Matlock, Jr., AO3004501.
Allan H. Matson, AO1858094.
Richard I. Matthews, AO3008354.
Herbert L. Mattox, Jr., AO936632.
Hubert D. Mattson, AO3019227.
Matt C. Mattson, AO3011550.
Michael M. Matula, AO2246415.
Walter E. Matula, AO825667.
John R. Mauch, AO3003062.
Harold A. Mauger, Jr., AO2205569.
Warren E. Maull, AO2228068.
William L. Maxfield, AO1860852.
Chester W. Maxwell, AO2233903.
Harold L. Maxwell, AO3011601.
Ralph Maxwell, AO3007023.
Maynard L. Mayberry, AO2219804.
Brooke W. Mayger, AO3006387.
William A. Mayhew, Jr., AO2209361.
Charles G. Maynard, AO3008371.
James L. McAlpine, AO2222124.
Frank H. McArdle, AO2218521.
David Y. McBrayer, AO3019983.
Robert C. McBryde, AO1863496.
Robert L. McCall, AO2228182.
William McCallum III, AO2232057.
Leroy L. McCampbell, AO2223766.
Bill D. McCann, AO2224745.
Robert O. McCartan, AO2230002.
William P. McCarthy, AO3004724.
Thomas H. McCarty, AO3021780.
Clifford G. McCathron, AO2095289.
Clifton H. McCauley, AO1860842.
Charles W. McClarren, AO3022608.
James B. McClary, Jr., AO2236182.
Monford M. McClatchey, AO2087672.
James R. McClure, Jr., AO2224788.
Donald D. McComb, AO1858605.
William F. McConnell, AO1864823.
Beverly B. McCord, AO2234769.
Hal E. McCord, AO3035472.
William L. McCord, Jr., AO3018328.
James S. McCormick, AO3020690.
Robert J. McCormick, AO2222076.
Thomas M. McCormick, AO3030215.
Wendell P. McCoskey, AO3023192.
Carroll W. McCoy, AO2236124.
James E. McCreedy, AO660071.
Charles E. McCullough, AO3017040.
Merle R. McCunn, AO784481.
John A. McCurdy, AO3023484.
James W. McCurry, AO3011143.
Alford McDaniel, AO2244857.
Gerald McDaniel, AO806284.
Thomas C. McDermott, Jr., AO2233274.
Brian McDonald, AO2230176.
Clayton D. McDonald, AO1863497.
George R. McDonald, AO1849215.
James G. McDonald, AO2206563.
John W. McDonald, Jr., AO869010.
Richard D. McDonald, AO1853324.
Richard Q. McDonald, AO2217129.
James E. McDonell, AO2253835.
Charles E. McDonough, AO2246953.
David H. McElveen, AO3014108.
Joseph J. McEntee, Jr., AO2232913.
Peyton C. McFarland, AO3032019.
Olin E. McFolin, AO2218969.
Paul J. McGarrigle, AO1860245.
Billy R. McGee, AO3017283.
John J. McGee, Jr., AO2245304.
James D. McGinley, AO3005450.
Lewis B. McGlohon, AO943961.
John R. McGoldrick, AO1862452.
John F. McGovern, Jr., AO2224938.
James B. McGowan, AO3023606.
Thomas P. McGowan, Jr., AO3006010.
Richard P. McGrath, AO3020323.
Mark A. McGregor, AO782382.
Lloyd A. McGrew, AO3035999.
Danny W. McGuire, AO1864983.
Melvin R. McGuire, AO3007031.
Ronald A. McGuire, AO3005328.
Thomas W. McGuire, Jr., AO2227716.
Thomas E. McHatton, Jr., AO3023215.
John T. McHenry, AO3016205.
John J. McHugh, AO3006610.
James T. McHughes, Jr., AO3006699.
Kenneth J. McIlvain, Jr., AO2219289.
William W. McIlvain, AO2209260.
Jerry R. McKee, AO2249308.
Francis J. McKenna, Jr., AO3006013.
Louis J. McKenna, AO3002566.
Robert K. McKenzie, Jr., AO2067160.
Richard G. McKibben, AO3006482.
Floyd L. McKinney, AO3005647.
Robert E. McKinney, AO787829.
Roger W. McLain, AO2205034.
John B. McLaughlin, AO833944.
Stewart L. McLay, AO3021938.
Douglas B. McLean, Jr., AO2225194.
Marcus H. McLean, AO2252789.
Ted M. McLean, AO2066691.
Billie B. McLeod, AO2222745.
Edward L. McLeod, AO1856675.
Thomas P. McLoughlin, Jr., AO3005621.
John F. McMahon, Jr., AO2209835.
William R. McMillin, Jr., AO3022012.
Jude R. McNamara, AO2225952.
Richard C. McNamara, AO3035672.
Arthur W. McNay, AO3022140.
William G. McNeeley, AO3006502.
John R. McNeil, AO2079884.
John W. McNeill, AO3008014.
Angus McPhail, AO3025225.
Randall M. McQuaig, AO3006015.
Joseph W. McRae, AO840663.
Charles F. McVicker, AO3006016.
Donald A. McVicker, AO4031633.
Howard H. McWhorter, Jr., AO2210802.
James S. Meador, AO2247836.
Marvin D. Meadows, AO3006017.
Arthur S. Mearns, AO2248113.
Arthur R. Mears, AO3034951.
David L. Medley, AO2227474.
Richard J. Meechan, AO3006053.
William B. Meharg, AO1866226.
Frederick C. Meier, AO2252620.
Harry Meier, AO3022904.
John L. Meisenheimer, AO2209673.
James W. Melcher, AO2216437.
Thomas Mellen, AO3037416.
Anthony J. Melli, AO3024975.
Thomas W. Mellor, Jr., AO2209167.
Bernard D. Melvin, AO840616.
Samuel A. Melvin, AO3004505.
Samuel J. Mencio, Jr., AO2228298.
Edward Mendes, AO3009275.
Donald L. Mendiola, AO3006023.
Edward H. Menke, AO2231916.
Harold J. Menke, AO3023297.
Edgar L. Meredith, AO3006018.
Frank J. Merrill, AO1857856.
Bobby M. Merriman, AO2077905.
Raymond J. Merritt, AO2223155.
John P. Merwick, AO3006283.
Gerald L. Metcalf, AO3037370.
Grady W. Metcalf, Jr., AO3021168.
Herman J. Methfessel, AO2222150.
William Metscher, AO2218977.
Laurie B. Metzger, Jr., AO2220715.
Harry H. Meuser, AO3002233.
Fredrick W. Meyer, AO2217892.
Lawrence H. Meyer, AO3013022.
Robert J. Meyer, AO3009268.
Peter N. Micale, AO3017309.
Gordon B. Mickelson, AO2222151.
William F. Mickelson, AO2208214.
Robert N. Middlebrooks, AO3037793.
James B. Middleton, Jr., AO1861541.
James H. Middleton, Jr., AO2244727.
James J. Mihalick, AO3023524.
Max L. Mihura, AO3021240.
Frederick J. Miklosky, AO3023098.
Harry J. Miknuk, AO1851929.
James T. Mikulecky, AO3006533.
Kenneth R. Milam, AO3005501.
Victor L. Milam, AO2228074.
Edmund W. Milauckas, AO2220269.
Charles H. Milian, Jr., AO1865311.
Robert L. Milks, AO799222.
Alfred M. Miller, Jr., AO2222559.
Allen D. Miller, AO3030402.
Billy J. Miller, AO2249256.
Carl S. Miller, AO2224942.
Daniel P. Miller, AO3034601.
Donald B. Miller, AO2210101.
Donald E. Miller, AO2225797.
Gerald R. Miller, AO3005530.
Horace W. Miller, AO3006159.
Milton E. Miller, AO819698.
Nelson L. Miller, AO2217830.
Robert B. Miller, AO3023839.
Robert L. Miller III, AO2245121.
William J. Miller, AO3006389.
Stillman C. Millington, AO3014681.
Ralph A. Millotte, AO3007044.
Leo T. Mills, AO3017619.
William M. Milstead, AO3007541.
Ollie F. Mims, AO3003003.
Jerney J. Minshew, AO2220270.
Michael B. Miraglia, AO1865057.
William T. Misencik, AO3007046.
Louis F. Miserocchi, AO3034927.
Alfred R. Mitchell, AO2217700.
Byron J. Mitchell, AO3015507.
John C. Mitchell, AO3009144.
Paul F. Mitchell, AO2248498.
William J. Mitchell, AO3024356.
Kurt H. Mittmann, AO3006624.
Robert L. Mize, AO2222959.
Stanley K. Moe, AO2234327.
William F. Moffett, AO2208808.
Kenneth F. Mohling, AO2224340.
Adolph U. Molina, AO2205386.
Robert B. Mollo, AO2225326.
Richard F. Molter, AO3007049.
Victor J. Molzer, AO2240125.
Thomas J. Monaghan, AO1851342.
Arthur E. Monahan, Jr., AO2249206.
Fred A. Money, AO2208809.
Thomas E. Mongno, AO2236183.
David L. Monroe, AO3036639.
Paul G. Montague, Jr., AO3002708.
Ernest A. Montemayor, AO3008030.
Richard J. Montgomery, AO2231130.
Thomas H. Montgomery, Jr., AO2227229.
Vernon E. Montgomery, AO3021504.
William T. Montgomery, Jr., AO2067323
Donald J. Moody, AO2226864.
Wayne L. Moody, AO2208363.

Lloyd B. Moon, AO3012754.
Herman S. Moore, AO2229868.
James H. Moore, AO929927.
Kenneth E. Moore, AO2219910.
Richard D. Moore, AO2224897.
Wallace W. Moore, AO3004872.
Warren C. Moore, AO1865058.
William E. Moore, AO2215894.
Dorman B. Moose, Jr., AO3037596.
Arthur C. Morabito, AO831578.
John J. Moran, AO2245307.
Billy B. Morgan, AO2224351.
Clyde E. Morgan, AO3005790.
Ernest O. Morgan, Jr., AO930176.
Glenn P. Morgan, Jr., AO722746.
Thomas P. Morgan, AO1858578.
Wallace M. Morgan, AO2216930.
Edward D. Moriarty, AO2250078.
Franklin P. Moritz, AO2231650.
Cordous L. Morris, Jr., AO2226376.
Jack Morris, AO949675.
James W. Morris, AO3016293.
Robert A. Morris, Jr., AO3002709.
Robert L. Morris, AO935720.
Robert L. Morris, AO3022185.
James S. Morrison, AO2102523.
William G. Morrison, AO3021993.
John E. Morrissette, AO3021680.
John C. Morrow, AO2208365.
William F. Morrow, Jr., AO2215929.
Donald P. Morse, AO3009276.
Henry A. Moseley, AO2235847.
Francis L. Mosier, AO2208739.
Billy S. Moss, AO3009341.
Charles H. Moss, AO2251109.
Dewey D. Mostad, AO3006286.
Lawson P. Mosteller, Jr., AO3008509.
Thomas J. Motes, AO3024680.
Leonard E. Motley, AO3007553.
Elbert L. Mott, AO2230971.
Richard R. Mottern, AO2250848.
Jerold G. Mulkey, AO2229101.
Thomas R. Mullen, AO2222842.
Ronald R. Mullenix, AO2218477.
Erman H. Mullins, AO2083631.
Norman H. Mullins, AO3023667.
Dean W. Munson, AO3023710.
Robert G. Munz, AO1333251.
Charles V. Murdock, AO3021475.
Francis X. Murgia, AO3023122.
John J. Murnin, AO2234580.
Edward R. Murphy, Jr., AO2217759.
Frank Murphy, Jr., AO2234773.
Jack C. Murphy, AO946315.
Loran D. Murphy, AO3022399.
Michael Murphy, AO3006697.
Cecil L. Murray, AO2219914.
Edmond F. Murray, AO3023630.
Francis J. Murray, AO3005153.
Francis J. Murray, Jr., AO3008261.
Don W. Musgrove, AO3013765.
Jack E. Musgrove, AO3004510.
Armand J. Myers, AO3014044.
Donald J. Myers, AO2251674.
Donald L. Myers, AO2231652.
Douglas C. Myers, Sr., AO1910000.
George E. Myers, AO3024256.
John R. Myers, AO3021725.
Paul R. Myers, AO1861543.
Roger B. Myhrum, AO3034482.
Louis J. Nadeau, AO2232610.
Richard D. Nadeau, AO3024061.
Robert F. Nagel, AO2237444.
David L. Napoli, AO3021865.
Joseph J. Narciso, AO2084176.
Robert P. Nass, AO3025762.
William J. Nassif, AO3007061.
Roger J. Naus, AO2204483.
George D. Navarre, AO2228080.
Herbert Navarro, AO2206232.
Robert A. Neal, AO2223048.
William D. Neal, Jr., AO2246256.
Francis R. Nealon, AO2230905.
Herbert L. Neathery, AO3010141.
George M. Nedel, AO3005223.
David K. Needham, AO701137.
Paul G. Neely, AO3006055.
Robert A. Neff, AO3015394.
James A. Neher, AO3022317.
David A. Nelson, AO2227553.
Deryl W. Nelson, AO1853369.
Donald F. Nelson, AO2204599.
Dudley F. Nelson, Jr., AO2224946.
John B. Nelson, Jr., AO3032294.
John E. Nelson, Jr., AO2224653.
Robert C. Nelson, AO1861349.
Robert W. Nelson, AO3022733.
Rolland D. Nelson, AO3007064.
Russell A. Nelson, AO3005286.
William E. Nelson, AO1864791.
Richard S. Nemeth, AO3013598.
E. Archie Nesmith, Jr., AO2219313.
Myrdon T. Neumann, AO1854046.
John F. Newell, Jr., AO2237619.
Franklin D. Newsom, AO3021137.
John A. Newsom, AO3024284.
Donald W. Newton, AO3008045.
Nicholas C. Nicholas, AO2250090.
Clyde C. Nichols, AO3037675.
Dennis E. Nichols, AO3021246.
Hubert C. Nichols, Jr., AO2223644.
Max E. Nichols, AO2220282.
Peter T. Nichols, AO2225107.
Ray E. Nichols, AO2237578.
Walter F. Nickerson, AO3024299.
Oliver P. Nicola III, AO3023711.
Alan F. Niedringhaus, AO3021593.
Donald C. Nielsen, AO2216851.
Edward E. Nielsen, AO3004365.
Charles G. Nieman, AO2248500.
Nicholas Niezek, AO2236383.
Fred R. Nikithser, AO2255844.
Peter K. Nikonovich, AO3035239.
George C. Nix, AO3023459.
James B. Nix, Jr., AO2225959.
Henry S. Nizko, AO3003364.
Howard R. Nolan, AO3024168.
John E. Nolan, AO2227556.
John J. Nolan, AO2219618.
Paul L. Noll, AO3007067.
Howard A. Nollenberger, AO2247738.
John P. Noonan, AO3025920.
Thomas J. Noonan, Jr., AO2227387.
Derald O. Nordbrock, AO2227230.
Glenn L. Nordin, AO2238440.
James W. Nordmeyer, AO2225200.
Merle E. Norem, AO2224298.
Murray A. Norman, AO3022905.
Thomas Norman III, AO2085637.
Joseph W. Norrbohm, AO2222210.
Donald O. Norris, AO2222843.
Karl D. Norris, AO2060069.
Lloyd R. Norris, AO2226865.
Edgar A. Northrup, Jr., AO2221968.
John F. Nortness, AO2062690.
Neal E. Norton, AO1853263.
Roy J. Notley, AO3004999.
Billy T. Nowlin, AO3023553.
Klyne D. Nowlin, AO3021321.
Cornelius Nugteren, AO3004513.
Harry C. Null, AO1866132.
George F. Nunes, AO3005025.
Rodolph L. Nunn, Jr., AO2215675.
Henry C. Nurge, Jr., AO2218121.
Robert K. Nystrom, AO2088183.
James L. Oaks, AO3007572.
John L. Obourn, AO2210872.
William R. O'Brien, AO3021726.
Francis R. O'Clair, AO2219920.
Charles J. O'Connell, AO716213.
William J. O'Connor, Jr., AO3022315.
William L. O'Connor, AO932628.
Myles R. O'Crowley, AO1864593.
Roscoe M. Odell, AO935876.
Edward F. O'Donnell, Jr., AO3000248.
John W. O'Donnell, AO3013862.
Norval L. Oexmann, AO2251398.
William K. Officer, AO2208981.
William S. O'Gwynn, AO3008265.
Donald G. O'Hara, AO3023790.
William D. O'Hare, AO2209195.
James T. Ohashi, AO2221305.
Russell L. Ohl, AO1865438.
Robert W. O'Keefe, AO3024125.
Thomas J. Olds, AO2236311.
James C. Oliver, AO2235728.
John K. Oliver, AO1864431.
Louis R. Oliver, AO3034346.
Don P. Olsen, AO3014954.
Eldon D. Olsen, AO2238262.
Larry R. Olsen, AO3009471.
Carroll O. Olson, AO2238296.
Carl W. Olsson, AO2205988.
Kelsey M. Olver, AO3013175.
Neil H. Olver, AO3005199.
George P. O'Malley, AO2245957.
Albert C. Omer, AO2216907.
Leo E. Omernik, AO3025803.
James W. O'Neil, AO3023749.
Joseph T. O'Neill, AO1860167.
Peter D. O'Neill, AO3023499.
Billie R. Oney, AO3005390.
Axel P. Ongstad, AO3008387.
Daniel H. Oplinger, AO3020789.
John W. Oplinger, AO3036675.
Albert G. Opp, AO3018335.
Thomas H. Opsomer, AO3022186.
William L. Orange, AO3004820.
Leo J. Origer, AO2222079.
Richard L. Orr, AO2227889.
Charles J. Orrico, AO2225248.
Nicholas A. Orsini, AO2248120.
Lawrence D. Ortolani, AO3021357.
Edward W. Osborne, AO3009372.
Harry H. Osbun, AO3014517.
Douglas C. Osburn, Jr., AO721187.
Leland A. Osburn, AO2209604.
Dennis M. O'Shea, AO3006508.
Thomas L. O'Steen, AO3007580.
Cornelius M. O'Sullivan, AO3005179.
George H. Oswald, Jr., AO3005539.
Walter H. Ott, AO2222847.
Gerald R. Otteson, AO841856.
Harvey L. Ottinger, AO3010008.
Kenneth A. Otto, AO3010861.
Lawrence A. Ouellett, AO3022351.
Robert E. Overbey, AO3004430.
William S. Overling, AO3007582.
Norris M. Overly, AO2224354.
Gordon Y. W. Ow, AO3021658.
Charles C. Owen, Jr., AO2208167.
Albert W. Owens, AO2225490.
Joy L. Owens, AO2221940.
Lorrimer E. Owens, Jr., AO2246730.
Nils O. A. Oxehufwud, AO3024521.
Richard J. Oxford, AO2226811.
Charles E. Ozmore, AO2247630.
Moody J. Pack, AO788075.
Robert Padden, AO3022479.
Adrian Paerels, Jr., AO3022933.
Harold R. Paetzel, AO3005854.
Charles M. Pagach, AO3021595.
Frank G. Pagano, Jr., AO1907351.
Gordon L. Page, AO3024285.
William H. F. Page, AO2030033.
Jerome J. Palermino, AO3024222.
Adolph Palma, AO3023460.
Dale M. Palmer, AO822529.
George K. Palmer, Jr., AO2208219.
Gilbert S. Palmer, Jr., AO3023658.
Richard L. Palmer, AO3005200.
Alessandro D. Panarese, AO2221313.
Richard G. Panuska, AO2240202.
Lawrence J. Paolozzi, AO3006056.
Anthony Papaneri, AO3036191.
Daniel J. Paparoski, AO940795.
Francis H. Papineau, AO3016320.
Orin V. Pardun, AO2234865.
Edward J. Parenti, AO2222236.
John H. Paris, Jr., AO3021540.
Maynard L. Park, AO2058248.
Alton B. Parker, Jr., AO2250350.
Elbert C. Parker, AO2205437.
Joseph H. Parker, AO2216130.
Lincoln K. Parker, AO3005947.
William H. Parker, AO3003108.
Gordon W. Parkhill, Jr., AO2222849.
Gordon K. Parr, AO2074081.
Daniel H. Parris, AO2222966.
Dana E. Parsells, AO687111.
Eugene M. Parsons, AO2251645.
Robert K. Parsons, AO2247346.
Russell K. Parsons, AO2217072.
William L. Parsons, AO3022567.
Donald L. Pascoe, AO2222012.
John V. Pasley, AO1848472.
James L. Passauer, AO2233896.
Lawrence K. Passey, AO3019834.
John S. Pate, Jr., AO3023157.
John F. Patellos, AO3023124.
Cameron D. Paterson, AO2101322.
Robert E. Patrick, Jr., AO2227020.
Roy D. Patrick, AO2249793.

Andrew L. Patten, AO2231997.
Curtis Patterson, AO2228085.
George E. Patterson, AO3009657.
James D. Patterson, AO3019464.
Jerrold E. Patterson, AO3019876.
John T. Patterson, AO2221818.
Lloyd A. Patterson, AO2228086.
Robert D. Patterson, AO3021727.
Robert S. Patterson, AO2223700.
Vernon D. Patterson, AO3004617.
Marvin C. Patton, AO2237312.
Melvin H. Patton, AO2222889.
Norman P. Patton, AO843097.
William E. Patton, Jr., AO723815.
Charles A. Paul, AO2222155.
William B. Paul, AO2210077.
Donald E. Paxton, AO2216853.
Frank W. Payn, AO2246339.
Harry E. Payne, AO2227477.
James B. Payson, AO3023054.
James W. Payton, AO3006446.
Donald A. Pearse, AO2206054.
Warren G. Peck, AO2231690.
Dale B. Peckman, AO1862906.
Richard T. Peckskamp, AO3009229.
William L. Pelfrey, AO3023936.
James L. Pelzer, AO3031006.
John E. Pendergast, AO3007083.
Caleb G. Pendley, AO2236513.
Anthony J. Pennella, AO2227286.
Douglas J. Pennington, AO2223293.
Lawrence E. Pennington, AO2224015.
Robert E. Pennington, AO3020822.
Hans G. Peot, AO3019100.
Hobart G. Pepper, AO2063092.
Jerome G. Peppers, Jr., AO2230578.
Harlan A. Pergande, AO3022991.
Calvin C. Perkins, AO2227989.
William H. Perkins, Jr., AO1860308.
Howard I. Perry, AO1854759.
Hugh D. Perry, AO3034549.
John S. Perry, AO2255862.
William M. Perry, AO2223350.
Louis J. Persiani, AO2098388.
Joseph H. Pertl, Jr., AO3005314.
Emil W. Pesaturo, Jr., AO3010568.
Richard A. Peshkin, AO3011861.
Chester A. Peteritas, AO2213716.
Jack W. R. Peters, AO3005473.
Jerry M. Peters, AO2253572.
Alfred C. Petersen, AO3023149.
Carl D. Petersen, AO3011482.
Alden C. Peterson, AO1847266.
Arthur C. Peterson, AO3024479.
Keith E. Peterson, AO1857680.
Keith R. Peterson, AO2226910.
Richard B. Peterson, AO3014055.
Richard J. Peterson, AO2222522.
Frank J. Petkevitz, AO3007086.
Paul J. Petrich, AO3013452.
Jerry J. Petska, AO1848486.
Edward A. Petty, AO1862715.
Fritz W. Pfefferkorn, AO3036640.
Ernest R. Pfefferle, AO3023570.
Leon K. Pfeiffer, AO2215265.
Boyd E. Phillips, AO2230425.
Donald L. Phillips, AO3007087.
Durell H. Phillips, AO2224302.
Frederick S. Phillips, Sr., AO2236082.
Glenn A. Phillips, AO2216131.
Harrop B. Phillips, AO2216132.
John F. Phillips, AO3018236.
Paul C. Phillips, AO1907732.
Phelon B. Phillips, AO3003008.
Wilbur O. Phillips, AO2219333.
Jimmey N. Phipps, AO2205300.
John L. Phipps, AO1865063.
Robert D. Phoenix, AO3021782.
Donald W. Pick, AO3008522.
Ronald E. Pickett, AO3009530.
Gordon K. Pickler, AO2221325.
Donald L. Pierce, AO3023831.
Fred P. Pierce, AO2218999.
Wellington C. Pierce, AO3004220.
Don W. Pihl, AO2228089.
Ray Pike III, AO2247973.
Sylvester C. Pike, AO2092447.
Roger A. Pile, AO2208952.
Edward J. Pilecki, AO2232544.
John E. Pilkington, AO2092329.
Walter F. Pilkington, AO3018758.
Herman H. Piner, AO3011652.
Monte R. Piper, AO3013397.
Jack A. Pittman, AO3006535.
Ralph S. Pittman, AO2230873.
Bruno F. Pitts, AO3006209.
Joseph J. Pizzicaroli, AO3022297.
Richard P. Plack, AO2231157.
Jimmie P. Platt, AO3013988.
Robert B. Plowden, Jr., AO2204785.
George J. Pluard, Jr., AO3022280.
William R. Plummer, AO2248617.
Gene L. Pobst, AO2217835.
Eugene F. Podhajsky, AO3021994.
Eugene O. Poindexter, AO2204313.
William R. Pokluda, AO2225251.
John W. Polk, Jr., AO3035051.
Earl A. Polzin, AO2228090.
Elmer J. Pool, AO3013487.
Walter H. Poore, AO2207816.
Orval R. Porritt, AO824868.
Melvin F. Porter, AO710168.
Scott S. Porter, AO2228606.
Thurman Porter, Jr., AO2234585.
William E. Porter, AO3013637.
James N. Portis, AO3023878.
Billy M. Poston, AO3016015.
Norman R. Potter, AO2234190.
Joseph R. Potvin, AO1848926.
Kenneth V. Poulton, AO2231323.
Billy D. Powell, AO2227969.
John L. Powell, Jr., AO3021682.
John R. Powell, AO826500.
Vandy M. Powell, Jr., AO3020056.
Aaron A. Powers, Jr., AO2239943.
Joseph G. Powers, AO3005111.
William R. Powers, AO2224172.
Allen J. Pratka, AO2225876.
Chelmer G. Pray, AO3005569.
Richard C. Prentiss, AO3031877.
Robert G. Presnell, AO2223649.
Reed A. Prestgard, AO3018460.
Ralph Prete, AO3022066.
Ralph N. Prettyman, AO3008079.
Mexion O. Prewitt, AO2232340.
Kenneth L. Priaulx, AO3035122.
George P. Pribyl, AO2224750.
Howard J. Price, AO2228467.
Ronald D. Price, AO2226341.
William S. Price, Jr., AO2216454.
William T. Price, AO2230776.
Harland E. Priddle, AO3008274.
Dorphan N. Priest, AO2238089.
Durward K. Priester, AO3025234.
Diedrich Prigge III, AO3006511.
Zeff C. Prina, AO2223164.
Leo D. Prince, AO3035786.
Philo T. Prior, AO2211136.
David P. Proctor, Jr., AO2224611.
Igor P. Prokofieff, AO3025862.
Henry G. Prosack, AO3010796.
Richard W. Pryor, AO3024104.
William M. Pugh, AO3017207.
Andrew F. Pulliam, AO1865722.
Duane W. Pulliam, AO3021077.
Gerald F. Punteney, AO2235559.
Bruce W. Purdy, AO3023400.
Charles H. Purdy, AO3004154.
Phillip M. Purdy, AO3023727.
James R. Pursell, AO3004081.
Ralph B. Pursifull, AO3023647.
Ernest L. Pyne, AO2207145.
Don O. Quane, AO3018114.
Thomas V. Quayle, AO3023554.
Malcolm D. Quick, AO3006422.
Robert E. Quick, AO3033951.
Thomas K. Quigley, AO1865542.
William B. Quinlivan, AO782357.
John V. Quinn, AO3024271.
Paul E. Raabe, AO3015829.
Michael H. Rabasca, Jr., AO2209170.
Raymond H. Rade, AO2027242.
Derald J. Radtke, AO3007615.
Edward F. Radziwan, AO3022850.
James F. Rafferty, AO3006703.
William J. Raflowski, AO2230280.
Robert Raful AO1860859.
Frank W. Ragland, AO2227491.
John W. Rago, AO2250620.
Lewis E. Raines, Jr., AO2227234.
Harold W. Rainey, AO1864469.
William M. Rainwater, AO3015866.
Harry E. Raisor, AO3021122.
Joseph V. Raiti, AO773805.
Billy L. Ralston, AO1865224.
Ruven L. Rambin, AO3021177.
William E. Ramer, AO2224763.
Jack E. Ramsey, Jr., AO2205087.
John E. Ramsey, AO3015949.
Thomas E. Randall, AO3004585.
James G. Randolph, AO2219339.
Paul L. Rankin, Jr., AO3020301.
Benedict O. Rasmussen, AO3004784.
Jimmie M. Rasmussen, AO2229650.
James C. Ratcliffe, AO1856614.
Forrest R. Ratliff, AO2231220.
Paul E. Raudenbush, AO2208064.
Clarence H. Rausch, AO3005112.
James F. Rausch, AO770403.
Peter A. Ravella, AO941614.
William D. Raven, AO822088.
Gene D. Rawlings, AO3011153.
Robert W. Rawlins, AO3004223.
David L. Ray, AO3024524.
Lawrence J. Ray, AO3021995.
Raymond C. T. Ray, AO2205610.
Robert E. Rayfield, AO3024201.
Bernard C. Reck, AO2227436.
Robert G. Record, Jr., AO2219634.
James E. Redden, AO1861097.
Louis J. Redmann, AO2236822.
John E. Redmon, AO3021359.
Philip A. Redpath, AO2223781.
Jack H. Reece, AO3016398.
Robert K. Reece, AO3007619.
William P. Reece, AO2223008.
Jack C. Reed, AO3005534.
Jackie G. Reed, AO3004777.
Marion E. Reed, AO2206006.
Marvin R. Reed, AO3024525.
Robert R. Reed, AO2208894.
Damon B. Reeder, AO2222239.
Jack C. Reedy, AO2222057.
Davis S. Rees, AO3024027.
Howard Reeve, AO3021808.
Carl N. Reeves, Jr., AO2226343.
Lawrence R. Reeves, Jr., AO3004000.
William E. Regan, Jr., AO2227364.
Kenneth W. Rehg, AO3023693.
Richard F. Reichardt, AO2228426.
Calvin H. Reichenbach, AO2239001.
Robert B. Reichenbach, AO2249921.
Carl A. Reid, AO3007621.
George R. Reid, AO2222634.
Guy W. Reid, AO2249288.
Malcolm Reid, AO942515.
Joseph E. Reidy, AO2232342.
Donald T. Reilly, Jr., AO2206942.
John J. Reilly, AO2209990.
Walter J. Reinhard, AO3004586.
Victor J. Reinhart, AO2219636.
Robert G. Reinking, AO2224016.
Harold T. Reitan, AO2219010.
Edward G. Reiter, Jr., AO2225209.
Richard D. Reitler, AO2015497.
Henry W. Rejent, AO1865094.
Roland R. Renard, AO2210319.
Earl W. Renfroe, Jr., AO2223892.
Randall R. Renken, AO2222567.
William L. Renwick, AO2247746.
Robert C. Revou, AO3012528.
William S. Rexford, AO2234205.
Peter L. Rey, AO2245241.
Dale L. Reynolds, AO2206373.
Francis E. Reynolds, AO2249365.
Marc C. Reynolds, AO2222973.
Marvin L. Reynolds, AO940509.
Pleasant G. Reynolds, Jr., AO2216540.
William G. Rheams, AO2073693.
Lynn R. Rhodes, AO3013771.
Rodger D. Rhodes, AO3005926.
George E. Rice, AO2205040.
Leo B. Rice, AO2220312.
Richard R. Rice, AO3007112.
James M. S. Rich, AO2236863.
Alvin B. Richards, AO1860590.
James C. Richards, AO2216047.
Howard E. Richardson, Jr., AO3018932.
Wesley M. Richardson, AO3005474.
William J. Richardson, Jr., AO3006526.
L. G. Richerson, AO1855724.
John P. Richmond, Jr., AO2234191.
Richard Richter, AO3007113.

George H. Rick, AO2222454.
Arthur E. Rickow, AO3004623.
Andre R. Ricou, AO3006566.
Leroy B. Riddle, Jr., AO3004520.
David T. Ridgway, AO2248606.
Paul F. Rieger, AO2232343.
Robert O. Riepling, AO2222635.
Albert M. Ries, AO3024921.
James W. Rigg, AO3008094.
Norville L. Riggan, AO3020927.
Robert P. Riggins, AO2237707.
Dick N. Riley, AO3011154.
Donald L. Riley, AO2250090.
Francis E. Riley, AO3005759.
Leon H. Riley, AO2205156.
Robert G. Riley, AO3022507.
William H. Riley, AO2225417.
Michael Rimm, AO1860986.
Richard E. Rinearson, AO2215289.
Jack A. Ring, AO942037.
Richard E. Ring, AO2227513.
Bill G. Rippy, AO2226869.
Willis P. Risdon, AO2062115.
Richard M. Ritter, AO1336689.
Willie J. Rivers, AO2228543.
Norman C. Roan, Jr., AO2231491.
Edward B. Robbins, AO2208290.
David M. Roberson, AO3023517.
Donald R. Roberts, AO2227289.
Russell C. Roberts, Jr., AO3005760.
Stephen L. Roberts, AO2220313.
Charles A. Robertson, AO3021035.
George B. Robertson, Jr., AO2222404.
Jack C. Robertson, AO3008097.
Robert E. Robertson, AO2221969.
John W. Robey, AO3034041.
Douglas G. Robin, Jr., AO3003753.
David A. Robinette, AO2251534.
Roy C. Robinette, Jr., AO2233978.
Arthur H. Robinson, AO3009621.
David G. Robinson, AO3002917.
Harry S. Robinson, AO2090881.
Leonard G. Robinson, AO1905672.
Roland R. Robinson, AO2204460.
William P. Robinson, AO932353.
Donald Robison, AO2222685.
Clayton W. Robson, AO2226765.
James W. Roby, AO2221360.
James T. Rock, AO2228429.
John M. Roddy, Jr., AO2219641.
Weston A. Roe, AO2224249.
Ray E. Roestel, AO779298.
David F. Rogers, AO2220786.
John A. Rogers, AO970001.
Lynn Rogers, AO832016.
Ross H. Rogers, AO3034122.
Max E. Rohlfs, AO2234633.
Gene L. Rohr, AO2224119.
George Rokuhara, AO2230332.
Harry L. Rollins, AO3024070.
Donald W. Romans, AO1865227.
Joseph Romeo, AO3023038.
Lester M. Romine, AO2222405.
Reed E. Romine, AO3020151.
Donald J. Rondeau, AO3005949.
William D. Roper, AO2241330.
Joseph A. Rosalia, AO2218575.
Richard D. Rosborough, AO3017666.
Martin W. Rose, AO699739.
Stanley D. Rose, AO3024806.
Franklin A. Ross, AO2251114.
Fredric S. Ross, AO3006538.
Gerald L. Ross, AO1862462.
Leroy E. Ross, Jr., AO2217080.
Lowell W. Ross, AO3019390.
Van E. Ross, AO2226076.
Arthur L. Roth, AO3003263.
Henry G. Roth, AO3021511.
Robert C. Roth, AO2209080.
Richard A. Rotkosky, AO3007636.
Donald E. Roulier, AO3023085.
William R. Round, AO3004955.
Marvin D. Roupe, AO3022321.
Lawrence M. Rouse, AO2228522.
Kenneth T. Roussel, AO3011093.
Richard J. Roussell, AO2227515.
Paul J. Routhier, AO2232230.
Charles W. Rowan, AO973105.
Ted W. Rowden, AO3008102.
Theodore R. Rowe, Jr., AO3008528.
Wesley J. Rowe, Jr., AO3022945.
Lonnie J. Rowin, AO3020002.
Jesse L. Rowlett, AO2214721.
Clayton A. Rowley, AO778956.
William T. Roy, AO2236208.
Council L. Royal, AO2235359.
Raymond M. Royall, AO2249366.
Robert M. Rubin, AO3025378.
Everett E. Ruble, AO938323.
William K. Rudewick, AO1863170.
William J. Rudy, AO3042812.
Franklin G. Rufty, Jr., AO2207779.
Dan H. Ruhl, Jr., AO826001.
Thomas J. Rulis, AO2206945.
Herbert L. Rumph, AO935779.
Harry V. Runge, AO2224615.
Jack C. Runyan, AO2206651.
John J. Ruppel, AO3037339.
Arthur J. Ruppert, AO3034610.
Warren G. Ruppert, AO2101125.
Henry C. Rushing, AO1859520.
Eugene J. Russel, AO2226189.
David J. Russell, AO1864772.
Francis M. Russell, AO815394.
Jay M. Russell, AO2248919.
John P. Russell, AO2231816.
Len C. Russell, AO2224614.
Richard E. Russell, AO3020416.
Louis F. Russo, AO2220317.
John A. Rutkowski, AO2236372.
Peter G. Rutledge, AO749622.
William H. Rutledge, Jr., AO1865279.
Richard R. Ryan, AO2223298.
Ronald J. Ryan, AO2207478.
Wallace C. Ryan, AO2221918.
William A. Ryan, AO2216249.
Gene V. Rydell, AO3016048.
Kenneth W. Ryker, AO1860794.
Donald J. Rynda, AO3007638.
Eugene J. Sacco, AO2223232.
Robert C. Saffell, AO2222160.
James D. Sala, AO2227744.
George L. Salem, AO2056725.
Leroy J. Salem, AO1863771.
Felix L. Sambogna, AO3036589.
Bob G. Samples, AO2221372.
Kenneth W. Samuels, AO3004906.
Theodore H. Sandberg, Jr., AO2216776.
Hyland G. Sanders, AO3008112.
Laurence A. Sanders, AO3002948.
John P. Sandiford, Jr., AO2249157.
Carl E. Sandmeyer, AO3004521.
Robert J. Sandvick, AO3037794.
Carl A. Sands, AO943481.
Reuben V. Sanguinet, Jr., AO3023159.
Marvin B. Sather, AO2226190.
Herman J. Sathoff, Jr., AO3017141.
Frank M. Satterfield, AO3005157.
George M. Sauls, AO3015824.
Bradley J. Saunders, Jr., AO701960.
Bernard M. Savage, AO939609.
Joseph E. Savage, AO2219025.
Richard F. Savage, AO2253521.
Richard J. Savage, AO945305.
Robert H. Savage, AO3005857.
William B. Savage, AO3007643.
August Savera, AO2227067.
David Savidge, AO2221971.
Harry S. Sayles, AO3024391.
Philip R. Sayre, AO2209388.
Billy H. Scarborough, AO3020806.
Grover J. D. Schack, AO2218782.
Calvin B. Schadel, AO2246736.
Henry P. Schaefer, AO1850676.
Gerald G. Schafer, AO1861030.
Charles J. Scharf, AO2208524.
Edward A. Scharlock, Jr., AO832021.
Gordon L. Scharnhorst, AO3025603.
Theodore J. Schaub, AO2210390.
William A. Schenck, AO3021479.
Charles W. Scherwitz, AO3022909.
Gene F. Schiedermayer, AO3005083.
Joseph A. Schiefen, Jr., AO1850239.
Richard L. Schildknecht, AO3031526.
David O. Schillerstrom, AO3019663.
Herbert F. Schimsk, AO2215520.
Harold L. Schipper, Jr., AO945162.
Gerald R. Schipull, AO2220802.
John Schlight, AO3022685.
Bernie R. Schmertz, AO2210785.
Ernest A. Schmid, AO2232851.
Glenn E. Schmidt, AO1907865.
Herman C. Schmidt, AO1850504.
John R. Schmidt, AO3013420.
Neilan D. Schmidt, AO2221381.
Thomas A. Schmidt, AO2227439.
Thomas E. Schmidt, AO3023324.
Joseph F. Schmiedl, AO2233943.
Donald F. Schmitt, AO3006423.
Russell E. Schmitt, AO2217034.
Leland A. Schmoker, AO3004626.
Frank J. Schmuck, AO2216305.
David L. Schneckloth, AO3006514.
Arnold Schneider, AO3011155.
Donald F. Schneider, AO2235435.
Howard D. Schneider, AO3015427.
Joe D. Schneider, AO2219651.
Robert R. Schnepp, AO3006367.
Richard A. Schoettger, AO2205222.
Gerrit J. Scholten, AO2079587.
Frederick K. Schollenberger, AO3035800.
Jean M. Schooley, AO1865069.
Kenneth C. Schow, AO3006021.
Gail A. Schreiber, AO3006675.
Louis I. Schreiner III, AO2223966.
Wallace A. Schrontz, AO2061524.
George L. Schulstad, AO2222976.
Charles R. Schultes, Jr., AO3006627.
Gilbert J. Schultz, AO3023488.
Robert G. Schultz, AO2219028.
Paul G. Schulz, Jr., AO2220805.
Donald E. Schumacher, AO2249806.
Danny C. Schuyler, AO3021082.
Frederick E. Schwab, AO2227564.
Donald J. Schwene, AO3010869.
Edward L. Schwing, AO3008122.
William T. Schwob, AO2228494.
Charles S. Scobee, AO2236674.
Merle F. Scoggins, AO774786.
Curtis W. Scott, Jr., AO2228540.
Horace L. Scott, Jr., AO2069322.
Jimmy F. Scott, AO3003164.
Melvin L. Scott, AO3004376.
Melvin R. Scott, AO760516.
Ralph D. Scott, AO2222045.
Richard E. Scott, AO781070.
William H. Scott III, AO3020618.
Aubrey C. Seal, AO3005858.
Forrest D. Seale, AO2249272.
Edward E. Seaman, AO3022173.
Ernest G. Seaman, AO2215713.
Walter J. Seaman, AO2223174.
David A. Searing, AO3004785.
Bobby J. Sears, AO3019845.
Michael T. Sears, AO2227894.
John F. Seaton, AO3004963.
Paul W. Seaton, AO1856801.
Bruce G. Seeber, AO3025300.
Thomas C. Seebo, AO2236347.
Walter W. Seemel, AO2237222.
Conrad H. Seibel, AO931256.
Reed E. Seiders, AO2232673.
Louis Seig, AO3019130.
Alan P. Seligsohn, AO3014276.
John W. Selleck, Jr., AO771813.
Lloyd M. Seltzer, AO1861354.
Rossi L. Selvaggi, AO2219031.
Elmer H. Selvidge, AO2215093.
Pius F. Senger, AO2219032.
Raymond E. Senn, AO3005203.
Gerald R. Sensabaugh, Jr., AO2249329.
Donald W. Service, AO2228495.
Henry H. Seward, AO3010043.
A. D. Sexton, AO3024687.
John N. Sexton, AO3034612.
Lawson L. Seyfried, AO842707.
Collins G. Shackelford, AO2219035.
John D. Shackford, AO2219957.
Stuart W. Shadbolt, AO3022977.
John E. Shade, AO3013602.
Paul R. Shaffer, Jr., AO3018040.
William R. Shaffer, AO2252577.
John P. Shanahan, AO3034740.
James M. Shankles, AO2245472.
Hugh R. Shannon, AO2219362.
Robert S. Shannon, AO2234638.
Bradford L. Sharp, AO3023141.
Laurence E. Sharp, AO3006115.
Oscar Sharp, Jr., AO2215875.
Robert S. Sharp, AO2221397.
Jerry B. Sharpe, AO3017959.
James W. Shattuck, AO1857758.
John V. Shaw, AO3008123.

Anthony T. Sheehan, AO3022782.
Richard J. Sheehan, AO2066886.
William G. Sheffold, AO2229572.
James A. Shelton, AO3013698.
Jack E. Shepard, AO2222243.
James D. Shepherd, AO3005883.
Philip R. Shepherd, AO2215338.
Reginald H. Shepherd, AO2223175.
William Sherengos, AO3009260.
John F. Sherer, AO2223703.
Donald T. Sheridan, AO2261999.
Donald E. Sheriff, AO2221403.
John Sherman, AO3022029.
William B. Sherman, AO2206365.
Roy E. Sherrett, AO3021811.
Donald T. Sherry, AO2217004.
Richard L. Sherwood, AO801095.
Eichi Shibata, AO2251789.
Chester V. Shidlowski, AO2207252.
Jack R. Shields, AO742614.
Robert A. Shildt, Jr., AO2069472.
David Shirley, AO3022262.
Edward D. Shivers III, AO1865507.
Gary L. Shockey, AO2208066.
Charles Shockley, AO1864923.
Crawford O. Shockley, AO3024371.
Robert W. J. L. Shofner, AO2223709.
Marion H. Shoop, AO1540440.
Theodore J. Shorack, Jr., AO2220619.
Donald R. Shover, AO3015435.
Donald R. Showen, AO1863398.
Thomas E. Shows, AO3005043.
Richard B. Shrodes, AO2237465.
William P. Shunney, AO3022571.
James A. Shuping, AO2215715.
Arthur L. Sidereas, AO2030304.
Charles E. Seifert, AO3024075.
Rollin S. Siefken, AO2207297.
Clifford W. Siess, AO3022610.
Robert Sigethy, AO3014412.
Richard G. Sigman, AO2214874.
John M. Signorelli, AO3016467.
Clyde B. Sikes, Jr., AO2227517.
Joseph Silagyi, Jr., AO2221921.
Burton Silver, AO3024766.
David S. Silver, AO3022101.
Bland B. Simmons, AO2218786.
Harry J. Simmons, AO2249368.
Jimmie L. Simmons, AO1865235.
Walter B. Simmons, Jr., AO2225362.
Ervin P. Simon, AO3005045.
Robert E. Simon, AO829573.
Robert V. Simon, AO2217937.
John M. Simonfy, Jr., AO3011752.
Albert L. Simpson, AO3007658.
William C. Simpson, AO3021601.
William L. Sims, AO3004734.
Forest A. Singhoff, AO2250174.
Joseph M. Sitar, AO3006270.
James L. Skaggs, AO1860802.
Alan L. Skarponi, AO3024610.
Ben C. Skelton, AO2217620.
Joseph A. Skiera, AO2221415.
Donald E. Skillings, AO2085851.
Edward E. Skipper, AO2245423.
Harold E. Skipper, AO2228471.
Anthony M. Skiscim, AO2252801.
Arvid N. Skogerboe, AO2223177.
Alma W. Skousen, AO2222338.
Anthony I. Skur, AO3022386.
Archie G. Slaten, Jr., AO3018229.
John M. Slattery, AO3035487.
Marvin R. Sledge, AO3007147.
William S. Sleeper, AO940483.
Francis W. Slepicka, AO2219367.
Richard B. Slight, AO2219959.
James L. Sloan, AO1905811.
Albert J. Smith, AO3007665.
Allen Smith, AO2219368.
Bobby D. Smith, AO2249396.
Bobby G. Smith, AO2227069.
Bobby R. Smith, AO3023520.
Conrad H. Smith, AO2216202.
Cooper R. Smith, Jr., AO2219369.
Daniel A. Smith, AO2249369.
Donald M. Smith, AO2222572.
Donald R. Smith, AO2228228.
Donald R. Smith, AO3008284.
Donald R. Smith, AO3010726.
Dwight Smith, AO2221418.
Earl H. Smith, AO788606.
Edgar D. Smith, AO3004540.
Enyard E. Smith, AO2249291.
Eugene S. Smith, Jr., AO3036098.
Guy E. Smith, AO2227592.
Harold A. Smith, AO1864360.
Harry F. Smith, Jr., AO2217845.
Herbert H. Smith, AO2222460.
Hiram L. Smith, AO941649.
Howell W. Smith, AO2222782.
Irvin J. Smith, AO2059634.
James E. Smith, AO2227895.
James T. Smith, AO2254619.
Jeff W. Smith, AO3003015.
Jerold F. Smith, AO2095906.
John B. Smith, AO3007153.
Laun C. Smith, Jr., AO2234196.
Leslie D. Smith, AO3004541.
Max E. Smith, AO2205615.
Norman G. Smith, AO3003608.
Odie Smith, Jr., AO3008643.
Paul G. Smith, AO3024631.
Ray W. Smith, AO3006397.
Raymond C. Smith, AO2215830.
Richard A. Smith, AO3013776.
Richard J. Smith, AO2229654.
Richard L. Smith, AO940108.
Richard N. Smith, AO2235770.
Richard P. Smith, AO945506.
Richard W. Smith, AO2247893.
Robert C. Smith, AO3017153.
Robert C. Smith, AO2233463.
Robert D. Smith, AO3016281.
Robert H. Smith, AO2227641.
Robert J. Smith, AO3016128.
Rodney C. Smith, AO2206948.
Samuel B. Smith III, AO2204554.
Terry R. Smith, AO2223795.
Walter G. Smith, AO3007672.
Walter L. Smith, AO3021944.
Wayne L. Smith, AO3023428.
William H. Smith, Jr., AO1864389.
William J. Smith, AO2219963.
William L. Smith, AO2235779.
Don M. Smock, AO841399.
William A. Snadecki, AO2205377.
Edward S. Sniezek, AO2221427.
Delbert L. Snodgrass, AO2209084.
William F. Snodgrass, AO2227070.
John W. Snouwaert, AO3035681.
Charles B. Snyder, AO3023791.
John A. Snyder, AO2206245.
Richard E. Snyder, AO2225363.
Joseph P. Sokol, AO836355.
James R. Somppi, AO2230901.
Robert Sonnett, AO2222869.
Lucien O. Sonnier, AO704761.
Charles E. Sooy, AO2224409.
William R. Soper, AO1848687.
Edward J. Soroka, AO2227295.
Marcial Sorrel III, AO2226349.
Frederick A. Soucie, Jr., AO3022978.
Herbert E. Southard, AO2246684.
George A. Sowell, AO3021147.
Carl D. Spaeth, AO841868.
Harry A. Spannaus, AO2227776.
Lawrence R. Sparks, AO2215397.
Raymond L. Sparks, AO706906.
William A. Spear, AO2220345.
Billy K. Spears, AO3024029.
Leslie H. Spellings III, AO2236393.
Bill T. Spencer, AO3023464.
James O. Spencer, Jr., AO2223301.
Milton L. Spencer, AO810588.
Robert E. Spencer, AO2223011.
Donald H. Sperry, AO3024030.
Lee H. Spiegel, AO3024274.
William R. Spillers, AO2248984.
James A. Spillman, AO2208254.
Donald L. Sprague, AO3032088.
Roger L. Sprague, AO2225887.
Philip G. Springer, AO2204604.
William P. Sprott, Jr., AO3013075.
John L. Sproul, AO1863252.
Richard Squire, AO2008980.
Donald E. Staber, AO3021998.
Richard E. Stadelbacher, AO3008531.
Kirby C. Stafford, Jr., AO940654.
William R. Staggs, Jr., AO2207349.
Dale S. Stahlhut, AO2216762.
Meno J. Stallone, Jr., AO2221431.
Robert L. Standerwick, AO2227241.
Miles E. Standish, AO3023890.
A. D. Stanley, AO2246068.
James D. Stanton, AO2068789.
Peter Y. Stanton, AO3016892.
George M. Stare, AO1906019.
William H. Stark, AO3015442.
Francis H. Starnes, AO2227683.
Thomas W. Stedman, AO2249219.
David E. Steele, AO2229279.
Donald L. Steelman, AO2230821.
Frank Steen, AO3021258.
Andrew P. Stefurak, AO2233519.
Joseph F. Stegall, AO3020303.
George E. Stegman, AO3004647.
Richard H. Stein, AO3005362.
George C. Steinike, AO1846878.
Taylor F. Stem, Jr., AO3022371.
David E. Stenquist, AO2229203.
John H. Stephens, AO2218084.
Cary D. Stephenson, AO2245059.
James R. Stephenson, AO719788.
Thomas J. Sterling, AO2249395.
Fred W. Sternenberg, Jr., AO3021362.
Clarence J. Stevens, AO2216145.
Donald W. Stevens, AO2230242.
John T. Stevens, Jr., AO1857053.
Roger L. Stevens, AO2225393.
Sharm R. Stevenson, AO2228837.
William M. Stevenson, AO839998.
Ervin C. Stewart, AO1859452.
Ervin O. Stewart, Jr., AO2221994.
Harvey J. Stewart, AO3020865.
Richard L. Stewart, AO3014803.
Robert D. Stewart, AO1858036.
Robert L. Stewart, AO2224123.
William J. Stewart, AO2248589.
Eugene L. Stickley, AO2210863.
Raymond B. Stiegel, AO2222462.
Roy S. Stieneker, AO2247664.
Charles S. Stiles, AO2237323.
Ralph W. Stiles, AO2222214.
Albert E. Stillman, Jr., AO2222162.
Victor M. Stockbridge, Jr., AO2250488.
Richard M. Stockstill, AO2217859.
John P. Stokenbury, AO3023200.
Gale Stokes, AO2206437.
Robert D. Stolpe, AO2206256.
Herbert H. Stone, AO2224308.
Walter T. Storer, AO3024632.
Fred B. Stork, Jr., AO2235136.
Kenneth E. Stout, AO3017056.
William R. Stout, AO841626.
Hugh R. Strain, AO2218073.
Harold W. Strasner, AO3037553.
Billy R. Strickland, AO3008422.
Howard E. Stripling, AO2225637.
Thomas M. Strohl, AO3016116.
Oren G. Strom, AO3014446.
Jesse E. Strother, Jr., AO3021425.
Hudson W. Stuart, AO3023558.
Thomas A. Studer, AO2253743.
Jack P. Sturgeon, AO3006370.
Richard A. Sublette, AO1857090.
Stanley C. Suderow, AO3005364.
George W. Sullivan, AO3006515.
Kevin I. Sullivan, AO2206369.
Roger H. Sullivan, AO3011458.
Mayo B. Sulser, AO2067380.
Joseph E. Summerour, Jr., AO1865131.
Kenneth W. Summers, AO3004964.
Robert L. Summers, AO2231822.
Darvel L. Sumner, AO2217169.
Donald L. Sundberg, AO2222465.
Allan J. Surridge, AO3023964.
Victor D. Sutch, AO830745.
Harlan D. Sutherland, AO2227465.
Keith W. Sutton, AO3007685.
Oleg V. Suzdaleff, AO2208817.
Robert F. Sveska, AO3005541.
Robert R. Swab, AO3013359.
John F. Swatek, AO2224097.
Joseph W. Swearingen III, AO2205236.
Charles F. Sweeney, AO1998127.
David L. Sweeney, AO2227778.
Richard C. Swift, AO3010878.
Robert E. Swift, AO3022105.
Grant V. Swinford, AO3004544.
Robert J. Sypek, AO3006541.
Joseph J. Szalay, AO2227824.
Frank I. Szemere, AO2245978.
Edward J. Tackett, AO703338.

Gordon G. Taft, AO2222486.
Wendell C. Tague, AO775194.
William H. Talbert, AO2230838.
Donald W. Tallman, AO2251805.
James A. Tanner, AO3003165.
William G. Tapia, AO3024440.
Thomas T. Tapper, AO2223790.
Donald L. Tarver, AO3005764.
Royce D. Tate, AO2249771.
Clarence C. Tatsch, AO2216480.
John A. Tauer, AO3025089.
Michael S. Tavenner, AO2204316.
Doyle J. Taylor, AO2226508.
Jack H. Taylor, Jr., AO2223800.
James H. Taylor, AO3008292.
Joel B. Taylor, AO3007668.
Richard H. Taylor, AO2224755.
Robert B. Taylor, AO825508.
Robert H. Taylor, AO826592.
Stanley K. Taylor, AO2210393.
Stillman V. Taylor, AO1865079.
William T. Taylor, Jr., AO2229864.
Tom A. Teal, AO784992.
Jack Tebo, AO3008158.
Therion D. Tedder, AO2215936.
Arlon M. Teeter, AO3020791.
Marlin E. Templeton, AO2224962.
Max L. Templin III, AO3017058.
Guy A. Tenereillo, AO2209340.
Lester R. Terrell, AO3011659.
Billy W. Terry, AO2248592.
Eugene M. Terry, AO2221455.
George H. Terry, Jr., AO2223907.
Homer T. Terry, AO2216482.
John R. Tesch, AO3022820.
Kenneth P. Tevebaugh, AO937306.
James S. Tewart, AO3015447.
John T. Thayer, AO2226731.
Albert H. Thelander, AO1851614.
Edward R. Therkelsen, AO1904916.
Donald R. Thiel, AO3006024.
Fred W. Thimm, AO3007690.
David M. Thomas, AO3002901.
Douglas L. Thomas, AO3022355.
Earle G. Thomas III, AO2222249.
Harry G. Thomas, AO3016422.
James D. Thomas, AO2226205.
James D. Thomas, AO3024655.
Jerry H. Thomas, AO3021709.
John R. Thomas, AO2227394.
Joseph G. Thomas, AO3023490.
Stover B. Thomas, AO2249702.
William E. Thomas, Jr., AO756355.
John F. Thomason, AO2222289.
Don L. Thompson, AO2247049.
Hadley N. Thompson, AO3023067.
Kenneth L. Thompson, AO3024278.
Kyle H. Thompson, AO2232313.
Norman A. Thompson, AO2227247.
Preston R. Thompson, AO3023715.
Thomas C. Thompson, AO2208748.
Wallace H. Thompson, AO3013708.
Herman O. Thomson, AO2216483.
James F. Thomson, AO2208116.
William Thornton, AO2227780.
Robert G. Thorpe, AO3034682.
Roscoe P. Thorpe, AO1847279.
Edward H. Thrush, AO3006160.
James A. Thurman, AO2227781.
Douglas, R. Tibbetts, AO3004963.
Jerry W. Tietge, AO3022469.
Jerald J. Till, AO3035308.
Edward C. Tillman, Jr., AO2206442.
John C. Tillman, AO3020225.
Thomas N. Tillman, AO2224127.
Martin F. Timpe, AO3023359.
Myron O. Tingelstad, AO3015749.
Henry A. Tipping, AO782408.
George H. Tissaw, AO2227895.
Bruce M. Tobey, AO2220372.
Donald O. Todd, AO2207839.
Edward L. Todd, AO3034254.
Clarence A. Toepke, AO2227225.
Gordon D. Tollerud, AO1863909.
Robert L. Tolson, Jr., AO2235185.
John H. Tomaseski, AO3007698.
Teddy J. Tomchesson, AO2244913.
Frank J. Tomlinson, AO2226920.
John A. Tondi, Jr., AO3008430.
John E. Toner, AO3004380.
Joseph S. Toth, AO3004775.
Earle F. Towne, Jr., AO943736.
Melvin Towner, AO714224.
William R. Townsend, AO1857926.
Stanley I. Toyama, AO2230141.
Jack C. Trabucco, AO2223872.
John W. Tracy, AO3023792.
Harrell K. Travis, AO2223357.
George T. Trayer, AO2225640.
Carl E. Trego, AO2218599.
Gary L. Tresemer, AO2224713.
Bruce B. Trevor, AO2204414.
Harold L. Trick, AO3005578.
Robert P. Trimble, AO2222410.
Russell C. Tripp, AO2226141.
John C. Trobaugh, AO2222165.
Joseph F. Trochta, AO2225265.
Richard W. Troop, AO3023202.
Jack D. Trost, AO2221922.
William R. Trott, AO2255002.
Charles E. Trowbridge, AO1861306.
Edwin N. Troxel, AO3014070.
Mylo A. Trueblood, AO3021399.
Robert A. Trusela, AO2233134.
Everett W. Truxal, AO3022176.
David G. Tryling, AO2248595.
George X. Tsirimokos, AO3013884.
Peter Tsouprake, AO2252948.
James E. Tuck, AO3037004.
Carle F. Tucker, AO3036194.
Oscar B. Tucker, Jr., AO2205304.
Roger D. Tucker, AO3023405.
Roger L. Tucker, AO2207512.
Ellsworth E. Tulberg, AO2227524.
Joe A. Tull, AO3020860.
Francis S. Turco, AO2249164.
Richard J. Turek, AO2223970.
Ernest C. Turley, AO2211223.
Alex Turner, Jr., AO3014541.
Charles J. Turner, AO3005429.
Charles M. Turner, Jr., AO2228437.
David W. Turner, AO2234284.
Eldon K. Turner, AO1856358.
George W. Turner, AO3021518.
Gregory A. Turner, AO3004652.
Leland E. Turner, Jr., AO3007195.
William L. Turner, AO3007703.
William P. Turner, AO2230865.
William D. Turpin, AO3011162.
Jacob T. Tutterow, AO3033706.
Herman L. Twede, AO2207202.
Kermit O. Twedt, AO3013405.
Francis G. Twohey, AO2228341.
Craig W. Tyler, AO2219680.
Robert H. Tyndall, AO2215904.
Newby C. Tyson, AO2248862.
Helmuth L. Uken, AO787080.
William L. Umscheid, AO3012297.
James W. Umstead, AO2249828.
Richard Unger, AO2089338.
Richard L. Uppstrom, AO3016627.
John C. Upshaw, AO1865007.
Relly E. Urich, AO2232394.
William A. Usher, AO2247859.
James L. Vadeboncoeur, AO3036258.
Raymond R. Vadnais, Jr., AO3017404.
Sylvester L. Vaeth, AO2219986.
Lawrence F. Vaicunas, AO3021519.
Bobby G. Valdez, AO2222650.
Rudolph A. Valentino, AO2231674.
Richard A. Van Bibber, AO3008540.
Alonzo A. Vance, Jr., AO2224263.
Howe L. Vandegrift, AO3014960.
James R. Vandegrift, AO3013969.
Daniel C. VanDeMark, AO3022530.
Robert J. Vanden-Heuvel, AO1865136.
Burley O. Vandergriff II, AO2237168.
Robert M. Van Dermark, AO3025940.
Kenneth J. Vandewalle, AO2223662.
Gerald L. L. Vanek, AO3025773.
William S. Van Gilder, AO2231826.
Oliver C. Van Hoesen, AO1865245.
Boyd L. Van Horn, AO3025941.
William R. Van Lew, AO2218807.
Daniel P. VanSickel, AO3013364.
Howard E. VanVallet, AO2224062.
Ross Van Wagner, Jr., AO709865.
Zack Varnedoe, Jr., AO1857328.
Nicholas P. Vasief, AO2229532.
John E. Vaughan, AO3011163.
Kenneth E. Vaughan, AO2207914.
George M. Vaughn, AO3023613.
Donald A. Vavra, AO3021862.
Robert S. Vayda, AO3021710.
Paul V. Vegna, AO3001350.
Servando J. Velarde, Jr., AO1863177.
Louis E. Velez, AO3018230.
David P. Vesowate, AO3034133.
Daurice C. Vest, AO3024768.
Don O. Vesta, AO2228440.
Charles H. Vibrock, AO3024560.
Carol D. Vickrey, AO2215400.
Robert C. Vickery, AO2231025.
Lawrence M. Vied, AO3007205.
Louis G. Villaume, AO2208071.
Gerald J. Vincent, AO3024393.
Lewis J. Vincent, AO3007710.
William J. Vinopal, AO3022831.
Ronald L. Violette, AO3024634.
Alexander P. Vivacqua, AO2228476.
William R. Vizzard, AO958454.
John F. Vizzini, AO2226735.
Alvard M. Voegelin, Jr., AO3025341.
Paul E. Vogel, AO2250674.
Cecil C. Voils, AO2238031.
Frederick C. Volker, AO2224027.
Iver C. Vollmer, AO939864.
Leland E. Vosburgh, AO2222651.
Frederick J. Vosper, AO3022287.
John E. Voss, AO2225131.
John M. Vowell, AO2225643.
Jerome Wacker, AO3037492.
Dannie T. Waddle, Jr., AO3013540.
Kay Wade, AO2226737.
James L. Wadley, Jr., AO2254604.
Harry F. Wadsworth, AO2223973.
Frank H. Wagner, AO842855.
Robert E. Wagner, AO3016952.
John A. Wagnon, AO2225513.
Raymond W. Wagus, AO3008541.
Robert D. Wainwright, AO3008433.
Lawrence L. Waitt, AO2218190.
Elvin J. Wakham, AO3022762.
Malham M. Wakin, AO3037720.
William D. Waldron, AO2206002.
Lee E. Walfinder, AO3019016.
Charles G. Walker, AO2224314.
John T. Walker, AO3013783.
Kenneth R. Walker, AO2248885.
Richard C. Walker, AO3021103.
Roe E. Walker, AO2209284.
Walter E. Walker, AO3010888.
William K. Walker, AO2228237.
William O. Walker, AO2224867.
Carl D. Wall, Jr., AO3020848.
Charles B. Wallace, AO3006190.
William J. Wallace, AO3016719.
Philip L. Waller, AO3026040.
Robert C. Waller, AO3024664.
Robert E. Waller, AO2236558.
Glen R. Wallin, AO788514.
Ernest S. Walls, AO2078855.
John B. Walls, AO2250909.
Kendall J. Walsh, AO3012711.
Harold J. Walter, AO2219993.
Kenneth L. Walter, AO3006594.
Thomas A. Walter, AO2237053.
Robert A. Walters, Jr., AO2205379.
Harold R. Walthall, AO2230843.
Horace H. Walton, AO2227668.
John W. Walton, AO2222783.
George E. Ward, AO786376.
George M. Ward, AO2220383.
Glen C. Ward, AO2228502.
James W. Ward, Jr., AO2226583.
Jarvis D. Ward, AO2227964.
John D. Ward, AO3043518.
John F. Ward, AO2249597.
John J. Ward, Jr., AO2205380.
John Wargo, Jr., AO3026429.
Clay W. Warix, Jr., AO2218813.
Charles N. Warner, AO3037395.
Larry S. Warner, AO2210663.
Max O. Warner, AO715071.
Milton J. Warner, Jr., AO2227669.
Adrian P. Warnshuis, AO3009544.
Edwin S. Warrell, Jr., AO2207593.
Charles A. Warren, AO2233491.
James L. Wasson, Jr., AO3023690.
Charles E. Waters, AO2000360.
William G. Waters, AO2215915.
Elmer R. Watkins, AO2222413.
Lloyd H. Watnee, Jr., AO3024035.

Barney T. Watson, AO2249517.
Bryce M. Watson, AO1848598.
Cleve B. Watson, AO2224130.
James F. Watson, AO3013970.
Laddie R. Watson, AO3008545.
Marion R. Watson, AO2208436.
Richard K. Watson, AO822306.
William J. Watson, AO2216316.
Thomas M. Watt, AO929049.
Paul D. Watterson, AO2096324.
Robert E. Watts, AO3023947.
William R. Waugh, AO2067393.
James H. Way, AO2246751.
Thomas A. Waynick, AO3009270.
Robert K. Ways, AO3023433.
Archie L. Weatherly, AO933397.
Donald E. Weaver, AO2248029.
Joseph B. Weaver, AO2227252.
Charles L. Webb, Jr., AO1864580.
George T. Webb, AO714795.
Gilson S. Webb, AO2254709.
James L. Webb, AO2222475.
Robert C. Webb, AO2228942.
Robert R. Weber, AO2228344.
Daren G. Webster, AO2207301.
James B. Webster, AO3004826.
Robert R. Webster, AO2228445.
George W. Wedding, AO2234679.
Donald H. Wedekind, AO1907296.
John R. Weed, AO2206447.
Allen R. Weeks, AO3006215.
Douglas L. Weers, AO3007213.
John H. Wehe, AO2228995.
Eugene L. Weidel, AO2228106.
Robert G. Weidenhamer, AO3016512.
William M. Weidlich, AO3008185.
Adrian Weigart, AO3009138.
Joseph R. Weil, AO2222529.
Richard L. Weimar, AO3020618.
Robert K. Weinkle, AO2226222.
Donald H. Weisiger, AO3035198.
Jerald E. Weiss, AO3025308.
James D. Welch, AO3018944.
Jerry L. Welch, AO2245843.
Thaddeus B. Welch, Jr., AO2205094.
William J. Welch, Jr., AO3022765.
Charles T. Weller, AO2206962.
Lee C. Wells, AO885486.
Jerome P. Welsh, AO3017734.
Donald R. Wendt, AO3022764.
Andrew L. Weniger, AO1540446.
Donald F. Wenzel, AO2221483.
Andrew W. Wertz, AO2222132.
Richard L. Wesbrook, AO2227750.
Wilbert D. Wesse, AO2089835.
David E. West, AO3016709.
James M. West, AO3036261.
Joseph H. West, AO2233013.
Herman G. Westbrook, AO2223237.
Bernard L. Westfall, AO3010976.
Jack D. Westfall, AO2247371.
Jerrold C. Westhafer, AO3021330.
Allan J. Westmaas, AO2209969.
Elton L. Weston, AO3024413.
Charles W. Wetesnik, AO3022192.
Ernest J. Wetherell, AO2230937.
Bruce B. Wetmore, AO2207554.
Donald B. Whalen, AO984316.
John R. Whaley, AO3010188.
Lawrence M. Whaley, AO3017061.
John F. Wharton, AO2204769.
Wayne N. Whatley, AO2215738.
Daniel M. Whealen, AO2217106.
George E. Wheeler, AO2234893.
George H. Wheeler, AO2221486.
James M. Wheeler, AO2220393.
Joe F. Wheeler, AO2229533.
Raymond D. Wheeler, AO3017736.
Robert A. Wheeless, Jr., AO2204863.
Robert B. Wheelock, AO3017653.
Richard J. Whelan, AO1903505.
Clarence E. Whinery, AO3025146.
Ted G. Whipps, AO3037387.
J. L. Whitaker, AO1856360.
Robert M. Whitaker, AO1860922.
Franklin M. White, AO2245698.
Harold R. White, AO3021712.
James H. White, AO2208294.
Otis P. White, Jr., AO3036603.
Robert B. White, AO3021130.
Roman A. White, AO3034934.
Roy L. White, AO1864929.
Cliff M. Whitehead, AO712065.
Kenneth L. Whitehead, AO2225721.
Rex A. Whitehurst, AO3018142.
Ronald E. Whitely, AO3022033.
Robert P. Whitener, AO2204790.
Homer F. Whitlow, AO3023651.
Bickie B. Whitmore, AO2207150.
James R. Whitmore, AO2227253.
Lloyd D. Whitney, AO3025829.
Arthur E. Whitson, AO2251795.
Solomon D. Whitten, Jr., AO2222174.
James E. Whittenberg, AO2224715.
Dewitt J. Wichmann, AO2236137.
Arthur R. Wicker, AO2236554.
Alan R. Wickersham, AO3012502.
Oliver G. Wicks, AO2207666.
James H. Widney, AO2229337.
Mark C. Wiekhorst, AO2215316.
Richard S. Wierenga II, AO2226359.
Robert C. Wight, Jr., AO2224495.
John H. Wigington, AO3021268.
Russell J. Wilcoxen, AO833648.
Robert E. Wildermuth, AO2023817.
Gerald L. Wiley, AO2236021.
Ray H. Wiley, AO3006274.
Charles E. Wilfong, AO3006574.
Claud A. Wilkins, AO2227967.
George I. Wilkins, AO1859518.
Albert L. Wilkinson, AO2246074.
William K. Willard, AO3036127.
Kenneth W. Willey, AO1849737.
Billy J. Williams, AO3025709.
Charles O. Williams, AO3024564.
Clarence R. Williams, AO2222049.
Clark E. Williams, AO2206873.
George C. Williams, AO2233993.
John T. Williams, AO806188.
Joseph B. Williams, AO2222091.
Lawrence E. Williams, AO2232079.
Peter D. Williams, AO3024511.
Richard E. Williams, AO2219091.
Robert Williams, AO2215862.
Robert C. Williams, AO2223975.
Thomas H. Williams, Jr., AO3015789.
Zeke D. Williams, AO3025148.
Don I. Williamson, AO3011169.
John G. Williamson, AO2204913.
Vernon C. Williamson, AO2011440.
Mitchell L. Williford, AO3025611.
Richard E. Williford, AO3008655.
John R. Willis, AO2227998.
Vincent C. Willis, AO819236.
Ray L. Willman, AO3005478.
Edward A. Willming, AO2204416.
William R. Willner, AO821578.
Harley N. Wills, AO1860990.
Donovan L. Willsie, AO2222653.
Andrew F. Wilson, AO2221498.
Artman H. Wilson, AO3007224.
Conrad L. Wilson, AO2209094.
DeLeon Wilson, Jr., AO3023434.
Dwight V. Wilson, AO2207667.
Ernest F. Wilson, AO1857478.
Frank Wilson, Jr., AO3023882.
Harold E. Wilson, AO3011045.
Jack W. Wilson, AO3020088.
James R. Wilson, AO2056516.
Kelley R. Wilson, AO2221923.
Mac F. Wilson, AO3036028.
Robert D. Wilson, AO1860957.
Ronald L. Wilson, AO2207786.
William R. Wilson, AO3044401.
Harry L. Winberg, AO2221976.
Gerald J. Winchell, AO2247216.
Leonard J. Wine, AO2253628.
Charles R. Wingate, AO2205162.
Davy L. Winkle, AO2206813.
Charles B. Winn II, AO2227529.
Gene G. Winn, AO3037608.
George M. Winn, AO2224316.
Guy H. Winstead, Jr., AO3020662.
Jack A. Winstead, AO3032230.
Norman M. Winter, AO2224585.
Donald E. Winters, AO2249835.
James C. Wise, Jr., AO3023362.
Frank R. Wisneski, AO2205829.
William O. Wissman, AO886497.
Paul G. Witherow, AO936350.
Harry M. Witt, AO1848970.
John P. Wittry, AO2235270.
Kenneth D. Wohllaib, AO2207153.
Robert C. Wolka, AO3013368.
Richard P. Wojick, AO2205546.
Robert K. Wolfe, AO3022076.
Jack G. Womack, AO3007750.
Richard J. C. Wong, AO2230144.
Glenn W. Wood, Jr., AO3005367.
Harry L. Wood, AO2230569.
Horace E. Wood, Jr., AO3023134.
Richard D. Wood, Sr., AO2232435.
Richard W. Wood, AO2207787.
John B. Woodall, AO2231759.
Lyman K. Woodbury, Jr., AO3009161.
Robin M. Woodruff, AO3036700.
Wesley D. Woodruff, AO3033962.
James W. Woods, AO3005237.
Jerry K. Woods, AO2223524.
Richard M. Woods, AO1865910.
Seabrook W. Woodward, Jr., AO3034684.
Charles D. Wooley, AO3016451.
Buel W. Woolverton, AO3022664.
Robert J. Wootton, AO3019527.
Luther D. Worley, AO1864603.
Wallace D. Worman, AO2226094.
Nestor Worobetz, AO2227999.
Delmar G. Worsech, AO3033719.
Francis H. Worth, AO1861469.
Joseph B. Wortman, AO2237630.
George C. Wren, AO3036829.
Harry L. Wren, Jr., AO2216945.
James L. Wren, AO3007234.
Eugene L. Wrenn, Jr., AO2245717.
John W. Wrentmore, AO2218819.
Harley D. Wright, AO3021369.
John C. Wright, AO2223811.
John C. Wright, AO2222694.
Marvin M. Wright, AO3007753.
Richard W. Wright, AO3005399.
Robert S. Wright, AO3022034.
William N. Wright, AO2222175.
Leo C. Wurschmidt, AO938398.
Lorenz F. Wustner, AO3034685.
John F. Wylam, AO2249840.
Sherrell W. Wylie, Jr., AO2216498.
Harry J. Wynne, AO2236162.
Doyal L. Wyrick, AO3025249.
James R. Yacobi, AO3036406.
William Yanchek, AO2226417.
Daniel R. Yankle, AO2225694.
John H. Yarbrough, AO3034842.
Robert L. Yarbrough, AO2204353.
Thomas H. Yasuhara, AO3009793.
James E. Yates, AO2215734.
Marvin A. Yeager, AO2222657.
Ronald E. Yeager, AO2251011.
Frank M. Yelton, AO3021271.
Eugene V. Yennie, AO2222491.
Robert L. Yeschek, AO944451.
Robert C. Yirka, AO3023043.
Raymond Yockey, AO2219413.
John W. Yocum, AO2222658.
Kenneth W. Yon, AO2224373.
Arthur R. Yore, AO3035496.
Leland A. York, AO1847093.
William R. Yost, AO2234039.
Albert L. Young, AO2222418.
Allan L. Young, AO3005991.
Charles G. Young, AO3035660.
Gerould A. Young, AO3011897.
James F. Young, AO3007757.
Keith R. Young, AO3004560.
Russell A. Young, AO3008658.
Sammie R. Young, AO2231174.
Donald J. Yuen, AO2225986.
John E. Zahm, AO3036075.
Leonard A. Zalewski, AO3019513.
Richard J. Zduncszyk, AO3007760.
Willis D. Zedaker, AO2222419.
Herbert R. Zehnder, AO938939.
Robert A. Zehring, AO2237261.
Robert S. Zeigen, AO1857655.
Charles M. Zeltner, AO3003724.
Maurice F. Zetena, AO2252850.
Lester W. Zielinski, AO2222770.
Dale H. Zimmerman, AO3005124.
Donald R. Zimmerman, AO2238259.
Harry C. Zimmerman, AO2235859.
Gerald W. Zinkan, AO2223116.
Henry Zinke, AO3034915.
Paul C. Zinsmeister, Jr., AO2233057.
James A. Zobel, Jr., AO3035380.

David H. Zook, Jr., AO2219097.
Donald B. Zook, AO2222659.
Albert J. Zuber, AO2208758.
Elmer J. Zulauf, AO2204463.
James T. Zumwalt, AO3034743.
Gordon K. Zunker, AO2218823.

*To be second lieutenants*

Raymond L. Abbott, AO3059040.
William W. Amick, AO3030589.
Gordon M. Amsler, AO3058526.
Stanford R. Amstutz, AO3051329.
George M. Anderson, AO3029111.
John E. Anderson, AO3048155.
William L. Andrews, Jr., AO3032474.
Douglas W. Armantrout, AO3049485.
Roy F. Austin, AO3055696.
George C. Avila, Jr., AO3048111.
Robert V. Baird, AO2211086.
Ward J. Baker, AO3057304.
Richard L. Ball, AO2207896.
James E. Banks, AO2228627.
Ronald L. Barker, AO3053855.
William M. Barlow, Jr., AO3049282.
Martin S. Barteau, AO3052012.
Robert R. Bartmes, AO3056067.
Edward J. Bauman, AO3049487.
Clarence J. Beardsley, AO3028869.
Frank N. Beaven, Jr., AO3029883.
Rodney B. Beckman, AO3057306.
Ernest A. Bedke, AO3046659.
Raymond E. Beery, AO3046732.
Robert D. Beiter, AO3055699.
Francis Belfinne, AO3050037.
Richard A. Bellinger, AO3031328.
Charles G. Bill, AO3009029.
Charles M. Billman, Jr., AO3068896.
Raymond L. Bilott, AO3067772.
Robert E. Bennett, AO3032531.
John N. Bently, AO3029885.
Richard Bentz, AO3032485.
Eldon G. Black, AO3052920.
Gordon N. Blackman, AO3027934.
Thomas C. Blake, Jr., AO3051836.
Philip K. Bock, AO3048114.
George D. Bolfeuillet, AO3029843.
Hillard C. Booker, AO3040505.
Leon Booth, Jr., AO3008778.
David L. Boos, AO3053213.
Joseph H. Bowers, AO3069885.
Neal F. Bowyer, AO3057973.
Earle O. Boyer, AO3068833.
Gary L. Boyer, AO3056884.
Albert Brander, AO3006910.
August J. Brandin, AO3027547.
Francis E. Brandon, Jr., AO3058490.
Duane C. Branson, AO3053924.
William J. Brashear, AO3055771.
Arthur L. Brattkus, AO3029213.
Morton Bregman, AO3047952.
Roger M. Briggs, AO3057514.
Bobby Brown, AO3057476.
David R. Brown, AO3052679.
David O. Brownwood, AO3055858.
Donald G. Bruckner, AO3050041.
Weston G. Bruner, AO3049965.
Sims A. Buckley, AO3047245.
Stanley P. Budzinski, AO3050491.
Ernest R. Bull, Jr., AO3053662.
Paul D. Burch, AO3054647.
James R. Burgener, AO3051849.
Robert V. Burkett, Jr., AO3053925.
Robert A. Butt, AO3059051.
Harley R. Cahill, AO3028058.
Robert S. Callister, AO2211362.
Paul C. Canfield, AO3057170.
Jerald D. Cannon, AO3056287.
Roy P. Capaldo, AO3057105.
Carol C. Carbaugh, AO3051786.
Jack W. Carlson, AO3052455.
Philip D. Carlson, AO3051234.
Elford L. Carwile, AO3064403.
Dale W. Cary, AO3028168.
Paul S. Cassedy, AO3049284.
Charles W. Cates, AO3030095.
Robert T. Caughey, AO3049657.
James F. Cavanaugh, AO3051086.
Robert S. Cavill, AO3053456.
Joseph M. Cestaro, AO3047958.
Philip Chaffee, AO3049784.
Richard F. Chandler, AO3049343.
Vernon M. H. Chang, AO3016351.
William F. Childs, AO3047904.
Kenneth D. H. Chong, AO3066691.
Robert V. Christensen, AO3048349.
Edward L. Claiborn, AO3046665.
James R. Clark, AO3009037.
Jerry B. Clark, AO3049497.
John T. Clarno, AO3055120.
Robert M. Clawson, AO3046741.
Leo C. Cloutier, AO3047566.
Leon J. Cock, AO3047959.
John P. Cogan, AO3049660.
Edward B. Cogswell, Jr., AO3029845.
Joseph L. Cohn, Jr., AO3027719.
Paul D. Colanzanni, AO3070902.
Donald W. Cole, Jr., AO3050900.
Leonard A. Collins, AO3027553.
Michael J. Collins, AO3048498.
James A. Colyer, AO3055706.
Vincent J. Connolly, AO3046255.
Richard P. Conway, AO3040930.
William T. Cornwell, Jr., AO3057972.
William J. Corrigan, AO3069442.
Kendrick S. Coryell, AO3053265.
John E. Cozine, Jr., AO3058660.
Jack L. Craggs, AO3049498.
William E. Craven, AO3047310.
Ivey D. Craver, AO2040604.
Robert C. Crockett, AO3030440.
Robert K. Crockett, AO3051751.
Roland G. Crosman, AO3049269.
John P. Cummings, AO3046182.
Robert B. Cunningham, Jr., AO3064206.
Clement G. Curtin, Jr., AO3053493.
Stanley R. Cushing, AO3058133.
John P. Cushman, AO3048744.
Edwin H. Dahlgren, Jr., AO2210087.
Raymond A. Danz, AO3046256.
Richard Davis, AO3040740.
Roy L. Davis, AO1852096.
Samuel E. Davis, AO3032100.
Dale B. Dawson, AO3049431.
Bobby G. Day, AO3028173.
James A. Day, AO3065619.
Ernest S. Dean, Jr., AO3027787.
Jon W. Dean, AO3058358.
Kurt E. DeBorde, AO2211822.
Donald L. Dederick, AO3046206.
Kelly L. Deloache, AO3028069.
Robert A. DeLorenzo, AO3055816.
Dwight M. DeNise, AO3069794.
Robert C. Dennis, AO3048817.
Roger M. Dersch, AO3028801.
Giles W. Desmond, AO3050494.
Victor D. Detering, AO3051286.
Allyn M. Devens, AO3008802.
David E. Dever, AO3060058.
Richard C. Deveresux, Jr., AO3070081.
Gary L. Dick, AO3029260.
Paul W. Dickson, Jr., AO3019269.
James P. Ditz, AO2211456.
Charles J. Doherty, AO3040677.
Raymond C. Dosky, AO3027637.
George B. Douglas III, AO3050258.
John J. Driscoll, AO3030203.
Richard D. Duckworth, AO3026152.
Clarence M. Duff, AO3056143.
Howard J. Duff, AO3008934.
Ian J. M. Duncan, AO3057662.
Dale W. Edwards, AO3058796.
Charles A. Ehmke, AO3057478.
Joseph H. Eibling, AO3062016.
Thomas J. Eigel, AO3068060.
Joseph Elliott, AO3057600.
John E. M. Ellis, AO3069665.
John H. Enders, AO3058116.
James E. Endicott, AO3053435.
Francis J. Engel, Jr., AO3056145.
Dino P. Equi, AO3046826.
Thomas E. Ernst, AO3049504.
James F. Erp, AO3059064.
David W. Evans, AO3057949.
Donald L. Evans, AO3051500.
Harold R. Evans, AO3040679.
Stanley E. Ewing, AO3032328.
Willis F. Fagan, AO3027866.
Thomas E. Fallows, AO2212026.
Clyde L. Falls, Jr., AO3058497.
Grover C. Farmer, AO3008810.
Neil J. Farnham, AO3056896.
Harold L. Felte, AO2206199.
William H. Fenton III, AO3046544.
Arthur E. Ferguson, AO3041091.
Richard B. Fink, AO3059346.
Crosley J. Fitton, Jr., AO3040997.
Richard E. Fitts, AO3010024.
Cletus G. Fleming, Jr., AO3038227.
Stanley K. Flentje, AO3052291.
Roger F. Fleshman, AO3028128.
William E. Fletcher, AO3058364.
Robert F. Fornis, AO3049680.
Dick L. Foster, AO3058189.
Boyd E. Founds, AO3031671.
Joseph D. L. Fournier, AO3008943.
George E. Foss, Jr., AO 3056702.
Bernard Freedman, AO 3008946.
Wilbur F. Freitag, AO2205112.
Kenneth A. Friedman, AO3050379.
Wayne E. Fullam, AO3049773.
James W. Funk, AO3056393.
Horace W. Furumoto, AO3048222.
Harold H. Gabby, AO3050308.
Charles J. Gaeta, AO3046828.
David A. Gandolfo, AO3069377.
James F. Garber III, AO3056009.
William T. Gardiner, AO3069303.
Lorin R. Gardner, AO3053405.
John Gargus, AO3067077.
James T. Gatza, AO3046492.
Charles C. Gaudet, AO3052017.
Herbert C. Gedmark, AO3048648.
Richard L. Geer, AO3049573.
Robert W. Gehlert, AO3056817.
Robert B. Geiger, Jr., AO3056278.
Joseph N. Gerberg, AO2207499.
David P. Gibson, AO3029556.
Joseph Gilfillan III, AO3050720.
Claude M. Gillespie, AO2207890.
Charles E. Gingrich, AO3069575.
Richard L. Glassberg, AO3050221.
James L. Gober, AO3051729.
John H. Goetsch, AO3046984.
Bruce R. Goss, AO3058665.
Eugene L. Gosse, AO3058991.
Richard F. Grabowsky, AO3050025.
Taylor H. Greene, AO3027119.
Carl R. Gregory, AO3058059.
William C. Griffin, AO3046600.
Tedd N. Griffith, AO2210972.
Thomas D. Grimes, AO3032264.
Karl H. Grosh, AO3064627.
Fergus C. Groves II, AO3046701.
Charles P. Gurler, AO3050201.
Dale R. Gustafson, AO3070619.
William L. Hale, AO2205231.
Charles E. Hall, AO3065096.
Donald J. Hall, AO3057493.
Earl R. Hall, AO3054460.
George P. Hall, AO3040939.
Harold R. Hall, AO3055365.
Jack R. Hall, AO3047214.
Ronald L. Ham, AO3027875.
James E. Hamer, AO3069063.
Richard A. Hamilton, AO3070017.
Virgil L. Hamlin, Jr., AO3046218.
Bobby F. Hammett, AO3054233.
Harry E. Hand, AO1862283.
William F. Haney, Jr., AO3027124.
Kenneth G. Hanks, AO3027565.
William A. Hanrahan, Jr., AO3047653.
Jack L. Hanson, AO3064381.
Robert E. Hanson, AO3067284.
Stanley C. Hanson, AO3056710.
Norman C. Harbert, AO3068360.
Samuel G. Harding, AO3053312.
James S. Harmon, AO3052684.
John F. Harmon, AO3068020.
Virgil C. Harrington, AO3067114.
Robert E. Harris, AO2255423.
Stanley Harris, AO3067327.
John W. Harrison, AO3029425.
Donald S. Harry, AO3064351.
Richard L. Hart, AO3040781.
David D. Hartman, AO3067401.
John H. Hartman, AO3054133.
Thomas N. Harvey, AO3050814.
William R. Haskett, AO3058281.
William H. Havens, AO3064307.
Joseph M. Hawkes, AO3059351.
Jerry P. Hawkins, AO3058366.
James W. Hayes, AO3053448.
Joseph M. Hayes, AO3070474.

John M. Haynie, AO3058433.
Cloyd A. Hays, AO3054617.
Richard F. Hazard, AO3032350.
James P. Healy, Jr., AO3049804.
Perry G. Hector, AO3033109.
Eugene M. Hedges, AO3053495.
Dewey L. Hegiar, Jr., AO3064324.
Gary A. Heilala, AO3067705.
Helmut Heimann, AO3068019.
Charles L. Heinrich, AO3069245.
Marion E. Heironimus, AO3029748.
Daniel I. Hejde, AO3051473.
Hubert M. Henderson, AO3028155.
Alton J. Hendrick, AO3027130.
Lee R. Henley, AO3033503.
John F. Hennessey, AO3046411.
Gordon C. Henrie, AO3040835.
David R. Henriquez, AO3046548.
Richard L. Hepburn, AO3050938.
John E. Hernandez, AO3058750.
Thomas C. Herndon, AO2206155.
Robert T. Herzog, AO3055176.
Vernon W. Hewitt, AO2210925.
Elmer J. Hickman, AO3031152.
Samuel L. Hicks, AO3052151.
Adoniram C. Hiebert, AO3067402.
David L. Higgins, AO3049440.
Robert L. High, AO3055987.
Charles C. Highsmith, AO3050817.
Richard L. Hildreth, AO3056712.
James R. Hill, AO3029028.
Thomas D. Hill, AO3056011.
Vaughn E. Hill, AO3068987.
Gerald L. Hilliard, AO3070201.
Richard D. Hilton, AO3040783.
James M. Hinnant, Jr., AO3065131.
Gilbert W. Hiter, AO3054333.
William B. Hoenig, Jr., AO3070676.
David B. Hoff, AO2209785.
Thomas S. Hoffman, AO3070817.
William D. Hoffmeyer, AO3068231.
Frederick L. Hofmann, AO2211245.
Darrell T. Holland, AO3008826.
Tilden S. Holley, AO3064843.
Donald R. Hollis, AO3027398.
Norman L. Hollis, AO3029981.
Roy S. Holloman, Jr., AO3054567.
Carl F. A. Holmquist, AO3069247.
Harold W. Holtzclaw, AO1854497.
Thomas C. Hopkins, AO3029461.
Harold A. Hornbarger, AO3052019.
Paul N. Hotinger, AO3048779.
Frank L. Houde, AO3040006.
Bobby G. House, AO3052329.
Clarence D. Howald, AO3048521.
Lowry O. Hoyer, AO3050552.
John R. Hubbard, AO3046415.
James E. Hudelson, AO3047500.
Harvey M. Hudson, AO3051451.
Eynon Hughes, AO3047915.
Jerome E. Hughes, AO3046990.
Vincent C. Hughes, Jr., AO2204268.
Robert K. Hughson, AO3070744.
William L. Hugo, Jr., AO3069582.
James F. Humphries, Jr., AO3068753.
Smith C. Humphries, Jr., AO3056085.
John D. Hunsuck, AO3029429.
Coley A. Hunsucker, AO3056912.
Thomas A. Hunt, AO3054856.
Orlondo L. Huntsman, AO3070184.
Patrick A. Hurley, AO3067912.
Frank P. Huskin, Jr., AO3039129.
William R. Hutcherson, Jr., AO3046551.
Charles A. Irwin, AO3055823.
Frederick M. Jackson, Jr., AO3068883.
William J. Jaeger, Jr., AO3050106.
Charles L. James, Jr., AO3029365.
Roy W. Jamesen, AO3008835.
Harold L. Jameson, AO3040049.
James M. Janis, AO3048755.
Charles J. Januska, AO3047529.
John H. Jarvis, AO3027240.
Joe A. Jefferis, AO3053701.
Robert B. Jenkins, AO3059055.
John G. Joern, AO3058672.
Robert P. Johannes, AO3066767.
Edward V. Johnson, Jr., AO3031823.
Bruce J. Johnston, AO3008970.
Richard E. Johnston, AO3066999.
Richard L. Johnston, AO3039837.
Robert L. Johnston, AO3049296.
Douglas N. Jones, AO3028983.
Harold D. Jones, AO3040838.
James W. Jones, AO3046706.
John G. Jones, AO3027603.
Raymon M. Jones, AO3049394.
Raymond G. Jones, AO3028594.
Robert G. Jones, AO3054241.
Ronald T. Jones, AO3052393.
Donald C. Jordahl, AO3070195.
Ralph M. Jordan, Jr., AO3046883.
Wayne E. Jordan, AO3037519.
Robert E. Julian, AO3027354.
Howard D. Jumper, AO3054597.
Charles G. Kadison, Jr., AO3047748.
Norman F. Kaelber, AO3050224.
Daniel A. Kaelin, AO3028798.
David W. Kaiser, AO3048556.
Darrel K. Kalbfleisch, AO3066730.
Nicholas P. Karras, AO3065441.
Kenneth G. Kastella, AO3040742.
Stephen E. Katz, AO3067379.
Samuel W. Keller, AO3028443.
Robert E. Kelley, AO3068022.
Morgan J. Kennedy, AO3067585.
Robert L. Kerby, AO3046994.
Henry F. Kerr, Jr., AO3046833.
Melvin E. Kersey, Jr., AO3066673.
Russell W. Kilmer, AO3049811.
Noel O. Kindt, AO3046996.
Samuel J. Kishline, AO3029916.
Edward K. Kissam, Jr., AO3047806.
Lane L. Kittle, AO3057484.
Ludvig W. Knagenhjelm, Jr., AO3047328.
Russell N. Knauss, AO3009193.
Peter J. Knoke, AO3049999.
Lawrence E. Knox, AO3052798.
William C. Koch, Jr., AO3046834.
Preston E. Koentop, AO3051161.
James L. Kolling, AO3030847.
David P. Koon, AO3058704.
Norman L. Koonce, AO3054959.
Chester T. Kordel, AO3070876.
William J. Koselka, AO3052326.
Vincent J. Kovacich, AO3027023.
Harry T. Kozuma, AO3046631.
Lavern J. Kracht, AO3054004.
Karl P. Kraemer, AO3049522.
Wilson P. Kraft, Jr., AO3029988.
Gene C. Krajack, AO3031680.
Joseph L. Krause, AO3068444.
Wolfgang K. Kressin, AO3057223.
John W. Krim, AO3057523.
Jerald G. Kriss, AO3056916.
Richard A. Kroeger, AO3053273.
John Kroehler, Jr., AO3067985.
Coe J. Kroese, Jr., AO3050645.
James H. Krueger, AO3057396.
Richard W. Krueger, AO3041099.
Edwin H. Krutsinger, AO3048890.
Michael E. Kucsma, AO3048834.
Richard K. Kuelpman, AO3014783.
Richard L. Kuiper, AO3055896.
Walter A. Kujawa, AO2210644.
Mikio Kunishi, AO3046633.
Melvin M. Kuwamoto, AO3009773.
Morgan B. Lafitte, AO3059029.
Roger A. LaFond, AO2204987.
James P. Lakatos, AO3055542.
George H. Lamb, AO3048757.
Henry A. Lamb, AO3027958.
Paul D. Lambrides, AO3068236.
John J. Lamkin, AO3047187.
Kenneth F. Lanan, AO3048671.
Gerald J. Lange, AO3068856.
William F. Lange, Jr., AO3067941.
Walter M. Langford, Jr., AO3046097.
Donald W. Langston, AO3056968.
Robert G. Lanning, AO3057125.
Edward R. Larrabee, AO3009196.
Richard N. Larsen, AO3056918.
Jerrel J. Larson, AO3051855.
Robert F. Latham, AO3065079.
James P. Latta, AO3057793.
Herbert W. Laundy, AO3070504.
Robert M. Lauver, AO3056044.
James C. Lavery, AO3040623.
Robert P. Lavoie, AO3052555.
George V. Lawler, AO3051390.
Knute F. Lawson, AO3047978.
Robert E. Lawton, AO3050008.
Maurice R. Leach, AO3050877.
Richard E. Leal, AO3048134.
John L. Leaphart, AO3029432.
Alfred G. Leavitt, AO3008976.
Ronald P. LeBright, AO3028121.
Clarence B. H. Lee, AO3046634.
Donald V. H. Lee, AO3057739.
James D. Lee, AO3040691.
Thomas H. Lee, AO3049299.
Richard G. Leiby, AO1856906.
Gerald G. Leigh, AO3048438.
James C. Leming, AO3047466.
Donald G. Lemke, AO2211749.
Hugh G. Leney, AO3048230.
Dan W. Leonard, AO3056776.
William C. Lesster, Jr., AO3058285.
Augustine R. Letto, AO3057960.
David C. Levin, AO3049917.
John C. Lewis, AO3047421.
Edgar J. Lindenmeyer, AO3049112.
Derbin K. Lindgren, Jr., AO3031709.
John A. Lindholm, AO3057796.
Roy O. Linn, AO3050881.
Charles G. Lipe, AO3048567.
Donald V. Little, AO3057684.
Theo G. Lofton, AO3028183.
Charles R. Lopez, AO3028086.
John H. V. Lorch, AO2255342.
Bernard F. Lukasik, AO3058897.
Albro L. Lundy, Jr., AO3050945.
James H. Luttrell, AO3064471.
Francis L. Lynch, AO3058929.
Clyde L. MacGowan, Jr., AO3050883.
John T. Mackesy, AO3065624.
Paul C. Mackin, AO3032296.
Edward M. Macomber, AO3008844.
George F. MacQueen, AO3027892.
Robert F. Magnus, AO3050295.
Robert F. Magyarics, AO3016744.
William M. Mallet, AO3046605.
Ervin C. Manning, AO3059084.
Stanley G. Maratos, AO3028774.
Edgar C. Marihugh, AO3032957.
Dean A. Marshall, AO3058899.
James S. Marston, AO3028448.
Jimmy G. Martin, AO2211760.
Jerry D. Massie, AO3059103.
Hans M. Mathiesen, AO3053236.
Richard D. Matthews, AO3068597.
Robert E. Maupin, AO3064778.
Marvin D. Mayer, AO3058202.
Robert H. McBride, AO3047817.
Roger T. McBride, AO3028722.
John T. McCandless, AO3051357.
George R. McCanless, AO3055928.
James D. McCarthy, AO3065310.
Clifton M. McClure III, AO2204780.
Jack McConathy, Jr., AO3057490.
Thomas P. McCurdy, AO3040794.
John E. McDaniel, Jr., AO3070631.
William B. McDonald, AO3058901.
William C. McEwen, AO3029992.
Joseph W. McGee, AO3027168.
Ronald G. McGlone, AO3055989.
Donald L. McHugh, AO3058936.
Francis J. McIlvaine, AO3030848.
Ray F. McNally, AO3040795.
Donald P. McNamara, AO3049642.
Charles C. McNeill, AO3031213.
Robert D. Mease, AO3048403.
Paul A. Meiners, AO3029182.
Robert A. Mellerski, AO3009131.
John W. Mengel, AO3047535.
Maurice B. Mercer, AO3047921.
Charles D. Merrill, AO3040892.
Charles D. Metcalf, AO3029467.
Solomon R. Metres, AO3050116.
Ronald J. Meyers, AO3027455.
Earl E. Milam, AO3027517.
Richard A. Milburn, AO3057993.
Victor J. Miles, Jr., AO3070449.
Gerald S. Miller, AO3057805.
Harlan S. Miller, Jr., AO3048943.
Jack S. Miller, AO3055348.
James I. Miller, Jr., AO2248707.
Roy B. Miller, Jr., AO3054497.
Walter W. Miller, AO3053044.
Robert N. Millhaem, AO3048949.
Gordon J. Milliken, AO3057574.
Edward K. Mills II, AO3050300.
Robert O. Moe, AO2210383.

Matthew E. Monczewski, AO3069390.
Jewel R. Montgomery, AO3028091.
Charles A. Moore, AO3029382.
Frederick M. Moore, AO3027811.
Hayden C. Moore, AO3064657.
Paul M. Moore, AO3057994.
Clark R. Morgan, AO3052987.
William E. Morgan, Jr., AO3028833.
Eugene E. Moring, Jr., AO3040697.
Douglas E. Morris, AO3047338.
Jack K. Morris, AO3057995.
Charles A. Morrissey, AO3070535.
Carlton H. Moss, AO3053556.
Reinardo P. Moure, AO3007554.
James K. Moyer, AO3058938.
David D. Mueller, AO3068637.
Harvey Mulhauser, AO3050987.
Anthony T. Mulherin, Jr., AO3065828.
Robert W. Mullenger, AO3048406.
Karl H. Muller, AO3050118.
John K. Munholland, AO3055877.
John D. Murff, AO3057575.
Robert R. Murfitt, AO3055747.
James R. Murray, AO3027739.
Richard W. Musgrove, AO3052702.
Arthur C. Mussman, AO3032593.
Jack D. Nations, AO3053942.
William O. Neal, AO3046471.
Eric B. Nelson, AO3067876.
Oscar W. Nelson, Jr., AO3057996.
Marvin E. Newell, AO3046683.
Albert S. Newton, AO3054407.
Frank A. Newton, AO3057280.
Gene A. Ninnemann, AO3028135.
Roy H. Nordstrand, AO3068188.
Warren E. Norman, AO3027059.
Roy C. J. Normen, AO3056039.
Ronald M. North, AO2207937.
Albert J. Nowotny, AO3047268.
Max T. Nunenkamp, AO3046684.
Bobby J. Nunley, AO3058328.
Ronald K. Oakley, AO3067143.
Bert R. Oastler, AO3067412.
John D. O'Brien, AO2210599.
Nicholas P. Obzut, AO3048695.
Arthur D. O'Connor, AO3067877.
Harold W. O'Connor, AO3049587.
Curt R. Offen, AO3040799.
Joseph K. O'Keefe, AO3048764.
Daniel R. Oliker, AO3028647.
Arthur W. Olson II, AO3046938.
Bob H. O'Neal, AO3027385.
Daniel M. Oredson, AO3052299.
John Ostrominski, AO3057283.
Patrick J. O'Toole, AO3058346.
Roy B. Owings, Jr., AO3029092.
Paul R. Ozmer, AO3053790.
Raymond K. Panczyk, AO3050072.
Harold K. Park, AO3050887.
James H. Parker, Jr., AO3027252.
Norman M. Parker, AO3040635.
John A. Parrish, Jr., AO3040983.
Henry R. Passi, AO3028453.
John R. Patrick, AO3040701.
Norman M. Paul, Jr., AO3048700.
William C. Paulsen, Jr., AO3065001.
Alvin L. Pavik, AO3064822.
James A. Pavis, AO3047015.
Frank W. Pazlar, AO3029035.
Ernest E. Pelto, AO3056336.
Jacque M. Perdue, AO3008992.
Frederick G. Perkins III, AO3057842.
William F. Perkins, AO3055169.
James M. Perry, AO3056200.
Richard L. Perry, AO3050206.
Arthur A. Peterson, AO3027972.
Donald C. Peterson, AO3027465.
Gerald L. Petty, AO3070239.
Lindsay F. Phares, AO3065779.
William J. Philler, AO3064418.
David W. Phillips, AO2207910.
Paul A. Phillips, AO3052213.
Henry W. Pickett, Jr., AO3054301.
Zigurds Pladars, AO3053046.
Edward G. Platt, Jr., AO3050685.
Charles E. Plowman, AO3029861.
Glenn E. Plumb, AO3052903.
Randall L. Plumb, AO3047088.
Max M. Plumhoff, AO3064519.
Glen B. Plummer, AO3040484.
Phillip E. Plutt, AO3048100.
John A. Pollard, AO3053169.
William B. Poor, AO3028606.
James W. Poore, AO3057889.
John E. Popper, AO3069156.
Richard S. Portnoy, AO3068491.
Ernest J. Potter, AO2208701.
Lee R. Powell, AO3030877.
John Powers, AO3058454.
John C. Pratt, AO3058684.
Philip C. Pratt, AO3048101.
James A. Pratz, AO3050179.
Willis L. Preston, AO3008864.
George P. Prewitt, AO3058519.
Albert E. Preyss, AO 3047874.
Norris E. Price, AO3058155.
Richard B. Price III, AO3070571.
Joseph E. Prickett, AO3049931.
Christo D. Pulos, AO3056342.
Tom G. Purnhagen, AO3069009.
George T. Pyle, AO3052115.
Gilbert A. Raines, AO3053446.
Charles N. Ramsey, AO3041060.
Bernard P. Randolph, AO3058203.
John E. Rasmuson, AO3029284.
Richard K. Ratliff, AO3057452.
Robert K. Rawlings, AO3055754.
Neil C. Rawlinson, AO3029195.
Chalmers F. Rea, AO3049370.
Charles D. Reagan, AO3047020.
John J. Reding, AO3009385.
David B. Reed, AO3050309.
John D. Reeder, Jr., AO3041019.
Clyde H. Reese, AO3029930.
Thomas P. Reidy, AO3032888.
Neil J. Rendahl, AO3046942.
Patrick L. Renehan, AO3053185.
William R. Reynolds, AO3058593.
Christopher L. Rhodes III, AO2205611.
Harold B. Rhodes, AO3032386.
Robert N. Rhodes, AO3046434.
Donald C. Richards, AO3056938.
Frank D. Richards, AO3058456.
Billy R. Ridlinghafer, AO3027907.
William G. Rigby, AO3040971.
Albert J. Roberts, Jr., AO3058005.
James F. Roberts, AO3049541.
Linwood Roberts, AO3048197.
Lionel W. Roberts, AO3057583.
O. D. Robertson, AO3029250.
Joseph E. Robidoux, AO3057584.
Roger V. Roell, AO3009001.
Ronald C. Roell, AO3057458.
Richard P. Roemer, AO3048585.
Charles M. Rogers, AO3058008.
William G. Rogers, AO3029135.
Arthur Rosner, AO3059035.
Robert D. Rowland, AO3069345.
Jerry W. Russell, AO3040861.
Richard L. Russell, AO3050605.
Charles J. Ryan, AO1858629.
David W. St. Clair, AO3067040.
Frederick J. St. Jean, AO3040734.
John F. Sakry, AO3051868.
Samuel F. Sampson, AO3040169.
William F. Sanderman, AO3029934.
Robert W. Sanders, AO3030411.
Richard J. Scandrett, AO3065003.
Ronald T. Schaefer, AO3048960.
Donald F. Schermerhorn, AO3065286.
Clarence A. Schmidheiser, AO3052167.
Frank K. Schmidt, AO3070649.
Norman H. Schnell, AO3051506.
Paul H. Schnucker, AO3064726.
Joseph A. Schoeler, AO3040489.
Walter J. Schuett, AO3055148.
Roger D. Schurr, AO3067257.
Norman E. Schwalm, AO3048712.
Russell L. Schweickart, AO3067642.
Walter G. Scott, Jr., AO3054304.
William A. Sears, AO3054178.
Morgan Seelye, AO3050764.
David H. Shaw, AO3040059.
William O. Sheaffer, AO3066960.
Don R. Shields, AO3027767.
Richard A. Shields, AO3058204.
Frederick C. Shinrock, Jr., AO3029041.
Thomas A. Shircliff, AO3038439.
Hubert C. Shirley, AO3057815.
Stanley F. Shively, Jr., AO3008878.
Norton F. Shofstall, Jr., AO3046438.
Edward N. Sidwell, AO3053065.
Robert M. Silva, AO3050893.
Jack Silverstein, AO3033394.
Paul J. Simon, AO3057462.
Elmer R. Singleton, AO3057497.
Nathan R. Skipper, Jr., AO3067418.
Jerry E. Slee, AO3047542.
Edmund P. Smart, AO3056737.
Addison F. Smith, AO3055966.
Douglas B. Smith, AO3051455.
Douglass W. Smith, AO3040709.
James A. Smith, AO3057423.
John E. Smith, AO3027830.
Lester S. Smith, AO3032939.
Murray L. Smith, AO3029004.
Robert D. Smith, AO3049552.
Robert J. Smith, AO3056219.
Thomas J. Smith III, AO3051248.
Wilbur H. Smith, AO3064318.
Willard E. Smith, AO3055256.
James P. Smothermon, AO3059063.
Barre E. Smuck, AO3009011.
Benjamin C. Snyder, AO3030551.
Paul E. Soherr, AO3032108.
Leonard F. Sokol, AO3007160.
Ronald L. Sollod, AO3028461.
Herbert E. Somerder, AO3041025.
Alvin M. Somers, AO3050766.
William R. Soukup, AO3029939.
Asa R. Spackman, AO3054875.
Casper T. Spangrud, AO3054148.
Donn A. Spegal, AO1904117.
Gerald C. Speidel, Jr., AO3065120.
Richard L. Spicer, AO3050409.
Robert E. Sprague, AO2209456.
Alfred M. Staehli, AO3032995.
Joe B. Stallings, AO3052185.
Warren E. Stannard, AO3050358.
Louis D. Staunton, AO3051272.
Gail F. Steele, AO3058687.
Thomas J. Steele, AO3048486.
Richard E. Steere, AO3050410.
Robert W. Steinberger, AO3058776.
David G. Steinke, AO3057818.
John G. Stephen, AO3057968.
William L. Stevens, AO3029223.
William M. Stewart III, AO3051607.
Thomas W. Stinson, AO3056358.
Kenneth R. Stormans, AO3055040.
Albert G. Story, AO3058688.
Conrad L. Story, AO3040958.
Dibrell C. Stowell, AO3054779.
John R. Stracener, AO3052897.
Ernest D. Strait, AO2210864.
Kearney W. Strand, Jr., AO3050769.
Don L. Stratton, AO3031538.
Ben R. Strickland, AO3027321.
Walter E. Stroup, AO3058166.
Robert F. Sturgeon, Jr., AO3057819.
Kenneth A. Styber, AO3048267.
Edward D. Sullivan, AO2208432.
Laurence F. Sullivan, AO3052066.
Theodore A. Sundin, AO3033493.
Thomas I. Swanson, AO3051740.
Frederick F. Swartz, AO2211714.
Joseph O. Sweeney, AO3052237.
Ben H. Swett, AO3046481.
Frank R. Swortzel, AO3067745.
Donavan L. Tadken, AO3050662.
Carlos E. Tadlock, Jr., AO3032959.
Charles H. Tardif, AO3041030.
Bobby L. Tarleton, AO3053116.
Billie J. Taylor, AO3040806.
Edward G. Taylor, AO3027592.
Richard F. Taylor, Jr., AO3033515.
Reily R. Teague, AO3064373.
Rene D. Tegtmeyer, AO3068650.
James E. Terrell, AO3047896.
David H. Thomas II, AO3071033.
George E. Thomas, AO3008889.
Lloyd H. Thomas, AO3056980.
Timothy L. Thomas, AO3029792.
James E. Thompson, AO3040042.
Leland L. Thompson, Jr., AO3040744.
Robert L. Thompson, AO3057849.
Leonard F. Thornton, AO3040736.
Richard W. Thornton, AO3057091.
Thomas V. Threatt, AO3027986.
Alwyn A. Throckmorton, Jr., AO3058168.
Jackie W. Thurman, AO3054534.
Donald E. Thursby, AO3070119.

Lee M. Tigner, AO3028465.
John F. Till III, AO3058398.
David Tillotson, Jr., AO2261209.
Ira F. Tindall, AO3057823.
Richard D. Tindall, AO2210813.
Ronald D. Tingley, AO3049377.
Kenneth F. Tobiason, AO3052187.
William E. Todt, AO3046848.
Jack S. Toedt, AO3048969.
Donald L. Toft, AO3032919.
William T. Tolbert, AO3027748.
Anthony J. Toljanic, AO3064701.
Owen T. Tolson, Jr., AO3047702.
Thomas M. Tomaskovic, AO3032457.
Gervasio Tonini, AO3069629.
Richard E. Tooke, AO3052899.
Frank D. Toombs, AO3053142.
Clifton E. Tourangeau, AO3040912.
Thomas F. Towry, AO3070314.
George P. Traband, Jr., AO3058299.
George C. Trail, Jr., AO3070071.
John C. Trapp, AO3064648.
Forrest L. Treanor, Jr., AO3056742.
David J. Tregilgas, AO3026924.
Richard L. Treherne, AO3069102.
Gaylord B. Treu, AO2204413.
Harold D. Tripp, AO3052113.
Donald C. Trolinger, AO3040323.
David M. A. Trost, AO3046138.
Sidney L. Tucker, AO2211332.
Floyd D. Tudor, AO3054922.
Harold J. Tuens, AO3058347.
Richard D. Turner, AO3027771.
Wyke T. Turpin, AO2205773.
Daniel A. Tuthill, AO3040714.
George G Tuttle, AO3057537.
Robert R. Tuttle, AO3030165.
William C. Tuttle, AO3057503.
Robert D. Tuxill, AO3067208.
William L. Tyler, AO3058466.
David B. Underwood, AO3047099.
Harold W. Underwood, AO3041069.
Chester E. Urey, Jr., AO3057201.
Elliott A. Uahkow, AO3050138.
Russel K. Utley, AO3058020.
Lewis G. Vale, AO3054198.
David R. Vance, AO3057824.
Morris E. Van Vooren, AO3055623.
Richard D. Van Zandt, AO3064526.
Daniel G. Vaughan, AO3026498.
Lee D. Velde, AO3057065.
David E. L. Verbie, AO3054537.
Kenneth W. Verch, AO3027263.
David M. Verrelli, AO3068845.
Joseph L. N. Violette, AO3067996.
Richard K. Voehl, AO3067420.
Frederick J. Vogler, AO3057825.
John C. Vogt, Jr., AO3059088.
Donald H. Volz, AO3052215.
William M. Vondersmith, Jr., AO3053515.
Robert V. von Kleist, AO2076280.
Gustav S. von Wolffradt, AO3058022.
Roger G. Waddill, AO3027345.
Robert G. Wade, AO3051910.
Paul E. Wagner, AO3047100.
Richard E. Wagner, AO2210965.
Robert B. Wagner, AO3064298.
Donald E. Walker, AO3052399.
Lorenz J. Walker, AO3054055.
Norman B. Walker, AO3027530.
Rees D. Walker, AO2255396.
Mervin A. Wallace, AO3031976.
Thomas H. Watterson, AO3055764.
Keith P. Watts, AO3056227.
Leonard W. Webb, AO3033205.
Alban L. Weber, AO3032232.
John V. Weber, AO3028785.
Eugene J. Webre, AO3033234.
Edward M. Weisbeck, AO3026461.
Richard H. Wells, AO3053240.
Richard C. Welty, AO2211799.
Wilfred E. Werner, AO3047484.
Dwayne F. West, AO3054780.
Dale L. Westerhout, AO3057539.
James W. Whalen, AO3029642.
Robert E. Wheeler, AO3058840.
Terrence G. Wheeler, AO3047517.
George A. White, AO3028310.
James W. White, Jr., AO3067019.
Lewis A. White, AO3030775.
John R. Wierdsma, AO3049637.
Louis H. Wiersma, AO3050191.
Larry D. Wiggins, AO3041036.
Robert E. Wilkes, AO3049638.
Joseph H. Wilkinson, AO3033101.
Earle D. Williams, Jr., AO3057299.
Arthur R. D. Willis, AO3053443.
Carl A. Willrich, Jr., AO3049740.
Joseph A. Wilmer, AO3028470.
Dick E. Wilson, AO2207738.
Melvin C. Wilson, AO3028304.
Richard D. Wilson, AO3037886.
Robert G. Wilson, AO3068433.
Whitney S. Wilson, Jr., AO2207456.
James C. Wine, AO3054781.
Frederick H. Wingate, AO3052464.
Frank R. Wink, AO3068207.
Roger D. C. Winquist, AO3049416.
Boyd E. Wise, AO3027003.
Harold Wise, Jr., AO3029715.
Robert O. Wishneski, AO3053525.
James L. Wissert, AO3053188.
Robert N. Witter, Jr., AO3049741.
Floyd D. Wood, AO3027997.
Billy Woods, Jr., AO3057506.
John D. Woods, AO3059147.
Thomas W. Woods, AO3066838.
Edward E. Workmon, AO3048152.
James R. Wright, AO2209473.
Moorhead Wright III, AO3067956.
Robert E. Yde, AO3054119.
Yoshitaka Yoshida, AO3050920.
James G. Young, AO3068149.
John G. Young, AO3054158.
Sumner S. Young, AO3029336.
Vincent N. Young, AO3058850.
Herschel O. Zarecor, Jr., AO3065638.
Richard C. Zeeck, AO3028214.
Eldon W. Zeller, AO3054026.
Donald L. Zink, AO2255158.
Robert A. Zoller, AO3047894.

The following-named Reserve women in the Air Force for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956):

*To be major*

Anna M. McKim, AL500483.

*To be captains*

Mary E. Bates, AL906783.
Jacqueline Crosby, AL1910716.
Mary E. Daly, AL900340.
Sara N. Harris, AL402718.
Freda M. Herrera, AL785738.
Mary D. McDermott, AL1910756.
Martha A. Pichon, AL600029.
Marjorie H. Raynor, AL200375.
Peggy L. R. Schissell, AL903304.
Eileen M. Smith, AL400137.
Helen E. Strong, AL222233.

*To be first lieutenants*

Ethel E. Apter, AL2219103.
Ruby C. Belew, AL1859065.
Voelia J. Bell, AL2236033.
Virginia Bernhisel, AL2220446.
Helen J. Blakeman, AL2249532.
William M. Bobbitt, AL2229121.
Patricia M. Bolander, AL2229122.
Ann H. Bonar, AL2250329.
Vinna B. Chapman, AL2220440.
Mary A. Delsman, AL2237062.
Jane A. Donovan, AL2253183.
Mary E. Dowd, AL3006835.
Jacqueline English, AL2219492.
Virginia L. Gunter, AL2236093.
Patricia A. Hayes, AL2231684.
Jean M. Helms, AL2229184.
Lenore Henson, AL2236617.
Margaret J. Hicks, AL2229162.
Ellen M. Hippeli, AL2253130.
Evelyn R. Houdyshell, AL2251102.
Bettye J. Jackson, AL2234162.
Gretl B. Jacobs, AL2234109.
Millicent P. Jones, AL2234161.
Richardine M. Jones, AL2247375.
Lucille E. Keith, AL2219243.
Charlotte L. King, AL2219553.
June H. Knox, AL2219560.
Rita A. Lawler, AL2234026.
Hattie I. Lee, AL2219874.
Lillian L. Leong, AL2248926.
Katherine P. Lewis, AL2236078.
Jean F. Lindley, AL1863222.
Isabella T. Lynn, AL2234158.
Mary M. Mackie, AL2236503.
Margaret I. McCaffrey, AL2234050.
Eleanor J. McCallum, AL2229527.
Naomi M. McCracken, AL2236577.
Sara J. McLellan, AL2229428.
Mary J. McNamara, AL2235451.
Mary W. Messinger, AL2234033.
Nina K. Morrison, AL1864600.
Sylvia G. Owens, AL2245988.
Marian L. Piper, AL2219000.
Lerline Poole, AL2236090.
June I. Rainey, AL2235683.
Dorothy Romanovich, AL2218776.
Betty J. Ruden, AL2229230.
Henrietta L. Scales, AL2220323.
Marcella M. Shepard, AL2219363.
Welda A. Smith, AL2220342.
Winnifred A. Springer, AL2250225.
Mary L. Storm, AL2219058.
Sue L. Sweeney, AL2235347.
Florence K. Thomas, AL2250227.
Jean M. Tradup, AL2219068.
Mittie R. Williams, AL2219403.
Robbie V. Young, AL2246084.

*To be second lieutenants*

Beatrice B. Avery, AL3056235.
Margie M. Clark, AL3056492.
Muriel A. Goetz, AL3008953.
Constance Hammond, AL3008958.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956), with a view to designation, under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform chaplain duties:

*To be majors*

John F. Albert, AO931120.
Walter F. Baniak, AO931948.
Edgar H. Brimberry, AO423440.
John A. Carlin, AO551414.
William L. Clark, AO408553.
William J. Clasby, AO437841.
John F. Daniels, AO395066.
James H. Dickinson, AO485095.
Marvin O. Gardner, AO478179.
Horace A. Guiler, AO467009.
Thomas C. Hanlon, AO517743.
Christopher J. Hinckley, AO528354.
Maurice A. Johnson, AO410694.
Simeon T. Johnson, AO422391.
Charles H. Marler, AO553339.
Francis G. McCullough, AO479217.
Eugene C. McGuire, AO513254.
Francis X. Murphy, AO447961.
Roland C. Reny, AO529251.
Bernard F. Schumacher, AO432793.
Meredith P. Smith, AO503689.
James D. Taylor, AO504123.
Glenn F. Teska, AO480697.
Paul Tomasovic, AO422696.
Ransom B. Woods, Jr., AO933364.

*To be captains*

Charles J. Barnes, Jr., AO2072595.
Warren Bedingfield, AO1859514.
John W. Behnken, Jr., AO530834.
John J. Bradley, AO2255627.
Sam E. Brian, AO930702.
Wesley J. Buck, AO2214620.
Joseph P. Casey, AO557048.
John L. Clancy, AO2253236.
Eugene M. Clemens, AO1855102.
Lawrence A. Dickson, Jr., AO504733.
James J. Driscoll, AO2252605.
Raphael E. Drone, AO2215056.
Paul S. Drumheller, AO2232549.
Wilds S. DuBose, AO965986.
John R. Durkin, AO964437.
Leonard S. Edmonds, AO536354.

Frederick J. Ellis, Jr., AO703381.
John J. Fader, AO2230520.
Frederick K. Finke, AO551231.
William E. Flood, AO2251458.
Rowland W. Folensbee, AO2234071.
Conrad J. Gaffney, AO545127.
Albert L. Gamble, AO2251363.
Frank J. Gilchrist, AO966886.
James F. Gribbon, AO962473.
Kenneth W. Hamstra, AO2233790.
Aloysius W. Hemkens, AO2251515.
Clarence H. Hesseldenz, AO2253780.
George M. Hickey, AO508480.
Clarence E. Hobgood, AO474526.
Robert P. Holdt, AO2232345.
Walter H. Huber, AO969681.
Kenneth R. Israel, AO2250795.
Ashley D. Jameson, AO533052.
Daniel B. Jorgensen, AO529593.
Conway B. Lanford, AO731314.
Clarence F. Letchworth, AO2254973.
LeRoy H. Lewis, AO2235453.
Stanley A. Llewellyn, AO2254884.
William J. Ludlum, AO2255880.
Orville L. McCormack, AO2261418.
Spencer D. McQueen, AO555648.
Vernon J. Meerdink, AO1851999.
Norman C. Metsy, AO2253075.
Richard D. Miller, AO2261769.
William F. Montgomery, AO2236491.
Bradley T. Morse, AO522382.
Elmore P. Nelson, AO2234124.
William C. Newbern, AO2230529.
Charles R. Posey, AO2246083.
John E. Prokopovitsh, AO966883.
Robert E. Quigg, AO2261368.
Clason L. Rohrer, AO2064328.
Robert C. Rothman, AO2249447.
Wayne E. Rowland, AO2236141.
John J. Scahill, AO1903751.
Paul G. Schade, AO525820.
Hugo G. Schmidt, Jr., AO1853986.
Chester L. Smith, AO2216370.
Stanley W. Spiewak, AO966183.
Philip D. Stack, AO2253837.
Leland R. Stevens, AO2261773.
Willis L. Stowers, AO533047.
Ersmond Swaffar, AO2247465.
Karl L. Swain, AO2261628.
Wayne L. Taylor, AO2261940.
Jacob E. Till, AO1865632.
Robert R. Wilson, AO2253546.
Glenn E. Wittrup, AO2250830.
Warren W. Yates, AO2255021.

*To be first lieutenants*

Robert N. Arinder, AO3059358.
Lee W. Backman, AO2255043.
Charles A. Baker, AO3059496.
Stuart E. Barstad, AO3043354.
John B. Basteyns, AO2255280.
Roy W. Browning, Jr., AO2255329.
Wayne L. Burkey, AO2255233.
James J. Butler, AO2235278.
Raymond J. Calkins, AO2255471.
John J. Campbell, AO2255293.
Richard Carr, AO2255046.
Joseph H. Coggins, AO2255030.
John R. Collins, AO2255060.
Calvin C. Cooper, AO2251824.
Isaac M. Copeland, Jr., AO2255031.
James A. Cruze, AO3059414.
James M. DeMott, AO2255120.
Charles E. Dennis, AO3043347.
Blanche J. Dier, Jr., AO2255026.
Michael B. Draovitch, AO2255077.
Clarence E. Drumheller, AO3043340.
Oakley E. Edwards, AO3059599.
John C. Friske, AO3059422.
Arthur E. Greenwalt Sr., AO2255232.
Wiley C. Guthrie, AO2255358.
Robert E. Hendricks, AO3045582.
Carl W. Henn, AO3045754.
Sheldon E. Hermanson, AO3045577.
Irving G. Hill, AO3059494.
Dean C. Hofstad, AO2255048.
Harry E. Houseman, AO3043835.
Bernard L. Hrico, AO2255125.
Mansfield E. Hunt, AO3042822.
Ralph S. Illingworth, AO2255247.
William H. Jacobs, AO3059476.
Norman C. Johnshoy, AO3059527.
Leonard D. Kelley, AO3059395.
George M. Klaric, AO2255037.
Michael Margitich, AO2255079.
Charles E. McCaughan, AO2255127.
Earl W. Milbrath, AO2255556.
Thomas J. Moran, AO2255058.
Hugh J. Mullin, AO2255166.
Wayne E. Paulson, AO3045620.
Charles W. Reider, AO2255111.
Gerald H. Riedel, AO2255080.
Dan R. Robison, AO3043427.
Jeremiah J. Rodell, AO3059207
Paul A. Roe, AO3043352.
Chester W. Ross, AO2255090.
Harold R. Sauer, AO3075239.
Peter C. Schroeder, Jr., AO2255405.
Robert A. Sloan, AO2255255.
Jasper J. Smith, AO3059621.
Henry L. Spencer, AO2255415.
Donal M. Squires, AO2255045.
Joseph F. Stuller, AO3043805.
Lawrence V. Tagg, AO2097080.
Theodore M. Tang, AO2271393.
Christian J. Thearle, AO3045586.
Willie L. Walker, AO3043024.
Robert J. Wayne, AO2255100.
James F. Wilson, AO3043341.
William B. Young, AO2255068.
Lawrence A. Zellers, AO3059480.

The following-named persons who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the first recess period of the 85th Congress for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under section 8294 of title 10, United States Code, as modified by section 1 of the act of April 30, 1956, chapter 223 (70 Stat. 119), with a view to designation, under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Department of the Air Force:

*To be majors, USAF (Medical)*

William C. Hernquist, AO473880.
George W. Powell, AO2240300.
George J. Race, AO961439.

*To be captains, USAF (Medical)*

Jose R. Ensanat, AO2255716.
Frederick W. Lovell, AO750416.
William C. Rike, Jr., AO2260649.
Thornton M. Stearns, AO3044414.
Howard H. Wayne, AO3001072.
Granville J. Womack, AO2086331.
Ralph E. Woods.

*To be captains, USAF (Dental)*

Jean B. Archambault, AO3000605.
James W. Decker, AO2241284.
Arthur E. Dibble, AO2239955.
Richard H. Everett, Jr., 0988657.
Charles F. Harless, Jr., AO3000715.
William S. Jameson, AO3000347.
Keith V. Kellow.
Emil A. Mellow, AO702135.
William J. Nease.
Malcolm G. Nichols, AO3000344.
Dick C. Seamons.
Myron T. Shervheim, AO3000727.
George Smolen.
Thomas N. Weems, Jr., AO434886.

*To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)*

Robert W. Clubb.
Walter J. Pories, AO3043265.
Robert A. Scott, AO3076267.

*To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)*

Adolph F. Basse.
Benjamin E. Dooley, AO2102295.
Russell A. McCallion II, AO3075099.

The following-named persons who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the first recess period of the 85th Congress for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force, under provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956), with a view to designation, under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated:

*To be captain, USAF (Judge Advocate)*

Paul A. Gross, AO1865345.

*To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)*

Robert W. Ebbers, AO3000890.
James A. Mann, AO3030766.

The following-named persons who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the 1st recess period of the 85th Congress for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force, under provisions of section 8291, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation for the performance of duty as indicated under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code:

*To be captain, USAF (Nurse)*

Meta M. Mills, AN1906647.

*To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)*

Rita C. Bourquein, AN2242618.
Eleanor M. Carey, AN2243322.
Virginia D. Connors, AN2243863.
Marjorie Cook, AN792947.
Lois V. Hope, AN2241721.
Helene A. Ingram, AN1906966.
Valedda A. Kiehn, AN1912723.
Patricia D. Komar, AN2242214.
Charlotte F. Mangin, AN2242881.
Helen M. Meredith, AN2243227.
Beverly W. Monroe, AN2242553.
Lois J. Morgan, AN2243486.
Lillian H. Parrish, AN2236213.
Mary H. Pavilkey, AN2242561.
Alice P. Scholz, AN2243330.
Joanne Seymour, AN2243582.
Irene L. Sofferis, AN2244053.
Frances E. Thomas, AN1912740.
Elizabeth C. Voght, AN2244453.

*To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Specialists)*

Mary J. O'Connor, AR2213736.
Joan A. Reardon, AM3000220.

*To be second lieutenant, USAF (Nurse)*

Sheila G. Barrett, AN3044262.

The following-named persons who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the 1st recess period of the 85th Congress for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force, under the provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956):

*To be captains*

Frederick J. Adelman, AO773511.
Robert H. Amy, AO704532.
Claude L. Ball, AO764174.
Richard G. Banister, AO822614.
Newell H. Beaty, AO714362.
T. G. Billingsley, Jr., AO700096.
Wallace T. Boblitt, AO714008.
Willis D. Boone, AO773544.
Harry G. Boorman, AO709230.
William E. Borders, AO895954.
Julian W. Bradbury, AO822924.
Robert E. Bruss, AO705532.
Charles W. Burgess, AO720774.
William L. Burke, AO829136.
Arthur P. Bush III, AO869961.
Richard A. Campbell, AO692658.
Alva F. Carden, Jr., AO693197.
Douglas H. Carruthers, AO766421.
Marvin H. Castleberry, AO814651.
Charles E. Chapman, AO678352.
Stanton D. Converse, AO2057562.
Maurice E. Cook, AO768458.
John O. Copley, Jr., AO828965.
Harold D. Cox, AO711954.
Otis J. Cox, AO705910.

Robert J. Craig, AO532543.
John I. Craw, Jr., AO753497.
Lawrence R. Cummings, AO704896.
Sherman R. Cummings, AO1647514.
Allen R. Davis, AO880695.
Gerald L. Davis, AO772307.
Jasper D. DeBruler, AO562849.
Ralph S. Decker, Jr., AO721038.
George B. Demmon, AO774050.
Harry R. Dexter, AO774054.
Milton A. Diver, AO774059.
Edward L. Dobrowolski, AO716633.
Thomas E. Doyle, AO737029.
Richard E. Dreher, AO823329.
Crowell C. Eddy, AO705878.
Clarence A. Edmonds, AO812396.
Bryce S. Evertson, AO748611.
William S. Farrell, AO821631.
Merle N. Fister, AO821628.
William M. Forsythe, AO807407.
Mood L. Gee, AO706927.
Mervin G. Getty, AO777648.
George E. Giffin, AO551340.
Lloyd P. Greenwood, AO665009.
Wayne G. Grooms, AO685301.
Edwin O. Hammer, AO2059509.
Edgar R. Harlan, AO763179.
Raymond H. Hathaway, AO716434.
John D. Henry, AO712565.
Alvin R. Herzog, AO705020.
Homer H. Houghton, AO710941.
Donald L. Howell, AO775366.
Paul A. Howerton, AO806450.
Billy H. Ingram, AO707922.
Charles S. Izenour, Jr., AO743341.
Joe R. John, Jr., AO772217.
Kenneth D. Johnson, AO823603.
Scott C. Johnson, AO680910.
Milton S. Jones, AO832826.
Kenneth W. Kagy, AO1696685.
Robert B. Kelsey, AO767269.
Werner K. Kern, AO1113781.
William M. Kerns, AO580342.
Frank L. Kimbrough, AO822021.
Donald J. King, AO827808.
Lawrence R. King, Jr., AO774189.
Roy T. Kittock, AO584466.
Donald E. Knebusch, AO708488.
Robert E. Lamb, AO679079.
Leroy M. Lancaster, AO829713.
Arthur D. LaRue, AO706489.
Thomas W. Leigh, Jr., AO719107.
Edwin Lewis, AO586220.
Henry W. Liljedahl, AO711435.
William J. Lindgren, AO717086.
Gerald P. Lipton, AO769150.
William A. Loughlin, Jr., AO826229.
Joseph J. Lukawski, AO774221.
William S. Mace, AO769302.
David J. Maloney, AO1055901.
Edwin H. Mammen, AO870011.
James C. Manley, AO719985.
Stephen J. Manzek, AO706947.
Michael Mariolis, AO867250.
Anthony Martinez, AO764379.
Frank Martinjak, AO710289.
John E. McRoberts, AO548282.
William F. Meyers, AO689480.
Gerald W. Might, Jr., AO824165.
Joseph F. Mika, AO551893.
Hiawatha Mohawk, AO800022.
Howard E. Moore, Jr., AO777906.
John L. Moose, AO1696721.
Eugene F. Moses, AO673919.
John D. Musick, AO695353.
Donald B. Myers, AO690883.
Robert D. Naylor, AO713589.
Arthur F. Nicholson, AO707970.
Leon S. Orser, Jr., AO827716.
William A. Owen, Jr., AO716941.
Garnet D. Page, AO829741.
Riley E. Patrick, AO716224.
John C. Perfitt, AO723670.
Reed T. Peter, AO888904.
Harold L. Peterson, AO716758.
William Pisaruck, AO823947.
John B. Pollock, AO779994.
Judge C. Potts, AO2060084.
Owen E. Pratt, Jr., AO667842.
Kelly A. Purvis, AO819869.
Russell W. Ramsey, AO822543.
Leroy D. Randall, Jr., AO761248.
John I. Redmond, AO767874.
David G. Reed, AO716946.
Harry E. Rees, AO820646.
Donald W. Remillard, AO742355.
Salvatore J. Romano, AO867537.
William J. Schneider, AO830976.
Charles A. Scolatti, AO776812.
John J. Shaughnessy, AO723445.
Alexander S. Sherry, AO830991.
Howard W. Smith, AO715622.
Fred W. Staeben, AO586416.
Theodore Stern, AO776820.
Maynard E. Stogdill, AO779658.
Roger B. Swanson, AO769080.
Merle D. Turner, AO774820.
Haymond A. Van Fleet, Jr., AO773695.
Therman C. Weir, AO765172.
Robert A. Wellman, AO585836.
Robert G. Whalen, AO684802.
Harris B. Wilhoite, AO716273.
Keith E. Williby, AO712972.
Howard E. Wilson, AO584755.
John J. Woolley, Jr., AO719488.

*To be first lieutenants*

Cornelius T. Andreae, AO3036476.
Samuel F. Armer, AO2204533.
Eugene K. Arkenasy, AO2205402.
Harry E. Auld, AO2206624.
William W. Bassett, AO3036163.
Frederick J. R. Benson, AO3034843.
Glenn E. Beynon, Jr., AO3036183.
James D. Black, AO2205725.
Robert D. Bradshaw, AO3008440.
Anthony J. Cerreta, AO3036305.
Winchell D. Chung, AO3035915.
Donald J. Cipra, AO3035835.
Sanford L. Cohn, AO3008449.
Bobby D. Collier, AO2206659.
Raymond M. Colovich, AO2207160.
David B. Coon, AO3036308.
John C. Corley, AO2209042.
Roy C. Dalton, AO3007322.
Hilmere J. Deines, AO2208339.
George F. Dersheimer, AO3036369.
William Dobbs, AO2206454.
Roger A. Dorwart, AO3044411.
Elliott L. Feinberg, AO2208927.
John R. Flynn, Jr., AO2205251.
Robert E. Ford, AO3035693.
Merlyn D. Fratt, Jr., AO2204587.
Byron J. Freeman, AO3036042.
William E. Freeman, Jr., AO2209746.
John D. P. Fuller, Jr., AO2205253.
Stewart R. Gable, AO3035667.
Samuel E. Gaskill, AO2209047.
Drexell A. George, AO3036375.
Richard G. Graalmann, AO2205022.
Harlon A. Hain, AO2214720.
Vincent F. Halter, Jr., AO2205072.
Rolf A. Hanning, AO2234445.
Robert A. Hanson, AO2205255.
Lewis B. Harrington, Jr., AO3036061.
Sam Haskins, Jr., AO3008470.
Robert J. Hempfling, AO3008472.
Charles R. Henson, AO3036113.
William H. Houlihan, AO3008480.
John C. Howay, AO3035921.
William H. Hurd, Jr., AO3036013.
Thomas S. Hutto, AO3025369.
Lloyd S. Jacobson, AO3036014.
Harold Katzman, AO2209572.
William E. Lenihan, Jr., AO2205801.
Alan L. Lomax, AO2208245.
Walter J. Lovingfoss, AO3036203.
Glenn T. Lowery, AO2205078.
Mack Luckie, Jr., AO3035850.
Daniel F. Lynch III, AO2204481.
John E. Lynch, Jr., AO3017511.
Edwin L. Marsh, AO2204595.
Joe B. Marshall, Jr., AO2207643.
Charles E. McClusky, AO2204515.
Martin H. McCormick, Jr., AO677094.
Christy D. McKenzie, AO2204517.
Kenneth E. Mintey, AO2207645.
Jerome M. Naylor, AO3010709.
Alfred Oliver, AO3036502.
Joseph J. Onate, AO2207333.
Charles D. Parker, AO2204784.
Joseph A. Powers, Jr., AO2206057.
Charles E. Rasmussen, AO3036238.
Wally F. Rather, AO2206474.
William R. Rawlinson, Jr., AO3036062.
Robert W. Reeves, AO2229568.
Howard L. Rice, AO2205680.
Charles W. Richardson, AO2205529.
Justus F. Rose, Jr., AO2204331.
Donald M. Salisbury, AO2206424.
Tilden R. Schofield, AO2207588.
Donald J. Smith, AO2207298.
Doss L. Smith, AO3036423.
Ernest L. Smith, AO2205499.
Forrest E. Storz, AO2210402.
Dutton G. Stoy, AO2205268.
Gene C. Sue, AO3020276.
Francis E. Sweeney, Jr., AO3036252.
Herbert B. Theiling, Jr., AO2208177.
Joseph F. Torres, Jr., AO2208317.
Wayne A. Tully, AO2207732.
Pallas L. Tye, Jr., AO3012406.
John A. Veylupek, AO2208381.
John G. von Jess, AO2208964.
William J. Walin, AO2204275.
Kenneth A. Wayson, AO3035679.
Alvin W. Williams, AO3008547.
DeRex Williams, Jr., AO3035657.
George E. Wilson, Jr., AO3008549.
William T. Wilson, AO3020942.
Reagan N. Woodard, AO3036357.
Burton D. Zeiler, Jr., AO2207595.

*To be second lieutenant*

Richard Stone, AO3080120.

The following-named distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions, subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, during the 1st recess period of the 85th Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Department of the Air Force under the provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956):

Gerald W. Cummings
Charles G. Fullerton
Deane H. Kihara
Henri J. Picard, Jr.
Gayle B. Wilhelm, AO3073036.
Thomas E. Winemiller

IN THE NAVY

(*) Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

*Rear Adm. Eugene J. Peltier, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years with the rank of rear admiral.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Edward C. Kenney

SUPPLY CORPS

*Lionel C. Peppell
Thomas A. Long

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Wayne R. Loud
Courtney Shands
Herbert D. Riley
Leonard B. Southerland
Frank Virden
Howard A. Yeager
Joshua W. Cooper
John E. Clark
William A. Sutherland, Jr.
John S. Thach
William D. Irvin
Glynn R. Donaho
Thurston B. Clark
James R. Lee
John Quinn
Harry E. Sears
William A. Schoech
David L. McDonald
William F. Raborn, Jr.
Charles E. Weakley
Henry S. Persons
Claude V. Ricketts
Roy L. Johnson
Joseph E. Dodson

MEDICAL CORPS

Irwin L. V. Norman
Courtney G. Clegg
Hubert J. Van Peenen

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

David M. Shoup — Henry R. Paige
Samuel S. Jack — Marion L. Dawson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

*Carson A. Roberts
James P. Berkeley
Donald M. Weller

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Randall M. Victory — Charles H. Hayes
Carson A. Roberts — Donald M. Weller
James P. Berkeley — William P. Battell
Wallace M. Greene, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John P. Condon — Lewis J. Fields
Frank C. Tharin — Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.
Robert E. Cushman, Jr. — Jr.
Richard G. Weede — Paul R. Tyler

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

*Bertrand T. Fay

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

William W. Stickney

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Carlton A. Fisher

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

(*) Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

*James C. Biggers
*James D. Blatchford
*Russell F. Boynton
*James R. Brace
*Charles D. Burton
*Frederick R. Chamberlain III
William J. Conover
*John H. Dahlmeier
*Robert E. Davis
*Charles E. Dayharsh
*Harold G. DeMoss
*Russell C. Diehl, Jr.
*Kay P. Ellifrit
*Joseph M. Enyedy II
*Michael J. Ford
*Thomas H. Fort
*Michael D. Gainey
Norman R. Gerness
*Robert E. Good
*Don F. Goodwin
*Larry Hebert
*James D. Hobart
*Rodney L. Johnson
*David L. Jones
*James R. Julian
*Robert J. Justice
*Stephen H. Kale
*Daniel D. Kana
*Beau K. Kansteiner
*Ronald S. Kareken
Donald J. Kazimir
William C. Kellum
*Phillip L. Kenner
*John W. Koenig
*James E. Konklin
Frederick A. Krinard
*Lawrence S. Kroll
Eugene R. Krueger
*Charles M. Lawrence
*Leo G. LeSage
*John R. Lewis, Jr.
*John L. Lightstone
*Albert W. Lynch
*Rodney K. Madsen
Patrick F. McGuire
*Charles L. Mackenzie
*David H. Middleton
*Edward J. Moyer
*Larry P. Mozer
*Gordon R. Nakagawa
*Lee E. Norton, Jr.
*Robert B. Osborne
Fred A. Page, Jr.
*Woodrow W. Pitt, Jr.
*Donald D. Pizinger
*Kenneth L. Plog
*William C. Rahmig
*Don D. Reeder
*Richard C. Renfro
*James L. Riley
*David A. Rogers
*Harvey J. Rowe
*John C. Schmidt
*Harry F. Schoenagel
Christian T. Schwafel
*Walter H. Schwartz, Jr.
*James B. Scott
*Albert G. Skinner
*Paul E. Streich
*Jack F. Talbott
*Kinnison H. Thomas
*Donald E. Turnquist
*Roger M. Vasey
*Philip V. Voorhees
*Richard L. Wall
*David H. Weir
*Donald J. Wille
*Allen D. Wynne
Richard L. Zieber

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert M. Hanna — William J. Rogers, Jr.
Robert H. Mangels — Richard E. Souslin
*Richard A. Remington — John H. Wulfkuhle

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Roger R. Caldwell — *Charles L. Soukup
*Robert L. Haymaker — *Leonard G. Suelter

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

COMMANDER

*Charles S. Sale

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

*Jerome Imburg

LIEUTENANT

Wayne I. Newton
*Lester P. Nyborg
*Maynard L. Sisler

*Robert M. Drake (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy and to be promoted to the grade of commander when his line running mate is so promoted, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-name Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

COMMANDER

*Albert D. Nelson, Jr.
*Richard R. Waite

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

*Francis W. Burke — *Lynne T. Greene
*David V. Christiansen — *Skender Nuredini
*George E. Cruft — *Paul H. Sebrechts

LIEUTENANT

*Charles E. Alexander, Jr.
*Rodger L. Alspach
*Donald L. Baxter
*Melvin Borowsky
*William "S" Brothers
*Gerald W. Cady
*Gerald C. Crary, Jr.
*James J. Daubert
*Enrique M. deArrigotia-Rodriguez
*Robert E. DeForest
*Leslie D. Ekvall, Jr.
*Charles H. Emich
*Robert M. Evans
William E. Evans III
James W. Fresh
*Willis J. Grant III
*Thomas B. Greer
*Frederick George
*Phillip J. Haggerty
*John W. Hauzenbiass
Jim F. Hicks
*Benjamin F. Hinton
*William J. Jacoby, Jr.
*Gerard W. Jauchler
*Norman Jepsky
*Robert M. Kemp
*William V. Kinnard, Jr.
*Douglas R. Koth
*Douglas R. Knab
*John C. Kramer
*Charles S. Lambdin
*James H. Lawrie
*James H. Loucks
*John A. Lynch
John C. McMillan
*Francis L. Maher
*Philip R. Martin, Jr.
*James E. Mathis
Josiah S. Matthews III
Daniel E. Mengedoht
*Mitchell Mills
*Gregg M. Moga, Jr.
*William V. Murawsky
*Dermot A. Murray
*William E. Murray
*Charles A. Novotny
*Joseph P. O'Connell
*Charles D. Officer
*Robert C. Ovington
*Frederick M. Patterson
*Jack W. Potter
*Victor A. Prather, Jr.
*Ronald A. Proulx
Donald M. Roser
*Orren L. Royal
*Edward M. Salisbury
*Dwayne L. Sargent
*Peter D. Sears
*Barton K. Siemmons
*Raymond C. Spaulding, Jr.
*William F. Spence
*David R. TenEyck
*Elias P. G. Theros
*James N. Trone
*Martin J. Valaske
*William J. Wagner
George A. Whipple
*Leo V. Willett, Jr.
*James E. Youker
*James M. Young

*Leonard S. C. Parkinson, Reserve officer, to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant commander when his line running mate is so promoted, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Richard A. Ansted — *Robert M. Sainato
*Arthur Arakelian, Jr. — *Albert B. Smith
*James H. Charles, Jr. — *Joseph C. Spoto
*James T. Christian — *William G. Walker
*Edmund M. Holland — *Francis A. Ward
*Thomas U. Hopkins — *Samuel T. Williams, Jr.
*Dan Marit
*John N. Reichheld

The following-named Reserve officers to be lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*William P. Armstrong — *William F. Hale
*Ray K. Atkinson — *James E. Hammer III
*Daniel M. Baird — *Kenneth K. Kaneshiro
*Grover G. Beeler, Jr. — *James E. Klima
*Charles N. Clark III — *John S. Lindsay
*Earl G. Clouser — *Calvin D. Nester
*Malcolm S. Davis — *Barry E. Pines
*Robert E. Gehrman — *William H. Prange
*Donald C. Gonder

*Robert J. Leupold, Reserve officer to be a lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant commander when his line running mate is so promoted, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) as previously nominated and confirmed to correct grade, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Vincent C. Caranante
*John R. Laverine

*James S. Maughon, Reserve officer, to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant commander when his line running mate is so promoted, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Alvin "J" Aaron — *George P. Kane
*George W. Baldauf — *James E. Kemp
*Robert E. Bertka — *Raymond B. Kessler
*William L. Blankenship — *Bobby M. Lanier
*Richard B. Bolton — *Donald R. Lawson
*Ronald R. Bowden — *William M. Leadford
*Laurence P. Bowdren — *Kenneth F. Lucas
*Donald J. Brideau — *Henry D. Littner
*James O. Bryan — *Samuel C. Lowe
*Eugene M. Byrant, Jr. — *Terrance J. McAuliffe
*Wilfred I. Casler — *Denzel H. McClung
*Howard T. Chastain — *Roland W. McDermott
*Patrick J. Collier — *Charles A. McFee
*Earl N. Condon — *Douglas M. Martin
*Joseph M. Correll — *Myron F. Mayo
*Rollin L. Crebs — *George W. Millard
*Bruce J. Dietz — *Charles J. Moore
*Chester J. Dunham, Jr. — *Chloe A. Mullinix
*Weldon R. Eckerman — *Earl R. Nourigat
*Glenn M. Ellis — *Paul J. Novak
*Glenn R. Erickson — *Frederick F. Novak
*Richard E. Erwin — *Charles J. Pearce
*Manuel S. P. Fernandez — *Normand L. Peckenpaugh
*Norman L. Flower — *Louis E. Pelletier
*Gerald R. Ford — *George W. Ramsey
*Raymond D. Francis — *Jack V. Robinson
*Benjamin C. Freeman — *Thomas J. Rucker
*James A. French, Jr. — *Roy D. Sanderson
*Henry D. Gobbel — *James Seminara
*John H. Gonsalves — *Carl B. Simmons
*John R. Gouldman — *Hubert H. Sowers, Jr.
*Emery J. Hatch — *Bobby L. Stephens
*Harley L. Heaton — *Charles T. Stephens
*Donald E. Hoover — *Forrest D. Stitzel
*Benny J. Jenkins — *Robert L. Surface
*Victor A. Swindall

*Roy W. Tandy, Jr.
*Russell J. Thompson
*Laurence H. Webb
*Robert L. White
*Edward F. Woomer, Jr.
*Arthur L. Young
*John A. Zimmeht, Jr.

*Robert J. Wherry, Jr. (ensign, line, United States Navy), to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named women officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, under provision of laws applicable to male officers:

COMMANDER

Doris Cranmore
*Mary T. Sproul

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

*Lucille R. Clark
*Melba A. Grafius
*Mary F. Keener
*Elizabeth Reeves
*Frances Spear

LIEUTENANT

*Maria E. Aquino
*Sara B. Butterfield
*Virginia J. Eager
*Katherine Keating
*Georgie I. Simpson
*Paula C. Towle

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Joan M. Beckwith

*William H. Freeman, officer candidate, to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy in lieu of ensign in line of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed to correct corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named United States retired officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

COMMANDER

*Alvin L. Gallin
*Samuel H. Pattie

*Vincent L. Willerton, United States retired officer, to be a lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy, for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the United States Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Fredrick R. Barker
Clifford M. Baumann
Joseph T. Bryan
Jerome J. Curtis
Chester J. Paskow
Paul F. Yates

*John S. Scrimgeour, Jr. (Naval Reserve aviator), to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Gail R. Bailey
George D. Barker
Walter F. Bates.
Gerald W. Beisel
Richard M. Boyd
James A. Broughton
John E. Buckley
Hubbard F. Burrows, Jr.
Charles J. Cellar, Jr.
Keith C. Crandall
Bernard N. Deibert
Edgar L. Devries
Vincent Doheny
Jacob F. Dolbow III
Verne G. Donnelly
William F. Edwards
Herman V. Fischer, Jr.
Stanley C. Fischer
Daniel A. Folta
John T. Glanville
Robert H. Golden
Alfred H. Gonzalez
Clark G. Grazier
Donald L. Harvey
Louis L. Herzog
William E. Heyl
William G. Hollinshead
Franklyn P. Knapp
Kenneth E. Kraus
Thomas J. Langston
Herbert E. Lotze, Jr.
Ronald M. Maratea
Norman G. Marshall
Billy L. McClellan
Eber C. McGonagill
Theodore W. Miller
David L. Moss
Paul R. Normand
Richard M. O'Connell
Donald C. Ord
James E. Ostergren
Paul N. Pfeiffer
Joseph L. Pietrowski
Jack J. Plesur
Lorraine E. Renner
James W. Ryan
John P. Sheehan
Carl W. Sommers II
Elias J. Stets
Thomas E. Sullivan
John B. Tapp
Benjamin A. Thomas
Emmanuel J. Villar
Louis K. Vonperbandt
Charles G. Wack
John H. Ward
Robert F. Welmorts
Richard S. Willett
Myron S. Winslow, Jr.
Richard A. Winter
Ronald A. Wright
Jack C. Zenor
Robert V. Zimmerman

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*Angelo J. Accurso
Martin A. Asbacher
*Robert C. Balchunas
*Richard F. Ballew, Jr.
*Richard N. Blackington
*David H. Bowling
*Francis L. Carelli
*Stanley D. Clark
*Robert W. Comey
*William H. Cook
*William B. Davis, Jr.
*David N. Denton
*Walter A. Ellinghausen, Jr.
*Jesse R. Emerson III
*Dewitt T. Ferrell, Jr.
*Edward J. Fischer
*Charles C. Fleming III
*Linus W. Freeman, Jr.
*Earl H. Graffam
*Donald E. Haack
*Corky J. W. Hedges
*Warren A. Helgerson
*Lee L. Henry
*Henry F. Herbig
*William G. Hertwig
Charles D. Hill
*Robert E. Howey
Frank W. Kiewel, Jr.
*Robert P. Lenahan
*Christopher J. Limerick, Jr.
*Joseph E. McClain
Alan G. Marshall
*Leslie J. Maxwell
Charles W. Nelson, Jr.
*John T. O'Hara
*Quinlan R. Orell
*Stevador D. Pendlay
*Robert L. Pritscher
*David G. Ramsey
*Percy E. Robinson, Jr.
Albert Ryan
*Robert E. Schroeder
*Albert C. Schutz, Jr.
*Richard B. Tennyson
*Earling R. Thonneson
*John R. Townsend
*Gerald R. Treber
*Everett L. Vernon
*James J. Weaver
*Wayne F. Weeks
*Robert L. Wheeler
*Joseph W. Wilson
*Robert W. Wilson, Jr.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Wayne D. Bodensteiner
*Dudley L. Carlson
*Robert R. Christian
*Herbert S. Meltzer
*Robert W. Moore
*Edward W. Oehlbeck
*Charles F. Schwaebe
*Michael J. Waldron
*Kenneth W. Westall.

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*Richard B. Darling
*Richard J. Hanley
*Lawrence M. Roulstone

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Angelo J. Accurso
Martin A. Asbacher
*Robert C. Balchunas
*Richard F. Ballew, Jr.
*Richard N. Blackington.
*William E. Boyer
*James F. Brandau
*Robert A. Buckholdt
*Robert K. Bueck
*Francis L. Carelli
*Stanley D. Clark
*Robert W. Comey
*William H. Cook
*William B. Davis, Jr.
*Robert E. DeLand
*David N. Denton
*Walter A. Ellinghausen, Jr.
*Jesse R. Emerson III
*Donald F. Emmett
*Donald W. Engelfried
*Dewitt T. Ferrell, Jr.
*Donald F. Fiene
*Edward J. Fischer
*Charles C. Fleming III
*Linus W. Freeman, Jr.
*August W. Gomer
*Earl H. Graffam
*Donald E. Haack
*Russell J. Hammond, Jr.
*Robert L. Hart
*Corky J. W. Hedges
*Warren A. Helgerson
*Lee L. Henry
*Henry F. Herbig
*William G. Hertwig
*Robert T. Holderness, Jr.
*Philip R. Holt
*Robert E. Howey
*Edward D. Idzi
*Allen L. Isaacs
*Lawrence M. Kane
Frank W. Kiewel, Jr.
*Richard E. Leaman
*Robert P. Lenahan
*Christopher J. Limerick, Jr.
*Joseph E. McClain
Alan G. Marshall
*John A. Maxwell
*Leslie J. Maxwell
*Robert E. May
*Merle A. Merkel
*Roger D. Munson
*John T. O'Hara
*Quinlan R. Orell
*Percy C. Overman
*Stevador D. Pendlay
*Lyle D. Persels
*Michael J. Puopolo
*David G. Ramsey
*Richard G. Reid
*Percy E. Robinson, Jr.
Albert Ryan
*Robert L. Salmon
*Conrad B. Sawiak
*Robert E. Schroeder
*Gustave P. Schuster
*Albert C. Schutz, Jr.
*"H" "O" Smith
*Richard B. Tennyson
*Earling R. Thonneson
*John R. Townsend
*Shannon L. Trebbe
*Gerald R. Treber
*Everett L. Vernon
*James J. Weaver
*James E. Webb
*Wayne F. Weeks
*Robert L. Wheeler
*Louis A. Williams
Joseph W. Wilson
*Robert W. Wilson, Jr.
*Gilbert L. Winans

ENSIGN

*Wayne D. Bodensteiner
*Dudley L. Carlson
*Robert R. Christian
*Herbert S. Meltzer
*Charles D. Metzler
*Robert W. Moore
*Edward W. Oehlbeck
*Charles F. Schwaebe
*Michael J. Waldron
*Kenneth W. Westall
*Julian E. White, Jr.

*James M. Ford, Jr., to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the line of the Navy in lieu of a permanent lieutenant as previously nominated and confirmed to correct grade, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers for permanent appointment to be lieutenants in the line of the Navy (special-duty-only law), subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Robert Brickates
*Carlton G. Conkey
*William J. Davis

The following-named women officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Sara P. Denby
*Joanne F. Fenzel
*Anne V. Goodwin
*Dorothy A. Larsen
*Shirley A. Staub

The following-named for permanent appointment:

ENSIGN

*Sara P. Denby
*Joanne F. Fenzel
*Anne V. Goodwin
*Dorothy A. Larsen
*Janet L. Peksa
*Shirley A. Staub

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*William E. Arns
*David E. Becker

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Thomas J. Gallagher

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*William E. Arns
*David E. Becker
*John A. Davies

ENSIGN

*Thomas J. Gallagher

*Judith W. Sterne, woman Reserve officer, for permanent appointment to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*Merton E. Ashton, Jr.
Boyd F. Brown, Jr.
*Allen F. Chapman
Stephen J. Drabek
*Richardson Hendrickson
*Kenneth E. Hill
Frank S. Jacobs
Arthur P. Jones, Jr.
*Robert L. McKitrick
*Thomas P. Pettijohn
*Arthur G. Pyper
Charles L. Rush
*Carl W. Short
*David C. Stumbaugh
*Arthur T. Ware

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Jimmy D. Webb

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*Donald E. Bennett
*Eugene H. Pillsbury

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Merton E. Ashton, Jr.
*Allen F. Chapman
Stephen J. Drabek
*Richard Hendrickson
*Kenneth E. Hill
*Raymond J. Kurowski
*Robert L. McKitrick
*Thomas P. Pettijohn
*Arthur G. Pyper
*Carl W. Short
*David C. Stumbaugh
*Arthur T. Ware

ENSIGN

*Jimmy D. Webb

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*Dean K. Veltman

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*Paul E. Traeumer
*Thomas J. Wootten

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Harry R. Miller
*David P. W. Plank
*Dean K. Veltman
*Everett P. Wuebbens

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*Kieth C. Boyce
Thomas J. Doyle
*Robert D. Keegan

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Ronald G. Gustafson
*William J. McCorkle
*John M. Weis

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*William D. Middleton

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Kieth C. Boyce
*Charles G. Bruch
Thomas J. Doyle
*Robert D. Keegan

ENSIGN

*Ronald G. Gustafson
*William J. McCorkle
*John M. Weis

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*Mary E. Florence
*Virginia A. Herington
*Bernadette A. McKay
*Geraldine T. Mooney
*Mary J. Nielubowicz

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Hildegard K. Baumbach

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

*Doris A. Dorsey

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Mary E. Florence
*Virginia R. Herington
*Bernadette A. McKay
*Geraldine T. Mooney
*Bettye G. Nagy
*Mary J. Nielubowicz
*Constance J. Wolff

ENSIGN

*Hildegard K. Baumbach

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Marvin W. Alexander
Robert Bain
James G. Baker
Richard L. Boles
Charles A. Crosby
Richard P. Dallaire
John W. Desjardin
Joseph R. DeView
Charles G. Dimon, Jr.
Gene E. Dotson
Kenneth D. Felton
Robert T. Frankenfield
Morton Golde
John Goodfellow
Lawrence V. Grant
Jack H. Hartley
Alvin D. Haverty
Aloysius G. Hennessey, Jr.
Thomas J. Herbert
Haydn F. Hoare
Richard M. Houser
Rollin E. Jeffries, Jr.
Norman L. Jeter
Bernard I. Joy
Joseph J. League
Eugene P. Lorge
Louis L. Ludwick
Giley R. McConnell, Jr.
Archibald J. McNeill, Jr.
Jarvis N. Messer
Herbert F. Nelson
Sebastian P. Passantino
Paul D. Pitts
David L. Punzelt
Carlyle D. Read, Jr.
James R. Redman
Robert D. Rohde
James C. Rowland
Rudolph H. Rumplik
Austin R. Schroder
Wallace J. Schwartz
Donald G. Scully
William H. C. Self
Edward Siska
Thomas A. Stanley
Douglas A. Stewart
Edward N. Stout
Jack C. Thompson, Jr.
Lawrence H. Wells

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Joseph J. Anderson
Marshall B. Brisbois
Harry J. Buck
Carroll E. Clausen
James H. Connelly, Jr.
John E. Craig, Jr.
Jerry D. Dage
Charles H. Erwin
Michael J. Estocin
Richard L. Gates
Henry B. Gledzinski
Robert J. Griesemer
Carl K. Hinger
John O. Holland
David R. Johnson
Edwin C. Johnson
Richard L. Leach
Robert J. LeFevre
Richard D. McKay
Wayne O. Musick
Harold N. Osborn
Jerry C. Padrta
Vernon W. Peters
Ronald M. Phillips
Bruce Richards
Albert Sandoval, Jr.
Jimmy R. Savage
Richard J. W. Smith
William R. Tully, Jr.
Jerry E. Waldhoff
Marshall D. Werner
Larry C. Wiggins
William W. Wigley

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Walter Y. Brubaker
Warren W. Erikson
James P. McAvenia, Jr.
William D. McClary
Joel R. Painter

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Marvin W. Alexander
Grant Augustine III
Robert Bain
James G. Baker
Byron E. Batthauer
William H. Beck
Phillip L. Bennett
Thomas E. Blaine
Richard L. Boles
Charles E. Brown
Robert D. Crane
Thomas L. Crockett
Charles A. Crosby
Richard P. Dallaire
John W. Desjardin
Joseph R. DeView
Charles G. Dimon, Jr.
Gene E. Dotson
Robert J. Duke
Kenneth D. Felton
Daniel R. Ford
Robert T. Frankenfield
Philip "F" Gibber
Morton Golde
John Goodfellow
Lawrence V. Grant
Indalecio Gusman
Edward T. Harris
James C. Harris
Stuart E. Harrison
Jack H. Hartley
Alvin D. Haverty
Aloysius G. Hennessey, Jr.
Thomas J. Herbert
Stanley Hinden
Haydn F. Hoare
Walter M. Hollister
Richard M. Houser
William J. Hussar
Rollin E. Jeffries, Jr.
Norman L. Jeter
Bernard I. Joy
James A. Joy
Joseph J. League
Eugene P. Lorge
Louis L. Ludwick
Giley R. McConnell, Jr.
John M. McIsaac, Jr.
Archibald J. McNeill, Jr.
Charles T. Magee, Jr.
Leo O. Manke
Jarvis N. Messer
Richard D. Mullen
Herbert F. Nelson
Neil M. Nokes
Sebastian P. Passantino
Charles A. Pearson
Paul D. Pitts
Robert D. Porter
Luther D. Pullen
David L. Punzelt
Carlyle D. Read, Jr.
James R. Redman
Gerald L. Riendeau
Robert V. Robey
Robert D. Rohde
James C. Rowland
Rudolph H. Rumplik
Gerald M. Ryman
John P. Samonds
Austin R. Schroder
Wallace J. Schwartz
Donald G. Scully
William H. C. Self
Edward Siska
Paul L. Siverly
Robert L. Skillen
James L. Smith
Stewart C. Smith
Ralph L. Spaulding
Thomas A. Stanley
Douglas A. Stewart
Edward N. Stout
Jack C. Thompson, Jr.
Philip A. Veatch
Claude C. Vernam
Floyd K. Walters
John B. Webb
Lawrence H. Wells
James E. Wise, Jr.

ENSIGN

Arcenio Alves, Jr.
Joseph J. Anderson
Marshall B. Brisbois
Harry J. Buck
Carroll E. Clausen
James H. Connelly, Jr.
John E. Craig, Jr.
Jerry D. Dage
Charles H. Erwin
Michael J. Estocin
Richard L. Gates
Henry B. Gledzinski
Robert J. Griesemer
Carl K. Hinger
John O. Holland
David R. Johnson
Edwin C. Johnson
Richard L. Leach
Robert J. Lefevre
Richard D. McKay
Wayne O. Musick
Harold N. Osborn
Jerry C. Padrta
Vernon W. Peters
Ronald M. Phillips
Bruce Richards
Albert Sandoval, Jr.
Jimmy R. Savage
Richard J. W. Smith
William R. Tully, Jr.
Jerry E. Waldhoff
Marshall D. Werner
Larry C. Wiggins
William W. Wigley

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy (special-duty-only law), subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

David J. Keeney

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

William T. Driscoll, Jr.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Stuart M. Cowan
Maitland G. Freed
David J. Keeney

The following-named women officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Wyline S. Thomas
Johanna L. H. Young

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Elizabeth M. Barrett
Lois M. Byrum
Lucile L. Connaughton
Joan E. Kennedy
Phyllis H. Wilson
Geraldine A. Witt

ENSIGN

Jordine C. Skoff
Wyline S. Thomas
Anna M. Ward
Johanna L. H. Young

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Newell H. Berry

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Norris K. Combs — Irving J. Green

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Newell H. Berry

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

John L. Bell, Jr. — Laurence Spears
Charles A. Harless — John B. Taylor
Robert J. Lanphere — Max W. Van Valkenburg
Joseph S. Sansone, Jr.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert A. Kaiser — James M. Stanton
John T. McCahon — George L. Trawick

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Charles J. Tripp

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Richard E. Awalt — Laurence Spears
John L. Bell, Jr. — John B. Taylor
Charles A. Harless — Max W. Van Valkenburg
Robert J. Lanphere
Joseph S. Sansone, Jr.

ENSIGN

Robert A. Kaiser — James M. Stanton
John T. McCahon — George L. Trawick

Margaret C. Beisser (Women's Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Joseph T. Dimino
Daniel F. Fogarty
John J. O'Connor

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Carroll R. Chambliss — John J. O'Connor
Joseph T. Dimino — Otto Schneider
Daniel F. Fogarty — William R. Swenson

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Charles L. Thoman

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Ellis G. Bauereis
William F. Bell
William E. Burdick

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Charles L. Thoman

ENSIGN

Ellis G. Bauereis
William F. Bell
William E. Burdick

The following-named officers for temporary or permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named for temporary appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Opal M. Lawrence
Elizabeth A. Converse
Ann Sefchok

The following-named for permanent appointment:

LIEUTENANT

Ellenora M. Calder — Dorothy T. Mink
Hazel L. Hogan — Libia G. Robinson
Mary S. Hyler — Mary Super
Mary T. Kovacevich

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Elizabeth A. Converse
Opan M. Lawrence
Ann Sefchok

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Myrl W. Allinder, Jr. — Gerald J. Massey
James C. Bigler, Jr. — Sherwood E. Milleman
Richard C. Capek — *George S. Prescott
Donn A. Carswell — James W. Ratzlaff
Don R. Damuth — Francis P. Russell
Richard L. Dulaney — Tommy J. Silver
Matthew Flessner — Norman F. Suedekum
Richard D. Larson — Clovis S. Vaughn
Malcolm L. MacKay

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel for limited duty in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Theodore A. Petras

The following-named (Army Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Howard W. Meissner

The following-named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Leon L. Anderson — James W. Henry
Charles W. Baker — Norman E. Henry
Harper L. Bohr — Richard A. Kerr
William P. Bohus — Robert P. Leftwich, Jr.
Jon B. Boss — Cledith E. Oakley
Earle D. Bottom, Jr. — George R. Peterson
Donald C. Brodie — Louis C. Plain III
Charles L. Byrd — John C. Platt III
Norman L. Capps — Robert L. Reed
Myles D. Cassidy — Robert E. Rose
James R. Caton — Clifton L. Rushing, Jr.
Robert S. Charles — William O. Samuels
John P. Clay — Charles J. Schlike
Samuel W. Cooper — Joseph B. Simone
John A. Crockett — Jerry R. Smiley
Robert F. Cullen — Bernard N. Smith
Richard O. Culver — Ernest M. Vollmer
Francis J. Cunningham III — Charles L. Ward
George A. F. Weida
Clifton Daniels — Edward R. Whiting
John L. Donnelly — Robert L. Woodward
Kenneth J. Feiereisen — Alfred Zeikus
Thomas J. Fraser, Jr. — Kenneth H. Zimmerman
Joseph M. Gratto
Charlie T. S. Harper

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

CAPTAIN, LINE

Allen, Charles V.
Allen, Arthur A.
Arentzen, Edward S.
Armstrong, James H.
Arnold, Joe H.
Bates, Fred L.
Becker, John J.
Beebe, Marshall U.
Belcher, Preston R.
Bevernick, Richard A.
Beyer, Aaron P., Jr.
Bjork, Wilbert M.
Biesh, Paul K.
Bogart, Gerard S.
Bontecou, Daniel
Bragg, Herbert K.
Brandt, Carl R.
Brewer, William F.
Brigham, Carroll W.
Brookings, Robert S., II
Brower, Charles M.
Brown, Carl W.
Browning, Frank H., Jr.
Buckley, Walter J.
Burns, David M.
Butler, Kenneth L.
Calder, William E., III
Carroll, Charles B.
Carter, George H.
Chase Elwood N., II
Clark, Sam E.
Conn, John P., Jr.
Cote, Oliver H., Jr.
Cottingham, Claybrook
Crutcher, William R.
Cunningham, Carl B., Jr.
Currie, John P.
Curtis, Walter L., Jr.
Curtis, Frederick L.
Daniel, James W., Jr.
Darroch, James W.
Davis, Theodore H.
Dawson, William P.
Dean, Orville O.
Dose, Robert G.
DuBois, Francis L.
Eady, Jack A.
Erly, Robert B.
Escobar, Frank A.
Ferguson, John A.
Ferrara, Maurice
Finley, Otto A.
Finney, Edwin C.
Fleming, Edward S.
Fox, Cyril
Francis, Duncan P.
Frauenheim, Gilbert J.
French, Lawrence C.
Fullaway, Frank L.
Gallagher, Harry J.
Goepner, Oscar W.
Goodwin, Harold B.
Grening, George M.
Hartung, Walter P.
Hathorn, Vincent L.
Hawkes, William M.
Hedrick, Roger R.
Heizer, Isaac J., Jr.
Henderson, Reed K.
Higgins, Donald C.
Higgins, John W., Jr.
Hilton, Hart D.
Hines, Kenneth W.
Hood, William A., Jr.
Houck, Herbert N.
Howe, Thomas P.
Hughes, Edwin T.
Hunnicutt, James L.
Huse, Robert E.
Huston, Robert C.
Jackson, Percival W.
Jadrnicek, James R.
Johnson, Joseph E.
Jones, Axton T.
Judson, Charles S., Jr.
Keighley, William H.
Kirkpatrick, William S., Jr.
Klein, Frederick N., Jr.
Knapper, John K.
Knepper, Edward W.
Knerr, Hugh S.
Laing, Hugh K.
Lambert, Valdemar G.
Larson, Francis W.
Lautaret, John D.
Lenney, James W.
Lewis, Hugh H.
Lewis, William E.
Lipham, Charles L.
Lipscomb, William R.
Lohmann, Eric A.
Lombardi, Richard C.
Loyall, Julius A.
Lundgren, Oscar B.
MacLean, Roderick K.
Madley, Edward P.
Maher, Eugene H.
Marvin-Smith, Harry
McCabe, Thomas E. L.
McNeely, Henry E.
Mead, Charles H.
Mercer, Willoughby
Meyer, William C.
Monk, Ivan
Moore, Elmer
More, Frank R.
Morgan, Edward M.
Morgan, Alfred D.
Muller, Harry P.
Murray, Thomas O.
Norman, Geoffrey P.
Olstad, Orville A.
Overton, William A.
Parker, Douglas G.
Perry, Adrian H.
Pflum, Raymond J.
Pickett, Harry D.
Pollock, Thomas F.
Porter, Neil C.
Pridmore, James A.
Privette, William G., Jr.
Purdie, Samuel B.
Redon, Alexander L.
Reese, John "D", Jr.
Reynolds, Frank G.
Riley, Frederic D., Jr.
Roberts, Howard S.
Rogers, Richard S.
Russell, Erickson W.
Scarpino, William J.
Schafer, William K.
Seyford, Frederick C.
Simonsen, Carl D.
Sinkankas, John
Sintic, Anton J., Jr.
Slye, Robert W.
Smith, Hinton I.
Sommer, Harold A.
Spencer, Edward C.
Straus, Ben A.
Straub, Paul F.
Sweet, Arthur B.
Tenney, Richard H.
Tetley, Curtis L.
Thompson, Geoffrey
Thorburn, Robert C.
Van Antwerp, Lloyd W.
Van Gorder, Harold B.
Voorhies, James F.
Wadsworth, Victor F.
Waliszewski, Henry L.
Wayne, Charles
Weber, Bruce S.
White, Frederic H., Jr.
White, Theodore G., Jr.

Whitener, James E. W.
Wicks, Delbert S.
Willett, Roland L.
Willis, Albert H.
Wright, Kenneth E.

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

Addison, James A.
Anderson, Gustave T.
Ballenberger, Louis P.
Bassham, Byron E.
Brody, Sidney I.
Bundens, Warner D., Jr.
Canaga, Bruce L., Jr.
Cantrell, William C.
Casteel, Byron D.
Christoph, Robert F.
Crafft, William M.
Duffner, Gerald J.
Ennis, Henry R.
Errion, Arthur R.
Galuszka, Albin A.
Gerber, Marvin L.
Hall, William K.
Hallborg, Robert B.
Hansen, Wayne S.
Holler, Moffit K.
Horton, Samuel H., Jr.
Huston, J. Wilson
Jahnke, Leonard P.
Jones, Walton L., Jr.
King, Elmer R.
Lockwood, James H.
May, Romulus, L.
McCurdy, Jack C.
McMahon, Francis J.
Miller, Arthur V., Jr.
Norman, Clyde W.
Nova, Philip L.
Patterson, Walter
Phillips, Philip B.
Pinto, Joseph C.
Rieder, John J.
Robie, William A.
Ross, Ralph D.
Scanlin, Harold R.
Schiff, Maurice
Schufeldt, Dean
Schugmann, Robert F.
Senter, Vance E.
Small, Milton M.
Spencer, James L., Jr.
Sudduth, Herschel C.
Talbot, Blake S.
Tebow, Louis E.
Thompson, Samuel V.
Tucker, Wilson D.
Vogel, Joseph
Wagner, Henry G.
Walsh, Robert E.
Wertheimer, Haskell M.
Wilbur, Carl E.
Wulfman, William A.
Wurzel, Edward M.

CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS

Abbott, William G.
Appleby, Charles A.
Auerbauch, Eugene K.
Beardsley, Henry L.
Blasdel, William G.
Boozer, Strong
Brooks, Irwin T.
Bryant, Edward J.
Burkhardt, John, Jr.
Burrill, John C.
Carter, Robert W.
Cates, William E.
Collins, Lewis S.
Collins, Ernest P.
Cooper, Charles D.
Curtin, Neale W.
Dean, Jack G.
Driscoll, George M.
Eagle, Carlton R., Jr.
Fahlbusch, Herman R.
Fielding, Frederick A.
Foley, Harry J. P., Jr.
Haddock, Ira F.
Kaufman, Frederick A.
Koch, John V.
Leiser, Harry W.
McNulty, Leo J.
Noel, Todd H.
Nixon, Harold E.
Owens, Bruce
Prout, Andrew W., Jr.
Roberts, Thomas C., Jr.
Snider, Earle K.
St. John, Sheldon C.
Stockenberg, Harold A.
Strock, Herman
Voils, Roy C.
Walters, Clarence J.
Watts, William P.
Williams, Chauncey C.
Williams, Everette M.

CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Arendt, Eric H.
Bennett, Fred D.
Kelly, Donald P.
McQuaid, Arthur P.
Morgan, Victor H.
O'Leary, Francis T.
Smith, Roderic L.
Tower, Hansel H.

CAPTAIN, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Atkins, Robert B.
Barnwell, Joseph B.
Batchellor, John K.
Boggs, Albert H.
Bollinger, James R.
Burky, John D.
Cassidy, John J., Jr.
Corradi, Peter
Daday, Edward A.
Davidson, William E.
Douglas, James
DuMont, Thomas J.
Frorath, Joseph W.
Gibson, Edwin E.
Gustafson, William M.
Hanson, Arthur H.
Jackson, Tulon L.
Jensen, Ralph C.
Klay, Andrew S.
Kravath, Fred P.
Marsh, James S.
McGraghan, Jack J.
Moore, William W., Jr.
Ohl, George, Jr.
Pritchard, Francis T.
Quinn, Edward J.
Reinhardt, Charles O.
Smith, Herbert E.
White, Joseph A.

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

Andrews, Wallace S.
Ashwell, James T.
Atkins, John H.
Bernard, Damon E.
Bowman, John F.
Brenning, Leo E.
Chapman, Judge C.
Cook, Francis W.
Costa, Angelo B.
Dierker, Wilbert M.
Dobyns, Frank D.
Dudley, George E.
Feder, Harold W.
Fernandez, Sergio
Flocken, John E.
Gargiulo, Edward A. H.
Hall, J. Kenneth
Hansen, Louis S.
Heck, Charles M.
Hildreth, Edward B.
Howell, Sidney R.
Huebsch, Raymond F.
Johnson, Harvey S.
LeClaire, George J.
Losee, Fred L.
Loving, Robert H.
Luallen, Leslie J.
Madden, George E.
McGonnell, Joseph P., Jr.
McKinney, Jackson F.
Mead, Meredith H.
Middleton, Robert A.
Moore, George T., Jr.
Moore, Paul A.
Morgan, Kenneth L.
Pierce, Howard W.
Rogers, James G., Jr.
Rusk, William S.
Ryan, Hugh D.
Scherer, George F.
Shipley, Norman B.
Stead, George O.
Stoopack, Jerome C.
Thomlinson, Christopher E., Jr.
Walker, Rupert S.
Wallace, Allen L.
Walter, George W., Jr.
Weaver, Walter A.
Wolcott, Robert B.
Young, Lawrence

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barnes, Laverne A.
Bosee, Roland A.
DeCoursey, John D.
Dudley, Horace C.
Hurlbut, Herbert S.
Lawlor, William K. A.
Lyon, Verne W.

COMMANDER, LINE

Abbott, Cecil C., Jr.
Allbright, Willard F.
Allen, Edgar L.
Allmon, Clyde E.
Armstrong, William H.
Baird, Harold J.
Baker, Quentin F.
Barnitz, James W.
Basler, Henry L., Jr.
Bates, George B., Jr.
Beadles, Joseph W., Jr.
Becker, Roger W.
Bitting, Frederick E.
Boydstun, Howard J.
Brambilla, Marius G., Jr.
Bremer, James R.
Brewer, Cleon A.
Briggs, Chester E., Jr.
Browning, Benjamin H., Jr.
Carlson, Walton L.
Cheverton, Robert E.
Christian, Oren R.
Colienda, Frank
Conder, Thomas L., Jr.
Coste, John E.
Crance, Elmer L.
Curtis, Clifford B., Jr.
Cyr, Richard F.
Danowski, Frank L.
Delaney, Henry L.
Derlin, Howard W.
DeVito, Raymond J.
Dinger, Elmer W.
Doherty, John P.
Dombroff, Seymour
Downes, Melvin R.
Durborow, James W.
Edwards, John Q., III
Empey, Robert E.
Epley, Robert H.
Erdner, Lewis E.
Flanagan, George
Ford, Arlo
Forrest, Harold M.
Francis, Arthur E.
Giblin, Robert B.
Gierisch, Jack K.
Gray, Theodore R.
Griffith, John "T"
Gulmon, Robert H.
Haley, Richard I.
Hannon, Paul G.
Hawkins, Gordon S.
Heishman, Jack C.
Heisel, Kenneth D.
Herider, George L.
Hilbert, Ray A.
Holcomb, John K.
Holl, Trygve A.
Hollinshead, Charles W., Jr.
Horrall, Eugene P.
Hoskins, Floyd E.
House, James O., Jr.
Hudson, William O., II
Hughes, John D.
Hydinger, Marlin C.
Jackson, Robert W.
Jeffords, Joseph D.
Jones, James A.
Jones, Marvin D.
Justiss, "C" "Y"
Kassell, Bernard M.
Kistler, John M.
Knight, Denman W.
Knight, Olyce T.
Kreitzer, William R.
Laliberte, William
Laliberte, Joseph H.
La Marre, Allen W.
Laplante, William J.
Larsen, Frank
MacGovern, Robert N.
Mackey, Wendell C.
McCrerey, Homer A.
McNamara, Paul E.
Medbury, Arnold H.
Michel, Glenn C.
Mikich, Emil
Mills, Lee G.
Mix, Arthur E.
Moore, Larry D.
Morton, Samuel L.
Murray, Arthur H., Jr.
Newton, Arthur G.
Nifong, James M.
O'Connell, Daniel J.
O'Connor, Remi C.
O'Flaherty, Roderick L.
O'Neill, Martin G.
Onofrio, Michael J.
Pace, Joseph J.
Peck, John R.
Pelley, Everett H.
Pittman, Milan L., Jr.
Prather, Hubert P.
Pruski, Leonard
Pump, Fred W., Jr.
Purcell, Jones W.
Pyne, George C.
Radcliffe, Jesse H.
Rains, Encil E.
Rapp, Lawrence B.
Redwine, "W" "J"
Rehnberg, Kay P., Jr.
Roach, Walter, Jr.
Rourke, Robert A.
Russell, Kenneth M.
Sanders, Charles C.
Schmidt, Harry E.
Semanski, Stanley A.
Sharp, Harry G., Jr.
Shortall, James E.
Slone, William J.
Smith, Frederick W.
Smith, Norman A.
Smithey, Talmadge A.
Stack, Martin J.
Stafford, James S.
Stephens, Jerrel D.
Storey, Stanford E.
Sullivan, John P.
Sumrall, Elton L.
Talbert, Cornelius H.
Taylor, Donald C.
Tefft, John E.
Thomas, John M.
Thurmon, Norman E.
Wagner, Erwin J.
Wallace, Wilfred G.
Warner, Robert E.
Webster, Williams S., Jr.
Weed, Sydney R.
West, Horace B.
Westrup, Warren E.
White, Gerald T.
White, Roy C.
Williams, Richard
Wilson, Frederick C., Jr.
Witting, Maurice E.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Hodges, James C., Jr.
Hood, Raleigh M.
Lieurance, Richard E.

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Barbero, Francesco M.
Barton, John J.
Emerick, Charles E.
Garrett, John H., Jr.
Greene, Daniel W.
Grimsley, Geleter
Herrick, Eugene G.
Hoft, John W.
Holtslander, Herman S.
Hooper, John C.
Hubona, Michael
Knapp, Michael J.
Krueger, Henry C.
Mogle, Howard N.
Normile, Walter G.
Parrish, Melvin O.
Rhoades, Benjamin A., Jr.
Schweizer, Earl G.
Stevens, Lester L.
Wade, John W.
Whitener, John H.
Yadon, James D.

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Cline, Warren F.
Corn, Harold D.
Grubb, Clarence A.
Jones, Joseph V.
Larson, Leif R.
Lewis, Chester A.
Meeks, Arthur F.
Miller, William A.
Nuckel, John, Jr.

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Giammusso, Anthony P.
Grossman, Frank D.
Johnson, Van L., Jr.
Lynds, Charles W.
Neskow, Robert S.
Robinson, Jack W.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barboo, Samuel H.
Boston, Lester E.
Brenner, Sidney G.
Buckner, James F.
Collins, Joseph W.
Daul, Arthur P.
Gadberry, Dwight L.
Hall, Heyward E.
Hill, Stanley E.
Huber, Melvin P.
Miller, Denny S.
Wilford, Walter H.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Abbott, George B.
Adams, Allan M., Jr.
Ambler, Joseph B.
Anderson, Richard B.
Anderson, David G.
Anderson, Kenneth J.
Andry, Walter G.
Arman, George H.
Atkinson, Aubrey E.
Atkisson, Horace W.
Atwell, Robert B.
Aulich, Julian
Baker, William B.
Baker, Robert G.
Baldwin, Merritt W. W., Jr.
Barnes, John W.
Barry, David C.
Bauer, Omer W.
Bean, Francis T.
Berchman, John J.
Berry, Robert M.
Birdt, George
Bishop, Wilbur C.
Bitney, Raymond H., Jr.
Black, John M.
Borgstedt, Forrest C.
Bors, Frank, Jr.
Boyd, Edward A.
Brazil, Rudolph, E.
Brent, Sherman E.
Bres, Harold A., Jr.
Brink, Merrill J.
Britt, Harvey R.
Brockman, James O., Jr.
Brown, Errington
Brown, Kenneth
Bruestle, Lester K.
Brumbach, Joseph W.
Brunner, Donald E.
Buchanan, Charles S.
Buchanan, Stewart V.
Buck, Robert M.
Buckles, Harland R.
Burr, Robert M.
Buswell, Lindsay L.
Carlisi, Salvatore
Carnahan, William R.
Carrier, Francis A.
Cavanaugh, Morrison E.
Chambers, Leonard C.
Chapman, Arthur S.
Chapman Kendall R.
Christensen, James S.
Clause, Harold
Clough, Duane M.
Coffey, Claude C., Jr.
Cole, James O.
Cooper, Lloyd F.
Cooper, Charles W., Jr.
Cooper, Marvin J.
Cosgrove, Thomas A.
Covert, Lawrence W.
Cox, John W.
Crandall, Walter R.
Cullen, John P.
Cummins, David E., III
Curtis, Donald P.
Damon, William Q.
Davis, Charles R.
Day, Charles P.
Deasy, Charles J.
De Carlo, Eugene
De Groote, Douglas F.
Dehler, Raymond L.
DePaul, Raymond

Dicks, Carl C.
Dinwiddie, John M.
Doran, George E.
Dorich, Albert P.
Dowdy, James C.
Doyle, James T.
Drago, Thomas R.
Drain, Merwin E.
Driscoll, John R.
Dunning, Bruce B.
Eaton, William G., Jr.
Ellenbrand, Ralph E.
Elliott, Chester E.
Eppes, George P.
Eriksen, George A.
Ernesti, John H.
Falardeau, Robert F.
Farnsworth, William D.
Ferguson, Samuel N.
Fielding, Teddy R.
Fisher, Lowell E.
Fisher, Robert D.
Forys, Victor S.
Fowler, William E.
Fox, Rex R.
Franklin, Billy S.
Gale, Philroy C., Jr.
Gallagher, Theodore J.
Gambert, Frank E.
Garofalo, Paul C.
Garren, Herman L., Jr.
Gaskill, George R.
Gilchrist, Darrell P.
Gibson, John S., Jr.
Gillespie, Nivin J.
Giorgis, Albert S.
Glover, John W.
Gordon, Wendell G.
Graham, Ralph E.
Gray, Robert J.
Green, James R.
Grey, Valentine
Griffin, Thomas H.
Griffin, Shade W.
Grove, Leo H.
Halwachs, Alois W.
Hamilton, Arthur W.
Hammond, James R.
Hansen, Hans P.
Hanson, Bernard T.
Hare, Roland W.
Harper, Wyatt E., Jr.
Harrison, Wayne J.
Harrington, John L.
Harris, John P.
Hatch, Vyrl S.
Hawkins, Carl R.
Hayes, Robert V.
Hazard, Carlton G.
Heath, Leroy A.
Hebert, Frank C.
Heinberg, Wolf
Henley, Nathaniel T.
Hicks, Richard J.
Hildebrand, Joseph H.
Hill, Robert D.
Hillery, Daren R.
Hinkelman, John W., Jr.
Hjalmarson, Magnus W.
Hogan, William M.
Holley, Ervin D.
Holmes, Robert A., III
Hooper, James A., Jr.
Houghton, Alexander J.
Howlett, John
Hubbeling, Johan D. W., Jr.
Huffnagle, Norman
Hughey, George H., Jr.
Hume, Hillis D.
Hutton, William L.
Ingram, Jack R.
Johnston, Harry D.
Johnston, Stuart M.
Jones, Robert S.
Jordan, Raymond C.
Justman, Leroy G.
Kahler, William
Kampman, Anthony J.
Kauffman, Charles C., Jr.
Kays, Robert L.
Kelley, Paul W.
Kelly, Leo
Kempf, Lawrence A.
Kenney, Robert N.
Kerling, Albert J.
Kerr, Claude E.
Kessler, Richard J.
Kimball, Keith W.
Klaessy, Dale S.
Klaus, Edward L.
Klockenkemper, Joseph B. G.
Klym, Charles S.
Kmetz, William H.
Kopps, Richard L.
Kostik, William J.
Kraushaar, David
Krier, Daniel L.
Kron, John A.
Krysan, Donald F.
Kyle, Kay L.
Lamb, Harold M.
Langdon, Richard H.
Lange, Earl B., Jr.
La Rose, Edgar H.
Laughlin, George W.
Latham, Hugh W.
Layton, Stephen L.
Leary, William, Jr.
Lee, Marvin C.
Leonard, Warren E.
Lincoln, John L., IV
Lewis, Clyde S.
Locke, Robert P.
Lockhart, James A.
Longwill, Albert E.
Lorenz, Samuel, Jr.
Love, David "K"
Lowery, Hugh H.
Luebke, George M.
Luedtke, Wilbert C.
Mallon, Richard J.
Maloney, David A.
Manger, Martin M., Jr.
Mann, Philip L.
Marzluff, Joseph O.
Masica, Eugene M.
Massey, Robert J.
Massey, Joseph P.
Mayo, Henry T., II
McClain, Merl L.
McCormick, Gordon H.
McDaniel, Hector S.
McHenry, Marcus
McKeever, James E. M.
McKell, Martin S.
McLaughlin, Burton .
McMonigle, John J.
McNiff, Thomas, Jr.
McOmie, Donald B.
Meyer, Emile F., Jr.
Middleton, Charles H.
Miller, Lawrence L.
Mills, Terry
Milner, William G.
Moore, Marion E.
Moore, Joseph E., III
Moorhead, Daniel R.
Morrison, William T.
Mowrer, Robert A.
Nelson, Joseph W.
Nelson, Robert R.
Nemetz, Joseph G.
Nicholls, Benjamin F.
Nickel, Walter F.
O'Connor, John J.
O'Day, Henry J.
Odell, Robert L.
Oest, John R.
Okkerse, Warren W.
Olson, Frederick G.
Ostrom, Ellsworth M., Jr.
Overman, Dana C., Jr.
Owen, Howard J.
Owen, Marler W.
Packer, Morris A.
Paige, Lennon T.
Panawek, Gregory
Peeler, James C.
Pettigrew, Thomas S.
Phillips, Richard B.
Pinzow, Leonard
Piotrowski, Alexander W.
Pirro, John J.
Pitts, Charles R.
Pledger, William G.
Plog, Leonard H.
Plomasen, Bruce W.
Polk, Mavis X.
Poplin, Glenn O.
Prindle, Dayo D.
Pryor, Frank P., Jr.
Puckett, Paul B.
Quanstrom, Carl R., Jr.
Racette, Henry J., Jr.
Raihle, Richard R.
Randolph, Beverley
Rankowski, Charles A.
Rapelyea, Oscar F.
Raposa, William C.
Reynolds, Norvan E., Jr.
Richardson, Guy D.
Risley, James R.
Robb, Roger W.
Robertson, David
Robert, Gerald M.
Robinson, Jack W.
Rockwell, Donald E., Jr.
Rohrich, Walter H., Jr.
Rorex, Sam, Jr.
Ross, Albert J.
Rossi, Edward C.
Scanzillo, Arnold J.
Scatolini, Albert G.
Schlarbaum, Donald A.
Schofield, Thomas G.
Schroeder, Joseph H.
Sciiris, Louis G.
Scott, Julian P.
Segal, Stanley L.
Sentman, Albert G.
Sepper, Frank
Setzer, Brooks W., Jr.
Seymour, Earl P.
Sharp, Alfred C.
Sheppard, Cedric W.
Sherman, Frank E.
Shuman, William P., Jr.
Sinclair, George T., Jr.
Skinner, Walter E.
Slabey, Theodore M.
Salasinski, Floyd M.
Sledge, Jack B.
Smiley, Robert W.
Smithee, Bruce
Smith, John E.
Smith, Byers G.
Smullen, Orville A., Jr.
Smyer, Theodore M.
Soltys, Leo S., Jr.
Southall, Donald L.
Stauffer, Howard C.
Stclair, William F.
Steadley, William A.
Steeves, Harold M.
Stephanian, George
Stephens, William E., Jr.
Stewart, Hal B.
Stone, Courtenay M.
Sutherland, William A.
Swanstrom, Willis E.
Sweet, Robert R.
Tabor, Thomas L.
Tarbox, William
Tatone, Lige
Therriault, William W.
Thomas, Ross J.
Thompson, Max E.
Tracey, Walter
Troupe, James E.
Trueblood, Harold J.
Tuffanelli, George T.
Turnbull, William O.
Ufer, Alfred L.
Van Demark, James L.
Vierregger, William T.
Viguers, Allan K.
Voller, Sherman L.
Volk, Ralph L., Jr.
Wade, William D.
Walden, Walter A.
Walker, William F.
Walker, Robert G.
Warton, John F.
Waters, David E.
Watkins, Ernest A.
Watson, Robert S.
Wear, Lavern G.
Webster, Harold A., Jr.
Wheeler, Felix H.
Whilden, Adolphus D., Jr.
White, John D.
White, Garrett "A", Jr.
Wigington, Everett E.
Wilson, Harry A., Jr.
Wilson, Gerald H.
Wilson, Edward P., Jr.
Wilzer, Kenneth R.
Winton, Matthew J.
Wood, Harold D.
Worrall, David J.
Zakarian, Aaron M.
Zelibor, Joseph L.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Allen, Frank F.
Chandler, Deck E.
Cummings, Ronald A.
Delaney, Thomas B.
Dempsey, John J.
Dinsmore, Harry H.
Downey, John J.
Dykhuizen, Robert F.
Ebersole, John H.
Ireland, Roger G.
Keeler, Clifford E.
Ketcham, James S.
Klein, Chester L., Jr.
Klein, Martin H.
Laning, Robert C.
Linehan, Francis J., Jr.
McLeod, Deane E.
Pascoe, Delmer J.
Paul, Jed
Smith, Thomas W. D.
Sparks, Henry A.
Speaker, Richard B.
Sweeney, Francis J.
Watten, Raymond H.
Webb, Martin G., Jr.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Anderson, Carl L. B.
Benson, William S., II
Benson, David W.
Bercaw, Jesse L.
Bland, Herbert L.
Blank, Arthur E.
Boswell, Harold
Boylan, Walter J.
Breeden, Robert L.
Brislawn, Richard W.
Brown, Emlin N.
Carleson, James W.
Cullen, Curtis
Curtis, James R.
Darrow, Edward E.
Davis, Lynn M.
Dunn, George G.
Eller, Lovelace H.
Ericson, James B.
Goodpasture, John W.
Hackenson, Bernard J.
Hickey, James E.
Hobbs, Robert C.
Johnston, Lloyd E., Jr.
Jones, Robert L.
Keener, James C.
Keyes, Lyle E.
Lawson, Walter E., Jr.
Lemel, Ernst
Lewis, Harvey E.
Lewis, William L.
Luebbe, Harry R.
Mandeville, Don C.
McCormick, John A.
McElhanon, Bryon P.
Miller, James H.
Nichols, Paul
Noga, Edward L. S.
Obendorfer, Wilson M.
Pavelka, Albert K.
Rose, Rodney
Rost, John R.
Sauer, Charles A.
Shapiro, Nathan E.
Spicer, Robert M.
Strait, James B.
Tetrault, Joseph H.
Walther, Frederick W.
Wendt, Ernest H.
Williams, Raleigh J., Jr.
Williams, William G.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bost, Warren L.
Parham, Thomas D., Jr.
Pigott, Charles S.
Schutz, Adam J., Jr.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Hammer, John G.
Lemmon, William R.
Manley, Robert B.
McGhee, Thomas J.
Seibel, Roy K.
Wilcox, Romeo E.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

DeLaurentis, Carlo A.
Donnenfeld, Oscar W.
Koppes, Paul A.
Kramer, Howard S., Jr.
Silberstein, Victor H.
Sobieski, Edward F.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Abernathy, Odell S.
Bing, John H.
Blasinski, Ervin W.
Edge, Cary O.
Gleason, Edmund H.
Goldenrath, Walter L.
Hoche, Herman E.
Johnson, Woodbury
Johnson, Chester H., Jr.
King, Arthur N.
Martorano, Joseph J.
Moore, Granville M.
Morel, Eugene J.
Pellarin, Victor L.
Pipkin, Alan C.
Teller, Leslie W., Jr.
Thompson, Henry A.

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Abdon, Albert L.
Abelein, Herman C.
Ackerman, Warren J.
Ackley, Richard T.
Adams, Joseph A.
Adams, Robert L., Jr.
Adler, Robert E.
Aillaud, Emmett R., Jr.
Albright, Donald S., Jr.
Allen, Raymond C.
Allender, Gene T.
Alley, Lester L.
Alsager, Richard H.
Anderson, Lee C.
Anderson, Lyle C.
Anderson, Norris O., Jr.
Anderson, William J., III
Anderson, Stanley J.
Anderson, Charles L. R.
Andrews, Jack B.
Anglim, Daniel F., Jr.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Armstrong, John E.
Arnold, Henry C., Jr.
Ashmore, Jackie K.
Ashurst, Albert J.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
Asmus, Paul A.
Aston, William J.
Augustine, William P.
Aumack, Robert F.
Aus, Charles A.
Ausbrooks, Erskine P., Jr.
Austin, James M.
Averett, Thomas R., Jr.
Axe, John R.
Babbitt, James A., Jr.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Bachtold, James B.
Backstrom, Robert L.
Bailey, William C.
Baker, James E., Jr.
Bakke, Harlan J.
Ballew, Richard F., Jr.
Barkalow, Gerald H.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barnes, Philip A.
Barnes, Clifford P.
Barney, Glenn P.
Barrineau, Edwin
Bartholomew, John L.
Barts, Donald P.
Barunas, George A., Jr.
Basso, Robert J.
Bauernfeind, Joseph H.
Bauer, Edward C.
Bauman, Charles J., Jr.
Bavle, Joseph R.
Beasley, James W.
Beates, James K.
Beatty, Lloyd D.
Beattie, Thomas T., Jr.
Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
Beck, Stuart M.
Beck, Donald M.
Beck, Stanley L.
Beckman, Kenneth L.
Belk, Reece G., Jr.
Bell, Gerald R.
Bender, Albert F., Jr.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Bergesen, Andrew J.
Bergman, Daniel
Bickel, William B.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Biles, Joel T.
Billings, Randall K.
Bippus, Henry
Bircher, William B.
Biron, Joseph E.
Blaha, Albert J.
Blaney, William C., Jr.
Blasi, Richard R.
Block, Peter F.

Boakes, William H.
Bond, John R.
Bonekamp, Fred H.
Borgstrom, Charles O.
Boston, Leo
Bottimore, Robert R., Jr.
Bowen, Jack W.
Bowers, Thomas L.
Bowling, William H.
Brady, Allen C.
Brainard, Donald R.
Branch, Alvin D.
Brand, Alvin
Brandson, John J., Jr.
Breedlove, James E., Jr.
Bres, John H.
Brewer, Thomas J.
Brick, John H.
Brodie, Robert, III
Brooks, William T., Jr.
Brown, Bruce W.
Brown, Charles "D"
Brown, James L.
Brown, James W.
Brown, Peter G.
Brown, Robert S.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
Bryan, Gordon R., Jr.
Bryan, Thomas S.
Bryant, William R.
Buck, John A.
Buck, Roger L.
Buffkin, John W., Jr.
Burden, James D.
Burke, William F.
Burke, William J.
Burkhalter, Edward A., Jr.
Burrows, Herbert J.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
Burton, Herbert O.
Busch, Ronald G.
Bush, Charles L.
Busse, Norman W.
Butts, John L.
Butzen, Thomas P.
Buzzell, Carlisle W., Jr.
Byrd, Paul R.
Byron, John B.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
Calhoun, William P.
Campbell, James S.
Campbell, William E., Jr.
Campbell, Neil V.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Card, Warren H.
Carden, Marshall B., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
Carlson, George R.
Carlson, Burford A.
Carmichael, Robert C.
Carpenter, Walter H.
Carr, William K.
Carraway, Terry F.
Carter, Frank R.
Carter, Edward W., III
Cauffman, Charles E.
Cavanaugh, John P.
Cedarburg, Owen L.
Chaffee, James L.
Chambers, John J.
Chanaud, Henry L.
Chandler, Hamilton A.
Chapman, Donald E.
Chapman, Howard M., Jr.
Childs, Richard V.
Childers, Donald J.
Christenson, Donald A.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
Church, George A.
Clarke, John R.
Clarke, Michael
Clarke, Walter L., Jr.
Clausner, Edward, Jr.
Clemens, Porter E.
Clemens, Robert F.
Coale, William A.
Cochran, James A.
Cole, Charles W.
Coleman, Gerald G.
Colenda, Herbert F.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Collins, Charles H.
Colvin, Robert D.
Comer, Curtis E.
Compton, Bryan W., Jr.
Condit, Maurice J.
Conlon, Frank S.
Connolly, Robert D.
Conroy, Thomas P.
Cook, Carroll T.
Cooper, Jack E.
Cooper, David L.
Cooper, Carleton R.
Corbin, Rex G.
Cornelius, Winston W.
Cornwell, Robert R.
Costello, Daniel J.
Cotter, Charles L.
Coulson, Eugene R.
Courtney, Robert A.
Covington, Gerald E.
Cowart, James C.
Cramblet, Frank
Crawford, Richard N.
Crawley, Don E.
Crosby, Russell U.
Cross, Daniel F.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crowder, James P., Jr.
Crowl, Otho W.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
Cunningham, Melville D.
Currie, Edgar I.
Czernicki, Leonard
Dagg, Robert M.
Dalla Mura, Richard A.
Dame, Harold E.
Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
Danner, William P.
Darfus, George H.
Darnell, Donald P.
Davey, Richard B.
Davi, Jerome A.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
David, James W.
Davis, Jack W.
Davis, Frederick P.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Robert L.
Davis, Ralph O.
Day, Lawrence C.
Decook, David W.
Defelice, Edward A.
Degnan, Francis J.
Demers, William H., II
Denmark, George T.
Dennis, Frank S.
Desrosiers, Roland J.
Dewing, Jay N.
DeWitt, Dean D.
DeWitt, Duane D.
Diers, Charles E.
Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
Dittmar, Louis C.
Dix, Robert D.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Dobbins, John B., Jr.
Dodd, Robert L.
Doering, Eugene R.
Doggett, Burton L., Jr.
Dollinger, Richard E.
Donnelly, John D.
Draddy, John M.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
Duffy, Charles G., Jr.
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
Duke, Marvin L.
Dukes, Warren C.
Dunaway, Gene T.
Dungan, John D.
Dunn, Delma D.
Dunn, Robert F.
Durham, Homer G.
Dwyer, Laurence A.
Eagye, Thomas R., II
Easterling, Crawford A.
Ebelacker, Richard M.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Eckert, Richard H.
Eckstein, John R.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.
Ehleringer, Henry G.
Elfelt, James S.
Ellena, Eugene D.
Ellis, Richard M.
Ellis, James L.
Ellison, David J.
Emlet, Harold B.
Englehart, Harry J.
English, Ernest C., Jr.
Epeneter, Gus W., Jr.
Erhart, James W.
Erkelens, Clarence
Estabrook, Robert K.
Estes, Dana, II
Fagan, Edward J.
Fallis, Claud B., Jr.
Farrell, John B.
Farrell, John R.
Fassula, Richard F.
Feagin, Frederick K.
Feit, Harry H., Jr.
Feldman, Harry G.
Fendorf, James E.
Fenton, Robert E.
Ferguson, George D., III
Ferrucci, David E.
Fiore, Harold J.
Fleming, William O.
Fletcher, Charles D.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
Forrester, James E.
Forsyth, Robert J.
Forsythe, Forrest
Foster, James R.
Foster, Ralph W., Jr.
Foster, William F.
Fowler, Arthur D., Jr.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, George A., Jr.
Fox, Kenneth
Fox, Richard T.
Frame, Edward L.
Francis, John P.
Francis, Thomas A.
Franke, Richard D.
Frei, Donald P.
French, Norman M., Jr.
French, Jack T.
Friedman, Arthur C.
Friesen, Edwin "J"
Frosio, Robert C.
Frost, William L.
Frudden, Mark P.
Fry, Gayle "A"
Fuller, Joe E.
Fuller, Robert B.
Gaches, John W.
Gallagher, Lawrence E.
Gamber, Harold W.
Gardner, Richard C.
Gardner, Richmond
Garland, John C.
Geiger, Eugene D.
Geist, Richard A.
Geitz, Kenneth L.
Gercken, Otto E.
Gesner, Paul L. B.
Gilbertson, John E.
Gilchrist, John F., II
Gillespie, Charles R., Jr.
Gire, Larold W.
Glore, John C.
Gnos, Kenneth R.
Gochenour, David T.
Goldman, Howard A.
Goodspeed, Richard E.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
Goslow, Paul
Gott, Herschel L.
Gottschalk, Arthur W., Jr.
Goulds, Ralph J.
Govan, George W.
Grace, Homer J.
Grady, Edward L., Jr.
Graf, Harry R.
Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
Grant, Thaddeus R.
Grayson, William R.
Greathouse, David M.
Green, Richard W.
Green, John N.
Green, Robert E.
Gregg, Robert F.
Gregory, George T.
Griffith, Thomas J.
Griffin, Jack R.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grozier, Roy E.
Grunwald, Edward A.
Guffey, Elton E.
Guion, Joseph E.
Gully, Robert L.
Gutknecht, Lowell E.
Haff, William B.
Hahn, William S.
Hale, John J.
Hall, Berkeley W.
Hall, Timothy K.
Hall, Harrell W., Jr.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hallett, Edward R.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
Hamilton, John W.
Hampton, Charles T.
Hansen, Merle C.
Harber, Russell L.
Hardy, Martin E.
Hardy, Corydon C.
Harper, Lorren G.
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Dale B.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
Harshbarger, John F.
Hart, William D.
Hart, Donald F.
Hartell, Ronald D.
Hartigan, Richard B.
Hartzell, Robert H.
Hassman, Andrew U., Jr.
Hausler, Carl O.
Hawkins, Larry L.
Hayden, Glenn M.
Hayes, Winston R.
Hayman, Robert B.
Haynsworth, Donald D.
Hays, Ronald J.
Hayward, Gerald R.
Hedges, Corky J. W.
Heigl, John T., Jr.
Hendricks, Jimmie "C"
Heneberger, Harry B., Jr.
Henning, John C., III
Herbig, Henry F.
Herndon, William J., Jr.
Herrin, Holden R.
Hiatt, Henry G., Jr.
Hibson, Leo A., Jr.
Hieronimus, Henry M.
Higginbotham, Leonard H.
Highberg, Roy W.
Hill, Howard A.
Hill, James C.
Hines, Gulmer A., Jr.
Hinsen, Kenneth L.
Hoare, Robert E.
Hodges, Lloyd W.
Hodnett, Robert A.
Hoffman, Robert D.
Hoffman, Samuel D.
Hofmockel, John L.
Hogan, Francis W.
Hoge, Kenneth G., Jr.
Holland, Alfred D.
Holland, James S.
Holler, Edward R.
HoHomon, George H.
Holmes, John S.
Holt, Robert E.
Honey, Arthur C., Jr.
Hoover, Richard M.
Hopf, Elwood J.
Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
Hoseman, Leland J.
Hovater, James D.
Howard, Joseph B.
Hubbs, Donald R.
Humphries, George P.
Hunter, Paul I.
Husbands, Joseph M.
Hussmann, Harry "L", III
Huth, Ralph L.
Ingram, Billy G.
Inman, Richard P.
Irish, George E.
Irwin, Wayne R.
Ismay, Arthur P.
Jacobson, Jacob H., Jr.
Jefferson, Robert R.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jenkins, Paul J.
Jennings, John S.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Wayne L.
Jett, William S., III
Jewell, Darl W.
Johnson, Dale C.
Johnson, Joseph J.
Johnson, Phillip T.
Johnson, Richard C.
Johnson, Richard "D"
Johnson, Robert M.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Johnston, Frederick B.
Johnstone, Richard A.
Joiner, Orrin
Jones, John P.
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, Ray P.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
Kallgren, Bruce M.
Kalmus, William B.
Kangas, Robert T.
Karns, Dane L.
Katz, Martin
Kaufman, Richard F.
Keach, Donald L.
Keeler, Donald J.
Kelly, Lawrence J.
Kelly, William P., Jr.
Kennedy, James R., Jr.
Kennedy, Nevin, III
Kephart, Robert D.
Kerr, Robert G.
Kersch, Roger N.
Kertz, Jacob D.
Ketchmark, Giles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiernan, Warren R.
King, Thomas R.
King, Robert A.
King, William R.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kinsley, Donald T.
Kirschner, David P.
Kirk, John J.
Klabo, Richard T.
Klett, George J.
Kluga, Norbert R.
Knighten, Charles E.
Knutson, Creighton R.
Koch, Richard A.
Koehler, Herman J., III
Kollmorgen, Leland S.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kosonen, Charles G.
Kost, John D., Jr.
Kozel, William J.
Kramer, Robert P.
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
Kremer, John L.
Kretchman, Frank C.
Kuhn Edwin A.
Kunkle Floyd S. Jr.
Kvello Allan
Lachowicz Michael R.
Lacy James E.
Lake Charles M. Jr.
Lamb Derwin T.
Lange Theodore J.
Larson Charles D.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
Latimer, Samuel E., Jr.
Lautermilch, Paul A., Jr.
Lawrence, John V.
Lawrence, Gergory E., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
Leach, Ralph W., Jr.
Le Dew, Thomas A.
Lehman, Donald A.
Leibowitz, Martin M.
Leis, Alfred C.
Lentz, Charles M.
Leppin, William P., Jr.
Lewis, Charles B.
Lewis, James R.
Libey, John D.
Lindsay, John D.
Lintner, Richard W.
Littell, Raymond W.
Little, James G.
Lockhart, Glenn S.
Lockwood, Harold R.
Long, Charles R.
Longhi, William J.
Loomer, Arthur R.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Losey, Willis M.
Loux, Raymond E.
Love, Henry H., Jr.
Lowe, Beverley J.
Lowry, William R.
Loyd, Rupert H.
Lyman, Jack N.
Lyne, George C.
Macfie, Richard B.
Mack, Robert P.
MacKenzie, John D.
Mackell, Richard A.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Harry P.
Maegli, Richard E.
Maice, Lee, Jr.
Mairo, Rex E.
Malloy, John E.
Maloney, Andrew
Malone, Roy W.
Mandeville, Robert C. Jr.
Manning, Richard T.
Marangiello, Daniel A.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Marin, William T.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Marriner, Richard E.
Martin, William K.
Martin, Gene A.
Massa, Emiddio
Mathis, Paul J.

Mattioni, Blasco
Mauney, Thomas C.
Maxwell, Leslie J.
May, Daryle C.
May, Harry L.
Mazzolini, John A.
McAlister, George C.
McAnulty, David J.
McArthy, Richard L.
McArthur, John C.
McBroom, William A.
McCarty, William D.
McCarthy, Francis X.
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClain, Kirby L., III
McClure, James R.
McCrary, Dewey W.
McCraw, Frank M., Jr.
McCumber, Harold E.
McDonnel, Harold A.
McDonough, William D., Jr.
McFall, Albert D.
McGlohn, Robin H., Jr.
McGrath, Harold A.
McJunkin, Russell E., Jr.
McKee, Kinnaird R.
McKellar, Edwin D., Jr.
McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
McLaughlin, Robert F.
McNally, John J., Jr.
McNerney, James F.
McQueston, Jack E.
McQuillin, John P.
Meader, Bruce I.
Meek, Donald B.
Meeks, Robert B., Jr.
Meetze, James C.
Mehl, James P.
Melim, Robert D.
Mench, Leland E.
Merchant, Paul G.
Merritt, Glen C.
Metcalf, Joseph, III
Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
Miller, Alfred E.
Miller, Byron K.
Miller, James P.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, Robert "A"
Miller, William L.
Millpointer, Edward D.
Mills, Joseph E.
Minnigerode, John H. B.
Mitchell, Joe C.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
Molling, Carl H.
Mongrain, Richard O.
Montague, Lloyd L.
Montgomery, Graden L.
Moore, Larry E.
Morgan, James E.
Morris, Everett L., Jr.
Morris, Howard L.
Morrow, Charles D.
Moss, Robert
Mow, Douglas F.
Moyer, Donald R.
Muck, Floyd R.
Mueller, George E.
Mull, Charles L., II
Mullen, Roger F.
Mullin, James
Munro, Ernest A.
Muros, Ralph L.
Murphy, Frank "M", Jr.
Murphy, Garrison E.
Murray, Gilbert S., Jr.
Murray, Douglas V.
Muto, Charles J.
Myers, Charles B.
Myers, Raymond W.
Nall, Delbert L.
Neander, Stanley B.
Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, William R.
Netro, Robert J.
Nevius, William B.
Newlund, Robert L.
Newman, James F.
Neilsen, Elwood M.
Nigels, Emile W.
Nix, Henry B.
Nix, Henry J.
Noble, Thomas I.
Nordan, Emile E.
Notz, Robert C.
Nulton, Frank I.
Nunneley, John K.
Nussbaumer, John J.
Nyce, William E.
Oberholtzer, James P.
O'Donel, James H.
O'Drain, John E.
O'Gara, Patrick E.
O'Hara, Jack F.
Ohls, Karl E.
Oldfield, Charles B., III
Oliphant, Don "L"
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Orem, John B., Jr.
O'Toole, Kevin J.
Owen, Charles K.
Owens, Robert L.
Ozburn, Forrest C., Jr.
Paddock, Charles O.
Page, Carroll S., Jr.
Paisley, Harrison B.
Palmer, Gary H.
Panciera, Vincent W.
Parent, Gerald "J"
Parker, James W.
Parker, John G.
Parks, John T.
Parrish, William I.
Parthemer, Lloyd L.
Paschal, Joseph B., Jr.
Patterson, Jerry C.
Patterson, William W., Jr.
Paulk, Joseph M.
Pauly, Donald E.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
Pelton, Robert L.
Perry, Roger E., Jr.
Perryman, Donald B.
Pester, Fred J.
Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
Peterman, Edward E.
Peterson, Richard E.
Peters, Robert E.
Pette, Donald C.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Pettigrew, Raymond A.
Pezzei, Engelbert G.
Pheasant, Alan G.
Phillips, Charles T.
Phillips, Alan R.
Phillips, Harry E.
Piraino, Daniel
Pittman, Jack R.
Platte, William A.
Pleasants, John B.
Pogue, David W.
Porter, Thomas
Portnoy, Howard R.
Powell, James R., Jr.
Prange, Eugene H.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
Preston, Samuel D., Jr.
Price, Allen B.
Prince, Gordon A.
Proctor, Sumner M., Jr.
Profilet, Leo T.
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
Purvis, Elvis E.
Putnam, Charles L.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Quinn, Jack Q.
Racy, Louis P.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
Radja, James E.
Raithel, Albert L., Jr.
Rapp, Fred L.
Ray, Thomas B.
Ray, Thermon L.
Reaves, Joseph C.
Reed, Robert K.
Regan, William B.
Reitmeyer, Clayton B.
Remsen, "T" Schenck IV
Rentz, Frank L., Jr.
Replogle, Thomas H.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Reyn, William P.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
Richardson, Robert L.
Richardson, Richard H.
Rigsbee, Clifford M.
Robertson, Charles G., Jr.
Roberts, Robert T.
Roberts, Robert "E"
Robertson, Douglas B.
Robinson, Donald G., Jr.
Robinson, Robert B.
Rochester, Carl W.
Rockwood, Jerred R.
Rockwell, Richard F.
Rodgers, James F.
Rogers, James O.
Rosenquist, Donald E.
Rosenberg, Donald D.
Roth, Franklin H.
Rough, Jimmie L.
Rowe, John D.
Rowley, Reginald C.
Rubin, Arnold J.
Ruble, Byron C.
Rudy, Byran C.
Ruggiero, Michael E.
Rulis, Robert A.
Rush, Thornwell F.
Russ, Jack E.
Rutherford, Ralph B.
Ryan, Philip J.
Rylee, James E.
Salin, Robert S.
Sample, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
Sarosdy, Louis R.
Sattler, Donald C.
Saul, Elmer L.
Sayers, Clay S.
Saylor, Eugene H.
Schaber, Rolph E.
Schaub, Robert L.
Schenker, Marvin L.
Schettino, Joseph N.
Schlank, John J., Jr.
Schneider, Arthur F.
Schubert, Leslie H., Jr.
Schulte, Richard J.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, John L., Jr.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
Schultz, Ford J. E.
Schutz, Walter J.
Schwarz, Ira N.
Schwartz, Sheldon O.
Scott, Melvin L.
Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
Seay, Wesley H., Jr.
Seipp, Russell M.
Seward, John A., Jr.
Shabe, Gerard P.
Shaffer, Guy H. B.
Shaid, Robert A.
Shanahan, Thomas L.
Shaughnessy, William D.
Shaver, Frank T.
Shea, Paul W.
Sherin, Joseph E.
Sherman, Peter W.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
Shimer, Melvin G.
Shrine, Bertram, Jr.
Shultz, Robert T.
Shutty, Michael S.
Siler, James R.
Simcox, James G.
Simensen, Richard E.
Simmons, Kenneth J.
Singleton, Floyd R.
Small, Robert H.
Smedberg, William R., IV
Smellie, Rex D.
Smith, Edgar M., Jr.
Smith, Melbourne L.
Smith, William D.
Smith, Jerome W.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Stanford A.
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, William F.
Smith, Lester R.
Smith, Douglas J.
Smyth, James M.
Sobieski, Leonard J.
Sollinger, David A.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
Soracco, David L.
Souders, Leroy E.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Speiser, Jack E.
Spencer, Robert W.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
Stack, Richard A.
Staheli, Gerald D.
Stallings, Alfred K.
Stanley, Gregory W.
Stanley, Richard M.
Stephan, Robert A.
Stephenson, Donald L.
Stewart, Thomas P.
Stewart, Merle A., Jr.
Stimler, Richard P.
St. Lawrence, William P., Jr.
St. Louis, Norman E.
Stoehr, Leonard A.
Stone, Bruce G.
Storey, Joseph D.
Stornetta, Wakefield S. M.
Stothard, Ralph B.
Strand, John A., Jr.
Stratmann, Charles I.
Stromski, Alexander S.
Stull, Donald
St. Ville, Edward L.
Sudhoff, Herbert A.
Summitt, Clyde W.
Sundstrom, Alex L.
Surman, William V., Jr.
Sutherland, Donald G.
Swadener, John R.
Swain, Roland H., Jr.
Swart, Robert L., Jr.
Tallet, Arthur J.
Taylor, Francis C.
Tebo, Ballard W.
Tennison, Lonnie D., Jr.
Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
Tetrick, Claude J.
Thomas, Walter R.
Thomas, John K.
Thomas, Gerald E.
Thompson, Theodore O.
Thompson, William S.
Thornburg, Thomas H.
Thorndike, Robert F.
Thory, John H.
Thurston, Dick W.
Thybaig, Robert C.
Tibbetts, Alan D.
Tillson, John G.
Todd, Troy E.
Todd, Walter H., Jr.
Tollefson, Norris M.
Tollefson, Charles H.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
Tomb, Paul D.
Traub, Charles, III
Trimble, Dan M.
Trotter, Thomas K.
Trout, Thomas W.
Tucker, Leonard L., Jr.
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Turnbull, James R.
Tuso, Paul B., III
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
Uhrig, William R.
Utterback, Paul W.
Vail, Harold W.
Vailiancourt, Richard P.
Vanderbeck, Eugene A.
VanDeweghe, Raymond
Vandermolen, Dale R.
Vandernaillen, Ralph E., Jr.
Van Kleeck, Justin L.
VanReeth, Eugene W.
Villanueva, Xavier V.
Vines, Thomas E.
Vining, Adrian D.
vonChristierson, William W.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wales, John R.
Walker, George D.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
Ward, Donald S.
Ward, Thomas M., Jr.
Wartman, Albert C., Jr.
Wasilewski, Alex, Jr.
Waterhouse, Charles N., Jr.
Watson, Peter J.
Watts, Charles R., Jr.
Weeks, Grady A.
Weeks, Robert H.
Wehner, William A.
Weisheit, Burton A.
Wells, William H.
Wenzel, Robert F.
West, Floyd P.
Wettroth, John R.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
Whitaker, Robert M.
Whitehead, Richard T.
White, John E.
Whitley, Walter J.
Whitman, Donald L.
Whitner, William C., III
Whittemore, Frederick H.
Whyte, Kent E.
Wigent, Richard A.
Wikeen, Donald B.
Wilber, Walter E.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
Wilkinson, Edward L.
Willard, Daniel D. M.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, Robert L.
Williams, Allen D.
Williams, Charles D.
Williams, Ross N.
Wilson, Clarence E.
Winberg, William, III
Winfrey, Harvey M., Jr.
Winnefeld, James A.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wiseman, Richard F.
Wood, Lewis I.
Woodbury, John L., Jr.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Woolridge, Edmund T., Jr.
Wooley, Robert T.
Wright, William B.
Wuethrich, Don L.
Wunderlich, Robert
Wylie, David C.
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yoran, George F., Jr.
Young, Duane C., Jr.
Youngblood, Norman L., Jr.
Young, Robert A.
Zeisel, Richard S.
Zilch, Charles H.
Zimmerly, Arthur, III
Zoehrer, Herbert A.

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS

Brill, Edward J.
Burke, Erwin L.
Carlton, Carter E., Jr.
Coulter, James A.
Feuerbach, Frederick J.
Gorsuch, George E.
Hadlund, Ralph L.
Henderson, Milton E.
Jackson, Frederick E.
Karrer, Max C.
Kaufmann, Herbert A.
Kurth, Leroy E., Jr.
LeBlanc, Gilbert A.
Mabie, Paul D.
Magnant, George J. A.
McAlpine, Frederick S.
McClard, Gerald J.
McDaniel, James W.
Miller, Richard J.
Murphy, Joseph L.
Museles, Melvin
Pearson, Howard A.
Pischnotte, William O.
Rankin, Charles A., Jr.
Roberts, Robert R. R.
Robins, John C.
Rotner, Melvin
Sanchez-Munoz, Pascual
Schefstad, Wilbur J.
Schehl, Charles A., Jr.
Scott, Lewis P., III
Shugoll, Gerald I.
Spierling, Paul R., Jr.
Stenzel, David M.
Taylor Robert W.
Thomas, Don F.
Vasquez, Mario A.
Viele, Billy D.
Williams, Thomas W.
Yenney, Matthew P. J., Jr.

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Armstrong, George K.
Baker, Clovis M.
Ball, Thomas F., Jr.
Barber, Ray C.
Bohl, Stanley C.
Boyd, David T.
Bray, Joseph A., Jr.
Bruch, Herbert W.
Burbank, Donald D.
Carpenter, Norman E.
Chapman, Allen F.
Cross, Charles W.
Curley, Wilfred B.
Davis, James B.
Devine, Wilfrid
Dewey, Wayne D.
Donley, Harold C., Jr.
Dunham, Donald J., Jr.
Dunlevy, John H.
Foster, Paul L.
Francis, Evans J.
Geiger, Merrill A.

Ghostley, Gary D.
Gordon, Gilbert H., Jr.
Gordon, Donald B.
Gore, Austin F., Jr.
Gove, Jack E.
Greenberg, Edwin G.
Hamilton, William C., Jr.
Hammond, James E.
Harvey, Robert R., Jr.
Hassenplug, John P.
Hendershot, Theodore R.
Hendrix, Robert E., Jr.
Hudson, Richard S.
Hutchinson, Arthur E.
James, Billy M.
Jones, Burton H.
Kick, David L.
Koller, Bertil R.
LaFrance, Philip H.
Mason, Philip J.
Maynard, Frank T.
McKitrick, Robert L.
McNally, Joseph J.
Mitchell, Billy R.
Mitchell, William F.
Mija, Theodore
Morgan, Donald G.
Nehez, James R., Jr.
Offerman, George S.
O'Neil, Harold P.
Pattermann, Frank G.
Perritt, Paul
Pettijohn, Thomas P.
Porter, Orland A., Jr.
Ramey, James B., Jr.
Ratley, James R.
Rice, Charles E.
Richardson, Mortimer J.
Ringhausen, Robert L.
Rippert, Donald J.
Rixey, Charles W.
Salsman, Thomas E.
Sherrell, David P.
Shisko, Joseph
Smith, Herbert R.
Stratton, Dene B.
Sullivan, John P.
Taylor, James A.
Thorup, Carlyle V.
Todd, Alexander W., Jr.
Tveita, Reynold C.
Umstead, Walter W., Jr.
Van, George E.
Walsh, John E.
Ward, Maxwell G., Jr.
Wasson, John A.
Webb, Davis L.
Webb, George H.
White, George H.
Wirsing, John A.

LIEUTENANT, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bell, John E.
Berger, John W.
Canfield, Robert A.
Conte, James W.
Crawford, Jack V.
Doverspike, Dale E.
Firth, Harry B.
Fisher, Jacob A. S.
Geeza, Boris
Gibbons, Martin F.
Hammond, Edward P.
Hawkins, Thomas G.
Hill, Rodger F.
Howard, William R.
Huffman, William W.
Jones, Asa W.
Kingsley, Donald F., Jr.
LeMaster, Donald C.
McDonald, Leo J.
Moore, Withers M.
Morris, Bernard N.
Moye, Thomas E.
Reid, James D.
Ricard, Normand A.
Shoulders, Harold A.
Smith, William G., Jr.
Smith, Richard R.
Stewart, Dell F., Jr.
Swanson, George C.
Wartes, Arthur J.
Williams, LeGrant E.
Wilson, Donald M.
Zeller, Dwight F.
Zeller, Kenneth P.

LIEUTENANT, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Biederman, Richard J.
Boyce, Keith C.
Church, Archer E., Jr.
Courtright, Carl
Davis, Walter E., Jr.
DeGroot, Ward W., III
Jones, Robert L.
Olson, Paul D.
Stevens, Warren G.
Surko, Alexander, Jr.

LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS

Ainley, James E., Jr.
Calhoun, Thomas M.
Capozzoli, Albert A.
Carrington, Paul B.
Carson, Earl M.
Clarke, Homer
Duff, James S., Jr.
Flagg, Roger H.
Foster, Richard D.
Grandich, Russell A.
Hodson, Harold W.
Klecinic, Edward P.
Milliette, Thomas R.
Pebley, Harry C.
Slagle, Lowell E.
Terry, Bill C.
Whatley, Thomas L.
Wooden, Robert A.

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Dwight J.
Akers, Thomas G.
Alexander, Ross D.
Asche, Clifton A.
Barkley, Lucien E.
Bergquist, Melvin D., Jr.
Berrian, James H.
Biggs, Leland M.
Bloom, Henry H.
Bobek, Francis R.
Boggs, Clifford W.
Boudreaux, Joseph C.
Bowe, Warren G.
Bryant, Harvey P.
Buck, Charles W.
Carr, Charles A., Jr.
Chansky, Ralph D.
Connery, Horace J.
Conrad, Ray W.
Courtney, John C.
Dempewolf, Eugene H.
Denningham, John S.
Devins, Thomas A.
Dewitt, Richard G.
Dinwiddie, Carl F.
Douglas, George P.
Dowling, James H.
Duffey, William S.
Feuquay, Donald E.
Fry, George E.
Gay, Laverne W.
Gehring, Jack H.
Gibbons, Harry C., Jr.
Hanavan, Robert J.
Harvey, Dallas C.
Jones, William H.
Jordan, Robert D.
Kelly, Daniel L.
Kramer, Ernest S.
Lacy, Dexter J.
Laedtke, Ralph H.
Leach, Thomas G., Jr.
Lee, Raymond W.
Lind, Vincent E.
Lipes, Wheeler B.
Marsh, William G., Jr.
McDonough, William A.
McGuire, Frederick L.
McIlraith, James D.
McKerley, Lowell H.
McMahon, Talmadge G.
Merrell, Walter C.
Meyer, William J.
Miller, Edwin B.
Mitchell, Thomas G.
Morgan, William J., Jr.
Newton, Richard R.
Nicholson, Earl M.
Nygren, Raymond A.
Peckham, Samuel "C," Jr.
Petoletti, Angelo R.
Pfau, Bernard J.
Reed, Robert F.
Rever, Rodney R.
Rudolph, Henry S.
Sanders, James M.
Sandeen, Garnet G.
Scales, Thomas N., Jr.
Schlamm, Norbert A.
Schwab, Albert J.
Sedam, Richard L.
Stiles, Thomas R.
Summerour, Thomas J.
Swindal, James R.
Sykes, Stanley E.
Thompson, Robert E.
Tober, Theodore W.
VanMetre, Milton T.
Warner, Albert D.
Zaller, Frank A.

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Berkman, Virginia O.
Black, Helen J.
Bracy, Edith L.
Breedin, Louisa F.
Bruce, Martha E.
Carmichael, Ruth M.
Conder, Maxine
Copic, Kathryn M.
Cordingley, Mary K.
Croteau, Marie A.
Donnelly, Elizabeth M.
Easter, Mary R.
Drew, Jennie C.
Eberhardt, Marie
Eldridge, Ruth E.
Elsesser, June M.
Fitz, Barbara O.
Fogarty, Anna L.
Hanley, Susan M.
Hanson, Dorothy M.
Hayes, Barbara
Hedrick, Betty S.
Henkel, Dolores A.
Herbert, Dellabelle
Hill, Gretchen S.
Humphreys, Regina B.
Hundley, Barbara J.
Jaeger, Elizabeth L.
Kallan, Addie E.
MacDonald, Patricia H.
Maley, Barbara A.
May, Frances M.
Merrick, Millicent E.
Miller, Jean L.
Miller, Claire R.
Moffitt, Jeanne T.
Muhlenfeld, Loretta T.
Murasheff, Lina D.
Murphy, Lorraine M.
Nesbit, Mary W.
Norris, Barbara
Olund, Anna C.
Osborne, Leah V.
Osborne, Loah G.
Parent, Shirley M.
Pommier, Angelina T.
Prest, Pauline P.
Ragland, Wilda R.
Rebick, Bette A.
Reece, Mary D.
Scarcello, Julia E.
Schlachter, Wilma R.
Seabury, Marion M.
Sganga, Anna
Shields, Dorothy J.
Siqueiros, Maria O.
Spence, Ruth G.
Stahr, Delores L.
Steffens, Gloria M.
Stilwell, Adelaide
Stipe, Gloria J.
Stone, Charlotte R.
Struble, Mary R.
Tomac, Dorothy A.
Vanatta, Rose L.
Vesper, Imogene L.
Walters, Anna L.
Whitfield, Gloria M.
Williams, Alice K.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Abbot, James L., Jr.
Ady, Howard P., Jr.
Almgren, Neal
*Anderson, Fernald P.
Arrington, John L., II
Balch, John B.
Baldwin, Charles A.
Barnes, Robert C.
Bemis, Wendell W.
Benitez, Rafael C.
Bennett, Thomas M.
Berg, Winfred E.
Berns, Max A., Jr.
*Bill, David S., Jr.
Blackburn, John R.
Blonts, Edward C., Jr.
Bobczynski, Sigmund A.
Bonner, Emmett P.
Bonvillian, William D.
Brandenburg, Howard
Breen, Roy E., Jr.
Brehm, William W.
Brent, Robert
Brownlie, Robert M.
Bryce, David G.
*Caldwell, Sam J., Jr.
Caracciolo, Felix
*Cassel, Charles M., Jr.
Cassidy, Herbert A., Jr.
Cattermole, George B.
*Chandler, Charles R.
*Childers, Kenan C., Jr.
Clark, Charles R., Jr.
Clark, Robert W.
Clarke, Frederic "B"
Clarke, Walter E.
Clausner, Marlin D.
Coleman, James P.
Compton, Emmett M.
Cooper, Francis T., Jr.
Crenshaw, Russell S., Jr.
Crouch, Partee W., Jr.
*Dancy, Charles A., Jr.
Daniels, James G., III
Dashiell, Edward L., Jr.
Dasteel, Robert H.
Davey, Harry E., Jr.
*Dawson, William S.
Dawson, George E.
Deacon, Edward T.
DeLoach, William R., Jr.
*Denton, William, Jr.
Dobie, Ernest W., Jr.
Duchin, Morris G.
Dudley, John B.
Duncan, George C.
Dunlap, Ernest H., Jr.
*Eddy, Thomas R.
Elder, Robert M.
Elsom, James H.
*Evans, Frank W., Jr.
Fargo, William B.
Fidel, John A.
Fischer, Arthur F., Jr.
Fisher, Ellis J.
Fitzpatrick, Francis J.
Forrest, Blake S.
Frazee, Murray B., Jr.
Gants, Saxe P.
Gehman, Harold W.
Gentry, William W.
Ghesquiere, George D.
Gibson, Edward L.
*Gill, Paul W.
Gillette, Robert C.
Goolsby, Lee D.
Gould, Richard K.
*Green, Robert R.
Greene, Howard J.
Guerry, John B., Jr.
Guinn, Dick H.
Gulick, Robert A., Jr.
*Harkleroad, Neil E.
*Harris, Leroy E.
Hendrix, Charles N. G.
Henry, Eugene B., Jr.
Higgins, Elmore F., Jr.
*Higgs, Alfred H.
Hingson, James M.
*Holmberg, Paul A.
Holzapfel, Valentine G.
Hooper, Posey A.
Howell, Willard Y.
Howland, John B.
*Hughes, John G.
Hughlett, Overton D.
Iarrobino, Charles A.
Isaman, Roy M.
*Johnston, James F. B.
Johnson, Stephen L.
Kaye, John B.
Keegan, Thomas D.
Keim, William J.
Kinney, Sheldon H.
Kline, Raymond P.
*Knapp, Elton L.
Kuntz, William E.
Laird, William R., Jr.
*Laney, Robert V.
Laning, Richard B.
Lawrence, John C.
*Lindon, Elbert C.
Linehan, Joseph D.
Locke, Ralph F.
*Loustaunau, Paul E.
Lowe, Marcus L., Jr.
McCall, Charles D.
*McCarthy, John C.
McConnaughhay, James W.
McCrocklin, James W.
McDaniel, George T., Jr.
McElroy, Richard S., Jr.
McElwain, Harry W.
McGuinness, Walter A.
*Mendenhall, Corwin G., Jr.
Merritt, Robert G.
Miller, Charles K.
Miller, Harold C.
*Moore, Waller C.
*Mott, Charles D.
Munson, John J.
*Murphy, Thomas W.
Norton, Gerald S.
Ost, Herbert E.
Parks, John E.
Parmelee, Clyde H.
*Pennell, Jesse L.
Pfeifer, Carl F.
Phillips, Douglas G.
Powell, Lucien C., Jr.
Powell, William O., Jr.
Price, Frank H., Jr.
*Pugsley, Edmond B.
*Quinn, John F., Jr.
Radel, Frederick M.
*Ralston, Frank M.
Raney, Clay H.
Reaves, Henry G., Jr.
Register, Allen B.
Reilly, James D.
*Renfro, John N.
*Ringness, William M.
*Ritch, John B., Jr.
Robertson, James M.
Roberts, Richard S.
Robinson, Leslie S.
*Rogers, Leon W.
*Roth, Eli B.
*Ruhe, William J.
Russell, Frederick N.
Salvia, Onofrio F.
Satterford, Robert B.
*Savidge, William L.
Schratz, Paul R.
Schumann, Roland W., Jr.
*Schwab, Ernest L., Jr.
Seiler, Edward H., Jr.
Seymour, Harry A.
*Shamer, Preston N.
Sharp, George F.
Sheridan, John G.
Shiflette, William M.
Shirley, Gene T.
Siegmund, Theodore C.
Simmons, George S., III
*Simpson, Eugene H.
Slagle, Robert J.
*Smith, James H., Jr.
Smith, Gordon W.
Smith, Robert H.
Spear, Louis P.
Standish, Edwin O.
Starnes, Will P.
Stow, Walter K., Jr.
Stultz, Ronald F.
Taeusch, Frederick L.
Thompson, Howard A.
Toulon, Alfred J., Jr.
Truax, Robert C.
Tunnell, Richard M.
*Utgoff, Vadym V.
Vandergrift, Jacob J., Jr.
VanWolkenten, Raymond V.
Vasey, Lloyd R.
Vossler, Curtis F.
Waldron, Alton L. C.
Wallace, James B.
Walley, Marion C.
Waring, Elmar S., Jr.
Warner, Rex W.
Weinel, John P.
Weisner, Maurice F.
*Weitzenfeld, Daniel K.
Wells, Harold A.
*West, John N.
West, Joseph M.
Wheat, Dick M.
Williamson, Thomas C.
Williams, John B. Jr.
Wood, Robert B.
*Young, Jack C.
Young, Lloyd V.
*Zimanski, Frank A.
Zoeller, Raphael A.
Zullinger, John R.

MEDICAL CORPS

Holloway, Charles K., Jr.
Holmes, Francis H.
Leach, Edwin M.
Mahin, Harry P.
Palmer, John R., Jr.
Pruett, Carl E.
Sweeney, Edwin C.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Bell, Thomas H.
Brandow, Henry W.
Carson, John D.
Christensen, Charles M.
*Claypoole, Jesse S., Jr.
Cobb, Richard
Corle, Frederic W.
Cosgrove, Paul F., Jr.
*Dexter, Robert C., Jr.
Dobbyn, Edward T., Jr.
Durant, William B., Jr.
Fisher, Allan J.
*Gore, John M.
Grassino, Caesar M.
Grubb, Francis B.
Haggard, James W.
Hunt, Harold H.
Jackson, Alfred C.
James, Nathaniel W., III
Jeffrey, Richard P.
Joshua, Edward R., Jr.
Logan, Daniel F.
*Madden, John E.
*Major, Samuel J.
*Moore, George E., II
Moore, Glen C.
Osborne, Charles S., Jr.
Roberts, Frank J.
Standish, Eben M.
Tonner, William G., Jr.
Walsh, James G.
Watson, Robert L.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Kleckner, John M.
Coe, Robert W., Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Aubey, Millard H.
*Pratt, Richard T.
*Reynolds, Luther S.

DENTAL CORPS

Hamilton, Traver R.
Standford, Walter O.
Susewind, Simon W.
Swearingen, John C.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

*Knight, Kenneth L.

NURSE CORPS

*Houghton, Ruth A.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Adams, Alden W., Jr.
Adams, Ollie B.
Adamson, Robert E., Jr
Ahrens, Alfred H.
Ainsworth, Herbert S.
Ajemian, Baret V.
Aldrich, James H.
Alexander, William H., II
Allen, Raymond W.
Almy, Charles B.
Amick, William C., Jr.
Anderson, Kenneth L.
Angleton, Joseph M.
Ansorge, Albert C., Jr.
Apple, Robert E.
Arbo, Paul E.
Arnold, Ernest S.
Arnold, Julian, Jr.
Arnold, Patrick H.
Asbury, David A.
Ashcroft, Jerome L., Jr.
Awtrey, Robert K., Jr.
Ayers, Arnold W.
Bach, Sverre O.
Bacon, Americus V. H., Jr.
Bagby, Robert G.
Bagley, David H.
Baldwin, Lorenzo W., Jr.
Ballard, Edward A.
Barber, Lester W.
Barbour, Henry S.
Barden, John W.
Barker, Arthur, Jr.
*Barker, Edwin F., Jr.
Barlow, Alton M.
Barnes, George J.
Barrett, Frank O., Jr.
Barrow, William B. Jr.
Bartles, William H.
Bartlett, Albert J.
Bartlett, Richard C., Jr.
Barton, Francis D.
Bass, Kenneth L.
Bates, Sheldon "S"
Battson, Arthur L., Jr.
Baumann, Edward W.
Baumgardner, Neal G.
Beatle, Ralph H.
Beckett, Philip E.
Bedsole, Donald S.
Beeby, Edwin N.
Behrens, William W., Jr.
Behringer, William E.
Bennett, George O.
Bennett, William, Jr.
Benson, LaRoyd E.
Bergquist, Alvin C.
Bergstedt, William C.
Berkstresser, Charles G.
Berree, Norman R.
*Beverage, Harry P.
Biche, Robert C.
Biddle, Edward
Biewer, Francis N.
Bird, Robert A.
Blaine, Ralph R.
*Blakely, Harry J.
Blakeman, James M.
Blalack, Russell E.
*Boatman, Harold B.
Boaz, Harold B.
Bogan, Lewis F.
Bohan, Norman C.
*Bonner, Minor J.
Bonnett, Ira W.
Boose, William R.
*Booth, Buford A.
Boscole, Robert A.
Bothwell, Robert L.
Bouldin, Jack F.
*Bowers, Roscoe H.
Boyes, Jon L.
*Brackett, Ralph A.
*Braddock, Oscar S., Jr.
Brady, Thomas J.
Bramblett, Harold W.
Brasher, Virgil R.
Breeden, George B.
Brewer, Robert P.
Bristow, Robert I.
Brittingham, Stanley H.
Broadbent, Harvey, Jr.
Brock, Clarence C., Jr.
Brock, Edwin D.
Brock, Marvin A.
Bronson, Earl D.
Brooks, Daniel P.
Brooks, David M.
Brouner, Albert M.
Brown, Thomas H.
Budd, Thomas W., Jr.
Budnick, Lawrence E.
Buescher, Joseph H.
Burk, Raymond W.
Burlin, Charles W., Jr.
Burnham, Fletcher H.
Butcher, Cecil O.
Butler, Hugh D.
Butler, William C.
Butt, Cyrus H.
Cabell, John B.
Cadle, John W., Jr.
*Cady, Joseph
*Calabrese, Joseph F.
Caldwell, Harry H.
Calkins, William M.
Cameron, Alan R.
Campbell, Charles B., Jr.
Campbell, Norman F.
Campbell, William C.
Capriotti, Anthony T., Jr.
Carlson, William S.
*Carpenter, Ernest L.
Carpenter, Albert P.
Carr, Charles A.
Carr, Robert T.
Carruth, Vincent D. D.
Carson, Albert C.
Casey, Martin M., Jr.
Casey, William C.
Cassani, Vincent L., Jr.
Castle, Hal C.
Catha, William H.
Cauble, Lawrence M.
Cavanaugh, Robert B.
Chadwick, Walter D.
Chanik, Evan M.
Chapman, Melvin L.
Chapman, Tyrus C.
*Chapman, William H.
Chapman, William C.
Chavis, Colie
Chellew, Homer W.
Cheney, Oakley W.
Christman, Thomas J.
Clapp, Atlee F.
Clapp, Clarence M.
Clark, Gilbert L.
Clark, Morris Y.
Clark, Weldon L.
Clift, Frank W., III
Cobb, Lewis M.
*Coleman, William J.
Colopy, Robert E.
Coogan, Robert P.
Cook, Creighton W.
*Cook, Raymond L.
Cook, Robert H.
Cook, William C.
Cooney, Lawrence F., Jr.
Cooper, Thomas H., III
*Copeland, William E.
Cornwall, Ernest S., Jr.
*Cowart, John S.
Cowdrey, Roy B.
Cox, Donald V.
Craig, Allan H.
Cramer, Shannon D., Jr.
Crandall, Charles N., Jr.
Crawford, Arthur G.
Crawford, Jack H.
Creamer, John J.
Croft, Alfred R., Jr.
Crosby, John T.
Crowder, Jonathan J.
Cruise, William H., Jr.
Crutchfield, Paul W., Jr.
Cryan, John J.
Cummings, Harry A.
Cummings, John N.
Cummins, Lawrence D.
Curtis, Charles S.
Curtis, Kenneth G.
Curts, Robert I.
Cutler, Henry O.
Dankworth, Theodore P.
Dannettell, Ralph, Jr.
Davidson, Edward A.
Davis, Donald C.
Davis, John F.
Davis, Robert J., Jr.
Dawson, Howard W.
Deal, Ronald A., Jr.
Debuhr, Calvin H.
DeBuhr, Claude N.
DeHuff, David
De La Mater, Stephen T., Jr.
DeLargy, John M.
Della Rocca, Peter
Dennis, Reyburn H., Jr.
*Dennis, Robert L. V.
DePrez, Richard J.
Derryberry, Wallace E.
DeWachter, Alphonse E.
Dexter, Lloyd D.
Dickerson, Claude L.
DiCori, Ralph
Diehl, William C., Jr.
DiFilippo, Dominic J.
Dixon, Walter J., Jr.
Dobson, Lawrence
Donaldson, John S.
Donnaud, Charles O., III
Donnelly, Grant L.
Donnelly, William E., Jr.
Donovan, John F.
Dooley, John
Doolittle, George H.
Driscoll, John F.
Dumas, Glenn I.
Duncan, Derwood D.
Duncan, Gordon
Dusek, Charles C.
Dyar, Joseph E., Jr.
Eaton, Russell S., Jr.
*Eckert, Virgil H., Jr.
*Eckardt, Marsh K.
*Eden, James D.
Edwards, Lewis L.
Elmstad, Henry A.
Eldridge, Edgar A.
Elliott, Michael M.
Ely, Charles S., Jr.
Emig, Alvin F.
Emmons, Oliver E.
Engen, Donald D.
Engle, Raymond K.
Erdman, Joseph J.
Erwin, Mason O.
Etter, William P.
Evans, Nicholas A.
Everson, Paul B.
Ewing, Harold T.
Fairbanks, John W.
Faubion, Richard D.
*Fickes, Leslie R., Jr.
Fields, Louis B.
Filitrault, Alfred C., Jr.
*Fisher, Ralph L.
Fitton, Cyrus F.
Fitzgerald, Robert E.
Fitzpatrick, Wayne N.
Flanagan, William R.
Flannery, William J.
Floerchinger, Ivan C.
*Flowers, Edwin M.
Foltz, Ralph E.
*Foote, Harlan W.
Ford, Albert T.
Ford, Raymond E.
Foreman, Robert P.
Forman, Robert N.
Forsberg, Francis C.
Foss, Newton P.
Foster, William G.
Fowler, Richard E., Jr.
*Fox, Frank A.
Frame, Ralph W., Jr.
Franke, Willard J.
Fritz, Charles W.
Froehlich, Edward W.
From, John L., Jr.
Furnas, Wendell J.
Gaibler, Richard
Galennie, George W.
Gallagher, Frank D.
Gallatin, Robert E.
Gannarelli, Anthony
*Gardner, Clyde G.
Gaskin, Edward R.
Gay, John W.
Gear, Bud B.
Geck, Albert H.
Gerber, Alfred R.
Gibb, Donald W.
Gibson, Oren "E"
Gibson, Richard H.
Gibson, Robert C.
Gibson, William C.
Gilbert, Eugene C., Jr.
Gilliland, Theodore M.
*Givens, Robert W.
Gleadinning, Bruce E.
Godfrey, Jack E.
Godman, Robert J.
Godwin, John T.
Gorman, Henry
Goudie, Gene
Grace, Joseph A., II
*Grafton, Warren C.
Graning, Leonard G.
*Grant, Edward G.
Grant, William W., Jr.
Greer, Howard E.
*Griffin, Harry K., Jr.
Griffin, John B.
Grimes, Harold J.
Grosser, John F.
Grosskopf, Homer L., Jr.
*Grotts, Joseph B.
Gummerson, Kenneth C.
Gustafson, Boyd E.
Gustafson, Robert B.
*Guyer, William R.
Hadley, Joseph E.
*Haines, George D.
Hall, Francis H. S.
Hall, William D.
Halstrom, Paul R.
Hammett, Wayne E.
Hancotte, John J., Jr.
Hanecak, Richard G.
*Hanna, Peter
Hanssen, Henry R.
Harbaugh, James A.
Harbin, Charles T.
Harkins, John A.
Harnagel, Harvey H.
Harrell, William C.
Harris-Warren, Herbert B. M.
Harrison, Henry I.
*Harrison, William T.
Hartle, Maurice C.
Hatfield, Roland B.
Havenstein, Paul L.
Hay, Lorin W.
Hayden, Charles H.
Heald, Joseph F.
*Heard, Homer B.
Heard, Jack F.
Heath, Philip E.
Heg, James E.
Heiler, Frederick J.
Heintz, John W.
*Hemmingsen, Charles J.
Henderson, David W.
Henderson, Stanley W.
Hendrick, William J.
Hennessey, Charles A., Jr.
*Henry, Max W.
Henson, William L.
Herlong, Daniel W.
Hermes, Bernard P.
Herrick, Harvey S.
Herrick, John J.
Herron, Adam A., Jr.
Herzig, Leroy L.
Hickle, Robert E.
Hickman, Charles R.
Hile, William H., Jr.
Hill, Clarence A., Jr.
Hill, Russell S.
Hiller, Harold W.
Hills, Stetson P.
Hinds, Claude, Jr.
Hipp, Ernest C., Jr.
*Hire, Charles W.
Hogan, Horace C., Jr.
Hoke, Leonard A., Jr.
Holbrook, James L.
Holloway, Ernest W.
Hollyfield, Ernest E., Jr.
Holmes, Audley W.
Holt, Bill B.
Holt, McHenry H.
Holter, Ralph K.
Honour, Walter W.
Hooper, John H.
Hoover, William L.
Hopkins, Paul W.
Hopper, Herman K.
Horn, Dean A.
Horner, Spencer W., Jr.
Horrocks, John N., Jr.
Horton, William G.
Howard, Leo T.
Howell, Jay S.
*Huggins, Jesse C., Jr.
Huggins, Judson D.
Hughes, Russell A.
Hutzel, Robert G.
Huxford, Richard W.
*Jackson, Douglas J.
Jackson, Harry L.
Jacques, Donald J.
Jakubowski, Thaddeus J.
*Jefferies, James S.
Jenkins, Henry C.
Jennings, Carl R.
Jennings, Joe C.
*Jewett, George W.
Johnson, Carl R.
Johnson, Charles R.
Johnson, Clarence R.
Johnson, David A.
*Johnson, Thor W.
*Johnson, William H.
*Johnston, Warren H.
Jones, Ben G., Jr.
Jones, George B.
Jonson, Russell M.
Joralmon, DeForest Q.
Joslin, Charles L., Jr.
Kane, John C., Jr.
Kaspary, John
Kauffman, Ralph J.
*Kay, Francis
*Keenan, Raymond J., Jr.
Keller, Robert M.

Kelley, Edmond L.
Kelly, Robert O.
Kendall, Jack D.
Kendall, Robert J.
Kendrick, Harold E.
*Kerr, James L.
*Kieffer, Robert W.
King, Benjamin B., Jr.
King, Geoffrey B., Jr.
*King, James P.
King, Randolph W.
Kingston, George W.
Kiser, William P.
*Kissling, Paul T.
Kitt, Robert B.
Kieffner, Frank P.
Klein, Theodore G.
Knotts, Sanford L.
Knull, William H., Jr.
Koster, Raymond W.
Kraft, Lester
Kubicki, Edward
Kunberger, George A.
Kunz, Karl W.
Lambert, Glenn E.
Landis, Cary E.
Landon, James B.
Landry, Adelard P.
Lane, Gene L.
Laney, Jack S.
LaRue, Wilbur H.
Lawrence, Emmett B.
Lee, Alan S.
Lee, Kent L.
Lemon, Thomas M., Jr.
Lendenmann, Werner, Jr.
*Lenihan, John J.
*Levine, Aaron A.
Levitt, Ben B.
Lewellen Robert S.
Lieber, James C.
Lindberg, Donald S.
Linnekin, Richard B.
Little, John C.
Livingston, William N.
Lockee, Garett E.
Locklin, William H.
Long, Robert L. J.
Loomis, Robert J.
Lowe, Harry C.
Lupia, Archie L.
Lynn, John M.
Mackey, Clarence E.
Mackey, William A.
MacKinnon, John D., Jr.
MacLeod, Alan R., Jr.
Madsen, Wilbur C.
Mahoney, George H.
Major, Arthur
Mallick, Edgar E.
*Mankin, Lee P., Jr.
Manship, Herbert K.
Markey, Francis H.
Marshall, William T., Jr.
*Marshall, Walter F.
Martin, Walter P.
Martineau, Joseph P. C.
Mays, Dixie J., Jr.
*Mazur, Anthony A.
McBratnie, Charles C.
McBride, Robert
McCabe, Donald C.
McCauley, James E.
McClane, Joseph L., Jr.
McConnell, Louis E.
*McCutcheon, Otis E.
McDonald, Robert R.
McElroy, John B.
McHugh, Lee T.
McKee, Clarence W.
McKee, Gaddis G.
McKinney, Andrew T.
McKinney, Clyde B.
McKinny, John B.
McLean, Eugene M., Jr.
*McMenamin, John J.
McNeela, John P.
McOwen, William C.
McVey, William J.
Meadows, Thomas N.
Mell, Kenneth L.
Mellin, Richard G.
Merrill, Ralph F.
Meshier, Charles W.
Methvin, James R., Jr.
Meyer, Herman E.
Miehe, Frederick W., Jr.
Millar, Donald B.
Miller, Charles L.
Miller, Donald M.
Miller, Jack N.
Miller, Kermit M. E.
Miller, Paul, Jr.
Miller, Rupert S.
Mills, George R.
Minard, Robert K., Jr.
Minniear, Carl W.
Monson, Donald W.
Montgomery, George P., Jr.
Moore, Richard S.
Moore, Walter R., Jr.
Moran, George F.
Morris, Robert L.
Mowell, Lawrence V.
Moyer, Eugene H.
Muller, Ragnwald
Muller, Walter E.
Munnikhuysen, Douglas Y.
Munson, John R.
Murphy, Daniel J.
Murphy, Joseph M.
Musial, Joseph S.
*Myers, Emerson W.
Myers, Lawrence S.
Naczkowski, Bruno R.
*Napier, Charles H.
*Nash, Francis T.
Neal, Raymond G.
Nelson, Hildry L.
Netting, Robert W.
Nicholas, Philip W.
Nickell, Orville B.
Nunnery, Edward D.
*Nyland, Hendrik W. T.
O'Bryan, George R.
Ochsner, Robert P.
Odbert, Jack A.
Ogilvie, Ernest J.
O'Leary, Arthur C., Jr.
Olive, Robert C.
Olsen, Clifford E.
*Osborne, Henry H.
Osgood, Arthur H.
*Otis, Gordon R.
Panther, Richard D.
Paolucci, Dominic A.
Passanisi, Emanuel J.
Patch, Arthur E.
Patrick, Urey W., Jr.
Patterson, William H.
Patterson, Joseph, Jr.
Patterson, Donald G.
Patton, Robert C.
Payne, William E., Jr.
Pearce, Robert N.
Peck, George W.
Peery, George G., Jr.
Pennington, Jack H.
*Perabo, Phil L., Jr.
Perkins, Leonard J.
Perry, Joe R.
Perry, John E.
Perry, Oliver H., Jr.
Peterson, John E.
Pettitt, Robert B.
Pierre, Emile E., Jr.
Poindexter, John T.
Poindexter, Jhon T.
Pope, Albert J.
Porterfield, Floyd R.
Potollicchio, Rodney A.
Pressler, William J., Jr.
*Price, Howard C., Jr.
Price, William H., Jr.
Prigmore, William B.
*Pritchard, Carl J.
Proctor, Erman O.
Prosser, John M.
Ramay, Wayne P.
Rank, Standlee L.
Rath, Elmer R.
Redfield, Vernon L.
Reich, Russel O.
Reynolds, Ernest E., Jr.
Reynolds, Herbert E.
Reynolds, Lester L.
Rhees, Thomas R.
Rice, Theodore C.
Rich, Clarence E.
*Richardson, John D.
Riediger, John R.
Rienstra, Dan "J," Jr.
Robb, Frank E.
Roberts, John W.
Robinson, Irving A.
*Rogers, Donald M.
Rolier, Donald T.
Roohan, James F., Jr.
Rosania, Hugh J.
Rosemont, Robert K.
Rowe, Robert A.
Rozier, Charles P.
Rule, Clyde L.
Rush, Philip J.
Russillo, Alfred G.
*Ruzic, John E.
Ryzow, Richard A.
Sadler, Stuart T.
Salop, John
Salsig, Edgar B.
Saxon, John S.
Schettino, Frank G.
Schlierf, Gerhard W.
Schmidt, Charles K.
*Schnell, Edward E.
Schubert, Russell C.
Schulze, Ralph "A"
Schumaker, Richard F.
Schwartz, Peter A.
*Schwartz, Walter E.
Scott, Maylon T.
Seeger, Billy F.
Seiler, Aubrey R.
*Shafer, Richard L.
Sharrai, Robert E.
Shead, Theodore M.
Shepard, Claude H.
Sherman, John O., Jr.
Sherwood, Wilbur G.
Shields, Robert A.
Siebengartner, George W.
Sims, Coleman W.
Sink, Robert E.
*Sipes, Lester H.
Siple, William L.
Skidmore, Ellis D.
Slattery, Francis L.
Slawson, Harry F.
Slaymaker, Basil D.
Slusser, Arthur H., Jr.
Smiegocki, Robert
Smith, Allen M.
Smith, Augustine W.
Smith, Charles B.
Smith, Leon L., Jr.
Smith, Richard P.
Snyder, Edwin K.
Snyder, Harry E.
Soisson, Thomas J.
Sonntag, Frank H.
*South, Marvin P.
Sparger, John
Spell, Billie C.
Stacy, Ray J.
Stafford, Carlos B.
Standard, Roy E.
Stanko, John
Stephens, Franklin T.
Stetson, John B.
Stevens, James H., Jr.
Stickles, Albert L., II
Stock, Edward J.
Stockton, Jackson A.
Stokes, Charles R.
Story, Emery G., Jr.
Stout, Fred E., Jr.
Stribling, John W., Jr.
Stuart, Jack C.
Stubel, Alvin T.
Suhre, Francis J.
Sullivan, Richard P.
Sundt, Robert K.
Surface, Wayne D.
Swift, Charles S.
Talley, George C., Jr.
Tamburello, Gaspare B.
Taylor, Ray A., Jr.
*Taylor, William D.
*Tenety, James, Jr.
Terrill, Scott E., Jr.
Thatcher, Roland C., Jr.
Thomaides, Thomas G.
Thomas, Alvin
Thomas, Charles M., Jr.
Thomas, Robert B.
Thompson, Ejnar N. C.
Thompson, James L.
Thomson, Fred R.
Thorington, Harry S.
Thornbury, Joe W.
Thornell, Enos
Thornhill, Henry E., Jr.
*Thornton, Joseph H., Jr.
Thrush, Thomas W.
Tingle, Jack E.
Tisdale, Charles H., Jr.
Topliff, John W.
Torbert, John H.
Townes, Herbert L., Jr.
Tozer, Arthur P.
Trautmann, John R.
Trottier, Albert R.
Truxler, Walter A.
Tucker, Charles E., Jr.
Tucker, Charles R.
*Tucker, William E.
*Turner, Maurice R.
Tyler, Claude L.
Upshaw, William W.
Upton, Laurence P.
VanHoomissen, Vincent F.
VanLimburg, Robert, C.
Vaughn, Allen A.
Vaughn, John W.
*Vehorn, Robert N.
Vito, Albert H., Jr.
Waddell, James
Wade, LeRoy G.
Wakeland, William R.
Walker, Gwin L.
Walker, Herbert P., Jr.
Wall, Charles L.
Wallace, Joseph W., Jr.
Walsh, Thomas W. F.
Walters, Hilmon E., Jr.
Walton, Nelson C.
Wanner, Vance R.
Ward, John G.
Watkins, George C.
Watson, George W.
Webster, David A.
*Weisenberg, Joseph O.
Wendorf, Edward G.
Wentworth, Ralph S., Jr.
West, David D.
Whidden, Wynn V.
Whipps, James J., Jr.
White, Jesse L.
White, Willett E.
Wiegard, John A.
Wiemer, Leo G. D., Jr.
Wilde, Norman W. W.
Williams, Clement G.
William, Henis J.
*Williams, James A.
Williams, Nathaniel T., Jr.
Wish, James R.
Wohler, Jack L.
Wojcik, Joseph J.
Wolf, Robert L.
Wooten, Robert J.
*Wozniak, Adam L., Jr.
Wrocklage, George M.
Wulf, Robert A.
*Yacht, Walter A.
Yates, Earl P.
Yeaw, William A.
Yelch, Lloyd G.
Youman, Harold R., Jr.
Young, Robert J.
Young, Robert J., Jr.
Zaborski, Leonard W.
Zaiser, Warren E.
*Zehner, John A.

MEDICAL CORPS

*Alsobrook, Harold K.
Bamberg, Paul G.
Boyd, Winton R.
Brannon, Leland C.
Broaddus, Carl A. Jr.
Champion, William J. O.
Doolan, Paul D.
Edwards, Donald W.
Flynn, John W.
Gallagher, William J., Jr.
Golbranson, Frank L.
*Greenburg, Rolland E.
Gundelfinger, Benjamin F.
Kent, Donald C.
Mitchell, Robert E.
Peckinpaugh, Robert
Peters, Earl R.
Sanborn, Neal D.
Stark, James E.
Stewart, James H.
Trier, William C.
Troy, John W.
Witt, Joseph A.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Babbit, Cameron W.
Becker, Charles
*Bengtson, Gorden W.
Blake, Dean L.
Burdick, Paul B.
*Byrd, Hugh D.
Clary, James H.
Cole, John P.
*Corey, James H.
*Eddy, George, Jr.
*Fawcett, Walter O.
Fernald, Joseph A.
*Ferrin, Darwin R.
*Foley, John A.
Gardiner, Charles V.
Gibson, William E.
*Hansley, Louis
*Hanson, Earl J.
James, Thomas J.
*Jensen, Harold B.
*Jones, Morton D.
Johnson, Herbert L.
Keers, David B., Jr.
*Lichtermann, Richard T.
Lohnes, Arnold E.
Maas, William C.
Marshall, John C.
McMorries, Edwin E.
McVoy, Richard E.
Meyer, William H., Jr.
Miller, James
Milliren, Howard C.
*Nichols, James F.
*Oakes, Robert G.
*O'Leary, Joseph J.
*Ormsbee, William R.
Papageorge, Andrew J.
*Pawson, Richard P.
Penebaker, George W.
Quarles, Palmer A., Jr.
Randolph, Robert R.
Rehberg, Jerome A.
Reilly, Frank J., Jr.
*Rogers, Ray L.
*Roth, Winston W.
Rubel, Robert L.
Russell, George D.
Sanders, Roy N.
Scharf, Samuel L., Jr.
Schoggen, Joe G.
*Seelos, Robert G.
Sheen, Raymond H.
Sherman, Joel H., Jr.
Sullivan, Raymond S.
Taylor, Kenneth D.
Van Pelt, James C.
Wade, Aredus B., Jr.
Washburn, Dale W.
Washom, Paul S.
Windsor, James M.
*Winkels, Fred C.
*Wilson, Roquel A.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bonner, Robert A.
Humphreys, David M.
*Iley, Charles H.
O'Neill, John J.
Sodt, William G.
Taylor, William A.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Barnes, George W., Jr.
Burke, John L., Jr.
Callaghan, Robert W.
Christensen, Wayne J.
Gibbons, Earl P.
Graves, Lenson W.
Griffiths, William H., Jr.
Harper, Milton J., Jr.
Hayen, Charles L.
Loeffler, Harry H., Jr.
Minwegen, Arthur P.
Plawchan, John D.
Reno, James N.
Scanlan, Melvin E.

DENTAL CORPS

Bassett, Donald R.
Benson, Lambert A.
Besbekos, George A.
Calton, Melvin L.
Gossom, John N.
Marmarose, Frank A.
Parry, Donald E.
Peachey, James B.
Pentecost, John W.
Prince, Clifford H., Jr.
*Smith, Roland C.
Sorenson, Adrian E., Jr.
Ulrich, George, Jr.
Vague, Curtis J.
Webre, Harvey P.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

*Alvord, Bertha I.
*Belknap, Floyd H.
*Bell, Gordon C.
Beretta, John J.
*Breathwit, William A.

*Britt, Thomas B.
Crenshaw, Mary E.
*Duane, Joseph P.
*Edrington, Harold G.
Ferber, Charles W.
Flickinger, Ruth L.
*Getts, Robert H.
*Gilpin, John H., Jr.
Hall, "G" Stanley
*Hanwell, Muriel
*Herman, Joseph E.
*Honeywell, Donald M.
*Hooper, Robert F.
Jachowski, Leo A., Jr.
*Johnson, Calvin F.
*Johnson, Kenneth L.
*King, Ira V.
*Lay, Leo M.
Lester, William P.
*May, Jack S.
*McCarley, Arthur T.
McReynolds, Paul M.
Minkel, Era M.
*Moore, Jack F.
*Olson, Albert
*Petiprin, Floyd R.
*Pfirrmann, Frank P.
*Rustad, George A.
*Sanders, Ernest
*Scheurer, Donald B.
*Snyder, Joseph F.
*Stewart, Fred E.
Townsend, Edna L.
*Welch, Edward W., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Akerely, Maude W.
Anderson, Jennie
*Baer, Annette
*Bates, Virginia M.
Beumer, Lucille M.
*Blaska, Burdette M.
*Brandenburg, Martha O.
Brochtrup, Rita M.
Browne, Ruth A.
*Cheek, Marie M.
Clarke, Rita D.
*Coderre, Evelyn I.
*Cohen, Ruth M.
*Cole, Deon
*Collins, Jeannette
Coxsey, Essie E.
Davis, Celia M.
Egan, Anne M.
*Ellingson, Norma A.
Erickson, Evelyn I.
*Feezor, Thelma L.
Gale, Dorothy M.
*Givens, Iris E.
Goldthwaite, Marie B.
Hankey, Lorraine M.
*Harrington, Eleanor M.
*Harrington, Mary A.
Hase, Thelma B.
Houp, Geraldine A.
Jones, Dorothy E.
*Jones, Virginia E.
*Kaes, Anna A.
Klein, Ruth O.
*Krouse, Nina M.
*Luehrs, Frances L.
Messer, Rina C.
*Mitchell, Ruth J.
O'Brien, Elizabeth
*Poulter, Marion
Poytress, Anne J.
Pressley, Patricia S.
Price, Frances F.
*Reilly, Alice R.
Scott, Margaret E.
*Stickles, Norma V.
*Thompson, Vera E. K.
*Vitollo, Angelica
*Von Stein, Marjorie E.
*Yetter, Doris M.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abraham, Sigmund, Jr.
Abrahamson, Paul E.
Achille, Frank A.
Ackiss, James H.
Adams, Frank M.
Adams, Hershel L.
Adams, Kenneth
Adelman, Joseph L.
Adkins, Joe D.
Aeschbach, Warren E.
Ahrendts, Luther A.
Aicklen, William J., Jr.
Aiken, Robert A.
Akins, Joseph W., Jr.
Alberta, Edward T.
Aldridge, Edward G.
Alexander, Charles S., Jr.
Alford, Zeb D.
Allen, Floyd J.
Allen, James B.
Allen, James B.
Allen, James B.
Allison, George E.
Almonrode, Roland H.
Ambrose, Robert W.
Ames, Lionel E., Jr.
Amme, Richard D.
Anderson, Arland T.
Anderson, Charles R.
Anderson, James L.
Anderson, John M.
Anderson, Richard W.
Ansel, David D.
Appert, Edward P.
Applebach, Richard O.
Apthorp, Grant B.
Arguelles, John R.
Armstrong, Vincent E.
Armstrong, Colin L.
Ashford, Robert L.
Askew, George V.
Athow, Robert P.
Atkinson, Roy C.
Austin, William H., Jr.
Ayres, James E.
Babineau, Francis E.
Bach, Nicholas R.
Bacon, Francis W., Jr.
Bade, Robert B.
Baekey, Richard A.
Baer, Joseph, Jr.
Bagwell, Wallace B.
Bailey, Daniel L.
Bailey, Edward C.
Bailey, Emera S.
Bailey, George G.
Bailey, Ira V.
Bain, John R.
Baker, William F., Jr.
Balfe, John M.
Ball, George F.
Bangham, James F.
Banks, Charles A., Jr.
Banks, Daniel L., Jr.
Barber, Albertus V., Jr.
Barfield, Charlie H.
Barker, Bertram E.
Barley, Cecil E.
Barnard, Ralph E.
Barnes, Alan F.
Barnes, Dowdell A., Jr.
Barondes, Earl D.
Barr, James H.
Barr, Robert M., Jr.
Barry, James H.
Barry, William
Barteluce, John J.
Bartlett, Ronald D.
Bass, Richard W., Jr.
Bassett, William E.
Bauer, Lawrence R.
Baughman, Fred H.
Bauman, Robert W.
Baumann, Hugh B.
Baxter, James A.
Beam, Jay K.
Beaman, Percy S.
Beane, Edward R.
Beatty, William F.
Bebb, Kenneth N.
Beck, Bartlette A., Jr.
Beck, Lester H.
Beck, William, Jr.
Becken, Bradford A.
Becker, Terrill F.
Begley, Robert E.
Bell, John H.
Bell, Miller L., Jr.
Bell, Roy M.
Bell, Samuel V., Jr.
Bendel, Roland M.
Benson, Harry L.
Berend, John J.
Berglund, Burton E.
Bernier, Raymond R.
Bernstein, Fred J.
Berry, Henry M.
Berry, John W.
Best, Carl O.
Betts, Martin B.
Beydler, Warren H.
Beyer, Delbert A.
Beyer, Henry J.
Bialy, Benedict B.
Bihr, Richard A.
Bird, Comer H., Jr.
Bird, George B., Jr.
Bird, Gerald T.
Bivin, Homer R.
Black, Charles H.
Blackburn, Edwin R.
Blair, James A.
Blair, Richard E.
Blank, Carl A.
Blevins, William D.
Bliesener, Arthur B.
Blitz, Victor E.
Blixt, Melvin D.
Blough, Arthur K., Jr.
Blount, Robert H.
Blumberg, David H.
Bobek, William J.
Bodamer, Robert E.
Bodnar, Andrew J.
Body, Lawrence G.
Boger, Clarence E.
Bohner, Jack L.
Bolling, Robert L.
Bond, John C., Jr.
Booth, Merson
Borgert, Duane D.
Borlaug, Paul V.
Bornhop, Rodney E.
Bothwell, John H.
Bott, Alan R.
Boulding, Austin L.
Bourimakie, Edward G.
Boushee, Frank L.
Bouwman, Fredric G.
Bowden, John L., Jr.
Bowdey, Floyd D.
Bowen, Edwin E.
Bowen, James W.
Bowen, Thomas J.
Bowerman, Robert G.
Bowers, Richard L.
Boyack, Maurice R.
Boykin, James O.
Brabant, Robert J.
Bradshaw, Ray H.
Brady, Charles G., Jr.
Brady, Donald P.
Brady, James "L", III
Braid, Robert A.
Braly, Henry L., Jr.
Brand, Richard G.
Brandenburg, George I.
Breen, Thomas J., Jr.
Brenner, Thomas B.
Brewer, William E., Jr.
Bridges, Jack H.
Bridwell, Samuel L.
Briggs, Winston D.
Brimmer, Herbert H.
Brisco, Kenneth B.
Brittain, Thomas B., Jr.
Brock, Robert J.
Brockmann, Victor D.
Brogan, Arnold H.
Bromley, Frederick B.
Brooke, Rupert
Brooks, Claude C.
Brooks, Richard L., Jr.
Brooks, Wharton H., Jr.
Broscha, Neil J.
Brower, Robert C.
Brown, Bryan B., Jr.
Brown, Carl D.
Brown, Donald B. F.
Brown, Edward J.
Brown, Floyd H.
Brown, Lofton C.
Brown, Louis F., Jr.
Brown, Thomas D.
Brown, Vergil N., Jr.
Bruce, John C.
Bruck, Thomas J.
Brumbaugh, Dale C.
Bryan, George H., Jr.
Bryan, Paul E., Jr.
Buck, Edward G.
Buck, Maurice D.
Buffington, Richard B.
Buller, Ronald M.
Bunganich, John, Jr.
Burdick, George S.
Burkart, John C.
Burke, Edwin J.
Burke, James A.
Burke, Robert E.
Burkett, Alva D.
Burton, James B.
Bush, Philip R.
Bush, Ward A.
Butler, John E.
Byington, Ward G.
Byrd, William J.
Caine, Arthur D.
Calhoun, Barclay F.
Callaway, John D., Jr.
Campbell, Ivan R.
Campbell, Kenneth C.
Campbell, Richard D.
Campbell, William M.
Cantrell, Charles E., Jr.
Cardillo, Robert J.
Carey, Edmond J.
Carlin, James
Carlin, Joseph W.
Carlquist, Roger
Carlstead, Edward M.
Carman, Warren E.
Carment, Frederick, Jr.
Carpenter, Harold L.
Carr, Herbert W.
Carroll, Kent J.
Carter, John T., Jr.
Cash, John J., Jr.
Casper, William F., Jr.
Casserly, Christopher J.
Castro, James
Causey, Charles W., Jr.
Chadwick, Daniel
Chamberlain, Raymond E., Jr.
Chandler, Donald E.
Chapman, James H.
Chapman, Kendall J.
Chase, Eugene C.
Chattleton, William
Cheek, Glen R.
Chelgren, John L.
Chittenden, Eugene H.
Chrisler, Robert P.
Christensen, Jack A.
Christensen, Donald W.
Christiansen, Edward F.
Christoph, Karl J., Jr.
Christopher, Frank J.
Chuilli, Ernest J.
Cislo, Louis
Clark, Carroll D.
Clark, James R. D.
Clark, William E.
Clawson, Frederic J.
Clay, Harold S.
Clement, Marwood E., Jr.
Clement, Robert R.
Clement, Robert F.
Clemente, Angelo E.
Clifford, William F., Jr.
Cloonan, Fred M.
Clubb, Reginald D.
Clymer, Roy E., Jr.
Cochran, William J.
Cocke, Edgar M.
Cockrell, Jack R.
Coe, Arthur S.
Coggins, Jack C.
Cole, Ben N.
Cole, Kenneth J.
Cole, Russell W.
Coley, Craig M.
Collins, Robert M.
Collis, James E.
Colonna, Harry W.
Colot, Peter
Colquhoun, Richard G.
Condon, Vernon W.
Conn, Robert H.
Connelly, John J., Jr.
Cook, Edward L., Jr.
Cooke, Robert S.
Copenhaver, James B., Jr.
Coppedge, John O.
Corey, Richard A.
Corley, Frank W., Jr.
Corrigan, John F., Jr.
Corrigan, Paul T.
Cort, Walter W., Jr.
Costanzo, Carl J.
Cottingham, John J.
Counihan, Henry R.
Cover, John H.
Coyle, Arthur J.
Crabtree, Alan B.
Craig, Neil
Crane, John W., Jr.
Craven, Phillip R.
Crawford, Bentley B.
Crawford, Lester D.
Crawford, Wayne H., Jr.
Crayne, Clarence L.
Creasman, Jesse C.
Creighton, Bert H., Jr.
Crispin, Robert E.
Crockett, Charles B., Jr.
Crohn, Arnold E.
Cross, William E.
Crouter, Robert W.
Crowe, William J., Jr.
Crowley, Herbert D.
Crownover, Miller T.
Crump, Frank L., Jr.
Cruse, Vernon E.
Cullen, James H.
Cullison, Chester D.
Cummings, Charles W.
Cummings, Donald E.
Cummings, Edward M., Jr.
Cummins, Peter P.
Curtin, Lawrence J.
Dadisman, Richard "A"
Dahlby, Philip C.
Dale, Robert L.
Dallas, Charles M.
Dallmann, Paul H.
Dandrea, Frank A.
Darby, Keith C.
Darcy, Robert T.
Darr, James, Jr.
Dauber, Robert A.
Davenport, Thomas T.
Davidson, Alan N.
Davidson, James B.
Davidson, John D.
Davies, Henry E.
Davies, James W.
Davies, Robert
Davis, Cabell S., Jr.
Davis, Ray E.
Davis, Theodore F.
Davis, William G.
Dawson, John F.
DeBaets, Donald J.
DeBaets, Ronald M.
DeCamp, Dwight E.
DeChow, Claude E.
DeCicco, John M.
Decker, Harvey L.
Dedman, Tyler F.
Deffenbaugh, Robert M.
DeGanahl, James A.
Degler, Forrest R., Jr.
De La Vergne, Cornel B.
DeLong, George E.
DeMille, Marvin R.
Denissen, Richard J.
Denkler, John M.
Denny, Lewis E.
Dent, George M.
Denton, Jeremiah A., Jr.
Dermody, Richard J.
DeVeas, Thomas E.
DeWerd, Theodor J.
Dias, Robert F.
Dibble, Henry M.
Dickey, John L.
Dickieson, Robert W.
Dickson, Richard "D"
Diffendorfer, Jarl J.
Dilley, Warren G.
Dillon, John M.
Dionne, Robert J.
Doak, William C.
Dobyns, Robert E.
Dodd, James R.
Doe, Willard C.
Doescher, Walter W., Jr.
Dolan, Eugene F.
Dollard, Thomas J., Jr.
Donaldson, Charles E., III
Donnelly, William N.
Donovan, Walter J.
Dorman, "R" "H"
Douglas, Stephen P., Jr.
*Douglas, Dee W.
Douglass, Walter M.
Doxey, Robert C.
Drabent, Eugene A.
Drago, Jack V.
Drake, John F.
Dras, David I.
Duckett, John P.
Dudley, Calvin C.
Dugger, Joseph
Dunlap, George R.
Dunn, Peter H. H., Jr.
Dunton, Stanley W.
Durden, Walter D.
Durey, Orin J.
Durfos, Robert E.
Durkin, Michael F.
Dyer, John C.
Dyer, Lennis H.
Dyer, Philip M.
Eadie, Charles J.
Earhart, Herman M.
Early, Paul J.
Easterling, Albert E., Jr.
Eckman, Charles J.

Edelson, Burton I.
Edwards, George D., Jr.
Edwards, Harold L.
Edwards, Maurice M., Jr.
Eidson, George V.
Ekas, Claude P., Jr.
Ekelund, Kenneth O., Jr.
Eldridge, Richard A.
Elefante, Frank L.
Elliott, Edward C.
Elliott, George B., Jr.
Elliott, Hollie H., Jr.
Ellis, Floyd E.
Ellis, Joseph M.
Ellis, Samuel S.
Elmer, Joseph S.
Elwood, Claire R.
Endebrock, Robert E.
Engle, Calvin R.
English, Harold G.
English, James G., Jr.
Enright, John P.
Enright, Robert E.
Erickson, Philip W.
Essert, Antone
Estelman, Herman J.
Estes, Lewis W.
Etcher, Robert W.
Evans, Jack E.
Evans, Joseph D.
Evans, William
Everett, James G.
Ewald, Arden A., Jr.
Ewing, John R.
Ewing, Paul C.
Faircloth, Floyd A.
Falter, Gilbert A., Jr.
Fargo, Robert R.
Farley, James E.
Farley, Russell J.
Farris, Frederick A.
Farris, George W.
Farshing, Donald D., Jr.
Faulkner, Doe G., Jr.
Fay, Lawrence J.
Fenn, Richard W.
Fenwick, Joseph E.
Ferris, Wilbur G.
Ferry, Reginald V.
Filson, Paul L.
Finneran, John G.
Fischer, David W.
Fisher, John H.
Fisher, William B., Jr.
Fiske, Clarence O.
Fitch, Robert A.
Fitchko, George W., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Jean
Fitzgerald, Paul F.
Flack, William W.
Fleischli, Robert E.
Fletcher, Gene C.
Flock, Loren W.
Flood, Robert H.
Floyd, Albert O.
Flynn, Clifford E.
Fontaine, Charles T.
Forehand, Wendell C.
Forsyth, Donald D.
Fortson, Thomas E.
Fosdick, Theron D.
Fossum, Theodore T.
Foster, William L.
Fowler, Earl B., Jr.
Foxwell, David G.
Foy, George E.
Fraker, Edward W.
Franklin, Isaac N., Jr.
Franz, Donald A.
Frasier, Elmer L.
Freeland, Harold H.
Freeman, James
Freeman, Peter H.
Fridley, Daniel C.
Fritsch, Edward C., Jr.
Fritz, Ernest S.
Fry, John C.
Fuller, Jack D.
Fuller, Richard, Jr.
Fuller, William T.
Gallagher, Joseph
Gallagher, Cornelius R.
Gammon, James M.
Garbee, Edwin T.
Gardiner, Richard S.
Gardner, James S.
Gardner, Walter T., Jr.
Garlinghouse, Bruce B.
Garlock, Dale F.
Garner, Alan S.
Garner, James P.
Garrison, Walter V.
Garvin, Wilbur C.
Gary, Stanley P.
Gatts, William H.
Gaunt, Richard H.
Gauntt, Wesley R.
Gauthier, Gene F.
Gay, William W.
Gaydos, Michael, Jr.
Gaynier, James R.
Geary, John T.
Geary, Joseph R.
Gebler, Gerard P.
Geel, Alan J.
Geer, Jon R.
Geiger, Robert K.
Gentry, John H.
George, Robert M.
Georgen, William M.
Gibbs, James T.
Gibson, George W.
Gideon, Robert A., Jr.
Gilliland, Frank
Gilmore, Russell G.
Gilson, Vincent E.
Girard, Jean L.
Glowasky, William A.
Gokey, Noah W., III
Goldman, Peter J.
Goldstein, David A.
Goodman, Ben, Jr.
Goodman, James E.
Gorder, Charles F.
Gordon, Jack W.
Gorman, Donald V.
Gormley, Robert H.
Gott, Charles L.
Gower, Harry T., Jr.
Gower, Robert F.
Graham, Thomas A.
Grantham, Delbert D.
Grause, Jerome E.
Gravely, Samuel L., Jr.
Graves, Robert F., Jr.
Gray, Gordon L., Jr.
Gray, Harland A., Jr.
Gray, Joseph W.
Gray, Leland T., Jr.
Green, Herbert W.
Green, Norman K.
Green, Robert P.
Greene, Wallace A.
Greig, Joseph E.
Gremer, Charles E.
Gresham, John L.
Griffin, Harry J.
Griffin, James W.
Griffith, Harold F.
Grigsby, Hubert C., Jr.
Grimes, William E.
Gross, James R.
Grove, George S.
Groves, Thomas E.
Grubbs, Harmon C.
Guertin, Louis H.
Guilday, Thomas J., Jr.
Gurney, Sumner
Gustafson, Harry W.
Gygax, Rex
Hadden, Robert B.
Haecherl, Frank S.
Hafner, Joseph J.
Hahn, George C.
Hahnfeld, Arnold A.
Haines, George V.
Haizlip, John W., Jr.
Hale, Claude E.
Hale, Robert F.
Hall, Carl, Jr.
Hall, Donald M.
Hall, James F.
Hall, Richard L.
Hallam, Orval K.
Hallett, Oliver S.
Hamilton, George
Hamilton, Joe
Hamilton, Jack M.
Hamilton, Robert M.
Hammans, William H.
Hancock, Burton W.
Hancock, David L.
Hann, William
Hanna, Donald L.
Hansen, Herman C.
Hanson, Edgar G.
Harbottle, Lyman W.
Hare, Guy C.
Hargarten, Robert W.
Hargrave, Seth E.
Harkins, William D.
Harlow, Harry B.
Harper, John R.
Harrier, John H.
Harrington, Maurice J.
Harris, Jack H.
Harris, William L., Jr.
Harris, William H.
Harrison, James L., Jr.
Hart, George L.
Hart, Harry S.
Hartman, Willard R.
Harvey, Donald P.
Hathway, Donald L.
Hatten, Robert R.
Hattersley, Julian
Haugen, Edward S.
Haupt, Richard W.
Hawley, Bennie O.
Hawvermale, Joseph R.
Haycraft, Logan, Jr.
Hayes, James W., Jr.
Hayes, James T.
Haynes, Kenneth G.
Haynes, William E.
Hays, Seymore T., Jr.
Hazelwood, James M.
Heckert, Nelson E.
Hedbawny, Edward J.
Hedgepeth, Charles H.
Hedrick, George F., Jr.
Heimbach, Hilton R., Jr.
Heininger, Howard G., Jr.
Heise, Frederick J.
Heising, John C.
Helms, Louis L.
Helton, William A.
Hemmer, Edgar H.
Henderson, James R.
Hendrick, Donald J. Jr.
Henry, Eugene M.
Henry, George L.
Herbert, Christopher A.
Herrick, Carl H.
Herron, Russell G.
Herzog, James H.
Hess, John A.
Hesse, Theodore S.
Hessom, Robert C.
Hester, Leo C.
Hickey, Joseph P.
Hickman, Wilbur M.
High, John R.
Highsmith, Frederick I.
Hill, Arnold M.
Hill, Edward C.
Hill, Elmer R., Jr.
Hill, John W.
Hinden, Harry J.
Hinds, Charles D.
Hinkle, William L.
Hintz, Warren S.
Hoag, Harold
Hodder, Arthur J., Jr.
Hodge, Alan G.
Hofer, Frank N., Jr.
Hoffman, Richard A.
Hoffmann, Henry A.
Hoffmann, Roy F.
Hogg, Gordon M., Jr.
Hokenson, Carl L., Jr.
Holbrook, James G.
Holden, William P.
Holland, John P.
Hollingsworth, Robert J.
Hollyer, Richard S.
Holm, Kenneth C.
Holmberg, Frank E.
Holmes, Robert T.
Holshouser, Jesse A., Jr.
Holton, Wallace C.
Hoofstetter, William B.
Hoover, John R.
Hornbrook, James M.
Houck, Donald F.
Houck, John F., Jr.
Hough, William L.
Hovde, Albin L.
Howard, Alfred M.
Howard, Donnell
Howard, John N.
Howard, Raymond B.
Howe, Thomas
Hoyman, William C.
Hubbell, George E.
Huber, Ernest, Jr.
Hubka, Verne R.
Hubler, Vernon R.
Huddle, Norman P.
Hudner, Thomas J., Jr.
Hughes, Leslie D.
Hullihan, John W.
Huling, Harold E.
Hulka, Edward H.
Hunt, Clinnie M.
Hunt, Robert S.
Hunter, "H" Reid
Hunter, Jack S.
Hunter, Perry F., III
Husty, Richard M.
Jackson, Clinton W.
Jackson, Donald C., Jr.
Jackson, Lee S., Jr.
Jackson, Thomas E.
Jacobi, Richard C.
Jacobs, Richard "B"
Jagoe, William H.
Jahant, John W.
Jameson, William E.
Jameson, James N.
Jandebeur, Harold E.
Janiec, Roy T.
Jefferson, Harry P.
Jenkins, Merlin F.
Jennings, Verne H., Jr.
Jensen, Charles W.
Jensen, William G.
Jermann, Donald R.
Jesse, Harold W.
Jester, Malvern H. L.
Jewett, Frederick F., II
Jex, Donald R.
Jochum, Joseph "B"
Johnson, Arnol, Jr.
Johnson, Benjamin T.
Johnson, Charles E.
Johnson, Edward L.
Johnson, Francis A.
Johnson, Harvey J.
Johnson, John D., Jr.
Johnson, Lester F., Jr.
Johnson, Philip W.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.
Johnson, Walter F.
Johnston, John W.
Johnston, Richard C.
Johnstone, Frank L.
Jones, Allen, Jr.
Jones, Grover C.
Jones, Stanley W.
Jones, Theodore
Jones, William M.
Jordan, Francis P.
Jordan, Glenn D.
Joss, Herbert L.
Joy, Charles T., Jr.
Joynton, Harry D., Jr.
Junghans, Robert C.
Juntilla, Harry W.
Justice, James O., Jr.
Kaetzel, Robert H.
Kaffer, Gerald H., Jr.
Kanak, Robert A.
Kane, Howard F.
Karlowicz, Mitchell J.
Karnagel, Donald T.
Kauzlarich, Frank P.
Kearney, Stuart D.
Kearny, James D.
Keefe, William J., Jr.
Keegan, Earl W., Jr.
Keen, Timothy J.
Keenan, Paul C., Jr.
Keener, Bruce, III
Keith, Francis L.
Keith, James
Keller, Robert C.
Keller, William F., Jr.
Kellersberger, Donald C.
Kelly, Eugene F.
Kelly, William J.
Kelly, William F.
Kelso, Quinten A.
Kemp, Glenn E.
Kennedy, Clarence L.
Kennedy, Herbert S.
Keough, Raymond F.
Kern, John S.
Kilgore, Frank J.
Killingbeck, William E.
Kimble, Elbert D.
King, Harry W.
King, John W., Jr.
King, Ogden D., Jr.
King, William L., Jr.
Kinney, Donald E.
Kinser, Ralph H., Jr.
Kirchner, Paul H.
Kirk, George G. E.
Kirkpatrick, James
Kiser, Charles A.
Kleczewski, Marion J.
Klein, Melvin E.
Kleist, Roy P.
Klemm, Wilbur C.
Kline, John L., Jr.
Klingberg, Franklin N.
Kluger, Raymond P.
Knock, Franklin C.
Knowles, Cline H., Jr.
Knueven, William H.
Knutson, Albert E.
Koch, Don R.
Kochis, Peter C.
Koehler, Robert H.
Koenig, William H.
Koett, Lee E.
Kojm, Leonard R.
Kolar, Robert P.
Kolda, Frank C.
Korb, Frank J.
Kosiba, Richard E.
Kosnik, Joseph T.
Koster, Edwin R.
Kovanic, Francis J.
Kosman, Robert J.
Krauthamer, Richard J.
Krebs, Edward C., Jr.
Krejcarek, Donald J.
Kreutz, Arthur R.
Krimmel, John E.
Kroencke, William H.
Krusich, Andrew F.
Kubiszewski, Robert J.
Kuehn, Walter J.
Kuhn, Francis X.
Kwart, Philip
Kwitkoski, Walter J.
Lackore, Raymond C., Jr.
LaHaye, James D.
Lakey, Keith G.
Lambert, Joel, Jr.
Lambertson, Tomme J.
LaMere, George L.
Land, Nathaniel B.
Lang, Hugh E.
Langford, John D.
Lansden, Humphrey B.
LaPerche, Jacques B.
Larcombe, Howard N., Jr.
Larkin, George M., Jr.
Larry, Walter C.
Larsen, Bertrand "O"
Larsen, Norman E.
Larson, William H.
Laskowski, Walter E.
Lasseter, Joe F., Jr.
Lathan, George R.
Latimer, Henry B.
Lauver, George I.
Lawrence, Kenneth W.
Lawson, Kent W.
Lawton, Lawrence W.
Layman, William H.
Layser, Richard G.
Leach, David C., Jr.
Lebiedz, Edward F.
LeBreton, Guy J., Jr.
Leddick, Roth S.
Lee, Earl B.
Lee, George H.
Lee, Harry B.
Lee, Robert E.
Leftwich, Linwood L.
Lehnig, Ernest P.
Leidholdt, Edwin M.
Leisk, William H. Jr.
Lember, David B.
Lemmon, Donald D.
Lenihan, Jeremiah E.
Lennon, Gerard T.
Leo, Joseph P., Jr.
Leonard, Elmer F.
Lewis, Chantee
Lewis, Harold L.
Lewis, John C.
Lewis, William S.
Lewison, Walter R.
Linder, Ivan L.
Lindgren, George B.
Little, George L., III
Livesay, Alvin R., Jr.
Lockwood, Warren H.
Long, Douglas L.
Longley, Wilbur E.
Longo, Charles R.
Loranger, Donald
Lott, Jesse P.
Lovett, Vincent D.
Lowans, Warren H.
Lowell, Percival D., Jr.
LuBien, William J.
Luoma, Walter R.
Lurker, Elmer R.
Lynch, Leslie O.
Lynch, Robert E.
Lyon, Henry J.
Macomber, Mark M.
Macon, Benjamin H.
MacOnie, Robert T.
Magee, William C.
Maige, George N.
Malan, Max E.
Maley, Leonard
Malinowski, John H.
Mandzak, Nicholas
Manganaro, Francis F.
Mangold, John F., Jr.
Mapes, George C., Jr.
Maragos, George
March, George P.
Marckensano, Louis A.

Marsh, Oscar H.
Marsh, Paul E., Jr.
Marsolais, Lawrence D.
Martin, Barney
Martin, Claude P., Jr.
Martin, Don M.
Martin, Frederick V.
Martin, James W.
Martin, Reginald E., Jr.
Martin, Samuel A.
Martin, Ward K.
Marts, Robert S.
Marvin, Stephen D.
Masek, Floyd E.
Mathews, John M.
Mathews, William R., Jr.
Matthew, William M.
Matthews, Howard L., Jr.
Matthews, Pierce Y., Jr.
Matula, Valentine G.
Maurer, Richard C., Jr.
Mawhiney, William T.
Maxwell, Raymond C., Jr.
Maxwell, Robert A.
Mayer, Donald R.
Maynard, Allison L.
McAdams, Edgar L.
McAdams, John W., Jr.
McArdle, Robert P.
McArthur, Robert R.
McBratney, Thomas R.
McCabe, Robert E.
McCamont, John A.
McCann, Carl J.
McCarthy, John E.
McClellan, Thomas G.
McClinton, Robert B.
McConnell, John H., Jr.
McCook, John A.
McCord, Wayne S.
McCracken, William H.
McDaniel, Charles B.
McDaniel, William O.
McDannold, Raymond K.
McDonald, Carlton A. K.
McDonald, Nathan F.
McDonald, Wesley L.
McDonald, William M.
McDowell, Charles E.
McEachern, Harold O.
McElwain, Richard S.
McGill, John C., Jr.
McGill, Myron G.
McGonagle, William L.
McGowan, James V.
McGrath, Charles J.
McGrath, John J. Jr.
McIlroy, Edward E.
McKenzie, Joseph F.
McKenzie, William W., Jr.
McKinley, William
McLaughlin, Norman H.
McLaughlin, Robert M.
McMahon, James P.
McMakin, Charles H., Jr.
McMurray, Samuel F.
McNary, Johnnie W.
McPadden, Gordon E.
McVeigh, Paul J.
McVey, Don C.
Mead, Frank C.
Mead, Merle P.
Meassl, James G.
Meek, Robert L.
Meekins, Willis E.
Meginniss, Walter M.
Meisenheimer, John L.
Melander, Vincent E.
Melesky, Joseph H.
Melton, John B., Jr.
Merritt, John A., III
Metcalf, Wayne C., Jr.
Metzler, Lawrence C.
Meyer, Wayne E.
Michael, Max A., Jr.
Midgette, Oliver P.
Miears, Roy E.
Miko, Charles R.
Miles, Bernard L.
Miller, William O.
Milligan, Donald P.
Minervino, Samuel A.
Mingo, John J.
Mitchell, Eugene B.
Mitchell, Frank A.
Mitchell, John E.
Mone, James V.
Monger, Albert J.
Mongillardi, Peter, Jr.
Mooney, Rodney T.
Moore, Charles M.
Moore, William G., Jr.
Moorman, Eugene R.
Moran, Thomas J.
Moreland, Herbert A., Jr.
Morgan, Clifford L.
Morgan, Daniel
Morgan, Lawrence P.
Morgan, Newton H.
Morgiewicz, Daniel J.
Moriarty, Norbert L.
Morin, Edward C.
Morris, John R.
Morris, Marion E.
Morris, Max K.
Morrison, Edward B.
Morrison, Wilbur M.
Moseley, Richard E.
Moss, James L.
Mossburg, Darrell L.
Mott, William R.
Mount, Harold W.
Mulligan, Eugene W., III
Muncie, Maurice O.
Munly, Richard E.
Munnikhuysen, Henry P.
Murline, Robert A. H.
Murphy, James J.
Murray, Kenneth A.
Murray, Richard D.
Murray, Stuart G.
Murrill, Robert L.
Mussetto, Bruno
Napior, Arthur D.
Navarrette, Claude, Jr.
Nealon, William G.
Negele, John H., Jr.
Neiss, Norman J.
Nelson, Clifford
Nelson, Perry W.
Nesbitt, James D.
Netherland, Roger M.
Neville, Joseph T.
Newcomb, Robert C.
Newell, William C., Jr.
Newkirk, Kenneth H.
Niemann, Jay J.
Nienberg, Robert J.
Nimitz, Charles E. C.
Nippert, Glenn E.
Nivison, William
Noble, Robert E.
Nockold, Louis W.
Noesen, Harold
Noll, Robert C.
Nord, Clifford E.
Nordberg, Delbert W.
Norman, Frederick W., Jr.
Norman, Oliver L., Jr.
Nourse, James A.
Nowery, William E.
Nuber, George E., Jr.
Nuss, Jerry J.
Nylen, William E.
O'Berg, Owen H.
O'Brien, Billie E.
O'Callaghan, Edmund W.
O'Connell, Thomas A.
Oddo, Phillip W.
Odgers, Ralph E.
O'Donnell, William F.
Ogden, Samuel B., Jr.
O'Grady, John P.
Ohme, Henry F.
Olds, Corwin A.
O'Leary, Stephen J., Jr.
Olmsted, Paul S.
Olson, Delbert A.
Olson, Raoul M.
Olson, Richard A.
Olson, Robert C.
O'Meara, Charles K.
Opitz, Albert G.
Orbeton, Maurice C., Jr.
Osborn, Neri, III
Osmer, James W., Jr.
Ostertag, Carl J. Jr.
Ostlund, Eugene W.
Owens, John D.
Pace, Robert D., Jr.
Packer, Duncan
Paddock, Richard A.
Palmer, Frederick F.
Palmer, George B., III
Panther, James E.
Parish, George R., Jr.
Parker, Hugh G., Jr.
Parks, William L., Jr.
Partridge, Harry, Jr.
Patch, Donald R.
Patterson, Randolph F.
Pavelle, John J., Jr.
Pearce, Claude E., Jr.
Pearson, George R. M.
Peddy, James T., Jr.
Pedneault, Henry R.
Peebles, George C., Jr.
Pehrsson, Pehr H.
Peniston, Robert "C"
Pentinmaki, Walfred N.
Peoples, George F.
Pepple, Donald J.
Perdue, Uley F.
Perkins, Henry C.
Perry, Dale S.
Perry, Francis A.
Perry, William J.
Peterson, Herrick R.
Peterson, John P.
Peterson, Robert J.
Peterson, William S.
Pettee, Warren E.
Pfeiffer, Willard D.
Pfundstein, Thomas D.
Phillips, Alva L., Jr.
Phillips, George W., Jr.
Phillips, Kenneth E.
Phillips, Merrill L.
Phinney, Glenn W., Jr.
Pickens, Jackson R.
Pickert, Aloysius J., Jr.
Pierce, John P.
Pierossi, Constantine
Pierucki, Ervin J.
Pinkepank, Merril C.
Pitz, Otto G., Jr.
Pline, Joseph E.
Ploetz, John D.
Ploof, Kenneth
Plunkett, Robert D.
Pollard, Robert D.
Polson, Arthur D.
Pomeroy, Leslie K., Jr.
Pool, George R., Jr.
Pope, John E.
Porcari, Thomas J.
Porter, William W.
Posch, Frank M.
Postlethwaite, Charles W.
Potter, Eugene W.
Powell, Arthur E.
Powell, James A.
Powell, Robert A.
Prange, William L.
Prassinos, George
Presgrove, Charles K.
Presson, Herman W.
Price, Charles H.
Price, Mood B., Jr.
Prichard, Reuben P., Jr.
Prum, Bruce E.
Puccini, Joseph E., Jr.
Puckett, Howard M.
Pugh, James M.
Pugh, Thomas B.
Pullen, Boyd M., Jr.
Purcell, Stephen E., Jr.
Pyle, Robert E.
Radtke, Robert N.
Rae, William C., Jr.
Raftery, John J.
Ragsdale, Duncan E.
Ragsdale, Homer C., Jr.
Rank, Cyrus "A"
Ranzau, Walter W.
Rappenecker, James C.
Rasmussen, John E.
Ratliff, John "H"
Rauch, Charles F., Jr.
Rawlins, Robert D.
Rawson, Charles E.
Readdy, Francis J.
Reams, Benton E.
Reardon, Francis P.
Rectanus, Earl F.
Reeb, Edward L., Jr.
Reeder, William H. L.
Reese, Donald H.
Reese, Walter "H"
Regan, William F.
Reichwein, Fremont E.
Reider, Richard K.
Reilly, David R.
Reilly, Jeremiah D., Jr.
Reinschmidt, Warren S.
Renz, Louis T.
Rex, James P.
Reynolds, Milton L.
Rezny, Ivan P.
Rezzarday, Joseph, Jr.
Rich, Harold G.
Rich, Robert G.
Richards, John P. M., II
Richardson, James P.
Riddick, John C.
Rideout, Joseph M., III
Riehl, Julian W., Jr.
Riggan, James M., Jr.
Rigot, William L.
Riley, Daniel P.
Riley, Edward E.
Riley, Paul A.
Rivers, Lee R. P.
Robertson, George A., Jr.
Robertson, William D., Jr.
Robinson, William H., Jr.
Roche, Robert P.
Rockcastle, Charles H.
Rockman, Abraham
Rodgers, Hollis "T"
Rodgers, Lawrence G.
Roe, Charles R.
Roetman, Orvil M.
Rogers, William H.
Rogers, William H.
Rohrer, Leonard V.
Rollins, Henry G., Jr.
Romatowski, Louis A., Jr.
Rooke, William A.
Rose, Charles J.
Rose, Meyer H.
Rose, Vernon D., Jr.
Ross, Claude M.
Ross, Royal R., Jr.
Ross, Seymour N.
Ross, William W.
Roth, Emil S.
Rouse, Jerome A.
Rowe, Donald E.
Rowan, Russell A., Jr.
Roy, Robert I.
Ruehrmund, James C.
Rumfelt, Milo
Rummelhoff, Warren E.
Ruoti, Anthony
Rusche, Alvin E.
Rush, William A.
Russell, George A., Jr.
Russell, Paul B.
Russell, Wallace L.
Ruxton, Robert T., Jr.
Ryan, Baylies Q.
Ryan, George G.
Ryder, Donald F.
Ryder, Everett G.
Saar, Charles W.
Sabin, Nelson
Sanders, Herman J.
Sanders, James E.
Sanders, Wilton T., Jr.
Sansom, Bayard T.
Sapp, Earle W.
Saubers, Maurice D.
Saul, James O.
Savage, Glenn A.
Sayre, George A.
Scappini, Mimo L.
Schafer, Elmer H.
Schaefer, William M.
Schafer, John B.
Schatz, Clifford E.
Scheer, Lawrence E.
Scherrer, David E.
Schloer, Eric G.
Schmoller, James R.
Schmucker, Stanley K.
Schneider, Robert F. J.
Schniedwind, Robert F.
Schoenherr, Charles G.
Schoonover, Ned W.
Schou, Aage J.
Schrang, William J.
Schuknecht, Arnold E.
Schuler, Foster R.
Scoggins, Marvin C., Jr.
Scott, Robert L.
Scott, William M.
Scudder, Harold
Seale, Thomas "M", Jr.
Seay, Howard R.
Seckinger, Neil V.
Seger, Josef M.
Seidel, George H.
Sell, Carl H.
Selliman, Edmund W.
Shadell, Colin P.
Shakshober, MacLean C.
Shanahan, John J., Jr.
Shapard, Harold J.
Sharpe, Owen B.
Shaver, Ralph N.
Shaver, William M.
Shaw, Fletcher H.
Shearer, Albert T.
Sheehan, William R.
Shelton, John P.
Shepard, Philip B.
Shepard, Willard M.
Sheppard, James C.
Sheridan, Martin J.
Sherman, Harold N.
Shidle, John H.
Shinn, William G.
Short, Edward A.
Shuey, Charles M.
Shugart, Kenneth L., Jr.
Shute, John W.
Simkins, William A.
Simmons, John A., Jr.
Simmons, Mitchell M.
Simone, William B.
Simons, Joseph T.
Sisson, Jonathan A.
Sisson, Luther B.
Skelly, Harold P.
Slater, Robert W.
Slonim, Charles E.
Small, Rufus C.
Smerdon, John E., Jr.
Smith, Albert J.
Smith, Bertram C.
Smith, Bert H.
Smith, Billie E.
Smith, Charles W.
Smith, Deming W.
Smith, George T.
Smith, George E.
Smith, George K.
Smith, Harold A.
Smith, Harold L.
Smith, Howard G.
Smith, James D.
Smith, James T.
Smith, James V.
Smith, John A.
Smith, John C.
Smith, Lloyd H.
Smith, Meredith A.
Smith, Ralph P.
Smith, Raymond T.
Smith, Richard C.
Smith, Robert H., Jr.
Smith, Robert P.
Smith, Robert S.
Smith, Stuart S.
Smith, Wade "K", Jr.
Smith, Wayne H.
Smith, Wellington P.
Smith, Wendell K.
Smith, Winfield S.
Snead, Leonard A.
Snure, Robert O.
Snyder, Charles E.
Snyder, Francis M.
Snyder, Jack L.
Songer, Jack R.
Soper, Malvern E.
Spahr, Arthur G.
Spangenberg, Walter, Jr.
Spann, Willis L.
Sparkman, Homer A., Jr.
Speed, Lincoln J.
Spencer, William A.
Spoon, Donald D.
Spruit, Robert E.
Spry, Warren L.
Stahl, Douglas
Stanfield, Henry L.
Stanley, Henry T., Jr.
Stanley, Hilton L.
Stark, Richard J.
Stecker, Kenneth W.
Stensrud, John D.
Stephens, Lawrence B.
Stevens, Jack M.
Stewart, Richard C.
Stickel, Robert H.
Stiles, Carl
Stiles, Robert G.
Stilwell, Edward P.
St. Louis, Joseph A. R.
St. Marie, John W.
Stobie, Edwin F.
Stockdale, James B.
Stolpe, Richard H.
Stone, Francis K.
Stone, John P.
Stone, Robert S.
Stone, Troy E.
Stonemetz, Claude A., Jr.
Stowell, Edward J.

Stratmann, William C.
Straton, Andrew C.
Strayve, Jerome R.
Strickler, Robert W.
Strobel, James W.
Strong, George T.
Strong, James T.
Stufflebeam, Jack M.
Suchcicki, Casimir J.
Sullivan, Elmer D.
Sullivan, John F.
Sup, George C.
Sutcliffe, George H. L.
Sutliff, Kermit R.
Svahn, Albert R.
Swanson, Hjalmer E.
Sweeder, Stanley E.
Switzer, John L.
Sylvia, Henry J.
Tait, Albert J.
Talago, Joseph, Jr.
Talmadge, Charles J.
Tanton, Paul W.
Tarpey, John F.
Taylor, Cecil O.
Taylor, David, Jr.
Taylor, Dean, Jr.
Taylor, Robert H.
Teasley, William A., Jr.
Tedholm, Charles E.
Tegfeldt, Carl G.
Tell, William M.
Terrass, Milford S.
Terry, Bernard E., Jr.
Thayer, Wirt C.
Thomas, Edward W.
Thomas, Lee R., Jr.
Thomas, Lon C.
Thomas, Paul B.
Thomas, Ralph L., Jr.
Thompson, Elmer N.
Thompson, Richard A., Jr.
Thompson, Robert K.
Thompson, William F.
Thomson, James
Thomson, Neil W.
Thomson, Robert G., Jr.
Thornton, John L.
Thorp, Harold L.
Thorson, Robert L.
Throckmorton, Bernard N.
Thummel, Gerald F.
Thurtell, Frank A.
Tilley, Herbert S.
Tilton, Charles N.
Timidaiski, James T.
Timm, Fred C.
Titcomb, Edmund B.
Titus, Ben E., Jr.
Tkach, George
Tobin, Daniel P.
Toohill, Donald L.
Toole, Wycliffe D., Jr.
Tripp, Jack L.
Trout, Roscoe L.
Truaso, Sebastian
Tucker, Edward C.
Tucker, Ralph M.
Tucker, Richard M.
Tuel, Merritt D.
Turlington, Oscar R.
Turner, John C.
Turner, John S.
Twaddell, Miles E.
Twarog, George E.
Uibricht, Frederick W.
Ulm, Robert B.
Underwood, John L., Jr.
Updike, Archie J.
Urban, Henry, Jr.
Urbanczyk, Louis T., Jr.
Usina, Joseph D.
Uzdevenes, John J.
Vaa, Norman A.
Vail, Malcolm E.
VanAtta, Bruce W.
VanGundy, Bryson, Jr.
VanLunen, Lloyd M.
VanSickle, John R.
VanTol, John
VanTuyl, Andrew J., Jr.
VanVleck, Marvin E.
Vasse, John C.
Vaughan, Jack A.
Vecchione, Felix S.
Vermilya, Jay "J"
Vermilya, Robert S.
Viney, Irwin J.
Vollertsen, Russel A.
Vollmer, Cecil R.
VonGerichten, Robert L.
VonSchrader, Chandler L.
Vosburgh, Everton P., Jr.
Vose, Frederic H. E.
Vose, Stephen J.
Voves, Martin C.
Wadsworth, Dwight
Waits, Jack E.
Walker, Grant J.
Walker, Grover "C", Jr.
Walker, Harrison M., Jr.
Waller, William, Jr.
Ward, Edgar F.
Ward, Raymond E.
Warde, William A.
Warriner, Victor G.
Warring, Leo B.
Washburn, Douglas A.
Waterman, Jack "E"
Waterman, John T.
Waters, Alex "C"
Waters, Lowell W.
Watkins, Robert W.
Watson, William H., Jr.
Watt, Gale V.
Weaver, John K.
Weaver, Keith T.
Webb, Milton G.
Weber, Kent J.
Weidman, Robert M., Jr.
Weidman, William K.
Welch, Edward F., Jr.
Welch, Paul R.
Wellings, Timothy F., Jr.
Wellons, Alfred G., Jr.
Wells, Donald M.
Wells, John T.
Wells, John T.
Wells, John W.
Wellsman, Howard C.
Wenger, Donald B.
Wente, David A.
Wensel, Harold F.
Werle, Joseph P., Jr.
Westcott, Robert O.
Westmoreland, Arthur
Whaley, Lucien O. G.
Wheat, Newton L.
Wheler, Clifford D.
Whipkey, Arthur L.
Whitaker, Andrew W.
Whitby, Walter T.
White, Bernard C.
Whitegiver, Robert B., II
Whittaker, Gordon S.
Whittle, Claude B.
Whyte, Herbert E.
Wicks, William F.
Wiener, Richard A.
Wiggins, Bryan D.
Wilda, Gerald L.
Wilkinson, Thomas R.
Willett, Charles F.
Williams, Buck D., Jr.
Williams, Bernard P., Jr.
Williams, Charles L.
Williams, David T.
Williams, Glenn E.
Williams, Hexter A.
Williams, Joseph L., Jr.
Williams, John G., Jr.
Williams, James S.
Williamson, Robert C.
Wilson, James G.
Wilson, Joseph H., Jr.
Wilson, Kenneth E., Jr.
Wilson, Robert D.
Wilson, Robert E.
Wilson, William D.
Wineman, Gordon L.
Winkler, Cornelius, Jr.
Winslett, Ernest R.
Witkowski, Eugene F.
Wood, Edward G.
Wood, Eugene E.
Wood, Harold E.
Wood, William D., Jr.
Woodard, David A.
Woodburn, Edwin C.
Woods, Kenneth
Woods, William L., Jr.
Woody, William S.
Working, Patrick L.
Wright, William R.
Wrzesinski, Robert
Wysocki, Walter J.
Yates, Andrew J.
Yates, William K.
Yeatman, Richard P.
Yelton, Harold M.
Young, Austin V.
Young, Floyd F.
Young, Grant C.
Young, Laurence R.
Yuengling, Douglas J.
Zebrowski, Walter T.
Zelov, Randolph D.
Zenni, Martin M.
Zent, John L.
Zimmerman, William R., Jr.
Zinsler, Frank G.
Ireland, Arthur G.
Irvine, Harry B.
Irving, Robert
Iselin, Earl C., Jr.
Zuehlke, Lloyd T.
Zumwalt, Marvin W.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abe, Henry H.
Abert, James G.
Ables, Aubrey E.
Adamson, Edwin C., Jr.
Adcox, James R.
Ager, Snowden C.
Agnew, Dwight M., Jr.
Ahlgren, Kenneth L.
Aitcheson, George A. Jr.
Akens. Robert J.
Alee, Thomas L., Jr.
Albrecht, Fred J.
Alecxih, Peter C.
Alexander, Adelore L.
Alford, William J.
Allen, George W.
Allen, John S.
Alvarado, Ramon C.
Ammerman, Arthur J.
Ammerman, Clell N.
Amoruso, Alfred P.
Andersen, Alexander
Anderson, Ernest J.
Anderson, Edward O., Jr.
Anderson, Eugene G.
Anderson, Falvie B., Jr.
Anderson, Giles B.
Anderson, Joe K.
Anderson, Joseph F.
Anderson, Stephen P.
Anderson, Thomas F.
Anderson, Walter S.
Anthony, Morris D.
Armstrong, Stephen O., Jr.
Arnold, Robert B.
Ascherfeld, Theodore F., Jr.
Ashton, Augustus T., II
Atwood, Henry C., Jr.
Aubuchon, Harvey
Augustine, Grant, III
Aumick, William A.
Austin, Carl G.
Austin, James W.
Austin, James F.
Austin, Robert C.
Avery, Billy J.
Bacon, William M.
Bailey, William R., Jr.
Baird, Thomas L.
Baker, Halbert E.
Baker, Walter F.
Baldwin, Fred, Jr.
Ballard, Gaylord B.
Ballow, Lawrence D.
Bandemer, Otto H.
Banfield, Thomas V., II
Banham, Herert G., Jr.
Banta, Thomas A.
Barkley, James P.
Barlow, James D.
Barnes, Harold
Barnes, Lee G.
Barnes, Robert G.
Barnett, Ralph S.
Barth, Joseph J., Jr.
Bartlett, Frederic R.
Barton, LeRoy L.
Bascom, Paul P.
Basford, Michael G.
Bassett, Bradley A.
Bates, Carl M.
Batthauer, Byron E.
Baty, Frank O.
Bauman, James R.
Baumgardner, John F.
Baxter, George L., Jr.
Bayne, John P.
Beal, Derald R.
Beard, Bill J.
Beck, John L.
Beck, Walter R.
Beck, William H.
Beckmann, Archibald B., Jr.
Beckwith, Gilbert H.
Beeson, Robert O.
Beeton, Harvey J.
Behrle, Walter F.
Belechak, Stephen C.
Bell, Bill J.
Bell, James F.
Bennett, Donald C.
Bennett, Phillip L.
Berg, Robert L.
Berger, Ronald A.
Berkhimer, Frank R.
Bernier, George, Jr.
Berthe, Charles J., Jr.
Beuris, Charles B.
Biasi, Nestore G.
Bibb, Benjamin O.
Biederman, Robert D.
Biggard, William
Billerbeck, Henry G.
Billeter, John L.
Bilyeu, Roland C.
Bishop, Bert W.
Bishop, Richard D.
Bissel, Norman H.
Bittick, Marshall V., Jr.
Blaes, Richard W.
Blaine, Thomas E.
Bliss, William S., Jr.
Bloom, Stanley A.
Boas, George L.
Bole, George T.
Bonner, Irwin G.
Booth, Joseph K.
Bordone, Richard P.
Borter, Edward E.
Bostwick, Charles G., Jr.
Botshon, Morton
Bottenberg, Foster L.
Bowen, Thomas J.
Bowling, Charles R.
Bowling, Roy H.
Boyd, John W., Jr.
Boylson, Michael E.
Bozell, Rex K.
Brackin, John D.
Bradshaw, Frederick L.
Brame, Frank A., III
Brammeier, Charles L.
Brandon, Horace W.
Brasted, Kermont C.
Bravence, John, Jr.
Breedlove, James D.
Brennan, John S.
Brewin, Robert L.
Bridges, Kenneth K.
Brill, Gordon A., Jr.
Briner, Robert R.
Brodhead, Edward M.
Brooks, Darrell H.
Brown, Charles E.
Brown, Christopher H.
Brown, Donald D.
Brown, Harold R.
Brown, Malcolm C.
Brown, Robert C., Jr.
Brown, Robert H.
Brownsberger, Donald E.
Bruley, Kenneth C.
Brummett, Eugene P.
Brunell, James I.
Buc, Gerald G.
Buc, William J.
Buchanan, Edward O.
Buchholz, Philip P.
Bullman, Howard L.
Bunce, Bayne H.
Bunger, Robert C.
Burkhardt, Lawrence, III
Burnett, William M.
Burnham, Don E.
Burns, Richard F.
Burris, Raymond M.
Burtis, Evenson M.
Busell, Lewis H.
Busey, James B.
Bush, Carl D.
Butler, William S.
Butner, Oscar W., Jr.
Byberg, Robert C.
Byington, Melville R., Jr.
Byrd, Mark W.
Byron, Robert S.
Cabanillas, Jose C., II
Caldwell, Charles B.
Caldwell, Hamlin A., Jr.
Calkin, Cecil B.
Cameron, Roderick A.
Cammall, John K.
Campbell, Bruce H., Jr.
Campbell, Donald S., Jr.
Campbell, John D.
Campbell, John P.
Campbell, John L.
Campbell, Robert J.
Cane, Guy
Cann, William A.
Canter, Howard R.
Cantilon, Henry C.
Cantwell, Richard B.
Carlson, Don P.
Carlson, Karl L.
Carmody, Cornelius J.
Carroll, James F.
Carson, George L.
Carson, James H., Jr.
Carson, Louis F., Jr.
Carter, Gerald M., Jr.
Carter, Winfred G.
Casimes, Theodore C.
Cavicke, Richard J.
Cavitt, William M.
Cayting, Hayward F.
Chamberlain, James L.
Chambers, Dudley S.
Chapdelaine, Jerrold E.
Chase, Edgar M.
Chase, Robert T., Jr.
Cheney, Donald A.
Chezem, Norman B.
Chidley, Ralph E.
Chisholm, George E., II
Christie, William G.
Clark, Philip K.
Clark, Richard G.
Clark, Richard G.
Cleaver, Stephen
Clemens, Eugene M.
Cliff, Athol W., Jr.
Clifford, Donald J.
Clingenpeel, William K.
Coakley, Walter J., Jr.
Cobb, Richard
Coe, Raymond P.
Cogswell, Charles E.
Colbus, Louis
Cole, Leonard I., Jr.
Coleman, Herman F.
Coleman, Irvin L., Jr.
Coleman, Thomas R.
Colgan, John G.
Collier, Byron H.
Collins, Benjamin F.
Collins, Ferdinand L, Jr.
Collins, William D.
Colvin, William P.
Colwell, Lawrence S.
Conaughton, Robert G.
Conboy, Thomas W.
Conklin, Robert B.
Connelly, John J.
Conner, Lawrence O.
Connolly, Paul P.
Connolly, Timothy W.
Connor, Samuel R.
Conrad, Glenn T., Jr.
Conroy, Robert O.
Conway, Paul B.
Cook, Harry K.
Cook, Russell A.
Cook, Vernon H., Jr.
Cooley, Charles H.
Coor, Lawrence W.
Copeland, Lawrence
Copeland, Edward C.
Coppola, Ernest J.
Cornell, Robert L.
Couillard, James P.
Courtney, Charles H.
Couser, Rodney W.
Cowan, Daniel R.
Cox, Gerald W.
Cox, Floyd E.
Cox, Gordon L.
Crabb, Eugene V.
Crabtree, Donald G.
Crane, Herbert C.
Crane, Robert D.
Crawford, George H.
Crawford, John W.
Crawford, Roderick P.
Crawford, William T.
Crockett, Thomas L.
Crook, Richard W.
Croom, William H., Jr.
Crosson, Harry E.
Crotteau, Roger D.
Crouch, Eugene
Cryer, John P.
Cumbie, Willie E., Jr.
Cummings, Joseph D.

Cunningham, Marshall E.
Currier, Richard A.
Curry, Thomas L.
Curtis, Robert E.
Cusick, Patrick J.
Cutts, Robert L.
Czaja, Bernard P.
Dagdician, James J.
Daigneault, Joseph J., Jr.
Daily, Hubert D., Jr.
Daley, Robert E.
Dalla Mura, Bart M., Jr.
Damico, Richard J.
Dancer, Jerry D.
Daniels, William D.
Daubenspeck, Richard E.
Davidson, Charles H.
Davis, Ralph G.
Davis, Ramsey L., Jr.
Davis, Robert C., Jr.
Davis, Russell E.
Dawson, Edward H., Jr.
Deam, Norman A.
Dean, Herbert J.
Dearcot, Michael E.
DeBoer, Jack "G"
DeFeo, Modestino R.
DeHart, William
Delbert, Edward G.
Delaney, John R.
DeLoach, John W.
Delvecchio, Frank V.
Demonbreum, James R.
Dempsey, Gerald M.
Dempsey, John F.
Derda, James R.
Derendinger, George L.
Deryckere, Archie G.
Desrocher, Marvin P.
Desseyn, Maurice H.
Deuel, Jamieson K.
Devine, Clarence A.
Dey, Gordon J.
Diamond, Ray B.
Dickey, Leonard M
Diehl, Ricky W.
Dierdorff, Loren M.
Diley, Lewis E.
Dillard, Marvin B.
Dillon, Alfred J.
Dilweg, John C.
DiPace, Joseph V.
Divelbiss, Dallas R.
Doney, Robert G.
Donnell, Joseph S., III
Donovan, Daniel E.
Donovan, Philip C.
Dougherty, John E., Jr.
Dowd, Francis X.
Downey, Louis A.
Downs, James R.
Dozier, Charles D.
Drake, William L.
Drayton, Henry E., Jr.
Drees, Morris C.
Drenkard, Carl C.
Drumheller, Maxley W.
Drummet, Richard C.
DuBois, Arthur N.
Ducat, Julian A.
Ducharme, George W.
Duff, Robert G.
Dugan, Francis V.
Dugan, Richard F., Jr.
Duke, Bobby G.
Dulke, Sylvester M.
Dunn, John F.
Dunn, Alvan N.
Dunn, Gordon V.
Dunning, James A.
Durant, Thomas W.
Durocher, Stephen F.
Dworsky, Alan J.
Dwyer, George M.
Easterling, Letson E.
Easton, Peter B.
Eckerd, Kenneth C.
Edgren, Donald H.
Ehl, James W.
Ehr, Richard L.
Elder, Ralph C.
Elliott, Donal W.
Elliott, Orville G.
Elmore, John E.
Elsbree, Frank B.
Emerson, John R.
Emmett, Donald P.
Engelbrecht, Richard H.
Erickson, Reuben E.
Erickson, William K.
Eriksson, Roger V.
Evans, Albert L.
Evans, Edwin D.
Evans, Robert C.
Evosevich, John N.
Evrard, William E.
Ewall, Thomas H.
Eyres, Thomas D.
Faddis, James W.
Fagan, Fredric G.
Farwell, Warren E.
Felter, John F.
Ferguson, David E.
Ferrazzano, Fred J.
Ferrer, Kenneth A.
Fiedler, Peter B., Jr.
Fields, William B.
Fillerup, Raymond M.
Fimian, James J.
Fitzgerald, David E.
Fitzgerald, Michael J.
Fitzwilliam, David A.
Flaherty, Robert M.
Flatley, John E.
Fletcher, John G.
Fletcher, William B., III
Foley, Paul R.
Folz, Charles E.
Forbes, Donald L.
Forsman, Arvid E.
Forsyth, James P.
Foster, Clifton G., Jr.
Foster, Frank P.
Foster, Scott R.
Foster, Thomas J.
Fox, Richard W.
Frazier, John D.
Frederick, John L.
Frentress, Bowheart "H," Jr.
Frick, Walter B.
Friddle, Frank R., Jr.
Fryberger, Elbert L., Jr.
Frye, Thomas A. W.
Fugate, Truman H.
Gadberry, Roy K.
Gadolin, Ronald
Gallotta, Albert A., Jr.
Gallup, Shelley P.
Galvin, Bernard J.
Gandy, John D.
Garcia, William V.
Gard, Gerald I., Jr.
Gardner, Bennett
Garlitz, Jerry E.
Garver, Hollis V.
Gaskill, Richard T.
Gates, Fred H., II
Gatlin, Edwin F.
Gatterman, Raymond D.
Geary, Jack E.
Gedney, George, Jr.
Gehring, Donald H.
Gentry, Osby Z., Jr.
Gentry, Timothy P.
Geronime, Eugene L.
Gherrity, Patrick F.
Gibber, Philip F.
Gideon, William C., Jr.
Gigliotti, Felix P.
Gildea, John F.
Gillham, Richard D.
Gilroy, John W., Jr.
Glasgow, Thomas A.
Gleason, Joseph P.
Glover, Albert K., Jr.
Glover, Dennis C.
Glovier, Harold A., Jr.
Glunt, David L., Jr.
Goldston, Vernon D.
Gordon, Arva F.
Gorman, Paul T.
Goschke, Erwin A.
Grahlert, Walter H.
Granger, Russell P.
Grassi, John L.
Gray, Basil F., Jr.
Gray, Charles A.
Gray, William C., Jr.
Green, Stanley E.
Greene, Charles R., Jr.
Greenlaw, William C.
Greenlee, John W.
Greer, Marvin S., Jr.
Greer, William E., III
Greisen, Bernard R.
Greiwe, William H.
Griffiths, Rodney D.
Grogan, Lee Roy
Grose, Robert H.
Grothe, Henry J.
Grouby, Edward A., Jr.
Grunwell, James G.
Guess, Malcolm N.
Gullickson, Grant G.
Gunlon, Allan R.
Gunn, Max C., Jr.
Gunter, Jack R.
Guzman, Indalecio
Hack, Arthur J., Jr.
Hageman, Roger H.
Hager, Wilbur G.
Haggard, Marion Z.
Haines, Robert S.
Hall, Charles F.
Hall, Donald L.
Hall, Howard L.
Halladay, Norman E.
Halpine, John D.
Hamel, Louis H., III
Hamelrath, Walter F.
Hamilton, Clyde E.
Hamilton, Jerry L.
Hamlin, Andrew L.
Hampton, Winfred F., Jr.
Hanegan, Ralph E.
Hankins, Elton E.
Happersett, Paul F.
Hargrave, William W., Jr.
Hargrove, John Q., III
Harlow, David L.
Harper, George T., Jr.
Harrell, Max A.
Harris, James C.
Harrison, Thomas K.
Hartley, Richard R.
Hartnagle, Eugene F.
Hartranft, Richard J.
Hatfield, Robert L.
Hatheway, Darwin L.
Havens, Stanley L.
Havicon, John W.
Hawkins, Charles W., III
Hay, James C.
Hayes, Francis X.
Hayes, James C.
Healy, James V.
Heft, James O.
Helgeson, Harry E., Jr.
Helm, George N., Jr.
Helms, Raymond E., Jr.
Hemings, Robert M., Jr.
Henderson, Nathan S., Jr.
Hendry, James D.
Henifin, Edward E.
Henriques, Joseph S.
Henson, George M.
Hernan, Peter J.
Herr, Arthur L., Jr.
Herren, Thomas C.
Herriott, Donald M.
Herzer, Oscar A.
Hessman, James D.
Heydon, Robert M.
Heyward, Irvine K., IV
Hickey, Edward J., Jr.
Hicklin, William C., III
Higdon, Marion A.
Higgins, Byron R.
Higgins, John F.
Higgins, Richard G.
Higgins, Thomas G.
Hilder, Leonard O., Jr.
Hill, Frank W.
Hill, William W.
Hinden, Stanley
Hiniker, Peter J., Jr.
Hinkle, David R.
Hiser, Francis A., Jr.
Hobbs, Allen, Jr.
Hocker, Walter B.
Hogan, Edward J., Jr.
Hogan, Thomas W., Jr.
Holland, William G.
Hollenbach, Richard G.
Hollingsworth, Robert L.
Hollingsworth, Roy M.
Hollister, Walter M.
Holloman, William D.
Holman, William C.
Holmes, James W., Jr.
Holt, Henry C., IV
Holtz, William F.
Hooley, Thomas J.
Hooper, Benjamin F.
Hope, Edgar G., Jr.
Hope, Herbert A., Jr.
Hopkins, Earl E.
Hopper, Thomas M.
Horn, Charles E.
Horner, John, Jr.
Horowitz, Charles L.
Horton, Robert L.
Hoskins, Bill J.
Howatt, Gerald J.
Howell, Franklin M.
Howell, Roswell L.
Howells, David A.
Hoyt, Richard L.
Hryskanich, Paul L.
Hubbard, Clifford R., Jr.
Huber, John J., Jr.
Hudgins, Thomas B.
Huffer, Maurice W.
Huffman, William L., Jr.
Hughes, George A.
Huisman, Roland K.
Hull, Fred A.
Hullryde, Donald
Hume, Kenneth E.
Humphrey, Morris L.
Hunter, Charles B.
Hunter, William G.
Hunter, William J.
Hurt, Jonathan S.
Hussey, Clifton M.
Hussey, William T.
Huttinger, Theodore
Hyde, Deloss C.
Ike, Robert C.
Ireland, Blair
Jahns, Arthur W.
James, Joe L., Jr.
Jauregui, Stephen, Jr.
Jellison, Robert K.
Jensen, Clifford V.
Jermstad, Robert J., Jr.
Jobe, Gordon A.
Jobe, James E.
Johns, Arthur J.
Johnson, Alfred C.
Johnson, David E.
Johnson, Harlie
Johnson, Robert E.
Johnson, Wesley A.
Johnson, William J., Jr.
Johnston, Fox H.
Joiner, Francis A.
Jolliff, James V.
Jones, Arthur L., Jr.
Jones, Carroll S.
Jones, Jerry D.
Jones, Robert H.
Jones, Robert F., Jr.
Jones, William O.
Jongewaard, Larry L.
Jordan, Stephen W.
Joy, James A.
Juergens, John G.
Jurkowski, Joseph A.
Kaiser, Dean E.
Kaiser, Gilbert J.
Kane, Michael G.
Kavanagh, Robert G.
Keating, John D.
Keele, Wayne, Jr.
Keeling, Gailen L.
Keely, LeRoy B.
Keener, John I.
Kehoe, Thomas J., Jr.
Keith, Clyde R.
Keith, Harold S.
Keller, Samuel F., Jr.
Kellogg, Edward S., III
Kelly, Richmond K., Jr.
Kiddle, Bradley D.
Killebrew, Carl W.
Kilty, Lawrence R.
Kimbrough, Harold S.
King, Donald E.
King, Edward L.
King, James E.
King, John E., Jr.
King, Richard B.
King, Wilbert A.
Kingsley, Stephen S.
Kinley, Frederic H. M.
Kinne, Loren H.
Kinney, Eugene P.
Kirbey, Russell W.
Kirkpatrick Hollis H.
Kirtley, Daniel J.
Kleffel, Walter H.
Kline, Arlington N.
Kneisl, John F.
Knepler, James L.
Knerr, Donald O.
Knies, George C., Jr.
Knight, Cecil P.
Knight, Eugene T.
Koci, Vaclav H.
Kohoutek, James G.
Kollmorgen, Frederick J.
Kopacka, William F.
Kowalskey, Zygmont J.
Kracha, John K.
Krahn, Chris
Kramer, Robert B.
Kratt, William J.
Kraus, Walter S.
Krigbaum, Kevin
Krikorian, Edwin G.
Krisciunas, John P.
Krisman, Frank A.
Kruger, David S.
Krumwiede, Jerold L.
Kube, Cleo J.
Kuffel, Robert W.
Kujawski, Theodore D.
Kuklinski, Steve T.
Kurth, Donald A.
Kurth, Ronald J.
LaBarre, Richard E.
Lacefield, Joe V.
Lambert, Walker W.
Lamore, James F.
Land, Elwood, W., Jr.
Lane, Robert E.
Lane, William J.
Langford, George R.
Langford, George M.
Langner, David S.
Langrind, Roy G.
Lannon, Francis W.
Larson, Ralph S.
Law, Vincent G.
Lawler, Frederick W.
Lawson, Thomas J.
Learned, Charles W., Jr.
Lee, Earl C.
Leenerts, Rolland E.
Legett, Thomas R.
Lehto, Robert K.
Leitner, LoRayne A.
Lemen, Ura B.
Leonhardi, Roger L.
Leslie, Richard
Levin, Burt L.
Lewis, David E.
Lewis, Jesse W., Jr.
Lewis, Martin E.
Lewis, Willis I., Jr.
Lietzan, Ernest W., Jr.
Limroth, David F.
Lina, Robert A.
Lindsay, Thomas L.
Link, John G.
Lissy, Ernest I.
Livingstone, Philip N.
Long, Charles L.
Lord, Waldon E.
Lott, Carl D.
Lowry, George C.
Lutz, William R.
Lyding, John F.
Lynne, Donald M.
Lyons, Philip
Mabe, James M.
MacIntyre, Donald S.
Mack, John
Mack, Chester M.
Mack, Robert E.
Maddox, Iven J.
Magee, Charles T., Jr.
Manheimer, Donald Z.
Manke, Leo O.
Mares, James A.
Margeson, Alan J.
Marriott, Jack L.
Marsh, Alvin "F"
Marsh, Barry B.
Marsha, Patrick P., Jr.
Marshall, John T., Jr.
Marshall, John T., Jr.
Marshall, Richard M., III
Martin, Charles W., Jr.
Martin, Donald F.
Martin, Edward H.
Martin, James P.
Martin, Robert T.
Martineau, Roger J.
Martini, Richard A.
Mason, Ralph S.
Mason, Ralph A., Jr.
Massey, Roger A., Jr.
Master, Carl L., Jr.
Masterson, Kieber S., Jr.
Matheny, John R.
Mathis, Harry L., II
Matthews, Paul C., Jr.
McBride, Earl P.
McBride, John B.
McBurney, Cleland V.
McCabe, Billy E.
McCaffree, Burnham C. Jr.
McCaffrey, Robert T.
McCall, Walter H.
McCarthy, Gerald D.
McClellan, Parker W.
McClenahan, Richard M.
McConnell, Cyrus, Jr.
McCoy, John J.
McCracken, John L.
McCullough, John A.
McDermott, John J.

McDevitt, Ronald F.
McElrath, Thomas W.
McElroy, Guy A.
McGill, James F.
McGown, William A., Jr.
McGurk, Robert J.
McIsaac, John M., Jr.
McKay, Robert W.
McKee, George R., Jr.
McKenna, Gerard A.
McKenzie, James A., Jr.
McKinnon, George H.
McKinster, James W.
McKnight, Kent A.
McLin, Robert D.
McMahill, Gary A.
McMahon, Thomas J.
McMillin, George W.
McMullan, James P.
McNally, Stephen P.
McNamara, William L.
McNenny, Patrick J. S.
McNulty, James F.
Melton, Arthur W.
Melville, Noel
Merkle, George W.
Merritt, Robert L.
Messinger, Marshal R.
Meyer, Donald J.
Meyer, Richard E.
Michaels, John R.
Milani, Louis F.
Millar, Ralph A., Jr.
Millen, Thomas H.
Miller, Bruce J.
Miller, Charles H., III
Miller, Glen "J"
Miller, John H.
Miller, Raleigh B., Jr.
Miller, Robert R.
Miller, Russell C.
Miller, William V., Jr.
Millman, Larry
Millner, Clayton L.
Minetti, Bernard L.
Mitchell, Donald F.
Mitchell, Lewis N., Jr.
Mobley, Arthur S.
Moebus, Louis F.
Montgomery, Kenneth
Montgomery, William J.
Montross, Robert W.
Moody, Frank L.
Mook, Joe
Moore, Bryon O.
Moore, Earle G.
Moore, Hugh A.
Moore, John R.
Moore, Milton W., Jr.
Moore, Percy J.
Moore, Robert E., III
Moore, Thomas G.
Moore, Thomas W.
Moranville, Kendall E.
Morey, Thomas J.
Morgan, Robert E.
Morris, Charles H.
Morris, William L., Jr.
Mortimer, Edward H., III
Morton, Theodore E.
Moss, Jack L.
Moye, William B., Jr.
Mudgett, Francis S.
Mullen, Richard D.
Multer, Richard P.
Mulvany, George M.
Mundt, Werner F.
Munis, John J.
Murphy, Arthur D.
Murphy, George A.
Murphy, Richard G.
Murray, Thomas F.
Musgrave, R. F.
Myers, Richard C.
Nagel, Harold A., Jr.
Nash, Owen W.
Nation, John R.
Neel, William M.
Neel, William C.
Nelles, Merice T.
Nelson, Floyd G.
Nelson, Jesse R.
Neuhauser, Daniel A.
Neville, Paul E.
Newton, John E.
Nichols, Jack H.
Nix, Walter C.
Noblit, Charles L.
Nokes, Neil M.
Nord, James R.
Nordhill, Claude
Noren, Rees E.
Nott, Edward C., Jr.
Nuss, Charles R.
Oberg, Chester R.
Oberholtzer, William E., III
O'Brien, John T.
O'Connell, William J.
Offrell, David W.
Ogilvie, Robert M.
Olander, Darrell W.
Oldmixon, William J.
Oleson, David E.
Olsen, Charles F.
Olsen, Jerome J.
Olsen, Robert M.
Olson, Richard L.
O'Malia, Robert J.
O'Neill, Norbert W.
O'Rourke, Daniel, Jr.
Orsik, Walter A.
Orsino, Leo A.
O'Shaughnessy, Robert J.
Otto, Robert O.
Owens, Robert M.
Owesney, William T.
Palau, Henry S.
Parker, Eugene H.
Parks, Richard E.
Parrish, Jon G.
Parsons, David E.
Pasztalaniec, Matthew F.
Patrick, Julian C.
Patten, Robert S.
Patterson, Lee R.
Patterson, William V.
Patton, Peter W.
Paulson, Allan G.
Pavia, Raymond F.
Payne, Dean M.
Peacock, Henry F.
Pearson, Charles A.
Pearson, George W.
Pedersen, Robert M.
Peery, William K.
Pennington, Benjamin
Perault, David J.
Perkins, Jack C.
Perkins, Joseph A., Jr.
Petersen, LeRoy E.
Petersen, Walter R.
Peterson, Alfred A.
Peterson, Malcolm C.
Peterson, Mell A., Jr.
Petit, Pierre A.
Petrie, Roland A.
Pettigrew, Joseph H.
Peugh, Dighton "W"
Pfarrer, Charles P., Jr.
Phelps, Robert L.
Philpot, Marvin L.
Phoenix, David "A"
Pickard, Dallas, Jr.
Pickell, Norman L.
Pieper, Thomas M.
Pierce, Robert K.
Pifer, Charles E.
Pine, Gordon F.
Pippin, William E.
Pitts, David T.
Platner, Fredric W.
Polini, Eugene T., Jr.
Pollack, Harold I.
Pollard, Charles E., Jr.
Polsin, Robert W.
Poore, Ralph E.
Popp, John, Jr.
Popplewell, Lewis M.
Poreda, Charles P.
Porter, George W., Jr.
Porter, Robert D.
Post, George W.
Potosnak, Joseph E.
Premo, Melvin C.
Price, Carroll R.
Price, Frank J.
Price, William J.
Prickett, Bruce L.
Priestley, Joseph R.
Primeau, Don G.
Pringle, Donald B.
Prochaska, George E.
Prosser, Rudolph J.
Pruitt, Thomas J.
Pugliano, Ralph J.
Purtell, Joseph M.
Quamme, Lyle D.
Quillin, Thomas E.
Quinn, Walter J.
Quirk, Thomas A., Jr.
Raines, Julian L.
Ralph, Richard P.
Ramos, Steve L.
Ramzy, James R.
Randle, Clinton P.
Raper, Albert D.
Rathke, Lorenzo J.
Raunig, David R.
Read, Richard R.
Reardon, John R.
Reasonover, Roger L., Jr.
Register, Marvin O.
Reid, John A.
Reid, Richard G.
Reid, Wilson G.
Reilly, Frank J. Jr.
Reinhardt, Jerry B.
Reisinger, John E.
Reiss, Charles E.
Renegar, Garland M.
Rennell, Robert J.
Reynolds, James V.
Rhoades, Roland J.
Rhodes, Thomas B.
Ribble, Lawrence, F.
Rice, Alan H.
Richard, John J.
Richards, Joseph D.
Richards, Walter E.
Richardson, Phillip D.
Richardson, William C.
Richter, Ronald P.
Richter, William J., Jr.
Riendeau, Arthur O., Jr.
Riester, John E.
Riley, Kenneth J.
Ritchie, John K.
Roberts, John W.
Roberts, Lytle C., III
Robertson, Robert R., Jr.
Robey, George R., Jr.
Robey, Robert V.
Robinson, William N.
Rockefeller, Harry C., Jr.
Roderick, Daniel W.
Rodgers, Henry C.
Rodriguez, William P.
Roe, Charles W.
Roff, Ray, Jr.
Rogers, Robert B.
Rogers, Thomas D.
Rogers, Warren F.
Roland, Gerald K.
Romaine, Howard G.
Rork, John K.
Rose, Charles B.
Ross, Charles C., Jr.
Rose, James S.
Rose, Rufus E., Jr.
Rose, William A.
Ross, Joseph E.
Rourke, Charles K.
Rowland, Charles M., Jr.
Ruggles, Kenneth W.
Rumelhart, Max R.
Rupp, Jimmie L.
Russell, Kenneth B.
Rutherford, Charles F., Jr.
Rutzler, Joseph A.
Ryan, Thomas J.
Sabol, Ernest J., Jr.
Salva, Fedor R., Jr.
Sanders, Wiley M.
Sandoval, Silvano P.
Santuae, Theodore A.
Sapp, Charles S.
Sassi, Norman M.
Sawyer, Kenneth R.
Schaadt, Douglas D.
Schafer, Edward D., Jr.
Schibel, Robert L.
Schlenzig, Robert E.
Schmidt, Don D.
Schmidt, Gilbert E.
Schnatterly, Lewis W.
Schnetzler, Estill E., Jr.
Schoeckert, Robert D.
Schoeffel, Peter V.
Schoonover, Charles D.
Schroats, Richard P.
Schultz, Eugene D.
Schuman, Martin S.
Schweitzer, Robert J.
Scott, Lawrence A.
Scott, Robert W.
Seabloom, James A.
Seacord, John M.
Sedlak, Richard K.
Seifert, James R.
Seifert, Robert J.
Seigenthaler, Thomas U.
Selby, Paul F.
Sellers, John W.
Sereno, August J.
Sesler, Ralph M.
Sewell, Robert L.
Shanaghan, John J.
Shannon, Edward R.
Shaw, Walter B., Jr.
Shearer, Oliver V., Jr.
Shearer, Thomas D.
Sheehan, Robert K.
Sheets, Jean P.
Sherrouse, James B.
Sherwood, William F.
Showchuk, William M.
Shields, Robert G.
Shimek, Paul, Jr.
Shinholser, Charles E.
Shirley, Milford E.
Shockey, George W.
Shorey, Clark W.
Shrader, Ebert F.
Shropshire, Edwin D., Jr.
Shuey, Robert L.
Shughrou, John J., Jr.
Shumaker, Lawrence A.
Shuman, Edwin A., III
Simmons, Reginald C.
Simon, Douglas M.
Sinwell, Raymond J.
Sisson, Thomas U., Jr.
Siverly, Paul L.
Skarlatos, Paul
Skelton, Stuart A.
Skillen, Robert L.
Skolnick, Alfred
Slattery, Francis A.
Slawson, Paul S.
Slyfield, Frederick J.
Smidt, Robert L.
Smiley, Charles B.
Smith, Albert L.
Smith, Brian W.
Smith, Chester R.
Smith, David G.
Smith, Donald E.
Smith, Edward R.
Smith, Irvin L.
Smith, Leighton D.
Smith, Stewart C.
Smythe, Robert E.
Snider, Lloyd H.
Snow, George M.
Snyder, Edward C., Jr.
Snyder, Herman L., Jr.
Soczek, William
Soderholm, Richard C.
Soldwedel, Eugene L.
Soltys, Mitchel S.
Sonniksen, Ronald G.
Sorenson, Curtis A.
Southwick, Charles E.
Southworth, John V., Jr.
Spargo, Richard A.
Spaulding, Ralph L.
Speelman, Thomas W.
Speirer, Paul E., Jr.
Spencer, Russell E.
Spiegler, Felix R.
Spohnholtz, James R.
Sprague, Maurice, Jr.
Springston, William A.
Spurrier, William W.
Stallworth, Lewis A., III
Stamm, Ernest A.
Starcher, Charles W., Jr.
Staton, John C.
Stearns, Russell E.
Steel, Charles E.
Steele, Francis X.
Steele, James C.
Steele, Ted C., Jr.
Stelter, Frederick C., III
Stephens, Wayne L.
Stephenson, Morris H., Jr.
Sterling, Kenneth L.
Stevens, Duncan P.
Stevens, Edward G., Jr.
Stevens, Harold F.
Stevenson, Lee Roy J.
Stevenson, Donald W.
Stewart, George R.
Stich, John D.
Stickling, William R.
Stilwell, Charles H., Jr.
Stoffel, Michael J.
Stoner, Thomas M.
Storck, Bernard F.
Storms, James G., III
Stovall, John C.
Strachan, John
Strong, Benjamin R.
Stroop, Paul D., Jr.
Sturm, Gerald M., Jr.
Sullivan, Russell, J.
Sutherland, Terence B.
Sutherland, William P.
Sweeney, John H., III
Sweet, Harry J.
Switzer, Anton R.
Swor, Jerry G.
Szpara, Thaddeus J.
Tabler, Benjamin E.
Taipale, Richard G.
Tall, Charles H., III
Tanner, Charles N.
Tanner, John P.
Tate, John F.
Tate, Charles E.
Taylor, Arthur C.
Taylor, Charles C.
Taylor, Don W.
Taylor, Timothy C.
Templeman, William E.
Terry, Edgar R.
Teuscher, John J.
Thalman, Robert H.
Thole, Charles P.
Thomas, George R.
Thompson, Richard L.
Thornton, Ray O.
Thudium, Wayne E.
Thunman, Nils R.
Thweatt, Freddie J.
Tibbetts, Herbert E.
Timm, Alvin R.
Tinkler, David R.
Tips, David S.
Tisdale, Albin A.
Tise, Donald G.
Tolg, Robert G., Jr.
Tom, Joseph
Tomenendal, Robert J.
Tomlinson, Alva C.
Tondora, Joseph E.
Tracy, George W., II
Treagy, Paul E., Jr.
Treat, Richard A.
Trenham, Herbert D.
Trevors, George A.
Trone, Dennis R.
Tucker, Eli L., Jr.
Tucker, Thomas A.
Turner, Ralph A., Jr.
Tuttle, George S.
Uelman, William C.
Ulmer, Donald M.
Ulrich, Charles H.
VanAntwerp, Richard D.
VanDyke, Willard H., Jr.
Varbedian, Alexander A., Jr.
Vatidis, Christopher R.
Vaughan, Evan J., Jr.
Vaughan, John L., Jr.
Vench, Everett K., Jr.
Vellom, Lee S.
Verich, Demetrio A.
Vogelberger, Peter J., Jr.
Vohden, Raymond A.
Walker, Charles
Walker, Jack O.
Walker, William R.
Wall, Richard H.
Wallace, Dallas L.
Wallace, James D., Jr.
Wallace, Richard M.
Walsh, Don
Walsh, Harvey T., Jr.
Walsh, Joseph A., Jr.
Walters, Floyd K.
Ward, Hugh W., Jr.
Watkins, David P.
Watkins, Howard B., Jr.
Watson, Robert M.
Watson, Thomas C., Jr.
Watson, Thomas P.
Webb, Haven N.
Weitz, Paul J., Jr.
Welborn, William P.
Welcome, Allan T.
Wells, John E.
Wells, Peter M.
Wells, Richard W.
Welsch, John W.
Welsh, Vincent P.
Wensman, Linus B.
Werness, Maurice H.
Wessel, James E.
West, Denton W.
West, William E.
Weston, Gustav R.
Wetrich, Charles R.
Wetzel, Weslie W.
Whaley, Daniel E., Jr.
Wheat, Billy V.
Wheeler, Charles G.
Whitaker, James E.
White, Charles E.

White, Donald J.
White, William A.
Whittier, James F.
Wight, Roy R.
Wildman, John B.
Wiley, James F.
Wilfert, Eugene N.
Williford, Donald M.
Williams, Bobby J.
Williams, Edward O.
Williams, Ronel J. D.
Willis, Arthur A., Jr.
Willis, James S., Jr.
Willmeroth, Earl R.
Wilson, David G.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wiltse, Irving M.
Winkowski, John R.
Wirt, Robert O.
Wisdom, Robert W.
Wise, James E., Jr.
Wisniewski, Sylvester S.
Witkowski, Charles C.
Wood, Fred L.
Wood, Hal D.
Wood, Leon G., Jr.
Wood, Noel T.
Wood, Ralph D.
Woodcock, Henry P., Jr.
Wooden, Bruce J.
Woodward, John L.
Woollard, Edwin F.
Wright, James R.
Wyckoff, Peter B.
Yarger, Luther D.
Yarwood, John O.
Yenowine, George H.
Young, Harold L.
Young, Paul F.
Youngblood, Newton C.
Zable, Joseph J.
Zelones, Vincent L.
Zettle, Harold
Zick, Richard A.
Zidbeck, William E.
Zinn, Jack W.
Zook, Richard M.
Zuilkoski, Ronald R.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Bonds, May K.
Kitchen, Etta B.
Sanders, Viola B.
Twining, Geraldine F.

SUPPPLY CORPS

Ashton, Isabelle G.
Hagopian, Bessie

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Cranmore, Doris

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bosier, Ruth M.
*Jackson, Helen C.
Lewis, Muriel J.
Thompson, Eleanor A.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Blessing, Marabelle
Burchard, Joanne C.
Clarke, Marjorie N.
Collins, Mary A.
Comer, Patricia A.
Cowling, Marvel I.
Daniel, Clara L.
Denton, Nancy L.
Eubanks, Martha A.
Forsey, Frances F.
Gerhart, Mary A.
Gilbert, Marguerite J.
Hartington, Pauline M.
Hearne, Nancy L.
Hilyard, Effie J.
Horgan, Janet E.
Kearney, Carolyn E.
Lambert, Mary A.
Mackie, Joan G.
McSweeney, Joan E.
Milford, Dolores A.
Mogge, Marjorie H.
Nash, Phyllis A.
Quigley, Robin L. C.
Smith, Cecily J.
Vradenburg, Joanne P.
Wilson, Lois J.
Wood, Joan M.
Young, Sue E.

The following-named line officer of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Gardner, Pat M.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

*Maher, Robert W.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

*Maguire, Connell J.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, George J., Jr.
Arnheiter, Marcus A.
Clare, James S.
Dawley, John W.
Connelly, Robert B.
King, Everett D.
Logner, Robert L.
Replogle, Thomas H.
Rodda, John D.
Swain, Roland H., Jr.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant:

*Edwards, Howard R., Jr.
*Norris, Lowry W.

*Arthur J. Carpenter, United States Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and the temporary grade of lieutenant.

*Matthew J. Ott, United States Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

*David M. Connor, Jr., Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

(*) Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

*Beeman, Theodore F.
*Meyerhoff, Wilbur F.
*Gallagher, Frank E., Jr.
*Smart, Henry J.
*Wismer, Ralph M.
*Dooley, George E.
*Mickey, Ross S.
*Owens, Robert G., Jr.
*Ahern, Thomas J.
*Marshall, David E.
*Gilliam, William M.
*White, John A.
*Larsen, Carl V.
*Waters, George F., Jr.
*Moss, Richard I.
*Thompson, Eugene N.
*Stevens, John W., II
*Oelrich, Martin E. W.
*Gray, Joseph A.
*Rooney, John T.
*King, Louis N.
*Platt, Jonas M.
*Appleyard, James O.
*Holomon, Walter
*Drake, Clifford B.
*Baker, Charles R.
*Armstrong, Robert H.
*Robinson, Wallace H., Jr.
*Lawton, Crawford B.
*Hooper, Marshall J.
*Riche, Hulon H.
*Bell, James O.
*Johnston, Paul T.
*Bergren, Orville V.
*Cornnell, Walter F.
*Wilson, Elliott
*Kelly, Bernard T.
*Kolb, Karl W.
*Cortelyou, Stoddard G.
*Souder, William H., Jr.
*Gomez, Andre D.
*Kantner, George B.
*Smoak, Tolson A.
*Pregnall, Daniel S.
*Oddy, Robert J.
*Banning, Virgil W.
*Wyczawski, Richard W.
*Nihart, Franklin B.
*York, Howard A.
*Finn, Edward V.
*Crockett, Winsor V., Jr.
*Croizat, Victor J.
*Fusan, Ernest C.
*Warren, Charles E.
*Batterton, Roy J., Jr.
*Anderson, Earl E.
*Taplett, Robert D.
*Humphreys, Wilson F.
*Harwick, Victor J.
*Hitt, Wade H.
*Houser, Robert H.
*Peters, Tillman N.
*Barnum, Allen T.
*Merchant, Robert A., Jr.
Benson, Alexander R.
Jones, John H.
Martin, Marlin C., Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Sheppard, Frank C.
*Luckel, Raymond L.
*Gagner, Harvey W.
*Beatty, Leonard I.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Roebuck, Albert M.
*Trammell, Paul C.
*Card, Edson W.
*Horton, Stephen, Jr.
*Kiehle, Fred E., Jr.
*Garraty, Raymond F., Jr.
*Gross, Leo V. R.
*Porter, William D.
*Ryder, Bertram S.
*Anderson, George
*McClean, Robert E.
*McCarthy, Edward R.
*Goss, Gerald E.
*Wood, Thomas B.
*Hogan, Francis C.
*Kirby-Smith, Ephraim
*Harte, Franklin J.
*Brenneman, Richard A.
*Bradley, Gilbert D.
*Krippner, Robert M.
*White, William K.
*Vaughan, William P.
*Stewart, Clyde S.
*Hazlett, Wesley W.
*Green, Wiley A.
*Nollet, Anthony R.
*Dalby, Marion C.
*Cosgriff, John E.
*Horner, Theodore J.
*Ervin, Robert M.
*Nicholson, Dennis D., Jr.
*Aufmann, Richard N.
*Westmoreland, William T., Jr.
*Mulroney, Peter J.
*Walker, Charles E.
*Greene, Thomas N.
*Jones, Jack R.
*Earl, Quentin V.
*Rudenauer, Francis X.
*Willis, Lloyd L.
*Ing, Herbert E., Jr.
*Heier, William D.
*DeLong, Phillip C.
*Harper, Edwin A.
*Reber, John J.
*MacLean, William G., Jr.
*Lewis, Ralph H.
*Hughes, Frederick E.
*Coffey, John F.
*Fry, William F.
*Mesko, John
Castagna, Anthony J.
*Einum, James R.
*Averill, Gerald P.
*Souplos, Alfred V.
*McCreery, Russell E.
*Sherbondy, Arthur L.
*Faser, Karl E.
*Bennett, Ernest C.
*Haffey, Eugene H.
*Keagy, Lowell T.
Sedgwick, Robert R.
Shapiro, Vernon W.
McMullen, Francis A.
Shelly, Kermit H.
Gehri, Donald J.
Bonner, Joel E., Jr.
Nuess, Robert H.
Phillips, William T.
Barker, Edward L.
Smith, Nathan R.
Breen, Richard R.
Olson, Virgil D.
Reed, Godfrey H.
Knapp, Raymond E., Jr.
Mitchell, Robert H.
Hurst, Thomas C.
Parran, Thomas, Jr.
Lengel, Dwain L.
Salvaggio, Marshall
Hilliard, Robert C.
Johnston, Oscar B.
Noel, Paul A., Jr.
Rickabaugh, David D.
Horne, Thomas M.
Maeger, Henry G.
McClure, Grover C., Jr.
Bowers, Marion B.
Schnettler, Edward L.
Hunter, Ovis D.
Skorich, John
Merrick, Herbert R., Jr.
Wortman, Harry D.
Hedahl, Everet A.
Stauffer, James E.
Cole, Glenn O.
MacNeil, John A.
Fisher, Don H.
Brewster, David A., Sr.
Hill, Harold S.
Penn, Lloyd S.
Matheson, Bruce J.
McCaleb, Edwin H., III
Walley, James M.
Scherer, John H.
Hanthorn, Jack E.
Cervell, Joseph G.
James, Albert E.
Fuss, Paul
Shute, James J.
Padalino, Mauro J.

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Knox, Dorothy M.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Sasser, Ruthledge S.
*Darnell, James B.
*Montrief, Alfred E.
*Assad, Albert J.
*McGuire, James L.
*Knack, Frederick J.
*Ford, Thomas F.
*Ratcliffe, Estes N.
*Blue, Daniel M., Jr.
*Shuman, William H.
*McKain, George E.
*Laubach, Richard C.
*King, Homer
*Lisi, Frank
*Amos, Raymond L.
*Mathis, George M.
*McComas, Glenn E.
*Glass, Hollis W.
*Murphy, Louis A., Jr.
*Folsom, Allison G., Jr.
*Protz, Albert L.
*Caminiti, Louis J.
*Valentour, James V.
*Wahrer, Maurice S.
*Howard, Frank L.
*Rubin, Norman
*Howard, William H.
*Stamps, Clyde H.
*Zlamal, Albert J.
*Stallknecht, Edward S.
Keenan, Lawrence W.
*Anderson, Everett L.
*Yezierski, Peter P.
Fiander, William A.
Henderson, Richard F.
Leach, Robert D.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Zorack, John L.
*Lenffer, Guenther W.
*Durning, Robert H.
*Cohoon, Jack A.
*Rice, Kenneth E.
*Hill, Robert E.
*Brixey, Perry T.
*Davis, Ernest K.
*Carper, Esten C., Jr.
*Uffelman, Paul R.
*Vosmik, Joseph M.
*Chiappetti, Donald A.
*Brady, Byron F.
*Marousek, Lawrence A.

*Allen, Robert L.
*Jackson, John M.
*Mooney, Arthur R.
*Caridakis, George
*Eykyn, Richard G.
*Marlowe, William H.
*Gardner, Marvin D.
*Cummings, Brian J.
*Stiles, Charles R.
*Cowling, David R.
*Carter, Ray N.
*Purdum, Frederick K.
*Masterpool, William J.
*Coyne, Richard J.
*Blank, Howard G.
*Thomson, Robert P.
*Erickson, Loren T.
Shinka, Michael J.
*Young, James R.
*Post, Robert J.
*Smith, Robert N.
Hess, John J.
*Worster, Lyle H.
*DuCharm, Roy M.
*Bush, Clayton O.
Marks, Billy C.
Damm, Raymond C.
Cashion, Dana B.
Howland, Willis T.
Arkadis, Nicholas D.
VanCleve, Roy R.
Clifton, William R.
Murphy, Edward S.
Roeder, Raymond E., Jr.
Johnson, Richard M.
Hopkins, Frederick W.
Sivert, Patrick G.
Hittinger, Francis R., Jr.
Smith, Edward E.
Garm, Philip J.
Trapnell, Nicholas M., Jr.
Deptula, Edwin A.
Thompson, Carl B., Jr.
Swords, John J.
Roosen, Paul J. G.
McCloskey, Donald V.
Sullivan, Ralph E.
Wells, Richard P.
Paradis, Eugene J.
Newson, Rollie D.
Hudson, Floyd G.
Counselman, John D.
Christolos, John N.
O'Keefe, Keith
Robbins, Jack W.
Edler, William S.
Harrell, James E.
Kavakich, Nicholas
Rudzis, Edwin M.
Stemple, James W.
Snelling, Edward W.
Moore, Ben A., Jr.
Muir, Joseph E.
Ruggiero, Alexander S.
Schryver, Hugh C., Jr.
Gastrock, Joseph K., III
Crocker, William G.
Hanlon, Edmund W.
Stewart, Gerald H.
Morrow, Richard C.
McAlee, George E.
Kleess, George J.
Fields, Paul R.
Covert, Bert R., Jr.
O'Connell, James P.
Sigmon, Emmett B., Jr.
Brimmer, Donald R.
Marchette, Donald E.
Sharon, Donald W.
Jones, Donald R.
Stuart, Vaughn R.
Cahill, John J. H.
Gallman, James R., Jr.
Phelps, Laurence M., Jr.
Alderman, Harry L.
Werner, Robert F.
Fly, Jerry D.
Wirth, Leroy K.
Dickey, Robert R., III
Collins, Edward E.
Brown, Travis D.
Kenyon, Joris P.
Nolan, Jack L.
Carey, Richard E.
Hall, Edward C., Jr.
Sisson, Donald D.
Coffman, Harold L.
Utter, Leon N.
McPoland, Edmund C.
King, Ethwer W.
Aitken, Hugh S.
Adams, Nate L., II
Scott, Kenneth M.
Doezema, Richard M.
Reames, John A.
Pollock, Edwin A., Jr.
Risinger, Robert O.
Duncan, Edward F.
Starek, Robert H.
Morris, Edward C.

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Carville, Elaine T.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Blake, Leonard F.
*Seal, Cecil O.
*Marshall, Henry R., III
*Scott, Joseph W., Jr.
*Draper, William W.
*Sobol, Harold
*Minor, Lewis D.
*Catallo, Merico L.
*Reddick, Dorris A., Jr.
*Hedin, John A.
Sandy, Allen D.
*Douglass, William E.
*DeFazio, Ernest L.
*Dugan, John W.
Stone, James E.
*Cignotti, Louis J.
*Stark, Clifford M.
Hardee, Lee H.
*Hardin, Harley S.
*Matthews, Jeter R., Jr.
*Sawyer, Harold L.
*Herndon, Gerald G.
Weatherspoon, James A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Barnett, Gordon P.
Elliott, John M.
*Manchester, Leslie D.
Washington, Harold M.
*Spiers, Homer F.
*Wells, Glenn T.
*Nilsen, Donald A.
*Mason, Floyd S., Jr.
Eckenfels, Gerald T.
*Block, Robert E.
*Arnold, John L.
*Harrington, James A.
*Ames, Carl S.
*Corbet, Jimmy A.
*Elder, Wilbur M.
*Delaney, James J.
*Dutton, Frank W.
Floyd, Joseph C.
*Olsen, Robert A.
*Keagle, Byron W.
*Frisbie, Clark W.
*Wescott, William J.
*Sims, Tony L.
*Metas, John G.
*Ashley, William C.
*Sommerville, Herbert C.
*Diller, Jack K.
*Bratt, Eugene J.
*Kennedy, Raymond G.
Lovullo, Joseph A.
*Hudson, Russell I.
*White, Jean P.
Capinas, Donald J.
*Jones, Jack D.
*McMillan, William W., Jr.
*Hawkins, Harold E.
*Jacobsen, Hans W., Jr.
*Sexton, William G.
*Ison, Leo F.
*Varian, Homer A., Jr.
*Naze, Allen F.
*Morgan, William H.
*Turner, Charles F.
*Rappe, J. C.
Keene, Gerald A.
*Lutes, George W., Jr.
*Doudna, Thornton E.
*Miller, Robert H.
Backus, Edward E.
McDonough, John F.
*Meyers, John F.
*Hamby, Ronald L.
*Eggleston, Joseph N.
*Bierhaalder, Dirk C.
*Nelson, Delbert L.
*Saucier, Frederick W.
Ledbetter, Archibald C.
*Hardacker, Nelson S., Jr.
*Fauver, Ronald E.
*Walton, Theodore C.
*Cook, Marcus H.
*Sottile, Louis T.
Coffin, Charles T.
*Cordiel, James B.
*Shovar, John F.
*Snodgrass, Clyde R.
*Kneale, Charles R.
Joyce, Danna
*Cornsh, Chester L.
*Campbell, William S.
*Doublet, Alvin J.
*Johnson, Herschel L., Jr.
*Walters, Raymond D.
*Himmer, Donald R.
*Bradberry, Joe E.
*Resnik, Edward D.
*Fancher, Clifton C.
*Wiley, Teddy R.
*Welch, Homer L.
*Clark, James E.
*Black, John G.
*Rishel, Austin C.
*Clark, Bobby E.
*Jordan, Thomas E.
*Reilly, Joseph H.
*Wahlstrom, Donald H.
*Eppley, Arthur
*Dolan, Russell E.
*Bond, David T.
Ritter, Otto W.
Baldwin, Harry J., Jr.
McClellan, William O., Jr.
*Nielsen, William J.
*Meek, Earl C.
*Hennessy, John A.
*Adams, Sammy T.
*Doub, Jay A.
Barron, Thurston B., Jr.
Gambrel, James E.
*Duncan, Billy R.
Walker, Allen R.
*Malone, Gordon E.
*Cronk, Robert A.
*McConnell, Warren M.
Thompson, Gerald E.
*Simmons, Jack A.
*Louder, Joseph J.
*Fisher, Ronald F.
*Lyles, James H.
*Stargel, Louis R.
*Hook, Robert A.
*Young, Norman L.
*Jeffreys, Gilbert V.
*Bond, Royce L.
*Arquiette, John B.
*Cope, John P.
*Cadwell, Robert A.
*Hastings, Paul F.
*Kuhn, Harold F.
*Subowsty, Edward B.
*Gajewski, Francis J.
*Kiraly, George, Jr.
*Zuck, Walter S.
*Black, James O.
*Light, William H., Jr.
*Bryant, Thomas M.
*Chapman, Edward J.
*Moeller, Alwin L., Jr.
*Irons, Milton E.
*Hout, Robert G.
Wager, Charles P.
*Higginbotham, Charles W.
*Marques, Prestin P., Jr.
*Evans, Donald C.
*Brooks, Stephen J.
*Purcilly, Joseph C., Jr.
*Weiland, Gerald A.
*Radabaugh, Harold V.
*Koppenhaver, Howard M.
*Klein, Robert D.
*Thurber, William M.
Marren, Martin J., Jr.
*Breslauer, Charles K.
Brewer, Clyde W., Jr.
*Turley, Gerald H.
*Fatherree, Bobby D.
*Gerding, Edward E.
*Verdon, Donald J.
*Jarnot, Fidelis W.
*Strickland, George E.
*Perkins, John T., Jr.
*Koleber, Leroy E.
*Evans, Richard L.
*Sparks, John A.
*Cole, Joe M.
*Reagan, Kenneth H.
*Hunter, Bobby G.
*Cantieny, John B.
Cox, Donald L., Jr.
*Thomas, Donald N.
*Hoxie, Robert F.
*Julian, Martin D.
*Holzinger, Bernard E.
*Finney, Robert B.
*Ryhanych, George W.
*Warholak, Michael E., Jr.
*Du Pont, James A.
*Wiese, James J.
*Johnson, Robert A.
*Baker, Gerald F.
*Brindell, Charles R.
*Harman, Donnie N.
*Palmer, Charles B.
*Rauch, Karl A.
*Erickson, Eldon L.
*Palic, Eugene
*Ryan, James, Jr.
*Powers, William T.
*Austin, Harold M., Jr.
*Christlieb, Beryl T.
*Croll, Robert M.
Justice, Harold E.
*Swenson, Louis S.
*Paige, Fred E., Jr.
*Etnyre, William R.
*Cook, Edward C.
*Smith, Clarence L.
*Scott, Robert P.
Dunn, Walter F.
*Friberg, James W.
*Bomgardner, George I.
Cowper, Thomas J.
*Jerabek, Milton H.
*Carter, Denton
*Parand, Carl A.
*Rahill, James W.
*Dixon, John C.
*St. Clair, Fred W.
*Thompson, David F.
*Bray, Richard P.
Des Jardines, Lawrence J.
*Pullin, Millard E.
*Hines, Jack D.
*Cronk, Robert R.
*Gimple, Walter L.
*Schroeder, John W.
*Geyer, George W., Jr.
*Bent, Russell F.
*Huckle, Richard A.
*Bottorff, Harry J.
*Monfort, Robert A.
*Lugger, Marvin H.
*Carruthers, Robert E.
*Harp, James J.
*Glasgow, Harold G.
*Daake, Duane L.
*Cawthon, Walter C., Jr.
*Fites, Malcolm V.
*Pishock, Stephen J.
*Studt, John C.
*Hatch, Richard L.
*VanSant, Frederick N.
*Garrett, Donald J.
*Duck, John E.
Helsher, Paul M.
*Maxwell, Hurdle L.
*Tighe, Paul J.
*Kehoe, James P.
*Eckert, John F., Jr.
*Shuttleworth, James E.
*Wonhof, Alan E.
*Warren, Frank R.
*Montague, James H.
*Seiler, David P.
*Fritschi, George W.
*Smith, Bernard B., Jr.
*Owen, Billy M.
*Piamondon, Robert A.
*Henry, Clark G.
*Young, Dale R.
*Daly, Daniel C.
*Hauck, Walter R.
*Tayntor, Charles E.
*Gradl, Herbert M.
*Miller, John H.
*Healsen, Arvid W.
Coffin, James H.
*Mann, Bennie H., Jr.
O'Brien, Charles H.
Harvey, Donald L.
*Dunbaugh, Charles R.
*Statzer, Merlin V.
*Krause, Albert C.
*Hutchinson, Robert N.
*Walker, Joe G., Jr.
*Smilanich, William E., Jr.
*Rhine, Wesley E.
*Murphy, Donald L.
*Weybright, Walter E.
*Drennan, Lawrence T., Jr.
Smith, Kenneth L.
*Gragan, David E.
*Dickey, David K.
*Thompson, Robert B.
*Sails, Carroll E.
*Horne, Ivan F.
*Poitevent, Walter O.
*Reesman, Clifford J.
*Jones, Robert D.
*Fridell, John R.
*Koelper, Donald E.
*Guay, Robert P.
*Fisher, Farris C.
*Calder, James D.
*Conrado, James S., Jr.
*Soliliday, Robert E.
*Needham, Michael J.
*Reilly, Donald J.
*Courtney, Richard G.
*Folck, Chester A.
*Murphy, Paul V.
*Danielson, Donald C.
*Raines, Thomas E.
*Liddle, Chester A., Jr.
*Conners, William L.
*Parish, Lowell W.
*Kelly, John F. J.
*Slack, Gerald J.
*Mann, John W.
*Rainbolt, Richard E.
*Beal, Don D.
*Clark, Fred E., Jr.
*Ratcliff, Percy D.
*Dutton, Thomas A.
*Barton, Willis W., Jr.
*Holt, Ralph P.
*MacDonald, Herman A., Jr.
*Wahlfeld, Howard W.
*Dockstader, Richard W.
*Bell, George N.
*Sanford, Herbert C.
Media, James W.
*Frisbie, H. Reed, Jr.
*McElheny, Ralph A.
*Smigay, Daniel B.
*Stitt, Charles L.
*Perez, Richard
Rapp, John M.
*Cooke, Richard M.
*Fennell, Patrick J., Jr.
*Wagner, David H.
*Daley, John J., Jr.
*Hammel, Charles F.
*Hieber, George A.
*Jacobs, Merrill M.
*St. Amour, Paul A. A.
*Duff, John C.
*Hendricks, Robert G., Jr.
*Fritalen, James W.
*Pagano, Vincent B
*Morris, Loyd E., Jr.
Gallagher, John H.
*Nelson, Robert C.
*Murray, Francis R.
Page, James D.
*McGahan, James F.
*Porrey, Wilmer H.
*Porter, George A.
*Treble, Charles
*Morgan, Donald C.
*Rueckel, Frederick A.
*Clatworthy, John
*Whalen, Robert P.
*Cavallo, Louis J.
*Bartlett, Stephen W.
*McAdams, Donald J.
*Pitchford, Charles F.
*Davidson, Darrell U.
*Sayce, Donald H.
*Twining, David S.
*Craig, Winchell M., Jr
*Rowlands, Cledwyn P.

*Ray, Billy W.
*Campbell, John W.
*Christy, Robert A.
*Eagan, Arthur J.
*Landers, James H., Jr.
*Caudill, Curtis E.
*Percy, Stephen
Layne, Donald Q.
*Wells, Ullie C.
*Jones, Robert W. G.
*Smith, Joseph N.
*Blair, John H.
*Balius, David H.
*Conlin, John C.
*Burke, Edward J.
*Simpson, Thomas H.
*Leftwich, William G., Jr.
*Johnson, Clifford H.
*Truesdale, Bruce A.
*Ferrington, George B., Jr.
*Comfort, Clayton L.
Watson, Leroy E.
*Hearn, Thomas M.
Wiltsie, Russell E.
*Stephens, Ray A.
*Hoch, Louis A., Jr.
*Smith, Kenneth E.
*Williams, Robert G.
*Pollard, Jack G.
*Delcuze, Godfrey S.
Baker, Clarence M.
*Bradley, William C.
*Heering, David P.
Coyle, Thomas J.
*Lee, Richard J., Jr.
*Clark, Bernard E.
*Sinclair, John E.
*Green, Gordon G., Jr.
*Boyd, Frank M.
*Cain, Thomas L.
Branson, William B.
*Rovegno, Donald C.
*Sulik, Richard A.
*Sullivan, William M.
*Hutchins, Walter P.
*Madden, Byron E.
*Greer, Roger W.
*Bowen, James T.
*Darron, Robert R.
*McKenney, Tom C.
*Kennedy, Thomas L.
*Adams, John M., Jr.
Spurlock, David A.
Savoy, Ernest R.
*Salzman, Frederick P., Jr.
*Keimling, Herbert S., Jr.
*Broderick, Richard S.
*Nelson, Ronald E.
Smith, Craig S.
*Hils, Donald W.
*Nugent, Thomas F. E.
*Steck, Louis J.
Cockey, John M.
*Greene, John W.
*Houston, Stanley S.
*Smith, Haywood R.
*Haskins, Francis W.
*Ayers, Thomas J.
*Prebihalo, Robert G.
*Foster, Richard M.
*Pitcher, Bert R., Jr.
*Miller, William S., Jr.
*Starnes, Cullen G., Jr.
*Jenks, Harry E., II
*Christensen, Don R.
Starr, Donald I.
*Ringler, Jack K.
*Brown, Guy L.
*Muhlig, John R., Jr.
*Platea, Anthony P., Jr.
*Pate, Gerald S.
*Ganey, Thomas P.
*O'Toole, John L.
*Slack, Thomas W.
*Burgess, Horace W.
*Blair, Richard R.
*Bloom, Allan H.
*Johnson, Mannon A., Jr.
*Thompson, Robert H.
*Boyd, Daniel Z.
*Pfeifle, Richard C.
Smith, John H.
*Cook, Walter T.
*Haviland, Harold D.
*Tyksinski, William A.
*Eaton, Carl G.
*Maas, Bertram A.
*Tiede, Herbert R.
*Bujan, Charles D.
*Selby, Donald P.
*Poindexter, John E.
*Vibberts, John L.
*Martin, Robert W., Jr.
*Swinney, James T.
*Marts, Austin M.
Lawrence, Rodney O.
*Hillyard, Gordon L.
*Dresely, John W.
*Rivard, Ronald I.
*MacDonald, Robert E.
*Jaksina, Stanley C.
Lockard, Edwin W.
*White, Robert D.
Sullivan, William J.
Jacobson, Douglas T.
*Dininger, Charles F., Jr.
*Hansen, Gunnar O.
*Deem, Richard G.
*Andersen, Andrew E., Jr.
Roe, John M., Jr.
Simpson, William A.
Allen, Thomas H., Jr.
*Andersen, Ernest J.
Bany, John B., Jr.
*Murphy, Leo P.
McDonald, Daniel V.
Teague, Charles E.
McCreight, Jack D.
Stultz, Raymond D., Jr.
Dorffeld, Charles E.
Eitel, Robert J.
Eleazer, William R.
Stanton, Thomas P.
Hyatt, John K., Jr.
Andersen, Eugene W.
Ryan, Philip J.
Coffey, William F.
Walling, Robert P.
Burk, Thomas K., Jr.
Simpson, Donald R.
Zimolzak, Frank
Peterson, Bob K.
Durham, John A., Jr.
Strain, Donald H.
Kilmer, Erich V. N.
Malovich, Arthur D.
Newman, Buel B., Jr.
Bird, Neale E.
McDermott, Arthur T.
Wolcott, Frank B., III
Rojo, Manuel, Jr.
Morris, Clark S.
Binney, Douglas C.
Duphiney, Randall W.
Alm, Richard A.
Emmons, Charles D.
Wood, Charles D.
Chace, Frank C., Jr.
Lippold, Orville V., Jr.
Litzenberger, Earle D.
Glidden, Thomas T.
Hamilton, John A.
Manhard, Albert H., Jr.
Kraynak, John P.
Cahill, John J.
Hower, Raymond R.
Alves, Edward R., Jr.
Dumont, Thomas J.
Walker, James H.
Sullivan, Thomas L.
Brandon, Francis X.
Goodin, James C.
Stoffelen, Peter L.
Turner, Robert C.
Paro, Eugene E., Jr.
Yelek, Don L.
O'Neill, John E.
Stiffler, Charles R.
Breckenridge, Floyd S., Jr.
Leisy, Robert R.
Martin, Richard L.
Orr, Arnold J.
Sears, Walter E., Jr.
Goodall, Robert L.
Eversole, Carl J.
Lunsford, William T.
Palmer, Richard L.
Nyland, William T.
Palmer, Robert P.
Eddy, James R.
Williams, Frank P., Jr.
D'Arco, Anthony J.
Mitchell, Frank H., Jr.
Beauchamp, Glen T.
Limbach, Walter R.
West, Frank K., Jr.
O'Connell, Patrick J.
Egger, Charles H. F.
Vidano, Albert J.
Crews, Duane D., Jr.
Brooks, Thomas D.
Kneussl, James K., Jr.
Mayer, Donald F.
Parsons, Francis M.
Franklin, Quentin I.
Sheahan, Robert R.
Viers, Willard G., Jr.
Sherlock, John, Jr.
Jarman, Lewis W.
Darby, Donald W., Jr.
Connolly, James J.
Dunn, Hollis T.
Leavitt, Edward J.
Shauer, Walter H., Jr.
Rogers, Lane
Chaney, Earl D., Jr.
Zimmerman, Eugene H.
Patterson, Richard E.
Merrill, Will A.
Flanagan, John H.
House, William E., Jr.
Somers, Allen H.
Palmer, Kenneth P.
Wyatt, Willard J.
Snead, Douglas L.
Bladergroen, Charles H.
Jones, Robert T.
Alber, John W.
McMonagle, James J.
Carpenter, Donald R.
Kittler, Simon J.
Lono, Luther A.
Ogden, Bruce P.
Donovan, Orval E.
Vandersluis, Jan P.
Bitner, Daniel S.
Fowler, William H., Jr.
Walker, John B., Jr.
Bright, Ray E., Jr.
Skipper, Kenneth J.
Thatcher, John L.
Costello, Thomas L.
Gallagher, Edward W.
Brower, Joseph P.
Pickett, Rex L.
Standish, Cameron
Hunter, Earl R.
Herron, David G.
Foster, David L.
Chester, John W., Jr.
Salter, Martin E., Jr.
Waters, George J.
Elam, David L.
Wood, Donald E.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Reinhols, Ruth F.
Ritter, Anne S.
Calhoun, Gussie R.
Bane, Mary E.
Brewer, Margaret A.
O'Holleran, Ruth J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abel, Gerald G.
Acey, John B.
Adams, Donald R.
Adams, John A.
Adkins, James M.
Adkins, Mars M.
Albert, Karl V.
Altick, Philip L.
Ambrose, Harry T.
Anderson, James E.
Anderson, James D.
Arman, Phillip T.
Armstrong, Joseph E.
Arney, Harold E., Jr.
Arnold, William P.
Austin, Henry E., Jr.
Avera, B. Lewis, Jr.
Bahler, Richard C.
Bailey, George N., Jr.
Bailey, Richard A.
Bair, Harry H.
Baker, Raymond C., Jr.
Ball, Herbert S.
Ball, William R.
Bambic, Eugene A.
Barfield, Douglas B.
Barra, Alfred P.
Barry, John A.
Bateson, Levi G.
Battaglia, David L.
Baublitz, Kenneth E.
Baughman, Robert C.
Beatty, John T.
Becker, Harry J., Jr.
Beeman, Charles A.
Beers, Thomas G.
Berry, Richard L.
Bennett, David R.
Benning, Robert M.
Benson, James H.
Bergey, Hugh W.
Bergman, Arthur A.
Berwald, Herbert T., Jr.
Bieger, Donald C.
Binkley, Peter D.
Bjorke, John W.
Black, Carl E. R.
Blalock, Ira, Jr.
Blanchard, Ronald E.
Bloomer, William A.
Boddy, Howard E.
Boemerman, George F.
Boone, William
Bowers, Donald V.
Boyd, Robert M., Jr.
Bradley, Robert L.
Brent, Joseph E., Jr.
Brinegar, Frank E.
Brown, Allen W., Jr.
Brown, Boyd R.
Brown, Donald P.
Brown, Earl E.
Brown, Leonard K.
Browne, Desmond F.
Brubaker, Ralph E.
Bruce, Frank H., Jr.
Bustamante, Miguel E., Jr.
Buxton, John S. W.
Byrne, William P.
Cady, Michael P.
Caldas, John J., Jr.
Caldwell, Robert C.
Cameron, Gordon B.
Cameron, Robert S., Jr.
Camper, Richard M.
Capka, Joseph R.
Capwell, George L., Jr.
Cardwell, Ronald E.
Carll, Randall C.
Carr, Arthur B., Jr.
Carr, Donald S.
Carr, Richard W.
Cassidy, Gerald W.
Celli, John G.
Chmelik, James J.
Christy, Howard A.
Cisewski, Richard J.
Clark, Don C.
Clark, Edward A.
Clarkson, Edward J.
Clauretie, David M.
Clemente, Philip E.
Cleveland, Robert E.
Clifford, Watson S.
Clute, Morrel G.
Coffey, Kenneth J.
Coffin, John C.
Colassard, Barry S.
Cole, Jack L.
Coleman, George F.
Collins, Josiah W.
Collins, Garrett L.
Condrey, Richard M.
Cooper, James L.
Cornthwaite, Arthur B., Jr.
Courson, Eugene S.
Cowart, James G., Jr.
Cox, James M.
Crampton, Ervin J.
Cranford, James O.
Crawford, John D.
Crevier, Robert E.
Crittenden, Jerry J. S.
Cummings, Robert C.
Curnutt, John R.
Curry, Kenneth D., Jr.
Cuthbert, Edward W.
Cwayna, Michael B.
Day, Lawrence E.
Daye, Burley A.
DeWitt, John W.
Doll, William O.
Doran, Edwin J.
Doyle, Edward F., Jr.
Driscoll, Rudolph W.
Ducoff, Donald
Dunevant, Rupert W.
Dunn, David J.
Durrett, Jack P.
Dye, Thomas W.
Edson, Herbert R.
Edwards, Myrddyn E.
Edwards, Cecil A., Jr.
Egertson, Randall E.
Ellerts, Bernard T.
Eller, Franklin P., Jr.
Elvig, John F.
Emberton, Bruce W.
Emery, Gordon P.
Engle, Charles K.
Esterline, Charles S.
Evans, William T.
Ewbank, Donald D.
Fahle, John J.
Ferguson, Edgar R.
Ficere, William G., Jr.
Fischer, Robert L.
Fisher, Albert T.
Fisher, Wilfred S.
Fiske, Terry N.
Fohl, Alan J.
Foley, William M.
Foote, William L.
Forehand, Lorraine L., Jr.
Foreman, Clarence D.
Foster, Harry V.
Fox, Kenneth F., Jr.
Frandsen, Jerald L.
Franklin, Donald H.
Frazier, Charles H., Jr.
Freeman, Bobby H.
Freeman, Robert A.
French, Russell W.
Frengel, William N.
Friederich, Eugene R.
Gaboury, Laurence R.
Gaffney, Jack A.
Gahagan, James S.
Galliart, Robert A.
Gamble, Grigsby V.
Gannon, Dominick R.
Garrett, William R.
Gary, John H., III
Gash, William J.
Geraghty, Gerald W., Jr.
Giles, Russell H.
Gleichauf, John G.
Goins, Bobby F.
Golden, Patrick P.
Gonzalez, John C.
Graeff, Edward W.
Grant, Robert D.
Gray, John T.
Green, James R.
Greene, Wallace M., III
Gregorcyk, Joe L.
Griffin, James T.
Grimes, Billy M.
Grissom, Esta D.
Groppe, Arthur K.
Guttormson, Darold L.
Hadfield, Michael J.
Hall, Donald A.
Halliden, Richard C.
Hansen, Billy M.
Hanson, Carl A.
Harding, James H., Jr.
Harrell, James T., III
Hatch, Donald J.
Hawkins, Joseph T.
Hawthorne, Richard W.
Hayes, Charles H.
Hazen, Joseph W.
Hearn, James D.
Heister, Theodore A.
Helms, Samuel H.
Henrich, Robert R.
Henry, Charles A.
Henson, Edwin B., Jr.
Herron, James M.
Hill, Donald P.
Hill, Robert E.
Hoag, John A.
Hohman, Richard B.
Holdridge, George L.
Honse, John H., III
Horn, Denis R.
Hotz, George E.
Houder, Charles H., Jr.
Howard, Thomas E.
Huss, Marvin A., Jr.
Hutchinson, Franklin G., Jr.
Hyatt, Richard C.
Ijams, Karl F.
Ivy, Henry C., Jr.
Jacks, Glenn G.
Jackson, Arthur M.
Jacobs, Frank C.
Janis, Robert V.
Jazwinski, Vincent T.
Jeter, David L.
Johnston, Carl B.
Jones, George E.
Jorgenson, Jack D.
Kahler, Billy J.
Kandra, Michael D.
Kaup, Jack V.
Keith, William F.
Keller, Thomas E.
Kelly, Francis J.

Kelly, John I.
Kerlin, William T.
Kerr, Hugh T.
Kettering, Alvah J.
King, Robert D.
Kirby, Patrick G.
Kirkhoff, Charles J.
Klinglesmith, Ronald W.
Knuebel, Kenneth P.
Koehn, John E.
Kraxberger, Billy D.
Kronkosky, Preston C.
Lafser, Raymond C.
LaMar James A.
Lange, Donald J.
Lapham, Thomas J.
LaRosa, Herbert S.
Lary, Ralph L., Jr.
Leach, George H.
Leahy, Albert D., Jr.
LeBrun, Robert A.
Lewis, Ernest P., Jr.
Little, Richard G.
Lockie, John E.
Lowrey, Bill G.
Ludlow, James L.
Lynch, Charles J., III
Lynch, Robert A.
MacDonald, James E., III
Macha, Benjamin E.
Mack, Jack A.
MacNulty, William K., Jr.
Madden, Donald P.
Maher, Richard L.
Maitland, Peter R.
Mallett, James J.
Manning, Robert W., Jr.
Marion, John E.
Markello, Charles A.
Marks, Roy M.
Martin, James E., Jr.
Martin, Ronald C.
Martino, Frank W.
Mason, Donald G.
Mason, Robert B.
Masters, James E.
Matuska, Richard J.
McAfee, Carlos K.
McCarty, James A.
McClintock, John H., Jr.
McCormick, John S.
McCormick, Jaren K.
McCoy, William O.
McDonald, Charles J., Jr.
McElroy, Howard M.
McFarland, Thomas G., Jr.
McGarvey, James M.
McInroe, Jimmy B.
McManaway, James L.
McMurer, Lawrence V.
McNelis, James F.
Mickley, Thomas B.
Miller, Donald R.
Miller, Henry G., Jr.
Miller, Paul W.
Miller, Robert C.
Mills, Harry L.
Milone, Donald E.
Monahan, John P.
Moore, Ralph E.
Moore, Robert H.
Morra, John A.
Morris, John B.
Morris, McLendon G.
Murch, David H.
Murrah, Alfred P., Jr.
Murray, John D.
Murty, James B.
Muss, Joshua A.
Nelson, Jack P.
Newton, Hartl W.
Nichols, John T.
Njos, Raymond A.
Norred, Caldwell V., III
Novak, Alan R.
Nulty, William H.
Nussel, Arthur H.
Oaks, Charles W.
Odom, David L.
Ohly, Robert G.
Oldham, John S.
Olin, Enos S.
Oliver, John P.
O'Neal, Robert P.
Onofrey, Richard E.
Onslow, Robert C.
Overcash, Bobbie G.
Owings, George E.
Owlett, Fred
Paden, John W.
Parker, Charles E.
Patton, Hal V., Jr.
Patton, Ray V.
Pauley, Donald C.
Perkins, Donald W.
Perron, Edward R.
Perryman, James M., Jr.
Peterson, George E.
Phifer, David W.
Phillips, John M.
Pifel, Bruce A.
Pike, Frank J., Jr.
Pine, Lloyd A.
Pittelko, Harvey P.
Plant, Robert
Pokorny, Robert A.
Poland, James A.
Porter, Russel W.
Prescott, Sherwood F., Jr.
Price, Robert O.
Raney, Thomas O.
Rapp, John T.
Rasmussen, Niles
Read, William T.
Reap, Thomas S.
Reveal, Stephen L.
Rice, David
Ridgely, Reginald H., III
Roberts, John W.
Roberts, Stanton H., Jr.
Robertson, Richard S.
Roddey, James C.
Rodecker, Robert E.
Rogers, John A., II
Rogers, Marcus B.
Rollings, Charles D., Jr.
Roos, John P.
Ross, Richard D.
Rountree, Julian H., Jr.
Royston, Wade H., Jr.
Ruda, Rudolf A.
Russell, Donald J.
Russell, Travis M.
Rust, Barry P.
Samford, Thomas D.
Sanders, Alber L.
Sanders, Richard P.
Sappenfield, Dale S.
Sasko, George M., Jr.
Scanlan, Francis V.
Scarborough, Kenneth L.
Schafer, John B.
Schappa, Joseph F.
Schilhab, Eugene E.
Schneider, Lawrence A.
Schrader, William C.
Schulken, James E.
Schuyler, John A.
Scolforo, Leo J., Jr.
Scott, Roger F., Jr.
Searles, Paul D.
Sebring, John A.
Seeley, Devon C.
Sentous, John L.
Shea, William S.
Sheehan, James F.
Shelton, Jerry L.
Shepherd, Alvah R.
Sheridan, John J.
Shildneck, James E.
Shockley, Gordon E.
Shoemaker, Franklin R.
Shoemaker, James M., Jr.
Shohfi, Albert E., Jr.
Shriver, George M., III
Shubert, James D.
Shunkey, William P., Jr.
Silva, Lionel V.
Sime, Colben K., Jr.
Slack, Paul D.
Slattery, William P.
Smiriga, Stephen R.
Solazzo, Vito M.
Solomon, Robert E.
Sparks, Donald R.
Staggs, Roy W.
Stahler, Richard M.
Steffey, Richard G.
Stevenson, Craig H.
Stewart, Arthur L., Jr.
Stewart, James T. Jr.
Stoy, Charles H.
Strand, Gordon D.
Stuckey, Robert D.
Sudduth, Donald E.
Sullivan, Patrick A.
Sullivan, Jimmy S.
Swift, James N.
Symm, Bernace M.
Symonds, Williston B.
Taylor, Charles H., Jr.
Terhorst, Bernard R.
Thomas, George A., Jr.
Thomas, William E., Jr.
Tolleson, Frederic L.
Toner, John G.
Torbett, John E.
Townsend, David C.
Trimble, Stephen A.
Trundle, Donald R.
Tunget, Everett L.
Tye, Charles
Tyler, John T.
Ullom, Thomas H.
Ultsch, Harold E.
Underhill, Walter S.
Utter, Robert A.
Vail, Alfred L.
Valentini, Mario S.
Valentine, Harry C., Jr.
VanBuren, Hildebert, IV
VanHemert, Willem
Vanous, Fredric J.
VanSickle, Andrew R.
VonHarten, William R.
Vosmik, George L.
Vreeland, Norman H.
Walker, Ralph V., Jr.
Way, John D.
Weaver, Calvin G.
Webb, Bruce D.
Weir, Robert K.
Wenrick, Robert C.
Whatley, John T.
Wheeler, Thomas M.
White, Francis V., Jr.
White, Richard C.
Whitley, Billy L.
Whitman, Fred T.
Whittemore, Edward P.
Widener, William W.
Wiedemann, Robert J.
Wieler, Eric H.
Williams, Charles P.
Williams, Robert H.
Wilson, Dwayne E. T.
Wilson, Milner B., III
Wilson, Peter B.
Wilson, Thomas E.
Winberg, James M.
Withian, Louis M.
Wright, James R.
Yager, Milan K.
Yeckel, Donald G.
York, Richard E.
Yost, Lawrence H.
Young, David L.
Zimmerman, Karl A., II
Zoubek, Henry J., Jr.

Berry, Fred H., Jr.
Boemerman, George F.
Elliott, Philip L.
Holmes, Lyell H.
Jones, Homer P.
Koch, John R.
Lapinski, Paul P.
Nalle, Thomas A., Jr.
Nelbach, Arthur A.
Ondrako, Stephen, Jr.
Pafford, Billy E.
Piper, William
Pratt, George E.
Throgmorton, James R.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first liuetenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Olds, Dorothy A.
Colmer, Patricia A.
Gifford, Shirley J.
Kuttel, Louise E.
Pinney, Claire A.
Twilley, Patsy A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Allen, Earl R.
Allworth, Norman D.
Altman, James L.
Amidon, Alton L.
Angus, Thomas P.
Arnold, Roy F.
Augustine, Charles A.
Babbin, Robert R.
Baer, John H.
Baker, Owen C.
Bancroft, Robert E.
Barney, Kline P., Jr.
Barutio, William H.
Bateman, Kent C.
Bates, William S.
Batson, Herman D.
Baulch, Ernest F.
Beans, James D.
Beaty, William D.
*Beeunas, Lawrence F.
Bell, Francis W.
Binns, Donald R.
Black, Frank R.
Black, Robert M.
Blaul, Daniel J.
Bond, William H., Jr.
Borland, Joseph P.
Boulton, Jerry D.
Brennan, Gene E.
Brooks, Robert P.
Brown, Donald G.
Brown, Gordon R.
Browne, Randolph M., III
Brownlee, Gordon D.
Buckley, Edward A.
Bullard, Donald E.
Burch, Gene P.
Burchard, Jerome C.
Burnes, Alan J.
Byrnes, Joseph B.
Canova, James H.
Carmack, Joe E.
Carpenter, Charles L., Jr.
Cerasoli, James R.
Chandler, James R. F.
Chelius, Carl R.
Chenault, Richard F.
Chess, Richard B., Jr.
Chwatek, Walter T.
Cisewski, Fred L.
Clapp, Wiley M., Jr.
Clark, Gordon N.
Clark, John W.
Clark, Richard W.
Coakley, Paul F.
Cobb, Jere B.
Cockell, Robert C.
Conaty, Donald B.
Cooper, John C., Jr.
Corr, Edwin G.
Corr, Ethelbert L., Jr.
Corrigan, Francis M.
Craig, Eric W. S.
Crouch, Logan A.
Currey, Stanley R.
Davis, Robert D.
Davison, Hollis E.
Dobrowolski, William D.
Doman, Tom R.
Doyle, Cyril W.
*Drake, James R.
Duggan, Donovan F.
Dunn, John L.
Duval, Robert C.
Easley, Jon T.
Eddins, James C.
Edwards, Charles S.
*Elardo, Frank P., Jr.
Ellison, George V.
English, John P.
Ernst, Edward H.
Evans, Emory S.
Farber, James F.
Fassler, Gerald D.
Faust, Frank B., Jr.
Fiel, Mervin A.
Firnstahl, Vernon E.
Fitzgerald, Stanley G.
Flattery, Paul C.
Flynn, John P.
Ford, Hadley C., Jr.
Fowler, John W.
Frank, George R., Jr.
*Fraser, James H.
Fredricksen, Ronald A.
Fuller, Irving L., Jr.
Futrell, John W., Jr.
Gale, George A.
Garcia, Robert E.
Gardner, George L.
Gatliff, James I.
Gerber, Frederic H.
*Germagian, Barker P.
German, Richard T.
Getchell, James A.
Gillette, Robert W.
Goddard, Charles D.
Golletz, Victor H.
Goodwin, William L.
Gore, Orrin R.
Gore, Gordon D.
Gorham, Bradford
Gould, Walter D.
Graham, Otis L., Jr.
Graves, Dean W.
Grosch, Glenn R.
Gullett, Charles H.
Gustafson, Richard A.
Hahn, Paul A.
Haldi, Donald A.
Hall, Donald D.
Hamel, William S.
Hammond, George L.
Harrison, Kenneth P.
Hart, Richard T.
Hatcher, William J., Jr.
Haven, Thomas W.
Haverkamp, Robert E.
Heiden, Charles H.
Hicks, Donald L.
Hines, David R.
Hoff, Robert M.
Hoffman, Marvin E.
Hollabaugh, Jon D.
Hooper, Robert C., Jr.
Hornback, Bert G.
House, David W.
Huff, Emmett S., Jr.
Hunt, Richard V.
Ingels, Larry T.
Inglisa, Angelo M.
James, Robert L.
Jensen, Robert G.
Jensen, Redmond R.
Jessup, William B.
Johansen, Peter J.
Johnson, Richard R.
Johnson, Edward T., Jr.
Jones, Duncan H.
Jones, Allan E.
Jones, Richard O.
Joy, Jim R.
Junger, Frank
Jurecka, James R.
Kahn, Paul F.
*Katen, Arthur C.
Kauffman, Francis M.
Keeney, Robert
Kellett, Morris C.
Kelly, Michael J.
Kiene, Christian F.
Kindig, Jerry L.
Kirchner, John A.
Kline, Franklin J.
Kozischek, Donald A.
Kreppein, Donald U.
Kristoff, Basil L.
Kruthers, James M.
Lawrence, Robert L.
Lawson, Charles S.
Layer, Robert W.
Lecky, Timothy B.
Leighton, David J.
Lessard, Paul F.
Lilla, John M.
Linford, Claude M.
Linnemann, John A.
Lipper, A. Michael
Lloyd, Charles F.
Long, Howard L.
Long, Basil M.
Lovejoy, Hugh M.
Lowe, Thomas F.
Lucas, Robert G.
Lutes, William R.
Mabry, David R.
Machenberg, Donald E.
Mackie, Carter G.
Maguire, James F., Jr.
Manzo, Joseph V.
Marada, Joseph P.
Mardick, Max L.
Marsh, John O.
Martin, Donald D.
Mason, Benjamin J.
May, Jacob T.
McGinn, James A.
McIlhenny, John B.
McIntyre, David S.
McLennan, Charles C.
McMahon, Bernard
McManus, John F.
McMillan, Colin R.
McSweeney, Harold R.
McTighe, Michael J.
Meador, James G.
Merritt, Richard O.
Mikulecky, Donald C.
Miller, John G.
Mixson, Joseph G.
Monteith, Joseph W., Jr.
Moore, Wilbur N., Jr.
Morgan, Louis L.
Mullally, Daniel E., Jr.
Mundy, Carl E., Jr.
Murray, Ronald L.

Murray, William R.
Napheys, Benjamin F., III
Nelson, Harold M.
Neumann, Peter F.
Newton, John S.
Norton, James C.
Oates, Richard H.
O'Brien, Paul M., Jr.
O'Donnell, John W.
Olf, Nelson M.
Olin, Charles H.
Orr, James W.
Orth, Allan J.
Osterman, Joseph V., Jr.
Parrish, Lionel J.
Patterson, Roy A., Jr.
Peavey, John T.
Peterson, Jerry D.
Peterson, William P.
Pikel, John J., Jr.
Piper, Earl S., Jr.
Pollock, John C.
Price, Allen I., Jr.
Putnam, Samuel G., Jr.
Pyne, Richard S.
Ramzel, David R.
Reams, Radford M., III
Redding, William P., Jr.
Revell, Joseph E.
Ridge, Paul E.
Ritchie, Robert D.
Robertson, James Y.
Robillard, George N., Jr.
Rodenbach, William J.
Rogers, Jack J.
Rogers, Robert P.
Roush, Paul E.
Royer, James E., Jr.
Ruck, Thomas L.
Rushin, Robert K.
Rutherford, Robert E.
Samsonoff, Ivan K. T.
Samuelsen, Conrad J.
Sanderford, James H.
Sargent, Richard H.
Sattolo, Arthur J.
Schuppe, Robert H.
Searby, Frederick W.
Senik, John P.
Shepard, Robert B., Jr.
Sheppard, Thomas P.
Silhanek, David K.
Simmons, Roger E.
Sindelar, Robert L.
Sistrunk, Francis
Smalley, David P.
Smart, Robert H.
Smeltzer, Gareth W.
Smiley, James B.
Smith, Stanley L.
Snyder, Brock R.
Sorenson, Dwight T.
Spivey, Lloyd G., Jr.
Squillace, Gaetano P.
Stephens, Carl M.
Stevens, Robert C.
Stowe, Edward L.
Strausser, Warren J.
Streitman, Henry W., III
Stringer, Anthony R.
Stubin, Charles S.
Sullivan, John C.
Sullivan, William L.
Swartwood, Robert E., Jr.
Swift, Richard P.
Tebbe, Carl G., Jr.
Thelen, John P.
Thomas, Carl R.
Tirschfield, William J.
Tivnan, John M.
Townsend, Bruce E.
Toxie, Paul G.
*Trapp, Earl G.
Treadwell, Russell P.
Tricca, Chester J.
Trippe, Samuel M.
Trower, William P.
Vazquez, Pedro R.
Vogt, John S.
Von Carp, Hermann E. F., Jr.
Waggener, Ronald W.
*Waite, Haines D.
Warren, George F.
Waterbury, Mark H., III
Webb, Richard J.
Wells, Samuel F., Jr.
Wells, Harry E.
Wells, Richard C.
Westmoreland, James H.
White, Edward A.
Williams, Larry R.
Williamson, Charles P.
Williams, Benjamin D., III
Williams, Morris M.
Wilson, Douglas N.
Windham, Aden D.
Wittmann, Philip A., Jr.
Woodbridge, Benjamin H., Jr.
Wright, David H.
Wuerch, George P.
Wulff, Fred A., III
Castin, Ray F.
Cate, Bradley .
Johnston, Gordon R.
Martin, David R.
Philon, Robert H.
Schroeder, Clifford
Sheridan, Michael K.
Drake, Clancy G.
Bruce, Robert C.
Raiselis, Donald R.
Irwin, William R.
Fairbanks, Edward J.
Ram, Cornelius H.
Sellers, Wiley J.
Hankin, Ronald M.
Shearer, William L.
Airola, John B.
Dahlquist, Martin J.
Ohman, James H.

William C. Kepple for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4, in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Harrington, Howard W.
*Sweet, Granville G.
Dodds, William H.
West, Wilbur E.
Tate, Albert L.
Hansen, Sigmund P., Jr.
Jorgensen, Eric I.
Sullivan, Vincent C.
Smith, Calhoun
Mitchell, Thomas R.
Leath, James G.
McCormick, Charles A., Jr.
McDaniel, John H.
Holliday, John H.
Addis, William J.
Carcelli, Thomas
Nix, Grover H., Jr.
Engemann, Ralph A.
Levan, Richard W.
Bushwitz, Henry W.
Richmond, James C.
Kasch, Lewis C.
Ross, Ferdinand J., Jr.
Wilkinson, Deronda A.
Ritchie, George W.
Saucier, William A.
Jones, Herschel B.
Lisicky, Joseph F.
Chambers, Alton B.
Graves, Frank E.
Day, Francis L.
McKonly, Norman E.
Dero, Joseph C.
Rhoads, Earl F.
Spencer, Justin A.
Kerr, John, Jr.
Yeater, Otto L.
Marquette, Jacob H.
Orr, James H.
Whitney, Robert L.
VanLiew, Willard J.
Smith, Hugh L.
Shea, Paul E.
Eaton, Byron A.
Wester, Willard K.
Stiles, Hugh A.
LeRoy, Howard P.
Jones, Robert W.
Blakslee, Robert R.
Kilduff, Carroll E.
Craig, Clarence C.
Schwinn, David K.
Jordan, Howard V.
Hall, Lowell N.
Monagle, Edward J.
Rudd, Howard A.
Post, Raymond A.
Tate, James D.
Spears, Hugh S.
Link, John F.
Grattan, Edward V.
Hendricks, Leo, II
Warner, Charles N.
Wall, Warren G.
Fellows, Lawrence E.
Reville, John T.
Butler, Arthur S.
Spencer, George D.
Robinette, James A.
Dement, Loomis L.
Gregory, Virgil C.
Cairns, Melburn W.
Marohn, Howard E. K.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Hays, George C.
Hornstein, Joseph
Potter, William T.
Seymour, Edgar F.
Ray, Clifton H.
Murphy, Robert L.
Hebert, Leonard S.
Martin, Fenton A.
Agro, Joseph V.
Booker, Dewey P., Jr.
Johnson, Emil D.
Matz, Emil G.
Farris, John L.
Schroeder, Warren F.
Massey, Roger A.
Johnson, James E.
Carr, Edward E.
Madden, Benjamin O.
Lowe, Alfred C.
Trowbridge, John E.
Schmidt, Earl G.
Sayre, Oscar D., Jr.
Butler, Robert E.
Kincaid, John E.
Blough, Clinton D.
Jakobson, Bert A.
Shelton, Jackson G., Jr.
Lampi, Edwin H.
Mowery, Oscar R., Jr.
Dunn, Edwin P.
Ailes, John F.
Parker, George H.
Poudevigne, Pierre
Bailey, Oliver W., Jr.
Stein, Max
Scroggins, Frederick D.
Anaszewicz, Edward A.
Bricker, Robert D.
Scharlach, Edward A.
Divine, Paul W.
Kirkland, William C.
Hoffmann, Leo O.
Hofmann, Charles E.
Twomey, Leslie T., Jr.
Wallace, Donald M.
Tedesco, George M.
Eisenhauer, George W., Jr.
Gill, William J.
Coleman, John D.
Hetman, Walter
Buccieri, George J.
Drewyor, Joseph A.
O'Callaghan, Daniel M., Jr.
Miller, Edward H.
Jennings, Thomas C.
Conant, Robert M.
Kazmerzak, Ervin L.
Bland, Charles L.
Brouillard, Albert J.
Dye, John W.
Boreleau, John, Jr.
Connolly, John J.
Tinsley, John E.
Rima, Russell R.
Smith, Archie L.
Hayes, Glen M.
Rhynard, Leslie
Wadginski, Kenneth F.
Witkoski, John A.
Hunter, Robert D.
Lott, Wilmer J.
Rust, Edward S.
Mort, Lotus T.
Elkins, James L.
Williams, Fowler S.
Buck, Clarence J.
Vick, William L.
Keck, Irving L.
Beebe, Jack C.
Fogle, Ralph T.
Chrisman, Addison L., III
Bookhardt, Henry A.
Sandlin, Milton M.
Brown, George W.
Baird, Maynard K., Jr.
Vismont, Joseph V.
Williams, David C.
Givens, Williams M.
Teichmann, Edward
DeCaro, Gabriel J.
McLendon, Jesse N., Jr.
Brown, William M., Jr.
Fawcett, James L.
Smith, Pierce H., Jr.
Griffin, Clair E.
Bayer, Robert, Jr.
Dancey, Robert W.
Peacock, Hubert W.
Parrington, Arthur C.
Rhine, Karl W.
Bowers, Clarence A.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

* Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, United States Marine Corps, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general for a period of 2 years from the first day of January 1958.

*Gen. Ray A. Robinson, United States Marine Corps, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of lieutenant general.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, *Lt. Gen. Robert E. Hogaboom, United States Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while so serving.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while so serving:

*Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy.

*Vice Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving:

*Vice Adm. Byron H. Hanlon, United States Navy.

*Vice Adm. Ralph E. Wilson, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. John Sylvester, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. Herbert D. Riley, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Vice Adm. Roscoe F. Good, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of vice admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Edmund W. Morton, S. J., president, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash., offered the following prayer:

Direct, we beseech Thee, O Lord, the thoughts and judgments of these, the lawmakers of our land. Grant them the courage to accept the grave responsibility which has been laid upon their shoulders by the people of this country. May they, with wisdom, deliberate the issues which confront them, and with justice, make their decisions for the common good of our citizens. Teach all of us this lesson, that when You created men endowed with freedom You put into our own hands the power to shape our destiny. Humbly we beg Thee to assist us in the use of this awesome power which we possess.

I am sure at this time that the Members of this House will join with me in an expression of condolence to the family of one of the Members of this House who recently was taken from us. Our sympathy is theirs, and our prayers are that God will give them courage and power to bear their suffering and loss.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 9, 1958, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

JANUARY 13, 1958.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law for the Honorable ERWIN MITCHELL as a Representative-elect to the 85th Congress from the 7th Congressional District of Georgia, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Henderson Lanham, has been received from the Governor of that State, and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk, United States House of Representatives.*

## SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ERWIN MITCHELL appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—1958 BUDGET (H. DOC. NO. 266)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed, with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The budget for the fiscal year 1959 which I am transmitting with this message reflects the swiftly moving character of the time in which we live. It is clearly a time of growing opportunity as technology and science almost daily open wholly new vistas to all mankind. Yet it is also a time of growing danger. The progress of the Soviets in long-range missiles and other offensive weapons, together with their continuing rejection of a workable disarmament, compels us to increase certain of our defense activities which we have only recently expanded many fold.

We know that we are sturdy today in the many strengths that keep the peace. This budget reflects our determination to remain so in the future.

This budget reflects another determination—that of adhering to those principles of governmental and fiscal soundness that have always guided this administration—economy in expenditures, efficiency in operations, promotion of growth and stability in a free-enterprise economy, a vigorous Federal-State system, concern for human well-being, priority of national security over lesser needs, revenues adequate to cover expenditures and permit debt reduction during periods of high business activity, and revision and reduction of taxes when possible.

To meet the responsibilities imposed on us by world conditions and by the fiscal principles to which we adhere, the budget for 1959 contains recommendations to provide:

(1) An immediate increase for 1958 of $1.3 billion in spending authority for the Department of Defense, and a further increase of $2.5 billion in 1959 over 1958, to be applied principally to accelerate missile procurement, to strengthen our nuclear retaliatory power, and to spur military research and development programs;

(2) A resulting increase of $2.8 billion in estimated 1959 expenditures over 1957 for missiles, nuclear armed or powered ships, atomic energy, research and development, science and education, plus a further provision of $0.5 billion for defense purposes, if needed; in addition, authority to transfer up to $2 billion between military appropriations, in order to take prompt advantage of new developments;

(3) A decrease of $1.5 billion in 1959 expenditures below 1957 for other military arms and equipment and aircraft of declining importance, in favor of the newer weapons;

(4) Curtailments, revisions, or eliminations of certain present civil programs, and deferments of previously recommended new programs, in order to restrain nonmilitary spending in 1959 and to provide the basis for budgetary savings of several billion dollars annually within a few years;

(5) Continuation of present tax rates to help achieve a balanced budget in 1959.

I believe that this budget adequately provides for our Federal responsibilities in the year ahead.

The estimated budget totals for the current fiscal year and for the fiscal year 1959 are compared with actual results of earlier years in the following table:

*Budget totals*

[Fiscal years. In billions

| | 1956 actual | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Budget receipts | $68.1 | $71.0 | $72.4 | $74.4 |
| Budget expenditures | 66.5 | 69.4 | 72.8 | 73.9 |
| Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−) | +1.6 | +1.6 | −.4 | +.5 |
| New obligational authority | 63.2 | 70.2 | [1] 74.4 | 72.5 |

[1] Includes $6.6 billion of anticipated supplemental requests.

Defense, science, and the budget: Americans are determined to maintain our ability to deter war and to repel and decisively counter any possible attack. Today we possess military superiority over any potential aggressor or aggressors. Every American should clearly understand that the vast defense programs undertaken during the past several years have greatly advanced our military preparedness and developed and harnessed impressive new scientific achievements. We have sharply increased the numbers of scientists and engineers assigned to top priority defense programs. We have expanded many fold the expenditures for the development of missiles, both defensive and counteroffensive. We have accelerated development of advanced guidance systems, new fuels, and heat-resistant materials. We have greatly enlarged our network of warning devices and communications.

Our longer range ballistic missile development, in particular, has long had the highest national priority. The result is striking. Whereas in 1953 we spent only $1 million on these programs, we spent $1 billion in 1957 and will spend more in 1958 and still more in 1959.

Our defenses are strong today, both as a deterrent to war and for use as a crushing response to any attack. Now our concern is for the future. Certain elements of our defense program have reached the point where they can be further accelerated. I will transmit to the Congress, immediately, a supplemental appropriation request of $1.3 billion for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1958. Further increases in new obligational authority are requested for the fiscal year 1959. The recommended authority for the military functions of the Department of Defense is $39.1 billion, which is $0.6 billion more than was requested in last year's budget for 1958 and $3.8 billion more than the amount the Congress has thus far enacted for 1958. Spending for military functions of the Department of Defense in 1959 is estimated to total $39.8 billion.

The development of longer range ballistic missiles, construction of missile sites and detection systems, and other missile programs including guided missile ships will be substantially augmented. The total expenditures for missile research, development, and procurement, for guided missile ships, and for missile-related construction will be $4.3 billion in 1958 and $5.3 billion in 1959, compared with $3 billion spent in 1957, $1.7 billion in 1956, and $1.2 billion in 1955. Commencing in 1958, we will procure a number of new missiles which have been recently developed and have now become operational.

As an indispensable part of our efforts to maintain an adequate defense, the budget recommendations for 1959 call for continued contributions to the efforts of free-world nations to promote the collective defense and economic growth. The Soviet threat to freedom is far more than military power alone. Poverty and ignorance, and the despair, fear, and unrest that flow from them, have always been enemies to liberty. The Communists well know this and unceasingly exploit these factors to extend their influence and control. This Soviet economic assault on freedom is rapidly growing. Conquest by this route is no less menacing to us and other free nations than conquest by military force. We must, accordingly, vigorously advance our programs to assist other peoples in their efforts to remove poverty and ignorance. As we succeed in these

military and economic efforts, our own freedom and security are strengthened, and the prospects for peace are improved.

Scientific and research efforts throughout the Nation must be expanded. This is a task not only for the Government but also for private industry, foundations, and educational institutions. The Government, on its part, will increase its efforts in this area. Supplemental appropriations for 1958 will be requested for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the National Science Foundation, as well as the Department of Defense. For 1959, new programs to promote education in science are being recommended and basic research activities are being generally expanded.

Changes in emphasis: Total Government expenditures (1) for all procurement to equip our forces and those of our allies with weapons, ships, planes, and missiles, (2) for atomic energy, and (3) for all scientific research and education will be approximately $21.1 billion in 1958 and $21.6 billion in 1959, compared with $20.5 billion in 1957.

Within these totals for procurement and science, we have gradually but substantially changed our emphasis. This administration's continuing attention in recent years to new concepts of defense is shown by the fact that more than 75 percent of the total funds for procurement in the 1959 budget and 1958 supplemental requests is programed for new types of equipment which had not been developed in the fiscal year 1955 or were not being bought in production quantities in that year—the first full year following the Korean conflict. In 1953, missiles alone took less than 2 cents of each dollar spent for major procurement; in 1957, missiles took about 15 cents of every procurement dollar; and in 1959 will take about 24 cents.

The greatly increased firepower of modern weapons and the continuing increase in efficiency permit a further reduction in the numbers of military personnel. Procurement of older types of weapons and equipment is also being reduced. Other defense expenditures will be reduced by closing installations that are outmoded or are of limited use, and by tightening maintenance standards, procurement practices, and supply management.

Budget authorizations and expenditures: As a result of the increases in our key protection programs recommended in this budget for the current fiscal year and the coming fiscal year, total new obligational authority and budget expenditures for each of these years will be larger than in 1957—even though it is recommended that certain other programs, both defense and civil, be retarded or reduced.

Total appropriations and other forms of new obligational authority recommended for the fiscal year 1959 amount to $72.5 billion. This is $4.7 billion more than has been enacted for 1958 and $2.3 billion more than for 1957. In addition, $6.6 billion of supplemental authorizations are estimated for the current year, 1958, for the Department of Defense, Commodity Credit Corporation, Export-Import Bank, and other agencies, as summarized in table 3 of part I of this budget document.

Budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1959 are estimated to be $73.9 billion. This is $1.1 billion more than now estimated for 1958 and $4.5 billion more than in 1957.

Not all of the obligational authority enacted for a fiscal year is spent in the same year. Amounts of authority enacted in prior years but which have not yet been spent and are carried forward from one fiscal year to the next are called unexpended balances. These balances are not cash on hand, but represent authority to draw on future receipts of the Treasury in order to pay bills.

The total balances of appropriations to be carried forward at the end of the fiscal year 1959 are estimated to be $39.9 billion. Of this amount 78 percent will have been obligated; that is, already committed.

The largest part of the unexpended balances of appropriations is in the Department of Defense, reflecting the long time which necessarily elapses between the placing of orders for complex military equipment and delivery and final payment. It is estimated that $32.1 billion will be carried forward by that Department at the end of 1959, of which $24.4 billion will have been obligated.

Budget receipts: Although higher than in previous years, the current estimate of receipts for the fiscal year 1958 is somewhat smaller than earlier expectations, reflecting readjustments currently taking place in our economy following the rapid growth of the past several years. It now appears that 1958 budget receipts will not exceed $72.4 billion, although they will be well above 1957 receipts of $71 billion. A combination of increased defense expenditures and decreased receipts in the revised estimates for the current fiscal year results in an estimated budget deficit of $0.4 billion.

There are strong grounds to support my confidence that the expansion of our economy will soon be resumed, bringing higher levels of receipts with present tax rates. The acceleration of defense efforts already underway, the increasing pace of activity in a number of programs involving State and local as well as Federal expenditures, the rapid pace of technological advance and its application by American industry, the expanding needs and desires of our growing population, and Government policies designed to facilitate the resumption of growth are among the major factors that justify this confidence. While there are many uncertainties in forecasting results 18 months in advance, our best estimate at this time of budget receipts for 1959 is $74.4 billion. This would produce a balanced budget with a surplus of $0.5 billion in 1959.

With relatively minor exceptions, present tax rates have not been changed since 1954 when a program of tax reduction and reform was enacted, saving taxpayers nearly $7.5 billion annually. If the Congress follows my recommendations, I believe that we shall be able to do what is required for our defense efforts and meet the basic needs of our domestic programs without an increase in tax rates. To maintain present rates I recommend that tax rates on corporation income and certain excises, which under existing law are scheduled for reduction next July 1, be extended for another year.

We shall continue our efforts to assure that no one can avoid paying his fair share of the country's total high tax burden. Pending legislation (H. R. 8381) which was developed jointly by the Treasury Department and the House Committee on Ways and Means to remove unintended tax benefits and hardships, should be enacted with a few modifications. The Treasury Department will continue to review the operation of the tax laws and make recommendations for such additional changes as are needed to close loopholes.

There are certain technical tax revisions which will give substantial benefits to small business, with a minimum loss of revenue and with no changes in tax rates. These revisions will be set forth in the Economic Report. They are based on the work of the Cabinet Committee on Small Business.

Debt limit: A debt limitation serves as a proper reminder of the importance of operating economically in discharging the responsibilities placed by the Constitution and the statutes on the executive branch. However, the present limit of $275 billion is too restrictive in view of rising defense expenditures and of the need for more flexibility to permit efficient and economical debt management.

Therefore, I will recommend that the present limit be revised upward temporarily through the fiscal year 1959. There should be an adequate margin to take care of any unexpected developments and to give the Treasury some much-needed flexibility in conducting its financing during this coming period.

Trust funds: The total budget expenditures and receipts discussed thus far exclude funds held in trust by the Government. Budget totals are important indicators of fiscal policy and are a major determinant of changes in the public debt. However, to measure more fully the scope of all Federal Government activities and their impact on the national economy it is necessary to consider the trust funds as well as the budget funds.

In the fiscal year 1959, the expenditures of the trust funds will rise by an estimated $1.2 million, compared with an increase of only $0.2 billion in their receipts. Payments for the highway program are estimated to increase $0.6 billion to $2.5 billion and benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program will also increase $0.6 billion to $8.7 billion. These payments will help contribute to economic stability during the coming period and will also aid in the long-run growth of the economy.

*Trust funds*

[Fiscal years. In billions]

| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Trust receipts | $14.4 | $16.4 | $16.6 |
| Trust expenditures | 13.0 | 15.2 | 16.4 |
| Trust accumulations | 1.4 | 1.2 | .3 |

Receipts from and payments to the public: A consolidation of budget and trust funds which eliminates interfund payments and noncash transactions shows that the total Federal payments to the public in the fiscal year 1959 will be $1.8 billion more than in 1958. Payments in the public in 1959 will be $0.6 billion less than receipts from the public. Additional details on this consolidation are presented in special analysis A of the budget document.

*Federal Government receipts from and payments to the public*

[Fiscal years. In billions]

| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Receipts from the public | $82.1 | $85.1 | $87.3 |
| Payments to the public | 80.0 | 84.9 | 86.7 |
| Excess of receipts over payments | 2.1 | .2 | .6 |

ANALYSIS OF MAJOR PROGRAMS AND BUDGETARY ISSUES

For purposes of summarization and discussion, budget expenditures are grouped into the categories of protection, civil benefits, interest, and general government.

Expenditures for major national security and for international affairs and finance, which together make up the category of "protection," will require 64 percent of estimated total 1959 budget expenditures. The $47.1 billion estimated to be spent on protection in the fiscal year 1959 is more than in any year since 1955.

An estimated 22 percent of budget expenditures in 1959 will be for civil benefit programs. These programs are grouped under the headings: Labor and welfare; commerce and housing; veterans services and benefits; agriculture and agricultural resources; and natural resources. The estimated $16.4 billion to be spent on civil benefits in 1959 is $0.6 billion less than the comparable amount for the current year.

The estimate of 1959 expenditures for interest is $7.9 billion, the same as in 1958. Expenditures for general government will require an estimated $1.4 billion in 1959, also about the same as in 1958.

*Budget expenditures and authorizations by purpose*

[Fiscal years. In billions]

| Purpose | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Protection | $45.2 | $46.3 | $47.1 | $45.9 |
| Civil benefits | 15.1 | 17.0 | 16.4 | 16.0 |
| Interest | 7.3 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| General government | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Allowance for proposed legislation and contingencies | | .2 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Total | 69.4 | 72.8 | 73.9 | [1] 72.5 |

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $70.2 billion for 1957 and $74.4 billion for 1958.

The budget also includes estimated expenditures of $1.1 billion for the fiscal year 1959 as an allowance for proposed legislation and contingencies not included in the categories above. Within this allowance $500 million is estimated specifically for defense contingencies, $339 million is estimated for proposed pay adjustments for postal and other civilian employees not in the Department of Defense, and $300 million is for other contingencies. The cost of proposed pay adjustments for military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense is included in the estimates for that Department.

PROTECTION

Our security is an integral part of the security of the entire free world. In addition to strengthening our own defenses, we must improve the effectiveness of our partnership with our allies. This requires a greater pooling of scientific resources, a freer exchange of technological information, and closer military cooperation. Preliminary steps to accomplish these objectives were taken at the recent Paris meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This budget reflects coordinated plans for strengthening our own and allied defenses. The composition of free world forces, and the equipment with which they are provided, must be designed for the needs of an era of increasingly destructive weapons with far-reaching range. Our Government's research and development will be generally expanded with particular emphasis on developing and improving missiles both for defensive and for counteroffensive purposes.

An effective system of military security requires closer economic cooperation through trade, investment, loans, and technical assistance with nations throughout the free world so that they can develop their resources and raise their living standards. To the degree that this economic cooperation strengthens the internal stability and ability of those nations to preserve their independence, the cause of a just and lasting peace will be advanced.

*Protection, including collective security*

[Fiscal years. In billions]

| Function | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Major national security programs | $44.4 | $44.9 | $45.8 | $44.3 |
| International affairs and finance | .8 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.6 |
| Total | 45.2 | 46.3 | 47.1 | 45.9 |

MAJOR NATIONAL SECURITY

New obligational authority recommended for major national security programs for 1959 is $44.3 billion, compared to $41.0 billion estimated for 1958 and $41.3 billion enacted for 1957.

*Major national security*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | New obligational authority | | | Budget expenditures | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate |
| Department of Defense—Military Functions: | | | | | | |
| Direction and coordination of defense | $15 | $26 | $356 | $14 | $21 | $215 |
| Army: | | | | | | |
| Present programs | 7,672 | 7,694 | 8,532 | 9,063 | 8,043 | 8,063 |
| Proposed legislation: | | | | | | |
| Military pay adjustment | | | 184 | | | 182 |
| Military construction | | | 320 | | | 35 |
| Navy: | | | | | | |
| Present programs | 10,220 | 10,469 | 10,284 | 10,398 | 10,640 | 10,724 |
| Proposed legislation: | | | | | | |
| Military pay adjustment | | | 146 | | | 142 |
| Military construction | | | 290 | | | 47 |
| Air Force: | | | | | | |
| Present programs | 17,097 | 17,219 | 16,801 | 18,363 | 18,388 | 18,008 |
| Proposed legislation: | | | | | | |
| Military pay adjustment | | | 188 | | | 184 |
| Military construction | | 520 | 965 | | 53 | 544 |
| Other central defense activities: | | | | | | |
| Present programs | 651 | 675 | 784 | 602 | 716 | 810 |
| Proposed legislation (military construction) | | | | | | 20 |
| Proposed civilian pay adjustment | | | 205 | | | 205 |
| Subtotal | 36,255 | [1] 36,905 | [2] 39,145 | 38,439 | 38,861 | [2] 39,779 |
| Atomic energy: | | | | | | |
| Present programs | 1,962 | 2,362 | 2,298 | 1,990 | 2,300 | 2,530 |
| Proposed legislation (plant acquisition and construction) | | | 120 | | | 20 |
| Subtotal | 1,962 | 2,362 | 2,418 | 1,990 | 2,300 | 2,550 |
| Stockpiling and expansion of defense production | | | 70 | 490 | 565 | 422 |
| Mutual security, military: | | | | | | |
| Military assistance: | | | | | | |
| Present program | 2,018 | 1,340 | | 2,352 | 2,200 | 1,946 |
| Proposed legislation | | | 1,800 | | | 354 |
| Defense support: | | | | | | |
| Present program | 1,110 | 689 | | 1,143 | 945 | 575 |
| Proposed legislation | | | 805 | | | 310 |
| Subtotal | 3,127 | 2,029 | 2,665 | 3,495 | 3,145 | 3,085 |
| Total | 41,344 | 40,905 | 44,298 | 44,414 | 44,871 | 45,836 |

[1] Includes $1,220 million of anticipated supplemental requests.
[2] Does not include $500 million for defense purposes shown in the budget under allowance for proposed legislation and contingencies.

Expenditures for these programs are estimated to be $45.8 billion in the fiscal year 1959, $1 billion more than in 1958 and $1.4 billion more than in 1957. Increases are anticipated for the military functions of the Department of Defense and for atomic energy development. Expenditures for military assistance and defense support will be about the same as in the current year, but appropriations will increase to finance the lead time for newer type weapons. Expenditures for the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials and for the defense production expansion program will decline.

Department of Defense, military functions: To accelerate the adaptation of our defenses to changing conditions, a request for supplemental appropriations of $1.3 billion for the Department of Defense in the fiscal year 1958 is being transmitted to the Congress. The result will be to increase total new obligational authority for 1958 for the military functions of the Department of Defense to $36.6 billion. A further increase of $2.5 billion is recommended for the fiscal year 1959, bringing the total for that year to $39.1 billion.

It is essential that we be able promptly to modify and accelerate programs when and as important discoveries or technological developments in weapons indicate such action to be desirable. To accomplish this end, the budget includes a contingency reserve of $500 million for defense purposes only. It also proposes that the Congress authorize the President to transfer up to $2 billion between appropriations available for military functions of the Department of Defense. This transfer authority is important and I will not hesitate to use it.

I have already discussed the urgent problem of reorganization of the Department of Defense in the state of the Union message. In the interest of the taxpayer, improved operating and fiscal controls must accompany larger appropriations.

Expenditures in 1958 are now estimated to be $38.9 billion compared with the original 1958 budget estimate of $38 billion. Estimated expenditures for 1959 are $39.8 billion, an increase of $0.9 billion over the current estimate for 1958, $1.3 billion higher than in 1957, and $4 billion more than in 1956.

These increased appropriations and expenditures are necessary for a speedup in the adjustment of military strategy, forces, techniques, and organization to keep pace with the rapid strides in science and technology. Since the end of the Korean conflict, new weapons systems of vastly increased combat effectiveness have been provided for our military forces, while numbers of military units and personnel have been gradually reduced. We can expect new developments at an ever-increasing pace.

The rapidly changing character of the military program is strikingly evident when the weapons and equipment we propose to buy in 1959 are compared with those bought as recently as 1955—the first full fiscal year after the Korean conflict.

There is hardly a production model aircraft on the Air Force's proposed list for procurement with 1959 funds that was included in its 1955 program. All the fighters and bombers proposed for procurement with 1959 appropriations will be capable of supersonic speeds and of using guided missiles and nuclear weapons. Of the $1.5 billion of aircraft, engines, and aeronautical equipment proposed to be bought by the Navy in 1959, about 80 percent will be for models which had not reached the point of being bought in production quantities in 1955.

Even in the new field of missile technology, there will be a very marked shift of emphasis from the earlier, initial weapons systems to the much more advanced systems of the future. The longer range ballistic missiles—Atlas, Titan, Thor, Jupiter, Polaris—only one of which was beyond the technical study stage 2½ years ago, will account for nearly half of the missile program for 1959. For the total missile program, about 90 percent of the dollars planned for procurement in 1959 are for weapons which were not in production in operational quantities in 1955.

Most of the ships in the proposed 1959 construction program are entirely new types not to be found in the 1955 shipbuilding list. These include guided missile destroyers and the first nuclear-powered frigate. The first three ballistic missile submarines for the fleet are included in the 1958 supplemental request.

Fully half of the proposed 1959 program of military construction is for facilities for the Strategic Air Command and for weapons systems and equipment which will have been brought into operational use since 1955.

Research and the operation of facilities for research, development, and testing of missiles will take a much greater proportion of the research and development budget in 1959 than in 1955. In the 4 fiscal years 1956–59, roughly $20 billion of research and development, procurement, military personnel, and construction funds will have been programed for the research, development, test, and evaluation of new weapons systems to bring them to operational status.

Programs requiring greater emphasis: The budget provides funds for a still greater expansion of the swiftly progressing intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missile programs. The Jupiter and Thor intermediate range ballistic missiles are being placed in production. Work on the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile will be accelerated.

Funds are also provided to speed up the operational availability of the Polaris intermediate range ballistic missile and the first three submarines designed to employ this weapon.

Expansion and further improvement of the continental defense early warning network will be undertaken and construction of a new ballistic missile detection system started, including the necessary facilities for communication with the North American Defense Command and the Strategic Air Command.

This budget includes funds for accelerating the dispersal of Strategic Air Command aircraft to additional bases and for the construction of alert facilities. The readiness of these retaliatory forces must be measured in minutes. Not only must planes be kept constantly in the air, but also additional combat air crews must be able to take off almost instantly upon receipt of warning of an impending enemy attack. Takeoff time will be appreciably shortened by constructing additional runways, fueling stations, and quarters for the crews at the runway. Within the total appropriations for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959, about $0.5 billion is provided for the dispersal and increased readiness of the Strategic Air Command.

Funds are provided for an expanded research and development effort on military satellites and other outer space vehicles, and on antimissile missile systems, to be carried out directly under the Secretary of Defense. An increase is also included for basic and applied research in other areas.

Antisubmarine warfare capabilities will be increased to counter potential enemy submarine threats.

While greater attention is given in this budget to the foregoing areas, conventional warfare capabilities of all the military services are also being improved. For example, funds are provided to initiate production of new models of small arms and ammunition, standardized for use by all members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Military and civilian pay: With the development of new weapons systems, the technical proficiency demanded of military personnel has increased tremendously. Personnel trained at great expense in the operation and maintenance of these modern weapons must have greater incentives to remain in service. For present and long-range efficiency and for greater equity, the military pay system must be recast. Minimizing the present large turnover in military personnel will reduce the percentage of men in training and add to the percentage of men assigned to combat missions.

The funds provided in this budget for military personnel are based on achieving these objectives and on making the changes in pay rates effective on July 1, 1958. The funds for the Department of Defense also include an allowance to cover its share of the cost of the revision in the pay structure for classified civilian employees recommended in the general government section of this message.

The revisions proposed are an adaptation of the principles recommended by the Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation in its report of May 8, 1957. The principles for military pay call for rewarding proficiency and merit and for stimulating career motivation. Attainment of these desirable goals requires elimination of the current longevity system in which a man of lower rank can receive more pay than one of higher rank, and the substitution of a system which would: (1) add two pay grades for both officers and enlisted personnel; (2) widen the pay differentials between grades by means of substantial increases for the senior officer and senior enlisted grades; and (3)

establish uniform entering pay rates for each grade.

Actions for economies: The programs and pay adjustments described above will be costly. Beyond the reduction of $1.5 billion for procurement of aircraft and conventional weapons from 1957 to 1959, it is necessary that every possible economy be effected in other defense activities to help offset the increased costs of the high priority programs. This means, among other things, that we must eliminate programs and facilities no longer needed and make sure that we have no needless duplication.

All forces, units, and activities are being reexamined to determine whether or not they will still be needed as modern weapons, improved techniques, and new organizations come into being. Any activity of the services not making an essential contribution to a military mission must be eliminated.

As with our active-duty forces, the size, mission, and organizational structure of our Reserve components must be shaped to meet the requirements of modern warfare. They must be designed to augment the active-duty forces quickly and efficiently. Our Reserve personnel programs will give greater emphasis to quality and readiness than to quantity.

The Department of Defense is now operating a very large number of installations and bases in the continental United States and overseas. Some of these installations involve use of costly or extensive facilities for activities that could be performed more economically at other locations. As the Department of Defense continues to adopt modern weapons and revised organizations, some of these stations will become unnecessary. On the other hand, dispersal of the retaliatory forces will require some additional bases and increased costs. Closing down and disposing of installations not definitely required for the combat forces or for their supply and distribution systems will help make funds available to support the new stations. Keeping nonessential installations in operation, thereby diverting personnel and funds from our true defense requirements at the expense of our combat capabilities, poorly serves our defenses and the general public.

All facilities and activities which are retained will be continually evaluated to prevent extravagance and wastefulness in operation and maintenance. The Department of Defense, in collaboration with the Treasury, Bureau of the Budget, and General Accounting Office, is also engaged in improving financial management in the operation and maintenance activities and other areas.

The supply and distribution activities of the armed services must also be further streamlined. The Department of Defense is now making a comprehensive review of procurement practices and inventory management. Emphasis is being placed upon techniques for coordinating defense supply systems so that they will be oriented to support adequately the increasing numbers of new weapons and avoid oversupply for older weapons.

In the interest of holding procurement costs to a minimum, I recommend that the Renegotiation Act be extended.

Development and control of atomic energy: Expenditures by the Atomic Energy Commission in the fiscal year 1959 will increase to $2,550 million, $250 million more than estimated for 1958, which in turn was $310 million over 1957. These increases reflect our determination both to increase the tempo of progress in achieving a greater nuclear military capability and to press ahead in our successful development of the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

From year to year we have hoped that success would finally crown our efforts to reach an international agreement which would permit, if not general disarmament, at least some reduction in the production of nuclear armaments. Again we find ourselves in a situation that leaves us no choice but to test and produce further quantities of such armaments for the defense of the free world. The substantial increase in the availability of uranium concentrates and the expanded capacity of the Atomic Energy Commission's production plants will result in greater production and larger operating expenditures in 1959.

During the last several years, the Atomic Energy Commission's research and development in both peaceful and military applications of atomic energy have grown rapidly to the highest levels ever attained. Continuing emphasis will be given to basic research, and construction will continue on four additional high-energy particle accelerators in the multibillion electron-volt range.

Applied research and development activities will be increased in 1959 and concentrated on those aspects which appear most likely to result in reaching technical goals. In particular, there will be continuing emphasis on naval and other military nuclear propulsion reactors, and on the more promising approaches to development of reactors to produce safe and economic electrical energy for civilian use.

Stockpiling and defense production expansion: Expenditures for stockpiling and expansion of defense production are estimated to be $565 million in 1958 and $422 million in 1959. The stockpile objectives on all but a few scarce materials will be substantially completed under contracts now in force. In October 1957, an advisory committee was established to work with the Office of Defense Mobilization on a study of stockpiling policies and programs in the light of current concepts of war and defense.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 has provided much of the basic authority required to bring about needed expansion of production capacity, to provide controls over the use of scarce materials, and to initiate other measures essential to enhance our military strength. It should be extended another 2 years beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1958. I do not now anticipate any specific new programs which will require financial assistance under this legislation, but accelerated research and development in certain military programs may require further expansion of production potentials for key materials. The authority to set priorities and allocate materials, currently being used for critical materials for direct military and atomic energy procurement, will continue to be needed.

Mutual security program: Soviet ambition poses a threat to the free countries that takes several forms: open armed attack, internal subversion, and economic domination. Mutual security helps to meet all forms of this threat. For the fiscal year 1959, I am recommending new obligational authority of $3,940 million for the mutual security program. Expenditures are estimated to be $3,868 million.

Two portions of the mutual security program—military assistance and defense support—are primarily related to our military defense effort and, therefore, are discussed in this section of the message. The other portions of the mutual security program, while they contribute to security and defensive strength, are primarily designed to promote the economic development and political stability of less developed countries. They are discussed in the international affairs and finance section of this message. The two parts of the mutual security program are combined in the following table:

*Mutual security program*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Function and program | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Major national security: | | | | |
| Military assistance: | | | | |
| Present program | $2,352 | $2,200 | $1,846 | ..... |
| Proposed legislation | ..... | ..... | 354 | $1,800 |
| Defense support: | | | | |
| Present program | 1,143 | 945 | 575 | ..... |
| Proposed legislation | ..... | ..... | 310 | 865 |
| Subtotal | 3,495 | 3,145 | 3,085 | 2,665 |
| International affairs and finance: | | | | |
| Development loan fund | ..... | 20 | 174 | 625 |
| Technical cooperation: | | | | |
| Present program | 114 | 136 | 103 | ..... |
| Proposed legislation | ..... | ..... | 47 | 104 |
| Special and other assistance: | | | | |
| Present program | 341 | 448 | 266 | ..... |
| Proposed legislation | ..... | ..... | 193 | 456 |
| Subtotal | 455 | 604 | 783 | 1,275 |
| Total, mutual security | 3,950 | 3,749 | 3,868 | [1] 3,940 |

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $3,807 million for 1957 and $2,764 million for 1958.

Mutual security, military assistance: The nature of military assistance varies by country and area, taking into account military need, technological abilities, and division of defense responsibility among the United States and other countries. Countries which have received military assistance maintain for the common defense of the free world the equivalent of 200 army divisions, and some 23,000 aircraft and 2,300 naval vessels. From 1950 through 1957 our assistance has augmented by about 17 percent the total defense expenditures of these countries.

In Europe, this assistance is programed according to the defensive strategy for the whole North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Military assistance for certain other countries, particularly in the Middle East and Asia, will continue to give special emphasis to the threat of internal subversion while also contributing to the deterrence of foreign attack.

In addition to missiles and other advanced weapons, the military assistance program provides for necessary conventional equipment, supplies, construction, and training for ground, sea, and air defense of friendly countries.

Continuing efforts are being made to maintain the forces needed for international defense purposes at the lowest possible cost. The strength of forces in assisted countries has been and will continue to be reviewed to insure that our support is related to current military requirements and technology. We are financing military equipment wherever possible on a basis of sales for cash and credit rather than by grants.

Recommended new obligational authority for military assistance in the fiscal year 1959 is $1,800 million. To fulfill probable needs growing out of agreements at the recent NATO meetings, an additional amount of up to $200 million for procurement of more missiles and other new equipment is covered by the allowance for proposed legislation and contingencies for the fiscal year 1958. Expenditures for military assistance in 1959, which will be made primarily from obligational authority enacted in previous years, are estimated to be $2,200 million, the same estimated for 1958.

I firmly believe that the current United States outlay for protection would have to be substantially larger were it not for the military assistance program which enables other countries to contribute more to collective defense. Without our military-assistance program the same degree of protection might not be obtainable at any cost.

Mutual security, defense support: Our military assistance is extended to many countries that are maintaining collective defense forces beyond their economic means. Therefore, we supply economic assistance under the appropriations for defense support so that these countries can provide for their defense forces and at the same time maintain economic and political stability.

New obligational authority of $885 million is requested for defense support. Expenditures in 1959 are estimated at $885 million or $60 million below the estimate for 1958.

In determining these amounts, account has been taken of the most effective use of local currencies obtained as counterpart for assistance dollars and from sales of surplus United States farm products. The local currencies, which are in addition to dollar grants, are used to help channel the countries' own economic resources to the most desirable objectives. However, these currencies cannot replace the dollars needed for materials and equipment that must be imported, mainly from the United States.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND FINANCE

The major objective of our international economic policies and programs is to help build the free world's economic strength in the interest of mutual well-being and the maintenance of peace. Expanded production, improved efficiency, and greater economic progress for ourselves and other peoples of the free world will depend to a considerable extent on an increase in the flow of international trade and investment. To aid in this worldwide objective and at the same time to expand our markets abroad and thus create new jobs at home, I am recommending the extension with broadened authority of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program. I am also recommending an expansion of the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank, an increase in new obligational authority for developmental and technical assistance under the mutual security program, and the authorization of funds to assist in the completion of the Inter-American Highway.

International affairs and finance are estimated to require $1.3 billion of expenditures in the fiscal year 1959, $156 million less than in 1958. The decline reflects primarily the fact that in 1958 the Export-Import Bank has made a substantial disbursement under a previously authorized loan to the United Kingdom.

*International affairs and finance*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Economic and technical development: | | | | |
| Export-Import Bank | −$100 | $393 | $51 | ------- |
| Nonmilitary mutual security program: | | | | |
| Development loan fund | ------- | 20 | 174 | $625 |
| Technical cooperation: | | | | |
| Present program | 114 | 136 | 103 | ------- |
| Proposed legislation | ------- | ------- | 47 | 104 |
| Special and other assistance: | | | | |
| Present program | 341 | 448 | 366 | ------- |
| Proposed legislation | ------- | ------- | 193 | 436 |
| Other: | | | | |
| Present programs (primarily reimbursement to Department of Agriculture for commodities shipped abroad) | 187 | 136 | 139 | 9 |
| Proposed legislation (Inter-American Highway) | ------- | ------- | ------- | 10 |
| Foreign information and exchange activities: | | | | |
| United States Information Agency | 108 | 100 | 108 | 110 |
| Department of State, exchange of persons | 18 | 26 | 21 | 21 |
| President's special international program | 7 | 15 | 11 | 8 |
| Conduct of foreign affairs: | | | | |
| Department of State | 155 | 122 | 109 | 181 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 832 | 1,468 | 1,312 | [1] 1,615 |

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $1,131 million for 1957 and $3,292 million (including $2 billion of anticipated supplemental authorizations for Export-Import Bank) for 1958.

Reciprocal trade: In order to pay for imports of goods and services from the United States other countries must be able to export to us. Progress for them and for us will receive its greatest impetus by development of the most favorable fields of production coupled with a gradual but steady reduction of unjustifiable trade barriers. We welcome the proposed European common market and free trade area as steps toward these broad goals.

We live in a world of economic, no less than political, interdependence. As the greatest producer, consumer, and exporter in the world, the United States must be a dependable market for foreign goods if mutually beneficial trade is to grow and prosper. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended for 5 years beyond its expiration date of June 30, 1958, with certain new authority for the President to negotiate gradual and selective tariff reductions. Legislation should also be enacted to authorize United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation to improve the administrative efficiency of our trade agreements with other countries. To provide coordinated Cabinet level direction of this program at home, I have recently established the Trade Policy Committee under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Commerce.

In addition, I recommend that the Congress delete a rider which in past years has been attached to the Defense Appropriation Act and which virtually prohibits normal competitive bidding by other countries on many defense contracts. The rider is clearly inconsistent with policies designed to expand international trade and makes our heavy defense costs even more burdensome.

Export-Import Bank: The Export-Import Bank has had a steadily increasing role in promoting United States exports and imports and in financing economic development projects abroad through loans to United States and foreign firms and to foreign countries. Since the bank requires repayment in dollars, its loans for economic development are made for projects that will earn or save dollars for the borrowing country, or for projects in countries with adequate prospects of earning dollars from other sources. It is now estimated that the lending authority provided the bank in 1955 will be entirely committed sometime during 1959. To assure continuity in the bank's operation and to provide for possible emergencies, I am requesting $2 billion in new obligational authority to expand the bank's lending capacity. This new authorization should be made available before the end of the current fiscal year.

Nonmilitary mutual security: While strengthened trade legislation and additional lending authority for the Export-Import Bank will help substantially in promoting world commerce and economic development, these actions are insufficient in themselves to accomplish our international objectives.

Few national desires are stronger today than the wish of the peoples of less developed countries to improve their living standards. It is our national policy

to encourage and assist this aspiration. As a country blessed with great natural resources, modern industry, and high productivity, we recognize the compelling humanitarian reasons for helping less fortunate people abroad as we help them at home.

The progress of some less developed countries will be dangerously slow without outside help, despite their best efforts. The people of these countries are conscious of the technological advances made and the levels of living enjoyed beyond their borders, and are understandably impatient for similar achievements. If western help is unavailable or inadequate, these countries may become dependent upon the Communist bloc. We are concerned that they strengthen their independence and find prospects for improved living standards within a free society. It is my earnest hope that other free governments will also enlarge their efforts in advancing the development, trade, and well-being of less developed countries.

In addition, without economic progress, military security may prove illusory. People who see little improvement in their economic conditions may question the value of the freedom that our mutual defense efforts are intended to preserve. The events of the cold war reemphasize the importance of our helping to insure that peoples of less developed countries have faith in their future.

For these various reasons, it is critically necessary to carry forward our development loans, technical assistance, and other special types of assistance under the mutual-security program.

Mutual security, development loan fund: In many cases, urgent needs for economic development in less developed countries cannot be financed by the Export-Import Bank or by other sources such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or private institutions. To meet such needs for financing economically and technically sound projects, the development loan fund was authorized in the Mutual Security Act of 1957. Loans from this fund may be made on less stringent terms than Export-Import Bank or other such loans, with repayments in local currencies as well as dollars.

Projects are now being considered and negotiations are being started with a number of countries which will result in the commitment of an appreciable volume of loans by the end of the fiscal year 1958. To make possible the continuation and expansion of such development loans, I am requesting provision of $625 million in new obligational authority for 1959, as authorized by the Congress in basic legislation last year.

Mutual security, technical cooperation: Because of technical assistance extended under the mutual security program, millions of people today are better off than before and productivity has been significantly increased. For example, disease has been lessened in many countries as people have been taught water purification techniques. Illiteracy has been greatly reduced. Farmers in many countries have learned how to diversify crops and improve livestock strains.

This budget requests $164 million of new obligational authority in 1959 to carry forward the United States program of technical assistance and also to provide for our joining with other nations to increase the financial resources of the United Nations program of technical assistance. This increase will help to broaden the scope of multilateral cooperation through a new program for regional surveys of resources and for regional training institutes approved last December by the United Nations General Assembly. I am convinced of the need for our own technical assistance program and I am equally convinced of the need for multilateral technical assistance programs, in which our contribution is multiplied by the funds and experts of many nations.

Mutual security, special and other assistance: The budget for the mutual security program provides for certain additional special activities, such as support vital to the stability of a number of friendly countries not covered by other categories of aid, our contributions to the United Nations International Children's Fund, and our refugee programs.

It is obviously impossible to predict today all of the problems which the free world will face during 1959. In order to help meet the emergencies that experience shows inevitably arise, I believe it necessary that a special contingency fund again be provided in the mutual security appropriation. For this purpose, $200 million is recommended for 1959.

Diplomacy, informational and cultural programs, and exchange of persons: Greater understanding among nations, on a people-to-people as well as a government-to-government basis, is a necessary part of our efforts to remove the misunderstandings that hinder disarmament, the building of a safeguarded peace, and the strengthening of freedom. It is especially important that Americans and peoples who have recently gained, or are approaching, independence come to appreciate each other's problems and aspirations. It is similarly important that Americans and Eastern Europeans renew the contacts that once were an important strand in friendly international relations.

The budget recommends $183 million in new obligational authority in 1959 for the conduct of foreign affairs, primarily for the operation of the Department of State. This amount includes provision for additional foreign service posts in Africa and for the strengthening of consular, economic, and political work in the Middle East and the Far East. New obligational authority requested for the United States Information Agency, and for exchange of persons, cultural presentations, and international trade fairs amounts to $139 million; within this total, there is provision for more exchanges of leaders, scientists, and students with Eastern Europe and other areas.

I wish here to call attention specifically to the need for a supplemental appropriation for the Brussels Fair. Congressional action on this important activity last year left United States participation badly hampered in comparison with programs of other nations, especially the Soviet Union. I consider this item of particular importance to our country and urge the Congress to expedite its approval.

CIVIL BENEFITS

The bulk of the Federal Government's budget expenditures for domestic programs is classified under five broad categories—labor and welfare, commerce and housing, veterans services and benefits, agriculture and agricultural resources, and natural resources. These benefits take various forms, such as grants to State and local governments, direct benefit payments to individuals, loans, public works, research, and other public services.

*Budget expenditures and authorizations for civil benefits*

[Fiscal years. In billions]

| Function | Expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Labor and welfare | $13.0 | $13.4 | $13.6 | $13.6 |
| Commerce and housing | 1.5 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 2.1 |
| Veterans services and benefits | 4.8 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Agriculture and agricultural resources | 4.6 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 3.8 |
| Natural resources | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Total | 15.1 | 17.0 | 16.4 | [1] 16.0 |

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $18.6 billion for 1957 and $20.4 billion for 1958.

Total expenditures for civil benefits in the fiscal year 1959 are estimated to be $16.4 billion. New obligational authority is reduced from an estimated amount of $20.4 billion in 1958 to $16 billion in 1959.

Under present conditions, I am not recommending enactment at this time of certain legislation now pending in the Congress for new programs which I have previously advocated. For example, instead of general aid for construction of schoolrooms, I am now recommending a broad temporary program of aid to education which is largely science-oriented. I am also deferring proposals for some other grant programs and for certain new public works projects.

I am also making recommendations to reduce some programs, to curtail expansion in others, and to transfer greater responsibility from the Federal Government to State and local governments or to private individuals or enterprises. All of these recommendations, in addition to being required by sound public policy, will help to hold expenditures in future years to prudent levels.

Some of the changes in legislation which I am recommending apply to three general types of activities—grants-in-aid, credit, and special services for which charges should be made.

Grants-in-aid: In the past 25 years, the number of grant-in-aid programs conducted by the Federal Government has increased many fold. Federal ex-

penditures and the amount of taxes levied at the national level have correspondingly increased.

As I have repeatedly emphasized, the continued vitality of our federal form of government requires that, to the maximum extent possible, primary responsibility for public programs be shouldered by that level of government most familiar with local problems and most responsive to them. We must exercise the utmost restraint in assigning new programs and responsibilities to the Federal Government, and we should continously search out those programs and activities now carried on at the national level that can and should be handled by the States or localities.

Prudent limitation of Federal activities cannot alone meet the the whole problem of overcentralization. The continued strength of our federal system also depends upon reinforcing the administrative and fiscal ability of the States to carry out their responsibilities. Accordingly, I suggested at the Governors' Conference at Williamsburg, Va., in June of 1957, that an action group be established to make recommendations on this and other aspects of the problem. A Joint Federal-State Action Committee consisting of 10 governors and of representatives of the executive branch of the Federal Government was subsequently created.

The initial progress report of this Committee, made last month, recommends complete transfer of two programs to the States together with the simultaneous relinquishment of a portion of the local telephone service tax which the Federal Government now collects. These programs are vocational education and the construction of waste-treatment facilities. Legislative proposals to carry out these and future recommendations of the Committee will be transmitted to the Congress. An orderly readjustment requires time for action by both the Congress and the State legislatures. Consequently, the effect of the proposed transfers on expenditures and revenues of the Federal Government will occur beginning in 1960. The report also recommends increasing the degree of State responsibility in three other programs: urban renewal planning; natural disaster relief; and regulating and promoting peaceful uses of atomic energy, particularly for health and safety.

Cooperation of this nature is a highly desirable and, in my judgment, a long overdue experiment in public administration and finance. The success of the venture depends upon further cooperation among the executive branch, the Congress, the governors, the legislative bodies of the States, and the local governments involved. As for this administration, I can say that the executive branch is eager, as well as willing, to do its part to insure that success.

Federal credit programs: From a few small beginnings, Federal programs for making direct loans, purchasing mortgages, and insuring or guaranteeing private loans have multiplied greatly over the past quarter century. As shown in special analysis E in this budget document, new commitments for a great variety of specific credit requirements in the fiscal year 1959 are estimated at $16.5 billion, predominantly for housing and agricultural programs. About three-quarters of these commitments are for guaranties and insurance of private loans, which usually do not require significant budget expenditures. However, net budget expenditures for direct loans and mortgage purchases will amount to an estimated $1.4 billion in 1959.

On June 30, 1957, the total amount of outstanding private loans guaranteed or insured in whole or in part by the Federal Government amounted to $55.9 billion. This is expected to increase to $65.9 billion by the end of the fiscal year 1959. In addition to these privately financed loans, the amount of direct loans outstanding on June 30, 1957, was $17.5 billion, compared to $20.3 billion expected as of June 30, 1959.

In order that Government credit programs will make a maximum contribution to economic growth and stability, this administration has placed special emphasis upon achieving a more consistent policy among them. For this purpose, it is necessary that such programs: (1) charge adequate interest rates on all new loans; (2) substitute private financing for Government loans and mortgage purchases wherever possible; and (3) be subject to effective budgetary control.

In many cases, present legislation sets maximum interest rates that do not permit the Treasury or the lending agencies to cover present costs. At my request, legislation has been submitted to the Congress requiring that, insofar as consistent with the purposes of each program, all costs of future loans be paid by the borrowers who benefit from the loans. Such legislation, by removing or reducing hidden subsidies, would make a significant contribution toward better budgeting.

Loans or mortgage purchases by the Federal Government should be available only if private financing cannot be obtained on reasonable terms. In several important areas Federal guaranties or insurance have encouraged greater participation by private lenders and reduced reliance on direct Government loans. Legislation should be enacted to authorize other Federal lending programs to substitute guaranties or insurance of private loans to the maximum feasible extent. Moreover, for all loan guaranty programs, the Government should be authorized to permit interest rates high enough to attract private lenders. I suggest that all limitations or ceilings placed on interest rates be reviewed, and that authority be provided to vary the rates for guaranteed or insured loans in line with market conditions and under proper safeguards.

A few Federal credit programs and a few other enterprise activities, as well, are not now subject to budgetary review and audit control. I again recommend that the Government Corporation Control Act be amended to provide for such review and control over all Govemnment corporations authorized to use Federal funds.

Charges for special services: When the Government provides a service conferring a special quasi-commercial benefit on identifiable individuals or groups above and beyond the benefits to the public generally, I believe it should charge the beneficiaries for the special service, rather than place the full burden of cost on the general taxpayer.

This principle has been put into practice in the financing of the new highway program through the payment of excise taxes by highway users into a highway trust fund. The forest and public lands highway programs of the Department of Commerce, however, are still financed from general revenues. Since most of these highways are on one of the Federal-aid systems, I recommend that their financing be transferred to the trust fund. Legislation will also be recommended to provide for payment from the trust fund of the expenses incurred by the Treasury in collecting taxes going into the trust fund, similar to the present practice of paying for the costs incurred by the Department of Labor in determining wage standards for highway contracts.

In the field of aviation, the Federal Government provides a wide range of special services benefiting private users of the airspace. As I have previously pointed out, it is increasingly appropriate that these users pay their fair share of the costs. As first steps toward this end, this budget proposes that a tax of 3½ cents a gallon be levied on jet fuels and that taxes on aviation gasoline be increased to 3½ cents a gallon from the present 2 cents, with increases of ¾ cent per year for 4 years in both taxes up to 6½ cents a gallon. The receipts from taxes on aviation gasoline, which now go into the highway trust fund, should be kept in the general revenues to help finance the operations of the airways.

Legislation should also be enacted to raise patent fees, and to charge employers of longshoremen for the costs of administering disability compensation. Recommendations elsewhere in this message to adjust postal rates and authorize more adequate interest rates on Government loans also will serve to reduce unnecessary subsidies to special groups.

In addition to the above specific recommendations, all Government agencies have recently been instructed at my direction to prepare legislative proposals generally designed to remove present restrictions or limitations on their authority (1) to recover full cost to the Government of services that provide special benefits to individuals or groups and (2) to obtain a fair market value for the use or sale of federally owned resources or property.

By enactment of the legislation proposed in this budget and of other proposals which I shall make from time to time, we can move closer to the ultimate goal of an equitable system of fees and charges throughout the Government.

LABOR AND WELFARE

Expenditures for labor and welfare, including the education and basic research programs classified under this heading, are estimated to be $3.6 billion in the fiscal year 1959, $200 million more than for the current year. The increase is primarily for scientific research and

education programs. Previous recommendations for new programs, such as general aid for school construction, are being deferred.

A large portion of the expenditures for labor and welfare programs consists of grants-in-aid to States and local governments, and cannot be reduced without changes in basic authorizing legislation. At this time, I am proposing revisions in the legislation governing five of these grant programs which will lead to some small reductions in the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1959, and to some larger reductions in later years. Under these proposals, the proportion or amount of Federal participation would be reduced for schools in federally affected areas, for hospital construction, and for public assistance. I am also recommending action on legislation relating to revenues so the States can assume responsibility beginning in 1960, and Federal aid can cease, for vocational education and waste treatment plant construction. Continuing work by the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, as well as thoroughgoing reappraisals by Federal agencies on their own initiative, should lead to further recommendations for reducing grant-in-aid programs in future years, with the States assuming more of the responsibility for these activities and themselves collecting more tax revenues to finance them.

*Labor and welfare*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Promotion of science, research, libraries, and museums: | | | | |
| National Science Foundation: Basic research | $32 | $38 | $55 | $58 |
| Other | 39 | 42 | 64 | 58 |
| Promotion of education: | | | | |
| National Science Foundation: Science education | 14 | 17 | 53 | 82 |
| Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: | | | | |
| Science and general education programs (proposed legislation) | ------- | ------- | 75 | 146 |
| Assistance for schools in federally affected areas: | | | | |
| Present program | 174 | 223 | 122 | |
| Proposed legislation | ------- | ------- | 90 | 130 |
| Vocational education and other | 54 | 60 | 60 | 58 |
| Department of the Interior | 48 | 53 | 60 | 57 |
| Labor and manpower | 400 | 411 | 420 | 432 |
| Promotion of public health: | | | | |
| National Institutes of Health | 165 | 202 | 203 | 211 |
| Hospital construction grants | 73 | 97 | 112 | 75 |
| Grants for construction of waste-treatment facilities | 1 | 31 | 51 | 45 |
| Other | 220 | 251 | 267 | 252 |
| Public assistance | 1,558 | 1,822 | 1,809 | 1,809 |
| Correctional and penal institutions | 32 | 34 | 36 | 37 |
| Other welfare services | 147 | 162 | 167 | 165 |
| Total | 2,966 | 3,443 | 3,643 | [1] 3,616 |

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $3,190 million for 1957 and $3,571 million for 1958.

Science, research, and education: In the face of Soviet challenges, the security and continued well-being of the United States depend, as never before, on the extension of scientific knowledge. Our technological progress requires a higher level of support for basic scientific research from both private and public sources. It also demands a growing supply of highly trained manpower—scientists, engineers, teachers, and technicians.

To this end, I am recommending an expanded program for the National Science Foundation and a new program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These programs will be closely coordinated. The Foundation is promoting science education and training primarily through grants to universities or fellowships to individuals. The program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will strengthen our general educational base, complement the activities of the National Science Foundation, and be channeled mainly through grants to States.

This budget proposes appropriations of $140 million for the National Science Foundation in 1959, more than three times the amount currently authorized. To permit immediate action in stepping up the Foundation's activities, the budget also includes a supplemental appropriation of $10 million for 1958.

These recommendations will enable the National Science Foundation to proceed vigorously in expanding support for basic research. Of the 1959 appropriation, $58 million, double the 1958 amount, is provided for research grants, for research facilities and equipment, and for related activities.

Assistance to basic research is provided also in physical sciences by the Bureau of Standards and in life sciences by the National Institutes of Health. Expenditures included in other parts of the budget for basic research by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Department of Defense will be higher than in the current year. Most of the expenditures will be for research projects carried on by university scientists and, as a byproduct, will contribute importantly to the education of graduate students.

The second major part of the National Science Foundation program is to help meet the need for improving and extending science education. The 1959 budget for the Foundation provides $82 million, including $3 million of administrative expenses, for this purpose, or about five times the present amount. Most of this is for expansion of programs which have proved their worth in improving high school and college science education. These programs include (1) action to interest able students in science careers, (2) measures to improve the methods of teaching and the content of courses in mathematics and science and to give supplementary training to college and high-school teachers, and (3) provision for fellowships to highly qualified college graduates and scientists for advanced study in science and mathematics.

I am recommending that legislation be enacted to authorize a temporary program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide grants to help stimulate the State, local, and private action necessary to meet certain critical educational needs. The major objective of this new program will be to provide matching grants to strengthen State departments of education and local school systems, particularly in the administration and teaching of science and mathematics. The new grant program will also foster improvement of general education through grants to States or educational institutions to extend testing and counseling services for young people, provide college scholarships for outstanding high-school graduates, strengthen graduate schools, expand the teaching of foreign languages, and improve the adequacy and reliability of educational statistics.

These recommendations for the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are designed to meet our most urgent needs for support of science, to aid in the identification and encouragement of talent, and to strengthen our teaching staffs. In planning these programs, account has been taken of several important considerations.

First, more effective utilization of available scientists and engineers is the most immediately productive attack on existing shortages in these fields. Action to achieve this is a responsibility of private employers and organizations as well as governmental agencies.

Second, the basic responsibility for science education and training as well as for conduct of research in our country depends primarily on non-Federal support, and requires a thorough understanding of the problem by all our citizens and their wholehearted support. Therefore, I strongly recommend that this Federal participation in the Nation's educational processes be limited to 4 years (allowing additionally for the completion of scholarships granted within these 4 years), and be considered as an emergency stimulant to encourage the States and local communities to bring their educational systems up to date in the light of our modern scientific age. The proposed Federal assistance is carefully designed to insure against any possible domination by the Federal Government of our educational system, which must continue to be locally controlled and operated in accordance with our American tradition.

Third, we must accept the fact that scientists are not trained overnight and science students do not become skilled scientists in a year. New programs in these fields must continue in most instances for a number of years to achieve concrete results. With full awareness of our tradition of not involving the Federal Government in the Nation's public educational processes, this stimulation I have proposed must not be so overemphasized that the programs cannot be later carried on by those who must continue to carry the responsibility—the local school districts, universities, and industry.

Fourth, the needs of our free society cannot be met by improving science and technology alone. The national needs require the development through a strong general educational system of a vast number of aptitudes and skills. Every community in our country should do its level best and if possible more than is now being done to provide better education for the growing number of students. A good deal of improvement in our teaching methods and standards and greater use of our present facilities can be achieved by acquainting the boards of education, superintendents, teachers, parents, and pupils with the needs the country faces.

Fifth, specialized programs must not be allowed to upset the important balance needed in a well-rounded educational program which must insure progress in the teaching of all areas of learning.

Schools in federally affected areas: The Federal Government has a responsibility for aiding school districts when it creates serious financial problems for them. It has recognized this responsibility in the past by providing grants to help build and operate schools in districts where enrollment is swelled by Federal activities. Experience with these programs, however, suggests that they should be modified; many of the communities for which grants have been made no longer have problems as acute as those suddenly generated by the migration of workers and families to them during the Korean crisis.

In view of the continued maintenance of a substantial Defense Establishment with shifting locations, authority for grants for construction and operation of schools should be extended, but the assistance should be restricted to instances where the Federal personnel both live and work on Federal property. However, grants for operation of schools on behalf of people living on taxable property should be gradually reduced during an adjustment period, and then terminated.

Labor and manpower: Rapid technological developments and constant changes within the economy create complex manpower problems. This budget provides increased grants to the States to handle unemployment compensation claims promptly and to maintain an effective employment service system. The budget also recommends funds for the Department of Labor to carry forward its efforts to help labor and management meet the demand for technicians and skilled workers which accompanies the demand for scientists and engineers.

I again recommend the enactment of legislation to improve the welfare of working men and women. In this field, recommendations are already before the Congress for legislation to assure equal pay for equal work, to revise the laws governing hours of work on Federal construction projects, to extend the coverage of the minimum wage, and to improve the coverage of unemployment compensation. I will make proposals in a special message to the Congress concerning amendments to the legislation on labor-management relations and the registration and safeguarding of union as well as welfare and pension funds.

Health and hospital programs: Expenditures for health programs have increased sharply since 1955. In 1959 the increase will be largely for construction programs already underway. New obligational authority for health activities is being reduced, principally with respect to construction of hospitals. This will not materially affect the planned level of obligations and expenditures for hospital grants in the fiscal year 1959, because prior-year appropriations are available and will be used. New obligational authority of $75 million is recommended for the fiscal year 1959.

The authorizing legislation for hospital construction grants will expire on June 30, 1959. In view of the progress already made toward meeting community hospital requirements for general beds, the Federal program should be modified to meet only the most urgent needs, with emphasis on specialized needs.

The Congress should take action on legislation under which the Federal Government can help the medical and dental schools to build teaching, as well as research, facilities to help meet medical and dental manpower needs.

Social and economic security programs: Nine out of ten workers are covered under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance programs, and 3 out of 5 are insured against unemployment. These benefits are financed through trust funds supported by special employment taxes. Retirement and survivors insurance is provided as well through trust funds covering railroad workers, Federal civil service employees, and veterans. Many individuals are also eligible under prescribed conditions for public assistance, veterans' pensions, military retirement, or other benefits financed from general appropriations in the Federal budget. Of the estimated $22 billion in total expenditures from budget and trust funds for labor and welfare programs and for veterans' services and benefits, an estimated $10 billion will be for old-age benefits.

The rapid growth of Federal programs for maintaining individual or family incomes, and the numerous piecemeal liberalizations in the applicable laws, suggest the need for appraising these activities as a whole. The Advisory Council on Social Security Financing is studying some of the problems of retirement and disability insurance financing, and this budget includes funds for other basic studies. In the meantime, technical provisions of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance legislation should be simplified and the paperwork burden on employers should be lessened by enactment of consolidated annual wage reporting for both income tax and social security payroll tax purposes.

Although Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance provides an increasing share of economic security for the aged, the dependent, and the disabled, the Federal Government's expenditures for public assistance continue to mount because of the successive amendments increasing the Federal matching share. These programs are now well established and the individual States have gained experience as to appropriate levels of assistance. In line with my belief that the States should have greater responsibility for programs of this nature, proposals will be sent to the Congress for modernizing the formulas for public assistance with a view to gradually reducing Federal participation in its financing. This legislation should be made effective starting in 1960 to assure that the States will have adequate opportunity to adjust their finances and their programs, thus preventing an adverse impact on needy recipients.

The railroad retirement system is a self-financed retirement and social insurance program operated by the Government for the convenience of the railroad workers and industry. The financing of this system is far from sound on an actuarial basis. I reiterate my earlier recommendations that the Congress take steps to increase employer and employee contribution rates sufficiently to correct this inadequate long-term financing.

Legislative action is also needed to place on a sound basis the financing of Federal contributions to the railroad retirement account for time which railroad workers have spent in military service. The Comptroller General has reported that under existing law the Federal Government has appropriated to this fund over $300 million more than the probable actual cost of benefits which will ultimately be paid, based on credits for time spent in military service. The Government should be charged only for the actual cost of benefits as they are paid. At the same time that the Government has been making overpayments to the railroad retirement account, it has been incurring a liability to the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for similar military service credits. In equity to all concerned, I recommend that overpayments to the railroad retirement account be recovered and applied to meet general budget liabilities to the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for military service benefits.

COMMERCE AND HOUSING

Net expenditures for commerce and housing programs, in the aggregate, are expected to decline from $2.1 billion in fiscal year 1958 to $1.6 billion in 1959. The principal reductions arise from proposed legislation to provide more adequate postal rates and from termination under existing law of the authority of the Veterans Administration to make direct loans for housing. Some other expenditures will increase substantially as the result of authorizations made in prior years. The major increases are in the Housing and Home Finance Agency for mortgage purchases and college housing loans, and in the Department of Commerce for improvement of the Federal airways.

I repeat my recommendation of last year for the prompt enactment of appropriate authority under which communities with basic problems of persistent unemployment can be assisted in their solution. Extension of the Export Control Act is recommended. Prompt enactment of legislation to control advertising on the interstate highway system is also recommended.

*Commerce and housing*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Postal service: | | | | |
| Present program | $518 | $656 | $684 | $701 |
| Proposed legislation | | | [1] −700 | [1] −700 |
| Community development and facilities: | | | | |
| Urban Renewal Administration: | | | | |
| Present program | 39 | 61 | 66 | 4 |
| Proposed legislation | | | | 200 |
| Other | 10 | 28 | 39 | 12 |
| Public housing programs | 60 | 71 | 79 | 126 |
| Other aids to housing: | | | | |
| Federal Housing Administration | −39 | −53 | −80 | |
| Federal National Mortgage Association: | | | | |
| Present program | −188 | −61 | 139 | |
| Proposed legislation | | | | 90 |
| College housing: | | | | |
| Present program | 97 | 162 | 219 | |
| Proposed legislation | | | | 200 |
| Veterans' Administration | 77 | 145 | −5 | |
| Other | −6 | −1 | −23 | 10 |
| Promotion of water transportation | 365 | 397 | 407 | 544 |
| Provision of highways | 40 | 38 | 7 | |
| Promotion of aviation | 295 | 413 | 572 | 654 |
| Other aids to business: | | | | |
| Small Business Administration: | | | | |
| Present program | 60 | 84 | −27 | |
| Proposed legislation (business loans) | | | 84 | 39 |
| Other | −10 | 35 | 34 | 47 |
| Regulation of commerce and finance: | | | | |
| Department of Commerce: | | | | |
| Present program | 7 | 8 | 6 | 6 |
| Proposed legislation (export-control extension) | | | 3 | 3 |
| Other | 37 | 41 | 43 | 43 |
| Disaster insurance, loans, and relief: | | | | |
| Small Business Administration: | | | | |
| Present program | 5 | 8 | −3 | |
| Proposed legislation (disaster loans) | | | 9 | 14 |
| Other | 15 | 18 | 18 | |
| Civil defense: | | | | |
| Federal Civil Defense Administration: | | | | |
| Present program | 63 | 67 | 44 | 42 |
| Proposed legislation | | | 20 | 26 |
| Other | −1 | (*) | (*) | |
| Total | 1,452 | 2,146 | 1,627 | [2] 2,061 |

[1] Does not include $160 million for pay adjustments shown in the budget under allowance for proposed legislation and contingencies.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of $3,852 million for 1957 and $4,026 million for 1958.

*Less than $500,000.

**Postal service:** In every year since the close of World War II, the postal service has incurred large deficits. These deficits have placed heavy and unfair burdens on the taxpayers, to the special advantage of large users of the mails. Even with the improvements in efficiency in the last few years, expenditures needed in 1959 to provide the minimum requirements for postal service under present legislation will exceed receipts by an estimated $684 million.

The reasons for these chronic deficits are clear. In the quarter century since 1932, postal costs have more than doubled. On the other hand, postage rates for letters and publications are almost identical today with those 25 years ago, and rates for advertising matter have been increased by only 38 percent. Only parcel post, which is required by law to pay its way, has had rate increases commensurate with cost increases. Meanwhile postal volume has almost tripled. Every expansion in volume at today's postal rates tends to add to the deficit passed on to the general taxpayers.

In meeting this problem the Post Office Department has made effective use in recent years of the management practices successfully developed by private industry. The organization and methods of the Department have been modernized and its administration decentralized in order to meet local needs more promptly and efficiently. Obsolete postal buildings are being replaced or renovated. An aggressive research program has been initiated. Specialized motor vehicles, mail-sorting machines, and other new equipment are being developed and installed. These will provide better service to the public at lower operating cost.

On the other hand, further increases in certain costs in 1959 and later years are expected. An amount of $25 million has been included in the Post Office Department budget to provide for recent and pending increases in charges by railways for transportation of mail. The general allowance for proposed legislation and contingencies also includes $160 million to cover the estimated costs of postal pay increases recommended to become effective July 1, 1958, as part of the general policy on employee pay.

In view of present and prospective postal deficits, legislation to authorize adequate postal rates has become one of the most urgent items of unfinished business before the Congress. The House of Representatives has already approved changes in rates for letters, publications, and advertising mail which would add materially to present revenues, but still leave a large deficit. To provide revenues which will more adequately meet present needs, the pending legislation should be amended, primarily by establishing a 5-cent letter rate on all except local letters. This is more than the 4-cent rate I recommended last year for both local and other letters, but it is needed to take account of the pay increase and other higher costs. The recommendations I am making should result in a net increase in postal revenues of about $700 million in the fiscal year 1959. With the postal pay adjustments which are being recommended, the postal deficit will still be substantial.

Legislation now before the Congress should be enacted to authorize the liquidation of the Postal Savings System. In view of the growth of federally insured private savings institutions and the availability of U. S. savings bonds, this system has become unnecessary. Its use has been declining and its termination will free Post Office staff for other duties.

**Housing and community development:** Last year our population increased by 3 million people; before another decade passes it will exceed 200 million. Almost 60 percent of our people work and live in the 174 metropolitan areas and within these areas most of the growth has been in the suburbs. The rapid growth of our population and its increasing concentration in urban and suburban areas have created unprecedented problems for both industry and government in helping achieve the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

Private industry and State and local governments have the basic responsibility for helping families meet this goal. The Federal Government can help best by guaranteeing loans, encouraging the private market for housing obligations, and by making limited grants to State and local public agencies. We must avoid unnecessary reliance on direct Federal financing. Such financing not only burdens the taxpayer but, more important, by discouraging private financing, limits the total amount of housing activity. To increase the effectiveness of Federal aids, important revisions are proposed in this budget.

Under the Housing Acts of 1949 and 1954, the Urban Renewal Administration makes loans and grants to help remove or prevent the slums which obstruct the orderly development of our cities. In July 1957, 178 federally supported urban renewal projects in 122 cities were actually in process of clearance and redevelopment, and plans were underway for 254 more projects in these and 142 other cities. By the end of the first decade of the program in 1959, over 600 projects will be either completed or in the planning or development stages.

Now that this important program is well underway throughout the Nation and the gains to participating communities have become well recognized, I believe the time has come when States and local communities should assume a share of the administrative responsibilities and financial costs more nearly commensurate with the benefits which their citizens receive. To this end I am recommending a fivefold program.

First, in the future the local communities should share in the costs of planning from the start. In the past, in most instances, the Federal Government advanced all the money required for planning projects, and the local share was paid only if and when projects based upon these plans went forward. The substitution of this cost-sharing formula for the previous advances will encourage more careful programing of individual projects and will mean fewer cases in which projects are abandoned after significant Federal outlays.

Second, I strongly support the recommendation of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee that each State establish a special agency for urban development, housing, and metropolitan planning to assume, as soon as possible, the financial responsibility for local planning of urban renewal projects. Adoption of this recommendation will be a constructive first step toward increasing the role of the States in this program and should ultimately permit the Federal Government to withdraw from supervision and review of planning.

Third, on all projects initiated in 1960 and later years, the States and localities should be required to provide an increasing share of the cost of buying and clearing the land and other net project costs. The present formula under which the local agency pays for one-third and Federal capital grants pay for the remaining two-thirds of the net project cost should be changed by providing for annual reductions, so that by the fiscal year 1962 the Federal Government would contribute not more than 50 percent of the cost of local projects. In the interim, the State legislatures will have an opportunity to decide the extent of their future participation and the local communities can likewise adjust their own financial planning.

Fourth, the Federal Government should give positive assurance concerning this program to the States and the cities by authorizing funds now for 1959 and each of the 5 succeeding years. Specifically an additional $200 million for capital grants should be provided in the fiscal year 1959. Since over $50 million in unused authority for capital grants will remain at the beginning of 1959, more than $250 million will be available for grants in that year. For 1960, $250 million should be authorized with a Federal participation of 60 percent of net project costs. For 1961, the amount should also be $250 million but the Federal share should be 55 percent. For 1962–64, the amount should be $200 million annually with the Federal share 50 percent. With the change in the statutory formula, the reduced Federal grants will support a generally larger urban renewal program.

Fifth, consideration should be given to authorizing the Urban Renewal Administration to help local public agencies finance nonresidential urban renewal projects which do not require Federal capital grants by guaranteeing obligations issued to finance such projects. In many communities, the increased property taxes obtainable from this type of redevelopment are so substantial that private financing should be obtained without ultimate net cost to the Federal Government.

Capital grants are only part of the present and prospective requirements for Federal support for the urban renewal program. It is estimated that in 1959 the Federal National Mortgage Association will make commitments of $250 million for the purchase of federally insured mortgages on housing in urban renewal areas and on housing for families displaced by this and other Government programs. The amount of these mortgage purchase commitments arises partly from the statutory requirement that all purchases by the Association be made at par—considerably above the prices which private lenders would be willing to pay. As I have previously urged, this requirement should be repealed. With more realistic mortgage prices, it should be possible to restore the incentive for private financing originally intended under the Housing Act of 1954 and thus avoid the necessity for additional large amounts of new obligational authority to finance purchases of mortgages under this program and under programs for armed services and cooperative housing. Even without par purchases, however, the Association will require $90 million of new obligational authority in 1959 to purchase mortgages which are not currently acceptable to private lenders. As urban renewal receives greater local support, these mortgages should become increasingly attractive for private financing, and hence the present special assistance program for them should be looked upon as a temporary stimulant only.

An estimated 81,000 families will be displaced from their homes in 1959 by urban renewal projects, highway construction, and other governmental (primarily State and local) action. Most of these families can afford standard housing available in the private market, and, if necessary, they can obtain insured mortgages which are eligible for purchase by the Federal National Mortgage Association. To make this program effective in high cost areas, the maximum amount of a mortgage that can be insured should be increased from $10,000 to $12,000 for single-family homes. The Public Housing Administration has authority to meet anticipated requests from local public agencies for loans and contributions to support the needed housing for families of lower income. To assure orderly provision of such units, the time limits governing this authority need to be extended beyond present expiration dates.

With the expiration in July 1958 of the special loan guaranty benefits for veterans of World War II and of the direct housing loan program for all veterans, the Federal Housing Administration again becomes the only Federal agency providing comprehensive insurance or guaranties of private housing credit. At my request, the Congress last year liberalized the terms under which Federal Housing Administration mortgages were insured, making broader benefits available for the general public, including veterans. To strengthen further the mortgage insurance and guaranty programs, I shall recommend legislation to revise ceilings on interest rates and to remove discount controls which now discourage private financing of military housing and certain other FHA-insured mortgages and which prevent many veterans of the Korean conflict from using their continuing loan guaranty benefits. To make the liberal terms of insured mortgages available for larger and better houses, the maximum mortgage amount on owner-occupied housing should be increased to $30,000. To provide more effective financing aids for housing built for the elderly, the special provisions in existing programs should be liberalized and consolidated into a separate rental housing program for elderly persons. Finally, to give continuing assurance to home buyers, builders, and lenders of the availability of mortgage insurance, an additional $3 billion per year should be authorized in the maximum permissible dollar amount of outstanding FHA-insured mortgages during each of the next 5 fiscal years.

To meet the increased needs for college housing arising from soaring enrollments, Federal loans to colleges should be entirely for essential dormitories and faculty housing, and should no longer be made for student unions and other less essential facilities. Private financing should be encouraged by (1) replacing the subsidized interest rates required by the present statute with rates in no event less than the Government's costs, (2) authorizing Federal guaranties of college housing obligations which do not have Federal tax exemption, and (3) prohibiting direct loans where private funds are available on reasonable terms. In addition, new obligational authority of $200 million is needed for the fiscal year 1959.

Water transportation: Our maritime legislation, originally enacted in 1936, is being reviewed with the aim of reducing future Government subsidies to the minimum amount consistent with the national interest. For example, it appears that the replacement period for ships receiving operating subsidies might well be extended from the present 20-year period to 25 or more years. This review will include the laws governing both construction and operating subsidies to determine what changes, if any, are needed. To the extent that changes are desirable, appropriate recommendations will be made.

Promotion of aviation: New obligational authority and expenditures for promotion of aviation will again increase substantially under the 1959 budget, primarily to expand the capacity of the Federal airways to accommodate the rapid growth of air traffic and the new types of high-speed aircraft soon to be in operation. The Civil Aeronautics Administration will require $230 million to operate and maintain the airways system and to enforce air safety regulations and $175 million for procurement of new airways facilities. The amounts for facilities in 1959 and later years will be less than would otherwise be needed because of the recently completed arrangements for sharing facilities and data with the Department of Defense. New obligational authority of $35 million is requested for the Airways Modernization Board, recently established to undertake needed research and development on improvement of air traffic control and navigation facilities. At the same time supplemental appropriations of $12 million are requested for the fiscal year 1958 and new obligational authority of $107 million for 1959 to permit the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to expand its research and development activities dealing with basic problems involved in the flight of aircraft, ballistic and guided missiles, and space vehicles.

To pay a substantial part of the cost of operating the airways system, I am recommending increased taxes on aviation fuels. I also think we should redouble our efforts to find ways and means to reduce and ultimately eliminate all subsidies for airlines.

Small business: The Small Business Administration has been providing extensive financial and technical assistance to small businesses, as well as disaster loans to businesses and homeowners, under temporary authority expiring

July 31, 1958. The experience of its first 4½ years has demonstrated the importance of these programs. Accordingly, I recommend that the limitation on the life of the Administration be removed and that new obligational authority of $53 million be provided. Including the proceeds from the increasing repayments on earlier loans, this will provide $161 million for new direct loans, participating loans, and other aids to small business during the fiscal year 1959. As mentioned earlier, certain tax revisions to aid small business should be enacted.

Civil defense: Our civilian defenses must be further strengthened through joint Federal-State action. To carry out this purpose, recommendations were transmitted to the last session of the Congress to provide for greater Federal sharing with the States of costs of civil defense personnel and administration and for placing added responsibility on the Federal Government for civil defense. New obligational authority of $26 million is provided in the budget for the first-year cost of this legislation, which has been approved by the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate.

Expenditures for activities designed to promote the defense of the civilian population against nuclear attack are estimated to be about the same in the fiscal year 1959 as in the current year. The question of a shelter program is under consideration and tests of various types of shelters are continuing. The budget provides for extending and improving the attack warning system, and for expanding research and training in civil defense problems. These increases will be offset by a temporary suspension of procurement of medical supplies.

The structure of Federal organization for the planning, coordination, and conduct of our nonmilitary defense programs has been reviewed, and I have concluded that the existing statutes assigning responsibilities for the central coordination and direction of these programs are out of date. The rapid technical advances of military science have led to a serious overlap among agencies carrying on these leadership and planning functions. Because the situation will continue to change and because these functions transcend the responsibility of any single department or agency, I have concluded that they should be vested in no one short of the President. I will make recommendations to the Congress on this subject.

VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

Expenditures for Federal services and benefits to veterans in the fiscal year 1959 are estimated to be $5 billion. This amount is $219 million greater than expenditures in 1957, but $22 million lower than the estimate for the current year. The expenditures estimated for 1959 reflect the cost of increases in disability compensation rates enacted in the past session of Congress and a steady growth in non-service-connected pension caseloads. On the other hand, reductions which exceed the increases in compensation and pensions will result from a decline in the readjustment needs of veterans of the Korean conflict and from economies in operations.

*Veterans' services and benefits*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Readjustment benefits: | | | | |
| Education and training | $774 | $729 | $626 | $625 |
| Loan guaranty and other benefits | 73 | 93 | 93 | 93 |
| Unemployment compensation | 53 | 44 | 18 | 19 |
| Compensation and pensions | 2,870 | 3,107 | 3,232 | 3,232 |
| Hospital and medical care | 765 | 807 | 804 | 806 |
| Hospital construction | 36 | 89 | 36 | 9 |
| Insurance and servicemen's indemnities | 47 | 44 | 40 | 52 |
| Other services and administration (Veterans' Administration and others) | 175 | 171 | 162 | 160 |
| Total | 4,793 | 5,034 | 5,012 | [1] 4,996 |

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $4,870 million for 1957 and $5,013 million for 1958.

In addition to these programs financed from regular appropriations, large veterans insurance operations are carried on through the trust funds reported in part III of the budget. Payments and dividends of $682 million are expected to be disbursed to veterans and their survivors from these insurance funds in the fiscal year 1959.

Under existing laws, our country is faced in the long run with large and increasing expenditures for veterans programs. While a further decline in readjustment benefits may be expected during the next several years, costs for pensions for needy veterans will increase sharply. These pensions meet needs not related to the veteran's period of service, but rather to the hazards to health and income that generally grow with increasing age. Fundamental changes have taken place in our society in the last several decades which require us to reconsider the laws providing veterans benefits and services which now overlap other growing public benefit and welfare programs. As I indicated last summer, a message on veterans affairs will be sent to the Congress at an early date. In that message there will be set forth for the consideration of the Congress recommendations for specific adjustments and improvements in the compensation, pension, and related programs which will enable us to discharge our national responsibilities to veterans with the greatest possible equity to all concerned.

The budget makes provision for new obligations of $50 million during 1959 for construction, modernization, and repair of hospital and domiciliary facilities. However, substantial unobligated balances of prior-year appropriations reduce the need for new appropriations for construction purposes to $9 million. The general operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration will be reduced more than 5 percent in the coming year because of numerous administrative improvements and declining workloads in the readjustment benefits programs.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources have amounted to over 30 percent of the Federal expenditures for civil benefits in the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 and are estimated to take almost as large a proportion in 1958. This compares with a little over 20 percent in 1953 and 1954. In this budget, I am recommending important revisions in our price support, conservation, and rural credit programs to place them on a sounder long-term basis with less reliance on the Federal Treasury. These revisions will result in only moderate reductions in budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1959, but should result in more significant reductions in 1960 and later years.

*Agriculture and agricultural resources*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Stabilization of farm prices and farm income: | | | | |
| Commodity Credit Corporation: | | | | |
| Commodity loans and purchases: | | | | |
| Present programs | $3,362 | $3,061 | $2,609 | |
| Proposed legislation (extension of title I of Public Law 480) | ---- | 28 | 93 | |
| Payments to producers and purchasers: | | | | |
| Present programs | 118 | 135 | 34 | $1,790 |
| Proposed legislation (special milk programs) | ---- | ---- | 75 | |
| Carrying charges and operating expenses | 1,000 | 1,100 | 1,224 | |
| Receipts (sales for dollars and other adjustments) | −1,793 | −1,666 | −1,564 | |
| Subtotal, Commodity Credit Corporation | 2,684 | 2,745 | 2,350 | 1,790 |
| Soil bank (excluding conservation practice payments) | 535 | 620 | 604 | 520 |
| Removal of surplus agricultural commodities | 171 | 150 | 150 | 225 |
| Sugar Act, acreage allotments, and other: | | | | |
| Present programs | 121 | 113 | 122 | 122 |
| Proposed legislation (acreage allotments) | ---- | ---- | −2 | −2 |
| Total, stabilization of farm prices and farm income | 3,511 | 3,628 | 3,293 | 2,655 |
| Conservation of agricultural land and water resources: | | | | |
| Agricultural conservation program | 240 | 251 | 227 | 235 |
| Soil bank (conservation practice payments) | 13 | 80 | 152 | 161 |
| Soil Conservation Service, watershed protection, Great Plains, and other | 80 | 106 | 112 | 110 |

*Agriculture and agricultural resources*—Con.

[Fiscal years. In billions]

| Program or agency | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Financing rural electrification and rural telephones | $267 | $339 | $376 | $215 |
| Financing farm ownership and operation: | | | | |
| Farmers' Home Administration | 245 | 270 | 208 | 208 |
| Disaster loans | 10 | −8 | −2 | |
| Farm Credit Administration | −28 | −5 | −4 | 2 |
| Research and other agricultural services | 227 | 259 | 279 | 201 |
| Total, agriculture and agricultural resources | 4,582 | 4,924 | 4,601 | [1] 3,849 |

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $5,298 million for 1957 and $6,393 million (including $2,187 million of anticipated supplemental authorizations) for 1958.

Estimated expenditures in 1959 are $4.6 billion, the same as in 1957, but $0.3 billion less than in the current year. The anticipated decline is primarily in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Total new authority to incur obligations requested for agriculture and agricultural resources in 1959 is $3.8 billion. This amount includes $1.8 billion to restore the capital of the Corporation for price-support losses realized in the fiscal year 1957; those losses were reflected in budget expenditures in 1957 and prior years.

Price supports and related programs: Expenditures for price supports and other programs to stabilize farm prices and farm income have averaged more than $3.5 billion per year during the last 3 fiscal years. Under present farm laws these expenditures are likely to continue at high levels. Our system of price supports has tended to price key farm commodities as if they were scarce, stimulating continued production in excess of the quantities that existing markets can take at these prices. Controls have not been effective in reducing overall agricultural production, despite the severe restrictions they impose on farmers' freedom to produce and market. As a result, the Government has become the market for huge quantities of agricultural commodities, and our surplus disposal operations have been greatly expanded both at home and abroad. Present agricultural policy, therefore, places a heavy burden on taxpayers and complicates our foreign-trade relations.

A technological explosion is occurring on American farms as can be seen from the fact that production per farm worker has doubled in the last 15 years. A new dimension in farm policy has been created which makes it virtually impossible to curtail agricultural output with the type of controls acceptable in our society. Under these circumstances, farm products are likely to continue to be abundant, and we cannot successfully continue with present obsolete legal formulas governing acreage allotments and price supports.

I shall send to the Congress shortly a special message recommending certain changes in existing legislation that will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to establish price supports for basic crops consistent with the increased productive capacity of our agriculture. These measures could not begin to have a significant effect in freeing the farm economy from Government controls before 1960 under a program of gradual adjustment of production to normal market demands.

Titles I and II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 expire on June 30, 1958. Although sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under title I of this act do not provide a solution to the basic problem of adjusting agricultural production, they have proved to be an important temporary method of coping with problems arising out of the longtime accumulation of surplus agricultural commodities. This budget proposes extension of titles I and II of this act for one additional year, with an increase from the present $4 billion to $5.5 billion in the authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation to incur costs and losses under title I. Such an authorization does not constitute new obligational authority, but the resulting costs and losses necessitate new obligational authority in future years to reimburse the Corporation. The budget includes, therefore, an anticipated 1958 supplemental appropriation of $1.3 billion to reimburse the Corporation for the 1957 program. The operations of title I of this act and the uses of the foreign currencies are summarized in the Department of Agriculture chapter of part II of the budget.

Both the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs of the soil bank have been helpful in diverting cropland from the production of agricultural commodities that are in excess supply. After careful consideration, however, I believe that more material and lasting benefits per dollar spent, both in reducing production of surplus crops and in obtaining enduring conservation of the Nation's agricultural resources, will be achieved under the conservation reserve program. This budget, therefore, proposes termination of the acreage reserve program at the end of the 1958 crop year, and recommends a conservation reserve program of $450 million for the 1959 calendar year, an increase of $125 million above the program for 1958.

I also recommend that the special school milk program be extended after its present expiration date of June 30, 1958, that the National Wool Act be extended, and that legislation be enacted to require a greater sharing by the States in the costs of disaster relief assistance to farmers.

Agricultural conservation program: The budget includes $235 million in new obligational authority to finance cost-sharing payments to farmers in the fiscal year 1959 for conservation practices performed during the 1958 crop year. These payments were authorized by the 1958 Agricultural Appropriation Act. I am recommending that a program level of $125 million be authorized for the 1959 crop year. This amount, together with other public efforts in support of soil and water conservation, will permit cost-sharing payments for the more permanent soil- and water-conservation practices that are needed to maintain an adequate agricultural resource base. Those practices which are a part of usual and required annual farming methods or which return immediate benefits to the farm are properly the responsibility of the farmer, rather than of the Government. Thus, the appropriation required for the fiscal year 1960 can be reduced to approximately $125 million.

Agricultural credit programs: The budget includes a new authorization of $206 million for loans to electrification and telephone borrowers. Over the years the Rural Electrification Administration programs have done much to enrich the lives of our rural families, and have contributed greatly to the advance of rural America and our country's economy generally. The increased use of power requires additional generating capacity and heavier transmission and distribution facilities to meet the growing needs for electricity in rural areas. Approximately one-half of REA electric power now goes to rural industrial and nonfarm residential consumers, and in the future these nonfarm users will account for a larger share of the increasing demands. This situation, together with the present state of development of rural electric cooperatives, clearly indicates that it would be in the public interest to broaden the sources of capital from which the REA system may obtain the financing necessary for continued growth and adequate service to consumers. Therefore, legislation will be proposed (1) to assist both electric and telephone borrowers to obtain financing from private sources where the security is adequate and the loans can be repaid within a reasonable time, and (2) as previously mentioned in this message, to adjust interest rates on future loans for all loan programs to meet the Government's costs.

Disbursements for direct loans under the loan programs of the Farmers' Home Administration, exclusive of farm housing loans, are expected to amount to $231 million in the current fiscal year. This budget recommends a reduction of the authorization for these direct loans to $175 million for 1959. The Farmers' Home Administration will continue to assist farmers in arranging operating loans from other sources. Also, legislation will be proposed to encourage private investors to make more insured real estate loans.

Utilization research: During the past year, the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products made a report to me and to the Congress which emphasizes the importance of research on utilization of farm products. Our present research on industrial uses of farm products is, therefore, being expanded as a step in carrying out some of the Commission's recommendations. Appropriations recommended for 1959

provide $19 million for domestic utilization research, and, to the extent feasible, steps will be taken to make available to the Department in the fiscal year 1959 up to an additional $5 million of foreign currencies, obtained from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, to contract for utilization research abroad. The research financed by foreign currencies will be directed toward increasing acceptance and use of our farm commodities and their products in foreign markets. Together with the amounts provided for the Forest Service (classified under natural resources) $26 million is estimated to be available for utilization research.

The Department will continue to review its research activities, particularly in farm production, with the objective of placing increased emphasis on utilization research wherever this is feasible. Studies are proceeding to determine the most effective organizational arrangements for conducting this research within the Department.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The 1959 budget recommendations for natural-resource programs contemplate the greatest possible economy in the use of Federal dollars, with due regard to the effectiveness of these programs in contributing to national security and long-term economic growth.

This budget contemplates curtailing some programs and stretching out construction on certain public-works projects where this can be done without impairing the value of investments previously made. At the same time, there will be necessary increases in expenditures for public works, because of the many commitments made for projects started in previous years. Total Federal expenditures for natural resources will increase $35 million over the current year. These expenditures are estimated to be $1.5 billion in the fiscal year 1959, of which about $1 billion will be for the development of water resources.

There should be increased financial participation by State and local agencies and private interests in conservation and development programs. Such participation multiplies the effectiveness of Federal Government expenditures for these programs. In particular, there should be a uniform and consistent basis of local sharing of the costs on all projects involving flood control which produce identifiable benefits to local groups.

*Natural resources*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Land and water resources: | | | | |
| Corps of Engineers, civil functions | $610 | $630 | $665 | $628 |
| Department of the Interior: | | | | |
| Bureau of Reclamation | 171 | 199 | 216 | 202 |
| Power marketing agencies | 42 | 41 | 38 | 36 |
| Indian lands resources | 39 | 42 | 50 | 35 |

*Natural resources*—Continued

[Fiscal years. In billions]

| Program or agency | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Land and water resources—Continued | | | | |
| Public domain lands and other | $24 | $28 | $29 | $26 |
| Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 37 | 44 | 19 | -------- |
| Tennessee Valley Authority: | | | | |
| Present program | −7 | 41 | 47 | 17 |
| Proposed legislation | -------- | -------- | 13 | 125 |
| Department of State | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Federal Power Commission | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Forest resources | 162 | 171 | 169 | 170 |
| Fish and wildlife resources | 51 | 65 | 58 | 58 |
| Recreational resources | 59 | 78 | 73 | 40 |
| Mineral resources | 62 | 63 | 56 | 51 |
| General resource surveys and other | 38 | 43 | 47 | 46 |
| Total | 1,296 | 1,457 | 1,492 | [1] 1,446 |

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $1,355 million for 1957 and $1,439 million for 1958.

Many of the resource programs yield financial receipts, most of which come from sale of power and timber and from mineral leases on the public lands and the Outer Continental Shelf. These receipts are estimated to be $859 million in the fiscal year 1959. The estimated expenditures for 1959 include shared-revenue payments of $78 million of these receipts to States and counties.

Water resources: The construction activities of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for flood control, navigation, irrigation, water supply, and power projects will be limited in 1959 to orderly continuation of work started in prior years. For the fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958, a total of $210 million was provided as the first-year appropriations for starting 407 new projects having an estimated total cost of $4.5 billion. As a result, expenditures for these two agencies in 1959 will be higher than in any of the 5 preceding years and will increase further in 1960. We should not at this time add to this extremely high level of commitments by starting any new projects in 1959.

Construction on 309 water resources projects which these agencies will have under way in 1958 will go forward in 1959 as economically as possible. Expenditures for maintenance and operation of present facilities in 1959 will be at levels which will provide reasonable protection of the Federal investment.

In the interest of sound and efficient water resources programs in coming years, funds have been provided to continue investigations and advance planning and to assemble basic data for future projects.

In accordance with my earlier recommendations, both Houses of the Congress have had under consideration legislation which would authorize the sale of revenue bonds by the Tennessee Valley Authority. I hope that action on appropriate legislation will be speedily concluded in order that the Tennessee Valley Authority may be in a position to meet approved needs for new generating facilities, with the Congress still retaining budgetary control of the program. This budget includes, under proposed revenue-bond legislation, $125 million to finance the construction of additional power generating units.

INTEREST AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Interest expenditures of $7.9 billion, predominantly on the public debt, will account for 11 percent of budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1959.

Expenditures for general government, primarily for central administrative costs not classified among the other major activities, will be held to about the 1958 level despite increases in workload accompanying the normal growth of population. The estimated total expenditures in 1959 of $1.4 billion are less than 2 percent of the total budget.

INTEREST

The estimated interest payments in 1959 will be about the same as in 1958. During the past several years, market rates of interest have been steadily increasing until recent months, reflecting the heavy competition for savings to finance record levels of capital investment. These higher rates have meant corresponding increases in the budget cost of refinancing the large volume of maturing Government obligations. With recent changes in interest rates, however, no further increase in payments for 1959 is now estimated.

*Interest*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Item | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Interest on the public debt | $7,244 | $7,800 | $7,800 | $7,800 |
| Interest on refunds of receipts | 57 | 61 | 62 | 62 |
| Interest on uninvested funds | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
| Total | 7,308 | 7,867 | 7,869 | 7,869 |

Apart from fluctuations in rates, the level of interest payments is determined by the size and composition of the public debt. The only sound long-run method of reducing this cost is to balance the budget, economic conditions permitting, and apply the surplus revenues to reducing the debt.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

If we are to retain in Government service the highly skilled and able civilian employees who contribute so much to the Nation's strength, it is clear that certain revisions are needed in the statutory pay structures for these employees, as well as for military personnel. My proposals for such revisions, to be effective July 1, 1958, and for other civilian personnel legislation, will be submitted to the Congress at an early date.

This budget includes in the 1959 allowance for proposed legislation and contingencies $160 million to meet the cost of pay revisions for postal employees and $179 million for employees in all other agencies except the Department of Defense. The budget for the Department

of Defense, the Government's largest employer, makes allowance for its share of the additional cost.

While the adjustments which will be proposed under the Classification Act will affect rates of pay at all levels, they will have as a primary objective more adequate compensation for those whose present salary is substantially less than their responsibilities. Salary rates for junior and intermediate scientific and managerial grades should be more nearly competitive with non-Federal rates. Pay relationships in the middle and upper grades should be revised to provide greater incentive for those who assume increased responsibilities and demonstrate their proficiency in discharging them. Statutory limitations on the number of positions in the highest pay grades should be removed altogether, to permit more reasonable salaries for scientists and executives carrying heavy burdens of leadership and decision. Structural revision of the postal pay system has already been substantially accomplished but a general pay increase under that system is now appropriate.

Last year I recommended a program of hospitalization and medical insurance for Government employees. In view of the priority given to recommended pay adjustments, I propose that this health insurance program be postponed.

To carry out the recommendation of the Hoover Commission for improving career opportunities and effectiveness in the civil service, legislation should be enacted to authorize the training of Government employees outside as well as within the agencies in which they are employed. Legislation should also be enacted to provide for each employing agency to bear its share of the cost of accident compensation benefits.

*General government*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Budget expenditures | | | Recommended new obligational authority for 1959 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 actual | 1958 estimate | 1959 estimate | |
| Legislative functions | $90 | $101 | $112 | $82 |
| Judicial functions | 40 | 44 | 46 | 46 |
| Executive direction | 12 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Federal financial management | 476 | 508 | 507 | 508 |
| General property and records management | 194 | 255 | 275 | 266 |
| Central personnel management and employment costs | [1]627 | 124 | 108 | 108 |
| Civilian weather services | 38 | 39 | 41 | 40 |
| Protective services and alien control | 187 | 193 | 197 | 198 |
| Territories and possessions and the District of Columbia: | | | | |
| Present program | 74 | 81 | 91 | 90 |
| Proposed legislation (land acquisition, National Capital Planning Commission) | ------- | (*) | 4 | 1 |
| Other general government | 51 | 17 | 8 | 9 |
| Total | 1,789 | 1,377 | 1,403 | [2]1,362 |

[1] Includes Government payment to the civil service retirement and disability fund. Starting in 1958, this payment was allocated among all employing agencies.
[2] Compares with new obligational authority of $1,835 million for 1957 and $1,368 million for 1958.
* Less than $500,000.

In order to meet the most pressing needs for new Federal buildings, the authority of the General Services Administration and the Post Office Department to enter into lease-purchase contracts should be extended.

I have been advised by the Attorney General that section 601 of Public Law 155, 82d Congress, concerning certain real estate transactions, reflects the exercise of legislative authority not warranted by the Constitution and that it is therefore unconstitutional. I recommend immediate repeal of this provision.

In furtherance of the invitation extended by the United States to hold the Eighth Olympic Winter Games in this country in 1960, I recommend that the Congress authorize the expenditure of not more than $4 million to assist in the construction of adequate facilities for the games and to defray the costs of providing assistance to the games by elements of our Armed Forces.

Legislation now pending before the Congress to place Government appropriation requests on an accrued expenditure basis should be enacted, in accordance with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. This is a businesslike approach and it is hoped that the opposition that developed in the past will be withdrawn as a result of further study and modifications in the way the procedure is to be applied. Likewise, efforts to achieve economy in Government would be greatly helped by legislation authorizing an item veto. This legislation would change the present situation under which every appropriation bill must be approved or disapproved as a whole, regardless of the merits or demerits of its individual items.

Last year, the Congress enacted legislation to cover some of my most urgent proposals for amending the immigration laws. I urge that legislation on my remaining proposals be promptly enacted.

I recommend again that the Congress enact suitable legislation providing for home rule in the District of Columbia. Under any such system the citizens of the District should be authorized to elect local officials, to vote in Federal elections, and to have a Delegate in the House of Representatives.

I also recommend that the Congress complete action on appropriate legislation admitting Hawaii and Alaska into the Union as States.

Americans have a tradition of uniting in action when their freedoms and welfare are threatened. We do not shirk our clear responsibilities when new challenges arise.

I feel confident that this budget expresses the way in which the American people will want to respond to the promises and dangers of the dawning age of space conquest. New dimensions must be added to our defenses, and outmoded activities must be discarded. Closer international cooperation is vital in a world where great distances are losing their meaning. As we devote more of our efforts and resources to these compelling tasks, we will have to limit our demands for less essential services and benefits provided by the Federal Government.

Our response must rise above personal selfishness, above sectional interests, above political partisanship. The goal of lasting peace with justice, difficult though it may be to achieve, is worth all of our efforts. We must make the necessary sacrifices to attain it. Our own people demand it and the nations of the world look to us for leadership.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 13, 1958.

---

## THE BUDGET

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the President's message just read from the desk is one of the most important executive papers ever submitted to the Congress. And the budget which it transmits meets as satisfactorily perhaps as could be expected the purpose for which it was drafted.

It represents a change in the attitude of the President, and perhaps the country, toward Federal expenditures. During the last session the President issued drastic orders to withhold appropriations and keep all expenditures within or lower than the amount provided for previous budgets. In the same session Congress cut a little over $5 billion from the estimates for the current year. And the country in general approved the reductions. There was prospect for even greater reductions in this year's estimates.

But the demonstration by Russian scientists of superiority in satellite research, and the realization that England had outdistanced us in the commercial application of atomic energy, brought a sharp reversal in official and national sentiment which is reflected in the pending budget.

This budget is drafted to meet the changed situation. It is a national defense budget. It is a peace budget. But it is ostensibly a balanced budget. Critics will say that it is in precarious balance and that the balance is temporary. That is for Congress to determine. A principal unknown factor is the maintenance of Federal revenues. Barring a precipitous decline in national income Congress could, if so minded, supply all defense needs without limit or reservation of any kind and still retain a balanced budget.

The situation is urgent. Russia has available more troops than all the allies combined—armed with newer and lighter rifles. She has more and better tanks, more submarines and more airplanes. And missiles in production which are still on allied drawing boards. The disparity grows with every day, every second. While we build one submarine Russia builds three. While we are producing one airplane Russia is producing a dozen. While we graduate 20,000 engineers, Russia graduates 50,000.

The constantly growing area of communism is extending around the world. We are beleaguered on every side. Our allies have escape clauses in their treaties. All overseas air bases from which our retaliatory Strategic Air Command operates are located on sites and under leases subject to revocation without notice. With few exceptions our allies are leaving the back door open and at the first alarm will get out so precipitously they will carry the door jam with them.

And let us remember there are no second prizes this time. We are not opposing a benevolent opponent observing the finer points of international warfare, who will spend billions of dollars rehabilitating America after the few of us who are left have negotiated a treaty of surrender. Sixty million men, women, and children, one-third of our population, will perish in the first attack. Another third will die before firing squads or in prison camps. Only the untrained and unskilled, incapable of leadership, will remain. All property will be confiscated and shipped to Russia as in Czechoslovakia, Estonia, and Poland or Russian terrorists will be imported to manage it as in East Germany. Khrushchev has told us frankly he will bury us.

He does not have to fly over the North Pole and across our carefully maintained radar lines. We will not be alerted. Russian submarines are now being equipped with missiles which can be fired under water and which will destroy any city within a radius of 500 miles. The Russian intermediate range ballistic missile, now said to be going into production would make this 1,500 miles. Without coming to the surface they can devastate the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and territory adjacent to any navigable river. If their intercontinental ballistic missile is perfected before ours we would be helpless.

We ask ourselves how a country so rich and powerful and enlightened that under the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt no power dared arrest a Pericardis and whose Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt dictated terms of peace to every nation and remade a large part of the map of Europe, has fallen to so low estate, and is today in such mortal danger.

The answer is right here in this budget, clear and unmistakable. This budget points unerringly to the cause—and the remedy. The Russian forces outclass us in every modern weapon—except one. Do you note that they are building tanks, planes, submarines, atomic reactors and H-bombs. But they are not building supercarriers. Only we are dumb enough to build *Forrestal* carriers.

The modern carrier is the most expensive and intricate piece of machinery ever built and requires more strategic stockpiled material, more money, more time, more capable engineers and architects, more electronic technique, more skilled workers and expert artisans than any machine ever devised by the mind of man. It has been estimated that a modern carrier with its equipment, armament, auxiliary vessels and service fleet costs approximately $1 billion and when in action covers with its supporting task force several acres of sea. It cannot be concealed and travels comparatively at a snail's pace. Trials in our own Navy have shown that submarines can run under it undetected and then wait for it and pick it off with a single bomb fired from under water. Planes flying so high and so fast as to be invisible and inaudible can pot it like a sitting duck. And yet we have spent billions of dollars on carriers in the precious time which Russia has used to outwit and outarm us.

The most eminent American scientists, among them Dr. Vannevar Bush, who more than any other one man was responsible for the collaboration of the House in the production of the atomic bomb, deplored the colossal waste in their construction. The second or third day after President Eisenhower's inauguration I went down to the White House and pled with him not to include it in the budget. I took it up individually with the members of the subcommittee and prevailed on them to cut it out of the appropriation bill. But the Navy adheres to tradition. They always want to fight the next war with the weapons used in the last war. And they came up next year and persuaded the subcommittee to put it back. Experience is a costly teacher, and now when it is all but too late and when precious time has been frittered away, the budget is throwing out the carrier which was to be laid down this year. It took us a long time to learn you cannot go to Moscow in a carrier or on the bayonets of foot soldiers and that the only possible way to deliver an H-bomb to the target in Russia is from missile-launching submarines or long range, land-based bombers. So at long last we have a budget providing for the missiles and the submarines as well as the land-based aircraft. God grant it has not come too late.

We haven't much time. We really haven't any time. But if the Strategic Air Command with our stockpile of bombs can hold Khrushchev off until the fall of 1959 we should have the situation in hand.

The long-range bomber, so essential to our defense in this crisis, is nevertheless on its way out. Russia is perfecting counter weapons which reduce its effectiveness and the missile is rendering it obsolescent.

But the submarine, the only unit of the Navy which would be left intact 6 hours after war was declared, can enter all waters and traverse all seas unobserved. Carrying missiles with a range of 1,500 miles which can be fired with precision under water it can carry the war to the enemy undetected.

With a crash program of standardized nuclear powerplants built by Admiral Rickover and missile-firing submarines powered like the *Nautilus*, the *Seawolf*, and the *Skate*, which can be turned out under the supervision of Admiral Rickover, we could be ready by the fall of 1959 to stop suicidal attempts on the part of any European or Asiatic power to disturb the peace of the world.

For the price of 6 carriers of the *Forrestal* type, we could build 50 nuclear-powered missile-firing submarines in less time and operate them at a fraction of the cost of operating the carriers.

I mention Admiral Rickover individually because he was not only the first man to construct a successful atomic reactor and the only man to power a submarine with atomic energy but he urged the Navy 2 years ago to design a missile-firing atomic submarine. If his suggestion had been adopted we would be out of the woods by this time.

But, as President Eisenhower well says in his state of the Union message:

> We could make no more tragic mistake than merely to concentrate on military strength.
>
> We must apply stern tests of priority to other expenditures, both military and civilian.
>
> In spite of these necessary increases, we should strive to finance the 1959 security effort out of expected revenues.
>
> This purpose will require the cooperation of Congress in making careful analysis of estimates presented, reducing expenditures on less essential military programs and installations, postponing some new civilian programs, transferring some to the States, and curtailing or eliminating others.

We had hoped the administration would take the lead and reduce nonessential spending. You will recall we made large cuts in the 1958 budget. We laid the groundwork for future tax relief. A dollar saved in one year, and saved again the next year, means a two-dollar saving. So, we had hoped he not only would retrench to the 1957 level, but also repeat the retrenchment in the next budget, especially in view of the necessity of providing some increases for vital defense needs. I am certain it will be a matter of distress to American taxpayers that the President has failed to accord them at least some hope of relief in that respect. Instead, he proposes to spend $6.1 billion more in 1959 than in fiscal year 1957 including the highway item—and two-thirds of that is outside the national defense category.

In many respects, the substance of this budget is practically a carbon copy of recent budgets. The dates, numbers, and words have been changed, but in other characteristics it remains the same.

It is the largest peacetime budget ever submitted to the Congress. It breaks even last year's record. And last year's budget was a record-breaker. So was the budget for the year before. But this one out Herods Herod.

It proposes spending of $73.9 billion—$76.4 billion including the highway program for proper comparison with earlier years.

It proposes enactment of $72.5 billion in appropriations and other authority to obligate—$74.8 billion including the highway item. This is $4.1 billion more than presently enacted for the current year.

It proposes—or at least assumes—a tax take of $74.4 billion not counting the highway taxes—and $76.6 billion with them—the highest ever in war or peace, topping even last year's record.

It again recommends extension of Korean wartime tax rates, though the war ended nearly 5 years ago. Without this, the 1959 budget would be written clearly in red ink.

It contemplates a cumulative 6-year budget deficit for the administration of $3.6 billion counting the highway fund and $4 billion without it. This is considerably worse than the picture a year ago.

The administration has failed to halt the upward trend of spending and now proposes to spend, including the highway trust fund expenditures, more than was spent in the last full year of the Korean war, fiscal 1953.

And this budget proposes new programs.

It also proposes new taxes not heretofore imposed.

To grasp the real dimensions and direction of this record-breaking budget, it is necessary to turn back and compare the present with the past. It would naturally be assumed that the first budget surplus, in fiscal 1956, meant that spending had finally been brought under control. Unfortunately that was not, and is not, the situation. For 1959 the President proposes to spend nearly $10 billion more than in the year ended only 18 months ago—and over half of the increase is for nondefense items.

Here are the official figures:

| | Major national security | All other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1956 | $41.8 | $24.7 | $66.5 |
| 1959 (estimated) | 46.3 | 30.1 | 76.4 |
| Increase | +4.5 | +5.4 | +9.9 |

It is appropriate to note, Mr. Speaker, that when they first showed a surplus in 1956, major national security of $41.8 billions was at its lowest total of the last 6 years. The surplus was not of course an achievement by economy or retrenchment—it came about through extension of war taxes and rising national income.

This spending budget is also far beyond the first year of the administration—it exceeds fiscal 1954 by $8.6 billion.

Furthermore, it is $6.1 billion above 1957 which ended only last June—$1.9 for national security and a whopping $4.2 in all other programs.

Finally on the spending side, it is $1.7 billion more than the revised estimate just given us for the current year 1958—and an even $0.3 billion of that is in nondefense items.

Congress acts on requests for authority to obligate the Government. And that takes several forms, appropriations being the most common, but other forms have been devised to get money out of the Treasury—through the side doors and the back doors. This is the important yardstick of measurement, because an obligation, once made, has to be paid.

The President has recommended new obligating authority for 1959 totaling $72.5 billion without the highway trust fund item and $74.8 billion with it. This latter total compares with earlier years in this fashion:

| | *Billions* |
|---|---|
| 1959 over 1954—the first year of the present administration | +$12.0 |
| 1959 over 1955—the low point of the last 6 years | +17.7 |
| 1959 over 1956—the first year showing a surplus in the last 6 years | +11.6 |
| 1959 over 1957—the last completed fiscal year | +2.0 |
| 1959 compared with current year 1958— | |
| Already enacted | +4.1 |
| Total proposed (including supplementals) | −2.6 |

These huge increases show the trend—strikingly upward—and they portend higher and higher spending. The reduction of $2.6 billion below 1958 is intriguing. But it is misleading. It appears favorable, but is superficial. It does not signify lower spending in the future.

In the last session, Congress enacted obligational authority more than $5 billion below the original 1958 budget requests. Now the President indicates his intention to submit supplemental and deficiency estimates of $6.6 billion for the 1958 fiscal year. That runs the total obligational authority recommendations to $77.4 billion which when compared to the 1959 budget shows the $2.6 billion drop. That is more apparent than real.

For example, the President tells us he plans to ask for $2.3 billion for fiscal 1958 to reimburse CCC for certain expenses. Under the normal budget timetable, those items would be included in the regular 1959 bill. He proposes $2 billion additional for the Export-Import Bank in 1958 fiscal, yet the budget shows they will not need it in 1958. Why ask for something not needed in 1958 unless for the purpose of producing a favorable but completely unreal comparison between the 1959 and 1958 budgets?

The resulting picture in the budget received today is sharply out of focus. If you put the 2 years 1958 and 1959 together, the picture is clear.

The budget shows new obligational authority proposed for 1958 and 1959, combined, aggregating $152.2 billion including the highway item, while corresponding budget receipts are shown at $151.1 billion. And there are ample grounds for regarding these income figures as unduly optimistic. They appear to be hopes, rather than expectations. Certainly if adopted as presented, this budget carries every indication of deficit spending in 1959 and beyond. It offers no tangible hope of reduced taxes, payment on our staggering debt, or harnessing inflation. It needs to be effectively revised. Let us hope it will be.

And lest, in our anxiety to assure adequate funds for necessary defense purposes, we lose sight of the makeup of these huge increases in recent years, I will include here a bird's-eye tabulation of how defense and nondefense obligating authority has been running.

*New obligating authority*

[In billions]

| | Major national security | All other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1954 (the 1st year) | $40.1 | $22.7 | $62.8 |
| 1955 (the low point) | 35.1 | 22.0 | 57.1 |
| 1956 (1st surplus year) | 37.0 | 26.2 | 63.2 |
| 1957 (last complete year) | 41.3 | 31.5 | 72.8 |
| 1958 (latest estimate) | 41.0 | [1] 36.4 | 77.4 |
| 1959 (budget estimate) | 44.8 | [1] 30.0 | 74.8 |

[1] These figures are misleading as to the trend. The $36.4 for 1958 includes $2.3 proposed supplemental for Agriculture for items which normally would be included in the 1959 regular bill. Also, it includes $2.0 for Export-Import Bank as a proposed supplemental when the budget message clearly shows they will have uncommitted authority of $300 million at the end of 1958. There are other instances shown in the budget which produce similar results without apparent reason. Adjustment for these unusual items would show a steady upward trend over recent years—not the precipitous drop as reflected here.

In addition the administration proposes to again lift the $275 billion statutory debt ceiling. We are not told how much of an increase will be sought. It is to be hoped the Congress will so revise the budget as to hold fast to the restraining influence of the debt ceiling. On three previous occasions the President has asked that it be waived. We are not only failing to make any significant payments on the debt but the proposal is to increase the debt from where it stood last June. If we adopt the budget as presented, the debt will have been increased in the 6 fiscal years of this administration by $5.1 billion.

Here is the record:

*The public debt*

| [In billions] | *Beginning of year* | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Actual increase, 4 fiscal years— | | |
| Fiscal year 1954 (July 1953) | $266.1 | |
| Fiscal year 1955 (July 1954) | 271.3 | |
| Fiscal year 1956 (July 1955) | 274.4 | |
| Fiscal year 1957 (July 1956) | 272.8 | |
| Fiscal year 1958 (July 1957) | 270.5 | |
| Actual increase, 4 years (July 1953–July 1957) | | +4.4 |
| 2. Estimated increase, 2 fiscal years— | | |
| Fiscal year 1959 (July 1958) | 271.2 | |
| Fiscal year 1960 (July 1959) | 271.2 | |
| Estimated increase, 2 years (July 1957–July 1959) | | +0.7 |
| 3. Increase during 6 years (July 1953–July 1959) as estimated in 1959 budget | | +5.1 |

NOTE.—Statutory debt limit of $275 billion was raised by $6 billion for fiscal years 1955 and 1956; by $3 billion for fiscal year 1957; for 1958 it was not raised. For 1959, the budget message advises another upward revision will be requested.

Mr. Speaker, when can we expect to make significant payments on this huge debt? At recent rates, it will take hundreds of years. One calculation some months ago dramatically shows its dimensions. If we set about to pay it off by the year 2100—143 years from now, assuming a 3 percent rate—it would entail total payments of $1,205,078,709,686.40.

The outlook for systematically liquidating this mortgage against present and future generations is bleak. If spending had been controlled during the past several years, the debt could have

been lowered to make room for necessary defense increases now facing us—and without war tax rates in time of peace. They cannot dispose of this situation under guise of defense. For nondefense items this 1959 budget proposes spending $10.2 billion more than in the first fiscal year of this administration.

We must dispense with every nonessential. We must also probe deeply and carefully into the defense budgets to make certain that we discard outmoded, useless weapons and systems. We cannot afford the luxury of adherence to business as usual. Entrenched concepts and strategies must be ruthlessly discarded.

Mr. Speaker, this record of failure to retrench is miles away from the assurances President Eisenhower gave in 1952:

Our children deserve a little better of us than to keep hanging bigger and better debts about their necks.

These bigger debts cost money. The estimate is $7.8 billion for interest cost in fiscal 1959. It has been steadily increasing. We now spend as much for interest as we did to run the entire Government 20 years ago.

I include at this point a tabulation showing expenditures for the past several years, segregated between defense and nondefense, with appropriate comparisons:

*Net budget expenditures—in billions*

[Figures from the 1959 budget]

| | Major national security | | All other programs | | Total net expenditures | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Defense—military | Total | As per budget | Including highway trust fund | As per budget | Including highway trust fund |
| 1. Fiscal year 1953 (war year) | $43.6 | $51.8 | $22.5 | $22.5 | $74.3 | $74.3 |
| 2. Fiscal year 1954 | 40.3 | 47.9 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 67.8 | 67.8 |
| 3. Fiscal year 1955 | 35.5 | 42.1 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 64.6 | 64.6 |
| 4. Fiscal year 1956 | 35.8 | 41.8 | 24.7 | 24.7 | 66.5 | 66.5 |
| 5. Fiscal year 1957 | 38.4 | 44.4 | 25.0 | 25.9 | 69.4 | 70.3 |
| 6. Fiscal year 1958 (current budget estimate) | 38.9 | 44.9 | 27.9 | 29.8 | 72.8 | 74.7 |
| 7. Fiscal year 1959 (budget estimate) | [1] 40.3 | [1] 46.3 | [2] 27.6 | [3] 30.1 | 73.9 | [4] 76.4 |
| Comparisons: | | | | | | |
| (a) 1959 compared with last war year (1953) | −3.3 | −5.5 | +5.1 | +7.6 | −.4 | +2.1 |
| (b) 1959 compared with 1st year of present administration (1954) | [5] | −1.6 | +7.7 | +10.2 | +6.1 | +8.6 |
| (c) 1959 compared with 1st year showing surplus under present administration (1956) | +4.5 | +4.5 | +2.9 | +5.4 | +7.4 | +9.9 |
| (d) 1959 compared with current year (1958) | +1.4 | +1.4 | −.3 | +.3 | +1.1 | +1.7 |

[1] Includes $0.5 billion for "Defense contingencies" which the budget fails to include in this category.
[2] This is 28 percent above 1954.
[3] This is 51 percent above 1954.
[4] This exceeds the war year of 1953 by nearly 3 percent.
[5] No change.

NOTE.—Highway trust fund began with fiscal year 1957.

Also, Mr. Speaker, a summary statement of income and outgo for the 6 budget years of the present administration:

*Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (−) or surplus (+), fiscal years 1954–59*

[In billions]

| | Net receipts | Net expenditures | Deficit (−) or surplus (+) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Fiscal year 1954 | $64.7 | $67.8 | −$3.1 |
| 2. Fiscal year 1955 | 60.4 | 64.6 | −4.2 |
| 3. Fiscal year 1956 | 68.1 | 66.5 | +1.6 |
| 4. Fiscal year 1957: | | | |
| (a) Including highway trust fund | 72.5 | 70.4 | +2.1 |
| (b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget | 71.0 | 69.4 | +1.6 |
| 5. Current fiscal year 1958 (revised estimates in 1959 budget, January 1958): | | | |
| (a) Including highway trust fund | 74.5 | 74.7 | −.2 |
| (b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget | 72.4 | 72.8 | [1] −.4 |
| 6. Fiscal year 1959 (budget, January 1958): | | | |
| (a) Including highway trust fund | 76.6 | 76.4 | +0.2 |
| (b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget | 74.4 | 73.9 | [2] +0.5 |
| 7. Totals, all 6 years: | | | |
| (a) Including highway trust fund | 416.8 | 420.4 | −$3.6 |
| (b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget | 411.0 | 415.0 | −4.0 |

[1] Original budget estimate was a $1.8 billion surplus. Current estimates reflect a drop of $1.2 billion in receipts and a $1 billion increase in expenditures, thus gaining from the $1.8 billion surplus forecast to this present $0.4 billion deficit estimate.
[2] Among many other things, assumes $2 billion increase in receipts and enactment of a postal rate bill yielding $700 million additional revenue.

I also append a comparative statement of appropriations and other authority to obligate the Government:

*Appropriations and other forms of authority to obligate the Government*

[A rearrangement of budget table 6 with certain additions]

[Figures in millions]

| | Enacted, 1954 | Enacted, 1955 | Enacted, 1956 | Enacted, 1957 | 1958 | | 1959 (total proposed) | 1959 compared with— | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Already enacted | Total proposed | | 1958 enacted | 1958 total proposed |
| 1. Appropriations: | | | | | | | | | |
| Annual | $51,834 | $45,774 | $50,824 | $56,968 | $56,740 | $61,373 | $63,128 | +$6,379 | +$1,755 |
| Permanent law (annual action not mandatory) | 6,810 | 6,819 | 7,358 | 7,753 | 8,346 | 8,346 | 8,334 | −12 | −12 |
| Total, appropriations | 58,644 | 52,593 | 58,182 | 64,741 | 65,085 | 69,719 | 71,462 | +6,367 | +1,743 |
| 2. Authority to expend debt receipts | 3,610 | 3,047 | 3,129 | 5,129 | 2,142 | 4,142 | 800 | −1,342 | −3,342 |
| 3. Contract authority | 880 | 960 | 2,406 | 341 | 494 | 494 | 265 | −229 | −229 |
| 4. Reappropriations | 412 | 1,207 | 423 | 141 | 114 | 114 | 60 | −54 | −54 |
| Total, all forms of authority | 63,546 | 57,807 | 64,140 | 70,352 | 67,845 | 74,469 | 72,587 | +4,742 | −1,883 |
| 5. Deduct appropriations to liquidate contract authority previously granted | −781 | −731 | −942 | −174 | −107 | −107 | −133 | +26 | +26 |
| Net new obligating authority per budget | 62,765 | 57,076 | 63,198 | 70,179 | [1] 67,738 | [1] 74,365 | 72,452 | +5,714 | −1,913 |
| 6. Add highway trust fund for comparability with prior years: | | | | | | | | | |
| (a) New program authority (contract authority) | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 2,580 | 2,905 | 2,905 | 2,230 | −675 | −675 |
| (b) Labor standards and refunds of taxes | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 95 | 95 | 110 | +15 | +15 |
| Grand total | 62,765 | 57,076 | 63,198 | 72,759 | 70,738 | 77,365 | 74,792 | +4,054 | −2,573 |

[1] New obligating authority so far enacted in the current year is $5.7 billion below that recommended in the original 1958 budget. However, the budget now proposes to submit supplemental estimates totaling $6.6 billion for 1958 (see summary table 3, p. 6 of Budget), principal items being $1.3 billion for defense; $2 billion for the Export-Import Bank; $2.3 billion for reimbursement to CCC for various expenditures made; and such other items as public assistance grants, veterans' compensation, etc. Some of these items would normally be carried in the 1959 regular bills. This therefore results in showing an unrealistic comparison between the 1959 budget and 1958 recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, this never-ending succession of recordbreaking spending and taxing budgets recalls the extraordinary circumstances surrounding last year's budget. Mr. Brundage, the chief architect of the spending side, said at the time that he was fearful spending in 1959 would go higher. He sat at the right hand of the President again this year—and the spending estimate is up $1.1 billion over 1958 without the highway item and $1.7 billion with it.

They have also chosen to ignore the outspoken warnings of former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey. You recall his famous warning about a "hair-curling" depression. His flat prediction was that the ever-increasing upward trend of spending would catch up with us if not reversed. He advised that we should not count on tax relief, until the spending trend was downward, not upward. But it keeps going up.

You may also recall the public warning of former Under Secretary of the Treasury Burgess. He admonished:

> A more anti-inflationary governmental fiscal policy is desirable. In the present high state of prosperity in this country, the Federal Government should have a larger surplus and should be retiring debt more rapidly.
>
> This is probably the most effective step which could be taken by the Federal Government.

Nor is this advice reflected in the budget received today.

Another authority—the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board—some months ago said that larger budget surpluses are essential to stem rising prices. Here is his statement:

> It is clear that the present situation calls both for a larger budgetary surplus than we have had or have in prospect.

There is no indication that the framers of today's budget gave heed to these warnings.

We are back to deficit budgets.

National revenues are falling off.

Unemployment is rising, and reaching serious proportions.

Excessive obligations, recordbreaking spending, continue. We are getting farther and farther from the promised land of a $60 billion budget held out by President Eisenhower in 1952.

We have made no progress in reducing the debt.

The cost of living keeps skyrocketing as the dollar plunges in value. The official index now stands at 121.6. It has registered increases in each of the last 15 months and is now at the high-water mark.

Inflation continues to gnaw at investments in bonds, life insurance, savings accounts, and pensions.

This budget situation leaves us with no room, no latitude, no margin for any further essential defense costs if that should become necessary, and no cushion to absorb any decline in revenues.

In the press and elsewhere, attention is sometimes called to Treasury income and outgo not reflected in the regular "budget" totals. These totals are interesting. I include a tabulation showing three ways, methods of visualizing the size of the 1959 budget:

*Three ways to state the size of the 1959 budget*

| | Receipts | Spending | Surplus |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. *The administrative budget.*—This is the one most commonly used. Its ingredients are "net budget" receipts and "net budget" expenditures. It shows net budget expenditures against what might be termed general, unsegregated Treasury receipts. It is the one which produces the $0.5 billion surplus. The "administrative" budget totals are | $74.4 | $73.9 | $0.5 |
| 2. *The cash budget.*—This is the term often applied to what the budget message refers to as "Receipts from and payments to the public"—an effort to portray the magnitude of the ebb and flow of funds between the Government and the public. Briefly, this combines "budget" figures (the administrative budget) and trust fund receipts and expenditures, and then eliminates intragovernmental and intrafund transactions which do not represent flow of funds either to or from the public (see tables, p. M12 and p. 881). As explained below, this method, as used in the budget, does not disclose the full magnitude. The "cash" budget totals are | 87.3 | 86.7 | 0.6 |
| 3. *A third method.*—The cash budget calculation (No. 2 above) understates the full scope of Federal income and outgo. This is because "budget" receipts and "budget" expenditures are stated, as in the past, on a net basis. That is to say, certain receipts are not shown as "budget receipts," but rather are offset against gross budget expenditures, thus arriving at net budget expenditures. These receipts are collections of interest, repayment of loans, postal revenues, and other income (primarily from outside the Government) of Government corporations, the postal service, and various revolving funds. The budget makes the distinction in this respect basically because such receipts are available for use or reuse (respending) by the corporation or other enterprise concerned and thus are not available for general appropriation purposes. (In the case of postal receipts for services rendered, budget totals reflect only the net deficit or surplus.) Counting such receipts as receipts, rather than as offsets to expenditures, the following tabulation more fully reflects the ebb and flow of funds: | | | |
| Net budget receipts (same as item 1) | 74.4 | ------- | ------ |
| Receipts treated in the budget as offsets to gross budget expenditures (see table 9, p. 18) | 9.3 | ------- | ------ |
| Trust fund receipts (p. M11) | 16.6 | ------- | ------ |
| Gross budget expenditures (net budget expenditures plus receipt offsets mentioned above) | ------- | 83.2 | ------ |
| Trust fund expenditures (p. M11) | ------- | 16.4 | ------ |
| Subtotal | 100.3 | 99.6 | .7 |
| Deduct intragovernment and intrafund transactions not directly involving the public (same items as are referred to in "cash budget" calculation in No. 2 above—see p. 881) | −3.7 | −3.6 | −.1 |
| Total (ebb and flow between Government and public) | 96.6 | 96.0 | .6 |

The President asks the Congress to cooperate with him by further cutting the estimates in this budget. He makes the request in so many words. The budget is the President's task and he should indicate reductions he considers necessary; but, as he asks Congress to collaborate, Congress should work with him to that end.

The budget as submitted is a balanced budget, but by the narrowest margin—a $74 billion budget barely in the black by less than half a billion dollars. And even that is contingent on three very uncertain premises—the enactment of a postage-rate increase raising first-class postage from 3 to 5 cents, an increase in Federal receipts for the fiscal year of $2 billion—and the continuation of war taxes.

In this connection it may be noted that for the last years we have a cumulative deficit of $4 billion. For the fiscal year 1956 we spent $4.1 billion more than the budget originally submitted by the President requested. For the fiscal year 1957 we spent $4.3 billion more than the President's original estimate. And in the current year of 1958 expenditures are $1 billion more than the President said he would spend when he sent his original estimate to Congress.

From July 1, 1953, the year the present administration took over, the national debt has increased $5.1 billion. And the total estimated expenditure for the fiscal year of 1959 is $2.1 billion more than the last year of the war budget under the Truman administration.

So, at best, the balance in the President's budget now before us is a very tenuous one. He pleads with us to keep it in balance. No one knows better than he the disastrous effect of national deficits, the lowered purchasing power of the dollar, the dreaded increase in the cost of living grabbing at the breakfast table of every family in America, the paralyzing increase in the cost of national defense. It is no time to be spending money we do not have for things we can do without. It is no time for gewgaws and sugar cakes. And it is no time for politics.

We are confronted by two hazards:

First, that we will be stampeded into a spending spree for everything that seeks to identify the situation. Cloistered at West Point and Annapolis, they know nothing of the value of money and care less. They habitually ask more than they need. They and their misleading advice, and their insane interservice rivalries, are responsible for the blind alley in which we find ourselves. I speak bluntly but it is a time for blunt speaking. The time for protocol is past.

Second, the demands of the lobbyists for business as usual. Russia reaches her present commanding position through a series of 5-year programs of self-sacrifice, and abnegation. England survives and outdistances us through rigid programs of austerity and "for export only." But we, the descendants of men who starved and froze at Valley Forge and died on a thousand battlefields to give us free government, expect to continue to enjoy all the luxuries the market affords. Perhaps a period of Russian discipline would be salutary—if the price were not so high.

May I say to the House that the committee starts hearings on the budget tomorrow. We shall appreciate counsel and advice from any Member who has a suggestion to offer.

## THE INTERNAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under date of August 19, 1957, I introduced an omnibus security bill—H. R. 9352—which has since been the subject of extensive study by experts in the field of internal security.

Today I introduced a bill entitled "The Internal Security Amendments Act of 1958," which embodies a number of refinements and revisions which have been made as a result of the study and recommendations since the introduction of H. R. 9352.

The Internal Security Amendments Act of 1958 amends the Internal Security Act of 1950 by—

First. Precluding abatement of proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board by reason of the dissolution, reorganization, or change of name of a respondent organization. The purpose of this amendment is to counter the Communist technique of changing the name or formal, technical structure of an organization in order to avoid the consequences of an adverse finding by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Second. Making it a misdemeanor for any person to misbehave before Congressional committees.

Third. Prohibiting Communist lawyers from practicing before executive departments and Congressional committees.

Fourth. Redefining the term "organize"—as used in the Smith Act. The purpose of this amendment is to overcome the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Yates case which construed the term "organize" to mean only the original formation of a group.

Fifth. Permitting the enforcement in State courts of State sedition statutes. The purpose of this amendment is to overcome the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Nelson case nullifying State sedition statutes.

Sixth. Protecting the security of confidential Government files. During the 1st session of the 85th Congress, Public Law 85–269, was enacted in an attempt to overcome the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Jencks case. Public Law 85–269 is applicable only to criminal cases, whereas the amendment in the omnibus security bill is applicable to any proceeding—that is, income tax, claims cases—as well as criminal proceedings in which confidential Government files may be subject to disclosure. Under Public Law 85–269, moreover, the test of admissibility is relevancy, while under the omnibus security bill the test of admissibility in the first instance is whether or not the security of the United States would be jeopardized.

Seventh. Permitting, under safeguards, disclosure of certain intercepted security information.

Eighth. Prohibiting the unauthorized disclosure of certain defense information.

Ninth. Making it an offense to use a false name for the purpose of procuring employment in defense facilities.

Tenth. Extending the statute of limitations for certain seditious and subversive activities.

Eleventh. Expanding the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act by—

(a) bringing within the coverage of the definition of "foreign principal" an organization which is "supervised, directed, controlled, or financed, in whole or in part, by any foreign government or foreign political party," regardless of whether the organization is supervised by a foreign government.

(b) Including within the registration requirements of the Foreign Agents Registration Act persons who have used the existing exemption for certain commercial activities, to disseminate propaganda.

(c) Eliminating cumbersome criteria pertaining to the form of political propaganda subject to the provisions of the act.

(d) Establishing in the Bureau of Customs an office of a comptroller of foreign propaganda and fixing responsibility for the control of foreign political propaganda.

Twelfth. Permitting immigration officers to be detailed for duty in foreign countries and empowering such officers to exercise certain functions with respect to issuance of visas.

Thirteenth. Denying admission into the United States of citizens of foreign countries which refuse to accept deportees from the United States.

Fourteenth. Permitting the detention and supervision of certain aliens under order of deportation.

Fifteenth. Requiring the Attorney General to report to the Congress certain waivers in the administration of the immigration laws.

Sixteenth. Canceling naturalization procured illegally, by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation.

Seventeenth. Revoking citizenship to one who becomes a part of the official apparatus of a Communist country without the consent of the United States Government.

Eighteenth. Strengthening passport security and travel control by—

(a) Prohibiting travel in violation of passport regulations even though there may be no technical state of war.

(b) Prohibiting the departure from the United States of carriers bearing passport violators.

(c) Precluding the issuance of passports to persons concerning whom there is reasonable ground to believe that they are going abroad for the purpose of engaging in activities which will further the aims and objectives of the Communist Party, or other subversive groups.

(d) Authorizing the withholding of passports to persons whose activities abroad would violate the laws of the United States, be prejudicial to the orderly conduct of foreign relations or be prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

(e) Requiring the registration of persons born abroad who are citizens of the United States.

---

## COMMITTEE TO STUDY DUTIES AND OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, of any public office of the United States, that of the Vice President is probably the most ill-defined, loosely construed, and historically confused.

Originally, the function of the Vice President was considered to be purely that of "President in waiting." Elected by the second highest majority—regardless of political affiliation—he was understood to be the choice of the electorate for the office of the Executive should the President die. And there his function ended.

For years this flavor of vagueness surrounded the Vice President. No more than a figurehead in the executive branch, the frustrations of inactivity and of lack of responsibility frequently turned competent officeholders into bitter men.

During the last 30 years, however, and beginning with the Vice President's inclusion in the Cabinet, a greater degree of responsibility has properly fallen to the office—depending, of course, to a large extent on the attitude of the President.

More recently, the trend toward even greater emphasis on the executive aspects of the office compels a careful examination of the duties attached to it—duties which have evolved in relation to the exigencies of the times, rather than with respect to principles rooted in a true understanding of the problems, duties and responsibilities implicit in the office.

Now, more than ever, a need for this kind of understanding exists.

While it of course remains true that the problem of succession in the event of Presidential death or disability presses to be solved, it is of greater importance that the office of the Vice President be endowed with truly significant function in the machinery of government.

As the President's burden of administrative detail is constantly mounting, so is his responsibility as the leader of a free people and as the spokesman for democratic ideals in the world. If he is to discharge the latter function with the effectiveness that crises in domestic and international affairs demand, he must be relieved of more of the pressure of the former.

But no useful purpose will be served by ill-considered legislative proposals, born of concern for the incumbent situation. This would only add to the already long history of disconnected revisions in attitude toward the office of the Vice President.

In a joint resolution which I have introduced today, machinery is provided that will attack the basic problem by

setting up a committee instructed to conduct a full study of the office and to determine to what extent the duties of the Vice President should be expanded or otherwise changed. The Committee would be made up of 15 members, headed by the Chief Justice of the United States. Two members would be appointed from the executive branch, 2 from private life appointed by the President, 5 from the Senate and 5 from the House appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

Because it is of the utmost importance that such a study be nonpartisan, and that it be derived from a broad base of qualification and support on the part of its members, two limits are included. First, that of the 4 members appointed by the President, not more than 2 shall be from the same political party, and not more than 3 members from the Senate and 3 from the House shall be of the same party. Second, of the members who are Senators or Representatives, not more than three in either case shall be members of the Committees on the Judiciary.

While adequate representation of the legal standpoint is necessary, the second protection will be insurance that the committee be not made up wholly of lawyers, in a return to the tradition of the wide experience and viewpoint of the Constitutional Convention.

The time to act is now. Democracy must move to streamline and modernize its machinery to meet the constant challenge of totalitarianism as a way of government.

## FARM PRICE SUPPORT LAW

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to plug a loophole in the farm price-support law.

This bill would increase the penalty a farmer must pay for growing "wildcat" cotton to 75 percent of the support price. At present the penalty is 50 percent, a level too low to stop some large "wildcat" cotton ventures.

The Arizona Farm Bureau Federation has adopted a resolution asking for such an increase, and I believe it is important, necessary legislation.

An overwhelming majority of our cottongrowers have voted year after year to accept acreage restrictions in order to have the security of a guaranteed price. When a few farmers flout the purposes of this law by planting vast acreages with no allotments, it defeats the whole program. It also adds to the surplus at a time when we are trying to reduce it and get cotton into a competitive position with synthetic fibers.

As an example, in my own State, a grower named Jack Harris last year took advantage of the soil-bank program to get the second largest payment made in the Nation—$209,701—for taking an entire farm of about 1,600 acres out of production. At the same time, he produced cotton outside the program, with no quota, on 4,700 acres. For producing more than 10,000 bales of "wildcat" cotton he paid a penalty of $965,595 and insists he was still able to show a profit.

Perhaps there should be some changes in the cotton program, but as long as we have a program to which a majority of the farmers subscribe, loopholes should be eliminated and enforcement made as tight as possible. That is the purpose of this bill.

## STATEMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point and to include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in the war of words with Soviet leaders, America has too frequently been kept off balance because we insist on adhering to the truth. Perhaps our declarations have been somewhat too weighty for easy comprehension. In any event, the world is not convinced of their effectiveness. Nevertheless, it is essential that other nations fully understand our statements and trust our motives. I suggest that the following statement of national policy be announced by the Government as one instrument of international application in the economic, military, and psychological propaganda areas:

> The United States of America, in efforts to further world peace, as evidence of good faith in seeking international disarmament, and proof of its desires to divert atomic research to peaceful, economic areas, announces the discontinuance of nuclear detonations for so long as no other nation causes a nuclear explosion.

Russia has gained a psychological advantage by her satellite program and by her disarmament proposals which must be countered. The United States and our allies have the necessary instrumentation capability to detect a Russian nuclear explosion. Hence, Russia would necessarily have to discontinue atomic tests or lose face. Should she choose to discontinue these tests, the United States could profitably expand peacetime research, development, and production in the nuclear field. If Russia insists on further nuclear tests, a free world would have a clear picture of Russia's real motives. Obviously, the interim period would not materially affect our national defense and a more favorable world opinion could result.

## FLOOD CONTROL AND INTERSTATE COMPACT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and pleased to join with my able, distinguished colleague, the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., in introducing today a bill providing for Congressional consent to a compact between Massachusetts and Connecticut to speed flood control in the Thames River Basin. Similar bills are being introduced today in the Senate by Senators PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, the compact has already been approved by the Massachusetts General Court and the Connecticut State Legislature. It will become effective after Congress has granted its approval and I know that my valued colleagues on the House Committee on Public Works, to which committee the compact bill is being referred, will give early consideration to this measure, as they have always done in the past respecting all flood-control proposals designed to help our New England area which was ravished by floods in August 1955, and where our continued vulnerability to great floods so deeply concerns us.

The compact calls for the creation of the Thames River Valley Flood Control Commission of 6 members, made up of 3 residents respectively of Massachusetts and Connecticut. This Commission will cooperate with the Army engineers in developing a comprehensive flood control program utilizing the water resources of the Thames River Basin.

In addition, the compact grants the consent of Massachusetts to the construction by the Army engineers to flood-control dams and reservoirs at East Brimfield, Buffumville, Hodges Village, and Westville, all located in Massachusetts, for the protection of Massachusetts communities and Connecticut communities downstream in the Thames Basin. Connecticut agrees, according to the terms of the compact, to reimburse Massachusetts 40 percent of the amount of taxes lost to the various communities in Massachusetts by the construction of flood-control works.

With the introduction of this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly on the progress which has been made in advancing flood protection for the Thames Basin, especially as it relates to the communities of Southbridge and Webster and other communities in my district, which suffered great losses in the 1955 floods.

### HODGES VILLAGE

According to present plans of the Army engineers, the contract for the construction of the Hodges Village dam will be awarded some time this spring. Some considerable concern was felt by residents of the Webster-Dudley area early in December when it became known that the Army engineers had postponed the opening date for construction bids. Actually, as I explained in a statement to the press at the time of reported delays on Hodges Village, the engineers expect to complete Hodges Village on schedule in the fall of 1959.

The postponement in the opening of the bids from December 7 to January 7 was made necessary by orders from the Army engineers in Washington to field offices throughout the country to review

all flood-control work in the light of anticipated budget cuts in the 1959–60 fiscal year.

Estimated total cost of Hodges Village is $5,300,000, of which $2,340,000 has already been appropriated by the Congress. Plans and specifications for the dam are now complete. The dam will be constructed on the French River in Oxford at the location known as Hodges Village. The construction calls for an earth-and-rock fill structure 2,050 feet long with a maximum height of 55 feet.

Negotiations are now underway for relocation agreements for State Highway 12. Relocation agreements for town roads, a high voltage transmission line, telephone and electrical distribution lines, a natural gas transmission line and part of the lower portion of North Cemetery are expected to be completed before July of this year.

BUFFUMVILLE

The Buffumville Dam and Reservoir, located on the Little River in Charlton, will be completed this spring. Estimated total cost of the project is $2,800,000, already appropriated by the Congress. The project consists of a rolled, earth-fill dam 3,255 feet long with a maximum height of 66 feet. An overflow spillway, with outlet works, is also provided.

The construction contract was awarded in August 1956. Road and utility relocations were completed in November 1957.

With Hodges Village, Buffumville will provide a high degree of protection from floods for the communities of Webster and Dudley and downstream points in the Thames Basin.

EAST BRIMFIELD

The East Brimfield Dam and Reservoir will be located on the Quinebaug River about 1 mile above Fiskdale. Estimated total cost of the project is $7,300,000, of which the Congress has already appropriated $2,550,000. The dam will be a rolled, earth-fill structure, 520 feet long with a maximum height of 55 feet. A chute type spillway and gate-controlled outlet conduit will be located on ledge on the right abutment.

The contract plans for the dam are now complete. Real estate for the dam site and a small part of the reservoir area have been acquired. Acquisition of real estate in the remainder of the reservoir area is now underway. The design for the relocation of Route 20 is nearing completion and an agreement for the relocation of Ste. Anne's Cemetery in Fiskdale is expected to be completed shortly.

Construction of the East Brimfield Dam and structure is scheduled to start this spring. Under present plans, the construction will be completed in November 1959.

WESTVILLE

The Westville project, now in the planning stage, is a companion project to East Brimfield. When completed, both are designed to furnish a high degree of flood protection to Southbridge and downstream points in the Thames Basin. The Army engineers have strongly recommended to appropriate local officials the need for additional local protection at Southbridge to supplement the Federal projects.

The Westville project calls for the construction of a dam and reservoir on the Quinebaug River in Sturbridge about 2 miles west of Southbridge. The dam would be 400 feet long with a maximum height of 36 feet.

TheCongress has already appropriated $179,000 for the planning of Westville. About $141,000 will be required to compete the plans for this project, which has an estimated cost of $6,550,000 for actual construction.

Army engineer testimony before our House Appropriations Committee has made it clear that construction costs for Westville would be reduced if East Brimfield were built first. Construction of Westville will be scheduled, under current plans of the Army engineers, after East Brimfield is well under construction.

I well realize the great stress which will be placed on defense appropriations this year and the consequent objective of prudence and economy in all governmental expenditures. However, it is of greatest importance to human life, property, safety and welfare that these flood-control projects go forward as planned and it is imperative that adequate appropriations should be made for this purpose.

I again express deep appreciation to the House Appropriations Committee and the Army engineers for their most valuable assistance.

## THE BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the budget message does reflect an attempt to maintain the fiscal stability of this Nation while providing the funds needed to meet the challenges of the times.

There are, however, two suggestions that need to be seriously studied.

The first of these involves the method for financing the Rural Electrification Administration. Because this proposal, if put in operation, is so far reaching, I have, in company with my colleague, the Honorable CHARLES W. VURSELL, of Illinois, introduced a joint resolution setting up a Commission to study and evaluate the entire REA program.

I feel that such a study is long overdue. Not only should the great record of REA be reviewed, but also the nature of the philosophy that underlies this nonprofit, cooperative program. REA has certainly been a godsend to our farmers in the period of mechanization now changing our rural industries everywhere.

I do hope that the Congress will act to set up this Commission in time for it to adequately function and report back its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress by March 30, 1959.

The second matter that I think is unrealistic is the failure to provide for new starts by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. No one can say that we should be reckless in this matter at this time, but to close the door completely against the launching of needed and desirable projects is shortsighted and I doubt that the Congress will deny their consideration.

## THE RUSSIANS HAVE IT—WE HAVEN'T

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Russians have it—we have not. The sputnik? Sure, but what was it? A satellite launched into outer space? It was not a weapon.

We have guided missiles which we can direct and control, and which are annihilating, destructive weapons.

Should war come tomorrow, which would you rather have? Which would give the greatest protection? Which would be more helpful in the winning of a war?

The Russians have the sputnik because they made that their primary objective. They devoted all their energies and strength to bring it into being and to launch it. While they were doing that, we were producing space-devouring, destructive missiles, jet fighters, and bombers.

While they were enslaving their people, depriving them of their freedom, by comparison starving them, in order to put the sputnik into space, we—more effectively preparing for national defense, the winning of any war that might come—were at the same time giving to our people the greatest degree of freedom, prosperity, and abundance of everything that any people ever enjoyed. We have had social security, old-age assistance, shorter working hours, longer relief from toil, more conveniences, comfortable living, and opportunities for recreation. We have enjoyed the American way of living.

Those who should know and who evidently do know tell us that, despite their spectacular superiority in the exhibitionist field, we have not as yet anything to fear from the Russians and their unguided, uncontrollable, nondestructive sputnik.

All we need do is to quiet down, forget for the time being—forget temporarily at least—some of the desirable but unnecessary social programs which some are stressing; take care of our own people; put faith and trust in those charged with our national defense; work a little more efficiently and economically to improve and add to our protective weapons. When and while those are being perfected, we can complete and launch a space satellite.

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message seems to be a complete and adequate answer to the statement of Senate Democratic Majority Leader JOHNSON.

The Senator, if my understanding is correct, stated that our first objective should be the conquest of space:

> Control of space means control of the world, far more certainly, far more totally than any control that has ever, or could ever, be achieved by weapons. Or by troops of occupation.
>
> From space, the masters of infinity would have the power to control the earth's weather, to cause drought and flood, to change the tides and raise the levels of the sea, to divert the Gulf Stream and change temperate climates to frigid.

He added that—

> If there is an ultimate position from which control of the earth may be exercised, our national goal * * * must be to win and hold that position.

From the statement of the Senator and other critics of the President comes the thought that we can control the universe. Senator JOHNSON, though he does not intend it, appears to be attempting to play God with human destiny.

For some weeks, at least one chairman of a Democratic subcommittee who attacked the administration has by his statements and press releases given rise to the thought that he may believe that he or his committee could better operate the Government than can those who have been chosen by the people to do that job.

If there is anyone in the United States of America who ought to know and who evidently does know how, threatened by an enemy, we should conduct our national defense, that man is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I was a Taft man. But certainly the President by training, by experience—and he has always been a military man—because of his acquaintance with affairs abroad and his position as commander of the Armed Forces which won World War II, should know the best course for this country to follow at the present time. To suggest that he does not know and would not follow policies for national defense which would best protect us is to doubt not only his ability in world affairs but his patriotism. That is absurd.

His position on domestic matters is another matter.

It might be well if those who so bitterly and insistently criticize his present policy in connection with our national security just remember that he was elected and entrusted with that power and responsibility, not some individual in the Congress or some committee of the Congress.

In the effort to rule the universe, some seem to have forgotten the result of the effort of those who attempted to build the Tower of Babel. The Lord took care of that one by causing a confusion of tongues.

Such a course will not be necessary now, because equal if not greater confusion has arisen among the President's critics. One is off on one tangent, the next one on another. There aren't points enough in the compass to accommodate them all.

Until they are elected by the people, let those who would usurp the President's duties and responsibility criticize, as is the privilege of all, but remember that, after all, the decision as to the manner of our national defense has by the Constitution been vested in the President.

---

## USING ARMED FORCES OR THE NATIONAL GUARD TO OBSTRUCT FEDERAL AUTHORITY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1957, I promised to introduce a bill which would make it unlawful for any person to use any member, a unit or units of the Armed Forces, or the National Guard to obstruct Federal authority.

Today I have introduced such a bill.

The reason is the unwise and intemperate action of a Governor of 1 of the 48 States of this Union in using the National Guard of his State to completely thwart the integration order of a Federal court for the orderly desegregation of a high school in his State.

It is my feeling that the unwise action of this rash man has set back the good feeling which existed, not only in his State but in the country, by several years and will make orderly compliance with the Supreme Court's ruling in the school case not only much more difficult but much more distant in the future.

It is my feeling that actions of this sort should be punished strictly and that there should be a Federal statute on the books to deter any further foolishness of that sort.

---

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

---

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER in two instances.

Mr. HOFFMAN to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REUSS and include extraneous matter.

---

## THE LATE RUSSELL W. KEENEY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the sudden passing of our esteemed and respected colleague, RUSSELL KEENEY, last Saturday night at Bethesda Hospital. His untimely and sudden death came as a great shock to his family and his many friends.

Representative RUSSELL W. KEENEY was born in Pittsfield, Ill., December 29, 1897. He was educated in Naperville grade and high schools; and received the degrees of bachelor of law and master of law from DePaul University, Chicago, Ill.; served in the United States Army during the First World War; and lived in Du Page County, Ill., for more than 53 years.

RUSSELL KEENEY was elected State's attorney of Du Page County in 1936; county judge of Du Page County in 1940, 1942, 1946, and 1950; and circuit judge of the 16th judicial district of Illinois in 1953. He was a member of the Glen Ellyn Post, No. 3, of the American Legion, having served as post commander. He was also a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; a 32d degree Mason; a member of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows and Rebekahs; Loyal Order of Moose; a member of the Elmhurst Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; and a member of the American Bar Association.

Judge KEENEY was elected to the 85th Congress on November 6, 1956, and faithfully served on the House Judiciary Committee. He served both his country and his State, using his outstanding natural talent, the enthusiasm of youth, the energy of middle life to benefit the laudable causes which held his firm convictions.

All of us here who so intimately knew and loved Judge KEENEY realized that he had a mind full of sympathetic understanding and a heart full of friendships. As one who was privileged to be his friend, I cannot reconcile myself to the thought of his death—rather, as so beautifully expressed by James Whitcomb Riley:

> I cannot say and I will not say
> That he is dead. He is just away!
> With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand
> He has wandered into an unknown land
> And left us dreaming how very fair
> It needs must be, since he lingers there.
>
> And you—oh, you, who have the wildest yearn
> For the old-time step and the glad return,
> Think of him faring on, as dear
> In the love of there as the love of here.
> Think of him still as the same, I say,
> He is not dead—he is just away.

I fully realize the inadequacy of words to assuage grief, and I hesitate to intrude in the sacred circle of a family in sorrow, but I do express the hope that the God of consolation may visit them with the comfort that strengthens the heart against pain, and that they may in time come to feel that in his life there was

typified the most sacred meaning of a life of devotion.

May there come to his family and his friends a peace from today's sorrow and surcease from the threat of defeat tomorrow, in the consoling realization of a life which was full and overflowing with kindness and good deeds.

Surviving Judge KEENEY are his wife, the charming and gracious Marge L. Keeney; a daughter, Mrs. Ladd Houdek, of Corunna, Mich.; a stepson, James W. Sansome, of Chicago; a stepdaughter, Mrs. Roy Roughton, of Glen Ellyn, Ill.; a sister, Alice Marie Keeney, of Chicago; and five grandchildren.

Friends may call at the Lee Funeral Home between 1 and 3 today. Services will be held at 2 p. m. on Thursday, January 16, at the Gary Memorial Church in Wheaton, Ill., the arrangements being made by the Hanerhoff Funeral Home, 304 North Main Street, Wheaton, Ill. Burial will be in Naperville, Ill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of our late colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Congressman KEENEY was a friend and law partner of the late Congressman Chauncey Reed, and was elected to the 85th Congress as the logical successor of Chauncey Reed.

Judge KEENEY, as all his friends called him, was trained and widely experienced in the law, both as an attorney and as a judge. He had what might be termed a judicial mind. He wanted to know all the facts in connection with a problem—whether it was a legislative problem, a judicial problem, or a political problem—before he made up his mind and rendered a decision.

I met Congressman KEENEY for the first time a year ago when he entered Congress. In that short time I have learned to admire and respect him for his many sterling qualities. He was impatient and disappointed with many of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court, and stated so in no uncertain terms. In his opinion our Supreme Court Justices followed neither legal precedents nor constitutional provisions in these decisions, but followed instead their own personal predilections and preconceived opinions.

Congressman KEENEY, in my humble opinion, was one of the most promising of our new Members. His untimely death after only 1 year of service in this body deprives the House of a most valuable Member, the 14th Congressional District of Illinois of an especially well-qualified Representative, and the Nation of a great and loyal American.

I extend to his wife and members of his family my heartfelt sympathy, and offer for their solace, consolation, and hope the beautiful words of an unknown poet:

THERE IS NO DEATH

There is no death; the stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death; the dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death; although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms.

Although with bowed and breaking heart,
With sable garb and silent tread
We bear their senseless dust to earth,
And say that they are dead.

They are not dead; they have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Tho' disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here and love us yet;
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

And we, the colleagues who were closely associated with this departed Member, will not soon forget his personality and his qualities.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there are times, such as this, when words are so inadequate to express what is in one's mind and heart. I am deeply distressed over the loss of our distinguished colleague, Judge RUSSELL KEENEY. His passing is a great loss to Illinois and to the Congress.

He served with us a little more than a year, but in that brief period we all came to recognize his stature as a man of character and a man of ability. In the brief period of his service in this body he made a contribution not only in the writing of legislation but also upon all of us as individuals.

He was born in Illinois, raised in Illinois, educated in Illinois, and did much for our State of Illinois. We looked upon him as one of our leading attorneys and an outstanding jurist. We always called him Judge and that certainly applied to him in the fullest sense. He reached decisions only after he got the facts, and he expressed his conclusions without the slightest dramatics but in a firm unpretentious manner. Because of his judicial approach to all issues he was persuasive with all of us in our consideration of the problems that have come before the Congress.

I extend my deepest and sincerest sympathy to Mrs. Keeney and family. I hope they will find some consolation in the knowledge that while Judge KEENEY is no longer with us he has left "footprints on the sands of time" as a guide to all of us.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I knew Judge KEENEY as well as the man he succeeded, Chauncey W. Reed, well and intimately. I served with both of them on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Judge KEENEY had a brilliant and profound legal mind. He did not form snap judgments, but once he took a position after a complete study of the problem he was just as solid and immovable as a rock. Most of all, he was a man with a fine judgment and a high sense of moral values and noble principles.

We on the Committee on the Judiciary will miss him greatly and I know all of his friends in the House will miss Judge KEENEY. His life, as described from the lips of those who preceded me this morning, and who knew him over a longer span of time than I, obviously was an inspiration to all his close associates in his native State of Illinois.

I know that his memory to his loved ones will remain as a benediction and I pray that the God of all will comfort his widow and family in this sad hour.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Judge KEENEY made a very significant contribution to the work of the Committee on the Judiciary. His fine legal mind, his balanced judgment, and his innate commonsense were all factors which were extremely helpful in the work of our committee. The quality which those of us who worked intimately with him will perhaps best remember was the one which has been mentioned here today, that he always thought a problem through, never made snap judgments, and when he had reached his conclusion was very firm in maintaining it. He had the respect and the affection of all of us who served with him on the committee and the many here in this body. I join in extending deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with those of my colleagues here today who are paying tribute to the memory of this distinguished former Member of this House, Congressman RUSSELL W. KEENEY, I did not have the privilege of serving on the committee with or knowing Judge KEENEY too intimately, but I did have the privilege of observing his activities in the brief time that he served in this House. And, I was very much impressed with the high, and I think too often rare, virtue that he possessed, one that has already been referred to, and that was his determination to place the welfare of his country above all else; and to place high principle above expediency; his desire at all times to do those things that he thought were for the best interests of this, our great, common country. He was a man of high virtue, of deep conviction, and I think we shall all miss him here in the future.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the tributes to Congressman RUSSELL

W. KEENEY voiced by the members of the Illinois delegation and his other colleagues in this House.

Congressman KEENEY, during his first year in this House, gave promise of being a worthy successor in the Congress to his distinguished predecessor and long-time law associate, the late Honorable Chauncey W. Reed.

We do not question the ways of Providence, yet it is to us a tragedy when such a promising career of service is cut short.

So far as my check of the RECORD discloses, Congressman KEENEY made but one speech on the floor of this House during the last session. However, this speech, dealing with the vexatious issues of civil rights legislation and made in support of the jury trial amendment which he had offered as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, symbolized to me his political courage and devotion as a member of the bar and a former member of the judiciary to the principles of constitutional government.

I had looked forward in this session to the privilege of becoming better acquainted with my colleague from Illinois.

Last October, Congressman KEENEY graciously introduced me at a patriotic meeting in Chicago and in visiting with him then, I learned that he had a stepsister who is a constituent of mine residing in Battle Creek.

To this sister, Mrs. Ralph Olmstead; to his widow, whom I was privileged to meet in Chicago last fall, and to all of the members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois delegation, as well as the entire House of Representatives was shocked to hear of Judge RUSSELL KEENEY'S passing late Saturday night.

Very few of us knew that he was even on a sick list. Judge KEENEY'S passing is sincerely regretted by all of us. We extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Keeney and his family. He had an illustrious career before being elected to Congress. His life had been full as an honored public servant. His future in the Congress and on the Judiciary Committee was assured. He served fearlessly on his committee as his independent voting demonstrated. His judicial ability was never questioned by the offense and defense.

RUSSELL KEENEY was born in Pittsfield, Ill., in the district I represent. He worked his way up as a public servant in almost every elective and appointive office.

His passing at 60, when at the height of his usefulness and career is tragic.

The 14th Illinois District has lost more than its share of fine representation in the passing of Judge RUSSELL KEENEY and the late Chauncey Reed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I well remember the first day that Congressman KEENEY sat with us as a Member of the House Committee on the Judiciary. He was an humble man, he was a kindly man, and he impressed me deeply on that first occasion and throughout the entire time that he served with us in this House. He was a brilliant lawyer, a perfect gentleman, and a magnificent American.

Mr. Speaker, RUSSELL KEENEY represented America and every section of America in the fullest and the deepest sense. His was the type of service that we can ill afford to spare. He was a personal friend of mine. Just 2 months ago on his way down to Florida, and sick then, I assume, though I did not know it, he stopped by my little home town of Leesburg to see me.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to have known a man like RUSSELL KEENEY. He has departed from our midst, but I am sure that his gentlemanly qualities will remain vivid and bright to each and every one of us and that we will realize the responsibilities that weigh so heavily upon us more because of the fact that we had known that eminent gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCVEY].

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply associate myself with those who mourn the untimely death of Representative RUSSELL W. KEENEY. It was not my privilege to be acquainted with Mr. KEENEY before he became a Member of the Congress. During his short stay in the Congress, however, I learned to admire him and to respect the high degree of ability with which he came to this body.

Few men have come to the Congress with a better background of preparation for the work of our lawmaking body than did Mr. KEENEY. He had served as State's attorney of Du Page County, Ill., and also, as county judge. He had furnished leadership in many civic and quasi-legal organizations. In the Congress, he was known as a man of honor whose word could always be depended upon.

RUSSELL KEENEY was admired and respected by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. His experience in the Congress, though short, was a brilliant one, of which anyone might well be proud.

We have lost a valuable servant whose every desire was to serve his country as a good American. His lifework stands as an eloquent testimony to a character which knew no compromise with the wrong, and whose every wish was to serve the best interests of the whole country.

I extend to his wife and his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. BOYLE].

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at this time on behalf of myself and the other members of the Illinois delegation, I want to pay tribute to my late colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary. Just a few moments ago, the dean of the Illinois delegation, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, said, "Yes, CHARLIE, just tell them that we all loved him." And I believe that probably is the homespun evaluation of all the Members of the Congress. Judge KEENEY brought into play in his short span of service, his impressive legal background, and great reservoir of empirical knowledge. We saw him demonstrate on the floor his appreciation of the fact that the role of a Congressman had a fiduciary relationship; that he owed to his constituents, to the State of Illinois, to the United States and to the world, care, obedience, loyalty, and a duty to account. We saw him perform the duties of his assignment, his chores, with diligence and dispatch and with honor. More and more were we impressed with the fact that his conduct fell almost squarely within the definition of a professional man; a man whose services could not be paid for in terms of mere money.

Having seen him perform on the Committee on the Judiciary I submit that he, almost as well as any man I ever knew, appreciated the dignity and the honor of the law and the duty of loyalty to the law because he, for one, believed that the law reached its highest eminence when it saved people from one-man rule, or the aggression of one-clique rule or one-group rule.

Mr. Speaker, I salute his memory. I believe he left his impression upon the Congress. To his family, and on behalf of the dean of the Illinois delegation and other members of that delegation I say, benedicomus Domino, the Lord be with him.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to Judge RUSSELL KEENEY, a friend and neighbor.

Whenever, as today, I drive down Constitution Avenue in the morning and discover our flag at half mast, I find comfort and great significance in the knowledge that a grateful nation so fittingly lowers its colors when there departs from this Washington scene, from this Hall of Congress, an honored Member who has been a distinguished American and who has left his mark beyond dispute upon the times in which he lived.

The 14th District of Illinois runs side by side with the 13th. I find it particularly hard to accept the fact that within the last 2 years the 14th District has twice lost a beloved Congressman. I like to think of what some in that district said to me when Judge KEENEY was chosen. In speaking of how long they had put their trust, and well put their trust, in Chauncey Reed, person after person said to me, "As you know, Mrs. CHURCH, we will feel perfectly safe with RUSSELL KEENEY." We who had the privilege of serving here with Judge KEENEY even this brief time know exactly what they meant. We all felt safe with RUSSELL KEENEY.

Besides his great judicial ability, besides the legal talent which was evident in every speech he gave and decision he made, there was a rare friendliness in him, an aura of good cheer about him. I will long remember how he enlivened even sometimes a friendly dispute by the shake of the head or a merry quip or a smile. He was a very human human being. So we shall miss him sorely: miss

his competence, his experience, his ability. Most of all, we shall miss him.

I should like to add, Mr. Speaker, that to his family, his widow, his children, all his relatives, I offer my deep and understanding sympathy. I can only assure them as I have others that they will come to find comfort and pride in the knowledge that the one whom they loved so dearly was taken at the height of his powers and at the time when he was giving his fullest service to his country. That country, and his friends, will long remember him.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passage of Judge KEENEY shocked us all and we are grieved. It is to be regretted that all of the Members of the House did not have the opportunity to become as well acquainted with the judge as the members of the Committee on the Judiciary. We all knew when he was selected to take the place of the late Chauncey Reed we had a man who was well founded in the law, whose character and principles were enunciated every time he spoke.

It was my happy privilege to work with him for more than 1 year on the Committee on the Judiciary. As has been testified by other Members, we always knew that Judge KEENEY analyzed every situation not for his personal gain nor for any purpose other than being a good, true American. As indicated before by other members of the committee, we knew that after he had analyzed and come up with an answer it was a firm, true answer. So I with other members of the committee join in paying the respect due our departed Member and extend sympathy to his family.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my friend RUSSELL KEENEY. Our friendship goes back to law-school days when we were together at De Paul University in Chicago. That was back in the years at or about the time of the First World War.

After that I saw RUSSELL KEENEY on many occasions. Du Page County and Cook County adjoin. I remember the career of RUSSELL KEENEY in the legal profession as it has been outlined here today by our colleagues. He has had just about every honor a lawyer can have in a community such as ours. After being admitted to the bar, a few years later he was a justice of the peace in Du Page County. He was a very active lawyer and always gave a fine account of himself at the bar.

He became State's attorney of Du Page County. He was a county judge and he was a circuit court judge. In the work of the court in Cook County on many occasions, Judge RUSSELL KEENEY sat as an aid to our county judge, Judge Jarecki. There the lawyers of Cook County and the lawyers of Du Page County realized and saw in the personage of RUSSELL KEENEY, a lawyer and a judge who gave a fine account of himself. RUSSELL KEENEY was a fine citizen, a fine father, and a fine husband. It took 35 years to bring RUSSELL KEENEY and me back together. We entered the 85th Congress together. Our offices are on the fourth floor of the Old House Office Building. His office and mine are right across the hall from each other. But, as has been so well said by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], he was a friendly gentleman; he was a gentleman who had a heart; he was a gentleman, too, who had a fine sense of humor. As one colleague to another, I am going to miss RUSSELL KEENEY. I have lost a friend. My sympathies go, too, to the widow and the other members of the family. RUSSELL KEENEY may have departed this life, but I am sure he is getting his reward in heaven.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr Speaker, I was greatly shocked this morning to learn of the passing of our colleague and friend, Judge KEENEY. Judge KEENEY and I served on the same subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I saw him almost daily. His service was short here in the House of Representatives but after he came to the Committee on the Judiciary we who were so fortunate as to serve with him on that committee grew to love him and to respect him. His opinions were sound. He was really not only a great lawyer but he was a great statesman. As has been said, he thought through every problem that was presented to that great committee. I do not know of any man who ever came to the Committee on the Judiciary during my time who made a better impression on his colleagues in the work of that committee. I am deeply grieved at his passing. I became very, very fond of him. We were very congenial friends. He was dedicated to the service not only of the State of Illinois but of the whole Nation. I know that we in the Congress have lost a man who would have made a great record in this House if he had been privileged to serve longer. He was a great American, a great Christian, a fine man, and a good friend. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I knew Judge RUSSELL KEENEY only for something over a year at the time of his death. However, in this body I did become well acquainted with him in the intervening months. It was easy to see that he brought the experience and knowledge of a long judicial career with him when he came to this body. Having been State's attorney and then county judge and then circuit court judge, a great deal of his approach to the law was judicial in temperament and in deed. He did an outstanding job on one or two pieces of legislation in this Congress. Though his time here was short, he left a mark that is certainly worthy of his name.

The thing I liked about Judge KEENEY was that you never had any difficulty finding out where he stood. In this body that is something of more than passing importance.

He came from a district which gave him a great deal of courage to stand up for the convictions which he had. He was never afraid to express them. That is one of the finest things that could be said about any man when he departs from the House of Representatives; that is, that he never lacked for conviction, nor did he lack courage to speak out on those convictions.

He was a student of the law. He was a student of this House. I may say also he was a good student of human nature. He had a kindly way which made him appealing to most people. He had that kind of appeal to me from the first time I saw him.

From the many conversations I had with Judge KEENEY I could tell that in the last year he had come to love this House and so many of the Members. It is too bad that we could not have enjoyed his company and shared his great capacity for work for a longer time. Had he lived he would have given to this House many an enjoyable moment. I had anticipated that Judge KEENEY would be with us for many years, and I think the Illinois delegation had planned accordingly.

All of us in the Illinois delegation and our wives will miss him. I am sure that all of us extend to his wife and to his family our deepest sympathy upon his passing. I am sure that they will enjoy many fond memories of a husband and a father and we in the House will all remember Judge KEENEY for what he was—a judicial scholar, a Congressional advocate of the highest type, and a Christian gentleman worthy of his State and his Nation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day in the State of Illinois for the filing of petitions for nomination. I presume that our dear friend and colleague was looking forward to his petition being filed today. Instead of that, we are here paying tribute to his memory. We pay those tributes with broken hearts. We may not have agreed always in the philosophies and on political issues, but all on this side of the aisle had for RUSSELL KEENEY a deep and warm affection, because within him was the spirit of humanity, and his was a mind of understanding and a heart of gold in its richness in the qualities of gentleness and of love.

For many years he was the law partner of Chauncey W. Reed. They were close friends. Then when Chauncey left us he came to take his place, to follow in his footsteps in this Chamber. As we loved Chauncey Reed so did we come to love RUSSELL KEENEY. Our hearts are broken on this side of the aisle, as they are on that side of the aisle.

To his wife, a charming woman, in her grief now, may it be of some solace that we send deep sympathy from our hearts.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep feeling of distress that I speak on this tragic occasion of the passing of our colleague and my good friend, RUSSELL KEENEY.

My district borders Judge KEENEY's district. We came here as new Members of this Congress, and we were soon thrown together through the sharing of many mutual problems.

I came to seek the advice and counsel of RUSSELL KEENEY on many of these problems. We came to be close personal friends.

Only 6 weeks ago Mrs. Collier and I and Judge KEENEY and his wife spent a very fine evening together. Even at that time, as sick as he must have been, he hid courageously any sign of of it, and made our evening a very pleasant one.

It is unfortunate that Judge KEENEY's time in this Congress was so short and that he did not have an opportunity to contribute all that I know he would have, had he been here longer.

So on this occasion I would like to extend my and Mrs. Collier's condolences to the bereaved family of Judge KEENEY.

His district has certainly lost a wonderful representative. The Congress has lost a fine and distinguished legislator, and I have lost a close personal friend.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, on the way to a church of my choice, I heard over the radio the sad and dreadful news of the passing of a great American. I speak of my friend and fellow Congressman, the Honorable RUSSELL W. KEENEY, of Wheaton, Ill.

Despite the fact we were members of opposite parties, we were warm personal friends. His dedication to principle, his sincerity of purpose, and his magnificent sense of responsibility were such as to inspire the love and admiration of all who knew him. I first saw him at the White House, where we were all together waiting to pay our respects to President and Mrs. Eisenhower in a usual and routine reception. Our personal friendship blossomed from that moment.

RUSSELL KENNEY was the type of man who emphasized and epitomized the greatness of patriotism. He was without compromise when the good of the Nation was at stake. His independence of thought and action was inspired by a kind of courage and fortitude typical of those who have founded our freedom and attempted to keep it pure.

He saw the good in all men. No bitterness or vindictiveness graced his lips. He knew, loved, understood, and forgave the weakness of his fellow man. Every heartbeat was for good, for hope, and for betterment of his Nation and its multitudes.

During the fall of 1957 he and his lovely wife, on the way to Florida, drove over a hundred miles out of the way to come by to see us. He came in our country law office, put his feet on the desk, and we discussed our mutual problems. We were so proud to have him, and I introduced him to numbers of my friends. Everyone in Chester, S. C., who met him, loved him. They loved, admired, and appreciated the great man that he was. His visit to my home was an honor, and we entertained him as a dedicated Member of this Congress.

This world, this Nation, the State of Illinois, and particularly the 14th District of Illinois was, and is, a better place to live because of RUSSELL KEENEY. The measure of his contribution to good cannot be set to any small scale. Death robbed the Nation of a great asset in him, impossible to replace.

From the acknowledged writings of the past, we borrow expressions, so apt, so true in course, to describe his life:

A man to meet with outstretched hand, a gentleman through and through.

To say that we will miss him would almost be profane. The Nation will miss him. Posterity will suffer because of his untimely passing.

Our sympathies go out to his wonderful wife and family.

May the Great Provider give us more men like RUSSELL KEENEY.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I knew Congressman KEENEY from our close association in nearby offices. As a consequence, we met frequently in the corridors and in the elevators. I learned to recognize in him many of the characteristics that would naturally tend to attract and build friendship. He was amiable, courteous, and kind.

I am indeed sincere in associating myself with the Illinois delegation in paying tribute to a deserving fellow legislator.

To Mrs. Keeney, whom my wife learned to love and respect, we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I was sorely grieved when it was announced that our colleague, RUSSELL KEENEY, had departed this life and our midst.

I only knew him during the time he so ably represented his people and his country in the United States Congress. I quickly learned to love him in serving with him on this floor and in the Judiciary Committee.

He was a man of deep conviction and understanding. He never put personal or party politics above the interests of our Republic, and his loss must be felt and mourned by the whole Nation. It will be difficult to replace a man of his integrity, ability, and principles. Such statesmen are too few.

I want to extend the deepest sympathy of myself and Mrs. Dowdy to his lovely wife and family, and may God's richest blessings comfort them in their bereavement.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the delegation assigned to represent the Congress in attendance upon the funeral of the late distinguished Chauncey W. Reed, of Illinois, I first came to know about Judge KEENEY. I first came to know Judge KEENEY himself as a colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary. I wish I were sufficiently articulate and eloquent to pay him the tribute he deserves.

The tribute that has been paid by Members of this House representing every section of our great country and every phase of political philosophy is the best tribute which any man could earn. Perhaps that tribute came because Judge KEENEY himself did not allow sectional considerations to color his judgment in dealing with the great issues with which he was faced during his service in this body.

I extend my deepest condolences to the members of his family in this their time of bereavement.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it was with a heavy heart that I learned this morning of the death of the able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable RUSSELL W. KEENEY, late a Representative from the State of Illinois. It had not been my pleasure to know Judge KEENEY prior to the convening of the 85th Congress in January 1957. However, he came to us with a good name and the reputation of splendid character which he demonstrated in his work upon the floor of the House and in his daily contacts with those who came to know him.

The Members of this House had the opportunity, indeed they were privileged, to observe him on the floor of the House of Representatives last summer as the author and one of the chief sponsors of an amendment to the then pending civil rights legislation which would spell out in terms of clear language the historical and traditional guarantee of trial by jury to all Americans.

Judge KEENEY knew then that trial by jury was indeed a sacred thing and not merely a loose collection of meaningless words. They were not meaningless to him because he knew that they contained lessons of the history of free men.

Though a comparative junior Member of this House in point of service, he was indeed a venerable advocate, learned in the science of law and jurisprudence. He was an able lawyer. He also served with distinction as a State attorney, a county judge and a circuit judge.

Judge KEENEY had more than a thorough and well grounded knowledge of jurisprudence. He had a courage seldom witnessed in this or any other deliberative body. On the issue of trial by jury he had the courage to stand up and oppose with every ounce of his strength the President of the United States, a member of his own political party. He dared to oppose the leadership of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties in Congress. He dared to oppose the senior member of each party on the committee on which he served. He dared to oppose the newspapers and political writers in his own

State. He dared to take and strongly advocate a position in conflict with the expressed views of a majority of the members of his own State delegation, Democrats and Republicans alike.

In all of this, however, he had the rich satisfaction that power, prestige, and high position cannot bring of knowing that he has held fast to those things which are good and that he was willing to stand up and be counted in defense of those principles which have made the United States of America a land of free men and, indeed, a land of freedom itself. During the short period of less than one full term, he endeared himself to those of us who were privileged to serve with him. On every day of his service he reflected credit and honor upon the great district and the great State which he represented. Indeed, he represented those things which were in the very highest tradition of public service and also in the highest traditions of the House of Representatives of the United States.

It is indeed with a feeling of heartfelt sympathy and a sincere feeling of personal loss that I extend to his family, his loved ones, and his friends my sympathy in their time of sorrow.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the Illinois delegation and my other colleagues in expressing deep sorrow at the death of RUSSELL W. KEENEY.

An eminent attorney and jurist, he brought to the House a wealth of experience and knowledge that were most helpful in solving the many difficult problems that confront America and the world.

A forceful speaker, he had the ability to express his views concisely and convincingly.

He was deeply interested in his Congressional work and spent many long hours to serve faithfully and in a conscientious manner his district, State, and country.

Although here only a short time, he won the high esteem of all his colleagues. In his death we have lost an able Congressman and a great American. My deepest sympathy is extended to his family in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I join others in mourning the passing of our colleague, Judge KEENEY.

I knew Judge KEENEY as an able and conscientious legislator.

Though he was privileged to serve in this body but a brief time; nevertheless, he won the respect and friendship of all his colleagues. Judge KEENEY was an able student of the law, and was possessed of a great intellect and outstanding ability. He was dedicated to the great principles of government which are embodied in our Constitution. He was a devoted patriot and a great American.

I admired him most, however, for the personal qualities of character which he possessed: his matchless integrity, his unbounded courage, and his intellectual honesty—qualities which are all too rarely found in public life today.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has suffered a distinct loss in the passing of Judge KEENEY. My deepest sympathies are with his family and loved ones.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. NIMTZ].

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory of Judge RUSSELL W. KEENEY, of Illinois, with whom I served on the Committee on the Judiciary. He and I were also on the same subcommittee of that committee. We sat in adjoining seats, thus we worked together on legislation before this committee since the day we were sworn in as Members of Congress, a little over a year ago. Those of us on the committee felt that Judge KEENEY brought to that body a wealth of experience which only a lifetime in the private practice of law, interwoven with experience as a State's attorney, a county judge, and as a circuit judge can give.

Mr. Speaker, I never knew the late Hon. Chauncey Reed, of Illinois, Judge KEENEY's predecessor, who was loved and respected by all in the Congress and about whom so much has been said today. However, I felt that in knowing "RUSS" KEENEY I had known Chauncey Reed, for as so often happens in the practice of law, some of the qualities, the manner of approach to a problem, the method of work, the greatness and the ability of the senior partner "rubs off" onto the junior partner, and I am sure that that happened between Chauncey Reed and RUSSELL W. KEENEY.

Judge KEENEY, having spent a lifetime in the private practice of law as well as some years on the bench, valued the rights of the individual and the protection of those rights under the Constitution. Those of us on the Committee on the Judiciary, I would say, felt that he was a statutory constructionist. Those of us who sat near him on the committee marveled at his ability to take a bill or resolution that was before us, look over the sentences, and with his pencil mark it up and change a word here and there, change a verb or the sentence structure, analyze it, give it more conciseness, and end up with a sentence that had exactness of meaning so that the courts, if they were ever called upon to interpret that sentence, would have no difficulty in doing so.

Judge KEENEY was a student of Lincoln and of the Civil War. I know that he and his wife, Marge, would spend their Saturday afternoons or Sundays visiting the Civil War battlefields about the area here or historic points where Lincoln had spent some of his time when he was in the District of Columbia. During the week, Judge KEENEY and I, as we sat in the committee room waiting for the committee to convene or as we walked from the committee upon adjournment to the floor of the House, would compare notes of what each of us had seen during our respective visits through the week. He would approach these visits to historic places as he would most any subject, analytically and with the desire to gain as much knowledge and factual information from them as he could. He would analyze why the battle had occurred where it did, why the commander had ordered an advance or retreat as he did. He was a great student of history as well as of the law.

We on the Committee on the Judiciary shall miss him. We shall miss his work, his statutory construction, his analysis of those things which come before us. As has been said before here today, his service here was short, but he has made his impression upon us. He has been a precept and an example for us and to us. He has by his work on legislation made his mark upon the sands of time. He was a true gentleman, a scholar, devoted to his family, his profession, and to his country.

I join with my colleagues in extending to his wife and family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Representative RUSSELL W. KEENEY, of Illinois, has gone to answer the rollcall of eternity.

At the young age of 60, and during his first term in the House of Representatives, he has been summoned to his heavenly reward.

RUSSELL had the personality that was perfectly attuned to his fine mind—kind, courteous, and dependable. As an experienced lawyer, State's attorney, and judge, he brought to the Congress a well trained intellect that listened and studied before reaching the conclusions that were always reasonable and just.

As a freshman member of the Judiciary Committee, he evidenced the capacity and judgment of a veteran. He was destined for greater recognition and honors, if death had not intervened.

By one of those strange coincidences, he was a law associate of the late Congressman Chauncey W. Reed who also contributed great distinction to the Judiciary Committee. Two men of outstanding ability and integrity, in line with the traditional character of the 14th Illinois District, and a credit to its people.

RUSSELL was a veteran of World War I, a master of laws, a dedicated public servant, and a man who gave much more to life than he ever asked of it.

To his relatives, friends, and constituents we offer our deepest sympathy. And yet, in this time of sorrow, we read from the book of his life, the thoughts and deeds that have earned for him eternal happiness in the company of the blessed.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn on Sunday morning of the passing of my good friend, Russ KEENEY. We in Illinois were most proud to have him succeed the late Chauncey Reed as the Representative from the 14th District of Illinois.

Like Chauncey, Russ has long been identified in legal and judicial circles in Illinois. He got his start in public life at the early age of 23 and has served in public office continuously for the last 20 years. In a variety of positions of public trust, he has always served with distinction bringing credit to his family, to himself, and to the party to which we both belong. When practicing law, he was known as a lawyer's lawyer. When serving on the bench, we could count on his judgments being sound and impartial.

Personally, Judge KEENEY was one of the most likeable, even-tempered, affable men I have ever known, quick of wit and eager to break into a broad grin at the slightest provocation. One could not help but be uplifted when in his presence. To engage him in conversation or discussion was a most stimulating experience, for he was a learned man.

My only regret is that in serving in this body for only a year, many Members of the House were not privileged to know him as well as I did. I am sure that if God had seen fit to prolong his life, there would have been many occasions when his presence would have made the difference in a number of the pressing problems that will come before us.

As has been pointed out here by those who have preceded me this afternoon, he was a man of wise counsel, and I am sure his words of wisdom would have inspired the House as no one else could. I do not believe there could be any more fitting tribute and memorial that we could pay to Judge KEENEY at this time than for us to firmly resolve on this occasion to pattern our conduct on the floor of this House as he did while sitting with us; a perfect gentleman at all times, with deep conviction, dedicated to principle and a sense of fair play, devoted to his country and his family, and loyal to his friends.

To his beloved wife, Marge, and the surviving members of the family, I extend profound sympathy and want to assure them that, individually and collectively, the Members of this House share their loss.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the passing of our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. KEENEY.

I served with him on the Committee on the Judiciary and I found him to be one of the most able constitutional lawyers in the country. No man in this great deliberative body was a more dedicated public servant than the gentleman from Illinois. We all will miss him and I extend my deepest sympathy to his family and constituents.

It is a great tragedy, Mr. Speaker, that the 14th District of Illinois has twice in a short span of time had its Congressman taken from our midst. Mr. KEENEY's predecessor, the late Chauncey Reed, served as chairman of the Judiciary Committee and was one of my closest friends. Mr. KEENEY and Mr. Reed were law partners and close friends. Both of them made important contributions to the welfare of our country through their Congressional service.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I learned of the death of Representative RUSSELL W. KEENEY.

In the 1 short year in which he was privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives, he demonstrated the qualities which could only have led to an outstanding record.

He was a man of unquestioned ability, of high principle, and endowed with unusual courage. Few Members of the House, in their first year of service, demonstrate as clearly these attributes.

The death of Judge KEENEY is not only a tremendous loss to the 14th District of Illinois; he is the caliber of public servant the Nation could ill-afford to lose.

I wish to extend my sympathy to his widow and other members of his family.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who, in 1 year's time, made a more favorable impression on the membership of this House than Judge RUSSELL KEENEY. He was forthright, a man of character and would not comprise a principle of political expedience. He was endowed with the oldtime basic fundamental principles of Americanism, principles that made this country great. He was not a sectional leader. He was an American.

Henry Grady spoke of Lincoln as the typical American. RUSSELL KEENEY typified the high principles, ideals, and basic American philosophy always exemplified by the delegation from the great and wonderful State of Illinois.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending to Mrs. Keeney and the family our deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in regard to eulogy for former Congressman RUSSELL KEENEY, it is with deep regret that I join with my collegaues in paying my respects to one of our most revered and capable colleagues in this House, namely, the Honorable RUSSELL KEENEY. Along with my colleagues I wish to express my deep sympathy to his wife and survivors.

RUSSELL KEENEY served only 1 year in Congress but during that period I had the opportunity of getting to know him intimately. He, along with myself, sat on what might be called the lower bench of the Judiciary Committee, which is made up of the newer members of that committee. Sitting near him, I had the privilege of hearing his off-hand remarks concerning legislation and other matters, as well as appreciating his often demonstrated legal ability in making sound suggestions on many bills and proposals before our committee. He demonstrated that he had a superior understanding of the law, that he possessed outstanding mental ability, and that he had a deep-seated loyalty to the basic legal concepts which had made him such an outstanding citizen, lawyer, and jurist in his home community and State. I can remember on many occasions his very piercing legal observations concerning legislation before the committee that often brought into focus many of the not easily discernible legal implications of the proposals before us. I, for one, respected his judgment and his ability as a jurist, a lawyer and as a member of the Judiciary Committee in Congress—loved him as a friend—admired his unswerving loyalty to his country and his devotion to duty.

Congress, particularly in these crucial times, needs leaders of the qualifications, capabilities and character of our deceased colleague, RUSSELL KEENEY. It is most unfortunate that the people of his district of his State and of the Nation are deprived of his services in the future by his untimely demise.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my respect and feeling of warm friendship for our departed colleague and to join with my colleagues in expressing my sympathy to his survivors.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1958, the Committee on the Judiciary adopted the following resolution:

We, the members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, hereby record our deep sorrow at the death of our friend and colleague, RUSSELL W. KEENEY, who died on January 11, 1958.

RUSSELL KEENEY was elected to the 85th Congress after a distinguished record of public service. He served in the United States Army during the First World War. He was elected State's attorney of Du Page County, Ill., in 1936; county judge, Du Page County, in 1940, 1942, 1946, and 1950; and circuit judge, 16th judicial district of Illinois, in 1953. He was a member of the Illinois County and Probate Judges Association, and for many years had been a law associate of this committee's former chairman, Chauncey W. Reed. He was a man of keen legal sense, integrity, and probity, and endowed with wide reservoirs of humanity; be it therefore

*Resolved*, That the members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives do hereby express their sorrow, and each his sense of deep personal loss, in the death of RUSSELL W. KEENEY; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this committee and a copy sent to the members of the family of the deceased.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 427) as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable RUSSELL W. KEENEY, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

*Resolved*, That a committee of 24 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members of the House: Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. MASON,

Mr. CHIPERFIELD, Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois, Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois, Mr. VURSELL, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MACK of Illinois, Mr. YATES, Mrs. CHURCH, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. MCVEY, Mr. SHEEHAN, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. BOYLE, Mr. GRAY, Mr. BYRNE of Illinois, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. LIBONATI.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 14, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1430. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under sections 7 through 14 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and the 1957 fiscal year Appropriations Act (70 Stat. 233), pursuant to the act of June 28, 1937, of the 75th Congress (50 Stat. 329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1431. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of six violations by officers of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1432. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the Seventh Report on the Operations of the Selective Service System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1433. A letter from the president, Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting a report by the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the calendar year 1957, pursuant to the act of Congress, approved September 26, 1888; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1434. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the act of July 2, 1956, concerning the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1435. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities at the request of public or private parties at the expense of the requesting party, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1436. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1437. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1438. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.), to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powered merchant ship"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1439. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report with respect to positions in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress within the purview of subsection (c) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, allocated to grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1440. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the appointment of members thereof, transfer of functions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr ABERNETHY:

H. R. 9893. A bill to extend and expand the authority of Public Law 480, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 9894. A bill to extend and expand the authority of Public Law 480, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 9895. A bill to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 9896. A bill to revise the basis for establishing wartime service connection for multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9897. A bill to exclude up to $3,000 commercial insurance from consideration as income for death pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 9898. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 9899. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9900. A bill to provide for special roll of correction, classifying, and grouping as follows: landless and retaining trust property; certain bands of the Sioux Tribe of Indians to determine who is Indian and who is not; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 9901. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Outer Space; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 9902. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Academy of Science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 9903. A bill to establish a commission to determine the inability of a President or one acting as President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 9904. A bill to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9905. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to grant scholarships and fellowships in scientific fields to promote the defense and security of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9906. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make unlawful the use of any member or unit of the Armed Forces or National Guard, as such, to obstruct Federal authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 9907. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the calling of the National Guard into Federal service except in time of war or invasion or upon the request of a State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9908. A bill to amend section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code to limit the use of the Armed Forces to enforce Federal laws or the orders of Federal courts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 9909. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy to convey a portion of Fort Adams, Newport, R. I., to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9910. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 9911. A bill to enable the Federal intermediate credit banks to limit endorsers' liability on loans in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 9912. A bill to provide minimum price support levels for whole milk and butterfat during the 2-year period beginning April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 9913. A bill to amend the Safety Appliance Acts so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to exempt 4-wheel-track motorcars and 4-wheel push trucks from any or all requirements thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9914. A bill to amend section 5 (10) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9915. A bill to amend section 1 of the Elkins Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 9916. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 9917. A bill to continue the temporary suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 9918. A bill to establish a Federal program of financial assistance to students in certain fields of science; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 9919. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to extend the privilege of substitution for the purpose of obtaining drawback upon reexportation to all classes of merchandise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9920. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 9921. A bill to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 9922. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Fair and Exposition, to be held in July 1959 at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 9923. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit temporary free importation under bond for exportation, of articles to be repaired, altered, or otherwise processed under certain conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 9924. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact between the State of Connecticut and the State of Massachusetts relating to flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 9925. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 9926. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to provide that disaster loans to cover economic injury may be made to small-business concerns in a duly designated disaster area without regard to the nature of the disaster; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9927. A bill making an appropriation for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 9928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9929. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Congressional award for distinguished achievements in fields of science and engineering; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 9930. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact between the State of Connecticut and the State of Massachusetts relating to flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 9931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit schoolteachers and administrators to deduct expenses incurred by them in attending classes to acquire additional training or education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9932. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State Board of Education of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9933. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, by the grouping of the titles of such act amended into separately named acts; providing for the application of such act so named; defining a livestock auction market, a stockyard, and packer buyer; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 9934. A bill to enable the Federal intermediate credit banks to limit endorsers' liability on loans in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 9935. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 9936. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to increase the rate of penalty for overplanting cotton acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9937. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 9938. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 9939. A bill to provide for the accelerated development of secondary school education in the natural sciences in the several States and Territories; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 490. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to establish a commission to determine the inability of a President to discharge the powers and duties of the Office of President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 491. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 492. Joint resolution establishing a commission on REA Loan Programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. J. Res. 493. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. J. Res. 494. Joint resolution to establish a Committee on the Office of the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. J. Res. 495. Joint resolution establishing a Commission on REA Loan Programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 428. Resolution establishing a position of a stock and inventory clerk, in the stationery room, Office of the Clerk; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H. Res. 429. Resolution reaffirming belief in the merit system principle for Government employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 430. Resolution reaffirming belief in the merit system principle for Government employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 9940. A bill for the relief of St. John's McNamara Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9941. A bill for the relief of Luciano Di Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 9942. A bill for the relief of Oak Hee Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H. R. 9943. A bill for the relief of Miss Anica Mahovlic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 9944. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States to the heirs and devisees of the late Alfred Sharp; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 9945. A bill for the relief of Amado Martelino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. R. 9946. A bill for the relief of Joseph Polhe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9947. A bill for the relief of Antigone Ligias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9948. A bill for the relief of Imrene Kiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 9949. A bill for the relief of Char Sing Zee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 9950. A bill for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 9951. A bill for the relief of Ida Magyar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9952. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha Nicometi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 9953. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 9954. A bill for the relief of John F. Biba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

356. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Wisconsin Motel Association, Milwaukee, Wis., on October 31, 1957, urging that the Congress give serious consideration and support to a proposed program of uniform numbering of the Interstate Highway System and of the alternate city and business routes connected with it; to the Committee on Public Works.

357. By the SPEAKER: Petition of David H. Johnson, Draper, Utah, relative to requesting reestablishment of citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Anniversary of Ratification of Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 13, 1958*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on December 15, 1957, I made, as usual, a Bill of Rights Day address. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address which I delivered over the American Broadcasting Co. network on that day on that subject.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL OF RIGHTS DAY ADDRESS

(Address of Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, broadcast by ABC on December 15, 1957, commemorating ratification of the Bill of Rights)

My fellow Americans everywhere, in many ways December 15 deserves distinction as our most important American day of commemoration even though it has never been designated as a national holiday. Why is this true? It is true because it was on December 15, 1791, that Virginia officially ratified the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to our American Constitution—thus making this great charter of freedom an integral part of the Constitution of the United States.

While December 15 is not a national holiday, the Bill of Rights Commemorative Society of New York renders a great patriotic and inspirational service by anually sponsoring programs which remind us all that our freedoms in America are not immortal. If we should become sleepy or careless sentinels guarding our great American free institutions, we could permit our great country to lose its distinctive and dramatic freedoms just as surely as some of the great governments of antiquity crumbled, collapsed, and disappeared.

When Gardner Osborn, of the Bill of Rights Commemorative Society, asked me to speak over the nationwide network of the American Broadcasting Co., I was pleased and honored to accept the invitation. This was especially true because in 1957 the people of the United States are commemorating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton—one of three or four distinguished early Americans whose statesmanship and vision contributed more than that of any others to the development and the ratification of our American Constitution. As national chairman of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, it is a pleasure to report to you that starting with January 11 of this year with important commemorative Alexander Hamilton programs in New York City and extending into every State of the Union, our Commission has sponsored programs and projects designed to call to the attention of all Americans once again the outstanding constitutional contributions and services to the struggle for effective independence for our country which were provided by Alexander Hamilton. In a very real sense Alexander Hamilton was a key man in the creation and consolidation of our enduring and expanding Republic.

The great writings of Alexander Hamilton incorporated in the Federalist Papers have provided us for all time a brilliant analysis and evaluation of our great Constitution. It was those Federalist Papers which more than any other single factor convinced our early Americans that since under our Constitution the Federal Government could exercise no power not expressly conferred upon it, this was indeed designed to be a Government of the people rather than one run by the politicians or by boards, bureaus, commissions, and cabinets of public officials who were either elected or appointed. It was this significant restriction by the people upon the powers of the Central Government that finally won support for and ratification of our Constitution and our first Congress then added the Bill of Rights to spell out and particularize even more specifically the rights of the individual citizen vis-a-vis his Government.

Our Constitution and the ensuing and inseparable Bill of Rights crystalized and perpetuated the high purposes set out in our American Declaration of Independence which said: "We hold these truths to he self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Thus through the entire life span of this Republic—from the time when our forefathers declared their independence, through the formative days of the Constitution, and down to the present time the emphasis has rightfully and consistently been upon seeking and securing the consent of the governed at every step in our unprecedented and unparalleled development.

Ours is indeed the opportunity state compared with any other system of government or any other country in the entire history of the world. Opportunity for the individual and the complete protection of his individual rights have always been the lodestars which have made us great and kept us strong.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

It is well on great commemorative occasions like this to emphasize how clearly, how comprehensively, how consistently, and how carefully the great words of freedom so meticulously selected by our American forefathers were designed to protect and perpetuate our freedoms and our individual opportunities.

It was no mere accident, for example, that the Declaration of Independence used the phrase, "All men are created equal." It did not say, because it could not say, that all men are equal. But it rightfully and clearly said "All men are created equal" because in the sight of God and under our great Constitution this is an eternal fact. Thus protection of the law, the powers of self-determination, the guaranties of our Bill of Rights, and the opportunity for self-advancement are equally assured to all under our Constitution. Having been created equal, each citizen has the equal right to seek success, to forge ahead, to advance himself according to his talents, his energies, his integrity, his personal aptitudes and the various other factors which after 40 or 50 years of life distinguish those who succeed from those who fail. But in America, each has had and each must have an equal right and an equal opportunity for self-advancement. Thus in our Republic, the Constitution with its hallowed Bill of Rights provides a fair chance for a free people to a degree and with a consistency never approximated by any other government of the past or present.

It is significant, also, that while well over 700 years of human history and individual struggle preceded our American Bill of Rights it is a fact that in the 166 years following its adoption this country had had to add no other significant guaranties of individual freedom to the Bill of Rights except for those growing out of the Emancipation Proclamation and no other country since 1791 has either equaled or exceeded the protections provided to Americans under our great Bill of Rights and the charter of freedom known as our Constitution. Tested by time and by trouble—the foresight of our constitutional fathers has provided this Republic with a matchless way of life it is both your duty and mine to protect and perpetuate.

OUR 10TH AMENDMENT IS UNIQUELY AMERICAN

While some foreign countries have approximated some of the specific guaranties of our Bill of Rights—and we hope and pray that many others will emulate them—there are no other countries anywhere which have provided their people with the priceless protections of our 10th amendment—the final protection set up by the 10 amendments comprising our Bill of Rights. To me, this 10th amendment is the headstone of our entire Bill of Rights because it says so clearly, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively—or to the people." Thus our entire commonwealth of 48 States and their respective governments and courts comprise a tremendous network of 48 separate but united bastions of freedom safeguarding us from the topheavy, powerladen, dictatorial central governments which have done so much to circumscribe human happiness and individual opportunity throughout our modern world.

THE ATTACK IS AGAINST THE 10TH

Small wonder then that it is this 10th amendment which has become the first and foremost point of attack by Communists at home and abroad and by every other enemy of our cherished American institutions. Indeed, it is this 10th amendment, today, which stands out among the entire Bill of Rights as the only one guaranteeing protections which are uniquely and exclusively an American safeguard against the excesses of uncontrolled and uncontrollable government in the capital cities of our era. No other government, anywhere, so surely protects the rights of its several states or segments—nor does any other government reserve so clearly the basic rights of its people. Should we Americans lose the uniquely American protections of our 10th amendment, all the other 9 safeguards of our Bill of Rights would be in constant jeopardy.

Permit me please one final observation. After 166 years of the Bill of Rights, each of the first nine amendments is more secure and more fully operative today than it was a century and a half ago. But not so—unhappily—with our 10th amendment. Today our 10th amendment functions less fully and less faithfully than in earlier times. What change there has been has been movement in the wrong direction. The forces favoring total government and fearing individual ownership and freedom have been relentless in their attacks against the full protections of the 10th amendment. Thus while the other nine parts of our Bill of Rights have grown stronger and more secure, we endanger their endurance also when we permit the 10th amendment to suffer by attrition, from

flank attacks, and by unconscious and unconscionable neglect. Like the 10 Commandments the 10 amendments of our Bill of Rights must function together and receive consistent support if they are to provide the good life, and enduring happiness.

My fellow Americans, let us all on this Bill of Rights Day—on December 15 of every year—rededicate ourselves to sustain and support every protection provided by our Bill of Rights and by our Constitution. What has been so nobly conceived and so constructively continued must not be destroyed or be permitted to deterioriate by consequence of our failure to speak up and to strike out in courageous, consistent support of all 10 important safeguards contained in our cherished American Bill of Rights.

## 1957 Award to Senator Eastland for Service to Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 13, 1958*

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief excerpt from the transcript of proceedings of the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, our largest and, I think, our soundest farm organization, at Chicago, on December 11, 1957, when our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], was presented the American Farm Bureau's 1957 award for distinguished and meritorious service in the interest of organized agriculture.

I know of no man who more richly deserves such recognition, and I think it is appropriate to have preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the comments made by the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Charles B. Shuman, when he presented the award, and the characteristically modest remarks of our colleague upon its acceptance.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION ANNUAL MEETING TRANSCRIPT, WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION, DECEMBER 11, 1957

President SHUMAN. This distinguished service award ceremony is one of the most important and one of the most pleasant that the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation has the opportunity to participate in.

I think I should tell you just a little bit about the distinguished service award. It has been made for a good many years, and the recipients of this award are among the most prominent people in agriculture in this country, and in public life. Each year there is chosen a committee—a small committee—of prominent people to consider the nominations made by the State farm bureaus for the distinguished service award of the American Farm Bureau, and this committee meets—their names are not announced—and they consider these nominations that come in. This year, as always, we had many nominations. All of the persons nominated by the State farm bureaus would have done credit to this award, and were deserving, but only 2 or 3 can be selected—and so the committee made their recommendations for the award, and we have here today and are honored by having 3 leading Americans to present this award for distinguished and meritorious service to American agriculture. The award winners are three—as I said—Senator James O. Eastland, of Mississippi, Mr. George G. Chance, of Texas, and Mr. Donald Kirkpatrick, long-time leader in Illinois and American agriculture.

I am going to present the award first to one and ask him if he cares to respond with a brief word for us, and then to the others.

The first award I want to make is to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi. Senator EASTLAND was born at Doddsville in the Mississippi Delta. He attended the University of Mississippi and the law schools of Vanderbilt and the University of Alabama. He was elected to the Mississippi House of Representatives as its youngest member in 1927. After one term, he divorced himself from active politics and practiced law and farmed for a living until his election to the United States Senate in 1941 to fill the vacancy created by the death of Senator Pat Harrison.

Today Senator EASTLAND is chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He is an authority on cotton and cotton legislation.

He is a strong advocate of seeking economic answers to farmers' economic problems instead of resorting to political panaceas. He understands the dangers of too much Government in agriculture.

He operates a large farm in the Mississippi Delta area, producing cotton and grains.

Senator EASTLAND, it is a distinct honor to present to you this award. We have two awards. One is in the form of a certificate that says on it, "The American Farm Bureau presents to the Honorable JAMES O. EASTLAND the 1957 award for distinguished and meritorious service in the interest of organized agriculture." Senator EASTLAND, congratulations. And this medal for your desk, which is appropriately inscribed. Again, congratulations.

Senator EASTLAND. President Shuman, members of the American Farm Bureau Association, it is with a deep sense of humility I can say that this moment is one of the high points in my life. Nothing has ever happened to me before that is quite equal to this distinction which you are now bestowing upon me. I come from a State in which agriculture constitutes the largest single segment of the economy. From my earliest youth, both in and out of public office, I have lived on and been nurtured by the soil that produces our food and fiber. To me agriculture has always been a way of life and the best way of life.

From the day when the first field was cleared and the soil tilled on this continent, the American farmer has been the backbone around which our great civilization has developed. The unprecedented growth and expansion of industry and commerce has in no way diminished the fundamental part of agriculture in our national life. Yet at the midpoint in the 20th century the farmer has become the victim of economic forces which are beyond his power to control by individual effort and individual initiative.

The farmer cannot be charged with responsibility for the increased production of agricultural products that were required by World War II. While industry and commerce have enjoyed the greatest profit ever in their history, the farmer, regardless of his degree of efficiency in operation, has become the victim of steadily diminishing profits.

Our problems are problems of plenty, of surpluses which depressed prices, ever increasing processing and transportation costs, and a production potential far in excess of consumer demands within this country. These problems cannot be solved by the individual. They cannot be solved by the Government. They can only be solved by organized and united effort.

No single organization or group has done more to promote the interest and welfare of the American farmer than has the American Farm Bureau Federation. In fact, you are today the greatest single force in agriculture—standing between the extremes of a long-range and continuing growth and prosperity for agriculture, or disintegration which will bring chaos and bankruptcy. You hold in your hand—your organization—the future of American agriculture. I know you will heed it. I know your rank and file members. I happen to be one of those rank and file members. I am confident that you will meet and conquer the present challenge.

During my 15 years service in the United States Senate, it has been my high privilege and pleasure to work in close and friendly contact with your elected officials and members of your professional staff. You have always chosen able, courageous and dedicated men to represent your interest and to implement the polices you here set. The Members of Congress—and I make this statement very sincerely—have the highest degree of respect and confidence in your leaders. For them the door is always open. As gloomy as is the agricultural picture today, had it not been for the constant, persistent effort of the American Farm Bureau to solve farm problems in their relation to Government, we would today be in a worse situation.

The salvation of the American farmers depends upon them and upon you, and it is my sincere conviction that your confidence is not misplaced. And I know, my friends, that the American Farm Bureau has prevented the socialization of agriculture when you have repudiated any form of Brannanism.

As a member of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee of the Senate, and as an individual, I pledge to you my continued and increased effort in working toward practical solutions to your problems and in cooperating with your leadership.

You have honored me far more than I deserve, and all that I can say is a heartfelt "thank you."

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 13, 1958*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter sent to my constituents, the first of the weekly reports to be sent while Congress meets, as is my practice:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JANUARY 11, 1958.

One hundred and thirty-eight Old House Office Building was the reunion scene of Congressman and staff (the best staff on the Hill, of course) to kick off the new legislative year. Frank Crowley, Mary Hornbeck, Dorothy Chrest, Kay Wharton, and Evelyn Brust are the Trojans shouldering the Congressional work of Texas' Fifth District, one

of the largest districts, populationwise, in the Nation. Later, in Congress, too, reunion camaraderie prevailed.

The state of the Union message found us all primed and ready to go, anxious to hear this important statement. (The President looks fine—pink-cheeked, alert and jovial, and obviously in good spirits.) "I am fully confident that the response of the Congress and of the American people will make this time of test a time of honor. Mankind then will see more clearly than ever that the future belongs not to the concept of the regimented atheistic state, but to the people—the God-fearing, peace-loving people of the world." Thus closed the best of the yearly statements I have heard. A difference this year was the limitation to security and peace, leaving other legislative areas to later messages. Yet the President laid out a basic framework within which other Executive recommendations will come.

To summarize, the President said: Two tasks face us, to insure our safety through strength and to build peace—both caused by "the threat," communistic imperialism. Their waging of "total cold war" can be combated only by the United States waging "total peace." United States assets today include a retaliatory military power capable of "virtual annihilation" of any attacker, which fact, the President claimed, "every informed government knows." The balance sheet shows also a rate of progress in the missile field so rapid "we will have the missiles, in the need quantity and in time." Further, we are not alone but have many freedom-loving friends, other nations. But Russia's total cold war includes the economic offensive by which Russian economic penetration is the means of later securing political domination. We must recognize and combat this danger by extending economic help to others. Through all our programs we must convey United States ideas and principles. The plan of action to focus our resources upon security and peace requires eight imperative items. They are: (1) Defense reorganization to eliminate harmful rivalry; (2) accelerated defense effort; (3) mutual aid; (4) mutual trade; (5) scientific cooperation with allies; (6) education and research boost; (7) priority of spending and need for savings; and (8) works of peace to reach peace-loving people everywhere. In conclusion, these actions will require two things of Americans—sacrifice and understanding.

Random commendations: (1) The President was plainspoken and forceful; (2) Russia is properly put on the defensive as the world's threat; (3) United States is dealing from strength, not weakness; (4) mistakes are recognized and admitted, including the psychological harm of Russia's satellite first and harmful interservice rivalry; (5) missile development is put in better perspective, silencing unfair critics. The previous administration by choice had no program during the critical years 1946–52; (6) the recognition of need for subordination of military to civilian; (7) a fiscally responsible approach—we must cut back nondefense spending. Increased expenditures are to be financed from revenues; we must expedite the shift from Government foreign aid to private capital; and (8) since people everywhere are peace loving, we must get through to them, bypassing dictators and governments where necessary.

Other criticisms: (1) Since suggested additional military cost is $1.3 billion, we are urged to cut back elsewhere to provide this. This is most important. We should not forget that Russia's announced goal is for us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. (2) Foreign aid frequently has not conveyed United States ideas and principles, and is in violation of our Constitution. (3) Does mutual trade always strengthen and broaden free enterprise or jeopardize United States industry competitively in the low-wage-paying world market? (4) Business operations by Defense Department weakens free enterprise; its elimination could provide added money now needed for missiles and satellites. (5) Federal aid to students for scholarships surely means Federal control; let's stress the local and private efforts for scholarships. (6) Scientific cooperation with allies leaves unanswered the problem of security risks.

Last year President Eisenhower defined liberty as "the opportunity for self-discipline." The broad underlying problem, it seems to me, is whether all citizens—in private or public life, military or civilian, those in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government, including Congressmen—will exercise self-discipline in the period ahead. On this, as I see it, hinges the fate of our civilization.

## Where Should Your Money Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 13, 1958*

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a letter from a long-time supporter is critical because, in a recent statement, it was suggested that a greater percentage of our tax dollars should go to assist our own folk rather than those in foreign lands. My friend's argument is that "unless we help the world to help themselves we'll go down the drain with the rest of those whose God is self. I feel that there is a law written in the fabric of the universe that works to the effect that if we give ourselves (our wealth, our know-how, our care) we'll be blessed, and otherwise we'll be cursed."

We are, to a certain extent, our brother's keeper. But charity begins at home.

The same mail brought a letter from one of my critic's neighbors. She wrote:

> My husband has been laid off from his job at the Clark Co. at Benton Harbor since Oct. 22 * * *. You know and I know that a poor man with a family can't get along very well without a job. With seven children it's bad. I guess they are laying off men everywhere, but what does it mean? Have you ever had seven children asking you what they are going to get for Christmas? * * * My husband needs work, or me—I'll work too. Don't get me wrong—I don't want you or anyone to give us anything but a job. We are willing and able to work. So how about some jobs in Michigan? * * * I can't find out what's going on here in Michigan. All the shops are going down. Hundreds of Michigan people need jobs. Hoping to hear from you soon with an answer.

I lack a satisfactory answer.

I do not have a job which I can give this woman or her husband. Do you?

It is my duty to do all I can to lessen the wasteful spending of tax dollars by our Government—for this family pays taxes on everything they use or consume. It is my duty to lessen the tax burden, the restrictions which hinder, sometimes end, the efforts of those who have or can obtain funds to establish a business, create jobs, meet a payroll. It may be unfortunate, but no one will create or continue a job unless he thinks he can make a profit. Jobs will grow fewer unless merchandise can be manufactured and sold at a profit—though not at an excessive profit.

I cannot get over the conviction that our first duty is to the neighbor next door. Toward balancing profits and wages—ending for a time at least desirable but unnecessary spending.

Nor can one group, neither employer nor skilled unionman skim off all the cream. The desire of some of the big unions for shorter hours and higher wages is natural and understandable, but it may be that, if we are all to have enough to eat, wear, and a comfortable home in which to live, the jobs must be spread, wages equalized, profiteering minimized, but hope of at least some profit made attainable.

There is no room for the mother of seven and her husband to economize. Nor are they the only ones who need work. We can pauperize our own people by continuing to send billions abroad.

Send me your answer as to how we can aid our home folk. Spread or share the jobs?

## Protecting the Oil Rights of 173 Million American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 13, 1958*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have the President's budget message. This Government of ours needs money. It needs income. The eyes of the Nation will be on the United States Supreme Court when it comes to another crucial decision in the long, historic battle over the Submerged Lands Act.

It is my earnest hope that our country's highest tribunal will confirm the Congress' intent that the rights of any individual States extend no further—I emphasize, no further—than 3 geographic miles, in terms of leasing offshore exploitation rights.

It would be unthinkable if, utterly contrary to international law, it should be decided that individual States on the Gulf of Mexico have rights up to three marine leagues; that is, 10.5 land miles.

Last month, I wrote to the Attorney General of the United States, urging that the Department of Justice press forward most vigorously in defense of the rights of the American people—all 173 million Americans. I may say, incidentally, that I have yet to receive a substantive reply to this letter.

Title to oil off the Continental Shelf is all-important. This Nation can ill afford to see a resource, which belongs to all of us, given away to 1, 2, or 3 States in the Gulf of Mexico.

The enormous educational needs of America, alone, require that royalties from off-shore oil leases come into the Federal Treasury, rather than into 1, 2, or 3 State treasuries.

The Department of Justice has no honorable alternative but to fulfill its duty to speak for the people of the United States as a whole; not for the oil industry, not for the State of Texas or Louisiana.

At the present time, I send to the desk two items. The first is the text of a release, describing my letter to the Attorney General, together with the letter, itself.

The second is an article from the January 2, 1958, issue of Labor's Daily. The article is devoted to the famous oil for education amendment, which has for so long been advanced and so ably by our distinguished colleague, the Senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The Nation is indebted to our friend from Alabama for his unstinting effort to make available tidelands revenue for the education of all of our children in the 48 States.

I ask unanimous consent that all of these items be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release, letter, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY DISPUTES PRESIDENT ON TIDELANDS OIL—URGES ATTORNEY GENERAL TO HOLD FAST TO 3-MILE LIMIT ON STATE OIL RIGHTS TO SUBMERGED LANDS

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, senior Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee, has disputed indications from the White House, and from inside the Justice Department, that the State of Texas might be allowed oil rights, extending beyond 3 geographic miles in the submerged coastal lands.

In a letter to Attorney General William Rogers, Wisconsin's senior Senator urged that the Department press forward "with all the vigor and legal strength at its command," so that neither Texas nor any other State gains oil rights beyond the traditional 3-mile limit.

WILEY asserted Federal title on the basis of both legal, historic and economic grounds. The critical budget problem facing the Nation was stressed particularly as a reason for not waiving Federal rights.

At a recent press conference, Attorney General Rogers had indicated that the Supreme Court would receive soon, from the Department, a new brief which would show that the administration "has not been inconsistent" in its views in regards to title to the submerged lands.

WILEY stated that there is "very real doubt in the public mind as to just what the position of the Department may be." He said that the doubt should be resolved "firmly and with clarity and consistency in the public interest."

"Under International Law," the legislator, senior minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee continued, "we cannot possibly assert that any State can have a boundary farther out than the 3-mile limit."

It is generally estimated that vast sums of money may accrue to the Federal Treasury, based on royalties from underwater leases, if the Supreme Court interprets the 1953 law as limiting States to 3 geographic miles, rather than 3 marine leagues, or 10.5 land miles, as Texas contends.

The full text of WILEY'S letter reads as follows:

DECEMBER 17, 1957.

The Honorable WILLIAM ROGERS,
*Attorney General,*
*Department of Justice,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR FRIEND: In this, the opening phase of your service in the high post to which you have well been appointed, I should like to bring up a most important subject:

I am writing to convey my earnest hope and recommendation that the Department of Justice will continue to press, in the current litigation before the Supreme Court, for the sound interpretation of the Submerged Lands Act of 1953, as limiting State off-shore exploitation rights to 3 geographic miles.

I well recognize the long controversy in which men of able legal judgment—judgment, inside and outside the Department—continue to have honest differences of opinion as to the extent of State title.

It is my personal view, however, that the Department of Justice has no honorable alternative but to continue to urge, with all the vigor and legal strength at its command, that the State of Texas not be allowed on its own to drill for oil up to 3 marine leagues, or 10.5 land miles or, for that matter, that no other State be similarly allowed.

Ordinarily, I would not attempt even to offer respectful advice on a judicial issue now pending before the highest tribunal.

It is clear, however, that there is very real doubt in the public mind as to just what the position of the Department may be in time to come. Such doubt concerning the official position of the legal arm of our Government must be resolved firmly and with clarity and consistency in the public interest.

I hope, therefore, that you and Solicitor General J. Lee Rankin will remove all doubt by unequivocally asserting the fullest Federal title beyond the 3-mile limit, as confirmed in the 1953 law.

In my estimation, the following points are indisputable:

(1) The Justice Department this fall, in filing its amended statement with the Supreme Court, was absolutely right when it declared flatly that the Texas boundary, when it entered the Union, "did not extend into the Gulf of Mexico more than 3 miles."

(2) The United States Congress has never approved a further boundary for that State. Therefore, the Federal Government is very definitely entitled to the exclusive possession of all land beyond that limit.

(3) Under international law, I do not see how we can possibly assert otherwise—that any individual State can have a boundary farther out than the traditional 3-mile limit.

(4) These remain issues of historic and legal principle and are wholly aside from the matter of just how much revenue may accrue to the Federal Treasury through royalties from underwater leases, if exclusive Federal title is asserted and validated.

(5) The fact of the matter is, however, that obviously, immense sums of money are definitely involved.

I do not see how we can possibly take an action or voice an argument which would, in effect, waive so much as a nickel which belongs to the people of the 48 States through the Government of the United States. I say this, especially at this time, when every nickel is needed to meet the rising financial requirements for the very survival of this country.

Needless to say, I deeply respect the views of the President of the United States on this issue, or for that matter, on any other issue. I know that he approaches this, or any other problem, with the deepest sincerity and based upon what he most honorably feels to be right. I am sure that is your own approach as well.

I am sorry to have to differ with the President in this particular instance.

But I feel that the needs of this generation, and of future generations, require the fullest protection of Federal right and title by the Department of Justice. Federal law is the law, and neither Texas, Louisiana, nor any other State should be allowed to upset it and to prejudice the rights of an entire Nation.

I will be looking forward to the pleasure of hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

With kindest regards and all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

---

[From Labor's Daily of January 3, 1958]

MEASURE REINTRODUCED IN CONGRESS—OIL FOR EDUCATION PROPOSAL SEEN AS SCHOOL AID HOPE

Back in 1953 labor and other public interest groups put up a strong fight in behalf of a proposal to turn over all royalties from offshore oil to the States for educational purposes.

This proposal was known as the Anderson-Hill amendment to the Submerged Lands Act of 1953. The amendment passed the Senate but was defeated in the House-Senate conference on the measure. It meant that more than $8 billion was lost for education purposes, according to the Washington Window column of Public Affairs Institute.

Once the act was passed without the Anderson-Hill amendment it appeared that a wonderful opportunity to provide ample funds for education was lost. Now, chances have suddenly become bright for achieving what was lost in 1953.

There are several reasons for the change. One, of course, is the emergency of the Soviet sputniks which drove home the fact with startling clarity, that American education—scientific and otherwise—is critically lagging. A second reason is the snarled legal picture relative to the Submerged Lands Act which has provoked sharp differences between President Eisenhower and his own Department of Justice.

The act gave to each coast State the submerged lands within its boundaries as those boundaries which existed when the State entered the union.

TEXAS OFFSHORE CLAIMS

Texas claims, as a result of treaties negotiated at the time it entered the union, that its boundary extends to the limit allowed by law, three marine leagues or 10½ miles.

However, despite Eisenhower's views, Attorney General William P. Rogers and his Solicitor General are of the opinion that the Submerged Lands Act limited exploitation rights to three geographical miles—or 3.5 land miles—for Texas as well as other States on the Gulf of Mexico.

Several months ago the Department of Justice filed an amended complaint with the Supreme Court declaring flatly that the Texas boundary when the State entered the Union did not extend in the Gulf of Mexico more than three geographical miles.

Since, in the department's opinion, Congress never had approved a further boundary for the State, the Federal Government is now entitled to exclusive possession of all lands beyond the 3-mile limit.

LITTLE EXPLORATION

This view directly conflicts with Eisenhower's 1952 campaign statements when the offshore oil issue was a heated one. He said at that time, and has never publicly altered his opinion, that Texas has a legitimate claim to "the submerged area extending 3 marine leagues seaward into the Gulf of Mexico."

What makes these differences between Eisenhower and his own Cabinet member of extreme importance is that comparatively little of the offshore oil exploration has taken place within the 3 mile limit. If private operators are going to make the killing they had hoped, they need authority to explore beyond the limit.

This, plus sputnik, has moved Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, to reintroduce his "oil for education" measure

again. He believes that with the critical education needs of this country his proposal merits and will receive wide support in Congress.

He points out that some $300 million in education funds have already been lost by the failure of his 1953 amendment to win final approval and this is despite the fact that oil and gas exploration has only just begun.

Whatever the legal claims on the 3-mile versus 3-league limit, there should be ample returns from royalties if the Hill bill should pass.

Geological surveys indicate that there are at a bare minimum, 15 billion barrels of oil under the entire Continental Shelf surrounding the United States. This is more than one-fourth of the expected discoveries of oil for the whole Nation—54 billion barrels.

Within the 3-mile limit for California, Louisiana, and Florida and within 3-league limit for Texas it is estimated that there are 2.5 billion barrels. And much of this rests in the additional area for Texas.

Senator HILL says that he does not want to get involved in the legal controversies in the 3-mile versus 10.5 miles for Texas even though there are rich deposits in the contested areas. Whatever the final decision on these limits may be, he sees ample royalties which, if applied to education, might decide the future of the free peoples.

## The Drive To Recognize Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 13, 1958*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a guest column published during the adjournment, which I prepared at the request of Cobina Wright, a syndicated columnist doing a great job of informing the American public.

There being no objection, the guest column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S BEHIND THE DRIVE TO RECOGNIZE RED CHINA

(Reprint of a guest column written for Cobina Wright by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota)

One of the hard-to-explain phenomena of our times is the number of high-minded Americans who fail to take a realistic attitude toward the tragic consequences which would flow from the recognition of Red Communist China. Far too many of our fellow citizens are either so naive or so ill-informed that they look with favor upon the recognition of this godless Red regime as though such action were inevitable, and as though all that would be involved would be the opening of one additional Communist Embassy in Washington, and the stationing here of another 50 to 100 emissaries and agents of international communism.

Bad as it would be to bring to our shores an additional cell of Communist spies and foreign agents, there are other consequences flowing from recognition of Red China which are far more dangerous and undesirable.

One of these, of course, would be the discouragement such recognition of Red imperialism would bring to the freedom-loving peoples throughout the rest of Asia who are bravely and successfully displaying a most gratifying devotion to democracy and self-government. Another drab dividend which recognition of Red China would bring to the debit side of the ledger would be the fact that such recognition would soon mean the displacement on the Security Council of the United Nations of loyal Free China and its Formosan Government by the Red China representatives. Then Communists would occupy two of the five permanent seats on the Security Council and would require only one additional vote to be in complete charge of that important control position of the United Nations.

Even beyond these three tragic results flowing from the recognition of Red China, however, there is still another which should cause every decent American of good conscience to enroll with the millions of discerning Americans actively opposing the recognition of Red China and supporting our Department of State and Secretary Dulles in their firm stand against such an eventuality.

I refer specifically to the terrible expansion of juvenile delinquency and the increased use of opium, heroin, and morphine that would follow closely on the heels of the recognition of Red China. No other single step could conceivably do as much to increase dope addiction in America and expand the type of juvenile delinquency so closely associated with that habit as the recognition of Red China and the establishment of normal trade relations between Red China and the United States.

Does this sound like exaggeration to you? Are you one of those unthinking citizens who fail to see the relationship between the dope habit and the recognition of Red China? Are you, perhaps, one of those who sees no inconsistency in proclaiming opposition to juvenile delinquency and dope addiction on Sunday and supporting the idea of recognizing Red China the rest of the week? If you are, or if you know those who are, let us look at the irrefutable evidence made available on this subject by the United Nations itself.

Largely unreported by the wire services and consequently overlooked by the general public were reports made this year at the 12th session of the United Nations Commission on narcotic drugs which met in New York City April 29 through May 31. For example, at that meeting, the International Criminal Police Organization of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs reported: "In Singapore most of the opium seized was identified as of Yunnan (Red China) origin. Opium of Yunnan origin accounted for 66.2 percent of the total seizures in 1956."

And the report of the Government of South Korea to the U. N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs said, "There was large scale traffic in South Korea in opium and heroin, the drugs having been smuggled from North Korea by way of illicit marine transportation." At the same session, Thailand reported "According to the authorities of Thailand, there were enormous seizures of opium, heroin, and morphine, all of which originated in Communist China."

Dr. Wei, the Chinese delegate to the U. N. Commission said, "The average world total seizure of raw opium has risen from 20 to more than 54 tons annually. The year 1950, the first year of the Communist Chinese regime on the mainland of China, marked the beginning of a new period in illicit opium traffic. That year the Chinese Communist Government offered 500 tons of opium for sale in the world market thus initiating narcotics warfare on a worldwide scale."

The basic reasons why Communist China is so energetically peddling narcotics in every area of the world where its agents can gain a foothold are clear cut. In the first place, it is the driving desire of Red China to secure the necessary foreign exchange required for financing its Communist activities abroad that induces the Red masters of China to subsidize the exportation and illegal foreign trade in narcotics. It follows that since American dollars comprise the most effective foreign exchange in the world, the Red Chinese concentrate their strongest efforts on the sale of dope to United States destinations. Once they were recognized so as to be able to operate in the United States legally, and with normal trade channels restored, this country would be deluged with the greatest flood of habit-forming narcotics in its history.

In the second place, it is also highly significant that the Communist loans to Red China in 1950 and again in 1954 specified repayment in American dollars. Even the Russian Communists recognize the value of our dollars and need more of them to finance their own Communist activities in this and other countries.

In fact, the twelfth session of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs in its report dated May 21, 1957, emphasizes the casual relationship between the narcotics trade of Red China and its Communist activities abroad. That report states, "It was apparent that the regime on the mainland of China was actively engaging in the illicit traffic in drugs in order to further its political aims, and also because the traffic was an excellent source of revenue for financing Communist activities abroad and for purchasing strategic materials."

Any habit or practice which depraves and destroys the dignity of human beings is in itself an aid to communism which feeds upon the frustrations, disappointments, and depravities of all mankind. Thus, as a third reason Red China desires a greater drug traffic with us, traffic in drugs is an ace in the hand of the Red Chinese which any way they play it strengthens their godless ambitions and weakens the capacity of the Free World to resist. So long as we refuse to give official recognition to Red China, however, we continue to maintain a roadblock against its aggressive purposes. Once we open our doors to these emissaries of evil and embrace them as representatives of a decent government, on the other hand, we invite to our shores a whole series of evil consequences which could well destroy the very foundations of our good society.

Individual hoodlums and racketeers will always try to smuggle narcotics into our great country, but Red China is the only country in the world which as a governmental entity endeavors with the full power and resources of the state to flood our communities with these deadly and destructive drugs. Under such circumstances, recognition of Red China would be a bid for disaster, and those advocating it must face the evidence of what this would mean to the youth of our country and to our efforts to stamp out drug addiction in the United States.

## Past and Present Role of House Reviewed and Analyzed by Representative Udall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 13, 1958*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of our most able colleagues, Representative

STEWART L. UDALL, of Arizona, has contributed a significant chapter to the constantly growing history of the Congress at work. Representative UDALL's outstanding essay, which appeared in the January 12 magazine section of the New York Sunday Times, is a sensitive analysis of the role ascribed to the House of Representatives by the Constitution, by usage and precedent, and by the practical demands of the legislative process. In order that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle may have another opportunity to read this important article, I include it here.

A CONGRESSMAN DEFENDS THE HOUSE—VARIOUS FACTORS HAVE CONSPIRED TO DOWNGRADE THE HOUSE—HERE, REPRESENTATIVE UDALL OFFERS A REAPPRAISAL OF ITS BASIC ROLE

(By STEWART L. UDALL)

WASHINGTON.—Each new session is a testing ground for the institutions of Congress, but recent events have indicated plainly that in 1958 the House of Representatives faces its biggest challenge.

Within the past year a perceptive journalist has written that the House is not "carrying its weight" and is in danger of becoming a rubber stamp for the Executive, while another veteran Washington reporter has termed the Senate "the one touch of genius in the American political system."

Although I believe these pictures are somewhat overdrawn, it is indisputable that the Senate is now playing the dominant role in our lawmaking process, however much it may hurt my colleagues to admit it. But this is not to say that the House is not doing its share of work in some sectors of the Washington vineyard, nor to admit that its influence is bound to decline. The truth is, I suspect, that when the whole picture is seen in perspective, the case for the House is much stronger than its critics have realized.

In the first place, the floor of each House is its principal showcase and the Senate is most clearly superior in public debate. As even the best observers sometimes forget, however, the Congressional House has many mansions. Thus, if the Senate has become the Nation's great forum, one might say that the House—by the quality of its committee work—has become its workshop. It is no wonder, then, that hard-working House committees at times follow Senate debates much like a cook who looks on while the hostess is praised for an excellent meal.

It is also evident that cubits are added to the stature of the Senate by the ease with which some of its Members catch the public eye. Although Senators speak for entire States and deserve greater attention than Representatives, their reputations frequently loom larger than life as a result of preferment accorded them by newsmen. A striking example of this type of upstaging occurred in 1955 when a policy statement issued by 20 of my colleagues got footnote treatment in the press; and a Senator, to our chagrin, made the front pages a week later by advancing the same ideas.

But the truth of the matter is that history itself has been a major influence in the downgrading of the House. There is, for instance, the factor of the Senate's emergence as a truly national body, resulting from the direct election of its members. Also, we have witnessed the unprecedented gravitation of power to the Presidency during this century. And we have seen awesome new world responsibilities thrust upon our Nation since the onset of World War II. All these things, to a degree, rather than substandard performances by the House, have added to Executive and senatorial powers.

Another irony of history is that in the one area—special duties—where the founders clearly sought to give the House supremacy, their attempt has miscarried. As last year's "battle of the budget" demonstrated so conclusively, the President, more than the House, now "initiates" appropriations legislation and has the power of the purse. And, to make matters worse for the hapless House, the vitality of the Senate's power of supervision over our foreign affairs (thought to be an inferior special function by the founders) has steadily increased with the growth of our global commitments.

Then, too, custom now dictates that most major bills be processed first by the House. In abiding this practice, the House consciously sacrifices its own prestige: not only is the Senate thereby invited to ponder the great issues at its leisure as a kind of legislative court of appeals, but it is assured the more dramatic role as well. Yet, although the House and its hard-working committees must on these occasions play Horatio to the Senate's Hamlet, this is a small price to pay for the good legislation that is achieved.

But if custom and history have been working overtime against the lower body, it is apparent that the Constitution itself is doing even more to limit its potential. The hard truth is that the founders provided much stronger hereditary characteristics for the Senate than for the House.

Each House of Congress is, in fact, a dual body: a constitutional institution which provides the broad framework, and an institution of men. It is fair, I think, that within the institution of men Congressmen should be held accountable for mastering their environment. That is to say, Senators and Representatives must accept blame if they fail to devise rules and machinery which will enable them to accomplish their business efficiently and democratically. But, conversely, we of the House contend it is quite unfair to praise the Senate for the length of its stride, or blame the House for being short-winded, when the grand design of the founders fixed the congenital bone and gait of each House. The House, after all, is not another Senate.

This may sound like a glib attempt to escape censure by pleading original sin, but the Constitution has made it so. Its mandates determine the tenure of Congressmen and fix the membership and special duties of their respective Houses. It has been my experience that the very nature of these mandates governs the actions of Congressmen in numerous and subtle ways.

The tenure provisions, more than any other "hereditary" factor, exercise a measurable influence on the way Congressmen vote. Madison and Hamilton predicted that 6-year terms would serve to make the Senate a stable body, while the shorter term would make the House susceptible to "the impulse of sudden passions" of the people. In the old phrase, the House will feel the heat, while the Senate may see the light. Each serves the country in its own way: if the House is more responsive, the Senate will usually be more responsible. Who should be surprised, then, if under such a system there are times when the House runs before approaching tides of public opinion, while the Senators, from higher ground, contemplate after the waves have broken?

Of course, every Congressman likes to vote his convictions when he can, but he also wants to keep his seat. And if the next election is only a few months away, it is understandable that the average Representative will be perhaps a little more inclined than the average Senator to follow the course of least resistance when a "gut" issue comes up. Those who complain that House Members spend too much time running errands for home folks, or respond too readily to the demands of pressure groups, are really making the charge that they are preoccupied with the next election—which is precisely what the founders intended.

Of course, the Senator can play it safe, too, but experience has taught him that most of the time he can break new ground with the expectation that in the years ahead voter opinion will come around to his point of view. On the other hand, he knows that quite frequently time will rescue him from a blunder which might have caused his defeat.

While short tenure limits the foresight of the House, the unwieldy size of the body has muted its voice. As in most large assemblies, debate in the House is controlled to the point where much of the discussion is not debate at all but a series of set speeches. It is worth noting that even the mother of parliaments, the 630-member House of Commons, long ago sacrificed free discussion on the altar of necessity. One wonders if the world's greatest deliberative body would be praised for the quality of its debate if it had 435 members instead of 96?

But even the House—whose 5-minute rule impartially muzzles both windbag and orator—has its high moments of debate. Anyone who has heard a RAYBURN or a HALLECK go for the jugular of an issue knows that brevity can be the soul of public speech as well as of wit.

However, even a stanch defender of the House must concede that many of its worst performances are not excusable on any grounds. There was the low point of the 1957 session, for example, when the FBI files bill was whisked through committee and passed in such unseemly haste. It remained for a dismayed freshman, FRANK COFFIN of Maine, to ask pointedly: "Can we expect to add to the dignity of our system of justice * * * without having conducted any hearings in depth, or seeking the reasoned advice of bench and bar?" I recall, too, a day in 1956 when the House ignored the commonsense counsel of a committee chairman, gave a powerful lobby its way, and overwhelmingly passed a costly bill giving automatic pensions to all 65-year-old veterans. And, again, there was a frantic afternoon in January 1955, when the House was stampeded into rubberstamping the Formosa Resolution with only the slightest pretense of real debate.

But if the House has its bad days, there are other occasions when it provides invaluable national leadership. Today's reciprocal trade program is largely the result of forceful action by the House in 1955. It is significant that in recent years the Cordell Hull of our Congress has not been a Senator, but the late Representative JERE COOPER of Tennessee, whose Committee on Ways and Means has had a dominant influence on our trade and tax policies.

In other fields the House and its committees are more than holding their own: school-assistance legislation—now a matter of national concern, thanks to the sputniks—has for some time been a special province of the House. And, year in and year out, the most demanding of all Congressional chores has been discharged best by Representative GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, and his subcommittee which scrutinizes the policies and spending plans of the Department of Defense. It should be noted also that, contrary to the general impression, the House played the key role in the enactment of the historic civil-rights bill last summer, by passing a "strong" bill which made the issue compromisable in the Senate.

There are good reasons why the House excels at committee work. While the Senate

emphasizes its willingness to provide almost unlimited time for debate on any issue, the House displays an equal willingness to devote almost unlimited time to committee spadework. I have checked, and find that, during the last three sessions, one House committee spent more than 80 days processing school construction bills; its Senate counterpart spent just 12. During the same period another House committee spent 79 days, against 16 in the Senate, studying the natural gas bill. Extreme examples, perhaps, but they confirm the point.

This willingness, harnessed to the House's extra manpower, becomes one of its principal assets. Vital Senate hearings are often conducted by four or six Members, but two or three times as many minds probe at the same issue in a similar House inquiry. Then there is the added fact that the House is more streamlined, and Representatives—who, with few exceptions, serve on only one committee—devote more time and become more expert in the problems that come before them. Inevitably, a Senator who has multiple committee assignments must spread his time so thin that he cannot effectively participate in the type of painstaking hearings conducted by most House committees.

As a result, the Senate is inclined to let the better-equipped House be the workhorse and the real decider in the field of regional and secondary legislation. This explains why such diverse groups as Indians, conservationists and postal workers regard the House as their stronghold.

An unwritten rule of the Senate club is that regional legislation is the business of the Senators from that region, and too often a bill is passed simple because Senator X wants it. The Senate does so without misgivings, knowing full well that tough-minded House committees will carefully weigh each proposal against the broad national interest.

When all of the explaining and defending is done, however, there is still the hard fact that the House does not live up to its full potential. In addition to a 4-year term (concurrent with the President's), what other remedies might be prescribed to improve the quality of the House's performance? Let me outline the most promising ones.

First, the House could readily upgrade itself as a national forum by adopting a rule allowing a climactic closing debate of 2 or 3 hours on major bills. This debate should preferably take place after a bill has been perfected by amendments; the most knowledgeable spokesmen on each side could then sum up their cases.

Secondly, House Members could continue to lead the way in reforming the committee system. (The Senate is tradition-bound in this area, and the arbitrary powers exercised by its chairmen will surely cause increasing embarrassment to that institution.) If the House can succeed in substituting the democratic process for the exercise of one-man rule in all of its committees, it will in time regain a large measure of its prestige.

A third suggestion would be that the House show fresh enterprise in using its investigative powers. This is a sector where the Senate has stolen many marches in recent years. (A House committee started to inquire into labor-management racketeering in 1953, and suddenly abandoned the project at the threshold.) Adequate funds, a good staff, and hardworking committeemen are the ingredients of any successful investigation, and the House has only itself to blame if it does not keep abreast in this field.

And, finally, the whole country would be in the House's debt if we put our manpower and vigor to full use in providing foreign policy surveillance. The chief reason our foreign-aid programs have been floundering lately is that Congress, and the country, have had too few facts on the actual operation of these programs. It should be plain that we would have a much easier time understanding and carrying out our policies that affect India or Poland, for example, if Congressional groups were more familiar at first hand with the forces at work in these countries.

Interestingly enough, an excellent pattern has already been set in this field. Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON of Ohio (who, incidentally, has paid her constituents the high compliment of believing that they value good work abroad better than fence-mending speeches at home) made a strenuous 3-month study mission in the fall of 1955 to 24 African countries, and her comprehensive report stamped her as, perhaps, the leading Congressional authority on that continent. If the Bolton idea were applied on a larger scale, one wonders how quickly the House's stock would begin to rise.

For all its shortcomings the House has many opportunities to win, and keep, the esteem of the country. But it is obvious, too, that the House can grasp these opportunities only if it is willing to break new ground, and if individual Members are willing to share a heavier load of work. There, as I see it, is the real challenge to the House today.

---

## Washington Report

---

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 13, 1958*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 18, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

The budget, a 5-pound, 1,400-page monstrosity, a maze of detailed figures, outlines the $73.9 billion planned expenditures ($421 per United States person) and $74.4 billion hoped-for receipts (income tax, individual $38½ billion, corporate $20½ billion, excise $9.3 billion, and others $6.2 billion) for fiscal 1959 (July 1958–July 1959). It is a "have your cake and eat it" budget, little, if any, belt tightening. In the face of increased military expenses, there's little cutting back elsewhere.

Some basic axioms help to give perspective to budget study. (1) United States debt is $1,582 per person, and yearly tax $432 (West Europe citizens by comparison, $285 and $114 respectively; (2) $74 billion is really $44 billion of 1940 dollars; (3) the basic yardstick is the national good, not local or personal aggrandizement; (4) waste and inefficiency must be sought out and eliminated; (5) 1957 budget lessons—(a) people are demanding too much Federal help; (b) Congress can't or won't economize; (c) the Executive won't provide continuing vigorous leadership in cutting expenditures; (6) population growth puts a strain on local and State services (schools, utilities, etc.) not Federal, so population growth doesn't require the same percentage of increased Federal services; (7) budget growth that absorbs all tax income (instead of some debt reduction and a tax cut) limits the Nation's maximum economic growth and stability; (8) Government must resist pressure groups (many national organizations even now are demanding of Congress billions more for their specific interests).

To cut the budget: (a) With 63 percent for defense, 25 percent for a fixed program set by existing legislation, there only remains 12 percent wherein small savings may be made, unless the big existing programs are reevaluated, streamlined, and cut (here again waste and inefficiency revealed); (b) specific areas for budget reduction: No new programs (for example, aid to education); reduce existing programs; get Government out of business operation (thousands of them); sell Government surplus property (plants, equipment, property); effect Hoover Commission economies by legislation (170 bills now pigeonholed by Democrat leadership); reduce foreign aid; reduce public works (no new projects just now); reduce or eliminate Federal public housing, power, and reclamation; streamline the military (unified supply, etc.); reduce farm supports, eliminate soil bank; reduce non-service-connected veteran aid; reduce or eliminate subsidies to industries—housing, aircraft, etc.; reduce State grants-in-aid.

The 1959 budget puts national security first, costing $46,336 million. Over half the weapon expenditures are for total new weapons and 90 percent of missile costs are for new missiles (since 1955). Research since 1955 will total $20 billion in 4 years. Mutual security, the military and economic aid for allies, costs $3 billion, while other foreign aid totals roughly another billion. The Atomic Energy Commission gets $2.5 billion more. The Export-Import Bank gets another $2 billion (new obligational authority). Then labor and welfare, $3.6 billion; commerce and housing, $1.6 billion; veterans, $5 billion; agriculture, $4.6 billion; natural resources, $1.5 billion; debt interest, $7.8 billion; General Government, $1.4 billion; split up the rest—something for everyone.

Bright spots: (1) A balanced budget is possible; (2) sound fiscal suggestions include adequate interest rates for money, Government service charges where special benefit is enjoyed, and some grants-in-aid and Federal programs shifted to the States; (3) programs which could be expanded or initiated are held in check.

Disappointments, dangers, and dilemmas: (1) No tax or debt cut in sight, maybe deficit financing; (2) the cash budget expenditures will actually be $87 billion or more (includes outside budget items like highways, social security, etc.); (3) Federal contingent liabilities go up—loans and guaranties to $79.5 billion, civil service retirement fund to $18 billion, social-security commitments to $200 billion or $?; (4) Government loans will be made (Export-Import, small business, and others) when private loans can't be obtained (is this fiscally sound, morally right, or constitutional?); (5) Federal pay increases may go even beyond budget figures when politics enters (another $500 million).

In conclusion, to me the budget is bitterly disappointing. I fail to find the hardheaded realism of earlier Americans who with guts have faced up to situation, fought war and adversity, carved out a nation, and defeated all comers. Yes; we're in an economic offensive, all right; but it isn't Russia we're fighting, just ourselves, our own greed and shortsighted complacency. Pressure groups demand Federal aid. We are doing the political thing, trying to please everyone. It is a political budget, something for everyone, business as usual. And many critics want to spend more, not less—almost without regard for our national security. Again, are the Communists succeeding in their goal of spending the United States in bankruptcy? Where now are the economy-minded citizens? We can and we must economize.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, we have entered upon this day beseeching Thee to inspire us with new ventures of faith, new vistas of hope, and new visions of a love bringing all mankind into a glad and grateful obedience to Thy holy will.

Grant that we may minister more faithfully and generously to the needs of men and nations everywhere as they look eagerly and wistfully for a light to illuminate the skyline of their loftiest aspirations.

May our differences in party politics never mar or break that unity of spirit and cooperation which is so sorely needed as we seek to gain those blessings of peace and prosperity which none can ever find or enjoy alone.

We thank Thee for the life and character of Thy servant whom Thou hast called unto Thyself. Thou hast opened unto him the gateway of the more abundant life and received him into Thy nearer presence. Give unto the members of the bereaved family Thy divine consolation.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

### Senate Resolution 215

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HENDERSON L. LANHAM, late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

### Senate Resolution 216

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

### Senate Resolution 217

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JERE COOPER, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

### Senate Resolution 219

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. RUSSELL W. KEENEY, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States, No. 58–6.

## DISABILITY INSURANCE PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in the opening days of this session, I introduced H. R. 9836, to amend the Social Security Act with respect to the disability insurance provisions.

During the recent recess, I had an opportunity to visit a number of field offices of the Social Security Administration, and to talk to the regional administrators of the program. The need for revision of the act's disability section was very clearly pointed out to me as a result of my conversations with them—the people who are closest to the actual working of the act. Consistently, the feeling was that overly strict eligibility requirements for disability insurance have created injustices in that many deserving applicants must be turned down for failure to fully meet those requirements; and that inadequacies in the act cause frequent and unnecessary administrative difficulties. It is my feeling that the amendments that my bill would make will correct these faults.

The current eligibility requirements defining coverage are not only that an individual be both fully and currently insured, but that additionally, and unique to the disability section of the act, that he have not less than 20 quarters of coverage in the last 40 quarters immediately preceding the onset of his disability.

In practice this means that every individual over 50 years who is either fully insured on the basis of work in the more distant past, or is currently insured, or is both, but whose fully insured status is not based on recent work—within the 5 to 10 years immediately preceding the onset of his disability—is disqualified for disability insurance.

It is of course important to remember that we are only considering those individuals who are 50 years old or older, and who are both permanently and totally disabled. While it is true that they may apply for a disability freeze to protect their eventual old-age and survivors insurance benefits at 65, the period of time up to 15 years during which they are unable to earn an income will be years of privation which I believe to be the state of affairs that enactment of the disability program was specifically designed to avoid.

My bill will amend the act to extend insurance to those individuals who are either fully or currently insured, and will eliminate the section that he be more fully covered than he must be to receive OASI benefits.

By providing new definitions of disability, H. R. 9836 will insure coverage to those who need and deserve it by remedying the gross injustice imposed by the current stringent definition of disability. Presently, an individual who is permanently and totally disabled for the purpose of his trade or profession, but who is able to carry on some small manner of employment even though it be utterly unsuited to his capabilities, is not eligible.

For instance, a dentist who becomes crippled with arthritis or anyone who has special mental or physical training and who becomes incapacitated for his work is held not to be totally disabled if he could conceivably sweep a floor or qualify as a car greeter in front of some nightclub. This may sound exaggerated, but it is actually what is happening today, as specific cases prove.

As revised, the term disability will mean:

> Inability of an individual, by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to be permanent or of long continued and indefinite duration, to engage in a substantial gainful activity which is the same as or similar to the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such impairment.

A further inequitable situation stems from a frequent duplication of disability insurance coverage by other Federal agencies with more realistic definitions of disability. Since many individuals are considered permanently and totally disabled for one kind of Federal or State insurance, but not for the purposes of the Social Security Act, an additional definition of disability is added:

> An individual shall be conclusively presumed to have furnished such proof (of disability) if he furnishes to the Secretary a formal declaration of his permanent and total disability, made by any Federal or State agency, which is still in effect and on the basis of which such agency is paying or has paid such individual monetary benefits for permanent and total disability.

While an opposite question of overly lenient disability definitions in some States might be raised, my purpose in this provision is to more nearly standardize eligibility requirements. It is patently unfair that an illness or injury that

is recognized by one governmental agency as permanently and totally disabling might not consistently be so recognized, and it is to this point that the amendment is directed.

I sincerely hope that Members of the House who believe in the position of these changes will communicate their views to the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, which during this session will consider revision of section 223 of the Social Security Act.

## NUCLEAR ROCKETS AND EXPLORATION OF OUTER SPACE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the need for a better understanding by the Congress and the public of the nature, scope, and purpose of basic research and its relationship to our atomic-energy program, the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is planning to hold 2 weeks of public hearings on this subject beginning Monday, February 3, to which some 50 top-ranking scientists from our national laboratories and participating universities are being invited.

The hearings will be devoted primarily to work that is actually being performed in the field and will cover the major areas of chemistry, metallurgy, and nuclear physics. Among the specific areas to be covered will be high-energy accelerators, or atom smashers as they are commonly called, and experimental work being conducted in the controlled thermonuclear of fusion field. I would like, at this point, to introduce for the record a tentative schedule of these hearings:

Monday, February 3, 1958, a general survey discussion of the basic research program.

Tuesday, February 4, 1958, a discussion by the working scientists of selected research topics in the field of chemistry.

First. Introduction.

Second. Nuclear chemistry:

(a) Chemical studies of high-energy nuclear reactions.

(b) Nuclear properties of the heavy elements.

(c) Studies of the fission process.

Third. Radiation and hot atom chemistry. The radiation chemistry of both aqueous and nonaqueous systems will be covered:

(a) Radiation chemistry.

(b) Hot atom chemistry.

Wednesday, February 5, 1958, continuation of chemistry research discussion and questions.

First. Chemical and thermodynamic properties at high temperatures.

Second. Effects of isotopic substitutes on chemical reactions.

Third. Selected topics in physical and inorganic chemistry:

(a) Studies in free radicals using microwave spectroscopy.

(b) Studies of molecular structures using neutron diffraction techniques.

(c) Solvent extraction techniques for the separation of actinide and rare earth elements.

(d) Ion exchange as a research tool.

Fourth. Geochemical studies.

Thursday, February 6, 1958, a discussion by the working scientists of selected research topics in the fields of metallurgy, solid state physics, ceramics, and radiation effects on solids.

First. Atomic structure and the fundamental properties of solids.

Second. Atoms in motion diffusion.

Third. Theory of alloys and solid solutions.

Fourth. The physical metallurgy of nuclear materials.

Fifth. Fundamental corrosion and oxidation studies.

Sixth. The effects of radiation on matter.

Friday, February 7, 1958, a discussion by the working scientists of selected research topics in the field of physics.

First. Low energy and medium energy nuclear physics:

(a) Basic concepts.

(b) Low energy neutron physics.

(c) Nuclear spectroscopy.

(d) Experiments and apparatus.

(e) The nonconservation of parity.

Monday, February 10, 1958, a discussion by working scientists of selected aspects of the controlled thermonuclear research program.

First. Introduction.

Second. Magnetic bottles for plasmas.

Third. Pinch discharges:

(a) Neutrons from pinches.

(b) The false neutrons.

(c) Some interesting pinch devices.

(d) The stabilized pinch.

(e) The turbulent pinch.

Tuesday, February 11, 1958, continuation of physics research discussion and questions.

First. High energy physics:

(a) Multi-bev accelerator experiments.

(b) Electron interactions.

(c) Elementary particles.

(d) Cosmic ray research.

(e) Cosmic ray rocket research.

Thursday, February 13, 1958, continuation of physics research discussion and questions.

First. Computers:

(a) University research computers.

(b) Applied mathematics research.

Second. High energy accelerators:

(a) The Brookhaven alternating gradient synchrotron.

(b) 15–45 bev electron linear accelerator.

(c) Fixed field alternating gradient system.

Friday, February 14, 1958, review of basic research program and level of support needed.

I would also like to call to the attention of the House the hearings to be held jointly by the Research and Development and Military Applications Subcommittees January 22 and 23, on the nuclear rocket program and advanced atomic engines for the exploration of outer space. Progress in this area of scientific research and development has been a matter of great interest and concern to the joint committee for a number of years and has acquired added urgency in light of Russia's recent dramatic scientific achievements, including her earth satellites. The hearings should be helpful in bringing the committee up to date in developments and provide information which will be useful in the development of sound national policies.

## TAXING INCOME OF NONRESIDENTS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a great number of my constituents, like many other residents of the State of New Jersey, whose employment is in adjoining States, are faced with the problem of having their income taxed as nonresidents of the taxing State. This is a grave situation and, in my opinion, one that results in discriminatory treatment. I believe it only fair and just that the Congress recognize the urgency of this question and give it early consideration.

I have been pleased to note that as a result of widespread and searching publicity given this issue by leading newspapers in New Jersey, some discussions have already been held among the governors of the various affected States. I have noted that some legislative proposals aimed at finding a solution to the problem has been advanced. Because of the immediacy of this matter, I have today introduced a resolution directing the House Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a study and investigation into the political, institutional, and other problems surrounding the power of the several States to tax the incomes of nonresidents, for the purpose of determining the need for, and advisability of, amending the United States Constitution in such respect. I am also introducing a proposal for a constitutional amendment prohibiting the States from taxing nonresidents which may be included in the study contemplated by my resolution.

## CHANTILLY AIRPORT—A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 304)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the first paragraph under the heading "Department of Commerce" of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1958, there is submitted herewith my report recommending a site for a new public airport in the vicinity of the District of Columbia.

Such report consists of a letter to me from the special assistant to the President for aviation matters, dated January 8, 1958, together with an enclosure entitled "Site Selection Study." It pro-

poses the site known as Chantilly, located partly in Loudoun County and partly in Fairfax County, Va., as the airport site which best meets the requirements of public safety, airport and airspace capacity, public service and cost.

Accordingly, I recommend the selection of the Chantilly site, and at this site have directed the Civil Aeronautics Administration to proceed forthwith with the construction and development of a new public airport to serve the growing needs of the National Capital region.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1958.*

---

## ELEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT COVERING UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS DURING YEAR 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 202)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, the 11th annual report, covering United States participation in the United Nations during the year 1956.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six was a year of great peril to world peace and thus a stringent test for the United Nations—notably because of the crises in Egypt and in Hungary.

In Egypt the United Nations caused the world to turn away from war. Through a series of resolutions, the General Assembly effectively mobilized world opinion to achieve a cease-fire, and France and the United Kingdom shortly agreed to withdraw their forces. The Assembly's moral pressure played a powerful part in securing the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egyptian territory in March of this year.

In the case of Hungary, the Assembly succeeded by massive votes in mobilizing opinion against the Soviet Union's blatant disregard of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. Although it has so far been impossible by peaceful means to secure freedom for the people of Hungary, this mobilization did arouse a strong revulsion around the world against Soviet imperialism.

The sharp contrast between the response of France, the United Kingdom and Israel on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other to the call of world opinion, is striking.

The Secretary General deserves particular commendation for his role in the United Nations actions during the Middle East crisis. As requested by the General Assembly, he developed within 48 hours a plan to set up, with the consent of the nations involved, the United Nations emergency force "to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities." The force took up its position in the Suez Canal area and later moved to other positions along the armistice demarcation lines. Today, it remains the guardian of peace in the sensitive Gaza and Sharm el Sheikh areas. The concept inherent in this force constitutes a potentially important development for the future of the United Nations as an increasingly effective instrument for maintaining peace.

Under a mandate from the General Assembly, the Secretary General also organized a fleet of more than 40 salvage vessels to remove the obstructions with which the Suez Canal had been blocked during the hostilities. By April 24, 1957, the canal was fully open and had resumed its role as an important artery in world commerce.

Thus the United Nations dealt effectively with a grave situation which could have caused general war. The restoration and maintenance of relative calm gives the United Nations the opportunity to work for the long-range solutions in the Middle East which alone can guarantee against the outbreak of new fighting.

Unlike the crisis in the Middle East, the situation in Hungary presented the problem of what the United Nations can do when one of its members refuses to respond to the peacemaking efforts of the General Assembly.

What began as a peaceful student demonstration in Budapest on October 23, 1956, mushroomed into a nationwide uprising of the Hungarian people aimed at national independence. It was crushed only through massive Soviet armed intervention. The United States proposed a resolution in the Security Council calling on the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops. When this resolution was vetoed by the Soviet Union, a special emergency session of the General Assembly was convened under the "uniting for peace" procedure.

As the climax of a historic series of resolutions, the General Assembly on December 12 condemned the Soviet Union's violation of the United Nations Charter "in depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental rights." It again requested the Soviet Union to halt its intervention in Hungary's internal affairs, withdraw its troops from Hungary, and permit reestablishment of Hungary's political independence. To these requests the Soviet Union turned a deaf ear.

On January 10, 1957, the General Assembly established a Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary consisting of representatives of Australia, Ceylon, Denmark, Tunisia, and Uruguay—a committee drawn from five continents—and instructed it to investigate the Hungarian situation. Denied admission to Hungary by the Kadar regime, the Committee carried out its mandate by collecting authentic evidence elsewhere, mainly from eyewitnesses who had fled Hungary. The results of this investigation were published in the Special Committee's report. They clearly refuted on a point-by-point basis the Soviet version of events in Hungary. The report confirmed that the purpose of the Soviet intervention was the suppression of the legitimate demands of the Hungarian people for freedom and independence. It revealed the naked truth of the ruthlessness of the Soviet intervention and its utter disregard for national sovereignty and basic human rights.

It was this report which led to the reconvening of the Assembly on September 10, 1957, and to the second resolution again condemning Soviet conduct, which was adopted by 60 votes to 10.

The United Nations succeeded in stopping the fighting in the Middle East because the parties involved complied with the recommendations of the General Assembly. In the case of Hungary, United Nations action was frustrated because the Soviet Union refused to comply with its recommendations. The blame lies not with the United Nations, but squarely on the shoulders of the men of the Kremlin who rely on force to keep Hungary from regaining its freedom.

The record of the United Nations clearly demonstrates that the processes of consultation, compromise, debate, and agreement are capable of relaxing tensions and resolving disputes if nations are willing to respect the opinions of mankind.

I was particularly pleased to note the progress made, under the aegis of the United Nations, in the fields of disarmament and the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee has been the center for serious negotiations which we all hope will lead to a mutually acceptable agreement. The establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency has been especially promising.

The United States welcomed the constructive work done by the United Nations over the past year toward the achievement of self-government and independence in the dependent areas and trust territories. The independence of Ghana and the termination of the United Nations trusteeship over Togoland under British administration constitute notable achievements.

By the admission of Sudan, Morocco, Tunisia, Japan, Ghana, and most recently the Federation of Malaya, the United Nations has increased its membership to 82. However, the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Vietnam are still excluded by the Soviet veto in the Security Council. The United States considers their admission necessary and desirable and will continue its efforts to bring about their entry into the Organization.

The humanitarian activities of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in providing minimum subsistence and housing for over 900,000 refugees in the Near East were continued by the General Assembly with United States support. Although the Agency is doing an excellent job under trying circumstances, we must find a permanent solution to the Palestine refugee problem.

The economic and social activities of the United Nations have become increasingly effective. Through many channels and in numerous programs, the United Nations and the specialized agencies have contributed to the economic progress of the newly developing areas

of the world and, in the words of the United Nations Charter, "the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations." This report gives a full account of many of the strikingly successful battles the specialized agencies have fought and won against disease, hunger, and illiteracy in many lands.

It has been the continuing pledge of the United States to give full support to the United Nations and to seek constantly for ways to increase its strength and to develop its effectiveness as an instrument to maintain world peace. This report to the Congress contains concrete proof that we are keeping that pledge.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1958.*

## CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 9739, DEALING WITH NATIONAL SECURITY INSTALLATIONS, MADE IN ORDER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if a rule is reported out tomorrow on the bill H. R. 9739, that, notwithstanding it has not laid over for 1 day, it be in order to call the rule and bill up for consideration.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not, will the gentleman explain what the bill is that he anticipates calling up?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security and for other purposes.

The reason for this request is that Members on both sides will be absent attending the funeral services of our late colleagues, our late colleague from Illinois, and our late colleague from Minnesota. They can be here tomorrow; they cannot be here Thursday. The leadership thinks it is only fair that we bring the bill up when they have an opportunity to be present and if there is a rollcall to be recorded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I now announce that the bill will be brought up for consideration tomorrow.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow or Thursday, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 45 minutes, on Thursday next.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous remarks.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an article notwithstanding that the cost of printing is estimated to be $783.

Mr. SANTANGELO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HENDERSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOEVEN and to include a statement.

## THE LATE HONORABLE AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to advise the House that our beloved colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, passed from our midst this morning. He had been recuperating from an illness at the Naval Medical Center in Bethesda and we had only recently been heartened by word that he was on his way to recovery and might soon return to his heavy labors here in the Congress of the United States.

He was born in Newark, Kendall County, Ill., on October 11, 1890, the son of Ole and Anna (Lunke) Andresen. His father was a Lutheran minister. At the age of 10, he and his family moved to Grand Forks, N. Dak., and 2 years later to Eagle Grove, Iowa. He later settled in Minnesota, where he entered the Red Wing Seminary in Red Wing and then St. Olaf College in Northfield, receiving bachelor of arts degrees from both insitutions in 1912. He was admitted to the bar in 1914, and on receiving his bachelor of laws degree from St. Paul College of Law in 1915, he established his law practice in Red Wing, which has been his home for the last 42 years.

In this 16th term of service to his district, State, and Nation, it can safely be said that no man more faithfully performed the duties of his office. Looking around this Chamber I see only a few great men who were here prior to AUGUST when he first took his oath of office on January 3, 1925. Our distinguished Speaker was here along with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. His classmates of the 69th Congress who grace this body today are even fewer in numbers though equal in stature. They include our distinguished minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

If any proof be needed as to the true greatness of our departed colleague it lies in the 16 times his constituents laid upon his shoulders the burdens of service in the House of Representatives. It may further be found upon the pages of our history in the last 32 years and certainly in the hearts of us all.

Any man or woman who serves here any length of time gains recognition for leadership in some particular field of legislation. AUGUST ANDRESEN was known from his first days in Congress as a stalwart and unfailing friend of farm people. Minnesota has lost one of her most illustrious sons, but more tragically the Nation's farmers have lost one of their greatest friends in their time of most urgent need.

A leader in agriculture, he left his mark upon every piece of farm legislation enacted during his years of service. Preeminent in the field of dairy legislation, his leadership was not only recognized but it was followed on the dairy measures which came before us. One of the finest tributes to his character came when he led the last great fight here on this floor in behalf of the dairy industry and when it was over he still could number among his friends every man who had opposed his stand.

In committee and on and off the floor he could clasp in friendship the hand of every man or woman with whom he had served. He never shirked a duty regardless of personal feelings or sacrifice. He never compromised a principle, and he fought to the last breath for the things he believed were fair and just. Even in his hours of sadness and failing health, his seat on the great Committee on Agriculture was seldom empty.

He suffered a great personal loss last spring when his life partner, Julia, was taken from him. That tragic occurrence marked the end of his zest for life and all that remained for him was his service here with us. It is a remarkable tribute that his devotion to duty never lessened and his last months among us could be numbered among his days of greatest effort in behalf of the farm people he loved so deeply and served so faithfully.

His loss is mourned by many, and especially by his brother, Carl M. Andresen, of San Francisco, and two nephews, John L. Andresen, of Long Island, N. Y., and Carl M. Andresen, Jr., of Seattle. We extend our condolences and deepest sympathy to them in the loss of their brother and uncle. We also express our sorrow to our colleague's faithful office staff who knew probably better than any of us the greatness of his character, the nobility of his spirit, and his limitless devotion to duty.

Our friend and colleague will walk among us no more. Even though other hands will take up his labors and carry his work forward, there will long be felt the void of his absence. May his spirit of dedication to the cause of justice, equity, and equality guide us in our efforts to serve our fellow men.

If any man deserved to have said of him at the close of his days, "Well done thou good and faithful servant," that man was AUGUST HERMAN ANDRESEN, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with a very deep and sincere feeling of sadness that I join in the ceremonies today honoring my very good friend, AUGUST HERMAN ANDRESEN. In the old Minnesota Third District, before the last Reapportionment Act, Mr. ANDRESEN represented a part of the counties of my present district and the county in which I lived. I became acquainted with him then, and over these many years our friendship has ripened. I represent the Congressional district which adjoins Mr. ANDRESEN's First Congressional District, and my office adjoins his office here in the New House Office Building. I have had no closer, more personal friend than AUGUST ANDRESEN. I know of no one who has served his country with deeper devotion than Mr. ANDRESEN. I know of no Member of the Congress who was more devoted and who gave more days and hours of his time to his district and to the people of his district. My colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], has spoken about his devotion to agriculture. Personally I consider AUGUST ANDRESEN one of the ablest experts upon the agricultural and dairy problems of our country. He had been a leader and a persuasive leader on the floor of the House in the forming of all legislation pertaining to agriculture since he became a Member of the Congress. I know he was a devoted and faithful member of the Committee on Agriculture during his entire time in Congress. As we have learned so often in the past, the important work done in Congress is done in the legislative committees.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a loss to his district, it is indeed a loss to the great State of Minnesota, and it is a great loss to those of us here who knew AUGUST and loved him. It was sad to learn this morning that he had passed away during the night.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to you that of all the people I have known here, I knew no finer Christian gentleman than AUGUST ANDRESEN. When the heat of the debate was over, AUGUST still felt the same kindly Christian feelings toward those who disagreed with him as he felt toward his warm friends who agreed with him.

It is a great personal loss to me. I am acquainted with the staff who were so devoted to him, as he was to his staff. I know how they worked unceasingly for his district, for the State of Minnesota, and for this great country which AUGUST ANDRESEN loved so much.

I know how devoted Mr. and Mrs. Andresen were to one another. I know the great sadness that came to AUGUST when his wife, Julia, passed away last spring. I am sure that they are united in the heaven we all seek to enter.

I extend my deep personal sympathy to Mr. ANDRESEN's brother, Carl M. Andresen, of San Francisco, and his two nephews, John Andresen and Carl Andresen.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to know well our beloved departed colleague, AUGUST ANDRESEN, until I came to the Congress in 1943, even though we were from the same State. Sometimes at political and other gatherings we shook hands and exchanged greetings, but I had not had the opportunity to get to know him well—as a person, as a legislator, or as a friend—until I came here. His going leaves a great emptiness in our hearts and in our House of Representatives that no one can fill.

Although shocked, I was not surprised at the sad news which came this morning. Mrs. Judd and I visited with AUGUST at the Bethesda Naval Hospital day before yesterday. It was clear that he was far from well. He had not gained as all of us hoped he would. But the good humor he exhibited, the twinkle in his eye, the little humorous twist that he so characteristically gave to comments in our conversation, made me know that whatever was ahead, AUGUST ANDRESEN was prepared to meet it with the calm, quiet strength with which he met everything that came in his long life of exceeding useful service to God, to country, and to his fellow men.

Doubtless the Nation and most in our State of Minnesota think of him first as the outstanding legislator that he was. He was diligent in his efforts, almost to a fault. No man on Capitol Hill worked harder or more tirelessly. Furthermore, in his legislative work, he learned early to shoot with a rifle instead of a shotgun. He did not spray his ammunition all over the landscape as do some, thereby reducing their influence and effectiveness in this body. He properly picked out agriculture, which is the basic industry of our State and particularly of his district, and especially the dairy industry, and concentrated on that. There was nothing in the whole field of agriculture that AUGUST ANDRESEN did not know and understand, and which he could not cogently explain and persuasively urge. How often we turned to him for information and advice and help—and so did people in the other districts of Minnesota. In his own First District, it seemed to me that he knew almost everybody by name and they all knew him and respected and loved him as their devoted Representative here in Washington.

I must add, frankly, that I think one of the several things that contributed to the partial loss of zest for life that he seemed to have in recent months was his profound unhappiness about the agricultural situation in the United States. He had given his life to it. He knew that the farmers were in trouble and that no one had a satisfactory answer to the problem. There are plenty of suggested solutions, but, yet, he knew that there are defects or inadequacies in each proposal that has yet been made to get our agriculture on a reasonably equitable par with the rest of our Nation's economy. He was disappointed and discouraged.

But most of us in Minnesota, and I think in this House, will perhaps not think of AUGUST ANDRESEN first as the outstanding, constructive, and crusading legislator that he was. We will think of him even more as the fine Christian man and gentleman that he was. He was intelligent, industrious, devoted, forthright, and courageous; but always gentle and kindly. I never knew AUGUST ANDRESEN to say a sharp word to any man, or ever heard him say an unkind or derogatory word about an individual behind his back. He did his best in presenting his views and then accepted what happened without rancor. His minister father would have been justly proud of the son.

We in the Minnesota delegation who have known him the most closely will probably think of him first as a personal friend. To me he was more like a father—well, he was not old enough to be my father, but when I came down here he took me under his wing as if he were my father. No one could have been more concerned, more thoughtful, and more helpful than AUGUST ANDRESEN has always been to me personally.

It leaves an aching void in one's heart to think that he will not be here with us again. As my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has said, when Julia Andresen, his lovely and devoted wife and partner of all the years was taken from him last year, something went out of him. He continued his work as always, but the fire in him seemed to have burned low. He lost 2 brothers, his wife, and 2 of her sisters in 1 year. No one and no interest could take their place. He worked in his office and went back to the lonely hotel suite. There was nothing else for him to do, really, except to work for his people, his State, and for our Nation until his broken heart gave out, as it did this morning.

Mr. Speaker, not soon will we who are here today be again privileged to know a man more wholeheartedly and singlemindedly and unselfishly devoted to our country and to the public welfare than AUGUST ANDRESEN. My deepest sympathy goes to his bereaved family.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON].

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved and shocked to hear about the death of my good friend and colleague, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Not only did we come from the same State but we were members of the same committee. That of course is where I learned to know AUGUST ANDRESEN. He was a very strong individualist, but I enjoyed talking to him because I appreciated his courtesies to me, a new member of the committee. He especially endeared himself to me on several occasions when I went out to visit his district to speak. He always said, "Well, COYA, don't be too hard on me." I always brought his greetings and good wishes to the district, and I know his people loved to hear from him.

My sympathies go to his whole family and those who loved him. I know we are going to miss him in our committee and in the House.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, even when it is indicated that quite likely is the loss possible of one whom we have come to know well and whom we have come to regard with respect and with affection, yet, when that sad event does take place, there is an unexpected grief, sadness and a void which words are inadequate to express.

In the 11 years I have been in the House it has been my good fortune to become personally acquainted with this great veteran, this distinguished senior Member of Minnesota's Congressional delegation, the late respected and beloved AUGUST ANDRESEN.

However, I knew him long before I came to the House. I came to know him more than a quarter of a century ago when I entered as a freshman in the oldest teachers college west of the Mississippi River, Winona, Minn., which was in the southeast corner of the State, in the First District, the Congressional district which our late beloved colleague has represented with such great distinction and effectiveness for almost a third of a century.

I recall then when the great problems confronting America were economic, and of all the economic sectors no group suffered as severely and intensely as the farmer. I recall as a young student the vigor and the earnestness with which the voice of the young, energetic, dedicated Congressman spoke in behalf of the farm people. He became an able and sincere legislator and always a gentleman, who devoted most of his life to public service. His ranking position on the House Committee on Agriculture, regardless of party affiliation, gave Minnesota's farmers a strong voice in that important committee and in shaping national farm policies and programs. As that voice grew, it became obvious that AUGUST H. ANDRESEN had not merely served his district and his State, but that being a Congressman was his life. It was a life shared in with devotion and loyalty by that wonderful person who was his wife whom he tragically lost last summer. It can be said of few men that he gave his all for that in which he believed. He served with great effectiveness for a long period of time.

The State of Minnesota this past week began its centennial celebration marking 100 years of statehood. An outstanding paragraph in one of the chapters of that book of 100 years of the history of Minnesota will be the great service covering one-third of a century that AUGUST H. ANDRESEN rendered his district, State, and country. If I may relate a little personal sidelight, a little more than a quarter of a century ago, just about the time when I first had occasion as a college student in his district to meet this young Congressman, he took interest in a young high school student from Red Wing, a young student whom I knew at that time. In addition to being a good student, this young man was also most active in many other school activities. This young student's name from Red Wing was Lauris Norstad. In view of his exceptional scholastic record, his ability, his personality, and his character, Lauris Norstad was one of the early appointments to West Point by AUGUST ANDRESEN. We all know Lauris Norstad now as general, the Commanding General of NATO with headquarters in Paris.

So it is in deep and sincere sadness that I express the deepest sympathy to all the relatives of the Andresen family both of AUGUST and Mrs. Andresen, and join our colleagues in expressing as much as it is possible through the inadequacy of words our most heartfelt appreciation and gratitude for a great public servant.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved at the passing of our dear friend, AUGUST ANDRESEN. I was shocked when I heard this morning of his death. I knew that he was not feeling well, but I had no idea that his condition was serious. AUGUST ANDRESEN was one of the most valuable Members of the Congress. He was serious and able. He was a student. He was a man of strong convictions honestly entertained. He made his marked contribution to the strength of our Nation during his years of service in this body. Every Member on both sides of the aisle who knew AUGUST admired and respected him. He was a man who grew upon you. The more you saw him, the more you liked him. As the result of our years of association in this body, there developed in me a profound feeling of respect for AUGUST ANDRESEN, and a strong feeling of friendship. To the members of the Minnesota delegation, to the people of his State and of his district, to the loved ones that he has left behind, I extend my profound sympathy. Our Nation has truly lost a great public servant in the passing of AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the loss of an old friend, a dear friend, always comes to us as a great shock. So it was this morning when I was called on the telephone and told that AUGUST ANDRESEN had passed away. I knew he had been in ill health for many months, but I had been led to believe recently that he was recovering and would once more take his place with us; so I was shocked to hear of his death.

AUGUST ANDRESEN and I became friends back in 1925. We both entered Congress in that year. I learned to know of his great devotion to the public welfare; I knew of his great fighting interest in agriculture; and I knew, next to agriculture, how dear to his heart were the small-business enterprises which dotted his district. To us AUGUST H. ANDRESEN through the years became an authority on the subject of agriculture, and to him we went for vital information concerning aid to this great industry.

He served on the first committee to study small business after the national lawmakers gave this segment of our economy its proper status back in 1939, when I appointed him as a Republican member of the study committee.

In all his various activities he showed that keenness of mind and that great thoughtfulness which is necessary to solve these tremendous problems. Today in this tense period of our national life we shall miss his good judgment and his easy, quiet way that endeared him to us all. So I speak today as one who has lost a great personal friend, a friendship that has extended for 34 years. I know that my loss is also the loss of his district, his State, and even of the National Government.

While he was devoted to these problems of agriculture and small industry he was also devoted to the little details that make a man beloved at home. Thousands of people in his district called him "Blessed," because of some little aid or comfort he gave to make their lives a little happier.

So I join with the Minnesota delegation in expressing my deepest regret on the passing of this great legislator, this great American.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we will all miss our colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, dean of our delegation. This year would have completed 32 years of faithful service to the First District of Minnesota in the House of Representatives. Few Members are privileged to serve so long.

AUGUST was a faithful representative who served his district tirelessly by keeping in close association with his many friends. He kept their interests always foremost in his mind.

He was in every way a fine Christian gentleman, reflecting throughout his career the early training he received as the son of a minister.

The past year was a sad and trying one for him. The loss of his talented and beloved wife was a deep personal tragedy which left a void in his life. He tried to carry this great burden of grief alone. Those of us who knew him could only sympathize in his sorrow. Throughout their life in Washington, Mrs. Andresen often sat in the gallery watching the deliberations in the House. The end of this close relationship was an almost unendurable loss for AUGUST.

My own acquaintance with him began at a meeting in Red Wing, Minn., his hometown, before my election to Congress. The warmth and respect shown by the audience was a personal tribute to him. He had just returned from a trip to Europe and spoke briefly of his experiences. The people present were proud of their longtime friend and fellow

townsman. It was evident that AUGUST enjoyed being among them and that the respect between them was mutual.

It was a privilege to know him, and I have pleasant memories of some of our talks. As dean of the delegation, he was always fair and courteous to me and often gave me valuable advice on work in which we shared an interest.

AUGUST ANDRESEN first came to Minnesota in 1905, at the age of 15, and always regarded Red Wing as his hometown. He graduated from Red Wing Seminary, St. Olaf College, and the St. Paul College of Law. In addition to his law practice, he engaged in financial and business enterprises. His interest in agricultural pursuits was evident in his long service on the House Committee on Agriculture. His own activities reflect the interests of the people of his district, and for this reason he was able to speak for them in this Chamber.

His position as ranking minority member of the Agriculture Committee was a source of pride for him and his friends. Just as he was a conscientious Member of the House, he devoted his time to the problems before his committee.

We have been enriched by our association with him and will cherish his memory.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what more I could contribute here this afternoon that has not already been said about our late colleague; however, I do want to join my colleagues from Minnesota and other Members of the House in their expressions of grief at the loss of AUGUST ANDRESEN.

AUGUST ANDRESEN was a great American; he was a great Representative of the district that he so well represented, the southeastern part of the State of Minnesota, and its great resources.

AUGUST ANDRESEN represented thousands of farmers and thousands of so-called loyal small-business men; and loyal they were, because election after election the majorities that were rendered on behalf of continuing the services of AUGUST ANDRESEN told the story.

Many kind things and many wonderful tributes have been said here this afternoon. So I do wish to join and share in expressing my regret and my sympathy at the loss of this great American, this defender of the right of the farmer to share in the economy and prosperity of our Nation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in their expressions of grief at the news of the death of our colleague, Congressman AUGUST ANDRESEN. From the remarks that have been made here today, it was on receiving word of his death that the Members of the House came to realize what a valuable and beloved Member of this body AUGUST ANDRESEN actually was.

He was a man whose power of personality, affection, and dedication were outstanding in this Congress. Those who served with him on the Committee on Agriculture know more thoroughly perhaps than other Members of this body the full measure of his dedication and the full measure of his service to that committee.

Perhaps the finest story that could be told about AUGUST H. ANDRESEN would be that of the wonderful relationship, love and affection between him and his wife, whom he lost last year. I remember his telling me at the close of the session last year that he really could not look forward to adjournment with any kind of joy because he faced the prospect of going back to his district alone, a thing which he had not done in some 30 years. He said that he and his wife had always anticipated the return to his district. He went on to say that he doubted whether he would go so far as to open the house when he returned to Red Wing. As one of my colleagues has said earlier here today, the difficult thing was that he was so alone in his grief. He did not speak about it. He had no one in his immediate family nor anyone else whom he really could ask to help him share that burden. So, it is wholly fitting that the Members of Congress, those of us from Minnesota, those who served with him on the Committee on Agriculture, and all of the Members who have served with him during these many years should pay tribute to him today. This Congress will sorely miss the presence of this fine Christian gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, it is with great difficulty that I pay tribute today to one of my warm personal friends. AUGUST ANDRESEN died a brokenhearted man. Our friendship had been very close with both AUGUST and Julia, his wife. We spent time together in Florida. We were closely associated here. I think he was one of the noblest and finest men that I have ever known, and his wife was one of the sweetest women I have ever known. It is very difficult for me to say anything that has not been said here in regard to his fine character and ability. If I were to say anything, I would say this, and I would quote that bad be the day for any man when he becomes absolutely contented with the life he is living, with the thoughts he is thinking, with the deeds he is doing, when there is not forever beating at the doors of his soul some great desire to do something larger for which he was made and meant to do. AUGUST ANDRESEN had that beating at the doors of his soul to do something larger that he knew he was meant and made to do. In the field of agriculture, in his contact with the people back home and their problems, he enriched the life of his district, he enriched the life of this Congress, he enriched the life of this Nation. Mrs. Reed and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to all of his relatives and friends and to the delegation from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I could hardly keep from shedding a tear this morning when I heard of the passing of AUGUST ANDRESEN. I have listened to these eulogies that have been given here this afternoon, but somehow I feel that I was nearer to AUGUST ANDRESEN than anybody in the world, almost. He and his wife lived at the same hotel with me and my wife, and every day we would see each other. That has been true for many years now. He came to this Congress the same year I did, and we lived intimately and close together nearly all of that time. After his wife passed away and every morning after he had been sick, I would stop down at the desk to find out how he was. Sometimes the bellboys would know; sometimes the elevator boys; and sometimes the girls who presided at the office desk would also know the last word. You know, Members of the House, it is a serious thing when you think a man is dying because of the love of his wife who had passed away. That is exactly what took AUGUST out. I will remember him for two things. I will remember him for that and I will remember him for this fact, that on many occasions in my voting here on the floor of the House I voted the way AUGUST ANDRESEN voted because he was very well posted on all matters connected with agriculture. I wrote many a letter saying that I followed AUGUST ANDRESEN. Why did I do that? Because I knew that he knew his work. He was thoroughly informed and absolutely honest and sincere about it.

So, now, at this time I am going to say "Goodby, AUGUST."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, AUGUST ANDRESEN was a courageous man, an industrious man and one who mastered the work that he had to do. His range was much greater than that of many men. He took part in and helped to form a great deal of the important legislation that we have considered here in this House. He never hesitated to take a stand even though it might be unpopular at home. He never hesitated to cast his vote for the thing that was right. I like to remember him that way.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if anyone had any doubt about the respect in which our late colleague, AUGUST ANDRESEN, was held, it would be dispelled by the absolute quiet and attention of the Members of this great body today. I grieve with the family of Mr. ANDRESEN in the loss of their splendid relative.

I always think of both the Andresens as one. I never saw a more devoted couple. They were a shining example of all that is admirable, to all husbands and wives. I loved his gracious, beautiful wife. I loved their devotion to each other. I treasured their friendship.

Mr. Speaker, he was an example, as much as any I know, of a man overcoming physical illness, physical unhappiness, living through will power and spirit and doing his great work for agriculture, his great work for small business, his great work for all that is fine in his State and in his Nation. He was one of Minnesota's greatest citizens and Minnesota has contributed many fine, patriotic men to the United States. Somehow I like to feel that it is not "goodby" but that he has just crossed a bridge; and we always will have the comfort of his inspiring work, his friendliness, his courage, and his great love for his country. Today America needs that as we have never needed it before.

May God rest his soul and may he find peace and contentment in the other world.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, my late colleague, Mr. ANDRESEN, served for 30 years upon the great Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. I now yield to the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a great and a good man has this day fallen. Our Congress and country has sustained a great loss.

When I became a Member of this House 23 years ago and was assigned to the Committee on Agriculture, AUGUST ANDRESEN was then a high-ranking and distinguished member of that great committee. Now that he has passed away, not a single member of the committee, as it is now constituted, was there when I became a member. One by one they have gone; either back to their homes or to their great reward. I have served with many members, but I have not served with any member who was a more devoted and dedicated public servant than our friend who has just passed away. AUGUST ANDRESEN was a man of conviction, of courage and character. He was thoroughly conscientious and sincere. While he and I did not always agree, as most of you know, never have I on any occasion had any reason to question the sincerity of his purpose. He was an upright gentleman and a forthright statesman, and the farmers of our Nation never had a greater champion. His life was a blessing and a benediction; not only to the people of his district and State, but to all of the people of this great Republic. I shall always cherish the memory of his fine friendship and we will miss him in the days ahead.

I was shocked this morning to learn that the noble spirit of our dear friend had passed from the shores of sound to the great realm of silence. I had made frequent inquiries concerning his welfare and I had been told that he would be back in his office at the end of this week. I am distressed to know that he will not be with us again. I want to express my very deep, sincere, and heartfelt sympathy to all of his loved ones.

All of those who were near and dear to him can be comforted by the glad thought that he distinguished himself in the service of his country and made a record of which they may be justly proud.

As one by one our friends depart, I recall these words from a little poem, Farewell, by Thomas Moore:

Let Fate do her worst—there are relics of joy,
Bright dreams of the past, which she cannot destroy,
Which come, in the nighttime of sorrow and care,
And bring back the features that joy used to wear.
Long, long be my heart with such memories filled.
Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled,
You may break, you may shatter the vase, if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang round it still.

As the years come and go, our hearts shall be filled with memories of AUGUST ANDRESEN.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman who will succeed Mr. ANDRESEN as the ranking minority member on the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply grieved to learn this morning of the death of our colleague, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, who was a member of the Committee on Agriculture, on which I serve.

Congressman ANDRESEN served many years in this House, beginning his service on December 1, 1924. He was the ranking member of the Republican Party on the Committee on Agriculture. He was loved and respected by all members of our committee, regardless of their political affiliation. It was my privilege to serve for 15 years with Congressman ANDRESEN on the Committee on Agriculture. He at all times kept in mind the great difficulties facing our agricultural people. Outside of his family and personal friends, the farmer was his first love. The farmers' problems were his problems. He was their champion.

In 1947 I had the honor to serve on a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture visiting Europe to check into the operations of the Marshall plan. Mr. ANDRESEN was subcommittee chairman. He was an excellent observer, and by his keen understanding was able to comprehend where our surplus foods were really accomplishing their purpose and where they were being used for political benefits.

Congressman ANDRESEN was a great American and his work on agriculture will be a solid monument to his memory.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it was 17 years ago that I became a member of the Committee on Agriculture. At that time AUGUST H. ANDRESEN had served approximately as long on that committee as I have served since then. He served for well over 30 years and he served agriculture devotedly.

There were many occasions when he and I saw things from entirely different viewpoints, but there was never an occasion when he was not working and seeking, to the best of his judgment, to improve the lot of the people he loved and represented. You cannot question the sincerity of a man who worked as industriously and devotedly as AUGUST ANDRESEN did for what he believed to be the best interest of the farm people of America.

He was one of the hardest workers that I have ever known. He was at his office early; he was at his office late. He was one who was always familiar with the matters coming before our committee. I always found him a source of information when he was on my side, and I always felt discouraged when I found him on the other side of any issue which might be before us. But whether he was on my side or on the other side, he would make the same good fight. He was a persistent man. He did not give up. He made a good fight for the people he represented.

He represented them well. He represented them honestly. He represented them to the end. He was a man of conviction. When he was with you, you knew he was going on with you, a loyal friend and a loyal advocate. Would that we had more of those qualities in this House and in this Nation because we need them.

We need that determination which so strongly characterized all of AUGUST ANDRESEN'S works. The gentleman from Colorado referred to his deep interest in agriculture up until the very end. Just yesterday I talked with him at the hospital and he asked me if we were going to have a record made of the hearings which were scheduled for this morning. He said he wanted to read the testimony; that while he expected to be back in the next few days, he wanted to read the record of what went on in his absence. He was reading the RECORD of the Congress, but he wanted to read the record of the committee. To the very end, he was interested in and was working for his constituents. I know of no greater tribute to one whose life has been devoted to the representation of people than to say that he never forgot the people he represented.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the untimely passing of my very good friend and colleague, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He was an honest man. He was a sincere man. In short, he was a Christian gentleman.

AUGUST ANDRESEN was the dean of the Committee on Agriculture, having served longer than any other member of the committee as now constituted. It was my privilege to be associated with him on that committee for a period of over 14 years. Personally, I shall never forget the many kind things he did for me throughout my service with Congress.

In the passing of AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, American agriculture has lost one of its most devoted advocates and friends. The dairy industry has lost one of its greatest champions.

AUGUST ANDRESEN was a lonely man after the death of his loving and devoted wife. After her passing he seemed to lose interest in life. On one occasion

before Congress adjourned last year he said to me: "I do not expect to be with you much longer. BILL HILL and you will have to carry on."

In the death of AUGUST ANDRESEN, I have lost a dear and devoted friend. His passing will be mourned by agricultural America. His passing is a great loss to his district, State, and Nation.

May he find peace, rest, and contentment—that for every soul—in that house not built with hands, eternal in the heavens.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the news of the passing of our committee's ranking minority member, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, was most saddening to me in view of the announcement that he was expected to return to his office this week. We members of the Committee on Agriculture had hoped that he could be in attendance at its first scheduled meeting of the session which was set originally for today.

It is a real shock to learn of the loss of one with whom you have worked through many tiring, gruelling sessions over a period of years.

I recall one trip especially which I made with him—a visit to several Western European countries in 1947. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Food and Agriculture of the Herter Foreign Aid Committee. He skillfully and tactfully discharged this assignment, this mammoth task, in a manner that brought real credit to the Congress and the Nation. On many occasions our group held hearings and attended the usual social functions. In each such instance it was the assignment of our subcommittee chairman to speak for the group—to make opening remarks or reply to addresses of welcome. This he did with fervor and devotion. He was a patriot—a true leader and inspiring associate.

AUGUST ANDRESEN had been carrying a heavy load for many months. His own health and that of his wife, who was ill for an extended time and who passed away in the spring of 1957, disturbed him no little. He continued to capably lead the fight for farm legislation in behalf of America's dairy farmers. The benefits which were attained by dairy interests over the past 20 years or more were due largely to his tireless efforts.

It was my privilege to sit on some conferences with AUGUST; one of which I recall in which so great a responsibility fell on him as titular head and spokesman for the Nation's dairy interests. It was in 1956 when a far-reaching omnibus agriculture bill was being revamped by the joint group. He spoke little until the section was reached affecting the dairy producers. I would like to quote from a newsletter to my constitutents dated March 30, 1956, regarding the effective work done by this great farm leader. In referring to seniority, the letter stated:

> What difference does it make? Perhaps this one point will illustrate what it can mean to the people who elect a man to Congress. We have been in continuous session, except for eating and sleeping, since Monday afternoon; and AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, had sat quietly listening and voting on the various issues until Thursday night at 9:30. Then ANDRESEN spoke out, and his voice persuaded the conferees to include a provision which will bring an extra $12 million to the pockets of the dairy farmers of America. It can readily be seen why his people sent him to Congress for 30 years.

Millions of people were benefited by his accomplishments as a Member of the Congress for 31 years. A real debt of gratitude is due him by American agriculture in general for his efforts which meant so much to farmers throughout this land.

I shall miss him greatly. I have lost a true friend.

The people of the First Congressional District of Minnesota have lost a champion and a fighter who had served agriculture longer than any Member of either House of Congress and one who will be hard to replace.

The Nation has lost one of its top legislators and statesmen.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN was not only my loyal friend; he was my neighbor, too, with only a State line separating our districts. I was born in his district on the old homestead that is still held in the name of my family. During his long and vigorous career several members of my family were his constituents. I knew him intimately throughout his political life. One of his brothers, now deceased, was a valued constituent of mine.

Congressman ANDRESEN came from sturdy Norwegian stock. He was tall, slender, and strong. His stride was that of a man whose conscience is clear and whose courage is unfailing. He was reared in a good home in which prayer and devotion were a daily ritual. Knowing him as I did, I proclaim him a Christian gentleman.

It is small wonder that he was the choice of the people in southeastern Minnesota over so long a period of years. They respected his sterling character, they valued his faithful service, and they trusted him implicitly.

It is sad to contemplate that deep sorrow came to him last year when his devoted wife departed this life. It seemed to those of us who saw him thereafter from day to day that grief had taken so firm a hold that he did indeed walk as one who treads alone some banquet hall deserted.

But, Mr. Speaker, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN left to all who knew him a beautiful memory. That is a priceless legacy. Of him it may truly be said: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mrs. Talle joins with me in expressing deep-felt sympathy to all the bereaved.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, when I was en route to the office this morning listening to the news coming over my automobile radio, word came of the passing of this great man who has been eulogized so beautifully and so appropriately here today. It was quite a shock when I heard that AUGUST had answered the last call. Only last Saturday, I believe it was, I spoke with his administrative assistant in the hall near my office. He told me that AUGUST was doing fine and was expected back in the House sometime this week. This was good news and I was happily looking forward to his return.

We on the Committee on Agriculture who have served with AUGUST for quite a long time are going to miss his presence. We are going to miss his wise counsel, his sharp questioning of witnesses, his logic and reasoning. We are going to miss the benefit of the vast knowledge which he as a Member of this body for some thirty-odd years gained as a result of hard work and devotion to duty.

Of course, none of us had any doubt as to the standing of AUGUST in his district, a great district incidentally, inhabited by the finest of people. His reelection year after year by large majorities evidenced the high regard in which he was held by his constituents. But if there should be any who had such doubt he need only to visit among the fine people of that area.

It has been my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to visit in AUGUST'S district on three occasions. On one of those occasions it was my privilege to address in my feeble way the Minnesota State Farm Bureau convention. In that address I made reference to several of the Minnesota Members, and particularly Mr. ANDRESEN as the dean of the Minnesota delegation. The chamber, which was overflowing with people, was rocked and shaken with terrific applause. The demonstration evidenced the great love and affection they had for AUGUST ANDRESEN, their faithful servant. He was, indeed, their man.

AUGUST ANDRESEN was possessed of a great intellect. He was a man of extraordinary quality and extraordinary ability. He was dedicated to the principles of sound constitutional government which is now so often treated too lightly. He was a man of honesty, of good character and integrity.

AUGUST was also a man of opinion, firm opinion. He was not known to waver or quibble. He sought what was right and once having found it he was not to be swerved. He was a man of very retentive mind. I expect he carried as much information in his mind about the problems of the millions of people who work on our farms as any man who ever passed through this body. He was their friend and left behind a record which will for years redound to their good. The great Committee on Agriculture and the farmers of the Nation can ill afford to lose his talent and ability. He was the workhorse, the leader, the expert of the American dairy farmer. They are going to miss him. So are we; and so will the country.

I do not want to let the opportunity pass without making reference to his beautiful, charming and intelligent wife. It was often that when AUGUST came to his office Mrs. Andresen would accompany him. Many times I have seen

him leave late in the day with that beautiful woman on his arm. They were an inseparable devoted couple. Shortly after she had passed away I was walking up the hall one afternoon as AUGUST was leaving his office alone. I gripped his hand and extended sympathy. He said, "TOM, no one will ever know how sad I am, and were it not for the friends I have here in this body, I do not believe I could stand the grief that is mine as of this hour." She was a devoted wife and he was a devoted husband. From that day on AUGUST was heavy laden. His grief was deep. The thought of his lovely wife was ever with him. It undoubtedly contributed to his passing.

Now, as the grim reaper has called him home it is with some comfort to all of us that AUGUST and his wonderful mate are one again. They have been remated in an everlasting life where there is no soreness, no pain, no grief.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join my colleagues in paying a last tribute to our departed friend and colleague, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. All of us will miss him. We will miss his friendliness, we will miss his counsel, and we and the farmers of the Nation particularly will miss his wisdom.

As I have sat here this afternoon I have been impressed with the quietness of the Chamber. To me that means an unspoken tribute to one that we were pleased to call a friend. It impresses me. I have been impressed also with the many expressions of deep love and affection that existed between AUGUST and his darling wife, Julia. They were a team, a devoted team, and, with my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], I have the same feeling, especially those of us who have seen the loss as was expressed on AUGUST'S face following Julia's death, that with two who were so much together in life we can find some solace now that they are at least together again as they were so joyfully with us.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my colleagues in paying tribute to a devoted friend. I first came to know AUGUST ANDRESEN in 1939 when I came to Capitol Hill as secretary to a Congressman. But it was not until 1951—although I had been honored and privileged to come here after the election of 1946 and consistently since as Connecticut's Congressman at large—it was not until 1951 when AUGUST ANDRESEN and his lovely wife, and Mrs. Sadlak and I were privileged to attend the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Istanbul, Turkey, that I got to know him intimately. It was during this assignment that he manifested to me his great knowledge of and interest in agriculture. He was interested in agriculture not only here at home, but when the subcommittee work and the work of the conference itself allowed in Turkey, AUGUST ANDRESEN and I went out to view the agriculture of that area. He was particularly interested to know how the help had been utilized that had been sent over there.

For this reason, likewise, he and I, with our wives, stopped in Greece, to look at their agriculture. He wanted to know more about it so that he would be better informed when he had to deal with legislation on agriculture on his return.

I recall very vividly, too—and this was brought to mind by what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has said—each of us take pride and satisfaction in the progress of our Academy appointments and when we returned to Paris and had occasion to visit General Eisenhower at NATO, on a Saturday morning, AUGUST ANDRESEN rightfully boasted that his first appointee to the Military Academy was Lauris Norstad; and I know that it was a source of increased pride and joy when further recognition of the ability and achievements of this outstanding soldier followed in later years.

We used to joke pretty much and I think for the record it should be stated that the one interruption in his long service to his constituency and Minnesota and the Nation was the time when AUGUST ANDRESEN ran as a candidate at large. And he used to say to me, "SADLAK, you can have that job of Congressman at Large. It was the one time that I ran, when I was a candidate at large, that I was beaten." But he said that jokingly, because we had a great respect for each other.

When Mrs. Andresen passed away I recall the tremendous effect it had on AUGUST ANDRESEN. As has been mentioned here, there was that lovely example of a man and wife who were one, completely devoted, completely dedicated. I remember the great effect her passing had upon him who remained. Now as has been said they are one again, to carry on their great devotion and dedication to each other in the hereafter where there is no ending.

I join in extending my condolences to the family of AUGUST ANDRESEN.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to speak about the great man who has crossed bar last night. I went out to see AUGIE the other day at Bethesda Naval Hospital and AUGIE said, "BEN, I knew you would come out to see me. I am glad you came." I said, "AUGIE, of course I would come to see you." He said, "BEN, this has been quite a siege, but I am getting along fine and I am going to get out of here one of these first days and be back on the job."

We talked about a great many things and after about 10 minutes I said, "AUGIE, I am not going to wear you out. I'm going now." "No, no, don't rush away; I want to talk to you. There are a lot of things I want to talk to you about." And so I stayed with him about 30 minutes.

It was a terrible shock to me when I learned of his passing this morning.

He said, "You know, it gets pretty lonesome out here, especially for me. I have been an awfully lonesome man since my dear Julia passed on. I hardly know what to do with myself. It is almost more than I can bear."

He said, "I have been wondering whether I should run for Congress again but, you know, BEN, I have no hobby whatsoever. My hobby is just work, work, work. I presume I would be completely lost if I did not come back to Congress.

"I have a lot of friends who have been very kind to me," he said. "The folks at home, my, how wonderful they have been to me. I know there are a lot of them that expect me to run again, so I have made up my mind to run again." I said, "AUGIE, I am sure you have made the right decision."

AUGIE ANDRESEN was a man devoted and dedicated to the welfare of his country. He had in his mind and his great heart only that burning desire to be right and to do good for his fellow man. In my opinion, in all his doings these nearly 20 years I have been with him as a colleague in the Congress of the United States I cannot think of a single time when I questioned his judgment on legislation which was under consideration. The Honorable AUGIE ANDRESEN was, in fact, my patron saint, so to speak.

I only wish I had the proper words that would clearly express my deep feeling about the loss of this great American, this great friend of yours and mine. I am sure he is happy now because he has joined his dear, beloved wife. I am sure God Almighty must have said to him, "You have run a good race. You have earned the comforts of a castle in heaven. Come home, AUGIE, and be with your beloved Julia."

God rest their souls.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the majority whip.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have served on the Committee on Agriculture with AUGUST ANDRESEN for a long time. Mr. ANDRESEN had served on that committee for many years before I came to the Congress. Most of the agricultural jurisprudence of this country was placed upon the statute books during his service in this House. His fingerprints are on every law. He was one of the really great members of that committee and of the House. In the field of dairy legislation, which was his specialty, in my judgment he had no peer in or out of the House of Representatives. AUGUST ANDRESEN was a kindly, sympathetic individual. He was my friend. I agree with those who have spoken before that, when a man dies, he will live again. I knew the devotion of AUGUST and Mrs. ANDRESEN for each other during their lifetime. I am sure they are together in eternity now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, like those who have spoken already, when I came to my office this morning I was deeply saddened upon hearing the news of the passing of AUGUST ANDRESEN. I realized at once that all of us had lost a friendly colleague and that this House, and in fact the

entire Congress, had lost a highly respected and dearly beloved Member. I also realized that the State of Minnesota and the entire Nation had lost an able and valuable legislator and statesman, and that also the State of Iowa had lost a fine friend and a valuable neighbor, and that the entire farming community of America had lost one of its stanchest friends and greatest benefactors. But, Mr. Speaker, I had a feeling deeper than all that; namely, that I had lost something more than words can express. I recall vividly more than 17 years ago in this Chamber when I first became acquainted with AUGUST ANDRESEN. I realized that I had found a new friend, a true friend, and I was not disappointed in that belief as a result of my first meeting on that day right near where I am standing now with AUGUST ANDRESEN. Any time I had a problem that I wanted advice on with regard to agriculture particularly, I could go to AUGUST ANDRESEN. He never failed me. He was kindly in his advice and sympathetic, but he would take the time to explain and then he would say, "Now, PAUL, in your State of Iowa, this will do so and so." He did not suggest to me how to vote, but he let me know what the result would be if the bill were enacted or if it were defeated.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, he came to me and asked that I go with him into his home State of Minnesota to attend some meetings dealing with agriculture. He extended the invitation in such a way that I felt he wanted me to go up there to help AUGUST ANDRESEN with his home people. I went. I was never so surprised in my life. No one could have gone into the State of Minnesota, his home State, and helped AUGUST ANDRESEN. The manner in which his people received him, the esteem in which they held him, and the love that they had for him were far beyond anything that anyone from outside the State of Minnesota could add to. Then I realized that, after all, AUGUST ANDRESEN extended me that invitation not to help him but to help me—I was the one who benefited from attending those meetings. I feel that I have been a better legislator as a result of that experience.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on making personal references in regard to AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and what he said to me the day his wife was laid away. When I went up to greet him and put my arm around his shoulder, he said: "I shall not be with you very long. I do not know whether it is worth carrying on or not."

I said: "AUGUST, I know how you feel, but you will carry on."

"Yes," he said, "I guess I will."

He did, and he is now, even though he has passed to the Great Beyond, still carrying on.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to insert their remarks relative to the life, character, and public service of AUGUST H. ANDRESEN in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH].

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues of the Minnesota delegation in expressing my shock at the passing of our late colleague, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and extend my deepest sympathy to them and to the members of his family.

It has been my privilege to sit at times with the Committee on Agriculture during public hearings that particularly pertained to agricultural problems in my district. Like all the members of that great committee, Mr. ANDRESEN was gracious to me at all times, and was effective in helping to resolve some of the problems which I presented to the committee.

I shall miss Mr. ANDRESEN very much.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness and a sense of irreparable loss that we have come to the contemplation of the untimely death of our friend and colleague, AUGUST ANDRESEN, and we mourn his passing as the removal from our midst of one who throughout his life was dedicated to undergirding and strengthening this that we call the American way of life.

The chosen field for AUGUST ANDRESEN's legislative activity was the realm of agriculture; and in that area he had no peer. As a junior member in the Committee on Agriculture, I constantly deferred to his experience and judgment, and I took constant delight in the vigor with which he pursued the conservative approach to this Nation's agricultural problems. The farmers of America, and especially the dairymen, have lost a stalwart champion, the Congress has lost a distinguished Member, and I have lost a stanch and trusted friend.

Those of us who were close to him sensed his inability to throw off the despondency which followed the loss of his beloved wife. It seemed that her going away took something from his heart; and if ever a person died of heartbreak, it was he. Now he has gone to join her in a sunnier land, and we are sure that this morning saw a glad reunion with the one that he loved and lost for only awhile. May the Guardian of that celestial place now have them in His tender care.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply sorry to learn of the passing of one who was always kind and friendly to me, the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I had the honor of serving with him on the Committee on Agriculture. I watched with admiration and respect his faithful work in behalf of his people. No one in the Congress was ever more devoted to his constituency and to his country. His good work will live in our memories in the years to come.

I join in extending sympathy to his survivors, and to his delegation in the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost another stalwart American in the death of AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

The Congress of the United States has lost an able Member and I have lost an admired and respected friend whom I shall miss greatly.

Although AUGIE ANDRESEN maintained an informed interest in all legislation to come before this body, those of us who knew him best will, I am certain, always associate his memory primarily with his efforts on behalf of agriculture.

It was as a veteran member of that great committee that he made his greatest impression on us and made his most substantial contributions to the country's welfare.

It occurs to me that AUGUST ANDRESEN was a representative, not only of the people of his district but of many farmers all over the land, in the full sense of that term.

Their problems and their welfare were his business and he never deviated from a determination to represent their interests here in the Halls of Congress.

I do not mean to imply by this that AUGUST ANDRESEN took any narrow positions. His outlook was as broad as the country itself, and he was firm in his conviction that the policies he advocated for agriculture would benefit our entire economy.

In these difficult times we can ill afford to lose a man of AUGUST ANDRESEN's long experience, personal integrity and dedication to the ideal of public service.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I join my many colleagues today in paying tribute to one of our much loved Members, AUGUST ANDRESEN. His passing comes as a great shock to all of us.

It has been my high privilege to serve with Mr. ANDRESEN for almost 6 years on the Committee on Agriculture and have always found him to be fair, sincerely honest and understanding.

Whether we agreed or disagreed with AUGUST ANDRESEN on the ideas he held, we admired him for his integrity and character with which he voiced his views. He always spoke from his heart, and his colleagues showed him great respect by giving their undivided attention.

While AUGUST ANDRESEN was a tireless fighter for agriculture and the dairy facet which his good State boasts, he never allowed his individual interest to prevent him from joining harmoniously in the welfare of overall agriculture.

We shall miss AUGUST ANDRESEN in the days to come on the Committee on Agriculture.

Agriculture has lost a great friend. Minnesota and the Nation are better for his having passed this way.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my very great privilege to know and be associated with AUGUST ANDRESEN. Having heard about him even before coming to the Congress as an outstanding Congressman, the evaluation was enhanced by the personal friendship that developed during our 11 years of association.

AUGIE, as those of us who knew him well called him, was truly imbued with the real spirit of public service. None who came with a problem were turned away nor were they given less than the best counsel. His real service was not confined to his district for he was a great fighter for agriculture and had a rich background of experience upon which to draw. Always fair, he did not permit

his specialty to warp his sense of what was best for the whole of our people.

When his good wife passed away less than a year ago he said that the loss was truly more than he could bear. A devoted husband and citizen of outstanding worth, he has rendered fine service to his country and set a noble example for his Congressional colleagues to follow.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of the Honorable AUGUST ANDRESEN brings to a close a career of public service equaled by few, and of which the State of Minnesota must be justly proud.

The privilege of having known him as colleague and friend is one I shall always cherish, for he has played a prominent part in some of my pleasantest and most lasting memories.

I recall our first meeting. I came to Washington to testify before the House Committee on Agriculture in 1943, representing agricultural interests of my home State of Maine. His kind but searching questions are still in mind. Then it became my privilege and honor to be elected to Congress, and since April 1952 to serve with AUGUST on the Committee on Agriculture. To work with him while he served as a ranking member of the committee offered me the opportunity to avail myself of his counsel and knowledge of matters relating to agriculture in particular and the Midwest in general.

His devotion to the best interests of the dairymen of America is a matter of history.

In his passing Minnesota has lost a great exponent of its attitude toward farm policy, and the country has lost an able, sincere and devoted public servant. A man firm in principle and conviction, his friendly hand was always extended to help another along the way.

His passing is a deep personal loss, and our deep sympathy goes out to members of his family. The memory of the man and his service to Minnesota and the country will long endure.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have lost a close friend of 18 years in the passing of AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. My district in New York is predominately a dairy farming district. After getting to know AUGUST ANDRESEN, I found that he probably knew as much about the dairy industry as anyone in the country. I used to go to him for advice and counsel on many farm bills. He always, being a man of honor and integrity, told me frankly the effects that any provisions would have on my district.

Over the years we have had so many pleasant times together that I feel a great sense of personal loss and I know that the State of Minnesota and the country at large has lost an extremely fine, competent and honorable legislator.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was indeed shocked and saddened this morning when I learned of his passing. I knew of his illness, but was hoping he would recover.

I considered AUGUST ANDRESEN one of the outstanding Members of this House. I met him before I came to Congress. I first saw him at a meeting in Chicago where farm problems were under discussion. I was immediately impressed with his knowledge of agriculture. My admiration for him has continued over the years. I think he was one of the best-informed men on agriculture in this country.

AUGUST ANDRESEN was a kindly man and was always of a friendly disposition. I called upon him many times for counsel and advice, and he was always willing to assist where possible.

The passing of AUGUST ANDRESEN is an irreparable loss, not alone to his district in Minnesota, but to the entire Nation. We need more men of the type of AUGUST ANDRESEN.

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues are experiencing grief today because of their long and intimate associations with our departed colleague, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. My own distress derives instead from a brief but rewarding friendship in which I benefited enormously from the understanding and kindness of this man of prestige and position.

A year ago when I first entered the Halls of Congress, I was assigned to the Agriculture Committee. I went at once to pay my respects to Mr. ANDRESEN, our ranking member. He welcomed me warmly and spoke of his great interest in the Agriculture Committee and its work. Thereafter we shared a strong common interest—the knowledge that we both represented outstanding dairy areas of the country. It was an unusual relationship we had, for he was the committee's ranking minority member, and I was its junior. Throughout the year, he showed a friendly concern for my progress.

We mourn today because the dairy farmer, even now in a time of crisis, has lost a vigorous champion. Congress has lost a Member with an unexcelled knowledge of the complex problems of agriculture. We have lost a friend.

To Mr. ANDRESEN's family, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, acting as the minority leader of the great House Committee on Agriculture, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN was very close to the hearts, not only of all of us Members on his side of the aisle but of all members of the committee. He possessed a tremendous grasp of America's agricultural problems and at the same time always remained sensitive to the feelings of the farmers themselves. He spoke their language. He was one with them and always for them.

He went about in a quiet, lovable way to achieve his ends and was a power in the Congress. Above all things, he was a great American, dedicated to her principles and her people. He was a leader we can ill afford to lose. I possess a great affection for this, my colleague.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The passing of AUGUST ANDRESEN is a distinct loss not only to our great neighboring State of Minnesota, but to our Nation as well.

I shall long remember the kind and friendly counsel and advice given me by AUGUST ANDRESEN as I entered this Congress as a new Member in 1953. He was never too busy to help me with the problems which confronted me as a new Member of Congress. My association with him on the House Agriculture Committee will long be remembered.

AUGUST ANDRESEN was kind; he was intelligent; and he was devoted to the development of the dairy industry as a vital force in the agriculture economy of our country.

I was indeed shocked to learn of his passing this morning. Only last week I had the privilege of spending 2 hours with AUGUST at the Bethesda Naval Hospital. He talked then of returning to the Hill this week to take part in the sessions of the 85th Congress. In our visit last week we reminisced about my helping in one of his campaigns while I was a student at Carleton College, which was located in his Congressional District.

AUGUST ANDRESEN was a great citizen. He was a great American. He had those qualities which make a real Christian gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is evident from what has been said here today that AUGUST ANDRESEN will long be remembered, not only as a man with countless friends, but also for the contributions he made to legislation that has been placed on the statute books. He is no longer with us but his work will be here forever as a lasting monument. He will never be forgotten.

AUGIE, as we fondly called him, was a Member of this body when I was first elected to come here. I cannot possibly tell you how helpful he was to me. He and I came from agricultural districts and, quite naturally, he and I have worked together on many matters in the field of agriculture. I think it may be truly said that he was an expert on agriculture, and on many occasions he and I have had personal visits to discuss our farm problems and how best to arrive at a solution.

As we all know, our late beloved colleague was a man of convictions and with the courage of his convictions. He worked vigorously, but always fairly, for those things in which he believed.

I will miss him. We all will. His passing is a great loss to the Congress and to the country as a whole.

I extend to his family and relatives my deep-felt sympathy.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the good fortune to know our esteemed colleague, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, as well as those who have previously lauded his virtues. While my acquaintance with him was brief and only in connection with the work of the Committee on Agriculture, I had sufficient time to determine that he was one of the finest gentlemen that ever graced the Halls of this august body. We were of different political faiths, but we were united together in the best interest of our country. Many were the times that I asked his advice and he was always honest and straightforward with me. I profited much from his wise counsel and shall miss him dearly.

Mr. ANDRESEN was a strong believer in our national security. I recall at one

time relating to him my happy experiences with the NATO Parliamentary Conference which I attended in 1956. He was thrilled no end that his appointee to the United States Military Academy, Gen. Lauris Norstad, had risen to the position of Supreme Commander of Allied Powers, Europe. He said, "I know the boy very well. I feel better for the safety of our country with him in that position."

I am grateful for the privilege of joining with all my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the memory of this outstanding Christian gentleman, patriot, and statesman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn this morning of the passing of our respected colleague, Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, who represented the First Congressional District of Minnesota.

Although I knew of his confinement to the Bethesda Naval Hospital, I gathered that he was on the road to recovery and consequently the news today has saddened me considerably.

GUS, as he was known to his colleagues and many friends, served in this body for 30 years and at the time of his passing was the ranking Republican member of the House Agricultural Committee on which he served with great distinction. He was generally recognized by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle as one who possessed considerable knowledge of the agricultural problems affecting the country.

I always found GUS ANDRESEN to be affable, kind, and considerate. His Congressional district, his State, and the Nation have lost an outstanding legislator. I extend to his brother my sincere sympathy on his great loss.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and country have suffered a great loss in the death of our colleague, AUGUST ANDRESEN.

AUGUST ANDRESEN was a man of the highest integrity and great ability. He was forthright and courageous. Years of study, keen observation, and personal experience with agriculture had made him a top authority in Congress on agricultural matters. Often, when a complex and perplexing agricultural bill was before the Congress, Members would ask one another, "What does AUGUST ANDRESEN think about this?" Their question was an expression of their confidence in AUGUST ANDRESEN'S soundness of judgment.

AUGUST ANDRESEN had a host of friends in and out of Congress. All who knew him respected him for his knowledge and ability and they, also, had great liking for him as a person. He was sincere, friendly, kind, and companionable.

AUGUST ANDRESEN, truly, was a great and a good man.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, although I knew of his serious illness, it was nevertheless a shock to learn this morning of the death of my colleague and friend, the Honorable AUGUST ANDRESEN.

Only a day or two before Christmas I visited him in the hospital. Since the First District of Minnesota is separated from the Third District of Iowa only by the State border, we had many problems in common and because of his long and rich experience in Congress it was then, as always, a privilege for me to have the benefit of his views.

AUGUST ANDRESEN was an outstanding champion of the American farmer. On the occasion of this visit he told me how, some days earlier, and although sorely afflicted, he had gone to the Department of Agriculture in an effort to convince the Secretary that his order, lowering supports on dairy products was unwise and unjust. To the end of life, he was dedicated to the welfare of agriculture.

I will always believe that he had a premonition of the nearness of death. Members of his staff had erected and decorated a Christmas tree in his hospital room and there were a number of gaily wrapped packages. He recalled briefly some of the Christmases of his boyhood and he was pleased and grateful for the little tree that stood at the foot of his bed. Then he wondered aloud if he would see another Christmas.

It was not a question to be answered. He did not mean it as such.

In the death of AUGUST ANDRESEN there has departed from among us a good man and an outstanding legislator.

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of AUGUST ANDRESEN in expressing my sorrow at his untimely passing. His death is a real, personal loss to all of us, and to all Americans, and in particular to those Minnesotans he so ably represented.

The many years of devoted service he rendered will long be remembered. His wisdom and courage will be sorely missed.

In the 16 terms to which he was elected by his people, AUGIE ANDRESEN became recognized as a legislator who was a true friend of the farm people of America, and to them his death is a special loss. He championed their rights and fought their battle, and earned their everlasting appreciation.

In the years during which it was my privilege to know him and work with him, I gained a great personal admiration for Congressman ANDRESEN, and a deep respect for his ability and his integrity.

On the Agriculture Committee and in this Chamber, he will be greatly missed.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in an endeavor to pay respect to our departed colleague, the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. "AUGIE," as he was affectionately known to all of us, was a great American, a student, a gentleman, and a scholar in every sense of the word.

He recently has had many hours of sorrow but he continued to do his work many hours per day so that his constituents might be given the same splendid service they have always had since he came to Congress back in 1924.

I have learned to know him personally and his passing will be a great loss to the country, as well as to the district it has been his honor to represent, and to all of us, his friends. I am sure he has already heard from that great Architect of the Universe, who the sun, moon, and stars obey, those welcome words, "Well done."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the death of AUGUST ANDRESEN we have lost a valued Member of this House. The dairy farmers, particularly in the great dairyland of the Midwest, have lost a great friend and champion of their interests. At this time when the dairy farmer faces his greatest challenge, this loss is particularly great. We will sorely miss his sound counsel in dealing with the agricultural problem facing the Nation.

I feel a personal loss, Mr. Speaker, because, to me, AUGUST ANDRESEN was a close friend and adviser.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in common with all other Members of the Congress, I feel a profound regret at the passing of AUGUST ANDRESEN. It seems like a very personal loss to so many of us in this Chamber.

During my 17 years in this body I grew to respect and admire Mr. ANDRESEN as one of the truly great men in the House of Representatives. He was a loyal and conscientious American at all times. He was a most capable and honest lawmaker. He was one of the most sincere friends American agriculture has ever had. Our House Committee on Agriculture will sorely miss his wise and penetrating counsel, his deep understanding of all problems coming before it, and his astute observations and decisions regarding these problems.

As an individual, AUGUST ANDRESEN was a fine and lovable man. The loss of his beloved wife less than a year ago was one from which he never did recover. She meant so much to him; theirs was a wonderful union lasting throughout most of their adult lives.

The American people will forever be indebted to the State of Minnesota for sending this great man to participate in the Nation's affairs.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of deep personal loss that I learned that our colleague, AUGUST ANDRESEN, had answered the last rollcall.

We had served together in this House for almost 30 years. We had shared in the difficulties presented by problems of vital importance to the Nation and to the world during that period.

I greatly valued his friendship.

He was a public servant of high character, ability, and with devotion to duty.

He made a fine contribution to his district, State, and Nation.

He will be recalled particularly, of course, for his work in the field of agriculture.

I shall miss him.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to all those close to him.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, few men who have served in the Congress have received such fine and heartfelt tributes as have been paid to our late beloved colleague, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No man could have deserved them more. He and I served together on the Herter Committee on Foreign Aid, and to its Subcommittee on Food and Agriculture, of which he was chairman, he brought his vast background and knowledge of agricultural problems. Truly a dedicated public servant he gave unstintingly of his time and attention to each and every task. To all who sought his help, he gave generous and wise counsel.

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN was a good man, a Christian gentleman who never compromised with principle and who kept the best interests of the Nation foremost in his mind. Minnesota has lost a sterling son but his memory will remain ever bright.

Much has been said of AUGUST ANDRESEN'S devotion to his lovely wife whose loss was more than his gentle, kindly spirit could bear. To all who grieve for him today, there must be consolation in the thought that they have been reunited again in eternal peace and happiness.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, my last remembrance of my old friend and colleague is based upon an event just last Christmas Eve. I was visiting with AUGUST in his hospital room and he told me how he was anticipating a little Christmas tree that was to be set up for him that afternoon by his faithful friend and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Bergquist. I was privileged to be there to see Mr. and Mrs. Bergquist and their two young daughters come in and start arranging for AUGUST what proved to be his last Christmas. To me that is the memory I want to carry of AUGUST ANDRESEN: To see him as I left the room, to see how his face lit up when he saw his lifelong friends, Mr. and Mrs. Bergquist and their family, come in and help him celebrate what otherwise would have been a very, very lonesome Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read, as follows:

House Resolution 431

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

*Resolved*, That a committee of 12 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necesary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members of the House: Messrs. H. CARL ANDERSEN, O'HARA of Minnesota, JUDD, BLATNIK, MCCARTHY, MARSHALL, WIER, Mrs. KNUTSON, and Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, HILL, and HOEVEN.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 15, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1441. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine Inc., transmitting the 30th Annual Report of the Work and Operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the act of Congress approved on May 7, 1928, as amended (22 U. S. C. 278a) (H. Doc. No. 260); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1442. A letter from the Director, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 39th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Atlantic City, N. J., September 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1443. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1444. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army aviation personnel above the rank of major receiving flight pay for the period July 1 through December 31, 1957, pursuant to the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946 (60 Stat. 20; 37 U. S. C. 118a-1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1445. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Report on Borrowing Authority for the quarter ending September 30, 1957, pursuant to section 304b of the Defense Production Act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1446. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the quarterly report on the progress of the liquidation of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1447. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to improve opportunities for small-business concerns to obtain a fair proportion of Government purchases and contracts, to facilitate procurement of property and services by the Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1448. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the military-assistance program administered by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1449. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of the Department of Agriculture with regard to foreign excess property disposals during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1450. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to empower the Judicial Conference to study and recommend changes in and additions to the rules of practice and procedure in the Federal courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1451. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing that the Department of the Interior has 1 position in grade GS-18 and 3 positions in grade GS-17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, which are not within the purview of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), respectively, of section 505 of Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1452. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the 41st Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9739. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 9955. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public-debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 9956. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public-debt limit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 9957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 9958. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 9959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 9960. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 9961. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9962. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H. R. 9963. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9964. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 9965. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organi-

zations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COAD:

H. R. 9966. A bill to establish a National Commission on Astronautics for the purpose of promoting research, development, and operations in the field of astronautics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9967. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9968. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 9969. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the financing, construction, and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOEVEN (by request):

H. R. 9970. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Sioux City, in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 9971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for tuition, fees, and books to certain public and private institutions of higher education for his education or the education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9972. A bill to amend section 2304 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit the Armed Forces to purchase textiles by negotiated contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 9973. A bill to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 9974. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 9975. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the calling of the National Guard into Federal service except in time of war or invasion or upon the request of a State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9976. A bill to amend section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code to limit the use of the Armed Forces to enforce Federal laws or the orders of Federal courts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 9977. A bill to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 9978. A bill to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaking vessel for operation by the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9979. A bill to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 9980. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price supports on dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 9981. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit schoolteachers and administrators to deduct expenses of attending classes to acquire additional training or education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. J. Res. 496. Joint resolution to permit the utilization of existing structures on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 497. Joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment prohibiting States from taxing incomes of nonresidents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 432. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 433. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the programs and policies of the Federal Government relating to science in order to determine whether changes should be made in such programs and policies in order to develop a comprehensive and well-integrated national science policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 434. Resolution authorizing additional expenses for conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 56 of the 85th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 435. Resolution proposing a study and investigation into problems surrounding the power of the several States to tax the incomes of nonresidents; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9982. A bill for the relief of Gunars Steprans-Staprans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 9983. A bill for the relief of Nettie L. Richard, Florence L. Morris, Tessie L. Marx, and Helen L. Levi; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 9984. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 9985. A bill for the relief of Eva Kubat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9986. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Luther A. Stamm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 9987. A bill for the relief of Ferris Abousada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9988. A bill for the relief of Tamara Olszewska and Lydia Olszewska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 9989. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9990. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9991. A bill for the relief of Felix Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9992. A bill for the relief of James R. Martin and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 9993. A bill for the relief of Miss Mary M. Browne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

358. Mr. HESS presented a petition of Roy A. Rooms, Jr., and other veterans in the Cincinnati, Ohio, area asking that increases in veterans' pensions be made automatically, when no improvement is shown in a specified time, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Depletion Tax Allowance for Professional Athletes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 14, 1958*

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on May 16, 1957, legislation providing for a depletion tax allowance for professional athletes. This bill is know as H. R. 7609, and the following is a statement which I presented to the Committee on Ways and Means in support of my legislation:

STATEMENT OF HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 7609

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the opportunity, at this time, to make a statement on behalf of H. R. 7609 which I introduced in the first session of the present Congress.

My bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of professional athletes, an income tax deduction for the depletion of physical resources. It would give a professional athlete an annual deduction of 15 percent of the gross income he derives from active participation in his respective sport. The bill covers all participants in sports, such as baseball, football, or tennis players, golfers, bowlers, jockeys, fighters, and other athletes who earn money by means of their skill and ability.

I believe this bill is justified on the acknowledged fact that a professional athlete uses up his physical resources, which are necessary to his livelihood, in a relatively short span of years. His short playing career, moreover, is often further reduced because of injury or by service in the Armed Forces. Take the case of Jerry Coleman of the New York Yankees who interrupted his

career for extended service during World War II, and again was recalled to active duty in the Korean conflict. The loss of these years in the service of his country is a costly sacrifice for any young man, but for Mr. Coleman, it is inordinately costly for he may have contributed half his major league playing career.

H. R. 7609 recognizes, and to me it is important recognition, the physical deterioration to which athletes necessarily subject themselves, while pursuing a career of providing public entertainment for public recreation and enjoyment. My bill will entitle them to the same kind of tax allowance we now provide for the depletion of certain natural resources, such as oil, gas wells, and minerals. Simple equity, I believe, requires equal treatment for the depletion of human resources.

Continued participation in such sports as baseball—our national sport—football, boxing, and tennis tend to deplete the body of much of its natural and acquired ability to sustain and rejuvenate itself.

Prolonged participation in sports in which running is a major feature may have the effect of seriously interfering with the normal functioning of vital organs in the most healthy body.

Inherent in most of the competitive sports is the constant danger of accidents, either fatal or seriously disabling which can quickly terminate a lucrative career.

Perfect timing, coordination, and alertness are the factors that determine the length of time that athletes may continue in their career. Baseball authorities have publicly stated many times that the average length of time that a national league baseball player is active professionally is less than 5 years. Other statistics indicate that the average span for all athletes' life in sports is approximately 7 years.

A writer made a detailed and exhaustive study into the chronological ages at which extraordinary proficiency has been exhibited most frequently by professional baseball players, tennis players, pugilists, ice hockey players, football players, automobile racers, bowlers, billiardists, and professional golfers. The report disclosed that, apart from billiardists, the maximum proficiency was reached before the age of 30. Baseball players, apart from pitchers, reached their peak at the age of 29. Boxers, tennis players, hockey players at the age of 27; and football players at the age of 25. Automobile racers reached their maximum efficiency at the age of 30. Golfers reached their maximum proficiency at the age of 32. It can, therefore, be seen that professional athletes have their greatest earning capacity before their age of 30 and their greatest earnings take place before they are 30 years of age. Thereafter, their ability, because of lack of coordination, alertness, and perfect timing, deteriorates, and their earning capacity falls off.

A great jockey, like Tony DeSpirito, terminated his brilliant career because of a spill in an accident. Herb Score, an outstanding ballplayer, almost lost the sight of one eye as the result of a baseball accident and perhaps his baseball career has been terminated. The great Dizzy Dean, at the height of his power and earning capacity, was hurt and his earning capacity was reduced substantially. Many of these athletes have had abrupt endings to their athletic careers and they find themselves with no accumulation of earnings or with no ability to go into another business or occupation.

After the career of an athlete has been terminated, it is often difficult for him to find employment. Generally, he has not prepared himself to enter another career or profession. Some are so physically broken that they are unable to engage in really profitable employment. And, while many of our athletes make millions of dollars during their glorious careers, they are frequently, at the end of their careers, broke and in debt to the United States Government for taxes. The great fighter, Joe Louis, is just one example.

H. R. 7609 is designed to relieve such conditions as I have outlined above. We must bear in mind that an athlete does not leave his profession because he no longer desires to participate in whatever sport he may have been pursuing. He leaves it, in most instances, because he has been so depleted that he no longer has the physical attributes required by his sport.

The income-producing potential of most persons, other than athletes, increases as they reach their forties, whereas the potential of athletes reaches its height at the age of 30 and decreases as they grow older.

The token tax allowance of 15 percent of their gross earnings would enable them to set aside a nest-egg and perhaps, in some small way compensate them for the all-too-short period of time they may spend in their sports career. It would also make an appropriate leveling adjustment for the high bracket taxes paid during a few high income years which are followed by years of greatly reduced earnings.

Before introducing this bill, I gave long and concentrated thought to the position of sports in American culture. I thought of the many efforts that we have made and are presently making to find ways of living at home and abroad with some degree of amity. It has been said that "sports are one index to the national genius and character of the American people." I do not believe that any of us will deny the truth of this statement. By enacting my bill into law, the Congress will not only overcome an inequity in existing tax laws but it will also recognize that one of the common denominators we seek is to be found in the existence of sports and competitive games which are an integral part of every culture known to history.

## Public Opinion Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 14, 1958*

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for the third year, I am making a public opinion survey of the people of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio in order to learn their feelings on some of the important issues confronting the Congress. Each year, the results of this poll have provided me with very valuable information about the trends of thinking in southeastern Ohio. I am gratified that this survey has been regarded with general interest among my colleagues here when its results have been reported.

The questions included in my 1958 poll are as follows:

1. Do you favor a freer exchange of atomic secrets between this country and our NATO Allies?

2. Do you favor increasing the pay of military personnel?

3. Do you believe Congress should act to authorize permanent residence for 30,000 Hungarian refugees temporarily admitted to the United States last year?

4. Would you support a constitutional amendment giving the President's Cabinet or some other group of officials authority to determine when a President is suffering sufficient physical disability to prevent him from carrying out the duties of his office?

5. Do you believe Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations?

6. Would you support increasing postal rates for first-, second-, and third-class mail to reduce the present postal deficit?

7. Do you favor a program of Federal scholarships for the training of additional scientists and engineers?

8. Do you believe that a new law is needed to safeguard the handling of labor union welfare funds?

9. Do you favor ending agricultural controls and the accompanying termination of price supports?

10. Would you favor an all-out Federal program leading to the exploration of outer space?

11. Do you favor any Federal policy which would reduce pensions for disabled veterans?

12. Do you favor action by Congress which would reduce tariffs on products imported into the United States?

13. Do you favor the expenditure for foreign aid of $4 billion in military and economic assistance and an increased program of loans to friendly foreign countries?

14. In the social security program, do you favor:

(a) Reducing the minimum age limit for benefits with a corresponding increase in individual and employer contributions?

(b) Increasing the amount of benefits with a corresponding increase in individual and employer contributions?

(c) Eliminating the restriction on outside income for persons receiving benefits with a corresponding increase in individual and employer contributions?

(d) Leaving the program in its present form?

## Report on Study Mission to Mediterranean and Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 14, 1958*

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on my recent trip to the Mediterranean and Near East countries:

This is a report on a 30-day study mission to certain Mediterranean and Near East countries which I undertook on September 19 to observe economic conditions and the effectiveness of the United States information and economic aid programs. I visited France, Greece, Turkey, and Israel. In Great Britain and Italy, I conferred with USIS officials and our Embassy personnel. In each of the other countries I also conferred with government officials and our Embassies on economic conditions and the reaction to United States policy. In a few instances I met with private citizens and newspapermen on some aspects of these subjects. All of them were cooperative and generous with time and information in helping me to a fuller understanding of the issues and problems they face.

FRANCE

In France strong feeling continues to exist over our actions in the Suez crisis, our handling of Near East developments, and our attitude on the Algerian question. Consequently, our information services there have been under severe strain. The USIS, however, is doing a commendable job in correcting popular misconceptions and in disseminating accurate information about our country and its policies.

Both Algeria and Cyprus present difficult questions that only time and human patience can solve. Insofar as Cyprus is concerned, the situation is anomalous because both Greece and Turkey are parts of NATO. In my opinion, their attitude toward the West is completely dependable. There are Turks living in Greece and Greeks living in Turkey on a friendly basis. And if the Cyprus question had not been brought to the fore in the fashion it was, there would have been no difficulty for the Greeks living in Turkey. Fundamentally and instinctively we favor independence for all countries, for the Algerians, Turks, and Greeks. Were we to urge independence for Algeria, we could be accused of making the French who live in Algeria a subject people. And were we to favor independence for Cyprus, we would make the Turks living in Cyprus a dependent people. If we oppose colonialism for one people, we should not jeopardize the status of another.

GREECE

Greece maintains a defense posture against the Communist threat which, in proportion to population and income in the opinion of some, is greater than any country in Europe. It is a poor country and its economy is increasingly burdened by these defense needs. It cannot support its population and therefore encourages its citizens to emigrate.

Greece also has a traditional interest in the Near East and believes that she has a special affinity with Egypt. Her leaders contend that Greece is a bridge between East and West, and could be useful in improving relations and settling the issues that agitate the Near East. Greece's policy is naturally influenced by the fact that about 80,000 Greeks have settled in Egypt, and during the Suez crisis, under the impact of Colonel Nasser's Egyptianization process, their position became very difficult. The extension of Soviet influence in Egypt and Syria has also aggravated tension and fears, including grave concern over its effects on the sensitive Cyprus question. Greece is as unhappy over a Soviet-dominated neighbor as we would be.

TURKEY

My visit to Turkey, though brief, was considerably enhanced by the information and materials provided me by United States Consul General Robert G. Miner in Istanbul. Turkey is a dynamic and robust country. It is making excellent use of American technical assistance in its recovery program but is running into difficulties because of a shortage of foreign exchange. This is a chronic condition, but it is especially acute now because of the numerous projects that have been started. Turkish economic ambitions appear to have outstripped the country's resources and thus have provided the Soviet Union with an opportunity to offer credits and direct help in expanding Turkey's industrial plant.

As the link between NATO and the Baghdad Pact and a member of both, Turkey plays a strategic role in our plans for Middle East defense. A major effort is now being made there to crisscross the country with modern roads and highways. It is alternately wooed and threatened by the Soviet Union, and could fall victim to Russian economic allurements if we failed to meet the threat with a creative economic program of our own. Its importance to free world defense will grow with the development of new oil resources in the country.

ISRAEL

I was impressed by the tremendous energy expended by the Israelis in the agricultural, industrial and cultural development of their country. New planned cities are being built where there was nothing but sand and desert, and modern concrete housing is going up at a rapid rate in order to provide homes for about 90,000 immigrants this year. Industrial buildings are included in all these planned cities. For the first time in several years, most of the immigrants are now from Hungary and Eastern Europe with lesser numbers from Egypt and North Africa. Despite the increase in immigration, I was told that there is work for all and that there is practically no unemployment.

Arab fears that Israel may be overrun by immigrants and be compelled to seek new territory are groundless. Outside of the Soviet Union, the only substantial body of Jews reside in the United States, and they are not emigrating. Soviet Jews are barred from leaving by the Kremlin's policy, and there is no present likelihood that this prohibition will be lifted.

Although Israel is a small country, I saw much open territory and no evidence of overpopulation. In my judgment, Israel has land on which to settle many more people than it has now. It does not need more territory to accommodate the natural increase in its population and those who may be in a position to immigrate. I traveled all the way from Elath, a new port city on the Gulf of Aqaba at the southernmost tip of Israel, where I inspected the terminus of the oil pipeline stretching north across the Negev to the Mediterranean, to the borders of Syria in the north near the Sea of Galilee. Everywhere it was possible to see the evidence of American technical assistance. The country offers a remarkable demonstration of the way in which natural difficulties of terrain and climate can be overcome with the aid of modern scientific techniques and engineering skill.

The people of Israel are industrious and able to make full use of American technical assistance. They are working to raise their living standards and per capita income, which at present is about $500, to a level comparable with any Western country, and their industrial and agricultural production has been rising steadily.

The area of reclaimed and cultivated land has been increased in the Huleh region of the Galilee and in the upper Negev by drainage and by irrigation. The full development of this latter area, however, is dependent upon the supply of sufficient water, and for this American aid is essential. The copper mines in the Negev are being developed with American equipment and technical assistance. Private American investment is evident in some industrial establishments in Haifa and Tel Aviv. Israel, however, is still operating under an unfavorable balance of trade, and will continue to need economic help for some time to come. Although production and exports are up, the sharp rise in immigration has put a great strain on Israel's economy. The trade deficit is expected to be between $300 million and $350 million this year. Inflationary pressures are increasing and the cost of living is rising despite government measures to keep food and clothing within reach of the average worker.

My talks with Israel Government officials, including President Ben-Zvi, convinced me of their great desire for peace with their neighbors. They feel that they can contribute greatly to the development of the Near East and to the raising of living standards and health standards. At the time of my visit, the borders with Jordan and Syria and Egypt were quiet but there was great concern in Israel over the new Soviet dominated government in Syria, the shipment of Communist arms and the development of Soviet air and naval bases in Syria, and what they meant to Israel's security. Strengthening of the Eisenhower doctrine to assure Israel against attack by its neighbors would help to deter the danger of such an attack and to reduce the tension.

Israel's ability to contribute to the technical development of other countries is demonstrated in a dramatic way in new African and Asian countries, where Israel missions have been able to establish working relations ahead of the advance experts of the Communist countries. I was told in Jerusalem that Israel missions are especially welcome in these new countries because they feel an affinity with a small country whose experience is recent like their own. Moreover, unlike the Communist bloc countries, it presents no menace of ideological penetration. Israel has military, agricultural and health missions in Burma, in Ghana, in Ceylon, and in Ethiopia, and also has sent technical experts to Nigeria. Educational facilities in Israel are also being made available to Africans and Asians for training in the science of government and in sociology as well as the physical sciences. Israel, thus is serving as an advance force for democracy in the new underdeveloped nations of Africa. The development of these countries will take long, and Israel's capacity to aid is limited. But it is of inestimable value to the free world, and we should help wherever possible to enable Israel to carry on and expand this program.

---

## A Public Memorandum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 14, 1958*

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint statement to the press made by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., on yesterday:

A PUBLIC MEMORANDUM

We have read the incredible remarks made by you in a hotel lobby in New York yesterday. It is obvious that you have forgotten certain parts of the record during the period you were President. Do you recall the following facts:

MISSILES

If today we are behind the Soviet Union in some respects in the race to perfect the weapons of the future—guided and ballistic missiles—a considerable part of the blame lies on the doorstep of your administration.

This fact is based not on the say-so of any self-seeking partisan but on the expert testimony of scientists and military leaders far removed from partisan politics—of men like Dr. Wehrner von Braun, Dr. Edward Teller, Dr. Simon Ramos, Dr. Theodore von Karman, Gen. Donald L. Putt, and Admiral Radford. Dr. von Braun, for example, declared "The United States had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. These 6 years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, are irretrievably lost."

Even your colleagues in the Democrat Party were telling us a similar story in times when this issue had less immediacy than it has today. Senator LISTER HILL, for example, declared in 1953, "From 1947 to 1949 the Air Force sacrificed, entirely because of lack of money, fully half of its research and development projects. The record will reveal, and a sad record it is, that in this period not one new aircraft or guided missile project was initiated by the Air Force."

Senator HILL might have added that this record becomes even sadder in 1950 when you cut meager amounts for research and development of the intermediate range ballistic missile and the intercontinental ballistic missile in previous years to exactly nothing—zero.

We rested on our oars during the last years of your administration while the Russians went to work. Your own Presidential Air Policy Commission on January 1, 1948, warned that, even then, other nations might be ahead of us in developing an intercontinental missile. You failed to act. When they urged that research in this field be given the highest priority—again in 1948—you failed to act. In 1947 you even impounded $75 million which Congress had provided for Air Force research and development. You did identically the same thing again in 1950.

Virtually all that has been done to develop the weapons of the future has been done by the Eisenhower administration which looked the facts in the face and acted. It gave the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile the highest national priority—the step that you were urged by scientists and military leaders to take in 1948. More than 99 percent of the money spent on long-range missiles by the United States has been spent by the Eisenhower administration—less than 1 percent by your administration. Expenditures for long-range ballistic missile development will have increased 1,000 times between the last Truman year and the next fiscal year.

In spite of the fact that we have been working on long-range missiles for only one-third of the time that the Russians have devoted to these weapons, we appear to be ahead of them in solving the difficult problem of reentry of missiles into the atmosphere. The Air Force, 2 months ago, gave us the world's first known demonstration of a true intercontinental missile capability by delivering a guided Snark to a target in the Atlantic 5,000 miles from the Florida launching site. The Navy's missile system, the Polaris, is 2 years ahead of schedule. And the day is not far distant when we shall be equipping all branches of our Armed Forces with weapons of these kinds.

PREPAREDNESS

When World War II ended we were the mightiest military nation in the history of the world. Yet 5 years later, due to your policy of drastically cutting down the armed services, we were not ready for the Korean war. Our airpower then was embodied in what General Vandenberg called a shoestring air force. We had in the nearby Japanese area only 6 General Pershing tanks, only 30 propeller combat planes, only 1 aircraft carrier, and not a single combat marine.

Before the North Korean Communists struck, General Eisenhower had warned that we were disarmed below the levels necessary for security. And after the fighting broke out, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON confessed that your administration had made this tragic mistake, saying "our economy was false, our overconfidence was unjustified, our emphasis was wrong."

Today, in contrast with 1950, we are ready—ready to meet an aggressor with a military force capable of smashing any other power on the face of the earth. Our Strategic Air Command and the Navy's airpower can deliver their devastating pay load to any point on the globe.

Our military situation today is incomparably better than that of 1950, when we were drawn into a war we were not ready for in an area which your own Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, had obligingly told the enemy lay outside our defense perimeter. Today we are vastly stronger in airpower than we were at the height of the Korean conflict.

In 1950 our Air Force had 48 wings; now it has 137.

In 1950 it had 12,500 active aircraft; now the Air Force has more than 25,000.

Then our Armed Forces numbered 1,400,000; now they number 2,600,000.

Then our Navy had 237 warships; now it has 409.

And let us underscore this: The weapons we have today incorporate the utmost ingenuity of man in electronics, advanced chemistry, and atomic science, not to mention such inconceivable destructive power that, for example, one B-52 can carry as much explosive force as was delivered by all the bombers during the entire duration of World War II.

The past is written. The future is what concerns the American people. We must put all our efforts into achieving the maximum national security and, in that, we invite you and all Americans to join us.

## Commemorative Stamp on Israel's 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 14, 1958*

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1958, the State of Israel will celebrate the 10th anniversary of its independence. After a lapse of nearly 2,000 years, the age-old dream of the Jewish people was at last fulfilled in 1948 when Israel was established as an independent, democratic, and sovereign State.

This is an excellent occasion for all freedom-loving Americans, who are genuinely interested in maintaining peace in the Middle East, to salute Israel as a symbol of democracy in that strife-torn area of the world. During this past decade the relationship between the United States and Israel has been most cordial. Close ties of friendship have grown up between the people of these two countries, based on a common dedication to the principles of freedom and democracy, dignity of the human being, and a strong desire for peace in the world.

On this occasion, I am pleased to introduce a bill which provides for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel. In adopting this bill we would not only express our reaffirmation of friendship for the people of Israel, but we would also encourage them to carry on in the face of extreme hardship until peace and stability is attained in the Middle East.

During the past decade Israel has gradually emerged as a dynamic little state. It has achieved great progress in nearly every endeavor. It is well on the road toward solving its economic and humanitarian problems. Nearly a million immigrants from the far corners of the earth have been admitted and integrated into this small country. Similarly, Israel has been highly successful in improving the standard of living of its people, in developing its agriculture, industry, and commerce, and in building its democratic way of life in the image of our way of life.

In recent years Soviet Russia has penetrated into the Middle East, primarily because Egypt and Syria provided a suitable beachhead for Communist subversion. Israel, as a stanch and loyal ally of the West, looks to the United States for aid and assistance in helping to lessen tension in the area and avert Communist control of the Middle East. Our country is vitally interested in the maintenance of peaceful and harmonious relations in this area because of its great strategic value in international affairs. In this respect, Israel is the only stable and forward-looking country in the Middle East, but its Arab neighbors are still plotting Israel's destruction. In this way they are keeping the area in constant turmoil and are playing directly into the hands of the Communists.

The United States must make it clear to the peoples of the Middle East that Israel is here to stay, that it constitutes a part of the Free World, and that any threats against Israel constitute a threat against the Free World which will not be tolerated. We must discourage all aggression in the area and pursue a firm policy which will eventually lead to a settlement and lasting peace in the Middle East. It is as much in our interests as it is in the interests of the peoples of the Middle East.

In adopting my bill for the issuance of a commemorative stamp we shall not only be extending greetings to Israel on the occasion of having reached an important milestone in its existence, but we will also give the people of Israel moral encouragement for the future. Above all, we shall demonstrate to the world that Israel does not stand alone in this troubled area. The hearts and prayers of the Americans are with them in their struggle for survival and in their aspirations for a just and lasting peace.

## Savings Banks and the Washington Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 14, 1958*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1957, I had the pleasure of addressing the 64th fall convention of the Savings Banks Association of the State of New York, at Miami Beach, Fla. My remarks on that occasion were as follows:

The topic Savings Banks and the Washington Scene could easily be assigned as the subject matter for discussion at each daily session of a full week's conference.

It will be quite impossible for me to even touch upon all the problems inherent in that title in the brief time I intend to take from the more pleasant tasks calling for your attention.

No doubt, many of you would give up golf, swimming, or even gin (both kinds) to talk about the determined efforts to tax mutual savings banks and how to meet those efforts. If so, may I suggest that you ask Congressman KEOGH to lead that discussion. Not only is he a savings-bank trustee, but more important, he is a very able member of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee which has jurisdiction over the subject. He

is waging a valiant fight on your behalf. He needs and deserves your cooperative support.

The issue of Government regulation of interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages as against letting the market fix the rate can be argued for days. My own reaction to that has been many times expressed in the suggestion that until the banks and insurance companies and mortgage investors take over and own FHA as a private institution, you will be compelled to submit to Government control. Insurance, whether of credit or of anything else, should be private enterprise.

The Government does not belong in that business or any other, except as an emergency measure or when private enterprise fails to do the required job. Insurance of mortgages has proved itself as a good paying operation. It is time that the business community took over that field of endeavor. Savings banks have a long and creditable history, particularly in New York State. They have rendered a fine and an important service to American economic history. They can have a broader and greater influence for good in the future, if only they do not rest on their laurels.

As in most things, there is no standing still. You either move forward or you stagnate. Remember the past, only so that you may improve its virtues, and eliminate its mistakes.

If that is reminiscent of what you heard from our great superintendent of banks, George Mooney, yesterday, I hope that you will agree with me that his was one of the most vigorous statements made to any association of this kind by a high and important Government official. He is rendering a great service to our State and to our country.

There are many fields that remain to be explored that are definitely related to your functions.

To mention but one—recent events have highlighted the need for college and post-college education. The drawback to more American boys and girls continuing their education after high school, particularly in the scientific fields, is lack of money.

Isn't that your business? I readily concede that by promoting thrift you try to fill that need.

But that isn't enough. Why can't you develop a program to lend money to students, repayable when they begin to earn their way in life.

You have ample precedent, with proof of success. We had such a national Government program and the losses were less than one-half of 1 percent of the interest earned. If the Federal Government was able to operate such a venture at a profit, you can do an even better job.

Permit me now to turn to my own present pet project. I hope you will make it yours.

The only novelty that I can claim for it, is that I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill on the subject.

I refer, of course, to H. R. 4296, to establish a national mutual savings bank system.

After its introduction I learned that many persons had been thinking and talking about the matter for a long time. I want you to know that I have no pride of authorship and am not wedded to any detail of the bill. In that connection it is well to remember that I am only one Member of the Congress, and the bill as it is finally reported will have to meet with the approval of a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress. It is strange that although you have a national association of savings banks, there is no national system of mutual savings banks. One might ask "Why a national association when you have mutual savings banks in only 17 States, none in 31 States, and none in any of the Territories?" The sponsorship of the principle of this bill will amply justify the purpose of that association. Let me give you a friendly warning—time is usually on the side of the opponents of proposed legislation. You can study this bill to death. If you make it a 5-year project, you might as well abandon it before you start.

No one admits more readily than I the immediate need for an overall monetary study of our fiscal affairs on every level. But if you want to be realistic about it, you must also agree with me when I say that a monetary commission, if and when appointed, will take from 2 to 5 years to complete their studies and bring in reports that the Congress may act on.

The climate will never be better for such legislation. Next May may be too late. Those who are interested in the enactment of this legislation should lose no time in unifying their forces and making known to their representatives of both Houses of Congress their desire to see this principle enacted. That should be coupled with requests to the Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses for early hearings so that all concerned may present their views and the groundwork may be laid for working out details satisfactory to all concerned.

The dual banking system is now so firmly embedded in our banking legislation that it is taken for granted. I have never heard of any bill having been introduced to challenge it.

Congressman BRENT SPENCE, the very distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee—to whom I have already referred—only a few weeks ago, in addressing a bankers' group, referred to the dual system of banking as "within the American Constitution of checks and balances."

I am delighted that among your guests today is my very dear friend, Jesse Wolcott. It was he, who, as chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee in the 80th Congress, welcomed me to that committee, made me feel at home and initiated me into a difficult and most interesting field of Congressional activity. Our friendship has grown stronger through the years. I welcome the opportunity to publicly pay my respects to him. Despite our political differences, if I had had the appointing power, I would have readily named him to the high post which he now holds as Chairman of the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. He brings to that office not only character and integrity but a vast fund of knowledge and experience, coupled with a strong desire to improve the operations of that Corporation in the best interests of our country.

Now Jesse, you know why I wouldn't let you see my advance copy of the speech. I know you would probably have blue pencilled that.

No one can speak more vigorously than he did in September 1957, when he said that he "would make special efforts to reconcile conflicting problems" in banking operations and practices, and "protect at all times the dual banking system."

Implicit in all these statements of policy is the fact that we do have a dual banking system. Few have stopped to consider, however, that we have one, only in part.

I hope we can enlist the aid of those and other distinguished proponents of the system in making it a genuine dual banking system.

We have State and Federal chartering and supervision of credit unions. We have State and Federal chartering and supervision of savings and loan associations. We have State and Federal chartering and supervision of commercial banks.

Why do we not have it as to savings banks? My bill attempts to supply the omission.

As to those who object to the enlargement of Federal regulation, let me say this: There have been complaints, some well-founded, some not so well-founded, directed against the activities of the banking authorities on the national level. The same type of complaints have been leveled against one or more of the banking authorities on the State level.

The fear of Federal control and regulation of banking has been minimized, if not entirely eliminated, by the manner of operation of the Federal Reserve System and of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. No one pretends that either is perfect. Both can be improved.

Does anyone know of anything better to take their place? That the answer is "no" is found in the fact that so many of the State institutions have voluntarily become members, and continue to be a part, of those organizations.

All national banks and all State banks are authorized to carry savings accounts. There are one or more savings and loan associations operating under Federal charter in every State in the Union. There are only 2 States out of the 48 which do not have State savings and loan associations.

All of these organizations compete for the savings dollar. I think no one can safely challenge the statement that some of this competition can be properly labeled unfair. Mind you, I use the word "unfair," not the word "illegal." At least a part of the blame for the unfairness of that competition can be charged to the difference between Federal and State statutory provisions and regulations.

In my opinion, a National Mutual Savings Bank Act would go far toward eliminating unfair competition, and would tend to bring into line the legal requirements that should apply with equal force to all savings accounts. When I introduced my bill, H. R. 4296, I made no pretense, nor do I now, that it is perfect either in form or substance. I know that after study and after hearing from all of those interested in the principle of the bill, the details thereof can be improved. What the minimum or maximum number of directors should be is of no real importance in talking about the principle of the matter. Similarly, the percentage of reserves that should be required, the kind of investments that should be permitted with the funds, while important, are obviously subsidiary to the main question. The enactment of a bill such as mine, will accomplish many things, all of them, in my opinion, good, none of them bad. For instance, it will give to the people in 41 States an opportunity to create savings banks whose sole purpose in life will be to encourage thrift.

This will come at a time when the one thing that all economists agree upon is that one means of beating inflation is to decrease spending by increasing savings.

I think I am the fourth man to say that in almost that precise language at this conference. An expanding economy demands the necessary tools. One important tool is money. Your institutions have been, and must continue as one source of supply. This bill will strengthen our economy by improving your operations.

Another good thing that will be accomplished will be to put strong pressure on State legislatures, to liberalize their branch banking restrictions so as to give to savings banks the same privileges as are accorded to commercial banks.

The third accomplishment, and as to this I realize there may be some disagreement as to its desirability, would be to afford to the savings and loan associations of the country an opportunity to be converted into savings banks.

At first blush the savings bankers may object that that would serve only to create more competition for the savings banks. Actually it would not create more competition than competition is already there. It

would, however, set up the same standards for the competitors.

I believe that savings bankers must agree with me that everyone would gain rather than lose if savings-bank requirements become the standards for savings and loan associations.

Another benefit to be obtained, and here, too, there is room for disagreement, is that the savings banks would improve their competitive position vis-a-vis the commercial banks.

It is my firm conviction that savings, whether in savings banks, loan associations, or in commercial banks, should be invested primarily in long-term obligations. Commercial bank funds should be primarily invested in short-term obligations. If commercial banks are to continue to take savings accounts, and I believe they should be allowed to, they should be restricted, however, as to where they invest those moneys.

These restrictions should be the same for all savings funds, no matter where deposited.

It was my privilege to meet with your committee, which was assigned the task of reviewing my bill. We exchanged ideas freely and frankly. I have read with great interest its report. I hope that each of you will do so at the earliest possible moment. It is as fine a piece of work as I have ever seen. It demonstrates what men of good will can do when they approach a legislative problem constructively.

Someone asked, "Isn't that lobbying?" Let me take long enough to tell you that lobbying is as much a part of our American way of life as the Bill of Rights. Of course, it is a privilege that is occasionally abused. Then it makes the headlines, and the respectable and respected lobbyist gets a black-eye. But we do not repeal the Constitution because a criminal occasionally escapes punishment.

My colleagues and I can spot the off-color lobbyist very quickly. We make short shrift of him. But the lobbyist who calls on us and fairly and honestly presents the pros and cons of a situation is a useful citizen who finds our doors are always open to him.

In this vastly complicated and troubled world of ours no one man and no one legislator, can hope to have all the answers. We must depend for much of our enlightenment upon those who know the specific problems; that is the proper function of the honorable lobbyist.

I return to your committee's report. The thought bears repetition, that pleasing as the details of the bill may be to some of us, our pleasure will not get the bill enacted. No matter how pleasant it may be to have your cooperation, that will not get the bill enacted. I have only one vote. I would like to sponsor a bill, however, that has the maximum support of the industries involved. Then we will get the maximum of support of the Congress.

It is indicated that most of your recommendations will meet with my approval and that I will probably endorse all of them. I base that feeling on the fact that your recommendations are prompted by your practical experience in your operation of the thrift system. There, too, however, I realize that different experiences cause different reactions. After full and free discussion of your recommendations you may change some of them.

I remind you that progress in the legislative field is accomplished by compromise. By taking the middle ground we can bring forth a good bill that should be acceptable to the vast majority of all concerned. I doubt whether we can get unanimity of opinion as to anything except the principle. Let's agree on what we all think would do the best job and then move forward. Personally, I like your suggestion that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, rather than the Comptroller of the Currency, be the chartering and supervising agency. The Comptroller of the Currency deals mainly with commercial banks. Without impugning the integrity or motives of any past, present, or future Comptroller, we can agree that that office is attuned to the thinking of the commercial banks. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board deals solely with thrift institutions; knows their problems and is acclimated to that field of endeavor. This issue should be resolved by the institutions themselves. I am certain that the Congress would rather not be required to decide that question for you.

Rather than the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, you suggest that the insuring authority should be the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I concur, but with reservations.

There is considerable sentiment in support of changing the composition of the Board of FDIC so as to remove the Comptroller of the Currency from membership thereon. The insuring organization should be independent of the chartering and supervisory agency. Such separation of authority will eliminate any conflict of interest and make for better management and efficiency in both organizations. While subscribing to that school of thought, I do not, however, take the position that FDIC shall be named in my bill, as the insuring agency, only if the desired change is accomplished. If we must wait for such a change in FDIC we can do so without impairing the effectiveness of my bill.

I hope that your association will approve at least that part of your committee report which endorses another one of my oft-repeated statements, to wit: "that the public sees much more of similarity than of difference between" savings banks and savings and loan associations, and that you "stand roughly upon the same competitive plane."

Based on the premise you and the savings and loan associations can move forward to quickly establish a national mutual savings bank system which will be of tremendous benefit to our Nation.

Here, too, there will have to be some give-and-take as between the privileges and restrictions imposed upon the two types of institutions. The compromise must be one which will promote the best interests of the country regardless of whether the one type of institution will have to submit to the greater restriction that applies to the other, or, conversely, one type of institution will attain the greater liberality that now applies to the other. To be specific as to only one of these differences: most States are more restrictive in the granting of charter to savings and loan associations than the national system. The national system is more liberal in the granting of applications for new branches than most of the States. The State savings banks are being restricted in establishing new branches. These matters must be resolved not on the basis of difference in legislative enactment but on the basis of community need and community interest, as well as the broader aspect of the national interest.

If as the result of the enactment of my bill, we eventually get one national insurance agency insuring all thrift institutions, the result must be greater efficiency at less cost. Surely you will concede that there is at least some justification for the complaint that savings and loan assocations should not pay a higher rate of assessment than the savings banks pay. Pardon me, but I used the wrong word—FDIC Act levies assessments; the FSLIC Act charges premiums. Isn't it strange, however, that the latter act levies the premiums on withdrawable and repurchasable shares and deposits while the FDIC Act charges the assessments on all deposits.

I hope you get my point. In trying to create distinctions where no differences exist, you merely succeeded in quibbling about words.

The practical approach dictates that you and the savings and loan associations coordinate your thinking. You are all thrift institutions serving the public by encouraging savings. Whether you pay dividends or interest on shares or deposits is unimportant. You are the mainstay of our free economy by making it possible for our citizens to own their own homes. You do that by investing the money which the owners of your institutions leave with you.

If you combine your efforts and show the Congress you want this bill, nothing can stop you from getting it. There are savings and loan associations in the State and, I dare say, in the district of every one of the 30 members of the House Banking and Currency Committee. In addition, there are savings banks in the State and, I am sure, in the district, of 14 of the 30 members of that committee.

Surely you can see how effective a lobbying job your combined organizations can do if you will put your minds to it.

The only objectors to this bill can be the commercial banks. If the objection does come from that source it will be because of shortsightedness on the part of commercial bankers. They are not thrift institutions and cannot do the job that is demanded by the American public of thrift institutions. The only competition commercial banks can give the savings institutions is by means of the interest rate. The need for money prompts the commercial banks today to increase that rate. In doing it they overlook the reason for the present statutory prohibition against commercial banks paying an interest on demand deposits.

As soon as the tight-money situation changes, the commercial banks will be compelled to lower their interest rates on savings and time deposits. In their shortsightedness, the commercial bankers overlook the fact that the time deposit, on which they pay interest, is merely a temporary immobilization of commercial funds. They are not the type of deposits sought by thrift institutions. Excluding time deposits, all savings accounts, no matter what called, should be channeled into long-term investments, and that should be done by law and regulation if necessary.

The commercial bankers should be your allies and not your opponents, not only as to the principle of this legislation but also in your fight for an extension of branches within the State of New York.

If I were the biggest and most important customer of any business enterprise that was opposing my just demands for the privilege to expand and broaden my service, I would find someone who would appreciate my trade and not try to destroy it or to limit it. In my opinion, savings banks, certainly in New York State, are the biggest, the best, and the most important customers of the commercial banks. If I were a savings banker I wouldn't do business with any commercial banker who wouldn't commit himself in writing to furthering my proper objectives which, as to the savings banks, is delineated by statute to the service of the public.

---

## John V. Riffe

---

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 14, 1958*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the day the Congress reconvened a great and good friend of many

Members of this House as well as of hundreds of thousands of American workers passed to his eternal reward. I refer to John V. Riffe, miners' and steelworkers' union leader and the last executive vice president of the CIO before its merger with the AFL, who died in Arlington, Va., at the age of 53 after a long illness.

Along with President David J. McDonald and a large group of steelworkers and AFL–CIO officials, the pallbearers at the services here in Washington included Senator H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Vice President Merrill Meigs, of the Hearst Corp.; Charles P. Howard, the attorney; and Mr. Riffe's physician, Dr. Harold Johnson, of Howard University.

A message from President George Meany and Secretary Treasurer William Schnitzler of the AFL–CIO, which was read at the service said:

Throughout his lifetime, John Riffe served the cause of trade unionism with devotion and understanding. He was a true humanitarian.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON wrote to Mrs. Riffe:

I greatly enjoyed John's friendship and it was a pleasure to work with him.

Born in Kentucky in 1904, John Riffe was a coal miner at 14 and secretary of his local union at 16, rising in responsibility in the United Mine Workers of America until John L. Lewis, the late Philip Murray, and others undertook the organization of the Nation's steelworkers. When he came to my State of California almost two decades ago as west coast director of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, he already had shown himself an able and determined organizer and negotiator for the men he represented.

It is inspiring to follow his subsequent career and see how these abilities deepened and widened, and the range of his effectiveness and service extended from his family and immediate associates to the Nation and the world. It was in California in 1940, on the introduction of Philip Murray, that Mr. Riffe met people active in the force of Moral Re-Armament. As was said at his funeral by Vice President William Grogan of the Transport Workers Union:

John Riffe found new effectiveness in his work as a trade-union leader after his meeting with Dr. Frank Buchman, initiator of Moral Re-Armament. He learned from Buchman the terrific power of an apology. Nobody could withstand his humility, which came from not thinking about himself at all. John Riffe lived for the whole world. He knew that men needed more than better working conditions and wages. They needed something for the heart.

The aims that John Riffe set for American labor were, in his own words:

1. To set the pace for unity in the Nation by achieving unity within its own house.

2. To create with industry a pattern of teamwork that will sell democracy to the millions.

3. With the united strength of labor and industry, to back the Government in a foreign policy that will win all nations.

Mr. Riffe's effectiveness in these purposes is movingly demonstrated in the messages received by his family, not only from the representatives of tens of millions of workers, but from persons of every walk of life in every corner of the world. In the midst of confusion at home and not a little unpopularity abroad, they reveal the kind of American leadership to which people everywhere respond. As the leaders of 5 million Japanese workers cabled, "Through him we have seen the new America."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the following selection of these messages about John V. Riffe, as a tribute to this truly great American and an inspiration to us all:

JOHN V. RIFFE—EXCERPTS FROM MESSAGES

Please accept our deepest sympathies on the death of your husband. Throughout his lifetime John Riffe served the cause of trade unionism with devotion and understanding. He was a true humanitarian and a fine man. We shall miss his warm friendship. (George Meany, president, AFL–CIO; William Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer.)

John Riffe has dedicated his life to the American labor movement. Countless thousands of American workers today have a greater feeling of human dignity and self-respect thanks to the untiring and unselfish efforts of your husband. In steel plants, in the South, and wherever he went he will always be remembered as a true friend. We of the industrial union department will miss his wise guidance and warm companionship. (Walter P. Reuther, president, industrial union department, AFL–CIO; former president, CIO; James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer; Al Whitehouse, director.)

The national officers, executive board members, and local union presidents of the United Steelworkers of America extend to you and your family our deepest sympathy in your great bereavement in the loss of your husband and our fellow coworker. (David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America, vice president, AFL–CIO.)

Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints. John lives—he lives in all the past. He lives, nor to the last of seeing him again will I despair. In dreams I see him now and upon his angel brow I see it writ, "Thou shall meet me there."

We are stepping into an age when all men are equal. That is God's gift. John lived it. (Frank N. D. Buchman.)

I greatly enjoyed John's friendship and it was a pleasure to work with him. * * * You may be sure our thoughts and prayers are with you and yours. (RICHARD M. NIXON.)

As a leader of organized labor for most of his life he contributed much to the social and economic advance of working people in America and throughout the world. He will be missed by the men and women he served so well but the results of his work, as reflected in their better and richer lives, will serve as a living memorial to him. (James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor.)

The country has lost a great man and labor its finest disciple. I will arrange for a thousand masses to the repose of his magnificent soul. (Eddie Dowling, Broadway actor-producer.)

This is John's crowning experience. He is a living force with us. (Muriel Smith, Ann Hartman, stars of Broadway and London, now playing in the MRA musical The Crowning Experience.)

His passing constitutes a great personal loss to you and to your family, and to his many associates in the labor movement. (John L. Lewis, international president, United Mine Workers of America.)

In the name of the officers and members of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, I wish to extend condolences to you and the bereaved family upon the passing of your dear husband and our beloved brother. (A. Philip Randolph, international president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, vice president, AFL–CIO.)

Your husband's contribution to the progress of organized labor will remain forever an example of self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of working men and women. His life from his earliest days with the mine workers through his participation in the founding of the United Steelworkers and his efforts in bringing the benefits of organized labor into the South, has indebted all of us to him. To us in the TWU your husband will always be remembered for his forthright and wise counsel, his outstanding leadership, and his unshakable integrity and adherence to principle. We mourn the loss of a great pioneer in American labor and a friend. (Michael J. Quill, international president, Transport Workers Union of America; Matthew Guinan, international secretary-treasurer; Frank Sheehan, director of organization.)

His contribution to the trade-union movement is beyond measure. His name will live in the hearts and memories of working people in our union, along with those of hundreds of others. His fame will be legend wherever working men and women meet in union halls through all the years to come. (O. A. Knight, president, Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers; vice president, AFL–CIO; T. H. McCormick, secretary-treasurer; B. J. Schafer, vice president; Elwood D. Swisher, vice president.)

John was a fabulous character. His name will be mentioned often through the years. He lived by the MRA precept of not who is right but what is right. With God's guidance John's fairness, courage and influence have undoubtedly done more to stabilize labor and management relations than any individual since Gompers. I have lost one of my dearest and most respected friends. (Merrill C. Meigs, vice president, Hearst Corp.)

Your message reached me only today. I am so sorry; my very deepest sympathy to you and your family. You and your children have the memory and heritage of a great and fine man. I regret that circumstances will not permit me to attend the services tomorrow, but I know you will have many warm-hearted friends with you. (W. Stewart Woodfill, owner-manager, the Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, Mich.)

We respond to the challenge of John Riffe's all-out fight that labor become instrumental in uniting home, industry, Nation, and all men. We want to back this with our living from Mackinac Island to the world. (John Markstrom, job steward, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local 46; Lloyd Wagner, job steward, United Association of Plumbers and Fitters, Local 635, Sault St. Marie, Mich.; all workers building the Moral Re-Armament center at Mackinac Island, Mich.)

John made an outstanding contribution to the welfare of his fellow man. (Donald MacDonald, secretary treasurer, Canadian Labor Congress.)

Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers, ORIT, mourns death of great colleague John Riffe and sends deepest sympathy to you and children in this hour of grief. (Luis Alberto Monge, secretary general, ORIT, Latin American section of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.)

Through him we have seen the new America. (Iwai, secretary general, Sohyo Federation of Labor, 3 million workers; Takita, president, Zenro Federation of Labor, 2 million workers; Yamamura, national chairman, Telephone and Telegraph Workers Union; Yanagisawa, national president, Shipyard Workers Union; Fukuda, chairman, Film and Stage Workers; Nishimaki, member, executive board for Asia, ICFTU, also international representative for the Seamen's Union; Senator

Suzuki, Communication Workers Union; Senator Shidzue Kato; Hon. Kanju Kato, former minister of labor.)

Korean friends honor John Riffe's statesmanship as an American and labor leader. Pledge themselves to live his quality of life. (Gen. Choi Yung Duk, founder of the Korean Air Force; Mrs. Park Hyun Sook, former cabinet minister; Congressman Yoon Sung Soon, chairman, national assembly foreign relations committee; Congressman Chun Choon; Peter Kook Chan Cha, Federation of Korean Trade Unions.)

Profound gratitude John Riffe's dedicated fight for workers America and whole world, especially for inspiration he and family have given us in France. (Maurice Mercier, secretary of the Textile Workers Union, Force Ouvriere; Mme. Mercier; Victor Laure, Seamen's Union, Marseille; Mme. Irene Laure, former president of the 3 million Socialist women of France.)

We Indian trade union and Socialist leaders are deeply grateful to John Riffe for his stand for moral values and international unity in an age when corruption and division threaten human existence. He has given a new orientation to the labor movement, away from dead-end materialistic philosophies toward the sure road of moral revolution. The new type of man he pioneered will build the new society he longed for and we dedicate ourselves to that task. Our sympathies and affection unite us of the East with you and your family at this time. (Shastri, former general secretary, Hind Mazdoor Sabha (Socialist Federation of Labor); Sibnath Banerjee, president, Hind Mazdoor Sabha, West Bengal; Satya Banerjee, vice president, Hind Mazdoor Sabha, West Bengal; Tripathi, deputy speaker of the assembly, Uttar Pradesh; Shukla, chairman, Socialist Party of Uttar Pradesh; Gopinath Singh, M. P., general council, Indian National Trade Union Congress; Narasinga Rao, vice president, National Dockworkers Union; Bhargava, vice president, Uttar Pradesh, INTUC; Anandhan, president, Southern Railway Employees Union; Thirumalaya, general secretary, Estates Staffs Union, South India; Fernandez, president, Bombay Municipal Workers; Tilak, vice president, Scindia Staffs Union; Bugwadia, general secretary, Union of Bank Employees.)

The Philippine Transport Workers Organization grieves at the passing of John, a great labor leader. To you and your kin our deepest sympathies. (Roberto Oca, president, Philippine Transport Workers Union.)

With great sorrow we join you in your bereavement. He has been a beacon light to a better way of life, a life that has illumined and affected us in this part of the world which is felt now and transmitted to generations to come. May he rest in peace and glory in the fact that he has helped to make this world better than he found it. (Senator and Mrs. Roseller T. Lim; Maj. and Mrs. Agerico Palaypay, chief aide to President Garcia; Dr. and Mrs. Aureo Gutierrez, dean, medical college, Far Eastern University (she was a founder of the university); Mr. and Mrs. Eusebio, former head of the Manila police, personnel office; Mr. and Mrs. Buhain, projects editor, the Manila Times; Mr. and Mrs. Dante Calma, office of the president; Mr. and Mrs. Papa.)

His steadfast acceptance of and holding to God's guidance and absolute standards for his life were a turning point in our thinking. The workers of the world have learned through his life to build unity wherever men are divided. (Bladeck, Dikus, Hartung, Herrig, Heske, Kurowski, Stein, Stoffmehl, Wegerhoff, Wessoleck, miners and union officers from the Ruhr in Germany, including eight former Communist leaders.)

John's fight for labor unity and men's true destiny will inspire many. (Aron, Erik, Gunnar, Per, Sven, mineworkers' leaders of the Swedish iron-ore mines.)

We Swedish trade unionists pledge ourselves to continue to fight for freedom and righteousness for which you gave your life. (Gustav Dahlstroem, Helge Jansson, Alf Soederlund, John Soederlund, Sigfrid Wikstroem, leaders of the metalworkers and transport workers of Sweden.)

We British workers grateful John's unselfish leadership which has won hearts workers everywhere and will ever remain an inspiration. In age of division he has shown us our true destiny to live ideology which can unite world. (Getgood, Vaughan, Lewis, Howard, Colclough, Pate, Feather, Walker, Grant, Keep, Johnson, Moncrieff, Goodwin, Svarth, trade-union leaders from the British, Welsh, and Irish coalfields, textile factories, steel mills, and docks.)

Salute passing of faithful comrade who found true destiny not as cog in machine, not as puppet under dictatorship of right or left, but as a son of God in teamwork of the free. (Sadie Patterson, textile workers organizer; treasurer, North Ireland Labor Party.)

Italian union men participate from their hearts in the bereavement of the family and of the Italian working class. United in his ideals common to all of us. (Ascari, national secretary, Textile Workers Union; Fossati; Quaglia, national secretary, Chemical Workers Union; Magni, union representative, Falck Steelworkers, Sesto San Giovanni; Tertulliani; Vigiani, senator, Christian Democrat; Rossi, newspaper editor, Sesto San Giovanni.)

We extend deepest sympathy to you and your family at this time of great loss. We are grateful for the shining example of John's life. The American labor movement loses a great man who was a source of inspiration to labor leaders around the world. We in Nigeria commit ourselves to fight for the fulfillment of his vision of labor setting the pace for unity in the nations. (Nwada and Lewis Agonsi, secretary, Railway Technical Staffs Association; Onumara Egwunwoke, secretary, Marine Floating Staffs Union; N. A. Cole, secretary, Nigerian Nurses Union; Joy Amata.)

Much gratitude for what John selflessly gave America, Asia, and Africa and all nations. We stand shoulder to shoulder in the eternal fight. (Samuriwo, president of the Southern Rhodesia African Association; Chigomah, welfare officer; Kajama; Chief Mangwende.)

With gratitude we honor the man whose selfless fight in matters of labor culminated in the historic merger of AFL and CIO. He gave us and all trade unionists in the world a glorious example of how to fight. (Otto Cadegg, national secretary, Swiss Railway Workers Union; Eduard Keucher, secretary, Transport and Food Workers, Schaffhausen.)

John's passing will be a great loss to labor and management. The torch righteous which he laid down shall be picked up by leaders of labor all over the world. Irene and I reaffirm our pledge to fight with you for what is right in American labor. (Irene and Bill Schaffer, Operating Engineers Local 12; former president, Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, Local 42.)

John's valiant fight for what is right and his daily living out the moral precepts he talked about will profoundly affect everyone whose life he has touched. His obedience to the will of God even in what seemed life's darkest hour will serve as a beacon light to guide his footsteps homeward. (Isabelle and Sam Graham, business executive, Greenwich, Conn.)

---

Among the hundreds of others who sent messages and tributes were the following: Senator Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Congressman George P. Miller, of California; Congressman George M. Rhodes, of Pennsylvania; Congressman John Blatnik, of Minnesota; Congresswoman Elizabeth Kee, of West Virginia; former Congressman Charles B. Deane, of North Carolina.

Six other AFL–CIO vice presidents: President Joseph Beirne, of the Communication Workers of America; President A. J. Hayes, of the International Association of Machinists; President Joseph Curran, of the National Maritime Union; President L. S. Buckmaster, of the United Rubber Workers; Chairman Emil Rieve, of the Textile Workers Union of America; Secretary-Treasurer Joseph D. Keenan, of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Many other officers, staff representatives, and members of the AFL–CIO and affiliated national and local unions, including the steelworkers, automobile workers, brewery workers, carpenters, clothing workers, furniture workers, glass and ceramic workers, marine engineers, marine and shipbuilding workers, retail, wholesale, and department store employees, shoe workers, textile workers, transport workers, typographical union, utility workers, and woodworkers.

G. T. Baker, president of National Airlines.

Mrs. Van A. Bittner.

Mrs. John Alden Carpenter.

Mrs. Milton Durlach.

Mrs. Emily Vanderbilt Hammond.

Mrs. W. W. Manning.

Mr. and Mrs. L. Parks Shipley, partner, Brown Brothers Harriman, Wall Street.

Mrs. James G. Thimmes.

A group of seven undergraduates at Princeton University.

The personnel directors of Canadian General Electric Co. and Shell Oil Co.

Mr. James Dickson, chamberlain to the King of Sweden.

Robert Carmichael, president of the Jute Industry of Europe.

Maori leaders from New Zealand.

Members of Parliament from Britain, Sweden, and Ghana.

---

## Integration and Its Ultimate Effect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 14, 1958*

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable H. Ralph Burton has just completed a treatise on the problem of communism and the drive toward public school integration in this Nation. A student of communism, its origins, history, and aspirations, Mr. Burton brings a scholarly appraisal of the existing threat.

It is significant that this subject has attracted Mr. Burton's study and inquiry, for as a leading attorney and investigator for the Government, he has achieved an outstanding record that makes definite and authoritative his dissertation.

Mr. Burton is a patriot in the truest sense of the word, and his analysis of the Communist conspiracy is full, complete, and timely. His treatment of the overall subject matter is skillful, and it is hoped that the membership of the Congress will see fit to read this learned and outstanding document carefully.

It has been my distinct pleasure on two occasions in past years to work with Ralph Burton. His services as general counsel of the Committee on Military

Affairs during the war years was superb. He discharged his duties with dispatch, zeal, and determination. I am reminded of the statement made of Mr. Burton by Representative E. E. Cox, of Georgia, in his speech in the House on February 26, 1946. Among other things he said:

During the last 5 years, H. Ralph Burton has been general counsel for the Military Affairs Committee, and director of the investigations of the war effort. Many things have been accomplished by the committee. Thousands of lives have been saved by the improvement in the fueling system of airplanes resulting from the investigations and recommendations of the committee. * * * The House Military Affairs Committee Report No. 839, 79th Congress, contains the most complete account of the plans of the Communists to sabotage the United States Army that has been prepared and this was done under his direction. Not an item therein has ever been challenged.

I was a member of that committee during a great part of that time, and I subscribe fully to Judge Cox's estimate of Mr. Burton.

For Ralph Burton had already achieved a fine reputation as a scholar, an investigator, and as a counsel for Congressional committees. Following his education in the George Washington University and the Georgetown University, Mr. Burton was associated in legal practice with the Honorable John G. Carlisle, formerly Secretary of the Treasury, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Senator from Kentucky. Mr. Burton became a member of the bars of the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and a member of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. He is a founder and life member of the National Press Club.

Starting in 1938 his talents were utilized as a special investigator for two Senate committees and by the House Appropriations Committee. As an investigator for the House Appropriations Committee he came again and again across the trail of the Communist conspiracy. Thousands of Communists and fellow travelers throughout the United States were eliminated from the Federal payroll at considerable savings. He fought Communists who were then working in positions that gave them valuable information on plans and specifications for municipal utilities in and around New York City.

In 1941 Ralph Burton became general counsel for the House Military Affairs Committee and following this service was connected with the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the House Campaign Expenditures Committee during 1948 and 1949, and in 1952 and 1953 he was general counsel for the House Select Committee on Current Pornographic Materials.

In each of these positions, Ralph Burton brought a legal and a scholarly mind to bear. His approach was to get the facts, all of the information, and to present it clearly and concisely.

He has followed this procedure in the article which follows. Mr. Burton's contribution is worthy of studious consideration:

INTEGRATION AND ITS ULTIMATE EFFECT

(By H. Ralph Burton)

Although this article represents a blunt departure from the usual manner of bringing attention to a situation, I believe that the facts I will present are serious enough to warrant such frankness, even as to the members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Communism has long been a principal subject of intensive research on my part. For many years, I have applied myself toward comprehending its many tenets, practices, and plans. Particularly significant are its methods of systematically weakening a victim marked for destruction, often covering a long period of years.

COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY TO CREATE NEGRO REPUBLIC IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Anyone who has any doubt whatever that our country is foremost among the intended victims of communism will be interested in knowing that, without cessation since 1928, extensive and diabolical plans have existed for creating in the United States a situation which would eventually result in its becoming an easy victim of aggression on the part of Soviet Russia and its allies. Communist forces base their scheme on their belief that there exists in the United States an outstanding potential for internal conflict. They believe that this, if founded upon a strong basis, could be developed to ultimate success from the Communist point of view.

Soviet Russia, therefore, chose a subject of controversy which, if left alone for the course of time to adjust, would have ultimately solved itself and which already showed the signs of friendly solution. That is the interrelationships between the races, white and Negro, particularly in the South. As an illustration of Communist plans to utilize slumbering antagonisms requiring only the pertinent propaganda and financing which they were prepared to furnish in extenso even though success would require the period of many years, there follows a quotation from a speech by Comrade Jones, Communist member from the United States of America, who spoke following the opening speech by Bukharin before the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International in the hall of the Trade Union House, Moscow, July 17, 1928:

"Comrades, the draft theses on the colonial question are by far the most thorough theses in point of detail that we have had up to now on this question. * * * We organized here at the congress a small subcommittee of the Anglo-American secretariat which dealt with the Negro question in America. This commission has done a considerable amount of work, which, of course, is by no means complete, but the first steps were made for a real investigation of this question. In this commission there arose some sharp differences as to the character of the Negro movement in the United States. One point of view is that these Negroes are a racial minority but are developing some characteristics of a national minority and that in the future they will have to be considered as a national minority. The other point of view is that these Negroes are a racial minority and are not developing any characteristics of a national minority and that the basis that they would develop these characteristics is rapidly disappearing, that there exists no national entity as such among the American Negroes. * * * The historical development of the American Negro has tended to create in him the desire to be considered a part of the American Nation. There are no tendencies to become a separate national minority within the American Nation. I have material on this which will be submitted to the colonial commission, in support of our disagreement, together with the theses drawn up by the Negro commission.

"This is a very important question and deserves careful study before any definite steps are taken in drawing up a program or advancing slogans for our work among the American Negroes. Some comrades consider it necessary at this moment to launch this slogan of self-determination for the American Negroes; to advocate an independent Soviet Socialist Republic in America for Negroes. There is no objection on our part on the principle of a Soviet Republic for Negroes in America. The point we are concerned with here is how to organize these Negroes at present on the basis of everyday needs for the revolution. The question before the Negroes today is not what will be done with them after the revolution, but what measures are we going to take to alleviate their present condition in America.

"We have to adopt a program that will take care of their immediate needs; of course, keeping in mind the necessity for organizing the revolution. * * * It is not so much the question of a new program but of carrying out the program that was adopted by the fourth and fifth congresses on this question. Up to now nothing has been done. The central slogan around which we can rally the Negro masses is the slogan of social equality. And the reason why we have not organized the Negroes in America and why we have such a small number of Negroes in our party is because we have not fought consistently for this principle."

It can, therefore, be readily seen that, as early as the fourth and fifth congresses of the Communist International preceding the one from which the above quotation is taken, plans were in formation for organizing the Negroes in America to demand equality, not only legally but also socially, holding out to them the possibility of establishing a Soviet republic for Negroes in America.

Immediately after Russia had been taken over by Lenin and his followers beginning on the 17th of November 1917, it was recognized by Lenin that one of the first and foremost objectives to be included in the Communist program of world control was the eventual subjugation of the United States of America and to that end he left nothing undone. It is not necessary to dwell upon developments toward consummation of the ultimate objectives of subjugation of the United States, except to say that it became one of the outstanding objectives of Soviet Russia. Recognizing that success of this plan could not be allowed to rest upon the pursuit of one course of action, Soviet Russia selected the agitation of the Negro in the United States, holding out the promise of not only legal but social equality and, to the more ambitious, the possibility of an independent Negro republic south of the Mason and Dixon line. A corollary objective of Soviet Russia was bankruptcy of the United States through instigating higher wages, to increase the cost of production particularly relating to national defense, and other phases of industry. It is to be recalled that Lenin said: "We shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction" (Reader's Digest, December 1949).

A third objective, which has to a large degree been successfully pursued, involved stimulating political liberals to make such demands of government as would create havoc—politically, financially, and socially.

Not very long after Comrade Jones submitted his views and plans before the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International in July of 1928, a plan was developed and put into action to bring to Russia groups of white and colored citizens of the United States who had yielded to the propaganda of the Communists, to train them as leaders of the planned revolution in the South.

Just how this plan operated can best be described by testimony which was given before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, 77th Congress, 1st session, by Charles H. White, an extremely intelligent Negro who, at the time he gave his testimony, was employed in the writer's project of the WPA in New York City. (I can personally vouch for the authenticity of this testimony because, at the time it was given, I was in charge of the investigations in the city of New York and State of New York of the Works Progress Administration, which continued for more than a year, and, after taking the affidavit of Charles White substantially corroborated all that he had to say by the affidavits of other Negroes who, like Charles White, had awakened to the real purpose of the Communists to use the Negro of the United States as a tool in the development of their plans.

Quotations from Charles White's testimony follow:

"Question. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party, Mr. White?

"Answer. Yes; I was from 1930 to 1936 inclusive.

"Question. Did you ever take a trip to Russia at the expense at the Communist Party?

"Answer. Yes; in 1930 and 1931, including a part of 1932.

"Question. Who paid your expenses for this trip?

"Answer. I was sent abroad by the Communist Party of the United States, district No. 6 of which Herbert Benjamin was then party secretary.

"Question. What did you do while you were in Russia on this trip?

"Answer. Well, I studied at the College of Professional Communists.

"Question. What did they teach you at that time?

"Answer. The course covered a number of topics, some of them dealing with labor problems and some other problems. The labor problems topics included such things as Marxism, Stalinism, and Leninism, a history of the Communist Party, of the Soviet Union, a history of the American labor movement, a book by Foster on Soviet America. * * *

"Question. Were you taught how to ride a horse while you were in Russia?

"Answer. Yes, there was a course in military strategy and tactics.

"Question. What was the type of instruction given you and what was explained as the purpose of the instruction?

"Answer. Practically the whole time I was there, for about 18 months, I was with about 100 other Americans who were there for the same purpose, and we were instructed in sharpshooting classes, and taught the handling and manipulation of rapid-fire machineguns, how to construct the various barricades in street fighting, defending public squares, taking public buildings, and how to destroy the tank, that is, the military tank, and horseback riding, and secret coding.

"Question. Getting back to Russia again, what was explained to you as the program of the Communist Party insofar as colored people were concerned, and the Black Belt in the United States?

"Answer. The program of the Communist Party for the Negroes was said to be self-determination in the Black Belt.

"Generally speaking, that means the Cotton Belt where most of the Negro slaves lived when they were brought to the States and where they are concentrated heavily.

"This belt was supposed to be separated from the United States in time as an independent black republic under the domination of the Communist Commissars, who, in theory, were supposed to have power over them.

"Question. Did you receive pay for the entire period from the Communist Party for the work that you did?

"Answer. There was no real salary to speak of. All of my expenses were paid, and with the exception of the trip abroad, the investment was modest. The trip abroad must have cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $5,000 because I traveled throughout the country in Russia.

"Question. You say there were about 100 in the party that proceeded to Russia?

"Answer. Yes, sir; that went with me.

"Question. Were you given instructions about the secrecy that should be maintained concerning this trip to Russia?

"Answer. Yes, sir; we were told that we were to have our names changed and that we were to keep away from Americans or foreigners generally in the capital, Moscow; that no one was to know our destination or purpose for leaving the United States.

* * * * *

"Question (page 1039). Mr. White, what activated you originally in becoming a member of the Communist Party?

"Answer. The stated purposes in the form of popular propaganda about better conditions, and for equal opportunities for Negroes, for unemployment relief, etc. All of those things played their role.

"Question. Did you have some difficulties which caused you, perhaps, to view things in a bad light?

"Answer. My mother was a widow. The propaganda was made to order, as far as I was concerned, because it appealed to my ambitions to get social security and opportunities; therefore, I was a fit subject for this propaganda. It is designed for all people commonly affected in the way I was.

"Question. What caused you to sever your connections with the Communist Party?

"Answer. The contradictions between the stated purposes and the actual acts of the Communist Party. I learned in time that the party really intended to exploit these conditions to get state power and that outside of that there was nothing else that they were interested in. I recall the words of Frederick Douglas who rejected the office of communism early in the 1800's because they tried to do the same things. During my study of the problem, I decided it was the same horse of a different color and with a slightly different approach. I felt that it was another minority group reaching for power over the corpses of a lot of people, and offering nothing in return but a blood bath, because they had nothing to offer.

"Question. * * * you have stated that the reason that you left the Communist Party was because you became convinced that it was not performing the function which it held out to the colored people of America, and I wonder if you would elaborate on that from the standpoint of what you have found in connection with your work with the colored people?

"Answer. Yes, sir. I would like to amend a previous statement I made, or to supplement it. I did not mean that the whole program of the Communist Party was ever accepted by me. I was all ready to study it and finally to accept it. They were trying to have me accept it. The part that was popular was presented as a front face, and that is the part they always present as the program. They always inject a part that is foreign to the average American mind. However, I felt that the activities of the Communist Party among the Negroes constituted an intensification of whatever exploitation existed among them prior to their entrance into this field. I do not look at it as something that was of any aid to them. I felt that it was a matter of riding on the backs of the Negroes to where they wanted to go, and in their activities I think they brought that out."

According to George Hewitt, who was in the first contingent of Negro students and who renounced communism in 1944, "the Communist Party was very careful in selecting those Negroes who would bow to every wish of the leaders." But, he adds, "they displayed grave underestimation of the majority of those Negroes whom they hoped to groom as future Marxian 'Uncle Toms.'"

This plan also ran into difficulties because of certain occurrences while these "Americans" were engaged in taking the course prescribed for them in Russia, when one of the white Communists from the United States, who at home had been ranting about discrimination, wanted the Negroes to meet the Russians on a socially equal plane. No colored student could walk on the street with a Russian girl or visit any place outside the school unless a white comrade accompanied him.

Those who remained converted to communism, and who were ready to pursue the course outlined by the Communists, returned home to find a devilish opportunity for the Communists to get their Negro program underway. In the case of the Scottsboro boys the party saw a cause made to order for its tactics. When the nine youths were convicted and sentenced, Communist agents persuaded the boys' parents to sign over the conduct of the case to the International Labor Defense (ILD), a Communist-front organization. Demonstrations were held all over the United States and the world, and the Communists enjoyed a propaganda and fund-raising holiday. It was offered as the proof that only self-determination for the Black Belt could solve the Negroes' problems. The ILD's legal stupidities were indicative of the Communist desire not to win the case—at least, not until they had milked it dry.

It has been alleged by fully responsible persons that $250,000 had been collected up to that time, although the ILD put the figure at $125,000, and the known expenditures came to only a small fraction of even a lesser sum. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that whatever balance was left (and it must have been a very substantial fund) was used for the purpose of financing Communist projects not related to the case.

Another example of Communi t ballyhoo is of interest. It involves the case of Angelo Herndon, who had been freed from a Georgia chain-gang sentence by a Supreme Court decision. He was met by a Communist delegation when he arrived in New York. He overheard one of the Communist greeters complaining, "It's a pity he isn't blacker." Herndon's light color made him less useful to the party as a Negro martyr.

Harold Williams, a Negro who had joined the Communist Party in the early 1920's, said, in renouncing the party 18 years later in an interview with the Pittsburgh Courier (March 18, 1939):

"The Communist Party is losing weight because it defends the Negro only when it becomes expedient to do so. * * * Prodigious efforts were made by the party heads to find jobs for white Communists while Negro comrades walked the streets without money for bread. So many Negroes have quit the party in disgust that the loss of colored membership in the past year has been over 79 percent. * * * The Negroes have found out that white Communists are just white folks after all and they are definitely through."

A Negro organizer, Mrs. Frankie Duty, on resigning from the party was quoted by the New York Amsterdam News as follows:

"I resigned because I want freedom of speech and action, neither of which is permitted in the Communist Party. * * * Because I questioned them (the Communists), they did all they could to sabotage my work in the alliance."

The reference was to the Workers Alliance, which she characterized as "only a Communist racket." (I can definitely verify this because, while conducting investigations in New York City and State, as previously mentioned, I took the affidavit of Mrs. Frankie Duty; it can be found among the records of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.)

Although numerous additional examples of desertion from Communist cells could be cited whenever needed, I believe that sufficient has been said to convince the reader that the Communist Party had failed in its effort to convert Negroes to the Communist cause, which the Communists recognize, thus requiring an entirely new approach. They by no means abandoned their plan to create a conflict between the white and Negro races in the United States, in which they have already partially succeeded.

It can, therefore, be seen that this plan did not offer to the Communists prospects for success due to the expense, the slowness with which it was proceeding, and the defection of many of those who participated in the effort to develop a nucleus of trained revolutionary propaganda leaders. Charles White awoke to the real situation and, in so doing, paralleled others in the same category. It became apparent that this presented a weakness in the plan which had been developed, requiring a change in procedure to permit a more rapid and comprehensive development of Negro discontent and ambition for more complete integration of the white and Negro races.

It should be very definitely understood at this point that absolutely nothing in my statements should be construed as an accusation involving Communist sympathies or ideologies on the part of those who have been unconsciously used as transmission belts for, or who actually became members of, the Communist Party. But, at the same time, it should be remembered that never in the history of the world has there been developed such a diabolical, relentless, and at the same time highly developed system for physical and mental destruction as that devised by the Communists in over 150 years of activity.

Soviet Russia, operating through the Communist international and its subordinate groups, recognized how susceptible some Americans are to any plan embracing the acquisition of votes, of the competition for financial success on the part of practically everyone, and the latent ambition of the Negro to participate in all, and particularly the social, activities of the white citizen. It did not require a great deal of effort on their part to inspire cooperation on the part of the so-called liberal to clamor for the rights of Negroes, through a civil-rights bill or otherwise, with a view to gaining the Negro vote, both locally and nationally; nor did it require any greater effort to stimulate the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (known as the NAACP). Thus, parallel to each other we have those seeking votes from the Negroes of the South and the NAACP, which has undoubtedly become one of the most expert agitation groups that the United States has ever seen.

NAACP criticizes others for agitating against the integration of schools, public conveyances, hotels, public pools, and the like, but there is no organization operating in the United States equal to the NAACP in constantly creating friction between the two races, agitation apparently being its principal weapon, in which type of activity it is excelled only by the Communist Party.

Agents of the Communist International had erroneously believed, during the early years of their efforts, that educated Negroes would be less susceptible to Communist propaganda and, hence, less instrumental in their despicable plans, but eventually they discovered that many of the Negro careerists were easily drafted to this Communist cause. Today, the major Communist effort is centered among such people.

They found their objectives being promoted to a considerable degree by activities on the part of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, an organization controlled by ambitious, educated Negroes, dedicated to agitating within the Negro race for equalization, both legal and social. Among its numerous members could be found a number already listed among those in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee as affiliated or sympathetic with the cause of communism and, although there is lacking in documentary form proof of actual cooperation, it is not difficult to deduct from events which have taken place a clear picture of the pattern followed.

Further detailed data concerning numerous members of this association are set forth in a statement appearing on page 2805 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated February 23, 1956, by Hon. E. C. Gathings, of Arkansas. Careful reading of this should leave no doubt about the group being a logical one to be approached with the objective in view. Quotations from this appear herein later.

Despite every contrary assertion by those in charge of activities in May of 1957, when the thousands of Negroes assembled in Washington for the stated purpose of impressing Congress with the need of civil-rights legislation (referred to as a prayer pilgrimage), there was among the chairmen and speakers at least one individual whose Communist leanings and comments are a matter of public record for over 30 years. It is difficult to understand indifference to this by the then Attorney General Brownell, since his files contained ample evidence of this. There is also a complete record in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives, among which is a photostatic copy of the masthead of The Messenger showing this cochairman, A. Philip Randolph, to have been the editor, and both the press and radio repeatedly referred to the absence of anything of such a nature in that group. A. Philip Randolph has served as a vice president, and is an important member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

During the 1920's, Mr. Randolph edited a Negro magazine entitled "The Messenger," which had a wide circulation. Following are excerpts from original copies:

"THE MARCH OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

"Still it continues. The cosmic trend of the Soviet Government with ceaseless step claims another nation. Russia and Germany have yielded to its human touch and now Hungary joins the peoples' form of rule. Italy is standing upon a solid volcano. France is seething with social unrest. The triple alliance of Great Britain—the railroad, transport, and mine workers—threaten to overthrow the economic and political Bourvivism of Merry Old England. The red tide of socialism sweeps on in America. South America is in the throes of revolution.

"Soviet Government proceeds apace. It bids fair to sweep over the whole world. The sooner the better. On with the dance." (The Messenger, May-June 1919.)

* * * * * *

"WE WANT MORE BOLSHEVIK PATRIOTISM

"We want a patriotism represented by a flag so red that it symbolizes truly its oneness of blood running through each one's veins. We want more patriotism that surges with turbulent unrest while men—black and white—are lynched in this land. * * * We want no black and white patriotism, which demands separate camps, separate ships, and separate oceans to travel on. What we really need is a patriotism of liberty, justice, and joy. That is Bolshevik patriotism, and we want more of that brand in the United States." (From The Messenger, May-June 1919—included in the United States Department of Justice report of "persons advising anarchy, sedition, and the forcible overthrow of the Government.")

* * * * * *

"You next take to task the editors of The Messenger, A. Philip Randolph and Chandler Owen, for being Bolsheviks. While you are generally adept at distortion of facts and misrepresentation of circumstances, you have not greatly misrepresented us.

"The old order is passing. It is passing in race relations. It is passing in class relations. The old relations are yielding to the magic touch of the new democracy. They struggle to hold their own but are doomed to disappointment.

* * * * * *

"The world of color is stirring. In America, China, India, and Africa, the hearts of the disinherited sons of color yearn for freedom. * * * Tides of nationalism and racialism rise threateningly in the hands of ebon races to throw off their white capitalist oppressors.

"Negroes in the United States and the West Indies are, at an amazingly accelerated rate, glimpsing the meaning of the new freedom." (The Messenger, February 1927.)

"The reviewer ditched this Jesus myth about the same time that he threw Santa Claus overboard; i. e., at the age of eight. * * * Mentally inferior people must worship something or somebody. (George Schuyler in The Messenger, February 1927, p. 44.)

From the Washington Times Herald, June 27, 1948:

"JIM CROWISM FIGHT OPENED AGAINST DRAFT—DISOBEDIENCE DRIVE URGED BY AFL LEADER

"NEW YORK, June 26.—A rebellion against the draft act was launched today by A. Philip Randolph, Negro AFL leader. Determined to fight Jim Crowism in the armed services, he announced a nationwide drive to urge Negroes and whites to refuse to register or be inducted and, if need be, to resort to such trickery as feigning illness and faking dependents.

"It was a daring step, but Randolph was prepared to face the consequences.

"'It may cost me my liberty,' he said, but he added that 'every march forward has cost something.'

"The drive, he said, will get underway throughout the country unless President Truman issues an executive order against segregation before August 16. It will be conducted, he said, by the League for nonViolent Civil Disobedience Against Military Segregation, whose formation he announced.

"The civil disobedience campaign was threatened by Randolph, president of the sleeping car porters union and treasurer of the National Committee Against Jim Crow in Military Service, at a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee in Washington March 3.

"Senators Morse, of Oregon, and Baldwin, of Connecticut, warned that Randolph and his followers would face treason charges if they carried out their threat.

"Field campaigners of the league will start visiting major cities Monday, Randolph said. Adherents subject to the draft registration after August 16 will be urged, he said, to take any of four main courses of action:

"1. Open refusal to register.

"2. Quiet ignoring of registration.

"3. Refusal to be inducted.

"4. Feigning illness, faking dependents, and other subterfuges."

From the Evening Star, June 23, 1948:

"RANDOLPH FORMS LEAGUE TO DISOBEY DRAFT LAW

"NEW YORK, June 26.—A. Philip Randolph, Negro union leader, announced today formation of a league to campaign for noncompliance with the draft unless President

Truman issues an executive order against segregation.

"Mr. Randolph, president of the AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, said the campaign would be waged on a nationwide basis. It will call for a program of nonviolent civil disobedience, he said.

"The Negro union leader said that even though 'It may cost me my liberty' he would urge members of his race and others subject to the draft registration after August 16 to refuse to register or be drafted.

"Mr. Randolph recently expressed similar views at Congressional hearing."

Reference is suggested to a statement with reference to A. Philip Randolph appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 3, page 3215. This is set forth, in part, later in this article, quoting from the statement referred to in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

INTEGRATION DECISION BY UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Comintern agents realized that, to develop a situation which could establish both the basis of impelling obedience and endless controversy backed by the force of law, nothing could be better designed for their purpose than a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States striking at the most sensitive of all questions in the United States, that of integration of the white and Negro races, something that the southern States of the United States could not, and would not, tolerate without endless resistance. That they eventually found this cannot be denied and, with the view of describing the related phases of the integration decision, a part of the speech of Honorable JAMES O. EASTLAND, on the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Brown et al.* v. *Board of Education of Topeka et al.*, and four related cases, is herewith quoted:

"Today, I am calling upon the Members of the Senate to consider an even more serious problem. The Court has not only arrogated to itself powers which were not delegated to it under the Constitution of the United States and has entered the fields of the legislative and executive branches of the Government, but they are attempting to graft into the organic law of the land the teachings, preachments, and social doctrines arising from a political philosophy which is the antithesis of the principles upon which this Government was founded. The origin of the doctrines can be traced to Karl Marx, and their propagation is part and parcel of the conspiracy to divide and destroy this Government through internal controversy. The Court adopts this propaganda as modern scientific authority.

* * * * *

"What the bar and the people of the United States are slow to realize is that in the rendition of the opinion on the school segregation cases the entire basis of American jurisprudence was swept away. There is only one other comparable system of jurisprudence which is based upon the winds of vacillating, political, and pseudo-scientific opinion—the Peoples Courts of Soviet Russia. In that vast vacuum of liberty, the basis of their jurisprudence is the vacillating, ever-changing winds of pseudo authority. And that today is the basis of American jurisprudence as announced by a unanimous opinion of our Supreme Court.

"SUPREME COURT ADMITS INCOMPETENCE

"Justice Frankfurter handed down an opinion as late as April 28, 1952, with the concurrence of Chief Justice Vinson and Justices Burton, Minton, and Clark, in which he absolutely denied the competence of the Court to pass upon issues such as those presented in the segregation cases. He said:

" 'Only those lacking responsible humility will have a confident solution for problems as intractable as the frictions attributable to differences of race, color, or religion. * * * Certainly the due-process clause does not require the legislature to be in the vanguard of science—especially sciences as young as human sociology and cultural anthropology. * * *

" 'It is not within our competence to confirm or deny claims of social scientists as to the dependence of the individual on the position of his racial or religious group in the community'."

Senator EASTLAND continued:

"The Supreme Court, unable to relate science to the fifth amendment, has done an unheard of thing. It has now found scientific authorities to attempt to sustain its view of what the 14th amendment should mean. Who are these authorities? From what background do they come? What has been the nature of their work and activities?"

Among those so-called modern authorities on psychology cited by the Court as its authority to change and destroy the constitutional guarantees of the people of the United States are a number of individuals whose public expressions and activities show clearly the influence of Communist contacts and reflect sympathy with that ideology. Had any effort whatever been exerted by those who had an interest in ascertaining the backgrounds and public records of the ones upon whom the Supreme Court relied for guidance in reaching such an earth-shaking decision on a subject which any citizen of the United States should know would rock his country to its foundation, they would have found a shocking record. No attempt is here made to give details about those whose names appear as authorities of the books cited by the Court as such data is available in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee, of the FBI, and numerous other public records, but among those whose so-called studies were used as a basis for reaching the decision in question are Theodore Brameld, concerning whom the files of the Un-American Committee contain many citations; E. Franklin Frazier, whose record in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee contained 18 citations of his connection with Communist causes in the United States; and Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, professor at the University of Stockholm, described as a social economist. He admitted he had no knowledge of the Negro question in the United States, but nevertheless was employed to make an investigation of race relations in this country, for which he was given ample staff and funds.

As Senator EASTLAND says:

"Myrdal has an utter contempt for the principles upon which the United States was founded and for the political system to which the people adhere. It is incredible that the Supreme Court could have overlooked, if they read it at all, certain remarks that are contained in his book, on which the Court mainly bases its decision. Myrdal stated that the Constitution of the United States was 'impractical and unsuited to modern conditions' and its adoption was 'nearly a plot against the common poeple.' This is purely Communist propaganda, which was cited by the Supreme Court, and on which the Chief Justice of the United States based a very far-reaching decision looking to the destruction of our form of government. I have often wondered what was the source of the pro-Communist influence in the Supreme Court.

* * * * *

"If Chief Justice Warren had only taken the time and trouble to refresh his memory from his own State's officially printed reports and records of his own administration as governor of his own State, he would have found, and he can still find, the names of these Myrdal social experts in the Fourth Report on Un-American Activities in California, 1948, and the sixth report published in 1951 on Communist-front organizations by the Joint Factfinding Committee to the 1948 and 1951 regular California Legislature, when the Chief Justice was Governor of the State of California.

"Certainly Judge Warren cannot claim unfamiliarity with his own State official reports on such an important subject."

* * * * *

Reference is again suggested to Senator EASTLAND'S speech, which is replete with the records of those upon whom Myrdal relied in preparing his Myrdal's American Dilemma. It is to be noted that, among those upon whom he leaned, was one Ruth Benedict, who was a coauthor of a pamphlet known as The Races of Mankind, which (upon my own recommendation as general counsel for the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives during the period of the Second World War) the committee demanded that the War Department cease to distribute, and to place beyond reach the remaining thousands of copies which had been purchased for distribution to members of the Armed Forces.

Senator EASTLAND, in closing his speech, said:

"From the beginning of the Republic, the judiciary, the Congress, the executive branch of the Government, and all the States have recognized that a State has the power under the Constitution to segregate children in its schools because of race. The Supreme Court of the United States has consistently so held throughout the years. Any person is credulous indeed to believe that southern people will permit all this to be swept aside by a Court who relies for its authority not upon the law but upon pro-Communist agitators and enemies of our system of government."

Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina joined Senator EASTLAND in sponsoring the resolution to which reference is made in his speech.

An entirely opposite interpretation has been placed upon the meaning of the 14th amendment by the present Supreme Court than was placed upon it by the same Court in 1896. The earlier interpretation had been generally well accepted, and efforts were being made everywhere to comply with that decision of the Court. For over 50 years, this interpretation had been accepted by both races, with better schools often being provided for Negroes than for white pupils.

A very careful study of departures from previous decisions, particularly noticeable since 1937, was recently made by Hamilton A. Long. Entitled "Usurpers—Foes of Free Man," it leaves no room for doubt that it would be by no means a novel procedure for the Supreme Court of the United States to recognize the almost certain destructive effect which the integration decision of 1954 is having upon the Nation, particularly at a time when, in every phase of national life, defense and self-preservation should be the foremost thought of every citizen of the United States.

How can this serious situation resulting from enforced integration (as decreed by the integration decision) be remedied, if at all? It is manifestly only by the Supreme Court reconsidering the dangerous departure from the previous decision[1] decreeing "separate, but equal" school facilities. It is appropriate at this point to call attention to a fundamental question affecting the basic laws of our land: That, when the Supreme Court renders a decision which has the effect of construing the Constitution of the United States, that decision from that time on should be considered as a part of the Constitution itself, never to be varied by any subsequent decision of that Court. For it to be otherwise would provide a means by which any Supreme Court of the United States, at any time, could render decisions which would represent merely obedience to the wishes of the executive branch of the

[1] *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537).

Government to meet political demands of the moment. Decisions of the Supreme Court should be of such character that all citizens of these United States can recognize in them expressions of the fundamental laws of our land. Otherwise, the citizens who are, in fact, the Government itself, and by whom the Government is sustained, will find it reasonable to disregard such laws—and that means chaos.

Nothing could be more pertinent to this phase of our subject than the words of Thomas Jefferson who (for which we all should be thankful) is still held in the highest regard, love and affection by the people of the United States, and who realized the danger to which a republic is subject. On this point (in 1821), he said:

"It has long, however, been my opinion, and I have never shrunk from its expression, * * * that the germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the constitution of the Federal judiciary; an irresponsible body (for impeachment is scarcely a scarecrow), working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the government of all be consolidated into one. To this I am opposed; because, when all government, domestic and foreign, in little things as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated. It will be as in Europe, where every man must either be pike or gudgeon, hammer or anvil. * * * If the States look with apathy on this silent descent of their government into the gulf which is to swallow all, we have only to weep over the human character formed uncontrollable but by a rod of iron, and the blasphemers of man, as incapable of self-government, become his true historians."

Apropos of this are a few words uttered by Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, in 1944, on the tendency of that Court to disregard precedence, which he said had become so strong in the Court of late. They follow:

"The reason for my concern is that the instant decision overruling that announced about 9 years ago, tends to bring any adjudications of this tribunal into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket, good for this day and train only. I have no assurance, in view of current decisions, that the opinion announced today may not shortly be repudiated and overruled by Justices who deem they have new light on the subject. In the present term the Court has overruled three cases. * * * It is regrettable that in an era marked by doubt and confusion, an era whose greatest need is steadfastness of thought and purpose, this Court which has been looked to as exhibiting consistency in adjudication, and a steadiness which would hold the balance even in the face of temporary ebbs and flows of opinion, should now itself become the breeder of fresh doubt and confusion in the public mind as to the stability of our institutions."

Pertinent to this is a statement by former Associate Justice Stanley Reed, cited in Human Events of October 19, 1957, in which he said:

"The civil rights decisions of the Supreme Court have called forth harshly worded criticisms. The objections proceed chiefly from those whose judicial philosophy differs from that of the Court majorities, but criticism is one thing the first amendment does not forbid. Fortunately, wrong decisions are not irremediable. The overruling of constitutional decisions when their error becomes apparent is essential."

Justice Reed was a member of the Supreme Court which handed down the integration decision. It is quite clear that his statement indicates his concern over a situation such as the one resulting from that decision. As serious as the effects have been so far, there are signs indicating even greater chaos in the years to come, from the integration decision as it now stands. It seems entirely appropriate, therefore, that the Supreme Court should go one step further in its reversal tendencies and reconstruct the integration decision, in the hope that it is not too late to save this Nation. Today, it is a danger to the unity of the United States and a weapon in the hands of Communist Russia. The Supreme Court has reversed decisions rendered by the greatest judicial minds in history, and thus destroyed with a stroke of a pen the great bulwark of law, a large part of which had, in effect, become a part of the Constitution itself. Is there any reason, therefore, for it not to reverse itself, thereby restoring to the people of this country at least some degree of reverence for the Supreme Court of the United States and a feeling of safety from what otherwise promises the loss of prestige and standing among the powers of the world today?

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

The NAACP has grown from 53 members (at the time of its founding, in 1909, by the alleged Communist, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois) to an organization of over a quarter of a million members today. It has branches in 45 States, the District of Columbia, and Alaska. Its basic objectives are full equality for Negroes, the "establishment of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission to enforce equality in all fields," with "equal pay for equal work"; and the abolition of segregation, not only in the public schools, but also in housing, eating places, travel facilities, theaters, and all recreational facilities.

The NAACP operates in coordination with other groups, for which reference can be made to the National Republic of September 1956, a monthly magazine of fundamental Americanism published in Washington, D. C.

Leadership of the NAACP is an explosive distillation of almost religious fervor, strongly laced with leftist tendencies. It is not surprising that the NAACP has been the prey of the Communists, who have long sought to use it to foment turmoil in the South, nor that it has been under the influence of the liberal leftists, who have wanted the sympathy and the votes of its members to put across their own program of gradual collectivism.

The antisegregation decision electrified the Negro race and leftwing groups, both North and South, with hope of success in integration, FEPC, and the like.

"It must be obvious to all that we must intensify the use of political action in the final surge of full equality," NAACP President Roy Wilkins recently told the NAACP convention.

Claiming that Negroes hold the balance of power in 60 Congressional districts and 16 senatorial contests, Clarence Mitchell, NAACP political strategist, said: "It is within our hands to determine whether there will be a Democratic or Republican 85th Congress."

"Negro strategy," says Theodore H. White in the August 1956 issue of Collier's magazine, "is as simple as it is profound. It is to alter totally the pattern of southern custom and life. * * * Negroes speak of this objective from their own parochial point of view."

Gov. James F. Byrnes said, in a speech delivered in 1956, that education should not be denied the Negro children because they are being used by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as pawns in an experiment to solve overnight a great social problem. He called the antisegregation decision "a most flagrant violation of the rights of judicial review," and called upon Congress to exercise its right to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to exclude schools. (Governor Byrnes is a former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.)

Previous reference has been made to an article which appeared on February 23, 1956, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, relative to Communist associations of the members of the NAACP. Although it is too long to be quoted in its entirety, its pertinence is such that excerpts therefrom are herewith quoted:

"Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on February 3 the Memphis Commercial Appeal carried an article written by Paul Malloy quoting from an interview with Thurgood Marshall, Negro special counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In the article it was stated—and I quote:

" 'The meeting sponsored by the Memphis NAACP chapter heard Marshall angrily deny claims his organization is Communist tainted.

" 'Marshall said:

" ' 'Edgar Hoover, boss of the FBI, says we are not subversive. Our conventions have been addressed by Harry Truman and President Eisenhower and Vice President Richard Nixon.'

* * * * *

" 'Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary, would have the people of the Nation believe that the NAACP has just been marked as a Communist target for infiltration.'

"Now let us look at this fellow Wilkins. He seems to be greatly disturbed about this issue of Communist infiltration of the NAACP because of its effect being the whole civil-rights movement will receive a black eye. Here is the record from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives:

" 'FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Roy Wilkins, national administrator and executive secretary, NAACP, 1954.

" 'The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

" 'The Daily Worker of July 15, 1949 (p. 5), in an article datelined Los Angeles, July 14, reported that Roy Wilkins, acting secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told a press conference he voted for Benjamin J. Davis, Negro Communist, at the last election. Davis is now on trial for his Communist beliefs, along with 11 other National Communist Party leaders, in New York City. Wilkins, however, refused any comment on the trial itself. The same information appeared in the Daily People's World of July 13, 1949 (p. 1).

" 'Mr. Wilkins was a member of the national committee, International Juridical Association, as was shown on the leaflet entitled "What Is the IJA?" and a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1942; he was identified as being from New York State. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as "a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense" (report 1311 of Mar. 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as having "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line" (report dated Sept. 17, 1950, p. 12).

" 'A letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy dated November 16, 1938, contains the name of Roy Wilkins in a list of sponsors of that group, cited by

the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948). * * *

" 'According to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1937 (p. 6), Roy Wilkins was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Friends of Chinese People.

" 'The American League Against War and Fascism was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); * * * The special Committee on Un-American Activities called the American League * * * as 'completely under the control of Communists.'

"Dr. DuBois was one of the founding fathers of the present-day NAACP, which was founded in 1909. This Dr. DuBois, who broke away from the Booker T. Washington group, was the leader of the Niagara movement. His record of citations from the House Committee on Un-American Activities takes up nine pages single-spaced:

" 'FEBRUARY 21, 1956.

" 'Subject: Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, founder of NAACP, leader Niagara movement.

" 'The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

" 'The Worker (Sunday edition of the Communist publication, the Daily Worker) on April 27, 1947, reported that almost 100 Negro leaders, headed by W. E. B. DuBois, Paul Robeson, and Roscoe Dunjee, last week called upon President Truman "to repudiate decisively" steps to "illegalize the Communist Party." * * *

" 'Dr. DuBois sponsored a statement attacking the arrest of Communist Party leaders (Daily Worker, August 23, 1948, p. 3); he sponsored a "Statement by Negro Americans" on behalf of the Communist leaders (the Worker of August 29, 1948, p. 11); he filed a brief in the Supreme Court on behalf of the 12 Communist leaders (Daily Worker, January 9, 1949, p. 3); he signed statements on behalf of Communist leaders * * * and in 1952, he signed an appeal to President Truman, requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, p. 4); also an appeal on their behalf addressed to President Eisenhower * * *.

" 'The Daily Worker of August 2, 1949 (p. 2), disclosed that Dr. DuBois endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., well-known Communist leader; he was honorary chairman of the committee to defend V. J. Jerome, chairman, cultural commission of the Communist Party, United States of America (letterhead dated June 24, 1952). A leaflet of the Civil Rights Congress (dated March 20, 1947) named Dr. DuBois as having defended Gerhart Eisler, Communist.'

* * * * *

---

" 'OCTOBER 13, 1955.

" 'Subject: Arthur B. Spingarn, national president, member of board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

" 'The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

" 'Arthur B. Spingarn is listed as an individual participating in the Conference on Africa, held by the Council on African Affairs in New York City, April 14, 1944, according to the council's pamphlet, For a New Africa (p. 37).

" 'The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. * * *

* * * * *

" 'An undated letterhead of the Public Use of Arts Committee listed Arthur B. Spingarn as a sponsor of the organization. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112), cited the Public Use of Arts Committee as a Communist front which was organized by the Communist-controlled Artists Union.'

---

" 'FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

" 'Subject: Channing H. Tobias, chairman of the board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

" 'The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

" 'An undated leaflet, The South Is Closer Than You Think, named Channing Tobias as a member of the executive board and as cochairman of the New York Committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. The Southern Patriot for December 1946 (p. 8) named him as an advisory associate for 1947–48 of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. This organization has been cited as a Communist front by the special committee on Un-American Activities (Report No. 592, June 12, 1947) wherein it was cited as a Communist-front organization which seeks to attract Southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South although its professed interest in Southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.

* * * * *

---

" 'FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

" 'Subject: Allan Knight Chalmers, national treasurer, member of the board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

" 'The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

* * * * *

" 'A leaflet entitled "Protestantism Answers Hate" contains the name of Dr. Allan Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle, New York, in a list of sponsors of the call to a dinner forum in New York City, February 25, 1941, under auspices of Protestant Digest Associates. The Protestant Digest was cited by the special committee as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line * * *" (Rept. No. 1311 of March 29, 1944).

---

" 'FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

" 'Subject: Grace B. Fenderson, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

" 'The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

" 'The pamphlet For a New Africa (p. 37), proceedings of the Conference on Africa held under auspices of the Council on African Affairs, April 14, 1944, named Mrs. Grace B. Fenderson as a conference participant.

" 'The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

---

" 'FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

" 'Subject: Willard S. Townsend, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

" 'The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

" 'One Willard Townsend was a signer of a plea for the release of Earl Browder from prison, according to an advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post, March 12, 1942. He was identified as international president of the United Transport Service Employees of America (CIO).

---

" 'FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

" 'Subject: A. Philip Randolph, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

" 'The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

* * * * *

" 'A. Philip Randolph supported a statement to Congress issued by the American League Against War and Fascism against neutrality measures as reported by the Daily Worker of February 27, 1937 (p. 2). The Daily Worker of April 22, 1938 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph was one of the signers of a letter urging open hearings on the neutrality act which was sent to Congress under auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. A. Philip Randolph was nominated as a member of the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the American Congress for Peace and Democracy held in Washington, D. C., January 6–8, 1939, as shown by the pamphlet Seven and One-Half Million * * * (p. 32). Letterheads of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy, dated May 18, 1938, and June 11, 1938, name him as a sponsor of the council. He was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League * * *, as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 2). A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939, listed A. Philip Randolph as a national sponsor of that organization.

" 'The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and in-

cluded it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as "organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before."

"'The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the group previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union. * * * The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, pp. 7442 and 7443). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States."

"'A letterhead of the organization, Commonwealth College, dated January 1, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the National Advisory Committee. He endorsed the reorganization plan of Commonwealth College, as shown by the August 15, 1937, issue of Fortnightly, a publication of the college (p. 3).

"'The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Commonwealth College as a Communist enterprise in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 76 and 167). The Attorney General cited the Commonwealth College as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

* * * * *

"'New Masses for October 26, 1937 (p. 11), reported that A. Philip Randolph was chairman of the National Negro Congress. A. Philip Randolph was president of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the Daily Worker of January 1, 1938 (p. 4), January 13, 1938 (p. 3), April 19, 1938 (p. 3), and the pamphlet, Second National Negro Congress, October 1937. He was president of the Third National Negro Congress, as reported by the June 1940 issue of the Communist (p. 549). The official proceedings of the 1936 National Negro Congress (p. 41), listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the national executive council of the organization. He spoke at a gathering of the congress, as reported by the Daily Worker of March 8, 1938 (p. 3). The Daily Worker of February 15, 1938 (p. 7), reported that A. Philip Randolph contributed to the official proceedings of the Second National Negro Congress.

"'The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7447). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *.

"'A. Philip Randolph was a consultant of the Panel on Citizenship and Civil Liberties of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown by an official report of the organization, dated April 19–21, 1942. The call to the second conference, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, April 14–16, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of that conference.

"'The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

* * * * *

"'A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy (letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938). The booklet, These American Say, published by the Coordinating Committe to Lift the Embargo, named him as a representative individual. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (program of conference, Feb. 12, 1940).

"'The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

* * * * *

"'The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 3), announced that A. Philip Randolph was scheduled to speak at the Southern Negro Youth Congress, Richmond, Va., February 12–14. "The People Versus H. C. L." listed him as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation. He was shown as a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee on an undated letterhead of that organization.

"'The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means. (Attorney General, letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on April 1, 1954, consolidated list.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

"'The Consumer National Federation was cited as a Communist-front group by the special committee in its report on March 29, 1944 (p. 155).

"'Public Use of the Arts Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p 112)'."

Others referred to in this article of February 23, 1956, and appearing also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 3, page 3215, all of whom had served as officers, members of the board of directors, or in other capacities for the NAACP, are:

T. C. Nutter, national vice president, member of national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

L. Pearl Mitchell, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

Eric Johnston, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

Bishop W. J. Walls, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

John Haynes Holmes, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

Mary McLeod Bethune, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

Oscar Hammerstein II, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

William Lloyd Imes, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

Ira W. Jayne, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. W. Montague Cobb, member of national board of directors, chairman of the national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

Westley W. Law, Savannah, Ga., national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. J. M. Tinsley, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

William H. Hastie, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Earl G. Harrison, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. Harry J. Greene, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

Roscoe Dunjee, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Robert C. Weaver, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Lewis Gannett, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Judge Hubert T. Delany, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Norman Cousins, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. Algernon D. Black, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. Ralph Bunche, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. H. Claude Hudson, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Carl R. Johnson, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Alfred Baker Lewis, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. James J. McClendon, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

A. Maceo Smith, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

James Hinton, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

Theodore M. Berry, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Earl B. Dickerson, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Benjamin E. Mays, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

A. T. Walden, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Arthur D. Shores, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Loyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Sidney A. Jones, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

W. Robert Ming, Jr., national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Arthur J. Mandell, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Robert W. Kenny, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Milton R. Konvitz, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Loren Miller, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Bartley Crum, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Morris L. Ernst, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Z. Alexander Looby, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Paul J. Kern, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Karl N. Llewellyn, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Shad Polier (Isador Polier), national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Jawn Sandifer, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Sidney R. Redmond, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

George M. Johnson, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Edward P. Lovett, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Louis L. Redding, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

Joseph B. Robinson, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. Edward L. Young, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

Viola Bernard, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. John P. Peters, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. Russell L. Cecil, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

Dr. C. Herbert Marshall, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

Gloster Current, director of branch department, NAACP, 1954.

Ruby Hurley, southeast regional secretary, NAACP, 1954.

Franklin H. Williams, west-coast regional secretary, NAACP, 1954.

U. S. Tate, regional special counsel for southwest, NAACP, 1954.

Thurgood Marshall, special counsel, NAACP, 1954.

Clarence M. Mitchell, director, Washington bureau, NAACP, 1954.

Henry Lee Moon, director, public relations department, NAACP, 1954.

Clarence A. Laws, regional director, NAACP, 1954.

Robert L. Carter, assistant special counsel, NAACP, 1954.

Torea Hall Pittman, assistant field secretary, NAACP, 1954.

Madison S. Jones, Jr., assistant field secretary, NAACP, 1954.

Let us now examine some references which reflect the reported plans of the Soviet Communists to disrupt the course of life in that part of the United States lying below the Mason-Dixon line so that they, the Communists, would be able to lead the Negro population in any direction that best suited their plans.

The decision in *Brown et al.* v. *Board of Education of Topeka et al.*, and decisions in related cases, provided the very weapon for which the Russian Comintern had hoped ever since the birth of their scheme to disrupt the relations between the citizens of the United States, conceived even before the speech of Comrade Jones on July 17, 1928. Equipped with this instrument of deadly portent, they proceeded to create the havoc only too well known today by citizens in every section of the United States.

It does not require great acumen to see how every piece of the pattern has fallen into place since that time when the opportunity presented was seized upon with eagerness by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, equipped apparently with almost unlimited funds and a personnel of educated Negroes, trained in the propaganda field, and sympathetic non-Negroes, many of whom are excellent speakers.

This association has apparently left nothing undone to disturb relations between the white and Negro races. It is charged that the NAACP is planting single Negro families in heretofore strictly white residential settlements and previously white apartment buildings, thereby creating new incidents. It has accused the District of Columbia Police Department of discrimination in handling arrests, in employing Negroes on the force, and in promoting those already on the force. It is attempting to force integration in police boys' clubs. It has encouraged mass attendance of Negro youth in white schools, regardless of the hesitancy of some of them to change schools, and regardless of a planned gradual process of integration. The NAACP has attempted to force employment of Negroes in professions and other fields. It has promulgated many local court cases in efforts to speed up integration. All this has created hatred among many Negro and white youths, dividing the youth of our country on racial grounds. Of course, some white people, too, have been guilty of agitation.

Under our system of government, anyone with a grievance can present it in a public way, regardless of whether or not, under the veil of pretended sincerity lies initiation or furtherance of an attempt to destroy the existing order of society and even government itself. I am referring directly to a complaint by Eugene Davidson, president of the local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which, in my opinion, constitutes one more step in the process developed by that group ultimately to subject the white race of this Nation to the will of what is now its largest minority, and complete social integration. Considering the cooperation consciously or unconsciously being given this effort the NAACP is receiving definite assistance from the Federal Government toward the consummation of such a goal.

It is important for readers to understand very definitely that no statements contained herein should impute any idea of antagonism to the Negro race. Any such impression would be an unfortunate error, since the writer firmly believes that their basic rights or fundamental liberties should be in no degree whatsoever less than those of any others. Equally firmly, however, the writer believes, and intends to show, that the white race, as such, is in danger of extinction in the United States, and that a Communist pattern relative to the present conflict concerning the white and Negro races definitely exists, with the hope on the part of the Kremlin that, out of the chaos which is thereby created, there will come an opportunity for the Russian Communist Party to establish a foothold in the United States.

COMMUNIST PROCEDURES AND THEIR EFFECT

An unfortunate tendency is prevalent to minimize seemingly fantastic schemes on the part of Communists. It should be remembered, however, that the plans of the Russian Communists since 1917, assisted by diplomatic recognition in 1933 and billions of dollars donated by the United States following that unfortunate decision, have developed so successfully that Russia is today a world power with communism prevailing in approximately one-third of the globe. North Vietnam and millions of its population are now behind the Iron Curtain; the Tachen Islands were surrendered to the Chinese Reds in the hope that this would lessen the danger; Afghanistan is now under Communist domination; Cambodia and Laos are neutral, and Laos is expected to be accepting communism in its government.

These concessions followed the Korean cease-fire, when practically everything demanded by the Communists was yielded to them, due to failure on the part of the United States to pursue its clear opportunity to drive the Communists from Korea, thus depriving us of a victory for which there is no substitute, as General MacArthur has said. Never before had this Nation failed to vanquish its foes and dictate all the terms of surrender or armistice. Therein lies a lesson, because of its similarity to the first compromise of its kind ever made by the Roman Empire, as near like our own civilization as can be found in history, when Theodosius compromised with the northern barbarians for a peace. (This it is hoped, is not significant, for at the time of Theodosius, the western Roman civilization was rapidly approaching its end. Today the tempo is faster.)

It is to be seriously regretted that those in power permitted this situation. With almost unlimited funds flowing from the United States to Russia since that year of 1933, there has been created a Frankenstein which now threatens the very existence of the free world and which compels the United States to be at all times no less than an armed camp.

History has never before produced anything to be compared with the techniques in political psychology, enslavement, and intrigue developed under the aegis of Communist despotism, even more cruel and unrelenting than those practiced by Asian princes. The average person, imbued with the spirit of democracy as known in England and America, is simply incapable of comprehending the extent of its deception, its power of persuasion, its penetrating espionage, and its ingenuity, directed principally today toward destruction of the United States.

It is very difficult, almost impossible, for people generally to believe in the existence of a definite plan by one nation in the world deliberately to plot the destruction of another, particularly when the motives are, for the time, somewhat obscure and its execution covers many years, even generations.

Periods of depression, such as the Kremlin hopes to inflict upon us, thereby "forcing the United States into bankruptcy," as Lenin expressed it, plays an important part in the furtherance of such purposes.

Communism, as practiced in Russia, presents a danger which is incomprehensible to the average citizen of free countries, and which overlooks nothing that could serve as a weapon aimed at the destruction of its intended victims. Turning to history in their search for power, Communist leaders have adopted the application of the strategy of "divide and conquer" attributed historically to Quintus Fabius Maximus, a great Roman general who used it to save, not to destroy, Rome. It has grown progressively successful, however, in recent years, as practiced by the Communists, who successfully throw to the press of the world the "apple of discord" in the form of the McCarthy-Army conflict and the discussion of the Oppenheimer question. Diversions from attention to serious problems of national defense involving our actual existence in this dangerous age; and the columns of the press everywhere have been filled with these controversies resulting no doubt from public demand, an unfortunate tendency of journalists today.

Could anything have been better designed for Communist purposes than engaging all the world in disputes concerning the application of democratic principles carried to a degree beyond the zone of safety in the zeal of participants to outstrip each other in gaining support of the voters?

It cannot be denied with honesty that Communists have developed a technique in presenting problems such as those under discussion, embracing both the zenith of perfection in perplexing their enemies and in convincing the public that their dupes and adherents are innocent victims of oppression,

deprived of their constitutional and social rights.

Pursuant to this strategy, they have for many years planned to utilize fully the inordinate desire of liberals to capture the vote of the Negro, North and South. They, therefore, proceeded to utilize their available channels to bring this idea to some northern so-called liberal Democrats and Republicans. They thought little and cared less of that danger which lurks constantly beneath the surface of a courteous exterior, but which remains unaltered in the heart and mind of every white man in the South, a determination that his children shall not be brought up from tender years in social integration with the Negro. This is not only known to Russian Communist planners, but is the basis of a scheme which has definitely been in the hands of their planners for destruction, as has previously been described in detail. If a majority of the Members of the United States Congress were told this, and it is hoped that they will be, it is to be feared that they would brush it aside, as they have all other such dangers for nearly 40 years.

Now, by insidious and clever dissemination of suggestions, and operating largely through channels effective in many high places, they have succeeded remarkably, even on Cabinet and legislative levels, in getting the assistance of not only many legislators, but of the executive branch of the Government as well, even to the extent of attempting to deprive citizens of the South of the right of trial by jury in civil-rights cases.

Thus, after at least 30 years of planning, Russian Communists have succeeded in causing discord among the American people, and, yet, our people do not seem to awaken to their danger. No effort has been spared, either by southerners or others who realize the danger of this conflict, to convince advocates of relentless pressure to render helpless the white citizens of the South against the miscegenation of their citizenry, to convince the northern liberals and their associates in other political categories of the unfair and dangerous schemes to gain political advantage by their effort, but to no avail. It is unfortunate, indeed, that desire for political power far exceeds the usually normal concern for material safety.

All this clearly parallels operational activities of Communist origin organized and developed over the decades, imbued with determination never to allow cessation of the effort to divide and conquer until, through sheer exhaustion and division of forces, the object of their iniquitous campaign becomes its victim.

REASONS FOR SOUTHERN FEELING

Let us now turn to reasons for southern resentment against complete integration of the Negro, both legally and socially, which is the aim of such organizations as the NAACP, as clearly demonstrated in their public statements, and as indicated in the plans of Soviet Communists to take advantage of such conflict to divide and conquer, assisted, they had hoped, by gestapo procedures in the hands of one or more ambitious Federal Government officials. Federal authority, such as originally contemplated by carefully hidden provisions contained in the Civil Rights bill, could easily be used to intimidate the whites of the South to the extent that they would be largely subjugated to the Negro population who, with the assistance of the NAACP or similar organizations, could so harass the white citizens of the South with actual or threatened legal action that life would become a continual burden, such as the baseless attack recently on the superintendent of police in the District of Columbia. The Negroes, led on in the ignorant belief that they had been given newborn superior right, could conceivably bring about such chaos as to create just such a situation as the Soviet Communists have been planning for over 30 years.

It is absolutely impossible to integrate white and colored children extensively and indiscriminately in schools and expect social barriers to continue to exist. Hours in school classrooms and on playground during formative years constitute the greatest possible danger, and will inevitably result in destroying the race of white Caucasians which have made these United States great, and bring about a genetic result such as that described in the following article (from the wires of the Associated Press) by Dr. Curt Stern, a University of California geneticist:

"UNITED STATES NEGROES SEEM CERTAIN TO DISAPPEAR—GENETICIST SAYS WHITES WILL HAVE SLIGHTLY BRUNETTE SHADE

"BERKELEY, CALIF., September 19.—The American Negro eventually will disappear by mixing into the Caucasian population, and the main mark he will leave on the white will be a slightly brunette shade, says a University of California geneticist.

"The process will require centuries, but just how long will depend on social developments, says Dr. Curt Stern, a professor of zoology who specializes in the study of heredity. Dr. Stern makes the statements in the October issue of the Scientific American.

"There will be two stages of the process, he adds.

"First, an increasing number of ostensibly black people who already have a mixture of white in them will become whiter as they mix with other whites, and their offspring will become known as white.

"Second, these supposedly little-diluted blacks will be somewhat more African in appearance than the Negro of today. Whether they will mix slowly into the overwhelmingly larger white group or be taken into it rather rapidly will depend on social considerations of the future.

"It seems likely, Dr. Stern reports, that the African genes of the remaining blacks will be dispersed among the Caucasian element so widely that they will add only a light-brownish cast to the white population generally.

"Eventually, Dr. Stern predicted, the fusion will become so thorough that only a few thousand people with black skin will appear in each generation, and they probably will have straight hair, narrow noses, and thin lips.

"The beginning signs of this change already are apparent, Dr. Stern adds." (Washington Evening Star, September 20, 1954.)

The eventual result of social integration will be that no newly married couple could possibly know whether their offspring might not be Negro in coloring and traits, in spite of their belief that both were of the white Caucasian race.

According to recent publicized statements from official sources, approximately 71 1/10 percent of children now attending the public schools of the District of Columbia are Negroes. It is a truism that you cannot improve the character of anything, be it animal, vegetable, or mineral, by mixing with it something of less quality; on the contrary, the eventual result is bound to be on a level somewhere between the two. It is unfortunate that the Supreme Court, in its policies and decisions on the subject of integration, has so completely overlooked the eventual effect upon the Nation, its first and most seriously affected victims being those who live below the Mason-Dixon line, where the heretofore-satisfactory relations existing between the races had been steadily improving, but are now disintegrating into a state of agitation, suspicion, and fear, endangering the entire Nation.

Many States at present have laws which prohibit the marriage of whites and Negroes, but in all likelihood, if ever the test of their constitutionality reaches the Supreme Court of the United States during the tenure of its present composition, such laws can hardly be expected to endure.

It can, therefore, be clearly seen that this serious issue now confronting the entire South presents a perfect opportunity for the liberals and their associates to fan the flames of discord, obsessed as they seem to be with winning the votes of the Negroes, not only in the South but throughout the United States, regardless of the disastrous effect it might have. Nothing could be better designed to further the Soviet Communist plans, as previously described in detail.

LIBERALISM

DeTocqueville observed, just about 100 years ago, that "the art of administration may be ranked as a science, and no science can be improved if the discoveries and observations of successive generations are not connected together. History holds lessons for modern government. We can profit greatly from a survey of conditions that human nature has devised and that human beings have endured in the administration of past peoples."

Liberalism has played a prominent part in history. It is of interest to note that, when world leadership followed as the result of governmental conservation in the ancient Roman civilization, nearest of all ancient republics in every respect to our own, the Gracchi brothers appeared upon the political scene, beginning 133 B. C. That was when Rome excelled all previous civilizations in the conservation of government, magnificent engineering accomplishments, great roads leading to even the remotest parts of the republic, arenas, government buildings, unbelievably great aqueducts, and the like.

When Julius Caesar was appointed dictator by the Senate to stem the flow of government funds raised by taxation of the people, and to accomplish other much-needed reforms, he temporarily eliminated the right to vote because the people had been led by politicians advocating unlimited government gratuities to vote for them so that such policies could be continued. Because he had temporarily suspended voting as the only way to restore the already depleted treasury of the government, Caesar was assassinated by the leaders of that same clique who held office by giving away the funds of the government treasury under the guise of liberal policies by a beneficent government which no longer had sufficient funds for national defense or conduct of government functions.

This inexcusable crime foreshadowed eventual disintegration of that great civilization which, after an intervening period of revolution of about 14 years, became an empire in 31 B. C., replacing the Roman Republic. Despotic rule thereafter prevailed, eliminating liberty and freedom for the people, which had been gained through centuries of great and intelligent effort, and lost forever through the act prompted by frustration on the part of liberal and paternalistic Roman senators and officials. Tiberius Gracchus and his liberalism had superseded that effective good judgment and the reasonable conservatism of the voters of the Roman Republic and the effect of this insidious political poison had run its course. Tiberius Gracchus' liberalism after less than a century had won, but Roman civilization was doomed.

John Steinbeck, Pulitzer prize-winning author, in an interview which was reported by the International News Service September 1, 1957, said:

"No nation has ever resembled the late Roman Empire so closely as modern America."

This is why we need a consciousness of today's trend toward disaster.

This pattern, according to history, seems an inevitable one.

It is an undeniable fact, proven by history, that one of the pitfalls which develop

inevitably during the life of any democratic form of government, whether comparable to the one originating in Greece centuries before the birth of Christ, or a more modernized form, is the unfortunate tendency which too frequently is for unlimited government gratuities. Democracies thus affected eventually cease to exist.

Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate, recently said, as quoted in one of his Sunday Star columns, Spires of the Spirit:

"In our intricate civilization there is an increasing tendency to seek first life's secrets and to taboo its risks. When that becomes the ruling passion, it spells ultimate ruin to an individual or a nation. History fairly shouts that when any system takes as its goal comfort and convenience to such an extent that the qualities of adventure are bleached out, it is doomed."

Prof. Luigi Einaudo, former President of the Republic of Italy, in his message to the 10th International Liberal Congress at Oxford, England, said:

"Indeed, the theme which you will debate, the significance of social security in a free society, is of the greatest importance. We all agree on the necessity that the state receive the means to defend its citizens against the worst hazards and that the inequality of opportunity should be diminished. Still, without doubt, there also exists the danger that such a policy, instead of helping a free society, undermines it. An excess of social security can destroy the instinct to save, the feeling of family responsibility, and the affection for one's property, big or small. We all know the consequences of such a policy of exaggeration; inflation, ubiquity of controls, statism, decay of political liberty, and the end of all personal and private initiative."

For lack of space (and also a probability of an overdose of the available facts in one article), it is now left to the reader to reach a conclusion as to the dangers involved. If the possibilities suggested seem fantastic, reference is made again to the extent of the world subjugated by the Communists in just about 40 years.

I'm very sure, if it is realized fully by those responsible for this decision that posterity will look back askance at those who were originally responsible for the creation of a miscegenated nation, that some remedial action will be taken.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Psalms 27: 14: *Wait on the Lord: be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, Thou art always speaking unto us through Thy Holy Word.

May we daily hear Thy voice calling and commanding us to commit our ways unto the Lord.

We rejoice that the words of the Holy Scriptures are a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path.

Incline our hearts to heed those sacred words for he that followeth them shall not walk in darkness but shall have the light of life.

Give us such a love of Thy truth that we shall come to know the truth of Thy love.

In the name of the Christ, the Eternal Word, we offer our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

---

### THE LATE HONORABLE DUDLEY A. WHITE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to advise the House of the death of one of its former distinguished Members, the Honorable Dudley A. White, of Sandusky, Ohio, who represented the 13th Ohio District in this body in the 75th and 76th Congresses.

Dudley White was a truly great American. He served his country as an enlisted man in the Navy during the First World War. Later, in World War II, he again joined the colors and became a captain in the Navy in charge of enlistments in the Navy. He also served as Ohio commander of the American Legion.

After leaving the House he was a candidate for United States Senator from Ohio. He was recognized as one of the outstanding newspaper publishers of modern times, having under his direction a number of important Ohio daily newspapers.

Mr. White indeed served his State and Nation ably and well. His death on October 14 of last year came as a shock and surprise to all of us. I am sure that the membership of the House joins me in extending our sincere sympathy to his very fine family. In his passing we have all lost a great and good friend, and Ohio and our beloved country has lost a true leader and a real patriot.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BAUMHART], who is absent on official business, may be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Dudley Allen White, Sr., an illustrious Member of the House of Representatives during the 75th and 76th Congresses, and my good friend, died on October 14, 1957, at the age of 56.

Dudley White served in this body, and represented the constituents of the 13th Ohio Congressional District, with sincerity and true legislative ability.

He was born in New London, Huron County, Ohio, January 3, 1901, attended the public schools and was graduated from the New London High School. His life was devoted to serving his country in time of conflict, to public office, and bringing to the people of Ohio good journalism.

During the First World War Dudley White served as an enlisted man in the United States Navy. In 1929 and 1930 he was State commander of the American Legion. He was Ohio's member of the national executive committee of the Legion in 1932. During World War II he was called to active duty in the United States Navy in 1942 as a lieutenant commander; he was promoted to captain and served as director of recruiting and induction until 1946. That year he was awarded the Legion of Merit for "exceptionally meritorious" service as director of recruiting and induction for the Navy during the war.

He entered the newspaper business at Norwalk, Ohio, in 1925, and became editor and general manager. He was associate publisher of the Reflector-Herald, in Norwalk, and vice president of Sandusky Newspapers, Inc., Sandusky. At the time of his death Dudley White was publisher of the Sandusky Register and the Norwalk Reflector-Herald.

His interest in and dedication to worthwhile endeavors read like a cross-section of American life. He was delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1928 and 1948, and was an alternate in 1932. For 5 years he served as a trustee of Bowling Green State University. He was president of a broadcasting company and a bank director. In 1953 he was appointed executive director of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. During President Eisenhower's first term, he served 18 months on the Hoover Commission.

No task was too big for Dudley White. He approached all problems with an enviable enthusiasm and unswerving zeal. He was known to his associates as a doer and a dedicated man.

Dudley White was not a candidate for reelection to the United States House of Representatives in 1940, but in that year was an unsuccessful candidate for the Republican nomination for the United States Senate. The man who defeated him is now a member of the Supreme Court, Associate Justice Harold H. Burton of Ohio.

Dudley White was a fervent patriot. He loved his country. He respected the Congress in our scheme of government. He was devoted to duty and a man I am proud to have called my friend. To Mrs. White, the daughter and son, I express deepest sympathy. He will long be remembered by those who were privileged to be associated with him.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, during our service here in the House of Representatives we all make many, many friends. As a matter of fact, on occasion it seems to me that all of us are friends one to the other. From time to time we may have our differences on matters that come before us for consideration, but on the whole we are friends.

However, I am sure every one of us comes to know certain Members better than others. Certainly that was my experience with the late Dudley White. I never had a better friend in the House of Representatives. I do not know that I ever had a better friend anywhere at any time than Dudley White. He was one of the finest, most outstanding, and able Members of this House that I have known. In addition to his service here he demonstrated his ability in other

fields, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has so well said. With it all he was a gentle, kindly, generous sort of individual whom we could all love and respect. So, as far as I am concerned, his passing is a matter of great sadness to me. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy and wish them the best in the years to come.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], the dean of our delegation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], in saying something nice about our friend, Dudley White. Just as the distinguished gentleman from Indiana has said, Dudley White was a sort of a many faceted individual; in other words, he was qualified and competent to do many things. He could adjust himself. He could do things that the average individual could not do, and eventually all those things resulted in his being a very popular and very useful man. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have many times said that one of the great privileges of serving in Congress is the friendships you make with those you serve with. It is natural that some of these friendships become more intimate than others. Dudley White was a warm, personal friend of mine. He was one of the finest and most stimulating men I have ever known. I loved to be in his company.

I can recall many experiences together. I had the privilege of visiting in his home and of knowing his family. I can now see his winning smile and still feel his vivaciousness.

I can even recall when I first met him. It was back in 1936 at the Republican Convention in Cleveland. He said to me at that time: "Before too long I will be in Congress with you." And so he came here and all of us who worked with him are richer by the association. We lost a great deal when he left Congress and returned to newspaper work. We lost an inspiring man and an able legislator.

Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Dudley A. White I have suffered a personal loss beyond words of mine to express. It was a distinct shock to me that such a fine and sincere man should be taken from us at such an early age. Perhaps that is selfishness on my part for we know he is in the peace and the richness of the heavenly world beyond. In that we, his friends, and his lovely family may be able to find some consolation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to have known our distinguished colleague, Dudley White, and his family all during his service here, and that friendship continued with them until his death.

Mr. White was an exceptional man in many, many ways. He had an enormous capacity for work. He was clear and accurate in his thinking. He had no inclination to espouse or go along with a cause that he did not believe in 100 percent.

His service in the Congress was outstanding. The years that he spent here were marked by hard work and devoted service to his district and country. He was very diligent in all his duties; attended all the sessions and took a keen interest in all Congressional activities.

To his family I want to offer my heartfelt sympathy and understanding in their great loss.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in commenting on the untimely passing of the late Dudley White, who so ably served the 13th District of Ohio in the 75th and 76th Congresses.

It was my privilege to only serve a portion of one session of Congress with Dudley White but I had known of his excellent record for many years. He was a past commander of the American Legion of Ohio and like many of us, was a World War I veteran.

He was highly respected, one who was devoted to his duties and was a great American and public official. I extend my sincere sympathy to his family.

---

## THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM P. COLE, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, with sadness and a poignant sense of personal loss, I announce to the House today the death of a distinguished Marylander, the late Honorable William P. Cole, Jr. This grand and noble gentleman, who was so full of life and who made friends easily and permanently, passed away after a prolonged illness, on September 22, 1957. Mrs. Fallon and I were deeply grieved. We loved him dearly.

Judge Cole, as he was known affectionately throughout the State of Maryland, was born in Towson, Baltimore County, on May 11, 1889. He attended the public schools there and was graduated from Towson High School in 1907.

He went on to Maryland Agricultural College, known now as the University of Maryland, and received a degree in civil engineering in 1910. Then he studied law at the University of Maryland in Baltimore. He was admitted to the bar in 1912, and commenced practice the same year.

Bill Cole was witty, he was intelligent, and he loved and understood his fellow man.

These traits of character stood him in good stead, and he got off to a good start as a young lawyer. But then, as in later years, responsibility to his country and to his fellow man came first. When America was drawn into the first of the great World Wars in 1917, Bill Cole knew what to do. In August of that year, he dropped his law practice to enter the training camp at Fort Myer, Va. He was commissioned a first lieutenant the following November and assigned to the 316th Infantry Regiment, 79th Division, at Camp Meade, Md.

He served overseas and was honorably discharged as a captain at Camp Dix, N. J., in June 1919. He then resumed the practice of law at Towson, Md.

Judge Cole was elected as a Democrat to the 70th Congress and took his seat in this Chamber on March 4, 1927, as a Representative from the Second Congressional District of Maryland. He was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1928, and resumed the practice of law in his hometown of Towson. But in 1930, the people of his district sent him back to the House of Representatives. He served in this body with great distinction in the 72d Congress and five succeeding Congresses.

Judge Cole resigned from Congress on October 26, 1942, to accept a Presidential appointment to the United States Court of Claims in New York, where he served as a member for 10 years.

On July 10, 1952, President Truman appointed Judge Cole to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. I might mention in passing that the oath was administered by the late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, a longtime friend. The Chief Justice told Judge Cole that this was the second time he had administered a judicial oath to him—and never before had he administered the oath to the same person more than once.

It is impossible to speak of Judge Cole and his many contributions without mentioning his great love for the University of Maryland. Next to his family, the judge's first love was the university. He served as chairman of this great school's board of regents for many, many years. And the university, to which he was always willing to give of his time and talents, owes him a great debt of gratitude.

As chairman of the board of regents, he exercised this position with great responsibility and played a vital part in the growth of the university.

He had the foresight to see the future technical developments in this country, and was instrumental in influencing the university to stress a mathematics and science educational program over other phases of college life.

He was also instrumental in the selection of Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, of Texas, as the new president of the university.

Judge Cole's interest in the University of Maryland went beyond the purely intellectual side, however. He never missed a football game. Rain or shine, he could always be seen on the sidelines, rooting for victory. He was justly beloved by all the students.

Judge Cole also served as regent of the Smithsonian Institution from 1940–43.

Judge Cole was a true Marylander. True to his ideals, loyal to his country and fellow man, and dedicated to service, his memory will forever be enshrined in our hearts as one who measured up to the very highest traditions of our

State. In his passing, we in Maryland have lost a good man and the Nation an invaluable servant.

Mrs. Fallon and I shall always cherish the memory of Judge Cole. He was our dear and trusted friend and we shall miss the many delightful hours we spent together.

To Mrs. Cole, who is one of the dearest and finest ladies anyone could ever meet in the journey of life, and to his host of friends in Maryland, we extend our deepest sympathy upon the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. It is with profound sadness that I rise to pay my respects to the memory of our departed colleague, a truly great and good man, the late William Purington Cole, Jr.

On May 11, 1889, William P. Cole, Jr., was born to William Purington Cole and Ida Estelle Cole, in Towson, Md. He grew up in the beautiful county seat of Baltimore County, which was to be the scene of his later success in life. After graduating from the county schools, he entered the old Maryland Agricultural College, which is now the University of Maryland. Receiving his degree of bachelor of civil engineering in 1910, he then enrolled in the law school of the University of Maryland, and was admitted to the Maryland bar in 1912. It was in Towson where Bill Cole first opened his office for the general practice of his chosen profession. It did not take long for the people of his community to gage the keenness of mind and great intellect of this young lawyer, for he developed a very extensive law practice and became one of the leaders of the Baltimore County bar. On June 27, 1918, he married Edith Moore. They had one son, William P. Cole III.

The one thing that saddened his otherwise happy life was the tragic loss of his only son who was killed in action in Europe on September 11, 1944.

In December 1917, William P. Cole, Jr., was commissioned a first lieutenant with the 316th Infantry of the 79th Division of the United States Army. He served with such distinction during three very important battles in France that he was promoted to the rank of captain in February 1918.

Although they say the law is a jealous mistress, Bill Cole gave of his time, thought, and energy to matters of religious, philanthropic, and civic endeavors. Because of his outstanding qualifications as a lawyer and as a man imbued with deep civic consciousness, he was urged to employ his talents to represent the large Second Congressional District of Maryland in the House of Representatives, and was elected to the 70th Congress in 1927. He was reelected to Congress in 1931 and served with distinction in the 72d to the 77th Congresses from 1931 to 1943. Among the committees to which the late Bill Cole was appointed was the same committee of which I now have the honor of being a member, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I often refer to his outstanding contributions and work when he was a member of that committee during his long tenure in Congress. We also remember him as one of the outstanding Presiding Officers in this body, for he was called upon to preside as Speaker pro tempore on many occasions.

Those of us who have known him and worked with him over the years and have observed his demeanor, whether in proceedings before committees or on the floor of the House of Representatives, have been deeply impressed by his devotion to the public welfare. He was indeed a truly dedicated legislator.

Because of Bill Cole's lasting contributions and his outstanding legal ability, the President of the United States appointed him as judge of the United States Customs Court in October 1942, and later as judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, where he served with distinction until his untimely passing.

On the bench he displayed his brilliant talents dealing with the highly technical and intricate problems involved in customs and patent law. Gifted with a remarkably clear and keen legal mind, he could assimilate a mass of facts and resolve them in opinions which sparkled with lucid and clear reasoning. He was a credit to the bar of Baltimore County, of the State of Maryland, and of the United States. There have not been many like him.

The late Judge Cole, always actuated solely by lofty patriotism, was a genuine public servant. He might be described as an old-fashioned American gentleman who was willing to give his all for the State and Nation he served so well and which he loved so much. His memory will be engraved on our hearts and his life stands as an inspiration for us to emulate.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues from Maryland and my other colleagues in the House in paying my respects to the memory of Judge Cole. While it was not my privilege to know Judge Cole personally, his reputation has been an inspiration to many, many people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, once more are we struck by the now-familiar pain that attends the passing of a former colleague. The grief I felt at the news of the death of Judge William P. Cole, Jr., summoned to my mind a fuller perception of John Donne's profound words:

> Who bends not his ear to any bell which upon any occasion rings? but who can remove it from that bell which is passing a piece of himself out of this world?

The bell tolled for Judge Cole last September 21, and his death diminished us all.

William Purington Cole, Jr., was truly a remarkable and talented man whose abilities encompassed many fields. Some of us in this House remember him best as an industrious and able legislator and a conscientious Representative, for 14 years, of the Second Maryland District. We remember that fateful day in 1933 when our Speaker, who was then chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, appointed Mr. Cole to head a subcommittee to investigate the petroleum industry.

The Special Petroleum Committee emerged from this beginning and William Cole naturally succeeded to its chairmanship. For almost 9 years he directed the activities of that committee in an investigation into orderly production, conservation, prevention of waste, transportation, and other aspects of the petroleum industry. The Cole committee, as it came to be known, set an impressive standard for fair and efficient investigatory practices. Through the policies it helped establish in the industry, the committee made what was generally acknowledged to be a major contribution to the war effort, and Judge Cole and his colleagues received much well-deserved praise and acclaim.

We remember that proud day toward the end of the 76th Congress when our Speaker was necessarily absent and the House of Representatives elected William Cole Speaker pro tempore. And I recall the deep concern his colleagues felt when, shortly after his reelection in 1940, he became ill and this House by unanimous resolution authorized Speaker RAYBURN to administer the oath of office to Mr. Cole at the Baltimore Hospital. We remember that we felt both sad and happy on October 26, 1942, when Congressman Cole submitted his resignation—sad to see him leave his position as dean of the Maryland delegation, happy for him at his appointment as judge of the United States Customs Court in New York City.

He had already displayed some of his versatility before his election to these Halls in 1926. Born in Towson, Md., May 11, 1889, he graduated from Towson High School in 1907 and from Maryland Agricultural College in 1910. After 2 years study at the law school he was admitted to the State bar and began practice. In 1917 he closed his office and joined the Army. His service with the 316th Infantry Regiment of the 79th Division included 11 months overseas duty and participation in 3 major engagements.

He returned to Towson a captain, and with a disability of the lungs that caused him difficulty for the rest of his life. Having reopened his law practice, his broad legal knowledge soon brought him renown as an attorney and his community elected him to Congress to succeed the Honorable Millard E. Tydings.

In 1942 his abilities and energies were still not exhausted. He served with such distinction as a judge of the Customs Court in New York that in 1952 President Truman appointed him to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in Washington, the position he held when he passed away.

Judge Cole was a devoted son of his alma mater, the University of Maryland.

For 26 years he was a member of the university's board of regents and for 12 years its chairman. In the opinion of Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, president of the university, "Judge Cole contributed more to the welfare of the university than any other person." In 1956 the William P. Cole, Jr., Student Activities Building was dedicated in his honor at the College Park campus.

In a life sunlit with public service, one great personal and tragic cloud marred his life. In 1944 his only son, William P. Cole III, was killed in action in France.

Lawyer, soldier, legislator, jurist, university regent—his resources seemed limitless. But what we will never forget are those personal qualities that so endeared him to us—his unfailing courtesy and patience, his tolerance of the opinions of others, his kindness and good humor. Nor will we ever forget that, as the Baltimore Sun wrote of him, he was "not a man who sought to gain his ends by bluster," but "beneath that bland exterior was a determined will which scorned retreat so long as he felt he was right."

We can only console his widow and ourselves with the thought that Judge Cole has accepted the judgment of the Proverbs: "Thou shalt lie down, and thy sleep shall be sweet."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of the late William P. Cole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of William P. Cole I have lost one of the closest friends I ever had in this House. He was a man of character, great ability, and all his life he served well. He was a gentleman of the highest type, loyal and devoted. His life was a great one.

To his widow, Edith, and other loved ones I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a high privilege to be able to join in paying tribute to our former colleague in the House, who so ably represented the Second Congressional District of Maryland for 7 years, William P. Cole, Jr. His resignation from Congress to accept the appointment of judge of the United States Customs Court, while a gain for that branch of the Government, was a decided loss for the legislative branch and the State of Maryland.

During his entire career, as an officer in World War I, a member of the bar, chairman of the board of regents of the University of Maryland, a Member of Congress, and as a judge in the Customs Court, he served with honor and distinction and brought great credit to the State of Maryland.

While it was not my privilege to serve with him in the House, I have known him for many years and have always held him in the highest esteem. His death last September left a vacancy difficult to fill. The people of the State of Maryland and the Nation, have lost a dedicated and devoted public servant.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in expressing my sincere regrets in the untimely passing of late Associate Judge William P. Cole, Jr.

Judge Cole was one of Maryland's most distinguished sons and the loss of his dedicated services to both the State of Maryland and the Nation will be deeply felt. Judge Cole served as a Member of this body for a period of 14 years, which period included the most difficult days this Nation had ever experienced. This period of service was followed by his appointment to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in which position he was serving with distinction at the time of his death. His guiding hand was evident during the term in which he served as a regent of the Smithsonian Institution and as chairman of the University of Maryland board of regents.

The example of dedicated public service set by Judge Cole will always serve as an inspiration to those who endeavor to follow in his footsteps.

## COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION OF THE CIO

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the other day COPE, committee on political education of the CIO, issued another in its long series of phony statements. It accuses the Honorable LESLIE ARENDS, the Republican whip, of a misstatement in blaming the Truman administration for failure to make progress in the missiles field. COPE beats the chest of former President Truman and takes credit for him for enactment of the National Science Foundation Act. The bulletin further states that this act had "among other objectives to undertake military research for national defense, including the development of missiles."

The quotation is true but the implication created is as phony as it can be. The facts are that Commander in Chief Truman never gave orders for the National Science Foundation to enter the missile field. In fact, a member of my staff was told this very morning by officials of the National Science Foundation that said Foundation has not and is not engaged in the missile field, neither then nor now.

In taking credit for Mr. Truman, COPE forgets to mention that President Eisenhower, when Chief of Staff of the Army, asked Congress and the administration to provide funds for development of missiles in the year 1946. It also forgets that only $1 million was spent on missiles prior to the time President Eisenhower took the oath of office.

The lameness of the COPE bulletin indicates the desperation of the politicians who are trying to blame the missile lag on the Republican administration.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 2251, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

## THE USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, my interest in atomic energy began in 1945 when I entered the A-bombed city of Hiroshima with our first occupation forces. Since that time I have tried to learn its technology and developments as a layman. It was while I worked for the Atomic Energy Commission at its Los Alamos, N. Mex., laboratories 10 years ago that I conceived an ambition to become a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That ambition has been satisfied today by my election to membership on that committee. I am tremendously grateful to my colleagues for granting me this high honor, and I will earnestly seek to justify the confidence they have expressed.

It seems an appropriate occasion to present this stocktaking, as of the end of 1957, of the use of atomic energy for electric power. This is the third such review I have presented, the two previous being as of the end of 1953 and the end of 1955. They will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for 1954 and 1956. This will be my last such review for two reasons: First, the publishers of private periodicals in the United States are so expanding their coverage in this field that by another 2 years an effort such as this to collect the bits and pieces of information into a comprehensive picture will be unnecessary. Second, having attained membership on the Joint Committee with its opportunities for classified information, it would undoubtedly be difficult for me to write another such review without running into information classification problems.

On December 2, 1942, just a few weeks over 15 years ago, the first chain reaction of nuclear fission was accomplished in a pile at the University of Chicago. One subsequent line of development has already brought extremely fast reactions of explosive force equivalent first to thousands of tons of TNT, and now, by fusion reaction principles, equivalent to millions of tons of TNT. A second line of development has led to the regulated release of energy to power ships at sea and electric generation stations on land.

Although it may be premature to report it as a certainty, the year 1957 may be marked as the first in which a controllable fusion reaction was brought about under laboratory conditions. It is clear that nuclear power in some guise in the

years ahead will carry an increasing share of total power generation, and probably in time will open the path to space travel to a degree which chemical fuels would find most difficult to duplicate.

The great rewards of nuclear energy are not coming easily and automatically. They have been expensive and give every indication of requiring major adjustments in our allocations of material and human resources. Our very survival as a civilization is going to depend upon the most skillful use of our military potential, our ability to work with friendly nations for common aims to better life on this planet, and the operation of our economy to keep output going up with a proper apportionment of that output. The mastery and development of nuclear energy will make an important contribution to these broad goals.

I have made this review worldwide in scope because so much of current policy is shaped by the political, economic, and technical consequences of nuclear developments everywhere. In presenting it to you I wish to acknowledge and express my appreciation to Dr. Charles S. Sheldon II of the Library of Congress and his staff for their long efforts in collecting and assembling much of the material included.

In presenting it, I would also like to say that the United States in the coming year will have to wrestle with a number of issues connected with nuclear energy. For example, what are the advantages and what are the dangers of sharing nuclear information among friendly countries? How fast should nuclear power development be pushed? Over how many projects should available personnel and production facilities be spread? What should be the relative roles of private and public enterprise in a new and expensive field of endeavor which is expected after a developmental period to assume a normal place in the economy? What steps will be required to keep our work in basic science moving fast enough to stay ahead of rapidly appearing technological needs? How will priorities be set for allocation of scarce resources needed to meet many demanding national programs, and will the costs be met through cutbacks in other programs, through heavier taxes, or through inflation?

Although it has yet to be discussed only guardedly, there is, I believe another additional and very basic question we should quickly decide: Should we at once embark on a crash research and development program aimed at controlled nuclear fusion within the shortest possible time?

It would be hard to imagine problems of greater significance. What is increasingly clear is that many of them require a technological training and understanding on the part of policymakers which is rare. Therefore, a burden is put on those with this specialized training to translate their knowledge into forms which are meaningful both to the policymakers and to the lay public. In the end, public understanding and support will be necessary to real accomplishment even if informed leadership is exercised by a few.

UNITED STATES CIVIL NUCLEAR POWER REACTOR DEVELOPMENTS—EARLIER POWER REACTORS

The first atomic pile of 1942 demonstrated that a controllable, sustained chain reaction was possible, and that some heat was generated in the process. The significance of this knowledge was not lost upon the experimenters, but the priorities of the period required emphasis upon developing weapons, and developing low-heat reactors which could convert as much uranium 238 into plutonium as possible for the weapons program.

After the war, relatively economical, small-scale experiments were carried on with a variety of reactor concepts, but the science was at such an early stage of development that many gaps in information had to be filled before any serious power program could be undertaken. The first real push was given the pressurized water concept, using highly enriched uranium. Under tight security wraps this work was pursued until an actual submarine prototype, the S1W, was operating in the Idaho desert, by 1953. That program was backstopped by another submarine reactor, one using liquid sodium as a coolant. The prototype intermediate reactor, known as S1G at West Milton, N. Y., was completed in 1955, and for a period supplied electric power to the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., until it ceased operation on March 21, 1957. A later part of this report will describe what has happened since, in the military reactor field.

During this early period the Atomic Energy Commission made available some restricted data information to firms and institutes with access permits to carry on a series of design studies which paved the way later to the demonstration programs still under way today. The Commission in its own laboratories did some small-scale testing of a number of reactor concepts in addition to those required for the submarine program. At Los Alamos, a liquid metal fuel reactor, Clementine, was completed in 1946, was dismantled in 1953, but it was not intended to generate electricity. Similarly, that laboratory built in 1956, dismantled in 1957, a reactor called LAPRE–1. This was of the aqueous homogeneous type, producing no power.

Another family of reactors are of the boiling water variety, built by the Argonne National Laboratory at the National Reactor Test Station in Idaho. Borax I of 1953 to 1954 produced no power, was followed by Borax II of 1954 to 1955 which did. Borax III of 1955 to 1956 for a short time in 1955 fed 2,000 kilowatts of electricity to the town of Arco, Idaho. Argonne also built in Idaho the EBR–1 of the fast breeder type. It was started up in 1951, and following an accident in 1955 is still being rebuilt.

At Oak Ridge, development began with an aqueous homogeneous reactor, the HRE–1, started up in 1952, and dismantled in 1954. Though a promising design it has had serious corrosion problems to overcome.

POWER REACTORS COMPLETED AND STILL OPERATING

The latest of the Borax series is number 4, completed in 1956, and still operating in Idaho. It is the only civilian reactor currently able to generate electric power completed prior to 1957. But this year saw five new reactors completed able to produce electricity. Three are part of the 5-year experimental program, one is a military prototype of civil interest, and one is a purely private venture.

The EBWR, boiling water reactor, an outgrowth of the Borax studies, went critical at Lemont, Ill., in December 1956, and by February 9, 1957, settled down to regular operation with an electrical output of 5,000 kilowatts.

Although it is a military reactor, the APPR–1, package power reactor, at Fort Belvoir, Va., is of civilian interest for the experience it will bring in building small reactors. It went critical in April 1957, turning out electricity, too. Further details are discussed under military programs.

The SRE, sodium reactor experiment, at Santa Susana, Calif., also went critical in April 1957, and reached regular operation on November 14, 1957. It serves as the prototype of a much larger plant to be built in Nebraska.

The Vallecitos, Calif., boiling water reactor, a private venture of the General Electric Co., began regular operation on October 24, 1957, supplying electricity to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. This plant is intended to test the plans for the large Dresden, Ill., power station.

The PWR, pressurized water reactor, at Shippingport, Pa., went critical in December 1957 and before long should be operating at the initial capacity level of 60,000 kilowatts. This, a part of the experimental program, is our first full-scale powerplant, and is claimed to be the first such intended primarily to produce power anywhere in the world. Calder Hall in England turns out a similar amount of power, has been operating at capacity since 1956, but is a plutonium producer as well.

POWER REACTORS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

The EBR–1, experimental breeder reactor, has been mentioned already. During tests, a certain instability in operations was noted, and it was decided to cut off coolant flow deliberately to measure what would happen. Personnel were kept at a safe distance. A 2-second delay in moving control rods during this experiment brought a surge of power which scattered radioactivity within the building alone. Work is still under way in rebuilding the reactor, many valuable lessons having been learned.

The HRE–2, aqueous homogeneous reactor, at Oak Ridge, is under construction and should be in operation shortly. It offers the hope of continuous operation with a recycling of its fuel; and if experiments are successful, it will be followed by full-scale plants later. The highly corrosive liquid fuel is proving hard to handle.

Three other reactors are under construction which will not themselves produce electricity with their heat output. The OMRE, organic moderated reactor, building at the National Reactor Test Station by North American Aviation, will study the advantages of using diphenal as a heat transfer agent and moderator. It should be completed

soon. Los Alamos is finishing two more small reactors. The LAPRE–2, aqueous homogeneous reactor, should be ready very soon, and perhaps later in 1958, the LAMPRE–1, molten plutonium reactor, will be completed. This may prove a useful step toward efficient use of plutonium fuel, presently not successfully used outside the weapons program.

The fast breeder reactor at Lagoona Beach, Mich., is the first large station being built under the power-demonstration program. This is the project spearheaded by the Detroit Edison Co., and shows great promise for eventual economy by producing more fuel for resale than it burns. Construction started early in 1957, and the outer protective shell was completed in October 1957. Completion of the whole station is scheduled for 1960. This has been a controversial project. Probably mindful of the accident with the EBR–1, although that was part of a deliberate test, three labor unions have called the reactor design inherently unsafe. This is disputed by Atomic Energy Commission scientists. A conditional permit for the construction was granted, pending final proof that all remaining safety questions be cleared up before the final certificate is issued for actual operation. The controversy had not been finally resolved by the end of the year, but work continues.

The pressurized water reactor at Indian Point, N. Y., for the Consolidated Edison Co. was begun in March 1957. To be completed in 1960, this plant will produce about half its power from nuclear heat, the rest by oil superheating of steam. Babcock & Wilcox is the builder.

The boiling-water reactor at Dresden, Ill., for the Commonwealth Edison Co. broke ground in March 1957 and was under actual construction by June 1957. It is also to be ready by 1960, and will be patterned after the Vallecitos plant also built by General Electric.

POWER REACTORS UNDER PROGRAM OR OTHERWISE PROPOSED

The Atomic Energy Commission has still more reactor concepts to try out as a result of research. Longest planned is the EBR–2, breeder reactor to be completed by 1959. It will take into account experience gained with its predecessor.

Still at early stages of planning is the LMFRE, liquid metal fuel reactor, as proposed by the Babcock & Wilcox Co. to the Brookhaven Laboratory.

The Arbor reactor to be built in Idaho is intended to be a flexible experimental type of boiling-water facility for testing out a series of ideas for improvements.

The PURR is contemplated as an experimental plutonium recycling reactor to be built at Hanford by the General Electric Co., but is not intended to produce electricity in its first version.

LAMPRE–3 may follow the other LAMPRE experiments to turn out 15,000 kilowatts from a molten plutonium reactor.

The Dow Chemical Co. would like to build at Midland, Mich., a liquid metal reactor to be completed in 1962 which would turn out 10,000 kilowatts of heat.

These various experimental reactors hold the ultimate fate of the nuclear-energy industry in the United States if more economic types are to be found which will be fully competitive. But their performance is obscure and inconclusive as far as the lay public is concerned. Public attention is more likely to focus on full-scale plants which produce consistent amounts of power for everyday use. Under the demonstration program which will test out various reactor concepts in partnership between the Atomic Energy Commission and private concerns are about 4 to 6 projects. These are at different stages of negotiation, and a simple count is difficult to present.

Fully approved for initial construction is the pressurized water reactor at Rowe, Mass., to be built for the Yankee Atomic Electric Co. by Westinghouse. It is to be ready by 1960.

Also approved is the sodium graphite reactor at Beatrice, Nebr., to be built for Consumers Public Power by North American Aviation. Now that the prototype is operating at Santa Susana, this larger plant should be put under construction in 1958 for completion in 1961.

A sodium-heavy water reactor at Anchorage, Alaska, has been accepted for negotiation by the Atomic Energy Commission. It is to be built for the Chugach Electric Association by the Nuclear Development Corp. As a novel type, plans are not yet complete.

An organic moderated reactor for the city of Piqua, Ohio, has also been accepted for negotiation by the Commission. Although the hope was to complete it by 1960, it may have to wait upon successful tests with the OMRE reactor, also being built by North American Aviation, at the National Reactor Test Station.

Of the 4 projects described above, the first 2 were offered in the Atomic Energy Commission's first round of demonstration powerplants, and the next 2 are from the second round. Among the first round original offers, were some plans found not acceptable, and the Dresden plant whose promoters later decided that freedom from complete Commission control was worth the lack of Government financial help. The second round has also had casualties—5 out of 7, as will be discussed later. A third round was called for, and the plans submitted so far have not gone through the complete assessment prior to contract signing. The three proposals received so far were all known earlier as tentative private plans.

The Florida Nuclear Power Group applied on April 30, 1957, to build with Commission assistance in west central Florida a natural uranium fueled, gas cooled reactor of 136,000 kilowatts, akin to the British Calder Hall type. Completion is hoped for in 1962 if the group maintains its interest.

The Central Utilities Atomic Power Association, headed by Northern States Power applied on May 15, 1957, to build a boiling water reactor to generate 66,000 kilowatts of electricity. This is also to be completed by 1962.

A late recruit to the third round was the Pennsylvania Power & Light which has long studied building an aqueous homogeneous reactor. It applied in December 1957 to build a 150,000-kilowatt station. However, work has proceeded so slowly on the HRE reactors at Oak Ridge that the current plan is to ask for funds to make a 2-year study only, with Westinghouse, and then at the end of 1959 to decide whether also to ask for funds to begin actual construction.

Outside the formal Commission programs, under private discussion are several other reactor plans, tentatively for completion before 1965, but difficult to tabulate as very certain because not enough is known about them.

The West Penn Group, headed by the American Gas & Electric Service Corp. would like to build in the Ohio valley a small plant by 1962, followed by a very large plant 3 years later.

The New England Electric System wants to build by 1964 a large plant somewhere in New England.

The Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Association wants Westinghouse to build by 1962 somewhere in the Southeast a heavy water moderated plant of modest size.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is considering rival plans from General Electric and Westinghouse for a water moderated plant to be built in California.

The Northwest Power Group has acquired land near Hanford, Wash., for the possible construction of a gas cooled, natural uranium fueled plant.

The Philadelphia Electric Co. considered having a big fast-breeder plant built, but has made no recent announcement about it.

The Middle South Utilities has called for proposals but has not yet announced its plans for construction.

Isotope Products, Inc., of Buffalo wants to have the General Nuclear Engineering Corp. build a plant to manufacture cobalt 60 and byproduct steam for a pulp and paper mill.

The city of Pasadena in 1956 made inquiry about construction of a forty- to sixty-thousand kilowatt electric plant, but the study appears to have been very preliminary.

The Atomic Energy Commission-Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority have a joint plan for a reactor to produce 15,000 to 20,000 kilowatts of electricity.

The Southwest Atomic Energy Associates have a study program which may lead later to construction of one or more plants in the 200,000- to 400,000-kilowatt range.

The east central nuclear group plans a test reactor for completion in 1962, but it does not include electric power generating facilities.

The discussion above makes it amply clear that no simple count can be made of the size of the United States program for nuclear energy. For it is in the nature of free enterprise for decisionmaking to be dispersed, not centralized. Some of the plans described above wait on availability of Federal aid; others are concerned with questions of rising costs, and availability of capital funds. Still others await the outcome of basic and applied research activities which can only be hurried to a point. There is not

yet any national will to build a program of set dimensions, as will be discussed below. In fairness to the United States beset with uncertainties, it should be pointed out that some of the large foreign programs on both sides of the Iron Curtain will not necessarily be completed on schedule, although there is less division of opinion in those countries over the usefulness of nuclear energy to them in the near future because of their much higher than United States costs for conventionally generated electricity.

THE COST PROBLEM

Two opposing forces are at work to influence the ultimate cost of nuclear power. On the one hand, new discoveries and more experience with known techniques, thereby allowing safe step-up of temperatures and pressures, are providing opportunities to extract more power from given investments, and hence to cut costs. The contrary pressure is compounded of inflation in the construction industry and the appearance of previously unforeseen problems in the practical construction of reactors, problems whose solutions are very expensive.

During the past year or two, British operating experience in particular has led them to raise to about twofold the amount of power they expect to generate from the power stations they now have under construction. But 1956 and 1957 in particular were sobering years in the United States as far as costs are concerned. These problems were foreshadowed in the annual review of the Joint Atomic Committee in February 1957, and were made fully explicit in the meeting of the Atomic Industrial Forum in November.

The work on the Shippingport reactor showed that such a pioneering effort puts a great strain on the manufacturers of components to attain the close tolerances and high qualities required. Frequent remanufacture contributed heavily to the rising costs of that project. The need for more basic research in metallurgy and in many other fields has become quite apparent from this project and from the smaller experimental reactors.

By last autumn, it was clear that the state of the industry was perilous enough that a number of equipment manufacturers were dropping out, and some others are reducing the size of their staffs of physicists and engineers. The power stations under construction with little exception found their costs well up. For example, the Indian Point plant in New York had its costs estimated originally at $55 million, and now the figure is $90 million. Shippingport with its research costs was to have been an $85 million project, but now the total will be near $110 million.

Although cost projections are difficult to make in a new field, some general guides are available. One of the best, definitive statements on the expected costs of nuclear power was presented in March 1957 by W. Kenneth Davis and Louis H. Roddis, Jr., of the Atomic Energy Commission. They showed that roseate estimates of 4 or 5 mill nuclear power, commonly advanced 2 or 3 years earlier, were unlikely for many years. Their estimates were that nuclear power from our first experimental plants had cost and would cost between 20 and 50 mills per kilowatt hour. After initial shakedown, the so-called first generation plants, as scheduled for completion between 1960 and 1964, should have costs in the range of 10 to 13 mills, not very competitive with the costs of conventional thermal plants where costs run from 4½ to 9 mills depending upon location in relation to fuel. Second generation plants to be completed from 1965 to 1967 after shakedown might operate with costs of 9 to 11 mills, with some further savings in the future as experience improved.

REACTOR PLANS DROPPED

Cost problems have been a factor in the abandonment of reactor plans, although not the only factor. Some of the reactor plans listed below, it may be argued, are merely being held in abeyance, but to all intents and purposes they are canceled unless conditions change very radically.

Sometime about 2 or 3 years ago, the Commission stopped talking about a reactor to be called the HTR, to have been the followup to the HRE–2 homogeneous reactor, but using thorium in place of uranium in the fuel mixture. Probably too much work remains to be done on the first two reactors of this type, to make scheduling of the HTR significant.

Next to be written off were 3 of the 7 proposals of round 2 of the demonstration program. This occurred on January 2, 1957. One of these was an application from the University of Florida. Their proposed plant with an output of only 500 kilowatts was deemed too small to fit the requirements of the program. The city of Holyoke wanted to build a 15,000 electric kilowatt plant with a closed cycle gas turbine system, but this was rejected on the grounds that technical feasibility was not sufficiently established. The city of Orlando wanted to build a twenty-five to forty thousand electric kilowatt station using liquid metal, but this had to be turned down on similar grounds as untried.

The next blow came during negotiations for the building of the Hersey, Mich., plant of the Wolverine Electric Cooperative. Unfortunately, the earlier cost estimate of Foster-Wheeler almost tripled for the 10,000-kilowatt plant. On October 3, the Commission announced that it was suspending negotiations for the construction of this homogeneous reactor, as it was reluctant to accept a proposal for construction on a cost-plus basis, and the latest cost estimate was too high for the power to be obtained.

A few days later, the same fate befell the boiling water plant of the Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn. Agreement on a suitable ceiling price could not be reached with AMF Atomics for the 22,000-kilowatt plant. The rejection took the form of an open invitation to the entire atomic construction industry to come up with a new proposal for building. There has been no enthusiasm shown for volunteering.

Other proposals have been made in the past for nuclear powerplants which have come to naught, but they were too tentative to describe as firm plans now discarded.

ROLES OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Considerable Congressional interest has centered the last 2 years on the size and speed of the United States program to develop nuclear energy. Recognizing that there is little cost incentive for private utilities to build nuclear powerplants today has led to several alternate policy recommendations as an answer. Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has argued strongly against a kilowatt race, which the United States could win if it saw any real necessity to do so. His emphasis would be upon continued testing to find the most economical reactor forms which ultimately could be competitive with cheap fossil fuels in the United States. Kenneth Davis, the Chief of the Reactor Division of the Commission, toward the end of the year suggested that if the United States wants to achieve lower operating costs at a fairly early date, it should concentrate its research and construction efforts on reactors of the water types—boiling and pressurized.

Several influential Members of Congress have argued that the presently conceived power-demonstration program of partnership with private industry is not boldly enough conceived to bring nuclear power very soon. Some are also concerned that public money is likely to be spent for private advantage, that these pioneering companies will achieve too strongly entrenched a position as a result of Government assistance. Those who so argue, however, have not satisfactorily demonstrated an economic need for nuclear power which exceeds conventional power in cost, nor shown how at any stage of development any but strong and financially resourceful private companies could engage in nuclear power projects. These arguments illustrate that the old struggle between private utilities and public power inevitably has become involved in the question of who is to develop nuclear power.

One of the more emotional arguments which has been raised is that unless the United States develops full-scale powerplants rapidly, international markets for reactor sales will be taken over by British, West German, and other builders. A related argument is that unless the United States develops reactors which can be fueled with natural uranium, reactor sales abroad will be lost. This has more substance. The United States has available enriched uranium from its gaseous diffusion plants, which it is willing to make available to friendly countries under conditions which will minimize the risk that this, or the irradiated fuel elements of partly converted plutonium, would be diverted to weapons. Many foreign governments are reluctant to have any major power program de-

pendent upon the whim of United States policy for future deliveries of fuel, and do not want our inspectors in their plants. Again, however, whether or not an overseas market for United States reactors would be worth the cost of developing it is problematical. Since the launching of the sputniks, the argument also has been made that the United States cannot afford to delay building many full-scale plants if the Russians and others are doing so, lest our international standing deteriorate psychologically in the uncommitted countries, and even among our allies. Unless there are not alternative means to avoid such consequences, however, the argument is not conclusive. As a matter of fact, the presenting of the argument in and of itself may have a greater deteriorating effect than any of its merits.

Although the United States has had the most advanced program for the development of enriched-uranium power reactors, and although the United States has been promoting the advantages of such systems to its foreign friends, expression in or by Congress that the British natural uranium system might be a better approach tends to undercut our leadership position.

Regardless of the merits of the arguments on enriched versus natural uranium, the fact remains that AEC and American industry have built up an unsurpassed competence in enriched-reactor technology. At the moment, to be brutally realistic, and right or wrong, this is all we have to sell to other nations. And we have been selling it successfully.

In 1956, legislation to launch a Government program of reactor construction failed of passage. However, it probably influenced a policy pronouncement of the Commission early in 1957 that unless a satisfactory private response were made to its third-round invitation, it would reconsider the earlier decision not to press for undertaking its own construction.

The 1957 legislative result of a year of discussion and debate was the passage of a bill which directed the Commission to do two things it was not particularly anxious to do, but the order was softened in its final form. Funds were made available for the construction of a large gas-cooled, natural-uranium plant of the type favored in Britain, and which appeals to some other countries. The plant is to be built at the National Reactor Test Station, but the Commission first is to report back in 1958 with its design studies before any construction starts. Also, funds were provided for a plutonium reactor to be built at Hanford, although the Commission claimed it could not yet use such a reactor at the present stage of research. However, in October, Louis H. Roddis, Jr., of the Commission stated that the MTR, materials testing reactor, at the National Reactor Test Station would soon be the first large reactor fueled with plutonium. This would be a most important development, as plutonium, a most difficult material to use, will be produced in some degree by most of the power reactors of the world and until now could only be used in the weapons program.

The partnership principle also was modified by the 1957 legislation. The public power cooperatives instead of negotiating directly with the constructors, have been replaced by the Commission in such negotiations as may be required. Only later will any reactors built under these conditions be turned over to ownership by the cooperatives.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPING NUCLEAR POWER

One major hurdle with respect to nuclear power was overcome in 1957. This was Government insurance against major catastrophe in reactor operation beyond the ability of any private insurance consortium to cover. Reactors for regular power production are designed with inherent safeguards, and the accidents which have been occasional in experimental work are supposedly impossible with the regular plants. Admiral Strauss has stated that a major disaster has only about 1 chance in 50 million of occurring with such a plant. Nonetheless, private underwriters recognized that if that one chance came, the damage from scattered fallout of radioactive material could run losses into the hundreds of millions. Unless private plant owners could find adequate insurance coverage, they would be blocked from construction of stations. The legislation finally passed provided that power station owners would have to purchase commercial insurance to the available limits, about $65 million, and then for losses up to $500 million would be covered by Federal protection.

The safety problem found specific form during the year in the arguments over the licensing of the Lagoona Beach plant, which already has been discussed.

Another problem of concern during the recent past, and actually one which has been longer in the making has been the shortage of trained personnel experienced to carry on the work of research and development of nuclear energy. This, in effect, sets a limit to how fast such programs can be expanded, and a worry of the Commission has been that it would be asked to encourage spreading too thin the available talent. The present session of the Congress probably will include further development of the plans for expanding the supply of scientific and engineering personnel. In so doing full recognition must be given to Rear Adm. H. J. Rickover's words when he testified last year before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy regarding the hiring of people to work on naval reactors. He said: "I found there were very few people who were qualified for our work. By 'qualified' I do not mean, necessarily, their technical ability, but the desire to work long hours and to be dedicated to a job as well."

Also of concern is the extent to which the United States should share technical information with other countries. On the one hand, it is argued that secrecy has held back progress and brought duplication of effort, that the Russians already know much of what we withhold from our allies and even from our own people. The counterarguments show a concern that some reactor information still has important implications for the weapons program and should not be disclosed. While one purpose of greater exchange should be that the United States would have the benefit of foreign ideas, these critics fear the flow would be one way, out of the United States. The problem is complicated by the appearance of proprietary information of private companies and the seeking of commercial advantage by many countries in making reactor sales. Other aspects of the security problem are more frankly military and outside the scope of this report. A solution of the nonmilitary aspects of the problem will probably be approached from the standpoint of making a distinction between technology and design. In general, technology could be better shared without danger to the national interest than details of design.

Another development of interest during the year has been the temporary glut of the uranium production market. Intensive prospecting is required if uranium supplies are to keep pace with ultimate needs. It is estimated that although uranium in the world should outlast coal for generating power, the United States has only a 10-year supply now located. Even this, of course, is a great improvement over earlier years when the greater part of all uranium had to be imported from the Shinkolobwe mine in the Belgian Congo and from Canada. At the same time that future needs are recognized, and the Commission has carried through a program to expand mill capacity, now the point of temporary glut has been reached. No new contracts for foreign purchase are being negotiated, and domestic incentives have been reduced.

Steps are being taken to increase the supplies of heavy water to encourage economical powerplants moderated with that material. The United States has been selling heavy water for only $28 a pound to stimulate research, but true costs, which are much higher, will have to be cut markedly before large scale use can be considered. The hope is to cut these costs by about three-quarters through hydrogen distillation at very low temperatures instead of water distillation, the better known method. A new plant for the purpose is building at Boulder, Colo., under the cognizance of the National Bureau of Standards.

Past experience makes clear that future years will continue to present us with fresh problems to be overcome before nuclear power replaces conventional power on any large scale. One of these problems predictably is that of disposal of radioactive wastes, in itself a good reason to stimulate research on thermonuclear power which will be discussed in detail later in this report.

Table I summarizes United States civil power reactors which have been built, planned, or projected.

TABLE I.—*United States civilian power reactor program (including all reactors with an electrical output)*

| Reactor concept name | Location | Scheduled completion date | Moderator | Coolant | Fuel | Heat output | Electrical output |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *(A) Reactor experiments* | | | | | | | |
| Boiling reactor experiment No. 3—Borax-3 | NRTS, Idaho | 1955 | Water | Water | 15 kilograms of 90 percent U-235 | 15,000 | 3,400 |
| Boiling reactor experiment No. 4—Borax-4 | do | 1956 | do | do | Highly enriched U-235 | | 2,400 |
| Experimental breeder reactor No. 1—EBR-1 | do | 1951 | None | Sodium potassium. | 48 kilograms of 90 percent U-235 in U-238 blanket. | 1,400 | 200 |
| Experimental breeder reactor No. 2—EBR-2 | do | 1959 | do | Sodium | 150 kilograms of 45 percent U-235 or 90 kilograms of 24 percent Pu in U-238 blanket. | 62,500 | 20,000 |
| Homogeneous reactor experiment No. 1—HRE-1. | Oak Ridge, Tenn. | 1952 | Water | Fuel solution of uranyl sulfate. | 3 kilograms of 90 percent U-235 | 1,000 | 140 |
| Homogeneous reactor experiment No. 2—HRE-2. | do | 1957 | Heavy water | Fuel solution | 4 kilograms of 90 percent U-235; later thorium oxide blanket. | 5,000-10,000 | 300-1,000 |
| Experimental boiling water reactor—EBWR | Lamont, Ill | 1956 | Water | Water | 4,500 kilograms of 1.4 percent U-235 | 20,000 | 5,000 |
| Sodium reactor experiment—SRE | Santa Susana, Calif. | 1957 | Graphite | Sodium | 2,100 kilograms of 2.9 percent U-235 | 20,000 | 6,500 |
| Molten plutonium—LAMPRE-3 | Los Alamos, N. Mex. | 196- | | | | | 15,000 |
| Gas cooled, graphite reactor | NRTS, Idaho | 196- | Graphite | Gas-cooled | Natural U | | 40,000 |
| *(B) Full scale plants, experimental or demonstration programs* | | | | | | | |
| Pressurized water reactor—PWR | Shippingport, Pa. | 1957 | Water | Water | 75 kilograms of 90 percent U-235 plus 12T natural U. | 236,000 | 60,000 (later 100,000) |
| Fast breeder | Lagoona Beach, Mich. | 1960 | None | Sodium | 2,100 kilograms of 20 percent U-235 | 300,000 | 100,000-134,000 |
| Pressurized water | Rowe, Mass | 1960 | Water | Water | 28,800 kilograms of 2.7 percent U-235 | 480,000 | 134,000 |
| Sodium graphite | Beatrice, Nebr | 1961 | Graphite | Sodium | 24,600 kilograms of 1.8 percent U-235 | 250,000 | 75,000 |
| Boiling water, closed cycle | Elk River, Minn. | 1959 | Water | Water | 90 percent U-235 | | 22,000 |
| Sodium, heavy water | Anchorage, Alaska. | 1960 | Heavy water | Sodium | 1.5 percent U-235 | | 10,000 |
| Organic moderated | Piqua, Ohio | 1960 | Diphenyl | Diphenyl | U-235 | | 12,000 |
| Gas cooled, heavy water moderated | West central Florida. | 1962 | Heavy water | Gas cooled | Natural U | | 136,000 |
| Boiling water | Minnesota | 1962 | Water | Water | Slightly enriched U-235 | | 66,000 |
| *(C) Full scale plants, independent projects* | | | | | | | |
| Boiling water, dual cycle | Vallecitos, Calif | 1957 | do | do | U-235 | 20,000 | 5,000 |
| Do | Dresden, Ill | 1960 | do | do | 68,000 kilograms of 1.1 percent U-235 | 682,000 | 180,000 |
| Pressurized water | Indian Point, N. Y. | 1960 | do | do | 275 kilograms of 90 percent U-235 in 8,100 kilograms of thorium. | 500,000 | 275,000 |
| Aqueous homogeneous | Allentown, Pa | 1963 | do | Slurry | Uranium-thorium slurry | | 150,000 |
| | Ohio Valley | 1962 | | | | | 13,000 |
| | do | 1965 | | | | | 200,000 |
| | New England | 1964 | | | | | 200,000 |
| | Southeast | 1962 | Heavy water | Heavy water | Slightly enriched U-235 | | 17,000 |
| | California | 1962 | Water | Water | | | |
| | Puerto Rico | 196- | | | | | 15,000-20,000 |
| | | 196- | | | | | 20,000 |
| | Hanford | 196- | | | | | |
| | | 1962 | | | | | |
| | | 196- | | | | | 200,000-400,000 |

| Reactor concept name | Total cost (reactor cost) (millions of dollars) | Cost per kilowatt (dollars) | Cost per kilowatt-hour (mills) | Constructor | Operator | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *(A) Reactor experiments* | | | | | | |
| Boiling reactor experiment No. 3—Borax-3 | 2.8 (reactor .6) | | | | Argonne NL | Dismantled 1956; rebuilt as borax-4. |
| Boiling reactor experiment No. 4—Borax-4 | | | | | do | Operating. |
| Experimental breeder reactor No. 1—EBR-1 | 6.0 (reactor 2.7) | | | | do | Rebuilding after 1955 explosion. |
| Experimental breeder reactor No. 2—EBR-2 | 39.6 (reactor 15.3) | 1,940 | | H. K. Ferguson Co | do | Dismantled 1954. |
| Homogeneous reactor experiment No. 1—HRE-1. | 12.8 (reactor 1.1) | | | | Oak Ridge NL | Operating. |
| Homogeneous reactor experiment No. 2—HRE-2. | 38.8 (reactor 3.3) | 3,400 | | Union Carbide | do | Building. |
| Experimental boiling water reactor—EBWR | 19.7 (reactor 4.9) | 980 | | Allis-Chalmers, Babcock & Wilcox. | Argonne NL | Critical Dec. 1, 1956; regular operation Feb. 9, 1957. |
| Sodium reactor experiment—SRE | 14.4 (reactor 9.3) | 1,550 | | | North American Aviation-Southern California Edison. | Critical Apr. 25, 1957; full operation Nov. 14, 1957. |
| Molten plutonium LAMPRE-3 | | | | | | Indefinite. |
| Gas cooled, graphite reactor | | | | Kaiser Engineering, ACF (designers). | | Plan to be offered Congress. |
| *(B) Full-scale plants, experimental or demonstration programs* | | | | | | |
| Pressurized water reactor—PWR | 110 (reactor 55) | (1) | 20 | Westinghouse | Duquesne Light Co | Critical Dec. 2, 1957. |
| Fast breeder | 49-68 (reactor 40) | 450 | | Atomic Power Development. | Power Reactor Development Co. | Fully approved but question on safety; construction started 1957. |

[1] 1,200 1st core; 770 2d core.

TABLE I.—*United States civilian power reactor program (including all reactors with an electrical output)*—Continued

| Reactor concept name | Total cost (reactor cost) (millions of dollars) | Cost per kilowatt (dollars) | Cost per kilowatt-hour (mills) | Constructor | Operator | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pressurized water | 41–57 (reactor 17.4) | 280 | 8–10 | Westinghouse | Yankee Atomic Electric Co. | Fully approved. |
| Sodium graphite | 29.2–42.5 (reactor 13.5) | 560 | 7–11 | North American Aviation | Consumers Public Power District. | Fully approved; start construction 1958. |
| Boiling water, closed cycle | 11.75 | 700 | 8 | | Rural Cooperative Power Association. | 4,400 kilowatts of electric power is from oil superheating; no contractor yet, following withdrawal of AMF Atomics. |
| Sodium, heavy water | 20 (reactor 8.6) | 800 | | Nuclear Development Corp. | Chugach Electric Association and NDA. | Under study. |
| Organic moderated | 8.0 | 640 | | North American Aviation | City of Piqua | Do. |
| Gas cooled, heavy water moderated | 40.2 | 300 | | General Nuclear Engineering. | Florida Nuclear Power Group. | Do. |
| Boiling water | 28.8 | | | Allis-Chalmers | Northern States Power, etc. (Central Utilities Atomic Power Association). | Oil superheated; under study. |
| *(C) Full scale plants, independent projects* | | | | | | |
| Boiling water, dual cycle | 5 | | | General Electric | General Electric, Pacific Gas & Electric. | Oct. 24, 1957, full operation. |
| Do | 45 (real cost perhaps 65–90, reactor 34). | 250 | [2] 7.5 | do | Commonwealth Edison, etc. | Ground broken March 1957; full construction began June 12, 1957. |
| Pressurized water | 90 | 320 | | Babcock & Wilcox | Consolidated Edison | Construction began February 1957; 135,000 kilowatts of electric power from oil superheating. |
| Aqueous homogeneous | 42 | 280 | | Westinghouse | Pennsylvania Power & Light. | Decision in 1959 as to whether to build. |
| | | | | Indefinite | West Pennsylvania Group. | Under study. |
| | | | | do | do | Do. |
| | 50 | | | do | New England Electric System. | Do. |
| | | | | Westinghouse? | Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Association. | Do. |
| | | | | General Electric or Westinghouse. | Pacific Gas & Electric | Do. |
| | | | | | AEC, Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority. | Do. |
| | | | | | Middle South Utilities | Do. |
| | | | | | Northwest Power Group | Under study; land purchased. |
| | 15–31 | | | | East Central Group | Under study. |
| | | | | | Southwest Atomic Energy Association. | Do. |

[2] Ultimate.

I would probably be remiss in closing this portion of my review without presenting to your consideration the editorial views of Nucleonics magazine in respect to our civilian power effort, since it is one of the powerful voices in the general field. I do not at this time accept or reject its proposal for a nonpartisan committee, but in leading up to it, an editorial in the October 1957 issue stated as follows:

NEEDED DESPERATELY: NUCLEAR STATESMANSHIP

There has probably been no period in the history of the United States civilian atomic energy effort that is as confused as the one we're in right now. Politics and technology have become so inextricably intertwined that it's impossible to tell which end is up. In fact, the situation seems to be so bad right now that if a high order of nuclear statesmanship does not come into play in the next several months it really won't make any difference which end is up.

To the extent that anyone can identify anything as facts these days, these appear to be the facts:

1. Gas-cooled, natural-uranium, graphite-moderated reactors: The Congress has directed the Atomic Energy Commission to move quickly toward the building of a Calder Hall type reactor, which AEC says shouldn't be built. The Congress says it wants an advance over Calder and that it has in mind the use of enriched uranium at a later date. AEC hurriedly sought proposals from industry, looking toward the initiation of construction in July 1958. Now, Congress says AEC moved too fast, that it is not seeking an advance over Calder, and, is in fact, handling things so that the results of the study to be carried out will dictate against actual building of a plant. Industry, meanwhile, moved into action helter-skelter, trying at the same time to make up for its deficit of Calder know-how, but intending to submit proposals for this new piece of business regardless of how much of an advance over Calder it could realistically propose.

2. Rise in prices: As in any business, the facts of life are learned the hard way, by actual experience. Before any power reactors were built or seriously engineered, economic reactor schemes were a dime a dozen. Now that some plants have come into operation and others are coming close to operation and still others have been studied definitively in a hardheaded way, the bloom seems to be off the rose. Economic reactors are no longer a dime a dozen. Rather, it's the ones that are twice removed from economic or three times economic that can be bought off the shelf. Thus, we came to the very real life situation last month where two major corporations reported a rather considerable disinterest in working with the AEC on building power reactors that might cost the companies much more than earlier estimates forecast. Regardless of the merits of this case, it points up the hard-to-assimilate fact that nuclear power is still a bit away from being an economic proposition in the United States.

3. Engineering problems: The final fact of life we'd like to report is the also obvious one that is now in the forefront: There are some not-too-small technical problems in certain kinds of reactors that the United States has been putting effort into. Homogeneous reactor systems are a case in point. There is reported in this issue the decision of a major utility group not to invest in a homogeneous power reactor because of the very high costs stemming from major technical difficulties. And the homogeneous program at Oak Ridge is riding rather low at the moment for very much the same reason.

Disregarding the very fine and useful progress that is being made in other parts of the United States reactor program, these then are the things that are in the limelight at the moment and that are causing confusion in American industrial ranks and in the minds of outsiders looking in at us.

The United States does not have unlimited manpower. Certainly, the finite number of reactor experts that we have places a finite limit on the diversification of program that we can indulge in.

In addition, and contrary to what other countries may think, we do not have unlimited money available for our atomic energy program.

Thus, we are not in the position many think we're in—that by pressing the right button we can crank out any number of new ideas that will pay off in relatively short order.

What we need more than anything else in the United States right now is to decide what it is that we really want in the atomic energy field. If we want a large number of different power reactors to be built domestically, then undoubtedly the Government is going to have to foot a big part of the bill with industry coming in to the extent it can.

If we want to develop reactors that can be sold abroad, we've got to concentrate on and push that which we're most competent

on. Because it appears that all the world, including England, is going to be moving rather quickly toward the building of enriched reactors, it would seem our best bet to concentrate our efforts on these.

But the editors of Nucleonics humbly reject any cloak of omniscience in this confused state of affairs. We do know for sure, however, that the dogfight now going on between the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the AEC is going to do this country no good. Certainly no dynamic reactor policies will result from it. In fact, it looks very much as if the conflict may worsen in the next 6 months.

The recommendation of Nucleonics is that the Joint Committee, in consultation with the AEC, set up a very high level, nonpartisan committee to study these questions:

1. What should the level and breadth of the United States domestic reactor program be?

2. What foreign atomic energy policies should the United States have? In particular, what is the most expeditious thing that the United States can do to improve its power reactor export position?

If the task can be set up and can be carried out with a high order of statesmanship, we may yet get out of the woods.

UNITED STATES MILITARY REACTOR PROGRAMS AND OTHER MOBILE POWER PROPOSALS

The primary use of nuclear material in the military services has been in weapons. However, the great strategic significance of nuclear power was recognized particularly in the Navy where fuel supply has been a principal logistic limit to operations, although Adm. H. J. Rickover, now Chief of the Naval Reactor Branch of the Atomic Energy Commission and Assistant Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships for nuclear propulsion, had to work hard to win support for a program. The use of nuclear power in aircraft or rockets has been recognized as potentially even greater in its implications for high performance, but the goal has been so remote until recently, that not as high a priority had been afforded these efforts in the past.

All of these developments are of tremendous concern to civil use of nuclear power because the great expenditures made to accomplish military ends will provide direct benefits to civil power even if a different set of economic rules applies.

Thus, in a submarine, performance and ruggedness come first, with cost a secondary consideration, if the nuclear-powered ship can conquer any nonnuclear-powered ship. Low cost and reliability dominate civil applications which compete against practical alternate use of thermal power. Both types of reactor goals add to our total fund of knowledge about reactors of any design.

THE NAVAL REACTOR PROGRAM

The original submarine reactor prototype was the S1W which has operated in a simulated section of submarine hull in the Idaho desert since 1953. It was followed by the S2W which powers the *Nautilus*, now completing 3 years of sea duty. These reactors are of the pressurized water type, developed by Westinghouse, and they paved the way for the civilian plant at Shippingport. The *Nautilus* has been a great success. One trip took it from New London to San Francisco and back with the trip being made under water from Panama to San Diego. Another trip made an extensive foray under the polar ice cap, to a point near the North Pole. Admiral Rickover called this one of the great adventures of all time.

Following the thermal reactor program, the Navy had General Electric develop its intermediate reactor, the S1G prototype at West Milton, New York, and its seagoing counterpart, the S2G in the *Seawolf*. These use sodium as a coolant, promising greater efficiencies in heat transfer, but our technology is not yet advanced sufficiently to make the steam superheating system work to full capacity without leaking, as a result of sodium corrosion. Both of these reactors have had these heat transfer troubles although the reactor as such has worked well. It is quite likely that the *Seawolf* later will receive a pressurized water reactor if further difficulties are encountered with the sodium plant, but meanwhile it is in commission, and performing regular duties.

Following the construction of these 2 prototype vessels, the Navy is now turning out at a rate of one every 6 months, a standard fleet nuclear submarine, of which there are four in the 578 class: the *Skate, Swordfish, Sargo,* and *Seadragon*. All of these use the SFR reactor, a pressurized water Westinghouse design, as will the *Halibut*, a guided missile submarine. These ships are being followed by another class of fleet vessels which are improved by use of the *Albacore* hull and a single propeller, which allows greater underwater speed and maneuverability. The first of this 585 class is the *Skipjack*. Other names which have been already assigned to nuclear submarines under program are the *Scamp, Scorpion, Sculpin, Shark, Snook,* and *Thresher*. Additional nuclear-powered submarines authorized by Congress are the *Permit, Pollack, Plunger, Triton,* and *Tullibee*.

The *Triton* is the largest submarine yet planned. It will have two advanced reactors, and will be a missile-launching ship. The prototype reactor at West Milton, N. Y., is the S3G, while those in the ship will be called S4G's. The reactors are built by General Electric, and are pressurized water designs.

It is probable that this Congress, by supplemental appropriation, will add at least three nuclear-powered submarines to the fiscal year 1958 shipbuilding program. These would be designed to carry and launch the 1,500-mile Polaris intermediate-range ballistics missile.

An earlier scheme for a nuclear-powered carrier was dropped some years ago, but the research effort then made was incorporated fairly directly into the Shippingport PWR civilian power reactor. Now nuclear power for surface ships is closer to actual accomplishment, with Westinghouse developing two reactor types: The A1W prototype is under construction in the Idaho desert, with two reactors being incorporated in a simulated section of ship's hull; the F1W multiple reactor system will be mounted in the guided missile cruiser *Long Beach*, now under construction at Quincy, Mass.

At Newport News, Va., a nuclear carrier of 70,000 to 80,000 tons is to be built, with eight reactors to be incorporated. This will be the world's largest warship. The Navy would like to order five sister ships at the rate of one a year. Presumably when the reactors are ordered from Westinghouse, they will be designated A2W's.

Under construction is another prototype reactor, the S1C at Windsor, Conn., designed to fit into smaller submarines not yet ordered. Combustion Engineering has the contract. There is also projected a D1G reactor project of the pressurized water type for small surface vessels of frigate size, held by General Electric and managed by the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory.

The Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks is also sponsoring a study of a portable nuclear powerplant which could be mounted in a barge for use at forward bases, but no contract has been let for construction.

ARMY REACTOR PROGRAMS

The first Army reactor, the APPR-1 went critical on April 8, 1957, and was dedicated at the end of that month. It was built at Fort Belvoir, Va., by Alco Products, producing 10,000 kilowatts of heat, converting into 1,625 kilowatts of electricity. The cost was about $4.3 million. Although theoretically its components are transportable, as a first model, it is rather heavy, amounting to 5,500 tons. This prototype is to be followed by the APPR-1a, by the same builder, and to be located somewhere in Alaska in 1959. These are both of the pressurized water type, and use about 25 kilograms of uranium enriched to 90 percent U-235 for the core. Its annual consumption of 5 kilograms of fuel saves hauling 12,000 tons of coal. The second model is more nearly portable, and will produce 1,550 kilowatts of electricity. Although this is undoubtedly very high-cost power, with capital costs of about $2,400 per kilowatt of capacity, it is intended for use in locations where delivery of conventional fuel might have to be by airlift, and where uncertain weather would make regular flights burdensome.

The Army program includes an even smaller reactor prototype, the ALPR for 1958 completion. This is of the boiling water type, built at the National Reactor Test Station in Idaho for the Argonne National Laboratory. It will produce under 1,000 kilowatts of heat and about 200 kilowatts of electricity. The cost of the project is 1.225 million dollars.

Another announced Army project is the GCRE reactor also building in Idaho. This is a gas-cooled design with the Aerojet-General Corps. and Battelle Memorial Institute participating in the development. It may use molten uranium and bismuth fuel, graphite moderation, and helium cooling, but final details are lacking.

Three other Army studies have been announced. General Motors did an engineering analysis for a possible nuclear-powered overland logistical cargo carrier which could move across many kinds of terrain independent of roads. Gilbert Associates, Inc. made a design study for a 20,000-kilowatt powerplant suitable for use overseas. Raytheon Manufacturing Co. made a design study of a liquid metal

fuel package reactor. From among these studies may come later contracts for actual construction.

These several projects have a commercial significance as well as strategic military importance. Many foreign locations in particular cannot afford and do not need for the present powerplants in the 100,000 kilowatt range. If enough work is done on these small military reactors, there should be benefits flow to the export reactor market as well, a useful supplement to other programs for international cooperation and economic development.

The Army is also engaged in the study of a food irradiation reactor which does not fall within the scope of this review of power reactors.

AIRCRAFT AND ROCKET REACTORS

The successful development of nuclear-powered aircraft or nuclear space rockets presents enormous technical difficulties in design and engineering. This is what lies back of the past tendency for the programs to blow hot and to blow cold. Effective combat aircraft with nuclear power have been sufficiently remote that when budget squeezes appeared, it was easier to assign funds to other projects which seemed more likely to reach operational use earlier. This is logical practice in the short run, but its effect over the long stretch should be subjected to thoughtful analysis.

Shortly after World War II, a design study project for nuclear aircraft was assigned to the Fairchild Aviation Co. under the name NEPA, but it did not lead to any actual construction because reactor science was still at so primitive a stage.

The military services and the Atomic Energy Commission in some past years have been reluctant to publicize just what work was being undertaken to develop nuclear aircraft. However, press releases issued from time to time, and public requests for appropriations have shown a considerable number of companies involved in such work.

Carbide & Chemical Co. at Oak Ridge in 1954 tested, then dismantled, a reactor called the ARE, intended to study applications in aircraft. It ran on molten uranium fluoride salts highly enriched with U–235, generating about 1,000 kilowatts of power on the average in 4 full days of continuous operation. Another Government activity has been the establishment in September 1955 of a facility near Sandusky, Ohio, for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the testing of aircraft reactor ideas and components.

The Air Force has had various study contracts intended to lead to reactor and engine construction with General Electric, Pratt and Whitney, and Curtiss-Wright. General Electric has constructed facilities at Evendale, Ohio. Pratt and Whitney has helped to run the big CANEL laboratories at Middletown, Conn. Airframe contract studies were made with Convair, Lockheed, and Boeing, in the competition for an eventual WS–125A contract to build a nuclear plane. The Air Force has also started work on its own test reactor to study components, at the Wright Aeronautical Development Center at Dayton, Ohio.

These several projects have had their vicissitudes. General Electric has worked with Convair to place a live reactor in a B–36 bomber to study problems of shielding and weight distribution, flying this plane from Fort Worth. General Electric also tested its HTRE–1 reactor at the National Reactor Test Station in Idaho. This reactor actually supplied heat to operate a jet engine on the test stand. Work is also under way in Idaho to build an enormous airstrip for eventual use by experimental aircraft. Another heat transfer reactor is to be built at Lockland, Ohio, by General Electric. There has been some feeling that the work presently being done is something which could lead in a relatively few years to an aircraft of only intermediate performance capabilities, but General Electric is confident that adequate performance can be attained.

The Pratt and Whitney effort was intended to be teamed with air frames built by Lockheed and/or Boeing. Apparently the design study was for a very high performance engine, and success must have been thought too far away, because the major Pratt and Whitney contract was canceled. Nothing recently has been said about a Boeing nuclear plane. Lockheed, however, is active in the nuclear field, but probably in another connection to be discussed presently.

The Navy has also had a series of design contracts with various manufacturers, these efforts being coordinated with the Air Force work. Both Martin Aircraft and Convair have been considered as potential builders of nuclear-powered flying boats. Howard Hughes, a pioneer in large seaplane construction, also is believed interested. Even the Air Force has given serious consideration to the advantages of seaplanes because of the hazard of land operations with radioactive materials. Accidents in or over water areas would likely be less serious in consequences, and a reactor could even be routinely lowered into water for extra shielding when not in use. Reactor or engine design contracts of the Navy have been with Allison Division of General Motors, Air Research of Garrett, the Nuclear Development Corp., General Electric, and Curtiss-Wright.

Only little bits of another area of development have been made public. This is to apply nuclear power not to heat the air passing through a more or less conventional jet engine, but to operate either ramjets or rockets. Chemically-powered ramjets and rockets have been so slow in maturing as techniques that understandably nuclear propulsion in these fields has also been slow.

The code name, project ROVER, has been applied to this effort. Apparently the N division of the Los Alamos Laboratory has been making design studies for many years. The Livermore Laboratory also had a contract which was canceled, but as a result of Congressional outcry, it was renewed again last fall. There are three signs that some progress is being made. The Lockheed company apparently has some related work under way. It is to build a research reactor at Palo Alto, Calif., for experimental purposes, and is developing a large reservation near Dawsonville, Ga., for test purposes. The Atomic Energy Commission must feel that some phases of the work are far enough along for larger scale testing because it is adding rocket or ramjet facilities both at Las Vegas, Nev., and the atomic proving grounds nearby.

The ramjet approach might allow the operation of supersonic planes, manned or unmanned, to travel unlimited distances around the earth, either very low to escape easy radar tracking, or in the upper atmosphere where friction is less. Nuclear aircraft with turbine jet engines might be particularly useful for ocean and Arctic radar patrol. Nuclear rockets suggest the possibility of outmoding the ICBM with guidance all the way to target so that interception by an antimissile missile would be much more difficult. A nuclear rocket of moderate performance, but with power sustained longer than is true of chemical fuels probably would heat and expel a gas. Another design approach which has been suggested is a runaway reaction midway between a controlled reaction and an atomic explosion. This could yield speeds as great as 100,000 miles per hour or more, probably of use only on trips well away from the earth.

The Air Force has design studies under way on even more exotic power systems, some of which would use nuclear reactors, such as ionic rockets and photon rockets. These would not be used for takeoff from the earth but are potentially important for travel to other parts of the solar system. This is an effort of great interest but not one which will become an operational phase of military technique within the next decade, as far as one can judge.

MERCHANT-SHIP REACTORS

It was in April 1955 that the President announced plans for a nuclear powered merchant vessel, a vessel to be used for demonstrating the peaceful uses of atomic energy, but not one which could compete economically in world commerce. The plan raised early Congressional opposition as a waste of money. That same spring there was some talk that the proposed new sister ship of the liner *United States* could be nuclear powered. The Norwegians that spring suggested their own ultimate hope would be for a nuclear-powered ship of 40 knots speed, using a jet-propulsion system in place of propellers.

The House of Representatives in the summer of 1955 passed a bill which substituted for the President's plan a vessel to be built with special attention to economical operation, although this would take longer to accomplish. However, the bill did not pass in the Senate.

In October 1955 the British Shipbuilding Research Association revealed that it was working with scientists at Harwell to develop plans for nuclear powered merchant ships to supplement the work on nuclear submarines for the Royal Navy, already under way for 5 years. A month later the Russians announced

plans for an Arctic icebreaker merchant vessel. As originally described, it was to develop 200,000 kilowatts of power and to cut its way through ice by means of steam jets as well as using its hull. The following month the United States Maritime Administration renewed its request for Congressional authorization for a nuclear-powered vessel.

In January 1956 the President sought funds for two nuclear vessels. One was to be an exhibition ship to be built fairly soon, and the other was to be a nuclear-powered tanker, a type that offers early opportunity to be economical in its operations because it will spend most of its time at sea, which allows its high speed and expensive powerplant to earn its capital costs, unlike the typical ship which spends much time in port because of cargo-handling delays.

By the spring of 1956 the administration plan for its first nuclear-powered ship had changed from a predominantly passenger vessel to one with both cargo and passenger capacity, propelled by the same general type of reactor as used in the *Nautilus*. A study contract was made that spring with Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. for the possible installation of a nuclear powerplant in a Mariner-type hull. Bethlehem Steel already had a contract for a study of various components of nuclear systems. In June 1956 West Germany formally created an association to design a nuclear-powered ship.

After considerable debate and some disagreement, finally by July a bill authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered vessel was passed by Congress and signed into law. It called for the Maritime Administration to build a combination passenger-cargo vessel. The authorized ship could carry an advanced type of pressurized water reactor, but if this were decided, construction would take about 9 months longer. The tanker proposal did not become law.

A Soviet official announced in September 1956 that the second Soviet nuclear ship would be a whaling factory ship of 50,000 tons, the largest in the world, and the hope was to launch it in about 3 years. Our Government that month granted a feasibility contract for a nuclear tanker to the Ford Instrument Co. division of Sperry Rand Corp. This design study was to consider development of a closed-cycle gas turbine which would bypass the intermediate step of converting steam to electricity as used in the pressurized water reactors. It was hoped that this could be the basis of a much more economical powerplant. In November a similar contract was awarded to General Dynamics.

All major seapowers are interested in the potentialities of nuclear plants. By March of 1957, the Japanese announced that they were studying nuclear-powered ships, and hoped by 1966 to have at least two in operation. The Osaka Shosen Kaisha revealed that it hoped to build a passenger vessel of 20,000 tons so powered.

In April 1957 a contract finally was let for the construction of the reactor for the first American vessel with nuclear propulsion. Babcock & Wilcox won the contract. The plans for designing the ship that same month went to George G. Sharpe, Inc.

Private industry also moved directly into this field of activity. Cities Service Petroleum made tentative arrangements in June 1957 to order from a Swedish shipyard a nuclear tanker of 65,000 tons deadweight. The hull was already on order as the last of three sister ships. It was hoped that a reactor from the United States could be installed in it before the ship would otherwise be completed.

The Sharpe firm made public through the Maritime Administration its exterior plans for the first ship, to be built at a cost of $42.5 million, and to be ready in 1960 after a keel laying in the spring of 1958. In July 1957 the Russians released the first photographs of their nuclear icebreaker, the *Lenin*, under construction at Leningrad.

By October the Maritime Administration had received 18 proposals for the design of a closed-cycle turbine nuclear plant for installation in a tanker. On October 29, 1957, our first nuclear ship was announced by the White House to have been assigned the name *Savannah*. Two days later, the French Government announced officially that it was going to construct a nuclear-powered tanker of 40,000 tons, with 40,000 horsepower, about double that of the first United States ship.

Finally in November, the contract for the actual construction of a ship's hull for the *Savannah* was awarded to the New York Shipbuilding Corp. of Camden, N. J.

Another important innovation under serious study is the submarine merchant tanker. First public attention was called to such possibilities by the Japanese in December 1956. Although still very tentative it was thought the first Japanese nuclear ship would be a conventional tanker, designed by the Hitachi Shipbuilding and Engineering Co., of 47,000 deadweight, with a sodium graphite reactor of 20,000 horsepower. But the second might be a submarine tanker, designed and built by the Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd. The ship would be of 30,000 deadweight, able to sail beneath the sea without regard to surface storms. Navigation would be from a special bridge projecting 15 to 18 feet above water.

The first British nuclear tanker was announced in March 1957 as having an expected capacity of 80,000 tons, and to be ready by 1963. In July Hawker Siddely and John Brown Nuclear Construction, Ltd. announced they were studying a 65,000 ton or larger nuclear tanker. By October 1957, sufficient detail of British plans had become public to reveal that a nuclear-powered submarine of 80,000 tons was under investigation by Saunders-Roe. This would have the fantastic speed of 50 knots. Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery stated that the Japanese plans had been enlarged to include a submarine of 65,000 tons.

In November 1957, American television audiences were shown films of the actual hull form for the British nuclear tanker being tested in a model basin. The proposed vessel, as the fastest in the world, would be able to deliver enormous quantities of oil from the Middle East around the Cape of Good Hope, probably to a new superharbor at Milford Haven in Wales.

With considerable fanfare, the Russian nuclear icebreaker *Lenin* was launched on December 5, 1957. It provides accommodations for 1,000, should be able to cut through ice 6 feet thick, and is expected to visit Antarctica before the end of the IGY. However, there is no evidence other than official Soviet statements that a nuclear propulsion plant is actually building to power the ship.

### NUCLEAR POWER ON THE WORLD SCENE

This report for the most part has only made brief allusions to nuclear developments outside the United States, except for the foregoing section on merchantship reactors which illustrates the competitive elements on the world scene which are likely to influence United States policy.

In fact, so much is happening in foreign countries, relating to nuclear power in general, that a much more extensive report is required. The material which follows summarizes the principal developments.

### BRITISH PROGRESS

In the early days of atomic development during World War II, Great Britain along with Canada, supplied scientific help to the United States, and made available British Commonwealth supplies of raw materials from which nuclear fuel could be refined. But in the Free World, only the United States had the actual costly plants for the gaseous diffusion of U–235 essential both to the making of weapons and to the building of reactors. We also had the only full-scale plants for the manufacture and separation of plutonium.

The terms of United States law after the war largely ended exchange of information and personnel in the field of atomic energy between the United States and its British and Canadian partners. The British had to build their own facilities for production, as well as expanding their experimental laboratories. They built rather limited facilities for the separation of U–235 at Capenhurst, but the output has been so small that all was required for the British weapons program. They also built plutonium piles at Windscale with the output going to weapons.

The British felt the urgency of a power program earlier than the United States because of national dependence on imported oil fuel and the increasing costs appearing in the coal industry. At the same time, availability of nuclear materials for even a modest weapons program was limited. This led, rather naturally, to considering the possibility of a dual-purpose reactor which would produce plutonium for weapons but operate at a high enough temperature to create steam for the generation of electricity. Of sev-

eral potential reactor designs, one type particularly commended itself to British conditions. This was the graphite-moderated, gas-cooled, natural-uranium-fueled reactor. This was a type that would not require the use of scarce U-235, a fuel which makes for compactness and efficiency, but which first requires a tremendous investment in separation plants. Also, the British design required a pressure vessel which was easier to construct at the present stage of metallurgy than the types under consideration in the United States. Graphite was more available than heavy water for use as a moderator.

This was the origin of the Calder Hall program in 1953, a compromise which would meet the pressing need for more weapons-grade plutonium and also give practical experience in the full-scale operation of a power station. As construction proceeded, and laboratory experimental work continued, the design concept looked promising enough under British conditions, and the power need was urgent enough if a power shortage was not to curb the further growth of the economy in the years immediately ahead.

So, at the same time that the United States, unpressed by power shortages, announced the initial 5-year demonstration program to test various reactor concepts in full scale, the British Central Electric Authority announced the plan to construct 12 nuclear stations by 1965, all modeled after Calder Hall, generating between 1.5 and 2 million kilowatts. It was thought that perhaps the last stations in the program would be liquid cooled rather than gas cooled, if technology had advanced sufficiently to make the improvement worth while. This $800 million program would make up one-quarter of the capacity additions planned in the Authority's power plans for the decade.

Meanwhile, the Atomic Energy Authority was concerned with development of other reactor models and had started work in the north of Scotland and Dounreay on a fast breeder reactor cooled with liquid sodium and potassium. This was to be a plant of intermediate scale, better able to afford operating experience than a small laboratory prototype.

By May 1956, the first Calder Hall reactor had gone critical. That summer, too, the British announced that revisions of plant design through advancing technology were likely to raise the power output of their program from the range of 1.5 to 2.0 million kilowatts to the range of 3 to 4 million kilowatts. On October 17, the Calder Hall A unit began regular operation, feeding power into the national grid.

The Suez crisis in the fall of 1956 gave a new urgency to nuclear power development in Great Britain, and the 10-year program was pushed forward to the point of signing contracts with builders and picking sites for the first of the stations for the Central Electrical Authority. In addition, the Atomic Energy Authority plans included a similar plant of the Calder Hall type at Calder Hall, and two more of the same type at Chapelcross. The Central Electric Authority plants under contract included one at Bradwell, Essex, one at Berkeley in Gloucestershire, and one at Hinkley Point in Somerset. A similar large plant was planned by the South of Scotland Electric Board at Hunterston in Ayrshire.

British resolution to spur their program even more became public in March 1957. The capital expenditure was raised from $840 million to over $2.5 billion, and the capacity was expected to be somewhere between 5 and 6 million kilowatts. It was expected that about 20 large stations would have to be built by 1965.

It is difficult to make an exact comparison in size between the British and United States programs, or to compare their differing objectives and reasons for being. The firm United States program is relatively modest in total kilowatts, but the British are not committed finally to construction of all their decade program, either. However, all rational methods of counting seem to indicate that by 1960, and also by 1965, the British lead in total nuclear power generation will be substantial compared with the United States, as each country projects plans today.

In October 1957, there was an accident at the Windscale plutonium reactor which melted down some fuel cartridges, and overwhelmed the chimney filters so that radioactive materials settled on part of the surrounding countryside. It is important to emphasize that this accident had nothing to do with normal power-generating procedures and probably not even with regular plutonium separation. Happily, most of the fallout was carried out to sea, but there were two unfortunate consequences of the accident. One was some loss of public confidence in reactor safety and possibly in Government candor—although this was belatedly rectified; the other was the loss of plutonium output for an indefinite period from this reactor, with a consequent cutback in important weapons development work by the British.

The United Kingdom is also expected within the next decade to have at least one large nuclear plant in northern Ireland. This may be a large, fast breeder reactor, which would depend upon the outcome of work under way at Dounreay.

A very inconclusive debate has raged between proponents of the American pressurized water reactors and the British gas-cooled ones. In the first place, each type of reactor has its place to fit the circumstances. Secondly, construction costs in the two countries vary enough as to change the economics of design. Thirdly, in both countries arbitrary changes in Government policy relative to the supplying of fuel and the repurchase of spent fuel elements for their plutonium can alter the apparent contrasts. Only after these are taken into account does the further important question of differences in interest rates, depreciation, and tax policy also become pertinent in making a judgment.

W. Kenneth Davis of the Atomic Energy Commission reported in July 1957 that using data supplied by the British, and translating these to American conditions, the gas-cooled reactor with natural uranium fuel will not give the United States competitively low-power costs in the foreseeable future. He points out that the British, despite their large commitment to construct gas-cooled plants, are working very hard on other experimental types of reactors.

A study sponsored by the Commission and made by the American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Co. under contract, was made public last May. It compared second generation plants of the Shippingport and Calder Hall varieties of similar power outputs—90,000 kilowatts—and this showed a slight cost edge for the Calder Hall design in the United States—17.9 mills as against 19.6 mills. In a British setting, the Calder Hall design has an even greater advantage—8 mills as against 13.1 mills. Congressional advocates of a gas cooled natural uranium reactor in the United States claim support from this study, but it is not necessarily inconsistent with the Davis conclusions. Very possibly more recent types of water reactors offer the United States the best economic prospects until some advanced breeding, homogeneous, aqueous, or molten metal reactor is completely developed. William L. Laurence, writing in the New York Times for January 5, 1958, summarized these possibilities as follows:

COST OF ATOMIC-POWERED ELECTRICITY BEING BROUGHT NEARER TO ECONOMICAL LEVEL

(By William L. Laurence)

The last week of 1957 saw two significant developments in the field of atomic power, each marking an important step toward the goal of producing electricity from the atom at a cost competitive with power produced from conventional fuels.

From the Argonne National Laboratory of the Atomic Energy Commission near Chicago, Ill., came the announcement that improvements in the operation of the experimental boiling water reactor (EBWR) has made the plant potentially capable of producing the Nation's cheapest atomic electricity, though it would still be far from being actually competitive with electricity from coal or oil.

At the same time came the announcement from the Atomic Energy Commission that an advanced type of an experimental atomic powerplant, known as the homogeneous reactor experiment No. 2 (H. R. E. 2) has gone into operation at the AEC's National Laboratory at Oak Ridge, Tenn. This type of nuclear reactor, when further developed, promises a number of distinctive advantages over present types of large-scale atomic powerplants which are expected to lead to a considerable reduction in the cost of industrial electricity from the nuclei of heavy atoms, uranium, plutonium, and thorium.

The experimental boiling water reactor consists of a system in which water is heated to steam by the fission process in the reactor core, the steam then passing directly into a turbine which operates an electrical generator. The system differs from the water reactor used in atomic submarines and at the large-scale atomic powerplant recently put in operation in Shippingport, Pa. In the latter type the heat from the split atoms is transformed to a heat exchanger by circulating water under pressure, the heat exchanger, in turn, producing steam for the turbine.

HOW IT WORKS

The homogeneous reactor type utilizes a solution of suspension of nuclear fuel in water, which serves both as a moderator, to slow down the atom-splitting neutrons, and

as a coolant. The newest type is a two-region reactor consisting of a cone filled with a heavy-water solution of uranyl silicate, a compound of uranium and sulfur which is soluble in water. The core is surrounded by a blanket containing heavy water, that is, water in which the hydrogen has a mass double that of hydrogen in ordinary water.

The fuel solution is pumped under pressure through the reactor vessel where it is heated by the fission of the uranium nuclei in the dissolved compound. The solution is then passed through heat exchangers, where the heat is released to produce steam. The steam can then be used to drive a turbine-generator system to produce electricity.

One of the great advantages of the homogeneous type of reactor results from the fact that it can be kept free from the fission products, the accumulation of which in plants using solid fuel elements constitutes one of the major operating problems. The homogeneous reactor plant includes chemical processing equipment for purifying the irradiated fuel solution by continuously removing solid corrosion and fission products, thus making it possible for the plant to be kept in continuous operation, without the requirement of costly reprocessing of the solid fuel.

IMPROVED DESIGN

The HRE–2 represents an advance in physical size and in technology over HRE–1, which in 1953 became the second United States reactor to produce electric power from nuclear energy. It has a heat output of 5,000 kilowatts, most of which will be dissipated into the atmosphere. The remainder will be supplied to a small turbine-generator system to produce 300 kilowatts of electric power.

Compared with its power output, the experimental boiling water reactor at Argonne is a veritable giant. It was originally designed to produce 20,000 kilowatts of heat and 5,000 kilowatts of electricity, a power level achieved on December 29, 1956. Following a year of experimentation, the plant was operated last week at a power level of 50,000 kilowatts, or 2½ times its original design level. Furthermore, the 50,000-kilowatt level, the AEC announced, was attained with no change in the number or arrangement of the fuel elements within the reactor core.

The new high level, it was reported, was achieved by causing the water to boil at a higher than normal rate, resulting in faster circulation through the core and in a more rapid removal of heat.

In addition, calculations by Argonne scientists and engineers indicate that with further modifications the EBWR could produce up to 100,000 kilowatts of heat and 25,000 kilowatts of electricity. This level of operation, however, would require the addition of more fuel and a turbine-generator and condenser of larger capacity than those of the present plant.

COST BROUGHT DOWN

The increase in the power level from 20,000 to 50,000 kilowatts means, according to Argonne engineers, a reduction in the cost of atomic electricity from 52 mills per kilowatt to 32 mills, or a reduction of nearly 40 percent in the cost. Chicago public utilities now produce electricity at a cost of about 7.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. On the other hand, it was pointed out, 20 mills would be economical in some areas.

Argonne scientists added that they believed it was possible that their equipment and methods could, in about 10 years, bring the cost down to 10 mills per kilowatt-hour, which would be within the cost range of conventional utility plants in the United States.

The key to atomic power economics is the cost of fuel, which, at the Argonne unit, is slightly enriched uranium, worth $750,000. This fuel, it was said, accounts for 20 of the 32 mills of the cost per kilowatt-hour. Considerable reductions are expected by getting more mileage from the fuel and by lowering the initial cost of its processing.

British merchant ship reactor plans have been described. Work on nuclear submarines is further advanced. More than 5 years of effort have been invested already. A prototype submarine reactor is building at Dounreay, and it will be of the pressurized water variety used in the *Nautilus*. The work is being done by Vickers, Rolls Royce, and Foster-Wheeler. The first submarine is to be named the *Dreadnought*. Current newspaper accounts indicate the project may be abandoned in order to release scarce scientific personnel to other projects.

Although this report is not concerned with nuclear weapons, perspective requires the mention that the British are now armed with home-developed weapons in both the kiloton and megaton ranges. Tests have been carried out in Australia and the central Pacific, including airborne fusion weapons. Progress has also been made in controlling the amount of radioactive fallout, that is, developing the clean weapon.

Substantial British progress in thermonuclear power is covered later in this report.

Table II summarizes the British power-reactor program.

TABLE II.—*United Kingdom civilian power reactor program (including all reactors with an electrical output)*

| Reactor concept name | Location | Scheduled completion date | Moderator | Coolant | Fuel | Heat output | Electric output | Total cost (millions) | Cost per kilowatt | Cost per kilowatt-hours | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) Atomic Energy Authority: | | | | | | | | | | *Mills* | |
| Calder Hall A | Sellafield, Cumberland. | 1956 | Graphite | $CO_2$ | Natural U | 260,000 | 65,000 (later 92,000) | $42–$56 | $565 | 7 | Construction started 1953. Went critical May 22, 1956. Regular operation Oct. 17, 1956. |
| Calder Hall B | do | 1958 | do | $CO_2$ | do | 400,000 | 92,000 | 42 | | | All 4 units contain 2 reactors each. Their purpose is to breed weapons grade plutonium at a ratio of 0.8. |
| Calder Hall A type | Chapelcross, Dumfriesshire. | 1958 | do | $CO_2$ | do | 400,000 | 92,000 | 42 | | | |
| Calder Hall B type | do | 1959 | do | $CO_2$ | do | 400,000 | 92,000 | 42 | | | |
| Fast breeder | Dounreay, Caithness. | 1958 | None | Sodium-potassium. | Highly enriched U–235 with thorium blanket; alternately Pu in U–238 blanket. | 60,000 | 15,000 | | | | Breeds plutonium at a ratio of 1.7. |
| (B) Central Electric Authority: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calder Hall Type PIPPA 1 and 2. | Bradwell, Essex. | 1960 | Graphite | $CO_2$ | Natural U | | 300,000 | 112 | 325 to 350 | | These 5 units include 2 reactors each, and breed some plutonium as well as producing power. They are to be followed by 15 more large reactors to be completed by 1965, but these may be water cooled rather than gas cooled. The first 3 were started in 1957. |
| Calder Hall Type PIPPA 3 and 4. | Berkeley, Gloucestershire. | 1960 | do | $CO_2$ | do | | 275,000 | 112 | | | |
| Calder Hall Type | Hinkley Point, Somerset. | 1961 | do | $CO_2$ | do | | 450,000 | 112 | | | |
| Do | North Wales | 1962 | do | $CO_2$ | do | | 500,000 | 112 | | | |
| Do | do | 1962 | do | $CO_2$ | do | | 500,000 | 112 | | | |
| (C) South of Scotland Electric Board: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Calder Hall Type | Hunterston, Ayrshire. | 1961 | do | $CO_2$ | do | | 180,000 | 49 | | | Work started in 1957, 2 reactors, breeds some plutonium. |
| Do | do | 1962 | do | $CO_2$ | do | | 180,000 | 49 | | | 2 reactors, breeds some plutonium. |
| (D) Northern Ireland Government: Fast Breeder. | | 1963–64 | None | Sodium-potassium. | U–235 or Pu–239 in blanket of thorium or U–238. | | 200,000 | 98 | | | 2 reactors, 1.7 breeding factor for production of plutonium. |

SOVIET PROGRESS

It remains difficult to report with certainty the exact status of Soviet nuclear-power developments because of Soviet restrictions on the gathering of news. What I report here is subject to the credibility of Soviet statements of their activities. In the middle of 1954, the first small nuclear powerplant was opened, one with a capacity of 5,000 kilowatts of electrical output. The first pictures of it were released in January 1955. Further details were not released until the time of the Geneva Conference in August 1955. Disclosures at that time also showed that the Russians must have one or more gaseous diffusion plants because of their use of enriched uranium in some experimental reactors.

The sixth 5-year plan announced at the beginning of 1956 called for the building of atomic powerplants by 1960 with a total capacity of 2 million to 2.5 million kilowatts, which is larger than the British 1965 goal of the same time—subsequently the British goal has been tripled. The Russians at that time also claimed that the first large station in the fifty to one hundred thousand-kilowatt range was already under construction.

At the 20th party congress, I. V. Kurchatov claimed that the Soviet Union was making good headway on thermonuclear-power research, on atomic-powered aircraft and land vehicles, and on an atomic-powered icebreaker. New power stations planned for completion by 1960 included a pair with a combined capacity of 1 million kilowatts in the Urals, and one of 400,000 kilowatts near Moscow. Kurchatov also stated that the Soviet program included building 10 different reactor types, falling within the general range of fifty and one hundred thousand kilowatts—probably their heat output—a program corresponding to the United States reactor-demonstration program.

Kurchatov made quite an impression on British scientists in April 1956 when he discussed at Harwell, Soviet experimentation with thermonuclear phenomena. The information he presented was more detailed than that allowed by the security rules of Britain and the United States.

Although not of immediate application for power programs, Soviet research in high-energy physics is worth noting. The Russians have completed a 10-billion electron volt particle accelerator, and are designing one with a capacity of 50 billion electron volts. The University of California bevatron has a capacity of 6 billion electron volts, and a machine projected for Brookhaven is in the thirty-to-fifty-billion range.

For a long time, the location of the first Soviet nuclear powerplant was not known. The first Western visitor to it, seems to have been the Norwegian physicist, Arne Lundby, chief of reactor physics for the Norwegian Atomic Institute. It turned out to be 67 miles south of Moscow, to be moderated with graphite and cooled by pressurized water. Its fuel is enriched from one-one hundred and fortieth to one one-twentieth of U-235.

The next detailed story about Soviet nuclear power was released in June 1957. The first big power station, location unknown, is to have a capacity of 420,000 kilowatts and be ready in 1960. It will be fueled with enriched and natural uranium, apparently an enlargement of the design concept used in the first 5,000-kilowatt plant. The first stage of construction will include three 70,000-kilowatt steam turbines.

No Westerner has been permitted to visit the location of this first powerplant, so the stage of construction is not known. It is possible that the Russians wish to complete their station and put it into operation before further disclosures are made. On the other hand, it is very likely that the amount of the total program to be completed by 1960 has been markedly reduced by higher priority projects in other fields of endeavor. Weight can be given to this interpretation because even with our great lead in nuclear research, there have been unexpected problems which have delayed several of our projects. Recent scientific achievements by the Russians, however, illustrate that it might be dangerous for us to base our policies on the firm conclusion that the Russian program has bogged down in any serious way.

The Soviet nuclear ship program has been discussed earlier. No mention has been made by the Russians of a nuclear submarine program. Considering the extreme importance of submarines to Soviet naval strategy, and the immense advantage nuclear submarines have over the diesel variety, it would be inconceivable that a nation with a nuclear energy program would neglect submarine reactors. The only safe planning assumption the United States should make is that a Soviet nuclear submarine is either under construction or already undergoing tests, and that the next 5 years will see the start of a fleet submarine program with nuclear power.

Strong Soviet public interest has been shown in nuclear aircraft. Some Western visitors returned from the Soviet Union recently, report that nuclear flight is expected soon, but this is speculative in character.

Soviet aid to satellite countries includes a power reactor of 2,000 kilowatts which began operating December 16, 1957, near Dresden in East Germany. Also scheduled for completion in 1957 was a 7,000 kilowatt reactor in Red China, with no announcement as to the location. Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia all have hoped for full-scale power stations to be complete by 1960, but there may be some delay.

FRENCH PROGRESS

The French program for nuclear energy has followed somewhat along the path of the British but is not quite as advanced. Following construction of a series of experimental reactors, the first production plants were planned for Marcoule in the Rhone Valley of southeastern France. These were patterned after Calder Hall. That is, they are gas cooled, graphite moderated plants operating on natural uranium and producing plutonium as well as power. The program was announced in March 1955. The Marcoule G–1 and G–2 reactors were expected to cost about $86 million.

In addition to the Marcoule program, operated by the French Atomic Energy Commission, a power program was announced in August 1956 by Electricité de France. The first station in the Loire Valley, for completion in 1960, is to have an initial power output of 60,000 kilowatts, later to be raised to about 300,000 kilowatts. It will be at Candes, followed by a similar plant at Chinon, also in the Loire Valley, a year or so later.

The G–1 reactor went into operation in January 1956, but its output of 5,000 kilowatts of electricity at full operation has been used completely in the operation of its own air blowers. This emphasizes its main purpose to be plutonium production.

Until the time of the Suez crisis, all public statements on the purposes of the atomic industry in France excluded the development of weapons. It is worth noting, however, that the decision to follow the Calder Hall pattern in the development of Marcoule clearly left the door open to making nuclear weapons with the plutonium produced, and this may very well have been done with foresight. After the Suez crisis broke, there was open talk that France might have to develop its own weapons. There were many individuals, however, who felt this might be disastrous for the future development of the Euratom program. By the end of 1957, the early development of weapons seemed to have become a definite policy, not just a threat.

The French have introduced one notable technological change. Their large pressure vessels are to be of reinforced concrete rather than steel. If the results are satisfactory, there may be opened a route to new economies in construction costs. The G–2 and G–3 reactors are to be in full operation by sometime in 1958, when they will turn out about 60,000 kilowatts. A G–4 reactor may be built by 1960 either at Marcoule or in Algeria.

There is a nuclear submarine program for the French Navy. The first vessel, expected to be quite large, may be completed in 1962.

EURATOM AND ITS ANTECEDENTS

When it was appreciated that nuclear energy could be used to generate useful power, countries the world over hoped to solve many of their problems through an expansion of energy derived from fission of uranium. The less developed countries hoped for the greatest changes, but were least ready for the new technology which had yet to be put to practical use. Many of the European countries were technically capable of handling atomic reactors with a minimum amount of new training, but in the early postwar years they were short of all the essentials of materials, equipment, and manpower to carry on individual development programs of any magnitude. There were a few cooperative efforts, as for example, the joint Netherlands-Norwegian research plan, with a reactor at Kjeller, Norway.

By the spring of 1955 the United States indicated that it was soon going to be prepared to render assistance to other nations who wanted research and power reactors. The Geneva Conference was seen as a means for peaceful development of the atom, providing an opportunity to arrange export of technology from the leading countries which had already made a start in nuclear energy. In July 1955 the OEEC was urging that Western Europe coordinate plans for nuclear development because it would be more economical and practical than to have each separate country carrying out duplicate efforts. Its detailed plan was to be announced shortly after the Geneva Conference closed. It was foreseen that success for the plan would depend upon British technology and upon French uranium resources. Many experts recognized that only nuclear power was likely to be able to meet the rising demand for power everywhere in Europe.

It was evident that if an early start were to be made on reactors, particularly any type other than the ones fueled with natural uranium, United States help would be required. A plea for early United States supplies was brought to this country by Gunnar Randers of Norway in October 1955. By the end of 1955 Jean Monnet of France was pressing hard for European cooperation in the field of atomic energy as an essential form of European union. The countries of France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg, which made up the Iron and Steel Community, formed an action committee to study what might be done, and it was their hope the British might be led to join the coalition.

By February 1956 the Action Committee was meeting with members of the OEEC, looking for areas of compromise which would make possible a supranational plan for atomic development. However, the British were afraid their own nuclear development plans would be close to impossible to carry through to meet their own needs, if resources were diverted to various European projects.

The planners also hoped that United States help could be obtained for the building of a gaseous diffusion plant to serve all the countries of Western Europe needing U–235. It was clear that questions of security to guard against use of certain nuclear materials in weapons was a stumbling block to the plans.

By October 1956 a draft statute had been prepared in the United Nations calling for the creation of an International Atomic Energy Agency. Some 82 countries unanimously approved its terms. Of necessity, it was a much more limited scheme than the proposals being made within Western Europe for cooperation. It set up procedures for exchange of information, supplying of nuclear materials. Many countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain signed the plan. In support of the program, the President in November 1956 stated the Atomic Energy Commission would make available 20,000 kilograms of uranium enriched to 20 percent of U–235—too low an enrichment to use in weapons. It was to be supplied to various countries under a number of bilateral pacts, as well as including 5,000 kilograms supplied to the International Atomic Energy Agency itself.

The closing of the Suez Canal not only lent greater urgency in late 1956 to the nuclear plans of Britain and France, but of all the countries of Western Europe. It was not settled yet whether a strong supranational organization like the Iron and Steel Community would be better, or whether the looser OEEC should set the pattern. A draft treaty under development was called Euratom, and it was hoped to have it ready early in 1957.

The six countries of the Iron and Steel Community did sign the proposed treaty, and in May 1957 announced specific goals for the first decade of construction. It called for 15 million kilowatts of electric power capacity. Clearly so ambitious an undertaking would take the help of the United States, Britain, and Canada. The plan was advanced by the three wise men—Louis Armand, of France; Franz Etzel, of West Germany; and Francesco Giordani, of Italy. The program was expected to cost about $2 billion just for fuels. It would rely initially upon the British type of reactor, and would need natural uranium from Canada, to supplement supplies from France and the Belgian Congo. The powerplants were expected to cost about 2 to 2½ times as much as conventional powerplants, meaning an extra cost of about $4 billion over what would have to be spent anyway for conventional plants otherwise needed during the decade. They estimated that the resulting electricity based on present technology would cost between 11 and 14 mills, as compared with current typical European costs for conventionally generated electricity of 11 to 12 mills. It is interesting to note that the expectation is that even if all nuclear fuel had to be imported, it would cost about $200 million a year at the end of the 10-year period, as compared with a cost of $800 million a year for an equivalent amount of coal and oil.

In the light of European needs for further economic growth, there seems but little doubt that the plan for nuclear expansion is well conceived, but there is great question whether all the resources needed to make it a reality in a decade are actually present. Clearly, reactors purchased from both the United States and Britain will be required. But United States reactors usually require enriched fuels, and many Europeans are reluctant to tie their power capacity to American willingness to supply enriched fuel unobtainable elsewhere. They feel their economic life would be too subject to possible changes in American attitudes, and that there would be restrictive requirements in accounting for the fuel consumed. Consequently there is great interest in spurring research on reactors which can burn plutonium resulting from the conversion of U–238 in natural uranium reactors. The British estimate they may be able to start using plutonium by 1966. If plutonium cannot be used successfully, the whole outlook for nuclear power in Europe will be changed. Cost calculations have assumed that the byproduct plutonium would have a high resale value and be useful for power as well as weapons.

At the present time, with so many problems still to solve, the Euratom plan must be labeled more a hope than a concrete plan for accomplishment. If 15 million kilowatts are to be ready in a decade, there should already be a series of sites picked out, lines of credit arranged, and contracts awarded to constructors. This has not come about. But this is not to say that nothing is being done in individual countries.

French progress has already been reviewed. Italy has carried on long negotiations with the United States for power reactors, and it was expected that Westinghouse would erect a large power station of the pressurized water type near Milan, plus a smaller one near Turin. The Turin reactor was to pave the way to a ship propulsion plant. But the discussion dropped out of the press, and after a long lapse, in November 1957, it was announced that the first big contract was awarded to a British consortium of eight firms for a Calder Hall type reactor with an electric power output of 200,000 kilowatts, the plant to cost $80 million. It will be erected north of Milan. By December 1957, a second award was made to the United States firm, Vitro Engineering Co. This is for a $45 million plant of 150,000 kilowatt capacity to be built near Anzio, with completion expected in 1962.

Germany has made a start in nuclear power, too, and is expected to make up for lost time to win a position of world prominence in this field of endeavor. German research includes work on thermonuclear power, but Germany also has more immediate plans, though many of them are tentative. One relatively small power reactor of 15,000 kilowatts capacity was contracted for in April 1957 by the Rheinisch-Westfalisches Elektrizitatswerk. The reactor core and controls were to be shipped by AMF Atomics in the United States and the construction was to be supervised by the British firm of Mitchell Engineering, Ltd. It was to have been a boiling-water plant. Unfortunately, rising costs forced the withdrawal of AMF Atomics in October, and the whole scheme is now in doubt.

Belgium has been expected to make an early start in atomic-power development, under preferential arrangements with the United States and Britain because of past use by these countries of the uranium of the Belgian Congo. It was hoped to have the first small power reactor ready for the Brussels World Fair of 1958, but there was a public outcry against having one so soon near a densely populated area. Consequently, the plan was blocked by the Belgian Government. A full-scale plant for Belgium is also projected, but negotiations are not yet complete.

Dutch programs have not advanced beyond the experimental reactor stage.

This completes the review of the six countries which are now members of Euratom. The new organization will begin formal existence on January 1, 1958.

SCANDINAVIAN PROGRESS

Sweden is already an important developer of nuclear energy. Indicative of the high state of the art in that country is that serious discussion is given to the question of manufacturing nuclear weapons. However, one may feel about such weapons, this is a choice open only to countries with considerable talent and experience. Such problems, that is, whether to make weapons, were concerning the Swedish Ministry of Defense, according to its official report of late October 1957.

In any case, the necessity for a nuclear-power program is not doubted and a moderate sized but detailed program is mapped out and work is underway. The State power board has ordered two large reactors. The first, called Adam, to be completed in 1960, will deliver 75,000 kilowatts of heat. It is to be fueled with 8 tons of natural uranium, and use heavy water as coolant and moderator. The cost is estimated at $40 million. It will be located at Vasteras. The second reactor, called Eva, is to be ready in 1963, and will be considerably larger. It will be of the same type, but will provide 100,000 kilowatts of electricity.

In cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission of Sweden, the Stockholm Electric Co. plans to open in 1960 a very similar reactor to the ones already described. The first is called R3a, will provide 76,000 kilowatts of heat, converted into 14,000 kilowatts of electricity. This will be followed in 1962 by a similar model R3b of the same size, and in 1963 by model R4, using 14 tons of uranium to generate 75,000 kilowatts of electricity. Still later in 1967, the atomic energy commission expects to complete a plant producing 300,000 kilowatts of electricity.

Not only is Sweden building a large tanker for American account which may carry a reactor made in the United States, but is working to develop reactors of its own for similar purposes.

Mention has already been made of similar Norwegian interest, stemming from the joint research effort being carried on with the Netherlands. In addition, the Norwegians expect to complete in 1958 a power reactor at Halden which will generate 5,000 kilowatts of electricity. It will use both natural uranium and enriched uranium from the United States, with heavy water used as moderator and coolant. Norway has long been a major producer of heavy water. The heavy water plant came under Allied attack during the German occupation. A first prototype ship reactor may be ready as early as 1959.

Finland is in the market for a power reactor from Britain or the United States. No other details are available.

LATIN AMERICAN PLANS

Many parts of Latin America are burdened with extremely high power costs, adding to the other difficulties which block rapid economic development. Nuclear power has been viewed by some as a panacea, but this is not the case. The smaller size nuclear plants suitable to most Latin America market themselves produce such expensive power that they are more likely to be a drain on the limited capital funds of these countris than to afford much help. In the longer run, of course, experience with experimental and prototype reactors can be important to the general technological development of many of these countries.

Concrete accomplishment to date has been limited, although there are a number of plans in the making. One of the first specific plans was that made by American & Foreign Power Co., announced in October 1955 to erect three 10,000-kilowatt stations, each in a different country where it has power holdings. Contracts were awarded for two of the plants in May 1956, one with General Electric, and one with North American Aviation. Since that time there has been no announcement as to which countries are to have these plants, for other negotiations conducted at governmental level are involved as well.

In August 1956, Brazil canceled its agreement with the United States for joint efforts for uranium searching. This was a victory for ultranationalists, and has not been calculated to speed other atomic cooperation. Brazil wants a 10,000-kilowatt research reactor to study thorium conversion.

By the middle of 1958, a research reactor is expected to be in operation in Venezuela. Cuba has similar plans.

Almost nothing is heard any more of the much publicized plan in Argentina to generate power from secret nuclear sources, supposedly involving cosmic rays. Dr. Richter fell into disrepute, and his early announcements have not materialized as real advances in practical power generation. The Argentine Government, however, is going ahead with plans to have built a conventional nuclear-power station to turn out 10,000 kilowatts of electricity.

The Martin Aircraft Co. has a contract with the Dominican Republic to build a pressurized water reactor with an electric output of 13,000 kilowatts at Ciudad Trujillo.

Meanwhile, most Latin American countries are participating to some degree in United States training programs looking forward to the day when they will have enough technicians of their own to do serious work in the field of nuclear energy.

CANADIAN PROGRESS

Canada has been a pioneer in the use of heavy water reactors. After developing three research reactors, the fourth one planned in Canada was anounced in January 1955 as a power producer, to be built near Chalk River, at Des Joaquims. This is a $15 million project, to produce 20,000 kilowatts of power. About one-third of the cost will be met by the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission, about $2 million will come from the Canadian General Electric Co., and the rest from Atomic Energy of Canada, Ltd., a government corporation. The completion goal was 1958 or 1959, but there have been some delays in the building of the NPD, as it is called, so now completion is not expected until 1960.

Nuclear power in Canada will have difficulty meeting the competition of very cheap hydroelectric power for many years. The Gordon Royal Commission on Canada's economic prospects reported in November 1957 that even as late as 1980, nuclear power is likely to account for only 2 percent of total Canadian power output. This, however, has not curbed research, even though there is no urgency for immediate construction of large capacity plants.

JAPANESE PROGRESS

Many elements in the Japanese public were emotionally opposed to the development of atomic power in Japan for reasons of previous military experience with this form of energy. However, the logic for use of nuclear energy is very compelling in a country with limited fuel resources. There are few good hydro sources left, and although most of the coal imports have been used for metallurgical purposes at the same time that other grades of coal were available for export, the not-too-distant future presents grave challenges if the Japanese economy is to serve the needs of the population.

On a trip to Japan in May 1955, the late John Jay Hopkins of General Dynamics urged a vast atomic development program for all free Asia. This was given prominence in Japanese newspapers at the time. In the months that followed, individual Japanese firms began to develop activities in the field of nuclear energy. Mitsubishi concerns have worked with Westinghouse, and the Mitsui combination has been associated with General Electric. The Sumitomo firms have been developing uranium ore properties. Hitachi has tested equipment for the production of heavy water. Nissan Chemical Industries is interested in the chemical separation of uranium from imported phosphate ore.

But perhaps the most obvious need for the Japanese is to stay in the forefront of countries developing nuclear-powered merchant ships. This progress has been described in another part of this report.

Early in 1956, the Japanese created the Japan Atomic Industrial Forum to bring together industrial information, and an atomic energy commission was created by the Government. The initial allotments of nuclear fuel from the United States have not been sufficient to meet Japanese desires, so efforts have been underway to find larger supplies of uranium.

By March of 1957, the Japanese Atomic Energy Commission had announced Japan's need as 3 million kilowatts by 1962, a program not far behind that of the British. There are, however, many questions as to how so large a program can be financed and equipped. Nine regional power companies in Japan that same month adopted a plan calling for construction by 1965–66 of 1 million kilowatts, and 10 million by a decade thereafter. This would seem a goal much more within grasp.

In May 1957 major meetings were held between United States and Japanese authorities to discuss atomic cooperation. Observers came from many other Asian and Pacific countries, but none

were invited from Europe. United States officials made a strong case for the pressurized water type power reactor as contrasted with the British gas cooled, natural uranium reactor. There were strong protests from the British about some of the comparisons which were drawn by the United States representatives.

The Japanese have now opened a well laid out nuclear research center on the coast about 40 miles north of Tokyo and have a series of research reactors planned. The first one went critical in September 1957. After the Japanese had listened to the pros and cons of the American and British reactor types, they apparently came to the decision to divide their orders for the present between the two countries. The first Calder Hall type reactor of 140,000 to 250,000 kilowatts is expected to be ordered during 1958–59. It is probable that pressurized and boiling water reactors also will be ordered, but details are lacking.

Impressive Japanese plans for surface and submarine nuclear ships have been described earlier in this report. They can be assessed in light of earlier Japanese achievements in building what were then the largest submarines, battleships, and aircraft carrier in the world. Future successes are to be expected.

OTHER ASIAN DEVELOPMENTS

India is the only other Asian nation with a sizable atomic program planned. Supplies of monazite sand are expected to yield thorium which can be bred into uranium 233, a fissionable isotope. As early as January 1955 Dr. B. H. Bhabha, director of the Indian Government's atomic energy establishment was talking up thermonuclear power as an ultimate means for supplying energy, and it was he who called world attention to thermonuclear power at Geneva in August 1955. Indian efforts to develop thermonuclear power are only at the level of theoretical research today.

The first uranium reactor in Asia started operating in Bombay in January 1957. The first three Indian reactors planned are all of the research type. A program for development of power on a large scale was made public in September 1957. The goal is 1 million kilowatts by 1962–65, not too different from the likely United States attainment in the same period. Under Indian conditions, conventional power costs about 12 mills per kilowatt-hour. The hope would be actually to cut power costs through nuclear energy. The concrete problem of power development for the first stage has as its major problem obtaining sufficient capital to carry it through—a danger faced by the overall economic development plan of India.

It was in March 1956 that the United States announced it planned to support a nuclear research center in the Philippines which would serve the associated countries of free Asia. But things tend to move slowly. By July 1957 the United States was still waiting to see whether the 16 countries of the Colombo plan wanted to participate in the Manila center, on which work had not yet started.

Manila itself may in time have a 60,000-kilowatt electric plant powered by a pressurized water reactor built by Westinghouse and Babcock & Wilcox for the Manila Electric Co.

The Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa is negotiating for an 11,500-kilowatt plant from the United States.

THE REST OF THE WORLD

Only a scattering of other projects have come to public attention in other parts of the world. In Europe, Austria, Spain, and Portugal are negotiating for nuclear plants. The Portuguese plant is to be 100,000 kilowatts with a 1965 target date.

Israel in the Middle East wants a nuclear powerplant. In Africa there are three major proposals. One would be a big plant in the Belgian Congo built by Babcock & Wilcox. Another would be in southwest Africa at Walvis Bay, turning out 50,000 kilowatts for the Tsumeb Co., the third would be in the Union of South Africa, for power research purposes.

The Mount Isa Mines Pty. of Queensland, Australia, is also interested in having a nuclear power reactor for experimental purposes.

THERMONUCLEAR POWER

Just as atomic fission is keyed back to the theoretical Einstein formula for the equivalency of mass and energy, so can thermonuclear reactions be linked, too, to abstract study of the process by which the sun gives out its stream of heat and light.

Dr. Hans Bethe as early as 1945 explained that the time might come when controlled reactions of this type were possible. In England, Sir John Cockcroft made similar remarks in September 1954. Dr. Bhabha of India in January 1955 predicted the time was not too far distant when such techniques would be possible.

In April 1955 there was journalistic speculation that the approach under study was to add lithium to uranium reactors, as it was believed by many that hydrogen bombs were based upon some such combination. Nothing has been said since to bear out this supposition as a good route to controlled reactions. At the time, the Atomic Energy Commission would make no comment whatsoever as to any possible research on controlled thermonuclear reactions.

At the Geneva Conference in August 1955, it was Dr. Bhabha again who brought world attention to the possibilities, and predicted that within 20 years successful results might be attained.

The first official announcement by the United States that it was studying thermonuclear reactors was made in August 1955, as a result of questions about the Bhabha statement. Then it was revealed that Project Sherwood had been started in 1951, and was matched by similar research in Great Britain and the Soviet Union. The difficulties to be overcome are enormous. In order to sustain a reaction, a temperature of about 100 million degrees centigrade must somehow be confined so that it does not instantly vaporize its container, and then useful energy must be withdrawn. The benefits which would flow from such a reactor are also potentially very great. Fuel to last for many thousands of years is available in the heavy water mixed with the oceans. One part in 6,400 of water contains deuterium which might be fused into helium. A reactor would not present the problems of fission byproducts which are now a health hazard.

At the time of the announcement that the United States was undertaking such research, it was made clear that it might take 20 years or more to determine whether the concept was controllable. It was added that the time was much too early to make cost estimates for this new source of power, in light of the great uncertainties surrounding it.

Only slowly since that time have lines of investigation been unveiled. It is known that the thermonuclear process keeps the sun emitting energy, but there, tremendous forces of gravity contain the reaction. In the laboratory, one approach has been to try to pinch deuterium gas with electromagnetic forces holding it in the center of a tube so that the walls of the chamber will not be vaporized. In the summer of 1956 there was speculation that a thermonuclear reactor might have to be 30 times the size of the largest ocean liner and would generate 5 times as much electricity as the whole United States consumes at this time. This would certainly suggest an investment of enormous size and limited economic applicability, if the speculation had any substance.

Before the end of 1956, it was revealed that temperatures had been obtained fleetingly that were as high as 2 million degrees centigrade. Also by that time, a laboratory method of causing fusion at any temperature, was announced, but not with any expectation of early practical application. It has been found that a negative mu meson can act as a catalyst to pull together light and heavy hydrogen to form helium. But a meson of this type has a fleeting life of only one millionth of a second, so that it does not afford opportunities to provide a sustained reaction. The Russians have suggested there may be a longer lived catalyst to sustain such reactions and that it exists in some cosmic rays. They hope their high-energy research will discover this elusive key.

It may be possible, too, to convert the energy of a thermonuclear reactor directly into electricity through an interplay of the hydrogen plasma and the magnetic energy used to contain it.

Discussions of research on the high-temperature approach are very similar by scientists in the United States, Britain, and Russia. Pulsed discharges held in a narrow channel by magnetic lines of force have been brought to very high temperatures, but there are still great problems in keeping the magnetic bootle leakproof. British calculations are that a cubic meter of deuterium-tritium gas kept at 10 million degrees centigrade might give a continuous yield of 100,000 kilowatts of electric power, burning about 1 gram of fuel in each hour. Higher temperatures would yield even more power.

By the spring of 1957, the Atomic Energy Commission was of the opinion that thermonuclear power was beyond the stage of wishful thinking and almost certainly would yield to a sustained de-

velopment effort. A device called the Stellarator C is to be built at Princeton to test the principles of such reactors. It is hoped this will be more nearly leakproof than the A and B models which have been tested. Model C will be ready for experimentation in 1960 or 1961.

Even private industry has shown an interest in these developments at this early stage. In May 1957 the General Dynamics Corp. interested some 11 Texas utilities in joining with it to undertake a $10 million program of exploratory research. Texas is a part of the country unlikely to find ordinary fission reactors competitive for many years, and the new approach might potentially give that area more reason for interest in nuclear power. By June, the General Electric Co. also began its own research in this field. Sweden reported early success with thermonuclear reactors at Uppsala University.

Late in July the British announced they were completing equipment which would make possible the detection of fusion reactions if they occur as expected in the pinched, high temperature gases. That month, too, it was revealed that the Westinghouse Electric Corp. was studying high vaccuum components for thermonuclear reaction purposes. The San Diego Gas & Electric Co. joined the Texas Atomic Research Foundation which General Dynamics leads.

By October 1957 scientists in both Britain and the United States announced that experiments since midsummer suggested that controlled thermonuclear reactions had been achieved. Substantial numbers of neutrons were being yielded from the hot gases. At that time there was no proof, however, that the neutrons necessarily originated from fusion, as they might come from other sources under conditions of high temperature. It was also made clear that the input energy had to be much greater, still, than the output energy.

In November it was also announced that the Max Planck Association at Göttingen, West Germany, was engaged in research along similar lines. The first official statement in the House of Commons was made November 26, 1957, that a controlled thermonuclear reaction had been achieved. This was apparently accomplished in an apparatus named Zeta at about 5,000,000° C.

Speculation is that the next important progress reports will be forthcoming at the Second International Conference on Atomic Energy for Peaceful Uses at Geneva in 1958. There is still little indication that economic power from controlled fusion will be available in less than 20 to 25 years. This means that there is no argument for slowing the development or building of fission reactors. All currently programed will fulfill their purpose before the new fusion power is available.

The Stellarator C may turn out to be a device for producing a continuous flow of power but this does not mean in economic amounts. It is being designed and built by Allis-Chalmers and the Radio Corporation of America.

As best an outside observer can see the shape of things to come through the veil of secrecy, thermonuclear research is proceeding on schedule with enough progress being made to be reasonably confident of ultimate success. The greatest current risk is that the importance of continued investment in fission reactors will be minimized by those with funds to invest.

The real significance of fusion power, from the limited perspective of today, may only be that remote generations will not have to worry about exhaustion of fuel reserves or dangerous accumulations of radioactive wastes. It is now too early to assume that thermonuclear power will be cheaper than fission power which itself is only slowly coming down to the levels of regular power costs. However, fission power may be developed in such a way that its impact on the economics and lives, even of today's generations, might be tremendously significant. For this reason we cannot afford to approach research and development in this field on a casual nonpriority basis.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

Each year that an effort is made to draft a report such as this, even cursory treatment of the subject yields a longer and longer product. The year 1957 has been one with setbacks and delays. But it is also the year in which five power-producing reactors began to operate in the United States and in which a number of countries announced very large programs for nuclear power production.

Although it is still only a hope, 1957 has been a year when encouraging progress reports on thermonuclear reactions have been made public. The enormity of the research effort still required in this and in other fields related to nuclear research should be clearly recognized.

The period immediately ahead will be filled with concrete manifestations of policy problems which up until now have largely been theoretical and anticipatory. It is hoped that this review will give some feeling of the spread of activities in the power development field alone; perspective helpful to the meeting of these policy problems. Other studies must cover related problems of radiation hazards, weapons development and control, and the needs for scientific training and research.

The United States continues to lead the world in the breadth of its nuclear efforts if not in the size of its program for producing quantities of nuclear power. More than pride requires that the work underway continue with our very best efforts.

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic conference, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 436) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit while the House is in session during general debate the rest of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am interrogating the members of the Federal Reserve Board now, and just started this morning. If I get through tomorrow and am not interrupted I would not object to this request if it is renewed tomorrow at noon, but now I shall be compelled to object because I have some matters on the floor tomorrow afternoon and shall have to be here, unless the gentleman will withhold his request until tomorrow. In that event I shall try to arrange my affairs so I can be there tomorrow afternoon. If he does not withhold his request at this time, I shall be compelled to object.

Mr. SPENCE. I am making this request not because I want to sit tomorrow afternoon but because I believe it is my duty. I want to treat the gentleman reasonably and with kindness, but I feel I ought to make this request.

Mr. PATMAN. I tried to get the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], to allow the committee to sit yesterday afternoon but he declined. If the gentleman wants to submit his request, all right, but I just cannot be there tomorrow afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object or not?

Mr. PATMAN. I ask the chairman to withhold his request until tomorrow, in the hope that I shall be in a position not to object to it. Will the gentleman withhold his request?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my duty to make this request. I would like to accommodate the gentleman. I would rather that we would sit only in the mornings. But, the way things have been going, it is absolutely necessary that we expedite the hearings. If this committee is going to function and if it is going to perform the duties that the people expect it to perform, we have to work and we cannot listen to the objections of each individual who may have other engagements.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may sit during such time as the House is engaged in general debate during the rest of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

## PROCUREMENT OF FUEL OIL FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of

calling the attention of my colleagues to a wire which, I assume, most of you received yesterday from the independent and domestic oil refineries of this country protesting the possibility that an award would be made yesterday for fuel oil for the Department of Defense, particularly the Navy. On receipt of this wire, I contacted the Procurement Section of the Department of Defense. I learned the bids were opened yesterday for approximately $100 million worth of fuel, most of it for the Navy. They received 105 bids. They say it will be at least 2 months before they can analyze all of the bids and make an award. In this time the Members of Congress who have refineries in their districts should take advantage of the opportunity to insist that the Department of Defense make most of the awards to the industries and refineries within the continental United States and not to foreign refineries.

## CRITICAL OVERSURPLUS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, late the other evening I received a telegram from an eastern petroleum corporation protesting Department of Defense policies in buying refined petroleum products in the Caribbean area. I assume all other Members of Congress received similar telegrams.

The thing which most interested me was a statement in this protest that there is not only no shortage of refined petroleum products in this country but that, in fact, there is a critical oversurplus of petroleum products in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the price of gasoline being increased last year presumably as the result of the shortage resulting from the seizure of Suez. Of course there was no shortage then. But now we are informed there is a critical oversurplus. Can we therefore now look for lower gasoline prices? If not, why not?

## SELF-EXPRESSION ON BEHALF OF THE BLIND

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Congressional recess I was privileged to receive a delegation of constituents representing the Toledo Council of the Blind and to discuss with them the need of a law to safeguard the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

As a result of this and other discussions, I have prepared legislation which I am pleased to introduce today for this purpose. As you are aware, countless organizations of blind persons exist today throughout the country. They have been formed by the blind quite naturally to advance their own welfare and common interests and provide to our blind citizens an opportunity for collective self-expression—an opportunity to voice their views on Government-financed programs for their aid and rehabilitation. It is important that these views be heard and considered.

Unfortunately, however, it appears that the freedom that each of our blind citizens should have to join or not to join organizations of the blind has been prejudiced by certain professional workers who through official action have exerted undue control and influence over the lives and conduct of their sightless clients. It is important that our blind citizens be protected against this kind of authority to interfere with their freedom of self-expression through organizations of the blind.

The bill which I am introducing is similar to that offered by Senator JOHN M. KENNEDY and would do two things. It would direct the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to consult and advise with representatives of organizations of the blind in his formulation and administration of programs for the blind and encourage State agencies to do likewise.

Secondly, the bill requires that no Federal officer or employee concerned with the administration of programs for the blind shall exert the influence of his office against the right of blind persons to join organizations of the blind and, further, the bill shall condition Federal grants to State programs for the blind so that employees in those programs will refrain from exerting the influence of their office against organizations of the blind.

I earnestly commend this meritorious legislation to the prompt and favorable consideration of my colleagues.

## THE LATE HONORABLE AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Committee on Education and Labor eulogizing a late member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1958, at 10 o'clock, Mr. Kelley's colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor met in open session and unanimously adopted a resolution testifying to the sorrow of his committee colleagues over Mr. Kelley's passing and testifying also to the outstanding record of public service achieved by this noble statesman. At the direction of the Committee on Education and Labor I include that resolution as a part of my remarks at this point:

Whereas the Honorable Augustine B. Kelley, of Greensburg, Pa., Representative of the 21st Congressional District of Pennsylvania, served with eminent distinction and great patriotism as a Member of the United States House of Representatives continuously since January 3, 1941, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor continuously since that time, in addition to other important capacities, and as the ranking member of said House Committee on Education and Labor during the 81st, 82d, 84th, and 85th Congresses; and

Whereas in the fields of education, and national and international labor, the Honorable Augustine B. Kelley acquitted his duties and responsibilities to the citizens of his State of Pennsylvania and to the citizens of his Nation with statesmanship, courage, wisdom, and foresight so as to render his public service an inspiring example to his colleagues in the United States Congress, to his countrymen, and to the causes of peace and freedom in behalf of all men: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the membership of the House Committee on Education and Labor assembled*, That said committee membership express its profound sorrow over the untimely passing of their beloved colleague on November 20, 1957, and that the Committee on Education and Labor when it adjourns today shall adjourn in reverence to his memory; and be it further

*Resolved by the membership of the House Committee on Education and Labor assembled*, That the afore-stated resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a copy of said resolution be sent to the beloved family of our late distinguished colleague, the Honorable Augustine B. Kelley of Greensburg, Pa.

Approved and adopted this 9th day of January 1958, by the unanimous vote of the membership of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Attest:

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
*Chairman, Education and Labor Committee.*

RALPH W. GWYNN,
*Member of Congress.*

## ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, at this time each year the Members of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, as well as other nominating authorities, are preparing to submit their nominations for the young men who will become the future leaders of our Nation's Military Establishment.

This has always been of great importance in the past. The threat to our security and way of life has grown rapidly over the last few years and the responsibility which we, as Members of Congress, have for providing our military leadership has grown proportionately.

As a new Member of Congress, going through the procedure of making my first nominations, I was shocked to learn that many of these young men receive appointment to our service academies without having been explicitly interviewed by the nominating authority to determine their leadership qualifications, character, and background.

At present, it is not possible for any young man to pursue a course of study in the service academies without having the necessary mental acumen. This is as

it should be, but our future officers must have far more than mental ability. Sturdiness of character and background are certainly important, but most of all, a young man should be possessed of the factors which determine leadership ability.

It is my considered opinion that as a nation, more dependent upon strong leadership now than ever, we can no longer afford the rather haphazard manner in which our cadets are chosen. At this time, I intend to propose that the Congress of the United States enact legislation to require that the Members of Congress certify to the Secretary of the service involved that they have personally interviewed each candidate and have taken every possible step to ascertain the individual's leadership qualifications, character, and background.

As an alternative, the bill would permit the nominating authority to set up a board of not less than three members, drawn from citizens of standing within the Member's district, who would interview the prospective cadets and report the results to the Member of Congress.

A second section of the bill would require that physical examinations to determine whether or not the candidate is physically capable of entering a service academy should be given prior to other tests required. I am of the opinion that it is a waste of time and money to have the prospective cadets go through a series of tests and interviews only to find that, in the last analysis, they are physically incapable of attending a service academy. The facilities of the service academies are limited, the training is a costly process, and, above all, our Nation requires officer material of the highest caliber. For these three reasons, I believe that the necessity for this legislation is indeed urgent.

## RESERVE MILITARY COMPONENTS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add to the remarks just made by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] regarding budget action on our military reserve components.

The United States Coast Guard and its Reserve are military components under law. In time of peace they come under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department. In time of war they are immediately transferred to the Navy.

The accent here today is on defense and very properly so. Federal agencies outside the Defense Establishment are being requested by the administration through the Director of the Budget to make contributions toward defense and many can. However, the Treasury's contribution should not be made by subtracting millions from Coast Guard appropriations, notably that of the Coast Guard Reserve, as indicated by the budget announced this week.

I do not know when adequate protection of our ports and harbors has been more important and I am at a loss to understand the Treasury action coming at a time when our military leaders are so concerned about the dangers being posed by the ever-increasing fleet of Soviet submarines. The Coast Guard is extremely important in this picture even as it is in carrying out its mission of seeing that no unorthodox weapons come near our shores in foreign ships.

At the recent NATO Parliamentary Conference held in Paris, real concern was expressed relative to the Soviet's submarine developments and I do not propose to help meet this threat by supporting a weaker Coast Guard.

## CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday next and also the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE TO ESTABLISH AND DEVELOP CERTAIN INSTALLATIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 437, Rept. No. 1280), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 437 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, back in the fall, when the Congress was not in session, the Russians launched a couple of satellites. I believe the Russian word is "sputnik." Mr. Speaker, I make this observation because, as one who is just a humble, ordinary variety Member of Congress, I have certain definite impressions about what has happened and what might happen as the result of the launching of these satellites. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this is an occasion for the American people to become hysterical or for the Congress to start charging off in all directions to try to meet that situation.

I am sure that if we are realistic we must take certain things into consideration and approach this matter in a sound, sane, and prudent manner. Yes, I grant you that a challenge has been posed to the free world by the launching of this gadget, but I think it is a challenge that can be met and I do not think it is an overwhelming challenge.

Let us view this situation, if we may, calmly for a few moments. I certainly hope that this Congress, the representatives of the people, will approach this challenge in a sane, sound, and prudent manner.

Let us go back a minute. Are we saying to ourselves and to the world that a backward nation, which 20 years ago was regarded as a second- or third-rate power in the world, has suddenly, overnight achieved a monopoly in the world of science and has driven America and the peoples of the Free World off the map? Some of us have been in Russia. I know it was my privilege in 1945, immediately after the cessation of hostilities, to be in Russia and my impression then definitely was that it was a backward nation, that they were lacking in the know-how, that they were lacking what we call in football parlance in depth of mechanics and scientists and the people who are necessary to perform these miracles that we read so much about now.

I also discovered in 1945 when I was in Germany, immediately after the cessation of hostilities, that the Russians were carting away the factories where scientific gadgets were made, they were kidnaping the German scientists and taking them back of the Iron Curtain, because they did not know then that we, under the appeasement policy, were going to submit to their retaining part of the German homeland.

Mr. Speaker, will you permit me to make this observation? The chief of the staff of my committee at that time was one Marion Folsom who is now a member of the President's Cabinet. We had borrowed him from the Eastman Kodak Corp. to head up the staff of this committee. Naturally, he was interested in what had happened to the Eastman Kodak factory in Germany, so we went to that factory and we found that the Russians were carting away this American property and taking it behind the Iron Curtain.

But the old superintendent, the head of that factory, told us with tears in his eyes that they were not only taking the factory but they were taking the skilled personnel from that factory, the men

with the scientific know-how, and carting them back also behind the curtain. Remember that the Eastman Kodak plant was one of the factories that were being utilized by the Germans in the advancement they were making in these missiles and rockets and things of like kind.

I do not claim that Russia is highly advanced or is ahead of us solely because they captured these German scientists or because Germany was ahead of all the world in ballistic missiles, but I do claim—and if someone knows differently I should like to be so advised—that the Russians have utilized that capacity, these men and equipment, to accelerate their development of intercontinental and intermediate missiles and the sputnik gadgets. I maintain, in my humble judgment, at least, that man for man, scientist for scientist, technician for technician, America is still ahead of Russia in the overall field.

We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in building up a great Air Force, a great striking power. Are we to believe now that because these gadgets have been sent up into the air, these gadgets which I have been told have no military value as such, this great Air Force of ours is powerless, and that this Nation is at the mercy of Russia? I just cannot believe that. It is difficult for me to believe that a nation which less than two decades ago was a backward nation, which is now operated and run by a group of dictators and where the populace are virtually slaves, has overnight become the greatest power on earth.

Yes; we must meet this problem. We must not only catch up with Russia but we should excel them in the field of missiles and I think we will do it. But the point I am trying to make is that this is no time for hysteria, this is no time for charging off in all directions.

I repeat what I have said often upon this floor, Russia wants war no more than we want war. Nobody can win a war. Russia is still following the Lenin doctrine, the blueprint of their great idol, Lenin, that the way to destroy America is to destroy its economy and then take over in the ensuing chaos and confusion. I am more apprehensive of this gadget inflation in this country than I am about a Russian attack. This is but another part of the cold war, and we must not permit ourselves to lose our sense of values.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is brought to us by our great Committee on Armed Services. There is nothing new about this, as I understand it. The bill would authorize $29,670,000 for a semiautomatic ground environment, that is known as SAGE. It would authorize $189 million for the ballistic missiles direction system; $24,600,000 for alert facilities for our strategic air command forces; $112,400,000 for ballistic missiles; $194 million for dispersal of Strategic Air Command forces; or a total of $549,670,000.

This is an authorization for facilities for a continuation of a program which was started heretofore. I am sure it is necessary. I propose to go along with it. I merely want to reiterate that I do not propose to be stampeded, and I hope the Congress and the American people will not be stampeded into hasty and unwise actions which might well destroy the economy of this country.

There are a number of other things that are affected by this hysteria including our educational system, which I shall not discuss at this time; but which must not become a victim to unwise innovations.

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, it is my conviction and my distinguished friend, the great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has reassured the Committee on Rules this morning, that because of the great striking power, the great retaliatory power that we now possess in this country, the Russian masters dare not put it to the test.

## RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 14, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been elected a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully,

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 14, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been elected a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully,

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

## AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE TO ESTABLISH AND DEVELOP CERTAIN INSTALLATIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the statements made by my colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. In essence, I agree with what he has said regarding the publicity and propaganda buildup which called the other day for a $74,900,000,000 budget.

No doubt this Congress must go along with every practical method and means of protecting our country; nevertheless we must not be pressured into a frenzy to appropriate billions and ride off in all directions, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] stated, on the expenditure of billions of dollars on defense projects that possibly in 4 or 5 years will become obsolete. Having been a member of two committees that held hearings on Communist aggression in this country and abroad, I firmly believe there is no danger of Mr. Khrushchev starting a war within the new few years. For that reason I believe this 2d session of the 85th Congress had better be on its guard in considering legislation expending billions indiscriminately because of propaganda created over the country on account of sputnik.

I was alarmed more than anything else the other day when I read a syndicated article to the effect that this Congress had better cut down on some of the domestic services that our Government renders the people of America and concentrate on this sputnik threat. Among other things mentioned in this article was that we should cut down on some of these services rendered to millions of people in this country such as veterans' benefits and services, social-security expansion, welfare, medical aid, labor problems, farm economy, and so forth. This article was nothing more than just a forerunner of additional propaganda for this Congress to reduce expenditures on services for our economic welfare that millions of people in America need, and need badly.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] stated that one of the great threats is inflation, and I agree. General unemployment over the Nation is a problem as serious as inflation, defense, and the rising cost of living. I am going to mention the unemployment plight of just one great industry. There are over 400,000 steelworkers unemployed in America. There are 10,000 total, including steelworkers, unemployed in the Calumet region in Indiana. Bear in mind further that this figure of 400,000 unemployed steelworkers over the Nation does not include those who are working only 3 and 4 days a week.

The basic industry in America is steel. If it is strangled through unemployment it affects everybody in America. No doubt, depression in agriculture and other industries has finally reflected in the lack of demand for steel products.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] told me this morning that in Detroit there are 260,000 unemployed. Last spring there were only 160,000 unemployed. Bear in mind again that these figures do include men who are working 2, 3, and 4 days a week. Imagine what that 2, 3, and 4 days' work a week does to a family budget when they are buying an automobile, a home, a television, and so forth, on credit payments.

This morning's papers said unemployment today is 3,800,000. When we add the 2-, 3-, and 4-day a week workers the figure mounts to many more millions. A year or two ago when one mentioned unemployment we were accused of preaching doom and gloom. Those days are over. The depression problem is in the lap of this Congress and we must

act. Unemployment is the main problem that we must get excited about in this country, including sputnik and inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this legislation the Armed Services Committee has reported out today. In this coming session of Congress we are going to depend upon the chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee to hold extended hearings on requests by the Defense Department for billions of dollars with the hope that only the essential and necessary money is spent.

We must keep our defenses up; yes, but we must depend upon the experience and the good judgment of the members of the Committee on Armed Services to fine-comb every appropriation that is presented by our Department of Defense to avoid unexcusable waste in these vast expenditures that are outlined in the President's $74 billion budget.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I take this 1 minute to indicate that I am 100 percent in favor of this legislation and intend to vote for it, of course. I should like to announce, however, that I have a special order for tomorrow at which time I intend to speak on the subject which is so much in the public mind today, namely the outer-space problem. I invite my colleagues to stay on the floor if they can and listen to my remarks.

I intend to devote some time to the consideration of an unusual type of underwater nuclear-propelled craft and also will speak of some of the possibilities of outer-space vehicles, also propelled by nuclear energy.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9739, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in these critical days, it is indeed appropriate that the first legislative proposal that comes before the House at the very start of the 2d session of the 85th Congress is one that relates to the defense of our country. We all recognize that the paramount duty of Government is self-preservation. The sole purpose of this bill is to strengthen the defense of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9739, which is a military construction bill for the Air Force, is emergency legislation.

The reason why it is an emergency is twofold: First, the items in the bill are in themselves of the highest priority, and in the second place, a prompt approval of this bill now will save up to 1 year in construction time.

If the construction in this bill had come up, not as a supplement to the fiscal year 1958 program, but rather as a part of the regular fiscal year 1959 program, we would find ourselves 1 year behind in our construction, at a time when we do not have 1 year to spare.

THE BILL IS INTRODUCED

The bill as introduced set out the construction to be performed only in the most general categories. No indication was given as to the specific locations where the construction would be performed nor with respect to the cost of the construction at each of these locations.

The backup books which were before the committee during the hearing did, of course, set out this detailed information. These books, however, could not be given general publication because they also contained some highly classified information.

The committee felt that as much information as is possible should be afforded Members of Congress in order that the consideration of the bill on the floor would be on the basis of full understanding of what the bill would do.

It is true that the bill contains some authority for which details are not given on the face of the bill; this, however, is made necessary by security considerations.

Even with respect to these items, I will attempt to tell everything that I can within the bounds of security.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

What will the bill do? It will do five things, each one directed toward our defense and our capability to retaliate if attacked.

The bill would grant authority in the amount of $549,670,000; $29 million of this would be for SAGE; $189 million for a ballistic-missile detection system; $112,400,000 for ballistic-missile sites; $24,600,000 for SAC alert facilities; $194 million for the dispersal of SAC. Now this totals $549,670,000.

Now I am going to attempt to describe each of these portions of the bill so that they will be understandable to the House and the House will realize their importance.

SAGE

SAGE—which means semiautomatic ground environment, is a system whereby we can detect the approach of enemy bombers and take action to destroy them.

Now, how does it work. As you know, we have airborne early warning aircraft. We have picket ships far out in the ocean, Texas Towers close to our shores, and radar installations on the ground along all of our boundaries. This system even gets information from weather station.

All of these various radars are tied together in such fashion that they can feed information as to speed, direction, height, and how far away are enemy planes which are approaching our country.

Now all of this information is fed into the SAGE system. Now, that means that at 36 centers throughout the United States, there will be great electronic computers. As the information is fed into these computers, the computers make complicated calculations and the computers tell whether missiles or planes should be used to repel the attack, and also, what bases should get their planes or missiles off to the attack.

You will note that I describe the system as semiautomatic. This means that the machines themselves don't send these planes or missiles off, but, rather, provide information to the various commanders throughout the United States who in turn do the actual direction of the battle.

An essential part of the whole system are leased communication lines which are, to all intents and purposes, telephone lines. Some of the information will come over these lines as an ordinary telephone conversation while other information will come over in the manner of a teletype.

Now, where are these various SAGE centers. As I say, the 36 of them are spread throughout the United States in 29 locations. For example, to mention only a few, they are located at Syracuse, N. Y.; Marquette, Mich.; Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Great Falls, Mont.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

In each of these installations, there will be about 500 personnel. These men will be stationed there all the time and the center will be on 24-hour alert.

One more word about SAGE. When this matter was before the House previously, it was told that the entire SAGE system would cost over $1 billion and that the annual operating cost would be $400 million. The House was also told that the annual cost of leased communications would be about $240 million, this $240 million representing a portion of the $400 million. These figures have since been revised by the Department of Defense and today the total cost of the system is estimated to be $1,945,000,000—almost $2 billion—and the annual operating cost $440 million, with the leased communications to cost approximately $150 million annually. The $29 million in this bill is another step toward the completion of this system, and when the work authorized by this 29 million is completed, the whole system will be well on the way to completion.

So, that is SAGE, and although it is a highly complex system, I hope I have given a reasonable description of how it works.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DETECTION

The bill contains authority in the amount of $189 million for the ballistic missile detection system. I would like to make it clear that this system is quite separate from the SAGE system which I have just described. The two systems, of course, will be used in conjunction. They will provide for the early warning essential to the quick reaction of our

retaliatory forces, SAC, as well as providing warning for our other military and civilian defense organizations.

The Air Force informed the committee that it has based its offense and defense on a capability to react within 15 minutes after warning. This points up the great importance of this portion of the bill.

Now, it of course is impossible to speak on this floor in detail with respect to this detection system. Suffice it to say that the $189 million will be devoted to construction in certain areas, which I cannot disclose, that will permit the installation of equipment that will detect and give warning of an attack with ballistic missiles.

The committee was assured that equipment has been developed which will do exactly this. It will detect a missile as it rises above the horizon and will afford a sufficient period of time to permit elements of our Strategic Air Command to become airborne—that is to get off of the ground. It should be understood that the purpose of getting SAC into the air is not to protect them from the missile or missiles but rather to have them in a position and on the way where they can make a devastating retaliatory attack.

BALLISTIC MISSILES

The next part of the bill relates to ballistic missiles in the amount of $112,400,000.

Now, I want to make clear that none of this money is for the missiles themselves or for their development. The $112 million will be devoted entirely to the construction of operational bases for the ballistic missiles. Some of it will go to Francis E. Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming. The House will recall that this base and its proposed use as a missile base was the subject of a press release by the Air Force a few weeks ago.

Another part of this sum will go toward the provision of additional facilities at Camp Cooke Air Force Base in California. And still another part will go for initial work at another location which as yet has not been definitely determined.

ALERT AND DISPERSAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES

The fourth element of the bill is the alert facilities for the Strategic Air Command in the amount of $24,600,000.

In this connection, let me refer to the President's statement of last week before this House when he said:

> We must protect and disperse our striking forces and increase their readiness for instant reaction. This means more base facilities and more standby crews.

I want to draw particular attention to that part of the President's statement which says we need to "increase their readiness for instant reaction."

SAC is alert today. But let us say it can be and should be even more alert. This can be effected by providing certain facilities which will permit additional numbers of our strategic bombers to get into the air with an absolute minimum of delay. It is to this end that this element of the bill is directed. The particular construction involved varies to some extent from base to base but, in general, the authority will permit the construction of additional operational apron, facilities for the ready crews, and utilities.

I believe we all have accepted the idea of dispersing SAC as widely as possible throughout the country. There are several reasons why this dispersal is necessary. First, with the airplanes spread over a large number of bases, the enemy has that many more targets which he must hit in order to knock us out.

Second, the more these bombers are dispersed, the more runway space there is available for them to take off, and the quicker, therefore, they can get into the air. There is nothing unusual about the construction items involved in this case. Generally, they provide for longer, wider, and safer runways at a number of existing Air Force bases. The placing of a squadron of bombers on a base generates other requirements, too. The additional crews must have some additional facilities. But all in all, the selection of existing bases cuts down to a very great extent the money which would have to be expended were new bases constructed.

Originally, there were 11 SAC home bases. Today the term home base has little meaning. The reason for this is that SAC is or, in the very near future, will be dispersed over 27 different bases with not more than 1 squadron of 15 planes on each base.

This bill will authorize the dispersal of 6 more squadrons for a total of 33. One other point of interest is the fact that when the squadron is dispersed, it takes with it the tankers necessary to keep it flying.

SAC ALERT FACILITIES

With respect to our alert facilities for SAC, I would like to say this. All of our warning systems are useless, unless we get SAC off the ground after the warning has been received.

After the warning comes the reaction. And the reaction time permitted us is very, very short. We must be able to get one-third of the SAC bomber forces off the ground within 15 minutes. If we are going to do this, we must have the bombers so positioned on the various bases that they can take off with no delay whatsoever.

Stated simply, the construction in this bill for alert facilities will permit the construction of parking stubs to provide for a quick run to the takeoff end of the runway. We must have a mess facility, and we must have some troop housing for these men who are on 24-hour alert.

Understand, these B–52's that are on alert will be separated from the main part of the base and will constitute, in a sense, a small base all by themselves. In other words, these alert B–52 aircraft will be self-sufficient and ready to go at a moment's notice.

TANKER RELOCATION

Although the bill does not divide the alert facilities, the dispersal facilities, and the tanker relocation facilities, these really are three separate elements of the bill. I have dealt with the dispersal and with the alert facilities. The last of these is the relocation of some of our tanker aircraft.

This is not to be confused with the tankers which are a permanent part of a B–52 squadron. These are tankers which will be located on bases which may or may not have any B–52's on the base.

These tankers will be located in the northern areas where they can rendezvous with SAC bombers coming from any part of the United States and refuel them in flight.

This bill will provide facilities at 8 existing Air Force bases which will permit relocation of 9 tanker squadrons. Other tanker squadrons will be located under authority to be requested in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed the purpose of the bill and I have told in such detail as I can what the bill will authorize in the way of construction. Although there have been 30 bills referred to the Armed Services Committee since the opening day of this session, this is the first bill which the committee has heard. I felt, and the committee agreed with me, that this represents a piece of legislation which admits of no delay. It is a bill which is entirely consistent with the thinking of the President, the thinking of the Armed Services Committee, and, I am sure, the thinking of every Member of this House.

I do not believe I can say anything further that will help toward the more complete understanding of the bill, but I and all members of the committee stand ready to answer any questions which security considerations will permit to be answered on the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman address himself to the language found on page 9, if he has not done so already? Unfortunately, I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's statement. It seems that the new Secretary of the Air Force has broad authority in the awarding of contracts and in the establishment of installations. I refer to the language in section 2, on page 9. Is there necessity for that surrender of authority?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman refers to the language of section 2, providing that the Secretary of the Air Force may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this act without regard to certain sections of the revised statutes and so on. I would say to the gentleman that that is the very language which has been in every public works bill for many years to my certain knowledge.

Mr. GROSS. This is language that has been in every public works bill?

Mr. VINSON. This is a public works bill. That is all it is really. It is nothing in the world but public works.

Mr. GROSS. This language confers broad authority on the Secretary of the Air Force in the awarding of contracts.

Mr. VINSON. Other Secretaries have had this identical authority. It is the very same language that is contained in every one of the public works bills.

Mr. GROSS. Both at home and abroad?

Mr. VINSON. This is the same language which was in the bill a year ago,

the year before last and for the last 5 or 6 or 10 years, and it is sound.

Mr. GROSS. I realize the gentleman has always been very careful in delegating to any Secretary of the Air Force or any other Secretary the authority to award contracts without competitive bids.

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. But, I must say 97 percent of all contracts for public works are under competitive bidding. In only 3 percent of the cases is it found necessary to make contracts by negotiations. I would say I would wish that were true with reference to all of the contracts of the Department of Defense. The bulk of the business of the Department of Defense is done by negotiation or at least somewhat more than 50 percent of it is, but in this field 97 percent of all contracts are under competitive bidding.

I am hoping we will soon have a bill here dealing with this subject matter and that we will pass legislation restricting negotiated contracts. But there are certain types of construction contracts where it may be to the interest of the Government to make negotiated contracts rather than public-bid contracts. It might possibly be true with reference to the facilities for the ballistic-missile detection, because nobody knows very much about all the phases of that problem.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Would the gentleman explain the necessity for section 4 on page 10 of the bill in regard to exemption of the auditing of books by the Comptroller General?

Mr. VINSON. It has relation only to foreign contracts, and you will note the President must find an alternative method.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Is it the anticipation of the committee that audits cannot be done within 3 years and that is why they have put in this provision?

Mr. VINSON. In the matter of foreign contracts, it cannot always be done within a 3-year period, and there are also local customs and practices to be considered.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. There is no indication by this section of the bill that the audit should not be as thorough as usual, or that the audit should not be done, is there?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all. I may say also that this is the same kind of language that goes in every public-works bill.

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman from Georgia will yield——

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I may point out that this relates to oversea contracts. It has been found in our dealing with foreign contractors that it is practically impossible to get them to maintain their books over a period of 3 years. The committee, therefore, provides this alternative method. Foreign contractors for the most part insist on following their customary procedure with reference to books, and this provides an alternate method.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The committee report at the top of page 4 states that the surfacing of roads at the Air Force Academy is not included on the basis that it is not an urgent item. That was on the understanding that we would not have an opportunity to complete the Academy this fall.

Mr. VINSON. When I received this bill and saw that item in it, I realized it should not be in this bill.

It does not fall within the classification of emergency. It should never have been put in this particular bill. The committee unanimously struck it out.

At the proper time when the public works bill comes in such an item could properly be carried, but not in this bill seeking a supplemental authorization on emergency matters this fiscal year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I wanted an explanation, and I assume that when the public works bill comes in it will be included.

Mr. VINSON. The statement of the gentleman from Colorado was well made.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then I understand it will come up in the regular order.

Mr. VINSON. That is right, in the regular order.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Take it up and put it in?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know about that, because there are a great many things that will be considered in the investigation now being made by the Committee on the Armed Services and there doubtless will be something in reference to the enormous cost of building the great Air Academy.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. In colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman from Georgia said, as I recall, that 97 percent of the defense contracts were let under competitive bidding.

Mr. VINSON. Of this type, public works.

Mr. MEADER. Only construction?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; only public works construction.

Mr. MEADER. As I recall, the gentleman's committee did criticize the lack of competitive bidding.

Mr. VINSON. Ninety-seven percent of all contracts for public works let by the Bureau of Yards and Docks and the Corps of Engineers for the physical building of installations is by competitive bid.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was the language stricken with respect to roads at the Air Force Academy, section 6 of the original bill on page 4? Is that the language that was stricken?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, that is it exactly. That is in the original bill.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand it is going to cost $135 million to build some more roads out there?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, no, this was an item for about $1.4 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, our Armed Services Committee chairman has given a fine description and analysis of what this bill will do, and I, therefore, in dealing with the bill itself, will touch on only its highlights.

I would like to say at the outset that while I give my wholehearted support to this bill, I will continue to give my support to all vital and necessary defense bills that come before the Armed Services Committee and the House. I am not going to be a party to any policy whereby money is needlessly put into the lap of any department of the Department of Defense unless the matters dealt with in that bill are completely justified.

We must all be aware that sputnik and the testing of the ICBM by the Soviet Union has created an atmosphere which is highly favorable to the granting of any authorization and any appropriation requested by the Department of Defense. We must give everything that is necessary, while exercising the greatest care not to give anything that is unnecessary—not give funds which cannot be efficiently and advantageously spent within a given time period—or authorizations which have not been most precisely justified by the Department of Defense. In other words, there is no panic involved here—only doing what objectively should be done.

All of this might sound as though I was halfhearted in my support of this bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. This bill was well justified before the committee, and this is evident by the fact that it was reported out unanimously with 34 of the 36 members present. I believe we could expect at least one dissenting vote if there had been doubt as to the need for the legislation.

The bill in all of its elements has the most intimate relationship with the President's message of last week. The President, for example, says:

> We must have sure warning in case of attack. The improvement of warning equipment is becoming increasingly important as we approach the period when long-range missiles will come into use.

This statement is directly related to the authority requested in the bill for further construction for the semiautomatic ground environment system—SAGE—in the amount of $29,670,000.

It is also directly related to construction for the ballistic missile detection system in the amount of $189 million.

The President's statement that "we must protect and disperse our striking forces and increase their readiness for

instant reaction" is likewise directly related to construction of alert facilities for the Strategic Air Command forces in the amount of $24,600,000 and construction for the dispersal of the Strategic Air Command forces in the amount of $194 million. The President's statement that "we must maintain deterrent retaliatory power. This means, among other things, stepped-up long-range missile programs and accelerated programs for other effective missile systems" again directly relates to that portion of the bill which deals with ballistic missiles in the amount of $112,400,000.

I think it is clear from the President's statements of last week and the provisions of this bill that the committee is doing its part toward effecting the program of the administration—which, in turn, is the program of all the people of the United States.

In past wars in which our country has been involved, it has been possible to accomplish much in the way of weapons development, enlargement of our forces, and expansion of our bases after the conflict was upon us. In those wars, fortune was with us, in that our boundaries were not violated and our homes, cities, and industries were not subjected to enemy attack. This situation now is changed.

Recent advances in the field of science have brought about the development of vehicles of destruction which greatly minimize the element of distance. In light of the more recent discoveries in weapons, the whole world is a potential battlefield. Weapons now in existence have capabilities for destruction almost beyond imagination.

We are currently involved in an extremely competitive weapons race with the Soviet bloc. This is a race which we cannot afford to lose. It is imperative, therefore, that we take the steps necessary to produce the weapons and the bases needed for the most effective utilization of those weapons at the earliest possible date.

The recent demonstrations of Soviet scientific progress and the implications this progress has for Soviet military technology emphasizes the need for acceleration in the achievement of maximum capability of our defensive systems and retaliatory forces.

In light of these factors, and to provide military capabilities in greater quantities and at earlier dates, the Department of Defense has recommended, and the President has approved, the bill we have before us today.

Base construction is a key element to our capabilities.

First, we must provide a maximum posture for the bombers of the Strategic Air Command.

Second, we must provide sites for an extremely powerful long-range warning system to provide a maximum warning period to our defensive forces and to the strategic bombers. This we need to permit rapid reaction by the SAC bombers upon receipt of tactical warning of an impending enemy ballistic-missile attack.

Third, we must develop sites and facilities for an earlier and increased capability to launch our own intercontinental ballistics missiles—ICBM's—and intermediate range ballistic missiles—IRBM's.

None of these objectives can be achieved without extensive construction of base facilities, and this essential construction must be initiated promptly. A major portion of the facilities provided by this authorization bill are in northern areas with a limited period available each year to do heavy construction work. The purpose, therefore, of taking emergency action at this time, rather than including the projects in the normal annual construction authorization legislation later in this session, is to take full advantage of the coming construction season. This early action will, for the most part, gain a full year in the completion and attainment of operational capability of the important programs involved in the authorization bill we are considering today.

The committee has made a close examination of every item included in this supplemental construction authorization bill and is satisfied that each item is directly related to, and required in support of, the priority operational objectives to be accelerated by this emergency action. The items to be constructed under this authorization are essential to the dispersal and quick reaction time of SAC, to the attainment of an early significant operational capability in ballistic missiles, to ballistic-missile detection and warning, and to improved air defense.

We must recognize the need to implement, on an accelerated basis, the newest and the best weapons system if this country is to maintain technological and military superiority. It is vital to maintenance of our national security. Our support and approval of this bill will provide the Air Force base construction which will push forward priority military programs and continue an adequate war-deterrent capability.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, may I simply reemphasize some of the remarks that our chairman made a moment ago about our committee embarking upon a complete investigation of the whole subject as it affects our national security. I think that is a responsibility that our committee of 37 members, a completely nonpartisan committee, has willingly undertaken in an effort to take all necessary steps to provide our country the kind of defense that we need. It is going to be a long, tedious task, but we of the committee want to do the kind of job I think the House has a right to expect of us and certainly the country has a right to ask of us. And so, as time goes on, we shall develop every phase of our defense posture and structure and we shall come to the House with all possible information. We intend our investigation to be thorough and objective.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for the splendid and comprehensive statement which he made, particularly the remarks he made concerning the intentions of our committee to scrutinize very carefully all of these projects that are submitted to us, so that our present emergency will not turn into an excuse for a grab bag for funds which ordinarly could not be justified by themselves.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he is one of the important members of that committee who can be very helpful and who I know will in his usual manner be extremely helpful as we diligently look into every facet of this problem, which I think our committee is qualified to do and intends to do.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I have some firsthand information which I think perhaps would be interesting to the membership as a whole and to the Committee. Camp Cook, which has been referred to by the distinguished Chairman, is in my district. All of us I think from time to time have been critical of the armed services for what seems to be inefficiency in their operations. I can say to you from my firsthand information that a splendid job is being done at Camp Cook in converting that old Army Base into a very important missile base, which it is. They are utilizing as many of the old buildings as they possibly can. They are not merely knocking everything down and starting from scratch. They have created splendid public relations in the area by the efficient way in which they are operating.

Mr. ARENDS. I am very glad that the distinguished gentleman has brought such information to the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to our distinguished Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in connection with what was said by our distinguished colleague from California, let me say that a portion of Camp Cook will be used by the Navy and a portion of it will be used by the Air Force. There will be complete joint use of it. It was in the interest of economy to establish that facility there.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. If the gentleman would yield for just this observation, let me say that a splendid job is being done by both services in cooperation with each other.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I feel our committee is determined to constructively and objectively do a good job for the welfare of this great country of ours, without any special benefit to any one individual.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

### ALERT AND DISPERSAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, Mr. VINSON, and the ranking minority member, Mr. ARENDS, have both given fine descriptions of what the bill

will do and the great urgency for its prompt passage.

I would like to deal with a matter that has for many years been of great interest to me, and that is the Strategic Air Command.

The Strategic Air Command's ability to conduct offensive air operations on a global basis is recognized as the primary deterrent to enemy aggression. This Nation is always faced with the possibility that this powerful deterrent will be ignored by potential aggressors, if they believe our strategic forces are vulnerable to surprise attack. We know that the Soviet Union has committed itself to creating a strong, modern, long range offensive force.

It is readily apparent that this capability is the prime threat to our national security. By design or miscalculation, the Soviet force may be launched against this country. Should this force be employed in a surprise attack against the United States, then the Strategic Air Command must immediately mount nuclear attacks designed to destroy the enemy's will and ability to wage war before irrevocable damage can be inflicted on the United States. The Strategic Air Command, to be effective, must react quickly and in great weight to be decisive.

To meet this objective of fast and powerful reaction, it is absolutely essential that our strategic force be dispersed at many locations throughout the United States to increase the probability of survival. Further, it is essential that this force be on alert—ready to launch the counterattack within minutes of the first warning. With this as our requirement, we must act immediately to make available the necessary alert and dispersal facilities.

It is necessary to accomplish some major construction at a number of bases in order that dispersal may be achieved. This construction must include the facilities essential for the support of B–52 combat units.

How shall we do this? To attain alert capability it is necessary that every bomber base be provided with paved hardstands near the end of the runway for those aircraft which are poised and ready to strike. For the combat crews who stand an around-the-clock alert to fly these bombers, there must be a ready building, also located at the end of the runway. These alert facilities must be made secure from sabotage.

There is one further action which must be taken to insure optimum employment of the strategic force, namely, the relocation of a number of conventional aircraft tanker units. In order that the fast-flying jet bombers may be refuelled at the proper point along their route to the target, the slower flying tankers must be out in front. That means moving a number of KC–97 squadrons to more northerly locations where their capability can be effectively used in refuelling the SAC bombers. This tanker relocation also involves some construction to adapt selected bases to the tanker requirements.

I would like to make two further comments with respect to the bill and its relation to the Strategic Air Command.

The committee received the assurance of the Air Force that the dispersal of the B–52's will in no way lessen the effectiveness of the Strategic Air Command.

The committee was further assured that the personnel strength of the Strategic Air Command bases would remain substantially the same because of the fact that when a squadron leaves a SAC base for dispersal, some other unit will come in and replace it. We can see, then, that this dispersal is a mere shifting of airplanes and men in order to spread throughout the whole country our first line of defense and offense in the Strategic Air Command.

My last remark relates to bombers of the Strategic Air Command and the missiles which so many feel will replace them in the near future.

Perhaps the missile will replace the manned bombers in time to come, but there is no evidence at the present time that the manned bomber, whether it be a B–47 or a B–52, will cease to be an effective weapon for many years to come.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. AVERY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that where a unit of SAC was being dispersed or was being reassigned that, in turn, another unit of SAC would go to that original place so that the end result would be that we would have about the same complement of strength in each one of these bases?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Substantially, the gentleman is correct, but it would not be another unit of SAC necessarily that would be placed in that SAC base from which the unit is being taken. The idea that has been given to the committee there is that when a SAC unit is being dispersed to another base, and all of you who have SAC bases in your area are interested vitally in this—whenever a unit is taken from a SAC base and moved to another base in this dispersal program, the idea is that a unit from another base, whether it be a training unit or any other type of unit, a materiel command or something of that sort, will be moved back into the SAC base from which the unit has been taken and the end strength of the bases would remain substantially the same.

Mr. AVERY. Referring to the list of bases which were included in the bill where these dispersals are to be made by and large were those to be bases that are reactivated or renovated or were they to be mostly new installations?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They are older bases. You will notice, however, that in this bill the SAC bases that have received the attention of the bill are largely those in the northern part of the United States.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. VINSON. May I remind our colleague that there are absolutely no new bases as a result of the dispersal of SAC.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding to me on this point.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, recent achievements of the Soviet Union point up the importance of giving additional impetus to the long-range ballistic missile. The legislation before us today is designed to do this for both the intercontinental ballistic missile and the intermediate range ballistic missile, referred to as the ICBM and the IRBM.

Specifically, the proposed construction authorization will augment and accelerate our ICBM base preparations, and will provide facilities earlier than planned for the IRBM recently ordered into production.

Let me describe some of these missiles. The Atlas, as you know, is a 5,000-mile intercontinental range missile. The Thor and Jupiter are competitive designs of the 1,500-mile intermediate range ballistic missile. Development of these missiles have been accorded top priority for some time and each has progressed now to the point where it is feasible to accelerate and augment plans for the initial units.

ATLAS

Atlas is a huge multistage rocket propelled by liquid oxygen and kerosene. It will travel 5,000 nautical miles in about 30 minutes. Launched vertically, the missile accelerates rapidly many miles into outer space. At a point known to missile men as cutoff, the engines shut down, and the thermonuclear warhead separates. Speed at this cutoff point is almost 5 miles per second. This tremendous speed gives the warhead sufficient momentum to carry it along a free fall path to the target. Halfway to the target, or as the missile men say, at the apogee, it will be several hundred miles above the earth's surface. When it nears the target, it reenters the atmosphere much like a meteor. Only by encasing the warhead in a special protective shell known as the nose cone can it survive the terrific temperatures and aerodynamic forces encountered during this reentry phase.

The Atlas program is being carried out by a team of competent contractors. General Electric provides nose cones and guidance systems; North American the engines; and Convair is responsible for the airframe, assembly, and end-item testing. Additionally, the guided missiles research division of the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp. provides technical direction and system engineering services. The over-all program is considered well founded and essentially on the tightly compressed schedule laid out by the Air Force in 1954. Although there have been only four limited range flight tests of this missile to date—and incidentally, the last two were highly successful—there have been many hundreds of tests in special facilities simulating flight environment. Results of these tests have been impressive and there is high confidence in the program.

I have dwelt on the Atlas at some length because much of the construction authorization proposed in this bill is to be used to augment and accelerate the preparation of Atlas operational sites, all to be located within the United States. These missiles are unique and require special facilities that can only be provided by new construction. Further, in order to better assure survival under attack, they must be dispersed at rather widely separated locations. These facilities are long lead-time items and unless this base-construction program is pursued with vigor, we may find ourselves in the embarrassing position of having a usable missile with no place to fire it from.

THOR AND JUPITER

The Thor and Jupiter missiles are single stage rockets that operate in a similar manner to the Atlas but at a shorter range. No bases other than training facilities will be established in the United States for these missiles. As has been announced, it is planned that the initial units will be deployed overseas this year. The units are so designed as to require but a limited degree of special facility preparations. Where possible it is planned that these facilities will be provided by the host nation. Where such arrangements are not possible, the Air Force plans to locate the units where existing United States support facilities can be utilized.

As I mentioned earlier, the Thor and Jupiter IRBM's are competitive missiles of similar design. Each employs the same basic engine derived from the Atlas program. Both are single-stage missiles with the same general performance characteristics and capabilities. Jupiter is under development by the Army; Thor by the Air Force. The Air Force as the designated user plans to employ the IRBM as an integral part of the Strategic Air Command.

Both the Thor and Jupiter missiles as yet are still in the development phase. To date there have been 10 flight test attempts with the Thor and 7 with the Jupiter. Five of the Thor tests, including the last four, were successful. A sixth might have been successful had it not been erroneously destroyed by range-safety action. Of the 7 Jupiter tests, 3 were successful and 4, including the last 2 failed prematurely.

Although most of the information which I have dealt with above has been available to a close reader of newspapers and magazines, I think that a review of the Atlas, the Jupiter, and the Thor as they relate to this bill will be helpful.

I would like to make one concluding remark concerning a matter which has been brought up on previous occasions but which I feel cannot be stressed too strongly, and that is this:

To use an old fashioned but very meaningful phrase, and our very able chairman has referred to it, we must never find ourselves with all of our defense eggs in one basket. We need our bombers, we need our fighter planes, and we need the long-range missiles which have been the subject of my remarks. There can be no doubt of this.

But while we must be aware of the possibility of a total war, we must be equally aware of the even greater possibility of a limited war.

And who will fight the most likely of the wars of the future? The same foot soldier, the ground forces, who has fought all of our previous wars.

The very fact that we are prepared, and the enemy is aware of our preparedness makes it all the more likely that if trouble should break out, it would be a small war, a limited war. For these, too, we cannot fail to be prepared.

We must keep our ground forces strong, alert, equipped, and ready to move as they have had to move since the beginning of our country.

I urge all Members of the House to support this bill. It has been well thought out. It was well justified before the committee. And we, I feel, have not only an obligation to pass this legislation but to pass it in the promptest fashion possible.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9739 which authorizes certain construction for the Department of the Air Force. In a few words this bill will meet the needs of our armed services by accelerating those military programs that are closely related to increased Soviet capabilities. Possibly, I should say this is the first step that is being taken by this Congress to meet the Soviet threat.

Mr. Chairman, by the early enactment of this bill we will save from 9 to 12 months in the acceleration of our offensive capabilities and our warning and defense position. The House Armed Services Committee of which I am a member has studied this bill very carefully and recommended its approval as it constitutes an essential step toward the fulfillment of the program of our country to make up for any lost time and to aggressively advance our capability to defend ourselves and to retaliate if we are attacked.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the beginning of many bills that this Congress will approve as a means of strengthening our national defense.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON Mr. Chairman, Congress has opened its session confronted by problems of an unusual character. Ordinarily the problems that confront Congress relate to domestic issues or questions of foreign policy. But, at this time we have a most unusual situation. It is different than any we have heretofore been required to deal with. Our present problems are the result of scientific and technological advances unexpectedly made known to the world by Russia.

The launching of a space satellite by Russia has awakened the world to the fact that a great scientific discovery makes necessary a complete readjustment in our thinking and planning for individual and national security. As yet, no one can estimate the effect of this new discovery. Will it eventually be a means of improving the welfare of people, or, as most people now fearfully believe, a means for their destruction?

Whatever its future use may be, the fact remains that at the present time the nations and people of the world look upon this new and mysterious discovery with fear. Consequently, deep and serious thought is being given to the subject, not only by scientists, but also by legislators and heads of government, whose duty it is to provide for the security of their people.

Until the recent discovery by Russia it had been generally assumed by all the nations of the world that our Nation was far advanced above all others in all types of missiles and atomic bombs of every category. This fact gave our Nation a great advantage in the so-called cold war. It gave courage and assurance of security to our allies and was a deterrent to unfriendly nations. But, with the penetration of the outer space by Russia, there came a distinct change in the attitude of all nations. No longer was there the same confidence in American superiority in the fields of missiles and nuclear weapons of war.

With this situation facing Congress and the policymaking departments of our Government it became necessary for President Eisenhower, as leader of the free nations of the world, to speak frankly with respect to the uncertainty and fear that had been created by the Russian discovery, and, to make recommendations to meet the new situation that would give reassurance of adequate security of our own people, as well as our allies. This he has done in an admirable manner in his state of the Union message delivered in person to the Congress.

The superb manner in which President Eisenhower met the challenge, answered his critics, and the wisdom and soundness of the policies he laid down to meet the emergency was attested by the fact that his speech to the Congress was interrupted 40 times during its deliverance by applause from both sides of the aisle—Democrats and Republicans, as well as the gallery filled with important persons both in and out of Government. Never before in the memory of the oldest person present had there been such a demonstration of approval and unity of thought regardless of political affiliation. It undoubtedly strengthened the hand of our President and reestablished our prestige among the free nations of the world.

The eight-point program submitted by the President deserves the wholehearted and enthusiastic support of every thoughtful and sincere citizen of this Nation.

In brief it is as follows: First, defense reorganization; second, accelerated defense efforts; third, continuation and strengthening of the mutual security program of both military and economic assistance to friendly nations; fourth, foreign trade encouraged; fifth, scientific cooperation with allies; sixth, scientific education and research; seventh, careful spending and saving; and eighth, work for peace.

Thus, in presenting the eight points the President makes plain not only a desire to provide an adequate system of defense to meet present-day needs, but likewise to assure a continuance of our basic national desire for peace. His words in this respect are well worth repeating, namely:

I say once more, to all people, that we will always go the extra mile with anyone on earth if it will bring us nearer a genuine peace.

It is now the duty of Congress to give serious, careful, and conscientious consideration to the program of the President, eliminate political partisanship, and act solely and entirely from the standpoint of providing adequate security against war and to promote every possible means to insure peace.

The bill before us today, H. R. 9739, is offered by the administration as the first step in the President's program to meet the emergency situation that has been presented the Nation as a result of recent scientific developments by Russia. If we are to meet the challenge that is presented, then there must be direct action by the Congress in the form that will enable our scientific endeavors and defense plans to progress.

It is to be sincerely hoped the situation will not develop into a race solely to produce weapons of war in which the nations of the world, particularly the leading nations, will strive to develop more and more deadly and destructive weapons.

The time has come when our efforts should also be directed toward the adoption by all nations of policies that will curtail, and even eliminate, the urge to create more and more deadly instruments of mass destruction.

Our national leaders and our people as a whole are committed to the cause of peace. It is therefore appropriate, by reason of our long-established record to promote peace, to take the leadership in an effort to bring the nations of the world to adopt a sensible and sane course that will discourage, and, if possible, preclude a continued race in military armament which in the end, if continued, could result in the destruction of the high standard of civilization that we know today. Is it asking too much to utilize our energies to build a peaceful atmosphere in which to live rather than an atmosphere that creates a feeling of constant fear? Let us meet not only the present situation as seems necessary by legislation of the character we have before us but also keep ever before us the need to find ways and means to promote peace if we are to survive and enjoy a peaceful atmosphere in which to live.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, the very able gentleman from Georgia has moved with all practicable speed and expedition to bring this emergency bill to the floor of the House and I desire to commend him. He has also made a fine statement in support of the bill.

I do not wish to speak at length on this measure because Chairman VINSON has so capably and fully outlined its provisions and purposes.

We are all agreed, I believe, on the need of orderly speed in pressing urgent defense programs. This bill will permit the continuation and acceleration of most essential defense activities relating to the progress and perfection of vital scientific and weapon systems—detection, ballistic missiles, deployment of forces, and related questions.

The bill has been expeditiously but carefully considered by the Armed Services Committee. It contains specific line items covering specific authorizations for necessary appropriations. It retains control by this Congress over both authority and expenditure. It deals with subject matters that must go forward at once without further delay. It is a safe, sound, forward-looking bill in every respect.

And it demonstrates one fact very conclusively—that Congress can and will act swiftly and efficiently whenever the national security and national welfare requires it.

However, from a legal and procedural standpoint, I am genuinely concerned by the proposed introduction of the amendment by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], which, in brief, as I understand it, would provide authority for the immediate establishment of the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

In order to make the record clear, it should be stated that it is the position of the Department of Defense that under the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, it does not need additional authority to create this agency. That is a proposition upon which I think there is room for reasonable differences of opinion. Obviously, if the Department of Defense can create this agency with its vast implications, it could create about any other agency without seeking the authority of Congress so long as it could get appropriations to conduct its activities and write authorizing language into an appropriation bill as in this case.

Under the amendment, for example, the new agency is vested with broadest powers of acquisition of land and construction and certain other activities, over which the House Armed Services Committee presently exercises jurisdiction to authorize.

Whether the proposed amendment legally constitutes a similar limitation upon the powers of the Department of Defense, which certainly the Department does not admit, or whether it would permit the Department to exercise exclusive authority are debatable questions. I think that these and other questions should have been resolved before the committee and that the regular procedure should have been followed and fresh authorization given to cover this specific agency with appropriate limitations and qualifications as has heretofore been our practice under the law.

However, this course was not followed. Instead the Department of Defense, claiming full authority to proceed, submitted the substance of this amendment to a bill pending before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Armed Services, under the leadership of my very able, dear and esteemed friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. It is expected that the pending bill, together with this authorization clause, will come to the House floor on Tuesday next.

While I applaud this evidence of expeditious action regarding urgent matters, and while I am most anxious to render wholehearted cooperation to the new Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, who has made such an excellent impression on our committee and in official Washington during the short time he has been discharging the duties of his great office, I nevertheless am of the opinion that the same results of speedy action could have been achieved if the matter had been duly considered and acted upon by the House Armed Services Committee in the regular course.

For these reasons, I desire to qualify my remarks in support of this legislation and state further that, while I do not propose to object and will support both the amendment and the bill, I nevertheless feel that the regular order should have been followed in this case.

I have utmost confidence in Secretary McElroy. It is my opinion that he will be an outstanding Secretary of Defense. From my observations of him during the exhaustive, trying hearings of the past few days, like the other members of the committee, I have come to entertain high respect for his ability, fairness, and high purpose.

I am of the opinion that he is a man of great stature and outstanding ability and that he is strongly committed to performing his duties in accordance with existing law and with full recognition of the responsibilities and duties of the Congress. I am sure that he will have our sympathetic consideration and wholehearted cooperation.

But the implications of this new Agency, involving as they do the possible revision of roles and missions expressly outlined in existing law, certainly require the most zealous and studied deliberations of our committee and the House. Fundamental changes will be required in our entire defense setup. That is unquestionable. But we must make sure that these changes are carefully thought out, and carefully worked out, and do not take place without proper deliberation upon all factors—legal, military, economic, and social—which should be meticulously considered in connection with reorganization and readjustment problems of the services. Our committee and the Congress have great obligations to fulfill in this respect.

It is also my hope that this amendment will not serve as a future precedent for considering amendments to important measures before the House. I am strongly opposed to redtape and unnecessary delay in dealing with Government problems. I am anxious always to see orderly procedure and expeditious action. But I see nothing in this situation confronting us at this time which would warrant the avoidance of our established legislative procedures.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read, and pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

SEMIAUTOMATIC GROUND ENVIRONMENT SYSTEM (SAGE)

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: Administrative facilities, $270,000.

K. I. Sawyer Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Administrative facilities, $277,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Utilities, $50,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $11,582,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $6,901,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $10,338,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Utilities, $172,000.

Syracuse Air Force Station, Syracuse, N. Y.: Troop housing facilities, $80,000.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DETECTION SYSTEM

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and ground improvements, $189 million.

BALLISTIC MISSILES

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and ground improvements, $112,400,000.

ALERT AND DISPERSAL OF STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND FORCES

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, $3,194,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, $1,461,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $895,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $664,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, $2,603,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,089,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, $1,524,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, $872,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $867,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $4,380,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities $690,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,668,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $1,116,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $2,368,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $8,958,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities, $29,644,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities, $23,762,000.

K. I. Sawyer Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities, $27,233,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $3,667,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $22,632,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities, $22,349,000.

Clinton County Air Force Base, Wilmington, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities, $8,776,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $4,715,000.

Ernest Harmon Air Force Base, Stephenville, Newfoundland: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $2,217,000.

Goose Airbase, Labrador: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance and production facilities, $2,007,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $4,995,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities, $6,979,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, and utilities, $7,079,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $17,487,000.

Various locations: Land acquisition as required for the stations listed above, $2,709,000.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774 (d) and 9774 (d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of sections 1 and 2 of this act, but appropriations for public-works projects authorized by those sections may not exceed $549,670,000.

SEC. 4. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313 (b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for adequately auditing those contracts, the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 5. Contracts made by the United States under this act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and section 15 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 547, 551). The Secretary of the Air Force shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 6. Any of the amounts named in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Air Force, be increased by 15 percent. However, the total cost of all projects may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated by section 3 of this act.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to establish within the Department of Defense the Advanced Research Projects Agency, hereafter referred to as the Agency. The Agency shall have a director, to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense, and such other employees as the Secretary of Defense shall from time to time authorize. It shall be the duty of the Agency to engage in advanced, basic, and applied research, as well as the development, of weapons systems for the military departments, and to engage in such research and development of weapons systems not under the immediate jurisdiction of any military department as the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, may assign to such Agency.

"Nothing in this provision of law shall preclude the Secretary of Defense from assigning to the military departments the duty of engaging in research and development of weapons systems necessary to fulfill the combatant functions assigned by law to such military departments.

"The Agency shall have authority to enter into contracts with persons, corporations, colleges, universities, institutes, Government agencies, and such other organizations as the Secretary of Defense may approve, for advanced basic or applied research, or development of, weapons systems, or to engage in such research or development within the agency by utilizing employees or consultants of the Agency.

"The Secretary of Defense shall assign the weapons systems developed by such Agency to such military department or departments for production and operational control as he may determine.

"Nothing contained in this provision of law shall be construed as repealing, limiting, abrogating or modifying the limitations on the powers and duties of the Department of Defense and the Secretary of Defense as are now contained in the National Security Act, as amended."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the committee I desire to call their attention to what this amendment is all about and to say that in the state of the Union message the President made reference to this agency.

In a statement made before the Committee on the Armed Services a few days ago by the new Secretary of Defense, he said:

I am establishing within the Department of Defense an Advanced Research Projects Agency, which will be responsible to the Secretary of Defense, for the unified direction and management of the antimissile missile programs and for outer space projects. I would expect to assign other special projects of this nature to this agency from time to time in the future.

The Agency will not be expected to take over research and development of weapons systems which fall clearly within the mission of any one of the military departments. It is contemplated that programs assigned to the Agency will be developed in full coordination with the military departments to the point where they are approaching operational capability so that they may be phased into the operation of one or more of the military services with no loss of time or interruption of development and production. We propose to establish the new Agency promptly and appoint a highly qualified director. The Director will have authority to arrange for the performance of work by other agencies of Government, including the military departments, to enter into contracts with private business or educational and research institutions, or to perform work directly with his own staff and facilities.

Of course, when the Secretary made that statement before the Armed Services Committee we immediately recognized the importance of the language and the purport of what he had in mind.

The appropriation bill is proposed to carry some $10 million dealing with this. The question was raised this morning in committee as to whether or not the Secretary has the authority to establish this agency, as Secretary of Defense, or whether it is an agency which the Congress should give him the authority to establish.

Another question that deeply concerned us was whether or not the Department of Defense can enter into any production contracts. Such contracts are now made by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. I know of no specific language in the National Security Act which gives to the Department of Defense the right to enter into a production contract. In fact, it was the concept when the Security Act was written that that office would be nothing more than a policymaking organization. Therefore, in view of the importance of this matter, we have submitted the pending amendment. It might have to be modified in conference or it may have to be added to or subtracted from, but I, at least, want it in this bill before the appropriation bill comes up for consideration.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. By placing the amendment here, the Congress will be indicating that it does authorize the authority within the Department, but it does not accept the theory that the Defense Department has authority over all agencies that they wish to create. Is that not substantially the situation?

Mr. VINSON. We do not by this amendment establish. We merely permit him to be vested with the authority to establish. We prescribe the language in here. I think the gentleman is correct in his conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. VINSON) he was permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this was left to our chief counsel, Mr. Smolt, to develop during the hearings this morning. It was necessary for me to appear before the Rules Committee at 10:30 in order to get a rule; therefore I was not present during all of the hearing. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and other Members were there, so I ask the committee to permit Mr. KILDAY to address you on the validity, the soundness, and the wisdom of this amendment being offered at this point.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt but that at the present time we are in a condition of emergency with reference to matters existing in the Department of Defense. This is not our first emergency. We have had recurring emergencies, and I think, to be more correct about it, we would have to say that this has not yet been called an emergency but more an urgency; that there is a condition or a situation of urgency.

I believe it has been true always, and I am sure since I have been here, that in a situation of this kind the executive departments attempt to secure the broadest of powers and to get from under any type of control that Congress has customarily exercised. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], in his remarks here today, pointed out that he wanted to see to it that the military got everything that they needed but that we should not, because there may be some symptoms of hysteria in the country, give them those things which are not needed.

I would like to point out the portion of this bill that has been stricken. As you realize, the committee struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted its own language. You will see that the Department, as it sent this bill up here, asked to be released from practically all Congressional control at this early stage. The bill as drafted would have permitted the Secretary of the Air Force to establish bases where he pleased so long as it came within the money limitation and the categories mentioned. He could have established such installations anywhere he pleased and in any number he pleased as long as he stayed within $29,670,000 for SAGE; ballistic missile detection system, $189 million; alert facilities for Strategic Air Command forces, $24.6 million; ballistic missiles, $112.4 million; the dispersal of Strategic Air Command forces, $194 million.

The committee has seen fit to strike out that language and to proceed as we have since the termination of World War II to authorize these matters by line item except where security prevents that being done, and that is what we have done here. I believe I can say that the Committee on Armed Services intends to remain vigilant on matters of this kind.

In his message on the state of the Union, the President referred to the fact that there are new weapons coming into the picture which actually belong to none of the services, because they are totally new in concept and do not come within the roles or missions of any of the services. The Secretary of Defense has told us that he proposes to establish within the Department of Defense an Advanced Research Projects Agency and to commit to it those things which our chairman read you from his statement before the committee today. That would include, perhaps, under the broad language that the Secretary was speaking of, the power to enter into production contracts by the Secretary of Defense, something that has not been permitted since the establishment of the Department of Defense. As has always been done, all the appropriations have run to the Secretaries of the military departments. The General Counsel of the Department of Defense takes the position that Congress, having established the Department of Defense, has endowed the Secretary of Defense with power to operate his Department as he sees fit except in those instances in which we have denied him certain powers. I know of no member of our committee who agrees with the General Counsel in his construction of either the National Security Act of 1947 as amended in 1949 or in his construction of title V of the United States Code.

Now, the President has stated that this research should be done at a level other than the individual services. We have a new Secretary of Defense who has very favorably impressed your Committee on Armed Services in his appearances before us now for 2 full days and half of today. His first attempt to accelerate research and development of missiles and antimissile missiles and the

new weapons that might be coming into the picture is by creating the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

I am sure that the Congress does not want in any way to impede the new Secretary of Defense. I am sure we all want to give him what he feels he needs in order to take this first step in bettering research and development on missiles and new weapons of all types. The language that we have brought here makes it clear, without stopping to debate what is the proper legal construction of the National Security Act or the amendments of 1949 or title 5 of the United States Code, that we give him the power to do everything that he said he proposed to do with reference to his Advanced Research Projects Agency, and we give it to him by positive provision of law, so that there will be no impediment to Mr. McElroy in his new office as Secretary of Defense in securing basic and applied research and development of any type of missile that he decides should be committed to that new organization within the Department of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. VINSON, Mr. KILDAY was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. KILDAY. So that the Secretary may proceed as he thinks best to give us the greatest guaranty of success in the great undertaking for which he has now assumed responsibility. I believe that we are here giving him everything that he proposes to do by his directive, except that we are doing it in the legal, proper, orderly fashion, by statute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand this amendment—and I do not believe there are printed copies of the amendment available; is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. There may be a carbon copy or two.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee give consideration to the amendment; did it hold hearings on it?

Mr. KILDAY. As the chairman explained, Secretary McElroy was before the committee this morning, as he was all day yesterday and all day on Monday and testified in very considerable detail in his opening statement on Monday and again this morning with reference to the Advanced Research Projects Agency. The General Counsel of the Department of Defense was present and testified in some detail as to his construction of the National Security Act. This amendment was not reported by the committee. This amendment is offered on the responsibility of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is chairman of the committee. But it was not offered by direction of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation and that is exactly what I wanted to get at. This is an amendment offered on the floor of the House which would create another agency of Government; is that not correct?

Mr. KILDAY. It creates an agency within the Department of Defense.

Mr. VINSON. It authorizes it, it does not create it.

Mr. KILDAY. That is true, it authorizes the Secretary of Defense to create an agency.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think there is any question, if the amendment is voted into this bill today, and if the bill is approved by the House and by the other body, that there will be another agency with a director, in the Department of Defense?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. And the question is whether we shall do it by law, in the legal and proper manner or not, because it is going to be done anyway. And we take the position, and take it very positively and very firmly, that these matters are going to have to be submitted here. If he can create this Agency without statutory authority, then he can create a hundred more. But if we approve this by statutory authority, we have not recognized his right to create another single one.

Mr. GROSS. Since the gentleman is assuming the responsibility for it here and now, I wonder if the gentleman could tell me how much more this is going to increase the personnel in Government and what the added cost is going to be?

Mr. VINSON. Ten million dollars.

Mr. KILDAY. There is a bill pending in the Committee on Appropriations which I understand we will have up probably next Tuesday. This bill is authorizing legislation for some of those projects. The chairman of that subcommittee is present.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, last month the Secretary of Defense said that he could dispose of some of the controversy and jealousy in the Department of Defense and move faster with the advanced weapons program and get more for the taxpayers' dollar if he could lift out of the services certain advanced work and let it all be headed up in one unified program. He called this the Advanced Research Projects Agency. He has asked for the right to transfer available funds now in the hands of the services to that program, for example in the military satellite program and in the anti-ICBM program, and so forth. He is proposing to transfer presently available funds in the hands of the Air Force, the Navy, and the Army to this agency, where he thinks he can get more progress, more for the money, and less duplication. That is the picture as it has been presented to us. I would not want to deny this new Secretary of Defense, who apparently is a man of real stature, on this effort to bring more order into certain military fields.

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to answer the other portion of the question of the gentleman from Iowa as to how many more employees this is going to create, and that sort of thing. This in and of itself will not increase it by one man. In the present attitude existing in the United States, I think it would be self-evident that there is going to be a great acceleration in research and development of missiles of all types and of all things having to do with outer space, so that there are going to be employed scientists of every character to engage in research and development. They are going to be employed someplace, either in the military services or in the Department of Defense. Under this provision they will be employed in the central agency within the Department of Defense, so that their services will be available to all of the military departments. But of itself it will not increase the number of employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to the committee substitute.

The amendment to the committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute as amended.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 437, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 374, nays 0, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]

YEAS—374

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Baring | Bray |
| Abernethy | Barrett | Breeding |
| Adair | Bass, N. H. | Brooks, La. |
| Addonizio | Bass, Tenn. | Brooks, Tex. |
| Albert | Bates | Broomfield |
| Alexander | Beamer | Brown, Ga. |
| Alger | Becker | Brown, Mo. |
| Allen, Calif. | Beckworth | Brown, Ohio |
| Allen, Ill. | Belcher | Broyhill |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Bennett, Fla. | Buckley |
| | Bennett, Mich. | Budge |
| Anderson, Mont. | Bentley | Burdick |
| | Berry | Burleson |
| Andrews | Betts | Bush |
| Anfuso | Blatnik | Byrd |
| Arends | Blitch | Byrne, Ill. |
| Ashmore | Boggs | Byrne, Pa. |
| Aspinall | Boland | Byrnes, Wis. |
| Auchincloss | Bolling | Canfield |
| Avery | Bolton | Cannon |
| Bailey | Bonner | Carrigg |
| Baker | Bosch | Cederberg |
| Baldwin | Boykin | Chamberlain |
| Barden | Boyle | Chelf |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Chenoweth | Holmes | Pelly |
| Chiperfield | Holt | Perkins |
| Christopher | Horan | Pfost |
| Church | Hosmer | Philbin |
| Clark | Huddleston | Pilcher |
| Clevenger | Hull | Pillion |
| Coad | Hyde | Poage |
| Coffin | Ikard | Poff |
| Collier | Jackson | Polk |
| Colmer | James | Porter |
| Cooley | Jarman | Price |
| Corbett | Jenkins | Prouty |
| Coudert | Jennings | Rabaut |
| Cramer | Johansen | Rains |
| Cunningham, Iowa | Johnson | Ray |
| | Jonas | Reece, Tenn. |
| Cunningham, Nebr. | Jones, Ala. | Rees, Kans. |
| | Jones, Mo. | Reuss |
| Curtin | Judd | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Curtis, Mass. | Karsten | Riehlman |
| Dague | Kearney | Riley |
| Davis, Ga. | Kearns | Robeson, Va. |
| Davis, Tenn. | Keating | Robsion, Ky. |
| Dawson, Utah | Kee | Rodino |
| Dellay | Kelly | Rogers, Colo. |
| Dempsey | Keogh | Rogers, Fla. |
| Dennison | Kilday | Rogers, Mass. |
| Denton | Kilgore | Rogers, Tex. |
| Derounian | King | Rutherford |
| Devereux | Kirwan | Sadlak |
| Dingell | Kitchin | Santangelo |
| Dixon | Kluczynski | St. George |
| Dollinger | Knox | Saund |
| Dooley | Knutson | Schenck |
| Dorn, N. Y. | Krueger | Scherer |
| Dorn, S. C. | Laflore | Scott, N. C. |
| Dowdy | Laird | Scott, Pa. |
| Doyle | Landrum | Scrivner |
| Durham | Lankford | Scudder |
| Dwyer | LeCompte | Seely-Brown |
| Eberharter | Lennon | Selden |
| Edmondson | Libonati | Shuford |
| Elliott | Lipscomb | Sieminski |
| Engle | Long | Sikes |
| Evins | Loser | Siler |
| Fallon | McCarthy | Simpson, Ill. |
| Farbstein | McCormack | Sisk |
| Fascell | McCulloch | Smith, Calif. |
| Feighan | McDonough | Smith, Miss. |
| Fenton | McFall | Smith, Va. |
| Fino | McGovern | Smith, Wis. |
| Fisher | McGregor | Spence |
| Flood | McIntire | Springer |
| Flynt | McIntosh | Staggers |
| Forand | McMillan | Stauffer |
| Ford | McVey | Steed |
| Forrester | Machrowicz | Sullivan |
| Fountain | Mack, Ill. | Taber |
| Frazier | Mack, Wash. | Talle |
| Frelinghuysen | Madden | Teague, Calif. |
| Friedel | Magnuson | Teague, Tex. |
| Fulton | Mahon | Teller |
| Garmatz | Mailliard | Tewes |
| Gary | Marshall | Thomas |
| Gathings | Martin | Thompson, Tex. |
| Gavin | Mason | Thomson, Wyo. |
| George | Matthews | Thornberry |
| Glenn | May | Tollefson |
| Granahan | Meader | Trimble |
| Grant | Metcalf | Tuck |
| Gray | Michel | Udall |
| Green, Oreg. | Miller, Calif. | Ullman |
| Gregory | Miller, Md. | Utt |
| Griffin | Miller, Nebr. | Vanik |
| Griffiths | Mills | Van Pelt |
| Gross | Minshall | Van Zandt |
| Gubser | Mitchell | Vinson |
| Gwinn | Moore | Vorys |
| Hagen | Morano | Vursell |
| Hale | Morgan | Walter |
| Haley | Morris | Watts |
| Halleck | Moss | Weaver |
| Harden | Moulder | Westland |
| Hardy | Multer | Wharton |
| Harris | Mumma | Whitener |
| Harrison, Nebr. | Murray | Whitten |
| Harrison, Va. | Natcher | Widnall |
| Harvey | Neal | Wier |
| Haskell | Nicholson | Wigglesworth |
| Healey | Nimtz | Williams, Miss. |
| Hébert | Norblad | Willis |
| Hemphill | Norrell | Wilson, Calif. |
| Henderson | O'Brien, Ill. | Wilson, Ind. |
| Herlong | O'Brien, N. Y. | Winstead |
| Heselton | O'Hara, Ill. | Withrow |
| Hess | O'Hara, Minn. | Wolverton |
| Hiestand | O'Konski | Wright |
| Hill | O'Neill | Yates |
| Hoeven | Osmers | Young |
| Hoffman | Ostertag | Younger |
| Holifield | Patman | Zablocki |
| Holland | Patterson | Zelenko |

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—54

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ashley | Hays, Ohio | Reed |
| Ayres | Hillings | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Baumhart | Holtzman | Rivers |
| Bow | Jensen | Roberts |
| Brownson | Kean | Rooney |
| Carnahan | Kilburn | Roosevelt |
| Celler | Lane | Saylor |
| Cretella | Latham | Schwengel |
| Curtis, Mo. | Lesinski | Sheehan |
| Dawson, Ill. | Macdonald | Shelley |
| Delaney | Merrow | Sheppard |
| Dies | Miller, N. Y. | Simpson, Pa. |
| Diggs | Montoya | Smith, Kans. |
| Donohue | Morrison | Taylor |
| Fogarty | Passman | Thompson, La. |
| Gordon | Powell | Thompson, N. J. |
| Green, Pa. | Preston | Wainwright |
| Hays, Ark. | Radwan | Williams, N. Y. |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Reed.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Cretella.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Ayres.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: To authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent from the floor at the time the vote was taken on the bill authorizing certain construction for the Department of the Air Force. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## AMINTORE FANFANI

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in this great body to deliver a very urgent message and to ask my worthy colleagues to take action before the fact.

Outside the borders of the United States, a man who fights for the things we believe in, with the same fervor and zeal as the best American statesman, is not an American. He is Amintore Fanfani, secretary general of the Democratic Christian Party of Italy. When the former great leader of Italy, and friend of the United States, Alcide DeGasperi, died, he left a will in which he bequeathed to Italy a legacy not of money but of hope for unity of the Italian people in order to serve the cause of freedom and peace.

In this will he clearly stated:

Amintore Fanfani is the only man in present day Italy with the ability to organize the Democratic Christian Party and lead it and the people of Italy against the threat of communism.

It was this same Fanfani who, only 2 days ago in a speech in Naples, spoke out against Khrushchev and the entire Soviet regime in these terms:

Italy is ready to negotiate with any country except those that have not yet given up the use of fifth columns in our country. No understanding can be reached with Russia as long as she persists in using Communist parties inspired by her to influence the politics and the fate of countries with which she wishes to negotiate. Russia cannot start a war without condemning herself to destruction. Khrushchev must choose: either he is a Communist desirous of subverting the world or he is a Communist desirous of preserving peace for his people. He cannot be both things. He will never obtain help and support from sensible people and from wise politicians by posing as a pacifist Russian while he is rearming with the secret aim of returning to be a Communist conqueror of the world when he has finished rearming.

I can assure this body that in view of what has occurred in recent months it was not an easy task for this great leader and friend of the United States to speak as he did. It was not easy for Amintore Fanfani to speak as he did at a time when the Italian people are subjected to an intensive peace offensive from Moscow, aimed at knocking Italy out of the North Atlantic Alliance, when the country is daily being threatened with atomic reprisals if she allows missile bases to be established on her territory.

It was not easy to raise a voice for freedom amidst the threats of the Communist Party of Italy—second largest in the world, second only to that of Russia—that Italy will become a candidate for extinction if atomic missiles are based on her territory.

The task was made more difficult by people in very high places who are even inside the Government of Italy, openly insisting that Italy declare a policy of neutrality.

Add to that the further recent Russian offensive of besieging the Vatican to accept a peace envoy as a permanent representative of the Holy See, and you cannot help but admire this great leader.

And speaking about a representative to the Holy See, this country must someday, soon I hope, remove the onerous distinction of being together with Russia the only two countries in the world without representation in Vatican City, which is without a doubt the greatest source of information and intelligence on earth.

But getting back to Fanfani and Italy—Amintore Fanfani spoke as he did because he sincerely believes that Italy's safety and future lies in an alliance of the free world against slavery and tyranny which are the only fruits of communism. Fanfani does not want Italy to be another satellite with an Iron Curtain around it. Fanfani wants its people to inhale the air of freedom and for Italy to be a partner and not a servant of other nations.

Amintore Fanfani has the respect of Members of this body on both sides of the aisle. During the presidential election here in 1956, Mr. Fanfani came here to study American politics, and was guest of President Eisenhower at the Republican convention in San Francisco, and of our great Democratic leaders in Chicago, which included such great statesmen as former President Harry S. Truman, our Speaker, Sam Rayburn; Senator Lyndon Johnson, majority leader of the Senate; Adlai Stevenson, Democratic presidential hopeful; Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York; Senators Kennedy and Kefauver; and our distinguished majority leader of the House, John McCormack. The only reason he met so many Democrats is because I am his friend and happen to be a Democrat. But he was too smart to get involved in any partisan politics in this country, and I am sure he must have met many more Republicans than I know about in San Francisco. As a matter of fact he went away from the United States as quietly as he came, without fanfare, without promising to anyone anything, but very much impressed with our form of government and the liberty which all of our people enjoy, and not just a privileged few.

At every opportunity he has proven himself a great friend of the United States, but an even firmer protector of the lives of the Italian people following his oath to DeGasperi that Moscow-trained Italians will never take over Italy.

Italians who love freedom as much as we do here in America, who place their faith in a supreme being do not want to, and if Fanfani can help it, would not be led to slavery by false Italian prophets like Togliatti and Negarville and others, who owe their allegiance not to the Republic of Italy, but to Khrushchev, the leader of the Cominform of the Soviet Union.

We here in America who know of the great sacrifices of this leader who has the best interests of his people at heart, and who know that communism is no more the answer for the people of Italy than it is for the people of the United States, laud this great man and pledge the help of this country's great resources and the strength of its people that Italy will never fall under the hammer and the sickle.

I say that this is the time, not after something disastrous happens, for us to show our genuine friendship for the people of Italy and to encourage Fanfani and his party to victory in the elections called for this spring.

It is for that reason that I am reintroducing today a resolution which I first introduced on February 9, 1956, and ask that the House Foreign Affairs Committee favorably report the same to the House with all due dispatch.

## REDUCTION IN FORCE IN THE RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently Subcommittee No. 1 of the Armed Services Committee unanimously agreed to a resolution requesting the Department of Defense to notify the Secretaries of the military services to temporarily stay the further involuntary release of Reserve officers from active duty. The chairman of the committee agreed with the resolution and joined me, as chairman of the subcommittee, in a letter to the Secretary of Defense notifying him of our request.

During the past year the Department of Defense directed the military services to reduce officer strength. Although plans for this reduction were laid as far back as February 1957 no notification was given to my subcommittee, nor to the committee, and I personally only learned of these involuntary releases after Congress had adjourned and when complaints from Reserve officers were received in my office. This despite the fact that my subcommittee was in session on one matter or another until adjournment and that I have repeatedly urged the departments to bring their problems to us, or at least inform us of impending actions with far-reaching consequences.

Because this action was initiated and implemented when Congress was in adjournment the subcommittee took the position that it was only right and proper that the Department of Defense agree to delay the further implementation of the release program until such time as the subcommittee could convene and conduct an inquiry and make such recommendations as might be appropriate or advocate enactment of corrective legislation.

I have just been notified by the Defense Department in reply to our letter, that it would not look with favor on giving so much as a temporary delay to the involuntary release of these Reserve officers.

Mr. Speaker, in my 21 years in Congress it is difficult for me to recall a single instance when the military services have acted in such a cruel and despotic manner toward the officers serving in their ranks.

We are told that it is difficult to get young officers to stay in the military and make it a career. We are told that we are losing well-trained military men to industry. We are told that what we must do is increase the pay of all officers of the armed services and in that way we can entice our young men to stay in the military and make it a career. And, still, while we are being told these tales the military departments are systematically releasing qualified Reserve officers from active duty.

I, for one, am not advocating that officers be retained on active duty if they are not needed. Neither do I say that unqualified officers should be retained in the military services. But these officers are needed and they are certainly qualified.

Mr. Speaker, the officers now being involuntarily released from active duty are not youngsters who have only recently reported to duty and been found wanting. Quite on the contrary, these officers are highly trained, specialized, and qualified Reserve officers with as much as 17½ years of active duty.

These officers are being released to cvilian life at an age when it is extremely difficult to find other employment. Particularly so when the majority of their adult life has been spent in the military. They are being released with only a small readjustment payment to tide them over until such time as they can find means to gain a livelihood. They are being released within only a few years—sometimes a few months—of the time when they would automatically be retained in order to qualify for retirement benefits.

There is no industry in the civilian economy with which I am acquainted who would treat their personnel as these officers are being treated by the military services. Every protection is given Regular officers and protection is given to qualified civil-service employees, but the Reserve officer who has served his country faithfully and well, often in 1, sometimes in 2, wars is cast aside before he can qualify for retirement with hardly as much as a thank you for his services to his country.

As a consequence I intend to ask this subcommittee to draft legislation to insure that this type of treatment will not again be visited on Reserve officers. I am still in the hope that our subcommittee will be able to meet in the afternoon or at night to go into this matter before the first of February.

## ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which, if enacted, will establish a National Commission on Astronautics.

It is obvious that the United States is faced with a situation of grave peril. This situation has arisen basically from the lack of proper perspective on the part of Government leadership. We could have had, at this time, a greater technical achievement than any nation on

earth if we had fully utilized our resources and capabilities in a vigorous, sustained manner, without the waste of time and duplication of effort which has impeded our progress. Coupled with our failure to exploit our abilities to the fullest has been the appraisal which now appears to be correct that research in and control of outer space holds consequences of the greatest magnitude. In studying the intent of the Soviet Union, it is obvious that research in and control of outer space is an objective of that Government. It should now be obvious to us that the Soviets are serious in this intention, which is made clearly evident in the present superiority of the Soviet Union in the technology of rockets and missiles and the successful achievement in taking the first steps into the field of astronautics.

As a consequence, the United States stands today semi-naked and exposed from two directions. The first is the more immediate peril which we face over the next few years from perfected operational intercontinental ballistic missiles of the Soviets. But secondly, and equally perilous, is the long-range threat of unilateral control of outer space by the Soviet Union.

The more immediate threat requires that we must immediately initiate and prosecute a missile program which will guarantee that from now on we will possess missiles and rockets superior or at least equal to anything that any other nation may develop. This immediate problem is one of national defense, and is the vital concern of the Department of Defense. It must be expedited without delay. The bill which I present does not remove any defense item out of the Department of Defense. The military will continue to perfect its program and its missiles.

However, the need for a civilian Commission on Astronautics is evident. We are in dire need of promoting research into the problems of interstellar travel; of the benefits of manned space platforms; and of all other beneficial products of conquering the space beyond the reaches of this earth, in order that the people may profit thereby. If the fields of research, development, and operation are permitted to fall exclusively to the lot of the military, we are inviting, at the outset, the hostility of a space war.

The end result of the legislation which I offer is to assure the common defense and security of this country, to further establish the general welfare of our people, and to promote the interests of international peace.

In President Eisenhower's recent reply to Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin he stated:

> I propose that we agree that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes.

The proposed National Commission on Astronautics is directed to this peaceful end.

There are three basic reasons for the passage of this bill.

First. To save time: A civilian Commission in the field of astronautics is not held by the redtape which binds the Pentagon in many of its decisions. Present "buildup—foldup" activities are time consuming. The space age is one which has been born in speed, and time is of the greatest essence. A civilian Commission, through coordinated and unified effort, would save time and advance a program into this new frontier. The matters which must be researched, developed, and operated could well be subjected to costly delay if this program is not released from military control.

Second. To save money: It is no secret that the Russians would like for us to spend ourselves into economic slavery. It is also no secret that we have been subjected to costly duplication in bringing our missile program to its present status. There has been no circulation of essential information, there has been obstinate rivalry and needless expenditure of funds because of this clumsy method of military operation.

The National Commission on Astronautics as a civilian commission would be organized to chart the various fields of endeavor, disseminate and circulate vital information, and avoid duplication of expense and effort.

Third. To save life: The knowledge of and the control of outer space will bring great blessings to man. The vast fields which will be opened up will bring commensurate benefits in the form of better communication, weather mapping, and general knowledge of our planet and the entire universe, which is vital to man's ever-increasing study of himself and his surroundings. By gaining leadership in this field, we can be assured that newfound knowledge will be used for peace.

Further, the control of space is vital to the future existence of a free people. The long-range threat of control of outer space by the Soviet Union must be met with a sensible, well-planned technical program which will insure that outer space will never become a bastion denied to the United States and used by our enemies to attack and destroy us.

The program I propose is sound, reasonable, economical, and capable of achieving the goals we seek. By planning on a long-range scale, we will avoid the very wasteful practice of starting and stopping, of duplication, and of other redtape extravagances, which have characterized so many of our development programs of the past. Because I believe that we must heed the wise counsel of the preponderance of this Nation's most able and talented citizens who tell us that whoever controls outer space will control the world; and because I feel that we must employ technological superiority in the pursuits of peace, we can do no other than be seriously set to the task of researching, developing, and operating this vital program in astronautics.

---

## ARBITRARY RELEASE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, last month I called to the attention of the Department of the Army a matter which is of fundamental importance and concern to the men and women serving in the Armed Forces of our country. I refer to the involuntary release from active duty of thousands of officers and enlisted men which has been ordered by the Secretaries of the respective services.

This policy is said to have been adopted in order to comply with recently announced manpower limitations, and it is being implemented—according to our Defense Establishment—by ordering the release of those whose loss would be least damaging to the accomplishment of the missions of the respective services.

Mr. Speaker, no one can question the shattering effect which this policy of arbitrary release from the service has had upon the morale of our Regular Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine personnel. It is demoralizing not only to those who have been released after years of satisfactory duty, but also to those who remain in service with the insecure knowledge that they may be the next to go.

It is also clear, Mr. Speaker, that this policy has done a tremendous amount of positive harm as far as attracting competent career men into military service. And by so doing, the inevitable result has been to increase our reliance upon the draft and to perpetuate this device as the principal means of providing military manpower.

Recently there was called to my attention the case of one of my constituents from Toledo, Ohio, who had nearly 16 years of honorable service to his country. After serving throughout World War II, my constituent twice reenlisted in the United States Army. But when he attempted to reenlist last year, at the age of 48, he was arbitrarily rejected.

When I inquired into the reason for this action, I learned that at no time had this soldier been subjected to any form of military discipline. I was told, however, that on two occasions he had been reduced in rank because of inability to discharge the duties of a noncommissioned officer and that his I. Q. was lower than normal.

Here we have a graphic example, Mr. Speaker, of how this arbitrary policy is actually working This man gave 16 years of his life to the service of his country. On the two occasions of his reenlistments he was considered by the Army to have adequate intelligence and to be otherwise qualified for retention in the service.

But with only 4 years more for retirement, the Army suddenly turns this man out. At the age of almost 50, he is forced to return to a civilian life which is strange to him and to seek employment which, because of his age, is all but impossible to find.

The Army explains this action by including this man among those "whose loss would be least damaging to the accomplishment of their mission."

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I question the validity of this explanation. I feel certain that as long as our military services continue to pursue this heartless procedure, which is so devoid of human values, the inevitable result will continue to be

the rejection of military service as a career by our young men and women. This can only lead to the costly, inefficient, and socially undesirable perpetuation of the draft as the principal means of supplying men for our Military Establishment.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriate committees of the Congress will take action in this matter while there is still time.

## PAY RAISE FOR CIVIL-SERVICE AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, our Federal civil-service and postal employees need more money.

It is an old refrain that I am presenting, but the central truth is still present. Let me quote just a few facts and figures. Time was when a Government job was sought after, not only because of the opportunity of service that it offered, but also because of the good pay and fine working conditions that Government employees used to enjoy compared with other groups in the population.

Today, all that has changed. Why? Because the pay of Government employees has not kept pace with the rest of the Nation's workers. Since 1939, the average salary of classified civil-service employees has increased 130 percent and that of postal employees has risen almost 145 percent, but they cannot compare with the increase in wages of workers in the manufacturing industries or even those in retail trade. The wages of the latter have risen 190 percent and those in manufacturing have more than tripled.

Looking at the situation from another viewpoint, let us take the prices of certain basic commodities. Since 1939, the price of rib roast beef and lamb has increased almost one-and-a-half times. Pork chops have increased even more—almost one-and-three-quarter times. Potatoes—a staple item on every grocery list—have almost tripled in price. Apples have risen two-and-a-third times, and coffee, as we all suspected, has skyrocketed—it now costs over four times as much as it did in 1939.

The picture is not completely black, of course. Prices of commodities other than food have risen much less; but food takes up more than a quarter of the money spent by the average family. For the modestly paid Government employees, price increases in food are felt more sharply than anything else.

The average letter carrier today makes $4,383. In most American cities, the average amount required to feed a family of four—a small family in these days of booming population—is well above that figure. Many fathers have to look for extra work after their regular job is finished. Often the mother has to work, with the result that the children do not receive the amount of attention they should have while they are growing up.

Though clouds of recession are hanging over us, we are living in prosperous times these days. In private industry, management and labor have been reaping their share of the rewards. But our public servants are neglected. And, as a result, the Federal Government is experiencing difficulties in hiring and retaining the type of personnel we need. Promising young men and women are going into private industry where their talents will be given opportunity to expand and earn their just returns.

Clearly an increase in the salary scale of Federal Government workers is called for. America is the richest, strongest nation on the globe. She deserves also to have the best of young talent that enters the labor market each year. But she cannot do this, nor indeed can she expect long to retain these faithful and devoted servants that she does have unless she gives them their just due. In all fairness, the pay boost should also include a retroactive provision making the raise effective from the time of the Presidential veto of the bill passed in the last session of Congress.

Prompt action is also essential on the bill reported just before adjournment to increase the pensions of retired employees. The Federal Government has a very real moral obligation toward its retired workers. Many of them devoted their entire careers to the public service, and now, through no fault of their own and because of circumstances over which they haven't the slightest control, they are feeling a severe economic pinch. The Government owes these people a fair and just livelihood.

America's public servants, active and retired, deserve to receive prompt relief from their predicament. I urge that priority be given the legislation in their behalf.

## KNOW YOUR LOCAL SCHOOLS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the 6 weeks coinciding with the opening of schools and colleges for the fall term of 1957, the radio and television stations owned and operated by the National Broadcasting Co. in 8 cities launched a public service project called Know Your Schools. It was aimed at the foundation of our education system, the average citizen and parent, living in the neighborhoods of the schools and colleges to which we look to train our youth to take their place in life.

Know Your Schools had the organizing leadership of the NBC owned stations division, and was developed with the cooperation of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It also has the endorsement and encouragement of such groups as the National Education Association, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the American Legion, and many more.

With that beginning, the Know Your Schools project was carried out by each NBC owned station within the community which it serves. The stations participating in this laudable endeavor were WRCA and WRCA–TV in New York City, WRCV and WRCV–TV in Philadelphia, WRC and WRC–TV in Washington, WKNB and WNBC in New Britain-Hartford, Conn., WBUF in Buffalo, WMAQ and WNBQ in Chicago, KNBC in San Francisco, and KRCA in Los Angeles.

The universal problems of education were examined in local terms by these broadcasting stations in cooperation with local school systems, colleges, parent-teacher groups, and citizen organizations interested in education. No master formula for solving the ills of education was prescribed. Rather, the energies of Know Your Schools went toward awakening greater citizen interest on the community level. The objective was to make the average citizen, and especially the parents, conscious of their responsibility for the proper education and training of the youth of our land.

The NBC owned stations utilized their "Impact Public Service" technique in the Know Your Schools project. Under this technique, for a given period of time a station places its full resources behind a single public service activity of interest to its community. In Know Your Schools, each station created one or more special program series, inserted features about education in suitable local programs already carried by the station, devoted saturation schedules of public service announcements to the subject, and organized station promotions. Virtually every broadcasting format known to the industry was employed. Altogether, the NBC owned stations contributed 200 hours of programs and 3,000 public service announcements—time and talent worth $1 million—to Know Your Schools. The most successful of these techniques will be documented and made available to other educators and broadcasters for duplication elsewhere.

In a letter to Mr. Thomas B. McFadden, vice president in charge of NBC owned stations, I stated the opinion that Know Your Schools would be an extremely useful service to the public in making it conscious of its responsibility to our youth. I added that—

> I am definitely of the opinion that money alone—whether it be Federal or State and regardless of the amount—will not do even a fair job unless there is some way to reinforce the minds of the parents of America, which have been, to some extent, shaken and confused by wars and the effect of wars. That reinforcement could come from such mass information mediums as the NBC-owned stations to broaden the public's knowledge, quicken their senses of responsibility and arouse new interest.

I congratulate Mr. McFadden and the general managers of the NBC owned stations, and reiterate the editorial words of Radio-Television Daily, the broadcasting industry newspaper:

> The impact of this public service programing has been impressive, not only to people in the educational field, but to people whose business is, in fact, the public good.

I am not only personally familiar with this undertaking but with some of the fine public-spirited gentlemen guiding it, among which happens to be one of my close friends and a neighbor, Mr. Don Bishop.

## COMPENSATION IN FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITIONS

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H. R. 9994, to create a Commission To Study the Adequacy of Compensation in Federal Land Acquisitions. It is my hope that this bill can be given early consideration so that the Commission's findings can be furnished to Congress at the earliest possible time in order to assure payments commensurate with losses suffered by displaced persons and to establish a uniform set of standards for all United States Government agencies.

We have all heard complaints from city dwellers and farmers alike that they do not receive proper and sufficient payment for property taken for Federal use. There is apparently universal acceptance that many injustices are being done. It is small solace to a displaced person to be told that his Government recognizes the injustice, the inadequacy of payment, and his difficulty or inability to reestablish himself, but that at the same time it does not know how to correct these inequities. Yet that is what he is being told.

While the Constitution of the United States says that no private property shall be taken for public use without just compensation, there are many real losses suffered for which there is no compensation. The Federal courts have classed these losses as consequential damages a term that has become so comprehensive as to include the special value of property to an individual; the disruption or even destruction of a business and the loss of its goodwill; accelerated depreciation of machinery in moving from one location to another; new or increased interest charges resulting from the move; and the difference between the value of the property required for public use and the price that must be paid for a replacement site.

The awareness of the Congress to these problems is evident from the fact that we have authorized the Defense Department and the Urban Renewal Administrator to make limited payments for moving expenses. In doing so, however, we have not only not gone far enough, we have established dual standards. There is a different basis for the payments authorized in Defense Department projects from those allowed in urban renewal projects. While this limited reimbursement does not fully compensate those involved, no moving expenses can be paid by any other agency. The inequity suffered by those whose property is required for a post-office building or, for example, a civil airport such as that proposed for the Washington area, is thereby heightened. Nor do I think that the solution lies in extending authority piecemeal to other agencies as we proposed in passing H. R. 6940, now pending in the Senate, which would authorize reimbursement for moving expenses in reclamation projects of the Department of the Interior on the basis of the formula used in flood-control projects of the Army. An article appearing in the January issue of the Appraisal Journal, a publication of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, serves to focus attention on the continuing piecemeal, and almost haphazard, approach to this subject. Entitled "Review of Efforts To Minimize Losses in Condemnation," by Milton A. Pearl, an attorney with the Department of the Army, the article discusses the need for action, the various proposals now pending before many of our committees, and comes to what I submit are these obvious conclusions:

> If the many committees of Congress studying the adequacy of compensation in condemnation cases continue their separate paths it will lead inevitably to a further divergence in the legislative authorization. Economies of time, effort, and money, plus the obvious desirability of having all Federal agencies acquire land under the same rules, indicate the benefits that will be derived if a halt is called to the piecemeal approach and the task of finding a solution is given to one group having no other responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, in the basic struggle in which we are engaged today our greatest asset is the fairness, freedom, and good will of the democratic way of life. If we are depriving even a small percentage of our citizens of their property, without compensating them in full for all of their losses, we are defeating our own purpose. It is submitted that we must review this problem with the same sense of urgency that we must give to the development of missiles and to the acquisition of the land and the establishment of facilities for their testing, launching, and use. Because the present system of payment for land required by the Federal Government is inadequate and because the piecemeal approach to the solution of the deficiencies has created a lack of uniformity which must be halted, I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill that would create a commission composed of members from the legislative and executive branches and outstanding public and industry representatives to study the problem. As a step toward the early consideration and adoption of this measure I suggest a reading of the article I referred to a moment ago and request unanimous consent that this important contribution to an important subject be printed in the RECORD.

## SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS AT THE AGE OF 60

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, ever since I became a Member of Congress in early January of 1955 I have personally sponsored legislation that would lower the age for social-security retirement benefits to 60 years for both men and women workers of our country. And now I have again introduced my latest bill to the same effect and on this same subject and my own bill has now been referred to the Ways and Means Committee of this body for its consideration and eventual action, as I hope.

As everyone knows, we are living in a time of machines and these machines have taken away the jobs of thousands of workers in my own Congressional District and all over America. Many coal mines have become so well equipped with modern machinery that the workers on their payrolls are just half as many as were formerly employed. One freight train crew can now haul twice the freight tonnage the same crew hauled a few years ago. Shop and mill working shifts of all kinds have been curtailed in the interest of more efficiency and in the name of continuing progress. No one desires to stand in the way of any of this progress. And so far as I know, no labor union in America has officially attempted to oppose installation of machinery anywhere in the country even though that machinery would certainly take the place of many workers when installed. But what could be the proper solution for all these job replacements by machines? Well, surely one effective solution would be an earlier retirement age for our workers. In other words, our workers could be taken from employment payrolls through an amended social-security law retirement age provision that would put some desirable monthly benefits in the pockets of these workers at the very same time. While a new and more efficient machine now gives a worker nothing but a kick in the pants and some advice to hunt himself another job, yet a new and more efficient amendment to our social-security law, if adopted by Congress, would give all our older workers past 60 some modest retirement benefits, and some opportunities to enjoy a few more happy years of free time before the end of life's journey.

What is social security? Well, it is something that does not cost the taxpayers or the Government anything whatever for the payment of any of its benefits, strangely enough. It is insurance, pure and simple. And insurance benefits always come from insurance premiums. If the risk is high, the premium must be high. If you take fire insurance on a paperboard house 2 miles from a fireplug, the policy cost, or the premium fixed, is necessarily high. But the fellow that wants to protect his house is always willing to pay the cost of protection and always wants his insurer to have actuarial soundness, at all times. So, all that is now needed for safe social-security benefits at 60 is for the provision of a suitable premium to be paid by employers and employees that will be commensurate with the added benefits.

From all my conversations with various people that would be affected, there is practically no objection among them for the added cost in view of the happy prospect of the added benefits.

We have heard much talk about our annual foreign aid that has already cost taxpayers over $55 billion. So now, what about a discussion of some American aid that will cost taxpayers nothing whatever?

In one of the great newspapers of the country, in its issue of July 11, 1956, there was a front page article emphasizing the impossibility of the average person over 45 years of age ever getting a job. A Labor Department survey shows, according to this article, that 3 out of every 4 employers ban middle-aged people. We all know this is true. According to the news article, there were then 47,400,000 people in America over the age of 45 years. But if we should provide social security benefits for workers at the age of 60 years, there would be many millions less people applying for these jobs and facing that vicious ban against the hiring of persons 45 years of age and over. Many would not seek or need these jobs at all since they would be able to live plain and simple lives in their little homes on the hills and up the hollows with some social security benefits coming in each month to keep the wolves of want away from their doors.

Moreover, if social security retirement at 60 years should become a general practice, there would be millions of job opportunities added for our young people all over America who are constantly coming out of the schools of the land. Every time a 60-year-old employee would retire, another job would be open for some willing youth of 18 or 20 years of age.

So, these are the stanch arguments for my bill or one similar, briefly summarized:

First. No cost to our taxpayers.

Second. Helping hand to our aging population.

Third. Additional job opportunities for our young people.

It is also worth while to observe that added social security benefits such as I have mentioned would inure to thousand of butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers throughout the country. Now money is a medium of exchange. So, added money is just added exchange that eventually finds its way into the hands of all who have anything to sell. Once upon a time, a man said he had loaned a football player a dollar. His friend asked if he ever got it back. "No," said the lender, "I only got a halfback on my books." Well, if we should increase social security benefits, many tradesmen and taxpayers could expect to get many real halves back in their cash registers through channels of trade and commerce. And I am not talking about football players—just plain old e pluribus unum, is what I mean.

The late Senator George of Georgia once stated, in talking about social security amendments pending before his retirement, "If we can get this through, then I am ready to go away from the Senate." So, perhaps it is proper for me to say, "If I can get my own social security amendment enacted into law to help our ordinary people, then I would be about ready to go away from the House and close my own career in that great body."

---

## A REVAMPING OF OUR TEACHING METHODS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the big problem in education today is not Federal scholarships—it is not financial at all.

The anxiety over possible shortages of scientists and mathematicians is caused by the failure to teach the basic subjects of education that produce mathematicians and scientists. Until we correct that in our elementary and high schools, additional money and control by the Federal Government imposed on education will hinder and never cure the problem.

Thirty years ago in the public elementary school system, as well as in private and church-related schools, the subjects taught were the basic subjects only. They were grammar, spelling, memory tests, writing, English, composition, arithmetic, history, geography, and in many cases introductory algebra and elementary science.

For high schools, the subject matter was English, literature, composition, grammar throughout 4 years, history 2 to 4 years, mathematics up through trigonometry—many areas had 4 years—physics, chemistry, biology, foreign languages for everybody, especially those bound for college, music and art as electives, physical education worked in when it could be. The foregoing was a 4-year drill—the children had to master the subjects or drop out, in which case they went to work. There were few laws prohibiting children under 16 years of age working. There was comparatively little juvenile delinquency.

Now it is different, and herein lies the explanation of our trouble in mathematics and science, which scholarships for college will affect very little.

Only the nonpublic schools stuck to the above program of basic education. To show the public approval, private and church-related schools grew at the rate of 106 percent in the past 20 years, while public-school enrollments increased only 31 percent. The nonpublic schools have produced a normal number of mathematicians and scientists. Many, but not all public schools, by any means, departed sharply from the basic educational material, reduced the time for or eliminated entirely some of these basic courses in favor of progressive educational material, such as social adjustment, sociology, home economics, bird watching, nature study, field trips, and so forth.

Failures in scholarship and discipline followed as night the day. Lawlessness and disorder in the schoolroom resulted. The schoolteacher lost command of her class. Little gangs took over in many classrooms. Juvenile delinquency outside the classrooms naturally followed.

They were taught the fun courses, the easy courses—coeducational classes in cooking.

Until we teach the subjects that make scholars, offering Federal scholarships ignores the real problem. This is typical of the political materialistic approach. Its only cure is money. It lacks capacity to go to the substance of the cure for ineffective education. Indeed, the proposal will throw another imbalance into the educational system which the first big Federal aid program created, that is, the emphasis for easy money from the Federal Government, overemphasized vocational education—manual arts, boatmaking, furniture making, cooking, housekeeping, dressmaking, and the like.

The so-called progressive education now absorbs a very substantial part of every child's time and of course shortens the time left for basic education. What is more, it adds enormously to the cost. It probably delays the utilization of television so as to take advantage of the great teachers who may handle 250 students in a class, or even more, compared to 25 or 30 in a class under ordinary practice.

We must not, we cannot waste either the time or the money involved or delay good teaching if we are to increase the number of scholars in mathematics and science. Indeed, there is no showing that there is any boy or girl qualified to pursue studies in mathematics or science unable to do so for lack of money. Scholarships and loan funds at some universities are going begging for qualified students. If any real need develops we may look to the great foundations or industrial groups or other private sources. The Government is the last place to turn.

Under no circumstances would it seem desirable, after 40 years of defeating its efforts to let the Federal Government get not only the nose but the whole hump of the camel into the schools. Its excuse for doing so has always been a false politically manufactured crisis.

In one particular, and one only, do we recommend a 100-percent imitation of the Russians in education, and that is: Make a complete and clean sweep of progressive education out of our schools. The Russian Communists thought they were smart when they threw out the czarist basic education material. It was, next to the German, one of the very best in the world. The Russians thought they were equally smart to adopt American progressive education. They were horrified with the results. The children began to run the schools and boss the teachers and showed up badly in the examinations. In 1932 out went the American progressive education system and back came the czarist system of basic education. Oddly enough the United States Office of Education is itself the authority for this change in Russia.

It is important that we study at this late date our own variety of Government thought control, through our own type of progressive education still being maintained. Instead of correcting the weakness of our own education as the Russians did by throwing it out, what have the National Education Association and the United States Office of Education, in particular, done?

They have built up a kind of mythology about the public schools all over this country by means of radio, television, speeches, news releases, and magazine articles. The public has been deceived for a generation or more to believe that:

First. Class sizes are increasing and schools are getting more crowded. This impairs the quality of the children's education. There was, so to speak, a clamor for our particular educational system, never any question about the product itself.

Second. Teachers are so badly underpaid that they are quitting in droves to take better paying jobs in private industry; not enough young people study for teaching, and many of those who do, do not take teaching jobs or leave soon; the teacher shortage is getting worse all the time.

Third. Classroom construction is not keeping up with the increasing enrollments, a large part of the bond issues are failing, an increasing percentage of the children are being housed in makeshift quarters and the situation is approaching a crisis stage because States and communities have reached the limit of their financial capacity.

Fourth. The source of all our educational trouble was very simply represented to be, "not enough money." They claimed the people were spending more and more on all types of luxuries, for personal consumption, for sumptiously equipped homes, for more powerful cars, for building superhighways, and so forth, while the schools' share was getting smaller and smaller. The picture of the schools as a Cinderella is very touching—but it is a false picture.

Each of these claims—and you have seen or heard of them many times—are false. It must be a fact that the monopolistic forces in education; our principal sources of information about our nationwide education system are more to be feared than the nationwide labor monopolies. I intend to prove this to you now.

### 1. SCHOOL SUPPORT

Between 1900 and 1957 national income multiplied 24 times.

Public school expenditures multiplied—in current dollars—60 times.[1]

The population of the United States grew 126 percent.

Public school enrollment grew 116 percent.[2]

So, while school enrollment grew more slowly than the population, school costs multiplied 2½ times faster than national income.

If we convert school expenditures in 1900 into 1957 dollars we find they multiplied 16.6 times while school enrollment multiplied 2.2 times.

#### SEVEN TIMES MORE

So, we are now spending seven times as much per pupil—in constant dollars—as we did at the start of the 20th century. Are the children learning seven times as much? Obviously not. The indications are that they are learning less than they did half a century ago.

Most economic statistics of the Department of Commerce go back only as far as 1929; the most recent year for which annual totals are available is 1956. The comparisons I am going to give are between 1929 and 1956. Amounts for 1929 were converted into 1956 dollars by the "implicit price deflator for gross national product" of the Department of Commerce.

| | 1929 | | 1956 | Increase in percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Current dollars | 1956 dollars | | |
| | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | |
| National income | $87,814 | $156,660 | $343,620 | 119 |
| National income by industrial origin: | | | | |
| All private industries | 81,911 | 146,129 | 301,481 | 106 |
| Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries | 8,278 | 14,768 | 16,084 | 9 |
| Mining | 2,048 | 3,654 | 6,050 | 66 |
| Contract construction | 3,808 | 6,793 | 17,704 | 161 |
| Manufacturing | 21,888 | 39,048 | 108,075 | 177 |
| Wholesale and retail trade | 13,358 | 23,831 | 57,874 | 143 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate | 12,693 | 22,644 | 30,932 | 37 |
| Transportation | 6,636 | 11,839 | 16,713 | 41 |
| Communications and public utilities | 2,864 | 5,109 | 12,499 | 145 |
| Services | 10,338 | 18,443 | 35,550 | 93 |
| **HOW DID THE SCHOOLS FARE?** | | | | |
| Public school expenditures [1] | $2,317 | $3,788 | $11,737 | 210 |

[1] School expenditures in 1929–30 were converted into 1956–57 dollars by the Consumers Price Index. Years shown are school years 1929–30 and 1956–57.

Sources of national income data: Department of Commerce, National Income, 1954, p. 176. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, July 1957.
Sources of school data: Office of Education, Biennial Statistics of Education, 1953–54. National Education Association, Advance Estimates of Public and Secondary Schools, 1957–58.

Private industry supplies the growing requirements for goods and services of the total population. The schools are responsible for educating the pupils who are enrolled. Did enrollment increase more than the population?

Far from it:

| | |
|---|---|
| Population July 1929 | 121,770,000 |
| Population July 1956 | 168,174,000 |
| Increase—percent | 38 |

Source: Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract, 1957, and Population Series P–25, No. 169.

| | |
|---|---|
| Public-school enrollment 1929–30 | 25,854,000 |
| Public-school enrollment 1956–57 | 32,339,000 |
| Increase—percent | 25 |

Source: Office of Education, Enrollment in Elementary and Secondary Public and Nonpublic Day Schools, 1930–65, February 1957.

So between 1929 and 1956 the population of the United States increased 50 percent faster than public school enrollment. During that time private industrial income and outgo doubled; school expenditures more than tripled—in constant dollars.

None of the industrial groups did as well as the schools although industry had to take care of a relatively greater increase than the schools.

Remembering that school expenditures in constant dollars increased 210 percent between 1929 and 1956, it may be well to make a few other interesting comparisons.

| | 1929 | | 1956 | Increase in percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Current dollars | 1956 dollars | | |
| | *Billions* | *Billions* | *Billions* | |
| Personal consumption expenditures | $79.0 | $125.2 | $267.2 | 113 |
| Corporate net profits | 8.3 | 13.2 | 21.0 | 59 |
| Personal income from interest and dividends | 13.2 | 20.2 | 29.5 | 41 |
| **HOW DID PUBLIC EDUCATION COMPARE IN REGARD TO WAGE AND SALARY PAYMENTS?** | | | | |
| Wage and salary payments: | | | | |
| All private industries | $45.5 | $72.1 | $189.4 | 163 |
| Public education | 1.56 | 2.48 | 7.63 | 208 |

Source: Department of Commerce, National Income 1954, and Survey of Current Business, July 1957. Conversion of 1929 dollars in 1956 dollars: Consumer Price Index.

In amounts of money received and spent the schools have done much better than private industry, nonschool employment, personal consumption expenditures, or corporate profits.

But, there still is a great deal of talk about shortages of teachers and of classrooms. Let us review how the schools have fared with respect to teachers and classrooms.

[1] 1900 national income, $15 billion; school expenditures, $215 million; 1957 national income, $360 billion; school expenditures, $12.9 billion.

Sources: Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education, 1953–54; N. E. A., Advance Estimates of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1957–58.

[2] 1900 population, 76 million; public school enrollment, 15.5 million; 1957 population, 172 million; public school enrollment, 33.4 million.

Source: Bureau of the Census; Population Statistics; Office of Education, Enrollment Statistics, February 1957.

2. THE TEACHER SHORTAGE

There has been a vast amount of publicity about teacher shortages and growing class sizes. Most people do not know that actually the number of teachers has been increasing more rapidly than the number of pupils, and that teacher-pupil ratios have been declining.

This is what Mr. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, wrote not very long ago:

> The number of teachers more than doubled between 1900 and 1950, while the number of pupils enrolled increased by two-thirds. The average number of pupils per teacher declined from a peak of nearly 37 in 1900 to 29 by 1940 and to 28 in 1950—America's Needs and Resources, the Twentieth Century Fund, New York, 1955, page 382.

What has happened since 1950?

In December 1957 the National Education Association published advance estimates of public elementary and secondary schools for the school year 1957–58, which show this picture of developments in the past 8 years:

| | Instructional staff | Enrollment | Teacher-pupil ratio |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1949–50 | 902,174 | 25,185,436 | 1:26.2 |
| 1957–58 | 1,329,551 | 33,506,814 | 1:25.2 |
| Increase in percent | +38.2 | +33.0 | |

So the schools have hired enough teachers not only to replace those who leave and to take care of the additional children but also to reduce further the teacher-pupil ratio during this period of unprecedented enrollment increase.

Meanwhile the percentage of so-called emergency teachers, that is those with less than standard certificates, dropped from 9.9 percent of all teachers in 1949–50 to 6.6 percent in 1957–58. This is remarkable because most States raised their certification standards. Teachers who could qualify in 1949 would be counted as substandard teachers in 1957.

There have been innumerable stories about teachers quitting the schools and taking better paying jobs, and about the schools being unable to find enough qualified replacements. I have just shown you that the number of teachers has increased 38.2 percent in the past 8 years. During that time all civilian employment increased only 10.8 percent—from 58.1 million in 1949 to 65.1 million in 1957. So it seems that in the final outcome the schools were able to attract and hire more than their proportionate share of the available skills.

How have the schools fared employee-wise over a longer period, compared with other industries?

| | Full-time equivalent employees | | Increase in percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1929 | 1956 | |
| Public education | 1,062,000 | 2,015,000 | +86 |
| All private industries | 32,712,000 | 46,772,000 | +43 |

Source: Department of Commerce, National Income, 1954, and Survey of Current Business, July 1957.

It is apparent that over the past 27 years, when enrollment increased proportionately less than the population as a whole, the schools enlarged their staffs at twice the rate of private industry.

The Office of Education has asserted that we are short 135,000 qualified teachers in 1957–58. This is based on computations which have been proven wrong in past years.

By release of September 2, 1956, the Office of Education estimated a teacher shortage of 120,700 in the school year 1956–57, based on a total supply of qualified teachers in that year of 1,195,400.

But by release of August 17, 1957, the Office had to admit that actually 1,252,700 qualified teachers were employed in the schools in 1956–57, or 57,300 more than estimated.

By release of September 8, 1955, the Office of Education estimated that the schools would be 141,300 teachers short in the school year 1955–56. This was based on a total supply of qualified teachers in that year of 1,115,700. By release of September 2, 1956, the Office admitted that actually 1,188,400 qualified teachers were employed in the schools in 1955–56, or 72,700 more than estimated.

Each year the Office of Education had estimated the new supply of qualified teachers at about 70 percent of the teacher graduates of the immediately preceding academic year. It disregarded the known fact that about half the qualified newly hired teachers graduated in earlier years, and enter—or reenter—the schools after some years of study, other jobs, homemaking, or military service.

So, even if we accepted the teacher demand estimate of the Office of Education at face value, the teacher shortage would be only half as much as the Office claimed. The demand estimate is based on a declining teacher-pupil ratio. If the schools maintained today the teacher-pupil ratio that prevailed in 1929–30—1:29.4 in the national average—there would be about 200,000 fewer teachers employed in the public schools, and teachers might have trouble finding jobs.

The teacher shortage is being artificially maintained by restricting access through the raising of academic requirements, by underestimating the supply, by adding more courses to the curriculum, and by demanding ever-smaller classes.

The public is being swamped with stories about teachers leaving their profession for industry. Actually, as we have seen, the ranks of the teachers have increased much more rapidly than those of private industry. Some teachers do leave the schools for nonteaching jobs. But all indications point to the conclusion that the reverse shift—from industry to teaching—is greater.

Not long ago, Dr. Harold Fields, vice chairman of the New York Board of Examiners found that 30 percent of the candidates for teaching licenses had full-time employment in business or industry at the time of taking the tests—the New York Times, September 16, 1956.

Another factor which accounts for the high teacher shortage estimates is the practice of the Office of Education to overestimate enrollment in the public schools. In each of the past 2 years the Office overestimated enrollment—releases of September 8, 1955, and September 2, 1956. When the advance estimates are compared with the actual figures, released a year later—releases September 2, 1956, and August 17, 1957—we find that enrollment was 578,000 and 475,500 lower than had been estimated.

But is there not a shortage of science teachers?

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion Folsom, in a memorandum published in the New York Times on December 31, 1957, stated:

> There is a current shortage of more than 8,000 high-school science teachers and yet—of the 5,000 graduates prepared to teach science last year—2,000 went into industrial jobs rather than the classroom.

This statement by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that 40 percent of the high school science teacher graduates went into industrial jobs is incorrect.

The National Education Association, in its 1957 Teacher Supply and Demand Report—the Journal of Teacher Education, March 1957, pages 41–42—showed that only 59.4 percent of the 1956 high school science teacher graduates had taken school jobs. That does not mean that the other 40.6 percent are in industrial jobs. The report showed that only 10.1 percent accepted other gainful employment. The remainder is divided as follows:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Military service | 6.8 |
| Homemaking | 2.1 |
| Continuing study | 9.3 |
| Seeking teaching job | 1.0 |
| No information | 11.2 |
| Total | 30.5 |

The conclusions to be drawn are different if 10 percent take nonteaching jobs rather than 40 percent.

Moreover, the National Education Association reported that in 1956–57, 5,500 new teachers of science were employed by American high schools, although the higher institutions had graduated only 2,600 in the immediately preceding academic year—the New York Times, January 3, 1958. This means then that many persons left other jobs to teach science in high schools. Since high-school teachers on the average are paid more than college instructors—in 1955–56 the average college instructor earned $4,087, the average high-school teacher, $4,350—there may have been a shift from higher to secondary education. It should be remembered, however, that while college instructors may have a more thorough knowledge of the subject they may lack some of the necessary pedagogical credits, and be forced to obtain temporary licenses until their disability is removed. Most college or university instructors or professors in science would be classified substandard teachers in the public schools—National Education Association, salaries paid and salary practices in universities, colleges, and junior colleges, 1955–56.

It is true that the schools need more science teachers. Is this so because schools cannot afford to compete with industry for science teachers? The answer is a matter of record.

School administrators do not want to compete for science teachers.

The educational magazine the Nation's Schools took a nationwide sampling of school superintendents:

Should public schools compete with industry for the services of science teachers by paying science teachers higher salaries than are paid teachers of other subjects in the same school?

The reply of 84 percent of the superintendents was an emphatic "No"—the Nation's Schools, June 1956.

There have been numerous suggestions how communities can meet teacher shortages in certain subject fields. But it is apparent that what needs to be overcome is not the teacher shortage but the resistance of teacher organizations to the adoption of measures for meeting the shortage.

Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, vice president of the Fund for the Advancement of Education wrote in the Farm Journal, March 1956:

We'd have no teacher shortage today if we really made use of our superior teachers. But we are not doing it. We're wasting them, only part way using them.

Here are some of the methods he suggested:

Bring children together in larger groups when feasible. Use fewer and better teachers for larger classes. Use assistant teachers and cadets to handle routine work and classroom supervision and let the real teachers teach. Bring new tools into the classroom—especially television—so that children everywhere can have the top teachers, the best minds in the Nation.

Productivity has greatly increased over the years, in industrial as well as in professional fields. For example, far more people today are getting an immensely better medical care than in 1921 although the number of physicians per 100,000 population has remained stable—134 in 1921, 133 in 1955.

The New York commissioner of education, James E. Allen, Jr., stated at the New York State education conference on September 19, 1955:

Almost every other profession has developed methods and practices which permit the successful practitioner to be of wider service. By employing assistants and utilizing modern labor-saving devices and professional aids, members of other professions have been able to extend the sphere of their service and influence and improve the quality of their work. In the teaching profession, generally speaking, the opposite has been true. We have tended to limit rather than extend the services of good teachers. * * * The situation makes it imperative that we think in terms of maximum efficiency in the use of the limited number of teachers available to us.

Some of the methods by which teachers could be more effectively used are (a) television, (b) use of teacher aids, (c) use of teachers for more than 180 days a year, and (d) elimination of nonessential courses.

(A) TELEVISION

Editorial Research Reports—volume II, page 1057—found:

At least 47 different school systems presented instructional programs on television for classroom viewing during the 1956–57 school year. Approximately 80 colleges and universities have televised hundreds of courses, many of them for credit.

The Fund for the Advancement of Education has sponsored and supported the adoption of television teaching in many communities and States. It published a research report by a former school superintendent who estimates that about 100,000 teaching positions could be saved nationwide by the use of television—Alexander J. Stoddard: Schools for Tomorrow, An Educators' Blueprint, the Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957.

The results of television education have been very encouraging. Students taught by TV have earned equal or better grades than those taught by live teachers.

(B) USE OF TEACHER AIDS

Teachers spend much time on unproductive paperwork, clerical, housekeeping, or custodial functions which could as well be performed by assistants who are either nonteachers or teacher apprentices. Teachers could then devote their time to instructing more children.

(C) USE TEACHERS MORE THAN 180 DAYS A YEAR

The average teacher works 180 days a year, 5 to 6 hours a day. Most other professional and working people spend between 233 and 243 days of 8 hours each at their jobs.

The average public school operates under 900 classroom hours a year. Even if teachers do a few chores after classroom time, they still work far less than the 1900 hours which professional or nonprofessional employees average in nonschool jobs. Which industry that claims to be short of specialized skills and expensive facilities would use them only two-thirds or three-fourths of normal working hours? Which industry could afford to give its employees 3 months off each year, at full pay, and use its plant 9 months out of 12?

Schoolteachers are working only part time. Why should they not work as many hours year-round as other people—and earn more money for doing so?

We are being told that teachers need long vacations to continue their professional studies. Do other professions—lawyers, accountants, engineers, architects, management and personnel executives, and so forth, not have an equal or even greater need for advancing their knowledge to keep up with progress in their respective fields? If they can do it on evenings, weekends, or during short vacations, why can't teachers do likewise?

If schools were open the year 'round, teachers could work about one-third more days and be paid proportionately higher salaries.

The plan most frequently suggested is the three-quarter year: pupils attend for three-quarters on a schedule staggered over 12 months. Simple arithmetic will tell that 1 million persons can do in 240 days what 1,333,333 can do in 180. So there is a tremendous possibility of getting along with fewer teachers and fewer classrooms, while at the same time paying teachers higher salaries.

This plan was on the program of the Governors' Conference in Williamsburg last June. Several States have set up study commissions to follow it up.

(D) ELIMINATION OF NONESSENTIAL COURSES

The December 1957 issue of the Journal of the National Education Association carried an article by a professor of home economics education at a State university, Boys, Too, Are Learning Homemaking. It said:

Homemaking classes, with boys, have become the accepted pattern in more and more of our junior and senior high schools today. * * * One year prior to the junior-senior prom, we were studying grooming, clothing selection, and social conduct.

Is that what we are sending our sons to school for?

All over the country, courses in marriage and family relationships, consumer education, date behavior, child development, etc., have been substituted for training in the essential disciplines. The number of courses has proliferated and in some of the large high schools they run to over a hundred. Some elective classes have 20, 15, or 10 pupils.

More and more curriculums resemble mail-order catalogs from which children are encouraged to select not what they ought to learn but what they would regard fun doing. Often there is an implied invitation—"If you don't see what you want, ask for it."

If the course offerings were reduced to a reasonable number of essential subjects, many thousands of teachers could spend their time teaching the children essential knowledge which is now sadly neglected. No purpose is served in adding more teachers unless we first eliminate some of the frills on which many teachers and pupils now spend much of their time.

Why has there been so little if any progress toward the adoption of the timesaving methods described in points (a), (b), (c), and (d)?

Because of the violent opposition of the teacher organizations. They call methods to save teachers' time educational nostrums to undermine adequate financial support of education; they scoff and sneer at them as panacea which must be firmly resisted.

The motives for this attitude are obvious: if timesaving devices were adopted, it would become apparent to the public that there is no teacher shortage but a teacher surplus. If schools were operated the year round or if they operated with the same teacher-pupil ratios that were used some 25 years ago, there would be several hundred thousand fewer jobs for teachers.

The drive for the lowering of teacher-pupil ratios and the opposition to timesaving methods are part of one vast featherbedding movement to create more jobs, maintain an artificial shortage and improve the bargaining position of the teachers. That teachers could earn more if they worked the year round as other people do, and that the schools then would be in a good position to hire better qualified teachers is immaterial to the paid staffs of the teacher organizations who are largely interested in recruiting more members from whom to collect more dues.

It has been claimed that smaller classes are necessary to give the children a better education. But there is no scientific evidence that children learn more in smaller classes. Last year, the Connecticut citizens for the public schools set out with the help of their State education department to prove that smaller classes resulted in a better education. They were very much embarrassed when they had to report that there was no correlation whatsoever between class size and pupil achievement. Nor did the amount of money spent per pupil affect educational achievement.

3. THE UNDERPAID TEACHERS

The "underpaid teacher" has become one of the most frequently used and abused catch phrases. If teachers are so grossly underpaid compared with other occupations, how were the schools able to increase their employment at twice the rate of private industry?

If nonteaching careers are more attractive, why is an increasing percentage of the college students going into teaching?

Between 1950 and 1956 the number of degrees conferred in teachers' education increased 24 percent while degrees in all other subject fields decreased 34 percent—Office of Education: Earned Degrees Conferred by Higher Educational Institutions, 1949–50 and 1955–56.

About three-fourths of all teachers are women. There are very few jobs which pay women as much as teaching. The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor conducted a survey of the jobs which women college graduates of 1955 held in 1956.

It found that about two-thirds of the employed graduates were teachers. Only a few of those in other fields—fewer than 10 percent of all graduates—were in occupations whose annual salaries exceeded that of the teachers. They were nurses, social workers, chemists, mathematicians, and so forth. All of them work 11 to 11½ months a year. To compare their annual pay with that of teachers who work only 9 months does not seem fair. On an hourly basis, teachers did far better than any of the other professions.

Men generally have broader opportunities than women college graduates. A study annually conducted at Northwestern University showed that in fall 1957, starting salaries offered by large corporations which actively recruit on campuses averaged $401 a month. This applies to a carefully selected group of better-than-average graduates.

Minimum starting salaries for college graduates in major urban school systems in fall 1957 run about $4,000 per year; in some cities such as Detroit, San Francisco, and Los Angeles the minimum is $4,500. This is less than the pay of other graduates for working 11½ months. But on an hourly basis it is considerably more than the earnings of accountants, engineers, or other college graduates in private industry.

The Office of Education, in a pamphlet, Teaching Is an Attractive Career, pointed at the attractions of teaching:

The relatively short hours on the job, and the long summer vacations that are three times as long as those in any other major vocation.

College graduates have the choice of working longer hours and earning more money or becoming teachers. Why should teachers get paid as much as other college graduates for working only two-thirds or three-fourths as many hours? Why should we not rather seek a way of enabling teachers to work as much as others?

This does not mean that teachers as a group are overpaid, although some probably do get more than they are worth. But the story of the underpaid teacher who was left behind when everybody else was getting ahead is a myth.

Some teachers, to be sure, are underpaid. There have been many suggestions to pay good teachers more than mediocre or bad teachers. But the teachers lobbies are fighting suggestions that teachers ought to be paid as other professions are: by individual performance and merit. They want single, uniform salary scales which can be controlled by collective bargaining. Such rigid schedules are a perversion of the sound principle of equal pay for equal work. Bad teachers do not do work equal to that of good teachers.

4. CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

In the past 6 years Congress has held many hearings and filled thousands of pages with testimony on an alleged shortage of several hundreds of thousand classrooms.

In 1952 the schools were supposed to be short 325,000 classrooms; in 1954 the Commissioner of Education testified that the shortage totaled 370,000 and that by 1959 we would be short 470,000. Then, suddenly, it was found that the shortage would be only 176,000, and in fall 1956, the Office of Education claimed a shortage of 159,000 classrooms. The vast discrepancies in these figures alone indicate that they were arrived at not by evidence but a lively imagination.

In some States the number of existing classrooms is understated. For example according to circular No. 490, there were in Alabama, in the fall of 1956, 26,000 teachers and 13,240 classrooms, 2 teachers for every classroom. The long-range phase of the school facilities survey, 2 years earlier, had shown 19,750 classrooms in Alabama. This would suggest that 6,500 classrooms were abandoned in Alabama between 1954 and 1956 which is absurd.

In several States the number of classrooms constructed is understated. The New York Education Department wrote the Office of Education that it could not supply an estimate of a classroom shortage. The Office of Education thereupon substituted an estimate of its own, and included it in the claimed national shortage of 159,000 classrooms. The Office of Education seems to believe that it knows more about the needs of New York schools than the New York Education Department.

The Office of Education has stated that in fall 1956 the schools were overcrowded by 2.3 million children. It also referred to classes of 35 or more children but did not mention how many classes are conducted with 20, 15 or fewer children.

The Office reported that 840,000 children are on so-called double sessions, one group of children using a classroom in the morning, another group in the afternoon. Such use of school facilities is standard in the Russian schools. This does not seem to prevent them from turning out more scientists and engineers of high quality than our schools. In West Germany about half the children are on "double shifts" without any visible effect on the quality of education.

In the United States, according to the Office of Education, 840,000 children, fewer than 3 percent of the total enrollment, are on a double shift. They attend school for 4 hours instead of 5, which is considerably more than "half-time attendance" as is sometimes said.

The Office of Education in a leaflet The Stolen Years claimed that a child by attending 4 hours instead of 5 loses a full 2 months a year, and almost 2 full years of schooling. It complained that we "steal school hours and days and years from children," and thus "rob them of much more than time."

This is plain nonsense. Any school that wants to make up for the 1 hour, can do so easily by shortening vacations. There is no reason why children can't go to school for more than 180 days.

Nor would there be any harm in giving children more homework. This used to be customary; it still is—outside the United States—with the result that children learn more. But that would mean more work for the children and for the teachers who have to correct the lessons. Work is nowadays being looked upon by educationists and by the children under their influence as just an "old-fashioned affliction."

There is no factual substantiation for a shortage of 159,000 classrooms except the claims of some school administrators and the fictitious computations of the Office of Education. But there is plenty of evidence that our classroom situation is getting better every year and is superior to the conditions that prevail anywhere else.

By fall 1958 we shall have constructed 550,000 classrooms since 1945. About half of all children will be going to school in buildings constructed in the past 13 years. This is a record unequalled in American history or anywhere else.

What is the outlook? For a few more years the annual enrollment increase will exceed 1 million pupils. Then it will gradually drop to 800,000, to 600,000, and less by the late 1960's. The annual additions will then require fewer classrooms than now. If the present rate of construction of 70,000 classrooms a year is maintained, we shall be able to use the majority of them for the purpose of replacing old school buildings. Within 10 years, three-fourths or more of our school plants will be of postwar origin.

States and communities, if left alone, will continue to build the needed school plants. The claim that we are building more and more sumptuous modern homes, stores, and factories, and let the schools run down, is a perversion of the

truth. Here is the record of the changes between 1929 and 1957.

*New construction 1929 and 1957*

| | 1929 | | 1956 | Increase in percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Current dollars | 1956 dollars | | |
| | *Millions* | *Millions* | *Millions* | |
| Private residential | $3,625 | $9,587 | $16,530 | 72 |
| Private nonresidential (industrial, commercial, utilities) | 4,682 | 12,382 | 16,770 | 35 |
| Total private | 8,307 | 21,969 | 33,300 | 52 |
| Public educational | 389 | 1,029 | 2,830 | 175 |

Source: Department of Commerce, Construction Review, "Statistical Supplement," and November 1957.
Construction expenditures in 1929 converted into 1957 dollars by Composite Construction Index, Department of Commerce.

School construction increased more than twice as fast as the building of homes, five times as fast as the construction of factories, stores, and utilities. It grew more than three times as fast as all private construction. That does not seem to indicate a "neglect of the schools."

Two years ago Congress approved an enlarged highway program which, it was claimed, put the schools at a disadvantage. The Department of Commerce just released statistics which show that in the first 11 months of 1957 public educational construction was up 11 percent, highway construction only 7 percent—Construction Review, December 1957.

So, the schools still came out ahead.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has stated that Federal aid is needed to help schools equip laboratories for science instruction. Are laboratories so expensive to equip? Dr. Elbert Little, executive director of the Physical Science Study Committee, was recently quoted as saying:

There is no essential piece of equipment which a science teacher and his students can't build out of cheap materials. Apart from the initial outlay for the plant, the cost of laboratory equipment and supplies need run no higher than $10 per student. (Popular Science, November 1957.)

Cannot the schools afford to build the original plant?

The president of the American Association of School Administrators, Dr. Henry I. Willet, said this in addressing the 1956 AASA convention:

I have found that our science laboratories are very similar to what they were 25 years ago, but this is not true of vocational shops, cafeterias, and similar activities, where we have the latest equipment. Even in some of the science laboratories of our new high schools, with all of the developments that we have had in recent years, I find the same equipment as a quarter of a century ago. (Official report of the 1956 AASA Convention, p. 144.)

It seems that some communities when building new schools are paying more attention to elaborate cafeterias, auditoriums, gymnasiums, and playgrounds than to science laboratories. That ought to be corrected locally.

There have been complaints that many school bond issues are being turned down by the voters. But the magazine, The School Executive, found in a nationwide survey:

That the overwhelming number of communities in America, where school bond elections are held, vote in favor of raising funds to build new schools. (The School Executive, September 1957, p. 106.)

The Investment Bankers Association of America in its survey of the municipal bond market in December 1957 reported that voters had approved 85 percent of the school bond issues. That does not seem to be a bad record which should give us much concern. But some people apparently feel that everything the schools demand is sacrosanct and ought to be approved automatically. They do not believe that schools should be subjected to the same type of public control which applies to other government functions.

Several magazine articles in recent months—Holman Harvey, Do School Pupils Need Costly Palaces? the Reader's Digest, September 1957; Dorothy Thompson, Must Schools Be Palaces? Ladies Home Journal, August 1957—have pointed at the extravagance and waste in numerous school projects.

We know that thousands of good school plants have been built in recent years at costs between $20,000 and $25,000 per classroom. The chairman of the Georgia State school building authority testified last year before the House Committee on Education and Labor that they had constructed close to 15,000 classrooms at a cost of about $13,000 each.

But many schools are being built at costs between $50,000 and $100,000 per classroom, and in some cases even more. Is it any wonder when the voters turn down some of those extravagant projects? Sometimes the auxiliary facilities cost as much or more than the classrooms. There is nothing wrong with gymnasiums, auditoriums, or swimming pools. But the essentials must come first.

One school recently put wall-to-wall carpeting in the classrooms—The Nation's Schools, June 1956, page 66. I am not sure by how much this will improve the spelling or the arithmetic of the children. But the parents sometimes do use arithmetic, compare their modest homes with the proposed school palaces, and turn down the bond issue.

It is easy to see what would happen under a Federal-aid program which would render control by the local voters less effective or nonexistent.

A subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee 2 years ago investigated the administration of Public Law 815 which authorizes grants for school construction in Federally affected areas—Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations for 1957, hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 84th Congress, 2d session, June 6, 1956. Under the law, the entitlement of the several States is supposed to be based on actual construction costs. But the investigators found that in some States where actual construction costs per pupil had been between $613 and $655, the Office of Education approved entitlements of $1,030 to $1,070. The responsible administrator in the Office of Education explained at the hearings that their architects and engineers felt that complete schools just could not be built for an average of $660 per pupil.

In other words, although the State was building school plants at that cost, the Office of Education decided that this could not be done and gave the State about 60 percent more.

WHY FEDERAL AID?

The record of school support is clear and overwhelming: The American people have supplied the schools with ample funds to provide a good training in the essentials of education for their children.

There is no substance to the oft-heard charges of a growing margin of luxury outside of education and impoverization of the schools, that "while our cars have grown longer, our television screens broader, our washing machines grander, our kitchens brighter, at the same time our schools have grown more dilapidated"—Adlai Stevenson, Vital Speeches of the Day, December 15, 1957, page 133. Such distortions of the truth are refuted by the simple facts that school expenditures have risen more rapidly than personal consumption expenditures, that teachers' salaries have increased faster than other wages and salaries, that school construction went up more than twice as much as home building.

The conclusion to be drawn is inevitable: the deficiencies in our educational system are the result not of lack of funds but of misapplication of funds.

The American people are taxing themselves heavily for the schools and school taxes are increasing steeply all over the country. State legislatures, in 1955, enacted the biggest tax boosts in a generation. At their 1957 sessions almost half of them again raised taxes. The greater part of the proceeds was appropriated for education.

The school forces raise the cry that our educational effort is not strong enough and that greater sacrifices are called for. There is some truth in that.

But do they mean that those in education ought to put forth a greater effort, that teachers and students ought to work harder? Do they mean that teachers might sacrifice their accustomed 3 months' vacations—not for free but for good pay—and work as long as other people? Do they mean, that pupils ought to be made to study harder, do homework, live up to scholastic standards?

They do not. When the educationists talk about greater educational effort and sacrifices they mean everybody else but themselves.

You may recall Mark Twain's saying that to be good is noble, but to tell others how to be good is nobler and less trouble.

The American public is being subjected to an avalanche of propaganda by the National Education Association and its branch at Third and Independence Avenue, the United States Office of Education. They are trying to prove that the schools need more of everything

and that this can be provided only by the Federal Government.

Vice President RICHARD NIXON expressed the conviction of the American people in a speech in New York on December 15, 1957:

> Whether it takes more classrooms, better teaching salaries, fewer frills, more algebra, and less square dancing, this responsibility cannot be passed by the people to Washington.

Despite this statement by the Vice President we are now faced with new proposals for Federal aid to education. Is it because the people want to pass this responsibility on to Washington?

The record proves otherwise. The American people are perfectly willing, able, and insistent that they want to keep their schools at home—not get them run from Washington.

No State legislature has petitioned Congress for Federal aid to the schools. But several State legislatures have petitioned against it.

The representatives of the governors on the joint Federal-State action committee which was created last year at the suggestion of the President, have resolved against an entry of the Federal Government into the school field by way of general subventions. The governors and the legislatures presently have the constitutional responsibility for raising the necessary funds for the schools. Since they are willing to bear it, why should Congress interfere?

Those who are charged with the direct responsibility for the management of the schools, and for raising a major part of the money, are the 50,000 State and local boards of education. They have the tough job of boosting taxes, passing bond issues, and taking the criticism that goes with this responsibility. Not one of them, nor even one of the more than 200,000 members of such boards, appeared to testify in favor of Federal aid at the hearings which the House Committee on Education and Labor held last year.

A number of State and local boards of education did appear at the hearings to tell the committee that they saw no need for Federal aid to the schools, and that it would be detrimental to the best interest of the schools.

The National School Boards Association, at its annual convention in Atlantic City last February turned down a resolution that would have favored Federal aid.

Who then is really behind this drive for Federal aid to the schools? Obviously, the schools and those who are de lege and de facto responsible for their management and support are opposed to it.

First, there are some do-gooders whose insatiable appetite for spending other people's money leads them to support every expenditure of public funds.

There are others who deliberately want to socialize the schools so as to transform them into an instrument for indoctrination with various "isms." They know that this cannot easily be done as long as the schools are controlled by local communities.

But the main force behind these machinations are the paid staffs of some of the teacher organizations, the powerful teachers' lobbies.

In no other field would an employee organization claim to represent the industry itself. It would not occur to anybody that industrial unions represent management rather than the employees. The remarkable thing is not just that teachers' organizations claim to speak for the schools. The really amazing thing is that many persons in the administration, in Congress, and in the press seem to recognize teachers' unions rather than the boards of education as the voice of the schools.

We are faced here with a group of employees who are claiming that their employers need Federal aid when neither their employers nor those who bear the final responsibility, legislatures and governors, have said so.

This is a conspiracy of the paid staffs of teacher organizations who are trying to justify their salaries to their members. The National Education Association has grown in the past 10 years from 386,000 to over 700,000 members. Its income from members dues has swollen from $1.1 million to $7 million. They have built themselves the most palatial office building in Washington from which to carry on the fight.

When the appearance of the sputniks dramatized the relatively greater educational advances of the Russians, the educationists tried to turn a neat trick: to deflect public attention from shortcomings of their methods and blame all educational deficiencies on lack of money.

A major danger in the Federal-aid proposals is the underlying assumption that another $250 million or $500 million or $1 billion will correct the defects in our education and keep us ahead of the advancing Russians. Nothing could be further from the truth. To believe that an appropriation could cure the ills would be a snare and a delusion. No amount of money can make up for the lack of hard study, the decline in scholastic standards, the breakdown of discipline in the schools.

THE REAL EDUCATIONAL DEFICIENCIES

The crux of our educational problem is the substitution of easy courses for the hard core of subject matter.

The Office of Education and its Commission for Life Adjustment Education have been and still are the leaders in this movement. With so much life-adjustment education, we would expect the children by now to be wonderfully adjusted to life. If so, crime statistics fail to bear it out. Each year the FBI reports a steep and disproportionate increase in juvenile crime. Almost half of all arrests concern persons under 18 years.

The New York Daily News very aptly called the new three R's "rowdyism, riot, and revolt."

This is the product of 20 years' life-adjustment education.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for at least one in that Department seems to realize what really ought to be done in the schools. In a speech last November 12, he was quoted as advocating "less chrome and country-clubbing" in the schools, and dropping "so-called popular or easy courses to allow more emphasis on basic subjects"—the Washington Post and Times Herald, November 13, 1957.

If that were done, teachers, classrooms and time could be used to teach science, mathematics, and foreign languages their proper field instead of date behavior and family relationships, a more proper field for families.

It is a mystery to me why the Secretary now advocates that we pour Federal money into the schools instead of correcting the basic shortcomings in the curriculum which he himself mentions.

Does it cost more to teach mathematics than square dancing? Is foreign-language training more expensive than consumer education? Does science instruction call for higher outlays than the numerous fancy courses to increase social competence for which high schools give credit toward graduation? If the schools cut back on the frills and reinstate learning to its proper place, there will be no additional cost.

Let us not avoid taking a good look at the quality, character, and content of public education before we buy more of the same thing.

I agree with the Secretary that the schools ought to place greater emphasis on mathematics. If they do not, scholarships to college will go begging. The Educational Testing Service in Princeton found this situation:

> In a survey of 211 prospective elementary teachers, 150 reported a longstanding hatred of arithmetic. * * * Future teachers pass through the elementary schools learning to detest mathematics. They drop it in high school as early as possible. They avoid it in teachers colleges because it is not required. They return to the elementary school to teach a new generation to detest it. (Time magazine, June 18, 1956.)

Are we going to correct this with an appropriation of Federal money?

We believe in the great benefits of competitive effort. Let us look closely then to see what the Soviets accomplish by long hours of hard study, strict standards of achievement, selection of the abler students and teaching them up to capacity to achieve stressing excellence rather than mediocrity and rejecting completely equality in capacity for learning.

Adm. H. G. Rickover said last November 22 in Detroit:

> It is time we face up to the fact that few American students at age 21 or 22 know as much after a 4-year college course as most European secondary school graduates know at age 18 or 19. (U. S. News & World Report, December 6, 1957.)

Will that be improved by a new federally aided testing program? Will that program tell us anything that presently available tests—and a good system of grading and report cards—will not tell us? Are we going to get better products from our high schools and colleges by adopting a Federal system of scholarships?

There are scholarships available at the present time for able students who are willing to work hard. Ample loan funds

are available in higher educational institutions which are inadequately used. It seems that young people nowadays are eager to borrow and go into debt for any purpose except an education. If young people are not willing to invest in themselves, if they have no confidence in their ability or are unwilling to work hard and strain their efforts—why should anybody else?

Our own tradition in education proves that when the people are convinced of what needs to be done that our genius for education is in the midst of our people—and always has been. It is not in the Federal Government.

---

## PROPAGANDA FOR GATT AND OTC

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, now that the President, in his state of the Union message, has asked the Congress to extend our present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 5 years and demands added authority to further lower our tariff duties, it is both fitting and proper that the Congress should know of the despicable and desperate propaganda that is being resorted to in an effort to lead America into membership in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and to lower by 25 percent the present import duty protection for basic American industries against excessive imports.

The Department of State recently issued a booklet entitled "Together We Are Strong," printed and distributed at public expense.

This booklet is nothing more nor less than outright propaganda in support of GATT and the OTC.

These are both highly controversial subjects and the Congress itself is divided on the issue. Yet here we find the State Department using money appropriated by the Congress from public revenues derived from all the people to peddle one side of the story and ignoring completely the other side.

I do not believe that the State Department is justified in expending funds derived from all the people to propagate a policy of the State Department which is actually bitterly opposed by many of those whose tax payments help to sustain that Department.

As an example of the biased character of the pamphlet, let me cite some of the data and conclusions contained in it.

On page 3 under the caption "World Trade Affects You," the question is asked, "How would you be affected if the United States stopped trading with other nations?"

This is followed by examples of the dire straits the people of this country would be in if they could not import. To quote:

> In our (hypothetical) tradeless world there is (would be) no coffee on your breakfast table, nor cocoa, nor tea. You can't (could not) buy chocolate or tapioca, or Brazil or cashew nuts. Spices like pepper, cloves, and mustard have (would have) just about vanished from your pantry shelves. Olives, olive oil, lobsters, tuna fish, sugar, figs, bananas, and dates are (would be) more expensive now, and sometimes your grocer doesn't (would not) have them at all.

Then the booklet points out that about 75 percent of the newsprint used by newspapers in printing their news is imported and an equal share of bauxite—the ore from which aluminum is derived.

There would "be no new car to replace the aging 'family buggy' if all imports were cut off," the report says. It lists over 30 different materials required for automobile manufacture of which we import substantial quantities. This is followed by a list of some 30 minerals in which our dependence on imports is anywhere from 10 to 100 percent.

It is, of course, a complete distortion of the case to suggest that anyone advocates shutting off all imports. Everyone knows that this country is not self-sufficient and that we need imports. However, our trouble has not been with inability to buy the materials we need. Quite the contrary. The trouble has arisen over exporting more than we need to import.

At the same time we should be delighted over such self-sufficiency as we do have. We learned a lesson on this score from the Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal. Certainly we should not strain to become more dependent upon foreign sources of supply by letting unfair imports destroy those of our own industries that some economic theorists regard as inefficient on the sole ground that any domestic industry is inefficient if it cannot compete with low-wage import competition. The countries that are heavily dependent on imports must regard our relative independence with envy and no doubt look upon the efforts of our freetraders to create more and more dependence on imports for us as the product of wayward thinking.

There is a further comment to be made on the list of items used by the State Department. Nearly all the important products of commerce found in that compilation are on our free list. The question then arises what moved the State Department to list these products unless it could have made no impression and no case without doing so. The fact is that no further tariff reduction or liberalizing of trade in these items could possibly increase our imports since there is no duty to be taken off. Among them are coffee, newsprint, tin, copper ore, bauxite—aluminum ore, cocoa beans, tuna fish—frozen, bananas, tapioca, lobsters, and pepper.

By listing these free-list items under a warning of the deprivations that would afflict this country if we stopped imports a wholly false impression is created. To lead unsuspecting readers to think that a protectionist tariff policy would cut off these imports or even reduce them materially represents deceptive propaganda of a low order and should be stopped. More than that. The State Department should be called upon to explain how such a pamphlet came to be written and distributed in the first place.

The obvious purpose of the pamphlet and of listing certain products within a context that hides their free-list status and then picturing our great dependence on these products, is to suggest that unless the United States stays in GATT and joins the OTC we will find our trade cut off by protectionist forces. This is a gross misrepresentation of the facts and it is shocking to find a foremost executive department resorting to such unworthy tactics.

While thus depicting our plight of dependence on the rest of the world for certain materials, the most important of which, to repeat, are on the free list, the pamphlet calls attention to our exports and the importance of our export market to various agricultural products, such as wheat, cotton, rice, soybeans, fats and oils, and such industrial products as civilian aircraft, railroad cars, sewing machines, textile machinery, machine tools, and so forth.

Now, in making a plea for importation of various raw materials, the pamphlet warns that our own resources are subject to exhaustion or to more costly production if we continue to rely on the domestic supply. Has it occurred to the State Department that when we export civilian airplanes, tractors, automobiles, industrial machinery, and so forth, we are also draining our own natural resources? Should we not then stop such drainage? The Department does not suggest this.

We are told to import because we want to export; but we are also told to import in order to avoid exhausting our natural resources. Yet the more we export the greater the drain on these resources. The reason we need to import more seems to be because we are already exporting more than we are importing. We also need to import more, apparently because we cannot live without imports and we must export in order to make sure that we can buy what we need from other countries. If this seems confusing the blame lies with the State Department's position.

Yet this is not all, for the pamphlet says that if we do not keep up our exports we will have unemployment; and unemployment in export industries is very bad because for every man laid off because of lack of a foreign market, the doctor and dentist also suffer, no less than the banker and the merchant, the farmer and the movie owner.

That this would be bad cannot be questioned but the pamphlet is completely silent on what happens when imports cause unemployment. Is the unemployment attributable to a fall in exports any worse than the unemployment that is traceable to imports? The pamphlet says nothing about the latter type of unemployment. This omission again shows the bias of the publication. Yet unemployment caused by imports is more disruptive than that caused by a decline in export orders. This is because imports often undermine domestic prices and also because import volume is not under domestic control as is production for export.

The fact is that if the volume of our imports is to be determined by our exports or our desire for foreign markets, we forsake the most natural yardstick

for determining what our imports should be. This should be the need of the domestic economy. What we need by way of imports bears little relationship to what the Government does in the field of international politics. Yet that is what the State Department proposes as the yardstick; and that is the sure road to state trading.

All the intermediate arguments used by the Department, such as our dependence on imports, the value of exports to our agriculture, and so forth, are nothing more than grist for the final grinding conclusion; and that, as just stated, is to use our foreign trade as a pawn of diplomacy. Domestic industry and agriculture are to be regarded as expendable ammunition stored in the State Department's armory, where they become pawns in the game of international politics.

Otherwise so distorted a treatise on our foreign trade as the one presented in the pamphlet "Together We Are Strong" would be wholly unintelligible. As an effort to make a case for State Department control over our foreign commerce it at least offers an argument, lopsided and deceptive though it is.

That the administration is tied into this one-sided propaganda campaign is evidenced in the President's state of the Union address. Under his remarks on mutual trade, I quote:

> 4. Both in our national interest, and in the interest of world peace, we must have a 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act with broadened authority to negotiate.
>
> World trade supports a significant segment of American industry and agriculture. It provides employment for 4½ million American workers.

His biased position is evident when he fails to tell the American people and the American industries affected how many American jobs are lost and how many more we will lose if we give him authority to further open our ports to the influx of cheaply made foreign articles, many of which are made under prison labor standards.

Another sample of how the White House is involved in this propaganda is found in today's press. Here is an article that says the President has employed Eric Johnston, at the taxpayers' expense, to "rally the faithful" by organizing a march on Washington and the Congress.

This mass gathering may rival in number Cox's Army and the veterans' visit to Washington in the Hoover administration. Of one thing we can be sure, they will not come afoot or on freight cars; they will not have to live in tents and shacks; they will put up at the luxurious hotels; there will be no troops to "chase them out of town"; they will dine at the White House.

They will converge on the Capital City by air. Some may even come from outer space. They will be headed by the well-known lobbyists Charlie Taft and Daniel W. Bell. Chief among the pilgrims will be representatives of General Motors and the Ford interests, the bulls and bullsies from General Mills, and from the handful of special interests engaged in export trade who are presently reaping the benefits from our misguided and unfair trade policies.

I must say that after examining this pamphlet I feel very apprehensive about entrusting our relations with other countries to State Department personnel if this is a representative example of their competence, honesty, and statecraft.

It is just possible when the great Eric arrives he may have some new ideas of propaganda, none of which will be for the benefit of our small basic producers. Members of Congress must not be misled by the same kind of wishful thinking that we heard before the depression of the late twenties, when we were told that prosperity was just around the corner. Do you remember back in the late twenties when we were lured into thinking that we were not in difficulties from an economic standpoint?

May I say at this point that I am more concerned and more worried over the mounting unemployment lists than I am over satellites. If unemployment in this country reaches, as it is estimated it might reach, 6 million by June of this year, we will be forgetting about some of the things Congress just concluded doing today or in this session. One of the best ways I know of that you can continue this slide toward a depression is to just go ahead and renew these trade agreements, and while some 10 or 12 of our big importers in this country are reaping the benefits 140 to 150 small basic industries are being driven out of business. One of these days you will be waking up and finding yourself a nation of importers rather than a nation of producers.

## TRINITY RIVER PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, just today I have learned that another very important portion of my district is interested in early construction of the San Luis project. This is the area known as Santa Cruz County.

I have previously introduced a bill which is identical to that introduced by my colleague from California, the Honorable B. F. SISK, except that it would further extend the service area of the San Luis project to include Alameda, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties. Now that Santa Cruz County has indicated a desire to be included I believe we have an even stronger argument for passage of a San Luis Reservoir bill with extended service to my area. I sincerely hope that the San Luis project with my amendment will be authorized at this session of Congress.

## REQUIRING CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES TO BUDGET AND ACCOUNT FOR THEIR EXPENDITURE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, early in the 1st session of this 85th Congress, I introduced a bill to require Congressional committees to budget and account for their expenditures of counterpart funds.

At that time, my proposal came on the heels of the shocking disclosure that two employees of the other body had taken a high, wide, and handsome excursion to Europe on these funds—a scandalous misuse of public moneys which damaged us all in the public's mind.

No action has been taken on that bill, H. R. 4764, to date. An effort to amend it into the Mutual Security Act received heartening support on this floor, but failed to carry.

Now our failure to act is haunting us again. This time it was an employee of one of our own House committees who took a trip to South America, drawing $1,832 from counterpart accounts. Whether his purpose was official business or sightseeing is in some dispute, but the publicity has again aroused public suspicion of all Congressional investigative tours.

What else can we expect as long as we fail and refuse to require full disclosure of how our committees spend counterpart funds?

Please understand that I favor the use of foreign currency to defray expenses of committee investigations abroad. With a few scandalous exceptions, I am sure counterpart funds so spent have been spent wisely. I do not propose to hinder legitimate investigations and my bill would not hinder them.

My bill would only make the amount of counterpart funds spent by committees deductible from, instead of supplemental to, the appropriations we set up to cover the respective committee expenses.

Under the present procedure, every committee has a blank check for the expenditure of counterpart funds. True, the expenditures must be accounted for, but not until after they have been spent. Unlike the meticulous precautions we take with other public funds, we are not required to justify and budget these foreign moneys which belong to the taxpayers of the United States.

It is only natural that funds spent first and accounted for later are spent more easily, are harder to keep tabs on. Small wonder that we are embarrassed by an occasional scandal, or that the people wonder why we are so reluctant to impose upon ourselves the commonsense restrictions which would prove we have nothing to hide.

We are all aware that as never before in our Nation's history it is important that we get every cent's worth of value we can out of every dollar we spend. I hope this Congress is going to set the proper example by enacting H. R. 4764.

## RESERVE OFFICERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted, as the distinguished Member from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] stated, that the Committee on Armed Services is taking up the very reprehensible situation that exists in connection with the forced resignation of Reserve officers. It is causing undue hardship and I am extremely sorry that the Defense Department refused to stop the RIF's until legislation could be passed. I deplore that and hope they will reconsider the matter. Our Reserve officers have done a large part of the fighting in the recent World War and in every other war. They deserve better treatment.

## A SMALL BUSINESS TAX BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9957, the small business tax bill I introduced yesterday would provide a measure of adjustments in our tax structure so that the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 will prove more equitable in their application to small-business concerns.

This bill has the support of a majority of the members of the House Small Business Committee. My colleagues, Hon. JOE L. EVINS, Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES, Hon. TOM STEED, Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, and Hon. CHARLES H. BROWN, have joined me in this action by filing identical companion bills and in urging favorable consideration of this bill. Since it is one of the most carefully worked out, and, in our considered judgment, one of the best small business tax bills to be presented to the House, it is anticipated that all members of the House Small Business Committee will come forward and join in this action of urging prompt and favorable consideration of these proposals which provide assistance to small business in the area where small business has been subjected to an oppressive tax burden.

The bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

SECTION 1. Declaration of purpose and policy.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this act to promote and facilitate the growth, expansion, and modernization of small and independent business enterprises engaged in trade or commerce.

SEC. 2. Reduction in rate of normal tax on first $25,000 of corporate income.

(a) Reduction in rate: Section 11 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to normal tax on corporations for taxable years beginning after June 30, 1958) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Taxable years beginning after June 30, 1958: In the case of a taxable year beginning after June 30, 1958, the normal tax is equal to—

"(A) 20 percent of so much of the taxable income as does not exceed $25,000, plus

"(B) 25 percent of the amount by which the taxable income exceeds $25,000."

(b) Technical amendments:

(1) Paragraph (2) (B) of section 244 of such Code (relating to deduction for dividends received on certain preferred stock) is amended by striking out "section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b) (2) (B) and (c) of section 11."

(2) Paragraph (2) (B) of section 247 (a) of such Code (relating to dividends paid on certain preferred stock of public utilities) is amended by striking out "section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b) (2) (B) and (c) of section 11."

(3) The rates of normal tax imposed by section 821 of such Code on the income of certain mutual insurance companies and interinsurers are hereby reduced in a manner which corresponds to the reduction made by subsection (a) of this section; and the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall prescribe a table showing the rates of normal tax under such section 821 resulting from such reduction for taxable years beginning after June 30, 1958.

(4) Paragraph (2) (B) of section 922 of such Code (relating to special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations) is amended by striking out "section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b) (2) (B) and (c) of section 11."

SEC. 3. Depreciation of used property.

(a) Section 167 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitations on use of certain methods and rates of depreciation) is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) acquired after December 31, 1956, if the original use of such property does not commence with the taxpayer, and the use of such property by the taxpayer commences after such date.

Paragraph (3) shall apply to property acquired in any taxable year only to the extent that the basis of such property (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition), when added to the basis of all other property described in such paragraph (determined as of the close of the day of its acquisition) which is acquired by the taxpayer during the same taxable year, does not exceed $50,000."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. Deduction for additional investment in depreciable assets and inventory.

(a) Allowance: Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 178. Additional investment in depreciable assets and inventory.

"(a) General rule: In the case of any person engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the additional investment in the amount of $5,000 or 20 percent of the net income of such trade or business for the taxable year (computed without regard to this section), whichever is the greater: *Provided, however,* That the total amount of any such deduction shall not exceed $30,000 for any taxable year.

"(b) Additional investment defined: For purpose of this section, the additional investment in a trade or business for a taxable year means the amount (if any) by which—

"(1) the aggregate, computed as of the close of the taxable year, of the adjusted bases of—

"(A) all property used in the trade or business of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167, and

"(B) all stock in trade and property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of the trade or business, exceeds—

"(2) a similar aggregate, computed as of the beginning of such taxable year.

"(c) Special rules:

"(1) More than one business under common control: If more than one trade or business is under the control of the same person or persons, all such trades and businesses shall be treated as one trade or business for purposes of this section.

"(2) Partnerships, trusts, estates, etc.: The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the application of this section, including regulations as to its application in the case of partnerships, trusts, and estates."

(b) Technical amendment: The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 178. Additional investment in depreciable assets and inventory."

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1957.

SEC. 5. Election of corporations to be taxed as partnerships.

(a) Election allowed: Subchapter R of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status) is amended—

(1) by striking out the heading and table of sections for such subchapter and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER R—ELECTION OF CERTAIN PARTNERSHIPS, PROPRIETORSHIPS, AND CORPORATIONS AS TO TAXABLE STATUS

"Part I. Alternative taxable status of certain partnerships and proprietorships.

"Part II. Alternative taxable status of certain corporations.

*"Part I—Alternative taxable status of certain partnerships and proprietorships*

"Sec. 1361. Unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations.";

and

(2) by inserting after section 1361 a new part as follows:

*"Part II—Alternative taxable status of certain corporations*

"Sec. 1371. Certain corporations electing to be treated as partnerships.

"SEC. 1371. Certain corporations electing to be treated as partnerships.

"(a) General rule: Subject to the qualifications in subsection (b), a domestic corporation may not later than 60 days after the close of its first taxable year, or the year of a change of ownership described in subsection (f), elect, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to be treated as a partnership for such year and all subsequent years, if all the shareholders owning stock in such corporation at any time on or after the first day of such year and on or before the date of the election consent to the election.

"(b) Qualifications: The election described in subsection (a) may not be made by a domestic corporation unless at all times during the period on or after the first day of its first taxable year or of the year described in subsection (f), as the case may be, and on or before the date of election—

"(1) such corporation has 10 or less shareholders all of whom are individuals (including all partners of any partnership owning stock in such corporation);

"(2) all the shareholders are actively engaged in the conduct of the business of such corporation;

"(3) no shareholder of such corporation is a nonresident alien or a foreign partnership;

"(4) such corporation is not a corporation which was a party to a reorganization described in section 368 (b), or a corporation to which section 355 (or so much of section 356 as relates to section 355) applies and such corporation has not received a distribution under section 332 (relating to liquidations of subsidiaries) except in a case in which the basis of the assets distributed is determined under section 334 (b) (2);

"(5) such corporation has only one class of stock; and

"(6) no more than 80 percent of the stock of such corporation is owned by persons who formerly owned the business of such corporation as an unincorporated enterprise taxable as a domestic corporation under section 1361.

"(c) Partnership provisions applicable: Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a domestic corporation making the election under subsection (a) shall be considered a partnership for purposes of this subtitle (except chapter 2 thereof) and shall be subject to subchapter K (section 701 and following, relating to partnerships) with respect to formation, operation, distributions, liquidation, sale of an interest, and any other purpose; and each shareholder of such corporation shall be considered a partner owning an interest in the partnership in the proportion which shares owned by such shareholder bear to the total number of outstanding shares of such corporation.

"(d) Limitation: An employee of a corporation making the election described in subsection (a) who is also a shareholder of such corporation shall not be considered an employee for purposes of section 401 (a) (relating to employees' pension trusts, etc.).

"(e) Election irrevocable: Except as provided in subsections (f) and (h), the election described in subsection (a) by a domestic corporation shall be irrevocable with respect to—

"(1) the electing corporation and its shareholders; and

"(2) any corporate successor to the business of the electing corporation and the shareholders of such successor.

"(f) Change of ownership: In the first year in which the shareholders who consented to the election described in subsection (a) own 80 percent or less of the stock of a corporation described in subsection (e), such corporation shall not be treated as a partnership for such year or for subsequent years, unless such corporation makes a new election in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a).

"(g) Constructive ownership: For purposes of subsections (b) (6) and (f), the ownership of a stock interest shall be determined in accordance with the rules for constructive ownership of stock provided in section 267 (c) other than paragraph (3) thereof.

"(h) Disqualification: If a corporation described in subsection (e) issues stock of a different class than that outstanding, the election described in subsection (a) shall be deemed never to have been made and the corporation shall be liable for all taxes due (except penalties) and such taxes may be assessed and collected as if no return had been filed.

"(i) Cross reference:

"For period of limitations on assessment and collection of tax where no return has been filed, see section 6501."

(b) Technical amendments:

(1) Section 1361 (b) of such code (relating to unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) no proprietor or partners having more than 80 percent interest in the profits or capital of such enterprise formerly owned stock in a corporation treated as a partnership under section 1371 which carried on the business of such enterprise."

(2) Section 1504 (b) of such Code (relating to definition of includible corporation) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) Corporations subject to tax as partnerships under section 1371."

(3) The table of subchapters for chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out

"Subchapter R. Election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Subchapter R. Election of certain partnerships, proprietorships, and corporations as to taxable status."

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1957.

SEC. 6. Installment payments of estate tax.

(a) Allowance: Subchapter A of chapter 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to place and due date for payment of tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6157. Installment payments of estate tax.

"(a) Estates consisting of stock or investments in closely held business enterprises:

"(1) Election to make installment payments: The executor of any estate described in paragraph (2), which is subject to the tax imposed by chapter 11, may elect to pay the amount of such tax in 2 or more (but not more than 10) equal installments.

"(2) Estates to which election applies: Paragraph (1) shall apply to an estate only if one-half or more of the value of the gross estate consists of stock or investments in a closely held business enterprise.

"(3) Closely held business enterprise: For purposes of paragraph (2), the term 'closely held business enterprise' means—

"(A) a business corporation having 25 or less stockholders, and

"(B) a business partnership having 25 or less partners.

"(b) Date for payment of installments: If an election is made under subsection (a), the first installment shall be paid on the date prescribed for payment of the tax by section 6151, and each succeeding installment shall be paid 1 year following the date for payment of the preceding installment.

"(c) Proration of deficiency to installments: If an election has been made under subsection (a) and a deficiency is assessed, the deficiency shall be prorated to the installments remaining unpaid on the date of such assessment, and the part of the deficiency so prorated to each such installment shall be collected at the same time and as a part of such installment.

"(d) Installments paid in advance: At the election of the executor, any installment, or part thereof, under subsection (a) may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment by subsection (b).

"(e) Acceleration of payments: If any installment under subsection (a) is not paid on or before the date prescribed for its payment by subsection (b), the whole of the unpaid tax shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary or his delegate."

(b) Technical amendments:

(1) The table of sections for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6157. Installment payments of estate tax."

(2) Section 6161 of such Code (relating to extension of time for paying tax) is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e), and inserting after subsection (c) a new subsection as follows:

"(d) Installment payment of estate tax: In any case in which an executor has elected under section 6157 to pay the tax imposed by chapter 11 in installments, subsection (a) (2) shall not apply to the amount determined by the executor as the tax imposed by chapter 11, and subsection (b) shall not apply to the amount determined as a deficiency with respect to any such tax."

(3) Section 6601 (c) (2) of such Code (relating to determination of last date prescribed for payment of tax) is amended by striking out "6152 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "6152 (a) or 6157 (a)," and by striking out "6152 (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "6152 (b) or 6157 (b), as the case may be."

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1957.

It is recognized that world conditions will in all probability require increased spending to insure survival of freedom. We should join in whatever action is required to protect our freedom and insure survival of our form of government. Measures that would enhance the opportunities for survival, expansion, and growth of small, independent, competitive enterprises are insurance policies directed to that end. Without the survival and expansion of the 4 million business enterprises in this country, most of which are small-business concerns, our effort to defend ourselves, protect our freedom, and insure our survival will be hindered seriously.

Recently the House Small Business Committee held public hearings on the problems of small-business financing. The witnesses included an impressive array of high policy-making Government officials, including the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, as well as prominent financial experts in private life. They were almost unanimous in the statement that one of the most serious problems of small-business financing is that of the tax burden on the very small concerns. They pointed out that while the large corporations have access to capital through large, well-organized, nationally known facilities, the small-business concern, in contrast, is without such facilities. The small concern must rely upon what it can retain from its earnings for investment in plant and equipment to meet the demands for survival, expansion, and growth.

Throughout the period since the 1st session of the 85th Congress adjourned, the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate has held extensive hearings at various locations across the country about the tax problems of small business. It heard numerous witnesses. Those witnesses confirmed the points made by the witnesses who appeared before the House Small Business Committee. They are in agree-

ment that one of the principal problems faced by small business today is the oppressive tax burden on the very small concern.

On May 31, 1956, the President of the United States appointed a Cabinet Committee on Small Business to investigate the economic condition of small business enterprises and to make suggestions for a constructive program, both legislative and administrative, for expanding the opportunities of small business to prosper and grow. On the basis of the investigation made by that committee, it submitted a report with recommendations on August 7, 1956. Recommendations were made for tax adjustments and for a small business tax bill that would help small firms retain earnings for financing expansion, to give them some advantage in pricing, and generally encourage the formation of new businesses. The four principal recommendations made in that respect were:

First. That the taxes imposed on business corporations be modified by reducing the tax rate from 30 percent to 20 percent on incomes up to $25,000.

Second. That businesses be given the right to utilize, for purchases of used property not exceeding $50,000 in any one year, the formulas of accelerated depreciation that were made available to purchasers of new property by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Third. That corporations with, say, 10 or fewer stockholders be given the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships.

Fourth. That the taxpayer be given the option of paying the estate tax over a period of up to 10 years in cases where the estate consists largely of investments in closely held business concerns.

The small business tax bill we have introduced would carry out those four recommendations. In addition, our bill would provide that:

In the case of any person engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the additional investment in the amount of $5,000 or 20 percent of the net income of such trade or business for the taxable year (computed without regard to this section), whichever is the greater: *Provided, however,* That the total amount of any such deduction shall not exceed $30,000 for any taxable year.

Some members of the House Small Business Committee are appearing before the Ways and Means Committee urging favorable consideration of proposals that wold give tax relief to small business. Tax relief such as is provided for in this bill is urged in testimony being presented to the Ways and Means Committee.

In the testimony I am to present to the Ways and Means Committee, I shall sum up the explanations of the provisions contained in the bill we have introduced. Also, I shall detail the reasons why the tax adjustments provided for in this bill are not only just but are required at this time if we are to have a flourishing, competitive society and a healthy small-business segment of our economy such as we often express to be our objective.

Again, it is emphasized that 4 of the 5 provisions contained in the tax bill we have introduced were recommended by the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business in its report on August 7, 1956. Those recommendations were made by quite conservative men, members of the President's own Cabinet. Their recommendations were conservative when made; and they are conservative now.

Of course, the view now will be expressed that today no adjustments should be undertaken in our tax structure. The argument will be made that it will cost too much money. It does appear that this tax bill will cost money if you take into account only the narrow question of what the revenue loss will be immediately and ignore what practical economic consequences will follow enactment of this bill.

The view is widely held in testimony by Members of the Congress and members of the financial and business community that tax adjustments such as we are proposing can be expected to eventually pay off in increased tax revenues.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his statements. I look forward to his appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means at which time he will expound on these matters further.

Further I want to comment that a subcommittee of the committee of which the gentleman is chairman, the Joint Economic Committee, has pointed out that tax revision is necessary in these times; if we do not make necessary revisions to remove impediments to growth, we well might lose the very revenue that we are counting upon. I believe that in this particular area to which the gentleman has called attention, the area of small businesses, we need to make revisions or we will lose this revenue. I know that the gentleman's Small Business Committee along with the Joint Economic Committee has weighed these matters carefully and has come to the conclusion that in the long run we will not lose revenue but will gain revenue through a revision of our tax structure in this area.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] for his contribution. The gentleman has been a very ardent and enthusiastic worker in the cause of small business. He has a small business tax bill himself with many provisions of which I am in agreement. I am not opposing any part of his bill. But this bill does not provide as much as the gentleman's bill or as much as some bills that have been introduced by other Members in the past, including myself, and even in this Congress, for the reason that we felt we could go this far consistently and have a reasonable hope of success in getting something done in this session of Congress. So that although it is not as much as is provided in other bills we believe that this will be of substantial help to small business concerns. I am glad to know that the gentleman is in accord with the objective of the bill. I am in accord with the objectives of his bill. I know that some of the provisions in this bill are similar to the provisions in the gentleman's bill.

I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield further.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want further to commend the gentleman for pointing out a very basic thing. All of us, including the gentleman, who are concerned in this area, have no pride of authorship. All we are trying to do, as I know the gentleman has done, is to call attention to a serious area in which we need to do something. What we can do, how much we can do is a subject which the Committee on Ways and Means is going to have to consider in their consideration of these various proposals. Although I have a bill, to which the gentleman has kindly called attention, I am not wedded to that method or any other particular method. I do feel that we need to do something in this area and the contribution to our studies which the Small Business Committee of the House has made under the gentleman's chairmanship, is certainly welcome.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman very kindly. The Committee on Ways and Means of the House is certainly one of the most important, if not the most important committee in the Congress of the United States. Their members work very hard.

I want to express myself, as I have expressed myself elsewhere, to the effect that the individual members of the Committee on Ways and Means are not properly equipped to do their jobs, and I can say the same thing for the individual Members of the House. However, referring specifically to the Committee on Ways and Means, that committee has so much to do with the revenues of the country, the tax laws, and many other intricate and complicated bills, that I think that each member of the Committee on Ways and Means should have an economist and in addition should have a well-qualified attorney to help him carry out his duties. I believe every Member of the House should have an administrative assistant who is an economist or who has knowledge of taxes, appropriations, and monetary matters so as to help the Members of the House.

These administrative assistants and the other assistants I have referred to as being necessary for the Committee on Ways and Means I think should be selected by the member himself so that the one selected will be obligated and responsible only to the member who selects him. I know we have good staffs on the committees. The Committee on Ways and Means has a wonderful staff, but I do not think it is sufficient. I believe the staff is necessarily under the jurisdiction of the chairman. I think the staff works more for the chairman and the committee generally and not specifically for any member. Therefore, I think it is very necessary that each member of the Committee on Ways and

Means have two additional people, someone qualified as an economist and someone qualified as an attorney to help him in carrying out his duties.

I personally appreciate the fact that I am associated with the gentleman from Missouri, not on the Committee on Ways and Means, because I am not on that committee and he is, but on the Joint Economic Committee. That is a committee composed of 7 Members of the House of Representatives and 7 Members of the United States Senate. We have had many fine hearings during the past few months. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has made a very fine contribution to all those hearings as a member of the subcommittee and has been very active as a member of the whole committee. I speak humbly as chairman of that committee. I am personally obligated for the fine service he has rendered.

## AMERICA'S EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOSER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, in the light of recent Russian advancements in science and technology; the important meeting of the member nations of NATO; and the pending legislation before this Congress, I rise to present a consideration of some of the challenges, particularly in the field of education, which America faces as a nation and as one of the leaders of the free world.

The realization of the speed of the times of which we are a part has been thrust upon us, for during the short period since the adjournment of the Congress, the world has witnessed two products of far-reaching scientific and technological advancement.

The advances of the Soviet Union in science and technology, symbolized by the presence of two sputniks in outer space, command the attention of the United States. It would be an enormous task to attempt to outline all of the far-reaching implications of the sputniks. But one point, I think, is apparent even to the most optimistic observer—the unprecedented Russian advancements in science and technology dramatize the emphasis which the Soviet Union has placed upon the training of technical people and on scientific education. If the United States is to compete with the Soviet Union in the race for the exploration of outer space, as well as maintain our democratic way of life and our leadership of the free world, we must be acutely aware of the Soviet scientific training and of the compelling need to increase the number of graduates in science in our country. In addition to meeting the worldwide competition in scientific advances, we must also recognize man's dependence upon science for survival.

It is unfortunate that some Americans needed a Russian sputnik to make them realize how vital education is in a dynamic era of scientific advancement. All Americans, however, have not been unaware of the importance of education to the welfare of a free nation. As far back as 1953, one of our university presidents stated:

> In the final analysis there is no substitute for the qualitative development of our best brains. Our foreign and military policy has no better ally than the educational system. In any assessment of American power, higher education has the same stature as our system of food production, our industrial organization, or our system of defense.

Again and again, we have been cautioned by scientists, leaders, and educators to remember that our Nation's future levels of productivity, future governmental development, future economic achievements and future scientific, military and cultural achievements are dependent upon the products of today's classrooms.

Yet, only a few short weeks ago, while Sputnik I beeped its way around the earth at a phenomenal speed, some people frantically asked questions as to why such an accomplishment was made by the Soviet Union before the United States. These very people in many instances had paid little or no attention to studies and reports which continued to show America's need for the well-trained person and her precarious lead in the training of scientists and engineers. Today we are faced with a definite challenge: A challenge to produce well-trained people in all fields who will help to increase the value of the American way of life and the quality of American production.

Facts and figures have been widely circulated. Suddenly every one seems to be aware of an educational challenge and many off-the-cuff solutions have been proposed. The theme of many newspapers has become "education is the thing this year." In the light of recent Soviet developments we have a new comprehension that education must be the concern of all people who want to maintain their individual freedom and way of life.

Efforts are being made to evaluate our educational system. Some have attempted to compare our educational system with the Soviet educational system and have suggested the reorganization of the United States educational system in the light of such comparisons. I caution the supporters of this plan of action to remember that the Soviet educational system is a product of a totalitarian society, and the American educational system is the product of a free society. As such they would inherently differ, each having been developed to meet the specific needs of a particular type of society.

In America, the educational system is composed of 48 separate State school systems. The Soviet Union has a national education system which dictates conformity to a program which intends only to expand the power of Russian communism. To propose that America catch up with Soviet Russia in certain phases of education by patterning after a system which has produced for one nation the answer for one particular need could come dangerously close to overlooking the fundamental upon which our American educational system is based—the concept of freedom.

With these factors in mind, we can realize that it is a fallacy for anyone to look to Washington and expect to receive some magic formula which will immediately bring each of the 48 State school systems into some predetermined national goal, or to expect students of certain abilities to be coerced into areas of study for which there is an expressed national demand. We can hope to acquaint the students of America, through guidance programs, cultural exposures, and certain specialized educational programs for the gifted, with America's need for the technically trained person, and the value of making thoughtful and wise choices of high-school subjects if they plan to pursue education beyond the high school. In a like manner, we must attempt to devise measures which will help to decrease the large number of students who do not go on to education beyond the high school because of financial reasons, or because of lack of motivation.

Perhaps most important of all, we must evaluate the quality of education in our schools and in our institutions of higher learning. We must study this evaluation in terms of the future development of our own educational system to meet the demands and needs of the times and of our society.

It is important that we realize the somewhat phenomenal educational accomplishments of the Soviet Union, such as their reduction of the national illiteracy rate from 60 to 70 percent in 1917 to about 1 out of 4 in 1956, and the increased number of Soviet graduates in engineering and science from about 30,000 in 1952 to 63,000 in 1955.

These figures in themselves issue a challenge. We must not, however, in the haste of producing, lose sight of the fact that our challenge is not necessarily to produce in numbers but to produce in quality as well.

I do not think that any informed person could deny that Americans need to exert allout efforts as we engage in a scientific race with the Soviet Union. Complacency, unfounded optimism, and a complete lack of a sense of urgency in these challenging times undoubtedly will prove detrimental to the welfare of the Nation and the free world.

I am by no means proposing speedup and crash programs of action which only push. We all know that waste, failures, national embarrassment, and ridiculous disagreements are the inevitable products of haste. Yet, there is a definite need for intensive, thorough, deliberate, and thoughtful planning. Now as never before, we have a need to include another "R" in the proverbial list of "R's." I refer to an "R" for reason.

Statistics show that if we are to maintain our lead, which is precarious at present, in the graduation of trained engineers and professional people, we must encourage most of our capable students to pursue education beyond the high school. It is no longer possible for American youth to float through high school, and in some instances 4 years of college, without any particular aim or direction other than to get a job that

pays well. The value of an education cannot be measured in terms of salaries, gifts, and awards.

The national need for additional qualified teachers, particularly in the exact sciences, and for technically and professionally trained manpower continues to exist. Perhaps one of the important points to emphasize is our need for well-qualified teachers. How will we fill the long list of vacancies with qualified, well-trained young people? Must we, too, resort to rewards for academic achievement such as was done in Soviet Russia where they reportedly award luxurious homes, handsome salaries, and chauffeurs or servants for outstanding scholasticism. Rather, we need to spend our time and efforts in the training, and retraining in some instances, of our young people in the purposes of education in a democratic society. We should accentuate and put new stress on American education as vital and necessary to better living, responsible citizenship, economic independence, and the general forward movement of the free world.

In the past, new scientific developments and adventures have created a need for international understanding, such as the freedom of the high seas, and national claims of certain polar regions. Perhaps one of the most complicated problems the Russia sputnik will develop is the control of outer space. A consideration of this problem will call for thinking extended beyond the usual realms to which we have become accustomed. Yet, the control of outer space is not a new problem but a modern extension of an old question.

How shall we educate people to the possibility of exploration of the moon and other planets? We must learn to develop open minds and always to think in terms of the times. Space travel has been, and surely will continue to be, an area for extensive study. The role of the behavioral sciences will become increasingly important as man attempts to expand and to increase his capacity for adjusting to new ideas and situations. Parents who wish to talk intelligently with their children will have to know something about space ships and rockets to the moon.

In every phase of life, we can perhaps find some ramifications of the expansion of science and technology, an expansion which has been significantly dramatized by tiny shiny objects in orbits beyond the earth's gravitational pull.

This new year, this Congress must provide legislation which will help to make education beyond the high school a reality for more of our capable students. During the first session, I proposed a student-loan bill (H. R. 4490) which offers a positive plan of action for needy and scholastically qualified students who desire to continue their post-high-school education. My loan bill would help enterprising students overcome their financial obstacle—the cost of higher education. I believe that my bill and similar proposals which are aimed at relieving some of America's educational problems, warrant the careful attention of the Congress. The speed of the times of which we are a part demand positive action based on calm reason and sound thinking.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make clear for the RECORD that I was not present when the vote was taken on the bill H. R. 9739, authorizing certain construction for the Department of the Air Force. Had I been present I would have voted "aye." I was making a speech at the Industrial College at Fort McNair.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. AYRES) for today, January 15, through January 21, 1958, on account of official business.

Mr. CRETELLA (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) on account of illness.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) for today, January 15, through January 19, 1958, on account of official business.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. ADDONIZIO, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the 13th day of February I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour, at the conclusion of the legislative business, this being in commemoration of the 60th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* which occurred on the 15th of February, but on that date the House will not be in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO), for 30 minutes on Wednesday, January 22, 1958.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Monday next, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. VANIK and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOSCH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. HARRISON of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 16, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1453. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 58th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Miami Beach, Fla., August 25–30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1454. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Exchange Stabilization Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1455. A letter from the chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of the Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, to December 31, 1957, pursuant to the act entitled "An act to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia," approved June 29, 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1456. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, United States House of Representatives, transmitting a statement in writing exhibiting the several sums drawn by him pursuant to sections 78 and 80 of title 2, United States Code, the application and disbursement of the same, and the balance, if any, remaining in his hands, pursuant to title 2, United States Code, section 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

1457. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1458. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Don Hummel, operating as the Mount McKinley National Park Co., which, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, will authorize him to provide facilities and services for the public in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1958, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1459. A letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the following claim: *The Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes of Indians (Montana), Petitioners, v. The United States of America, Defendant* (docket No. 279 (1st claim, pars. 7–10)), pursuant to the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U. S. C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1460. A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 740, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 437. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9739, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 9994. A bill to establish a Commission To Study the Adequacy of Compensation for Real Property Acquired by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 9995. A bill to extend the National Wool Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 910); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9996. A bill to authorize a revision of the boundaries of the Edison Laboratory National Monument, New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 9997. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 9998. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9999. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 10000. A bill to amend the definition of dependent to permit working mothers and widowers to deduct amounts paid for care of children while parent is working and to correct present inequities in this provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 10001. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1953, relating to the Arch Hurley Conservancy District, Tucumcari reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 10002. A bill to increase the amount of an individual's earnings which may be counted as the basis for his benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10003. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 10004. A bill to provide that the procuring of certain licenses and the payment of certain taxes shall not be required for buses carrying only schoolchildren or Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts for sightseeing purposes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 10005. A bill to provide for the joint development of the waterpower resources of the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, by the United States and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., to reduce expenditures of the United States, to increase revenues of the United States, to encourage the most widespread use of the power generated at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10006. A bill to authorize the Santa Cruz Harbor project, Santa Cruz, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 10007. A bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H. R. 10008. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the rental value of a parsonage shall not be included in determining the amount of a retired minister's outside earnings for the purposes of the work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10009. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain surplus real property to Newaygo, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 10010. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of certain surplus property to public health agencies of a State, its political subdivisions and instrumentalities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10011. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to allow acreage planted to the 1958 crop of winter wheat in excess of wheat acreage allotments to be considered in establishing such allotments for the future; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 10012. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, with respect to the valuation of intangible benefits from works improvement; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 10013. A bill to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 10014. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit, under certain conditions, the extension of coverage by the insurance system established by such title to policemen and firemen of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10015. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1959, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10016. A bill to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McINTOSH:

H. R. 10017. A bill to prohibit Government agencies to acquire or use the National Grange headquarters site without specific Congressional approval; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10018. A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 10019. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 10020. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code with respect to the nomination of cadets and midshipmen for appointment to the service academies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10021. A bill to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 10022. A bill to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 10023. A bill to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 10024. A bill establishing a general policy with respect to payments to State and local governments on account of Federal real property and tangible personal property by providing for the taxation of certain Federal property and for payments in connection with certain other Federal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 10025. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price supports on dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 10026. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer an additional income-tax exemption for a dependent child who is a student above the high-school level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 10027. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10028. A bill to amend title II of the Veterans' Benefits Act to limit the closing or transfer of functions or activities of Veterans' Administration regional offices, or hospitals, homes, or centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 10029. A bill to provide a 2-year presumptive period of service connection for

organic heart disease which develops within 2 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 10030. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10031. A bill to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to be known as the Assistant for International Cultural Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 10032. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. J. Res. 498. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 499. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the birth of Samuel Chester Reid; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. J. Res. 500. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution expressing the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Italy and expressing the hope that Italy will remain one of the free and democratic nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the deferment from induction of schoolteachers under the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 438. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 64 and House Resolution 65; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. Res. 439. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to secure an agreement with Japan to protect Alaska-spawned salmon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 10033. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Lyon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 10034. A bill for the relief of Anna Petrakakis Palatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 10035. A bill for the relief of Federico Luss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 10036. A bill for the relief of Ernest Lee (Lee Ming-Sing); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 10037. A bill for the relief of Miss Helga Albrecht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTOSH:

H. R. 10038. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Imakuni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 10039. A bill for the relief of Vincenza Biello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 10040. A bill for the relief of Jeronimo Casas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10041. A bill for the relief of Mary Stathacopoulos and Evangelia Stathacopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 10042. A bill for the relief of Hsuan Wei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## A Stamp To Commemorate the 175th Anniversary of the Birth of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 15, 1958*

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to issue a stamp commemorating the 175th anniversary of the birth of a distinguished American, Capt. Samuel Chester Reid.

Samuel Chester Reid was born in Norwich, Conn., on August 25, 1783, the son of a lieutenant in the British Navy. Young Reid, following in his father's footsteps, joined the United States Navy during the War of 1812 and soon after took command of a privateer, *General Armstrong*. During the Battle of Fayal in the Azores, Captain Reid proved his adroitness as a seaman by outmaneuvering the British ship *Carnation*, which was accompanied by a fleet of 12 landing craft and a crew of about 500. When it was evident that after another attack he would lose many men and possibly his ship, Reid scuttled the ship, thus losing only two men. Three hundred British were injured and their fleet severely battered. Due to Captain Reid's efforts, the British expeditionary force was late in reaching New Orleans and was unable to invade Louisiana before the treaty of peace was signed. Gen. Andrew Jackson was thus enabled to reach New Orleans first and triumph in one of the brighter events of the War of 1812. Without Capt. Samuel Chester Reid, the Northwest Territory might easily have become British land.

After resigning from the Navy, Reid became the first harbormaster of New York, established the first lightship at Sandy Hook, and established a semaphore system which quickly noted the arrival of ships.

At this time many States were being admitted to the Union and the original flag of 1 star and 1 stripe per State became highly unsatisfactory. A committee of the Congress prevailed upon Captain Reid to redesign the flag. Congress adopted his suggestion that stars representing the additional States be added to the blue field and that the stripes represent the Thirteen Original Colonies. Mrs. Reid had the distinct honor of sewing the first flag of this kind and it was flown over the United States Capitol on April 13, 1818.

When Captain Reid died in 1861, his grave was unmarked and his past deeds forgotten. Many years later when someone was going through old records of the Green-Wood Cemetery, it was brought to light that the burial place of this very great American had long gone unnoticed. Through the efforts of private citizens the Associated Granite Craftsmen Guild of Greater New York volunteered to erect a monument, and a shaft of perfectly matched pieces of granite marks his resting place. Former Secretary of the Navy, Charles S. Thomas, paid tribute to this Navy hero on October 28, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that deeds of heroism and patriotism such as those of Samuel Chester Reid should not go unnoticed by the American people and I urge this body to support my resolution commemorating the 175th anniversary of his birth.

## The Budget Message With Respect to REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 15, 1958*

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be commended generally on his budget, as he has realistically met the pressing problems on the military and foreign front, and, of necessity, has called for reductions on less essential nonmilitary expenses on the home front.

I have been disappointed with the budget message with respect to REA, and have today introduced a resolution in cooperation with Congressman HORAN, of Washington, calling for a thorough study of the financing of this organization that has done so much not only for the farmers but for the economy of the Nation.

I felt such a study should be made as to the philosophy that underlies this nonprofit cooperative program which has been a godsend to the farmers of America and the economy of the Nation.

I am satisfied that before any serious changes are made with reference to REA that such a study should be made bringing out all of the facts, which will make

a further contribution to the economy of the Nation.

The Commission is empowered to make this study and make its recommendations to the President and the Congress by March 30, 1959.

## Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 15, 1958*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, America's crash education program to stimulate lagging scientific research and development efforts may crash before it gets off the ground.

The desperately needed school construction program is out. Although the classroom shortage is critical in the South and in the thousands of new suburban communities surrounding our large cities, this legislation is doomed on the integration issue. Unless integration is insured by law, segregated schools would be planned and built in the South.

The President's higher education scholarship program, providing scholarship funds for distribution by the several States on a matching basis, would unfortunately limit such scholarship awards to public institutions and deny the participation of privately endowed colleges which in the past have provided the bulk of higher educational opportunities.

I prefer to support a program stimulating higher education by, first, allowing a tax deduction up to $600 per year per dependent to taxpayers who send their dependents to college; second, establishing a Federal student loan fund for high-aptitude students pursuing higher education, particularly in essential and needed subjects; third, a grant-in-aid program providing tuition and support to exceptional students pursuing vital courses of study and pledging several years after graduation or completion of their studies to public research and development projects.

This type of program is better suited to our free enterprise system in that it would leave the selection of college to the individual student, provide no governmental interference with educational institutions, public and private, and at the same time provide equal opportunities to both public and privately endowed colleges to adjust to the current educational crisis. The program could be flexibly administered to favor educational training in demand and short supply.

Incentives for scholarship could be stimulated. Tax deductions, student loans and grants-in-aid could be limited to students with scholarship standards in the upper one-half of their classes. This would develop scholarship competition and force out the drones and space consumers in our scholastic systems. In this space age there is less and less room for space consumers.

We cannot continue to waste the vital natural resource of half-trained and underdeveloped American talent. We have the facilities—we have the aptitudes. We must give more recognition to achievement in the sciences, in the arts and humanities, in all fields. The potential to earn money alone is not enough to meet the challenges of today. We must encourage the development of scientists and scholars and scholarship in every way possible.

## Veterans' Day, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 15, 1958*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on November 11, 1957, to deliver the following address as part of the Veterans' Day celebration in my hometown of Altoona, Pa. The inspiring program was sponsored by the various veterans' organizations of Altoona and was an appropriate observance of Veterans' Day.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE VETERANS' DAY CELEBRATION, 1957

I am highly honored by the opportunity to do my part in keeping alive the sacred traditions of this American holiday.

Armistice Day, which has been celebrated on November 11 since 1918, has been changed by law to Veterans' Day.

Originally marking the end of hostilities in World War I, Veterans' Day commemorates the services of those who fought in all the wars in which our country has been engaged.

As we assemble here today we dedicate ourselves to the commemoration of the patriotic service of all veterans.

The pattern of existence of our veterans organizations was set by the survivors of the Civil War in the Grand Army of the Republic.

Then followed the United Spanish-American War Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, and other groups.

Today it is a common thing to find veterans in all age brackets in all walks of life.

Our defenders in time of war are champions of peace, champions of sound stable government.

Today veterans everywhere are asking the people of this Nation to keep faith with those comrades who did not survive the horrors of war.

Veterans everywhere are asking that we renew our faith in the American ideals for which their comrades died.

On many occasions we turn to the old quotation which tells us that a man who has no regard for the past has no regard for the future.

The full effect of this truth grows upon us when we see it working out in human destiny.

When we safeguard the values of days gone by the happiness and richness of our lives are better established.

Historic shrines are meant to cultivate our capacity for the appreciation of the past.

Our own State of Pennsylvania and Blair County are dotted with historic shrines that we the citizens of the Keystone State take pride in showing our visitors.

Then, too, all Americans know of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery; Independence Hall in Philadelphia; Valley Forge; the Battlefield at Gettysburg; the Statue of Liberty in the New York Harbor; Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington; Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson; and the Lincoln Memorial in our National Capital.

Yes, the list of these historic shrines is endless.

As a matter of fact almost every city and town in the United States has a shrine, a statue, or a plaque which commemorates some event or person, which is part of our American tradition.

When Americans talk about cherished traditions of this great Republic we rarely have in mind a clear definition of the words we use.

We find in them a fitting cloak for the emotional sentiment we feel when we utter them.

Let me assure you that we are all firm believers in the glorious traditions of our great Republic.

We have demonstrated that fact by fighting for them in various wars.

These traditions represent the finest in thought and deed that veterans have fought and died for since the founding of this Nation.

All that is asked is that real meaning be given to these words, so that when we say them we have in mind a clear picture of our experience as a Nation. Yes, a deep-seated experience rather than a mere thrill of emotion, such as we feel when we see the flag raised or hear the Star-Spangled Banner.

Webster defines the word "tradition" as "a custom which has prevailed as from generation to generation."

This definition is clear enough, although some who use the term seem not to realize that a tradition is a living, moving, growing thing, not something absolute, unalterable, and forever fixed.

We often smile at young people who talk about "starting a new tradition."

But they are more than half right.

The world, as Thomas Jefferson took pains to emphasize, belongs to the living generation; and each new generation leaves its mark on the American tradition.

Tradition is not something that ended with Benjamin Franklin, or George Washington, or James Monroe, or Abraham Lincoln, or Herbert Hoover.

Tradition is constantly developing, whether we realize it or not.

At this very moment we are part of a tradition that will mark the era in which we live.

There are two fundamental concepts of American tradition that I have singled out for discussion with you.

First, the character of our people.

The character of our people is one of the great defenses of our Nation.

It was a people of strong character who built this Nation, but only a strong people can be trusted with our great power, privileges, and responsibilities.

One has only to read the history of early Pennsylvania, New England, Virginia, and

the Middle Atlantic settlements to be impressed by this fact.

Our forefathers were sturdy pioneers with a strong sense of righteousness, justice, and personal integrity. At the time of the War of Independence the majority of the Colonists had been brought up on the fundamental concepts of reverence, industry, frugality, and honesty. These concepts represented a stern philosophy, one that was strong and never weak.

The original settlers of this Nation, which included the English, Scotch, and Irish, were followed to this new Nation by freedom-seeking French, by Germans fleeing Prussian militarism, by Italians, Scandinavians, and others who saw the vision of liberty and opportunity. They were refugees from political and religious oppression, but they were not fugitives from high moral concepts and disciplined religious living.

There was something noble and great in these pioneering Americans which we, on this Veterans' Day need, if we are to emerge from the present chaos as a people worthy of survival. We need these stern qualities today which make character a firm alloy, compounded of human strength and divine grace, kindness and firmness, gentleness and ruggedness, and finally, a determination to live for and to enforce justice.

It is a fundamental truth that only men of majestic character can be trusted with their own destinies. Therefore it follows that if our American tradition is to endure we need a people of strong character.

My second emphasis is based on the premise that we believe in the right of a republic to survive and to grow. This does not mean that we should spend our lives and our fortunes in an effort to acquire new territory, but it does mean that we must be on guard to protect and defend our cherished American ideals of liberty and freedom.

In defending these ideals we must continue to face the danger, not only of individual death, but also of collective destruction.

It is only when we fully understand all the implications of atomic warfare that we shall acquire added courage and calm, together with a firm determination, to avert the senseless massacre of a conflict waged with atomic power. There is no illusion as to any ultimate victory to be gained by anyone in atomic warfare. Frankly, it is a suicidal enterprise. The death-dealing capabilities of atomic weapons move in a strange sphere. They are guilty of no geographic discrimination. If directed at us, there will be no security, even if we flee the city and move to the country. The remotest village in the Dakotas or in the Carolinas, the palace on the banks of the Ganges, the United States Capitol in Washington, and the Kremlin in Moscow, may all be total victims of such war.

Atomic weapons know no religious prejudices. They would destroy in even measure Catholic, Jew, Protestant, Moslem, Hindu, and heathen, believers and atheists, minister and congregation, club, labor union, and fraternity member. Atomic warfare has no color prejudice. White groups and brown, black or yellow would be victims without partiality or preference. Nor is social position in life recognized by atomic warfare. The president of the bank and the Union Square agitator, the scoundrel and the peace-loving citizen, the scientist and the dock laborer, the innocent and the guilty, all would be swept away.

We must all be imbued with the knowledge that atomic warfare means not just disaster or tragedy, but in large measure, it means total death.

We are now living in a moment of history when we must stay both alert and full of expectation.

Yes, we must be alert for every avenue that will promote peace.

Meanwhile we must wait, expect, promote, and feel sure about a grassroot movement toward self-preservation.

The preservation of the human race will be due to mankind's determination to dwell in peace with each other.

One may be sure that even behind the Iron Curtain there is no group willing to die wholesale for a dictator's mad scheme for world domination through atomic conflict.

Throughout the last decade, all over the world, the oppressed have been rising to demand their share in life.

This is the supreme challenge to Americans who not only believe in the American way of life, in the meaning and power of our Republic, but who also are grimly determined to prevent the world from self-destruction.

If the American people were ever given an outright clear-cut opportunity to decide on the question of communism, they would promptly vote "No."

The truth is that the issue of communism has never been presented to the people in any honest or manly fashion.

It is fed to us in small doses.

Communism presents itself to us in varied forms of disguise.

But communism dressed in gentleman's clothing, or in any other garb, is communism still.

Communism thinks of peace only in terms of death to our American way of life.

Like the leopard communism cannot change its spots.

Having returned recently from Russia, I know that behind the Iron Curtain there is no such thing as individual freedom.

In Russia freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of thought, and every other freedom is denied the people.

The dictates of the Kremlin must be obeyed.

For the common people, and there are millions of them in Russia, only one rule is certain: They are tools of the state.

In Russia the people are told that liberty is the price of economic security.

In reality, behind the Iron Curtain the great masses of the people have neither liberty nor security.

From my own personal observations the Russian people are living in abject slavery and bound by the chains of a Communist dictatorship.

In the face of the great challenge that we are confronted with today, can we doubt for 1 minute that our form of government must survive and grow?

How can our Republic survive and grow if here in the United States at its source and center, as citizens we cannot reconcile its behavior with its theories and its ideals?

If we profoundly believe in the right of our form of government to survive and grow as a nation, we must stay united, utilize superhuman patience, and above all show superhuman ingenuity.

We must acquire a combination of grim courage and wise benevolence.

The ultimate objective of all Americans is universal peace.

In this burning desire for peace surely veterans who have known war firsthand desire it most.

As heirs of the traditions of the American form of government, all Americans on this Veterans' Day 1957 must rededicate themselves to the ideals of this Nation.

To those of us who are veterans, and who have already made sacrifices for the continuation of the American way of life, let me admonish you that there are further sacrifices demanded in the race for our survival as a nation.

In this connection let me repeat the warning of a great American, our President Theodore Roosevelt, whose 100th birthday anniversary is commemorated this year.

Teddy Roosevelt said: "The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, the love of soft living, and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

Ladies and gentlemen, that warning sounded by Teddy Roosevelt over 50 years ago is a grim prediction of the challenge this Nation faces today in the batle for survival.

If Teddy Roosevelt were alive today he would condemn those who are using partisan politics to advance their own interests, and at the expense of the Nation as a whole, and at a time when national unity was never at a greater premium.

He would remind us of our lack of national defense at Pearl Harbor in 1941 and again in Korea in 1950.

Even though we were unprepared at that time, all Americans united in support of the President of the United States, and petty partisan politics were consigned to the national ashcan.

Today our great Republic is again at the crossroads of its destiny.

This means that the crying need of the hour is not carping criticism but the traditional national unity for which this Nation is noted in time of national peril.

Therefore let me conclude my remarks by makng an earnest appeal to organizations such as yours in demanding that the decisions which concern the security of this Nation be removed from the political arena and decided in the good old American tradition of patriotism and love of country.

Let me add that as a united nation we can successfully meet any crisis; but, mark you, if we are torn asunder by political bickering we are virtually writing our own ticket for national ruin.

## The Plight of the Postal Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 15, 1958*

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the last recess, I made it my business to visit a few post offices to see how the Government of the United States treats its employees, the postal workers.

I was interested in comparing the working conditions of those who carry on the services of the Government with those working in private industry.

As a former member of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania, and one interested in American labor, I introduced much legislation to improve the working conditions of those who toil in the mills and mines of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Much progress has been made in private employment through the cooperation of management and union representatives of labor, to improve the safety, the health, and the conditions under which employees work.

As one who has worked in the steel mills of Pittsburgh, I can well remember the lack of toilet facilities and, in some cases, where there were none at all.

I remember men leaving the mines and mills after a 12-hour day, in sweaty

clothes, and with the grease and grime of work still on their faces and clothing.

I have seen and heard women on streetcars complaining about having to sit next to workers in their dirty clothes.

These conditions have been corrected in private employment by labor and management through negotiations, and by the passing of safety, sanitation, health, and other necessary legislation by the various States.

These laws have resulted in giving to private employees the necessary toilet facilities based on the number of employees, and the washrooms are well policed so that cleanliness is kept at a high level.

Shower baths are provided in sufficient numbers so that, after a sweaty day, the worker can shower and change into his "going home" clothes with no fear of dirtying others against whom he may accidentally brush on his way home.

Dining rooms are afforded so that those who carry their lunches can sit at tables and eat rested and at ease.

Lighting in the working area is considered very important to the efficiency of the work turned out, and to avoid eyestrain of the employees.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and elaborate the many, many advances made by private employers which not only improve the worker's efficieney, but which also strengthen his morale, his health, and his self-respect.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on, elaborating on this subject for I believe it spells out the difference between a loyal and appreciated employee and an indifferent one.

Mr. Speaker, the one employer in the United States who has made the least progress along these lines, and who is not living up to the laws of sanitation, health, and working conditions of our States, is the United States Government—Uncle Sam—especially with respect to those employed in the post offices of our Nation.

I find these unsatisfactory working conditions are not applicable to any one post office, but to all post offices.

If the same working conditions existed in private employment, inspectors from the labor and health departments of the States would be "hauling" the employers into courts and prosecuting them.

Many Congressmen would be attacking and making political hay for votes by exposing the employers and posing as the employees' champion.

Gentlemen, we must take our part of the blame.

We are the "Board of Directors." I ask every Member to visit the post offices in his district. This is what he will find:

A gloomy lighted interior.

Lighting of the 19th-century vintage that causes eyestrain, headaches, and which does not provide sufficient light to do a good job.

Toilet facilities that belong to a backward country, and with no thought of how many employees must use them.

In the Christmas rush, lines were formed outside of each washroom. In most cases, no attendant was on duty to see that they were kept clean, and that toilets were kept flushed.

There were not even enough washbasins to wash their hands.

Instead of a battery of showers in a bathroom of sufficient size in the largest post office in my own district, I found one little cubby hole set aside for a shower that had long lost its usefulness.

Lockers were jammed into a room so crowded you had to back out because there was not enough room to pass another person.

Even at that, employees were sitting on the floor and in corners eating their lunches, since there was no room in the so-called dining room.

A dark, dismal dining room consists of wooden benches and tables. Again it lacked an attendant to see that wrappings and leftovers were put in containers by the diners.

In the postal transportation department a penitentiary would look more inviting to work in. Again, there was not enough custodial help to have policing at all times. On the contrary, in the mills and factories of today, "the sweeper" is constantly sweeping up.

The lighting, the ventilation, and the dark, dirty walls and floors made this department the worst of all.

Mr. Speaker, in private establishments where there are hundreds of employees, at least a registered nurse, or a first-aid hospital is on hand every hour of the working week. In most cases, there is also a doctor. The Post Office Department does not concern itself with these so necessary services.

The local postmaster is not to blame. When economy is needed, the Postmaster General practices economy—on the physical requirements that are so needed to give an employee's place of employment a pleasant environment.

Local heads of post offices want to improve the working conditions of the men, but are always denied the necessary funds.

If the United States can lose millions of dollars carrying newspapers, magazines, periodicals, and so forth, they can give to their employees good working conditions and pay wages in line with private enterprise.

Congress should vote more money to carry on the postal service, but should mark it for wages and proper maintenance of post offices.

The postal rate of the mail which shows a big loss should be increased to absorb the cost of that particular class of mail.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported every increase in postal rates that has come before the Congress.

I do not believe in starvation wages for postal employees so that a large newspaper company or a large publishing house can make large profits. There should be no free riders.

Mr. Speaker, this is the physical aspect under which they work. But in addition, the post office employee, as well as the Government employee, is the lowest paid employee in comparison to others doing the same type work in private industry.

The financial condition of these employees is pitiful.

They must, if they have a family, work two jobs—or put their wives to work to meet obligations.

The postal worker's income is not sufficient to educate his children properly.

At night they can be found as gas attendants, working in community stores, attending bars, working at movie houses, working as laborers for contractors on their days off, and doing jack of all trades they can get to increase their income to buy clothes and food for their families.

The cost of living has gone up and up every month. Profits of companies who use the mails to carry on their business are at an all time high. Circulation of papers, magazines, and periodicals has increased. The wage of those employed in private industry has increased, but the postal workers are expected to continue to hold the line, for the President has stated, in vetoing legislation, that the small postal increase in wages would contribute to inflation. I have yet to hear the President request large corporations to cut their profits to stop inflation.

The Holland bill, H. R. 9658, would double the amount of the increase which was voted in the last session of Congress, thereby giving the postal worker $1,092 across the board. Although this amount does not compare to wages paid in industry, it may contribute enough to permit a postal worker to spend evenings with his family instead of working extra to support them.

But, of course, the postal worker is "hatched" and is denied the right to engage in political activity.

Mr. Speaker, in many of the talks I have had with the postal worker, I have said, and I quote:

> Remember, although you are "hatched," and are not permitted to engage in open political meetings, your father and mother are not "hatched," your brother and sister are not "hatched," your uncles and aunts are not "hatched," your in-laws are not "hatched," and above all, your sons and daughters and wives are not "hatched."

This is an election year. I hope they take my advice.

---

## Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 15, 1958*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the week ending January 9, 1958, there were 324 business and commercial failures in this country as compared with 203 the previous week and 256 in the same week 1 year ago.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1958

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in this still moment, when all earth's strident noises are hushed and our own voices silenced, as we turn our thoughts to Thee in whom we live and move and have our being, make plain to our understanding that legislative enactments and economic adjustments in themselves cannot bring personal or collective salvation except as they clear the way for the spiritual restoration and rearmament without which we labor in vain and all else is as sinking sand.

In constant pursuit of the highest, scorning all expediency, casting aside all counsels of despair, may we press on with buoyant feet, firm in the faith that for ourselves, our Nation, and our world, the best is yet to be. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 13, 1958, was dispensed with.

## ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, and EDWARD MARTIN, a Senator from Pennsylvania, appeared in their seats today.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills, the presentation of petitions and memorials, the submission of resolutions, and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate next Monday because of my attendance at the funeral of the late Representative August H. Andresen. I expect to remain in the State on Tuesday of next week also.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 309)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Seventh Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 15, 1958.*

## REPORT ON PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 306)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the second semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

## REPORT ON UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 202)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, the 11th annual report, covering United States participation in the United Nations during the year 1956.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six was a year of great peril to world peace and thus a stringent test for the United Nations—notably because of the crises in Egypt and in Hungary.

In Egypt the United Nations caused the world to turn away from war. Through a series of resolutions, the General Assembly effectively mobilized world opinion to achieve a cease-fire, and France and the United Kingdom shortly agreed to withdraw their forces. The Assembly's moral pressure played a powerful part in securing the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egyptian territory in March of this year.

In the case of Hungary, the Assembly succeeded by massive votes in mobilizing opinion against the Soviet Union's blatant disregard of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. Although it has so far been impossible by peaceful means to secure freedom for the people of Hungary, this mobilization did arouse a strong revulsion around the world against Soviet imperialism.

The sharp contrast between the response of France, the United Kingdom, and Israel on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other to the call of world opinion, is striking.

The Secretary General deserves particular commendation for his role in the United Nations actions during the Middle East crisis. As requested by the General Assembly, he developed within 48 hours a plan to set up, with the consent of the nations involved, the United Nations Emergency Force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities. The force took up its position in the Suez Canal area and later moved to other positions along the armistice demarcation lines. Today, it remains the guardian of peace in the sensitive Gaza and Sharm-el-Sheikh areas. The concept inherent in this force constitutes a potentially important development for the future of the United Nations as an increasingly effective instrument for maintaining peace.

Under a mandate from the General Assembly, the Secretary General also organized a fleet of more than 40 salvage vessels to remove the obstructions with which the Suez Canal had been blocked during the hostilities. By April 24, 1957, the canal was fully open and had resumed its role as an important artery in world commerce.

Thus the United Nations dealt effectively with a grave situation which could have caused general war. The restoration and maintenance of relative calm gives the United Nations the opportunity to work for the long-range solutions in the Middle East which alone can guarantee against the outbreak of new fighting.

Unlike the crisis in the Middle East, the situation in Hungary presented the problem of what the United Nations can do when one of its members refuses to respond to the peacemaking efforts of the General Assembly.

What began as a peaceful student demonstration in Budapest on October 23, 1956, mushroomed into a nationwide uprising of the Hungarian people aimed at national independence. It was crushed only through massive Soviet armed intervention. The United States proposed a resolution in the Security Council calling on the Soviet Union to

withdraw its troops. When this resolution was vetoed by the Soviet Union, a special emergency session of the General Assembly was convened under the "Uniting for Peace" procedure.

As the climax of a historic series of resolutions, the General Assembly on December 12 condemned the Soviet Union's violation of the United Nations Charter "in depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental rights." It again requested the Soviet Union to halt its intervention in Hungary's internal affairs, withdraw its troops from Hungary, and permit reestablishment of Hungary's political independence. To these requests, the Soviet Union turned a deaf ear.

On January 10, 1957, the General Assembly established a Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary consisting of representatives of Australia, Ceylon, Denmark, Tunisia, and Uruguay—a committee drawn from five continents—and instructed it to investigate the Hungarian situation. Denied admission to Hungary by the Kadar regime, the Committee carried out its mandate by collecting authentic evidence elsewhere, mainly from eyewitnesses who had fled Hungary. The results of this investigation were published in the Special Committee's report. They clearly refuted on a point-by-point basis the Soviet version of events in Hungary. The report confirmed that the purpose of the Soviet intervention was the suppression of the legitimate demands of the Hungarian people for freedom and independence. It revealed the naked truth of the ruthlessness of the Soviet intervention and its utter disregard for national sovereignty and basic human rights.

It was this report which led to the reconvening of the Assembly on September 10, 1957, and to the second resolution again condemning Soviet conduct, which was adopted by 60 votes to 10.

The United Nations succeeded in stopping the fighting in the Middle East because the parties involved complied with the recommendations of the General Assembly. In the case of Hungary, United Nations action was frustrated because the Soviet Union refused to comply with its recommendations. The blame lies not with the United Nations but squarely on the shoulders of the men of the Kremlin who rely on force to keep Hungary from regaining its freedom.

The record of the United Nations clearly demonstrates that the processes of consultation, compromise, debate, and agreement are capable of relaxing tensions and resolving disputes if nations are willing to respect the opinions of mankind.

I was particularly pleased to note the progress made, under the aegis of the United Nations, in the fields of disarmament and the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee has been the center for serious negotiations which we all hope will lead to a mutually acceptable agreement. The establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency has been especially promising.

The United States welcomed the constructive work done by the United Nations over the past year toward the achievement of self-government and independence in the dependent areas and trust territories. The independence of Ghana and the termination of the United Nations trusteeship over Togoland under British administration constitute notable achievements.

By the admission of Sudan, Morocco, Tunisia, Japan, Ghana, and most recently the Federation of Malaya, the United Nations has increased its membership to 82. However, the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Vietnam are still excluded by the Soviet veto in the Security Council. The United States considers their admission necessary and desirable and will continue its efforts to bring about their entry into the Organization.

The humanitarian activities of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in providing minimum subsistence and housing for over 900,000 refugees in the Near East were continued by the General Assembly with United States support. Although the Agency is doing an excellent job under trying circumstances, we must find a permanent solution to the Palestine refugee problem.

The economic and social activities of the United Nations have become increasingly effective. Through many channels and in numerous programs, the United Nations and the specialized agencies have contributed to the economic progress of the newly developing areas of the world and, in the words of the United Nations Charter, "the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations." This report gives a full account of many of the strikingly successful battles the specialized agencies have fought and won against disease, hunger, and illiteracy in many lands.

It has been the continuing pledge of the United States to give full support to the United Nations and to seek constantly for ways to increase its strength and to develop its effectiveness as an instrument to maintain world peace. This report to the Congress contains concrete proof that we are keeping that pledge.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1958.*

## REPORT ON NEW PUBLIC AIRPORT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 304)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the first paragraph under the heading "Department of Commerce" of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1958, there is submitted herewith my report recommending a site for a new public airport in the vicinity of the District of Columbia.

Such report consists of a letter to me from the special assistant to the President for aviation matters, dated January 8, 1958, together with an enclosure entitled "Site Selection Study." It proposes the site known as Chantilly, located partly in Loudoun County and partly in Fairfax County, Va., as the airport site which best meets the requirements of public safety, airport and airspace capacity, public service, and cost.

Accordingly, I recommend the selection of the Chantilly site, and at this site have directed the Civil Aeronautics Administration to proceed forthwith with the construction and development of a new public airport to serve the growing needs of the National Capital region.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1958.*

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. August H. Andresen, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE DURING THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate for

the remainder of the present session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AUTHORIZATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO MAKE REPORTS DURING THE ADJOURNMENTS OR RECESSES OF THE SENATE DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournments or recesses of the Senate during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the Committee on Appropriations be, and it is hereby, authorized to report appropriation bills, including joint resolutions, with accompanying notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### Increase of National Marketing Quotas and Acreage Allotments

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### Revision of Method of Computing Basic Pay for Members of the Uniformed Services

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Report on Flight Pay of Army Officers

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering flight pay of officers of that Department, for the period July 1–December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Report on Agreements With Owners and Lessees of Certain Lands Adjoining Naval Petroleum Reserves

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements with owners and lessees of land inside or adjoining the naval petroleum reserves for conservation in the ground of oil and gas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### Report on Liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in Liquidation)

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### Report on Borrowing Authority

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended September 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### Report of Audit of Exchange Stabilization Fund

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the period July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### Progress Report on Liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of liquidation of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### Report of United States Tariff Commission

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

### Report on Disposals of Foreign Excess Property

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on disposals of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Report on Examination of the Military Assistance Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on examination of the military assistance program administered by the Department of the Army (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Facilitation of Procurement of Property and Services by the Government

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve opportunities for small-business concerns to obtain a fair proportion of Government purchases and contracts, to facilitate procurement of property and services by the Government, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Audit Report on Inland Waterways Corporation

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

### Termination of Federal Supervision Over Klamath Indian Tribe

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### Proposed Concession Contract in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### Settlement of Claim of Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes of Indians v. The United States

A letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, the settlement of the claim of the *Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes of Indians* v. *The United States* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### Report on Audit of Future Farmers of America

A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### Study of Rules of Practice and Procedure in Federal Courts

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to empower the Judicial Conference to study and recommend changes in and additions to the rules of practice and procedure in the Federal courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### Report on Positions Filled in Certain Grades Under Classification Act of 1949

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that 4 positions had been filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–17 and GS–18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### Promotion of Interests of National Defense

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the interests of national defense through the advancement of the aeronautical research programs of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Harold Kilmer, of Millbury, Mass., relating to the establishment of a missionary library in every nation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of C. Z. Bondy, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Free Federation of Puerto Rican Workers, San Juan, P. R., favoring the compulsory teaching of English in Puerto Rican schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## RESOLUTIONS OF AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at the 61st annual convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association, at Oklahoma City, Okla.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 61ST ANNUAL CONVENTION, AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, OKLAHOMA CITY, JANUARY 6–8, 1958

### ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Whereas the Hoover Commission Report has pointed out various ways of economizing in Government spending that would save taxpayers billions of dollars without impairing Government effectiveness; and

Whereas Congress has been loathe to adopt these economy measures, which in no way would interfere with necessary spending for defense: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we again urge Congress to enact measures as suggested in the Hoover Commission Report.

### TARIFFS

Whereas our import duties are among the lowest in the world; and

Whereas the Trade Agreement Act, which expires next June, has been shown to be a tool for further lowering our protective tariffs; and

Whereas our present inadequate protective tariffs would be further endangered by endorsement of the Organization for Trade Cooperation which in effect would take away the power of Congress to set tariff rates and make trade agreements: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we urge Congress not to extend the trade-agreements program and to resist pressure for endorsement of the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

### LABOR UNIONS

*Be it resolved*—

That, although we are not opposed to honest trade unions, we express our belief that no man should be denied employment solely because of membership or nonmembership in an organization;

That we deplore the ruthless and unjustified actions of some labor leaders; and

That we ask that labor unions be subjected to the same controls and regulations as are now in force for corporations and industry.

### FUNDS FOR MEAT INSPECTION

*Be it resolved*, That the American National Cattlemen's Association in recognition of the importance of Federal meat inspection both to the producer of livestock and the consumer of meat, and in further recognition that Federal meat inspection is a service to the public and should properly be supported by public funds, requests that adequate funds be appropriated to carry on this service effectively.

### AMENDMENT TO TAX LAWS

*Be it resolved*, That we favor legislation similar to the Jenkins-Keogh bills which would grant voluntary retirement benefits to self-employed individuals who do not now have available to them retirement benefits available to employees of corporations, and the vast majority of stockmen are self-employers who should be entitled to similar tax-protected retirement benefits; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we favor legislation providing for averaging of income for tax purposes similar to the legislation proposed by Representative CURTIS in H. R. 126 except that the association desires a 10 rather than a 5-year averaging period; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we favor legislation revising the involuntary conversion provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to provide greater flexibility with respect to the replacement requirements when land is condemned and when breeding cattle are sold because of drought; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we favor legislation similar to that proposed by Representatives BAUMHART and SIMPSON in H. R. 8523 and 8989, providing for the payment of the Federal estate taxes in installments; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we shall continue our support of and cooperation with the National Live Stock Tax Committee in its efforts in connection with the above mentioned legislation.

### TAXING AUTHORITY

Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs has permitted, condoned and promoted certain forms of taxation by the tribal councils of the Pine Ridge and Rosebud areas upon non-Indian permittees and owners of business, and there have been proposals to tax personal property; and

Whereas since the non-Indian residents of the reservation are already overburdened with taxation to support the regular State and county governments: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we oppose such discriminatory double taxation by administrative action and favor legislation to limit taxing authority to regularly constituted State governments and their subdivisions.

### INTERSTATE HIGHWAY

Whereas the present interstate highway law calls for public hearings, for urban areas but none for rural areas: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we ask Congress to amend the public hearings procedure of the Interstate Highway Act, or require hearings in all rural areas transversed by the Interstate Highway System as well as the present hearings in urban areas.

### SOIL BANK

Whereas acreage allotments, with the practice of diverting crop lands to grass, are mainly responsible for increasing the surpluses of beef which have confronted the industry in the past critical years; and

Whereas in spite of repeated promises by high officials in Government that the soil bank land would not be grazed, Congress inserted emergency clauses which allowed grazing in the very first year of soil bank operation: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we firmly oppose the use of diverted acres to the production of meat; and be it further

*Resolved*, That all drought emergency clauses be stricken from the soil bank program.

### CONDEMNATION OF LAND

Whereas there are certain agencies of the Federal Government that are attempting to acquire private land through the assumed right of condemnation; and

Whereas we, the members of the American National Cattlemen's Association, have always strongly believed in and supported the fundamental principle that the right to privately owned property is a sacred human inherent right that must never be subjected to encroachment or allowed to suffer unwarranted attack; and

Whereas we have observed the ever-present and dangerous development of an alien philosophy that the right to privately owned property is subject to the Government's authority to seize such property through the exercise of the power of condemnation for the acquisition of land for wildlife refuges and similar purposes; and

Whereas we feel that our association is an organization that should always support the principle of private ownership of property and should oppose any and all attacks, direct and indirect, on that fundamental principle: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the officers of this association be, and they are hereby instructed to keep alert to discover such unwarranted and unjustified attacks on said fundamental principle and to assist in resisting such attacks by giving moral support and such other assistance as the president and his vice president deem necessary.

### TAYLOR GRAZING LAW

Whereas the Taylor grazing law was enacted in 1934 as a conservation measure to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon Federal range; and

Whereas the administration of the act by the Bureau of Land Management has more and more ignored the basic principle of stability by attempting to adjust range use to fit theoretical range survey carrying capacity figures, by ignoring established range division usage of settlers, and by circumventing certain administrative restrictions embodied in the law, through code terminology, and further by using range survey figures as an adjudication tool instead of solely as a basis upon which to charge fees: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we favor long-term binding cooperative agreements between the Bureau and the permittee; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we urge the national council to give this special attention; and be it further

*Resolved*, That any genuine and established necessities for range-use reductions due to drought or other temporary causes be made on a nonuse basis, with a clear understanding that reestablishment of such reduced use go to the primary, qualified user upon whom such reduction was initially made.

### LAND TRANSFERS

Whereas the grazing districts of the Bureau of Land Management comprise such large areas and the nature of assignment of personnel to these areas requires that the employees have a thorough knowledge of their districts: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we request the Bureau of Land Management to refrain from making too frequent transfer of range management personnel.

### LAND APPLICATIONS

Whereas there is an increasing number of 5-acre tract applications; and

Whereas if this practice continues it will jeopardize stability of our range privileges: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the class of land now available for small tracts be reclassified and be limited to areas adjacent to cities and towns.

### FOREST MULTIPLE USE

Whereas national legislation and regulations establishing wilderness preservation areas and recreational areas is contrary to the multiple-use principle in management of Federal lands; and

Whereas enactment of special interest legislation and regulations seriously handicap multiple-use management of Federal lands: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we oppose all legislation and regulations not in accord with the multiple-use principle.

### APPEALS IN FOREST USE

Whereas, under rules and regulations now existing for appeals from decisions of agents of the Forest Service, the decision becomes effective pending determination of the decision on appeal; and

Whereas if the decision is reversed on appeal the appellant has no method of restitution for his loss pending the appeal: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That regulation 10 (a) on appeals be amended to provide that any decision relative to reductions in numbers or time of grazing on any permit by any agent of the Forest Service or Department of Agriculture be stayed pending final decision on appeal.

GRAZING REDUCTIONS

Whereas, the Forest Service has in the past made restrictions in grazing permits or other uses of forest lands without due regard for the consequences that would result from such reductions to livestock operations: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That except where the permittee objects, or in case of prior agreement, the Forest Service shall not reduce the numbers or period of use until the matter of such reduction shall have been reviewed by the local advisory board if one exists.

WITHDRAWALS OF LANDS

Whereas in almost every issue of the Federal Register there appears applications by either the Defense Department, the Fish and Wildlife Service, or some other of the various Federal agencies for withdrawal of land from the public domain; and

Whereas many of the current withdrawals are not being used to the fullest extent; and

Whereas these withdrawals are foreclosing on multiple use, to the detriment of the economy of the western public-land States: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we petition Congress to enact legislation requiring all Federal agencies to obtain the approval of Congress for withdrawal of any area of land.

SECTION 15 LAND

Whereas the lessees of public lands known as section 15 lands have no preference rights in the renewal of their leases nor in the purchase of their leased lands; and

Whereas this places these lessees at a distinct disadvantage in developing a stabilized operation and discourages the lessees from practicing a longtime conservation program: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we recommend that the regulations of the Bureau of Land Management respecting the leasing and sale of section 15 lands be so amended as to provide preference rights to lessees in the renewal of their leases or prior preference rights to all leases of land sold where such lessees are owners of contiguous lands.

IMPORTS OF CATTLE AND BEEF

Whereas cattle and dressed beef and canned and processed beef from foreign countries are attracted to our markets whenever domestic prices reach a level at which we can operate without loss; and

Whereas the present import duties are inadequate to protect our markets against importations of more cheaply produced cattle and beef from foreign countries; and

Whereas our present protective tariff was written several decades ago and is now inadequate under present conditions of greatly increased costs of production in the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we ask Congress and the Tariff Commission to revise these old import duty rates and import quotas to a more realistic basis, to preserve American markets for American producers.

FEDERAL BEEF GRADING

Whereas voluntary Federal beef carcass grading is today an integral part of the beef marketing system; and

Whereas it is essential that Federal carcass grading be constantly reviewed by this producer organization to insure that it be uniformly applied and to keep in step with our dynamic meat and food economy; and

Whereas the elimination of conformation of grading would not be desirable; and

Whereas the Federal grade standards for beef combine into each grade two primary characteristics which are not necessarily related; namely, (1) quality of meat as determined by the texture, firmness, marbling, maturity, and (2) the proportion of various cuts and ratio of fat, lean, and bone which are a function of the conformation and finish of the carcass; and

Whereas there is a wide range in the value of carcasses within each grade because of the variation in yield of major retail cuts and the ratio of fat, lean, and bone; and

Whereas the present grading system does not identify these differences in cut-out yields within a given quality grade; and

Whereas it is essential that our market system identify beef carcasses that have combined high quality meat with a minimum of waste fat and bones in order to encourage production of carcasses that more nearly meet the consumer demand: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American National Cattlemen's Association hereby urges the Department of Agriculture to proceed immediately with the development and field testing of a grading system wherein present quality grades would be further divided and identified into groups differing in yield of major retail cuts, and ratio of fat, lean, and bone; be it further

*Resolved*, That the meatpacking, wholesaling, and retailing industry be requested to assist in every way possible with the development and perfecting of such a grading system; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the beef-carcass grading committee be established as a permanent committee charged with the responsibility of review of the Federal beef-carcass grading program; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the American National Cattlemen's Association vigorously opposes pending legislation and any future legislation that would make Federal grading of beef mandatory.

BEEF PROMOTION

Whereas cattle produced by the members of this association ultimately reach the consumer market in the form of edible beef and beef products, which fact not only justifies but requires beef cattle producers to be genuinely interested in the beef market and in all problems related to the marketing of beef and beef products; and

Whereas we know that the consumption of beef can be greatly increased by truthful and realistic dissemination of the facts about beef from the standpoints of health and nutrition; and

Whereas since the consuming public has never been fully or adequately informed about the real benefits that are derived from beef and beef products, we therefore know that an appropriate medium to conduct a widespread campaign of research, education, promotion, and merchandising of our product, beef, must be devised and put into operation for the general benefit of not only our industry but also for the particular benefit of consumers; and

Whereas the National Beef Council was brought into existence because of former recommendations of our association. It had and has for its purpose the accomplishment of those things just mentioned, all of which are essential to the general welfare; and

Whereas the American National Cattlemen's Association should continue its support of the National Beef Council and should greatly augment that support. In particular, our association should assume the leadership in the effort to assure adequate financing of the research, educational, and promotional campaign planned by the National Beef Council: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the officers of the American National Cattlemen's Association be, and they are hereby, instructed to actively assist in the effort to secure Federal legislation to authorize a voluntary checkoff program at the federally posted markets of the country for the financing of the operations of a national beef-promotion program and to give to such effort both personal and financial aid and support.

GAME LANDS PURCHASES

Whereas in most, if not all, of the western public land States the State game commissions are using funds derived from operation of the Robinson-Patman Act with which to buy land, thus removing the land from the tax rolls, which increases the burden on remaining fee lands; and

Whereas the tax loss to local communities includes not only the land tax but also the personal taxes tied to the land in the form of livestock taxes in many cases more than the land tax itself: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we petition Congress to amend the Robinson-Patman Act so that State game commission real property be placed on tax rolls, thus supporting their fair share of the tax burden; and be it further

*Resolved*, That no land may be purchased in these instances without obtaining the consent of the respective county commissioners serving the county in which the land proposed to be purchased lies.

FIRING AREA

*Resolved*, That we oppose the establishment of an impact area for the firing of missiles in the area around Fort Sill, Okla., since this project will make necessary the removal of a large number of families from their homes and the taking of a large area of good farmland out of production; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we urge that the facilities at Fort Sill be expanded as a preliminary training base, similar to the Navy's using inland training bases, and that long-range firing be done elsewhere, thus conserving this productive farm area and providing for the expansion of Fort Sill at the same time.

DEER REDUCTION

Whereas the Nevada and Montana Fish and Game Commissions, through extensive study and control, have reduced deer herds in order to keep them in balance with available forage and at the same time not cause an imbalance between permitted livestock and available forage: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we petition the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to cause this practice to be applied on all Federal lands under their respective management.

WATER RIGHTS

Whereas for nearly a century it has been the settled rule that western water rights are dependent on and determined by State law; and

Whereas since the 1866 Congress has recognized such sovereign rights; and

Whereas said State water rights are now in jeopardy because of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pelton Dam case: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we urge Congress to pass S. 863, which would by law reaffirm the rights of the States to control, supervise, and adjudicate their water.

TRADE PRACTICES IN MEATPACKING

*Be it resolved*, That the American National Cattlemen's Association reaffirms its action to provide adequate enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act within the Department of Agriculture and legislation to strengthen the provisions of this act with regard to unfair trade practices; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the principles involved in the present Cooley-Hill bill, H. R. 9020, be endorsed.

RAIL RATES

*Be it resolved*, That it be the policy of the American National Cattlemen's Association to do everything possible to restore the relationship of rail rates between fresh meats and packinghouse products on one hand and livestock on the other, westbound, existing prior to August 15, 1957.

RECERTIFICATION IN BANG'S DISEASE

*Be it resolved*, That the American National Cattlemen's Association recommend that the

animal disease branch of the Department of Agriculture be urged to adopt in its provisions for recertification of modified certified brucellosis-free areas the following optional procedure:

A ranch shall be eligible for recertification when all cattle have been officially calfhood vaccinated and all heifer calves in the future are 100 percent officially calfhood vaccinated or spayed.

BRAND AND THEFT

*Resolved*, That the Federal statute be so amended, so that, in all areas where the Federal Government has jurisdiction over criminal law, the theft of any cow, calf, horse, sheep, or goat, or any other species of domestic livestock, be punishable by imprisonment in the Federal penitentiary.

FUNDS FOR RESEARCH

Whereas reliable sources have repeatedly been quoted in the press to the effect that cuts in the national budget for agriculture may be necessary to finance the defense effort; and

Whereas a healthy, independent agriculture that could exist without subsidies is dependent on more efficient production and expanded markets; and

Whereas such a situation can be developed only through intensive and well-planned research: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we vigorously recommend not only that there be no cuts in appropriations for agricultural research in any field but that such appropriations be increased, to the end that agriculture may be less dependent on subsidies.

CATTLE REPORTS

Whereas the reports of cattle-on-feed and calf-crops issued by the Department of Agriculture are of particular value as a service to the beef cattle industry, and

Whereas the Department has indicated its willingness to extend and improve the requested reports and services as indicated below, if funds are made available:

Expansion of quarterly on feed estimates to 13 additional States: Idaho, Michigan, Wisconsin, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Washington, Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, and Oregon.

Expansion of the tabulation of beef steer and heifers sold out of first hands by grades and by States of origin, at seven additional markets as listed below: South St. Paul, Sioux Falls, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Indianapolis, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, and Cincinnati.

Preparation and publication of a monthly report bringing together data on marketings, in shipments, range and pasture conditions, feed prospects, current prices, etc.

Expansion of cattle on feed estimates in California and Arizona to a monthly basis for a trial period of 1 year.

Expansion of January 1 cattle on feed estimates to 6 additional States. This would include the following States: Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, and Alabama: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American National Cattlemen's Association lend its full support to actuating plans for this improved and extended livestock reporting.

WESTERN MARKET OUTLOOK

Whereas the Western Livestock Marketing Research Committee has recently conducted a successful experiment in market and outlook reporting through publication of a weekly and monthly "Western Livestock Round-Up"; and

Whereas this publication, if continued, would be of great service to cattlemen and livestock men generally; and

Whereas it does not duplicate any publication now in the field: Be it

*Resolved*, That this association commends the effort to report better market and outlook information in the western States and urges continuance of weekly and monthly publications, modeled on the experimental "Western Livestock Round-Up"; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; O. V. Wells, Director, Agriculture Marketing Service, Washington, D. C., and Mr. Harold Abel, of the Western Livestock Marketing Research Committee, Denver, Colo.

BEEF QUOTATIONS

Whereas wholesale dressed beef quotations are of considerable importance to those engaged in the livestock industry; and

Whereas carcass beef quotations are restricted to a limited number of markets at the present time; and

Whereas expansion of such reporting facilities would be advantageous to producers in other areas by keeping them better informed on marketing trends: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the American National Cattlemen's Association makes recommendations that wholesale carcass beef quotations be expanded to include reports on the Denver and Omaha markets, and further suggest that should such a service be delayed due to the inability of obtaining funds that the Research Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the USDA be approached to see if such a project might be incorporated into their branch of an experimental basis.

LIVESTOCK QUESTIONNAIRES

Whereas the administration and field personnel of the United States Department of Agriculture have demonstrated unusual cooperation and dedication in securing, assimilating and disseminating livestock market information and other facts on livestock numbers, information invaluable to proper conduct of an industry in a free economy; and

Whereas the cooperation of producers and feeders is necessary to make these reports fully effective: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That all stockmen be urged to give serious attention and prompt reply to all livestock questionnaires issued by the Department.

1958 ADDITIONAL BRUCELLOSIS FUNDS

Whereas this association has been informed that not all funds made available by Congress for brucellosis eradication for fiscal year 1958 have been used; and

Whereas it has come to our attention that several States need and have requested additional funds which were denied; and

Whereas the expenditure this year is at the same level as fiscal year 1957 which has proved to be inadequate to meet the urgent need for the program for fiscal year 1958; and

Whereas a sound need for additional funds to carry program now under way exists: Be it

*Resolved*, That this association urge the Department of Agriculture to allocate from funds made available by Congress for brucellosis eradication such funds as may be needed to adequately support the program now under way.

BRUCELLOSIS FUNDS FOR 1959

Whereas brucellosis of cattle is a disease of great economic importance to the livestock industry of this country; and

Whereas great gains in eradicating the disease in cattle have been made under the accelerated program in the last 4 years; and

Whereas there is an essential need for continuing the national program; and

Whereas the great amount of work remaining to be done and with the confidence and support of States and farm and livestock organizations: Be it

*Resolved*, That this Association urge Congress to appropriate sufficient funds for brucellosis eradication for each of the fiscal years 1959 and 1960, which is the same amount as was available to the Department for such purpose the last 2 years.

ACTION ON PENDING LEGISLATION BILL S. 2192 (THYE)

Whereas because of the enormous trade and travel with foreign countries where dangerous animal disease, not found in this country, abounds; and

Whereas the problem of rabies in livestock is a matter of increasing concern of livestockmen because of danger of spread from wildlife: Be it

*Resolved*, That this association recommend enactment of bill S. 2192, which would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to (1) protect against importation of foreign animal diseases, (2) take immediate action for the eradication of dangerous diseases, such as foot-and-mouth disease in case of an extraordinary emergency, and (3) cooperate with the States in the control and eradication of communicable diseases such as rabies of livestock.

---

## THE PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURE MESSAGE—SUMMARIES OF RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, today President Eisenhower's agriculture message has been presented to Congress. It is fitting that the views of Minnesota farm organizations also be brought to the attention of the Congress.

In the January issue the Minnesota Farmer presented summarized versions of resolutions which were adopted by the Minnesota Grange, the Minnesota Farmer's Union, and the Minnesota Farm Bureau in their conventions last fall. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these summaries be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks and that they be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration.

There being no objection, the summaries were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MINNESOTA FARM ORGANIZATIONS RESOLVE

THE MINNESOTA GRANGE

(By William B. Pearson, master)

The grange rejects both Government-managed pricing and completely free markets as acceptable solutions to overproduction and underpricing of farm products. It asks for self-help programs to be developed to meet farm needs commodity by commodity.

It suggests that if, for the protection or convenience of consumers, it appears desirable to have ample supplies of farm products at all times to avoid the risk of shortages, then consumers should share the cost for such protection and convenience. Agriculture has neither the moral nor the economic responsibility to protect consumers against shortages when such protection entails disproportionate risk or loss on the part of producers.

Farmers have been—and are—subsidizing consumers of America. If farmers had received parity since the Korean war, consumers would have paid many billions of dollars more for food and clothing. Instead of sharing in the overall price increase prevalent throughout the economy, farmers have actually been receiving less. If farm commodity prices had gone up at the same rate as other cost-of-living items since the Korean war, food and clothing would now be about 15 percent higher.

Primary emphasis should be placed on farmer-managed self-help programs and the Government should be asked to do for farmers only those things which they cannot do equally well for themselves.

Managed marketing of farm commodities, with the help of the Government, is essential to economic survival of agriculture in the years ahead. Managed marketing to enhance producer income is greatly to be preferred to that dubious freedom whose chief characteristics could well be economic poverty and progressive loss of human dignity.

Acreage allotments have proved largely ineffective in bringing production into balance with demand. Adoption of marketing controls is urged. Unless effective ways can be devised to limit the volume of farm produce going to market, the prospect of the future is that available supply will consistently exceed effective demand. In such a situation prices would almost certainly be depressed and a progressive reduction in net farm income could scarcely be avoided.

Acreage reserve program, in its present form, is of extremely questionable value and should be considerably modified if not completely overhauled.

It favors the general principle of cross compliance which would prevent a farmer who places one farm into the soil bank or under allotments and then plants another farm without regard to any crop restrictions.

It endorses a self-help dairy program providing a base and surplus plan whereby that portion of a producer's production, moving directly into consumption, would be supported at a minimum of 90 percent of parity. A tax on all milk sold from farms plus an assessment on the surplus portion would raise funds to make the program self-supporting. This program would be run by producers through a dairy stabilization board, with its members nominated by producers.

An act by the Minnesota Legislature which shall compel the use of milkhouses by all producers of whole milk, within 4 years from date of enactment of law; said act shall include the minimum requirements for a milkhouse.

THE MINNESOTA FARMER'S UNION

(E. H. Christianson, president)

Farmers cannot achieve parity of income in the normal free market, regardless of the supply and demand situation * * * because they, individually, do not have any effective bargaining power on the prices they receive for their products.

Federal farm price supports are a means by which the Government can intervene in the market on behalf of farmers to give them some of the bargaining power which they do not have in the free market.

There are two ways in which price support measures can do this: Through establishing a price floor under farm commodities; and by giving the farmers the legal mechanism by which they can avoid the marketing of price-depressed oversupplies.

We recommend that production or marketing controls, when authorized by vote of producers, should be placed in effect in response to a price condition rather than in response to a supply condition as at present. We believe that controls should be available on a standby basis and, for example, should go into effect wherever prices on a commodity threaten to drop below 90 percent of parity.

The Government should make the support loans or direct payments to farmers conditional upon their staying within marketing quotas or acreage allotments.

We recommend that all farm programs should be contained in one comprehensive package farm bill, with various sections tailored, as necessary, to fit the separate commodities.

Congress should establish price supports on the basic commodities wheat and corn and the feed grains at not less than 100 percent of parity. Variations in the support rates should be authorized to take into account the proper feed value relationship of corn and the other feed crops.

We recommend that the soil-bank acreage reserve should be discontinued after 1958 and that the emphasis of the soil bank be placed on a permanent conservation-reserve type of program.

Payments under the soil-bank conservation reserve should not exceed $5,000 in any one year to any one individual, regardless of the number of farms in which he may have an interest.

A national minimum corn acreage allotment of 51 million acres should be established for producers in the commercial corn area.

County allotments should be made on the basis of recent crop history. Within the county, allotments should be divided on the basis of tillable acres, with a reasonable minimum allotment assured for each producer. For this purpose we suggest that 60 percent of the county allotment be divided equally among all producers who wish to raise corn, the balance of 40 percent to be divided among producers on the basis of tillable acres.

Congress should direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take action to provide full parity returns to producers of all major perishable products.

The most effective means of supporting products, which are not readily storable for long periods of time, is through direct payments to farmers. Under this method, the producer is reimbursed for the difference between the market price and the support level.

We recommend that the programs be financed in part through a processing tax and import levies, such as is the case on sugar and partly the case on wool. We do not believe that the programs should be producer-financed. So-called self-help plans are a delusion. The net return to the farmer under such a program would be even less than under present support programs.

Because of the rapid development of new phases of agriculture, we recommend that Congress investigate and, if necessary, hold public hearings in various parts of the country on the development and dangers of contract farming and vertical integration.

THE MINNESOTA FARM BUREAU

(C. W. Myers, president)

We believe in a high income for farmers.

We believe that the future of farming depends on its being a free competitive enterprise, each farm producing that which it is best suited for, and receiving the price for its products in the marketplace, regulated by supply and demand and with as few regulations as necessary to meet the sanitary and quality requirements.

Price support programs that have a tendency to encourage an increase in production without developing a corresponding increase in market demand can be of little lasting benefit to agriculture.

Programs that require acreage reduction and provide price supports on certain crops, with no restriction on the use of the retired acreage, will not result in any reduced production.

We believe efforts spent on research to expand markets and uses of farm products will be much more effective than many of the programs now in effect.

We believe a soil-bank program properly developed and properly administered will be of great help.

An overall feed-crop allotment for a farm rather than separate allotments for various food crops would have more appeal to the average producer of feed crops and, by attracting more compliance, would be more effective in reducing total feed production.

We believe Public Law 480 has aided greatly in disposing of surplus agricultural products and should be extended.

We are in favor of commodity loans at a realistic level as an aid to orderly marketing, and we favor more use of on-the-farm storage.

We urge that a study of the use of tillable acres instead of or in conjunction with crop history as a basis for setting crop allotments be made.

We are opposed to compensatory payments.

We recommend that the president of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation appoint a committee of about 10 people to study, review, and make recommendations to our next year's resolution committee as to the best way for farmers to administer their own program with the ultimate goal being to get the Government out of the farm program.

We believe that the agencies supervised by the Farm Credit Administration will adequately meet the credit needs of farmers.

Farmers throughout the State and Nation have a common interest that transcends all commodity interests. It is a dependable, understanding source of credit. Credit should be extended with prudence in times of prosperity and in sympathetic understanding in times of stress.

We urge continued support of the Farm Credit Administration and its three branches, the Federal Land Bank, Production Credit Associations, and Bank for Cooperatives.

We further recommend that Farm Home Administration be used and highly recommended to young farmers whose limited borrowing collateral makes it hard for them to start farming without an agency of this kind.

All feed is bought and sold on a hundredweight basis while grains are bought and sold on a bushel basis, resulting in unnecessary paperwork in converting one to another, an inconvenience to all concerned. We favor shifting from a bushel to a hundredweight basis of measurement in the buying and selling of corn as is now used in sorghum as a trial the first year and, if the result is favorable, the rest of the grains follow the second year.

We are in favor of strengthening pure seed and feed laws. Regulation governing marketing grains could be stricter to keep export grains free of trash; therefore our grains would be better able to meet the competition of foreign grains.

We urge support and passage of a National Milk Sanitation Act which will set up Federal grades for milk that will allow all milk meeting Federal standards to move interstate.

## RESOLUTION OF SUFFOLK COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION ENDORSING SENATE BILL 1165

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Suffolk County Bar Association of New York, which resolution endorses Senate bill 1165, to provide additional pay and promotion for members of the legal profession serving with the armed services.

The resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SUFFOLK COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States Senate bill 1165, which provides for additional pay and promotion for members of the legal profession serving with the armed services in a legal capacity, bringing the pay and promotion status of military lawyers to a level commensurate with the special professional pay and promotion schedule now available

to members of the medical and other learned professions serving with the military; and

Whereas it is the sense of this association that lawyers should receive such commensurate compensation and rank for their professional training and skill are certainly as valuable to the Armed Forces as those of the other learned professions; that the armed services are having great difficulty in procuring and retaining even a minimum of military lawyers, and that if they are unable to do so, it will be impossible to administer properly the present Uniform Code of Military Justice; that said code was made the basis of military justice largely through the efforts of civilian lawyers, and that we therefore have a responsibility to insure its successful operation; and that, finally, this bar has a peculiar interest in and knowledge of the needs and problems of the armed services: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this bar association endorses Senate bill 1165, and urges upon the Congress of the United States its passage, and the secretary be and he is directed to send copies of this resolution to the Members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate from this State, and to the American Bar Association.

## RESOLUTION OF AMERICANISM COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION, NASSAU COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Americanism committee, the American Legion, of Nassau County, N. Y., renewing its appreciation to the Un-American Activities Committee and its individual members, and commending the committee for its devotion to the duty it has undertaken.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF AMERICANISM COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION OF NASSAU COUNTY

Whereas the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress since its inception has rendered incaluable patriotic service in exposing and recommending legislation against Nazi, Fascist, and Communist activities in the United States; and

Whereas this dedicated committee, and its individual members, have long been subjected to incessant scandalous and scurrilous attacks from sources closely affiliated or connected with groups opposed to our form of government; and

Whereas this said committee continues to serve diligently protecting our country from internal and foreign enemies and their dangerous ideologies: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the American Legion of Nassau County is desirous of renewing its appreciation to the Un-American Activities Committee and its individual members and commends its devotion to the duty it has undertaken; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Congressmen and that the resolution be forwarded to the executive committee of the Department of New York, the American Legion, and if the same be favorably received, that the resolution be forwarded to the national executive committee, the American Legion, for its consideration and further action.

## RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MANDAN, N. DAK.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of adverse publicity concerning many public works projects, particularly those which have been such a big help in our Western States and have contributed so immensely to the overall wealth and opportunity in our Nation. The Chamber of Commerce in Mandan, N. Dak., a very fine organization, has taken exception to an article, entitled "The Case Against Reclamation" which appeared in a recent issue of the Nation's Business.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Mandan Chamber of Commerce be printed in the RECORD. I believe it will be of great interest to Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a recent issue of the Nation's Business carried an article, entitled "The Case Against Reclamation," which can be detrimental to the construction of future reclamation projects in 17 Western States; and

Whereas we in North Dakota are dependent on the future development of the Garrison Diversion project to maintain and stabilize our production; and

Whereas we know that reclamation projects in the 17 western reclamation States will repay to the Government the full costs of reclamation projects already in operation; and

Whereas we in North Dakota have every reason to believe that our people will repay to the Government the total cost of the project in the same manner that other projects are repaid: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of Mandan, N. Dak.*, That the Nation's Business examine the repayment record of the existing reclamation projects and publish an article entitled "The Case for Reclamation"; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our Congressional delegation and to Mr. Richard W. Smith, manager, Natural Resources Department, United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

## SEVENTH-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I submit a resolution on behalf of myself, the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 220), as follows:

Whereas Thursday, January 16, 1958, will mark the 75th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act which signaled an end to the "spoils system" and marked the beginning of the competitive civil service that today embraces a career work force of more than 2 million employees; and

Whereas a competent career service is a foundation of good government, an informed citizenry, the lifeblood of our democracy; and

Whereas the Government's ability to attract and retain well-qualified people for the Federal work force depends upon an informed public opinion—upon public knowledge and understanding of the career civil service and its place in our democracy; and

Whereas it is advisable to focus public attention on the Federal service and on the achievements of career civil servants in behalf of the people they serve; and

Whereas the position of world leadership assumed by the United States underscores the need for public understanding of the responsibilities of the Government and of the career service through which vital programs authorized by the Congress are carried out: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate reaffirms its belief in the merit system principle for Government employment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on proceeding to the consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, do I understand the resolution is being submitted by the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator from Kansas agree to a slight change of one word? During the reading of it I heard the words "the lifeblood of our democracy." I suggest that the word "democracy" should be changed to "republic," because we are not a democracy.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Kansas wishes to state that the resolution was presented on behalf of the majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairman of the Civil Service and Post Office Committee. I sincerely hope the resolution will be approved as read. I have no objection to the suggestion made.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator from South Carolina object to changing the word "democracy" to "republic"?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I see no reason——

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the resolution is needed, but I am getting tired of hearing our Republic called a democracy. I should like to hear it called what our basic Constitution calls it. Will the Senator agree to the change I have suggested?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it would be nice if the language read "democratic republic."

Mr. GOLDWATER. All I am asking is whether the Senator will agree to changing the word to that contained in the Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have no objection if the Senator from Kansas has none.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not see why the Senator from Arizona should take umbrage at the fact that the United States is called a democracy, and not a republic. I think the suggestion offered by the Senator from South Carolina is appropriate, that the reference should be to a democratic republic,

and I am willing that the word "democratic" be spelled with a small "d" rather than a capital "d."

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona has no objection to the term used by the Senator from Illinois, because the Senator believes we are a democratic republic; but I think we ought to use the language of the Constitution, and the words "democratic" or "democracy" appear nowhere in that cherished document. I should like to see the Members of this body use the constitutional language as often as we can. I think the word used should be "republic" rather than the word "democracy," which has been in use only since the time of Woodrow Wilson in 1917.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Arizona has modified his amendment so that the resolution would read "a democratic republic," with "democratic" spelled with a small "d"?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona would be very happy to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois. I have no objection to the word "democratic" appearing, so long as the words of the Constitution are in the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think if the resolution were worded "democratic republic" it would carry out exactly what the United States is, for we are not a democratic nation, and we all realize that. Not everything is left entirely to the people. The republic comes into consideration also. That being so, I think the two words would signify and make known to the people exactly what this Nation is at the present time under our present Constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; without amendment:

S. Res. 208. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate certain specific matters under its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1176); and

S. Res. 210. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ a temporary additional clerical assistant (Rept. No. 1177) to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration (without amendment):

S. Res. 212. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the common defense (Rept. No. 1174).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration (with an amendment):

S. Res. 209. Resolution to investigate the problems of American Small and Independent Business (Rept. No. 1173); and

S. Res. 213. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make certain expenditures and employ additional assistants and consultants (Rept. No. 1175).

## ELEANOR J. KEEFER

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 226), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eleanor J. Keefer, widow of John A. Keefer, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 7 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## HESTER SCOTT WAILES AND MARY SCOTT GLASS

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 227), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Hester Scott Wailes and Mary Scott Glass, sisters of Louise S. Joubert, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to 5¾ months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## LUSANNAH CLARK RICHARDS

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 228), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lusannah Clark Richards, mother of Harriet C. Richards, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 229), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Minerals, materials, and fuels;

(2) Irrigation, reclamation, and power development;

(3) Public lands;

(4) Indians;

(5) Territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select 1 person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $180,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 230), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res.

231), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) Clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) Improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws;

(3) Supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $365,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## FURTHER STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT AND THE WAR CLAIMS ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 232), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and also the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider bills affecting said acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW AND MATTERS RELATING TO ESPIONAGE

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 233), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $209,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4 Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATON

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 235), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, informa-

tion, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 236), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 237), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 238), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the improvement and strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code, including ways and means of improving Federal law enforcement and administration of justice in United States courts through changes in and additions to existing laws and procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $45,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS ARISING BY ESCAPE OF CERTAIN REFUGEES

Mr. KEFAUVER (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 239), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems in certain Western European nations, and in certain Near Eastern, Middle Eastern, and Far Eastern countries, created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBERS AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 240), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ two additional professional staff members and two additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (a), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

## TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS — INCREASED EXPENDITURES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original

resolution (S. Res. 241), and submitted a report (No. 1179) thereon, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations (authorized by S. Res. 93 of the 84th Cong., 1st sess., agreed to July 25, 1955, and extended from time to time) is hereby authorized, under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to continue the functions authorized by Senate Resolution 93, agreed to July 25, 1955, only through July 31, 1956, at which time its records, duties, and functions shall be assumed by the Committee on Foreign Relations which shall give special attention to the subject of disarmament in such manner as the committee may determine.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the Committee on Foreign Relations, from February 1, 1956, through July 31, 1956, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the Committee on Foreign Relations under this resolution, which shall not exceed $34,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1172)

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Joint Committee on Defense Production, submitted the annual report on the activities of that joint committee, together with materials on national defense production, which was ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ENTITLED "INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTY PROGRAM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT NO. 1178)

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted a report entitled "Informational Media Guaranty Program," which was ordered to be printed.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Robert M. McKinney, of New Mexico, to be representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Finance:

Julian B. Baird, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs;

Tom B. Coughran, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury;

A. Gilmore Flues, of Ohio, to be an Assistant of the Treasury; and

Sumner G. Whittier, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MCNAMARA, and Mr. CHURCH):

S. 2998. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 2999. A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1953, creating the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 3000. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide for an accelerated atomic-power program, to accelerate the development of controlled thermonuclear processes, to accelerate the development of nuclear propulsion for rockets, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 3001. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, for the purpose of prohibiting compulsory unionism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3002. A bill to extend the special milk program for an additional 2 year period; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3003. A bill for the relief of Clara V. Samec; and

S. 3004. A bill for the relief of Joanna Strutynska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3005. A bill to provide benefits established by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to persons who graduated from Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps training in 1954 and served on active duty for training in the Air National Guard before February 1, 1955; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the first and last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 3006. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat of imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3007. A bill for the relief of Katina Leckas and Argery Leckas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3008. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit, under certain conditions, the extension of coverage by the insurance system established by such title to policemen and firemen of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3009. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to accord Korean war veterans equal naturalization privileges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3010. A bill for the relief of Jose Mararac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3011. A bill to provide for an effective system of personnel administration for the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 3012. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees of navy yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 3013. A bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3014. A bill for the relief of St. John's McNamara Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3015. A bill to permit the payment of dependency allotments authorized by the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to certain persons performing active duty for training with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3016. A bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates; and

S. 3017. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities at the request of public or private parties at the expense of the requesting party and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 3018. A bill for the relief of Kurt Weydemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3019. A bill for the relief of Herta Wilmersdoerfer;

S. 3020. A bill for the relief of Ramon Escarra y Vasquez;

S. 3021. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Wojczul;

S. 3022. A bill for the relief of Pilar Diez Castello; and

S. 3023. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3024. A bill for the relief of Federico Luss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3025. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 632), relating to the rehabilitation and preservation of historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes; and

S. 3026. A bill to repeal the Federal Explosives Act (55 Stat. 863); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3027. A bill for the relief of the late Richard A. Steinacker; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3028. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Cseri;

S. 3029. A bill for the relief of Peter E. Dietrich; and

S. 3030. A bill for the relief of Mineard Stolz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3031. A bill for the relief of Joseph Daniel Maeda Betterley (Toshikazu Maeda); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 3032. A bill to extend the Federal Tort Claims Act to members of the National Guard when engaged in training or duty under Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3033. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Highway Act to permit the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse the States for the United States pro rata share of the value of materials stockpiled in the vicinity of Federal-aid highway projects for use in the construction or reconstruction work involved in such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3034. A bill to authorize the training of employees of the United States Department of the Interior at public or private facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 3035. A bill to amend section 1231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to property used in the trade or business and involuntary conversions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3036. A bill to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (20 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city;

S. 3037. A bill for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr; and

S. 3038. A bill to make the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act applicable to certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. THYE):

S. 3039. A bill amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3040. A bill to permit certain alien spouses of members of the Armed Forces to reenter the United States without payment of visa fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 3041. A bill to provide for assisting the States in the improvement and control of certain areas adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 3042. A bill for the relief of Miss Allegra Azoux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3043. A bill to provide certain benefits for Government employees employed as firefighters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3044. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide certain safeguards against the misuse of the funds of labor organizations;

S. 3045. A bill to strengthen democratic processes and procedures in elections of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes;

S. 3046. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to deny the benefits of such act to labor organizations having officers who have been convicted of certain offenses; and

S. 3047. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair-labor practice to engage in picketing unless authorized by a certain percentage of the employees of the employer whose premises are being picketed; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3048. A bill to deny income-tax exemption to labor organizations which participate in, or intervene in, political campaigns on behalf of candidates for public office; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. BRICKER):

S. 3049. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HICKENLOOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 3050. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (by request):

S. 3051. A bill to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3052. A bill to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 3053. A bill for the relief of Nettie L. Richard, Florence L. Morris, Tessie L. Marx, and Helen L. Levi; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3054. A bill for the relief of Kraemer Mills, Inc.; and

S. 3055. A bill for the relief of Ronald H. Denison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3056. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for Mr. NEELY) (by request):

S. 3057. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955;

S. 3058. A bill to amend the act regulating the bringing of actions for damages against the District of Columbia, approved February 28, 1933; and

S. 3059. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3060. A bill for the relief of Romulo A. Manriques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution requiring that the design for the United States Air Force Academy chapel be approved by the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services before appropriated funds are expended for the construction of such chapel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income to a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the power of the States and their political subdivisions to tax the salaries and wages of persons who are not domiciliaries or residents thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ISRAEL'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution. A similar concurrent resolution will be submitted in the other body today, commending and congratulating the new State of Israel on its 10th anniversary of independence.

On its 10th anniversary Israel has reached a historic point in its development as a free, democratic nation. From infancy and danger, it has grown to strong, stalwart independence—a showcase of the free world in the vital Near

East area. Friendship and close ties between Israel and the United States are built upon a parallel history of pioneer development in which both peoples showed much heroism together with a common dedication to the principles of democracy, the dignity of the individual and lasting peace with honor.

The Congress since 1922 has supported the creation of the Jewish national home and now the United States and Israel are both working for social and economic development in the Middle East and the promotion of peace. It is therefore most fitting that Congress take the initiative in recognizing the friendly and long-standing ties of our country with Israel by adopting the commemorative resolution I am today introducing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56), submitted by Mr. JAVITS, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas it is the high tradition of the United States to encourage the establishment and maintenance of independent, self-governing, free nations in the world; and

Whereas the State of Israel was created as an independent nation by declaration of the United Nations; and

Whereas the United States was the first of the family of nations to extend diplomatic recognition to the State of Israel; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States since 1922 has supported the creation of a Jewish homeland, now the State of Israel; and

Whereas, the United States and Israel are working together for economic development and the promotion of peace in a vital and strategic area of the free world; and

Whereas the State of Israel will mark the 10th anniversary of its independence on April 24, 1959: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States extend its most cordial greetings to the people of Israel and their Government on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of their national independence in recognition of the democratic ideals held in common by the United States and Israel and in reaffirmation of the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Israel; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the President is hereby requested to appoint a United States delegation at the appropriate time to represent the United States at ceremonies marking the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel.

## ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution pertaining to the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems as authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 172, agreed to August 29, 1957, is hereby authorized to make expenditures from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, which shall not exceed $80,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

## CONTINUATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT FIELD—INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 221), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the select committee, authorized and directed to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities, established by Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, 1st session, agreed to January 30, 1957, as amended by Senate Resolution 88 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, agreed to February 7, 1957, is hereby continued. Any vacancy in the select committee so continued shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments were made under section 2 of Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, 1st session, as amended.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the select committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized, as it may deem necessary and appropriate to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and further with the consent of other committees or subcommittees, to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of Senate Resolution, 85th Congress, as amended, the select committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959, on which date the select committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, as amended, expenses of the select committee, under this resolution, shall not exceed $500,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the committee.

## INCREASED EXPENDITURES BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 222), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the amount authorized in Senate Resolution 74, agreed to January 30, 1957, and Senate Resolution 186, agreed to August 26, 1957, 85th Congress (authorizing and directing the committee to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities), is hereby increased by the additional amount of $20,000.

## ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES AND PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN ACTS BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 223), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $200,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS UNDER ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 224), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Interstate commerce generally;
(2) Foreign commerce generally;
(3) Maritime matters;

(4) Interoceanic canals;
(5) Transportation policy;
(6) Domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
(7) Communications;
(8) Federal power matters;
(9) Civil aeronautics; and
(10) Fisheries and wildlife.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed , shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## STUDY OF CRITICAL AND STRATEGIC RAW MATERIALS AND RESOURCES OF EASTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 225), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

*Resolved*, That S. Res. 78, 85th Congress, agreed to May 20, 1957 (authorizing and directing a study of critical and strategic raw materials and resources of the Eastern Hemisphere), is amended by striking out "January 31, 1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1959".

(See additional resolutions printed in full which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the special milk program for an additional 2 years.

Mr. President, this is the legislation in which milk is provided for children in our schools and nonprofit institutions and nonprofit summer camps. It expires at the end of this fiscal year, unless extended. I should like to see this valuable program made permanent, but feel the very minimum we should do is to continue it another 2 years. I understand the administration will concur in the 2-year extension.

Mr President, this is a program created by Congress itself—not by the Department of Agriculture. In 1954, after Secretary Benson pulled the rug out from under dairy farmers by drastically lowering support levels, we authorized use of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to increase milk consumption by children in schools. In 1956, we extended the school milk program and, under legislation I introduced, broadened the program to provide as well for children in nonprofit child-care institutions and summer camps. The language now authorizes the program for children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under—not restricting it to public schools—and also covers children in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

It has meant a great deal to better nutrition for youngsters, and a great deal for the dairy industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement issued by the Department of Agriculture explaining how the special milk program is used for summer camps and similar child-care institutions, with which some of our colleagues may not be as familiar as they are with the school program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR SUMMER CAMPS AND SIMILAR CHILD-CARE INSTITUTIONS

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

The United States Department of Agriculture is interested in making more milk available to more children.

As a part of this effort, in 1954 the Congress authorized the Department to use funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to increase milk consumption by children in schools. In July 1956, the Congress expanded the program to include nonprofit child-care institutions and nonprofit summer camps for children.

This pamphlet tells how the program operates in summer camps and child-care institutions. If you sponsor a nonprofit camp or child-care institution, or if you are interested in one, it will be well worth your while to read this pamphlet carefully. If you can increase the quantity of fluid milk served to children in your institution or camp, you can receive assistance to help you finance the cost of the extra milk served.

SUMMER CAMPS AND INSTITUTIONS

A wide variety of organizations are now included in the special milk program—nonprofit institutions that serve preschool children or children that are not able to attend regular schools. And, of course, it includes institutions, such as neighborhood houses or summer camps, that serve children of school age when schools are not in session.

Summer camps include almost all types of organized activity conducted for children during the summertime. They include nonprofit camps run by boys' and girls' clubs, civic or church groups, and by organizations such as the Boy and Girl Scouts, 4–H Clubs, Campfire Girls, etc. They include the fresh-air camps some organizations sponsor to give underprivileged city youngsters a vacation in the country. They also include organized recreational programs conducted at community playgrounds and parks—whether they are sponsored by the local government, some civic organization, or some other nonprofit sponsor.

WHAT IT MEANS TO YOUR ORGANIZATION

If your organization is eligible to take part in the program, you can receive assistance to help finance the cost of additional milk served to children.

Note carefully that the purpose of the program is to increase milk consumption by children.

Therefore, before you apply for participation, review the kind of milk service you have been providing children and what steps you can take to serve more fluid milk to them.

HERE'S HOW THE PROGRAM WORKS FOR YOU

Because of the wide variety of types of summer camps and institutions operated, there is a correspondingly wide variety of ways in which they can serve milk to children. Therefore, the opportunities to increase milk consumption vary widely. Some camps and institutions sell milk to the children at a specific price per half pint. Others—and this is the more general practice in camps and institutions—charge the children a certain amount by the day, or week, or month, and provide the milk, meals, and all other services as part of that one charge.

How your camp operates determines how the program can help you.

1. If you sell milk as a separately priced item:

The most direct way to increase milk consumption by children—the aim of the special milk program—is to lower the price of milk to them. Therefore, the Department has established a system of reimbursement payments to enable camps and institutions to sell milk to children at a reduced price. They may receive up to 3 cents reimbursement for each half pint of milk they serve to children.

This is the maximum rate. If you sell milk as a separately priced item, the exact amount of reimbursement paid to you depends on the price you pay for the milk, the price at which you sell it to the children, and the cost of handling the milk in your camp or institution. Generally, that handling cost should be 1 cent or less per half pint.

Suppose, for example, milk costs you 6½ cents a half pint. All the costs that are involved in your handling it add up to one-half cent a half pint. If you plan to sell milk to children at 4 cents a half pint, you would be eligible for the maximum reimbursement rate of 3 cents for each half pint sold to children.

At the end of the month, you will file a claim for reimbursement which will report the number of half pints you have sold to children at the reduced price, and the amount of reimbursement that is due you.

2. If milk is provided as part of a complete service:

Many summer camps and institutions do not charge children separately for each half pint they drink. Instead, they find it more practical to combine all services provided, and to charge a set rate per day, or per week, or per month.

If that's your form of operation, here's how the program will work for you.

When you apply for participation, you must show the specific method or plan you will inaugurate to provide your children with more fluid milk. Then a reimbursement rate will be assigned, within the 3-cent maximum, that will reimburse you for the approximate cost of the extra milk served—that is, the milk you serve in addition to what you previously or normally served. However, if you have not previously served any fluid milk to children, you cannot receive more than 3 cents for each half pint served.

Suppose, for example, that you have been serving 2 half pints of milk to each child each day. When you apply for participation, you state that you plan to serve another half pint to each child, making a total of 3 half pints each day. If the milk costs you 6 cents a half pint, it will cost you an additional 6 cents for each child in attendance to serve that extra half pint each day. The reimbursement rate assigned to you will be designed to cover this additional cost.

At the end of each month, you will file your monthly claim for reimbursement. That claim will show how much milk you actually served to children—and how that total compares with what you showed in your application that you planned to serve. If you did not substantially serve as much extra milk as you had planned, your rate of reimbursement will be reduced. You should, however, have little difficulty achieving the increase you plan, if your original planning is done with care.

HOW YOU CAN USE MORE MILK IN YOUR CAMP OR INSTITUTION

The special milk program thus makes it possible to do what you have always wanted to do—to serve more fluid milk to children.

This program is completely flexible and can be adapted to a variety of local uses. It is up to you to decide when and how the extra milk is to be offered to the children. Here are a few suggestions:

You can start serving milk to children, if you have not been doing so. City playgrounds and recreational programs, especially, have an opportunity to increase the use of milk by children in this way.

You can serve fluid whole milk to children at an additional meal—a third meal, for example, if you have been serving it only at two.

You can serve an afternoon or evening pickup snack, with milk.

You can serve extra fluid whole milk at meals—many children can drink more than the usual half pint of milk.

You can (even if you operate on a total-cost system) offer the children opportunity to buy milk at a reduced price, whenever they choose.

You can use fluid whole milk, in place of other beverages you have been offering to children.

HOW TO APPLY TO TAKE PART IN THE PROGRAM

Nationally, the special milk program is administered by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. In most of the States, the program is administered in summer camps and other child-care institutions by the State's educational agency.

Interested sponsors in the following States should make application directly to their State educational agency, at their State capital: California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont, Washington, Wyoming, Alaska.

In a few States, the program is handled for summer camps and child-care institutions by some other State agency. Interested sponsors in the following States should apply to the agency listed:

New York: State Division of Standards and Purchase, Albany, N. Y.

Ohio: State Department of Public Welfare, Columbus, Ohio.

Utah: State of Utah Department of Public Welfare, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Delaware: Delaware State Hospital, Farnhurst, Del.

Tennessee: State Department of Agriculture, Nashville, Tenn.

In other States, the program is handled for summer camps and child-care institutions directly by the United States Department of Agriculture. Interested sponsors in the following States should apply to the Department office listed:

Northeast (Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, West Virginia): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 139 Centre Street, New York 13, N. Y.

Southeast (Alabama, Florida, South Carolina, Virginia): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 50 Seventh Street NE., Atlanta 23, Ga.

Midwest (Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 431 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 5, Ill.

Southwest (Arkansas): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 500 South Ervay Street, Dallas 1, Tex.

Western (Arizona, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Oregon, Hawaii): Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 630 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3002) to extend the special milk program for an additional 2-year period, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF VETERANS' ASSISTANCE ACT TO CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide a remedy for an injustice to a group of young Reserve officers who served on active duty prior to February 1, 1955, but who are precluded by the wording of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 from receiving the same GI bill benefits earned by other young men and women serving in the armed services prior to that date.

About 1,500 young men, graduates of the Air Force ROTC class of 1954, are prevented by a technical error on the part of the Air Force from receiving their just benefits under the GI bill. Because these young men must be given eligibility soon if they are to receive any GI benefits at all, I urge my colleagues to act favorably on this legislation during the present session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from 1st Lt. John T. Mayo, which sets forth the case very well.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *June 28, 1957.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I am writing to you in regards to a problem concerning veterans. Because of your interest in fair play I hope that you can help.

The men of the 1954 AF ROTC class signed a contract with the Air Force in the beginning of their junior year. This contract stated that in turn for satisfactory completion of the ROTC program, they would be given Reserve commissions in the Air Force. However, in the middle of the senior year the Air Force discovered that there were too many potential officers and decided that only those who elected to enter flight training would be given the commission. The others were "allowed" to spend 2 years on active duty as an airman third class, one step above a basic airman. I applied for flight training but was found physically ineligible. Before graduation a change was made in which we could go on active duty with the National Guard as an alternative. If we went on duty with the National Guard, we were not eligible for the GI bill. Thus I find myself in the position where I was on duty in time for the veterans' benefits (Nov. 15, 1954) but unable to receive the benefits because the Air Force broke their contract. The ones who elected the airman third class were awarded their commissions while on active duty, but the National Guard officers weren't given the GI bill. Not all of the National Guard officers were in service in time to get the bill and this may explain why few people are aware of the injustice.

General Kelly stated that the Air Force overprogramed and were forced to make that change. Why should a group of people who gave 2 years of service be hurt because of an Air Force error? Certainly a large company could not operate like that. This is one of the reasons that qualified people are not staying in the service. One has to have faith in an organization to work there.

I sincerely hope that you will be able to help in this problem as I am sure you can see the injustice in it. The serviceman looks toward the Congress for help as his voice is too small to be heard against the mass of the Air Force. I hope you will be able to do something before the opening of the fall semester at college in order that those eligible, myself included, shall be able to receive their benefits. Thanking you for your trouble, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. MAYO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3005) to provide benefits established by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to persons who graduated from Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps training in 1954 and served on active duty for training in the Air National Guard before February 1, 1955, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO THE EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN GAINS FROM GROSS INCOME

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat of imminence of condemnation.

Identical bills are being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representatives ALBERT, EDMONDSON, JARMAN, MORRIS, and STEED. The proposed action would be a long-delayed correction of a gross injustice by the United States Government against certain private property owners.

Mr. President, the need for this legislation has been recently brought home to us by conversations with numerous people in Oklahoma who are facing the possibility of condemnation of farmlands which they have owned, in many cases, since statehood or before. Except for its condemnation for a public pur-

pose, this land would not be for sale at any price, but would remain in these families for generations to come. Much of this land was homesteaded, and the gain for tax purposes will be almost the total value. They will be paid its present value by the Government, but under present law, this fair compensation will then be reduced by a 25-percent tax on the gain—so that the Government will pay them with one hand and take away with the other.

While under present law, a displaced owner can avoid tax on the capital gain by reinvesting in another farm, other farms are difficult, if not impossible, to buy without leaving the area where these people have spent their whole lives. Also, many of these people are getting along in years, and should be permitted to retire, rather than starting over, on the proceeds of the forced sale of their homesteads.

Simple justice requires that the present inequities be corrected by excluding the compensation which they receive from income.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3006) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat of imminence of condemnation, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association and the Fire Fighters Association of Minneapolis have contacted me with a proposal to amend the Social Security Act. I have had this proposal drafted and offer for introduction a bill which would have the effect of setting Minnesota apart insofar as police and firemen retirement systems are concerned and would enable members of these associations to adopt social security coverage by a two-thirds vote of the respective funds requesting such a change.

This proposal has had the unanimous endorsement of the Minnesota Police Pension Council and several firemen's retirement organizations in Minnesota. They have been assured of bipartisan support of the Minnesota Congressional delegation and it pleases me that my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], joins with me in offering this proposal at this time for proper reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3008) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit, under certain conditions, the extension of coverage by the insurance system established by such title to policemen and firemen of the State of Minnesota, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## PROPOSED CITIZENSHIP LEGISLATION FOR VETERANS OF KOREAN WAR

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States has served honorably in an active-duty status in the Armed Forces of the United States during either World War I or World War II, and who, if separated from such service under honorable conditions, may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States.

This same privilege of naturalization is denied to veterans of the Korean war who served in our Armed Forces under honorable conditions. This I think is most unfair and discriminates against veterans of the Korean war. It is only simple justice that veterans of the Korean war receive the same naturalization privileges accorded veterans of World War I and World War II.

Mr. President, I, therefore, introduce proposed legislation to accord Korean war veterans the same naturalization privileges accorded our other war veterans. The only change I propose in the existing statute is to add the following phrase, "or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955."

I believe that this change will be noncontroversial and I hope that my bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration from the Senate Immigration Subcommittee and the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to grant Korean veterans who served honorably in the Armed Forces equal naturalization privileges. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks the text of the bill, together with a letter I recently received from Comdr. Robert K. Fong, of the American Legion, Cathay Post, No. 384, 1524 Powell Street, San Francisco, Calif., in support of this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3009) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to accord Korean war veterans equal naturalization privileges, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended to read as follows: "Any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States, has served honorably in an active-duty status in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States during either World War I or during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 21, 1946, or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized as provided in this section if (1) at the time of enlistment or induction such person shall have been in the United States, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, or Swains Island, whether or not he has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or (2) at any time subsequent to enlistment or induction such person shall have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. The executive department under which such person served shall determine whether persons have served honorably in an active-duty status, and whether separation from such service was under honorable conditions: *Provided, however*, That no person who is or has been separated from such service on account of alienage, or who was a conscientious objector who performed no military, air, or naval duty whatever, or refused to wear the uniform, shall be regarded as having served honorably or having been separated under honorable conditions for the purposes of this section. No period of service in the Armed Forces shall be made the basis of a petition for naturalization under this section if the applicant has previously been naturalized on the basis of the same period of service."

The letter presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

CATHAY POST NO. 384,
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA,
*San Francisco, Calif., January 4, 1958.*

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Best wishes from Cathay Post for a happy new year.

Just a few lines to let you know that the enclosed resolution unanimously passed Cathay Post at its regular meeting on December 3, 1957, and was forwarded to the seventh district, which represents roughly half of the Legion posts in San Francisco. The resolution, in its identical form, also unanimously passed the seventh district, and is being forwarded to the department State convention for its approval in June 1958. If passed at that time, it will be forwarded to the national convention to be held at Chicago, Ill., in September of this year.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars National Commander Houdebush also approved the resolution when he was in San Francisco on December 6, 1957. He forwarded it to Omar Ketchum, VFW legislative director in Washington, D. C., for action.

We have many members who are vitally affected by the subject matter of this resolution. We would like to express our heartfelt thanks to you for your desire to assist us by bringing forth the legislation in question. We have given wide publicity to your proposed action and you have gained the undying friendship of the Chinese communities over the entire Nation.

If there is anything which we can do to assist you in your endeavors, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT K. FONG,
*Commander.*

RESOLUTION TO AMEND SECTION 329 (A) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT TO ACCORD KOREAN WAR VETERANS EQUAL NATURALIZATION PRIVILEGES

Whereas under section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States, has served honorably in an active-duty status in the Armed Forces of the United States during either World War I or World War II, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized; and

Whereas any person who has served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United

States during the Korean war is not accorded the same rights and privileges of naturalization as given to the veterans of World War I or World War II; and

Whereas simple justice requires that Korean war veterans be treated alike, for they fought and died in the same manner as the veterans of World War I or World War II, in the service of their country, in its hour of need; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration treats all veterans alike in passing on their service-incurred disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That (insert your organization's name) exert its wholehearted efforts to enlist support of all for the purpose of amending section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to read as follows:

"Any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States, has served honorably in an active-duty status in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States during either World War I or during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946, or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized as provided in this section."

## SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION FOR THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for an effective system of personnel administration for the executive branch of the Government, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

The bill (S. 3011) to provide for an effective system of personnel administration for the executive branch of the Government, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, 75 years ago today, President Chester A. Arthur signed "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States." This bill had been sponsored by Senator George Pendleton of Ohio. The purpose of the Pendleton Act was to bring integrity and prestige into a governmental service ridden with the chaos of a rampant spoils system that had culminated in the tragedy of the assassination of President Garfield by a disappointed jobseeker.

For three-quarters of a century, the Pendleton Act has been the foundation upon which we have built the great civil service of today. In 1883, 14,000 men and women were covered by civil service. Now, 2 million are covered. They include some of the most skilled and talented people, doing some of the most important and difficult tasks in the world. And, I might add, they are no more adequately appreciated by our people than are our teachers.

The efficiency of the Federal civil service has a direct bearing on the well-being of every American citizen, and on the successful operation of every business. And whether we are able to attract outstanding people into Government service, whether they are inspired to remain and do their best work, will have a great bearing on whether, in a world of danger, America survives.

And so, it is fitting today that while we pay our respects to the Pendleton Act and to the great civil service tradition on their 75th anniversary, we also look to the future and ask whether that act—which is still basically unchanged after 75 years—can be improved.

I think it can. I think it should. I believe that like quite a few other aspects of our Government, the Pendleton Act has become obsolete. I, therefore, introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will repeal that act and substitute for it a modern charter for our civil service which incorporates into law some of what has been learned about personnel administration in 75 years of governmental and business experience, since 1883.

We must remember that the Pendleton Act was, in its conception, an act intended to prevent certain things from happening. It was an act to prevent political favoritism. It was an act to eliminate the spoils system. Accordingly, it was, and is, couched in somewhat negative terms; and it has been administered, almost of necessity, largely in negative terms.

Since 1883, we have learned that personnel management is not merely the prevention of abuses, but the positive accomplishment of certain ends. Every competent executive has not only negative but positive personnel programs—positive programs of recruitment, assignment, training, promotion, and career development, in order to build an organization of high competence and of high morale.

This is one purpose of my bill—to right the balance between the negative and the positive in the basic directive laid down by the Congress for the management of the career service of the Federal Government.

The second purpose of my bill is to recast the structure of personnel management in the Government to make possible the greater emphasis upon positive ideas and positive leadership.

The President, under the Constitution, is responsible for the faithful execution of the laws. He is the chief executive. An integral part of any executive's job is the formulation and establishment of wise personnel policies and programs. To carry out this responsibility in the Federal Government—comprising 2¼ million public servants—the President obviously needs assistance of the highest caliber.

Yet, the agency set up by law as the principal personnel management agency of the Government—the Civil Service Commission—is designed not as an agent and assistant to the President, but as a policeman watching over the President and his subordinates.

A modern corporation has one vice president for personnel responsible to the president, not a three-man directorate independent of him.

The Civil Service Commission has seen the need for positive leadership as well as for policing, and has tried to fill it. But the Commission cannot be 2 agencies, with 2 points of view, at the same time. Meanwhile, of necessity, a unit in the White House dealing with personnel problems has developed, but without benefit of statutory recognition or charter.

The bill which I have introduced would recognize that two kinds of jobs exist by clearly separating these jobs and defining each. It places upon a Director of an Office of Personnel Management, responsible to the President, the duty of assisting the President in establishing personnel programs and providing personnel leadership for the entire career service. At the same time, my bill reaffirms the independence of the Civil Service Commission as a policing agency and directs it to set up a working appeals system that will assure that employees or applicants for employment, in jobs covered by the merit system, will have a hearing on grievances of any kind, including political or personal favoritism. Under this clearly defined responsibility, the Civil Service Commission will carry out more effectively the original basic purpose of the Pendleton Act to protect the merit principle against a reversion to the old spoils system.

The bill I have introduced is based upon a report last year by a special consultant, Mr. James R. Watson, to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I had the honor to serve last year as Chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of that committee and so had occasion to discuss the report with authorities in personnel management, both within and outside the Government. I found that the basic philosophy of the report met with widespread acceptance. The bill draws also upon the ideas of some of these authorities as well as of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee staff, although I do not contend that any of these gentlemen are necessarily in agreement with all of its provisions.

The executive committee of the National Civil Service League, of which Mr. Watson is the executive director, has given general endorsement to this bill. It is interesting to note that this is the same organization that worked with Senator Pendleton 75 years ago in the drafting of his bill. One of its officers, Dorman B. Eaton, became the first president of the United States Civil Service Commission.

We could have no more significant support today than that of this organization, which has been a constant partner to the Government throughout 75 years of civil-service development.

In short, the purpose of the bill is to place in the office of the president, at a top salary, a director of personnel management who shall have the authority to deal with all positive matters of personnel, administration, and procedure, which are the work of the executive vice president in charge of personnel in every well-regulated large corporation, and leaving to the Civil Service Commission the quasi-judicial functions which it now exercises.

## WAGE RATES FOR EMPLOYEES OF NAVY YARDS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees of Navy yards. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3012) relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees of Navy yards, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. PAYNE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The bill I am introducing today would amend the 1862 statute under which the Navy makes wage rate determinations for civilian employees in the naval shipyard so that there would be more flexibility in this determination.

The fact that a certain method of wage determination was equitable some 96 years ago is no indication that the same policy is either equitable or in the public interest today. The need to change the method of wage determination for civilian employees in our shipyards is a pressing one, for the present method is antiquated and downright unjust.

The situation at the Kittery-Portsmouth Navy Yard has brought this problem to my attention. This yard is situated at Kittery, Maine, about 60 miles from the Boston Navy Yard. The employees at this yard, although a relatively short distance away from their fellow workers in Boston, are paid considerably less. For example, under the latest pay rates a laborer at the Kittery yard is paid $1.59 while a laborer doing the same work at the Boston yard is paid $1.83. There is no need to cite further figures, for the percentage difference remains about the same for all blue-collar workers in these yards.

When asked to explain the reason for this differential, the Navy replies that it is required to conform its wages to those prevailing in local private industry. Yet there is no similar private industry in the Kittery area. The closest similar industry would be found in the Boston area. It is in this manner that the "immediate vicinity" criteria fails to operate as it was intended to operate. Is it just and is it in the public interest that men doing the same job less than 60 miles apart are paid at different wage rates?

I have no doubt that when Congress established the present method it was a most equitable system. But this was a policy created in the days of the horse and buggy and it does not apply in the days of rapid transit. The present method punishes men who live a few minutes travel time from fellow shipyard workers, but work in less fortunate yards. The classified services have standardized wage rates throughout government and most civilians employed by the Armed Services have the benefits of civil service, yet the shipyard workers seem to have been forgotten.

The bill which I am introducing today would give to the Secretary of the Navy the power to adjust wage rates is "consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates for persons employed on similar work in private establishments within such geographical area or areas as the Secretary deems appropriate." In eliminating the "immediately vicinity" clause of the 1862 statute we will be bringing it up to date. With the changes that have come about in our modes and convenience of transportation the consideration of "immediate vicinity" has become meaningless.

There is no good reason why the Navy's civilian wage scale should be shackled by restrictive statutory requirements. The elimination of the "immediate vicinity" criteria of the existing statute would give the Navy a more meaningful method of wage determination—one that would be truly in the interests of the workers, the economy, and the public as a whole.

---

## AMENDMENT OF SECTION 605 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO INTERCEPTION OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for myself, and on behalf of Senators IVES, ERVIN, MUNDT, GOLDWATER, and CURTIS, I am introducing a bill amending section 605 of the Federal Communications Act to clarify the rights of State law-enforcement agencies to use wiretaps to uncover evidence of the commission of serious crimes. When it is referred to the Judiciary Committee I will press for its early approval.

The Supreme Court in its recent decision in the Benanti case ruled that wiretap evidence obtained by State officers under authority of State law was inadmissible in the Federal courts. The language of the decision has left a cloud on the right of the States to legally authorize law-enforcement agencies to obtain court warrants to intercept communications in cases where there are reasonable grounds to believe that these agencies would uncover evidence of serious criminal activity.

The Court did not rule on the constitutional questions. Its decision was based solely on an interpretation of the intention of Congress when it passed section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, which declares:

> No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person.

This Court decision has given me much concern over the effect it would have on law enforcement and prosecution of serious crimes.

It is my belief that the Congress never intended to cripple and hamper law-enforcement agencies in their efforts to stamp out crime and punish criminals.

As chairman of the Senate select committee investigating into improper activities in the field of labor and management, and as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am cognizant of the problems facing prosecutions and enforcement agencies in their conscientious efforts to eliminate crime and to punish the criminals, particularly the organized criminal syndicate rings engaged in widespread criminal rackets, such as labor racketeering, narcotics, bribery, and extortion rings.

The detection, investigation, and prosecution of crime, particularly organized crime, will be seriously handicapped and weakened. In many cases, prosecution and investigation of crimes would be completely thwarted and would collapse were wiretapping to be denied to the law-enforcement agencies.

When the select committee launched its investigation into the labor situation in the New York area, it did so, unaware of the extent racketeers had penetrated the teamsters union and certain other branches of organized labor in the Nation's largest city. The committee and I believe, the public was shocked at its revelations.

What was portrayed was a picture of ruthless gangsters led by Johnny Dio and Anthony "Ducks" Corallo joining in an alliance with Jimmy Hoffa to seize control of the transportation industry in the Nation's largest and richest city. The control of this strategic economic area by unscrupulous gangsters presented, and continues to present, a threat to the economic security of this country. For the past 23 years, since the enactment of section 605, there was no question of the right of State authorities to authorize wiretapping to obtain evidence of serious crimes. This conspiracy could not have been presented in such clarity without the use of intercepted telephonic messages which were made available to this committee through permission of the New York State Supreme Court and the offices of the New York County district attorney.

Congress has never intended to permit the criminal to use the means of modern communication with impunity by enjoining law enforcement agencies from intercepting his communications. To accept such interpretation would mean that Congress intended to give criminals free license and encouragement to use communications without fear or handicap and, as pointed out in an editorial in the Evening Star, January 5, 1958, grant these criminals a privileged sanctuary. It is an interpretation that I cannot accept.

In the field of criminal detection and prosecution, the law enforcement agencies are constantly waging a war against criminals who attack society. To do so effectively, it is necessary and essential to intercept their communications.

Many States, such as New York State, have enacted laws to enable their enforcement agencies to intercept communications under proper safeguards and to eliminate the dangers of promiscuous and improper use. In New York, for example, the enforcement agencies must apply to the court of highest original jurisdiction for a warrant to permit the interceptions. This warrant is only granted when the court is satisfied that reasonable grounds exist that evidence of crimes will be obtained as a result of the wiretap.

This bill, sponsored by myself and Senators IVES, ERVIN, MUNDT, GOLDWATER, and CURTIS, is to clarify the effect of section 605 and to assist State law enforcement agencies to give back to the States the right, under proper statutory provisions, to investigate and prosecute criminals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3013) to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State

law, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PAYMENT OF DEPENDENCY ALLOTMENTS TO ENLISTED RESERVISTS PERFORMING ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING WITH THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit the payment of dependency allotments authorized by the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to certain persons performing active duty for training with the Armed Forces.

As Members of the Senate may know, certain members of the Reserve Forces, going into the active forces for training only, are not eligible for the customary dependency allowances for their families at home. These are the dependency allotments in which a portion is contributed by the Government and a portion by the serviceman.

It seems to me grossly unfair that enlisted reservists, who are put on active duty for training, are not allowed to arrange dependency allotments such as are granted to others on active duty in the various services. The Department of the Army in a letter dated November 22, 1957, has said to me that—

> The Department of Defense has recognized that it is inequitable to deny Class Q allotments to the dependents of Reserve and National Guard personnel who are called to active duty for training. Therefore, it has recommended a change in the law to permit such payments.

No change has been made in the law thus far and I am most anxious to see that such a change is made in the interest of fairness to all enlisted persons who go into the Armed Forces.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2015) to permit the payment of dependency allotments authorized by the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to certain persons performing active duty for training with the Armed Forces, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## DEALERS' AIRCRAFT REGISTRATION CERTIFICATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, requesting this proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3016) to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, D. C.*

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the enclosed proposed bill to provide for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates be introduced in the Senate.

This proposed legislation is in the nature of a perfecting amendment to title V of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 521 et seq.), under which this Department provides for the registration of civil aircraft owned by United States citizens and the recordation of documents affecting title to such aircraft.

For over 8 years, this Department has been issuing special purpose dealers' aircraft registration certificates under general authority contained in title V. These certificates, similar to the more familiar automobile dealers' license plates, are issued to aircraft manufacturers, distributors and dealers for 1 year. A dealer's certificate may be used by the holder to operate aircraft for production flight tests, in ordinary trade channels, and for demonstration purposes. This makes it unnecessary for the holder to register each aircraft that he owns in the course of his business during the year. It greatly facilitates the dealers' operations and simplifies the Government's work by eliminating the need for a large number of applications for individual registration of the aircraft held in normal trade channels. The regulations presently governing the issuance and use of dealers' aircraft registration certificates are published as Part 502 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

A special problem has arisen because of certain language contained in section 503 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 523). Under that section, this Department is directed to establish and maintain a system for the recording of title documents affecting civil aircraft of the United States. The term "civil aircraft of the United States" is defined in section 1 (15) of the act to mean "aircraft registered under this act." Our authority to record title documents might thus be considered limited to those affecting registered aircraft.

Where a dealer holds an aircraft under a dealers' aircraft registration certificate, the aircraft itself may not be considered to be registered under the act even though the dealer has been issued a certificate or registration valid for special use of the aircraft under our regulations. Accordingly, although we now place in our records documents received from the public which affect title to aircraft held under dealers' certificates, but not otherwise registered, some doubt exists that the persons who file them are afforded the full benefit of the priority provided in this section for recorded documents. (See footnote 3, 14 C. F. R. 503.3 (a) (4).)

It is important that this priority for recorded liens against aircraft held by manufacturers, distributors, and dealers under dealers' certificates be assured. This industry, like many others involving the sale of relatively high cost articles, requires credit for its operations. Lending institutions are reluctant to advance money against this equipment unless the security of their liens is assured.

The amendment which we propose in the enclosed bill would give specific statutory authority for the issuance of dealers' aircraft registration certificates, and would provide that aircraft held under such certificates would be (to the extent provided in regulations of this Department) "deemed registered under" the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. This would make it possible to insure the validity of liens recorded against such aircraft.

We believe that this bill is highly desirable to facilitate the financing of the operations of aircraft manufacturers, distributors and dealers, and we recommend it to the Congress for early enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that it has no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER WILLIAMS,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

## AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UNDERTAKE CERTAIN ACTIVITIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities at the request of public or private parties at the expense of the requesting party and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by the Department of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3017) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities at the request of public or private parties at the expense of the requesting party and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The Department of Commerce is presently authorized under several statutes to undertake certain activities for private or public organizations or persons and to charge the expense thereof to those requesting the service. Depending upon the type of activity performed and the statute under which performed, this authority may result in the reimbursement of appropriations or the covering of amounts received into the Treasury. Increasing difficulty has been encountered in the administration of these activities under present laws. In those cases where the activity may appropriately be performed under a statute permitting appropriations to be reimbursed, the only problem encountered is in making absolutely certain that the same service cannot be performed by private activities. However, in those cases where the activity can only be performed under a statute which requires that funds received in payment be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury or where receipt of payment is not authorized, the activity can be performed only if it is of a priority which justifies its accomplishment at Government expense. No matter how important the activity may be to the requesting party, it will not be performed unless it is of sufficient value to the public at large to justify its performance in lieu of other authorized activities.

Where the project requested is of critical importance to those affected but cannot be justified for performance with appropriated

funds in view of its relatively low priority, interests desiring the project are often willing to underwrite its cost. Even in those cases, however, the Department cannot undertake the task when the payment could not be used to reimburse the appropriation bearing the expense of the project but would be deposited in miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury. An example of difficulty which arises because the Department is unable to perform such services because it may not receive and use payment therefor is the meteorological work of the Weather Bureau of this Department.

By law the Weather Bureau is directed to take such meteorological observations as may be necessary to establish and record the climatic conditions of the United States. There are many State and local requirements for greater detail and density of observations. When another Federal agency such as the Corps of Engineers, Soil Conservation Service, Bureau of Reclamation, Atomic Energy Commission, etc., requests the observation, it can transfer funds to the Weather Bureau which already has the facilities and know-how for the job. When a State, local or private agency has the requirement, it cannot secure performance directly by the Weather Bureau even though that organization wants to perform.

As a result of this situation, the executive subcommittee of the Pacific Southwest interagency committee at a meeting on January 10, 1956, drafted the following resolution for consideration at the PSIAC meeting on February 29, 1956:

"Whereas at the present time the Department of Commerce has no authority to accept funds from State and private agencies for Weather Bureau activities, and whereas there is a demand for those activities beyond the present ability of the Weather Bureau under funds available through its appropriations, and whereas State and private agencies are at times ready to advance funds to the Weather Bureau for specific purposes; therefore the PSIAC, representing 7 Federal agencies and 8 States, urges in the interests of further cooperation among Federal and State agencies in the field of water resource development, that the IACWR recommend through appropriate channels legislation authorizing the Weather Bureau to accept funds from State and private agencies for work outside the regularly scheduled program of the Weather Bureau."

There is attached a letter from the chairman of the Interagency Committee on Water Resources also urging the enactment of legislation to meet this problem.

Another example of the need for this legislation is found in the services of the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department. In the performance of these services, the ability to negotiate with business for mutual participation has become increasingly important.

Economic research concerning spread of costs from producer to consumer, the study of water supply, technical studies concerning substitutes for critically short materials, are examples of areas in which Business and Defense Services Administration staff can provide service to one or several fields of industry, and for which the industry benefited should and would pay.

The proposed legislation would authorize the Department to undertake such activities at the request and expense of others without sacrificing programs more important to the general welfare.

As a matter of administrative convenience, the legislation repeals certain authorities which would be duplicative of the proposed legislation.

The Department urges early enactment of this legislation which would occasion no increase in budgetary requirements.

## REENTRANCE OF CERTAIN ALIENS WITHOUT PAYMENT OF VISA FEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit certain alien spouses of members of the Armed Forces to reenter the United States without payment of visa fees when they have left the country in order to accompany those to whom they are married when engaged on official business of our country, under official orders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3040) to permit certain alien spouses of members of the Armed Forces to reenter the United States without payment of visa fees, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

## ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN AREAS ADJACENT TO NATIONAL SYSTEM OF DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for assisting the States in the improvement and control of certain areas adjacent to the national system of interstate and defense highways and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be left open for additional sponsors for a period of 48 hours.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 3041) to provide for assisting the States in the improvement and control of certain areas adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to say, Mr. President, that we face the unpleasant prospect of coast-to-coast billboard alleys defacing our highways, unless this Congress takes action. The bill is intended to focus the attention of the Senate Committee on Public Works and of the Senate itself upon this problem early in the present session. It is a proposal to assist the States, rather than to coerce them, and would make travel on our interstate highway system a pleasure instead of a nightmare of neon bulbs and garish sounds.

---

## CORRECTION OF IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR AND MANAGEMENT FIELD—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, out of the investigation made by the Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in the Labor and Management Field, of which I am a member, there have come several salutary actions up to now. There has been court action to punish some of the guilty labor officials. There has been disciplinary action by the unions themselves, in certain areas of activity. There has been disciplinary action by the Ethical Practices Committee of the AFL–CIO against certain erring unions.

I believe the time has come however, for legislative action to be taken by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. It is now time for Congress itself to act. One of the functions of Congress is to investigate such matters, in order to expose evildoing and to bring about punishment; but it is also a function of the Congress to legislate so as to prevent the recurrence of things of the kind which has been exposed by our committee.

We are confronted with the question of what can we do and what we should do to prevent improper activities of these types from happening again and again. It must be remembered that all the improper activities with which we are concerned in this investigation have occurred in the face of existing legislation, now on the statute books. Obviously, something new is needed to prevent them in the future.

So, Mr. President, after talking with a great many persons in this county, in over 20 States; after conferring with the witnesses who have been before our committee; after conferring with some of the most important labor leaders in the county, and with persons both in and out of the Senate, I have prepared a package of five bills which I think should be enacted into law during the current session and which I sincerely believe are vitally needed to correct the types of improper activities thus far called to our attention.

The first of these bills deals with the matter of protecting the integrity of union funds and safeguarding the money a union member has to pay into pension and welfare funds and the money he has to pay in order to remain a member of a union.

In that connection, I make what seems to me to be an appropriate analogy. I think we should treat a union leader with no more or no less suspicion than that with which we treat the president of a national bank. In my opinion we should make it no more difficult or no easier for a union leader to steal or misuse the money of a union than money can be stolen or misused from a national bank by its president.

So I have included in the provisions of the bill the corresponding provisions of the National Banking Act, in order to safeguard the money paid by the union members for their welfare and pension accounts. As an enforcement measure, I include in the bill a provision that unions which fail to follow the provisions of the act shall lose their tax-exempt status.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred, and printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3044) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide certain safeguards against the

misuse of the funds of labor organizations, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(14) The term 'welfare or benefit plan' means any plan, fund, or program administered or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a labor organization, either alone or jointly with one or more other labor organizations or with one or more employers or other persons, for the purpose of paying or providing, for the benefit of members of such labor organization who are employed by an employer in an industry affecting commerce, for medical or hospital care, pensions or annuities on retirement or death of beneficiaries, compensation for injuries or illness, or insurance to provide any of the foregoing, or life insurance, disability and sickness insurance, or accident insurance; but shall not include any plan, fund, or program established by statute to provide benefits established by statute."

SEC. 2. Section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(i) (1) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, after the expiration of 6 months following the date of enactment of this subsection, unless there is on file with the Board a certification by the Comptroller of the Currency that the books and records of such labor organization, the books and records of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit, and the books and records of any welfare or benefit plan administered or controlled by such labor organization (or national or international labor organization), directly or indirectly, either alone or jointly with one or more other labor organizations or one or more employers or other persons, have been examined within the 6-month period preceding the raising of such question or the making of such charge in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, and that none of the assets of any welfare or benefit plan administered or controlled by such labor organization (or national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit), directly or indirectly, either alone or jointly with one or more other labor organizations or one or more employers or other persons, were found to be invested in any securities acquired subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph which a national banking association would be prohibited from purchasing for its own account under the provisions of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U. S. C. 24) and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency promulgated thereunder.

"(2) Upon request of any labor organization and the making available by it of all its books and records, and the books and records of any welfare or benefit plan administered or controlled by it, directly or indirectly, either alone or jointly with one or more other labor organizations or one or more employers or other persons, the Comptroller of the Currency shall conduct a full and complete examination of the books and records of such labor organization and of any such welfare or benefit plan. If, as a result of such examination, the Comptroller of the Currency is of the opinion that the assets of such labor organization or plan have been or are being handled, used, or administered in an unsafe or unwise manner, or, in the case of funds collected from members, are not being devoted to the purposes for which they were collected, he shall notify the officers of such labor organization or other persons responsible. Unless the practices with respect to which such notification is given are promptly discontinued, the Comptroller of the Currency is authorized to publish a report of such practices. If the Comptroller of the Currency is of the opinion that any such practices are in violation of the laws of the United States or of any State, he shall make available to the appropriate law enforcement officers the facts concerning such practices. The Comptroller of the Currency is authorized to utilize the services of any national bank examiner in making the examinations authorized by this paragraph. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to reimburse the Comptroller of the Currency for expenses incurred in making such examinations."

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 31 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"§ 664. (a) Embezzlement and false entry with respect to labor organizations or employee welfare and benefit plans

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of a labor organization or engaged directly or indirectly in or connected in any capacity with the administration, management, or control of any welfare or benefit plan—

"(1) embezzles, steals, or unlawfully takes or converts to his own use or the use of another, any moneys, credits, funds, securities, property, or other assets or things of value of any such labor organization or such welfare or benefit plan, or

"(2) makes any false entry in or wilfully destroys any book or record, kept or made for any such labor organization or welfare or benefit plan, with intent to injure or defraud such labor organization or plan or any beneficiary thereunder, or to deceive any one authorized or entitled to examine the affairs of such labor organization or plan, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'welfare or benefit plan' shall have the same meaning as when used in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended."

(b) The analysis preceding Chapter 31 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"664. Embezzlement and false entry with respect to labor organizations or employee welfare and benefit plans."

SEC. 4. No labor organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year which begins more than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act unless there has been filed with the National Labor Relations Board by the Comptroller of the Currency a certificate with respect to such labor organization under paragraph (1) of section 9 (i) of the National Labor Relations Act after an examination conducted during such taxable year in accordance with paragraph (2) of such section. In any case in which more than one examination under paragraph (2) of such section is conducted with respect to a labor organization during such taxable year, only the last such examination shall be considered for purposes of this section.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the second bill deals with the democratic procedures which should be followed by labor unions. Union member after union member has testified—with considerable validity, I am sure—that if the union members themselves had control of their unions; if they could provide for secret ballots and secret decisions; if they were able to determine whether and when to strike; and what assessments to make, and how nominations should be made; and if there were other guaranties for democratic processes, most of the excesses by labor unions would be eliminated. So my second bill deals with that subject; it provides procedures for the nomination of union officials by democratic processes and for their election by secret ballot, to be counted by neutral counters; and the bill provides for secret ballots in connection with strikes and union assessments.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred, and printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3045) to strengthen democratic processes and procedures in elections of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be is enacted, etc.*, That section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(i) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor organization under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, unless such labor organization shows to the satisfaction of the Board, that the constitution or bylaws of such labor organization and of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit—

"(1) provide for the election of their respective officers by the members under a system or systems which include (A) procedures for nominating opposing candidates for each office under a party or other system which will afford members of the labor organization an opportunity to participate in the selection of candidates, (B) use of the secret ballot for all voting in any such election, and (C) the counting and tabulation of the votes in such election and the certification of the results thereof by one or more officers or employees of the Board;

"(2) provide for the authorisation of strikes, the fixing of the amounts of dues, the levying of assessments, the imposition of fines, the authorization for disbursements of union funds in amounts exceeding $ ———, and the determination of all other matters directly affecting the economic well-being of the members, only by majority vote of the members taken by secret ballot; and

"(3) provide, in any case in which provision is made for the suspension or modification of the rights of self-government of any constituent unit for disciplinary or other reasons, for the restitution of such rights within 90 days following a request therefor by such constituent unit authorized by majority vote of the members thereof taken by secret ballot;

and that such provisions of the constitution and bylaws were complied with during the

preceding 12-month period. Upon request by a labor organization the board shall assign one or more officers or employees of the board to count and tabulate the votes cast in any election of officers held by such labor organization and to certify the results thereof."

SEC. 2. No labor organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year which begins after the date of the enactment of this act unless such labor organization shows to the satisfaction of the National Labor Relations Board that, during such taxable year, the constitution or bylaws of such labor organization and of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit contained the provisions described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 9 (i) of the National Labor Relations Act, and that such provisions were complied with during such taxable year.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the third bill deals with the problem of racketeers in unionism. Earlier this afternoon the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], introduced a bill, on behalf of some of us—I am one of its sponsors—dealing with one aspect of that subject, from the standpoint of wiretapping. But much more needs to be done. Mr. President, it seems to me that by means of the bill I am now introducing we shall establish very appropriate criteria for eliminating racketeers from labor unions, because my bill provides that Americans who are convicted after being charged with the commission of any offense against the laws of the United States or the laws of any State of the United States, and who are consequently denied the right to vote in elections held under the laws of the States of their legal residence; that criminals of that character shall be denied the right to hold office in the labor unions of this country; and that violation of that provision—as in the case of the other two bills I have previously introduced—shall cause the union concerned to lose its tax-exempt status.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be received for appropriate reference and that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3046) to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to deny the benefits of such act to labor organizations having officers who have been convicted of certain offenses, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(i) No investigation shall be made by the Board of any question affecting commerce concerning the representation of employees, raised by a labor oragnization under subsection (c) of this section, and no complaint shall be issued pursuant to a charge made by a labor organization under subsection (b) of section 10, unless there is on file with the Board an affidavit executed contemporaneously or within the preceding 12-month period by each officer of such labor organization and each officer of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit that he is not ineligible, by reason of conviction of any offense against the laws of the United States or of any State, to vote in elections held under the laws of the State of his legal residence."

SEC. 2. No labor organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year which begins after the date of the enactment of this act unless there has been filed with the National Labor Relations Board during such taxable year an affidavit executed by each officer of such labor organization and each officer of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit that he is not ineligible, by reason of conviction of any offense against the laws of the United States or of any State, to vote in elections held under the laws of the State of his legal residence.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the fourth bill deals with the subject of illegal picketing. It came about primarily out of the evidence before our investigating committee coming out of Flint, Mich., in which any Member of the House or Senate can find harrowing reports of businessmen who are beleaguered and belabored by picket lines which were not made up or supported by a single member of the plant. Something must be done to safeguard such employers as well as the employees in cases of this type. Something must be done to avoid the situation that occurred in Flint, Mich., and which brought about the shocking evidence we received at the hearings involving the related activities of Nathan Shefferman and his associates.

My bill provides that at least 33⅓ percent of the employees of a plant must be involved or must have expressed their support of a picketing project in it before a picket line can be declared legal, and that sponsorship of illegal picket lines will withdraw the organization from a tax-exempt status.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3047) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair labor practice to engage in picketing unless authorized by a certain percentage of the employees of the employer whose premises are being picketed, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 8 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and," and by adding a new paragraph as follows:

"(7) to engage in picketing on or about the premises of any employer for the purpose of organizing any of the employees of such employer or for the purpose of forcing or requiring such employer to recognize such labor organization as the representative of his employees, unless prior thereto such labor organization shall have obtained the approval in writing of at least 33⅓ percent of the employees of such employer of the class or classes which such labor organization is attempting to organize or represent."

SEC. 2. No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any taxable year which begins after the date of the enactment of this act if the National Labor Relations Board determines that such organization engaged, at any time during such taxable year, in an unfair labor practice under section 8 (b) (7) of the National Labor Relations Act. This section shall not apply if such determination is set aside under the provisions of section 10 (e) or (f) of such act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the fifth bill in this package of bills deals with the very difficult problem of the use by labor unions, for political purposes, of money collected by compulsion or coercion. This is a field with which Congress has endeavored to wrestle but without adequate safeguards or results. This is a field now being considered by the Federal courts and in which confusion and contradictions are growing steadily worse and worse. This is a field in which Congress should not fail to act because of timidity or partisan concern. This particular problem was brought out last year in a dispute betwen the Santa Fe Railroad and the nonoperating unions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release put out by the Santa Fe Railroad on September 26, 1957, in which it points out the controversy existing between the employees and the company was whether or not the company should be required to collect dues to be used for political purposes.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATCHISON, TOPEKA & SANTA FE RAILWAY CO.,
*Chicago, Ill., September 26, 1957.*

The single point of disagreement between the Santa Fe and the nonoperating unions is whether the company should discharge employees for the failure to pay money to the unions which would be used for political purposes.

This point is obscured in the statement made by the unions today. The Santa Fe offered to sign an agreement which would require each employee, as a condition of employment, to pay the unions initiation fees, dues, and assessments subject to a single condition. This condition was that the money so required to be paid would not be used for the support of political candidates, parties, or committees or for the advancement of political ideologies. The unions flatly refused this proposal and indeed refused to permit any limitations on the political use of funds collected by compulsion from employees. The company feels it would be wrong to discharge any employee from his job for failure to make political contributions. The unions insist that no limitations be placed on the use of money they can exact from employees as a condition of holding their jobs.

It is idle to say that the condition asked for by the Santa Fe to protect the rights of employees would in any way weaken the bargaining position of the unions or have

anything to do with the power of management over wages or working conditions. It is equally farfetched to say that this protective condition would give the management control over the unions.

The condition that the Santa Fe has suggested is in conformity with recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Courts of Texas and Georgia, defining what may be done under a union-shop agreement. These decisions were handed down after the union-shop agreement had been made on the large majority of American railroads and naturally enough were not reflected in those agreements. What the unions are asking the Santa Fe to do is to go contrary to what the courts decided in those cases.

It is surprising that a strike vote is being spread at this time while the case is still in mediation under the auspices of Chairman Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of the National Mediation Board.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should say, in all fairness, that since I have used this matter in talks at home and elsewhere an official of the nonoperating union has written me and said it did not intend to strike, and that the indicated matter was not the point at issue. I have put in the RECORD the statement from the Santa Fe Railroad. If the letter received by me from the union official is correct, it demonstrates the confusion which exists and the need for legislation. If the letter is inaccurate, it makes even more important the necessity for enacting appropriate legislation to protect the American trade union member against this second attempt at taxation without representation on our North American Continent.

The bill provides one simple enforcement provision, which I shall read:

Labor organizations which do not—

I repeat the word "not"—

Labor organizations which do not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office—

Shall continue to enjoy their tax-exempt status. Those found guilty of engaging in such practices shall lose their tax-exempt status, because that exemption is denied to other organizations around the country who engage in similar political practices.

I point out that in this bill Congress would deal much more gently with labor unions involving themselves in political campaigns in using money collected by compulsion than it does with corporations, because we make it a crime for corporations to do that. The bill simply provides that labor unions may do it, but they may not do it and at the same time enjoy the tax-exempt privileges Congress has conferred upon them.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill for appropriate reference and ask that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3048) to deny income tax exemption to labor organizations which participate in, or intervene in, political campaigns on behalf of candidates for public office, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 501 (c) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exempt organizations) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) (A) Labor organizations which do not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

"(B) Agricultural or horticultural organizations."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply only to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in conclusion, these bills have been introduced on my own responsibility. I do not want the silence of other Senators on my committee to indicate that they are either in opposition or favorable to them, because I have not asked for or solicited cosponsorship from any other Member of the Senate. I have conferred with many Senators. I have advised with many Senators. I have discussed these matters with other members of our investigating committee but I have asked no Senator on or off of the committee to become a cosponsor. I think each Member should express himself as he desires to on the bills. I wish to say that, because the bills have been introduced by a single member of the committee, this does not imply other members of the committee either oppose or approve them.

Mr. President, may I point out, finally, that none of these bills can remotely be described as being punitive in nature—or an effort to cripple honest unionism in America. In fact, each of these bills moves in the direction of providing greater dignity, greater safeguards, greater freedom, and greater opportunities for the individual dues-paying members of our labor unions. Approximately 80 percent of all of the complaints which our committee has been investigating have come from these individual dues-paying members of the labor unions involved. These five bills, once enacted into law, will, I am completely confident, eliminate most of the abuses of which these labor union members have so frequently and vigorously complained.

Some labor union leaders have expressed themselves as being favorable to some of these bills. Other labor union leaders, in their own personal interests, may well oppose them all.

However, Mr. President, Congress has asked our investigating committee to explore these problems, to expose the facts, and to enumerate the steps required to solve the unsavory situations brought to light. I hope the appropriate legislative committees of Congress will now hold hearings on the suggested and needed correctives and that the country, generally, will rally behind a movement to get action on these urgent matters early in this session of Congress. Otherwise the money and time expended by our investigating committee will have come to naught.

## INCREASE OF NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a summary of its provisions, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3049) to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. BRICKER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Farm Food and Fiber Act."

INCREASE OF NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 2. Section 371 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d), and by adding subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The Secretary may increase by not more than 50 percent any national marketing quota or acreage allotment for any year or crop for any basic agricultural commodity under this title if he determines after investigation that such increase is necessary in the interests of the welfare of the agricultural economy (1) to avoid hardships to producers of the commodity, (2) to meet potential market demands for the commodity, (3) to avoid undue restrictions on marketings, (4) to prevent disruption in the orderly marketing of the commodity, (5) to insure adequate farm income, or (6) to make allowance for statistics of the Federal Government more recent than those used in the original determination of the marketing quota or acreage allotment, or (7) because of any combination of the factors above. The determination of any national marketing quota or acreage allotment shall be made by the Secretary after consultation with the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board."

DISCONTINUANCE OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS ON CORN

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, acreage allotments shall not be in effect for the 1959 and subsequent crops of corn.

LEVEL OF PRICE SUPPORT FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

SEC. 4. (a) Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended:

(1) by striking out "nor less than the level provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) as follows:" and substituting therefor "nor less than 60 percent of the parity price therefor determined after considera-

tion of the factors specified in section 401 (b).";

(2) by striking out subsections (a), (b), (c), (d) (4), and (e);

(3) by striking from subsection (d) (3) the words "except tobacco" and the words "and no price support shall be made available for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers;";

(4) by changing the comma in subsection (f) immediately preceding the words "except that" to a period and striking out the balance of subsection (f).

(b) Section 2 of the act of July 28, 1945, Public Law 163, 79th Congress, is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 3 (a) of the act of August 29, 1949, Public Law 272, 81st Congress, and the last sentence of section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, are hereby repealed.

LEVEL OF PRICE SUPPORT FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 60 percent of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply."

CONTINUANCE OF SPECIAL DAIRY PRODUCTS PROGRAM

SEC. 6. (a) The last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "for each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1958, not to exceed $75 million," and substituting therefor "for each of the 4 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1960, not to exceed $75 million."

(b) Section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31, 1958" wherever it appears and substituting therefor "December 31, 1960."

CCC ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 7. (a) Section 9 (b) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the Board of Directors, there shall be an Advisory Board reflecting broad agricultural and business experience in its membership. The Board shall consist of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall serve for a period of 3 years, except that two members of the first Board shall serve for a period of 2 years and two members of the first Board shall serve for a period of 1 year. Not more than four of such members shall belong to the same political party. The Advisory Board shall meet at the call of the Secretary, who shall require it to meet not less often than once each 90 days; shall consult with and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the level at which price support shall be made available for any commodity and the establishment of national marketing quotas and acreage allotments; shall survey the general policies of the Corporation, including its policies in connection with purchase, storage, and sale of commodities and the operation of lending and price-support programs; and shall advise the Secretary with respect thereto. Members of the Advisory Board shall receive for their services as members compensation of not to exceed $50 per diem when actually engaged in the performance of their duties as such, together with their necessary traveling expenses while going to and coming from meetings."

(b) Section 401 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The determination of the level of price support for any commodity shall be made by the Secretary after consultation with the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board."

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

SEC. 8. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) Sections 109 and 204 of such act are amended by striking out "1958" and substituting in lieu thereof "1959."

(b) Section 103 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "$4,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,500,000,000."

The summary presented by Mr. HICKENLOOPER is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED FARM FOOD AND FIBER ACT

Section 1: The act may be cited as the Farm Food and Fiber Act.

Section 2: Amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to authorize the Secretary to increase, up to 50 percent, the national marketing quota or acreage allotment for any basic agricultural commodity where in the interests of the welfare of the agricultural economy he determines such action is necessary for specified reasons. The Secretary would be required to consult with the CCC Advisory Board in establishing national marketing quotas and acreage allotments.

Section 3: Discontinues acreage allotments on corn.

Section 4: (1) Removes the present requirements for supporting basic commodities at minimum levels ranging between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity, depending on the supply, and for tobacco, at 90 percent of parity; and substitutes authority for supports at a level not less than 60 percent or more than 90 percent of parity, determined after considering the 8 guidelines specified in the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (sec. 401 (b)); (2) provides for price support for tobacco at 50 percent of parity if marketing quotas are disapproved, as is provided for the other basic commodities; (3) repeals section 2 of the act of July 28, 1945, requiring supports on fire-cured tobacco at 75 percent of the loan rate for burley tobacco, and on dark air-cured and Virginia sun-cured tobacco at 66⅔ percent of the loan rate for burley tobacco, but not to exceed the higher of the 1957 level or 90 percent of parity; (4) repeals those provisions of law requiring that middling ⅞-inch cotton be the standard grade for purposes of parity and price support.

Section 5: Changes the minimum support level on dairy products from 75 percent to 60 percent of parity.

Section 6: Extends the special milk program for children for 2 years, i. e., until June 30, 1960, at the present level of $75 million a year, and extends for 2 years, i. e., until December 31, 1960, the special program for making dairy products available to the military agencies and veterans' hospitals.

Section 7: (1) Amends the law relating to the CCC Advisory Board to provide that a specific duty of the Board shall be to make recommendations to the Secretary as to price support levels and the establishment of national marketing quotas and acreage allotments, and to require the Secretary to consult with the Board in establishing price support levels and national marketing quotas and acreage allotments; (2) increases the membership of the Advisory Board from 5 to 7; requires that members be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation; and provides for staggered terms of office.

Section 8: Extends titles I and II of Public Law 480 for 1 year, i. e., until June 30, 1959, and increases the amount authorized under title I from $4 billion to $5,500,000,000.

## INCREASED MILEAGE ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL MAIL CARRIERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the mileage allowance for the rural mail carriers.

There are approximately 32,000 rural letter carriers in the United States, and each day they drive the equivalent of 60 times around the earth. The history of the great service these workers have given the people living in rural areas is well known. Although this service has been generally good despite bad weather and other factors, all is not well with our men who carry the mail to the out-of-town areas. With cost of living advances over the past several years, most rural letter carriers have found that they are having to bear part of the costs of transportation for their routes. Their present allowance was set in 1951.

For example, statistics show that the price of tires has gone up 30 percent; the price of gas and oil is up 18 percent; the price of tools and parts is up 70 percent; taxes are up 42 percent; and insurance costs have climbed 27 percent.

To help meet this need, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the basic equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers from 9 cents per mile to 11 cents per mile, and to provide for a minimum allowance of $4.50 per day.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3050) to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

The bill was to increase the basic equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers from 9 cents per mile to 11 cents per mile, and provide for a minimum allowance of $4.50 per day.

In practice, this would mean that a carrier with a route of 41 miles or less would receive the minimum allowance of $4.50, whereas carriers with routes of over 41 miles would receive 11 cents per mile.

Present law provides that an additional allowance may be paid to carriers serving heavily patronized routes of not to exceed a total of $3 per day when combined with the regular 9-cent-per-mile allowance. In other words, a carrier serving a route of 33 miles or less deemed to be a heavily patronized route, receives 9 cents per mile and may be given an additional allowance which will not exceed a total of $3 per day. Carriers having routes of over 33 miles can receive

nothing extra because the 9 cents per mile gives them in excess of $3 per day.

The proposed bill provides that the Postmaster General may give carriers an additional allowance of not to exceed $2.50 per day for serving heavily patronized routes, in addition to their basic mileage or minimum daily allowance, without regard to the length of their route.

## CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1958

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the first session of the 85th Congress a pay bill was passed in both Houses of Congress and was submitted to the President. In his Memorandum of Disapproval, the President stated that an inquiry would be made into the need for adjustments in the structure of executive branch pay systems and that in the event this inquiry demonstrated the need for adjustments, recommendations would be made early in the next session of Congress. After many studies by the executive branch of the Government, agreement has been reached on pay proposals that would cost the Government $1,052,000,000, and I can definitely advise the Senate that this legislation has the approval of the President of the United States. Today I am introducing bills for pay increases for both postal and classified employees.

I am introducing for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended and for other purposes. The objectives of this bill are:

First. To relieve pay inequities among the various grades under the Classification Act by realining the various pay levels.

Second. To provide increases in pay rates as are required to place the Government in a reasonably competitive position in the labor market.

Third. To provide flexibility and greater monetary incentive for the reward of unusual talent, high proficiency and higher degrees of skills and training.

Fourth. To adjust upward the entrance pay level for professional, scientific and managerial personnel.

Fifth. To remove the numerical limitations on the so-called supergrade positions, and

Sixth. To remove the numerical limitations on the number of positions authorized in the scientific and professional categories and receiving pay at levels authorized under Public Law 313, and to provide for a possible wider use of this authority.

It has now become abundantly clear that there is need for equitable adjustments along the lines of the proposals contained in this bill. Along with others who have studied this problem, the Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation, chaired by Ralph J. Cordiner, has reported a very considerable gap between Federal and non-Federal salaries, especially in the upper level pay brackets. The Cordiner Committee recommended to the President that corrective action be taken. The findings of this and other study groups have formed the basis for the recommendations we are now making for the consideration of the Congress. I believe you will find the bill to be a realistic and reasonable approach to what is rapidly becoming a very serious problem in the administration of our defense and other essential Government programs.

Under this bill, which the President has approved and supports fully, adjustments will be made to provide an increase of at least 6 percent to all grades of employees. However, its primary objective is to provide more adequate compensation to those whose present salaries are shown to be substantially less than salaries for non-Federal employment, when compared with positions of similar responsibility. The proposed realinement of the Classification Act pay schedule would particularly affect the middle and top bracket levels, which include the thousands of employees in the scientific, engineering, managerial, and other professional categories. This realinement will establish greater intergrade differentials in the upper grades, thus eliminating as much as possible the compression which has occurred in these grades in recent years. In order to do this, employees in grades GS–11 through GS–14 would get an approximate 7½ percent increase, while those from GS–15 through GS–18 would be increased proportionately so as to permit the GS–18 to receive a salary of $18,000 per year.

Also, as I have said previously, the entrance level for college recruitment and the intermediate salary rates for scientific, professional, and managerial positions would be adjusted upward. In addition, pay incentives would be provided for those who demonstrate marked proficiency in doing their work.

The proposed bill would remove altogether the numerical limitations on the three highest grades. There are now only 1,226 employees of a total of nearly 1 million under the Classification Act who can receive from $12,900 to $16,000 per year. Of these 1,226, only 130 can receive $16,000 per year under the Classification Act.

The elimination of this ceiling is regarded as essential to permit more reasonable salaries for those key scientists and executives carrying the heavy burdens of leadership and decision. The bill would also remove the statutory limitation on the number of scientific and professional positions that can be established under pay rates as now provided in Public Law 313, and would provide that the President can authorize these positions for any agency and in any number he deems appropriate under the proposed statutory language.

The administration believes that the removal of the numerical limitation on the higher grades, the increase in the pay ceiling, the higher entrance level for college graduates and the incentive payment for high proficiency will make the pay structure for Government service more equitable to scientific and managerial personnel and will attract more able young people to the Government service.

I urge that this bill be given prompt and careful attention. This Congress is faced with the consideration of vital Government programs. In the last analysis, it is the individual civil servant—the scientists in the Government laboratory, the technical expert in the military department, the career official representing us abroad—on whom we all must reply to make these programs effective. Increasingly in these times our citizens are properly demanding from these Federal employees nothing less than outstanding competence and superior performance and leadership. I think it behooves us to consider their conditions of employment carefully not only from the standpoint of equity to the employee, but also as a matter vitally affecting our Government's ability to carry out its functions properly.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill and its explanation be incorporated in my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3052) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as "The Classification Act Amendments of 1958."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of section 603 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1113 (b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

| "Grade | Per annum rates | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GS–1 | $2,855 | $2,945 | $3,035 | $3,125 | $3,215 | $3,305 | $3,395 |
| GS–2 | 3,140 | 3,230 | 3,320 | 3,410 | 3,500 | 3,590 | 3,680 |
| GS–3 | 3,370 | 3,460 | 3,550 | 3,640 | 3,730 | 3,820 | 3,910 |
| GS–4 | 3,625 | 3,715 | 3,805 | 3,895 | 3,985 | 4,075 | 4,165 |
| GS–5 | 3,895 | 4,040 | 4,185 | 4,330 | 4,475 | 4,620 | 4,765 |
| GS–6 | 4,325 | 4,470 | 4,615 | 4,760 | 4,905 | 5,050 | 5,195 |
| GS–7 | 4,800 | 4,945 | 5,090 | 5,235 | 5,380 | 5,525 | 5,670 |
| GS–8 | 5,270 | 5,415 | 5,560 | 5,705 | 5,850 | 5,995 | 6,140 |
| GS–9 | 5,770 | 5,915 | 6,060 | 6,205 | 6,350 | 6,495 | 6,640 |
| GS–10 | 6,270 | 6,415 | 6,560 | 6,705 | 6,850 | 6,995 | 7,140 |
| GS–11 | 6,880 | 7,110 | 7,340 | 7,570 | 7,800 | 8,030 | |
| GS–12 | 8,150 | 8,380 | 8,610 | 8,840 | 9,070 | 9,300 | |
| GS–13 | 9,675 | 9,905 | 10,135 | 10,365 | 10,595 | 10,825 | |
| GS–14 | 11,105 | 11,335 | 11,565 | 11,795 | 12,025 | 12,255 | |
| GS–15 | 13,000 | 13,425 | 13,850 | 14,275 | 14,700 | | |
| GS–16 | 14,500 | 15,000 | 15,500 | 16,000 | 16,500 | | |
| GS–17 | 16,000 | 16,500 | 17,000 | 17,500 | 18,000 | | |
| GS–18 | 18,000 | 18,500 | 19,000 | 19,500" | | | |

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph 4 of this subsection) is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph 4 of this subsection) is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the general schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph 4 of this subsection) is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at the maximum longevity rate or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade in effect on and after such date.

(4) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate established as a result of the operation of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1133), he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on the effective date of this section to which he would have been entitled under the provisions of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 1121) had said section 803 not been enacted.

(5) Officers and employees receiving a rate of basic compensation authorized by law, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, which is in excess of the appropriate rate of basic compensation as determined under paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection shall continue to receive such rates, until they leave such position or are entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179, as amended by 70 Stat. 762) is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 505. No positions shall be placed in grade 16, 17, or 18 of the general schedule except by action of, or after prior approval by, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners."

(b) The following parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 104 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 234; Public Law 121, 84th Cong.);

(2) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Federal Prison System" and under the subheading "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Prisons" contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 273; title II of Public Law 133, 84th Cong.); which reads as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the Attorney General hereafter is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, to place three positions in grade GS–16 in the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949";

(3) Section 206 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 360; Public Law 163, 84th Cong.);

(4) The second paragraph under the heading "Civil Functions, Department of the Army" and under the subheading "Administrative Provisions" contained in title III of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 364; Public Law 163, 84th Cong.);

(5) The heading "Commodity Credit Corporation" and the paragraph thereunder contained in chapter I of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 451; Public Law 219, 84th Cong.);

(6) That part of section 205 (a) of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended by an act entitled "An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953" (69 Stat. 547; Public Law 268, 84th Cong.), which reads as follows:

"Subject to the standards and procedures under section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, not to exceed 15 positions in the Small Business Administration may be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule established by that act, and any such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by such section."

(7) The last paragraph under the heading "General Services Administration" contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 345; Public Law 623, 84th Cong.);

(8) Section 302 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes" (70 Stat. 743; Public Law 854, 84th Cong.);

(9) Section 503 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes" (70 Stat. 762; Public Law 854, 84th Cong.);

(10) That part of section 3 (a) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1120; Public Law 1024, 84th Cong.) which reads as follows: "at grades GS–17 each";

(11) Subsection 2 (d) (5) of the Airways Modernization Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 350; Public Law 85–133);

(12) That part of section 205 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 423, Public Law 85–167) which reads as follows: "the position of Administrator of the Southeastern Power Administration shall be in grade GS–18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to the numerical limitation contained in section 505 of said act;".

(c) Positions in grades 16, 17, or 18, as the case may be, of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, immediately prior to the effective date of this act, shall remain, on and after such effective date, in their respective grades, until other action is taken under the provisions of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect on and after such effective date.

(d) Section 1102 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 971, 5 U. S. C. 1073), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1102. The Commission shall prepare and submit to the President an annual report with respect to the rates of compensation under, and the administration of, this act. This report shall include a statement of the total number of positions placed in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 under section 505 of this act during the year, the number of positions placed in each of such grades during the year, the total number of positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 in existence at the close of the year, the number of positions in existence in each of such grades at the close of the year, and such other information as the Commission may deem appropriate. The President shall submit an annual report to the Congress which shall contain, among other matters, such recommendations, based upon the report of the Commission, as he may deem advisable."

SEC. 4. (a) (1) Clause (2) of that paragraph of section 602 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1112) which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 5 of the General Schedule (GS–5) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to perform, under immediate supervision, and with little opportunity for the exercise of independent judgment, simple and elementary work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training; or".

(2) Clause (2) of that paragraph of the same section which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 7 of the General Schedule (GS–7) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) under immediate or general supervision, to perform somewhat difficult work requiring (A) professional, scientific, or technical training, and (B) to a limited extent, the exercise of independent technical judgment; or".

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall exercise its authority to issue such standards or regulations as may be necessary for the administration of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 5. The Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended by inserting after section 701 thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 702. (a) The head of any department or agency may grant within-grade advancements in compensation in recognition of continuing performance substantially above that ordinarily required in the type of position concerned. An advancement under this section shall be in addition to those under section 701 and shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a) of section 701.

"(b) No advancement under this section shall exceed one step increase and no employee shall be eligible for more than one advancement under this section within each of the time periods specified in section 701."

SEC. 6. Section 704 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 801. All new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade, except that the head of any department or agency may (a) in accordance with standards prescribed or approved by the Civil Service Commission, appoint eligible individuals who have qualifications clearly above the average expected of qualified eligibles for the position concerned at such higher rate or rates of a grade as the Civil Service Commission may designate for this purpose, and (b) make new appointments at rates above the minimum when this will make it possible to match the appointee's salary immediately prior to appointment, but no such appointment shall be made at a rate higher than the lowest rate which equals or exceeds an appointee's salary rate immediately prior to appointment."

SEC. 8. Subsection (b) of section 802 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1132), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any officer or employee who is promoted or transferred to a position in a higher grade shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled or longevity rate of such higher grade which exceeds his existing rate of basic compensation by not less than two step increases of the grade from which he is promoted or transferred. If, in the case of any officer or employee so promoted or transferred who is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate for his grade or the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade under section 604, section 1105 (b), or any other provision of law, there is no scheduled or longevity rate in such higher grade which is at least two step increases above his existing rate of basic compensation, he shall receive (A) the maximum longevity rate of such higher grade or the maximum scheduled rate of such higher grade if there is no longevity rate for such grade, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation, if such existing rate is higher."

SEC. 9. (a) as used in this section the term "department" means the executive departments and the independent establishments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The President may authorize the head of any department to establish civilian positions within the department, in such numbers as the President considers necessary to carry out the research and development functions of the department that require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

(c) Subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission as to rates, the head of a department may fix the compensation for positions established in his department under subsection (b). However, the compensation may not be less than $12,500 or more than $19,000 a year.

(d) Positions established under subsection (b) are in the classified civil service of the United States. However, if the Civil Service Commission or a person designated by it approves a proposed appointee's qualifications, no competitive examination may be required.

(e) The head of each department shall report to Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, on the number of positions established under subsection (b) in his department during the preceding calendar year. The report shall list the name, rate of compensation, functions, and qualifications of each incumbent. However, the head of a department may omit any item if he considers that a full public report on it would be detrimental to the national security. In such a case, he shall present the information, in executive session, to such committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives as are designated by the presiding officers of those bodies.

(f) The following laws and parts of laws are repealed:

(1) The second sentence of section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended (21 U. S. C. 113a);

(2) Section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 210 (g));

(3) The act of August 1, 1947, as amended (5 U. S. C. 158);

(4) Sections 1581, 1582, 4021, 7471, and 9021 of title 10, United States Code; and

(5) Subsection 2 (d) (6) of the Airways Modernization Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 350; Public Law 85-133).

(g) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The analysis of chapter 81 is amended by striking out the following items:

"1581. Appointment: professional and scientific services."; and

"1582. Professional and scientific services: reports to Congress on appointments.";

(2) The analysis of chapter 373 is amended by striking out the following item:

"4021. Appointment: professional and scientific services."

(3) The analysis of chapter 873 is amended by striking out the following item:

"9021. Appointment: professional and scientific services."

(h) The enactment of this section does not affect any position existing, on the day before the effective date of this section, under authority of the laws or parts of laws repealed by this section, the compensation attached to any such position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his right to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken under subsection (c) of this section.

SEC. 10. Any appropriation required to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, may be apportioned on a basis indicating the need for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such increases as may be granted officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law (except those rates applying to wage board employees, which are adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates), but only to the extent that such increases do not exceed the increases provided in section 2 of this act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period after enactment into law.

## INCREASED COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill that will give a uniform pay increase to all of more than 500,000 postal field service employees, including postal clerks, city mail carriers, rural carriers, supervisors, and postmasters.

This bill will provide for an upward adjustment of 6 percent in the salaries established in the Postal Field Compensation Act of 1955.

The bill gives additional authority to the Postmaster General to approve increased starting salaries in areas where it is difficult to obtain a sufficient number of qualified eligibles because of higher pay schedules in similar work.

It is estimated the cost of this bill will be $160 million for the first year and $185 million for the next fiscal year.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the explanation of the provisions be made a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3056) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) section 301 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 118; 39 U. S. C. 971) is amended by striking out the postal field service schedule contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following new schedule:

*Postal field service schedule*

| Level | Per annum rates and steps | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | $3,053 | $3,159 | $3,265 | $3,371 | $3,477 | $3,583 | $3,689 |
| 2 | 3,276 | 3,387 | 3,498 | 3,609 | 3,720 | 3,831 | 3,942 |
| 3 | 3,530 | 3,652 | 3,774 | 3,896 | 4,018 | 4,140 | 4,262 |
| 4 | 3,879 | 4,012 | 4,145 | 4,278 | 4,411 | 4,544 | 4,677 |
| 5 | 4,113 | 4,246 | 4,379 | 4,512 | 4,645 | 4,778 | 4,911 |
| 6 | 4,442 | 4,590 | 4,738 | 4,886 | 5,034 | 5,182 | 5,330 |
| 7 | 4,802 | 4,966 | 5,130 | 5,294 | 5,458 | 5,622 | 5,786 |
| 8 | 5,184 | 5,364 | 5,544 | 5,724 | 5,904 | 6,084 | 6,264 |
| 9 | 5,597 | 5,793 | 5,989 | 6,185 | 6,381 | 6,577 | 6,773 |
| 10 | 6,148 | 6,360 | 6,572 | 6,784 | 6,996 | 7,208 | 7,420 |
| 11 | 6,763 | 6,996 | 7,229 | 7,462 | 7,695 | 7,928 | 8,161 |
| 12 | 7,442 | 7,696 | 7,950 | 8,204 | 8,458 | 8,712 | 8,966 |
| 13 | 8,193 | 8,469 | 8,745 | 9,021 | 9,297 | 9,573 | 9,849 |
| 14 | 9,010 | 9,307 | 9,604 | 9,901 | 10,198 | 10,495 | 10,792 |
| 15 | 9,911 | 10,220 | 10,547 | 10,865 | 11,183 | 11,501 | 11,819 |
| 16 | 10,918 | 11,236 | 11,554 | 11,872 | 12,190 | 12,508 | 12,826 |
| 17 | 12,084 | 12,402 | 12,720 | 13,038 | 13,356 | 13,674 | 13,992 |
| 18 | 13,568 | 13,886 | 14,204 | 14,522 | 14,840 | 15,158 | 15,476 |
| 19 | 14,840 | 15,158 | 15,476 | 15,794 | 16,112 | | |
| 20 | 16,960 | | | | | | |

Whenever the Postmaster General finds that a sufficient number of qualified eligibles for employment in positions in the Postal Field Service Schedule of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 cannot be obtained in one or more areas or locations at the existing minimum rates for such positions and that there is a possibility that a sufficient number of such eligibles can be obtained by increasing the minimum rate for such positions in such areas or locations to one of the higher rates of the salary level in which such position is placed, the Postmaster General may establish such higher rate, not in excess of the rate for the fourth per annum rate and step of such salary level, as the minimum rate for that position in the area or location concerned.

(b) (1) The rural carrier schedule contained in section 302 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 119; 39 U. S. C. 972 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

*Rural carrier schedule*

| | Per annum rates and steps | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Carriers in rural delivery service: | | | | | | | |
| Fixed compensation per annum | $1,646.60 | $1,697.00 | $1,748.00 | $1,799.00 | $1,850.00 | $1,901.00 | $1,952.00 |
| Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route | 69.50 | 71.50 | 73.50 | 75.50 | 77.50 | 79.50 | 81.50 |
| For each mile of route over 30 miles | 23.30 | 23.30 | 23.30 | 23.30 | 23.30 | 23.30 | 23.30 |
| Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned: | | | | | | | |
| Fixed compensation per annum | 1,646.60 | | | | | | |
| Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route | 69.50 | | | | | | |
| For each mile of route over 30 miles | 23.30 | | | | | | |
| Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |

[1] Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

(2) Section 302 (c) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 119; 39 U. S. C. 972 (c)), relating to additional compensation for rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes, is amended by striking out "$4,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,980".

(c) The fourth-class office schedule contained in section 303 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 120; 39 U. S. C. 973 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

*4th-class office schedule*

| Gross receipts | Per annum rates and steps | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| $1,300 to $1,499.99 | $2,665 | $2,754 | $2,843 | $2,932 | $3,021 | $3,110 | $3,199 |
| $900 to $1,299.99 | 2,442 | 2,524 | 2,606 | 2,688 | 2,770 | 2,852 | 2,934 |
| $600 to $899.99 | 1,999 | 2,066 | 2,133 | 2,200 | 2,267 | 2,334 | 2,401 |
| $350 to $599.99 | 1,555 | 1,607 | 1,659 | 1,711 | 1,763 | 1,815 | 1,867 |
| $250 to $349.99 | 1,111 | 1,148 | 1,185 | 1,222 | 1,259 | 1,296 | 1,333 |
| $200 to $249.99 | 888 | 918 | 948 | 978 | 1,008 | 1,038 | 1,068 |
| $100 to $199.99 | 668 | 690 | 712 | 734 | 756 | 778 | 800 |
| Under $100 | 444 | 459 | 474 | 489 | 504 | 519 | 534 |

(d) Section 401 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 122; 39 U. S. C. 981), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Any increase in basic salary granted by law on or after the effective date of this amendatory subsection shall not be deemed to be an equivalent increase in basic salary within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 201 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 89; 39 U. S. C. 961 (c)), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective at the beginning of the first pay period which begins after its enactment into law.

The explanation presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF POSTAL PAY BILL

This bill provides an upward adjustment of 6 percent in the salaries established by the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955. It will give a uniform pay increase to all of the more than 500,000 postal field service employees, including postal clerks, city letter carriers, rural carriers, supervisors and postmasters. It will thereby maintain an equitable pay relationship among the various positions and employees in the postal service.

In addition, the bill authorizes the Postmaster General to make appointments under the Postal Field Service Schedule, in certain circumstances, at other than the initial step of the salary level of the position to which appointed, but not in excess of the rate of the fourth step in such level. This authority would be available for use in the larger metropolitan centers whenever the Postmaster General finds that a sufficient number of qualified eligibles for employment cannot be obtained in the area at the existing minimum rates for the positions and that there is a possibility of obtaining a sufficient number of qualified eligibles by increasing the minimum rate. To the extent that the minimum rates are increased in any area or areas under this authority, employees already on the rolls in such area in the positions and levels affected would be advanced to the new minimum rate unless they were already at or above the new minimum rate.

It will be noted that the authority to increase the hiring rate under those circumstances is similar to the authority already available to the Civil Service Commission under section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

The bill further provides for the repeal of section 201 (c) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955. That section places rigid numerical limitations on the positions which may be assigned to salary levels 17, 18, 19 and 20 of the Postal Field Service Schedule. These limitations have had the effect of nullifying the very principle of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, namely, equal pay for equal work. The act establishes and defines certain key positions and commands the Postmaster General to pay to the incumbents of those positions the salary provided in the Postal Field Service Schedule. In a few cases the limitations in section 201 (c) have prevented the Postmaster General from making the advancement in salary to which employees are entitled under the other provisions of the law, particularly in postmaster positions. With the rapidly increasing mail volume and the consequent increase in the number of employees, postmasters at some additional offices are progressing rapidly toward higher level key positions. If the limitations in the act are not removed, the Department will be unable to advance postmasters in such cases, even though they meet the definitions of the key positions for higher levels.

The bill provides an effective date of enactment into law.

Based on current budget estimated for the year 1959, the cost of this bill will be approximately $160 million, including hiring above the initial step and the effect on fringe benefits. After the first fiscal year, this cost could increase to approximately $185 million.

## APPROVAL OF DESIGN OF UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY CHAPEL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution which, if passed by the Congress, will require the Secretary of the Air Force to obtain approval of the design of a chapel for the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs from the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate before public funds can be spent for its construction.

When I and several other Members of Congress made a trip to Colorado in the spring of 1955 to see the site selected for the Air Force Academy and to review building plans prepared by a Chicago firm of architects, so much dissatisfaction was expressed with the proposed design for the chapel that the then Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott, promised that the design would be revised.

It was on the basis of this assurance that $3 million to build the chapel was included in the supplemental appropriation bill passed by the Congress last August.

Since then the revised plans have been disclosed; and, in my opinion, the new ones are worse than the old ones. Some Senators may have noticed the comparative pictures which were published this week in U. S. News & World Report.

It is variously referred to as a series of wigwams, accordions, or something of the kind. There never has been anything like it in this country or anywhere else. It is supposed to be an expression in art of a new concept of religion. Before we spend $3 million, we had better look into the matter, and that is the purpose of the resolution.

Some distinguished architects and a few clergymen have approved the selected design, but the fact remains that this chapel, which will be perhaps the only religious influence in a very secular setting, is different from the design of any cathedral, church or chapel in the history of the world. The designing architects claim that structures heretofore built as houses of worship are outmoded and that the Academy boys should have a chapel reflecting a new concept of religion in keeping with modern thought, science, and modern art.

I confess to being old-fashioned in my views on modern art. When I look at a painting I want to see something I can identify, instead of merely a splash of colors. I also am old-fashioned in my religious views, and would not donate my personal funds for a house of worship which might just as well be a museum of modern art or a skating rink.

Therefore, I am reluctant to spend the hard-earned tax dollars of constituents who may share my old-fashioned views, and before the Air Force undertakes the proposed construction I feel that there should be a positive expression of sentiment on the part of a substantial number of Members of Congress.

The Armed Services and Appropriations Committees are senior committees of both branches of Congress and the House Appropriations Committee is the largest committee. Action by these committees, therefore, would give a fair indication of Congressional attitude.

I have no desire to unduly delay construction of a chapel for the Air Force Academy and I hope that the appropriate committees will act promptly on this resolution so that designs can be submitted and approved and the work can proceed.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

*Resolved*, That no funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated shall be available for expenditure for the construction of a chapel at the United States Air Force Academy unless the design for such chapel is approved by the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and the Secretary of the Air Force is advised in writing by the chairman of each such committee that such design is approved by the committee of which he is chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 137) requiring that the design for the United States Air Force Academy chapel be approved by the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services before appropriated funds are expended for the construction of such chapel, introduced

by Mr. ROBERTSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN:

Address entitled "What Is Government's Responsibility to American Agriculture?" delivered by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND at the annual meeting of the Illinois Agricultural Association, November 13, 1957.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Address by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON before the 26th annual convention of the National Reclamation Association, Phoenix, Ariz., November 7, 1957.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Addresses delivered by him, Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, and Fred C. Scribner, Jr., Under Secretary of the Treasury, delivered at ceremonies in connection with the designation of Alexander Hamilton Place, in Washington, D. C.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him, with exhibits, relating to the role of educational television and of station WHA–TV.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Message from Adlai E. Stevenson and message from him to Cordell Hull award for leadership in building United State foreign economic policy, presented to Hon. Clare Boothe Luce December 10, 1957, by Committee on Foreign Trade Education.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Article entitled "Ordeal by Hunger," written by Senator HUMPHREY, and published in the Fall Co-op Grain Quarterly.

## AMENDMENT OF CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE GOVERNMENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive A, 85th Congress, 2d session, a Supplementary Protocol between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on August 19, 1957, amending the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income signed at Washington on April 16, 1945, as modified by the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, and the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on May 25, 1954, and that the supplementary protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the supplementary protocol between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on August 19, 1957, amending the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income signed at Washington on April 16, 1945, as modified by the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, and the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on May 25, 1954.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary protocol of August 19, 1957. That protocol has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Secretary of State. 2. Supplementary protocol with the United Kingdom amending the income-tax convention of April 16, 1945, as modified by supplementary protocols of June 6, 1946, and May 25, 1954.)

## PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

## REPORT ON STATUS OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS (S. DOC. NO. 77)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, under date of December 30, 1957, the Secretary of the Interior transmitted to the Vice President the first annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects as required by section 6 of the authorizing act of April 11, 1956—70th United States Statutes at Large, page 105. The document was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I request unanimous consent that the letter and accompanying report, including a copy of the statement Hydrologic Bases for Financial Studies—Colorado River Storage Project be printed as a Senate document.

I suggest that in the future the Secretary of the Interior could improve the value of the annual reports by showing the allocations of appropriations by years to each of the several units as well as investigations and comparable expenditures or obligations. Data of this character are submitted to the Appropriations Committees each year, but it would be historically informative to have all of the information in one place each year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SCIENCE AND EDUCATION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to announce that on next Tuesday, January 21, the committee will begin public hearings on the subject of science and education for national defense.

The committee will consider these matters in two phases, the first general and the second legislative. The first part will be devoted to receiving testimony from eminent scientists, educators, and others, on the need, in the light of recent Russian scientific and educational achievements, for Federal action to strengthen American education. The second part of the hearings will be legislative in character and will have as its purpose to receive testimony on pending legislative proposals in this field.

When the committee begins the second part of the hearings on bills, we will welcome testimony from all Members of the Senate who are sponsors of legislation in this field or who wish to give us the benefit of their views. Following the testimony of Members of the Senate, the committee will invite witnesses from the administration and from all interested scientific, educational, and other public organizations or associations, as well as individual witnesses whose knowledge and experience would be of benefit to the committee.

Requests to appear before the committee should be directed to the chief clerk of the committee as soon as possible.

## CURRENT DEPRESSION IN MONTANA'S NONFERROUS METAL INDUSTRY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today, under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], there has been introduced a bill to bring some relief to the copper-mining industry.

As the Senate well knows, since 1934, special legislation in this field has been on the statute books, because of the peculiar and difficult situation which copper enjoys —and I use advisedly the word "enjoys." There is need for serious consideration of the new bill, and there is great need that it be passed and enacted into law.

I hold in my hand a clipping from the Smeltermen's Voice, published at Anaconda, Mont., and dated January 1958. The clipping indicates just how the depression in the copper industry has affected employment in the Montana area. For example, the Butte Miners Union, No. 1, had, as of January 1957, 5,109 dues-paying members. As of October 1957—the date of the latest figures I have—the total number of dues-paying miners there was 2,251, which, if my calculation is correct, indicates a decline in employment approximating 60 percent.

In Great Falls, Mont., the high for the Great Falls Mill and Smeltermen's Union, No. 16, was 1,419 in January 1957; the reduction which has occurred since

then has been 335, making a total, as of October 1957, of 1,084. The clipping I hold in my hand provides other figures which indicate just how badly hit Montana is because of the copper situation. I ask unanimous consent that these figures, taken from the Smeltermen's Voice, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Current depression in Montana's nonferrous metal industry results in reduction in number of employed members in Montana's mine-mill local unions*

| | Date of recent high | Number of employed members | Date of latest report | Number of employed members | Reduction |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Butte Miners Union No. 1 | January 1957 | 5,109 | October 1957 | 2,251 | 2,858 |
| Great Falls Mill & Smeltermen's Union, No. 16 | do | 1,419 | do | 1,084 | 335 |
| Phillipsburg Mine & Mill Workers Union, No. 24 | February 1957 | 182 | September 1957 | 124 | 58 |
| East Helena Mill & Smeltermen's Union, No. 72 | July 1956 | 299 | October 1957 | 275 | 24 |
| Anaconda Mill & Smeltermen's Union, No. 117 | July 1957 | 2,690 | do | 2,359 | 331 |
| Deer Lodge Miners Union, No. 834 | August 1957 | 154 | do | 148 | 6 |
| Phosphate Mine, Mill & Smeltermen's Union, No. 904, Melrose | May 1957 | 150 | September 1957 | 82 | 8 |
| Total | | 10,003 | | 6,323 | 3,680 |

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me observe, further, that earlier this week the price of copper dropped from 27 cents a pound to 25 cents a pound. The copper industry needs help; so do the lead, zinc, tungsten, and manganese interests. I am hopeful that at this session we shall be able to do something of assistance to this vital industry.

## JOHN V. RIFFE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to pay a tribute to a distinguished American who recently passed away.

At a time like this, when our country and, in fact, the world have been shocked by the abuses by some labor leadership and the misuse of union and welfare funds to such an extent that the enactment of some sort of legislation seems required, in order to protect the workers in our industries, it is gratifying and inspiring to have called to our attention really outstanding labor leaders of unimpeachable integrity, dedicated to the highest moral standards.

One of these outstanding leaders, whom it was my personal privilege to know well over a period of years, was John V. Riffe, who died in Washington on Tuesday, January 7, after a long illness. John Riffe was the last executive vice president of the CIO before its merger with the AFL–CIO, in 1955. He was one of the principal leaders of the CIO in bringing about the move toward unity in the labor movement. He had worked for it tirelessly. But beyond that, during the last years of his life John had dedicated himself to the Moral Re-Armament Movement and its emphasis on human relationships based on the highest moral standards, both in the home and in our public relationships.

George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, in a message to Mrs. Riffe after John's death, said:

> Throughout his lifetime John Riffe served the cause of trade unionism with devotion and understanding. He was a true humanitarian. We shall miss his warm friendship.

Recently, I requested from the AFL–CIO headquarters a biography of John Riffe. In that biography I find a compilation of the years of successful effort during which he had devoted his energies in bringing about a better feeling between workers and between unions. His big emphasis was on God-guided unity, not division, in the union movement.

My own personal relations with John began when I was chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the beginning of President Eisenhower's first administration. I conferred with various labor leaders at the time, and John was one of them. I was particularly impressed by the fact that his approach to human relations was based on deep spiritual convictions. We soon became warm friends.

John Riffe was born in Jenkins, Ky., in 1904. At the age of 14, he started work in the Kentucky coal mines. He early plunged into active responsibility in the United Mine Workers of America, and later took part in the formation of the United Steel Workers, CIO. For the rest of his life, he occupied responsible positions with that organization.

At the funeral services held for John Riffe at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, on last Friday, many moving tributes were paid to his memory. Because of my close friendship with him, I had the great privilege to serve, together with colleagues of his in the labor world, as one of his pallbearers. Many messages have been received by Mrs. Riffe from leaders and trade-union workers in foreign countries who knew of his outstanding leadership. Tributes came from representatives of business, industry, and Government in this and many other countries. Among the tributes from labor leadership in this country, in addition to that from George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, were messages from Walter Reuther, president of the industrial union department, AFL–CIO, and former president of the CIO; James Carey, secretary-treasurer of the AFL–CIO; David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers of America, and vice president, AFL–CIO; John L. Lewis, president, United Mine Workers of America; and many others.

I have mentioned these widespread tributes because of the universal recognition of this great, spiritual statesman in the labor movement. I am personally happy to pay him this profound and sincere tribute through these few remarks.

Mrs. Smith joins me in sending to Mrs. Riffe and all of her children our expression of sympathy and also our deep appreciation of the great personal inspiration that John Riffe has given to us and to all others with whom he came in contact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a moving tribute which was given to John Riffe by the international officers and delegates at the 10th biennial convention, in New York, of the Transport Workers of America, AFL–CIO, during the period of John's recent, critical illness. At the time, John was attending the Assembly of Nations for Moral Re-Armament, on Mackinac Island, Mich. The tribute which I have asked to be printed is signed by Michael J. Quill, international president, Transport Workers Union of America, and William Grogan, international vice president.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> It is with real warmth in our hearts that the international officers and delegates of the tenth biennial convention of the Transport Workers Union of America AFL–CIO extend to our brother John Riffe, the last executive vice president of the CIO, our sincere fraternal greetings.
>
> We hail his sterling contributions to the building of the labor movement in the United States both as a former member and official of the United Mine Workers Union, as an official of the great Steelworkers Union and as the director of the CIO southern organizing drive and many other notable organizing efforts. We recognize the great part he played in bringing the 30,000 members of the railroad divisions into our union.
>
> Your credo in the labor movement will always live in our hearts because you have stood for the finer things in life. We recognize and pay tribute to your steadfast fight for sound ethical practices both within the labor movement and within industry and your example in living and applying sound moral principles in your work in the labor movement.
>
> The test was that you practiced what you preached. The entire labor movement is forever indebted for your untiring efforts to eventually consummate the historic merger between the AFL and the CIO. All our officers and delegates join in prayers that you have a speedy recovery so that you may again take your rightful place in the fight to make our labor movement a greater one in years to come and the world a better place to live in.
>
> Sincerely and fraternally yours,
> MICHAEL J. QUILL,
> *International President,*
> *Transport Workers Union of America.*
> WILLIAM GROGAN,
> *International Vice President.*

## ISSUANCE OF PASSPORTS BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the ramifications of the cold war have heightened and brought into sharp focus many aspects of modern life. Among them have been international

travel and the issuance of passports. Particularly during the past year the subject of passports has been a controversial one here in the United States. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee held several hearings on the question last summer, and its study is still being carried on.

Mr. Roderic L. O'Connor, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, has recently written an article entitled "The State Department Defends," which appeared in the January 11 issue of Saturday Review. In this article Mr. O'Connor explains the bases for authority of the Department of State for issuing or refusing to issue passports and reviews the procedures of appeal.

We recognize—

He states—

that passport facilities can only be denied with scrupulous regard to the requirements of due process of law.

Well reasoned presentations which enable us to gain further insight into the matter are always welcome, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE DEPARTMENT DEFENDS

(By Roderic L. O'Connor)

Out of more than half a million passport applications made to the State Department last year, only about 450 were denied on substantive grounds. Only 13 final denials were turndowns on the ground of Communist activities.

Yet today the Department's role in the issuance of passports has become an issue of increasing controversy. The Department's traditional right to deny passports, either to certain individuals, or to all individuals for certain areas, has lately been challenged with growing frequency in the courts, and criticized in the press. In view of this controversy, I am glad to have the opportunity to explain briefly the Department of State's position with respect to passports, and the reasons behind that position.

The passport is a document which has long been in use among most of the countries of the world. It was originally a letter of introduction from a chief of state requesting the authorities of one state to give due consideration to the citizen traveling from another state. The first mention of a passport in this sense occurs, in fact, in the Bible.

"Moreover, I said unto the King (of Persia), if it please the King, let letters be given me to the Governors beyond the river, that they may let me pass through 'til I come into Judah," Nehemiah, chapter 2, verse 7.

Today the passport is regarded as a document of identity and nationality. It has become in recent years under our laws a necessary document to allow the United States citizen to depart from the United States for travel outside the Western Hemisphere. It is also necessary under the laws of most foreign countries to have a passport in order to gain admittance to them. Thus, as a consequence of either the internal restrictions of our own laws on exit from or entry into the United States, or the restrictions imposed by foreign governments on travel across their borders, it is now a virtual impossibility for an American citizen to travel outside of the Western Hemisphere without a passport.

Because of its origin, the right of any government to grant, or withhold, a passport is recognized internationally. Our Secretary of State has had, since the early days of our Republic, the authority to issue passports or to restrict them. In fact, Congress enacted legislation in 1803 and in 1815 which dealt with the Secretary's issuance of passports. The basis of the present passport laws stems back to 1868. Most Secretaries of State have, at one time or another, exercised this right. It was not until recently that the Secretary's rights in this respect have been challenged in the courts.

The question now being debated is centered on the issue of the extent to which the Secretary of State has discretionary authority to deny passports to United States citizens who wish to travel abroad, or to issue passports which are restricted for travel in certain areas. I should like to clarify the Department's position on this issue.

The Secretary's authority both to deny or restrict passports stems from his basic constitutional powers in the conduct of foreign relations as well as from precedent and certain statutory authority. In denying passports to United States citizens, for reasons of national interest, the Secretary can base his denial on two general grounds. The first of these grounds is that the applicant is a member of the Communist Party; under Communist Party discipline, domination, or control; or that his travel abroad is to assist knowingly the cause of international communism. A recent decision in the Circuit Court of Appeals stated that, "to that end the Secretary may refuse to permit an adherent of the Communist movement, clothed with American citizenship, from being present in places where he may readily create incidents or may assert statutory rights to activity on the part of this Government in his behalf. The Secretary may preclude potential matches from the international tinderbox."

The second of the general grounds on which the Secretary may deny passports is that the applicant's travel, usually to a specific country or countries, is inimical to United States foreign policy or detrimental to the orderly conduct of United States foreign relations. This ground of refusal can be, but it is not necessarily, related to the first. It is related in the sense that anyone who can be shown to be a member of the Communist conspiracy or to be traveling abroad in connection with that conspiracy is likely to be engaging in activities inimical to our foreign policy. However, a traveler who has nothing to do with communism may still be subject to restriction for reasons of foreign policy.

When the Secretary issues a passport restricted for travel to certain areas, he is, in our view, making a determination that it is contrary to the foreign policy objectives of the United States to have American citizens traveling within those areas. That foreign policy determination does not in and of itself constitute a ban or prohibition which prevents Americans from going to these areas.

It is the practice of the Department of State, however, to refuse passport facilities to those American citizens who indicate an intention to travel into such areas contrary to the policy of their Government. As a practical matter, the refusal of passport facilities may, but does not necessarily, prevent the citizen from traveling abroad.

Since the denial of passport facilities may have this serious practical effect, the Department recognizes that such denial cannot be made arbitrarily or capriciously. The Department recognizes that such denials can be, in practice, a limitation upon any natural right the citizen may have to travel.

However, we believe that any such right, like all other rights, is subject to reasonable limitation in the national interest. We recognize that passport facilities can only be denied with scrupulous regard to the requirements of due process of law. Moreover, the citizen's right to appeal must equally be protected. We believe that our present procedures meet this test.

The State Department has for many years issued passports which have had stamped in them various restrictions as to their validity for travel to certain areas. Traditionally we have not issued passports for travel to countries in which we do not maintain diplomatic representation. We have of course, made exceptions to this general rule, as in the case of the Soviet Union in the 1920's and, in the last few weeks, Bulgaria. The State Department has also traditionally refused to validate passports for travel in areas where armed hostilities or national disasters make the presence of United States citizens hazardous.

Generally speaking, such restrictions have not in the past been challenged. We believe the authority to impose such restrictions is an important part of the Secretary's power in the field of foreign policy which should not be impaired. Moreover, experience indicates that if this authority is used on grounds which are clearly based on foreign policy that the courts will not substitute their judgment for that of the Secretary of State. When it comes to exercising a judgment on what constitutes interference with our foreign relations, the courts have long recognized that under the Constitution that right and responsibility rests with the Secretary of State. We believe it is important that this position should be understood and upheld by the citizens of America.

It was for the very reason of foreign policy that the United States Government placed its ban upon travel of American citizens to Communist China. Not only past and current events are involved in this policy but also the avowed future plans of a regime which has dealt in war, torture, deceit, and skulduggery. The Chinese Communists brazenly defied the United Nations in a war which cost more American casualties than World War I and they have never shown the slightest sign of repentence or made peace. Red China has violated an armistice agreement not only with respect to Korea but also Vietnam, and has built up huge military forces poised for action in both areas. It has repeatedly declared its intention of seizing Formosa, by force if necessary, and has adamantly refused to renounce force.

More than 157 American civilians have been unjustly imprisoned by Red China since 1949. At least five Americans have died as a result of their imprisonment. Many have been tortured. Six of these remain in prison today despite a public commitment to release them.

It is our view that on this record of demonstrated inhumanity, American citizens face abnormal risks in Red China. Moreover, it is our belief that our foreign policy objective throughout the Far East and Southeast Asia would be made more difficult to attain if American citizens were allowed to travel freely and to engage in trade and cultural relations with a regime which is an avowed enemy and has never shown the slightest inclination to follow the practices of civilized nations.

There have been, however, some cases where people have ignored these restrictions and traveled to restricted areas. This has caused a great deal of difficulty for the Department. The sole penalty provided by law for misuse of the passport is a criminal penalty which subjects the offender to as much as $2,000 fine or 5 years in prison. However, this penalty is a harsh one. Except in the most flagrant cases, the punishment would not seem to fit the crime.

Moreover, the problem is not met simply by refusing to issue passports to all applicants who have previously violated the restrictions. The Secretary of State's power to withdraw or withhold a citizen's passport

is not designed to be a punishment. It is designed as an instrument of foreign policy. The language of our regulations makes it clear that it is primarily our estimate of future action which is controlling in reaching a decision on the withholding of a passport, not the record of past action. Thus, the fact that a citizen has violated the restrictions in the past may be some evidence that he will do so in the future and thus interfere with the orderly conduct of United States foreign relations. However, we have never felt that such past action was the only factor in reaching a decision as to whether the passport should be withdrawn or not.

Under these general principles, the Department has made every effort to follow a uniform practice in handling the cases of citizens who have violated our restrictions. Regrettably, there have recently been a good many of these. Only this fall, a group of 42 American citizens traveled en masse to Communist China in direct violation of our restrictions. In each of these cases the Department made every reasonable effort to notify the citizen at his first point of exit from Communist China that his passport has been tentatively restricted for direct return to the United States. In each case where he would accept such notification, the citizen was advised of his rights to a hearing and of the applicable regulations under which this action has been taken. Moreover, because of possible hardships involved, the Department did not insist that any individual return at once to the United States. Instead, we announced that we would allow 60 days from the time of notification for the citizen to appeal our decision to endorse his passport for return home only. Only one citizen took advantage of this offer and, on December 18, 60 days after all members of the group had been notified, we announced that the period of grace had terminated.

Under these circumstances, the Department feels it has no alternative but to notify appropriate foreign governments that the passports of the 24 citizens who remain abroad are valid only for direct and immediate return to the United States. We have instructed our consuls so to endorse their passports when, and if, they turn up in their jurisdictions.

Some of these citizens have already refused to receive notification. Some have already refused to turn over their passports to our consuls for endorsement and may continue to so refuse. This will enter into the consideration of whether a passport should be granted them in the future.

When each citizen returns to the United States, his passport will be taken up. In each case, of course, the individual may appeal our decision. If and when he does so, we will judge each case on its merits. We shall inquire what the individual's intention is regarding future travel were he again to receive passport facilities. We shall specifically ask whether, if he were granted a new passport, he intends to abide by the restrictions in the passport. On the basis of the answers to these questions, and on the basis of all other pertinent information available to us, we will reach a decision in each case.

These decisions will be reached fairly and expeditiously. They will be reached with due regard to the rights of the individual. I am confident, however, that all Americans will agree that these individual rights must be weighed against the demands of our national interest. In reaching these judgments, I believe we have a responsibility to see to it that individual Americans are not allowed capriciously to disturb the delicate international situation by breaking restrictions which have been imposed for sound foreign policy reasons. If this factor is borne in mind, I am confident that the State Department's actions on this question will receive a full measure of public understanding and support.

## ONE-MAN MILK CZAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, farmers are not the only ones concerned about Secretary Benson's crackdown on the dairy industry.

Consumers are beginning to get worried, too. Most housewives know that abundance is their best assurance of fair prices. Despite Secretary Benson's public bid for consumer support by telling them he is trying to bring milk prices down, more enlightened consumers are looking at the fine print behind Benson's promises and note that he is also telling farmers that his aim is to reduce production. If he succeeds in curtailing production—and I for one do not believe his price slash will do it—it can only mean higher prices for the consumer, not lower prices.

Mr. Benson had better make up his mind. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot tell the farmer he is going to get him better prices in the market place by cutting production, and out of the other side of his mouth tell the consumer he is going to give him lower prices.

A letter from an Illinois citizen raises the challenging point whether the Secretary of Agriculture alone should be allowed to set the price of milk in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, and suggest that our city friends think over the points raised.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ALONE BE ALLOWED TO SET THE PRICE OF MILK IN THE UNITED STATES?

Recently the Secretary of Agriculture has been guaranteeing the dairy farmer 88 percent of what the Government says is a fair price for the farmer's milk. On December 19, 1957, however, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that he would cut this guaranty to 75 percent of a fair price. He announced this cut in price to the farmer would result in a saving to the housewife of one-half cent per quart for milk.

The dairy farmer has been producing about 5 percent more milk than the market has been able to absorb at today's retail prices. It is the Secretary's often stated idea that if he can just get the farmer's selling price for milk low enough, then enough farmers will quit milking cows so that there will be no "surplus" of milk. In this event then (if there is no surplus) presumably the farmer's selling price would raise to "parity." To use the Secretary's line of reasoning when this happy event for the farmer would come about, it would mean the cost of milk to the housewife would be raised by 1½ cents per quart.

Six months before Secretary Benson announced his lowered prices to the American farmer Khrushchev boasted on a nationwide American telecast that Russia would soon surpass the United States in the per capita production of milk.

Thus we have the American Secretary of Agriculture using every means at his command to curtail the production of milk in the United States while, at the same time, the Russian dictator is striving to increase the supply of milk for the Russian people.

Under these circumstances there can be no doubt but that Russia will sometime surpass the United States in the per capita production of milk. When this happens it will be a bigger propaganda victory than sputnik in many of the depressed areas of the world where cow's milk for children is such a precious commodity.

But then comes up a most natural question, "Are we really producing more milk than we need?" If we are, of course we should quit producing so much milk.

Few men in America work as hard as the dairy farmer. He starts to milk his cows at 4 o'clock in the morning and again at 4 o'clock in afternoon—365 days in the year. He works hard, long hours to produce the world's most nearly perfect food. But if he is to be paid 25 percent less than he ought to be paid for his work, of course all of us would advise many dairy farmers to quit milking cows and to look for some more remunerative kind of work.

In the week ending December 14, 1957, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that if nobody would trust him alone to set the price at which corn, cotton, and wheat would be supported by the Government then he would consent to having these prices set by a bipartisan committee of the Congress.

This then brings up another natural question, "If, as the Secretary admits, nobody will trust him alone to set the prices at which corn, cotton, and wheat are supported—then why should we trust him alone to set the price at which milk is supported?" The supply and the price of milk is of much more importance to the housewives and children of the United States than is the price and acreage allotments of corn, cotton, and wheat.

I have two suggestions to make. (1) Let us accept the Secretary's offer with respect to crops, but transfer it to the matter of milk. Let us have a bipartisan committee of the Congress set the Government support price for milk but let Congress also set up a committee of agricultural economists, representatives of housewives, dairy executives, and dairy farmers to advise with the Congressional committee in the setting of the milk price to the farmer. They would do a more enlightened job than would the Secretary of Agriculture alone (any Secretary of Agriculture alone). We are putting too much power in the hands of one man when we let the Secretary of Agriculture alone set the price of milk for the people of the United States.

There are relatively few dairy farmers in the United States. They are "little people". They work hard but they have no organization of consequence, they don't represent many votes, and they have no powerful lobby in Washington—they just about have to take what Government rulings and prices are handed them, or quit milking cows.

Do we want a lot of dairy farmers in the United States to quit milking cows?

The housewives of the United States will be listened to by the Congress on any such important subject as milk. My second suggestion is that the P. T. A.'s of America, and the Leagues of Women Voters, and all groups of women, carefully consider this matter of our milk supply and price. Then let your Congressman and your Senator know what you think of this "one man control" of our milk supply and price.

L. W. COOK.

DECATUR, ILL.

## ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many of us had hoped that the administration would summon the courage to propose a separate appropriation for economic assistance to India. Instead, the decision has apparently been made to include a modest amount for Indian aid in the new mutual-security bill, which, combined with possible loans from other sources and some Public Law

480 assistance, can be added together in a minimal package.

Frankly, I do not think that this is the dramatic program which the situation really requires. Several disturbed statesmen and commentators have brought the facts of the matter to our attention recently. In each case the facts have seemed to spell out a real challenge for the future of democracy in Asia, should India's second 5-year plan fail.

One of the best of these articles was written by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. It is entitled "If India Falls" and appears in the January 1958 issue of the Progressive magazine. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF INDIA FALLS

(By Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY)

In the wide span of American responsibilities in foreign policy none has been more perplexing than the formulation of a policy toward the new and uncommitted nations running from Casablanca to Djakarta. Over the past few years we have begun to appreciate that tested formulae we have applied to events in Western Europe and NATO have only limited application to the broad medley of changes occurring in an uncommitted world. Though we have learned that we must come to terms with the new nationalisms, we have tended to interpret their meanings too much against the backdrop of our own historic experience.

Easy as it is to proclaim a position of "anticolonialism," many sympathetic observers in the West have not fully realized that some of the new states have set their courses in an environment empty of positive democratic or liberal aim; that their attainment of political independence was but a prologue to the harsh realities of political and economic growth.

We have begun to learn that a purely military response to the tides in the Middle East and Asia is an illusory breakwater. For military pacts and arms shipments are themselves new divisive forces in areas shot through with national rivalries, often without historic boundaries and allegiances. We are beginning to see, too, the special attraction and emotional appeal which the Soviet Union has in the fluid pattern of events in the uncommitted world, to people full of social resentment and accustomed to authoritarian rule. Communism to them is the alternative, with the glamour of novelty, of breaking fresh ground, and of seeming to offer disciplined, coherent, and irresistible answers to the overwhelming problems of economic management and progress. Indeed, it has been one of Marxism's cruelest ironies that it has gained special force not in advanced industrial societies, but in areas of stagnation, peasant economy, or petrified authoritarianism.

Can the underdeveloped countries achieve economic modernization in freedom? The outlook in many countries is not hopeful. Some of these countries provide barren soil for any real economic progress to take root—they cannot productively absorb investment capital, they do not possess the skills or plans or social outlook which derive genuine benefit from economic assistance, their rapid gains in population seem certain to outpace any attempted increase in living standards. There are, of course, exceptions—and we dare not give any up as lost.

But one country in particular, India, has successfully pointed the way to progressive economic development; it has achieved a steady rate of growth, established the firm beginning of an industrial base, maintained an economy in which the private sector plays a large role, and avoided an excess of governmental regimentation and controls. In India democracy has prevailed in the face of heavy obstacles, the national and per capita incomes have risen despite the continuing rise in population, and education has spread. Two national elections have been held on the basis of universal suffrage. The parliamentary framework is no mirage and is sustained by capable political leadership and a first-rate civil service.

In 1956 India completed its first 5-year plan. During that time national income rose by nearly 18 percent, at least 5 percent more than expected. Quite apart from its intrinsic economic achievements, this plan, with its emphasis on agriculture, helped to generate a mood of national confidence, to divert national energies away from sterile colonial grievances and into the task of national self-development. Moreover, the plan was favored by good harvests and benign weather. During the period of this plan (1951–56) the United States aided India with nearly $300 million as well as a wheat loan of $190 million and a share in World Bank loans running to $40 million. Few assistance contributions we have made have been better used for real economic development.

India's second 5-year plan is now in its second year. In contrast to the first plan it stands in great peril. It may soon collapse. In part this danger is the handmaiden of success—the fact that the Indian economy is expanding, that the government has not imposed a rigid series of controls, that it has permitted a considerable sector of private enterprise. This plan, moreover, is ambitious—two-and-a-half times as large as the first plan. It is seeking to cross the most difficult threshold of economic growth—the establishment of capital-generative basic industries such as steel. It is trying to double Indian national income in real terms in the next 10 or 12 years. It seeks to mobilize India's rich resources in hydropower, iron ore, manganese, coal. The essential features of the plan include three steel mills, which absorb the largest fraction of the investment and which would expand crude steel output to 6 million tons; railway and transport improvements costing over $2½ billion; machine moulding shops and a step-up in hydroelectric and coal output, as well as critical but less expansive plans for agriculture and irrigation, service industries, housing, and education.

Clearly this plan, which is developing at a time of poor harvests and growing unemployment, and which requires the importation of machinery from abroad, is dependent upon international credit. But this is a time of high prices in foreign capital. The World Bank's interest rate is more than 5½ percent. The road ahead for India's plan seems extremely difficult indeed.

It is easy to dismiss India's needs with the assertion that she has launched a grandiose and impossibly large scheme calling for a scale of efforts and cumulative capital infusion wholly beyond her capacity. Yet this is hardly the fact. The investment represented is less than $7 per head per year. Until 1961 it seeks only a total increase in income of 5 percent per year, or about 3½ percent per capita—by no means an extravagant goal when set beside the parallel effort of totalitarian planning by China. If the plan succeeds, India's rate of investment will still be less than 10 percent of total national income, compared with nearly 20 percent in Russia and 15 percent in prewar Japan. In a country with twice the population of all Western Europe, the scale of financing will only equal Sweden's (with a population of 7 million).

India, moreover, has taken stern measures of economic self-discipline. Austerity characterizes the current economic program of the Indian Government. Taxes are high, especially after the recent addition of wealth and expenditure taxes; stiff import controls and licensing have been imposed to ease the drain on India's foreign exchange reserves. Foreign travel has been almost prohibited. Though few persons have an income level that contributes much taxation in a nation whose per capita income is under $60, persons of measurable income are taxed more heavily than anywhere in the world. In fact, the real question is whether these austerity measures may not have reached the point of becoming self-defeating—drying up too much private capital, debilitating the private sector by the rigidity of import controls, sapping the incentives on which much of the plan was predicated.

Unfortunately, a serious foreign exchange crisis has forced India to prune its plan to the core. Her balance of payments gap may be as much as $3 billion over the next 3½ years. Her foreign reserves have already been almost halved in the past year. Import restrictions on consumer goods have been tightened and some expenditures under the plan curtailed, extend in time, or canceled. Railroad stations, office buildings, foreign cultural missions, radio transmitters, and health centers have been the victims of the cutback. But these measures have only closed the gap a little; the heavy expenditures lie in the heart of the plan—steel, transport, irrigation, machine plants, power.

Can the Indian Government cut further into the plan without deflating all its vital energies? It is quite clear that it cannot; for a genuine program of economic development is a seamless web which cannot be pulled apart and rewoven from cheaper materials. The Indian economy has reached a level of maturity and complexity in which the various elements of the plan are interwoven—steel and transport and coal and machine tools are part of a single complex and must grow together. Moreover, electric power and education are the muscle for a developmental effort. Without them there will be a husk without the kernel.

Further serious cuts in the plan, in short, would not save money. They would only veil and compound even greater costs in the future—or decree the death sentence of the plan and India's democratic experiment in Asia. There may be some stretch-out which can be made, a few frills to be cut and a few postponements which are possible, but they little affect the overall scale of the plan or the size of India's loan and aid requirements.

If the second 5-year plan collapses, so may India. If India collapses, so may all of Asia. If all of Asia collapses, so does the security of the United States of America. However sharply one may reject the concept of American ideals impelling us to help others in need, however blind one may be to the dependence of our own economic well-being upon our closing the prosperity gap between ourselves and the have-not nations, no thoughtful citizen can fail to see our direct stake in the survival of free government in India. If India—the showcase of the democratic experiment in Asia, the only real contender with Peking for the faith and following of that continent's millions of questioning citizens—should fall prey to internal disorder, agitation, or disillusionment, or if she should join China (with a population of nearly 1 billion between them) in the Communist camp, the free world would never be the same.

Though the Indian Government has consistently been reluctant to ask for outside help, neither that Government nor our own can avoid the fact that the second 5-year plan is fully dependent upon outside capital. The Communist world need not supply

it—their purposes would be even better suited by the Nehru Government's failure. It is the free world—basically its wealthiest leader, the United States—that holds the key to India's future; and India's future may well be the key to the free world.

The central issue is not India's neutrality, or the statements of Nehru and Krishna Menon, or India's relations with Pakistan, or the existence of nationalized industries, or competition with or restrictions on American products. We may talk about these and other problems—we may assert they require further study or negotiation or delay—but they cannot obscure the central issue: the survival of India, of Asia, of the free world. No discussion can avoid the harsh facts of India's real needs, of her dependence upon the second plan's success, of that plan's dependence upon American funds, and of our dependence upon a free and independent India.

It is not as though the Indian Government has warned: "Help us or we shall go to Moscow." They have attempted no such intimidation. But they know and we know what the alternatives are to economic and political stability in Asia—and what happened in the Indian state of Kerala, where well-educated but despairing citizens freely elected a Communist government.

The necessity for American action is so apparent that the real question now, I would hope, is not whether we respond but how. There is some indication that the administration is unwilling to take the matter directly to Congress, but may prefer instead to piece together an aid program from existing laws, much as they did in the case of Poland last spring. Would this be enough?

At the present time the United States is furnishing India about $70 million in hard currency assistance, most of it on a loan basis. About $60 million is for economic development purposes—such as machinery and steel plates—and the remainder in technical assistance. In addition, India will receive about $360 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities—largely wheat and rice—over a 3-year period, with a substantial portion of the local currencies resulting from the sale of these commodities also loaned back to India for economic development purposes. Although the total is thus already a larger level of assistance than we were providing under the first plan, it falls far short of her requirements, even after the assistance likely to come from other nations and the World Bank.

There are, of course, avenues of increased assistance under present legislation which the administration is exploring:

First, the law on agricultural surpluses may be capitalized by another half billion or more dollars, with some of this going to India—but there are many other claimants, including close allies such as Greece and Turkey.

Second, the Export-Import Bank might reshape its policies so as to include India. But its current requirements for early repayment and for the purchase of American goods make it of little help to India's program—and a half a billion of its current credit has already been committed to Great Britain.

Third, India might receive a larger loan from the new ICA (International Development Fund). But the Congress capitalized this fund at only $300 million; and even if a sharp increase were voted at this coming session, it also must serve many "customers" without committing an exaggeratedly large percentage of its funds to any one country.

Perhaps these laws could all be used; perhaps we could adapt the proposals for increasing India's credit suggested by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, our able former ambassador to New Delhi, who urged that we sell an additional $160 million of agricultural surpluses against rupees, and convert the $190 million wheat loans of 1951 to a rupee basis. But these steps do not seem to me to come to terms with India's real needs over the full span of the second plan. That effort requires something more than merely small injections of adrenalin.

Too often in the past our aid to India has been marked by reluctance, vacillation, and excessive redtape. It seems to me that, rather than relying year by year on a series of expedients, holding the Indians in perpetual suspense, and giving aid short of the minimum required, the time has come to meet the problem head on with special legislation, to act generously according to our ability in full recognition that the success of the Indian development scheme is in our own best interest.

Because of the shortage of time, it may be necessary in the coming year to pass an emergency-type program for India to last until there has been a full assessment of needs—as Congress did in the fall of 1957 for the start of the Marshall plan. But it would be no service to ourselves or to India to hope that a final solution can be found by squeezing small items from all existing laws and hoping that they can do the job with a little belt tightening in India. If our actions are to have the maximum economic and psychological impact, it is essential that we meet this challenge boldly and with courage.

This is not to say that the $600 million loan figure informally suggested to our Government by Indian Finance Minister Krishnamachari represents a magic number as either a floor or a ceiling. Our stake in the plan is vital enough for us to make certain that we grant neither too little nor too much. The Indian planners themselves seem uncertain about their "built-in deficit," about what further cuts or postponements are plausible, or what their real needs will be for dollar loan support through 1961. The serious plight of the plan is obvious in India's talks with American, British, and German leaders—but the exact nature of its needs need to be spelled out more fully.

The parallel here with the problems of European recovery just 10 years ago is striking. Like that of postwar Europe, the Indian economy has reached the crucial and precarious point of success or failure, with much the same political dangers. Secretary George C. Marshall in 1947 urged the European countries to make a reckoning of their primary requirements. After such a review and a candid presentation of needs, it was possible for Congress to commit itself to the Marshall program of European recovery. Today, if we are to become effective contributors to India's economic survival and health, it is essential that India present us with a searching and wholly realistic accounting of its plans and needs.

As long as her precise requirements are shrouded in uncertainty, we are likely to continue purely stopgap and patchwork remedies which will satisfy neither India nor potential lenders. It is far better if a frank exchange exists between both countries, both in terms of generating support and securing a level of aid which rests on more than false expectations or cloudy hopes. There exists in the United States a large reservoir of good will toward India and a genuine concern that its economic growth be unimpaired. But a fund of good will becomes a source of support only if there is assurance that India herself knows her destination and goals and is aware of the means necessary to reach them. It would be an important step forward if the United States would begin at once to undertake the kind of bipartisan surveys which were made in Europe in 1947–48, both through Congressional committees and executive study groups.

It is not suggested, of course, that the United States Treasury be the sole source of support to sustain the Indian plan. On the contrary, the occasion provides a splendid opportunity for the kind of real multilateral assistance and joint effort many of us have long urged. It is likely that Germany will make a significant contribution, that Canada and Great Britain and the Colombo plan countries can make modest ones, and that in the improved climate of relations even Japan may be a contributory state in textile machinery. Moreover, the International Bank has already made loans for railroad development and to the Tata Steel Co., and will probably make more beyond the $360 million already committed.

The Soviet Union, too, may well be a contributor—and some will say that American aid is thus futile or misguided. The Soviet Union has, to be sure, loaned India much of the money to build the Bhelai steel mill on a 12-year 2½ percent loan and has recently negotiated another $126 million loan at low interest. But here seems to be an extraordinary opportunity to match systems with the Soviet Union on favorable terms, to show our true concern for economic development, and to push India well ahead in its competition with the Chinese economy (which is also on its second plan phase and experiencing serious trouble, especially in the agricultural sector).

Finally, some help can be expected from private investment, which has already entered India in some quantity and will continue to do so on an expanded basis. But private investment cannot cover the gap. There is little question that dollar for dollar private investment is both the most durable and most resilient form of assistance; and varied foreign concerns and banks have made investments in India. (Krupps of Germany is building a steel mill; the World Bank has repeatedly shown confidence in the private sector of the Indian economy.) But it is equally true that we are in a period of investment capital starvation, with an overabundance of capital outlets and a depletion of available sources. The United States channeled over $4 billion into private foreign investment last year, but less than 10 percent of this was venture capital in underdeveloped states. Well over three-quarters is attributable to investment in Canada, in Latin America, and Middle East oil.

There is no visible political glory for either party in coming to the aid of India, particularly at this time of high taxes and pressing defense needs. The task of selling such a program to the American people is far more difficult than that of a decade ago—for we were more familiar with the people and problems of Europe, our ties were closer, their economies were more directly allied with our own and held out more certain promise of success. But the need and the danger are as great now as then—India today represents as great a hope and challenge to the future of liberal democracy as Western Europe did in 1947—and our people are still, I am confident, equal to the effort.

I realize that it is difficult to give resonance to such words and proposals in the mood which has governed our approach to foreign aid and economic policy in the past sessions of Congress. But this mood has in part been induced by the persistent counsel of caution, by the lack of vision and purposefulness with which we have approached the problems of the underdeveloped world. If we are to break the aimless drift and deadlocks in policy, if we are to regain the initiative in world affairs, if we are to rouse the decent emotions of Americans, it is time again that we seek projects with the power of stirring and rallying our hopes and energies.

In the Indian loan appeal the United States can both demonstrate our creative magnanimity and serve well our national interest in Asia.

## UNION DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of this body to an outstanding example of union democracy in action, which has been taking place for the last 2 weeks here in Washington. I know our distinguished Presiding Officer, the Vice President, is aware of this, because he addressed the distinguished assembly of delegates.

I am referring, Mr. President, to a series of working conferences that are being held here by one of America's great unions, the United Steel Workers of America. These conferences were addressed by the Vice President and by the Senate majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas].

During these 2 weeks 4,000 rank and file leaders of this great union, representing 1¼ million members from nearly every State in America, have been holding workshop meetings here. They have been discussing not only how to best serve the people they represent in their unions, but also their communities, their States, and the Nation.

These leaders come from the working heart of America—from the iron ranges of my own State of Minnesota, from the lead and zinc mines of the Rocky Mountains, from the great industrial centers, from the giant steel centers of Gary, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago, and elsewhere, and from the fabricating mills and plants which produce not only the weapons of national defense but the instruments of peaceful living in the home.

In addition to their many industry problems, they are faced with a common problem—the specter of growing unemployment and recession. They are deeply concerned, not only for themselves, but for the entire Nation and the Free World.

Mr. President, I am proud to say it has always been my privilege to have the support of this great democratic union membership. It represents industrial democracy at its best. Within the framework of its democratic constitution, the rank-and-file members elect their own officers, from the local union to the international level. Their election structure is similar to the democratic election structure of our Nation.

Their elected president, David J. McDonald, one of the truly able and distinguished labor statesmen, has brilliantly presented an analysis to these conferences of the problems facing the economy in this uneasy and troubled world. I know Mr. McDonald to be one of the true labor statesmen of America, Mr. President, and a great public servant of our country.

Mr. President, I commend this analysis to every Member of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEELWORKERS AND THE ECONOMY: WHAT IS HAPPENING AND WHAT MUST BE DONE

(An address by David J. McDonald, President, United Steelworkers of America, January 6, 1958)

As America enters a new year of crisis, it is necessary to speak forthrightly about the state of our national economy.

Another periodic business downturn has overtaken us, and it shows evidence of becoming as severe as, or perhaps worse than, the recessions of 1949 and 1954. Because of recent production cutbacks, the living standards of millions of our families have already begun to deteriorate, our security is being weakened, and our prestige overseas is undermined.

As spokesman for over 1,250,000 steelworkers who are deeply affected by these events, and as an American, I cannot refrain from expressing my candid views about what is happening and what must be done.

Even before the first sputnik flashed across the sky and dramatized the rapid rise of Soviet scientific, industrial and military might, our own unmatched productive system—the inspiration and defensive bulwark of the entire Free World—had entered a dangerous downward drift.

Manufacturing and mining output in the United States has dropped 7 percent between December 1956 and December 1957. Moreover, the fall-off has been accelerating rapidly during the last 4 months.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, reports that its industrial production went up 10 percent during the year just ended.

Our output, moreover, continues to decline and most economists foresee no upturn before the second half of 1958, if by then, unless vigorous corrective action is taken immediately.

By mid-November, 3.2 million Americans were already unemployed. This was the highest jobless count for any November since 1949. Since then—although official figures are not yet available—we all know that unemployment has gone up still more.

Workers in manufacturing are particularly hard hit. By mid-November, factory jobs had already been slashed by 654,000 since December 1956. In the same period, the workweek in manufacturing fell off from 41.0 hours to 39.3. Furthermore, employment in major nonmanufacturing categories has also leveled off or declined.

Unemployment and underemployment inevitably overtake the economy when the output of one great American industry after another stagnates or declines.

Today, the aluminum industry is turning out about 12 percent less than its rapidly expanding capacity could provide; 20 percent less major electrical appliances are being manufactured than could be produced; 25 percent less automobiles; 40 percent less freight cars; 50 percent less machine tools.

And, today over a third of the production capacity of the great basic steel industry of the United States stands idle. Blast furnaces, open hearths, and rolling mills capable of turning out an additional 50 million tons of steel ingots a year to meet our civilian and defense requirements, are now shut down.

Meanwhile, 125,000 members of the United Steelworkers of America in basic steel, ferrous and nonferrous metal mining, and in metal fabricating establishments are unemployed and 200,000 additional members are working short time.

The loss of purchasing power suffered by our membership alone, due to unemployment and the reduced workweek, now approximates a rate of $850 million a year.

Steel industry forecasters express only a hope that production may rise sufficiently in the last part of 1958 to achieve an average operating rate of about 75 percent of capacity for the year. But even if this goal is reached, the United States will have lost—and irretrievably—about 35 million tons of steel that could have been produced. This is in addition to the loss of 15 million tons that we could have turned out in the last 6 months of 1957, but did not.

In 1957–58—as in 1949 and 1954—our constantly rising capacity to produce has again outpaced the ability of 55 million American families to buy the wealth our national economy is able to turn out.

For 2 years our soaring investment in new plants and in more efficient equipment sparked the boom which ended last year. In 1956, capital investment skyrocketed to a record $35 billion, more than $6 billion higher than the year before. In 1957 it rose still higher, to $37 billion. This tremendous expansion of production capacity has created the possibility of an unprecedented growth in the output of goods of all sorts.

Unfortunately, however, demands from all sources have lagged far behind our rising ability to produce. In fact, in many important categories 1957 sales were lagging behind the levels of a year or even 2 years before.

For example:

In the first 11 months of 1957, the sale of new automobiles came to 5½ million, a shade less than the year before. During the same period in 1955, however, over 7 million new cars were sold.

Last year, new housing starts fell to less than a million for the first time since 1948. In 1956, we started to build over 1.1 million new dwelling units and more than 1.3 million in the course of the year before.

Shipments of major electrical appliances also lagged in 1957—freezers were down 5 percent from the year before, refrigerators down 9½ percent, ranges down 14 percent.

Furniture sales also fell off about 10 percent last year.

Freight carloadings are running about 15 percent below a year ago.

Waning optimism about the health of the economy was finally reflected on Wall Street and set in motion the stock-market slump that began last July. As production schedules leveled off or moved downward, the decline gradually spread, like a chain reaction, from one industry to another.

For 3 successive months the personal income of the American people has been going down, although most of the drop so far is in "labor" income, and reflects the wage losses from unemployment and the shorter workweek.

Retail sales have likewise shown a downward trend in recent months. As more and more families find their income falling, and millions become apprehensive about their jobs and debts (consumer debt is now at a record high) a lag in sales is not surprising.

Meanwhile, manufacturing and trade inventories are near an alltime peak. As could be anticipated under these circumstances, incoming orders and the unfilled backlogs of many manufacturing concerns, are now declining.

Thus, the immediate outlook is not good.

During the 1949 recession, rapidly rising Federal, State, and local expenditures and rising automobile sales helped to cushion the decline. During the 1954 slump, booming home construction and rising consumer purchases did the same. Unfortunately, no comparable upward movement in any major area is immediately in sight on the basis of production forecasts.

Housing starts now show no sign of rising appreciably above the level of 1957.

Automobile production—with 800,000 new 1958 models reported to be in dealers' showrooms and overflowing the lots—hardly looks promising for 1958. In fact, industry sources now predict lower sales than a year ago.

Since midsummer, exports also have been falling.

Furthermore, in the face of idle production capacity, businessmen are revising their plans for new plant and equipment downward. An overall drop of at least $2 billion—or about 7 percent—is forecast for 1958. Outlays by manufacturers are already expected to fall 16 percent. If demand fails to rise very quickly, these totals may well be cut still more. (At the same time, our capacity to produce with more efficient machines and with fewer employees will still be rising

rapidly as expansion programs for this year as well as for previous years are finally completed.)

Although total Government outlays will go up in 1958, there is no indication that the increase now planned will be sufficient to restore full employment and production in the months immediately ahead. The national administration, although belatedly accelerating defense procurement contracts, apparently will propose an overall Federal budget rise of only two to three billion dollars. At the State and local level, where tax collections are beginning to level off, public assistance costs are rising, and the debt burden is now at an alltime high, we cannot be too certain that public works outlays will continue to rise substantially.

As steelworkers, we have no desire to make political capital out of the deteriorating economic situation and the absence of an adequate effort to change it. However, events are becoming increasingly critical for hundreds of thousands of our members, and for the Nation.

Instead of vainly waiting to see if the situation gets worse, in 3 months or in 6—and facing the possibility of having to cope with a much more difficult problem later on—action must be taken now to reverse the downward trend.

The great American productive system can be, and must be, immediately restored to full operation to meet the daily needs of our expanding population and the defense requirements of the imperiled free world. Our economy must, in fact, move constantly forward to higher levels of production and efficiency.

By the last 3 months of 1958, it is possible to achieve a record production rate at least $25 billion higher than our output level during the last quarter of 1957.

We are completely confident this production goal can be achieved. These are our views about why we must achieve it, and how:

1. THE DEFENSE OF THE FREE WORLD MUST BE MADE SECURE

Many argue that until a worldwide disarmament agreement can become a reality, only our own overwhelming retaliatory power will effectively deter aggression.

As steelworkers, we do not deem ourselves experts who can advise precisely what must be done, how much, and how fast.

But this we certainly do know. No other nation on the face of the globe can match our physical and manpower resources available to do any job. Given the facts and the leadership, Americans will support, and will accomplish, whatever must be done.

Is it not time to be getting on with the job?

From mid-1957 to the end of this year, about 50 million tons of steel that America could and should have been producing to remain strong and prosperous, will likely be lost if we keep on drifting. This tragic waste is actually equivalent to over 80 percent of the entire 60 million ton steel production goal the Russians have set for themselves in 1958.

Furthermore, the present recession is already causing a mountainous production loss of other vital materials and equipment.

We recognize, of course, that many factors other than the amount of money spent and materials used up determine the effectiveness of our defense preparedness. Scientific research, military production planning, and the training of technical personnel are increasingly vital too. We are not apostles of frenzied defense spending for its own sake, alone.

American educational leadership—on which our scientific and technical advances, our public welfare and our defense all irrevocably depend—must be restored. Far more facilities for scientific research and training must be established. Competent teachers must be attracted to the schools, and kept there, by the payment of adequate salaries. Furthermore, a vast extension of higher education in all fields must be achieved through scholarships and by other means.

Is it not a national scandal that today only 4 out of every 11 high school graduates who are qualified, actually enter college? The rest either lack the necessary motivation to continue their education, or are financially unable to pay for it.

In addition, we must further extend our effort to aid underdeveloped free nations, for humanitarian and security reasons alike. Stronger economies, as well as military aid, are essential everywhere to strengthen freedom. Unfortunately, the gap between the poor nations and the wealthy ones is getting wider, rather than diminishing.

We should be helping more, by increasing mutually beneficial trade, by increasing technical assistance, and by increasing our grants and loans—particularly at a time when demands on our industry are slack and our farmers are capable of producing an abundance we cannot ourselves consume.

2. THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES OF AMERICAN COMMUNITIES MUST BE EXPANDED TO MEET OUR GROWING NEEDS

There is much to be done at home that could keep America's mammoth productive system continuously and fully employed.

For example, at the present time we could be producing more steel, cement, aluminum, and glass to help end the critical classroom shortage across the Nation.

American schools and colleges are already filled to overflowing. Yet, enrollments are now increasing by over a million a year. By 1965, elementary, high school and college attendance is expected to be 15 million higher than it was in 1955.

Already the classroom shortage exceeds 150,000. In the next 5 years, according to responsible estimates, America should build at least half a million new schoolrooms. A total of about 15,000 new schools should be constructed throughout the Nation.

Passage of the Federal School Construction Act will give needed aid in this area. More than Federal-aid at the college level and for scientific and technical research is now needed; we must strengthen our entire school system from the bottom up. Passage of this act is essential to help build schools in communities where they are now most critically needed. At the same time, it will put idle men and machines back to work. Most important, it will show that Americans mean it when we say that our education must once again lead the world.

In addition, a tremendous backlog of unmet public facility needs—besides our school requirements—has been gradually building up.

In 1940, we were a Nation of 132 million people. There are 172 million Americans today. Ten years from now there will be 200 million.

Naturally, this astronomical population rise is increasing the demand for every type of public facility. Moreover, the construction lag during the depression and two wars has intensified the crisis we now face.

Despite our record postwar state and local construction of streets and highways, water, sewerage and industrial waste facilities, airports, parks and recreational centers, hospitals and other institutional buildings, the need keeps mounting, particularly in the congested metropolitan areas where most of the population growth is now occurring.

According to Government studies, even the present peak rate of State and local public works construction is less than half of our current need.

On the Federal level, we are also lagging in harbor improvement, flood control, the expansion of power facilities, the strengthening of our merchant marine, the improvement of our national parks and forests, and the construction of Federal buildings.

All of these public facilities—Federal, State and local—are essential and urgently needed public improvements.

By accelerating this kind of construction now, we could stimulate employment and utilize industrial capacity we are presently wasting. Furthermore, the wealth of the entire Nation could be greatly and permanently increased.

Prompt Federal leadership could rapidly increase home construction and slum clearance in cities across the country. Only last month Fortune magazine pointed out—"Today some 17 million Americans live in dwellings that are beyond rehabilitation—decayed, dirty, rat infested, without decent heat or light or plumbing. This problem affects all our metropolitan cities * * * but it is most severe in the biggest, richest, and most industrialized. The number of people crowded into slums is growing faster than the cities as a whole."

Responsible public groups report that a national housing goal of two million new units a year is now required if the dream of an adequate home for every American family is ultimately to be fulfilled. Surely, we can at least achieve the 1.5 million annual housing starts long ago proposed by the late Senator Taft. It can be done with proper Federal leadership.

In the first instance, public policies must support the construction of well built and reasonably priced homes for the middle-income market, by allowing low initial payments and long-term mortgages at low interest rates, geared to ability to pay.

To meet the needs of families who cannot afford to undertake home ownership, public housing also must be substantially increased.

Is not now the time—particularly when idle plants and manpower are available—to move faster toward the goal of decent homes in decent neighborhoods for all Americans, regardless of their economic status?

3. WE MUST RAISE THE LIVING STANDARDS OF ALL AMERICAN FAMILIES, AND PARTICULARLY THE NEEDIEST

Millions of our fellow citizens still live in poverty despite the unequaled American economic gains of the last 20 years. And, poverty continues to breed upon misfortunes which still abound in these United States. These include: Substandard wages; unemployment and underemployment; old age without adequate resources; the impact of accidents, ill health, and death upon the unprotected family; educational deficiencies; discrimination because of color, race, or creed.

Uncounted millions of our fellow Americans still work for less than $1 an hour. The protection intended by the fair labor standards laws has just passed them by.

For the unemployed, our State compensation system barely provides an average of $28 a week. Only in 2 States do even these meager benefits continue beyond 26 weeks; in 13 States, they end after 20 weeks, or less.

For the aged, our Federal social-security system is providing an average of only $24.50 weekly for a married couple, and only $16.10 for a primary beneficiary alone.

Under our State workmen's compensation laws, payments for work-incurred injury, and for death, continue to be scandalously low. Besides, we still have no adequate system that insures the American family against income loss due to non-work-incurred disability and the soaring medical cost of catastrophic illness.

It should come as no surprise that a Congressional inquiry, 2 years ago, found 31 million Americans in families with cash income of less than $2,000 a year. Even in prosperous 1956, 29 percent of our families had incomes of under $3,000 before taxes, according to the Federal Reserve Board. Furthermore, 53 percent of our families had less than $500 in liquid savings with which

to face emergencies; 23 percent had none at all.

Surely, there is no moral and no economic justification for unused factory and farm capacity when so many American families still are in need of so much.

America must set about raising family incomes fast enough to keep pace with its constantly rising ability to produce. And it must move fastest where the need is clearly most urgent.

We should raise the standards and coverage of minimum wage laws immediately.

We should expand the benefits and the coverage of our social-security laws so that the unemployed, the aged, the sick, widows and orphans, and the victims of industrial accidents can begin to live in dignity and decency.

We must oppose the increasing use of sales taxes and wage taxes that already bear so heavily on our lowest income families. Exemptions for dependents under the Federal income tax law must also be raised to a level that more realistically reflects the cost of raising a child.

Furthermore, all wage and salary earners must fairly share in benefits from productivity gains that they constantly are helping to bring about.

Steelworkers can claim a measure of achievement in this regard. Yet, in the basic steel industry productivity—the real output rise per manhour—has actually gone up far faster than the real wage gains of the workers. Between 1939 and 1957, real hourly straight time wages went up 53 percent. Steel productivity, on the other hand, rose 71 percent.

The determination of many industrial leaders to profiteer on every wage increase—while making labor the scapegoat for the higher prices they impose—is a major reason why real family incomes have not kept pace with our rising capacity to produce, and, in fact, why for millions real income has been falling.

The steel industry is a classic example of the way this inflation-making process operates.

Although steel prices had already been raised $13.50 a ton in less than 1 year, only last July they were hiked $6 more. Yet, prices could have been cut by $6 and profits still would have compared favorably with profits earned by the industry in most any prior year.

Is it any wonder that in 1957, despite drastically reduced production, steel profits were higher than at any time before?

This effort by the steel and other industries to wring ever higher profits from ever higher prices has triggered the inflation that has plagued us all through the postwar years. A stable relationship between costs and profits is never long established. While a few profiteer, the many suffer. Ultimately, the process becomes self-defeating even for those who start it, because prices move so high that full production cannot be maintained. This is a major reason for the recessions which occur every 3 or 4 years.

4. MOST IMPORTANT, WE MUST BE DETERMINED TO UTILIZE FULLY AMERICA'S UNMATCHED RESOURCES AND OUR LEADERS MUST GUIDE THE WAY. THIS IS A TIME FOR ACTION

Twelve years ago, when Congress passed the Employment Act of 1946, it pledged to the American people that:

"It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all of its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining * * * maximum employment."

There is no need to tell steelworkers—with thousands of our members now unemployed or working part-time, and facing uncertainty and distress—that this pledge to the Nation has not been fulfilled.

Yet, in the hands of the Federal Government there are, and have been, the means to prevent this unnecessary economic downturn.

By working cooperatively with State and local governments, and with private groups, and by using the economic know-how and vast monetary, fiscal, and procurement powers at its command much could have been done.

While an increase in family spending should have been a major tax policy objective at the end of the Korean war, the Federal Revenue Code Amendments of 1954 conveyed billions in tax savings to wealthy individuals and corporations instead. Practically no relief has been granted, on the other hand, to the 28 million Federal taxpayers with incomes of $5,000 or less.

In the name of fighting inflation, brought on largely by profiteering and the capital expansion boom—a blunderbuss hard money, high-interest rate policy has been pursued without adequate thought of its consequences. Unfortunately, it has hindered critically needed public construction. Besides, high interest rates have added billions to the carrying charges of family purchases of appliances, automobiles, and homes, and to the public cost of meeting the charges on Federal, State, and local debts.

In the name of economy, rising public service needs have been ignored and existing programs have been cut.

But this, I trust, is all behind us.

Let us now look to our defenses.

Let us accelerate the construction of the public facilities our expanding population so critically needs.

And, let us now—management, labor, and Government together—pursue those enlightened policies that are necessary to build up family purchasing power to match our rising capacity to produce.

If we but use our unmatched physical and human resources wisely, we can have adequate schools for all our children, decent homes and neighborhoods for all our families, and banish poverty forever from this land.

This unwarranted business downturn can be ended practically overnight. It must be. Americans are in no mood to tolerate the fatal doctrine of a balanced budget while their country keeps drifting down.

In April 1954, at another grave time for the steelworkers, the executive board of this great union said:

"The United Steelworkers of America neither view the present nor the future with hysteria. Our faith in this Nation and its capacity to meet its problems is unlimited."

We hold true to this view today. But it is time to get on with the job.

---

## DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, much of the press has given quite a distorted version of the issues involved in Secretary Benson's announced plans to further slash dairy supports. By and large, his propaganda claims have been taken at face value without many alert correspondents taking the trouble to check into the facts—and compare what Secretary Benson is saying now to what he promised then, and what happened to the past promises.

At least one newspaper took a more objective look—and came up with the conclusion that Mr. Benson is just pulling the wool over the public's eye.

The Springfield Leader Press of Springfield, Mo., carried an editorial on Thursday, January 9, which put the issue in true perspective. It concluded with this observation:

Mr. Benson should be guided by one of two objectives: to save Uncle Sam money or to improve the dairymen's market. We maintain—and history supports us—that he will fail in both.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDOING OF THE FARMER

By cutting dairy price supports to 90 percent of parity, Agriculture Secretary Benson said yesterday he anticipates a decline of at least 40 percent in Federal dairy products purchases in the next year.

On what basis does he make such a prediction? Surely not on the basis of experience. Mr. Benson, when he announced the price prop cut a few weeks ago, admitted that it would probably stimulate farmers to produce more milk, but he hoped that lower prices would also stimulate consumption accordingly.

At that time, Newsweek, a magazine not noted for its support of farm subsidies, dryly observed that past experience showed an increase in production could be expected, all right, but that this had always resulted in larger surpluses.

Turn back the clock to the last dairy subsidy reduction. In 1952, Uncle Sam was buying only three-tenths of 1 percent of our dairy output, when he was supporting prices at 90 percent of parity. Late that year, Mr. Benson rolled back the support level to 83 percent on milk used in manufacturing and 80 percent on butter.

Farmers immediately began to produce more milk and in 1953, United States dairy surplus purchases jumped from a mere 3 percent to 8.2 percent of the Nation's dairy output. Did he save money—better the market?

In the years since, the dairy farmer has slowly brought his output nearer to balance. Benson, yesterday, indicated the surplus would run to about 3 percent. However, United States Department of Agriculture estimates at mid-fall were well below this. The 1956 surplus was only about 3 percent and 1957's production was running behind its anticipated level, which hinted that 2 percent would be nearer right.

The United States dairy cow population fell 600,000 in 1956, as much as it did in the preceding 5 years. Butter production, for the first time in years, declined in 1957—which meant less Federal purchases. And across the Nation, milk markets were closer to complete balance than they'd been in years. In other words, the dairyman was digging out of his own depression.

If history repeats itself, production will soar again in 1958 and the same market morass, the same heavy purchases of surpluses will be suffered again.

Mr. Benson should be guided by one of two objectives; to save Uncle Sam money or to improve the dairymen's market. We maintain—and history supports us—that he will fail in both.

---

## THE REPLY OF DEAN ACHESON TO THE PROPOSALS OF GEORGE F. KENNAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. The former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, has made a very convincing refutation of some of the proposals recently advanced by Mr. George F. Kennan in his recent Reith lectures which were broadcast in Great

Britain over the facilities of the British Broadcasting Corp.

No one can question Mr. Kennan's ability, and no one should question his patriotism. In 1947, he helped to formulate the doctrine of containing communism, and by his writings aided in winning acceptance for this principle.

In his Reith lectures, Mr. Kennan in effect proposed that there should be a nuclear free zone in central Europe consisting of West Germany on the one hand and the Communist satellites of East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary on the other. He also advocated the mutual withdrawal of troops from this area, and indeed expressed the belief that all British and American troops should be withdrawn from the Continent if Russia would similarly withdraw her troops from her satellites.

I was in England—and later on the Continent—during and after Mr. Kennan's broadcasts, and I can testify from personal knowledge of the deep impression which they made upon public opinion throughout Europe. When joined with the successful launching by the Soviets of their two satellites, and our unfortunate failure in the same line, they served to increase the drift toward neutralism.

Mr. Kennan had every right to make his statements, and reasonable men should consider them. But Mr. Acheson has, I believe, made a convincing refutation of them. I would merely amplify his excellent general arguments by two specific illustrations of how Russian intimidation would inevitably operate were Mr. Kennan's proposals to be carried out.

First, with Russia's superiority in the field of the intermediate missiles, she could threaten West Germany with bombardment from Russian launching bases while we would need forward launching bases in West Germany as a deterrent against Russian attack. If these were given up, as Mr. Kennan advocates, the Russians would then be free to bully West Germany into doing its will. It would be difficult for the West Germans to resist.

Second, if our forces are withdrawn from the Continent of Europe or even from West Germany, it will then be infinitely easier for Russian troops subsequently to reenter the supposedly neutral zone than for British and American forces to do so. This would be true both militarily and psychologically. Mr. Kennan's full suggestion would, therefore, largely break up the Western Alliance and enable the Russians to take over the Continent of Europe. This would ultimately be almost fatal to our own security. Mr. Acheson has again performed a distinct public service, and I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the body of the RECORD. I am happy to add that former President Truman has expressed himself similarly to Mr. Acheson.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPLY TO KENNAN BY DEAN ACHESON

I am told that the impression exists in Europe that the views expressed by Mr. George Kennan in his Reith lectures, particularly that a proposal should be made for the withdrawal of American, British, and Russian troops from Europe, represent the views of the Democratic Party in the United States. Most categorically they do not, as Mr. Kennan would, I am sure, agree. The opinions stated in the Reith lectures are not now made by Mr. Kennan for the first time. They were expounded by him within the Democratic administration early in 1949, and rejected. They are, today contrary to the expressed opinion of Democratic leaders in the Congress and outside of it.

Mr. Kennan can speak with authority in the field he knows—and a broad one it is—the field of Russian history and culture, and the attitudes of mind induced by the practice of Marxist-Leninist ideology. Mr. Kennan has never, in my judgment, grasped the realities of power relationships, but takes a rather mystical attitude toward them. To Mr. Kennan there is no Soviet military threat in Europe. "If," he says, "the armed forces of the United States and Britain were not present on the Continent the problem of defense for the continental nations would be primarily one of the internal health and discipline of the respective national societies, and of the manner in which they were organized to prevent the conquest and subjugation of their national life by unscrupulous and foreign-inspired minorities in their midst." A desirable state of health and discipline would enable them to say to the Soviet Union that while it had the power to overrun them, "not a single Communist or other person likely to perform your political business will become available to you for this purpose." Then follows this almost Messianic statement:

"I think I can give personal assurance that any country which is in a position to say this to Moscow, not in so many words, but in that language of military posture and political behavior which the Russian Communists understand best of all, will have little need of foreign garrisons to assure its immunity from Soviet attack."

How can any man speak of a "personal assurance" to any such effect? On what does the guaranty rest, unless divine revelation? But, even in its terms, the assurance seems to contain its own refutatiton. In the present state of the distribution of power in this world, and in the light of the use made by the Russian Communist regime of its power to extend its authority, can one doubt that were it not for the American connection there would be no more independent national life in Western Europe than there is in Eastern Europe?

Mr. Kennan's prescription for salvation by internal health and discipline within the national societies of Europe calls for a degree of wholesome purity which does not exist within any state I can think of. Not only that, but the normal and natural consequences of leaving Russian military power unopposable on the Continent would seem to mean a vast increase in the number of those Communists and other persons likely to perform Russian political business available to supplant those who ventured to oppose that business. The very withdrawal from the Continent of the Allies, whose presence alone permits Western Europe to withstand Soviet pressure, will make impossible the development of that national health and discipline which is supposed to make their presence unnecessary.

To speak, as Mr. Kennan did, of the alternative to American and British power in Europe, as being "Soviet attack" is misleading. In many, perhaps in most, cases an attack by Soviet forces, faced with only token resistance, would not be necessary, as it was not in Czechoslovakia in 1948, or in Poland today. Soviet purposes could be accomplished by intimidation, with the lesson of Hungary in everyone's mind. Poland, by the way, might be the country which could come nearer than any in Europe to making the defiant declaration Mr. Kennan advocates. They know the Russians even better than Mr. Kennan does. But that does not free the Poles from Russian domination. It is idle to suppose that they would be more free if the power capable of opposing the Soviet Union withdrew from the Continent.

In a recent book I have stated my view of the matter in this way:

"When we say that the Western European nations can survive as independent states 'only with the active support of America,' what exactly do we mean? We mean something very specific. We mean that the only deterrent to the imposition of Russian will in Western Europe is the belief that from the outset of any such attempt, American power would be employed in stopping it, and if necessary, would inflict on the Soviet Union injury which the Moscow regime would not wish to suffer. The regime will not believe that this will happen if the United States and Western Europe are separated and stand alone. The problem of coalititon policy on both sides of the Atlantic is for leaders and people to understand this truth, act upon it, and with steady nerves run whatever risks are necessary."

There, too, I discuss, as there is not space to do here, why this course seems to me to offer the best way to a solution of Europe's problems. It recognizes the inescapable factor of power and the adjustment between two positions of power. But Mr. Kennan thinks otherwise. Let me quote him again:

"It cannot be stressed too often that NATO's real strength does not lie in the paper undertakings which underpin it; it lies—and will continue in any circumstances to lie—in the appreciation of the Western spiritual and cultural community. If this appreciation is there, NATO will not be weaker as a political reality, because it may be supplemented or replaced by other arrangements so far as Germany is concerned."

There are many things one might say about this. One is that the "other arrangements so far as Germany is concerned" would leave the military protection of Europe to massive nuclear retaliation, which is just where Mr. Kennan and all the rest of us do not want it to be. A second is that it indefinitely delays the day when nuclear weapons of all sorts might be canceled out and the guaranty of European security placed on allied conventional forces. But perhaps the most pertinent statement for our present purpose is that, so long as we are giving personal assurances, I think I can give mine that Mr. Kennan's opinion is not shared by any responsible leader in the Democratic Party in the United States.

## COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed order, and ask for immediate action upon it by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed order will be read.

The proposed order was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Government Operations and that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] be appointed to fill the vacancy thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the proposed order.

The order was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by way of explanation, I should like to make a brief statement.

On behalf of the Senate majority steering committee, I wish to express deep appreciation to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] for their generosity.

We in the majority were confronted with a difficult situation in terms of committee assignments when the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] was elected last year. The situation was solved when the junior Senator from Ohio unselfishly volunteered to resign from the Banking and Currency Committee.

Although this solved one problem, it opened another—a second assignment for the junior Senator from Ohio, which is required by law.

That situation has now been resolved by the resignation of the junior Senator from Texas from the Government Operations Committee.

Mr. President, this situation has been adjusted in a spirit of harmony and cooperation. I congratulate the two Senators and express the hope that the Senate will not forget what they have done.

## THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday the Democratic policy committee met and cleared the following bills, which are presently on the Senate Calendar and have been there since last year. I should like to mention their order numbers so that all Senators will be alerted to the fact that they may be taken up in the Senate at any time during the next few weeks.

I emphasize that the listing I am about to make does not in any way indicate the order in which it is expected the measures will come before the Senate.

I shall try to keep in constant communication with the minority leader and keep him informed at all times of the plans of the majority before any motions are made.

The policy committee has cleared the following measures:

First. Order Nos. 11, a concurrent resolution to create a joint Congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President, and 441, a concurrent resolution to print a compilation of materials relating to the development of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries, which are to be acted upon today.

Second. Order No. 716, S. 27, increasing rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

Third. Order No. 722, S. 1168, amending Securities and Exchange Act, as amended.

Fourth. Order No. 727, S. 72, to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from civil-service retirement and disability fund.

Fifth. Order No. 740, S. 734, to revise basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Sixth. Order No. 861, S. 1483, to amend the act of August 27, 1954, relating to the rights of vessels of the United States on the high seas and in territorial waters of foreign countries.

Seventh. Order No. 1074, S. 984, conferring jurisdiction on Court of Claims in re compensation for uranium furnished the United States.

Eighth. Order No. 1178, H. R. 5822, amending section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Ninth. Order No. 1183, Senate Joint Resolution 80, amending the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

Tenth. Order No. 1188, Senate Resolution 148, prescribing procedures and contents for reports to Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

## PROPOSED INCREASED IMPORT TAX ON COPPER

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to join the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and other colleagues in the sponsorship of a bill to provide for an increased import tax on copper.

Until a few months ago, we have had a world undersupply of copper and the domestic price has been significantly above the basic price of 24 cents, established in 1951 as the level at which an excise tax of 2 cents per pound would apply. In fact, the price level was so favorable from 1951 to 1956 that we passed a series of bills suspending the present import tax. Under ordinary circumstances, such a suspension bill would have come up this month, in view of the pending expiration of the present suspension on June 30 of this year. However, we have seen a demonstration the past 6 months that, as in lead and zinc, production of copper is catching up with international demand, and the domestic price has been falling steadily, resulting in unemployment in copper mining in Utah, Montana, and other copper-producing centers. During 1957, roughly 800 copper workers lost their jobs in Utah.

We have taken the position that now is the proper time to examine and improve the basic copper import tax legislation which was passed by the Congress in 1951, and that is the purpose of this bill introduced today.

When the 24-cent base price was established in 1951, the average domestic copper marketing price was 24.2 cents per pound. Between 1951 and 1957, the Utah Mining Association informed me, the increase in labor, power, steel, freight, and other major factors determining cost of production, ranged from 20 percent to as high as 33 percent. These increased costs, we feel, justify the proposed increase in the base or peril point from its present level of 24 cents to a more realistic level of 30 cents.

The bill also proposes that the 2-cent per pound import tax also be increased to a more realistic level of 4 cents.

Copper is Utah's largest mineral industry, employing roughly 8,000 persons in mining, milling, and refining. Nearly a third of the Nation's copper production is produced at one mine, Kennecott Copper Corp.'s Utah copper mine at Bingham Canyon, Utah. This is the world's largest open-pit nonferrous metal mine, second only to Chile's Chuquicamata mine in estimated reserves.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the copper industry to the economic stability and to the military security of this country. Congress must act now to prevent the same degree of stagnation and demoralization that has occurred within our vital domestic competition of foreign minerals.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles on this subject, published in the Salt Lake Tribune, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of January 11, 1958]

### UMA CAUTIONS CONGRESS ON PRICE, JOB DECLINES

(By Robert W. Bernick)

Utah Mining Association has advised the State's Congressional delegation that some 1,500 Utah employees of the nonferrous metals industry lost their jobs during 1957 and the first days of 1958 as a result of the tragic drop in metals prices.

For most part, these price declines have been a result of huge and growing imports of foreign-produced metals—particularly lead and zinc.

"Mining unemployment is but a portion of Utah's total under present adverse economic circumstances, but it is a substantial portion," Mr. Romney wrote United States Senators ARTHUR V. WATKINS and WALLACE F. BENNETT and Congressmen WILLIAM A. DAWSON and HENRY ALDOUS DIXON.

Mr. Romney said that the "50 to 60 men who will be laid off with announced curtailment of operations at Tooele smelter (of International Smelting & Refining Co.) must be added to the total of some 650 from lead-zinc mining and 800 more or less from copper mining during the year 1957."

Included in the Tooele curtailments "are many technical, staff, and skilled men, who, aside from the economic loss related to their unemployment, pose a possibility of their loss to the industry through ultimate reemployment elsewhere."

His figures on unemployment are based on statistics gathered by the Utah State Department of Employment Security.

"At year's end, conditions affecting mining employment and related industries in Utah's economy showed a continuing downward trend," Mr. Romney reported to the Congressional group.

He picked zinc, where figures are finally available for the year, to disclose what has been happening.

"In December 1957 domestic zinc smelters produced 86,270 tons of slab zinc from both domestic and foreign ores and concentrates. Of this total, 62,730 tons were shipped to domestic consumers, 210 tons were exported, and 9,188 tons were acquired by the Government in stockpile purchasing. This left 14,142 tons of zinc in stock in hands of processors—adding already to excessive supplies at smelters," Mr. Romney said.

If we do not count Government stockpiles, which cannot long continue, the industry produced some 23,330 tons of slab zinc in United States last month which did not find a market with domestic consumers or in exports, Mr. Romney said.

During all of 1957, the domestic zinc industry, in processing American and foreign ores and concentrates, turned out a surplus of 267,169 tons of slab zinc—for an average monthly surplus production of 22,264 tons.

To this, of course, must be added the huge flood of slab zinc from foreign smelters and refineries which has taken away a large part of the American market from American processors and miners.

Despite Government stockpile purchasing in 1957, which at least took 179,466 tons of zinc off the market, there was left 87,703 tons of zinc in surplus. And this must be added to the surplus of 78,974 which existed when 1957 started.

As a result, stocks of surplus zinc in hands of processors in the United States totaled 166,673 tons.

This level of surplus is exceeded only by the 180,843 tons which over-rung the market in 1953. The latter figure was largest surplussage of zinc since World War II.

Mr. Romney said that the data submitted to the Congressional delegation does not include imports of slab zinc which are sold directly to domestic consumers and are not, therefore, a part of domestic smelter slab zinc statistics.

---

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of January 9, 1958]

SHORTAGE OF ORE TO CLOSE BLAST FURNACE AT TOOELE

TOOELE.—International Smelting & Refining Co. will curtail operations within the next few weeks because of shortage of ores for the reduction plant here, W. J. McKenna, manager, confirmed Wednesday.

Mr. McKenna said the plant lead blast furnace would be shut down and that between 50 and 60 men would be furloughed, for several months.

The ore shortage results from crippling of the domestic mining industry through record high flood of foreign produced lead and zinc into the United States. Independent mine operations which ship their ores to the Tooele plant have been forced to close or reduce operations under impact of price declines.

Mr. McKenna said that slag treatment and custom mill would continue operations until a large enough stockpile of lead concentrates is built up to warrant relighting of the blast furnace.

The curtailments at the Tooele reduction center would not affect operations of United Park City Mine Co., lead-zinc producer at Park City, which ships to the Tooele plant, Mr. McKenna said.

In all, some 250 mill and smeltermen are employed at Tooele.

---

## ISSUE OF FAIR PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES STILL FACES THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when President Eisenhower vetoed H. R. 2474 after the adjournment of the last session of Congress, the question of fair and proper salaries for postal employees remained very much alive as an obligation of the 2d session of the 85th Congress. We cannot shirk or avoid this responsibility. Families of postal employees today are not enjoying a decent standard of living, because their paychecks are insufficient to cope with the rising prices of recent years.

One of the most thorough and sound analyses I yet have seen of the President's veto message appeared in the October 1957 issue of the Portland Poker, which is the monthly periodical of the Portland chapter of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks. This is chapter No. 128. Author of the analysis is John Almeter, vice president of local No. 128 and one of its outstanding leaders.

Mr. Almeter's statement is particularly pertinent where he points out that the administration seems far more alarmed over $279 million added to the budget to provide fair pay to postal workers than over some $3 billion added to the budget because of higher interest rates going to banks and other lenders of money. The New York Times has just reported that the profits of banks rose 10 to 15 percent in 1957.

In view of the fact that our Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has just voted to present another postal pay bill to the Senate—if some of us prevail in its deliberations—I believe Mr. Almeter's article entitled "The Veto Message" should be printed in full in the body of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VETO MESSAGE

(By John Almeter)

As was expected, the President vetoed our much needed pay raise. This means that for another year we shall have to tighten our belts, cut down a little more on necessities (the luxuries went by the board months ago), keep our wives working and begin the long road back toward getting an equitable increase which is long overdue.

In all fairness we should not put all the blame on the Chief Executive. While we in Oregon were extremely fortunate in having a delegation in both the House and Senate who worked diligently in our behalf, it was the stalling and delaying tactics of a few Members of Congress which held our bill up so that by the time it reached the President's desk there was no chance for recourse on the veto which everyone knew was probable.

In looking over the veto message we are left with the feeling that the writer did a magnificent job. The wording and doubletalk was excellent; however, the reasons given to justify the veto were about as weak as cambric tea.

We are told that the increase is not justified as the cost of living since 1951 has increased only 8.9 percent. As we received an 8 percent increase in 1955, another pay raise at this time would not be justified. In the past 28 months prices have increased 1½ times more than the 42 preceding months. Therefore if an 8 percent raise was approved in 1955, we see no reason why a 12 percent was not feasible at this time. For the 12th month in a row, prices have risen. Food prices alone have risen 4.2 percent during the past year. Add to this the increase in the cost of medical and dental care, bus fare, gasoline, two increases in fuel oil, clothing, etc., and we feel sure that we can arrive at a figure which is much larger than the 8.9 percent increase since 1951 as quoted by the author of this veto message.

It is pointed out that fringe benefits have grown substantially. While this is true, they certainly have not kept pace with the fringe benefits given private industry since 1951. We appreciate the benefits we have received, such as low-cost life insurance, unemployment compensation and liberalized retirement and survivor's benefits. We must remind the author, however, that we are paying more for the liberalized retirement and although we are receiving the insurance at a very low figure and it certainly is nice to have, it took money out of our check—did not augment it.

We are told that Federal employees have the right to expect fair wage treatment in relation to each other and in relation to employees in private business. In this we heartily concur. Our only question is, "When are we going to get it?" In this veto message there seemed to be concern that because of the across-the-board increase, executives would get less percentage-wise than lower paid employees. While this is true, it seems that top-level employees were pretty well taken care of in 1955 with the passage of Public Law 68 and that top executives received rather large increases in 1956 with the passing of the executive pay bill.

Government employees whose salaries are tied to the Wage Labor Board have received a 25.8 percent increase since 1951 while workers in private industry have averaged better than 20 percent during that time. Comparing our paltry 8 percent increase it seems that at least a 12 percent increase should be voted immediately if we are to receive fair treatment.

The statement was made in the veto message that this raise would cost the Government approximately $850 million—about $279 million for postal employees and the rest for other Government workers. It is true that this would add a considerable amount to the Federal budget but why so much concern over $850 million when the hard-money policy instituted to stem inflation is costing the Government over $3 billion more per year just in interest on the national debt. There seems to be very little concern when steel prices are raised. Year after year these increases have added to the national debt in increased prices for guns, tanks, and instruments of war. There seemed to be very little worry over the fact that last year we had 2 gasoline and oil raises within a period of 3 months. While we do not argue pro or con as to the merits of the raise in interest rates, steel, gas, and oil or other prices, we do resent being made the scapegoat. We alone are supposed to keep down costs and the debt ceiling in this inflated economy while prices and wages in industry run rampant.

It is noted that the Government's salary position must support recruitment and retention of able employees. We, also, are in complete agreement with this statement with the exception that we feel adequate salaries should be paid so that recruitment of able employees is possible in the lower grades as well as in the higher. While the large turnover in personnel which is costing the Government millions is not in the top executive or supervisory branch but in the lower pay brackets, the concern with wages seems to center around the top brass. It should be remembered that it is just as important to pay an adequate wage to get good young men in the Government service who will make the Government service their career as it is to pay top wages for executives.

We understand an inquiry is to be made into the pay structure. What ever happened to the Cordiner report? Wasn't this a committee set up by the administration to make a study of pay for certain Federal employees? It is our impression that this report was suppressed as it was far too liberal and pointed out many facts that the administration refuses to admit. We cannot help but feel that any committee set up will be used to get as many facts and figures as possible to oppose an adequate pay increase for postal employees in the next session of Congress. We sincerely hope that we are wrong in our assumption but after 3 vetoes on 4 pay bills, who can blame us for having very little faith in the present administration as far as salary legislation is concerned?

---

## THE NATO REPORT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND SECRETARY DULLES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe the body of the RECORD should contain a frank and candid editorial from the Oregonian of December 25,

1957, analyzing the weak and futile performance of the President and his Secretary of State in their addresses to the Nation following the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Conference in Paris. Title of the editorial is "Impression of Weakness."

Although this Portland newspaper vigorously backed the Republican ticket in 1952 and again in 1956, it expresses both alarm and disgust over the impact upon our allies of the type of presentation made by Messrs. Eisenhower and Dulles in their respective speeches.

The future of the free world is at stake in the future of NATO. That is why the indecisive showing of the President and Secretary of State is so disturbing at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Oregonian, which is published in my home city of Portland, Oreg., appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPRESSION OF WEAKNESS

The NATO report by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles to the people of America by television Monday night misfired so badly that there must be consternation in Washington and other NATO capitals on this Christmas Day.

The contrived format of the "show"; the spectacle of two tired, aging men talking about the gravely compromised half-measures, which both bind and separate America from its European allies, in falsely casual tones, without any air of great conviction, and with the President permitting Dulles to monopolize the program with a long monologue, then summarizing by reading a statement of generalities—all of these added up to the worst public relations job in memory on issues of such importance to the United States and survival of non-Communist nations.

The sense of what they were trying to say—and most of it was sound enough—was lost to TV viewers dismayed by the physical appearance of the President, his face in profile for most of the time as Dulles droned on; the seeming vigor he displayed in public appearances in Paris entirely absent; the power and confidence he can convey to an audience coming through only at fleeting intervals. Ike's profile showed the toll of illness and bone weariness. At a time when the Western World desperately desires the President to take full and vigorous leadership, he sat and listened to a Secretary of State whose tireless capabilities have been frustrated, diminished by the rigidity of his crusader's mind.

Instead of the President's springing back into command, thus to assure free people that the NATO conference really was more fruitful than it appeared on the surface, Mr. Eisenhower sat back and allowed Secretary Dulles—whom, in effect, he had overruled in accepting the Paris compromises—to interpret, even to dissemble a bit, to repeat the tired theme of Soviet faithlessness, to make it appear that the NATO nations are in full accord, when, in fact, they have settled almost none of their deep disagreements.

Neither the President nor the Secretary even hinted at the economic sacrifices, the social and political readjustments, which the American people must accept if this Nation is to meet the Soviet challenge either by strengthening NATO or by perilous and far more costly withdrawal accompanied by massive, unilateral armament.

In rejecting the banal Soviet proposal for unlimited, all-nations U. N. debate, after Soviet scoffing of NATO's suggestion of a foreign ministers' meeting on disarmament, neither Eisenhower nor Dulles gave any hope for an alternative to massive armament.

But still, it was not so much what was said about NATO unity—though this remains to be proved in the year ahead—and the nastiness of the Russians, as it was the method of saying it that caused this report to the American people to raise apprehension rather than hope.

It seems obvious that President Eisenhower, well aware of the deep distrust of Secretary Dulles in some governments of Europe who are our allies, loyal as always to his appointees and hopeful of rebuilding his Secretary's prestige, deliberately cast Dulles in the major role. But in deferring to him, sitting nervously, casting occasional birdlike glances at the Secretary, who was having trouble with his dentures as well as his justification of his pre-NATO and post-NATO statements, the President became the victim of a grave image of weakness. As the NATO Conference itself showed again, the President is not weak in spirit, flexibility of mind, and ability to lead. But an impression of weakness is as fatal a defect in this crisis of world affairs as weakness itself.

This is no time for contrived performances, for glossing over the fundamental differences among North Atlantic allies, for dissembling or concealing of grim facts the people must know. It is a time for face-forward, straight-talking explanation, no matter who may be hurt.

In a single broadcast, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles lost a great deal of the confidence the President, at least, sought so assiduously—and successfully—to rebuild in Paris. We hope the damage can be undone.

---

## ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK AT CLATSOP, OREG., WINTER HEADQUARTERS OF THE GREAT LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two thoughtful editorials on the proposed national memorial park at Fort Clatsop, near Astoria, Oreg., on the historic Oregon seacoast.

These editorials appeared in the Astorian Daily Budget of January 9, 1958, and in the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland on January 11, 1958.

I take particular pride and satisfaction in presenting the editorials for inclusion in the RECORD because, on July 12, 1955, I introduced in the Senate the first bill ever offered to establish Fort Clatsop as an integral part of our national park and national monument commemorative system. The editorials generously give me some of the credit for what has been accomplished.

In turn, I should like particularly to commend the Oregon Historical Society and its Clatsop County chapter. They are the groups which truly have kept the flame of Oregon history alive, and which have nurtured continuing and enduring interest in the great Lewis and Clark Expedition that made Fort Clatsop its winter quarters in 1804 and 1805. To the officers and members of the Oregon Historical Society and to that of Clatsop County, I give my warm salute and congratulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials appear in the body of the RECORD, because the Senate must act on the authorization implementing the current recommendation for a national memorial park at Fort Clatsop, first headquarters of Americans on the great Pacific seaboard.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Astoria (Oreg.) Daily Budget of January 9, 1958]

FORT CLATSOP RECOGNITION

Establishment of a national memorial park of about 100 acres at the Fort Clatsop site will mark successful culmination of a long effort by this community, with the help of the Oregon Historical Society, Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER and Representative WALTER NORBLAD

The campaign has been for establishment of a national monument. We get instead a national memorial park, which is something few folks around here have heard of, but which seems to amount to about the same thing as a national monument. It provides Federal control and Federal maintenance and care of an important national shrine, and that's what we wanted.

The campaign isn't over yet. Congress must appropriate the money to establish and maintain the site, but with administration approval already given, we can hope that Congressional approval won't be too hard to get.

Fort Clatsop lay neglected for many years. National attention was called to this neglect some years ago when Bernard de Voto of Harper's magazine, a nationally known writer on historical subjects, visited the spot. He wrote in the magazine a savage indictment of the people who had permitted rubbish and brush to blight a location of transcendent historical importance.

De Voto's needling stimulated local historians to activity. Efforts to improve and care for the site began. The local community bore the original burden, even though a site of such importance ought to be more than of community importance and responsibility. Eventually the sesquicentennial observance of the Lewis and Clark expedition brought new public interest in Fort Clatsop. It stimulated not only local efforts to improve and care for the site, but the effort to have a national monument established.

Now comes the administration approval of a national memorial park, the next-to-last step in a successful campaign.

Establishment of this park will be of immeasurable value to the Sunset Empire in promoting tourist interest in the area's history.

---

[From the Oregon Journal of January 11, 1958]

FORT CLATSOP RECOGNITION

The recommendation by Hatfield Chilson, Under Secretary of Interior, that Congress designate Fort Clatsop, near Astoria, as a national memorial under the National Park Service is the major step toward the realization of such a goal. Fort Clatsop is the site where Lewis and Clark wintered in 1805-6.

The prospect that Congress will act favorably on the Interior Department's recommendation is heightened by the fact that the National Park Service's investigation was directed by an act of Congress, which had been sponsored by Oregon's Senators RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and WAYNE MORSE and Idaho's Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK. Senator DWORSHAK's interest stems from the fact that Fort Clatsop is the "end of the trail" for the Lewis and Clark (Lolo Pass) highway across Idaho, the completion of which is now being vigorously sought. Senator NEUBERGER in particular has worked diligently on the Fort Clatsop project since 1955, using the Lewis and Clark sesquicentennial of that year as a springboard.

The competition for this recognition has been especially keen. Many other States have historic sites which they are constantly pressing upon the Park Service for such recommendation. This action not only ranks Fort Clatsop as one of the most important spots along the whole Lewis and Clark trail but puts it in company with places of primary historic interest in the whole country.

Earlier news stories reported that national monument status had been sought for Fort Clatsop. The recommendation that it be a national memorial instead does not imply an inferior status. It's simply that the criteria are different. Monuments are "landmarks, structures, objects, or areas of scientific or prehistoric interest * * *." National memorials are "structures or areas devoted to the commemoration of ideas, events, or personages of nation..l significance."

Among such places are the Lincoln Memorial, Washington Monument (the word having a different meaning here), Thomas Jefferson Memorial, all in Washington, D. C., and the Lee Mansion, Arlington, Va.

The recommendation appears to have disposed of earlier doubts expressed by a Government archeologist about existence of conclusive physical evidence that Fort Clatsop is in fact the spot where Lewis and Clark wintered. The Oregon Historical Society, which has owned the site for 50 years and which has worked hard to win for it national status, has long been positive that this is the place. The historical society, along with Clatsop County community interests, deserves particular credit not only for preserving the site, which includes a replica of the expedition's log fort, but for efforts to win national recognition.

## REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday was an unfortunate day in the history of our country.

Only 1 week ago, in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower listed first in his proposals for our security and prosperity the importance of reorganizing the Defense Department.

In doing this, the President not only reaffirmed the position he took on this subject over 10 years ago, but also recognized the vast technological changes which have occurred since that time.

Apparently he realized that if this Nation was to remain solvent, its defenses would now have to be organized on the basis of progress instead of tradition.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD what the President said on this subject in his state of the Union message of last January 9.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 10, 1958]

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

I. DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

The first need is to assure ourselves that military organization facilitates rather than hinders the functioning of the Military Establishment in maintaining the security of the Nation.

Since World War II, the purpose of achieving maximum organizational efficiency in a modern Defense Establishment has several times occasioned action by the Congress and by the Executive.

The advent of revolutionary new devices, bringing with them the problem of overall continental defense, creates new difficulties, reminiscent of those attending the advent of the airplane half a century ago.

Some of the important new weapons which technology has produced do not fit into any existing service pattern. They cut across all services, involve all services, and transcend all services, at every stage from development to operation. In some instances they defy classification according to branch of service.

Unfortunately, the uncertainties resulting from such a situation, and the jurisdictional disputes attending upon it, tend to bewilder and confuse the public and create the impression that service differences are damaging the national interest.

Let us proudly remember that the members of the Armed Forces give their basic allegiance solely to the United States. Of that fact all of us are certain. But pride of service and mistaken zeal in promoting particular doctrine has more than once occasioned the kind of difficulty of which I have just spoken.

I am not attempting today to pass judgment on the charge of harmful service rivalries. But one thing is sure. Whatever they are, America wants them stopped.

Recently I have had under special study, with the intimate association of Secretary McElroy, the never-ending problem of efficient organization, complicated as it is by new weapons. Soon my own conclusions will be finalized. I shall promptly take such executive action as is necessary and, in a separate message, I shall present appropriate recommendations to Congress.

Meanwhile, without anticipating the detailed form that a reorganization should take, I can state its main lines in terms of objectives:

A major purpose of military organization is to achieve real unity in the Defense Establishment in all the principal features of military activity. Of all these one of the most important to our Nation's security is strategic planning and control. This work must be done under unified direction.

The Defense Establishment must therefore plan for a better integration of its defense resources, particularly with respect to the newer weapons now building and under development. These obviously require full coordination in their development, production, and use. Good organization can help assure this coordination.

In recognition of the need for single control in some of our most advanced development projects, the Secretary of Defense has already decided to concentrate into one organization all the antimissile and satellite technology undertaken within the Department of Defense.

Another requirement of military organization is a clear subordination of the military service to duly constituted civilian authority. This control must be real; not merely on the surface.

Next there must be assurance that an excessive number of compartments in organization will not create costly and confusing compartments in our scientific and industrial effort.

Finally, to end interservice disputes requires clear organization and decisive central direction, supported by the unstinted cooperation of every individual in the Defense Establishment, civilian and military.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The recent Rockefeller report supports without reservation the position the President took on this matter in his state of the Union message.

Later, however, there was opposition expressed by prominent Congressional leaders—who I am certain are just as sincere in their position as I am in mine.

One week later the President was asked the following question:

Could you expand somewhat on your state of the Union message in that part on the military and tell us how you think unification, in reality, in the Pentagon, can move from the discussion to the actual stage?

The President replied in part:

Now my personal convictions, no matter how strong, cannot be the final answer. There must be a consensus reached with the CAB—with the Congress, with the people that have the job of operating the services to get the very finest kind of organization we can; and I am certainly hopeful that it goes in the direction of what I believe, but I would be the last to ask for a detailed organization in which I believe, because, I think, say, organization has got to be effective after there has passed from the scene a man who happens to have particularly strong convictions in the matter.

How can one have "particularly strong convictions" in a matter if within a week the position on that matter is withdrawn?

I ask unanimous consent that what the President said in his press conference yesterday with reference to unification be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the President's Press Conference, Wednesday, January 15, 1958]

EDWARD P. MORGAN, the American Broadcasting Co. "Mr. President, perhaps there is no area of Government in which you need less to draw on your advisers and can draw more from your personal experience than the military. * * * Could you expand somewhat on your state of the Union message in that part on the military, and tell us how you think unification, in reality, in the Pentagon, can move from the discussion to the actual stage?"

Answer. "I don't mind discussing it at all. * * * It is perfectly clear, it certainly must be clear to most of you people that my own convictions about the proper organization of the Defense Department are rather fixed.

"Since 1947, I have given many, many active hours to this kind of study. I have reviewed the whole military record as I have known it for 45 years and, therefore, I think my views are completely objective, and with nothing whatsoever of personal bias in them.

"But I have this: I am the Commander in Chief for a fixed period, and at least we know that I am not going to be in this job more than 3 years.

"Now, my personal convictions, no matter how strong, cannot be the final answer. There must be a consensus reached with the CAB—with the Congress, with the people that have the job of operating the services to get the very finest kind of organization we can; and I am certainly hopeful that it goes in the direction of what I believe, but I would be the last to ask for a detailed organization in which I believe, because, I think, say, organization has got to be effective after there has passed from the scene a man who happens to have particular strong convictions in the matter."

Question. "You are not saying, sir, or are you, that you will not fight for unification of the services?"

Answer. "Well, now, just a minute. I don't know who you are fighting. I am trying to put before the Congress a plan which I think will be effective, and certainly in the discussions and many conferences that will go on in the formulation of the plan that I have in mind, there will be a good deal of argument, no question about it, and my views will certainly be expressed to the very best I can; and, as I say, if the trend and tendency is not in that direction, then I couldn't possibly have anything to do with it."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the President does not intend to try to implement his convictions, that may well mean nothing will be done to really modernize our defense structure, in which case the taxpayer will continue to pour millions of dollars down the drain in order to maintain the unbusinesslike status quo now characteristic of our Defense Department.

As a result of this waste, even though in recent years we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on our security, it is now universally recognized that neither our Army, Navy, nor Air Force is in the right condition to resist an attack, either directly against ourself or against any ally to whom we are irrevocably committed.

---

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PURCHASES OF FOREIGN PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one subject near and dear to the hearts of most Americans is the practice of buying at a bargain. It is a custom that has played a part in the development of the great free-enterprise system which we enjoy today. Virtually all Americans, from the small boy with a penny to buy bubble gum to a millionaire investor looking for gilt-edge securities, hunt for bargains.

But we have learned that bargains are not always what they seem to be. For the past several years the Department of Defense has been taking advantage of what I consider to be a very, very doubtful bargain. I refer to the purchases of tax-free foreign petroleum products in competition with our domestic products which pay taxes to help run this Government.

At the present time, the Department of Defense is in process of considering bids which may lead to Government purchase of 24 million barrels of foreign jet fuel. This foreign fuel, according to a Defense Department officer, has been purchased over several years, periodically, at what looks to be a cheaper price than that of domestically produced fuel. It has been said that the Defense Department operates on a budget, and that the matter is a simple one of economics; that with the same number of dollars, the Department can buy more barrels of foreign fuel than it can of American produced fuel. At first blush, this looks like a bargain. But when one stops to consider, it is doubtful that America is getting a bargain from these foreign purchases. Let us remember that these are American tax dollars that are being spent outside this Nation; that every dollar spent is money which can never find its way into the pockets of the oil worker, the royalty owner, the refinery worker, the American company employee, or into the firm treasury, or into taxes from, or business with, anyone along the way. This tax, wage, or income money is totally lost to America.

In some periods of history, notably World War II, it was wise to purchase foreign oil. But oil products in America are not in short supply today. On the contrary, there is a tremendous surplus. Production allowables in my State of Texas are at a low ebb. Oil tax revenues are down; rigs are idle; lease and royalty payments are slow; oil field unemployment in many areas is serious. Is this a time to spend our tax dollars abroad on products we have in surplus supply? In this time of mounting unemployment, business recession, and hard money, hard times, is it wise to add to that business recession and labor unemployment by buying foreign oil and turning our backs on our domestic producers?

Certainly, no one can deny that the Department of Defense can purchase jet fuel and other petroleum products from foreign low-wage, no-tax areas cheaper than it can buy them in America. But let me ask this question: Do those foreign countries pay the wages and have the standard of living that Americans enjoy? What is more, do the citizens and the firms involved furnish any of the tax dollars for such defense expenditures?

Mr. President, I will be the first to admit that herein lies a complex problem. But it is one which urgently requires study and solution. I urge that an appropriate committee, possibly the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, make a thorough investigation of these purchases. The policy of our Defense Department of purchasing large quantities of foreign oil products needs careful reappraisal.

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert at this point in the RECORD a series of telegrams from my State, including reports by R. B. Kahle, of Houston, president of Eastern States Petroleum & Chemical Corp.; and F. L. Martin, of Corpus Christi, president of the Suntide Refining Co. They sharply oppose such purchases by the Department of Defense, and they point out that oil refineries in the gulf-coast area are closing as the Defense Department is purchasing, or considering the purchase of, the 24 million barrels of jet fuel.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON, TEX., *January 9, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

We have just sent the following telegram to the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Neil H. McElroy:

"Hon. NEIL H. MCELROY,
*"Secretary of Defense,*
*"Washington, D. C.:*

"Over the last 2 years the Defense Department's purchasing of petroleum products in the Caribbean area has increased at an alarming rate and has, as of now, substantially eliminated the gulf coast and east coast American refiner from the sale to the Government of jet fuel and Navy special fuel oil and is taking a substantial portion of military gasoline procurement from these areas.

"The purchases of jet fuel in the Caribbean over this present winter season has been a substantial factor in causing a distress market for distillates, gasoline, kerosene, heating oil, and so forth, and is one of the most important factors tending toward a probable cut in the posted price of domestic crude.

"In a great part the layoff of employees in American refineries on the east and gulf coasts in the last few months is due to this Defense Department purchasing policy and further reduction of employment is inevitable if these policies continue. It is difficult for us to see how this is helpful to national defense and national prosperity.

"American refiners located on the east and gulf coasts can adequately supply these motor gasolines, jet fuels, and Navy special fuel oil and it is obvious that every barrel of these products purchased from the Caribbean refiner means a reduction in the production of crude oil in this country of at least a like number of barrels.

"It has been alleged and the President's Cabinet Committee has reported that a voluntary reduction of imports of foreign crude oil to this country is essential for the national security, yet the Defense Department, the one Department of the Government specifically charged with national security, has continued to increase its purchases in the Caribbean area to the detriment of domestic production of crude oil and to the detriment of the refining industry on the gulf and east coasts of the United States.

"It is obvious that the offshore purchase of these products by the military (the largest single buying agency in the world) reduces employment of American labor, the employment of American capital in refining facilities, and the amount of crude which American producers can sell through American refiners to the market.

"If the present policy of the Defense Department is continued and maintained at the rate of expansion of the last 2 years there will be no purchases by the military from United States refiners. No American refiner can compete with the wages, working conditions, and tax situation of the Caribbean refiners. These refiners pay no school, city, county, State, or Federal taxes, including Federal income taxes. They are exempt by specific conditions of their contracts with the Defense Department from living up to the provisions of the 8-hour law, the Walsh-Healey Act and the nondiscrimination clauses set up by Congress or the executive department as a protection to American labor and to the American way of life.

"There is no emergency now requiring that because of shortage of products in the United States these products should be purchased outside of the United States.

"In reply to a telegram which we sent to the Defense Department in July of last year, your Department replied that 'the bids are being carefully analyzed in accordance with existing regulations and many factors of consideration enter into such an analysis. Awards will be made on the basis as determined above with the primary procurement objective being one that will be most advantageous to Government, price, and all other factors considered.'

"The Defense Department also stated that 'its foreign purchases are not precluded by law' and therefore the policy would be continued.

"In December, Admiral Lattu, Executive Director of the Military Petroleum Supply Administration, at a meeting of the Western Petroleum Refiners Association as reported by Oilgram, called for continued purchases in the Caribbean area, and urged that Caribbean refiners supply up to 90 percent of Navy special fuel oil. Every barrel of these purchases reduces the amount of oil produced in the United States and manufactured by American refiners.

"It must be obvious to everyone that an American refiner acting under American laws, including the 8-hour law, the Walsh-Healey Act, paying American wages, paying American taxes, cannot compete with Caribbean refiners operating under more favorable conditions. In a realistic sense, even though perhaps not in a legal sense, these products are dumped on the American market and should be precluded by the theory that has produced the Antidumping Act as applying to foreign-produced products.

"The question is not academic and actually is not a legal one. We urge that you take action to require the Defense Department to buy products manufactured by American refiners and reduce the purchases of Caribbean finished products if such products are available under conditions and prices which cost the American taxpayer no more than purchases in the Caribbean area.

"Purchases in the Caribbean area at apparent lower prices are not made at a lower cost to the American taxpayer when American wages and American taxes, including school, city, county, State and United States Government taxes are considered.

"We urge that you order your Defense Department purchasing agency to discontinue this policy of Caribbean purchases and buy products when available under proper circumstances from American refiners.

"It is our opinion that these purchases are made at a lower apparent price solely because the charges against the Defense Department budget are thereby reduced, even though the true cost to the American taxpayer is substantially greater.

"It is, of course, facetious, specious and dishonest to argue that the American defense is jeopardized by the importation of crude oil limited now by the cartel-like application of a voluntary oil import program while the Defense Department is purchasing large volumes of finished products from foreign sources.

"The Defense Department has requested bids returnable on January 14 for 24 million barrels of jet fuel and other products from the gulf coast and the east coast and the Caribbean area for delivery over the next few months. This amount of finished products taken from American refiners and purchased in the Caribbean will certain have an adverse effect on the national economy, a reduction in employment and will continue to contribute to the so-called recession period which seems to be on the horizon and in our opinion probably will produce a nationwide cut in the posted price of American crude."

We think this offshore buying program of the Defense Department is harmful to the American economy and if continued is certain to produce a cut in the posted price of American crude, a reduction of employment in American refineries, and contribute largely to a possible recession in American business. We thank you for your past interest in this situation and we urge your continued efforts toward the elimination of this un-American policy.

R. B. KAHLE,
*President, Eastern States Petroleum & Chemical Corp.*

---

HOUSTON, TEX., *January 11, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Because the policy of the Government in buying petroleum products in foreign areas, when such products are not only available but in critical surplus supply in this country, transcends the issue involved in the projected purchase of 24 million barrels of jet fuel in the Caribbean on January 14 as it represents a theory that the Government benefits when American tax dollars are expended in foreign countries rather than in the United States, we have today sent the following wire to each Member of Congress:

"Should the Defense Department under its announced policies purchase 24 million barrels of refined petroleum products, largely jet fuel, from Caribbean area suppliers under bids to be opened January 14, the economy of United States will be deprived of $100 million paid to these foreign refiners and $100 million less will be paid to American refiners, producers, suppliers, and labor in the United States. Layoffs of labor are occurring daily in American refineries because of excessive product inventories and depressed prices resulting from Government's policy of decreasing American petroleum product purchases while increasing foreign purchases. Not only is there no emergency and no shortage of supplies in this country making such a purchasing policy necessary but there is a critical oversupply of petroleum products in the United States. Would you please investigate this urgent matter affecting the whole of the United States economy."

We think the Defense Department and perhaps the executive branch of the Government has forgotten the fundamental fact that when a tax dollar is expended in the United States, it goes to the people of the United States. Even though the same product could be purchased at 10 percent lower price when produced by foreign labor and foreign capital, expenditure in the United States goes solely to American citizens, and is spent over and over again in our American economy. Incidentally, in relation to this foreign purchase, we calculate that the purchase of this 24 million barrels of jet fuel in the United States, rather than in the Caribbean area, would mean one more allowable day of production under Texas proration practice. We solicit your active interest in this problem.

R. B. KAHLE,
*President, Eastern States Petroleum & Chemical Corp.*

---

HOUSTON, TEX., *January 14, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

At the opening of the bids for jet fuel today Shell Oil Co., a foreign owned company, was the low bidder in the Caribbean with a price of 7.32 cents per gallon, or approximately $3.07 per barrel for 145 million gallons, 75 million gallons at 7.75 cents and 63 million gallons at 7.97 cents. Standard of New Jersey subsidiary bid 7.97 cents or $3.345 per barrel for 252 million gallons. ESSO's bid at the gulf was reported to be 8.79 cents per gallon or 34⅓ cents per barrel more than their Caribbean bid. Shell's bid at the gulf is reported to be 9.4 cents or almost 80 cents per barrel higher than their bid from the Caribbean. These differences in bids indicate that even these companies recognize that American operated refineries cannot compete with the favorable tax position and un-American labor situation of their Caribbean associates. Seven and ninety-seven hundredths cents bid price per gallon, that is, $3.345 per barrel, is only 14 cents over the price of a barrel of west Texas crude delivered at the gulf coast and is 9 cents lower than a barrel of east Texas crude at the gulf coast. It is obvious that the posted price of Texas crude must be reduced if this tremendous Government purchasing is to be let at the prices brought out in this letting; namely, 14 cents over the price of west Texas crude and 9 cents under the price of east Texas crude with no allowance for manufacturing cost.

R. B. KAHLE,
*President, Eastern States Petroleum & Chemical Corp.*

---

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.,
*January 11, 1958.*

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Bids will be opened January 14 for 42 million barrels of jet fuel. We are gravely concerned with the Defense Department's purchasing oil products in the Caribbean and other foreign areas which adversely affects our national economy as a whole. As you know, in the past substantial amounts have been purchased by the Defense Department from the Caribbean and other foreign sources and shipped into this country on the eastern gulf and west coasts, and these foreign purchases are in direct competition with the domestic crude oil production which we as an independent refiner have to purchase and refine to meet this competition. The low prices in the past from the Caribbean have placed the domestic refiner at an unfair disadvantage. Our company is bidding on a substantial amount of products manufactured from domestic crude and there will be serious repercussions for the independent refiner and producer if this practice of foreign purchases is continued. It is practically impossible for the independent oil refiner and producer to compete with the wages, working conditions and tax structures of the domestic price, of Caribbean refineries and other foreign areas shipping into this country. It will only lower all domestic price structures and at the same time vitally affect the American tax revenue by reducing the earnings of the oil industry in this country as well as add to the surplus of crude and refined products we have with us and at the same time will destroy all incentive for future exploration by the independent oil companies.

Crude prices have already been reduced in many midwest and southwest areas and no doubt further reductions will be made due to the Armed Forces foreign purchases. We are especially anxious to see that the Armed Forces purchase throughout the eastern, gulf, and west coast areas which would have a beneficial effect on the domestic crude oil refiner and producer, as there is a tremendous amount of other refined products imported into this country which we have to compete.

We have a 750,000-barrel-per-day refinery which is the most modern on the gulf coast and were encouraged to build it by the Petroleum Administration for defense. We recently completed a $9.5 million petrochemical expansion and these products would be very valuable in case of emergency. Our daily crude runs, consisting of domestic crude only, have been reduced to 40,000 barrels per day due to a great extent to the increased rate of foreign competition over the past 5 years.

If this practice by the Defense Department is continued, further reductions will be necessary, not only by our refinery but by other eastern gulf and west coast refineries. The Advisory Committee on Fuels Policy determined that voluntary reduction of imports of foreign crude is essential for our national security, but the Defense Department who is in charge of our national security, is continuing to increase its purchases in the Caribbean area to the detriment of the domestic oil producer and refiner.

We ask that you use your best efforts to require the Defense Department to purchase domestic products first and eliminate the practice of foreign purchases.

F. L. MARTIN,
*President, Suntide Refining Co.*

---

## THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the language of the President of the United States in his special farm message today is extremely unfortunate. He says his recommendations constitute a "program that can make a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families." The substance of his message flatly contradict this objective in many respects, especially for the Nation's dairy farmers.

Wisconsin dairy farmers today are suffering from a severe depression under prices for milk of $3.25 a hundred pounds. The Secretary of Agriculture has ordered a cut in milk prices down to only $3 per hundred pounds, to take effect on April 1.

The University of Wisconsin's agricultural economics department has estimated that this will result in a loss in net income of Wisconsin dairy farmers of between $43 million and $46 million. This is a terrible blow to Wisconsin—not only to her farmers, but to her entire economy.

And now, in his message, he proposes that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to cut the price of average test milk as low as $2.40 a hundred pounds.

Milk prices at that level will simply destroy Wisconsin's farm families. It is a cruel insult added to injury to say this would be a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families.

What the President is proposing is almost unbelievably shocking. Most Wisconsin farmers are paid on the basis of 3½-percent test milk. The President is advocating that Ezra Taft Benson be given the power to cut milk prices for 3½-percent test milk to $2.13 a hundred pounds. This, Mr. President, spells depression at the worst level that history has ever seen. Farmers cost's are today at the highest record in history. Farm families cannot survive for long with $3 milk; they will be destroyed immediately with $2.13 milk.

Mr. President, the American people, if they only understood the facts, would be outraged by the injustice of the President's proposal.

Dairy farmers in eastern Wisconsin, according to studies made and published by the United States Department of Agriculture, earned only 43 cents per hour for their labor in 1956. These figures are not based on the returns of small, inefficient, submarginal farmers—these are the figures that apply to farmers who are among the world's most efficient dairy producers. The average capital investment of these farms is $34,000—according to official United States Department of Agriculture figures. Mr. President, a $34,000 investment such as the average Wisconsin farmer has made in his farming operations should enable the owner to earn a return of more than 43 cents per hour.

Yet what the President proposes will not help to bolster this terribly unjust and inadequate return: It will eliminate it completely. The dairy price levels contemplated by Secretary Benson's recent action, and the further devastating cuts that would be authorized by the President's recommendation, will simply wipe out all the returns on their labor that farmers are able to get at present; it will destroy the economic foundations of Wisconsin, and it will cruelly punish farm people for having outproduced all other segments of our own economy, and all other agricultural systems anywhere in the world.

## A LETTER OF THANKS

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I received a letter the other day that I should like to share with my colleagues. In fact, the young man who wrote this letter has asked me to express his thanks to the Congress and the country that made his education possible. Too often, I am afraid, we all take for granted the benefits that our democratic system has given us. But now and then we are reminded how fortunate we are. This reminder comes from John Dimanin, whose home is in Dearborn, Mich., but who was born in Greece. This is what John Dimanin has written me:

KIRKSVILLE, MO., *January 9, 1958.*

DEAR SENATOR MCNAMARA: I have just completed 4 years of schooling under the GI bill, and I would like to have you thank the Members of Congress and all the persons who made the GI bill possible for the Korean veterans.

Since I was discharged in December of 1953, I have completed over 2 years at Wayne University and am in my second year at the Kirksville School of Osteopathy and Surgery, Kirksville, Mo. So you can see I have taken advantage of the benefits offered.

I served as both an officer and enlisted man, and believe me, it was a pleasure and honor to have served in the Army.

I can honestly say that if it had not been for the GI bill, I doubt if I would have gone on to complete my schooling. So you can see I've benefited from my service and from the GI bill. And having been born in Greece, I am doubly thankful to this country.

The Veterans' Administration in Detroit under Col. Lloyd Jameson has been wonderful with all the assistance they've given me. They've solved many problems for me.

Senator, I would like you to find a way to inform all those connected with the Veterans' Administration, Congress, and anyone connected with the GI bill that I am grateful for the future they have made for me by providing my education.

JOHN DIMANIN.

Mr. President, all that I can say to John Dimanin for this letter of thanks is: "You're welcome."

## COMMENDATION OF AMBASSADOR JOHN DAVIS LODGE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to comment upon the remarks made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the opening day this week, when he spoke of Ambassador John Davis Lodge, the American Ambassador to Spain, and the accusation that Mr. Lodge had been in any way derelict in his duty because he had been absent from his post so many times.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the splendid analysis of these charges, and his complete refutation of the charges.

I wish to state that I myself visited Spain, and spent 2 weeks in Spain during the month of October. I know from my own personal knowledge that we have never had, in the opinion of the Spanish people, an Ambassador who was a harder worker or more devoted to his duty than the former Governor of Connecticut, Mr. John Davis Lodge.

I very gladly join with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and with my own distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] in trying to make clear the fact that, far from being derelict in his duty, former Governor Lodge, now Ambassador Lodge, has been a very active, hard-working, and effective Ambassador of the United States.

## RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT IN COMMUNIST NATIONS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, shortly before the Congress reconvened, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee issued as a committee print a report on resources development in the Communist nations of the world.

The report established authoritatively that our country is rapidly losing out in river and resources development, which are prerequisites to economic, industrial, military, and national strength. If any Members have not seen this report, I hope they will call the Interior Committee for a copy.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has advised me that in the current year appropriations requests for reclamation, flood control, and rivers and harbors items were cut to 1.12 percent of the budget, in line with administration policy. I am further advised that resources development work is a target for economy, instead of expansion, in the budget draft being prepared to send to the Congress later this month.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article by Thomas P. Whitney, the Associated Press foreign news analyst, reporting Russia's 15-year plan to pass the United States current production in electricity, iron, steel, coal, petroleum, cement, and other items.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal of December 29, 1957]

REDS PUSH INDUSTRY

(By Thomas P. Whitney)

The Soviet Government is preparing a grandiose new 15-year plan to build the industrial might which the United States possesses today.

This longer range plan running to 1972 will apparently embrace shorter term economic development plans within itself, including the current 5-year plan ending in 1960.

Preliminary Soviet targets for the 15-year industrial buildup have been announced by Nikita Khrushchev. Here are the figures on Russian goals for 1972, compared with Soviet production in 1957 and United States output in 1956 as presented by the Kremlin chieftain:

| | U. S. S. R. 1957 | U. S. S. R. 1972 | U. S. A. 1956 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pig iron | 37.0 | 75–85 | 69.0 |
| Steel | 51.0 | 100–120 | 104.5 |
| Coal | 462.0 | 480–750 | 400.0 |
| Petroleum | 98.0 | 350–400 | 354.0 |
| Electricity | 210.0 | 800–900 | 684.0 |
| Cement | 29.0 | 90–110 | 84.0 |
| Sugar | 4.5 | 9–10 | 2.1 |
| Wool cloth | 250.0 | 550–650 | 299.0 |
| Shoes | 315.0 | 600–700 | 565.0 |

NOTE.—Figures are in millions of metric tons, except for electricity (in billion kilowatt-hours), wool cloth (in million meters) and shoes (million pairs).

Khrushchev said of the plan:

"This is a preliminary prognosis, which may be corrected by the facts of life in one direction or another: It's more likely it may be corrected on the side of reduction in the time period for carrying out these plans.

"Even with our rich experience in running a planned economy it is difficult to foresee with absolute exactitude the growth of pro-

duction in various fields, particularly if one takes into consideration the stormy development of contemporary science and techniques and the further growth of our corps of trained personnel, which can give additional sources of acceleration of growth of production."

Experts in the United States are inclined to take the new Soviet economic plan seriously. Experience has shown that the Kremlin's postwar economic plans, though they contain certain propaganda elements, are serious programs for development. Basic goals are generally realized despite some readjustments.

Mr. MURRAY. This body must give a great deal of attention to our military situation, to sputniks and missiles and keeping up with the Communists in military power.

We cannot possibly win the race with Russia and the Communist nations in the long run if we neglect basic resources development. We cannot outproduce them if we have less energy available with which to run industrial plants, if we have inadequate mass transportation, or if great industrial areas are periodically inundated by floods.

Just as this Nation must invest more in basic research, so must we also increase our expenditures for basic resource development and our determination to get maximum benefits from our resources.

This Nation cannot afford the colossal waste of energy, and flood control and navigation benefits, which will occur if the giant Hells Canyon Dam is not authorized and built. I know of nothing more symbolic of the present administration's inability to grasp our situation in world affairs than the situation in the Middle Snake River.

The administration has obstructed construction of a great hydroelectric project at Hells Canyon by the Bureau of Reclamation and given the green light instead to private power company development. The private project will develop less than half the potential benefits of the resource. There will be a loss of power in the magnitude of a half-million kilowatts. Two-thirds of potential flood-control benefit—flood control that is urgently needed by the industrialized lower Columbia River Basin—will be wasted, as will the potential aid to navigation.

Some of us have for years warned that the United States must husband and develop her resources—that we cannot maintain our position of world leadership unless we do. But studies and reports like the great Paley Commission report on Resources for Freedom have gone virtually unheeded.

This Nation is not going to win either the race for military power, nor the race for the minds of men, if we continue to let our resource development program fall behind, our energy resources to be wasted, our river valleys to be subject to unnecessary devastating floods, waterways to deteriorate, and waste to run rampant.

It is as essential for this Nation to speed river and resources development programs as sputnik or missile programs.

We could do no more significant thing than to stop the resource-wasting, low-dam projects in the Middle Snake River and start full development of the Middle Snake River without delay. By passing the bill which this body has already approved, the House of Representatives could tell the world that this Nation is determined to do more than shoot 1 or 2 sputniks in the air; that we are reversing old, wasteful, resource policies to match and better, in the next 15 years, 50 years or 500 years, all the increase in national strength and productive capacity which our Russian competitors have initiated.

---

## FRAUD, GRAFT, AND FOLLY IN THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Look magazine, which is published by the Cowles brothers, once ardent supporters of President Eisenhower.

The article was published in the October 1, 1957, issue of Look, and is entitled "Fraud, Graft, and Folly in the Farm Program." It is a shocking indictment of the Eisenhower-Benson administration of the Department of Agriculture.

I also ask consent to include after the article a statement in reply issued by Secretary Benson which is even more shocking. Mr. Benson defends himself by saying:

> It is impossible to handle multi-billion-dollar programs without some abuse.

Mr. President, this statement leaves the inevitable impression that the Secretary of Agriculture, who had been away from his desk all summer vacationing and riding through national forests, is a man resigned to abuses rather than a man who stays on the job and works diligently to minimize them.

When President Dwight D. Eisenhower was running for office he told the people of America:

> I pledge you that—whatever my future personal status—I shall not rest until the peddlers of privilege and the destroyers of decency are banished from the Nation's house.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### FRAUD, GRAFT, AND FOLLY IN THE FARM PROGRAM

After almost 5 years of the Eisenhower team's farm efforts, there is shocking news for the American taxpayer in the vast domain of surpluses, storehouses and subsidies operated by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson. The man who came to clean up the mess on the world's largest plantation has seen his good intentions eroded by widespread fraud, graft and folly. Not only is the mess still there; it may even have grown.

Congressional investigators have discovered scandal in almost every farm program—in the soil bank, in cotton subsidies, in the grain trade, in storage bins, on the export market, in cheese making, in transportation, in warehouses, in administration and even in the school-lunch program.

Benson's Department is the welfare state in miniature, if anything costing almost $30 billion since 1933 can be called miniature. It inspects the meat you buy, gives you groceries when you're hard up, passes advice to grocers, makes movies, tells pants makers what the public wants, devises sudsier soaps, better insect repellents, finer frozen juices and crunchier pickles. It tells you how to wash a rug or remove a spot from a dress, provides campgrounds for city hikers and hundreds of other services—as well as doling out advice, comfort, and cold cash to farmers. Yet, behind this benevolent facade, something is radically wrong.

Consider the soil bank. It was set up to funnel $1,200 million annually into farmers' pockets and to slash piled up Government surpluses. To do this, the Government pays people not to grow things.

Last summer, Representative STEWART L. UDALL (Democrat, of Arizona) revealed to Congress that individual payments—ranging from $56,000 to $209,701—had been made to 11 Arizona cotton farmers, all for not growing cotton. The largest Government check went to Jack A. Harris for not growing cotton on 1,666 acres in Pima County. Harris then leased 4,500 acres in another county, trucked his gear to the new site and planted cotton—thereby tripling production.

UDALL invented a new term, "boonswoggling," to describe this deal. Yet Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse defended the payment as tending "to obtain a reduction in production" and said there was nothing unorthodox about the fact that Harris was growing three times as much cotton somewhere else. Harris declared that his maneuver was intended to show "how ridiculous the soil bank is," and added, "What I've done is all within the law and it's being done by others in the industry. I don't understand UDALL's singling me out."

Many farmers don't like the mess any more than the taxpayers. (As if in frustrated reprisal against a system nobody really understands, an enraged Georgia farmer recently bit the left ear off a Government credit agent who had come to talk about the farmer's loan.) But while the system exists, people will take advantage of it.

Two years ago, a man walked into a west Texas supply store and made a series of purchases against deposited credit. The purchases included a $127 saddle, a polo mallet, a polo-mallet head, dog food, horse goggles, stirrup buckles and two Navaho blankets.

Not long ago, this shopping list stunned a group of United States Senators seated around a conference table in Washington. Reason: The purchases were made from emergency aid extended by the Nation's taxpayers to help needy farmers feed drought-stricken herds. Ranchers needing help were required to sign this statement: "Without the assistance applied for under the emergency feed program, I will be unable to maintain my basic foundation herd and to continue livestock operation which I have been conducting for (blank) years."

In return, the rancher got a drought-relief certificate, approved by the county farm committee, good for feed orders at a local store. In practice, the certificates became scrip, used for general credit at dollar face value. An Agriculture Department auditor visited the rancher early this year on a routine check. The man's drought-needy herd, he testified before a Senate agriculture subcommittee, "comprised a horse and a dog."

Through 4 days of hearings on similar cases, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, hammered at reluctant agriculture officials. At first, they estimated that $2 million of the big drought-feed program had vanished in unwise or illegal payments. Gradually, the figures increased as more cheating was revealed. It was admitted that 163 cases had been sent to the Justice Department for prosecution. Finally, the Agriculture Department prodded by Senators, ordered a complete audit of the drought program. It is still in progress.

Rumblings of funny business in drought relief came as early as 1954, when Senator WILLIAMS questioned a $32,585 subsidy to the rich million-acre King Ranch in Texas. The

ranch had applied for and received drought-relief aid. In June 1954, when WILLIAMS revealed the handout, a King Ranch racehorse, High Gun, won $89,000 by capturing the Belmont Stakes and $27,500 by taking the Peter Pan Handicap. WILLIAMS promptly proclaimed on the Senate floor that High Gun was the first horse "on relief" to win rich stake races.

No one denies that drought has been a harsh, baking reality, and that farmers have seen life savings wither to dust. But some of the $658 million spent by the Government in 4 years to ease the burden has taken strange paths.

Agriculture officials admitted to the Senate subcommittee that $4,500 in emergency feed subsidy went in 1956 to the huge Robbins ranches, covering almost 60,000 Kansas acres. After exposure by the subcommittee, the Department made formal demand for repayment on the ground that the Robbins ranches were not in financial need.

In Upton County, TEX., the subcommittee reported, two members of a local farm committee approved large subsidies for themselves, but used only a fraction for drought feed. Another Upton County farmer who got $3,620 in drought-relief credit used some of it to buy a bridle, a man's hat, 50 dressed fryers, bolts, washers, fly bait, horse goggles, nipples, horseshoes, cement, and fly spray.

On the west coast, testimony disclosed mutually profitable deals between farmers and dealers. With drought subsidies averaging about half the going price of grain, farmers with ample feed in hand were getting drought allotments anyway. Thus a farmer could buy $60 worth of feed from a dealer, using $30 of his own money and $30 of the Government's, and then resell the grain to the dealer for $50. His profit was $20, and the dealer's, $10. No grain changed hands and everybody made money but the taxpayers.

In another probe, a House Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, reported a soil-bank chamber of horrors that outraged commonsense:

In Ellsworth County, Kans., one man leased 420 acres of Government-owned land from the Corps of Engineers and then announced he was not growing wheat on it. He paid $1,475 in rent and collected $2,500 for not growing wheat.

In Saline County, Kans., a man rented 160 acres of the Smoky Hill Air Force Base from the Government at $621 a year. For not growing wheat on part of it, the Government gave him $1,015.

SOIL-BANK SHENANIGANS

In Butler County, Ky., a man applied to put his acreage in the soil bank and collect money for not growing corn. An agent who measured the land found the "cornfield" was covered with 6-foot-high brush. Agriculture officials ruled he could qualify as a subsidized corn nongrower if he cleared off the brush.

Also, in Kentucky, investigators found that farmland owners with jobs in town had no intention of planting anything. When the soil bank arrived, they got paid for their lack of intentions. (By the same logic, a suburbanite ought to be able to collect Government money by promising not to grow corn on his lawn.)

Operation of two conflicting bounty laws made North Dakota an Alice-in-Wonderland. The Soil Bank Act paid farmers to cut wheat production. But the Durum Wheat Act gave an acreage bonus to farmers who shifted to the durum type of wheat. Thus a farmer in Grand Forks County, N. Dak., legally collected $10,366 for not growing wheat, although he actually increased wheat production by 538 acres. He had simply shifted from spring wheat to the bonus durum type.

In a South Dakota county, where the wheat crop was almost a total failure, and land prices nevertheless soared. Speculators were buying land in hopes of putting tenants off the farms and collecting Government money for not growing grain.

Traders as well as farmers are in a position to turn a fast buck. From the Government's bulging cotton holdings, merchants buy under competitive sealed bids. Last year, the Justice Department charged that there was a conspiracy to violate antitrust laws by allocating bids and fixing prices on buying Government cotton.

Eight large cotton firms and four individuals were indicted in New Orleans. Justice officials charged that the firms had purchased 60 percent of the $40 million worth of Government cotton sold in 1954–55, in a conspiracy to hold down prices. Ironically, presidents of three of the firms were unpaid members of Benson's cotton advisory committee. All denied the charges.

Investigations disclose highjinks in grain storage too.

Over the years, the Agriculture Department had bought 193,000 bins in which to store the Nation's surpluses, at a cost of $177 million. The Senate investigations subcommittee reported that thousands of the bins bought in 1954 were defective—with holes big enough for rats to crawl through. The bins had been inspected by the Navy under contract to the Agriculture Department. The committee accused both agencies of confusion, gross carelessness, and a lack of coordination.

Testimony before a House Government operations subcommittee revealed another storage angle. Cries for more storage space in 1954 brought Jack P. Burrus to the Department of Agriculture with a new gimmick. He signed to store 37 million bushels in tents at an annual fee of $6,600,000. This canvas granary turned into a colossal flop. Starlings pecked holes in the tents; water seeped in; insects moved in; the huge piles at Fort Worth, Tex., and St. Joseph, Mo., started to rot.

After a prolonged hassle, the Department gave Burrus an export subsidy to get rid of some of the grain. Burrus estimates that he lost $15 million on the deal. The Agriculture Department thinks it lost $8 million. Chairman L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, North Carolina, of this House subcommittee declares both sides goofed. Cost to taxpayers: large but undetermined.

Government grains trading heaps more losses on the taxpayer. The Agriculture Department hires fobbers, or forwarding agents, to handle bookwork on grain exports and port storage. But investigators for the House Appropriations Committee reported a conflict of interest among fobbers, some of whom trade grain on their own account while handling the Government's. As a result, the Government ships high-quality grain to embarkation points and permits the trade to blend off its own inferrior stocks, in the words of the House committee. Uncle Sam is forced to take a lower price abroad. Grain operators profit. Taxpayers lose.

The Agriculture Department sometimes doesn't even wait to be asked to hand out money. Once, in a weird transaction, it bestowed over $2 million on some of the Nation's leading cheese companies. Here's how it worked:

Early in 1954, Secretary Benson said he would lower dairy price supports on April 1. The Department of Agriculture then told cheese companies they could sell their products to the Government in March at the prevailing high rate with a guaranty they could buy them back in April at the lower price.

This was strictly a paper transaction. The cheese never left the owners' warehouses. They merely signed papers giving the Government title until April, held onto the cheese and in April got checks totaling $2,096,401.64 from Uncle Sam.

It's easy to take advantage of a prodigal Government. In the 1953 drought, the Agriculture Department contracted with processors to sack cottonseed pellets for emergency animal feed. But, in many instances, short weights averaging 7½ pounds to the 100-pound sack left taxpayers holding the bag for $500,000. More expensive was the Department's decision, in 1954, to sell large stocks of surplus dried milk for animal feed. The consequences were bewildering:

First, the Government lost money on the sale. Second, feed processors made about $10 million without reducing feed prices to farmers. Third, since dried milk for human consumption was selling at a much higher price, some operators diverted the low-cost animal feed. In New York, a court convicted two men of reselling 330,000 pounds of dried milk for human use at a profit of $26,000. Fourth, whey dealers yelped. Whey, the product that is left when milk is made into cheese, had been mixed in animal feed. Now the cheaper dried milk replaced it and the whey men were going broke.

THE SLIPPERY MILKY WAY

The Agriculture Department had an easy answer. It announced a new price-support program for whey and bought 41 million pounds of it. Instead of being up to his ears in dried milk, Benson was up to his ears in whey. Loss to taxpayers: about $73 million on dried milk and $1,500,000 on whey.

Some Federal farm funds wind up in the school-lunch program, both in surplus commodities and in money to deliver the goods to the States. Thereafter, the States assume the cost of distributing the food within their borders. Investigation by Chairman Fountain's subcommittee—prompted by a Chicago Sun-Times exposure—turned up this story in Illinois:

James W. Dunbar, Republican probate clerk of Sangamon County, also headed a trucking firm, Dunbar & Co. He got an exclusive contract from his good friend Vernon L. Nickell, Illinois superintendent of public instruction, to distribute Government surplus commodities to schools and State institutions.

Dunbar's trucking outfit, which had been losing money, suddenly prospered. By its own reckoning, it made $396,000 in 29 months of distributing school-lunch supplies, but the subcommittee said profits "greatly exceeded" that amount because of questionable items charged off as business expenses.

Travel charges against school-lunch distribution totaled $66,707, said the committee, including $555.90 for rail tickets and a chartered plane for a fishing trip by Dunbar, Nickell, and Harold A. Wolfe, Illinois school-lunch director. Dunbar explained: "It was about the only time we could sit down and talk about the school-lunch program and get their different versions of it."

Other expenses included two round-trip air tickets to Florida, $1,344 for football tickets, and other sums for liquor.

"Inordinate profits of Dunbar & Co.," said the subcommittee, "constituted the major portion of the excessive cost of distributing donated commodities in Illinois." The State of Illinois indicted Dunbar and three others, but a panel of judges quashed the indictments.

It was no surprise that Republicans, out of power for 20 years, should cast greedy eyes on more than 200,000 full- and part-time Agriculture jobs, but some of the patronage endeavors raised eyebrows. A Senate agriculture subcommittee revealed that in Missouri the State Republican com-

mittee urged grand old party leaders to take over the 4,300 Federal farm jobs in the State. In one county, a motel operator was installed as farm-office manager. In another, a fist fight erupted when Republicans tried to give a Federal farm job to a party leader who had broken a bin seal and sold his Government-mortgaged corn.

Around the Nation, lucrative legal aspects of farm loans were switched from Government to private attorneys, with Republican lawyers getting the gravy. Washington sent lists of grand old party precinct and county chairmen to the States for Federal farm appointments.

In Montana, Carl O. Hansen, State Farmers Home Administration boss, was forced to resign amid conflict of interest charges. Hansen bought wool on a commission basis for a private firm while directing the State FHA office. An assistant on the Government payroll helped Hansen with the private wool purchases. At the top level, a Senate investigation of FHA inefficiency led to the resignation in June 1956 of the national administrator, R. B. McLeaish.

What's wrong with the giant farm program? Democrats blame Benson's bungling, but that's only a part of the story. Benson personally opposes many of the subsidies, in degree. He told a Senate committee that we need better programs than those which lose markets, restrict the opportunity for farmers to make their own decisions, and pile up surpluses.

There must be better programs—to this all sides say "aye"—but no one has the answers. Democrats as well as Republicans want to continue farm-aid spending; neither party wants to write the kind of laws and regulations that would stop chiseling for fear of giving all farm programs a black eye.

The programs have grown so big—all farm spending will approximate $5,500,000,000 this year—that neither party is able to control them. Nobody can predict the impact on the total economy of a price-support program for a single crop. Nobody, indeed, knows enough to manage almost $8 billion worth of surpluses.

The page reserved for the history of the Government's 25-year struggle to shore up a farm economy that is changing so fast it can hardly be measured, let alone managed, might be headed with this inscription: "Too much sugar. Too many flies. Not enough flypaper."

---

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON

I have seen the article in Look magazine entitled, "Fraud, Graft, and Folly in the Farm Program." The article has in it a number of half-truths, distortions and falsehoods. There is nothing new in it. Many of the infractions of law and regulation described in this article were uncovered by our own investigators. It is largely a rehash of charges made against the Department by various investigating committees of the Congress during the past 4½ years. Very little is said in the article regarding our defense against these charges. This defense has been made in full detail. It was and is available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in printed hearings of the various committees. The authors of the article chose to report the charges and ignore the defense.

The article alleges that Government farm programs have occasionally been abused. With this I agree. It is impossible to handle multibillion-dollar programs without some abuse. The article charges the Department with lagging in moving to correct these abuses. With this I disagree. It infers that large numbers of farm people are fundamentally dishonest. This I totally reject.

For 4½ years we have been trying diligently to reverse the trend toward a socialized agriculture. We have repeatedly urged legislation which would change the unsound, wasteful features of the old program born during depression and war. We will continue our fight for a sound program and for a prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

---

## A REALISTIC APPROACH TO THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today the administration and Secretary Benson are recommending to Congress legislation which represents further progress toward turning back to the American farmers the management of their own farms. I am not necessarily endorsing all their suggestions, but they do represent a realistic approach to the farm problem.

The projection of the high support incentive production plans of World War II over into peacetime economy has resulted in the inevitable accumulation of huge amounts of agriculture surpluses.

Not only has this brought about tremendous losses for the American taxpayers, but also the ever-present threat of these huge inventories in our warehouses has inevitably had a dampening effect upon market prices.

Had this been recognized in the immediate postwar period and the 90 percent wartime incentive production support prices been lowered, as was intended, the plight of the American farmer over the past 10 years would have been much better and the producers of those affected commodities would not be in the situation in which they now find themselves.

Likewise, the high support prices for a few basic commodities has resulted in an unfair advantage to certain types of farmers while at the same time other groups of farmers were actually being hurt by the same program, for instance; Over 80 percent of the price supports and stabilization costs in the 1956–57 period were concentrated in 3 crops and in butter and manufactured dairy products. Nearly one-half—48 percent—of the costs were incurred on 2 crops, wheat and cotton.

The major Federal costs of price supports and stabilization programs based on fiscal years 1956 and 1957 are as follows:

| | Percent of costs | Percent of total cash farm receipts from 1956 sales |
|---|---|---|
| Wheat | 30.0 | 7.4 |
| Cotton | 18.2 | 5.9 |
| Corn | 13.8 | 5.2 |
| Dairy products | 20.2 | 14.7 |
| Poultry and poultry products | 0 | 10.6 |

Last year the cost of the agriculture support program was in excess of $3¼ billion. Eighty percent of this cost was represented by losses sustained on the 4 above mentioned crops.

Furthermore, the type of program which has been in operation for the past several years has been a major benefit to the large scale and ofttimes absentee type of farmer while the middle or small farmer received a negligible percentage of the benefits; for instance; as 80 percent of the total, or about $2½ billion, was being spent on 4 crops, 80 percent of this amount went to less than 27 percent of those farmers, while 56 percent of all the farmers producing corn, wheat, cotton, and dairy products received only 9 percent of the benefits.

The purpose of any sound agriculture program should be to protect and assist the bona fide farmer and not to promote and encourage the expansion of the absentee ownership or corporation type of operation.

A further glaring example of the inequity in our basic farm program, and one which is corrected under the administration's new proposal, is the example mentioned a couple of weeks ago wherein it was pointed out that under the operations of the soil bank program 10 large operators received $1,470,582.53 subsidy from the United States Government, with the top beneficiary receiving over $250,000.

It should also be pointed out that under the existing program only farmers in certain States are being supported while in many other States he is being allowed to shift for himself.

I call attention to the fact that while wheat and corn account for 12.6 percent of the total cash farm receipts the expenditures of the Government in support of these two crops represented 43.8 percent of the total cost of our agriculture support programs.

On the other hand, not only has the poultry industry, which represented 10.6 percent of the total cash farm receipts, operated without the benefit of any support prices but also it has been confronted with high feed costs resulting from the artificially supported grain markets.

I commend the poultry industry, which on numerous occasions has been confronted with marketing problems and low prices, upon the fact that it has been realistic enough to realize that the solution to those problems does not rest with the United States Government.

What the American farmer needs and wants is a sound agriculture program designed to help the bona fide American farmer, and not one which is designed to promote absentee ownership, or to expand the corporation type of operation at the taxpayers' expense.

---

## SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it is important at this time of national and international crisis for us to pay great tribute to the fine nonpartisan career service and the outstanding people in it. The examples of splendid performance of public duty and unselfish dedication are unparalleled in world history.

It was on January 16, 1883, that President Chester A. Arthur signed into law the Civil Service Act. At that time the new law covered only a handful of employees. Today the Civil Service Act covers 86 percent of all Federal employees and 91 percent of those in the continental United States. Nearly two and one-half million men and women engaged in occupations embracing every

type of employment in the Federal Service are covered. Their daily work and actions touch Americans every day of their life.

Since 1883 much has been done to transform the civil service into a true career service, but the basic fundamentals of the merit system were established by the original law.

It is in keeping with the dignity of this 75th anniversary development that we openly and intelligently reexamine this law to make certain whether it is adequate or whether it should be changed.

The overwhelming responsibility which the Federal Government now faces requires degrees of expertness which a few short years ago were never conceived of and makes it imperative that we know the executive branch of our government is working in the most effective possible manner to attract good people to the public service and seeing that they are fairly treated as they produce great things for all the people of the United States and continue to bring reassurance in the years of international tension.

During these 75 years of the history of the Civil Service Act, many committees, including Presidential committees, have made studies and recommendations for the extension of its coverage and the improvement of its operation.

Within the last 2 years the Hoover Committee on the Reorganization of the executive branch of the Government has had a task force studying the program and made substantial recommendations for changes, based on the information they obtained in these hearings.

Several bills have been introduced carrying these changes into effect and I hope this session of Congress will have an opportunity to act on them.

Near the conclusion of the first session of the 85th Congress, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced S. 2317, which, if enacted, would establish a commission to study and revise the present compensation system for civilian salaried employees of the Federal Government and amend the compensation schedule of the Classification Act of 1949.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for many years, I appreciate the need for this type of study.

The bill provides that there be established a Commission of 12 members—4 chosen from the executive branch of the Government, 4 from private life, and 4 from the Congress of the United States.

This Commission, if given proper authority could, in my opinion, be of valued service to the future of the civil-service system.

I should also like to pay tribute to the dedicated private citizens who have formed and supported and directed the National Civil Service League. The National Civil Service League was founded in 1881 and is truly a citizen organization that is devoted to the adoption in government of a modern personnel system based on merit, and to exclusion of public employment from partisan control.

The present officers of this organization are—as were those of the past—dedicated individuals, promoting the cause of a nonpolitical merit system for government employees. It was this private group which helped bring the Pendleton Act into existence and has continued to work in a constructive manner throughout the years, with the Congress as well as the executive branch of the Government. The history and vitality of such a citizens' group is, in itself, a tribute to the dynamic and fully democratic nature of our Government.

The ability to allow complete and open relationships between such private organizations and all branches of government has been a factor which has lead to important strength in public administration and our entire democratic process.

Again, Mr. President, I say it is an honor and a privilege to pay tribute to the civil-service system and what it has meant to our Nation on this, its 75th anniversary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation issued by the President of the United States on the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Whereas the Federal civil-service system was established by the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, and will be 75 years old on January 16, 1958; and

Whereas the enactment of that act and the establishment thereunder of a merit system of employment within the Federal Government have given impetus to the establishment of similar systems at State, county, and municipal levels of government; and

Whereas a strong civil service, based on the merit principle, is now recognized as an essential factor in stable, responsible government in the United States, as well as in many other countries; and

Whereas the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act is an appropriate time to salute the civil service of the United States and to increase public knowledge and understanding of its importance in our system of self-government:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to participate in the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act on January 16, 1958, and throughout the ensuing year.

I also call upon the heads of Federal departments and agencies, governors, mayors, and other public officials, as well as leaders of industry and labor and members of all public-spirited groups, to study our Federal, State, and local civil-service systems, with a view to their continuous improvement in every way possible, and to arrange appropriate ceremonies in honor of the public service of our able and devoted civil servants throughout the country.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America do be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 13th day of January 1958, and of the independence of the United States of America the 182d.

[SEAL] DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
*Secretary of State.*

## AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the President has sent to Congress a message on agriculture. It is my further understanding that in the message he recommends a continuation of Public Law 480, as well as an extension of the Wool Act. I am in favor of both proposals, because I believe they represent sound judgment on these subjects.

I understand the President also suggests that we take a look at the soil bank program. I believe that is long overdue.

However, if my understanding is correct, the President also advocates a change in the price support structure for the basic commodities, and that he advocates legislation which would allow a leeway in price supports for the six basic commodities, ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

In my opinion, Mr. President, if such legislation is enacted it will mean that parity will end up at 60 percent. The most recent indication of what the administration is doing in the field of farm props is the action taken recently with relation to dairy products.

The Department of Agriculture has announced that at some time in the near future—I believe on April 1—the price supports on dairy products will drop to 75 percent. I believe that recommendation goes entirely too far.

I would call to the attention of the administration that over the past 5 years or so, 600,000 small farm families have left their farms. I would further point out to the administration that at the present time, based on figures furnished by its own Commodity Credit Corporation, 1,400,000 farm families earn less than $1,000 a year. For the past 6 years the income of farmers has been declining, while the costs of the farmers have been rising steadily. Alone, over this period, this segment of our economy has been caught in this price-cost squeeze.

I sincerely hope that Congress will not be in accord with the recommendation in the recent message by the President of the United States for a lowering of price supports to as low as 60 percent. If I had my way, the lowest price support, insofar as the 6 basic commodities are concerned, would be 90 percent. I believe farmers would be able to live within that particular orbit. However, if price supports are reduced to 60 percent, then we can expect more and more small farmers to be forced off the land, and more and more corporate farming to come into being.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from Mr. Kenneth J. Sire, of Billings, Mont. I believe it is one of the finest letters on farm problems that I ever received, and I hope every Senator will take the time to read it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLINGS, MONT., *January 4, 1958.*

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: It is not often that I write Members in Congress, but in my book I think

it is time I vent my feelings. Since Congress is controlled by the Democrats I am hoping they may be able to do something.

As for world affairs, that is your department, but I think this administration is doing poorly. As for business, well the chamber of commerce and the Republicans seem to be doing pretty well. I'll let Walter Reuther take care of labor. I am writing as, and I know on behalf of, and for the farmer. I might mention very strongly, small farmer.

The program which Benson tries so hard to coat with sugar for urban consumption is to force the small farmer out of business. Continued dropping of prices will do just that, leaving production in the hands of corporations which will intensify our surplus problem, rather than ease it. Not many years ago there were 6½ million farmers; today there are 4½ million. Where we had 3 farmers living off of the land we have now 2 farmers, and yet the acres in production are the same or larger.

It is the land which is doing the producing. You drop prices and you force the smaller out who is absorbed by his larger neighbor. The land is still there, it is still producing, the difference being that 1 farmer is doing it instead of 2. North of Great Falls, Mont., there is a large farmer. He, his 2 sons, and 4 hired men occupy and produce an area once inhabited by 42 farmers and families. Those 42 farmers had their cows, pigs, chickens, beef animals, grains, and hay all coming from the land. They, as 42 farmers, did not produce nearly as much toward surplus as does this man today. This particular situation is proved by the fact that today on fewer acres we are producing more. I might mention my entire discussion is in terms of wheat, and the small producer of wheat, because I am familiar with his problems.

Today there are 4½ million farmers of which 2½ million are not contributing to our surplus problem. Freeze them out with lower prices and you will have the same land in production with 2½ million fewer families living off the land with the result that our so-called surplus problem will be intensified.

Who benefits from Benson's program? The average small farmer does not. Not a single one of his crackpot ideas has been of a nature where I could benefit. I have not received $1 under his program because it is and was not designed for the small fellow.

The taxpayer has not benefited. Benson is spending as much or more.

The consumer has not benefited. Four years ago I sold my wheat for $2.15 per bushel. This year I will be lucky to get $1.70 per bushel, yet bread has gone up 4 cents per loaf during that same period and my costs of farming have increased a full 25 percent.

I don't care what Benson, Fortune, or Time magazine say. I know what is happening to me and it doesn't hurt good.

My solution: exactly as General Motors or Du Pont would do, curb production. Put a bushel limit per producer, not farm. Permit the price for this limit to be parity with the grand total not in excess of domestic consumption. Any wheat in excess to go at the free market. Put a limit on corn and feed grain and that limit be per producer. Let the farmer do with his excess acres as he sees fit. Cut out soil bank and all the rest. Let him live with a limit on wheat and feed grains.

There is not a single segment of our economy that isn't protected, either because of size, unions, or Government help. What is so wrong to help the small farmer through his elected representative?

You gentlemen in Congress have got to do something, and you sure as the dickens should establish that Congress passes the laws and the administration only administers those laws.

The least you can do is get prices back up and Benson out. It is serious for the small fellow.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH J. SIEL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

## PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read Senate Concurrent Resolution 28.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to legislative and administrative action of the Federal and State Governments in connection with the development of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries. Such compilation shall be prepared under the direction and supervision of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of such Senate document, of which 1,000 copies shall be bound in cloth and 4,000 copies shall be bound in paper. One-half of such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and one-half of such additional copies shall be for the use of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) was considered and agreed to.

## PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 11, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) dealing with the presidential succession.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, to create a joint Congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to create a joint Congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 on page 5, line 22, to strike out "1957" and insert in lieu thereof "1958".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "1957" and insert in lieu thereof "1958".

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the amendment is acted on, I may say, first, that I did not know the Senator intended to offer this particular amendment. I, myself, would not wish to delay the final report of the committee. What is the date which the Senator is now proposing?

Mr. GREEN. The concurrent resolution was introduced in 1957. The year is now changed to 1958, 1 year later, but the date remains June 30.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had thought the concurrent resolution now before the Senate provided that the report would be made on June 30, 1958. Is that what the committee amendment proposes?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is very important that the joint committee report to Congress this year, so that there will be time for Congress to act on the question before adjournment sine die.

Mr. GREEN. The year is changed from 1957 to 1958, and the date remains June 30.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So there would still be time for Congress to act this year?

Mr. GREEN. I think so.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is that the only amendment?

Mr. GREEN. That is the only amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who is unavoidably absent at this time. It is an amendment which is customarily included in resolutions of this kind, which create committees. The amendment is as follows: On page 6, in line 5, following the word "assistants", to read:

*Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed, and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

I understand that the amendment is acceptable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

AMENDMENT OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5822) to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment.

---

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, the Presidential succession measure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting minority leader whether the civil aeronautics bill, if passed over at this time, will thereafter be made the pending business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The bill will remain on the calendar, and will not be brought up until it is cleared with the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Oklahoma, the author of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to create a joint Congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. GREEN obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Was the amendment I offered adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not yet been adopted.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 proposes the creation of a temporary joint Congressional committee of 10 members, 5 from each House of Congress, to study all aspects of the nomination, election, succession, inability, and duties of the President and Vice President. The purpose of the proposed study is to achieve a sound basis for legislative action necessary to make the laws certain and complete in this most important area of Government activity.

For 12 years, beginning with January 1946, I have crusaded for the establishment of a joint committee of the Congress to study the several problems inherent in presidential succession. I have introduced bills in 1946, 1947, 1949, 1951, 1953, 1956, and 1957. On three occasions, my proposals received Senate approval, but died in the House. My most recent effort, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, has been on the Senate Calendar for almost a year. I hope it will be approved without further delay.

I am aware that two measures which have been introduced in the Senate relate, in part, to the matters covered in my resolution; but these measures have never been reported by the committee to which they were referred. It is my belief that remedial legislative action in the area of presidential succession should be predicated on a concentrated and scholarly analysis of the problems involved. In my opinion, the most adequate and appropriate forum for such analysis would be a joint committee of the Congress.

To those who would argue for the establishment of a national commission on presidential succession, I should like to explain why I differ with them. The Chief Executive ought not be in the position of appointing members of a commission to study his own office. A joint committee would be less cumbersome in organization and operation than a national commission. It would be less expensive, involve less delay, be a more direct approach to the problem, and be in a better position to coordinate its studies with those independently made by standing committees of the Congress.

All of us are conscious that ambiguity shrouds the constitutional provisions relating to the transfer of the Executive power of the United States. We should endeavor to resolve that ambiguity now by cool, deliberate consideration and action. Adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 provides the opportunity. I urge its approval.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the taking of action by the Senate on the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island.

As he has pointed out, he has been rather persistent over a period of years in attempting to have a study of this subject matter made.

As I expressed earlier, I hope, however, that the appointment of such a joint committee—if the concurrent resolution is finally agreed to by the other body—will not delay the taking of action by the Congress of the United States in dealing at this session of the Congress with the matter of presidential succession, with particular reference to presidential disability.

This question certainly is not a partisan one. There have been several instances of this sort in the history of our country; I refer to the case of President Garfield, who was incapacitated following the attempt—which of course was finally successful—to assassinate him. He was in a condition of coma for a period of time, and was incapacitated, although he was not immediately killed by the assassin. Subsequently, there was the case of Woodrow Wilson, who was incapacitated for a considerable period of time. It so happened that in both those cases the condition of world affairs was such that no serious damage was done to our country. However, such a situation could develop at any time in the future of our Nation, regardless of whether the then occupant of the White House will be a Democrat or a Republican. The matter should be approached from a nonpartisan point of view.

I hope the joint committee—if the House of Representatives agrees to its appointment—will be appointed immediately, so it can get to work on the question and can hold whatever hearings may be desirable; or if by any chance the House of Representatives does not elect to take that course of action, then I hope that the respective standing committees of the two Houses of Congress will, at this session of Congress, before the sine die adjournment, act on proposed legislation or on a constitutional amendment dealing with this subject.

Several different approaches have been suggested. Undoubtedly the Congress will wish to explore those several possibilities in the way of determining presidential disability. But the Congress should not continue to delay finding a solution for the problem, and I certainly hope the Congress will act on it before the sine die adjournment of this session.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was not able to hear all of the remarks of the Senator from California, but I wish to call his attention to the fact that the constitutional amendment subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee has before it three proposed constitutional amendments relating to the disability and removal of the disability of the President, and also a bill, introduced by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

Some time ago we announced hearings to be held before the subcommittee, to commence on the 23d of this month, at which time we hope to hear from the Attorney General and a number of political scientists and constitutional lawyers of ability.

It is the hope of the subcommittee—and I believe, of the Judiciary Committee—in the near future that an appropriate resolution or other measure may be reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Of course the House committee has already held hearings and, I believe, is in the process of holding more.

I do not know whether the Senator from Rhode Island has in mind going into the same subject matter that is being covered by the Judiciary Committee, if the proposed joint committee is established. I think it would be an unnecessary duplication in that particular field.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will yield, I might say that, so far as I know, in our legislative procedures there is nothing which would in the slightest preclude hearings being conducted by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee before the subcommittee to which he has

referred. I was glad to learn that such hearings are to be held. That merely underscores the fact I mentioned earlier, that I hope that at this session of the Congress some action can be taken on the question of presidential disability.

As the distinguished Senator from Tennessee himself knows, the President of the United States recommended at the last session of Congress that the matter be taken up. There are honest differences of opinion as to whether the suggestions the President made and the suggestions which the then Attorney General made are the procedures which the Congress will finally decide to approve or care to follow; but there certainly is a very real problem involved, and one which must be considered by the Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will certainly agree that it is a most important problem and one that should not be left dangling without being settled. I think the President is to be commended for taking the initiative himself and asking that the entire problem be considered by the Congress. The point I was making was that I did not know if the joint committee which would be established by the resolution of the Senator from Rhode Island contemplated covering the same field or whether there would be a duplication of part of the inquiry or just what the situation was.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to answer the question, I do not see that there will be duplication. I hope the present examination into the question will continue and that the results of the inquiry will be available to the joint committee which would be appointed under the resolution, if adopted. The joint committee would deal with a good many questions besides the one question that the present committee is considering. It seems to me it is very advisable to clear up the whole question, if possible, so that in the eventuality referred to, the disability of the President, there may be no interruption of our form of government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from California yielded the floor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I have yielded the floor, but I shall be glad to answer any questions that are directed to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I had not had the opportunity of examining the powers which would be granted to the joint committee under the resolution. I did not know whether the joint committee would have authority to report bills to the Senate or the House, or if the bills it recommended would have to go to the regular standing committees, in which event a bill with reference to a constitutional amendment or relating to legislation defining disability or restoration of ability of the President would come to the Judiciary Committee. I think that point ought to be cleared up.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not think that there is any doubt that the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is correct. As the minority leader said, the adoption of the resolution would not preclude in any way the study which the committee is undertaking. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has said, the work of the joint committee would not duplicate the work of the Judiciary Committee. We recognize the authority of the Judiciary Committee, but this inquiry would go a little beyond the study of that committee, and its findings might be useful to the study made by the joint committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GORE. Has the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee recognized any lack of jurisdiction of his subcommittee in this field?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator all proposals for constitutional amendments are, of course, referred to the Judiciary Committee. The various proposals for constitutional amendments in connection with the inability of the President, and the removal of the inability, and all constitutional amendments with reference to authorizing Congress to have presidential primaries in connection with the selection of the nominees, have always been referred to the Judiciary Committee. I think there is no question about the committee's jurisdiction. We have had hearings in past Congresses on questions of selection of nominees for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. We have had hearings on the question of succession. Of course, a succession bill was reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate some time ago.

Mr. GORE. If the special joint committee is to study the identical subject matter being considered by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary headed by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, how can duplication be avoided?

Mr. KEFAUVER. So far as I can see, it would just mean that there would be two committees studying the matter.

Mr. GORE. Does the resolution come to the Senate with the recommendation of any established legislative committee of the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is my understanding that the resolution was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I do not know of any standing committee that has recommended it.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee 2 or 3 questions for my own information, because I am not familiar with the resolution. My first question is, Am I to understand that the Judiciary Committee now has, and has had for some time, under study and consideration the major subject matters of this proposed resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to my colleague from Oregon that the Judiciary Committee now has under study and, before this resolution was put on the calendar by the policy committee, had announced hearings in connection with the problem of determining when inability of the President occurs and how that inability may be removed. In that connection, we have before us proposals for constitutional amendments and also proposals for legislation. The Judiciary Committee has also had before it for a number of years, and now is considering, different methods of electing a President, either by popular vote or by the Mundt-Coudert plan or the Lodge-Gossett plan, different alternatives to the electoral college. The Judiciary Committee has also had before it bills and proposals for constitutional amendments to enable Congress to devise some other means for the selection of nominees for the Presidency and the Vice-Presidency than by conventions, that is, a national primary system for the selection of the nominees by the major parties for President and Vice President.

The Judiciary Committee, of course, has in times past had before it for consideration bills with reference to succession to the office of the Presidency, and related matters of that kind.

At this point I should like to clear up the record. My colleague from Tennessee asked if this proposal for the joint committee had been recommended by any standing committee. I thought my colleague was referring to the Judiciary Committee. This matter did not come before the Judiciary Committee. The resolution was presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The joint committee, of course, has been recommended by a resolution from the Rules Committee, but has not been recommended by any other standing committee.

Mr. MORSE. My next question is this: Does the Senator from Tennessee believe that the subject matter of this resolution falls within the jurisdiction of both the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration? The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has just invited my attention to what the Rules of the Senate have to say with reference to committees, page 42 of the Rules and Manual of the United States Senate, subsection (d).

> Matters relating to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; presidential succession.

The matter seems to fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and, therefore, the resolution would be properly reported by that committee.

Does the Senator from Tennessee believe that the Judiciary Committee also has jurisdiction over the same subject matter?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am quite certain that all the points suggested in the resolution with reference to establishing the joint committee are covered under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee

and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Of course, as was stated by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], that fact is not contested. An effort is not being made to take away the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration or the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is desired to have a committee to study and make its recommendations. I take it those recommendations would be made to the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration. I suppose that is where they would wind up.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit, I am a little concerned, Mr. President, about what I fear is a growing tendency in committee procedures of the Senate to duplicate effort, with corresponding duplication of cost.

I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee clear the matter up, if he can. I am a little concerned as to whether, if we pass this resolution and the Committee on the Judiciary continues its investigation, we shall not find ourselves paying out money for identical studies, only to have the two studies finally submitted to a standing legislative committee for a report to the Senate, when one committee could have done the job all alone.

If the point I raise is a valid point, I think, Mr. President, our Senate leaders ought to get together and make a recommendation as to who is going to do this job, because I do not think we can justify paying twice for the same objective.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say in response to the Senator's observation that as I understand the resolution to establish the joint committee there is no authority to report bills on the committee's own motion. Its recommendations would have to go, in the main, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

As to the matter of all constitutional amendments, all legislation affecting the inability or removal of the inability of the President, the establishment of presidential preference primaries, or the abolition of the electoral college, all of those related matters are being considered and have historically been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. Some aspects of the problem are properly, of course, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

This proposal would really amount to the establishment of another committee to hear testimony and make recommendations with reference to matters which will be acted upon by the other two committees. So far as I am concerned, the subject matter requires all the light we can obtain. If the Senate desires to have two committees considering the subject I have no personal objection, although I imagine we would have the same witnesses before each committee. We would cover pretty much the same field.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me, I should like to address a comment or a question to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and to the acting majority leader, as follows: Has the leadership of the Senate, in placing this matter on the calendar today, given consideration to a question as to whether this involves duplicating costs?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that until the majority policy committee had met on yesterday, I believe it was, and I was telephoned by the majority leader, I did not know that the matter was going to be up for consideration today. I assumed the decision was made by the majority policy committee.

The one question I raised, both with the majority leader when I spoke to him and also publicly on the floor, was that I wanted to be sure that the passage of such a resolution creating a joint committee would not delay action by the Congress of the United States on the question of presidential disability, because I think—and I am expressing a personal opinion—that matter should be considered and acted upon at this session of Congress.

I was personally pleased to learn that the Committee on the Judiciary is holding some hearings on the subject.

I believe the discussion has brought out that there may be some duplication, but I do not believe that it will in any way foreclose the Committee on the Judiciary from going ahead with its hearings, which have been indicated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join with the distinguished minority leader in what he has had to say, and to point out that this type of legislation has passed the Senate three times previously; that it was reported out by the Committee on Rules and Administration unanimously; that it was reported out by the Democratic policy committee unanimously; that there will be some duplication, perhaps, but we think that over the long run it will be beneficial to the Committee on the Judiciary, which we realize has primary responsibility.

We desire to be helpful. That is the purpose behind the proposal. I hope the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will recognize the intent that there be no duplication and no precluding anything from coming under the jurisdiction of the Senator's committee, but instead a desire to be helpful and to meet a difficult and troubling problem.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. I wanted to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the resolution does not contain exactly the subject matter before his committee, but is very much broader. In the first place, it covers all of the questions as to the election of the President and Vice President, and how they shall be elected. Second, it covers the succession to the office of the President, when the President ceases to be. In the third case, it covers the inability of the President to discharge his powers and duties.

Finally, it covers the powers and duties of the President.

All of that subject matter would be covered by the report of the joint committee, which would carry a great deal more prestige and influence than any committee of either one House, in my opinion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In response to the Senator from Rhode Island, let me say that I know the Senator is a very able and distinguished Senator, and carries a great deal of prestige. However, inasmuch as the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate have had a great deal of experience with this question over a period of a great many years, I must disagree with the Senator in the statement that a report from the proposed joint committee would carry more prestige and authority than a report from the Judiciary Committee of either the House or the Senate.

The second point is that all of the questions mentioned by the Senator from Rhode Island—the election, the succession, the definition of disability, a new method of electing the President, or a constitutional amendment for a presidential primary—necessarily involve amendments to the Constitution. That subject is fundamentally and primarily one over which the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction.

If it is the idea of the Senator from Rhode Island that we should not act in the Judiciary Committee until the proposed joint committee has held full hearings and made its report, I believe that, in the interest of expediting consideration of these important questions, the proposed joint committee should not be established.

If it is the idea of the Senator from Rhode Island that the Judiciary Committee should proceed with its hearings and make its reports, and not wait upon the action or the hearings of the proposed joint committee, I have no particular objection to it. But we do not want our committee placed in a position in which, when we have a bill to report, we shall be met with the argument that the joint committee has not had time to consider it, and that we should not act until the joint committee has considered the subject.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I think the Senator's committee should proceed with its work. I am sorry that it has not proceeded faster and produced results.

This question has been brought up year after year. On three different occasions a measure dealing with the subject has passed the Senate, and the subject has been before the Senate upon many other occasions.

I think we are constantly being reminded of the risks we are taking in not providing for all these possible contin-

gencies—not merely for the contingency of the death of the President or inability of the President to act, but a great many other contingencies which are left undecided by our present Constitution and laws.

A study by a joint committee should carry enough authority to produce results. That is one reason why there should be a joint committee.

A further point is that we do not wish to pass a measure which the President must sign. There must be action by the Senate and House combined, rather than action with respect to which the President would be passing on his own case.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I point out that any statute, to be effective, must be signed by the President.

Mr. GREEN. That may be true; but that does not necessarily imply that such a course would be necessary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know how we could enact any law without the concurrence of the President.

The point I wish to make clear is that if the Judiciary Committee reports a bill, we should not be met with the argument that we should not proceed, but should defer action until the joint committee has had time to hold hearings and make a report.

I think this question should be acted upon at an early date. We already have quite a record. There was testimony before the House committee. We have a great deal of information in the Senate committee. There have been previous hearings on the subject, and we shall be ready to act within a very short time. We would not wish to be delayed by consideration by the joint committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that we are in full accord with the position he has announced. We desire to be helpful. We recognize the primacy of the Judiciary Committee. We want the hearings to get started. We hope, if the concurrent resolution is adopted, that what the joint committee will do will be helpful to the Senator's committee in arriving at a final determination.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Senate has already passed similar measures upon three separate occasions. But that is not enough. If the Senator's committee reports a bill and it receives the approval of the Senate, that will not accomplish anything further than was accomplished by the previous action of the Senate. But if a joint committee is appointed to consider this subject, it may succeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to congratulate both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Rhode Island on their interest in this very vital subject.

My observation of the activities of the Senator from Rhode Island extends back to the 80th Congress, 12 years ago, when he and I were members of the minority on the Senate Committee on Rules. As I recall, the other party was in charge of the organization of the Senate, and in charge of that committee.

At that time the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island was the leader in insisting on what is now so obvious to all of us, that there were certain questions which should be decided. The suggestion which he made then I considered to be sound. He now makes the same suggestion. I supported him in reporting unanimously from the committee a proposal to deal with the subject. As I recall, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] was at that time a majority member of the Rules Committee.

The purpose of the effort which was initiated by the Senator from Rhode Island was to have a joint committee, because of the fact that, apparently, the subject had been differently viewed by the two Houses up to that time. I believe that the same situation has prevailed since that time, perhaps because the rules pertaining to succession to the Presidency affect one House more directly than the other.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island felt that the reports of a joint committee, appointed by the two Houses, would have great weight before the standing committees which would consider the various proposals. If the proposal of the joint committee involved a constitutional amendment, of course it would have to be referred to the Judiciary Committee in the Senate, as well as the Judiciary Committee in the House. However, the Senator from Rhode Island felt that a study submitted from a joint committee of that kind would receive a favorable hearing and preferential treatment. I agreed with him then, and I still agree with him.

I should like very much to be consistent. Having approved this approach repeatedly in the past, it seems to me that now, when this problem is so much more actively before the conscience of the country than it has ever been, it is time to renew the effort.

I assure the Senator from Tennessee that I, for one, would not desire in any respect to detract from the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. I could not if I wished to do so. The proposal before us would not detract from the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

A given subject would not necessarily come before the Judiciary Committee, because certain parts of the study involve possible statutes, which would not involve the proposal of a constitutional amendment.

On this subject the Constitution itself, in article II, paragraph 5, provides as follows:

> In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

There are other features of the subject matter proposed to be assigned to the joint committee which could be handled by statute, rather than by constitutional amendment.

It seems to me that not only is no loss of jurisdiction involved on the part of the Judiciary Committee, the committee so ably served by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, but that, instead, the proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island, that a joint committee be appointed, would mean that in its very deliberations it would, to some degree at least, compose the differences in points of view between the two Houses, and that its report upon any proposal would commend itself immediately to the wisdom of the two Houses and of their standing committees. Certainly such a report would be entitled to great respect.

So, in order to remain consistent, and particularly in view of the present situation, which brings this question to our attention much more forcefully than I think it has ever been brought to our attention before—and we all regret that situation—it seems to me that we should take the same position, and invite the other body to join with us in this effort, which we have tried to initiate two or three times previously by unanimously adopting a measure with that objective in view, in the hope that joint consideration in a committee of high standing, which would not have power to report legislation, other than for consideration by the committees, would result in a higher standing and prestige for such a measure than would be the case if it were merely introduced by a Senator, by a Member of the House, or by a group of Senators.

Therefore I hope that, while giving our approval again to the long and studious effort of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, which is completely nonpartisan, as is shown by the fact that he originated this effort back when the Senate and, in fact, both Houses were under the control of the now minority party, we will support this effort at this time; and I do so without the slightest intention of slowing down in any way or impairing in any way the efficiency or effectiveness or jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I believe this is a good way for us to go into this subject matter, and is one which may quickly bring back to us proposed legislation, either by way of constitutional amendment or statute, or both, which would command great respect of both Houses of Congress.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the observations of my distinguished colleague from Florida. I believe I should point out to him that, in an effort to follow and to implement the provisions of the Constitution which he has read, a number of bills have been introduced in both the House and in the Senate. One such bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Maine

[Mr. PAYNE]. Those bills have been introduced in an effort not only to define disability but to set up some method of deciding when the disability shall have ceased to exist.

The bills have been filed on the theory that this could be done by statutory enactment, rather than by constitutional amendment. Those bills, both in the House and in the Senate, have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and they are among the bills on which, I announced last week, hearings had been set to begin on January 23.

I say to my colleague from Rhode Island and to my colleague from Florida that I have no objection whatever to a joint committee making a study of the subject, but with the understanding that there will not be any request or suggestion or any demand made upon the Committee on the Judiciary or upon the Senate that action on any of these matters now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary be withheld or deferred until the hearings of the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island have been concluded and the report made by that committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I believe I can give the Senator from Tennessee that assurance. We have nothing like that in mind. We are in full accord with the Senator's view.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know that no Senator would wish purposely to delay consideration of a bill, but it might conceivably happen that if the Senator from Rhode Island had begun hearings on the matter of disability, and its definition, and our hearings were already completed, and our report filed, a request might be made that the whole matter be deferred until the other committee had completed its lengthy hearings. However, if I might have assurance that that is not going to be the case, I would have no objection.

Mr. GREEN. I have no objection to giving that assurance.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am perfectly willing to yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he yields the floor?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator from Florida has pointed out a matter which I hope the Committee on the Judiciary itself will consider in its hearings, and which the proposed joint committee, too, will consider, if in the judgment of the other body a joint committee should be created. That is the language in the Constitution which reads:

> And the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both to the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

It is quite conceivable to me that Congress, after proper hearings and following debate and discussion on the floors of both Houses of Congress, might determine that this could be done by legislation, rather than by constitutional amendment.

Congress might determine, out of an abundance of caution and in a desire to provide adequate safeguards, to both pass legislation and adopt a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment. If Congress, in its judgment, determined to act under this constitutional provision, which appears to give Congress the authority to act in the case of the inability of a President to act and to determine when the disability shall be removed, and passed such legislation, and if the President of the United States signed such legislation, it seems to me that the courts would give tremendous weight to such action in passing judgment on that kind of Congressional action, particularly when there appeared to be a constitutional provision permitting Congress to act in that field.

We must all keep in mind that even under the most accelerated conditions the adoption of a constitutional amendment might very well entail several years. We live in an age of jet planes and missiles and atomic power. Therefore I do not believe it is a matter which should be left with any uncertainty. The very safety of our Republic, and perhaps the preservation of human freedoms elsewhere in the world, might very well depend on leaving no hiatus in the matter of the executive power in this country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the observations of the distinguished minority leader. I realize that this is not the time or place to discuss whether the purposes we have in mind, or the purpose of the President in asking Congress to consider the question, can be accomplished by legislation, rather than by constitutional amendment.

I do wish to point out that in the speech I made on this subject last week I went into the subject in some detail. I referred to the question that would arise as to the validity of legislation passed under the section of the Constitution which the Senator has read. It largely revolves around the word "both."

In any event, the former Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, and most constitutional lawyers, I believe, agree that the risk would be too great to attempt to rely solely upon statutory enactment, and that this is particularly true in the matter of trying to set up rules of procedure for the removal of the disability, so that the President could again act after the Vice President had taken over. That is where the great rub comes.

The Attorney General and others have pointed out that unless we were absolutely certain about the legality of what was done, in the event the President resumed the office of the Presidency after having been out of that office, his acts might be questioned, and a great many lawsuits and disturbances, economic and political, of a tremendous magnitude might result.

In any event, these are matters upon which the Committee on the Judiciary will have further hearings. We will endeavor to report either resolutions, constitutional amendments, or bills which we think will properly deal with the problem.

The only assurance I wanted—and I now have it, both from the Senator from Rhode Island and the acting majority leader—was that there would be no holdup or delay as a result of the creation of the joint committee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if it is possible to have action on the Green resolution at this time, so that the resolution may be agreed to and the Senate may go on to other business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

---

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the President's agricultural message to Congress should give both the farm and nonfarm population much food for thought.

Agriculture is the basic industry of the land and without a strong agriculture, the country itself cannot be strong.

With the President's message as a whole, I am in agreement. It includes many admirable recommendations.

For example, shifting the emphasis of the soil bank to the conservation reserve and eliminating the acreage reserve, which pays farmers for not producing and lends itself to great abuses, is a good recommendation which will meet with the general approval of all people.

Our land is our heritage, but much of our heritage has been dissipated.

It will be good for the country to set aside and revitalize over a period of years or put to its proper use land which is tired, worn out, eroded, or misused.

The President's proposal to continue the rural development program and to do all that we can to keep the families on the land, but, at the same time, help them to live decently, is also good.

We must remember, however, that the success of the rural development program will not depend wholly upon the attention of special counselors or county agents or other factors of the direct program.

Whether the million and a half families now living on incomes of $1,000 a year or less will be able to remain on the land and improve their position will depend largely upon the success of other programs, such as the REA, the Agricultural Conservation program, rural highway construction, and the extension of small industries into rural areas.

If we adequately provide for those programs, then the prospects for progress in the rural development program itself will be greatly enhanced.

The President's recommendation that Public Law 480 be extended will meet with the approval of almost everyone.

Public Law 480 has contributed largely to the fact that we have recently been enjoying the largest business in agri-

cultural exports that we have ever had either in peace or war.

The temporary drop in export business below last year's record high is due partly to the fact that the amount authorized under title I of Public Law 480 for this fiscal year is proving to be inadequate and partly because the sale of cotton for export last year was so successful that we no longer have adequate supplies of the proper grade.

The time to sell agricultural surpluses is when someone wants to buy.

Not only should Public Law 480 be extended, but adequate provision should be made for doing the maximum amount of business which can properly and successfully be done under title I.

The President makes recommendations which, if approved by Congress, will enable us to continue our traditional high production of cotton and to retain our foreign and domestic markets.

There may be some difference of opinion concerning details of the cotton program, but the President's recommendations in general are adequate and sound.

The same may be said of the recommendations relating to the corn program.

The wool program should be extended as recommended by the President.

Wool is a deficit commodity and cannot be regarded in the same light as are those commodities which are produced in surplus.

Because of weather conditions, the wool program has not yet been able to operate to its fullest extent.

With the recommendation for continuance of the school-milk program, I am in full accord.

The recommendation of the President that the Secretary of Agriculture be given greater discretion in alloting acreages to basic commodities would probably prove helpful.

This would also be true of the request to give the Secretary discretion in fixing price supports between 60 and 90 percent of parity if there were assurance that such supports would not promptly be placed at the lowest possible level under the law.

The Secretary has this discretion in regard to small grains at the present time and has not fixed supports even as low as 60 percent.

However, apprehension has been growing that supports would be placed at the lowest possible level permitted by law. This apprehension should be allayed.

This fear that the Department intends to lower price supports generally has been stimulated by the recent action of the Secretary in announcing a reduction in price supports for dairy products to the minimum.

I myself will reserve my decision as to whether to support this particular part of the President's program until I am assured that it will be used properly and not misused.

Although, as I have stated, the President's agricultural message on the whole is good and is one to which I can give my approval, there are, however, some recommendations of the President and actions on the part of the Secretary in which I cannot concur.

It would not be fair for me to let the impression prevail that I will support all proposals of the administration whether I believe in them or not.

I disapprove wholeheartedly of the change in the support price for dairy products. The parity formula has never been favorable to dairy products, yet the administration now proposes to lower supports not only 25 cents per 100 pounds, as already announced, but asks for authority to lower them another 50 cents a hundred pounds.

This would bring the support level of milk to the farmer down to about 5 cents a quart. I do not believe any consumer in the United States wants the farmers to produce milk for 5 cents a quart.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose the floor, and for a question only.

Mr. JAVITS. I was hoping to agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I would expect the Senator from New York to agree with the Senator from Vermont in this respect.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask a question bearing on the dairy problem, which is very serious for New York. I have very great respect for the Senator's knowledge and integrity. I agree that no consumer would want to have the farmer sell his milk for any ridiculous price.

But does the Senator translate a reduction in the support price, such as would be authorized in contemplation of the President's message, into harm to the farmer so as to result in a reduction in the supply of milk, because it was unprofitable to produce it, and thus very seriously harm the city consumer?

Mr. AIKEN. The question as to how the support level affects the supply of milk is one which has been argued over and over again since I have been a Member of the Senate. It has never been answered satisfactorily to me. Sometimes it affects the supply one way, and sometimes another.

New York State can overproduce. New York State farmers, after several years of being in a bad squeeze, have, during the last few months found themselves on a profitable level. I should like to have them stay there.

The dairy program is one part of our agricultural program that is making progress. Dairy farmers generally had a good year in 1957. I see nothing wrong with that and hope they have many more of them.

The dairy producers themselves have done a remarkable job in developing markets, improving the quality of their product and devising more economical methods of production and handling.

The amount of dairy products owned by the Government has decreased in terms of milk equivalent from 10,381,000,000 pounds at the end of calendar year 1954 to only 1,748,000,000 pounds at the end of 1957.

If that is not progress, I do not know progress when I see it.

At the time when the announcement of the reduction of the support price for dairy products was made on December 18, 1957, the Department stated that—

> During the 1956–57 fiscal year which ended last June 30, the cost to the Federal Government of programs primarily for the stabilization of dairy prices and incomes was $379 million.

That release gave the impression that the dairy situation had gone from bad to worse. It put the dairymen of the country in the worst possible light. But that statement was not correct.

In order to arrive at the figure of $379 million, the Department has included not only accumulated losses on products acquired in previous years, but also the cost of dairy products used by the armed services, dairy products used in lieu of dollars for overseas programs, and dairy products used in programs authorized by the Congress, such as the school-milk and school-lunch programs and various other programs, for which dollars would have had to be used if dairy products had not been available.

The total actual loss on the dairy program for that year could not be far from $100 million.

This is a far cry from the $379 million referred to in the release, and also is a far cry from the losses sustained as a result of earlier programs.

Had this support program been left alone, the dairy farmers of America would have had their own problem well in hand, with supply and demand in balance, in another 2 or 3 years.

The second proposal of the President with which I cannot agree is, indeed, an indirect proposal. I think it will be found in the last paragraph of his message. It relates to the financing of REA cooperatives. It speaks of broadening the base for borrowing by these cooperatives.

If I correctly understand the situation, however, in high positions in Government there are those who intend that in the future, REA cooperatives would be required to go to Wall Street for money for financing generating and transmission facilities.

There may be some cooperatives who are strong enough to do this. There are many others, however, to whom this requirement would mean embarrassment and possibly failure to service their areas.

Let us not fool ourselves. The corporate utility interests do not just want to put the REA cooperatives on what they may call a sound financial footing. They want to kill them; and any requirement that the cooperatives go to Wall Street for their money would be an effective step in this direction.

The power companies can spend unlimited amounts for propaganda and advertising purposes, and can charge the cost to their consumers. The REA cooperatives have no such advantage as this.

I wish to serve notice that I will oppose any move which seems likely to lead to the ultimate destruction of the rural-electrification program.

The third matter to which the President refers indirectly, and with which I cannot agree, relates to the agricultural conservation program.

There have been efforts, which began some years before President Eisenhower took office, to rearrange this program in such a manner that a large part of its benefits would be lost to most of the States, and any gains would be acquired by a few.

If the practices of this program are restricted to what some choose to call permanent practices, and if the utilization of any of the funds for lime, phosphorous, and other mineral elements necessary to efficient production is prohibited, then most of the States east of the Missouri River will be definitely penalized.

The benefits to my own State of Vermont would probably be reduced from 75 to 80 percent; and the same would be true in the case of most of the States east of the Missouri River, as I have said.

I cannot support any proposal to increase greatly the benefits from this program to a few States, while decreasing them to most of the States.

I am sorry that I cannot agree with all of the President's agricultural program; but it seems best to make it clear here and now that such is the case, rather than to let the farm people of the country believe that I will support any proposal which I believe will work to their disadvantage.

Nor will I support any effort to place upon the shoulders of our farm people any blame for conditions which properly belongs to other segments of our national economy.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for his excellent statement. I heartily agree with him on the position he has taken with respect to the decrease in the price supports for farm commodities. Certainly dairy farming is a most important segment of the farming economy.

Let me say that a wheat farmer who has a large farm can produce wheat at a much cheaper price per bushel than can a farmer who has a smaller number of acres. However, that situation does not necessarily apply to the dairy farmers; a dairy farmer who has only a limited number of dairy cows can compete fairly well with the large operator. I was very sorry to see the supports for dairy commodities decreased. I may say that in the apartment in which I was living when Congress adjourned last August, I was paying 25 cents a quart for milk. Upon my return, this month, I find that I have to pay 30 cents a quart for milk.

I heard the Senator from Vermont say that if the program were put into effect in the way the Secretary of Agriculture wants it done, the support on milk would be lowered to a point where the average farmer would only receive about 5 cents a quart for his milk.

Mr. AIKEN. I referred to the support level. This year it amounts to approximately 7 cents a quart. The Secretary announced a reduction, as of April 1 next, of $3 a hundred, which will bring it down to approximately 6 cents a quart. The request in the President's message is for authority to lower that support to approximately $2.50 a hundred, which would be 5 cents a quart. I do not believe any consumer who is paying from 20 to 30 cents a quart for milk wants the farmer to produce milk for 5 cents a quart.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself also with practically all the other things the Senator from Vermont had to say, particularly with respect to the REA.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for the stand he has taken in regard to dairy products. I think he is entirely correct. I also agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], in regard to wheat.

I am one Senator who agrees all along the line. So far as cotton, corn, wheat, dairy products, tobacco, and all the rest are concerned, I believe in the high supports; and I do not favor lowering any of the supports.

I also wish to commend the Senator from Vermont for his remarks regarding rural electrification. I think it has been a Godsend to the farmers of the Nation. I know it has been in South Carolina. In 1934, only approximately 5 percent of the farms of South Carolina were electrified, whereas today approximately 96 percent of the farms of South Carolina are electrified. That is good, not only for the farmers, but also for everyone else, for the South Carolina stores sold a great deal of electrical equipment, most of which was manufactured in other States, States north of the Mason-Dixon line. So all concerned made a great profit out of that operation, and it has been beneficial for the Nation as a whole.

Therefore, I hope nothing will be done in any way to wreck or stop the cooperatives throughout the Nation. Instead, I hope they will be allowed to proceed in the way they have proceeded in past years.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. Of course, the REA cooperatives originally went into what was called the "skim-milk territory," which the utility companies either could not or would not serve. After the REA's went into those areas, things began to change. The farms began to show improvement. People painted their buildings. The Senator has seen all of that occur.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Absolutely.

Mr. AIKEN. After a while, people built new homes along the lines; they did so because they could obtain electricity. Finally, small industries moved there. That area was converted from "skim-milk territory" to—in some instances—a lucrative service area.

Now those who refused to serve it in the first place want to "muscle" in and take it away from those who had the courage and foresight to go ahead and do the job. I believe we should stand by those people who built the progressive rural areas. They took chances. They had to fight everything to get in there at all. They had Government help. The job is not done yet. There might be some cooperatives that could go to Wall Street and borrow ten, fifteen, or twenty million dollars for generating plants; but there are hundreds of others that are still on the borderline. Perhaps they need a $200,000 plant with which to produce power and keep them going and serve their people. The difference in the interest rate alone could mean the difference between their continuing to be successful and their failure and having to give up the ghost.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union.

## PROCEDURES FOR REPORTS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Order No. 1188, Senate Resolution 148. I wish to announce at this time that it is not intended that any action be taken on the resolution until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 148) to prescribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the message which has just been delivered to the Congress from the President of the United States

relating to the so-called food and fiber or agricultural policies. I want the record clear. Today my comments will be general in nature. Later it will be my intention to analyze this message and the administration farm bill paragraph by paragraph, section by section, and to attempt, at least to the best of my ability, to set the record straight, because in reading the message in the time that has been permitted me, I find not what I would call inaccuracies, but I surely find distortions of what are the facts.

Mr. President, all that President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have outlined in this farm message is another program that will result in weakening American agriculture and perpetuating low-income hardships for a neglected and, I say, mistreated segment of American citizens. It exposes what this administration has been seeking all along, despite all its denials; namely, cheap agriculture. I say this is an insult to the American farm families who have every right to share equally in the American standard of living.

Nothing in this message offers any hope to alleviate the distressed and depressed conditions in American agriculture, but, much to the contrary, the message would indicate that things are improving, when the facts are to the contrary.

The national averages alluded to in the message are averages which do not take into consideration great areas of American agriculture. The way one judges what is happening in the American farm economy is by what is happening to the American farm family. One does not judge the price of agricultural land by the price of suburbia real estate, real estate taken out of agriculture that will be used for developing shopping centers. That is not a fair standard.

Fortunately, as a program, it will never see the light of day, because this Congress is too patriotic to enact it. Congress just will not become a party to such blatant liquidation of agriculture.

I submit the message is misleading and is based on false assumptions disguised as facts. It attempts to hide the failure of this administration's farm recommendations to date by asking Congress to again follow it down the same misguided path of further depressing farm income.

The same arguments voiced by the President for lowering supports still further were voiced on the floor of Congress and elsewhere when this administration won approval for the program now in effect. The same promises of what would result were made then. Yet the administration now complains about the results that really happened. This is not a frank or honest approach supported by facts and experience available to the Department of Agriculture.

I cannot help but note that at the time we discussed the so-called flexible price formula we were told that when supplies were in abundance price supports would be lowered, that when supplies were more in line with demand, price supports would be raised. In the instance of a certain quality of cotton, for example, where the surpluses have been liquidated, the administration now finds, under the formula which it itself recommended, price supports would be raised. And it is at this point that the truth comes out, because it is at this point that the administration says it does not want to have the formula, the escalator clause, which would provide a more equitable price for the cotton, to come into effect.

I say to my friends in every part of agriculture that every agricultural commodity and every agricultural producer is in this together. If we permit the Secretary and his agents to divide agriculture, if we permit the Department to "work over" and finally depress the dairy industry, it will soon come to cotton. If we permit it as to cotton, it will soon come to soybeans and vegetable oils.

I sound a word of warning that every commodity group had better stand together. As Benjamin Franklin said so aptly, "We either hang together or we will hang separately."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that has been his view all along. I serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with him. We see eye to eye on this matter. Producers of all commodities, whether of cotton, tobacco, wheat, or other commodities, must get together and do something for agriculture in the United States. If we do not, we shall all suffer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina, who is a dedicated, trustworthy, and experienced friend of the American farm family and the American agricultural community.

Mr. President, it is certainly intellectually dishonest to call the flexible price-support program of 75 to 90 percent of parity rigid. It is called rigid now, although the administration fought for this program 3 or 4 years ago as the answer to what it claimed was rigid in the past. I know that in 1954 the administration said that the 90 percent of parity program was rigid. They said, "What we need is flexibility. We need 75 to 90 percent of parity." They won their argument, because of a Presidential veto of a good farm bill. Now they have the 75 to 90 percent of parity.

Now the same Secretary who called that formula flexible 3 years ago calls it rigid today. The only thing that is rigid is the thinking of the Secretary—intellectual calcification.

Mr. President, the truth is there is nothing more rigid about 75 to 90 percent than 60 to 90 percent of parity. All it means is that one formula permits the Secretary to drop prices still lower.

In this farm bill or this farm proposal the formula is to be 60 to 90 percent. This is what one can call recession for agriculture in easy but determined stages.

A flagrant example of what I am talking about has already been discussed very ably by the Senator from Vermont, in the instance of dairying. Secretary Benson has already announced his determination to cut dairy price supports to the very minimum the present law allows, but now he wants authority to cut them still further, and still further in the future, so he asks that the law permit lower minimums of 60 percent of parity.

Instead of cutting production, the previous lowering of supports has resulted in the farmers having to increase their output in order to meet minimum living costs.

Mr. President, it is my intention—not today, but when I have the opportunity to evaluate all the statistical evidence which is available to us—to point out that these programs which the Secretary says are reducing production are not doing so. I shall be able to present evidence to my colleagues—incontrovertible evidence—that the very program which this administration told the American people would lead to the solution of farm problems has instead aggravated those problems, intensified those problems, and cost the American people millions and millions of dollars.

Senators will remember that the present Department of Agriculture is spending more money in 1 year than previous administrations spent for agriculture in 4 years. The present Department of Agriculture, under this administration, Mr. President, has its own program under its own management, and despite having its own program under its own management, agricultural conditions continue to be worsened.

Mr. President, one of the answers given now by the Secretary is that we must simply move farmers off the land. That is the Secretary's way to solve the problem—apparently by liquidating the people.

Mr. President, instead of cutting production, as I said, the program has resulted in production levels being increased. It is ridiculous, therefore, for the President to still be talking about higher supports as incentives for higher production, when slashed income has resulted in just such incentives under the present program.

It is equally ridiculous for our President to be talking from one corner of his mouth about the lowering of prices to cut production, and then out of the other corner about giving the farmer more freedom to produce more, and that is what the message says. There are two kinds of bait. There is one kind of bait which says to the farmer, "We want you to cut production and in order to do it we are going to have to lower supports." Then a paragraph later the message says, "If you want to produce more you have to have more freedom, and that means having lower and fewer price supports."

Mr. President, one cannot have it both ways, not even in the White House. Obviously this message from the President indicates that he is simply putting his signature to Secretary Benson's stubborn determination to permanently relegate agriculture to a second-rate position in the American economy.

I was asked the other day about the President's budget for agriculture. I did

say then, and I shall repeat now, that while I thought the budget was not what it should be—I do not mean to make generalized accusations, and I shall later in an agricultural speech to the Senate comment upon it—I thought there was one item in the budget which should have been included. I did not feel the travel money for the Department was adequate. I thought they ought to provide in the budget a number of one-way plane, train, and bus tickets, starting with the Secretary of Agriculture and some of his associates. I think that would be a very good expenditure. That would be a trip which is really necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator ever pick up a hitchhiker?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be happy to do that, may I say to my genial friend, who is always so hospitable. I should be happy to do so, and I know the Senator from Oregon, on his treks back across the country, would not mind stopping off at Salt Lake City, if need be, to let out at least one passenger.

Mr. President, in conclusion, at a time when our food and fiber may well be one of the most valuable forces we have for freedom in this world, it is tragic to see such treatment of our food and fiber producers.

I rise to say, Mr. President, at a time when Congress is concerned about a shortage of rockets, missiles, space satellites, at a time of concern about our national security, there is only one segment of our economy which is fully prepared for any eventuality. They are the greatest patriots in the world—the American farmers, the American farm families, and the American agricultural economy. Rather than be condemned, I suggest they should be praised. In fact, American agriculture should get an E-award for efficiency. American agriculture should get a citation for service beyond the call of duty. Instead of that, farmers are given abuse. Instead of that, farmers are told they ought to work for less. Instead of that, farmers are told production is unwanted, at the very time food and fiber may be the instrumentality we need for peace.

When I think of the President's state of the Union message, I remember he called for works for peace. I suggest, Mr. President, that one of the works for peace is the compassionate, humanitarian, and generous use of lifegiving food. When I think of the dairy farmers and think how important powdered milk is for the hungry people overseas, I say to the President of the United States that he should call upon our dairy economy to increase its production rather than reduce it. He should call upon our dairy farmers to step up their output, so that we can meet some of the great crying needs of humanity. This is one thing the Soviet Union does not have. We have agriculture, Mr. President, that does not require the critical examination of an investigating committee to see why it cannot produce. Our agriculture is able to produce. But we have an administration which I say has never appreciated the potentialities of this great force.

Mr. President, so long as we have such bungling administration of our farm programs by people unwilling to see agriculture share fairly in our economy, no laws we enact can do much good. The truth is that neither Mr. Benson nor this administration has a workable farm policy, other than the simple advocacy of removing or making ineffective any Federal program designed to equalize agricultural income.

I invite to your attention, Mr. President, the fact that in point eight of the President's message he fortunately—and I wish to commend him—recommended the extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. He recommends the extension for 1 year. I have conducted hearings with regard to that act, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, at the request of the chairman. I have been interested in the proposal ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. I say to Senators that an extension of 1 year is uneconomic. I say to Senators that an extension of 1 year does not provide for adequate programing. I say to Senators that an extension of 1 year will cost money which will not yield results, and we ought to have an extension for a minimum of 2 years, so that we can program our agricultural resources so that they will do the good around the world that can be accomplished by their judicious and wise use.

So, Mr. President, I call upon my colleagues not to be stampeded by this latest barrage of mimeograph paper. I call upon them to examine most carefully the food and fiber policy of the Nation. I suggest that time after time we have been misguided down a path of so-called agricultural solutions which have ended in agricultural catastrophes.

I remember that at one time it was said that the acreage reserve would do the trick. I remember a letter which I received from the Department of Agriculture dated September 30, 1954. That letter said to me, when I proposed a conservation reserve, that the conservation reserve was too costly; the conservation reserve was subject to maladministration; the conservation reserve was not a sound agricultural policy.

Today, at long last, the administration admits that its acreage reserve, which was subject to abuse, which was very effective in 1956 in the agricultural belt as a political instrumentality; the acreage reserve, into which we poured almost $1½ billion, has done little or nothing except to bring shame upon agriculture. But the conservation reserve is the long-term, long-range, sensible, well-designed program of conserving the fertility of our soil, rather than paying people to do nothing. I am delighted that at long last the administration has indicated, at least, that the conservation reserve makes sense. It made sense 3 years ago, but then it was ridiculed. Now it makes sense because the proposals of the administration have been found to be indefensible, in terms of their adequacy, because of the failure of this administration to apply them justly and equitably.

This will not be the last of the argument on agricultural policies. I know that the farmers are a diminishing number in our economy. I suppose that is why some people think they can be treated with such disdain. So long as there is one farmer left in America, I will raise my voice for at least equality of treatment for him. I submit that the arithmetic of politics is no way to judge what is fair, decent, and just. The American farm economy has taken it in the neck too long. It seems to me that it is time for certain changes in those who administer our agricultural policies.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield. In fact, I would prefer to yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the latter portion of the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota he almost answered the question which I intended to ask him.

I noticed, when the Senator was talking about picking up a hitchhiker, that he did not pick up the Secretary of Agriculture in Salt Lake City and bring him here. He let him out at Salt Lake City.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator meant to take him home to stay.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

I must confess, however, that apparently the Secretary's policies are those of the President. I have said, so many times that it is almost redundant, that until there is a change in the White House there will be no basic change in agricultural policies. However, I must say in all candor that there are a number of people whom I know, who are good, solid Republicans, who could do a much better job as Secretary of Agriculture. At least, they would try to believe in some of the programs. I feel that the Secretary does not even believe in his own programs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was interested in one particular comment which the Senator made. In fact, I was interested in all his comments, but there is one about which I wish to ask him particularly. It relates to the movement which characterizes almost every action that is taken to try to force people off the farms. As I understand, the Senator feels that the message is a continuation of that philosophy. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do; and I think the seventh or eighth paragraph of the message so indicates.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was about to ask the Senator if that were not the case. The President states that there are 2,700,000 other farms which produce relatively little for sale. He tells a few other things affecting, positively or negatively, those farms, and then he dis-

misses them. Does not the Senator think it is quite significant that those people at least make a living on those farms for themselves and their families?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Even if they produce very little for sale, if they are able to make a living for themselves and their families they are doing something, are they not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They certainly are, and that is very important in a period of rising unemployment, which we are now facing.

The present Presiding Officer [Mr. MORSE] spoke 2 days ago about the unemployment problem in his State. I suggest that to have a farm program which has as one of its purposes the process of human attrition, driving people away from their land, is only to aggravate unemployment, and, furthermore, not to take into consideration human values.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator believe that we shall never solve the farm problem or establish a good farm policy until we make an attack on a broad front, with a program that is bold and venturesome?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is any of that philosophy reflected in the message?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The message is "old biscuits, hardly warmed up." The biscuits are becoming older.

However, even with the present farm program, with many aspects of which I disagree, if there were a careful, methodical, spirited administration, we would have much better results.

Finally, I have disagreed with some of the policies which we have enacted, but I feel that the administration of the Department of Agriculture has not been up to standard. I feel that it has been weak. I feel that it has been indecisive. I say that the administration of the Commodity Credit Corporation has depressed market prices and has tended to accumulate inventory. Today the very existence of the private grain trade is threatened because of the Commodity Credit Corporation stepping in and taking over the field of business.

This Senator has said many times that the purpose of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to supplement private activities, and not to supplant them. I do not wish to see our agriculture Government-owned and socialized. However, I submit that there is not a sensible merchant in the country who any longer holds much inventory. The reason he does not hold much inventory is that he is never sure where the Department of Agriculture policies are going to lead. Therefore he dumps the inventory on the Government. That is why today the Government has huge stocks in inventory.

I do not mean to be personal in my references, but I see before me a former Secretary of Agriculture, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. At times we have disagreed with respect to price support levels. I have not tried to pretend that price support levels represented the last word. I think they are but a part of the total agricultural picture. However, I will say that the Senator from New Mexico was able to dispose of tremendous quantities of goods in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation while he was Secretary, without depressing normal market prices. He watched every single aspect of the transaction, and did not permit the Government to destroy both the farmer and the private trade in farm commodities. He watched the program. He administered it. I call for sound administration now, along the same principles.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When he was Secretary of Agriculture, the Senator from New Mexico administered the program in such a way that it did not cost the taxpayers billions of dollars. Is not that true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I do not recall the facts, but I remember that some years ago during the debates I heard the report made that on certain transactions the Government actually made money.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But that is not true today, is it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Government did make money. I remind the Senator from Minnesota that it was a little easier to do so then than it would normally be. One cotton transaction involved $225 million, and a copra transaction involved several million dollars. I fully agree with the Senator that the aim of the Department of Agriculture should be to clear the shelves.

Regardless of how I feel—and I have differed with the Senator from Minnesota many times on what the level of the price supports should be, and how the program might be administered—no price-support program will do any good if we continue to load the shelves with billions of dollars worth of commodities, only to have them dumped into the markets.

Not long ago I talked with one of the largest purchasers of cotton in the United States. I do not want to embarrass him or the mills he operates by mentioning his name. However, he is a substantial buyer of cotton. I said to him, "Are you still holding to your old policy of not buying any cotton?"

He said, "Why should I gamble? I just go out and take my cotton out from under the loans. I have so much of it, I do not have to gamble."

This has the effect of depressing farm prices. That is one point with respect to which I believe the present program has been extremely deficient, because it is necessary to clean out the shelves of these tremendous overhanging surpluses as we go along.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree with that particular objective in our farm policy, if it is done wisely and not blindly. There are ways of using our abundance constructively instead of just competing for the farmer's normal market.

---

## THE THREAT TO AMERICAN PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the greatest threat to American private foreign investments today is the confiscation and nationalization programs sponsored by several foreign governments which are under the Communist influence. As the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has said so often, "Confiscation is the attribute of communism. Private ownership, the integrity of property rights, and contractual obligations, on the other hand, are the distinguishing characteristics and handmaidens of the free world." I join the Senator in that feeling and apprehension.

The troubles in the Middle East resulting from the nationalization of the Suez Canal Co. by Egypt, the current confiscations and nationalizations in Indonesia and other parts of the world under Communist domination, threaten the peace and security of the free world. Such actions threaten all private and governmental investments abroad.

Most of the difficulties our own country has experienced with our neighbors south of the border have arisen over the confiscation or nationalization of private American properties—in Guatemala, Venezuela, and particularly in Mexico. Secretary Hull was harassed for several years due to the nationalization of our oil properties in Mexico. Many private investors are concerned with world conditions where the climate for trade and investment is overshadowed by the constant threat of confiscation.

At the recent convention of our National Foreign Trade Council in New York—and incidentally this Council is composed of members owning over 90 percent of our private foreign investments—this organization again passed resolutions on this vital subject matter. Among other things the council resolved:

> The convention places particular emphasis on good faith and integrity as basic requirements in the creation of climates favorable to the international flow of private investment capital. This means, specifically, recognition of the sanctity of contract and respect for private property rights on the part of governments of nations seeking such capital. A further essential is the provision of safeguards against expropriation, nationalization, or other taking of private property owned by nationals of other countries.
>
> Private enterprise has been and continues to be largely responsible for research and development in advanced industrial techniques and in their productive application. In the more highly developed economies, recognition and respect for the private property rights so created has a solid legal foundation.
>
> To encourage and accelerate the dissemination of these valuable techniques in other areas, recognition should be accorded to privately owned technical industrial information, and protection as positive and effective as that afforded to other property rights should be provided by the governments concerned. Economic development will move

forward at a faster rate in those countries which provide the necessary protection.

To this end, it is important that procedures for the recognition of industrial property rights be standardized throughout the world by domestic law and by adherence to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The free world has a right to be disturbed at the action taken by the delegates to the recent Asian-African Conference at Cairo. The delegates there—dominated by Russian influence—freely discussed confiscation. Russia, it seems, promised to supply those countries with any losses they might sustain by seizing and confiscating foreign investments, particularly our own.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] discussed the evil effects of our continued seizures and vesting of the assets of our former enemies, the Germans and Japanese, on Monday of this week.

I endorse and subscribe to his views. The Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act, of which I am chairman, will make a determined effort during the present session of the Congress to resolve our differences with respect to the vested assets problems.

Mr. Harry Schwartz of the New York Times has written a very illuminating article on the subject matter. It appeared in the Times on January 7, 1958. I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSCOW STEPS UP ECONOMIC WAR ON PRIVATE INVESTMENTS ABROAD—BACKS CONFISCATION OF ASSETS OF THE WEST IN UNDERDEVELOPED LANDS—CHAOS IS DECLARED TO BE SOVIET AIM

(By Harry Schwartz)

The Soviet Union's economic war against the West reached a new high in the closing days of 1957 after having gained major successes earlier in the year.

At the Asian-African meeting in Cairo late last month the Soviet Union issued an open declaration of war against all western private investment in the underdeveloped countries. By backing confiscation of such existing investment, Moscow obviously hopes to block any substantial future private investment in these countries.

As the Soviet spokesman indicated clearly in Cairo, Moscow's picture of the future is one based upon the pattern set by Egyptian nationalization of operation of the Suez Canal and Indonesian seizure of Dutch assets. A major spread of this pattern would torpedo economic cooperation between the major western nations and the non-Communist underdeveloped countries. In resultant chaos and economic hardship, the Soviet Union is apparently confident it can make great gains and bring more countries under Communist rule.

SOVIET CONFIDENT

Long ago Soviet spokesmen made plain they believed the key economic weakness of the West was its dependence upon oil, copper, and other raw materials from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. If Moscow can deprive the West of many of these sources of raw materials it feels confident its victory in the competitive coexistence struggle will be assured.

At the Cairo meeting the Soviet Union sought to convince the Asians and Africans that they did not have to fear any economic consequences of widespread nationalization of foreign private investment. It sought to convince them that Moscow was ready and eager to give them all the capital resources they needed for economic development.

While the Soviet propagandists held out glittering promises of aid in Cairo, they kept silent about the key fact of the Soviet economy at present; the Soviet Union itself is suffering from a severe capital shortage and has had to cut back its own economic development plans because of that shortage. Barring some major change in the world situation, the Soviet Union can give only marginal additional help to the underdeveloped countries whose needs for foreign capital total many billions of dollars. These totals are beyond anything Moscow could or intends to give these countries in the foreseeable future.

Moscow's line was received credulously and hopefully in Cairo. The Soviet promises of aid to Syria and Egypt appear to have made a great impression throughout Asia and Africa because of the amounts directly involved in these deals, which follow earlier Soviet promises to and partial deliveries of aid to India, Afghanistan, Indonesia, Burma, and Turkey.

In its economic aid propaganda offensive, Moscow has several advantages over the West that it uses skillfully: Soviet aid is offered in the form of long-term loans carrying very low interest, usually about 2 percent, and lacking much of the redtape that usually surrounds similar Western offers. Moreover, the Soviet Union offers to assist underdeveloped countries with technicians, including the training of large numbers of young people from these countries in Soviet universities and other technical institutions.

The West is handicapped in this field by many factors. Western private investors expect dividends from their investment and naturally ask for safeguards for their initial investment. The West suffers from a shortage of technicians. Also, Western institutions for technical training are not equipped to handle large numbers of students from Asia and Africa.

Moreover, Soviet aid is not subject to scrutiny by the Soviet Legislature. United States economic aid, on the contrary, must face the Congressional gauntlet each year.

UNITED STATES AID IS LARGER

The Soviet Union has probably given or promised less than $2 billion worth of economic aid in all to non-Communist countries in the last 3 years, far less than the total of United States economic aid and private investment in those countries. Yet the political gains of the Soviet Union have been immense and the influence of Moscow has grown enormously in these countries, while that of the West has declined.

In much of Asia and Africa, Soviet aid is often considered to be philanthropy, while United States private investment is often considered to be a species of robbery and Government aid a means of political pressure.

However, an aspect of Soviet aid was revealed early in the year. Yugoslavia, which had been scheduled to receive Soviet aid, was punished when Moscow postponed the aid because of political disagreements with Belgrade.

---

## ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION AT KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing in the Senate today the bill which the administration has sent to Congress for grappling with the grave problems confronting the Klamath Indian Reservation.

I am introducing the bill "by request" because I, myself, entertain serious doubts concerning certain of its basic features. I believe a far preferable solution would be my own bill, S. 2047, providing for Federal purchase of the Klamath timber and marshlands. I offered this bill for myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on May 9, 1957.

However, Mr. President, the sands of time are running through the hourglass on our opportunity to act. If we do not work out a reasonable solution before the end of this session of the 85th Congress, the valuable resources of the Klamath Reservation must go under the auctioneer's gavel, according to the terms of Public Law 587, passed by the 83d Congress in 1954. This could produce a chaotic situation.

Therefore, I believe the administration's proposal should be before the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. As chairman of this subcommittee, I think in all fairness it merits consideration and full hearings, despite the serious misgivings which I have regarding the bill. That is why I am introducing it "by request" today. This introduction on my part follows a very thorough explanation of the bill which was made to me personally on January 13 by the Under Secretary of the Interior, Hatfield Chilson. I appreciate his courtesy.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVIEW BOTH PROPOSALS

I am calling a meeting of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee for February 3, 4, and 5 so that hearings may take place on the administration bill, as well as on S. 2047, which already has been the subject of extensive hearings in the field at Klamath Falls, Oreg., and at Portland, Oreg., on October 2 and 4, 1957.

I fear the administration has made a mistake of serious consequences in not endorsing our Federal purchase bill, S. 2047. I think this because S. 2047 has received the united support of the Klamath Tribal Council, of the management specialists appointed by the Interior Department to supervise termination over the Klamath Tribe, of labor, and education and civic groups in the State of Oregon, of the Governor of the State of Oregon, of the special Oregon State legislative interim committee on Indian affairs, of conservation and outdoor groups, of most of the daily and weekly press—indeed, of virtually all segments of Oregon life. I doubt if any piece of legislation to solve a controversial problem in modern times has been so universally and unanimously supported by every major economic, social, and political group in Oregon. I have been proud that such a bill carries my name and sponsorship.

However, the administration has chosen not to back this bill as its answer to the grave riddle of the future of the Klamath Tribe and resources. It has presented an alternative proposal—a proposal which first offers the reservation for sale to private interests. This is the bill I am introducing by request in the Senate today.

Let me emphasize that the Eisenhower administration has thus assumed, once more, full and complete responsibility for what happens in the Klamath Basin. Because I am not at all convinced that the solution which they propose can satisfactorily undo the difficult problems created by the Klamath Termination Act, I am concerned to keep the record straight that this is a dilemma which I, both as a Senator from Oregon and as chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, have inherited from former Oregonians in public office before my own election to the Senate. Public Law 587, terminating Federal custodianship over the Klamath Tribe, was passed during the 83d Congress under the auspices of my predecessor in the Senate, Hon. Guy Cordon, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and in the House under the auspices of another Oregon Republican, Hon. Sam Coon, then Representative of the Second District, in which the Klamath Reservation is located. This legislation was backed by Ex-Gov. Douglas McKay, of Oregon, then serving as Secretary of the Interior in President Eisenhower's Cabinet, and it was, of course, accepted and signed by the President, himself.

ORIGINAL TERMINATION BILL CONTAINED UNWISE ASPECTS

The termination bill was put on the statute books despite the last-minute inclusion of the highly debatable withdrawal provisions, and thus created the present danger of hasty and ill-conceived liquidation of the reservation—unless we can effect some rescue operation by midsummer of this year. The Klamath muddle has now been compounded, in my opinion, by the unwillingness of the administration to accept the reasonable answer of Federal purchase, which we offered in S. 2047. The administration rejected our bill. Instead, it has sent to us its own proposal as an alternative. In so doing, the administration has asserted with vigor and emphasis its willingness to accept full responsibility for the Klamath situation. I question the wisdom of the administration's substantive decision, although I welcome this clarification of the issues at stake.

As I say, in view of the present dilemma faced by the subcommittee of which I am the chairman, I feel I must always keep those facts squarely on the record—but let me emphasize that I have made, and I fully intend to continue to make, every effort to keep partisanship out of our continuing search for a nonpolitical and workable solution to this perplexing problem, which will be in the public interest and that of the Indians. The press and the public have recognized that fact, and I want to assure my colleagues on the committee and all interested parties that we shall continue to proceed in this spirit.

In doing so, we shall also be acting in the spirit of the interim committee of the Oregon State Legislature which has subordinated differences of political allegiance in reaching a unanimous conclusion to endorse Federal purchase of the Klamath Reservation. This committee of the Oregon Legislature is headed by a Republican, State Senator Leander Quiring, of Umatilla County. It includes as a member Mr. David C. Epps, of Linn County, the State Democratic chairman. In disregard of such divisions, this Oregon legislative committee has endorsed without dissent the Federal purchase plan proposed in S. 2047. Our Senate Indian Subcommittee will give equal nonpartisan consideration to this bill and to the bill I am offering today at the request of the administration.

I believe the plan of the administration must be considered. Time is of the essence. As chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, I have an obligation to hear the administration and its spokesmen and adherents. That is why I have presented their bill "by request." It is only fair to do so.

Let me explain a few of the doubts which I harbor concerning the measure.

WHAT WILL BE ATTITUDE OF THE LUMBER INDUSTRY?

For the first time in history, a sustained-yield covenant is proposed to be written into legislation dealing with Indian trust land which may pass into private timber company ownership. This is a policy that the private lumber industry long has challenged, dating from the industry's bitter opposition to the pioneer bills of the late 1930's in this field sponsored by the late Representative Walter M. Pierce, of the Second Oregon District, even though the Pierce bill did not require sustained-yield management on private land, but only required minimum cutting practice. As I recall, the industry predicted this legislation could result in ultimate real control of cutting on private land so as to force sustained-yield management. I, myself, am not totally out of sympathy with the administration's long-range efforts in this respect, but I shall await with interest the reaction of such organizations as the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association to have this principle established in a bill to solve an Indian problem.

I want it to be well known that the subcommittee has still not been furnished with any information by the Department of the Interior on the overall value which is proposed for use in the planned sales. It is of vital importance to the Indians and prospective buyers that this information be made available.

Until we of the subcommittee and all the Members of the Senate learn the overall total value which should be placed on the ponderosa pine timber presently growing on the Klamath Reservation, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to pass finally upon the administration's proposed substitute for S. 2047.

The Department's recommendation does not set forth any data on the size of proposed sale units, the extent to which all prospective purchasers will be able to acquire units of sufficient size to meet their ability to finance a purchase.

The Department has included language which would limit the sustained-yield covenant to 75 years, which I believe is a lesser period than is required to grow a crop of ponderosa pine timber in the Klamath area and weather zone. We do not know at this time whether the proposed sustained-yield covenant will affect the price to be actually paid the Indians and the results of such a consequence.

I set forth these few points here in order to make the record clear that a sound, private purchase proposal which adequately protects the Indians' rights may not be without major problems. It will be the purpose of our subcommittee to investigate thoroughly every facet of the administration's bill, and of S. 2047, before proposed legislation is reported to the full committee and to the Senate for action.

In conclusion, as one of the Senators from Oregon, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—and I am certain my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon, WAYNE MORSE, shares my views in this respect—I feel that we have before us at least two major obligations. One of them is to protect the equity and rights of the Indians, whose property this is, in the final analysis.

The other obligation is to safeguard the economy of southeastern Oregon and all the rest of our State, because what happens in southeastern Oregon to this vast stand of timber will have an impact throughout Oregon—indeed, throughout the entire Pacific Northwest.

Furthermore, with respect to the protection of the resources, we have a genuine obligation, as I see it, to continue the vast marsh of the Klamath Reservation as a marsh, where thousands, if not millions, of waterfowl have refuge, and where they nest and breed every year as they travel the great Pacific flyway between the Canadian Arctic and the tropical zones to the south.

If this marsh is put on the auctioneer's block, it very likely will be converted to grazing land or cropland. If that happens, thousands, if not millions, of birds will come and find no nesting ground or sanctuary. They will necessarily be driven from there to feed on the croplands of farmers near by. There then will ensue a fierce and bloody slaughter, without any regard to conservation practices; and the people who participate in the slaughter will have justification for so doing, because their crops are being destroyed.

It seems to me that this could do major damage, for generations to come, to one of the great natural assets of the North American Continent, namely, the vast flocks of waterfowl which still survive there and each year mysteriously travel between the Arctic and the Tropics.

I could speak in greater detail about the responsibility we face; but I wish to make one further fact clear. This is a problem which is not of my creation. It is a problem which has been brought about by the unwise, hasty, and ill-conceived termination of the Federal Government's custodianship over the Klamath Indian Tribe. At the 11th hour there was included in the legislation before the 83d Congress the withdrawal

provision which now confronts us with an emergency as to time.

If this session of the 85th Congress does not pass a bill which will solve the dilemma, the resources I have described will be sold at a bargain-basement sale commencing in August of this year. I believe that such a time schedule indicates the extent, the size and the urgency of the problem which confronts us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the junior Senator from Oregon for defending, once again, the interests of the Indians. I should like to ask, if I may, 1 or 2 questions, to see if I am clear in my own mind.

I have inspected a number of Indian reservations, particularly in the Southwest. I have always been struck by the fact that the reservations which were set aside for the Indians were located on land which at that time had very little value, and which, unless there are subsurface deposits which will be discovered, has very little value now, and on which it is extremely difficult for the Indians to make a living.

In other words, if the white men did not want the land, the Indians were allowed to take it.

Do I correctly understand, in the case of the Klamath Reservation, that that reservation has extremely valuable timber?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The stand of ponderosa pine timber growing on the Klamath Reservation is one of the most valuable stands of such timber growing in the New World.

Ponderosa pine, as distinguished from Douglas-fir, is a very slow-growing tree. A Douglas-fir tree may grow to commercial stature in 80 or 90 years. A ponderosa pine tree, such as the type growing on the Klamath Reservation, may take almost two centuries to develop commercial volume. Thus the timber is of enormous value.

In further answer to the question of the Senator from Illinois, the value of the timber has been variously estimated as from $80 million to around $130 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not have been possible to develop the principle of sustained yield, and to cut a certain proportion of those trees each year, or to cut certain sections each year, and then to use the royalties for the benefit of the Indians?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me explain to the Senator the present situation on the reservation—but a situation which will end in August of this year unless Congress acts.

At present, and for many years past, the timber growing on the Klamath Reservation has been managed by trained and capable foresters of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. These men and their associates have sold this timber at competitive bids, under sustained-yield cutting practices. The Indians then have shared in per capita payments based on the stumpage fees which were received for the sale of that timber. This seemed to me to be a reasonable situation, one which certainly was in the interest of conservation of natural resources, which I know to be one of the major goals of the senior Senator from Illinois.

But the 83d Congress, under the urging of the Eisenhower administration, and particularly of Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, passed the unwise legislation to which I have referred. That was a law to terminate Federal custodianship over the Klamath Indian Tribe. Under the terms of that law, any member of the tribe can elect to withdraw and ask for his per capita share of the assets. The only way in which he could secure his per capita share of the assets would be to have a portion of the timber or the marshland sold, so that it could be converted into cash.

Thus, if Congress does not intervene, the Federal custodianship will cease this summer, and this vast block of timber, plus the marshland where waterfowl now nest, will be sold at public auction to the highest bidder.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand the Senator to say that, in practice, all the Indians will elect to have their shares withdrawn?

Mr. NEUBERGER. As I understand, a survey has been made by the Stanford Research Institute among the members of the Klamath Tribe. The survey was sponsored by management specialists appointed by former Secretary McKay to supervise the liquidation of the tribal assets.

If I am not mistaken, the survey showed that approximately 70 or 75 percent of the members of the tribe would elect to withdraw and receive their per capita share of the tribal assets.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was because some of them had already gone to the cities, and therefore they did not feel any continuing need for a home to which to return; and also because others were poor, and wanted to get a cash, lump-sum settlement. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; the Senator from Illinois—as he generally is—is absolutely correct in his analysis.

Let me explain further that according to the appraisals of the timber which have been made, it is possible that each tribal member's share will vary in value somewhere from $35,000 per tribal member to approximately $55,000. The amount has not yet been finally determined, but it will be somewhere in the realm of that financial value. The Senator from Illinois can see that, therefore, a family of 4 on the Klamath Reservation or, although having left the reservation, or formerly on the reservation, can qualify for approximately $120,000 to $200,000 per family, a very substantial sum of money.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course it will be argued that this should be left to the free choice of the individual Indian, and that he should have a right to choose whether he will live in a communal community, or whether he will take his share in cash and will go elsewhere.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Our bill, S. 2047, provides essentially that the Federal Government shall purchase the assets of the Klamath Reservation. Under that purchase, the valuable timber I have described will be added to the contiguous Fremont and Deschutes National Forests, and the United States Forest Service will manage the timber and will sell it at competitive bidding, open to all prospective purchasers, large and small. Of course the management will be under the traditional sustained-yield practices of the United States Forest Service. Under the provisions of the bill, the marsh area will be made a national waterfowl refuge, under the able management of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

It is true that our bill will require the appropriation by the Federal Government of a substantial sum of money. But if anyone has faith in the value of the natural resources of the United States, it seems to me that this marvelous stand of ponderosa pine timber—a stand which, if cut, will not be duplicated for perhaps centuries to come—eventually will return to the Federal Government not only the amount of money invested in the reservation, but also much more, in addition, as the years and decades go by.

So what the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I hope to do is have the Federal Government purchase the reservation, pay the Indians their fair, prorated share, according to what each tribal member is entitled to, but have the resources there managed by the United States Forest Service and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. That is the purpose of S. 2047, the bill we have introduced.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The group of Indians who wish to remain in the community would do so, would they?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Indians who wish to remain in the community could do so. There are many allotted lands, already belonging to Indians, which they would continue to own.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the plan, the Indians would get the income, would they?

Mr. NEUBERGER. They would get the income. They could live in a tribal status somewhat similar to that which they have today, but without Government supervision or direction.

I want to make this clear, because I have referred to the management specialists who were appointed by former Secretary of the Interior McKay. Those two men, Mr. Thomas B. Watters, of Klamath Falls, and Mr. Eugene G. Favelle, of Lakeview, Oreg., have, in my opinion, attempted to do a very conscientious and painstaking job in protecting the equity of the Indians involved. I think it significant that, although these two men were appointees of the national administration, they have unequivocally endorsed Senate bill 2047 for the safeguarding of the resources of the reservation. They have retained a capable forester in Earle Wilcox, formerly with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a vague memory that when Mr. McKay was Secretary of the Interior, he claimed that the Klamath Indians were supporting his

program. Will the Senator from Oregon discuss that issue?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; I will. It is a complicated issue.

In fairness to Mr. McKay, let me say I believe it is substantially true that at the time the termination act was unwisely enacted in 1954, it was accurately said that the Klamath Indians were supporting his position, in favor of termination. I think that derives from many origins. In my opinion there was held up to the Indians the future prospect of having a great amount of money paid to them in cash at a relatively early date. In fairness to the Indians, I wish to say that not only people with red skins or people of Indian origin would respond to a lure of that particular type.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If I am not mistaken, white people are even more susceptible to such a lure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In addition—and let me say that I was not then a Member of Congress, so I speak from memory—I believe that the termination bill was sweetened by including in its provisions one for a $250 per capita payment for each Klamath Indian. I may be mistaken about that. But I think that may have been somewhat contributory to the Indians' position at that time. At that particular time the Indians were in favor of the termination act. The promise of the payment of a great deal of additional money had been held out to them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the feeling of the Indians now?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The feeling of the Indians now has remarkably changed. The executives of the tribal council testified before our subcommittee in October 1957, definitely and without equivocation in favor of Federal purchase, under the provisions of our bill. They said they thought this would be the best thing for the Indians; that it would bring the fairest price to the Indians; and that the Indian tribe, speaking through them, was in favor of Federal purchase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, it gives to the Indians the same choice and the same capital payment as the McKay plan would do, but it conserves for the Government a unique stand of timber which, if it moves into private hands, probably would be quickly cut off. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. Under the termination act passed in 1954, the management specialists might have to liquidate approximately 4 billion feet of pine timber in approximately 2 years. To dump that vast amount of timber on any market would depress the price, so the Indians would not receive anywhere near its fair value. In addition, all of it would be dumped on the market at this particular time, when new housing starts have been so stifled, due to the tight-money policy which the Members of the Senate have discussed at various times; and therefore the price would be even lower than the price under normal conditions.

Our bill contemplates giving the fair-payment price to the Indians; but the timber would belong to the Government and be sold over a long period of years by the United States Forest Service, on a sustained-yield basis.

The intervening circumstance which now has developed is the fact that the national administration, speaking through the Department of the Interior, has declined to endorse our bill for Federal purchase. Instead, the administration has sent up its own proposal. I am introducing this proposal today, by request, as the Senator from Illinois has heard.

This proposal first offers the timber stand to private enterprise, to private lumber operators. But if they reject it, the Federal Government will acquire the resources of the reservation. But many questions arise in connection with this alternative plan. One of them arises because of the fact that the timber would be sold in such large blocks that virtually all small timber operators might be excluded from bidding on it, because I understand that the cost of even relatively small blocks would be approximately $5 million, and obviously that amount of capital could not be raised by a small sawmill owner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it fair to say that the general policy of the Eisenhower administration has been to diminish the number and the size of Indian reservations, and that it aims at either their ultimate elimination or their great diminution?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would believe that would be a generally fair statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that the Indians, then, as individuals would be more or less forced to go out into the general population and live there?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe the Senator from Illinois has made a further accurate description of the policy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that the Indians should have freedom of choice. They should not be chained to the reservation, but I also think it is important that they should have a place to go home to if they find life in the cities unsatisfactory, and that if they are in effect squeezed out by the sale or impairment of reservations, perhaps results would be unfortunate. Many thousands of Indians have come to Chicago. I have tried to acquaint myself with the problems involved. While we have tried to be extremely friendly to them, it is a difficult adjustment for many to make. I have come to feel that it is highly important to keep the reservations not only for those who want to stay on the reservations but as places of refuge for those who try out industrial life and, for one reason or another, do not like it and want to go back to the reservations.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I share much of the feeling of the Senator from Illinois.

I realize that he has a much more profound sociological knowledge of this subject than I do. When we held our hearings at the site of the Klamath Reservation, there were elderly Indians who testified virtually with tears in their eyes over what would happen to their ancestral home. I think they should have the freedom to preserve their status.

There is one thing that disturbs me about this situation. The Senator from Illinois mentioned some of the bleak and meager reservations of the Southwest, where there are hardly any resources. I would prefer to have seen those reservations selected as the guinea pig for the termination program of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a good reason why that was not done. Nobody wants those reservations. They have no commercial value.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It seems to me it was an unfortunate choice—for more than one reason—that virtually the first Indian tribe selected for termination was an Indian tribe of one of the most complex sets of resources in its possession of any tribe in the Nation, and one of the most valuable natural resources. I would share with the Senator from Illinois the view that the tribe selected for termination should not have been an Indian tribe that had such a difficult set of resources to administer, and the maladministration of which could have been so ruinous to that particular geographic area, to Indians and white citizens alike.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I appreciate the very helpful information developed by the Senator from Illinois.

I have concluded my presentation. I understand the Senator from Tennessee was waiting to obtain the floor. Before I relinquish the floor, I should like to submit, by request, the administration bill dealing with the Klamath Indian Tribe, ask that it be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3051) to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), is amended by adding a new section 28 as follows:

SEC. 28. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of this act.

(a) The tribal lands that comprise the Klamath Indian Forest, and the tribal lands that comprise the Klamath marsh, shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, jointly.

(b) The portion of the Klamath Indian Forest that is selected for sale pursuant to subsection 5 (a) (3) of this act to pay members who withdraw from the tribe shall be offered for sale by the Secretary of the Interior in appropriate units, on the basis of competitive bids, to any purchaser or purchasers who agree to manage the forest lands for not less than 75 years according to sustained yield plans to be prepared and submitted by them for approval and inclusion

in the conveyancing instruments in accordance with specifications and requirements referred to in the invitations for bids: *Provided*, That no sale shall be for a price that is less than the realization value of the units involved as shown on the appraisal approved by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 5 (a) (2) of this act, which is hereby determined to be their fair-market value if as much as 75 percent of the forest were offered for sale on a competitive market within the time limit provided in section 6 (b) of this act, as amended, without limitations on use. The terms and conditions of the sales shall be prescribed by the Secretary. The specifications and minimum requirements for sustained yield management to be included in the invitations for bids, and the determination of appropriate units for sale, shall be developed and made jointly by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. Such plans when prepared by the purchaser shall include provisions for the conservation of soil and water resources as well as for the management of the timber resource under principles of sustained yield. Such plans shall be satisfactory to and have the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture as complying with the minimum standards included in said specification and requirements before the prospective purchaser shall be entitled to have his bid considered by the Secretary of the Interior and the failure on the part of the purchaser to prepare and submit a satisfactory plan to the Secretary of Agriculture shall constitute grounds for rejection of such bid. Such plans shall be incorporated as conditions in the conveyancing instruments executed by the Secretary and shall be binding on the grantee and all successors in interest. The conveyancing instrument shall provide for a forfeiture and a reversion of title to the lands to the United States, not in trust for or subject to Indian use, in the event of a branch of such conditions. The purchase price paid by the grantee shall be deemed to represent the full appraised fair-market value of the lands, undiminished by the right of reversion retained by the United States in a nontrust status, and the retention of such right of reversion shall not be the basis for any claim against the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture shall be responsible for enforcing such conditions. Upon such reversion of title the lands shall become National Forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

(c) If all of the forest units offered for sale in accordance with subsection (b) of this section are not sold before January 1, 1960, the Secretary of Agriculture shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation taking title in the name of the United States to all or any part of the unsold units that in his judgment are suitable for administration as a part of the national forest system. Compensation for such taking shall be the realization value of the units taken as shown on the appraisal referred to in subsection (b) of this section, and shall be paid out of funds in the Treasury of the United States, which are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose not later than the time limit provided in subsection 6 (b) of this act, as amended. Such lands shall become national forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended. Any of the forest units that are offered for sale and that are not sold or taken pursuant to subsections (b) or (c) of this section shall be subject to sale without limitation on use in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this act.

(d) If at any time any of the tribal lands that comprise the Klamath Indian Forest and that are retained by the tribe are offered for sale other than to members of the tribe, such lands shall first be offered for sale to the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be given a period of 12 months after the date of each such offer within which to purchase such lands. No such lands shall be sold at a price below the price at which they have been offered for sale to the Secretary of Agriculture, and if such lands are reoffered for sale, they shall first be reoffered to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to purchase such lands subject to such terms and conditions as to the use thereof as he may deem appropriate, and any lands so acquired shall thereupon become national forest lands subject to the laws that are applicable to lands acquired pursuant to the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended.

(e) The lands that comprise the Klamath Marsh shall be a part of the property selected for sale pursuant to subsection 5 (a) (3) of this act to pay members who withdraw from the tribe. Title to such lands is hereby taken in the name of the United States, effective January 1, 1960. Such lands are designated as the Klamath Forest National Wildlife Refuge, which shall be administered in accordance with the law applicable to areas acquired pursuant to section 4 of the act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451), as amended or supplemented. Compensation for said taking shall be the realization value of the lands shown on the appraisal referred to in subsection (b) of this section, and shall be paid out of funds in the Treasury of the United States, which are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose not later than the time limit provided in subsection 6 (b) of this act, as amended.

(f) Any person whose name appears on the final roll of the tribe, and who has since December 31, 1956, continuously resided on any lands taken by the United States by subsection (c) of this section, shall be entitled to occupy and use as a homesite for his lifetime a reasonable acreage of such lands, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may issue to safeguard the administration of the national forest.

(g) If title to any of the lands comprising the Klamath Indian Forest is taken by the United States, the administration of any outstanding timber sales contracts thereon entered into by the Secretary of the Interior as trustees for the Klamath Indians shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(h) All sales of tribal lands on which roads are located shall be made subject to the right of the United States and its assigns to maintain and use such roads.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall in any way modify or repeal the provisions of subsection 5 (a) of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), providing for and requiring members of the Klamath Tribe to elect to withdraw from or remain in the tribe, following the appraisal of the tribal property.

SEC. 3. The act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), is amended by adding at the end of subsection 5 (a) (5) the following sentence: "If no plan that is satisfactory both to the members who elect to remain in the tribe and to the Secretary has been prepared 6 months before the time limit provided in subsection 6 (b) of this act, the Secretary shall adopt a plan for managing the tribal property, subject to the provisions of section 15 of this act."

SEC. 4. The first proviso of subsection 5 (a) (3) of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), relating to distributions in $200,000 installments is repealed.

SEC. 5. The second proviso of subsection 5 (a) (3) of said act, relating to Indian preference rights, is amended by deleting "any individual Indian purchaser may apply toward the purchase price all or any part of the sum due him from the conversion of his interest in tribal property" and by inserting in lieu thereof "any individual Indian purchaser who has elected to withdraw from the tribe may apply toward the purchase price up to 100 percent of the amount estimated by the Secretary to be due him from the sale or taking of forest and marsh lands pursuant to subsection 28 (b), 28 (c), and 28 (e) of this act, and up to 75 percent of the amount estimated by the Secretary to be due him from the conversion of his interest in other tribal property."

## LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO NICOLAI BULGANIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I understand that the President's reply to Bulganin has not appeared in the RECORD. I wish to say that the President's straight-from-the-shoulder reply to Bulganin and his talk in the joint session should clear away the fog in the minds of people at home and abroad, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT TODAY MADE PUBLIC THE FOLLOWING LETTER TO NIKOLAI BULGANIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When on December 10 I received your communication, I promptly acknowledged it with the promise that I would in due course give you a considered reply. I now do so.

Your communication seems to fall into three parts: The need for peace; your contention that peace is endangered by the collective self-defense efforts of Free-World nations; and your specific proposals. I shall respond in that same order and make my own proposals.

I

Peace and good will among men have been the heartfelt desire of people since time immemorial. But professions of peace by governmental leaders have not always been a dependable guide to their actual intentions. Moreover, it seems to me to be profitless for us to debate the question of which of our two governments wants peace the more. Both of us have asserted that our respective peoples ardently desire peace and perhaps you and I feel this same urge equally. The heart of the matter becomes the determination of the terms on which the maintenance of peace can be assured, and the confidence that each of us can justifiably feel that these terms will be respected.

In the United States the people and their Government desire peace and in this country the people exert such constitutional control over government that no government could possibly initiate aggressive war. Under authority already given by our Congress, the United States can and would respond at once if we or any of our allies were attacked. But the United States cannot initiate war without the prior approval of the people's representatives in the Congress. This process requires time and public debate. Not only would our people repudiate any effort to begin an attack, but the element of surprise, so important in any aggressive move, would be wholly lacking. Aggressive war by us is not only abhorrent; it is impractical and impossible.

The past 40 years provide an opportunity to judge the comparative peace records of our two systems. We gladly submit our national record for respecting peace to the impartial judgment of mankind. I can as-

sure you, Mr. Chairman, that in the United States the waging of peace has priority in every aspect, and every element, of our national life.

II

You argue that the danger of war is increased because the United States and other Free-World nations seek security on a collective basis and on the basis of military preparedness.

Three times in this century wars have occurred under circumstances which strongly suggest, if indeed they do not prove, that war would not have occurred had the United States been militarily strong and committed in advance to the defense of nations that were attacked.

On each of these three occasions when war came, the United States was militarily unprepared, or ill-prepared, and it was not known that the United States would go to the aid of those subjected to armed aggression. Yet now it appears, Mr. Chairman, that you contend that weakness and disunity would make war less likely.

I may be permitted perhaps to recall that in March 1939, when the Soviet Union felt relatively weak and threatened by Fascist aggression, it contended that aggression was rife "because the majority of the nonagressive countries, particularly England and France, have rejected the policy of collective security," and Stalin went on to say that the policy of "Let each country defend itself as it likes and as best it can * * * means conniving at aggression, giving free rein to war."

Now the Soviet Union is no longer weak or confronted by powerful aggressive forces. The vast Sino-Soviet bloc embraces nearly one billion people and large resources. Such a bloc would, of course, be dominant in the world were the Free World nations to be disunited.

It is natural that any who want to impose their system on the world should prefer that those outside that system should be weak and divided But that expansionist policy cannot be sanctified by protestations of peace.

Of course the United States would greatly prefer it if collective security could be obtained on a universal basis through the United Nations.

This was the hope when in 1945 our two Governments and others signed the Charter of the United Nations, conferring upon its Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Also, by that Charter we agreed to make available to the Security Council Armed Forces, assistance and facilities so that the Council could maintain and restore international peace and security.

The Soviet Union has persistently prevented the establishment of such a universal collective security system and has, by its use of the veto—now 82 times—made the Security Council undependable as a protector of the peace.

The possibility that the Security Council might become undependable was feared at the San Francisco Conference on World Organization, and accordingly the Charter recognized that, in addition to reliance on the Security Council, the nations possessed and might exercise an inherent right of collective self-defense. It has therefore been found not only desirable, but necessary, if the free nations are to be secure and safe, to concert their defensive measures.

I can and do give you, Mr. Chairman, two solemn and categorical assurances.

1. Never will the United States lend its support to any aggressive action by any collective defense organization or any member thereof;

2. Always will the United States be ready to move toward the development of effective United Nations collective security measures in replacement of regional collective-defense measures.

I turn now to consider your specific proposals.

III

I am compelled to conclude after the most careful study of your proposals that they seem to be unfortunately inexact or incomplete in their meaning and inadequate as a program for productive negotiations for peace.

You first seem to assume that the obligations of the charter are nonexistent and that the voice of the United Nations is nothing that we need to heed.

You suggest that we should agree to respect the independence of the countries of the Near and Middle East and renounce the use of force in the settlement of questions relating to the Near and Middle East. But by the Charter of the United Nations we have already taken precisely those obligations as regards all countries, including those of the Near and Middle East. Our profound hope is that the Soviets feel themselves as bound by the provisions of the charter as, I assure you, we feel bound.

You also suggest submitting to the member states of NATO and the Warsaw Pact some form of nonaggression agreement. But all of the members of NATO are already bound to the United Nations Charter provision against aggression.

You suggest that the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union should undertake not to use nuclear weapons. But our three nations and others have already undertaken, by the charter, not to use any weapons against the territorial integrity of political independence of any state. Our profound hope is that no weapons will be used by any country for such an indefensible purpose and that the Soviet Union will feel a similar aversion to any kind of aggression.

You suggest that we should proclaim our intention to develop between us relations of friendship and peaceful cooperation. Such an intention is indeed already proclaimed as between ourselves and others by the Charter of the United Nations to which we have subscribed. The need is, not to repeat what we already proclaim, but, Mr. Chairman, to take concrete steps under the present terms of the charter, that will bring about these relations of friendship and peaceful cooperation. As recently as last November, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union signed and proclaimed to the world a declaration which was designed to promote the triumph of communism throughout the world by every means not excluding violence, and which contained many slanderous references to the United States. I am bound to point out that such a declaration is difficult to reconcile with professions of a desire for friendship or indeed of peaceful coexistence. This declaration makes clear where responsibility for the cold war lies.

You propose that we broaden the ties between us of a scientific, cultural, and athletic character. But already our two countries are negotiating for peaceful contacts even broader than scientific, cultural, and athletic. We hope for a positive result, even though in 1955, after the Summit Conference, when negotiations for such contacts were pressed by our foreign ministers at Geneva, the accomplishments were zero. It is above all important that our peoples should learn the true facts about each other. An informed public opinion in both our countries is essential to the proper understanding of our discussions.

You propose that we develop normal trade relations as part of the peaceful cooperation of which you speak. We welcome trade that carries no political or warlike implications. We do have restrictions on dealings in goods which are of war significance, but we impose no obstacles to peaceful trade.

Your remaining proposals relate to armament. In this connection, I note with deep satisfaction that you oppose competition in the production of ever newer types of weapons. When I read that statement I expected to go on to read proposals to stop such production. But I was disappointed.

You renew the oft-repeated Soviet proposal that the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union should cease for 2 or 3 years to test nuclear weapons; and you suggest that nuclear weapons should not be stationed or produced in Germany. You add the possibility that Poland and Czechoslovakia might be added to this nonnuclear weapons area.

These proposals do not serve to meet the real problem of armament. The heart of that problem is, as you say, the mounting production, primarily by the Soviet Union and the United States, of new types of weapons.

Your proposal regarding central Europe will, of course, be studied by NATO and the NATO countries directly involved from the standpoint of its military and political implications. But there cannot be great significance in denuclearizing a small area when, as you say, the range of modern types of weapons does not know of any geographical limit, and when you defer to the indefinite future any measures to stop the production of such weapons.

I note, furthermore, that your proposal on Germany is in no way related to the ending of the division of that country but would, in fact, tend to perpetuate that division. It is unrealistic thus to ignore the basic link between political solutions and security arrangements.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, at a time when we share great responsibility for shaping the development of the international situation, we can and must do better than what you propose.

In this spirit, I submit some proposals of my own.

IV

1. I propose that we strengthen the United Nations.

This organization and the pledges of its members embodied in the charter constitute man's best hope for peace and justice. The United States feels bound by its solemn undertaking to act in accordance with the principles of the charter. Will not the Soviet Union clear away the doubt that it also feels bound by its charter undertakings? And may we not perhaps go further and build up the authority of the United Nations?

Too often its recommendations go unheeded.

I propose, Mr. Chairman, that we should rededicate ourselves to the United Nations, its principles and purposes and to our charter obligations. But I would do more.

Too often the Security Council is prevented, by veto, from discharging the primary responsibility we have given it for the maintenance of international peace and security. This prevention even extends to proposing procedures for the pacific settlement of disputes.

I propose that we should make it the policy of our two Governments at least not to use veto power to prevent the Security Council from proposing methods for the pacific settlement of disputes pursuant to chapter VI.

Nothing, I am convinced, would give the world more justifiable hope than the conviction that both of our Governments are genuinely determined to make the United Nations the effective instrument of peace and justice that was the original design.

(2) If confidence is to be restored, there needs, above all, to be confidence in the pledged word. To us it appears that such confidence is lamentably lacking. That is conspicuously so in regard to two areas where the situation is a cause of grave international concern.

I refer first of all to Germany. This was the principal topic of our meeting of July 1955 and the only substantive agreement

which was recorded in our agreed directive was this:

"The heads of government, recognizing their common responsibility for the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany, have agreed that the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by means of free elections shall be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security."

In spite of our urging, your Government has, for now 2½ years, taken no steps to carry out that agreement or to discharge that recognized responsibility. Germany remains forcibly divided.

This constitutes a great error, incompatible with European security. It also undermines confidence in the sanctity of our international agreements.

I therefore urge that we now proceed vigorously to bring about the reunification of Germany by free elections, as we agreed, and as the situation urgently demands.

I assure you that this act of simple justice and of good faith need not lead to any increased jeopardy of your nation. The consequences would be just the opposite and would surely lead to greater security. In connection with the reunification of Germany, the United States is prepared, along with others, to negotiate specific arrangements regarding force levels and deployments, and broad treaty undertakings, not merely against aggression but assuring positive reaction should aggression occur in Europe.

The second situation to which I refer is that of the countries of Eastern Europe. The heads of our two Governments, together with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, agreed in 1945 that the peoples of these countries should have the right to choose the form of government under which they would live, and that our three countries had a responsibility in this respect. The three of us agreed to foster the conditions under which these peoples could exercise their right of free choice.

That agreement has not as yet been fulfilled.

I know that your Government is reluctant to discuss these matters or to treat them as a matter of international concern. But the heads of governments did agree at Yalta in 1945 that these matters were of international concern, and we specifically agreed that there could appropriately be international consultation with reference to them.

This was another matter taken up at our meeting in Geneva in 1955. You then took the position that there were no grounds for discussing this question at our conference and that it would involve interference in the internal affairs of the Eastern European states.

But have not subsequent developments shown that I was justified in my appeal to you for consideration of these matters? Surely the Hungarian developments and the virtually unanimous action of the United Nations General Assembly in relation thereto show that conditions in Eastern Europe are regarded throughout the world as much more than a matter of purely domestic scope.

I propose that we should now discuss this matter. There is an intrinsic need of this in the interest of peace and justice which seems to me compelling.

3. I now make, Mr. Chairman, a proposal to solve what I consider to be the most important problem which faces the world today.

(a) I propose that we agree that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes. We face a decisive moment in history in relation to this matter. Both the Soviet Union and the United States are now using outer space for the testing of missiles designed for military purposes. The time to stop is now.

I recall to you that a decade ago, when the United States had a monopoly of atomic weapons and of atomic experience, we offered to renounce the making of atomic weapons and to make the use of atomic energy an international asset for peaceful purposes only. If only that offer had been accepted by the Soviet Union, there would not now be the danger from nuclear weapons which you describe.

The nations of the world face today another choice perhaps even more momentous than that of 1948. That relates to the use of outer space. Let us this time, and in time, make the right choice, the peaceful choice.

There are about to be perfected and produced powerful new weapons which, availing of outer space, will greatly increase the capacity of the human race to destroy itself. If, indeed, it be the view of the Soviet Union that we should not go on producing ever newer types of weapons, can we not stop the production of such weapons which would use or, more accurately, misuse outer space, now for the first time opening up as a field for man's exploration? Should not outer space be dedicated to the peaceful uses of mankind and denied to the purposes of war? That is my proposal.

(b) Let us also end the now unrestrained production of nuclear weapons. This, too, would be responsive to your urging against "the production of ever newer types of weapons." It is possible to assure that newly produced fissionable material should not be used for weapons purposes. Also, existing weapons stocks can be steadily reduced by ascertainable transfers to peaceful purposes. Since our existing weapons stocks are doubtless larger than yours, we would expect to make a greater transfer than you to peaceful purposes stocks. I should be glad to receive your suggestion as to what you consider to be an equitable ratio in this respect.

(c) I propose that, as part of such a program which will reliably check and reverse the accumulation of nuclear weapons, we stop the testing of nuclear weapons, not just for 2 or 3 years, but indefinitely. So long as the accumulation of these weapons continues unchecked, it is better that we should be able to devise weapons which will be primarily significant from a military and defensive standpoint and progressively eliminate weapons which could destroy, through fallout, vast segments of human life. But if the production is to be stopped and the trend reversed, as I propose, then testing is no longer so necessary.

(d) Let us at the same time take steps to begin the controlled and progressive reduction of conventional weapons and military manpower.

(e) I also renew my proposal that we begin progressively to take measures to guarantee against the possibility of surprise attack. I recall, Mr. Chairman, that we began to discuss this at our personal meeting 2½ years ago, but nothing has happened although there is open a wide range of choices as to where to begin.

The capacity to verify the fulfillment of commitments is of the essence in all these matters, including the reduction of conventional forces and weapons, and it would surely be useful for us to study together through technical groups what are the possibilities in this respect upon which we could build if we then decide to do so. These technical studies could, if you wish, be undertaken without commitment as to ultimate acceptance, or as to the interdependence, of the propositions involved. It is such technical studies of the possibilities of verification and supervision that the United Nations has proposed as a first step. I believe that this is a first step that would promote hope in both of our countries and in the world. Therefore I urge that this first step be undertaken.

▼

I have noted your conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that you attach great importance to personal contact between statesmen and that you for your part would be prepared to come to an agreement on a personal meeting of state leaders to discuss both the problems mentioned in your letter and other problems.

I too believe that such personal contacts can be of value. I showed that by coming to Geneva in the summer of 1955. I have repeatedly stated that there is nothing I would not do to advance the cause of a just and durable peace.

But meetings between us do not automatically produce good results. Preparatory work, with good will on both sides, is a prerequisite to success. High level meetings, in which we both participate, create great expectations and for that reason involve a danger of disillusionment, dejection and increased distrust if in fact the meetings are ill-prepared, if they evade the root causes of danger, if they are used primarily for propaganda, or if agreements arrived at are not fulfilled.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, this is my proposal:

I am ready to meet with the Soviet leaders to discuss the proposals mentioned in your letter and the proposals which I make, with the attendance as appropriate of leaders of other states which have recognized responsibilities in relation to one or another of the subjects we are to discuss. It would be essential that prior to such a meeting these complex matters should be worked on in advance through diplomatic channels and by our foreign ministers, so that the issues can be presented in form suitable for our decisions and so that it can be ascertained that such a top-level meeting would, in fact, hold good hope of advancing the cause of peace and justice in the world. Arrangements should also be made for the appropriate inclusion, in the preparatory work, of other governments to which I allude.

I have made proposals which seem to me to be worthy of our attention and which correspond to the gravity of our times. They deal with the basic problems which press upon us and which if unresolved would make it ever more difficult to maintain the peace. The Soviet leaders by giving evidence of a genuine intention to resolve these basic problems can make an indispensable contribution to clearing away the obstacles to those friendly relations and peaceful pursuits which the peoples of all the world demand.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

---

## MISSILE PREPAREDNESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a couple of days ago I said in a statement that the important thing for us, insofar as missile and preparedness developments are concerned, is to look ahead, and not spend our time in recrimination over past mistakes.

Certainly, there are plenty who can take the blame for the lag in our present defenses, from President to Cabinet members on down. But one makes little progress forward while looking backward.

Today I want to call the attention of the Senate, and through this body, to the President, to the mistake of one whose only error in this program seems to be that of over-zealousness, in an age when the big failure was the lack of zeal.

I am speaking of Col. John C. Nickerson, Jr., who has been banished to Panama to a routine job because he refused to take "No" for an answer. If Colonel

Nickerson's superiors had been showing the same zeal, then perhaps today we would have a satellite in the air and be nearer the Soviet in missile preparedness. When I refer to his superiors, I am not talking about Colonel Medaris or Mr. von Braun. I am speaking of others.

What Colonel Nickerson objected to was the memorandum by Charles E. Wilson, then Secretary of Defense, giving the Air Force jurisdiction over missiles beyond the 200-mile range. He objected to the decision and fought it. He has been shown to be right, for now, two Soviet satellites and many Soviet missiles later, the decision has been reversed and has been shown to be wrong. In fact, it seems quite clear now that the team at Redstone Arsenal, of which Colonel Nickerson was a member and which he was trying to keep working together by fighting this decision, could have launched a satellite back in 1956, almost a year before Sputnik I began to circle the earth.

In fact, there was testimony at Colonel Nickerson's court-martial that he and Ernst Stuhlinger, a former German scientist, now a member of the Redstone team, and an American scientist, had discussed a satellite launching as early as 1954. By September 1956 they had the hardware that was needed. Now the Jupiter is going to be used to make a satellite attempt, and if they are successful it will be with substantially the same hardware they would have used in 1956. The only difference would be that now the psychological advantage will be gone and the United States will only be duplicating an old Russian achievement.

In taking this action, there is no doubt that Colonel Nickerson made some mistake in judgment in the way he went about it. But at the same time he deserves considerable credit for placing the welfare of his country above his personal welfare in undertaking the fight at all, for he obviously knew he was running a considerable personal risk.

As a soldier, personal risk was nothing new to Colonel Nickerson. He has two Silver Stars, Distinguished Unit Citation, plus Bronze Star and the Air Medal. He first met the rockets during World War II—on the receiving end. They were the V–2 rockets developed by the German scientist, Wehrner von Braun, now an American citizen, and the leader of the Redstone team of which Colonel Nickerson was such a valued member. At his court-martial, a fellow-American veteran of the V–2 era, Julian H. Robertson, now president of the Erhlanger Mills Corp., of Salisbury, N. C., testified in Colonel Nickerson's defense. He told how he and Nickerson weathered the buzz-bomb attacks in London, and how Nickerson at that time became interested in missiles, and attempted to take a German rocket-launcher apart. He said that when the Allied troops were taking Brest, France, Nickerson took some crude rocket pipes, sent to the front by Ordnance, and fashioned a rocket-launching device that they fired toward the enemy. "Colonel Nickerson was among the few who then saw the potentials of that weapon," Robertson said. "He was a soldier's soldier."

The scientists with whom Colonel Nickerson worked at Redstone Arsenal, Dr. von Braun and Dr. Stuhlinger, also, now a naturalized American citizen, testified as to the effective work which Colonel Nickerson did in this field. Dr. von Braun said that he was one of the three top men on the program in the United States. These German scientists at Redstone Arsenal appreciated the work of their team for another reason also—they knew that many of the fellow-German scientists who had been captured on the eastern front were now working on rocket and missile development in the Soviet Union, and they knew the tremendous progress that was being made. They, perhaps more than the rest of us, and certainly more than the then Secretary of Defense, realized the time limit on this race. They, along with Colonel Nickerson, had also previously felt the frustration as men of science and vision who have tried to make important progress in the face of opposition from men of little vision. Dr. von Braun had felt it not only from Charlie Wilson in this country but also in wartime Germany, for he once spent 2 weeks in jail, sent there by Hitler, because he was trying to launch a rocket to the moon, when Hitler thought he should have been doing something more practical.

At Colonel Nickerson's court-martial, he was sentenced to a year's suspension from rank, loss of $1,500 in pay, reprimanded and transferred out of missiles. He was sent to Panama. Today he is inspecting locks and sewers in Panama.

I hardly think that this is a sensible use to be making of a man who is an acknowledged expert, a man of much more vision than those who court-martialed him, one who has a contribution to make to this Nation's race to space.

I say, Mr. President, let us take Colonel Nickerson out of the sewers of Panama and bring him back to the launching pads of the United States. If we are going to look around for scapegoats because we are running behind in the race to space, let us look at some of those who erred because of too little vision, too little zeal, and not at those whose only sin was overzealousness.

I urge the President, acting as the Commander in Chief, to review the court-martial and make the determination whether he wants Colonel Nickerson to remain the exiled victim of interservice rivalry and of his own eagerness, or whether he wants him devoting his proven talents to the missile program of the United States.

I think there can be but one answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

---

## THE ATOMIC POWER PROGRAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the period in which we live has been variously described as the atomic age, and, more recently, as the age of space. However it may be described, the years and decades ahead present a challenge to the ingenuity and wisdom of mankind.

Throughout history, man's material progress has been measured by his ability to marshal sources of energy to supplement his own physical efforts. Indeed, industrial and commercial progress is measured by the amounts of energy consumed.

In the years from 1850 to 1950 the estimated total world consumption of energy was, to use a technical term, "4Q." What is the meaning of the term "Q"? It is a scientific unit of measurement, a quantity equal to the heat value of 38 billion tons of coal. In the next 50 years it is estimated that there will be a consumption of 16Q. That is 4 times the consumption in the previous 100 years, and almost twice as much as was used during the time from the birth of Christ to 1850.

For the most part, this very substantial quantity of energy has been obtained from fossil fuels, supplemented by devices to harness the power of falling water. The United States still has relatively abundant supplies of these conventional fuels measured in terms of the requirements of the past. But the scientists predict that mankind's energy requirements in the next 100 years will amount to 187Qs. That is 47 times the amount that was used from 1850 to 1950. Measured by this need, our supply appears inadequate for the long range future. On a world basis, known reserves of fossil fuels will be sufficient to supply only about one-fourth of total energy requirements.

If we are to avoid an energy shortage in the future, we must take today those steps which will insure a supplemental supply. The most readily available source of energy is atomic power achieved through controlled nuclear fission. And, if United States leadership in this vital field is to be assured, bold and big programs are necessary.

Mr. President, I have long considered our current program for the development of atomic power grossly inadequate. Because of tardiness in our program of atomic power, we are fast losing, if we have not already lost, our preeminence in this field. Last fall I had an opportunity to visit Europe, and while there I saw at first hand the progress being made by Great Britain and some countries in Western Europe and, perhaps more important, I saw evidence of the progress and great effort by the Communist regime in Soviet Russia to outstrip the United States in atomic power.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee a few questions. He has done much excellent, forward-looking work in this field, both when he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives, when he handled the nuclear appropriations, and also during his service in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am well aware of the bills the junior Senator from Tennessee has introduced, which, if they had

been passed at the time they were introduced, would perhaps have put the United States ahead in this field, rather than behind. I quite agree with the Senator we are behind in this field at the present time.

The point behind my questioning is that, even though there is a time lag of 18 months to 2 years in the ballistic-missiles field, through a "crash program" with mobilization assignments and with a bit of good luck we can overcome and overtake the leadership of the Communists in that field; is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. I have confidence that, with proper leadership, and with proper concentration of money, materials, and talents, the United States can not only overcome whatever lead the Soviets may now have, but outstrip them decidedly.

Mr. MONRONEY. We should not, however, neglect what is actually the development of the right arm of strength, namely, the development of atomic energy for peaceful uses. Should Russia vastly outstrip us in the use of commercial-sized reactors, which can be sold at reasonable prices, and placed in many of the neutral countries and in countries which today are even allied with us; should Russia be able to forge ahead of us in the commercial development of atomic reactors for power, for generation of fresh water from sea water, or for motive power for ships, trucks, or trains; should we lose that leadership while Russia establishes a supplier-consumer relationship with many of the uncommitted parts of the world, then we shall have lost a leadership which we cannot regain within time limits during which we could perhaps regain equality or superiority in ballistic missiles.

Mr. GORE. In reply to my able and distinguished friend from Oklahoma I invite his attention to the fact that President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message that officials of the United States had failed to foresee the political and psychological impact of the Russian scientific breakthrough in the launching of the satellites.

I thoroughly agree with the statement by President Eisenhower. I happened to be in Europe at the time of the launching of the first satellite. I felt its impact, and I felt, as a result of my visit to the Soviet Union, that the Russians were as determined to outstrip the United States in the vital field of nuclear power as they were determined to outstrip us in launching the first satellite. If they succeed in establishing the commercial relationship to which the able Senator has referred, if they succeed in clearly outstripping the United States in the peacetime use of atomic energy, I must say to the Senator that I think they will have again scored a victory over the United States, and that the psychological and political impact of such additional victory may be as underestimated today in the United States as was the impact of the satellite launching.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it correct to say that we could even excel, in the period of the next 2 years, in the power to create millions or tens of millions of people, in our war potential, and yet still lose the war for the hearts and minds of people all over the world, because Russia has made the breakthroughs for the working reactors of atoms for peace?

Mr. GORE. Let us always bear in mind that the cold war is being waged for the loyalty, the affiliation, the hearts, and the minds of the peoples of the world, particularly the uncommitted portions thereof. If the United States permits the world to understand that it is seeking to place the greatest emphasis upon the destructive uses of atomic energy, I think she will make a great mistake. Let us maintain leadership in the field of peacetime uses of atomic energy. Thus I believe we shall be formulating a strong basis for appeal to the better instincts of mankind everywhere.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee was at the International Atomic Energy organizational meeting at Vienna, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I was present as an observer for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It seems to me that the administration, our leadership in the White House, has grossly underestimated the impact on the hearts and minds of people of the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

The President's great stroke in the direction of influencing world opinion in favor of America's peaceful desires was when he made a hurried trip to the United Nations some 3 or 4 years ago and delivered the hope-inspiring idea that America was willing to share its atomic know-how for peace, and also to put up, as a capital research fund, as much of its uranium as an international body would need to gear the efforts of the world scientists toward beating swords into plowshares and harnessing the atom to work for peace.

After he had made that great speech—and it had perhaps the greatest diplomatic impact of anything the United States has done during the present administration—the program was allowed to go into slow motion, until the organizational meeting at Vienna, which was the outgrowth of the seed which had long since been planted.

I still fear that the administration—and I shall be specific—first, showed a lack of the imagination necessary to conceive the importance to the people of the world which our leadership in this field could attain; secondly, it underestimated the President's own importance in world leadership in capturing the hearts and minds of the peoples of the world.

I remember that the great gift we made in enriched uranium, putting up some thousands of grams of enriched uranium as the capital investment in the bank, represented our first contribution to give meaning to the international organization.

In addition, we agreed to match, gram for gram, uranium of any other kind which any other nation would put into the bank for atomic research. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GORE. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I also remember—and this illustrates the point of lack of imaginative leadership which is so basically necessary—the lack of realization by President Eisenhower of his influence in the world, in connection with the announcement of that great contribution, running, I am told, to $1 billion or more. The announcement was made at a cocktail party for the press, by Admiral Strauss.

The President would have done much better if he had recorded a message on tape or television film, so that the great conference could have been started with a word from the President on the meaning of atoms for peace to our country. It would have been much better to have started the conference with a word from our President, whose original idea it was, saying, in ringing tones, that we believe in and want peace, and are willing to make the major contribution to converting the atom into a workhorse for man's betterment.

Instead, the announcement by Admiral Strauss appeared on the want-ad pages of the world's newspapers. If the President had taken only 15 minutes of his time to tape record or film a message to that great conference, it would have made the headlines on page 1 of newspapers throughout the entire world, because the President of the greatest Nation in the world thought it important enough to deliver such a message.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on his always forward look in this great field. The potentialities for establishing world peace will be limited if America determines that it has time to lose. We must not lose the race in the field of peacetime use of atomic energy while we try to win the race in the ballistic missile field.

Mr. GORE. I am very grateful for the eloquent and able remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma. Like him, I felt, at the meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, the world's deep interest in peacetime uses of atomic energy, and I though I felt a yearning by the people of many nations to have the United States vigorously assert its leadership in this field. Uncounted millions of people all over the world want to see dramatic actions on the part of the United States. I think they want to see dramatic evidence that they can look with confidence to the United States for leadership. They want to see this leadership illustrated by programs of actions designed to assure technological superiority on the side of the free peoples of the world in this struggle.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the able speech he is making. I know how deeply interested he is and how well versed he is in the whole subject of atomic energy. I think the point he is now making is a particularly fine one. Personally I know very little about the subject matter. I have been very much concerned because a lack of a sense of

urgency in connection with this program has overcome this administration. A great deal of that lack of a sense of urgency has been due to the reliance the administration has placed upon private industry picking up the tab and doing the research work necessary to develop the peaceful side of atomic energy.

It so happens that in my State the Duquesne Light Co. has recently put into operation a plant for the atomic generation of electric power. That is fine. However, I have the feeling—and I ask the Senator whether or not it is his feeling also—that it is almost foolish to look to private industry to do the necessary research and development work for the peaceful development of atomic energy, because at the moment there is no profit in the program.

I yield to no one in my feeling that we must have private enterprise do everything that private enterprise can do, and that we must let the Government do only those things which private industry cannot do. However, I do have the strong feeling—and I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee agrees with me—that we cannot look for much help from private industry until such time as we can get the whole industry of atomic-energy production and development on a profitable basis, and that we are now far from that stage.

Mr. GORE. I wish, first, to thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his generous compliments. In response to his question, I observe that he has referred to the one and only intermediate-size atomic reactor in the United States. We have no large-scale plant in operation. The Duquesne Light Co., to which he referred, contributed only $5 million toward the construction of the reactors; the Federal Government contributed $95 million.

Insofar as dependence upon private enterprise, stimulated by the profit motive is concerned, let me observe that, as a participant, in a small way, in the private enterprise system, I have never noticed that one who is governed by the profit motive is stirred to activity by the prospect of losses. There are no prospects for profits in atomic energy in the immediate future. We are put in the anomalous position, by the administration's policy, of depending upon the profit motive to maintain America's leadership in this vital field, when those governed by the profit motive cannot be stirred, are not stirred, and will not be adequately stirred, by the prospect of losses in order eventually to achieve the generation of economic power by the fission process.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator not agree with me that every day that we rely, to the extent that we are now relying, on the profit motive in private industry, to enable us to catch up with and keep ahead of the Russians in the field of the peaceful development of atomic energy, is only an additional day that we are running the grave danger of losing the race.

Mr. GORE. We are falling further behind every day in the actual construction and operation of large-scale atomic powerplants.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not intend now—and that I have not had any such intention in the past—to deprecate the expenditures of private industry in this field.

The Duquesne Light Co. has made a contribution. It has put $5 million into a reactor which is now generating electricity at a cost of 64 mills. It is a losing proposition. They will lose a portion of that $5 million. However, it may require not one Shippingport plant, but another generation, or a third generation or a fourth or fifth generation, before we finally do, by trial and error, develop, through experience, methods, and processes for generating electricity by atomic processes at economic rates.

I do not believe it is fair to expect Duquesne Light Co., or any other private corporation, to undertake such great losses. They have a responsibility to their stockholders, as well they should have. I think it is important, however, to the United States and to the position of the United States in world affairs, for the whole people to undertake this program, and for close teamwork to exist between private industry and Government, so that we may utilize fully the resources of Government, private industry, and our technical institutions in achieving the great goal of peacetime atomic power.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with what the distinguished Senator has said. Would it not also be correct to say that it might not be possible during the next 5 years or so, when we in this country have an abundance of low-cost conventional fuels, to have atomic energy by reason of not being capable of competing with our present adequate supply—temporarily, at least—of low-cost fuel, whereas the people of the world whom we are trying to influence, in a peaceful and friendly way, toward better conditions do not have adequate supplies of low-cost fuel?

As the distinguished Senator knows, in Bangkok, Thailand, last year, at the Interparliamentary Union sessions, we saw the generation of electric power from teak wood and mahogany as fuels, to keep the tiny electric lights burning in the tourist hotels.

It seems to me that if we are to reach those countries, we must realize that the rest of the world is not as fortunate as we are with relation to cheap conventional fuels, and that coal must be transported half way around the world in order to generate the electricity those countries need. With the research and development that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has referred to, we can literally send in by airmail enough atomic energy to generate power to supply a city of 10,000 for a year or two. Let us consider for a moment the possibility in that way of touching the lives of those people with the 20th century brilliance of an electrically lighted age. That is our destiny. We should not fumble the opportunity, with the know-how that we have, to enlarge upon it.

As the distinguished Senator has said, and as the distinguished ranking member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and former chairman of the Joint Committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has said, it is later than we think, and that we should be the ones to make the breakthrough. We cannot make the breakthrough with blueprints, while Russia is showing reactors of 100,000-kilowatt capacity. We are not that good salesmen.

Mr. GORE. Before commenting on the Senator's able statement, I wish to advert to the Duquesne Light Co.'s reactor at Shippingport, and to advise the junior Senator from Pennsylvania that that reactor was begun under the terms of the McMahon Act, which was repealed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. We have no intermediate size reactors constructed or even in early prospect under the program based on the 1954 act. This program has been a gross failure.

To comment upon the statement of my friend, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, I should like to advise him that a little more than a year ago I was in Japan. I had a conference with the chairman of the Japanese Atomic Energy Commission. I undertook to persuade him and his country to wait until the United States had gone through its program of research and development, and I expressed the view that eventually a more efficient type of reactor would be produced here.

He looked at me and said, "But, Senator GORE, we cannot wait 5 years. You have an abundance of coal in your country. You have an abundance of oil and gas in your country. We have no such abundance, but we have millions of people who must live by production on these tight little islands."

That illustrates the point which the Senator has so ably made. Let me point out that Japan is one of the nations whose loyalty and affiliation mean a great deal to the United States in the cold war struggle. We have but to lose the loyalty and the affiliation of only a very few nations, which we could perhaps count on one hand, in order to lose the balance of power.

I yield to my able friend, the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee upon what he has been saying, and to ask him a question, to follow up the question asked by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania pointed out that the present cost of generating power from atomic energy was so much higher than the cost in connection with generating power either by hydroelectric methods or by coal, as fuel, that it was not profitable for private industry.

I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee would be able, if he thinks it is proper to do so, to tell us something about the comparative costs per kilowatt-hour of generating power by atomic energy. As I understand, the generating costs for hydroelectric power range between 2½ and 4 mills a kilowatt-hour. The cost of generating power from coal, I believe, is somewhat higher than that.

Can the Senator from Tennessee tell us what the approximate costs are at the Shippingport plant?

Mr. GORE. I believe the experience thus far at Shippingport shows the cost to be approximately 64 mills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Sixty-four mills?

Mr. GORE. Sixty-four mills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or 20 times the cost of generating power in the Tennessee Valley or on the Columbia River.

Mr. GORE. From large, efficient hydroelectric plants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. GORE. And, of course, many times the cost of generating electricity by efficient steam-electric plants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. GORE. But I wish to point out that this is our first atomic reactor to produce more than 5,000 kilowatts. It may well be that after the shakedown experience, Shippingport will be more efficient. But Shippingport was not expected to be an efficient or economic producer of power. It was the first effort we have made to generate electricity in amounts in excess of 5,000 kilowatts. We hope that the next generation of reactors of this type will be far more efficient.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator doubtless knows the facts upon which a news article which was recently published in the New York Times was based, concerning the costs at the Argonne reactor, which is located in my State. The article in the New York Times stated that the past costs had been 55 mills a kilowatt-hour, but that new developments which were being carried out made the operators confident that with the same apparatus more killowatt-hours of electricity could be generated and the unit cost reduced to 32 mills a kilowatt-hour. Does the Senator from Tennessee know about that?

Mr. GORE. I am aware of the press release, and of some of the circumstances. However, I point out to the able Senator from Illinois that Great Britain considers that she is now generating electricity by atomic processes at economical rates, and that she is pressing forward with a vast program of large-scale development. I think we must do likewise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I brought out the Argonne development merely as a basis for stating the fact that the Argonne reactor is Government-owned and Government-operated. Is not that true?

Mr. GORE: Yes; that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the significant reduction in cost which has occurred has been in a Government-owned reactor of a type for which the Senator from Tennessee has been pleading for some years.

Mr. GORE. That is true; but I also point out that the Shippingport reactor is owned by the Government, too.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Owned but not operated.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Tennessee have any figures to show the costs of the big British reactors in terms of costs per kilowatt-hour?

Mr. GORE. None that I could supply to the Senator with any real confidence. I have heard costs discussed. As the Senator knows, cost accounting is a complicated field. When in Britain last fall, we discussed the subject. Suffice it to say that the British are staking their future economic survival upon atomic power.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is also true that the coal veins in England are much more shallow than those in the United States, and that they are also not regular, but follow the contour. So the costs of mining are extremely high.

I believe that the output per man-day in the British coal mines is approximately 1 ton, and has not increased for many years, whereas the American output, which was 4 tons 30 years ago, has risen to 3 or 4 times that much since then. So the British production costs for coal are much greater than ours; therefore, what might be economical there would not be economical here, where the tonnage price of coal is less. Is not that true?

Mr. GORE. That is true. I have just been advised by a member of the joint committee's technical staff that the latest information from Great Britain indicates that, on the basis of British cost data, the cost of atomic electricity in Great Britain is between 8 and 9 mills, which means that it may well be competitive there, as the able Senator has said. But it also means that there are parts of the United States in which it might be competitive.

Moreover, the indications are that further technological improvement may bring the cost of atomic electricity in Great Britain, and by Great Britain's program, to one-tenth the cost at which it is now being generated at Shippingport.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, this is corroboration for the Senator's thesis that inasmuch as the production of atomic power will be unprofitable in the United States for a considerable period of years for private industry, the Government should carry on the experimental work in order to make the breakthrough in costs, which probably will come.

Mr. GORE. The indications are that the generation of electricity by atomic processes in this country will be uneconomical until, by trial and error and experience in the actual construction and operation of atomic power plants, we have learned how to generate it at economical rates. It will cost money to do this.

I do not know how we can obtain such experience except through a program led by the United States Government. That does not mean that private enterprise should be excluded. There can be the closest teamwork and cooperation between the Government and private enterprise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand and quite agree with the Senator from Tennessee.

May I end my questioning on a minor and somewhat humorous note? Does this not provide the State of Colorado and the Rocky Mountain region with an economical substitute for the Colorado River project? Instead of generating power at excessively high cost, that area could be given the money to develop atomic energy. Would not that be much more appropriate than carrying out the Colorado River project in the Rocky Mountains?

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator. I hope he will not lead me into a controversy concerning water in the Western States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know that the Senator from Tennessee, who wants Government appropriations for the development of water in the Tennessee Valley, has, in effect, formed a compact with Senators and Representatives from the semiarid States on the principle that if they will scratch his back, he will scratch theirs; therefore, he does not want to say anything which might diminish the appropriations for water.

But as one Representative from one of the "conquered" States of the Union, one of the big industrial States which pay the taxes, but which have very little voice, I applaud this progress in the field of atomic energy, and I hope we can furnish large quantities of cheap atomic energy to the people of the Rocky Mountain States, so that they will not continue to hold up the taxpayers of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The Chair did not hear what the Senator from Illinois said. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. After the description of the alleged relationship which the able Senator from Illinois has given, I should like to inquire the meaning of the term he used—"in effect."

The Senator has said that, "in effect," a compact had been formed. As I understood his description of it, the compact would seem to be quite in being.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to venture further into a subject into which I have perhaps somewhat inappropriately ventured. But I always notice that there is a sort of mutual admiration society between the various districts in the South which are interested in water and the Rocky Mountain region, which also is interested in water, and that the South now supports the Rocky Mountain States, and the Rocky Mountain States support the South; and no matter what the projects are, they are said to constitute conservation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, water is one of the essential elements of life.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is incontestable. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Not only is water one of the essential elements of life; it is also essential for industrial progress and for economic development; and in the future the conservation of water will become one of the foremost problems of the Nation. Even today the water resource is becoming critical in many areas of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that without the Tennessee Valley development and the development at Oak Ridge and the power generated there and

the power generated by falling water at Bonneville, there could not have been the development of atomic energy in the first place, and we still are dependent on the high development of natural-resource electricity, in order to continue to have in the bank, so to speak, the atomic energy we now have?

Mr. GORE. Of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The voting record of the Senator from Illinois indicates that he always has supported the Tennessee Valley Authority and always has supported the power developments on the Columbia River, because there we have unique situations—large flows of water and low-generating costs.

But that is not an argument in favor of high-generating costs on the Upper Colorado or for large dams in Oklahoma. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the able senior Senator from Illinois upon the prescience of his personality and upon his conviction, and to welcome him into the compact as a full-fledged member. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; I protest; I protest.

Mr. GORE. His record has been made. Like the junior Senator from Tennessee, he has maintained that the economic and efficient development of natural resources in any part of the United States makes all of the United States a stronger and better nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I must protest. I appreciate this eulogy on the part of my friend, but it goes too far. I favor the development of waterpower where it is economically and socially feasible, but not when we have to pay too high a price for it.

Mr. GORE. I said that the able Senator from Illinois has a record which sustains the point of view that economic and efficient development of natural resources in any part of the United States makes the whole country stronger and better.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All right.

Mr. GORE. I believe the Senator from Illinois will now agree with that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not rise to defend the great resource developments on the Columbia River, because they need no defense; and I know that my friend, the Senator from Illinois, is one of their leading adherents.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the knowledge he always conveys to us about atomic energy, on which he is an outstanding authority.

I was pleased to hear him refer to the pioneering work done in connection with the submarine *Nautilus*. We in Oregon are proud of the fact that in the United States Bureau of Mines laboratories at Albany, Oreg., was developed the process for zirconium, without which the remarkable feats of the submarine *Nautilus* would not have been possible; and we are also proud of the fact that today at Albany, the Wah-Chang Co., Inc., is producing zirconium for the submarine *Nautilus* and other atomic submarines.

The question I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee applies to a very broad realm of the nuclear program, which concerns and disturbs many persons. Their alarm may be due to misinformation, but I am sure it is sincerely founded. It stems from the fact that many of these people are afraid of the possible deleterious impact on human life of the waste materials and the byproducts. In the Pacific Northwest we are particularly conscious of this problem because the famous Declaration of Conscience, which was written approximately a year and one-half ago by the immortal Dr. Albert Schweitzer, mentioned especially some of the wastes from the Hanford plant. I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee, through his vast knowledge of this subject, will give us some brief information about whether any actual peril is posed to human life, to genetics, and to children growing up in a particular area, because of possible dissemination of waste material from nuclear plants.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, unless a nuclear reactor is constructed with adequate safeguards, great dangers are involved. Not only must the United States undertake to occupy a position of leadership in this field from the economic standpoint and from the standpoint of international relations, to which the able junior Senator from Oklahoma referred, but it must also take the leadership in developing safe and efficient reactors. Unless the reactors—many of which will be located in areas of congested population—are constructed safely and with proper safeguards, millions of people would be in danger of suffering contamination.

Mr. NEUBERGER. There was an episode in England about 6 or 8 months ago, I believe; it involved possible contamination because of a leak or defect in a nuclear reactor. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. It was a rupture of a fuel element in a small reactor, and it contaminated an area of approximately 10 square miles, according to the information I have. However, the contamination was by isotopes of iodine, which have a half-life of only a few days, and therefore it did not contaminate the area with the deadly kind of poisoning which would be involved if strontium 90 had been showered over the area.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I always learn a great deal by listening to him.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I wish to say to him that the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Radiation is holding hearings on waste disposal this very spring. The problem is one which we regard as vital, and one to which the committee has given careful attention; and it is a problem to which the Atomic Energy Commission and the President have given attention; and it is one of the goals of the International Atomic Energy Agency. That is to say, one of the goals of that Agency is to develop efficient, safe, sound types of reactors.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Again I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on the same point, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that as we go forward in a semiexperimental or quasiexperimental field to develop large-scale reactors, in the interest of safety and the interest of establishing and creating safety standards, again the Government's construction of them would make possible the construction at locations much more distant from central markets than perhaps private industry could afford to engage in? In other words, the whole picture from the beginning—from the point of view of the protection of human life, and including the importance of the impact on the minds of the peoples of the world—indicates that the Federal Government should take the lead because only the Federal Government can deal with the losses which must occur as we go through this curtain of progress, in order to bring about at a 10- or 20-year earlier period the advantages of economic generation of electricity and other benefits from atomic power.

Furthermore, it seems to me that American free-enterprise industry—being allowed to have all of the know-how, without the payment of cost or royalty, after the Federal Government has developed, by means of its expenditures, these secrets—will have an opportunity to take the leadership in the markets of the world in connection with the sale of atomic reactors to Japan, Laos, Thailand, Pakistan, and other countries which today desperately need a fuel which can be easily transported, in order to supply their energy needs. It seems to me that would open the greatest field for private industrial development and production of these overseas reactors; and only through help from the Federal Government in making these breakthroughs can our private business not fall behind the government-subsidized and socialized manufacture of these by Russia and the Iron Curtain countries.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Again I say that we shall not be able to accomplish these goals until and unless this country has sufficient experience in the field to be able to develop economic reactors.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity of discussing this subject with my colleagues. I had not intended to speak at length today on the necessity for an accelerated atomic energy power program. Suffice it to say that we simply cannot afford the complacency and the unhurried manner which has marked our program to date.

In 1956, the Senate passed a bill which would have directed that the resources of this Nation be marshaled to bring into being processes for the economic generation of atomic power in commercial and industrial quantities. Unfortunately, that bill did not become law. It was defeated by a narrow vote in the House of Representatives.

During the 18 months since that action was taken by the Senate, the need for the vigorous power program it approved has become even more urgent. We have continued an inadequate program while other nations forged ahead. An additional 18 months of time has largely been lost. Further delay will but make it more difficult, if not impossible, to recapture the position of leadership which we once so clearly enjoyed.

I have today introduced a bill which includes the atomic power program already approved by the Senate, together with other proposals upon which I consider affirmative action to be needed.

Mr. President, the dreams of today become the realities of tomorrow. Who, except perhaps a Jules Verne, would have predicted even 10 years ago that 100 men, in 1957, in an enclosed vehicle, without access to air or fresh water, or light or warmth from without, could have conducted an extensive exploration of the previously impenetrable darkness beneath the polar icecap extending over a period of 5 days? Yet this feat was accomplished recently by the officers and men of the submarine *Nautilus*. The *Nautilus* traveled 1,383 miles under the ice and reached 87° north latitude—farther north than any other ship has ever sailed. It was made possible by atomic energy.

I believe, Mr. President, that this same source of energy can be used not only to propel a vehicle into space, but to make possible controllable mobility beyond the earth's atmosphere. Furthermore, I believe the utilization of atomic energy can make possible the maintenance in such a vehicle of the necessary conditions for human existence. Substantial competent scientific data supports these views.

Fuels employing chemical processes have limitations to which nuclear energy is not subject. The rate of release of nuclear energy can be controlled over a wide range, varying from an almost immeasurable intensity to comparative quiescence, with almost instantaneous acceleration or deceleration between the two extremes. No oxygen or other chemical substance need be present for its application.

If we are to succeed in the race to place into operation a space vehicle, subject to control and direction by man, we must proceed with all possible speed in the development of nuclear propulsion.

Some may think that manned space vehicles began to be seriously considered only upon the happening of recent events. Such is not the case. For several years the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been supporting a project on which the Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission have been working and which, if successfully completed, will serve as a basis for the development of space travel. Within the next few days, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will begin hearings on the status of this project. These hearings will be a continuation of others which have been held involving the development of a nuclear-propelled rocket, upon which the Atomic Energy Commission has been engaged for some time. It is only recently that the veil of secrecy surrounding this project has been somewhat relaxed. In 1956, Congress authorized the expenditure of $9.1 million for construction work over and above that which had previously been planned. This money was subsequently appropriated.

Notwithstanding the support by the Joint Committee and the Congress and the excellent work of the Atomic Energy Commission, subsequent actions by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense have resulted in sharp cutbacks in this project and curtailment of essential work.

In January 1957, the Joint Committee ascertained that with only 5 months remaining of the fiscal year, 96 percent of that fiscal year's funds for construction work had not been released by the Bureau of the Budget, despite requests by the Atomic Energy Commission for such release. While some of this money has since been released—though not all—unnecessary delays have been caused. In addition, during the past year, cuts amounting to more than $16 million were made from funds previously authorized and appropriated by Congress for this project. These cuts were made without proper recognition or consideration of the technical aspects of the program.

In December 1956, a special committee of the Department of Defense concluded that this project was highly important to any consideration of large satellites in space flights, and concluded further that its potential military value was sufficient to warrant a prompt effort to demonstrate technical feasibility. Despite these recommendations, a cutback was ordered and the project was allowed to proceed only on what was called a moderate scale.

This program has been retarded, Mr. President, during a period in which the Soviet Government has been known to be working actively on a similar program. Evidence of Soviet activity appeared at least as early as November 1956 in a magazine Missiles and Rockets, which reported interviews with Soviet scientists who discussed their work in this field. It is imperative that this undertaking receive the full support of the Congress and of the President of the United States if it is to succeed.

The Atomic Energy Commission, with its network of national laboratories, staffed with nuclear scientists, is uniquely qualified to perform the technical work required for the development of manned nuclear rockets, capable of space travel. There is no necessity for creating an additional agency to undertake the task—at least, I see none now. We must utilize the technical proficiency available to the Atomic Energy Commission to the fullest extent if the United States is to remain the preeminent power in this atomic age.

I have included in the bill I have introduced specific authorization and direction to the Atomic Energy Commission to accelerate this project for nuclear propulsion of rockets and to initiate a project for a manned and controlled space vehicle. I hope this proposal receives promptly the full support of the Congress and of the American people.

Mr. President, I return now for a moment to the basic question of energy.

The feasibility of atomic energy for peaceful uses has been demonstrated. Technical obstacles which remain, though formidable, can and must be overcome. They will be overcome promptly if we will but make up our minds that they must be overcome and undertake to devote the necessary resources to the program as outlined in the bill I have introduced.

But our objectives must not be limited by the potentialities of fission energy, great though they be. Supplies of uranium, the fission fuel, though abundant in terms of all known yardsticks, are not inexhaustible. We know already that the potential energy available from the thermonuclear or fusion process dwarfs that available from atomic fission. The problems of harnessing it are vastly more difficult. There are many uncertainties about the possibility of obtaining thermonuclear energy in usable form. It may prove not to be feasible at all. Admittedly, years of research are required before the answers are known. Yet, the possibilities are enormous. We cannot afford to overlook this opportunity. Neither can we afford to lag behind other countries in this endeavor.

A breakthrough in the field of thermonuclear energy will not just happen. It will occur, if at all, only as a result of intensive effort. The bill which I have introduced today gives specific legislative sanction and support to a dedicated effort to crack the fusion barrier. It enunciates a policy decision on the part of the United States to endeavor, by all practicable means, to harness the energy of the H-bomb. The H-bomb itself was developed as the result of our compulsion to arm ourselves with the most destructive of weapons for the defense of ourselves and the free world. We must demonstrate to the world that we will apply ourselves equally as diligently to constructive efforts in the thermonuclear field for peaceful purposes.

Mr. President, the challenge of the space age will test our vision, our courage, and our willingness to make sacrifices today in the interests of a better tomorrow. We must not fail the test. It is in the hope of making a constructive contribution that I make these proposals and make these remarks.

---

## THE FREE IMPORT POLICY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Reno Evening Gazette dated January 9, 1958, which contains a very pertinent paragraph having to do with the closing of mines of this Nation. The same free import policy is vitally affecting several hundred industries, including textiles, livestock, machine tools, precision instruments, crockery and glassware. That paragraph reads, in part:

Not only in Nevada, but in all other mining States, the mineral producers are the victims of a Government free trade policy that started with the New Deal and has been

retained by the global giveaway believers in the executive and legislative departments back in Washington.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE'S A STRONG POLITICAL FLAVOR HERE

More noise about the need for a special session of the legislature comes echoing out of the southern part of the State. The source of this latest rumble is a Las Vegas assemblyman who has been acting for some time like a candidate for higher office.

Says he, the legislature should be summoned forthwith to dispose of a 3-pronged emergency. The sorry state of the mining industry is one-third of this emergency, and he would come to the relief of the distressed metal producers by doing away with the State's tax on net proceeds of mines. Then there is the never-satisfied school bloc that wants more money. And the third fraction is the gambling industry and its control.

There is no doubt that the mining industry needs help, but so do a lot of other industries in this State, too. And tax favoritism is not the remedy. Not only in Nevada, but in all other mining States, the mineral producers are the victims of a Government free trade policy that started with the New Deal and has been retained by the global giveaway believers in the executive and legislative departments back in Washington. For Nevada to repeal its tax on the output of the mines would be to subsidize this industry at the expense of all other enterprises and individuals in the State, and these other enterprises and individuals are also in need of tax relief.

Talking about the need for school legislation, the special session promoter suggests that the State's lawmakers forced school administrators to put more money into teachers' salaries and less into ornate and costly buildings. This was inspired by the confused state of finances in the Las Vegas school system, where millions of dollars have gone into luxurious auditoriums, mammoth gymnasiums, and other unnecessary and expensive luxuries. As a result, there isn't enough money left to give the teachers a substantial pay increase. This is a local matter. The State should not be called upon to discipline an extravagant school board, and at the same time put unneeded and binding restrictions on the school boards of the rest of the State.

As for the gambling business, one has only to recall what happened in the 1957 regular session of the legislature. The big gamblers—most of them centered in Las Vegas—just about controlled the legislature, and came within a whisker of getting themselves established over and above all legitimate business in the State. The same legislators who served in the 1957 session would be back for a special 1958 session. And the same lobbyists would be on hand to dispose of any efforts to clamp down on the gamblers.

Special sessions of the legislature are intended to deal only with emergencies—real emergencies. There is no emergency at this time, only a manufactured one. In fact, the whole proposal from Las Vegas sounds like the tentative platform of an ambitious politician calculating his chances for the 1958 State elections.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, for more than a century of time the Congress of the United States regulated our foreign trade and national economy in accordance with article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act (so-called reciprocal trade) transferred that Congressional responsibility to the Executive with full authority to transfer it to any one area on earth—under the auspices of any organization that he might spearhead.

In 1947 the President did transfer that responsibility of Congress to Geneva, Switzerland, where it now resides and is being administered by 37 competitive foreign nations through multilateral trade agreements—the terms of which Senators and Congressmen are not allowed to know until such agreements are signed.

It amounts to a conspiracy to destroy the workingmen and investors of this Nation.

Congress can regain its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce and national economy by just sitting still and allowing the 1934 trade agreements to expire in June 1953.

## THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is now 3 days since the President of the United States delivered his budget message. I believe the time has come for Members of this body to state freely and candidly their feelings about that document, for it is not too much to say that the fate of this Nation hangs to a large extent upon our ability in the Congress to awaken the American people to the deadly peril in which they live, and to take the legislative action necessary to insure our country's safety.

Mr. President, the President's budget message must be deeply disappointing to millions of Americans. His state of the Union message last Thursday led us to hope that at long last he appreciated the grave dangers facing this country. Yet it is now clear that the President has no real feeling of urgency about our present national insecurity.

He seems unaware of the changed world situation resulting from the rapid buildup of Russian strength and the steady deterioration of our own once-proud position. The speech made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] gave us a striking example in the field of atomic energy, where we have lagged and lagged and lagged, failed to appropriate the necessary money, failed to take the necessary action, and are on our way toward losing the preeminence in this field which came from our first discovery and breakthrough in the control and use of atomic energy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his generous comments. I wish to observe that in my humble opinion a source of economic energy will be among the final arbiters of world power in the struggle for technological superiority.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator, and I thank him for his comment.

Mr. President, the budget message appears to have been drafted in a vacuum from which the sputniks, the successful firing of the Russian ICBM, the humiliating failure of our Vanguard efforts, the Gaither report, and the Rockefeller report have all been excluded. Indeed, those who drafted the state of the Union message must never have been introduced to the Budget Bureau and the Treasury officials who so obviously are responsible for the budget message

Permit me to deal briefly with the field of national security.

Everyone would agree that it will take more than money to win back the security we have come so close to throwing out the window. Reorganizing our Defense Establishment and our State Department, and replacing old, tired, and obsolete thinking with men of imagination and a real sense of urgency are equally necessary. Yet without enough money we will never match the Russian pace. I am in no position to state categorically that the budget requests for missile development are clearly inadequate. Yet any citizen who reads the Rockefeller report or reads those leaked portions of the Gaither report, which I have every reason to believe are accurate, cannot fail to feel that the program in the missile area is inadequate. However, I am prepared to await the evaluation of the Preparedness Subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] before speaking further on this subject.

It must be clear to anyone who reads the budget message:

First, that the Strategic Air Force is not to receive any more planes than those called for a year ago, nor will its other critical problems be promptly financed toward solution, while the Russian Air Forces are being built up.

Second, that atomic-missile-carrying submarines are not being ordered in adequate quantities, while the Russians are building hundreds of submarines and are on their way to their own atomic-powered submarine.

Third, that reduction of manpower and funds for the Army further weaken our ability to deter "brush warfare," which the Communists can initiate any day almost anywhere in the world. Thus we stand still while Russia moves ahead.

Mr. President, as early as April 1956 I had occasion to remark in a public address that the budget for that year for military purposes in my judgment was $4.5 billion short of what was needed to properly protect the security of this country. Mr. President, I have had no occasion to regret that remark. I believe if that money had been appropriated we should not now be in the sad situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. President, let me turn for a moment to the field of education.

Everyone who has seriously studied our educational system and compared it with the Russian agrees that our desperate needs in this field in order of priority are: First, higher teachers' and college professors' salaries to attract and retain in the profession the best available brains; second, school and college construction; and third, scholarships and other methods for assuring that the brains of our country are adequately educated.

Yet the President ignores the salary problem, turns his back on the continuing school shortage situation which he

recognized a year ago, proposes to wreck the college housing loan program with higher interest rates and other restrictions, and confines himself to a temporary and modest college scholarship program. One may well ask where the President expects millions of American boys and girls to go to school in the years ahead and what caliber of instruction he thinks awaits them on arrival at the now completely obsolete little red schoolhouse.

Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post appeared a column written by Walter Lippmann entitled "Not Good Enough," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT GOOD ENOUGH

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President's program, as set forth in his message and in his budget, is not likely, it would appear, to win for him the kind of popular support which he will need in this Congress. For while his delivery of the message did much to quiet the apprehension about his health, the substance of his proposals will almost certainly produce a sense of disappointment and frustration.

The country was expecting and was ready for a large expanding national effort. What the President has proposed is a narrow concentration on specialized strategic weapons accompanied by a contraction in almost every other field of national activity. The program says, in effect, that if only we can catch up with the Russians in missiles, all will be well and we can retreat almost everywhere else along the line.

If experience is any guide, the President will find that the country cannot be rallied successfully to a program of this character. It expected a program of national revival. It is offered a program for contraction. The country will prove once more that a democracy can be rallied more successful by a big and a bold program—like, for example, the Marshall plan—than by a small and timid program—like for example, one which regards the United States as being too poor to build schoolhouses or to devote new water resources in the arid lands of the West.

A small and timid program provokes all the various interests that are hurt by it without interesting and rallying the great mass who will respond to a national call. There is every prospect, therefore, that in this Congress leadership will come not from the White House but from the senior Democrats, organized around RAYBURN and JOHNSON. For the Republicans who must run this fall the program is an invitation to disaster, and the President will have very little, if any, ardent Republican support. For the Democrats, the program is a political bonanza, enabling them to seize the initiative not only in the welfare measures, which are their old standbys, but also in the field of national defense.

This need not have happened if the President and his advisers had grasped the nature of the challenge, and had risen up to respond to it. Once it was certain, as it was, that there would be no opposition to getting more money for missiles, the crucial point was what this Nation was going to do about education and research. For that is where we are most deeply challenged, and it is there primarily and fundamentally that we must demonstrate to ourselves, and to the world, our capacity to respond to the challenge.

In this perspective, the educational proposals are a pitiably inadequate response, and the abandonment of the school construction bill an inexcusable retreat from responsibility.

How the program was put together becomes clearer as we see it as a whole. The sputnik has been treated as a challenge to our missile program which has to be met. The new money for missiles and the like has been covered by the President's accepting, as he never has before, the views of those in his inner councils who want to cut back and, in principle, would like to dismantle, the welfare measures which have come down from the New Deal.

No doubt there is room for cutting back on some of the subsidies and grants-in-aid. But the basic conception of the program is, considering the time we live in, a curious one—that this Nation, challenged as never before in its history, is to reduce and contract its national responsibility for the internal development and welfare of the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is one pertinent paragraph in that column which I should like to read. Speaking of education, Mr. Lippmann says:

> In this perspective, the educational proposals are a pitiably inadequate response, and the abandonment of the school construction bill an inexcusable retreat from responsibility.

Last year the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whom I see in the Chamber, and I joined in sponsoring two bills relating to education, to deal with the problems of teacher salaries and of school construction in a way which would preclude Federal control, and also to deal with the great need for scholarships to help outstanding young people who could not otherwise obtain higher education. At that point we awaited the President's school construction bill, which we believed would eventually come to the Senate. Now we are faced, a year later, with the fact that not one of those pieces of proposed legislation has moved forward, and the basic reason is that the President of the United States and his administration have been unwilling to use their full influence and give their full support toward working out solutions to the desperate crisis in education.

Mr. President, I should like to speak next of housing and urban redevelopment.

The President has turned his back on the goal of a decent home for every American family. By failing to sponsor needed amendments to public housing legislation, he would continue the present administrative roadblocks which have enabled Albert Cole, HHFA Administrator, a lifelong opponent of public housing, to bring Senator Taft's public housing program practically to a halt. By his completely unrealistic suggestion that State and local governments pick up a larger share of the cost of urban redevelopment, he has called for the slow strangulation of that program just as it was springing to life.

I am sure that many of my colleagues who came to the Senate from State and local governments know as well as I do that those governments are not now and will not be in the foreseeable future in any position to pick up a substantially larger part of the tab or check for any one of these desperately needed programs. The administration appears now to be on the way to abandoning these programs in a false plea for economy, despite the fact that last year the gross national product of this country reached a new peak, and we are unquestionably the richest Nation in the world. Despite those facts, we are devoting a smaller share of our gross national product to the public sector of our economy than we were devoting some 15 years ago.

Mr. President, by the President's failure to recognize that tight money and high interest rates have prevented home builders from selling as many as 1 million new homes in 1957 where the clearly demonstrable need is for 2 million a year, he has done his part to insure that no American family of moderate income will be able to buy a decent new home in 1958.

Mr. President, perhaps one of the most indefensible parts of the budget message is the lip service the President pays to area redevelopment legislation for communities with heavy and persistent unemployment. This, Mr. President, is a critical need, not only in my State, but in many another State. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], 17 other Senators, and I have cosponsored legislation to carry into effect some measure of relief for those pockets of unemployment in our country, which are now becoming greater and greater every day.

Mr. President, in the budget message we find faint praise for a program of area redevelopment, but the praise is accompanied by omission from the budget of every cent of the quite inadequate appropriation proposed for this purpose last year. This is one of the clearest demonstrations of deeds turning their back on words that I have had the opportunity to observe. It must be hoped the Congress will act to meet the important need for such legislation, and support its action wtih an adequate appropriation.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post of Tuesday, January 14, 1958, there appeared a lead editorial, spread over 2 columns, entitled, "An Inadequate Budget." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have that editorial printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INADEQUATE BUDGET

The President's budget does not measure up to the challenge of the times. In seeking to avoid both deficits and tax increases, the administration is also avoiding—or seriously underrating—many vital challenges which face the Nation in a time of unprecedented peril from abroad and growth and change at home.

In ordinary times most Americans would applaud the President's dedication to the task of maintaining the relative freedom of the American economy. This is in large measure a question of how much of the national economic effort can be kept in private as distinguished from Government hands. And most assuredly there is no lasting freedom, either, in an inflationary spiral which destroys wealth and blights the fruit of labor.

But freedom has other enemies just now, in the sagging American educational base

and other unmet domestic needs no less than in the global military and economic efforts of the Soviet Union. Measured against these challenges and against the untapped capacities of this country for hard work and sacrifice, what the President proposes is in many ways a retrenchment and, we fear, a flight from reality.

Since 1955, expenditures have been rising at a fairly steady rate which, if maintained, would by next year have pushed the budget above the $74.3 billion peak of 1953. Appropriations—which lead expenditures somewhat—have been rising even faster, portending what the administration has in the past seemed more to fear than to comprehend, a very much higher level of spending commensurate with national growth in the decade ahead. Congress last year blunted the appropriation drive considerably with the aid of a divided administration. It provided only $67.7 billion of spending authority compared with $70.1 billion for 1957. But even before the sputniks, no one really believed the lid was on to stay. It is probable that Congress in the remaining months of this fiscal year will provide most of the $6.6 billion of supplemental appropriations which the President will ask, pushing the 1958 total $1 billion higher than requested a year ago. Spending, now projected at $72.8 billion, will also exceed the original estimates by about $1 billion.

But what of 1959? Here the pattern for this administration's remaining years should be revealed—the years in which the Nation either will begin to catch up with Russian weapons advances or fall irretrievably and disastrously behind; the years in which the Nation either will help meet the economic requirements of emergent countries in Asia, Africa, and South America or cast its destiny in a new isolationist mold; the years in which two decades of neglect of housing, educational, and other domestic needs either will be overcome or grievously compounded by failure to meet the far greater needs of an exploding population. These are needs in the public domain, requirements for collective action, and, in the main, for Federal action.

For 1959, the President proposes a reduction in total appropriations—which if achieved would be the first since 1954—to $72.4 billion, compared with $74.3 billion now sought for the current year. He calls for an increase in actual spending that would be smaller than that recorded in any of the post-Korean economy budgets. Spending would rise from $72.8 billion to $73.9 billion, an increase of 1½ percent, or less than the rate of normal economic growth and probably not more than what is required merely to offset inflation. Moreover, in the abandonment of some domestic programs and the projected sharp curtailment of others, Mr. Eisenhower lays the groundwork for a further relative contraction of the Federal share in the Nation's economy during the years beyond.

To be sure, the budget proposes some helpful shifts of emphasis. There will be considerably more money for certain missile programs, though apparently much less than many knowledgeable critics contend is necessary. Atomic energy development, research (at least in military fields) and science education come in for favored treatment. But at what cost. Other vital military programs—notably bomber procurement, dispersal of bomber bases, the submarine defense and missile programs and the Army's capacity for fighting limited wars against a potential enemy now equipped with many superior weapons—all have been notably, perhaps critically shortchanged.

Scarcely any increase in spending worth mentioning is asked for the mutual security program on which the President has laid such great stress. And civil benefits appropriations would be slashed by $4.4 billion, actual spending by $600 million. The lack of boldness in these two areas raises the question whether the administration is not beginning to think of a defense budget and the security it will buy as ends in themselves. Where are the works of peace? What is it that we are trying to protect? Is the United States to be concerned only with preserving freedom's square mileage—or is it concerned with freedom's institutions, its hopes and its promise of a richer and fuller life?

It is difficult wholly to reconcile this kind of a spending and appropriation budget with the philosophy which seems to underlie the revenue estimates for 1959. They call for a $2 billion increase over 1958 based in the main on current tax rates. This is $0.6 billion less than the growth which the President, a year ago, forecast for fiscal 1958 over fiscal 1957. But it is $0.6 billion more than the gain which now appears likely to be realized in fiscal 1958. Therefore it is probably neither unduly optimistic or pessimistic, but an informed estimate based upon continued expansion of the economy. The release of the pending backlog of defense appropriations already enacted will surely provide a short-term stimulant, and there is room for some safe further easing of credit curbs if this seems necessary. But for the long pull, the confidence which the administration reflects in its approach to 1959 revenue estimates will not be shared by the country—and growth will lag—if its leadership commands, "Do as I say, not as I do."

What is fundamentally missing from the 1959 budget is a recognition that this country cannot operate in these times "on the cheap." The share of the national product that is devoted to defense and to mutual security and to basic domestic services adequate for stable times is not enough for a time of extraordinary change and growth. It is time to face up to the need for a sizable increase in the Federal budget—and to stop pretending that the country either can or wishes to ignore whatever adjustments or sacrifices this may entail.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I first wish to express my regret that I was unable to be present during all of the Senator's message, but I wish to commend the Senator upon that which I have heard and associate myself with his remarks.

Secondly, Mr. President, I wish to commend the editorial staff of the Washington Post and Times Herald for what is one of the most intelligent and well-conceived and well-stated editorials that I have read for many a year. The editorial, which the Senator from Pennsylvania has just had printed in the RECORD, starts with what I would call an all-inclusive and all-descriptive sentence:

> The President's budget does not measure up to the challenge of the times.

I would add only that the President's budget does not place adequate confidence in the American economic system either.

I was particularly impressed by the words of the Senator from Pennsylvania when he noted that our economy is not operating at full steam, or full pace. With an economy in which steel production is at approximately 70 percent of capacity, and metals at far less than capacity production, and with an economy in which there are nearly 4 million unemployed, it is quite obvious that we are not even trying to test the American economy as to its capabilities.

I do not believe it is a budget which is adequate in terms of our defense needs. I have so stated in a letter to my constituents. I believe the budget fails to recognize anything that the Soviet Union is doing in terms of an economic offensive from an international standpoint. In the light of all the talk by the President and his associates about the dangers of the Soviet economy from the standpoint of its offensive, the budget before us is a retreat from last year. It is a retreat, and the American people ought to see it as such. Surely the budget does not take care of the basic social and human needs in our economy, as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has so ably and brilliantly pointed out.

When we think of the great needs of our schools, when we think of the programs that we need for proper assistance to our schools, particularly in communities which feel the impact of Federal activity, when we think of the funds that have been withdrawn and that should be allotted for vocational rehabilitation, when we realize that the only suggestion with reference to REA is that it pay more interest, and when we take a look at the budget from the standpoint of slum clearance and housing and urban renewals and educational needs, and in the field of research, it is a budget of a tired and timid administration.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks, with which I am in complete accord. I recall that he was once the distinguished mayor of the great city of Minneapolis, and has a very clear understanding of the problems of State and local governments. I ask him whether or not he would agree with me, as a former mayor of Philadelphia who knows something of the problems on the State and local governmental level in Pennsylvania, that it is unrealistic and complete folly to believe that we can abandon any substantial part of the Federal programs to the States and localities without killing the programs?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Pennsylvania is again stating an obvious truth, namely, that State and local governments today are literally flat on their backs in terms of ability to raise additional revenues.

The rising indebtedness of this country on the State and local governmental scene is tremendous. The rise in the cost of government is far greater at the local level than anywhere else. Therefore, to say in a budget message that we will place these responsibilities on the local and State governments is to say that we are going to permit someone else to act as the political mortician for the burial of the programs. The administration does not have the intellectual stamina or the moral courage to say to the American people that the projects are going to be killed. What the administration says is: "Here is the corpse. You bury it." That is what the administration is saying, instead of finishing the job itself.

I believe in an expanding American economy. I do not believe our country has even started to prove its potentialities. I believe there is an opportunity in America for a far higher standard of living. We need people at the head of our Government, in responsible political leadership positions, to give our country a sense of direction. That is what is needed in every field of government.

Once we have that kind of leadership, the Soviet Union will become insignificant, and we shall not have to be worried about some of the problems which now confront us domestically and internationally.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if he does not believe that the American way of life epitomizes the highest state to which man has been able to aspire and which man has been able to reach, and that that way of life constitutes one of the strongest elements of America's appeal for leadership?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. GORE. Yet, when we are challenged, one of the first things proposed is that we start whittling away at the American standard of living.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct in what he is saying. In substance, the administration is proposing a defense program that protects geography. I am not sure that it will even do that, of course. I am in favor of a program that will protect and guarantee what we call our free way of life. That is what the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Tennessee have been discussing.

The President has delivered another one of his lofty and worthy state of the Union messages. That was a job of the pen. Then along comes the budget message, which outlines the fiber and flesh and blood of the governmental policy.

The budget message is filled with salt water; there is not much blood in it, and there is not much fiber in it, either from the standpoint of defense or foreign aid, and certainly not from the standpoint of the domestic scene.

It is a budget which underestimates the ability of the American people to produce. It does not consider the capacity of the American economy. It is a budget which the Washington Post—and that is a newspaper which supported President Eisenhower in two campaigns and has supported his administration—calls, in one of its most significant editorials in this period of human history, inadequate to meet the challenge of the times. I say "amen" to that.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to compliment in the highest terms the able address and analysis being delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania. He has called to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the country the inadequate programs presented to Congress.

By way of illustration, I should like to point to the fact that the budget is wholly and utterly inadequate in its provisions to meet the Russian challenge on technical education. Does the Senator find in the budget adequate proposals for funds to meet the challenge of Russian scientific education?

Mr. CLARK. I do not.

Mr. GORE. I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his efforts and his diligent work in this field.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was not the Senator from Pennsylvania led to believe a month ago, by what was reported in the press dealing with interviews with Mr. Folsom, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that we would be presented with a rather broad and comprehensive program for Federal aid to education which—although not adequate, and even bearing in mind that the administration had taken a solid position for nothing—might at least be some advance in that field?

Mr. CLARK. I will say to my able friend from Minnesota that we had reason to believe that we would get a better program from Mr. Folsom than we had from his predecessor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Does the budget, which lays down the governmental policies so far as the executive branch is concerned, carry out that hope? I am not referring to the state of the Union message. That message was for public consumption. The budget, of course, is for consideration by Congress. The administration has a very nice way of separating the two. It really knows its business in that respect. The administration has one message for the public, and another one for the representatives of the people, who must vote on the policies.

We in Congress get the budget message. That has always less in it than what is promised to the public in the state of the Union message. It is an old system that is being worked over and over again. Does the budget message on education fulfill what the Senator was led to believe was the program of the administration in the field of higher education?

Mr. CLARK. I think it does not carry out what many members of the American public were led to believe would be the program. I do not like to indicate a bit of cynicism on my part, but I must say it was just about what I had expected. In my judgment it is about 25 percent of the minimum amount that is needed for education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's judgment is good as to what was to be expected, and it is equally good as to an evaluation of what arrived.

If the Senator will permit me, as long as our colloquy relates to our observation of the budget, and is a part of the splendid presentation made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I should like to ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of his remarks, there be printed in the RECORD my so-called letter to the editor, which I send out once a week to the weekly newspapers in the State of Minnesota. I regret to say that it is not used as widely as I should like to have it used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his courtesy.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Minnesota.

The budget is not really balanced, it is only by the most unrealistic estimating that the budget is brought into precarious balance. There is not one item of objective evidence to warrant the hope that the present recession will end before the year is out with a resulting increase in revenues. The indications are all the other way as unemployment increases, housing starts continue at an alarming low, and plant construction slows down.

Moreover, actual expenditures and obligational authority are grossly underestimated, as one can see from considering the $6.6 billion of additional estimated supplemental requests above the budget estimates which fiscal 1958 has already called forth. There is every reason to believe the experience will be repeated. Nor can this be blamed entirely on the Congress, because many of these additional appropriations result from the President's own requests.

We have one before us today, coming from the White House, namely, the additional request for appropriations in the defense field.

In point of fact, the budget is so clearly out of balance that prompt attention should be given to closing the many tax loopholes through which hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue to which the Government is in equity entitled are constantly slipping away.

I noted with interest what the President of the United States said—and it was a very radical thing for him to say—in his news conference yesterday, namely, that he would prefer a deficit to an increase in taxes. It may well be that economists can make a good case for that viewpoint. But can anybody make a good case for continuing the unconscionable tax loopholes which give privileges to groups in our society who are not entitled to them, while we have urgent budget needs in a time of great danger?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for what he has said, and to associate myself again with his remarks relating to what are properly described as tax loopholes.

In the tax debates in the Senate in 1951, 1952, and 1954, some of us joined together to try to plug those loopholes and to remove them from the tax laws. I can only say to the Senator that the most recent revenue act sponsored by the

administration, instead of plugging the loopholes, expanded them. They took what I call a country path or a country trail, which permitted small vehicles of loopholes to get through, and made it into a 4-lane highway, so that a 10-ton truck of tax evasion could be driven right through the fiscal highway. Believe me, the loopholes are there. The Senator is correct. I shall join with him once and for all in any battle which comes up in the Senate to plug those loopholes.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I know that, since he was a distinguished Member of the 84th Congress, he will agree with me that we are not speaking in generalities when we say that in the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to the Congress dated January 5, 1956, the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] points out in chapter and verse exactly where the tax loopholes are, so that all who run can read.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is why I voted against the tax bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one must be fair; so, in fairness, one must commend the President for his strong stand—indeed, I would say his courageous stand—in support of reciprocal trade, a stand which, I am certain, caused great grief among the members of his own party, but a stand for which I think we must give him all due credit.

We must commend him for his advocacy of the mutual security program; for his advocacy of an extension of minimum-wage coverage; for an expansion of the National Science Foundation, although, in my judgment, that did not go far enough; and for his courage to be willing to admit now that he was wrong when he rejected last year the recommendations of the Cordiner Committee, which would have provided additional pay for qualified engineering and scientific and other specialized personnel, both in the armed services and in the civil service.

It takes a big man to admit he is wrong. I am happy to say that the President was willing to do it.

I hope the bills sponsored last year in the Committee on Armed Services by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by me will promptly receive favorable action by this body, those bills embodying, as they do, the recommendations of the Cordiner report.

The fundamental difficulty with the President's budget is that it is based on an obsolete philosophy, a philosophy which fails to recognize the proportions of the Russian threat, a philosophy which in its heart believes that the real threat to American freedom is higher taxation.

In point of fact, we have for years stood almost idly by while our once strong national defense deteriorated in comparison with that of imperialist Russia and China, while the public sector of our economy was starved to keep taxes low for those who can afford to pay and while we put our Nation's emphasis on material instead of spiritual values.

The President of the United States calls for sacrifices; but he wants those sacrifices to be made not by those who can afford them, but by the children of tomorrow, who will forgo a decent education; by the homeless who will be denied decent shelter; by the old, who lack adequate security; by the jobless, who cannot obtain employment; and by the ill, whose health problems he will not face up to.

The President says:

I believe this budget adequately provides for our Federal responsibilities in the years ahead.

With all deference to a great military leader and a courageous American, I am compelled to say it does not.

The President says:

Americans have a tradition of uniting when their freedoms and welfare are threatened.

And so we do. The President says:

We do not shirk our clear responsibilities when new challenges arise.

Nor do we when brave and realistic leadership shows us the way. When Congress heard the President's state of the Union message last Thursday, I hoped we had found that leadership. It seems to me to have vanished over the weekend.

EXHIBIT 1

NEWSLETTER FROM SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

INADEQUATE BUDGET

After listening last week to President Eisenhower's promising words in his state of the Union address, it was a disappointment to study details of his budget message. Perhaps it was best summed up in the first sentence of a Washington Post editorial: "The President's budget does not measure up to the challenge of the times." The Eisenhower program, as revealed in the budget, is tragically short of meeting the Nation's needs in this space age. It grossly underestimates the Nation's capacity, as well as the necessity, to rebuild its defenses and at the same time to build its social and economic strength by which the competition with communism will finally be won. Once again it is apparent that in spite of his brave words, the President is unable or unwilling to rise above the bookkeeping mentality that shackled the Government's programs under the height of ex-Secretary Humphrey and brought the United States into mortal danger.

TURNING BACK CLOCK

For the sake of bringing the budget into precarious balance, the President has not only skimped on defense and foreign aid, but has proposed turning back the clock on conservation, housing, urban renewal, vocational education, social welfare, and other programs vital to the national welfare. His proposals for defense budget is less than military and civilian experts have said is necessary. Research and development for penetrating outer space have again been slighted and starved, virtually assuring that we will have to negotiate with the Russians on unequal terms. Budgeted expenditures for international economic and technical development—in spite of the President's eloquent words in the state of the Union message—are below what we should be doing anyhow, and much below what is required to match and counter the Soviet economic offensive.

IGNORES RECESSION

There is no recognition of the economic recession that continues to grow. If we are to engage in an all-out struggle with the Soviet, the first requisite is full employment and fullest utilization of our productive resources. The new budget fails to keep pace with our normal economic growth, let alone provide any incentive for accelerating that growth to meet any emergency challenge. Under present international circumstances, any recession in the United States is dangerous and all too costly. While our built-in safeguards may prevent a recession today from blossoming into the kind of full-fledged depressions we have had in the past, any economic slowdown and increase in unemployment reflects against our free economic system at a time when it is on trial before the world in competition with the state capitalistic system of the Soviet. We cannot forget that.

WAGING PEACE

Many of us took our greatest hope from the portion of the President's state of the Union message talking about waging peace. Yet no provision has been made for any effective action on this front. In fact, as the Washington Post commented editorially: "The lack of boldness in this area raises the question whether the administration is not beginning to think of a defense budget and the security it will buy as ends in themselves. Where are the works of peace? What is it that we are trying to protect? Is the United States to be concerned only with preserving freedom's square mileage—or is it concerned with freedom's institutions, its hopes and its promise of a richer and fuller life?"

SHIRKS RESPONSIBILITIES

"Americans," said the President, "do not shirk our clear responsibilities when new challenges arise." Yet that is exactly what the new budget does. It is a statement of lack of confidence in the American people, in the American economy, and in the Government of the United States to meet the promises and dangers of the dawning age of space conquest. It is the triumph of a balanced budget over a balanced program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened to the speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I do not question the patriotic impulses and motives which led him to deliver it. Certainly I am not here at this time of day to answer his speech in detail, because, in fact, I am sure that as the session continues it will be shown that on many of the things which he mentioned we are in agreement.

The only reason I rise is to refer to the final statement of his speech, in which he questioned whether the President has met the issues of this day. If this budget is adopted in its present form, a question may possibly arise as to whether it is in balance. A question may arise as to whether there should be deficit financing or a raising of taxes. As the Senator has said, that is a matter of judgment. Many economists might differ on that issue.

But if the programs which the Senator has suggested in his speech are needed at this time, and if the programs which my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has suggested are adopted, then this budget will be greatly out of balance, and the issue

will be whether we would support increased taxes. I may say that I would. We cannot have it both ways.

So I ask my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania if he and other Senators on his side of the aisle would support an increase in taxes to meet the program about which he has spoken.

Mr. CLARK. I can speak only for myself to the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. So far as I am concerned, I would. I have so stated on many public occasions during the past 12 months.

Mr. COOPER. I think those who have questioned the program must meet that issue. I have listened to the discussion of the question as to whether the defense proposal and the foreign aid proposal are adequate. I can only say that they are greater than or approximate the proposals which were made last year, and which Congress struck down. The same may be said concerning the proposals on education, which it was not possible, even, to have come out of the committee of this body.

The question of direction can only be from the administration.

The question is whether the Nation wants to trust the administration or trust Congress, which has so greatly changed its position in 1 year.

Mr. CLARK. I did not in this speech question the adequacy of the programs for mutual security or foreign aid. I do not know enough about them to be able to say whether they are adequate or not.

Mr. COOPER. The amount is $800 million more than the Congress voted last year.

Mr. CLARK. I think perhaps the Senator from Kentucky was present when both the defense budget and the mutual security budget were before the Senate last year. I went across the aisle and spoke to 3 or 4 of my Republican friends and said, "If you gentlemen will propose amendments to those bills to restore the amounts requested by the President, you will get 1 vote from 1 Democrat." I could not find any takers.

Mr. COOPER. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe our esteemed friend from Kentucky deserves a frank answer to a frank and direct question. Needless to say, if we are to be critical about the budget and say that it does not provide adequately, from one's point of view, for the national security and for domestic needs, what we are really saying is that we need more money. That is what I say. I say, furthermore, that if more taxes are needed, I shall vote for them.

I am not one who believes that even a deficit is the worst thing that could happen to this country. As a matter of fact, in an economy which is in recession, it may very well be that from an economic point of view deficit financing can be justified, because deficit financing provides greater credit for the American economy, strange as that may sound. But that is the way it works under this strange, mystical financial system we have.

I do not want to play both sides of the street. I respect the honesty and integrity of the Senator from Kentucky. We cannot be in favor of increased appropriations unless we are willing to pay for them, or to stand up and say that we are willing to take the responsibility, in part, for deficit financing. I am willing to do either of those things.

I do not share the optimism of some concerning the mutual security budget. I have only my personal point of view; I lay no claim to expert knowledge. But let me state my personal point of view. Last year the President originally requested $4,800,000,000 for mutual security. He retreated approximately $300 million before we in the Senate even got started on that authorization; the President reduced it of his own volition. That left a requested authorization of $4,500,000,000; and, as we know, that authorization was made by us largely intact. It was reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I believe no major changes were made in the Senate. The actual authorization voted by us was, in round numbers, approximately $4,400,000,000. The Senator from Kentucky is correct when he says the President's request this year, a request for $3,900,000,000, is approximately $800 million more—as I believe he said—than the amount which finally was appropriated last year. However, it is also $600 million less than was requested last year. The President of the United States does not make the appropriations; the Congress makes them. If the Congress makes a mistake, it must bear the responsibility. But if $4,500,000,000 was required last year, before sputnik, before the revelations we now have, before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee had the exposé it is obtaining now in regard to our inadequacies, before the State Department revealed—as it has within the last month—the dimensions of the Soviet economic offensive; if $4,500,000,000 was required last year, when Eisenhower could say, "Peace and prosperity," and could convince most of the people that he was correct, how in the world are we going to be able to get by with a request by the President for $3,900,000,000 this year, when supposedly the Soviet Union is making inroads in the Middle East; when supposedly, according to the President, the major threat of the Soviet Union is economic, not military? In that connection, I point out that the President said in his message that the major threat from the Soviet Union is economic. With the major threat from the Soviet Union being economic, the President now proposes that we retreat to the extent of $600 million from what he said were the minimum estimates last year, after he had revised those estimates downward to the extent of $400 million. Actually, the present estimate is $1 billion less than the President first requested last year.

Mr. President, I know that Senators do not obtain votes or do not make themselves great public heroes or great vote-getters by saying that the foreign aid program is inadequate. Nevertheless I say it is inadequate. It is grossly inadequate, not only in terms of money; it is also inadequate in terms of the way it is managed.

I repeat today what I have said to the Senate before. Last year the Congress was told that an international development loan fund was needed, and that the financing should be on a loan basis, and that we had to set it up at once. We did that. We appropriated money for the international loan fund. We authorized $625 million more for this year. But when was the loan fund established? It was established only last month. Only last month the administration finally got the board set up, and only within the last month did the administration finally find a director for it.

Mr. President, do you wish to know how many loans have been made? Up to last month, approximately one loan was made. They had to find one they could make. The same administration which tells us we must do these things, and tells us that the urgency is here and that the hour of decision has arrived, waited 6 months before it even moved to set up the International Loan Board. This is one of the reasons why the administration will have trouble getting international aid funds appropriated this year.

But I wish to go on record now as saying that I do not believe the mutual security budget is adequate. I think it reveals again the failure of this administration to recognize the proportions, the dimensions, the intensity, and the dedication of the Soviet menace. We have missiles misery. No doubt we shall be able to appropriate all the money the administration wants appropriated for missiles, and I am in favor of doing that. But for all we know, the Soviet may be leading us down a blind alley—an alley of rearmament and of constantly increasing expenditures for the military, while the Soviets are working out economic and loan programs and are beating us to the punch day after day.

Let us read the newspapers. I do not know who in the administration reads them. But this morning we were told in a feature article written by Mr. Kenworthy, and published in the New York Times—we were told it again—that the State Department itself has released reports that the Soviet Union not only is engaging in a tremendously large foreign-aid program, but also is keeping its promises and is delivering on schedule and is stepping up its economic offensive.

But what is Dwight Eisenhower recommending? Let us stop kidding ourselves, Mr. President. A newspaper headline does not mean that there is a bigger program. Instead, it may mean that we are being fooled.

This budget recommends a $600 million retreat from last year, in terms of the Presidential recommendation. Oh, yes; it is $800 million more than Congress finally appropriated. But the President does not appropriate; he recommends. I suggest that the President recommend a program that is big enough in any area. Then if the Congress makes a mistake or falters, the public will find that out. The public is fed up with a Congress that has put budget ceilings ahead of security. The public is fed up with a Congress and with an

administration that have put a balanced budget ahead of adequate security and power. It is time that we consider that fact.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Minnesota. I wonder whether he realizes that accountants have a little too much to do today with fixing public policies in a time of peril.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I also thank him for his presentation of these matters, because I do not like the budget.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## BUDGET REQUIRES CLOSING TAX LOOPHOLES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have always felt that the greatest compensation I receive from service in my position in the Senate is the education I receive by means of the enlightenment which is bestowed upon me from seminar to seminar, as I carry out my work in the Senate.

This afternoon I have taken one of the most educational seminars of my 13 years in the Senate, as I have listened to three great educational lectures by three of the keenest minds in the Senate. One was given earlier this afternoon by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], as he discussed some of America's problems in agriculture; one was given later in the afternoon by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as he again brought to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the American people some very pertinent facts which they need to know in regard to the atomic-energy problem which confronts us.

I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have been proud to be associated with him, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and other members of the Senate as for the past several years we have sought to urge upon this administration the need for a crash program for the development of nuclear power. It will be recalled that some time ago I fought here on the floor of the Senate for the building of a pilot plant reactor at Hanford, Wash., only to be roundly criticized as a mere theorist by some of the reactionary press of my State and elsewhere. But I think this afternoon the Senator from Tennessee made a great contribution to our body of knowledge in connection with the atomic-energy needs of the country. I wish to commend him for what I think was an outstanding lecture—one suitable for delivery, let me say, from any college platform in America.

In the last half hour we have listened to a very able analysis of the budget, by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I do not have to tell the Senate that his position in American politics and the recognition that is given him throughout the country as a great constitutional liberal will cause his speech of this afternoon to be heeded from coast to coast.

The day when the President sent to Congress his budget message—and I have taken the time to read it—I knew that here was another manifestation of gross incompetence on the part of the President of the United States. Of course, I recognized that incompetence on Inauguration Day in 1953; my course of action since then has been a consistent one of seeking to awaken my colleagues in the Senate and the people of my country to the need to exercise our powers in the Congress of the United States to check a grossly incompetent administration. This is only the most recent bit of evidence which has been presented to us. But, Mr. President, it will not be the last.

I have always been willing to vote for the appropriation of funds for a demonstrable need to promote the general welfare of my country. I have also urged that we in the Congress do something to stop the favorable discrimination that the President of the United States, through his fiscal policies, has shown big business interests in the country from the very beginning of his administration.

The RECORD will show that I have fought the tax loophole proposals of President Eisenhower. I have felt they have been unjustified.

It is one thing to say that we must vote for increased taxes if we vote for higher appropriations—and I am ready to do that—but only after we have cleaned up the tax program of the Eisenhower administration and adopted a tax program based upon an ability to pay.

We would not have this tax problem, Mr. President, if a coalition had not gone to work in the Senate, when a group of Democrats entered into a coalition with the Republican side of the aisle and let the administration put through this unfair tax program. I hope now that as my colleagues give more and more evidence of their determination to carry the fight to the administration, there will be fewer coalitions and that we will insist that these questions be decided in the interest of the general welfare of the people of this country.

When we rid the tax system of the Eisenhower tax favoritism to big business interests in this country, then the senior Senator from Oregon will be ready to vote for increases in taxes based upon ability to pay; but until we do so I will vote for deficit financing because I do not propose to impose higher taxes upon the little taxpayers of this country—little so far as their economic status is concerned, but big when one considers what they pay in relation to their ability to pay.

### PRESS AWAKENING OVERDUE

I wish to make these comments, Mr. President, because I am amused these days by the awakening of the American press, which has done such an effective Pravda job for the Eisenhower administration ever since it took office. By and large, the American press has much to answer for, because in my judgment, if it had carried out the historic responsibilities of journalism in this country, the American people would have had many of the facts that have been kept from them about this administration, and some reforms may have been brought about.

At long last, the Washington Post is beginning to write some editorials that raise some overdue questions as to the competence of the administration.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Pennsylvania placed in the RECORD a recent Washington Post editorial on the President's budget. I note that in the Washington Post of this morning there was an editorial entitled "State of the President," and I ask unanimous consent to have it incorporated at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATE OF THE PRESIDENT

It would be encouraging to think that President Eisenhower is as good as new. Unhappily, his news conference yesterday, the first since October 30, did not convey that impression. Mr. Eisenhower appeared to have aged and slowed down as a result of his stroke and other illnesses, and he faltered a good bit in answering questions. One can only admire his dedication and determination to carry out his job; but there is room for concern, too, over his diminished vigor.

In several particulars we thought the President was less than satisfying, despite the constructive general tone of his remarks. The first concerned his letter to Prime Minister Bulganin. Mr. Eisenhower seemed surprised to learn that his letter did not contain an expression of hope that it would receive the same publicity in the Soviet Union that the Bulganin message received here. This, of course, has not been the case; until yesterday, at least, the people of the U. S. S. R. had not learned of the President's letter. This kind of clamp on information is one of the real barriers to a rapprochement with the Soviet Union; it is one of the areas in which the Iron Curtain operates most viciously, and where the Soviet leaders acknowledge their fear of allowing the people to know the truth. With so much at stake, one would think that the President would have made sure that the stricture was in his letter.

A second and not similar point concerned the Gaither report. Mr. Eisenhower said that he would not release the report because it was made to him in confidence. This seems to us an altogether flimsy reason for withholding. This newspaper has enough respect for the distinguished Americans who comprised the panel to think that most of them would welcome publication of their conclusions; some of them, we feel sure, are dismayed that their warnings about the lagging trend of the country's defenses have not received more attention. The President may disagree with them. If so, let him state his disagreements; but let him give the public the whole story. The effect of the administration's performance, whatever the President's wishes, is to indicate that it is afraid to give the people the full facts about the defense peril.

A third point concerned reorganization in the Pentagon. Mr. Eisenhower's desire to avoid cramming through his own conclusions is understandable; but if he is waiting for a meeting of minds in the Defense Establishment, he may wait a long time. The responsibility for advocating necessary improvements is ultimately his; if there are to be changes, he will have to initiate them.

Finally, because of the heavy burdens on the President and his evident frailty, the influence of his advisers has become increasingly important. That is why it is so alarming to see the degree of insulation in which Mr. Eisenhower operates—to see him brush

aside all the mounting protests against Secretary Dulles and cling to him pathetically as the wisest man he knows.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think this editorial is long overdue. I think the editorial writers of the Washington Post should have been writing editorials of this type for quite some time now, because this is nothing new in regard to the condition of the President. It has been obvious, it seems to me, to those who want to see, for quite some time. But I am glad that we are at last beginning to get some objective journalism from the American press, as evidenced, for example, by an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune dealing with the fact that the Soviets are making great headway with their economic offensive in South America. I speak on this subject as chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Relations. It bears out what some of us have tried to tell the Senate in speeches for the past several years with regard to this subject. I have a second editorial from the New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Argentina Looks East." There is no new information in these editorials, but I am glad that the Republican editorial writers of the New York Herald Tribune at last are recognizing some facts of foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 27, 1957]

THE SOVIETS TOUCH A SORE SPOT

The Soviet effort to move in on South American oil development, reported yesterday in this newspaper by Mr. Joseph Newman from Buenos Aires, touches a sore spot in hemispheric relations. Petroleum is the lifeblood of a modern nation. Those countries that do not have sufficient resources of their own in this vital respect, feel dangerously dependent on foreigners and must pay with precious foreign exchange for transfusions of the fluid. But even if petroleum is in the ground, expensive imports of skills and machinery are necessary if it is to be extracted. The long history of "concessions" to foreign capital in underdeveloped lands have made the latter very reluctant to grant the established oil companies rights of exploration and production. On these needs and fears the Soviet Union is prepared to capitalize.

Brazil, for example, where the Soviets are making their first moves through a trading firm called Torgbras, headed by a Brazilian, Col. Tito do Canto, has vested a government corporation, Petrobras, with the exclusive right to develop its petroleum potential. Brazil has had a serious problem with foreign exchange; its purchases of oil products abroad have accounted for some 20 percent of its imports and the use of petroleum products has been growing with the increased industrialization of the country. Petrobras has been sinking wells and building refineries to cut down on this drain of foreign exchange, and the president of Petrobras expresses confidence that by 1960 the government monopoly will produce enough to meet all Brazil's needs. This is challenged by many, in and out of Brazil. In any case, unless alien oil companies are to be taken into partnership for oil development, Petrobras will need large sums for extracting and refining machinery.

In most areas of Brazil's growing industry, foreign capital, private and public, has been welcomed. But petroleum is a hot political issue; the nationalists, both of the right and of the left (including the Communists), are intensely opposed to any weakening of Petrobras' position. The general policy of the United States has been to encourage private enterprise in the hemisphere, and the relaxation of Government controls over industry and finance. Petrobras thus has received no help from the American Government, and the transactions between American equipment and machinery manufacturers and the Brazilians have been on a straight commercial basis.

Now the Soviet Union which has no objections to government-operated industries—quite the contrary—has offered to supply Brazil with the drills, refining equipment, and other necessaries of a burgeoning industry. In other parts of the world the U. S. S. R. has, for political purposes, made economic arrangements that include long credits and barter deals for the commodities of the purchasing country, placing little or no immediate strain on foreign exchange. If the negotiations with Brazil are successful, the Soviets would have won friends among the Brazilian nationalists, established close liaison with, if not a measure of control over, the Brazilian oil industry, and be ready to extend operations to lands with a similar problem, such as Argentina and Chile.

It would be, of course, a major tragedy if this should occur. There is a long tradition of close friendship between the United States and Brazil, and American investment in that country has been heavy. Certainly no objections to Petrobras as a Government corporation should interfere with assistance to Brazil in this critical area of its economy. The American belief that private enterprise could do the job more efficiently is well founded in experience. But the emotions of nationalism are not amenable to argument. The United States cannot give the Soviets the keys to South America to prove its point.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 4, 1958]

ARGENTINA LOOKS EAST

It is bad enough that the free world has so bungled things as to allow a Soviet penetration of the Middle East. It would be catastrophic if we now witlessly abet a Soviet penetration of Latin America. But there are already signs of this happening. More than a week ago, our Joseph Newman reported the activities of a firm offering Soviet autos, oil drilling rigs, and other goods to Brazil. Brazil, like Argentina and Chile, believes that United States credits for such purposes have been withheld because Washington wishes to encourage private enterprise, and the South American countries favor government monopolies in certain areas of the economy. Now comes the natural result of Washington's coyness and Moscow's offers—Argentina is sending an economic mission to the U. S. S. R. next week. Brazil, Uruguay, and Colombia may follow suit.

To open South America to Soviet economic penetration, for so academic a reason as encouraging private enterprise in countries which are determined to keep certain industries in government hands, is stupid. Latin America generally feels that it has been given the short end of the stick in the disposition of United States economic aid. It is especially resentful of any effort by Washington to shape policies through such aid. Much damage has already been done, as the Argentine mission to Moscow makes clear. No more can be permitted to occur. Our relations with South America are so close and so important as to demand the instant correction of anything that weakens hemispheric unity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, following the editorials which I introduced from the Washington Post and the New York Herald Tribune, a remarkably critical editorial, for this newspaper, the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., which has given my State many an Eisenhower snowstorm editorial. The editorial is entitled "Impression of Weakness."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPRESSION OF WEAKNESS

The NATO report by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles to the people of America by television Monday night misfired so badly that there must be consternation in Washington and other NATO capitals on this Christmas day.

The contrived format of the show; the spectacle of two tired, aging men talking about the gravely compromised half-measures which both bind and separate America from its European allies, in falsely casual tones, without any air of great conviction, and with the President permitting Dulles to monopolize the program with a long monolog, then summarizing by reading a statement of generalities—all these added up to the worst public relations job in memory on issues of such importance to the United States and survival of non-Communist nations.

The sense of what they were trying to say—and most of it was sound enough—was lost to TV viewers dismayed by the physical appearance of the President, his face in profile for most of the time as Dulles droned on; the seeming vigor he displayed in public appearances in Paris entirely absent; the power and confidence he can convey to an audience coming through only at fleeting intervals. Ike's profile showed the toll of illness and bone weariness. At a time when the Western World desperately desires the President to take full and vigorous leadership, he sat and listened to a Secretary of State whose tireless capabilities have been frustrated, diminished by the rigidity of his crusader's mind.

Instead of the President's springing back into command, thus to assure free people that the NATO conference really was more fruitful than it appeared on the surface, Mr. Eisenhower sat back and allowed Secretary Dulles—whom, in effect, he had overruled in accepting the Paris compromises—to interpret, even to dissemble a bit, to repeat the tired theme of Soviet faithlessness, to make it appear that the NATO nations are in full accord, when, in fact, they have settled almost none of their deep disagreements.

Neither the President nor the Secretary even hinted at the economic sacrifices, the social and political readjustments, which the American people must accept if this Nation is to meet the Soviet challenge either by strengthening NATO or by perilous and far more costly withdrawal accompanied by massive, unilateral armament.

In rejecting the banal Soviet proposal for unlimited, all-nations U. N. debate, after Soviet scoffing of NATO's suggestion of a foreign ministers' meeting on disarmament, neither Eisenhower nor Dulles gave any hope for an alternative to massive armament.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall continue to support the President on any issue on which I think he is right, but this is one Senator whose criticism will not be silenced because there are those who think it is not good politics to tell the American people the realities

as to what is going on in this administration.

THE BUDGET

Mr. President, in connection with the budget, I wish to raise a question or two. I shall vote for whatever dollar amount is demonstrated, after the Appropriation Committee has considered the request of the administration, to be needed for defense. But after 13 years in the Senate I have come to expect a repetition of a stereotyped pattern in the Senate. Mr. President, whenever the Pentagon Building is ready for another raid on public funds, we should get ready for a great deal of scare propaganda. The old mills of propaganda for stirring up the hysteria of public opinion will turn it out overtime.

I do not doubt the fact that we are in a dangerous position. But we had better keep calm in this situation and not sit here as rubber stamps, giving approval to every budgetary request made by the Pentagon Building through the White House in connection with the defense program. I think we had better question how much padding there may be in such a request. I remember that in the Congress a few years ago we passed a bill, of which I was proud to be author. It was unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. I was a member of the committee at that time. It was a bill sponsored by the American Legion. It was a bill that the Hoover Commission and the Committee on Economic Development said would save millions of dollars. My recollection is it was said that it would save an estimated $2 billion. It was a bill that provided for the centralization of the purchasing operations of the Pentagon Building. The RECORD will show that we brought out in the hearings almost unbelievable waste in the purchasing of military supplies.

It will be recalled that last year, in the debate on appropriations, I asked for a progress report on what had been happening in the carrying out of the law, because it is the law. The Pentagon had not yet finished its cataloging, to say nothing of putting the law into effect. The Pentagon said it had to finish its cataloging first.

Mr. President, there is tremendous waste going on year in and year out in the Pentagon Building, and there is no dispute as to the facts of it. The President of the United States was elected to that office, in part at least, because of the general claim made by his supporters at the time that we needed a President who was a military expert and who could knock some heads together at the Pentagon Building. We have been waiting for that. What do we have concerning his activity to end jurisdictional disputes in the Pentagon? A reply to the effect that he hesitates to do it, because he does not want to use his position to do it. I say to the President of the United States that he owes it to the people of the United States to do it. It is one reason why they elected him, and it is about time he got on the job of doing it. He cannot do it off the job, either. It is a full-time job, and this is one of the most important tasks confronting him. It involves great savings, amounting to billions of dollars, which can be made for the benefit of the taxpayers, if the President of the United States will take the steps necessary to carry out the law already on the books to centralize military purchasing.

Thus, one can proceed ad infinitum with a bill of particulars against this administration, proving what I have said so many times, and repeat today. It can best be described as a grossly incompetent administration, one not working for the best interests of the people of this country.

THE FARM MESSAGE

The message we received today on agriculture, as I turn to a brief statement on it, is but further evidence of a lack of understanding on the part of the President of the United States as to what has happened in our country.

The farm message of the Eisenhower administration reflects a policy of destroying the ability of small farmers to continue on the land. The administration's theory is to force small farmers by an economic squeeze into congested urban areas where they will join the ranks of the unemployed and unskilled labor. This is a faithful carrying out of the big business philosophy which seeks to transform our family farms, traditionally the backbone of American agriculture, into factories in the fields.

Secretary Benson recently pointed out that 56 percent of our farmers produce only 9 percent of our farm commodities. Yet I note from the census figures that these 56 percent of our farm families live on 24 percent of our farmland. If the Eisenhower administration should be successful in transferring the land from the small to the factory-type operation by driving the small operator into the city one inevitable result would be an even greater production of surplus commodities.

The President had some grisly news in his farm message for the REA cooperatives too. If the REA's are forced to swallow the sugar-coated strychnine pill of private financing, they will die by the scores as a result of interest-rate increases and skyrocketing overhead charges.

The message promises to work diligently for lower price supports to the farmer. Translated this means lower prices at the farm gate for the unit of food or fiber sold. To get the same cash income, it forces increased production. Another factor that should be noted is that production costs have gone up at the same time as the cost to the farmer of consumer goods he uses has risen. In 1952 it took 76 bushels of wheat at $2.14 a bushel to pay for a 4-burner gas stove that cost $163. In 1957 to buy the same stove at $175 the Oregon farmer had to sell 85 bushels of wheat at $2.07 a bushel.

In 1952, 9 head of milk cows would buy a tractor, in 1957 it took 17 head.

The administration is shedding some crocodile tears over the plight of the small farmer in the message, but it fails to say that under Eisenhower the interest rates of Farmers Home Administration loans for farm ownership have risen from 4 percent in 1952 to 4½ percent now. Soil and water loans are up from 3 percent to 4½ percent.

The facts as to what this administration has done to scuttle the interests of the small farmers of America speak for themselves.

As I close my comment on the farm message, I wish to say that I shall be very much interested in seeing what kind of sugar-coated pill the Eisenhower administration will try to feed the farmers for their political swallowing in the 1958 campaign. My judgment is that they have swallowed all the Eisenhower pills they intend to swallow. In 1958 this administration will start getting a very clear answer from the farmers for the way it has betrayed its trust to the farm population of this country.

Mr. President, I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

---

## ALLEGED CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I seek to do justice to a group of doctors who feel that the senior Senator from Oregon has done them an injustice in the past, and I shall do so by way of explaining the history of this incident, and I shall ask to have certain items printed in the RECORD.

On August 21, 1957, by request, I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of monographs in regard to antivivisection.

These materials were supplied by individuals who are genuinely concerned over the possibility that inhumane practices are followed in many instances in the dissection of animals for research purposes by medical scientists.

One of the items inserted in the August 21, 1957, RECORD referred to an experiment conducted by Prof. Fred R. Griffith, Jr., of the University of Buffalo, and his associate, Charles H. Whitcher.

Professor Griffith immediately protested the printing of the comments of this antivivisection group and supplied me with a copy of his report of the experiment as it was published in the American Journal of Physiology in January 1949. I asked to have it printed in the September 29, 1957, issue of the RECORD, because I thought common courtesy called for such action.

Before inserting the monographs supplied by those who oppose vivisection, I made it clear that I am not an antivivisectionist; that there should not be useless experimentation, and that such experiments on animals as are performed should be conducted in the most humane manner possible. In addition, I pointed out that I knew nothing about the facts, true or alleged, which were set forth in the antivivisection materials, but that the people who requested their insertion in the RECORD were entitled to have these publications available for the reading of Senators.

They were responsible people. They were sincere people. They have very deep convictions in regard to the question of experimentation on animals, and in a democracy they have the right to petition their Government. When all

is said and done, the insertion of material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a form of petitioning the Government.

Mr. President, an important item that was overlooked by several medical scientists when they protested so vigorously my placing of those items in the RECORD, is the fact that under our system of government people have the right to express views that are not popular. I hope the day never comes when the opposite is true. Under the Constitution these same people have the right to have their points of view considered by the legislative branch of the Federal Government. The insertion of their materials by request merely implemented their right to be heard. It will be a sad day for our Nation if fear of vigorous criticism or political reprisals ever deters a United States Senator from placing materials in the RECORD when he deems it proper to do so.

By the same token, the medical scientists whose animal research activities were protested by the antivivisection group are entitled to be heard on their side of the case, and to use equally vigorous terms in retorting.

Mr. President, that is why I offered Professor Griffith the same courtesy that had been given to those who protested his experiments. I told him I would place in the RECORD any comments he might care to submit. He accepted my suggestion and has submitted a rebuttal letter dated October 8, 1957.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Griffith's letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSIOLOGY,
UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO,
*Buffalo, N. Y., October 8, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senator, the Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On August 21 of this year you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reprint of a leaflet put out by the National Humane Association of Chicago (an antivivisection outfit) which very seriously misinterpreted a report of an animal experiment which a student of mine and I had published in the American Journal of Physiology, volume 156, No. 1, January 1949, under the title "A Possible Role of the Skin in the Effect of Adrenaline on Body Temperature and Respiratory Metabolism". The gist of the experiment, to make a long story short, consisted of testing the effect of adrenaline injected into cats that were perfectly normal, except for being anesthetized, and then later after the effect of this first injection had worn off another similar injection was given after the animal, still completely anesthetized, had had most of its skin removed. To a layman, unacquainted with the long and complex effort to come to an understanding of how the powerful hormone adrenaline produces the many of its important effects, this may seem a very superficial and silly thing to have done; although I assure you it actually proved to be very important in its result. The misinterpretation referred to above, however, had to do with the truth and veracity of our claim that the animals were properly anesthetized; and this, in turn, was due to our use of the anesthetic dial-urethane for this purpose, the National Humane Association claiming that dial (and overlooking the urethane) is not an anesthetic but merely a soporific which would not have made the animals painless in surgical anesthesia but merely sleepy and groggy. It is true that in human medical use dial is usually used merely as a soporific (sleeping pill) to produce sleep and not for surgical, painless anesthesia; but the difference is merely one of dosage as any physiologist, pharmacologist, or properly trained physician knows. Some anesthetics are so powerful in their action and have such narrow limits of safety that they are not safe in the untrained hand of the layman; but dial can be safely used in small amounts as a sleeping pill; larger doses—and especially when combined with an unequivocal anesthetic such as urethane—produce complete, painless, surgical anesthesia. When I brought this to your attention in a protest against republication of the misinterpreting leaflet of the National Humane Association in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, your reply was that you felt bound to give equal recognition to both sides of controversial questions. This is an unexceptional attitude and is highly to be commended; the only difficulty of applying it here, however, is that you, as a layman, could not know that there is no real controversy involved; there are no pros and cons to be balanced against each other and debated. Dial-urethane as used by us does produce, as we reported, deep, painless, surgical anesthesia; any statement to the contrary is simply untrue. It's as simple as this: If I had done an experiment, in reporting which it would be necessary to make the statement that "fire can be made to cause a burn" you, as a layman, would know from experience, I was telling the truth; so, if some organization that was opposed to the kind of experiment I had made and, wishing to disparage both me and my kind of work, came out with a brochure to the effect that "fire cannot cause a burn," you, I am sure, from universal experience, would recognize its error and, I am also sure, would not feel compelled to give it the status of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an opposing side of a controversial issue. The only difference between the real controversy at issue here and this hypothetical one is: Everybody knows fire can cause a burn; on the other hand, perhaps only a few hundred specially trained experts in all the world know the fine points about many unusual anesthetics; therefore many people can be easily fooled by a pretentious statement by a seemingly authoritative organization. I would, therefore, have no real objection for the statement "fire cannot burn" to be republished in the RECORD because nobody would really ever be fooled; but every time the erroneous statement of the National Humane Association about my work is taken up and republished a great many people are taken in by it and I immediately receive another batch of scurrilous and usually anonymous letters condemning me for my implied brutality—which doesn't really matter; and animal experimentation is given a black eye for an entirely false and erroneous reason—which matters a very great deal. There may be plenty of sound, high, moral and ethical arguments about animal experimentation which deserve debate and consideration pro and con impartially; but to confuse the uninstructed lay public by broadcasting a technically abstruse but entirely real error is not, I think, being impartial or fair. Dial-urethane is a perfectly reliable general anesthetic when used as we used it.

Yours,

FRED R. GRIFFITH, Jr.,
*Emeritus Professor of Physiology.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several weeks after I inserted, by request, certain material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21, 1957, on the subject of alleged cruelty to animals in medical research, I received a very strongly worded letter of criticism from a Mr. Ralph Rohweder, executive secretary of the National Society for Medical Research. I ask unanimous consent that this letter, dated September 27, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH,
*Chicago, Ill., September 27, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senator,*
*Eugene, Oreg.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In recent weeks I have received letters of anguish and anger from persons in the medical sciences. They are disturbed that you should have used your influence to aggravate the scurrilous libel against more than 100 of America's distinguished medical scientists published originally by the National Antivivisection Society and its pseudonym, the National Humane Education Association.

The antivivisection propaganda you had reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was issued in pamphlet form beginning in 1949. The distortions in this material were exposed in a series of side-by-side comparisons published in the Bulletin for Medical Research beginning in September 1950.

While you specifically disclaimed any knowledge of the facts, can you really escape responsibility for throwing the mud still farther?

As I recall, the expression "McCarthyism" refers to character assassination with unproved accusations. What is it to have published a series of attacks on individual scientists when you "know nothing of the facts, true or alleged, set forth in the material"?

I am enclosing copies of some of the articles that appeared 5 to 7 years ago clarifying the antivivisectionist distortions.

Time has, however, made these refutations all too modest. It is the nature of basic research to seem impractical at the time. Like living things, the seeds of basic research take time to flower and bear fruit.

We know now, for example, that Dr. Ivy's work on artificial respiration revealed that the method then prevalent was almost totally useless. Thousands of victims of drowning and electric shock were dying simply because the prevalent method of artificial respiration would not even produce sufficient tidal volumes of air to maintain life. As a result of the work by the Ivy group at the University of Illinois, a new effective method of artificial respiration has been adopted by the Red Cross, the Boy Scouts and other such agencies throughout the world.

Another piece of research excoriated by the antivivisectionists gave us the most effective chemotherapeutic substances so far discovered for use against cancer. This was research on the purines at the Sloan Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, New York.

These are but two examples. Other research subjected to public scorn by you has already saved thousands of lives.

I realize that a Senator is urged to act in some way on hundreds of matters for which he has insufficient time to become informed. It would seem reasonable, however, to avoid actions to defame the character of individuals unless there is time to become reasonably confident of the grounds.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH A. ROHWEDER,
*Executive Secretary.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a reading of Mr. Rohweder's letter makes it quite evident that he did not have a com-

plete understanding of the obligations and functions of a United States Senator in making known the views of fellow American citizens, particularly where they are in opposition to Mr. Rohweder's views. Consequently, I replied to Mr. Rohweder supplying him with the information that he lacked, and at the same time I offered to do exactly what my colleagues in the Senate would have done under similar circumstances; namely, I informed him that I would give him and his associates the same courtesy in making their views known in reply to the antivivisection groups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter dated October 16, 1957, containing my reply to Mr. Rohweder.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 16, 1957.

Mr. RALPH A. ROHWEDER,
*Executive Secretary, National Society for Medical Research, Chicago, Ill.*

DEAR MR. ROHWEDER: Your letter of September 27 arrived in my office on October 8. Had you thought about the subject of your letter at greater length, I believe you would have delayed mailing it much longer. In fact, I have a hunch that you would have replaced it with a letter that demonstrates an elementary knowledge of the democratic process. A friend in Oregon also sent a copy of your emotional mimeographed sheet directed against me.

I read with amusement your silly assertion to the effect that it was something akin to McCarthyism for me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21 certain materials expressing the views of an antivivisection group. Your assertion demonstrates that you were guided principally by your adrenal glands in issuing this diatribe.

What you failed to comprehend is a very fundamental concept of our democracy; namely, that the people have the right to express points of view that may not be popular. This is one of the great strengths of our democracy. In inserting the materials that appear in the August 21 RECORD I made available for the reading of Senators the position of the group that opposes vivisection and as I indicated in my remarks preceding this insertion, I am not an antivivisectionist.

When a Senator inserts material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by request, he does not sponsor it. Under those circumstances he extends an accommodation to individuals or groups who ask for the insertion of material that they believe, from their point of view, should reach the attention of Members of the Congress through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If you sat in my seat in the Senate, you would soon discover that there are many people or organizations who hold to points of view quite different from your own, but who, in a democracy, are entitled to be heard and have their petitions considered by the legislative branch of the Federal Government. This is one of the rights they enjoy under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. When they ask the elected representatives to insert materials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they are exercising one of the methods of petitioning their Government.

The whole tenor of your intemperate letter and mimeographed sheet indicates that you have little understanding of the nature of a Senator's obligation to represent all segments of society, including those who disagree with you and your associates.

What you fail to understand is that by inserting the antivivisectionist's views I did not underwrite their position. Let me make it clear to you that their point of view is not going to be silenced by trying to drop some sort of iron curtain of censorship between them and the public. To the contrary, if their allegations are baseless the only way they are going to be silenced is by the publication of the facts. I think you should recognize the importance of being prepared at all times to meet the attacks of the antivivisectionists. The issue they have raised is one that cannot be killed and buried, because it will not remain dead.

By way of contrast to your outbursts, I plan to do for your group exactly what I did for the antivivisectionists. I shall publish in an early issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 1958, the 10 articles attached to your letter entitled "The Scientist's Version," in answer to a portion of the items I inserted for the National Humane Education Association. In that connection, I note the comment in your September 27 letter, "Time has, however, made these refutations all too modest." If you wish to supplement or revise any of these articles before I insert them, I shall be glad to hear from you and will cooperate in every way possible.

Upon checking the August 21 daily RECORD and the materials you supplied, I note that you have not submitted items to refute the following leaflets: the first on page A-6891, those appearing on page A-6892, the second on page A-6893, the first on page A-6894, the first on page A-6895, those on pages A-6896 and A-6898, the second on page A-6899, that on page A-6900, those on pages A-6901, A-6902, A-6903, and A-6904. If you wish to forward replies to these I shall see to it that they are also inserted in the RECORD.

Prof. Fred R. Griffith, Jr., supplied a reply to the leaflet appearing as the third item on page A-6691. It will be published in the January RECORD.

In closing, let me assure you that I shall never let criticism or reprisals of the type set forth in your letter and mimeographed sheet dissuade me from publishing the views of any group that may be unpopular to you or your organization, in the event I deem it appropriate to make these views known through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Rohweder not only sent a scorching letter to me, but he became remarkably active in sending into Oregon and elsewhere certain material roundly criticizing me for having given the forum of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to those with whom he is in disagreement. All in all, it would appear that Mr. Rohweder is not an exponent of dignified silence as a method of showing disdain for the antivivisectionists or for those who insert their materials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am pleased to report, however, that Mr. Rohweder accepted my invitation to insert in the RECORD, by way of reply to the antivivisection materials, the explanations of the scientists working in these instances.

His letter of January 8, 1958, setting forth his own additional comments, is less vitriolic than his former correspondence, and I would be less than human if I did not appreciate that fact.

I ask unanimous consent that his January 8 letter be inserted at this point in my remarks in order that the scientists who criticized the antivivisectionist material that appeared in the RECORD on August 21, 1957, may have a fair opportunity to set forth their rebuttal of the charges leveled against them.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SOCIETY
FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH,
*Chicago, Ill., January 8, 1958.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. MORSE: The scientists named in the antivivisectionist tracts published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have responded gratefully to your offer to present their explanations of their work. However, as tends to be the case when many people are involved, we still do not have all the documents.

We shall send them all to you shortly.

Naturally I am sorry that I did not convey to you clearly enough the philosophy of our objection to the publication of the antivivisectionists documents.

Of course antivivisectionists have a right to express their views. No one, certainly not this society, objects to honest expression of antivivisection opinions. There is, however, one obligation associated with freedom of speech in America. The person who specifically defames the character of another must know what he is talking about.

In other words, abstract opinion enjoys almost complete license but specific, damaging charges against individuals must be backed by evidence.

This is why it seemed to me so anomalous for you, especially, to publish a collection of personal attacks with the comment: "I know nothing of the facts, true or alleged, which are set forth in this material."

It may not satisfy you one bit to know that perhaps my over-strong reaction was due to the very degree of my respect for your identification with the great, warm humanitarian principles of the American law.

This is the psychological phenomenon that make breaches between friends and breaks in families especially emotional.

I sincerely hope that we may soon wash out the bad products of hasty action and hasty reaction.

Sincerely,

RALPH A. ROHWEDER,
*Executive Secretary.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am asking unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain monographs explaining the experiments by the medical scientists upon animals, and setting forth their rebuttals to the antivivisection monographs previously mentioned. I think these scientists are entitled to have this material available for the reading of Senators in exactly the same manner as the antivivisection materials were made available.

Mr. Rohweder has not supplied answers to all the materials I placed in the RECORD on August 21, but he has my assurance that they will be inserted in the RECORD when received. If for any reason I cannot get unanimous consent to have them inserted in the RECORD I want him to know that I will stand on the floor and read them into the RECORD.

## NUCLEAR PROPULSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the people of America have so much interest in the possibilities of a satellite, a space ship, or even a long-range intercontinental ballistic missile that I feel it important that there be some discussion of the

progress we are making in the general field of nuclear propulsion as it might be related to missiles or satellites.

To begin, we would of necessity be discussing what has been called Project Rover. This is the code name for our project for nuclear rockets to propel long range missiles and possibly satellites. I want to make an attempt to indicate what happened to slow down Project Rover, why we are not making very much headway in the study of nuclear propulsion as far as missiles, airplanes, and satellites are concerned, and what we may do to increase the tempo of our activities in this very important field.

This is not an attempt to become involved in arguments as to the politics that may, or may not, be involved in nuclear propulsion. I am going to try to recite the facts, and people can make their own political conclusions from them. Personally, I think we will be better off if we avoid some of the political discussion that could be indulged in, and devote our time to deciding what steps America must take if we are not to lose both the psychological and the military values that are involved in this whole program.

I want to go back to July 1956. At that time Project Rover was adequately financed for the ensuing fiscal year 1957, involving many millions of dollars for construction and operations.

I might say that it is a little embarrassing to keep saying that it was adequately financed by a satisfactory number of millions of dollars. I regret that it is not possible to break down the classification placed on this program, so that the American people may get some idea of the size of the work involved. The program carries a classification tag, even though it seems to me we are not fooling anyone with it but the American people.

We had had a problem in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Atomic Energy Commission had appeared in a special meeting in late June, had testified that it needed some additional money for construction, and had received over $9 million in additional funds through the following steps:

On June 22, 1957 the Atomic Energy Commission came up before the joint committee, at the AEC's own request, to ask for the added $9 million which they said was urgently needed to push ahead the Rover program. In response to this urgent plea the joint committee immediately approved authorization of the extra funds and I remember that I personally made a special visit to the Senate Appropriations Committee the same day, I think it was a Saturday, to ask that the money be made available to AEC. The Appropriations Committee duly approved this request and the money was appropriated.

I cite that because there are some people who say that Congress is responsible for the slowdown of many of these projects. The Atomic Energy Commission came before us at a special meeting one morning, and it placed its recommendation before the Committee on Appropriations the same day.

It is my understanding that the initial AEC request for operating funds for fiscal year 1957 was cut down by about $4 million. Of course, we were then going through a period of study, and were attempting to learn what the future of nuclear propulsion would be insofar as ballistic missiles and satellites might be concerned.

At that time, Mr. Eger Murphree, connected with the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, was a guided missile czar. At least that was his title. He appointed a committee under the chairmanship of General Loper, who is chief of the Military Liaison Committee. There were 10 members on the committee:

Herbert B. Loper, chairman, Nuclear Rocket Propulsion Committee, Assistant Secretary of Defense—Atomic Energy.

J. B. Macauley, special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Research and Development.

J. H. Sides, rear admiral, United States Navy, Deputy to the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Guided Missiles.

Dr. Clark Goodman, assistant director for technical operations, Atomic Energy Commission.

A. R. Luedecke, major general, United States Air Force, chief, Armed Forces Special Weapons Project.

Leland S. Stranathan, major general, United States Air Force, director of development planning, DCS/DEV.

D. J. Keirn, major general, United States Air Force, chief, Aircraft Reactors Branch, Atomic Energy Commission.

Dr. Herbert F. York, director, University of California Radiation Laboratory, Livermore.

Dr. Homer J. Stewart, California Institute of Technology.

Mr. Allen F. Donovan, Ramo-Wooldridge Corp.

The terms of reference of the Loper committee were to determine the prospects of meeting the original requirement for testing the rocket's nuclear powerplant by a certain date within the next few years. The exact date, I am told by the Defense Department, must still remain classified. It is a little difficult to show how this subject was postponed; nevertheless, it is still classified.

The Loper committee made a report and I am not desirous of questioning in any way the wisdom of that report. I do, however, point out that they indulged in a somewhat difficult task. They were charged with the responsibility of determining the prospects of the application of nuclear propulsion to an intercontinental ballistic missile, and to discharge that responsibility, the committee felt that its members should compare the potentials of nuclear propulsion and chemical propulsion devices, which might become available in the same time period. That was a pretty tough assignment.

We knew a lot about chemical propulsion because we had had a good many tests of small chemical devices, and when the Loper committee attempted to predict from these early tests what the properties and capabilities of a superchemical fuel might be in a couple of years, there was no assurance that the estimates were to be correct. The committee members merely did the best that they could to determine what might be the final estimate of propulsion by a superchemical not yet developed, and the qualities of which were not known.

On the other hand, they also had to estimate how nuclear rocket propulsion might work. And this was a shot in the dark. We had never attempted to develop the extremely high temperatures which would naturally accompany nuclear propulsion. Likewise, we had no device in which we had tried to check its lift properties. So in the end, the Loper committee had to guess how a nuclear rocket propulsion device might work. And I do not criticize it for guessing, because that was the purpose of its appointment. In any event, the Loper committee concluded that the AEC should engage in a "prompt effort to demonstrate the technical feasibility" of the project by a specified date within the next several years and should continue at the then existing rate and scale of effort.

To illustrate the difficulty, I was discussing the subject with an expert who had participated in the work, and he said to me, "We were asked to compare oranges with lemons, even though we had never seen the lemons."

At an earlier time in one of our hearings, I developed the fact that project Rover, which is the nuclear rocket propulsion project, was decelerated by the Department of Defense, and that it was the decision of Mr. Murphree to cut back the Rover program even before a formal Loper report was issued. This was discussed at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on January 28, 1957.

I therefore wish to point out that Mr. Murphree, who had spent his life with chemicals and chemical fuels, and gasoline and similar substances, cut back Project Rover before the Loper committee had given him advice as to whether or not Project Rover should be cut back.

I think we need to bear in mind that the decision of Secretary of Defense Wilson did not carry out the recommendation of the Loper committee. In fact, General Loper was not even consulted before the decision was made. The report was ignored by Mr. Murphree and a letter, dated January 12, 1957, was prepared to the AEC for Secretary Wilson's signature which largely negated the original requirement which had been received from the Department of Defense, and established a requirement to demonstrate the feasibility of nuclear propulsion for an application not yet really known. No time was indicated when this should be done, and the words "a modest effort" were used instead of the recommendation that it be done promptly. In other words, there is a big change from a prompt determination to a modest effort to check it out.

The Department of Defense could help clear up this whole situation if it would release the Loper report. I believe that the original requirement was to demonstrate the feasibility of an engine involving nuclear propulsion on a short time scale. I think that the present goal is far from that. We hope to see a first preliminary test of one of the devices in

the next year or two and if it works, we can then proceed to move on to other tests. It will be well into the 1960's before there is a real test of the powerplant that might be used in nuclear propulsion. In any event, the target dates for the project have had to be moved back—and by that I mean delayed—at least 2 years, and maybe more.

This cutback had its significance in the dollars that were assigned to this sort of work. The flow of fiscal 1957 funds for AEC work in nuclear rocket propulsion was held back by the Bureau of the Budget pending the Loper report. That meant that from July, 1956 until January, 1957 the Bureau of the Budget withheld almost all the operating and construction funds allocated for this work. This involved many millions of dollars. Now they allowed some money during this holdup period. They allowed the AEC group interested in the rocket program to go ahead on a month to month ration, but they were not allowed to spend any of the construction money, except $1 million, which went into the laboratory at Livermore, Calif., and there was a little money that went into the design of certain facilities for the Nevada Proving Grounds. But this money for design work was in reality wasted because AEC could not subsequently use the plans which had been prepared and had to junk them and take an entirely new set of plans and go to work.

In the early part of January, 1957 the Bureau of the Budget on the basis of the letter from Secretary Wilson saying that "a modest effort" should be made, reduced the construction funds $10 million from the total appropriated by the Congress and approved by the President. Well, a million dollars had already been spent at Livermore, so that had to be subtracted from the remaining funds. The operating funds at that time were cut by nearly $6 million. That, of course, meant that the work could not proceed at both Livermore and Los Alamos, and the AEC therefore had to choose the laboratory that seemed to have the most capability and the best approach to the problem, and cut out work on Project Rover at the other laboratory. The decision was reached to go ahead at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory and assign certain other work to the Livermore laboratory. There just was not enough money for both laboratories to operate, and I want to suggest now that I think it would have been well if both laboratories had been allowed to proceed.

Anyhow, Project Rover was assigned to the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory the end of January 1957, and another related project under a classified code name was assigned to Livermore.

I regret that some newspaper people have cited to me the code name, but I still cannot use it. Incidentally, this is a very promising project, and nothing should be allowed to interfere with the progress that is being made and can be made on that. The money that had been spent at Livermore, and the group of people who had been brought together for Project Rover at Livermore were identically the kind of facilities and the types of people needed in this other classified project and, therefore, the effort which was going on at Livermore on Project Rover could be, and was, successfully and properly diverted to work on this project, and this was done and I think successfully.

The budget for fiscal 1958 did not allow any more funds for construction for Rover because of the late date of getting started on the 1957 funds. Obviously, since the Atomic Energy Commission could not commit all these funds in the few remaining months of fiscal year 1957, asking for more funds for fiscal year 1958, which obviously could not be spent, would have been a little absurd. The AEC was allowed an operating budget for fiscal 1958 which was a little less than that for fiscal 1957. The ground rules for 1959, which were indicated to AEC, were that efforts were to be carried on at approximately the same level as 1958. The net result has been the moving back or delaying of the target date for demonstration of feasibility by at least 2 years from that which was set out in the directive to the Loper committee.

Now I have had it reported to me that the AEC had planned to accelerate the Project Rover expenditures and had planned to use for fiscal 1958 about $20 million more than has actually been allotted. I believe that the planning experts, or those in charge of the program at AEC, would admit that that was about the 1958 figure which they hoped to reach. Of course, Livermore was included in the program at that time and when the Bureau of the Budget clamped down unilaterally in January 1957, AEC's original planning figure was completely unrealistic and, therefore, it had to be abandoned.

I know we have a fiscal 1959 budget before us, and I suppose that the dollars for the Rover program will be carried in that somewhere and will be revealed in time to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to other proper members of the Congress. But it undoubtedly will not request added authorization for construction money because the original authorization which was in the 1957 budget has never been withdrawn from the books. The AEC has a $10 million authorization left over from the previous cutbacks, and if they go ahead with their present plans, this construction work will probably stay well within the authorization figure.

I do not wish to be understood as saying that there are no other funds for the nuclear propelled rocket program because the Air Force does have some money for this purpose. In 1957 it was authorized to spend a few million dollars and then again in 1958 an additional few million dollars on the studies and development of airframes, tanks, pumps, and so forth, associated with the nuclear propelled rocket. AEC will probably not have the responsibility for the airframe that undoubtedly should belong with the Air Force, but these groups have been working well together, and I think that they will probably continue to get along very nicely.

The important point for some of us to remember is that a missile to go to the moon, for example, or a vehicle to travel in outer space, cannot just be suddenly concocted out of a bucket load of chemicals. I do not hesitate to say that on the basis of information I have gathered from scientists, I do not believe we will ever have a missile capable of going to the moon and back again unless it be nuclear propelled. Bear in mind that it will take about 3 million pounds of lift, according to those who have done some calculating, to get off the ground a missile that is capable of going to the moon. If that estimate is accurate, we now have no engines that will give anywhere near that amount, even when you group a great battery of them together in a single device like the Atlas, and if we cannot get more than that from the Atlas engines, we would surely have a hard time in building a chemically fired engine that would give a lift of 3 million pounds. So when people talk about putting manned missiles or space vehicles on the moon, they are probably talking about waiting until we attain nuclear rocket propulsion, and that is why it is important to speed up nuclear propulsion in this country.

I cannot speak here of the comparative strength of a nuclear engine of this size because the lift of our largest chemical rocket engine is still classified.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not nuclear energy possess certain other characteristics which chemical fuels do not possess, and which would cause it to be an effective—perhaps the only effective—source of energy to be used in the areas beyond the earth's atmosphere?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee, who has certainly been a diligent member of the committee in trying to examine these questions, that it possesses certain qualities which are very valuable.

Many of us who have been down under the sea in the *Nautilus* were impressed by the fact that the *Nautilus*, once launched under an icecap, can navigate under it for months, if need be, before returning to discharge its passengers.

One man in the *Nautilus* said, one evening, when a group of us were aboard, "If you wanted to test the real capability of the *Nautilus*, the only thing which need ever bring it back to harbor would be the necessity for allowing the sailors to reenlist." The *Nautilus* could stay under the sea, as it has done, and cross the oceans indefinitely.

The same general qualities apply to a nuclear-propelled projectile, when we once have it. We will not only put it up in the sky, but we will be able to keep it there for a long time, if we desire to do so.

Furthermore, in the case of intercontinental ballistic missiles, we all recognize that if a missile is to be fired with a relatively low trajectory and is designed to hit a target of an area of only 5 miles, the problem is much more difficult than one in which the missile can be tossed into a higher trajectory and be brought

down again, as in the case of a nuclear rocket.

Anyone who doubts this should try to toss a basketball into a wastebasket.

This high trajectory possibility has attracted the attention of scientists who are greatly interested in nuclear propulsion for the intercontinental ballistic missile. There are other interesting situations which arise in connection with the ICBM—and to which I shall refer later.

A three-stage weapon is a very cumbersome object to put into the air. Its weight—that of the heavy warhead and the three heavy engines—is so great that the delicate machinery inside might have a tendency to fail. One little valve caused trouble in one of our missiles the other day.

The Senator from Tennessee knows that there is hardly a part of the *Nautilus* which was not built in duplicate. That was to make certain that the *Nautilus* would continue to traverse the ocean. Then a path was laid out for it once it was under the water. There is a great factor of safety built into it by extra parts.

A great factor of safety was built into every atomic bomb I ever looked at, and certainly in every hydrogen bomb, so that if one system of ignition failed, something else would be there to do the job.

But we cannot afford to follow that practice in the case of a chemically-fueled intercontinental ballistic missile. As I say, the problem is so great that we can have one chance, and one only. If a single valve fails, as it did a short time ago in one of our tests, the whole missile fails.

A nuclear-propelled device would be wholly different. Extra safety factors can be added, if desired. By a small change in the fuel supply of the nuclear element, it can be made certain that the lift will be tremendously increased. Therefore, the possibility exists that guidance systems can be added which will be far more cumbersome and far heavier than the guidance systems we are now talking about.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I said earlier on the floor that I agreed with the statement which President Eisenhower made in his state of the Union message that this country had failed to see the political and psychological effect of the Russian breakthrough in launching a satellite. That has an important effect.

We might as well acknowledge that the Russians have stolen a march on the United States; that they have beaten us to the launching of a satellite by means of chemical propulsion.

Overtake them we must. But there is not so much drama, there is not the impact on world public opinion involved in overtaking the Russians in a similar launching that there would be in leapfrogging the Russians, so to speak, and beating them to the launching of a manned satellite or space vehicle with controlled mobility.

Mr. ANDERSON. I could not agree more with the Senator. Furthermore, I might point out that at one time the Air Force had placed upon it the responsibility for a part of the program in this country for the development of plans for a large space satellite. I understand that one of our Government officials, when asked about this project, which had the code name "World Series," said he had never heard of it. I can only say that I had heard of it, and that many others who are interested in this program had heard of it.

It was a program which proposed that, ahead of the schedule of the Russians, we put into the heavens a satellite which would have carried a payload of at least 200 pounds. That included scientific equipment. At a later time, a satellite would have been launched carrying a payload which may have run from 1,000 to 5,000 pounds.

I think it is too bad that we did not do that. But, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, having failed in that regard, we will not have very much psychological advantage if we put into orbit something which weighs only about 1,100 pounds, as the Russian satellite does. We must talk about something else, it seems to me, which will have far greater possibilities.

If we could utilize some of the genius which I think we still have in this country, we might be able, as the Senator says, to leapfrog to these accomplishments.

I refer now to a talk I made at Rochester, N. Y., a couple of years ago to a conference on high energy nuclear physics. During the afternoon I had an opportunity to visit with a number of scientists who had been associated with the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, some of whom I had met at the time they were at Los Alamos. I stopped a scientist and asked him if he had any regrets about the period of time he spent on that rocky cliff at Los Alamos.

"Oh, yes," he said, "very great regrets, because as we went down the main highway, determined to build a bomb, we saw so many other interesting side roads we would have liked to follow, most interesting paths leading off into the most scientific, entrancing possibilities. But we had to push them away, forget them, and go on to the main goal, which was the bomb."

One of the interesting and fascinating sideroads they would have liked to follow was the possibility of putting a satellite into the sky. Ideas were conceived then which I believe should have been followed.

But I want to return to my statement that, in my belief—and this is not the estimate of scientists; it is just from my own discussions with men who are scientists—it will take 3 million pounds of lift to put on the moon a space vehicle which might be brought back. We do not have any means by which we can do that unless we use nuclear power.

So when men talk about putting space vehicles on the moon, they will probably have to wait until nuclear propulsion can be attained.

If we think that there are certain psychological advantages in space travel, interplanetary travel, and journeys to the moon or in the setting up of space platforms, then by all means we should be pushing the work in the development of nuclear rocket propulsion. Some persons have the idea of placing in the sky a great space platform. If we proceed by means of nuclear propulsion, rockets will probably be used in that connection; but nuclear propulsion must be used.

Furthermore, there is a possibility, and I list it only as a possibility, that we may find that even a 5,000-mile intercontinental ballistic missile will have to be nuclear propelled if it is going to have great reliability. I can conceive of our learning that the Atlas and Titan, well-designed though they may be, will have some possibilities of failure, and will not be as reliable as we want them to be. We just can not send up missiles with nuclear warheads unless we are sure they are going to reach the target for which they are intended and will not drop onto some friendly land between America and the target zone. So we shall want to be careful that each will reach its intended target.

Therefore, in order to press forward vigorously and effectively in developing nuclear rocket propulsion, we need a program that has clear objectives, even if they can not be too precise at this stage of the game. We also need clear lines of authority and steady support for the program, so it can be pursued to a successful conclusion at the earliest possible time.

In brief, I hope we do not get into the same fix we have been in for over 10 years with the aircraft nuclear propulsion program. Beginning with the old NEPA project in 1946, the ANP program has been characterized by ups and downs in funding, by on-again-off-again planning, and by an administrative setup that has been just short of chaotic at times. So far as I can see, there never have been any real clear objectives, nor have the contractors been able to find out where the program is going from year to year. In 1953, Secretary Wilson attempted to kill the project outright; but thanks to the intervention of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—and particularly through the efforts of MELVIN PRICE and the late Carl Hinshaw of the other House—it was kept going somehow. After 10 long years of this merry-go-round, it now appears that the project is once again getting back on its feet. But it has been a long and costly wait.

The point is that if we really need nuclear-rocket propulsion for missiles and for space travel—and I think we must have it—we are going to need some clear-cut objectives to aim for and a well-administered program to see that we get these promptly. Prospects of developing space platforms and taking trips to the moon give a whole new dimension to our life, and we must be prepared to cope with the situation.

One of the most important factors in connection with whether we succeed or fail in this new era is how well we

organize and conduct our scientific development efforts. It seems logical to me that since flight into space will require some form of nuclear propulsion, one alternative to be considered is to have the Atomic Energy Commission and some of its laboratories, such as that at Los Alamos, take on the development job. This would have the advantage of utilizing going organizations who are familiar with the kind of work which will be required.

Another alternative would be to set up a separate Government agency under civilian management, in which centralized responsibility would be vested, for space development plans. Such an agency could proceed to coordinate scientific efforts on space development throughout the country and overseas the construction of facilities for its own research and development work.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, an excellent study on the formation of a "Space Commission" and a prospective on Space Research in Operation, which were prepared by a special committee of the Los Alamos, N. Mex., chapter of the Federation of American Scientists.

Mr. President, I wish to say that these came about in a strange fashion. I got together a group of perhaps a dozen scientists who are very much interested in this field. I asked them, "If you were to handle it, if you were the responsible agency in Washington, and if you were given the task, how would you go about setting it up?"

They said, "Come back later."

When I returned, later, they had prepared the material which I now submit. It gives their viewpoint. It is not necessarily the final one. But whatever the steps which are taken, I would expect that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will be taking an active and continuing interest in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this subject is not new with me or with the other members of the Joint Committee. Back in June and July of 1955, I sent to the President two letters, cosigned by the junior Senator from Washington, Mr. JACKSON, who is chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee, emphasizing the importance to the Nation's future strength and security of a vigorous program—on a wartime footing—to develop an operational ICBM at the earliest possible moment.

On April 6, 1956, I spoke to the Sixth Annual Conference on High Energy Nuclear Physics, at Rochester, N. Y., and I should like to quote several comments from that talk:

From page 4:

Moreover, we should not restrict ourselves merely to consideration of hazards implicit in wars of annihilation with atomic weapons. In technology applied to military ends, novelty is ever a prime goal.

From page 10:

We may think of climate control or worldwide weather modification. Recent advances in meteorology suggest that efforts in this direction may produce useful results some time in the future.

Another example on a large scale which inevitably crosses national boundaries is the project to send a rocket into outer space. Purely from a geographical viewpoint, efforts to send missiles and ultimately passengers to the moon and the nearby planets are of worldwide interest.

Mr. President, that was in April 1956—some time ago. At that time I received some interesting comments, as a result of that discussion. The text of my remarks was sent to all the members of the Federation of American Scientists; and there came to my office hundreds of letters suggesting that something should be done. After much consultation with members of the joint committee, Senate Resolution 295 was prepared. It proposed that the United States spend some time in this field, and that perhaps we set up a world laboratory to work on this outer-space problem or at least on such research.

In the normal course of events the resolution was referred by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to the Foreign Relations Committee. It requested the viewpoint of the Department of State. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the text of Senate Resolution 295; the report of the Department of State. This report is particularly significant in view of the statement made by the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], before the meeting of CBS Affiliates at the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington, D. C., a few days ago, which I thought was very fine.

At that time—in 1956 when Senate Resolution 295 was introduced—the Department of State said:

As to the establishment of a world laboratory, experience indicates that greater promise lies in national efforts developed on a cooperative, or better still on a coordinated basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the course of my remarks at Rochester, N. Y., in April 1956, I also said:

While the intensely nationalist feelings characterizing international relations on our planet at the present time suggest that we may even see, as a result of interplanetary travel, an extension of the competitive colonialism which the last century saw for the backward areas of this planet, the prospect of seeing different sections of Mars staked out by different national governments of this earth seems on the face of it ludicrous. Are we trying to play God and develop a new planet in our own image and likeness? A much more rational and probably more productive basis for the exploration and development of other worlds would be under an organization which properly reflects the common interests of all the peoples of this earth in such development. The Man in the Moon belongs to the children of every country, is a part of their dreamworld, and if reached by space ship, might better remain the property of all.

Returning now, however, from the fanciful and the future to the more immediate problems of initial efforts to get a space ship away from the earth, we recognize hazards of a rather severe sort which may arise as a result of the erroneous function of a space missile intended for the moon but which instead, through defective mechanism or planning, lands on the territory of another nation. If such a nation were at that time in an advanced state of tension in anticipation of a possible attack, this simple error might touch off the spark of world conflict.

Which brings me to the competitive race to develop an intercontinental ballistic missile. We in the American Congress have already learned that it would be a drain on all our budgets if that race should set a pattern in the whole field of space conquest. Russia and this country are working at high speed toward the attainment of an intercontinental ballistic missile, called by many "the ultimate weapon." Yet if the missile were to be attained almost simultaneously and prove to be as accurate as now forecast, if indeed it could carry atomic warheads with a striking power of several kilotons and place them within the area of a small circle, then no city in the world is safe, no jet interceptor can police the skies and no highway can promise egress from the affected area. In that day the people of the earth would banish the weapon as poison gas was outlawed in World War II, but only after the expenditure of fantastic sums of money, materials and scientific skills.

Might it not be better to examine the chance to use space conquest as another project for an international laboratory? If we will never use this weapon once we achieve it, might it not be set aside as one segment of worldwide competition that could be surrendered to the effort to halt the race for a full arsenal of atomic arms in every land?

From page 15:

It is to that problem that I have directed these words. If the great powers find themselves in an atomic stalemate today—and I think they do—it is a carryover of patterns of national security which modern science has rendered obsolete. The military techniques which might emerge from the new areas of technology that I have been discussing can make the stalemate no worse. Already it is at a level in which any major power can precipitate almost total destruction upon an adversary (and in return upon itself) if it should make so tragic an error in judgment. Yet there is the danger that if these new areas of technology are developed in secret, some nation which at some future time is led by reckless rulers, may feel that it has gained so great a lead in some field of science that it may dare to launch an attack for world conquest. While this error in judgment will almost certainly be answered by mutual annihilation approaching totality, every effort must be bent while still we have the chance to prevent such dreadful miscalculations from occurring. Scientists, it seems to me, might suggest to the statesmen that modern technology could make the greatest contribution to the security of great powers if statesmen would move as far as possible from the secret competitive development of technologies under which we have largely operated in recent years. The scientists might urge, indeed, that the race for atomic arms could best be halted by having new fields of science developed jointly by all nations.

It is that theme which I am happy to see stressed by so many leaders today.

Mr. President, the following statement was issued today by Hon. Carl T. Durham, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

I believe that what my associates on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have been saying today on the need to conquer outer space is very important for the security and prestige of this country.

We on the joint committee have been concerned with bold projects for many years. The development of the H-bomb and the *Nautilus* are examples. So also are peacetime proposals such as an accelerated atomic power program.

We consider this challenge of the conquest of outer space so important that I am appointing a special subcommittee on outer space propulsion to consider means of accelerating this country's efforts in this field. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, who is vice chairman of the full committee and who has long been interestd in nuclear-rocket propulsion, has kindly consented to serve as chairman of this subcommittee. I would hope that the members of the committee in the House and in the Senate who have a special interest in this program will consent to serve on the subcommittee.

I expect that the subcommittee will be established and in operation following the executive hearings being held next week on this subject by the research and development and the military applications subcommittees.

---

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT ON THE FORMATION OF A SPACE COMMISSION BY A SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS, LOS ALAMOS (N. MEX.) CHAPTER, DAVID L. HILL, CHAPTER CHAIRMAN

Recent startling developments have pointed out for all the world to see that we have fallen dangerously behind the U. S. S. R. in the development and exploitation of science in the national interest. This hard fact is not surprising to anyone who has followed recent trends in the support and encouragement of Soviet science, including education, as opposed to our reluctance to place the proper emphasis on intellectual endeavors. Indeed the past few years have seen the emergence of an anti-intellectual climate and an atmosphere of smug self-satisfaction which places a premium on conformity and finds us woefully unprepared to meet the current challenge.

The root of the difficulties in which we find ourselves is in the system which places the military in such close control of scientific research and development.

After a long history of resisting and attempting to discard such developments as the steamboat, submarine, smokeless powder, radio, airplane, atomic submarine, atomic bomb, and so forth, the military, in the short space of ten-odd years has become scientifically inclined to the extent of investing large amounts of time and money in research. To be sure, in the absence of other support this was better than nothing; however, there is considerable doubt in the scientific community as to the ability of the military to conduct scientific research in such a manner as to produce optimal results for a given expenditure of time, talent, and money. The military has a long history of tradition for the sake of tradition, interservice rivalry and bickering, and a discouraging lack of imagination in scientific matters.

In view of all this, together with the success of the civilian Atomic Energy Commission, there seems to be little wisdom in permitting the military to continue to exercise direct control over such a large fraction of the talent and money devoted to research today. This is especially true in the case of research pertaining to space travel, satellites, and ultraterrestrial research in general. It is obvious that for maximum scientific productivity this research should be done in a climate unfettered by narrow traditions, not unduly restricted by precedent and free from the "orders" of a ranking officer.

We suggest one way in which these ends can be achieved. This is by the formation of a civilian Space Commission modeled after the Atomic Energy Commission, which has long since proved the wisdom shown in its formation.

In forming this Space Commission a few mistakes made in setting up the AEC could be rectified.

The Commission should comprise 5 to 7 members, and at least 3 to 4 of these should be scientists, the chairmanship being held by a scientist well experienced in scientific administration. Also included should be one representative each from industry and the military. As in the AEC, this Commission would report to the President and be empowered to request and receive appropriations from Congress. It would have the authority to decide what avenues of research (applied or basic) would yield the most profitable results for a given expenditure of time, talent, and money.

The establishment and staffing of the laboratories devoted to ultraterrestrial research would be one of its prime responsibilities. The Commission is to have the authority and stature commensurate with its responsibilities. It should have all necessary authority to decide an issue on its scientific merits without regard to irrelevant political considerations of interservice rivalry.

It is believed that with such a Commission the talent that is now widely dispersed would gravitate into work sponsored by this Commission resulting in the assemblage of our most able scientists in a well-coordinated organization. Such an organization is essential if we mean to regain the ground lost under the present system.

While the establishment of a Space Commission will do much toward giving order to a very disordered system, it is felt that much more can be done toward giving science and technology its proper place in the national picture.

The most important single step would be the creation of a Department of Science and Technology with full Cabinet status. It seems clear that the contributions of science and technology to the commerce, health, and living standard of our Nation make such a move mandatory. We know of no other field of human endeavor that has given anywhere near that of science to the peoples of the United States and the world in general. There is no doubt that almost all of our commerce today was created by science or at least depends heavily on it. (An excellent case in point is the television industry which has been created by science and technology in the space of fifteen-odd years, and is over a $5 billion industry.) Yet, we do not have a Department of Science and Technology while the need for a Department of Commerce seems clear to everyone. We, therefore, suggest that all steps necessary for the creation of a Department of Science and Technology be taken at once in order that science and technology may have its proper place in our society as soon as possible.

PROSPECTIVE ON SPACE RESEARCH IN OPERATION

America is faced with the elementary need for those tools which will insure our survival in the face of Russian advances in science and technology. The need is much broader than the word "missile" would imply although it has been strikingly demonstrated in these past few months for all the world to see by the Russian successes with earth satellites. We will consider the root causes for the slow start and then recognize the splendid opportunity afforded America for world leadership in the challenging and exciting new area of outer space research, and the technological harvest the Nation will reap from a properly oriented and organized program. It is manifest that in a sensible approach to the organization of a space research and development program, we will take advantage of this opportunity to win men's hearts and minds and not be content with narrow military objectives alone.

*A. International aspects of space travel*

Missiles, experimental satellites, and space platforms are but the steppingstones toward space operations and space travel. The idea of space travel has fired the enthusiasm of men. We propose that the United States combine the best of nationalism and of internationalism in its approach. Let us be nationalistic to the extent that we move ahead vigorously with our own resources without permitting the redtape of international agreements to delay our research and development. On the other hand, let us be international by having our laboratories open to the scientists of many lands and perhaps of all lands. Let them be welcome to come and join with us in our effort. Initially, they may come as guests, but soon such a program might lead to joint support from the government of many nations. Thus we may succeed in diverting the military threat of competitive nationalistic conquest of space. By turning men's minds away from missiles as a new arm of war, and directing their attention instead on the conquest of the new frontier, great resources of enthusiasm and good will may be mobilized around the world and redound to the benefit of the United States.

It is implicit in this suggestion that the work will be unclassified because we believe such an approach will be relatively more advantageous to the United States. This view is supported by the current failures of the classified approach in the missile field.

*B. The value of extraterrestrial travel*

We are unable now to evaluate in any quantitative way the worth to mankind of traveling to the moon, to the nearby planets or into outer space. However, the restless and inquiring spirit of man has throughout the ages pressed on wherever there were frontiers. The rewards of this search for knowledge are manifest. They include the very clothes we wear and the books we read. Our civilization is the composite of these outpourings of the inquiring spirit. Let the attention and energy of men be diverted away from this troubled planet of armed camps in which we live, and diverted toward the conquest of outer space instead of toward the conquest of each other.

*C. National planning for nonmilitary objectives*

Recent events have highlighted that the principal national planning for scientific research and development is in connection with military objectives. As a consequence the cultural and economic objectives of the United States, as well as its concern with maintaining prestige in the community of nations, has suffered because we as a government refuse to create appropriate authority for planning toward nonmilitary objectives. The present work of the National Science Foundation, as well as of certain other agencies, is of great value to our country. However, in order to be really effective this work must be amplified and must be placed at a higher level of operational authority in the Government. The creativity and productive power of private individuals, private institutions, and corporations may be aroused by such an authority to make their proper contribution to the national interest.

*D. The fountainhead of military strength*

In the present age of advanced technology, the defense of a country depends increasingly upon the wealth of scientific principles available for creation of military devices. By training and by delegated responsibility, however, the military people themselves cannot be expected properly to encourage and to support fundamental scientific research. Military decisions must always be taken in terms of present defense and military strength of the immediate future. Long-range commitments to scientific research having no forseeable application will always tend to be abused and sidetracked by a military directorate. Thus the necessarily restrictive military interest itself demands that an agency equivalent in authority, prestige and budgetary priority to the Department of Defense, itself, should be created to assure the optimum growth of our national science program. Its task should be to provide funds where needed, and to assure that the freedom of individual enterprise and incentive as required for creative work in science should always be present.

*E. Organizational approach*

The injury to our missiles program arising from intraservice rivalries and disputes has been sufficiently well publicized that it need require no comment here. Although the present missiles program should probably move toward the achievement of the immediate objectives under approximately the present organization, it is clear that the next generation of missiles should be mothered by an authority operating separately from, and independent of, the Department of Defense and its fighting subdivisions.

The research and development for our missiles program is presently under a diffuse structure which we shall call industrial producers type of organization. We believe this type of organization to be faulty and we propose instead a project-center type of organization for research and development. The industrial producers type of overall organization has a number of defects, including the following:

1. Research in fundamental science is not germane to the short-term profit interests of an industrial corporation. Hence with rare exceptions industrial producers do not have an adequate assembly of scientists.

2. When the aircraft companies were given the responsibility for research and development on missiles, they attempted to remedy their scienific staff deficiencies by going into the personnel market with disruptive salary offers to buy the necessary personnel to provide adequate contract proposals and then to fulfill their contract commitments. These hiring practices of the aircraft companies served to uproot many hundreds of scientists from places in which they were effectively contributing to the national defense.

3. The newly employed scientists were, with rare exceptions, utilized ineffectively and in many cases are still not being utilized effectively in the aircraft companies. In many cases, singly or in small groups, scientists are assigned problems to work on which can be effectively treated only by a substantial number of men working together. Thus there are not enough men together to make an effective or critical group.

4. Communication barriers between the companies prevent scientists in different parts of the country, who are assigned to work on closely related problems, from learning of the activities of their fellows. The natural difficulties of communicating between geographically separated companies are worsened by the proprietary interests of different industrial producers, which prevent them from making available to other industrial producers the information which one company may have uncovered.

5. Coordination of work by subcontractors has been, in the main, faulty. Thus missiles are assembled of components each of which may be satisfactorily meeting its specifications, but the overall assembly suffers because systems analysis for the unit as a whole has been inadequate. Many early failures of our missiles can be traced to the absence of sufficient overall coordination between the different companies contributing component parts to the missile.

6. Because each small team of scientists knows that there are probably several other teams trying to do the same thing, the sense of urgency on a given team, as far as the national program is concerned, is diminished. When the frustrations from inadequate staffing and the difficulties of communication become too wearisome, it is easy for a team to relax somewhat, assuming that somebody else will accomplish the job they find too tiresome to do.

7. A research and development program which must be closely coordinated to receiving and holding a contract for a specific job is defective for at least two reasons:

(a) The rush in each company to try to get a slice of Government money available in a given area of missile development leads to chaotic research conditions, with poorly conceived plans patched together to try to submit a proposal as soon as required for bidding. Such a proposal is very likely inadequate and in addition the pressure for its conception and preparation drains away manpower which should be left free for long-range research.

(b) In the present organizational setup, the research programs are in general closely tied to production and are subject to the same vagaries in support as are the production items. Thus, the continuity is lacking for the continuing long-term research necessary to make breakthroughs into new principles and methods; moreover, the knowledge in the scientific world that such impermanence of research operations is characteristic of the industrial producer, inhibits the ability of the company to acquire the highest caliber of scientific personnel.

8. The proprietary interests of the various industrial producers now engaged in the missiles program are providing a chief bottleneck for progress in this field. The Ramo Wooldridge Corp., which has the responsibility of receiving information on activities throughout the missiles field is unable to transmit to one company information which it receives from another because of the restriction of proprietary interests. Not only would it clearly be in the national interest to have free and complete exchange of information between companies, but would probably also be in the interests of the companies themselves in permitting each to achieve more efficient and rapid results. However, under the present system the old tradition of proprietary interests is tending to blind management to the necessity for a new mode of operation.

The characteristics listed above indicate why the industrial producer's approach has bungled our missiles effort.

In contrast, the project center type of organization was highly successful in the early years of the atomic energy project and also in the development and application of radar. Some of the advantages of the project center type of approach are the following:

1. Responsibility for achieving the proposed program is uniquely delegated to the project. Thus the highest sense of urgency is generated which leads to (a) the fullest dedication of the individual staff members to the task at hand, and (b) attracts into the project organization concerned scientists who wish to be sure they may go where they can make the maximum contribution to the Nation.

2. Scientists are brought together in one laboratory or at least into laboratories which are in close communication so that a sufficient number of people are available to form a "critical" or reactive unit for solving each particular problem.

3. A diversity of backgrounds, approaches and disciplines may be assembled in one large interacting project such that a minimum of delay is involved in working out new fields that require the merger of several disciplines and technologies.

4. The established objective is understanding of scientific principles and achievement of successful application. These objectives lead to better research results than the objectives mentioned above of rushing together some sort of contract application or, in general, trying to direct operations in such a manner as to be profitable from the short-range point of view.

5. Continuity of support for a research program is usually available so that the top-grade scientists are willing to make the investment of the years of time sometimes necessary to achieve significant advances.

6. The production of devices need not be done by the project organization itself. Once the specifications have been drawn as the result of the fullest liaison between scientists and engineers, then the work of production itself may be done in existing shops which are mostly under the roofs of the industrial producers. Industry moreover is accustomed to handling business this way and likes to receive a well-defined set of specifications and simply do the job as defined.

7. The organization operating the project should be neither a profit-seeking corporation nor directly an agency of the Government. The difficulties which the profit motive interposes in the conduct of long-range research and development have already been noted. The disadvantage of direct Government operation is the excessive amount of redtape which is then involved. Optimum operation apparently comes from a private nonprofit foundation or some other private agency which may operate the project on a cost basis for the Government.

8. When deserving programs of research have been conceived, there should be a minimum of difficulty in obtaining financial support for the research. A general defect at present in our country is that inadequate sums are available for the fundamental basic research that alone can generate the knowledge on which subsequent power over nature must rest. We have grown accustomed to spending large sums of money for engineering development but have not as a Nation yet come to understand that basic research itself is the source of all subsequent applications. Moreover, it must be emphasized that the criteria for the support of basic research should not be the existence of an immediate or apparent application of the results. Such criteria would inhibit the very creative process which is the objective of fundamental or basic research. It is to be observed that such an organization would avoid the fragmentation of effort characteristic of the present producer's approach.

*F. Incentives*

Clearly, if our system of free enterprise deserves to win out in the industrial competition with the Communist bloc of peoples, then it should be able to win the competition by the intelligent mobilization of the individual initiative, enterprise and resource of the free world. To some extent, the present mode of operation of the missiles program is a blundering effort to do just this. However, it seems apparent that we cannot longer afford to operate in a manner handicapped by the present difficulty of industrial producers in carrying on adequate scientific research programs. For the industrial production itself, we may continue to rely with confidence on our large industrial producers.

A review suggests that we, as a capitalistic country, have been exceedingly slow to apply capitalistic incentive to promote fundamental scientific research. Here we notice an amusing contrast with Communist Russia where tax-free prizes of large amounts have long been given to provide capitalistic incentive to the work of Soviet scientists. It is suggested that in the field of space research and operations, as well as in other important scientific areas, salary scales should reflect the importance of science to our society. In addition, a number of large prizes might be established for scientists and engineers. Such prizes might be offered for (1) ideas that come into use in national laboratories, world laboratories or elsewhere, even though such use is for research purposes only, and therefore not commercially rewarding. The size of the prizes might be determined by (a) the singularity of the idea involved, (b) the priority of the idea; (2) a second basis for prize awards would simply be the best papers in a given field each year.

From a long-range point of view, much has been appropriately said about the anti-intellectualism in America which discourages many talented youngsters from going into scientific careers, and much has also been well said about the inadequate level of science training available in our grade schools and high schools. We recognize these problems but do not dwell upon them here. Our objective in these comments has been to set a framework in terms of general comments, supplemented by specific suggestions, which we hope will permit an early, positive showing of results in recovering for America its position of leadership in this area of science and technology.

Although we have in this discussion for timely reasons concentrated upon space research and operations and termed this area of technology as the new frontier, it should be remarked that the nature of scientific progress has been such that new frontiers are ever opening to mankind and will probably continue to do so. Thus, the need for and justification of a Department of Science is even broader and stronger than its value in supporting science as it may apply in time toward our position in space research and operations. It is only that this field provides at the present time a most dramatic evidence of our need for a properly coordinated support of scientific research in this country.

We believe that much of the remedy for the dismaying state of our present missiles and space research program must come through legislation of imaginative and courageous conception. We believe that the fundamental defect in the present situation stems from our failure as a nation to comprehend the challenge of the new area of technology now opening for the conquest of outer space. It is imperative that America be set on the right track in moving into this great new endeavor. The above comments represent an effort to outline the character of legislation which would (1) mobilize the great energies and talent of the free world toward outer space research, (2) have the early effect of strengthening our military posture, and (3) cast our effort in such a form that it may tend to draw together the peoples of the world, and permit in the foreseeable future the full conversion of military postures into attitudes of cooperation of all peoples in the conquest of outer space.

---

EXHIBIT B

Senate Resolution 295

Whereas the principles which underlie scientific progress are universal in their application;

Whereas history reveals that all nations benefit from the cross-fertilization of ideas among the scientists of all nations;

Whereas the great progress of the United States in atomic energy and many other scientific fields has been furthered by the work of scientists of other nations;

Whereas the excessive isolation of basic scientific research behind rigid national walls breeds suspicion and may tend to divert a disproportionate part of the scientific effort to destructive rather than constructive effort;

Whereas greater communication and contact and common effort among the leading scientists of the world will produce more intensive progress in such fields as medicine, nuclear energy, weather control, and the solution of the mysteries of outer space, which will be of lasting benefit to all mankind; and

Whereas the present year, being the International Geophysical Year in which all nations are cooperating in meteorological research, provides a fitting occasion for the advancement of international scientific cooperation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States explore with other nations, through such channels as he finds appropriate—

(1) the means of conferring on an outstanding scientist in each of the major scientific fields, selected annually on the basis of contribution to the good of mankind, regardless of nationality, an honorary world passport;

(2) the means of creating a world laboratory to serve as a center of advanced scientific research and to supplement and facilitate national efforts in this connection; and

(3) the means of giving additional encouragement to the travel and exchange of scientists throughout the world and the exchange of scientific information.

SEC. 2. On the basis of such exploration, the President shall make suitable recommendations to the Congress.

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, July 12, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Reference is made to your letter dated June 26, 1956, addressed to the Secretary, requesting the Department's comments on Senate Resolution 295 introduced by Senator ANDERSON June 25, 1956, favoring steps for the advancement of international scientific research.

The Department is in sympathy with the broad objectives in the resolution of encouraging international exchange of scientists and scientific information. Its general comment on the measure is that the extension of the traditional national and international procedures does not appear necessary for achieving these ends. Its particular comment is that endeavors toward the issuance of honorary world passports and the establishment of a world laboratory are likely to encounter stubborn articles.

As you know, the Department has for some time administered exchange of persons programs in which opportunities have been provided for American scientists to study, teach and lecture abroad, and for foreign scientists to carry on similar activities in this country. It has encouraged private exchange programs, international scientific assemblies, and private travel by extending its advice and lending its facilities. Also, the Department has stimulated the interchange of scientific information through formal exchange agreements with foreign countries and through informal arrangements. It has also assisted private programs for scientific information exchange. Other departments and agencies of the Government carry on similar programs. Beyond these activities, the United States had contributed to the United Nations for the purpose of carrying out programs for the international exchange of scientists and scientific information. Thus, procedures and mechanisms already exist for the encouragement of scientific progress. It is the Department's view that these might well continue to be utilized to achieve the broad aims envisaged in the resolution.

Issuance of honorary world passports raises such practical questions as the constituted issuing authority, the likelihood of appropriate changes in national laws, and the matter of selecting outstanding scientists for such honor. This section of the resolution, moreover, may be regarded as discriminatory. In any event, an honorary passport would not in itself guarantee free mobility since many nations require a visa for entry.

As to the establishment of a world laboratory, experience indicates that greater promise lies in national efforts developed on a cooperative, or better still on a coordinated basis. Further, it is believed that the demand for such a laboratory originating from scientists themselves would insure greater success than would the initiation of such an establishment through Goverment auspices.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL
(For the Secretary of State).

---

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, BEFORE A MEETING OF CBS AFFILIATES, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

I am here today to speak to a group which has a grave responsibility for informing our people.

In the Chamber of the Senate of the United States, I am the designated leader of the majority party. That is a title of which I am proud but one which carries with it responsibilities that would cause any man to be humble. But it is a designation which, for this occasion, I have left behind.

I am not here as a Democrat.

I am not here as a leader of the Senate.

I am here as an American.

In this town, we have the habit of dividing all things by lines of affiliation: the offices, the jobs, the various positions, and, sometimes, even our judgments.

At this hour in our history, I, for one, believe that there are certain facts which cannot be divided along such lines and certain judgments we must reach and decisions we must make together, as Americans, and as Americans only.

Even as we sit here at these tables there orbits in the sky above us—around and around this earth—the most compelling fact of our times.

The sputniks out in space have only one meaning.

There is no Democratic meaning.

There is no Republican meaning.

There is, in truth, no narrow American meaning.

In all history, mankind has never faced so great a challenge—or so great an opportunity. If outer space is allowed to become the province of the earth's imperialists, then the freedom we have fashioned at so high a price shall fall into eternal jeopardy.

If, however, free men set their sails for this new world as our forebears did when this continent was opened, then we have the opportunity of adding a new dimension to freedom—and, with it, the very real prospect of reaching our goal of total peace.

These are exciting thoughts, exciting goals.

We would be out of character with our American heritage if we were not stirred by what we can now see on ahead in this new age.

We would be even more out of character—both as Americans and as free men—if we should lose this hour of opportunity in preoccupation with partisan thoughts of who is to receive the credit and who is to receive the blame.

Facts are not partisan, and the facts are these:

For a decade now, the free world—led by the United States—has summoned up its resources and resourcefulness to contain the

most powerful and most ruthless aggressor ever to appear among the governments of the earth.

The physical containment has, in large part, succeeded.

It has succeeded, I should say, until now.

Today no responsible man can say or would say continued success of our past policies is assured.

There is now abundant evidence that a pattern of history is repeating. We, like the dynasties of ancient China on down to the Republic of France, have built a wall against aggression, but now we find that we are the imprisoned.

The Soviet has, dramatically, leaped over our wall.

More importantly, we are awakened to the reality that advances of Soviet technology and science have made our wall of security a relic of another age.

Let me cite for you certain specifics, certain facts which all of us, as Americans, must sit down and consider together.

These are not facts of my invention. These are facts testified to by our military leadership coming before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

First. The Soviet has under arms nearly as many divisions as do all the free nations combined.

Second. The Soviet air strength is probably close to that of our own.

Third. The Soviet submarine armada now numbers 500, while ours totals only 110.

Fourth. The Soviet shipyards are building 100 new submarines annually, while we are building fewer than 10.

Fifth. The Soviet capacity to launch a one-half ton satellite into space indicates the capacity on their part to launch long-range ballistic missiles against our cities from Soviet soil.

Sixth. The Soviet has now the capacity to launch, from land bases or from its submarines, shorter range missiles against our installations at home and overseas.

These are military facts. They are important. I would mislead you if I did not say that there are more, more which in time I believe should become public knowledge.

What is the sum of these facts?

The facts of comparative strength between the two strong powers do not add up to disaster—but they do, clearly, total up to peril.

For the moment, the stalemate is not clearly broken. The Soviet striking power is great and growing greater, but our retaliatory power is great, also. This the Soviet knows, as we know.

The Soviet, however, also knows—as we must come to know—that the rate of growth of their striking power far exceeds ours.

We are behind but we are not yet hopelessly behind. Our peril becomes a disaster when we fall so far behind that there is no hope of recovery. It is to the prevention of that disaster all free men must now dedicate their efforts.

How is such disaster to be prevented?

Some, looking back to the past, will answer only that the Nation must retool its productive capacity, get ready for a massive effort, and move forward to match the Soviet sputnik for sputnik, missile for missile, and sub for sub.

If war were inevitable, I would join in such a call.

But no man who looks beyond the moment will suggest that war is the inevitable consequence of mankind's new adventure into space. I, myself, am confident that it is not.

Space may well be the sea in which the human race will someday find an island of peace.

To reach that island, we need more than weapons.

We need, in fact, to free ourselves of the bonds of a weapon psychology.

Our greatest need in this hour is to unleash the pioneering spirit and the daring and brilliance of our people and set this Nation's course on the pursuit of peace.

We cannot, of course, ignore the need for weapons now.

We need a faster rate of production for our missiles, far faster than any yet permitted or any yet envisioned.

We need continued production of our proved long-range bombers for our Strategic Air Command.

We need an acceleration of our submarine production.

We need these things now, for this reason:

In the past, we have had the time to mobilize and build our strength while others fought—on their soil—the wars we were eventually to enter and help provide the margin of victory.

We shall not have such time again.

Our own soil is within the target range of a hostile nation for the first time in the American experience.

For the next 10 years or more, we must be ready every night for any challenge that might come before morning. There is no other way.

Behind the security that such strength affords, though, we must do more than content ourselves with a stalemate. We must lay aside the illusion that a nation is strong merely because its military strength equals that of its adversaries.

If we can now buy time, and I believe that we can, we must make certain that we make proper use of what we purchase.

This means, as I see it, that we must change our ways—and those changes will make this both a happier land and a better world.

We have had since the end of World War II much time.

The evidence is indisputable that we have not used that time to full advantage.

What has been wrong? Why have we lagged?

Why do we stand now in a posture of relative weakness?

When such a question is asked, as it should be asked, there is an ever-present danger that we shall frame our answers in terms of credit and blame.

To do this now could well be fatal.

There is little question that wrong decisions have been made.

There is no question that such errors are divided along any partisan lines.

Furthermore, there is little doubt that such decisions, picked out of the context of the past, may seem glaringly wrong today, but at the time many of them met with majority approval.

As Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons on June 18, 1940: "If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."

I say that such must be our creed at this hour.

It is with that creed before us that we must proceed, as responsible men, to assess the position of free men in the world today.

I see no gain in picking petty quarrels with the past.

I myself am willing to draw a line at the here and now, and measure responsibility in terms of what is done for the future rather than in terms of what was done in the past.

From this base, I believe we can take a more honest look at the problems we face.

What are those problems? Let me call them as I see them.

First and foremost, I believe that we are paying too high a price for conformity.

Ours has been, always, a Nation built by the greatness of men's hearts and spirits and minds. America's vigor has come from the originality, the freshness, the vision of our people, all our people, not merely an intellectual elite.

For a decade now, we have seen growing a climate of contempt for these values. We are paying a price for that.

Our investigating committee has found, in some most striking examples, that this has been at the heart of some of our preparedness difficulties.

The fight to build for this Nation an atomic submarine is a record of the persistence against great odds of one man, Admiral Rickover, who believed that it could be built. Because he was more determined to perform than to conform, this brilliant man was—on numerous occasions—shunted into obscurity and his services to the Nation were very nearly lost.

This past few days, in our committee room, I sat 2 feet away from a great Army general and watched him choke back the tears of deep emotion. He told us that his decision to retire from service was final. He said he could not speak freely and he could not support a policy which meant placing American troops in the range of enemy missiles without adequate weapons of defense.

Over and over again, I have heard—and our committee has heard—the leading military men of this Nation come before us and say that a conventional system has cut back on our programs for unconventional developments.

Over and over, we have heard them say that we are not, even yet, doing all that we could and should be doing to move forward in this hour of challenge.

This is not the road to strength.

This is not the road America should travel.

We must turn to the dedicated men of vision and welcome them into the councils of respect and dignity.

We must provide a climate in which the men and women of our universities, our research centers, our career services, our world of journalism and communications can make a full contribution of their talents.

Let me make this point clear.

It is not true that the abilities of Soviet science far exceed those of our American scientists.

As free men, who respect the freedom of man's mind, we must not allow political policies to chain our most priceless resource.

As we face this problem of removing the fetters from our capacity, we must also remove the fetters of tradition from our policy.

Our defensive strategies, in a military sense, are undergoing reappraisal and reexamination.

It would be a mistake to stop there.

Our foreign policies require the same reappraisal.

So, also, do our domestic policies and values.

We have, for long, held a position of strength in world affairs. That position is no longer secure. We must not be so inflexible that we can imagine no changed policy to cope with a changed position.

Domestically, likewise, each of you as businessmen know that our economy is now undergoing a period of change. This change is not merely a cycle through which we are passing. There are new problems, new challenges arising to the very functioning of our system.

Channels of distribution are undergoing change.

Changes are evident in consumer demand and consumer taste.

Profoundly important population shifts are continuing.

We must not wait for calamity before undertaking a cure.

Just as we erred in our estimate of what Soviet gains might mean in the realm of technology, so can we err by complacency in our estimate of what domestic losses might mean in the realm of our economic health.

These things I mention only briefly, to emphasize that in this challenging period we need more, far more, than a purely military response to the Soviet challenge.

We need the marshalling of our resources, physical and mental, such as we have never had before.

We need imagination and freshness.

We need force and boldness in our leadership.

We need, further, I believe, to look beyond the danger evident now to see the horizons of peace in outer space.

I am no scientist and I do not pretend to be.

But the brilliant men of this age—the brilliant minds of America—tell us things that we cannot ignore.

Out in space, there is the power to control the earth's weather, to change the climate where we live, to alter the tides, and direct the Gulf Stream on a different course.

From space, snapshots can be taken of your backyard.

The whole technology of communication can be changed.

It is a fascinating, daring, exciting world.

The frontier it opens for human advancement exceeds any man has ever faced.

Surely we cannot, as leaders of free men, ignore it.

Surely we cannot, with this opportunity before us, fail to see that this affords us the one clear course to recapture the initiative for freedom.

Here is an opportunity to bring men together in common cause as never before.

Here is an opportunity for us to sponsor the flourishing of mankind's genius.

Before this session of Congress ends, I am hopeful that we shall be able to establish in our Government a proper agency for direction of a new national effort in this realm.

I am hopeful, also, that we shall be able to provide a program for the enlargement of our research activities, making the laboratories and the equipment available to draw the best from the minds of our people.

I am hopeful that, furthermore, we shall be able to foster the strengthening of our total educational process, not to produce an army of technicians, but, rather, to pour forth legions of broadly-educated men and women.

As we do these things, I trust that in our relations with other nations we shall be imaginative, and that we shall make it evident that America's free world leadership is not sterile.

We should, certainly, make provisions for inviting together the scientists of other nations to work in concert on projects to extend the frontiers of man and to find solutions to the troubles of this earth.

Our President, holding as he does the esteem of men throughout the world, has a rare opportunity to lead in this labor boldly and forcefully, and in the vigorous pursuit of peace he will find the Nation undivided in his support.

Further, it would be appropriate and fitting for our Nation to demonstrate its initiative before the United Nations by inviting all member nations to join in this adventure into outer space together.

The dimensions of space dwarf our national differences on earth.

If we are to win space as the outpost of peace, all men may—and should—share in that endeavor.

We, with our great resources and our great abilities, must not allow the leadership to slip from our grasp.

The world in which we live is a world in which danger abounds.

There is no greater danger, though, than for us to shrink from the responsibilities of the hour.

Ahead, if we move with speed, if we move with daring, we shall find fulfillment of our quest for peace.

If we are to reach such a goal, our response must begin now. This, more than we realize, is the year of decision, the year our course is set.

In such a year, we need be responsible men, loyal to our Nation, faithful to freedom, strangers to partisanship, and friends with the imagination that has been so much a part of our heritage.

---

## ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this morning the Department of State made a very important announcement regarding the Government of India. I quote in full the statement:

The Department of State announced today that the United States Government desires to assist the Government of India in meeting its current economic problem. It has accordingly informed the Government of India of its willingness to discuss a loan program of approximately $225 million from the currently available resources of the United States Export-Import Bank and the development loan fund. In addition the United States Government is considering on an urgent basis further measures to assist India in meeting its present grain shortage.

The United States Government has invited the Government of India to send representatives to discuss these matters further. The Government of India has accepted this invitation; a delegation will leave India for Washington shortly.

The current economic problem arises from India's need of foreign exchange in connection with its second 5-year plan.

With the purpose of achieving economic self-sufficiency and stability, India began its first 5-year plan in 1950; and in May 1956, embarked on its second 5-year plan. These programs call for the development of a balanced industrialization with development of both public and private sectors of the Indian economy.

Great progress was made under the first 5-year program. Its greatest emphasis was upon agricultural production to provide food for the Indian people; and with the aid of good weather, production rose by about 23 percent. During the same period, a great effort was made to begin industrialization; and industrial production rose by 33 percent.

But, successful as it was, the first plan may be said to have laid only the base for the effort contemplated in the second 5-year plan, which began in May 1956. It is India's objective to provide new employment for the 8 million new workers who will come into its labor force; to increase its income by 25 percent—from $22 billion to about $28 billion—by 1961; and to increase investment 11 or 12 percent. Its emphasis is to develop the basic and heavy industries, among them coal, iron and steel, electric power, machine tools, and heavy chemicals, which themselves will generate subsidiary and consumer industries, and parallel with this expansion, to enlarge India's overburdened railway and other transportation systems.

The chief effort in such a program must be made by the Indian Government and its people, and no one recognizes this more clearly than do India's leaders. During the first 5-year plan, at least 90 percent of the total investment came from the Indian people. The total investment by the Indian Government and people in the second plan, of $12.2 billion, is roughly comparable to a total investment in the United States over a period of 5 years of about $250 billion. I do not know of any country in the world, unless it is Soviet Russia, which is making an effort of anything like this magnitude. And when we consider that it is being done by a people with an average per capita income of $55 and a per capita consumption of 1,900 calories daily, the magnitude of their effort should be better understood.

Even with this tremendous effort of self-help, an industry cannot be built in India without foreign exchange with which to buy the tools and steel and other capital goods which India cannot produce. India has drawn to the very limit upon its sterling reserves, it has restricted its imports and taken other drastic measures to meet its foreign exchange needs. Yet with all this, it is estimated that the gap in foreign exchange will amount to $1.4 billion. It is my understanding that India hopes that at least a minimum of $500 million of loans and capital goods to meet this gap may be provided by the United States.

It is in this background that I want to discuss briefly the important announcement that was made today by our State Department. Since India's independence, the United States has made available to India approximately $1 billion in grants and loans and surplus agricultural products. The announcement today that our Government is willing to discuss a loan program of approximately $225 million from the resources of the United States Export-Import Bank and the development loan fund, and that it is considering further measures to assist India in meeting its present grain shortage, cannot be considered unimportant. I should like to say that in my service as a representative of this country to India, I found a great interest on the part of the President and the Secretary of State toward affording India support in the development of its economic program. Today's announcement should be hailed as another step in this program.

I do want to state views which I hold on this matter of assistance to India, for the consideration of Congress and for public opinion in this country. I believe we should make the decision to see to it that India secures our full support in the attainment of the objectives of its second 5-year plan.

I know that the first priority of our Government and people is to take whatever steps are necessary to assure the security and freedom of the United States. The President, the administration, and the committees of Congress, including the Subcommittee on Preparedness of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] are working at this task. I have no doubt that the Congress will support whatever measures are needed to protect this country. I do point out, however, that our security will depend upon elements beyond military measures.

Even as we undertake this first duty and priority of military security, we must do our best to hold together the elements of democratic strength and freedom throughout the world. Our security and freedom are inseparable from theirs.

The Soviet challenge is not military alone. Mr. Khrushchev has announced boldly that the Soviet Union intends to compete with the United States in fields in which we have considered ourselves supreme—the fields of industrial and scientific advancement. The statement recently issued by the State Department indicates that Mr. Khrushchev means what he says. In the last few years the Soviet Union has committed itself to advance approximately $2 billion to countries in Asia and the Middle East. And the launching of sputnik by the Soviet Union has symbolized to the peoples in these countries a new strength in science and technology, which are the very things they want most.

I know that we must guard our resources because our economic base must support whatever efforts we make in both military and economic fields. I know that every expenditure and particularly those relating to foreign aid, will be closely watched and opposed.

Nevertheless, there are many humane and long-range interests to support foreign aid to these independent countries which satisfy me. But today I argue our own self-interest and security. If these countries fail, or turn increasingly to the Soviet Union, we shall in time find ourselves isolated from a great part of the peoples of the world.

I believe strongly that the success of India in its efforts to achieve economic stability is essential to our future security and interest. India achieved independence in 1947, and in 1950 its constitution became effective. In the short time that has elapsed, India has held two free elections of the largest participation of free voters in the world. It has been able to reduce the dominions and princely states in existence at the time of its independence from over 500 in number to approximately 20. As I have said, it has successfully completed its first 5-year plan, and has a good chance of success with its second 5-year plan, if it receives necessary assistance. Whatever criticism may be made about India's foreign policy, India has great influence in the world and its objectives are peaceful. It is the second largest country in the world in point of population, it has great resources, an able and trained leadership, and it is pursuing its goals by democratic means. It is certain that the countries of Asia will watch with interest the experiment of Communist China, attempting to advance by totalitarian methods, and that of India by democratic and voluntary methods. If India should fail, there is grave danger that the peoples of Asia and the Middle East and Africa would view it as a failure of the democratic method and that the cause of democratic institutions in these areas would be in danger. If this should ever happen, we would find ourselves isolated from a great part of the world, the balance of power would actually be against us, and our present danger would be immeasurably increased. I hope that a successful and effective foreign-aid program will be developed during this Congress. The effort of India and our relationship to it in terms of support, is crucial in Asia, and to our goal of democratic institutions in the world.

In addition to the measures which are under consideration in the State Department, I have advocated that the balance of the wheat loan due the United States, approximating $170 million, now repayable in dollars, be changed into repayment in local currency. This would place it in conformity with our present Public Law 480 programs and, I believe, would enable the Indian Government to extend its credit at the World Bank and Export-Import Bank, perhaps by at least $100 million. But if this is not enough, I urge that in the remainder of India's 5-year program, we place ourselves firmly on her side, as Soviet Russia has done with Communist China, and supply the foreign exchange essential for her success. If this involves action by the Congress—and I believe it will—it should be taken.

The taking of such a step would show that the United States has creative plans beyond military measures. It would show that we have confidence that peace will be attained, and in the ultimate success of the democratic systems of the world. All of this, it seems to me, was implicit in the great state of the Union message which President Eisenhower delivered last Thursday.

## THE ADMINISTRATION'S FARM PROPOSALS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have read the administration proposals for agriculture thoroughly and carefully. I can agree with the administration when it recognizes that the American farmer is caught in a serious and devastating cost price squeeze. I can also support, and have already called for, extension of such programs as Public Law 480 to dispose of surpluses, the soil bank, the rural development program, and increased research into new uses and markets for agricultural products.

But the inescapable fact is that at the same time the administration advocates these measures to relieve the declining agricultural economy, it turns around and proposes a rolling readjustment which would lower price supports, wipe out corn acreage allotments, and so forth.

Five years ago I recommended the soil bank, Public Law 480, and also increased research into new uses for agricultural products. I pointed up the cost-price squeeze which pinched the farmer's income. I still support this type of constructive approach to the long-range solution of the farm problems. But I cannot sit idly by and condone measures which I believe would further aggravate the very problem which the administration states exists.

The farm program presented by the administration seems to be founded upon two major inconsistencies.

First. It recognizes that the farmer is caught in a cost-price squeeze and that the prices the farmer has to pay out as operating costs have doubled from 1939 to 1952, and have increased another 3 percent since then. But then the solution put forth is to lower price supports and further reduce income while the cost is still rising.

Second. The administration recommends the elimination of corn acreage allotments. It is not clear why this should be recommended when acreage allotments for the other basic crops would be increased. The reasons given for disposing of corn allotments are the very same reasons which I gave on the Senate floor and in the Agriculture and Forestry Committee last year in support of my efforts to obtain an increase in the corn acreage allotments to a level reasonably consistent with planting practices in the commercial corn area. The reason why only 14 percent of the corn production in the commercial corn area was eligible for the full price support is clearly evident from the 62 percent of the corn farmers who voted in favor of increased acreage allotments.

The President expressed concern over the surpluses which have accumulated and in his recommendations has attempted to arrive at a solution of the problem of surplus increases. The answer is not to be found in his statement that reduced price supports "should open the door to market expansion, increased acreage allotments and greater freedom to produce." If supports were to be reduced while our farmers were encouraged to increase production, it does not seem that a reduction in surpluses would result. Farm operators are faced with certain fixed costs which must be met with increased production if price supports are lowered—this, I say, is not the way to work a reduction in surpluses.

It is obvious that a long range constructive program must be evolved if American agriculture is to be placed in a strong and healthy economic position.

In order to do this I submit that priority attention should be given to the disposal of present surpluses and the curbing of future surpluses through the conservation reserve portion of the soil bank and through extension of Public Law 480. This should be the first task.

Price supports should not be lowered at this time. Such action would not lead to reduced production. It would, in fact, stimulate further production and will aggravate the surplus problem. So I repeat we should, first of all:

First. Extend Public Law 480 and support its provisions to dispose of surpluses through trade, barter, and international assistance programs.

Second. Support the conservation reserve portion of the soil bank. This program will take land out of production for a period of time up to 10 years, and will at the same time build up the soil.

Third. Inaugurate an expanded and vigorous program of research into new uses and markets for agricultural products immediately.

These are three vitally important steps which must be taken immediately.

These measures will attack the surplus problem. Once that problem is solved, the farmer's prices will rise, and the argument over price supports will cease.

Mr. President, I desire now to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

## THE FARM PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram as of this date from W. M. Thatcher, general manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn. The telegram refers to the farm economic question and to the question of farm price supports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 16, 1958.*

The Honorable EDWARD J. THYE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Many thousands of upper Midwest and Great Plains farmers fear that the Secretary of Agriculture's scheduled appearance before the Senate Agriculture Committee Friday will signal the launching of the administration's latest campaign to destroy price-protection laws. We join with them in believing that the only hope for farmers now is positive and immediate action by Congress to restore cuts in grain and dairy price supports and to firmly oppose any further cuts in farm income by the administration.

Specifically, we urge that you make clear your intention to help prevent a 22-cents-a-bushel cut in wheat prices already ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture for the 1958 crop. We ask, too, that you urge other Members of the Senate and House to give the same serious consideration to the economic plight of grain farmers as you are now giving to dairy farmers.

Wheat farmers have cooperated in every program to control production. They have taken a 37-cents-a-bushel cut in wheat prices since 1954. They are facing another 22-cents-a-bushel cut this year. Let us make it clear that the 22-cents-a-bushel cut on wheat price this year will be the equivalent of a 25-percent cut in net income. Farmers will take a $250 million loss from this cut alone. Dairy farmers face a similar loss.

Dairy co-ops have protested vigorously in behalf of their members against the Secretary of Agriculture's support-price cut. We are expressing the angry protest of grain farmers. This entire region is concerned with this loss. Congress is the only hope of farmers to reverse the Secretary's unfair cuts in dairy and wheat price supports. Any cut in farm prices plied on top of already falling farm income threatens to widen the existing business recession into a real depression. It is your responsibility to see this does not happen.

M. W. THATCHER,
*General Manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.*

P. S.—Copies of this wire sent to all members of Senate and House Agriculture Committees and to upper Midwest Senators and Representatives.

## DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, OF MINNESOTA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

*Resolved,* That a committee of 12 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved,* That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved,* That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 242), as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

*Resolved,* That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved,* That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I considered AUGUST ANDRESEN a personal friend and associate. I knew him as a completely devoted and dedicated public servant. He was a man who was concerned with people and their problems. His 16 terms of service to the people of Minnesota are clear and convincing evidence as to the esteem they had for him. His record of service is a tribute to the great effort he always put forth for his people.

Mr. President, a little more than a year ago, in the fall of 1956, I was privileged to attend a dinner given in honor of the late Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN and the late Mrs. Andresen. The dinner was at Winona, Minn. His friends came from various parts of the State, but of course that was his particular district, the First District of Minnesota. His friends paid tribute to him and to Mrs. Andresen. I am happy that that occasion took place while they were both living, because Mrs. Andresen died in the year 1957, only some 6 months following the dinner.

At the time the people of the First District of Minnesota told of the untiring efforts of Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, in his effort to serve the people, his constituency in the First District. I was privileged to speak briefly at that dinner. I paid tribute to Representative ANDRESEN's public service.

AUGUST ANDRESEN established a very personal approach in carrying out his duties. He has actually become a real part of many homes and families in southern Minnesota. His will be a keen loss to the farmers, the small-business men along the main streets, the laboring men, the professional people throughout the entire State of Minnesota.

He was their friend, servant, and counselor. The people confided in him, had faith in him, and trusted him. This confidence, faith, and trust were never misplaced with AUGUST ANDRESEN.

There is a real emptiness today in the hearts of all who knew AUGUST ANDRESEN—there is an emptiness in the Congress of the United States—and there is a void which never will be completely filled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on proceeding to the consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THYE and Mr. HUMPHREY as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative from Minnesota, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 20, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 3, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Harker T. Stanton | Professional staff member. | $7,309.98 |
| Henry J. Casso | do | 6,214.32 |
| Edward P. Guinane | Professional staff member (to July 31). | 632.72 |
| Cotys M. Mouser | Chief clerk | 5,723.88 |
| James M. Kendall | Assistant chief clerk | 5,590.08 |
| Betty M. Mason | Clerical assistant | 2,867.28 |
| Blanche M. O'Berg | do | 3,483.84 |
| Helen A. Miller | do | 2,815.92 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $3,703.31 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 15,000.00 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 18,703.31 |
| Expended during period | 3,480.37 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 15,222.94 |

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Everard H. Smith | Chief clerk | $7,399.98 |
| Thomas J. Scott | Assistant chief clerk | 7,150.62 |
| Francis S. Hewitt | Assistant clerk | 6,704.76 |
| Edmund T. King | do | 6,348.06 |
| Kenneth J. Bousquet | Professional staff member. | 6,704.76 |
| Earl W. Cooper | do | 6,808.80 |
| Herman E. Downey | do | 6,704.76 |
| Leonard E. Edwards | do | 6,348.06 |
| Joe E. Gonzales | do | 6,258.90 |
| William J. Kennedy, Jr. | do | 6,348.06 |
| Cecil C. McDaniel | do | 6,704.76 |
| Harold E. Merrick | do | 6,704.76 |
| Raymond L. Schafer | do | 6,348.06 |
| Thomas F. Shannon | do | 6,036.00 |
| John M. Witeck | do | 6,214.32 |
| William W. Woodruff | do | 6,704.76 |
| Gloria S. Butland | Clerical assistant | 2,713.14 |
| Virginia D. Carroll | do | 2,713.14 |
| Leon DeVille | do | 2,610.42 |
| Mildred L. Fowlkes | do | 2,713.14 |
| Ruby C. Hutchinson | do | 2,713.14 |
| Sally L. Heath | Clerical assistant (from July 16). | 2,298.67 |
| Mamie L. Mizen | Assistant clerk | 4,646.16 |
| Rebul H. Nichols | Clerical assistant | 2,713.14 |
| Rose M. Parker | Clerical assistant (to July 15). | 208.97 |
| Gardner C. Turner | Staff member | 6,704.76 |
| Alonzo B. Gonzales | do | 4,049.04 |
| Maurice P. Pujol | do | 5,500.92 |
| Franklin B. Dryden | do | 6,036.00 |

CARL HAYDEN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report on miscellaneous expenses during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

| | |
|---|---|
| Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of June 30, 1957 | $24,151.49 |
| Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 24,151.49 |
| Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1957, as of June 30, 1957 | 350,301.39 |
| Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 350,301.39 |
| Amount authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1958 | 380,000.00 |
| Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 23,127.77 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 356,872.23 |
| Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act for 85th Cong., as of June 30, 1957 | 6,240.72 |
| Additional authorizations by S. Res. 154 and 187 | 20,000.00 |
| Total available for expenditure | 26,240.72 |
| Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 15,577.91 |
| Unexpended balance as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 10,662.81 |

CARL HAYDEN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Atkinson, Herbert S. | Assistant chief clerk | $4,400.97 |
| Be Lieu, Kenneth E. | Professional staff member. | 6,145.00 |
| Braswell, T. Edward, Jr. | do | 6,808.85 |
| Dantzic, Maurene E. | Clerical assistant | 2,867.33 |
| Darden, William H. | Professional staff member. | 6,808.85 |
| Francovitch, Virginia C. | Clerical assistant | 2,404.90 |
| Johnson, Edna E. | do | 2,764.56 |
| Welker, Mary M. | do | 2,764.56 |
| Wingate, Harry L. Jr. | Chief clerk | 6,145.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $3,942.84 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 10,000.00 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 13,942.84 |
| Expended during period | 2,538.65 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 11,404.19 |

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 2, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Bush, Morris W. | Investigator [1] | $1,102.24 |
| Canaday, Alyce D. | Clerical assistant | 2,353.50 |
| Cooper, Genevieve | Secretary | 2,661.78 |
| French, Stuart P. | Special counsel | 5,010.48 |
| Friedenberg, Ronald | Attorney [2] | 4,415.97 |
| Gilless, Ben J. | Attorney | 4,516.69 |
| Hartford, Carolyn G. | Stenographer [3] | 465.22 |
| Hewell, Harry Pat | Attorney [4] | 1,184.16 |
| Horwitz, Solis | Counsel [5] | 4,440.12 |
| Jeffries, Jo Ann V. | Clerk-typist | 2,096.58 |
| McGillicuddy, Daniel F., Jr. | Attorney | 5,055.06 |
| McPherson, Harry C. | Attorney-investigator [6] | 1,058.52 |
| Miller, Mary M. | Stenographer [7] | 612.60 |
| Neal, Robert M. | Attorney | 3,381.12 |
| Shepard, Don E. | Research assistant [8] | 1,006.14 |
| Stewart, Jo Ann | Assistant clerk [9] | 524.14 |
| Tookes, Philip J. | Investigator | 3,535.26 |
| Wheeler, Shirley H. | Stenographer | 1,942.44 |
| Wilson, Glen P. | Assistant clerk [10] | 788.93 |

[1] From Nov. 12.
[2] From Nov. 16.
[3] From Nov. 19.
[4] From July 8 to Oct. 2.
[5] From Sept. 1.
[6] From Nov. 1.
[7] From Nov. 12.
[8] From Nov. 1.
[9] From Nov. 16 to Dec. 31.
[10] From Nov. 14.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $156,983.19 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | None |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 156,983.19 |
| Expended during period | 50,461.09 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 106,522.10 |

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman.*

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*Chairman, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| John H. Yingling | Chief clerk | $7,400.00 |
| Robert A. Wallace | Staff director | 7,150.67 |
| Paul Cyr | Assistant clerk | 6,808.85 |
| William F. McKenna | Counsel (to Dec. 15) | 6,241.45 |
| James B. Cash, Jr. | Professional staff member. | 6,808.85 |
| Donald L. Rogers | Counsel | 6,808.85 |
| Henrietta S. Chase | Clerical assistant | 3,432.52 |
| Florence Barr | do | 3,175.61 |
| Pauline C. Beam | do | 3,124.23 |
| Caro M. Pugh | do | 3,124.23 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $9,311.75 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 9,311.75 |
| Expended during period | 1,551.58 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 7,760.17 |

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(S. Res. 45, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Matthew Hale | Assistant counsel | $6,808.85 |
| Arthur J. Wilson | Staff assistant | 4,640.47 |
| Olin Cavness | do | 4,302.88 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $79,122.19 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 79,122.19 |
| Expended during period | 22,268.87 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 56,853.32 |

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

(S. Res. 44, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing

the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Jack Carter | Staff director | $6,808.85 |
| Milton P. Semer | Chief counsel | 6,808.85 |
| Dean F. Cromer | Staff assistant | 5,322.60 |
| Carl A. S. Coan | Research director | 5,233.44 |
| Dudley L. O'Neal, Jr. | Assistant counsel | 4,049.04 |
| Clarence R. Jacobs | Investigator | 3,329.70 |
| Mildred Mitchel | Clerical assistant | 2,661.78 |
| Doris I. Thomas | do | 2,507.64 |
| Betsy L. Rill | Clerical assistant (to Aug. 31). | 630.36 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $54,703.52 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 54,703.52 |
| Expended during period | 42,004.13 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 12,699.39 |

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Leo A. Casey | Chief clerk | $7,399.98 |
| Charles W. Lee | Assistant chief clerk (from Sept. 1). | 3,500.98 |
| William P. Gulledge | Professional staff member. | 7,150.62 |
| Donald P. Feldman | do | 5,188.80 |
| Ruth W. Bryant | Clerical assistant | 3,483.84 |
| Arlene B. Williams | do | 3,483.84 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $8,339.05 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | -------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 8,339.05 |
| Expended during period | 1,829.35 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 6,509.70 |

M. M. NEELY,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 7, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Elizabeth B. Springer | Chief clerk | $6,258.90 |
| Evelyn R. Thompson | Clerical assistant | 3,483.84 |
| Betty Mae Tapy | do | 3,483.84 |
| Sandra Everly | Clerical assistant | $2,507.64 |
| Jesse R. Nichols | Document clerk | 2,918.70 |
| Serge N. Benson | Professional staff member. | 6,808.80 |
| Samuel D. McIlwain | do | 7,150.62 |
| Reginald Barnes | Professional staff member (from Dec. 16, 1957). | 383.09 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $8,956.67 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 8,956.67 |
| Expended during period | 4,962.00 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 5,038.00 |

HARRY F. BYRD,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 10, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Carl M. Marcy | Professional staff member. | $7,399.98 |
| Pat M. Holt | do | 7,150.62 |
| Alwyn V. Freeman | do | 6,808.80 |
| Julius N. Cahn | do | 6,808.80 |
| C. C. O'Day | Chief clerk | 6,808.80 |
| George C. Denney, Jr. | Assistant chief clerk | 6,808.80 |
| Mary Ann Sames | Clerical assistant | 3,368.27 |
| Milrae E. Jensen | do | 3,312.57 |
| L. June Connell [1] (to Oct. 13, 1957). | do | 1,766.32 |
| Orrin E. Cressey [1] (to Dec. 17, 1957). | do | 2,707.90 |
| Judith Anne Lund [1] (from Dec. 23, 1957). | do | 93.18 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $5,330.29 |
| Additional funds authorized during period (S. Res. 152, agreed to July 3, 1957) | 10,000.00 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 15,330.29 |
| Expended during period | [2] 13,908.56 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 1,421.75 |

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 59, agreed to Jan. 30, 1957.
[2] Includes $5,000 statutory receipt.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

(Under authority of S. Res. 185, agreed to Feb. 8, 1956; S. Res. 286, agreed to July 13, 1956; S. Res. 61, agreed to Jan. 30, 1957; S. Res. 151, agreed to June 26, 1957; and S. Res. 192, agreed to Aug. 26, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Goetz, Betty Lou | Staff director | $5,010.48 |
| Smith, Carolyn F | Assistant clerk | 2,473.37 |
| Underwood, Paula L. | do | 2,421.99 |
| Welsh, Carolyn W. (from Sept. 16). | do | 2,710.26 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period by S. Res. 151, June 26, 1957 | $10,000.00 |
| Additional funds authorized during period by S. Res. 192, Aug. 26, 1957 | 30,000.00 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 40,000.00 |
| Expended during period | 13,999.31 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 26,000.69 |

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 10, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

(Under authority of S. Res. 35, agreed to January 30, 1957, as amended)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Bowen, Theresa | Assistant clerk | $2,747.42 |
| Burroughs, Betty | do | 2,490.51 |
| Douw, John DeP | Assistant clerk (from July 1 to Sept. 21). | 458.06 |
| Hansen, Morella R. | Research assistant | 4,031.91 |
| Kuhl, Arthur M | Chief clerk | 6,808.80 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $32,658.83 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 32,658.83 |
| Expended during period | 17,169.60 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 15,489.23 |

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Walter L. Reynolds | Chief clerk | $7,150.62 |
| Glenn K. Shriver | Professional staff member. | 6,808.80 |
| Eli E. Nobleman | do | 6,808.80 |
| Richard J. O'Melia | Professional staff member (to July 7, 1957). | 264.78 |
| Miles Scull, Jr. | Professional staff member. | 6,808.80 |

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Ray Kiermas | Professional staff member (from Sept. 4 to Oct. 31, 1957). | $1,741.96 |
| W. E. O'Brien | Professional staff member (from Nov. 1, 1957). | 2,012.00 |
| Ann M. Grickis | Assistant chief clerk | 3,997.68 |
| Ray Barnett | Clerical assistant | 3,175.56 |
| Vivien I. McConnell | do | 3,072.84 |
| Kathryn Keeney (Mrs.). | do | 2,918.70 |
| Esther M. Hutchinson (Mrs.). | do | 2,815.92 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $9,802.63 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 9,802.63 |
| Expended during period | 1,258.08 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 8,544.55 |

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Buffalohide, Maxine B. | Assistant clerk | $2,815.94 |
| Calabrese, Alphonse F. | Investigator | 6,036.00 |
| Dearborn, Alice S. | Assistant clerk | 3,021.47 |
| Duckett, Margaret W. | Acting chief clerk (to July 15). | 234.66 |
| Do | Acting chief clerk (from Sept. 9). | 1,786.39 |
| Duffy, LaVern J. | Investigator | 5,278.03 |
| Dunne, Robert E. | Assistant counsel | 5,278.03 |
| Egan, Thomas G. | Investigator | 5,278.03 |
| Healey, John S. | do | 5,278.03 |
| Juliana, James N. | Chief counsel to the minority. | 6,808.84 |
| Kamerick, Paul E. | Assistant counsel | 6,808.84 |
| Kennedy, Rosemary K. | Assistant clerk | 2,764.56 |
| Maher, Joseph F. | Investigator | 5,278.02 |
| Maxwell, Barbara L. | Acting chief clerk (to Sept. 8). | 850.27 |
| Multy, Leo C. | Investigator | 5,723.80 |
| O'Donnell, Donald F. | Acting chief counsel | 7,101.08 |
| Switzer, Mildred L. | Assistant clerk | 2,764.56 |
| Tierney, Paul J. | Assistant counsel | 6,036.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $132,470.36 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 132,470.36 |
| Expended during period | 103,575.45 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 28,894.91 |

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Adlerman, Jerome S. | Assistant chief counsel. | $7,150.67 |
| Aporta, John Allen | Investigator | 5,500.96 |
| Beck, John W. Jr. | Research assistant (to Nov. 30). | 1,283.77 |
| Brown, Delores I. | Assistant clerk (from Nov. 14). | 681.00 |
| Brucas, Marie | Assistant clerk | 2,250.75 |
| Cheasty, John Cye | Investigator | 2,456.27 |
| Davies, Dorothy H. | Assistant clerk (from July 15). | 2,535.83 |
| Greene, Robert W. | Investigator (from Dec. 2 to 11). | 293.22 |
| Gross, Helen K. | Assistant clerk (to Sept. 27) | 1,336.20 |
| Johnson, Vernon J. | Investigator | 4,722.99 |
| Jones, Edward M. | do | 4,646.19 |
| Kaplan, Arthur G. | Assistant counsel | 5,233.44 |
| Kelly, James P. | Investigator | 4,253.83 |
| Kennedy, Robert F. | Chief counsel | 7,400.00 |
| Kenney, Mary F. | Assistant clerk | 2,747.42 |
| Kilburn, Jeanne F. | Assistant clerk (from Oct. 7). | 1,218.19 |
| Kopecky, George M. | Assistant counsel | 5,545.55 |
| Langenbacher, Irwin | do | 5,456.34 |
| Lynch, Mary A. | Assistant clerk (from Dec. 12). | 264.69 |
| MacIntyre, Duncan M. | Assistant counsel (Aug. 1 to Nov. 15). | 3,078.84 |
| Martin, George H. | Investigator | 5,268.02 |
| Mates, Lillian | Assistant clerk | 2,764.56 |
| Maxwell, Barbara | Assistant clerk (from Sept. 19). | 1,400.45 |
| May, Walter R. | Investigator | 5,545.55 |
| McGovern, John J. | Assistant counsel | 6,808.84 |
| McInerney, Michael J. | Research assistant (from Sept. 20). | 1,032.25 |
| McShane, James J. P. | Investigator | 4,253.83 |
| Meriwether, Robert L. | Clerical assistant (to Sept. 18). | 797.19 |
| Mills, Ralph W. | Assistant counsel | 6,036.00 |
| Novello, Angela M. | Assistant clerk | 3,226.94 |
| O'Donnell, Philip K. | Assistant counsel | 5,367.20 |
| O'Hara, Eleanor D. | Assistant clerk (to Sept. 20). | 693.57 |
| Osolin, Katherine F. | Assistant clerk | 2,250.75 |
| Ranstad, Harold | Assistant counsel (from Aug. 1). | 2,898.35 |
| Ricciuti, Angeline M. | Assistant clerk (from Dec. 4). | 337.61 |
| Rowlett, Rita D. | Assistant clerk | 2,764.56 |
| Rufo, Marie M. | Assistant clerk (to Nov. 15). | 1,957.81 |
| Salinger, Pierre E. G. | Investigator | 6,808.64 |
| Schofield, Marie S. | Assistant clerk (to Oct. 15). | 1,522.74 |
| Scott, Yvonne | Assistant clerk | 2,764.56 |
| Shea, Mary D. | do | 2,764.56 |
| Sheridan, Walter J. | Investigator | 5,545.55 |
| Sloan, Susan | Assistant clerk | 2,507.65 |
| Sullivan, Elizabeth K. | Staff editor | 2,764.56 |
| Terry, John A. | Research assistant | 1,942.46 |
| Von Derau, Inez M. | Assistant clerk | 2,250.75 |
| Watt, Ruth Young | Chief clerk | 4,151.84 |
| Wilber, Georgia H. | Assistant clerk | 2,764.56 |
| Willse, Sherman S. | Investigator | 4,253.83 |
| Young, Ruth B. | Assistant clerk (from Oct. 21). | 1,218.19 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $197,057.63 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 150,000.00 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 347,057.63 |
| Expended during period | 299,308.38 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 47,749.25 |

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from June 30, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Callaghan, Richard L. | Chief clerk | $7,400.00 |
| French, Stewart | General counsel | 7,150.67 |
| Gamble, James H. | Professional staff member. | 6,808.87 |
| Lineweaver, Goodrich L. | do | 6,808.87 |
| Stong, Benton J. | do | 6,808.87 |
| Callaghan, Marcia M. | Clerical assistant | 2,867.33 |
| Davis, Dorothy A. | do | 2,713.20 |
| Donnelley, Rosemary | do | 3,072.87 |
| McSherry, Nellie D. | Assistant chief clerk | 5,545.55 |
| Todd, Pauline B. | Clerical assistant | 2,867.33 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $7,567.44 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 7,567.44 |
| Expended during period | 5,898.47 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 1,668.97 |

JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees under Senate Resolution 46, agreed to January 30, 1957, during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Culp, Gordon C. | Professional staff member. | $4,641.43 |
| Curtis, Dorothy S. | Clerical assistant | 2,713.14 |
| DeMaras, James H., Jr. | Professional staff member. | 2,527.53 |
| Eaton, Eugene D. | do | 5,813.04 |
| Erickson, Karen | Clerical assistant (to Sept. 15). | 745.12 |
| Harrington, Joan M. | Clerical assistant | 2,713.14 |
| Heller, Hanes A. | Research assistant (to Sept. 7). | 596.12 |
| Hoban, Cecelia A. | Clerk-stenographer | 2,815.92 |
| Holderer, Geo. B. | Professional staff member. | 6,258.90 |
| Horgan, Edward E., Jr. | Research assistant (from Sept. 16 to Dec. 31). | 934.22 |
| Humphrey, David J. | Research assistant (to Aug. 31). | 1,349.68 |
| Lahr, Mary Catherine. | Clerical assistant | 2,661.78 |
| Mann, Jerry E. | do | 2,045.18 |
| Mapes, Milton C., Jr. | Professional staff member. | 5,411.76 |
| McDonald, Joseph F., Jr. | do | 6,036.00 |
| Nelson, Elmer K. | do | 6,808.80 |
| Nyce, Peter, Q., Jr. | Research assistant (to July 30). | 67.22 |
| O'Connor, Adele R. | Stenographer | 2,661.78 |
| O'Toole, Richard F. | Professional staff member. | 6,437.28 |
| Redwine, Robert W. | do | 6,258.90 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $112,941.36 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 112,941.36 |
| Expended during period | 95,024.94 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 17,916.42 |

JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Chairman, Standing Committee and Subcommittee.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Bailey, James E. | Assistant chief counsel. | $6,808.84 |
| Barton, Frank L. | Staff member | 6,808.84 |
| Baynton, Harold I. | Chief counsel | 7,350.72 |
| Jarrett, Edward | Chief clerk | 7,150.62 |
| Moore, Jeanne C. | Clerical assistant | 2,661.80 |
| Rudolph, Vera B. | do | 3,483.89 |
| Shaffer, Martha P. | do | 3,072.84 |
| Smigen, Cecelia M. | do | 3,072.84 |
| Wissman, Bertram O. | Assistant chief clerk | 6,808.84 |
| Zapple, Nicholas | Staff member | 6,808.84 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $8,610.73 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 8,610.73 |
| Expended during period | 1,626.15 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 6,984.58 |

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(S. Res. 26, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Black, John W. | Staff member | $3,792.18 |
| Bourbon, August J. | do | 5,545.55 |
| Bowers, Joan A. | Clerical assistant | 2,507.65 |
| Busby, David | Staff member | 5,322.62 |
| Butz, John R. | Clerical assistant | 3,226.99 |
| Fadely, Catherine E. | do | 2,815.95 |
| Huse, Harry C. | Staff member | 5,322.62 |
| Kohler, William L. | do | 4,302.88 |
| Luckey, Albert B., Jr. | do | 5,545.55 |
| Monk, Jane E. | Clerical assistant | 2,507.65 |
| Murphy, Robert T. | Special counsel | 6,808.84 |
| Moore, Milo | Professional staff member (through July 31). | 1,134.80 |
| Ogden, Daniel M., Jr. | Staff member (through August 31). | 1,075.66 |
| Rogers, Kathryn B. | Clerical assistant | 2,404.89 |
| Stern, Edward A. | Staff member | 4,965.92 |
| Torre, Catherine C. | Clerical assistant | 2,610.42 |
| Watkins, Charles D. | Staff member | 3,894.94 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $152,499.99 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 152,499.99 |
| Expended during period | 80,123.13 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 72,376.86 |

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters relating to petroleum and petroleum products)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

None.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $50,000 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 50,000 |
| Expended during period | 0 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 50,000 |

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE OF THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Joseph A. Davis | Chief clerk | $6,808.80 |
| Francis C. Rosenberger. | Assistant chief clerk | 6,808.80 |
| Thomas B. Collins | Professional staff member. | 6,808.80 |
| George S. Green | do | 6,808.80 |
| Robert M. Kilgore | do | 6,808.80 |
| J. Carlisle Ruddy | do | 6,808.80 |
| Wayne H. Smithey | do | 6,808.80 |
| Robert B. Young | do | 6,808.80 |
| Mary I. Rogers | Clerical assistant | 3,278.34 |
| Mildred E. Canon | do | 3,278.34 |
| Carrie Lee Conner | do | 3,278.34 |
| Katharine M. Ellis | do | 3,278.34 |
| Costas C. Chrissos | do | 3,278.34 |
| Richard F. Wambach | do | 3,278.34 |
| Beatrice M. Gray | do | 2,815.92 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $7,504.69 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 7,504.69 |
| Expended during period | 1,209.47 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 6,295.22 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 8, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

(Under authority of S. Res. 49, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Caldwell, James N., Jr. | Assistant counsel (to Oct. 1). | $2,049.43 |
| Escoe, J. Delmas | Assistant counsel | 4,188.01 |
| Grieg, Lydia S. | Secretary | 2,610.42 |
| Irwin, Mary A. | Legislative consultant. | 4,232.24 |
| MacNaughton, Marcia J. | Research assistant | 2,199.36 |
| Maloney, Walter H., Jr. | Assistant counsel (from Oct. 21). | 1,260.62 |
| McCandless, Sue H. | Research assistant (from Nov. 1). | 681.74 |
| Patton, William D. | Assistant counsel | 4,136.63 |
| Simmons, Belva T. | Research assistant | 2,507.64 |
| Slayman, Charles H., Jr. | Chief counsel and staff director. | 6,808.80 |
| Teeple, Jane W. | Secretary (to Dec. 1). | 2,089.70 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $66,651.61 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 66,651.61 |
| Expended during period | 35,748.69 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 30,902.92 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Chairman.*

THOS. C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
*Subcommittee Chairman.*

JANUARY 8, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

(Under authority of S. Res. 50, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Downey, Mabel A. | Clerk | $3,021.42 |
| McElroy, Marcia L. | Stenographer | 2,006.58 |
| Huss, John D. | Clerk (to Sept. 15) | 1,002.02 |
| Wood, Harlan | Counsel | 6,808.80 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $39,060.55 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 39,060.55 |
| Expended during period | 14,485.96 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 24,574.59 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Chairman.*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
*Subcommittee Chairman.*

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(S. Res. 51, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing

the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Ashcraft, Ann | Clerk | $2,302.08 |
| Blair, Drury H | Staff member | 6,808.80 |
| Brown, James M | Legal assistant | 5,188.80 |
| Buckner, Catlett L | Staff member | 4,456.63 |
| Burton, Robert R | do | 5,723.88 |
| DeGooyer, Franzetta R. | Clerk | 2,070.06 |
| McCarthy, Mary C | Clerical assistant | 2,250.72 |
| McCloskey, Mary J | Clerk | 2,070.06 |
| McMullan, David M | Clerical assistant (to Sept. 20, 1957). | 317.63 |
| Mesmer, Fred M | Staff member | 6,808.80 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $56,916.86 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 56,916.86 |
| Expended during period | 41,981.48 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 14,935.38 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Subcommittee and Full Committee Chairman.*

JANUARY 8, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(Under authority of S. Res. 52, agreed to January 30, 1957, as amended)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Louis, Margaret M | Stenographer | $2,147.94 |
| McGill, Elizabeth T | Secretary | 3,278.34 |
| Mitler, Ernest A | Special counsel | 4,253.82 |
| Perian, Carl L | Research director | 3,997.68 |
| Schonberger, Claude M. | Research assistant (to Oct. 20, 1957). | 2,097.63 |
| Sullivan, James L | Chief counsel | 5,010.48 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period: | | |
| S. Res. 52 | $29,788.97 | |
| S. Res. 126 | 74.42 | |
| | | $29,863.39 |
| Additional funds authorized during period: | | |
| S. Res. 191 | | 10,000.00 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | | 39,863.39 |
| Expended during period: | | |
| S. Res 52 | $24,514.65 | |
| S. Res. 126 | 33.11 | |
| | | 24,547.76 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period: | | |
| S. Res. 52 | $15,274.32 | |
| S. Res. 126 | 41.31 | |
| | | 15,315.63 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Chairman.*
THOS. C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
*Subcommittee Chairman.*

JANUARY 10, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

(Under authority of S. Res. 53, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Guthridge, Eleanor C | General counsel | $6,808.80 |
| Beaton, Adele V | Clerk (to Oct. 3) | 1,348.71 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $36,913.85 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 36,913.85 |
| Expended during period | 10,291.09 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 26,622.76 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Chairman.*
WILLIAM LANGER,
*Subcommittee Chairman.*

JANUARY 6, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS IN THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE

(S. Res. 54, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Gasque, Cecil A | General counsel | $6,808.80 |
| Culotta, Samuel A | Associate counsel | 5,055.06 |
| Amidon, Robert H | Attorney (from Dec. 10, 1957). | 568.95 |
| Langer, Jennie J | Secretary | 3,638.04 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $27,045.68 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 27,045.68 |
| Expended during period | 17,641.80 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 9,403.88 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Chairman.*
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Subcommittee Chairman.*

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

(Pursuant to S. Res. 55, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1958, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Clesner, Herschel F | Investigator | $3,797.27 |
| Ercegovich, Ann M | Secretary | 2,686.90 |
| Gibbons, Richard M | Secretary-typist | 2,147.94 |
| Haaser, Stephen G | Chief clerk | 4,787.52 |
| Hollabaugh, Marcus A. | Counsel | 6,808.80 |
| Hoy, Ann S | Secretary | 3,175.56 |
| Huber, Walter B | Investigator | 4,787.52 |
| Solo, Robert A | Consultant [1] (S. Res. 167). | 452.22 |
| Stedman, John C | Associate counsel | [2] 8,337.71 |
| Vernon, Raymond | Consultant [1] ($945.55 under S. Res. 167). | 1,007.21 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $52,599.77 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 52,599.77 |
| Expended during period | 39,585.04 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 13,014.73 |

[1] (W. a. e.) When actually employed.
[2] Includes w. a. e. salary for May and June 1957 paid in August.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Chairman.*
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Subcommittee Chairman.*

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

(Under authority of S. Res. 36, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds aavilable to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No employees.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $4,958.71 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 4,958.71 |
| Expended during period | 628.86 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 4,329.85 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Chairman.*
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
*Subcommittee Chairman.*

JANUARY 6, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SENATE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE

(Under authority of S. Res. 57, agreed to January 30, 1957, as amended)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds

available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Arnett, Lucy V. | Stenographer | $2,815.92 |
| Banner, Paul H. | Economist | 4,548.06 |
| Beaton, Adele V. | Stenographer (from Oct. 4). | 1,261.70 |
| Blair, John M. | Chief economist | 6,808.80 |
| Bolton-Smith, Carlile. | Attorney | 6,808.80 |
| Browne, E. Wayles, Jr. | Economist | 5,768.46 |
| Chaney, Katherine Ford. | Stenographer | 2,404.86 |
| Chumbris, Peter N. | Counsel for the minority. | 6,714.68 |
| Clifford, George E. | Assistant counsel | 4,975.22 |
| Cole, Raymond C., Jr. | Investigator | 4,447.12 |
| deFelice, Antoinette M.[1] | Stenographer | 81.87 |
| Dixon, Paul Rand | Counsel and staff director. | 6,808.80 |
| Flurry, Horace L. | Assistant counsel (from Sept. 3). | 4,161.51 |
| Green, Paul S. | Hearing editor | 4,921.32 |
| Hamilton, Irene Till [1] | Economist (from Sept. 18). | 1,072.75 |
| Layton, Philip R. | Assistant counsel | 5,768.46 |
| Measday, Walter S.[1] | Economist (from Nov. 22). | 114.31 |
| McHugh, Donald P. | Counsel | 6,808.80 |
| Montier, Gladys E. | Clerk | 3,381.12 |
| More, Carolyn A. | Research stenographer (from Nov.1). | 715.98 |
| Neville, Gareth M. | Assistant counsel | 6,808.80 |
| Oliver, Mae | Records clerk | 3,278.36 |
| Olshine, Lucille L. | Research assistant | 2,764.56 |
| Ott, David J. | Junior economist (to Aug. 19). | 170.63 |
| Posmantur, Peter T. | Attorney (from Oct. 30). | 971.68 |
| Read, Arlone | Stenographer | 2,507.64 |
| Roseman, Louis | Attorney | 2,867.28 |
| Rice, Downey [1] | Assistant counsel (from Sept. 11). | 534.43 |
| Shine, D. Bruce | Research assistant (from July 16 to Sept. 9). | 365.34 |
| Snyder, W. B. Watson.[1] | Consultant | 1,123.61 |
| Sparks, Wilbur D. | Attorney | 4,548.06 |
| Waltman, Vera M. | Stenographer | 2,439.69 |
| Whitaker, Ken G.[1] | Consultant | 411.11 |
| Williams, Thomas C. | Research employee | 2,713.14 |
| Zalany, Emily W. | Stenographer | 2,559.00 |

[1] When actually employed.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $133,652.32 |
| Additional funds authorized during period (S. Res. 166) | 50,000.00 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 183,652.32 |
| Expended during period | 127,645.94 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 56,006.38 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Chairman.*

ESTES KEFAUVER,
*Subcommittee Chairman.*

JANUARY 10, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

(Under authority of S. Res. 58, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Baker, Dorothy C. | Records manager | $4,646.16 |
| Barber, Frank D. | Investigator | 3,740.76 |
| Betts, Mary E. | Secretary | 2,507.64 |
| Buckley, Wilburn | Investigator | 5,857.62 |
| Dua, Bernice E. | Secretary | 2,507.64 |
| Duffy, Edward R. | Investigator | 5,144.22 |
| Fox, Miriam O. | Confidential secretary. | $3,483.84 |
| Frank, Nelson | Investigator | 3,843.54 |
| Garcia, Roy | Clerk | 3,021.42 |
| Hutto, Ralph H., Jr. | Assistant editorial director. | 5,055.06 |
| Lowell, William E. | Editorial director | 6,303.48 |
| Malaney, Elinor L. | Confidential secretary. | 3,483.84 |
| Malaney, Ethel A. | Stenographer | 2,764.56 |
| Mandel, Benjamin | Research director | 6,303.48 |
| McManus, Robert C. | Investigations analyst. | 6,125.16 |
| McManus, William F. | Research assistant | 3,792.18 |
| McShan, Antoinette M. | do | 3,124.20 |
| Morris, Robert | Chief counsel | 6,808.80 |
| Pierce, Clarence A. | Investigator (through Oct. 31). | 2,493.84 |
| Poe, Edgar A., Jr. | Clerk (through Sept. 20). | 954.64 |
| Richards, Ann E. | Stenographer | 2,970.06 |
| Rusher, William A. | Associate counsel (to Aug. 19). | 1,703.81 |
| Schedler, Dean | Investigator (from Dec. 15). | 323.38 |
| Schroeder, Frank W. | Chief investigator | 6,125.16 |
| Sisson, W. D. | Clerk (from Sept. 4). | 1,563.16 |
| Sourwine, J. G. | Associate counsel | 6,808.80 |
| Stavropulos, Mary | Clerk | 2,610.42 |
| Tonnar, Helen H. | Secretary | 2,764.56 |
| Munson, Lyle H. | W. A. E. | 712.40 |
| Stokes, Alvin W. | W. A. E. (Oct. 22-30). | 283.96 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $183,421.03 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | 0 |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 183,421.03 |
| Expended during period | 129,568.52 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 53,852.51 |

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Stewart E. McClure | Chief clerk | $6,808.80 |
| Roy E. James | Assistant chief clerk | 6,808.80 |
| Crawford C. Heerlein | Clerical assistant | 3,483.84 |
| Vivien T. Harman | do | 3,381.12 |
| Thelma W. Blankenship. | do | 3,124.20 |
| Marjorie M. Whittaker. | do | 3,072.84 |
| Helen H. Papps | do | 3,072.84 |
| Alice H. Price | do | 2,867.28 |
| Helyn Eagle | do | 2,867.28 |
| Lucille Gould | do | 2,661.78 |
| Mary Miniutti | Clerical assistant (to Aug. 31; and from Sept. 3 to 5). | 877.67 |
| John S. Forsythe | General counsel | 6,808.80 |
| William G. Reidy | Professional staff member. | 6,808.80 |
| Michael J. Bernstein | do | 6,808.80 |
| Merton Bernstein | do | 6,808.80 |
| Frederick Blackwell | do | 5,199.66 |
| Paul Cotter | do | 6,808.80 |
| Joseph Stone | Professional staff member (to Aug. 31). | 2,269.60 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $7,019.67 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 7,019.67 |
| Expended during period | 3,527.90 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 3,491.77 |

LISTER HILL,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Brawley, H. W. | Chief clerk | $7,399.98 |
| Kerlin, J. Don | Professional staff member. | 6,808.80 |
| Paschal, Frank A. | do | 7,180.62 |
| Faucette, Andrew McC. | do | 6,808.80 |
| Finzel, Hubert H. | do | 6,808.80 |
| Perrott, Virginia E. | Assistant chief clerk | 3,543.82 |
| Sisk, Elizabeth R. | Clerical assistant | 3,308.24 |
| Thornton, Peggy L. | do | 2,670.34 |
| Gooselaw, Jay E. | do [1] | 2,670.34 |
| McDonald, Innis E. | do | 2,927.26 |
| Finney, Joan M. | do | 3,072.84 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $6,998.99 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 6,998.99 |
| Expended during period | 4,031.38 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 2,967.61 |

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 20, agreed to Jan. 30, 1957.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 13, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE GROUP LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM, THE CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM, AND THE POSTAL SERVICE

(S. Res. 25, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Alexander, Betty C. | Clerical assistant | $2,211.31 |
| Brown, Paula M. | Clerical assistant (from Aug. 8). | 1,461.51 |
| Gandal, Gabriele | Clerical assistant | 2,516.20 |
| Johnston, Nannette G. | Clerical assistant (from Nov. 1). | 1,015.71 |
| McEnroe, Louella C. | Clerical assistant | 2,935.80 |
| Miller, William W. | Investigator | 4,839.59 |
| Fuller, Walter D. | Consultant (per diem). | 3.79 |
| Gaines, Pendleton | do | 7.58 |
| Helwege, Walter R. | Consultant (per diem, from June 6). | 202.89 |
| Putman, Russell L. | Consultant (per diem, from Nov. 13). | 11.37 |
| Seastrunk, F. Jack | do | 11.37 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $38,320.41 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 38,320.41 |
| Expended during period | 17,715.94 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 20,604.47 |

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Theo W. Sneed | Professional staff member. | $6,303.48 |
| John L. Mutz | do | 6,303.48 |
| Frances Ortiz | do | 6,303.48 |
| Filo M. Sedillo | Chief clerk | 7,399.98 |
| Charles N. Kapnic | Assistant chief clerk | 6,303.48 |
| Eloise Porter | Clerical assistant | 3,483.84 |
| Frances T. Clark | do | 3,483.84 |
| Ercilia E. Martinez | do | 2,918.70 |
| Lorenzo E. Tapia | do | 3,021.42 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $9,475.00 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 9,475.00 |
| Expended during period | ---------- |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 9,475.00 |

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
*Chairman.*

---

JANUARY 1, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

(Under authority of S. Res. 34, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Fernandez, Cruz S | Clerical assistant | $3,483.84 |
| Graves, John R | Clerk (to Sept. 1) | 1,255.48 |
| McBride, Paul | Clerk (from Sept. 1) | 3,032.04 |
| Mollica, D. F | Clerk | 3,406.77 |
| Mounton, Rodney F | do | 5,278.02 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $57,025.97 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 57,025.97 |
| Expended during period | 24,716.87 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 32,309.10 |

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
*Chairman.*

---

JANUARY 6, 1957.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Harrison, Gordon F | Chief clerk | $7,399.98 |
| Moore, Marian G | Assistant chief clerk | 3,483.84 |
| St. Claire, Darrell | Professional staff member. | 7,150.62 |
| West, Langdon C | do | 6,808.80 |
| McCain, Robert S | do | 6,036.00 |
| Hanlon, Joseph | do | 5,610.48 |
| Gavin, B. Floye | Clerical assistant | 3,483.84 |
| Mitchell, Elizabeth S | do | 3,072.84 |
| Sharp, Hildreth T | do | 2,001.84 |
| Downs, Eleanor L | do | 2,713.14 |
| Coder, John P | Printing and editorial assistant. | 1,017.96 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $9,813.80 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 9,813.80 |
| Expended during period | 1,467.95 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 8,345.85 |

THOS C. HENNINGS, Jr.
*Chairman.*

---

JANUARY 9, 1958.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Clark, Alice | Chief clerk | $3,535.26 |
| Duffy, James H | Chief counsel | 6,808.80 |
| Gale, Clara R | Research assistant (from Dec. 7). | 471.36 |
| Humphrey, David R | Clerical assistant (from Sept. 5). | 2,609.38 |
| Kath, Norma H | Clerical assistant | 2,302.08 |
| Mase, Sadi J | Associate chief counsel | 6,808.80 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $43,619.61 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | ---------- |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 43,619.61 |
| Expended during period | 24,442.99 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 19,176.62 |

THOS. C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
*Chairman.*

---

DECEMBER 31, 1957.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Amis, William D | Professional staff member. | $6,180.53 |
| Byrne, Elizabeth | Assistant chief clerk | 3,483.84 |
| Jehle, Philip F | Professional staff member. | 5,759.52 |
| Messick, Wiley S | do | 5,237.38 |
| Novak, Gertrude C | Clerical assistant | 2,610.42 |
| O'Connor, Blake | Professional staff member. | 6,180.53 |
| Ruppert, Minna L | Chief clerk | 5,322.60 |
| Ryan, Nell F | Clerical assistant | 2,404.86 |
| Smith, Don W | Clerk messenger (from Sept. 1). | 1,363.48 |
| Stults, Walter B | Staff director | 7,399.98 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $8,389.84 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | None |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 8,389.84 |
| Expended during period | 5,722.32 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 2,667.52 |

JOHN SPARKMAN,
*Chairman.*

---

DECEMBER 31, 1957.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

(Pursuant to S. Res. 42, agreed to January 30, 1957)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees during the period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name | Profession | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Adams, Walter | Professional staff member (from July 1 to 31; and from Aug. 19 to Sept. 16). | $2,193.95 |
| Alford, William C | Clerk-messenger (to July 7). | 71.54 |
| Burwell, Rose M | Clerical assistant (July 1 to Oct. 16; and Nov. 18 to Dec. 31). | 1,778.02 |
| Chaternuck, Pauline | Clerical assistant (from Oct. 17). | 383.04 |
| Creech, William A | Professional staff member. | 4,597.14 |
| Dye, Elaine C | Clerical assistant | 2,302.08 |
| Erickson, William J | Professional staff member. | 5,768.46 |
| Flynn, John J | do | 4,597.14 |
| Foulke, Roy E | Professional staff member (to July 31). | 841.50 |
| Hall, Edwin P., Jr | Clerk-messenger (to Sept. 9). | 705.20 |
| Hendry, James B | Professional staff member (July 2-6). | 118.16 |
| Smith, Don W | Clerk-messenger (from Aug. 26 to 31). | 51.10 |
| Weadock, Robert L | Professional staff member. | 4,646.16 |
| White, Lee C | do | 5,500.92 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds available for expenditure at beginning of period | $55,926.91 |
| Additional funds authorized during period | None |
| Total available for expenditure during period | 55,926.91 |
| Expended during period | 42,740.98 |
| Balance available for expenditure at end of period | 13,185.93 |

JOHN SPARKMAN,
*Chairman.*

---

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 16, 1958:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

James Major Baley, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina for the term of

4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 9, 1957.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Nelson P. Rose, of Ohio, to be general counsel for the Department of the Treasury, to fill an existing vacancy.

The following-named candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

*To be senior surgeon*

George Brecher

*To be senior sanitary engineer*

Lewis A. Young

*To be scientist*

Robert R. Omata

*To be assistant scientist*

Clarence J. Weinmann

*To be nurse officer*

Jessie M. Scott

II. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

*To be assistant sanitary engineer*

Morton D. Sinkoff

III. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

*To be senior surgeons*

Bohdan G. Giel
William F. Mayes

*To be surgeons*

Daniel M. Bloch — Thayer M. Mackenzie
Maurice F. Herring, Jr. — Alfred S. Nelson

*To be senior assistant surgeons*

Gordon Allen — Mark H. Lane
Clement P. Cotter — William C. Mohler
John L. Getz, Jr. — Joseph J. Noya
Lloyd Guth — Jacob Robbins
Martin D. Hicklin — William L. Walter
William M. Jackson — Harry W. Weller

*To be assistant surgeon*

John R. S. Remsberg

*To be dental surgeon*

John M. Frankel

*To be senior assistant dental surgeon*

F. D. Morse, Jr.

*To be senior sanitary engineer*

Thomas H. Seltzer

*To be scientist*

George E. Jay, Jr.

*To be assistant pharmacists*

Mark H. Barnett
Wesley R. Gladhart, Jr.
Paul J. Le Sage

*To be sanitarian*

Donald R. Johnson

*To be senior assistant nurse officers*

Lucile G. Buderer
Harriett Hicok
Virginia D. Hines

*To be senior dietitian*

Janet E. Stroupe

IV. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

*To be senior assistant dental surgeon*

Christopher E. Kennemer

*To be senior assistant veterinarian*

Paul Arnstein

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

*To be major generals*

Maj. Gen. Thomas Morgan Watlington, O16780, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

*To be brigadier generals*

Brig. Gen. Norman Edgar Youngblood, O28996, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lyle Edward Seeman, O17082, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David William Heiman, O17094, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Everett Potter, O17098, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert George Butler, O17191, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Legare Kilgore Tarrant, O17208, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Evan McLaren Houseman, O17307, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ralph Thomas Nelson, O17308, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alexander McNair Willing, O38619, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Louis Edward Cotulla, O29069, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Harvey Cash 2d, O38628, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Norman Hayden Vissering, O41603, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Dreyfus, O29117, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alvin Galt Viney, O17511, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Lloyd Person, O17517, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Philip Henry Draper, Jr., O17543, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Milton Colby, O17562, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ralph Robert Mace, O17578, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Darwin Hamlin, O17619, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edmund Chauncey Rockefeller Lasher, O17624, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Reisner Ranck, O17647, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Kerr Ghormley, O17674, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Little Cook, O17675, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lester Skene Bork, O17685, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Greene Calloway, O17690, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, O17706, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hugh Mackintosh, O17716, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., O17730, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Bruce Easley, O17735, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Norfleet Griffin, O17775, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Arnold Carter, O18023, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Philip Campbell Wehle, O18067, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, O18088, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Knox Wilson, Jr., O18218, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore Francis Bogart, O18245, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul Russell Weyrauch, O18252, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Herbert Lucian Scofield, O29462, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William White Dick, Jr., O18384, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Frew Train, O18415, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Knight Waters, O18481, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Orlando Collette Troxel, Jr., O18487, Army of the United States (colonel U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Thomas Pachler, O18488, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin John Messinger, O18503, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin Anderson Walker, O18552, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Rogers Woodward, O18582, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

*To be brigadier generals, chaplain*

Brig. Gen. Frank Alden Tobey, O41696, Army of the United States (colonel, chaplain, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

*To be major generals*

Brig. Gen. Louis Jacob Rumaggi, O14900, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Olaf Helgesen Kyster, Jr., O16830, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Mercer Christie Walter, O17151, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Ned Dalton Moore, O18212, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Arnold Carter, O18023, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul Amos Gavan, O17169, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Frederick Bohlender, O17814, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Fraley Van Natta, O17086, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Alvin Galt Viney, O17511, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. Thomas William Mattingly, O20068, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Frank Sherman Henry, O18989, United States Army.

Col. Kenneth Adelbert McCrimmon, O18336, United States Army.

Col. Harold Walmsley, O18769, United States Army.

Col. Howard Raymond Whittaker, O29408, United States Army.

Col. George Thomas Powers 3d, O19137, United States Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299.

*To be major*

James, Lee B., O25619.

*To be major, Women's Army Corps*

Parks, Dorothy W., L280.

*To be captain*

Estrada, Leon P., O68098.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be first lieutenants*

Brown, Raymond V., O75157.
Granger, John D., O75197.
Haywood, William M., Jr., O75207.
McCord, John S., O75247.
Roberts, William P., O75277.
Thomas, David L., O75305.
Wallace, Danny C., O75312.
Wilks, Clarence D., O75318.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be colonel*

*Radsch, Rex William, O251502.

*To be lieutenant colonels*

Ashworth, Talmadge DeWitt, O348299.
Bacharach, Gustav Moore, O316111.
Banks, Keith Bateman, O296383.
Bash, James Hoyt, O310183.
Benner, James Daniel, O343091.
Cameron, Harry Frank, Jr., O371208.
Coffey, Frederick James, O291713.
Cole, John Scott, O329506.
Cumming, William Francis, O307078.
Downing, Wayne Edward, O311990.
Elting, John Robert, O297917.
Emmerich, Rollins Stanley, O342278.
Fallen, Arthur John, Jr., O311965.
Goodwin, Walton, 3rd, O314438.
Jacks, Samuel T., O336314.
King, Ryan William, O363232.
Kitto, George Joseph, O311723.
LaPointe, John Thomas, O302493.
Lautz, Edward Hale, O306360.
Leidholt, Ernest Bruno, O312990.
Luther, Henry, O355252.
Rice, Kenneth Eaton, O321728.
Rolle, Norman Benjamin, O307520.
Schimmel, Bernard Hastie, O285646.
Springer, Louis Ferguson, O308918.
Thacher, Coleman Wallace, O318126.
Wyles, Eben Richards, O311589.

*To be majors*

Abel, Carl Mullaney, O1321134.
Abrino, Francis Eugene, O347987.
Adair, George William, O346621.
Adams, Hobert Dewey, O1321729.
Adams, James Dana, O1633513.
Akins, James Don, O454330.
Andrews, George Henry, O885383.
Anido, Victor Maurice, Jr., O400743.
Augustauskas, Anthony Stanley, O1284626.
Bachtel, Charles Levi, O1634283.
Baker, Chester Argus, O373526.
Bankson, Rodger Russell, O353092.
Baranouskas, Raymond Martin, O1302757.
Barton, Jack Everett, O455350.
Baxter, Samuel Ford, O370439.
Beach, William Victor, O373546.
Beebe, John Eliott, Jr., O350538.
Bell, William Woodrow, O354682.
Bercaw, Roger Matthew, O1822316.
Bergsagel, Ralph Monrad, O1573039.
Bermingham, Peter Francis, O1058723.
Betts, Charles Archibald, O379879.
Billard, Jules Frederic, O1014799.
Bishop, Raymond Chapman, O403627.
Blom, Arthur Ralph, O345765.
Boardman, William Morgan, O485039.
Boesch, Eugene Francis, O900014.
Bogen, Paul Logasa, O355729.
Booth, Reed Alexander, O353066.
Born, Raymond Nicholas, O455595.
Bott, Frederic Charles, O451081.
Boudman, Arthur Belles, O1051042.
Boughn, Robert Estes, O395744.
Boyce, William Murray, O364353.
Brashear, Goldman Taylor, O452022.
Bremkamp, Louis Edward, O425627.
Brewer, Dwight Cleland, O408121.
Brey, Albert Joseph, O393404.
Brown, Burnett Jackson, O384169.
Brust, Robert Philip, O391121.
Burdell, Frank Edward, Jr., O450078.
Burgess, John Frank, Jr., O415367.
Burkholder, James Brooke, O392322.
Burns, Donald Edwin, O453138.
Buser, George Wager, O454341.
Buttleman, Leslie Louis, O1308469.
Campbell, John Edward, O385096.
Carroll, Walter David, Jr., O328170.
Carter, Lamar Gordon, O342723.
Case, Frank Borton, O1535567.
Chamblee, John James, O2034666.
Charles, Alvin Kenneth, O426222.
Chegin, Thomas Eugene, O402781.
Clark, William Jerome, O1825116.
Clautice, Edward Wellmore, O370396.
Cole, Jack Newcombe, O450829.
Comrie, Russell Malcolm, O374514.
Contole, William Salvatore, O352670.
Cook, Harvey James, O393475.
Cook, Richard Halliday, O394007.
Cotter, Arthur Edward, O421018.
Coupe, Robert Dennis, O1311985.
Cowan, Donald Erwin, O378196.
Craig, James Lewis, Jr., O316415.
Crawford, Grover Lee, Jr., O335563.
Cullen, Joe Clark, O405785.
Cunningham, Thomas Joseph, Jr., O1283382.
Cushwa, William Ellison, O1283035.
Cutter, James Frederick, O352842.
Daly, Thomas Martin, O1554885.
Darms, John Livingston, Jr., O450842.
Daulton, James Otto, O1016425.
Davis, Woodrow Wilson, O1703775.
DeLancey, Raymond Winthrop, O335096.
De Milt, Irving Francis, Jr., O1031398.
Dempsey, Michael Angelo, O1296336.
Derosier, Gerald Arthur, O396010.
Dittmer, Robert Edward, O1580868.
Dosch, Harry Albert, Jr., O351100.
Downey, Earl Courtney, O411360.
Draper, James Leon, Jr., O407465.
Driscoll, Arthur Francis, O1795776.
Duke, Henry Bradford, O349007.
Durst, John Edmond, O405757.
Duttweiler, Charles Henry, O1112126.
Dwyer, Frank Arthur, Jr., O418311.
Dyer, Joseph Cross, O906431.
Ernst, Carl Julius, O338888.
Farber, Leo Joseph, O408578.
Fellows, John Lee, Jr., O1291612.
Files, Maynard Whitney, O386767.
Finnegan, John Bernard, O1102725.
Ford, John Millspaugh, O1308319.
Foster, Gayle Herbert, O340522.
Francis, Gus Christ, O371149.
Fuller, Robert Joseph, O438626.
Fullerton, Thomas Kennedy, O413687.
Gaddis, Shelton, O353108.
Gallagher, Hugh Thomas, O1546059.
Gates, Vincent Ira, O1284317.
Gausman, Willis Ferdinand, O440209.
Geehan, Bernard Thomas, O382672.
Genger, Edward Paul, O1322907.
Gill, William Edgar, O379858.
Gillen, Joseph Xavier, O1040719.
Gilroy, Eugene Michael, O1173619.
Gobeille, Gerard Alphonse, O1052360.
Goff, Kenneth Joseph, O1165181.
Goldberg, Seymour Louis, O1296197.
Goldblum, Kirby Donald, O361861.
Golden, Simon Socrates, O1633238.
Goodell, Henry Ward, AO1039976.
Gundling, David Louis, O407763.
Hager, Ernest Julius, O1285579.
Haley, John James, O392232.
Haley, Joseph Kelly, Jr., O377570.
Hall, John Broughton, O1173980.
Hall, Lloyd Carroll, O407885.
Hames, William Elbert, Jr., O1647065.
Hamilton, Doyce, O1300480.
Hamilton, Howard Edmund, O450296.
Hansen, Herbert Carl, O1551416.
Hansen, Richard Arthur, O455639.
Hanson, Mark Kellogg, O426815.
Hanson, Walter Scott, O421014.
Harris, James Benjamin, O400913.
Hayes, Arthur Ennis, O1001147.
Hayes, Melvin Bennett, O1581786.
Hearst, Don Allen, O1286647.
Hensley, William Wilson, O1581174.
Higgins, Wayne George, O371409.
Hills, Henry Murel, O315460.
Hinton, Reginald James, O1313094.
Hodge, William Lyle, O1048819.
Holland, Norman Leonwood, O1573267.
Hollis, Charles Edwin, O1548075.
Holm, George Philip, O454681.
Holt, Harvey Scott, Jr., O371789.
Howard, Harry McVern, O441001.
Hulsey, Alvin, O1301309.
Hunt, Wheeler Houston, O372236.
Hustead, George Lincoln Thomas, O391507.
Hutchinson, Wallace Charles, O386002.
Ice, Jack Carleton, O1037550.
Irving, Thurman Algernon, O353004.
Jacobs, Harold John, O1283615.
Jensen, Norman Christian, O375770.
Johnson, Elliott McClintock, O1283440.
Johnson, Walter Raymond, O1296582.
Jones, Charles Evans Hughes, O390371.
Jones, Robert Ellis, O376938.
Kalergis, James George, O453613.
Kane, Frank Raymond, Jr., O1045793.
Keisel, Walter Irving, O373741.
Kennon, William Upshur, O352483.
Kersey, Sidney Prentiss, O328123.
Kirkwood, Walter Vernon, Jr., O375096.
Kohlhagen, Werner S., O1049541.
Kolankiewicz, Charles Francis, O1556170.
Kramer, Theodore Jr., O1166106.
La Mont, Charles Edward, O367436.
Ladd, Harvey Martin, O1181935.
Lahmer, John Arthur, O389208.
Lail, James Gano, O426722.
Lau, Ernest Victor, O455966.
Laudieri, Mario Frank, O407457.
LeClair, Joseph Albert, Jr., O1048670.
Ledgerwood, Howard Gail, O1280064.
Lehman, Arthur Maurice, O1636203.
Lehman, Robert Hersh, O1040564.
Levy, Gilbert Paul, O1575420.

Lewis, Keith Lester, O1548093.
Lewis, William Douglas, O416137.
Licord, Frank Albert, O681916.
Lieberberg, George, O1635029.
Likens, Ellery Albert, Jr., O1016024.
Lindow, Rodman Edward, O379038.
Loomis, Jester Mortimer, Jr., O370235.
Lovejoy, Charles Douglas, O374232.
Lowrie, Elvin Stewart, O1286314.
Lucas, John George, O407180.
Lyon, David Lockwood, O462176.
Malone, Patrick Matthew, O1051271.
Marsh, Curtis Naum, Jr., O316325.
Martin, John Roy, O399024.
Martin, Robert Wheeler, O1285969.
Mason, William Hovey, O397347.
Mathews, Bernard Lilse, O370509.
Mathews, Charles Braxton, Jr., O1046555.
Mattice, Edson Russell, O358222.
Mattson, Rudolph Leonard, O1823179.
Mausert, Ryerson Newhall, O360170.
Mayer, Edward Emil, O423736.
Maynard, John Blackwell, Jr., O315060.
McConnell, John Arvel, O346769.
McConnell, Kendred Chris, O452014.
McDowell, Richard Dittmar, O423199.
McGowan, James Frederick, O418864.
McGrath, Vincent Jerome, O1638044.
McKaney, William Aloysious, Jr., O401337.
McKay, Robert John, O1167108.
McKean, Sterling Judd, O341423.
McMullin, William Carrington, O352459.
Mendelson, Sheldon Harold, O375162.
Merrill, Clifford Royce, O450462.
Miller, Maynard Charles, O329984.
Mills, Webster, O362454.
Misdom, Howell Ellis, O356572.
Mitchell, Barry Harry, O453184.
Mitchell, George Rodda, O1290982.
Mollen, Irving Roth, O352341.
Montesclaros, Melecio Juan, O1305289.
Moore, Alva Joseph, O401751.
Moore, Robert Lee, O387362.
Moran, James Joseph, O453873.
Morrell, John Russell, O1105038.
Morris, Raymond Claude, O359755.
Murday, Stanley James, O424853.
Murphy, John Leo, O401692.
Newman, William Curtis, O354474.
Noonan, James Henry, Jr., O1059024.
Oberg, Vincent Gustavus, O1046593.
Oberman, Marvin Dee, O1284008.
Pearson, Robert Alexander, O1573502.
Pelham, Charles Clay, O366819.
Pell, Mark Gair, O340436.
Peters, Gus Stanley, O449601.
Phillips, Wayne Nevel, O1170136.
Picciotti, Romulus Augustus, O428718.
Pickett, Joseph Robert, O1285115.
Pierce, Thomas Arthur, O1944781.
Pool, Flournoy P., Jr., O451841.
Pope, Cornell, O1104345.
Povendo, Nicholas Anton, O451513.
Prebil, Fred Charles, O376553.
Prentice, Neil Buchanan, O1106414.
Prescott, Dana Serr, O453446.
Pumphrey, A. T., O540446.
Quante, Frank, Jr., O391106.
Rael, Zacarias Francisco, O1101629.
Rankin, Robert Bruce, O449838.
Reid, Marion Mercer, O1017388.
Renfro, Henry Moore, O349066.
Rich, Arthur Armstrong, O367202.
Riggins, Jack Franklin, O386895.
Riley, James Anderson, O371534.
Riley, William Thomas, Jr., O463940.
Rogers, George, O1172628.
Rogers, Poole, O1581347.
Rollason, Richard Norton, O452074.
Ross, Homer Glenn, O1286708.
Rounds, Raymond Bennett, O1040607.
Rowland, Will Cassell, O342971.
Rowlands, Richard Arthur, Jr., O387550.
Roye, Herbert Francis, O1283676.
Ryckaert, Elmer Bernard, O405774.
Sabel, August James, O455224.
Safer, Joseph, O342755.
Salmon, Henry Sanford, Jr., O408538.
Salthouse, Wirt Charlton, O362465.
Sanders, Joe Maxwell, O347853.
Sanderson, Walter Laurence, O470095.
Saunders, Raymond Wilbur, O382765.
Sauter, Louis Francis, Jr., O1580271.
Sawbridge, John Joseph, O462624.
Sayre, Gorden Earl, Sr., O374215.
Scales, Joseph Walter, O1182957.
Scanlon, Donald Lawrence, O1796160.
Schauers, Charles Julius, O451064.
Schmidt, Hugh Francis, O323268.
Schrecengost, Howard Elmer, O1284223.
Shealy, Carroll Durham, O383146.
Shelton, James Alexander, O465969.
Shropshire, Lewis Walter, O334652.
Silvestri, Armand Joseph, O1945491.
Skeath, Elbur Jay, O430493.
Skees, Hugh Shelby, O332924.
Skrien, Cyrus Alexander, O1045597.
Smith, Arthur Lewis, Jr., O341943.
Smith, Grover Gathreon, O1325529.
Smith, Malcolm White, O442992.
Smith, Marshall James, O1284040.
Sommer, Harry Arthur, O1586211.
Stell, James Howell, O1286915.
Stern, Gates Barnet, O341100.
Stier, Robert Joseph, O2035392.
Stine, Harlan Chester, O1010888.
Swanson, Arthur Victor, O1573962.
Swears, Clayton Cole, O453909.
Tanner, Royal Kendrick, O341970.
Taylor, Harry Joseph, Jr., O383419.
Taylor, Thomas A., Jr., O381958.
Terribile, Valentine Thomas, O376341.
Terris, Alexander Anton, O1170578.
Thomas, Joseph Anthony, O1579220.
Tinari, Emanuel Joseph, O1302905.
Trigg, Thomas King, O353458.
Troxell, Raymond Alexander, O423174.
Urban, George, O1171401.
Varhol, Michael Clement, O373963.
Waddell, Charles Christian, O405453.
Welch, Louis Charles, O406265.
Weltmer, Noyes, Jr., O360432.
Woolsey, Myron Frank, O1324384.
Wyatt, Othel, O395190.
Yarrington, William Ray, O454442.
Young, James Sanford, O1040859.
Zall, Emil Anthony, O1307116.

*To be captains*

Adams, Robert Edson, O961393.
Adams, Robert Frank, O2034656.
Agee, Charles Daniel, O520512.
Aiken, Jamie Lee, O2204195.
Aines, Donald Sutphen, O949399.
Alexander, Marvin Lucas, O2033672.
Allen, Andrew Sherrod, O955201.
Allen, Fred Eugene, O1298494.
Allison, James Wesley, O960928.
Allman, Phillip Hugh, Jr., O967669.
Alvarez, Alfred Anthony, O2033950.
Ambrose, Wayne Russell, O1924745.
Amburn, Warren Gamble, O1336587.
Amenson, Raymond Carl, O1178994.
Anderson, Burton Lloyd, O1649260.
Anderson, Philip Calvin, O536277.
Anderson, William Alex, O945641.
Armeli, Jerry Philip, O2202951.
Arnold, Stanley Watson, O1325363.
Arnold, William Joseph, Jr., O1059990.
Arnwine, Henry Boggess, O722973.
Ashley, Merle Welden, O1038422.
Austin, Henry Marshall, Jr., O1327800.
Badger, Joseph Eugene, O2021238.
Bailey, James, O1300438.
Bailey, John Franklin, O1313707.
Ball, John James, Jr., O2020871.
Bangs, Robert Ross, O1684938.
Banks, Thomas Girard, O2026261.
Barbour, Edward Lambert, O948508.
Barda, James Joseph, O1295980.
Barkley, James Robert, O965315.
Barlow, Bowman Orlando, O1019073.
Barnwell, John Carter, O1120323.
Barris, Donald Frederick, O1117352.
Baugh, Jack Ray, O1287649.
Baxley, James Warfield, O954486.
Bean, Robert, O1913379.
Beardsley, William Franklin, O956341.
Beauchamp, Darwin Delbert, O788311.
Beene, Dudley Crawford, O2279931.
Berger, Newell James, Jr., O949628.
Bergner, John, O1341619.
Birdsong, Eff W., Jr., O1179782.
Bishop, Bertram Joseph, O961373.
*Black, Marion Ray, O973640.
Black, William Edward, O1684937.
Bledsoe, James Elton, O1331807.
Blood, William Carr, O1341848.
Bodroghy, Robert Francis, O1913467.
Boland, Richard Henry, O1688405.
Boll, Kenneth Harry, O2262799.
Boman, Truman Robert, O1018042.
Bonham, Mark Myatt, Jr., O957422.
Bosan, George Steven, O545400.
Boutelle, Guy Chester, O2007270.
Bowman, Elmo Lyle, O2211115.
Bowman, James Homer, O1112577.
Boyer, Samuel Reitzel, Jr., O961901.
Bradley, James Thurman, O2207619.
Brann, Durward Herschel, O1171916.
Brennan, William Hubert, O2041414.
Bridges, Wayne Walter, O1112045.
Briggs, Jack Leroy, O2033963.
Brigham, Bruce Alan, O547557.
Brinker, Joseph Raymond, O1333422.
Brock, Luther Austin, O976097.
Brooks, Lawrence Phillip, O1338437.
Brown, Royal Baxter, O1340745.
Browne, Harvey Melvin, O1043583.
Brummer, James Louis, O1058738.
*Brundrett Tom Houston, O2207455.
Brunt, Julian Gould, O887328.
Buchanan, Thomas E., O961608.
Buchanan, James, Jr., O1178423.
Bundy, James Albert, O1166026.
Burns, George T., O1342321.
Burton, Kenneth Jack, O2209686.
Busbey, Arthur Bresnahan, Jr., O556641.
Bush, Sydney Arnold, O1647134.
Bushong, Charles Ralph, O1046384.
Bynum, Pierre Dallas, O1917616.
Byrne, John Patrick, O2021015.
Callanan, John Austin, O2014524.
Cannon, James William, O2014768.
Carey, Eldon Winfield, O1913250.
Carney, Jonathon Donald, O1331707.
Carpenter, Jay Dawson, O1031393.
Carranza, Hector, O2207370.
Carroll, George Franklin, O977933.
Case, Francis Richard, O1080552.
Case, Richard Haynes, O2019985.
Chamberlain, Edwin William, Jr., O1688805.
Charron, Frederick Eugene, O528466.
Chelenza, Nicholas Joseph, O1999830.
Cherry, Hugh George, O1552858.
Ching, Kenneth En Yin, O445557.
Chivers, John, O966623.
Chrisenberry, John Stanley, O1337139.
Cicero, Raymond Frank, O1302602.
Claridge, Earl Willis, O2262314.
Clark, John Lanham, Jr., O1012167.
Clark, Richard Paris, Jr., O1913307.
Clarke, Arthur Morrow, O737729.
Coan, Bernard Francis, O961195.
Coffman, Warren George, O2019292.
Cole, Philip Joseph, O1640965.
Collins, John Martin, O1640322.
Colville, Warren Randall, O1917805.
Condit, Ross Rowland, Jr., O491054.
Connors, Robert Joseph, O2206497.
Connolly, John Edward, O549099.
Conrad, Herman Andrew, O959646.
Cooley, Richard Edmund, O948968.
Cooper, William Walker, O779796.
Corley, Arthur Verrell, O2000759.
Cox, Kenneth Rudolph, O997270.
Coyle, Martin Joseph, O1060744.
Craig, Harry Wilbur, O854618.
Crane, Joe D., O1686494.
Crecelius, Richard Allan, O1177354.
Crochet, Elby Joseph, O2206747.
Cronin, Eugene Joseph, Jr., O1535597.
Crouch, Edward Oliver, O1305204.
Culp, James Franklin, O989597.
Cummings, Arthur Bernard, O2021043.
Cummings, Clyde Edward, O1186811.
Cushing, Robert Leo, O973855.
Cuta, Weston Walter, O1919167.
D'Ambrosio, Eugene Joseph, O1326698.
D'Louhy, George Joseph, O2274782.
Dahl, LaVerne Harold, O1315914.
Dalton, Joseph Richard, O1080439.
Dameron, Fred, O971578.
Daniels, Hiram Edward, O1913407.

Darden, Harry Lee, O1046068.
Daub, David Louis, O1642781.
Daugherty, Robert Murray, O1794789.
Davis, Joseph Arthur, O1173920.
Davis, Walter Ray, O511706.
de Latour, Louis Adam, O555847.
Delavan, Patrick N., O75172.
de Lorimier, Charles Tancred, O955760.
De Sanctis, John Nicholas, O1638952.
DeVall, Sherral Clyde, O1648574.
De Weese, Robert Edgar, Jr., O959313.
Decker, James William, O949993.
Del Vitto, Jon Marc, O2033607
Denham, John Paul, O1582678.
Dent, James Robert, O525367.
Desrosiers, Marcel Leo, O2200901.
Dews, Hampton, O1686738.
Diaz, George Francis, O1322002.
Dicus, Forest Joseph, O974009.
Dietrich, Frank Leslie, O954068.
Diggs, Walter Frank, O1556269.
Dillender, Jack Percy, O1824813.
Dinkins, Holly Walker, O1290042.
Dixon, Robert Mobley, O2033732.
Doren, Donald March, O1045717.
Dotur, Stephen Paul, O2028375.
Duarte, Stanley James, O1645807.
Ducote, Richard Joseph, Jr., O1101416.
Dufault, Robert Charles, O1041135.
Duff, Joseph Cornell, O979167.
Duke, Herbert Jackson, Jr., O1923507.
Dulaney, William Dykes, O993892.
Dunham, Wesley Loyal, O2211537.
Dunks, Fred, O1552053.
Dunn, Harold Raley, O1581671.
Dunn, Thomas Moore, Jr., O2021131.
Durham, Guy, O964370.
Durocher, Norman Lawrence, O2282483.
Earnest, George Custer, O2204424.
Eaton, William Henry, O2269569.
Eckes, LeRoy John, O543054.
Edwards, Ahmed Thomas, O956072.
Eichinger, Louis Simon, Jr., O1924651.
Ellison, Richard Wright, O521960.
Ellison, Robert Jack, O956034.
Ells, Leo Ernest, O2033922.
Elvington, Carl Willis, O2018664.
Emerson, Vaughn Claire, O1686662.
Emrich, Robert Fred, O1638220.
Ernst, Henry Samuel, Jr., O1589184.
Erwin, Charles Edward, O1693830.
Esco, Oliver Norton, Jr., O1341766.
Evans, Arthur Bracton, O993682.
Evans, Dell Guthery, O965713.
Evans, Lester Joseph, O972978.
Everding, Francis Roman, O2200425.
Ewing, James William, O1052763.
Farwell, Lester Charles, O522595.
Faulkner, Oscar Lee, Jr., O2014814.
Fender, Louis Hill, O947182.
Ferrell, Odel Preston, O1178141.
Fierke, Alfred Henry, O1177793.
Firnstahl, Norman Paul, O949757.
Fisher, Charles Mecabe, Jr., O1546978.
Fisk, Eugene Norman, O1327829.
Fitzgerald, Douglas Inmon, O1046798.
Fitzgibbons, Eugene Thomas, O2200291.
Fleshman, William Howard, O1177798.
Flournoy, Robert Wilson, Jr., O2061816.
Fogel, Milton Irving, O1559326.
Fortune, Samuel Alfred, Jr., O959105.
Fox, William Innis, O1340276.
Franks, Glenn Edward, O1185219.
Frye, John William, O1683461.
Fulmore, Charles Eugene, O971033.
Fulton, Taylor Roscoe, O957268.
Gaige, Delburt Clair, O963182.
Gallagher, Francis Edward, O971260.
Gardner, Frank Keith, O1649019.
Garman, George Albert, Jr., O2284032.
Gately, Matthew John, O1335774.
Gatrell, Wallace Bassett, O946697.
Gentry, Paul, O1917624.
Gentry, William Henry Lee, O1185037.
Giacomozzi, Francis, O1015730.
Giamario, Theodore Thaddeus, O1556423.
Gibson, Ramon Shroyer, O1031317.
Gieson, Robert John, O463992.
Gilbert, Robert Raymond, O543438.
Goen, Ira Jeane, O2021066.
Gojsza, William Paul, O1118719.
*Gordon, Phillips Nason, O994285.
Gorler, Howard William, O1698147.
Gorwitz, Bertram Kall, O1176352.
Gouge, Kenneth Guy, O2205220.
Gough, Robert Byron, Sr., O1337292.
Graber, Gordon Ladd, O1299732.
Grabowski, William Stanley, O1555049.
Graham, Elmer Harvey, O543932.
Grasser, Peter George, O2033740.
Graver, Herbert Arthur, O1169985.
Green, Warren Larry, O1948913.
Greene, Vernon Edward, O2005633.
Gregg, Arthur James, O2021060.
Griffin, Frank L., O1688574.
Grisard, Gus Henry, O1633909.
Grombacher, Gerd Susman, O885638.
Guss, Stephan John, Jr., O1950359.
Hagadus, Raymond, O2025514.
Haigler, Rayford Hansel, O2204700.
Haile, William Guthrie, O514805.
Halloran, Joseph Edward, Jr., O527705.
Hammerle, Robert Arnold, O1330648.
Hanks, Clinton Martin, O2033784.
*Hanley, Thomas Lesley, O995987.
Hansoette, Raymond, O1550813.
Harsh, Keith Rolland, O1319618.
Hartline, William Emmett, O1178180.
Haugan, Edgar J., O1342271.
Hawley, William B., O1300795.
Haynes, James Thomas, O1334142.
Hays, Marshall C., O538610.
Hayward, Fred Otis, Jr., O1046478.
Head, Robert Laverne, O975996.
Heckman, Bill Alexander, O1553837.
Heisel, Clarence Leo, O991311.
Helker, Albert Aloysius, O2203269.
Henderson, Joseph Leroy, O1341267.
Hendrickson, William Richard, O994639.
Herigstad, Bert Henry, O1340655.
Hertzog, Frank Sherman, O522606.
Hesser, William Frederick, O1046126.
Heuston, Harold William, O1339360.
Hicks, Robert Ricker, O989257.
Hieta, Clifford William, O2210272.
Higginbotham, Travis Lee, O1685027.
Hill, James William, Jr., O500509.
Hinton, William Sanders, O1684989.
Hobbs, William Aaron, O2205135.
Hoffman, Paul Martin, O1556149.
Holbrook, Bruce, O963899.
Holper, Ambrose Clement, O1048416.
Holst, Melvin, O1913397.
Hooker, William Patterson, O1340895.
Horneij, Edwin Henry, O454738.
Hornstein, David Hood, O546711.
Horton, Charles Lawrence, O1913358.
Hoskin, Charles Edward, 3d, O443134.
Howard, Charles Franklin, O2204038.
Howard, Charles R., O1290250.
Howell, Fred Foster, O556810.
Huckaby, Lewis Clyde, O2262809.
Hughes, David Willis, O1055334.
Ingram, Earl, O1315585.
Irvin, Darrell Boots, O2211299.
Isaac, Lee, O377096.
Ishida, George Sadaharu, O1922516.
Israelson, Nathaniel Herbert, O1042606.
Iverson, Vernon LeRoy, O983365.
Ivins, William Edgar, O973910.
Jackson, Robert James, O1822010.
Jenkins, Paul William, O1172091.
Jensen, Frank Lewis, Jr., O1924588.
Johns, Leo Doyle, O1170021.
Johnson, Charles Walter, Jr., O2046315.
Johnson, Ernest Walter, O1013600.
Johnson, Ervin Vance, O1172094.
Johnson, George Norman, Jr., O965219.
Johnson, Haskell Lee, O1895141.
Johnson, Hugh Herbert, O977665.
Johnson, John LeRoy, O1548454.
Johnson, Robert Overn, O1637770.
Jones, Chesley Huey, O1645083.
Jones, Ernest Eugene, O1179470.
Jones, James Dalton, Jr., O2204420.
Jones, John Robert, O981608.
Jones, John Roberts, O2204058.
Jones, Norman Gordon, O1846937.
Jones, Paul Burnell, O1996694.
Jose, Allen Fremont, O2200868.
Kalagian, Samuel Peter, O826681.
*Kark, John Sobchuk, O1917881.
Karns, Robert Henry, O954216.
Karst, Ralph August, O1595612.
Kelly, Arthur Lancaster, O994681.
Kendree, Ulmont Redvers, Jr.
Kerns, Raymond Clyde, O1175190.
Kersey, Irwin Joseph, O960106.
Kiehhnau, Donald Wilbert, O975669.
*Killen, Milton Stribling, Jr., O2205351.
*Kimman, John William, Jr., O981429.
Kincy, William Perry, Jr., O533703.
King, Justice Burnard, O1650176.
King, William Thaddeus, Jr., O1035299.
Kinnaird, Ralph Donald, Jr., O976163.
Kinnan, Floyd Hamer, O1054650.
Klevesahl, Fred Carl, O1686766.
Knight, John Christian, O2203566.
Koch, Richard Parry, O1339451.
Komoto, Yasuro, O1540915.
Krakower, Albert M., O816881.
Kreiner, Richard E., O2203009.
Krug, Robert Wright, O2014786.
Labar, Merwin Kent, O986756.
Lafiamme, Norman Albert, O958054.
Lamason, Jerry Lynn, O1120591.
Lamm, Warren Willard, O1688634.
Lampert, Ernest Robert, O539914.
Lange, Arthur George, Jr., O1339549.
Lantzky, Karl Albert, Jr., O544452.
Larkin, Daniel Thomas, O982695.
Larkin, James Joseph, O434034.
Larsen, Edward Dean, O1186982.
Lawrence, Clyde Kelley, O2002476.
Lawrence, J. W., Jr., O1688653.
Lemonier, Donald Joseph, O1042866.
Leahey, Wallace Joseph, O1327017.
Leary, James Timothy, O2033947.
Leary, John Richard, O552002.
Leavey, William Joseph, O974534.
Lee, Donald Clifford, O2208219.
Lemr, Charles Francis, O992767.
Leneker, Herbert Warren, O2017419.
Lennon, Lynwood Bridger, O979837.
Leon, Robert Morris, O1165250.
Leonard, William Blair, O1556850.
Leroy, Charles Louis, O976071.
Levitt, David Maurice, O975536.
Lewis, Hilliard Harrison, Jr., O982647.
Liebershal, Theodore Michael, O974462.
Lindley, Joseph Haskell, O533456.
Lindstrand, Nelson Leonard, Jr., O2046694.
Lippencott, George Henry, O1633372.
Little, Lewis Dewitt, O2019479.
Littlejohn, James Jeffries, O980843.
Livingston, Douglas Morris, O1634075.
Long, Carl Lawrence, O530635.
Louis, Eugene, O1053231.
Low, Russell Vernon, O966154.
Lowman, Richard Delbert, O2033853.
Luckey, James Preston, O1573900.
Luper, Robert Bryan, O955570.
Lynch, Camille Leo, O1581922.
Lynch, James Edward, Jr., O519237.
Lynch, Thomas David, Jr., O1178880.
MacDonald, Alan, O1043412.
MacDonald, Robert William, O972281.
MacPherson, William James, O460036.
Malinowski, Theodore B., O1330203.
Martin, Hugh Gatz, Jr., O1038428.
Martineau, Leo Joseph, O165832.
Martinez de Andino, Jose Antonio, O954380.
Martino, Angelo James, O1688717.
Mathieu, Robert Nicholas, O2208639.
Mattice, Harold Howard, O989701.
Mattingly, Howard, O1596415.
Mattoon, Hugh Maxwell, O548102.
Maughan, George, O1332393.
Mazuchowski, John Paul, O949165.
McCaffrey, John Ellsworth, O1550656.
McClary, William Taylor, O1797677.
McConnell, Donald William, O1183126.
McCune, John Ramey, O1056800.
McDade, Robert Alexander, O1317324.
McDonald, Francis Archibald, O1560498.
McGlone, James Fortune, O2033107.
McGrew, James Wallace, O1646408.
McKennon, Alton Carneau, O978266.
McKenzie, Donald Hamilton, O2010596.
McKeown, William Leigh, O1688673.
McKiernan, Brian Joseph, O2014779.
McKinnis, Charles Cyrus, O1175799.
McKlveen, Richard Bradley, O1635076.

McLaughlin, Robert Leo, O1341457.
McLean, Charles Patrick, O2033859.
McTaggart, Richard Russell, O1686745.
Mearns, George, O541758.
*Meeken, Stanley Raymond, Jr., O2201067.
Meers, Boyce Rhea, O1342200.
Mellen, Thomas Wright, O1285267.
Metosh, Cyril Patrick, O1688595.
Middleton, Harry Fredrick, O1341563.
Miele, Anthony Raymond, O1341353.
Migaleddi, Peter Dante, O946108.
Miles, Edwin Ralph, Sr., O987851.
Miller, Allen Wallace, 3d, O1055672.
Miller, David Irving, O1643879.
Miller, Herman Jefferson, Jr., O957904.
Miller, John Gilmore, Jr., O956926.
Millett, Lewis Lee, O1540712.
Minkel, Edward Joseph, O1651261.
Mitchell, Bartholomew Vincent, O2200632.
Mitchell, John Edward, O2204967.
Mitchell, Stephen Clare, O1015770.
Mittelstadt, Jack, O1319634.
Moore, Jesse Norman, O1166569.
More, Roryo La Verne, O2023297.
Morehouse, Richard Carlton, O2032295.
Morgan, Thomas Leo, O1018715.
Mortrude, James Oliver, O971102.
Moseley, Lonnie Leroy, O763709.
Moye, Jack Joyner, O1913460.
Mulligan, Donald Edward, O991136.
Mundinger, Robert George, O514465.
Munroe, Irving William, O969531.
Munroe, Roscoe Hoyt, O1540945.
Murray, Stephen Sutherland, O1314313.
Myers, Philip Henry, O958978.
Myers, Robert William, O2210270.
Myrick, Stonewall Jackson, O977270.
Neal, Harold, O959263.
Nelsen, Ellsworth, O2014485.
Neumann, Edward John, O949548.
Newport, Elswick, O1117303.
Newton, Cleon Hampton, O1796141.
Nicholson, James Edward, O1180644.
Nicholson, Leslie, O1181972.
Novak, Thomas Edward, O992239.
O'Brien, Peter, O2208622.
O'Neill, William James, O1325927.
Ohm, Herbert Phillip, O965275.
Olgher, Howard Loy, O412637.
Orr, Robert Clayton, O2210725.
Osick, John Joseph, O1037893.
Otterbourg, Charles Raymond, O1046223.
Overstreet, Lewis Daniel, O1313120.
Pannell, Napoleon Bonaparte, O1183588.
Papile, James Dominic, O2018914.
Parker, Wilbur Reese, O1548119.
Parmaley, Gee William, O413798.
Parsons, George Augustus, O959360.
Parsons, Othal Talmadge, O1019333.
Paulson, Norman Walter, O1118782.
Payne, Bruce Ryburn, 2d, O1326058.
Payne, Thomas Allan, O1057201.
Peat, Howard T., O938585.
Pence, Lawrence Dean, O1922574.
Penrose, Clifford Eugene, O1287580.
Percival, Allen Clare, O460448.
Perry, Raymond Lee, O1590103.
Persall, Jack Gordon, O977611.
Persky, Harold Dean, O450162.
Pheips, Franklin Edmunde, O2210384.
Phelps, Harry Joe, O1186885.
Pineau, George Pierre, O1062864.
Pinney, Harold Davis, O2017111.
Pittenger, Ronald Ray, O1059909.
Platts, William Holbrook, O969501.
Pleier, William Francis, O1688417.
Plyler, Daniel Bruce, O972196.
Pollard, William Francis, Jr., O1313301.
Polson, Harold Alfred, O1924757.
Pottle, Arthur Freeman, Jr., O544258.
Powell, Elbert Wells, O2029439.
Powell, Richard Louis, O1183596.
Preston, John Edward, O991234.
Preuss, Richard John, O2211434.
Proctor, William Martin, O1293830.
Putman, Oliver Lawrence, O1045217.
Quinn, Daniel Gibson, O2206555.
Quinn, John D., O1341701.
Quinn, Thomas Gene, O2208225.
Rainer, Hewlett Evan, O2262953.
Ray, James E., O995621.
Redd, Milton LeRoy, O963137.
Redshaw, Ward Fuller, O985765.
Reese, Emmett Calvin, O966054.
Rehm, Walter Richard, O1340930.
Reign, Lewis Lingo, Jr., O1118791.
Reisacher, Robert William, O522392.
Rettie, Robert Grant, O1061525.
Rettstatt, Karl Thompson, O1341040.
Rich, Roy Morene, O2033795.
Riggsby, Raymond Monroe, O885708.
Rishell, Clair Lyle, O1688528.
Ritz, Robert Emmett, O992450.
*Rizor, George Arthur, Jr., O2211112.
Robbins, Stephen Leon, O1184291.
Robertson, David Hiner, O1169307.
Robinson, Herbert Allen, O1062068.
Rock, Fairfield, O442209.
Rodgers, George Manuel, O2207202.
Rodgers, Thomas Edward, O2074546.
Roegge, Alvin Lawrence, O928596.
Roley, Ronald James, O1598351.
Romero, Paul Varela, O2025595.
Rose, Harry Archibald, O1168057.
Roseman, Frederick Ellsworth, O982546.
Ross, Douglas Mackenzie, O1634273
Ross, Marvin Gilbert, O1336428.
Rossini, Martin Amato, O1635280.
Rothwell, Louis Jay, O2014758.
Rovegno, Lawton Cowie, O1342004.
Rubin, Harry, O2203025.
Rutherford, Benjamin, O1175297.
Ryason, Robert Raymond, O2208355.
Sabol, Fred, O1917535.
Salvador, Felix, O959328.
Salzman, Charles Nathan, O1648679.
Sample, James Clarence, O955636.
Savelle, Duane H., O1688699.
Sawyer, Robert Kendal, O2009782.
Scales, Robert Hinds, O1101648.
Scanlan, Francis Edward, O2021038.
Schaefer, Martin William, O1061536.
Scheib, Helmut Victor, O2018582.
Schiff, Erwin Herbert, O1582464.
Schrenk, Ralph Dale, O991241.
Schrinel, Paul Joseph, O1651708.
Schultz, Robert Dee, O1333719.
Schulz, Theodore Grandi, O556945.
Schwartz, William Craig, O1330760.
Seideman, Charles Henry, O1913221.
Selfe, John Keith, O840981.
*Seliskar, Jack, O1924810.
Shanley, Irving Thomas, O1918880.
Sharpe, Melvin Bruce, O955806.
Shea, William Leo, O1688719.
Simmons, Melvin Lee, O984721.
Simon, Paul Norman, O1342012.
Sims, Thomas Auburn, O2204090.
Singleton, Jack, Jr., O529509.
Sisson, George Dillard, Jr., O2014751.
Sites, George Edward, Jr., O949852.
Sizemore, Burley, O964382.
Skeiber, Stanley Charles, O411802.
Slaughter, John Ritter, O521836.
Smeltz, John Oscar, O989022.
Smith, Carroll William, Jr., O2207542.
Smith, Charles Wade, O2210204.
Smith, Edward Bradshaw, Jr., O2017295.
Smith, Malcolm Russell, O977443.
Smith, DeWitt Clinton, Jr., O1322277.
Smith, Elbridge Alvah, O1177640.
Smith, Gerald Alfred, O1633567.
Smith, Harry Arthur, O1175317.
Smith, Merle James, O1554278.
Smith, Paul Vincent, O1318097.
Smith, Sam Henry, O977818.
Smith, Thomas Eldridge, O2014578.
Smith, William Franklin, O954749.
Smith, William Murphy, O1913463.
Snow, Morgan Williams, O1120411.
Snyder, Paul Beck, O2020998.
Soll, Donald Armin, O1030519.
Speer, James Bryan, Jr., O992778.
Standish, Myles Ellsworth, O1646623.
Squires, Shreve Durham, O962724.
Stark, Lloyd, Jr., O1335592.
Steen, Jud Oliver, O538772.
Sterling, William Richard, O540397.
Stevenson, James Russell, O1296928.
Stockell, Charles White, O1182721.
Stooke, Willard Nixon, O1102072.
Suddaby, Arlen Reed, O2014532.
Sweeney, Bradley Warren, O2207155.
Sweeney, Harvey Orvin, O1334376.
Swenson, Richard Wesley, O442722.
Swilley, George Reson, O527655.
Swope, Herman Enos, O1166391.
Symmes, Kenneth Russell, O1341722.
Taft, Philip Henry, O528411.
Tank, Albert Kessler, O442777.
Taylor, Royal R., O1292614.
Thomas, Charles Newby, O973165.
Toohey, James Bernard, O1019040.
Trask, Norman Edward, O2014542.
Trost, Leonard Edward, O522004.
Trost, Robert Walter, O545178.
Tucker, Harold, O1686727.
Turk, Stanley J., O1168115.
Tynan, James Daniel, O1309447.
Tyree, Louis Andrew, O2014698.
Underwood, Maurice Roscoe, O978178.
Updike, Robert Earl, O2210291.
Upton, Clifford Aman, O1540900.
Vallese, Blaise Humbert, O984318.
Van Dyken, Harold Bartholomew, O753312.
Vaughan, George Leland, O1340236.
Veazy, Eli Lincoln, O2202997.
Veteto, Hobart H., O1913298.
Vogt, John Edward, O974420.
Wagner, Matt Richard, O1693128.
Walker, Aaron Eugene, O2060862.
Walker, Faris Thomas, A959284.
Walker, John Robert, O516847.
Warrington, Robert Oneil, O971300.
Watkins, John B., Jr., O991508.
Waugh, William Lee, Sr., O1688771.
Webb, Roy Lester, O579596.
Weber, John Paul, O1799018.
Weeks, Robert John, O1175355.
Weibel, Rodney Wilson, O1115823.
Weidner, Earl Rymond, Jr., O1651972.
Wester, William Albert, O1167271.
Wheeler, Neil William, O2014671.
White, Charles Lyle, Jr., O1688815.
White, Kenneth Henderson, Jr., O2021214.
*Wholey, Paul Robert, O2003814.
Wilkerson, Robert Thomas, O956593.
Williams, Gordon Elwood, O2020601.
Wilson, J. Frank, O2206157.
Wilton, Clifford James, O1688823.
Winchester, Harold Gene, O2206039.
Winningham, James Loy, O1688696.
Wolaver, James Francis, O441459.
Wortham, James Tilford, O946416.
Wright, Dean Earl, Jr., O2200695.
Wright, Floyd Donald, O1101295.
Wright, Lawrence Sidney, O1913251.
Yates, Arnold Robert, O2014624.
Yerkes, Charles Weaver, Jr., O2036575.
Yocom, Robert Dickerson, O1296309.
Young, Frederick Lee, O1304301.

*To be first lieutenants*

Adams, Henry Lloyd, O1915930.
Aikman, Jim Bill, O1937735.
Alton, William Sheppard, O1876724.
Alter, Allen Grant, O1935318.
Ames, William Fentress, O1873321.
Anderson, Charles Witsell, Jr., O2002794.
Anderson, David Just, O1861683.
Anderson, George Byars, O2003338.
Andolina, Edward Samuel, O1873947.
Archibald, Norman Ellwood, O4019195.
Arkley, Robert James, O276874.
Austin, Kenneth Stuart, O1875764.
Bailey, David Gibson, O2004823.
Baird, Niven James, O1879934.
Baker, Fred Ilisley, Jr., O1889789.
Balzhiser, Robert Maurice, O4016718.
Banze, William Charles, O1923521.
Barbano, Ralph Joseph, O1889339.
Barker, James Martin, O2003038.
Barnett, John Henry, O991716.
Barry, James Gordon, Jr., O1940622.
Bartolacci, Alfred Dean, O4001776.
Barton, Stephen Fletcher, O2210785.
Bass, Richard Herman, O4011783.
Beardsley, Hamilton Otis, O1929810.
Beasley, Lewis Edward, O2275935.
Becker, Hans Valentine, Jr., O2021673.
Beckwith, George Glen, O1930092.
Beckwith, William James, O1876373.
Beebe, John McRae, O2021000.
Behneman, John Francis, O1881492.

Bennett, Willard Magnus, Jr., O4016820.
Benson, Carl Gotfred, O990217.
Birmingham, David F., O1892989.
Bodine, James Frank, O1890597.
Bolak, Aloysius, O1876313.
Bond, Robert Glenn, O1933467.
Bowden, Hollis Allison, O955805.
Boyd, Gerald Marshall, O4019851.
Boyer, Gene Tunney, O4006107.
Boykin, Curtis Ralph, O1886830.
Bradley, Wray Erickson, O1919293.
Brantley, Edward Grady, O1914523.
Bray, Victor Hugo, O2266022.
Brazil, Hal Buckner, O968024.
Breunig, Joseph Timothy, O2021126.
Brinson, William Barney, Jr., O1887396.
Brobeck, Irvin, Jr., O2097838.
Brockwell, Leyburn Watts, Jr., O2004050.
Brown, Hugh Robert, Jr., O4044167.
Brown, Robert Franklin, O4021356.
Buckman, Joseph Clifton, O1880775.
Burch, Oiger Dewey, Jr., O1879344.
Burgess, Bobby Lee, O2002800.
Burnison, George Ernest, O4016456.
Burns, Sumner Colson, O1932466.
Bush, Ralph, O1887205.
Buzzell, Kenneth Eugene, O1862054.
Bynum, Donald K., O2269080.
Calvert, Charles Leonard, O2205752.
Cannon, Glen Badger, O1889434.
Cannon, Sammy Joe, O1880396.
Carder, Kenneth Early, O970960.
Carey, Gordon Thomas, O4005119.
Carlson, Donald, O4015121.
Carpenter, James Albert, O1916477.
Cary, David Bromwell, O1893843.
Caudle, Lester Clegg, Jr., O4012542.
Chamberlain, George Robert, O1925782.
Chase, Marvin Knight, Jr., O2211529.
Ching, John Yen Sung, O4014566.
Chirio, Michael Lawrence, Jr., O1930079.
Chriss, James Vincent, O1877858.
Clark, Donald Eugene, O1885402.
Clark, John Francis, O1935424.
Clark, Roy Clayton, Jr., O2096820.
Cleary, Alexander Bruce, O2211012.
Clements, John Kenneth, O4013360.
Clinton, Frederick Curtiss, O1922606.
Clyburn, Thomas Benjamin, 3d, O4013328.
Coggins, Donald Wade, O1937620.
Cole, David Albert, O4015069.
Comish, Leo Stanford, Jr., O1882138.
Comiskey, Ralph Edward, O1929215.
Cook, Ralph Jeffrey, Jr., O1891619.
Coursin, Raymond Edwin, O1894048.
Cozad, Jack Gerald, O4013366.
Cragun, Dwight Lloyd, O1929295.
Creekmore, Billy Brown, O4023742.
Crocker, Merle MacDonald, O1931420.
Crumit, Ellis Glen, O4006724.
Culton, William Hiram, O2265333.
Curry, Paul Richard, O1886423.
D'Renz, Charles Francis, O2097779.
Darling, John Edward, O1889575.
Davis, Addison Dimmitt, 3d, O2003522.
Davis, Richard Klare, O1882550.
Davis, Robert Stuart, O1887896.
De Muynck, Jack Edward, O1930868.
Dean, James Cook, O2030453.
Deets, Robert Morton, O1920185.
Delahanty, John Francis, Jr., O1881589.
Desmarais, Arthur Joseph, O1876419.
Diesu, Angelo James, O4009334.
Dieterle, Junior H., O1933408.
Diggory, Mark Lawrence, O4020564.
Dillon, John Patrick, O1932478.
Dixon, Philip Wesley, O4004966.
Dodds, Jack Allison, O1885659.
Duerr, Richard Dale, O4017551.
Dunlap, Robert R., O1886982.
Durany, John Adam, O1894135.
Durkee, Richard Yuill, O4006735.
Ecrette, Joe Dudley, O1880546.
Edgington, Roger Noel, O2034073.
Elfers, Delwyn Philip, O1931444.
Elliott, James Clay, Jr., O953638.
Ellis, James Paul, O1885930.
Ennis, John Alexander, O4001476.
Esperdy, Sergio Anthony, Jr., O1926857.
Fail, Eulan Thomas, O1935338.
Fallon, Joel Brian, O1935114.
Farmer, Garry Hilton, O4018893.
Favre, Rolland Mascot, Jr., O1893165.
Federhen, Herbert Melancthon 4th, O2201283.
Fedko, John Theodore, O1935638.
Fellerhoff, John Hersey, O4013963.
Ferebee, David Willoughby, Jr., O1876440.
Fink, Charles Augustin, O995514.
Fitts, William Henry, O1919253.
Fitzgerald, Thomas William, O4021174.
Fleming, Daniel Mahrt, O1926883.
Fleming, Robert Joseph, O1702266.
Flickinger, Robert Edward, O4000320.
Foster, Samuel Gibson, O1924891.
Frankhouser, Enoch Duncan, O1891139.
Freeze, James Elias, O2021621.
Friedman, Arthur Marshall, O1935845.
Fulton, Thomas George, O4013530.
Gallagher, George Merlin, O2034072.
Gallant, George William, O1893012.
Gallegos, William Joseph, O2206748.
Galyon, Norman Lester, O4009357.
Gan, Maurice Kaplan, O1888978.
Gannon, Timothy Gerard, O1882178.
Gardner, Frank Curtis, O1925316.
Gatti, Raymond Edward, O4020576.
Geoghegan, Malcolm Humphreys, O1876765.
Geraci, John Francis, O4009254.
Germuga, Gerald Andrew, O1892945.
Gessner, Richard Allan, O1862164.
Gibbs, Robert Mitchell, O1927841.
Gillingham, Richard Ivan, O4006613.
Gimple, Lloyd Allen, O4021090.
Glisson, William Charles, O2028692.
Glover, Rupert Franklin, O4005201.
Godwin, Ralph Lee, O1876307.
Gonsales, Orlando Eloy, O1931835.
Goodale, George Silas, O1889425.
Goodwin, Clifton Ray, O4014977.
Goodwin, William Earl, O1914885.
Gorham, John Milton 2d, O2002974.
Graffis, Howard Welty, O1935242.
Green, L. D., O1878756.
Gregoire, William Nelson, O1924976.
Griffin, Guilford Wayne, O1933779.
Griswold, William Herbert, Jr., O2208786.
Gum, Harold Hannah, O1917844.
Guynn, Jerry Clare, O4015745.
Hale, Marvin Luther, Jr., O4044402.
Haley, John Carter, O1887461.
Hall, Alvin Owsley, Jr., O1879241.
Hall, Richard Melcenis, O2265599.
Harman, Asher Waterman, Jr., O4003264.
Harrison, Hugh Barrett, O1924942.
Hennessey, Bruce Lee, O795939.
Herriford, Robert Levi, Sr., O1881261.
Hetherly, Jimmy Hilary, O1915955.
Heyward, James Oliver, O4012171.
Hickey, Thomas Bishop, O4015868.
Hill, Charles Edgar, Jr., O2004639.
Hobbs, Guy Everett, Jr., O4013098.
Holliday, John Philip, O1891198.
Holloway, Teddy Glenn, O4005806.
Holt, Daniel Rex, O4024154.
Homeyer, Bruno Curt, Jr., O1940633.
Hormann, Vaughn A., O4019346.
Horton, Richard Danforth, O1861661.
Howard, Jakie Milford, O1873849.
Hoye, James Gregory, O1883462.
Hughes, Martin, Jr., O1873285.
Hughes, Norman James, O4013407.
Hull, Frederick Burdette, Jr., O4002441.
Hurtubise, William Oliver, O4020783.
Husic, Robert Anthony, O4002147.
Hutchins, Alvin Carl, Jr., O1879146.
Hylton, Alvin Roy, O2102869.
Jacobsen, Richard Lavern, O4009364.
Jarvis, Robert Conway, O1887679.
Jensen, Harold Ernest, O976001.
Johnson, John Sigered, Jr., O1931558.
Johnston, John Allan, O1892304.
Jones, Gordon Dale, O1883236.
Jones, William Henry, Jr., O2002930.
Joyce, Robert Michael, O2283537.
Justice, Robert Eugene, O2034089.
Katz, Abraham David, O1873998.
Keith, Harlan A., O1341839.
Keith, Norman Aaron, O1915962.
Kelley, Robert Lee, O2028598.
Kelley, Robert Walker, O2030521.
Kelly, Edward Joseph, O4004416.
Kempf, Neil Harland, O1929315.
Kirkpatrick, James Samuel, O1934813.
Kostoff, Peter Clements, O1876869.
Kouten, James J., O998354.
Kramer, George Robert, Sr., O2104163.
Kurek, Robert Ashley, O2028390.
Lafever, Morris, O4012464.
Lang, John Edward, O1882681.
Lapinskes, George Sylvester, O4021816.
Larsen, David Philip, O1932104.
Laskowski, Frank W., Jr., O4012369.
Lefebvre, Bernard Roland, O1916154.
Lethcoe, Dale Leroy, O1929599.
Liggett, Wilson Merrill, O4017234.
Lloyd, Elwood Alon, O973382.
Lobdell, Edward Dunn, Jr., O4019351.
London, James Edward, O2266000.
Lovato, Lawrence, O4026541.
Lynch, William Arthur, O1883389.
Madsen, Charles Gordon, O2266265.
Malouin, Leon Francis, Jr., O4011504.
Marchioli, Alexander Dominic, O4028596.
Marrow, James Edgar, O4012063.
Martin, James Rodgers, O4013110.
Mashburn, Wilbur Franklin, O1919457.
Mason, Elijah Franklin, O4012596.
Mayer, David Edward, O4005702.
McCue, James Albert, O4003500.
McGarry, Bernard James, O1880219.
McGregor, John Ennis, O1882354.
McKay, Eugene Thomas, O1882679.
McKinney, John Walter, O1931272.
McMillen, James Arnold, O2021842.
McQueen, James Thomas, O4023756.
Meinhardt, Harry Philip, O1925817.
Mihalik, John Alfred, O4007147.
Milburn, Lloyd Edward, O1939870.
Mock, Newell Abbott, Jr., O4024058.
Monshower, Alvah Charles, Jr., O1919235.
Montrose, John Leslie, Jr., O2211988.
Mooneyhan, Jack LaVerne, O2004653.
Morgan, Abbott Robert, O4037753.
Morris, John Jerry, O1881677.
Morris, Joseph Jarrell, O2265611.
Morton, Hurshall George, O1919067.
Moseley, Robert Lawson, O4006541.
Mosher, David Lee, O4009204.
Moxley, Robert James, O4009829.
Mullen, Jack Leroy, O4001402.
Muller, Ludwig Jacob, O1926304.
Murphy, James Kenneth, O4017275.
Musser, John Bruce, O4017439.
Myers, Richard Leo, O1936986.
Myfelt, Kenneth Flaud, O2266415.
Neff, Paul Raymond, O1926667.
Nicholson, Rowland Joseph, O1928052.
Nikas, Nicholas Bill, O1926540.
Noffsinger, Gordon Alton, O4002225.
Nordstrom, Arthur Hugo, Jr., O4002226.
Norgard, Donald Richard, O1930029.
Nutter, Raymond Thomas, O4003042.
O'Boyle, Peter A., O1881806.
O'Grady, Patrick John, O1876280.
O'Meara, Edward Joseph, O1891823.
O'Rourke, Michael Keith, O2103688.
Omps, Avon Richard, O1873381.
Parini, Romano John, O4026604.
Parker, Wilson Cavitt, Jr., O1880390.
Patterson, Archie Olea, O2003843.
Paul, Lloyd Herbert, O1877639.
Paxman, James Carter, O4013765.
Payne, James Arthur, Jr., O1931026.
Payne, Thomas Leon, O1939420.
Persons, George Albert, O4003313.
Petersen, Peter Barron, O4006708.
Peterson, John Robert, O1883707.
Petree, Neal Cleere, Jr., O1880269.
Petty, Carlisle R., Jr., O2030506.
Piepho, Carlton David, O4009834.
Pinney, David Raymond, O2262543.
Pins, Dwane Francis, O1936464.
Poe, Donald Elliott, O1915828.
Pogoloff, Boris, O1879702.
Ponder, William Lester, Jr., O1936931.
Poplin, Carroll Bailey, O1887326.
Pratt, James Robert, O1931224.
Prawl, Sherlund Dale, O4017494.
Presson, Charles Wesley, O1872757.
Pruitt, James Robert, O1937281.
Queeney, Edward Leo, O1893057.
Quinn, William Joseph, O1875253.
Raab, Kenneth Edward, O4027771.

Raisig, Paul Jones, Jr., O4009060.
Ramsey, Phillip Edward, O1929224.
Ratcliff, Walter Allen, O1939903.
Reddell, Eugene Baxter, O1880962.
Reed, Lynn McCrea, O1884013.
Reid, John Ambrose, Jr., O1883878.
Revis, Blaine Amos, O4006936.
Riser, Clarence Albert, O1917939.
Ritz, Karl Clifford, O4004267.
Roberts, Norman Lee, O1883876.
Roper, Charles Alan, O1939471.
Ropp, Ralph Edwin, O1880091.
Rosing, Willis S., Jr., O4026381.
Ross, Robert Ingram, O4006015.
Roth, Loren William, O1695191.
Rozsypal, George Frank, O1919468.
Rufe, Charles Peyton, O4015503.
Rumsey, David Weaver, O1891824.
Russo, Vincent Mario, O1875264.
Sajo, Alexander John, O1926556.
Sampson, Edward Eugene, O4005780.
Sargent, Francis Michael, O1876442.
Schlager, Robert Lewis, O2004241.
Schleusing, Fredrick Carl, O2263360.
Schneider, Malven Eugene, O2266169.
Schultz, Paul Edward, O1889772.
Schweizer, Robert Louis, O4009198.
Scott, Albert William, O1881454.
Scudder, Wilbur Alanson, Jr., O1891269.
Seale, Billy George, O2021676.
Seaman, Richard Thomas, O4020924.
Seaton, Peter Paul, O4018149.
Selby, Carman T., O1925676.
Selig, William Louis, O4016495.
Severance, Fayette Leroy, Jr., O4011077.
Shave, Kenneth Leroy, O1701187.
Shea, Eugene August, O2263766.
Sheaves, William Bryant, Jr., O1920191.
Shields, Roger James, O4009062.
Short, Frisco Whalen, O1916016.
Shuler, William Aiken, Jr., O2004674.
Shunk, William Alexander, O1877469.
Sisman, Lawrence, O4000024.
Skeen, Henry Gene, O1936264.
Slocum, Frederick Vernon, Jr., O4006846.
Smith, David Campbell, O1937623.
Smith, Tommie Gene, O995342.
Snow, Robert Ray, O1935895.
Sprang, Alan Wesley, O4004132.
Spaulding, Stanley Lee, O2104533.
Spence, Thomas Henry, O4009787.
Spicher, William Frederick, O1893785.
Starr, Merle Dean, O2030534.
Steed, Robert Berkley, O4009401.
Stelmachowicz, Peter Joseph, O400132.
Stewart, Harvey Edgar, O2205911.
Stidham, Dorris Neal, O1928329.
Stockelman, James Clarence, O1890504.
Stocker, Lee James, O1890829.
Stokinger, Richard Henry, O4006441.
Strunk, Herbert Rankin, O4003674.
Stuckey, Jack Clayton, O1916077.
Sumpter, Cecil A., Jr., O2263586.
Swank, Robert David, O1889482.
Sykes, Earl Ray, O1882129.
Taylor, John Mason, O4001287.
Teague, Martin Wayne, O4024787.
Templeton, James L., Jr., O4024142.
Tennant, Frank Bair, Jr., O1886124.
Tenore, Jacob Andrew, O2030420.
Thomas, John Elam, Jr., O991917.
Thomas, Patrick Emerson, O4005858.
Thompson, Donald Keith, O4013671.
Thorpe, Marion Eugene, O1929165.
Todd, Harold Casselberry, O4016496.
Towle, Allan Martin, O4037421.
Trevethan, Alexander, O4004598.
Trosper, Robert Lee, O4024675.
Tufft, Arthur Herbert, O1889972.
Turner, Robert Ian, O997378.
Varnum, Charles Somers, O1927666.
Vaughn, Luther Cornelius, O4012671.
Veley, Corydon, Alexander, Jr., O1937503.
Vermillion, Lewin Edward, O4001456.
Vorhies, Harold Winston, O1889029.
Walden, Don Earl, Jr., O1876451.
Wall, James Edgar, O987194.
Walsh, Alden Churchill, O4011093.
Warden, Donald Wilmore, O1877474.
Watson, Robert William, O1883745.
Watts, Bobby Morriss, O1885624.
Watts, Harry Lee, 3d, O967783.
Weinstein, Saunder, O4015196.
Wells, Roy Davis, O1939478.
Wenneson, Richard Meade, O1884033.
Westin, Paul Robert, O1929343.
Westlake, Richard Keith, O1892246.
Weyland, Bruce Marion, O2102606.
White, Loren Jr., O1919045.
White, Richard Leon, O1877107.
White, Ulysses Xerxes, O4012129.
Wilcox, William Robert, O1925261.
Wilkes, Jack Byron, O2265110.
Willcox, Edward Cooke, Jr., O1885312.
Williams, Cyrus Lancel, O1886965.
Williams, Maurice Cameron, O1882264.
Williams, Raleigh Noah, Jr., O4005537.
Williams, William Hudson, O4011986.
Williford, Henry Grady, Jr., O1939424.
Wilson, Henry Haddon, O4023418.
Woeber, Frank Anthony, O1876757.
Wolbert, Herbert Karl, O1935521.
Wood, Charles Cox, O4011105.
Worthy, William Ward, Jr., O4006408.
Wright, Gilbert Parkhurst, O1876695.
Wright, Lewis Winbert, O4002775.
Young, Harrison Joseph, Jr., O1893711.
Young, Roger Quitman, O4037123.
Zapata, Roland Tamez, O1940785.
Zarnick, Dale Leroy, O1928588.

*To be second lieutenants*

Abbott, Lawrence Eugene, O4056930.
Acre, Lawrence Dale, O4050477.
Adelstein, Stanford Mark, O1929867.
Albert, George, O4057630.
Alexander, Joseph Edward, Jr., O4065525.
Allen, James Burroughs, Jr., O4058831.
Andrews, David Phillips, O4039391.
Andrews, William George, Jr., O4038816.
Ardizzione, Leo Anthony, O4030714.
Aschettino, Richard Francis, O4047382.
Aumock, George Eugene, O4030778.
Avera, Graham Joseph, O4075373.
Ayers, Bradley Earl, O4030716.
Ayers, Louie Frank, O4075631.
Badovinac, Nick John, Jr., O4010091.
Baggs, Linton Daniel, 3d, O4075775.
Bailey, Clarence Alvin, O4075632.
Bailey, James Allen, O4026298.
Baird, Richard J., O4060544.
Baldridge, Thomas Howard, O2104403.
Baldwin, James Albert, O2004735.
Barney, Charles David., Jr., O4051922.
Barnum, James Edward, O4042114.
Barnum, Robert Charles, O4061460.
Barrett, Francis Xavier, O1890189.
Barry, Arthur Alfred, O4039849.
Bass, Ogden Loeb, O4049306.
Bauer, Frank, O4010623.
Baumeister, Harold Joseph, O4069297.
Baxter, Richard Byron, O4077004.
Bayless, Robert Ewing, O4050593.
Beal, Bruce Talcott, O4025367.
Bean, Loring Bruce, O4033239.
Beck, Frederick Samuel, O4068535.
Bell, James Farrell, O4040481.
Bell, Leroy Crawford, O4058820.
Blair, Robert Joseph, O4033649.
Bomar, Hobby Jackson, Jr., O4076083.
Borichewski, Joseph C., 4032042.
Borris, Roger John, O4030523.
Bostwick, Clinton Clay, Jr., O4063364.
Boswell, Leonard L., O4063770.
Bowman, Richard Lindon, O1939699.
Bradford, Wilson Emery, Jr., O4032290.
Bramlet, James W., O4074237.
Bratt, Clarence Merle, O4046309.
Brier, James Roy, O4033037.
Brigham, David Ray, O4083184.
Brink, Donald William, O4062606.
Broman, Ralph Waldo, O4019326.
Brooks, William Cooper, Jr., O4044859.
Brown, Joe Augustus, O4028856.
Bruce, Bruno Ernest, O4040198.
Brumit, Charles Daniel, O4006988.
Bruns, Thomas Vincent, O4017822.
Brusanovski, Frank John, O4038979.
Bruskiewicz, Glenn Louis, O4060684.
Buckles, Rodney Gail, O4048065.
Budd, Chester Francis, Jr., O4074450.
Bue, Paul Andrew James, O4051423.
Burns, Paul Patrick, O4031922.
Burton, Donald Luther, O4049529.
Bush, Emory Wilton, O2268610.
Buxton, John Lacy, O4048856.
Cahalane, Robert Edward, O4064400.
Cahill, William James, O4058430.
Caldwell, Darrol Dean, O4059613.
Callahan, James Joseph, O4053210.
Camaren, Rueben James, O4013875.
Carey, James William, O4060127.
Carmody, Robert Warren, O4068412.
Catalano, Victor Joseph, O4042372.
Chakalian, Rouben Victor, O4076748.
Chapman, Charles Walter, O4030888.
Church, Campbell Scott, O4033657.
Clarke, Charles Cushing, Jr., O4076569.
Clinger, Charles Ellsworth, O1916343.
Clites, James Earl, Jr., O4068539.
Cochran, James Oliver, O2279147.
Collar, Robert Daniel, O4071685.
Colozzi, Salvatore Frank, O4052064.
Conklin, Willard David, O4071389.
Connett, Walter Theodore, O1883495.
Conroy, Robert Edward, O4066245.
Cook, James Henry, O4049354.
Couvillion, Herbert Harvey, O4024973.
Cowan, Robert Edward, O4030649.
Cowles, Richard Webster, O4062621.
Cox, Elbredge Reed, O4062940.
Crook, George Roger, O4024687.
Cross, Ray Shelton, O4028938.
Crouch, Curtis Sherman, Jr., O1940016.
Culkin, Donald Edward, O4064787.
Cullen, James Foster, O4031452.
Cumbus, John Riley, O4075387.
Daly, George Martin, O4034136.
Daniel, Bartow David, O4058785.
Davis, Harold Milton, Jr., O4065536.
Davis, Philip H., O4074466.
Davis, Robert Hugh, O4034307.
Day, Thomas Everett, O4017605.
De Amaral, Charles Francis, Jr., O4025672.
Deel, Arlin, O4070108.
Del Colliano, John Francis, O4059269.
Dickinson, John Richard, O4027857.
Dion, George Joseph, O4065935.
Dixon, Glen 3d, O4045039.
Dorand, Edwin Joseph, O4009743.
Downer, William John, Jr., O4030230.
Dreybus, George Newell, Jr., O4058683.
DuVal, Richard Allen, O4070440.
Dubois, Ronald William, O4052423.
Duncan, John Russell, O4062762.
Dunn, James Turner, O4044784.
Durant, John Joseph, O4052424.
Dwayer, William Melvin, O4047223.
Ebbole, Robert, O4046108.
Eitel, James Weldon, O4074375.
Ellingwood, Dean Chesley, O4020596.
Elliot, Harlen Oral, O4043031.
Ely, Sumner Richard, O4076519.
Emrick, Charles William, O4047478.
Epperson, Thomas Allen, O4071483.
Farrell, John Curtis, O4024494.
Faulkner, Jack Sherwood, O4045042.
Feaster, Lewis Lavon, O4060387.
Ferenz, James Francis, O4077125.
Finkbiner, Glenn Grover, O4025820.
Fiora, Edward Frank, Jr., O4041207.
Fisher, Harry Clayton, Jr., O4041202.
Fiske, William Sigmund, O4070362.
Fitzgerald, Thomas Edward, O4051971.
Fletcher, Edward Neale, O4058516.
Flynn, James Francis, O4068422.
Foster, Andrew Paul, 3d, O4058566.
Franklin, John Robert, O4031392.
Freshley, Robert L., O4025779.
Friedheim, Jerry Warden, O4059674.
Fries, Cecil Edward, Jr., O4070399.
Froebel, Martin Charles, O4071500.
Fuerbringer, Neil Lewis, O4041486.
Galvin, John Francis, O4064417.
Gantt, Gerald Dale, O4042884.
Garcia, Heriberto Arnaldo, O4025922.
Garneau, Lucien Roger, O4036918.
Gatlin, Clifford Irving, O4047850.
Gatti, Michael Angelo, O4031876.
Geddes, Garth Lowe, O1936552.
Goodman, Roland Alfred, O4047666.
Gorman, Irving Thomas, O4038232.
Gourley, William Harvey, O4035715.
Grace, Paul Martin, O4051834.

Grey, Harold Moulton, O4019689.
Griemsmann, William Klaus, O4051527.
Grossheim, Paul William, O4056473.
Guthrey, William Lawrence, O2021813.
Gutsmuth, Henry Ronald, O4047279.
Haas, Donald Anthony, O4050609.
Haberstock, Roy Alan, O4051657.
Hall, George Wheeler, Jr., O1931968.
Hall, Lawrence Henry, O4041170.
Hall, William Basil, O1925065.
Hall, William Earl, O4048846.
Hamer, David Thomas, O4010458.
Hamilton, Milton Hugh, Jr., O4034391.
Hamlin, Donald Auer, O4025679.
Hanchey, Jennings Brian, Jr., O1941110.
Haney, Kenneth William, 3d, O4017362.
Hanks, James Wesley, O4071185.
Harget, Paul Daniel, O4010118.
Harper, Henry Hearn, O4026615.
Harrington, Regis Arthur, Jr., O4057452.
Hartmann, Frederick Donald, O4057114.
Harts, William Garrod, O4048926.
Hatchett, Monte J., O4026272.
Hawkins, Richard Stubbs, O4066227.
Hay, James Ralph, O4036487.
Haydon, James Frederick, O4040785.
Hayward, Donald Paul, O4039080.
Herbert, Anthony Bernard, O2284605.
Herrman, Larry Jack, O4056928.
Higgins, James Maurice, O4059892.
Hill, Melvin Dale, O4068350.
Hoge, Philip Ramage, O4027345.
Holland, Billy Cox, O4062822.
Holmes, Justin Allen, O4062482.
Holt, Robert Braden, O4046936.
Hookway, William Arnold, O4032755.
Houts, Francis Coy, O4042272.
Howard, Bobby Gene, O1880486.
Hoyt, Richard Eugene, O4047491.
Huhn, John Norman, O4036969.
Humphrey, Paul Wayne, O4061994.
Hunt, J. Howard, O4068471.
Hurdle, Karl Vincent, O4029882.
Hurt, Maure, Jr., O4076900.
Hutchinson, Kent Crosby, O4074495.
Jacobs, Carl Marvin, O4041757.
Jacobs, Irwin Maurice, O4076622.
Jarrell, William John, O4049191.
Jensen, James Robert, O4031316.
Jensen, Kenneth G., O4050077.
Jerrett, Lyle Edward, O4052360.
Johnson, James Clifford, O4059833.
John, Joseph Michael, O4061327.
Jolly, Lewis, Jr., O4042559.
Jordan, Donald Havens, O2030494.
Joyce, Cecil Lee, O4045268.
Joyce, John Joseph, O4031879.
Judy, Jerry Edward, O4068387.
Kallestad, Richard Dean, O4018090.
Kantor, George William, O4059108.
Kanzler, Norbert Alvin, O4030242.
Keenan, George Edward, O1872470.
Keith, Donald Morton, O4060661.
Kelleher, Vincent James, O4035625.
Kelley, Norman Dale, O4058869.
Kelly, Edward Victor, O4051360.
Kelly, John Joseph, Sr., O4064423.
Kelly, Richard Patrick, Jr., O4037737.
Kemp, Freddie Lee, O4010976.
Kennedy, Paul Stanley, O4076824.
Kilgallen, John Edward, O4010360.
King, John Norman, O4068266.
Kinnard, Jason Lewis, O4044527.
Kirk, K. Leslie, O4013709.
Kirkwood, John Hugh, O4061872.
Kitay, Peter Nathaniel, O4065885.
Kleypas, Kenneth Allen, O4071948.
Kneibert, Richard George, O4064193.
Knipp, James Daniel, O4061348.
Knowles, Thaddeus Edwin, Jr., O4037567.
Koch, Edwin Kenneth, O4035514.
Krawczonek, John Michael, O4035752.
Lance, Edwin Virgil, O4077030.
Langford, James Jerry, O4043134.
Langridge, Alan Lewis, O4025582.
Lantero, Lawrence Louis, O4058287.
Lanzi, Constantine Herman, O4045313.
Layman, Earl Robert, O4042968.
Lehnert, Edwin Donald, O4024544.
Lenderman, William Roosevelt, O4068389.
Leonard, Richard John, O4017999.
Lewi, Kenneth Edward, O1880455.
Lewis, Charles Edward, Jr., O4069059.
Lewis, John Chester, O4046189.
Light, Clarence Oakey, Jr., O4033333.
Liska, Donald Joseph, O4065959.
Logan, William Henry, O4012157.
Long, John E., O4071417.
Longshore, Robert Louis, Jr., O4063129.
Loomis, John McArthur, O4010465.
Loop, James Walter, O4076933.
Love, Albert Scruggs, Jr., O4047932.
Lucas, Dale Adrian, O4060838.
Lynn, Charles Thomas, Jr., O4044180.
Machatton, Joseph George, O4061778.
Macheledt, Matthew William, Jr., O4056842.
Mahlberg, Donald Stanley, O2265975.
Manning, Billy Randolph, O4046403.
Marsh, Russell Ledwith, Jr., O4050236.
Martin, Ernest Harrington, O4049535.
Mathis, Philip Munroe, O2266157.
Matthews, John Grayson, O4010369.
McCamic, Jolyon Whitehead, O4042194.
McCollum, James Terry, O4061419.
McCray, Wayman Floyd, O4026198.
McCullough, Ronald Jay, O4004714.
McDonald, Merle Allen, O4024680.
McDuff, Charles Robert, O1940869.
McFarland, Timothy Vincent, O4050080.
McGar, Robert Douglas, O4024734.
McGinniss, Donald Theron, O4053254.
McMillan, Thad Calhoun, O4048002.
McMillen, Earl Joseph, Jr., O4004334.
McNelis, David Nicholas, O4035239.
McNutt, George Richard, O4046851.
McVeigh, Andrew Jackson, 3d, O4010980.
Mendel, Thomas Elroy, O4031089.
Merritt, Hubert Dean, O2272847.
Messer, Hollis Darrell, O4058572.
Meyer, Gerald Joseph, O4040696.
Mielke, Karl Albert, Jr., O4048778.
Miller, Ronald Wilbur, O4040860.
Miquelon, David Stewart, O4017404.
Molinelli, Robert Fletcher, O4076308.
Moody, Gordon Nelson, O4027361.
Moore, George Dewey, Jr., O4037102.
Moore, James Hubert, O4042902.
Moore, Jimmy Nelson, O4031244.
Moore, John Mac, O4025884.
Moore, Virgil Everett, Jr., O1926770.
Morrison, William Wallace, Jr., O4049937.
Montalvo, Martin Thomas, O4076729.
Morriss, Robert Henry, O1937383.
Mosher, Jack Beauford, O4063724.
Moss, Franklin Acker, O4062867.
Muckenfuss, Adam Eldredge, O4033995.
Munier, Paul Leo, O4017792.
Murphy, Vincent Paul, O4038726.
Murray Donald Theodore, O2021660.
Myers, Clair Gordon, O4031096.
Myers, Maynard Dale, O1917763.
Myrick, Howard Anthony, Jr., O4044986.
Naddef, Wilfred Joseph, O4040914.
Naegel, Charles Louis, O4035834.
Neighbors, James Daniel, O2004657.
Nickell, Phillip Dean, O2104842.
Noskowski, Nicholas Joseph, O4031498.
O'Brien, Robert Joseph, O4027286.
O'Connell, Marvin George, O4041052.
O'Rourke, Robert Lennon, O4046410.
Owens, Robert Corby, O4052927.
*Padilla, Ramon, O5301547.
Parker, Owen Lowell, O4050633.
Pearson, Roger Comstack, O4042863.
Penzler, Harry Donald, O4059862.
Pepper, Earl Elliott, O4019510.
Phillips, Robert Allen, O4048959.
Pipkin, John Robert, O4069182.
Pittman, Paul Hubert, Jr., O4043107.
Plant, Robert Anthes, O4052022.
Plunkett, Eli Benson, O4075661.
Pohlman, William Frank, O4039265.
Poindexter, Everett John, O1886604.
Posz, Joseph Daniel, O4047717.
Potter, Allen Randall, O4048651.
Priddy, Bobby Edward, Sr., O1935169.
Proctor, Marvin Prince, O4069660.
Purvis, John William Gregg, O4046256.
Putorek, William Paul, Jr., O4010522.
Quigg, Stuart Masterson, O4037761.
Raco, Joseph Daniel, O4004576.
Rakowitz, James Alphonsus, O4049211.
Rector, Donald Duane, O4040741.
Reed, James Robert, O4057570.
Richards, John Homer, Jr., O4062997.
Riley, Leonard Joseph, O4052459.
Riley, Ronald Thomas, O4031179.
Rimbach, Douglas Opie, O1938635.
Robertson, Gene Weldon, O4024694.
Robinson, Thomas Jefferson, O4037415.
Rodgers, Robert J., O5405036.
Rodgers, William Edward, O4033248.
Rose, Richard Edward, O4059368.
Ross, Robert Edward, O1893699.
Rowinski, Thomas Henry, O4066667.
Royal, James Wilson, O4026172.
Russell, George Gheen, Jr., O4071442.
Rydel, Albert S., Jr., O4032648.
Sanders, William Carlton 2d, O4063078.
Sandlin, Malcolm Ray, O4024897.
Sapp, Clarence Donald, O4068368.
Savery, Donald Fenwick, Jr., O4049117.
Scherer, George Halford, O4036163.
Schwartz, Norman, O4062675.
Scott, Frank Harry, O4031590.
Seagrave, David Allen, O4041232.
Sefton, Norman Harold, O4066378.
Serpico, Frank Lawrence, Jr., O4002770.
Shadoan, William Lewis, O4035196.
Shanahan, Norman Kim, O4042513.
Shaw, Robert Leland, O4050223.
Shearer, Donald Albert, O4035015.
Shepard, William Cullom, O4025116.
Sherzer, Morton Philo, O4046356.
Short, Kenneth Melvin, O4047761.
Short, Robert James, O4075663.
Shumway, James Dyke, O4059487.
Simons, Simon Ira, O4059986.
Simpson, John Edward, Jr., O4026096.
Sinclaire, John, Jr., O4045088.
Skanchy, Robert Kelly, O1928099.
Smith, Albert John, O4045090.
Smith, Derald Henry, O4075455.
Smith, John D., O4063182.
Smith, William Harvey, O4059171.
Smith, Willis Bryant, O4044550.
Snare, Ross William, Jr., O4060518.
Snyder, Ronald Edward, O4060816.
Soderberg, Charles Arthur, Jr., O4027747.
Sovers, George Arthur, O4046171.
Standeven, Ernest John, O4039114.
Steinmetz, Charles Paul, O4035412.
Stewart, Donald Edward James, O4036206.
Stewart, Joe Fancher, O4042651.
Stipe, John Warren Mobley, Jr., O4075665.
Stockhammer, Gordon Francis, O4065005.
Stone, Gordon Lee, O4075268.
Storms, Robert Newell, Jr., O4059735.
Sullivan, David Duane, O4041801.
Swagerty, Daniel Lee, O4061611.
Sweeney, Daniel Joseph, O4010434.
Taylor, William Jesse, Jr., O4031019.
Teed, John Frederick, O4033913.
Tennant, Harold Butler, O4077068.
Thornton, James Harvey, O4029174.
Tomberg, Ralph Thomas, O4030956.
Treat, Robert B., Jr., O4049641.
Trowbridge, Clarence Arthur, O4038911.
Tucker, Andrew Leon, O1925254.
Turner, Donald Eugene, O1923566.
Tyner, Robert Otis, O4013205.
Undercoffer, John Thomas, O4047556.
Underwood, Frank Eugene, O4032612.
Valerius, Millard Russell, O2104308.
Van Wootten, Richard Angus, Jr., O4021066.
Vydra, Anthony Ladislav, O4053020.
Wade, Herman Leverne, O4036535.
Waite, Richard D., O4074643.
Walenty, John George, O4070486.
Walker, Billy Murray, O4025247.
Walker, James Richard, O4045906.
Wallace, Edwin Lawrence, O4031271.
Walter, John Gale, O4032996.
Warner, Darrell Gene, O4035417.
Weiher, Ronald George, O4004829.
Welch, William Roy, O1941047.
Wesson, Robert E., O4028755.
West, Louis, O4071343.
West, Wallace Wayne, O4044497.
Weyers, Orval Leonard, O4056991.
Williams, Cyril Howard, Jr., O4000657.
Williams, Donald Edward, Jr., O4049348.
Williams, John Kent, O4061235.

Williams, Nevin Roger, O4046437.
Williams, Robert Caldwell, Jr., O4038510.
Williams, Thomas Lee, Jr., O4025486.
Wilson, Daniel Marvin, O4075478.
Wilson, Gary Lee, O4047759.
Wilson, William Eugene, O4006174.
Wingate, Jack William, O4042670.
Wolfinbarger, Herman Rickie, O4034351.
Wood, Leonard Thomas, 01876122.
Worsh, Frederick Murray, O4066560.
Worthen, Freddie James, O4012130.
Wurman, James Wade, O2276528.
Yancey, Ernest Vincent, O4010190.
Young, Gregor Theodore, 3d, O189174.
Young, Richard Bruce, O4076589.
Zeigler, Charles Sheldon, O4042991.
Zychowski, Edward Frank, O1929466.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be lieutenant colonels*

Bush, Chester Keys, O297457.
Perry, Harry Edward, O398359.

*To be majors*

Ackerman, Everett Franklin, O451623.
Blackwell, James Marion, O477035.
Brumfield, Jesse William, O340130.
Cawthon, Charles Ready, O407674.
Devolites, Milton Charles, O450741.
Domina, Donald Eli, O1534002.
Kaplan, Clarence, O427384.
Kealey, Robert Charles, O2047021.
Lewis, Garland Bennett, O439614.
Lukas, Frank Walter, O1305079.
Morse, Warren Clinton, O407911.
Nolan, Patrick Theodore, O1639873.
Verfuerth, Vincent Paul, O509548.
Verzi, Martin Andrew, O1544147.
White, Wilson Elmer, O450921.

*To be captains*

Adams, Raymond Edward, O2048609.
Allen, Edward Vincent, O973899.
Clark, Dave Clyde, O2046923.
Coker, Larry Warren, O460093.
Coner, Charles Edward, O104265.
Cooper, Robert Eugene, O538574.
Couch, James Hamilton, O2050027.
Datel, William Emil, O2264587.
Dolson, James Frederick, O2047972.
Drotning, Theodore Benedik, O2049871.
Ellis, Paul Halstead, O1534474.
Goldstein, Bernard Lewis, O1547949.
Hazeltine, Stillman Edward, O959319.
Hinrichs, Herbert Harold, O2051172.
Hoffman, Edgar Franklin, O453820.
Hoffmann, Kenneth Leo, O1312769.
Israeloff, Joseph, O965869.
Kammerer, William Morris, O888414.
Kneepkens, John Alphonse, O1997260.
Kurtz, Myers Richard, O991984.
LaVault, Paul Aubert, O1534317.
Luban, Albert Joseph, O1547377.
Lucas, Kenneth, O988762.
Martin, Ersel Edward, O1534328.
Mattie, Edward Carmine, O2005587.
Nation, Marvin Eugene, O2007452.
O'Hern, Robert Stephen, O2046775.
Overmyer, Chester Ernest, O1311200.
Parkinson, Ralph Waldo, Jr., O1997306.
Patrick, Darvin Oliver, O961619.
Pemberton, Samuel Heywood, O2002515.
Pezzulli, Frank, O1337617.
Porter, William Raymond,O964967.
Poucher, Clyde Rolland,O1544242.
Ramshur, Loren Condell, O2014069.
Rowe, Russell Heavilin, Jr., O992533.
Shepard, Leonard Granville, O1547455.
Shively, Charles Joseph, O1543408.
Smith, Donald Eugene, O2013918.
Sternlicht, Irwin Robert, O981418.
Sutherland, William Benjamin, Jr., O1039237.

*To be first lieutenants*

Christie, Thomas Cecil, O4003645.
Dicker, Frank William, O994111.
Drenner, Buckley Lawerntz, O1917731.
Greene, Philip Densmore, O954242.
Grimes, Cecil Herrin, O1917802.
Killo, William Stephen, O4006114.
McDonald, Neil Jarvis, O2262964.
Moore, A. Gordon, O2104568.
Mueller, Louis Carl, O2263374.
Noble, James William Howard, O1888145.
Walter, Fred Lee, O2264434.
Webb, Richard, 3d, O4006303.
Williamson, Robert Luther, O996661.

*To be second lieutenants*

Allgood, Gerald Duane, O4049620.
Bethel, Howard Dwain, O4051353.
Bohnstedt, Nolan Duane, O4041696.
Bonfield, Robert Lawrence, O4042580.
Brown, George Lampros, O4066319.
Bunce, George Edwin, O4032928.
Cedola, Vincent Joseph, O4065922.
Cooney, James Patrick, Jr., O4056476.
Crenshaw, William Alva, O4075878.
Durr, Walter Leonard, O4039356.
Fitzsimmons, John Joseph, O4059881.
Gensler, Herman Harry, O2284018.
Gulevich, Wladimir, O2283670.
Hardman, John Goodwin, O4076791.
Haswell, Edward Alanson, O4049524.
Heldmyer, Harry Fredrick, O4059858.
Kinchen, Robert Preston, O4071265.
McGinnis, John William, O4047648.
Noble, Ralph Everett, O2282912.
Peterson, Charles Wayne, O4059946.
Pfeiffer, William George, O4056435.
Ryan, William Joseph, Jr., O2283679.
Salmon, Ray Weeks, Jr., O4019399.
Seeley, Sam Taylor, O2284554.
Smith, Robert Crow, O4016850.
Smith, Lee Roy, Jr., O1941038.
Sommers, George A., O4030316.
Walcott, Daniel Frank, O4061130.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3292, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be lieutenant colonels*

Garnett, James, O389981.
Lee, John G., O1000148.
Nelson, Wilner Nels John, O329803.

*To be majors*

Ahern, Robert James, O375643.
Herrod, Ralph, O432411.
Hunt, James William, O1996938.
Marchus, David Edward, Jr., O1284356.
Martin, Harold Vandersand, O349588.
McCartin, George James Joseph, Jr., O456117.
O'Donovan, William Enlow, O1318075.
Starr, James Carleton, O1323039.

*To be captains*

Dorsey, Frank J., O1928024.
Hart, Robert Edwin, O955216.
Lennon, Daniel Aloysius, Jr., O1636208.
Smith, Donald B., O1685729.
Wofford, Ralph Webb, O1845374.
Wondolowski, Peter Stanislaus, O401750.

*To be first lieutenants*

Ashlaw, Herman W., O982547.
Beitman, Laurence John, O2276946.
Costello, John L., Jr., O2285391.
Dunn, Robert Edward, O2276820.
Kugler, John B., O2283742.
Loane, Jabez W., IV, O2287323.
Miller, Glen Robert, O4019098.
Moody, Glenn Ray, Jr., O2286801.
Oglesby, John Thomas, O2003605.
Pusateri, Lawrence Xavier, O2272591.

The following-named officers for appointment as chaplain in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be majors*

Gorski, Joseph, O460877.
Heim, Donald Wallace, O482757.
O'Connor, William Vincent, O529709.

*To be captains*

Brown, Norman Richard, O2270830.
Burnette, Lester Eugene, O468886.
Heckard, Floyd Lee, O553084.
Higgins, William Joseph, O931819.
Jones, Joseph Woodrow, O1011833.
Kettler, Earl Cornelius, O996741.
Land, Clifton E., O2263945.
Lindsey, Chester Ray, O931676.
McMinn, Thomas L., Jr., O2273125.
Underwood, Carmah Curfew, O527992.

*To be first lieutenants*

Beasley, Joseph Hodgin, O2275727.
Brady, John Charles, O996290.
Casey, Walter Edward, O2274980.
Fosmire, William Lewis, O1878027.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Womens' Army Corp, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3311, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be majors*

Kunert, Betty Katherine, L504648.
Wilton, Ella Amanda, L220109.

*To be captains*

Bennett, Judith Christian, L802010.
Biasini, Isabelle, L200289.
Brinegar, Maurine Olive, L803746.
Byrne, Elizabeth Josephia, L1020581.
Harllee, Frances Elizabeth, L804185.
Harth, Elizabeth Agatha, L603875.
King, Ruth Ann, L311162.
Moon, Lou Anne, L501262.
Wood, Nancy Benton, L402096.

*To be first lieutenants*

Babyk, Helena Florentyna, L1010542.
Berry, Elizabeth Anne, L1020003.
Collins, Joyce Louise, L1020641.
Devany, Rebecca Bland, L1010692.
Etheridge, Wanda J., L1010770.
Fea, Jennie Wren, L1020302.
Hunter, Onie Ruth, L1010889.
Long, Alice Agnes, L117528.
McWilliams, Bonnie Jean, L1010490.
Wachuta, Laverne Ester, L508209.

*To be second lieutenants*

Archambault, Claire Annette, L1010795.
DeSarro, Margaret Mary, L1010809.
Husband, Patricia Rue, L1010847.
Keil, Barbara Joan, L1010881.
O'Rourke, Kathleen Rosemary, L1010786.
Pleasants, Katherine, L1010808.
Pons, Mildred Elaine, L1020664.
Roffee, Ruth Olive, L1010829.
Sousa, Rita Esther, L5302004.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress; title 10, United States Code, section 3291, as amended by Public Law 85–155, 85th Congress:

*To be lieutenant colonels*

Griffin, David J., MC, O76176.
Moulton, Charles W., MC, O422005.

*To be majors*

Baze, Wallace R., DC, O73985.
Bhaskar, Surindar N., DC, O4023052.
*Hauschild, Thomas B., MC, O76206.
Horne, David E., DC, O5003647.
Kruszewski, Edward P., DC, O1725498.
*Mendenhall, Max K., MC, O76385.
Monahan, James L., DC, O74020.
*Price, Delbert D., DC, O1534363.
Rose, Lawrence R., MC, O75423.
Shaver, Robert C., Jr., DC, O352588.
Wakeham, Richard D., DC, O973604.

*To be captains*

Alderson, Thomas H., DC, O1878205.
Alexander, William N., DC, O2267388.
Beavers, William T., DC, O4043589.
*Bohling, Walter H., Jr., DC, O983077.

Blundell, Mary L., AMSC, R2594.
Bushnell, Theodore L., MC, O4027872.
*Catlin, Frank R., MC, O4030404.
Clarke, Theodore C., DC, O2270746.
Clement, Cecil F., Jr., DC, O1182542.
Cokrhame, Jack, MC.
Cotter, Anastatia, AMSC, R2367.
Crittendon, William F., MC.
Desetti, James G., Jr., DC.
Dewar, Betty J., ANC, N797013.
DuPree, Lydia, ANC, N804067.
Fukunaga, Francis H., MC, O4055398.
Gardner, Richard M., MC.
Halterman, James L., DC, O4046600.
Hathaway, Edythe J., ANC, N777453.
*Hathaway, Robert G., MC, O4022005.
Hehn, Mary K., ANC, N726430.
*Hemenway, Mary, AMSC, M2903.
Jender, Joseph G., MC, O4056127.
Jennings, William A., DC, O2271331.
Johnson, George L., MC, O4002277.
*Kirchner, Marvin M., MC, O75382.
*McClure, Gammon D., DC, O980924.
Mikvy, William P., DC, O4045718.
Neimes, Robert E., MC, O4016505.
Petz, Arthur J., MC, O4056319.
Schane, William P., MC, O5202342.
*Scully, Bernard R., DC, O1081175.
*Singer, Kathryn C., ANC, N725082.
Snartemo, Alfa M., ANC, N737169.
Stewart, Hugh A., Jr., DC, O2270969.
Suddarth, Jerome A., DC.
*VanMeter, Richard L., MC, O4050856.
*Vocke, Lester E., DC, O1799402.
*Weiland, Jerold T., DC, O4056102.
Worthington, Robert L., MC.
Zachary, Jimmy B., MC, AO3042041.
*Zimmerman, Joseph S., DC.

*To be first lieutenants*

Acomb, Kent M., DC, O4071026.
Aiken, Hovey E., Jr., MC, O4011641.
Baird, William L., Jr., MC, O1942354.
Baxter, Lucille N., ANC, N900056.
Burke, Frances M., ANC, N900272.
Christopher, Mildred E., ANC, N900104.
*Coats, William C., Jr., DC, O2277579.
*Coddington, Robert C., MC.
*Copeland, Sage D., MC, O2003672.
Dangerfield, Harry G., MC, O5701217.
*Dwyer, Mary P., AMSC, R20007.
Giordano, Wally P., MC, O5003221.
Gray, Barbara D., AMSC, M3037.
Harding, Clarke T., Jr., MC, O2283398.
Hersperger, Webb S., MC.
Jones, Virginia A., ANC, N900294.
*Latimer, Estill V., AMSC, M3030.
*Maier, Eugene S., MC, O2284732.
*Margolis, Bernard M., MC, O2284644.
McRoberts, Terry E., DC, O2284676.
Mooney, Patricia E., AMSC, R2655.
Morris, Mary V., AMSC, J100093.
*Newton, John P., MC.
Pickford, Barbara, ANC, N902280.
Quesenberry, Esther M., ANC, N792609.
Ranberg, Florence V., ANC, N901148.
*Roberts, Fred F., MC, O2283884.
Siegt, Dorothy M., ANC, N900472.
Sommer, Albrecht P. J. W., MC, O2282664.
Strickman, Bernard, MC, O5202690.
Tabrisky, Joseph I., MC, O5500582.
*Teofan, Ronald O., DC.
Thompson, Beatrice E., AMSC, M3031.
Waters, Dean G., MC, O5202691.
Wilson, Shannon D., ANC, N901478.
Zahn, Genevieve F., ANC, N805137.

*To be second lieutenants*

Arseneau, Joanne L., ANC, N902546.
*Forbes, Betty L., ANC, N902575.
Gregory, Barbara A., ANC, N902684.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Jones, David W., Jr., O49631.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant:

Roesser, Joseph C., O73481.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grade of second lieutenant:

Keolanui, Lawrence K., Jr., O72744.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

*Inlow, Neely S.
Johnson, William H., Jr., O4084573.
King, Damon D.
Kistler, Thomas E., Jr.
*Merrill, Benjamin L.
*Posey, William L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

*Adamski, Richard G.
Alexander, Lon C., Jr.
*Allen, George E., II.
Allen, John R.
*Anderson, John L.
Bartlett, William E., Jr., O5305083.
*Bartlett, William G., Jr.
*Bauer, Donnell G.
*Binzer, Solomon V.
Black, Reuben, O5300911.
*Black, Robert D.
*Bouten, Franklin J.
*Bracey, Alonzo
*Bradley, Lee M.
Brown, John, Jr., O5300278.
Brownfield, Willim I., O5300493.
Burnett, Richard J., Jr.
*Caldwell, Chellus M.
*Churchill, Carl L.
*Cordonnier, David J.
*Corner, Charles R.
Cromartie, Eugene R.
*Culpepper, Oren R.
*Danner, Billy G.
*Davis, Carl J.
Davoli, James O., O5202947.
DeLoach, Ray B., O5302601.
*Dorsey, Harry M.
Downs, Clifford, Jr., O4068894.
*Feit, Thomas P. P.
Flynn, William S., O4085411.
*Foley, Roger M.
Gallagher, Harold D., O5504414.
*Gray, Josef E.
*Greenwalt, Randall A.
*Gregory, David T.
*Hall, David W.
*Harbuck, James B., Jr.
*Hartley, Robert G.
*Issel, Kenneth A.
*Kastenmayer, Walter W., Jr.
*Knight, Jerry C.
Landry, Gerard, O4065557.
*Larsen, Gary W.
*Lengyel, Jack R.
*Lovejoy, Dan H.
Lundgren, Duwayne C., O5400770.
*Luthy, Arthur P.
*Maddox, George B.
*Maldonado, Victor S.
Mattingly, Roger K., O5504559.
McBath, Donald L.
*Michener, Edward H.
*Morris, David W.
*Motes, Clyde L.
Mulloy, Robert L., Jr., O5302636.
*Murphy, Malcolm J.
*Olson, Bruce G.
*O'Malley, Joseph G.
*O'Toole, Thomas M.
*Parks, David W.
Pendell, Roger A., O5202290.
*Petesch, Gary L.
Plummer, Harold L.
Polo, Richard J., O4065339.
*Purser, Evan G.
*Riddle, Walker M., Jr.
*Roemer, Richard O.
*Rowe, Terry E., Jr.
*Rowley, Dan M.
*Schad, Charles T.
Schrader, Frederick A., O5202032.
*Shook, William H.
Sowell, Arnold M., O5201760.
Spiecker, John S., O5502743.
Steedly, Ronald E., O5300578.
Steinbach, James J.
Streips, Eugene A., O5303064.
*Sullivan, George C.
Suprise, Lyle G., O5504481.
Takane, James N., O5300013.
*Terpstra, John J., Jr.
Tipton, James A., O5302351.
*Tobiason, Robert G.
Ward, Rayburn L., Jr., O5302859.
*Warren, Peter J.
*Weiler, John L.
Whedbee, John S., O5302437.
*Wheeler, Edward W., Jr.
Williams, Jimmie L., Jr.
Wynn, Sidney R., O5303126.

NOTE.—Those officers whose names are not preceded by the symbol (*) were appointed, transferred, or promoted during the recess of the Senate. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were not appointed or promoted during the recess of the Senate.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Ecclesiastes 12: 13: *"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."*

Almighty God, grant that in our moment of prayer our listless and languid spirits may be quickened into newness of life and touched to finer and nobler issues.

We penitently confess that frequently we are guilty of the incredible folly of trying to solve our problems and discharge the duties and responsibilities of our high vocation without first holding counsel with the God of all wisdom.

May our sense of duty and our vision of the ultimate triumph of justice and righteousness, of peace and good will, be so clear and commanding that we shall never yield to doubt and defeatism.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations from committees, which were read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., January 15, 1958.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I understand that I am to be appointed to the Judiciary Committee, and accordingly I hereby submit my

resignation from the Committee on Government Operations. My committee assignments then will be Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

Respectfully yours,

H. ALLEN SMITH,
*Member of Congress.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., January 16, 1958.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Speaker's Office, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to become effective instanter.

In terminating my membership on this committee I wish to express to Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE and my other colleagues there my sincere appreciation for their many acts of friendship and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

BASIL L. WHITENER,
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

---

## AMENDMENTS OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL ALLOTMENT AND SUPPORT PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 308)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The people of the United States are living in a world of rapid change. Developments both abroad and at home require reemphasis in some of our efforts, redirection in others. This is true of defense, of education, of industry, and of labor. It is also true of agriculture.

The rapid changes taking place in agriculture are largely the result of a major breakthrough in agricultural science and technology. In recent years agriculture has been experiencing a veritable revolution in productivity.

A century ago, an American farmworker fed himself and three others. Today he feeds himself and 20 others. A century ago, our population was 82 percent rural. Today it is only one-third rural and only 12 percent of our population actually live on farms.

Farm production per man-hour has doubled since 1940. There has been more change in agriculture within the lifetime of men now living than in the previous 2,000 years.

Changes of such magnitude place great stress on our farm people and on the social, political, and economic institutions which serve them. Far-reaching adjustments are being made which involve the lives and hopes of 20 million men, women, and children on the farms of America.

The scientific revolution in agriculture is irreversible and is continuing. It cannot be avoided and it need not be feared. In recognition of this basic fact, we must find ways of utilizing more completely the abundance that our farm people are now able to produce; we must find ways of further expanding markets for this increased production, not only among our own citizens but among people all over the world who need the food and clothing we produce in such abundance. At the same time we must help our farm people to cope with the sometimes harsh consequences of their own unparalleled ability to produce, while preserving and strengthening free enterprise and the family farm.

Those who have fared best during the years of this agricultural revolution are the farmers on the 2,100,000 commercial farms that produce 90 percent of the food and fiber that goes to market. Affected quite differently are the farmers on the 2,700,000 other farms that produce relatively little for sale. To them, the farm is primarily a place to live, with an opportunity to grow products for home use, for about three-fourths of their income is derived from off-farm sources.

Commercial family farms have their problems. So do small-scale farmers, subsistence farmers, and part-time farmers. The problems, however, are not always the same.

There is evidence that those farmers who produce the bulk of our farm products are meeting the problem of adjusting their operations to the changes now in progress. Moreover, there are other indications of strength in our farm economy.

Prices received by farmers on the average are running 3 percent above those of a year ago.

During the last 2 years, farm net income has stabilized following several years of decline.

Farm real estate prices are at an all-time high, reflecting a basic optimism in the future earning power and security which farming and farmland ownership offer.

Three-fourths of our farms are owned by those who operate them, the highest percentage on record.

Total debt of our farm people equals only 11 percent of total assets as compared with 19 percent before World War II.

Exports of farm products, assisted by special Government programs, reached an all-time high of $4.7 billion during the year ending last June 30.

Surplus holdings of farm products in the hands of Government appear to have passed their peak. Government investment in price-supported commodities now stands at about $7 billion, $1 billion below a year ago.

Substantial progress has been made in programs of education, research, conservation, and other activities of proven merit. Work in all those areas has been substantially expanded.

With Government help, farm people, in the best American tradition, have gained bargaining power through their own farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives.

Yet key problems remain unresolved.

Rising production costs continue to limit net farm income. Prices of articles farmers buy more than doubled from 1939 to 1952. Since then they have risen 3 percent. Prices received by farmers have not kept pace with their increased production costs. These are hard facts every farmer faces.

Moreover, acreage controls have failed to bring agricultural production into line, despite the severe restrictions they impose on the individual farmer's freedom to produce and to market his products. And unrealistic price-support laws, some of which date back to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, result, as farmers now realize, in loss of markets.

Furthermore, there are large numbers of rural people who have not benefited from price supports. Nor have they benefited as they should from the great changes under way in agriculture. In fact, some have been put at a competitive disadvantage by the onrush of farm technology and other economic changes.

This is true not only in particular rural areas of low income, but for some people in almost every farm community. There are millions of rural people who, for reasons of small farms, poor soils, limited resources, age, inadequate credit, lack of education, poor health or insufficient managerial ability, have been unable to make the adjustments called for by modern technology.

Few of the dollars spent on agricultural programs have been of appreciable help to this group.

Price supports have scant meaning to a farmer with little to sell.

Reductions in acreage to support higher prices are contrary to the needs of a farmer whose production is already too small to give him a proper livelihood.

In my special agricultural message 4 years ago, I indicated that the Secretary of Agriculture would give attention to the problems peculiar to farm families with low incomes. As a result, the rural development program was initiated. It is widening opportunities for those rural people on the lower rungs of the economic ladder.

For underemployed farmers who desire to continue in agriculture, the rural development program, in cooperation with States and localities, offers research, education, supervised credit, and cost-sharing by the Federal Government in improving land, timber, and water resources. Farm and home improvements are a major part of the program.

For those who wish to supplement or replace limited farm incomes with greater income from nonfarm sources, there are being established vocational training programs in trades and skills. Additional industries are being established in farming areas where more employment and higher incomes are needed. Farm families which are interested are also being informed of job opportunities in other segments of the economy.

Though only about 3 years old, the rural development program has already achieved much, and with the increased emphasis planned for the coming year, progress promises to be more rapid in the future.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Basic agricultural legislation now on the books was originally devised as an emergency effort to cope with a depression, then changed to help fight a war, and subsequently revised again in an

effort to meet the needs of peace. It has not been adequately modified to deal with the effects of the technological revolution in agriculture. This must now be done.

It is essential that the following major steps be taken this year to improve the status of rural people in greatest need, to aid agricultural adjustment, provide more freedom, expand markets, and, thereby, to help raise farm family income.

First. The conservation reserve program of the soil bank should be strengthened, and the acreage reserve program terminated after the 1958 crop.

The conservation reserve has shown promise in retiring marginal acres from crop production, in aiding the cause of conservation, and in taking whole farms out of production. The program is wholly voluntary and must remain so.

Because of its late enactment, the acreage reserve program was hampered during 1956 in achieving production adjustment. And although the 1957 program succeeded in reducing wheat production by about 175 million bushels, cotton by 2 million bales, and corn by 220 million bushels below what it would otherwise have been, the number of farmers participating in 1958 is likely to be low, in part because of limitations that Congress imposed on the extent of participation by any one farm. So in the future the production adjustment accomplished by the acreage reserve is likely to be small.

We should now shift the emphasis of the soil bank away from the short-term acreage reserve, aimed at reducing surpluses of particular crops to the long-term conservation reserve, aimed at overall production adjustment.

This change will aid all farmers, especially the low-income farmer, who will, if he desires, be better able to retire his entire farm from production.

Expansion of the conservation reserve will be an effective instrument of adjustment only if it is accompanied by needed changes in price supports. It must not become merely a means of offsetting the production stimulus supplied by price supports held continually at incentive levels.

The budget message recommends a conservation reserve program of $450 million for the 1959 calendar year.

Second. Authority to increase acreage allotments for cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco should be provided. Under present legislation acreage allotments and price supports for certain of the basic crops are determined by legal formulas. Under these formulas, allotments have already been cut sharply. Allotments for certain crops are likely to be reduced even further, despite growing evidence that acreage restrictions have not brought about needed adjustments.

Authority should be provided for the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with criteria which the Secretary will propose to the Congress, to increase allotments up to 50 percent above the levels determined by existing formulas.

The law already specifies that the Secretary may provide price support at levels above those determined by formula, and this authority has been used. The law should also provide authority to increase acreage allotments when the statistical formula yields results clearly contrary to the general interest. But any acreage increases must be related to price adjustments which will permit the growth of markets necessary to absorb the increased production.

Such liberalization of acreage allotments as is possible would permit greater efficiency and higher incomes for small farmers who now are sharply restricted in the size of their operations.

Third. Acreage allotments for corn should be eliminated. The corn program has not worked. Huge surpluses have accumulated. As surpluses rise, present legislation provides that allotments must shrink. As allotments shrink, participation in the corn program dwindles. A year ago, 62 percent of the corn farmers who voted in the referendum favored the elimination of corn acreage allotments. In 1957, only about 14 percent of the corn production in the commercial corn area was eligible for the full price support. Thus, as allotments shrink, participation spirals downward, and price-depressing surpluses spiral upward.

Fourth. The escalator clauses in the basic law should be abolished. Provisions now in the law require that price supports be raised as soon as the surplus is reduced. This means that as one surplus is moved, incentives are automatically provided to build another. Until this basic law is changed, farm people can expect to be kept continually under the shadow of price-depressing surpluses.

The soil-bank and surplus-disposal programs have already cut deeply enough into our surplus to throw these escalator clauses into action to build more surpluses. Elimination of these escalator clauses is necessary if surplus-disposal programs and the soil bank are to achieve their purpose.

Fifth. The overall range within which price supports may be provided should be substantially widened. Presently, price supports must be provided by rigid formula for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, tobacco, and dairy products between 75 and 90 percent of parity. This range is too narrow to permit the growth of markets needed to absorb the production which, despite acreage controls, our farms appear certain to produce. Price supports for the above-named commodities should be determined administratively between 60 percent and 90 percent of parity, using the 8 guidelines now provided by law for practically all other commodities. This needed change in price-support policy would open the door to market expansion, increased acreage allotments, and greater freedom to produce.

For commodities like the feed grains, with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture has had wide discretion in the past, price support has been offered at levels as high as could be justified under the criteria specified by law. This will be the Secretary's practice under the recommended legislation.

Sixth. Price supports for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop. For cotton the law specifies that supports must be based on a grade that is far below the average quality. The law should be corrected to put cotton price supports on the same basis as for all other crops.

Seventh. The membership of the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board should be enlarged and the Board's responsibilities increased. The recommended changes in determining acreage allotments and price-support levels will make additional administrative discretion a necessity. To assist the Secretary of Agriculture in exercising this discretion, the bipartisan Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board should be increased in number from 5 to 7. Members should be appointed by the President as at present, but with confirmation by the Senate. The Board should advise the Secretary regarding the establishing of price supports, determining of acreage allotments, and related subjects.

Eighth. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act should be extended. This law is one of the major authorities for moving surplus commodities. The law should be extended for 1 year with an additional $1.5 billion authorized for sales for foreign currencies. But it must not, however, be allowed to become a device to postpone needed production and price adjustments. The extension should be limited to 1 year to give Congress the opportunity for annual review.

Ninth. Research efforts aimed at increasing industrial uses of farm products should be expanded. Our farms and forests are a major source of our raw materials. To a greater degree than at present, these raw materials can be used in industry, thereby broadening markets for our abundant farm products. New uses and new markets can be developed for our surplus crops. To bring this about, increased utilization research is needed and is proposed in the budget message. This will be moving in the direction recommended by the President's Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

In addition to the nine steps outlined here, the Congress should, as recommended in the budget message, (a) extend the National Wool Act; (b) continue the special school milk program; (c) broaden the sources of funds for the Rural Electrification Administration; (d) require State participation in programs to relieve the effects of drought or other natural disaster; and (e) improve conservation accomplishment by restricting cost sharing to those practices which achieve longer lasting conservation benefits.

These several recommendations constitute a farm, food, and fiber program which will assist our farmers to adjust to today's rapidly changing economy. It is a progress program that can make a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

## SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 309)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 7th Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 15, 1958.*

## ANNUAL REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1957—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 263)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

## SECOND SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 306)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the second semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1958.*

## RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications:

JANUARY 16, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been elected a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
*Member of Congress.*

---

JANUARY 16, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation from the Committee on the District of Columbia effective this date.

With the expression of my highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN,
*Member of Congress.*

---

JANUARY 16, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having been elected a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
*Member of Congress.*

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 440) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, New York.

Committee on Government Operations: KATHRYN E. (Mrs. WILLIAM T.) GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania.

Committee on the Judiciary: BASIL L. WHITENER, North Carolina; ROLAND V. LIBONATI, Illinois.

Committee on Un-American Activities. WILLIAM M. TUCK, Virginia.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 441) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Education and Labor: JOHN A. LAFORE, JR., Pennsylvania.

Committee on the Judiciary: H. ALLEN SMITH, California.

The resolution was agreed to.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts be kind enough to give us the legislative program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the bill H. R. 3831, the tax bill, Technical Amendments Act of 1957, from the Committee on Ways and Means. If there is any rollcall on the bill, the rollcall will go over until Tuesday, and we could make arrangements, probably, to take it up later that afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] informs me that the committee appointed to attend the funeral of the late August H. Andresen cannot get back here until Wednesday, but we can work out later the matter of when to have the rollcall on the tax bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; we can discuss that later.

On Tuesday there will be the bill H. R. 9955, providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit. The bill H. R. 3831 may be passed without a rollcall vote, and I understand the committee will not ask for a rollcall. Although I cannot speak for all the members of the committee, I understand that is so. However, there will be a rollcall on the public debt limit bill, I think that is safe to say.

I have been informed by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], that the supplemental appropriation bill will be reported out next week, probably either Monday or Tuesday, Tuesday being the probability, and that the bill will be brought up next week. I cannot state which day next week that bill will be brought up, except to advise my colleagues of the conversation I had with the gentleman from Texas, that the bill will be reported out and will be brought up next week.

Mr. MARTIN. To get the picture clearly before the Members of the House, what will we do on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Tuesday there is the bill providing for the temporary increase in the public debt limit. That is definite.

Mr. MARTIN. How long will the debate be on the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. They do not have a rule on it as yet. Can the gentleman from Arkansas give us some information on that? I see the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is here. They probably have some idea on that.

Mr. MILLS. It is very difficult to answer the question of the minority leader with respect to the time because there has been no discussion in the Committee on Ways and Means even on the point of how much time we will ask the Committee on Rules to give us for general debate on the debt ceiling bill. I hope we can dispose of it with a minimum of debate, frankly.

Mr. REED. If the gentleman will yield, I think an hour ought to be enough.

Mr. MILLS. That would be entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. MARTIN. It is my understanding that a rollcall vote will be had on this measure. How are we going to protect the Members of the funeral delegation who are attending the funeral of our late colleague from Minnesota? They will not be back, I repeat, until Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota when the burial of our late friend will take place?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The funeral will take place on Monday afternoon in Red Wing, Minn. There is no possible way that we, who are on that delegation of 12 Members, can return here and be ready for work on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the statement of the gentleman is self-explanatory and the situation is clear to all of us, I am sure; so, so far as I am concerned, if my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is agreeable, if any rollcall votes are to be taken on Monday or Tuesday, they will be put over until Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. That is very well, but I understand that this date might inconvenience some on the Democratic side; and if the majority leader cares to postpone the vote until Thursday that will be all right with me.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend is very kind. It so happens that it will conflict with something that the majority leader himself has committed himself to, but I am willing to subordinate myself for the benefit of the many and I will try to be here. I have a speaking engagement that I am committed to. If it is agreeable to the gentleman, if any rollcall votes should be called for on Monday or Tuesday, they will go over until Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is very generous; but, as I say, I am anxious to be equally generous with the gentleman from Massachusetts; and, if he wants the rollcall vote to go over until Thursday, that will be all right with me.

Mr. McCORMACK. But Thursday would be just as bad for me.

## COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, January 17, 1958, to file a report on the bill H. R. 9955, a bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

## SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 429) reaffirming belief in the merit system principle for Government employment.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Thursday, January 16, 1958, will mark the 75th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act which signaled an end to the spoils system and marked the beginning of the competitive civil service that today embraces a career work force of more than 2 million employees; and

Whereas a competent career service is a foundation of good government, an informed citizenry the lifeblood of our democracy; and

Whereas the Government's ability to attract and retrain well-qualified people for the Federal work force depends upon an informed public opinion—upon public knowledge and understanding of the career civil service and its place in our democracy; and

Whereas it is advisable to focus public attention on the Federal service and on the achievements of career civil servants in behalf of the people they serve; and

Whereas the position of world leadership assumed by the United States underscores the need for public understanding of the responsibilities of the Government and of the career service through which vital programs authorized by the Congress are carried out: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House reaffirms its belief in the merit system principle for Government employment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE WEEK

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Resolution 429 as a means for the entire membership of this House to give appropriate recognition to one of the most important events in the history of our Federal civil service.

Seventy-five years ago today, on January 16, 1883, President Chester A. Arthur signed the first Civil Service Act. This act sounded the death knell for spoilism and political patronage in appointments to Federal positions. It marked the end of a long period of struggle for reforms to end a century of filling public offices without any regard to ability or the public interest—and to replace it with a plan based on the principle that superior qualifications are the only test of eligibility for public office.

In all probability the name of Charles Gieteau has little or no significance today to most of the 2,400,000 Federal employees who now enjoy the benefits of our civil service merit system. This disappointed office seeker's crime, when he assassinated President Garfield, crystallized public opinion to strong indignation which forced adoption of the Civil Service Act in 1883. This act remains the foundation of merit in Government employment as we know it. It has been the model for extension of the merit principle throughout State, local, and municipal governments in America.

It is most appropriate, therefore that we resolve today to rededicate ourselves to the great principle embodied in this law. But this resolution should be coupled with a note of caution. Devotion to the ideals of the Civil Service Act should not lead us into a false sense of security or overreliance on its infallibility simply because these ideals have withstood the test of time. We should never reach the point of relaxing our guard against any weakening of the merit principle. It is our responsibility not only to maintain this principle but to strengthen and extend it when changes are needed.

After all, as well and as soundly as the Civil Service Act was planned, and as effective an instrument as it has been for efficient Government, the early planners could not have been expected to foresee all of the needs and requirements, all of the complexities and problems, of the future. With all due honor to them, it is our duty to adapt the merit framework they provided to present space-age needs of our Government.

Your Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has maintained close watch to guard against any tendency toward weakening of the competitive merit system. We have conducted studies and investigations, on a continuing basis, to strengthen and extend the competitive civil service.

This can be accomplished only by full consideration of matters relating to the civil service in the Post Office and Civil Service Committees. Right now there are too many positions—such as the so-called supergrade positions and schedule C positions—that can be created without certification by the Civil Service Commission as to the propriety of their grades and salary levels. Prospective appointees to these positions should be subjected to the test of meeting minimum qualifications, established under Civil Service Commission standards, before they are placed in the positions. We have found many examples of appointments of individuals who simply do not have the qualifications for important Government work assigned to them. This creates a serious weakness at top level which is bound to interfere with efficiency and economical conduct of the public business.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that House Resolution 429 will receive the unanimous approval of the House as an evidence that we reaffirm our faith in competitive merit for our Federal civil service.

## SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of House Resolution 429. I have introduced an identical resolution, House Resolution 430, marking the 75th anniversary of the Civil Service Act of 1883.

I have just come from a most impressive ceremony in which this occasion was observed by leaders throughout the executive branch. It is singularly appropriate that the program in this celebration included many very fine awards honoring Federal civil servants for long and meritorious service and outstanding accomplishments. These awards, I am sure, would have met with the full approval of the early planners who wrote the first Civil Service Act.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 429 is a simple yet strong reaffirmation of one of the most effective national policies ever laid down by the Congress of the United States. This is the firm and unshakable principle of merit in the selection of the men and the women who conduct the public business.

With this resolution the Members join 170 million Americans in observance of the diamond anniversary of our civil-service merit system. Federal, State, and local officials and employees—civic, professional, and educational leaders—outstanding businessmen and industrialists—from Maine to California and from Puget Sound to Cape Canaveral are celebrating National Civil Service Week in commemoration of the signing of the Civil Service Act by President Arthur on January 16, 1883.

It is a real tribute to the wisdom and foresight of those who took this first, great step toward efficiency and integrity in our civil service, that through three-quarters of a century their ideals have endured and grown in stature to universal recognition. Merit in the civil service today is as much a part of our national creed as the Bill of Rights.

It seems to me that there is something very fundamental—something symbolic of the American way of life—in the application of true merit standards to those who serve the public. The strong competitive spirit that built our independence, our wealth, and our world leadership is naturally receptive to the logic of a system in which the holding of public office rests on merit determined through open competition.

It has been my privilege, during 21 years as a Member of the House, to be associated very closely with our Federal civil service and to work toward a stronger merit system to the best of my ability. It is most gratifying to be able to report that the competitive merit system is immeasurably stronger today than ever before in history. More than 91 percent of Federal employees in the United States now are in the competitive service—compared to 61 percent 21 years ago. This is far cry from conditions when the Civil Service Act was signed, when merit applied to only 10 percent, a mere handful, of Government employees.

Nor should we overlook one of the chief benefits of a vigorous and enlightened competitive civil service—a benefit not foreseen, I am sure, by the early planners, but nonetheless valuable. This is the prestige it brings to our entire Government and all the people in it, the sense of confidence—yes, and appreciation—it instills in the public. Confidence begets confidence. There is nothing that contributes more to superior performance than knowledge that those we serve are aware of our efforts and give us the greatest gifts in their power—their confidence that their affairs are in capable hands.

## ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ADMISSION OF OREGON INTO THE UNION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue, on or before February 14, 1959 (the 100th anniversary of the date on which the State of Oregon was admitted into the Union), a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of Oregon into the Union.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary this morning and asked that Senate Joint Resolution 131 be substituted for House Resolution 467, my own resolution, which had been reported out of committee only this morning. I did this in order to expedite this particular matter. Governor Robert Holmes and the centennial commission are most anxious to proceed with their plans as rapidly as possible.

I would also like to take this opportunity to invite you, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and the citizens they represent, to come and visit Oregon. We welcome travelers at any time, but we take particular pleasure in extending an invitation for 1959—Oregon's centennial year. On February 14, 1859, Oregon officially became the 33d State of the Union.

Oregon offers year-round vacation and recreational opportunities—skiing, swimming, hiking, boating, fishing or for the less energetic, relaxing in the sun. Proud of her 400 miles of rugged and constantly changing coastline, Oregon also boasts some of the highest peaks in the Cascade and Coast Ranges. Lakes and streams alive with fish and virgin forest still waiting visiting and local hunters—in scenic and active pleasures, Oregon is the equal of any State in the Union.

Blessed with a Mediterranean-type climate, Oregon rarely suffers from prolonged cold spells in the winter or long periods of intensive heat in the summer.

But in 1959, besides these natural and unchanging attractions, Oregon, for its 100th birthday celebration, will feature the Oregon State Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair. Countries all over the world will send their goods to Oregon giving Americans a chance to see exhibitions of these foreign products and, incidentally, bringing scenery, products, and industries to a national and international audience. A sideline effect of this exchange of goods will be the resulting stimulation of trade between this area of the country and the other parts of the world.

Since you have passed this bill which authorizes the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate our 100th anniversary, I want you to realize my hope, supported by all the citizens of Oregon, that all of you and your constituents can join us, in Oregon, for this celebration of a vital, prospering 100 years.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of this resolution. The 100th anniversary of the entry of the State of Oregon into the Union will take place on February 14 of next year and our State will proudly celebrate that event.

In connection therewith an international exposition will be held during the year in Portland and all the citizens of our State are joining in an effort to make it a memorable event.

It goes without saying that each and every Member of this House is most cordially invited to join us in attending the exposition and taking part in this festive year.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ADDRESS BY JOHN GLEASON, COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to be followed by such other Members from Illinois as wish to speak on the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois delegation in this body today is experiencing a sense of great pride to which I, with other of my colleagues, wish to give expression. Last night the American Legion gave a dinner in honor of the Members of the Congress of the United States. This is an annual occasion to which all in the Congress, a large majority of us members of the Legion, look forward with keen anticipation.

The dinner of the American Legion is always an enjoyable and thrilling occasion, but the one last night will take a top position in our memories. The speaking program was confined to one address, that of the commander in chief, John Gleason. It was one of the best speeches in content and in delivery that I have ever been privileged to listen to on similar occasion. This was the tenor of the remarks of my colleagues on all sides. The address was brief. It was a

stirring challenge to the American patriotism that is deeply imbedded in all veterans. It was delivered with eloquent sincerity. Many of my colleagues remarked that it furnished a pattern for future after dinner speakers.

Commander in Chief Gleason did honor to himself and to the great American Legion. As one of the founders of the American Legion in Illinois, elected at its first department convention held at Peoria as chairman of the department executive committee, I was especially happy that last night's eloquent speaker, the commander in chief of the American Legion, is from the Department of Illinois. The thrill of pride that I experienced at the outstanding performance of Commander in Chief Gleason was equal to that which I experienced when, at the convention of the American Legion in Philadelphia, Howard Savage was elected as Illinois' first commander in chief of the great American Legion. It was Commander in Chief Howard Savage of Illinois who headed the second AEF on the return to France as legionnaires of the men who only a few years prior had been fighting on the battlefields of France in World War I.

May I extend to Commander in Chief Gleason the congratulations of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States on a job magnificently well done.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to call to the attention of the Members the following very fine address by John S. Gleason, Jr., national commander, the American Legion, at the national legislative commission's annual dinner honoring the Members of Congress, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, January 15, 1958:

The American Legion is proud and pleased to welcome you to this dinner in honor of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States. We are grateful to the Members of Congress who have taken time from their busy schedules to be with us so that we might first visit with them personally before paying tribute to them publicly tonight. And we are indebted to you officials and military leaders of our Government, to the members of the press, and to all of our distinguished guests for your courtesy and cooperation in joining us as we salute the Members of the most important legislative body in the world.

We in the American Legion are well aware of the many, grave problems which the Congress must resolve in the trying months ahead. We realize that the life and death issue of our security and survival must command the first attention and constant concern of you Senators and Representatives. And we recognize that to the difficulties and complexities of this supreme challenge have been added other serious problems affecting every segment of our economy, from farmers to veterans . . . every facet of our national life, from the welfare of our children to the care of our aged.

It is true that the responsibility for enacting the legislation needed to provide for our common defense and insure the welfare of all our people has been reserved to the Congress alone. But it is no less true that the obligation to understand, to accept and to carry out the purpose and provisions of the laws you enact is reserved to us, the American people.

One area in which the American Legion has been privileged to exercise a special interest and effort has been in the field of veterans' affairs. We have not yet explored the full range of this broad and complex subject. But we have long realized that the program of hospital and medical care and of other essential benefits for veterans enacted through the years by the Congress of the United States is the most comprehensive, the most constructive, and the most compassionate ever conceived and carried out by any nation.

The American Legion can never express too often or too strongly its deep appreciation to you Members of the Congress of the United States for the significant and lasting contribution you have made to the welfare of our Nation's veterans.

You have built wisely and well the sound structure of benefits now available to disabled veterans, and to the widows and orphans of our deceased veterans. But you appreciate, I'm sure, that this structure can always be improved. Certainly it must always be subject to change to meet developing conditions.

But improvement and emasculation are not synonymous. Neither are change and destruction, although some individuals, including responsible Government officials, seem to think so. This element would diminish the scope of the present veterans program, restrict its future availability, and undermine its historic, basic foundation—all in the name of economy, security, and social progress.

The American Legion is determined that this attack will not succeed. We're confident that it won't as long as the Congress of the United States has anything to say about it.

You can be equally certain of the American Legion's confidence and support of your efforts to arm America militarily, scientifically, economically, and politically against the increasingly powerful threat of Communist Russia.

If studied interest and informed, constructive comment will help to guide, encourage, and sustain you in the months ahead as you decide America's destiny, indeed, the destiny of civilization itself, then you can be certain that the American Legion's voice will be heard in the Halls of Congress and throughout our land. It will be the voice of patriots unafraid and dedicated to but one cause—the security and survival of America as a free Nation under God.

Be assured, too, that the American Legion will back you completely if, in your final judgment, our security demands that we forego a tax cut, forget about a balanced budget and raise the debt ceiling. We will support changes in the organization and operation of the Defense Department, and especially our rocket and missile research and development program, which are demonstrably necessary and practical. But these changes must be based on studies and recommendations clearly and completely nonpartisan in nature. And they must not do violence to the patriotism, the dedication and the abilities of those devoted Americans in our laboratories and our Armed Forces who have served and sacrificed beyond measure to meet the frightening challenge of Soviet science.

This is a time for patriotism and sacrifice, not politics and scapegoats. American Legionnaires and all Americans will meet the challenge to our freedoms and our survival. Of this response we are confident. To this task we dedicate ourselves tonight.

Strengthened by this knowledge, armed with this support, and inspired by divine providence, you Senators and Representatives of the United States Congress cannot help but provide the dynamic, courageous leadership which America so desperately needs in this hour of crisis. You cannot help but answer Daniel Webster's challenge, inscribed on the wall of the Chamber of the House of Representatives, to "see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Thank you for being our guests tonight.

## MEETING OF INTERESTED MEMBERS REGARDING CONDITIONS IN THE SOUTHWEST

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, an acute disaster hit a great area of this country during the 1957 growing season. I will say that it was more than a disaster, it was a calamity in a large area of the Southwest and the Deep South and in the State of Minnesota. Heavy rains during the planting, growing, and harvest seasons greatly reduced farm yields and the quality of farm commodities. Farmers are unable to pay their 1957 obligations in a large percent of the territory ravaged by floods, excessive rains, early frost, and freeze.

A meeting will be held at 2 o'clock this afternoon in the committee room of the House Committee on Agriculture, 1310 New House Office Building, to discuss the extent of this disaster and what to do about it. I hope all those who are interested in this subject will be present. We will welcome your presence whether you represent an affected district or not.

## THE MALLORY DECISION

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEATING) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it becomes increasingly clear, day by day, that Federal law enforcement officials—particularly here in the District of Columbia—are being handcuffed by the effects of the Mallory decision. They face a real crisis unless legislation is enacted to soften the reverberations of that opinion. The confusion among lawyers, the public, and the police as a result of this ruling on Federal arraignment procedures, should be cleared up without delay.

Never in my memory has there been such widespread consternation about a ruling affecting police operations. Numerous civic, legal, fraternal, and law enforcement groups all over the country have urged Congress to act.

Last July, I introduced corrective legislation and am gratified to note that the vigorous public reaction, plus the

natural alarm of police officials, is now being reflected in similar bills which have now been introduced in the other body.

A House judiciary subcommittee has already held extensive hearings on this matter, at which time both defense and prosecution points of view were forcefully presented.

I am confident that when all the evidence is in and the record evaluated, the subcommittee will agree that legislation along the lines of my proposal, H. R. 8600, provides the best available solution. Under the terms of this bill, statements of confessions obtained from a suspect would be admissible in evidence despite any lapse of time between arrest and arraignment. Of course, if during this period other circumstances militated against the rights of the defendant, it would be up to the jury to determine whether such circumstances destroyed the reliability of the confession. I believe this is a sane, workable and just measure which will provide adequate safeguards for both suspected criminals and for the public at large.

In an effort to speed action on this and related measures which have been introduced, I have urged the chairman of the subcommittee to request departmental reports and to prod final subcommittee action. I have further asked the Attorney General to expedite the Justice Department report as speedily as possible.

Further delay invites peril for all our citizens. The time to take the shackles off the police is upon us. Legislation to revise the Mallory decision is absolutely necessary in order to protect our citizens from criminal elements in our society. I hope the committee and then Congress as a whole will enact ameliorative legislation without further delay.

---

## AGRICULTURE

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the administration desires that we should have larger farm units which will be permitted to produce in greater abundance at a lower price.

The farm program of the Eisenhower-Benson administration calls for reduced price supports and greater freedom of production. This policy denies the majority of our family farmers the right to share in the rewards of increased efficiency. This policy simply says that the family farmer must farm more acres, at lower prices, must work harder and longer, and still have no guaranty of any economic stability.

If the Government of the United States were to turn the printing presses loose in the Treasury Department and print an excessive supply of currency and because of this overproduction the valuation of the dollar went down—we would call it currency inflation of the worst sort and demand that it be stopped immediately. But the administration's policy for the farmer is to produce more at a lower price. This is commodity inflation of the worst sort and this policy needs to be changed immediately.

What is meant by the family farm? In its simplest terms it is a farm which is operated, and preferably owned, by a farmer and his family, with possibly some seasonal part-time help. It is impossible to generalize as to how many acres it should comprise, for this will vary a great deal according to such factors as soil fertility, climate, and the type of crops or livestock produced.

In regard to size, however, there is one important point that is often overlooked in these days of farm consolidation. Agricultural price levels should be kept high enough to enable a farmer to have an income at a par with that of an industrial worker, without having to farm so many acres that he must work many more hours than the factory worker. The increased productivity of the industrial worker is leading to a shorter workweek for urban people. Increased agricultural productivity, on the other hand, has led only to greater profit for middlemen and less income for farmers. In an effort to hold up his income the farmer has been increasing his land holdings, but all the while his pay has been less and less. Production is not reduced by the mere method of driving farmers off the land. Someone else comes in and adds to his holdings and production continues. The land left by those forced out of farming is absorbed and kept in production by the neighbors who survive and who are compelled to add to their holdings, and thus to their work, in an effort to make a living. Or this land is kept in production by corporations which buy it in order to diversify their investments. These corporations operate their huge land holdings as factories in the field.

The trend toward the concentration of agricultural land in the hands of fewer and fewer owners must be stopped. The Magna Charta has been hailed in history as a great document. One of its most significant provisions stripped feudal landowners of much of the power which they had enjoyed for centuries over the economy and life of the surrounding countryside. They were lord of the land and, hence, the entire country. For a more recent case in point we have only to look at Japan to know what can take place. We have lauded General MacArthur for going into Japan immediately following World War II and breaking up those tremendous landholdings. And yet, the farm policy now being administered will bring about the same conditions here that we had to break up in Japan. If we are not able to stop this concentration of landownership the day will come when most farmers will be laborers working for absentee landlords.

Today, American farmers are becoming a pauperized people in the land of plenty. The farmer is the only economic group which sells everything at wholesale, buys everything at retail, and pays the freight both ways.

Whether it is in an organization, a philosophical ideal, an economic theory, or a piece of legislation, the people of this land look to find the constructive element. America has been made great on the basis of constructive building. We are not content with the employment of tearing down other peoples and nations. We believe in the basic good of all people and we have based our Government on the principle that it would be the servant of all, protecting the basic rights and safeguarding the welfare of our entire citizenry.

In order to serve the best interests of the people we must put forth workable programs to stabilize the economy of agriculture. This program must be positive and one of action. I should like to suggest the following:

First. It is obvious that the Government is now supporting the entire feedgrain market in the general area of 70 percent of parity. If this can be done at this level, then it can be done at a higher level. In order to get agriculture back on its feet we must have supports at least at the 90 percent of parity level based on a fair parity formula using 1946–49 as the base period.

Second. The 90 percent of parity support program should be limited to production based on the best soil conservation practices for each farm, along with reasonable cross-compliance measures.

Third. A vast new program to seek out and establish new nutritional and industrial uses for farm products should be set up and implemented on the most urgent basis.

Fourth. In order to serve the vital needs of civil defense, it is proposed that a national emergency food storage program be set up to transform surplus agricultural commodities into edible storables.

Fifth. It is imperative that the President become fully knowledgeable of the facts relating to our rural economy and take an enlightened stand to make certain that this situation does not continue in its present demoralized condition.

Sixth. We have an abundance in the United States of the things which are necessary to man. Ninety percent of the world's people do not have enough. Let us command the courage to make the wisest use of our wealth to benefit not only our own people but also to pull the free world up to a higher standard of living, that they may see for themselves that democracy is to be preferred as a way of life over communism.

Surely, it is not in our concept of democracy that farmers are to be held as simple economic factors in the computation of the gross national product. Farmers are people. Farmers are first class American citizens, entitled to full participation in the prosperity and well being which our dynamic and expanding economy can produce. Surely, it is not in our concept of democracy that we can accept the cold materialistic philosophy of those whose only answer to the problems of the family farmer is to get off the farm and let agriculture become big business. The family farm operation is a way of life but more than this, it is the most efficient method of farming. It is this way of life and this efficient manner of farming which are threatened with

economic destruction. In the absence of the farmer's ability to control his own market to maintain a level with the rest of the economy, then it becomes the duty of Government to do that which he cannot do for himself.

This nation stands upon the threshold of an age of plenty, the like of which the world has never dreamed. The energy of the atom and the powers of the sun are about to be harnessed to do the labor of tomorrow. The machines of automation are about to be harnessed to do the labor of tomorrow. The machines of automation are already taking over the monotonous and demanding tasks of industrial production and office work. The back-breaking tasks of the farm are being taken over by machines of all types. But, this age of plenty will never come to full reality if these machines become Frankenstein monsters which make economic slaves of our people. But if, through our resourcefulness and our ingenuity, we can expand our economy to all the people by utilizing these inventions for good, then for the first time there are prospects of plenty not only for the fortunate, but for all. There will be leisure, not only for the rich, but for all. There will be full education and cultural opportunities, not only for the well-born, but for the son and daughter of the factory worker, the storekeeper and the sharecropper.

This is the mighty challenge of the future. As Americans we must rise to meet the challenge and progress in the freedoms of a democratic nation.

This must be the America of today—confident and unafraid, ready to try new solutions to new problems, full of faith in the future, with faith in the people and with faith in God.

## CHANTILLY AIRPORT

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know who is to be most accommodated, but I want to commend the decision locating the new airport at Chantilly. I have looked that point up on the map and I find it is about as close to West Virginia as it could possibly be placed.

May I say that if the Baltimore airport is not suitable for interim use, we cordially invite Washington visitors to land at the Cleveland airport and come here by bus or by train. It is only a little bit farther away than the Chantilly airport site.

## PROTECTION OF ALASKA-SPAWNED SALMON

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to secure an agreement with Japan to protect Alaska-spawned salmon. I would not want by inference to give the idea that the Japanese have not lived up to the letter of their previous agreement with us, nor that Japan has not cooperated with us by free interchange of statistics and scientific data. But the spirit of our agreement with Japan requires an adjustment based on new evidence and scientific knowledge which has come to light recently. The result is our red-salmon resource of the Bristol Bay area is in serious danger of almost complete depletion due to the Japanese high-seas fishing fleet.

I hope our Government will request the Government of Japan prior to the 1958 fishing season to impose restraint upon their fishing fleet in order to protect and preserve salmon of American origin for American fishermen.

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to commend the President's statement on the agricultural situation. I should also like to call attention to the studies that the Joint Economic Committee recently completed which went into the economic features of the commercial agricultural problems. Whether or not you agree with the conclusions for a remedy, I think that everyone must face up to the economic factors that exist in this problem. I want to call attention particularly to one statement: It has not been adequately modified, that is, our previous policies, to deal with the effects of the technological revolution in agriculture, and that is the underlying economic factor. There are many things in this recommendation, I might say, that I think many of us can agree with.

## FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HILL) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in considering the President's nine-point program as outlined in his special message on agriculture, I feel certain these recommendations will, when carefully considered and written into legislation, assist our farmers to adjust their operations to the rapid changes taking place in agriculture. These changes should lead to expanded markets, make our agriculture stronger, and provide economic equality for the farmer.

I support the President's recommendation that the acreage-reserve feature of the soil bank be abandoned after the harvest of this year's crops. The acreage-reserve section of the soil bank is an emergency program and has served a useful purpose. The real strength in the soil bank is in the long-range program of the conservation reserve. I agree with the President that the conservation reserve should be broadened and strengthened. I am hopeful that great benefits will accrue to the Nation from the long-range operation of the conservation-reserve program. While it is aimed, as the President said, at overall crop-production adjustments, it carries limitless possibilities for the future. I believe the conservation reserve should have every penny of the $450 million recommended by the President.

Recommendations that the Secretary of Agriculture be given authority to increase acreage allotments for cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts will provide the machinery for correcting one of the serious defects in the operation of present programs. Present law has required the establishment of smaller and smaller quotas until many small family-sized farms are forced into an uneconomic operation. Quotas in themselves have not solved our surplus problems.

The proposal that acreage allotments for corn should be eliminated is squarely in line with the facts. The acreage allotment program simply has not worked. Only about one-seventh of the corn produced in the commercial corn area in 1957 was eligible for the full price support. Most corn farmers simply could not afford to restrict themselves to their allotments. A year ago, moreover, 62 percent of the corn farmers who voted in the referendum favored the elimination of corn acreage allotments.

Removing some of the acreage controls would simply result in bigger surpluses under the existing basic price-support legislation. Numbers 4, 5, and 6 of the President's recommendations, therefore, are concerned with the price-support laws. He urges that the escalator clauses under which the level of price support rises as the surpluses decline should be eliminated. Certainly it is not commonsense to spend billions of dollars in surplus disposal only to allow incentive supports to take over and set the stage for new surpluses. That is precisely the case under the prevailing escalator clauses. They must be eliminated if the surplus disposal programs and the soil bank are to achieve their purpose.

The President urges that price support for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop rather than on seven-eighths Middling, which is a grade far below average quality. He urges that the law be corrected to put cotton price supports on the same basis as all other crops. This is sensible.

Because the proposed changes in the approach for determining acreage allotments and price-support levels will make additional administrative discretion necessary, the President proposes that the membership of the Commodity Credit

Corporation Advisory Board should be enlarged from 5 to 7.

Our exports of agricultural products in fiscal 1957 reached an all-time high of $4.7 billion. About two-fifths of these exports were moved through Government programs—and particularly through the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, or Public Law 480. Our agricultural exports in the past fiscal year were equivalent to the production of 1 acre of United States cropland out of every 5. It is very largely because of our export programs that the Government holdings of surplus farm products have been reduced by one-sixth in the past year and a half. In view of these accomplishments, I feel sure that few, if any, Members of Congress will challenge the wisdom of a 1 year's extension for Public Law 480 and the authorization of an additional $1.5 billion for sales for foreign currencies.

Finally, I most heartily endorse the recommendation that research efforts aimed at increasing industrial uses of farm products should be expanded. Our farms and forests are a major source of our raw materials. Yet only a very small part of agricultural production is channeled into industrial uses. We can and we must develop new uses and new markets for our surplus crops. To do this, increased research is needed. I concur also in increased emphasis for the rural development program envisioned by the President in his message.

The program presented by the President seems to be an eminently sound approach to our farm problems. I have today introduced the necessary legislation to carry out the recommendations of the President.

## TAX RELIEF FOR COLLEGE TUITION

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, I introduced a bill to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children. At that time, I stated on the floor of this House that many of our young people were being deprived of a proper education because parents could not afford the expense of maintaining and educating them. I urged at that time passage of my bill because it would have provided tax relief for the proud parent who wanted to educate his child but could not because of financial hardship.

The following year, Congress amended the law permitting a parent to continue to claim the $600 dependency allowance for a child over 18 attending college. This legislation, although a step in the right direction, fell far short of my legislative goal.

Mr. Speaker, in 1955, I reintroduced my bill. In urging favorable consideration, I said:

> It is difficult to understand why deductions are now allowed for medical expenses, child-care expenses, charitable donations, death benefits, and other expenses, and yet, when it comes to educating one's own child, the barrier is raised. The present $600 allowance has become obsolete because we know that to maintain and educate a child in college costs more than twice as much as the allowance permitted by our tax law.

Needless to say, this measure died a natural death in the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, last year, I again reintroduced the same bill.

On this occasion, I said:

> The need for college-trained people has greatly increased. The future technological development, health, and welfare of our country is greatly dependent upon the scientists, engineers, and other professional people. In most instances, the average parent finds it beyond his financial means to educate his child in the professions.
>
> Tax relief for a parent who wants to educate his child represents a sound and wise investment in the youth of America. It is not only vital to our young people but important to the future of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, if my bill had received favorable consideration 5 years ago when first introduced, many a young man would have followed the hard intellectual road to science. We certainly would not find ourselves in the present predicament.

It took the dramatic launching of Russia's sputniks and other challenges to make us realize that we have done very little in encouraging the utilization of the intellectual capacities of our young people. We had to suffer a damaging blow to our scientific and technological prestige to awaken us to the urgent need for more scientists and engineers.

Mr. Speaker, let us once and for all times remove the barriers and open the gates to education. Let us no longer deprive our young ones of a proper education because of the current fallacy in our tax laws.

## CONDITIONS IN COPPER INDUSTRY

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen from the copper-producing States have introduced today legislation designed to place a floor under the copper industry which would halt a downward price spiral which threatens to force many producers to shut down their operations. Last year nearly 50 percent of the copper in the United States was produced in my Congressional district, and it is already apparent that the drastic curtailment of production will create serious economic problems unless action is taken by the Federal Government to keep our domestic producers in business.

The pertinent facts are these:

First. Copper prices have been in a sharp decline for the past year, and on Monday of this week the price dropped from 27 cents a pound to 25 cents—a price which is too low to permit producers to operate at a profit.

Second. Copper is a basic and in some cases irreplaceable raw material for national defense purposes.

Third. For reasons of national security, since the onset of the Korean war the United States Government has underwritten new production which it is estimated has added 250,000 tons of copper annually to American production—an expansion which represents about the same figure as the surplus production which has depressed prices to their present level.

Fourth. Competition for the domestic market from low-cost foreign producers has been a major factor in producing a glutted market and an abnormally low price—the best comparative figures which I can get at the moment indicate that while the average hourly wage paid to Arizona miners last year was about $2.43, the total daily wage paid by many foreign producers does not exceed twice that amount.

Fifth. American copper producers are mining the lowest grade ore and paying the highest wages in the world today.

Mr. Speaker, recent history indicates that the American copper industry has preferred to operate under free market conditions, and this industry has only turned to the Federal Government for aid now as a last resort measure when confronted with a serious crisis. I think there is good reason to anticipate that if the industry can receive temporary shelter against disaster, expanding market conditions will soon produce a healthier economic climate and a return to normal operations.

In my opinion, the copper industry does not want and is not now asking for the protection of a high tariff. However, due to decided advantages held by low-cost foreign producers, while the market is at the bottom of its present cycle, the industry is asking for a floor and import tax which will tend to balance out competition between the foreign and domestic producer.

In fairness to the copper industry it should be pointed out that since the beginning of World War II—when copper prices were placed under strict Government controls—copper has been sold on the free market in this country except for a period of 4 months in 1949. The truth of the matter is that in the intervening years spokesmen for the copper industry have actually urged Congress to suspend the import tax the industry was entitled to under our reciprocal trade program. As near as I can ascertain, the wisest spokesmen for the copper industry would prefer to go through a period of low prices—which will permit large producers to at least show a slight profit—and expanding markets, rather than press for legislation which would mean a high tariff, artificial high prices, and shrinking markets for copper.

I think I should also point out that if our Government felt it was necessary to expand our productive capacity for national security reasons under the Defense Production Act, then these same reasons of national security require at the very least the maintenance of this expanded capacity.

It is also significant since the most reliable statistics demonstrate that the

cost of producing copper has increased about one-third since a 24-cent peril point for copper was established by Congress in 1951, simple equity requires that the peril point be updated and upgraded so that it reflects current economic realities. In essence, this is all that the copper industry is requesting of the Congress at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a general outline of the facts which have compelled members from copper-producing areas to present this legislation today. Copper mining is one of the 2 or 3 largest extractive industries in our country today. In many ways it is a unique industry. In copper producing sections of our country entire communities have been built where these copper deposits are located, and once mining operations are shut down these communities wither on the vine. An extractive industry like copper or steel is not a tap which can be turned on and off overnight.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the reasons why we have requested a new floor for the copper industry at this time.

---

## EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF BILL RELATING TO IMPORT TAX ON COPPER

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today, together with several other Members on both sides of the aisle, I have introduced a bill to amend the existing copper import tax legislation so as to enable the copper mining industry of the United States to survive.

This is attempted by changing the present peril point of 24 cents per pound to 30 cents per pound and by imposing a 4-cent-per-pound import tax which shall not be in effect when the domestic market price is 30 cents per pound or more. The bill thus seeks to achieve needed protection for the domestic copper industry and at the same time keep to a minimum any interference with foreign trade. It would leave the domestic market wholly free to all copper producers when the price is above the peril point.

### BACKGROUND

The Internal Revenue Code has, since 1932, provided for an import tax on articles of imported copper—4 cents per pound on most items. That import tax, however, has been severely cut by Presidential proclamations under foreign trade agreements—GATT—specifically, the 4-cent tax was cut to 2 cents in 1949, further cut to 1.8 cents in 1957, and is now scheduled to be cut to 1.7 cents on June 30, 1958. And, since 1951, by act of Congress, the tax has been suspended altogether, with the support of the domestic copper producing industry. The suspension enactments in 1951, 1953, 1954, and 1955, each contained a proviso to the effect that the suspension would end if the domestic market price of copper fell below 24 cents for a calendar month. The 1955 suspension, which is still in effect and contains such proviso, will terminate on June 30, 1958.

Since the 1955 suspension, far-reaching changes have occurred in the copper producing industry. Substantial increases in foreign production, coupled with constantly increasing wage and other costs in the United States, have rendered precarious the position of the domestic producing industry. The domestic copper price has fallen from a high of 43 cents per pound in 1955 and 46 cents in 1956 to 27 cents per pound, and even lower for custom smelters, at present. The price in Europe has fallen even further, the London metal exchange price being now the equivalent of approximately 22 cents. The result has been shutdowns and important curtailments at practically all domestic copper mines, with substantial loss of employment and damage to the communities and States involved.

These changes and their consequences indicate the necessity both for a reestablishment of the import tax on copper at 4 cents per pound, and for a revision of the so-called peril point, that is, the price below which the import tax becomes effective. This peril point should be set at a level which will encourage and maintain an active, healthy domestic copper mining industry. Reestablishment of the import tax at 4 cents per pound will afford some real measure of protection when the price falls below that peril point.

### EXPLANATION OF SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

#### RATES OF IMPORT TAX (SEC. 4541)

The rates of import tax set forth in the present bill are the same as originally enacted in 1932, as follows:

On copper-bearing ores and concentrates, and on copper in various specified forms, such as bars, ingots, rods, sheets, tubes, wire, and plates, the rate is 4 cents per pound.

On all other articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930 in which copper is the component material of chief value, the rate is 3 cents per pound.

On all other articles dutiable under the Tariff Act of 1930 which contain 4 percent or more of copper by weight, the rate of tax is 3 percent ad valorem or three-fourths of 1 cent per pound, whichever is lower.

#### WHEN TAX WOULD BE APPLICABLE (SEC. 4542(A))

The bill provides that import taxes at the above rates will become applicable if the average domestic price of copper has fallen below the 30 cents per pound peril point for a period of 1 month. But, if in any succeeding period of 1 month, such price has risen to 30 cents per pound or more, the tax will be suspended. Determination of the domestic market price of copper will be made monthly by the Tariff Commission.

These provisions will result in an alternating "on" and "off" application of the import tax depending on the domestic market price of copper, and thus the relief afforded by the bill will be automatic and prompt. It is believed that these provisions are feasible and capable of easy administration.

The provision—section 4542 (b)—of the bill which prescribes how the average market price shall be determined by the Commission is the same as the provisions for such determination contained in the suspension legislation of 1951, 1953, 1954, and 1955.

#### "ENTRY INTO WAREHOUSE" PROVISION (SEC. 4543(A))

Provisions of existing law relating to customs clearance, and bonded warehouse entry and withdrawal, were not designed for dealing with an article subject to an import tax which is applicable only part of the time.

Paragraph (a) of section 4543 of the bill, dealing with the entry of certain imported copper material into bonded warehouse, has been inserted to close an obvious loophole which would otherwise exist. Without this provision, it would be possible, under existing law, to bring into the country unlimited amounts of copper, free of import tax, at times when it was known, or known to be probable, that the import tax would soon be in effect, that is, soon be "on." That could substantially nullify the effects of the tax.

To prevent such a result, section 4543 (a) provides that, at times when the import tax is not in effect, that is, is "off," copper in the specified forms can be entered through customs, or withdrawn from bonded warehouse, only when accompanied by a certification that it is "imported for use" or "sold for use," that is, imported by a person, or sold to a purchaser, who intends to manufacture a different article from it.

The provision is thus intended to prevent the entry through customs, or withdrawal from bond, of tax-free copper, unless it is to go into consumption.

#### REPEAL OF LAW SUSPENDING IMPORT TAX (SEC. 4543 (C))

The provision for repealing the present copper import tax suspension law—Public Law 38 of the 82d Congress, 1st session—is necessary because such law now suspends the very sections of the Internal Revenue Code which the present bill would amend, and there thus might be confusion as to whether the later or earlier enactment should prevail.

#### "TREATMENT PROVIDED FOR IMPORTS" PROVISION (SEC. 4543 (D))

The first part of this provision, prior to the proviso, in effect provides that the import tax rates on copper—for example, 4 cents per pound on most items—reestablished by the present bill, shall for purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 be considered as having been in effect continuously since 1932. Unless this provision is inserted, the rate in effect on January 1, 1955—which rate on such date the President can, pursuant to such section 350, cut by not more than 15 percent in order to carry out trade agreements entered into on or after June 12, 1955—would necessarily have to be considered to be 2 cents per pound, rather than 4 cents.

The second part of the provision, consisting of the proviso, is designed primarily to permit administrative officials to reestablish, in existing trade agreements, the import-tax rates imposed by the bill, and to make other changes

therein, without going through certain formal requirements of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

The above provision, and indeed the entire bill, is designed to operate whether or not the Congress sees fit to vote, during the present session, a further extension of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today, along with several other Members of Congress from the West, I introduced legislation to halt the importation of excessive amounts of foreign-mined copper. The legislation will also halt the comcomitant of this excessive importation—the exportation of the jobs of our miners to foreign lands.

The seriousness of the current copper situation cannot be exaggerated. Despite drastic curtailment of domestic production—in my district alone nearly 900 copper miners have been laid off—the price of the metal continues to drop. This week it hit a new low of 25 cents per pound. At this figure, our domestic mines cannot operate profitably.

Mr. Speaker, I have little sympathy with those who maintain that an increase in the import tax on copper will ruin the economy of some of our friends in South America. It has been due in large measure to the short-sighted policies of these governments that the current copper crisis is upon us.

The Chilean Government, for example, rigidly regulates the production of the American-owned copper mines within its borders. To date, I am informed, it has refused to permit these countries to cut copper production. As a result, foreign-mined copper continues to add to the world surplus, further contributing to price declines.

I do not intend to stand idly by while the miners in Utah and other parts of the West bear the full brunt of the cutback in world copper production. Nor do I intend to keep quiet while the Chilean Government continues to reap revenue from copper production, while the local government units and schools in Utah lose one of their major revenue sources—the tax income from copper properties.

In closing, I would like to quote with approval a recent statement by the gentleman from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, who needs no introduction to this body.

Representative REED said recently:

> Our industry should not be required to survive in the United States by sufferance of the American State Department. * * * We must bring to a halt the prevailing practice of legislative amendment by Federal bureaus and return to Congress the primary responsibility for the establishment and conduct of our tariff policy.

Representative REED is 100 percent correct. There is something wrong with a national trade policy that promotes boom towns in French Morocco and leaves ghost towns in Utah and the rest of the mining districts in the West.

I hope the House Ways and Means Committee will schedule an early hearing on this legislation to afford our domestic copper mining industry the protection it must have to survive.

## REASSIGNING SCIENCE ATTACHÉS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying to hear that the Department of State has at long last seen fit to recognize the importance of scientific developments by filling the long-vacant position of science adviser by the appointment of Dr. Wallace R. Brode.

I trust that Dr. Brode's first order of business will be to recruit an efficient staff of science attachés to implement a uniform interflow of scientific information.

I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from California, JOHN MOSS, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations dealing with the dissemination of Government information, was one of the prime motivating forces in this action in support of my request of January 3, 1956, in which I demanded the reimplementation of the science adviser program which had been discontinued by the withdrawal of science attachés from stations abroad.

I feel confident that if this program had been competently staffed and maintained since its inception in 1951, it is doubtful if our international scientific posture would be as embarrassing as it is today.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the failure to continue the science attaché program as I requested in 1956 was not due to a lack of funds in the Department of State. As a matter of fact, the Department of State has admitted in a letter to the gentleman from California, Congressman Moss, dated January 13, 1958, that it never requested funds for this program from Congress.

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a great deal could be said about the message on agriculture that we received from the White House this morning, particularly with reference to the features of the message which deal with price supports. I think the most significant thing that can be said about it is that this Congress is not going to put these recommendations into effect.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman has just said.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. The House is fully aware of the gentleman's keen interest in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the second observation I would like to make is that if the recommendations of the administration were adopted, it would have the effect of making the Secretary of Agriculture an economic czar over the American farmer. This message not only recommends that we change the level of the flexible price support system further downward to a minimum of 60 percent on basic commodities instead of the present 75-percent minimum, but it would also abolish the factors that give the farmer any protection. Thus the fourth recommendation states:

> The escalator clauses in the basic law should be abolished.

If we adopt the recommendations in this message we will be saying to the Secretary of Agriculture, "For any reason or for no reason you can set the level of supports at 60 percent of parity." Every farmer in America knows what Benson would do with that. This Congress is not going to give him that power over the farm people of this country.

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AGRICULTURE AND PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, to accept the recommendations sent down here today relative to price supports will mean a further decline in the agricultural economy of the United States of America. I felt very much heartened to hear the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], state that in his opinion the House of Representatives will not approve any such recommendations on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, who has demonstrated no sympathy whatsoever with the price support program, to be put into effect.

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my feeble voice to the comments just made by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and by my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] relative to the President's message. I think everyone knows and would readily concede that American agriculture has not shared in the pros-

perity that the country as a whole has enjoyed for the past few years. In fact, the President's message concedes that our farmers have not enjoyed that prosperity. But what does the message propose to do about it? Does it suggest more income? Does it promise more income? It does not. It simply offers more work, more acres to be farmed, in return for lower prices. In other words, it offers more work for less pay. Such does not bear the prospects of increasing farm income or of giving farmers a fairer share of the Nation's current prosperity.

The administration has up until now received every single thing it has requested of Congress to bring the farmers of the country parity at the market place. That was its campaign promise of 1952—"parity at the market place." It first sought flexible supports and got it. It next sought the Surplus Property Disposal Act, and got that. It next sought the rural development program and got that. Then they sought the soil bank, which was represented as a cure-all, and Congress gave them that. Now they concede defeat and propose to throw most of what they sought and got out the window. Now they seek something else. They seem to be groping in the dark with no assurance of where they are going or when they will get there. It all adds up to 5 years of utter failure and broken promises.

I do not want to be political about this thing. We have already had too much of that. I think the Secretary should be given a fair hearing in the Committee on Agriculture, and I am sure he will be. I think the Members on both sides ought to listen to him attentively, and both sides ought to be willing to listen to the views of the other. Neither should be so rigid and firm in their actions and thinking as they sometimes have been in the past. I do not know how the President and Secretary Benson are going to be able to convince the Congress and our farmers that the thing farmers need is more work and less pay; but I am willing to listen. However, they are going to have to come up with much better proof and argument than has been offered up until now.

For 5 years now we have been waiting on the program which they promised would give our farmers parity at the market place. In fact, we are well on into the sixth year of waiting. Instead of things getting better under Eisenhower and Benson, they have gotten worse. And this is true even though they have gotten from the Congress everything they have asked for.

We are getting somewhat used to these annual messages. We are offered a new program every 12 months. As the new programs have been enacted the economy of the American farmer gets worse, the surpluses get larger, and the agricultural budget grows and grows and grows. We just do not get anywhere under the administration's new programs. It is very discouraging.

But again, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Secretary should have a fair hearing. And I want him to have it. I should warn however that when considering the failure of the administration's various programs up until now the Secretary is going to have to be mighty convincing in order to sell this latest program to the farmers and the Congress.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## THE GAS BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the American people must be alerted to the fact that the gas and oil lobby again proposes to make a raid on the pocketbook of American families using gas for cooking and heating. The gas bill which was vetoed during the 84th Congress, because of the unscrupulous lobbying practices of the gas and oil people, is again to be brought before Congress this session, probably early in February.

So that there will be no misunderstanding it should be made clear that this bill will cost each American family using gas for domestic purposes between $40 and $80 per year in additional gas bills, and will result in a windfall of over $1 billion per year for the greedy, unconscionable group that seeks its passage. Unless this legislation is defeated the hard-earned paycheck of the American family is going to be raided to fatten the income of the gas and oil people.

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, although the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is not on the floor at the moment, I have consulted with him, and I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to report on Tuesday for consideration on Tuesday the first supplemental defense appropriation bill, any record votes to go over until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE BOTH REALISTIC AND CONSTRUCTIVE

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the recommendations of President Eisenhower's farm message, and I have introduced a bill designed to place the President's program in operation. It is a realistic appraisal of the problem. The technological revolution in agriculture enables a farmer today to produce as much in 1 hour as his father produced in 2 hours back in 1940.

The President points out very plainly that the solution to the surplus problem is not ever more stringent acreage controls. Acreage allotments are already so small that they have made it impossible for many farmers and ranchers to operate efficiently under them.

Nor are price supports and acreage controls the answer to the difficulties of the millions of farmers whose operations are already too limited to provide them a decent living.

I say again that this is a realistic message. It urges expansion of the rural delevopment program to help the people of underdeveloped areas and the operators of small low-income farms. I support that program vigorously.

The President makes sound recommendations that will help farm families adjust to present-day conditions. He urges termination of the acreage reserve of the soil bank with the 1958 crops and greater emphasis on the conservation reserve. This makes sense. The acreage reserve has done much of the job it was set up to do. It is a short-term program. The conservation reserve in 1959 can take over the longer time job of land-use adjustment—and return benefits to all our people in wiser use of our soil, water, and timber resources.

I support the President's recommendations that the Secretary of Agriculture have discretionary authority to raise acreage allotments for wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco.

It makes no sense to continue a program that is a proven failure. Relatively few corn producers comply with acreage allotments for corn. It is just realistic therefore to abolish the corn allotments as the message recommends and give corn producers the greater freedom they desire.

Similarly, it makes no sense to engage in huge surplus disposal programs while at the same time retaining price support formulas that tend to result in new surpluses. I support the proposal to abolish the escalator clauses.

I also endorse the recommendations that price support for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop and that the membership of the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board be enlarged.

One of agriculture's greatest needs is market expansion. The President urges that Public Law 480 under which many of our surpluses are being moved should be extended. He urges also that research efforts should be expanded for widening markets and finding new uses for agricultural production. I heartily concur in these proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I say again this is a realistic appraisal of the agricultural situation. Adoption of these recommendations will help make our agriculture stronger and will give our farm and ranch families more freedom to make their own decisions.

## WIDOWS, MOTHERS, AND RETIRED WOMEN

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 3 of the 9 bills which I introduced on January 8 to amend the Social Security Act merit particularly close attention because they reach into questions that are basic to our whole concept of public welfare and that effect, in a very real way; the well-being of the Nation.

No one can question that the widowed mother who has been enabled through the survivors insurance program to hold her family together and to provide for the needs of her children until they are grown has performed a task that demands courage and strength. Of the many categories of social security beneficiaries, she is among the most deserving in that her social security payments can make it possible for her to care for her children, to train and educate them, and so to contribute—in this personal way—to the country's strength through its youth.

When her youngest child becomes 18, and her responsibilities effectively come then to an end, her social security payments stop until such time as she becomes eligible for benefits in her own right. Frequently this occurs when she is too old to find adequate employment for her own support. Particularly in light of the struggle that she has gone through to maintain her family, the hardship that this reduction in income works is severe in the extreme. For what we are really saying to her now is, "True, we agree that you deserve assistance for the worthy purpose of raising your children. Now that you have performed your function, however, your job is done as far as we are concerned, and you must shift for yourself as best you can."

I submit that this attitude, even though not announced in so many words, runs exactly counter to an enlightened philosophy of social welfare. We must, it seems to me, continue to assist those women as my bill, H. R. 9841, will do, who are forced to enter the labor market at an age when little or no hope of securing work exists.

H. R. 9841 will continue benefits to women who are 50 years old when their youngest child reaches 18. I firmly believe that in all humanity and justice, we can do no less than this.

The same principle applies to the widow of an insured worker who had during her husband's lifetime been receiving with him OASI benefits. While, of course, her payments are not stopped, as in the previous case, they are now cut in half on the death of her husband.

This time we are concerned with women who are too old to be expected to earn a living, even if jobs for them existed. And yet, in what is frequently the last years of their lives, they must adjust to a social-security income that is reduced by 50 percent. Adjustment must too often mean giving up a home and familiar surroundings, dependency on relatives or reduction to substandard living conditions.

In H. R. 9837, I provide that a widow's benefit be the same as her husband's primary insurance amount. While this still represents a 25-percent reduction from the previous family benefit, it will at least help to insure a minimal decent living standard. Again, can we in good conscience do less?

Finally, I believe that it is of great importance to provide full benefits to women at the retirement age of 62, rather than the reduced benefits they now receive at that age.

When the Social Security Act was amended in 1956 to make women workers and survivors insurance beneficiaries eligible for benefits at 62, it was recognized that for older women, employment is difficult to find and to retain on a basis that is regular enough to provide for their needs. In going this far toward recognizing the economic facts of life affecting women workers, the amendment was a progressive step. But in stopping short of providing full benefits at 62, the intent of the amendment was, in my opinion, perverted.

In actual practice, this is what too often happens: A woman who has earned the right to OASI benefits finds that well before she has reached retirement age, illness or infirmity, or prejudice in the labor market against older women workers is forcing her into a dependent or marginal condition. The only hope for her independence, or often, for her very subsistence lies in her coming social-security benefit. Her 62d birthday frequently represents salvation.

Finally, she is presented with the alternative, on reaching 62, of accepting reduced benefits then, or of waiting 3 more years for full benefits. Although she knows that she must be satisfied with reduced benefits for the rest of her life if she elects them before 65, it is nonetheless not likely that she will wait those 3 years. The act now says she is eligible for benefits at 62. The present reduction made for accepting benefits then can only be construed as discriminatory, if not actually punitive. H. R. 9839, in providing full benefits to women at 62, will restore the intent of Congress to the act.

I firmly believe that these proposed amendments are necessary; they are just; and they are consistent with the basic humanitarian principles that gave birth to the social-security program. I urge that my colleagues give each of them their careful thought, and that they communicate their views to the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee.

## MEETING THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the text of President Eisenhower's reply to the two proposals of Bulganin was published in the newspapers of January 13. He made three major proposals. I believe they were constructive in principle and I shall support the best program of implementation which the executive and legislative branches of Government can develop.

I plan to comment today on the part of his proposal which he stated and I quote "to be the most important problem which faces the world today." I quote the point designated in his reply as 3 (a):

> 3. I now make, Mr. Chairman, a proposal to solve what I consider to be the most important problem which faces the world today:
>
> (a) I propose that we agree that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes. We face a decisive moment in history in relation to this matter. Both the Soviet Union and the United States are now using outer space for the testing of missiles designed for military purposes. The time to stop is now.
>
> I recall to you that a decade ago, when the United States had a monopoly of atomic weapons and of atomic experience, we offered to renounce the making of atomic weapons and to make the use of atomic energy an international asset for peaceful purposes only. If only that offer had been accepted by the Soviet Union, there would not now be the danger from nuclear weapons which you describe.
>
> The nations of the world face today another choice perhaps even more momentous than that of 1946. That relates to the use of outer space. Let us this time, and in time, make the right choice, the peaceful choice.
>
> There are about to be perfected and produced powerful new weapons which, availing of outer space, will greatly increase the capacity of the human race to destroy itself.

And this is the President speaking on his own responsibility—the Commander in Chief of all the defense forces of the United States.

> If indeed it be the view of the Soviet Union that we should not go on producing ever-newer types of weapons, can we not stop the production of such weapons which would use or, more accurately, misuse, outer space, now for the first time opening up as a field for man's exploration? Should not outer space be dedicated to the peaceful uses of mankind and denied to the purposes of war? That is my proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I could not be in closer agreement with the President's words as quoted. The problem we face is, How can we persuade the Soviets to agree to cooperate in bringing into being a guaranteed arrangement that will insure the people of the world that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes?

The Soviets have proven by their actions, during the years when they were far behind us in almost every phase of military power, that they would not cooperate with the family of nations in establishing a peaceful world. I need not recount the record of Soviet uncompromising obstructions both within and without the United Nations.

Now that we have witnessed their forward surge in space weapon capabilities based on demonstrated advanced missile propulsion power, are there any among us who believe that this added power will cause them to become more conciliatory? Can we as reasonable men expect a new

humility to govern their actions? The President has many times before and now once again pleads for deeds instead of words.

Until those peaceful deeds demonstrate a sincere desire for universal peace on the part of the Soviets, we of the free world would be fools indeed as well as traitors to our birthright of freedom if we falter for a minute in our vigilance in the preservation of liberty.

While we explore therefore every avenue, every opportunity for constructive negotiations in the direction of peace—we must prudently pursue the goal of military strength—strength which can be used if negotiations fail—strength to protect the freedom of our own country and the strength to help our allies in the free world against the Communist aggressor if he decides to strike for world domination.

I want to stress the point.

Every attempt should be made to work through the United Nations organization, but due to the delay which is inherent in that organization and the obstructive power of the veto—we must initiate protective research and development prior to and pending such possible collective action.

What is our military strength today? Has the Soviet suddenly relegated our former military superiority to one of inferiority to theirs? What is the significance from a military standpoint of the two sputniks and their vigorous and apparently well advanced intercontinental ballistic missile program? These and many other questions must be resolved in the interest of national survival and they demand a clear cut national policy followed by a national program to implement that policy.

This Congress will hear much about our missile defeat. This will be good. It is a time for speech and debate, for the congress to show its greatness and to prove the wisdom of granting powers to elected officials.

This is a particular burden on those among us who are assigned to certain committees. For one, I feel the duty of being a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—the duty to express my deep convictions—convictions based on a variety of information pertaining to scientific information now in being and in prospect. As we start this year we find the United States in a new role—playing "follow the leader" behind the Soviet Union.

A few short years ago the Soviet Union was racing to duplicate our technical supremacy.

For 4 years they engaged in a crash effort to duplicate our atomic bomb. After several years of effort they duplicated our hydrogen bomb explosion—9 months later than ours. For 5 to 8 years they extended themselves to make jet bombers and fighters to equal ours. They now have jet engines with an estimated thrust 30 percent greater than ours.

In these and other fields they came from behind. During the time when we were ahead, we sat in smugness saying they would not catch up. We were fatally occupied with the harassment of scientific leaders and in the name of security destroyed some of them.

But today everything is reversed. It is we who are trying to catch up. It is we who are now playing "follow the leader," an awkward and dangerous game.

Our foreign and military policy is fixed on deterring aggression through fear of hydrogen retaliation. This policy of deterrence will not work if the Soviet Union can control outer space and from it destroy our striking or delivery power, if it is dependent upon planes or upon missiles which are solely land based.

Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has even hinted at repudiation of hydrogen weapons. In fact, each week finds both powers becoming more committed to their wartime use. It is possible that a minor international incident might be the cause of their employment in strategic warfare. Such a strategic war of the near future may be decided only by control of outer space and the area under the oceans. Many scientists believe that in the foreseeable future, strategic attacks on our country will be launched from under the surface of the oceans contiguous to our land mass or from space vehicles stationed in outer space orbits.

If, as the years progress, we fail to control and master these areas, we will default from world leadership and become a second class power. The Gaither and Rockefeller reports may say this in detail, but as a fact simply stated, our decline in the world will follow Soviet mastery of the strategic avenues of attack.

Without this control we face future positions of weakness as we did at the NATO Conference where we gave concessions to compensate for our lack of technical superiority in the missile field. We may never again be the leader in conferences with nations or groups of nations in the free or Communist world, if we sit as a second rate scientific power in conference with nations who are ahead of us in techniques and weapons.

And we will be a second rate power, I tell my colleagues today, as long as we play follow the leader—for just as long as the Soviets set the scientific pace, and we only try to catch up in the areas where they are ahead.

We will be bringing our energies and spending our energies on duplicating that which is passé.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that no new and imaginative program is being advocated by the Atomic Energy Commission or the Department of Defense. Nothing startling is on the drawing boards or in the computers.

Instead there is too much complacency and the inadequate suggestion that we need only spend a few billions of dollars more for missiles to follow the leader and afterward all will be well.

One technical defeat will follow another if we do not look beyond that which is feasible today and make bold and adventurous plans. Any technical leadership we enjoyed in the past was accomplished by trying for things deemed by many to be impossible. It was done with courage and without fear of failure.

The success of the Manhattan project of World War II, which developed the atomic bomb, was hardly promising at its inception. It was a calculated risk.

My colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, knows very well the mathematics of chance that were involved in appropriating the money that his committee made available under his skilled direction. It was a calculated risk. Even Admiral Leahy told President Truman that as an ordnance proposition he knew an atom bomb would not work. That was the climate at the time.

The decision to make the hydrogen bomb was a tremendous gamble. It was taken by President Truman against the advice of 3 of the 5-man Atomic Energy Commission and against the advice of the 15-man Scientific General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission. I know, because I was the chairman of the special subcommittee that studied the feasibility of the hydrogen project, and which recommended that it would be started.

The decision to make an atom powered submarine—the *Nautilus*—was made with scant assurance of success, short of knowledge that Admiral Rickover was hard to defeat. The Navy thought so little of this project that they gave him a converted ladies' powder room for an office. But for the support of the Congress I doubt if the project would have been supported to successful completion. Practically every component in the *Nautilus* was a new creation for which scientists and engineers had to "invent on schedule," a Rickover phrase describing his developmental philosophy.

Admiral Rickover deserves the warm thanks of the Nation for it is evident that his development work in submarines is ahead of the Soviets. We believe also that the Shippingport civilian power reactor is at this time ahead of their reactors in being. Many of us recall the fight against Navy tradition waged by the Congress to have the then Captain Rickover promoted and retained to serve his country. The country has gained immeasurably from this action.

It is only initiative and bold decisions such as these which will bring us back to the forefront of nations. It is only this kind of courage which will guarantee us time to develop the peace and preserve our civilization.

Remember this, when the Soviets were racing to copy our achievements they did not neglect other bold ideas, or else there would be no sputnik, and we would not have suffered the missile defeat.

It would be wrong just to recite these needs. I will be specific and offer a program.

I have said earlier that to win a strategic war we would have to control space and the area under the ocean. There should be concurrent projects to produce vehicles for this purpose.

My colleague on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, has spoken with great clarity on the need for "underwater satellites".

A major program should now be started to bring them into being. The underwater satellite would be an advanced, large size nuclear powered submarine with the capability of launching long range missiles.

It would be very difficult to attack these vessels from space, and in periods of great crisis they could be secreted under the polar ice cap as was recently shown feasible by the *Nautilus*.

I ask my colleagues to get a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post and read that story. It opens up a complete new vista in the abilities to protect our Nation.

There are open pools of water in the polar iceberg sea that allow submarines to rise within 1,500 miles of the city of Moscow. It would be very difficult to attack these vessels from space. The satellite would only be vulnerable to other submersibles and there should be a concurrent development of attack submarines capable of protecting a mother ship.

The one area of technical military work where our lead over the Soviet Union is clearly pronounced is in the nuclear-powered submersible. We should exploit this advanced technique by increasing the numbers and quality of nuclear submarines and by immediately starting the project to build the advanced underwater satellite heretofore mentioned. Remember the Russians have already concentrated their naval effort in underwater fighting craft and are reported to have over 500 submarines, most of which are of the long-range snorkel type.

It is also estimated that they are building 100 additional submarines each year. The United States possesses a few over 100 submarines, many of which are obsolete World War II holdovers. Do you recall the havoc which Hitler's fleet of less than 100 submarines made in allied shipping during World War II?

It would be criminal and just short of treacherous to allow this type of naval program to lag and allow the Soviet to lull us into playing "follow the leader" for control under the seas.

We have asked our allies for intermediate-range missile-launching sites in Europe even though we do not have the missiles. The request has been met with worried response, but far worse, it threatens Soviet duplication—they will be ringing the borders of Europe with like weapons—perhaps sooner than we produce the missiles. Such would lead to a precarious situation—endangering world peace almost to the breaking point. It threatens the good will of our friends abroad and assists the primary Soviet objective of splitting our alliances and, indeed, they are splitting. The problem of locating missile bases in NATO nations is so desperate that political parties in several countries must risk their political life on this one point. If we bring the large submarines armed with missiles into being quickly, the necessity for the highly vulnerable IRBM sites in Europe would lessen and our friends would breathe easier while world tensions soften.

CONTROL OF SPACE

I am now turning my attention to the other challenge we face, that is the control of outer space. Make no mistake—we are faced with the challenge—the 118-pound Sputnik I was the opening notice and the 1,100-pound Sputnik II was the clincher. Are there skeptics who believe this chapter of science is ended?

I can tell you that many of the scientists who developed the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb are not skeptics.

I can tell you that many of the scientists and engineers who built the *Nautilus* are not skeptics.

There were many skeptics who would have blocked the Manhattan atomic bomb project. But, thank God, there were a great number of scientists and engineers who thought it could be done. And, there was a limited number of men in the Congress of the United States, including our Speaker, of course, and our majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who knew about this, and they were not skeptics. Yes, we also had a Commander in Chief who had the courage to order it started.

There were many skeptics who tried to block the hydrogen project. A wave of opposition passed over the country: We shall not do this, we should not do this. But, thank God, we had many scientists and engineers who thought it could be done, and the Atomic Energy Committee, with the exception of 2 members of the 18-man committee, thought it ought to be done, and once again we had a Commander in Chief who had the courage to order it done. America, the free world, had a narrow squeak that time. Nine months later, after we exploded the first hydrogen device in the South Pacific, the Soviets exploded a hydrogen device. We bought freedom by 9 months.

You answer the question, what would have happened if President Truman had vetoed the hydrogen gamble, or appointed a commission to make a long-range study lasting 2 or 3 years?

Once again we face a momentous decision. This time we are not the leader in a new field of science. We are a follower. The challenge is more urgent. The decision takes less courage because the door of outer space has been opened. The second Soviet-made sputnik is orbiting in outer space this very minute.

We are still earthbound with our 4-pounder and our 21-pounder.

Once again many of our foremost scientists and engineers are chafing at the bit. They are anxious to tackle the job. Will the Congress and the Commander in Chief accept the challenge and make the courageous decisions demanded now—today?

I do not know. As for me, not as an individual but as a United States Representative, I want it recorded now—today—that I advocate action, action without delay.

I am willing to pay more taxes and willing to take the political chance, if there be one, in the forthcoming election. In the past 12 years I've seen many scientific miracles accomplished, and many times I've seen the routing and discomfiture of the skeptics.

If we lose, we only lose dollars. If we win, we buy time to achieve peace.

The control of space will not come from the possession of missiles alone. We should have a major project, the size of the Manhattan project, if necessary, to develop a space vehicle.

A space vehicle might even be a craft which would carry humans outside of the earth's atmosphere and gravitational force. Once outside, it would have power sources for travel and conceivably could go to the moon or to other planets.

While nuclear power may have only limited advantages in propelling intercontinental ballistic missiles, it appears to offer great hopes for travel in space. Such phenomena as the use of the particles of the atoms themselves to drive the vehicle after the atoms split, could possibly come into play.

The sputnik and the ICBM are but missiles, distant cousins of the artillery shell. Rocketry is not new to the world. And, except for some areas of the Soviet technology, there had been few advances beyond the German V–2 rocket of World War II. But I do not demean the ICBM as a weapon. In today's world it can well be called the ultimate weapon.

However, were we to develop space vehicles, the ICBM would not necessarily be the decisive factor, because control of space would restore the threat of retaliation and restore the power of deterrence.

From space, ICBM launching sites could be destroyed.

Perhaps interception in flight would be feasible. Above all, the development of such a vehicle would restore our world leadership.

Let us consider the source of propulsion for our missiles today and probably that of the Soviet missiles and their sputniks. We only know of two classes of missile fuel, that is, liquids and solids. Both require oxygen, or its equivalent, during the few seconds or minutes in which they burn.

This need of oxygen causes very difficult problems and can only be furnished for a few moments. In those moments, energy must be expended at a fantastic rate in order to achieve an altitude of 300 to 600 miles and a speed of approximately 18,000 miles per hour.

When the initial propulsive power of the fuel ceases, the orbital factor takes over. The sputnik vehicle no longer contains inherent propulsive power. If we had a continuing propulsive power, lasting weeks or months, tremendous vistas of altitude, range, and independent directional ability seem to be possible.

The energy released in a large atomic-hydrogen bomb explosion is many times greater than we or the Soviets will use in propelling ICBM's or sputniks.

The nuclear power in the *Nautilus* reactor core is released gradually. The nuclear core is extremely small, when compared with other fuels of like energy content. It lasts a long time. It does not require oxygen for energy release. Neither does nuclear fuel.

Do these interesting facts prove the feasibility of nuclear propulsion for space vehicles? Decidedly not. But they are very intriguing to scientists and engineers.

They seem to offer great possibilities to many scientists and engineers in the nuclear field. Many problems accompany these possibilities, but no more than faced the scientists who made the atomic and hydrogen bombs and the *Nautilus*. Many of these scientists and engineers believe the problems can be solved if we go at it the same way we went at these other problems.

Today's atomic reactor is a very heavy mass, mainly because of its heavy shielding to protect human life. Some scientists believe an unmanned, nuclear propelled, space vehicle can leave most of its shielding at the launching platform and expend its radiation from the chain reaction in limitless space.

With the solution of shielding and medical problems, some day man might occupy a space vehicle and, through the factor of continuing propulsive power, direct the vehicle into a safe return to earth.

Think for a moment of the great possibilities of continuing nuclear propulsive power in a space vehicle. We know of the thousands of miles the *Nautilus* has traveled on one loading of fuel and the potential such a ship could cruise up to 4 years on one nuclear core. A new 100,000 miles estimate will allow the *Nautilus* to cruise for 4 years on 1 loading of fuel.

Just think of this potential if it could be transferred to space. Just think of a *Nautilus* in outer space rather than in the ocean. Of course, it would be a vastly different craft. But with the use of the tremendous and long-lived fuels of atomic energy, a space vehicle could travel over great distances and for long periods of time.

The physics of space travel are such that each added thrust of energy affects the vehicle's speed and direction. This principle and the almost unlimited power potential of nuclear energy suggests flights staggering to the imagination.

While it is quite apparent that we lag behind the Soviets in the development of missiles, we do appear to have a lead in the uses of atomic power for propulsion. We have accumulated much knowledge in this field and our major laboratories have been working for years on propulsion for ships, planes and other things. It is for these reasons that I believe we should project our plans into the future. We should, after proper consultation with some of the same scientists and engineers that have brought other dreams into reality, inaugurate a space project.

We have the capacity for such a project. We have the scientists and engineers. In hearings before the Joint Committee we have learned that some major atomic reactor development laboratories are not scheduled to work capacity.

I suggest that Admiral Rickover be assigned to the job of developing the space vehicle. I believe he is the one man with the greatest background of combined experience in the various fields of engineering, physics, and atomic propulsion development. He has the best record of industrial-military atomic project development. He was the driving force that gave us the *Nautilus* submarine and its sisters. He built the first large electric power-producing atomic reactor, at Shippingport, Pa. He is the type of man that could produce results in either the atomic underwater satellite or atomic propelled space vehicle. His services should be used to the utmost and any resource he would need in dollars, men, or facilities should be furnished by a Nation—grateful for past accomplishments and hopeful for future deeds. I do not think that the developmental costs for either project would be too great. We have learned that such revolutionary developments as the *Nautilus* cost but a small fraction of our overall defense expenditures.

OTHER IMPORTANT PROJECTS

Of course, the two major projects I cited are not enough. There must be production and development across the board. The Joint Committee has published a program designed to give us overall scientific, technical, and production supremacy in the atomic field.

The committee, under the able chairman, CARL DURHAM, and he is an able chairman, and he has been a great guiding force on that committee, has called for a speedup in the development of the nuclear powered aircraft and the fixing of a completion date.

The program includes an increase in our production of fissionable materials for small yield atomic weapons which would be necessary in limited war—in so-called brush type wars.

The committee has constantly advocated acceleration of the atomic power program to follow through on an atoms-for-peace policy, knowing that weapons alone will never win the minds of men, a bill that failed in this House by only a few votes just last year.

The program for taming the thermonuclear reaction for peaceful purposes, and I am talking about the hydrogen reactions now, has enjoyed the committee's encouragement and support.

I understand the British atomic scientists will announce, in fact, on January 24, will announce an important laboratory breakthrough in the hydrogen fusion field. This discovery may lead to peacetime use of energy derived from the fusion of inexhaustible hydrogen. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], has ably spearheaded the advocacy of further experiments of this type.

I would therefore emphasize that my proposal for two major projects to control the space and the area under the seas is a program that is complementary to the joint committee program.

The committee's program is a sound program and should be carefully studied by each Member of the Congress.

I have the privilege of reporting that our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], will today appoint a special committee to study this space problem in its relation to the one fuel which seems to offer the most promise for the greatest use in a vehicle in space—nuclear energy. That committee will be announced today.

In connection with many of these scientific and technical programs I would like to state some simple axioms which have developed during my experience in atomic energy matters. They are:

First. Scientific projects are successful only when there is unified direction and command in the hands of one person, and I am speaking about the *Nautilus* type of project. Collective leadership works poorly in the technical world on specific projects.

Second. Creativeness and accomplishment comes from the concentration of numbers of scientists and engineers rather than from their dispersal, as is occurring under the so-called partnership program of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Recently a group of experts told us that our scientists and engineers in the atomic program are spread out in what they called subcritical masses—groups too small to function—too small to have an opportunity to whet their ideas against each other, to discuss the problems, and to suggest to each other the solutions thereof.

I agree with those who speak of a shortage of scientists and engineers, but I look upon this as a more urgent need of the future. We must have an educational system today which will produce scientists for future years. For today's crisis we have an adequate number for the projects I mentioned and other vital work. Talent should be concentrated into major laboratory centers for work on challenging new projects.

Third. The expenditure of dollars alone is no answer.

The efficiencies which evolve from unified direction and concentration of expert manpower produces savings. One need only compare the defense value we have received from Atomic Energy Commission projects where some of these concepts were used, to the overall defense expenditures, to see that very few dollars buy much more defense when major laboratories work on important projects under unified direction.

Every Member of this Congress must ask himself if he is beginning to see the decline of Western civilization. Have we lost the spirit, the courage, and the will to be the center of world power, freedom, and culture? Will we make the moves now to insure time for securing the peace?

In but a few years we have become dedicated to a kind of standpat philosophy whose cliches and mottoes fail to define it. It is a school of thought which permits vital programs to be halted, top scientists to be discouraged, and the balanced budget to be a sacred cow.

In the face of a challenge for survival, without courage, imagination, and the will to survive our Western civilization will decline—each of us who does not face his responsibility will help make a truism of the Marx-Lenin prediction that the capitalist system will fail.

In closing, let me say this Congress has greatness within its grasp.

If we have the courage to meet the challenge which has been hurled at us from the science laboratories of the Soviets—our liberties will be preserved and future generations of the Free World will rise up to call us blessed.

## THE RAYBURN LIBRARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, former President Harry S Truman, in accepting an invitation to be present last fall at the dedication of the Sam Rayburn Library at Bonham, Tex., wrote to Mr. Aubrey L. McAlister, publisher of the Bonham Daily Favorite:

> My good friend SAM RAYBURN has been Speaker of the House longer than any other man in the history of our country, and, in my opinion, he is the greatest Speaker of them all.

And from across the aisle in this Chamber came a moving tribute from the office of your opposite number and good friend of many years, the minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.:

> It has been your privilege to serve our country for many years, and the country is richer for your services. The fact that you have been Speaker of the House of Representatives for more years than any man in history indicates the extent of that great service you have rendered the American people.

And I cannot forbear to add the splendid tribute of Edward R. Murrow, renowned political commentator and world-famed reporter:

> I have never known a man in public life—

Wrote Mr. Murrow—

> who enjoyed more universal respect than Mr. SAM. Not only his party but his country is in his debt, for he has so frequently devoted himself to the Nation's destiny rather than partisan political interest. His candor, his tolerance of everything, save hypocrisy, have made him one of the real ornaments of American statesmanship.

Your magnificent record, sir, bore visible and fitting fruition in the dedication, on October 9 last, of the Sam Rayburn Library in your own hometown of Bonham. No one who has read of the outpouring of respect and affection by your Texan friends and neighbors on that happy occasion could fail to be deeply impressed by so hearty and spontaneous a tribute. It was, in truth, a great popular ovation and, as such, perhaps even more moving than the no less sincere tributes of the Nation's leaders. After all, next to his own family, it is a man's boyhood friends and neighbors who know him best.

The splendid building which will henceforth house the invaluable books and documents you have gathered together over the years is massive testimony of the universal regard and esteem in which you are held, and it will in time to come—a very long time to come, let us hope—eventually enshrine your memory. You have frequently been heard to remark that the way to study history is read the lives of men and Carlyle says somewhere that "biography is the only true history."

As the recipient in 1948 of the Collier's award for outstanding service, you invested the very substantial honorarium which accompanied it in the purchase of the land upon which the Sam Rayburn Library now stands. I quote from the Bonham Daily Favorite at the time of the dedication last autumn:

> When word got around that Mr. SAM was building a library, the money began to come in. * * *
>
> Since then some 8,500 individuals and firms from throughout the Nation—friends and associates, rich and not so rich, all with a desire to have a part in making Mr. SAM'S dream come true, have sent in contributions. They have ranged from a dime upward into the thousands of dollars. A vast majority of the schoolchildren in Fannin County joined in the dimes for Mr. SAM campaign in 1955.
>
> Whether the gift was a dime or $10,000, the giver's name is recorded with the same prominence in the permanent record of contributors now on display in the library.

And so, dear Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to set forth in the RECORD of the proceedings of this House this splendid tribute of the love and esteem in which you are held, and will ever be held, by your neighbors back home. We, too, pay affectionate tribute, not merely to the character and personality which has been an inspiration to us all, but to the long, brilliant, and steadfast career unexcelled in the history of this body.

## THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have not, of course, had the time or opportunity to carefully study the President's special farm message or the contents of the proposed legislation to effectuate its recommendations, but it does not take much study on my part for me to express a fundamental disagreement with the proposals relative to our price support programs.

First, Mr. Speaker, may I say that no responsible Republican Congressman from the Midwest was, to my knowledge, called into consultation in the development of these proposals. With certainty, I can say that I was not only not consulted but was not even advised as to the contents prior to today. This, in my opinion, is a grievous error on the part of the executive branch. I have said before and will say again today that we have more intelligence, more knowledge, more experience, and better judgment represented in the membership of our Committee on Agriculture and Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture than can be found anyplace in the leadership of the United States Department of Agriculture. That is why I must say that it is unfortunate in the extreme that someone downtown did not have the wisdom or the foresight to draw upon the experienced farm leaders in the Congress in the drafting of such an important message as this.

Before I get into any discussion of the proposals now laid before us, may I say one thing more. It is common knowledge that we have had some divisions evident within the ranks of agriculture in the Congress. Those divisions have followed sectional, commodity, and political lines and no one has deplored those divisions more than I have. I have said this before and it bears repeating today—I have never been party to these divisions and will not do so today nor tomorrow. I will support good cotton, tobacco, peanut, or other southern commodity legislation just as readily and as vigorously as I will similar proposals which deal with commodities produced in my own district. That is as it should be and is in accord with a policy I have followed for 20 years. I commend that policy to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and from all parts of the Nation who just might be inclined to go their separate ways. Face up to it—we are decidedly in the minority and we need to muster our full strength in the Congress to pass worthwhile farm legislation.

Now, let us look briefly at some of the recommendations placed before us for consideration. There is the proposal that the Secretary of Agriculture be given authority to increase, up to 50 percent, national marketing quotas or acreage allotments. That is one point we should consider with extreme caution. We are all agreed that the principal cause of low farm commodity prices is a supply in excess of demand. It might be a very dangerous instrument to place in any man's hands this proposed authority to increase by 50 percent the potential production of any commodity without due regard to market and supply conditions.

Then, there is the proposal to discontinue the corn acreage-allotment program. That, in my judgment, would be like canceling out our satellite program just because we did not get a satellite in orbit ahead of Russia. It is unthinkable that we should abandon any program of good purpose just because it has not for one reason or another done the entire job expected of it. To me, this seems merely a continuation of the fight by the Secretary for cheap feed grains which he has carried on since his first month in office. Cheap corn and cheap feed grains ultimately mean cheap livestock and it would be foolhardy in the extreme to abandon completely a program designed to stabilize such a major segment of our agricultural economy.

The President's message, which undoubtedly speaks for the Secretary of Agriculture and sets forth his views on these matters, points up the inadequacies of the present corn program. I readily agree that the present program is not working well and that it has had little or no appeal to corn producers. I come from a major corn producing district and this is a subject I know something about. There are 2 good reasons why only about 14 percent of the 1957 corn crop was produced in compliance with acreage allotments. The first reason is

the comparatively low price support announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. There was little or no incentive for compliance and we are all now paying for his lack of foresight.

There is another very important reason for this failure and we cannot lay the blame at the doorstep of the Secretary of Agriculture. I refer to the failure of the Congress last year to enact legislation providing a realistic acreage base for the national corn allotment. In one of the most unpleasant displays of sectionalism I have ever witnessed in connection with farm legislation, my good friends from the South whom I have never failed to support in their emergencies joined forces to defeat the proposed bill to increase the corn allotment. You simply must have fifty-six to sixty million acres of corn allotted nationally if you are going to have any measure of compliance, and last year we had only 37 million due to the failure of Congress to take constructive action.

The message also proposes that price supports be flexed still further down with minimum supports ranging as low as 60 percent of parity. Someone said to me a few moments ago: "CARL, why are you so displeased with this? Certainly a floor of 60 percent of parity is far better than the zero range of flexibility proposed last year." The answer to that is that a drowning man needs to be saved, not just thrown something to keep his head barely above water and then left to sink or swim. Minimum support levels of 60 percent of parity may look better than zero to some, but as far as I am concerned one is just as unacceptable as the other. We who share a responsible interest in agriculture seek to repair the damage to our farm economy, and we certainly will not be party to any further deflation.

There are, of course, some commendable recommendations. I am glad to see the extension of the special milk program suggested. This has proved to be a very worthwhile program to make dairy products available to our schoolchildren, members of the Armed Forces, and our hospitalized war veterans. It should by all means be extended and expanded if possible.

I am also personally very much in accord with the recommendation for the extension of the Public Law 480 program. For many years I have urged an effective program to share our blessings of abundance with less fortunate people both at home and abroad. Public Law 480 and related domestic programs have proven that we were right in asking for these programs and I urge prompt action by the Congress to carry out this recommendation. In my judgment, we can win more lasting friends all over the world with our surplus food than with guns, planes, bombs, or dollars. This is the humanitarian, the Christian way, to help our neighbors and we certainly have no competition from the Soviet when it comes to making food available to hungry people. They might match us in money, in weapons, and in scientific achievements—but they cannot even get into the race with us when it comes to food and fiber. Let us exploit this great advantage to the utmost and strengthen the free world where it will count the most.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I favor extension of the National Wool Act and am introducing legislation to accomplish that. I am also heartily in favor of the proposed improvements in the conservation reserve. I have criticized the Secretary on his stand on price supports, but I want to commend him for his support of an emphasized conservation reserve.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I reject completely the proposed reductions in farm commodity price supports. It is not enough, however, to merely criticize without suggesting alternatives. Time will not permit a detailed presentation, but I do want in the remaining moments to lay before the House my own proposals for constructive action to meet the urgent needs of American agriculture.

What are the basic problems we seek to solve. First and foremost is the problem of commodity prices and low farm income. If you do not have a fair price, nothing else has much significance. Second, we have the problem of temporary surpluses which are depressing our commodity markets. Third, we have the problem of production which is today slightly in excess of consumption and thus contributes to our surpluses. Finally, we have the problem of what best to do with the surpluses on hand in elevators and warehouses all over the Nation.

There is no partial or piecemeal solution. We either attack on all fronts and overcome the difficulties, or we keep running around in circles the way we have for a number of years. Here is what I propose in the way of remedies.

To meet both the evident need and to overcome deficiencies and criticism of the present price-support operations, I propose a new approach to the whole price-support question. I have recommended to the Committee on Agriculture legislation to provide price supports at a minimum of 90 percent of parity on the commodities produced on average or family-size farms. For example, under my proposal we would support at 90 percent of parity the price on the first 4,000 bushels of corn per farm, 3,000 bushels of wheat, 25 bales of cotton, and so forth. By this means we would meet the need of our average or family farmers, we would protect their income, and we would place an umbrella of protection over the entire agricultural economy at much less cost and without piling up such huge accumulations of surpluses. At the same time we would eliminate the criticism of present programs as being of primary benefit to large producers. In addition, necessary adjustments in supply would be made by these large producers who are best equipped to make such adjustments. The family farm, which we all seek to protect, would, under my program, receive the maximum of protection.

The next step in my program is the improvement and expansion of the conservation reserve, which is the real Soil Bank as initially proposed by myself several years ago. As far as I am concerned, we can terminate the acreage reserve program as it has not demonstrated sufficient merit or value. In so doing, we should double the national average payment under the conservation reserve, remove the present restrictive requirement of compliance with acreage allotments, and bring 50 million or 60 million acres of good cropland into the soil bank. This will quickly bring production into reasonable balance with consumption and thus solve our temporary problem of surpluses, not to mention the immeasurable value of conservation practices applied to this land.

While we are doing these things to achieve economic stability and balance of supply and demand in agriculture, we should expand our market development and surplus food distribution programs. Let us make good use of our abundance and let us feed hungry people both at home and abroad. I predict that these food distribution programs will prove so effective and so valuable that we may be looking for supplies in a few years to meet the demand.

Let us reject a negative approach and move boldly in the direction of constructive programs to stimulate and stabilize our agricultural economy and make purposeful use of our surpluses.

Let us set aside any partisan, sectional, or other differences and get the job done which all of us agree must be done.

We in the Congress have no apologies to make for our demonstrations of interest in and concern for the farm people of this Nation. Neither should we accept without challenge recommendations from any source which in our own good judgment are not in accord with the fundamental interests of American agriculture. Personally, I have fought a long time against heavy odds but as far as I am concerned the fight will not be over until we have gained our objectives and have seen programs effectuated which will assure our farm people their rightful place in the economic sun. To my way of thinking they are fully entitled to and must have full income parity with other segments of our economy. I am unwilling, as I have always been, to settle for anything less.

---

## THE PRESIDENT PRESENTS BENSON'S BLUEPRINT TO BANKRUPT FARMERS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the special message just delivered to the House.

The President has submitted to the Congress a program to drive many thousands more of our farm families off the land. With the earnings of agriculture now at a lower rate, compared to the rest of the economy, than for any year since the great depression, the President now proposes a further and deeper slash in farm income.

It is a program to solve the agricultural problems by forcing families off the farm by threat of bankruptcy.

It is the further activation of Secretary Benson's advice to farmers that they "seek other employment." That philosophy already is looking quite silly to our city friends, as industrial unemployment edges close to the 5 million mark and our Government encourages more farmers to leave the land and increase the jobless rolls in the cities.

The farm program is not working because Mr. Benson will not let it work.

In response to the President's message, I simply would like to remind him that agriculture is the one element of America's free-enterprise system, above all others, that has defied the best efforts of the Communist world to match or even approach its production and performance. Yet, under his policies of the last 5 years, our farm families are the least rewarded for their labors, among all the important economic groups of America.

The President points out that during the last 2 years net farm income has stabilized. It has stabilized the same way a ship stabilizes when it has sunk. It is on the bottom. The Department of Agriculture's figures show that farm net income for 1955 and 1956 was at the lowest level since 1943. The percentage of the national income represented by farm net income is substantially lower than even the depression years of the early 1930's.

The President points out that exports of farm products reached an alltime high in the year ending last June 30, but he does not point out that about a billion dollars worth of these exports were made under the barter program directed by Congress which the Secretary of Agriculture has discontinued. Nor did he explain that it cost the Government more than a billion dollars to reduce surpluses by $1 billion.

The Commodity Credit Corporation supported the price of major storable crops for 20 years prior to 1953, not at a loss but at an actual profit of $13 million. For these two decades, the Commodity Credit Corporation price supports on these basic crops, on the nonbasics, perishables, storables, and nonstorables—potatoes, eggs, wool, and everything else—amounted to only $1,064,000,000, but the losses in the last 5 years, 1953 through 1957, were approximately 4 times the combined total of the previous 20 years—slightly over $1 billion in 20 years—around $4 billion in 5 years.

Notwithstanding these gigantic losses, Commodity Credit Corporation investments in surpluses have increased from less than $2½ billion in 1953 to more than $7 billion as we go into 1958.

The President admits that the soil-bank program is a failure and advocates the outright repeal of the acreage-reserve part of the program.

The President continues to complain about surpluses but holds out the vague promise of increased acreage allotments, with no indication of what he intends to do with the increased surpluses resulting therefrom.

The public has not been given the true picture with reference to the operation of the farm program. These figures that I have used are figures taken from Mr. Benson's own records, and I challenge him or anyone else to deny the accuracy of the statements I have just made. Mr. Benson's program will lead this Nation into bankruptcy at a very rapid rate. This blueprint for bankruptcy that he has presented here today is the same old thing that he has been advocating ever since he has been in office; that is, to constantly lower commodity prices to disastrously low levels, and drive thousands and hundreds of thousands more farm families off the farms into the city streets looking for jobs that are not there.

I am perfectly willing to repeal the acreage reserve program. I am likewise willing to continue the conservation reserve program; and to expand and strengthen it, but I doubt very much whether this program will go very far in solving our surplus problem.

I am perfectly willing to give him the $1,500,000,000 that he asks for to continue the program of selling our surpluses for foreign currencies. When we come to look at this message we will all realize that Mr. Benson is just saying over and over again one thing. That is, "Give me more discretion, give me more control over the destiny and over the livelihoods of the farmers of America. Make me a complete and absolute czar over the price support program." And, you and I know what will happen if he gets that authority. And, I want to say here and now immediately on the delivery of this message that I have no idea that this Congress will be silly enough or foolish enough to give Mr. Ezra Taft Benson any more authority over the destiny of American agriculture than he already now has.

I am willing to give the Secretary authority to increase acreage allotments if the formulas in existing law result in decreasing acreage too drastically, but not if commodity prices are to be driven down to disastrously low levels. If commodity prices are to be driven to drastically low levels, the Secretary should submit some plan which will maintain farm income at a level which will enable farmers to maintain an American standard of living.

I wonder whether the President is speaking for corn farmers, when he advocates the repeal of acreage allotments and mandatory price supports which in effect would remove corn from the list of basic commodities. Although we have tried to provide a better farm program for corn farmers, we have not yet to date been able to find out just what kind of a corn program the farmers want.

I am in favor of extending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for 1 year and authorizing an additional $1,500,000,000 for sales for foreign currencies. At the same time, I think the Secretary should reinstate the barter program which he abruptly terminated last May.

I am in favor of increasing our agricultural research, in the hope that we might find more industrial uses for farm and forestry products.

Points 4, 5, and 6 are the part of Benson's program for reducing farm prices and farm price supports with which the Congress has disagreed ever since Mr. Benson first presented them.

---

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON GUIDED MISSILES

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, early last fall I announced in the press that upon the reconvening of Congress in January, I would introduce a very important measure.

Among the very first measures introduced during this session was a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Guided Missiles. My bill—H. R. 9613—would provide for the establishment of a joint committee of the House and Senate to study the problems relating to the navigation, use, and control of outer space. This committee would be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In no instance would there be more than four members of the same political party on the committee from each House of Congress.

The committee would make continuing studies of the activities of the various Government departments, services, commissions, and the activities of private agencies, relating to the development, use, and control of guided missiles, ballistic missiles, earth satellites, and other mechanisms designed for the navigation, use, and control of outer space and the conditions beyond present human navigational air limits.

The bill also provides that all legislation of this nature would be referred to this joint committee for action.

The chairmanship of this joint committee would alternate from year to year between the House and the Senate with the vice chairman being elected from Members of the opposite House.

In view of the recent advances made by the Russian Government in the missile and earth satellite fields and the apparent lag in our own missile development due to interservice bickering, I feel that this legislation is extremely necessary at this time. We need to establish through legislation legal authority for one specific committee of Congress to study these tremendous problems relative to the navigation, use, and control of outer space.

The American people, now more than ever before, do not know who to believe concerning our national defense and the security of our Nation. In the face of petty interservice squabbles, the Russians rocketed an artificial moon into an orbit around the earth. Our people, as a result of this and other reported scientific developments by the Russians, now are apprehensive and greatly concerned about this Nation's scientific programs

and developments. They are losing faith with and scarcely believe spokesmen of our military departments concerning their efforts and abilities in safeguarding our country against an attack from without.

This is not difficult to understand when recent events are reviewed in light of the testimony of Colonel Nickerson, General Gavin, Admiral Rickover, and more recently the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General White. It is even rumored that due to the lack of a definite and unified missile program in the Pentagon, Mr. William M. Holaday, the so-called czar, of the Department of Defense missile program is about to resign. There can be little doubt that our missile and satellite programs are in bad need of close scrutiny when men of this stature and integrity speak out openly against the progress being made by our missile program and they do so knowing full well the risk they are taking.

It is my firm belief that only a joint committee of Congress can properly delve into this melee in the Pentagon and get our Nation back on the road to real security in the scientific, missile, and earth satellite fields. It is true that the Congress now has committees which have or are attempting to take on this work as an added field of endeavor. This I feel will not suffice. The members of these committees are now overworked, their staffs are overburdened, and they do not have adequate time to search deep into this program as would this joint committee which I propose.

There is no doubt that the present situation we face is as great, if not greater, than the quandary in which Congress found itself prior to the establishment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. We are now on the threshhold of a new era and the solution of the complex problems of this era require an adequate and practical approach. The proper approach, in my mind, is one the Congress has always taken when a completely new field of problems has been presented to it—the establishment of a special or particular committee to handle those problems exclusively. This can only be accomplished by legislative act setting up a joint committee similar to that established to study the realm of atomic energy. The bill I have introduced is patterned after the bill which constituted the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and presents the only practical solution for the proper supervision of these programs so vital to our national security and defense.

Recently I noted in the press that the Pentagon is in the process of organizing its own space agency which will have its own director and budget. Although I do not have full details of this move it appears to be a move in the right direction. I hear that this plan would give a top-level civilian official control of the purse strings and the authority to initiate projects rather than simply reviewing plans of the Armed Forces. This, if it is put into effect, will go a long way toward getting our missile and satellite programs back on the track. It is more important to note that the Pentagon itself recognizes the need for an agency to deal with these space problems exclusively. I feel that it is time that the Congress recognizes this fact also. We should have a joint committee of Congress continually studying the activities of the various Government agencies relating to the use, control, and development of guided missiles, ballistic missiles, earth satellites, and other mechanisms for the navigation, use, and control of outer space. Such a committee would at all times know the progress of these various programs and be ready to recommend to the Congress legislation to assure that our Nation will remain strong and the leader among nations of the world.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge the most careful consideration of my bill—H. R. 9613—by the House Members. I will personally make this request to the members of the Rules Committee.

---

## THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion in light of the remarks just made by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in regard to the President's agricultural message. I am sorry the gentleman seems to have left the Chamber, because I would like him to hear my remarks.

The main thing that I was interested in was that there were no affirmative recommendations on his part as to what can be done and needs to be done to meet this very serious agricultural problem that faces the entire Nation. I previously, in a 1-minute address, pointed out one factor of the President's address which I think we all must recognize, and that is the forepart of the remarks which try to lay out the economic problems involved in the agricultural program. I think it is most important that we agree, if we can agree, on what are the basic economic problems that lie there.

Now, the Joint Economic Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator SPARKMAN, of which I was a member, just recently completed about 2 weeks of hearings on a group of panel papers prepared by outstanding agricultural economists throughout the country going into these problems that seem to face us in this area of national endeavor. This was an objective study and there was no attempt to come up with any particular preconceived idea of how to solve these problems. The thing I am pleading for now is not necessarily for the answers that Secretary Benson may be advocating but rather that we direct our attention to what the problems are and recognize that they exist and the fact that what we have been doing in the past, since 1946, indeed, has not been solving the basic problem. Essentially, it seems to me that the President has struck the keynote when he says, referring to the agricultural problem in the past, that it has not been adequately modified to deal with the effects of the technological revolution in agriculture. And, indeed, we have had a technological revolution in agriculture which is not completed, and we are going to continue to see a rapid change in agricultural technology for the next few years.

I again emphasize that I am not sure myself whether the programs that have been advocated by the President are suited to meet this problem. I think I am satisfied that the programs in the past certainly have not and to have a preconceived idea as expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that is all along the negative line—and, I might say, too, advisedly, it seems to me along the political line—is not the way you are going to solve these problems. If the Committee on Agriculture will do as I heard the gentleman from Mississippi, I believe it was, say, when he discussed this matter, and will keep an open mind on these things when they go into the hearings in the ensuing months and get down to the base of the economic problems without any preconceived notion as to what might be the way to solve them, indeed we might come up with the answers. And, in my judgment, indeed we must come up with the answers, because agriculture is a very basic and important industry in our national economy.

I might say one other thing. One of our problems is the fact that agriculture has been the main source of income for our people in the rural areas, so much so and almost exclusively so that we have come to look upon the rural economy and the agricultural economy as synonymous. But the situation today is apparently, judging by the reports of objective economists—who, incidentally, disagree with each other as to solutions, but according to their analysis of the situation, the agriculture industry is insufficient in these days to provide the livelihood for the number of people in the rural communities. So the question lies, What other source of income can be provided for the people in the rural communities? This is one alternative. The other alternative would be, of course, Is some of the rural community going to continue to move toward the suburbs and the centers of the cities?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman agree with Mr. Benson that we should drive these farmers off the farm without any consideration given to their future?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would answer the gentleman's question quite quickly because the implication is that the gentleman is saying that he would drive them off the farm.

Mr. COOLEY. That is what he is doing.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. He is not. It is the economic situation that is doing it. And I say to the gentleman, if he does not face up to those economic problems then he will be driving them off the farm. No American wants to drive anybody anywhere.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought the gentleman was just advocating that we had

too many people on the farm and that they must go to the suburbs.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I did not advocate anything. I was calling attention to the economic factors and I was saying that it is the economic factors that are doing it. I am saying that if you do not meet up with those economic factors and come up with a solution you, in effect, will be the one who is responsible. Does the gentleman follow the logic there?

Mr. COOLEY. No, I have not been able to follow any of the gentleman's logic.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am sorry.

Mr. COOLEY. For 11 consecutive years prior to the time Mr. Benson took over, commodity prices were at or above 100 percent of parity. We had a profit in the program. Now we have gigantic losses. Then we had surpluses, now we have more surpluses.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Those surpluses have continued to grow since World War II ended.

Mr. COOLEY. Since Korea, since the middle of 1953.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I regret to say that this problem has been with us since about the end of World War II.

Mr. COOLEY. July 1953.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. One other point. The gentleman in his talk on the agricultural situation fails to point out one primary thing. We are concerned here with human beings. And that is the per capita farm income.

Mr. COOLEY. And that is down. That is less than half of what the man in the city is getting.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me give the gentleman another figure. The first figures we have, beginning with 1934 for agriculture people and nonagriculture people are these. The percentage of increase even today of per capita income has been greater for people on the farm and in agriculture than it has been in industry.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman has not read the President's message.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am not referring to the President's message.

Mr. COOLEY. He said exactly the opposite of that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am talking about the economic situation.

Mr. COOLEY. The President said that the things that the farmer was buying were going up in price at a more rapid rate than the price of the things he was selling.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What I was pointing out was this, that as far as the per capita income of the individual is concerned, the reason that has not declined in the same fashion is that the population in the rural areas has declined, so all the money there is is divided up among fewer people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close my remarks again by urging the Committee on Agriculture to review the papers and the economic factors that lie behind this problem. I think by grappling with the situation, but avoiding the inclination to accuse someone of doing this or doing that, but rather of appraising what the economics are going to produce we may get results. Unless we do something about it in that fashion and with that approach we will not come up with the correct answers.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS, for 45 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. FLOOD, for 1 hour, on February 13, commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. MCCORMACK, for 5 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CELLER in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. CELLER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY.

Mr. BREEDING.

Mr. IKARD (at the request of Mr. JARMAN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL.

Mr. GRIFFIN.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 20, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1461. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1958 in the amount of $2,054,000 for the President's special international program (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1462. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to better adapt the price support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1463. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report pertaining to an agreement between the Department of the Navy and the Standard Oil Company of California entered into during the calendar year 1957, under which a program of water injection was instituted, pursuant to section 7424 (b) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1464. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress, and Public Law 548, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1465. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and the proceedings of the Disabled American Veterans national gathering, held in Buffalo, N. Y., August 19 through 23, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Seventeenth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to General Accounting Office operations in Europe (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 10043. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 10044. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 10045. A bill to provide for the sale of all of the real property acquired by the Secretary of Commerce for the construction of the Burke Airport, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 10046. A bill to prohibit officers and employees of the United States, Territories of the United States, and the District of Columbia from treating water supplies with fluoride compounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10047. A bill to provide for the redistricting of the judicial district of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 10048. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10049. A bill to extend the National Wool Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 910); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10050. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10051. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 10052. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 10053. A bill to better adapt the price-support program to the needs of farmers by providing more latitude for increasing acreage allotments, establishing price supports, continuing authority for the disposition of surpluses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 10054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 10055. A bill to provide for the control of certain advertising on federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on other lands adjacent to such National System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 10056. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to assure more equitable allotments of cotton acreage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 10057. A bill to protect the right of the blind of self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10058. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 10059. A bill to enable the Federal intermediate credit banks to limit endorsers' liability on loans in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 10060. A bill to provide for a national self-help dairy stabilization program and to provide for an adequate balanced and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10061. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 10062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 10063. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10064. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 10065. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct-loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10066. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain industrial manufacturing plants owned by the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 10067. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Science Academy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10068. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education in certain fields of science; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 10069. A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1953, creating the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 10070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the condemnation of certain property by the United States or a State, or from the sale of such property to the United States or a State under threat or imminence of condemnation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10071. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain persons to permanent positions in hospital management and administration in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10072. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain persons to permanent positions in hospital management and administration in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 10073. A bill to provide minimum price-support levels for whole milk and butterfat during the 2-year period beginning April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 10074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10075. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 10076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 10077. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 10078. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 10079. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 10080. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10081. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 10083 A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 10084 A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 10085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 10086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 10087. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10088. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. J. Res. 501. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. J. Res. 502. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. J. Res. 503. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a Federal Academy of Science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the vicinity of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution to conduct an investigation covering attempts on the part of the United Nations to organize a world government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Res. 442. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the convoking of a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the refugee problem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 443. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses incurred by the House Committee on Banking and Currency in conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 86; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 10090. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Botta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 10091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Jeske; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 10092. A bill for the relief of Theresa Asphar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 10093. A bill for the relief of Taeko Takamura Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10094. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 10095. A bill for the relief of Helen Michalea and Konstantinos E. Skopeteas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 10096. A bill for the relief of Olin Fred Rundlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## What Is Government's Responsibility to American Agriculture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN**
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "What Is Government's Responsibility to American Agriculture?" which was delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] at the annual meeting of the Illinois Agricultural Association on November 13, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO AMERICAN AGRICULTURE?

(Address by Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND)

I think it was Henry Mencken who once said, "Any generalization on any subject, including this one, is inevitably wrong." This is certainly true of the subject assigned to me. It would be easy, but dangerous, to generalize on the subject of government's responsibility to American agriculture.

Nevertheless, there are a few generalizations we need to make before proceeding.

I'm speaking to you as one who has devoted his entire life, with the exception of the duties of being a Senator, to farming. My principal farming enterprise has been the production and marketing of cotton. However, the continued operation of the Government's cotton program has caused me to change my business so that I am now devoting over two-thirds of my acreage to the production of soybeans, feed grains, and livestock. Even though I recognize my responsibility as a Member of the United States Senate and as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I wish to address my remarks today as one farmer to another.

In our concentration upon the immediate problems of our time it is well to remind ourselves that there are some basic overriding principles which have made America what it is today. We are inclined to take these principles for granted—but we cannot afford this luxury. They are constantly under fire, not by frontal attack, but by the process of chipping away a little here and a little there. One of these basic principles is the principle of private ownership in a competitive economy. A second is the maintenance of strong and responsible government at the State and local level. The basic concept of the American society, as I see it, is the dispersal of economic power by the institution of private ownership, and the dispersal of political power by dividing such power between the three branches of the Federal Government and between the Federal Government and the States and the people. These are the arches that hold up the capstone of liberty.

At any point where a breach is made in one of the walls to divide and separate these powers, the fundamental rights and freedom of all the people are endangered. We in the south deeply and sincerely believe that the control and operation of public schools is and always has been a State and local matter. When the Central Government breaches the division of powers and orders a crack combat division into a State to force the entry of Negro children into a white public school, it is a matter of vital concern to each and every individual in every State in the Union. When the constitutional balance of political power is destroyed in one place it is just as effectively destroyed in every other, although any new overt acts may not have been committed.

Rural people have had a clearer insight into the significance of these basic principles of freedom and prosperity than many of our urban friends—and it is to rural people that many of us who hold these principles dear, look to, to support and maintain the basic concepts without which all else would be bitter fruit.

The Farm Bureau of Illinois, which I understand has upward of 200,000 farm family members, has a tremendous responsibility in making sure that farmers understand clearly government's responsibility to agriculture. Let me say that the Illinois Agricultural Association, which is the Farm Bureau affiliate, together with the Farm Bureaus in the other 47 States, offer the greatest hope for determining government's proper responsibility to agriculture. I hope you will not fail in this responsibility.

One of the paramount contributions that Government can make to the welfare of farm people is to take such measures as may be appropriate to avoid excessive fluctuations in the general level of business activity and the general price level.

There are certain fundamental truths that we should always keep before us. I'd like to list a few of these for you, and I am sorry that time will not permit a complete discussion because each one of these points, if correctly developed, would take all the time that has been allotted me. These are as follows:

(1) You cannot multiply wealth by dividing it.

(2) You cannot legislate the poor into freedom and wealth by legislating the wealthy out of it.

(3) Governments cannot give to people what they do not first take away from the people. (The power to tax misused is the power of destruction.)

(4) That which one man receives without working for, another man must work for without receiving it.

(5) The Government cannot guarantee you a fair price or income without all-out controls, with their great limitations in opportunity to create the goods that constitute real wealth.

(6) Uncle Sam must finally dish out money on the basis of equal shares—and to a politician this is 1 share, 1 vote.

(7) The Socialists and the Communists, those who would divide the wealth, never get tired. We do.

As we discuss Government's responsibility to American agriculture, let us keep these fundamental truths in mind.

No matter how difficult the problems of farmers may be at this time, I think few would deny that they would be immeasurably worse if the level of business activity were to slacken off substantially.

We seem to have developed a situation in this country in which the orthodox remedies of fiscal and monetary action have demonstrated their capacity to level off a boom, but not as yet been effective in stopping the upward trend in prices.

This, too, is harmful to farmers, because undercurrent conditions of actual and potential overproduction of farm products, price inflation does not significantly increase farm prices, but does significantly increase the price of things that farmers buy.

Currently, the general price level is 21 percent higher than the 1947-49 average. This means that the value of the dollar as a medium of exchange has declined a fifth during the past decade.

During 19 of the past 20 months the price level has increased. This is like saying that in 19 of the past 20 months the value of the dollar has been reduced.

We in Congress who have, under the Constitution, an obligation to regulate the value of money, need to find out why, and to take action to prevent the continuing deterioration in the value of our currency. I have my own ideas on this that time does not permit me to develop. Suffice it to say that in my view this is a responsibility that government has to farmers, as to other groups, and that the manner in which this responsibility is handled is of paramount importance to farmers—even more so than some of the other activities more directly related to agriculture.

I think, too, that government has a responsibility to keep open the channels of international trade for the disposition of farm products. Farmers have a big stake, bigger than they often appreciate, in a high level of trade between nations. The agricultural situation today would be immeasur-

ably more critical had it not been for the expansion in farm exports in recent years.

Exports of farm products are several times as high as imports of competitive products. The average commercial farmer sells about $1,000 worth of farm products to foreign markets. Not only is this important in itself but if any significant portion of this production had to be disposed of in domestic markets the impact upon domestic prices would be catastrophic. Even farmers who do not produce commodities that move into export outlets have a major stake in a high level of foreign trade, because most farms are suitable for the production of many commodities. If cotton exports decline, for example, much of the land now used for cotton will go into the production of grain, feed and livestock products, with harmful consequences to farmers in other areas.

Unfortunately, much of the current high level of farm exports is artificially induced by one or more Government programs. For example, farm exports would be far lower were it not for what is generally called the Public Law 480 program—the program of exporting farm products for foreign currencies. I know that this program originated in the Farm Bureau. I think we must continue this program at least temporarily because, assuming the existence of surplus stocks, it makes good sense to make use of them to aid in the progress of undeveloped countries. Nevertheless, I look forward to the day when such programs can be curtailed or eliminated, because it does not appear they provide an adequate underpinning for a permanent farm export program. It would not be wise for agriculture to come to depend too much on an artificial inducement to high farm exports.

In the fields of research, extension, the preservation and wise use of our land and water resources, farm credit and farm marketing services—I expect there would be almost unanimous agreement that these are programs that are well justified, not only in the interest of farm people, but in the interest of the general public as well.

I suppose that the subject assigned to me presupposes that I would talk primarily about national farm price policy—and I have now gotten to that point. I felt that it was necessary to begin with the more general comments that I have made in order to make it perfectly clear that in my mind these are the fundamental overriding issues that are the important things to farmers and to their real and long-run prosperity.

Among my colleagues opinion runs the full gamut on this question of national farm price policy—from those who believe that every governmental intervention into the price system is fundamentally inconsistent with our economic system with harmful long-run effects upon those supposedly benefited—to those who think that farmers cannot survive economically without Government price fixing on all or most commodities. And this variance in viewpoint is but a reflection of the diversity of opinion that exists among farmers with respect to this most difficult and perplexing of public policy issues.

Part of the answer to the question of my subject—what is Government's responsibility to American agriculture—is that those of us who have been placed in a position to do so by the electorate have a tremendous responsibility to look carefully and honestly and intelligently at the economics of the problem, and particularly at the long-run results and consequences of any proposal. In this endeavor we should give appropriate consideration to any conclusions that may be drawn from the experience to date with national farm programs. There is just no excuse for not learning from experience. They say the reason history repeats itself is that no one was listening the first time.

If we do look at the experience of the past we cannot, I think, avoid certain conclusions.

The price-support programs of the past, and specifically the policy of setting price supports at or close to 90 percent of parity may have helped some farmers in a given year.

But such programs have set in motion certain long-range developments which have turned out to be harmful to the ability of farm people to earn satisfactory incomes.

We have artificially encouraged production beyond what the market can take.

We have promoted competitive production in other countries.

We have expanded the use of synthetic substitutes.

We have lost markets that often, tragically, cannot be regained.

We have tended to fragmentize the right to produce.

We have built up surpluses, expensive to the public to maintain, and depressing in their impact upon farm incomes.

We have imposed restrictions upon the ability of individual producers to improve the efficiency of their operations.

We have diverted acreage from controlled crops to other commodities, in particular into feed and livestock production.

Mississippi has increased livestock by 93 percent in the last 5 years, and irrigated corn is producing fantastic yields in my State Small cotton allotments are putting small farmers in the dairy and poultry production business throughout the South.

The program and the consequences of the program have indeed become a part of the problem—have made the problem more difficult to deal with.

I wish time would permit me to review for you the history of the agricultural adjustment program as applied to cotton. I am sure that there is a lesson in this experience for the farmers of the Midwest and for that matter the entire country. As a producer of cotton, I have seen my right to produce, steadily but surely, eroded away. I have been forced to reduce the cotton production on my farm by more than 40 percent. I have watched synthetic fiber production increase and take over my market. I have seen during this period production of cotton in other countries increase more than 10 times because of the protective umbrella we held over price in this country.

At this point in history we will go inevitably in one direction or in another. We shall go in the direction of more comprehensive intervention of Government in the price and marketing of farm products—or—we shall seek to reverse the trend and gradually reduce the dependence of farm people upon political management of the farm economy.

The general situation in Washington with respect to farm programs recalls the story about the two boys who so admired a heavyweight boxer that they bet all their money that he would beat the champion.

But their fighter was knocked out in the third round.

"You know," said one of the boys ruefully, "I don't think Sam is as good as he used to be."

"Yeah," replied the other. "And I don't think he ever was."

In the general disillusionment with the panaceas of the past, it is but natural that we should explore new avenues—and perhaps some old or unused avenues.

Someone told me recently, and I am sure it is so because of my own contacts, that farmer opinion is somewhat in a state of flux, that farmers are looking for new answers. I can assure you the same situation prevails on Capitol Hill.

This is all to the good. Such analysis and resurvey is the stuff of which progress is made.

But I hope that all of us, myself included, will look carefully and honestly at the economics and the long-run consequences of any proposal. Will it really help farmers in the long run, or does it involve jumping from the frying pan into the fire?

In the writing of the present farm-program legislation we have written certain definitions or formulas for determining supply, demand, quotas, and the level of price supports. These formulas have not worked too well because no static formula will fit a dynamic, constantly changing economy. Even though the formula is right today, it is wrong tomorrow.

Secretary Benson's answer to this is to eliminate formulas and leave the determination to administrative discretion.

This I cannot buy. It leaves too much authority in the hands of one man. Even though some people might be willing to leave such authority in the hands of the present occupant of the office, no one can know how some future occupant might use or abuse the authority vested in him.

It seems to me that we still have a job to do in finding a way to establish standards by legislative action, particularly as to the level of price support, which contains sufficient recognition of the current market situation to be realistic and workable and yet which avoids the delegation of complete discretion to the—or to any—Secretary of Agriculture.

Among the welter of proposals currently being debated is the question of supporting farm incomes by direct payments to farmers. Such proposals usually involve payments on units of production to bring the total return per unit up to a specified level. And such proposals usually involve an extension of the payment feature to include many other commodities such as livestock, eggs, fruit, vegetables, hogs, in addition to those now supported.

If we are to use the payment approach there is no valid reason to limit price support to a few storable commodities.

A guaranteed return per unit of production would provide a strong incentive for farmers to increase the number of units produced. Financing would be facilitated. The payments themselves would be in part reinvested. The net effect would be to increase capitalization in an industry that is already overcapitalized—to expand the agricultural plant which is already expanded to produce beyond what the market will absorb.

The increased production thus created would move to market at lower prices. The farmer's return from the market would decline; the farmers return in the form of a payment from Government would increase.

In a recently published study, the Department of Agriculture reached the conclusion that within a few years after the institution of a payment program at 90 percent of parity for all major commodities, the annual cost would run between seven and ten billion dollars per year. In 1957 total net farm income is estimated at $11.7 billion.

I think their estimate is too low. Regardless of cost, if we go this route, we will make peasants out of every farmer in America.

Unless we are to assume that the general public, through its representatives in Congress, is willing to support unlimited expenditures for agriculture, we must assume that the costs of a payment program would result eventually in the adoption of measures to limit the Government's commitment. Such measures would increase a limitation upon the amount to be paid to any one farmer; or production quotas, or both.

The institution of production quotas of the kind that would be necessary to minimise Government liability, and for the commodities it is proposed be covered by payment programs, would subject agriculture to a degree of centralized control of farm

production and marketing operations far beyond anything heretofore envisaged or dreamed of.

The history of Government programs would indicate that limitations on payments would be invoked at a relatively early state in the program. Note the reduction in the maximum payment under the agricultural conservation program from $10,000 per farm to $1,500.

Or in most recent history—when the soil bank program was under consideration, Congress rejected limitations on soil bank payments on the grounds that the purpose of the soil bank was to reduce production of surpluses and the cooperation of the larger producers was needed. Yet, 1 year later, a limitation of $3,000 for the acreage reserve program was approved.

In any Government program involving the payment of public money to individuals, the inevitable tendency is to work toward a uniform basis—and what is more uniform, more equitable, than an equal payment to each farmer?

So, in a period of a relatively few years it would appear the inevitable consequences of a payment program would be:

1. Increased production.
2. Lower market prices.
3. Farmers would hope to get most of their net income in the form of Government payments.
4. Limitations on the number of dollars each farmer could receive.

The most efficient farm operators would be squeezed between the low market prices induced by guaranteed returns and the limits on the amount that might be paid to any individual.

The result would be a complete dependence of farmers on government, and the leveling off of opportunity in agriculture at a comparatively low level.

Farmers, who would thus become essentially wards of government, could not likely retain the independence and self-reliance that have made farmers the bulwark of responsible self-government.

Personally, I have a higher ambition for those who are and will be farmers.

I do not believe there is any panacea for the income problem in agriculture. Any government that is big enough to give us all we want is also big enough to take all we've got—including our freedom.

I'm sure that you are aware of the rapid decrease in the proportion of farmers to the rest of the population in America. It seems to me as a farmer that we must be stupid if we put our whole dependence and economic welfare into the hands of the Congress or the administrative agencies of government. It is estimated, for example, that by 1975 only 6 percent of the population of America will be producing more than 90 percent of the food and fiber. Are we naive enough to believe that in such a situation that we can continue to pile up huge surpluses of agricultural commodities—let alone think about the Government dipping into the Treasury and paying us at a rate of $10 to $15 billion annually.

There are some things that government can do to alleviate the situation. These, government should do. But I think we should be instinctively suspicious of any proposal that leads in the direction of more comprehensive Government direction of and responsibility for the business of producing and marketing farm products. Let us subject such proposals to a most rigorous scrutiny. Let's not jump before we know where we are jumping. Let's be sure we know what the long-run consequences of any proposal may be, before, rather than after, we buy it.

It is a real pleasure to have the opportunity of discussing this subject with you—because I know that what the future holds for agriculture will not be determined by what the present occupants of legislative chairs may think—but rather by what you and millions of others like you think. Most Members of Congress vote in part in accordance with their personal convictions and in part according to the way they think their constituents want them to vote. Most Congressmen are just average people who have more problems and responsibilities than they know what to do with. Most of them want to do what's right. But they are not much wiser than their constituents urge or permit them to be. As one of my friends tells me, "He has heard the clamorment of the people."

I think, too, I would be remiss, if, while discussing Government's responsibility to agriculture, I did not touch at least briefly upon the reciprocal responsibility of farmers to themselves, to the Government, and to the public generally.

I am sure you would agree with me that farmers need to do a lot more than cast a hopeful eye in the direction of Washington. Farmers have a responsibility as individuals to do what they can to improve their own economic position, to work individually and in their community and through the organizations they have created and which they control, to expand markets and increase the efficiency of production and marketing. They have a responsibility to Government and the general public to call for genuinely helpful action, but to avoid proposals that are impractical, excessive in cost, or harmful to the public. Preservation of your right to take individual, local, and private action is a responsibility of government.

Let me close by expressing my confidence that I am speaking to an audience that is conscious of and dedicated to the great heritage of political and economic principles bequeathed to us—and by confidence that each of you in his own way in his own sphere has the capacity to make a contribution toward finding sound answers consistent with those principles—and that in doing so you will be promoting progress and freedom in America. And it is important that you do so. "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle."

I wish I could recall the name of the man who said, "The conditions upon which God has given liberty to man is eternal vigilance, which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt." In the run of history this quotation is not unrelated to the topic you asked me to discuss.

## H. R. 4662, the King-Jenkins Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in a letter sent to the chairman, I have urged members of the House Ways and Means Committee to report favorably H. R. 4662, known as the King-Jenkins bill, so that this important bill may receive early action by the Congress.

H. R. 4662 would permit teachers—including college teachers—to deduct from gross income up to $600 for tuition, books, other equipment, travel and living expenses while away from home—to the extent that these expenses exceed normal living costs—while pursuing advanced educational objectives relating to their professional qualifications.

H. R. 4662 and its many companion bills should not be construed as special treatment for teachers. Other professional groups already are permitted to deduct from gross income similar expenses. To deny teachers this equal right is to discourage them from improving their abilities at a time when our Government is proposing vitally important step-ups in our educational system.

Teachers give up their vacations to go to summer school and drive long distances in winter over hazardous roads to attend extension classes because they want to become better teachers. They should be encouraged, not discouraged.

Under present regulations, a teacher cannot deduct these educational expenses unless he would have lost his position had he not taken the courses.

Many teachers and professional groups within my district have written me urging support of H. R. 4662, which I have pledged. I now urge that this bill be reported from committee and passed as soon as possible.

## Deducting Amounts Paid for Tuition, Fees, and Books to Certain Public and Private Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, while it is true that the recent sensational scientific and technological advances of the Soviet Government have given point and a much needed sense of urgency to the need for a searching reappraisal of our educational system and the way in which it is tending, and focused renewed emphasis on the sciences, it is my belief that we should be mindful of the overall needs of our educational system lest we forget the fact that democracy such as ours has need for a broad base of aptitudes and skills which must not neglect any field of human endeavor.

With this thought in mind, I have introduced H. R. 9971, which will permit a Federal income-tax deduction for amounts paid to any accredited institution of higher education for tuition, fees, or books in connection with the education at a level above the 12th grade of the taxpayer or for any individual for whom the taxpayer is entitled to claim an exemption.

My bill is unique in that it takes account of, and makes provision for, the education of the taxpayer himself, in addition to those who look to him for their support and education. This is important in two respects. First, it provides an incentive for those many young men and women of our country who because of financial condition of their families must undertake to educate

themselves by hard work and an individual struggle, in short, to support themselves and to acquire an education at the same time, and, second, it will provide a deduction to the taxpayer who is a teacher and who, to the ultimate benefit of the country as a whole and his community in particular, seeks to further his individual skills as a teacher. I am sure that we are all mindful of the fact that the product of our education system can be no better than the skills concentrated in the hands of those who train, guide, and develop the young minds that we entrust to their skills.

The deduction permitted by my bill can be availed of only if the educational institution is an accredited institution which qualifies for deductible contributions under the Internal Revenue Code. The point of so limiting the bill lies in the belief that no useful purpose is served in providing an incentive for matriculation in substandard institutions which ultimately can do harm to the career of a student, and because I believe that recognition should be given to the many contributions made to the American way of life by those nonprofit private and public educational institutions which, without rewards, endeavor to equip and man our Nation to meet the challenges of a constantly changing world.

## President Eisenhower's Agricultural Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, although I approve of many of the recommendations contained in President Eisenhower's agricultural message, delivered to the Congress today, I cannot agree that it represents a progress program that can make a substantial contribution to the well-being of America's farm families.

Personally, I want no part of a price-support structure set at 60 to 90 percent of parity. I note that the President has called for flexing price supports downward in order to open the door to market expansion. Mr. Speaker, even if the consumer price for farm production was reduced, I fail to see how the already glutted world market could be expanded. Domestically, figures indicate that the American people, despite rapid population increases, are eating less than ever before; in fact, it would seem, to the point where almost everybody is on a diet.

I question further the wisdom of a more flexible support pattern: How can a farmer produce on the basis of 60 percent of parity when the farm equipment and machinery he buys today is being sold for 160 percent of parity?

It is my opinion that the solution to our farm problems still is to be found in a formula composed of 100 percent of parity, acreage controls, cross-compliance, and full participation. It is my understanding that there are statutes on the books already which would permit the creation of just such a formula.

## The Minority Is Not Always Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult problems a Member of Congress must from time to time face occurs when, after extensive study and objective consideration, he discovers that his convictions on the merits of a vital issue do not accord with the convictions of an overwhelming majority of his colleagues. I am sure that all of the Members of this body have, at one time or another, been beset with agonizing doubts when what appears to be essential truths demand that you counter the popular trend.

I found myself in just such a situation in 1952, during the consideration by the 82d Congress of fair trade legislation. In this instance, however, evidence in the subsequent 6 short years, clearly demonstrate that what was then contrary to the majority and the popular stand nevertheless was right. I am gratified that in State after State the courts are ruling that so-called fair trade is contrary to fundamental guaranties of American society. Their decisions underscore the validity of objections to Federal enabling legislation for resale price maintenance, a pernicious system of price fixing which is contrary to basic American competitive and contractual concepts.

You all recall the situation that existed in 1952. By that time, advocates of fair trade had secured enactment in 45 States of laws prohibiting deviations from prices that had been established by a manufacturer for his trademarked goods. Those laws prohibited price deviations, not only by those who had by contract agreed with the manufacturer to maintain resale prices, but also, in the infamous nonsigner clauses, prohibited deviations by those who had never agreed to maintain resale prices and who might not even have knowledge of such a contract.

The United States Supreme Court in 1951 in the Schwegmann case effectively emasculated fair trade and the burden it imposes on interstate commerce in its ruling that prices set by manufacturers were not enforcible against nonsigners. Immediately fair trade advocates introduced bills to overrule the Supreme Court's temperate and wise decision.

Certain of these bills were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I was then chairman. Other bills were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Both committees held exhaustive hearings on all phases of this problem, and both committees reported out bills to overrule the Supreme Court and to reinstate fair trade.

Only three members of the Judiciary Committee, of which I was one, signed the minority report—House Report No. 1516—in opposition to fair trade. The report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—House Report No. 1437—contains no minority views in opposition to resale price maintenance. Subsequent action in the House was equally one sided. On May 8, 1952, by a vote of 196 to 10, the House after vigorous debate, adopted the McGuire bill that had been recommended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

In both the Judiciary Committee's minority report in opposition to resale price maintenance and on the floor of the House, I opposed fair trade on a number of grounds. Extensive evidence was marshaled to show the history of fair trade included the following results:

It promotes concentration of economic power.

It injures the competitive status of independent retailers.

It fosters violations of the antitrust laws.

It is unfair to the consumer.

The nonsigner clause that makes a man responsible for the terms of a contract he did not sign, and of which he has no knowledge, and which he does not approve, offends treasured principles of American ethics and is contrary to the entire system of commercial law that is the fabric of our economic well-being. Subsequent events have sustained these arguments. Whereas in 1952, 45 States had fair-trade legislation, today only 31 State fair-trade laws are undisturbed by the State judiciaries. In two States, Virginia and Nebraska, the courts have voided their entire Fair Trade Acts. In 12 other States, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina and Utah, the courts have voided the State laws as to nonsigners and thereby have rendered fair trade in those States virtually ineffective. I am confident that, as time goes on, the complete elimination of fair-trade price fixing will demonstrate the historical truism that time converts many a minority position into the majority one.

## Presentation of Cordell Hull Award for Leadership in Building United States Foreign Economic Policy to the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, much has already been said by some of my colleagues about the presentation of the Cordell Hull Award for Leadership

in Building United States Foreign Economic Policy to the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce on December 10, 1957, by the Committee on Forign Trade Education.

At the request of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that a message sent to the award meeting by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, together with one I sent, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE MESSAGE OF THE HONORABLE ADLAI E. STEVENSON, DECEMBER 10, 1957

I have long been a supporter of the reciprocal trade agreements program and I intend to do all in my power to see that this program is renewed and liberalized when it comes before Congress early next year. I think an intensive effort must be made to explain to Congress and to the country precisely why it is in the national interest that this program be extended. And I am sure that the administration will have the support of many leading citizens and voluntary organizations on a nonpartisan basis provided it is prepared to lead the way and stay on the course.

---

EXCERPT FROM THE MESSAGE OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UNITED STATES SENATOR, DECEMBER 6, 1957

You are certainly right about the growing threat to our reciprocal trade program, and the urgent need for greater effort to stimulate public understanding as to our stake in foreign trade. Perhaps no issue before the coming Congress will be of more importance to our future, yet it will be difficult to mobilize the support we need for a realistic trade program unless the public can be awakened to how closely it is linked with successful international relations.

It seems to me that the American business community can and must accept this challenge of asserting some vigorous leadership toward public education in the direction of expanded foreign trade and strengthened foreign economic policy, putting aside short-term self-interest where necessary in the realization that all of us have a tremendous stake in the long-range goal of building a more secure world and more peaceful society in which all humanity can enjoy the blessings of progress and improved economic conditions.

---

## Rollcall for Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of the principal address at the annual dinner of the National Reclamation Association at Phoenix, Ariz., on November 7, 1957, which was delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is entitled "Rollcall for Reclamation."

The attention of the Senate is invited to this masterful, factual presentation of the situation confronting the Nation, and particularly the West, with respect to the reclamation program as a result of the financial policies of the present administration, especially regarding the urgent need for a reappraisal of the program and policies.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], a former Secretary of Agriculture before coming to the Senate, is now the able chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee and senior majority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He is also a former Member of the House of Representatives.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] gave the Reclamation Association and the country facts that must be taken to heart if the economic stability of the Nation and the West is to be maintained. He warned of the threats to the ability of the United States in the not too distant future to provide food for its rapidly expanding population. He pointed out that had the current high interest policies of the Eisenhower administration for reclamation projects been in effect earlier, the Nation would be without many great conservation and multiple-purpose reclamation projects, producing water for irrigation, hydroelectric power, flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife protection.

I considered the ANDERSON speech of such high value to the country that I asked the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his permission to have his presentation printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is vital that the country be alerted to the problems that confront reclamation.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLLCALL FOR RECLAMATION

(Address by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON)

Six hundred years ago, the Hohokam Indians irrigated their crops in the Salt River Valley, perhaps on this very spot.

Four hundred years ago, Francisco Vasques de Coronado followed the San Pedro River, then a broad, fast-flowing stream and now a dry stretch of dust, into the Southwest in search of the seven cities of Cibola. He was led on by the story that the walls of the houses were formed of pure gold, but when he came to Hawikuh, he learned to his early disappointment and eventual dispair that what Fray Marcos de Niza took to be gold was only corn shining in the blaze of a desert sun.

Like the conquistador of four centuries ago, the modern seeker of agricultural wealth has heard of the riches that pour forth from acres reclaimed from the desert by giant dams behind which are stored the waters of winter snows and summer rains. One by one these dams dot the landscape, while below and beyond them, new farms blossom with food and fiber. The pattern has been much the same: High dams to provide a strong head of water which can be released through whirling turbines to generate the white gold of electricity—the breadwinner for the irrigation of the fields.

REAPPRAISAL OF RECLAMATION

But there may be a new rollcall of reclamation—a reappraisal of possibilities. The white gold of a decade ago may not settle to the bottom of our prospector's pan. Higher construction indexes, reduced agricultural prices, and spiraling interest costs may combine to end for a time the successful search for feasible reclamation projects. It is this unwelcome prospect that I would discuss with you tonight.

May we take it for granted that there are a dozen interesting excursions into history that we might make before we talk about our present problem.

There was the West of the Indian when the beavers were the persistent builders of dams and the chief contributors to conservation by slowing down the rate of early spring runoff.

There was the West of Kit Carson, Bill Williams and Jedediah Smith where only the occasional traveler would disturb the prairie dogs or watch the whirlwinds of dust.

There was the West that General Kearney claimed from Mexico and out of which was carved this State and my own. The general found beautiful irrigated valleys, but there were no elaborate engineering works—merely brush dams built into the stream by the Spanish don who owned the land from the river to the hills. There was no need of soil analysis, no study of stream aggradation, no bonded debt. The water served only the acres where the simple ditch would carry it. Thus it had been flowing for a century across the fields of what I now call my farm before Kearney came into the valley of the Rio Grande.

But the turn of the century saw the picture changing. The railroad had hurried the development of centers from which cattle and ore could be shipped, and these had turned into towns or were becoming cities. The vast stretch of pasture was not enough; the diversification of crops was started. Farming on irrigated land became more of a task than the individual could handle, so there were formed associations of water users aided by the lawyer and the banker from a nearby town. Private finance was too limited; farm prices were too low. Thus, by 1900, men were looking to the Government for help.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT ON RECLAMATION

President Theodore Roosevelt in 1901 sent a special message to the Congress. In it were these words:

"The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States."

Then he stated the case for the West:

"It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for the storage of water as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid regions by engineering works of another character."

During the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed. It provided a 10-year repayment period for irrigation works. At that time, the generation of power was not considered in arriving at project feasibility. Those who used the water—the farmers, ranchers, and orchardmen—would pay the bill and pay it quickly.

REPAYMENT PERIOD EXTENDED

Twelve years later, after it became apparent that the 10-year period was too short, the Extension Act of 1914 stretched the repayment period to 20 years. Another 12 years demonstrated that still more time would be required, and in 1926 the Fact Finders Act extended the repayment period to 40 years. At the end of another 10 years it was necessary to stretch the repayment period to 50 years by adding a development period of 10 years ahead of the 40-year repayment program. Congress was trying to keep step with the growing cost of making land and the increasing problem of paying installments as they came due.

For our purposes tonight, we need not review the early sources of financing. There has been a reclamation fund, supplemented

by Treasury loans, by revenues from the Oil and Mineral Leasing Acts and some other sources including repayments from the water users.

SALT RIVER VALLEY PROJECT AND PUBLIC POWER

Of more interest to us is the 1906 change in the revenue picture—by coincidence brought about by the situation in this Salt River Valley.

During the construction of Roosevelt Dam it was found that electric energy was needed to operate construction machinery. So a very small hydropower plant was built. When the dam was completed the Government found that it had power to sell.

During the period, 1906 to 1922, the Government sold the power on a lease basis of up to 10 years. In 1922, the lease period was extended to 50 years. The extension probably is the basis for the present 50-year payout test for feasibility of reclamation power installations.

At any rate, as the realization grew that construction and operating costs of irrigation projects exceeded the ability of water users to repay, more and more attention was being shifted to the hydropower phases of proposed projects.

FACT FINDERS REPORT

In addition, a group known as the Fact Finders, under the chairmanship of the late Governor Campbell, of Arizona, succeeded in establishing a rigid land classification system which eliminated many bad projects. At first, reclamation advocates had assumed that almost any combination of land and water would produce crops. But a shrinking in total irrigable acres as a result of the land classifications threw an increased per-acre project cost upon the remaining irrigated acres. Farming, already unable to cope with the financial aspects of the projects, was being further penalized and power was called in to make up the deficit.

Other factors came along to add to the troubles. In the 1940's it was admitted that the cost of drainage facilities must be included in estimating total project costs. This meant that still more projects had to be rejected.

POWER REVENUES AID IRRIGATION

Then a sixfold rise in construction costs struck another blow to projects dependent upon water users for repayment. The undertakings became so enormously expensive that every remaining irrigation proposal in the West became automatically unfeasible if revenues from hydropower were unavailable.

During the period we have been reviewing, Hoover Dam, the first major reclamation power development, was authorized. Feasibility of the project hinged on obtaining power contracts prior to start of construction. The contracts were to be in sufficient amount to repay the cost of the structure within the 50-year period. The authorizing legislation made a further provision—no costs of the dam were to be allocated to the release of water for irrigation purposes, although such water was given high priority in the operation of the project.

So we had two contrasts by the mid-1930's Irrigation works alone were pretty largely a failure. Power structures, though, seemed to be endowed with a golden future, even with irrigation as a partner.

IRRIGATION-POWER ASPECTS MERGED

It was but a matter of time until the irrigation-power aspects of the reclamation program were being merged deliberately.

Perhaps the first such effort involved the Central Valley project in California. Here roughly one-fourth of the costs of this giant irrigation system are to be repaid from power revenues.

Having taken this step, Congress in 1938 authorized the Colorado Big Thompson project, limiting repayable costs by water users to 28.7 percent and providing that the balance of the Federal outlay would be reimbursed through the sale of power.

The following year, 1939, the Columbia Basin project, the largest multiple-purpose project ever undertaken anywhere, was authorized and more than 84 percent of the cost will be reimbursed by power sales.

The Missouri River Basin project, another large undertaking, requires irrigators to repay only one-fifth of the irrigation costs. On the upper Colorado River storage project the irrigation repayment requirement drops to 13.5 percent.

POWER ASPECTS WELL ESTABLISHED

Thus, the power-generation aspect of the reclamation program has become well established. If time could stand still, the remainder of the reclamation and irrigation program might be patterned after these multiple-purpose prototypes.

But time does not stand still. Just when we had found—in power—the solution to the problem of how to irrigate the desert, three new factors intruded to make difficult if not impossible the scheduling of future irrigation construction. They were: The higher cost of construction, the higher cost of money, and the postwar drop in agricultural prices. Since power from falling water is the real breadwinner and must pay four-fifths to seven-eighths of the total cost, the interest charged on the amount allocated to power holds the key to the future of all your dreams.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Suppose we call the roll of reclamation prospects and examine our future case by case.

To me, no area development is more important than the upper Colorado River storage project. Under general reclamation law, most reclamation projects pay 3 percent interest on the portion of cost allocated to power. REA gets money at 2 percent, but reclamation is expected to pay 3 percent. Why, I don't know; but the upper Colorado project is on a still different basis.

Senate bill 1555 of the 83d Congress was introduced to authorize the project. In section 2 it provided that:

"Interest on the unamortized balance of the investment in the commercial power features of the said project shall be returnable at a rate not less than the average rate paid by the United States on its long term bonds outstanding at the date of authorization of the project."

INTEREST RATE ESTABLISHED BY LAW

On April 1, 1954, the then Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, sent a draft bill covering changes in S. 1555 desired by his department and the Bureau of the Budget. That draft provided for repayment of unamortized balances at a rate—and I quote now from paragraph (e) of section 4:

"To be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year for which said appropriation is enacted, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date 15 or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent."

The intent of that language was incorporated into the version of S. 1555 reported to the 83d Congress. The provision as reported was carried forward in S. 500 of the 84th Congress and became the provision of Public Law 485 of the 84th Congress. I include the language again to make the reference complete. It is in paragraph (f) of section 5, as follows:

"(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public-debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum."

EFFECT OF CHANGE IN INTEREST RATE

What is the effect of changing from interest rate to market yield on long-term Government bonds? The bill was signed into law April 11, 1956, and the first money for Glen Canyon was made available. The market yield on long-term bonds during the month of June 1956 was 2⅞ percent. If appropriations had not been promptly sought and received, the interest charge against Glen Canyon would have been pegged at the rate effective during June of 1957 which was 3⅛ percent. That difference in rate would apply to any participating project started in fiscal 1958 and could be the difference in determining whether such a project would ever pay out and hence whether an appropriation to commence it would ever be justified.

We could have less concern if the project was being asked to pay what money costs the Government. On August 13, 1957, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Randolph Burgess, sent me a letter in reply to mine of August 3 showing that while the average rate on the interest-bearing debt as of July 31, 1956, was 2.605 percent and as of July 1, 1957, was 2.742 percent, the rate applicable to any participating project started after July 1, 1957, or during fiscal 1958 will be 3⅛ percent. I will attach to my address a table illustrating that fact. It is from a technical analysis of the public debt released by the Treasury Department July 1957.

Now what is the effect of a 3⅛ percent interest rate? And what will happen to other projects if their costs continue to climb and they have to be started under 3⅛ percent rate? Let's look again at Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams. Interest against them is charged at the average yield of long term bonds on June 30, 1956, which was 2⅞ percent. At that rate these projects will pay out in 47 years. If there had been 1 year's delay either in passing the authorizing legislation on the original upper Colorado River storage bill or the appropriation to start work on the dams, the interest rate would rise to 3⅛ percent and 80 years would have been required to pay out these 2 structures.

POWER COSTS ASSURED FIRST

Now the Colorado River storage project law requires that the power costs of these dams must be assured before any funds can become available from the sale of power to pay for the irrigation works associated with them under the act. Therefore, if 1 more year had intervened, money for participating projects would have been scheduled not in 47 years but in 80 years.

The Congress has many times had before it the central Arizona project including the Bridge Canyon Dam. Suppose the Congress were to authorize it the first day of the next session and the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House checked into its feasibility. A letter from Mr. Dexheimer, dated August 23, 1957, points out that at present prices the estimated cost allocable to power

at Bridge Canyon is about $340,600,000. If we used the same annual gross revenues of $11,880,000 estimated in House Document No. 136 of the 81st Congress and estimated net annual revenues of $7,586,000, the project can look feasible if money is cheap, but at 3⅞ percent interest which would be effective during fiscal year 1958, the average annual cost would be $19,146,000 and interest only would be $12,347,000 or nearly $5 million more than the net annual revenues from the Bridge Canyon project.

TRINITY PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Let's continue our rollcall of reclamation projects by taking a look at the Central Valley project in California, with the Trinity division. If expenditures to date on that project were indexed to reflect January 1957 costs, the total estimated construction cost, if undertaken at present prices, would increase about 27 percent. If that project had had to be constructed at these higher costs and at an interest rate of 3⅞ percent, the rough studies made by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that payout of the increased costs allocable to the power investment plus interest during construction would not have been possible since the annual net power revenues would be approximately $10,482,000 and would not be sufficient to meet the necessary annual interest charges.

Suppose we want to see what happens if we wanted to make a project of this nature feasible. The Bureau of Reclamation has computed that to achieve payout of the power investment in a 50-year period at an interest rate of 3⅞ percent, the annual net power revenues would have to be increased to about $18,300,000. Average firm power rates of about 7.6 mills per kilowatt-hour would be required to produce such annual net revenues. The present revenues from firm commercial energy average 4.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

I do not say that current could not be marketable at 7.6 mills. I do say that to change the firm commercial energy average rate from 4.5 mills to 7.6 mills would cause something in the nature of a revolution.

EFFECT ON MISSOURI BASIN PROJECT

The Missouri River Basin project at 3 percent interest can pay off in 61 years, but at 3⅞ percent it could never pay off because the interest costs on the power facilities exceed the net revenues.

The Colorado Big Thompson project will pay out in 41 years at 3 percent. But it would require 74 years at 3⅞ percent. If the rate should go to 4 percent, as some bankers think it will by next June 30 and if that rate were to be applied to it, the Colorado Big Thompson project could not pay out at all.

I have mentioned Hoover Dam, which will pay out within the 50-year limitation at the present 3 percent interest and existing power rates, but it would never pay out at 3⅞ percent since interest costs would exceed power revenues.

I have not mentioned the Columbia Basin project (Grand Coulee Dam) up to this point for a special reason. Power generated there is sold through the Bonneville Power Administration to be mixed with other power in the region. The arrangement is such that the Bonneville agency pays whatever the cost of the power may be. Even though Grand Coulee power may be very costly, the impact of its cost can be lessened when it is mingled with lower cost power if that need ever arises.

However, not even the Grand Coulee powerplant could have been expected to pay out at 3⅞ percent interest.

NEW PROJECTS FACE PROBLEMS

I have reviewed these projects well known to all of us to indicate the difficulty there will be in trying to put through additional reclamation projects when the Nation requires more food and fiber. Most of the great projects we have built in the past—Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee powerplant, whose projects on the Missouri Basin—would have been difficult if not impossible had the 3⅞ percent interest rate been applicable for the repayment of costs allocated to power. If we believe, as I am sure we do, that construction costs are going to continue to advance and that more and more reclamation projects will depend upon power revenues to bring irrigation costs within the capacity of farmers to repay, then we must recognize that if reclamation is to go on, the interest charge must come down, at least to a flat 3 percent figure and possibly lower.

The questions we are likely to be asked are: Do we need more irrigation? Do we need to develop more farmland when the Department of Agriculture is paying to have farmland taken out of cultivation and put into a soil bank?

IRRIGATION QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Two and a half years ago, actually April 19, 1955, in an address to the Senate of the United States on the subject "Reclamation—Food for the Future," I tried to answer these questions. I asserted that the population of the United States was on the loose, that we were having what I termed "a great baby boom." I tried to calculate how long it would take for our increasing population and our shrinking farmland to catch up fully with the then surplus production of food and fiber.

Tonight the population figures could be brought up to date. In my Senate talk, I had quoted the experts who estimated a 1975 population of 175 million persons. Against that I had given another estimate that went as high as 190 million persons. The U. S. News & World Report for October 4, 1957, gave the surprising figures that in 1957 there were 171 million people in the United States and that by 1967 there would be 202 million persons. In other words, by 1957 we had reached the population figure of 171 million, whereas the rather conservative figures which I had used only 2 years before had estimated a 1975 population of 175 million people.

GREAT POPULATION INCREASE FORECAST

The Census Bureau, according to Business Week of August 31, 1957, sees a 57.6 million increase in population by 1970. Add that to 171 million now and we can foresee a population of about 230 million. With the West as the fastest growing area, the need for many new reclamation projects to keep pace with rising population is now being demonstrated.

With the need for more irrigated acres easy to demonstrate and with money rates making project feasibility harder and harder to establish, the friends of reclamation must be ready to battle for their cause in the next Congress.

For there are enemies abroad in the land. The Wall Street Journal, in an article on August 19 and an editorial on August 23 last, took a double-barrel shot at reclamation. Their story by Ray Vicker said that one bureau of our Government—Reclamation—was planning to bring in 150,700 acres of new cropland and add supplementary water to another 93,000 acres, while a different agency—the Department of Agriculture—tabulated the farmland idled by the soil bank at 28.4 million acres. Mr. Vicker wondered why one agency is bringing new land into production while another is taking it out.

It is a fair question that we must meet and answer. Of course, I go into a barber shop and pay a barber to cut my hair and then give him an extra half dollar to rub into my scalp a tonic to make it grow again. Each spring and fall I put fertilizer on my lawn to make the grass grow higher and then go around with a power mower to cut it down. This, in the language of the Wall Street Journal editorial, is "fantastic and a bureaucratic extravaganza."

But the cold, hard facts are not fantastic. Abe Martin used to say, "It is funny how a man with facts can break up an argument." Before I made any claim that the increase in production per acre would not and could not keep pace with the steady decline in cropland and the amazing boom in population, I consulted the Department of Agriculture, where I am not entirely a stranger.

NEED FOR IRRIGATION FORECAST

The Department in a letter to me last September 24 dealt with this question. It anticipated a population of 230 million by 1975. Its studies indicated that with high level employment we might experience a 40-percent increase in market demand from 1956 to 1975. "While we now have overproduction and burdensome surpluses of agricultural products, total output," says the Department, "seems to be at an annual rate equal to that which may be needed 4 or 5 years hence." No irrigation project approved in 1956 or later can possibly be in a state of production by that time to cause any worry over its possible contribution to an already swollen agriculture storehouse.

The careful studies of the Department, giving full credibility to presently known improvements and later results of new research, indicate that there will be a need for new cropland. The production per acre index shows this. In 1942 the index stands at 100 and by 1954 it was only 101. The great increases in production per acre are behind us. The first use of hybrid corn, the first lavish spreading of high-powered fertilizer shot the index up 25 percent in a few years; but these days are over now and we are not likely to see any equivalent new force even from atomic development.

I look at the prospect of 3 million new mouths to be fed in America every year. I look at a million acres of cropland being lost to shopping centers, highways, and airports every year. I then draw but a single conclusion: our fight must be intensified; pending projects must be approved; new projects must come off the drawing boards and go before the Congress for ultimate approval; reclamation must go on.

---

## Designation of Alexander Hamilton Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, I am happy to report that at ceremonies on the south plaza of the Treasury Building, on last Saturday—the 201st anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton—the short street south of that building, formerly known as Treasury Place, was officially designated by its new name, Alexander Hamilton Place.

I feel that the naming of a street in our National Capital after our first Secretary of the Treasury, who contributed perhaps more than any other single American to the development and adoption of our cherished American Constitution, is highly appropriate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

the addresses delivered on that occasion by Fred C. Scribner, Jr., the Under Secretary of the Treasury; by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; and by me.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUNDT

Today we ring down the curtain on the year-long observance of Alexander Hamilton's bicentennial. In recommending the establishment of an Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission the Judiciary Committee had this to say in its report to the Senate:

"The Commission shall have the duty of preparing plans and a program for signalizing the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

"Alexander Hamilton was born on the island of Nevis in the British West Indies on January 11, 1757. It was in the American Revolution that Alexander Hamilton stood with Washington and Franklin in developing the basis of what is today our great Federal Republic. Hamilton was the fertile mind and organizing genius of President Washington's administrations. For this great work he has been described as the architect of the American Union. Hamilton represented the conservative mind in its most brilliant and useful form. His devotion to the free press, to free speech, and to the institutions of freemen is too little appreciated. The finest monument that could be erected would be an adequate edition of his writings. Such an edition would not be merely a monument to Hamilton—it would be a genuine and enduring contribution to the Nation which he labored so ardently to create. The committee is of the opinion that the works of Hamilton would be particularly appropriate in this era of world history, when so many countries throughout the world are struggling with the problem of self-government or trying to find a proper formula to use in adopting for themselves the self-government best suited to their environment, capabilities, and abilities, and the making available to those people the complete works of Alexander Hamilton will serve not only this Republic, but the world."

I am happy to tell you that this monument is being erected with private funds. Columbia University has received an initial grant of $200,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation and Time, Inc., to edit and publish The Papers of Alexander Hamilton. This work is in the hands of a distinguished editorial board headed by Dr. John A. Krout, vice president and provost of Columbia University and a member of the Hamilton commission. The editor is Dr. Harold C. Syrett and the assistant editor is Jacob E. Cooke. The Hamilton commission has aided this project by a worldwide search for letters and documents that had long been lost or hidden from view.

The commission's approach has been to stimulate others into activity and to guide their efforts. In this we have had considerable success. A large one-volume edition of Hamilton's writings was published by Dial Press. Somewhat abbreviated, this same work was published by Pocket Books, and sells for 35 cents. A one-volume biography was published by McGraw-Hill; and the first volume of a two-volume biography has been published by Macmillan. The Liberal Arts Press has published two Hamilton books, each in cloth and in paper covers—mainly for students.

The commission also developed programs for the high schools and for the colleges and universities. Many of the latter had special lectures on Hamilton, emphasized his work in history and government classes and seminars, and had library exhibits. In the high schools contests were held for Alexander Hamilton scholarships—one in each State, Territory, possession, and the District of Columbia. The 55 winners were brought to Independence Hall in Philadelphia to take part in a 4-day students constitutional convention where 13 national winners were selected for additional scholarships. This entire scholarship program was financed by private funds which were raised by a special committee headed by Frederick C. Crawford, of Cleveland, Ohio.

These are but some of the Hamilton commission's achievements. Together with others, which I do not have time to describe, we believe we have contributed much to a better understanding of Alexander Hamilton's great work in getting the Constitution written, in getting it ratified, and in getting the Federal Government organized under that instrument of government under which we live today.

In closing the year-long observance of Hamilton's bicentennial, I am happy to announce that, at the commission's request, the National Park Service will change the name of the street on which the Treasury Building faces from Treasury Place to Alexander Hamilton Place.

This will be a fitting tribute to the man who, more than any other, thought out the Constitution of the United States and the Government of the Union organized under it; and, out of the chaos and utter confusion after the Revolution, raised a structure of government, every part of which is imbued with his ideas and principles. These ideas and principles—the eternal truths of government—have, we hope, become better known and understood through the efforts of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

I now read you the letter from Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton designating the renaming of Treasury Place as Alexander Hamilton Place:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, D. C., January 10, 1958.*

Hon. KARL MUNDT,
*Chairman, Alexander Hamilton*
*Bicentennial Commission,*
*4026 Main Treasury Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR KARL: With further reference to your very fine suggestion of December 23, 1957, on behalf of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, recommending the change of the name of Treasury Place—which runs between 15th Street and Executive Avenue East—to Alexander Hamilton Place, I am glad to inform you that we feel the suggestion is a very worthy one. It is hereby approved.

We have made no announcement of this change as we feel it would be only fitting that the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission make the announcement in such manner and at such time as they may wish.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. SEATON,
*Secretary of the Interior.*

---

ALEXANDER HAMILTON ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

My home State of Massachusetts has a special interest in Alexander Hamilton. It was at the port of Boston that young Hamilton landed in October of 1772 when he came to the mainland for his education and, as it turned out, to make a permanent home. And it was after a trip to Boston in early 1774 that he returned to New York convinced of the righteousness of the colonial cause, so convinced that he promptly began writing and speaking in behalf of freedom.

In reflecting on the achievements of Alexander Hamilton, it is impossible to escape recognition of the great contribution which he made to our Nation in its infancy. He has left his imprint in the institutions of our Government and in the philosophies and ideals by which we work. As our first Secretary of the Treasury, his policies and actions laid vital blocks in the foundation upon which our Federal Government and our Nation has grown. His strong belief in a federalized nation and in a strong Central Government were of immense importance in bringing together the resources of our Nation for a common purpose. Even today, although we retain the sovereignty of our States, we realize more and more the fundamental importance of what he told us—the necessity for fiscal integrity—the necessity for a Federal Government with the power to marshal the resources of this vast country, of ever-increasing importance in the missile age we are now entering.

Though we look with great pride to these significant achievements and contributions, we should by no means overlook the brilliance of his military career. In 1776 he commanded a New York artillery company which he had equipped largely from his own resources. He fought with General Washington in the battles of New York and across New Jersey. From 1777 to 1881 he served on General Washington's staff. Not only did he perform many sensitive and delicate missions for Washington, but he won great distinction on the battlefield.

In fact, in Yorktown in 1781 Hamilton led the final American charge, capturing the vital position that brought about the surrender of Cornwallis.

As a Member of the Continental Congress, Hamilton worked in behalf of the young Republic. He did much to bring about the Annapolis Convention which, in turn, led to the calling of the Constitutional Convention in 1787. At this Convention as New York's delegate, he vigorously worked for a strong and stable government. The Federalist Papers which he wrote in collaboration with James Madison and John Jay still are among the most important documents in amplification of the formation of the Constitution of the United States.

Throughout his life Hamilton maintained an intense interest in military affairs. He was the first advocate of a national military academy for officer corps training. Not only did he draft a detailed curriculum for such an institute, but in mid-1790 he formally recommended to President Washington the establishment of a naval academy. Though Washington, just before his death, strongly endorsed this project it was some years before Congress established first the Military and later the Naval Academies. Hamilton instituted the United States Coast Guard, always an arm of the Treasury.

In 1798 he rejected a United States Senate seat to serve as a major general in the Army. He was in command of all our military forces north of the Potomac, in the Northwest, and along the Mississippi. Upon Washington's death, Hamilton became the commanding general of the United States Army. He worked unceasingly to strengthen the Armed Forces and our coastal defenses. When the danger of war with France subsided, he made a final inspection tour that satisfied him that our defenses had been greatly strengthened. He then resigned his military command.

Our country and its government owe much to this great soldier, this creative, foresighted statesman, able author, and loyal patriotic citizen. We honor his memory with gratitude for what he did for us and with pride in his accomplishments.

---

ADDRESS BY HON. FRED C. SCRIBNER, JR., UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT CEREMONIES MARKING CLOSING OF THE HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL

Mr. Gordon, President Platt, Senators Mundt, Saltonstall, fellow Americans, this

morning's ceremony marks the 201st anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton the first Secretary of the Treasury. It is also the concluding ceremony of the year-long observance of the 200th anniversary of Hamilton's birthday, a program planned and directed with great effectiveness by the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission under the chairmanship of Senator MUNDT.

It is a privilege and honor for me, as a representative of the Treasury Department, to join in this ceremony sponsored by one of our great national patriotic organizations, the Sons of the Revolution.

Americans are busy people. We are vitally concerned with the present and the future. Because of these concerns, we are as a nation frequently remiss in honoring the great men of past generations whose leadership and abilities have contributed so much to the strength and character of our country. We should more frequently pause in our daily tasks to note and learn from the works of those who provided leadership during the early days of this Nation. Through knowledge of the challenges met by these leaders and through study of their contributions, we would find inspiration and strength as we seek solutions for the problems and concerns which are ours today.

The Sons of the Revolution, by this ceremony, participated in by representatives of the Armed Forces, the church and two of the most distinguished Members of the Senate of the United States, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, speak the gratitude and appreciation of all of the people of this country as we pause for a few brief moments this morning to place a wreath on this statue of Hamilton which stands here before the Treasury and in sight of the Capitol and the White House.

As a young man of 32, Alexander Hamilton became the first Secretary of the Treasury. He had been a bold and vigorous military leader in the Revolution. As a Representative of the State of New York, he had participated in the Constitutional Convention. Upon the completion of the drafting of the Constitution, he led a vigorous campaign to secure its ratification by his State. He was the leader of the Federalist group which in the New York ratifying convention secured approval of the Constitution by three votes. His voice and his pen were mighty forces in securing the acceptance by the young Nation of the Constitution which became the charter of our great country.

When Alexander Hamilton took office as Secretary of the Treasury, there was no public credit. Hamilton created it. It was he who insisted on funding the national debt and planned the creation of a sinking fund to satisfy the Government's bonds as they became due. It was he who insisted that certain obligations incurred by the States in the cause of the Union should be paid by the new Central Government. The credit of the new Government became firmly established under Hamilton's careful planning.

Each day in the Treasury we honor Alexander Hamilton. His portrait occupies a place of honor in the private office of the Secretary. We honor Hamilton by following in many areas programs and practices which he instituted so many years ago. We honor him through the continuation in the Treasury of many of the functions of the department which he wisely established in the first days of the Treasury's existence. He conceived and organized the United States Coast Guard to help enforce our customs laws and protect the revenue, and this fine service remains to this day under Treasury jurisdiction. He established the United States Mint. He organized under the Treasury a hospital for seamen, which developed into the United States Public Health Service, now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

But Hamilton's real greatness lies in the contribution which he made in giving life and vitality to a paper Constitution. We can agree with Dean Louis Hacker in his estimate of Hamilton:

"A theoretical frame of government is one thing; the creation of an administrative machinery under which such high hopes can be translated into reality is another. This latter was Hamilton's accomplishment; and that is why, when men gather to reflect on the governmental process, which, with justice, can maintain order and yet encourage the individual in the full play of his creative powers to reflect, work, and produce, they must honor Alexander Hamilton."

We cannot, however, sum up Hamilton's contribution in the Treasury better than was done by Henry Cabot Lodge in his study of Alexander Hamilton, when he said, "Hamilton exercised the powers granted by the Constitution, pointed out those which lay hidden in its dry clauses, and gave vitality to the lifeless instrument. He drew out the resources of the country, he exercised the powers of the Constitution, he gave courage to the people, he laid the foundations of the National Government—and this was the meaning and result of the financial policy."

It is entirely fitting that the close of the very successful Hamilton bicentennial should be observed here today under the auspices of the Sons of the Revolution and with the participation of the Bicentennial Commission. Both have added materially to public awareness and knowledge of one of our great national leaders. Hamilton's greatness lives on in the Treasury and in the Nation.

---

## The Splendid Role of Educational Television and of Station WHA–TV

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, education has always been important in America, from the days of the frontier settlements in the Thirteen Colonies, through modern times. But today, in the age of sputnik and intercontinental missiles, in the age of the United Nations and the World Atomic Energy Agency, education is more of a necessity than ever before in our history. I mean education in right ideas, as well as in machines, education in the intangibles as well as the tangibles.

Inevitably, the American people are taking a close look at their educational system. They seek to determine its strength and its weaknesses, in order to better serve the needs of our country and of our youngsters themselves.

Even the wearers of rose-colored glasses would admit that there are a good many things wrong with American education, but there is plenty that is right and constructive and wholesome in American education, as well.

It is our task to build upon the solid foundations which have already been laid by the devoted teaching profession in our land, and by parents, as well. One such solid foundation is the miracle medium of educational television. It is a part of the broader foundation of increased overall use of audio-visual materials.

This represents one of the most exciting new chapters in the history of United States education. In particular, the growing use of television has emerged as one of the most distinguishing characteristics on the American teaching scene.

Illustrative of this situation, I have been pleased to prepare a statement on the subject of the splendid role which one educational television station plays—the fifth such educational TV station to go on the air in the Nation—the award-winning station, WHA–TV, Madison. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

A deep interest in communications has long been a distinguishing characteristic of the people of Wisconsin and of their State university.

It is no accident that WHA, Madison, the University of Wisconsin's radio station, enjoys the title of "The Oldest Station in the Nation." It had its origins in experimental "wireless telephone" transmissions over station 9–XM in 1917, followed by scheduled program service which began in 1919.

The Wisconsin School of the Air, founded in 1931, is the oldest continuing broadcast service on a statewide basis. It provides programs in creative art, music, science, nature study, history, language, arts and other subjects, to add to, and enrich, classroom teaching in elementary schools.

Since September, 1933, station WHA has provided, as well, organized, systematic instruction at the college level through the College of the Air.

In 1945, came the development of a State FM radio network to augment and extend the services of station WHA. The 8 FM stations, as well as station WLBL, the AM outlet in the central part of the State, are operated by the State Radio Council.

BIRTH OF EDUCATIONAL TV IN MADISON

Inevitably, with the onset of television, Wisconsin pioneering, once more, came to the fore. A closed-circuit TV laboratory was provided in the university in 1952. In 1953, the far-sighted Wisconsin legislature authorized the university and the other agencies of the State Radio Council to construct and operate an experimental television station. This action paved the way for the establishment of WHA–TV. On May 3, 1954, it began programed operations.

In the almost 4 years which have elapsed, station WHA–TV has provided some of the brightest chapters in nationwide educational television.

As elsewhere, the record has not been without its problems—birth pains and growing pains, financial and otherwise.

Taxpayer controversy has raged over the question of the further extent to which public funds should be used in educational television in Wisconsin or, for that matter, the rest of the Nation.

But the solid record of achievement of WHA–TV speaks for itself in terms of tremendous contributions to all phases of Wisconsin life.

We have, indeed, been fortunate in the high caliber of men and women associated with WHA–TV. The State university's division of radio-television education handles not only the broadcasting phase, but instruction and research. The overall mission is to produce graduates with a broad

competence in the many specific skills in these fields, as well as to produce a growing body of pioneering experimental findings.

TRIBUTE TO FUND FOR ADULT EDUCATION

This very brief review of the background and contributions of WHA–TV could not be complete without paying tribute to the Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education which provided the grant-in-aid of $100,000 which made it possible for the station to be constructed in the first place. Few seeds have ever grown to such fruition as has the Ford Foundation's splendid aid to educational TV in this country.

Nor can even so brief a report be complete without reference to the splendid contributions of the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor, Mich., which, for example, provides approximately one-third of WHA's filmed programs.

FINE AID BY COMMERCIAL TV

Let this point be noted, too. In discussing educational television in the 48 States, I do not believe that anyone should commit the error of failing to observe the very important role played in educational activities by commercial television in our land. After all, commercial television is the fundamental type of TV in America. American sponsors have not only paid the bills of the vast TV industry, they have made it possible—directly and indirectly—for commercial TV to aid educational TV.

I might mention at this point that the other day I was pleased to receive a very beautifully illustrated and eloquent book entitled "Educational Television and Groucho Marx" published by the National Broadcasting Co. It describes what I regard as a most enheartening story of the contributions made by commercial television; in this instance, by the NBC network, to educational television.

I like the thoughts expressed by Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, president of NBC, who said: "Every citizen has a stake in the success with which these stations carry out their mission. The drastic shortage of teachers and classrooms lends special urgency to their efforts to build themselves into a major educational force. Those of us in television have an interest beyond that of the average citizen to lend such support as we can in solving these problems."

He has faithfully put his words into deeds by, for example, the splendid live programs produced by NBC in cooperation with the Educational Television and Radio Center.

But WHA–TV is my basic theme today. For it symbolizes what I regard as some of the very best work in educational television anywhere.

But now let the station tell its own story. I include now excerpts from a report which it filed last midyear, describing the type of program which it carries. At the conclusion is a list of the able members of the university's radio-television committee, together with its radio-TV instructional staff.

---

EXCERPTS FROM WHA–TV REPORT IN JUNE 1957

B. TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Following are brief descriptions of the major program areas and examples, indicating the range, scope, and variety of programs produced by WHA–TV during its first 3 years of experimentation.

*1. Organized instruction for adults*

These were programs planned as continuing series or courses for out-of-school listening on the adult level. Some were rather informal; others closely paralleled traditional course offerings.

The university extension division produced telecourses in foreign languages, piano playing, music appreciation, and psychology. The latter course, consisting of 54 half-hour programs, was offered for college credit along with the correspondence course requirements.

A list of courses broadcast is given subsequently, and information about research which accompanied the broadcasts is to be found in section IV.

Two informal telecourses on the college level should be noted:

(a) And the World Listened: 13 half-hour programs presented dramatic reenactments of memorable speeches by world-famous orators whose words reflected and shaped the times in which they lived and spoke. Prof. Frederick W. Haberman, chairman of the department of speech, served as consultant and narrator for the series.

(b) The National Government: 12 half-hour programs designed to further understanding of the structure and workings of our Federal system of government. The TV teacher was Ralph Huitt, professor of political science, who used a variety of visual materials, including newsreel clips and film footage shot especially for the series. This series evolved from a correspondence course developed by Professor Huitt for the extension division under its contract with United States Armed Forces Institute. The Department of Defense urged the development of the television series, kines of which it purchased for use in military installations around the world as instructional films and for broadcast to troops overseas through its system of television transmitters.

Kinescope recordings of both of these series have been placed in the film library of the bureau of audiovisual instruction and are available for schools and study groups as well as for broadcast by commercial stations in Wisconsin.

Many other telecourses, originating at other universities and colleges, were broadcast by WHA–TV by means of kinescopes and films supplied by the educational television and radio center. These are listed in appendix A.

*2. Vocational information and instruction*

The department of agricultural journalism of the university, which produces the farm and home radio features over the State radio facilities, was among the first agencies to participate in WHA–TV's programing. From the first week until October 4, 1956, it presented two programs a week in each of two areas:

(a) Today's Home: Quarter-hour programs presenting authentic information and demonstrations on homemaking methods and practices—consumer information, child care, nutrition, etc. The program featured specialists from the school of home economics and Agricultural Extension Service.

(b) Today's Farm: Quarter-hour programs serving farmer interests with latest findings in vocational agriculture: market information, livestock management, farm equipment, soil conservation, etc. The program utilized specialists from the college of agriculture and the Agricultural Extension Service.

The two series gave agricultural and home economics specialists opportunity to acquire considerable training and experience in television. In 1956, because of budget reductions and the need to reach wider audiences, the Department of Agricultural Journalism terminated its television production and confined its work in the medium to developing 5-minute films.

During 1954 the State Department of Agriculture produced a series aimed at farming interests, the Wisconsin Farm Picture, which emphasized crop reporting and predictions.

For housewives a series of special interest was Let's Go Shopping, presented in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. It provided latest consumer information, shopping tips, and data on the best buys in foods and textiles.

Living and Learning, produced by the Madison Vocational and Adult School, presented over a 2-year period a great variety of vocational material. Notable series concerned the Heart Kitchen, child care, driver education, and home safety.

*3. News and discussion*

(a) Spot news: From the beginning WHA–TV carried a daily quarter-hour newscast presented in cooperation with the school of journalism. The newscasts were planned to give news of significance to viewers in the area and to go behind the news for pertinent background information, supplied usually by interviews with authorities and visiting specialists. The United Press wire provided news reports, and visuals were derived from the United Press photo service, the U. W. News Service, and other sources. Some feature materials and pictures were supplied by students in the courses in Radio-Television News.

(b) Discussion: This is an area in which WHA–TV has done some of its most significant programing. The station feels that it has a special responsibility for critical inquiry into problems of public concern; accordingly, it has presented a continuing schedule of forums, debates, press conferences, and discussion programs.

* * * * *

*4. Programs for children and youth*

(a) Out-of-school programs: In this area WHA-TV has achieved recognized success. Before the start of operations, parents and teachers indicated that they felt WHA–TV could make a valuable contribution to children's programs for home viewing; accordingly, considerable effort was directed at fulfilling this expectation. Developments included:

(1) The Friendly Giant: This program, created by Robert Homme, was first broadcast on the inaugural program of WHA–TV, May 3, 1954, and has continued on a five-per-week basis ever since. A quiet, relaxed bedtime program for young children, it presents musical games and a reading of children's books in an appealing setting of a castle inhabited by a friendly giant with various puppet friends. The program has won three first awards in national competition at the Institute for Education by Radio-Television, and kinescope films of the program have been distributed nationally for broadcast by other educational stations and commercial stations as well.

(2) Play Tree: This was a puppet-show series presented for late afternoon viewing, emphasizing songs and the teaching of social values for children.

(3) The Play Wagon: This series of 13 experimental programs made use of television to stimulate young people's participation in creative dramatics.

(4) Views of Youth: This was an extended series providing information and ideas about social behavior and recreation for teen-agers. Subjects ranged from hints on grooming and fashions to suggestions on how to study and how to build a "hi-fi" set. Guidance for the series was provided by a board comprising students and faculty advisers from the area high school.

b. In-school programs: Early efforts in this area were directed at testing the television effectiveness of certain radio programs and teachers known to be successful on the Wisconsin School of the Air. Brief experimental series included programs in drawing, science, nature study, and rhythmic games. Subsequent programs for schools were developed especially for television. They included series in conservation, American history through folksongs and pictures, Wisconsin history as related in children's books, social studies, and arithmetic. Distinctive among these was Figure It Out, planned and presented by Prof. Sara A. Rhue, elementary

teaching specialist in the University of Wisconsin School of Education. A trial series was broadcast in 1955, followed by a revised and expanded series in 1956. The programs were designed to enrich the study of arithmetic by relating the story of the development of our number system through many years and many lands.

Program viewing in the classrooms was arranged in cooperation with the Madison public school system and supervising teachers of Dane County. A total of 36 schools participated in the experiments over the 3-year period.

*5. Special features*

In this group were a number of one-time-only broadcasts which were not a part of the regular schedule. Such programs included several special dramatic productions and a great number of "remote" programs originated outside the studios.

The first "remote" special feature was a broadcast of Governor Kohler's message to the joint session of the Wisconsin Legislature, January 13, 1955. This broadcast was originated in the assembly chamber of the State capitol and was fed to the WHA-TV transmitter by microwave relay.

As the station acquired more "remote" facilities, it increased its broadcast of programs originating outside of the studios. Coaxial cables leading from the studios to various points on the campus and the conversion of a used truck into a mobile unit permitted the origination of programs directly from the scene. Play rehearsals, concerts, and convocations were given from the Wisconsin Union Theater, and tours of art exhibits were presented from the Memorial Union galleries. A regular series of university symphony orchestra rehearsals was broadcast from Music Hall, and several tours were made of exhibits in the first-floor galleries of the State Historical Society and of its museum. In several instances the station was able to make temporary cable installations to enable it to pick up programs from buildings and grounds in proximity to the studios. Such on-the-spot programs were presented from the printing laboratory of the journalism school, the hydraulics laboratory, and the Lake laboratory, as well as from the union terrace and the lakeshore area.

The 30 special events remotes broadcast by WHA-TV, in addition to the January 1955 broadcast from the State capitol, included the La Follette Centennial Address by Chief Justice Warren, June 19, 1955, State Historical Library; the "Sifting and Winnowing" Plaque Rededication Ceremonies, February 15, 1957, Bascom Hall, and Lincoln Terrace; University of Wisconsin Honors Convocation, June 14, 1957, Wisconsin Union Theater.

*6. General programs*

(a) Drama: A good deal of effort was devoted to experiments in finding simple, inexpensive ways to present dramatic materials on television for educational needs.

Medea, the first full-scale drama, was completely staged in costume in a studio 15 x 30 feet with a cast of 16. The total effort involved 1,600 hours by 60 people and involved an out-of-pocket cost of $147.37, of which $55 went for composition board to cover the studio floors so cameras could be rolled smoothly.

Festival for Easter was a full-hour production telling the Easter story as interpreted in music, painting, and drama. It included participation of a 30-voice a capella choir and the staging of a medieval blank-verse drama of the Resurrection. Other full-hour drama presentations included Premiers (three original one-acts), The Imaginary Invalid, and The Shoemaker's House.

A number of student plays originally given in the Play Circle Theater of the Memorial Union were transferred to the TV studio and with some compression and modification presented as television plays.

Dress rehearsals of the Wisconsin Player's productions of Trial by Jury and School for Scandal were broadcast directly from the stage of the Wisconsin Union Theater.

• • • • • • •

In rehearsal, Twelfth Night. This was a series of five hour-long readings utilizing the rehearsal technique, including comments by the director and questions from the cast, to illuminate Shakespeare's play. The series progressed from the first reading, through blocking and stage business, to a final full-dress performance of one scene.

Drama of Poetry. Readers were used to illustrate points made in Prof. Harry Glicksman's lectures on poetic literature.

The TV Drama Quartet, presented on alternate weeks during the winter of 1956–57, was designed to explore the TV possibilities of readings of a variety of dramatic literature. Programs included Antigone, Electra, The Wasteland, and Prometheus Bound.

(b) Dance: Members of Orchesis, the dance organization of the university, participated in a variety of WHA-TV programs. They played a prominent role in the production of Medea, in which original dance sequences were used to separate the scenes; produced In Season, a special program of original dances and music interpreting poetry of E. E. Cummings; presented a series of lecture demonstrations on elements of the dance; and produced a weekly quarter-hour program called Dance Impromptu consisting of dance improvisations set to classical and modern music.

(c) Music: Music offerings have been greatly varied. They ranged from performances by artists on the School of Music faculty (Pro Arte Quartet, Gunnar Johansen, Leo Steffens) and concerts by choruses and instrumental groups, to quiz programs and courses in playing the piano and music appreciation. Included were:

Looking at Music—telecourse in music appreciation by Prof. Sigfrid Prager.

Key to Music—a series of 32 half-hour illustrated talks by Prof. Hilmar Luckhardt on the elements of music.

Playing the Piano—beginning piano lessons taught on television by Prof. Leon Iltis.

Do You Know Music?—an informal quiz program utilizing a panel of experts to answer a variety of questions about music and composers.

Symphony Rehearsal—a remote pickup from Music Hall of actual rehearsals of the University of Wisconsin Symphony Orchestra. Conductor Richard Church stopped and started the orchestra in accordance with developments and occasionally turned to the TV audience to discuss some phase of the music.

Rather extensive use was made of folk music, in such series as Wisconsin Is My Doorstep, The Play Tree, Song Pictures of America, and America in Verse and Song.

The Art of Listening was an informal music appreciation series in which fine recorded music was played, with the host and viewer listening together.

(d) Literature: In addition to the dramatic literature previously mentioned, other types of literature—stories and poetry—have been the subject of experimentation. Prof. Raymond Stanley, working with Professors Pooley and Glicksman, presented a number of poetry programs (Drama in Poetry, Drama of Poetry), and with Balladier Ed Sprague, presented a combination of poetry, picture, and song (America in Verse and Song).

During June 1957, Of Books and Such, a series of experimental programs using the informal panel quiz approach to literature was presented with promising results.

(e) Art: WHA-TV has made extensive use of television to bring current area art exhibits into the home. Program series known as Gallery and Arts in Revue presented portions of major exhibitions held in Madison. Paintings, ceramics, sculpture, and graphics were brought to the studio for televising, accompanied by comment by the artists or art experts. Exhibits have been transported to the studio from the Madison Free Library, Vocational School, School of Education, Memorial Library, and the Madison Savings & Loan Building. In some instances cameras have been taken directly to the galleries in the memorial union or historical library for on-the-spot television tours of the exhibits.

C. PROGRAM RESOURCES AND PARTICIPANTS

Another aspect of the experimental nature of WHA-TV has been reflected in a very active exploration of program resources of the State, university, and community, and a search for personnel who can effectively communicate on television. As indicated below, there has been extensive and widespread participation by many agencies and institutions.

*1. State agencies*

(a) University: The university serves as the main source of program originations for WHA-TV in accordance with its obligation to develop improved learning tools and techniques and to extend its benefits to the people of the State. Approximately 35 percent of the WHA-TV program originations during the first 3 years came from the university. Many departments and divisions participated, with the extension division as the main contributor. Other instructional units which made extensive contributions are: college of agriculture, school of home economics, school of music, department of speech, school of medicine, the department of athletics, the school of journalism, and the department of physical education—women.

Many faculty members participated in the form of occasional appearances and, in some cases, in sustained series. Such participation, with the exception of two series produced by the extension division, was on a voluntary basis without extra compensation or reduced teaching load.

University students participated by serving on camera crews, as panelists (Quiz the Professor), and as actors, musicians, readers, and dancers in a variety of broadcasts.

(b) State boards, commissions, departments: State agencies participated extensively, particularly during the first year, in exploring the potentials of television for their purposes. The Department of Agriculture and the Conservation Commission presented program series, and others presented several periodic broadcasts. Most of the participation was in a program entitled "At Your Service," a series designed to promote a better understanding of the functions and services of our State government.

• • • • •

*2. Civic groups, quasi-official agencies, etc.*

A variety of organizations and public service agencies contributed to the program service. These ranged from municipal institutions such as schools and libraries to local chapters of organizations such as the Red Cross, Boy Scouts of America, and the Association for Mental Health. The Men's Service Clubs of Madison took part in a series of seven programs under the title of "Civic Service." Some agencies produced complete series: State Medical Society (March of Medicine), and American Automobile Association (Wisconsin Weekend). The Madison Vocational and Adult School presented a continuing series of weekly half-hour programs throughout the school years 1955–56 and 1956–57 under the general title of "Living and Learning."

*3. Federal agencies*

Representatives of Government agencies, particularly agents of various agricultural branches, were frequent guests on WHA–TV programs. One series, Let's Go Shopping, was presented under the auspices of the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture.

A generous number of public service announcements, slides, and film clips were used in behalf of such agencies as Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marine recruitment, United States Treasury Department, Social Security Administration, Veterans' Administration, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

*4. National and international agencies*

Spot announcements and film clips were presented for many charitable and social service agency promotions: muscular dystrophy, mental health, crippled children, March of Dimes, etc.

Film program sources included the British Information Service, United Nations, India Information Service, and the National Film Board of Canada.

*5. Educational television and radio center*

The main source of educational TV programs is the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor, Mich. The center acquires and distributes kinescopes and films to affiliated educational television stations across the Nation. It provided WHA–TV with an average of 5 hours of filmed programs per week (approximately a third of the schedule) and thus gave Madison area viewers the opportunity of seeing the best of the educational TV programs produced across the Nation. Many programs featured distinguished scholars, artists, musicians, and scientists who would otherwise be unavailable to the community.

In 1957, the center cooperated with the National Broadcasting Co. to present a live network program service to educational stations on the basis of 5 programs a week for 13 weeks. These and other center programs are listed in appendix A.

D. ADDITIONAL USES OF WHA–TV PROGRAMS

*1. National distribution*

Through the making and distribution of kinescope recordings (TV films) certain WHA–TV programs are given lasting value and extended use A notable example is the Friendly Giant, popular children's program originated by WHA–TV and currently broadcast by 18 educational stations throughout the country. Under a special arrangement with the Educational Television and Radio Center, the university laboratory has made 156 kinescopes of the Friendly Giant, thereby enabling other educational stations to broadcast the feature three times weekly for a year without repetition.

*2. To Armed Forces overseas*

During 1956 WHA–TV produced 12 programs in a series, the National Government, designed to show how our Government functions and to build better understanding of American democracy. The programs, produced in cooperation with the university extension division and the United States Department of Defense, are to be broadcast by television stations at military installations overseas and used as films for special study purposes by Armed Forces elsewhere.

*3. Commercial stations*

From the beginning the university extension division has made kinescope recordings of its television productions for distribution by the bureau of audiovisual instruction. These are available to commercial stations and have been broadcast by stations in Eau Claire, Green Bay, La Crosse, Madison, Marinette, Milwaukee, and Wausau.

*4. Schools and study groups*

Since a kinescope recording is actually a 16 mm. film, it can be used in classrooms and for adult group study wherever a projector is available. The bureau of audiovisual instruction lists eight series of WHA–TV programs in its 1957 film catalog.

E. AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

Two WHA–TV-produced programs have been accorded recognition at the Annual Exhibition of Educational Radio and Television Programs conducted by Ohio State University at Columbus, Ohio.

The Friendly Giant won a first award in the children's out-of-school classification for 3 consecutive years, 1955-57. Quiz the Professor won an honorable mention in 1956 in the classification of public affairs programs.

Further recognition for WHA–TV came in the form of a contract from the Educational Television and Radio Center to produce 13 full-hour dramatic programs, Great Plays in Rehearsal, based on a trial series of four programs presented during the spring of 1956. This should result in a series of significant programs in an area hitherto unexplored by educational television stations.

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN DIVISION OF RADIO-TELEVISION EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY RADIO-TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Henry L. Ewbank, department of speech (chairman).

Henry L. Ahlgren, associate director of agricultural extension.

Frederick W. Haberman, department of speech.

Glenn Koehler, department of electrical engineering.

Allan W. Ostar, university extension division.

Robert C. Pooley, department of integrated liberal studies.

Lindley J. Stiles, dean, school of education.

Robert Taylor, director, university news service.

Walter A. Wittich, school of education.

RADIO-TELEVISION INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

Harold B. McCarty, professor of radio-television education and director, division of radio-television education.

Robert N. Dick, coordinator, radio-television, university extension division.

S. Watson Dunn, associate professor of journalism and commerce.

Harold A. Engel, professor of radio-television education.

Henry L. Ewbank, professor of speech.

William G. Harley, professor of radio-television education.

Mrs. Aline W. Hazard, assistant professor of agricultural journalism.

Arlene McKellar, associate professor of radio-television education.

Jerry C. McNeely, assistant professor of speech.

Ordean G. Ness, assistant professor of speech.

Karl F. Schmidt, assistant professor of radio-television education.

James A. Schwalbach, associate professor of agricultural and extension education.

Raymond J. Stanley, associate professor of radio-television education.

John H. Stiehl, associate professor of radio-television education.

Robert Taylor, director, university news service; associate professor of journalism.

Donald J. Voegeli, assistant professor of radio-television education.

Roy C. Vogelman, associate professor of radio-television education.

Maurice E. White, associate professor of agricultural journalism.

## Tight Money Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, during the year 1957 the Federal Reserve Board rapidly—and in my opinion recklessly—applied the tight money policy to the economy of the United States. Again Members of Congress called attention to the dangers which the policy invited. As a result, we are now in a recession. Unemployment is at its highest point in 8 years. Farm problems which have been severe have been made worse and the trek of farm families away from the farms where they can no longer make a living has been increased.

Housing construction, one of the greatest of the employers of labor, hit a postwar low in 1957. Capital expansion of industry is down. In many communities necessary schools could not be built. More and more small businesses have gone to the wall. In the last five months or more billions of dollars have been cut from the value of stocks listed on the stock exchanges.

The Federal Reserve System has made one belated cut in the rediscount rate. I notice recently that the interest rate on prime commercial paper has been reduced one small notch. Yet the basic interest rates have not come down enough nor fast enough to undo the damage which the tight money policy caused last year.

It is time, in my judgment, for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to admit that it went too far and too fast in committing this Nation to a system of scarce and high-priced money.

It has never seemed to me that the basic causes of the inflation which we have been going through would be cured by any tight-money policy. This has been proved by recent events. Money has been made tight and costly yet prices have not come down. On the contrary they have rapidly increased.

I doubt that there is a Member of the House who has returned to Washington free of concern about the current recession and its effect on the people the country over. In this connection I wish to quote briefly from an article by Richard A. Lester, professor of economics at Princeton University. In discussing the proposals by labor unions for wage increases this year as a tonic against recession, Professor Lester has this to say, and I quote:

To organized labor, wage increases are taken as an economic cure-all for almost everything. The recent AFL–CIO convention passed a resolution declaring that "the very fact of an economic slackening makes it doubly imperative that unions gain sizable wage increases to bolster consumer buying power" and stimulate an upturn in the economy. That negotiation of substantial boosts

for labor would prevent and overcome a recession like the current one is, however, questionable. The growth of consumption has been a rather steady factor in our postwar economy. The big spurts and relapses have occurred mainly in capital outlays—for new plants and equipment, manufacturers' inventories, and housing. The high-interest, tight-money policy, badly overdone in the past year, has been particularly destructive here. And changing the tight-money policy is therefore likely to be a better cure than boosting wages.

This is the opinion of a seasoned expert. I commend it to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I suggest the times and the economic situation of the Nation demand a slackening of this "destructive" and "badly overdone" tight-money policy. It is within the power of the Federal Reserve Board to bring down interest rates at any time it pleases. That time is right now.

---

## Free Trade or Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, commerce among nations is a very great and involved subject. It challenges even the experts. Even experts disagree. This, however, does not exempt or excuse any Member of Congress from giving the subject his most careful study and full consideration. Since trade with other nations may affect the very livelihood of many of our constituents, indeed the very economic well-being of the Nation, it becomes a subject that we must consider. The fact that it is difficult and involved does not excuse us from giving it our very best. We are going to determine during this session whether or not change is needed in our laws relating to trade with other countries, what those changes should be, and legislation that will effect them. Since the reciprocal-trade law is expiring, Congressional action is imperative.

### TRADE WITH FRIENDLY COUNTRIES IS DESIRABLE

In the world we live in today, friendly nations, particularly those outside the Iron Curtain, should be more than ever eager to aid and assist each other. The strength and well-being of one is of interest to all. Our record in recent years bears abundant proof of our Nation's desire to be helpful to our neighbor nations. No nation in history can even approach our magnificent record in aiding, often at great sacrifice to ourselves, the nations that have been allied with us where we have had common cause in world affairs. Many feel that we have even gone too far along these lines. However, I know of no one in the Congress who would not be most willing to give aid to friendly nations if at the same time we were incurring no disadvantage to ourselves. I feel that our trade relations with other nations can and should be so conducted. Trade among nations is not different from trade among families. When families trade each party is convinced that the trade is surely not against the best interest of either; in fact, it is the rule that trade, when engaged in, is to the best interests of all parties. Such trade is truly desirable.

### FREE TRADE IS UNFAIR

Trade may be of very great advantage to some but at the great disadvantage of others. Production costs vary in different countries. Currency values by which goods exchange and for which goods are produced, also vary in different countries. Living standards of workers, and also employers, also vary greatly in different countries. For these reasons there cannot be free trade and fair trade to all parties at the same time. The party in disadvantage is the nation with the highest standard of living, and as the nations are now constituted, this means our own. It is easy to see that American producers cannot compete in a free market, with a nation with lower living standards, lower labor costs, lower price levels, and hope to survive.

Some of the greatest potentially industrial nations now have a wage level even as low as one-tenth of that in the United States. Labor costs represent a substantial part of the cost of production. Obviously, the United States producer could not pay $100 for labor on a product where its competitor in a free market pays only $10. One does not need to be an expert to see this. Either America must lose that market, reduce its production costs, including the wages paid workers in order to meet the competition, or provide import controls to protect our own workers and our own industries. This fact is self-evident. It has been the same since the time when American business and American workers became better paid than the businesses and workers in these other nations. We have built this higher standard. We have proven it can be done. We have lived with it and by it for many years. We can, we should, and I trust we will maintain it.

We should trade freely as long as the imports coming into our markets do not harm a domestic industry. If and when an import item harms a domestic industry, then and there that import should be stopped. It seems to me that the national interest demands that this simple rule be applied. Those who cry for free trade, if they have their way will be commemorated by the graves of American industries that have been sacrificed. The way will be crowded with displaced American workers and their families who could not exist in free competition with those whose living standards were as low as one-tenth of their own.

### THERE ARE MANY THINGS WE NEED TO IMPORT

There is a huge demand for many products that are not produced at all in the United States. There are other products where the production here is far short of our needs. Imports of such products are to our great advantage. They run into very great volume. To sell them here is a benefit to our neighbor country from whence they come. To be able to acquire and enjoy them is of great benefit to our people. Such international trade is most desirable. I believe every Member of Congress will agree. To this extent, then, I believe we might well—all of us—be termed pro-international trade. The strength of our economy and that of our friends may measure our ability to survive in this very highly competitive world. It may also measure the extent that we may continue to hold our high standard of living, and, if so, to what extent we may be able to increase and expand it. Trade among the nations to the extent that it is fair and beneficial to all parties is good and should be encouraged.

### HOW ABOUT TRADE WITH THOSE WHO MAY NOT BE FRIENDLY?

Should we trade with our friends only? Or should trade be extended to include those nations which are not friends? If we should trade with our friendly neighbors, to what extent? How far should we go in an effort to influence our friends with regard to their trade with nations that are now somewhat unfriendly?

We hear so much these days about how necessary it is for our friendly neighbor, Japan, to export and that if we do not open our markets for more and more of her products, then, of necessity, she must sell to Communist Russia, or to Communist China. Well, just why should she not sell to Communist Russia? We do. Why should she not sell to Communist China? England does. We sell to England; England sells to Communist China. Why should we not sell also to Communist China? Why should not Japan sell to her near, though unfriendly, neighbor? Surely, if it is all right for England it should not be so wrong for Japan. Surely, also, it would be far better for us to see Japan selling to Communist Russia and China rather than to see imports from Japan destroying healthy industries and taking away thousands of well-paid jobs for American workers.

If we are to sacrifice, say a number of our own industries in order to support the economy of a friendly ally, we are being manifestly unfair with our own people. Why should one factory be doomed and its hundreds or even thousands of workers be forced into an existence on a Government sale?

Do the free traders think they can destroy important segments of our economy without endangering the general welfare? We may think we can operate or cause this injustice without affecting other industries, but things just do not work out that way. They tell us that industries like plywood, pottery, clothespins, textiles, chemicals, to name only a portion of them, are all expendable; that the workers in these industries should be taken under the protection of the Government and trained for other kinds of work and that the factories should be either let go or be converted into other types of production. They do not tell us, however, what other work the workers will be trained to perform.

They offer no hope for those workers who are somewhat advanced in years and are too old to be trained again to start out new in some other field. Who

will take the place of these millions of workers in the expendable plants in the lines of customers for homes, appliances, clothing, food, automobiles, and all of our other industries?

If the free traders have their way, we shall move into an economic debacle that will not only ruin those industries and workers which have so far been marked as expendable, but others will be drawn into the maelstrom and all will be definitely, and soon, very adversely affected.

IMPORTS SHOULD BE DEFINITELY LIMITED

Our market should be wide open to imports of all items that it will take which are not available from domestic producers. They should also be open to imports in those lines where domestic production does not meet the demand, up to the point where the imports do not adversely affect our domestic producers. Our market should be closed to all items that are produced in abundance by domestic producers.

Laws to protect our domestic economy are necessary. Such laws are fair. They permit us to engage in trade that is good for the United States of America. This should be our first and foremost consideration. If it is to our intelligent self-interest to aid the economies of friendly neighbor nations, then that aid does not penalize a segment of native industry by importing cheap substitutes to destroy them. This is what I mean by fair trade versus free trade. If our foreign trade is to be a part of our overall foreign policy, let it be fair to the hundreds of small industries that mean so much to our own citizens. Let it be tailored to serve the best interests of the United States as well as the interests of the nations with whom she trades. Let our commerce with the nations, our political arrangements, and our cultural activities, in fact all of our relationships with neighbor nations—friendly or otherwise—be tailored to be helpful to others but first, last, and all the time, be done to promote the general welfare of everyone in the United States of America. We can be the good neighbor to others. We can also be true to our own.

---

## Ordeal by Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, hunger is still an immediate threat to the happiness, to the very survival, of millions of people in many parts of the world. I am convinced that our Government in the United States, which is uniquely blessed with a superabundance of food, has fallen far short of its opportunities to make our food really count in the efforts of humanity to establish the peaceful and prosperous world which ordinary people everywhere desire.

No one, in my estimation, better understands the opportunities which our agricultural abundance offers to this Nation than the able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He has written an article entitled "Ordeal by Hunger," for the fall 1957 issue of the Co-op Grain Quarterly, published by the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. Because of the extremely important observations the Senator makes regarding the national interest in wiser use of our agricultural resources, I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDEAL BY HUNGER

(By Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY)

Food and fiber is a great potential force for freedom in the world today, an influential instrument with which we are blessed in abundance if we are only wise enough to use it for building toward friendship and peace.

That conclusion is inescapable after my recent tour of Italy, Egypt, Lebanon, Israel, Greece, and Spain.

Food is the common denominator of international life.

Lack of adequate food is the underlying factor in many of the economic and political problems bringing trouble to this area of the world.

The answer is in our hands. It rests in our own abundance, and our potential to produce in even more abundance if we have the vision and imagination to use it for human good.

I am convinced that Government policy has been too shortsighted about how powerful a factor sharing of our abundance of food and fiber can be in our foreign relations. A disserve has been done the American people by creating the impression our abundance was just an unwanted headache, a problem instead of a blessing.

We need to do an about-face. We need to look upon our great agricultural production and productive capacity as a source of strength in the world scene. Instead of telling farm families to quit producing—or forcing them to do so by deliberately depressing farm prices and income to seek scarcity as a cold economic answer to a human problem—we as a nation should say "thank God" for the farmers who have kept us from the deprivation and hunger facing vast areas of the world. We should see that our farm people are properly rewarded for making available to our Nation not only the means of visibly expressing our humanitarian concern for fellow mankind everywhere—but also giving us a tremendous bargaining power in growing economic warfare against Communist Russia.

American food and fiber is vital to the very existence of millions of undernourished people—and the brightest ray of hope for building stronger economies and greater political stability in most of the countries I visited.

I wish every American farmer who has been told he must drastically cut down his production could have walked with me through the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, the orphanages in Greece, or among the masses of unemployed huddled in shanty towns in Spain. I wish they could have seen the young hands outstretched for food.

I wish our farmers could have been with me in Italy to hear our own Embassy officials flatly declare that our country's most effective weapon against communism in that area had been the distribution of American food directly to the people by our church and other voluntary agencies.

I wish, too, they could have been along to hear Spanish officials explain how they had been trying in vain to buy 500,000 tons of wheat from America and now faced bread rationing as a result of our inaction. I wish all of you could have heard that story repeated in Israel, Greece, and other lands.

But most of all I wish one could have been along to give me a better answer than I could provide to this question I encountered at every turn:

How can a great nation like the United States justify spending a billion dollars paying farmers not to produce, and yet quibble about paying them to produce for our friends and allies who so urgently need that food?

No one who has walked in the midst of mass want and deprivation as I did, could ever face the American farmers and talk about surplus.

Believe me, there is no surplus—unless it is a surplus of people who need the life-giving benefits of the blessings of food we have to bestow.

It isn't a question of just a gigantic give-away.

Most of the food and fiber can be marketed for foreign currencies, if we expand and extend Public Law 480. Countries want to buy—but they lack American dollars.

We have uses for foreign currencies to finance economic development loans to other countries, to pay our own obligations abroad, for military procurement, and for many other purposes. We can do more for peace by using such funds obtained with American food to finance vocational education, for example, than we can by just shipping guns or handing over American dollars.

We can use our foods to form the foundation of an entire new foreign and economic trade policy for American business and industry—and achieve many of our foreign policy objectives at less cost.

We have had lots of lipservice to trade, not aid, but little concrete action. One of the objectives of our foreign policy has been to encourage American business and industry to invest abroad, to use its know-how, to help build economies of other free countries—and to keep the Soviet orbit from making neutral countries dependent on them for industrial products.

Our business firms tell us they have problems borrowing foreign currencies for capital investments and operating expenses abroad. Why doesn't it make good sense to earmark a part of the funds received from sale of American farm products, for loans to American business enterprises with branches or affiliates abroad?

Such a policy serves dual purposes: It broadens America's economic and trade influence in the world, and it throws the support of American business and industry behind a farm program based on abundance instead of scarcity.

I talked with American businessmen abroad, and with more since my return. They would welcome such a plan, and would vigorously support expansion of farm marketing for foreign currencies.

In effect, we would be turning our farm abundance, beyond our domestic needs and normal dollar exports, into a big revolving loan fund to finance most of our foreign-aid operations as well as American business expansion abroad. We would be loaning the money, and drawing interest on it, instead of giving outright dollar grants. The dollars we as a nation invested to create such a program, would be going to American producers of farm products—but the benefits would be shared by everyone, at home and abroad.

On the humanitarian side, beyond food sales, we can and should do more to support the work of our great church and philanthropic agencies such as CARE.

Whether we give or sell our food abundance, let's not cheapen it by labeling it surplus, calling it a problem, and advertising to the world that we really do not care about

hungry people—we just want to get rid of something we do not want.

Even Russia is smarter than that. After we had refused to sell Egypt any of our wheat, despite all our talk about surplus, they turned to Russia. At first Moscow said they doubted they could do it—they needed all the wheat they had. Then they came back to the Egyptians saying, in effect, "Here—we haven't much, but we will share it with you." They sent a shipload or so of wheat—and ballyhooed it into a major propaganda victory.

We have allies overseas who we are depending upon, under NATO, to hold the line of freedom in event of another all-out war. Yet these are in food deficit countries, where armies would collapse without continuing supplies of food from abroad.

Everywhere you turn—among diplomats, among military leaders, among businessmen, among social and welfare workers—the answer comes back the same: food. Food can be a vital key to success or failure in our foreign relations.

Are we recognizing that fact?

## Jewish Contributions to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered before the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York at a dinner in my honor on December 15, 1957:

ADDRESS BY HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES, DECEMBER 15, 1957

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very grateful for the opportunity to be here with you today. I am also grateful for the opportunity to see so many of my friends, as well as the opportunity to exchange a few thoughts and opinions with you.

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies and its scope of activities is well known to me for many years. Many of my Jewish friends have spoken to me with great pride of your work and achievements in human welfare. And you have much to be proud of in this work of unselfish service to others. Charity is one of the basic foundations of a free and humane civilization. The great sages and the inspiring works of your faith, as of mine, have emphasized it strongly.

The late Albert Einstein once said: "Only a life lived for others is a life worth while." And someone else put this thought in these words: "Give to the world the best you have, and the best will come back to you." The ideal of service to others, aside from its practical purposes, is sometimes more rewarding to the spirit of the giver than to the recipient. So in this sense, I wish to extend to all of you my deep appreciation for the service you are rendering to the less fortunate of your kinsmen. And with the approach of a new year, I pray that the year ahead may be a successful one for your endeavors, and may you go from strength to strength.

In times such as these, when the free world is threatened by tyranny and the enslavement of humanity, I believe it is of utmost importance for us to underscore the spirit of American freedom and the part played by the various minority and nationality groups in strengthening our freedoms and building America to its present greatness. At the moment, of course, I am thinking of the honorable role played by the Jews of this country in helping to make America strong and to enrich American democracy.

In the past 300 years, since that day in September of 1654 when the first group of Jews numbering 23 souls in search of freedom landed at New Amsterdam, Jews have helped to build this country and have helped it attain its position of leadership in nearly all human endeavors. Together with their neighbors, Jews have worked to attain freedom of religion, to establish their rights to citizenship, to share in building and defending the communities in which they lived. Throughout these three centuries, they have been part and parcel of America, just as have all other who sought refuge along these friendly shores.

The record, for anyone who cares to consult it, is one of remarkable contributions on the part of American Jews to the well-being, the growth, and the preservation of the United States as the foremost democratic nation in the world. In countless ways have the Jews helped to advance this Nation on the road to a strong and secure bulwark of freedom. The American Jewish community, numbering some 5½ million people, is proud of the role that the Jews of today and their forebears in the past have played in the arts and sciences, in industry and commerce, in cultural and intellectual enlightenment, in religious toleration, in politics and statesmanship, and last but not least on the field of battle in defense of American honor and security.

We have been taught from our earliest days that democracy is the rule of the majority. That is true, but I prefer to see it in another way. To me, democracy also represents the zealous protection of the rights of the minority—and basically each one of us in this country belongs to some minority: because of racial descent, national origin, religious belief, economic position, political adherence, social status, or geographic location. The founders of this Nation recognized this situation and, therefore, they adopted the Bill of Rights which is the basis for all our civil rights and civil liberties.

Whether we be rich or poor, foreign-born or native, white or Negro, Christian, or Jew, northerner or southerner, Democrat, or Republican, we enjoy these rights alike. Destroy the rights of any one American, and the rights of all Americans are at once jeopardized. We all have certain inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To make it more specific, I would say we all have the right to worship God according to our conscience, the right to earn a livelihood and live in dignity, the right to an education that will develop our talents and capacities to serve our country and fellowmen. These are minimum rights and privileges. Anyone who attempts to deny those rights to any American is betraying our past and present, and undermining our future.

America means unity, not divisive activity. We must have unity of purpose, as well as unity of the people. In the world in which we live we must see our goals ahead with clarity and understanding, otherwise we shall all be doomed. We cannot afford the luxury of casting aspersions on one group or another in our midst, whether it be Negroes, Jews, Italians, Irish, or any other group. This is a time when we must stand together, shoulder to shoulder, under the banner of liberty, in defense of our way of life as opposed to Communist enslavement.

The Jews of America have throughout our Nation's history been a force for unity. American history is replete with many examples of Jewish men and women who have rendered dedicated and unselfish service to this country in times of war and peace. I do not want to overburden you with many names, but allow me to mention just a few who helped write golden pages in American history:

Isaac Franks, who was aide de camp to Gen. George Washington during the Revolutionary War with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Haym Salomon, a Polish Jew, who helped finance Washington's army.

Judah P. Benjamin, a Senator from Louisiana and an outstanding leader of the Confederacy during the Civil War.

Emma Lazarus, the great poetess, whose poem The New Colossus is engraved on the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty.

David Belasco, the pioneer of the American theater.

Joseph Pulitzer and Adolph S. Ochs, who by their achievements in journalism have helped to fully realize the freedom of the press in this country.

Samuel Gompers, who built the American labor movement to its present position of influence.

Supreme Court Justices Louis D. Brandeis, Benjamin N. Cardozo, and Felix Frankfurter, who have rendered great service in our highest tribunal in the land.

Bernard Baruch, the elder statesman and adviser of American Presidents.

And, of course, our very beloved former Governor of New York and former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, whose record of public service is unmatched.

Need I mention more such names? You know them as well as I do. You can find them in any book on American history. But what does all this prove? Simply this: That in a democracy such as ours, where the rights of all citizens are recognized and protected, the Jews have made significant contributions in every field of human endeavor. Where given the opportunity, the Jews contributed of their brain and brawn and have helped make America what it is today—the greatest democratic nation on earth and the spokesman for freemen everywhere. What is true regarding the role of the Jews is also true regarding every other minority group in this country. All of them share alike in their efforts and responsibilities, in their duties and achievements, in their loyalty and patriotism.

Bigotry against one group is a threat to all others. Practicing discrimination and intolerance against Jews, will eventually affect Catholics and Negroes, Italians and Poles. It will affect us all and will poison our hearts and minds at a time when we need unity most, in order to form a common front against a common enemy who is threatening our land, our way of life, our whole future.

Ours is a plural democracy. It is perhaps one of the greatest sources of strength for this country which consists of so many different and varied groups, each of them contributing of its best, culturally, economically, politically, morally, and in every other way. Those who preach racial and religious intolerance do not understand the meaning and the goals of America—genuine understanding, mutual cooperation, and common brotherhood.

Let me conclude with this little story. It is told that when God made the oyster, He provided him with absolute economic security. He built the oyster a house, a shell, to protect him against his enemies. When the oyster is hungry, he simply opens his shell and food rushes in for him. But when God made the eagle, He told him: "The blue sky is your limit. Go, find your own shelter and build your own home." And so the eagle builds his nest on the highest mountain crag, where wind and storm threaten him all the time. For food he has to fly long distances through rain, snow, wind, and cold.

My friends, when America had to select a national emblem, it selected the eagle, not

the oyster. And since then our limit, too, has been the sky. Like the eagle, we are not frightened by winds and storms. We have found shelter and food, we have built this land to its present glory, we even have enough to share with other nations. But all this was achieved only through cooperation and unity and understanding. It would not have been possible otherwise. Let us continue in that same spirit. Let each of us contribute to the best of his ability as in the past toward a strong, a safe, and a secure America for all.

---

## An Immigration Policy for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 16, 1958*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I will make before the American Council of Jewish Women, Friday, January 17, 1958:

AN IMMIGRATION POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

Please do not ascribe to me any wish to flatter when I tell you, with utmost sincerity, that I consider the Council of Jewish Women one of the most intelligent, perceptive, and forward-looking groups on the American scene today. I know how painstakingly the council's representatives—and this I know from my own personal experience—keep abreast of affairs in Washington, scrutinize the bills, educate themselves on the pros and cons of the vital issues before the Congress. The council could never be accused—as so many groups can easily be accused—of trying to squeeze or stretch the facts to fit a preconceived notion.

That is why, knowing that the opinions of the council are informed opinions, I welcome this opportunity to talk to you freely, without the sense of being irked by the necessity to please.

The subject of an immigration policy for the United States is one, I sometimes feel, that has been drowned by a deluge of words. There is none of us who has been intimately concerned with the liberalization of our immigration policy who has not, at one time or another, felt that whatever observations we can make have long since become trite and platitudinous. Emma Lazarus' inscription on the Statue of Liberty has been quoted so often that even the most ardent supporters of good immigration legislation must cringe at its sound.

Let us make no mistake; this is a danger. Too many of us get weary of the old subjects, tired of the old tune, not realizing, of course, that we must go on talking, must go on agitating, must go on sponsoring, because the remedy—the just and right remedy—has not as yet been supplied. This is precisely what has happened in the whole area of refugee relief. People grew weary of the refrain. Then we enter into a new phase of the battle: To battle the apathy that follows the weariness.

This is always the danger point: The flagging of enthusiasm that ends inevitably in retreat. And yet the fact of the refugee is an inescapable fact of contemporary history. Geographical partition produces refugees. Political divisions produce refugees. Supernationalist movements produce refugees. And, tired as we may be of the story, the refugee exists, and to turn aside in weariness will not erase the fact of his existence.

This Congress enacted, in the first session, a modest immigration law which will benefit, it is estimated roughly, some 80,000 aliens, among them orphans, close relatives of United States citizens, those afflicted with tuberculosis, those who were guilty of misrepresentation of facts, and a small measure of relief for those escaping from Communist or Communist-dominated countries and the Middle East. The question then remains, having taken this step forward, How much further will the Congress go?

I am not clairvoyant and do not presume to know. But I do know what is unfavorable and what is favorable in the climate which could or could not produce changes in the immigration law. I know that approximately two-thirds of the Congress are against change; particularly, they are opposed to any change in the national origins system.

I know, too, that there will be a different argument used this time to uphold the national origins system. Spokesmen against change will move away from its heaviest emphasis on possible subversives, and even away from the argument of inability of southern Europeans to assimilate easily into our culture. The argument is shifting to what will undoubtedly be termed "problems of overpopulation." It will be pointed out that we already have a population of some 170 million; that in about 20 years the population of the United States will increase by some 60 million; that the pattern of large families will continue; that our schools are overcrowded, to put it mildly; that our hospitals are already inadequate for our growing population; that automation is and will continue at accelerating pace to displace American workers; that increased population—either through natural increase or through immigration—will increase demands which, in turn, will increase inflation because productivity will not catch up with such demands.

It will be argued that immigrants almost invariably settle in cities already populated beyond the point of comfort, adding to congestion and, hence, contributing to delinquency. It will be argued that immigrants do not settle on farms where population is decreasing.

These, I believe, will be the main burden of the refrain. These arguments will have to be answered and I maintain that all these assertions can be rationally met.

I would like to make one modification. I have seen growing evidence of the adoption of these arguments by former proponents of liberal immigration. I have been told that some groups would be willing to settle for the change from a 1920 census base to a 1950 census base, a redistribution of unused quotas, and a modification of some of the deportation provisions. They have based their conclusions on the arguments I have just given you. I have been advised that they will stop pressing for the departure from the national origins system.

What I cannot understand is the perfectly obvious flaw in this kind of reasoning. Assuming for a moment—and I, for one, do not make such assumption—that increased immigration is at this time against the best national interests, what in the name of sanity has that to do with discrimination in public law? If the United States admits 2, 5, 25, or 250,000, must they not be admitted on an equality of selection? Must they not be admitted on criteria that apply to all peoples, regardless of race, color, or creed? We must be prepared to meet these arguments, not with heat, but with light.

Hearings on my bill, H. R. 3364, will be held early in this session. It may be that the council will be among the groups to testify. I ask you to depart from exhortation and generalization and denunciation, and to concentrate on meeting the arguments I have given above. The arguments must be based on America's imperative need to be, above all, just to all people. The argument must be based on America's absorptive capacity. The argument must be lodged in facts and figures on America's new industry, on our decreasing pool of skilled and unskilled workers. The American image has been badly damaged upon our insistence on the retention of the national origins system.

If sputnik has caused us to lose face and threatens to drive noncommitted nations into the eastern camp, then how many years have we had of losing face among the noncommitted nations when America's basic immigration law says that one group of people is more desirable than another?

I believe that what we have to seek to establish at this point is not so much an unrealistic increase in numbers permitted to enter the United States, but the reassertion in our immigration law of the American principle of equality of opportunity for all, regardless of race, color, or creed. I believe it can be shown that the rigid quota system applied to Europe, Asia, or Africa, yet removed from the Western Hemisphere, has resulted in weakening the argument that some persons assimilate easily and others not at all.

Some 49,000 Mexicans enter the United States each year, as against approximately 210,000 from Europe, Asia, and Africa all together. I have seen no injury to America from the Mexican influx, nor has it been a subject for comment by any of our immigration restrictionists. I merely point this out to show the fallacy of the restrictionists' thinking when it is based on a pretended homogeneity of the American people.

Around the sixth century, A. D., when few Europeans could write, the Chinese had already invented paper. Later, they invented the printing press. There is no such thing as white race supremacy. Centuries before America was discovered, when Europe was still a continent of barbarians, other peoples of many races found better ways of living. Arabs invented numerals, the Phoenicians the alphabet and money, the Chaldeans astronomy. The Celts invented the wheel plow. The Chinese invented the compass, and porcelain. Yet, strangely, these very races are unfairly dealt with in our immigration statutes.

This is the kind of testimony we will need, indeed, must have. Let the facts speak rather than emotion, for emotion only engenders emotion in turn, and consequently we go around and around the same circle as we have done these many years.

You will agree that limits must be set; not all will agree as to what those limits should be. For my part, I seek to have established a total annual quota of 250,000. I have based this on the average number of immigrants actually admitted into the United States within the last decade. My new bill, in most aspects, is similar to the legislation introduced in the 84th Congress and known as the Celler-Lehman bill, but I have extensively revised the earlier bill in its two most significant areas.

In retaining the basic features of the Celler-Lehman bill, I am, of course, proposing the elimination of the discriminatory features of the present law. Under my proposal, there will be no discrimination based on national origin or race, and there will be no classification of United States citizens into two categories, native-born and naturalized. There will be no additional grounds for loss of United States citizenship by naturalized citizens except those that apply to native-born citizens.

All provisions of the present law which permit its retroactive application in deportation proceedings have been eliminated in my

bill. Similarly, all of the unduly harsh provisions applicable now in exclusion proceedings have been humanized in my proposal. I have provided for a full and unlimited judicial review of administrative decisions made in all immigration and naturalization processes, including deportation and entry, and I have retained all the humanitarian provisions of the Celler-Lehman bill designed to prevent the separation of families. I have made the provisions applicable to suspension of deportation more human by eliminating the stiff restrictions of the present law in removing the requirement that suspension of deportation could be granted only if it would cause what the present law refers to as "exceptionally and extremely unusual hardship."

The revised features of my new bill pertain to what I believe is the heart of our immigration policy, namely (1) our quota system, and (2) jurisdiction over immigration.

The bill I am offering contains a new formula for the distribution of quota immigrant visas. This is a new formula devised for the first time since 1921, not based on national origins and not depending on any "nose count" of the United States population.

Wives, husbands, and minor children of United States citizens will continue to be admitted as nonquota immigrants, but I have added to the non-quota-class parents of United States citizens and professors of academic schools.

In an attempt to make the new quota flexible in order to permit the United States to adjust its intake of immigrants in enlightened self-interest to the fast changing political, economic, and social situation of the world, under my new proposal our annual quota will be distributed among five classes of immigrants without regard to national origin, race, or any results of the United States census, as follows: (1) Family unification, (2) occupational class, (3) refugee asylum class, (4) national interest class, and (5) resettlement class.

Within each of the 5 classes, no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any single country. Here is how the annual distribution of the overall immigration quota will be established: Each year the President of the United States, after consulting with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and with the Attorney General, would submit to the Congress, prior to March 1, the proposed allocation for each of the 5 classes, and Congress will have 60 days following the submission of the President's proposal to disapprove it by passing a concurrent resolution. If the proposal is not disapproved by the Congress, it would take effect on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following. If the Congress disagrees with the President, the allocation effective in the preceding fiscal year would automatically become effective.

In order to get the joint executive-legislative responsibility for the annual distribution of the total immigration quota started, I propose that the first Presidential allocation plan shall reach the Congress within 6 months immediately following the enactment of my bill and if agreement is not reached on this first Presidential proposal, the total annual quota of 250,000 would be simply cut across the board so as to give each of the 5 classes 20 percent of the total. This interim allocation would, of course, be valid for the first fiscal year of operations, pending the submission of the next Presidental proposal which, again, will be subject to Congressional disapproval.

My main purpose in proposing this flexible distribution of a permanently fixed annual quota is to permit the President to decide—on a year-to-year basis—with Congressional concurrence, whether it is desirable in any particular year to grant more immigrant visas to relatives of United States citizens or to, say, refugees, or to, perhaps, immigrants possessing special skills needed in the United States at that particular time, or to any of the other classes.

The 15 percent permanent limitation affecting the participation of any single country in the distribution of the fivefold allocation is, in my opinion, a sufficient guaranty that no unfair distribution of visas for the benefit of inhabitants of one particular country would be practicable.

The second revised feature of my bill affects the administration of the law. Under the present law, we have a two-headed system where officials of the Department of State issue visas to both immigrants and nonimmigrants abroad, while officials of the Department of Justice determine at ports of entry whether the holders of visas are admissible to the United States. This is an antiquated, cumbersome, and expensive system. It creates anxiety and uncertainty in the minds of the immigrants and nonimmigrants alike, and it causes friction between two governmental agencies operating independently in the same field and stepping on each other's toes.

Under my proposal, the entire administration of our immigration and nationality laws will be placed in the hands of a Director of Bureau of Immigration and Citizenship, who will be an Assistant Attorney General, subject to confirmation by the Senate. His officers, acting as immigration attachés, will be stationed at our consulates abroad and will issue immigrant and nonimmigrant visas after a finding is made that the recipient of a visa is found to be eligible actually to enter the United States.

In addition to simplification of procedures and elimination of dual standards, as well as uncertainty in the minds of immigrants or foreign visitors, my proposal will automatically open visa issuance to administrative review in the Department of Justice by the well-qualified and trusted Board of Immigration Appeals. The issuance of diplomatic visas will, of course, remain a function of diplomatic officers of the Department of State.

I believe that the administrative system which I propose will not only provide for a more efficient and more equitable issuance of visas abroad, but that it will also bring a great saving to the American taxpayer.

I have every reason to believe that the hearings on immigration will be both intensive and extensive. Twenty-eight Members of Congress have followed me in the introduction of this bill, which is, in itself, a most heartening fact. However, be it noted that the greatest majority of those who introduced identical legislation come from the heavily populated States. While it is reasonable to expect that these States, having benefited from immigration, would be most liberal in immigration matters, it is an indication of the educational work that must be done in the Midwest, Western, and Southern States.

If we, the proponents of liberalized immigration law, do our homework, defer to reason and not passion, drop the name calling which only serves to antagonize and strengthen the opposition, we can, through the forthcoming hearings, if nothing more, at least start the ball rolling toward an immigration law that will do honor to us and proclaim an effective and working democracy to those abroad.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1958

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living and of the living dead, amid all the tensions of these days which, with their vast issues, demand our utmost that freedom may endure, there come to us constant reminders, as comrades vanish from our side and sight, that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day.

We think gratefully today of a colleague who has passed through the door called death to a larger room of service and progress. As a Member of this body for a long span by our reckoning, he served his State and the Nation and this Capital City. Thou knowest that with faith undimmed, with valor and unbowed head, he met the inroads of bodily affliction.

We remember today his vivid personality; his rugged belief in government not of the elect, but of the elected; his uncompromising candor; his hatred of cant and hypocrisy; his unbroken loyalty to the welfare of the toilers for more abundant life. We are conscious, now that his voice is stilled, of those qualities which bound him as with bands of steel to those who labored by his side.

Emulating our fallen comrade, in a dark day when so many lights have gone out, may we join those who, refusing to curse the darkness, light the candles of faith and hope. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 16, 1958, was dispensed with.

### JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order, and I request its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed order will be read.

The order was read, as follows:

*Ordered*, That in the event the Economic Report of the President is transmitted to the Senate today prior to the adjournment, the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD without reading and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Economic Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is entered.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 279)

Under the order entered today, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Economic Committee:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*January 20, 1958.*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I present herewith my economic report, as required by section 3 (a) of the Employment Act of 1946. In preparing this report, I have received the assistance and advice of the Council of Economic Advisers. I have also had the advice of the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies of the Government.

I set forth below, in condensed form, what I consider to be the major conclusions and recommendations of the report.

### THE ECONOMY ACT IN 1957

The past year was a prosperous one, despite a decline in the closing months. Over 65 million people were employed, 300,000 more than in 1956. The Nation's output of goods and services totaled $434 billion, and personal income was $343 billion. Both were 5 percent larger than in the preceding year. A considerable part of these increases, however, reflected higher prices.

In the final quarter of the year, gross national product was about 1½ percent below the peak reached in the third quarter. Personal income after taxes declined one-half of 1 percent, and personal consumption expenditures somewhat less. In December, however, unemployment amounted to 5.2 percent of the civilian labor force, compared with 4.3 percent in September.

This change in economic conditions called for adjustments in economic policies. During much of the year, the task of restraining inflationary pressures was paramount, and policies were directed to this end. In the closing months of the year, and currently, the task has been to facilitate readjustments in the economy essential to the resumption of sustainable economic growth, but to do so without reviving inflationary pressures.

### THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION AND OUTLOOK

As we look ahead in 1958, there are grounds for expecting that the decline in business activity need not be prolonged and that economic growth can be resumed without extended interruption. The policies of Government will be directed toward helping to assure this result.

The demand for goods and services for final use has been well maintained. A considerable adjustment in inventories has already taken place, and present holdings are generally not heavy. Personal income has fallen very little, and purchases by consumers are continuing at a high level. The confidence of business concerns in the economic future is evidenced by their long-range plans for the expansion and improvement of production facilities and the high rate at which they are carrying out these plans. The increasing amount of resources committed to research and development is further evidence of this confidence and assures the continued working of forces that make for expansion.

Financial conditions are increasingly favorable to resumption of economic growth. Credit is more readily available and its cost is lower. These conditions, together with the recent reduction in the cash investment required of prospective home buyers under Federal mortgage insurance programs, tend to promote increased home building. More ample and lower cost credit also favors a continuation of the large and growing volume of capital expenditures by State and local governments, and should help moderate the decline in investment outlays by business concerns.

At the turn of the year, the economy was beginning to feel the effects of an acceleration of the placement of defense contract awards, prompted by the need to move forward quickly with programs essential to the strengthening of the Nation's defenses.

### THE LONGER PERSPECTIVE

At a time like the present, when the economy is adjusting to the large additions to productive capacity made in the past few years, it is well to view our economic prospects in a longer perspective and to consider some of the sources of our strength.

There are good reasons for confidence that a vigorous expansion of our economy can be sustained over the years. Our domestic market for goods and services has about doubled every quarter of a century, and we should do at least as well in the next 25 years. The needs and wants of our growing population will continue to enlarge markets for output. To keep pace with expanding requirements, State and local outlays must continue rising at some such rate as the recent $3 billion a year. Research and technological developments are opening up vast new fields for profitable investment. Worldwide economic development can enlarge foreign markets for our products. The annual personal savings of Americans, which are close to $20 billion, and the strength of our financial institutions, will help attain the economic capacity necessary to meet these growing requirements.

The latest challenge of international communism will require a further increase in the economic claims of national security, which are already heavy. If we follow suitable private and public policies, this challenge can be met without distorting our economy, or destroying the freedoms that we cherish. Whatever our national security requires, our economy can provide and we can afford to pay.

### THE CHALLENGE TO ECONOMIC POLICIES

A realistic appraisal of our economic prospects, though it warrants confidence, also requires that we acknowledge an unfavorable feature of recent economic developments. In 1957, our gross national product rose 5 percent, but four-fifths of this increase was accounted for by rising prices.

There are critical questions here for business and labor, as well as for Government. Business managements must recognize that price increases that are unwarranted by costs, or that attempt to recapture investment outlays too quickly, not only lower the buying power of the dollar, but also may be self-defeating by causing a restriction of markets, lower output, and a narrowing of the return on capital investment. The leadership of labor must recognize that wage increases that go beyond overall productivity gains are inconsistent with stable prices, and that the resumption of economic growth can be slowed by wage increases that involve either higher prices or a further narrowing of the margin between prices and costs. Government, for its part, must use its powers to help keep our economy stable and to encourage sound economic growth with reasonably stable prices.

The resumption and maintenance of economic growth promise greater economic capability for meeting the Nation's needs. If this opportunity is to be fully realized, however, growth must take the form of increases in real output, accompanied by a stable price level. This can be achieved if weight is given to long-run as well as short-run considerations in policies and practices that affect our economic welfare. It can be guaranteed by a public opinion that is alert to the consequences of wrong policies and insists on policies which will yield economic growth without inflation.

### MEASURES TO HELP ATTAIN ECONOMIC GOALS

A legislative program is presented in this report to help solve urgent problems that confront the Nation today, foster a resumption of growth, and build stronger foundations for economic advances in the years ahead. Fiscal policies are recommended to meet, within the framework of a budget in which expected revenues are adequate to cover projected expenditures, the Nation's needs for strengthened defenses, for the improvement of our position in science and education, and for other essential activities. Legislation is proposed to increase the effectiveness of the Federal Government's credit programs and its programs for the insurance and guaranty of private credits, to widen and strengthen our economic ties with other nations; to foster adjustments intended to bring agricultural production into line with commercial demands and reduce the fiscal burden of price-support programs; to give individuals greater protection against economic hardships, promote integrity in labor-management relationships, and improve industrial relations; to enhance the competitive character of our private enterprise system; and to strengthen the economic position of small businesses.

Favorable consideration of this program will materially enlarge the Nation's capacity to meet present challenges and to achieve sustainable economic growth and improvement in the years ahead.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Thursday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to announce that at the session today, no business will be transacted, except for the taking of action on the resolution to be submitted by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. It is not planned to have any statements made or insertions made in the RECORD or bills introduced today. On an occasion such as this, it has been the custom of the Senate to have only the formal resolution presented, and action taken thereon, followed by adjournment.

I may say that arrangements will be worked our with members of the family of the late Senator NEELY, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator's colleague from West Virginia, and other Senators, to set aside a day for eulogies; and appropriate announcement will be made at the proper time.

### DEATH OF SENATOR NEELY, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it is with sorrow that I announce to the Senate the death on Saturday morning, January 18, 1958, of our colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia—Senator MATTHEW MANSFIELD NEELY.

Later, as is the custom of the Senate, there will be set aside a day when Members of this body will have an opportunity to speak in eulogy of our departed colleague, this distinguished statesman. At that time I expect to speak again in respect to Senator NEELY.

However, I should like now to state briefly some facts about his life and his great record of public service and to make some brief, personal observations concerning his long and eventful career.

MATTHEW M. NEELY was born at Grove, Doddridge County, W. Va., November 9, 1874.

In 1902, he graduated from West Virginia University, and was that year admitted to the Marion County bar. He was a successful lawyer from his earliest days at the bar, and occasionally found time throughout his busy public career to take part in trials before the courts.

The first public office he held was that of mayor of Fairmont, W. Va., an office to which he was elected in 1908. From that time until his death—a period covering half a century—he dedicated his abilities to serving the people of his State; and they reciprocated by electing him to Congress 10 times, and once to the governorship of his State.

He served as clerk of the House of Delegates from 1911 to 1913, and was first elected to the House of Representatives on October 14, 1913, to fill an unexpired term in the 63d Congress. He was reelected to the 64th, 65th, and 66th Congresses.

In 1922, he was elected to the first of five terms in the Senate. He was elected to a second term in 1930, and was reelected in 1936.

He resigned from the Senate on January 12, 1941, to become the Governor of West Virginia.

In 1946, he was elected to the House of Representatives, and in 1948 was again returned to the Senate. He was reelected in 1954 for the term beginning January 5, 1955.

On October 21, 1903, MATTHEW M. NEELY was united in marriage to Miss Alberta Claire Ramage, of Fairmont, W. Va. This gracious lady survives him, as do two sons and a daughter, Alfred R. Neely, John Champ Neely, and Mrs. Harold S. Pettit.

Senator NEELY was a member of numerous charitable, fraternal, and civic organizations. He was a veteran of the armed services of our country, having served in the First Regiment, West Virginia Voluntary Infantry, throughout the Spanish-American War.

Although an injury he sustained in a fall a little more than a year ago kept him confined to the hospital much of the time during the 85th Congress, his keen interest in the problems of our country remained as great as ever. Despite his physical infirmities of the past months, his mind remained sharp and clear to the last. One of his last, great resolutions, expressed only a short time before his death, was to gain Congressional approval for a large cancer research program.

Upon learning of Senator NEELY'S death last Saturday morning, I made the following statement, with which I close my remarks today:

I have learned with great personal sorrow of the death of Senator NEELY. So far as I know, no one has served our State longer or more notably in the National Government, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives. He also served as Governor of the State. His long career in public life has been equaled by very few men. He was a noted and eloquent orator and a strong advocate of any cause that he espoused. While we belonged to different political parties, our personal relationship as Senators was friendly and cordial, and we conferred upon subjects of interest to our State. The people of West Virginia mourn the passing of their distinguished fellow citizen and statesman. I extend to the members of his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 243) was read, and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

*Resolved*, That a committee of 15 Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased at Fairmont, W. Va.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will later appoint the committee provided for by the second resolving clause of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator NEELY, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Thursday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, January 23, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

II Timothy 2:15: *Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman who needeth not to be ashamed.*

Almighty God, we have entered upon a new week challenged by tasks and responsibilities which demand the consecration of our noblest manhood and womanhood.

Grant, as colleagues and coworkers, we may feel that America's great hour has come when we must strengthen the moral and spiritual foundations of our Republic if we are to survive and help build a finer civilization.

Inspire us with the firm conviction and the glad assurance that we are always living and laboring for the one thing of supreme importance when we seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 16, 1958, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 242

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, late a Representative from the State of Minnesota.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to

join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to create a joint Congressional committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President; and

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to print a compilation of materials relating to the development of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries.

## SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York, Mr. HOWARD W. ROBISON, be permitted to take the oath of office today. The certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD W. ROBISON, of New York, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## TESTS OF ALCOHOL IN THE BLOOD OR URINE TRIED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR OPERATING VEHICLES WHILE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF LIQUOR

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 969) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor, with amendments thereto, and insist upon the amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN]?

There being no objection, the Speaker appointed the following conferees: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. DOWDY, and Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois.

## ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 279)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*January 20, 1958.*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I present herewith my economic report, as required by section 3 (a) of the Employment Act of 1946. In preparing this report, I have received the assistance and advice of the Council of Economic Advisers. I have also had the advice of the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies of the Government.

I set forth below, in condensed form, what I consider to be the major conclusions and recommendations of the report.

### THE ECONOMY IN 1957

The past year was a prosperous one, despite a decline in the closing months. Over 65 million people were employed, 300,000 more than in 1956. The Nation's output of goods and services totaled $434 billion, and personal income was $343 billion. Both were 5 percent larger than in the preceding year. A considerable part of these increases, however, reflected higher prices.

In the final quarter of the year, gross national product was about 1½ percent below the peak reached in the third quarter. Personal income after taxes declined one-half of 1 percent, and personal consumption expenditures somewhat less. In December, however, unemployment amounted to 5.2 percent of the civilian labor force, compared with 4.3 percent in September.

This change in economic conditions called for adjustments in economic policies. During much of the year, the task of restraining inflationary pressures was paramount, and policies were directed to this end. In the closing months of the year, and currently, the task has been to facilitate readjustments in the economy essential to the resumption of sustainable economic growth, but to do so without reviving inflationary pressures.

### THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION AND OUTLOOK

As we look ahead in 1958, there are grounds for expecting that the decline in business activity need not be prolonged and that economic growth can be resumed without extended interruption. The policies of Government will be directed toward helping to assure this result.

The demand for goods and services for final use has been well maintained. A considerable adjustment in inventories has already taken place, and present holdings are generally not heavy. Personal income has fallen very little, and purchases by consumers are continuing at a high level. The confidence of business concerns in the economic future is evidenced by their long-range plans for the expansion and improvement of production facilities and the high rate at which they are carrying out these plans. The increasing amount of resources committed to research and development is further evidence of this confidence and assures the continued working of forces that make for expansion.

Financial conditions are increasingly favorable to resumption of economic growth. Credit is more readily available and its cost is lower. These conditions, together with the recent reduction in the cash investment required of prospective home buyers under Federal mortgage insurance programs, tend to promote increased home building. More ample and lower cost credit also favors a continuation of the large and growing volume of capital expenditures by State and local governments, and should help moderate the decline in investment outlays by business concerns.

At the turn of the year, the economy was beginning to feel the effects of an acceleration of the placement of defense contract awards, prompted by the need to move forward quickly with programs essential to the strengthening of the Nation's defenses.

### THE LONGER PERSPECTIVE

At a time like the present, when the economy is adjusting to the large additions to productive capacity made in the past few years, it is well to view our economic prospects in a longer perspective and to consider some of the sources of our strength.

There are good reasons for confidence that a vigorous expansion of our economy can be sustained over the years. Our domestic market for goods and services has about doubled every quarter of a century, and we should do at least as well in the next 25 years. The needs and wants of our growing population will continue to enlarge markets for output. To keep pace with expanding requirements, State and local outlays must continue rising at some such rate as the recent $3 billion a year. Research and technological developments are opening up vast new fields for profitable investment. Worldwide economic development can enlarge foreign markets for our products. The annual personal savings of Americans, which are close to $20 billion, and the strength of our financial institutions, will help attain the economic capacity necessary to meet these growing requirements.

The latest challenge of international communism will require a further increase in the economic claims of national security, which are already heavy. If we follow suitable private and public policies, this challenge can be met without distorting our economy, or destroying the freedoms that we cherish. Whatever our national security requires, our economy can provide and we can afford to pay.

### THE CHALLENGE TO ECONOMIC POLICIES

A realistic appraisal of our economic prospects, though it warrants confidence, also requires that we acknowledge an unfavorable feature of recent economic developments. In 1957, our gross national product rose 5 percent, but four-fifths of this increase was accounted for by rising prices.

There are critical questions here for business and labor, as well as for Government. Business managements must recognize that price increases that are unwarranted by costs, or that attempt to recapture investment outlays too quickly, not only lower the buying power of the dollar, but also may be self-defeating by causing a restriction of markets, lower output, and a narrowing of the return on capital investment. The leadership of labor must recognize that wage increases that go beyond overall productivity gains are inconsistent with stable prices, and that the resumption of economic growth can be slowed by wage increases

that involve either higher prices or a further narrowing of the margin between prices and costs. Government, for its part, must use its powers to help keep our economy stable and to encourage sound economic growth with reasonably stable prices.

The resumption and maintenance of economic growth promise greater economic capability for meeting the Nation's needs. If this opportunity is to be fully realized, however, growth must take the form of increases in real output, accompanied by a stable price level. This can be achieved if weight is given to long-run as well as short-run considerations in policies and practices that affect our economic welfare. It can be guaranteed by a public opinion that is alert to the consequences of wrong policies and insists on policies which will yield economic growth without inflation.

MEASURES TO HELP ATTAIN ECONOMIC GOALS

A legislative program is presented in this report to help solve urgent problems that confront the Nation today, foster a resumption of growth, and build stronger foundations for economic advances in the years ahead. Fiscal policies are recommended to meet, within the framework of a budget in which expected revenues are adequate to cover projected expenditures, the Nation's needs for strengthened defenses, for the improvement of our position in science and education, and for other essential activities. Legislation is proposed to increase the effectiveness of the Federal Government's credit programs and its programs for the insurance and guaranty of private credits; to widen and strengthen our economic ties with other nations; to foster adjustments intended to bring agricultural production into line with commercial demands and reduce the fiscal burden of price-support programs; to give individuals greater protection against economic hardships, promote integrity in labor-management relationships, and improve industrial relations; to enhance the competitive character of our private enterprise system; and to strengthen the economic position of small businesses.

Favorable consideration of this program will materially enlarge the Nation's capacity to meet present challenges and to achieve sustainable economic growth and improvement in the years ahead.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to those Members who have special orders for today, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] that we will not have any special orders today. So they may govern themselves accordingly.

## ASSISTANCE IN OUR PRESENT TAX AND BUDGET EMERGENCY

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which I feel will assist in our present tax and budget emergency in a substantial way.

The Soviet Union has catapulted a tremendous challenge aimed directly at the international stature of the United States. This Government must recapture, in as brief a period of time as our capabilities will permit, the leadership momentum which has marked our progress through most of the past 50 years. The challenge, however, is an insidious one because in our attempt to develop ultimate weapons which we pray will never be used, we may be tempted to sacrifice our democratic institutions and the delicate balance of our successful economy.

The problem, therefore, is to find the means to strengthen our defenses and still maintain our prosperity and American way of life.

The economic indicators of the past several months make it abundantly clear that the rates of taxation are already at too high a level for long-range operation. The Government has been finding it necessary, as a matter of fact, to increase the flow of risk capital into the economy by the purchase of Government securities in the open market. This and other similar measures have been taken in order to prevent an outright depression. Where then is the money to come from? We cannot further sacrifice the integrity of our economic structure; and to directly mobilize our industrial resources would be a complete and utter defeat without the firing of a shot. But the money is here and the resources are here—moneys and resources which can be tapped without violently disturbing our economy.

We must systematically begin to plug the many loopholes in our Internal Revenue Law. The first glaring loophole which can easily be plugged is that concerning the millions of people who file no income tax return at all. The bill is aimed at this vulnerable target.

By a simple and inexpensive provision this bill will force several million tax evaders who have never filed tax returns to do so or to be immediately exposed and apprehended.

Recent statistical studies have shown that more than 26 billion dollars of income is not reported. At average rates this means that nearly 7 billion dollars in taxes are evaded. This figure does not include additional billions which may be chiseled on exemptions, deductions, and expenses.

My proposal would require the Secretary of the Treasury to give a numbered receipt card to everyone filing an income tax return.

No one will be able to do business with the Government where his signature is required without placing the number of his receipt card alongside of his signature. Failure to do so will be reported immediately to the Secretary of the Treasury and any such documents will be considered void.

The receipt will merely signify that a return has been filed. It will not give further information.

Racketeers and tax cheats will find their normal business activities thus curtailed.

In order to supplement the provisions of the act, I have written to the Secretary of the Treasury asking that upon the passage of this bill that he request all State and municipal governments to cooperate with the Department of the Treasury either by means of regulations or laws in the numerous instances where signatures are required, such as with automobile registrations, driving licenses, jury duty, voting, corporation applications, opening of bank accounts or safe deposit vaults, applications for telephones and in other relevant situations.

In my letter to the Secretary, I further suggested that he obtain the cooperation of police departments and prosecuting officials in the cases of arrests, accident reports, and so forth. It was also indicated that in the event the proposal is made into law I would communicate with the Bureau of the Census requesting that this information be made part of the 1960 census procedure. Following is the text of the aforementioned letter:

JANUARY 16, 1958.

HON. ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
*The Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Mindful of the tremendous task confronting you in producing revenue in the present state of emergency, I am introducing a measure which I believe will assist you in the collection of approximately $7 billion of additional revenue without increase in any tax rate or additional cost to any taxpayer. Copies of the bill are enclosed herewith.

The problem of apprehending the millions of persons who have never filed a return has always been a major one.

Recent statistical studies indicate that more than $26 billion of income are unreported. At the average rate this would mean nearly $7 billion are evaded in taxes. This does not include additional billions which are chiseled on exemptions, deductions, and expense accounts.

The ancient, ineffective, and frowned-upon informer method has never produced a tangible or substantial result. I feel, therefore, that by the simple provisions contained in my measure this will be rectified at once.

Forwarding of a numbered receipt card to a taxpayer is inexpensive and expeditious. This has never been done for the individual taxpayer. By requiring any person doing business in the normal course with the Federal Government where a signature is required, to annex such a number with his signature, or the reason why such number is not available, would restrict the life of the tax cheat and the racketeer. It would flush him out by the provisions which require his failure to furnish this information to be sent directly to you, from which point your agents would take over. Decent taxpaying citizens would surely have no objection as the receipt card would not divulge any confidential information nor would it involve in any way the accuracy of the return.

I realize, of course, that this would leave a gap in which the evader might possibly be able to continue his activities without dealing at any time with the Federal Government. Upon passage of the bill, I respectfully request that you communicate with

each and every State and municipal government asking their cooperation either by law or by regulation to require this procedure to be followed in all appropriate cases of dealings in and with local or State governments, such as with automobile registrations, driving licenses, voting, jury duty, corporation applications, opening of bank accounts or safe deposit vaults, applications for telephones, and in other relevant situations.

It is my considered opinion that this not only has a practical effect but a most salutary one. It in no way curtails constitutional or civil rights. It is merely for purposes of information and no law-abiding citizen could validly object. It is no different from many instances in which a person is required in ordinary transactions to supply his social-security number.

The additional money which must surely flow in as a result of this act would provide the funds sorely needed at the present time. It would provide a method for obtaining information as to past illegal evasion. In this connection, it is further respectfully requested that communication be had with local and State law-enforcement agencies and police departments in situations in which apprehensions and accident reports are made in the normal course, to forward information on this item. A further thought occurs to me that perhaps in the taking of the 1960 census this item might be added as an additional bit of information.

The principle behind the bill is that the Government should not act for or protect those who refuse to contribute to its defense and support.

I would appreciate your comment on the foregoing proposal.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT ZELENKO,
*Member of Congress.*

The bill would merely be one to supply information and would do so on a thorough and substantial basis instead of the ancient, inefficient, isolated, and frowned-upon informer process. It will not in any way curtail or infringe upon the civil or individual rights of any law-abiding person as it is merely a means of further identification. It is no different from many instances in which a person is required in ordinary transactions to supply his social-security number.

The substantial increase in tax income which must surely result by this act will ease the tax burden on all taxpayers. If estimates are correct, it might even supply the additional funds needed in our present emergency.

The principle behind the bill is that Government should not act for or protect those who refuse to contribute to its defense and support.

In closing, I wish to extend to the Scripps-Howard newspapers and to Jack Steele, one of their outstanding journalists, my sincere praise for their recent series on the vital problem of tax abuses. As a matter of fact this bill may be said to be one of the results of their call for immediate action by the Congress.

I urge the early passage of this legislation.

## THE PRESIDENT'S FARM MESSAGE

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a telegram from Fred Heinkel, president of Missouri Farmers Association, concerning the President's farm message. Fred Heinkel is one of the Nation's most distinguished and highly respected farm leaders and authority on our farm problems. He is especially noted for his loyalty to and for what is in the best interests of the farmers of America. This is his comment:

COLUMBIA, MO., *January 17, 1958.*

Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

The President's farm message of yesterday reveals a complete lack of understanding of the farm problem and a lack of sympathy for the plight of American farmers. In the main, it is simply a plan for economic disaster. We hope that the Congress will reject his proposals and will unite to see that such a program is not enacted into law.

It should be recognized that the President's proposal constitutes, not a farm program, but the abolition of a farm program.

The technological revolution in agriculture, as described by Mr. Eisenhower, has resulted in a vast increase in the productivity of our Nation's agriculture. Through increased efficiency and new scientific approaches to farming, an enormous benefit has been conferred upon the people of this country and of the whole world. However, the cost of this revolution, which has been tremendous, has been borne by the farmers alone and the benefits flowing from such advances have been reaped almost exclusively by the nonfarm population.

The President and the Secretary of Agriculture have failed to see the effects of a farm depression upon the rest of the Nation's economy. Historically, general depressions have been farm led and farm fed. The Nation's economy is today feeling the severe effects of the farm depression which has been gaining momentum since 1952. We hope that the administration will soon recognize—even though it has not done so yet—that a sound and prosperous agriculture is an absolute necessity to a sound national economy. This may be a forlorn hope, but we feel that the Congress can and will take such steps as are necessary to put agriculture in a strong and healthy position.

It is significant that at the same time the President was announcing his disastrous program, the Federal Reserve Board dropped margin requirements to 50 percent on the purchase of stock on the stock market. Obviously, the move in lowering these down payment requirements is to bolster the sagging stock market. The Nation's leaders should recognize that the stock market sag and the business slump generally have their roots in an ailing agriculture. Government participation is the only presently available means whereby the prices of agricultural products can be maintained at an equitable level. Maintenance of farm prices is necessary if we are to forestall bankruptcy for our farmers and prevent the spread of this depression to every part of our country.

MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION,
F. V. HEINKEL, *President.*

## FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEART LAW

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, the chief inducement for a person to become an employee of the Federal Government was the security provided by the Federal retirement system.

That has been canceled, to a large extent, by the Social Security Act, the private pension plans, and the fringe benefits applying to employees in private industry, that have come into being in recent years.

There has not been comparable progress in the relationship between the Federal Government and its employees.

The retirement and disability compensation laws have not been amended to cover their obvious shortcomings and to bring these systems in line with modern conditions and circumstances.

For instance, what protection is there for the individual—or his family—who is disabled or dies from a heart condition, when that individual is an employee of the Federal Government?

When a man is injured on the job, or dies as a result of that injury, the claim is definite and clear.

But the human heart works 24 hours a day, and the strain on it caused by the job, may weaken it over a period of time, and may not become evident until he reaches home, or, even while he is asleep.

Because the Federal laws do not cover such contingencies, and because such omissions in the laws deny to Federal employees the protection to which they are entitled under these circumstances, I propose a Federal employees' heart law to fill this gap.

As it is plainly impossible to check every Federal employee's heart upon the conclusion of his day's work, or, in the absence of unusual circumstances, to decide that the impairment of his heart began on or off the job, the equitable presumption is that it was occasioned by his work.

I believe, therefore, that the retirement and disability compensation laws affecting civilian employees of the Federal Government should be amended to make this presumption clear and binding, in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

In this way, we shall strengthen the protection afforded to employees of the United States Government, thereby improving the confidence and morale of such employees.

In heart cases, they must not suffer because of defects in the present laws that, in effect, militate against their retirement and disability compensation rights.

My bill, to be known as the Federal employee heart law will create a presumption that certain impairment of health caused by hypertension or heart disease of a Federal or District of Columbia employee is incurred in line of duty for purposes of certain retirement and disability compensation laws or systems.

Subject only to the following conditions, to protect the public interest:

First. That such employee shall have passed an appropriate physical examination immediately prior to his entry into such employment, or within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later; and

Second. That it is not established by competent evidence that such condition of impairment of health was not incurred in the course of his employment.

As Federal employees are entitled to retirement and disability compensation rights similar to those that protect workers in private industry, I submit that this bill will correct an obvious injustice. And it will provide them with insurance against total or partial disability, or death, resulting from heart impairment or failure that is the reasonable consequence of their employment.

## MINERAL LANDS EXCHANGE LEGISLATION

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, already this session, many new proposals have been introduced asking Congress to approve new Federal aid for education programs for the States. Today, I have introduced a measure which asks Congress to approve legislation to permit several public-land States to obtain revenue promised them by Congresses of many years ago. That this long-promised revenue is earmarked for the support of public education is in itself a most persuasive argument for an early approval of my bill.

When Utah and some of the other public-land States were admitted to the Union, the various Congresses recognized that these new States would have a difficult time finding a tax base to support their public education systems. This difficulty arises because in these public-land States more than 50 percent of the area is federally owned and consequently not subject to State and local taxes. In Utah, this untaxable Federal property represents more than 70 percent of the State's land area.

To overcome this taxing deficit, Congress at the time of statehood granted these public-land States numbered sections of land in place. The mineral royalties and other income from these lands was reserved for the support of public schools. In Utah, this grant amounted to four sections out of every township or one-ninth of the State's land area. Similar grants were made to New Mexico, Arizona, and other public-land States.

After these land grants had been made, many Federal reservations in the Western States were created or enlarged. Many hundreds of thousands of acres of land granted for the support of our schools were absorbed within these new reservations as were the potential revenues that these lands would yield. It is true that the States are granted the right to choose other areas in lieu of the land taken. But the law as it now stands restricts the State's choice to lands not mineral in character.

Mr. Speaker, this restriction on the lands that the States may choose is unfair and unrealistic. Many of the original school sections taken back by the Federal Government have proved rich in minerals, particularly gas, oil, and uranium. Yet under the law, our States cannot replace these lands unless they can find other public-domain lands not mineral in character.

In an era when exploratory wells go 15,000 feet down; when new minerals and new uses for those minerals are being found every day, it is virtually impossible to find any land not mineral in character.

My legislation would remove that restriction. The States would be permitted to select land to compensate them for their losses without this bar. The Federal Government, however, would be protected in that a State could not choose land in a producing status or on a known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field. Thus the Federal Government's interest in proven production on the Federal domain is amply protected.

It appears to me only simple justice to the public-land States involved for Congress to make available revenue sources already dedicated for the support of their schools.

While we are considering broadening Federal aid for education, we should act to make available Federal grants provided for, in some cases, more than 60 years ago.

## WHY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST TEACHERS IN TIMES LIKE THESE?

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I am in dead earnest about the United States winning this race for scientific supremacy. If we win it, we must remove the present tax discrimination against teachers and offer greater incentives to teacher growth. A lawyer can travel across the week course in pediatrics. His expenses are deductible. A doctor can take a 6-week course in pediatrics. His expenses are deductible. Not so with a teacher. If he takes a 6-week course in summer school, his expenses are not deductible. I think we should not only remove these barriers, but we should offer every incentive.

My attitude is about like the following story. There was a group of small Boy Scouts relating their good turns in Scout meeting. Some hashed over old saws like conducting a blind man across a street or carrying an old woman's traveling bag. But, one boy had a good turn that was really original. He said, "I saw my neighbors, Mr. and Mrs. Brown, running for the bus, and I felt they were too fat and too slow to catch it. So, I sicked the dog on them."

### THIS COULD BE OUR LAST OPPORTUNITY TO WIN THE RACE FOR SCIENTIFIC SUPREMACY

Gentlemen, to appear before you this morning is an opportunity that I cherish and one for which I am grateful. Along with millions of Americans, I am in dead earnest about winning this race for scientific supremacy, because who knows but that this could be our last opportunity.

In Germany I once saw a statue called Opportunity. It shows a little bald-headed man with only one tuft of hair as a forelock. He is in the posture of running rapidly. The whole idea is that opportunity must be grasped by the forelock when it is coming toward us; it cannot be grabbed from behind once it has passed. Our very existence might depend on grasping today's opportunity to maintain scientific supremacy, and I for one am unwilling to go along with those who say we cannot afford to save our own necks or with those who throw obstructions in the way of scientific progress.

As Adm. Hymen Rickover recently declared:

> The powerful thrust of sputnik's launching device did more than penetrate outer space. It pierced the thick armor encasing our complacent faith in America's * * * technological supremacy. It blasted the comfortable conviction that only in an atmosphere of personal independence * * * can science and scientists flourish. It shook the belief * * * that a high standard of material well-being is both the outward manifestation and the necessary basis for technological progress.
>
> It did greatest damage to our trust in the American educational system—up to now almost as sacrosanct as motherhood.
>
> Sputnik may well be the catalyst which brings about drastic and long overdue reforms in utilizing the Nation's intellectual capacities. It may thus do in matters of the intellect what Pearl Harbor did in matters industrial and military. * * * We found then that in a national emergency we could take prompt and vigorous action and perform industrial miracles, so I am convinced we can now take similar action and perform educational miracles. (The Balance Sheet on Education, published by the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation.)

The bills before us today will help to clear away dangerous and unwarranted obstructions to educational progress and, in addition, stimulate that progress.

### GREATER TEACHER INCENTIVES A NECESSITY

The psychologist, Flemming, said, "Tell me a boy's I. Q. and I will tell you what he might be able to do; but show me what a boy wants to do and I will tell you what he will do."

The will to do is probably the greatest motivating power in human behavior. It is this motivating power that American education needs in greater abundance. It definitely must be supplied in ever-increasing quantity.

Donald C. McGraw, of McGraw-Hill Book Co., says:

> As far as financial incentives are concerned, we have virtually socialized the academic profession. * * * Ironically, the Soviet Union has deliberately and successfully used capitalistic incentives to improve its educational system.

The National Education Association places the average college faculty salary at a little more than the average income of the industrial workers in the United States. The average faculty salary is around $4,100 for instructors and $5,730 for associate professors, while the factory workers in 1956 received $4,580.

Alexander Korol, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, points out that the head of a department in a Russian university can receive 6,000 rubles—or about $7,200 per year—a month based upon relative purchasing power which is eight times the income of the average Russian worker.

McGraw points out further that the Russian spread of the income between a full professor and the lowest academic professor is greater than 15 to 1, while in the United States full professors earn twice as much as beginning instructors. The president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences is the highest paid man in the nation. Russian teachers of science are given country homes, vacations, maids, chauffeurs, and cars, and are placed in a class with the elite. Furthermore, top science students need not worry about much of anything except keeping up their grades.

WE CANNOT HAVE SCIENTISTS WITHOUT TEACHERS OF SCIENCE

Now, we cannot have scientists without teachers of science, and it is not likely the colleges can attract and graduate in the immediate future a sufficiently large portion of young men and women to meet the manpower needs in education—National Policies Commission, Manpower and Education, page 115.

The same Commission says:

In recruiting teachers there must be extensive provision for inservice training as contrasted with preservice training.

The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School states that—

The most critical bottleneck of expansion and improvement of education in the United States is the mounting shortage of excellent teachers. * * * Colleges and universities have found themselves at a growing competitive disadvantage in the professional manpower market.

This committee estimates that by 1970 there will be only one new Ph. D. available for every four or five new college teachers needed, and that unless something unusual happens our percentage of Ph. D.'s on the college faculties will drop from the present 40 percent to 20 percent—second report to the President, page 30.

The best estimates I can find are that unless college faculty, buildings, and facilities are provided at a faster rate than they are at the present time, by 1970 one out of every three students applying for admission will be turned away.

The President's committee says:

If the United States is to become increasingly a society of students it must also become increasingly a society of teachers. * * * If an unwelcome choice were required between preserving quality and expanding enrollments, then quality should be preferred; because it would do neither individual nor the Nation any good to masquerade mass production of mediocrity under the guise of higher education. The Nation needs both quality and quantity, and it can have both if it desires to do so. (Commission on Higher Education, p. 4.)

While I was in California this fall I asked the dean of the school of education at my old alma mater, USC, how many teachers he had in practice teaching. He replied, "406." I asked him how many were preparing to teach math and science. He replied, "Seven. Industry is picking off our prospective math and science teachers down in the sophomore and junior years so fast that they are not even leaving us seed corn."

I call your attention to the above facts merely to show that unusual incentives to teachers must be provided, and very soon. The bills before you today, Mr. Chairman, are just one small, but important, step in this direction.

THE LEAST WE CAN DO IS REMOVE TAX DISCRIMINATION AGAINST TEACHER IMPROVEMENT

Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code granting tax deduction for necessary business and professional expenses has been liberally interpreted in areas other than teaching. Business executives with little restraint dine on filet mignon and occupy fancy hotel suites, deducting the costs as necessary expenses. A lawyer may attend a tax institute or a bar association convention in London, a doctor may take a refresher course in pediatrics or an actor may enroll in physical culture to lose weight and these expenses are tax deductible.

This is not so with the teacher. If he attends summer school, enrolls in an extension course during the winter or takes a semester off to "brush up," the expenses are not deductible unless he was forced by administrative edict to take the extra schooling.

Only after the decision of the United States Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals on May 19, 1950, in the case of Hill against Commissioner, did the Internal Revenue Service concede even to allow the deductions for courses required by administrative edict. However, the IRS still interpreted the court's decision in the most restrictive possible fashion.

The IRS would allow teachers to deduct the cost of their voluntary education providing it does not advance their skills, is of short duration and does not carry academic credit. The drawing of this line is unfortunate and arbitrary. It means that the method used by doctors and lawyers to keep abreast of professional developments is tax deductible, because their method does not involve the granting of academic credit. However, the method used by teachers to keep abreast of changes is not tax deductible, because academic credit is given. The aim in both cases is the same, and the tax treatment should be the same. Doctors and lawyers unquestionably increase their skills and prestige by attending such courses, just as teachers do.

This unfortunate discrimination places a premium on stagnation in education, where dynamism is most urgently needed. Every year new scientific developments turn scientific teachings of the past into the outdated theory or folklore. Yet science teachers cannot even deduct their necessary expenditures to keep abreast in their fields, because the best available method for them to do so is to take college courses, and these are disallowed by IRS.

The IRS has argued that the reason other deductions are allowed, such as for the spangled tights of an entertainer, is because those expenses are necessary for his employment. However, there is no greater need for a doctor to take his voluntary refresher course or the lawyer to attend his voluntary tax institute than for a teacher to take voluntary coursework in his field. It is imperative that we end this discrimination against those who are in the greatest need of help.

REMOVAL OF THE TAX DISCRIMINATION HAS OTHER ADVANTAGES

Removal of the tax discrimination against teachers is not only required for the sake of justice, but it may have a greater impact on education per dollar of cost than any program the Federal Government might consider.

First, the cost of the program is extremely small. Compare a probable revenue loss of $15 million to $18 million annually with the billion dollar educational assistance program Congress will consider this year.

Yet the impact of this small expense will be great, because it will be an incentive for teachers to be on top of their field, and it will only help the teachers who are sacrificing the most to stimulate their students. From the standpoint of impact, compare this with a salary increase to teachers. Although this is greatly needed, it suffers from the handicap that the immediate impact is a blanket one, covering equally the alert and the stagnant. Or compare the tax deduction program for teachers' education with a tax deduction on student expenses. This might be meritorious, but it would help the wealthy, who don't need it, even more than the poor who are in lower tax brackets. The impact of the tax deduction for teachers who advance their own training would help only the deserving. It would also enable many additional teachers who must now seek summer work to attend summer school or take evening classes.

A final argument in favor of this type of assistance is that it involves no Federal control and in no way expands Federal bureaucracy. Many Congressmen who want to assist education, but who are concerned about Federal control, should wholeheartedly and promptly support this type of program with great enthusiasm. My bill, H. R. 6131, limits deductions for professional improvements to $600. I would, however, make no objection to any amendment which would place the total outlay in the tax exemption column.

## CHANGING PARTY AFFILIATION

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, 1957, I notified the people of my constituency that henceforth I considered myself a member of the Democratic Party and would support the candidate of that party and its policies and program. Inasmuch as I had been elected to the 85th Congress as a Republican, I did, on November 1, 1957, notify the Republican leader in the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., that thereafter I would consider myself an affiliate of the Democratic Party and would, if permitted to do so, attend and become a member of the Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives. I was invited to attend such a caucus on January 14, 1958. I make this statement at this time, Mr. Speaker, so that the records and proceedings of this House will properly portray my present party affiliation. I insert at this point a copy of the letter I addressed to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., on November 1, 1957.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., November 1, 1957.*

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
*Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. MARTIN: This is to ask that my name be withdrawn from the rolls of the House as a Republican Congressman. After I vote for the Democrat gubernatorial candidate as well as the entire Democrat ticket for Hudson County, N. J., in the general election on November 5, 1957, I will officially become a member of the Democrat Party.

I have notified the Democrat State committeeman and the Democrat State committeewoman to list me as a member of the Democrat State organization and to notify the chairman of the National Democrat Committee, the Speaker of the House, and the majority leader of the House that I will sit on the Democrat side of the House when the next session of Congress convenes.

Thanking you for your many past courtesies and with every good wish.

Sincerely yours,

VINCENT J. DELLAY.

## RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1958.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*The Speaker, United States House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having changed my politics from Republican to Democratic during the gubernatorial campaign in New Jersey last year, this is my official resignation from the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as a Republican member.

With my best wishes.

Sincerely,

VINCENT J. DELLAY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief statement, to inform my colleagues that the bill scheduled for today will not be brought up. The reason for that is that the Committee on Rules is considering another rule. It is a bill that was reported out last session. There is no real urgency. The bill will be programed next week.

Also I desire to inform my colleagues that due to the death of our dear friend, MATT NEELY, if there is any rollcall on a bill that will be brought up tomorrow or Wednesday, that rollcall will be postponed to Thursday. The other day I announced that rollcalls would take place on Wednesday of that week so that Members attending the funeral services of our late friend, August Andresen, would have the opportunity to return. The unfortunate death of our dear friend, MATT NEELY, took place subsequent to that announcement. The burial will be on Wednesday. So that if any rollcalls are ordered on any bill, they will take place on Thursday instead of Wednesday.

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution—House Resolution 444—and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That MILTON W. GLENN, of New Jersey, be elected to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

## POSTPONEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDERS TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all special orders entered for today may be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, permission has already been granted for the consideration tomorrow afternoon of the supplemental defense appropriation bill, 1958, which the Committee on Appropriations plans to report tomorrow morning. In that connection I have conferred with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and at this time I ask unanimous consent that all points of order against this bill be waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think I ought to say at this point that I do not object to this request because it simply makes in order public works language which has not yet been authorized, the transferability and the appropriation of funds connected with the missiles program. There is nothing else in the bill that would be subject to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. KELLY (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), for the balance of the week, on account of the death of her mother.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow and Thursday, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY, for 1 hour, on January 27.

Mr. HORAN, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. DENNISON, for 1 hour, on January 27, and 1 hour on January 28.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia and to include a speech made by Hon. BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, at the Walter F. George School of Law, Mercer University, Macon, Ga., on November 1, 1957.

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITTEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KNOX and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. ARENDS and to include extraneous matter.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study and inves-

tigation of all matters connected with the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President, to the Committee on Rules.

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to print a compilation of materials relating to the development of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries, to the Committee on House Administration.

## SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union.

## THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to the House the passing of a former Member representing the First District of Kansas, W. P. Lambertson, of Fairview, Kans., on October 26, 1957.

W. P., or Bill as he was familiarly known by his friends, was born near Fairview, Brown County, Kans., in 1880 and that was his continuous voting residence during his entire life span, only being away from Fairview while representing the First District in the Congress of the United States. He attended public schools there and later attended Ottawa University at Ottawa, Kans., as well as the University of Chicago Law School.

He had a long record of public service. He served as a representative of Brown County in the Kansas State House of Representatives from 1909 to 1911, and later was speaker of that body in 1919–21. Between these two terms in the house of representatives he served in the State senate, representing the first Kansas senatorial district from 1913 to 1915. He was elected to Congress first in 1927 and served 7 successive terms until 1945. After completing his Congressional career he returned to his farm near Fairview and resumed his first profession, that of a farmer. He continued this pursuit until the time of his death. Mr. Lambertson was preceded in death by his most efficient and attractive wife, Floy, in 1953. Surviving the former House Member are two sons, Milan and Alonzo Lambertson, and two daughters, Mrs. Robert Reynolds and Mrs. Ferrill Copeland.

As a member of the Kansas Legislature and as a Member of this body, Mr. Lambertson was known as a rugged individualist, and as a Member who was always willing to clearly state his views and his position on any issue regardless of the circumstances surrounding the issue, or regardless of whether his position would be a popular one. He took direct issue with many public officials, even including a former President of the United States. He was an ardent foe of communism and was one of the first Members of this House to raise his voice to warn this body and the Nation of the imminent danger of communism to our American way of life. He was one of the foremost champions for the authorization of the first Un-American Activities Committee, chairmanned by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable MARTIN DIES.

I had a rather unusual association and acquaintance with Mr. Lambertson. I knew him first as a State legislator and a friend of my father's; later as my Congressman, and then as a constituent; but most important as a personal friend. Although not always in agreement with him, I held him in high esteem. His death brings a note of sadness to every Kansan, regardless of political affiliation, and further lowers the curtain on a colorful epic in the history of Kansas from the turn of the century through the 1950's. The leaders of this period guided the destiny of Kansas through three wars, two depressions, several droughts, and witnessed the plowing up of the sod in the West and the development of the great petroleum industry. Their wisdom and dedication to duty helped to provide us with many of the advantages we enjoy today.

Mr. Lambertson was a great son of Kansas, and a loyal and honored Member of this body. His death is a loss to the State and to the Nation.

WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

The death of former Congressman W. P. Lambertson, of Fairview, occurred last Saturday at the age of 77. Funeral service was held Tuesday. At the request of the children, this writer prepared a tribute to his old friend, which was read at the service at the Fairview Baptist Church. For the benefit of Mr. Lambertson's friends in this county, we produce it here:

" 'Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale her infinite variety.' I think Shakespeare's lines might be transposed to apply to our departed friend, William P. Lambertson. For well on to a half century he provided the political life of his State and Nation with variety. He was a nonconformist. Without sacrificing in any degree his ideals of personal and public morality and justice, he simply did not fit into the common mold in which the general run of public servants are shaped.

"It was my privilege to be with him at the outset of his political career. I was chief clerk of the house in 1909 when Bill Lambertson with his devoted and talented wife arrived, sent down as Brown County's representative. He confided to me then that he expected to embark on a political career. How well he adhered to that resolution is amply proved by his future advances; several terms in the house, including the speakership, a term in the State senate, a term on the board of administration, eight terms in Congress, service as county commissioner and mayor of his town of Fairview. I know of no Kansan who approaches this record in years of public service. And, with one exception, all the offices were won by popular vote of the people.

"In all his periods of legislative and administrative service, I never knew of his influence being subsidized for his own gain by capitalistic interests. More often, when he felt the cause was just, he would be found advocating the rights of the common man.

"He had an exceptionally retentive mind, and I recall no Kansas figure who excelled him in his capacity for making friends, remembering names and events.

"Not always did our views exactly coincide, but on rare occasions when our opinions clashed, we granted one another the right to his own belief, and respected that privilege. Nothing ever occurred to mar the close friendship that existed over a period of a half century and endured to the end.

"I was always glad that no office or duty ever lured him away permanently from the home where he was born. As a farmer he was deeply rooted to the soil. From his window he could look out on the undulating fields of Brown County land, and behold as fair a scene as exists on the face of the earth.

"The passing of William P. Lambertson will leave a void in the community, and beyond. In the presence and hearing of his friends and neighbors here, I have tried to avoid overstatement or indulge in fulsome flattery. You know the man even better than this writer did. But I am glad, as I know you must be, that he was vouchsafed a full and useful life. His children, relatives, and friends will feel bereft, but the thoughts of the good life he lived will be to them ever a poignant and fragrant memory.

"W. T. B."

---

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital of November 2, 1957]

CLIF STRATTON WRITES

Drove to Fairview last Tuesday to attend the funeral services of William Purnell Lambertson, for whom, during his 16 years in the National House of Representatives and in the years since, we conceived a sincere affection. The Baptist Church building filled; it took half an hour after the services—three ministers paid tribute to "Ole Bill"—for the crowd outside to come inside and file past the bier.

Bill Lambertson, during his 77 years, had a long record of faithful public service: 8 years in the Kansas House of Representatives (speaker in 1919 session); 4 years in the State senate (1913–17); 8 terms in Congress (1929–1945); mayor of Fairview; county commissioner of Brown County, term ending year before his death; minority member State Board of Administration during term of Jonathan Davis as governor.

The farmer from Fairview all his life was a fighting nonconformist. A Republican in politics, he became a stalwart supporter in Congress of the policies and programs of Franklin D. Roosevelt until FDR made his "quarantine speech" during his second term, committing the United States to World War II several years in advance; at that point Lambertson became an America firster and a severe and vociferous critic of FDR and most of the New Deal philosophy.

Until World War II came along, with early and almost daily Congressional committee meetings, Bill was an enthusiastic member of the "Kansas daylight golfing club" that played early morning golf on Washington public courses. Incidentally, he swung just about the sweetest two-iron of any amateur golfer we have known. Other early-bird golfers included Representatives Clifford Hope, Ed H. Rees, the late U. S. Guyer and his secretary, Russell Jones, Frank Carlson (now Senator), the late James G. Strong of Blue Rapids, and yours truly—with occasional visitors from home.

One of the highlights of these golfing excursions was the way Bill got us out of a police station. That particular morning Rep. (now Senator) FRANCIS H. CASE of South Dakota was along; ED REES and I believe FRANK CARLSON also were in the party. Bill "chauffed" us. On the way back we reached the Washington Public Library a few minutes after 8 o'clock. Generally we reached that point a few minutes before 8, when "no left turn" sign went up. This morning it was up, but Bill failed to notice it. All of us were escorted to nearest police station, seated in outer office until the lieutenant would see us, before we were booked. A sergeant kept his eye—and it turned out, both ears—on us.

Bill arose to the occasion. He soliloquized: "Yes, it's true I'm a Member of Congress." Sergeant cocked an ear. "It's true I am a member of the House Appropriations Committee." Sergeant leaned forward, both ears cocked. "Come to think of it, I am on the Appropriations Subcommittee that handles the District of Columbia." The sergeant was on his way to the lieutenant's office with that. The lieutenant emerged, and a pleasant time was had by all.

---

[From the New York Times of October 28, 1957]

W. P. LAMBERTSON SERVED IN HOUSE—KANSAS REPUBLICAN, MEMBER FROM 1928 TO 1944, DIES AT 77—FOE OF ROOSEVELT

HIAWATHA, KANS., October 27.—William P. Lambertson, Republican Representative from Kansas from 1928 to 1944, died yesterday en route to a hospital from his home in Fairview. His age was 77. The cause of death was not immediately determined.

Mr. Lambertson, an outspoken opponent of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was defeated in the 1944 Republican primary by Albert M. Cole, who was elected to succeed him. Mr. Cole is now Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Surviving are two sons, the Reverend Milan Lambertson, of Kansas City, and Alonzo Lambertson, of Fairview; two daughters, Mrs. Robert Reynolds, of Hiawatha, and Mrs. Ferrill Copeland, of Tucson, Ariz.; a sister and two half-sisters.

* * * * *

In 1940 he said deserving actors and actresses were being deprived of Federal relief because Communists had taken over key posts in the theatrical profession in New York. He charged that seven Communists were on the Actors' Equity Association governing council.

Bert Lytell, president of the association, denied the charges and asked Representative MARTIN DIES, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to investigate them.

In 1942 the association approved in a referendum of its membership the adoption of a constitutional amendment barring Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from holding office or being employed by the union.

As an outcome of Mr. Lambertson's charges, 2 vice presidents and 8 council members had resigned, asserting Communists controlled the organization.

BAREFOOTED CONGRESSMAN

Mr. Lambertson was known in Washington as the barefooted Congressman. He got up at 5 o'clock in the morning to play golf barefooted. He said he never wore a dress suit.

He was born on a farm at Fairview and attended Ottawa (Kans.) University and the University of Chicago Law School. He then went back to farming and made a success of it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks certain newspaper editorials and articles written about our deceased colleague and, further, that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD to pay tribute to Mr. Lambertson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Kansas, the senior member of the delegation [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of a former Member of the House of Representatives from Kansas, the Honorable William P. Lambertson, who has passed on to his reward.

Mr. Lambertson was a Member of this House when I first came to Washington. I served with Mr. Lambertson over a period of 18 years. During that time he was a Member of the Appropriations Committee of the House.

Bill Lambertson, as he was familiarly known, was a man of keen intellect. He was a student of Government affairs. He was well informed. He reached conclusions with respect to matters of state after careful study and deliberation. He had fixed opinions. He was determined in his views. He did not hesitate to take a stand on public issues. When once committed, there was little or no compromise, but you always knew where he stood. He was described by many of his friends as a rugged individualist.

He worked hard. He was sincere. He was deeply religious. He was loyal to his State. He was devoted to his family and to his country. Our sympathy goes out to the members of his family who survive.

THERE IS NO DEATH

There is no death; the stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death; the dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death; although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms.

Although with bowed and breaking heart,
With sable garb and silent tread
We bear their senseless dust to earth,
And say that they are dead.

They are not dead; they have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Tho' disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here and love us yet;
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I knew Bill Lambertson very well from the time he first came to the House of Representatives. He was a man of fine character He devoted himself to his work here in the House. He was a valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations and always could be counted on to vote for those things which were in the public interest. He always had courage enough to stand up and say what he thought. I found him a very fine man to work with and one who was absolutely dependable and always striving to make the Government better.

I extend to the family of the deceased my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from New York for his most eloquent tribute.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, whenever a colleague with whom I have served passes away, I always feel a sense of personal loss. Hon. William P. Lambertson, of the State of Kansas, with whom I served in the House of Representatives from March 4, 1929, to January 3, 1945, was a unique and interesting character, as well as a man of great ability and integrity.

We were close personal friends, and at that time we were both interested in playing golf. "Bill," as he was affectionately known by his colleagues, had a dry wit and a keen sense of humor. One day when driving home from the golf course he entered a one-way street from the wrong end. A policeman arrested him. "Bill" made no protest when taken to the police station. When asked by the judge who he was, "Bill" replied that he was a Member of Congress. There was consternation in the courtroom, and abject apologies were made by the judge, much to the amusement of the Congressman.

Representative Lambertson was a diligent and able legislator, especially in the field of agriculture. My contacts with my friend by letter continued through the years up to almost the time of his death. He was a grand, good man, and a fine American. I extend my sympathy to his family and friends in this time of their bereavement.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with deep regret of the passing of our former colleague and friend, Hon. William P. Lambertson of Kansas.

He had a distinguished career in the public service, serving some 8 years in the Kansas House of Representatives, including 1 term as its speaker, serving 4 years in the Kansas Senate, and in other official capacities in his native State, and serving here in this House for some 16 years from 1929 to 1945.

I knew him well because we served together for many years on the Committee on Appropriations, to which he brought ability, independence, and strength of character.

He made a fine contribution to those whom he represented and to the welfare of his country.

I offer my most sincere sympathy to the members of his family and others close to him.

---

## THE LATE HONORABLE MATTHEW MANSFIELD NEELY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of loss that I call the attention of my colleagues to the death of West Virginia's senior Senator, MATTHEW MANSFIELD NEELY, who in addition to his long record of outstanding service in the other body, also served with equal ability for a number of years as a Member of the House of Representatives.

This great statesman first came to Congress in 1913. President Wilson named the late John W. Davis, then representing the First Congressional District of West Virginia, as Solicitor General of the United States. Young NEELY, best known to his close friends as

"MATT," was elected at a special election to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Mr. Davis.

I am sure our distinguished Speaker will recall Mr. NEELY came to Congress during the first term that launched the remarkable career of service by Mr. RAYBURN, that began 45 years ago.

Among the many and glowing tributes paid this great American, I like most of all the editorial comments in today's daily Post and Times Herald.

The Post editorial writer said, and I quote:

West Virginia's coal miners and organized labor in general lost their most eloquent, untiring, and inflexible Federal servant in the death, at 83, of Senator MATTHEW MANSFIELD NEELY. His fellow Senators lost one of their hardest working colleagues and, for all his barbed prose in a tough campaign, a thoughtful, kind, and courtly peer. Unfortunately the highest tribute which the Senate could pay to MATT NEELY will probably not be paid. But if he could, he would undoubtedly ask that the eulogies be short and that the committee meetings, just for once, all start on time. Never has the Senate had a more determined foe of wasted words and wasted hours.

The New York Times of Sunday, January 19, 1958, said:

In a political career spanning half a century, Mr. NEELY seldom forsook the role of the common man's David seeking out the Goliath of the special interests.

Twenty-five years in the Senate, nearly another 10 in the House of Representatives and still another 4 as Governor of his native West Virginia spelled out his service in high elective office.

But before going to the House in a special election in 1913, Mr. NEELY put in 2 years as mayor of Fairmont, W. Va., where he practiced law, and another 3 years as clerk of the West Virginia House of Delegates.

Mr. NEELY'S reputation as a liberal and friend of labor, won early in his Congressional career, earned him a place in the front ranks of the fight for the New Deal and Fair Deal. Few so enlisted brought as much fire to the campaign. He was an orator of the old school, and, if there was anything stronger than his convictions, it was the caustic bite of his tongue.

Senator NEELY also led some memorable fights. His was the bill in 1950 that eventually liberalized the Displaced Persons Act voted by the Republican 80th Congress. And battling for suffrage for the District of Columbia, he said citizens there were "shipwrecked on a voiceless, voteless island in the midst of the greatest ocean of democracy in the world."

At times, Senator NEELY opposed his own self-interest in taking up battles. Thus it was that his fight in 1945 for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, taken up as he himself was making a periodic political comeback, undoubtedly was a factor in his failure to win reelection to the House in 1946.

Senator NEELY never was the all-conquering hero at the polls. Four political defeats accounted for the 8 years he had spent outside public service since 1908. But in each instance the setback was more a party than a personal defeat—and each time he came back stronger than ever.

The Harding landslide in 1920 cost Mr. NEELY election for a fifth consecutive House term. Two years later, he was elected to the Senate, but went down to defeat with Alfred E. Smith in seeking to be returned in 1928. He won another Senate term in 1930, was reelected in 1936, and was elected Governor in 1940.

Two years later, Mr. NEELY sought unsuccessfully to get back to the Senate. He won a House term again in 1944, only to lose again in the Republican sweep of 1946. He got back to the Senate to stay in 1948.

Through the years, Mr. NEELY had strong support from John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers. And through the years, Mr. Lewis could count on the Senator's support, whether for a mine-safety bill or a measure to impose quotas on oil imports.

Mr. NEELY was born November 9, 1874, on a farm near Groves, W. Va., the son of a country physician. He was of Scottish, Irish, and Welsh descent, but his ancestors had been in the country since Revolutionary days. His college studies were interrupted by service in the West Virginia Volunteers during the Spanish-American War, but he returned to get arts and law degrees from West Virginia University.

In the process, he won a Phi Beta Kappa key, numerous oratorical honors, and the medal for being the best-drilled cadet in the school's military department.

For nearly 2 years before his death, the ailing Senator had spent most of his time in the Bethesda (Md.) Naval Hospital. In May 1956 he underwent an operation after having suffered a severe attack of sciatica. In November of that year, he fractured his hip.

When Congress convened on January 7, the Senator appeared in a wheelchair. After 45 minutes, he returned to the hospital.

Senator NEELY was married in 1903 to Miss Alberta Claire Ramage, of Fairmont. There are three children, John C., a Baltimore internal revenue employee; Alfred, a Fairmont attorney; and Mrs. Corinne Neely Pettit, Charleston, S. C.

He headed the 1951–52 crime investigation which led to the appointment of Robert V. Murray as chief of police, and later praised Chief Murray and his men for anticrime achievements.

Senator NEELY was a stormy petrel in West Virginia politics from 1908, when he jumped into the political swim as mayor of Fairmont, W. Va., and in national affairs since 1913.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my respects to Mrs. Neely and the members of this wonderful family. The Nation, the State, and the Fairmount community have lost an outstanding man, an outstanding statesman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of United States Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY takes from our ranks one of the most sincere, courageous, and colorful legislators of our Nation's history; a man of deep faith, of strong idealism. Senator NEELY dedicated his life to fighting for those measures and actions that were for the best interests of the backbone of America, the workers, the farmers, and the small and independent businessman.

MATT NEELY could always be found on the side of the exploited, the sick, the poor, the underprivileged, and those discriminated against.

MATT NEELY was a builder in making America a better country in which to live. He stood for everything that was good, noble, and uplifting.

MATT NEELY has left indelibly his imprint upon the pages of American history, a constructive imprint.

The country has lost one of its truly great men. West Virginia has lost one of its outstanding citizens.

To Mrs. Neely and her sons and daughter, I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY whose death on Saturday brought great sorrow here and in his home State of West Virginia.

MATTHEW NEELY will be sadly missed. His long years of distinguished service in the United States Senate, in the House of Representatives and as Governor of the great State of West Virginia were spent in rendering outstanding assistance to the people he so ably represented. Senator NEELY had great ability. He was a dedicated public servant. His courage and devotion to duty brought him the respect and love of all who had the privilege of knowing him personally. Mr. Speaker, the United States Senate has lost one of its finest Members. West Virginians have lost a wonderful friend and Senator NEELY'S family has lost a devoted husband and father. I join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to the family of this great American.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speawer, I ask unaimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, one of West Virginia's foremost public figures passed away on Saturday morning. He was the Honorable MATTHEW MANSFIELD NEELY, senior Senator from West Virginia, who had served one of the longest continuing tenures in the upper House.

He was steadfast and in his convictions and had the courage of a lion in public and private life.

Although there were many who did not agree with the causes he espoused, it was with admiration that these dissenters viewed his forthright stand on matters of public concern.

His long career had embraced service in both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate as well as a term as Governor of our mutual home State.

This long course of public service began in 1911 when he served as clerk of the house of delegates in the West Virginia Legislature. Thereafter, there were only a bare handful of years when he was not in some position of public trust and honor.

Members of the West Virginia delegation in this House, I am certain, feel a great sense of personal loss. I, for on , am grateful in the remembrance of his kind advice and counsel in a great many personal ways during my first term here in the 83d Congress.

While we were of opposite political faiths and philosophies, we shared a community of interest in seeing to it that the welfare of West Virginia and

the United States was advanced at every opportunity.

While his last illness had prevented him from leaving any great imprint on the affairs of the Senate for 2 years, it is the prior period of his vigor and activity that will make him long remembered by his colleagues, friends, and fellow West Virginians.

He championed many causes and will be recorded by history as one of those to be found in the forefront of any valid liberal cause.

I know that his family, especially Mrs. Neely with whom Mrs. Neal and I are old friends, will feel his loss keenly. He will be mourned by a wide and varied acquaintanceship.

He was cast in a mold which has no duplicate either here or elsewhere. The people of West Virginia have truly lost a great defender of their fundamental rights and liberties.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of MATTHEW NEELY touched me very deeply. When I came to this House he was a Member of it. He served here well; he served excellently as Governor of his State, as president of West Virginia University, and for a long time as Senator from that great State.

MATTHEW NEELY had as much courage as any man I have ever served with. He had tremendous ability, and he also had the facility of speech to express himself. His was a long, full, and useful life in these United States of ours, and the world is better for his having passed this way.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, my family and I mourn the loss of a good friend—the late senior Senator of West Virginia, MATTHEW MANSFIELD NEELY, and extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Neely and her sons and daughter.

Long have been the years of admiration and respect I have had for this great West Virginia liberal who championed the causes of labor and advanced the progress of our beloved Mountain State.

I recall a time when I was quite a young lad that my father, Jacob Staggers, with great admiration, asked the distinguished Mr. NEELY to shake hands with me. I remember well the straight figure, the penetrating eyes, and the friendly smile—characteristics that identified MATTHEW NEELY wherever he went.

From that time since, MATTHEW NEELY has impressed me with his great energy, self-reliance, straightforwardness, and his armor of sureness. I often wondered if at any time he felt that he might be wrong, or maybe just a little mistaken. But I never found an answer to that feeling—always he seemed to be so sure.

Although many times we did not agree, I say here with deepest respect and gratitude that I knew Senator NEELY as a friend, as a leader of the Democratic Party of West Virginia, as a representative of the State of West Virginia in the Charleston executive mansion, in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate of the United States. As he progressed up the ladder of fame, he never failed to keep a lifeline open between himself and the people back home. Knowing and loving people was his greatest possession.

MATTHEW NEELY has now vacated the Democratic leadership in West Virginia, but he has left behind a store of wisdom and hard facts which will be useful and fruitful to his successors. I shall long remember our campaigns together and the sound advice he freely gave me and other younger candidates. There is no doubt that he was a champion and loved the fury of a political fight.

He was a man of mental superiority and great physical endurance, yet he was a man of meekness and gentleness too. MATT NEELY read his Bible with the zest and eagerness of a disciple, and for every occasion and situation he could quote an applicable verse from the Scriptures. Gentle and warm were his accounts of childhood days in West Virginia, and subsequent years of teaching the boys and girls in a hillside schoolhouse.

Appropriately writes Bill Hart, one of Senator NEELY's lifelong friends and editor of the Dominion News, Morgantown, W. Va., in his January 20 column, It May Interest You:

What made NEELY great? What caused him to stand out above all his contemporaries for nearly 50 years? There will be many explanations, here are ours:

First and foremost was his courage; then his ability; third, his complete confidence in himself to do any task he set; fourth, his genuine desire to know people; fifth, his memory; sixth, his poise; seventh, careful attention to his health; eighth, his deep religious convictions; ninth, an uncanny knack of doing the right thing at the right time in politics; tenth, past master at judging people; eleventh, adroitness in not being maneuvered into any commitment or situation he did not desire to be, and the latter, undoubtedly, caused him to have many political enemies.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to the absence of two other Members from West Virginia who are out of Washington at the present time. I ask unanimous consent that they may be permitted to insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker—

Whether at Naishapur or Babylon,
Whether the cup with sweet or bitter run,
The Wine of Life keeps oozing drop by drop,
The Leaves of Life keep falling one by one.

In the quiet hours of last Saturday morning, at the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, the great soul of the senior Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable MATTHEW MANSFIELD NEELY, winged its way behind the twilight's purpled veil to dwell in that blessed land beyond the stars. His passing reminds us that "the wings of man's life are plumed with the feathers of death."

The years of public service rendered by MATTHEW M. NEELY cover the space of a half century. All my life I had heard of him until I came to know him. He was a man who possessed phenomenal resources of memory, a man who had prodigious physical endurance, a man whose courage was as that of the Spartans. His was a long and rich and colorful life but now the silver cord has been loosed and the golden bowl has been broken. As I think of him and other friends—

Linked together,
I've seen around me fall,
Like leaves in wintry weather;
I feel like one
Who treads alone
Some banquet hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled,
Whose garlands dead,
And all but him departed.

MATTHEW MANSFIELD NEELY served a number of terms in this House and he will be missed by his colleagues and friends here. The memory of him will ever live within the hearts of his people. On behalf of my colleagues and from the depths of my own heart, I express my tenderest sympathies to his charming wife and to all of the members of the family circle. May God bless them and keep them, and may the divine light of Heaven guide and direct them in their greatest hour of sorrow. They may be comforted by the thought that their loved one was a great citizen and a true American in the real sense and meaning of the word, and they may rejoice in the promise that loved ones may eventually be reunited in the—

City of temples and turrets of gold,
That gleam by the sapphire sea,
Like jewels more splendid than earth may behold,
Or are dreamed of by you and by me.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Senator MATT NEELY leaves a great void in the liberal ranks in Congress. In his more than 50 years of dedicated public service MATT NEELY consistently displayed the type of political courage and devotion to liberal principles which served as an inspiration to all who knew him.

The people of his State and of our Nation have lost a vigorous and effective defender of the public interest who will be sorely missed. I extend my condolences to his widow and children in their great loss.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, although I am not from West Virginia, Mrs. Reece came from that State. Her father and Senator NEELY served together in the United States Senate and, of course, I served with him here in the House of Representatives for many years. A close personal relationship existed between Senator NEELY and Mrs. Reece's family. I knew her father had a high appreciation of the Senator's abilities and his facility for expressing himself both in an entertaining and effective way. He served his State and his Nation proudly and well in all phases of political and social life. I feel a great sense of loss in the passing of Senator NEELY. My association with him over the years constitutes one of my very

pleasant reflections. He will be greatly missed not only in the State of West Virginia but in the Nation.

My profoundest sympathies go out to Mrs. Neely and the other members of his family and likewise to his host of friends throughout the State who were so deeply interested in him over the years.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution—House Resolution 445—and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY, a Senator of the United States from the State of West Virginia.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

*Resolved*, That a committee of six Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members of the House: Mr. BAILEY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mrs. KEE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. MOORE.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

## ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 21, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1466. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1467. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1468. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners, of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to an act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 108); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1469. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners, of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, pursuant to Public Law 686, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1470. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend and improve the act of September 23, 1950, and the act of September 30, 1950, which provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1471. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to provide salary increases for Foreign Service personnel equitable to those being otherwise provided for civil service and other officers and employees of the Federal Government"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1472. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the Bureau of Narcotics covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1473. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 45th Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the act of February 14, 1903 (5 U. S. C. 604); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1474. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion in the case of *William E. Nash* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 13–55), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and to House Resolution 93, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1475. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion in the case of *Herman Benson, et al.* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 17876), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and to House Resolution 319, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1476. A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the court's opinion in the case of *The State House, Inc.* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 14–55), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and to House Resolution 290, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1477. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Natale H. Bellocchi and Oscar R. Edmondson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1478. A letter from the executive director, the American National Theatre and Academy, transmitting a report of the American National Theatre and Academy for the year 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1479. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote the interests of national defense through the advancement of the aeronautical research programs of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1480. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting a report with respect to positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1481. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order entered in the case of Eduardo Pires, A–7483662, relative to rescission of adjustment of status granted under section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. A. 155 (c)), pursuant to section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1256 (a)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1482. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting several reports of individuals admitted to the United States pursuant to section 212 (d (3)) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for medical treatment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1483. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence for certain aliens, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1485. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, pursuant to Public Law 863, approved July 1, 1948 (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1486. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation for the case of Lidia Ditenberg, A–7810686, pursuant to section 244 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (2)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1487. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications of certain aliens for permanent residence, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1488. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of January 16, 1958, the following bill was reported January 17, 1958:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 9955. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted January 20, 1958*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4642. A bill to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; with amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 6995. A bill

to amend Public Law 883, 84th Congress, to provide for the conveyance of certain additional property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 1408. An act to provide allowances for transportation of house trailers to civilian employees of the United States who are transferred from one official station to another; without amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 446. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9955, a bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; without amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 447. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8381, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 10097. A bill to provide for 3-year terms of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committeemen in order to give added continuity and stability to the farmer committee system, and to provide for elected members of the State committee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10098. A bill to deny income-tax exemption to labor organizations which participate in, or intervene in, political campaigns on behalf of candidates for public office; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10099. A bill to amend title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to provide for the utilization of surplus agricultural products through the use in motor fuels of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown on farms in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10100. A bill to strengthen democratic processes and procedures in elections of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10101. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make it an unfair labor practice to engage in picketing unless authorized by a certain percentage of the employees of the employer whose premises are being picketed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10102. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide certain safeguards against the misuse of the funds of labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10103. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to deny the benefits of such act to labor organizations having officers who have been convicted of certain offenses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 10104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 10105. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 a year the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10106. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $900 the additional personal income tax exemptions allowed a taxpayer and his spouse by reason of their attainment of age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10107. A bill to insure the equal protection of the laws to all persons regardless of race, color, religion or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 10109. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 10110. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 10111. A bill to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes with respect to certain lands granted to States and Territories for public purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 10112. A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of guar seed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 10113. A bill to provide a tax incentive for the employment of older workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 10114. A bill to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the soil-bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 10115. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 10116. A bill to stabilize the market supply and price of farm-produced feed grains and livestock to insure the continuous ample volume of meat products for consumers and to provide equitable opportunity for farm producers to achieve income parity, to provide means of meeting natural farm production disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 10117. A bill to extend and expand the authority of Public Law 490, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10118. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of certain surplus property to public health agencies of a State, its political subdivisions and instrumentalities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H. R. 10119. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the imposition of an import tax on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 10120. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 10121. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10122. A bill to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaking vessel for operation by the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 10123. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit a Representative in Congress to nominate as a candidate to a service academy, a person domiciled at any place in the State from which such Representative is elected; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 10124. A bill to provide that an employee whose remuneration is paid jointly by two or more political subdivisions of a State may elect social security coverage as a self-employed individual if he has not been covered, by an agreement under section 218 of the Social Security Act, as an employee of any such subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 10125. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 10126. A bill to provide for a national self-help dairy stabilization program and to provide for an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 10127. A bill to extend for an additional period of 2 years the authority to regulate exports contained in the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 10128. A bill to extend for an additional period of 2 years the authority to regulate exports contained in the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 10129. A bill to provide for a national self-help dairy stabilization program and to provide for an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 10130. A bill to amend title II of the Veterans' Benefits Act to limit the closing or transfer of functions or activities of Veterans' Administration regional offices, or hospitals, homes, or centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10131. A bill to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 10132. A bill to broaden use of disaster loan revolving fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 10133. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States in Massachusetts to the city of Quincy, Mass.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 10134. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall not sever service

connection of any veteran's disability when he has been in receipt of compensation for 10 or more years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 10135. A bill to provide for a national self-help dairy stabilization program and to provide for an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 10136. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to issue identifying numbered receipt upon the filing of income tax returns in order to aid in the collection of income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. J. Res. 504. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. J. Res. 505. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution providing for the remains of the unknown American of the Second World War and of the unknown American of the Korean conflict to lie in state in the rotunda of the United States Capitol before burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. Res. 448. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to secure an agreement with Japan to protect Alaska-spawned salmon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 449. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the staff consultation entitled "The Communist Mind"; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take action so as to afford protection to certain small industries of West Virginia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 10137. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Mrs. Sarah R. Wallace against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10138. A bill for the relief of Edeltraud Collom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10139. A bill for the relief of Wallace Y. Daniels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 10140. A bill for the relief of Umeko Suchiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 10141. A bill for the relief of John J. Flynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 10142. A bill for the relief of Hugh Lee Fant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 10143. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carrie E. Vincent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 10144. A bill for the relief of Helen Revesz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10145. A bill for the relief of Washib Ullah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

359. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted at the 42d Annual League Conference by the New Jersey State League of Municipalities regarding Federal sewage treatment plant program; housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal programs; Federal taxation of municipal and public agency bond income; and Federal payments in lieu of taxes; to the Committee on Public Works.

360. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the recording secretary, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Santa Rosa, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging adoption of the Forand bill entitled "Social Security Amendments of 1958"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Educational Deficiencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vast hysteria engendered by Soviet Russia's launching of a sputnik, by the international rumors of manned rockets in space, and the imminence of a decision on whether we should waste any more of our time in fruitless conferences with Khrushchev & Co., I am impressed by a communication I recently received from an organization of engineers and scientists in which the statement is made that enrollments in our scientific and engineering schools is at an alltime high.

The point is further made, one with which I am in heartiest agreement, that it is folly to lay too much emphasis on the exact sciences, to try and force square pegs in round education holes, by attracting young people to such studies when many of them may be basically unfit to grasp the subjects.

There is a danger, too, that the stampede of many of our people in the direction of forgetting the humanities, philosophy, literature, language, and the other great broad bases of our western civilization in favor of a slide rule, electric computer, or surveying transit would have two possible effects:

First. Attracting inferior talent to our technical schools might give us a quantity of graduate engineers, but it occurs to me that the quality of such people would suffer greatly.

Second. Important segments of our society would be deprived of future leadership in fields as vital to our survival as a free, humanist people as the development of new and better rockets and satellites.

In my own State of West Virginia, a recent survey was concluded by some education experts, headed by Eston K. Feaster, dean of the School of Education at West Virginia. Our educational rating, I am unhappy to say, is 41st in the list of 48 States.

Now, my point is this: During each successive session of our State legislature for the past 24 years, the education interests have successfully induced members to boost the appropriation for State school aid. Today, public education costs account for some 54 percent of all State expenditures each year.

Yet, Dr. Feaster's group had this to say:

> The most alarming symptom was [the teachers'] fatalistic attitude toward pupil deficiencies and derelictions. The charge most frequently lodged against pupils was "They don't know how to study." The tone of the accusation and of the teachers' elaboration on it was one of resignation to fate, of washing their hands of responsibility. Until teachers become imbued with the attitude that pupil deficiencies in minimum essentials are the unfinished business of every teacher, the situation in West Virginia will grow progressively worse.

The survey further disclosed that since 1945 enrollment in physics courses has dropped 10 percent, chemistry 17 percent, Latin—3 years only in our system—is off 20 percent, all of which would seem to indicate that such things are not being stressed enough.

On the other hand, something called office practice enrollments have climbed by 139 percent and so-called driver education has 7 times more enrollments than it had 10 years ago.

When we hear so much about crash programs in the field of exact science, it makes me wonder just how much good such programs will do. There is no doubt that we cannot recover in weeks from more than 40 years of the gradual indoctrination of our teachers with the progressive education theories under which a youngster can do pretty much what he pleases in the classroom, decide what courses he will take, and is subject all the time to less and less discipline so necessary for the immature mind.

It may be that the Feaster report will be enough of a shock to the parents of our West Virginia children and to their teachers to begin a return to the fundamental aspects of education which are

the process of learning, of retaining and assimilating knowledge in the latitude to which the individual mind can reach, and to know how to put to use that knowledge by orderly processes of logic and reason.

By the same token, before any hasty crash program is formulated, I hope this Congress will take a long and careful look at it lest we be swept away by the hysteria of the moment.

## Tax Incentives in Lieu of Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, pending the spelling out of further details as to the administration's proposal for a Federal program of educational scholarships to develop more scientists, I want to strongly urge that in this moment of public concern as to our defense capabilities that we not rush into Federal aid to education. Meeting and outmatching Soviet technological progress is a matter requiring careful study and it may well be that shortages in engineering and scientific personnel could be overcome by making these ultimate careers more attractive. In other words, rather than by a hysterical crash program and trying by scholarships to mass produce our youth into physicists and other scientific calling, that we consider other means of correcting any deficiencies.

My fear in part is that we might at the direction and under the influence of Federal dictation deemphasize the study of the humanities and philosophy and subjects like history. But even greater is my fear that this scholarship idea will serve to lift control of education away from the local level and the parents themselves. I don't want bureaucrats from Washington and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prescribing the textbooks and curriculums of the schoolchildren of America.

Offhand I am wondering if in lieu of Federal scholarships for example, equal student aid and incentive to learning could not be offered by allowing parents an income tax deduction for tuition and costs of sending their children to college.

Right now I am in support of legislation to allow teachers, like other professional people, a deduction for the expense of any courses or classes they take from time to time to improve their scholastic qualifications. Not only will such a deduction be fair, but also it will prove an incentive to the teaching profession for self-improvement. Frankly, I have no idea of the cost to the Federal Treasury, but I am wondering if the deduction to parents would not be equally effective, yet more desirable than scholarships. Surely such a means of encouragement to young people to obtain higher education would be free of the danger of Federal dictation and likewise eliminate the expense of a Federal agency in administration costs—every dollar would be for aid and assistance. There would be no cost of bookkeeping or reports or anything else. The taxpayer would do it all when he or she made out their tax return. And let me say I would not limit any such tax deduction to scientific students. The deduction should be available to all parents to enable them to educate their children, regardless of the subject or type of education.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose Federal aid to education. I want to keep the management of our schools at home. Such a plan of allowing parents a tax deduction rather than outright grants for scholarships would seem to retain better the framework of local responsibility. I hope the appropriate committees will explore alternate programs before accepting the idea of Federal scholarships.

## Dedication in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend at the dedication of the Jewish Center in Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic, on December 28, 1957.

Following are the remarks which I made upon that occasion:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ABRAHAM J. MULTER ON DECEMBER 28, 1957, AT DEDICATION OF JEWISH CENTER IN CIUDAD TRUJILLO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

It is indeed a great pleasure to be back in your very lovely country. How grand this world would be if the peace that prevails here could be extended to God's children everywhere.

It is an even finer privilege to be permitted to participate in this remarkably unusual event.

But you may ask, what is remarkable or unusual about the dedication of a religious building? Civilized people have been doing that for hundreds of years.

Who among you, however, can recall a similar incident in history, with the same combination of seasons and circumstances.

Beginning with the 24th day of Kislev, by the Jewish calendar; the 17th day of December, by our modern calendar; and for 8 days, Jews throughout the world, as was our happy opportunity in Sosua on the further end of this island, celebrated the Hannukah Festival. By and during that holiday, we rededicate ourselves to God as we memorialize the victory of the Maccabees over a Syrian king who had attempted to outlaw the teachings of Judaism and the worship of the one God of all mankind. The conclusion of that Jewish festival ushered in Christmas week, which begins with Christians throughout the world praising the same God for having sent to a troubled and rebellious world, Jesus of Nazareth.

The event the Jews remember occurred according to their calendar in the year 3594—2,124 years ago. That which our Christian brothers sanctify occurred 167 years later.

Most people overlook the fact that if that pagan king had succeeded in destroying Judaism there could not have been any Christianity to teach the Ten Commandments.

That lesson is effectively taught in your country.

In your great hall, set aside for joint sessions of your Congress, is a most impressive mural, in the place of honor, in the center of the front wall above the podium, where none can miss it. It depicts God giving Moses the Ten Commandments.

The first of those commandments pronounces the oneness of God. That is the traditional cry of the Jew wherever he is, wherever he goes. That is what you have emblazoned on the front of your new synagogue: "Shma Yisroel Adonai Aylohenu Adonai Achod—Hear, Oh Israel, the Lord, our God, the Lord is one." A clarion call we never enunciate without also repeating: "Boruch Shem Kavod Malchuso Leholum Voed—Praised be the name of the Lord forever and ever."

The true significance of all of this must be apparent.

For thousands of years Jews have been driven from pillar to post. Few countries would receive them; most imposed restrictions looking to their eventual assimilation into other religious sects. Some gave them temporary haven. Few made them genuinely welcome or accorded them the full rights of citizenship. Even in my own great free United States of America, we had to fight for full equality. It seems that fight is never won.

Here in your country, we find history being reenacted but in reverse. While every other so-called democratic country was figuratively tearing its hair out in despair at the atrocities of Hitler, your great and benevolent Generalissimo Trujillo opened his heart—but more important—he opened the doors of his country. This was not a mere welcome of words. Platitudes and sympathy never rescued souls, transported people or sustained bodies. He made travel documents available, arranged transportation and provided sustenance until they became self-supporting.

But his beneficence did not stop there. No one knows better than he that bread alone sustains no souls.

The Jewish village of Sosua, has from its inception, had its synagogue.

But in bringing Jews here, this religious man had in mind the past errors of history. There would be no ghettos in his land. Hence there were no restrictions. Fences, yes, to restrain animals, but not to restrain humans.

It was but natural, therefore, for Jewish families to settle throughout your country. Where there are 10 Jewish males, there is a minion; where there is a minion, there must be a synagogue.

Until now that synagogue in this city was in rented quarters.

Again, because of the magnanimity of the Generalissimo, history reversed itself.

Jews are accustomed to governments confiscating and destroying their places of worship. But the world is here taught a new lesson in separation of church and state. The state here says we care not how you worship, but do worship, and do it in dignified surroundings worthy of teaching the word of God.

Again no empty words, but deeds and money. This edifice is possible only because the kind Generalissimo has made available 80 percent of the total cost, the Jewish community supplying the small differences.

My friends, Judaism teaches us that a synagogue is never one house but three. It can never fulfill its true function unless it is three houses in one.

It must be a house of assembly such as this room, a center in which the people con-

gregate—that is for the present; it must be a house of study like the library across the patio, that is for the children to learn of the past in order to live in the future. Lastly, it must be a house of worship like the synagogue we prayed in last night—that is for God and eternity.

Therefore, in this holy season, let us dedicate not only a center for ourselves, but ourselves to the principles of freedom and assembly; let us dedicate not only a study for our children but let us dedicate them and ourselves to the principle of freedom of thought and of speech and lastly, as we dedicate ourselves to the principle of freedom of religion, let us dedicate this institution to God.

In the holy spirit of the season, the spirit of Hannukah and the spirit of Christmas, I usurp the privilege of the clergy and with poetic license, I invoke, with changes appropriate to the occasion, the ancient Hebrew blessings: May the good Lord bless you in your going out as He has blessed you in your coming in; may the good Lord lift up His face unto you and cause His countenance to shine upon you; may the good Lord bring to this country, its government, its officials, its people, to all of you and to all the world, sholom, paz, peace.

## America Honors Albert Gallatin and His Native Switzerland on January 29, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, we again celebrate the anniversary of Albert Gallatin, born 197 years ago in Geneva, Switzerland, who emigrated to America in 1780 and became one of the great guiding forces in the Government of our new Republic.

Through the force of his intelligence, the wisdom of his policy, the tenacity of his purpose, Albert Gallatin so far overshadowed most of his contemporaries that he soon became the chosen confidant and close collaborator of Presidents Jefferson and Madison. For many years, he served Jefferson as Secretary of the Treasury, and as his emissary abroad on the most delicate of diplomatic missions.

Not very long ago, Mr. Raymond Walters, the perceptive and scholarly biographer, who has written an excellent volume devoted to the life and achievements of Gallatin, closed his book with the following statement:

> So passed a noble adopted son whom the American people have thus far failed to recognize duly for his great and unselfish service.

If Mr. Walters implies that this Nation has lacked in gratitude to Gallatin he is correct. I am glad, however, to report that the people of America are beginning to repair this sorry omission in the homage which a country owes to one of the most illustrious of its forebears.

One encouraging sign of this change is the recent formation of a permanent Gallatin society at New York University, that great institution of learning which was brought into being largely as the result of the efforts and devotion of Albert Gallatin. Last year, that society bestowed its first Gallatin Award on Dr. Jonas Salk, the scientist who developed the polio vaccine. This choice was most appropriate because it symbolized Albert Gallatin's faith in the precious contributions which immigration would make to the betterment of our national life, and Albert Gallatin's lifelong devotion to the promotion of science.

There is today, however, a far more important area in which we can prove our gratitude. We should be moved by our remembrance of Gallatin's unparalleled achievements to pay part of the debt of honor we owe him to his native Switzerland, in much the same way that we are accustomed to honor the Government of France for the contributions which Lafayette made to our national life.

Modern Switzerland has the distinction of being America's best cash customer in Europe. Through her industry and her honorable application to the principles of open commerce, which Gallatin himself espoused, Switzerland has enriched American industry and farms by purchasing many billions of dollars of American goods since World War II. During that period, the United States has accumulated a trade surplus of nearly one-half billion dollars in our trade with Switzerland.

The response of our National Government for the past 4 years has been a policy of harassment directed against the export of Switzerland's watches to the United States.

I believe we should all take advantage of Gallatin's anniversary today to consider how we can promptly rectify this destructive policy and repair the damage which has been done to our good relations with democratic Switzerland.

## Long-Range Ballistic Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the dramatics of the sputnik launching by Soviet Russia last October stimulated a healthy concern throughout our country as to our own defense status. The American people wanted to know especially what has been done and what is being done for the development of missiles as the new defense weapon. The people we represent became increasingly uncertain with respect to our missiles program from the confusion of conflicting statements made by those presumed to have some knowledge of the subject.

Many of these various utterances, on the air and in the press, were self-serving conclusions rather than statements of the facts. As representatives of the people it is vitally important that we have facts. It is likewise important that the people we represent get the facts. Only with the facts can we, and the people we represent, arrive at sound conclusions with respect to what has been done and what is being done on the missiles program.

To this end, as the ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I determined to make a thorough and wholly objective study of the missiles program from its very inception. I determined to get the hard, cold facts and once obtained to present them to you and that you may, in turn, present them to the people you represent.

That was the purpose of my concentrated study of this subject. That is the purpose of my memorandum on the history of long-range ballistic missiles, prepared for public distribution and which I am today inserting in the RECORD. It presents as concisely as I know how my findings of fact all should know.

LONG-RANGE BALLISTIC MISSILES—A HISTORY

INTRODUCTION

Major military weapons never spring forth fullblown overnight. The first operational B–17 took a decade to develop. The B–29 and B–52 are likewise the outgrowth of years of effort.

Similarly with modern rocketry. Though in America it began 14 years ago, it turned seriously to long-range ballistic missiles only 4½ years ago.

Not until fiscal year 1953 were expenditures in any one year on long-range ballistic missile programs even as much as a million dollars.

Since 1953 these programs have advanced with impressive speed. Today they involve the expenditure of nearly five times as much each day as was spent in all of fiscal year 1952.

In the early postwar years military studies slowly advanced American ballistic missile knowledge. Propulsion, guidance, heat, and weight problems were very difficult. Their solution obviously was costly. Yet, the level of effort remained low and sporadic. Moreover, critical decisions controlling warhead weights were withheld. Until 1953 the operational feasibility of long-range ballistic missiles seemed far distant to those in authority. As a result, these programs were deemed unworthy of major effort. To be sure, one such program, the forerunner to Atlas, was started as long as 11 years ago, in 1946, but it died 3 years later in the 1949 defense cutbacks. The program was revived in 1951 but even then only as a low-level effort.

From World War II to 1953, due partly to scepticism as to the practicality of long-range ballistic missiles and due also to emphasis on strategic bombers, our missile effort, such as it was, went mainly into such air defense missiles as Nike–Ajax, Terrier I and Falcon. Some short-range ballistic missiles and some relatively slow nonballistic long-range missiles of the V–1 type did receive some support. Corporal and Redstone are examples of the former and Snark and Navaho of the latter. Long-range ballistic missile efforts, however, were held down to low-level studies.

Viewed in retrospect, therefore, it is hardly remarkable that as of 1957, 12 years after World War II, American long-range rocketry is in some respects matched or surpassed by the Soviets. That result was foreordained by years of low-priority attention and lack of funds while the Soviets evidently were advancing their rocketry full blast.

What is remarkable is how rapidly the ICBM and IRBM programs of the United States have advanced in less than 5 years. The speed of this advance in so short a period augurs well for the Nation's security. It is convincing testimony to the competence of our scientists and engineers.

1943–46

The year 1943 marks the beginning of our World War II rocket programs. The work was principally on solid propellants. It was carried forward by the Office of Scientific Research and Development and, with military support, at the Allegany Ballistic Laboratory. From it evolved our World War II Jatos, other successful rocket motors, and our first serious efforts with liquid rocket engines. During the summer of 1945 this work produced the Army Wac Corporal, a nitric acid and aniline fueled rocket.

When World War II ended, the allied nations placed scientific teams in Germany to analyze that nation's technical accomplishments in rockets and missiles. A number of the best German scientists and engineers were induced to go to Russia and the United States.

The United States, however, pressed this effort less aggressively than the Soviets. In the latter part of 1946 the Russians identified other scientists and technicians associated with German missile programs. Hundreds of them were removed to Russia. German research facilities and production plants were stripped of machinery, instruments, blueprints, and missiles or missile components. These, too, were shipped to Russia. Thus, the Russians fully exploited German missile technology. The orientation of Soviet scientists and technicians was greatly facilitated, and they were afforded the know-how to bring uncompleted German ideas swiftly to a design conclusion.

The advantage the Soviets thus achieved as the race for ballistic-missile supremacy began is evident.

1946–50

This period is one of halting low-level efforts on long-range ballistic missiles. It is capped by the defense cutbacks of 1949. This economy drive canceled the only ICBM program the United States had.

In 1946 several potentially useful programs had been started. As captured V–2 rockets were used up, the development of American designed and produced rockets began.

For instance, the Army arranged in 1946 to rebuild the V–2's. In the so-called Bumper program the V–2 was converted into a first-stage booster rocket. It carried a second rocket, the Wac Corporal, which in turn carried scientific instruments to high altitudes. Maximum speed attained during these tests was 5,000 miles per hour; maximum altitude, 250 miles. The standard V–2 performance was 3,600 miles an hour and approximately 100 miles maximum altitude.

The year 1946 marked the Air Force's first attempt on the ICBM. The program, known as the MX–774, was intended to advance long-range rocket techniques. It turned out, however, to be very short lived. The Defense slashes of 1949 terminated this program. For the next 2 years Convair used corporate funds to carry on MX–774 weapon studies at low technical levels.

In 1946 the Air Force also established the Snark and Navaho programs. These were long-range air-breathing guided missiles of the V–1 type, not the ballistic type. From Navaho's launcher a liquid propellant booster and similar programs grew the high-thrust liquid-propulsion engines for today's Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, and Redstone.

Also in the late 1940's the Navy developed the first version of its Viking, an upper-atmosphere sounding rocket designed to carry scientific-research instruments.

1950–53

The Army's Redstone, a 200-mile tactical ballistic missile, was begun in 1950. Not until August 20, 1953, was the first Redstone missile fired, a flight test that was only partially successful. Much of the information obtained from this and subsequent Redstone firings was applied to the Jupiter when that program was initiated in 1955.

In the design of long-range ballistic missiles weight is critical. Generally speaking, it takes 200 pounds of launching weight to place 1 pound of warhead on a target several thousand miles away. Because the first atomic warheads weighed 9,000 pounds, clearly a major reduction was required in nuclear-warhead weight for missile use.

During the 1946–53 period, the Atomic Energy Commission embarked on a program of atomic-weapon improvement. Warheads were ultimately developed in which the ratio of yield to weight was materially improved and the weight significantly reduced.

However, during this development period no assumption was made that suitable warheads would be developed. For this and other reasons, long-range ballistic missile development languished. The warhead problem, therefore, became one of the central factors in the delay of American progress on such missiles. During this slack period in the United States the Soviets evidently went full speed ahead with their own long-range ballistic missile programs.

Nor was it until January 31, 1950, that development of thermonuclear weapons was permitted to go beyond low-priority studies in the United States. On that date the President directed the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with this development.

In September 1950, Mr. K. T. Keller, president of Chrysler Corp., was appointed Defense Department Director of Guided Missiles, with authority to institute a Manhattan-type project for missiles. However, after analysis of the missile programs, Mr. Keller decided against a Manhattan-type project on the ground that it would take a year to institute such a program. He also decided to act as an appraiser rather than czar of the missile program. In 1953, Mr. Keller was asked to remain with the new administration. He resigned late that year at his own behest.

Missile feasibility studies started in 1949 by the RAND Corp. were completed in the fall of 1950. These studies confirmed the military worth of long-range ballistic missiles. Subsequently, in January 1951, the decision was made to resume studies of the MX–774 weapon, redesignated Atlas. This program was given a long-term, low-priority objective—that of determining whether a large 5,000-mile ballistic rocket was within the then technical state of the art. Six months later, in June 1951, the Atlas project was reactivated at Convair.

On June 16, 1953, the Secretary of Defense ordered a review of the guided-missile program to identify and eliminate duplication. He stated that "a continuous effort should be made to standardize on one missile for production and use by all military departments, wherever, within the employment limitation of each type of missile, standardization appears to be practicable." The Secretary of the Air Force was requested to organize and Chair a study group. He in turn assigned responsibilities for the activities of this group to his Special Assistant for Research and Development. The Special Assistant had this review made by two subgroups. One reviewed all missile programs, except strategic missiles. The other was a separate group of civilian scientists chairmanned by Dr. John von Neumann. Later known as the Strategic Missiles Evaluation Committee, it reviewed the strategic missile programs of the Air Force.

1954

The Strategic Missile Evaluation (von Neumann) Committee reported on February 10, 1954, the highly significant possibility of achieving a major technological breakthrough on warhead size. The Committee recommended the formation of a special management organization to assure early ICBM availability.

As for technical factors, the von Neumann committee found that the ICBM project should be completely reoriented to take advantage of warhead technology, thus permitting relaxation of guidance tolerances and propulsion requirements. The Committee further noted the potential desirability of an IRBM.

On February 19, 1954, the Committee's report was discussed between Air Force representatives and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Research and Development), who approved the broad reorientation of the program.

Accordingly, the Air Force set up the Gillette group to study the von Neumann report and define the organizational realinement required to accelerate the ICBM. This study resulted, later in 1954, in a streamlined organization under the Air Force Research and Development Command. It was known as the Western Development Division and was an autonomous group responsible for directing and tying together the effort toward primary objectives.

By February 1954, the Secretary of the Air Force had assigned extremely high priority to the project. On March 23 the Chief of Staff of the Air Force approved an Air Force Council recommendation to reorient and accelerate the ICBM program.

During the Castle tests in the Pacific through the period of March to May 1954, the feasibility of developing a smaller lightweight, high-yield thermonuclear weapon was proven, thus confirming the soundness of the von Neumann recommendations of February 10.

On April 9, the Deputy Secretary of Defense noted in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Air Force:

"I understand that Air Force proposals are to be submitted through ASD Research and Development for the reoriented strategic ballistic missile project.

"It is a matter of concern that our plans in this area be formulated with a thoroughly realistic appraisal of the capabilities of our contractors to meet their commitments. We must make sure that the program moves forward with all practicable speed."

During the period of June through August major management and procedural changes were proposed, reviewed and placed into operation within the Air Force.

On July 28 responsibility for the Atlas project was placed in the Air Research and Development Command. The next day full authority, responsibility, and accountability for the project was assigned to Brig. Gen. B. A. Schriever. Atlas then became the basic mission of the Western Development Division of ARDC, with Schriever commanding. The Ramo-Wooldridge technical contract with ARDC became the technical base to the organizational pyramid directing Atlas.

From February through August 1954, the ARDC with its contractors, Convair, RAND Corp. and Ramo-Wooldridge, undertook extensive technical review of the Atlas program. As the new administrative organization began functioning, its effort during the fall of 1954 focused upon further acceleration of this program.

1955

By the spring of 1955, the Atlas program was expanding rapidly. The $3 million program in fiscal year 1953 had grown to $14 million in fiscal year 1954, to $161 million in fiscal year 1955.

In February 1955 the Killian Committee recommended that concurrently with the ICBM effort, an IRBM program be initiated to develop a missile of 1,500-mile range.

In June 1955 the ICBM Scientific Advisory Committee (formerly the Strategic Missile Evaluation Committee) recommended a multiple approach in order to assure earliest attainment of an ICBM operational capability. In July and August 1955 the Defense Department was in consultation with the President and his advisers in respect to its proposal that the President give the Air Force

ICBM program the highest national priority. In September 1955 the President approved assignment of the highest priority to the ICBM research and development program. The same month the Titan ICBM project was established in supplementation of the Atlas program to provide the desired multiple approach.

In the meantime the Defense Department continued to study various means to achieve an IRBM capability and concurrently reviewed its organization to determine whether additional management changes were needed.

On November 8, 1955, the Secretary of Defense approved the formation of the Defense Ballistic Missile Committee and ordered organizational changes in the military departments to handle the ICBM and IRBM programs. At the same time he approved a program of four types of missiles—two of intercontinental range, Atlas and Titan, and two of 1500-mile intermediate range, subsequently named Jupiter and Thor. The Jupiter weapon system was to have the capability of being launched either from land or sea.

The Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force at once implemented the new organizational program. The Air Force placed its ICBM and Thor programs under the already established Air Force Ballistic Missile Committee. Like committees were established by the Army and Navy for the Jupiter program. On November 17, the Navy created the Office of Special Projects and assigned to it responsibility for the technical development of the sea-based IRBM. As part of the Jupiter program, which employed a liquid propellant, the Navy also began studies of a solid propellant version to reduce shipboard logistical problems. On February 1, 1956, the Army activated the Army Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Ala., under the direction of Brig. Gen. J. B. Medaris.

At its first meeting on November 25 and 28, 1955, the Defense Department Ballistic Missile Committee reviewed the service approaches for accelerating the development of the two ICBM's and the two IRBM's. In December the Secretary of Defense presented to the President and his advisers the new organizational alinement and the four-missile program. On December 21 the President assigned the highest priority to the two ICBM and the two IRBM programs. It was anticipated that some program conflicts would occur, and the Secretary of Defense was requested to report promptly any interferences which might delay the new weapon systems.

In proceeding with dual approaches on the ICBM and IRBM programs, the Secretary of Defense was following the multiple approach concept recommended by the Scientific Advisory Committee in June 1955. In the case of the two ICBM programs, differing technical approaches are being followed. In the case of the two IRBM programs, it was intended that Thor would be based upon experience already gained in the Atlas program, while Jupiter would be based on experience gained by the Redstone Arsenal team from the V–2 and Redstone missiles.

On December 14, the Defense Ballistic Missile Committee approved technical approaches recommended by the services for ICBM and IRBM programs and reserved $515 million of Defense funds to carry out these programs.

1956

On January 20, 1956, in order to assure a common interchange of technical information, as well as provide competent guidance for all the programs, the Scientific Advisory (von Neumann) Committee was transferred from the Air Force to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. On the same date this Committee reviewed the long-range ballistic missile programs and presented certain recommendations to assure that these programs would proceed at the maximum rate. In the following month, with organizational alinements complete and objectives clearly determined, the growing momentum of the programs compelled adoption of a general overtime workweek. This action became essential at this stage because (a) the staffs were still small and major effort was needed in practically all areas, and (b) most of the effort was concentrated in facilities preparation and engineering areas in which there were either shortages of technical personnel or testing bottlenecks.

In April 1956 the Navy solid propellant study had advanced enough to be made specifically a part of the Jupiter program.

The feasibility of the IRBM warhead was further established in the Redwing test at the Pacific Proving Ground in July. The following September the Atomic Energy Commission estimated that the IRBM warhead weight could be further reduced.

In September 1956, a Jupiter C multistage test vehicle was fired to test the propulsion aspects of the firing stages. It went 3,300 statute miles, rose to 680 statute miles, and reached a maximum velocity of roughly 13,000 miles per hour. During the same period the Air Force X–17 reentry test vehicle flight test clearly demonstrated that the reentry problem was solvable.

In October 1956, the Scientific Advisory Committee recommended initiation of a new, smaller, solid-propellant IRBM with the capability of being launched from a submarine.

In November 1956 the Secretary of Defense reviewed service responsibilities for operational use of the IRBM. He assigned responsibility for operational deployment of land-based IRBM's to the Air Force and ship-based IRBM's to the Navy. Also in November the development of the Polaris (solid propellant) IRBM weapon system was approved by the Secretary of Defense, and the Navy was authorized to terminate its participation in the Jupiter program.

The next month, following Navy withdrawal from the Jupiter program, separate Army and Navy ballistic missile committees were established under the chairmanship of the respective service Secretaries.

1957

In January the Scientific Advisory Committee again reviewed the Jupiter and Thor programs. It concluded that in view of the importance of the program objectives, both programs should continue. By separate actions in February of 1957 and April of 1957, the Defense Ballistic Missiles Committee approved the reservation of $1,380,000,000 for support of Army, Navy, and Air Force IRBM and ICBM programs.

In view of the rapid buildup of long-range ballistic-missile programs, in May the Secretary of Defense directed the Ballistic Missile Committee to review the programs' overtime requirements. In July the Committee reviewed service studies of overtime needs. It concluded that in view of the greatly increased number of trained technicians, overtime was justifiable only to resolve critical bottlenecks in meeting schedules. It determined that a ratio of overtime hours to total hours of 8 percent on a program basis by January 1958 would adequately meet all urgent needs.

In August the Secretary of Defense ordered a review of the Thor and Jupiter programs to consider whether the 2 programs should be combined or 1 selected for continuance. In the same month the highest priority of Atlas was reaffirmed, although the program was reviewed for such economies as possible without delay in the program. The alternate Titan program was reduced from 4 to 2 test missiles per month. During this period, it was decided to discontinue the Navaho project which had become obsolescent because of progress in the development of long-range ballistic missiles.

A further review of the IRBM programs revealed an adequate supply of missile components but a bottleneck situation in testing and reduction of data. The Secretary of Defense therefore set overtime for both programs at 3 percent but exempted support of static and flight testing from this limitation. The services were instructed to advise the Secretary if this order would delay missile development. Because a single land-based liquid propellant IRBM program was under study, the Secretary of Defense imposed a temporary limitation on the production rate of IRBM's until September 15, when the study was to be completed.

In August the Secretary of Defense also directed a 5-percent reduction in the Polaris program, but rescinded this directive in October. In September 1957, the Secretary relaxed from 3 percent to 5 percent the restriction on overtime in the Jupiter program. The following month all overtime restrictions were removed. Also in October, after Air Force review of the Atlas and Titan programs, the Secretary approved for planning purposes the 1958 fiscal year programs and production schedules. It was estimated that $1,349,000,000 would be required in fiscal year 1958 for IRBM and ICBM programs. This was slightly less than the fiscal year 1957 figure due to the completion of the large test facility program for long-range ballistic missiles.

Following receipt of the findings of the Jupiter-Thor review the Secretary of Defense determined in October to continue both programs in order to assure early availability of an operational IRBM.

SUMMARY

Today the deterrent and retaliatory capabilities of the United States depend largely on the ability of Navy and Air Force jet bombers to deliver nuclear weapons. This deterrent power will remain of critical importance for a considerable time to come. However, the growing defenses against jet bombers emphasize the need for long-range ballistic missiles.

Maintenance of adequate military strength therefore requires development of both IRBM's and ICBM's. It is highly unfortunate that these programs did not get off the ground until 4½ years ago. Since then they have surged forward with great speed. Since 1954 we have been repackaging knowledge to fit into long-range ballistic weapons and carefully adjusting individual components so they will reliably work as a complete unit. Solution of one of the last major scientific unknowns in respect to IRBM's was proved possible in the middle of 1957 with the successful reentry of a nose cone attached to a Jupiter C test missile.

Most of these weapons are now undergoing a shakedown phase to determine which components are marginal and to perfect the weapons. Just as a new automobile has inherent defects which require correction during the production period, so early ballistic weapons have similar problems which test flights (including those which fail) serve to solve. From now on, with the programs at last well underway, missile failures will become progressively fewer. These weapons will soon become a major addition to our retaliatory capabilities.

The slow development of the various long-range ballistic missile programs over two-thirds of the postwar period is reflected in funds expended through these years. From the start in fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1952 only approximately $3.6 million was spent. About $3 million was programed in fiscal year 1953, $14 million in fiscal year 1954, $161 million in fiscal year 1955, $515 million in fiscal year 1956, and $1,380,000,000 in fiscal year 1957. Programed for fiscal year 1958 is $1,349,000,000.

The overall total since fiscal year 1946 is almost $3½ billion. Nearly all of this has been spent in the last 4½ years.

In long-range ballistic missiles the future looks indeed promising. Present programs

call for spending several times as much on these programs every day as was being spent in an entire year only 5 years ago. The progress already achieved through this massive effort has been tremendous. Proof of this progress lies in the 1957 firings of Thor and Jupiter, just over 2 years after their development was recommended. As the programs continue at the scheduled rates, the Nation has every reason to expect gratifying results. Indeed, it is worthy of repetition that the progress made in so short a time promises that America will adequately do this job, having at last buckled down to the task only 4 years ago.

TABLE A.—*United States missile programs*

Department of Defense fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1958

[Funds programed in millions of dollars]

| | Total missiles | Surface-to-surface missiles | Long range surface-to-surface missiles | IRBM and ICBM |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fiscal year: | | | | |
| 1946 and prior | 70 | 19 | 9 | 1.95 |
| 1947 | 58 | 20 | 6 | |
| 1948 | 81 | 36 | 11 | .27 |
| 1949 | 98 | 45 | 18 | .1 |
| 1950 | 134 | 65 | 22 | |
| 1951 | 784 | 186 | 113 | .5 |
| 1952 | 1,201 | 247 | 143 | .8 |
| 1953 | 1,203 | 443 | 270 | 3.0 |
| 1954 | 1,067 | 360 | 258 | 14.0 |
| 1955 | 1,501 | 590 | 376 | 161.0 |
| 1956 | 2,083 | 959 | 679 | 515.0 |
| 1957 | 4,284 | 2,009 | 1,745 | 1,380.0 |
| 1958 (estimated) | 4,309 | 1,771 | 1,593 | 1,349.0 |
| Total | 17,473 | 6,731 | 5,246 | 3,426.0 |

NOTES

1. Above estimates include research and development, production facility expansion and tooling, procurement and production for test, evaluation, and service use, construction or conversion of ships identified with the guided missiles programs, and construction costs for the ballistic missile programs and certain research and development facilities. They do not include military personnel costs and the full cost of operation and maintenance of guided missile installations.

2. IRBM and ICBM expenditures for fiscal years 1955 to 1956, inclusive, and fiscal year 1957 were $258 million and $982 million, respectively, and are estimated to be $1,250 million for fiscal year 1958.

## Dairy Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio report made to the residents of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan on January 17, 1958.

The report follows:

I would like to discuss with you the new dairy stabilization bill which I have just introduced.

As you know, the dairy price supports are set by the Agricultural Act of 1949. It was signed into law by President Truman and has not been changed, insofar as dairy prices are concerned, since its enactment. Under that law, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to support dairy prices at 75 to 90 percent of parity, to assure an adequate supply. As we all know, there has been a dairy surplus for about 5 years. In a long-delayed action, the Secretary of Agriculture announced December 18 that price supports would be dropped from 83 to 75 percent of parity April 1, the beginning of the next dairy marketing year.

While I cannot question the Secretary's legal obligation to take this action, I do vigorously oppose his negative attitude in not coming forth with positive endorsement of a new and improved program to replace the Agricultural Act of 1949. For this omission there is positively no excuse whatsoever.

Over 2 years ago I reported to you that the present price-support program was inadequate and loaded with danger for dairy farmers. I asked at that time for a new program that would not be subject to political manipulation; a program which dairy farmers themselves could manage; a program which would assure good, solid, satisfactory prices, with government out of the dairy business and dairy business out of government. You will recall that I commended a self-help dairy-stabilization program to your favorable consideration.

Since my report to you 2 years ago, farm leaders (with my encouragement) have been meeting to iron out all possible differences and perfect a final dairy bill which they could support. I regret that it has taken so long for them to reach agreement. On the other hand, it was hopeless to get a bill through Congress until farm organizations were of one mind. The opposition of even one farm organization is almost enough to kill a bill fighting its way through the legislative mill.

Final farm organization approval was won the second week in January. It carries the full endorsement of the following national farm organizations: The National Grange, the National Milk Producers Federation (of which the Michigan Milk Producers Federation is a member), the National Farmers Union, and the National Conference of Commodity Organizations. While the American Farm Bureau Federation has not taken formal action on the bill it is significant that a midwest dairy conference of farm bureaus, meeting in Madison, Wis., recently, endorsed the desirable features of a self-help bill. The Michigan Farm Bureau was one of the nine States represented by delegates at the conference.

The bill is drafted and I, with many other Representatives and Senators from both sides of the aisle—Republicans and Democrats—have sponsored this long-needed legislation. The battle is far from won but I can assure you that the prospects have never been better for economic equity for dairy farmers in a peacetime economy. Dairy prices, if this bill is passed, will assure you as dairy farmers a net increase from 61 cents to 76 cents more per hundred for your milk than will the prices under 75 percent of parity.

Now I call on the Secretary of Agriculture to take a constructive look at the work of farm organizations in drafting this bill with the help of those of us in Congress. It merits his support. Further, with the bill under consideration he should extend present price supports until the Congress has had an opportunity to act and dairy farmers have had an opportunity to vote on the new peacetime dairy program.

## Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include copy of my weekly newsletter, Keenotes, which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia)

The Russian sputniks have focused national attention on education in the United States.

Is our present educational system adequate for the space age? Can we, with existing facilities, meet the challenge of the Russians? What sort of educational program must be undertaken? What is the role of the Federal Government?

These are just a few of the questions to which Congress must address itself in the coming months. The answers we come up with could well mean the difference between continued United States superiority in science and technology—and weapons—and falling behind the Russians.

Numerous proposals have been advanced for meeting the challenge. President Eisenhower has proposed federally financed scholarships for outstanding science students who are unable to pursue their higher education without help. Other proposals include: Strengthening of the public-school system from top to bottom; Federal aid for construction of school rooms, help in raising teachers' salaries; a drastic revision of school curriculums to place more emphasis on science and related subjects.

Russia is now turning out more trained scientists and technical people than the United States. Because of the nature of its Government, Russia can concentrate money and attention on science education more easily than we can. Education in this country is primarily the responsibility of local government. No one wants Federal control; in the long run that would destroy, not help, free education.

One thing must be kept in mind: Scientists cannot be trained overnight. It seems obvious, then, that we must develop plans that (1) will be of maximum help immediately, and (2) will strengthen the educational system for the long struggle ahead.

Secondary schools have not placed sufficient emphasis on science. Twenty-three percent of the Nation's high schools offer neither physics, chemistry or geometry. Many teachers, on an emergency basis, have less than minimum training.

The first need is to attract more and better high school students to science. Better teachers, who can stimulate youthful curiosity and interest, are the crux of this particular problem.

The National Science Foundation, a Government agency, is trying to fill this need by financing summer refresher courses at colleges and universities for high school science and mathematics teachers, enabling them to learn about new scientific developments and new teaching methods. This is a sound, practical approach and I hope the program can be expanded.

Scholarships can fill a definite need. Talented students without funds should be given the advantage of higher education. Otherwise, it would be a terrible waste of human resources.

Also, we must assure the Armed Forces and other Government agencies access to trained scientists. Primarily to meet this need, I have proposed setting up a United States Academy of Science, patterned after the great service schools. Graduates would agree to serve, after graduation, for 5 years with the Armed Forces or with a Government agency working directly in the science field.

This is a new, bold idea. The bill, as now written, is certainly not perfect. It was offered in legislative form to stimulate thinking about the problem, to attract comments and suggestions. This concept, long range in nature, offers hope of meeting what will be a critical need in the future.

It has been said, and rightly, that education is everybody's business. I hope the readers of Keenotes will let me have their ideas about what should and must be done, both immediately and for the years ahead.

## The Budget Can Be Balanced, and Farm Income Stabilized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the era in which we live finds us in a maze of problems, which seem almost beyond the minds of men to comprehend and hence, to solve.

There is no question but that we, and the Free World, face an enemy so astute and ruthless that we dare not underestimate his strength and purpose to destroy us—either by military might or by the easier way of forcing us to spend ourselves into complete economic collapse; financial bankruptcy of our Government and of our people, to the end that we lose confidence in our form of government, and thus are forced to yield to some form of socialism or outright communism.

This is a disturbing picture to face—to say the least—but we must be realistic and face up to it unafraid and with unbounded determination to meet the problem with the very best we have in our minds and hearts and to solve it in God's good time, which we pray will be sooner than we dare hope.

There may be little that one in my position—or that any Member of Congress or a majority of the people—can do insofar as our military security program is concerned except to support the appropriations and legislative requests of the President since few of us are military experts; however, there is much Congress can do—with the people's help—in holding down nonmilitary spending to the bare necessary minimum, by reducing such expenditures by the billions below the budget requests, to ward off financial collapse.

I have not as yet had sufficient time to make a thorough study of the budget requests; hence, I cannot at this early date say definitely how many dollars I believe can be saved in each item I recommend for reduction below budget requests. I shall, however, here point out a few of the places where billions can be saved in total.

Surely we cannot afford to spend all the billions requested in the budget for highway construction—neither the Federal Government nor the States can now afford it nor for the Federal aid to education requested; nor can the American taxpayer afford to spend in the neighborhood of $12 billion annually to pay the salaries per diem, retirement, office space, and so forth, for about 2,400,000 Federal employees; to say nothing about a thousand and one items in the budget which can—and must—be reduced by a substantial amount or eliminated entirely. Thus, at least $3 billion, in total, can be saved in the 1959 budget request, and I believe Congress will save it.

Most every department and agency of the Federal Government has more employees than are needed by any stretch of the imagination. I propose to introduce an amendment to almost every appropriations bill, which will provide that only one vacancy out of three may be filled until a reduction of 10 percent in personnel below the budget request, has been effected, which we estimate will alone save over one-half billion dollars without depriving any present Federal employee of his, or her, job. This was done in 1951 and 1952 with good effect.

AGRICULTURE

You may have noted that up to this time in these remarks, I have not mentioned where I feel savings could be made in relation to Federal expenditures for agriculture.

The great surplus of feed, food, and fiber which we now have in Government storage, and which are depressing farm commodity prices and costing billions of dollars annually to purchase and store, can, I am sure, be disposed of in a manner not only to help our farmers, but to reduce Federal expenditures by the billions, as well as to help feed and clothe starving, ragged people around the world; thus, making millions of loyal friends for America in foreign lands where we need loyal friends, instead of letting them drift away from us and become slaves to the Communists. Hence, our God-given surplus can, instead of a burden, be a blessing to us and to the suffering people of the world. Hungry people care little about all our great contributions in dollars; they cry "food, food."

To accomplish this, here is my plan.

Congress to pass a law freezing all commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of July 1, 1958, then establish a Commodity Surplus Disposal Commission of four experienced men in farming and foreign trade to be appointed by the President to serve with the director of the Farm Commodity Disposal Agency in the Department of Agriculture. The director of the Farm Commodity Disposal Agency would be the fifth member and chairman of the Commission. Give the Commission full authority to dispose of, by sale or barter, any and all commodities over and above that needed to insure a safe amount for the near future needs of the United States of America. Permit the disposal of these commodities only to foreign countries and to our own school lunch and welfare programs. The law should provide the Commission with authority to dispose of these surplus commodities for foreign currencies or for United States dollars held by foreign governments, and at a price competitive with other nations but without so-called dumping against the wishes of friendly nations—but undersell the nonfriendly nations wherever and whenever it is possible to do so, for obvious reasons.

The freezing and the more rapid disposal of the price depressing farm surplus—so costly to all our taxpayers and in some instances doubly costly to our farmers—having thus been resolved would immediately result in better farm income, which our farmer deserves and must have in order to make a fair profit and thus be enabled to purchase needed farm machinery, trucks, automobiles, fencing, lumber, household equipment, and so forth, and which will in turn put millions of idle factory workers back on the job. Surely, our entire economy needs that stimulant now. Remember, our farmers buy over twice as many dollars worth of manufactured goods as the average American when his dollar is worth 100 cents in purchasing power. His dollar is only worth about 80 cents at this time.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am quite certain that if such a law as I have here proposed would be enacted, the farmers of America would be glad to have Congress repeal the acreage reserve section of the Soil Bank Act. If we would take, say one-half of that $500 million saving and apply it to the conservation reserve payments for the 1959 crop year, which would have the effect of greater soil conservation—we would reduce crops now in surplus and save $250 million in doing so.

Finally, to insure complete effectiveness of my proposal, I further suggest that the old historical acreage allotment basis for corn be replaced with a bushel quota for each farm or farm unit, with a 10,000 bushel limit for any one farm—as recommended by Mr. L. L. Henderson, of Corning, Iowa, for the reasons he so ably and fully explains in his letter to me entitled "It's Bushels We Store, Not Acres."

Supports on farm commodities are being lowered as time goes on, and we see little or no hope for higher supports since it is clear that a majority of the American people—mostly from large consuming centers—want cheap feed, food and fiber, and it is reflected through their representatives in Congress. The cheaper the crop, the more the farmer must raise to pay his bills or stop buying much needed goods; hence, surpluses continue to pile higher year after year. That must be stopped.

We know that too often the result of low supports on farm crops is that the support prices become the ceiling price as well as a floor, driving futures down on the board of trade, which materially affects the cash market for such commodities, and yet we now learn that even lower supports are in the offing.

By exerting greater efforts on the disposal of surplus commodities now held in storage by the Government, I am sure additional sales of at least $2 billion dollars more in export sales of these commodities in fiscal year 1959 would not be too much to expect; likewise in following years until all surpluses have been disposed of to a safe level. As the storage facilities are emptied, the Commission should sell them—the grain bins, for instance, should be sold to the farmers or to members of private industry who deal in such commodities. The dollar cash returns for surplus commodities

and for storage facilities to be recovered by the United States Treasury.

The total effect of the program I have here proposed would put more land into conservation reserve, while growing more soil conserving crops; hence, there would be less crops in surplus, thus stopping surpluses from piling up again while the commodities now in Government storage are frozen and being more rapidly disposed of.

So far as corn is concerned, by changing from the historical acreage basis to a bushel basis, it would be double insurance against a repetition of the past. In addition to that, every proposal I have here made, if put into effect will save hundreds of millions of dollars for the 1959 crop year, in addition to increasing sales from foreign exports starting July 1, 1958, and last—but not least—it will stabilize farm income on a higher level and keep it stabilized, while bringing about greater buying power by our farmers—a great stimulant to our entire economy. Thus the budget can be balanced and farm income stabilized on a higher level.

I am pleased to say that I have explained my plan to many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I am encouraged by having most of them say it looks like the best solution they have heard, not only for our farmers but also for our economic, financial and, to some degree, our security problems.

I hope every Member of Congress, our farmers and farm organizations, as well as everyone in general who is giving deep thought to the great problems of the day—as I have—will give this proposal their deepest and most serious consideration.

---

## Homemakers' Tour in St. Martin Parish, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, each time I have an opportunity to observe some phase of the Federal Extension Service, operated in cooperation with the States, I realize more and more how much this work means to the success of agriculture and to the Nation's welfare. Through the leadership provided our farmers and their families by the Extension agents, these programs contribute much to a happy and prosperous American way of life.

During this year's adjournment of Congress I was privileged to meet with those participating in the annual homemakers' tour in my home parish—county—of St. Martin, La. This was conducted under the direction of Mrs. Elsie H. Castille, home-demonstration agent. Two hundred homemakers joined in the tour, visiting eight homes. At noon the group gathered in Evangeline State Park, in my hometown of St. Martinville, for luncheon, and upon the invitation of Mrs. Castille I was pleased to be present. I was very glad to have the opportunity to stress the importance and value of home-demonstration activities and the Extension Service in general, and to commend the agents for their efficiency and devotion to duty, and all participants for their interest and cooperation.

I greatly enjoyed the occasion, since I am personally acquainted with most of the homemakers, who were on this tour in my home parish, and their families, and I was happy to gather with these friends and to note their enthusiasm over home-demonstration activities and their just pride in this fine, constructive program of cooperative effort in which they share mutual benefits.

Mrs. W. L. Bruner, of Breaux Bridge, president of the home demonstration council, presided during the luncheon program.

Homes visited during the tour were those of E. H. Friedman and Herman Melancon, both R. F. D., Breaux Bridge; Will Bienvenu, Al Grace, and Grover Rees, Sr., all of Breaux Bridge; and Reuben Bienvenu, Miss Inez Gauthier, and Earl Willis, all of St. Martinville.

The parish home demonstration council now serves as a subcommittee of the parish advisory committee. In cooperation with the home-demonstration agent, they recommended that major emphasis during 1957 be placed on housing, homefurnishing, and landscaping. Mrs. Castille, who, by her ability, energy, and initiative, has proven a worthy successor to those who have served so well in the past as St. Martin Parish home-demonstration agent, took up this year's program with the former agents, Mrs. Dorothy Broussard and Mrs. Mildred Arceneaux, and also worked with the housing specialist, Mrs. Bertha Bryson, in arranging clinics for groups of homemakers with similar problems, also individual home visits, and in furnishing up-to-date material on matters of home interest. These included information concerning wall finishes, new floor material, new insulation material, blueprints for kitchen-cabinet construction, and remodeling. This data was made available through Home Demonstration Club meetings, Adult Achievement Day, circular letters and home visits. Several night clinics for young couples planning landscape designs for their homes were conducted by Miss Winona Chauffe, home-garden specialist, who also made home visits with Mrs. Castille.

The first homemakers tour in St. Martin was staged when Mrs. Dorothy Broussard was home-demonstration agent. So much interest was shown by both club and nonclub members that it was decided to make the tour an annual project sponsored by the home demonstration council. Each year the club members submit to the council tour committee the names of homes they have seen that they think other homemakers would be interested in visiting. These are passed on to the home-demonstration agent who adds the names of families she has assisted in the program or homes which she has visited and which have features of construction or decoration that meet the standards recommended by the specialists. This applies to landscaping, interior decoration, house plans and construction. After studying the list, the home-demonstration agent visits each of the homes suggested, taking with her some up-to-date Extension Service information. At each home she comments on some points of interest and usually the homemaker shows her over the whole house. If it meets the standards, the agent mentions the tour and the fact that this particular home was recommended as one to be included, and invites the homemaker's cooperation. I understand there has never been a refusal. However, it is a matter of not planning too many visits for the day. Often the agent suggests some minor addition or that time be permitted for shrubs to grow in order to present a better showing, before a home is placed on the list to be visited.

The homemakers are interested in many matters that affect their families and community. They were among the first to participate in the emergency infant feeding training program. One hundred and eighteeen in St. Martin Parish completed this training and will receive certificates. I am advised that Louisiana is the only State doing this particular civil defense job with home demonstration club women.

Among other activities last year, the homemakers in my parish visited surrounding towns in a group. These pleasant occasions provided an excellent opportunity for the members to know one another better and to get new and fresh ideas from the people in nearby areas. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that these outstanding ladies typify ideal homemakers and set such a fine example for happy homelife in their respective communities.

I am indebted to Mrs. Castille for the following list of the St. Martin Parish homemakers who made the 1957 tour. She explains, however, that inadvertently, and owing to the large number of participants, the following list is not complete:

Mesdames Henry J. Mills, Charles Gary, W. L. Bruner, Albert M. Broussard, Moise Castille, Maurice LeDoux, Jos. Thibodeaux, Simon Broussard, Carrol Green, Onesiphore Robichaux, Roy Baudoin, Paul Romero, Earl Hollier, Pressley Delcambre, Leo M. Delahoussaye, Alfred Zeringue, Andres Brasseaux, Ashton Roberthon, Louis Champagne, Lynn Chauffe, Sanders Delhomme, Claude Guidry, Edmond Cormier, Edward Dupuis, A. J. Domingues.

Mesdames Simeon Thibodaux, Joseph Theriot, Paul Doucet, Nolan Fuselier, Sidney Broussard, Harris Pellerin, Leroy Trosclair, Lloyd Tauzin, Grover Rees, Sr., Vital Trosclair, Dalton Broussard, Felix Broussard, Carlton Castille, John Hollier, Dan Broussard, Leon Dupuis, Theard Hollier, Felix Pellerin, A. P. Young, Lowell Bernard, Donald Bernard, A. C. Mills, Ray Gonsourin, Paul Tauzin, L. H. Dauterive.

Mesdames J. Fortune Bonin, Regis Lagrange, Dan Kinniff, Antoine Stelly, Howard Singleton, Percy Bourque, Israel Curry, James Borel, Carl Poche, Jr., Carl Poche, Sr., Eugene Leonard, Steve Guidry, Sidney Guidry,

Alton Huval, John Melancon, James Patin, Herman Melancon, Alcide Dupre, George Scott, Laurent Laporte, Earl Morrogh, Louis Guidroz, Frank Wright, Israel Bourque, David Theirot.

Mesdames James Guirard, Hubert Melancon, Gam Barras, Freddie Laperouse, Houston Thornton, Donald Dauphine, Fernest Benoit, Clarence LeBlanc, John Calais, Daniel Guidry, Sr., Stoney DeVillier, Joseph P. Roberts, Jules Roy, Penn Morrow, Bobby Morrow, Harold Melancon, Antoine Bourque, Lucien Blanchard, Wade O. Martin, Sr., Percy Bernis, Lazaire Romero, Anita Zimmerman, L. C. Bordelon, Simon Dauphine, Ferdie Guidry, Melvin Dupuis, Noah Hayes, E. H. Friedman, Homer J. LeBlanc, Sr., Bazile Legrand, Jerome Boucvalt, Wesley Dugas, Morris Soileau, Marcel Potier, Clifford Mouton, Herman Bienvenu, Francis Gauthier, Ignace Delahoussaye, Conrad C. Gauthier, Jack Ozenne, Mrs. Alice Bienvenu, Theodore Dore, Paul Romero, John Maraist, Jos. Rousseau, Lawrence Roy, W. P. Bartley, Ben Dugas.

Mesdames Gerard Duran, Vira A. Laughlin, Paul Beyt, Felico Eastin, A. C. Gauthier, Evelyn B. Wetzel, Andrew Bienvenu, Jr., Elsie H. Castille, Iphis Savoy, James Babin, Tom Periou, Laurent Potier, Reuben Bienvenu, Claude Hebert, Cecil Eastin, Albert Maraist, B. M. Heard, Earl Willis, Robert Coleman, Diana Broussard.

Misses Audrey Savoy, Dozita Bourque, Marie Louise Roy, Maude Greig, Lena Ann Champagne, Barbare A. Fremin, Effie Soulier, Inez Gauthier, and Jeanne Castille.

## Cotton Acreage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, with reduced acreage, reduced farm prices, and disastrous weather conditions, the cotton-growing sections of the South face a terrible situation. My own district, as well as much of the central South, has been declared a disaster area by the Department of Agriculture and the President. This situation has caused many farmers to sign up their cotton land for the soil bank. In view of the number signing up, the Department of Agriculture put a stop order on signups.

Thus, cotton acreage will be reduced considerably below last year's plantings. This comes at a time when United States supplies of good quality cotton is low; and this removal of acreage from an already small national allotment will further seriously affect the future, not only of the cotton-growing sections of the South, but of the Nation and, if permitted to continue, will seriously endanger our domestic and world markets. It is having a disastrous effect at the moment in a great slowdown in local business activity, which will be felt throughout the year.

Since there is an urgent need for more cotton acreage rather than less, it becomes apparent that steps must be made to see that these acres which the farmers have rented to the Government—under what the Department of Agriculture now calls an unsound program to be abolished next year, because of their economic situation—should be put back into production. I have, therefore, prepared for introduction today the bill, as follows:

A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to release cotton acreage from the acreage reserve for the 1958 crop year, to establish a substitute for the acreage reserve program for cotton, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That title I of Public Law 540, 84th Congress, known as the Soil Bank Act of 1956, is hereby amended by adding the following:

"SEC. 107. Whereas the removal from production of cotton acreage placed in the acreage reserve for the 1958 crop year has seriously endangered the supply of good quality cotton essential to retain domestic and foreign markets, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to sell, in such lots and on such terms and conditions as he may determine, cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas equivalent to that signed up in any given county or county area to farmers in such county or county area for the 1958 crop year. Such acreage allotments and marketing quotas as may be purchased by any such farmer shall be considered as additional allotments and quotas for the 1958 crop year. All funds received by the Secretary from such sales shall be added to funds available to the Secretary for acreage reserve payments. Such sale shall not affect the history of either the farm from which transferred or that to which transferred. For the crop year 1959 and thereafter, cotton acreage for the United States shall be increased to 10 percent above the level established for crop year 1958.

"SEC. 108. Whereas the removal of land from production in cotton growing areas has hurt business activity in local communities and will work against efforts to establish stable economic units; and whereas, a substitute is needed for the acreage reserve program, which program should not be continued beyond crop year 1958, no payment shall be made by the Secretary for removal of land from production under the acreage reserve for the crop year 1959 and thereafter: *Provided, however*, That any farmer may release his acreage allotment and marketing quota to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee for for sale to other farmers in the county or county area, and such acreage allotment and marketing quota shall be offered for sale to other farmers in the county or county area under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. Such payments as shall be received shall be turned over by the ASC County Committee to the farmer who sold his acreage allotment and marketing quota. Such sale shall not affect the acreage allotment and marketing quota of the farm or farms from which sold or the farm or farms to which sold, except during the 1 year in which sold. Neither shall it affect the permanent acreage allotment or marketing quota history of either farm."

Mr. Speaker, further, I have introduced another bill which would broaden the authority of the Farmers' Home Administration, and enable such Agency to meet the need with a minimum of dislocation. Many of the banks and others who have furnished production funds to farmers in years past find themselves unable to make advances this year. I believe it highly essential that the following amendments be made in the law. I quote the bill which I have introduced today:

A bill to broaden use of disaster loan revolving fund

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 2 of Public Law 38, 81st Congress, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following sections:

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to participate in production disaster loans to farmers and stockmen made by commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other regular responsible sources of credit up to 80 percent of the amount of the loan. The Secretary may utilize the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a), for the Federal Government's share of such loan and for administrative expenses in connection therewith.

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to insure and make commitments to insure production disaster loans made by responsible lenders other than the United States and to include in such insurance contracts agreements to service loans insured thereunder and to purchase such loans on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall utilize the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a), for making such loans and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. He may utilize the fund to pay taxes, insurance, prior liens, and other expenses to protect the security for loans which have been insured thereunder."

## Excerpts From Address of Brooks Hays at Walter F. George School of Law, Mercer University, November 1, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 20, 1958*

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech made by our colleague, Hon. BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, at the Walter F. George School of Law, Mercer University, Macon, Ga., on November 1, 1957:

This historic university acclaimed throughout the Southern Baptist Convention territory has honored me greatly in asking me to speak on Law Day. For many reasons the invitation brought me much pleasure. Georgia Baptists have been unusually hospitable to me over a long period, and the State itself has a special place in my affections. Long before my election to Congress I had occasion to visit Georgia in the course of my work as an official of the United States Department of Agriculture and I acquired an appreciation of its culture, its history and its claim to leadership. It is a theme I enjoy pursuing, but it would be carrying owls to Athens to dwell upon the story of the State's progress and the opportunity now afforded you for an inspiring new role in the region's life.

I am glad to come to the district represented by one of our Nation's most distinguished Congressmen, my longtime and beloved friend, CARL VINSON, whose effectiveness and devotion as a public servant are universally recognized. And this visit revives stirring memories of a friendship I valued

and of a career which has inspired all who were privileged to serve in the Congress with that preeminent Georgia statesman whose name your law school bears. The ennobling influence of Walter George will live on.

I want to talk to the law students today out of my own experience as a legislator and a politician who believes that a knowledge of the law is a great aid and often an indispensable adjunct in the public service. I wish to speak of our tasks as citizens with the special mission of bearing Christian principles into the arena of political conflict. I believe an appropriate caption for this talk would be the "Due Process of Lawmaking."

The phrase "due process of law" is familiar to all. It is given sanction in the Constitution and it has rich meaning for those whose property or liberty or life is in jeopardy. The well-trained and morally disciplined lawyer is but fortifying those principles which are at the core and center of our Christian faith. And in those excursions into political conflict which every lawyer must take, though he may never run for office, it will be apparent that without the guidance and depth of religious instruction the techniques of both law and politics may be tragically abused. This is a period in your lives in which the sacred character of the legal professioh should be impressed upon your mind and heart. The commonwealth is one of the Christian's finest workshops. Without the buttress of Christianity modern education would become mere window dressing.

Due process of law is the special guardianship of lawyers and judges; due process of lawmaking belongs to legislators and political leaders. Process itself has value. It must be reversed in a democracy. Every lawyer learns this pretty early. What a shock it would be, having proved, for example, that a defendant had been denied his right to a duly impaneled jury of his peers to hear a higher court say, "but he was obviously guilty anyway." There is no way to assure the innocent of their rights of due process but by according those same rights to the guilty.

The due process of lawmaking is also an ideal for democratic governments though it does not have the prescribed legal forms afforded due process of law. I use the term "lawmaking" in the sense of determining national or State policy, and since there are formal procedures for treatymaking the term is broad enough to embrace world law. I am speaking, however, not of the technical rules for moving a bill through legislative bodies, but rather of the democratic processes which involve influencing public opinion and the ultimate expression of that opinion in wise and beneficial policies.

In the atmosphere of a Christian campus it should be easy to perceive the role of moral leader in the affairs of state. We Baptists have a fine tradition. We seek not to dominate the state but rather to influence it. That influence is exerted by sending into the struggles for decent government our dedicated sons and daughters who believe that the service to be rendered there may be a Christian service and may bring a satisfying human experience. The lawyer has a special gift for this service. He is an acknowledged leader. He should excel in interpreting public issues in terms of moral value. In modern times he can fill a dual role: craftsman in legal affairs, and preceptor in political morality. The two may sometimes appear to be in conflict. The practitioner of lawmaking may be impeded by the lagging views of the electorate. Part of his job is to correct this by giving enlightenment. As one of my colleagues put it: "A legislator should be a window as well as a mirror." He is dutybound to take into account and deal sympathetically with the fears and fallacies that beset us mortals. At the same time he may be pressured by those who would focus only on moral considerations. Patience here is also required. He should avoid contempt for the abstract goodness of the moralist. A sense of realism should not lead to a grading down of his service to levels of ignorance or dullness that might characterize some of those he seeks to represent. We must not succumb to mediocrity. I have been defeated often enough to know that even a majority of the people can sometimes be wrong. And perhaps to simulate modesty I should add—elected often enough.

Sir Henry Maine gave us a good adage: "Social opinion must be in advance of law and the greater or less happiness of the people depends upon the narrowness of the gulf between them." Dr. Northrup of Yale University had this in mind in distinguishing between "living law" and "positive law." Living law applies to the community and social standards sustained by the customs and attitudes of the people; positive law to the decrees of legislatures and courts. The two are often identical but occasionally in conflict. When in conflict as in the current controversy over implementing the Supreme Court school decisions of 1954, a difficult question is posed for lawyers, moralists, and political leaders.

I refer to the problem for illustrative purposes; it is far too complex for treatment in a single talk. I would like to say, however, that out of the Little Rock experiences I have gained a new comprehension of the magnitude of the problem. It is a tremendous challenge to our imagination, our vision, our patience, our sense of justice, our skill in defending valid sectional viewpoints and our ability to dwell in peace with those of other sections who do not share our views.

One other point on that theme: I have faith in our capacity to meet that challenge. In the State which produced Ben Hill, Henry Grady, and other immortals, I know that I am in the company of men of like faith. We have faith that the "indestructible union of indestructible States" may be preserved without undue strains; but this will come about only if larger numbers of all Americans, North and South, resolve to explore the problem in utmost good will—determined that social opinion rather than force shall be the basis for change in patterns of living. Criticism of court decisions must not be construed as defiance. We may surely be permitted to seek alterations to national policy without being charged with disloyalty to constitutional principles. Christian, rather than doctrinaire, attitudes on both sides will provide the answer, but time is an essential element. And the Jeffersonion principle of considering local variations in conditions should be embraced in the national policy. This coupled with demonstrations of our ability to achieve justice for minority groups in specific situations should be constructive aids in getting a fresh start toward national unity and racial harmony.

The ideal of due process of lawmaking can be greatly served if all branches of government will reexamine the problem in the light of difficulties growing out of edicts requiring sudden change in age-old customs of the people. The South assured by such a reexamination that haste and force will not prevail should seek to stimulate throughout the region those forces of moral fervor and racial good will which have had our support.

Jeffersonian democracy accentuates local determination, but pleads for justice for all and would lead every community to accord basic rights. This is sound governmental policy and is a concession to social customs which are subject to change.

I have mentioned the opportunity offered the lawyer of playing a dual role. As advocate he struggles to achieve justice for a client, and as civic worker he undertakes to direct public policy for just and righteous ends. Primarily though he is a worker—a craftsman—not a prophet. On this point let him reverently turn to the church to relate himself properly to the source and inspiration of true law and to build in his own career and in the thinking of the people an appreciation of the moral guidance which ministers and law school faculties supply. This does not imply that our ancient opposition to authoritarianism is to be diluted, that differences are not to be aired. I urge merely that an effort be made to channel the church influence into the processes of government and that a firm though flexible partnership between lawyer and Christian minister be used for perfecting human society. When Paul suggested to the Ephesians that we "speak the truth in love," he was giving wise counsel for all of us.

The Baptist influence in the South is perhaps greatest of any religious organization—not because we are more virtuous or sensitive than other Christians, but we are more numerous. And in the Nation as a whole we have forums which can be properly used for relieving tensions and presenting the truth. This is a part of the service of reconciliation that the Nation needs.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Meletius M. Wojnar, of the Order of St. Basil the Great, assistant professor of oriental canon law, the Catholic University of America, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we, the Congress of the United States of America, in the name of the entire Nation, acknowledge You as our Lord and God. And therefore, as a nation, we worship You and we respect Your law. We thank You also for Your protection from all evils and for conserving in our Nation the great principles of democracy: freedom, prosperity, and justice for all. Finally, we beseech You for peace for our country and for all other countries.

And, especially on this occasion of the 40th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, we ask You to grant to the Ukrainian Nation and its 40 million people and to all the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain the opportunity to live and to worship You in freedom, independence, and in peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

---

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

**Senate Resolution 243**

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

*Resolved*, That a committee of 15 Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased at Fairmont, W. Va.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1958

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 10146) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1288), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1958

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has just filed the report on the $1.2 billion supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1958. The report covers only 14 pages. There have been thousands of columns printed and millions of words have been spoken about our defense situation. Questions have been asked as to the adequacy of appropriations and programs. I do hope that all Members of the House will find time to read these 14 pages.

The bill will be taken up, as I understand the plan of leadership, tomorrow for debate and, if there is a rollcall, that will come on Thursday.

The hearings consist of only one thin volume of less than 400 pages. Those hearings are full of information that should be in the possession of all Members of the House. I rise to alert the Members to this bill and to ask them to read the report and look into the hearings in order that we may take proper action when we call up the bill for consideration tomorrow.

## THE FOUR-WAY TEST

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me today to join with the Delray Beach Rotary Club and its president, J. Arnold Carter, who is in Washington today, in presenting to each Member of Congress a 3-inch hemisphere paperweight with the four-way test inscribed on it. You should receive it today.

The origin of the four-way test dates back to 1942 and was created and set forth by Herbert J. Taylor, of Chicago, Ill., who was president of Rotary International in 1954–55. During the depression years Taylor, in seeking divine guidance in a particularly important problem, turned to the the Scriptures of the Bible, and it was from this that the four-way test evolved.

FOUR-WAY TEST

1. Is it the truth?
2. Is it fair to all concerned?
3. Will it build good will and better friendships?
4. Will it be beneficial to all concerned?

It has been variously described as a guide to use in any relationship of government, business, or social life; a yardstick of all things thought, said, and done. The proven results obtained by groups, communities, governing bodies, and individuals who have adopted it are somewhat amazing. Rotarians the world over are extremely enthusiastic about the merits of the application of the test when applied to any relationship of one person with another.

Members of the Delray Beach Rotary Club are very enthusiastic at the opportunity to bring before Congress the four-way test, and it is hoped that each Member will adopt this as his motto and that it will be beneficial in promoting worldwide peace and understanding.

## TELEVISION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, television belongs to the people.

In its presentation of entertainment, advertising, and news, it is a new democratic medium of communication that must be kept free from monopolistic control.

There is a movement underway in favor of pay TV that would reduce it to the status of a jukebox screen, where you would have to pay to see what is currently free. If such a system should prevail, it would deny to many a poor family the programs that can be enjoyed now by every viewer irrespective of his economic position.

It would place privilege above choice. Outstanding programs will be seen only by those who pay a monthly fee or a stipulated price per program. The national television audience will be split between the have and the have-nots, introducing a divisive element that could have far-reaching social consequences.

We never contemplated such a split personality for radio. Why, then, should we foster it in television?

Test samples of public opinion on this issue are running heavily against pay-as-you-see TV. A few months ago, the people in the Salinas-Monterey and San Luis Obispo areas of California were polled as to their views on this issue. The verdict: 4 in favor, 5,002 against.

In order that pay TV will not be imposed on the American people against their will, I have introduced a bill similar to that proposed by Senator WILLIAM LANGER, and designed to "prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes." It reads:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1064), as amended, is amended by adding after section 507 the following:

"CHARGING FEES FOR VIEWING TELECASTS IN PRIVATE HOMES

"SEC. 508. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to impose or attempt to impose, either directly or indirectly, any toll, fee, subscription, or other charge, on the general public for the privilege of viewing television programs in private homes until such person has been so authorized by the Commission subsequent to the date of the enactment of this section.

"(b) The Commission shall not authorize or permit the imposing of any such toll, fee, subscription, or other charge referred to in subsection (a) of this section until it is authorized to do so by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this section."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out "section 301" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 301 and 508."

As you will note, the emphasis is on "viewing telecasts in private homes." This is a right that must not be restricted by any mercenary factor. In this right of choice, all Americans must be equal.

Therefore, I urge passage of protective legislation that will maintain our tradition of free television, and promote the democratic principles on which it is based.

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

## AWARD OF CROSS OF COMMANDER OF THE ORDER OF ORANGE-NASSAU TO HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10147) to permit Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, Member of Congress, authorization to accept the award of Cross of Commander of the Order of Orange-Nassau conferred upon him by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H. R. 10147

A bill to permit Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, Member of Congress, authorization to accept the award of Cross of Commander of the Order of Orange-Nassau conferred upon him by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, Member of Congress, is

authorized to accept the award of the Cross of Commander of the Order of Orange-Nassau conferred upon him by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, together with any decorations and documents evidencing such award. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to deliver to the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER any decorations and documents evidencing such award.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of January 31, 1881 (5 U. S. C., sec. 114), or any other provision of law, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER may wear and display the decoration referred to in the first section of this act after acceptance thereof.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that the Government of the Netherlands has bestowed this accolade of honor upon our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. In accordance with his philosophy of immigration, he has been most painstakingly cognizant of his duties as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee. He has responded with expertness. I frequently am in disagreement with him but never doubt his sincerity. I think the work that he has done with reference to the activities of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration is exemplary. It is for that reason, I am sure, among others, that the Government of the Netherlands and its distinguished Queen has bestowed upon him this distinction.

I am very happy that he is the recipient thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution—House Resolution 446—and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9955) to provide for a temporary increase in the public-debt limit, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 446 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 9955, a bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

The resolution provides for the usual closed rule, waives points of order against the bill and grants 3 hours of general debate. The only amendments that may be offered are those amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but such amendments are not subject to amendment.

Section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act provides a permanent limit of $275 billion on the amount of the public debt. This bill provides that the debt limit shall be increased by $5 billion, beginning on the date of enactment of the bill and ending June 30, 1959.

My colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], in presenting his request for a rule before the Committee on Rules, pointed out that following the request of the Secretary of the Treasury to raise the debt limit to $280 billion, a public hearing was held. After hearing the testimony presented, the Ways and Means Committee determined that the full $5 billion temporary increase in the debt limit should be allowed. The increase would provide for the immediate cash requirements of the Government since the cash balances have been very low. The increase would also provide a wider margin between the actual public indebtedness and the statutory limit which would give more flexibility in managing more efficiently and economically the fiscal affairs of the Government.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 446 so the House may proceed to the consideration of this measure for which ample time for debate has been provided.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman explain to the House why this is a closed rule?

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is a little difficult to do in one sense and not very difficult to do in another. Revenue bills coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means are very complicated. Members of the Ways and Means Committee appeared before the Committee on Rules and convinced us that the bill should be brought up under a closed rule and a majority of the committee voted that way.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying this is a revenue bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. In a sense it is. There is $5 billion of revenue involved.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I still have no substantial explanation of why this bill should be called to the floor under a gag rule. Will the gentleman say what the representation was that caused the committee to report out a closed rule?

Mr. TRIMBLE. The only explanation I can give the gentleman from Iowa is the one I have just given, that the Committee on Ways and Means sought this kind of rule and the Committee on Rules on the showing made granted it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell me where we can obtain a copy of the hearings in connection with the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. In the Committee on Rules. I am not sure that the proceedings were taken down.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the hearings on the bill itself would be before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I find myself in opposition to both the rule and the subject matter of the bill which it makes in order.

First, as I think most of the membership know, I am never enthusiastic about closed or so-called gag rules. I opposed this type of rule in committee because I could see no justification whatsoever for it. The issue is a simple one here. It is merely a question of whether the debt limit should be raised and if so, how much. Certainly the membership should have an opportunity to offer amendments either cutting or raising the amount. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill. As I stated to the House the other day, I do not think this is a time for hysterical reaction to the new phase of the Russian cold war—the sputnik. This is the justification urged for further increasing our debt limit.

I am sure we are all aware of the fact this country has the greatest national debt not only of the present family of nations, but in the history of the world. We cannot go on indefinitely increasing this debt without bringing about the destruction of our fiscal system and thereby pulling the pillars down on this Nation, the leader of the free world. Again I repeat that the Russian masters are following the Lenin doctrine of destroying this champion of the free peoples by destroying it from within.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience go along with this rule or the bill. One way to stop increasing the national debt is to stop increasing the debt limit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I speak as a minority member of the Committee on Rules and rather reluctantly bring this rule before the House. Very frankly, and I think I owe it to the House to say so, I voted against this closed or gag rule when it was before our committee. I did so because I believed an opportunity should have been given for those members of the Ways and Means Committee who supported only a $3 billion increase in the national debt limit, instead of $5 billion to have their proposal voted upon. I now understand—and I certainly hope

so—that when a motion to recommit is made it will carry the $3 billion figure.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I assure the gentleman that will be done.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much. That arrangement will at least give the House an opportunity to decide for itself whether we should have a $3 billion increase in the national debt limit, a $5 billion increase, or none at all.

In further explanation of this present situation, and of my vote in the Rules Committee, let me point out that in the past similar bills have been brought up in the House to increase the debt limit, under gag rules whereby the House membership had no opportunity to express their full will, but only, as in the old German Reichstag, to vote "Ja" or "Nein" on the bill as reported. The bill would then go to the Senate, and in turn the Senate would reduce the amount by which the debt ceiling would be lifted to $3 billion.

In the end, the Members of the House of Representatives are left looking like a lot of dumb sheep. So I am getting a little bit tired of these closed or gag rules, especially when the legislation to be considered is not a general revenue bill, but only to a measure containing one real issue in it, the amount by which we should increase the national debt.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for the position he has taken in the Rules Committee in his effort to give the House an opportunity to work its will upon this and other bills that have come before the House, particularly this bill. It is unthinkable that there should be a gag rule on one of the first measures of any consequence to be brought before the House in the present session.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me say to the gentleman that it is not a happy circumstance in which I find myself, or to disagree with the large majority of the Members of the Rules Committee, for all of whom I have great respect. But this is certainly not a general revenue bill. It is not made up of a great number of paragraphs, sections, ideas, and items dealing with many questions. It brings up only the question whether we want a $5 billion increase in the national debt limit or whether we would rather go a little slow and perhaps keep the brake on the spenders a bit by saying: "We will vote a $3 billion increase now to give you elbow room. Then if we have to increase the national debt limit later, because of any great emergency, we can do so."

Let me say further that I am reluctant, in my own mind, as to the wisdom or need of increasing the debt limit. I understand fully the position of the Treasury Department. I know something of the testimony that was given before the Committee on Ways and Means as to the necessity for lifting the debt limit. However, there are two ways to balance our budget. One is by deficit spending; the other is by reducing public spending, so that we do not go over the present debt limit.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 3]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Addonizio | Friedel | Passman |
| Allen, Ill. | Garmatz | Patterson |
| Andersen | Granahan | Pillion |
| Arends | Grant | Prouty |
| Barden | Gray | Rabaut |
| Belcher | Green, Pa. | Radwan |
| Bow | Halleck | Rains |
| Brownson | Hillings | Rodino |
| Buckley | Hosmer | Roosevelt |
| Budge | Jackson | St. George |
| Byrne, Ill. | Judd | Schwengel |
| Canfield | Kean | Scott, N. C. |
| Carnahan | Kearney | Sheehan |
| Chiperfield | Kelly, N. Y. | Sheppard |
| Christopher | Knutson | Simpson, Ill. |
| Church | Lennon | Springer |
| Clevenger | Lipscomb | Staggers |
| Coffin | McCarthy | Taile |
| Collier | McCulloch | Thompson, La. |
| Cooley | McDonough | Tollefson |
| Cunningham, Iowa | McVey | Tuck |
| Dawson, Ill. | Macdonald | Vursell |
| Delray | Merrow | Wainwright |
| Dies | Michel | Wier |
| Dorn, N. Y. | Moore | Williams, N. Y. |
| Dorn, S. C. | Morrison | Zelenko |
| Frelinghuysen | O'Hara, Minn. | |
| | O'Neill | |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## INCREASE OF THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, even at the risk of being misunderstood by some Members I want to repeat what I said in the Rules Committee, and that is that had a majority of the Members of the House voted during the past 20 years as I have voted, for economy and against certain great expenditures, our national debt would now be somewhere around $100 billion instead of nearly $275 billion. I realize, however, that is all water over the dam. I do, however, want to point out that there are means and methods which the Congress can and should follow to eliminate waste and extravagance in the spending of the public borrowed money which will be made available when the debt limit is raised. I refer to the recommendations of the first and second Hoover Commissions, some of which have been put into effect with resultant high savings of public moneys and by greater efficiency in the operation of some of the agencies of Government; but there are still pending in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, a great many bills to put into effect the recommendations of both the first and second Hoover Commissions which, if enacted into law as requested, in many instances by the President of the United States, would sharply cut and greatly reduce public spending, and would result in such great savings as to perhaps make it possible for us to meet the increased cost of our space age national defense without the necessity of borrowing more money, or raising taxes. This is something to which we should give our attention in the days and weeks ahead, because the people of the United States are entitled to our best effort to operate this Federal Government in this new age on a sound basis. They are demanding we eliminate waste and extravagance wherever we may find it, and that we make every effort to get greater efficiency and economy in the transaction of the public business.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I voted against the granting of this closed rule by our Rules Committee because, at that time, I had no definite assurance the House would be given an opportunity to vote on reducing the amount of the increase in the debt limit. Since that time I have been assured, as you heard stated here today on the floor of the House by responsible Members, that there will be an opportunity for us to vote upon a motion to recommit to reduce the increase in the debt limit to $3 billion, rather than for the proposed $5 billion increase now in the bill.

It is my understanding that we will have before us, when we finally come to vote upon this bill, at least three choices or ways to vote: One, of course, is to vote for the entire committee measure containing the $5 billion increase in the debt limit; another is to vote for the motion to recommit, fixing the increase at $3 billion; and, of course, finally just vote "No" on the whole measure. Therefore, under such circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to oppose adoption of this rule; inasmuch as it will now be possible for the House to work its will under the limitations I have just mentioned and which I believe will give us all an opportunity to express our own convictions on the pending legislation.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

### THE DEBT INCREASE BILL INVOLVES $163 MILLION A YEAR IN UNNECESSARY INTEREST CHARGES AND APPROVES PRIVATE BANKS HAVING FREE USE OF $3 BILLION OF TREASURY FUNDS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the Rules Committee and requested that committee not to give a closed rule on this bill, because I wanted

to offer an amendment. Other Members, I think, should also have the privilege of offering amendments.

I desired to offer an amendment that would save the Government a lot of money. Under existing law the Treasury can borrow directly from the Federal Reserve banks, up to $5 billion. That law is in effect now. Under the amendment I proposed, if the Treasury went above the $275 billion debt limit, that money would be borrowed, through exercise of existing law, directly from the Federal Reserve System. If the whole amount were borrowed in that way, it would save the Government $163 million a year in interest charges. I asked the committee to give me an opportunity to offer this amendment, and to extend the time of debate, which was proposed to be 1 hour. The Rules Committee did not accede to my request but, instead, has given a closed rule, although it graciously extended the time of debate to 3 hours. We will have plenty of time to talk, but we cannot vote on anything except what has been described by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

THREE OF THE FIVE BILLIONS ARE FOR PRIVATE BANKS

In this bill, Secretary Anderson has really demonstrated courage. He is a courageous man. He came before the Committee on Ways and Means and said that he wanted to keep $3½ billion on deposit in the Reserve banks and in the private commercial banks. He laid it right on the line. He did not quibble about it. In other words, he wants the Congress to endorse his placing in the Federal Reserve banks and in the commercial banks $3½ billion. That is one of the purposes of this bill. A half billion dollars of that, I think, is necessary. Secretary Anderson needs a half billion dollars in the Federal Reserve banks, as the Treasury has had in the past, but it is unnecessary to keep $3 billion in the private commercial banks, because the people have lent that money to the Government. The Government is paying interest on it, and for the Government to keep it on deposit with the private commercial banks, at no interest—remember not one penny of interest does the Government get—I think is wrong. This does not serve any public-interest function. The money in the private commercial banks is beyond the issuance of a Government check; it is removed from that. It has to be brought into the Federal Reserve banks before the Treasury can issue a check on it. So I say this is going away out of line, to let the banks have from three to six billion dollars on deposit all the time, money that is costing the people 3 and 4 percent interest. In other words, it is costing taxpayers $240 million a year on $6 billion, or $120 million on $3 billion—that will be the average if this bill becomes effective.

FULL $5 BILLION OF FEDERAL RESERVE AUTHORITY IS AVAILABLE

So the question is whether we will place our approval on an announced policy to keep $3 billion, as an average, in the private commercial banks, on which the Government will receive no interest but upon which the Government and the taxpayers will be paying interest at all times.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas knows that I have always been interested in the renewal of the act which provides that the Government can have $5 billion outstanding at any one time. Can the gentleman from Texas tell me what use is presently being made of that ability to borrow money?

Mr. PATMAN. It has been endorsed by every Secretary of the Treasury. It has been endorsed by the Federal Reserve System and by the previous Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Burgess. So, why should it not be used? Why should we take an action that will make this $5 billion cost the Government an unnecessary $163 million every year to carry this additional amount?

Mr. GROSS. What use is being made of that ability to borrow today?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely none; not one dollar's worth of securities are now held by the Federal Reserve System under the $5 billion direct-purchase authority. It has been used substantially in the past.

HOW TO USE BANKERS' INFLUENCE TO KEEP THE DEBT DOWN

If, in authorizing this $5 billion increase in the Federal debt we required the Treasury to raise whatever money they do raise under this, by selling the new securities direct to the Federal Reserve System, then it wil be a lot less likely that the Federal debt will be increased unnecessarily. Under those conditions the banks would oppose increasing the Federal debt and help us hold it down. Thereby we could have the power and the influence of the bankers of the country working to keep the debt down, instead of working to increase it. But, as the bill stands, $3 billion of this is for the private banks, remember that, my friends, and a vote for this bill as it stands is a vote to put $3 billion in the banks, for free use by the banks, upon which the people are paying interest.

I think that Congress is going to have to face up to this problem of the Federal debt, and make some definite plan for paying it off. We ought to work out a sinking fund plan, with a definite schedule for reducing the debt when times are good. It should have been reduced substantially the past few years, during prosperous times.

Now to make perfectly clear how I think this bill to increase the ceiling on the Federal debt should be handled, let me read from the statement I made to the Rules Committee, explaining why we should have an opportunity to amend the bill. I said:

H. R. 9955 is to authorize an increase from $275 billion to $280 billion in the Federal debt limit. I hope that when this committee reports the bill, it will give it an open rule, so that amendments may be made on the floor of the House.

The amendment I propose to the bill is as follows:

*"Provided*, That any amount of the Federal debt in excess of $275 billion is represented by securities of the United States held by the Federal Reserve System as a result of direct purchase from the Treasury of the United States."

There are several reasons for requiring the Treasury to sell directly to the Federal Reserve System.

HOW $163 MILLION A YEAR WOULD BE SAVED

First, this will save the Federal Government about $163 million a year in interest charges. In the past, the Federal Reserve System has charged the Treasury one-fourth percent on such securities. This rate is in contrast to about 3½ percent which the Treasury would have to pay to sell the new securities to the private banks or the public generally. Furthermore, it does not really matter what interest rate the Treasury may pay the Federal Reserve System. The System is owned by the Government, and it pays 90 percent of its net income back into the Treasury.

AMENDMENT WOULD USE TRADITIONAL METHODS

Second, the authority for the Federal Reserve System to purchase up to $5 billion in securities direct from the Treasury already exists, and it is traditional and orthodox. Prior to 1935 this authority was without limitation. Since 1942 the limit has been $5 billion at any one time; and the authority has run only for periods of 2 years. But extensions of the authority have been requested each 2 years, and each time the authority has been extended without objection. The present authority expires June 30, 1958, and the Secretary of the Treasury has already requested its extension for another 2 years.

Since 1954, however, the authority has not been used. At the present time, therefore, the full $5 billion is available. But it is not likely to be used to any substantial extent unless Congress requires that it be used.

SAME PURPOSES OF DEBT INCREASE AND FEDERAL RESERVE AUTHORITY

Third, the authority for the Federal Reserve System to purchase securities directly from the Treasury has exactly the same purposes as the $5 billion increase in the debt limit which the Secretary of the Treasury is now requesting. The Secretary of the Treasury has said that this increase in debt authority is not for the purpose of bringing about a general increase in the national debt, but for the purpose of giving him "elbow room" to manage a debt of about the present size. He has explained that the new authority is needed to smooth out the differences between the ups and down when revenues are flowing in and the requirements of the Treasury to pay its bills when due. He has given the same purposes for the Federal Reserve purchasing authority, as has the previous Secretary of the Treasury, and as has the Federal Reserve Board.

ADMINISTRATION OBJECTED TO COST-SAVINGS AMENDMENT

It is my understanding that the Treasury objected to my proposed amendment, principally on the ground that to sell securities direct to the Federal Reserve would be inflationary. Furthermore, the claim was made, I understand, that this authority for direct sales to the Federal Reserve was intended, and given, only for use in adjusting some unusual situations, and then on very short-term, day-to-day basis.

As for the argument that my proposal would be inflationary, this is a nonsensical argument for objecting to the amendment. If there were a question here, the question would be whether my proposal is more or less inflationary than each of the alternative methods which might

be used for selling the new securities. More particularly, the question would be whether my proposal is more or less inflationary than the method which is most likely to be used, which is to reduce required reserves of the commercial banks—a highly inflationary method.

INFLATION IS PHONY ARGUMENT

But in any case, there are at hand several methods by which the inflationary effects can be readily controlled, or offset, or even reversed, depending upon the precise degree of credit ease or restraint which the monetary authorities wish to achieve. And, furthermore, these methods will be used in any case. For example, if the $5 billion in additional Federal securities should be sold without reducing required reserves of commercial banks, then the effects would be highly deflationary. Are we to assume that our monetary authorities would tolerate $5 billion of deflation in the economic posture we are in today, without acting to counter the deflation?

Assuming that my proposal would be inflationary to an undesired degree, the same methods can be used to counter that inflation. For example, the Federal Reserve Board could raise required reserves slightly—or what is more realistic, it could refrain from lowering required reserves, as it seems about to do. Or another way of the inflationary influence could be offset is by the Treasury maintaining smaller deposits of its money with the private banks than it has been doing, and smaller than the unjustified amount which Secretary Anderson has stated the Treasury plans to maintain in the future.

HOW THE PURPOSE OF FEDERAL RESERVE PURCHASES WAS PREVIOUSLY STATED

As for the argument that the authority for the Treasury to sell securities directly to the Federal Reserve System was put into law for the purpose of day-to-day adjustments only, this argument is plainly refuted by previous statements of Secretary Anderson, by Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, and by the Honorable W. Randolph Burgess, formerly Under Secretary of the Treasury. Here is what these people have previously said the purpose of this authority is:

Hon. Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury:

"The direct purchase authority is of important assistance to the Treasury in smoothing out the effect of short-run peaks in Treasury cash receipts and disbursements so that the disturbing effect of their flow through the banking system may be held to a minimum. Also, if the Treasury did not have the authority it would be necessary to maintain larger cash balances than is now the case.

"The authority is only used occasionally, primarily immediately preceding periods of heavy tax payments. However, it is an essential fiscal mechanism in avoiding unnecessary strains on the money market at such times and in handling the distribution and utilization of Treasury cash balances and holding them to a minimum. Any borrowing under the authority is, of course, subject to the statutory debt limit." (Letter from the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, dated January 3, 1958, to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives.)

Hon. William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System:

"This is an operating convenience under which the borrowing is always of a strictly temporary nature and occurs primarily in taxpayments periods. The authority has made it possible around such times for the Treasury to bridge temporary gaps between the Treasury's payment needs and its tax receipts, and in this way to smooth out some of the uneven flows of funds through the banking system and the money market that would otherwise result from the Treasury's operations.

"Avoidance, through this method of Treasury borrowing, of the sharp strains on the banking system that would otherwise arise from sudden drains on the Treasury's accounts with banks is equally as helpful to the Federal Reserve in carrying out its parallel responsibilities in the field of monetary and credit policy, as it is to the Treasury in administering its fiscal responsibilities effectively." (Statement of Mr. Martin before the House Banking and Currency Committee on February 29, 1956, on H. R. 9285, Direct Purchases of United States Obligations by Federal Reserve banks. (84th Cong., 2d sess, p. 15.)

Hon. W. Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary of the Treasury: "The primary purpose of this direct borrowing authority has been to help the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System work together in minimizing the disturbing effects on the economy of short-run peaks in Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, particularly around the time of quarterly income-tax payments. There short-run movements of funds are large, and precise estimates of their day-to-day patterns are often difficult. This direct borrowing authority is a useful mechanism for the Treasury and the Federal Reserve and its use has avoided unnecessary strains on the money market on a number of occasions." (Id., p. 2.)

I ask that the previous question be voted down.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 9955, to provide for a temporary increase in the public-debt limit.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9955, with Mr. WRIGHT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering today H. R. 9955, a bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means last Friday afternoon after having hearings in public on Friday from about 10 o'clock until about 1 o'clock. During the course of the hearings the Secretary of the Treasury made a statement, as well as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Let me say before going into an explanation of the bill and the reasons why I think we must pass it, that the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas was discussed in the committee, though—and I am not violating any confidence in saying this—no one offered his suggestion in the form of an amendment, so that there was no vote in the committee on his suggestion. It was, however, gone into extensively and information was obtained from the experts who were there with us in the executive session of the committee for that purpose. I will have a little bit more to say about his proposal during the course of the general debate.

The bill before us, I say, is very simple in its form and in its purpose. The bill would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to issue an additional $5 billion of Federal securities, over and above the permanent debt limit of $275 billion, for a temporary period running from the date of enactment of the legislation until the end of the next fiscal year, June 30, 1959. The Secretary, in presenting his argument in behalf of the proposed legislation said that it was needed for three reasons:

First. The fact that cash balances have been running distressingly low.

Second. There is need for more flexibility, for more efficient and economical management of the debt.

Third. Even with a balanced budget there will still be large seasonal fluctuations in receipts which make operations under the $275 billion limitation most difficult.

In the committee consideration was given not only to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas, but also to an amendment, made by a member of the committee, that instead of reporting the bill as introduced with a $5 billion temporary increase, that we report the bill with a $3 billion increase. The course of debate indicated to me, although I would not attribute any thought to any member of the committee, that it was generally conceded by all on the committee who had an opportunity to hear the testimony and who participated in the executive session that the situation at present is such that the Secretary of the Treasury cannot proceed to discharge the business before him within the debt limit presently existing of $275 billion. Therefore the question primarily before the committee was one of the amount by which we should temporarily increase this limit, either $3 billion or $5 billion.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], in discussing the rule, referred to the fact that it might be possible for the membership to vote on this question in connection with a motion to recommit. Therefore, in the few minutes remaining I should like to point out to my colleagues why I have reached the conclusion that the debt ceiling should be raised temporarily by $5 billion rather than by any lesser amount.

First of all, let me tell you that when the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and I introduced the bills here in question, following the request from the Secretary of the Treasury that we do so, we said that we introduced the proposed legislation reluctantly because we share the thought of most Members and we do not like the facts and realities which put us in the position of believing that we cannot get by in the discharge of our responsibilities under a debt ceiling of $275 billion, but we must recognize them for what they are.

Let me look then to see why I personally reached the conclusion that a $5 billion increase is required at this time. In frankness, if we were legislating here only with respect to the remainder of this fiscal year I could perhaps hold out to the membership of the Committee that $3 billion would suffice. I could perhaps have joined some of my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means who have said that we can get through the remainder of the present fiscal year with a $3 billion increase. I believe that $3 billion of additional authority might be sufficient in the present fiscal year. I fear, however, that if we do go along with the suggestion that it is said will be made maybe in a motion to recommit and pass the legislation with only $3 billion of additional authority, we are being unmindful of the needs that will arise in connection with the coming fiscal year, 1959, and even more with contingencies that may arise then, or may well arise within the remainder of this fiscal year.

Let us examine some of those contingencies.

The President has submitted a budget that estimates a surplus of $500 million for 1959, and which estimates that the fiscal year 1958 will end with a deficit of $400 million.

Mr. Chairman, that this budget is predicated upon optimism is admitted. This budget is predicating its estimates of receipts for the remainder of the present fiscal year and for the fiscal year 1959 on a degree of optimism that I hope will be achieved, but a degree of optimism which, we must recognize, is not based upon circumstances which actually exist today.

First of all, let us look at the conditions which exist today. We are in what is commonly referred to as a downturn in economic activity by the press, one which began sometime last year and is still in progress.

The receipts estimated under the budget, for the remainder of this fiscal year and for the coming fiscal year, are predicated upon an upswing in the economy, a reversal of the downtrend during the course of this calendar year.

In order to reach the level of personal income which the economic report and the budget expect, it is necessary for us to have a total of $10 billion more of personal income, on the average, in calendar 1958 than we had for the entire calendar year 1957. There are people who will say that these estimates of business revival—of economic upturn, are too optimistic. I am not saying they are too optimistic. I do not know. But I want you to realize that the estimates of revenue in the budget are based upon optimistic assumptions for the year 1958 and not upon known conditions that prevailed at the time the budget was submitted to the Congress.

Even under these optimistic assumptions of what will happen, let us look at the budget itself which is presented to us for 1959, and said to be balanced. It calls for some $2 billion more spending for 1959 than the budget did for 1958, but to offset a billion dollars of that additional spending we find that it is assumed that $700 additional millions in revenue will flow into the Post Office Department upon the contingency that Congress will pass a 5-cent postage stamp in lieu of a 3-cent postage stamp.

Another $300 million is added on the plus side to balance expenditures and on the assumption that the Congress will reduce agricultural supports to the extent of some $300 million.

I am not saying what the Congress will do with these two items, but it is entirely possible, is it not, that instead of the budget's ending up with a billion dollars of more spending than the present fiscal year we may well end with $2 billion more spending. That is one contingency that faces us, one that we must take into consideration when we determine what actual needs, respecting the debt limit, may be.

Let us look at the second point that the Secretary makes in justification for $5 billion additional authority. He says that he wants elbow room within which to manage the public debt. We have always given to Secretaries, regardless of party, much more elbow room than the Secretary of the Treasury has had since this temporary increase that we last voted expired on June 30, 1957.

Mr. Chairman, there have been times this fall when the cash balance within the Treasury was so low as to cause the Secretary of the Treasury to wonder whether he could get by under the existing ceiling until Congress returned in January. Now, do we do anything worth while by holding down the debt ceiling in such a way that the Secretary of the Treasury does not have flexibility in the handling of the public debt?

In February of this year there will be some $14 billions of securities coming due. It is only realistic to recognize that many of the holders of these maturing securities will want cash instead of a new issue. This means we must borrow money from somebody else in order to have the $14 billion to pay for the securities that are coming due. In my opinion there should be enough flexibility under the debt limit to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to take advantage of such borrowing means as are in the greatest interest for the public, and not having to be caught in a position of having to issue securities for redemption purposes at a rate of interest that may not be in the best interest of the public or the Treasury. There should be enough flexibility in order that the Secretary of the Treasury can issue securities ahead of the maturity date if a better interest rate can be obtained in that way.

We do not save anything, Mr. Chairman, by putting the Secretary of the Treasury in a straitjacket. All we are doing is subjecting him to the issuance of more short-term securities, in lieu of long-time securities that are being redeemed. I would like to see more of our debt in long-term securities rather than having so much of it in short-term securities. We do not do anything in the interest of economy if we make it impractical to permit much of this debt to be transferred into other long-term securities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I regret the gentleman's committee did not see fit to make available to the Members the hearings that were held, whatever they were.

Mr. MILLS. Everybody who wanted to be heard by the committee was heard. We heard three witnesses who asked to be heard. Nobody else asked to be heard. It is not the practice of our committee to extend invitations to people to be heard before us. I am sure the gentleman knows that. I do apologize to the membership of the Committee because the hearings themselves are not available. I thought they would be available. It is to be regretted that they are not available, but frankly I am trying to do a job for your administration, if I may put it on that basis. I could make a whole lot out of this thing if I wanted to be political about it. I have no desire to be political, and I know my friend does not have any desire that I be political. I am trying to do this because the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget have convinced me that the facts and realities are such that we are faced with a situation, and that we cannot, in the face of that situation, discharge our responsibility in the best interests of the national economy and our defense needs without going along with the case that the Secretary made.

I am not here because I like this thing. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] does not like it. We said at the time we introduced the bill together that we did not like this, but we wanted it clearly understood that, so far as we personally were concerned, this was no indication of any lessening of our personal desire that we economize in Government spending in every way we can economize.

Mr. GROSS. I am concerned with the flexibility of the taxpayers in the years to come, whether the youngsters of tomorrow are going to have any elbow room.

Mr. MILLS. I am no less concerned, but let me point out to the gentleman that you do not accomplish economies in Government reductions in Federal spending by maintaining the debt limit at its present level. We accomplish economy and savings by cooperative effort between the administration and the Congress to weed out those expenditures that are not essential at a given time.

We in our committee are in this position: I say to the gentleman from Iowa, we have nothing whatsoever to do, except as individual Members of Congress, with respect to appropriations. We know that

the Congress has made efforts to reduce the spending of the Government as indicated by what it did in the last session, but still the President tells us that in spite of what we did—and this is not criticism of him, it is the way the thing works—that we will actually spend more money as shown by his estimates in January 1958 than he thought it would be necessary for us to spend when he sent his estimate of expenditures in January 1957.

And, in addition, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there will still remain, unless we rescind them, a backlog of appropriations that amounts to $70 billion as of June 30, 1958; that must also be taken into consideration. We are faced with it.

Now, will we give the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to carry out and discharge the responsibilities we have imposed upon him of managing the public debt in the public interest and of paying the bills of the Nation when they are presented for collection? That is the issue before us today.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for the nonpartisan position he has taken in this matter. I also wish to commend him for the very able presentation he has made so far today.

The gentleman has referred to this as a temporary increase.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. How temporary is this temporary increase to be?

Mr. MILLS. My friend from Connecticut realizes that we have gotten by in years past. I think we started in 1954 to grant a temporary increase when needed. The expiration date of the last temporary increase was June 30, 1957, the public debt was then $275 billion.

We are hopeful, of course, that this is a temporary increase but I cannot assure my friend of what lies before us in the months ahead. I cannot assure my friend that the optimism that is the foundation of the budget, with respect to the predicted economic upswing, will prove stable; I cannot assure my friend that we will not have to spend more for defense than the present budget estimates. I cannot make predictions. I can but pray to God that our hopes are fulfilled.

Mr. MORANO. In another year you may be back before us asking that the limit be increased again.

Mr. MILLS. I can assure my friend that any action by our committee in reporting to the floor of the House such a request will be predicated only upon a change of conditions as we know them today, and because the $5 billion will not be enough. And it will not be enough if the optimism of the budget with respect both to economic conditions and spending more for defense is not justified.

Mr. MORANO. Does the gentleman hold out any hope this debt limit is going the other way and be reduced?

Mr. MILLS. The Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee as well as the members of that committee are not in a position to tell the gentleman from Connecticut what the House and the Senate may decide is a fair amount for the Government to spend in the years ahead; nor can I tell the gentleman what the position of the executive departments may be with respect to those funds made available to them. As I said, the Committee on Ways and Means is not a spending committee.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I observe in reading the debate in this House in past years when we proposed an increase in the ceiling a reference to the deposit of Federal funds, I believe time deposits, in various States and the possibility they offered a basis of flexibility. Can the gentleman state as to the condition with respect to those deposits now?

Mr. MILLS. It is my understanding at the moment all the flexibility we have is approximately a half billion dollars—maybe around $600 million.

Mr. JOHANSEN. And that includes money in the banks?

Mr. MILLS. No; there is some additional amount in the banks.

Mr. HERLONG. It is $1,100,000,000.

Mr. MILLS. One billion one hundred million dollars is the correct figure.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made a statement here today, and I had hoped that the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee would answer it in some manner, that leaves an impression there is a more economical way to handle this situation than is being presented to the House at this time.

Mr. MILLS. I am always reluctant to engage in debate with my friend from Texas because he has been here so many more years than I have. He has devoted himself studiously to the subject matter of monetary policy and what constitutes good monetary policy. But let me say that there is existing authority today, voted from his committee, for the Treasury Department to make available to the Federal Reserve and for the Federal Reserve to accept securities from the Treasury Department up to the amount of $5 billion. My understanding has always been it was never intended when we granted that authority that it was to be used promiscuously. It was to be used in emergencies and then only on a sparing day-to-day basis. What the gentleman from Texas suggests, whether he intends it or not, would result in a rapid expansion of the availability of bank credit. That may be what he has in mind. I think it is a serious and grievous error for the Congress to superimpose its own thinking on the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department as to when this should be done and the conditions under which it should be done, because if we bind them in an inflexible position we run the risk of creating great danger in the too rapid expansion of bank credit.

Mr. BONNER. That is the position the Treasury Department finds itself in now.

Mr. MILLS. I have always been told that in handling the public debt it is highly inflationary to put very much of your public debt into banks or into the Federal Reserve System, that it is much better and in the best public interest to have that debt held largely by individuals.

Mr. BONNER. But the public will read the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. I think this debate is very wholesome.

Mr. MILLS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Do I understand now that this raising of the debt limit is a temporary matter and will only last so long?

Mr. MILLS. Let me be frankly honest with my friend from North Carolina and everybody else. We are presenting it to you as a temporary proposition to expire June 30, 1959. But, when debt is once incurred, it becomes permanent unless we can pay it back. Now, let us be perfectly honest about it. I hope it is temporary. The Secretary of the Treasury has expressed his hope that it will be temporary.

Mr. BONNER. This would only last so long?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. But, the gentleman knows, if we come to June 30, 1959, and we owe $280 billion, it must be paid.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for the explanation he has made here today, and I certainly intend to go along with the legislation. But, there is one thing in my mind that I feel he should explain to the House. Inasmuch as the amount of the national debt has not increased, supposedly, since 1955 and since the fiscal year 1955 up through the fiscal year 1958, according to the President's own budget, the interest rate on the national debt has increased more than a total of $4 billion, I would love for the gentleman to explain what brought about the increased interest payments to the membership of this House.

Mr. MILLS. If my friend from Kentucky will pardon me, I do not want to inject the matter of interest into this discussion, because we are thinking here in terms of the amount of securities involved and what is needed to permit their management.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In connection with the act to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] referred, providing for a $5 billion cushion for the Treasury, is it not a fact that that was designed for short-term credit rather than long-term credit, but there is no prohibition in that

act which prevents it being used for long-term credit purposes?

Mr. MILLS. I would not for 1 minute deny the right that exists under existing law for the Treasury to sell securities to the Federal Reserve. What I find wrong with Mr. PATMAN'S suggestion is the rigidity of the proposal.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think there must be a misunderstanding about the $5 billion that the gentleman from Texas was talking about. I think there may be a feeling here that that is borrowing authority outside of the debt limit, and it is not. That $5 billion is within the present limitation of $275 billion.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And that makes a big difference.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand that every year for the past 4 years—at least I have been told many times—we have had a balanced budget. Now, if the budget has been balanced in the last 4 years, how does it happen that the national debt continues to go up?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman recognizes that we granted a temporary increase in the debt limit three times since this administration came into office. That was to permit the elbowroom that I talked about here earlier today. There are times in the course of a fiscal year when you take in money at a more rapid rate than other times. But, the gentleman knows that the expenditures by the Federal Government are a regular thing, month by month, week by week, and day by day, so that there will be periods of time when the Treasury is running into the hole because money is not coming in and expenditures are being made to meet due obligations. There are other times when your money is coming in much faster than expenditures are being made, and there will be very wide variations in the amount of the debt within a fiscal year.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But we still have a balanced budget.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, in completing my statement I would like to read into the record of this debate the history of the debt limitation as prepared by the Treasury Department.

*Debt limitation under sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act as amended—History of legislation*

| Act— | |
|---|---|
| Sept. 24, 1917: | |
| Sec. 1 (40 Stat. 288) authorized bonds in the amount of | [1] $7, 538, 945, 400 |
| Sec. 5 (40 Stat. 290) authorized certificates of indebtedness outstanding (revolving authority) | [2] 4, 000, 000, 000 |
| Apr. 4, 1918: | |
| Amending sec. 1 (40 Stat. 502) increased bond authority to | [1] 12, 000, 000, 000 |
| Amending sec. 5 (40 Stat. 504) increased authority for certificates outstanding to | [2] 8, 000, 000, 000 |
| July 9, 1918, amending sec. 1 (40 Stat. 844) increased bond authority to | [1] 20, 000, 000, 000 |
| Mar. 3, 1919: | |
| Amending sec. 5 (40 Stat. 1311) increased authority for certificates outstanding to | [2] 10, 000, 000, 000 |
| New sec. 18 added (40 Stat. 1309) authorized notes in the amount of | [1] 7, 000, 000, 000 |
| Nov. 23, 1921, amending sec. 18 (42 Stat. 321) increased note authority to outstanding (establishing revolving authority) | [2] 7, 500, 000, 000 |
| June 17, 1929, amending sec. 5 (46 Stat. 19) authorized Treasury bills in lieu of certificates of indebtedness, no change in limitation for the outstanding | [2] 10, 000, 000, 000 |
| Mar. 3, 1931, amending sec. 1 (48 Stat. 1506) increased bond authority to | [1] $28, 000, 000, 000 |
| Jan. 30, 1934, amending sec. 18 (48 Stat. 343) increased authority for notes outstanding to | [2] 10, 000, 000, 000 |
| Feb. 4, 1935: | |
| Amending sec. 1 (49 Stat. 20) limited bonds outstanding (establishing revolving authority to) | [1] 25, 000, 000, 000 |
| New sec. 21 added (49 Stat. 21) consolidated authority for certificates and bills (sec. 5) and authority for notes (sec. 18). Same aggregate amount outstanding | [2] 20, 000, 000, 000 |
| New sec. 22 added (49 Stat. 21) authorized United States savings bonds within authority of sec. 1. | |
| May 26, 1938, amending secs. 1 and 21 (52 Stat. 447) consolidated in sec. 21, authority for bonds, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills and notes (outstanding bonds limited to $30,000,000,000). Same aggregate total outstanding | [2] 45, 000, 000, 000 |
| July 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 1071), amending sec. 21 removed limitation on bonds without change total authorized outstanding of bonds, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills and notes | [2] 45, 000, 000, 000 |
| June 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 526), sec. 302, sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting "(a)" after "21." and by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph as follows: "(b) In addition to the amount authorized by the preceding paragraph of this section, and obligations authorized by sections 5 and 18 of this Act, as amended, not to exceed in the aggregate $4,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time, less any retirements made from the special fund made available under section 301 of the Revenue Act of 1940, may be issued under said sections to provide the Treasury with funds to meet any expenditures made, after June 30, 1940, for the national defense, or to reimburse the general fund of the Treasury therefor, any such obligations so issued shall be designated 'national defense series'." | [3] 4, 000, 000, 000 |
| Feb. 19, 1941 (55 Stat. 7), amending sec. 21 to read "Provided that the face amount of obligations issued under the authority of this Act shall not exceed in the aggregate $65,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time." Eliminates separate authority for $4,000,000,000 of national defense series obligations | [2] 65, 000, 000, 000 |
| Mar. 28, 1942 (56 Stat. 189), amending sec. 21 increasing limitation to $125,000,000,000 | [2] 125, 000, 000, 000 |
| Apr. 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 63), amending sec. 21 increasing limitation to $210,000,000,000 | [2] 210, 000, 000, 000 |
| June 9, 1944 (58 Stat. 272), amending sec. 21 increasing limitation to $260,000,000,000 | [2] 260, 000, 000, 000 |
| Apr. 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 47), amending sec. 21 to read: "The face amount of obligations issued under authority of this Act, and the face amount of obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States (except such guaranteed obligations as may be held by the Secretary of the Treasury), shall not exceed in the aggregate $300,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time." | [2] 300, 000, 000, 000 |
| June 26, 1946 (60 Stat. 316) amending sec. 21 decreasing limitation to $275,000,000,000 and adding, "the current redemption value of any obligation issued on a discount basis which is redeemable prior to maturity at the option of the holder thereof shall be considered, for the purposes of this section, to be the face amount of such obligation" | [2] 275, 000, 000, 000 |
| Aug. 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 895), amending sec. 21, effective Aug. 28, 1954, and ending June 30, 1955, temporarily increasing limitation by $6,000,000,000 to | [2] 281, 000, 000, 000 |
| June 30, 1955 (69 Stat. 241), amending Aug. 28, 1954, act, by extending until June 30, 1956, increase in limitation to | [2] 281, 000, 000, 000 |
| July 9, 1956 (70 Stat. 519): | |
| Amending act of Aug. 28, 1954, temporarily increasing limitation by $3,000,000,000, for period beginning on July 1, 1956, and ending on June 30, 1957, to | [2] 278, 000, 000, 000 |
| Effective July 1, 1957, temporary increase terminates and limitation reverts, under act of June 26, 1946, to | [2] 275, 000, 000, 000 |

[1] Limitation on issue.
[2] Limitation on outstanding.
[3] Limitation on issues less retirements.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I join with my distinguished colleague and chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], to urge the membership of this distinguished Committee to support the passage of the bill H. R. 9955 to provide a temporary increase of $5 billion in the statutory debt limit.

I want to say here that I deplore the fact that we have to do this, but I believe it is absolutely essential to do it if we are going to play fair with those who are managing our debt.

This legislation was requested by the administration to authorize a temporary increase of $5 billion in the public debt. Under the legislation the existing public debt limit of $275 billion would be increased immediately upon enactment of the bill to $280 billion for a period ending on June 30, 1959.

As the membership of this Committee knows, this legislation was recommended in the President's budget message to the Congress and in addition its enactment was ably supported by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury and the distinguished Director of the Bureau of the Budget who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in public hearings on January 17, 1958. To report in summary form to the membership of this Committee on the substance of the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means by the administration spokesmen I will state that the following points were made: First, the cash balance position of the Treasury is such as to render it difficult for the Federal Government to at all times meet its obligations as they come due; second, the narrow margin between the actual public indebtedness and the statutory limit tends to deny the fiscal flexibility necessary for the efficient and most economical management of the debt; third, Federal receipts are seasonal in nature and do not uniformly correspond to the less seasonal character of expenditure outgo; and fourth, the increase in the debt limit does not constitute authorization for increased spending and the administration will maintain maximum vigilance in endeavoring to safeguard against any expenditure of public funds that is not absolutely essential to the public welfare and security.

In connection with the implication in the last point I enumerated I would like to state that the need for considering this legislation implies in effect a day of accounting for the traditional spenders in Congress and elsewhere in our Federal

Government. The need for this legislation today cannot solely be attributed to today's circumstances but instead reflects more basically the evils of the past 25 years of an ever-increasing Federal bureaucracy and the adherence to the fallacious philosophy that in peace as well as in war the Government can spend the taxpayer's dollar more prudently than the taxpayer can himself. We should all realize that as we increase the public indebtedness we are assuring to future generations an onerous tax burden that will not be of their own creation.

During the course of the public hearings on this legislation the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means made searching inquiry of the Secretary of the Treasury to determine whether or not a lesser amount of increase than the $5 billion provided for in this bill would not be sufficient to deal with the current fiscal situation. Secretary Anderson convincingly made the point that the contingencies of our debt and fiscal management fully warranted and even necessitated the granting of the amount provided for in H. R. 9955. One of the contingencies cited by Secretary Anderson that I believe particularly impressed the committee was the prospect of the sudden need for fully exploiting a possible scientific or technological breakthrough in our defense effort that would occasion the need for this flexibility in debt management.

I am convinced that the Members of the House are sufficiently aware of the record of public service rendered by my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and myself to know that we would not be here today advocating this legislation if we were not convinced that its enactment by the Congress was essential to the welfare and security of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, these matters probably have been mentioned, although I was called away and could not be here in the early part of the debate to hear the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. However, there are a few points we should keep in mind. I do not believe anybody in the House would want a situation to arise where the Government could not meet its obligations, could not meet its payrolls. You can imagine the effect that either of these consequences would have on the country at large and on our banks. It would simply frighten the people to find their Government unable to meet its obligations.

I do not know whether this point was brought out or not, but in a transit strike such as occurred in New York where the payroll checks were held up, where money that should come in does not come and obligations are due and have to be met, you have a situation where the Treasury finds itself short a billion or two billion dollars. There are many other contingencies that could arise that would throw us into a rather chaotic situation. So we ought to listen to the Secretary of the Treasury, who has the responsibility of managing the public debt.

Another thing I want to call to your attention is this: It will not be long before there will be bills before this body to increase foreign-aid programs. When you stop and think of the situation where our public debt is greater than the combined debts of all the other countries we are helping with foreign aid, I think it is time we stop and do something for our own people here at home. We ought to cut down on our liberality in foreign aid.

There are many other situations and contingencies that may arise. You will have the trade agreement bill up in this body. Think of the unemployment that is going on. In one case alone 17,000 people are out of employment because of the steel shipped in here by Japan. If our steel companies cannot meet the situation, what industry can? You will find that there is not a Congressional district today that is not suffering from unemployment because of the imports that are pouring into this country. Why are they pouring in? Because we have spent $60 billion in one form or another in foreign aid, and that meant the retooling of factories in the various countries of the world that compete with us.

We have to do a little bit of thinking, as I said before, about our people here at home. They have been carrying this burden and have been very patient. We have to assume the responsibility of stopping this matter of pouring money into situations abroad which are not necessary, as many of you know who have been abroad. You know that foreign-aid money is not being wisely spent. You know that great projects have been promoted abroad that are of no use at all to these foreign countries and to the welfare of their peoples. It is just spending money, any way to spend money.

It has to be stopped, and there is only one solution to achieving tax reduction, just one, and that is to stop the spending. When we begin to slow down the spending we will find ourselves all right.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we will find ourselves picking up economic vitality when we enact legislation that gives a little tariff protection against all these shipments that are pouring into this country.

I thank you for your patience in listening to me. I think I have a record for economy since I have been in this Congress. I think all told I have voted against more than $68 billion in unwarranted spending in this House. I think we would have been in pretty good shape if we had been a little more prudent in looking after our own people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say how proud I was of the demonstration put on by our new chairman, and the very forceful and very powerful argument he made for what I consider a rather weak program.

I also want to say that our ranking member did about as good a job as could possibly be done along that line, because in my opinion raising the debt limit is a very foolish move. There is not one of us that does not know that the spenders are in the saddle and have been for the last 15 or 20 years.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I cannot yield at this time.

When I say "the spenders are in the saddle," I mean the New Deal spenders and the Modern Republican spenders; and I am not throwing any aspersions upon the President. But I do want to say that if this House had not listened to the spenders in the last 15 or 20 years, our debt limit would not have been over $100 billion. Instead of that it is approximately twice as much as all the countries of Europe put together owe; and it is time for us to call a halt. Refusing to raise the debt limit is one way to call a halt.

Mr. Chairman, the President has asked the Congress to raise the national debt limit from $275 billion to $280 billion. This simply means he is asking us to increase the borrowing power of the administration by $5 billion so that his "spenders" will have that much more to spend if they feel they need to do so. It means the administration then will not need to live within its income of $75 billion—the largest income Uncle Sam has ever enjoyed. It means also that the present administration has no intention of adopting the money-saving Hoover recommendations nor of reducing the foreign aid program.

I was one of the three members of the Ways and Means Committee who voted against this proposal in committee. I will be one of the minority to vote against it on the floor. As a Nation we can and should live within our income just as the great majority of the American people live within their incomes.

Mr. Chairman, if this Congress would just do two things—namely, adopt the Hoover recommendations, and stop giving out foreign aid—we could save $10 billion a year. That would make possible a tax cut of $5 billion, a payment on the national debt of $3 billion, and we would still have $2 billion extra for needed national defense.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, today we are confronted with the request of our President and Commander in Chief that we raise the national debt limit five additional billion dollars.

Today, I will cast my first vote to raise the national debt limit. Twice before have I voted on the issue of whether or not the debt ceiling would be raised, and each time I voted "no." I distinctly recall voting against raising the debt ceiling on July 31, 1953, and speaking on this floor against that proposal. On another occasion I voted against raising the national debt limit.

I well recognize the grave danger in my vote today. I am voting to raise the ceiling now only because I am of the opinion that our Nation faces the gravest dangers ever confronting the human race. I am voting to raise this ceiling on the premise that our leadrs in both parties will realistically and immediately start a program to build intercontinental missiles, satellites, submarines, planes, and speedily accomplish scientific achievements that will insure the protection of our citizens, our Nation, and our philosophies, and will proceed to win this race against death that Russia is so

relentlessly waging. If our leaders will bend their backs and give their hearts and souls to this serious task, we can and will win this race.

Mr. Chairman, this serious dilemma does not stem from a shortage of scientists, nor from alleged deficiencies in our schools as some persons claim they have suddenly discovered. We have sufficient scientists who are dedicated. I do not share the view that it is necessary for us to restore any scientist to the job of developing weapons that will destroy the human race, when that scientist for many years associated with Communists and married the widow of a Communist.

I do not share the view that our high schools have fallen down on the job. On the contrary, I think that our schools have performed magnificently. I well understand that some of our fine young high-school pupils select easy courses when they have preferences as to what courses they will pursue. No school or teacher can be criticized for such decisions, however, because actually those are decisions that the parents should diligently work out with their children, to the end that they would aspire to take subjects that, although harder, would insure their making a contribution to their country and to the world.

Actually, I think that our public schools have no problems that a little more money from the State level would not cure. I believe that most of the respective States can furnish that money now. I am confident that if the Central Government could reduce the taxes a little in order that the States might use that released taxation for education, our schools would surprise everyone with the type of students they turn out.

No, Mr. Chairman, our dilemma does not stem from a shortage of scientists or from real deficiencies in our schools and teachers. The unpleasant truth is that this dilemma that we find ourselves in is directly traceable to the fact that some leaders in both of our major parties have for the past 3 years been engaged unwittingly in the social revolution stirred up by minority groups, not realizing perhaps that this social revolution was originally conceived by the Communists. For the past 3 years civil-rights legislation was designated as the No. 1 business of the present national administration and by some leaders of both major parties.

I sincerely hope that those leaders were listening in on television last Saturday night when Mike Wallace interviewed John Gates, a Communist and the former editor of the Daily Worker. If they were listening, they heard John Gates take the credit for this movement and give it to the Communist Party. John Gates affirmatively said the credit belonged to the Communist Party, failing only to say that the Communist Party started this agitation for the express purpose of dividing our people.

Mr. Chairman, this emergency is going to last a long time. We have no other alternative except to face this appalling fact. Anyone advocating all-out war now is a menace to the world. Any person with ordinary sense is bound to know that an all-out war would virtually destroy civilization. In order to prevent this war, we must be stronger than our adversaries. Since we confront these awful truths, never has it been so necessary that for every dollar spent, we get a dollar's worth of implements or service. I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that each and every person entrusted with the spending of defense money will understand that he is the guardian of that trust set up for the purpose of preserving everything precious to all humanity everywhere.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I listened to all the testimony that was presented to the committee on the proposed increase of the debt limit, and I am convinced that we cannot get along with only increasing it $3 billion; I am convinced that the full $5 billion increase contained in the bill is necessary; and I am speaking as one who is not given to loose action with the taxpayers' money. I think you know my reputation in that regard.

I know you have heard the question asked: What would happen in the event we do not pass this bill as it is drawn today? It simply would mean that the Government would have to postpone paying its obligations.

If we want to call a halt to the spenders—and I should like to call a halt to the spenders, my friends, but I believe the time to call a halt to the spenders is when the appropriation bills come up—then we should cut off or postpone a lot of appropriations.

To postpone the payment of our obligations would cause the world to say we were welshing on our obligations. We cannot do that; we cannot be in the position of postponing our obligations.

Some people have the impression that by failing to pass this bill we would save money. Again, that is not a factual belief. We would not save money, as a matter of fact it would cost us more money.

Testimony was given to the committee by the Secretary of the Treasury to the effect that the debt limit has forced the Government in the past 7 months to resort to more expensive financial practices. Let me give you two examples of how that has cost us money.

Last fall the Federal Government borrowed nearly $2 billion through the Federal National Mortgage Association to keep this borrowing outside of the debt limit. This involved an extra cost of about one-half of a point in interest over the rate on direct borrowing, or a cost of $10 million in interest on that one transaction alone.

Another example: Contractors were encouraged to use their own financial resources to finance work in progress rather than to use Government progress payments; because, again, the Treasury had to postpone its obligations to keep from going over the debt limit. Assuming that $200 million payments were postponed for 6 months in this way, then the contractors would have to be compensated for the extra interest cost of the money which would be at least another $3 million more than the cost of the same borrowing by the Federal Government.

So while it is easy to say: "Hold them down," we will not save any money by failing to increase the limit.

And then you heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] ask the question: "Why does the national debt continue to be raised each year when we have had a supposedly balanced budget?"

The reason for these recent extensions of the debt limit is that the revenues come in most heavily in the latter half of the fiscal year and expenditures must be met evenly through the year. This means that the debt is higher in the winter months than at the end of the fiscal year.

While the debt at the end of the fiscal year has not increased significantly in recent years I would like to emphasize that the debt has been drastically reduced compared to our national ability to pay. In 1946 when the debt limit was set at $275 billion the public debt stood at 132 percent of the gross national product. Presently the debt stands at only 63 percent of the gross national product.

I might say that the problem with which the debt limit is mostly concerned is the enormous backlog of appropriation authority. The budget document estimates that at the end of the present fiscal year there will be an accumulation of $70 billion of unspent appropriation balances.

A few years ago that amount was about $100 billion. The balanced budget that we have each year is a comparison of estimated cash expenditures as against estimated revenues. The national debt is our cash situation. We are continually spending money actually that has been appropriated in recent years. The debt limit, however, prevents the administration from suddenly spending, say, $10 billion, from this backlog above the amount of planned expenditures in the budget document.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If that be true then it is not correct to say that we have a balanced budget. If we have been appropriating more and spending more than has been taken in, then the budget has not been balanced.

Mr. HERLONG. There was a backlog several years ago of fifty-five to sixty billion dollars in the Defense Establishment alone which had been appropriated but not spent. That is down. We are spending what has already been appropriated.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I always understood that a balanced budget was the result of income equaling outgo, or vice versa.

Mr. HERLONG. We have two budgets. We have an estimated budget and an actual cash budget.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If we have two kinds of budgets, do they consist of one that shows the real thing and the other a political budget?

Mr. HERLONG. No. The budget presented to the Congress is an estimate, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Still the budget has been balanced?

Mr. HERLONG. On the basis of estimated revenue as against estimated expenditures.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. In view of this carryover of previously appropriated funds, then is it not true the decision as to whether we are going to create a situation requiring an increase in the debt ceiling is a decision that is essentially administrative rather than legislative, because the decision as to the amount and the rate of spending of this previously appropriated money is basically an Executive decision; is that not correct?

Mr. HERLONG. It is principally up to the Bureau of the Budget and the Executive to determine when that money is to be released, but they can release no more than they can obtain from the revenues and under the debt ceiling.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the decision is made that we have to step up expenditures two or three billion dollars more, it is entirely believable we might be faced with a new and further request for raising the debt ceiling?

Mr. HERLONG. Yes. That is why I do not want to hamstring us with a $3 billion increase at this time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. One of the parts of the problem that faces us is this vast carryover of previously appropriated funds?

Mr. HERLONG. There is always a carryover of previously appropriated funds. The necessary lead time on defense contracts and things like that causes it. That is going to continue to be at a pretty high level for some time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The more that carryover the more the potential problem; is that not correct?

Mr. HERLONG. That is true.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, the addresses by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas and the distinguished gentleman from New York have practically exhausted this proposal because those gentlemen have covered every phase of the problem.

However, there is one thing that should go in the RECORD at this time and that is this little bill itself to see what it does. It is the best argument in favor of its passage. The bill provides:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this act and ending on June 30, 1959, the public debt limit set forth in the first sentence of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, shall be temporarily increased by $5 billion.

It does not say how it is going to be spent or what is going to become of it. As a matter of fact, they already owe it. So, I say, that explains itself. We are doing today what we ought to do; just exactly what we ought to do, and I do not see how you can get around it. We have to pay, but we do not have to pay forever. This is limited to the period ending June 30, 1959, and the limit is prescribed. It is not such a terrible bill either way, and I am glad that it is not, because I want to support it.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill. At the outset I would like to commend the chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. As our new chairman he has already demonstrated that he will give our committee excellent leadership, and I am sure the information he will bring to the House from time to time will be in accord with the facts. Keeping in mind the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded him as chairmen of the committee during my membership and with the greatest of respect to them, I do commend the gentleman from Arkansas to this body as a worthy successor to them.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with the gentleman and others who see fit to support this piece of legislation. I am really not troubled about it as some of my good friends are, for the principal reason that I do not see much in it beside the making certain that we do have the dollars to pay the bills, the bills being the obligations that you and I create. They are not bills that are created by somebody downtown. They are not bills that are created by some entity called an administration. They are bills that are created by the membership of the Congress. While it is true that the Democrat Political Party controls the House and the Senate and thereby is in the majority in creating these spending obligations and that we are now creating the means by which they are to be paid, it is not political when I say that this is legislation that has to be passed, a bill presumably for the advantage of all the American people. And, keeping that in mind, I just cannot see any real objection in following good financial policies and providing the money to pay the bills. Really, it is rather analogous to any one of us going to a bank to have the board of directors of the bank allow us a line of credit so that we may, as the exigencies of the situation require, and as we need the money, go to the bank and borrow according to our business requirements. That, I say, is what we are doing here.

Now, it was argued that if we are lax and permit too great authority in these respects, there might be an attempt to waste money; that the administration, recognizing that it has more borrowing power, might see fit to cause wasteful and useless expense. I am not troubled that way, for I repeat that the present situation is in the hands of the Congress.

Now, secondly, we are told by the Secretary of the Treasury and by the Director of the Budget that in view of the narrow cash margin within which the administration must operate today, the problem of the spending obligations coming in faster at certain times of the year in comparison with the tax dollars that are coming in from the taxpayers makes the need for this legislation particularly acute.

So I repeat, all we will do under the pending legislation is to provide an area within which, if the spending obligations are created by the Congress, the money may be secured at the lowest possible interest rates so that the security of the country, financial and otherwise, may thereby be maintained.

Mr. Chairman, it is to be regretted that debate on the legislation before this committee, H. R. 9955, providing a temporary increase in the statutory debt limit should be made the occasion by some of my Democrat colleagues for what might be characterized as uninspired politically motivated remarks about the conduct of our Nation's fiscal affairs. My regret stems from the awareness that this legislative measure presently under consideration is necessary to the economic and military strength of our Nation. To disregard facts in the manner some of my Democrat colleagues have done under these circumstances is to fail to bring to the consideration of this legislation the mature judgment and evaluation that it requires.

The partisan attack made by my Democrat colleagues requires answer and I will endeavor to answer the charges accurately and without distortion by examining the record.

When the present Republican administration assumed office the national debt was rising steadily under the impact of heavy Government spending. The Republican administration inherited a spending program created by the Truman administration that called for a $9.4 billion budgetary deficit for the fiscal year ending in June 1953 and the public indebtedness exceeded $266 billion. Moreover, the Truman budget submitted to the Congress in early January 1953 projected even higher Government spending with an estimated deficit of $9.9 billion for fiscal year 1954. If the Truman proposed deficit had been allowed to occur in 1954, the public indebtedness would have been $276 billion on June 30, 1954. In addition to these scheduled budgetary deficits that the Republican administration inherited from the Truman administration, the Republican Party also was confronted with $80 billion in unpaid obligations and spending commitments that it had been bequeathed by the defunct Truman administration.

The advent of the Republican administration brought into being an immediate program to effectively cope with the chaotic condition that existed with respect to our Federal fiscal affairs. The proposed deficit of almost $10 billion that had been projected by the Truman administration for fiscal 1954 was reduced to an actual deficit of $3.1 billion. As a result the public debt under the Eisenhower administration on June 30, 1954, was $271 billion instead of $276 billion as had been planned by the Democrat Party.

The balanced budgets actually experienced in fiscal years 1956 and 1957 and the projected balance in 1959 mean that the debt is no longer rising, other than for seasonal fluctuations. The debt in June 1959 is expected to be substantially the same as the low point reached in

June 1957. The goals of a balanced budget and substantial tax reduction which the Republican Party established for itself in the pre-1952 election campaign have been in part fulfilled. That the Republican Party will effectively seek to further the realization of these goals is a firm commitment that the people of our Nation know will be honored when the security and economic well-being of our Nation will permit.

Mr. Chairman, I will at this time as part of my remarks include a summary of budgetary data covering the fiscal years 1946 through 1959 which I am confident will be of considerable interest in demonstrating the marked superiority of the Republican Party over the Democrat Party in handling our Nation's fiscal affairs.

*Federal Government budget picture, fiscal years 1946–59*

[In billions of dollars]

| Year ending June 30— | Receipts | Expenditures | Surplus (+) or deficit (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1946 | 39.8 | 60.4 | −20.7 |
| 1947 | 39.8 | 39.0 | +.8 |
| 1948 | 41.5 | 33.1 | +8.4 |
| 1949 | 37.7 | 39.5 | −1.8 |
| 1950 | 36.5 | 39.6 | −3.1 |
| 1951 | 47.6 | 44.1 | +3.5 |
| 1952 | 61.4 | 65.4 | −4.0 |
| 1953 | 64.8 | 74.3 | −9.4 |
| 1954 estimated [1] | 68.0 | 77.9 | −9.9 |
| 1954 | 64.7 | 67.8 | −3.1 |
| 1955 | 60.4 | 64.6 | −4.2 |
| 1956 | 68.2 | 66.5 | +1.6 |
| 1957 | 71.0 | 69.4 | +1.6 |
| 1958 estimated [2] | 72.4 | 72.8 | −.4 |
| 1959 estimated [2] | 74.4 | 73.9 | +.5 |

[1] Budget document of outgoing administration, Jan. 9, 1953.
[2] Budget document, Jan. 13, 1958.

This table shows that in 3 of the 6 fiscal years under the Republican administration a budgetary surplus either has been realized or is projected. This record was achieved in the face of the greatest tax reduction enacted in the history of our Nation, in the amount of $7.4 billion, which occurred at a time that the Republican administration was supported by a Republican Congress. Under the leadership of the Democrat Party only 3 of the previous 20 years produced budgetary surpluses, and two of these surpluses can properly be attributed to the Republican-controlled 80th Congress.

It is safe to say that the heavy burden of inherited spending commitments of the Truman administration were in large part responsible for causing the public debt to rise by an estimated $5.1 billion during the first 6 full fiscal years of the Eisenhower administration. It should be noted, however, that this amount is substantially less than would have occurred if the Democrat Party had remained in power, and it is significantly less than the $7.7 billion increase that occurred during the 6 previous years under the Democrats.

I would like to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], for his able remarks on this legislation. Without doubt, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] stands as an outstanding example as a consistent advocate of fiscal responsibility and integrity. His wisdom and judgment on fiscal matters have contributed greatly to the advancement of the national interest. It is therefore significant and should be heeded by us all that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] stated in his remarks today that—

> The need for considering this legislation implies in effect a day of accounting for the traditional spenders in Congress and elsewhere in our Federal Government. The need for this legislation today cannot solely be attributed to today's circumstances but instead reflects more basically the evils of the past 25 years of an ever-increasing Federal bureaucracy and the adherence to the fallacious philosophy that in peace as well as in war the Government can spend the taxpayer's dollar more prudently than the taxpayer can himself.

Today we find those same traditional spenders in Congress that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] referred to being especially politically vocal in their criticism of the Republican administration.

On the subject of spending I presume that we can conclude that those members of the Democrat Party who today criticize the President for not proposing sufficiently high spending in his budget for fiscal year 1959 and who suggest it may be necessary to increase proposed spending by an additional amount in excess of $2 billion are the same Democrats who only last year were claiming credit for having reduced the budget for fiscal year 1958 by amounts ranging from three to six billion dollars. By their panic induced about-face they are clearly demonstrating their undeviating allegiance to the Truman doctrine of military preparedness predicated on a feast or famine basis. It will be recalled that this Truman doctrine of totally neglecting our Defense Establishment in peacetime and then hysterically spending billions for hasty rearmament in wartime was responsible for our tragic lack of preparedness on the eve of Korea and our failure in the period from 1946 through 1952 to maintain an effective rocket and missile development program so as to keep our Nation well ahead of imperialist Russia in military research. Under the leadership of the Republican Party we have departed from the feast or famine Truman concept of national insecurity and have engaged in a soundly balanced preparedness program that finds our Nation the possessor of the most powerful military might in the world but still finds our Nation dedicated resolutely to preserving peace.

On the subject of spending, fiscal statistics clearly demonstrate the Republican superiority in promoting wise economy and gives conclusive proof to the indictment of the Democrat Party as being the profligate spenders. In the period of the Republican 83d Congress our Nation benefited from a sharply declining level of Federal spending from 1953 to 1955 and during the Democrat-controlled 84th and 85th Congresses there has been a sharp rise in the level of Federal spending. The budget reduction in the Republican phase was approximately $10 billion and the total increase in the Democrat phase more than exceeded that figure. The increase in the Democrat spending in the 84th Congress can in substantial part be attributed to the fact that the Democrats provided for nearly 200 new or increased programs based largely on the imposition of Federal aid programs on the States.

Again, for politically motivated reasons some of my Democrat colleagues in this chamber have undertaken today to talk about recession and unemployment. They have, in effect, charged the Republican administration with bringing about this acknowledged period of economic adjustment. These panicky exponents of rampant inflation who think anything less than a 5-percent annual increase in the cost of living is a recession have apparently forgotten the unemployment that existed in the short-lived period of peacetime during the Truman era when unemployment in February 1950 stood at 4.7 million. In evaluating the charges of these members of the Democrat Party it is well to look at the record with respect to the economic health of our Nation.

Under the Republican Party the American people have experienced a meaningful increase in spendable income, in purchasing power, and in personal economic security. The cost of living rose under the Democrat Party at an average increase of about 7 percent per year for the last 13 years that party was in power but has risen at an annual average of only 1.2 percent over the past 5 years under the Republican Party. With confidence in our Republican national leadership the business community is spending unprecedented sums on new plant and equipment providing more jobs for our American workers and increasing worker productivity so that labor's reward for its services is greater in terms of real income. The farmer who suffered from Truman inflation and Truman-induced regimentation of enforced surpluses has begun to realize a return to the economic prosperity that he so justly deserves. Farm income per worker in 1957 was $1,920—an increase of $209 over 1955. Farm prices have been rising moderately and more important the farmer's economic future is more secure and promising under the sound policies advocated by the Republican administration.

Our Democrat colleagues have also undertaken to comment on the interest cost attributable to the public debt. That increase in the rate of interest under the Republican Party has only been slightly in excess of three-quarters of 1 percent since the Republican Party came into power January 1953. It should be remembered that these interest payments are made to the holders of Government securities—the American people—and it is a matter of keeping faith with them that they should receive a fair interest rate on their investment. More significantly however is the fact that the interest cost was 2.1 percent of national income in December 1952 and was exactly the same percentage in December 1958.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the facts that conclusively refute the unfounded criticisms expressed by my Democrat colleagues today. These facts demonstrate the fiscal realities of

the superiority of the Republican Party over the Democrat Party in conducting our Nation's fiscal affairs.

In closing let me express support of H. R. 9955 and urge its enactment as legislation that is in the national interest.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

INTEREST RATE INCREASES RECORDBREAKING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the last 5 years interest rates have been increased more than at any other time in the history of this Nation. It has been estimated by statisticians and people who have given some thought and study to the effect of interest-rate increases, that the American people will pay during the year 1958 on an average of $10 billion more in interest charges than they paid in 1952. An interest rate may seem to be rather insignificant, but when it is compounded and added clear across the board it soon becomes very great in amount.

SIXTY DOLLARS PER CAPITA INCREASE

Let us see what $10 billion per year means. If you divide that by the number of people in the country, about 172 million, you will find that the per capita increase is $60. This means that during this year 1958 interest costs will be $60 more per capita, than they would have been on a comparable or equal debt in 1952. That is $300 per family of 5. That does not necessarily mean that every man, woman, and child has to be in debt, to be obligated to pay their part of the $60. Interest charges go into the cost of everything that people buy, or that is bought for them, and into every service for which they pay. Every time the interest rate is raised on utilities, for instance, on electric lights, water, gas, telephone, transportation—the rates go up, and the consumers pay for it. Then, of course, when the people vote city bonds for any purpose the interest rates go up on these, and the cost is in the tax bill. Interest goes into every kind of bill, including the rent bill.

So there are many ways the people pay this $60 per person. It is added on to everything they buy.

As a result of the tight-money high-interest policy of the last few years, high interest rates have been woven into our economy, into our debt structure. It will take 20 or 30 years—and on some debts 40 years—to get them out. There is no way to get them out, except to pay.

BANKS HAVE PROFITED GREATLY

Because of the high-interest policy, the banks have profited more than anybody. Under this administration, every action taken in the name of fighting inflation, has been an action that increased interest rates and made it harder to fight inflation.

HIGH INTEREST HAS CAUSED DEMAND FOR DEBT INCREASE

There were lots of ways to fight inflation, but in the last few years only one way was selected. That was a way that would give the money-lenders more interest. It is by reason of the banks' collecting all this high interest that our national debt is as large as it is today. If we had the high interest out of this national debt, it would not be even as high as $275 billions. But now we have a bill here to raise the debt limit from $275 billion to $280 billions. Why? Because of high interest.

THREE BILLIONS OF INCREASE TO GO TO COMMERCIAL BANKS FOR USE

In regard to this $5 billion increase, Secretary Anderson was very courageous and forthright as to its purpose. He came right out before the Committee on Ways and Means, when testifying for this bill last Friday, said in fact, I want this increased debt so that the Treasury can keep $3 billion in the private banks. In table 3 attached to his forward statement, this is set out in black and white.

Why should the Treasury keep $3 billion in the commercial banks for them to use? The banks do not pay interest for that money. But the Treasury is paying interest on it. The Treasury has sold bonds, and collected money from the people, and the bondholders will collect the interest on those bonds, while the money—$3 billion of it—is in the banks. The banks can lend this money out and collect interest, or invest it in the very bonds that the Treasury is paying interest on, and not pay one penny of interest to the Treasury. Why should we reward the banks this way?

FOR FEDERAL RESERVE

I like the banking system, and I am a friend of the Federal Reserve System. But there are certain changes I should like to see made. I should like to get the private bankers off the policymaking boards. I do not think the bankers should have any more right to fix interest rates, to help themselves, than the railroad owners should have a right of being on the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix freight and passenger rates, to help themselves. That is an exactly comparable situation. So, the first change I would make in the Federal Reserve would be to get the bankers out of the System, keep them from running the Government's regulatory System. They do not belong on there. Outside of that, and a few other little changes, the Federal Reserve System is fine.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly want to thank the gentleman for enlightening the House. May I ask him just how much the interest rate has increased? According to the figures I have taken from the budget, the annual increase in interest charges since 1955 is $1,431,000,000. If I interpret the various budget figures correctly and I think I do, the increased interest on the public debt since 1955 through the current fiscal year, resulting from the tight-money policy of the administration, totals $4,137,000,000. Supposedly there has been no increase in the public debt during that 4-year period, but the increased cost resulting from the high-interest-rate policy of the administration is alone sufficient to require an increase in the debt ceiling of $275 billion. Why are we paying so much interest now on the same amount of debt?

Mr. PATMAN. Because the administration has deliberately caused the increase in interest rates. That is why. The service charge for carrying the national debt, caused by interest, has gone up from below $5 billion to $7,800,000,000. This is because many of the Treasury securities are short term, and each time they refinance it is at a higher interest rate.

Now let us make a comparison, for the purpose of bringing to your attention what this means. This national debt represents the cost of two major wars. One time we were told that men were going to sacrifice and going into the armed services at a very low wage. By reason of that we are also going to have low-interest rates, we then thought. People who would furnish the money to fight the wars were not going to be treated any better than the people who went into uniform. So, take 1952, and just before the amount that was paid to the veterans of all wars, for pensions, compensation, benefits, hospitalization, insurance, and everything else, was exactly the same as was paid in interest charges on the national debt. That was just before 1952.

But now this administration, while it is trying to lower benefits to veterans; take them off the pension rolls; and reduce their expenses here and there, it actively pursues policies to give the people who are furnishing the money, the bankers and the bondholders, more benefits. Their benefits have been increased from $4.8 billion to $7.8 billion for carrying the same burden—which is a 60-percent increase.

It will take us 25 to 50 years to get over this administration's high interest, hard money, policy. It will take us that long by conserving and saving and doing everything we can to pay the interest that has been unnecessarily imposed upon us. The administration, in fighting inflation by raising interest rates, is just as logical as using gasoline to try to put out a fire. Increased interest rates mean increased costs of production and distribution, and increased costs of production and distribution mean increased prices. So instead of deflating and fighting inflation by decreasing the cost of money—a major factor in all production—they have actually been feeding the flames of inflation all along. Do you need more proof? If you do, look at the record. For more than 2 years increased interest rates went into effect almost every month, and with each increase prices went higher. You might think that after trying such a program for 6 months, say, the administration would have stopped, looked and listened, and would have paid some attention to what they were causing; but no. They did not stop. They went on 6 months more, and prices went up further. Then they pressed even harder for another 6 months more, and prices went still higher. Yet they still claim they were fighting inflation. How hypocritical! It was just the opposite of fighting inflation.

FOR BANKERS MAKING A FAIR PROFIT

Now, my friends, why should we want to reward people who have caused this

interest rate inflation and who have profited by it so much? While the farmers were in a depression, small businessmen in a depression, home builders in a depression, even the railroads and now the automobile people in a depression, the bankers have been making plenty of money.

I like to see them make a fair profit. But I do not like to see them given special advantages. I like to see bankers have a fair profit, yes, and I am for a strong commercial banking system. I would like to see unit banking, instead of chain banking, I deplore the fact that there is a tendency to concentrate banking into a small number of banks. The banks should be controlled by local people in every town. I believe in a profitable commercial banking system; we have got to have it, but we do not want to permit bankers to have advantages that cause the rest of the people to suffer. We do not want to make everybody else suffer while giving the banks advantages that they are not entitled to receive.

So in this bill, Mr. Chairman, remember this, when you vote for a $5 billion increase, you are voting to authorize Secretary Anderson to keep $3 billion of that money in private commercial banks over the country.

When you vote for this $5 billion, then you vote to put $3 billion of it into private commercial banks for no good reason on earth, except that it helps the banks.

Some people will contend—I have heard them say so—that the banks render a service to the Government. Yes, they do, but they are well paid for that service. I do not want them to render any service free. But why should we put aside $3 billion that the people are paying interest on, that the banks pay no interest on but get the free use of, to collect interest on? When you vote for this entire $5 billion, you vote for $3 billion to go to these private commercial banks for their use free of charge.

WILL RESERVE REQUIREMENTS OF BANKS BE RAISED?

I keep hearing that the Federal Reserve is going to lower the discount rate. May I warn you, Mr. Chairman, that instead of increasing the discount rate every time, in order to fight inflation, they should have raised reserve requirements of the banks. That would not have been a mandate to the banks to automatically, deliberately increase interest rates clear across the board.

Now, as the administration and the Federal Reserve start to fight deflation, they will say the country has to have more money. They will soon reduce reserve requirements of the commercial banks so that the banks can create more money to buy the bonds that will be issued under this increased debt ceiling. But they will want to keep interest rates high, so they will not do much about reducing interest rates.

The Federal Reserve officials are talking about reducing required reserves of the commercial banks, to where the banks will have only a 10-percent reserve, clear across the board—country banks, Reserve city banks, and central Reserve cities banks.

Do you know what that will mean? It will mean that the banks will have $6,300,000,000 of reserve dollars—high-powered dollars, if you please—upon which they can expand loans and investments $10 to every $1. In other words, it will mean they can expand their loans and investments by $63 billion.

If the ex-soldiers were to come in here and ask for a $3-billion bonus, they might be run out with tear gas and bayonets. But when the bankers come in here and demand a $63-billion bonus, that will be all right; that is the bankers. And they are demanding this now, as a 5-year program, to be accomplished step by step. Remember, I am telling you that is the bankers' goal. The bankers' goal, Mr. Chairman, is for the Federal Reserve to reduce reserve requirements to only 10 percent. They will be like the goldsmith of old, who could take $1 of gold and lend $10 worth of money on it, on the theory that people would very seldom come back and ask for the actual gold. That is our fractional reserve system. I am not against the fractional reserve system, as such; I am for it. I just want it used in the public interest and not stretched to the point where it is in the selfish interest of a few. That is all I am objecting to. The bankers, I am telling you, will pretty soon get a reduction in reserve requirements and every time you see a dollar reduction, it means they can make loans of from 6 to 10 times on every dollar of the money that is released from the present required reserves.

The banks should not have this $3 billion of Treasury money that they will get under this bill, that is, $3 billion that they will get the use of and pay no interest on.

You cannot justify it, Mr. Chairman; you cannot defend it. There is no way to defend it. This is the first time the question has ever been presented definitely and positively for the Members of the House to vote on. Personally, I am going to vote for the reduction to $3 billion. The bill really should be $2 billion. I would vote to reduce it to $2 billion; then the Treasury would have plenty of money, but without keeping $3 billion in the commercial banking system, which is what I object to. You cannot justify it. There is no rhyme nor reason for it. It does not make any kind of sense—common, book, or horse.

So I ask the Members, Mr. Chairman, to vote for the reduction.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take this time, first, to express my support of this bill, H. R. 9955, and to commend the chairman of our committee and the ranking minority member thereof for their clear exposition of what this bill is all about.

Mr. Chairman, essentially this bill is a question of managing the public debt and is not in any sense involved in an economy proposition. My record is pretty well known; my views are pretty well known, in regard to appropriations. I can assure you from having studied this debt matter that actually a vote against this bill would be a vote against economy because it would cost us money if we do not provide this necessary flexibility in the management of our public debt.

I want to say, however, that those who are using this occasion to point out the need for economy in our Government are doing so quite appropriately because we are now at the point where we are totaling up what we have done. A metaphor that illustrates the point is this: You cannot stop the progress of an elevator by grabbing hold of the elevator indicator to try to stop it. That would be the effect of grabbing hold of the amount of the Federal debt and saying that by holding on to that you are going to stop the progress of the expenditures. I do say, however, that every time these matters come before the Congress it is quite appropriate to call attention, and for all of us to pay attention, to the fact that this is what we have done. This is the result of the appropriating that we have been doing in the past. From that angle a review of the Federal debt serves a worthy purpose. In fact, there are those who say, "Why should we have a debt ceiling at all? What is the purpose? What purpose does it serve?" And there is some merit to that argument. I think one real purpose a debt ceiling serves is this, and a very good purpose. It requires the executive branch of the Government to come before the Congress periodically to account to the Congress for how they have handled the public debt. And, the public debt can be handled in many different ways. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has his ideas of one way of handling the public debt. You can argue other ways as to how the public debt might be managed, but by coming before the Congress periodically the executive department has to account to the Congress for how the debt has been managed. So, that is one very good purpose, I submit, in having a debt ceiling.

Now, the second purpose is this: Why argue over whether it should be a $3 billion or $5 billion extension? I think there is a legitimate area for argument, because although you cannot effect economy through placing the ceiling on the debt at a particular point, you can give good warning and you can also force the executive, in a fashion, to be a little bit careful over the expenditure of the dollars. They have a little leeway in how they spend the money. So, it is very legitimate to go into the details of whether it should be three or five or ten billion dollars. In my judgment, and I think in the judgment of the Committee on Ways and Means, to most of us it seemed that $5 billion was the more intelligent figure to grant to the administration at this time. Three billion dollars would probably be uneconomic. Do not think for a minute that by voting for $3 billion you are casting an economy vote. The issue is simply one of good debt management.

Now, to the fourth item here, the suggestion that the gentleman from Texas has made of managing the public debt through requiring or setting up a provision that some of those additional amounts be generated through the Federal Reserve banks. In essence that is

no more than printing press money when you analyze it, because throwing these vast new sums into the Federal Reserve System would simply generate that much additional credit. The Federal Reserve banks already have adequate authority to provide any additional bank reserves which may be required to insure a sound financial structure. This proposal would constitute an unnecessary interference with the Federal Reserve System in the performance of its duties to influence the Nation's money supply in a way that would stimulate neither inflation nor deflation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman had about 20 minutes to explain his theory, and I would like to take 1 or 2 minutes to point out why it is unsound.

The first reason that I am pointing out, throwing these funds into the Federal Reserve System, in effect amounts to printing press money. It generates additional credit in the economy and so interferes with the Federal Reserve's present powers that they do have to adequately provide additional money if they see fit.

The second point I would like to make is in answer to the points made that the Government creates the interest rate. Actually, the interest rate is an economic phenomenon and not a governmental phenomenon. The Government, because it is a big debtor, has a considerable influence over this economic phenomenon, but let us not forget that essentially the Government is the tail and the private economy still, thank goodness, is the dog in our society. Just to compare the differences, our private debt is $436 billion as opposed to $275 billion Federal debt. So, it is not the Government that is doing this. That is essentially what the market is.

And I want to call attention to some of the economic factors which create this tight money, which is really the basis of this problem we are discussing here. We have been growing at an average rate of about 3½ percent in our gross national product each year. Today it requires about $14,000 of investment to employ one man.

We have about 1 million men coming into the labor market each year, new employees, new men for whom we have to have jobs. If you multiply that figure by $14,000 per man, then you get $14 billion of new capital that we need each year in order to go ahead in this great expanding economy of ours. That money must come from somewhere and it comes in essence only from the savings of our people.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Permit me to make one more point on this and then I shall yield to the gentleman.

The other factor lying behind this tight money situation comes from the effect of inflation on the capital accounting system of the private sector of our economy. If you put a machine on your books in 1940 costing $100,000, to replace that machine 10 or 15 years later, in 1956 or 1957 would take $200,000—the identical machine. That is because of inflation. But under our tax structure only $100,000 is allowed to be retained in earnings for replacement. So that because of inflation we are now having to dig into our pockets for additional savings, almost double in amount, to replace our capital equipment. That is the other fundamental reason behind the tight money situation, which is economic and not governmental.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman said that the exercise of this $5 billion authority would be like printing press money.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. How does the gentleman account for the fact that it was endorsed and recommended under the administration of Secretary Humphrey? Under Secretary Burgess endorsed it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not think he did.

Mr. PATMAN. And Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, as well as Mr. Robert B. Anderson, our present Secretary of the Treasury, endorsed that method of getting $5 billion from the Treasury. I have the testimony and I shall put it in the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wish the gentleman would. I think the gentleman is in error.

One final point so that we do not becloud the issue and get to thinking in terms of big banks and little people. There is some testimony in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance in June and July of 1957 to which I wish to refer. This comes from the Secretary of the Treasury. On page 12 of the hearings there is a list showing who gets the interest paid on the Federal debt. Incidentally, that interest is $7 billion.

One billion four hundred million dollars represents payment of interest to social security funds.

Six hundred million dollars of the public debt was received by the Federal banks; 90 percent of that comes back to the Federal Treasury.

One billion four hundred million dollars went to the commercial banks. That is the point that was made.

Six hundred million dollars went to other financial institutions which are mostly insurance companies and savings banks.

Five hundred million dollars went to corporations.

Four hundred million dollars went to State and local governments and about $400 million to nonprofit institutions.

The remainder, about $1.8 billion, the largest single segment of the interest on the public debt, went to individuals either in the form of cash payments or accumulated interest.

So let us keep this on the proper plane.

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEWES. Because the gentleman who has the floor is known as one of the more solid thinking economists, I should like to ask him this question with regard to the remarks of the preceding speaker who is a notorious advocate of greater money. Is it not a fact that under his policy of greater money an inflationary effect is created, so that while the interest rates nominally under his policies remain the same, the individual is required to work harder and longer to pay that interest rate?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is no question that it produces inflation. I suggest if the gentleman from Texas thinks that we need more credit throughout the country, that he seek to do that through his own committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, instead of trying to do it through the Committee on Ways and Means, which is concerned solely, as we are here, with debt management.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, listening to this debate makes me believe that it might be appropriate if we all asked ourselves, "Why do we have a statutory debt limit? Unless it is to serve some useful purpose, would we not be wiser to repeal it than be wasting time with amendments?"

If there is a purpose, it seems to me we are obliged to see whether this particular bill before us is in aid of that purpose or whether it would thwart that purpose. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who preceded me, suggested that one of the reasons for the limit was so that we could reexamine the operations of the Secretary of the Treasury as far as management of the debt is concerned. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, that can be done much more expediently without wasting the time of the whole Congress. We have committees that can constantly be keeping the operations of the debt management under surveillance, under check, under investigation. If the statutory limit on the borrowing authority of the Treasury has any purpose to serve, I submit it is to put a brake or a restraint on Government spending. It will not provide that restraint, however, if we continue to raise the limit without sound justification for every dollar of increase.

Let it be remembered that there is only one basic way in which the Government can pay its bills, and that is through taxes. Our concurrent expenditures will be met either out of current revenues or a combination of current revenues and interest-bearing deferred taxes, which is what borrowing actually is. In authorizing additional borrowing, what we are in effect doing is authorizing additional taxes on future taxpayers. As a tax bill, it should require at least the same amount of justification as would be required if we were now considering a tax-increase bill, and that is all I am asking. There is no sound justification in my judgment for the full $5 billion increase provided by this bill.

What is the justification that has been presented to us? Only that the present ceiling in view of our cash position and the demands that will be made upon the Treasury make it difficult to conduct day-to-day fiscal management affairs. Read the second page of the committee

report, where there is reiterated the justification made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that is what you will find is the fundamental justification made by the Secretary.

I concede there are difficulties, but that does not justify making it easy for the Federal Government to get started on another period of deficit financing. Part of the trouble we are in today is because Congress has made it too easy, too easy for itself and too easy for the executive branch, to increase spending and then pay the bills with borrowed money. We have been postponing the day of reckoning. It is time that we make that process of postponing and borrowing more difficult instead of easy. I will agree with all of my friends who have spoken that there is no gimmick that can force Congress to economize. Economy will come only when there is a will on the part of the Congress to do so. I think that today would not be too soon to evidence that will. We can do so by being cautious in our approach to this piece of legislation.

If we are having fiscal management difficulties, there are two ways to get out of it. Raising the debt limit and borrowing more money is only one. The other way is to cut down our expenditures, and I respectfully suggest that instead of taking what always appears to be the easy way out, for a change we take the hard but prudent way and do something about cutting expenditures. If we vote for this increase I do not see how you can expect to make any savings. I am not talking about savings by the Executive. I am talking about savings and frugality by the Congress.

There are those who attempt to put the blame for our present fiscal situation upon the executive branch. Make no mistake about it. The responsibility for spending rests right here in the Congress. No money can be spent by the Executive unless the Congress first authorizes the spending and then appropriates the money. Because the Congress has appropriated excessively in the past, and we are today spending at a rate which puts our cash balance at an extremely low level, I think there is a demonstrated need and justification has been presented to borrow some money on a temporary basis in order to get us through the year ahead.

Let me give you the facts and figures as presented to us. These are not figures picked out of the air. They are figures presented to us by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget. We have been operating with a cash balance of about $4 billion. The projection of expenditures and revenues during the next year, using the Treasury and budget figures as presented to us, shows that this balance will be dangerously reduced in the coming months. For example, at the worst point in the next 18 months, December 15, 1958, going on the assumption of the budget, it is expected that the public debt will reach about $277 billion and that there will be at the same time a cash balance in the bank of $3,500,000,000. In other words we will be required to borrow $2 billion more than the present debt limit in order to meet the demands that will be made upon the Treasury. Also, because of certain problems inherent in refinancing the public debt, the debt outstanding at any given time is always somewhat short of the ceiling. I think therefore there is justification for giving them this leeway to operate and to take care of that situation. I think justification has been presented for an increase in the limit to $278 billion, or an increase of $3 billion. In other words, if we increase the debt by $3 billion, we will have on hand at the low point, the lowest point in the next 18 months, as presented by this statement—and I regret that the table No. 3 in the Secretary's statement was not put into the committee report. To me that was the most important table presented by the Secretary. If we increase the debt by $3 billion, we will have on hand at this low point, December 15, 1958, $3.5 billion in cash, and unused borrowing authority of $1 billion, or a total of $4.5 billion.

I might add there is another $500 million in the free gold which the Treasury can also fall back on if necessary. In my judgment that is not too difficult a situation for the Treasury to live with. They have demonstrated during the last 4 months that they can live with that kind of a balance. Why then should we give them more?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I have this question in mind: Would the gentleman not admit that this table 3 is based upon the projections which are contained in the budget including the optimistic approach with respect to revenue at that period of time?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent; and that, I think, is all we should act on at this point, an amount based on what is proposed to us as the official picture for the future. If there is a change in the picture this Congress is going to be here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I know that the gentleman believes that they ought to have money for contingencies or elbow room. If you are going to do that why have any limitation and give them full elbow room? Unless the limit is going to provide some kind of a restraint, then the debt limit will serve no real function as far as the monetary system and fiscal affairs of this country are concerned.

In cutting the $2 billion all I am asking is that you remove the fat from the request, and I am not removing all of the fat, because, according to the table furnished by the Secretary, future requirements are based on having $3.5 billion on deposit in banks plus $3 billion for contingencies.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that $1 billion for contingencies would be completely adequate and still not create difficulties or such severe difficulties that we could not live with them. If all of the difficulties are to be removed then we might just as well repeal the law and let the sky be the limit. As far as I am concerned there has not been any restraint on spending. If the statutory debt limit can furnish such a restraint, then let us make sure it does so. It will be my purpose, Mr. Chairman, when the proper time comes, to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to reduce the amount of the increased debt limit in this bill from $5 billion to $3 billion.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I want my friend from Wisconsin to know that I share the thought he has expressed. I support the need for greater economy in areas where economies can be made. But will not the gentleman admit that the debt ceiling itself cannot result in the accomplishment of economies that must be made with respect to appropriations directly? And will not the gentleman further admit that the purpose that can be served by a debt ceiling is to prevent the administration or executive departments from bringing about a radical change with respect to spending funds that have been made available? And that no material increase of any appreciable extent could occur under the $5 billion ceiling that is suggested by the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman a minute of my time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I will agree with the gentleman's first premise that there is no gimmick whereby we can guarantee or force Congress to economize. Congress is either going to do it, or is not going to do it; it has control of the purse strings.

I would disagree with the gentleman that this whole operation is a matter of executive control, and that all we are doing is to exert pressure on the executive, or to make sure they do not change their spending policy, because spending policy fundamentally lies right here in the Congress. My only thought is that I believe this debt ceiling, if there is any purpose for it, should serve as a warning signal, to act as a restraint and make us stop and figure out where we are going. I do not think we can project our thinking far enough into the future to say how much we need, but I feel that $3 billion will take care of it as far as we can see at this time.

Mr. MILLS. So far as this fiscal year is concerned I might agree with the gentleman, $3 billion takes care of it; but we are legislating here for an 18-month period.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But you are basing it on the President's budget and estimates, and those estimates do not show a need for a $5 billion increase. The figures show a need for only a $3 billion increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the gentleman an additional minute of my time because I wanted to make the point that this $5 billion is, as the gentleman says, based upon the budget situation. But within that situation the

gentleman recognizes fluctuations occur, pointing to the fact that on December 15 of this year under the most favorable conditions it is thought that the debt might go to $277 billion in order to have $3½ billion on hand.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Plus the $3 billion for fluctuations and contingencies.

Mr. MILLS. The $3 billion additional under the bill. What I am trying to point out is this: We can still exercise this control over any radical change in spending within the $5 billion just as we can within the $3 billion and at the same time take care of any contingencies that might arise on the basis of the optimism of this budget.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. We give them $5 billion, then we keep going and there is no requirement that Congress take another look to see where we are going and why.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the many fine arguments made and many fine distinctions drawn by Members in reference to the bill before us. It seems to me that the very fine arguments that have been made and the very thin lines of distinction that have been drawn would be more applicable under normal conditions than those that face our country and the world today.

The basic question that I consider involved in this bill, and the reason why I am going to vote for it—I regret that the ceiling is not higher—is the world situation that exists. You and I know that much of the freezing or a considerable part of the freezing of the last 3 or 4 months is probably due to the fact that our Government is very close, and has been, to the debt limit. That has brought about restrictions through the freezing of appropriations and if a flexibility had existed some such action would not have been taken.

Our national debt now, as I understand it, is over $274 billion. The last amount I heard was $274.3 billion. We have read in the newspapers of the artificial means taken by the administration through the sale of FNMA securities and others to get enough money so that they could carry on at least the minimum functions of government during the past 3 or 4 months.

As we project our minds into not only the future but as we analyze the present, we realize that there is an extreme emergency that exists. The responsibility rests upon those of us in elective positions in the Congress and in the executive branch, the President, Vice President, and other appointed officials, to devise those policies which will be for the best interest of our country and in carrying out those policies to make such appropriations and expenditures as will assure success for the safety of our country.

The basic proposition that appeals to me is the national defense angle. It is vitally imperative that we vote this increase. If we do not do so we might place our country in a straitjacket. I think it is too great a calculated risk for me to take. I think it is too great a calculated risk for any other Member of this body to take. The question of $3 billion or $5 billion should not enter our minds. I think if we are going to err in judgment, we had better err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness, on the side of safety than on the side of uncertainty. I think we had better err on the side of greater flexibility in meeting the immediate task that confronts us than on the side of further restriction. If the majority party in this body and in the other body were playing politics, we would only put through an increase of $3 billion or $2 billion and then compel the administration to come back for more. But, I do not think that we can afford to play politics in connection with the situation that exists in the world today and which faces us. I think the $5 billion temporary increase is the wise course and the wise step for us to take, enabling flexibility for the next 18 months, rather than for a limited period of 6 or 8 months and then compelling the administration either to come back or be forced to make sharp restrictions in expenditures that are necessary for the best interests of our country. As a matter of fact, I am of the opinion that the administration should have made its recommendation before the last session of Congress adjourned. I do not make that statement in any severe critical way but as an observation of my own opinion. I realize that a new Secretary of the Treasury came in, and being human he probably did not want one of the first actions that he took to constitute recommending such a major one as an increase, even temporary, in the debt limit. However, this is a matter that faces us now. The argument of my friend from Wisconsin and the argument of my dear friend from Texas all would be interesting and probably pertinent another day and under different conditions. But, to me, my mind is made up on the importance of the passage of this bill in connection with the future national defense of our country, and I think from that angle it is wise for us to vote for the $5 billion rather than take any chance on any lesser amount.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to say the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, that I agree with him that this matter should not be approached on a partisan basis, because it has been my observation that Democrats and Republicans share in this staggering burden of Federal debt, and Democrats as well as the Republicans likewise share in paying Federal taxes. So, this transcends any political consideration.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to my friend.

Mr. MILLS. All of us are also concerned about the welfare of the United States, regardless of party, too, are we not?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. MILLS. Sure.

Mr. GROSS. But I do not agree that because we have gone from one emergency to another, some real and some synthetic, in the 10 years I have been in this House that we should pass this bill.

Someone spoke of a printing press bill or printing press money a little while ago. Let me call your attention to the fact that the bill that others of you voted for in the House, to provide a $5 billion cushion for the Treasury, that is, the Treasury could have $5 billion outstanding at any one time, was described by the late Senator Taft of Ohio, as a printing press money bill. I am one of the few that consistently opposed and voted against it. When you start talking about printing press money just remember that a number of you have voted several times for a printing press money bill to the tune of $5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, let it be clearly understood by those who support this bill that they are simply adding more weight to the millstone of debt and inflation that already hangs heavily around the necks of the American people.

It is interesting to note that prior to World War I, public debt could be created only by an act of Congress. Prior to July 1, 1914, there could be no debt authorized by the Government except by act of Congress, which also had to specify the purpose for which the debt was created.

The statutory limit was first fixed at $11.5 billion. If my information is correct, only twice in the years that followed has there been a reduction in the debt.

In 1953 the administration asked Congress to raise the debt limit from $275 billion to $290 billion. The House approved this increase by passage of H. R. 6672 on July 31, 1953. I voted against it.

However, when the bill went to the other body, and despite pleas of the administration that without a $15 billion increase the Government would be unable to pay its bills and panic would result, the Finance Committee of the other body refused to report the bill.

What happened? The administration reduced its spending and stayed within the debt limit. There was no panic.

The other body did, in 1954, amend the bill to provide a temporary increase in the debt limit from $275 billion to $281 billion. In 1955, Congress provided that the temporary increase would expire on June 30, 1956, which it did, leaving the present statutory limit of $275 billion.

What has become of all the brave promises of other years of economies that would provide balanced budgets; of an end to inflationary deficits; of payments on the Federal debt?

I recall that in 1953, Secretary of Commerce Weeks asserted it was high time to halt "international handouts and global boondoggling." I am sure Mr. Weeks was not trying to shoot down the foreign-aid program with a slogan as President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message a couple of weeks ago, insisted some people were trying to do.

And in 1953, former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey pointed out the danger of continuing to spend American

taxpayer money abroad to build competitive enterprises, adding that "our scale of taxation is already too high and to maintain a sound and honest dollar we must bring our expenditures and revenues into balance."

This bill, if enacted, can have only one purpose: to permit expenditures and revenues to be thrown out of balance. And additional Federal debt means that the interest and other carrying charges, now costing the taxpayers nearly $8 billion each and every year, will be increased. Already the interest on the Federal debt is the second largest item in the spending budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am irrevocably opposed to any increase in the Federal debt at this time. I voted for reductions in spending last year which, if adopted, would not only have easily kept the Federal debt within the present limitation but would have provided some payment on the principal.

Let me ask Members of the House this question: If you ran up a huge debt, made no effort to reduce it, and continued to live far beyond your means, would your creditors lend you more money?

But your Federal Government, with a stratospheric debt of at least $275 billion, wants to pile up ever more debt through additional borrowings and at the highest interest rates in many, many years.

Thus, policies which could land us in prison as individuals amount only to the floating of more and more money-borrowing bonds as far as the Federal Government is concerned.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I have no moral right at this time and in the circumstances to kite checks and hand on to the children of today and tomorrow the obligations and responsibilities that we adults ought to face today. It is an evil thing to mortgage the future of our children to the extent that the Federal Government has already mortgaged them.

There ought to be the will and the courage now to reduce expenditures, balance the budget, and make payments on the debt.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the request of the administration that the debt limit be raised $5 billion. I do not believe any effort to reduce it is an economy measure. In fact, it might well be that it would be the reverse, it might cost the Government more money than if the full increase was made at this time.

We know and we must face the fact that we have realities to consider. We are in a period where we are obliged to undertake a big missile program in order to keep ahead of the Russians. It will require money, plenty of money. The administration must be given the opportunity to raise the money efficiently and with all possible savings. I believe it is far better to do this than to be forced to raise taxes.

I can visualize that unless we raise the debt limit sufficiently we might be in a position where we could not meet the bills contracted. In what position would that place the country if the Government were unable to pay its bills? It might bring about a situation that would be very disastrous; and, if Congress was not in session that would provoke an awkward complication.

Let me point out this fact: We have a very able man as Secretary of the Treasury. He does not want to spend money if it is not necessary to do so. He wants to keep expenditures down. I trust our Secretary of the Treasury and I trust the President of the United States. I believe they want to have an economical Government as well as any Member of the House. But this coming year the Secretary of the Treasury is going to have $50 billion of debt that must be refinanced. Are we going to put him in a position where he can do that refinancing to the best advantage of the Government, or are we going to force him occasionally to pay money because he cannot raise the full amount necessary at a single refinancing?

I repeat, this is not a question of economy, and I hope further it is not a partisan question, because we all want our debt to be as low as possible. We all want to bring our finances into proper order. This administration has shown its desire for keeping the debt limit down when it refrained from asking the increase last year and was barely able to get through the year.

I say to my friends, let us not put the administration in a straitjacket. Let us give them the opportunity to function in an orderly efficient manner and the way which is for the best interests of the country. Let us not forget above all we must maintain missile security and that will cost real money which must be paid. I hope we will not vote to recommit but will pass this bill, which the administration has requested and needs.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, with the harmony that prevails, and particularly after having heard from our distinguished majority and minority leaders, both in support of this bill, I suppose I will be accused of injecting partisanship into a matter that should be and I trust will be finally disposed of on the basis of nonpartisanship.

If many of the speakers who last night participated in the opening of the 1958 Republican Congressional campaign had been as moderate in their language as our distinguished minority leader I probably would not take the floor now. We heard last night almost every adjective in the dictionary with an invidious connotation, thrown out over the air and aimed at the Democrats, Democratic policies, and the Democratic Party and its officeholders.

At the expense of being accused of partisanship, let me inject into this debate these facts; irrefutable facts from the record.

It was in 1952 that Candidate Eisenhower told the country that $265 billion of debt was much too much for this country. The debt limit was then $275 billion. We had never exceeded $265 billion up to the time when he took office in 1953. His campaign pledge of 1952 was, regardless of anything, he would reduce the national debt to less than $265 billion.

During the first 4 years of his administration, at his request and with the help of the Democratic Party, that debt limit and that debt were increased, because we had to have the money for our national security and for the welfare of our people.

In 1956, forgetting he was also President, Candidate Eisenhower again promised the country "Our debt will be reduced. The debt limit is too high."

It was an open secret last year that unofficial representations were made by the executive department to the Congress to increase the debt limit again. Just as openly and just as unofficially, the answer went back to the White House, "Send up an official request and the Democratic Congress will give this country what it needs." No official request came up, and there was no increase.

This year we have an official request before us. I am very happy that our distinguished majority leader preceded me and let you know the Democratic policy and the Democratic program is—and this is a complete answer to everything that was said on the air last night as our Republican friends pointed the finger at the Democrats and Democratic officeholders, and begged for a Republican Congress—the complete answer is that the Democratic Party always was ready, willing, and able, and will at all times be ready, willing, and able to give this country, and will give it, whatever it needs for its welfare and its security and its defense, no matter who the occupant of the White House may be and no matter what his partisan politics may be.

The distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and our colleagues in that committee who supported him in bringing this bill to the floor are to be commended for their courage and their statesmanship.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to the fact, that the things that were said last night recall to many of us, the days of "Prosperity is just around the corner." They promised us more and greater prosperity. Even though we are just dripping with prosperity now there was more just around the corner. It is too bad that we do not have the facilities to print photographs in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like to reproduce this one.

Prosperity is just around the corner but apples are back on the corner again. This is a very recent photograph. If you go by the Social Security Building any morning you will find there once more an apple seller. He has not been able to find that prosperity which is just around the corner.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman contend that we have not had a real era of prosperity in this country during the last 2 or 3 years?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, we have; and we can continue to have it and we should

have it. We should not have unemployment reaching the point where it is today, where within another month it will have reached, throughout the entire country, proportions that will be labeled "distressed labor conditions."

Mr. MARTIN. That is what the gentleman thinks.

Mr. MULTER. What I am trying to call your attention to is that this administration must do something about that in order to avoid the miseries of unemployment. The Congress cannot do it alone. We need leadership in the White House to do it. We are not getting that leadership today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I have been serving in the House now nearly 14 years. During this time I have been waiting for the day when we would set a limitation on ourselves, set a limitation on our taxes, and set a limitation on our debts. It would seem to me that the logical argument here today is that we might as well adjourn if we raise this debt limit another $5 billion. If we are going to raise the debt limit, give unlimited debt powers, unlimited taxing powers and assume that this Congress is never going to begin to liquidate those Government projects that would give us billions in dollars in the Treasury, why stay here and argue?

We could start with TVA. There are a couple of billions we can liquidate and get in our pockets. Let us continue by selling 490,000 housing units and stop building more at the taxpayers' expense and more borrowed money. We could stop Government lending which now makes up 16⅔ percent of all the money that is lent in this country today. Let us stop subsidies for food. Right now we have a $9 billion loss in our food subsidies. We could put an end to that. Does not Congress plan to function after this vote?

Let us stop reclamation programs. Let us not vote this scholarship fund of $1 billion which we do not need, and thereby increase our debt. Then, let us follow some of the military advice and get into some real savings. Let us take the Army-Navy budget and reduce it according to General Bonner-Fellers by $9 billion and foreign aid by $5 billion. Then let us add to the Air Force an increase of $2 billion, research another billion, and then ICBM another billion. After you do all that we would save $10 billion on the military side and expand our expenditures where they should be, on the Air Force.

That is not talking about the little fringe economies that the Hoover report talks about; that is talking as the President talked in Oklahoma City. He said whole categories of our socialist economy must be cut out if we are going to stop, ever, unlimited taxing and unlimited deficits and unlimited borrowings.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the measure before the House, and I shall also oppose a motion to recommit. I support this measure because I am convinced it is necessary for the orderly functioning of our Government, and I am convinced that it is necessary in the interest of economy and efficiency to support it. I feel, however, I would be remiss as a Member of this body if I did not point out some of the things which I have noted in the past few years and some of the interpretations that have been placed upon these events. I realize, of course, that under our system of government it is difficult to make any statement without being accused of partisanship. Under our system, I have never been too concerned about whether or not there would be some degree of partisanship. I think it would be a terrible thing if we had a monolithic type of government and we were deprived of the opportunity of criticizing or pointing out deficiencies, whether it be in my party or in the opposition party. I trust that my remarks today will not be interpreted as partisan. As far as I am concerned, they are completely and totally factual.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third or fourth time in the last 5 years of this so-called sound administration that we have been requested to raise the national debt limit. The only time in the previous administration under President Truman that we changed the debt limit was when we reduced it from $300 billion down to $275 billion.

In 1954 we increased the statutory debt limit to $281 billion or by $6 billion. Again, in 1955 we acted maintaining that figure at $281 billion. It was set in 1956 at $278 billion. Now it is requested that we increase it to $280 billion. During this same period of time the national debt has increased from about $267 billion to approximately $274 billion. As a matter of fact, there has been a net increase approximately of $7 billion in the national debt since the conclusion of the Korean conflict. Most of the cost of that conflict was paid for by current revenues.

As a matter of fact, I pointed out here some years ago that this administration, as far as I was able to ascertain, was the first administration which had actually recommended deficit financing, because when we had a budget which everybody knew would be out of balance 4 or 5 billion dollars, no recommendations were made that revenues be raised to make up for that deficit.

Frankly, I am concerned about our economic condition, and I want to make a statement. I am not saying this in any criticism of the present Secretary of the Treasury because I think he is tremendously able and I admire him very much. What I am pointing out are facts that cannot be denied. If I felt that our economic condition had improved I would not be here talking to you today.

But let us look at the situation. Do you remember some years ago we heard a lot about inflation. Well, is the value of the dollar more or less than it was then? As a matter of fact, again last month the cost of living reached its highest peak in history. The strange thing about this inflation is that it is occurring at a time when unemployment is increasing. Would any of us here say we are satisfied with the economic conditions as they exist? In the month just concluded we had more unemployment than at any time in the last decade, if my figures are correct.

What about servicing this debt? The debt is only about 9 or 10 billion dollars more than it was 5 years ago, although I am sorry to report it is even a nickel more. But despite the fact that it is only a few billion dollars more than it was, the cost of servicing this debt has almost doubled. As a matter of fact, only recently, for short-term credit, the Government paid more a few months back than it had paid at any time, I think, since sometime back in the twenties.

Now, is all of this healthy for our economy? I am afraid it is not. We had fewer housing starts last year than we had for many years. We have more unemployment than we had in many years. We have more real doubt about the efficiency and the stability of the Government than at any time that I can remember. Have we gotten better defense for this money? Well, I do not know. I am certainly no expert on defense, but every time I pick up a publication which contains the expressions of experts, every time I read the expressions of experts before Congressional groups in this body and in the other body, I find that they say we have fallen tremendously behind in defense. And I have seen charts published in magazines which have not been particularly friendly to my side of the aisle which indicate that our enemy, the Russians, have forged considerably ahead of us. And I saw some figures this morning which showed that this budget, as recommended for the approaching fiscal year, namely, 1959, insofar as defense is concerned, will only pick up the additional cost brought about by the continuing inflation.

So again I say that here in this most vital area of all, namely, the security and the defense of all of us as Americans, we do not have too much to feel secure about. Frankly, I wish it were otherwise. I wish that we had checked inflation. I wish that we had pursued economic policies which would not have encouraged unemployment. I wish that our gross national product had kept up. That, to me, is one of the most distressing signs of all. You know, we are in a great growing country. The population of the United States of America today is something like 173 million or thereabouts. This means that each year, as young men and young women come into the labor force, we must create new jobs, new opportunities, new employment. And this is particularly true in light of the tremendous technological changes which are now taking place. Automation is taking the place of labor in many vast industries in our country; so that, if the gross national product does not continue to advance, then unemployment increases even though employment itself remains stable. These are all frightening aspects of our economy. And I can well understand how at public caucuses it is customary to point with pride, as was

done last night; but frankly, as you examine this economy and look at it, there is less to point to with pride and more to look at with real concern. Look at agriculture. Why, I have seen figures that more families have left the farms in the last few years than in previous generations. All through the farming areas of our country there is a feeling that these people who contribute the food and the fibers which feed and clothe our people are the forgotten segment of our economy. So that we have our job cut out for us. We have a crisis in the defense program; we have real trouble at home on the domestic scene; we have continuing inflation; we have growing unemployment; and we have a growing debt. And we face the prospect of additional deficit financing.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill certainly not out of any feeling that it will cure these ills; because it will not; but I support it because, if it is not passed, the ills which I have enumerated will become even more acute.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry this bill to raise our Federal debt limit is before us today. It seems to me there is a way to make such a request unnecessary—at least, at this time.

Now when an individual, a company or a corporation finds it is about to go in the red, but knows it will in a short time receive income to again put it in the black, it asks its creditors for an extension of time to meet its obligations.

In this particular instance, the next 3 months are the big income-tax-collecting months. It might well be that by Uncle Sam paying only the bills which absolutely must be paid during that time, it can be proven that it will not be necessary to raise the debt ceiling. Congress will still be in session, and should we find it absolutely necessary to raise the debt ceiling, it can still be done and no harm done. Surely, it is worth trying, instead of doing it this easy way. Sammy has proved to be a liberal spender for the past 25 years, you know. It is time Papa—the taxpayers—said to Sammy, "You better be careful, old boy, or soon you might not have the dollars nor the credit to help yourself or any one else—here or abroad—to wage peace, let alone war."

It may be that to raise the debt limit here requested will not touch off uncontrolled inflation; but who knows All we need do is to look at every nation in this world that made federal spending easy, and that has happened to over one-half the nations of the world; and what do we find there—uncontrolled inflation, strife, and hungry, restless people, to say the least.

Perhaps this is not the straw that will break our backs—not the camels—but I, for one, will not take the chance; at least, until I know it is more necessary than it is today, or at least until we have tried the solution I have just suggested.

You may say, "Oh, let us do it now, just look at the size of the budget for 1959. That if we do not do it now and get it over with, we will have to do it anyway before this session ends." Now, will we? Let us not be too sure. Remember that, generally speaking, the American people—our boss—want every possible penny saved in nonmilitary spending and while it is true most everybody wants more than adequate spending for the military, I am sure they expect us to get as near 100 cents worth of security for every dollar spent as is safely and humanly possible.

And, so I am sure you can expect this Congress will reduce the budget request for fiscal year 1959 by at least $3 billion. Consequently, if anticipated revenues become a reality, it is very possible that we will have a balanced budget for fiscal year 1959.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, Russian policies have been consistent over the years, as I have observed them, alarmingly so. The mission of Russia has been world domination. They have made strategic withdrawals, it is true, but there has been no abandonment of their policy. Just as consistently Russia has repeatedly said that they will accomplish their objective by destroying America from within, by destroying us economically.

Time does not permit my going into a discussion of that in full. The President, though, has presented a precariously balanced budget. Some people here today have suggested that it is overly optimistic, with revenues overestimated and expenditures understated. Be that as it may, the President himself, in his state of the Union message, indicated that for Congress to meet its responsibilities, to bring about a balanced budget, it is necessary that we exercise restraint, and that we must eliminate expenditures for unnecessary and improper Federal programs.

I personally believe that by doing this, by cutting foreign aid, by eliminating a major portion if not all of the proposed Federal-aid-to-education recommendations, by elimination of waste in the military and by other means we can adequately provide for the security and defense of this country and at the same time provide the necessary and proper Federal programs here at home, pay something on the national debt and still, perhaps, have a most needed reduction in taxes. I am ready to devote myself to the accomplishment of these objectives.

There have been other reactions to his message, though. According to reports that we read in the press, there are powerful forces within the liberal element, of the Democrat Party particularly, including some who are Members of this body, who have indicated that they will push for $2 billion more than the President has requested for military or defense spending, whether it can be well spent or not. Reading would suggest an effort to get off a political hook or to make political hay. Furthermore, they have indicated that they are going to push for all present and many additional Federal Government programs right here at home even if it means an unbalanced budget and going back to deficit spending. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that if we increase the debt limitation more than is necessary, we are playing right into the hands of those who would so have us abandon fiscal responsibility.

Regardless of the good intentions of the Executive and of responsible Members of Congress that have been expressed here today, we would be contributing to the accomplishment of the objective of those who are for fiscal irresponsibility and wholesale deficit spending if we vote to raise the debt ceiling any more than is reasonably required for management purposes. I can understand and agree with the necessity for maneuverability and the possibility of interest savings, and so forth, if that is provided. We should not, however, raise the debt ceiling one more cent than is necessary for this, or we will be playing into the hands of the big spenders. I suggest to you on the basis of the very able statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], that we can live and that the administration can live and accomplish its avowed objectives with an increase of $3 billion.

I intend to vote for the motion to recommit and to substitute that figure, and I urge you to do likewise. If this is accomplished, then those who are urging big spending, for political purposes and otherwise, will be faced with the proposition of themselves having to present a resolution for further extension of the debt ceiling to cover the deficit spending. That is as it should be. It will properly brand them in the eyes of the American public as the ones who are leading this country to economic ruin. Speaking for myself, I am not going to vote for an unnecessary increase in raising the debt ceiling to help them accomplish their purpose, either now or later. Let the people who are for the deficit spending come to the well of this House and present a resolution to cover the additional indebtedness that will have to be borne by ourselves and future generations of Americans, thereby contributing to the destruction of America from within by destroying us economically. We are entitled to a record vote on that issue. Right now we should support the motion to recommit, which will supply all of the funds necessary for better management of the debt, for carrying the expenditures through the lag time between outgo and periods of heavy receipts, and for other purposes. If anything more than the $3 billion can be justified, which has not been done here today, let that justification be made in the other body or at a later date.

We can correct our error without difficulty if we have not provided enough. If we vote too much, those who follow the course of fiscal irresponsibility will fix it so that the only way the error can be corrected is by paying off the additional debt incurred through ill-considered and unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, you would think, to hear some of the speeches, that we are in a deplorable condition. We seem to be trying to develop an inferiority complex. I still believe that we are the

greatest free Government on the face of the earth. I still believe that we have a sound defense. I still believe in my Government from A to Z.

For the almost 40 years I have been in Congress I have always voted for economy, because I believed it was essential that our country should be fiscally sound. I believe also in our public officials. I know they are not spending any money except what Congress has authorized. I believe that when they study, as they have to study night and day, the fiscal affairs of this Government, and then bring their knowledge to us before our Committee on Ways and Means, and we hear them, they are entitled to respect and consideration. I believe they are people who are loyal to this Government.

I urge you today not to try to cripple this Government when you know that this extension of $5 billion is considered necessary, necessary by our committee, necessary by our officials in the executive branch who administer the funds we appropriate here. I urge you to support this bill.

I have been for economy, as you know, all these years, and I am proud of that record. My district is proud of that record. My people know that I will continue to fight for the solvency of this Government. I know from the testimony that came before our committee that this $5-billion increase is needed. I think we should protect our country and fight for our country all the way. That is what I intend to do while I am in Congress.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I rise humbly to pay tribute to the man in the House who to me has stood for the best Government, the greatest economy in Government, the greatest personal integrity in Government, more than anyone else I have known during the 8 years I have been here.

Recalling the history that has been given in brief here this afternoon, I wonder whether the gentleman would be kind enough to insert in the record of today's committee session a complete history of the rise in the debt from 1935 to 1952.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentlewoman for her compliments. I cannot plead guilty to her kind personal tribute to me. Of course, it is highly pleasing. I will try to accommodate the gentlewoman by putting in the RECORD the facts she has asked for.

TABLE 1.—*Debt limitation under sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, history of legislation (1934–57)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Act: | |
| Jan. 30, 1934, amending sec. 18 (48 Stat. 343) increased authority for notes outstanding to | [1] $10,000,000,000 |
| Feb. 4, 1935: | |
| Amending sec. 1 (49 Stat. 20) limited bonds outstanding establishing revolving authority to | [1] 25,000,000,000 |
| New sec. 21 added (49 Stat. 21) consolidated authority for certificates and bills (sec. 5) and authority for notes (sec. 18). Same aggregate amount outstanding | [1] 20,000,000,000 |
| New sec. 22 added (49 Stat. 21) authorized United States savings bonds within authority of sec. 1. | |
| May 26, 1938, amending secs. 1 and 21 (52 Stat. 447) consolidated in sec. 21, authority for bonds, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills and notes (outstanding bonds limited to $30,000,000,000). Same aggregate total outstanding | [1] 45,000,000,000 |
| July 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 1071), amending sec. 21 removed limitation on bonds without change total authorized outstanding of bonds, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills and notes | [1] 45,000,000,000 |
| June 25, 1940, (54 Stat. 526), sec. 302, sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting "(a)" after "21." and by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph as follows: "(b) In addition to the amount authorized by the preceding paragraph of this section, any obligations authorized by sections 5 and 18 of this Act, as amended, not to exceed in the aggregate $4,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time, less any retirements made from the special fund made available under section 301 of the Revenue Act of 1940, may be issued under said sections to provide the Treasury with funds to meet any expenditures made, after June 30, 1940, for the national defense, or to reimburse the general fund of the Treasury therefore, any such obligations so issued shall be designated 'national defense series'." | [2] 4,000,000,000 |
| Feb. 19, 1941 (55 Stat. 7), amending sec. 21 to read "Provided that the face amount of obligations issued under the authority of this Act shall not exceed in the aggregate $65,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time." Eliminates separate authority for $4,000,000,000 of national defense series obligations | [1] 65,000,000,000 |
| Mar. 28, 1942 (56 Stat. 189), amending sec. 21 increasing limitation to $125,000,000,000 | [1] 125,000,000,000 |
| Apr. 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 63), amending sec. 21 increasing limitation to $210,000,000,000 | [1] 210,000,000,000 |
| June 9, 1944 (58 Stat. 272), amending sec. 21 increasing limitation to $260,000,000,000 | [1] 260,000,000,000 |
| Apr. 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 47), amending sec. 21 to read: "The face amount of obligations issued under authority of this Act, and the face amount of obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States (except such guaranteed obligations as may be held by the Secretary of the Treasury), shall not exceed in the aggregate $300,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time." | [1] 300,000,000,000 |
| June 26, 1946 (60 Stat. 316), amending sec. 21 decreasing limitation to $275,000,000,000 and adding, "the current redemption value of any obligation issued on a discount basis which is redeemable prior to maturity at the option of the holder thereof shall be considered, for the purposes of this section, to be the face amount of such obligation" | [1] 275,000,000,000 |
| Aug. 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 895), amending sec. 21, effective Aug. 28, 1954, and ending June 30, 1955, temporarily increasing limitation by $6,000,000,000 to | [1] 281,000,000,000 |
| June 30, 1955 (69 Stat. 241), amending Aug. 28, 1954, act, by extending until June 30, 1956, increase in limitation to | [1] 281,000,000,000 |
| July 9, 1956 (70 Stat. 519): | |
| Amending act of Aug. 28, 1954, temporarily increasing limitation by $3,000,000,000, for period beginning on July 1, 1956, and ending on June 30, 1957, to | [1] 278,000,000,000 |
| Effective July 1, 1957, temporary increase terminates and limitation reverts, under act of June 26, 1946, to | [1] 275,000,000,000 |

[1] Limitation on outstanding.

[2] Limitation on issues less retirements.

TABLE 2.—*Budget receipts and expenditures and public debt*

[Fiscal years. In millions of dollars]

| Fiscal year | Budget receipts | Budget expenditures | Surplus (+) or deficit (−) | Public debt at end of year |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1933 | 2,021 | 4,623 | −2,602 | 22,539 |
| 1934 | 3,064 | 6,694 | −3,630 | 27,053 |
| 1935 | 3,730 | 6,521 | −2,791 | 28,701 |
| 1936 | 4,069 | 8,493 | −4,425 | 33,779 |
| 1937 | 4,979 | 7,756 | −2,777 | 36,425 |
| 1938 | 5,615 | 6,792 | −1,177 | 37,165 |
| 1939 | 4,996 | 8,858 | −3,862 | 40,440 |
| 1940 | 5,144 | 9,062 | −3,918 | 42,968 |
| 1941 | 7,103 | 13,262 | −6,159 | 48,961 |
| 1942 | 12,555 | 34,046 | −21,490 | 72,422 |
| 1943 | 21,987 | 79,407 | −57,420 | 136,696 |
| 1944 | 43,635 | 95,059 | −51,423 | 201,003 |
| 1945 | 44,475 | 98,416 | −53,941 | 258,682 |
| 1946 | 39,771 | 60,448 | −20,676 | 269,422 |
| 1947 | 39,786 | 39,032 | +754 | 258,286 |
| 1948 | 41,488 | 33,069 | +8,419 | 252,292 |
| 1949 | 37,696 | 39,507 | −1,811 | 252,770 |
| 1950 | 36,495 | 39,617 | −3,122 | 257,357 |
| 1951 | 47,568 | 44,058 | +3,510 | 255,222 |
| 1952 | 61,391 | 65,408 | −4,017 | 259,105 |
| 1953 | 64,825 | 74,274 | −9,449 | 266,071 |
| 1954 | 64,655 | 67,772 | −3,117 | 271,260 |
| 1955 | 60,390 | 64,570 | −4,180 | 274,374 |
| 1956 | 68,165 | 66,540 | +1,626 | 272,751 |
| 1957 | 71,029 | 69,433 | +1,596 | 270,527 |
| 1958 (estimate) | 72,400 | 72,788 | −388 | 271,200 |
| 1959 (estimate) | 74,400 | 73,934 | +466 | 271,200 |

NOTE.—The change in the public debt from year to year reflects not only the budget surplus or deficit but also changes in the Treasury's cash balances, the effect of certain trust fund transactions, and direct borrowing from the public by certain Government enterprises.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to take this opportunity to add my tribute to those already paid here today to our new chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. It has been my pleasure to work with him closely now for a number of years. I have learned to respect and admire him. While we have suffered a great loss in the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Jere Cooper, we are most fortunate to have as his successor my good friend, WILBUR MILLS.

For the last few hours we have been discussing the necessity for increasing the debt limit. We have heard arguments pro and con, and I do not intend to belabor the question further. However, I want the Members to know that I am one of those who believe in the solvency of our Government, one of those who believe that we should cut expenditures where we can cut them without hurting either our national defense, our general welfare, or our economy. I am one who has always been reluctant to see the ceiling of our national public debt raised, but after hearing the testimony that was presented to our committee this past week, I come to you and say, "My colleagues, I am going to vote for this resolution, and I think in the interest of America you, too, should do the same thing."

It is most important that the ceiling on the public debt be increased by $5 billion, as this resolution provides. If you had the privilege of listening to all the testimony that we did, and I certainly hope you will read the hearings when they are made available, you would find real necessity for this action. In fact, we were told that one time last fall the cash balance in the Treasury was so low that when the Treasury was seeking to transfer funds from one depository to another in order to meet bills, if a severe storm had interfered with the transfer of that money millions of our aged people and millions of pensioners would not have been able to get their pensions on time. I say there is an urgent reason, that reason alone, to provide the monthly checks for our pensioners, for passing this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield if I have time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Rhode Island referred to our late beloved colleague, Jere Cooper, in a very fitting way, and how fortunate we were, with the act of God taking him away from us, in having as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. There is no Member of the House who is more greatly respected than the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] not only for his extraordinary ability, but for his devotion to duty, and above all for his fine ethical outlook on life.

An illustration of his leadership, showing the elements of leadership that he possesses is the fact, as I remember, this recommendation for a temporary increase of $5 billion in the national debt ceiling was made on Tuesday of last week. On Friday of last week the chairman called the Committee on Ways and Means together for public hearings. And the bill was reported out, and the bill is now before the House of Representatives today. In other words, within a period of 1 week one of the most important measures of this session of Congress was messaged to the Congress, and the Ways and Means Committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], held hearings and reported the bill out and the bill is now before the House. I think that is leadership of an outstanding nature and is a compliment to the gentleman from Arkansas and his leadership.

Mr. FORAND. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and I point out that the reason for that speed was not because the Ways and Means Committee had nothing to do, because as you all know we are holding hearings on tax revision and our schedule calls for us to hear from 18 or 19 witnesses each day, but because of the urgency of this situation and the nonpartisanship involved, our leader called us together and action was expedited. For that I compliment him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, the argument presented by members of the Ways and Means Committee have convinced me that a precarious margin between the anticipated commitments and the debt limit does exist.

As has been said this is because the Congress has been too liberal in its appropriations. Now it becomes necessary for the Congress to acknowledge its mistakes and call upon the taxpayers to cover for them.

Extension of the debt limit is requested as an emergency measure. Like similar emergency requests it is most certain to become permanent.

The national debt of the United States of America is twice the size of the total debt of all our allies with whom we are fighting a cold war. Nearly every one of these allied governments is taking radical steps to reduce its commitments, hoping to bolster its economy and stabilize its financial structure.

While I recognize and fully approve our Government's expenditures for our own defense I cannot approve increasing allocation of American taxpayers' money to restore the solvency of foreign countries that indicate their readiness to believe they must assume a soft attitude toward our powerful antagonist.

America's strength and survival depends ultimately upon our own solvency. Solvency just cannot be preserved if we continue deficit spending with its accompanying inflation. It is time we resolve to avoid further debt and adopt a pay-as-we-go policy. Better an increase in tax now to keep our fiscal house in order than mislead our people into believing all is well.

If Russia, by squeezing the lifeblood of her people, can create a superior military force to threaten the democratic world, most certainly the American people will willingly contribute from their incomes the necessary cost of building a defense system to protect them from foreign aggression and from internal financial bankruptcy.

National debt and inflation can destroy America just as surely as defeat in war. Rather than destroy ourselves by spending abroad where experience shows its futility, let us put our own house in order. America, strong, united, solvent, and determined, can maintain world leadership; otherwise our chances of survival against a ruthless, dictatorial, slave-driving Communist enemy are nil.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the second year of the second term of Mr. Eisenhower starts off, as others, with beautiful promises, high sounding and descriptive phrases, and the stark realism that inflation continues. There is no real effort on the part of this administration to check it. This administration lacks a sincerity of purpose, and its hypocrisy must be exposed.

We are asked to increase, temporarily, the public debt limit. We are asked to give the Treasury Department a free hand to obligate us $5 billion above the present authority. By this request the administration has admitted its failure to cope with the problem of inflation and provide a program to return to a sound dollar.

It is therefore evident that we can expect no leadership in tightening the belt by the administration. The Congress, must, therefore draw the line. The Congress could, if it would, take the reins of leadership toward economy and efficiency in Government, and I am ready to vote for such a program.

Last night, in an effort to discredit the Democratic Party, Assistant President—some give him credit for having much more power and say-so than "assistant"—Sherman Adams tried to sidetrack the American people from thinking of their serious home-front fiscal and economic problems. He began to talk about Pearl Harbor.

What we in America want of the President and his advisers is a fact-facing realization of our home-front difficulties, and recommendation for constructive legislation to correct it. For the last 5 years the record of the Republican administration on the home front may be summed up in two words: failure and insincerity.

The farmer, under this administration has suffered disastrously. He is in debt. He wants relief. He wants tax relief and he is tired of wasteful Government spending.

The textile industry, the plywood industry, management, and labor are suffering. The white-collar worker cannot pay his debts. The dollar value is going steadily down. Unemployment is on the increase. A recession is underway, and that recession may be classified as minor, or temporary, by those in power, but to the man losing his business, with his back to the wall, or unable to pay his debts, there is nothing minor about it.

Raising the debt limit is no solution to the problem. The Secretary of the Treasury never made a claim that this is the panacea. How encouraging it would be if the administration had issued a statement that it would forego raising the limit for fear of encouraging further inflation. The taxpayer needs some encouragement, not tomorrow, but today.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his statement before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, stated that cash balances are running distressingly low. He did not say, according to the report on this bill, dangerously low. Everybody I know is having trouble keeping cash balances. Too much Government and too much Government debt have materially contributed to that condition.

One of the grounds for the request takes into account contingencies which might develop in a world filled with uncertainties. The world has always been filled with uncertainties and this administration has done more to place the United States in a position of uncertainty than any in the history of this great Nation. They wish Congress to bail them out, temporarily, from this fiscal dilemma, and have Congress share the blame for Eisenhower inflation.

As of January 15, 1958, according to the report on this bill, our debt was pegged at $274.4 billion. Our limit is $275 billion. We are asked for $5 billion, but the papers today carried a report that $3 billion would suffice. Why not $1 billion at a time? Why not take stock again and again to remedy this situation.

A vote against this legislation is a vote for economy. A demand for it. The American people desire it.

Let no man be misled into thinking this is part of the missile program. Propaganda in that direction may be forthcoming, but the facts are that last week we voted $549 million for the missile-detection and defense program. The missile program has been voted the money by present and past Congresses. What we need is dedicated use of those funds and realistic production.

Let us start now to stop inflation and vote against H. R. 9955.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, may I add to the remarks which have been emphasized by my colleagues on the

Ways and Means Committee that the most important reason for the temporary increase in the public-debt limit is the flexibility that is required over the next 18 months. May I likewise emphasize the statements that have previously been made that this does not in any way tend to open the floodgates of expenditures, but is a warning to continue to keep the brakes on the spending, though these brakes must be applied here in the House on the appropriation measures, and appropriations cannot be increased by the Treasury Department since they must pay the bills which we authorize and approve.

One additional impelling reason for my voting for the temporary increase is the possibility of need for immediate funds in the event to follow through to the fullest advantage should a technological breakthrough occur.

Mr. Chairman, I endorse H. R. 9955.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, in a sense it is unrealistic to vote against a temporary increase in the debt limit.

But, then, in a sense, it is always unrealistic to protest the inevitable.

There is no doubt that we are here faced with the inevitable. The outcome of the impending vote is a foregone conclusion. Very probably some increase in the debt limit this session is actually unavoidable although it may end up with something less than the $5 billion figure.

If, as I suspect, a temporary increase is necessary it is because arithmetic is still inexorable.

Uncle Sam has so far discovered no satisfactory way to dodge the bill collector. But there seems to be a lack of understanding that bills paid with borrowed money are not debts truly paid. They are debts merely juggled. They are debts merely transferred to a different creditor, with a deferred due date and a heavy interest charge.

We today have such deferred debt to the tune of nearly $275 billion, much of it the heritage of war. But a very substantial amount is the heritage of extravagance, folly, and sheer waste. And some of this extravagance, folly and waste is of recent and current origins. Hence our inevitable predicament today.

Yes, I repeat, protest against the inevitable is in a sense always unrealistic.

But failure to protest may, in the longer view, be even more unrealistic. Failure to protest may prove both fatalistic and, ultimately, fatal.

Absence of protest can accelerate the process of progressive capitulation to bad habits.

Therefore, I intend to vote for the motion to limit the increase to $3 billion—as the lesser evil. And then I intend to vote on final passage against any increase.

Very frankly this is a vote of protest against the immediate inevitability because of my anxiety over the far more crucial inevitability toward which we are headed.

It is a vote of protest in line with the votes for economies which I cast in the last session. Had these economies been adopted an increase in the debt limit would quite probably now be unnecessary.

It is a vote of protest against the resurgent doctrine, currently mouthed by spokesmen of Americans for Democratic action, that debt does not really matter.

It is a vote of protest against the popular theory of democracy—spelled with a small "d"—that government must provide anything and everything the people or pressure groups want or demand, without regard to reasonable priorities, and without regard to the ability of the government or the willingness of the people themselves to pay for it.

It is a vote of protest against the philosophy of luxury and softness—the notion that there is nothing that we cannot do without, or even temporarily defer, if we happen to want it right now.

It is a vote of protest against inconclusive legislative action to date which has made the postage stamp a symbol of our unwillingness to face facts and which has accumulated a postal deficit equal to, or exceeding, the $5 billion it is now proposed to raise the debt limit.

It is a vote of protest against the evasions and doubletalk—and pleasant smiles—of many departmental and agency witnesses which have largely frustrated nonpartisan efforts of the House Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization to curtail unnecessary filling of Federal job vacancies.

It is a vote of protest against the swarming hordes of would-be hitchhikers on sputnik, promoters of new welfare state spending to the tune of many more billions which, if recklessly approved, will have to be paid for through higher taxes or more borrowed money made possible by further increases in the debt limit.

It is a vote of protest against these grandiose schemes for more and more spending which jeopardize our ability to finance absolutely necessary increases in costly military defense.

It is a vote of protest against the zealous advocates of more and more governmental foreign missionary efforts who, I am sure, would be somewhat dismayed and possibly more moderate in their demands if they had to rely on foreign-missions-Sunday free-will offerings instead of having easy recourse to tax funds or deficit Federal spending.

It is a vote of protest against Congressional failure to come more effectively to grips with the threat to debt limitation always present in vast annual carryovers of appropriated funds.

Finally, it is a vote of protest against the tardy twinges of conscience and remorse which assail us whenever the issue of an increase in the debt limit arises, but which are all too often lacking when we face the one genuine inevitability—that more spending must always mean more taxes or more debt or both.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

(The bill reads as follows:)

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this act and ending on June 30, 1959, the public-debt limit set forth in the first sentence of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, shall be temporarily increased by $5,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, no amendment to the bill is in order except amendments offered by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, there are no committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9955) to provide for a temporary increase in the public-debt limit, pursuant to House Resolution 446, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill. I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 9955, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 1, line 7, after the word "by" strike out "$5 billion" and insert "$3 billion."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on the bill be postponed until next Thursday, in accordance with an agreement previously entered into with the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill we considered in the Committee of the Whole today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

## MILITARY DISCHARGE AND THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday afternoon, a drama took place in the Supreme Court that will vitally affect the lives of hundreds of ex-servicemen. Before the bench that day were two cases, that of John Henry Harmon and Howard Abramowitz, both men who had performed their military duties in an exemplary manner, and whose records were without blemish.

Both had been summarily discharged as undesirable despite their honorable service records solely on the basis of their activities as civilians, before their military service began.

Harmon and Abramowitz appealed their cases up through the machinery for redress that the Military Establishment provides, and were at each step denied any change in the character of their discharges. Not until Harmon took his case to the Federal court did the Army reconsider its position—then upgrading his discharge to general—still a less than honorable discharge.

On Wednesday, after living for years with the social stigma and deprivation of legal rights attached to a less than honorable discharge, both men had reached the highest and the final seat of justice. And there, before the Supreme Court of the United States, counsel for the defendant, Secretary of the Army Brucker, admitted that the Justice Department had advised the Army that it had no authority to issue a discharge based on civilian conduct—a statement that was in fact a confession of error.

My colleagues, this body passed a bill, H. R. 8772 now pending before the Senate Armed Services Committee, in the last session which would provide machinery for ex-servicemen who had been tendered a less than honorable discharge to redeem themselves by allowing them to petition for a new type of general discharge after 3 years of commendable postservice civilian conduct. During the short debate on the bill, a number of its supporters are on record as saying that the bill did not go far enough. Clearly, it did not.

In fact, it may seem that in a backhanded manner, the House of Representatives has almost endorsed the very thing which the Justice Department has advised is unauthorized, and by implication, unconstitutional.

I sincerely hope that the other body will either reject or strongly revise the bill before it, and that the Members of the House will have a further opportunity to participate in the writing of equitable legislation.

## SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD NOT MEAN FORCED RETIREMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, of the several bills amending the Social Security Act which I have introduced in this session, the one that will most crucially affect the greatest number of people is H. R. 9842, which will raise the limit on earnings for social security recipients from the present $1,200 to $5,000.

My district in Los Angeles is the home of many more retired people than is average, and for this reason I have both a special interest in the problems of our older citizens, and perhaps a better opportunity to see and to appreciate those problems than would be possible with a more diverse constituency. Invariably, people who are receiving social security benefits who speak or write to me—and many do—feel strongly that the income limitation is unfair, that it opposes their natural desire to continue as productive a life as possible and most important, that it prevents them from augmenting an inadequate income.

A system that in effect penalizes beneficiaries by reducing benefits each month in which they earn more than $80 is to me, quite frankly, an unjust system, and must naturally depress incentive to work. Is it any wonder that many who have spent years contributing to the social security fund cannot understand why the more they work, the more their Government, which contributed nothing to the fund, reduces the benefit that they have earned. Such a policy could only be understandable if it were realistic; but it is not. By raising the earning limit to $5,000, however, my bill will give beneficiaries an opportunity to provide a decent living for themselves, and restore to them the sense of self-respect that they had known as productive members of their community.

Since H. R. 9842 was introduced early in the session, I have had some reaction to it from organized labor. Originally many unions were opposed to provisions allowing any outside earnings because of the possible unfair advantage that employers would take of older workers through "wage cutting" devices. The merit of this argument is pointed up by one Washington, D. C., employer who is publicly recruiting older workers with the bold assertion that they need not lose their social security benefits by coming to work for him, because he will see to it that they are not paid more than $1,200 in a year.

There are two alternatives to combat this exploitation. First, to eliminate allowed outside earnings altogether, in which case we would incur the obligation to see that social security paid enough to recipients for them to maintain a reasonable minimum standard of living. Since obviously it does not, the only answer is then to raise the earning limit to a figure that will discourage wage cutting and will make a decent living standard possible for beneficiaries. I believe that nothing below $5,000 will accomplish this.

In periods of unemployment, such as we have now, there is a natural inclination on the part of some to oppose any proposals which would increase the number of people in the labor market. I state quite frankly to them that to me, this is the kind of fear that a President of the United States referred to in his words, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The answer to such fear is not to restrict the labor market, but to affirm with action the philosophy that our economy must obligate itself to full employment, and to insure the opportunity for all to work who desire to do so within the limits of their need and ability. Social security should not mean forced retirement.

## BILL FOR RECORDING OF LIENS BY COAST GUARD

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to revise the Coast Guard registration of certain undocumented vessels in order to provide for notation of liens, mortgages and other encumbrances on the reverse side of the certificate of award, and to further provide for the issuance of a duplicate certificate to remain on board the vessel, while the original is held by the lending bank.

The Coast Guard has advised me that it has no authority under existing law for the recording of mortgages or for the notation of a lien or other encumbrance on the so-called certificate of award, and the legislation which I have introduced today is designed to provide this necessary authority.

Mr. Speaker, in the last decade the number of pleasure craft in operation in the United States has nearly tripled—from 2½ million in 1947 to more than 7 million today. Last year about 30 million persons took part in recreational boating on the waterways of our country. This is nearly 17 percent of all persons living in the continental United States, according to the most recent Bureau of the Census report.

It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that this boating activity represents a tremendous investment on the part of American boat owners. During the calendar year 1956, about $1¼ billion was spent at the retail level for new and used boats, accessories, safety equipment, fuel, insurance, docking, maintenance, and so forth. A substantial portion of this amount, of course, is represented by purchases which were made on credit.

And this brings us to the necessity for the legislation which I have introduced today. At the present time there is no way that a lien against a boat can be appropriately indicated on its title papers. This has serious implications in connection with the problems that arise when transferring title and certificate of ownership from one owner to another.

Because of the lack of adequate title transfer and lien recording devices, boat owners, boat purchasers, marine dealers and lenders have serious problems. The boat owner is not adequately protected against transfer of title in cases of theft

and expenses incurred against his boat when not in his possession. The new purchaser of a boat is not adequately protected against liens and charges against a new boat when he cannot search the title before he purchases the craft. Similarly, the marine dealer, when accepting a boat in trade and reselling the boat to a new purchaser, is not adequately protected against the liens which were incurred prior to his obtaining possession of the boat. The marine-service man is not adequately protected for services performed on a boat when not in the hands of the rightful owner or when not paid prior to transfer of title.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the present situation has made the financing of boats unnecessarily difficult. Because there is no adequate lien recording system in the boating industry, lenders generally have been very reluctant to engage in mass financing or purchases such as the automobile business has experienced. Lending institutions feel, and understandably so, that they must be extremely careful in financing the purchase of a boat in order to make sure that there are no prior liens outstanding.

In providing that the form of the certificate of award be revised to include notation of lien, the bill which I offer will entail no additional burdensome detail for the United States Coast Guard. In the case of new boats, under existing law the Coast Guard requires that a builder's statement be submitted to them with the request for the issuance of a certificate of award, while in the case of used boats the certificate of award originally issued must be submitted with the request for a change in the registered owner.

In either case, it will be a simple matter to forward with the request for the certificate of award a copy of the security instrument setting forth the lien holder and the amount of lien so that this information can be included in the preparation of the certificate of award.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that Congress take this necessary step to stay abreast of the tremendous increase in recreational boating and the demands which accompany this increase.

## JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE (JAYCEE) WEEK

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House of Representatives to National Jaycee Week, which is being celebrated by some 200,000 young men between the ages of 21 and 35 in over 3,500 communities in these United States.

This is the week that the attention of all the people in this great country should be turned to the accomplishments of young men as exemplified by the honors bestowed upon the 10 outstanding young men of the United States by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce this past Saturday in Phoenix, Ariz. These 10 young men were symbols of the truly significant contributions to society that are being made every day not only in the United States but in all the countries of the free world.

During Jaycee Week we honor this distinguished and enterprising organization which has grown from a mere handful of young men who realized the need for an organization based on the principles of "leadership training through community service," in the short span of some 38 years, to an organization that has become one of the most vital currents in the stream of American life. The Junior Chamber of Commerce can well be proud of its accomplishments. They have sponsored such notable projects as the Voice of Democracy Contest, which enables youngsters of high school age to tell the world their views on our democratic way of life. They have given the youth of this Nation the opportunity to become better citizens and to learn true sportsmanship through competition in the fields of golf, tennis, and driving contests and have backed the need for physical fitness in the youth of today. However, they have not limited their activities to youth and have sponsored and demanded better government on the local, State, and national levels. They have continually improved their communities through building programs and by constantly urging their fellow citizens to study and be aware of their Government and to vote for what they believe in. They are among the leaders in seeing that the recommendations of the Hoover Commission are fully studied by our citizens.

I feel that we all owe the Jaycees a debt of gratitude for carrying out their fine program of leadership training in communities throughout the world and for helping produce through community service the leaders of the free world. This reaffirms our faith in the future of America. America cannot help but continue as the leader in these troubled times as long as we can look to young men of action who have not yet been overwhelmed by the magnitude of our problems and who have not traded their spirit of adventure or desire to improve their communities for the safer and more sophisticated path of clinging to the status quo or of sitting back and finding fault with what is being done by others.

Yes, we will continue to strengthen America with the vitality of youth as long as we have organizations such as the Junior Chamber of Commerce that firmly believe that, "the hope of the future lies in the hands of youth and action."

## ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ROBERT B. ANDERSON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an address by Secretary of the Treasury Anderson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following are the remarks by Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson at a salute-to-Eisenhower dinner, Sheraton-Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass., 6 p. m., Monday, January 20, 1958:

I am honored to join tonight with you and countless other Americans in saluting the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower. I count it one of the great privileges of my life to be a part of his administration.

I am also honored to have had the opportunity of serving with so many outstanding sons of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, both in the Congress and in the executive branch of the Government.

Massachusetts ranks high in its contributions to the historical development and the future of this Nation. The Republican Party is proud of the distinguished men and women from the great State of Massachusetts, at the top levels of both the Congress and in the executive branch of the Government.

As we pay tribute to our great President, let us also honor those in his Republican administration, who have contributed to the peace, security, and better well-being of the American people in the past 5 years. It is a record of accomplishment which deserves the continued support of all Americans.

Today, we are face to face with many of the problems of the world with which we have grown accustomed, but we stand at the dawn of man's breakthrough into outer space.

Four centuries ago, the knowledge that mankind lived on a ball whirling in space gradually permeated the 16th century world. Men looked out across the oceans and into the skies and felt a new fear of unknown distances and unknown shores.

But there was time, then, to probe the new lands; time for the sciences of navigation, geography, engineering, astronomy, to gradually reduce the personal dangers of sailing out beyond the sheltered coasts. Nations continued to rise and fall, but geography and natural barriers still played almost as important a part in determining the course of history as they had in the time of the Caesars. Protected by two oceans, our own country grew to maturity without fear of foreign invasion.

Four centuries beyond this age of exploration, the vastness of outer space has become the new world, and each nation's concept of national security has taken on a wholly new meaning. In the space age which we have now entered, the dangerous first voyages and discoveries are no longer a matter of individual adventure or national pride; success is required of us as a Nation and as a people.

In this situation—unprecedented in the history of civilization—we may in all humility recognize the goodness of providence which has placed at the head of our country a man whose moral integrity, warm humanity, experience in world affairs, and capacity for world leadership have made him a symbol of peace to free men everywhere.

As in previous critical times, the President's recent messages have been inspired by his fundamental belief in democracy—a belief in the values and in the ultimate triumph of the democratic process. The programs which have been outlined for meeting the challenge of Soviet scientific achievement show an overwhelming devotion to the basic goal of providing an adequate protection while insuring the strength, the resilience and the power for growth of our free society. Now as always, the President's proposals reflect the determination of our Nation to remain strong in ways that keep the peace. But at the same time, they

reflect an equally firm determination to protect the basic strengths of our economy and our society.

What is the strength of America? What is the American future? These are questions which every American must ask himself. They are questions which only the people themselves can answer—and the whole world is waiting to hear what that answer will be.

Let me start with the first question: What is the strength of America?

We have the most powerful productive engine that the world has ever known.

We have the highest standard of living—not for a few, but for many.

We are a Nation of believers in the future of America, and from our earliest days as a Nation we have faced that future without fear.

We are a Nation dedicated to friendship with others, in actions as well as words.

Yet our most valuable export, and the one prized by others, is still—as it was in 1776—the concept of freedom and humanity for which our Nation stands. In recent years, as the threat of Communist enslavement has grown, we have extended a helping hand to others. We haven't just talked freedom—we have entered into arrangements for mutual security, and the free world has attained a strength which only an alliance of independent and self-respecting peoples can achieve. No free nation is cowering in fear of America, and no free nation ever will.

These are the things for which America stands. They are so familiar, so enduring, that they tend to be taken for granted—by others, as well as by ourselves. Yet the true realists are those who see with clear unbiased vision the source of America's strength—economic, political, and spiritual. That source is freedom—manifested in every phase of the life we have built for ourselves here in our great country.

If we could take a cross section of America on any working day, what aspect of our life might stand out as most characteristic of the way of living we have achieved here? I believe that it would be, not something dramatic—not something stemming from the leaders of Government or industry—but the simple fact that every day millions of independent decisions are being made in our economy. They are being made by businessmen, consumers, housewives, workers, students—by everyone participating in the life of our Nation. They are being made in an atmosphere of freedom, self-confidence, and self-respect which would quite probably be unbelievable to someone knowing only the regimented existence of a police state.

Is this a good thing? Is it something we want to preserve? Can we preserve it, in the face of the Soviet threat?

I believe that America will give a ringing yes to each one of these questions. Widely ranging private initiative and resourcefulness have made our country what it is. They represent the solid foundation underlying the confidence of our people in the future. They constitute a vital aspect of defense which the Soviet rulers have not even bothered to understand, much less to emulate.

This, then, is our greatest strength—not our material achievements, not alone our defense position at a given period of time, but the unlimited scope for free minds to push forward the frontiers of knowledge—to compare, to probe, to experiment, to question, and then to probe again. Mistakes have been and will be made—changes of direction will often be required—but out of the millions of decisions which a free people make every day comes the invincible strength of America.

And what of the American future?

Right now, our economy is passing through a readjustment in many sectors of business. In some areas, there is evidence that the readjustment has run its course; in others, it may be of longer duration. In the daily decisions of businessmen, investors, consumers, this readjustment is being carefully weighed, as it properly should be. We have had an unprecedented prosperity; the readjustments now going on are in part the consequences of a period of rapid expansion during the past several years. But our basic strengths remain unimpaired; they leave no doubt that we have the ingredients for a healthy economy and one that will expand to meet all essential needs, military and civilian.

It would be a mistake, I feel, for anyone to sell our dynamic economy short for any protracted period. We have the assets for keeping our productive engine operating at a high level. We have the manpower and the skills. We have a growing population with growing needs and demands. We have a belief in the future—and a confidence that the future can bring better living for all of us. We have, in addition, a willingness in our people and our Government to use the mechanisms at our command so as to employ our economic strength in a way which will assure a reasonable rate of sustainable growth.

We are justified in looking to the future with confidence because of the factors making for economic soundness at the present time. What are these factors? We need to review them in order to approach our new tasks as a nation with assurance and vigor.

First of all, we have the industrial capacity, the skilled manpower, and the managerial talent for producing an expanding volume of goods and services. This is a factor whose importance can scarcely be exaggerated. Our industrial capacity is sufficient to meet all essential defense and civilian needs without undue strain—providing we use our resources wisely.

The postwar decade as a whole has been marked by an extraordinary volume of business investment in plant and equipment. From 1946 through 1957, such investment totaled over $300 billion—a dollar outlay equal to United States military expenditures during World War II, 1941–1945. Moreover, industrial capacity will be further enlarged and modernized this year. Business plans for fixed investment in the calendar year 1958 exceed actual spending in any previous years except 1956 and 1957. In short, we are continuing to improve and expand our basic economic mechanism—already by far the most productive and most flexible in the world today.

Growth in the labor force—a part of our growth in population—will provide three-quarters of a million new workers within the next year.

Output per man-hour in the private nonfarm sector of the economy has been increasing at an average rate of more than 2½ percent a year for the postwar period. Agricultural productivity has been increasing even more rapidly. As a result in part of the readjustment now going on in the economy, incentives are currently very strong for reducing costs and maximizing efficiency. There are many reasons to expect that productivity gains in the period just ahead will at least match the long-term growth rate.

Along with these capacities, we have an efficient financial system fully capable of providing the short- and long-term financing necessary for high and rising levels of activity.

These are some of the productive resources of our Nation, vitalized and nourished by the resourcefulness and energy of the American people. On the other side—calling upon these resources for fulfillment—are the increasing expenditures to ensure a strong defense position, the increasing opportunities opened up by science and technological advance, a more rapid pace of activity in certain State, local, and Federal programs, and the continued desires and drives of a growing population to augment individual living standards and maintain national well-being.

Viewed in perspective, our long-term problem is surely not one of too little demand for the available output of American industry. It is, rather, a wise use of our capacity so as to meet competing demands without endangering the source of our strength—the vitality of the American economy.

Turning for a moment to the short-term situation, there are a number of factors which indicate that the present loss of momentum in the economy may not be of long duration.

First, numerous adjustments in output, materials, prices, and manpower utilization have already taken place. Likewise, reduction of inventories which has already occurred in many lines has brought a better balance of market supply with demand.

In the financial markets, there have been prompt and responsive readjustments in such factors as the relation of the yields of common stocks and bonds and in interest-rate levels. Credit availability is adjusting itself to provide more opportunities for investment in new projects and the enlargement of others.

Revival in residential housing markets and in residential construction has been a sustaining influence in construction activity for recent months, and with loanable funds now more readily available, housing activity may well be an element of strength in the period ahead. Added to this will be an increasing pace of activity in certain Federal programs, such as highway building, and in a number of State and local activities involving various types of community facilities.

The agencies of the Government will be administering their defense and domestic programs so as to provide a maximum contribution to employment, production, and purchasing power.

Most important of all, however, is the fact that confidence of the American people has remained strong during the adjustment taking place in domestic activity and in the face of disturbing events in the international scene and this confidence is, in my belief, consistently increasing.

It is against this background of strength and confidence in the American economy and among the American people that the President has presented his program in answer to the Soviet challenge. The President's budget is a practical and prudent document that will add significantly to our military strength while recognizing that "the productivity, the adaptability of the American economy is the solid foundation stone of our security structure."

In addition to outlining an effective program for Federal action, the President has made it clear that we shall continue to adhere to those principles of governmental and fiscal soundness which contribute so much to the economic stamina of our Nation.

These principles, as they have recently been set forth by the President, are economy in expenditures; efficiency in operations; promotion of growth and stability in a free-enterprise economy; a vigorous Federal-State system; concern for human well-being; priority of national security over lesser needs; revenues adequate to cover expenditures and permit debt reduction during periods of high business activity; and, finally, simplification of the tax structure and reduction of taxes when possible.

These are the basic guides of sound government policy which the President again emphasized in the budget message of January 13. No one of these objectives has been pushed aside or minimized in the face of the Soviet challenge. Instead, they have been restated strongly and fearlessly as the principles we live by and intend to go on living by in the future.

The very statement of these principles however, underscores the fact that the actual power of decision in this country rests with

millions of free people. Economy in Government, efficiency in administration, giving up lesser needs to achieve a sound defense program, these and every one of the other goals outlined by the President depend for their success on a nationwide acceptance of responsibility for the affairs of Government. In the last analysis, governmental policies take effect in our democratic system because we, as individuals, have decided that they are good and right. The President and the Congress can point the way. They can set up programs and these can be enacted into law. But, as our history has proved many times, very little progress can be achieved in the long run without the understanding and support of the people of the Nation. Facing up to problems, self-discipline, actually helping to shape the course of government; these are the responsibilities of every citizen in a free country.

This is no light burden. Every American is behind the President in his determination to devote the necessary resources and funds to building an adequate defense. But we need to stand behind him also in his determination to build that defense without weakening the economy.

This means, of course, that some peacetime programs will require strict evaluation and impose the necessity for making difficult choices. Our defense requirements increase, rather than lessen, the importance of prudent and economical use of our resources in every area. They increase, rather than lessen, the need for prudent financial management. As the President has said with respect to our military position: "Our real problem, then, is not our strength today; it is rather the vital necessity of action today to insure our strength tomorrow."

Let us never forget that the responsibility for the ultimate success of actions taken by our Government in the months ahead lies with the people—with each one of us. Each one of us has a responsibility for understanding the issues before the country, for thoughtful appraisal of them, and, finally, for participation in their solution. Only if we accept these responsibilities can our Nation fulfill the task of leadership in the cause of peace and freedom which our President has so clearly and forcefully set before us.

The tasks which lie ahead of us demand responsibility of all the people. They cry out for willingness to lay aside all that is trivial and for unity in all that is important.

The Republican Party must continue to fulfill its task of leadership in the cause of peace and freedom. It must stand united in support of those things which bring us protection and undergird us with economic strength.

Our dedication must be to responsible action. Our efforts must be directed toward unity of purpose. Our achievements must add up to the accomplishment of the task which the President has set for us—the betterment of mankind in a world of security and peace.

## EXTENSION OF PRESENT TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the second of a series of speeches I plan to make in an effort to keep my colleagues in the House advised of the misleading propaganda being used by the administration and the several departments of the Government concerned in an effort to force approval of a 5-year extension of our present trade agreements, with added authority to the President to further reduce import duties.

This past week, I severely criticized the State Department for using the taxpayers' money, provided in their appropriation, for the publicaiton of a booklet under the caption, "Together We Are Strong," which contained a mass of misinformation and downright falsehoods in an effort to mislead the American people into thinking that it was necessary to extend these trade agreements and give the President added power to further complicate the problems facing a great majority of our domestic producers who are presently meeting too much competition from foreign articles made by underpaid workmen with a lower standard of living than the standard of wages and working conditions set up for our American workmen.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects to another Federal Department which is anxiously trying to edge into the Hollywood show the great Eric Johnston is organizing to further mislead the American people.

I refer to the Commerce Department and particularly to the bluenosed aristocrat from Massachusetts, Sinclair Weeks, head of the Department of Commerce.

One of the amusing acts in the great Eric's show will be enough to create a belly-laugh. Imagine if you can, my colleagues, this traditional protectionist trying to out new deal Roosevelt, Truman, and President Eisenhower. Such change of face on the part of this new Sinclair is enough to cause his Pilgrim ancestors to turn over in their graves.

Here is what Mr. Weeks proposes. He has already advised the Members of Congress, under date of January 13, 1958, that he has been selected as Chairman of the Trade Policy Committee established by Executive Order on November 25, 1957. This Committee, he goes on to inform the Congress, is composed of the Secretaries of Commerce, State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor.

I fail to find anything in our present tariff laws, including our reciprocal trade agreements, that empowers the President to create another bureau of government, at a great expense to the taxpayers, which would largely duplicate the present duties of the Tariff Commission and add numerous jobs to the already overloaded Federal payroll. He further explains that the committee is set up to advise the President on the action he should take on the findings of the Tariff Commission affecting import duties and quota limitations.

I begin to understand now why the President is asking for money in the current budget to build added office facilities at the White House. No doubt, the great Sinclair wants office space there for his experts who will determine what advice the President should have. Here I would like to make the point that I know of no group better able to give him advice than his own self-appointed Tariff Commission. There is no sound logic in setting up a duplicate bureau.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my remarks some excerpts from Mr. Weeks' letter to the Members of Congress outlining the duties of his recently created Committee as follows:

It will be the responsibility of the Trade Policy Committee to review the reports (findings and recommendations) of the Tariff Commission submitted to the President relating to escape-clause cases and relating to review of prior escape-clause modifications of tariff concessions; and the Trade Policy Committee will make recommendations to the President as to what action he should take on such report.

The President already has a committee on reciprocity. Mr. Weeks fails to say that this new Committee which he is to head will supersede the reciprocity committee. It is just possible that both groups may continue to function and the President will not lack information. I would like to make a point that he is already getting too much of the wrong kind of information.

A careful reading of this excerpt would indicate that this illegitimate group would not only advise the President on current orders of the Tariff Commission, but would review all prior action taken by the Tariff Commission under the escape-clause provision. Why all this duplication? What better advice could the President need than the records of the Tariff Commission that are based on sworn testimony and the facts presented?

It is interesting to note how they propose to nullify the present escape-clause provisions in the act. I quote further:

From time to time the Tariff Commission will present a report for Presidential action. The Executive Secretary of the Trade Policy Committee will receive these reports and circulate copies to each member of the committee. Thereafter, a meeting of the committee will be convened for discussion of the Tariff Commission report and the various views submitted. The product of this meeting will be a report to the President presenting the comprehensive viewpoint of the committee, including concurring and divergent views. The report will include a specific recommendation for Presidential action.

It is interesting to note how this unauthorized group, composed of the Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of State, the Secretaries of Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor propose to invade and subvert the powers of the Congress to regulate commerce, to make treaties, and to fix tariffs.

I quote:

From time to time the Trade Policy Committee will be presented with problems relating to basic policy decisions as contemplated by the Executive order. These subjects, in the form of proposals, shall be circulated to all members of the Trade Policy Committee and meetings will be held promptly at the request of any member of the Trade Policy Committee, culminating in a report to the President indicating concurring and divergent views and with specific recommendation for Presidential action.

At the request of any member of the Trade Policy Committee, the Committee will be convened to discuss any policy issue, which may arise in the administration of the trade-agreements program. To facilitate the task of selecting policy issues for Trade Policy Committee consideration, all documents of the Trade Agreements Committee (e. g., position papers for GATT meetings)

will be transmitted to the Executive Secretary of the Trade Policy Committee for circulation to its members.

The staff of the Trade Policy Committee will include an Executive Secretary of the Committee located in the Department of Commerce.

SINCLAIR WEEKS, *Chairman,*
*Trade Policy Committee.*

Congress has never formally ratified the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade—better known as GATT—with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. Here is plain proof of their intention to continue this illegitimate action in completely ignoring the Congress.

I urge you, my colleagues, to join hands now in an effort to regain your authority when the trade agreements come up for renewal at this session.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought Eric Johnston was going to take over the foreign giveaway program.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inform the gentleman from Iowa that Mr. Johnston has been added to the staff of the President's office for the sole purpose of putting on a show to put across the 5-year extension of our present trade agreements. He is already on the job getting it organized.

---

## WHAT IT TAKES TO MAKE A SUCCESS IN FARMING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time in order to report to my colleagues and the Congress on a progress report on the subject of just what it takes to make a success in farming. I want to call attention to a publication of the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Information Bulletin No. 180, which is entitled "Farm Resources Needed for Specified Income Levels." I have been requesting this study for 6 years, and I am happy that my insistence has, at last, been rewarded. I am pleased today to be able to make some remarks concerning this new bulletin which the Agriculture Research Service has just issued. To those of you who might wish to obtain copies of this bulletin, I repeat, it is Agricultural Information Bulletin No. 180.

This report deals with these questions in terms of specified types of farms in six widely separated areas: Cotton-beef farms in the Piedmont of South Carolina; dairy-cotton farms in western Tennessee; cotton farms in eastern Oklahoma; dairy farms in eastern Wisconsin; wheat-beef farms in the Central Plains of Kansas; and wheat farms in the Triangle-Judith Basin of Montana. An additional study, I understand, will deal with the Columbia Basin in Washington.

Just what do you have to have in order to start farming today? Prior to this new study, I doubt that anyone really knew. The attraction of rural life has always been alluring to folks who live in urban confines or have felt the oppression of cosmopolitan canyons of stone and brick and steel. Many have migrated to the country without knowledge of farming and attempted to succeed in a field of enterprise about which they knew nothing. They have failed. They have failed miserably and have become members of a class that many of us in the Congress sincerely want to help. It is futile, however, to discuss the small farmer or try to discuss the plight of the family-size farm without a full knowledge of just what is involved.

Bulletin No. 180 serves to give us prior knowledge. It should be further developed to the end that those who aspire to enter farming might know what is required—and also that those of us who want to protect and assist them know what we are doing.

Certainly we need to know what financial and intellectual resources are required when we attempt to help a man succeed in farming through the Farmers' Home Administration. There we are trying to help a man who cannot get credit elsewhere.

We do him little good if we grant him a Federal credit on an enterprise that cannot possibly succeed.

We need benchmarks for our judgments. Bulletin 180 promises to supply them. For instance, the report shows that to realize annual earnings of $2,500, the investment needed for farms in specific situations varies from $14,000 for an eastern Oklahoma cotton farm to more than $89,000 for a Montana wheat farm. A similar level of earnings can be made with investments of $26,900 for a South Carolina Piedmont cotton-beef farm, $24,000 for a dairy-cotton farm in western Tennessee, $37,000 for a Wisconsin dairy farm, and $80,000 for a beef-wheat farm in central Kansas.

To realize annual earnings of $3,500, farm investments range from $17,000 for an Oklahoma cotton farm to $122,000 for a Montana wheat farm.

The differences in necessary investment are due to the widely varying proportions of investment and labor required to produce a given level of operator earnings under different systems of farming. The Oklahoma cotton farm, for example, requires less than one-sixth of the investment of the Montana wheat farm, but the amount spent annually for labor on the cotton farm is more than 6 times that spent on the wheat farm.

I really feel that a perusal of Bulletin 180 will astound you and I commend it to your reading.

I strongly feel that it will revise all of your thinking about the entire farm picture. It will color your approach to farm legislation and eventually assist in the appraisal of every phase that relates to our agricultural industry and the underlying philosophies which support it.

I suppose it is a part of our American heritage for us to recall the time when a man could start a successful rural business with "40 acres and a mule"—and again it is a part of the legend of the West to refer to a successful farmer as one who "came here 50 years ago with nuthin' but a poke on a stick." Those times are past.

All of us have seen a mechanical revolution take place in our own lifetime. The radio, automobile, airplane, the vast spread and use of electricity, the development of home appliances—everywhere we look we see our way of life completely changed from that of our grandfathers. We look forward to another great revolution generated by nuclear physics and the atom age.

Nor has this change left the farmer untouched—to compete and succeed, he must have at least the essentials of mechanical help. The farm equipment industry has become one of the giants of our time. I can remember as a youth, watching early day combines being pulled through the wheatfields of eastern Washington by horses. It was quite a sight to see 32 horses harnessed together, hauling one of those pioneering combines designed to speed up the business of harvesting wheat.

I saw horses replaced by the steam tractor, and then in the late 1920's the steam tractor gave way to the diesel tractor and the one-man combine.

What has happened to wheat raising has happened to all agriculture. To succeed he must keep up with the times; he must meet the efficiencies of other farms as they acquire and use new methods and inventions. This does take money and the knowledge that must attend the use of these new equipments.

I would also like to pay my respects to those who prepared this and thank Dr. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service; Mr. John M. Brewster, agricultural economist, Farm Economics Research Division; Mr. James A. Munger, agricultural economist, also of the Research Service; and the following economists of the Farm Economics Research Division of the Agricultural Research Service: Mr. C. P. Butler, South Carolina; Mr. S. W. Atkins, Tennessee; Mr. W. F. Lagrone, Oklahoma; Mr. Emil Rauchenstein, Wisconsin; Mr. C. W. Nauheim, Kansas; and Mr. D. C. Myrick and Mr. Howard Hjort, Montana.

If we would help this and future generations to succeed in the business of farming, we need to fully know what success in farming requires.

The following is a letter received from Dr. Shaw:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
*Washington, D. C., January 14, 1953.*

Hon. WALT HORAN,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORAN: I am enclosing a copy of Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 180, Farm Resources Needed for Specified Income Levels. I thought you would be interested in receiving this report because of your interest in the size of farm needed in different areas to obtain fairly adequate farm incomes. This report covers the six farming areas shown on page 8. A more detailed study of sizes of farms and related problems was undertaken in the Columbia Basin, and a separate report is being prepared on that area.

You will note that the operator earnings levels in the attached report represent the net income available to the operator for his

labor and management after deducting a wage allowance for unpaid family labor and an interest charge on the farm investment.

The report shows that to realize annual earnings of $2,500, the investment needed for farms in specific situations varies from $14,000 for an eastern Oklahoma cotton farm to more than $89,000 for a Montana wheat farm. A similar level of earnings can be made with investments of $26,900 for a South Carolina Piedmont cotton-beef farm, $24,000 for a dairy-cotton farm in western Tennessee, $37,000 for a Wisconsin dairy farm, and $80,000 for a beef-wheat farm in central Kansas.

To realize annual earnings of $3,500, farm investments range from $17,000 for an Oklahoma cotton farm to $122,000 for a Montana wheat farm.

The differences in necessary investment are due to the widely varying proportions of investment and labor required to produce a given level of operator earnings under different systems of farming. The Oklahoma cotton farm, for example, requires less than one-sixth the investment of the Montana wheat farm, but the amount spent annually for labor on the cotton farm is more than 6 times that spent on the wheat farm.

The sums available for family living on farms with $2,500 annual operator earnings varied, depending upon how much equity the family had in the farm. If the families became full owners of the farms under an acquisition plan involving both a real-estate loan and a 6-year non-real-estate loan equal to half the market value of livestock and equipment, the amount available for family living before retiring the non-real-estate loan was about $2,000 to $3,000 annually. After retiring this loan, the amount available for family living ranged from $3,100 to $3,800. After retiring the real-estate loan, income available for family living rose to a range of $3,500 to $6,400. These conclusions are useful for determining safe credit commitments.

Sincerely yours,

B. T. SHAW,
*Administrator.*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, on tomorrow, for 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 1 hour, tomorrow.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLLAND and to include a speech.

Mr. PORTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI) in one instance and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. BEAMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania and include a speech by Hon. Sherman Adams, assistant to the President of the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT (at the request of Mr. MILLS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. MILLS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HENDERSON and to include extraneous matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 22, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1489. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 6911 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the grade, procurement, and transfer of aviation cadets"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1490. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Facilities Corporation, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the period February 1 through June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 312); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1491. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a report in connection with the restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts, pursuant to the act of July 25, 1957 (31 U. S. C. 701–708); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1492. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the Veterans' Administration's report on its activities in the disposal of foreign excess property, for the period January 1, 1957, through December 31, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1493. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the third annual report of activities and research conducted by or under contract with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to encourage the distribution of domestically produced fishery products for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 376), as amended by the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 119); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1494. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of Thui Yet Chow, A–5239727, involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10146. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Seventh Annual Report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production. (Rept. No. 1289.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. (See S. Rept. 1172.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1290. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 10146. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 10148. A bill to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 10149. A bill to amend the act of June 7, 1918, to provide for the notation of liens, mortgages, and other encumbrances on the certificate of award issued for a vessel under that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 10150. A bill to incorporate the Navy Wives Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 10151. A bill to provide certain flood control measures on the Chicopee River in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 10152. A bill to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of iconostas and the doors thereof for use by certain religious organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 10153. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a State, in extending social security coverage to its employees by an agreement under section 218 of such act, may not exclude services compensated on a fee basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10154. A bill to empower the Judicial Conference to study and recommend changes in and additions to the rules of practice and procedure in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 10155. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Incular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 10156. A bill to provide appropriate public recognition of the gallant action of the steamship *Meredith Victory* in the December 1950 evacuation of Hungnam, Korea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 10157. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide lump-sum payment for the unused sick leave to the credit of an officer or employee immediately prior to his separation from the service on retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 10158. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make special livestock loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H. R. 10159. A bill to establish a Commission on the Establishment of a United States Academy of Science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 10160. A bill to revise and modernize the fish and game laws of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 10161. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that that portion of the Ryukyu Islands over which the United States exercises jurisdiction shall be regarded as a separate quota area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10162. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10163. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Fair and Exposition, to be held in July 1959 at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 10164. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 10165. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the County of Sacramento, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 10166. A bill to extend and liberalize the direct home-loan program for veterans, to extend the guaranteed home-loan program, to provide special assistance to paraplegic veterans under the direct home-loan program, to stimulate the making of direct farm-housing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 10167. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10168. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to release cotton acreage from the acreage reserve for the 1958 crop year, to establish a substitute for the acreage reserve program for cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10169. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for price support at parity for the first 3,500 bushels of wheat produced on each farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 10170. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 10171. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 10172. A bill to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by the act of Congress, for the appointment of members thereof, transfer of functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10173. A bill to provide for the transfer of title to certain land at Sand Island, T. H., to the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 10174. A bill to amend the Lanham Act to provide a preference in the purchase of housing thereunder to the widows of veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 10175. A bill to provide for posting information in post offices with respect to registration and voting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. R. 10176. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to clearly authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to waive the requirements of section 10 thereof under such conditions and to such extent as he may prescribe in connection with inspection under the act prior to January 1, 1959; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10177. A bill to create a presumption that certain impairment of health caused by hypertension or heart disease of a Federal or District of Columbia employee is incurred in line of duty for purposes of certain retirement and disability compensation laws or systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 10178. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide additional Federal support to States and certain nongovernmental agencies to enable them to carry out adequate demonstration programs for the vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10179. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 10180. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to encourage the training of additional engineers and scientists and the expansion of facilities for engineering and science education by providing scholarships and fellowships for engineering and science students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. J. Res. 506. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. J. Res. 507. Joint resolution to establish the Verrazano-Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. J. Res. 508. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the second Sunday in January each year as National Family Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. J. Res. 509. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York, N. Y., from May 7 to May 17, 1958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10147. A bill to permit Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, Member of Congress, authorization to accept the award of Cross of Commander of the Order of Orange-Nassau conferred upon him by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 10181. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Drina Sinovcic and Vincence (Vincent) Sinovcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 10182. A bill for the relief of Harry (Zwi) Goldenberg (Sponder); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10183. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sumiko Igawa Nomura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 10184. A bill for the relief of Fai Ying Chan (Chin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 10185. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Zsigmond Balla and daughter Julia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 10186. A bill for the relief of Jan Libiszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10187. A bill for the relief of Renata Falkiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 10188. A bill for the relief of Alexander Hahn and Suzanne Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10189. A bill for the relief of Adamantia Andrikopoulous (Pappas) Papavasiliou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 10190. A bill for the relief of Ashghen and Hagop Tozlian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 10191. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jack McGillivray Tedford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

361. Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin presented a petition adopted unanimously at the annual meeting of the Metal Treating Institute in Chicago on November 3, 1957, stating the position and attitude of the industry and its anxiety to cooperate and be of service in any activity in keeping with the skills and facilities of its members, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Address by Sherman Adams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

**HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and address:

Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, chairman of the Republican Congressional campaign committee, today urged the American people to read carefully the text of a speech by Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, if they want to keep the record straight on the difference between the Democrat and Republican Parties.

The Pennsylvania Republican said that of all the "good speeches delivered at Republican fund-raising dinners, the night of January 20, the speech of Mr. Adams is closest to the hearts of Republicans.

"It was a fighting Republican speech, and it set the record straight on just where the blame lies for the sorry mess this Nation was in when Republicans took over in 1953.

"Mr. Adams cites chapter and verse where Democrats failed the Nation in building a modern military defense. His proof is irrefutable and should be required reading for the chairman of the Democrat National Committee and his stable of political orators in Congress and elsewhere who have been so glib of late in glossing over the facts of our security.

"I commend Mr. Adams for his courage and intelligence in helping the Republican Party set the record straight. I am sure the American people will also."

---

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SHERMAN ADAMS, THE ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, DELIVERED AT THE MINNESOTA UNITED REPUBLICAN DINNER, LEAMINGTON HOTEL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MONDAY EVENING, JANUARY 20, 1958

Fellow Republicans, before I say I am glad to be here, I had better explain something.

For a New Hampshire man to develop a feeling of being at home, as far away as this, reminds me that we used to think of Minnesota as a pretty wild and woolly country. When I was a boy, the travel of an average American citizen was 300 miles a year. So, setting out for Minnesota was a pretty foolhardy venture, and nobody ever expected to see the traveler again.

Well, times have changed, and you in Minnesota and we of New England have come to adopt a more neighborly point of view. Of course we in New England celebrated our centennials long ago, before any of us were born. Although centennials with us are now celebrations of the Johnny-come-latelies, we nevertheless wholeheartedly share your pride in the achievement of the first 100 years of your great State of Minnesota.

The fact is, you Minnesotans are our kind of people.

As a onetime woodsman, I get a Paul Bunyan kind of zest when I recall from childhood that this region was covered with towering timber and, in lumber production, led all but two States in the Union.

So a woodsman from the other end of the Great Lakes senses kindred spirits and common values here. That's also why, perhaps, as I contemplate Minnesota of today and of earlier years, there comes to mind the defiant words of my own State's motto—"Live free or die." That resolute attitude accords with your traditions as well as mine.

So by our own restrained self-appraisal, we can agree that grit, character, and strength characterize the people of our two States. Now I also must grudgingly concede that these attributes are not ours alone. They belong as well to others.

Now, these past 5 years I have come to know a remarkable man. The great qualities I have mentioned, and many others, he possesses to a superlative degree. Born a Texan, he was raised a Kansan. An ardent admirer of Colorado and Georgia, for a short time a New Yorker, today he is a Pennsylvanian. And yet this man really belongs to every State and to all our people. Beyond that, he is beloved throughout the world and is a symbol of hope to all mankind. Though not from New Hampshire, nor from Minnesota, yet the grit, character and strength we prize in the people of our States this man has aplenty—as much as anyone I expect ever to know.

You know this man in some respects almost as well as I do; as leader of our party, as leader of our Nation and literally the leader of the Free World—our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

A few thoughts about him I would like to share with you this evening.

Because of recent miracles of science and technology, we live in the most dangerous, yet most promising, period of all the ages. In such a period our President means more to all of us than perhaps we realize.

This question will help make my meaning clear.

What is it that we the people want most of all?

Surely, foremost in all of us is one deep yearning: above all else, we want a lasting peace. We want an end to the tensions, suspicions and hatreds in the world. Coupled with this we want the arms race stopped. We want to turn to the betterment of all mankind the genius and vast wealth being consumed in ever greater amounts by devices of death and destruction.

This longing for peace relates directly to President Eisenhower.

For in matters of peace and war, no other man in our time has the rich experience, the wise understanding that he has. Nor has any other such confidence and respect of world leaders or his unshakable determination to build an enduring peace.

So it is that no other man in our time is as likely as he is to achieve a genuine peace.

Nor is any other as likely to save humanity from the holocaust of nuclear war.

For such a leader to guide us and the Free World in such a time, all of us should be profoundly thankful.

And next to peace, what do we want the most?

The answer, I believe, is strength.

We want military strength. We use it to keep peace while we build the peace.

We want economic strength. We need it to stay militarily strong. We need it to generate new opportunity for those who come after us.

We want spiritual and moral strength. This we need to maintain our will, our self-reliance, our confident enterprise on which economic vigor and growth depend.

I

Military strength: Who above all others in America today can best marshal that strength, is best equipped to direct it, and least likely to let petty considerations unbalance and erode it away?

Again, our President—one of the great military captains of all history.

Now, here, I have a few parenthetical observations.

Nowadays, back in Washington, hardly a day goes by but that some armchair strategist intones doom for America. Nor hardly a day goes by but that some political soothsayer first proclaims, then bemoans, American weakness. Disaster is too mild a word to describe our pitiful plight.

There is an interesting aspect to this. In large measure this professional shuddering comes from those whose attitude about defense has been dictated by political expediency.

Now I realize that the predicament of our political opposition calls for sympathy. They are driven unmercifully to find a political paste that will bind together their party of the North and their party of the South to give them the appearance of having common goals.

But, even so, they ought to know better than to keep on politicking with national defense. As a matter of fact, they ought to be called strictly to account by the American people for using this subject as party glue.

I'll say simply this: We Republicans greet the opposition on this battlefield with as much anticipation as on any other they can conjure up.

In such a contest, we have abundant ammunition.

We do not need to bring up the military catastrophe of Pearl Harbor nor the scientific catastrophe of losing our atomic secrets.

Nor do we need to dwell on policies that led to the Red invasion of Korea, nor the plight of our defenses when the invasion began, nor the handcuffs put upon our conduct of that war. We need not even refer to the tragic loss of China, nor the surrender of positions of freedom throughout the world.

We can also ignore at the moment the wasteful and crippling defense planning between World War II and the following war they couldn't end.

Right now, checking back only a year is enough.

Last year the President proposed $38½ billion for defense. The opposition sponsored a $2.5 billion cut. Too much for the military they said.

Now off they richochet again. The President's defense budget this year is about $39.5 billion. That's $3½ billion more than the opposition was willing to grant last year. Yet many of them are now whooping it up for more. Their cry indicates a no more objective appraisal of our defense needs than their cry 9 months ago to slash satellite, research and development, missile, and other defense programs

As for missiles, sputniks, space control and the like, I remind you of a significant fact:

Not until 1952—the last year of the Democratic national administration—did our country start spending even as little as a million dollars on long-range ballistic missiles. Today, 5 years later, we spend over a thousand times as much. Complacency? Maybe so—but whose? Penny-pinching in defense? Maybe—but whose? Failure to act in time to assure the Nation's safety? Perhaps. But whose failure was it?

I have another fact or two.

From World War II until 1953, our country's long-range ballistic missile program was as dead as the proverbial dodo. Meanwhile, the Soviets were going full speed ahead. In

those 8 critical postwar years our Government spent only $3½ million on these weapons. "M" for millions. That, my friends, averages out to about $437,000 a year. In only 2 years of the same period the previous administration spent $50 million for peanuts. That's 60 times more for peanuts than for long-range missiles.

Now, 1953 was the first postwar year that the opposition was relieved of its administrative responsibilities so it could devote its full energies to its real talent—just talking. At long last, the long-range missile program was taken out of the deep-freeze where President Eisenhower found it. He put life into it. He turned it quickly into a herculean effort.

From the $437,000 a year average from 1945 to 1953, the long-range missile program has zoomed to over a billion dollars a year. That is 2,000 times as much. There is no complacency in that kind of action.

Thor and Jupiter are 1,500-mile missiles. Neither one existed before this Republican administration. They were born 2 years ago. Yet already they are being put into production.

Atlas is a 5,000-mile missile. It was born 11 years ago. Now, that was fine. That action in 1946 showed vision, imagination and foresight. It should have put America ahead of the Soviets in long-range rocketry and sputniks as well. But there was just one trouble. In 1949, after having put up a couple of million dollars in 1946, the last administration killed the Atlas program to save money. President Eisenhower picked it up. He gave it priority over all else in the Defense Establishment. Today, as a result, this weapon shows tremendous promise.

Polaris is a submarine-based 1,500-mile missile. It promises to become one of the most significant weapons in America's arsenal. Polaris was born just over a year ago. Its development is racing forward as fast as scientists and engineers can make it go.

Before these efforts there was, in respect to these missiles, noth ng—nothing, that is, in our country, although there was plenty going on in Russia. Today the whole missile program is running into figures far in excess of the World War II Manhattan project which developed the atomic bomb. Each of these new weapons has been advanced at tremendous speed in an effort to compensate for the 8 years irretrievably lost after World War II.

Meanwhile, the opposition gyrates, orates, and berates in their frenzy to find a remedy to heal up their sores caused by the continuing combat between the northern and southern wings. I concede they have their hands full trying to corral implacably opposed Democrats under one political roof. Their political lasso, evidently, is a headlong attack in the area of their most dismal performance. So today, back in Washington, we see President Eisenhower, the Secretary of Defense and his various assistants being daily charged with delaying essential defense programs and with letting the Communists build up a terrible threat to our Nation's safety while we are supposed to be doing relatively nothing.

I suggest this: The next time you hear this kind of political buncombe, just ask why the opposition ignored long-range missiles from World War II until the country passed the reins of government to the Republicans in 1953.

II

Now, let's talk a minute about economic strength.

I want to quote a passage from the President's January 9 state of the Union message. He said this:

"We have just concluded another prosperous year. Our output was once more the greatest in the Nation's history. In the latter part of the year, some decline in employment and output occurred, following the exceptionally rapid expansion of recent years. In a free economy, reflecting as it does the independent judgments of millions of people, growth typically moves forward unevenly. But the basic forces of growth remain unimpaired. There are solid grounds for confidence that economic growth will be resumed without an extended interruption."

Last week, in his budget message to the Congress, the President made another statement.

He said he is determined to adhere to economy and efficiency in the operations of our Government—that the reinvigoration of our Federal-State system is still a prime element in his program for America—and also that he intends to continue reducing the national debt during prosperous periods.

The President then called upon the Congress to curtail, revise, or eliminate certain programs. Some programs he had previously recommended he asked be deferred. These actions, he said, would hold down nonmilitary spending next fiscal year and save several billion dollars in a few years.

These matters I mention tonight for this reason: If we are to remain economically strong despite heavily increased military expenditures, all of us must insist upon stringent economy in the nonmilitary side of Government. We must be willing to forego or hold up at least temporarily various projects that we do not urgently need right now.

III

All right, you say, that makes sense. Let's do it.

But getting that done is going to be a monumental chore, I assure you.

Already Congressional leaders of the opposition have announced that they see no need for deferring politically rewarding programs simply to keep the budget balanced. This chant their troops have taken up, and believe me, it will get deafening before this session of Congress goes much longer. It's about as easy to make water run uphill as it is to get a Democrat in an election year to bite this kind of a bullet.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are many public figures in this administration and, indeed, among the people of Minnesota, who can detect nothing but harm in deficit financing, a steadily growing Federal debt, further cheapening of the currency, and an ever-growing Federal intrusion into private and local affairs.

These issues are among the real battle lines this election year. For, as the American voter comes to understand the record of the opposition's delinquencies in national defense, especially in missiles and rockets, you can be sure that our opponents will try once more to sell their old gloom and doom psychology and will paint with a broad black brush the most dismal picture they think they can get away with.

Look out for this kind of an argument, which, if you listen closely, you can already hear. "An unbalanced budgets hurts no one. A little inflation helps the economy. Anyway, America's domestic needs are so critical that the Federal Government must do more and more, not less and less as the President has proposed."

This attitude is not new. We have faced it for 5 years. Happily, for the first 2 years we had a Republican Congress to work with toward common executive-legislative goals. But, for the following 3 years, we have had Democrat Congresses to work with. Many of the goals of the Congress and the Executive have been far from mutual in this period. This coming year they look like they will be more divergent than ever. Let me give a few examples:

Public power: The opposition will fight for more Federal development of power; our party generally will fight to encourage private initiative and private enterprise to the greatest extent consistent with the public good.

Public housing: The opposition will fight for far more public housing as it has every year; our party will try to carry forward gains such as those made these past 5 years through private effort—a period in which more homes have been built and bought than ever before in our history.

Agriculture: The opposition will generally try to reestablish Federal regimentation and control programs that have never worked in all their tragic history and that were saved from total collapse in past years only by three national disasters—the terrible drought of the late 1930's, World War II, and the Korean war. Our party will continue its efforts to build farm programs that don't have to depend upon disaster to make them work. We will keep on trying to free farm people from Federal domination, to encourage a return to growing crops for markets instead of for Government storage, and to build for the time when efficiency and competition will again govern the farm economy. As part of this maneuver, the opposition will continue to dodge sane answers to farm problems. Instead, they will keep on questioning the reputation and disparaging the motives of every farm spokesman who dares to oppose their effort to tighten the Federal grip on farm people.

Labor: The opposition will, if they can, block efforts to protect union workers from excesses of their own leaders, and will prevent, if they can, any accomplishment in protecting workers' pension funds.

As this session of Congress proceeds, divisions such as these will take place every day all up and down the line. You will see these differences in veterans' affairs, in natural resources measures, in Federal aid to State and local governments, in airport and hospital construction, in Federal credit programs, in the pay of Government employees, and on and on.

Remember this passage in the President's state of the Union message:

"After all, it is no good demanding sacrifice in general terms one day, and the next day, for local reasons, opposing the elimination of some unneeded Federal facility.

"It is pointless to condemn Federal spending in general, and the next moment condemn just as strongly an effort to reduce the particular Federal grant that touches one's own interest."

IV

Which takes me now to the major point I want to stress tonight—the supreme importance of doing all we can to elect a Republican Congress this year.

Here in Minnesota you have done well in providing for the country and our Republican cause Members of the Congress who stand for sound principles of government. These men I count as warm personal friends. I know them well, for I served with them in the Congress, and I respect them highly: JOE O'HARA, CARL ANDERSON, and the pride of Minneapolis, WALTER JUDD. Each one of them I salute.

I had expected to see another close friend here tonight—Auggie Andresen. Well I know of the esteem in which he was held by all who knew him. His sudden passing was a shock to all of us. When Auggie Andresen left this life, America lost a splendid gentleman, a fine public servant, and a warmly beloved political leader. And every one of us lost a respected friend.

Now I want to speak of another Member of the Congress whose friendship I have prized for many years, United States Senator, ED THYE.

Ed has many great qualities: he is independent—he is thoughtful—he is frank and outspoken—he is nobody's captive or spokesman—he belongs to every citizen of Minnesota. He stands for the principles of our party in a traditional sense. He accepts the responsibilities of our party in facing up squarely to problems we face today. In

Washington I have come to know the respect and affection in which he is held all over your great State. I know you will see that his able service is continued for years to come.

I want also to pay my respects to your mayor—Kenneth Peterson. I wish every Republican candidate could duplicate the accomplishment which he made last year. My congratulations to him for his personal victory and the example he has set for all of us.

My friends, the discussion we have had adds up about like this: For a solid, strong defense program; for steadiness in foreign affairs; for sound handling of the Nation's fiscal problems; for policies at home and abroad that will preserve for our children the freedom and opportunities that we have known; for a Government efficiently driving toward specific goals instead of frittering away its efforts in endless partisan strife—for these goals our country needs a Republican Congress from 1958 to 1960. Nor do I need point out to this audience the importance of having a Republican Congress as we prepare for the tough political grapple sure to come in 1960.

Every one of you here, by your participation in this occasion, signifies to me that you are determined to do your part.

What we need now to do is to keep on—to keep at it—and enlist in our cause every person we can to help make this year 1958 the finest Republican year we have had since 1952.

▼

And now I want to revert briefly to the other element of our strength I mentioned earlier. I refer to our moral and spiritual strength from which our other goals and values are all derived.

Our President has spoken frankly about the dangers facing our Nation. We are confronted by a brutal tyranny. It is capable of deeds more inhuman than any evil force has ever contemplated in history. Unprincipled, atheistic, regimented, its progress is impelled by human slavery and brute force. Utterly contemptuous of human life and dignity, its pawns are wantonly thrown into its struggle to make itself master of the universe. This Communist system, subverting modern science and technology to its own sinister purposes, increasingly threatens our national survival. Day by day, night by night, for longer than we can foresee, we must stand alert and poised, ever ready to counter this deadly menace—as ready, as courageous, as resolute as our minutemen and frontiersmen were in years long since passed into history.

In this fateful struggle our physical resources, we know, are equal to the threat. We know our skills, ingenuity, and intellectual vigor are also equal to the threat. I say, however, with the utmost earnestness, that all that we have and all that we stand for will surely be swept away unless the moral and spiritual fiber of America is also kept equal to the stern trials that our generation and those to follow will have to face.

These qualities of the spirit—iron determination, raw courage, perseverance in the face of obstacles, initiative, the eagerness to accomplish and to stand on one's own feet, free and unafraid—these qualities, I say, are the very essence of our real strength and worth as a Nation. These attributes of our national character surging through our free competitive society are as indispensable to victory as our military might. In this long struggle before us, we must be ever watchful, as we mind our material defenses, lest we, through paternalistic governmental practices, sap this strength and resolution on which all else depends.

Finally, my friends, in so speaking of the foundations of our liberties, I remind you of the eloquent words of a very wise Frenchman who visited our land long ago. Patiently he sought the greatness and genius of our Nation and our people. He searched our fields and forests, our mines and commerce, our Congress and our Constitution, and he found not the source of America's greatness.

But after completion of his search he said: "Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power.

"America is great because America is good—and if America ever ceases to be good—America will cease to be great."

That vision must always be vivid—always shining before our eyes. Then we shall always keep lofty the ideals and high purposes to which this Nation was long ago dedicated—by the Minnesota frontiersman, by the minuteman at Concord, and by all those forebears whom we think back to at centennials.

## Auto Crash Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on the Traffic Safety Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which our good friend and colleague, KENNETH ROBERTS, of Alabama, is chairman.

The appalling loss of life and property on the Nation's highways is a subject that should be brought to the attention of every Member of the House and to every citizen of the United States. All of us realize that it is impossible to legislate virtue and, also, that it is impossible to pass laws that will eliminate this terrific and sad loss of life and property. However, it is hoped that the attention of the public can be focused on this important problem and, also, on the work that is being done by various groups to assist in working toward a solution to this problem.

In November, it was my privilege to represent our subcommittee at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico where there was a demonstration of the automobile crash research program, so ably conducted under the direction of Col. John P. Stapp, Chief, Aero Medical Field Laboratory. Colonel Stapp and other volunteers have been human guinea pigs in this experimental crash-program work. All of their studies are made on a very scientific basis and their findings have been invaluable to those who are interested in reducing traffic accidents and traffic injuries.

Consequently, it was a shock to many of us when we learned that the Air Force was considering the elimination of funds to support further automotive crash research. We felt that, especially, the aeromedical problems of flight at very great altitudes, as well as the same experiments conducted on ground level as applied to automobiles and other rapidly moving vehicles, was of the greatest importance in our studies.

Later, we received information from the Holloman Air Force Base advising us that the Air Force had decided to continue this very worthwhile work. I was quite pleased to know that this effort was not being suspended.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to enclose a letter which was written by Colonel Stapp, the fastest man on earth, to Chairman ROBERTS expressing his appreciation for the interest displayed by our committee. I feel that all of us should be expressing thanks to the Air Force for their very wise decision to continue this project which may mean the saving of millions of dollars and, more important, the saving of millions of lives:

AERO MEDICAL FIELD LABORATORY,
AF MISSILE DEVELOPMENT CENTER,
HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.,
*January 8, 1958.*

The Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
*Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS: This is to let you know that your statement in your letter of November 27, "As you know, I feel that your basic research is an invaluable contribution to the future safety design of the automobile and I would be regretful if the Air Force did not continue its support of this program," is largely responsible for a reconsideration of the status of the car crash program by the Human Factors Office of Air Research and Development Command and the United States Air Force, with the result that we are initiating a full-scale project in this area and should be able to carry on adequately.

I want to express my sincere thanks for the help given by your Congressman BEAMER and your committee at a time when backing was sorely needed to keep this program alive. I assure you that it will be carried on in a manner that will justify your confidence and that the results will continue to be manifested in improved safety design and safety devices in vehicles for both the Armed Forces and civilians.

If I can be of any further service to you or your committee, please consider me at your disposal.

Yours very sincerely,
JOHN P. STAPP,
*Colonel, USAF (MC),*
*Chief, Aero Medical Field Laboratory.*

## Opposition to Proposal for Combining the Veterans' Administration With the Social Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a petition containing 222 signatures. This petition read as follows:

Hon. JOHN E. HENDERSON,
*Member of Congress,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The undersigned petitioners respectfully direct your attention to the movement for combining the Veterans' Administration with the Social Security Administration and wish to go on record opposing it.

Please use your influence to defeat such legislation which would be distinctly unfair to veterans.

I was impressed by the petition for several reasons. In the first place, it contains the names of a number of responsible and respected citizens of Morgan County, Ohio, which is one of the counties of my 15th Congressional District. The names of the mayors of several of the villages were on the petition as well as the sheriff of the county, leading merchants, farmers, laborers, and businessmen.

I do not regard this as the petition of a pressure group or an organization with narrowly selfish interests. Rather, I regard it as a spontaneous reaction to the current discussions in many quarters which have as their goal the dismantling of existing veterans' programs. Although there is no legislation of this kind pending before the House or any of its committees, I view the prospect of such proposals with considerable concern. Legislation of this kind would be a breach of faith to hundreds of thousands of veterans—particularly those whose ages are such today that the assistance provided for in our current program is genuinely needed.

## The 40th Annversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Ukrainian National Republic. It is fitting that we join with Americans of Ukrainian ancestry and with freedom-loving peoples everywhere in commemorating this important date and in expressing our deepest sympathy for the present plight of the Ukrainian people.

The Ukrainian National Republic became one of the first victims of Communist expansion and aggression when its sovereignty and independence were brutally crushed in 1920. In spite of the long years of enslavement, however, the people of Ukraine have preserved their strong national feelings, and their resistance to communism and of the bloody persecution which they have suffered at the hands of Communist Russia speak for themselves.

In our age of tremendous technological and scientific innovations, our ultimate weapon in the struggle with communism is man. We must not become blind to this basic truth. The human desire for freedom is more potent and more explosive than any scientific weapon. It will survive any hardship, and it will outlast the effect of any weapon of destruction.

We must remember this as we pay tribute to the brave people of Ukraine who have amply demonstrated their undaunted determination to regain independent national status. We must encourage the spirit of freedom which flames in their hearts by pledging ourselves anew to the task of building a better world in which all nations may live in peace, freedom, and justice.

This is our goal. May the knowledge of this fact encourage and hearten the people of Ukraine and the peoples of the other Communist-dominated nations.

## Solving the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I heard and have reread the President's special message on the farm situation. He outlines nine ways to tackle the present situation in order that farmers can live on their lands. This message reminds me somewhat of Aesop's fable about the cats. One cat said that he knew only one way to save himself from dogs and that was to climb a tree quickly when in danger from them. The other cat said he had nine ways of getting to safety. At that juncture some dogs came along, and the first cat shinned up the nearest tree and was safe. The cat with the nine ways of avoiding dogs took so long to make up his mind as to which one of the nine plans he would select that he was an easy prey for them.

I will not outline all the nine ways by which the farm people are to be saved, but will refer to a few in particular, and in general suggest that none of the nine is to be depended upon to save the family-type farm of the United States. However, plan 8 says:

> We should shift the emphasis of the soil bank away from short-term acreage reserve, aiming at reducing surplus of particular crops to long-term conservation reserve aimed at overall production adjustment. This change will aid farmers, especially the low-income farmer, who will, if he desires, be better able to retire his entire farm from production.

That is about the only way a farmer under this projected plan can come out with any money—get paid for sitting in the shade and have the Government hand him over cash for doing nothing. I wonder if the President has any idea how many farmers will take this proposition? I wonder if he knows how much that will cost?

Plan 2 seems to still rely on the soil bank, for it says:

> Allotments for certain crops are likely to be reduced even further, despite growing evidence that acreage restrictions have not brought about needed adjustments.

A thing that did not work is to be worked further. Will that solve the farm situation?

Under plan 1, the President admits that there are some farmers who cannot make a go of agriculture under the present plan, or the plan now suggested by the President. For those farmers who wish to supplement their incomes—and there are millions who do—the Government, State, and municipal governments are going to provide vocational training schools so the farmers thus affected can learn some trade other than farming. These farmers will be furnished credit, and the result will be that the fatal day of the entire collapse of the farming venture will be strung out over a few years and involve the farmer in a debt which he cannot repay.

I never thought we would come to a time when farmers must quit and do something else.

We have tinkered with this farm problem ever since the McNary-Haugen bill was passed by Congress and vetoed by two Presidents, and nothing has been settled. The present plan has in it the proposition that says to the farmer, "You cannot make a living on a farm, so go to school and learn some trade—any trade you learn will be better than trying to farm where the Government will not let you plant crops."

The suggested program of the President is just as clear as mud, and when we fix up the nine ways he has in mind to "help" the farmers, all this fuss about the farm problem will be ended and farmers will be prosperous, bread will be back to 6 cents per loaf, and beefsteak 20 cents per pound.

I am afraid another Benson dream has been transmitted to the President.

## Verrazano-Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution to establish a Verrazano-Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission. The purpose of this Commission shall be to prepare suitable plans for the celebration in 1959 of the 435th anniversary of the discovery of New York harbor by Giovanni da Verrazano, the 350th anniversary of the explorations of the Hudson River by Henry Hudson and the discovery of Lake Champlain by Samuel de Champlain.

My bill provides that the Commission be composed of 11 members as follows: 2 members of the Senate, 2 from the House of Representatives, 6 appointed by the President upon recommendation of the Governor of New York, and the Director of the National Park Service or his representative. None of them shall receive a salary for this service. An initial sum of $100,000 is to be appropriated to the Commission to prepare plans for the celebration and to carry out its functions.

Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, has already designated a civic committee to promote this celebration, with State commissioner of commerce, Ed-

ward T. Dickinson, as coordinator. The plans of this committee, however, call for a celebration only of the 350th anniversary of the voyages of Hudson and Champlain, while omitting the equally significant discovery of Verrazano 85 years earlier. Many citizens of New York feel that equal homage should be paid to the gallant Italian discoverer of New York harbor and the mouth of the Hudson River.

I want to state here emphatically that I wholeheartedly support the accomplishments of Henry Hudson and Samuel de Champlain, those intrepid explorers who made history in 1609. Hudson, a Dutchman, explored one of the country's most important rivers which played a significant role in the development of the States of New York and New Jersey. Champlain, a Frenchman, by his discovery of the lake bearing his name, similarly contributed toward the development of the area of northern New York and Vermont.

By adding the name of Verrazano to the proposed celebration, we shall in no way detract from the achievements of Hudson and Champlain. On the contrary, we shall give it broader scope and add to it another illustrious name associated with our early history. By including the name of the Italian explorer Verrazano alongside the names of the Dutchman Hudson and the Frenchman Champlain there would be a continuous chain of history from the discovery of New York Harbor up the Hudson River to Champlain Valley.

The Florentine navigator Verrazano discovered the harbor of New York in the year 1524. Thus, we have the beginning of one of the most dramatic events in American history when Verrazano opened the great portals of New York Harbor through which millions of people were subsequently destined to enter this land of freedom in their quest for a better life and for greater opportunities.

Under the sponsorship of King Francis I of France, Verrazano was commissioned as pilot of the 100-ton 3-masted caravel named *La Dauphine* in honor of the King's eldest son. The vessel set sail in search of the blessed land of Cathay, but it reached the coast of South Carolina and then proceeded northward until by mid-April of 1524 it sailed into New York Bay. In a report to the King, Verrazano wrote that "we found a very agreeable site located within two small prominent hills, between which flowed to the sea a very great river, which was deep within the mouth." This is believed to have been the area between Brooklyn and Staten Island, in the area where the Hudson River enters Upper New York Bay and empties into the Atlantic Ocean.

Such is the Verrazano story in brief. It is interesting to note that in 1909, at the time of the Hudson-Fulton celebration in New York, a statue to Verrazano was unveiled in Battery Park at the tip of Manhattan, where it still stands to this day. It might also be noted that if it had not been for Verrazano's maps Henry Hudson's later exploration of the Hudson River might have been delayed for a considerable time. Thus, the gateway opened by Verrazano 435 years ago assumed not only commercial and other importance, but it represents the greatness that is America and the symbol of our way of life.

I urge the Congress to recognize the historical achievement of Verrazano by adding his name to the proposed celebration in 1959 in New York. I also call upon Governor Harriman, of New York, to support my resolution and to request his committee to broaden the celebration by including Verrazano's name.

---

## America's Future in Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a speech which I made concerning America's future in science before the Roving Roundtable, Unitarian Church, Moorewood and Ellsworth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 19, 1958.

The speech follows:

AMERICA'S FUTURE IN SCIENCE

(Address by Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND)

Remember those good old days—back in early October 1957?

Those days when complacency reigned—and the "father knows best" attitude was being broadcast to all corners of the Nation from Washington?

And then—the "beeps" of sputnik I automatically rang the alarm that awakened all America with a jolt—one of those rude, startling jolts that cause a slight dizziness when you sit up quickly.

We rubbed our eyes and looked about—and saw the beginning of a new era as the doors of tomorrow and the future opened.

We knew it had to be the beginning of a new era as the only other alternative was the destruction of civilization as we had known it * * * and that we refuse to accept.

Oevnight jet planes became a thing of the past—and satellites and space stations did not sound like science fiction any longer * * *.

Outer space had been entered and soon it would be conquered.

To some of us, this was not too surprising for we had been trying to inform the public and prepare them for this. However, when we gave the facts that showed the advances which had been made—and were being made—by the Soviet Union * * * we were accused of being pro-Communist. When we tried to show where our Nation was lagging * * * we were said to be spreading Communist propaganda.

Thanks to the Sputniks I and II America, and her people, are now awake and aroused.

Thanks to the sputniks we are now making a long overdue reappraisal of our educational system.

Thanks to the sputniks—we are reexamining our foreign policy.

Thanks to the sputniks—we have finally realized that what this country needs are more eggheads, and less fatheads.

That science is going to control our future is no longer news, and that there is a shortage of engineers and scientists in America today cannot be denied.

There are three compelling reasons for increasing our supply of scientists and engineers.

First, and most important, to meet the demands of the domestic economy.

Second, to maintain our military effectiveness.

Third, to sustain our policy of foreign assistance for, although we act as humanitarians and we want to help people of other lands, there is also a selfish motive—self-protection.

There is still a more fundamental reason—for whatever else it may have done, the release of nuclear energy announced the arrival of what has already been named "the scientific revolution."

In the days past we met the industrial revolution—and we conquered it. That period was primarily an adaptive age.

From now on, in the scientific revolution we will have a truly creative age.

From now on—scientists and engineers will replace the technician, the craftsman and the production worker. In fact it has already started.

You no doubt saw in the papers, last week, that J. & L. opened their new plant in Aliquippa. There, a few engineers tape the machine—the steel slabs are put in at the beginning of the operation with a card of instructions on the slab—the engineer then tapes the machine according to instructions—and starts the mechanism and it goes on and on and on until it comes out at the desired thickness, weight, shape and ready for shipping.

The tomorrows we have been reading about for the last few years have now become today.

It would be foolish to deny that the United States is in competition with the Soviet Union in the whole technical manpower field.

Just last week, here in Pittsburgh, William Hearst, Jr., said that the Soviet Union has one grim aim—and that is to surpass us in every way. I must admit that I have seldom been in accord with the Hearst views in general, but what he said in his talk before the Golden Triangle Association verified what I had said early in 1956 in Congress. (No doubt that is the reason I now agree with him.)

He said that Russia is, as we know, ahead of us in the scientific field—both in research and production.

They have had jet planes, carrying 70 or more passengers, in operation for over a year, and these planes are Russian, from the drawing-board beginning to the rolling down the runway for a takeoff. No German designer had anything to do with them, nor did any stolen secrets. And, these are being used for civilian use, not just military.

They have new two-tone automobiles coming off the production line—Russian from start to finish, no old dies from the United States or Britian as they used to have.

They have new housing developments in Moscow—already housing 400,000—that are the latest word—and their aim is to have sufficient housing for 2 million.

They are bending every effort to excel in medicine, the arts, music—indeed, in every line, even to developing athletes for the 1960 Olympics.

It is clear that Russia has primarily embarked on a program of scientific and technological expansion, and we know that her output of trained men and women in engineering and science has surpassed that of the United States.

These accomplishments are a cause for anxiety—for, not only does a large and competent corps of technical manpower increase Russia's military potential—it gives her also an economic tool which is becoming increasingly important in diplomacy.

Assistance to the undeveloped countries, helping them to share the benefits of modern technology, raising their living standards, these are fundamental parts of the American foreign policy, the old point 4 program. They also are a part of the Soviet's foreign policy. And, with the aid of their technical personnel, their teachers, their scientists, engineers, and technicians, they are actively assisting some of these neutral countries.

The psychological effect on the peoples of those countries is great, and it will be a most important factor in our own future.

Let me go back to early in May 1956 when I told my colleagues: "The Western World is in a new grave kind of danger. The West has been threatened by military and political domination from the East, but never before has it faced the loss of its leadership in science and technology.

"Today, that leadership is in greatest jeopardy. In fact, it will certainly be lost unless we find new ways to meet the new and dangerous challenge coming from the Soviet Union.

"Today's struggle is no mere military struggle, limited to the fields of Europe or Asia Minor. This is a military, political, economical, and technological race between two giants of the entire world—the United States and the Soviet Union.

"The key to that race is supremacy in scientists and technological manpower."

I made this statement when I introduced the Holland bill that would provide scholarships for future engineers, scientists, and physicists; assume adequate salaries for teachers of mathematics, chemistry, physics, and related subjects in our secondary schools and colleges; and grant subsidies for the engineering schools, enabling them to enlarge their graduate school and research departments and further the education of those most talented so that they might become Doctors of Science.

The deans of the 150 accredited engineering schools in America, as well as the National Science Foundation, were consulted and they cooperated in the preparation of the Holland bill.

The Holland bill remained in committee during that session of Congress—and I reintroduced it in January 1957. There were preliminary hearings held in March, last year, and I appeared and stated:

"Upon authentic information I have received from newsmen, who have recently returned from Russia, the Soviet Union has the most dangerous weapon in the world—the atheistic scientific trained mind—and she has it in plentiful supply.

"This information should cause every American to shake off his complacent attitude and face the stark inevitable truth—that the Soviet Union has surpassed this country in the development of scientific manpower.

"The newsmen further reported that 'schools and colleges—not jet planes—not H-bombs—are the greatest Russian latent threat to America and the West.'

"Records show that the Soviets graduated two and one-half times as many engineers and scientists as we did in 1956, and they have more than double that number of science students this year, 1957, than we do."

I went on, at that hearing, and gave the committee the information on the Russian schools, which you are all familiar with by now. I pointed out at that time, March 1957, that Russian students, graduating from the 10th grade in 1955 had completed 5 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry, 6 years of foreign languages, and 5 years of math above the arithmetic level.

In November, 8 months later—and 6 weeks after sputnik—the President, in his Oklahoma City speech, suggested that we have a nationwide testing of high school students; a program to stimulate good quality teaching of math and science; provide for more laboratory facilities, etc. And he also gave the first administration recognition of the educational program of the Soviet schools.

I showed, at those hearings in March, that in Russia about 30 percent of the top grade high school graduates were given scholarships and were paid for going to college.

Education along these lines, as we all know, make engineers, doctors, and men and women of science. It makes nuclear scientists—and it makes teachers of these subjects for high schools and colleges. This I pointed out in March 1957.

I do not want to be critical or political, but the facts must be stated. The position we now find our Nation in was caused by men who refused to accept their responsibility of leadership.

Some have blamed the public for their lack of interest in the sciences and their ridicule of the eggheads. The people of America, however, are not wholly to blame—for they elect men and women to public office to act as leaders—and they expect them to lead. Instead, they were lulled into the feeling of false security.

Right after sputnik I the President said: "So far as the satellite itself is concerned, that does not raise my apprehensions, not one iota."

Secretary of Defense Wilson, now retired, stated: "Sputnik was a neat, scientific trick."

And, Secretary Dulles, on a visit to the United States, said: "The Soviet satellite launching was of probably doubtful military value and would not change this country's defensive position." (We know how wrong he was.)

At that time, apparently, these men did not realize—nor want to recognize—that time was of the essence. They seemed to be of the opinion that life can be beautiful and they didn't want to be a disturbing influence.

We now know that the National Security Council had advance information on the launching of the first sputnik, but they felt, after a lengthy discussion, that it was not necessary to inform the public in advance.

What did they think the psychological effect on the people of the world would be—or did they care?

Sputnik II, or "muttnik" as we wisecracked about it, went into outer space.

Our answer? We sent General LeMay dashing down to Rio and back at the fantastic speed of 600 or more miles per hour. Not a very impressive answer to the sputniks traveling 18,000 miles per hour.

And I hate to point this out but I feel I should, Russia's display of technological knowledge and scientific achievement was in the form of a geophysical experiment, and our display was strictly military, the Strategic Air Command in action.

We harnessed the atom for power, for what, the *Nautilus*, a submarine, a weapon of war.

Their first atomic-powered vessel was a peaceful icebreaker.

Soviet propaganda continually paints the United States as warmongers while they are always for peaceful coexistence. Our display of military might to the neutral world, unfortunately, gives them something to talk about.

Washington at last woke up. The executive branch, I mean.

There was a hustle and a bustle. Dr. Killian, of MIT, came in to advise the President; Mr. Holaday was appointed to advise Secretary of Defense McElroy, the National Science Foundation was asked to make a special report; the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers was requested to turn in their report—there was plenty of action, lots of lights, always the cameras, and, as usual, the normal amount of confusion.

Reports from the various committees and departments came in and were released for public consumption.

They said the solution was as follows:

"Federal scholarships for those who had the ability, the aptitude, and the ambition to become scientists but lacked the finances.

"Incentive plans to encourage students to go into graduate work and provide teachers, not only for the grade schools and high schools but to build our universities' engineering faculties with the best teachers.

"Provide adequate funds for the universities to carry on research work to the fullest extent.

"To pay salaries to our professors, doctors, and teachers in keeping with what they would earn in private employment, by having the Federal Government subsidize the difference in pay.

"These plans would turn out the best in scientists, the best in teachers, the best in engineers."

I could not help but feel a little pride when I read these recommendations, for they certainly were all contained in the Holland bill.

I wired the President and asked that he and Dr. Killian review the legislation I introduced and which was already in the legislative mill awaiting action. That was in November.

The President has since presented his solution to the problem—with his $1,800,000,000 program for education. It is on a Federal-State basis, and it would take approximately 2 to 3 years to go into effect. State legislatures must act upon it before it could be a working program. And, incidentally, where are the States to get the additional money?

We have wasted too much time already, and 2 or 3 more years would be too late.

Only last Wednesday, Dr. A. R. Hibbs, chief of the research section of the jet propulsion laboratory at California Institute of Technology, said: "I'm frightened. How much more time will the Russians give us?"

"The Russians have missile rocket motors more than twice as powerful as anything we have. And even now—more than 4 months after sputnik I—we still have no realistic program for the development of such motors.

"The United States 'Government planners' had decided on 5 missile-development programs in spite of the fact that our real missile experts would be sorely taxed to successfully carry out 1 or 2 of them.

"Only men who are completely unaware of the exacting requirements of missile development, only men who are technically incompetent in the very fields most affected by their policy discussion could have reached such absurd conclusions."

This is rather an alarming picture, I know. It isn't a very pretty one to paint for you—but I believe an informed America is a strong America.

This session of Congress is indeed a most important one—in fact, Senator JOHNSTON advised his colleagues that they should work and act as though it might be the last one—and I am sure that you will find that the attitude of most of the Congressmen and Senators to be deeply concerned over the seriousness of the situation.

The President presented his budget, his suggestions, and his views.

As Walter Lippmann said last Friday:

"The substance of his proposals will almost certainly produce a sense of disappointment and frustration.

"The country was expecting—and was ready—for a large expanding national effort. What the President has proposed is—a narrow concentration on specialized weapons and a contraction in almost every other field of national activity.

"The program says—in effect—if only we can catch up with the Russians in missiles,

all will be well and we can retreat almost everywhere else along the line.

"The President will find that the country cannot be rallied successfully to a program of this character. It wanted a program of national revival * * * it was offered a program for contraction.

"The country would support a big, bold program—like the Marshall plan, for example—but it was offered a small and timid program, one which regards the United States as being too poor to build schoolhouses or to develop new water resources in the arid lands of the West.

"Once it was certain that there would be no opposition to getting more money for missiles—the crucial point was what this Nation was going to do about education and research * * * for that is where we are most deeply challenged.

"In this proposed plan, the educational proposals are a pitiably inadequate response, and the abandonment of the school construction bill an inexcusable retreat from responsibility.

"There is every prospect, therefore, that in this Congress leadership will come not from the White House, but from the senior Democratic leaders who have always supported national defense and watched out for the Nation's welfare."

## Commemorative Stamp Honoring Early Polish Settlers at Jamestown in 1608

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a letter which I wrote to the Post Office Department on January 9, suggesting that a special stamp be issued to commemorate the significant part played by Polish artisans in the founding of Jamestown and their work in establishing the first factory in the United States in 1608.

I am also including the reply which I have received from the special assistant to the Postmaster General, explaining the Department's position in taking adverse action on this request.

I am sorry that the Department has found it impossible to issue such a special stamp, and I want to take this additional way to help call attention to the significant contribution made by the Polish artisans in the founding of our country.

The letters follow:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
*January 9, 1958.*

Hon. ROY WALTER,
*Special Assistant to the Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. WALTER: I am enclosing herewith a copy of an article entitled "Jamestown's 350th Anniversary Recalls Aid to Colony by Polish," by Thomas E. Kissling which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 31, 1957, by the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI.

This article points up in a most interesting fashion, the significant part played by Polish artisans in the founding of Jamestown and their work in establishing the first factory in the United States in 1608.

It occurs to me that a special stamp commemorating the part played by these early Polish settlers would not only be of interest historically and to philatelists, but would also make a very helpful and significant contribution today in the field of foreign relations.

I would like to suggest that such a stamp be issued at the earliest possible date and should appreciate hearing from you about this.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS S. GORDON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 17, 1958.

Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your letter of January 9 and the suggestion that a commemorative stamp be issued honoring the early Polish settlers and the part they played in the founding of Jamestown.

The proposal that the establishment of industry in Jamestown in 1608 be recognized by a stamp has already been received and given the fullest consideration by the members of our Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee. We can appreciate the value such a stamp, possibly embracing the part played by the Polish artisans, would contribute to the field of foreign relations but, unfortunately, we cannot accede to such a request.

As you know, the Postmaster General's Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee has been charged with considering the many hundreds of requests for new stamps received annually. This committee has been faced with the necessity of selecting roughly a dozen outstanding subjects and has found it necessary to disapprove a stamp for Jamestown this year.

A set of three stamps was released in 1907 to mark the 300th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown and in 1957 a stamp was issued jointly noting the International Naval Review and the Jamestown Festival. We feel this is ample recognition for the many contributions Jamestown has made, particularly in view of the fact that many events and personages have not yet been recognized on our postage stamps.

I am sorry this reply must be unfavorable but I am certain you will understand the Department's position in this instance. Incidentally, you may find the enclosed booklet about our stamp program of interest.

Cordially yours,
L. ROHE WALTER,
*Special Assistant to the Postmaster General.*

## Report on Mission to Europe Conducted by Hon. Emanuel Celler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a report on a mission to Europe conducted last November by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York. The report contains some noteworthy observations on the important subject of confiscation of private property, expropriation, and the protection of private investments and property throughout the world.

The report follows:

While on a European mission in November 1957, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, visited West Germany. The Congressman investigated installations producing atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and studied problems of refugees and expellees from Iron Curtain countries.

During an 11-day tour of West Germany, Mr. CELLER participated in a press conference which took place at the Amerika-Haus, Frankfurt, on November 21. The Congressman read two statements to the press—one on West German democracy, praising West Germany for its program of restitution for Jewish and Christian victims of Nazi persecution, and the other advocating an international treaty to safeguard foreign invested capital.

Members of the German press evinced great interest in Mr. CELLER's statements. There was general agreement that Mr. CELLER's call for support of a world Magna Carta for the protection of private foreign investments lent further stature to his leadership and statesmanship. During the discussion period the press was particularly pleased with Congressman CELLER's ability to explain the particulars of the proposed international convention code.

During the conference, Congressman CELLER referred to West Germany's "Cadillac prosperity" and said: "I've never seen a country develop as quickly and efficiently in so short a time as West Germany. It's the result of a great deal of hard work and industry, plus American economic aid which totaled $5 billion." The Congressman lauded the country's economic and industrial recovery.

Mr. CELLER also praised West Germany's program of restitution payments to Jews and Christian victims of "Nazi sadism." "All this is called 'wiedergutmachung,'" he said. "This is perhaps the first time in history," declared the Congressman, "that any government voluntarily has undertaken to provide compensation for the crimes of a previous regime." He pointed out that this is the first time in the history of the persecution of Jews, which has gone on for centuries, that Jews have been compensated for wrongs done them.

With respect to his statement concerning an international treaty for the protection of private foreign investments, Congressman CELLER called attention to the recent and spreading actions involving seizures of private property interests. He cited seizure of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., expropriation of the United Fruit Co. by the Guatemalan Government, Egypt's seizure of the Suez Canal, confiscations of foreign properties by the Argentine Government, the failure of Indonesia to honor her contractual obligations with the Netherlands, and others.

In the face of this growing and serious problem, Mr. CELLER emphasized the necessity to protect and make secure private capital investments in foreign countries against confiscation, seizure and nationalization. He pointed to the only constructive and practical solution to this vexing problem in the proposal which was first presented to the recent International Industrial Development Conference in San Francisco—a world Magna Carta or international investment treaty which is the brain child of Mr. Hermann J. Abs, director of the Deutsche Bank and Credit Institute for Reconstruction, Frankfurt. Mr. Abs' Magna Carta was reported by the press as "the first concrete proposal" to come out of the San Francisco conference.

The Congressman strongly urged acceptance of the Magna Carta principle. Signator

nations, he explained, would be bound by the terms of the Magna Carta from arbitrarily seizing private investments, since credit and other sanctions would be invoked against the aggressor nation. The international convention code would be reenforced by an International Court of Arbitration which would establish effective and enforceable rules of law for the securing of private foreign investments. The Magna Carta, the Congressman asserted, would be a great step forward in the development of world trade and in the protection of those countries that are interested in peace.

Mr. CELLER told the press gathering it would be a great achievement if West Germany could blaze the trail in establishing such a world Magna Carta under the leadership of Mr. Abs.

One German paper, the Boersenzeitung, reported that during the press discussion, Mr. CELLER expressed the opinion that if such a world Magna Carta had been in existence during World War II the United States probably would not have confiscated German property. This paper also suggests that with the convening of the next Congress in January the administration will submit a new plan concerning the return of seized property.

Another German paper, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, reporting on the Magna Carta, said Mr. CELLER admitted that at present there are bilateral agreements between nations which do safeguard foreign investments to a certain extent, but that such agreements are more often disregarded than observed. The International Court of Arbitration provided for in the Magna Carta, said the Allgemeine Zeitung, would have jurisdiction to decide violations in individual cases and impose sanctions. If a member is declared guilty, continues the Zeitung, other member nations are committed to refuse new private or public credits, and thereby they can set up a kind of financial blockade against the guilty country.

The Zeitung also points out that Congressman CELLER called it absurd for the United States on one hand to grant the Federal Republic of Germany $5 billion in economic aid and on the other hand retain German property.

The Frankfurt Neue Presse also discussed the Abs' Magna Carta, suggested by Congressman CELLER as a solution to the present unsettled condition affecting private foreign investments.

During the press meeting, Congressman CELLER was asked whether the United States will in the future grant the Federal Republic of Germany economic aid. The Neue Presse states that the Congressman replied due to the favorable economic situation in Western Germany this would hardly be the case. On the other hand, says the Neue Presse, Mr. CELLER declared there are at work within the American economy strong efforts with the aim to place more private capital at the disposal of the German economy than has been done up to now. But independent thereof, the American Government of course will continue to grant military aid.

Appended hereto are copies of Congressman CELLER's two statements made at the Frankfurt press conference as follows: (1) West German Democracy, and (2) International Treaty to Safeguard Foreign Invested Capital.

NOTE.—Since November 21 when Congressman CELLER appeared before the press in Frankfurt, the free world has been shocked by the further flagrant violations and utter disregard for the sanctity of private property exhibited by the Indonesian Government in confiscating Dutch private interests. This latest case of arbitrary seizure of private foreign investments points up still further the desperate need for establishing an international convention code or treaty for protection of private property rights. Attached is Congressman CELLER's release, dated December 9, 1957, which was issued to the press with the announcement of Indonesia's latest action involving Dutch investments.

---

STATEMENTS READ AT PRESS CONFERENCE HELD BY CONGRESSMAN EMANUEL CELLER, AMERIKA-HAUS, FRANKFURT, GERMANY, NOVEMBER 21, 1957—WEST GERMAN DEMOCRACY

Two important facts are clearly discernible concerning the emergence of the new Germany into a truly democratic state. First, the Bundestag in Bonn contains no Nazi or Communist representative. I am informed that one neo-Nazi party was outlawed by the Supreme Court of Germany on the ground that it was not a political party but a criminal conspiracy engineered from Soviet Russia. There is a fringe of Naziphile groups which barely stay within the law but they are small in numbers and fail to attract the 5 percent of the vote that is required for representation in the Bundestag.

To me, this means that the German people have been progressively repudiating nazism and have identified themselves with the democracies of the free world. On several occasions millions of the German people by secret ballot have chosen to ignore the reactionaries of the right and the reactionaries of the left, and voted into office genuinely democratic parties such as the Christian Democratic Union, the Social Democrats, and the Free Democrats. This advance toward democracy has been greatly encouraged by the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer and his cabinet.

A second startling and yet paramount fact is West Germany's program of restitution to surviving victims of nazism and the conclusion of a treaty at Luxembourg whereby West Germany agrees to pay over a period of years to the Israeli Government in the neighborhood of $800 million. To the conference of Jewish Material Claims against Germany, West Germany agrees to pay $107 million and to hundreds of thousands of Jewish and Christian victims of Nazi sadism there is to be paid an estimated total of almost $10 billion. All this is called Wiedergutmachung. It is indeed a unique fact in human history. With the exception perhaps of the restoration of personal private property, the German Government was under no obligation under international law to make these payments. This is perhaps the first time in history that any government voluntarily has undertaken to provide compensation for the crimes of a previous regime. This is the first time in the history of persecution of Jews, which has gone on for centuries, that Jews have been compensated for wrongs done them. Heretofore, their only compensation was that fate decreed that they shall stand at the graves of their tormentors.

It is significant that the implementation of this program of Wiedergutmachung by heavy financial commitments was developed precisely on the eve of a national election. Thus, the Adenauer government started this program with the confidence that the German people themselves wanted it and were willing to be taxed heavily for it.

This recent gesture has not received the publicity is deserved. Wiedergutmachung is hardly known in the United States, and even in Germany it has probably slipped from memory more quickly than is warranted. Of course, the atrocities of Hitler and his henchmen cannot be wiped out in terms of money. These settlements do not atone for murders and tortures committed by the Nazis. Yet the settlements do have a great moral significance in acknowledging responsibility. It is significant also that when the Bundestag passed the bill unanimously its members stood for a minute in silent prayer to the memory of those slaughtered in the name of Germany.

INTERNATIONAL TREATY TO SAFEGUARD FOREIGN INVESTED CAPITAL

Last December I was in Mexico City and saw on one of its famous boulevards an imposing monument which was erected to commemorate Mexico's nationalization of its oil industry. Many of the oil refineries and producing companies had been owned and built up by the investment of capital, primarily of American nationals. This industry in toto had been appropriated and nationalized by the Mexican Government without such as "by your leave." There have been numerous similar instances of confiscation and nationalization without just compensation by other governments of industrial entities and concerns owned and financed through foreign invested capital. Among recent violations of such foreign private rights was the nationalization of properties of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. by Iran, expropriation of the properties of the United Fruit Co. by Guatemala, the seizure of the Suez Canal by Egypt, the forceful transfer of banks and insurance companies owned by British and French nationals to Egyptian ownership, the action of the newly formed Indonesian Government in refusal to recognize its contractual obligations to its former mother country the Netherlands, and the confiscation by the Argentine Government of various foreign enterprises.

Such artificial restraints and arbitrary action impede the proper flow of international private capital, exports and investments, and oft-times prevent and impede the flow of capital so essential for the development of underprivileged nations. Unless there is a free flow of private capital to such countries, the state must move in to supply the essential capital. In other words, the economic and financial vacuum must be filled. Either it is filled by private capital or by state-controlled political capital. If by the latter, then the private enterprise system goes aglimmering. We of the western democracies prize highly the system of private initiative and enterprise. We must, therefore, protect and make secure private capital investments in foreign lands. There must be protection against artificial and unnatural restraints and investment dangers like confiscations, seizures and nationalizations without just and honorable compensation.

This can be done by setting up an international society or community whereby its member nations subscribe to a sort of financial Magna Carta. This scheme was outlined at San Francisco by Dr. Hermann J. Abs, director of the Deutsche Bank of Frankfurt, and personal adviser to Germany's Economic Minister Ludwig Erhard. This international convention would be bolstered by an International Court of Arbitration which would establish effective and enforceable rules of law for the securing of private foreign investment. These rules would afford protection to the investors and to the recipient nations alike. While it is true that at the present time there may be bilateral treaties between some nations offering a modicum of such protection, I regret to state that these treaties are more often honored in the breach than in the observance.

This International Court of Arbitration would determine whether cases brought before it involve violation of the principles of this Magna Carta. If a nation is found guilty, sanctions could be imposed by the court in the following way: Member countries would be under obligation to refuse any new private or public loans or credits to be granted to the country in default. In other words, there would be an obligation by the other countries signatory to the Magna Carta to offer a sort of financial blockade to the offending country.

It strikes me that the establishment of such a compact or Magna Carta would be a great step forward in the development of

world trade and the safeguarding of all countries vitally interested in world trade and peace. It would indeed be a great achievement if West Germany could blaze a trail to the creation of such a Magna Carta under the leadership of Dr. Hermann Abs and Economics Minister Erhard.

---

STATEMENT ISSUED BY REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER IN CHICAGO ON DECEMBER 9, PRIOR TO RETURNING TO NEW YORK—GOVERNMENT BY CONFISCATION

The law of the jungle apparently prevails in Indonesia. Dutch national banks and business operations have been expropriated without notice. Dutch factories have been seized. Dutchmen are deported. Wild men bent upon revenge seem to be masters. The excuse is that the Dutch will not cede to Indonesia that which racially, geographically, culturally, linguistically was never part of Indonesia, namely, West New Guinea. The Dutch are sound in their position of refusal but are suffering intolerable confiscation, extortion and blackmail. Our representative at the United Nations should caution Sukarno at Jakarta that we view with dismay these strongarm tactics.

It also points up the need for some international treaty or Magna Carta whereby signatory nations would pledge the sacredness and protection of foreign invested capital. Such a plan was offered by Hermann J. Abs of the Deutsche Bank and was well received at the recent economic conference at San Francisco.

Any nation signatory or nonsignatory to the Magna Carta which is guilty of seizure and confiscation of private invested capital without just cause and without fair and reasonable compensation would be treated by signatory nations as a pariah and would be deprived thereafter of all economic aid, grants or loans. In other words, the offending nation would be treated to a measure of financial blockade. Such threat of punishment would prevent the type of confiscation we are now witnessing in Indonesia. It might have prevented the seizure of the Suez Canal, the seizure and nationalization of American oil companies in Mexico and the recent seizure of Italian and Swiss properties in Argentina.

Such a Magna Carta would be a great boon to underdeveloped nations. It would encourage investment of private capital in countries that are prosperous in land but suffer penury and want.

---

## Power Struggle on the Canadian Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, last December there was published in Harper's magazine a thoughtful article by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, bearing the title which I have used for this insertion of remarks. That article ought to have the widest possible distribution. Its subject is the water resources of the Pacific Northwest, both United States and Canadian. In the long run, what men of the two nations do in the years immediately ahead in the utilization of this vital resource, will be as meaningful to the residents of Miami and Montreal as those of Seattle and Vancouver.

To Alaskans, this is not a proposition for academic consideration. To them, and especially to the people of southeastern Alaska, the so-called Panhandle, an agreement between the two good neighbors as to the use of water could well be the greatest economic boon which might be conferred. For years the Taiya project has been under active discussion and even consideration by a leading American industrial firm. It is a great dream, this, of taking water from the mighty Yukon River originating in Canada and diverting it so that the energy derived from this rushing stream might turn the wheels of industry at Skagway in Alaska. But the project, engineers say, is as practical as it is tremendous in scope. Senator NEUBERGER tells of this and of other significant matters in this article which I take pleasure in calling to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From Harper's magazine of December 1957]

POWER STRUGGLE ON THE CANADIAN BORDER

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator, Oregon)

At least 20,000 years before men, in a gingerly compromise, located the 49th parallel as the line at which Oregon Territory ended and Great Britain's holdings began, the rivers were already there and geography's stubborn pattern had been set. This explains why some of the world's greatest and most inexhaustible sources of energy are today vexingly split by the border between the United States and Canada. For who, among the backwoodsmen and colonials who argued over these frontiers, could have been aware of the unseen giant of hydroelectricity?

The best-known of these sources are, of course, the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers, which share the same ruffled water. And after decades of argument, the long-heralded St. Lawrence Seaway is under construction at last. In addition to providing a navigation channel to the ocean, the seaway will generate 1,880,880 kilowatts of prime power, to be divided equally by the two nations. Another 1,900,000 kilowatts at Niagara Falls will soon be developed by the New York State Power Authority.

Yet the combined total of these two projects is a full 50 percent less than the tremendous 5,653,500 kilowatts of water power from the Yukon, Columbia, and St. John Rivers which is still locked up around stalemated conference tables in Washington and Ottawa. By way of measurement, this unrealized power is just about twice the hydroelectric capacity of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and virtually triple the output of Grand Coulee, the largest single electricity producing plant in the world. On its development depend the prosperity and future expansion of three great regions in each of the countries involved—Alaska, the Pacific Northwest, and upper New England under our flag: and the Yukon Territory, British Columbia, and the Maritime Provinces in Canada.

Today these kilowatts are lost in the billowing spray of innumerable waterfalls and rapids. But if only the United States and its friendliest international neighbor could decide how they should be apportioned, they could become the fuel for scores of manufacturing plants. This would seem to be a fairly simple challenge. How can either nation lose when the booty to be divided amounts to a pair of TVA's? Nevertheless during recent months some observers have despaired of an agreement ever being reached. Worse yet, relations between the United States and Canada have deteriorated seriously.

Canada actually has under serious consideration a proposal to divert out of the Columbia River one-fourth of the flow of that greatest of all western waterways, before it crosses the border into the United States. This, of course, would leave stranded all the ambitious plans for the expansion of such existing American water power projects as Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, Bonneville, McNary, and The Dalles.

The difference at Grand Coulee alone would be prodigious. If Canada, as it has proposed, siphons 15 million acre-feet of water out of its segment of the Columbia, Grand Coulee will maintain only with difficulty its peak capacity of 1,974,000 kilowatts. But if Canada and the United States could agree to mutual storage reservoirs on the upper river, Grand Coulee's production might soar to 2,838,000 kilowatts. The difference is equal to nearly our entire share of the St. Lawrence Seaway power plants.

THE EISENHOWER DILEMMA

Two circumstances are primarily responsible for this sad turn of events. One is the rising tide of nationalism in Canada. There were constant complaints about American influence over Canada's economy even before the Conservative victory at the polls last June. And after that victory the New York Times declared: "It is simply a matter of fact to state that the Conservatives are expected to take a somewhat tougher line vis-a-vis the United States than did the Liberals, particularly on trade matters." This certainly includes exports or imports of immense quantities of water power.

The second circumstance is still more alarming—and of more immediate concern to Americans. It is the evident determination of the Eisenhower administration to abandon the plans of the Corps of Army Engineers for comprehensive development of the Columbia Basin. An unexplained irony of our era is that while the President has urged Congress to spend over $300 million for power and reclamation undertakings on the Colorado River, where 17 million acre-feet of water flow to the sea, he has balked at any and all new projects in the Columbia Basin, which has a majestic runoff of 180 million acre-feet. And because the Columbia River contains three-fourths of the potential international kilowatts, the attitude of our Government toward the Columbia is crucial. That attitude is hostile, to say the least, to any further Federal projects like Bonneville and Grand Coulee. President Eisenhower himself epitomized it in his personal insistence upon surrendering the mile-deep Hells Canyon site, located on a swift tributary of the Columbia, to wasteful underdevelopment by what the Times has described as private exploitation, at private cost and private profit.

In view of this position, the Canadian storage potential confronts the administration with a dilemma. If an agreement is signed with Canada, the projects in the United States which will benefit are Federal plants, built during the halcyon political era when a Republican Senate leader, Charles L. McNary, of Oregon, cooperated with a Democratic President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to tap the churning reaches of the river system containing 42 percent of the country's undeveloped water power. But adding mighty new generating machines to these plants does not square with President Eisenhower's program for the Columbia Basin, where he quite candidly favors private utility companies. And in 1954, he appointed as American Chairman of the Canadian-American International Joint Commission, which is charged with these vital negotiations, the former governor of Idaho, Len Jordan, who spearheaded the long struggle to block the Federal dam at Hells Canyon, and whose cuss words to describe public power were the strongest ever used in a region never accustomed to mild political language.

To ex-Governor Jordan the President entrusted the future of the river system which feeds the largest hydroelectric network owned by the American public—the Bonneville Power Administration, which to date has sold $462,805,892 worth of the energy generated at Government dams in the Northwest. And while he was responsible for the dealings with Canada that would determine the fate of Bonneville, Mr. Jordan traveled through the land making speeches which denounced as a scandalous Federal monopoly the very agency he was presumed to be representing at the international conference table. A typical such address prophesied that Government dams could soon lead to "federally owned sawmills, federally owned mines, federally owned fish canneries, and federally owned farms and livestock ranches." The first Federal dams across western rivers were erected, of course, under Theodore Roosevelt.

If Mr. Jordan could have merely preserved the status quo, the administration might have been content. In the absence of a successful agreement with Canada, the Federal generating plants could not be expanded. Meanwhile, the administration itself could distribute, as agreeably as possible from the aspect of the private utilities, such kilowatts as were left. But after May 13, 1955, such a course was no longer possible. On that date the Canadian Parliament approved an appropriation of $250,000 to study the feasibility of diverting the waters of the upper Columbia into the neighboring Fraser River watershed—a proposal championed by Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, Chairman of the Canadian side of the International Joint Commission.

Such a diversion is no idle fantasy. By drilling a tunnel about 12 to 15 miles long through the Monashee Mountains, engineers could pour into one of the sources of the Fraser, at Shuswap Lake, a massive segment of the Columbia. As a result Canada would obtain more than 1,200 feet of extra head—8 times the drop of Niagara Falls—from a volume of water nearly equivalent to the total flow of the Colorado River, making possible an amount of power equal to the output of two Hoover Dams. And the 10-mile tunnels at the fabulous Kitmat project of the Aluminum Company of Canada, off to the north, have already demonstrated the practicability of such lengthy diversion for hydroelectric power production.

Would Canada dare divert a portion of a great river on which a neighboring and trusted ally is so heavily dependent? Perhaps she would. The Canadians believe they have the legal right to proceed. The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, which also created the International Joint Commission, provides that "each of the high contracting parties reserves to itself * * * the exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion, whether temporary or permanent, of all waters on its own sides of the line which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary." Some international lawyers claim the United States could bring huge damage suits if its powerplants are throttled, but under the treaty these might have to be litigated in the Exchequer Court of Canada—a chilly atmosphere for American complaints.

About the only comfort for the United States in this crisis comes not from humankind, but from the great food fish of the North Pacific region—the sockeye salmon. One of the principal salmon runs spawns in the headwaters of the Fraser. Intricate fish ladders and staircases have been built to convoy wayfaring salmon past hurtling chutes of froth, where the river is funneled between rockslides. The Fraser's sockeye migrations are worth a conservative $32 million annually to fishermen and canneries. High dams on the Fraser, to take advantage of the diversion of water from the Columbia, would blockade off the fish from their spawning grounds. And so British Columbia politics reverberates to protests over the diversion—not because it would injure the United States but because it would imperil the sockeye salmon. The upper Columbia, by contrast, is a fishless river. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, director of the Wildlife Management Institute and one of North America's leading biologists, has said, "I know of no better place to secure large amounts of water power for industry, without doing harm to fisheries, than on the upper reaches of the Columbia River."

Nearly 2 years ago, when I was in British Columbia studying this question for the Senate Interior Committee, I rode across the forested hump of Coquihalla Pass in a little red-painted train with Howard C. Green, then member of Parliament from Vancouver. As we looked down on Arrow Lakes, site of a proposed dam to store the Columbia's surplus flow, he said to me: "Really, you Americans ought to be bending over backward to work out an arrangement with us for our two countries to divide the benefits of Canadian storage. Sometimes we don't understand your intransigence. After all we hold most of the trump cards. We can divert the river because the river originates in our country. Possession is nine points of the law. We might already have done so, if it were not for the fish question."

Mr. Green is today Minister of Public Works in the new Conservative cabinet of Prime Minister John Diefenbaker. And, as these words are written, Canadian crews with transits and diamond drills are searching for the natural spot to drive a tunnel through the Monashees.

### THE COLUMBIA'S CHALLENGE

It is no trick for two countries to share a river that flows along an international boundary—the St. Lawrence or Niagara, for example. The benefits are merely divided into two equal parts. A river which crosses a boundary at right angles is a sterner proposition.

Even the mathematics of the situation are complicated. The first 465 miles of the Columbia's 1,270 miles flow within Canada. The river leaps full blown from Columbia Lake and surges northwest toward the Arctic, until it is bent into a spectacular hairpin curve by the ramparts of the Canadian Rockies. Of the final volume of 180 million acre-feet of water that the Columbia contributes to the Pacific Ocean, some 62 million flow out of Canada. And many Canadian leaders feel that Canada has complete custody of the river while it makes its tortured canyon passage inside their borders.

But certain extraordinary physical characteristics of the Columbia make its joint use essential for two nations as determined to get along with each other as Canada and the United States. No river is more mountain born. Its source lies among the pinnacles and crags of most of the great ranges south of the sub-Arctic. And when the Rockies and Selkirks and Kootenais are mantled with melting snow cushions 40 feet deep, the Columbia's volume has risen to five-sixths that of the Mississippi itself. But when winter halts this melting process, the river dwindles down to a modest backwoods stream. No other major waterway has such wild fluctuations—from twice the volume of the Nile to a poky trickle. The average annual maximum flow of the Columbia at the boundary is 10 times its low-water average. This, of course, adds up to feast or famine for the huge powerplants on the American side of the line. Their penstocks can be either alarmingly dry or filled close to flooding.

But if the Columbia's crest waters could be stored in Canada's gorges and chasms, the contrasting droughts and freshets that dissipate much of the river's strength would be avoided. Ideal receptacles for these reservoirs pock the ranges. At Mica Creek, just below the Columbia's horseshoe bend, for instance, is a dam site where 10,500,000 acre-feet of water can be retained back of steel and concrete. The dimensions of such a project can best be appreciated by realizing that the proposed high dam at Hells Canyon would have stored 3,800,000 acre-feet of water, and the loss of this to a private power company scheme has rocked Pacific Northwest politics for years; and the end has not yet been heard.

The Chief of our Corps of Army Engineers, Maj. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, told a Senate subcommittee over which I was presiding that the next logical projects to build in our realm of richest hydroelectric-power resources were definitely within the Canadian segment of the Columbia Basin, where enough water could be impounded to increase by 70 percent the nameplate rating on generators at such American powerplants as Chief Joseph and the Dalles Dams, without pouring any more concrete in the United States. Yet our Government has been so indolent and casual about reaching an agreement to make this possible that private corporations and various utility syndicates are now demanding the right to supersede the International Joint Commission and the State Department and to negotiate directly with Canada.

That restless personage, Mr. Henry J. Kaiser, in quest of additional kilowatts for his burgeoning aluminum factories, has proposed that he erect a dam at Arrow Lakes where the Columbia flattens out into a wide belly of blue water. The resulting extra generation downstream at such plants as Bonneville and Grand Coulee would be divided equally between the United States Government and Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. Out of his 50-percent share, Mr. Kaiser would reimburse the Province of British Columbia for being allowed to impound Canadian water on Canadian land.

When I was in Canada on behalf of Chairman JAMES E. MURRAY of the Senate Interior Committee, I found the business-oriented Social Credit regime in British Columbia highly disposed toward the Kaiser plan. The industrialist was even said to have deposited $100,000 in a bank at Vancouver to demonstrate his good faith. However, the Liberal government at Ottawa frowned so sternly on the idea that a bill was hastened through Parliament requiring a federal license before any project could be undertaken on a river bisecting the border. It now remains to be seen what position the Conservative administration will take.

A parallel to the Kaiser proposal, on an even grander scale, is that of the Puget Sound Utilities Council, a combine of power companies and large municipal systems operating in the State of Washington. The council hopes to build a massive $300 million dam at Mica Creek near Boat Encampment on the Columbia, and to transfer title to the project to the Province of British Columbia, which would receive as an outright gift the 704,000 kilowatts produced by Mica Creek's turbines. This is equivalent to receiving one and a half Bonneville Dams. Presumably, the council would also arrange with the United States Government a method whereby it would acquire, for the booming Seattle-Tacoma industrial area, the 1,076,000 additional kilowatts made possible in our own country by the Mica Creek storage reservoir.

### THE UNCOLLECTED BILL

In a sense, such suggestions lower the dignity and prestige of our Government. No Canadian corporations or combines have offered to replace their country's government in the negotiations at stake. And what is to be said for either Kaiser Aluminum or the Puget Sound syndicate claiming as their own the extra power produced at projects belonging to the public?

"Senator," I was told by an Army engineer officer who must remain anonymous, "if Kaiser or Puget Sound can swing this deal, then Conrad Hilton is crazy if he doesn't ask permission to build an extra wing at the White House and rent it to paying guests."

The mere hint that brokers or middlemen take over the management of negotiations between nations as traditionally friendly as Canada and the United States is a symbol of the utter collapse of negotiations at the government level. True, the stubbornness which the two chief negotiators ascribe to each other has not helped the solution of questions inherently difficult and complex—ex-Governor Jordan has recently been replaced on the American side by an even more conspicuous symbol of hostility to Federal power, ex-Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

General McNaughton has argued that the value of upstream storage to the Bonneville system should be measured in terms of the alternative cost of steam-power generation in the Northwest—which might be 6 mills per kilowatt-hour, compared to the 2½ mill power generated by the waters of the Northwest's rivers. Other Canadian spokesmen insist that Canada receive a proportion of the downstream kilowatts, on the theory that no amount of coin of the realm can duplicate for British Columbia the spectacular industrial development they have seen cheap hydroelectric power bring to the United States.

The United States has made no counterproposals in response to these demands.

Our Government's indifference to the issue is underlined by the situation existing on the Pend Oreille River, a tributary of the Columbia which originates in Montana and Idaho and frets a turbulent course northward into Canada. The Hungry Horse Dam, a part of the Bonneville system, provides storage that is helpful to the Waneta plant of the West Kootenai Power & Light Co. on the Pend Oreille River in British Columbia. Here the United States might set a precedent which could guide a settlement with Canada about the main stem of the Columbia, where the watershed positions of the two nations are reversed. Accordingly, I wrote Secretary of State Dulles to ask if an arrangement had been made or sought, to exact reimbursement from the Canadian company.

I received this reply from John S. Hoghland II, Acting Assistant for Congressional Relations:

"I believe no arrangements have been made for payments by the owners of the Waneta project in British Columbia for benefits received as a result of storing water upstream in the Hungry Horse Dam. There have been no diplomatic negotiations regarding this subject, and no requests for compensation have been made through the State Department."

Two weeks before Mr. Hoghland's letter came to my desk, the authoritative Vancouver Daily Province reported that Federal experts in Ottawa agree with Senator NEUBERGER, and say Canada expects to pay.

Does our Government care?

### SHORTCHANGING ALASKA

It is not only in the Pacific Northwest that vast industrial and economic expansion has been thwarted by the stalemate at the conference tables. Alaska, until now dependent on the seasonal uncertainties of fishing, mining, and logging, might acquire the first sizable permanent manufacturing establishment in its history.

The mighty Yukon rises in deep upland lakes only 15 miles from Dyea Inlet on the Pacific. But the 19,000-foot peaks of the coastal ranges barricade it from the ocean. So it plods 2,100 meandering miles in the other direction, emptying at last in the Bering Sea. After 840 miles in the Yukon Territory of Canada, it passes a lonely boundary marker and spends the rest of its sluggish existence in Alaska.

But what if the Yukon could be turned around and a substantial segment of it diverted to the Pacific? What if the drop now dissipated in its 2,100-mile pilgrimage to the Bering Sea could be compressed into a slanting 15-mile tunnel through the mountains, and then a crashing vertical descent of more than 1,700 feet? This could mean a second Kitimat, where the reversal of the normal flow of the hanging lakes southeast of Prince Rupert has made it possible for the Aluminum Co. of Canada to lay out in the wilderness the largest aluminum-reduction plant ever planned, as well as a community which will have 50,000 inhabitants.

Another Kitimat—this one located in Alaska, observes Alaska's veteran Delegate in Congress, E. L. BARTLETT, could revolutionize the economy of Alaska and move us from the frontier to the industrial age, in one vast stride.

All the ingredients are there. The Yukon rises in five mountain-rimmed lakes connected by stubby rivers, and only the mountains keep them from pouring through penstocks into immense powerhouses which could be built at tidewater. The mountains can be tunneled. They are among the highest in the Western Hemisphere, but an easy obstacle compared to the swath which has been cut through scrub pine and alpine fir in the foothills of the coastal and Chilkat ranges. This swath denotes the international border.

The Taiya Valley, where the turbines and generators would be constructed near sea level, is in Alaska. The lakes feeding into the Yukon are in Canada, divided about equally between Yukon Territory and the Province of British Columbia. They might as well be in Siberia, for all the progress that has been made in working out agreements with Canada for the joint development of these vast, interdependent northwestern resources.

In June of 1951 the United States Bureau of Reclamation submitted its first extensive report on the Taiya project. The gist was that it seemed to be technically feasible to produce an eventual 900,000 kilowatts of water power on the shores of Dyea Inlet near Skagway, Alaska, if only some of the lakes nourishing the Yukon could be tapped. This is not only as much energy as the American share of the St. Lawrence Seaway, but, better still, the Bureau's engineers contended it could be developed at the extremely low rate of 2.1 mills a kilowatt-hour. And, the report confidently predicted, low cost of the abundant power potential would attract numerous industries from more costly power sites in the United States. Added transportation costs would be more than offset. This forecast came true almost before the reports were stitched and bound—the Aluminum Company of America took over McKinley National Park Lodge and announced ceremoniously that it was ready to erect a mammoth smelter at Dyea inlet if the Taiya power project went through.

At this juncture the government of Canada called attention to the fact that, although Canadian water would produce Taiya power, virtually all the benefits would go to Alaska, an insultingly one-sided bargain. In the last days of the Truman Administration a few desultory efforts were made to offer Canada some quid pro quo. Because of the immense Canadian light-metal expansion at Kitimat and at Arvida in Quebec, Dr. John R. Steelman of the White House staff told Delegate BARTLETT that perhaps some concessions could be worked out with respect to our tariff on aluminum ingots. Other proposals involved licenses for the importation of Canadian natural gas southward across the border. But none of these ideas got out of the talking stage.

Delegate BARTLETT, who speaks for Alaska on Capitol Hill but is not allowed to participate in rollcalls, has been the leading public advocate of Taiya. Admittedly he is a partisan Democrat, but his prime interest is his constituency, and his opinion is worth listening to.

"Taiya originally was proposed when Mr. Truman was President, and a few efforts were made to reach an agreement with Canada over the great possibilities of the project," he says. "The efforts did not reach success. But, since 1953, nothing has happened, and when I say 'nothing' I mean just exactly that. Taiya appears to have been completely forgotten and abandoned. Rarely do I hear from the administration about what once had been our bright hope for economic independence for Alaska."

Recently the Frobisher interests of Canada have talked of committing the water in the Yukon's lakes for power dams in the vicinity of Whitehorse to process the abundant minerals found in that region. This would probably not match the Taiya potential, because the drop would be infinitely less, but it would avoid the apportioning of benefits internationally.

### NEW POWER FOR MAINE

Across the continent, on the St. John River, the same story of interminable delay is repeated. The St. John rises in the State of Maine and empties into the Bay of Fundy from New Brunswick. The projected Rankin Rapids storage reservoir of 1,460,000-acre-feet capacity in Maine could confer valuable advantages on power sites downstream where the river forms the international boundary for 70 miles, and where it lies wholly within the Canadian province of New Brunswick. At 5 locations, a total of 567,500 kilowatts could be generated—230,000 at Rankin Rapids, approximately 4 miles above the border, and the rest at sites claimed by Canada.

This power could be of great economic importance, because both Maine and the Canadian Maritime Provinces have lagged behind the recent general prosperity of their respective countries. But some formula must be worked out for requiring reimbursement from Canada for any addition to the production of its powerhouses made possible by water storage in Maine. Such a formula has completely eluded two nations which toegther could complete the Alaska Highway, defend the Aleutian Islands from direct invasion, establish farflung radar networks on Arctic Tundra, and agree trustfully to leave almost 4,000 miles of border without a single blockhouse or pillbox.

Our Government's lackadaisical approach to the problem of the waterpower bonanza going to waste on the borders cannot be separated from the Eisenhower administration's weird and inexplicable attitude toward the river which dominates the situation—the Columbia.

### A TREASURE TO GAIN

The Columbia is to power production what the Mississippi is to navigation or the Nile to irrigation. I can remember standing on its shores with a famous Swedish hydraulic engineer who had been a delegate to the 1936 World Power Conference in Washington. Over and over again he exclaimed, "Do you people know what you have here? This is a great river like the Rhine, but it falls as far as our mountain brooks in Scandinavia. What a treasure."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt and such Senators of both parties as George W. Norris, of Nebraska, Homer Bone and Clarence C. Dill, of Washington, Charles McNary and Rufus C. Holman, of Oregon, Burton K. Wheeler and James E. Murray, of Montana, and William E. Borah, of Idaho, knew precisely what they had in the Columbia. Under their joint aegis, a vast hydroelectric

system came into existence. It not only generated more energy than any other waterpower operation in the world, it also reclaimed immense expanses of arid land, retarded floods, and increased by 8 or 10 times the tonnage being navigated through the towering barrier of the Cascade Mountain Range.

On top of all this, the system has proved financially successful. Entirely as a result of power sales, the Bonneville Power Administration is $77 million ahead of the repayment to the Treasury, which Congress established about 20 years ago. After less than two decades of operation, the power facilities of Bonneville are more than 41 percent paid for.

This power system has had a profound impact on the economy of the Pacific Northwest. The decade from 1938 to 1947 was the only period in the history of Oregon and Washington when they showed a greater gain in industrial payrolls than the national average. This coincided exactly with the time when low-cost kilowatts from the Columbia River system first became available. Not an ounce of aluminum was smelted west of the Mississippi in 1939. By late in the 1940's, nearly half of America's expanding aluminum production was originating in the Pacific Northwest. Every one of these potlines used energy from the Columbia for fuel. And bigger things were ahead. The Corps of Army Engineers had already planned such projects as McNary, The Dalles, and Chief Joseph Dams. But there were still many more choice sites left among those analyzed and recommended in the corps' famous 8-volume 308 Report of 1948—among them John Day, Paradise, and Hells Canyon.

Then the Presidency passed into the hands of the Republicans. Under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, 20 river projects of greater or lesser magnitude had been authorized for Federal construction in the basin of the Columbia. Since Mr. Eisenhower entered the White House, he has preferred to turn over such sites as remain to private power companies.

This has taken two forms. At Hells Canyon, the administration has simply relinquished the site to a private utility corporation for three smaller dams which develop only one-fourth of its storage potential. At John Day, a site rivaling Hells Canyon in dimensions, the White House has proposed that the Government construct the fish ladders, spillways, and other "nonreimbursable" features of the dam, while a syndicate of power companies underwrites construction of the powerhouse. Of course, the revenues would be distributed accordingly.

The net result has been a lid on expansion of the Columbia River power system and a slowing down of the Northwest's economy. Per capita incomes have fallen off by comparison with the national average. In a region without local stores of oil, coal, or natural gas, it has been little short of calamitous to have its inexhaustible supply of industrial fuel—falling water—no longer tethered to giant penstocks and turbines. The Oregonian of Portland has stated that cheap and abundant power offers the best chance for an industrial revival.

To break the stalemate, I have introduced in the Senate a resolution calling for the creation of a North Pacific International Waterways Agency, staffed by engineering experts and technicians of the United States and Canada, to supplant the present International Joint Commission and to plan projects on international waterways along both sides of the border. The only considerations would be maximum power production, flood control, and other benefits. Accountants and engineers would use their calculating machines and slide rules to decide how the costs and benefits should be apportioned. The two sides of the present Commission, each representing a different nation, are certain to accentuate national interests. A single agency, staffed by both countries, would be far more likely to place geographic realities first and international rivalries second.

Think what one will of President Eisenhower's domestic policies, in the field of world affairs he has put forth what I regard as a sincere and conscientious effort to be a successful leader of the free nations. The bogged-down river negotiations with our nearest ally offer him a magnificent opportunity for leadership at the international level—if only he can overcome his private-utility bias against the expansion of Federal powerplants.

Energy reserves could help shape the industrial competition now looming between the free and the Soviet world. Khrushchev is committed to a policy of excelling us on the production line. Water power is the most enduring and reliable energy of all, because it lasts forever and consumes not a cupful of such expendable fuels as coal, petroleum, and uranium. The rulers of the Soviet Union understand this. They are tapping Russia's rivers to the maximum. Soviet power production has soared 86 percent since 1950. Although still considerably behind the output of the United States, the Soviet Union actually tops our entire continent in potential hydroelectricity. I am informed by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington State, who recently visited Russia, that 40 big waterpower plants are under construction there. Three of these—Stalingrad Dam on the Volga, Krasnoyarsk on the Yenisei, and Bratsk Dam on the Angara River—will each exceed the power capacity of Grand Coulee.

"If the six major rivers of Siberia were fully developed," adds Senator JACKSON, they alone could produce 600 billion kilowatt-hours of power per year. This is more than 3 times present Soviet production, double the Kremlin's 1960 goals, and virtually equal to our own national electric-power output."

In view of Russia's urgent hydroelectric program, can the United States and Canada afford to let go to waste indefinitely the untapped resources of the Yukon, the St. John, and the Columbia merely because of obstinacy or lethargy at the conference table?

---

## Postal Rate Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of my good friend and respected colleague, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, given before the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association in Portland, Oreg., on December 6, 1957:

REMARKS BY HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON

I am happy to have this opportunity to discuss with you the pending postal rate increase bill now before the Congress. Undoubtedly, you are generally familiar with the proposals in H. R. 5836. They call for substantial increases in the rates to be charged for the several classes of mail. But before discussing with you the proposals and philosophy contained in the new postal rate-increase bill, I should like to review, in a broad way, the indispensable place the post office has in our economy and the close, personal importance it holds for each of us.

Our postal service has had a vital part in the growth and development of America. History records the fact that the postal service was substantially responsible for the creation and growth of our merchant marine; that the fundamental need of our people for adequate postal service contributed heavily to the growth and development of our vast system of railroads. Until recently, our postal service provided substantial subsidies essential to the growth and development of the airlines. If there is any question in your mind having to do with the vital part the postal service contributes to the continuing operation of the railroads, we need look no further than the frantic protests raised when a branch rail line is proposed to be discontinued as a result of the cancellation of an existing mail-carrying contract with a railroad.

Beneficial postage rates have given many an infant business its start in life, to grow, to employ people, to pay taxes, to help make America strong and great. Fair postal rates have greatly aided in making Americans the best informed people on the face of the earth, have broadened and strengthened our cultural and spiritual heritage. There is no doubt in my mind that the postal service of the United States provides a tremendous bulwark to all the many phases of our national life and, as such, is an essential public service.

The 83d Congress in 1954 gave full confirmation to the public service concept when the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, under the leadership of Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, through its Advisory Council, declared: "The Post Office Department is fundamentally a public service to the people of the United States, and should be so considered."

More recently this year, under the leadership of Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, a citizens' advisory council filed with the Senate committee a substantial and detailed report entitled "The Post Office as a Public Service." The council declared its finding that the total public service values that could be definitely pinpointed in cost figures were greater in total than the deficit stated as having been established by the Post Office Department for fiscal year 1955. It is in the area of public service, in the identification and cost of the several items of public service, that we come into bona fide conflict with the present administration and its postal philosophy.

The present Postmaster General has referred to the Post Office Department as a public utility, or as a business which should be fully self-supported through postal fees paid by users of the mails. That sounds fine as a superficial theory, until the Postmaster General's theory runs head on into the practical consideration of the large deficits on specific public-service items for which the Congress has declared low beneficial postal rates.

For example, the hundreds of nonprofit magazines and newspapers of this country have a large annual circulation. They serve principally religious, fraternal, and scientific groups. These publications incur a postal deficit of approximately $50 million per year, that is, the difference between postal revenues and allocated expenses. In the several rate bills proposed by the present administration since 1952 there has been no effort made to increase the below-cost postal rates on this type of publication. It is my belief Congress was wise in authorizing beneficial below-cost postal rates for such public service cultural publications. But, when questioned on postal revenue losses in this area of service, the Postmaster General has been distinctly evasive.

To be consistent in his contention that the Post Office Department should be on a pay-as-you-go basis, why has the Postmaster General not asked for substantial increases in postal rates for this particular category of mail? The Postmaster General's testimony to Congress gives clear impression that he feels these losses from below-cost postal rates in the public service should be borne by other mail users through excessively high postal charges. Such a policy is practically punitive in its effect, particularly on small businesses. I don't think we have reached a point in this country where we are going to ask businesses—which must make a profit or perish—to underwrite such public service postal losses, particularly as such nonprofit publications compete for advertising with the in-business-for-profit newspapers and magazines.

Another type of desirable public service in the field of publishing, which has substantially contributed to our national advancement, is the free-in-county newspapers. These cost the Post Office a net revenue loss of approximately $14 million a year. To be consistent in its pay-as-you-go philosophy, the Post Office Department should charge full cost for this kind of service. But, to put that service on a pay-as-you-go basis, would sound the death knell of many of our fine and valuable county newspapers. There are many other types of public services which could be enumerated to emphasize the point.

RURAL FREE DELIVERY A PUBLIC SERVICE

Rural free delivery is one of these. Rural free delivery was established in 1896. Today, it serves approximately one-fifth of the Nation. Rural free delivery carriers deliver mail to more than 35 million of our people. This year, the Citizens' Advisory Council reported that approximately $95 million was the cost of the public welfare service provided in rural free delivery. Were the Post Office to insist on a pay-as-you-go basis for rural free delivery, farm families would pay much more for postal service than they do now. Frequently it costs 10 times more to deliver a letter on a remote rural route than in a crowded city. The rural free delivery system was established to provide our farm and suburban folks with benefits equal to those of the city dweller. Without rural free delivery, families in lonely rural areas would be heavily penalized.

Consider, too, America's parcel-post service, which annually carries upwards of a billion small packages to even the most remote regions of our country. Parcel post is a constant and personal part of the life of each of us—businessmen, farmers, householders. We're all particularly aware of that fact right now in sending and receiving our Christmas packages.

But the essential national function of parcel post, a self-supporting service with rates set by the Postmaster General and the Interstate Commerce Commission and not by Congress, is being curtailed.

Throughout the Nation's legislative history in the development and growth of our great postal service, there is constant, frequent reference to the fact that adequate postal communication should be provided to all Americans, everywhere, without primary considerations of cost or profit to the Government of the United States. Postal service has always been considered primarily and basically a vital public service.

These examples are cited to demonstrate the fallacy of the present administration's philosophy that the Post Office is a public utility, or should be considered as a business on a pay-as-you-go basis. Carrying the administration's philosophy to the ultimate would mean that we would have to pay much more for postal services. Such higher postal rates would be manifestly unfair in many respects, because the ordinary mailer would thus also be carrying the burden of losses on public-service items. Or it would mean the elimination of uneconomic operations as is the practice in private business, which, in turn, would deny many of our citizens an adequate mail service.

WHY PICK ON THE POST OFFICE?

I am not afraid to vote general taxes to help make up any postal operating deficit which is due to an adequate and efficient postal system which serves the American public at fair and equitable rates. Our Federal Government consists of some 10 major departments and hundreds of lesser bureaus. There is no valid reason why the Post Office should be singled out for operation at a profit, while all the others can incur large deficits which amount up to many billions of dollars.

Postal rates could be raised to a point where they hampered and choked off many legitimate business undertakings. This might be necessary for a profitmaking postal system. Yet would it be wise?

I have not subscribed to the so-called Hoover Commission theory that those who get governmental services should pay for them. It sounds persuasive. When adapted to our postal system it demands stiff rates from certain users. Yet, apply it to other spheres of Government and see what happens.

Would this theory not exempt from school taxes all families without children of their own? What about local fire protection? Would the Hoover theory not result in billing a household for turning out the hook and ladder to douse an attic fire? If an elderly woman faints on the sidewalk, should her family be billed for the hourly wages and motor-vehicle costs of the patrolman who drives her to a hospital or doctor's office? These are questions implicit in the whole idea of those who get governmental services should pay for them.

I consider the Post Office a service institution. I want revenues to be as near as possible to postal costs and expenses. But I do not want a false standard raised for fusing these two areas. We could balance the postal budget at the cost of impairing the Nation's economy, particularly to the detriment of the less favored users of our mail system.

You have commented considerably, pro and con, in your columns on the current postal rate controversy. I know the American Newspaper Publishers Association has declared it wants no subsidies, and that the association has resisted postal rate increases until publishers may know precisely what the costs are. Unfortunately, much of the Post Office Department propaganda has found its way into newspaper columns. Much of it is so misleading that the average American finds it difficult to arrive at a sound judgment. For example, the Postmaster General has frequently referred to the fact that the Post Office Department incurs a $250 million annual loss on second-class mail. Second-class mail, as you know, is the category including newspapers and magazines.

SUMMERFIELD BLAMES MAGAZINE PUBLISHERS

Recently, in a nationwide telecast, Mr. Summerfield said that the loss on second-class mail amounted to $250 million per year, and further commented that "the newspapers are responsible for a small portion of the total loss of second-class mail." In short, he placed most of the blame squarely on the backs of the magazine publishers. But what is the actual truth?

In the Cost Ascertainment Report for 1956 the Post Office shows the total loss on second-class mail as amounting to $269 million. Of this loss, the newspapers account for approximately $104 million, and that is making no allowance for that portion of exempt publications which is used by newspapers.

Despite Mr. Summerfield's statement that the newspapers are responsible for a small portion of this alleged loss, his own accounting facts reveal that they are responsible for approximately 50 percent of this alleged loss. I do not make this statement as being critical in any essential of our newspaper industry, but rather as showing the confusion that exists in the public mind as a result of misleading information and inaccurate statements.

I referred to the $269 million as an "alleged loss." This alleged loss, and others, are based on mere cost-ascertainment determinations, and the Post Office Department has repeatedly warned the Congress that to use cost ascertainment exclusively as a ratemaking device is a fallacy. Accordingly, the Post Office Department has modified cost ascertainment by making certain provisions for the usual allocation of costs based on standard ratemaking factors, such as priority and preferment of service, value of product, ability to pay, and other intangible factors. When this formula is applied to Post Office Department costs, an amazing result is revealed. The alleged second-class deficit of $269 million, so glibly asserted by the Postmaster General in publicity statements, suddenly shrinks to $102 million. That is a reduction of $167 million. And the $102 million still remaining includes many items of public service for which the Post Office itself has requested no increase.

If second-class mail is to be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis, then many publishers of newspapers and magazines would be required to foot the bill for much free and privileged mail, some of which is in direct competition with your industry.

The forthcoming session of the 85th Congress will see great pressures being exerted for the enactment of a postal rate-increase bill. This undoubtedly will be used by the administration as a basis for approving Federal and postal employees' pay increases. I am thoroughly opposed to linking pay increases with rates, for it doesn't make sense.

There are now over 2 million employees in the Federal Government. Approximately one-fourth of these work for the Post Office Department. Is it the administration's contention that mailers, through increased postal rates, should bear the brunt of employee pay increases for the entire Federal Government? Certainly, the Federal Government is not asking for increases in visitors' fees to the National Parks, for increases in Patent Office fees, for increases in airline fees for use of airway facilities, nor for increases in payment for other public services provided by the Federal Government.

CONSIDER PAY INCREASE ON ITS MERITS

I support a fair and adequate pay increase for Federal and postal employees. But such pay increases should be considered strictly on their own merits, with no relation whatsoever to rates or fees to be charged the American public for services provided by the Federal Government.

I wonder how often we tend to forget that in the early days of the postal service the recipient paid for the transmission of mail at the time he received it. The high rates imposed, and the difficulty of collecting, led the Congress early to enact lower beneficial postal rates in the public interest.

In 1792, George Washington made the following statement to the Congress: "In consequence of the rate of postage imposed on the transmission of newspapers by the Post Office law, many persons in Virginia who had heretofore taken newspapers from this city had declined receiving them any longer; and that many others declared that they had only continued to take them under a full persuasion that the rates of postage would be reduced during the present session of Congress, and that if such reduction would not take place they would desire their printers to stop their papers." The public service obligations of our postal system to the American people were obvious then as they are now.

For a moment or two let us analyze the rate bill as it passed the House. You will recall that it provides for a 1-cent increase in first class mail—that is letter mail; a 1-cent increase in airmail, and increasing the postal-card rate from 2 cents to 3 cents. The bill provides for an increase of 60 percent on second-class mail, spread over a period of 4 years. It also provides that the 5,000 press-run newspapers will be exempted from the rate increase. There is also a provision limiting the subsidy to any one publication to $100,000 based on the Post Office Department's cost ascertainment figures.

For third class mail, the bill provides for immediate hiking of the bulk minimum per piece rate from 1½ to 2½ cents.

The House bill also carries, as title II, a postal policy which is not only inconsistent with the Post Office Department's own philosophy respecting postal rates, but does nothing to resolve many of the public service problems of the Post Office Department. A policy provision such as the one contained in this bill is not self-executing, and needs revision if it is to provide a workable and equitable basis for present and future postal rate action.

I do not favor the postal rate bill as passed the House. I believe there is much work still to be done before we can properly or fairly solve the perennial postal rate dilemma.

First of all, Congress should adopt a modern postal policy enumerating the public services properly to be paid for out of the general tax funds as expenditures in the public welfare. The present bill does not include such essential policy provisions.

As I have mentioned, the present postal rate bill provides that the 5,000 press run newspapers shall be exempted from postal rate increases. This may be a valid provision, although certain newspaper groups have strenuously objected to it. But my point is this: if this provision remains in the bill, then I insist it is incumbent upon the Congress to put a dollar value on the subsidy involved, and provide that it be borne from the general tax funds. It should not fall upon other postal customers. Depending upon which set of figures is used, this subsidy could run anywhere from $10 million to upwards of $20 million or more per annum.

THE NEED FOR A POSTAL POLICY

At the present time, postal rates are being determined by the Post Office Department, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Congress of the United States. Once the Congress has adopted a much needed postal policy, I believe that all postal ratemaking authority should be vested in the Congress, so as to insure continuing consistency with postal policy.

With respect to the proposed increase in first class mail, for years this category has shown a substantial profit. Now, under the present Post Office formula costs have been shifted so that it carries a substantial loss. However, the Post Office formula was adopted without benefit of a Congressional policy enactment, which makes their findings inconclusive and possibly inaccurate.

The proposed rate increases for second class mail, in my opinion, would tender to foster monopoly. Bear in mind that there are 25,000 publications equally divided between newspapers and magazines entered as second class mail. Unquestionably, some of the larger publications could stand a 60 percent increase in rates spread over 4 years, but what about the smaller publications whose profit margins are declining, and whose struggle to stay in business would end if faced with a 60 percent increase? Are we ready in this country to turn our press over to the hands of a few, and vest it in a quasi-monopoly? Under such circumstances I doubt if our press would be any longer free.

Would it possibly dare to call to the attention of our people the shortcomings of the present administration with respect to our scientific race with other nations? Would the publication Aviation Weekly have told us, as it did in a recent edition, that the technological and scientific developments of Russia have been observed for a period of 2 years through our radar installations in Turkey?

Our press discharges the obligation our forefathers placed upon it when it brings to public light mistakes and inconsistencies of our leaders, who are held responsible for actions which benefit the general welfare.

I recognize that many daily newspapers have found other ways to distribute their mail than through the post office. Editor and Publisher recently reported a 11 percent decline in the use of the mails for newspaper distribution since the last 30 percent increase went into effect in 1951. But many weekly newspapers and magazines, totally dependent on mail for delivery, may not be able to withstand the impact of a drastic rate increase such as is currently proposed; 60 percent added to present second class mail rates would mean a total increase of 108 percent since 1951. I believe this is a cost factor far in excess of the increases in other business costs.

You have perhaps given some thought to the so-called Rhodes amendment, which limits the subsidy of any one periodical to $100,000 per annum to be determined by cost ascertainment findings of the Post Office Department. Just a word on that. In the first place, the Post Office Department itself has condemned cost ascertainment as a sole basis for postal ratemaking, secondly, it seems to me the Rhodes amendment would vest in the Postmaster General a power over the free press perilous to our country's welfare.

The proposed arrangement would permit one individual, the Postmaster General, to set varying costs on competing publications. He could give preferment to one publication over another. Bias could enter into such judgments. The implications of such a dictatorship are obvious. Even the present Postmaster General admits the Rhodes amendment is unworkable. I, for one, am reluctant to support it.

TOO STEEP INCREASE ON THIRD CLASS

The proposal to raise the per piece rate on third class mail from 1½ to 2½ cents is far too drastic. It would cause widespread damage to small business, which is already in sore straits. Many small businesses in this country find third class mail essential as an effective and economical means of advertising and selling their products. These are the small businesses which cannot afford the substantial cost of advertising through radio, television, and the press.

I feel that the United States Government owes small business every possible encouragement to prosper and grow. There has been testimony before the committees of Congress that small businesses dependent upon the mails could not survive this large increase proposed in postal rates. Bear in mind that there are 225,000 third-class mail permits in existence today. It is estimated that the users of these permits have built up a total of about $15 billion annual business. I, for one, would want to approach the matter of increasing third-class mail rates with exceeding caution, and with the full knowledge of the great damage to the national economy which could easily result from ill-considered Congressional action.

The present administration is asking our people to pay more money for less service. It is asking us to pay a premium for built-in waste and inefficiency. The Oakland Tribune of Oakland, Calif., in an editorial dated August 20, 1957, asked that we bring back the pony express and stated: "The truth must be faced: whatever the reason, mail service in the bay area is little better than in the days of its infancy."

There is general complaint that the mail service is deteriorating throughout the Nation. Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, who is chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, has offered a bill to provide modernization of postal facilities. He proposed to borrow $2 billion from the Federal Employees' Retirement Fund. He believes this will provide better service to the American people at drastically reduced costs. I shall support him in this effort.

The Postmaster General has laid the blame on Congress for not providing sufficient money for modernization and technical improvement. But the Congress has given him practically every dollar he has requested. Last year, for example, he asked for $22,200,000 for administration and research, of which $4 million was actually for research. Initially he got $20,500,000 of this, plus another $2 million in the form of a supplemental request. Of $229,500,000 which he requested for buildings and facilities, Congress initially voted $220 million, and added $17 million in a supplemental appropriation.

The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has spent many thousands of dollars investigating these postal problems. I don't want to see this substantial expenditure of the taxpayers' money wasted. I am thoroughly convinced it will be possible in the next session of Congress to develop a modern postal policy so greatly needed. Once Congress has accomplished this, I feel we will then be in a position to act intelligently and constructively on postal-rate increases and other crucial postal matters.

---

## Opportunities for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of an address I delivered in New York before the Italian Board of Guardians on December 17, 1957. I was one of the founders of this very worthy organization back in 1936 to combat juvenile delinquency and to rehabilitate young delinquents to useful citizenship.

The address reads as follows:

SCIENCE OPPORTUNITES FOR YOUTH

Mr. Chairman, dear friends, I am extremely grateful for your invitation to speak to you on this occasion. This organization and its activities always finds a warm spot and a responsive chord in my heart. As you well know, my interests and my efforts in public welfare began more than two decades ago when I became active in this organization. To this very day I am still vitally interested in the problem of delinquent children and related problems.

The famous Irish novelist George Moore was asked on his 80th birthday to what he attributed his longevity. He replied: "I never touched tobacco, liquor or a woman until I was almost 11 years old."

Unfortunately, not all people are endowed with the talents of a George Moore. Many a youngster, who tastes tobacco or liquor or who falls into bad company at an early age, suddenly discovers that he has become a problem of society whom we call a delinquent. In some instances, we are able to rehabilitate these youngsters and to make

worthwhile citizens out of them. This is the kind of work your organization has been doing successfully for so many years. In too many other instances, it is either too late or beyond the scope of rehabilitation, and such youngsters waste their lives behind bars.

I often think: How different their lives could have been if they had had a fair chance to develop their talents and their capacities for the productive and the positive things in life? Occasionally, we read in the press of grim crimes committed by youths or adults where they utilized their superficial knowledge of science to cause death or destruction. And we wonder: Why? Here was a person who showed a definite inclination to things scientific. Why couldn't we have given him a proper kind of training in this field of endeavor so that he would have utilized his inclination for the betterment of society, not for its destruction? Where have we failed?

We all know the size of the delinquency problem, which at times appears staggering and frightening. In 1956, for example, more than 530,000 children appeared before police and juvenile court authorities throughout the country. By 1965, it is estimated by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, over a million of the Nation's children will appear before the courts, if the upward trend in juvenile delinquency continues unabated. This is a tremendously large percentage of our youth, when we consider the fact that the majority of these boys and girls who come before the courts are between 15 and 17 years of age.

Their offenses include everything from gambling to murder, and from driving while intoxicated to rape. Figures compiled by the FBI for 1955 show that young people under 18 committed 68 percent of the auto thefts, 61 percent of the larcenies, 58 percent of the burglaries, 27 percent of the robberies, 23 percent of the rapes, 10 percent of the assault cases, and 7 percent of the homicides. These are figures of which we cannot be proud. They should be studied and well analyzed by parents, educators, court authorities, the police, civic leaders, and others.

Not only has the number of delinquents increased alarmingly in recent years, but there is some indication that the nature of delinquency has changed as these youthful criminals have made greater use of our technical and scientific knowledge for their purposes. The magazine Newsweek, in its issue of August 19, 1957, had an article on "Why the Young Kill," in which it said that today's juvenile delinquents are different than those of a generation ago.

"Today's teen-age gangs," it is stated in the article, "take killing in their stride, and they have gone far past the zip gun. To get their 'piece' (the gun that is their heavy artillery) they join the National Guard and steal a .45 caliber automatic pistol; they have even taken submachine guns. The weapon can be anything."

Zip guns and teen-age gangs are of fairly recent origin. The zip gun was invented in 1943, and this invention practically revolutionized the approach of the juvenile gangsters to acts of delinquency. It is said to have been invented by an unknown genius in a vocational correctional school in New York, who made it during his free hours while an inmate at the school. Using one of the school lathes, he took a piece of metal tubing, which was used as insulation for the wiring inside an electric lamp stand, and constructed it into a gun barrel that could fire a single pointed pellet propelled by heavy twisted bands. While the instrument was inaccurate beyond 10 feet, it could and did kill.

What a pity that such inventiveness and ingenuity could not be applied in a more productive way.

Or take the case of Max Shinborn, known about a generation ago as the king of burglars. He came to New York from Germany at the age of 24, with a wide knowledge of mechanics. He obtained a job with the Lilly Safe Co., one of the largest in the country at the time. There he perfected his knowledge of the workings of combination locks and the composition of safes. He mastered every detail of the science, art, and practice of safemaking, so much so that no burglarproof safe was burglarproof from Max Shinborn. In a book entitled "Celebrated Crimes," the author (George Dilnot) says of Shinborn that "he pursued burglary as a science, as a high art, with an assiduity that might be envied by kings of industry in any other walks of life."

Such examples of delinquent ingenuity are to be found very often in the crime reports in our press. In many such instances the perpetrators of the crime proceed with skill, and through the use of some scientific knowledge which they picked up secondhand in order to perform the criminal act.

Former Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, who was chairman of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency when he was in the Senate, published a book in 1956 entitled "Youth in Danger." Let me quote to you a few sentences:

"Too many of us, I believe, have a tendency to regard a delinquent as a youth who is just bad to the bone, and it is a bit startling to be told that delinquents frequently possess in high degree those very qualities that, funneled in a different direction, create the leaders of our society. Yet this is literally true. There is sound statistical evidence to justify the statement that delinquents often are conspicuous for their abundant energy, assertiveness, physical prowess, and imagination—all admirable components of the personalities of many of our outstanding men.

"Delinquents, indeed, may possess these estimable traits in greater degree than nondelinquents, and it is a part of their tragedy that qualities containing such potential good becomes the basis of their undoing. I know that the picture I am giving here reverses the widely prevalent conception of the delinquent as a weakling, a mental incompetent, a generally inferior human being. In any given case, he may be. But we should rid ourselves of the misconception that delinquents as a class are uniformly inferior. Many of them are superior to more law-abiding but more placid and less energetic nondelinquents."

I do not wish to go into a discussion at this time of means and methods to stem the continuously rising delinquency rate. This is a problem in itself. You are, I am sure, familiar with some of the suggestions that have been raised concerning the possibility of curbing delinquency tendencies among our youth. Some maintain that this process should begin on the family level in the home, others believe the schools should become the most important single factor in detecting delinquency traits. Some advocate improving our curricula, others think we ought to improve teacher training so that the teachers can detect emotional problems and the symptoms of tension in children at an early age.

I want to suggest another way, an indirect way; it is not a solution of the problem, but one which would have considerable influence on our youth for the good. For the past few weeks I have given a good deal of thought to the idea of a United States Science Academy, which would be established and administered along the same lines as the United States Military Academy at West Point, the Naval Academy at Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy at Denver. In fact, I am now in the midst of drafting a bill to set up such an academy and I shall introduce it when the new session of Congress opens on January 7.

I often have the strong conviction that our public authorities in the Federal Government, in the States and municipalities, are failing in their responsibilities to the youth of America. Because of my interest in setting up a United States Science Academy along the lines just described to you, I would be the last one to question the need for producing missiles and others of the latest weapons for the defense of our country. But I tell you it is just as important to take care of the problems of our children and to provide for them the opportunities for a good education that will bring out the best that is in them, as it is to produce the latest weapons. Right now the emphasis is on science and scientific training. If we had provided the opportunities for scientific training, if we had had a United States Science Academy, many of these youthful offenders might have had the chance to use their talents and capacities for constructive purposes and could have avoided the path of crime.

If there is any thought I want to leave with you today it is this: There is still much lethargy among the people, particularly among people in authority, toward the problems of juvenile delinquency. We must keep up the fight against this lethargy. And this is where your organization can do a wonderful job. Do not become discouraged. Such things cannot be accomplished overnight, but it can be done and it must be done.

Another thought in this direction is to help provide as many opportunities of an educational nature, not merely recreational, for our youth. This can be done by encouraging young people to continue their education in all fields, but especially in science. It can be done by urging Congress, the State legislatures, the municipal governments, to appropriate more funds for educational purposes, for building more schools, for training more teachers. It can be done by urging the State and city boards of education, the colleges and schools, to reevaluate and improve curriculums and to make the climate in the schools more appealing to youngsters.

I might also suggest that your organization could go on record in support of my proposal for the establishment of a United States Science Academy, and to obtain similar endorsements from other groups.

The thing to remember is this: We get out of life what we put into it; we find in life that which we are trained to look for. The child who gets no specific training for a constructive life, or is even denied such opportunities, cannot be expected to develop into a responsible and law-abiding citizen. Let me illustrate it, in conclusion, with this little story:

A man who owned a large tract of land once invited four young men to spend their summer holiday on his farm. Although the farm was large, it was rocky and quite barren. The man promised the four young people that he would give them anything of value they might find on the place. After the summer was over, the man asked each of the four young men what they had found.

The first grunted out roughly: "There's nothing I want here. There's nothing to see, nowhere to go, nothing to use."

The second, who was an artist, said that he admires the scenic beauty of the place and its winding valley, and that he depicted its scenes in several paintings which he made during his stay.

The third, a botanist, said that he found great delight in collecting certain rare herbs and roots which he found on the farm, and that he will sell them to a manufacturing druggist when he returns to the city and expects a nice sum of money for it.

The fourth, a geologist, made certain explorations of the earth and the rocks on the farm and he discovered a few nuggets of gold.

Four men and four different approaches, each of them pursuing life in his own way. The tragedy concerns the first one, who saw

nothing and found nothing. How tragic it is that so many of our youth grow up to see nothing and to find nothing in life. These are the ones who fill our courts and jails, they make the crime columns in our newspapers. They deny themselves the opportunity for a decent life, because they are denied the opportunity to obtain a proper education and the development of their talents. It is high time that we correct this situation before it gets too much out of hand.

## Social Security in 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 21, 1958*

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, three present Members of the House—Mr. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Mr. THOMAS A. JENKINS, and I were members of the Ways and Means Committee in 1935 when it reported out the Social Security Act. The report accompanying this legislation included minority views which Mr. JENKINS and I signed. These views concluded with the statement that:

> The minority membership of the Ways and Means Committee have at no time offered any political or partisan opposition to the progress of this measure, but on the contrary, have labored faithfully in an effort to produce a measure which would be constitutional and that would inure to the general welfare of all the people.

That nonpartisan spirit has prevailed throughout the intervening 23 years, both during the periods when my good friends, Mr. Robert L. Doughton and Mr. Jere Cooper, were chairmen of the committee and our party was in the minority, and during the periods my good friend, Harold Knutson, and I were chairmen and ours was the majority party.

All of us on both sides of the House have a right to be proud that in social-security legislation over the years we have followed the letter and spirit of this initial statement and "have labored faithfully in an effort to produce a measure that would inure to the general welfare of all the people." That this tradition of statesmanship shall continue to govern our actions is currently of highest importance in view of recent social-security developments to which I shall shortly refer.

The 23 years since the enactment of social security have witnessed profound changes. We have had not only the greatest war in history but the greatest economic expansion in any two decades of our national life—and our Social Security System has reflected this fact. Between January 1, 1937, when social-security taxes first became payable, and 1950 when its coverage was first substantially amended, our economic expansion was reflected by the constant increase in social-security revenues. Earning subject to social-security taxes and accordingly social-security-tax receipts, doubled between 1938 and 1942, and in 1950 were nearly three and a half times what they were in 1938.

Besides increases due to our economic growth, revenues have been further increased by the 1950 and subsequent amendments. These have increased coverage from about three jobs out of five to the presently nearly universal coverage, and have increased the maximum employer-employee taxes on an individual from $60 per year to a present $168 plus $21 for disability. This has meant a nearly fourfold increase in revenue—from less than $1.7 billion in fiscal 1948–49 to over $6.5 billion in fiscal 1956–57—plus a third of a billion from 6 months' taxes for disability.

As rapid as these increases in contributions have been, they have not kept pace with the increase in benefit disbursements. The natural increases in numbers eligible for benefits and in benefit levels would have been great. But these increases were greatly augmented by the 1950, 1952, 1954, and 1956 amendments which liberalized benefit formulas, provided for new starts, disability freezes and dropouts for computing benefits, reduced eligibility requirements, increased permissible earnings of beneficiaries, reduced the retirement age for women, and otherwise increased benefit payments. In combination, benefit expenditures have increased some tenfold, from less than $0.7 billion in 1948–49 to nearly $6.7 billion in 1956–57—while supporting contributions increased less than fourfold—from some $1.7 billion in 1948–1949 to some $6.5 billion in 1956–57.

Let me repeat these critical figures for the fiscal year ending last June, giving the exact amounts to the nearest $1,000: contributions $6,539,887,000, and expenditures $6,664,638,000. For the first time in its history the System's disbursements exceeded its contributions. It lacked $124,751,000 of being pay as you go. This crossing point, where expenditures exceeded contributions was estimated in 1956 to occur just before 1960. On the basis of those estimates, we provided in 1956 for a combined employer-employee tax increase of 1 percent, effective January 1, 1960, and for similar increases in 1965, 1970, and 1975.

At the time of the 1956 amendments your committee secured the best estimates then possible. When the conference agreement of July 16 settled the minor Senate-House differences, estimates were again made, this time on the agreed bill, and were printed on July 23, 1956. Table 7 of those estimates showed for 1957 and 1958 that contributions would exceed benefit expenditures, that in 1959 the contributions plus interest would exceed benefit expenditures, and that in 1960 with the scheduled social-security tax increase, contributions would again substantially exceed expenditures. In each of these years the trust fund would increase. The balance of $21.8 billion at the beginning of 1956, was estimated to increase to $24.5 billion by the end of 1959, and to nearly $26 billion by the end of 1960.

These estimates were based on high employment assumptions and were so labeled. High employment means not only high-payroll tax receipts, but also importantly affects the number who decide to retire and hence the size of benefit disbursements. Intermediate assumptions were made for other factors such as mortality.

I mention these assumptions because, as is illustrated by what has actually happened since the estimates, it is utterly impossible to make any social security estimates not subject to very substantial variations. Perhaps we should have warned the House as to these implications of high employment assumptions, but I question whether it would have made any difference had we done so. I feel that we have had as good actuarial advice as is possible, and that the actual situation which has developed is not to be considered a reflection on Mr. Robert J. Myers, who has been the social-security actuary and our committee's actuarial adviser for many years. Mr. Myers has rendered to the social-security program and to the Congress very distinguished service as the chief actuary and as the Congressional adviser on actuarial matters. Mr. Myers has brought to his duties great professional competence and abundant integrity that have given to those relying on his ability deserved confidence in his well-considered views. Instead, it is due to economic and other uncertainties inherent in old-age and survivors' insurance, which cannot be resolved into dependable estimates by any actuary. We find this inherent uncertainty reflected in the latest Trustees' Report on the Social Security Trust Fund, filed last April 30. This report contains estimates which have two assumptions as to future employment levels. Under one of these, the trust fund is estimated to increase by June 30, 1961, more than $2 billion over the estimated balance of June 30, 1957. Under the other assumption, the trust fund is estimated to decrease some $1.8 billion. Both estimates include contributions plus interest on the trust fund, in receipts. Both estimates show that expenditures will exceed contributions—under one assumption this deficit is over a quarter of a billion dollars, under the other it is over $4 billion.

Recent experience indicates that even this disturbing report may prove optimistic.

Estimated contributions for fiscal 1956–57 were more than a quarter of a billion dollars above the amount actually realized and estimated expenditures nearly a quarter of a billion dollars less than were actually spent. The estimated surplus of contributions over expenditures turned out to be nearly a half billion dollars wrong. It turned out that we had nearly a quarter of a million dollar deficit.

The estimates for the current year may prove to be overoptimistic by a much greater margin than were last year's estimates.

It is questionable whether the revenues for the current year will actually exceed last year's revenues, but the estimates call for about a billion dollars more. It is practically certain that expenditures for the current year will be far more than three times the expenditures which we have figures on for the first third of the year—so we can feel almost certain that these are again very greatly underestimated.

I look forward to the next trustees' report, which we should receive by next April, as I feel certain that its new estimates will take account of the actual experience occurring since the last report. It should prove most helpful in deciding on appropriate action.

The last few months have demonstrated that social security's basic variables so affect its income and outgo that even with the finest actuarial advice there is a tremendous uncertainty as to what costs are going to be and what social security tax rates will be needed to meet these costs. We have had brought home the fact that in contrast with ordinary insurance and annuities where the annual premium is fixed within narrow limits and actuaries deal principally with mortality, social security requires also the best guess possible of future economic conditions. For these future conditions largely determine the total earnings which will be taxed and hence the System's future contributions, and also greatly affect the size of the rolls and, in the long range, the benefit levels, and hence the expenditures. We need more experience in the actual operations of the 1956 amendments.

The situation I have outlined calls for statesmanship of a high order. As is always the case, there are numerous social-security bills pending before the Ways and Means Committee for liberalizing the System. These were introduced in good faith and possibly may be construed as commitments of their authors. I am deeply appreciative of this situation. I feel that the authors' constituents will appreciate that these bills were introduced on the assumption that the 1956 estimates of receipts over expenditures were correct and that the surplus of receipts over disbursements would make the proposed liberalizations feasible. I cannot believe that public opinion would favor enacting these bills under the present circumstances. I should like to stress this point because the American people are vitally concerned in the soundness of our Social Security System. Would it not be considered a betrayal of our trust if we, at this time of a mounting social-security deficit, recklessly deplete the trust fund by further liberalizing amendments?

The fundamental principle, adopted at the outset of the old-age and survivors insurance system, was that the System should be actuarially sound. The original act established what was termed the "old-age reserve account" and which, since the 1939 amendments, has been called the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. The principles leading to its establishment and purpose were reaffirmed by the 1956 amendments. In establishing disability insurance at that time we likewise established a separate trust fund, the Federal disability trust fund, separately financed by the additional social-security tax which was imposed and earmarked solely for disability benefits.

There have been, particularly in the early days of social security, divergent views as to the appropriate size of the trust fund, but since 1939 the present general yardstick has been in the law. It contemplates that Congress shall act when the trust fund is unduly small or unduly large. This general yardstick is referred to as the "3-times rule"—the relation of the trust-fund balance to three times the estimated expenditures during any of the ensuing 5 years. There is also the unwritten rule that the System should not operate in the red—the pay-as-you-go rule. I do not believe that this House will ever knowingly act in violation of these rules.

Members of this House are keenly aware that they are, in reality, social-security trustees who represent, on the average, some 400,000 citizens of their respective district, practically all of whom are concerned with this great System as present or prospective, direct or indirect contributors and beneficiaries.

I have included in this 400,000 not only those presently employed and directly contributing toward benefits and those actually receiving benefits, but all, including wives and children whose breadwinners' take-home pay is affected by social-security deductions and whose every purchase is affected by social-security taxes passed on to them by way of higher prices, and who are in turn given a floor of protection by the System.

Each of us is pressed to make changes in the System and each recognizes that many of these changes may be desirable. Each of us appreciates that these proposals must be evaluated in terms of immediate and long-run costs, as such costs must, at least ultimately, be reflected in the social-security taxes. In thus weighing benefits and burdens we exercise a necessary trusteeship.

The Congress has been subjected increasingly to articles in the press which point out that social security has been liberalized every election year since World War II and cynically forecast that this year will be no exception. We properly resent this inference that social security is considered a political handout, irresponsibly provided by the Congress. Every student of the system knows the care and consideration which have been given each change. We have at times differed among ourselves on some details, but we have likewise recognized the integrity of those with whom we differ. Amendments have been adopted only after a careful appraisal of their results, and we have been zealous above all else to preserve the financial integrity of the System.

The fact should be published that each 2 years there is a new House of Representatives, and that social-security proposals introduced the first year are in general the bills whose necessary study and consideration precedes our action in the second year—which is inevitably also an election year. The public should be fully appraised of the careful and considered actions which precede social-security changes.

I particularly stress the importance of a broad understanding of the reasons why the present social-security situation has developed. Members who may be disappointed in not getting action on social-security proposals which they prize, should take satisfaction that inaction demonstrates the falsity of charges that we are playing politics with social security. Much more important, it gives our people concrete evidence that their deep faith in the integrity and security of our contributory insurance system is not misplaced.

I cannot think of anything more tragic, both to the present and future beneficiaries of the System, than our knowingly enacting any proposal that would scrap the principle of pay-as-you-go and operate the System in the red, or which would increase expenditures at a time when the System already is so operating. Such action would undermine public confidence both in the System and in the Congress which controls the System. It is essential that the solvency of the old-age and survivors trust fund be preserved so as to safeguard the benefit rights of the millions of Americans who look to the OASI program for their retirement security. It is particularly essential that such benefit rights be protected with respect to our Nation's low- and middle-income families.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Elder Kenneth R. Pinkstaff, pastor, Metter Primitive Baptist Church, Metter, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Unto the Supreme Architect of the Universe, we lift our voices in prayer. Accept our humble praises for Thy rich mercies and loving kindness that Thou hast bestowed upon us as a great nation. Grant, O merciful God, Thy eternal wisdom and divine understanding shall be granted here in the leadership of these men that God and this Nation might be blessed. Thou knowest the future, Thou understandest our faults from afar off. Shun us from evil that we may follow in the paths of a Holy God. Endow Thy blessings on all the leaders of our Nation and especially upon the President in the capacity of leadership. It is written that God shall preserve the nation that seeks him. Remember now, our Father, the rank and file of our people and grant Thy benefits in the sustaining qualities of life. May the schools and churches be the guiding lights of this great country. Bless, O merciful God, the sisterhood of nations and especially the nations that are enemies to the great cause of Christianity. May the shining light of Thy supreme liberty and the glowing radiance of the grace of God be upon us and may the God who is able to keep us from falling, present us faultless before the angelical throne of the eternal heaven, we ask it in Thy great name both now and forevermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MIDDLE EAST PEACE WITH JUSTICE PLAN

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, 40 prominent educators, editors, diplomats, churchmen, and writers, all long experienced in Middle East problems, have called for a peace with justice settlement of the Arab-Israeli controversy lest the strategic Arab world be driven once and for all into the outstretched arms of the Kremlin.

Their proposal is clear and understandable. I believe it to be worthy of very special attention.

The members of the national committee for security and justice who formulated the basis for settling the 10-year-old controversy included Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick; Prof. William Hocking, Harvard; Prof. Philip Hitti, Princeton; Profs. Millar Burrows, John Brubacher, and Marvin Pope, Yale; Prof. Christina P. Harris, Stanford; Prof. H. P. Beck, City College, New York; historian Harry Elmer Barnes; author Alfred M. Lilienthal; editors Father Ralph Gorman, Sign magazine; Father Vincent Kearney, America; William R. Mathews, Arizona Daily Star; W. L. White, Reader's Digest; Dr. Alford Carleton, former president Aleppo College; former Ambassadors Wallace Murray, Harold Minor, and Joseph Green; Mrs. William L. Rogers, chairman, San Francisco Council of Churches; and Mrs. Frank Smith, trustee, American University, Beirut, Lebanon. The plan was recently made public in Dallas, Tex., by Committee Counsel Alfred M. Lilienthal who is on a national lecture tour. The text of the plan follows in full:

MIDDLE EAST PEACE WITH JUSTICE PLAN

November 29 marked the 10th anniversary of the United Nations resolution partitioning Palestine. Since that day in 1947, the Holy Land and the Middle East has experienced continuous bloodshed, turmoil, and warfare. Nearly 1 million Arab refugees face the rigors of their 10th winter in exile, many of them still living in camps subsisting on a United Nations bounty of 7 cents per day.

The sole party to benefit from this tragedy has been the Soviet Union. As this committee publicly warned at its very inception in January 1956: "The Arab world is being driven once and for all into the outstretched arms of the Kremlin."

At the heart of the Middle East tensions lies the unresolved Arab-Israeli controversy. Any settlement of the differences between Israel and the Arab States must be based on the resolutions of the United Nations of which Israel is a creature. The State of Israel has no legal claim to any land beyond what was assigned to her under the 1957 U. N. partition plan. In the year 1957, her occupation of certain territory by force cannot be recognized as constituting a right of possession.

It is our belief that the following constitutes a basis for settling this 10-year-old conflict with justice and with due consideration to the national security of the United States. Israel as the intruder into the area must first agree to these concessions:

1. The surrender of western Galilee and other territory which Israel seized during the 1948 war. Rectification of the truce lines between Jordan and Israel and the reassignment of lands separated from border villages to whom they belonged at the time of the partition. This latter would involve a minor readjustment but would remove a major obstacle to peace. It is estimated that some 200,000 Arab refugees could be resettled in Galilee.

2. The internationalization of the Holy City of Jerusalem. The new city must be yielded by Israel to international rule. A hundred thousand Arab refugees could be settled in the Jerusalem international zone and its environs.

3. Granting of permission by Israel for the return of 100,000 Arab refugees to live within her borders. Those Arab refugees not falling into any of the above categories would be compensated for their property losses in accordance with past resolutions adopted since 1948 by the United Nations. Any settlement to the refugees must include real and adequate compensation for property losses to be paid to individuals and not simply given in a lump sum as a contribution for the resettlement of these refugees.

4. De-Zionization of Israel—the Israel State must cease attempting to serve as a headquarters and spokesman for world Jewry and must discontinue her practice of encouraging by propaganda the emigration of Jews to Israel. This will require the disavowal of the claim of both Israel on all Jews and of all Jews upon Israel. The expansion of the State of Israel remains the gravest threat to the Arab world and constitutes the principal reason for the disastrous arms race in the area.

5. Granting by Israel of free access to an overland corridor across the Negeb linking the Arabs of Africa (notably Egypt) with the Arabs of Western Asia and availability to Jordan of a free port in Haifa.

Were Israel to agree to such concessions, this would in fact make her the kind of a state the United Nations believed it was decreeing in 1947. The Arabs would have no reason, while not conceding the fact that the historic relationship of Jews to Palestine has no standing in international law, as acts of magnanimity in the face of the exigency of displaced Jews not to agree to the following concessions:

1. Recognition by the Arab States of the State of Israel.

2. Lifting by the Arab States of their trade boycott.

3. Granting by the Arab States of free access for Israel to the Suez Canal.

4. Granting by the Arab States of free access for Israel to the Bay of Aqaba.

5. The internationalization of the Holy City of Jerusalem. The old city must be yielded by Jordan to international rule.

A settlement based upon the above concessions could be enforced by a new United States policy. The United States must adopt a consistent, constructive, and long-range policy for the area as a whole, including a program for economic development. This would entail the end of the special and exceptional position enjoyed by Israel and of past policy based on maintenance of a balance between the State of Israel and on the part of the seven Arab States. The United States through the United Nations would guarantee the final boundaries agreed upon by Israel and the Arab States and would enter into pacts with Israel and the Arab States guaranteeing their security.

---

## LATIN AMERICAN REGIONAL DISARMAMENT PROGRAM

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last night in New York City before the Overseas Press Club, Ambassador Gonzale J. Facio, of Costa Rica, delivered an important speech setting forth constructive suggestions for a Latin American regional disarmament program. Ambassador Facio, who is also the Vice Chairman of the Organization of American States, based his recommendations on the fact that Latin American peace has not been maintained by large armies, but by the development of peaceful machinery for solving disputes.

The Ambassador said:

The inter-American system has built the most effective peace machinery the world has ever known. The OAS Charter itself reaffirms the principles of collective security and lays the basis for more harmonious inter-American relations.

The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, or Rio Treaty, has made it possible to put an end through collective action, to every armed conflict that has arisen in the hemisphere.

As a distinguished Member of the other body stated in commending Ambassador Facio's leadership, Latin America offers an exceptional opportunity for a region breakthrough on disarmament, a breakthrough for which the people of all nations never cease to pray.

---

## SALUTE TO UKRAINIANS ON ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 40th anniversary of the declaration of the independence of the Ukraine, and I wish to join my distinguished colleagues in the House in saluting these gallant people.

On January 22, 1918, the government of Ukraine issued a proclamation of independence. Shortly thereafter, Ukraine was invaded by the Bolsheviks, and was incorporated into the Communist Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Iron Curtain is drawn across the afflicted Ukrainian nation.

Ukraine is a nation of 40 million, the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. For 37 years its people have been enslaved under the iron yoke of communism. They have endured mass murder, wholesale deportations, brutal torture in slave labor camps, the destruction of their churches. Yet they have never abandoned hope of eventual liberation and the reestablishment of their land as a free, sovereign, and independent republic. Ukrainian patriots have engaged in continuous and valiant underground resistance. The fight goes on today to regain their independence and free way of life. The lamp of free-

dom still burns in the hearts of its people. It will not be extinguished and will blaze again, proudly and fiercely when liberation has been won.

This anniversary is an appropriate occasion to make known to the courageous people of Ukraine that we Americans are wholeheartedly dedicated to the cause of human freedom, and once again express our determination never to rest until freedom is restored to people now living in Communist captivity.

## FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with the many distinguished Americans of Ukrainian descent in observing the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence. The largest captive non-Russian nation in eastern Europe, Ukraine today is enslaved by the Communist tyranny but the hope of freedom remains alive. The best evidence of this is the vicious anti-American campaign being waged in the Communist press of the Ukraine.

These proud people are being flooded with lies about discrimination against Ukrainians in the United States in an effort to discredit our Nation as a symbol of freedom. We are proud to have in our midst over 1,500,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent who are loyal, hard-working citizens respected in every form of endeavor. Many are great scientists and educators who have contributed much to American life. They are lending their talents and their skills to making the United States the best hope of freedom in the world.

Communist campaigns against Ukrainian nationalists are grim evidence that the spirit of independence is still alive in eastern Europe. We cannot permit the lies of the new "hate America" campaign to dishearten these brave people who are suffering so much to keep faith with the freedom they once enjoyed.

Our best reply is the respect with which we hold their countrymen who are living among us as fellow Americans dedicated to the preservation of freedom.

## COMMEMORATION OF 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, is a day of great importance to Ukrainian Americans. It is of even greater importance to the Ukrainians that live under the domination of Communist imperialism. This day is celebrated each year as one means to hold forth hope for freedom and independence for these oppressed people.

Former President Hoover has said: "The Ukrainian people became the first victims of the tide of Communist imperialism which subsequently engulfed so many free nations." There has long burned a strong desire on the part of the Urkainian people to control their own affairs and their own destiny. As a free people with great resources, they are in a splendid position to make many contributions to their fellows throughout the world.

At present, the energies of this gifted people are confined to projects which result in a glorification of the Soviet dictatorship. Moscow is now engaged in a vast propaganda campaign to discredit the free world in the eyes of the Ukrainian people. Ukrainian culture and individualism is being suppressed in an effort to more closely integrate the Ukraine with centralized thinking originated in Moscow. The U. S. S. R. insists that the Ukraine is an independent republic and must therefore have votes in the U. N., but this proclaimed independence is indeed a sham.

I firmly believe that it is necessary to accomplish more at this time than merely call to the attention of the American people commemoration of the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, which was destroyed by the Russian Communists in 1920. This is an appropriate time for serious consideration of methods by which the Soviet propaganda campaign can be offset. I am calling upon the United States Information Agency, through its Voice of America and other means to increase its efforts to bring home to the Ukrainian people the truth concerning the free world. It is important that the Ukrainian people see us as we are and not as the Soviet propaganda machine has described us.

Truth is one of the most powerful forces in the world today. It is one weapon that we possess that the Soviets do not. A forceful program of presentation by the United States Information Agency can be one of the greatest steps forward toward insuring that future Ukrainian independence days will be celebrated under freedom rather than tyranny.

## NATIONAL SCIENCE COUNCIL

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is again confronted with a critical period in which our institutions and our people are being put to a test—a test to determine whether we measure up to meet the new and greater dangers posed by the Soviet Union.

It is my firm conviction that our Nation and our people can withstand the new challenges. But new steps must be taken, and new direction must be given to some of our existing institutions and their programs.

In accord with this, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 10203, today which would establish a National Science Council. Through adoption of this legislation I sincerely believe striking achievements would be made in coordinating our effort so that the maximum results would be obtained in our scientific and technological research and development programs.

Four years ago, the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the Committee on Government Operations conducted an extensive study of our military research and development programs. It was my privilege to have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Operations which submitted the 24th Intermediate Report of the Committee on Government Operations, entitled "Organization and Administration of the Military Research and Development Programs—House Report No. 2618, 83d Congress, 2d Session."

The purpose of the committee at that time was to bring to the attention of the Congress and the executive branch of Government the unfavorable conditions existing in our military research and development programs and our recommendations for correcting such situations. It was the belief of our subcommittee in making recommendations that a number of beneficial changes could be achieved through administrative action within the Department of Defense. Other changes necessarily would have been made effective through legislation based on the recommendations of the committee and submitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

In the 4 years that have followed, a few of the recommendations of our committee have been placed into effect. Other recommendations remain only as recommendations; no action has been taken. At least one has met with defeat on the floor of the House: that taking place in the 84th Congress when it was submitted by the President as a reorganization plan.

In this age of advanced technology, when seconds measure miles traveled, and when the sky no longer is the limit, the necessity of a sound research and development program is not even questioned. It was my opinion 4 years ago that a definitive research and development program was most essential to our national defense. Today I am more convinced than ever that a coordinated program of research and development is not only most essential, but is the one course we must follow to prevent what may in the foreseeable future lead to the destruction of our Nation.

Adoption of the recommendations contained in the subcommittee's report—House Report No. 2618, 83d Congress, 2d session—would have placed our Defense Establishment in a superior position. I think we are yet the strongest Nation in the world.

However, the adoption of those recommendations now is not an adequate solution of our problem. Had we acted upon the report issued in July 1954, our Defense Establishment would have been much closer to our ultimate goal than it is today.

We Americans always find a solution to our problems, no matter how insurmountable they may seem at a given moment. We can and we will find a solution to the problem which confronts us in stepping up the pace of our numerous and varied scientific programs.

I am firmly convinced the answer lies in the creation of a National Science Council. Through this approach we would achieve coordination and integration of both policies and programs which are concerned with research and development for our national defense. The programs of the Department of Defense as well as all Federal programs in science and technological research would be favorably affected.

A short time ago the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], introduced legislation which would establish a National Science Council. I have personal and intimate knowledge of the majority leader's keen interest in this field. Because of this interest and because of his patriotic and unswerving interests in our Nation's welfare, he has acquired a vast amount of information on the problems of research and development.

It was a privilege and an honor to have had the present distinguished majority leader participate in the hearings and assist in the preparation of the report on the military research and development program during the 83d Congress.

And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the report referred to was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee and the full committee.

Today I join with the distinguished majority leader in introduction of a bill providing for the creation of a National Science Council. This bill incorporates the majority leader's recommendations with some additional ones which I feel confident the gentleman will accept. Passage of this proposed legislation will provide our Nation with a program designed to meet the problems of the space age.

NATIONAL SCIENCE COUNCIL—DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Provisions of the bill are briefly outlined in the following:

The National Science Council would consist of five members, appointed by the President and subject to Senate confirmation. The Council would serve as principal adviser to the President and National Security Council with respect to new developments in the field of science and technology which affect national security. One of its primary tasks would be to more effectively coordinate policies and functions of departments and agencies of the Government relating to programs for research and development.

This legislation would place at the disposal of the President a five-man council in charge of our scientific programs, bringing about a coordination of all projects under one head, thereby eliminating the confusion of a system that has lacked central scientific direction. It would provide the President with an advisory committee which would be able to keep the President informed on all of our scientific programs, yet be free of the bias of particular agencies or branches of service concerned with such projects.

In addition, the duties of the Council would be:

To establish priorities for carrying out projects for research and development in science and technology; to achieve maximum utilization of the Nation's resources by transferring materials and facilities from agency to agency on a priority basis; to avoid overlapping and duplication of programs by formulating and carrying out such plans; to transfer funds from one program to another and from one agency to another; and to transfer personnel for their most efficient utilization.

Another important function would be the formulation of and placing into operation a plan for collecting, abstracting, analyzing, translating, and disseminating scientific and technical information and data from all sources, including information from foreign nations.

The Council would also be given authority to formulate two other programs, but such programs would not be mandatory and may be placed into effect at the discretion of the Council. One program would be formulation of plans for cooperating with institutions of higher learning to insure that such institutions provide the base of learning necessary to the effective education of scientists and engineers.

The other program would be formulation of a plan for obtaining information and data on research and development from industry, foundations, and institutions of higher learning.

IMPORTANCE OF COORDINATED PROGRAMS

Had this Council been in operation, the confusion of our own satellite programs would not have existed, for this Council would have made a determination as to which organization would have carried on this particular development.

You will recall the reports that a number of Soviet Union magazines last summer contained stories about the sputnik but because of a lack of translation facilities and personnel, these articles went unattended. The Council will carry on a program which will alleviate this difficulty, bringing to the immediate attention important scientific articles translated from a foreign language.

Another step that could be taken by the Council under this legislation might be establishment of a nationwide guidance and aptitude testing program for our schools, or if not establishment of such a program by the Council, cooperation by the Council with whatever agency may establish such a program.

An opportunity to tap other sources for vital knowledge in our sciences is also provided should the Council desire to place into operation a plan for obtaining information from industry, foundations, and universities. Considerable basic research is carried on in these institutions, and the availability of this scientific information could be an invaluable aid to our Nation's security. I want particularly to emphasize at this point that this provision of the bill is aimed at obtaining vital scientific information from all industry, our large plants as well as the small concerns. Great achievements have been made through industrial research and development, and full utilization of these accomplishments should be made by our Government.

The necessity of this program cannot be minimized. I think the need for legislation such as I am proposing in H. R. 10208 has been amply illustrated in many respects. Soviet Union gains in science and technology have been rapid, as we know only too well when we review the achievements of the Russians in launching two satellites, their development of intercontinental missiles, their extensive and extremely mobile submarine fleet, equipped with the most up-to-date scientific instruments and weapons, and their testing and development of nuclear bombs.

I am convinced establishment of a National Science Council will provide us with a major solution to one of our most disturbing problems, that of achieving coordination and integration of our varied programs in research and development which so vitally affect our national security.

The value of this program in scientific achievement cannot be measured other than to say it will bring outstanding gains for our country. But the value in savings can be measured in the dollars we will not spend for costly duplication of programs. I think the money we will save in creating this Council to coordinate our scientific efforts will be tremendous. One of the Council's activities most certainly will be directed to coordinating basic research activities so that duplication will be eliminated. Under proper direction, I believe savings of millions of dollars will be possible through establishment of a National Science Council.

Today we are confronted with a menace that grows ever stronger as the Soviet Union continues to pour the major share of its resources into the development of a powerful war machine. To meet the challenge we cannot continue our present system of operation. We must make new approaches which are designed to realize the utmost in development of our vast resources.

One such new approach is contained in the bill which I have introduced today. I believe this legislation in establishing a National Science Council can be instrumental in furthering our scientific programs to a point where we will no longer need worry about Russian technological achievements. Eventually, the Science Council can be adapted to play a leading role in the President's proposed program of science for peace.

---

## COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LONG.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH to revise and extend his remarks and include a table and extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY in two instances.

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. TABER and to include a letter.

Mr. ANFUSO, Mr. ZELENKO, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. ROONEY.

Mr. FARBSTEIN.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. REUSS in two instances.

Mr. SCUDDER.

Mr. CRETELLA.

Mr. KEATING.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. HOLLAND (at the request of Mr. WALTER), for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

## SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10146) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 5 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself. However, I hope we can finish the debate on the bill today.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this measure, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bailey | Dingell | Morrison |
| Barden | Eberharter | Moulder |
| Barrett | Fallon | Norrell |
| Bass, Tenn. | Farbstein | O'Neill |
| Belcher | Granahan | Passman |
| Blitch | Grant | Pillion |
| Boland | Green, Pa. | Powell |
| Bow | Gubser | Radwan |
| Breeding | Halleck | Reed |
| Brownson | Herlong | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Buckley | Hillings | Schwengel |
| Budge | Holifield | Scott, N. C. |
| Carnahan | Holland | Scott, Pa. |
| Celler | Judd | Smith, Wis. |
| Christopher | Kelly | Spence |
| Coudert | Lennon | Staggers |
| Davis, Ga | McCarthy | Talle |
| Dawson, Utah | McGregor | Ullman |
| Denton | Macdonald | Williams, N. Y. |
| Dies | Merrow | Zelenko |
| Diggs | Moore | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10146, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, last year when we considered the Department of Defense appropriation bill the May sun was blazing down on the Capitol and we hoped that the prospects for the future were bright. Today the atmosphere is heavy and dark, and we meet amid encircling gloom. But I am not superstitious, and I refuse to believe that there is any ill omen in the weather.

Last year a majority of the Members of the House followed the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee in cutting the Defense budget by about $2½ billion. We will not argue now about the correctness of the figure. The cut in funds was a bold and determined action by the House designed to accomplish at least in part a number of things, including the following:

First. More unification among the services—compelling more unification by reducing the dollars and making closer cooperation in various programs and in the organizational setup imperative.

Second. A reduction in the huge carryover in unobligated defense funds at the end of the fiscal year. The total availability of money for the Defense Department in the previous year had been $74.4 billion and the estimated unobligated carryover on June 30, 1957, was $10.8 billion. It was agreed that a large carryover under the present system was necessary, but a gigantic unobligated carryover in the sum of $11 billion was considered as excessive, and we took steps to reduce it.

Third. A reduction in certain requested funds which, if granted, would result in overfinancing many programs and in an invitation to bad management and waste. As one example, and there were many others, we cut about one-half billion dollars out of the Army request for production and procurement funds. Despite our reduction, there is still an excess of funds in the account.

As an overall proposition, we made reductions in many areas for the announced purpose of compelling better procurement practices, better management, and more economy in the field of money and manpower. We did not think it unwise or improper for Congress, which has the power of the purse, to try to use this power in an effort to get a more effective defense program and more value for the defense dollar.

Today the Russian sputnik is orbiting the earth and there is a sense of apprehension in the air. In that atmosphere we are struck straight in the face now with this question. Did we hinder the defense program last year in reducing the defense budget? The positive and unequivocal answer to this question is, no, we did not. It is unmistakably clear and now undisputed from any responsible source that last year Congress gave the Department of Defense several hundred million dollars more than is being used for this year's operation. The amount as given by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNeil, is $899 million. This is made clear in the hearings on the bill, pages 315 and 329.

There has been a dramatic change in the world picture since last October when the Soviet space satellites were launched. Our intelligence people have become aware of a previous miscalculation of Soviet progress in satellites and long-range ballistic missiles. They have revised their estimates of Soviet capability in these desperately important fields. They have concluded that the danger to this country is definitely greater than was surmised by them at the time Congress passed the defense bill last year.

Mistakes are made from time to time, and had we been in error, we could in good faith and logic now take note of the miscalculation of our military and civilian advisers and try quickly to repair

the unintended damage to our defense program by making hasty deficiency defense appropriations now.

The report on the bill clearly shows that the Defense Department is not asking for the restoration of one single dollar of the cuts made in the bill last year. The money which is provided in this bill is for new programs which have never heretofore been presented to Congress for funding.

It has developed that in the defense appropriations bill of last year, Congress gave the Department of Defense large sums of money which are excess to the needs for the program presented last year. One of the explanations for this is the spending ceiling which was imposed by the Bureau of the Budget which slowed down spending and retarded many programs.

For the purpose of making the point clear, I would like to analyze briefly the aircraft and related procurement appropriation of the Air Force of last year. On July 1, 1957, there was a total carryover of unexpended funds in this account in the sum of $11.3 billion. In new funds we provided in the bill last year for this account $5,886,000,000, making a total availability for the year of $17.2 billion. The budget request for new money in this account last year was cut by Congress in the sum of $314 million.

Most of this cut was assigned by Congress to excessive spare parts. There was assigned by the House a cut of $75 million to the nonballistic missile program. We pointed out in the report and on the floor that the IRBM and the ICBM had the highest priority and that the program should be pursued vigorously without any money restrictions.

On May 24 last year, in discussing the Defense appropriations bill, I said:

> We even cut missiles a bit, but nobody is going to suffer greatly because we nicked this program about $75 million.

The cut was not in the ballistic missile program. It was not in the IRBM or the ICBM program. We made that point very clear in the House and in the committee report. I quote the following from the committee report, page 77:

> None of the reduction is to apply to the ballistic missile program.

With respect to the ballistic missile program, I made the following statement in the House debate on May 24:

> Particularly in the field of ballistic missiles, the sky is the limit—and I say this for all to hear—from the standpoint of the committee and the Congress—the sky is the limit in this most highly competitive field now between the Soviet Union and the United States, and that is in the ballistic missile area.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to question the chairman of this very important committee because since the Congress adjourned last year many people, Members of the House and outside of the Congress, have been accused since the advent of sputnik of having been responsible for our present lack of facilities and preparedness because we voted for cuts.

Mr. MAHON. I can yield my friend some time in general debate.

Mr. WIER. I was just going to ask the question. This is the question: I was among those who were accused of voting for that cut, which I did, and that I was not acting in the best interest of the country.

Mr. MAHON. The cuts by Congress did not retard the defense program. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. WIER. Among others who were questioned about the cuts was Charley Wilson, former Secretary of Defense, and I remember definitely the news services calling attention to Charley Wilson's answer to that and his having cut the defense appropriation. I remember the answer that Charley Wilson gave and that was that he was not responsible, but the responsibility lay in the White House where a later cut was made in these necessary appropriations. Is that true?

Mr. MAHON. The committee report on the pending bill and what I have heretofore said in these remarks make it clear that the reduction by Congress of the defense budget last year did not in any way retard or impair our defense program. A ceiling was imposed on defense spending by the Bureau of the Budget, but I do not want to get into that matter at the moment.

What I have heretofore said is only a part of the defense picture. Let us go back to 1946 when this country first began to think about a long-range ballistic missile. This was the beginning of the study stage. In the days of these early studies there was no general feeling of urgency because United States military strength at the end of World War II was vastly superior to the Soviet Union. In post-World War II days, we concentrated more on the shorter range nonballistic missiles, missiles designed to stop fighter and bomber aircraft which were then the major threat to this country.

In hindsight, long-range ballistic missile studies were not pursued with sufficient energy; first, because by reason of our vastly superior strength, there was no apparent need of urgency, and second, because prior to 1953 or early 1954, our military people were told by the technological experts that an ICBM or IRBM with an atomic warhead would be so big, heavy, and unwieldy that it would not be feasible. Sufficient thrust could not be provided to carry such a large and heavy warhead to the target. The long-range bomber was considered more trustworthy, more accurate and dependable. And to produce an ICBM or IRBM that did not have an effective atomic warhead was regarded as the height of folly.

The first hydrogen bomb was detonated in November 1952. The test was successful, but several months were required for full evaluation. The significant moment had come. The feasibility of the smaller warhead for the long-range ballistic missile was established during 1953, or by early 1954, as a result of the hydrogen bomb.

A lot of progress was made during those earlier years in ordinary nonballistic guided missiles. But not until 1953 did research in ICBM possibilities, which had been proceeding for some years, reach the breakthrough stage. We can be thankful that this was accomplished as soon as it was because it has given us an opportunity to avert disaster.

If one is bent on fault finding, there may be enough blame to go around when we look back. For a certainty, when we look forward there is enough glory to go around if we measure up to the responsibilities of the hour, make the right decisions, make them promptly, and get going with the necessary programs. In summary, it is fair to say that during the 12-year period of 1946 to 1958 far less than a perfect job has been done in the ballistic-missile field.

I personally am not interested in trying to dissect our blunders or in political maneuvering. There is no place for politics in this picture; indeed, the best thing politically and the best thing for the country is for us honestly to face the future and get on with the job. Some are afraid we do not have time to catch up in the critical areas where we are lagging. I do not share that philosophy. I am no defeatist. I think we can get the job done. I refuse to entertain any other thought.

A further fact needs to be made clear. Despite the mistakes of the past this country has made great progress—not as much as could have been made and should have been made, but much progress. As Americans we have stumbled but by no means have we fallen on our faces. Neither our own people nor our friends and enemies overseas should underrate our progress to date. It has been substantial. But we must move much faster. We must unfetter science and industry and the people in the Government who work on the operating levels in the defense program.

I wish to say frankly, and I have said this before, that after visiting in recent weeks many laboratories, defense plants, and installations generally from coast to coast, and conferring with the people of industry and listening to the testimony of the people in the operating levels in the services, I am encouraged over the spirit I find. I am encouraged to believe that we can meet the challenge to our security. We can do it if we will make prompt and sufficiently bold decisions and apply our best energy to the job. Some of the essential decisions have been made. Many others have not been made. They must be made and without delay. Decisions are pending now.

There is no room for encouragement and hope if we are to follow the practices of "business as usual." There is still some of that attitude in the defense picture, but not as much as there was before—not as much as there was as late as last November when the defense subcommittee made a tour of vital defense plants and consulted with defense officials here at the Capitol.

Mr. McElroy, the new Secretary of Defense, is making a fine impression in his contacts with Members of Congress and Congressional committees. He is new at

the job, of course, and cannot be expected to instantaneously get a full grasp of all our defense programs and problems. He made a fine impression when he appeared last November and again a few days ago before the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. We told him in our hearings, and I said today, that we must and we shall give this man our best cooperation in his effort to lead the gigantic defense effort of our country.

Another thing that has encouraged me recently has been the statement by the President in his state of the Union message in which he indicated that he was going to do something about eliminating some of the chaos which presently exists in the Department of Defense organization. I do not quote his words, but the general idea was that there is much room for improvement and that he planned to make the defense programs more effective. And when he spoke a couple of nights ago in Chicago, he said this:

A prompt and effective modernization of the Defense Department is necessary.

At that point he departed from the text of his speech and said:

In this I intend to participate personally until the job is done.

That was a very encouraging statement.

Certainly I feel that the Congress will want to do everything it can to encourage the President to get into this picture actively in order to get maximum results during these decisive weeks that lie ahead.

The House of Representatives today or tomorrow could make terrific headlines across the Nation and throughout the world, perhaps, if we would reject this supplemental appropriation as an inadequate approach to our problems. We could add hundreds of millions of dollars for more B–52's, more ICBM's, more money for the Polaris submarine program, more money for space weapons generally. Yes, we could get a headline which would read "The House grabs the ball from the Commander in Chief and runs with it." Well, it is my judgment that we will have time to revise drastically defense budgets later in this session if we determine that it will be wise to do so.

The request in this case was that we give this money and give it quickly. In an effort to cooperate, we arranged for the hearings on the bill to start before the actual request for funds was received from the budget. We have provided all the funds requested by the President and certain additional latitude.

For us to take the time to go into other fields and discover other requirements would take weeks. We might be successful in our hunt, but if we did that we would lose the objective of this bill. This bill is no good without quick action, because this bill is nothing but a series of programs and projects lifted out of the 1959 budget and advanced to the 1958 budget in order that we may get going sooner. So it would therefore be most unwise, it sems to me, not to follow the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations in this situation. In the regular bill, which comes a little later, if we are not satisfied, we can then work our will. But let us give the Commander in Chief and the new Secretary of Defense a little more time to make additional recommendations to Congress and let us have time to look over the 1959 budget and see what it really is. That will be best for defense.

Mr. Chairman, if we should load this bill down with additional hundreds of millions of dollars, what will be the result? It will mean that at the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1958, the Department of Defense, instead of having $8 billion in unobligated funds will have a much larger carryover of unobligated funds, this would represent a further lack of control of the purse by Congress.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The point that the gentleman from Texas is making is that this supplemental request is for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to buy some time on some very vital programs.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is exactly right. And the way to buy time is to move with haste.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I wanted to ask a question. I think I clearly understood the gentleman to say this. Is it the purpose of this appropriation bill to maintain the supplementary defense program as presented by the Secretary of Defense without increasing the bill or diminishing the bill? Is that the gentleman's judgment and the judgment of the committee?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The point is, let us give the new Secretary what he has asked for. Let us give him a chance to take the ball and run with it. I think he is entitled to our cooperation. The request which he has made is most conservative.

What is in this bill? The purpose of this bill is to accelerate the Strategic Air Command program for making our forces more alert. If you are going to have a B–52 ready to take off with 15 minutes of warning you have to have certain construction. Along the runways there have to be little arteries of concrete whereby each plane can come onto the main runway and takeoff in a hurry. Also, you have to have living quarters for the crews near by.

Another thing the bill does is to disperse our Strategic Air Command into more bases and areas where it would be more secure against attack, where we do not have so many of our eggs in the same basket.

Another interesting thing is the money which is provided in this bill for the early detection of the intercontinental ballistic missile. We have no way of knocking down such a missile at this time if we are confronted with it. We do not even have any way to detect it. Our DEW line, our radar screen, is not capable of detecting an intercontinental ballistic missile. Those missiles go up to a very high altitude and if we have the right kind of equipment we can detect them in the earlier phase of flight. If we have the right equipment we may be able to detect the flight of the missile. We also have studies designed to perfect ways of intercepting these missiles. First, we have to be able to detect the approach. We have provided for a few installations which will enable us to do that. This will be a very expensive program. Further large sums will be required.

Another thing that is provided here is a speedup of the ballistic-missile program for attainment of operational missiles. We provide funds for the supporting hardware.

In the report we say, in effect, "We wish you would take some of these surplus funds you have on hand and will not need during the fiscal year 1958 and apply them to expediting the Titan program. That is the follow-on intercontinental ballistic-missile program in which we are now engaged.

We provide funds here for three Polaris submarines. These are submarines that will be able to fire intermediate range ballistic missiles from under water. This is a tremendous step forward in modern defense. It is a program that has the unqualified support, insofar as I know, of all our military people, of all the services, and certainly of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. From the hearings it is my understanding that the Navy Department stated that they might come in at a later date during this session with a supplemental request for an additional six Polaris submarines. If that supplemental request is submitted by the Navy Department, would it be a proper statement that the Committee on Appropriations will give it urgent consideration?

Mr. MAHON. Certainly the committee would give it early and urgent consideration. I know the gentleman appeared before the committee and asked us to put more Polaris submarines in this bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. The Secretary of the Navy said if he found it feasible after more exploration and research on this subject he would ask for more submarines. I am sure that his request would receive the support and cooperation of the Congress.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I am happy to see you have approved the program for the three Polaris missile submarines. Is there anything in this bill that would provide for a defense against a Russian submarine or any other submarine that might approach our shores with that kind of Polaris-firing submarine?

Mr. MAHON. This bill is restricted in scope. It represents an effort to expedite the programs I have described. In the last year's defense appropriation bill a lot of money for submarine warfare and various devices calculated to meet this problem were included. I think the gentleman can be sure that there is no lack of funds for that particular purpose at this time. We will certainly provide additional funds in the big bill which will come on later in the year.

Now, we are being asked to provide for the transfer of $100 million in funds in the Defense Department, to the emergency fund, in order that in the event of a sudden breakthrough the President and Secretary of Defense could quickly channel that money into that field, so that no time would be lost. We have agreed to that transfer of $100 million to the emergency fund. We provided a total of $135 million for the emergency fund at the last session.

In this bill is money for the Advance Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense, which was authorized by the House a short time ago. I do not know whether this new approach will work or not. Certainly the objectives are meritorious. We have not undertaken to deny the Secretary of Defense the opportunity to try this method in order to get quicker action and more money for the defense dollar.

Mr. Chairman, that is a brief summary of the bill. I wish to commend to you the reading of the report on the bill, which is very clear and contains, better than I have been able to state, just what this bill does.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. It is true that while this bill is described as a supplemental bill, it is not, in the strict sense of the word, a supplemental bill at all, because it does not deal with any item to restore or to increase the appropriation that was made in the last year's bill. In other words, what we are doing is simply taking the first page out of the 1959 appropriation and making it applicable to 1958.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Every one of these items would no doubt have appeared in the budget for 1959.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. All we are trying to do is to gain time and buy time by making this money available between now and July?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is entirely correct and I appreciate his clarification of the issue.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. The gentleman knows what profound respect I have for him in his field. We may interpret a given set of facts differently, we may differ in judgment on evaluating a situation, as we did last year. I voted against the defense appropriation cuts. I well knew that much of the money was and is being wasted. But the way to eliminate it is through better organization and better men. Correct the system; but in an era of danger such as this, it is better to be safe than sorry.

I have a couple of questions I would like to ask. The enemy capability is the bull's eye in preparing defenses. Does the enemy have a stockpile of 800-mile range missiles capable of carrying a warhead?

Mr. MAHON. There are many people who believe that the enemy does have an operational intermediate-range ballistic missile, one that would fire within the area of 700 to 800 miles. I am afraid that is true. Naturally it jeopardizes our forces overseas.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Well, now, in a way it could jeopardize our own security.

Mr. MAHON. Anything that jeopardizes our men or our friends overseas jeopardizes us.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Yes. And the continental United States, too.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; it jeopardizes the continental United States in that way.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Does the enemy have a missile-launching device for submarines?

Mr. MAHON. I feel confident that the enemy does have a missile-launching device for submarines, but we cannot go completely into the intelligence picture on the floor.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman means does Russia have missile-launching submarines that can be guided, the answer is "Yes."

If the gentleman means ballistic missiles, the answer is "No."

Mr. MAHON. I think that is the best estimate of the situation. We have, and we think the Soviets have, submarines that will launch missiles. I am not speaking of the ballistic missiles.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Does the gentleman feel, from the intelligence reports, that they are developing and perfecting guided-missile-launching apparatus for submarines?

Mr. MAHON. It would seem to be beyond the realm of possibility that they were not working very hard in this new field, a field which we are working on. As already stated, we believe the Soviets now have submarines with non-ballistic-missile-launching capabilities. So do we. The Russians, we think, do not have submarines that will launch ballistic missiles; neither do we. The Russians are probably engaged in a program for ballistic-launching submarines; so are we.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. One other question: Do qualified persons believe that an antimissile missile is practical?

Mr. MAHON. Of course if you ask the scientists and the military people you find that they are never on the pessimistic side; they feel that they can make the antimissile missile. The Army unofficially indicated last November that it would like to have a $6 billion program for perfecting the anti-intercontinental ballistic missile. We have been working on anti-intercontinental ballistic missile possibilities for a number of years.

But let me express this thought. Our enemies have never been able to stop all American attack aircraft; they were not able to do it in the Korean war; they were not able to do it in World War II. We never have thought we could stop all enemy aircraft that might attack us. If we cannot stop substantially all enemy aircraft how can we expect very quickly to work out a device for stopping with a considerable degree of reliability an intercontinental ballistic missile which has soared 800 miles above the earth and is coming toward us at a speed of 15,000 miles an hour? This is no small problem. But we are working on it. I think however that while we are working on it we may be forced to conclude that in this field perhaps a good offense is better than the type of limited defense that might be within the realm of capability in the near future.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Is it not true, that, for these very reasons, the Rockefeller report and Dr. Edward Teller have been saying that we should not overlook a shelter program to protect from fallout?

Mr. MAHON. I think they probably suggested we go into a shelter-building program, but that is the kind of thing we should take up in the regular bill, not in this supplemental bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman not feel that in the case where there is any considerable doubt as to whether the enemy is operating with any particular weapon, that the only safe course to pursue is to adopt the assumption that they do have it?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Missouri is eminently correct.

There is no doubt in my mind whatever, and I have heard days and weeks and years of testimony in this military field, that the Soviet Union is ahead of us in the field of ballistic missiles. Those who wish to argue that we are ahead will agree, I think, that we should proceed as though we were behind; and I think it well to point out that this country can no longer afford the luxury of miscalculating and underestimating from year to year the strength of the potential enemy.

This is a time of great urgency and potential danger and if there is any doubt about the requirement of a program for the defense and the survival of this country, we should resolve that doubt in favor of security and get on with the defense program which appears desirable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 43 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill

(H. R. 10146) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the special orders for today will be transferred until tomorrow.

There was no objection.

## HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## THE LATE HONORABLE LAWRENCE H. SMITH

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart that I have to make a very heartbreaking announcement. It is one of these occasions when you wish you were not compelled to do so and I know that every Member of this House feels the same as I do.

At 12:20 today LAWRENCE HENRY SMITH, United States Representative from the First Congressional District of the State of Wisconsin, passed away as a result of a heart atttack. He collapsed on his way to the House restaurant for lunch so that he could be on the floor of the House for the day's session and program. He immediately became unconscious and never regained consciousness.

The State, the Nation, and the world all mourn the passing of a great statesman. He was a great statesman. I doubt whether there ever sat in the halls of Congress a man who exemplified as much courage, integrity, sincerity, and industry as did LAWRENCE HENRY SMITH. In the estimation of all the Members he was an ideal statesman in every respect. I doubt whether a Member ever sat in this Chamber who had the unanimous respect and admiration of each and every one of his colleagues, no matter on what side of the aisle they might be seated.

Although many times he did not agree with the majority, those who did not agree with him had nothing but the highest admiration and respect for his opinions and his judgment. He was one of those who could disagree most vehemently without being disagreeable. His opposition generated admiration and respect—never hate and condemnation. If there was anyone who had any doubt, and I do not think there was, about his sincerity and his integrity, that doubt was ultimately resolved in favor of LAWRENCE SMITH.

The way he died is typical of his great statesmanship. He died working for his country. He was warned by most of his colleagues to take things easier. But the crisis of the times impelled him to work harder than ever. Our Nation and the world can ill afford to lose him. But our Nation and the world are much better off because he lived and served.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, these events that happen so suddenly make it most difficult for us to express in words the feeling that is in our hearts.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a man who was dedicated to the welfare and wellbeing of his country. He was a gentleman at all times, he was a statesman at all times, a man of firm convictions and unyielding as long as he felt his position was right and for the best interests of his country. I have lost a very close friend and adviser, the State of Wisconsin has lost one of its greatest statesmen and native sons.

We all mourn his passing and extend our very deepest sympathy to his wonderful wife, Eleanor, and to his children.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the Wisconsin delegation and other friends in expressing my deep sorrow at the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH. For many years it was my privilege to enjoy his friendship. I knew what a great patriotic American he was and the patrictism that he brought into his work. He was a devoted man, dedicated to the service of Wisconsin and to the country. We will all miss him. We will miss his cheerful smile, his friendly handclasp. We might have our differences of opinion, but that did not affect LARRY SMITH. LARRY SMITH was a man of real strong convictions and possessed the courage to fight for those convictions. He always gave his best for the country. No man can do more. To his good wife, who has won the admiration of all through her grand patriotic services, and to his family may I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, there are moments when personal sorrow is so deep that words are inadequate to express it. I came to Congress 7½ years ago, and from the moment that I came through the door LAWRENCE SMITH has been at my right hand with counsel, breathing encouragement in moments of frustration, always giving me his cheer, always reminding me that the best that a man or a woman can give here is none too good for a great country.

LAWRENCE SMITH'S district is just to the north of mine, and there is so much crossing over the Illinois-Wisconsin border, north to south and south to north, that we have sometimes felt that we served almost the same district. We have served districts which shared the same convictions; districts which demanded of us that we stand by those convictions. I know of no one in the Congress, during the 22 years that it has been my privilege to know it, who has so strongly stood for what he believed as did LAWRENCE SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, after his first heart attack, which was a serious one, there were many of his friends who urged him time and time again not to give so much of himself. There were moments when we tried to dissuade him from taking the floor to speak for a stand not too popular but one in which he believed with all his heart, but on every such occasion LAWRENCE SMITH said, "What good would I be here if I did not give all of myself that I could?"

So, today, we share the grief of his widow, who has given so much of herself to Washington, and of his family, who, like his friends, respected LAWRENCE SMITH as much as they loved him. I know of no one who has ever come to the Congress in the history of the United States who showed more courage, who stood more strongly by his convictions, and who felt so fully that even his life was not too much to give to his country.

The Congress will be a lonely place without him.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing away of our esteemed colleague, the late Honorable LAWRENCE SMITH, of Racine, came as a deep shock to me as it has, I am certain, to all of the Members of this body. It was a tragic occurrence, and I would like to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his widow and his family.

The late Congressman SMITH was the dean of our Wisconsin delegation in the United States House of Representatives. I had the privilege of serving with him in the House since my first election to Congress, and I respected him particularly for his sincerity and his stanch integrity. He was a fine gentleman, always courteous and considerate of the people who came in contact with him. We shall miss him greatly, and so will, I am certain, the people of his district who elected him as their Representative to nine consecutive Congresses.

Through our common assignment to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I enjoyed close association with LARRY SMITH for the past 9 years. While we differed frequently in principle, I admired him for his conscientious devotion to his legislative duties, for his diligent questioning of witnesses who appeared before the committee, and for his adherence to policies which he considered to be in the best interest of our entire Nation.

There was nothing petty or egocentric in LARRY SMITH'S discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to him by his constituency. He was firm in his convictions, courageous in their defense and modest at all times. He was a worthy opponent of those who disagreed with him, yet he was a steadfast friend. He had the respect and affection of many Members on both sides of the aisle.

My wife joins me in extending our sincere condolences to his widow, Eleanor, and to his family. May they find consolation in their bereavement in the

thought that the good Lord shall number him among His very own. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues from Wisconsin in grieving the sudden passing of Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH. LARRY, as we fondly called him, was a dedicated man. He had certain principles in which he firmly believed and he fought for those principles. He respected those who did not agree with him and he had their respect.

I remember that from the time I came to Congress I counseled with LAWRENCE SMITH. He did a great deal for me, and I greatly appreciated it. I know of no individual from Wisconsin who has served in the Congress who has done more to create harmony in Wisconsin than did LAWRENCE SMITH.

His passing is deeply felt not only by his colleagues here, but the people of his district know they have lost a conscientious legislator.

To his beloved wife and his family Mrs. Withrow and I extend our sincere sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, this is a staggering loss to all of us, and especially to me personally. LARRY SMITH came here to the Congress about 2 years after I did. We have beeen close friends ever since, associated in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

LARRY SMITH served his country gallantly in war and just as gallantly in peace. He was a great student, a man who had profound, firm, and unswerving convictions, but a man who was always gentle and courteous and who never did a mean thing to anybody.

He and I differed often in our votes on matters in our committee, although many times we were together. But I think those who served on the committee would join me in saying that his was always a constructive approach. Time and again criticisms which he made resulted in better legislation. Time and again amendments he offered resulted in better legislation.

His sense of service was so unswerving that, as has already been said, at the time he first had this serious type of illness, which was a premonition of what was to come, there were many of us who said to him that the time had come for him to take it easy. But he felt that here was his duty, and he not only continued to serve in Congress but he did not swerve or save himself in the exacting work of his committee and in the exhausting work of this floor. So he has gone down fighting a good fight.

To his dear wife, Eleanor, and to his children goes the sympathy of all of us. May they receive the blessed comfort promised by our Lord to those who mourn.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin has lost its most outstanding citizen in the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH, chairman of the Wisconsin Congressional delegation. Members of our House delegation had learned to lean on LARRY for advice and counsel.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a great American. He was a fine Christian gentleman.

This noon as I sat in the House restaurant LARRY and his longtime friend, Del Kenny, of West Bend, entered the restaurant. I got to him as soon as possible. His attack was a great shock. I had been with him at dinner last night and he was in good spirits as we visited with Wisconsin friends.

As a new Member of Congress in 1953, LAWRENCE SMITH, as dean of our delegation, spent many hours with me. He was patient, he was helpful. There is no one that has given me more help and sound advice here in Washington than LAWRENCE SMITH.

LARRY had a fine career. He will long be remembered by the citizens of Wisconsin and America as a true conservative.

LARRY was State commander of the American Legion. He has contributed much to civic and community life in Wisconsin. He gave much to help his community, to help his State, and to his Nation here as a Member of Congress. This Congress has suffered a great loss today. Our State of Wisconsin and our Nation will miss LAWRENCE.

Certainly from our entire delegation goes deepest sympathy to the members of his family and his dear wife, Eleanor.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to speak when one's heart is overfull, yet each of us, I am sure, is impelled to record here our sorrow at his going, our gratitude that LARRY SMITH has lived.

I came to the Hill in the 76th Congress—our deeply loved colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin, joined us in the 77th. Since then we have sat side by side in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, exchanging ideas, arguing our points of view, quietly and earnestly. His comments as we listened to the witnesses and to the discussions were often amusing, always gentle, always kind.

After his first severe illness it became apparent that LARRY was giving his life, bit by bit, to his country. Today the last bit of strength came to an end, and we are left shocked and grieved that he has really gone. Yet will we always be grateful for his living—for his presence among us—for his gentle smile, his quiet wisdom, his indomitable courage, his unswerving faith.

LAWRENCE SMITH was one of the Members of this House who began his day with prayer, who set himself straight with his God before he took up the burdens of the day. To him God has been an ever-present, ever-accessible reality, of whom he could ask clarity, understanding, courage at any moment, as the need came upon him.

LARRY and I talked often of life with a big L; the miraculous adventure of living that we are privileged to experience. I believe he felt as the eastern sage expressed it, that—

Never the spirit was born, the spirit shall cease to be never;
Never was time it was not, end and beginning are dreams;
Birthless and deathless and ageless remaineth the spirit forever
Dead though the house of it seems.

Surely this man with whom we have worked and played, this consecrated patriot, this rare spirit who has been among us, has but stepped across the threshold to a fuller, freer life of larger opportunity and greater beauty.

To Eleanor, his companion and his wife, I would extend my understanding and affectionate sympathy, knowing that she will be upheld by her own stanch faith and her certainty that there can be no separation when a love such as theirs holds them close.

For us all, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we pray together in our hearts James Martineau's beautiful prayer:

We seem to have given him back to thee, dear God, who gavest him to us. Yet, as Thou didst not lose him in the giving, so we have not lost him by his return. Now as the world giveth, givest Thou, O Lover of Souls! What Thou givest, Thou takest not away For what is Thine is ours always, for we are Thine. And life is eternal; and love is immortal; and earth is only a horizon; and a horizon is nothing save the limit of our sight. Lift us up, strong Son of God, that we may see further; cleanse our eyes that we may see more clearly; draw us closer to Thyself, that we may know ourselves nearer to our beloved who are with Thee. Prepare us for that happy place that where they are and Thou art, we may be. Amen.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the greatest shocks that I have suffered in a long time. In fact it is very difficult for me to say what I wish to say in regard to LAWRENCE SMITH.

I rode up in the elevator with him this noon. I followed him into the dining room. I saw him go over to a small table on the right. I thought, "I believe I will go over and sit with LAWRENCE." As he reached for the chair to sit down, he fell forward on his face, striking the table, and the blood flowed from his nose. He lay there on his back. I wiped the blood from his nose. I felt for his pulse while someone was sending for the doctor. I could feel the slightest flicker of a pulse and I thought then the end had come.

This is getting to be a very serious matter in the House of Representatives. We can so ill afford to lose men like LAWRENCE SMITH. Yes, he was dedicated to many things. There was one thing he believed in. I know he believed in the Holy Bible. I know he believed that he some day would go to another world. I know that he believed in our Constitution as much as he believed in the Holy Scriptures. He practiced his beliefs here on this floor. His life is going to make a great contribution to this country, because I have always believed that every man is some boy's ideal. He may not know who the boy is, but he forms an opinion and he wants to grow up and be

just like that man. That is a wonderful responsibility. Many youths I am sure in his Congressional district and elsewhere who have known LAWRENCE SMITH will want to grow up to be the type of man he was. How rich a heritage that would be for the United States of America, if every man so lived that he would be some boy's ideal—an ideal to make that boy a finer citizen.

There is so much I would like to say in regard to LAWRENCE SMITH. Our thinking ran along the same channel as far as foreign affairs is concerned, and in many other respects.

Mrs. Reed joins with me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Smith, her children, relatives, friends, and the Wisconsin delegation.

I feel so deeply for his dear wife and his children. My sympathy goes out to them. God bless them. I believe that many of his friends on the other side were waiting for him to come.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. TEWES].

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, the dean of our delegation has gone. The suddenness of his passing has left all of us with a numbness and a sense of shock.

Our relationship was warm, personal, and cordial despite the contrast of our positions, for he was Wisconsin's senior Representative and I its junior. Perhaps this gave us a special bond.

Our acquaintanceship predated my election to Congress. He was helpful to me in reaching a decision when I first was urged to be a candidate in 1956. Then he aided me during the course of my campaign. Finally he gave cheerfully of his valuable time to introduce me to my new responsibilities here in the Halls of Congress.

LARRY SMITH had the respect of all, whether they agreed or disagreed with him. He was firm in his convictions but gentle in the conflicts which resulted from them. On those occasions when our decisions brought us in opposition, I never felt from him any malice or any disrespect. I, in turn, held him in the greatest esteem for the integrity of his beliefs.

These moments here in the well of the House he loved so much are a rare tribute to LARRY SMITH. He left us but a few moments ago and already this body is conscious of its loss. Here men from all walks of life, from all parts of the country, and of all philosophical beliefs are rising to speak the feeling and regret which has hushed the House.

From Mrs. Tewes and myself I offer our deepest sympathy to Eleanor, his constant companion and helpmate, and to his family.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has only been within the last 3 years since I have been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee that I have come to know LARRY SMITH intimately. Many times he and I were on opposite sides of the question before the committee.

I would go further than the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] when he said LARRY SMITH could disagree without being disagreeable; I found that he could disagree with me and elicit my admiration. He could disagree with one in such a way that one felt the strength of his convictions shining through and at the same time the warmth of his character and personality, and one felt that although he disagreed, he was still a friend. Many times after committee meetings I have discussed the issue with him and I came to know him better each time and to have deep sense of admiration and respect for him. He filled a great need as a balance wheel on the committee because he gave his viewpoint in such way that those who disagreed with him could at least look long and respectfully at the point of view he presented.

His friends will miss him, Congress will miss him. I did not have the privilege of knowing his wife and his family, but to them goes my deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened by the sudden death of LAWRENCE SMITH, dean of the Wisconsin delegation. I knew LARRY for many years. I first met him some years before I came here when he and I debated one night before an audience in his native Racine County. At that time I learned to know what has since been brought home to me more and more, that here was a man of great earnestness, and sincerity, and goodness. He was a gentleman.

Since then he has paid me hundreds of little kindnesses. Just the other day when I discussed a point of foreign policy with him and wanted to explore it more fully, he took the trouble to write out his thoughts and bring them to my office to study in order to get the benefit of his thinking. I am going to treasure that last note I received from him the more.

If we in this body can follow the example of LAWRENCE SMITH for fairness, sincerity, gentleness, and goodness, we need have no fear for the future of this, the greatest of legislative bodies.

To his beloved wife Eleanor and his fine family go my deepest sympathies. We are going to miss LAWRENCE SMITH.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am doubly shocked at the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH because my wife and I were present in the dining room when this tragedy occurred.

Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Representative LAWRENCE SMITH today is a severe shock. A veteran of 17 years here he had the confidence of his constituents in the First District of Wisconsin.

I came to know him as a freshman Representative from the Ninth District of Wisconsin who came to Congress, like he did, as the result of a special election. Although we came from different political parties I always found LAWRENCE SMITH to be a gentleman who was generous and courteous in his discussions of political matters. No person ever questioned the sincerity of his viewpoints which always were precisely and accurately expressed. His devotion to duty is well known here on Capitol Hill where he started his day early and worked late in behalf of those who sent him here. I sincerely mourn his death and know that the Wisconsin delegation has been saddened by his loss. Mrs. Johnson and I shall miss him greatly. Our sympathies go out to his wife Eleanor and his children.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, none of us know normally how we are attracted to various Members of this distinguished body. I have served here over 17 years and LAWRENCE served here for at least that length of time. I do not remember just when our friendship began, but, being an early riser I know that each morning at 8 o'clock LAWRENCE SMITH, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], and myself open up the cafeteria. It was not infrequent that we all occupied the same table for breakfast.

This morning two of us were there, LAWRENCE SMITH and myself, but later we were joined by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. We enjoyed a very pleasant breakfast. He did not appear to be ill. We discussed the budget, we discussed the state of the national debt, and, as it would happen, we discussed the raising of the public debt. I told him I was going to vote for it. He said he was not. We did not question each other's integrity. Of course, I did not question his. I asked him why? He said, "That would be my way of protesting against spending and that is my reason for voting against it. We are spending too much money."

But, as many of you have observed, never did he make one feel badly or cause one uneasiness because of his disagreement. He was a million percent American gentleman. Here I am from the Deep South, he from the Middle Northwest, and friends for many years. LAWRENCE SMITH visited me in Charleston, my hometown. We offered our guest house in the spring of the year when our flowers beckon so many people from so many sections of America. Last spring he visited us and I was hopeful he would again this year.

LAWRENCE and his wife were two of the most charming people one could meet. He made many friends in my part of the world and, for that matter, wherever he went. As head of the subcommittee on real estate of the Committee on Armed Services, I worked with him very closely, and he worked tirelessly for the initiation and construction of a tactical airbase in his district, the Bong Airbase. He worked all the time, and it was such a great pleasure to work with him. But, this morning as he sat

there he did not think and I did not think that, as the poet said:

But such a tide as moving seems asleep;
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

We will miss him. He will leave a void here. We will all remember him. He has returned home with the soundless tide to the boundless deep.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our distinguished colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH, has shocked all of us. His is the most recent of the passing of several of our distinguished Members, and that should bring to all of us the serious thought of what pressures the Members of the Congress are under. It should cause us to pause for a moment and realize that it is well for all of us to give our best, as LARRY did, to the task that has been assigned to us by our constituents and to the responsibility we have as Members of this great body, to the care and the protection of all the people of our country. LARRY was a living example of one who devoted himself to the *n*th degree in discharging his great responsibilities, and as was so well said by some of our colleagues a few minutes ago, he gave his life for what he thought was best for all of our people.

I have been privileged to have known LARRY SMITH and his good wife over a period of many years. To know LARRY was to love him. He was a man dedicated to the *n*th degree to his responsibilities. There is so much that could be said of the fine example he gave to all of us by his actions. He was studious and knew the subjects that he was to speak about and, as was said, he was never offensive but, rather, he stood firm in expounding his beliefs. That is true Americanism. It can well be said of him: This world is better because LAWRENCE SMITH lived.

My prayer is that the good Lord will give strength to his devoted wife and to his family to bear this great burden that has been thrust upon them and He will have mercy on his soul.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, to some of us who have just returned from the funeral of one of our other distinguished friends, Mr. Andresen, of Minnesota, the passing of Mr. SMITH illustrates that all of us stand more or less a heart-beat between this life and eternity.

Things that have been said about LARRY SMITH have been so true and so sincere. LARRY came to the 77th Congress at a special election, and I have known and admired and respected him all of these years. LARRY, I think, more or less illustrates something that is so necessary in this country, of people who believe in principles and who sustain those principles no matter how few or how great the allies may be. With it all he had the noble gentleness of a fine Christian gentleman. I suppose there could be many things said, such as his deep devotion to his country and to his district, and that when you lose people like August Andresen and LARRY SMITH it is a long time before you can replace them in their respective districts and in the Halls of Congress.

To Mrs. Smith, to his family, to his district and the State of Wisconsin I extend my deepest sympathy. May eternal light and justice, the kind of justice that LARRY SMITH wanted in this country, be his forever.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, within all too short a number of days we again have a colleague who has answered the last call. The knock came to the door of life for LARRY SMITH unexpectedly today. It impresses upon all of us that we live such lives as to be ready for that knock when it comes our way. LARRY SMITH lived such a life.

Many, many fine words have been spoken this afternoon about the life of LARRY SMITH, about the devotion of this man to his duties. They are all true. But yet words can never really express what LARRY SMITH really stood for—his accomplishments, his hopes, his ambitions, and his contribution to all of us. In my official capacity as party whip, knowing of LARRY'S strong convictions, on many occasions I have sat down with him, he quietly but firmly explained his position on some issue. Of course, to try to change a man who had such honest convictions would be foolhardy. He very plainly and forcefully set forth his deep-seated convictions on the issue at hand. He forcefully presented the reasons why he felt he was doing the right thing for his district and the people of this great country. I admired him for it. I admired him for his convictions.

Many times people in my district have said, "How can you get along with people who so violently differ with you?" And I said that if there was one thing that I have learned in public life, it is to respect and honor anyone who differs with you and differs with you out of sincere convictions. With such individuals we will never quarrel, however wide our opinions or views.

At his request a couple of years ago, I was privileged to go to his district to make a speech. Unfortunately, he could not be there that night. As I left there I said to my wife, "There is something very wonderful here this evening. After the meeting one after another of those who were present came up to me and in no uncertain terms—almost in an explosive way—they told me of their love and their respect for this man who was their servant in the Congress of the United States." He looked upon them as their servant. They looked upon him as the leader.

I know of no better way to know actually what a man is than how he is regarded by his people at home, where daily he has to deal with people he represents and has close personal contact with them.

LARRY SMITH was a great American. LARRY SMITH was honorable in the fullest sense. He was honest, upright, and straightforward. He did his job. To it he applied his energy and talents. He gave his life in a continuing effort to solve the problems that constantly arise in the country. I recall the verses of an old hymn which may be familiar to you. It begins:

Are you willing, are you ready? says the Master.

I am sure that LARRY SMITH was ready.

My deep sympathy for his lovely wife, Eleanor, and his family. Yes; they will miss him, but they must know there are countless others who, with us, will miss him, too.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the life and deeds of the Honorable LAWRENCE SMITH will shine through the mists of centuries a glowing tribute to a great patriot. LARRY SMITH had the courage of his convictions. He always strived to do the right as God gave him the power to see the right.

My office is only a short distance down the corridor from LARRY'S. I visited with him often and many times after hours. LARRY was a hard worker. Saturdays he would be at his office. At night you would often see the light burning in LARRY'S office, and with him was his devoted wife. She was always at his side, helping in every way to carry on the good fight which LARRY constantly waged for his beloved country's welfare.

We have lost a great statesman. I have lost a great, good friend. America has lost one of the most sincere, one of the most devoted, one of the most valuable servants who has ever graced the floor of Congress. LARRY SMITH was indeed one of God's noblemen. I grieve with his wife and family. God rest his soul.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened by the sudden passing today of our beloved colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin, with whom it has been my honor and privilege to serve in this House and on the Foreign Affairs Committee for so many years.

LARRY SMITH, as we affectionately referred to him, was first elected to the 77th Congress in a special election in August 1941. He joined the Foreign Affairs Committee in the 79th Congress and has served with great distinction as one of the outstanding leaders on the committee. LARRY SMITH was a man of the highest integrity who stood firmly by his principles. He was consistent in his views and won the respect, admiration, and affection of all who knew him, regardless of whether or not they agreed with his position on legislative matters. When taking the opposition, he was always an honorable opponent and far from engendering bitterness his tactics and friendly opposition served always to cement old friendships and ever win new friends for him.

In the passing of LARRY SMITH the Congress has lost an outstanding leader

and a very great man, one who was not afraid to fight for what he believed right even when he knew that his vote would not be on the prevailing side. Our country needs more men like him. He will be missed by countless friends all over the country and our heartfelt condolences and sympathy go out to his bereaved loved ones.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to describe the shock and grief which I personally feel on the passing of Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH, of the First District of Wisconsin. Ever since I came to the Congress, about 5 years ago and as a freshman served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it has been my good fortune and privilege to be closely associated with LARRY SMITH. We collaborated many times on certain pieces of legislation about which we both had strong ideas. During that period of collaboration and friendship I grew not only to know him but to admire him; indeed, in many respects, to have a deep fondness for him.

I will miss him very much. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will miss him very much. The Congress of the United States will miss him very much. The people of his own district of Wisconsin, the people of that State, indeed, the people of this country will miss him very much. In many respects he has left a vacancy that is difficult, if not impossible, to fill. His integrity, his courage, his firmness in doing what he believed to be right in the best interests of our Government are qualities that sometimes are difficult to come by these days in the degree to which they were found in the person of LARRY SMITH.

Mrs. Bentley and I certainly want to extend our deepest sympathy and condolences to his wonderful wife and family and the people of his district. I express the hope that those of us who remain behind can recall the lessons that he left for us to follow during the 17 years in which he served in this House of Representatives.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT].

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed sad news to learn of the passing of our colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH. I did not believe that I could take the floor to join in the tributes of my colleagues, but in sitting here with you listening to those tributes to a great husband, a fine father, and a true friend of mine, it has been the spiritual lift that I needed.

In the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH I have suffered a deep personal loss. When I arrived in Washington in 1950 as a Member of this distinguished body he was a veteran of nearly 10 years of service in this House. His friendship, counsel and advice was invaluable to me as a newcomer as I know it was to many other Members of Congress.

In all of his activities LAWRENCE SMITH was a man of great personal dignity and charm but to most of his friends he was always affectionately addressed as "LARRY." He was always willing and anxious to help, and I turned to him many times in the years I have been in Congress. Everyone in Wisconsin knew him to be a hard fighter for what he considered to be right and in the best interests of the people, but he had no enemies. He was respected by supporters and opponents alike. His numerous election campaigns were always conducted on a high level, and he had the confidence of thousands.

To me LAWRENCE SMITH was the perfect gentleman, and he so conducted himself both here on the floor of the House and in his private life. I greatly admired his courage and judgment in public affairs and I know that this Nation is a better place to live because he lived and unselfishly served the country he loved.

He was a native of my home State of Wisconsin and was educated in Wisconsin schools and colleges. He early demonstrated his patriotism by serving as a first lieutenant in the famed 32d Division during World War I. He came to Washington in 1941, following a special election and served continuously since that time. During most of his years of service he was a member of the important House Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the work of that committee he devoted himself vigorously to the task of solving some of the most pressing problems confronting the Nation. He also gave of himself unstintingly as a member and department commander of the Wisconsin division, American Legion.

When he experienced a severe heart attack several years ago many of his friends urged him to lighten his burdens but he regarded himself as a good soldier and expendable in the service of his country. He will be greatly missed in this Chamber and by his devoted family. To Mrs. Smith and their three children I extend my deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, three times in just a few days the angel of death has gathered in a Member of this House. Our hearts are so full that our tongues are almost silent.

LARRY SMITH was a good man. He was a Christian man. Yes, as has been described, he was a courageous man. He was courageous because of his unalterable faith, not only his faith in this great Republic, but above all his faith in Eternal God.

LARRY will not answer any more rollcalls on the floor of this House but he will be with us. He will be with us forever in our memories, and he will live on forever, through his children.

His life has not ended. His real life, his better life, has just begun, because truly LARRY SMITH was a good and faithful servant who shall have his just reward.

Mrs. Scrivner joins me in extending to Eleanor and the children our heartfelt sympathy, knowing full well that we cannot lessen the loss or lighten the road, but knowing that she will be sustained by the same unfaltering trust in that same Master of all men that sustained LARRY throughout all of his days.

> Beautiful life is that whose span
> Is spent in duty to God and man,
> Beautiful calm when the course is run,
> Beautiful twilight at set of sun,
> Beautiful death with life well done.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am joined with my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber in the shock and great grief that have come to us. Only a few days ago LARRY SMITH and I with Mrs. Smith and the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] were guests of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] at a luncheon honoring a visiting Minister of the Government of Uganda. LARRY SMITH was so full of life, so vibrant in his interest in the subjects discussed in our conversations, so sweet and charming as ever he was even when differing with you on questions under consideration, that the furthest thought from my mind was that he was on the eve of his departure from us. The House has lost a Member so beloved by everyone that there was no one on either side of the aisle who was not his friend. He will be missed, but he will be remembered as long as any who had the good fortune of being his colleague is left.

In the Committee on Foreign Affairs there will be a void of which we will be sensitive when next we meet and on every later occasion. In the shock of this moment I cannot try to contemplate the conference table in the room of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with the chair from which radiated the sweetness and the charm of LARRY SMITH vacant.

In every sense he was a great American. That is a term that we so often use but applied to LARRY SMITH it is truly and accurately descriptive. He may not have agreed with others of his colleagues, but he never quarreled with them. He could debate with eloquence and with great force; but there was never any anger, any question of the integrity of another mind that was not in agreement with his own mind. He was always a gentleman. He was always a devoted public servant and he was a friend with all the warm attributes of a sincere Christian character.

To his wife Eleanor and to his children go my deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the Wisconsin delegation in their sorrow over the loss of our good friend and distinguished colleague, LARRY SMITH. Here was a man of so many good qualities that it would not be possible even to enumerate them. He was kind, he was humble, he was courageous, he was dedicated, he was able. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word. Mr. Speaker, LAWRENCE SMITH was a great Congressman. He was articulate and forceful. This House can ill afford to lose men who present their points of view with such clarity and with such conviction as

LAWRENCE SMITH was always able to present his points of view on the important problems which came to us from the great Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It seems to me that representative government thrives on the competition of ideas. The viewpoint which LAWRENCE SMITH represented in the field of foreign affairs was not the viewpoint that generally prevailed in this House in recent years, but it was a very important and worthy approach to our problems in the field of diplomacy. It may well be that his position on these issues, if it had prevailed, would have brought us closer to the goal of peace to which we all aspire than the programs which have had more popular support in this body. LAWRENCE SMITH was a leader. He was the most eloquent and articulate spokesman of the viewpoint which he represented in this Congress. We have lost a truly great statesman.

I extend his wife and children my deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, a sturdy oak has fallen. The grim reaper has taken my good friend LAWRENCE SMITH. He passed this way and left his footprints in the sands of time. We are better men and women because he walked among us. It is a privilege to have known him.

There have been four deaths among Members of Congress this session. The terrific strain on our Members is really taking its toll. Let this again be a warning to all of us to slow down before it is too late; and may we be ready when the Master calls.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a great American; he was a tireless worker who never let his constituents down. Not in the best of health, he bravely carried on in spite of his physical handicaps. He was a devoted public servant who will be greatly missed by all who really knew him. LAWRENCE SMITH served well his day and generation. What more can be said of any man?

Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his devoted wife and the members of his family.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible for some of us to realize that LAWRENCE SMITH is gone. In the words of the poet I think we would say, rather, that "he is not dead, he is just away."

Mr. Speaker, other Members have mentioned the many noble characteristics that LAWRENCE SMITH possessed. Those of us who knew him well, admired him and worked with him around the committee table would most certainly share those views.

The things that impressed me most about him was the fact that his actions were based upon firm philosophies and beliefs—beliefs that were a part of his very fiber, and he was guided by them; whether they were popular or unpopular with most men.

He did what he thought he ought to do. He presented his point of view in a gentle, friendly but forceful manner.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a great Representative. He had a fine war record. He was a distinguished citizen.

We shall miss him and we pray God to bless LARRY SMITH and to comfort his wife and children in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, in the 15 years that I have been in this House, I remember no period when death has paid us visits more frequent or more costly than in the last 3 months.

The sudden death of LAWRENCE SMITH has robbed me of a warm friend. He and his wife, my wife and I were all in Beirut together in 1953, and we returned home together. He was a most considerate and charming companion. One might disagree with LAWRENCE but no one could question his sincerity or gainsay his patriotism. Duty, I am sure, was the watchword of his life. He lived for the performance of his duties here.

Some years ago LAWRENCE was stricken and within a week I asked him solicitously about his health. He made me a most reassuring reply. I hoped that we might be colleagues in this Chamber for many years to come.

All of us suffer a great loss when men like LAWRENCE leave us. For all of us the bell has tolled.

To LAWRENCE's wife and his children, I offer my especial and most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the distinuished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy today and words are utterly inadequate to express my feelings. I was inexpressibly shocked and saddened when I came to the House Chamber today and learned about the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH. I wish to join my colleagues from Wisconsin and others who have paid tribute to this great American.

LAWRENCE SMITH and I came to this House in the same Congress. I came a few months ahead of him, as LARRY was elected in a special election in the summer of 1941, and took his seat in September.

I remember my first conversation with LAWRENCE SMITH, which was on the floor of this House.

He made a deep impression upon me and I immediately recognized his sterling qualities. My admiration and esteem for him has grown over the years. We formed a close friendship which has meant a great deal to me, and his untimely passing is a great personal loss.

LAWRENCE SMITH was truly a Christian gentleman and statesman. I have never seen a more devoted and consecrated Christian. He believed in God and in his church. He was a man of great faith and he lived his religion. I never heard him speak ill of anyone.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH is an irreparable loss not only to this body but to his district and the entire Nation. We cannot afford to lose men like LARRY SMITH. We shall not see his like again.

I respected LARRY SMITH for his great courage. He was a man of principle and fought for what he believed. I recall that he had deep-seated convictions concerning certain aspects of our foreign policy, and was always able to support his position with facts and figures. He did a great deal of research work. His speeches on the floor, and his insertions in the RECORD, always contained information of great value.

I am going to miss LARRY SMITH and the House will not be the same without him. His life will always be an inspiration and a challenge to me.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our deep personal sympathy to Eleanor and the children. May God comfort them and give them strength to bear this heavy loss, which all of us share with them.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound shock and sorrow that I learned of the sudden passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Perhaps the achievements of a man during his lifetime constitute the best possible eulogy. If that is true, any words of mine can only be superfluous because the life of LARRY SMITH was an inspiration to all who knew him.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I became intimately associated with LARRY SMITH. Frequently I was unable to share his views but never did I question his sincerity or the depth of his convictions.

He was gentle, but firm—unspectacular, but sound; one who at all times was dedicated to causes he believed to be right and in the best interest of our Nation.

The House of Representatives has lost an outstanding Member. I have lost a close personal friend.

May God's blessings be upon his devoted wife and their children during this tragic hour.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of tributes here today to Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH is the measure of the esteem and respect and the affection in which he was held by his colleagues.

As a younger Member of Congress who was not privileged to serve on the same committee with him, I am taking this time to join in these tributes because his friendship was one of the treasured inheritances which I received from my distinguished and beloved predecessor and LARRY SMITH's good friend, the late Congressman Paul Shafer. Curiously, my coming to this House coincided with the time of LAWRENCE SMITH's earlier critical illness.

It was a privilege to have known him. He did me the high honor of accepting an invitation last year to speak in Kalamazoo, Mich., in my district, and in that address he brilliantly and eloquently ex-

pressed his views on current issues, his adherence to constitutional principles and the faith that was in him. As a younger Member of Congress, I can only express the hope, sharing as I do so many views that he held, that I may in some measure match the courage of his adherence to those views and match the tolerance, respect, and kindness which he always exhibited to those who might differ with him.

Mrs. Johansen joins me in extending deepest sympathies to Mrs. Smith, to his children, to his colleagues from the State of Wisconsin, and to the citizens of his district who, with the State and Nation, have suffered a heavy loss.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, like so many who have spoken today, have lost a friend. Many fine things have been said about LARRY SMITH here, and they are so richly deserved. He was, in the fullest meaning of the word, a gentleman. LARRY yielded to no one in his devotion to those things which he felt honestly were good for this Nation of ours, and he was eloquent in his expressions of them. LARRY leaves a proud record here of services to his district, his State, and to the Nation. To me that is a legacy beyond price to those he left behind. Mrs. Horan and I wish to join in sending our deepest sympathies to his beloved wife, Eleanor, and his children.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, like so many others here today I rise at this time with a very heavy heart. It has been my privilege throughout more than 15 years to serve in this body with many men and women. Among them were many of outstanding ability and prominence; but I can say that none exceeded our late friend, LAWRENCE SMITH, in either ability or prominence. He was indeed a man among men. He merited and had the respect of every Member of this House throughout his long career.

In my early days here LAWRENCE and I became good friends. It was a friendship that I cherished and it grew year by year. His charming wife is a very close friend of my family. I doubt that Mrs. Abernethy has a closer friend among the wives of the Members than she has in Mrs. Smith.

Several Members have mentioned the fact that they had different views from those of LARRY SMITH on matters that come before us from time to time. I am in another category. It was not often that LARRY and I differed. He and I almost always saw the issues alike. In fact, many times I have stepped across the aisle and counseled with him on pending issues. He has done the same with me and I always felt honored when a man of such great ability did so.

LARRY was loyal to his political party. But with him the party was always made secondary to his Americanism. He was an American first, a party man second. If he had a choice to make between his politics and his country he always chose his country. I admired him for it. This House admired him for it and the words that have been spoken on this heartrending occasion indicate very clearly that his colleagues not only admired him but they respected him.

LARRY SMITH was of the old school. Unfortunately for the country, they are a passing group. Their sound logic, reasoning, judgment, and statesmanship are sorely needed again. No foundation ever crumbled under them. In fact, it was his kind that built the strong foundation on which our country rests. We can ill afford to lose him.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a strong constitutionalist. He was a man of deep dedication and profound conviction. He was dependable. When you learned where he stood today, you knew where he would be tomorrow.

Another great quality I appreciated in our departed friend was his nonsectionalism. He loved this country, all parts of it, all States, all sections, and all peoples. He never once said or did anything that would be offensive to people of other sections.

I am one of those who very frequently met him in the Capitol in the early morning hours. As the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] said a moment ago, LARRY was really one of the early risers and late workers. On several occasions I accused LARRY and his wife, Eleanor, who was always with him, of opening the Capitol every morning. Seldom have I come down that he was not already here. I enjoyed my association with him at the breakfast table to which the gentleman from South Carolina referred.

He worked faithfully and he worked hard. In fact he worked too hard, and because he did, I have no doubt but that is the reason he is not here at this hour.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a deeply religious man. His faith was deeply rooted in the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. The deeply consecrated man that he was, if he could speak to us at this hour his words would be something like those of the poet who said:

If but one message I may leave behind,
One single word of courage for my kind,
It would be this—Oh, brother, sister, friend,
Whatever life may bring, what God may send,
No matter whether clouds lift soon or late,
Take heart and wait.

Despair may tangle darkly at your feet,
Your faith be dimmed, and hope, once cool and sweet,
Be lost; but suddenly above a hill,
A heavenly lamp, set on a heavenly sill
Will shine for you and point the way to go,
How well I know.

For I have waited through the dark, and I
Have seen a star rise in the blackest sky
Repeatedly—It has not failed me yet.
And I have learned God never will forget
To light His lamp. If we but wait for it,
It will be lit.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of my friend and our colleague and I join with the fine delegation from Wisconsin and the other Members of this body in expressing deep sympathy to his fine family and particularly to his lovable, adorable wife.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I learned to know LAWRENCE SMITH best as a very able member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and as a devout member of our regular Thursday morning prayer group. My heart would be heavier if I departed from these Halls today without sharing with you my own sorrow over his sudden and tragic passing.

There is little I can add to the spendid words so eloquently spoken here today as a tribute to him and expressing our mutual sorrow over his passing. My thoughts and prayers go out for his devoted widow and other loved ones in this their hour of bereavement.

As many of you have been speaking this afternoon, there suddenly returned to me the words of a poem I learned as a child—I hope I can recall them—words, the substance of which, the heart and soul of LARRY SMITH may well be uttering at this moment, words so descriptive of his life. The poem is entitled "Gethsemane":

It seemeth such a little way to me across to that strange country, the beyond,
And yet, not so strange, for it has grown to be the home of those of whom I am so fond.
They make it seem familiar and most dear,
And journeying friends bring distant regions near.
So close it lies that when my sight is clear,
I think I almost see the gleaming strand.
I know I feel those who have gone from here
Come near enough sometime to my hand;
I often think but for our veiled eyes
We should find heaven right around about us lies.
I cannot make it seem a day to dread
When from this dear earth
We shall journey out to that still dearer country of the dead,
And join the lost ones so long dreamed about.
I love this world, yet shall I love to go
And meet the friends who wait for me, I know.
I never stand above a bier and see the seal of death set on some well-loved face,
But that I think, once more to welcome me,
When I shall cross the intervene's space, between this land and that one over there,
Once more to make the strange beyond seem fair
And so for me 'tis no sting to death.
For grave has lost its victory. It is but crossing with a bated breath, white-set face, a little strip of sea,
To find the loved ones waiting on the shore, more beautiful, more precious then e'er before.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and deeply grieved by the death of LAWRENCE SMITH. Without question, the Congress has lost one of its finest Members, and I know I have lost a good friend.

LARRY SMITH, as many of us knew him, was a man of unquestioned integrity, of courage, and loyalty to his God and his country. Once convinced of the course he must pursue in public affairs he was unswerving. Never, in the time it was my privilege to serve with him in this House, did he yield to the blandishments of expediency.

He was a devoted husband and father; a fearless and dedicated public servant.

He could leave to his family no richer heritage, and he could leave to the people of his district and his friends in Congress nothing in memory that could be more enduring.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending to Eleanor, his widow and constant companion, and their children, our heartfelt sympathy in their hours of deepest sorrow.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of the late LAWRENCE SMITH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, LAWRENCE SMITH was a good and kindly man. If you knew him you liked him.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his wife and all who loved him.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, LARRY SMITH was my friend and to call him a friend was a privilege indeed. To him, the service in the Congress was more than a job or a position, it was a responsibility of the highest order.

By his very attitude, he imparted to his colleagues and constituents alike a sense of confidence and dependability.

Not only was LARRY SMITH a highly respected Member, he was also able to combine this quality with that of likeability. The regard prevailed on both sides of the aisle.

The Nation has lost a valuable public servant. Our sympathy is extended to the surviving members of his family in their grief.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I learned today of the death of our beloved colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH. To know him was to like him. Many today have mentioned his many kindnesses, his gentle nature, his firmness. He lent dignity and strength to this great legislative body. He ably represented not only his district but, as a great American, made this House of Representatives a greater legislative body.

His memory will be cherished by all of us in this Chamber. Mrs. Marshall and myself express our sympathy to his family.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the 3 years I have served as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I learned to admire and respect our late colleague, Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH.

He was a man gentle in nature, but one who always had the courage of his convictions.

The death of LAWRENCE SMITH is a great loss to the committee on which he served, to the Congress, and to our Nation.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his widow and to the members of his family.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, LARRY SMITH and I came to Congress at about the same time. We had mutual friends in Wisconsin so when he first came I looked him up. We have been close friends over the years that we have served together. I feel a great sense of loss in his passing. I know of no one in the House that was held in higher respect than LARRY SMITH. He had, it seems to me, a perfect concept of devoted duty to his job. While we did not always agree on legislation it never showed in the slightest in our friendship. He was absolutely perfect that way yet he steadfastly and courageously and emphatically stated his views on the floor of the House.

I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Smith and his family.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult indeed to put into words the sorrow I feel at the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH or how great is the loss to this Nation. Yet his deeds, his words live on in the minds of those of us so privileged to know him. I shared breakfast with him frequently and often benefited from his viewpoints and his counsel. Even now, I study pamphlets and speeches he gave to me, the most recent being the Confessions of a Bureaucrat by Potomacus.

LAWRENCE and I were on the losing sides of many votes in this House, and our bond of friendship was strengthened by a kinship of outlook. We shared companion views on the role of Federal Government in our lives. Perhaps my most sincere and heartfelt compliment and commemoration will be to do whatever I can to preserve this old-fashioned traditional view of constitutional government which LAWRENCE SMITH so consistently championed. Finally, if one test of success is to have made the world a little better by having been here, then LAWRENCE SMITH was a great success.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of our beloved colleague, the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH, is a source of real sorrow, and I extend my sincere sympathy to his loved ones in the great loss they have sustained.

In his Congressional duties, Representative SMITH, as a member of the Wisconsin bar, found his legal training of invaluable aid to him in his legislative activities and in his membership on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. He was thorough in all his undertakings, applying his fine talents to the maximum in analyzing all issues. A constant and unrelenting foe of world communism, our departed colleague had at all times an all-consuming love for his country and was a militant exponent of the American ideals of liberty and freedom. So imbued was he with the obligations of his oath of office and so intense was his desire to serve his country and his constituents with vigilance and devotion that he labored zealously with the myriad of present-day problems, unmindful of his own health. It is proper to conclude that such devotion to duty was a contributing factor to his sudden collapse while engaged in carrying out his Congressional duties on the floor of the House.

Representative LAWRENCE SMITH served with distinction as a first lieutenant, Infantry, 32d Division, during World War I. From the time of his discharge from military service, he became active in veterans' affairs. He was honored by the American Legion in being elected department commander of Wisconsin and later served as national executive committeeman and national child-welfare chairman, American Legion. The veteran population of this Nation had a stanch friend in Congress in Representative LAWRENCE SMITH as he never missed the opportunity to be of service to the men and women of America who had worn the military uniform. He had added inspiration for his service to veterans from the fact that his beloved wife, Eleanor Rowley Smith, enjoyed the distinction of serving as national president of the American Legion Auxiliary, an honor in which her husband shared her pardonable pride.

Mr. Speaker, we shall all miss the companionship of Representative LAWRENCE SMITH. From a personal standpoint, I regard his death as a great loss because he embodied all the characteristics of an able and sincere legislator who had the best interests of his country at heart.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I still cannot believe that LARRY SMITH is gone. His kindness to me and his counsel during my Congressional service were invaluable. He was easily one of the most outstanding Members of this body and his leadership in the field of foreign affairs will be sorely missed by all Americans.

My heart is too full to speak further at this time except to say, Thank God for giving us men like LARRY SMITH.

I extend my profound sympathy to his family and his constituents.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden, tragic death of our colleague, LARRY SMITH, brings home to us again for the fourth time in a few short days how transitory is our presence here; impresses us with the fact that the hold, the influence of each of us has no permanency.

Since coming here in January of 1935, 23 years ago, I recall the services of no man which have been of more help to me personally than were those of our colleague.

On foreign affairs, the amount of and the manner in which our money was expended abroad, he was a never-failing source of accurate information. Always his counsel pointed the true way toward the greater welfare of our own people, the manner in which our own national security could best be achieved.

Upon his counsel, many of us—perhaps it might be said, all of us—who did not at all times agree with the foreign policy of previous administrations, relied without question.

Nor was his help limited to matters legislative. Always in the contacts which we had with him was a personal element dominated by charity and by friendliness.

Those of us who remain, whether the time be short or long, will not forget the services which he rendered, not only to our country but to each of us.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, LAWRENCE SMITH is dead. Never again will his sincere, honest, and courageous voice be heard in this Chamber, pleading for the things in which he believed and the principles for which he stood.

While his voice, one of the most courageous in all the Congress, no longer will be heard, the example of his diligence, integrity, and fearlessness will live on here as an inspiration to all of us who remain and to new Congressmen who come in future years to carry on the great work of this Congress of free men.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a man of great ability and unmatched courage who lived every minute of every day for the welfare of the country he loved and the people he served so faithfully and well. His district, his State, his Nation, and this Congress, of which he was for 17 years a Member, all are better because of his life and his deeds. He was admired by all who knew him for his courage and integrity, and loved for the warmth and kindness of his personality.

Mrs. Mack joins me in extending sympathy to his widow, Eleanor, and his family in their great loss.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The House of Representatives and the people of this country have suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of our good friend, LAWRENCE SMITH.

I have known LAWRENCE SMITH rather intimately since he first came to the House of Representatives. He was one of the outstanding legislators in the United States Congress. He was a real student with respect to legislation upon which he was expected to pass his judgment. Although many times he was in the minority, he did not waiver nor give excuses for his position on legislative matters. He always voted in the best interest of his country as he saw it. Sometimes he was in the minority, sometimes in the majority, but, in any event, his statesmanship rose above political interests.

LARRY SMITH was a kind of man who held no ill feeling against anyone. He believed that every Member of the House was entitled to his own opinion. He also felt the best interests of America were at stake. LAWRENCE SMITH was industrious. He was sincere. He was diligent. He was capable. He was devoted to his task. He was devoted to his country, and above all, he was devoted to his family. He was a real Christian. He lived life to the full. A heart weakness had menaced him for years; he ordered his life by its dictates—but still went his calm, cheer-spreading way. In the end it struck him down, but he was ready for the blow—gallant in bearing, with no regrets, no fears—his unfaltering spirit sustained by this reflection:

I know the night is drawing nigh,
The clouds hang low o'er hill and bay;
The autumn leaves are dewless dry—
But I have had my day.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH was one of the greatest Americans and finest gentlemen who ever served in this House.

His tragic passing in the prime of life has left us stunned and deeply grieved.

Like the brave soldier he was, Doc SMITH died at his post of duty. His passing was like the falling of a great oak in the forest resounding throughout the stricken Capitol, his district and State and throughout the Nation.

It was the poet Goethe who said "Courage is the greatest quality of the human heart; without it thou wert better never born."

The Nation needs more leaders today with the courage of Congressman SMITH. It is said of him that he was a man of strong convictions and that is true. He was also a man of infinite trust in God and unswerving devotion to his beloved country. He fought with unceasing vigor even at the expense of his health for the political principles, moral ideals and spiritual truths he so tenaciously embraced, and he lived to see many of his prophecies and fears come to pass in the shape of developments in the international scene.

Doc SMITH was beloved, respected and admired for his character, integrity, ability and Americanism by every member of this illustrious House. He had a limitless capacity for making friends and inspiring the faith and confidence of his people. His sincerity of purpose, friendliness of nature and gentility of soul—his profound faith, fairness and amiable human traits compelled deep respect and enduring affection.

By his untimely passing into that land from whose bourne no traveler returns, Doc SMITH has left an irreplaceable void in this Chamber where he served so faithfully and with such outstanding distinction for many years. His achievements were many and great—his devotion to duty unsurpassed—his love of his country and his fellow man never to be exceeded. His noble fellowship will long inspire us to greater devotion and effort.

The great New England poet, Longfellow, put it well:

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime
And departing leave behind us
Footsteps on the sands of time.
Footsteps that perhaps another
Traveling o'er life's weary main
Some forlorn and shipwrecked brother
Seeing shall take heart again.

In the life, philosophy and unselfish service of LAWRENCE SMITH we can all "take heart" in the tasks which face us. His memory will be hallowed here. And his high idealism and patriotism, his love of God and country and his fellow man will long remain to inspire us.

To his bereaved, loving wife and devoted family, I join in extending most heartfelt sympathy. May they find in their unfaltering faith the blessings and consolations that the Heavenly Father alone can bestow, and may they be strengthened to bear the irreparable loss which they have sustained by the thoughts of a loving soul who gave unselfishly and courageously of himself to the very end.

May the soul of our dear, beloved friend, LAWRENCE SMITH, rest in eternal peace.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of our friend and colleague, LARRY SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to join those who have spoken in tribute to his memory.

An attorney, a veteran of World War I, and a Member of this House for 17 years, he was a devoted public servant and true friend.

He gave of himself without stint in the service of his district and the Nation. He won widespread respect and affection among his colleagues.

The eloquent words which have been spoken here this morning since his sudden death in the Capitol bear witness to his high character, his fine ability, his devotion to duty, and his capacity for friendship.

I have valued his friendship ever since he came to the Congress. I shall miss him greatly.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his wife, to his family, and all those close to him.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, there was no more conscientious or faithful servant in the House of Representatives than LARRY SMITH. He was constantly at work for the interests of his constituents and he was extraordinarily honest in the fulfillment of his convictions. Time and again he stood up in the Hall of Congress defending what he believed to be right and for the best interests of our country, and it made no difference to him whether the cause he was pleading was a popular one or not. What mattered to Congressman SMITH was whether he thought it was right and honest. With such a character, there can be no wonder at the admiration and the friendliness of all who came in contact with him.

He was indeed a gentle man, never harsh in his judgments, always respecting the feelings of others and forever willing to lend a helping hand. In the later years when his health was not too good, he never let up in his work but assumed the responsibilities of his office with a courage that brought inspiration and hope to his many friends. The House of Representatives has lost an outstanding Member, and those who were counted among his friends have been glorified by his friendship and their faith has been strengthened by the example of his life.

I extend my most sincere and heartfelt sympathies to his widow and family and may they be comforted in the knowledge of the affection in which he was held.

He never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed though right were worsted wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise
Our battles to fight better,
Sleep to wake.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their eulogy of Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH. "LARRY," as he was affectionately known to us, was one of those rare individuals who was always willing to express his views, even though they differed from those of others. He was a martyr to that which he believed and he had many, many Members of Congress who would join with him in his beliefs.

The records show that he was highly respected by the membership, and he, with his lovely and gracious wife, Eleanor, will go down in the records of the Congress as individuals who represented a hard-working team in their district.

Words fail me when I attempt to express by sincere sympathy to Eleanor and

the family. Our prayers and best wishes will be with them always.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am filled with sorrow at the suddenness of the death of my very close friend, LARRY SMITH.

Many things can be said of him. However, I merely express the thought that he was a great American, a great legislator, and a man of convictions in the preservation of his country.

Mrs. Becker joins with me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his good wife, Eleanor, and his family. Our prayers will be with them at this time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I entertained the highest respect and admiration for LAWRENCE SMITH. I counted him as a friend. He was an understanding, sympathetic, big-hearted type of person. And, as every last one of his colleagues in this House knows, he was a man of the highest honor who always put the country's welfare ahead of partisan or selfish considerations. Who among us can say as much?

This fallen statesman was in the fullest measure just what he pretended to be. As Socrates put it:

> The shortest and surest way to live with honor in the world is to be in reality what we would appear to be; all human virtues increase and strengthen themselves by the practice and experience of them.

I share with my colleagues a deep feeling of loss in the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH. The entire Nation is the loser. And I extend to the surviving family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues from Wisconsin and other Members of the House in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory, life, and service of our esteemed colleague and friend, the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin.

As others have indicated he was one of the most respected Members of the House and his absence in this body will be sorely felt. Wisconsin and the Nation have lost a deeply consecrated public official.

In a very personal way I should like to say that LAWRENCE SMITH assisted me very materially in the passage of a piece of legislation in my early years of service in the Congress and his friendship in this matter to me, a freshman Member, created a tie which I have greatly valued ever since.

He served with devotion and distinction as a member of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs where he carved a record which will long endure. The most enduring monuments are those erected by devoted service to the Republic.

I wish to extend an expression of my sympathy to the members of the family.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to the many, many personal friends to learn of the sudden passing this noon of my very close friend, LARRY SMITH, the ranking Member of the Wisconsin delegation.

From his early youth, he was devoted to the cause of the general welfare and better livelihood of his fellow man. His service to his country began in the United States Army during the First World War and he did not forget his comrades-in-arms but continued his interest in various positions of leadership in the American Legion.

LARRY SMITH believed in the principles of our Founding Fathers. He was a stanch supporter of the American way of life. He was unshakeable in his convictions and even those who may have opposed his strong viewpoints respected his honesty and integrity in arriving at a conclusion. This world and this Congress needs more men of the type of LARRY SMITH.

His family has lost a loving and considerate husband and father. His friends will find it hard to fill the void that his counsel and fortitude have left and his constituents, whom he represented so faithfully and so loyally in the Halls of Congress, have lost a champion of their rights.

I want to extend to his beloved wife, Eleanor, and his children Mrs. Scudder's and my deepest and heartfelt sympathy. We share in their loss and we fully realize that mere words cannot make up for it. May it be a comfort to them to know that our prayers are with them.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, LAWRENCE SMITH was one of the outstanding Americans of our time. He was a courageous, loyal, forthright, and enthusiastic American. He could stand alone. Propaganda and conformity had no effect on LAWRENCE SMITH. He dedicated his life to the principles of Americanism that made this country the greatest nation in the history of the world. He believed in every letter of the Constitution and in preserving it as written.

Congressman SMITH did not believe that friendship could be bought, nor national wealth acquired by spending and waste. He was a bitter foe of totalitarianism and centralization of our own Government. He believed in individual liberty and had confidence in the people's ability to govern themselves at the local and State level. His forthright foreign policy is day by day being proven the policy that this Nation should have followed. We go from one crisis into a more deepening crisis with this same old foreign policy of spending.

I entertain the hope that this Congress will yet adopt Representative SMITH's foreign policy which, I believe, is the only sure way to preserve this Republic and its basic, fundamental liberties.

He was sincere, kindly, and every inch a gentleman. He was my warm personal friend and I am going to miss him every day that I serve in this Congress. In all of his courageous fight, he has had the help of one of the finest ladies that it has ever been my privilege to know—Mrs. Lawrence Smith. Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending to her and her fine family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am grieved by the death of our beloved colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin. He came to the House a very short time after I first was elected a Member of Congress and I have known him intimately through the years. His service to the Nation was outstanding. He distinguished himself by his capable, studious, and able approach to the many momentous problems which confronted us during his service here. At no time did LARRY SMITH fail to stand on his own two feet and by so doing he gained the admiration and respect of each of us.

It is a sad thing to note the passing of a good friend. As I look back over our service together I am further saddened by the realization that his important voice in legislation is now stilled forever.

I extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of the times in which we live has placed on the Members of this Congress grave responsibilities for decisions which will shape the course of history. Let no one doubt the sincerity with which the tasks confronting us are met.

This concern has taken from this Chamber another colleague in a session already marked by the loss of several others.

I was lunching with a group from my State of North Dakota when LARRY SMITH of Wisconsin approached. I called to him, to introduce him to those with whom I was lunching. Even before his friendly smile could form in greeting, he pitched forward across the table, stricken with the attack which claimed his life.

Mr. Speaker, I need not express the shock I felt in that moment. The loss of Congressman SMITH has been well expressed by his colleagues from Wisconsin, and by other Members of this House. It is a personal loss which I feel very deeply, Mr. Speaker, for I had learned to love and respect LAWRENCE SMITH. Each Member must feel that loss, as will the country he served so well. To Mrs. Smith, and to their children, my deepest sympathies are extended.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked over the passing of one of our most outstanding colleagues in the person of LAWRENCE SMITH, chairman of the Wisconsin Congressional delegation.

It was my good fortune to have known LARRY intimately since I first became a Member of the House of Representatives. He served his country in World War I and upon his return from the service he became affiliated with the American Legion and later served as State commander of the Department of Wisconsin.

He was a man dedicated to his work as a Member of the House of Representatives. He was a true American and always fought for those things he believed in.

The House has lost a fine colleague and I have lost a good friend. To Mrs. Smith and to his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened when I learned of the death in the United States Capitol Building of Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH.

During the 11 years I have served as a Member of the House of Representatives I have had the privilege of becoming acquainted with many outstanding people from every section of our country. Of those with whom I have served here, LARRY SMITH was one whom I regarded as really an outstanding Member. He was able. He had the capacity to get to the bottom of an issue and determine the facts. He could distinguish the true from the false. He could determine whether a proposition was meritorious or frivolous.

He was courageous. He did not trim his sails to meet every passing breeze. Once he had determined what was right and just, he had the courage to support his beliefs and convictions with all the energy and force at his command. He was kind and gentle by nature, a warmhearted and loyal friend.

He loved America and its institutions. He believed in constitutional government, and abhorred sham and makebelieve.

I regarded LARRY SMITH as one of the truly great Americans of our time. He will be greatly missed not only in his circle of friends and acquaintances, and not only by his family and his constituents in the home district. He will be missed by all those who believe in constitutional government and Americanism. Our country is greater and stronger because of his efforts. It will be difficult indeed to replace him.

I extend deepest sympathy to his wife and family in this time of bereavement.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected passing of our colleague, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, was a particular shock to me, because it had been my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 83d Congress.

I had the pleasant and rewarding experience of working closely with him on a subcommittee which enjoyed his distinguished and fairminded chairmanship. In this study of the scope and effectiveness of the mutual assistance programs of the United States, LARRY SMITH brought to his work a keen and methodical mind and an unassailable intellectual integrity.

It was characteristic of our late colleague to be considerate and gentle with others and respectful of viewpoints which might conflict with his own. He was stern, however, in judging himself and, in doing so, epitomized the true public servant. In his constant effort to find the truth, and to act in legislative matters on the basis of a studious appraisal of their relationship to the public good, he never spared himself. LARRY SMITH did not shape his convictions on public issues impulsively or to fit a pattern of political action drawn up for him by someone else.

In the high standards of conduct in public life which he set for himself, our friend from Wisconsin provided a worthy example for us all. Ever mindful of the dignity of this House and his responsibilities to the citizens who sent him here to guard their interests, he served with distinction his country, his State, and the district he so honorably represented.

My deepest sympathy goes out to his widow and children in this bereavement, a loss profoundly felt by all who knew and respected him.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened and shocked to learn of the sudden passing of LAWRENCE H. SMITH who served so well and conscientiously for a number of years for the great State of Wisconsin. I had the privilege and pleasure of talking to Congressman SMITH almost daily since his office was located near my office in the Old House Office Building. Congressman SMITH always seemed to be in good spirits, and I thought he had completely recovered from the heart attack he suffered some time ago.

I am certain that there is not a Member of the United States Congress who worked longer hours than Congressman SMITH. He was one of the finest men that I have had the pleasure and privilege of knowing since I have been a Member of this great body. He was an American first and never made any compromise with a principle. He voted his convictions at all times and could give you a good reason as to why and how he cast his vote without being disagreeable. I do not believe that he had an enemy on the floor of the House, and I cannot imagine his having one in his great State which he so ably represented.

I certainly feel much richer for having the privilege of knowing Mr. SMITH, and he has left a great example for all of us to follow. I know that he was a great believer in the Constitution of the United States, and he believed in this great document as it was written and not as it has been interpreted by certain people. The State of Wisconsin and the Nation as a whole have lost one of their most valuable citizens in the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his lovely wife and family. We shall all greatly miss Mr. SMITH not only as a Congressman but as a friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today the flag above the United States Capitol flies at half staff. A most distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, LAWRENCE HENRY SMITH, has died.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a statesman who had dedicated himself to his country. He was a gentleman of strong convictions and great integrity and, having possessed these qualities, he became an outstanding leader of the House.

He was a kindly man, devoted to his fellow man. He was a loving husband and father who was adored by his family.

This country, in whose service LAWRENCE SMITH actually died, will sorely miss the contribution he could have continued to make in his country's behalf had God seen fit to spare him longer.

One of the first people I met when I came to Congress was "LAURIE" SMITH. He advised me with respect to many, many matters.

He and his charming wife, Eleanor, several times visited at our home in Troy.

I deeply regret the passing of this friend whom I admired so much and I deeply grieve for his wife and family whose loss is irreparable.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, this body has been in a state of shock ever since we learned of the sudden passing of our great and good friend LARRY SMITH. The high regard in which he was held by the entire membership without regard to party affiliation is a tribute not only to his integrity but also to the unvarying sweetness of his temperment and his unfailing cheerfulness even in the face of the most depressing reverses.

In the eulogies given in his memory on this floor I have detected a degree of sadness and a sense of personal loss which has not been noticed on previous occasions when we have paused to mark the passing of a departed brother. And on the faces of those who did not speak there was the mark of deep sadness that always comes when we see a great public servant like this good friend move on to that great convocation of those who have loved and served the Lord.

LARRY SMITH's life was one of dedication, starting with honorable service in World War I, a term as State commander of the American Legion, and then a year of high pride and satisfaction as he stood on the sidelines while his gracious wife filled the high office of national president of the American Legion Auxiliary. Yes; LARRY SMITH's life was marked by many milestones of service; but we, his friends and colleagues, will remember him for his courtesy, and I shall remember that only a day ago he dropped his hand on my shoulder as he passed me and said: "It's a good day, Paul." May the Great Comforter console the loved ones who are left to mourn, and may He grant his soul eternal peace.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that we record the passing of one of our patriotic, conscientious, and hard-working Congressman, LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of the First District of Wisconsin.

Congressman SMITH came into the 77th Congress a few months after I became a Member. We were personal friends. We pay tribute to a great Congressman. This was a great loss not only to the First District of Wisconsin, but also to this House and our Nation.

LARRY, as his friends all called him, was a serious, studious, devoted and dedicated Congressman. His work came first and was taken seriously. He gave his very best, never sparing himself and undoubtedly his intense concentration on his work certainly hastened his early departure.

I join with the many Congressmen here today in expressing our sympathy to his wife and family and assure them that we shall miss him greatly.

Congressman SMITH was a real student of foreign affairs and on this committee he devoted his energy and carried out with great effort the ideas and the program which he felt was proper for this Nation to support. He had the admiration, the respect and love of the Members of this House regardless of political affiliation. While many disagreed with him, all of them admired Congressman SMITH and commended him for his zeal and his purpose.

We shall miss him but he shall not be forgotten.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is most difficult to realize that LAWRENCE SMITH is not among us but has moved on to a greater reward. His distinguished service to community, State, and Nation—yes; even beyond—to all free peoples of the world is written in the pages of the proceedings of the Congress and the history of his home State of Wisconsin.

His warm friendship made easier the work of his colleagues and associates, and firmly places his memory in the recesses of our heart.

His lovely wife, Eleanor, was always at his side. Her leadership in women's organizations and her interest always complemented LAWRENCE'S work.

Mrs. McIntire joins me in extending to Eleanor and the family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected passing of Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH was a great shock to all of us.

We were all happy to hear of his recent recovery from a serious illness and hoped that he would be with us in full vigor and health, but destiny had other plans and now he has gone.

I knew and admired LARRY SMITH ever since I came to Congress. He was a man of great and firm convictions and with the courage to express and stand by them.

I enjoyed his sincere friendliness. He was always helpful and willing to give of his time and talents on any subject he was interested in.

LARRY SMITH was a great American and spent most of his time and energy in defending and protecting this Nation against its enemies.

His services in the House of Representatives will be difficult to replace.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my sympathy and condolences to his wife and family.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our beloved colleague, the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin, deeply shocked and saddened me.

LARRY SMITH was a scholarly hard-working gentleman who won the esteem, respect, and affection of all who came to know him. He served with distinction on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and while I often disagreed with him on foreign affairs I learned to respect his views.

The House of Representatives has lost an outstanding Member who served his district, State, and country with great devotion to duty. I have lost a good friend. To his devoted wife and children, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, as so well pointed out by those who have spoken, LARRY SMITH'S passing brought grief and a sense of great loss to us. His profoundly religious spirit was expressed in many ways, in his devotion to what he believed to be right, in the gentle way in which he expressed his own point of view without offense to those who differed with him, in the disciplined way of life which characterized his career, and in his uncomplaining manner of accepting a long illness. He seemed to be living by the sentiment expressed by Whittier:

> I know not what the future hath
> Of marvel or surprise,
> Assured alone that life and death
> His mercy underlies.

I shall miss him in the meetings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in the unofficial conferences on problems of underprivileged people which we were accustomed to attend, and in the Sunday morning services of Calvary Baptist Church which was his Washington church home.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of LAWRENCE SMITH we have lost the statesman who better than anyone else could express the views of the great heartland of America. The United States would be in a far stronger position, a real leader in world affairs, if the policies advocated by LAWRENCE SMITH had been followed. We would be far stronger economically, as well.

During the past several years I have had the great benefit of his advice and support in efforts to modify the status-of-forces treaties. Having his support, I knew my position was correct. In this, as in everything else, LAWRENCE SMITH would have the United States of America act its rightful role as a sovereign nation, and a powerful nation, confident, forthright, and fair in its dealings with others.

America has suffered a staggering loss, far transcending the deep personal grief that all of us must feel.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution—House Resolution 450.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

*Resolved*, That a committee of 11 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. WITHROW, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. VAN PELT, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. REUSS, Mr. TEWES, Mr. GORDON, and Mrs. CHURCH.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 23, 1958, pursuant to its previous order, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1495. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other authorizations for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, and for other purposes, in the amount of $2,896,519,968, for various agencies (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1496. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report showing the condition of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1956 and 1957, pursuant to Public Law 724, 79th Congress (H. Doc. No. 314); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1497. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67) (H. Doc. No. 315); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1498. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 10 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (49 Stat. 1363); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1499. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting 49 reports covering 61 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (1) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1500. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; to the Committee on House Administration.

1501. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 9, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a letter report on the Severn River, with particular reference to Ringgold Cove, Anne Arundel County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1502. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide an adjustment of salaries for personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs: H. J. Res. 347. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to 13, 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 509. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York, N. Y., from May 7 to 17, 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 10192. A bill to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the

National Wool Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 10193. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 10194. A bill to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10195. A bill to amend section 103 of the Dependents' Medical Care Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 10196. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10197. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to clearly authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to waive the requirements of section 10 thereof under such conditions and to such extent as he may prescribe in connection with inspection under the act prior to January 1, 1959; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 10198. A bill to create a rebuttable presumption that stolen diamonds of a value of $50,000 or more have been transported in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 10199. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for finality of orders of the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10200. A bill to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10201. A bill to provide that the chairmanship of the Federal Trade Commission shall rotate among the Commissioners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 10202. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 10203. A bill to provide an improved farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. R. 10204. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McINTOSH:

H. R. 10205. A bill to provide that the rate of duty applicable to wheat fit for human consumption shall apply to seed wheat unfit for human consumption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 10206. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 10207. A bill authorizing the modification of the Crisfield Harbor, Md., project in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 10208. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, to provide for the coordination and integration of policies and procedures with respect to Federal programs in the fields of science and technology; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 10209. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the founding of the free State of Israel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 10210. A bill to amend title I of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall approve the acquisition of certain lands of national historical significance, or interests therein, for highway purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEWES:

H. R. 10211. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10212. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. J. Res. 510. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10213. A bill for the relief of Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 10214. A bill for the relief of Basile G. Skalenakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10215. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amina Youssif Cosino (nee Simaan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOSER:

H. R. 10216. A bill for the relief of John Haskell Chesshir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 10217. A bill for the relief of Chan Yick Wah; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 10218. A bill for the relief of Demedrios Diamantidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 10219. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Bourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10220. A bill for the relief of William E. Nash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 10221. A bill for the relief of the Galveston, Houston & Henderson Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 10222. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonio Ferrise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

362. Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petition adopted by 25 residents of Barnegat, Ocean County, N. J., requesting that the advertising of alcoholic beverages be removed from radio and television advertising in connection with sports events, keeping in mind the fact that thousands of children are devoted to sports, especially in baseball; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

363. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary, Joint Committee on the National Capital, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted at its meeting on January 18, 1958, in support of House bills 9239, 9510, and 9595, and Senate bill 2283, and requesting that public hearings be held on these bills; to the Committee on Public Works.

364. Also, petition of the secretary general, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted at a convention at Miami Beach, Fla., on October 23, 1957, strongly urging that restrictions against trading with Communist China and Russia be continued and tightened; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Fortieth Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, which the Russian Communists destroyed in 1920. I have been privileged to address branch meetings of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on many occasions. I am glad to have this opportunity to extend my congratulations to this organization which is doing such a splendid job in keeping the cause of Ukrainian independence alive today.

There is little doubt but that Moscow's enduring fear of its captive nations and peoples still remains one of the firmest deterrents to war. Today in Ukraine, for example, which is the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, Moscow is waging a vicious anti-American campaign to convince the Ukrainian people that the American imperialists are like the Nazi liberators in World War II. However, the current difficulties of the Soviet Union still continue and will continue as long as the Ukrainian people and indeed all captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, believe that they have not been forgotten by the Free World. The recent letter of President Eisenhower to Soviet Prime Minister Bulganin, which held that the fate of the captive peoples

of Eastern Europe remained a proper subject for discussion at a possible summit meeting is ample proof that this Government has indeed not forgotten those peoples.

I want again to commend the Congress Committee for its efforts on behalf of Ukraine's aspirations for national freedom and to assure them of my continued efforts to render them all possible assistance in this fight for the freedom of their own people.

## Ukrainian Independence and Cultural Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, commemoration of Ukrainian independence reminds us that the Ukrainian people have suffered and continue tc suffer great injustices at the hands of their rulers in Moscow. The Free World is familiar with the Soviet massacre at Vinnytsya, the enforced famine in the early 1930's, and the general suppression of Ukrainian patriotism. The Free World is less familiar, however, with the more subtle Soviet acts of discrimination in the area of linguistics and literature. Discrimination and suppression of this nature do not have the dramatic effect of other Soviet actions, but they are important because they strike at a vital area of Ukrainian national life.

For over two decades the Soviets have tried to impose upon Ukrainians the supremacy of the Russian language and to relegate the Ukrainian language to the level of an obsolescent native dialect. Russian words have been introduced into the language, and their usage established by decree as the accepted norm for the writing of literature, both official material and that of a strictly literary character. Publication of a Ukrainian-Russian dictionary which clearly gave the Russian language a distinct advantage was a powerful Soviet device in the Russification of Ukrainian culture.

The extent to which the Soviets continue to discriminate against the Ukrainians and other nationalities in the U. S. S. R. was brought to light by a recent analysis of a book list of Soviet publications of important newspapers and periodicals for 1956. According to this analysis, 62.3 percent of the total number of 559 titles were published in the Russian S. F. S. R.; the remainder was published in the other 15 Republics. Moreover, only 156 of the 212 publications, or 27.9 percent, published by the non-Russian Republics were actually printed in the national language. Of the remaining 56 publications, 50 were printed in Russian and 6 both in Russian and some other language. Furthermore, only newspapers and periodicals of general interest were published in the language of the nationalities, whereas the few professional and other specialized literature were published in Russian. The inequity of Soviet nationality policy is brought into clearer focus by the fact that the Russians comprise only slightly more than 50 percent of the entire population of the U. S. S. R.

In the face of such calculated discrimination doubtless the Ukrainian language and the Ukrainian cultural tradition will be placed in jeopardy; for "Russification" is a corrosive force that has thus left its mark upon the Ukraine. Nevertheless, the Ukrainian people have a great pride in their nation, its literature, and its language. And, however intensive the Soviet drive of "Russification," they will resist, and they will preserve their national soul.

On this 40th anniversary of Ukrainian independence it is fitting that we pay tribute to the Ukrainian people and extend to them a word of comfort in their struggle for cultural survival and freedom.

## H. R. 8002

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to consent given me I submit the following letter for the RECORD:

THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT,
*Research Department, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I have a very queer letter from you in connection with H. R. 8002.

Every letter put out by your organization indicates that you do not have the slightest conception of what the proposed bill would be. It sets up a scheme to operate the Government very largely by contract authority, a scheme which has been found by practice to be absolutely dangerous, and one which will utterly destroy the control of Congress over Government expenditures. If you really meant to be honest about it, you would pay attention to the situation and grasp that the thing you are doing is extremely dangerous and will be disastrous to our country.

The first year such a thing was in operation, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, if he was a big enough faker, could claim that he had saved a lot of money, and he could say that after the second year, but the third year the chickens would come home to roost, and the appropriations required to meet the accrued indebtedness would be way beyond what they had ever been, and after that time there would be no way of counting anything. Every single bit of literature that you people have put out indicates a total lack of appreciation of the problem that Congress is confronted with, and the lack of interest in doing a good job.

I hate to be spending time and money on this when, if you would only do something constructive, there is such a great opportunity to activate a real savings. To start with, we should get rid of the performance budget which is costing us billions of dollars every year. The only support for the bill is, presently, the pressure from people who do not understand it, and there is such a terrible unwillingness on the part of those who are backing it to sit down and appreciate the dangerous course which you are pursuing.

I suppose it is too late now to expect you to turn over a new leaf, but I would feel that, in view of the recent document which you addressed to me, I owed you one last effort to try and get you to take an intelligent position on this matter.

Very sincerely yours.

## Anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 95th anniversary of one of the great events in the history of the Polish nation and of the freedom-loving peoples of the world. It is of particular significance today to recall this particular instance of the enduring heroism of these brave people. On this day, 95 years ago, Polish patriots led an insurrection against Russian control. Unfortunately, the insurrection failed and Poland was annexed to the Russian Empire. Multitudes of brave, patriotic Poles were subjected to barbarous punishment and entire villages were exiled. The flame of freedom and independence, however, continued to burn. It continues to this day.

While some measure of permanent autonomy for Poland has been wrested from the Soviet Government, we commemorate this event in the hope that its independence will continue to grow.

Americans in recalling the irrepressible spirit of the Polish nation must ask themselves if the United States is doing all it can to assist the forces of freedom throughout the world.

Mindful of our traditions and of the contributions of Polish-Americans to the free life of America over the past three and one-half centuries, our unfair immigration policies must be changed so as to allow entry into the United States of Polish exiles and refugees.

Finally, we must develop a firm United States diplomatic policy to help all the oppressed peoples of the world.

The American and the Polish peoples have been in the forefront of the fight for liberty. We pray that the valiant Polish nation will soon have its deserved share of that most precious of all possessions, human freedom

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I join with my colleagues and all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world in sending greetings to those who

continue to fight for the liberation of the Ukrainian people and all peoples in the enslaved nations. We, in the United States, who are dedicated to human liberty, are ever cognizant of the continuing struggle of the Ukrainian people for national independence.

## Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest assets in the struggle to maintain and extend the blessings of liberty to all peoples throughout the world lies in the spirit of freedom and independence which still burns in the hearts of men and women behind the Iron Curtain. No greater fear exists in the minds of the masters of the Kremlin than that this spirit will overflow and sweep away the reign of terror imposed on these peoples. To their undying resolve to combat Communist tyranny we owe our everlasting gratitude.

On this day, 40 years ago, the people of the Ukraine formed a free and independent national republic. They had played an important role in the destruction of the czarist dictatorship. Now they expressed their desire to live in liberty by forming a popular government representative of their wishes and aspirations. Bold and courageous as this step was, it was destined to be obliterated under the ruthless heel of Communist tyranny. In 1920 the hordes of the Red army swept into the Ukraine, crushing the new Republic and placing in its stead a puppet regime, nominally free, but actually subservient to Moscow in thought and deed.

However brutally this was accomplished, however mercilessly the opposition was eliminated, the flame of freedom could not be quenched. Since the ninth century the people of the Ukraine had enjoyed a tradition of independence. The new, self-styled, arbiters of the fate of the Ukraine were to find it no easy task to destroy that heritage.

In the years that followed, many fled to the Free World. I have known many of these gallant people who have made their homes in my home city of Rochester. They have proved excellent citizens and have contributed much to the cultural vigor of the community. Their devotion to a free way of life has enriched our whole country.

Others stayed behind to continue the fight for freedom in another way. Year after year the Ukraine has been a hotbed of agitation. Year after year it has proved a powerful reminder that men may live in slavery, but they dream of freedom, that shackles may bind the flesh but cannot bind the mind. In the past 12 months courageous men and women have risked their lives to send the message ringing around the world: "We shall be free. We shall not remain slaves to the thirst for power of a few men who rule for themselves alone. When fear seeks to destroy freedom, it is fear itself that will be destroyed."

In a day of missiles and nuclear weapons, it is well to take time on this 40th anniversary of the creation of the Ukrainian Republic to remember this: The power of the human spirit and its eternal craving for freedom is a greater force against tyranny than our most destructive hydrogen bomb. To those in bondage behind the Iron Curtain we must give our continued assurance that their resistance is not in vain, that theirs is not a forgotten front.

Our country is the stronger today for their efforts, just as it is richer for the contributions their brothers have made here. May the time not be far off when all may join in the celebration of a new and lasting independence.

## The Polish Insurrection of 1863: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, commemoration of the Polish Insurrection of 1863 calls the attention of the Free World to the fact that Poland has been in the past as in the present a victim of Russian imperialism.

Poland has also been a victim of a less tangible adversary, geographic determinism. A nation cannot escape its geography, and in the case of Poland geography has proved to be one of its mortal enemies.

For decades, even centuries, Poland has been between the anvil and the hammer of Russian power on the one side and Germanic power on the other. Polish history is marked by many partitions solely because it had become a pawn in the great power struggle between the Slav and the Teuton.

Presently, geographic factors loom large in the determination of Polish foreign policy. However much the Polish Communist regime may wish to follow the example of Tito, if indeed that is its ambition, it cannot escape the cold, hard fact that Poland's eastern border adjoins the Soviet Union and that its western border adjoins Communist East Germany, in which many Soviet divisions are stationed, ready to close like a pincer from east and west in the event of a Polish uprising. Facts such as these are important to understand, for they encourage a more realistic appraisal of the highly difficult position the Polish people are in today.

Thus, the Poles are truly a captive people. But they had been a captive people before, and history records that they had emerged from their captivity to establish a genuine independent republic. What the future holds for these gallant people we do not know. But the promise of the future may well be freedom and genuine national independence. A people so gifted, so heroic, and so resolute are deserving of nothing less.

## Ninety-fifth Anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1863, January 22, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 100 years ago—while our forefathers were locked in the Civil War—the people of Poland took up arms against their Russian oppressors.

The Polish Insurrection was short lived, but the heroic effort of those courageous Poles became part of the noble Polish heritage that flared forth again at Poznan in 1956. And it became part of the heritage that formed the hard core of resistance to Communist tyranny which has won the Polish nation a limited amount of relief from the crushing excesses of Communist oppression.

Indeed, the Polish people have resisted several attempts to destroy their national identity. The Russians failed to make Russians of them in 1863. The Austrian and German Empires failed at similar tasks. I have no doubt that the Polish people will also successfully resist today's efforts to communize them.

For the Poles have learned the value and the high cost of freedom, and they are strong in their knowledge. On January 22, the 95th anniversary of the Polish Insurrection, we in this country salute their courage and their dedication to freedom at any cost.

## The 40th Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today on the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, which the Russian Communists destroyed in 1920, I extend felicitations to the people of Ukraine and best wishes to these brave people in connection with their aspirations for national freedom. As a captive nation they have long endured suffering and hardship and despite the domination of Soviet tyrants have never relinquished their will and courage to advance the cause of democracy.

It is my fervent hope that these enslaved people will soon enjoy the independence and freedom which they have so long cherished.

## Commemorating the 40th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, today it is most fitting that all Americans join in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence; that we extend a hand of friendship across the Iron Curtain barrier as an expression of the devotion our peoples share for human and national freedom.

Tragically, there can be no similar observance in the Ukraine. The bright flame of freedom which lighted that nation with such promise 40 years ago has been darkened by the bitter night of communistic tyranny.

The Ukrainian people, whose love of and striving for freedom dates back more than 1,000 years, saw their new-born republic's independence die in 1920, when Red Russian armies took over their country and its government. Since that time, the brutal tide of Communist conquest has engulfed many free nations; today, that tide threatens the peace of all the world.

During these days of crisis, however, one basic truth stands out. Despite the brutal oppression of Godless communism, it has not been able to obliterate the freedom-loving spirit of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Nowhere is this truth more evident than among the 40 million people of the Ukraine. Through the long years of subjugation—in which their religious beliefs have been trampled upon, their patriots liquidated, their citizens thrown into slave labor camps—the Ukrainian people have steadfastly and courageously rebelled against their Communist oppressors.

Even today, reports from behind the Iron Curtain indicate that this underground fight continues. Indeed, there are indications that—despite its advances in new weapons of war—the Kremlin's weak spot still is its constant fear of its captive nations.

That is why, today as we rededicate our enduring friendship with the brave people of the Ukraine, I would like to make a part of the RECORD an excellent analytical article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune last December. I believe this article warrants the closest study by all of us in the Congress. It follows:

UNITED STATES DEFENSE AND AVIATION—DEATH SENTENCES REVEAL RED UPSETS IN UKRAINE

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

The Soviet Union unquestionably is having current difficulties in the Ukraine, its traditional granary, as well as a prime source of coal for its heavy industry and a major training ground for Soviet scientists and technicians.

Official Soviet reports of death sentences just passed upon a group of Ukrainian nationalists and partisans from the Rovno Province bordering on the Pripet Marshes appear to confirm stories related by refugees from Hungary. These were to the effect that before the Budapest revolt of last year, Soviet soldiers had told them of recent fighting between regular Red army troops and Ukrainian partisans—although such anti-Soviet guerrilla warfare was believed to have ended in 1949.

SECOND LARGEST REPUBLIC

One-fourth of the Soviet Union's annual class of young scientists and technicians graduate from institutions in the once independent Ukraine, now the second largest republic of the U. S. S. R. The great astronomical observatory at Kiev—the ancient Ukrainian capital—and the Gravimetric Institute of Poltava, where Peter the Great crushed the combined Swedish and Ukrainian Armies in 1709, are currently chief centers of Soviet scientific participation in the International Geophysical Year.

One present task of the Kiev observatory is directing monitoring connected with the Soviet sputniks. This background drops clues as to why such wide publicity is being given to the alleged experiences in the United States of Prof. Orest Stephen Makar—now working as a professor of geodesy at the Polytechnic Institute of Lvov in the western Ukraine.

Professor Makar came as a supposed refugee to the United States in 1949. He now is believed to have been a Soviet agent during his entire stay in this country. But amazingly, after being dismissed from St. Louis University he secured employment at the White Sands, N. Mex., atomic and guided missile proving grounds with limited clearance to handle within his scientific specialty classified material up to secret. After being naturalized in October 1956, he went to Stockholm and then suddenly fled with his wife into the Soviet Union.

Geodesy is a branch of applied mathematics particularly important in long-range guided-missile work. It comprises methods used to determine by observation and measurement the exact position of cities and other geographical points around the globe. Professor Makar was interviewed and reinterviewed after his arrival in Moscow, where he was hailed as one of the world's foremost experts on aerial photography.

But in a new broadside recently published in Pravda and republished throughout the Ukraine—Professor Makar charges that all the Slavs including the Ukrainians are being discriminated against in the United States. They are regarded in America as second-class people, according to him and cannot rise above the level of manual laborer. The actual facts are that there now are more than 1,500,000 Ukrainians and persons of immediate Ukrainian descent in the United States, who have gained an unusual reputation for being good, hard-working citizens. Many like Prof. Lev Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, and the late film star, John Hodiak, won high places in law and education as well as in the arts and sciences.

LAUDED BY EISENHOWER

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, whose activities to promote good citizenship and advance the cause of democracy on a worldwide scale recently have been commended by President Eisenhower and such political liberals as Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, says in a reply: "It is clear that the Makar charge must be part of a widespread new anti-American propaganda campaign of the Kremlin policymakers."

## Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of this 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to these valiant people in their fight for freedom from Russian domination.

When the Russian Empire was shattered after the Russian Revolution of 1917, nearly all non-Russian elements of that loosely held and ill-governed autocracy began to clamor for freedom and national independence. Forty million Ukrainians, the most powerful and the largest of these elements, were very anxious to act likewise. Even before the end of the First World War they had the chance, and early in 1918, on January 22, they proclaimed their national independence and established a Republic. That proclamation, issued exactly 40 years ago, is a distinct landmark in the political history of the Ukrainians. It represents the culmination of their centuries-old arduous and costly struggle for the attainment of their national goal—the realization of their long-cherished political independence.

For 2½ years, the Ukrainians—under their patriotic and self-sacrificing leaders—fought against invaders from the north and from the east, and managed to safeguard their hard-won independence.

Unfortunately, in the end they were forced to surrender their independence, their country—and their all to Communist Russians in November of 1920. Since then the Ukrainians have sacrificed themselves by the millions and have suffered much under the unrelenting tyranny of Communist totalitarianism, yet even under this inhuman regime, brave and stout-hearted Ukrainians have kept up their spirit of independence.

As the Ukrainians celebrate this memorable day, let us all hope and pray that their persistent struggle will be rewarded and they will once more be free and independent people.

## The 40th Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, in an age when we are conscious of intercontinental missiles and traversing the mysteries of outer space; when the spread of communism is prevalent throughout the

world, it is good to take time to consider the free-minded people in countries behind the Iron Curtain who still strive to attain the freedom they once knew.

Today Ukrainians everywhere commemorate the 40th anniversary of their independence which was torn from them by the Russian Communist in 1920.

The Ukraine is often referred to as "the bread basket of Russia." Its forty-million-odd people have a proud history extending back to the ninth century. Its mining industry ranks second in the world and the black soil region makes it a rich agricultural nation.

We can only continue our prayers and efforts for the liberation of this nation and all other countries suffering under the Communist heel and hope that in future years the celebrations will be ones of independence and not the anniversaries of the years when freedom reigned.

## Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today we welcome the opportunity to commend the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic as an independent nation. While the Ukraine is not today independent because of Soviet domination, we must never forget that the citizens of the Ukraine still yearn for a return to their freedom and to their rightful sovereignty, for the Ukrainian nation will always remember, and the Ukrainian people will never give up their fight or the right of self-determination.

It is for this reason each year that the Congress memorializes itself and the American people of the fact that the Ukraine is not a mere province of Russia but a proud nation. Recent death sentences in the Soviet Union indicate the turmoil which exists there and reveals the determination to upset Red domination of the Ukraine.

Ukrainian nationals continue to constitute the largest percentage of victims of Soviet slave labor in concentration camps. This all speaks well for the heroic struggle which Ukrainians are waging in their own way to resist Communist rule and to achieve freedom. Their expressed adherence to religious beliefs and theological principle in the face of determined Soviet efforts to subjugate the Ukrainian people is another indication of their refusal to be enslaved and exploited. During these days when our emphasis tends to be directed toward military preparedness and technological achievements, we often forget that we have allies behind the Iron Curtain who contribute in great measure to deterring Soviet aggression. We must not let these friends of democracy down. We must continue to respond to their aspirations for freedom and for that future day when they can be permitted to travel throughout the world and to find reunion with their families everywhere.

## Army Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this time, to call to the attention of my colleagues a matter which I think is serious as far as the defense of our great country goes. I am afraid that we are being propagandized into doing too many of the things that the Russians would have us do.

We have become all too concerned about the satellite and about the missile program, and I am sure that it is very well we do, but not to the point where we will neglect one of the principal arms of defense of our great country—our Army.

I fear that we are now in the process of cutting the Army even below the danger point. The Secretary of the Army recommends 929,000 soldiers and it is felt by many of our Army personnel and the Secretary of the Army, that this is as low as we should go. During these times, when war could occur at any moment, when the security of this great country hangs in the balance, to my way of thinking, it is foolhardy and almost criminal for the Congress of the United States to sit idly by and let the Bureau of the Budget or any other branch of the Government cut the Army to the danger point. I dare say that there is not an Army officer in this country who would agree that the Army should be cut below a million men. It is the duty of the Bureau of the Budget and all other agencies created by Congress, to assist the Congress in doing its work. Are we to sit idly by and permit the destruction of our Army—start again to tear down the forts and camps that cost billions of dollars of taxpayers' money and again allow ourselves to be found shorthanded in the matter of trained men and material to defend our country? It may be argued by some, because of the missile program and the threat of attack by missiles, that we do not need the Army. In my humble opinion there will never come a time when the foot soldiers will not be called upon to bear the brunt of any war that may be fought now or hereafter. Should we be attacked, we would need a large and well equipped standing Army here at home for protection purposes alone, to say nothing of the need in the event we again were called upon to fight overseas. So, I appeal to you, my colleagues in the Congress, to study this program and study it well and hard, using your best judgment in not permitting the Bureau of the Budget or any other agency created by the Congress to dictate your thinking on this all important matter. Let us go along with the Secretary of the Army and restore the $250 million that will be needed and give him the right to recruit the necessary men to bring our Army to the required standard of not less than 929,000.

There is another thing I would like to discuss along this particular line at the present time and that regards the servicemen being discharged. I have had a number of officers come to my office, who have had as much as 17½ years service. All along they have been encouraged to make the Army their career and that has been their desire. They have had no thought of quitting the Army, but today they find themselves faced with the reality of being discharged against their wishes. Many of these officers could retire within the next year or two, and they have earned that retirement. I talked to one officer, just last week, and he told me that his being forced into leaving the Army against his wishes will cost him and his family in the neighborhood of $90,000. To me it is unthinkable that the Government encourages men to go into the Army and make a career of it; yet the same Government finds it necessary to discharge those men against their wishes, thereby working hardships on the men and their families. So much for that.

My colleagues, I am afraid that we are being driven into doing things that Russia wants us to do by falling in line with propaganda from Russia. The destruction of our Army is one of them. By giving lip service to a great Army—by talking defense and means of defense—we are little by little destroying our Army, the very thing that we will need so badly if war should come. Let us not be caught short again. We have been caught short before in disaster, and may I say that in my humble opinion it has cost us many lives—many men and also many dollars. We will not have time if a war comes now with the present atomic missile weapons of war. May I repeat, we will not have time to prepare for war as we have in the past. We will have to be ready on the spot to begin immediately to defend our country and repair damage done by the enemy's bombs and if we do not have the manpower in our Army to do this, then again, our people and our great country will have to suffer for the shortsightedness of the Congress of the United States.

We are today, through our foreign-aid program, aiding others to bolster their economy and their power of defense. It certainly will be a sad thing if we spend our money building for other countries the things that they need to defend themselves and care for their people and then in the end find that we have bled ourselves white helping peoples in foreign nations and have neglected the most vital thing—being prepared to defend ourselves in an emergency. Nine hundred and twenty-nine thousand men for an Army—to care for as large a country as the United States. We certainly are not, in my opinion, using good judgment. Some of the people who are advising the Congress to cut down on the Army are merely men who know nothing about anything except figures. And all you hear is cut, cut, cut. I, too,

want to reduce taxes. I, too, want to operate as cheaply and economically as we possibly can, but there are many other places where waste and extravagance are being practiced which could and should be stopped. It will do no good to save $250 million by cutting the Army to the danger point and then spending an equal amount or more on foreign aid.

I trust that my colleagues in the Congress of the United States will give serious consideration to voting to restore the $250 million that the Secretary of the Army requests and which, I believe you will find, is sorely needed.

## Saginaw Postal Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year, when the controversial subject of postal salaries is again expected to be before the Congress, I wish to bring to the attention of the House certain illuminating facts. They relate to the largest post office in my district, located at Saginaw, Mich.

First, with respect to examinations for the positions of clerks and letter carriers. From March 21, 1956, to November 27, 1957, 656 persons took the examinations. Of clerks who passed the examination, there were 28 on the active register and 64 on the inactive register for a total of 92 carriers passing the examination; there were 21 on the active register and 35 on the inactive register for a total of 56 or a grand total of 148 who passed the examination out of 656 applicants.

There were 47 eligibles who declined or who failed to reply to an offer of appointment. There were 2 clerks who were passed over 3 times and whose names were then removed from the register. During this 20-month period there were 50 appointments as clerks and carriers. Of these 50, 26—of whom 25 were clerks—vacated their positions after appointment. This clearly evidences, Mr. Speaker, the serious employment situation we have today in the Post Office Department if we are to presume that such an experience is typical throughout the country.

Now I would like to pay a brief tribute to the 82 regular clerks and 20 substitute clerks that staff the Saginaw Post Office. These figures cover the period October 19–December 27 of the past year which includes the pre-Christmas workload. During that time the post office at Saginaw has been allowed 40,589 work hours at about $2 per hour; 5,562 hours of overtime at about $3 per hour; and 9,974 hours of so-called Christmas assistance at about $1.65 per hour. The hours actually used during that period came to 41,429 work hours, 5,345 overtime hours, and 8,007 Christmas assistance hours. With a little subtraction and multiplication we find during this period that the Saginaw postal clerks saved the United States Government during these 10 weeks, the sum of $2,246.55, even though postal receipts increased 5 percent over a year ago. I mention this, Mr. Speaker, to show that although the Saginaw postal clerks were disappointed over not getting their expected pay raise, they are not laying down on the job.

To recap briefly, I desire to call attention to two important matters: the employment situation within the Post Office Department is extremely serious, perhaps critical, but the postal employees themselves are giving, and I am sure will continue to give, their best efforts to the job at hand. The House should keep these two points in mind when postal pay legislation is again before us.

## Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, today is the 40th anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian Independence. It is gratifying to know that this day is a cause for recognition at New Haven, Conn., in the district which I represent. On this day, the Ukrainian flag flies its blue and gold colors of that nation over the city hall there.

Ukrainia was one of the first nations to fall under the tyranny of the Bolshevik imperialists. Despite the destruction of her churches, horrible man-made famines of the 1930's, mass deportations, purges and murders, Ukrainia's national spirit and her moral fiber have not dimmed the hope and passion of a nation whose destiny it is to be free and sovereign. She will go down in world history books as a symbol of the struggle for freedom and independence.

This strong and unebbing will for national liberty has been renewed through the centuries of Ukrainian human history from the 9th to the 14th century under the old Ukrainian Kievan State, in the Ukrainian Kozak in the 17th century, and most recently in the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917 to 1920.

Ukrainian Independence Day is a fitting means to demonstrate to the rest of the free world our protests to international communism, which treacherously designs the envelopment of the entire globe.

With over 40 million people, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, Ukrainia stands as an important strategic ally in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism.

Ukrainia has a historic right to national freedom. Her independence cannot be ignored. We of the Free World should stand stanchly behind this right of the Ukrainians, if we are to be assured that the foundations of liberty and independence for all nations are to be preserved.

## Fortieth Anniversay of Ukrainian Independence, January 22, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we who are endowed with freedom remind ourselves that great numbers of our fellow men throughout the world do not enjoy the same liberty that we hold dear.

Therefore, on the 40th anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic's greatest attempt to free its people from oppression, it is especially appropriate that we pledge never to forget any of man's efforts to build a peaceful world.

On January 22, 40 years ago, when the Ukrainian Parliament issued its Fourth Universal—the document that corresponds to the American Declaration of Independence—people the world over recognized another of man's significant attempts to win freedom and liberty.

On the anniversary of that great event all of us will benefit by rededicating ourselves to the cause of freedom. All of us salute the heroic people of the Ukraine, then and now, who hold freedom and self-determination to be man's most important goals.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the independent Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed. We today solemnly commemorate the 40th anniversary of this important chapter in the history of the struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian Nation.

Unfortunately, shortly thereafter the Ukrainian nation succumbed to Bolshevik tyranny. Soviet military power crushed this young republic late in 1920.

Even its churches were destroyed. The people suffered under a horrible Soviet-created famine in 1932–33. Vast purges and deportations were decreed by Moscow.

Nevertheless, the Ukrainian Nation maintains an indestructible hope and passion to be a free and independent sovereign nation.

This nation of over 40 million people is one of our most important allies in the

struggle against Soviet Communist imperialism. The spirit of the Ukrainian people stands as an inspiration to the free peoples of the world in their struggle for worldwide freedom and justice.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an address made by me at the auditorium of the Chopin School in Chicago on January 19, 1958, on the occasion of the observance of the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence—January 22—by the United Ukrainian-American organizations of Illinois. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor, a privilege, and a thrilling experience to be here on the 40th anniversary of the independence of a great nation and a proud people.

Today we are making history, you and I, in this tremendous gathering and all the countless thousands at similar gatherings in all the States of our Union.

Today throughout the Free World the voice of Ukraine is being heard and all America is fired by the inspiration of the million and a half of our countrymen and countrywomen of Ukrainian birth or descent.

No better people ever came to cast their lot with us. Our country is a finer land, its qualities of character and its store of achievements enriched, because of the coming to our shores of the sons and daughters of Ukraine. I am proud that in the district that I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States are many in whose veins flow the proud Ukrainian blood. They are foremost in all good works. They are pillars in strengthening the standards in which we believe and which we seek to uphold.

You of Ukrainian birth or descent now in the United States number a million and a half. By your industry, your character, your devotion and your vast contribution in every field of endeavor you have interwoven yourselves into the American fabric and deeply imbedded yourselves in the affection of your neighbors.

### HONORING FELLOW AMERICANS

In honoring the Ukrainian day of independence, and the unconquerable spirit of freedom that ever has characterized the people of Ukraine and defied the powers of tyrants, today we honor also our fellow Americans. Yours is the rich heritage of an ancestry that embraced Christianity a thousand years ago, that gave scope to education and culture and vitality and vision to a mighty sovereign nation that reigned before there was a state of Russia. No one is deeper rooted in the age-long struggle of man for the full attainment of human contentment and dignity. It is our great good fortune that you are fellow Americans. Today we honor you and the land from which you came. As Voltaire said in 1763, Ukraine has always aspired to freedom.

It was an honor that deeply touched me to be introduced to this tremendous audience by the Honorable Michael Hinko, a young man of great ability who is destined to exercise an ever broadening influence in the vital decisions of our country. To Stephen Koropas, the dynamic president of the dedicated organization responsible for this great meeting, and to all who worked so hard with him for its success, I extend my heartfelt thanks. And to John Duzansky, tireless in his good works, I bring from Washington the personal greetings of the Honorable Edward O'Connor, champion of the cause of Ukrainian-Americans in the high counsels of the Federal Government.

I look over this vast audience, and I see many faces, both of men and women, and in them I glimpse, unafraid and unconquerable, the spirt of a great and noble people that in the heel of tyrants find not the weight of crushing power but the challenge to revitalized efforts.

Soon it will come to happen. Soon our world now tormented with the fear of a war that would raze our civilization will be rescued from present torments and restored to the path of peace. It will come surely as tomorrow's sun will dispel the darkness of today's midnight. It will come with the breaking from bondage of Ukraine, the bread basket and the sugar bowl of Russia, the second of the Soviet Republics in population and the source of more than 50 percent of its iron and coal. It is in the hearts of the 40 million people in captive Ukraine that again their land shall be free. Today you and I help in bringing closer the glad day of Ukrainian liberation by what we are doing in our participation in these gatherings in observance of Ukrainian Independence Day.

### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Today we formally commemorate the 40th anniversary of the birth of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic. This is Ukrainian Independence Day in a very modern sense because it also marks the rebirth of Ukraine as an independent and sovereign nation.

Over 300 years ago Ukraine was not only an independent state but the center of a rich culture and a thriving commerce that linked Europe and Asia. Ukraine first lost its independence to the schemes of empire launched by the czars of Moscow, with the signing of the Treaty of Peregaslav in the spring of 1654. This treaty, which was intended to provide Ukraine with the assistance in maintaining her independence, was used by the Russian Czars to reduce her to a colony of the empire.

For over 200 years Ukraine remained a colony of the old Russian Empire. The ruling caste in Moscow all during these long years exerted extreme efforts to absorb the country into Russia, that is, to make Russians out of the Ukrainians. It is a shining tribute to the strong character of the Ukrainian people and to their heroic spirit that the Russians were defeated in that evil task. The case of Ukraine and its centuries-long struggle for individual liberty and national independence stands today as a symbol of the greatness which becomes a people who refuse to submit to the tyrant's command.

### CRACK OF OLD EMPIRES

World War I introduced a new era for the colonial and subjugated nations of the world. As that war was drawing to a close the empires began to crack and fall. There was a great awakening of the people of Europe and Asia to the natural right of all people to self-government and to the need for a world in which all nations were accorded an equal dignity.

President Woodrow Wilson gave real meaning to the aspirations of colonial and subjugated people in his call for national self-determination as a guidepost to rebuilding a war-torn Europe.

From the ruins of empires there sprang up many national republics which attempted to pattern their constitutions and forms of government in the image of the United States. Among these were Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Turkestan—all of which are today held captive within the reconstructed Russian Empire.

### HIGH POINT OF IDEALISM

That era has often been called, by astute scholars of that period of history, the high point of American idealism in the affairs of nations. At no point since has the great idealism of our Founding Fathers and their inspired Declaration of Independence held such an influence upon the hopes of struggling humanity throughout the world. Just as the certain hand of destiny led us to an unprecedented position in world affairs over 150 years ago, so will it raise us up once again to deliver the oppressed peoples and nations from their exploiters.

### ONLY 45 PERCENT RUSSIAN

It seems to me strange that in this age of enlightment there is so little common knowledge in the United States about the many non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. All too frequently we hear the people of the Soviet Union referred to as Russians and the Soviet Union as Russia. It seems to be uncommon knowledge that Russia is only one of many nations which make up the Soviet Union, and that the Russians comprise only about 45 percent of the populations of the Soviet Union.

On the whole, we know little about the distinctive cultures, languages, traditions, and folklore which characterize the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. Yet, we, as leaders of the Free World, are expected to be sensitive to the hopes and aspirations of all the people of the world as we seek to lead the way to peace and tranquility among nations. We suffer from an acute shortage of information about the non-Russian people of the Soviet Union which seriously impairs our leadership of the Free World.

Americans of Ukrainian origin are to be congratulated for all the efforts they have made over the years to reduce this critical deficiency.

### EXPERIENCE IN ISRAEL

Just a few weeks ago I visited the new State of Israel, as a member of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. While there I met men and women who had come from all the nations of Europe—some of whom had fled the countries of their birth to escape persecution and death.

Among them was a talented engineer of some 60 years who was born in Ukraine and who took part in the events leading up to the independence of Ukraine in 1918. He escaped during World War II and then took part in the campaign to establish the independent State of Israel. He spoke with feeling about the aspirations of the Ukrainian people to be free and independent and then predicted that as surely as day follows night Ukraine would once again be free and independent. I was inspired by the convictions of this man who had known from personal experience the tyrants' whip and the degradation which befalls the people behind the Russian Iron Curtain.

### UKRAINE PLAGUES KREMLIN

The people of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, like the people of the Baltic States and Communist-occupied central Europe, have awakened to the climax of events which are now taking place within the modern-day Russian Empire. The demand for individual liberties and the rights of nations to govern their own affairs rocks that empire to its very foundations.

Ukraine has been in the forefront of this movement, making great sacrifices in her unending struggle to throw off the yoke of the occupier. Because of this hard resistance to all Russian efforts to tame the Ukraine that nation has been the special target of mass deportations, constant purges, and even mass starvation programs.

It seems that the more the Russians persecute and exploit Ukraine the more determined the Ukrainian people become to win back their freedom. This is a fact of life which plagues the rulers in the Kremlin and haunts their proconsuls who are sent to Ukraine to keep that nation in bondage.

RUSSIAN COLONIALISM

All the empires of the 19th century, except one, have passed or are in the process of making the necessary accommodations for self-government of the nations concerned. That exception is the reconstructed and vastly expanded Russian Empire.

We seem to have no hesitancy in calling for the speedup of independent status for the colonial people of Asia and Africa. Moreover, we do not hesitate to call for such action despite the fact that our proven allies such as Britain and France at times become angry at us for doing so.

Yet, when it comes to calling for such action to be applied to the reconstructed Russian Empire we seem suddenly to lose our voice as a nation. Is it because we are ignorant of the facts or because we suffer from a peculiar fixation that somehow the Russians will, like the golden hordes of Ghengis Kahn, fold their tents of occupation and in the silence of the night fall back to their national frontiers? I believe it is a combination of both—and that we must work harder to dispel both these opiates upon long overdue action. You can count on me, as always, to stand with you in this work of peace.

The national independence movements which have started anew behind the Iron Curtain cannot be stopped. The tremendous ground swell of human aspirations which grips that entire area is moving ever forward to a climax—a climax which will, in God's good time, bring an end to the terrible darkness of Russian imperial communism. I join with you in the fervent hope that that happy day will not long be delayed.

## Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence and established a republic, which was destroyed by the Russian Communists in 1920.

Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, is one of the most resourceful regions of the world. It is now the breadbasket and sugar bowl of the Soviet Union. In addition to its agricultural production it also stands high throughout the world in its industrial undertakings.

During its long years of subservience Ukraine has continued to struggle for liberation. One of the first victims of Russian Communist aggression, it has proved to be the Achilles' heel of the Russian Communist empire.

I am honored to pay tribute to these gallant fighters for freedom. I pray that Ukraine may soon shed its yoke of tyranny and again join the free nations of the world.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable day for Ukrainians everywhere on which I extend my heartfelt congratulations. It is their independence day, the 40th anniversary of that great event which took place on January 22, 1918, even when part of Ukraine was still under alien rule.

So many world-shaking events have occurred since that time that we are inclined to forget this important event. It is true that many revolutionary and startling events have altered many things in this world, including man's attitude to these events; but man himself has remained remarkably unchanged, and especially so in his appreciation of freedom and in his willingness to fight and die for it. This is well illustrated by the history of the Ukrainians.

The Ukrainian people have endured the oppressive yoke of ruthless Russian regimes, both czarist and Communist, longer than any other people. For more than 300 years they have suffered under Russian tyranny; and unfortunately they are still suffering from it. But through all this hardship and oppression they have steadfastly clung to their national ideals, even at the risk of their lives. In 1918 when they saw their chance of attaining their independence they proclaimed it and set up the Ukrainian Republic. Even though they were to lose this most cherished of their prizes in the fall of 1920 under the onslaught of the Red army, still they retain its solemn national significance. Its celebration still remains their symbol of freedom and independence.

It is that sadness and hope that we celebrate this memorable day, a day whose full meaning yet awaits fulfillment.

## The 40th Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 22, 1958*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, just 40 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Constituent Assembly met and adopted a proclamation establishing an independent Ukraine Republic comprising a nation of some 40 million people. Its independence, however, was shortlived. In 1920 Communist Russia occupied the Ukraine, destroyed the independence of this nation, and enslaved its people to this very day.

Thus, the Ukraine became one of the first victims of aggression by the Kremlin rulers. Since then many millions of Ukrainians have been deported to the slave labor camps and salt mines in Siberia, while those remaining on their ancestral soil have been dealt with ruthlessly.

Notwithstanding all this suffering and long enslavement, the people of the Ukraine continue to strive for freedom and to hope for their liberation from the yoke of communism. In their hopes and struggles to achieve freedom, the eyes of the Ukrainian people are turned primarily toward America for words of encouragement, for expressions of friendship, for signs of sympathetic understanding.

On this occasion of the 40th anniversary of Ukraine Independence, it is most appropriate for the freedom-loving American people to express their solidarity with the people of the Ukraine. To them and their kinsmen in America, who have never forgotten them in their tragic plight during these 4 long decades, we send our greetings and our wishes that their country will soon be liberated and will join the Free World as an independent and democratic nation.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1958

The Very Reverend Father Stephen Hallick-Holutiak, of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States of America, Cleveland, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

O heavenly and gracious God, spirit of truth, whose might is ineffable, whose glory is inconceivable, whose mercy is infinite, and whose love toward mankind is unutterable: we praise Thee.

We are living in times of great unrest and tension. Dark and evil forces of ungodly communism threaten to enslave more and more freedom-loving peoples. Many nations have fallen before the brutal might and violent force of Communist imperialism. First among these nations is Ukraine, who today commemorates the 40th anniversary of the restoration and proclamation of her independence. Only Thou, O God, knowest of the suffering, oppression, slave labor, imprisonment, death by famine of millions of men, women, and children in the Ukraine, and, likewise, those in other countries who have suffered a similar fate.

O great and merciful God, speed the day when all nations shall be free; grant the world true and lasting peace. Strengthen with courage and determination those who seek to do Thy holy will. Grant Thy blessings, O Heavenly Father, to these, Thy servants, who have taken the responsibility of leadership in our Government and in the free world. Give them strong and loving hearts; inspire them to great things in their deliberations. Protect them and guide them by the grace of Thy Holy Spirit, that Thy will be done. May Thy name be forever blessed. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 20, 1958, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

The message announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 969) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. DOWDY, and Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois were appointed as managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9955. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; and

H. R. 10147. An act to permit Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, Member of Congress, authorization to accept the award of the Cross of Commander of the Order of Orange-Nassau conferred upon him by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands.

## ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union, and it was signed by the Vice President.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 9955. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 10147. An act to permit Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, Member of Congress, authorization to accept the award of the Cross of Commander of the Order of Orange-Nassau conferred upon him by Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate until next Wednesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

## COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR NEELY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces that, pursuant to the second resolving clause of Senate Resolution 243, relative to the death of Senator NEELY, of West Virginia, agreed to on Monday last, the Chair appointed on the 21st instant the members of the committee to attend the funeral at Fairmont, W. Va., on yesterday.

Without objection, the names of the members will be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The members of the committee are as follows: Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HILL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. THURMOND.

## BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE MILITARY ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, section 1056, of the United States Code, the Chair appoints the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], as two members from the Committee on Appropriations, and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

## MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I have reappointed the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

I have also reappointed to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE].

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since the Senate meets today following adjournment, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on overobligations of appropriations in that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 6911 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO GRADE, PROCUREMENT, AND TRANSFER OF AVIATION CADETS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6911 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the grade, procurement, and transfer of aviation cadets (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of December 31, 1957, there was an aggregate of 2,666 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

### CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, covering the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### REPORT OF BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting pursuant to law, a report of the official operations of that government, for the

fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF COUNCIL ON LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council covering the period from January 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia for the calendar year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SALARY INCREASES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to provide salary increases for Foreign Service personnel equitable to those being otherwise provided for civil service and other officers and employees of the Federal Government (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the condition of the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1956 and 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON SURPLUS PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on surplus property disposed of during the past year, 1957, by the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF NARCOTICS, RELATING TO RESTORATION OF BALANCES WITHDRAWN FROM APPROPRIATION AND FUND ACCOUNTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Narcotics covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, dated December 23, 1957 (with an acompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal Facilities Corporation, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the period February 1 through June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farm Credit Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of sales and transfers of foreign excess property by that Administration, for the period January 1, 1957, through December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of activities and research conducted by or under contract with the Fish and Wildlife Service, to encourage the distribution of domestically produced fishery products, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NATALE H. BELLOCCHI AND OSCAR R. EDMONDSON

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Natale H. Bellocchi and Oscar R. Edmondson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID FOR DAMAGE OCCASIONED BY VESSELS OF COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the application for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS AFFLICTED WITH TUBERCULOSIS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning individuals admitted to the United States notwithstanding affliction with tuberculosis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESCISSION OF ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF A CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order relative to the rescission of adjustment of status granted Eduardo Pires (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Thui Yet Chow from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Four letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and improve the act of September 23, 1950, and the act of September 30, 1950, which provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, in that Bureau, as of December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FILLING OF CERTAIN POSITIONS BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on the filling of positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, by the Civil Service Commission in the Department of Commerce, for the calendar year 1957; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES IN DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an adjustment of salaries for personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Finance:

*To Whom It May Concern:*

This is to certify that the following house concurrent resolution was regularly adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia on January 15, 1958:

"House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action so as to afford protection to certain small industries of West Virginia

"Whereas West Virginia manufacturers of pottery, glass, ceramics, clothespins, and numerous other small industries are compet-

ing constantly with imports of foreign commodities; and

"Whereas said foreign commodities, because of the low cost of foreign labor and the use of inferior material, are sold at such low prices that the aforesaid West Virginia manufacturers are unable to compete with them without some means of protection; and

"Whereas the import of said foreign commodities is presently permitted virtually without restriction and without protection to the aforesaid small industries; and

"Whereas the present influx of foreign commodities is causing irreparable damage to the aforesaid small industries and can only result in their eventually being driven out of business, which would foster increased and widespread unemployment in West Virginia: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take immediate action to afford relief and protection to the aforesaid small industries of West Virginia, through regulation by tariffs and through such other means as are available to the Congress for the accomplishment of said end; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Given under my hand this the 15th day of January 1958.

C. A. BLANKENSHIP,
*Clerk, West Virginia House of Delegates.*

A resolution adopted by Local Union 751, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Santa Rosa, Calif., favoring the enactment of the so-called Forand bill entitled "Social Security Amendments of 1958" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Edwin McKane Helm, of Lakewood, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to revise the laws relating to the registration of patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of William F. Anderson, of La Puente, Calif., praying for the enactment of a minimum wage law, and so forth; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Seal Beach, Calif., favoring the recognition of Orange County, Calif, as a metropolitan area; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 2862) to exchange certain lands in the city of Detroit, State of Michigan; to the Committee on Public Works.

The petition of Dudley D. Slater, of Toledo, Ohio, relating to the suspension of the voting rights of the State of Ohio in the Senate (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## CIVIL RIGHTS—PETITION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in transmitting the appended petition signed by 125 of my New York constituents, Dr. Leroy Augenstine, of Shoreham, Long Island, N. Y., writes me as follows:

The enclosed petition requires very little comment. It was drafted during the Little Rock incident to provide a means for people other than the vociferous troublemakers in the South to express their desires for civil-rights action. The 125 signatures (whites only) were gathered from neighbors and coworkers over a period of about 3 months by myself and 4 friends. Of the 109 people which I personally contacted, 93 (85 percent) signed.

I ask unanimous consent that the petition may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned, representing voters of both parties, believe strongly that the recent civil-rights bill was inadequate in a number of important details: first, it only dealt with voting privileges; and second, it did not contain sufficient safeguards against lack of good faith. Recent shocking events—such as the emasculation of a Negro, the Nashville school bombing, the Little Rock student incident and most important, Governor Faubus' extremely questionable use of the National Guard—have demonstrated that there are a significant number of bigots, both in the general public and in positions of responsibility, who do not intend to act in good faith; accordingly, the present civil-rights bill will be of little use. We thus feel that it is imperative that measures be taken immediately to minimize the possibility of further infringements of civil rights so that the disastrous effect of the above incidents upon our own morale and on our international standing can be reversed; it should be possible to insure that the desire of the overwhelming majority of Americans for justice will be satisfied.

Therefore, we petition you to exert all the power of your office at the next session of Congress to obtain speedy enactment of a new bill which will: (a) insure that actions either to deny or unduly delay the full enjoyment of all civil rights should not go unpunished, but (b) at the same time not exert excessive pressure which might alienate the moderate, responsible majority in the South. We believe that this can best be accomplished by reinstating the original House bill or one which closely parallels it. This bill should deal with all civil rights and should not include the jury-trial proviso. We further urge that reasonable but definite timetables for integration of schools, transportation, and other public facilities should be added as well as specifying minimum penalties for infractions.

## COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the medical board and staff of St. Joseph's Hospital, Yonkers, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the staff of St. Joseph's Hospital does not feel that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should set fees for service; and

Whereas the Government would be the sole selector of the hospitals to be used by these patients; and

Whereas the total cost of this program run by Government agencies would be entirely too high; and

Whereas popular opinion in the United States opposed the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills, and they are also opposed to this present form of national compulsory health insurance for a smaller segment of the population; and

Whereas we are completely opposed to compulsory health insurance; and

Whereas we are completely in favor and will always support and promote voluntary health insurance, and promote economic security and responsibility for individuals and families; and

Whereas progress has been satisfactory in the direction of voluntary health insurance, and we feel Government intervention with compulsory health insurance would be fatal: Be it therefore

*Resolved*, That the medical board and medical staff of St. Joseph's Hospital are inexorably opposed to H. R. 9467 by Congressman FORAND, of Rhode Island.

## TARIFF RATES ON IRISH WOOLENS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the New York State board, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, relating to tariff rates on Irish woolens. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, as an American organization, is dedicated to the establishment and promotion of friendly relations between the United States and Ireland and their peoples, including a free and unrestricted reciprocal trade and commerce; and

Whereas a principal Irish export to the United States has been the products of the woolen and worsted industry of Ireland, composed entirely of hand-woven and nonautomatic loomed cloth; and

Whereas the United States Government, pursuant to the Geneva wool tariff reservation, and for the protection of the domestic woolen industry, has imposed a quota tariff on woven woolen imports, under which the ad valorem duty on such imports is increased from 25 to 45 percent in each year when the total imports of woven woolens from all countries of the world reaches 14 million pounds; and

Whereas the products of the Irish woolen and worsted industry, while subject to the operation of the said quota tariff, do not, in fact, adversely affect the American woolen industry, because of the relatively small amount of Irish cloth imported into the United States, and because these imports demonstrably are not truly competitive with American-produced cloth; and

Whereas the effect of the imposition of this quota tariff on the Irish woolen industry has been exceedingly disruptive and ultimately will be entirely destructive, resulting in unemployment, serious economic distress and emigration, thereby reducing the purchasing power of the Irish nation; and

Whereas the imposition of the said quota tariff upon Irish woolens and worsteds will have the further effect of discouraging the production of other Irish manufactured goods for export to the United States, because of the implied threat of the imposition of similar tariffs on other Irish products, with similar economic hardships; and

Whereas exports from Ireland to the United States in 1956 totaled $8,800,000 and exports from the United States to Ireland for the same year exceeded $38 million, resulting in a favorable balance of trade for the United States, which must be equalized by greater Irish exports to this country, if the United States is to continue to find a market for its exports in Ireland, therefore, we, the New York State board of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, do strongly urge that the said quota tariff with respect to

Irish woolens and worsteds be promptly rescinded, or that the increase in ad valorem duty under said tariff be not applied to Irish hand woven woolens, nor to any country which exports less than 400,000 pounds of machine woven woolens to the United States in any year; and we further respectfully request that the report of the Committee for Reciprocity Information contain such recommendation with respect to the said quota tariff and the imposition of the increased ad valorem duties thereunder, and that such recommendation be contained in the report of the Trade Policy Committee to the President of the United States.

TIMOTHY J. DRISCOLL,
*President, New York State Board, AOH.*
FRANCIS J. O'MARA,
*Chairman, Buy Irish Committee, New York State Board, AOH.*

## PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, by request, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, a petition, signed by Mamie Dixon and sundry other citizens of the State of Kentucky, relating to the prohibition of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the petition, together with the signatures attached, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*To Our Senators and Congressmen:*

May we again call your attention to our urgent request for relief from the invasion of our homes by the advertising of the alcoholic beverage industry. This advertising is aimed at our children and youth. Parents today are helpless against the mass suggestion through newspapers, magazines, and especially TV and radio that to drink is harmless, conducive to health.

We urge your active support of bills now before you to remove this advertising from the channels of interstate commerce and over the air.

Mamie Dixon, 259 London Avenue, Lexington, Ky.; Grace Gentry Lamb, Rural Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Al Smith, Rural Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. B. L. Murphy, Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. John Moore, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Robert Baesler, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. John White, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Marvin Robey, Eastern State Hospital, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Raymond Stevens, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Sarah Barrett, 1417 3d, Highlawn, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Lee Hazelwood, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Miss Mary Farney, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. William Kelley, Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. H. G. Witt, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. G. H. Ginter, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Herbert Ashcraft, Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Maude Hephenstine, Star Route, Goddard, Ky.; Mrs. Mattie St. Clair, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Margaret Penrod, Rural Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Shelly White, Rural Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. J. R. Barber, Route 2, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Elijah Benton, Rural Route 7, Gentry Road; Mrs. Joe Helmburg, 366 South Broadway Park, Lexington, Ky.; Ruth H. Baesler, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Elsie Cregor, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. James Teater, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Milton Calvin, 379 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.; Roy K. Stevens, Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Robert C. Griggs, 132 Withers Avenue, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Wiedon Welch, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Roy K. Stivers, Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. W. R. Flynn, Rural Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Frank Batten, Jr., Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. Charles Long, Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Margaret Tucker, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Frank Batten, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Royce Robey, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Frank Creger, Route 7, Lexington, Ky.; Herbert Ashcraft, Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Don Ashcraft, 590 Stratford Drive, Lexington, Ky.; Harry B. Tucker, Jr., Route 5, Lexington, Ky.; Harry Dixon, 1713 Silver Lane, Lexington, Ky.

## PRICE SUPPORTS—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated January 20, 1958, containing resolutions which were adopted by the Blackwater Farmers' Union, Local 470, of Garrison, N. Dak., relating to price supports.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARRISON, N. DAK.,
*January 20, 1958.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
*Washington, D. C.:*

The following resolutions were adopted by the Blackwater Farmers' Union, Local 470, at their January 17 meeting. This local has a membership of 132.

"The lowering of price supports in the past has never resulted in lower consumer prices, therefore we, the members of the Blackwater Local 470, resolve: 1. That all Senators and Representatives and all commodity groups work together to form a united front and come up with an overall farm bill with a goal of 100 percent parity for all commodities. 2. That money continue to be made available to REA and RTA at a low interest. 3. That the school lunch program be continued to be made available to all schools."

Yours truly,

Mrs. HUBERT ERB,
*Secretary, Blackwater Farmers' Union, Local 470.*

## PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the North Dakota State Dairy Show at a special meeting in Jamestown, N. Dak., January 17, 1958, relating to price supports.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution was adopted by the board of directors of the North Dakota State Dairy Show at a special meeting in Jamestown on January 17, 1958:

"Whereas the support price on dairy products is scheduled to be reduced on April 1, 1958; and

"Whereas the economy of North Dakota depends directly upon the economy of the farmer; and

"Whereas dairy production provides a means of stabilizing the farm economy; and

"Whereas a reduction in dairy price supports would have a depressing effect on the dairy industry in North Dakota: Now, therefore, the North Dakota State Dairy Show respectfully requests that Senator WILLIAM LANGER give full consideration to these facts and use his influence in retaining the dairy price support at the present level."

Respectfully submitted.

NORTH DAKOTA STATE DAIRY SHOW,
CLAYTON PAULSON, *President.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948 (Rept. No. 1180);

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 233 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies (Rept. No. 1181);

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes (Rept. No. 1182); and

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee (Rept. No. 1183).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 8216. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax (Rept. No. 1184).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 2920. A bill to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall (Rept. No. 1185); and

S. Res. 214. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate certain matters under its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1188); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 207. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing (Rept. No. 1187); referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. Res. 224. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters under its jurisdiction; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 245), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Finance is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 85th Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946.

## ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 1186)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (g) (2) (B), is given the duty of studying the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view of determining its economy and efficiency, and, under subsection (C), of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government. Its jurisdiction and responsibilities make it in effect a watchdog subcommittee over the several hundred separate departments, agencies, and independent offices of the executive branch of the Government, which is composed of 2,328,000 civilians and 2,693,300 military personnel. The cost of operating these various departments of the Government is approximately $67 billion.

During the past year the subcommittee conducted 49 actual investigations and 47 preliminary inquiries. Fourteen days of public hearings were held during which time 70 witnesses were heard. In addition, there were 15 days of executive sessions at which time 45 witnesses were heard.

The subcommittee's investigations and hearing extended through the operations of many governmental agencies including the Department of Defense, Department of the Army, Department of the Air Force, Civil Aeronautics Board, Department of State, Export-Import Bank, Department of Labor, National Labor Relations Board, the Department of Treasury, and the General Services Administration.

Prolonged hearings were held in connection with textile procurement in the military service. Evidence introduced clearly showed bribery, inefficiency, and other improprieties existed on a large scale in the Government procurement of millions of dollars worth of military clothing. Although the investigating subcommittee is not a court of law, and does not seek to be, the direct result of the information developed at the hearings held in 1955 was the conviction of six individuals in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York for conspiracy to defraud the United States Government. The sentences which were imposed on May 15, 1957, are as follows:

Harry Lev, 9 months and a fine of $5,000; Raymond Wool, former Air Force captain in the Purchasing Section of the Armed Service Textile and Apparel Procurement Agency, 18 months and a fine of $1,500; Marvin Rubin, 15 months and a fine of $1,000; Mrs. Mella Hort, former procurement clerk in the Armed Services Textile and Apparel Procurement Agency, 2 years' probation and a fine of $1,500; Maurice Ades, 2 years' probation; and Joseph Porreca, former Chief Inspector of the Textile Fabrication Branch, New York Quartermaster Procurement Agency and the Armed Services Textile and Apparel Procurement Agency, 2 years' probation and a fine of $3,500.

Hearings also were held concerning leaks of the secret Civil Aeronautics Board decision of August 2, 1956. The investigation disclosed two leaks which had caused a substantial increase in the trading of Northeast Airlines stock on August 3, 1956. Legislation, making it a criminal penalty for anyone in any regulatory agency to wilfully disclose information in any adjudicated matter, has been introduced in the Senate. At the present time this bill is before the Judiciary Committee.

Investigation revealed that 350 M–8 armored cars, purchased by the United Auto Parts Co., Inc., from the United States Army at an average price of $375 were subsequently rebuilt and sold to the French Government at an average price of $3,675. At the time of the purchase from the United States Army, certain demilitarization provisions as well as scrap warranties were stipulated in the contract of sale. The Department of State, despite the fact that it was aware of the apparent violation of the contract by the United Auto Parts, Inc., granted an export license to the French Government for these vehicles.

The investigation of the conflict of interest situation involving Robert Tripp Ross, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative and Public Affairs, resulted in his resignation.

Supply waste and excesses in the Northeast Air Command, which consisted of nine Air Force bases in the Northern Hemisphere, was the subject of investigation by the subcommittee. Testimony revealed that one Army unit had spare parts for technical equipment amounting to $1 million, whereas it should have had $75,000 worth. In one instance an Army warrant officer, contrary to all regulations, caused to be buried excess parts valued at approximately $33,000. The Department of Defense has reported that the accumulation of excesses was the result of many improper practices being carried on by Air Force base supply, as well as by certain units in the field. Corrective action has been taken by the Secretary of Defense, who, together with the Air Force and the Army, was most cooperative.

Executive hearings were held concerning the Export-Import Bank of Washington, General Services Administration, and Minera Fernandez, a corporation which owned a manganese mine in Parral, Mexico. Testimony showed that the bank lost $650,000 and GSA lost $90,618.78 in their attempts to obtain manganese from this mine.

Public hearings were held in January of this year on labor racketeering in connection with the violation or nonenforcement of Government laws and regulations in the labor union field. The subcommittee was interested in determining the adequacy of existing statutes affecting the Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Treasury Department, and whether present rules and regulations enable them to administer the law efficiently. The subcommittee was also interested in whether any changes should be made to enable these agencies to determine the adequacy, accuracy, and truthfulness of financial reports supplied by labor unions and labor union officials. Testimony revealed that certain reports and financial statements must be filed by labor unions with the Department of Labor, but this Department is powerless to make any investigation concerning the truth or falsity of the material filed. This is also true of the National Labor Relations Board.

The subcommittee also wanted to know if additional legislation is needed to aid the Bureau of Internal Revenue to investigate labor organizations which under the law are tax exempt. Testimony revealed that this Bureau is very much impeded in securing the records of any labor organization because of a decision by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth District.

The subcommittee was well aware that many of the matters involved in labor racketeering, which it had been investigating for several months, did not fall within its jurisdiction. However, its limited inquiry in this field was believed to come within its jurisdiction. Several witnesses testified in connection with this subject matter, four of whom objected to the jurisdiction of the subcommittee in this field. As a result of their testimony, Frank Brewster, Einar Mohn, Nugent LaPoma, and Harry Reiss were cited for contempt of the Senate on February 19, 1957, in that they had refused to answer certain questions. On June 26, 1957, Frank Brewster was found guilty by the United States District Court in Washington, D. C., and received a sentence of 1 year and a fine of $1,000. Similarly, Nugent LaPoma was found guilty on July 31, 1957, receiving a suspended sentence of 1 month and a fine of $1,000. These cases have been appealed and by agreement Einar Mohn and Harry Reiss will not be tried pending the outcome of this appeal.

In many cases deficiencies, resulting from waste and inefficiency, were administrative in nature and were brought to the attention of the executive branch involved for corrective action. This was particularly true in cases involving intra-agency matters requiring organizational or procedural changes within a given agency.

The work of the subcommittee was conducted with an appropriation of $210,000, and approximately $12,000 of this amount will be unexpended and returned to the Treasury of the United States.

On January 30, 1957, the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field was created by the Senate under my chairmanship. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 74, creating this select committee, six professional staff members of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

were loaned to the Senate select committee. These staff members had been investigating labor racketeering for several months prior to the creation of the select committee, and it was felt that their experience in this field was invaluable to the work that the select committee was to undertake. In addition, 1 clerk from this subcommittee was loaned to the select committee, and 2 clerks worked jointly for both committees. Thus, approximately $97,000 of the money appropriated to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has been used by the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

The subcommittee wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the General Accounting Office for the assistance rendered during the past year.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Government Operations Committee, I submit the annual report of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Mr. President, I may say that the report contains detailed information which I believe will be of great interest to the Members of the Senate. However, in view of the fact that I must return immediately to my committee, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

## REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

## REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government issued during the recess of the Congress. These reports were concerned with employment and payrolls during the period June-November 1957, inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Personnel and pay summary, June through November 1957*

| Total and major categories | Civilian personnel in executive branch | | | Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In November numbered | In June numbered | Increase (+), decrease (−) | In October was | In May was | Increase (+), decrease (−) |
| Total [1] | 2,330,107 | 2,401,314 | −71,207 | $959,203 | $963,757 | −$4,554 |
| Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense | 1,237,516 | 1,240,310 | −2,794 | 498,284 | 487,226 | +11,058 |
| Department of Defense | 1,092,591 | 1,161,004 | −68,413 | 460,919 | 476,531 | −15,612 |
| Inside continental United States | 2,133,005 | 2,196,503 | −63,498 | | | |
| Outside continental United States | 197,102 | 204,811 | −7,709 | | | |
| Industrial employment | 569,206 | 653,685 | −84,479 | | | |
| Foreign nationals | [2] 240,910 | 267,894 | −26,984 | 26,987 | 29,260 | −2,273 |

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Subject to revision.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1957, and comparison with June 1957, and pay for October 1957, and comparison with May 1957*

| Department or agency | Personnel | | | | Pay (in thousands) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | November | June | Increase | Decrease | October | May | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 85,516 | 96,019 | | 10,503 | $33,082 | $32,430 | $652 | |
| Commerce [1] | 51,681 | 52,290 | | 609 | 24,792 | 23,918 | 874 | |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 53,297 | 52,592 | 705 | | 23,023 | 22,706 | 317 | |
| Interior | 49,702 | [2] 55,334 | | 5,632 | 23,214 | [2] 22,538 | 676 | |
| Justice | 30,703 | 30,613 | 90 | | 15,963 | 15,813 | 150 | |
| Labor | 5,874 | 5,937 | | 63 | 2,882 | 2,882 | | |
| Post Office | 536,367 | 521,198 | 15,169 | | 200,790 | 194,341 | 6,449 | |
| State [3] | 34,276 | [2] 33,987 | 289 | | 13,948 | 13,159 | 789 | |
| Treasury | 77,990 | 78,376 | | 386 | 37,069 | 37,597 | | $528 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | | | | | |
| White House Office | 398 | 389 | 9 | | 238 | 244 | | 6 |
| Bureau of the Budget | 447 | 442 | 5 | | 323 | 314 | 9 | |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 31 | 31 | | | 24 | 23 | 1 | |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 71 | 72 | | 1 | 28 | 30 | | 2 |
| National Security Council [4] | 61 | 26 | 35 | | 39 | 19 | 20 | |
| Office of Defense Mobilization | 265 | 273 | | 8 | 161 | 165 | | 4 |
| President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization | 6 | 6 | | | 4 | 3 | 1 | |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | |
| Advisory Committee on Weather Control | 16 | 9 | 7 | | 4 | 4 | | |
| Airways Modernization Board [5] | 26 | | 26 | | | | | |
| Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission | 3 | 9 | | 6 | 3 | 6 | | 3 |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 571 | 606 | | 35 | 92 | 101 | | 9 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 6,808 | 6,910 | | 102 | 3,956 | 3,793 | 163 | |
| Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System | 587 | 589 | | 2 | 314 | 320 | | 6 |
| Boston National Historic Sites Commission | 2 | 4 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 662 | 602 | 60 | | 341 | 356 | | 15 |
| Civil Service Commission | 4,284 | 4,475 | | 191 | 2,028 | 2,181 | | 153 |
| Commission of Fine Arts | 4 | 4 | | | 2 | 2 | | |
| Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | | 1 |
| District of Columbia Auditorium Commission | | 18 | | 18 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 201 | 185 | 16 | | 133 | 121 | 12 | |
| Farm Credit Administration | 916 | 950 | | 34 | 502 | 530 | | 28 |
| Federal Civil Defense Administration | 1,264 | 1,272 | | 8 | 735 | 696 | 39 | |
| Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review | 8 | 7 | 1 | | 4 | 3 | 1 | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,200 | 1,197 | 3 | | 660 | 654 | 6 | |

[1] November figure includes 160 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] Adjusted to exclude the Virgin Islands Corporation, which is now being reported as an independent agency.

[3] Revised.

[4] November figure includes 12,046 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 11,449 in June and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 2,979 of these trust-fund employees and the June figure includes 2,779.

[5] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[6] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 133, 85th Cong. Functions transferred from Civil Aeronautics Administration, Commerce Department, Nov. 5, 1957.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1957, and comparison with June 1957, and pay for October 1957, and comparison with May 1957*—Continued

| Department or agency | Personnel | | | | Pay (in thousands) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | November | June | Increase | Decrease | October | May | Increase | Decrease |
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | | | | | | |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,183 | 1,148 | 35 | | $624 | $610 | $14 | |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board | 776 | 750 | 26 | | 390 | 374 | 16 | |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 323 | 332 | | 9 | 251 | 249 | 2 | |
| Federal Power Commission | 707 | 758 | | 51 | 407 | 410 | | $3 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 731 | 744 | | 13 | 443 | 443 | | |
| Foreign Claims Settlement Commission | 100 | 114 | | 14 | 58 | 66 | | 8 |
| General Accounting Office | 5,450 | 5,515 | | 65 | 2,868 | 2,634 | 234 | |
| General Services Administration [1] | 27,312 | 27,412 | | 100 | 10,971 | 10,414 | 557 | |
| Government Contract Committee | 21 | 21 | | | 11 | 11 | | |
| Government Printing Office | 6,426 | 6,460 | | 35 | 3,069 | 3,183 | | 114 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 9,722 | 9,893 | | 171 | 5,033 | 5,140 | | 107 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 16 | 14 | 2 | | 12 | 11 | 1 | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,217 | 2,188 | 29 | | 1,189 | 1,174 | 15 | |
| Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission | 4 | 5 | | 1 | 3 | 3 | | |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,740 | 7,992 | | 252 | 4,287 | 4,126 | 161 | |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 270 | 254 | 16 | | 114 | 111 | 3 | |
| National Capital Planning Commission | 35 | 36 | | 1 | 21 | 20 | 1 | |
| National Gallery of Art | 329 | 333 | | 4 | 116 | 116 | | |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,128 | 1,151 | | 23 | 719 | 679 | 40 | |
| National Mediation Board | 107 | 109 | | 2 | 86 | 83 | 3 | |
| National Science Foundation | 303 | 323 | | 20 | 169 | 152 | 17 | |
| National Security Training Commission [2] | | 6 | | 6 | | 2 | | 2 |
| Panama Canal | 14,275 | 14,168 | 107 | | 3,645 | 3,669 | | 24 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 2,457 | 2,431 | 26 | | 983 | 1,025 | | 42 |
| Renegotiation Board | 337 | 359 | | 22 | 232 | 275 | | 43 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 32 | 38 | | 6 | 23 | 27 | | 4 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 828 | 785 | 43 | | 473 | 456 | 17 | |
| Selective Service System | 6,296 | 6,856 | | 560 | 1,624 | 1,879 | | 255 |
| Small Business Administration | 1,269 | 1,161 | 108 | | 704 | 618 | 86 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 840 | 878 | | 38 | 352 | 316 | 36 | |
| Soldiers' Home | 1,000 | 1,062 | | 29 | 274 | 260 | 14 | |
| Subversive Activities Control Board | 33 | 37 | | 4 | 24 | 26 | | 2 |
| Tariff Commission | 215 | 217 | | 2 | 133 | 131 | 2 | |
| Tax Court of the United States | 152 | 145 | 7 | | 97 | 93 | 4 | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 14,910 | 15,651 | | 741 | 7,540 | 7,455 | 85 | |
| Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission | 11 | 8 | 3 | | 4 | 4 | | |
| United States Information Agency | 11,044 | 11,820 | | 776 | 3,498 | 3,555 | | 57 |
| Veterans' Administration | 175,062 | 174,022 | 1,040 | | 63,401 | 62,320 | 1,081 | |
| Virgin Islands Corporation | 614 | 717 | | 103 | 79 | 148 | | 69 |
| Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission [3] | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 1,237,516 | 1,240,310 | 17,838 | 20,632 | 496,284 | 487,226 | 12,548 | 1,490 |
| Net change, excluding Department of Defense | | | 2,794 | | | | 11,058 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 1,629 | 1,694 | | 65 | 1,078 | 1,094 | | 16 |
| Department of the Army | 410,840 | 429,236 | | 18,396 | 167,074 | 170,538 | | 2,464 |
| Department of the Navy | 367,088 | 389,725 | | 22,637 | 160,070 | 168,491 | | 8,421 |
| Department of the Air Force | 313,034 | 340,349 | | 27,315 | 132,697 | 136,408 | | 3,711 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 1,092,591 | 1,161,004 | | 68,413 | 460,919 | 476,531 | | 15,612 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 68,413 | | | | 15,612 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 2,330,107 | 2,401,314 | 17,838 | 89,065 | 959,203 | 963,757 | 12,548 | 17,102 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 71,207 | | | | 4,554 | |

[1] Includes 6 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.
[2] Agency abolished by letter from the President dated Mar. 25, 1957.
[3] Agency abolished June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 705, 83d Cong.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1957, and comparison with June 1957*

| Department or agency | November | June | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 94,152 | 94,665 | | 10,513 |
| Commerce [1] | 47,476 | 47,976 | | 500 |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 51,490 | 50,740 | 750 | |
| Interior | 46,492 | 51,514 | | 5,022 |
| Justice | 30,165 | 30,069 | 96 | |
| Labor | 5,737 | 5,824 | | 87 |
| Post Office | 533,826 | 518,719 | 15,107 | |
| State [2] | 8,526 | 8,592 | | 66 |
| Treasury | 76,989 | 77,366 | | 377 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | |
| White House Office | 398 | 389 | 9 | |
| Bureau of the Budget | 447 | 442 | 5 | |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 31 | 31 | | |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 71 | 72 | | 1 |
| National Security Council [3] | 61 | 26 | 35 | |
| Office of Defense Mobilization | 265 | 273 | | 8 |
| President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization | 6 | 6 | | |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| Advisory Committee on Weather Control | 16 | 9 | 7 | |
| Airways Modernization Board [4] | 26 | | 26 | |
| Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission | 3 | 9 | | 6 |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 21 | 20 | 1 | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 6,781 | 6,891 | | 110 |
| Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System | 557 | 559 | | 2 |
| Boston National Historic Sites Commission | 2 | 4 | | 2 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 658 | 598 | 60 | |
| Civil Service Commission | 4,267 | 4,459 | | 192 |
| Commission of Fine Arts | 4 | 4 | | |
| Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| District of Columbia Auditorium Commission | | 18 | | 18 |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 201 | 185 | 16 | |
| Farm Credit Administration | 906 | 940 | | 34 |
| Federal Civil Defense Administration | 1,264 | 1,272 | | 8 |
| Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review | 8 | 7 | 1 | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,176 | 1,172 | 4 | |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,181 | 1,146 | 35 | |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board | 776 | 750 | 26 | |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 323 | 332 | | 9 |
| Federal Power Commission | 707 | 758 | | 51 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 731 | 744 | | 13 |
| Foreign Claims Settlement Commission | 100 | 114 | | 14 |
| General Accounting Office | 5,375 | 5,441 | | 66 |
| General Services Administration [5] | 27,252 | 27,313 | | 61 |
| Government Contract Committee | 21 | 21 | | |
| Government Printing Office | 6,425 | 6,460 | | 35 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 9,546 | 9,725 | | 179 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 16 | 14 | 2 | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,217 | 2,188 | 29 | |

[1] November figure includes 160 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] November figure includes 1,758 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,733 in June.
[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 133, 85th Cong. Functions transferred from Civil Aeronautics Administration, Commerce Department, Nov. 5, 1957.
[5] Includes 6 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1957, and comparison with June 1957*—Continued

| Department or agency | November | June | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | | |
| Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission | 4 | 5 | | 1 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,740 | 7,992 | | 252 |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 270 | 254 | 16 | |
| National Capital Planning Commission | 35 | 36 | | 1 |
| National Gallery of Art | 329 | 333 | | 4 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,111 | 1,132 | | 21 |
| National Mediation Board | 107 | 109 | | 2 |
| National Science Foundation | 303 | 323 | | 20 |
| National Security Training Commission [6] | | 6 | | 6 |
| Panama Canal | 423 | 404 | 19 | |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 2,457 | 2,431 | 26 | |
| Renegotiation Board | 337 | 359 | | 22 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 32 | 38 | | 6 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 828 | 785 | 43 | |
| Selective Service System | 6,110 | 6,662 | | 552 |
| Small Business Administration | 1,253 | 1,149 | 104 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 838 | 877 | | 39 |
| Soldiers' Home | 1,003 | 1,032 | | 29 |
| Subversive Activities Control Board | 33 | 37 | | 4 |
| Tariff Commission | 215 | 217 | | 2 |
| Tax Court of the United States | 152 | 145 | 7 | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 14,910 | 15,651 | | 741 |
| Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission | 11 | 8 | 3 | |
| United States Information Agency | 2,673 | 2,776 | | 103 |
| Veterans' Administration | 173,820 | 172,780 | 1,040 | |
| Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission [7] | | 4 | | 4 |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 1,171,718 | 1,173,433 | 17,468 | 19,183 |
| Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense | | | 1,715 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 1,584 | 1,650 | | 66 |
| Department of the Army | 349,917 | 366,731 | | 16,814 |
| Department of the Navy | 335,302 | 357,099 | | 21,797 |
| Department of the Air Force | 274,484 | 297,590 | | 23,106 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 961,287 | 1,023,070 | | 61,783 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 61,783 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 2,133,005 | 2,196,503 | 17,468 | 80,966 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 63,498 | |

[6] Agency abolished by letter from the President dated Mar. 25, 1957.

[7] Agency abolished June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 705, 83d Cong.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1957, and comparison with June 1957*

| Department or agency | November | June | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 1,364 | 1,354 | 10 | |
| Commerce | 4,205 | 4,314 | | 109 |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 1,807 | 1,852 | | 45 |
| Interior | 3,210 | [1] 3,820 | | 610 |
| Justice | 538 | 544 | | 6 |
| Labor | 137 | 113 | 24 | |
| Post Office | 2,541 | 2,479 | 62 | |
| State [2] | 25,750 | [3] 25,395 | 355 | |
| Treasury | 1,001 | 1,010 | | 9 |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 550 | 586 | | 36 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 27 | 19 | 8 | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 4 | 4 | | |
| Civil Service Commission | 17 | 16 | 1 | |
| Farm Credit Administration | 10 | 10 | | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 24 | 25 | | 1 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 2 | 2 | | |
| General Accounting Office | 75 | 74 | 1 | |
| General Services Administration | 60 | 99 | | 39 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 176 | 168 | 8 | |
| National Labor Relations Board | 17 | 19 | | 2 |
| Panama Canal | 13,852 | 13,764 | 88 | |
| Selective Service System | 186 | 194 | | 8 |
| Small Business Administration | 16 | 12 | 4 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| United States Information Agency | 8,371 | 9,044 | | 673 |
| Veterans' Administration | 1,242 | 1,242 | | |
| Virgin Islands Corporation | 614 | 717 | | 103 |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 65,798 | 66,877 | 562 | 1,641 |
| Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense | | | 1,079 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 45 | 44 | 1 | |
| Department of the Army | 60,923 | 62,505 | | 1,582 |
| Department of the Navy | 31,786 | 32,626 | | 840 |
| Department of the Air Force | 38,550 | 42,759 | | 4,209 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 131,304 | 137,934 | 1 | 6,631 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 6,630 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 197,102 | 204,811 | 563 | 8,272 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 7,709 | |

[1] Adjusted to exclude the Virgin Islands Corporation which is now being reported as an independent agency.

[2] November figure includes 10,288 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 9,716 in June. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 2,979 of these trust-fund employees and the June figure includes 2,779.

[3] Revised.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1957, and comparison with June 1957*

| Department or agency | November | June | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 3,141 | 3,125 | 16 | |
| Commerce | 2,471 | 2,448 | 23 | |
| Interior | 6,906 | [1] 7,281 | | 375 |
| Treasury | 5,590 | 5,589 | 1 | |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 148 | 166 | | 18 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 14 | 14 | | |
| General Services Administration | 1,105 | 1,122 | | 17 |
| Government Printing Office | 6,425 | 6,460 | | 35 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,740 | 7,992 | | 252 |
| Panama Canal | 7,219 | 7,152 | 67 | |
| Tennessee | 12,124 | 12,805 | | 681 |
| Virgin Islands Corporation | 614 | 717 | | 103 |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 53,497 | 54,871 | 107 | 1,481 |
| Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense | | | 1,374 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | [2] 135,025 | [2] 178,349 | | 43,324 |
| Outside continental United States | [2] 10,575 | [2] 23,462 | | 12,887 |
| Department of the Navy: | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 204,206 | 219,447 | | 15,241 |
| Outside continental United States | 5,232 | 5,680 | | 448 |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 154,979 | 165,288 | | 10,309 |
| Outside continental United States | 5,602 | 6,588 | | 806 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 515,709 | 598,814 | | 83,105 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 83,105 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 569,206 | 653,685 | 107 | 84,586 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 84,479 | |

[1] Adjusted to exclude the Virgin Islands Corporation, which is now being reported as an independent agency.

[2] Subject to revision.

[3] Revised.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of November 1957, and comparison with June 1957*

| Country | Total | | Army | | Navy | | Air Force | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | November | June | November | June | November | June | November | June |
| Belgium | 7 | 6 | | | | | 7 | 6 |
| Denmark | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| England | 5,574 | 6,676 | | | 36 | 37 | 5,538 | 6,639 |
| France | 23,918 | 25,047 | [1] 17,189 | 17,785 | | | 6,729 | 7,262 |
| French Morocco | 5,401 | 5,788 | [1] 51 | 160 | 926 | 966 | 4,424 | 4,662 |
| Germany | 90,407 | 98,226 | [1] 76,532 | 82,140 | 401 | 433 | 13,474 | 15,653 |
| Japan | 110,287 | 126,546 | [1] 57,003 | [2] 65,404 | 17,914 | 19,169 | 35,370 | 41,973 |
| Korea | 4,639 | 4,888 | [1] 4,639 | 4,888 | | | | |
| Malta | 93 | 118 | | | 93 | 118 | | |
| Netherlands | 40 | 41 | | | | | 40 | 41 |
| Norway | 24 | 22 | | | | | 24 | 22 |
| Trinidad | 519 | 535 | | | 519 | 535 | | |
| Total | 240,910 | 267,894 | [1] 155,414 | 170,377 | 19,889 | 21,258 | 65,607 | 76,259 |

[1] Subject to revision.
[2] Revised.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French and English reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government decreased 71,207 during the period June through November 1957. The total in June was 2,401,314. In November there were 2,330,107 civilian employees.

Employment by civilian agencies of the Federal Government showed a net decrease of 2,794 during the period from June through November 1957, decreasing from 1,240,310 in June to 1,237,516 in November. Civilian employment in the Department of Defense decreased 68,413 during the same period, dropping from 1,161,004 in June to 1,092,591 in November.

In the Department of Defense white-collar employment increased 14,692 from 562,190 in June to 576,882 in November, and industrial employment decreased 83,105 from 598,814 in June to 515,709 in November.

In May the Federal civilian payroll was running at an annual rate of $11,565 million, and in October it was running at an annual rate of $11,510 million.

These figures summarize compilations of monthly personnel reports certified by executive agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures since Congress adjourned August 30, 1957.

In addition to this regularly reported civilian employment, there were foreign nationals working under United States military agencies overseas, excluded from usual personnel reporting, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid. These numbered 267,894 in June and 240,910 in November, a decrease of 26,984.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 3061. A bill to incorporate the National Society Daughters of the Union 1861–65; and

S. 3062. A bill for the relief of Nettie Korn and Manfred Korn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 3063. A bill for the relief of Andjelka Kolacio and her minor daughter, Slavka Kolacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 3064. A bill to amend section 221 (d) (2) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3065. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 3066. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Xenofon Molin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3067. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3068. A bill to regulate certain internal affairs of labor organizations by providing processes and procedures for insuring democratic control of such organizations by the rank and file membership thereof; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KNOWLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3069. A bill to extend and improve the act of September 23, 1950, and the act of September 30, 1950, which provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 3070. A bill to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3071. A bill for the relief of John P. Vournas, Gus E. Vournas, and John E. Vournas; and

S. 3072. A bill for the relief of Charles Herband; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3073. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act so as to prohibit the Federal Power Commission, in exercising their ratemaking power with respect to the transmission and sale of electric energy subject to its jurisdiction, from treating as operating expenses those expenses incurred by electric utilities in propagandizing against Federal power policies and rural electric cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to prohibit the allowance as a business deduction of expenses incurred by electric power companies in propagandizing against Federal electric power policies and rural electric cooperatives; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3075. A bill to provide that 1958 price-support levels on wheat and dairy products shall not be lower than the levels established for 1957; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3076. A bill to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases; and

S. 3077. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant easements for rights-of-way over national forest lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3078. A bill for the relief of the Smith Canning Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. THYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. LONG):

S. 3079. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to permit the institution of actions for damages for violations of the Robinson-Patman Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3080. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Araki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 3081. A bill to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for reserve officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 3082. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the computation of retired pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3083. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to clarify the requirements of such section in the case of loans made by national banks when the collateral offered represents liens on grazing lands; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3084. A bill to limit the amount of price-support payments which may be made to producers of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3085. A bill to continue the temporary suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3086. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to raise the amount of insurance benefits payable thereunder, provide full benefits for women at age 62, raise the maximum amount of annual earnings with respect to which benefits thereunder may be based, provide for hospitalization insurance, eliminate any age requirement for eligibility for disability insurance benefits, provide insurance benefits for dependents of disabled individuals, and to otherwise revise, improve, and liberalize the insurance system established by such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3087. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3088. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3089. A bill to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States before December 31, 1958, to be planned and conducted by the Special Staff on Aging of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other agencies of that Department and of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 3090. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 3091. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 3092. A bill to add certain lands located in Idaho to the Boise and Payette National Forests; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3093. A bill to extend for an additional period of 2 years the authority to regulate exports contained in the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 3094. A bill for the relief of V. Bruce Keene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3095. A bill for the relief of Zee Yung Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3096. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3097. A bill to require labor organization reports, to ensure disclosure of certain labor organization information, to define certain duties and responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to provide further safeguards for workers against improper activities in the conduct of labor organization affairs;

S. 3098. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 3099. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3100. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transporation;

S. 3101. A bill to amend section 1 of the Elkins Act, as amended;

S. 3102. A bill to amend the Safety Appliance Acts so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to exempt 4-wheel track motor cars and 4-wheel push trucks from any or all requirements thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3103. A bill to amend section 5 (10) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption; and

S. 3104. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the filing of brief statements by certain motor carriers subject to the safety and hours of service regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the last four above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3105. A bill to enable the States of Washington and Oregon to open the new Interstate Bridge over the Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., constituting a portion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, as a toll-free bridge by providing for the reimbursement of such States for the Federal share of the costs of construction of such bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) (by request):

S. 3106. A bill to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 848, 84th Congress), to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powdered merchant ship; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 3107. A bill to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the appointment of members thereof, transfer of functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 3108. A bill to authorize the modification of the project for the Navarro Mills Reservoir, Tex., in order to authorize installment payments with respect to construction charges allocated to water supply; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3109. A bill for the relief of Victor Saigh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3110. A bill to establish a Commission on the Establishment of a United States Academy of Science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 3111. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Academy of Science and Technology; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3112. A bill to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to be known as the Assistant for International Cultural Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

**Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, today I am joining the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in introducing a new measure to authorize the appointment of a Coordinator for Cultural and Technical Exchange, with the rank of an Assistant to the Secretary of State. This position was recommended in May 1956 by Dr. J. L. Morrill, the president of the University of Minnesota, and I have long had a special interest in the concept. I am grateful that the State Department feels that it can support this bill, which will be a companion**

to H. R. 10031, introduced last week by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 3113. A bill to provide for the determination of the ability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HILL, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 3114. A bill to amend the Bonneville Project Act in order to establish the Columbia River Development Corporation; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3115. A bill for the relief of Estill H. Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3116. A bill to recognize certain national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organizations, for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3117. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended to provide for outer space development through the peaceful application of atomic energy and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3118. A bill for the relief of Leonora Holmes Mola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3119. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act in order to revise the authority to grant scholarships and fellowships under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 3120. A bill to exempt the production of durum wheat in the Tulelake area, Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., from the acreage allotment and marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3121. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of certain surplus property to public health agencies of any State or of any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 3122. A bill to amend section 301 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the definition of the term "commercial corn-producing area"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3123. A bill for the relief of Jenny Evelyn Duncan; and

S. 3124. A bill for the relief of Tommy Ilton Chatterton (Tommy Kim); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to permit the utilization of existing structures on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the determination of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. FREAR)

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1958, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brigadier General Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for determination of the ability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office; and

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make provision for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the office of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Federal and State jurisdiction; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MATTHEW M. NEELY

Mr. REVERCOMB submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 246), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable Matthew M. Neely, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## NEGOTIATIONS FOR PRESERVATION OF ALASKAN SALMON

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 247), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the salmon fisheries of the Territory of Alaska are vital to the economic welfare of the Nation as well as to the Territory; and

Whereas the salmon fisheries constitute a valuable natural resource that provides millions of pounds of food and employment for thousands of persons annually; and

Whereas the 1947 Red Salmon pack was 1,350,000 cases valued at $43,200,000; and

Whereas the average Red Salmon pack for the past 10 years has been only 677,000 cases; and

Whereas the wholesale value of the 1957 Red Salmon pack was only $21,664,000; and

Whereas in 1951 Japan negotiated a treaty with Canada and the United States whereby Japan agreed to abstain from taking salmon spawned in Alaskan waters; and

Whereas in 1954, with the treaty in full effect Japan initiated high seas fishing on a substantial scale; and

Whereas Japan has increased and expanded its high seas fishing program during the years 1955, 1956, and 1957; and

Whereas studies indicate that unless emergency action is taken the Red Salmon cycle will be impaired and weakened to a point from which full recovery may never be possible; and

Whereas under the circumstances the United States is faced with closing certain fisheries entirely to our fishermen thereby creating severe economic dislocation, or, in the alternative, allowing them to fish 7 days a week to meet the Japanese competition; and

Whereas to do either of the foregoing would end in serious economic dislocation and possible destruction of the fisheries; and

Whereas the taking of Alaskan salmon by Japanese fishermen must be stopped for the good of all concerned: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State together with other appropriate officials of our Government immediately initiate negotiations with the appropriate officials and agencies of the Government of Japan for the purpose of:

(a) Effectuating the purposes of the treaty entered into by the United States, Canada and Japan in 1951, and

(b) Establishing a zone in which there shall be a cessation of all fishing in waters on the high seas where a substantial proportion of salmon of North American origin are found.

## INVESTIGATION OF RELATIONSHIPS OF RIVER AND RELATED WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on December 20, 1957, a committee print was issued which included a memorandum on relationships of river and related water resource development programs of the United States, Soviet Russia and Red China. Copies of the print were circulated to the members of the committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works, as well as to newspapers and others.

The subject is undoubtedly appropriate for inquiry by the Senate in order that all of the pertinent facts related thereto may be made public.

To achieve this result, I submit for appropriate reference, a Senate resolution that directs the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works to hold hearings on the subject matter of the committee print and report their findings to the Senate. Appropriate hearings will be held on the resolution by the two committees before findings are reported to the Senate.

The distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] informs me that he is preparing a statement on resource developments in Soviet Russia based on his personal observations on a recent trip through that country. Senator ELLENDER's observations, I am sure, will be illuminating and of great value in supplementing the data presented in the committee print. I trust the Senator's statement will be available to the joint hearings contemplated in considering the resolution.

Cosponsoring the resolution with me are the chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the Flood Control Public Works Subcommittee [Mr. KERR], the chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee [Mr. ANDERSON], and the chairman of our Public Lands Subcommittee [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Copies of the committee print are available at the office of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works jointly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The resolution (S. Res. 248), submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. O'MAHONEY) was received and referred to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works, jointly, as follows:

Whereas in committee print dated December 20, 1957, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs transmitted a summary of available information on the relationships of river and related water resource development programs of United States, Soviet Russia and Red China, which was subsequently officially laid before the President of the United States;

Whereas said information indicates comparative conditions and progress or lack of progress in river control, irrigation, hydroelectric power development and associated water resource conservation and use that require a complete revelation of facts and circumstances that should be brought to the attention of the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas a full disclosure of comparative conditions and programs in water resource development programs in the United States and other countries mentioned is vital to the future economic stability and survival of this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works hold joint hearings on the facts and circumstances in connection with the relationships of river and related water resource development programs and other pertinent matters and report their findings to the Senate during the current session.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF URBAN RENEWAL PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 221 of the National Housing Act in order to relieve some of the critical problems involved in relocating families from urban renewal projects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3064) to amend section 221 (d) (2) of the National Housing Act, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 221 currently provides liberal mortgage insurance for construction of cooperative projects of 10 or more units and for purchasers of single family dwellings who have been forced to move by slum clearance activity. My bill would extend these provisions of section 221 to include 2-, 3-, and 4-family structures. It would require that the owner be an occupant of one of the family units; the remaining units to be allotted to similarly dislocated families on a basis of priorities determined by the Federal Housing Commissioner. Any housing constructed under this amendment would be required to meet the normal FHA standards as well as to conform with all State and local regulations relating to public health or safety and all zoning regulations. Following the pattern set in other sections of the Housing Act, my amendment establishes maximum mortgage amounts and a schedule of minimum downpayments. These are shown in the table at the end of this statement.

This bill has been developed in response to a definite need on the part of localities involved with urban renewal projects. The limitations of the present wording of section 221 were first brought to my attention last spring by the slum clearance and redevelopment director of Portland, Maine, where the city's first urban renewal project will soon be completed. Further study of the problem was made last month when the Banking and Currency Committee's Housing Subcommittee held 2 days of hearings in Portland. The real value of existing multifamily dwellings for relocation purposes was vividly portrayed in Portland where the housing vacancy rate is well below the national average. Landlords forced to move by the urban renewal project wanted to acquire relatively small multifamily houses so as to make them available to their former tenants and the tenants, in many cases, preferred to continue in this rental type housing rather than purchase a home of their own. Portland is not alone in this respect as such situations are especially prevalent in the medium and smaller sized cities where the relatively low number of families to be relocated frequently makes large housing developments uneconomical.

Last year the Senate approved a similar amendment which I proposed, but it was eliminated in the conference with the House on the housing bill. Feeling that this change in the existing law would be of considerable benefit to nearly all cities undertaking urban renewal projects, I hope that early Senate action can be taken on this bill this year.

*Mortgage maximums and downpayments under Payne amendment*

| | Single-family dwellings | 2-family dwellings | 3-family dwellings | 4-family dwellings |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mortgage maximum | $9,000 | $18,000 | $25,000 | $32,000 |
| Mortgage maximum (high-cost areas) | 12,000 | 20,000 | 27,500 | 35,000 |
| Minimum downpayment | 200 | 400 | 600 | 800 |

## BRIDGE CANYON DAM, COLORADO RIVER LOWER BASIN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a fifth dam on the lower Colorado River rivaling Hoover Dam in size is proposed in a bill which I now introduce.

The proposed site of the new dam would be in the main stream of the river at Bridge Canyon just above Lake Mead. I have introduced the measure twice before, but it was proper to delay the serious consideration of the bill until construction began on Glen Canyon Dam which is located above Bridge Canyon.

Glen Canyon Dam, which is now under construction, has a storage capacity of about 26 million acre-feet of water; but being a low, regulatory dam, it is unsuitable for large power production. The proposed Bridge Canyon Dam would store only 3.7 million acre-feet, but it is a high dam, and with the combined storage capacities of both dams amounting to almost 30 million acre-feet, the power output at Bridge Canyon would be approximately 750,000 kilowatts, almost as much as at Hoover Dam.

Under the terms of the bill, the dam would be 740 feet high and 1,950 feet wide at its crest. Construction of the dam would make it possible to reduce storage space reserved in Lake Mead for flood control, which would increase the average available power head for the Hoover plant. The construction of the project would advance the interest of all the Colorado River Basin States and Nevada could easily utilize one-third, or her fair share of the power. It would require 5 years to construct the project following the passage of the bill.

The construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam would extend industrial development in the lower basin States in accordance with a long-range plan envisioned when I was State engineer in 1927–35. The first dam, Hoover Dam, formerly Boulder Dam, was started during the Coolidge administration and was built under the Boulder Dam Project Act. Since then, two other dams, Parker and Davis, have been built on the Colorado River. All of these projects produce commercial power as well as contributing to the highest beneficial use of the lower basin water supply.

The entire cost of the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam will be repaid with interest over a definite amortization period under the precedent set by Hoover Dam in 1928.

When Bridge and Glen Canyon Dams are both built, the power produced in the lower basin States, if properly integrated with Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams, will be mostly firm power.

In the meantime we are fighting to get our share of the water on the lower Colorado—900,000 acre-feet—for southern Nevada for which I laid the foundation in 1927 to 1935 as State engineer and Colorado River Commissioner for my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a history of the Bridge Canyon Dam and incidental works, as it relates to bills which have been introduced over the years, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGE CANYON DAM AND INCIDENTAL WORKS: COST ESTIMATE OF CONSTRUCTION BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—INTERIOR

79TH CONGRESS

S. 2346 was introduced on June 18, 1946, by Senators MCFARLAND and HAYDEN, 79th Congress. No record in Interior of an estimate of construction costs being submitted to Congress.

80TH CONGRESS

S. 1175, introduced by Senators MCFARLAND and HAYDEN on April 28, 1947. Cost estimate: $317,471,000, based on April 1946 prices.

81ST CONGRESS

S. 75, introduced by Senators MCFARLAND and HAYDEN on January 5, 1949. Cost estimate: $356,616,000, based on July 1947 prices.

82D CONGRESS

S. 75, introduced by Senator MCFARLAND on January 8, 1951 and this bill passed the Senate on June 5, 1951, but did not pass House. Cost estimate: $413,273,000, based on January 1951 prices.

83D CONGRESS

S. 1438, introduced by Senator MALONE March 23, 1953. No cost estimates were submitted to Congress, but tear sheets, when you introduced bill, used the same figures as above, $413,273,000, but you excluded the transmission costs of $87,959,000.

84TH CONGRESS

S. 403, introduced by Senator MALONE on January 14, 1955. Cost estimate: $444,400,000, based on 1954 prices.

85TH CONGRESS

Bill to construct Bridge Canyon Dam introduced today. Bureau of Reclamation estimates the cost of construction to be $494,500,000, based on October 1957 prices.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill itself be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the bill will be printed.

The bill (S. 3067) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That for the purpose of controlling floods, improving navigation, and regulating the flow of the Colorado River, and for the generation, use, and sale of electrical energy as a means of making the project herein authorized a self-supporting and financially solvent undertaking, the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, subject to the terms of the Colorado River compact, is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain (1) a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, which dam shall be constructed to an elevation of not more than 1,877 feet above sea level; (2) complete plants (other than steam plants for the production of electrical energy), transmission lines, and incidental structures suitable for the fullest economic development of electrical energy generated from water at the works constructed hereunder for use in the operation thereof and for sale in accordance with Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto); and (3) such appurtenant dams and incidental works necessary for desilting as may be necessary in the opinion of the Secretary for the successful operation of the undertaking herein authorized.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall have the authority to acquire, by purchase, exchange, condemnation, or otherwise, all lands, rights-of-way, and other property necessary for said purposes: *Provided*, That, anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary shall not have the authority to condemn esablished water rights or the water to the use of which such rights are established.

SEC. 3. The estimated cost of the construction of the said works shall be determined by the Secretary. The Secretary shall also determine (a) the parts of said estimated cost that can be properly allocated to flood control, navigation, fish and wildlife conservation, respectively, and any other purposes served by the project which may hereafter be made nonreimbursable by law, the sums so allocated, together with the expenses of operation and maintenance attributed by him to such purposes, to be nonreimbursable, and (b) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to power and probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues: *Provided*, That the repayment period for costs so allocated shall be such reasonable period of years as may be determined by the Secretary, but in no event to exceed 75 years.

SEC. 4 In the production, sale, exchange, and distribution of electric energy generated by the works herein authorized, the Secretary shall be governed by the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and revenues derived from the sale of such energy shall be credited in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291).

SEC. 5. The works provided for by the first section of this act shall be used first, for river regulation, improvement of navigation, and flood control, and second, for power. The title to all works herein authorized shall be in the United States and the United States shall until otherwise provided by law control, manage, and operate the same.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein shall be construed as modifying or affecting any of the provisions of the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understanding recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

SEC. 7. This act shall be deemed a supplement to the reclamation law, which said reclamation law shall govern the construction, operation, and management of the works herein authorized except as otherwise herein provided.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. (a) In aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works authorized by this act, there is hereby granted to the United States, subject to the provisions of this section, (1) all the right, title, and interest of the Indians in and to such tribal and allotted lands, including sites of agency and school buildings and related structures, as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, or maintenance of said works and any facilities incidental thereto, or for the relocation or reconstruction of highways, railroads, and other properties affected by said works; and (2) such easements, rights-of-way, or other interest in and to tribal and allotted Indian lands as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, maintenance, relocation, or reconstruction of said works, facilities, and properties: *Provided*, That before designating any tribal lands, or any easements, rights-of-way, or other interests in tribal lands, the Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to negotiate a contract for the purchase of such lands or interests on reasonable terms from the tribe of Indians concerned, and that the Secretary shall proceed with the designation of lands or interests under this section only if he finds that reasonable efforts to negotiate with the tribe of Indians concerned have been made, but have not resulted in, and are not apt to result in, a mutually satisfactory agreement. The Secretary is authorized to provide in any such contract for the payment of compensation in the same forms through which compensation may be made pursuant to a designation under this section, and any tribe of Indians entering into such a contract is authorized to execute the conveyances or other instruments needed for its effectuation, notwithstanding any provision of law or of any tribul constitution or charter to the contrary.

(b) As lands or interests in lands are designated from time to time under this section, the Secretary shall determine the just and equitable compensation to be made therefor. Such compensation may be in money, property, or other assets, including rights to electric energy developed at any of the generating plants herein authorized. Any Indian tribe or individual Indian owning lands or interests designated under this section who is dissatisfied with the determination of compensation made by the Secretary shall have a right of action against the United States to recover such additional sums of money, if any, as may be requisite under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or under any treaty or agreement made by the United States, to provide just and equitable compensation for the taking of the lands so designated. Such action may be instituted in the United States district court for the district where the lands or interests are situated or in the Court of Claims, at the election of the plaintiff. The amounts of money determined as compensation hereunder for tribal lands shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the credit of the appropriate tribe pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560). The amounts due individual allottees or their heirs or devisees shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the superintendent of the appropriate Indian agency, or such other officer as shall be designated by the Secretary, for credit on the books of such

agency to the accounts of the individuals concerned.

(c) Funds deposited to the credit of allottees, their heirs or devisees, may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary, for the acquisition of other lands and improvements, or the relocation of existing improvements or the construction of new improvements on the lands so acquired for the individuals whose lands and improvements are acquired under the provisions of this section. Lands so acquired shall be held in the same status as those from which the funds were derived, and shall be nontaxable until otherwise provided by Congress.

(d) Whenever any Indian cemetery lands are required for the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, in lieu of requiring payment therefor, to establish cemeteries on other lands that he may select and acquire for the purpose, and to remove bodies, markers, and appurtenances to the new sites. All costs incurred in connection with any such relocation shall be paid from moneys appropriated for the purposes of this act. All right, title, and interest of the Indians in the lands within any cemetery so relocated shall terminate and the grant of title under this section take effect as of the date the Secretary authorizes the relocation. Sites of the relocated cemeteries shall be held in trust by the United States for the appropriate tribe, or family, as the case may be, and shall be nontaxable.

(e) The Secretary is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to prescribe such regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed as, or have the effect of, subjecting Indian water rights to the laws of any State.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have just introduced for the construction of Bridge Canyon Dam lie on the table until Monday, January 27, 1958, to permit any Senator who may wish to do so to join in its introduction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## CORRECTION OF ABUSES IN LABOR UNION AFFAIRS—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, a bill to correct widespread abuses that have developed in the operation and management of union affairs. If passed by the Congress, this proposed new legislation will represent a bill of rights for our working men and women who at present are, or who may become, members of the Nation's unions.

In the past twenty years, membership in the Nation's unions has increased from 3 million to more than 17 million. Not counting the vast sums of money already available to officials of these unions, it is conservatively estimated that annual sums of dues, fees, and assessments paid by our union members amount to more than $600 million each year.

In my judgment, the Nation's working people who contribute a part of their monthly salaries to support the activities of their unions are entitled to control effectively the management of their affairs.

The American way of life, with its foundations fixed on maintaining and protecting human dignity and the aspirations of free men in a free society, has always demanded that with power must rest responsibility.

During the past year, the extensive series of hearings in the Congress has forcefully demonstrated that the powers of a considerable number of union officers are being misused.

There have poured into the offices of Senators and into the Senate committees thousands of letters from union members alleging abuses, misfeasance, and acts of violence on the part of certain local, regional, or national union officers. These do not, and should not, constitute indictments against all labor officials. Many of these officials, past and present, have labored unceasingly in the best interests of their fellow workingmen.

In the past 4 months, I have traveled the breadth and length of California many times, and have discussed these problems personally with many members of various unions.

If I can summarize their comments in a phrase, they requested that Congress give them assistance in obtaining democratic control by the rank and file of the membership over the management and operation of local, regional, and national unions.

Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced is for that purpose.

Every specific provision of the bill has been drafted to provide the members of our unions adequate representation in the conduct of their own union affairs.

Mr. President, any public official who attempts to work constructively in this field faces the hostility of certain union officials who do not want their vested positions of power disturbed. I have already had my views on the need for this bill of rights for union members substantially distorted. However, I am willing to assume this risk.

I wish to state for the public record my firm judgment that unions have played in the past, and will play in the future, an important role in the strengthening of our national economy. I am hopeful that unions will continue to grow in membership and importance, but, further, that they also will grow in responsibility.

I believe that this measure to provide a bill of rights for workers will receive, now or in the not too distant future, the favorable consideration of the Congress. I sincerely request that all interested persons read carefully the provisions of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in my remarks at this point the full text of the bill I am introducing, and a brief summary of its provisions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3068) to regulate certain internal affairs of labor organizations by providing processes and procedures for insuring democratic control of such organizations by the rank and file membership thereof, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That title IV of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE IV—REGULATION OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS FOR PURPOSE OF INSURING DEMOCRATIC CONTROL BY MEMBERSHIP

"SEC. 401. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'labor organization' means any labor organization which (A) is the representative for or has as one of its purposes or exists for the purpose of representing employees in collective bargaining in any industry affecting commerce or is seeking to become such a representative or (B) has an affiliate or constituent unit in a State other than the State in which it has its principal place of business or in any foreign country.

"(2) The term 'officer' includes a member of any board, council, committee, or other body established by the constitution or charter of a labor organization which is empowered by such constitution or charter to exercise governing or executive functions with respect to such labor organization.

"(3) The term 'employee welfare plan' means a plan, fund, or program established by an employer or by employees of an employer, or by any group, association, or other organization thereof, for the purpose of providing for employees in an industry affecting commerce or their dependents benefits in case of illness or other disability or upon retirement or death, but does not include a plan, fund, or program established by law for the purpose of providing benefits provided by law.

*"Election of officers*

"SEC. 402. (a) After the expiration of 1 year following the enactment of this section, no person shall be eligible to serve as an officer of a labor organization unless he shall have been elected as such officer by popular vote of the membership at an election held within the preceding 4 years in which all members of such organization shall have been entitled to vote, and at which the votes of the members voting shall have been cast by secret ballot.

"(b) Upon the filing with the National Labor Relations Board (hereinafter referred to as 'the Board') of a petition alleging that an individual is serving as an officer of a labor organization, who is not eligible under subsection (a) to serve as such officer, the Board shall proceed in accordance with section 406 (a) to consider the matter and if it determines such allegation to be true it shall enter an order directing the labor organization to remove such individual from such office.

*"Recall of officers*

"SEC. 403. (a) Upon the filing with the Board of a petition therefor signed by at least 15 percent of the members of a labor organization, the Board shall conduct an election at which the members of such labor organization shall be entitled to vote by secret ballot on the question of recalling any elected officer or officers of such labor organization named in such petition. If a majority of the members voting in such election vote to recall any officer named in the petition the Board shall declare the office held by such officer to be vacant. Not more than one election for the recall of the holder of any one office shall be held under this section in any 12-month period.

"(b) Upon the filing with the Board of a petition alleging that an individual who has been recalled under subsection (a) as an officer of a labor organization is serving as such officer (other than pursuant to a subsequent election to such office), the Board shall proceed in accordance with section 406 (a) to consider the matter and if it determines such allegation to be true it shall enter an order directing the labor organiza-

tion to remove such individual from such office.

*"Initiative and referendum on internal affairs*

"SEC. 404. (a) Upon the filing with the Board of a petition therefor signed by at least 15 percent of the members of a labor organization, the Board shall conduct a referendum at which the members of such labor organization shall be entitled to vote on the question whether they favor any proposal specified in such petition—

"(1) to amend, modify, revise, or repeal any provision of the constitution, bylaws, or other governing rules or regulations of the labor organization;

"(2) to amend, modify, revise, or veto any decision of the officers or governing body of the labor organization with respect to—

"(A) dues, initiation fees, assessments, salaries of officers and employees of the labor organization, gifts, grants, loans, donations, or investments made by the labor organization, expenditure of funds of the labor organization or projects involving the use of such funds or the resources or assets of the labor organization or involving the use of paid manpower, or other matters relating to the financial affairs of the labor organization;

"(B) attendance at union meetings, picket line duty, performance of services on behalf of the labor organization, contributions, welfare activities, distribution of literature, support of political or ideological causes, issues, parties, platforms, or candidates, lobbying or legislative activities, or other matters relating to the conduct or activities of members of the labor organization; or

"(C) fines, suspensions, expulsions, loss of status or union benefits, or other matters relating to the disciplining of members.

"(b) Upon the filing with the Board of a petition alleging that a labor organization or its officers have failed to carry out any proposal favored by a majority of the members voting in a referendum conducted under this section, or are carrying out any proposal disapproved by a majority of the members voting in such referendum, or are otherwise disregarding, or failing to comply with or give effect to, the wishes of such majority as disclosed by the results of the vote in such referendum, the Board shall proceed in accordance with section 406 (a) to consider the matter and if it determines such allegations to be true it shall enter an appropriate order directing the labor organization and its officers to carry out any proposal favored by such majority, to refrain from carrying out any proposal disapproved by such majority, or otherwise to comply with or give effect to the wishes of such majority as disclosed by the results of the vote. The order of the Board may include provisions directing the labor organization or its officers to make such restitution of rights or property as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives of any proposal favored by such majority.

"(c) (1) No referendum shall be conducted under subsection (a) to amend, modify, revise, or veto—

"(A) Any decision made by any officer or representative of a labor organization in the course of collective bargaining negotiations with respect to wages, rates of pay, hours of work or any other terms or conditions of employment which directly affect or involve the duration of the work period or a concrete, material benefit or loss to the employees which is measurable in terms of money; or

"(B) Any decision the precise content of which is specifically required by the constitution, bylaws, or other governing rules or regulations of the labor organization; or

"(C) Any decision with respect to any matter which is specifically required or prohibited by law.

"(2) No referendum shall be conducted under subsection (a) among the membership of a local union alone in connection with any matter which is governed by the constitution, charter, bylaws, or other governing rules or regulations of the national, international, or other multilocal labor organization of which such labor organization is a constituent unit or with which it is affiliated.

"(3) Not more than one referendum shall be conducted under subsection (a) (1) during any 18-month period. Not more than one referendum shall be conducted under subsection (a) (2) with respect to any particular decision.

*"Strike ballots*

"SEC. 405. (a) No strike shall be called or sanctioned by a labor organization unless at least 30 days prior to the commencement of such strike such labor organization shall have given notice thereof in writing to the Board and the employer, and either individually in writing, or by announcement at a meeting of the membership of the organization, to the members of such organization in the unit or units involved in the strike.

"(b) Upon the filing with the Board, upon or at any time after receipt by the Board of a notice given under subsection (a), of a petition therefor signed by at least 15 percent of the employees in the unit or units involved in the strike, the Board shall conduct a referendum on the question whether such strike should be called or continued. If a majority of those voting in the referendum vote against the strike no strike shall be called or sanctioned by the labor organization until at least 90 days have elapsed following the referendum and notice has been given in accordance with subsection (a). If a majority of those voting in the referendum vote in favor of the strike no subsequent petition may be filed under this subsection until at least 90 days have elapsed following such referendum, and unless such subsequent petition has been signed by at least 30 per cent of the employees in the unit or units involved in the strike.

"(c) Any individual who participates in a strike which has been called without notice as required by subsection (a), or which has been called or continued after a majority of the employees in the unit or units involved in the strike voting in the most recent referendum conducted with respect to such strike under this section shall have voted against such strike, shall not during the existence of the strike or thereafter, unless reemployed or reinstated by the employer, be considered to be an employee of such employer for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act.

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to supersede or modify in any way the requirements of section 8 (d) of the National Labor Relations Act.

*"Procedure*

"SEC. 406. (a) A petition under section 402 (b), 403 (b), or 404 (b) may be filed by any member or group of members of a labor organization, or by any individual or organization acting in behalf of such member or members, except that no such petition may be filed by any employer of such employees or by any organization with which any such employer is affiliated. Upon the filing of such a petition, the Board shall conduct an investigation and if it finds evidence to support the allegations in the petition it shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an unfair labor practice charge and the appropriate provisions of subsections (b) to (l), inclusive, of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act shall apply to such proceeding.

"(b) Elections and referendums provided for in sections 403, 404, and 405 shall be conducted by the Board, except that the Board may delegate, generally or in specific cases, authority to conduct such elections or referenda to any public or private agency or organization which, in the opinion of the Board, is qualified to conduct such elections or referenda.

*"Trusteeships over local union affairs*

"SEC. 407. (a) No national, international, or other labor organization having more than one local or constituent unit shall remove the officers of any local union for the purpose of establishing a trusteeship over such union and administering its affairs, unless—

"(1) such action is authorized by, and is taken in accordance with the provisions of the constitution, charter, bylaws, or other governing rules and regulations of such labor organization; and

"(2) the funds, assets, resources, and property of the local union (other than amounts normally required to be paid to such labor organization by its local or constituent units in the absence of a trusteeship) are used exclusively in connection with the affairs of the local union and for the benefit thereof, and are not diverted to or utilized for any other purpose during the period of the trusteeship.

"(b) No such trusteeship shall continue after the expiration of 1 year from the date it is established, and no such trusteeship shall be established with respect to any local union until at least 6 months have elapsed following the termination of any preceding trusteeship established with respect to such local union.

"(c) In any case in which the officers of a local union have been removed and such a trusteeship has been established, the trustees are authorized, during the term of the trusteeship, to conduct elections for new local union officers at which all members of such local union shall be entitled to vote. Any such officer or member so elected shall not be subject to recall pursuant to section 403 for a period of 6 months following the election.

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to modify any existing legal rights or remedies with respect to the funds, assets, property, or obligations of the local union upon the dissolution of such local union, or its expulsion or withdrawal from the national, international, or other union with which it was affiliated.

"(e) Any member of a local union over which a trusteeship is established or continued in violation of subsection (a) or (b) may bring an action in behalf of such local union in any district court of the United States for equitable relief to compel compliance with the provisions of such subsections, and for restitution of funds, assets, or property of the local union and for damages to such union. Any amounts awarded in any such proceeding shall be payable to the local union, except that costs, including counsel fees, of such proceeding may be assessed in favor of the person bringing the action.

*"Protection of members*

"SEC. 408. (a) Upon the filing with the Board by any member of a labor organization of a petition alleging that such member has been disciplined by his labor organization so as to deprive him, in violation of the provisions of the constitution, charter, bylaws, or other governing rules or regulations of the labor organization, of his rights to vote in any election conducted by such labor organization, of his right to vote in any election conducted under section 403, 404, or 405, the Board shall conduct an investigation and if it finds prima facie evidence of the truth of such allegations it shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an unfair labor practice charge and the provisions of subsections (b) to (l), inclusive, of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act shall apply to such proceeding. If after hearing the Board finds that the voting rights of such

member have been denied in violation of the provisions of such constitution, charter, bylaws, rules, or regulations it shall order the labor organization to cease and desist from such wrongful action, and, if the election was conducted by the labor organization and the wrongful action could affect the results of the election, shall invalidate such election or, in the case of a referendum conducted by the Board under section 403, 404, or 405, shall set aside such referendum if the result thereof was unfavorable to the petitioners.

"(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to supersede or modify in any way the provisions of any law of any State or Territory, or to prevent any person from exercising any right which he may have under any such law.

*"Monopolistic allocation of territory among labor organizations*

"SEC. 409. (a) Every contract, agreement, understanding, or arrangement between two or more national, international or other labor organizations having more than one local or constituent unit or between two or more local labor organizations each affiliated with a different national, international, or other labor organization having more than one local or constituent unit, for a division or allocation of jurisdiction for representation purposes on a geographical, territorial, or area basis is hereby declared to be unlawful.

"(b) Upon the filing with the Board of a petition alleging that a contract, agreement, understanding, or arrangement has been entered into in violation of subsection (a), or that a labor organization has refused on a geographical, territorial, or area basis to admit to membership employees who would otherwise be eligible to membership or to represent employees under section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act which it would otherwise represent, the Board shall conduct an investigation and if it finds prima facie evidence of the truth of such allegation it shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an unfair labor practice charge and the provisions of subsections (b) to (l), inclusive, of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act shall apply to such proceeding. If it determines such allegation to be true it shall enter an order prohibiting the parties from carrying out or in any way giving effect to such contract, agreement, understanding, or arrangement, or from continuing to refuse to admit to membership or represent such employees.

*"Collective bargaining agreements for excessive term and waiving the right to strike*

"SEC. 410. (a) No collective bargaining agreement entered into by any labor organization shall be effective or binding upon the parties thereto for a period in excess of 2 years unless such contract shall have been approved by a majority of the members of the labor organization in the unit covered by the contract, voting by secret ballot in a referendum held for such purpose by the labor organization.

"(b) No provision or provisions in a collective bargaining agreement waiving or canceling the union members' right to strike shall be legal or effective unless such provision or provisions shall have been approved by a majority of the members of the labor organization in the unit covered by the contract, voting by secret ballot in a referendum held for such purpose by the labor organization.

*"Registration of employee welfare plans*

"SEC. 411. (a) The person or persons responsible for the administration of an employee welfare plan shall register such plan with the Securities and Exchange Commission (hereafter referred to as the 'Commission') in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) (1) The registration of a plan under this section shall be in such form as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe. It shall include information with respect to (1) the nature and type of the plan, and the benefits provided thereunder, (2) the number of employees covered by the plan, (3) assets of the plan and investments of its funds, (4) receipts and disbursements of the plan during the preceding year, and (5) such other information as the Commission shall determine to be necessary in the public interest and shall by regulation prescribe.

"(2) A plan shall be registered under this section within 60 days after the effective date of the regulations promulgated under this subsection or after the date on which such plan is established, whichever date is later.

"(c) The person or persons responsible for the administration of an employee welfare plan registered under this section shall file with the Commission annually a report bringing up to date the information included in the registration and containing such further information concerning the plan or its administration as the Commission shall determine to be necessary in the public interest and shall by regulation prescribe. Such annual report shall be in such form and shall be filed at such time as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe.

"(d) The Commission is authorized to require by regulation the certification by an independent public accountant of the accuracy of any of the information required to be filed in any registration or annual report under this section.

"(e) The Commission shall make available for public inspection at its principal office the registrations and annual reports filed under this section.

"(f) (1) The Commission shall examine the registrations and reports filed under this section, and is authorized to make such investigations as it may deem necessary to determine whether in any case the provisions of this section have not been complied with. Whenever it is of the opinion, as a result of such examination or investigation, that any provision of this section or of any other law have been violated it shall call the facts with respect to such violation to the attention of the Attorney General or, in the case of a violation of a State or local law, to the appropriate State or local law-enforcement agency.

"(2) For the purpose of any investigation authorized by this subsection, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witness and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 49, 50) are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Commission.

"(g) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, upon application by the Commission, to restrain violations and compel compliance with the provisions of this section.

*"Sanctions and penalties*

"SEC. 412. (a) Whenever the Board shall determine that—

"(1) an individual is serving as an officer of a labor organization who is not eligible under section 402 (a) to serve as such officer or who has been recalled from service as such officer under section 403, or who has been convicted of an offense under subsection (c) of this section;

"(2) a labor organization or its officers are failing to carry out a proposal favored by a majority of those voting in a referendum conducted under section 404, are carrying out a proposal disapproved by a majority of those voting in such a referendum, or are otherwise disregarding or failing to comply with or give effect to the wishes of such majority as disclosed by the vote in such referendum;

"(3) a labor organization has called, sanctioned, or is participating in a strike which has been called without notice as required by section 405 (a) or within 90 days after it has been disapproved by a majority of those voting in a referendum conducted under section 405 (b); or

"(4) a labor organization has entered into a contract, agreement, understanding, or arrangement made unlawful by section 409, or has refused on a geographical, territorial, or area basis to admit to membership employees who would otherwise be eligible to membership or to represent employees under section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act which it would otherwise represent;

during any period for which any such activity or failure to act so determined by the Board continues to exist such labor organization shall not (A) be considered to be the representative of employees for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, (B) be exempt from Federal income tax under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or (C) be considered to be a labor organization for the purposes of sections 6 and 20 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 17; 29 U. S. C. 52) or the act of March 23, 1932 (29 U. S. C. 101 et seq.).

"(b) Any individual who—

"(1) knowingly serves as an officer of a labor organization while ineligible to serve as such officer under section 402 (a) or after having been recalled from service as such officer or member under section 403 (other than an individual who subsequent to such recall is duly reelected to the office from which he was recalled);

"(2) being an officer of a labor organization and having responsibility with respect to any proposal voted on at a referendum conducted under section 404, wilfully fails to carry out or to participate in carrying out a proposal favored by a majority of those voting in such referendum, wilfully carries out or participates in carrying out a proposal disapproved by a majority of those voting in such referendum, or otherwise wilfully disregards or fails to comply with or give effect to the wishes of such majority as disclosed by the vote in such referendum;

"(3) being an officer of a labor organization, wilfully calls or sanctions, or orders, requests, or encourages any members of the labor organization to participate in a strike which has been called without notice as required by section 405 (a) or within 90 days after it has been disapproved by a majority of those voting in a referendum conducted under section 405 (b);

"(4) wilfully removes or participates in the removal of the officers of any local union for the purpose of establishing a trusteeship over such union otherwise than in accordance with section 407 (a), or continues or participates in the continuation of any trusteeship in violation of section 407 (b); or

"(5) wilfully authorizes, makes, or participates in the making of any contract, agreement, arrangement or understanding declared by section 409 to be unlawful, or wilfully carries out or gives effect to, or participates in the carrying out or giving effect to any such contract, agreement, arrangement or understanding;

shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment for not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"(c) Any individual, group, or organization which wilfully interferes with, restrains or coerces any employee or member of a labor organization seeking to initiate or participate in any of the procedures or activities set forth in the foregoing provisions of this title shall be guilty of a felony and

upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or by imprisonment for not to exceed 5 years, or both.

"(d) Any person or persons responsible for the administration of an employee welfare plan required to be registered under section 411 who wilfully fails to register such plan or to file any annual report thereon, in accordance with the provisions of such section or the regulations promulgated thereunder shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed $1,000 or by imprisonment for not to exceed 1 year or both."

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

SEC. 2. (a) Section 8 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and," and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(7) to call, authorize, sanction, or participate in a strike with respect to which notice has not been given as provided in section 405 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, or after a majority of the employees in the unit or units involved in the strike voting in the most recent referendum conducted with respect to such strike under such section have voted against such strike."

(b) Section 9 (c) of such act is amended—

(1) By adding at the end of paragraph (2) a new sentence as follows: "Whenever a petition shall have been filed pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (1) (A) of this section the Board, in determining whether a question of representation affecting commerce exists, shall ignore the existence of any collective bargaining agreement covering the bargaining unit for which the petition was filed, and such agreement shall not constitute a bar to the processing of such petition, or to the holding of an election, or to any certification or decertification resulting from such election, except that regardless of the results of such election, the terms and conditions of such existing collective bargaining agreement shall continue in full force and effect so far as practicable until the expiration date of such agreement unless modified or terminated by mutual consent of all who remain affected by the agreement."

(2) By inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of paragraph (3) thereof a comma and the following: "except that an election may be ordered at any time where the Board has determined under section 412 (a) of the Labor Management Relations Act that a labor organization which is the representative of the employees is no longer eligible to represent such employees".

(c) Section 9 (g) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary of Labor shall make available to the public, in accordance with such regulations as he may deem appropriate, the information filed by labor organizations pursuant to this subsection and subsection (f). The Secretary shall inspect such of the information so filed as he may deem necessary for the purpose of determining its accuracy, and if he is of the opinion that false information has been filed in any case he shall bring the facts with respect thereto to the attention of the Attorney General."

PAYMENTS TO LABOR ORGANIZATIONS BY PERSONS ENGAGED BY EMPLOYERS

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by inserting after the word "employer" a comma and the following: "or any person engaged or retained by such employer as a labor relations expert or consultant or for the purpose of dealing with his employees or their representative,".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting after the words "employer of such employees" a comma and the following: "or any person engaged or retained by such employer as a labor relations expert or consultant or for the purpose of dealing with his employees or their representatives,".

The summary presented by Mr. KNOWLAND is as follows:

SUMMARY: LEGISLATION PROPOSING A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR UNION MEMBERS (AMENDMENTS TO THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947)

Section 401: Definitions—labor organization, union official, employee welfare plan.

Section 402: Provides for election of union officials within 4-year periods by popular vote of the membership through secret ballot; confers jurisdiction on National Labor Relations Board to consider individual petitions that union officials have been illegally elected.

Section 403: Confers jurisdiction on National Labor Relations Board to conduct elections by secret ballot on the question of recalling union officials previously elected; petitions directing the Board to act must be signed by a minimum of 15 percent of the union members; limits number of such elections which can be conducted during a single year period.

Section 404: Provides for National Labor Relations Board to conduct secret election upon request of a petition signed by minimum of 15 percent of labor union members on following subjects:

(1) Amendment, modification or repealing provisions of union constitution or union rules or regulations.

(2) Amendment, modification or vetoing decisions of union officials on questions of dues, initiation fees, assessments, union salaries, fines, suspensions, expulsions, union benefits, support of nonunion activities, etc.

(3) Prohibits National Labor Relations Board elections under this section on matters involved in collective bargaining negotiations or on subjects permitted by union constitution, bylaws, or other union governing rules or regulations.

(4) Limits number of elections permitted to be conducted under this section.

Section 405: Provides for referendum by National Labor Relations Board where petitioned by minimum of 15 percent of employees in the labor unit involved on question of calling or continuing of strikes; also requires that notification of strike be filed with 30-day notice to National Labor Relations Board, employer, and union members; provides limit to number of referendums that can be requested; removes protection of NLRB from employee who participates in strike after majority vote against strike under this section.

Section 406: Provides that petition under sections 402, 403, and 404 may only be filed by union members or an individual organization specifically acting on their behalf; prohibits employers of such employees or organization affiliated with such employers from filing petitions under these sections; permits the NLRB to delegate supervision of elections provided in sections 403, 404, and 405 to qualified public or private agencies or organizations.

Section 407: Specifies restrictions on establishment of trusteeship over local union affairs by national or international unions; establishes 1-year limitation for continuation of trusteeship and provides that union funds under trusteeships must be utilized exclusively for the benefit of the local union and its membership; authorizes trustees to conduct elections, where applicable, for new union officials; permits union member to institute legal action on behalf of local union to compel compliance with provisions of this section.

Section 408: Establishes NLRB protection for union members who, through disciplinary action of union officials, have been deprived of their right to vote in union elections.

Section 409: Prohibits division or allocation of territory for representation purposes by two or more unions. Section protects right of union member to participate in union organization of his own choosing.

Section 410: Prohibits collective bargaining agreements for a period in excess of 2 years unless approved by majority vote of union membership; prohibits provisions in collective bargaining agreements waiving union members' rights to strike unless provisions have been approved by secret ballot vote.

Section 411: Provides new system of registration of employee welfare plans with the Securities and Exchange Commission; requires employee welfare plans under management and union jurisdiction to be registered; authorizes certification of the accuracy of information on welfare plans submitted; provides Federal court jurisdiction to require compliance with this section.

Section 412: Sanctions and penalties for noncompliance with provisions of the law; provides both civil and criminal penalties.

AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Section 2: Establishes additional unfair labor practice where provisions of section 405 relating to notification of strike or referendum on strike are violated; directs that representation elections may be held during period covered by collective bargaining agreement but provides that terms and conditions of collective bargaining agreement continue without regard to results of such elections; permits representation elections where labor organization is determined under section 412 (a) that it is no longer eligible to represent employees; provides that Secretary of Labor shall make information, required to be filed by labor organizations to obtain certification, available to the public.

Section 3: Makes it illegal for employer representatives to transmit any money or thing of value to representatives of his employees; makes it illegal for representatives of employees to receive from employer representatives any money or thing of value.

## FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to extend and improve the act of September 3, 1950, and the act of September 30, 1950, which provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes.

As the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am introducing this proposed legislation at the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order that Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, which will expire in the near future, may be extended and amended.

In the communication from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Vice President, the following significant statement appears:

For Public Law 815 we estimate that the amount to be appropriated for assistance in school construction in fiscal 1959 would be reduced from $62 million if this law were to be extended in its present form, to $20,500,000 if the proposed amendments are adopted;

comparable savings could be realized in subsequent years. For Public Law 874 we estimate that the cost in the fiscal year 1959 would be reduced from $149 million if the law were extended without amendment, to $110 million if the proposed amendments are adopted; in the fifth year (fiscal 1963) costs under Public Law 874 could be reduced to about $53 million under the draft bill, as compared with costs of more than $200 million if the law were extended without amendment.

These reductions will obviously be controversial and should be subject to careful study by our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They are in line with the present budgetary policy of the administration.

In explanation of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the communication, dated January 17, from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, addressed to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, enclosing this proposed legislation and commenting on its substance and purpose.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a detailed analysis of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3069) to extend and improve the act of September 23, 1950, and the act of September 30, 1950, which provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter and analysis presented by Mr. SMITH are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*January 17, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft of a bill extending and amending Public Law 815 (20 U. S. C., ch. 14) and Public Law 874 (20 U. S. C., ch. 13). Both of these laws were originally enacted by the 81st Congress and have subsequently been several times amended and extended. Public Law 815, which authorizes Federal financial assistance in the construction of public elementary and secondary schools in federally affected areas, was extended at the last session of the 85th Congress by Public Law 85-267 and is now scheduled to expire as respects new applications for assistance on June 30, 1959. Public Law 874, which authorizes Federal financial assistance in the maintenance and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in such areas, is now due to expire June 30, 1958.

The draft bill includes amendments which would extend for 4 years some of the authorizations in Public Law 815 and would eliminate others. The draft bill would also extend some but not all of the authorizations in Public Law 874 for 5 years. The objective underlying all these proposed amendments is to limit Federal payments under these acts to those situations where there is a clear and direct Federal responsibility to provide this type of special educational assistance.

The more important of the amendments to each law are briefly discussed below. A detailed section-by-section analysis of the draft bill is included.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 815

The proposed amendments would continue without substantial change the provisions of Public Law 815 which authorize Federal payments to local educational agencies on account of increases in school enrollments of children who reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property. However, two categories of children for which payments are authorized under existing law would be eliminated. One such category consists of children of parents either living on or working on Federal property, but not both.

Federal assistance in providing necessary school facilities under existing law for this category of children has, since 1950, involved payments to some 1,300 school districts of more than $400 million on account of almost 750,000 school children. These payments have greatly helped school districts to cope with the sudden and substantial increases in their school enrollments which were occasioned by the great upsurge in Federal defense activity during and following the Korean war.

In the case of most of these children, the homes or other places where they reside are fully taxable by the school districts which provide their education. In not being able to levy real-property taxes on the places where their parents are employed, these school districts are now not different from many other suburban communities which must look wholly or principally to residential property for revenues to meet the local share of the cost of their public-school systems. Also, the Federal installations which provide employment to the parents of such children generate economic benefits to the communities in which they are situated, and to nearby communities, which should tend generally to compensate for any loss in revenues occasioned by the tax immunity of the property of the installations concerned.

Another category of children eliminated by the amendments to Public Law 815 contained in the draft bill, is that involving increased numbers of children of parents who have migrated to a community to accept employment in Federal activities conducted directly or through a contractor. In this situation neither the places of residence nor the places of employment of the parents of such children need be tax exempt. The Federal assistance provided for this category has been justified primarily on the basis of the necessity, in the interest of the national-defense effort, of overcoming difficulties in recruiting and retaining the labor force needed to man the defense activities—difficulties which would arise and persist if the school situation were substandard.

Today, however, there is little evidence of a continuing and substantial migration of labor by reason of defense-contract activities. Furthermore, a substantial proportion of the increased enrollments in most of the school districts which have claimed or would claim assistance for this category of children more properly is attributable to the trend toward suburbanization and the opening of new residential subdivisions in suburban areas than to the activities of the Federal Government.

Another amendment to Public Law 815 included in the draft bill provides for repeal of section 308 which presently authorizes additional Federal payments to a school district of an amount sufficient to finance an approved construction project to house the federally connected enrollment increase, if without such Federal payment the school district would be unable to construct the project. Similar Federal payment is authorized also in the case of a federally aided construction project for the purpose of completing a building which in the course of construction is destroyed by fire, tornado, or flood. The repeal of this section will affect relatively few school districts since it has been seldom used for the first purpose and not at all for the second purpose stated above.

Also permitted to expire would be title IV of the existing Public Law 815. Under this title Federal assistance in school construction has been authorized for public school districts providing education for substantial numbers of children residing on Federal property which are in need of additional school facilities but are unable to qualify for assistance on the basis of increased numbers of federally connected children enrolled in school. This title has been used to assist in the construction of 174 projects costing $24.7 million, mainly for the education of children living on Indian reservation lands. It is believed that the need for additional school facilities for most such districts has now been met and that continuation of this title is no longer necessary.

In addition to the foregoing changes of major significance the enclosed draft bill would make a number of minor amendments to Public Law 815. These include:

1. Elimination of section 304 (b) and the proviso clause at the end of section 305 (a), the purposes of which have been accomplished.

2. The method of computing increases of federally connected children has been changed, so as to provide a more rational measure of increase, by comparing estimated membership at the end of an increase period with membership at end of the previous increase period (the base year), rather than (as under existing law) with the average daily membership in such base year.

3. The proviso contained in section 305 (c) by which children living in Federal housing sold or transferred to non-Federal ownership were deemed to continue to be federally connected for certain purposes, has been eliminated as unjustified.

4. A provision is added making it clear that the Commissioner of Education's authority to make regulations may not be delegated to other Federal personnel.

5. The labor standards at sections 205 (b) (1) (E) and 208 (d) of Public Law 815 (sections 6 (b) (1) and 11 (d) of the act, as it would be amended by the bill) have been changed to include provisions securing to laborers and mechanics on construction projects aided under the act, the payment of time and one-half for overtime work in excess of 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, and to make more specific the functions and authorities of the Secretary of Labor in the administration of these standards.

6. The definition of "Federal property" has been changed to exclude post office property and property used primarily for the provision of benefits (as well as services) to local areas, since such property primarily serves local rather than national interests, and to exclude flight training schools on State or municipally owned airports which are not owned by the Federal Government and can have no Federal tax immunity.

The amendments to Public Law 815 would apply to applications based on enrollment increases in the regular school year 1959-60 and the next 3 years.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 874

Since enactment of Public Law 874, in 1950, the number of school districts receiving assistance under its provisions has steadily increased as has the amount of assistance provided. In fiscal year 1957 about 3,300 school districts, some in every State and Territory, received assistance under section 3 of the act of more than $105 million on account of more than 1 million federally connected children; total costs un-

der the act amounted to $112 million. In the current school year (1957–58) the number of such school districts has increased, and aggregate costs will approximate $126 million. Were the law extended without amendment, aggregate costs for fiscal 1959 would reach about $150 million.

The proposed amendments to Public Law 874 parallel generally those proposed for Public Law 815 in that the authorization for Federal payments on account of children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property is continued without substantial change, while existing authorizations for payments on account of other categories of children are discontinued or greatly limited.

The most important amendment to Public Law 874 contained in the draft bill is the gradual reduction over a 4-year period in the Federal payments now being made on account of children of parents living in private taxable homes but employed on Federal property, or residing on Federal property but working on taxable property. Under the bill payments now being made on account of these children would be reduced 20 percent a year, and no new payments on new children in this category would be authorized except in situations involving substantial increases in the number of such children.

Thus, the amendments proposed in the draft bill would limit Federal assistance for children of this type up to the number for which a school district received Public Law 874 payments for the fiscal year 1958, to a diminishing percentage of the actual average daily attendance of such children during the fiscal years 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962. Whereas these districts, if otherwise eligible, are being paid for the fiscal year 1958 an amount equal to their 1958 local contribution rate times 50 percent of the number of such children, they would, if otherwise eligible, be paid for the next 4 years amounts equal to their 1958 local contribution rate times 40 percent, 30 percent, 20 percent, and 10 percent of the number of such children.

The reasons already set forth in explanation of the elimination of this category of children from Public Law 815 are equally applicable here. The provision for gradual reduction in the payments now being made on account of these children, is being proposed in order to give the affected school districts ample time to make any adjustments in their tax base and rates that may be needed to provide revenues to take the place of the Federal funds being withdrawn.

Moreover, the bill authorizes temporary Federal assistance to school districts which experience substantial enrollment increases in children in this category to help tide the districts over the 1- or 2-year period after the establishment or expansion of a tax-exempt Federal installation during which they may incur additional public school expenses before additional revenues can be provided. Thus, under the proposed bill, if in any year during the extended life of Public Law 874 there is an increase in the number of school children whose parents live or work on Federal property (but not both), over the number in the prior year and in the school year 1957–58, and such increase equals 6 percent or more of the number of nonfederally connected children in average daily attendance in the preceding year and in 1957–58, the draft bill would authorize a Federal payment to be made for one-half the number of children in such increase at the current local contribution rate, and for the following year would authorize a payment of one-half the previous year's amount.

In this connection, the draft bill would eliminate a provision in existing law for a minimum local contribution rate based on the national average local contribution rate per pupil paid under section 3 of the law in the second preceding year. A national average of local contribution rates bears no reasonable relation to the loss a particular school district may suffer as a result of the immunity from local taxation of Federal property on which children reside or their parents work, and hence should not be used in determining the rate of Federal payment to a school district.

The draft bill would not extend the provision of section 4 of Public Law 874 which now authorizes payments on account of increased numbers of children whose parents work for Federal contractors. The reasons already given for eliminating the analogous category of children from Public Law 815 are applicable here.

Under Public Law 874 Indian children who are eligible for educational services provided with funds furnished by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act (25 U. S. C. 452) are not counted for the purposes of the Public Law 874 program unless the Governor of the State elects to have them counted. In that event the State becomes ineligible for educational assistance through the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act. Indian children who receive only special services, as distinguished from educational services, under the Johnson-O'Malley Act are counted under the Public Law 874 program where the Governor has made no election.

The proposed draft bill changes the present law by permitting each school district, rather than the Governor on a statewide basis, to decide whether assistance for the education of Indian children residing on tax-exempt land within the district will be sought under the Public Law 874 program or through the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act. Each district will be able to choose the program that is financially most advantageous to it, but will not be eligible to participate under both programs at the same time. This change is recommended by the Department of the Interior in order to avoid duplicate Federal payments to any district based upon the residence of Indian children on tax-exempt land.

In addition to these major changes, the enclosed draft bill would make a number of other relatively minor amendments to Public Law 874. These proposed amendments include the following:

1. Payments under section 2, which are based on loss of taxable property through its acquisition by the United States even though no additional school attendance load is caused thereby, would be modified to provide that such acquisition must have occurred within a period of 15 years prior to the year of application for payment. It is felt that over this period the local educational agency should become fully adjusted to the loss of tax base through the Federal acquisition.

2. Payments with respect to children whose parents both live and work on Federal property, would be somewhat liberalized. Thus, section 3 (c) (2) of the act would be amended to authorize waiver by the Commissioner of the eligibility condition which requires that there be 10 or more such children in average daily school attendance, when application of this condition would defeat the purposes of the act. Also, the special 6 percent eligibility requirement for cities which in the school year 1938–39 had an average daily attendance of more than 35,000 children, together with the 3 percent absorption requirement as applied to such cities (at sec. 3 (c) (3) of the law), would be eliminated as respects children of parents who both live and work on Federal property.

3. The definition of Federal property would be amended to exclude (a) outleased Federal property if the leasehold is taxable, except where leased from the Department of the Army, Navy, or Air Force under section 805 of the National Housing Act, (b) flight training schools operated on any State or municipally owned airports, and (c) post office property and other property used primarily for the provision of benefits (as well as services) to local areas. The last two exclusions parallel amendments to similar provisions in Public Law 815, and the first is necessary to assure limitation of the law to nontaxable Federal property.

4. The special provision in the HEW Appropriation Act of 1954 which included the Boulder Dam project land as Federal property, regardless of the taxability of leasehold interests in the land, has also been repealed consistently with the exclusion of all taxable outleased federally owned property.

All amendments to Public Law 874 would become effective July 1, 1958.

The effect of the various amendments proposed to be made by the attached draft bill on the cost of these programs of school assistance in federally affected areas will vary somewhat with the nature and extent of the activities of the Federal Government. For Public Law 815 we estimate that the amount to be appropriated for assistance in school construction in fiscal 1959 would be reduced from $62 million if this law were to be extended in its present form, to $20.5 million if the proposed amendments are adopted; comparable savings could be realized in subsequent years. For Public Law 874 we estimate that the cost in the fiscal year 1959 would be reduced from $149 million if the law were extended without amendment, to $110 million if the proposed amendments are adopted; in the fifth year (fiscal 1963) costs under Public Law 874 could be reduced to about $53 million under the draft bill, as compared with costs of more than $200 million if the law were extended without amendment.

In compliance with Public Law 801, 84th Congress, there is enclosed a statement of cost estimates and personnel requirements which would be entailed by enactment of the enclosed draft bill.

We shall appreciate it if you will be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the proper committee for consideration. In view of the expiration of Public Law 874 on June 30 of this year and the desirability of giving the local educational agencies concerned as much notice as possible of changes in this law which would affect their planning for the school year 1958–59, it is hoped that early attention can be given to this legislative proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
*Secretary.*

---

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1958—DETAILED ANALYSIS

The draft bill amends the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, 81st Cong.), by extending title III thereof, with various amendments, for 4 additional years, covering increases in school membership through June 30, 1963. It also amends the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Cong.), by extending it through June 30, 1963, with amendments.

AMENDMENTS TO THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 23, 1950

Section 1 of the bill amends the act of September 23, 1950, by rewriting it. Under the act as rewritten, titles I, II, and IV would not be continued.

*Purpose and appropriation*

Section 1 of the act of September 23, 1950, as amended by the bill, authorizes appropriation, for each fiscal year through the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, of such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary for the purpose of providing assistance for the construction of urgently needed minimum school facilities in school districts which have, since the school year 1958–59, had substantial increases in the number of children in their schools who reside on tax-exempt Federal property. Such appropriations (other than the sums appropriated for administration) would be available until expended.

This section is the same as section 301 of the existing law, except that the authorization for appropriations has been extended for another four fiscal years to cover school enrollment increases of children residing on Federal property. Also, the provision that appropriations are available until expended has been transferred from another part of the law.

*Portion of appropriations available for payments*

Section 2 of the act, as amended by the bill, requires the Commissioner of Education to determine for each fiscal year the portion of the appropriations which is to be available for carrying out sections 8 and 9 (relating to grants for the construction of temporary school facilities and to the provision by the Commissioner of facilities for children residing on Federal property). The remainder of the appropriations is available for payments to local educational agencies for the Federal share of projects for which applications have been approved under the act.

This section is the same as section 302 of the existing law except for changes in references.

*Establishment of priorities*

Section 3 of the act, as amended by the bill, provides for the establishment by the Commissioner of dates before which applications for payments with respect to projects must be filed, in order for the applications to be approved for purposes of sharing in the appropriations available (for the purpose) on the dates established. If the funds available for the purpose on any such date are inadequate, the Commissioner's regulations, based on relative urgency of need, determine the order of priority for approval of the applications. The last date established by the Commissioner under this section may not be later than June 30, 1963. To be considered an application for purposes of this section, an application would have to meet the conditions for approval set forth in the act (in sec. 6), other than the requirement that there be sufficient Federal funds available to pay the Federal share of the cost of the project.

This section is the same as section 303 of the existing law except for date and reference changes and except for a rearrangement, for purposes of clarification, of the provisions relating to the regulations governing priorities.

*Federal share for any project*

Section 4 of the act, as amended by the bill states that the Federal share of the cost of any project is an amount equal to the cost of such project. However, this amount is subject to three limitations. First, the Federal share is subject to the limitation on the total payment which may be made to any local educational agency under section 5 of the amended act with respect to increased school membership in any increase period. Second, the Federal share cannot exceed the cost of constructing minimum school facilities. The cost of the facilities will be determined by the cost thereof in the community in which the project is being constructed.

The Federal share of the cost of the project may also not exceed the cost in the community of constructing minimum school facilities for the school children who will otherwise be without minimum facilities at the close of the increase period. (This term is defined in section 13. See below for explanation of its meaning.) The number of school children without minimum facilities will be determined for purposes of this limitation on the basis of the school facilities built or under contract on the date on which the Commissioner establishes, under section 3, the earliest date on or before which the application for the project was filed. Also considered as available for the children, for the purpose of determining the number of children who will be without minimum facilities, are school facilities included in any project the application for which has been approved under this act.

This section is the same as subsection (a) of section 304 of the existing law except for reference changes. Subsection (b) of section 304 has been omitted. It related to the special situation of those local educational agencies which had filed applications on or before November 24, 1953, and had entered into construction contracts after that date which reduced or eliminated payments to which those agencies would otherwise have been entitled under the law. Thus, the provisions of this subsection have been executed.

*Limitation on total payments to any local educational agency*

Section 5 of the act, as amended by the bill, establishes a maximum on the total payments which may be made to any local educational agency, with respect to the increased school membership of federally connected children during any increase period. Subject to subsections (b) and (c) of section 5, which further limit the total number of children to be included for purposes of computing the maximum, the maximum will be based on a percentage of the cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the State multiplied by the increase since the base year (defined in sec. 13) in children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property (situated in the same State or within reasonable commuting distance of the school district).

Subsection (a) of this section sets forth the method for determining the extent of the increase in the number of these children. This is done by deducting from the number of such children who will be in the membership of the schools of the local educational agency at the close of the increase period (the period of 2 consecutive regular school years following the base year), the number of such children who were in the membership of the schools of such agency at the close of the base year. The maximum amount is then computed by multiplying the increase by 95 percent of the per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the State.

Subsection (b) of the new section 5 imposes eligibility conditions which (except as provided in subsection (d)) must be met before an increase can be counted toward the maximum amount payable to a local educational agency. The increase must be 20 or more children and must be equal to at least 5 percent of the total membership of the schools of the local educational agency at the close of the base year.

Since most communities in the country are experiencing an increase in school membership, subsection (c) of the new section 5 would reduce the total number of children who may be counted for purposes of determining the maximum under this section to the extent that the increase in nonfederally connected children who will be in the membership of the schools of the local educational agency at the close of the increase period is less than 107 percent of the membership of such nonfederally connected children at the close of the base year.

Subsection (d) of the new section 5 authorizes the Commissioner to waive or reduce the 5-percent eligibility condition in subsection (b) or waive or reduce the percentage of the increase in nonfederally connected children required by subsection (c), or both. Such waiver or reduction, however, would be authorized only when and to the extent that, in the judgment of the Commissioner of Education, exceptional circumstances exist which make such action necessary to avoid inequity and to avoid defeating the purposes of the act.

Subsection (e) is designed to prevent the same children from being counted as part of an increase during two consecutive increase periods. Under this subsection if a local educational agency files an application with respect to a construction project in two consecutive increase periods and any payment has been or may be made on the basis of the first application, then in determining the total number of children which may be counted for purposes of the maximum on the payments to the agency during the year in which the second application is filed, the number of children whose membership at the close of the first increase period was compared with membership in the applicable base year is to be subtracted from the number of children in the same category whose membership at the close of the second increase period is compared with membership in the applicable base year.

This section differs from section 305 of the existing law in several respects, in addition to differences in references and dates.

First, the second and third categories of children with respect to whom Public Law 815 now authorizes payments—those whose parents either reside on or work on Federal property, and those whose membership results directly from activities of the United States in so-called critical defense areas—are not continued in the new section. Also deleted, as no longer needed, is a provision permitting an applicant to elect which category to count children under, if countable under more than one.

Second, also not continued in the new provisions is the provision in the existing section 305 (a) under which children attending a federally owned school operated by a local educational agency could be counted as part of an increase in school membership for purposes of this section, and would be determined to be without school facilities at the close of the increase period, if the Commissioner found that the Government-owned school could more appropriately be used for other school purposes or was no longer available for use for such purposes and that the agency will submit an application for a project to provide off-base school facilities for the children.

Third, school membership at the close of the increase period would be compared with school membership at the close of the base year, instead of with average daily membership during that year as in the existing provisions of section 305, in order to determine the amount of the increase in membership.

Finally, the draft bill also eliminates the existing provision of section 305 under which children residing on housing property, which was considered Federal property prior to its transfer or sale by the United States, are not to be counted as federally connected in determining the eligibility of the local educational agency under subsection (b).

*Applications*

Section 6 (a) of the act, as amended by the bill, requires submission of an application, through the State educational agency, to the Commissioner in accordance with his regulations before any payments may be made to a local educational agency.

Subsection (b) of section 6 sets forth the conditions which must be met by an application before it may be approved. The application must set forth the project with respect to which it is filed; contain a description of the site, preliminary drawings,

and other related information; contain assurance of ownership of the site or the right to construct and maintain facilities thereon for at least 20 years and of the local educational agency's legal authority to undertake the construction; contain assurance that the construction will be begun in a reasonable time and prosecuted to completion with reasonable diligence, that adequate funds to defray the non-Federal share of the cost will be available, that laborers and mechanics employed on the project will be paid prevailing wage rates and time and one-half for overtime work in excess of 40 hours in a week or 8 hours in a day, that the school facilities will be available for the federally connected children on the same terms, in accordance with the laws of the State, as they are available to other children in the school district of the local educational agency, and, finally, that the local educational agency will submit necessary reports relating to the project reasonably required by the Commissioner.

Any application meeting the above requirements must be approved if not inconsistent with overall State school construction plans and if there are sufficient Federal funds available to pay the Federal share of the cost of the project and other projects with a higher priority. In order to expedite action on applications which involve urgent needs for new schools to take care of increased school enrollments occasioned by new Federal housing projects, this subsection authorizes approval of applications in such situations in advance of the cutoff dates established by the Commissioner for priority purposes under section 3. Such advance approval, however, may be given only if the Commissioner determines it to be likely that the need of the applicant local educational agency is sufficiently great to qualify it for payments when the priorities are established.

Subsection (c) of section 6 of the act, as amended by the bill, requires notice and opportunity for hearing to an applicant local educational agency before its application is disapproved by the Commissioner.

This section is the same as section 306 and section 205 (b) (1) of the existing law except for addition at section 6 (b) (1) (E) of overtime pay standards to the prevailing wage standards now provided at section 205 (b) (1) (E) of existing law, and except for reference changes and deletion of the material at the end of section 6 (b) (2), which material would be no longer operative when the bill is enacted.

Section 7 (a) of the act, as amended by the bill, sets forth the procedure for making payments. Upon approving an application of a local educational agency with respect to a project, the Commissioner is to pay to the agency 10 percent of the Federal share of the cost of the project. After approval of the final drawings and specifications of the project and execution of the construction contract, the Commissioner is to pay the remainder of the Federal share to the agency, in accordance with his regulations and in reasonable installments.

Subsection (b) of section 7 requires the return to the Treasury of the United States of any funds paid to a local educational agency which are not used for the purposes for which paid.

Section 7 is the same as section 307 of the existing law except for the deletion, as unnecessary, of the provision that payments are to be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

*Where effect of Federal activities will be temporary*

Section 8 of the act, as amended by the bill, relates to cases where part or all of the attendance of federally connected children in a local school district is of temporary duration. In such cases the Commissioner is directed to make available to the local educational agency such temporary school facilities as may be necessary to take care of the temporary school membership; or he may pay an amount equal to the cost of such facilities to the local agency for use in constructing regular school facilities. In no case, however, may the amount so paid exceed the cost in the school district of constructing minimum school facilities for the federally connected children. Any temporary facilities made available to a local educational agency under this section may be transferred to such agency without charge, on such terms and conditions as the Commissioner determines appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

Except for change in references, this section is the same as section 309 of the existing law.[1]

*Children for whom local agencies are unable to provide education*

Section 9 of the act, as amended by the bill, provides that the Commissioner shall arrange for constructing or otherwise providing minimum school facilities for children residing on Federal property if no tax revenues of the State or any political subdivision may be expended for the free public education of the children or no local educational agency is, in the judgment of the Commissioner after consultation with the State educational agency, able to provide suitable free public education for the children. The facilities provided are, to the maximum extent practicable, to be comparable to minimum school facilities provided in comparable communities in the State. Children for whom facilities are provided under this section are not to be included in computing under section 5 the maximum on the total payments to a local educational agency.

The provisions of this section are not applicable to children who reside on Federal property under the control of the Atomic Energy Commission.

This section is the same as section 310 of the existing law except for reference and date changes and except for removal of Indian children attending federally operated Indian schools from the groups specifically excluded from application of the section. (This exclusion would be replaced by the broader provision making inapplicable for purposes of this section, the specific inclusion of various Indian lands within the definition of Federal property.)

*Withholding of payments*

Section 10 (a) of the act, as amended by the bill, provides for the withholding of payments to a local educational agency for failure to comply with the specifications for a project, for diversion of Federal funds from the purposes for which paid, or for failure to carry out any of the assurances given in an application, until the Commissioner is satisfied that the failure to comply or diversion or default has been corrected or arrangements have been made for repayment of diverted or improperly expended Federal moneys. This withholding action may be taken only after notice and opportunity for hearing to the local educational agency.

Under subsection (b) of the new section 10, the withholding action of the Commissioner, and his refusal to approve any application, would be subject to judicial review on the record in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the local educational agency is located, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Except for changes in references, this section is the same as sections 311 and 207 (b) of the existing law.

*Administration*

Section 11 of the bill provides for administration of the act by the Commissioner. It authorizes necessary regulations and requires inclusion of a report of administration of the act in the Commissioner's annual report to the Congress. This section also prohibits any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any State or local school or school system by any Federal agency, officer, or employee in the administration of this act.

This section also provides that, with respect to the requirement that prevailing wage rates and time and one-half for overtime be paid mechanics and laborers on any project for which funds are paid under the act, the Secretary of Labor shall have the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (5 U. S. C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Copeland Act (40 U. S. C., 276c).

Except for changes in references, and clarification of the Secretary of Labor's authority in connection with labor standards, this section is the same as section 208 of the existing law.

*Use of other Federal agencies; transfer and availability of appropriations*

Section 12 (a) of the act, as amended by the bill, authorizes the Commissioner to utilize other Federal agencies and to delegate performance of his functions, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education or of any other Federal Department or Agency. Such utilization or delegation of other Departments and Agencies is to be pursuant to agreement, with payment for the cost thereof to be made in accordance with the agreement. The authority of the Commissioner under this section with respect to other Federal Departments and Agencies is to be exercised whenever it would avoid duplication within the Office of Education of existing available staff and facilities.

Subsection (b) of the new section 12 requires other Federal Agencies, which administer Federal property on which children reside or which are principally responsible for Federal activities that may give rise to a need for school construction, to comply to the maximum extent practicable with the Commissioner's requests for information he needs to carry out the act.

Subsection (c) of this section prohibits appropriations other than those made to carry out this act from being available between June 30, 1951, and July 1, 1964, for the same purposes as this act. This prohibition is not applicable to appropriations for the construction of school facilities on Federal property under the control of the Atomic Energy Commission, appropriations for the construction of federally operated school facilities for Indian children, appropriations for school construction under the Alaska Public Works Act, and appropriations authorized prior to September 23, 1950 (the date of enactment of the original law), for construction of school facilities for Indian children.

This section is the same as subsections (a), (b), and (e) of section 209 and subsection (a) of section 105 of the existing law

[1] Except for the provision that appropriations shall remain available until expended, which has been included in section 1 above, section 308 of the existing law has not been continued. That section also authorized a special fund, equal to not more than 10 percent of the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year, for making additional payments to help finance the non-Federal share of the cost of projects in certain special or emergency situations. It also contained a special temporary provision, already executed, making some exceptions from the requirement, established in regulations of the Commissioner, as to the minimum percentage of children who must be federally connected for an application to be approved.

except for date and reference changes and except for the exclusion of the making of regulations from the functions which may be delegated to other Federal officers and employees. In this respect the draft bill would follow the existing provisions of section 105 (a) dealing with delegation to Office of Education personnel of the Commissioner's functions.

*Definitions*

Paragraph (1) of section 13 of the act, as amended by the bill, defines "Federal property" as real property owned or leased by the United States and not subject to State or local taxation. Specifically included in the term is real property which is leased from the United States even though the leasehold interest is subject to State or local taxation. Also included specifically, except for purposes of section 9, is real property held in trust by the United States for Indians or Indian tribes, or which is held by Indians or Indian tribes and is subject to restrictions on alienation imposed by the United States. Specifically excluded, however, is real property used by the United States primarily for provision of services or benefits to the local area where the property is located, real property used for a labor supply center, labor home, or labor camp for migratory farmworkers, real property under the jurisdiction of the Post Office Department and used primarily for the provision of postal services, and low-rent housing projects held under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Relief Appropriations Act of 1935, the United States Housing Act of 1937, or Public Law 671 of the 76th Congress.

This paragraph of the definitions is the same as paragraph (1) of section 210 of the existing law, except for (i) the addition, to the types of property specifically excluded from the definition, of Post Office Department property and property used primarily for provision of "benefits" to local areas, (ii) the deletion of the specific inclusion of schools located at State or local airports and providing flight training under contracts with the Air Force, and (iii) the amendment making the inclusion of Indian lands inapplicable for purposes of section 9.

Paragraph (2) of section 13 defines the term "child" to mean any child who is within the age limits for which the State provides free public education. It is the same as paragraph (2) of section 210 of the existing law.

Paragraph (3) of section 13 defines "parent" to include a legal guardian or other person standing in loco parentis. This is the same as paragraph (3) of section 210 of the existing law.

Paragraph (4) defines "free public education" as education provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without tuition charge, and which is provided as elementary or secondary school education in the State. It is the same as paragraph (4) of section 210 of the existing law except for the addition, for clarifying purposes, of the requirement that no tuition be charged. This addition makes the definition the same in terms, as well as substance, as the definition in the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Cong.).

Paragraph (5) of section 13 provides that school membership shall be determined in accordance with State law or, in the absence thereof, in accordance with the Commission's regulations. Where, however, a tuition charge is paid or contracted to be made by the local education agency in the school district of which a child resides to another local educational agency for the child's free public education, then the membership of the child shall be considered as membership of a school of the agency receiving the payment if the two local agencies so agree and the agreement is approved by the Commissioner, or, in the absence of such an approved agreement, as membership of a school of the agency making the tuition payment. This paragraph also provides that, in determining school membership, children who are not provided "free public education" may not be counted.

This paragraph is the same as paragraph (5) of section 210 of the existing law except for the fact that the latter also applied to determinations of "average daily attendance" and "average daily membership." These terms do not appear in the act as amended by the bill; hence their absence from paragraph (5).

Paragraph (6) of section 13 provides that the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in a State is to be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of contracts entered into during the fiscal year preceding that in which the application, with respect to which the determination is made, is approved. If the available information for the preceding fiscal year is found by the Commissioner to be inadequate or not sufficiently representative, the determination is to be made on the basis of the available information and after consultation with the State educational agency. The cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the school district of a local educational agency is to be determined by the Commissioner, after consultation with both the State and local educational agencies on the basis of information contained in the application and such other information as the Commissioner may obtain.

This paragraph is the same as paragraph (7) of section 210 of the existing law, except that the existing paragraph also applies to determination of the cost of constructing "complete," as well as minimum school facilities. Under the act, as amended by the bill there is no need for any reference to "complete" school facilities.[2]

Paragraph (7) of section 13 provides that all determinations with respect to the eligibility and maximum amount of payment are to be made as of the time of approval of the application for which made and on the basis of the best information then available.

This paragraph is the same, with the exception of one minor change, as paragraph (8) of section 210 of the existing law.

Paragraph (8) of section 13 defines the terms "construct," "constructing," and "construction" to include preparation of drawings and specifications; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and inspection and supervision of construction.

This paragraph is the same as paragraph (9) of section 210 of the existing law.

Paragraph (9) of section 13 defines "school facilities" to include classrooms and related facilities, and necessary or appropriate initial equipment, machinery, and utilities. Specifically excluded are athletic stadia, or facilities or structures intended primarily for athletic or other events for which admission is to be charged the general public. Also excluded are interests in land and off-site improvements except for purposes of sections 8 and 9 (relating to provision of temporary facilities and provision of facilities by the Commissioner where local educational agencies are unable to do so).

This paragraph is the same, except for changes in references, as paragraph (10) of section 210 of the existing law.

Paragraph (10) of section 13 provides that the determination of whether or not school facilities are minimum school facilities is to be made by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations and after consultation with the State and local educational agencies.

This paragraph is the same as the portion of paragraph (11) of section 210 of the existing law dealing with "minimum school facilities." The existing provision, however, also indicated what school facilities would be deemed "adequate." There is no need for the continuation of the latter provision.

Paragraph (11) of section 13 defines "local educational agency" as a board of education, or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a county, township, independent, or other school district in the State. The term also includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains school facilities or which has responsibility for the provision of such facilities.

This paragraph is the same as paragraph (12) of section 210 of the existing law.

Paragraph (12) of section 13 defines "State educational agency" as the officer or agency primarily responsible for State supervision of public schools. It is the same as paragraph (13) of section 210 of the existing law.

Paragraph (13) of section 13 defines State to include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, Wake Island, and the Virgin Islands. This paragraph is the same as paragraph (14) of section 210 of the existing law, except that the existing provision includes the District of Columbia for purposes of title I. Since title I would not be continued under the act, as amended by the bill, this portion of the definition was deleted.

Paragraph (14) of section 13 defines Commissioner of Education and Commissioner as the United States Commissioner of Education. This is the same as paragraph (15) of section 210 of the existing law.

Paragraph (15) of section 13 defines base year as the regular school year 1960–61 in the case of an application filed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. In the case of an application filed prior to that fiscal year, it means the regular school year preceding the fiscal year in which the application is filed or the regular school year preceding such school year, whichever is designated in the application. While this definition differs in terms from the definition of base year in section 312 of the existing law, it is patterned after, and is the same in principle, as the existing definition.

Paragraph (16) of section 13 defines the term "increase period" as the period of 2 consecutive regular school years immediately following the base year. Again, while this definition differs in terms from the definition of "increase period" in section 312 of the existing law, it is patterned after, and is the same in principle, as that definition.

*Short title*

Section 14 of the act, as amended by the bill, provides that the act may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance in Federally Affected Areas Act." The existing law does not provide a short title.

AMENDMENTS TO THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1950

*Extension of Public Law 874*

Section 2 (a) of the bill amends section 1 of the act of September 30, 1950 (declaration of policy) to reflect the limited scope of the amended law which would restrict continuing payments to payments on account of children whose parents live and work on Federal property, and limit payments on account of children whose parents live on or work on Federal property (but not both) to situations where there is a substantial increase in such children.

Section 2 (b) of the bill amends two provisions of the act to September 30, 1950, so as to extend the duration thereof for another 5 years (through June 30, 1963). Corresponding amendments have been made by other sections of the bill which involve sections of the act containing duration provi-

[2] Sec. 210 of the existing law also includes a definition of "current fiscal year" in par. (6). Since this term would not appear in the amended law, the definition has not been continued.

sions; these will not be again mentioned in this analysis.

*Fifteen-year limit on payments made on account of acquired land*

Section 3 of the bill amends section 2 (a) of the act of September 30, 1950, so as to provide that no payments will be made under that section with respect to any property for any year after the 15th fiscal year following the year in which the property was acquired by the United States.

*Amount of and eligibility for payments*

Section 4 of the bill would amend various provisions in sections 3, 4, and 5 of the act of September 30, 1950, to continue with slight modification the provisions for payments on account of children who reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property, to limit substantially the provisions for payments on account of children whose parents reside or work on Federal property (but not both), to reduce the rate of payment per federally connected child, and to repeal provisions for payments on account of children of Federal contractors. These amendments are explained more fully below.

*Children whose parents reside and work on, or reside or work on, Federal property*

Subsection (a) of section 4 of the bill would continue without substantive change the provisions of section 3 (c) (1) and (2) of the act of September 30, 1950, insofar as they apply to "A" category children, i. e., children who reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property (or with a parent on active duty with the uniformed services).

The new section 3 (c) (2) of the act, as added by the bill, would provide new formulas for payments on account of "B" category children—those who either reside on Federal property or reside with a parent employed on Federal property, but who do not reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property (unless the school district elects to count its "A" category children as "B" category children).

With respect to any number of "B" category children up to the number for which a school district received payment under section 3 (c) for the fiscal year 1958, the school district in the 4 succeeding fiscal years, if otherwise eligible, would receive progressively smaller payments each year; thus, it would be entitled to receive payments equal to 40 percent of the number of such children in attendance during fiscal year 1959, times its 1958 local contribution rate, 30 percent of the number during fiscal year 1960 times its 1958 rate, 20 percent and 10 percent for fiscal years 1961 and 1962 attendances of such children, and no payment in fiscal 1963.

With respect to increases in "B" category children occurring during any of the 5 fiscal years in the period July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1963, a school district, if otherwise eligible, could receive for the year in which the increase occurs a payment equal to one-half its increase in "B" category children times its local contribution rate for such year; in the succeeding year it would be entitled to one-half this amount. However, it could receive no payment unless the number of "B" category children it had in attendance during the increase year also exceeded the number of such children it was entitled to receive payment for in fiscal 1958 (if any), and unless the increased "B" children attendance exceeded both the preceding year's "B" children attendance and its fiscal year 1958 "B" children attendance by 6 percent of its nonfederally connected attendance (i. e., all children in school attendance other than "A" or "B" category children) in the preceding year.

*Eligibility conditions*

In order to qualify for any payment on either "A" or "B" category children under the amended act, a school district would still have to have enough such children in school attendance to meet the basic 3-percent and 10-or-more eligibility conditions at section 3 (c) (2) of the act (redesignated section 3 (c) (3) by the draft bill). However, section 4 (b) of the bill would amend these provisions to permit the Commissioner in exceptional circumstances to waive the 10-or-more eligibility condition as applied to "A" category children. Under the draft bill (as under existing law) he can waive the 3-percent eligibility condition as applied to either "A" or "B" category children.

Section 4 (c) of the bill amends the special eligibility conditions set forth at section 3 (c) (3) of the act of September 30, 1950 (redesignated section 3 (c) (4) by the draft bill) which apply only to school districts having a school attendance during the fiscal year 1939 of over 35,000 children. The bill would restrict the application of the first of these special conditions (the 6-percent eligibility condition) to "B" category children only, and would restrict the second condition (the 3-percent absorption requirement) to "B" category children for which a school district seeks payments under section 3 (c) (2) (A) of the act as it would be amended by the bill. Thus, neither of these special conditions would apply to "A" category children, and the second (absorption requirement) would not apply to increases in "B" category children which may form the basis for payments under the new section 3 (c) (2) (B).

Sections 4 (d), (e), and (f) of the bill merely make necessary changes in section references and dates in section 4 (c) (4) and (5) of the act of September 30, 1950 (redesignated sec. 4 (c) (5) and (6) by the bill), and in sections 3 (e) and 5 (c) of such act.

*Computation of local contribution rate*

Subsection (g) of section 4 of the bill would amend section 3 (d) of the law, which provides a method for determining the local contribution rate, by eliminating the national average per pupil local contribution rate as a minimum rate, and by substituting "generally comparable" for "most nearly comparable." The latter is a technical amendment relating to the choice of the school districts the per pupil expenditures of which are to be used for purposes of determining the local contribution rate for the local educational agency concerned.

*Repeal of Federal-contractor category*

Subsection (h) of section 4 of the bill would repeal section 4 of the act of September 30, 1950, which provides for payments to certain school districts which experience substantial school attendance increases as a result (generally) of the in-migration of children of persons who are employed by Federal contractors.

Subsection (i) of section 4 of the bill makes necessary changes in section references in section 5 of the act of September 30, 1950.

*Definition of Federal property*

Subsection (a) of section 5 of the bill amends the definition of "Federal property" in section 9 (1) of the existing law by deleting the second sentence which specifically includes as Federal property real property owned by the United States, but leased from it, even though the leasehold interest is subject to State or local taxation. The provisions of the original law, however, which specifically included real property leased from the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force under section 805 of the National Housing Act (for purposes of title VIII of that act), would be reinstated.

Subsection (b) of section 5 of the bill would delete the specific inclusion in Federal property of State or local airport schools providing flight training under contracts with the Air Force.

Subsection (c) of section 5 of the bill would add to the types of property specifically excluded from this definition any property under the jurisdiction of the Post Office Department and used primarily for postal service and any property used primarily for the provision of benefits to local areas.

*Boulder Canyon project land*

Section 6 of the bill would repeal the provision of the Department's 1954 appropriation act which specifically included, as Federal property, land within the Boulder Canyon project reservation, and provided for the deduction, under section 3 (g) of the law, of any school taxes collected on any leasehold interest within the Boulder Canyon Union School District.

*Indian children*

Subsection (a) of section 7 of the bill would amend paragraph (2) of section 9 of the existing law by deleting the second sentence thereof. This sentence now excludes from the definition of "child" Indian children who are eligible for educational services under a capital grant by the United States or under the supervision of, or pursuant to, a contract or other arrangement with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This subsection would also amend the third sentence of section 9 (1) of the existing law by making it inapplicable for purposes of section 6. This sentence specifically includes certain Indian lands in the definition of Federal property.

Subsection (b) of section 7 would substitute for the present section 10 of the act, which permits each State to elect coverage of children residing on Indian reservations and other lands under Public Law 874, a provision which would render ineligible for Johnson-O'Malley Act payments for any fiscal year any local educational agency (except one that educates out-of-district Indian children who reside in Federal dormitories) which applies for and receives funds under Public Law 874 for such year. Thus, while the above-noted amendments with respect to Indian children would make Public Law 874 (except sec. 6) fully applicable to them if their parents reside and work on tax-exempt Indian lands in like manner as it applies in the case of all other children residing on tax-exempt Federal property with a parent employed thereon, the new section 10 would render any school districts applying for and receiving payments under the amended Public Law 874 ineligible for Johnson-O'Malley payments.

*Short title*

Section 8 of the bill would give to the act of September 30, 1950, the short title of "School Operations Assistance in Federally Affected Areas Act."

*Effective date*

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 9 of the bill provide effective dates for the amendments to the act of September 23, 1950, made by section 1 of the bill. Those amendments will apply in the case of applications filed after June 30, 1958, with respect to an increase period including the regular school year 1959–60 or any subsequent school year. The provisions of the existing title IV, however, will continue effective to the extent necessary to carry out agreements for assistance made prior to June 30, 1959, in accordance with the provisions of that title.

Subsection (c) of section 9 provides that the amendments to the act of September 30, 1950, made by sections 2 to 8, inclusive, of the bill are effective for the period beginning July 1, 1958.

*Short title*

Section 10 of the bill provides that it may be cited as the "School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas Amendments Act of 1958."

## CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when the Congress adopted the school milk program, it did so by an amendment to the price-support provisions of the law. The result has been that the cost of the school milk program has been charged to the price-support loss over the years the program has been in effect. That is not as it should be. So I send to the desk a bill which will limit the school milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition for another 2 years as a separate project, which it properly should be. Last year $56 million was charged up as a price-support loss, when it should properly have been charged to a program to improve the nutrition of school children.

Let me add, Mr. President, that if any Senator wishes to put his name on the bill as a cosponsor, I shall be very glad to have him do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3070) to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

---

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN EXPENSES BY ELECTRIC POWER COMPANIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to prohibit the allowance as a business deduction of expenses incurred by electric-power companies in propagandizing against Federal electric-power policies and rural electric cooperatives. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3074) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to prohibit the allowance as a business deduction of expenses incurred by electric-power companies in propagandizing against Federal electric-power policies and rural electric cooperatives, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Mr. President, I am today introducing two bills. (1) To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to prohibit the allowance, as a business deduction, expenses incurred by electric-power companies in propagandizing against Federal electric-power policies and rural electric cooperatives (REA); (2) to amend the Federal Power Act so as to prohibit the Federal Power Commission, in exercising their ratemaking power with respect to the transmission and sale of electric energy subject to its jurisdiction, from treating as operating expenses those expenses incurred by electric utilities in propagandizing against Federal power policies and REA.

Testimony before Congressional committees has revealed that electric power companies have spent millions of dollars in so-called advertisements in magazines and other media in propagandizing against Federal electric power policies and REA.

These advertisements make it appear that the Federal Government is losing money in Federal taxes, whereas the record discloses that the principal purpose of the REA and Federal electric power policies are for the purpose of giving cheaper power rates to areas where many private electric power companies had refused to venture and serve until after the Federal electric power and REA had been instituted.

The witnesses who have appeared before Congressional committees have testified that the public utilities have listed, as expenses, before the FPC in utility rate hearing, the costs of such advertising propaganda against Government policies dealing with Federal electric power and rural electric cooperatives.

It is bad enough for the electric power companies to attack the Federal Government's electric power policy and the REA, but it adds insult to injury to permit the electric power companies to make the Federal Government pay for it through permitting a tax deduction on income taxes for the advertisements and, further, for the public to pay for such propaganda through higher rates due to the cost of such propaganda.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning I introduced two bills dealing with REA. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared in connection with the bills may be printed in the body of the RECORD following the introduction of the bills.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have asked for the floor because I want to speak up against the robbery of the American people. It is a robbery that has been going on for years, but I don't think we should let another day pass without doing something to stop it. I am referring to the practice of electric power companies in spending countless millions in propaganda advertising and political activities and then adding the costs of this propaganda to their cost of operation and making the consumer pay for it in his electric bill.

As everyone knows, the electric power industry is a monopoly industry. The man that wants electricity must buy it from the company that services his community and he must pay the rates which they charge. The consumer has absolutely no choice in the matter. Because of this monopoly position enjoyed by the electric power companies the law provides that they are allowed to charge only such rates that will enable them to cover their costs of operation and their costs of obtaining the money that they need for that operation. Obviously, money spent to attack some public development, or to propagandize the consumer along certain political and economic lines, are not a cost of the operation of an electric power company.

The electric consumer wants, and is entitled to receive, the best possible electric service at the lowest possible cost. The electric consumers should not have to pay the cost of expensive advertisements, in slick national magazines, attacking TVA, or a Federal Hell's Canyon project, or the rural electric cooperatives of the country. Expenditures of that kind do not contribute to any better or cheaper service for the consumer—on the contrary, all that they do is to increase his electric bill.

Can you imagine what the electric consumer would say if his electric light bills showed that 5 or 10 percent of it—or any amount of it, no matter what the percentage—was being charged him because his electric power company wanted to feed him propaganda against rural electric cooperatives? Or because they wanted to lobby against Hells Canyon? Can you imagine what would happen if your electric bill read: "$10.00 for electricity, $1.00 to finance propaganda by the company to make you think TVA is socialistic." I don't have to tell you that overnight there would be such a howl of protest that either the electric power companies would stop that practice immediately, or something would be done to make them stop it. The only reason that the electric consumers all over the country are not raising their voices in protest—the only reason they are not knocking at our doors and filling our offices—is that they don't know what is going on. They are being taken and taken badly, but they don't know it.

But you and I know it, and the public utility commisisons of the country know it. What possible excuse do we have for allowing this robbery to continue? I tell you that I am going to speak up against it at every possible opportunity and I am not going to let up this fight until this outrageous practice is stopped.

Now, back in the 1920's the National Electric Light Association tried to control public opinion through its propaganda advertising and political activities. And of course, at the same time they were charging the costs of this public opinion control to the electric consumer himself in his electric bill. These practices became so outrageous that they were investigated and exposed by the Federal Trade Commission, and for a while conditions improved. Some of the more naive thought perhaps the practice had been licked and that the electric power companies would not again try to brainwash their customers at their customers' expense, but apparently it takes a lot more than that to keep the electric power companies in line. Actually, for the last 15 years these old practices and abuses have been renewed and once again the electric consumer has had to foot the bill for his misinformation. The electric power companies of the country have spent and are spending millions of dollars of their customers' money in this attempt to mislead and control the thinking of their customers. They have tried and are trying to brainwash them at their own expense.

There are four major organizations through which the electric power companies are carrying on this brainwashing campaign. There is the Edison Electric Institute, which prepares the statistical ammunition and cooperates with educational institutions in the preparation of literature. Then there is the electric companies' advertising program, which hands out advertising to magazines and newspapers, sponsors weekly radio and television programs, and provides its member companies with the material for them to use locally. Then there is the electric companies' public information program, which provides material for use in speeches, and by the local press and employee publications. Finally, there is the National Association of Electric Companies, which carries on the lobbying activities in Washington.

Between the years of 1941 and 1952, the electric companies' advertising program alone spent more than $5 million for mass circulation news ads and almost $7½ million for national radio and television hookups. Their advertisements appeared regularly in the Saturday Evening Post, Life, Farm Journal, Country Gentleman, and the Pro-

gressive Farmer. They have sponsored such national programs as Nelson Eddy, the Hour of Charm, Helen Hayes, and Meet Corliss Archer.

This is just a small sample of what the electric power companies spend for propaganda purposes. I can go on and on listing their expenditures, but you know them as well as I do. You know that the amount is huge, the purpose improper and the practice inexcusable.

And what is this propaganda that the electric consumer is being compelled to finance without his consent? There is the propaganda that tries to convince the American people that any activity of cooperatives or any Government agency in the electric power field is socialism. I have here a copy of an advertisement which has on it a map of the United States covered by dots, supposedly representing existing and proposed Federal power and cooperative installations—and in bold print under the map is the question "A Socialistic United States of America?"

This is the most outrageous type of misrepresentation imaginable. The cooperatives are the finest example of private enterprise that we have. They are not Government owned. They are owned by the same farmers that they serve. Coupling the cooperatives with Government installations is completely dishonest—and the power companies know it. Yet they tax their customers in order to feed back to them this lying hogwash. The good farmers who own and operate these rural electric cooperatives bitterly resent this shameful, lying attack on their patriotism. And I for one intend to do something about it.

This whole advertisement is, of course, hogwash. There is no element of socialism even in the Government's power program. The Government is not in the retail electric business and the electric power companies are not in a free-enterprise business. Socialism to me and to the American people means interference by the Government in the free-enterprise system. It does not mean the activities of the Government in the electric power field, any more than it is socialism for a local government to supply its citizens with sewage facilities or with water. The electric power companies know this just the same as you and I, but they don't care what they say if they can turn the public against Government and cooperative power activities—especially when they can make their customers pay for it.

And look at all the ads by the electric power companies trying to establish themselves as the "tax-paying electric industry." They don't pay the taxes and they know it. The taxes are included in their operating expenses and all they do is collect it from their customers and turn it over to the government. They don't pay the taxes—their customers pay them.

And look at all the other misleading propaganda they publish about the rural electric cooperatives. They talk about the profits that the cooperatives are making. What profits? How can a cooperative make profits? How can anyone make profits out of dealing with himself? The cooperatives were organized by their members in order to serve themselves. They serve themselves at cost. Anything that is left over at the end of the year belongs to the same farmers who furnished the money. The power companies know this. They know that cooperatives do not make profits. They know that cooperatives are nonprofit organizations. And yet they keep repeating this same lie over and over again.

Now what possible sense does it make—what possible right do the electric power companies have to spend millions in this type of propaganda advertising and then turn around and charge the electric consumer the cost for having his brain washed? There is no right—neither legal nor moral—and yet this has been going on for years. I ask you—what are we going to do about it?

Fortunately, some of the State public service commissions are beginning to wake up to their responsibilities and are refusing to permit the power companies to include these propaganda expenditures as part of their operating expenses. I salute the public service commission of Wisconsin for recently ruling that electric power companies cannot charge their customers for the cost of political advertising attacking rural electric cooperatives. But there is not enough of this type of ruling. We need more vigilance and concerted action by all of the State regulatory bodies to make sure that not one cent of this brainwashing fund is charged to the electric consumer. And we in the Congress can do something about it also. We can pass laws to make sure that the Federal Power Commission does not allow these propaganda expenses to be charged as operating expense in any case before the Federal Power Commission. And we can also pass laws to make sure that these expenditures cannot be relied upon by the power companies to reduce their income taxes.

There are, of course, types of advertising which are definitely part of the operations of an electric power company. Advertisements which help increase the use of electricity, or which tell the consumers of new electric appliances, or which help educate the consumers on the proper use of electricity—all these are legitimate purposes. And the costs of advertisements relating to these purposes are a legitimate expense of operation. Advertising going beyond this, however, is not an expense of operation and must not be charged to the consumer.

Now, I want to make it perfectly clear that I don't care how much these electric power companies spend on their propaganda and I don't care what they say in their propaganda. Of course, like every American, I would like to see the day come when they told the truth for a change. But even if they want to keep on telling their lies, let them do it. Let them say whatever they want to about BILL LANGER, and TVA, and Bonneville, and Hells Canyon, and the rural electric cooperatives, provided they pay for it out of their stockholders' money and not charge it to the electric consumer in his electric bill. That is my point: Let them talk, let them advertise, let them do anything they want to do, but let them pay for it out of their own money.

I tell you it is a disgrace and crying shame that this has been allowed to go on as long as it has. Those of us in every branch of every government that have allowed this to go on should hang our heads in shame. We have stood by and watched the electric consumer get robbed of millions of dollars and we have not done anything to stop it. I say that the time has come when we must do something to stop it and I hope that in this session of Congress we can get through some bills which will stop it at least insofar as the Federal Government can stop it. And by the illustration we give by our action, I hope that the State legislatures and the State commissions will stop this robbery at the State level.

Now, there is another thing I want to talk about and that is the current drive that is on to double or possibly triple the REA interest rates. The Director or the Bureau of the Budget sent a proposed bill up to the Congress last June which would raise the REA interest rate from its present level of 2 percent to at least 4½ percent and it might possibly go higher than that. Now, the Government entered into an agreement with the rural electric systems that the interest rate would be 2 percent provided the systems extended service on an areawide basis to all of the people in rural areas who wanted and needed electric service.

The REA cooperatives have carried out their part of the agreement as is evidenced by the fact that more than 95 percent of the farms have electric service today.

At the very same time that the administration sent this bill to the Congress it was negotiating a loan to the British Government for $3,750,000,000 at 2 percent, with permission for the British to waive up to 7 annual payments of interest and principal if payment threatened to work a hardship on them, and they have exercised their right to waive payment. It is all right to lend the British money at 2 percent and waive annual interest and principal payments, but when it comes to our own rural electric systems, which are serving thinly populated rural areas, then this is all wrong.

I am bitterly opposed to any change in the REA interest rate and will fight it as long as I am in the Senate.

I want to give you 3 or 4 reasons why the REA interest rate should not be increased:

1. The rural electric cooperatives have a most enviable repayment record. No other agency of the Federal Government in the lending business can claim as good a repayment record. As of June 30, 1957, the rural electric borrowers had paid back $425.8 million in principal and $281.5 million in interest. Furthermore, as of that date, only $200,602 in principal and interest was overdue more than 30 days.

2. Throughout the life of the rural electrification program the Federal Government has made—not lost—money. This fact comes straight from the Comptroller General of the United States who reports in the REA audit for fiscal year 1956 that the REA has a net margin of interest income over interest expense of $54,177,262.

3. As long as the Government continues to subsidize the private power companies under sections 167 and 168 of the income-tax laws there can be no justification for an increase in the REA interest rate except for purpose of destroying the program.

I mentioned earlier the British loan and I will not repeat here anything further on it.

This attempt to raise REA interest rates is nothing more nor less than an attempt by the commercial power companies to destroy the REA systems; and if we are not on our guard here in the Congress, it will be done.

---

## NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS ON WHEAT AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that 1958 price-support levels on wheat and dairy products shall not be lower than the levels established for 1957. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3075) to provide that 1958 price-support levels on wheat and dairy products shall not be lower than the levels established for 1957, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Mr. President, as we fully realize, the many problems facing the farmer in America are of great concern to many of us in Congress. I know that there will be much legislation introduced in both Houses of Congress during this session to attempt to aid the many problems that face the American farmer. At the appropriate time, Mr. President, I will make some extended remarks on the reasons why I believe that the 1958 price-support levels on wheat and dairy products should not be lower than the levels established in 1957.

There has been talk of lowering price supports on certain products. I cannot go along with this view whatsoever.

I am today introducing a bill to provide that the 1958 price-support levels on wheat and dairy products shall not be lower than the levels established for 1957.

I urge my colleagues in both Houses to give very serious consideration to this bill with the hope that it will become law in due course.

I am herewith submitting my proposed bill and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full with these remarks.

The bill is as follows:

*"Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(g) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to cooperators for the 1958 crop of wheat shall not be lower than the level applicable with respect to the 1957 crop of wheat.'

"SEC. 2. Section 201 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the level of price support to producers of whole milk, butterfat, and the products thereof shall not be lower, during the marketing year beginning April 1, 1958, than the level at which such prices were supported during the marketing year beginning April 1, 1957.'"

---

## AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT, RELATING TO INSTITUTION OF CERTAIN ACTIONS FOR DAMAGES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I was disappointed to learn that on Monday of this week the Supreme Court had held, in a 5 to 4 decision, that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act was not an integral part of the antitrust laws, and that accordingly private suits for treble damage redress or for an injunction may not be brought under its provisions. This important ruling was made in the companion cases of Nashville Milk Co. against Carnation Milk Co. and Safeway Stores against Vance.

In practical effect, this decision means that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act has been repealed. It is common knowledge that the Department of Justice has never enforced, and has no intention to enforce, section 3's criminal prohibitions against predatory pricing practices. And now, as a result of Monday's decision by the Supreme Court, private plaintiffs have been denied the right to enforce the provisions of the section. Thus, section 3 stands unenforced, in one case by a Government agency which has abdicated its enforcement responsibilities, and in the other, by antitrust victims restrained from seeking relief under its provisions.

To the small-business community, this situation regarding the enforcement of section 3 demands a speedy remedy. How the situation came about is unimportant. It does not matter whether the 5 members of the Supreme Court majority or the 4 members of the minority were correct in their construction of the legislative history of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. Bearing such considerations in mind, I propose a twofold program to remedy the situation. First, I am introducing a bill which will clearly define section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act as an integral part of the antitrust laws and thus make the statute available in civil actions to private parties. Secondly, I am going to call upon the Department of Justice for a full explanation of its reluctance to enforce section 3. Congress must know why the Department has failed in its enforcement of the only price-discrimination statute entrusted to its care.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for a week, in order that other Members of the Senate may indicate their interest in it and perhaps join as cosponsors of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 3079) to amend the Clayton Act to permit the institution of actions for damages for violations of the Robinson-Patman Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would the Senator from Alabama be good enough to add my name to the list of cosponsors?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## MILITARY PAY AND TERM RETENTION CONTRACTS FOR RESERVE OFFICERS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to military pay and term retention contracts for Reserve officers.

This bill is requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal explaining the purpose of the bill.

I ask that the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of "Bills Introduced."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3081) to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. RUSSELL is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, January 14, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation "to change the method of computing basic pay for members of the uniformed services, to provide term retention contracts for Reserve officers, and for other purposes," together with a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1958 and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is: (1) To effect a fundamental modernization and improvement in the present system of compensation for the uniformed services; and (2) to provide additional incentive for selected Reserve officers to remain on active duty beyond the period of obligated service to meet the requirements of the military services. It should be stated at the outset that this proposal is a basic change of the military pay system designed to attract and retain the quality of personnel needed in our modern Armed Forces.

With respect to the need for a fundamental modernization and improvement in the present system of compensation for the uniformed services, the military services are faced today with the problem of developing and maintaining a work force balanced by skills which will achieve optimum performance from the present weapons of warfare and those now under design or development for military operational use in the years ahead. The extensive career incentive legislative program enacted by the Congress in 1955 and 1956 has better equipped the military services to meet their numerical manpower requirements. These important measures set the foundation for vigorous programs in all the Armed Forces to increase the retention of experienced technical and leadership personnel.

These improvements have enabled the Armed Forces to bring the quantity problem under better control, but they have also given new emphasis to the quality problem—the need for a balanced skill structure.

In recognition of the changes necessitated by the rapidly advancing technology of weapons systems and because of the increasing requirements of military services for highly skilled technical and leadership personnel, the Secretary of Defense organized the Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation. This Committee was composed of Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric Co., as Chairman; Mr. Carter L. Burgess, former Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve) as Vice Chairman; and as members: Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University; Mr. Charles R. Hook, chairman of the board, Armco Steel Corp.; Mr. H. Lee White, a member of the law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft of New York; the Assistant Secretaries for Manpower and Personnel of each of the military departments and high ranking military officers of each of the military services.

The Committee was requested to produce a forceful program of administrative and legislative measures which would give the military services the ability to attract and retain the scientific, professional, technical, combat leadership and management skills required today and in the future. The Committee was further requested to give consideration to how the present compensation practices aggravate the problem of personnel procurement and retention and how those practices might be changed to provide a solution to the manpower problem.

The Committee, in its findings, confirmed the problem of the military services as now being one of quality as opposed to quantity; that it is not a matter of a total number of people on board, but the level of competence of those people; and that while the machinery of modern defense is becoming ever more complex and technical, yet the principles and practices which had guided the military services in the recruitment, development, and compensation of men have not changed substantially in the history of our country.

The Committee expressed the view that the present compensation practices of the military services are so clearly out of step with the times, so inadequate to the needs of a technically advanced form of national defense, and so contrary to all that has been learned about human motivations, that they can be considered a major impediment to national defense. It was concluded that a fundamental modernization of these compensation practices constituted the basic step in the process of development of the highly skilled and balanced force needed by the military services today and in the future.

The modernization of the pay system envisaged by the Committee and upon which the Department of Defense has premised the attached legislative proposal is founded on four basic compensation principles:

1. The compensation system must be designed to encourage meritorious performance. The system must be progressive in nature so as to contain challenging rewards for successful handling of positions of increasing difficulty and responsibility.

2. The compensation system must provide a pay structure that reflects more accurately the particular gradation of skill and experience represented in the varying needs of different service situations. At the same time, this improved structure must carry with it the kinds of controls or selectivity necessary to insure that rewards are genuinely given where deserved and that increased rewards do not contribute to excesses in occupational areas already overcrowded.

3. The compensation system must provide compensation levels which are reasonably comparable to those paid people employed elsewhere in similar positions and occupations. Although it is completely impractical to make concrete and binding comparisons between industry and the Armed Forces because of the differences in the circumstances of employment, they can be used as guides in determining compensation levels that are appropriate to the needs of defense.

4. Without basic patriotism on the part of its members, there can be no Armed Forces. However, in time of peace patriotism alone is not a sufficient motivation for a career in the Armed Forces. The members of the Military Establishment must receive sufficient compensation to enable them to discharge their responsibilities to both their country and their families.

In translating the proposals of the Committee into legislation, the Department of Defense has given special consideration to the problem of converting from the present system of pay to the new system. In this connection, the following provisions which are not a part of the Cordiner report are included in the attached draft:

A 6-percent increase in basic pay for all personnel with more than 2 years of cumulative service. Enlisted personnel would be entitled to receive either a 6-percent increase in their present rate of basic pay or the new proposed rates of basic pay, whichever is higher.

Officer personnel would be entitled to either a 6-percent increase or the new proposed rates of basic pay, whichever is higher. Where the new rates of basic pay are higher, however, the officer would be phased into the new rates by a conversion plan which will provide a four-step phase-in. This will allow time to implement certain management proposals now under study, so that personnel receiving large increases may be carefully screened and selected.

In addition, the Department of Defense has revised downward the proposed rates of active-duty pay for general and flag officers from original Cordiner rates. It should also be noted that the attached proposed legislation does not extend the new proposed rates of pay to retired personnel.

The proposed legislation would amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to reflect the compensation principles recommended by the Committee. The major changes to the Career Compensation Act would accomplish the following:

(1) Revision of the present military compensation system to provide increased recognition for merit and performance instead of longevity.

(2) Eliminate pay inversions wherein substantial numbers of juniors receive more pay than their seniors by providing a pay scale in which the entry rate for each grade exceeds the highest pay rate of any lower grade.

(3) Expand the pay structure 2 pay grades for enlisted personnel (E–8 and E–9) and 2 pay grades for officers (O–9 and O–10) thus providing for a more precise delineation of levels of responsibility.

(4) Provisions of pay for senior officers that is more commensurate with their responsibilities and more nearly comparable with that paid to similar positions in industry.

(5) Relief of compression in the officer and enlisted pay structures through the establishment of suitable pay differentials between grades.

In additon to the problem discussed above, one of the most pressing officer manpower problems facing the Armed Forces today is the inability of the Armed Forces to retain a sufficient number of qualified young Reserve officers for extended periods of active duty beyond obligated service but short of retirement. The Reserve officer retention plan contained in the legislation is the same as that forwarded to the Congress last year and included in H. R. 7473.

I would emphasize that the proposed legislation is an essential part of an integrated program contemplated by the Department of Defense to achieve and maintain the necessary quality, experience level, and optimum balance by skills of personnel in the Armed Forces. Included in this program is the establishment of a system for proficiency pay equivalent to 1 or 2 pay-grade advancements to enlisted men who can qualify therefor by demonstrated high-quality performance of duty. The proficiency-pay system is being established under existing law. However, this measure cannot be fully effective unless there is first established the proper number of enlisted pay grades and pay differentials between grades as provided in the proposed legislation.

The Department recognizes that there exists a dual problem of encouraging personnel retention on one hand, and controlling it on the other. The Department of Defense must and will meet this problem by instituting concrete "personnel control" procedures.

I believe that if this legislation is enacted it will result in a significant improvement in the retention rates, quality, and desired balance by skills of personnel of the Armed Forces, and thus contribute directly to the defense of the Nation.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Preliminary estimate of the additional cost for this proposal for fiscal year 1959 will be $518 million if this legislation is effective on July 1, 1958. More precise costing for fiscal year 1959 and for subsequent years together with estimated savings is under development.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL H. MCELROY.

---

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO CHANGE THE METHOD OF COMPUTING BASIC PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES, TO PROVIDE TERM RETENTION CONTRACTS FOR RESERVE OFFICERS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 amends the Career Compensation Act of 1949 in the following respects:

Clause (1) of section 1 amends section 102 by adding two new clauses. The first provides that, for the purpose of the act, members of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard, while serving in that status, shall be treated as if they were members of the uniformed services. This would make explicit the coverage by the act of those members. Although, under sections 3062 (c) and 8062 (d) of title 10, United States Code, members of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard while in their Reserve status or when called into Federal service are members of the uniformed services, they are not actually members of a uniformed service while performing training or other duty in their State status for which they are entitled to pay from the United States. This clause does not broaden the coverage under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 which members of the National Guard now have when performing the type of duty for which they are entitled to pay and allowances from the United States. It is added in order to avoid specific mention of the National Guard at each place its members would be entitled to the benefits of that act. The second clause provides that the term "active duty" is defined to include active duty for training or any other full-time duty, in order to obviate the necessity of including those terms specifically throughout the bill where they are meant to be included. Where they are not meant to be included, words of exclusion are added.

Clause (2) (A) of section 1 strikes out present sections 201 and 202, dealing with basic pay and service creditable in the computation thereof, and inserts new sections 201, 202, 203, 204, and 205 in place thereof. The replaced section 201 set forth tables of basic pay, based on cumulative years of service, for all members of the uniformed services; provided for the distribution of various grades into pay grades; set forth the conditions under which members were entitled to basic pay; and provides additional monthly pay of $100 and $200 a month for lieutenant generals and generals, respectively.

The new section 201 (a) sets forth new pay tables for commissioned officers, based on years of service in grade, rather than cumulative years of service.

The new section 201 (b) distributes the various commissioned officer grades into pay grades. Two new commissioned pay grades are established, O–10 for generals and admirals and O–9 for lieutenant generals and vice admirals. While both of these grades were formerly allocated to pay grade O–8 along with major generals and rear admirals (upper half), additional monthly pay was provided by section 201 (f).

The new section 201 (c) provides additional increments of basic pay, as set forth

in the table therein, for officers in pay grades O–5 to O–8 serving on active duty under a call or order that does not specify a period of 30 days or less. However, the additional increments of pay would not be considered a part of their active-duty pay or monthly basic pay for the purpose of computing retired pay, severance pay, or readjustment payments, under any provision of law or the pay provided for Reserve officers released from active duty under section 680 of title 10, United States Code, or the accumulated leave payments under section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act or section 219 (c) of the Public Health Service Act.

The new section 202 sets forth new pay tables for warrant officers, based on years of service in grade, rather than cumulative years of service.

The new section 203 (a) sets forth new pay tables for enlisted members, based on years of service in grade, rather than cumulative years of service. Two new enlisted pay grades are established, E–9 and E–8.

The new section 203 (b) directs the Secretary concerned to distribute enlisted members into the various pay grades, in the manner determined by him and with the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

The new section 203 (c) is a continuation of present section 201 (e), without change in substance, and provides that aviation cadets of the Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps are entitled to monthly basic pay at the rate of 50 percent of the basic rate of a commissioned officer in pay grade O–1.

The new section 204 sets forth the conditions, formerly set forth in section 201 (d), under which members are entitled to basic pay.

The new section 204 (a) provides that a member on active duty (including active duty for training or any other purpose) is entitled to the basic pay of the pay grade to which assigned or in which distributed, according to his years of service in that pay grade. For this purpose, a member of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard who is performing full-time training, training duty with pay, or other full-time duty, authorized by section 316, 503, 504, or 505 of title 32, United States Code, is considered to be on active duty.

The new section 204 (b) restates and clarifies the first and second provisos of present section 201 (d). The new section provides (1) that when a member of a uniformed service is ordered to active duty (which term under the amendment made to section 102 by this act includes active duty for training) for a period of 30 days or less, or when a member of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard is called into Federal service for a period of 30 days or less, the time required to perform travel, as prescribed by regulations of the Secretary concerned, from home to first-duty station and from last-duty station to home is considered active duty; and (2) that when a member of a uniformed service is ordered to active duty for a period in excess of 30 days, or a member of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard is called into Federal service for a period in excess of 30 days, the time required to perform travel from home to first-duty station and from last-duty station to home, by the mode of transportation authorized in his orders, is considered active duty.

The new section 204 (c) is taken from the last sentence of present section 201 (d) which authorizes the payment to a member of a uniformed service at the time of his release from active duty, of any pay and allowances accruing to him incident to his release from active duty without regard to the actual performance of the travel home. The new section provides that any payment accruing under any law to any member of a uniformed service incident to his release from active duty, or for his return home incident to release from that duty, may be paid to the member before his departure from his last-duty station, whether or not he actually performs the travel involved.

The new section 205 replaces present section 202 which set forth the kinds of service creditable in computing cumulative years of service for basic-pay purposes. Since, under the new sections 201–203, basic pay is based on years of service in grade, it is no longer necessary to compute cumulative years of service for basic-pay purposes. The substance of former section 202 as relates to the computation of retired pay, however, is retained and restated as section 1405 of title 10, United States Code, by section 5 (3) of this act. The new section 205, therefore, sets forth only rules relating to computation of service in grade.

The new section 205 (a) sets forth the general rule that all periods of service of a member in a pay grade, whether or not on active duty, shall be credited in determining his years of service in that pay grade. For this purpose—

(1) no service which preceded a period of more than three months during which the person concerned was not a member of a uniformed service may not be credited as service in any grade;

(2) a member on active duty in any grade while holding another grade (such as a Reserve serving in a higher or lower temporary grade or a regular serving in a higher temporary grade) is considered to be serving only in his active duty pay grade;

(3) a member holding a temporary grade, higher than his Reserve grade, while not on active duty (such as a Reserve of the Air Force or Army released from active duty while serving in a higher temporary grade) is considered to be serving only in his temporary grade;

(4) an enlisted member or warrant officer of the National Guard who is also a Reserve commissioned officer (as authorized in sections 3354 and 8354 of title 10, United States Code) is considered to be serving as a commissioned officer only when on active duty as such; and

(5) a member who served in a pay grade before becoming 18 years of age may be credited with that service under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

The latter clause continues the provision presently contained in section 202 (c).

The new section 205 (b) provides that, for the purposes of determining years of service in a pay grade, a member whose name is on a temporary disability retired list or any other retired list of a uniformed service may not count his service while not on active duty. However, if a member whose name is on a temporary disability retired list is later restored to active duty (as authorized in section 1211 of title 10, United States Code), he is entitled to credit, for the purpose of this section, for the years of service in his pay grade while he was on that temporary disability retired list.

The new section 205 (c) relates to computation of service in grade of a member whose grade is reduced, who reenlists in a regular component within 3 months after release from active duty as an officer of the same service, who is ordered to active duty in a pay grade lower than that of any temporary or permanent grade he holds; or who is discharged from a Reserve enlistment for immediate enlistment in a regular component of a uniformed service in a pay grade lower than his Reserve grade. If his grade was reduced for other than inefficiency or disciplinary reasons, or if he is so ordered to active duty, enlisted, or reenlisted, he is entitled to the highest pay of the grade to which he is reduced, ordered to active duty, enlisted, or reenlisted, or to the highest pay of any intermediate pay grade to which he may later be promoted, provided he served in the higher grade at least 1 year. For example, an E–7 who is reduced to E–5 for other than inefficiency or disciplinary reasons, would be entitled to the highest pay provided for pay grade E–5 and if the member were subsequently promoted to pay grade E–6, he would be entitled to the highest pay provided for that pay grade. If he did not serve in the higher grade for at least 1 year, or if he was reduced to a lower pay grade for inefficiency or disciplinary reasons, he is credited in the pay grade to which reduced, ordered to active duty, enlisted, or reenlisted, or in any intermediate pay grade to which he may later be promoted, with only his actual years of service in the higher grade, in addition to any service previously performed in the lower grade. In addition, if a member who was reduced to a lower pay grade for inefficiency or disciplinary reasons is later again promoted to the grade in which he was serving before the reduction, he may not be credited with his previous service in that grade.

The new section 205 (d) is designed to prevent the automatic advancement of each member to a higher step of basic pay within his pay grade. If it is determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, that any of the service in the member's current step in his pay grade is unsatisfactory, his advancement to the next higher step in that pay grade may be withheld until such time as his service in the current step is determined, under those regulations, to be satisfactory. No service determined to be unsatisfactory under this subsection may be counted in determining years of service in any pay grade. The purpose of this provision is to insure that the member concerned may not enter a new step in a pay grade until he has performed the requisite amount (1 or 2 years as the case may be) of time in the preceding step.

The new section 205 (e) provides that, for the purpose of determining years of service in pay grade, service is considered to begin on the date the person concerned entered into the pay grade concerned, for pay purposes.

Clause (2) (B) of section 1 redesignates present section 203 as section 206 and restates subsection (b) thereof to prescribe different rates of special pay for doctors and dentists. Section 203, as amended by the act of April 30, 1956, chapter 223 (70 Stat. 122), provided special pay based on years of active service, regardless of pay grade. As restated, the subsection provides special pay on the basis of pay grades and years of active service as follows:

(1) $100 per month for medical and dental officers in pay grades O–2, O–3, and O–4, who have not completed 2 years of active service.

(2) $200 per month for medical and dental officers in pay grades O–2, O–3, and O–4, who have completed at least 2 years of active service.

(3) $150 per month for medical and dental officers in pay grade O–5.

(4) $100 per month for medical and dental officers in pay grade O–6, O–7, or O–8.

(5) $100 per month for veterinary officers in pay grade O–1, O–2, O–3, or O–4.

(6) $50 per month for veterinary officers in pay grade O–5.

Clause (2) (C) of section 1 redesignates present section 204 as section 207 and revises the tables in subsection (b) thereof to place incentive pay for hazardous duty under section 207 (a) (1) and (2) on the same basis of years of service in grade as is provided in new sections 201–203 for basic pay.

Clause (2) (D) of section 1 amends present section 205 (c) by striking out the reference to section 204 and inserting in place thereof a reference to section 207, which is present section 204 as renumbered.

Clause (2) (E) of section 1 redesignates present section 205 as 208.

Clause (2) (F) of section 1 redesignates present section 206 as 209 and restates the section to include within the special pay

table therein the two new enlisted pay grades (E-9 and E-8) established by new section 203 of the act.

Clause (2) (G) of section 1 amends present section 207 (e) by striking out the references to section 208 and inserting in place thereof references to section 211, which is present section 208 as renumbered.

Clause (2) (H) of section 1 redesignates present section 207 as 210.

Clause (2) (I) of section 1 amends present section 208 (a) by striking out the reference to section 207 and inserting in place thereof references to section 210, which is present section 207 as renumbered.

Clause (2) (J) of section 1 amends present section 208 (d) by striking out the words "(computed in accordance with the cumulative years of service of the member)," as under new section 203, basic pay for enlisted members is based on years of service in grade, rather than cumulative years of service.

Clause (2) (K) of section 1 redesignates present section 208 as 211.

Clause (3) (A) of section 1 amends section 302 (f), relating to quarters allowance, by striking out the table therein and replacing it with a new table reflecting the 2 new commissioned officer pay grades (O-10 and O-9) established by new section 201 of the act, and the 2 new enlisted pay grades (E-9 and E-8) established by new section 203 of the act.

Clause (3) (B) of section 1 amends section 302 (h) relating to quarters allowance for enlisted members, to reflect the two new enlisted pay grades (E-9 and E-8) established by new section 203 of the act.

Clause (3) (C) of section 1 amends the 10th sentence of section 303 (c) by striking out the reference to section 201 (e) and inserting in place thereof a reference to new section 204 which contains the provisions presently in section 201 (d) (formerly (e)).

Clause (3) (D) of section 1 amends section 304 (c) by inserting a reference to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, thereby providing for him the personal money allowance of $4,000 a year now provided for the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Air Force, Chief of Naval Operations, Commandants of the Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Clause (4) (A) of section 1 amends section 501 (d) by strikng out the reference to section 204 and inserting in place thereof references to section 207, which is present section 204 as renumbered.

Clause (4) (B) of section 1 amends section 508 by striking out the words "basic pay" and inserting the words "base rate" in place thereof, and by striking out the words "with under 2 cumulative years' service," as the intent of section 508 is to provide cadets and midshipmen with pay at the lowest rate of pay grade O-1. The above changes are necessary to reflect the change in basic pay computation from cumulative years of service to years in pay grade.

Section 2 amends the tables contained in section 1 (c) of the act of May 19, 1952, relating to temporary basic allowances for quarters for enlisted members, to reflect the two new enlisted pay grades (E-9 and E-8) established by new section 203 of the act and provides for those pay grades the same allowance as prescribed for pay grades E-4 through E-7.

Section 3 provides, in general, a method of converting, over a 3-year period after the effective date of this act, the basic pay, or compensation based thereon, of members of the uniformed services from the rates in effect on the day before the effective date of this act to those prescribed in sections 201-203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act.

Subsection (a) provides that an enlisted member who was a member of a uniformed service on the effective date of this act (except an aviation cadet) and who had more than 2 cumulative years of service on the day before the effective date of this act is entitled to either (1) a 6-percent increase in basic pay computed at the rate in effect under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 before the effective date of this act, or (2) the rate prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, whichever is higher.

Subsection (b) provides that—

(1) an officer with more than 2 cumulative years of service on the day before the effective date of this act, and who was a member of a uniformed service on the effective date of this act, will be entitled to have his pay increased by 6 percent; or

(2) if, after that officer's pay has been increased by 6 percent, the rate he would receive is still less than the applicable rate for his grade and years of service in grade, prescribed in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, the officer will be entitled to receive during the first year the dollar amount prescribed in the "1st year" column of the table set forth therein in lieu of such 6 percent increase.

Cadets of the United States Military Academy, Air Force Academy, or Coast Guard Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, aviation cadets, and contract surgeons are not affected by this section. Their pay will be computed at the rates prescribed in sections 203 (c) and 508 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, and section 504 of that act, as the case may be.

The amounts shown in the table are cumulative. They represent that maximum increase that may be paid to the member over the amount he was entitled to receive on the day before the effective date of this act. At the beginning of the fourth year following the effective date of this act, any difference that might remain between the "then" pay of the member and the applicable rate in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, is added so as to put the member on the full rate.

An officer entering a basic pay status for the first time during the 3-year period beginning with the effective date of this act (or who, if he was a member of a uniformed service on the effective date of this act, had less than 2 cumulative years of service) will be entitled to basic pay computed at the rates in effect on the day before the effective date of this act increased by the applicable amount set forth in the table in section 3 (b) of this act (depending upon the year following the date of enactment of this act that he becomes entitled to basic pay).

Subsection (c) provides that a member's cumulative years of service for the computation of basic pay under this section (including entitlement to the 6 percent increase) are frozen as of the day before the effective date of this act. Such a provision is necessary to prevent inequities and inconsistencies which would otherwise arise during the phase-in period in computing the pay of officers upon promotion.

Subsection (d) is a savings provision. It provides that if the rate of basic pay to which a member was entitled on the day before the effective date of this act, and increased, in the case of a member with more than two cumulative years of service on the day before the effective date of this act, by 6 percent, is more than the applicable rate otherwise prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, the member is entitled to the higher rate. It is intended that his pay continue to be so saved until that saved rate is less than the applicable rate of pay prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, for a member of his grade and years of service in that grade or until he is reduced in pay grade for inefficiency or disciplinary reasons. If he is reduced for other reasons, it is intended that his basic pay be (1) the rate in effect on the day before the effective date of this act, applied to him as if it were in effect at the time of his reduction in grade, and increased by 6 percent, or (2) the applicable rate prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, whichever is higher. It is further provided that a member is no longer entitled to the benefits of this section if, at any time during his coverage by it, he ceases to be a member of a uniformed service for a period of more than 4 months.

Subsection (e) is also a savings provision. It applies only to medical, dental, and veterinary officers. Since the rates of special pay provided by section 206 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, are less in some cases than the rates previously authorized, such an officer could, in the absence of this subsection, be entitled to less total pay during the 3-year period beginning with the effective date of this act. This subsection is intended to prevent any reduction in the total pay which these officers were receiving on the day before the effective date of this act (with basic pay increased under subsection (b)).

Subsection (f) provides that a member, who on the day before the effective date of this act is under competent orders requiring the performance of hazardous duty and the rate of his incentive pay for that duty on that date is higher than that provided for him under this act, continues to be entitled to the higher rate, whenever he is entitled to incentive pay under those orders, based on his cumulative years of service on the day before the effective date of this act. However, this subsection no longer applies to him after such date as the rate of incentive pay for his grade under this act is higher, because of increased years of service in pay grade, or after there is a change in his pay grade. For example, a qualified submarine officer who is away from his duty station on leave for a period of more than 15 days, although not entitled to incentive pay for that period of absence, would remain under orders for that duty and would be covered by this subsection.

Subsection (g) lists the categories of persons to whom the savings provisions in subsection (f) apply, as follows:

(1) To persons who are members of the uniformed services on the effective date of this act.

(2) To enlisted members whose enlistments terminated during the period between the date of enactment and the effective date of this act and who reenlist within 3 months after that termination.

Section 4 provides, in general, the rules for computing increased retired pay for members of the uniformed services who are—

(1) retired before the effective date of this act, serve a continuous period of at least 1 year on active duty, and are released from that duty on or after the effective date of this act; or

(2) retired during the 3-year period described in section 3 (b) of this act.

Subsection (a) provides that, except for persons covered by subsection (b), the changes in rates of basic pay made by this act do not apply in computing the retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, equivalent pay, severance pay, or readjustment payments, authorized under any law, or the pay provided by section 680 of title 10, United States Code, section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (37 U. S. C. 33 (c)), or section 219 (c) of the Public Health Service Act, of any person who became entitled to that pay or those payments before the effective date of this act.

Subsection (b) provides that, if a member entitled to retired pay before the effective

date of this act performs continuous active duty for at least 1 year after being retired, and, if his release from that active duty takes place any time on or after the effective date of this act, he may elect to have his retired pay recomputed on the basis of the applicable rates prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act.

Subsection (c) applies to officers who become entitled to retired pay, severance pay, or readjustment payments authorized under any law; or the term retention pay provided by section 680 of title 10, United States Code; or pay provided by section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (37 U. S. C. 33 (c)), or section 219 (c) of the Public Health Service Act; during the period beginning with the effective date of this act and ending before the fourth year after that date. It provides that, subject to subsection (d), such pay or payments will be based on the monthly basic pay to which he was entitled on the day he became entitled to such pay or payments.

Subsection (d) provides, in effect, that, for members in grades O–5 through O–8 (whose pay under section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, consists in part of an "active-duty supplement"), any increases in basic pay received during the 3-year period beginning with the effective date of this act, will be held as first applying to bring his basic pay up to the applicable rate prescribed in that section. Thus, any increases in basic pay received by the member, up to the applicable rate prescribed in section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, would be included in computing the retired pay of the member if he should retire before being fully phased-in under the table set forth in section 3 (b) of this act.

Section 4 (e) is a savings clause. It restates, without substantive change, the rule presently contained in the proviso of section 202 of the Career Compensation Act granting 30 years of service, for the purpose of computing retired pay, to certain members who received double-time credit toward retirement because of service outside the continental limits of the United States between 1898 and 1912.

Section 5 amends title 10, United States Code, as follows:

Clause (1) of section 5 amends section 555 (a) by striking out the reference to section 232 (a) of title 37, since the source statute for that section (section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949) is repealed and replaced by section 1 of this act, and inserts a reference to the replacement section (202 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act).

Clause (2) (A) of section 5 amends section 679 to accomplish the following:

Subsection (a) authorizes the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into contracts with Reserve officers under their jurisdiction to serve on active duty for the period of time which the Secretary concerned determines necessary to meet the needs of his service, but not less than 2 years. This authority would not apply in time of war, or of national emergency declared after January 1, 1953, or to officers of the Medical or Dental Corps of the Army or Navy, the Veterinary Corps of the Army, or medical, dental, or veterinary officers of the Air Force.

Subsection (b) provides that a contract may not be made with a Reserve officer unless he has served on active duty for at least 2 years.

Subsection (c) provides that each contract shall provide than an officer may not be released from active duty without his consent during the period of the contract (1) because of a reduction in, or redistribution of, personnel strength, except upon the recommendation of a board of officers appointed by an authority designated by the Secretary concerned to determine officers to be released from active duty; or (2) for any other reason, without an opportunity, if he so requests, to be heard by a board of officers before the release. This requirement does not apply if the officer is dismissed or discharged under sentence of a court-martial; released because of unexplained absence without leave for at least 3 months; or released because he is convicted and sentenced to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution and the sentence has become final.

Subsection (d) provides that these contracts will be subject to such policies, procedures, and controls as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for the armed forces under his jurisdiction or by the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy.

Subsection (e) provides that these contracts terminate when a war or national emergency occurs and that the officer concerned may be kept on active duty during a war or emergency without his consent as otherwise provided by law.

Clause (2) (B) of section 5 amends section 680 to accomplish the following:

Subsection (a) provides that, except as provided in subsection (b), a Reserve officer who performs active duty under a contract made under section 679 is entitled to term retention pay for that active duty if he completes the prescribed period of active duty; is involuntarily released from active duty before the expiration of the specified period; or a war or national emergency occurs before he completes the specified period. However, he is not entitled to term retention pay if his involuntary release is for physical disability resulting from his intentional misconduct or willful neglect or for moral or professional dereliction.

Subsection (b) sets forth the circumstances under which an officer under contract may be eligible for term retention pay. These circumstances are—

(1) release for appointment in a regular component;

(2) release for a reason described in section 679 (c) (2) (A)–(C) (dismissal or discharge under court-martial sentence; release for unexplained absence without leave for at least 3 months; or release for conviction and sentence to confinement in penitentiary or correctional institution and the sentence is final); or

(3) eligibility for retired pay under any provision of law, or for severance pay for physical disability.

Subsection (c) is the formula for computing term retention pay. The officer's years of service (but not more than 12) under contract are multiplied by 2 months' basic pay to which he was entitled on the date of termination of his last contract, thus providing for up to 2 years' pay at the rate he was receiving on the date of that termination. If he dies after completing his contractual service, but before being paid for it, payment is made to his beneficiaries in the manner prescribed in the act of July 12, 1955, for the payment of deceased officers' pay accounts. In all other cases, payment is made only to the living officer and is payable at the time he is released from active duty.

Subsection (d) provides that service credited under subsection (c) may not be credited in computing readjustment pay under section 265 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952. However, that service shall be credited to him in determining, under that section, the years of continuous active duty necessary for eligibility for that pay. It further provides that the total amount of payments made to him under section 680 and under section 265 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 may not be more than 2 years' basic pay at the rate to which he was entitled on the date he was last relieved from active duty.

Subsection (e) provides for the monthly deduction of an amount sufficient to recover, during the life expectancy of the officer, any term retention payments made to him if—

(1) he later qualifies for retired pay under any provision of title 10 except chapter 67 (retired pay for nonregular service at age 60); or

(2) he later qualifies for compensation under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration for a disability incurred during a period for which he received that term retention pay.

The deduction may not be more, in any one month, than 25 percent of the officer's monthly retired pay or monthly compensation. In addition, this subsection provides that there shall be deducted from any severance pay to which an officer who received term retention pay is entitled an amount equal to that received as term retention pay.

Clause (2) (C) of section 5 is a technical amendment to reflect, in the analysis of chapter 37 of title 10, the sections of that title amended by clauses (2) (A) and (B).

Clause (2) (D) of section 5 is a savings provision to the effect that clauses (2) (A)–(C) do not affect the rights or benefits of any person who entered into a contract under section 679 as it existed before the enactment of this act. However, that person may rescind a contract entered into before the enactment of this act in order to enter into a contract under those sections as restated in this act. If he rescinds the old contract and enters into a new one within 1 year after the date of eactment of this act, the new contract is effective as of that date.

Clause (3) of section 5 adds a new section 1405 to list the service which may be used in determining years of service for the computation of retired pay. The provisions of law mentioned in the new section 1405 presently authorize retired pay to be computed on the basis of cumulative years of service for basic pay purposes under present section 202 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. However, under that act, as amended by this act, basic pay will henceforth be computed on the basis of years of service in grade rather than cumulative years of service, and present section 202 is eliminated from the act. In order to allow the computation of retired pay to continue to include this service without change, the new section 1405 of title 10 restates, for the purposes of computing retired pay under the sections set forth therein, the substance of the rules presently contained in section 202 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Clause (4) of section 5 adds a new item to the analysis of chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, to reflect the new section added by clause (3) above.

Clause (5), (6), (8)–(10), (16), and (20)–(22) of section 5 amend various sections of title 10, United States Code, relating to the computation of retired pay. As presently written, these sections refer to years of service used in computing basic pay. The amendments strike out these references and insert references to section 1405 of title 10, because, as explained in clause (3) above, the years of service creditable for the computation of retired pay are now set forth in that section.

Clause (6) (see clause (5)).

Clause (7) of section 5 amends section 3536 (b) by striking out the reference to service credit for the computation of pay of the leader of the Army Band as, under section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, basic pay is computed on the basis of years of service rather than cumulative years of service.

Clause (8) (see clause (5)).

Clause (9) (see clause (5)).

Clause (10) (see clause (5)).

Clauses (11), (12), (23), and (24) of section 5 amend sections 3991 and 8991 to provide that the retired pay of an enlisted member of the Army or Air Force, respectively, will be computed on the basis of the pay to which he was entitled on the date of his retirement, rather than that to which he was entitled on the date of application for retirement, or the pay of his retired grade, as presently written. The purpose of the change is to assure that enlisted members who are serving in a pay grade that is higher than their enlisted grade will have their retired pay computed on the basis of that pay grade.

Clause (12) (see clause (11)).

Clauses (13) and (25) of section 5 amend sections 4385 (c) and 9385 (c) by deleting therefrom the words "(under 4 months)". These sections, dealing with attendance of members of Reserve officer training corps units at camps, authorize them to be paid at the lowest enlisted rate. Under present section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, that rate is "E-1 (under 4 months)". The amendment made by this clause conforms to that rate (E-1) as set forth in the new section 203 of that act.

Clause (14) of section 5 repeals the last sentence of section 5596 (f). This provision saved for enlisted members and warrant officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who are temporarily appointed to officer grades the pay and allowances that they were receiving before that temporary appointment if that pay and allowances are greater than that which they would have received as officers. The pay and allowances of persons appointed under this section before the effective date of this act is specifically saved by section 6 of this act.

Clause (15) of section 5 repeals the last sentence of section 5597 (h). For explanation see clause (14).

Clause (16) (see clause (5)).

Clause (17) of section 5 amends section 6221 (b), relating to the pay of the leader of the Navy Band, to delete therefrom reference to service which may be credited for pay purposes. The deleted language is no longer necessary as, under section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, his pay is based on years of service in pay grade, rather than cumulative years of service.

Clause (18) of section 5 amends section 6326 (c) (2) to provide that the retired pay of enlisted members of the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps will be computed on the basis of the pay grade in which serving on date of retirement, rather than on the rate of pay of the grade in which retired, as presently written. The purpose of this change is to assure that enlisted members who are serving in a pay grade which is higher than their enlisted grade, will have their retired pay computed on the basis of that pay grade.

Clause (19) of section 5 amends section 6969 (b), relating to the pay of the leader of the Naval Academy Band, to delete therefrom reference to service which may be credited for pay purposes. The deleted language is no longer necessary as, under section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, his pay is based on years of service in pay grade, rather than cumulative years of service.

Clause (20) (see clause (5)).

Clause (21) (see clause (5)).

Clause (22) (see clause (5)).

Clause (23) (see clause (11)).

Clause (24) (see clause (11)).

Clause (25) (see clause (13)).

Section 6 is a saving provision to protect the pay and allowances of members of the Navy or Marine Corps temporarily appointed as officers before the effective date of this Act.

Section 7 amends section 501 (b) (2) of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that no person will be paid mustering-out pay under that Act if he receives term retention pay under this Act.

Section 8 amends section 423 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the computation of retired pay of members of the Coast Guard. As amended, the section provides for that pay to be computed on the basis of years of service computed under section 1405 of title 10, rather than on the basis of cumulative years of service for pay purposes as presently written. As added by section 5 (3) of this Act, section 1405 contains, for retired pay purposes, the substance of the service computation provisions presently contained in section 202 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, but deleted therefrom by section 1 (2) of this bill as basic pay will no longer be based on cumulative years of service.

Section 9 amends the act of June 3, 1948, relating to the computation of retired pay of members of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the same respects and for the same reasons as the amendment made by section 8 above for the Coast Guard.

Section 10 is a series of technical amendments to the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act to change the references therein to sections of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 which are amended by section 1 of this act.

Section 11 amends section 265 (a) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, relating to the computation of readjustment payments for Reserve members involuntarily released from active duty, to provide for that pay being computed on the basis of the pay to which the member was entitled when released, rather than the pay of the grade in which he was serving at the time of release. Under title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, it is possible for certain members to be entitled to the pay of a pay grade which is higher than that in which the grade in which they are serving is distributed. The amendment made by this section conforms the subject act to the Career Compensation Act, as amended by this act.

Section 12 amends the Public Health Service Act in the following respects:

Clause (1) amends section 207 (d) (1) to delete therefrom words relating to cumulative years of service credited, upon appointment under section 207 (a), for the purposes of basic pay. Under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, those words are unnecessary as basic pay is based on years of service in grade rather than cumulative years of service. In addition, the reference to section 207 (d) (2) is deleted since that part is repealed by clause (2) of this section.

Clause (2) repeals section 207 (d) (2) and redesignates section 207 (d) (3) and (4) as 207 (d) (2) and (3). The repealed part deals with service credit for cumulative years of service for basic pay purposes and is no longer necesary for the reasons explained above.

Clause (3) amends section 210 (g) by striking out the words "active duty pay" and "pay" and inserting the words "basic pay" in place thereof to conform to the terminology of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Clause (4) amends section 211 by striking out the words "active pay," "pay," and "active-duty pay" and inserting the words "basic pay" in place thereof to conform to the terminology of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Clause (5) amends section 221 (a) to preserve the applicability of the substance of the rule presently in section 202 (a) (7) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, which limits its applicability to officers of the Public Health Service who are commissioned as medical or dental officers. Section 207 (a) (7) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 is repealed by this act and restated in substance by section 5 (3) of this act which adds a new section 1405 to title 10, United States Code.

Subsection (b) repeals all provisions of law which before the effective date of this act authorized the credit of years of service for the purposes of pay and pay period, longevity pay, or basic pay for officers appointed in the senior assistant grade or above in the regular corps of the Public Health Service. The repealed provisions are unnecessary as, under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act, basic pay is based on years of service in grade rather than cumulative years of service. It is further provided that the credits previously authorized under the repealed provisions shall lapse.

Section 13 amends section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by striking out the words "base and longevity pay," and inserting the words "basic pay" in place thereof, to conform to the terminology of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act.

Section 14 provides that the Secretary of Commerce will prescribe the pay and allowances for certain administrative enrollees who are part of the academic staff and supporting services of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, who are not members of the uniformed services but whose compensation is assimilated to the pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services.

Section 15 repeals section 110 of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, relating to the pay of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the Deputy Surgeon General, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Chief of the Bureau of Medical Services and the Bureau of State Services. The pay of these officers will, after 3 years from the effective date of this act, be covered by section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by this act.

Section 16 provides that, except for sections 1 (3) (D), 5 (2), and 15, the effective date of this act is July 1, 1958. Section 5 (2) (relating to term retention contracts for Reserve officers) becomes effective on the date of enactment of this act. Sections 1 (3) (D) (relating to the personal money allowance of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service) and 15 (repealing present provisions of law relating to his salary) are repealed as of July 1, 1961 (the date of full implementation of the pay provisions of this act).

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce for proper reference a bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to clarify the requirements, when the collateral offered represents liens on grazing lands, in the case of loans made by national banks.

Less than a year ago a series of bank mergers in several of the intermountain States, including my own State of Utah resulted in the acquisition of many local banks in rural areas by national banks. In the granting of loans now, these "new national banks" are subject to Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act which defines the type of security these banks may accept on loans.

Where land is given as security, Section 24 requires that it be improved real estate, including improved farmland and improved business and residential properties.

By letter under date of April 2, 1957, Mr. Ray M. Gidney, Comptroller of the Currency, informed me "that grazing or

rangeland—which has no improvements thereon—is not improved real estate. It follows that loans made primarily on the security of unimproved grazing or rangeland do not conform to section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act." This interpretation is provided for in the Comptroller's Circular Opinion No. 2050–C and is followed by all national banks.

Until the mergers I referred to a moment ago were consummated, the acquired local banks had accepted, as a regular course of business, liens on grazing lands as security for loans to local ranchers and stockmen. The agricultural economy of the intermountain States is primarily a livestock economy, dependent upon open rangeland for animal forage during many months of the year.

As you know, Mr. President, most of the Western States, particularly the intermountain States, are range States. By that I mean that a large percentage of the total land area is classified as rangeland. In Utah, for example, 88 percent of the land is rangeland. On this land, forage production is very small per acre, and although the area is large in total acreage, it produces normally only about one-half of the required livestock forage.

On the other hand, the acreage of irrigated lands is small. On these lands are produced a wide variety of cultivated crops, including forage crops, grasses, wild hay, pasture and alfalfa, and feed grains, such as barley, oats, and corn. These crops are used to provide feed during the winter when rangelands cannot sustain the animal population.

Much of the saleable land in many of our western counties is rangeland. Security in the form of improved real estate, as it relates to agriculture, in many areas is now limited to irrigated or dry farming lands as a result of these bank mergers. If this is not changed to include improved grazing land, it will work extreme hardship upon our livestock people in areas of the West now serviced only by national banks and other banks, subject to the lending provisions of the Federal Reserve Act.

Good grazing lands, Mr. President, often are the most liquid assets which ranchers have at their disposal. Appraisers who work for these local banks, which in the past could accept such lands as security for loans, have always kept the value of these lands low enough to make them good security.

In light of these facts, Mr. President, the bill I have sent to the desk amends section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to provide that the term "improved real estate" as security for national bank loans, shall include grazing lands. But in order to insure beyond any question of a doubt that such grazing lands are sound collateral, eligibility is limited to those, first, lands on which the owner or lessee has carried out range improvements under a program of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service or the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, or as a member of a local conservation district; or second, those lands on which the owner or lessee has expended money in carrying out range management or soil conservation practices recognized and approved by a county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee, the local representative of the Soil Conservation Service, or the county agricultural extension agent.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks, together with a letter to me from the Comptroller of the Currency, dated April 2, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3083) to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to clarify the requirements of such section in the case of loans made by national banks when the collateral offered represents liens on grazing lands, introduced by Mr. WATKINS was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C. 371) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'improved real estate' shall include grazing lands (1) on which the owner or lessee has carried out range improvements under a program of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service or the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, or as a member of a local soil conservation district, or (2) on which the owner or lessee has expended money in carrying out range management or soil conservation practices recognized and approved by a county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee, the local representative of the Soil Conservation Service, or the county agriculture extension agent."

The letter presented by Mr. WATKINS is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,
*Washington, April 2, 1958.*

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 26, 1957, advising us of the letters you have received from livestock people in your State relative to the question of obtaining loans from national banks when the collateral offered represents liens on grazing lands.

Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U. S. C. 371) provides in part that any national banking association may make real-estate loans secured by first liens upon improved real estate, including improved farm land and improved business and residential properties. Our real-estate loan circular furnished to all national banks, a copy of which is enclosed, contains a résumé of the general conditions which national banks are expected to follow in making loans secured by real estate and does not attempt to describe the conditions to be followed covering every type of loan secured by collateral, a part of which may represent a lien on real estate.

Loans are frequently made by national banks on the security of a chattel mortgage or other lien upon cattle or sheep. In order to be certain of pasturage in the event it should become necessary to take possession of the cattle or sheep, the bank may wish to take a mortgage on the borrower's grazing area which might be unimproved land or a leasehold interest. If the mortgage is taken by the bank to protect itself against such a contingency, it would not be necessary to apply the requirements of section 24. In such a case we would consider that the national bank making a loan secured by a lien on livestock is taking the lien on grazing land out of an abundance of caution in order to strengthen the primary security and to protect the loan against some unfavorable contingency. Of course, the primary responsibility for making a loan and any decision relative to the collateral which may be required of a particular borrower are matters which must be determined by the board of directors of the bank.

In a case where the lien on real estate is not taken out of an abundance of caution as additional security to protect the primary security for a loan, and the bank decides to make a loan in reliance upon a real-estate lien, the loan is a real-estate loan which must conform to the restrictions and limitations of section 24. Whether any piece of real estate is improved within the meaning of section 24 is almost wholly a question of fact and opinion as the term "improved real estate" is subject to varied interpretations. The nature of the improvements must be taken into consideration.

A parcel of land would be considered as improved real estate where it forms merely a part of the farm and is used for pasture. If the land or a greater part thereof is under cultivation as a farm, it is considered as improved real estate under the law even though no buildings have been erected thereon. If the land or a greater portion thereof is not under cultivation as a farm, it would be considered as improved if it had improvements of a permanent nature thereon such as a dwelling or other insurable improvements. However, it is the opinion of this office that grazing or range land (which has no improvements thereon) is not improved real estate. It follows that loans made primarily on the security of unimproved grazing or range land do not conform to section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act.

We shall be pleased to consider any further questions you may have in respect to this subject.

Sincerely yours,

R. M. GIDNEY,
*Comptroller of the Currency.*

---

## LIMITATION OF AMOUNT OF PRICE-SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO PRODUCERS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in February 1956 I introduced a bill, S. 3126, which would have limited price support, determined on the basis of the support price, to $50,000. The Senate Agricultural Committee neither reported out the bill nor included provision for such a limitation in the first major price-support bill, S. 3183, which came before the Senate for debate that year.

During the course of that debate, the Senate did, however, consider several amendments of this nature. First, we considered the $25,000 limitation contained in the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to which he later offered an amendment raising the limitation to $50,000, per my suggestion as contained in the amendment I had planned to offer. Second, the Senate later adopted the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to that offered by the senior Senator from Delaware, putting the limitation at $100,000.

Upon completion of debate on S. 3183, it was laid aside, and the House passed bill, H. R. 12, amended so as to contain the essence of S. 3183, was passed by the Senate. However, as H. R. 12 emerged from the conference committee, it did not contain the Williams-Watkins-Russell price-support-limitation amendment.

Since that time I have had occasion to study this matter again. I still believe that the Senate was right in amending H. R. 12 so as to provide for a limitation on price-support assistance, and I think that it ought to again address itself to this matter. For this reason, Mr. President, I send to the desk for proper reference a bill which would limit the total amount of price support to $50,000, which can be made available to any person, as defined in the bill, by the Commodity Credit Corporation or other agency of the United States Department of Agriculture.

While I voted for the Russell amendment, I did so at the time not because I believed that the $50,000 limitation I had originally proposed would not do the job, but because under the circumstance it seemed necessary to support the higher figure if any limitation at all was to be adopted.

Mr. President, the lack of a limitation upon the amount of price support assistance a farmer can receive gives, in my opinion, unnecessary financial assistance to a great many of the 134,041 farms which, according to the last agricultural census sold farm commodities valued at $25,000 or more. While it is clear that during certain marketing periods even these farms may need some price support assistance, it is equally clear that many of them simply do not need unlimited price support assistance, and some none at all.

The American people are getting tired of hearing about farmers defaulting on one-, two-, and three-hundred-thousand-dollar nonrecourse commodity loans. Especially is this true when it appears unlikely that a realistic limitation of $50,000 would materially affect the market price if all the wheat producers, for example, who get over that amount each year decided not to comply with the acreage eligibility requirements and raised all they physically could plant and harvest.

For example, in 1953 out of some 541,000 wheat loans, only 1,400 involved loan amounts exceeding $25,000. Since these 1,400 loans involved only 29 million bushels out of a total United States production of 1.1 billion bushels, it is unlikely, had these growers all stayed out of the support program, even had controls been in effect, that their total production would have materially affected adversely the market price.

The same appears to be true with respect to other crops. In 1953, for example, only 10 of the 43,000 loans on oats were in amounts exceeding $25,000. These 10 loans were on some 294,000 bushels out of a total production of 1.2 billion bushels. Had these 10 remained outside the program, any increased production, due to this fact on their parts, with or without cross-compliance, could not have affected the market price one iota.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I submit that the figure $50,000 as a limitation is realistic. It fits the situation, and will not tempt farmers in large enough numbers to ignore participation in the programs and thus adversely affect the market price by substantially increasing total production of the crop in question.

At the same time, it will place the emphasis where it is needed, namely upon the family-type farm. The size of the limitation proposed gives full protection to efficiently operated family-type farms. On the other hand, it will stop unlimited assistance to those nonfamily type corporation farms which simply do not require public assistance and whose activities in or out of the program cannot adversely affect the market price.

Mr. President, because the Department of Agriculture's position on this matter is reflected in a letter to me dated December 23, 1957, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a copy of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3084) to limit the amount of price-support payments which may be made to producers of agricultural commodities, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such title a new section as follows:

"SEC. 421. The total amount of price support made available under this Act to any person for any year through loans to such person, or through purchases made by Commodity Credit Corporation, or other agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, from such person, shall not exceed $50,000. The term 'person' shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. In the event of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing association, such limitation shall apply to the amount of price support made available through such cooperative association to each person. The limitation herein on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchases of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitations."

(b) The amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to 1958 and succeeding years.

The letter presented by Mr. WATKINS is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D. C., December 23, 1957.*

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: This is in reply to your inquiry of November 14 concerning the Department's position on legislation which would limit the amount of price support given to an individual producer.

We favor passage of legislation of this type. As your letter indicates, such legislation would be in accord with the President's farm program message of January 9, 1956. In that message the President requested Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price support loans to any one individual or farming unit at a level sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms.

However, we have no specific recommendation as to the level at which this limit should be established. In testifying before Congress on this subject on several different occasions, we have pointed out that we feel that the specific level selected should be determined by the Congress.

We would have no objection to the $50,000 limit established in your proposed bill.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
*Acting Secretary.*

## AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security program to bring the law more closely into line with present-day living costs and the needs of working people for their retirement programs.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a statement summarizing the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3086) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to raise the amount of insurance benefits payable thereunder, provide full benefits for women at age 62, raise the maximum amount of annual earnings with respect to which benefits thereunder may be based, provide for hospitalization insurance, eliminate any age requirement for eligibility for disability insurance benefits, provide insurance benefits for dependents of disabled individuals, and to otherwise revise, improve, and liberalize the insurance system established by such title, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. PROXMIRE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE

1. Raise benefits for everyone by an average of about 12 percent. This would boost the smallest payments by 17 percent—from $30 to $35. The top payment, which under present regulations is based on annual earnings of $4,200 or more, would be raised from $108.50 a month for a single person to $120.70, and from $162.75 to $181.05 for a married couple. Widows with children would receive still higher benefits.

Another provision (No. 8 below) would enable people whose earnings have averaged above $4,200 a year to earn retirement benefits more in line with their normal living expenses. By increasing the wage base to a maximum of $7,500 a year, the maximum would be increased to $181.20 for a single person or $271.80 for a married couple.

2. Allow social-security pensioners to earn $1,500 a year instead of the present limit of $1,200.

3. Sixty days of free hospitalization per year for persons receiving social security. We can no longer ignore the medical plight of the aged, who are generally unable to

buy private medical insurance. This feature is badly needed. It will be paid for out of the social-security fund, like all the other provisions.

4. Make women eligible for full benefits at 62. They now must take reduced benefits for life if they start receiving benefits at 62. Older women have a tougher time than men in the job market. Also, since most wives are several years younger than their husbands, this provision would make it possible for more couples to retire on full benefits when the husband reaches 65.

5. Remove the age requirement for disability. At present a person must be 50 to receive disability benefits. But a younger man who becomes disabled often has even greater financial responsibilities, since he probably has a growing family. Under this bill, he would be eligible for social-security disability benefits at the time of his disability, regardless of his age, and could also receive benefits for dependents. The law now provides that a person cannot collect benefits for dependents until he becomes 65.

6. Increase widow's benefits from 75 percent of their husband's allowance to 85 percent.

7. Allow a 4-percent increase in benefits for each year worked past the eligibility age. This would reward those who continue to work and pay into the fund. It might actually save the Government money.

8. Raise the wage base from $4,200 to $7,500. This is a revenue-producing feature which would cover the cost of many of the improved benefits. As it stands, a worker pays and receives social security only on the first $4,200 of his income. If he earns $4,200, his maximum retirement benefits are now 31 percent of his previous income. But if he earns $7,500, his benefits will be no higher—and will amount to only 17 percent of his previous income. By raising the wage base, this worker's benefits will be increased to 20 percent of his previous income.

9. More liberal system for computing farmers' income. The farmer would be allowed to disregard the recent years of unnaturally low farm income in establishing his base for benefits.

10. Allow a wage earner, in computing average income, to disregard one low-income year for every seven worked.

11. Remove the reduction in benefits that now applies if one receives veterans' or other benefits in addition to social security. Retirement benefits are not now reduced, and neither should disability benefits be.

12. Increase social-security payments from 2¼ percent of wages to 3 percent for both employer and employee, with a comparable increase for the self-employed.

These 12 important points will take a big step forward in improving the social security system and bringing it up to present-day living costs and retirement standards for our older citizens. They can be carried out without impairing the self-supporting character of the social security system.

But they do not do nearly enough to take care of the needs of many thousands of our older people who, through no fault of their own, were unable to earn adequate retirement benefits to support themselves decently in their old age. It is a shame for a country as rich as ours to expect elder citizens to exist on social security payments as low as $30 a month.

I am sponsoring and supporting additional legislation to give special help to people who cannot receive adequate retirement and survivors benefits under the social-security system.

(1) A food-stamp plan. I have introduced a bill to provide for a food-stamp plan which will enable older persons and others living on low incomes to buy all the food they need at greatly reduced cost—down to as little as one-quarter of the retail price. For just 40 percent of their total income or one-quarter of the retail cost, whichever is greater, people living on low incomes would be able to buy all the food they need for good, wholesome, health-conserving diets.

(2) A special amendment to liberalize the public-assistance law has been introduced in the House by a strong group of Democratic Congressmen, headed by JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, and in the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. I will vote for this bill when it reaches the floor.

This bill will improve public assistance for the blind, needy aged, physically handicapped, and dependent children. It will permit earnings of up to $600 a year without losing benefits, and will permit ownership of a $5,000 home free of lien.

(3) A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of residence. At present many deserving persons are denied public assistance even when they are in the most terrible need, just because they haven't lived in their particular State long enough to meet eligibility requirements set up by some of the State governments, including Wisconsin's. I am sponsoring a bill to put a stop to this inhuman discrimination.

---

## ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL PARK AT FORT CLATSOP, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on July 12, 1955, it was my pleasure to introduce a bill for myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] to authorize a study of the feasibility of including old Fort Clatsop, near Astoria, Oreg., among the historic shrines of national importance. Our bill was enacted. The study has been completed and favorably reported on by the Secretary of the Interior, and I am introducing proposed legislation today establishing the Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the vicinity where the intrepid adventurers, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, ended their westward trek which brought the American flag overland across the continent for the first time in 1805. I introduce the bill for myself and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The story of the Lewis and Clark Expedition always has been a source of great inspiration. Its great significance in our national heritage should be firmly established for future generations. Certainly in all history, few explorations resulted in greater fruits of discovery. Their efforts affirmed the claim of the United States on the unmapped western hinterlands. Their boots scuffed the first American pathways across mountain, plain, and desert so that eventually our flag could bridge the span from Atlantic to Pacific Ocean.

Indeed, the challenge faced by the junior Army officers, Lewis and Clark, and their band of men when they headed westward from St. Louis into unknown and hostile wilderness is not unlike the situation which confronts the Nation today, as we peer into the mysterious voids of the space age. Those on the expedition of 1805–1806 suffered hunger, thirst, cold, and sickness. The threat of attack hovered on the trek toward their westward goal. Beset by all the adversities that try the bodies and minds of men, they refused to abandon their purposes and objectives. They exhibited courage, skill, and determination. It would be wise, as we wrestle with the problems of atoms and missiles, to memorialize at Fort Clatsop the moral values symbolized by the Lewis and Clark Expedition. It would be well for us of this generation to be reminded that the growth and strength of the Nation was not achieved without hardship and sacrifice, nor can it be maintained without recognizing that these conditions often are the unrelenting price levied for human advancement.

The efforts of many individuals and organizations preceded the favorable report of the Park Service on establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial. The persistence of such men as Mr. Thomas Vaughan, of the Oregon Historical Society, and Mr. Burnby M. Bell, of the Clatsop County Historical Society, made possible much of the support for proper recognition of the Lewis and Clark Expedition's winter encampment at the mouth of the Columbia. They and many Oregon people who have worked with them on the Fort Clatsop project deserve grateful acknowledgment for advancing the idea of a national memorial for the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the text of the bill to authorize Fort Clatsop National Memorial.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3087) to provide for the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purpose of commemorating the culmination, and the winter encampment, of the Lewis and Clark Expedition following its successful crossing of the North American Continent, there is hereby authorized to be established, in the manner provided herein, Fort Clatsop National Memorial.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall designate for inclusion in Fort Clatsop National Memorial land and improvements thereon located in Clatsop County, Oreg., which are associated with the winter encampment of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, known as Fort Clatsop, and, also, adjacent portions of the old trail which led overland from the Fort to the coast: Provided, The total area so designated shall contain no more than 125 acres.

SEC. 3. Within the area designated pursuant to section 2, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire land and interests in land by purchase, donation, with donated funds, or by such other means as he deems to be in the public interest.

SEC. 4. Establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial shall be effected when there is vested in the United States of America, title to not less than 100 acres of land associated with the historical events to be commemorated. Following its establishment, Fort Clatsop National Memorial shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have received much personal satisfaction

in writing about the Lewis and Clark Expedition. I also have had an opportunity to write a brief article for the New York Times of November 25, 1956, telling of plans for recognition of the expedition and its valiant members at the Fort Clatsop Memorial. I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article entitled "Monument on the Pacific."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONUMENT ON THE PACIFIC—HISTORIC FORT IN OREGON MAY SOON BECOME NATIONAL SHRINE

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(NOTE.—Mr. NEUBERGER, junior United States Senator from Oregon, is author of the bill authorizing a national monument at Fort Clatsop.)

ASTORIA, OREG.—The oldest of all American settlements on the Pacific Coast soon may become the country's newest national monument. Under the terms of legislation passed by the 84th Congress, the National Park Service is presently studying the possibilities of creating a national shrine at rebuilt Fort Clatsop, near the picturesque mouth of the vast Columbia River. This was where Meriwether Lewis and William Clark spent the bleak winter of 1805–06, after they had carried the flag of the United States from St. Louis to the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

Fort Clatsop has an eminent rank in history. It was the first American military post anywhere west of St. Louis. It was the first habitation by Americans along the Pacific seaboard. It was the first edifice to house white persons in the Pacific northwest. It was where American conquest of the West began.

Last year, as part of the sesquicentennial observance of the arrival of Lewis and Clark at tidewater, Fort Clatsop was totally reconstructed on the exact site of the original post. The drawings and sketches of Lieutenant Clark, found in the expedition's journals, were followed faithfully. The famous fort is 50 by 50 feet in dimensions, with 3 rooms along 1 wall, and 4 along the other. A military parade ground occupies the center square, for the men of Lewis and Clark were enlisted in the United States Army.

COMMUNITY PROJECT

Reconstruction of Fort Clatsop was a community project. The Oregon Historical Society had strained a limited budget to obtain the site. The Crown-Zellerbach Corp. provided all the logs for the stockade and buildings. The logs were cut to the exact proportions of those described in Lieutenant Clark's 150-year-old plans. Even the flagpole was made the precise height of that from which flew the original Stars and Stripes to wave within sight of the Pacific Ocean.

In re-creating Fort Clatsop, difficulty was encountered in finding men with experience at constructing a log fort. The most skilled cabinetmakers and woodworkers did not have this type of skill. Two Finnish immigrants, recently arrived in the United States at last were discovered. They had just the talents needed.

These men, at daily carpenter's wages, undertook the major construction job. Thomas Vaughan, director of the Oregon State Historical Society, considers them actually responsible for the success of the project. Thus did two newcomers to America rebuild the oldest buildings which ever housed Americans west of St. Louis.

As a national monument, Fort Clatsop will possess many fascinating features. During the summer months of 1956, even with the most minimum sort of custodial care, more than 10,000 visitors trekked to the fort. The stockade commands a panorama of the sloughs, inlets and bays which surround the wide mouth of the Northwest's greatest river. Lofty trees of Douglas-fir form a natural fortress beyond the man-built bulwarks. On clear days, stately freighters and sleek passenger liners can be seen standing out to sea, ready to breast the Columbia's rolling bar.

STREAM NAMED FOR EXPLORERS

Fittingly, a near-by smaller stream is named the Lewis and Clark River. It meanders off into the wooded hills. In the distance bulks the 3,266-foot summit of Saddle Mountain, one of the highest peaks in the gentle Coast Range. Lewis and Clark themselves referred to this spectacular landmark in their journals, but never bestowed its nomenclature. Elk and deer inhabit the forests, and are tracked down during Oregon's hunting seasons. Indeed, the abundant supply of game induced the explorers to settle at the site of Fort Clatsop in 1805, rather than across the river in what today is the State of Washington.

The location of firepits, barbecue pits, log remains, and other remnants has left no doubt that the rebuilt structure is on the ground occupied by the original Fort Clatsop, which Capt. Meriwether Lewis named for the Clatsop Tribe of coastal Indians. Both the Oregon Historical Society and the National Park Service have taken great care to locate the site accurately.

At least $50,000 has been invested in the site and in the reconstruction of the celebrated fort. With the establishment of a national monument, Thomas Vaughn, of the historical society, believes that it will become one of the principal tourist attractions of the north Pacific seacoast.

Visitors who glimpse the reconstructed fort also will have an opportunity to savor of some of the finest boating, hiking, fishing, and surf-bathing anywhere in the West.

The spacious Clatsop beaches stretch southward for many miles from the mouth of the Columbia River. These beaches, of sand as white as glacial snow, are frequently guarded by towering headlands and lofty capes. The surf is foamingly picturesque, although often too chilly for all except the most Spartan swimmers. Back and forth across the Columbia's bar prowls the Engineer Corps dredge *Essayons*, largest in the world, deepening the river entrance to 48 feet. This has long been a goal of mariners and pilots. Peacock Spit, near the Columbia's mouth, has claimed more vessels than any other shoal off the north Pacific coast.

Astoria, a few miles from Fort Clatsop, is the principal salmon-fishing community in the Northwest. During the late summer, hordes of Chinook salmon return to the Columbia from the sea, where they may roam as far as the Kamchatka. These fish must ascend to the river's remote headwaters. There it is their destiny to spawn and then to die. They run a gantlet of sports fishermen and commercial gillnetters en route.

The Chinooks frequently weigh up to 50 or 60 pounds. Although Lewis and Clark wearied of this diet, they are among the tastiest of fish. Tourists catching a river giant like to have their salmon canned at a custom cannery, with the proud fisherman's own name on the fancy labels.

TRANSPORTATION

No railroad passenger trains serve Astoria, but there is frequent service by Greyhound buses and West Coast Airlines. The highways are excellent. U. S. 101 threads along the seacoast, hugging cliffs and looping headlands. State Route 26 twists across the Coast Range via the Wolf Creek drainage basin. The distance from Portland is 98 miles. Route 26 goes through Seaside, Oregon's most popular beach resort, which is approximately 18 miles from the site of reconstructed Fort Clatsop. Lewis and Clark strolled along the generous beaches, and distilled salt from sea water at Seaside to cure their elk steaks and roasts.

When they were in Oregon long ago, some of the argonauts of Lewis and Clark climbed a great cape back of Seaside now known as Tillamook Head. In the lonely solitude of that vast scene, they were relieved to get back to the snug coziness of their stockade of logs at Fort Clatsop. The rebuilt version of that first of all American homes in the West is being studied today by the National Park Service for establishment as a national shrine. Fort Clatsop, after all, symbolizes America's beginning as a Nation which stretches from "sea to shining sea."

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would extend the authorization for the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems. I am proposing $900 million for fiscal year 1960 for these roads and $925 million for fiscal year 1961 for the system.

I am suggesting $30 million for forest highways for fiscal years 1960 and 1961; $27 million for forest development roads for fiscal years 1960 and 1961; $16 million for national park roads and trails for fiscal years 1960 and 1961; $16 million for parkways in national parks for fiscal years 1960 and 1961; $12 million for Indian reservations and land roads for fiscal years 1960 and 1961; and $2 million for public lands roads for fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

The present act authorizes funds for the roads enumerated only through fiscal year 1959; therefore, it is necessary that steps be taken to extend the authorization for these roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3088) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Welfare.

## AMENDMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], I introduce a bill which, in effect, will restore the basic provisions of part III, which were eliminated from last year's civil rights bill.

The task of achieving full civil rights for all our people, regardless of race or color, is no less pressing this year than it was last year, when we undertook a great effort to secure the enactment of civil-rights legislation. If anything, to assure equal opportunity to all citizens is more important in the light of the stepped-up Russian challenge in the cold war. Indeed, the Russian effort in connection with earth satellites and foreign economic pentration is particularly directed toward impressing the 1 billion people of the free world in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East with communism and influencing them to reject the institutions of freedom.

While we respect the position of the administration not to seek additional civil-rights legislation at this session, we consider it our duty to press forward whenever and wherever the opportunity presents itself to strengthen the civil-rights statutes.

In my State there is a strong feeling that the civil-rights bill was inadequate. I have previously pledged this course of action, and I am following through. Experience has now clearly shown that the backing of law is needed, in order to give community action by conciliation, mediation, and technical assistance the opportunity to be effective in most cases of discrimination and segregation. We shall not solve the problems of discrimination and segregation on grounds of color, race, or religion—so harmful to our country at home and abroad—if we do not keep trying through the use of experience-tested procedures. I have great respect for the new Federal Civil Rights Commission, and believe it can render a great service by its investigations in the field. I do not believe, however, that it was created to defer the enactment of moderate laws such as that proposed by this bill, the need for the enactment of which has already been clearly demonstrated.

The bill would authorize the Attorney General, upon written complaint, to commence civil injunctive procedings against local officials who deprive, or those conspiring with those officials to deprive, a citizen of his constitutional rights to equal protection of the laws, under the 14th amendment.

In addition, the Attorney General would be granted the specific authority to commence civil action at the request of a State or municipality, where it is itself seeking to assure to the citizens their rights under the 14th amendment, but is prevented from doing so because of a conspiracy or threats of violence.

The authorization contained in this bill would permit civil action at an early date, before the situation had become dangerously acute in any locality, as it did in Little Rock. It will be recalled that the existing remedies in law are now for criminal prosecution. Practically, these are found unenforceable, because they are too stringent. Hence the need for civil remedies.

Under present law, an individual may bring such suit for civil injunction; but in many cases the individual is not financially able to commence proceedings, and the recent rash of so-called antibarratry statutes will make it increasingly difficult for those deprived of their rights to seek judicial redress. Therefore, this bill would permit the Attorney General to act upon a showing that the person about to be deprived is himself financially unable to prosecute a civil proceeding on his own behalf.

The events at Little Rock, Ark., occurred following our last session. The events at Little Rock demonstrate that in the last analysis, where local public officials seek to prevent the enjoyment of constitutional rights, the Federal Government has, as President Eisenhower has said, the "inescapable duty" to protect those rights.

The turning point at Little Rock was the fact that the court had already entered an injunction on the application of the local board of education. It was based upon the fact that other local public officials, including Governor Faubus, were violating this specific court decree, that the Federal authorities, in the person of the Attorney General and the President, had the right to intervene to protect individual Americans, as well as the community, against violence. It seems to me that this demonstrates conclusively that the Attorney General ought to have the power to get such a civil injunction decree, and should not be compelled to rely upon the happenstance that a decree to enforce civil rights has already been entered upon the suit of some individual affected or some public body. The legal situation found at Little Rock or the analogous legal situation which occurred at Clinton, Tennessee, will occur all too rarely. The protection of the civil rights of the individual should not be allowed to rest on legal accidents. Events in Little Rock in retrospect demonstrate the effectiveness of providing the right to invoke civil sanctions by the Attorney General, to assure that constitutional rights are given effect.

Mr. President, in support of the bill which I have introduced, I now quote from a memorandum prepared by Prof. Samuel Beer, of Harvard University, for a meeting in Boston of lawyers and other persons interested in this problem. In the memorandum Professor Beer stated as follows:

Part III of the original bill (H. R. 6127): authorized proceedings by the Attorney General for injunctive relief against conspiracy to interfere with civil rights, including those derived from gurantee of equal protection of the laws. As of now, an individual can seek preventive relief under title 8, United States Code, 1940 edition, sections 43 and 47 (3). But in view of the anti-NAACP laws in Southern States, a person threatened with loss of civil rights is in fact under a grave handicap. This makes it all the more desirable that the Attorney General should be able to take the initiative and intervene in such a case. It is particularly important that part III be restored.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3090) to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO BANKRUPTCY OF WHEAT FARMERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am sending to the desk on behalf of myself and 15 other Senators a bill to prevent wholesale bankruptcy of wheat farmers of the United States.

Cosponsors of the measure, from both political parties, include my colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and Senators CARROLL, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, HENNINGS, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, KERR, MAGNUSON, MORSE, PROXMIRE, YARBOROUGH, and MONRONEY.

At the request of the offices of several additional Senators who are interested in the measure, I request that the bill lie on the table through Monday, January 27, so that Senators not now cosponsoring may join in introducing it.

Mr. President, in April 1956, the President of the United States reversed a decision of the Secretary of Agriculture to cut wheat price supports to $1.81. The President himself announced a $2 support level for wheat that year. The measure I have just introduced for a large, bipartisan group continues the $2 level on the 1958 crop, canceling the announced support of only $1.78 per bushel.

Wheat farmers have overwhelmingly supported acreage allotments and indicated their readiness to accept bushel quotas on their marketings.

In the war years these farmers expanded their production beyond 75 million harvested acres to produce the wheat necessary to win the war and write the peace. Despite economic hardship, they cut their harvested acreage down to 49,784,000 acres in 1956 and by an additional 6 million acres last year. They have cut their production from 1⅓ billion bushels during the peak wartime demand to less than 1 billion bushels—only 947 million bushels—last year.

These reductions in acreage and production have been made in spite of declining price supports and economic hardship. As the President of the United States himself recognized in April 1956, the wheat farmers are in serious financial trouble. Thousands have gone broke. Thousands more—the backbone of food producers who are as essential to our security as missile makers—will go broke if the $1.78 level goes into effect.

The United States Department of Agriculture released a study earlier this month on the investment necessary to realize fixed amounts of income from farming. The study shows that some cotton farmers realize $2,500 income from a $14,000 investment. But the study found that it takes an $89,000 investment on a Montana wheat farm to realize the same amount of income.

To earn $3,500 the required investment varied from $17,000 in certain cotton areas to $122,000 for a Montana wheat farm.

This Nation cannot afford to bankrupt such wheat farmers wholesale, for national security reasons if no other, and I am sure that the Members of the Congress have no desire to do so. If the President of the United States knew the facts about the effect of a $1.78 support price for wheat, I am sure he would agree that support should be continued at a level at least as high as he himself ordered in 1956.

Unfortunately, the announcement of $1.78 support levels on 1958 crop wheat has resulted in rather heavy plantings of winter wheat for 1958 harvest. A little of this heavier planting results from an increase from 15 to 30 acres in the amount which may be planted and har-

vested without penalty for use on the farm. There are, of course, other factors, but clearly it was the prospect of low prices which resulted—as it almost invariably does—in farmers seeking to maintain gross income through increased output.

With improved support, many of these farmers will be able to hold excess production in bond to market in 1959. Marketing penalties will offset losses caused by marketing of overquota wheat.

The confusion will be ended, and order and cooperation restored, if a fairer support level is adopted.

It is my hope that there can be action on this measure before spring wheat planting gets under way. I favor at least 90 percent of parity support for wheat as a permanent program. Wheat farmers have shown they will adjust production to make such price support feasible without great expense to the Government. It is obvious, however, that 90 percent supports would be vetoed at this time. It is my hope that a $2 per bushel support level can be agreed upon by all of us and quickly enacted into law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until Monday next, so that other interested Senators may add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 3091) to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and other Senators today in cosponsoring a bill to overrule the latest reduction in the price support rate for wheat which Secretary Benson has ordered for the present crop.

Wisconsin was once the Nation's leading wheat State, but our production of wheat has declined sharply in the last half century or more. Nevertheless, wheat continues to have much greater importance to the Wisconsin economy than is commonly recognized.

The 1957 wheat crop in Wisconsin was valued at $2½ million, according to the State Crop Reporting Service. The 22 cents per bushel cut in wheat supports that Secretary Benson has ordered will cost the economy of my State more than $300,000 a year.

But this direct interest of Wisconsin farmers in the wheat price support rate is not the most important reason for their concern. Lower prices for wheat mean increased downward pressure on prices for all farm commodities, including dairy products. There cannot be high prices for dairy commodities if producers of other commodities are getting such low incomes that they would be inclined to shift into dairying.

Moreover, farmers and their representatives must stand together. Wisconsin dairy farmers need the aid of wheat producers from Montana and other States, of cotton producers from the South, of corn and hog producers from the Midwest, and so forth.

This is not, of course, a satisfactory program for the long range. Like the emergency dairy bill to prevent the cut in milk prices from taking effect next April 1, this bill will hold the line and prevent farm conditions from getting worse in the period immediately ahead, until a workable long-range farm program can be enacted.

---

## EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Export Control Act of 1949 will expire June 30, 1958. In the interest of the national security it is essential that this act be extended for two additional years.

The Export Control Act authorizes the President to prohibit and curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, and possessions of any articles, materials, or supplies including technical data. The act provides that this authority may be used on the basis of three standards: The national security, the foreign policy, and domestic scarcities. It is under this act that shipments of all commodities from the United States to Communist China are embargoed and shipments of strategic commodities to the rest of the Soviet bloc are carefully controlled.

The President has delegated the authority in this act to the Secretary of Commerce, who has the benefit of advice from the various agencies interested in exports, such as the Departments of State and Defense.

Congress has been receiving regular quarterly reports from the Secretary of Commerce, as required by the act, which contain complete information about operations under the act.

National security and foreign policy considerations during the next 2 years make it evident that the extension of this act will be necessary. The need for the extension is indicated also in the President's recent budget message.

The Secretary of Commerce, in his letter of January 20, addressed to the President of the Senate, requested the extension of this act. I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, D. C., January 20, 1958.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Export Control Act of 1949, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., secs. 2021–2032), expires by its terms on June 30, 1958. I recommend that the Congress extend this law for another 2 years, and I attach a proposed draft bill to accomplish that purpose.

Under this act, the Congress has authorized the regulation of exports of commodities and technical data to the extent necessary to safeguard our security and our domestic economy, and to further our foreign policy. These controls are administered in the Department of Commerce, by delegation of authority from the President, and they are needed and used for all these purposes at the present time. More specifically, they are being employed to limit the volume of exports to all destinations of a few important materials that continue to be in short supply and to prevent the European Soviet bloc from obtaining our strategic goods and technical data. They are also used to implement the national policy prohibiting all economic relations with Communist China and North Korea. Exports to friendly nations, on the other hand, even of strategic goods are substantially free of export license controls except to the extent necessary to prevent diversion, transshipment, or re-exportation to unauthorized destinations.

The act provides for interdepartmental consultation in its administration, including the determination of what commodities should be controlled, to what destinations, in what manner, and to what extent. For this purpose, I have established an Advisory Committee on Export Policy on which are represented, among others, the Departments of State and Defense. It is our considered judgment that world tensions are such that export controls should not be permitted to expire on the present termination date of the act. The President stated most recently in his message on the budget, this is "a time of growing danger," and, as we see it, under such circumstances, controls of this nature are clearly essential for the indefinite future.

There is ample flexibility in the act to permit us to make any necessary changes in the scope and direction of export controls as and when conditions change, so that no other substantive amendments of the law are required. And, if at any time these controls should cease to be needed, they can be readily terminated, for section 12 of the act allows this to be done in advance of the specified termination date either by concurrent resolution of the Congress or Presidential order.

The attached draft bill would amend section 12 to change the present termination date from June 30, 1958, to June 30, 1960. A similar extension was authorized by Congress in 1956. It will provide for the minimum extension required from the viewpoint of efficient administration and enforcement, while yet providing an opportunity for the next Congress to review the program and authorize its further extension if still necessary.

For budgetary, planning, and personnel reasons, and so that no doubts may arise as to the continuation of the policies involved, I respectfully urge consideration of this recommendation by the Congress as early in this session as possible. We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the act for 2 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3093) to extend for an additional period of 2 years the authority to regulate exports contained in the Export Control Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## TAX RELIEF FOR TEACHERS TAKING CERTAIN COURSES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, today we are waging an all-out effort to improve educational standards throughout the country. It is essential that we do so in order to meet successfully the Soviet challenge. The battle for educational superiority is now on, and we all recognize that it must be won if we and the rest of the free world are to continue to survive.

In our efforts to win this battle, those engaged in the teaching profession have an extremely important task entrusted to them. Particularly is this true when we stop to realize that they share a great amount of the responsibility, together with parents and the community, of molding the minds of the future citizens of this great land. All too often their efforts are very much taken for granted.

It is gratifying to note that those in the teaching profession are fully cognizant of the responsibility which they share, and are anxious to continually improve their qualifications as teachers. On the part of a large majority of them, it is virtually mandatory to continue their education during the summer recess, in order to keep current with modern teaching methods, as well as to further their ability to carry out in the most effective manner their chosen profession. The expenses incurred by them for such activities have placed upon their shoulders a heavy financial burden, for it is generally known that the salaries of teachers in many localities are none too attractive.

The rising costs of living have added to their burden. Because of this problem, many of our highly qualified teachers have already left the teaching profession, and many more are thinking of doing so, despite the fact that teaching is their first love. This is a problem with which we in the Congress should concern ourselves, in these perilous days, by exploring all avenues, in order to encourage highly qualified teachers to carry on, as well as to develop an adequate reservoir of them for future needs. The youth of our Nation, and the Nation itself, will suffer irreparably unless we exert every effort to insure that we have a teaching profession amply stocked with highly qualified teachers, second to none.

I have thought about this situation for some time, and believe that one of the ways in which we in the Congress can be of assistance, as a step in the right direction toward achieving our objective, is to grant tax relief for the expenses incurred by teachers in connection with courses pursued by them to further improve their qualifications and keep pace with modern teaching techniques. In this way we can better prepare the youth of the Nation to face the problems of the future, and indirectly can make an immeasurable contribution toward winning the battle of educational superiority—a battle which must of necessity be won if we are to be successful in waging a campaign of total peace.

Mr. President, at this time I introduce proposed legislation to provide for this purpose, and I request that it be appropriately referred. I sincerely hope that the Congress will act promptly and favorably on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3096) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for amounts paid by a teacher for his further education, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1 OF THE ELKINS ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1 of the Elkins Act, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a justification for the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3101) to amend section 1 of the Elkins Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

The attached draft bill is designed to clarify and make certain that every shipment knowingly transported in interstate or foreign commerce at less than the applicable tariff rate, whether actually so transported or such result is reached indirectly by means of a device, constitutes a separate offense under section 1 of the Elkins Act. It would also subject the carriers to the treble-damage forfeiture provisions of paragraph (3) of section 1 of that act.

Paragraph (1) of section 1 of the Elkins Act provides, in part, that "it shall be unlawful for any person, persons, or corporation to offer, grant, or give, or to solicit, accept, or receive any rebate, concession, or discrimination in respect to the transportation of any property in interstate or foreign commerce by any common carrier * * * whereby any such property shall, by any device whatever, be transported at a less rate than that named in the tariffs published and filed by such carrier."

The thing prohibited is the departure from the tariff rate by any means whatsoever, whether direct between the parties, or indirect by the employment of the most devious subterfuge. Among the various devices which have been condemned by the Commission, the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, as resulting in the transportation of property at less than tariff rates are donations or contributions to the construction costs of a shipper's plant, sale of land to a shipper at less than cost, leasing of property at inadequate rentals, use of carriers' funds or credit free or at inadequate interest, and providing storage facilities to shippers free or at inadequate charges.

It is the Commission's position that section 1 of the Elkins Act, as presently worded, contemplates that each shipment transported in interstate commerce at less than tariff rate, whether actually so transported or such result is obtained by any device, constitutes a separate offense. It appears necessary, however, that the act be amended so as to spell this out specifically since the Department of Justice has recently taken the position that when devices are used to obtain transportation it is the device which constitutes the offense and not the transportation at concession rates resulting from the use of such devices.

This position was taken by the Department of Justice following the dismissal by the United States District Court at Louisville, Ky., of all but one count in each criminal information filed against the Southern Railway Co. and the Louisville Produce Association, Inc., in 30 and 20 counts, respectively, charging violations of section 1 of the Elkins Act. The court in dismissing all but one of the counts against each defendant stated:

"While the informations contain multiple counts, each information charges in substance only one offense under United States Code, title 49, section 41 (1)."

The Solicitor General of the United States refused to appeal this ruling of the court although the Commission recommended it. Subsequently, after further consideration of the Commission's position by the Solicitor General and the Department of Justice, the Commission was advised by letter dated July 17, 1957, that the Department was against the filing of informations which are based on the theory that each shipment transported subsequent to donations or contributions by the carrier to the shipper constitutes a separate offense. Again, on November 19, 1957, the Department of Justice advised a United States attorney, to whom the Commission had transmitted proposed indictments which were based upon the Commission's theory, that "We have concluded, upon reviewing this matter, that such a legal theory is unsound."

Under the theory followed by the Justice Department each shipment constitutes a separate offense when it is actually transported at less than tariff rate, but not when the same result is obtained by devices. Under this theory, a thousand shipments transported at $100, each, less than the tariff rate would result in 1,000 offenses, but if the carrier by a lump-sum payment of $100,000 to the shipper thereby obtains 1,000 shipments, there is only one offense. With a maximum fine of $20,000 for such offense the carriers will not, under this interpretation, be effectively deterred from "purchasing" traffic, by means of donations, concessions, and other devices, and the Elkins Act can no longer be considered "a terror to evildoers." In *Penna. R. R. Co.* v. *International Coal Mining Co.* (230 U. S. 184), at page 206, Mr. Justice Lamar stated:

"The act imposes heavy penalties, independent of the amount of the rebate paid, and as each shipment constitutes a separate offense, the law in its measure of fine and punishment is a terror to evildoers."

As an additional deterrent, paragraph (3) of section 1 of the Elkins Act would be amended by the proposed bill so as to subject carriers, as well as the shippers and receivers, to the treble-damages forfeiture provisions. Since the carriers are usually the moving parties in inducing shippers by means of attractive concessions to locate along their lines, it is believed that they would be further deterred from committing such violations by subjecting them to the forfeiture provisions of paragraph (3), in addition to the criminal provisions to which both shippers and carriers are now subject.

## EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN FOUR-WHEEL MOTORCARS AND TRUCKS FROM SAFETY APPLIANCE ACTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Safety Appliance Acts so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to exempt 4-wheel track motorcars and 4-wheel push trucks from any or all requirements

thereof, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a justification for the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3102) to amend the Safety Appliance Acts so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to exempt 4-wheel track motorcars and 4-wheel push trucks from any or all requirements thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

The attached draft bill would amend the Safety Appliance Acts only to the extent of granting the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to exempt 4-wheel track motorcars and 4-wheel push trucks from any or all requirements thereof, and to authorize the Commission to prescribe such other appliances and devices, and the specifications therefor, found to be desirable or necessary in the interest of safety of operation of these small maintenance cars.

The Safety Appliance Acts require all railroad locomotive engines to be equipped with power driving-wheel brakes and appliances for operating the train-brake system. Cars must be equipped with automatic couplers, efficient hand brakes, secure sill-steps, hand holds and grab irons, and, on cars requiring them, secure ladders, running boards, and roof hand holds. The Commission is charged with the responsibility of enforcing these acts, and, in addition, must prescribe the number, dimensions, location, and manner of application of most of these devices.

At no time since the enactment of the various safety appliance laws has the Commission considered small 4-wheel track motorcars or 4-wheel push trucks to be within the scope of these laws. It has not, therefore, prescribed any standards with respect thereto. On May 13, 1957, however, the United States Supreme Court, in a 5 to 4 decision, in *Baltimore and Ohio R. Co.* v. *Jackson* (353 U. S. 325), specifically held that the Safety Appliance Acts were applicable to these vehicles.

Although it may be possible, with appropriate dimensional modifications, to install all of the required safety appliances on these small vehicles, rigid application of the statutory requirements to these cars is not, in the Commission's opinion, practical or desirable. The various appliances presently available were designed solely for standard railroad cars and are wholly unsuitable because of their size and weight for use on these small-track cars. Any additional degree of safety that might therefore be attained by their installation would be more than offset by newly created hazards. These vehicles, for example, must be lifted from the rails after use, and any substantial increase in their weight would make their removal more difficult. Since it is often necessary to clear trains on short notice, these cars would be hard to handle in emergencies, with cumbersome appliances which have little or no practical value. Train-track motor car collisions would inevitably occur. Thus the appliances would result in a greater potential danger not only to the employees but also travelers. Possibly, suitable appliances of this nature may eventually be designed for these small cars. At present, however, none are available.

Other appliances, such as sill-steps and end and side handholds, would also have no practical value on these vehicles. While these appliances are necessary on conventional cars to facilitate coupling and uncoupling and the boarding of such cars, the deck of a track motorcar or push truck is so close to the ground that these appliances would serve no useful purpose. In fact, if installed and used, these appliances would place the employee in such an unnatural and awkward position that he could easily lose his balance and fall from the car.

Thus, many of the mandatory provisions of the Safety Appliance Acts, when applied to these small 4-wheel track motorcars and 4-wheel push trucks, would not promote the safety of employees and travelers. On the other hand, there undoubtedly are a number of other appliances and devices not now required by the acts, such as windshield wipers, headlights, and horns, which may contribute materially to the safety of operation of these small-track vehicles. It is, therefore, desirable that the Commission be granted authority, as proposed in the draft bill, to prescribe such appliances and the specifications therefor if found necessary or desirable in the interest of safety.

In order to provide a greater degree of flexibility in the law so as to make its application to track motorcars and push trucks more practical, it is urged that the Safety Appliance Acts be amended as proposed in the attached draft bill.

---

## AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO UNIFICATION OR ACQUISITION OF CONTROL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 5 (10) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption. I ask unanimous consent that a justification for the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3103) to amend section 5 (10) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

The attached draft bill is designed to provide a more reliable criterion for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption of subsection (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The present yardstick for exempting motor carrier transactions from the requirements of section 5 is an aggregate of not more than 20 vehicles "owned, leased, controlled, or operated by such parties, for purposes of transportation subject to part II." In applying this exemption, numerous questions have arisen concerning, for example, (a) vehicles used in intrastate commerce, exempt transportation, or private carriage, but which are available or suitable for regulated interstate service, (b) equipment or noncarrier affiliates, (c) vehicles leased or short periods, (d) disabled vehicles, and (e) combinations of vehicles. The time and effort expended in establishing the number on which jurisdiction depends, where the question is close, has proved disproportionate to the benefit intended to be allowed by the exemption. It has proved virtually impossible in many instances to check whether the exemption was applicable to transactions purportedly consummated under the exemption, and subsequently questioned as improperly exempted.

Gross operating revenues of carriers would be a definite and practical basis for the exemption. The figures would be readily ascertainable from annual reports which all carriers are required to file, and from quarterly reports which carriers with average gross revenues of $200,000 or more are required to file. As of December 31, 1956, there were 3,079 of the latter and 13,782 with average gross revenues of less than $200,000 per annum. On the basis of a limited study, the Commission is of the opinion that the use of $250,000 as the measure for the exemption will correspond roughly with the present measure in paragraph (10).

---

## AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO THE FILING OF CERTAIN STATEMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the filing of brief statements by certain motor carriers subject to the safety and hours of service regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a justification for the legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3104) to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the filing of brief statements by certain motor carriers subject to the safety and hours of service regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

The purpose of the attached draft bill, which is in the nature of a substitute for bills H. R. 5664 and S. 1490 introduced during the 1st session of the 85th Congress, is to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with an expedient method for the proper and effective administration of its motor carrier safety and hours of service regulations.

An important part of the Commission's statutory responsibility for motor carrier safety relates to private carriers of property, exempt commodity haulers under section 203 (b) (6), local carriers in commercial zones, and carriers operating in foreign commerce between points in a foreign country through the United States. The Commission is, however, unable to administer its safety and hours of service regulations effectively with respect to these carriers because at the present time it does not know who they are or where they are located.

According to the Commission's latest field estimates there are about 92,000 private carriers, operating about 844,000 vehicles, and about 48,000 for-hire carriers, operating about 226,000 vehicles, which are exempt from economic regulation.

Since these regulations were first prescribed in 1939, copies have been served on all known carriers subject thereto. Under present circumstances copies are served on private carriers, and on carriers operating under the section 203 (b) exemptions, as they become known to the Commission either through observation on the highways by staff members, or by happenstance. Consequently, copies of the regulations have been served on only about one-third of the private carriers and on about one-fourth of the carriers operating under the exemptions in section 203 (b). Moreover, recent road checks have confirmed the Commission's belief that there are many such carriers who do not even know that they are required to comply with the Commission's safety regulations. In the absence of a more effective method of reaching these carriers, the Commission can never hope to acquaint all of them with the regulations to which they are already subject.

Investigations of a number of major accidents have disclosed serious violations of the Commission's safety regulations in the operations of non-certificated carriers. This is especially true with respect to those aspects of safety which are covered only by the regulations of this Commission, particularly those relating to maximum hours of service of drivers, driver qualifications, and proper maintenance of vehicles. Although no data have been accumulated, it has been recognized that many very serious accidents are traceable to ignorance or disregard of the Commission's regulations by such carriers.

It has been the Commission's policy to obtain, insofar as possible, compliance with its motor-carrier safety regulations. The Commission's only purpose in requesting such legislation is to make it possible to send these carriers information and educational material to promote better compliance, and thereby help reduce the number of accidents on the Nation's highways. This proposal does not contemplate the filing of complicated or elaborate reports. It is only necessary that the Commission be kept informed respecting the identity of such carriers, their location, and the number of vehicles which they own or operate. This could be accomplished through the simple expediency of mailing a post card once a year.

The Commission is now empowered under section 220 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain reports from private carriers. In this connection, section 220 (a) provides, in part, as follows:

"The Commission is hereby authorized to require annual, periodical, or special reports from all motor carriers, brokers, lessors, and associations (as defined in this section); to prescribe the manner and form in which such reports shall be made; and to require from such carriers, brokers, lessors, and associations specific and full, true, and correct answers to all questions upon which the Commission may deem information to be necessary."

Although the question is not settled, there is some doubt as to whether the requirements of section 220 may not be extended to carriers exempted under section 203 (b) (6) of the act. In any event, the proposed draft of substitute bill is suggested as a simple and preferable alternative to existing law. This is not only consistent with the Commission's long-standing policy of keeping the reporting requirements under the act to a minimum but, further, would make uniform the application thereof to both private and exempt carriers.

The enactment of the proposed substitute bill is essential to the proper and expedient administration of our motor-carrier safety regulations, and would assist the Commission in the discharge of its responsibility to the public. With modern highway safety problems demanding more and more attention, the Commission believes adoption of this proposal would represent a big step in the reduction of highway accidents by providing these carriers with information and educational material to promote better compliance with its safety regulations.

## INDEMNITY PROTECTION IN RESPECT OF THE NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP—AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended—Public Law 848, 84th Congress—to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powered merchant ship. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement as to the purposes and provisions of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3106) to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.), to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powered merchant ship, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BRICKER), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

The Congress has enacted authority to build an atomic-powered merchant ship (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.; 70 Stat. 731). The law, by an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, provides for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation (including training of personnel) of a nuclear-powered merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States. The Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, may employ persons, firms, and corporations, on a contract or fee basis, for the performance of special services deemed necessary in carrying on activities and functions under the law.

The Secretary of Commerce has specific authority under Public Law 701, 84th Congress (70 Stat. 631), for the purpose of developing, trial, and testing, to operate vessels owned by the United States which have been constructed for experimental or testing purposes.

In making preliminary studies of the problems in connection with the building, testing, and operation of the first nuclear-powered ship, which will be a merchant type ocean-going vessel, the Department has met with problems in the important and critical matter of third party liability of designers, builders, and operators of the new vessel. Being a facility which will be used in world-wide ocean-going commerce, the matter of third party liability takes on a special significance in a field of liability which apparently must remain indeterminate until experience and judicial determinations can provide guides for private insurance and indemnity organizations in this field.

The Department is concerned with prompt progress in the construction of the new nuclear-powered merchant ship. The Department has encountered difficulty in securing contracts in respect of the proposed vessel. These difficulties rise out of the practically immeasurable monetary liability in a particular case of possible nuclear disaster in connection with the ship, even though the possibility of such an occurrence with consequent legal liability may be only remote. It appears to be the generally accepted legal viewpoint that only experience and judicial determinations will fix the extent of the legal liability of designers, builders, owners, and operators of an atomic-powered vessel. The fact that the vessel will operate in ocean-going commerce and will necessarily operate in proximity to shoreside establishments and properties, both domestic and foreign, expands the geographical field of risk very broadly. Insurance and indemnity protection from private organizations may be available but only in limited amounts, deemed insufficient by prospective designers, contractors, and operators.

The Department in the legislative proposals recommends meeting these problems by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce, in connection with the design, construction, maintenance, repair, use, and operation of the ship, to provide that the United States will indemnify any contractors or agents of the United States against liability on account of claims (including reasonable expenses of litigation or settlement of such claims) by third persons (including employees of the contractor) for death, bodily injury, sickness, or disease, or loss of or damage to property, arising as a result of such activities in connection with the ship. The indemnification would be effective to the extent that the liability arises out of the contract or agency and to the extent not compensated by insurance or otherwise. The bill would authorize the Secretary to require indemnified contractors or agents to procure private insurance against the covered hazards to the extent available at reasonable terms.

Payment under the liability provision would be made only with the approval of the Secretary, or his designee for that purpose, and would be made out of funds obligated for performance of the contract or agency agreement or out of any funds appropriated by Congress for making such payments.

Early and favorable consideration of this proposal is recommended in order that there may be no delay in the construction of this nuclear-powered merchant vessel.

The Director, Bureau of the Budget, has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed measure to the Congress.

## UNITED STATES ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Commission on the Establishment of a United States Academy of Science.

Since I am not a scientist, nor a mathematician, nor an educator, I would not presume to suggest details as to the curricula, operation, or administration of such an Academy. Therefore, my bill calls for establishment of a Commission composed of nine members, appointed by the President, from the fields of education and science and the Armed Forces. It shall be the duty of the Commission, after appropriate study and inquiry, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to the establishment, organization, and administration of such an Academy.

In the interest of national defense, our armed services must continually be assured adequate manpower and knowledge in the fields of science and mathematics. I am convinced that an United States Academy of Science, within the Department of Defense, would materially supplement existing sources of manpower and knowledge. In addition, such an Academy would give proper recognition and voice to scientists and mathematicians in the development of our national defense which, unfortunately, is not now accorded them.

Modern defense weapons are vitally dependent on basic research in science and mathematics. Therefore, I believe it to be of utmost importance that the proposed Academy provide for such basic research. Not only would it be of inestimable value in the development of our defense mechanisms but the fruits it would bear would ultimately serve all mankind in the peaceful pursuits of life.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3110) to establish a Commission on the Establishment of a United States Academy of Science, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

---

## PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I propose to speak briefly on the subject of Presidential inability or disability. The illnesses of President Eisenhower, beginning with his heart attack in September of 1955, have served to focus attention on this subject not only by the people of the United States, but beyond our shores as well. We are fortunate, indeed, that in each instance he has been able to make rapid and full recovery, enabling him to quickly resume his leadership in the most important and demanding position in the world today.

Article II, section 1, paragraph 6, of the Constitution provides:

> In case of the Removal of the President from office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation, or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

It is not my intention now to discuss this constitutional provision in detail. It is sufficient, I believe, to call attention to the fact that there are few people, if any, who feel the provision is adequate.

Apparently it does not take care of the contingency of a President who is so disabled as to be unable to perform the powers and duties of his office and is unable or unwilling to do anything about it voluntarily. There are those who believe that whatever gap there may be in our laws in this respect can easily be remedied, however. They contend that there is clear authority under this constitutional provision for the Congress to act by statute—whatever form that statute might take—and thereby provide a solution for what otherwise might easily become a national, if not international, crisis. There is other responsible authority for the view that there are constitutional defects which preclude Congress from acting in any way short of a constitutional amendment.

Since I am not a lawyer I do not presume to make any judgment as to which of these views is correct. But it is a problem that is with us, and that requires as early a solution as we can give it.

I am pleased that on Thursday of last week the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, submited by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], providing for creation of a joint Congressional committee to look into all matters involved in the election, succession, and duties of the President and Vice President. Such a study will include the Presidential inability question and its possible solution. However, one cannot fail to note the unwillingness of the other body to enact similar resolutions passed by the Senate in previous Congresses.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled hearings on this subject, beginning Friday, January 24, 1958. I congratulate its chairman, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], for having the discernment to recognize the high priority which this problem deserves. It is my hope that from these hearings will emerge constructive solutions to this difficult and vexing problem.

We as a nation have been extremely fortunate that until this point in our history we have never been faced with a serious crisis because of a President being totally disabled. Under earlier administrations, we have had narrow escapes, however. I have in mind the case of the shooting of President Garfield by an assassin in 1881, followed by a lingering illness before his death. Then there was the long illness of President Wilson from which he never fully recovered, although he served out his term of office.

Some attention was given in the Congress to the problem of providing more adequately by law or by constitutional amendment for the case of Presidential disability immediately after both of those episodes. However, nothing came of those efforts. The problem remains with us, and it must be solved. We cannot take the chance that our past good luck in avoiding a serious national crisis because of Presidential disability will hold out for all future time. In view of world conditions, it seems imperative that now as never before is the time that we in the Congress should face up to the need for providing an appropriate solution as promptly as possible.

President Eisenhower himself has urged the Congress to act, and in his behalf, former Attorney General Brownell has proposed that the Constitution be amended so as to provide a Cabinet decision on Presidential inability. That proposal is embodied in a joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 294—introduced in the other body by Representative KEATING. Other measures have included: a bill by Senator PAYNE—S. 238; and proposals of constitutional amendments by Senator FULBRIGHT—Senate Joint Resolution 100—and Senator KEFAUVER—Senate Joint Resolution 133 and Senate Joint Resolution 134. In addition to the Eisenhower proposal in the other body, there is a bill—H. R. 6510—and a proposed constitutional amendment—House Joint Resolution 334—by Representative KEATING; and a joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 293—and a proposed constitutional amendment—House Joint Resolution 295—by Representative CELLER.

The solutions embodied in these measures are many and varied. There has been little crystallization of opinion to date as to what forms those solutions might take. It is precisely because there has been no general agreement upon a remedy that I am today proposing as points of departure yet other approaches for study and consideration by the Congress. In addition, the question of Presidential inability to serve is essentially political in nature, even though there may be questions of fact involved requiring outside medical or other evidence. It is for this reason that I feel it should be determined by the elected representatives of the people rather than by those holding appointive office.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill and two joint resolutions providing alternate proposals to amend the Constitution. The bill and one of the joint resolutions I am introducing attempt solutions of the Presidential inability problem in somewhat different detail than is embodied in any of the measures now pending in Congress to which I have already alluded in these remarks. The other joint resolution which I am introducing is somewhat similar to a proposal of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], Senate Joint Resolution 133. I do not propose to discuss those details now, however. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill and joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill and joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 3113. A bill to provide for the determination of the ability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for determination of the ability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office; and

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make provision for the continuous discharge of the powers and duties of the office of the President of the United States.

The explanation presented by Mr. BRIDGES is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF MEASURES PROPOSING SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEM OF PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

INTRODUCTION

In the bill I have introduced the question of Presidential inability would be determined by the Congress. Its initial consideration would be by a Congressional committee, composed of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the majority and minority leaders of both Houses. Following affirmative action by this committee, a concurrent resolution would be reported to each House, the adoption of which would require the concurrence of two-thirds of those present and voting.

Both of my proposals of constitutional amendment are based on the assumption that the Constitution might not now contain authority for Congress to provide by legislation for the determination of the ability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

In one joint resolution I am proposing by constitutional amendment to achieve what the bill is designed to do by statute.

The other joint resolution proposes, as an alternative, a constitutional amendment which, among other things, grants Congress constitutional authority to provide for the making of such determinations, but would not incorporate into the Constitution itself details of the methods to be used.

BILL

The bill is based upon the assumption that constitutional authority now exists under which the Congress by legislation may provide for the determination of the ability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the bill creates a committee for the consideration of any question which may arise as to the inability of the President to discharge those powers and duties. It is composed of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the majority and minority leaders of both Houses. The committee would be convened whenever the Vice President, by letter transmitted to the President pro tempore of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House, might suggest doubt as to the ability of the President to discharge his powers and duties. It could also be convened, in the absence of any such letter, upon request made by any four members of the committee, that number being prescribed as a quorum of the committee.

Subsection (b) of the first section makes it the duty of the committee, when convened for that purpose, to determine whether there is probable cause for belief that the President is unable for any cause to discharge the powers and duties of his office. If a determination is made, by the affirmative vote of at least four members, that such inability exists it is then the duty of the majority leader of each House to introduce in his House a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it has been determined by the Congress that the President is unable to discharge his powers and duties.

Subsection (c) of the first section provides that if such a resolution is adopted by both Houses, by the affirmative vote of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting in each House, the powers and duties of the President shall then devolve upon the Vice President, who shall discharge them until the disability of the President is removed or until a new President is elected and takes office.

Subsections (d) and (e) of the first section of the bill deal with the restoration to the President of his powers and duties upon the termination of his inability to discharge them.

Subsection (d) requires the committee described above to be convened upon receipt, by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, of a letter from the President advising that in his opinion his inability has ceased to exist. Upon the basis of such a letter, the majority leader of each House would be required to introduce in his House a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress has determined that the inability of the President no longer exists.

Subsection (e) provides that upon the adoption of such a concurrent resolution by both Houses, by majority vote of all Members present and voting in each House, the President shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his office, and that the Vice President shall then resume the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of Vice President.

Section 2 of the bill is intended to insure the prompt disposition by the Congress of any concurrent resolution introduced in conformity with the provisions of the first section. Section 2 would amend the rules of the Senate and of the House to provide for the placement of any such resolution upon the appropriate calendar without reference to committee. The Senate rules also would be amended to provide that no such concurrent resolution would be subject to amendment; that no Senator would be entitled to speak for more than 1 hour in debate thereon; that no dilatory motion would be in order; and that points of order and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer made in the consideration of such a concurrent resolution would be decided without debate.

Following the precedent of section 101 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the rule changes so made are explicitly stated to be made by the Congress in the exercise of its constitutional right to adopt rules for its proceedings, and the right of each House to alter such rules is expressly reserved.

JOINT RESOLUTION

The companion Senate joint resolution is based upon the assumption that the Constitution does not now provide authority under which the Congress by legislation may provide for the determination of the ability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office. It would propose an amendment to the Constitution which would add thereto a new article providing the mechanism for such determinations.

Sections 1 and 2 of the proposed constitutional amendment would provide that such determinations be made in precisely the same manner for which provision is made by the first section of the bill described above.

Section 3 of the proposed constitutional amendment would provide, in a manner comparable to that prescribed by section 2 of the bill described above, for the expeditious consideration by the Congress of any concurrent resolution reciting a determination by the Congress that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, or that any previously determined disability of the President has ceased to exist.

Section 4 of the proposed constitutional amendment would authorize the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, acting jointly, to call the Congress into special session for the consideration of any concurrent resolution for a determination that the President is unable to discharge his powers and duties if the committee established by section 1 of the amendment should determine, at any time at which the Congress is not in session, that there is probable cause for belief that the President is unable to discharge those powers and duties.

Section 5 of the proposed constitutional amendment provides that it shall be inoperative unless ratified by legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

ALTERNATIVE JOINT RESOLUTION

The alternative joint resolution also rests upon the assumption that the Constitution does not now provide authority under which the Congress may provide for the determination of the ability of the President to discharge his powers and duties. It differs from the joint resolution described above in that it proposes a constitutional amendment which would grant to the Congress constitutional authority to provide for the making of such determinations, but would not incorporate into the Constitution itself a detailed prescription of the method to be used in making such determinations. The amendment proposed by the alternative joint resolution is based upon the theory that (1) the Constitution should provide a means for the solution of any problem of Presidential inability which may arise in the future, but (2) the fallibility of human foresight may render impracticable any undertaking to place in the Constitution itself detailed provisions regulating the disposition of every contingency which might conceivably occur at any time during the future life of the Nation.

Sections 1 and 2 of the alternative amendment proposed by this joint resolution would replace the present provisions of the sixth paragraph of section 1 of article II of the Constitution, which would then be repealed by section 5 of the amendment.

Section 1 of the alternative amendment deals with the situation in which the President is rendered incapable of performing his duties because of his removal, death, resignation, or inability occurring at a time at which there is a Vice President who can discharge those duties. It would restate the first clause of the sixth paragraph of section 1 of article II of the Constitution in a manner which would expressly confirm the historical interpretation given thereto by providing that in the case of the removal, death, or resignation of the President, the Vice President shall become President, and shall serve as such for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was elected. It would add a new provision to the effect that in the event of the inability of the President to discharge his powers and duties, such powers and duties would be discharged by the Vice President only during the continuance of the inability of the President. Thus, it would be made clear that in the event of incapacity of the President arising from causes other than removal, death, or resignation, the Vice President would not succeed to the office of President or become President.

Section 2 of the alternative amendment deals with the situation in which the President is rendered incapable of performing his duties because of his removal, death, resignation, or inability occurring at a time at which there is no Vice President who can discharge those duties. It restates, without change, in effect, the present provisions of the second clause of the sixth paragraph of section 1 of article II of the Constitution. Like the present constitutional provision which it would replace, it would confer authority under which the Congress may provide by law for such a situation.

The first sentence of section 3 of the alternative amendment provides new express authority under which the Congress shall provide by law for the determination of all questions of fact arising under sections 1 and 2. The second sentence provides new authority under which the Congress is authorized by concurrent resolution, adopted with the concurrence of two-thirds of all Members present and voting in each House, to provide for the discharge of the powers and duties of the President at any time of

emergency at which there may be no person who is qualified, under the Constitution or under any statute previously enacted, to discharge those powers and duties. That sentence is intended to enable the Congress to supply an officer to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President if (1) no person can qualify therefor under any existing constitutional or statutory authority, and (2) the Congress is precluded from making provision by statute for the designation of any such person because of the absence of any person who is qualified to sign any bill which it might enact for that purpose.

Section 4 of the alternate amendment contains a provision (comparable to that of section 4 of the principal proposed amendment described above) authorizing the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, acting jointly, to convene the Congress in special session if they should determine, at any time at which the Congress is not in session, that there is probable cause for the invocation of the provisions of the second sentence of section 3. Thus, provision is made for the solution of any unusual situation which has not been foreseen, and for which no provision has been made by statute.

Section 6 of the alternative amendment provides that the proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless ratified by legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

---

## COLUMBIA RIVER REGIONAL CORPORATION BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a proposal known as the Columbia River regional corporation bill has been drafted by the Northwest Public Power Association as an amendment to the Bonneville Act. This proposal has the support of many groups, newspapers, and individual citizens in our part of the country. They long have urged introduction of such legislation so that hearings might be held upon its numerous features by the appropriate committee of the Senate.

I imagine some of these requests have come to me because I am the only Senator from the Pacific Northwest who serves on the Public Works Committee, where the bill probably will be referred by the Parliamentarian, inasmuch as it amends the original Bonneville Act.

However, I want to make it clear that the predominant request to introduce this bill has come from the Northwest Public Power Association, and I am offering the measure in the form in which that group transmitted it to my office. Although I myself do not subscribe to every feature of the measure, I believe completely that the basic idea has genuine merit and deserves a thorough and careful hearing by the appropriate Senate committee.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I am introducing this bill today by request, in the hope that extended and exhaustive hearings will disclose how it would operate and in what ways it might be improved. I have been assured by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works [Mr. CHAVEZ] that he will cooperate in arranging hearings on so important a piece of legislation. His kindness and cooperation are profoundly appreciated.

My cosponsors include many of the able and outstanding Members of the Senate from the Pacific Northwest and from the area of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the regional-corporation bill contains numerous features similar to the TVA self-financing act which was approved by the Senate last year. These cosponsors are the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. President, a number of other Members of the Senate have expressed personal interest in this legislation, in addition to the cosponsors whose names I have enumerated. So that further cosponsors may join in introduction of the measure, I ask that it lie on the table until Monday, February 3, 1958, for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this is a complex proposal. I do not entirely agree with all of its many features. Some of the cosponsors may feel similarly. But Congressional hearings are one valuable avenue by which such proposals are studied by the American people, and in this manner they often are hammered into final and improved form on the anvil of legislative study and analysis.

In essence, this regional corporation would make possible the expansion and development of dams and power facilities in the Pacific Northwest through use of their own hydroelectric power revenues. To that extent, the bill might be said to be substantially comparable to the TVA self-financing act on which the United States Senate already has acted favorably.

### COLUMBIA RIVER POWER SYSTEM FAR AHEAD OF REPAYMENT SCHEDULE

The fiscal soundness of this approach is indicated by the fact that the Federal Government's capital investment in Columbia River dams falls in the "gilt-edged" category. A report from the Office of the Comptroller General shows that Pacific Northwest Federal power projects were $78,806,820 ahead of schedule in repayments to the Federal Treasury at the end of the 1957 fiscal year. The Federal loan payout schedule until that time had called for $148,017,884 in payments on principal, but the projects had earned sufficient additional revenue to repay $226,824,704, thus exceeding requirements by more than 50 percent. In addition, the dams have returned $161,718,044 in interest payments, and have recovered $123,933,335 for all operation and maintenance expenses of the projects.

Numerous groups in the Northwest have come to the conclusion in recent years that some form of self-financing was advisable in our region. This conclusion has been reached reluctantly. Under Federal financing, such great projects as Grand Coulee, Bonneville, McNary, The Dalles, Chief Joseph, Hungry Horse, and many others were constructed on the Columbia River and its surging tributaries. During the national administrations in office from 1933 until 1953, some 20 such projects were authorized for Federal development in the Northwest. No new major projects have been authorized for Federal construction since 1953.

Policies established for use of Columbia River water resources are of profound national significance. Waters of the Columbia are the source of nearly 40 percent of the Nation's potential water power. The Columbia provides the country's only inland water navigation route to penetrate a major American mountain range. The Columbia and its tributaries nurture our country's largest runs of migratory fish. Over 6 million acres of arid but fertile soil can be cultivated through proper harnessing of the Columbia's flow.

The power supply of the Columbia has been a vital factor in defense of this Nation. During World War II, generators of Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams made possible the processing of the aluminum needed for 50,000 planes a year. They stoked the Hanford plutonium works where vital elements were prepared for the atomic bombs whose mushroom clouds at Nagasaki and Hiroshima spelled the end of worldwide hostilities.

The Columbia is to the Pacific Northwest what the Mississippi and Missouri are to the great agricultural heartland of the Nation, and what the Hudson and Ohio are to the industrial complex of our Northeastern States. The regions of our country are diverse and widely separated, but there is a close interrelationship of economic factors. The progress and prosperity of the entire country, therefore, depend on conditions which exist in each. Five years ago, the Pacific Northwest States had an expanding Columbia River power system which sparked the economic growth of the entire region. This fact was emphasized in a 1954 report of the Stanford Research Institute which stated:

> Any detailed examination of the region's manufacturing growth during the past 12 years must conclude that a large part of it has been due to the region's ample supply of low-cost power, either directly or indirectly.

### SLOWDOWN OF COLUMBIA DEVELOPMENT OCCURRED IN RECENT YEARS

The Pacific Northwest States do not now have the economic thrust provided by an outpouring of low-cost kilowatts from Federal dams. The Bonneville Power Administration has not signed a new industrial power contract in 5 years. The spigot has been turned off on construction of vitally needed flood control, navigation, and power facilities. Moreover, continuation of this negative policy can be gloomily anticipated for the future. It is reflected in the President's recent budget message which forbade the start of any new water-resource development projects anywhere in the United States.

Only two new starts on major power dams have been begun during the past 5 years. These are Ice Harbor, on the

Snake River; and John Day, on the main stem of the Columbia. Funds for both undertakings had to be obtained, alas, by those of us in Congress, over and against the opposition of the present administration and its Budget Bureau. Great credit is due to men such as the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for leadership on the Appropriations Committee in this effort. In the budget for the fiscal year 1959, a meager $2 million is recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for John Day, a project ultimately to cost some $300 million. At such a rate, it might take more than a century of time to complete John Day to its last parapet.

While development of the Columbia is postponed and delayed, we learn that the Soviet Union has under construction 40 major river projects, 4 of which exceed the energy output of Grand Coulee—heretofore the world's premier generating unit. The Columbia is put in the deep freeze while concrete and steel rise on the Volga, the Angara, and the Yenisei. My friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has told me of seeing in the U. S. S. R. turbines for an Angara River dam nearly three times as large as any in operation in this country. In view of the challenge, this Nation cannot afford any longer to abandon its water-resource requirements.

I do not make these references in any partisan sense. But they are part of modern history, and they explain the reasons for introduction of this regional corporation bill. Unless I am mistaken, the present national administration has never made any bones of its opposition to continued Federal expansion of many choice multiple-purpose sites in the Columbia Basin. Furthermore, our negotiations with Canada for joint use of the vast storage resources of the upper reaches of the Columbia have deteriorated to the point where the Canadian Parliament actually has appropriated $250,000 for a study of the feasibility of diverting out of the upper Columbia a volume of water supply equal to the total flow of the Colorado River at Glenn's Ferry. More than one newspaper or organization has pointed out that, through the licensing authority of the Federal Power Commission, choice sites have been lifted out of the comprehensive plan for the Columbia Basin and have been granted to a private utility company here, a municipal system there, as well as to public utility districts and similar entities. Unified development has been lacking. Wildlife and fisheries considerations frequently have been ignored.

It is against this background that the regional corporation bill has been drafted and sent to me, with the request that it be introduced in the Senate, so hearings may be begun.

I wish to stress again that this introduction does not imply agreement on the part of my cosponsors or myself as to the dotting of each "i" and the crossing of every "t."

HEARINGS WILL DEVELOP MEANS TO IMPROVE OR AUGMENT PROPOSAL

One or two reservations come to mind immediately. I am not certain that the regional corporation should sell its bonds exclusively to the United States Treasury for an indefinite period. Perhaps after a preliminary period, the corporation should be allowed to sell its bonds on the open market, if terms are favorable. Hearings will have to develop the rate provisions of the act, as to whether they shall be pegged at 2½ percent or at the prevailing cost of money to the Treasury.

In addition, we must take into cognizance the present controversy over the rates paid by rural electrification cooperatives, in comparison with current Treasury borrowing costs. Should not the regional corporation receive the same privilege?

Several observers with wide background in this field have expressed to me some reservations over section 12 (a), which provides a 5-year period before the President could transfer to the regional corporation units of the Columbia River power system. These people believe the 5-year period should be eliminated or drastically reduced, so that a project languishing for funds can be taken over by the regional corporation and hastened to completion with Columbia River power revenues.

Mr. L. C. Binford, for example, who is chairman of Oregon's State Water Resources Board, confided to me recently his concern that perhaps the Regional Corporation bill does not give sufficient weight to such ancillary values as wildlife, fisheries, forestry, scenery, and pollution control. That is something which hearings certainly can disclose to us. It is my fervent hope that conservationists such as Mr. Binford and others will testify as witnesses before the Rivers and Harbors subcommittee, which is presided over by the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The proposed corporation is governed by the public-power preference clause in the Bonneville Act. I, myself, along with my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE], am the sopnsor of an amendment to the Bonneville preference clause known as S. 2206. This would assign to industrial uses of power a substantially higher priority than at present. It also would provide for more uniform geographic distribution of power among the several States of the basin. It is my hope that the measure, in final form, will contain the substance of the preference-clause changes proposed by S. 2206, particularly because the Pacific Northwest is now so desperately and urgently in need of new payrolls which are attracted by low-cost water power.

But I have deliberately not intruded my own changes into the Regional Corporation bill, as delivered to me by the Northwest Public Power Association and its executive secretary, Mr. Gus Norwood. I felt that, once I had included my own changes, others would rightfully be entitled to equal consideration. As these changes would be added, the bill would cease to be that of its original authors. Nor could I assess accurately or fairly the worth or value of each amendment proposed to me. I would be substituting my own judgment for that of the drafters of the bill. I could not accept responsibility for such sovereignty over a proposal as complex and with as many ramifications as this one. Thus, I am introducing it "by request" in exactly the form in which it came from its authors. I believe this is eminently fair.

Mr. President, every person who knows me personally must realize that I long have favored Federal financing, management, and operation of our great multiple-purpose Columbia River projects such as Bonneville and Grand Coulee. In 1936, I wrote for Harper's magazine some of the first national articles ever published about these magnificent undertakings; that was at a time when I was barely old enough to vote. I thrilled to the dedication speeches at these projects by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. I was one of the first employees of the Bonneville Power Administration, working for 6 or 8 weeks for the late Administrator J. D. Ross, in a small office in Portland, as a part-time public-relations adviser. I have felt that our Federal power system under the Bonneville Act did more to develop the Pacific Northwest than any event since the Lewis and Clark Expedition or the coming of the first transcontinental railroads. In my 45 years, I have been privileged to sit at the feet of great Federal power advocates, such as Mr. Ross, the late Senator George W. Norris, the late Senator Charles L. McNary, the late Senator William E. Borah, Senator James E. Murray, ex-Senator Rufus C. Holman, and many others—and to hear from them of their faith in this time-tested approach to water-resource development.

But, Mr. President, as the illustrious poet James Russell Lowell wrote in his immortal Present Crisis:

> New occasions teach new duties,
> Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> They must upward still and onward,
> Who would keep abreast of truth.

The stern exigency of events has compelled us from the Pacific Northwest to consider seriously some other method of financing and keeping on a continuous basis the great power, reclamation, navigation, and flood-control projects which are so vital to our region. That is why the regional corporation bill is being introduced in the Senate today by me, for my colleagues and myself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, explanatory material, provided by Mr. Gus Norwood, about the Columbia River regional corporation bill, and also an analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement and the analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BILL

1. Purpose of the proposed legislation is to carry forward and to improve the Government's water resources programs in the Pacific Northwest by providing a better form of administrative organization and a better method of financing.

2. By improving the stability and adequacy of power supply these programs would result in urgently needed uplift for the re-

gional economy. A specific new purpose of the legislation is stated: "to promote the diversified economic and industrial development of the several States in the basin."

3. This bill creates the Columbia River Development Corporation whose 5-man board would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

4. Modeled after the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation Act, the Corporation would be enabled to issue and deposit with the Secretary of the Treasury its 50-year electric revenue bonds to finance its programs on a self-liquidating basis.

5. Like other Government corporations it would be enabled to use its revenues.

6. The Corporation would be fully subject to the budgetary and other controls imposed by the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945.

7. Provision is made for repayment of all Federal investment on a self-liquidation basis.

8. The bill is generally analogous to the TVA self-financing bill which was approved by the Senate in 1957.

9. The Corporation would succeed the Bonneville Power Administration and assume its assets and liabilities and functions.

10. A public regional corporation to market power from Grand Coulee, Bonneville and other Federal projects was first proposed in 1936 by the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission in a 192-page report to the President.

11. Having in mind this original corporate proposal, Congress wrote into the Bonneville Act of 1937 the language: "The form of administration herein established for the Bonneville project is intended to be provisional pending the establishment of a permanent administration for Bonneville and other projects in the Columbia River Basin."

12. The bill retains the traditional preference or antimonopoly clause.

13. As one step in insuring the adequacy of power supply and in preventing future power shortages the bill requires: "the Corporation shall be responsible for preparing and presenting to the Congress advance programs for construction of such projects and other facilities as will meet the anticipated net power requirements of the Pacific Northwest."

14. The bill does not concern itself with whether power is sold locally by public or private utilities. The Corporation may serve all comers.

15. The bill avoids the controversial approach of both the interstate compact and the Columbia Valley Authority.

16. The Corporation is required to conform to strictly defined standards and goals of comprehensive, multiple purpose conservation of water resources. It is required to construct fish ladders. It will continue present subsidies to irrigation.

---

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS, BONNEVILLE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1958

Section 1: Section 1 designates the bill as "Bonneville Project Act Amendments of 1958."

Section 2: Section 2 continues existing jurisdiction of the Secretary of War and the Chief of the Engineers and creates a permanent administration for Bonneville and other projects in the Columbia River Basin as contemplated by the Bonneville Project Act. It establishes responsibility to the President and makes the Corporation marketing agent for all federally generated power produced in the Pacific Northwest.

Section 3: Section 3 amends subsection (a) of section 2 of the Bonneville Project Act to make the act consistent with the corporate form of administration. It establishes a board of five full time directors to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate; defines their duties as policy, directive, and general supervisory functions; sets forth the qualifications of directors; enables the Corporation to construct hydroelectric projects or other power producing facilities which are authorized by Congress; establishes the unified and orderly development of the Columbia River Basin through the timely construction of multiple purpose projects as the standard which the Corporation shall meet. This section also contemplates that the Corporation shall be the President's agent for coordinating activities with Canada. It further imposes on the Corporation a positive duty to obtain the counsel, assistance, and participation of residents of the area, particularly as represented by the State and local governments and other organizations, public and private, in the development and operation of its program.

Section 4: Section 4 adds to the objectives of the Bonneville Project Act the promotion of "the diversified economic and industrial development of the several States in the basin"; and strengthens the statutory authority to maintain a grid system for the Pacific Northwest.

Section 5: Section 5 removes a limitation of existing law by permitting, but not requiring, the Corporation to alleviate hardships resulting to owners of property because of acquisition by the Corporation when they are required to sustain expenses in relocating businesses.

Section 6: Section 6 authorizes the acquisition of property by exchange.

Section 7: Section 7 adds technical powers necessary to the corporate form of administration; provides specifically for wheeling electric energy as a service by the Corporation; authorizes the Corporation to adjust for dislocations caused by its acquisition or construction of any projects; and requires that the Corporation file complete annual reports, including a financial statement, with the President and Congress.

Section 8: Section 8 defines "Pacific Northwest" and the "Columbia River Power System." The Columbia River Power System excludes specific nonpower facilities which do not constitute an integral part of any power dam or are not necessary for the operation of a project for the generation of power.

Section 9: Section 9 conforms the existing provisions of the Bonneville Project Act to the corporate form of organization; provides for the sale of electric energy to Federal agencies and in conjunction with other provisions of the act places upon the Corporation the responsibility for fixing and maintaining adequate rate schedules.

Section 10: Section 10 authorizes the Corporation to make the most advantageous arrangements for maintenance of facilities by utilizing the services of other agencies, public or private, with which it is doing business.

Section 11: Section 11 expands existing section 6 of the Bonneville Project Act by making express provision for wheeling electric energy; by fixing the responsibility for adequate rates and charges for services on the Corporation; requiring that the rates be both as low as possible consistent with sound business principles and at the same time adequate to make the reimbursable activities of the Corporation self-liquidating, including the repayment of principal and interest to the United States.

The section further both limits and defines the purposes to which the costs of multiple-purpose projects may be allocated and requires the Corporation to present, in the interests of full disclosure of the facts to appropriate Government agencies, a tentative cost allocation which is not now required from any agency. The section further reinforces the responsibility to the President by requiring presidential approval of the allocation of actual costs. The bill continues the requirement that accounting records be maintained in accordance with Federal Power Commission requirements.

Section 12: Section 12 defines the responsibility of the Corporation as: (1) Requiring an advance program which, in the interests of regional responsibility, must be submitted to the governors of the States in the Pacific Northwest prior to its submission to Congress and the President, and on which they, as well as the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army, have the right to include their comments.

The bill further directs that the program of the Corporation shall be designed to conserve, develop, and improve the water resources of the region in order to obtain optimum public benefits. Moreover, it imposes on the Corporation a new responsibility to select among projects so as to attain the objects of the act. A statutory objective for the control of floods on the Columbia River is established, and the Corporation is directed to take cognizance of this and of the approved plans of the Corps of Engineers for navigation improvements. It fixes the responsibility of the Corporation for multiple purpose, optimum development of the natural resources. The Corporation is, nevertheless, limited by the section to multiple-purpose facilities in the Pacific Northwest and projects to be constructed are required to be submitted to Congress as part of the annual budget program required by the Government Corporation Control Act. Additional limitations are imposed in that the statutory authority of the Secretary of the Army to prescribe regulations for the operation of projects for flood control is specifically recognized.

The section further permits the utilization of existing Federal agencies to carry out the functions of the Corporation so that their present organization need not be disrupted.

This section also incorporates statutory requirements applicable to the Bureau of Reclamation protecting the rights of water users under State laws.

Section 13: Section 13 amends existing provisions for open-market purchases to compensate for the increased cost of materials and services.

Section 14: Section 14 amends section 9 of the Bonneville Project Act to establish a composite advisory council. This continues the intragovernmental council established by the original Bonneville Project Act and incorporates the concept of the Bonneville Regional Advisory Board which includes non-Federal agencies. Other provisions are designed to assure that the advisory council shall be independent of the Corporation.

Section 15: Section 15 amends section 10 of the Bonneville Project Act, relating to personnel, to conform to the corporate form of organization. The civil-service law and the Veteran's Preference Act are made generally applicable. Additional restrictions against political tests or qualifications are imposed and present protective legislation is extended to the employees of the Corporation, as well as to the employees of persons contracting with the Corporation.

Section 16: Section 16 establishes priorities according to which the funds of the Corporation shall be expended, subject to the limitations imposed pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act. It further provides for the issuance of revenue bonds by the Corporation, which must be repaid within a 50-year period, bear interest at the rate of 2½ percent per year. The approval of the Secretary of the Treasury is required both as to financial feasibility and conformity with the orderly management of the fiscal affairs of the Government.

The section further provides for the purchase of the Corporation's bonds by the Treasury and requires that the cost of assets acquired from the United States allocated to power shall be paid within a 50-year period.

Section 17: Section 17 provides for the orderly transition to a corporate form of organization. Portions of the Columbia River power system shall be transferred by the President when he finds that more effective management or the efficiency of operations will be promoted. The facilities of the Bonneville Power Administration, however, will be transferred as soon as the Board of Directors is appointed.

The section also strengthens the authority of the Corporation to promote industrial development by prohibiting the Corporation from entering into or carrying out existing contracts which purport to restrict the sales of industrial power in any manner not expressly authorized by the act. The Corporation is required to assume obligations of the United States.

Section 18: Section 18 provides for the application of the Government Corporation Control Act and authorizes negotiations leading to the operation of the Corporation pursuant to an intertsate compact.

Section 19: Section 19 makes minor language changes.

Section 20: Section 20 provides for a period up to 6 months in duration for the transfer to a corporate form of organization at the discretion of the President.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, along with the explanatory material received from Mr. Norwood's office, I believe that recent editorials from representative Oregon newspapers should be included in the RECORD, for the information of Members of the Senate. These editorials are from the Oregonian, of December 28, 1957; the Oregon Journal, of January 5, 1958; the Salem Statesman, of December 30, 1957; and the East Oregonian, of December 10, 1957.

The editorials in the Statesman and the Journal are somewhat critical of certain aspects of the regional corporation bill, although not necessarily hostile to the idea in its entirety. The editorial from the Oregonian is by the editor of the editorial page of that newspaper, Herbert Lundy, who has been one of the leading and most faithful advocates of this particular approach to water-resource development in the Pacific Northwest. Mr. Lundy long has insisted that a new method of obtaining funds for Columbia Basin projects is essential to orderly and continuous development. The editorial from the East Oregonian likewise urges early consideration of the proposal.

In my opinion, the RECORD also should contain an editorial entitled "Power Planning Chaos" published in the Oregonian of January 17, 1958. This editorial demonstrates why some unified and more successful method is now required in order to bring about comprehensive use of the vast resources of the Columbia River system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all these insertions be made in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of December 28, 1957]

REGIONAL POWER AGENCY CAN DO THE JOB

The Oregonian welcomes Senator NEUBERGER's announcement that he will introduce a Columbia Basin regional power corporation bill in the coming session. A thorough Congressional examination of this proposal is long overdue. In our opinion, this is one formula for planned and comprehensive regional development, largely self-financed, on which leaders of both political parties, the Eisenhower administration and a Democratic Congress can reach substantial agreement.

In brief, the plan calls for: A new Federal corporation with directors elected or appointed from the Northwest States to absorb the Bonneville power marketing agency; this agency to finance the power costs of new multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects by selling revenue bonds backed by system earnings; the agency to be empowered to go into atomic generation when this becomes feasible; Congress to continue to appropriate funds for traditional nonreimbursable costs assigned to flood control and navigation; the use of a portion of power revenues to assist irrigation to be continued, under Congressional direction, possibly through establishment of a Columbia Basin account; the Federal and regional responsibility for fisheries and recreation, affected by dam building, to be recognized and met.

There are, of course, many complex problems involved, none of which seems too tough to be solved, beyond this bare outline.

One is the historic Federal preference clause which is retained in a bill prepared by the Pacific Northwest Public Power Association. Senator NEUBERGER favors modification of the preference to stimulate Federal power sales to industries and for a better distribution of power consumption so that Oregon and other Northwest States will be more competitive with Washington. Private utilities and many who believe there is no longer any need, if there ever was a need, for preference, favor eliminating it entirely.

Another is the need to obtain the lowest possible costs for power production. Revenue bond financing would cost more than Congressional appropriations with repayment at interest. But a Government guaranty of such bonds would provide a lower rate. Also, an agency which could plan its financing and construction could build dams and power lines more cheaply than agencies laboring under the uncertainties and setbacks of Congressional appropriations. In any event, the Northwest is moving into a period when availability of large blocks of power is becoming more essential than obtaining the lowest rates in the Nation.

It had been expected that a regional power corporation bill would be introduced in the past session by Senator JACKSON of Washington. At the last moment he decided against it. Perhaps he thought it might be a political hazard in his race for reelection next year. Also, it has been argued that Congress might use the existence of such a bill as an excuse to refuse funds for John Day Dam. Since there will be great pressure in Congress against more funds for northwest dams, due to the missiles program, we think more delay on the regional agency plan would be inexcusable. We must have the machinery to do the job for ourselves if the declining Federal interest evaporates entirely.

There is no sound reason, in our view, why the Eisenhower administration should not support the Federal corporation plan for northwest power. It already has precedents. The President has proposed legislation in two Congresses to make the Tennessee Valley Authority a self-financing agency. The St. Lawrence Seaways Corp. legislation drafted by the administration embodies many of the same principles. The Eisenhower "partnership" idea fits the regional corporation plan—this, indeed, would be a true partnership, between Congress and a regional authority in which Northwest States would have a considerable voice, which would be governed by northwest residents elected by the people or appointed by the President.

The Oregonian has been proposing establishment of a regional power corporation since 1951. It has been approved in principle by many individuals and groups. We believe it can be worked out and can become the most potent force for northwest progress ever devised. Thus, we welcome Senator NEUBERGER's decision to introduce such legislation and believe that adequate hearings in Washington and in the region will show the strength of what is, essentially, a do-it-yourself project of great magnitude.

---

[From the Portland Sunday Journal of January 5, 1958]

QUESTIONS ON POWER CORPORATION

In general, anyone with an idea which might eventuate in more power, public or private, for the Pacific Northwest deserves a hearing. This still is true despite the fact that the regional outlook for power now is the best it has been for 10 years, due primarily to greatly expanded non-Federal construction.

For this reason, Senator NEUBERGER's proposal to introduce a regional power corporation bill, by request, in order that it could be given a full hearing before the Congress, should not be shrugged off.

At the same time, it should be borne in mind that the regional power corporation bill as developed in the past 3 years by the Northwest Public Power Association (Gus Norwood, executive secretary) raises more questions than it answers. And unless Senator NEUBERGER makes some fundamental changes in the measure, it probably will get no farther than the earlier Norwood bills or the Columbia Valley authority bills which preceded it.

Senator NEUBERGER himself raises both general and specific questions concerning provisions of the sixth draft of the Norwood proposal.

He questions whether a new Government entity provides a better medium for expanding and diversifying the region's economy by tapping unused water resources than through a proper program of Federal dam construction.

And he again raises the question concerning the advisability of perpetuating the public preference clause (as the latest Norwood draft does) which discriminates against big industry and the private distributors of Bonneville power, particularly in Oregon. They will be squeezed out of the Federal Columbia power picture in a few years as public preference customers as Washington takes more and more of BPA's total production.

There are other obvious questions which Senator NEUBERGER does not raise. The Norwood bill (which draws liberally on TVA, CVA and St. Lawrence Seaway legislation for ideas) assumes that the regional corporation could finance the proposed takeover of the Bonneville power system and the power features of the Federal Government's power projects in the Columbia Basin by issuing utility revenue bonds payable in 50 years. It bases this assumption on a secondary assumption that the United States Treasury would guarantee payment of these bonds, at least in early stages of operation.

The magnitude of these assumptions becomes apparent when one remembers that the Bonneville Power Administration alone has approximately $420,000,000 invested in its transmission grid and the Federal Government has another $1,500,000,000 invested in power facilities at multipurpose projects.

If a regional power corporation assumed repayment of obligations of this size and undertook construction of another $2,000,000,000 worth of projects simultaneously, it is doubtful that the bond market could or would absorb such a load—even with Uncle's backing.

There are other factors, of course—the question of veto authority over all power projects in the region, public and private, and the question (also left unanswered) as to who would pay for nonreimbursable features of future projects such as fishways, flood control and navigation facilities.

The point is, such a proposal would demand most careful scrutiny as to feasibility and public interest. And this scrutiny should not be permitted to slow down existing Federal projects, such as John Day, which will spell the difference between power plenty and power stringency in the next decade.

---

[From the Oregon Statesman, Salem, Oreg., of December 30, 1957]

POWER AGENCY FOR NORTHWEST

Senator NEUBERGER has agreed to introduce by request a bill to create a Pacific Northwest power authority. The "by request" implies a readiness to have the content of the bill given consideration without a firm commitment to its support. In this instance the request comes from Herb Lundy, editor of the editorial page of the Oregonian who has been advocating a regional power agency for many years.

While the idea has some points of similarity with the once strongly advocated—and bitterly opposed—Columbia Valley Authority, it has this essential difference: The government would be more localized, also no grandiose scheme of overall development, as under TVA, is contemplated. The gist of the plan was explained in an Oregonian editorial Saturday:

"A new Federal corporation with directors elected or appointed from the Northwest States to absorb the Bonneville power marketing agency; this agency to finance the power costs of new multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects by selling revenue bonds backed by system earnings; the agency to be empowered to go into atomic generation when this becomes feasible; Congress to continue to appropriate funds for traditional nonreimbursable costs assigned to flood control and navigation; the use of a portion of power revenues to assist irrigation to be continued, under Congressional direction, possibly through establishment of a Columbia Basin account; the Federal and regional responsibility for fisheries and recreation, affected by dam building, to be recognized and met."

Initially the agency's revenue bond financing would be supported by the treasury, although this may not be necessary. If county PUDs in Washington can float bond issues running into hundreds of millions with no more assets than a power license, surely a BPA (Bonneville Power Agency) could do the same, and at lower interest rate than the recent Chelan PUD issue where the coupon rate was 5 percent.

There would be some obvious advantages from a local authority. The pull and haul for Congressional appropriations would be halted. Projects could be scheduled better. Comprehensive contracts could be let. Administrative costs should be lower.

On the other hand some difficulties can be foreseen. Unless the unfair "public preference" clause is omitted, Oregon would virtually be eliminated as a sharer in the agency's power output, unless it had a surplus to dispose of.

The problem of government also rises. If it is to be a Federal authority, then it will remain a Federal instrumentality. If it is to be a regional agency, the mechanics for its continuing control is complicated. The compact idea is not flexible enough. There are successful interstate authorities—Port of New York for instance—but none where the contention potential is so pronounced. If appointments are to be made by governors, we have chances of disagreement there—or of reversal of policies depending on the swings of political fortunes. The old argument between upstream and downstream States would arise. A prime question is this: To whom would the governing body of the agency be responsible—to the Congress, to the President, to the States (governors or legislatures), to the people of the several States?

Still other questions present themselves: What would its status be, in case it wanted to construct a dam, with relation to conflicting interest: fishing, irrigation, wild life? Also how would costs be apportioned on multiple-purpose projects like Libby Dam?

We do not imply that these difficulties cannot be hurdled. That should be possible; but we would do well to have them spelled out in advance rather than to plunge in with blind optimism.

It may be too late for such an agency to get authorization from Congress. So many of the potential sites already are committed that the pattern already has been pretty well fixed. Also Congress is characteristically slow to move, and certainly will not enact this measure unless it has hearty support from the Northwest Congressional delegation.

Let us have the bill introduced, however, and laid open for public discussion and Congressional consideration. The idea itself has merit. Give the bill to implement it a close but fair look.

---

[From the East Oregonian, Pendleton, Oreg., of December 10, 1957]

A REGIONAL CORPORATION

Because the Congress will be asked by the Eisenhower administration to appropriate more funds for defense there has been much speculation as to the availability of funds for domestic programs. It has been anticipated that the administration will adopt a "no new starts" policy which would halt appropriations for water resources development projects—hydroelectric, reclamation, and flood control.

How would this—delaying of construction of John Day Dam, impounding funds for construction of the Crooked River reclamation project, withholding funds for several other projects that have been authorized—affect the economy of the State of Oregon?

Oregon's economy is dependent upon the development of three basic resources—wood, soil, and water. Wood products manufacturing contributes most to the State's economy and agriculture stands second. Full utilization of the water resources of the State in the direction of increasing agricultural production and providing all available hydroelectric energy from our streams could do much more toward growth of the State's economy than has been done.

Some of the job of developing the State's water resources can be done by the private power companies. They are doing some of it now. But there is much they cannot do. They cannot build reclamation projects and neither can any other private group. And they cannot provide low-cost power that will attract those industries that must have low-cost power.

Metallurgical industries have been moving into the Ohio Valley and eastward because the Northwest cannot provide them with abundant low-cost power. Although they are paying more than they would be charged for Bonneville power the higher cost is just about offset by higher freight rates they would pay on products manufactured in the Northwest and shipped to the populous centers of the Midwest and East. Low-cost power must be available in the Northwest in sufficient quantity to attract those industries here. There are too many contrary factors that make the region undesirable to them.

What can be done to assure the continued development of the vast hydroelectric potential of this region?

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER says it is the responsibility of the Federal Government and he refuses to accept the administration's premise that the Nation cannot afford to develop its resources at the same time that it is catching up with the Russians in the missiles race. He points out that the Russians are well able to keep both programs going simultaneously and argues that the United States is quite capable of matching the Soviets.

There is another approach to the subject. Its proponents do not take issue with Senator NEUBERGER, but it has been their thinking for some time that the day might not be too far off when the Congress, no matter in which party's control, would refuse to annually spend large sums of money for the development of the hydroelectric potential of the Northwest. They point out that it has been increasingly difficult to get adequate funds. The Oregonian has been a spokesman for this group. It is that newspaper's suggestion that a regional corporation, composed of the Federal Government and the Northwest States, be formed to build hydroelectric projects in this region. The job would be financed by borrowing funds on existing installations, thereby removing the Federal Government from financing.

We think Senator NEUBERGER is entirely right, that this Nation is well able to pay for the development of its resources while it is spending for an adequate defense. But we would like to see the introduction of legislation that would establish a regional corporation. Then, if the Congress refused to make any more appropriations for hydroelectric projects in the Northwest the region would not be placed in a vacuum. A regional corporation would permit progress on the huge task of developing the region's hydroelectric potential. We do not see how industrial and business growth can be accomplished without full utilization of the water resources of the region.

---

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of January 17, 1958]

POWER PLANNING CHAOS

The President's budget for Northwest water projects illustrates again why this newspaper advocates a regional power corporation for comprehensive planning and orderly construction of Columbia Basin power units with major self-financing by sale of revenue bonds.

The $2 million item for John Day Dam in the Columbia would barely keep that needed project alive. The Eisenhower administration originally favored partnership construction of this dam, which is a link in the Federal system. But Congressman Sam Coon's bill to effect that, with local utilities to be the cash-contributing partners, never got out of committee, and Coon was defeated at the next election.

The next administration budget did not include anything for John Day. But the Democratic Congress approved a token amount, $1 million, to nail down the project, as a Federal undertaking. The administration accepted that, but in the present

budget squeeze to provide more billions for arms without new taxes, only $2 million was asked for John Day. Only preliminary work could be done, if that figure should be accepted by Congress, toward construction of a $350 million project.

Ice Harbor, Hills Creek, and Cougar Dams, also given life by Congress without administration approval, fared better in the budget. But the administration policy is no new starts—a policy which Congress may accept, this time, in view of the new sums needed for missiles, earth satellites, and the military generally. That means postponement of lower Monumental Dam, the next in a stairway of four to bring navigation to Lewiston on the Snake, and of Green Peter Dam, on the South Santiam, another project, like Cougar, on the South Fork of the McKenzie, originally labeled partnership by the administration.

The President did include $196,000 to complete a Bureau of Reclamation study of feasibility of a high dam at the Pleasant Valley site in the Snake—a study sought by Secretary of Interior Seaton but forbidden by a committee of Congress last session. Here, again, orderly planning has taken a beating from the political pull and haul between administration and Congress. Northwest Power Co.'s application for a lower dam at Pleasant Valley is before the Federal Power Commission and a decision may be expected before Congress can act on the high dam survey item. The higher dam should have been studied long ago.

The record of Federal planning and construction in the Columbia Basin is that of a drunken man staggering up hill on a windy day. Besides the tug-of-war between Congress and the administration, and between the political parties, there has been an underground cold war among the Federal agencies, including the Army engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Power Commission and Bonneville Power Administration, and a constant struggle between public power and private power.

We see no relief from this chaotic warfare which is strangling Northwest water resource development, in view of the space-age requirements for more and more appropriations for arms to compete with Russia. The time is right for Congressional approval of a single, self-financing Northwest agency to absorb the Bonneville Power Administration and take over planning and construction of multiple-use projects.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, I send to the desk the bill and the insertions to which I have referred, and I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3114) to amend the Bonneville Project Act in order to establish the Columbia River Development Corporation, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN DURUM WHEAT FROM ACREAGE ALLOTMENT AND MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to exempt the production of durum wheat in the Tule Lake area, Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., from the acreage allotment and marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3120) to exempt the production of durum wheat in the Tule Lake area, Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., from the acreage allotment and marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. KUCHEL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KUCHEL

I am introducing this bill for the veteran homesteaders of the Tule Lake division of the Klamath project in northern California. That basin, totaling about 68,000 acres, lies above 4,000 elevation which limits its crop program to alsike clover, alfalfa, potatoes, and malt barley. Since World War II, veterans settled the land. A combination of low tariffs, prohibitive freight rates and the diversion of acreage from the basic crops have rendered these crops profitless. This has resulted in the economic failure of 40 percent of these settlers in the past 3 years. After 5 years of extensive experimentation in cooperation with the University of California, durum wheat has emerged as the crop most likely to solve the problem. They have proven that they can raise not only high-quality durum wheat, but have established a local market for macaroni that no other durum area can fill. However, they have been unable to obtain wheat allotments to raise it legally, and they have requested this legislation as a last desperate means of saving their community. Through it, they ask the permission of the Congress of the United States to stay in business.

## PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO GIVE CONGRESS POWER TO DETERMINE DISABILITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO DISCHARGE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF HIS OFFICE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a method of determining disability of the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 141) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the determination of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For the third time in the history of this Nation, we are confronted with a situation which graphically demonstrates the ambiguity created by precedent in the Presidential succession provisions of our Constitution.

When, after having been shot down by a disappointed office seeker, President Garfield lay ill for 80 days and his sole act as President was his signature on an extradition paper, the country wondered if it would be constitutionally proper for the Vice President to assume the powers and duties of the President. Even the Members of the Cabinet debated whether, if he did so, the President, upon recovery, could resume the duties of his office.

When President Wilson lay seriously ill, the victim of a severe stroke, the Nation again pondered these issues.

Now President Eisenhower, himself the unfortunate victim of heart attack, ileitis, and cerebral spasm, has called upon the Congress to settle once and for all the perplexing issues arising out of the Presidential succession in times when the President is incapacitated.

JOHN TYLER SET PRECEDENT MORE THAN 100 YEARS AGO

We would not be here reviewing this problem had it not been for the precedent established by Vice President John Tyler in 1841, when, upon the death of President William Henry Harrison, he insisted upon taking the oath as President of the United States and resisted all attempts to address him as Acting President rather than the President.

He had already taken the oath of office as Vice President of the United States. There is no language in the Constitution requiring the Vice President, upon succeeding to the powers and duties of the office of President, to take a new oath of office. It was John Tyler who created that precedent, as the result, I am confident, of a misconstruction of the language of the Constitution.

There were many in Tyler's day who would not agree that he was President, but rather felt that he was Acting President. Among the newspapers of the day, the Harrisburg Intelligencer, the Richmond Inquirer, and the New York Evening Post expressed that view. Some Members of Congress raised the question of how they should address him when they notified him that the Congress was ready for work. It was Mr. Wise of Virginia who informed the Congress that Tyler would insist upon being regarded as the President and, although this did not meet with the approval of persons such as Senator William Allen of Ohio, Vice President Tyler had his way, and was thereafter known as the President.

THERE WAS A POLITICAL BACKGROUND TO TYLER'S ACTION

It may be of interest to point out that this action was the result of the fact that William Henry Harrison was a Whig and Tyler a Democrat. Harrison was nominated by the Whigs as their candidate for President in 1840. The campaign was conducted without a political platform upon the part of the Whigs.

John Tyler, who had been at least a dissident Democrat, so far as some of the policies of Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren were concerned, was persuaded by the Whigs to accept the nomination for Vice President. However, when Harrison died, the Cabinet, headed by Daniel Webster, sent a message to Mr. Tyler, at his home in Virginia, to the effect that, owing to the regrettable death of the President of the

United States, William Henry Harrison, he, John Tyler, was now Acting President. Observe I say "Acting President."

Instead of responding to this message, Tyler came hurrying to Washington, and he persuaded Chief Judge William Cranch of the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia to administer to him the oath of President of the United States.

The reason behind his insistence upon being known as the President was that he was fearful that the Cabinet, appointed by General Harrison, would attempt to direct his activities in the Office of President and in discharging his duties and powers of that office.

So, refusing to be subject to the orders of the Cabinet, he took the oath as President.

CONSTITUTION CITED IN ARGUMENTS ON BOTH SIDES OF QUESTION

The language of article II, section 1, clause 6 of the Constitution formed the basis of the arguments both pro and con with respect to the right of Vice President Tyler to become more than Acting President. That part of the Constitution reads as follows:

ARTICLE II, SECTION 1, CLAUSE 6, THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

In case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation, or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The matter of Presidential succession first appeared in the Constitutional Convention in the draft submitted by Charles Pinckney. When the original draft of the Constitution went to the Committee on Style it contained two separate clauses dealing with Presidential succession. Although the manner of the selection of the President and the status of his successor had not been decided upon by the Convention at that point, it is interesting to note the language of these two clauses.

This is the language which went to the Committee on Style, and which was revised solely for the purpose of attaining what the members of that committee deemed to be better literary quality in the great document which was being prepared. I now read the Pinckney provision:

In case of [the President's] removal as aforesaid, death, absence, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers or duties of his office, the Vice President shall exercise those powers and duties until another President be chosen, or until the inability of the President be removed.

The Legislature may declare by law what officer of the United States shall act as President, in case of the death, resignation, or disability of the President and Vice President; and such officer shall act accordingly, until such disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

Please note that in this draft the Vice President was to exercise the powers and duties of the Office of the Presidency as distinct from the office itself. Also note that he was to serve until the inability of the President be removed. Further, the delegation of power to Congress was to establish what person should act in the event both the President and Vice President were disabled. The Committee on Style changed this language so that it became one clause instead of two, and in so doing brought much of the confusion which now exists.

However, I believe that the primary cause of the confusion was the action of Vice President Tyler, as I have already described it, because the clause of the Constitution as it now reads refers to the "powers and duties of the said office," and then adds: "The same shall devolve on the Vice President."

DRAFTERS OF CONSTITUTION INTENDED THAT VICE PRESIDENT SHOULD ASSUME DUTIES OF THE OFFICE, NOT THE OFFICE ITSELF

It is clear from the language of the Constitution itself and from what was said in the Pinckney draft that the intention of the drafters of the Constitution was not that the office should devolve upon the Vice President, but that the powers and the duties thereof should so devolve upon him.

The wisdom of the Founding Fathers is certainly legendary, but it is obvious that in this area at least, it was not infallible so far as the Committee on Style was concerned. When John Tyler established his precedent and the others of his day acceded to it, they rested their argument upon that part of the clause 6 which states that in case of removal of the President from his office, or of his death or inability to discharge the duties of his office, the same shall devolve upon the Vice President. It was their position as I have said, that the words "the same" referred to "the said office" rather than to the powers and duties of the said office. Their argument may be disputed today in theory but it is established in precedent for, since the assumption of the Office of the Presidency by Vice President Tyler, six other Vice Presidents have assumed that office upon the death of the President. Vice Presidents Fillmore, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Truman gained office in this manner.

It is important to note that there are four instances in which the words "the same" apply with equal logic. First there is removal from office; secondly, there is death; thirdly, there is resignation; and fourthly, there is inability. What devolves upon the Vice President by virtue of this clause devolves in each of these cases and the pattern having been established that it is the office which devolves upon the Vice President upon the death of the President, it is difficult to maintain today, if the Vice President were to act in the President's stead during the President's incapacity, that the Vice President had not become President. This, of course, would exclude the possibility that the President could, upon recovery, resume the powers and duties of the Office of President.

This very difficulty has twice before caused conscientious Vice Presidents to refrain from assuming the powers and duties of the Presidency, although the situation then existing certainly demanded it.

AMENDMENT WOULD ENABLE PRESIDENT TO RESUME DUTIES UPON RECOVERY FROM DISABILITY

The purpose of my amendment, Mr. President, is to remove this ambiguity completely, and to provide that when the disability exists, particularly in days of great crisis, the Vice President shall, by virtue of his office and by reason of the Constitution, become the Acting President, not the President. This would enable the President, who was ill and disabled, to resume his office upon recovery, and there would be no question or doubt about it.

NATION HAS SUFFERED FROM LACK OF LEADERSHIP DURING INCAPACITY OF PRESIDENTS

That this Nation suffered by reason of the failure of Vice President Arthur and Vice President Marshall to assume the Office of President may be inferred from the inactivity of the Presidents during their periods of incapacity. Allusion has already been made to the fact that during his 80 days of illness, President Garfield signed but one official document, that being an extradition paper. In President Wilson's day he was not able to meet with the Cabinet for 8 months. More than a score of bills became law without his signature. The Democratic Members of Congress sought unsuccessfully to get his advice on certain matters then pending before the Congress. Leadership and direction were obviously lacking.

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP BY THE EXECUTIVE IS ESSENTIAL

While it was important to have leadership and direction in 1881 and in 1920, it is doubly important to have such characteristics today. It is foolhardy to suppose that this country may indulge in the supposition that since the Nation has not suffered greater tribulation during these periods of Presidential incapacity, it may expect to escape unscathed in a similar crisis in the future.

It is not sufficient to consider this matter in the light of what the office means to the United States alone. We must consider what the Office of the Presidency of the United States means to the world as well, for this Nation occupies a position of leadership which we must maintain in order that the free institutions we revere may continue to exist.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER HAS ASKED CLARIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

We are confronted then both by an opportunity and by a challenge. The opportunity has been made possible by the candor and frankness of President Eisenhower, who has stated that when you are confined to your bed you think about a lot of things and that one of the things he thought about was the determination of the inability of the President. His reflection caused him to request of the Department of Justice to submit a proposed solution of the issue we are discussing today. Such a proposal has been submitted in the House of Representatives by Congressman KEATING. It must be obvious to all that inherent in the assumption of such a proposal by the President is the idea that

the present provisions of the Constitution are inadequate in this regard. If they are inadequate, the paramount question is what new remedy shall be invoked by which to determine the inability of a President.

This then is our challenge. We must determine the critical question of who, or better yet, what body, shall determine when a President is incapacitated, and when he has recovered sufficiently to perform the duties of his office.

SEVERAL METHODS HAVE BEEN PROPOSED

The President has suggested that the Cabinet be the agency to determine the ability of the President to discharge the functions of his office.

Senator FULBRIGHT has submitted another proposal under which the Supreme Court would make such a determination after submission of the issue to the Congress.

The chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has authored two proposals, one of which would require the appointment of a commission to determine the issue. The other proposal of the chairman would leave determination of that question to await the enactment of a statute following authorization for such procedure.

While I do not desire in any manner to deprecate the efforts of any other person who has seriously considered this matter, I am convinced that each of them represent certain difficulties which I shall specify in a moment. I believe that the proper approach to this problem would be to vest the determination of this issue in the Congress of the United States. The President is the only Federal officer elected by all the people of all the States. The Members of Congress are elected by the people of the several States and Congressional districts.

CONGRESS CAN BEST REPRESENT THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE IN THIS MATTER

We are, of course, dealing with the highest elective office which is in the power of the people of the United States to bestow on any man. To interpose the Supreme Court, or the members of the Cabinet between the people of the United States and the Office of President would seem to me to violate the spirit of the Constitution as we know it. The determination of the inability of the President of the United States must be publicly accepted and the vehicle calculated to gain public acceptance most readily, it seems to me, is the vehicle to be adopted. There is no group, nor could there be any individual, who represents a better cross section of public opinion than the Congress of the United States. Their decision would be less apt to be motivated by temporary gain than any other agency for any such temptation would be tempered by the knowledge that they would soon have to stand accountable before the people of the United States in free and open elections. There is no such check existent so far as the members of the Supreme Court or the Cabinet are concerned, and while I would not impute bad faith to anyone who might occupy those offices, I am deeply conscious of the fact that we are dealing with the Constitution and that we must, therefore, examine all contingencies. It has been argued that the members of the Supreme Court, or the members of the President's Cabinet, could be removed by impeachment in the event that they were unfaithful in the task which they would be called upon to perform, should the President be incapacitated. Impeachment is a difficult proposition, not lightly to be considered, and often fettered with political implications of the greatest magnitude. The check which impeachment affords, therefore, is hardly as formidable as the check represented by the ballot box.

With this in mind, I would like to review some of the provisions which I have written into the amendment which I now offer.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution may be printed at length at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Whenever the President proclaims that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, or whenever the Senate and the House of Representatives pass a resolution declaring that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President, or if there be no Vice President, the officer next in line of succession to the office of President as provided by law, shall be Acting President.

"SEC. 2. An Acting President shall exercise the powers and duties of the office of President under this article until (1) the end of the then current Presidential term, (2) such Acting President finds and proclaims that the inability of the President no longer exists, (3) the inability of the President is determined, in accordance with section 3 of this article, no longer to exist, whichever first occurs.

"SEC. 3. Whenever, during any period in which an Acting President is discharging the powers and duties of the office of President under this article, the Senate and the House of Representatives pass a resolution declaring that the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office no longer exists, the Acting President shall cease to exercise the powers and duties of the office of President and the President shall exercise such powers and duties.

"SEC. 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case where either or both Houses of Congress are not in session, declaring what officer or officers shall convene such House or Houses for the purpose of enabling them to perform the duties conferred upon them by this article.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I certainly would not be offensive to my friend from Wyoming. I share his concern about former President Tyler's confusion. But I am wondering what has happened to the 3-minute rule. Has it become a casualty this afternoon? We are in the morning hour, I admonish my colleague.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I regret that I was not close enough to hear what my friend from Illinois said.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are in the morning hour, and I wondered whether the 3-minute rule had become a casualty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The 3-minute rule has frequently been a casualty in the progress of these matters. Senators have been very indulgent, the Senator from Illinois particularly. He is always kind and indulgent toward me. I express my public appreciation to him now, as I have done on many occasions before. I now come to the analysis of the proposed amendment, and then I shall be finished.

ONLY PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY IS DEALT WITH IN AMENDMENT

My joint resolution, I should explain, deals only with the question of the inability of the President. It does not attempt to repeal article II, section 1, clause 6, insofar as that article relates to the death, resignation or removal of the President. My resolution provides that the President may himself proclaim that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office and that when he does so, the Vice President shall succeed him as Acting President. It also provides that in the event the President does not, or cannot, make such a proclamation, the Senate and the House of Representatives may pass a resolution declaring that he is unable to discharge the duties and powers of his office, and the Vice President may thereupon assume those duties. I have required in my resolution that the President proclaim, rather than announce, his disability, for a proclamation is a more formal act which is widely publicized and disseminated and which would serve to fix the date, the time, and the place of such action so as to avoid, as near as possible, litigation which may result.

CONGRESS COULD DETERMINE PRESIDENT'S ABILITY TO RESUME DUTIES

Under the terms of my joint resolution the Acting President is permitted to exercise the powers and duties of the Office of the President until the end of the current Presidential term, if the President does not recover sufficiently to assume those duties himself. If the President does recover, the Acting President may so declare and the Vice President will then cease to exercise the functions of the Presidency. In the event that neither of these two contingencies occur, my resolution would permit the Senate and the House of Representatives to determine whether the President had sufficiently recovered to again resume his duties. Since I realize that the Congress is not always in session, and its function under my resolution is of extreme importance, I have taken the precaution to provide authority for the Congress to pass a statute declaring what officer or officers may convene either or

both Houses of Congress to determine the issue of inability. These basically are the provisions of the amendment.

CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION REGARDING PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY WOULD BE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

I should touch on one other matter in discussing my proposal. When the proposal states that the Senate and the House of Representatives may pass a resolution declaring inability, or declaring that the inability has been removed, I am referring to the type of resolution which is popularly known as a concurrent resolution. This is a resolution which, as all Members know, does not require the signature of the President. A concurrent resolution, as such, is not mentioned in the Constitution. It has been used for so long, however, without serious question that I believe it forms a proper vehicle to be utilized in this instance.

## GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the two Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. FREAR] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1958, as General Pulaski Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

This year marks the 178th anniversary of the death of General Pulaski, a great Polish patriot who gave his life on behalf of those ideals and liberties which we as a nation cherish. He gave his life for our country during our fight for freedom. The memory of General Pulaski is significant to us not only for the debt of gratitude which we as Americans owe to him and to his people, but also because General Pulaski's service in the cause of freedom stands as a symbol of the cooperation of free men of the world wherever they may be to join together in common cause. Regardless of nationality, the principles of freedom and liberty upon which our country was founded have always bound men together.

Let us take time this year to pay tribute to the great Polish patriot, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who lived for, fought for, and died for the cause of American liberty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 142) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1958, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brigadier General Pulaski, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. FREAR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SMALL BUSINESS DISASTER LOANS—ADDITIONAL SPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, today I reported from the Banking and Currency Committee, Senate bill 2920, a bill to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall. The bill was originally sponsored by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and myself. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who had similar bills before the committee, be added as cosponsors when the bill, as reported, is next reprinted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to say that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] came before our committee and testified, and has been of great assistance in developing this bill; and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has also taken a great interest and has submitted to the committee a very fine statement.

## PROVISION OF SCIENTIFIC SCHOLARSHIPS TO CERTAIN CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the following Senators have indicated their desire to join with me as cosponsors of S. 2737, a bill to provide scientific scholarships and fellowships for children of veterans and other individuals from interest resulting from the investment of certain funds obtained under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and to provide for the repayment from such funds of certain American war claims against Germany and Japan:

Senators DOUGLAS, THURMOND, SMITH of Maine, SYMINGTON, and SCOTT.

I ask unanimous consent that their names be included on the next printing of this legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN AREAS ADJACENT TO NATIONAL SYSTEM OF DEFENSE HIGHWAYS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of January 16, 1958, the names of Mr. PURTELL and Mr. CLARK were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3041) to provide for assisting the States in the improvement and control of certain areas adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSH on January 16, 1958.

## INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL AND CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a committee amendment to S. 27, the pending postal pay bill, Calendar No. 716. Also, I submit a committee amendment to S. 734. The pending Classification Act pay bill, Calendar No. 740.

I ask that these amendments be printed so that every Member of the Senate may have full opportunity to study them carefully. If that is done I am confident they will be quickly approved as presented, without objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendments will be received and printed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should also like to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, three tables. The first table relates to the pay of our postal employees and the second table relates to the pay of employees under the Classification Act. Each table shows (a) the current rate of pay in each grade or level and step of the schedules, (b) the rate that would be established by the administration bill, and (c) the rate that will be established by the adoption of the committee amendment. Also shown in each instance is the exact difference between the administration bill and the committee amendment.

The third table shows the number of employees currently in each step of each level of the postal field schedule. In view of some recent articles appearing in certain local newspapers, I ask that each Member of the Senate pay particularly close attention to the number of postal employees in level 4 and particularly the number of employees in step 7, and the three longevity levels of level 4. These figures speak for themselves and show that the postal employee who enters level 4 as clerk or carrier ends his Federal career 25 or 30 years later in level 4. This employee only gets an increase in pay when Congress votes it for him.

Mr. President, the committee amendments I have just submitted do not alter, materially, the pay bills pending on the Senate Calendar. These bills which were reported last spring provided that they become effective at a then current date. The committee amendments, in recognition of that fact, would make the increases retroactively effective to October 1, 1957.

Additionally, the amendments include a number of provisions recently recommended by the administration.

Otherwise, the bills, as amended, are essentially the same.

The provisions of the bills will be explained and discussed fully at the proper time. However, I cannot conclude these brief remarks without paying proper tribute to the fine work done last year, and again this year, by the Federal Employees' Compensation Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. Serving with him on the subcommittee were the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the distinguished senior Senator from

North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

The subcommittee held long and exhaustive public hearings last spring, following which they reported an equitable, well-designed bill to the full committee. The full committee acted promptly and reported the bill to the Senate.

Again this year the subcommittee acted with dispatch in the development of appropriate amendments to the pending bills.

I am most happy to report that the amendments were adopted unanimously by the subcommittee and approved unanimously by the full committee.

I have never seen a finer spirit of cooperation or more complete agreement than that which prevailed in both the subcommittee and the full committee in connection with the consideration and approval of these measures.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Postal pay table—Comparison between (a) present rates, (b) rates in administration bill, and (c) rates in S. 27*

| Level | | Step 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Present rate | $2,880 | $2,980 | $3,080 | $3,180 | $3,280 | $3,380 | $3,480 |
| | Administration plan | 3,053 | 3,159 | 3,265 | 3,371 | 3,477 | 3,583 | 3,689 |
| | S. 27 | 3,335 | 3,445 | 3,555 | 3,665 | 3,775 | 3,885 | 3,995 |
| | Difference [1] | +282 | +286 | +290 | +294 | +298 | +302 | +306 |
| 2 | Present rate | 3,090 | 3,195 | 3,300 | 3,405 | 3,510 | 3,615 | 3,720 |
| | Administration plan | 3,276 | 3,387 | 3,498 | 3,609 | 3,720 | 3,831 | 3,942 |
| | S. 27 | 3,560 | 3,675 | 3,790 | 3,905 | 4,020 | 4,135 | 4,250 |
| | Difference [1] | +284 | +288 | +292 | +296 | +300 | +304 | +308 |
| 3 | Present rate | 3,330 | 3,445 | 3,560 | 3,675 | 3,790 | 3,905 | 4,020 |
| | Administration plan | 3,530 | 3,652 | 3,774 | 3,896 | 4,018 | 4,140 | 4,262 |
| | S. 27 | 3,820 | 3,945 | 4,070 | 4,195 | 4,320 | 4,445 | 4,570 |
| | Difference [1] | +290 | +293 | +296 | +299 | +302 | +305 | +308 |
| 4 | Present rate | 3,660 | 3,785 | 3,910 | 4,035 | 4,160 | 4,285 | 4,410 |
| | Administration plan | 3,879 | 4,012 | 4,145 | 4,278 | 4,411 | 4,544 | 4,677 |
| | S. 27 | 4,175 | 4,310 | 4,445 | 4,580 | 4,715 | 4,850 | 4,985 |
| | Difference [1] | +296 | +298 | +300 | +302 | +304 | +306 | +308 |
| 5 | Present rate | 3,880 | 4,005 | 4,130 | 4,255 | 4,380 | 4,505 | 4,630 |
| | Administration plan | 4,113 | 4,246 | 4,379 | 4,512 | 4,645 | 4,778 | 4,911 |
| | S. 27 | 4,410 | 4,545 | 4,680 | 4,815 | 4,950 | 5,085 | 5,220 |
| | Difference [1] | +297 | +299 | +301 | +303 | +305 | +307 | +309 |
| 6 | Present rate | 4,190 | 4,330 | 4,470 | 4,610 | 4,750 | 4,890 | 5,030 |
| | Administration plan | 4,442 | 4,590 | 4,738 | 4,886 | 5,034 | 5,182 | 5,330 |
| | S. 27 | 4,665 | 4,815 | 4,965 | 5,115 | 5,265 | 5,415 | 5,565 |
| | Difference [1] | +223 | +225 | +227 | +229 | +231 | +233 | +235 |
| 7 | Present rate | 4,530 | 4,685 | 4,840 | 4,995 | 5,150 | 5,305 | 5,460 |
| | Administration plan | 4,802 | 4,966 | 5,130 | 5,294 | 5,458 | 5,622 | 5,786 |
| | S. 27 | 4,950 | 5,115 | 5,280 | 5,445 | 5,610 | 5,775 | 5,940 |
| | Difference [1] | +148 | +149 | +150 | +151 | +152 | +153 | +154 |
| 8 | Present rate | 4,890 | 5,060 | 5,230 | 5,400 | 5,570 | 5,740 | 5,910 |
| | Administration plan | 5,184 | 5,364 | 5,544 | 5,724 | 5,904 | 6,084 | 6,264 |
| | S. 27 | 5,255 | 5,440 | 5,625 | 5,810 | 5,995 | 6,180 | 6,365 |
| | Difference [1] | +71 | +76 | +81 | +86 | +91 | +96 | +101 |
| 9 | Present rate | 5,280 | 5,465 | 5,650 | 5,835 | 6,020 | 6,205 | 6,390 |
| | Administration plan | 5,597 | 5,793 | 5,989 | 6,185 | 6,381 | 6,577 | 6,773 |
| | S. 27 | 5,675 | 5,875 | 6,075 | 6,275 | 6,475 | 6,675 | 6,875 |
| | Difference [1] | +78 | +82 | +86 | +90 | +94 | +98 | +102 |
| 10 | Present rate | 5,800 | 6,000 | 6,200 | 6,400 | 6,600 | 6,800 | 7,000 |
| | Administration plan | 6,148 | 6,360 | 6,572 | 6,784 | 6,996 | 7,208 | 7,420 |
| | S. 27 | 6,235 | 6,450 | 6,665 | 6,880 | 7,095 | 7,310 | 7,525 |
| | Difference [1] | +87 | +90 | +93 | +96 | +99 | +102 | +105 |
| 11 | Present rate | $6,380 | $6,600 | $6,820 | $7,040 | $7,260 | $7,480 | $7,700 |
| | Administration plan | 6,763 | 6,996 | 7,229 | 7,462 | 7,695 | 7,928 | 8,161 |
| | S. 27 | 6,860 | 7,095 | 7,330 | 7,565 | 7,800 | 8,035 | 8,270 |
| | Difference [1] | +97 | +99 | +101 | +103 | +105 | +107 | +109 |
| 12 | Present rate | 7,020 | 7,260 | 7,500 | 7,740 | 7,980 | 8,220 | 8,460 |
| | Administration plan | 7,442 | 7,696 | 7,950 | 8,204 | 8,458 | 8,712 | 8,966 |
| | S. 27 | 7,545 | 7,805 | 8,065 | 8,325 | 8,585 | 8,845 | 9,105 |
| | Difference [1] | +103 | +109 | +115 | +121 | +127 | +133 | +139 |
| 13 | Present rate | 7,730 | 7,990 | 8,250 | 8,510 | 8,770 | 9,030 | 9,290 |
| | Administration plan | 8,193 | 8,469 | 8,745 | 9,021 | 9,297 | 9,573 | 9,849 |
| | S. 27 | 8,310 | 8,590 | 8,870 | 9,150 | 9,430 | 9,710 | 9,990 |
| | Difference [1] | +117 | +121 | +125 | +129 | +133 | +137 | +141 |
| 14 | Present rate | 8,500 | 8,780 | 9,060 | 9,340 | 9,620 | 9,900 | 10,180 |
| | Administration plan | 9,010 | 9,307 | 9,604 | 9,901 | 10,198 | 10,495 | 10,792 |
| | S. 27 | 9,140 | 9,440 | 9,740 | 10,040 | 10,340 | 10,640 | 10,940 |
| | Difference [1] | +130 | +133 | +136 | +139 | +142 | +145 | +148 |
| 15 | Present rate | 9,350 | 9,650 | 9,950 | 10,250 | 10,550 | 10,850 | 11,150 |
| | Administration plan | 9,911 | 10,229 | 10,547 | 10,865 | 11,183 | 11,501 | 11,819 |
| | S. 27 | 10,050 | 10,350 | 10,650 | 10,950 | 11,250 | 11,550 | 11,850 |
| | Difference [1] | +139 | +121 | +103 | +85 | +67 | +49 | +31 |
| 16 | Present rate | 10,300 | 10,600 | 10,900 | 11,200 | 11,500 | 11,800 | 12,100 |
| | Administration plan | 10,918 | 11,236 | 11,554 | 11,872 | 12,190 | 12,508 | 12,826 |
| | S. 27 | 11,075 | 11,375 | 11,675 | 11,975 | 12,275 | 12,575 | 12,875 |
| | Difference [1] | +157 | +139 | +121 | +103 | +85 | +67 | +49 |
| 17 | Present rate | 11,400 | 11,700 | 12,000 | 12,300 | 12,600 | 12,900 | 13,200 |
| | Administration plan | 12,084 | 12,402 | 12,720 | 13,038 | 13,356 | 13,674 | 13,992 |
| | S. 27 | 12,255 | 12,555 | 12,855 | 13,155 | 13,455 | 13,755 | 14,055 |
| | Difference [1] | +171 | +153 | +135 | +117 | +99 | +81 | +63 |
| 18 | Present rate | 12,800 | 13,100 | 13,400 | 13,700 | 14,000 | 14,300 | 14,600 |
| | Administration plan | 13,568 | 13,886 | 14,204 | 14,522 | 14,840 | 15,158 | 15,476 |
| | S. 27 | 13,760 | 14,060 | 14,360 | 14,660 | 14,960 | 15,260 | 15,560 |
| | Difference [1] | +192 | +174 | +156 | +138 | +120 | +102 | +84 |
| 19 | Present rate | 14,000 | 14,300 | 14,600 | 14,900 | 15,200 | | |
| | Administration plan | 14,840 | 15,158 | 15,476 | 15,794 | 16,112 | | |
| | S. 27 | 15,000 | 15,300 | 15,600 | 15,900 | | | |
| | Difference [1] | +160 | +142 | +124 | +106 | −212 | | |
| 20 | Present rate | 16,000 | | | | | | |
| | Administration plan | 16,960 | | | | | | |
| | S. 27 | 16,000 | | | | | | |
| | Difference [1] | −960 | | | | | | |

[1] The amount by which the rates in S. 27 differ from those in the administration bill.

TABLE 2.—*Classified salary table—Comparison between (a) present rates, (b) rates in administration bill, and (c) rates in S. 734*

| Grade | | Step 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GS-1 | Present rate | $2,690 | $2,775 | $2,860 | $2,945 | $3,030 | $3,115 | $3,200 |
| | Administration plan | 2,855 | 2,945 | 3,035 | 3,125 | 3,215 | 3,305 | 3,395 |
| | S. 734 | 2,890 | 2,980 | 3,070 | 3,160 | 3,250 | 3,340 | 3,430 |
| | Difference [1] | +35 | +35 | +35 | +35 | +35 | +35 | +35 |
| GS-2 | Present rate | 2,960 | 3,045 | 3,130 | 3,215 | 3,300 | 3,385 | 3,470 |
| | Administration plan | 3,140 | 3,230 | 3,320 | 3,410 | 3,500 | 3,590 | 3,680 |
| | S. 734 | 3,180 | 3,270 | 3,360 | 3,450 | 3,540 | 3,630 | 3,720 |
| | Difference [1] | +40 | +40 | +40 | +40 | +40 | +40 | +40 |
| GS-3 | Present rate | 3,175 | 3,260 | 3,345 | 3,430 | 3,515 | 3,600 | 3,685 |
| | Administration plan | 3,370 | 3,460 | 3,550 | 3,640 | 3,730 | 3,820 | 3,910 |
| | S. 734 | 3,415 | 3,505 | 3,595 | 3,685 | 3,775 | 3,865 | 3,955 |
| | Difference [1] | +45 | +45 | +45 | +45 | +45 | +45 | +45 |
| GS-4 | Present rate | 3,415 | 3,500 | 3,585 | 3,670 | 3,755 | 3,840 | 3,925 |
| | Administration plan | 3,625 | 3,715 | 3,805 | 3,895 | 3,985 | 4,075 | 4,165 |
| | S. 734 | 3,670 | 3,760 | 3,850 | 3,940 | 4,030 | 4,120 | 4,210 |
| | Difference [1] | +45 | +45 | +45 | +45 | +45 | +45 | +45 |
| GS-5 | Present rate | 3,670 | 3,805 | 3,940 | 4,075 | 4,210 | 4,345 | 4,480 |
| | Administration plan | 3,895 | 4,040 | 4,185 | 4,330 | 4,475 | 4,620 | 4,765 |
| | S. 734 | 3,945 | 4,090 | 4,235 | 4,380 | 4,525 | 4,670 | 4,815 |
| | Difference [1] | +50 | +50 | +50 | +50 | +50 | +50 | +50 |
| GS-6 | Present rate | 4,080 | 4,215 | 4,350 | 4,485 | 4,620 | 4,755 | 4,890 |
| | Administration plan | 4,325 | 4,470 | 4,615 | 4,760 | 4,905 | 5,050 | 5,195 |
| | S. 734 | 4,385 | 4,530 | 4,675 | 4,820 | 4,965 | 5,110 | 5,255 |
| | Difference [1] | +60 | +60 | +60 | +60 | +60 | +60 | +60 |
| GS-7 | Present rate | 4,525 | 4,660 | 4,795 | 4,930 | 5,065 | 5,200 | 5,335 |
| | Administration plan | 4,800 | 4,945 | 5,090 | 5,235 | 5,380 | 5,525 | 5,670 |
| | S. 734 | 4,865 | 5,010 | 5,155 | 5,300 | 5,445 | 5,590 | 5,735 |
| | Difference [1] | +65 | +65 | +65 | +65 | +65 | +65 | +65 |
| GS-8 | Present rate | 4,970 | 5,105 | 5,240 | 5,375 | 5,510 | 5,645 | 5,780 |
| | Administration plan | 5,270 | 5,415 | 5,560 | 5,705 | 5,850 | 5,995 | 6,140 |
| | S. 734 | 5,345 | 5,490 | 5,635 | 5,780 | 5,925 | 6,070 | 6,215 |
| | Difference [1] | +75 | +75 | +75 | +75 | +75 | +75 | +75 |
| GS-9 | Present rate | 5,440 | 5,575 | 5,710 | 5,845 | 5,980 | 6,115 | 6,250 |
| | Administration plan | 5,770 | 5,915 | 6,060 | 6,205 | 6,350 | 6,495 | 6,640 |
| | S. 734 | 5,850 | 5,995 | 6,140 | 6,285 | 6,430 | 6,575 | 6,720 |
| | Difference [1] | +80 | +80 | +80 | +80 | +80 | +80 | +80 |
| GS-10 | Present rate | $5,915 | $6,050 | $6,185 | $6,320 | $6,455 | $6,590 | $6,725 |
| | Administration plan | 6,270 | 6,415 | 6,560 | 6,705 | 6,850 | 6,995 | 7,140 |
| | S. 734 | 6,360 | 6,505 | 6,650 | 6,795 | 6,940 | 7,085 | 7,230 |
| | Difference [1] | +90 | +90 | +90 | +90 | +90 | +90 | +90 |
| GS-11 | Present rate | 6,390 | 6,605 | 6,820 | 7,035 | 7,250 | 7,465 | |
| | Administration plan | 6,880 | 7,110 | 7,340 | 7,570 | 7,800 | 8,030 | |
| | S. 734 | 6,870 | 7,100 | 7,330 | 7,560 | 7,790 | 8,020 | |
| | Difference [1] | −10 | −10 | −10 | −10 | −10 | −10 | |
| GS-12 | Present rate | 7,570 | 7,785 | 8,000 | 8,215 | 8,430 | 8,645 | |
| | Administration plan | 8,150 | 8,390 | 8,610 | 8,840 | 9,070 | 9,300 | |
| | S. 734 | 8,140 | 8,370 | 8,600 | 8,830 | 9,060 | 9,290 | |
| | Difference [1] | −10 | −10 | −10 | −10 | −10 | −10 | |
| GS-13 | Present rate | 8,990 | 9,205 | 9,420 | 9,635 | 9,850 | 10,065 | |
| | Administration plan | 9,675 | 9,905 | 10,135 | 10,365 | 10,595 | 10,825 | |
| | S. 734 | 9,750 | 10,000 | 10,250 | 10,500 | 10,750 | 11,000 | |
| | Difference [1] | +75 | +95 | +115 | +135 | +155 | +175 | |
| GS-14 | Present rate | 10,320 | 10,535 | 10,750 | 10,965 | 11,180 | 11,395 | |
| | Administration plan | 11,105 | 11,335 | 11,565 | 11,795 | 12,025 | 12,255 | |
| | S. 734 | 11,250 | 11,500 | 11,750 | 12,000 | 12,250 | 12,500 | |
| | Difference [1] | +145 | +165 | +185 | +205 | +225 | +245 | |
| GS-15 | Present rate | 11,610 | 11,880 | 12,150 | 12,420 | 12,690 | | |
| | Administration plan | 13,000 | 13,425 | 13,850 | 14,275 | 14,700 | | |
| | S. 734 | 12,600 | 12,900 | 13,200 | 13,500 | 13,800 | | |
| | Difference [1] | −400 | −525 | −650 | −775 | −900 | | |
| GS-16 | Present rate | 12,900 | 13,115 | 13,330 | 13,545 | 13,760 | | |
| | Administration plan | 14,500 | 15,000 | 15,500 | 16,000 | 16,500 | | |
| | S. 734 | 14,000 | 14,300 | 14,600 | 14,900 | 15,200 | | |
| | Difference [1] | −500 | −700 | −900 | −1,100 | −1,300 | | |
| GS-17 | Present rate | 13,975 | 14,190 | 14,405 | 14,620 | 14,835 | | |
| | Administration plan | 16,000 | 16,500 | 17,000 | 17,500 | 18,000 | | |
| | S. 734 | 15,500 | 15,800 | 16,100 | 16,400 | 16,700 | | |
| | Difference [1] | −500 | −700 | −900 | −1,100 | −1,300 | | |
| GS-18 | Present rate | 16,000 | | | | | | |
| | Administration plan | 18,000 | 18,500 | 19,000 | 19,500 | | | |
| | S. 734 | 17,500 | | | | | | |
| | Difference [1] | −500 | −1,000 | −1,500 | −2,000 | | | |

[1] The amount by which the rates in S. 734 differ from those in the administration bill.

TABLE 3.—*Distribution of postal field service employees, June 30, 1957*

| | Total | Scheduled steps | | | | | | | Longevity steps | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | O | A | B | C |
| All employees | 519,898 | 80,055 | 74,308 | 32,452 | 36,824 | 35,400 | 47,580 | 213,279 | 332,511 | 37,871 | 76,064 | 73,452 |
| PFS schedule | 474,698 | 75,389 | 69,466 | 30,811 | 34,987 | 32,108 | 44,350 | 187,587 | 310,688 | 30,500 | 68,416 | 65,094 |
| Level 1 | 3,443 | 738 | 110 | 20 | 117 | 330 | 1,230 | 898 | 2,611 | 439 | 285 | 108 |
| Level 2 | 27,244 | 8,942 | 3,572 | 2,074 | 8,320 | 580 | 2,487 | 1,269 | 23,379 | 2,325 | 1,192 | 348 |
| Level 3 | 35,741 | 6,636 | 3,436 | 2,703 | 2,390 | 6,511 | 12,262 | 1,803 | 28,563 | 3,068 | 2,558 | 1,552 |
| Level 4 | 329,296 | 52,421 | 44,145 | 18,272 | 16,090 | 15,577 | 17,563 | 165,228 | 228,951 | 15,333 | 46,424 | 38,588 |
| Level 5 | 27,143 | 2,550 | 5,247 | 1,991 | 1,732 | 764 | 2,966 | 11,893 | 14,064 | 1,927 | 5,744 | 5,408 |
| Level 6 | 10,244 | 1,237 | 5,169 | 1,005 | 358 | 670 | 332 | 1,473 | 4,677 | 1,828 | 2,219 | 1,520 |
| Level 7 | 17,521 | 808 | 2,597 | 1,003 | 791 | 2,867 | 5,526 | 3,929 | 3,405 | 2,606 | 4,278 | 7,232 |
| Level 8 | 10,029 | 844 | 796 | 1,558 | 2,732 | 2,478 | 967 | 654 | 2,236 | 1,473 | 2,559 | 3,761 |
| Level 9 | 5,969 | 430 | 492 | 1,243 | 1,159 | 1,580 | 800 | 265 | 1,305 | 662 | 1,418 | 2,584 |
| Level 10 | 3,346 | 231 | 1,252 | 353 | 854 | 493 | 108 | 55 | 489 | 416 | 775 | 1,666 |
| Level 11 | 1,709 | 255 | 853 | 236 | 196 | 128 | 9 | 32 | 400 | 182 | 280 | 847 |
| Level 12 | 1,086 | 108 | 594 | 246 | 58 | 16 | 41 | 23 | 151 | 143 | 285 | 507 |
| Level 13 | 877 | 93 | 546 | 82 | 110 | 4 | 9 | 33 | 178 | 62 | 211 | 426 |
| Level 14 | 592 | 43 | 414 | 4 | 65 | 54 | 2 | 10 | 117 | 23 | 126 | 326 |
| Level 15 | 280 | 20 | 164 | 3 | 11 | 51 | 21 | 10 | 100 | 6 | 40 | 134 |
| Level 16 | 112 | 9 | 63 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 6 | 44 | 4 | 13 | 51 |
| Level 17 | 39 | 10 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 8 | 18 |
| Level 18 | 11 | | 1 | 1 | | | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | | 6 |
| Level 19 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Level 20 | 13 | 13 | | | | | | | 2 | | | 11 |

## ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 23, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate with appropriate ceremonies the 100th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oregon into the Union.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 316)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States recommending amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. The Chair is informed that the message has been read in the House of Representatives; and, without objection, the reading of the message in the Senate will be dispensed with, and the message will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The message is as follows:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

There are submitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress, recommendations for amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act and for additional legislation to provide greater protections for the rights of individual workers, the public, and management and unions, in labor-management relations.

I

No labor-management relations legislative program today can ignore the disclosures of corruption, racketeering and abuse of trust and power in the labor-management field. Many of these disclosures have been made in Congressional hearings and in investigations by grand juries and local law enforcement agencies. In the various States vigilant attention by law enforcement officials, and public interest in the effective enforcement of existing laws against criminal activity, are doing much to eliminate many of the evils and abuses which have occurred. Union officials—most of whom are decent, honest Americans—are also doing much to eliminate the few in the ranks of organized labor who are corrupt. However, the importance to American workers and to the public of preventing the impairment of the individual rights of employees and the fact that voluntary action is inadequate in this respect have become increasingly evident. In order to protect the basic rights of the individual worker and to maintain the integrity of trade unionism itself, action on the part of the Government is needed.

The American public is in need of reassurance:

1. That the funds which are set aside for the benefit of working men and women in health, welfare, and pension plans are accounted for.

2. That the moneys which are contributed by workers to union treasuries are being used solely to advance their welfare.

3. That organizations in which working people associate together voluntarily to improve their status through collective action will be administered in such fashion to reflect their will.

4. That working people are more fully protected from dealings between representatives of labor and management which have the effect of preventing the full exercise of their rights to organize and bargain collectively.

5. That the public is protected against unfair labor and management practices within the collective-bargaining relationship which give rise to the exercise of coercive power by one as against the other tending to impede the peaceful development of that relationship, or which infringe the legitimate rights of innocent third parties.

The Secretary of Labor has recommended to me a comprehensive program of legislation which, if enacted, will, I believe, give that reassurance to the American public. His recommendations constitute the program of this administration in the labor-management field, and the administration urges the Congress to enact legislation:

1. To require the registration and detailed annual reporting to the Department of Labor, with appropriate disclosure, of all plans which provide health, welfare, or pension benefits to working men and women, whether administered by employers, by unions, or jointly by both. The administration made specific legislative recommendations in this respect in 1956 and 1957.

2. To require:

(a) That all labor organizations, having members employed in industries affecting commerce or which receive benefits of tax exemption under the Internal Revenue Code, including regional and local conferences and councils, shall:

(1) File with the Department of Labor detailed annual financial reports, which shall be available for public examination.

(2) Maintain proper financial books and records open to the scrutiny of all of their members.

(b) That officers of such labor organizations who handle union funds be held to the highest degree of responsibility for the funds committed to their care by union members; and that the members of such organizations be given an unequivocal right to sue in Federal or State courts to enforce these responsibilities. This would not supersede existing State statutes of judicial remedies.

3. To require that all labor organizations:

(a) File annually with the Department of Labor detailed information as to their constitutions, bylaws, and organizational structure and procedures.

(b) Show by appropriate reporting that their members have the right and opportunity to elect and have elected at intervals of not more than four years, their local officers directly by secret ballot, and their national officers either directly by secret ballot, or through delegate bodies elected directly by the membership by secret ballot, with due notice of any election being given to the members. The Department of Labor would be authorized to make full public disclosure of these reports.

4. To require:

(a) That all employers report to the Department of Labor all financial dealings with labor organizations or their representatives either directly or through

a third party, but exempting those employer payments specifically authorized by law or reported under other requirements of law; to require that all labor organizations and representatives of labor organizations report to the Department of Labor all such financial dealings with employers either directly or through a third party; and to authorize the Department of Labor to make full public disclosure of these reports.

(b) To prohibit by the application of appropriate civil and criminal laws financial dealings between employers and labor unions which operate to impair the rights of working people to organize, to select their bargaining representative or effectively to bargain collectively; specifically to amend the Taft-Hartley Act to prohibit payments made to employee representatives by employer agents or representatives, as well as those made directly by employers, except as authorized by law; to cover employer payments to an employee representative other than a representative of his employees; to prohibit payments over and above payments for regular job duties made by an employer, his agent or representative to an employee or group or committee of employees to influence other employees in the exercise of their right of self-organization or the selection of a bargaining representative; and to make it clear that employer payments to trust funds for apprenticeship and training purposes are not prohibited.

5. For effective administration of this program of reporting and disclosure of general union funds, conflicts of interest, union organization and structure and also the program for reporting and disclosure of welfare and pension plans, the administration recommends that there be created in the Department of Labor a Commissioner of Labor Reports who would be responsible to the Secretary for the performance of duties under the new legislation. The Commissioner should be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. In the administration of these reporting requirements, the Commissioner of Labor Reports would be empowered through authority derived from the Secretary of Labor to:

(a) Make full public disclosure of all information contained in the reports;

(b) Seek injunctions against violations;

(c) Investigate reports of violations of the reporting requirements, including the accuracy of reports filed, and charges that union election or procedural practices are not in accordance with the reporting requirements; and

(d) Issue subpenas for the production of all appropriate books and records and compel testimony by witnesses.

6. In order to ensure the effective enforcement of this program, the Administration recommends that the following criminal and administrative sanctions be enacted into law:

(a) Criminal.

(1) The embezzlement of general union funds, false statements or entries, or willful destruction of books should be made punishable as a felony.

(2) The Criminal Code provisions relating to filing of false information should be made specifically applicable to these reports.

(3) The failure of an employer or a union to file required reports should be made a misdemeanor.

(4) A new bribery section should be added to the Criminal Code making it a felony for an employer, or his agent or representative, or any union official or representative, to make or receive any payments to influence improperly the actions of the other in labor-management matters. To facilitate prosecutions of violations of this section there should be included a provision for immunity to witnesses.

(b) Administrative.

At the present time any labor organization covered by the National Labor Relations Act is denied access to its processes if it fails to file financial and organizational reports. This should be continued. In addition, subject to the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act, including judicial review, for the willful failure to file true and proper reports the administration recommends that:

(1) all labor organizations and employers be denied all rights or privileges available to them under Federal labor management relations laws;

(2) All labor organizations be liable to revocation of any outstanding certification as bargaining representative under any law of the United States;

(3) All labor organizations be liable to the forfeiture for an appropriate period of tax exemptions available to them under the Internal Revenue Code.

7. Certain provisions of the National Labor Relations Act afford opportunity for labor or management to coerce the other, often with detrimental effect on individual employees, innocent third parties and the general public. The administration recommends that the ambiguities and inequities that exist in these provisions be removed by amending them as follows:

(a) Amend the secondary boycott provisions of the act to make it clear that they prevent direct coercion of an employer to cease doing business with another; coercion of employers by inducement or encouragement of individual employees to refuse to perform services; coercion of secondary employers who do not come within the act's definition of "employer"; and coercion of employers to enter into or to enforce agreements to cease using the products of, or to cease doing business with, another person.

To further amend the secondary boycott provisions to make it clear that they do not prevent activity against a secondary employer who is performing "farmed out" work in behalf of a struck employer; or activity against secondary employers engaged in work on a construction project with the primary employer.

(b) Amend the act to make it an unfair labor practice for a union, by picketing, to coerce an employer to recognize it as the bargaining representative of his employees or his employees to accept or designate it as their representative where:

The employer has recognized in accordance with law another labor organization: The employees, within the last preceding 12 months, have rejected the union in a representative election; or it is otherwise clear that the employees do not desire the union as their bargaining representative.

(c) Amend the act to eliminate the statutory prohibition which bars economic strikers who are not entitled to reinstatement from voting in representation elections.

II

In addition to the above the administration recommends that several other changes be made in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. Some of these changes have been proposed before, some are new, but all are intended to strengthen and improve the act where experience has shown that correction is needed. These proposals are as follows:

1. Amend the act to eliminate the jurisdictional gap referred to in recent Supreme Court decisions by authorizing the States to act with respect to matters over which the National Labor Relations Board declines to assert jurisdiction.

2. Amend the act to authorize the Board, under appropriate circumstances, to certify as bargaining representatives, without a prior election, unions acting in behalf of employees primarily engaged in the building and construction industry.

3. In view of the enactment of the Communist Control Act of 1954, amend the act to eliminate the provision requiring the filing of non-Communist affidavits by officers of unions seeking to use the act's processes.

4. Amend the act so that parties to a valid collective bargaining agreement may not be required to negotiate during the life of the agreement unless it provides for reopening or the parties mutually agree to its being reopened.

5. Amend the act to make it clear that when the Office of the General Counsel becomes vacant the President may designate some other officer or employee to serve as Acting General Counsel during the vacancy.

These legislative recommendations are designed to benefit and protect the welfare of American workers and the general public, to curb abuses, and to provide greater harmony and stability in labor-management relations. They take into consideration the fundamental principle that an effective right to organize and bargain collectively is an essential part of this Nation's free and democratic society.

I urge that the Congress give speedy consideration to these proposals.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 23, 1958.*

---

## THE ADMINISTRATION'S LABOR PROPOSALS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in line with the administration's labor proposals, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills to carry out

the recommendations of the President. I introduce these bills as the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

The first is Labor Reports Act of 1958, and then two bills dealing with amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended. These three proposals are in accord with the program of the President.

I wish to express my approval and support of the President's proposals to strengthen and improve our laws relating to labor-management relations. The recommendations constitute a practical approach to the complex problems in this field. Considered as a whole, they make up a comprehensive program for dealing with these problems in a manner which is in the best interest of all parties concerned.

This program reaffirms the position that the proper role of Government in the labor field is to maintain a framework of laws which promotes integrity and responsibility in labor-management relations and encourages free collective bargaining without Government domination.

The specific proposals have been tailored to fit the particular practices or abuses toward which they are directed. They provide reasonable and practicable protections for regular union funds as well as welfare and pension plan funds. The reporting of practices and procedures and the right and opportunity of union members to elect officers by secret ballot place in the hands of union members the tools whereby they may help themselves improve the standards of democratic procedures in their own unions. The proposals with respect to secondary boycotts and picketing would provide needed protection against union coercion. Certain inequities regarding the voting rights of economic strikers would be eliminated, and stability of collective bargaining relationships would be assured.

The administration's program is a fair and equitable one, which provides added protection for the rights of employees, employers, and the public, and will, I believe, be welcomed by responsible labor organizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 3097. A bill to require labor organization reports, to ensure disclosure of certain labor organization information, to define certain duties and responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to provide further safeguards for workers against improper activities in the conduct of labor organization affairs;

S. 3098. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 3099. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him at the Eisenhower dinner at Detroit, Mich., on June 20, 1958.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Speech on civil-rights legislation, 1957, delivered by him before the Pacific southwest board, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in Los Angeles, Calif., September 17, 1957.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Address delivered by Senator KERR at 37th annual meeting of American Petroleum Institute in Chicago, Ill., on November 11, 1957.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address entitled "Inflation and Growth," delivered by Senator BENNETT before the Chicago Economic Club on November 14, 1957.

Remarks of Senator Bricker, Senator Lausche, Governor O'Neill, of Ohio, response by former Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, at 64th annual banquet of Ohio Chamber of Commerce, at Columbus, Ohio, on October 16, 1957.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him and article published in the Wisconsin Agriculturalist and Farmer on the subject of tree planting.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWIN M. STANLEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 6, 1958, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Edwin M. Stanley, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge, for the middle district of North Carolina.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

## NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARINGS ON S. 1870, RELATING TO THE RENDITION OF MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS ON COIN-OPERATED MACHINES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the hearings previously scheduled to commence January 15, 1958, on S. 1870, a bill to amend section 1 (e) of title 17 of the United States Code with regard to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines, have been rescheduled to commence at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Wednesday, February 19, and to continue through Friday, February 21, 1958. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, chairman.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF LAWRENCE EDWARD WALSH TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL AND MALCOLM R. WILKEY TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, February 3, 1958, beginning at 2:30 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, upon the nomination of Lawrence Edward Walsh, of New York, to be Deputy Attorney General, and Malcolm R. Wilkey, of Texas, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF W. WILSON WHITE TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 4, 1958, beginning at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, upon the nomination of W. Wilson White, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS TO COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, February 10, 1958, beginning at 2:30

p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, before the Committee of the Judiciary, upon the following nominations to be members of the Commission on Civil Rights: John A. Hannah, of Michigan; John S. Battle, of Virginia; Doyle Elam Carlton, of Florida; the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, of Indiana; Robert G. Storey, of Texas; J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON SUNDRY NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the following nominations:

James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Greece, vice George V. Allen.

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, vice Lester D. Mallory.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to be Ambassador to Thailand, vice Max Waldo Bishop.

John Wesley Jones, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the United Kingdom of Libya, vice John L. Tappin.

Lester D. Mallory, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Guatemala, vice Edward J. Sparks.

Edward J. Sparks, of New York, to be Ambassador to Venezuela, vice Dempster McIntosh.

Clifton R. Wharton, of California, to be Envoy to Rumania, vice Robert H. Thayer.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today from the President of the United States sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Notice is given that the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule, will give consideration to these nominations.

## THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I regret that from many quarters, political and otherwise, there seems to be some attempt to criticize both the President and Secretary of State in connection with our foreign policy. In my few remarks today in the morning hour, I wish to make clear my complete and unconditional support of our President's foreign policy, as enunciated by him and our Secretary of State.

On Thursday, January 16, the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, delivered an outstanding address before the National Press Club, which address is obviously complementary to the state of the Union message of the President of January 9, and to the President's diplomatic and inspired reply, dated January 12, 1958, to Mr. Bulganin's attempted needling.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Dulles' address before the Press Club be printed in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD, following Mr. Dulles' remarks, the pertinent article entitled "Dulles Stars at Bat," written by James Reston and published in the New York Times of January 17; also the article entitled "Dulles Seen Opposed Only to Fruitless 'Summit' Talk," written by David Lawrence and published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 17.

In his article, Mr. Lawrence quoted a very significant paragraph from the Dulles speech, and I am advised that the quotation was received with enthusiasm by the members of the Press Club present. The paragraph was as follows:

> There is a difference between being respected and being liked. We do not run the foreign policy of the United States with a view to winning a popularity contest, and we have to do things which we know are not going to be popular. But we have not done, in my opinion, anything for which we are not respected; and I prefer being respected to being liked.

These are certainly the words of a courageous statesman, as David Lawrence emphasized.

There being no objection, the address and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1958

I shall speak first about sputnik. The launching of an earth satellite by the Soviets may mark a decisive turn in the worldwide struggle between Communist imperialism and the free world.

No doubt the Communist rulers gained a success. They have an opportunity to gloat, an opportunity that they have not neglected. But sputnik, mocking the American people with its "beep-beep" may go down in history as Mr. Khrushchev's boomerang.

It jolted the American people and produced a reaction which was healthy, the kind of reaction that has, in the past, served freedom well. A wave of mortification, anger and fresh determination swept the country. Out of that mood is coming a more serious appraisal of the struggle in which we are engaged, and an increasing willingness to make the kind of efforts and sacrifices needed to win that struggle.

It is, of course, essential that our Nation should react in the right ways. If we act like a bull in the arena which puts down its head and blindly charges the matador's red cape, that could be our undoing. Our response must be a "heads up" not a "heads down" response. We must see clearly and think straight. We must appraise accurately the strength of our adversary and also his weaknesses. We must design our own strategy to parry his strength and to exploit his weaknesses.

II

Communist imperialism has elements of strength that make it formidable.

The rulers have an iron grip upon the people—nearly one billion of them—and subject them to a harsh discipline of work and sacrifice. Thus they abstract vast sums for military establishments and for implementing political-economic offensives.

The directing forces of Communist imperialism have from the beginning seen the struggle as a long one, lasting, as Lenin and Stalin used to put it "for an entire historical era." Accordingly, they have engaged in long-range planning and have not relied upon quick successes, as has been the undoing of so many militaristic dictators. This planning now shows results in a large and ever-growing corps of scientists and technicians who, as a special privileged class, serve the state and party at home and abroad.

At home they have enabled the Soviets to develop a military establishment equipped with the most modern weapons, both conventional and nuclear. It must, I think, be conceded that the Soviets, by concentrating on missiles for the past 12 years, have been more imaginative and more daring than we have been over the same period.

The steady buildup of Soviet industrial power now makes it possible for the Soviet bloc to conduct economic warfare to gain control of newly independent and newly developing countries. It loans large sums as aid and makes attractive barter deals whereby it absorbs raw materials in exchange for its manufactured products.

Communist propaganda is highly developed and particularly effective. Its effectiveness is at least superficially augmented by the fact that those who direct the Communist propaganda feel no obligation to speak the truth or to tell in one part of the world the same story that they tell in another.

III

The assets of Communist imperialism are surely formidable. But there is no reason whatever for us to be discouraged or to think that those assets enable it to dominate the world. Communist imperialism has its weakness as well as its strength. For example:

1. Even the most potent despotism is bound to pay some attention to the mounting demands of the people for more consumer's goods. The spectacular shifts which have occurred in Soviet leadership over the last 5 years are not merely struggles for power but struggles between the adherents of different policies. We need not exclude the possibility of there coming into power those who will primarily seek the welfare of the Soviet people and not continue to keep them impaled on the sickle of Communist imperialism.

2. Minds that are fine enough to deal with modern scientific and technical problems cannot be kept from coming to independent conclusions about other matters. The growth within the Soviet Union of a new intelligentsia is bound to affect Soviet policies.

3. The leaders of the newly independent countries seek jealously to safeguard their independence. They know that there are hundreds of millions within the Sino-Soviet bloc who desperately need better living conditions, and that consequently the Communist rulers would not deny betterment at home and confer it abroad except to make major political gains. Therefore the governments of the newly independent countries are wary and look for safe alternatives to Communist aid and trade.

4. Perhaps the greatest weakness of the Soviet position is that it does not seem able to disengage itself from the partition of Germany and the suppression of the independence of the nations of Eastern Europe.

IV

I now speak of United States policies. They are compounded of confidence and realization of how formidable are the resources of those who seek world domination.

United States peaceful policies, coordinated with the policies of dependable allies, have both a defensive and an affirmative character.

1. We will maintain a strong, balanced military posture including enough ever-pres-

ent and ever-alert retaliatory power to deter Soviet aggression. The President's state-of-the-Union message made clear that need. There seems little doubt that the Congress will respond.

2. We propose to counter the economic threat. It will be harder to get the resources to do that. But unless we wage successfully the political-economic war that is now being fought, Communist imperialism can win without ever a gun being fired. It is vital that the newly independent and newly developing countries should find in freedom the way to lift up their own people. It is vital that the United States continue to be a dependable market where other free world nations can sell what they produce and buy what they need. Without assurances in these two respects, Communist imperialism would gain control of many lands with their human, material and strategic values; and in the end our own economy would be strangled by lack of the exports and imports which are essential to our economic health.

3. We must see to it that our freedom is a dynamic force. That is not just a task of Government, but even more of our free citizenry.

Today there is a challenge to liberty more formidable than any in recent times. Powerful men are fanatically teaching that human diversity and human dignity are false ideals, and that human needs can best be satisfied by a materialistic, atheistic society which imposes conformity and treats human beings as cogs in a great economic machine.

In the face of that challenge, our own society is closely observed. We are widely regarded as the principal exponents of freedom and as leaders of the free world. Many are trying to judge whether this freedom of ours is really a product they want to import. It is up to us to make our freedom so rich, so dynamic, so self-disciplined, that its values will be beyond dispute and its influence become so penetrating as to shorten the life expectancy of Communist imperialism.

President Eisenhower, in his last month's speech at NATO, said that "there is a noble strategy of victory—not victory over any peoples but victory for all peoples." That strategy can be, and I am confident will be, implemented by such policies as I describe.

V

Given the intensive nature of the present struggle, what place is there for negotiation? First of all, let me say emphatically that there is a place for negotiation. Negotiation is one of the major tools of diplomacy. It would be the height of folly to renounce the use of this tool. This Administration has not done that in the past and does not intend to do it for the future.

We must, on the basis of past experience, assume that negotiation with the Communists, if it is to bring acceptable results, will be a long, hard task. I have often engaged in that work and have spent many days personally participating in high level face-to-face negotiations with the Soviets. I have had considerable education as to their methods.

Whenever negotiations involve matters of real substance, the Communists go at them in a tough, hard way. They are highly legalistic and seek to devise loopholes through which they can subsequently escape from what seem to be their obligations. They practice inexhaustible patience, withholding what they may be prepared to give until the last moment in the hope that they can get what they want without giving as much as they are ready to give. They astutely take into account any weaknesses of their opponents such as impatience to get the negotiation over or willingness to treat any agreement as a success, without regard to the contents or dependability. Furthermore, the scope of possible agreement is limited by the fact that the Communist record of performance is so poor that never ought the United States rely on any promises by the Communists which depend merely upon future good faith.

The negotiations which ended the Korean fighting took 2 years and involved 575 meetings. Many of the armistice provisions were quickly violated by the Communist side, but the essential—the abstention from warfare—has stuck, because it was in the mutual interest.

The negotiations for the state treaty which gave Austria her liberty took approximately 8 years and involved some 400 meetings. This treaty has been lived up to by the Communist side.

The negotiations for the International Atomic Energy Agency, which were finally concluded in 1956, took almost 3 years.

The negotiations with the Soviet Union for cultural contacts, upon which we are now engaged here at Washington, began 2½ years ago at the Geneva Summit Conference.

Our negotiations at Geneva with the Chinese Communists have been going on for over 2 years. We got an agreement for the release of the American civilian captives. But that agreement remains partially dishonored.

I do not suggest that negotiations must be so prolonged. With good will there is no need that they be so prolonged. But always in the past, if the negotiations involved real matters of substance, the Communists have proceeded very carefully and with a design to gain every possible advantage.

I believe that there should be, and will be, further negotiations with the Soviet Union. There are many areas where there could be dependable agreement in the common interest. Also, I believe that the Soviet rulers, and I know that we, do not want our two nations to drift so far apart that there is increased danger that the cold war will turn into a hot war.

President Eisenhower, in his reply of last Monday to Chairman Bulganin, took a major step looking to what could be further negotiations and agreements of exceptional importance.

He proposed strengthening the United Nations by reducing the use of the veto power.

He proposed proceeding with the reunification of Germany as agreed at Geneva in 1955.

He proposed considering how to give the peoples of Eastern Europe their promised, and long overdue, opportunity to have governments of their own choosing.

In the field of armament he advanced the most significant proposal that could be made at this time to assure human survival, namely, that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes. It is unhappily too late now to assure fully what the United States proposed in 1947—that all fissionable material should be used only for peaceful purposes—although we still can, and should, do that for newly produced fissionable material. But it is possible now to assure that outer space—all of it—should be dedicated to peace and not to war. I might add at this point that we have been much interested in the suggestions made by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON in this field.

And finally President Eisenhower proposed that, since ability to supervise fulfillment of agreements is at the heart of all armament proposals, joint technical study groups should be established at once to explore the technical problems involved in supervision. He said that, so far as we were concerned, this could be done without any prior Soviet acceptance of any disarmament proposal. It could also be done without any Soviet commitment to the possible interdependence of the various proposals.

President Eisenhower's letter to Chairman Bulganin should dissipate once and for all any impression that the United States does not want to negotiate, or is afraid to negotiate with the Soviet rulers. The truth is quite the contrary. We do want a summit meeting, provided the proper conditions obtain.

We do not, however, want a summit meeting which merely represents another episode in the cold war, and which would be held under circumstances that would carry great peril to the free world.

There are, I know, many who feel that the cold war could be ended and the need for sacrificial effort removed by a stroke of a pen at the summit. That is the kind of illusion that has plagued mankind for a long time. Actually, peace is never achieved in that way, and nothing could be more folly for us than to act on the belief that all our danger could be ended by peaceful platitudes proclaimed from the summit by heads of government.

The expansionist goals of the Communist Parties, and the exploitation of the subject peoples for military and economic aggressive purposes, will not be altered by one iota by generalities uttered at a summit conference. But with the free peoples it is different. Their governments cannot make the necessary efforts except as the people themselves feel the need to work and sacrifice for the security of their nations and of their ideals. A summit conference which diverted the free nations from doing what is necessary for their security, without any comparable change in the Sino-Soviet bloc, could be a great, indeed a fatal, disaster.

Equally, it could be a disaster if the free world leaders at such a conference felt that, to avoid the danger inherent in a platitudinous declaration of peace, they had to go to the other extreme and break off in an atmosphere of hostility. That could intensify the cold war and make more likely that it would turn into a hot war.

For these reasons, it is essential, as President Eisenhower pointed out, and as Mr. Khrushchev once himself agreed, that any summit meeting should be well prepared. There should be assurance that significant topics will be discussed, and that there is a good prospect of arriving at significant agreements which will be fulfilled.

The way to such a meeting was clearly pointed out by President Eisenhower in his last week's message to Chairman Bulganin. It is now for the Soviet rulers to make clear whether or not they want a summit conference which will genuinely promote the cause of peace and justice in the world. We do.

---

[From the New York Times of January 17, 1958]

DULLES STARS AT BAT—AN EVALUATION OF HIS SKILL AT GETTING OUT OF A HOLE—ESPECIALLY IN JANUARY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—When a visitor to the National Press Club can empty the bar at 12:30 p. m., and induce more than 500 reporters to pay $1.75 for a press club luncheon, it is a safe assumption (a) that he is controversial, or (b) a celebrity, or (c) both.

Anyway, John Foster Dulles did it today. He arrived among his critics in good spirits, hit quite a few curve-ball questions out of the park, and departed at 2:15 with the score very definitely in his favor.

Washington may not agree with President Eisenhower that Mr. Dulles is the best Secretary of State since Thomas Jefferson, but nobody doubts his durability. He can get into more holes than a gravedigger, but he is a master at climbing out of them, especially in January.

Last January he produced, in quick succession, the misnamed Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East, and the "right of innocent

passage" for ships in the Gulf of Aqaba. In another January, when he was being pressed hard on what his foreign policy was, he produced the "doctrine of massive retaliation." Now he is moving on outer space.

A GIFT AT ARGUMENT

It is not difficult to understand why he became one of the most successful lawyers in America. His gift of argument is impressive. He is the hardest working man in town, he takes his lickings with good grace, and he seems to be learning how to cut his losses.

At least this was the impression he made today. He has been talking about negotiating with the Russians for weeks, but today he convinced a lot of people that he actually was willing and eager to come down to specific cases and get the negotiations started.

Moreover, what he implied in public he has lately been saying more explicitly in private:

Let's get down to cases with something specific. Let's take the problem of controlling outerspace objects, separate it from all the other controversial disarmament questions, and set up a technical international committee to explore it without commitments or relation to any other problem.

Mr. Dulles is troubled by two things:

The clamorous criticism against him all over the free and neutral worlds; and the fear that the pace of rocketry development will be faster than the pace of negotiations for control of outer space objects.

SHUNS LIP-SERVICE CHARGE

He is trying to extricate himself from the widely believed charge that he is merely giving lip-service to negotiations, that he is stonewalling for time in order to close the missile gap, and meanwhile, that he is actually opposed to negotiations.

He did not wholly dispel the image of the reluctant negotiator today. In his discussion of how public opposition to the Soviet menace might collapse in the face of new shining promises from a summit meeting, he left the same old impression that his confidence in the people's judgment was really not very deep.

Nevertheless, he did adopt Lewis Carroll's principle that "the way to begin is to begin." He has a good memory and he does his homework. He properly blames Moscow for the lost opportunity of the Baruch atomic energy control plan—and he does not want to have history proclaim that the Secretary of State of the United States was responsible for refusing to negotiate with the Russians when rocketry was still detectable and controllable.

When he wrote his last book, "War or Peace," Mr. Dulles paid a glowing tribute to Vyacheslav Molotov, former Soviet foreign minister, as one of the most astute diplomats he had ever known. But Molotov was the man who kept saying "No" to the United States proposals that atomic energy should be controlled before it was too late.

Mr. Dulles does not want to get into the same position on the question of controlling rocketry. He has a sense of history and he knows, perhaps better than the President, that many of the leaders of the world are critical of him. Therefore, he does not want to be blamed for refusing to negotiate about the control of outer space while it is still controllable.

So he is persuaded that here is a limited field where both sides have something to gain by negotiating an agreement on the control of outer-space objects for scientific purposes alone. He is sincerely trying to get negotiations started in this field—before rocketry, like atomic weapons, becomes uncontrollable.

DIFFERS WITH KHRUSHCHEV

The general feeling here is that this is a good move. Nikita S. Khrushchev told this reporter in Moscow last fall that if a broad disarmament agreement could be negotiated with the United States, "it is quite possible to bring about a situation in which these means [sputniks and outer space objects] would serve exclusively peaceful purposes." But he put the big disarmament agreement first, and Mr. Dulles is suggesting the space-object agreement first.

Nevertheless, even if Mr. Khrushchev does not agree, Mr. Dulles' move can be used as a demonstration that he is not the no-man his detractors have been saying. His offer today was a casual expression of opinion, but a policy, supported by the President, to begin conversations with the Soviets as soon as they and the Allies approve the means of negotiation.

The question will then remain whether the change of tone by Mr. Dulles today can, if accepted by the Soviets, make up for the suspicions and criticisms of the Secretary in the past.

HEARTENED BY PRAISE

That he has the confidence of the President is clear. President Eisenhower described him yesterday as "the wisest, most dedicated man I know."

"I believe," said the President, "he has got greater knowledge in his field than any other man I know." And he added that the personal and intimate evaluations of Mr. Dulles by other world leaders agreed with the President's judgment that the Secretary should stay on the job.

This expression of confidence clearly touched and exhilerated Mr. Dulles today. He was full of bounce and self-confidence. He has a new and hopeful idea, and if the world leaders really do share the President's conclusion about the Secretary of State, this may be a useful year of negotiations after all.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 17, 1958]

DULLES SEEN OPPOSED ONLY TO FRUITLESS SUMMIT TALK

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—If the newspaper writers of Europe could have been present at the National Press Club today when Secretary of State John Foster Dulles answered a barrage of questions from a big gathering of reporters here, they would have learned more about the foreign policy of the United States than ever before. They would have had to revise their oft-repeated charges that Mr. Dulles is rigid and inflexible and unwilling really to see a summit conference held.

For Mr. Dulles said flatly that the United States wants such a conference but doesn't want it to end in disaster or illusion and hence that it seeks to make sure that the Soviet leaders seriously intend to negotiate instead of just playing a propaganda game.

WANTS PROPER CONDITIONS

The Secretary told of the years and years of diplomatic conferences that have been held—and some still going on—with the Soviet representatives and of the broken pledges. He insisted that there could be a summit conference to sanctify agreements previously made by the foreign ministers. He pointed out, however, that when the foreign ministers or ambassadors negotiate, they do so by direction of the President or the head of state in every case. He added:

"President Eisenhower's letter to Chairman Bulganin should dissipate once and for all any impression that the United States does not want to negotiate, or is afraid to negotiate with the Soviet rulers. The truth is quite the contrary. We do want a summit meeting, provided the proper conditions obtain.

"We do not, however, want a summit meeting which merely represents another episode in the cold war and which would be held under circumstances that would carry great peril to the free world.

"There are, I know, many who feel that the cold war could be ended and the need for sacrificial effort removed by a stroke of a pen at the summit. That is the kind of illusion that has plagued mankind for a long time. Actually peace is never achieved in that way, and nothing could be more folly for us than to act on the belief that all our danger could be ended by peaceful platitudes proclaimed from the summit by heads of government."

Yet this is precisely the point of view being emphasized in many European newspapers which have been attacking Mr. Dulles as unwilling to negotiate.

The American Secretary of State is eager to negotiate, but he doesn't see any sense in bringing the heads of state together to give an appearance of peace which would discourage the taking of the defense measures deemed necessary against Communist imperialism.

WORLD UNDERMINE DE FENIE

Mr. Dulles said it would be "the greatest triumph of Khrushchev's career if he could bring about the relaxation of military effort by the West merely by pronouncing platitudes of friendship and good will without any corresponding acts to assure such a purpose.

Mr. Dulles did not hesitate to answer explicitly the questions that were asked him about the policy he followed in the Suez dispute and his attitude about nonrecognition of Red China. He declared, for instance, that America concurred in the British and French position about the Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal but, with respect to America's protest against the military steps taken then, he believed he would recommend the same policy again if it occurred. He said it was a tragic affair and it was with a heavy heart that he took the steps he did. He said nothing would be gained now by reopening old wounds which have been healing.

NOTES RED CHINA HOSTILITY

As for Red China, Mr. Dulles said that in theory there was no reason why some day recognition shouldn't be extended, but that the conditions America feels must prevail do not prevail today. He emphasized Red China's persistent hostility to American policy in the Far East.

As for American prestige abroad, Mr. Dulles feels it "stands higher than ever before with the governments of the free world countries," but he commented that public opinion in those countries "may perhaps have been somewhat misled." He added that the United States is "respected more than it has even been before." he then remarked:

"There is a difference between being respected and being liked. We do not run the foreign policy of the United States with a view to winning a popularity contest and we have to do things which we know are not going to be popular. But we have not done, in my opinion, anything for which we are not respected, and I prefer being respected to being liked."

Those are the words of a courageous statesman—not the words of a craven politician seeking public favor at the expense of the national interest.

---

## FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I want to join in the solemn occasion of the celebration of the 40th anniversary, on yesterday, January 22,

of Ukrainian independence. To these brave people who have kept alive the spirit of freedom and independence through the long winter of Russian oppression, we in America offer our deep friendship. Like them, we look forward to the day of an independent Ukraine which once again will be welcomed into the family of free nations. We and all other God-fearing peoples, in an ever-growing brotherhood, cherish with them the significance of this proudly remembered day; and we send to them our deep expressions of hope and friendship.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very happy to add my voice in commemoration of the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. Although it is a sad and sobering thought that on this occasion the valiant people of the Ukraine are enslaved by Soviet tyranny, I know that American people everywhere join in a fervent prayer that the time is not too far distant when the Ukrainian people can truly observe their Independence Day by proclaiming their freedom from the iron hand of the Kremlin.

To Ukrainian Americans, I say "Thank you for the great contributions you have made to our country," and I pledge myself to support of a firm United States diplomatic policy to help all oppressed peoples regain their freedom.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, yesterday we observed the 40th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

It has been my pleasure and privilege in this body to present a joint resolution in behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. BUSH] calling for the designation of January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day, as an indication that the brave people of the Ukraine have not been and never will be forgotten or forsaken.

We honor Ukrainian independence today with the hope and the prayer that it may soon be restored to this proud land which was the seat of an independent and free state from the 9th to the 14th century and again from the middle of the 17th century to late in the 18th century. Its history, however, has known more than 300 years of oppression and this 40th anniversary finds the Ukraine ground under the Communist boot.

Ukrainians in the homeland or wherever they are today still love liberty as fiercely as it can be loved and this deep patriotism and the great spiritual blessings with which they have been endowed guarantee the eventual return of the freedom they love and long for so much.

Let us, then, on this anniversary, salute the Ukraine and its people. Let us join with them in their prayers. Let us continue to show in our every action that they and their unrelenting pursuit of liberty are not forgotten but rather honored.

Freedom denied anywhere is and must be our cause. Let free men and women everywhere take new courage from the heroic Ukrainians and renew our determination that their efforts to regain their independence will be crowned with success.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, yesterday, January 22, marked the 40th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence.

On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people, possessing a separate, distinctive and proud national history extending back to the 9th century, formed a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. That great moment in their history was the result of generations of heroic effort and a deep sense of liberty which neither the Mongol hordes of the 13th and 14th centuries nor the iron rule of the czars could destroy.

The independence the Ukrainian people achieved in 1918 was short lived. It was smothered by Russian Communist armies in 1920, making the Ukraine one of the very first victims of this century's counterpart of the Mongols and czars of the past. Although independence was extinguished in 1920, the spirit of freedom has never died in the Ukraine. This despite the unbelievable inhumanity inflicted upon the Ukrainian people by the genocides of the Kremlin. Feats of heroism by the freedom loving Ukrainians in their efforts to be free of Russian colonialism and brutality are a matter of historical record.

It is only fitting that we recognize these ceaseless efforts of a great people by joining with them to commemorate this anniversary of their independence. It is with heavy hearts that we take cognizance of their present plight, but it is with hope and determination that we dedicate ourselves to a future which will witness the rebirth of independence in the Ukraine and other enslaved countries of the world.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, yesterday, January 22, was the 40th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. The Russian Communists destroyed that independence in 1920. Nikita Khrushchev, known to those enslaved people "as the butcher of the Ukraine," was there during the made-in-Moscow famine of 1932–33 which ended the lives of 5 million patriotic Ukrainian peasants. The Ukraine, the largest captive non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, remains today under Moscow's baleful domination.

But it is not without cause that the Ukrainians are known as the Irish of Eastern Europe. Moscow's enduring fear of its captive nations is one of the most powerful deterrents to war against the West. The rich and populous Ukraine is the greatest source of that fear to the rulers in the Kremlin.

Of this significant anniversary, let us join in looking ahead to that bright future date when Ukrainian independence shall live again in reality—as it lives today in the hearts of the Ukrainian people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the Ukrainians. There are about 45,000 Ukrainians in the city of Chicago. I know many of them well. They are solid, rugged, law-abiding citizens, who epitomize the other 40 million in the Ukraine. I glory in the fact that, once having experienced the sunlight of freedom, they will not let the present flouting of liberty by the Soviet Union deter them from continuing their efforts until freedom is won by them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday marked important anniversaries in the national experiences of two peoples who have suffered under many centuries of imperialistic subjugation, and who are today the unhappy victims of the most despotic imperialism the world has ever seen—the atheistic imperialism of the Soviet Union. These are the people of Poland and of the Ukraine.

In 1863, on January 22, Polish patriots led a revolt by the Polish people against Russian control. The revolt failed, resulting in the direct incorporation of Poland into the Czarist Russian empire. The Polish people were barbarously punished by Czarist police and armies. Whole villages were exiled from their homes, with Russians brought in to take over their land. Poland remained under Czarist bonds for generations, but the fierce independence and patriotic zeal of the Polish people did not die. Finally, after World War I, free Poland again emerged into the family of nations, only to be smothered and divided again early in World War II under the Nazi and Communist attacks, one from the east, the other meeting it from the west.

The Ukrainian people's history is even more tragically one of foreign imperialism and subjugation. After centuries of Czarist rule and Russian domination, the people of the Ukraine made a brave bid for national independence. On January 22, 1918, a Ukrainian National Council at Kiev proclaimed the independence of Ukraine. The new nation was quickly beset with attacks both from the Bolsheviks and the Czarist regime's sympathizers in the civil war that ravaged the crumbled Czarist empire at the close of World War I. Late in 1920, the Soviets gained control over Ukraine, ending that unhappy nation's independence.

Mr. President, there are hundreds of thousands of Wisconsin citizens who are themselves immigrants or are descended from Polish and Ukrainian people who have come to the United States to make their homes and their lives here. They are indeed entitled to be proud of the brave history of their people, and we will share in the great heritage which they have added to our American culture. I join them today in saluting the courage, the patriotism, and the durable faith that has sustained the peoples of their nations under such almost endless oppression. Their patriotism is a powerful example for all the world, and an inspiration to all Americans.

I share, with Wisconsin's citizens of Polish descent, in the determination to help the people of Poland to attain the greatest measure of freedom and independence from the present-day Soviet imperialism. Our goal must be to help the Polish people to win the right to free elections and an end to their present captive status.

In this connection, the United States should do everything that will be practical and effective to encourage the people of Poland to help to give them the spirit, the means, and the support

whereby they can begin to free themselves from economic dependence upon the Soviet Union. As recommended by the Polish-American Congress and other Polish nationality organizations in this country, we should extend all practical economic help to Poland in the form largely of food shipments to help them widen the fundamental gulf between their nation and the Communist imperialists. I wish to commend the initiative that has been manifested by Senators GREEN, HUMPHREY, KENNEDY, PASTORE, and SPARKMAN in getting a program of loans for these purposes extended to Poland.

We must, of course, insist with great care that only food and similar consumer goods—not machinery useful for the war potential of the Soviet Union, should be included in any such shipments, but, on the other hand, we should not hesitate to provide nonstrategic food and other consumer goods to the Poles.

We must also keep up the pressure of our National Government to continue the United Nations investigations of Soviet aggression against the nations and peoples of eastern and central Europe, including those of both Poland and the Ukraine.

In the meantime, we should demonstrate the sincerity of America's concern for these brave people by easing certain unfair and discriminatory barriers in our immigration laws, which keep out of this country many potentially valuable new citizens from Poland and the Ukraine.

It will, in 1958, be 350 years since the first Polish settlers set foot in the United States of America. They settled in Jamestown Colony in 1608, to establish America's first glass industry. Millions of Poles and Ukrainians too have immigrated to the United States in the three and one-half centuries since these first-comers to Jamestown. They have served our Nation well—in our factories, mills and mines, on our farms, in commerce, the professions, and in government. And not the least of their service to America has been their contribution of the spirit of independence and love of liberty, that we mark on yesterday's anniversaries of these great days in the patriotic memory of the Polish and Ukrainian people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the peoples of the Ukrainian National Republic.

Yesterday marked the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of this republic which climaxed a long and historic struggle for freedom by spirited and dedicated people. The Ukraine was successful in stemming the tide of communism for several years but was unable to resist the treacherous and tyrannical force which ultimately engulfed them. Their subjection to Communist domination stands as a warning for all free people of the earth but their resistance, their lust for freedom and independence, and their fight against communism and Soviet aggression is an inspiration to all.

On behalf of their many relatives and friends in this country I wish for the people of the once independent Ukrainian National Republic the freedom and dignity which they as a people fought so hard to achieve. Their spirit and desire for self-determination, along with the spirit and desire of all of the peoples now under Communist enslavement, deserves our tribute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the American people would be remiss if the anniversary of Ukrainian independence was forgotten for the reason that these people are now under the iron fist of Soviet imperialism. I, therefore, present the following pertinent remarks:

January 22, 1958, was the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, which was destroyed by the Communists in 1920. Today, more than 6 million of its citizens are reported as political prisoners in Russian Communist slave labor camps. Their tragic situation must not be forgotten by all freedom-loving peoples.

There are indications that the Ukrainian people, who were the first victims of the tide of Communist imperialism which subsequently engulfed other free nations, will ultimately prove to be the Achilles' heel of the Communist Empire. In 1957, nationalist disturbances and the blowing up of Soviet troop trains demonstrated the inherent weakness of Soviet satellite domination. The people of Ukrainia are already demanding the end of Soviet "colonialism."

Therefore, it is with hope and a belief that the spirit of freedom still lives in the hearts of all Ukrainians, that I direct the attention of the Senate and the American people to the courageous Ukrainians, who, on this anniversary, fight for their traditional freedom. May God continue to bless them in their dedicated and sacrificial endeavors.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this week commemorates the 40th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, which the Russian Communists destroyed in 1920. The indomitable spirit in which the Ukrainian people have approached the task of rescuing their brave homeland from iron-fisted Communist rule can be both a source of pride to them and a fine example to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. Millions of Americans sympathetic with this cause pray that Ukraine and other captive nations will again become free and independent members of our community of nations. Recently, in New York City, I made an address at the ceremony opening a pictorial exhibit by the Assembly of Captive European Nations. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JAVITS AT THE OPENING CEREMONY OF A PICTORIAL EXHIBIT BY THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS

The restoration of freedom and independence to the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe is vitally essential to freedom in the world. It is more urgent than ever for us to dedicate ourselves to the task of helping these captive peoples recover the liberty to which they are entitled and of which they have been deprived by the Soviet aggressor.

I cannot help but note the title of the last section of this impressive exhibit by the Assembly of Captive European Nations. The title reads "The Indivisability of Freedom." To many this phrase constitutes the essence of the message that our country has to give to the Free World and to the Soviet Union. To paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, it is that this world cannot permanently endure half slave and half free.

The courageous attempts by the peoples of captive nations to shake off the Communist yoke have been put down. Many lives were lost. Many aspirations were drowned. But by their very acts of resistance the workers and students in East Berlin, the patriots in Poznan, Poland, the heroes of the Hungarian revolution and countless others have fashioned ultimate victory out of momentary reverses. For they have taught us that man will fight for his freedom wherever and whenever that freedom is sought to be extinguished—notwithstanding every effort to brainwash him and deny him an opportunity to learn about freedom.

We of the United States are in this sense the ideological brothers of more than 100 million people in the captive European nations. Many of our forefathers came from these countries. But more than that we are united in our joint fight against the forces of a physical and psychological ruthless suppression that would make this world half slave. As long as freedom is suppressed behind the Iron Curtain the freedom of the entire world is threatened. I hope that the message we see here today will be repeated and repeated on all sides. May I join in this message to the captive peoples in Eastern Europe. We must stand firmly for our common ideals of freedom, liberty, and justice, for only then can we assure our children a future of peace, security, and human dignity.

---

## NINETY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH INSURRECTION OF 1863

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday marked the 95th anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1863, when the brave people of Poland rose up to wrest control of their country from the Russians. Their unhappy history has been one of subjection and terror, but the flame of freedom has continued to burn brightly in the hearts of the Polish people. With the 1956 uprising, the Polish people again demonstrated to the world their will to free themselves from Soviet terrorism. They have won friendship and support throughout the freedom-loving countries and, what is more, a greater measure of political autonomy and religious freedom. In recognition of their heroic achievement, America should extend her helping hand through greater economic and technical assistance programs. Our abundance of food and fiber can be a positive force for freedom by edging Poland toward a greater degree of independence from Soviet influence. To this great cause I pledge to continue my efforts to help these valiant people assume their rightful place in the family of nations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I also wish to express the hope that the Ukrainian people may regain their independence. Once the Ukraine becomes independent, the power of communistic imperialism will be greatly reduced.

I also express the hope that the ties between Poland and Russia may progressively diminish. I join the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in ex-

pressing the hope that our foreign policy with relation to that country will be guided by that principle.

## TRIBUTE TO MR. HENDERSON, OF ST. ALBANS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, throughout its long history, has recorded the passing of many great men—wise makers of law, able administrators of public affairs, great military leaders, and countless others who during their life occupied a prominent place in the life of the Nation.

This morning I should like to place in the RECORD, as my sincere tribute to his memory, the passing of a man who possessed another and a more unobtrusive kind of greatness—the ability to mold and form human character.

For 40 years "Pop" Henderson lived quietly and modestly amongst us. He was the sort of person who never sought the limelight, preferring the rather cloistered atmosphere of St. Albans' School. Yet, Mr. President, his influence for good has gone far beyond those precincts. Successive generations of boys, most of them now men, have felt and benefited from the influence for good he exercised in the chapel, in the schoolroom, and on the athletic field.

Mr. President, as an acknowledgment of the truly great life this humble man of God lived, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Mr. Henderson, of St. Albans."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. HENDERSON, OF ST. ALBANS

The Reverend James Henderson, 78, died yesterday in Emergency Hospital after 40 years' service at St. Albans School. He was teacher, coach, and lifelong friend to hundreds of St. Albans boys.

"Pop" Henderson was an impressive figure on the day 40 years ago when he arrived at St. Albans to serve as rector, football-basketball-baseball coach and mathematics and sacred studies teacher.

Standing 6 feet 1 and weighing 225 pounds, he punctuated his most intricate lectures on algebra with the words "It's dead easy." Students who mastered "Pop" Henderson's problems never had any trouble later.

The citation on the gold medal he won last November for service to St. Albans reads in part: "Pop's boys respect him as a great teacher; they admire him as a great coach; and they love him as the great Christian gentleman he is."

The man who won the admiration and love of students and masters alike was born in Belfast, Ireland. He came to Massachusetts as a boy of six, and there began his preparation for a life of service through teaching.

At Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., he was captain of the football team in 1901. It was during his days at Trinity that he became known as defensive football's first roving center. Later he spent 3 years at Berkeley Divinity School, and then headed west to combine football coaching with missionary work.

The years following World War I were lean years for St. Albans School, and the "football parson" who had arrived in 1918 had to go through at least one season with a squad totaling only 12 boys.

His coaching during those years laid the foundation for an outstanding athletic tradition which the school has tried to carry on since Mr. Henderson's retirement 10 years ago.

Mr. Henderson continued to conduct services in the school chapel and was adviser to the athletic department until shortly before his death.

He is survived by his wife, Blanche Gould Henderson of 3888 Porter Street NW., a son, James Henderson, who is headmaster of the Maumee Valley Country Day School, Maumee Valley, Ohio, and a sister, Mrs. Albert Sadler, of West Acton, Mass.

## WHICH PRESIDENT DOES AMERICA HEAR, IKE OR SHERM?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD articles and editorials from the Washington Post, the Washington Star, and the Washington Daily News. These newspapers, all of which supported President Eisenhower with great enthusiasm in the campaigns of 1952 and 1956, unanimously agreed that the show put on by the Republicans in their money raising banquet of Monday night was a flop.

I have been unable to find any "rave" notices by these friends of the administration. In fact, to summarize their critiques of the production, it was about as inept, ineffective, and dismal as it could be in every department except the "cash register" section.

I had intended to have printed in the RECORD the speech by Sherman Adams, the Assistant to the President. I find, however, that my Republican colleague, Mr. SIMPSON, chairman of the Republican national campaign committee, inserted it in the RECORD of yesterday.

I commend it to all Senators for their reading. Perhaps they have wondered, too, whatever happened to the speech writers for the "old" NIXON. Now we can figure with some certainty that they are not among the growing army of the unemployed. White House employment must be pleasant and secure.

It is most interesting that most of the writers, Walter Lippmann in the Washington Post, and Doris Fleeson, in the Washington Star, as well as the editorial writers for the Washington News, and the Post editorial entitled "The GOP's Two Faces" all point out the huge size of the egg laid by Sherman Adams, the Assistant to the President.

Since all of these skilled political writers note the fact that the President's alter ego was traveling in the opposite direction from the President in his talk, one must wonder seriously if the man who runs most of the President's business is in fact in step—or even in contact—with his boss. Certainly the lines of communications—staffwise, that is—must have been adversely affected by interference from sputnik in its last flights over the White House.

Understanding good football, as every Oklahoman does, it must be embarrassing to the coach to be playing on the defensive and have his star quarterback downfield clipping in an offensive play.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 22, 1958]

THE ADAMS AND NIXON TECHNIQUES—WORM'S-EYE VIEW OF FORMER CONTRASTED WITH VICE PRESIDENT'S PRACTICAL SPEECH

(By Doris Fleeson)

Politicians do not create the issues of a campaign; they only ride them.

Some politicians have a greater gift for the jugular vein than others; some are more astute, some more ruthless. While their chosen techniques often indicate the man, few are able to obscure a real issue.

It does not therefore much matter substantively that in the kickoff of the Republican Congressional campaign President Eisenhower kept to the high road and his principal aide, Sherman Adams, took a worm's-eye view of history. The President ignored the economic recession and Soviet achievements in missile and outer space; Adams cataloged a purplish array of Democratic sins, including the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

But the public is aroused by the Soviet conquest of outer space, with all its implications, and is hurting from the business downturn. These are the issues of 1958 which will confront all Members of the House and the one-third of the Senate this fall.

Significantly, the ablest Republican politician operating today—Vice President NIXON—made a less colorful but far more practical speech. The Vice President urged maximum Federal aid not only to avoid recession, but to insure the country's continued expansion and prosperity.

He also took accurate aim at the conservative sources of Republican campaign funds by invoking what would be for them the dire vision of a New Deal run by new dealers determined to make it work. The Vice President gibed, too, at the Democratic division on civil rights, a potent lure to the Negro vote.

The important aspect of the Adams speech is that he has again called attention to the potent semihidden issue of the campaign, the one which will be argued by word of mouth rather than in formal attack. It is whether President Eisenhower today after three serious illnesses, is really running the people who are running the Government.

Adams was completely in character as Adams in his contribution at Minneapolis; he told the politicians nothing about himself that they had not already learned. What he said was utterly unimaginable coming from Eisenhower, and it was said in cold blood without any real provocation.

It is Adams notably who commands the day-by-day operations of the White House with their profound influence upon the lives of all Americans. His occasional bitter speeches are only the piece of the iceberg that is floating out of the water; as with the iceberg, the potentially dangerous part is submerged, protected from accountability by the doctrine of separation of powers which he pleads whenever Congress questions his role.

The President will, of course, pay to an undetermined degree for the irritation Members of Congress feel when Adams jabs at them. They can reach the President through legislation, and they will.

[From the Washington Post of January 23, 1958]

A BAD BLUNDER

(By Walter Lippmann)

By his Minneapolis speech on Monday, Gov. Sherman Adams has made more difficult the delicate situation in the President's office. The situation is delicate because the

diminished strength of the President has made necessary an unusual, almost certainly an unprecedented, delegation of powers to the White House staff of which Governor Adams is the chief. The flat contradiction between the Adams speech and the President's own speech that same evening raises the question of how faithfully the President's will is being carried out by those to whom his powers are delegated. For on an issue of national importance Governor Adams was in open contradiction with the letter and the spirit of the President's speech.

If that can happen publicly, what goes on in the privacy of the President's office? This is a fair question, and it is a necessary one. For the Government of the United States is today being carried on under a special dispensation which can work only if there is a general and complete confidence in it. There must be confidence that the officials who exercise the President's powers are men who know him so well that they can act as he would act if he had the time and the energy to do the whole work of his office.

Were this complete confidence seriously broken, there would be a demoralizing political uproar about who exercises power and who can be held accountable.

The outward evidence of the country's confidence has been that Congress, the press, and the public have accepted the theory that Governor Adams and his assistants are confidential agents of the President who cannot be questioned by committees of Congress or in press conferences. This immunity rests on the principle that their relations with the President are confidential, and that their acts are to be treated as being his acts. For these acts, the President is accountable to the people. But his agents are accountable to him.

This is a complex and subtle theory which we have developed to meet an unusually difficult situation. It is not easy to keep believing it in the face of the known evidence about the President's absences from the White House, and the many evidences that he is not always well informed. Yet we have all wanted to believe in the theory since, given the facts about our constitutional system, we have no better choice than to believe it.

But the country will not go on believing it if it turns out that the confidential agents of the President are playing politics on their own, and contrary to the President's own political beliefs. The moral of it is that in the position he occupies, and with the immunity which he claims, Governor Adams should not make speeches at all, should nourish no political ambitions of his own, and should acquire, or at least simulate, what used to be called a passion for anonymity.

On the substance of the question, which is whether defense is a legitimate party question, the answer, I believe, is that here honesty will prove to be the best policy. Thus, it is the duty of the Democrats in Congress to examine the administration's defense proposals in the light of the best intelligence available and of the testimony of experts. It is not only their right but their duty to decide whether the administration's program is adequate and how it could be improved. The Democrats will be expected to come forward with their own program of amendments which Congress can then debate.

It is when we come to the post mortems for our having fallen behind in the race of armaments that an ugly partisanship will show itself. The country will do well to be very skeptical and very suspicious of all attempts to fix the blame on one party or the other. There have been too many Democrats and Republicans involved in the complicated history of the missiles and other strategic weapons to justify any verdict that one or the other party is guilty.

If there is to be an inquest, and there is much to be said for having one, it should not be made by a Congressional committee, composed of men among whom many must run for reelection in the fall. The inquest should be conducted in a judicial spirit by some kind of panel or commission which inspires general confidence and is composed of men who personally have nothing to gain and nothing to lose by the outcome of the elections.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 22, 1958]

GOP Pep Talks

The Republican orators gave it the old college try in their Monday evening pep rallies, but the televised show that came into our living room was not the sort of thing that sets the prairies afire. On the contrary, it was dull and uninspiring. There were moments, in fact, when it was necessary to turn one's mind resolutely away from the impression that these were politically condemned men eating a last meal.

It is not our purpose to appear here, however, as one of those "pessimists" to whom the President paid his respects, or as a prophet of "gloom and doom," or what have you. Maybe it is a bit early to be writing off the Republican prospects next November. At any rate, 40,000 of the party faithful turned out for the dinners across the country, paying from $25 to $100 a plate for the privilege. We have seen no figure on the exact total of the take, but it must have amounted to a tidy sum. So the Republicans, while they may not be able to snare the wary voter in winning numbers, certainly should have the wherewithal to get in there and try. Nor is the wherewithal an item to be sneered at in any political campaign.

---

[From the Washington News of January 22, 1958]

It's Confusing

A mild difference of opinion was apparent Monday night as the GOP opened its 1958 campaign with speeches in some of the principal cities.

"Security and peace," said President Eisenhower in Chicago, "is not a partisan or political matter. Americans must not and never will let the issue of security and peace become a pawn in anyone's political chess game."

Sherman Adams, the President's assistant, speaking in Minneapolis, apparently hadn't read the boss' speech. His own address practically amounted to a dare to the Democrats.

They should, he said, "know better than to keep on politicking with national defense * * * ought to be called strictly to account by the American people for using this subject as party glue."

Mr. Adams referred to the "military catastrophe of Pearl Harbor * * * the scientific catastrophe of losing our military secrets * * * politics that led to the Red invasion of Korea * * * the tragic loss of China * * * the crippling defense planning between World War II and the following war they couldn't end."

In the interest of public enlightenment as to what the party expects to stand for in the pending Congressional campaign, it is respectfully suggested that the leaders of the GOP should get together.

---

## ARTISTIC ENDEAVOR IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, January 15, 1958, was an important day in the history of artistic endeavor in the United States. It was the occasion at the State Department of the swearing in and the first meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Arts.

As sponsor in the Senate of the legislation which was enacted as Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act, I was asked to be present on that occasion with the Secretary of State and the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith].

A list of the Committee members, a general description of their duties, and an outline of their program at the opening of a 2-day session was contained in a press release issued by the Department of State on January 14. I ask unanimous consent that this press release be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Advisory Committee on the Arts To Open 2-Day Session in Washington, January 15–16, 1958

The Advisory Committee on the Arts appointed by the Secretary of State, under the terms of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, will meet at the State Department for a 2-day session to inaugurate its duties.

The members of the Committee will take their oath of office at 9:40 a. m. Wednesday, January 15, and will be greeted by Secretary Dulles at the opening session.

The Committee, under the chairmanship of Rufus H. Fitzgerald, chancellor emeritus of the University of Pittsburgh, will devote its first sessions to receiving a general briefing concerning international programs in the arts sponsored or assisted by the United States Government. On the basis of such information they will conduct their subsequent evaluations of the effectiveness and the adequacy of these programs.

Members of the Committee in addition to Dr. Fitzgerald are: Gilmore Clarke, architect; Sumner McKnight Crosby, art historian; LaMar Dodd, artist and art educator; Thor Johnson, musician; James Albert Michener, author; Robert Montgomery, actor and television executive; George Lloyd Murphy, actor and motion-picture executive; Charles Nagel, art museum director; Mrs. Helen Crocker Russell, civic leader and art patron.

The Wednesday and Thursday program will include addresses by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey and Representative Frank Thompson, authors of the aforementioned legislation, by Dr. Thurston J. Davies, executive director of the Office of the United States Commissioner General for the Brussels Fair; Mr. Robert V. Dowling, chairman, board of directors, American National Theater and Academy; Andrew H. Berding, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs; Donald B. Cook, staff director, Departmental Staff of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange; E. Allan Lightner, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs; Russell L. Riley, director, International Educational Exchange Service; the Honorable George V. Allen, Director, United States Information Agency, and Thomas Beggs, director, National Collection of Fine Arts.

The purpose of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act "is to strengthen ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States, and the contributions being made by the United States economic and social system toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for its own people and other people throughout the world; and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the

other countries of the world." It provides for appointment of an advisory committee on the arts to advise and assist the President and Government departments and agencies in the conduct of the cultural program authorized by this act and—with special reference to the role of the arts—in other international cultural activities.

The Committee members were selected, under terms of the act, for their experience or interest in one or more of the arts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this opening session I had the honor to address the Committee in an informal and extemporaneous way. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of my remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT THE FIRST MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ARTS, JANUARY 15, 1958

The CHAIRMAN. We are happy to have with us this morning Senator HUMPHREY, a coauthor of the bill under which this Committee functions. We are glad also to have with us Senator SMITH, of the Smith-Mundt bill. I regret that Congressman THOMPSON couldn't be with us this morning. He will be with us Thursday. We have regrets from Senator MUNDT that he could not be with us this morning.

We should like very much, Senator HUMPHREY, to have you talk to us at this time. We know you have done a lot of thinking about this and we would like to have your ideas and appreciate your being here.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Dr. Fitzgerald, members of the Committee, and my associates in Government, both in the legislative and executive branch.

First of all I want to say that in looking over your agenda today, I gather that your session will be one of quality and quantity. I note that you will have a very busy time. The agenda also reveals to me the scope of the interest and the responsibility of this Advisory Committee on the Arts.

I was impressed and touched by the remarks of the secretary because I am sure we all feel that these are the most critical times we have ever faced. They are subtly critical. If they were as openly challenging as we have been accustomed to in other days of our history, I suppose you would see the American people rise up as one. But the challenge of Soviet society and the challenge of its ideologies and practice is so varied and diverse that sometimes we fail to comprehend that we have a totalitarian challenge—a challenge in totality.

Somebody said to me the other day at a meeting, Senator SMITH—a meeting of the Advisory Commission on Information, in which you have such an interest—that we have "missiles misery." He pointed out that the American people are obviously aware of the need for a sudden advance and improvement in rocketry, missiles, satellites, and in the science of outer space. But the question is whether we have the kind of economic enlightenment and the kind of artistic and cultural appreciation that is required to meet this challenge.

I was greatly impressed when I heard the leader of the Soviets, Khrushchev, on that CBS telecast Face the Nation, lay down the gantlet to the whole Free World, particularly to the American people and the Government of this country, when he said: "We declare war on you." He then listed the areas in which the war had been declared, and you can rest assured those areas included education, and of culture.

It is for this reason that some of us in Congress—I hope all of us—have taken a renewed interest in matters relating to our education, our cultural developments and activities, the fine arts and the humanities.

Senator SMITH, to my right, was one of the early spokesmen and pioneers in the field of cultural and educational exchange. I am so pleased to see him here today.

In the 84th Congress, it was my privilege to be a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and to introduce legislation which subsequently became Public Law 860. Congressman FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey, in the House of Representatives, introduced the companion bill. This act among other things formalized activities which already had been undertaken in a more or less ad hoc manner in the field of cultural exchange and trade fair participation. This act, as you know, is known as the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Participation Act, Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, and in this law, in Section 10, is a provision for the mandatory establishment of the Advisory Committee on the Arts.

Now, of course the real parent of this committee is the Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, which had recommended for years that a committee of this nature be appointed.

I felt that it was the duty of Congress to take this recommendation seriously and, therefore, we made it a mandatory part of the law, removing it from the discretionary area.

I was about to say we had gone through a gestation period for some time and finally the birth occurred. Reversing the usual order, I want to say a word or two about the marriage now.

The appointment and the formalizing of the Committee on the Arts indicates a kind of marriage, the first instance of this kind of marriage in American life—a marriage between Government on the one hand, and the arts, through this Committee, on the other.

Now, there have been some people who have been highly critical of this very possibility. They have protested such a marriage, saying that it would mean too much Government control, a stifling of the creativeness which could come from people interested in the fine arts.

Shakespeare was among the first group of skeptics to worry about a governmental interest in the arts, when he referred to "Arts made tongue-tied by authority."

He worried about the hard hand of government being placed over the creativeness of the human mind and spirit.

Then there was a more contemporary writer, a cynical and skeptical one at times, but one of our best minds, Henry Louis Mencken. In his book of essays, entitled "Prejudices" he voiced another apprehension expressed occasionally in Congress and in the executive branch. He referred to artists as "Never Puritans and seldom"—this is what he said—"seldom even respectable." I quickly disassociate myself from this summary judgment. I hasten to assert not only my own disagreement but I am sure that Mencken himself would not have said what he did had he been here this morning with this distinguished assemblage.

I want to conclude on this note. This joining together in a cooperative spirit by government and art through this Advisory Committee on the Arts is to me very good and sound, and I appeal to you to make it a success. We cannot afford to fail even on the domestic scene. I know we are primarily concerned here with international developments and the effect of this participation upon our international relations. But, very frankly, as I said earlier today to Mr. Murphy, in our pleasant visit in the diplomatic reception room, it is a pity that the American people themselves do not know more about what is going on in the fields of cultural exchange, of educational exchange, of trade fairs.

What a pity it is that more people don't appreciate the opportunities open to us in the field of participation in the arts. It is encouraging, however, to know that many of you, like Mrs. Hawkes, have spoken throughout America about this good work. I want to commend you, and assure you that you have friends in Congress. Congress will be watching you, not in terms of an investigating kind of watchfulness but a watchfulness filled with affection and sympathy. If there is anything we can do, I hope you will feel free not only to advise the Secretary but also that you will give the Congress the advice and counsel we need to make improvements.

We have a job to do. We are proud of our country. I will tell you, fellow Americans, I am tired of hearing we don't do well. We have everything with which to do; I am sure we have the will to do what needs to be done. I would like to think that American art and culture would be made known, not only to ourselves but the world, even if Stalin had never been born, if Marx had never got locked up in that museum in London, and if Lenin had never stormed across the scene.

There are some things worth doing. If there is some way we can, by doing these things, make an impression favorable upon others, then our works have been twice blessed.

Thank you very much and congratulations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I know that the Senate will want to join in hailing what we hope will be an active and enterprising new Advisory Committee. This Committee has a real opportunity to break new ground. It is the first top-level Federal committee established by Congress in the field of coordinating the arts at home and abroad.

Following their 2-day meeting, the Advisory Committee on the Arts issued a statement, which I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point. I ask unanimous consent that this may be done. The statement is contained in a press release issued by the State Department on January 16, 1958.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ARTS

The Advisory Committee on the Arts ended their 2-day session today. At the conclusion of this meeting, the Committee issued the following statement:

As members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts, we are glad to place such special knowledge and experience as we may have at the service of our Government in its promotion of cultural relationships with other nations and peoples.

At a time of reassessment of the Nation's scientific and technological accomplishments, the creation of this committee furnishes gratifying evidence that our Governments, the creation of this Committee furtural achievements. Our maturity in the arts can win us the respect of others as surely as our progress in science.

The Committee's initial meeting has been devoted to a familiarization with the Government's interest in the arts as a means of communication with other peoples, and with the various interrelated programs through which this interest is made evident. We have been impressed by the statements made to us. In particular, the Secretary of State spoke eloquently, and with manifest

sincerity, of the importance he and the Department of State attach to demonstrating America's achievement in the arts as a hallmark of our national maturity. The remarks of the Honorable George V. Allen and other officials of the executive branch were of like character. Assurances were received from Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON that they and many of their colleagues in the Congress share fully in this interest in the arts in our international relations.

The reports received on the scope and effectiveness of our Government's programs for artistic presentations and exchanges were equally impressive to the Committee. The fact that so much has been accomplished with limited resources is a tribute to the ingenuity and imaginativeness of the administrators of these programs and to the generosity of so many of the artists who have participated and of public-spirited citizens and groups. The success to date suggests that consideration should be given to an expansion of these activities.

It will be one of our important tasks as an advisory committee to give continuing review and guidance to these programs—in particular to the President's cultural presentations program and the reciprocal visits of artists under the international exchange program. It is our desire to be of assistance to the Department of State and to the other agencies, public and private, in the realization of the objectives of these programs.

We recognize the complexities of the relationship between government and the arts, but we see no necessary incongruity in the artist's serving the legitimate ends of government or in government's giving recognition to the artist. We believe that in the arts integrity and quality are important watchwords, and within the framework of our relations with other nations we are confident that these values have been, and will be, honored.

The arts illumine the mind, kindle the spirit, and move the heart. Surely there can be few better ways to serve the cause of international understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the establishment of the Advisory Committee on the Arts is just one additional step long overdue in what should be a general effort on our part to increase our attention to the role of arts and culture in international relations. Increasingly this subject has been attracting editorial support. On January 17, the Minneapolis Star contributed a notable editorial on this subject, We Arm To Parley.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star of January 17, 1958]

WE ARM TO PARLEY

Several times in recent months we have heard the argument that the United States cannot afford to increase cultural exchanges or enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union for fear that the American people would become indifferent to the Communist danger. This argument, we contend, is sheer nonsense.

It may be difficult to believe that this theory is seriously considered in Washington, but we heard it first from the lips of a State Department official. Now the Washington correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, MAX FREEDMAN, reports that some officials in Washington fear that "all this talk of diplomatic negotiations can easily undermine the campaign for higher defense expenditures."

Perhaps it is such a fear that motivates Secretary of State Dulles. For he has been strangely reluctant to go forward with efforts to negotiate with the Soviets, increase cultural exchanges with them, or improve United States-Soviet relations on other fronts.

Yet it shows little confidence in democracy to fear that the Russians might contaminate us with their friendship. This approach implies that a free people would succumb to the blandishments of the Communists. It reflects little faith that the Communists might be affected favorably by their experiences under democracy.

Perhaps even more serious is the inference, in any approach, that Government officials should decide whether the public should come in contact with people of different political beliefs. This approach follows the "big brother knows best" principle.

We have long contended that the Russians ought to be permitted to come freely to this country to learn more about our people and our form of government. We have argued that if the Russians really got to know us, they would learn that their fears about any aggressive designs by the United States on the Soviet Union are only the product of Soviet propaganda.

Nor do we think that the American people would fail to support a missiles program if our Government pushed harder for talks with the Russians. As President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union address, we seek peace and security. We would move toward both goals by approving higher defense spending and seeking further negotiations with the Soviet Union. As Winston Churchill once said, "we arm to parley."

## THE BRUSSELS FAIR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the Senate floor on January 9 I spoke about the challenge confronting us immediately in connection with the needed appropriations for the Brussels Fair. I wish to reiterate the importance of immediate action today. I earnestly hope, Mr. President, that the Appropriations Committees will find it possible to hold hearings without delay, if hearings are necessary.

The public attention to this issue is increasing. There is no question that additional funds will be required. My bill, S. 2923, asked for an additional appropriation of $2,054,000, a figure which the State Department is prepared to defend.

In this connection, Mr. President, the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post discusses the outlook for the Brussels Fair in an article entitled "We'll Go on Trial at the Fair." The article is written by Ernest O. Hauser, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'LL GO ON TRIAL AT THE FAIR—A PREVIEW OF UNCLE SAM'S PITCH AT THIS YEAR'S WORLD'S FAIR IN BRUSSELS, WHERE THE SOVIET SHOW WILL STAND FACE TO FACE AGAINST OURS—EUROPEANS WILL JUDGE US BY WHAT THEY SEE

(By Ernest O. Hauser)

BRUSSELS.—Are world's fairs obsolescent? The universe has shrunk since the first universal exposition, in 1851, drew approximately 6 million spectators to London's glittering Crystal Palace. Men and ideas traveled slowly in those days, and seeing was believing. In our age of cheap and rapid travel, of radio, film, and television, what is the point of mounting yet another global kermess where Man can gaze at the accomplishments of Man?

The people now preparing the Brussels Universal and International Exposition of 1958 have no illusions on this score. Their fair, they know, may well be the last of its kind. So much more reason, they will tell you, to make it an unparalleled success—a giant firecracker whose brilliant flash won't be forgotten for a long, long time. Thirty-five million visitors, they hope, will take a look at the 50-nation extravaganza, opening on April 17 and closing 6 months later. Belgium, the anxious host, is spending some $300 million on the project, plus some $400 million on sprucing up the Belgian capital for the occasion.

For the United States, now finishing one of the most spectacular pavilions on the exposition grounds, Brussels will mark a precedent. Never before have we participated on a comparable scale in a world's fair—and there are those who say that this historic fact alone will make the Brussels Exposition. Still, even as the star performers of this show, we'll be on our mettle like the rest of them. Our national pavilion, as it happens, is just across the way from the pavilion of the Soviet Union. Already, as he picks his way across the muddy grounds, the visitor is irresistibly attracted by the two looming rival structures which will, undoubtedly, become the fair's prime objects of curiosity.

This is no trade fair, and no hawking is permitted; to have your order books around would be obscene. True expositions, as distinguished from commercial fairs, are ruled by solemn international agreement. A charter signed in 1928 by the governments of 35 nations—including Russia, but not the United States—lays down the ground rules. According to these rules, a "universal exposition" should be a stock-taking of our civilization. This ever-changing world, arrested in one quivering moment, should hold still for inspection, as it were, before proceeding on its headlong course.

Hence, Belgium's aim to make the Brussels fair "a balance sheet in the creation of a more human world." There is much gossip here of transcendental matters; and nice, round words, like "humanism," "progress" and "the pursuit of happiness," fill the moist Belgian air. Unfortunately, Belgium has picked the atom for a mascot. While Man himself serves as a general theme, the Atom—symbol of our age—will cast its eerie shadow on the fair. A weird Rube Goldberg fantasy called the "Atomium" will be to Brussels, 1958, what the Eiffel Tower was to the Paris Exposition of 1889, and the Trylon and Perisphere to the New York World's Fair of 1939. Raising itself to a height of 360 feet, this monstrous Christmas tree will represent the structure of a simple metal crystal, with nine enormous spheres acting as atoms. Escalators will move up and down inside the hollow branches, and there will be a restaurant in the top atom.

Brussels seems a good place to stage this kind of competition. It certainly is not for nothing that this is the fifth international exposition to be held here in seven decades—the last took place in 1935. A crossroads in the flow of goods and people, the Belgian capital sits in the hub of a highly developed, thickly settled region. Within a 200-mile radius lie the coal mines and the cotton mills of northern France, the busy factories of Western Germany, the crowded shores of England. Some 135 million people live and work within this compass. Keen traders, the inviting Belgians have no intention of suppressing their own commercial instincts for the duration of the fair.

As for ourselves, we are going into Brussels, 1958, with the diffidence of a party whose case is not yet proved. Most of the 200,000 visitors expected to throng our building on a busy day are likely to be total strangers whose mental image of America and our way of life, at best, is sketchy. They have known us first as liberators, then as the generous dispensers of dollar aid and finally as wide-eyed tourists. They have also seen our movies, they have read about McCarthy, about Little Rock, they have heard about American materialism, and they are wondering where fancy ends and truth begins.

Here, then, for the first time since World War II, is our chance to put ourselves across—to tear down a whole web of misconceptions and show what we believe to be our real face. This, evidently, is no simple one-way propaganda job; the opposition plies its trade across the street, and most of our customers will be comparison shoppers.

"We have divorced our thinking from a frontal conflict with the Russians," one of our planners said. "All we want, frankly, is the best pavilion and the most beautifully designed exhibit."

But to begin at the beginning. When our State Department, in the fall of 1954, received the Belgian invitation, it did not look at Brussels—more than 3 years off—as a matter of immediate concern. Handing the project, as a sideline, to one of its officials, it let things ride. It was not until July 31, 1956, that Congress was in a position to vote empowering legislation. And in October of that year Howard S. Cullman was sworn in as our Commissioner General.

He seemed the right man for the job. A rich tobacco merchant who, for many years, had headed the efficient and politically clean Port of New York Authority, Cullman was probably best known as a successful Broadway angel. Among the 150 plays and musicals he had sponsored were hits like Life With Father, South Pacific, The King and I, and Teahouse of the August Moon. His flair for showmanship was bound to prove an asset, and his financial independence allowed him to turn down the $25,000-a-year remuneration provided for the job.

But there were only 18 months to go when he stepped in. Most other nations had their feet well on the ground by then, and some, like Germany, had done a year's constructive planning. To make things worse, Congress was in an economy mood. While holding out hope for eventual approval of the $15 million Cullman and his small, handpicked team considered necessary, the legislators were unwilling to put more than $12,345,000 into the enterprise. That, even now, is all there is, and Cullman's inability to lay his hands on more has caused some painful cuts, particularly in the entertainment program.

Still, what the United States has on the ground by now needs no apologies. Like other major nations, we were assigned a 6½-acre site. It is roughly triangular, rising toward the rear to form a natural amphitheater. Leaving the narrow forward portion of the triangle free—part of it will be taken up by a reflecting pool—we are constructing in the rear a massive, circular pavilion.

Though no less modern than most of the other national pavilions, the structure is far from extreme; its restful and harmonious lines give it an almost classic air. The worst that can be said of it is that, with its flat, overhanging lid, and its Great Seal of the United States over the door, it looks like an American officer's cap. Its architect, Edward D. Stone—identified with such Manhattan landmarks as Radio City Music Hall and the Museum of Modern Art—likes to make people shudder by picturing the kind of thing he could have built if he had wanted to appear audacious. "Terrific, isn't it?" he will exclaim, with fitting modesty, as he clambers all over the enormous steel-and-plastic pile.

No open-span round structure of this size has ever been attempted; the floor, 340 feet across, would hold a couple of football fields. But the pavilion's most conspicuous feature is the bicycle-wheel roof; made of 2,100 translucent plastic panels airlifted in 8 planeloads from New Hampshire, it is suspended from the rim by thin steel cables—a system borrowed from Rome's oval Colosseum, whose canvas top used to be strung in just this manner. An opening in the roof lets in sunshine and rain. And the illusion of the great outdoors is further heightened by a pool in the center of the floor, and 11 fine old willow trees which our builders have been careful to preserve. The outer skin of the pavilion is a transparent mesh; lighted from the inside, the heavy drum will be transformed into an airy apparition.

There is little doubt that the $5 million edifice itself will be our No. 1 exhibit at the fair. Already, it is something of a legend. A British Sunday paper has forewarned its readers that "the American pavilion * * * will have the biggest dome in the world, housing a whole forest and a huge-floating platform" and costing about $42 million.

However, this is but a shell to hold our national presentation, and while admitting that it is stunning, one might well ask, "But is it functional?" As almost all the impedimenta of our civilization are rectangular, a round pavilion may not be ideally suited for the display of this civilization, as anybody who has ever tried to fit rectangular furniture into round spaces will appreciate. But then, this is a Government project. Our designing team was hired when it was too late to change the structure; and, being stubborn individualists, they went ahead and squared the circle, constructing a rectangular world within the drum, and leaving foreign visitors with an impressive insight into our wonderfully democratic way of doing things.

The actual producers of the show—Peter G. Harnden Associates, a private firm of designers—were given a good deal to chew on. Cullman's team had solicited opinions on what our exhibits should be like from 30 prominent Americans. A conference held under the auspices of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology had further crystallized the issue. What almost everyone insisted on was modesty. "No bragging" was the keynote. We should present ourselves as a dynamic, restless people, saddled with problems just like everybody else, groping for the right answers and committed to a constant search for an improved way of life. The theme of our show would be the "continuous American revolution."

To translate this philosophy into 120,000 square feet of three-dimensional exhibits was no small order. The end result, as visitors will see it at the fair, is, in the main, the work of two creative minds—Industrial-Design Consultant James S. Plaut, our deputy commissioner general; and Architect Bernard Rudofsky, associated with the Harnden workshop as top designer for the project. While it is impossible to say at this stage whether their presentation will go down as a success or a resounding failure, it is certain to create enough attention to make the exercise worth while.

The general mood of the exhibit will be one of tranquillity—a welcome calm designed to give the visitor relief from the aggressiveness of the fair as a whole; to grant him, after loud and garish miles, a respite. There will be a minimum of graphs, statistics, obtrusive photomurals, and heroic slogans. Nor will we show off our wealth—no bronze, chrome, plate glass, or rich marble. If we seduce, we shall seduce by understatement.

"The visitor," the working script predicts, "will recall the United States Pavilion as an experience rather than an exhibition."

Although 100 college students from back home will serve as guides during the fair, there is no prescribed itinerary. You are on your own, and you may start and finish where you like. Here then—with the proviso that some items are still tentative—is your sneak preview of our main exhibits.

Surveying the ground floor, you'll find it a strange wedlock between tradition and avant-garde. Side by side with such down-to-earth displays as twin exhibits on atomic energy and automation—the only hints of our industrial might—you will encounter abstract works of art and some engaging bits of whimsey. A surrealistic spread of objects, displayed under a giant ceiling map of the United States, delineates the Face of America. Among the wrinkles there will be a bale of tumbleweed from the Southwest, a California gold nugget, Hollywoodiana, cowboy accouterments, a row of rural mailboxes, American Indian artifacts, the model of a side-wheeler, a copy of the Declaration of Independence, an Idaho potato mounted like a jewel, strange butterflies, and a live rattlesnake. "They'll taste the continent in a few samples," Rudofsky says. "We will present the unexpected, the things the movies don't show. Some of these objects will be seen for the first time in Europe."

Wherever possible, we shall imply rather than shout our message. A working model of the New York Stock Exchange, complete with ticker tape and a big board, will get across the public ownership of our corporations. An electronic-scale model of Philadelphia, with buildings that turn turtle and drop out of sight to be replaced by a new city, will document American urbanism. Voting machines—placed in our pavilion on President Eisenhower's personal request—will illustrate the everyday mechanics of our democracy. And a pictorial show of the opening up of the American West will remind Europeans that we, too, have a past.

But it is on the balcony that the originality of the designers comes into its own. The stylized prototypes of some American houses—a Texas ranch, a Southern cabin, a New England cottage—lead up to islands showing, each in its own way, a facet of our domestic life. None of these units—an American kitchen, a sun deck, a living room, a children's playpen, and so forth—will try to be the real thing, but will attempt to capture the elusive essence of an environment created by and for Americans. Appealing to the viewer's sense of beauty and imagination, these items may be brilliantly successful or fall completely flat. At any rate, no one can say that they are exhibition cliches.

The one display most apt to make Americans feel suddenly at home and give the stranger an authentic feel of our daily life is a characteristic street—a streetscape—complete with signposts, manholes, traffic lines, street lamps, a billboard, show windows and a functioning corner drugstore—where Europeans may have their first soda at the fountain.

So far, so good. The bombshell will be hidden in the leafy grounds where a small building will enshrine bits of unfinished business. Here, in a haunting black and white, we shall present such unsolved problems as slum clearance, the dust bowl, civil rights and race relations, along with progress made toward their ultimate solution. This, obviously, is the sector of the show most likely to blow up in our planners' faces, as visiting Americans themselves may not see eye to eye on all the answers. But, the designers ask, Is there a better way of making friends than taking all the skeletons out of

their closets and airing them for international inspection? And, quite conceivably, they'll win their point.

America will thus sink in. Whatever one may think of individual items, the freshness of the whole approach, the intellectual titillation provided by the show in its entirety, will keep the thing on a remarkably high level. And the sophisticated European audience is likely to appreciate the total absence of the direct sell. What else? Short films, playing on scattered screens, and the first movie-in-the-round shown outside the United States will add a visual touch of American life and scenery. Several teams of pretty girls will model American fashions. A restaurant will try to serve American corned-beef hash and apple pie. And, in a spacious theater, adorned in simple white and gold, a program of American plays, musicals, ballets, and concerts—somewhat reduced for lack of funds—will uphold our cultural renown.

Although the total impact of our Brussels effort can't be assessed until the gates are open, the contrast between our formula of calculated modesty and the big Soviet noise across the way is certain to have its effect. There will be nothing very subtle about the Russian pavilion. Ignoring a Belgian request to all foreign exhibitors to use no more than 70 percent of their allotted acreage for construction, the Russians are covering nine-tenths of theirs with a colossal glass-and-steel box—a kind of super-Parthenon designed to awe rather than please. Inside, you'll find, surrounded by the implements of progress—industrial, agricultural, and plain cultural—a large statue of Lenin. As Russia's commissioner general for the fair happens to be Assistant Minister for Machine Tool Production, the Russians will be bulging with machine tools where we shall bulge with understatement.

Still, as this phase of the cold war will be fought in plain view of 35 million spectators, there is little point in our discounting the Russians in advance. They are, by all accounts, spending more money on their show than the United States, although the $50 million mentioned in the press is probably exaggerated. And while such live exhibits as a coal mine and an oil well hardly sound exciting, the Russians may have some surprises up their sleeves—astral and otherwise. Their restaurant, where national dishes will be served, is likely to prove one of the sensations of the fair. And their essays in culture, which will include a presentation of the Bolshoi ballet, will make our own shortage of funds for the performing arts doubly regrettable.

As Belgium could invite only the nations with which she is on speaking terms, some Governments, including those of mainland China and Eastern Germany, have not been asked. Others, though invited, have since bowed out for lack of interest or cash—notably India, Pakistan, South Africa, Australia, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, and Greece. But what remains will be sufficiently universal to justify the label of the fair. The presence of Monaco, Liechtenstein, and San Marino—the last just freed from 12 years of Communist rule—will prove that size is not a requisite of sovereignty. And the pavilions of seven international organizations, from the United Nations to the European Coal and Steel Community, will add their one-world touch.

Still, a brief stroll around the foreign section, reverberating with the din of last-minute construction work, and smelling of enthusiasm and fresh paint, reveals a frightening variety of states of mind. West Germany parades her eight rectangular pavilions in a clear, orderly, headstrong formation. The Netherlands, whose theme is Water—Friend and Enemy, is turning part of her establishment into the sea. Morocco's closed-mouth and forbidding fortress makes you think of the wind in the high Atlas. Italy gently draws you into an Italian village, with a fine little piazza and palazzo. The Czechs are sheathing their three windowless pavilions with 7 million diamond-shaped pieces of gilt glass. Great Britain, always a nation of shopkeepers, uses a modest government pavilion as come-on for a huge, hangarlike showcase of British goods, erected by the Federation of British Industries. The Japanese, torn between old and new, crown their exquisite paper house with a futuristic metal lid. And the Brazilians can be found under a tricky fiber canopy that looks like a tarpaulin.

Our neighbor on the right, the sovereign state of Vatican City, is welcoming all sinners to a gleaming-white city of God from which a startlingly modern church raises a 180-foot belfry. The world Protestant churches have their own pavilion in another sector of the fair grounds. The French, as if they did not have enough problems at home, have had hard luck at Brussels. Having first run into burst sewers underneath their site, which made it difficult to sink foundations, they found that the design their architects came up with was so advanced that the building could not be constructed. Only when the original idea of pivoting the entire roof upon a single strut was compromised by the addition of two new supports would the pavilion stand up—a heavy blow to every Frenchman's love of abstract logic.

All of these handsome structures, the agreement says, must be razed when the fair is over, at the exhibitors' expense. Some European countries, with this sad end in mind, use prefabricated materials for their buildings, and have foreseen their reerection at home—the Soviet pavilion, for example, will serve as an exhibition hall in Moscow. We, living all the way across the water, are less fortunate. Not only will our beautiful pavilion transform itself into a lumbering white elephant the day the show is over, but, having to depend largely on local labor and materials, we have to pay a Belgian tax on some of the transactions involved—an ugly $480,000 surprise to our planners. Although the matter has led to some pointed questions in the United States Senate, where the tax was referred to as a holdup, there is little hope for Belgian leniency.

What everyone would like to know, at this point, is whether Belgium will relax its rule against serving liquor, other than beer, in public places. Without a sampling of French and Italian wines, a dash of vodka, Scotch or rye, many a visitor, it is feared, may drop dead from exhaustion prematurely.

But what about the Belgians as exhibitors? Reserving for themselves the spacious grounds of the annual Brussels trade fair—the foreign zone is, normally, a royal park—they will spread themselves over nearly one half of the 500-acre exposition grounds. There, at their ease, they will display their own civilization, with emphasis on its material and commercial aspects. However, the world's hosts do not intend to play dog-in-the-manger. In giving their own manufacturers a chance to show their wares, they are willing to grant foreign firms asylum on their sovereign grounds, and half a dozen large American concerns, unable to exhibit in the United States pavilion, will have pavilions of their own across the line. The lofty purpose of the exposition, of course, prevents the sale of goods displayed.

More of a blown-up country fair than a sophisticated exercise in self-portrayal, the Belgian show will have something for everyone. The sector given over to the country's famous diamond industry, for example, is almost certain to rank with the main attractions of the fair. There will be the inevitable midway, to be sure, and a gay and capricious folklore land, taking you back to the year 1900. A surprisingly large portion of the Belgian site is set aside for the displays of Belgium's African domain, especially the Belgian Congo. But it appears there will be no attempt—as in France's Algerian exhibit—to refute charges of colonialism.

By now, this country of 9 million inhabitants is heavily committed to the exposition. Although the transformation of traffic-locked and cluttered Brussels into a modern capital had long been on the books, the fair has turned the long-term project into a $400 million crash program. There seems to be no street here, at this writing, that is not being widened or at least torn up. New overpasses, underpasses, throughways are gradually emerging from the chaos. The city's shopkeepers anticipate fat profits, while the more sensitive look forward to the fair as one looks forward to an earthquake, and talk of going on a nice, long trip. The one question to which the Belgians, so far, have given little thought is where to billet the invading army. Hotel space in the city of 1,300,000 is woefully inadequate, and visitors may have to fan out over the surrounding country, bivouac on ships in nearby ports or use the Brussels-Paris helicopter service for commuting.

Will it be worth the trouble? It is one thing to talk about a rattlesnake, and quite another thing to hear it rattle. To judge a fair, you want the noise, the smells, the fireworks and, above all, the crowds. This much is sure: the Brussels Exposition, a peaceful contest among 50 nations, will give the jaded traveler a new sense of affinity with a bewildered, striving, basically inoffensive species: man. As such, the first world's fair since World War II will warrant the enormous effort made to give it diversity and punch. And, if it does turn out to be the last, it will at least be worthy of its famous predecessors.

---

## ASIAN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the Congressional recess a good many informed, intelligent Americans visited other countries of the world and sent home reports which could be helpful to Members of Congress. I think too often we in the Senate and House of Representatives tend to rely on official information too exclusively. When, as has happened so often in recent months and years, the net impact of official information differs seriously in emphasis from the impact of unofficial information, perhaps it is all the more important to pay attention to the latter.

The distinguished editorial page editor of the Washington Post, Mr. Robert H. Estabrook, has recently been in Asia. Many of us have followed his excellent and thought-provoking reports as they appear in his newspaper. One of these, a general summary of the current situation in Asia and of our policies in Asia, appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, December 29, 1957.

In this article Mr. Estabrook stressed the following major propositions which, I feel, are not fully understood here in the United States:

First. The Soviet sputniks and missiles prowess have dealt a devastating blow to American prestige in Asia.

Second. Our Secretary of State is universally unpopular and his policies are everywhere under attack in Asia.

Third. To Asians who are caught in the midst of a social revolution, our official support for reactionary and anti-

Asian regimes is regarded as undemocratic.

Fourth. Military pacts in south and southwest Asia have been ineffective and, in the Pakistan-India theater, disruptive of previous balances of power.

Fifth. Economic aid and technical assistance are the most useful aspects of the American policy in Asia.

Sixth. Our domestic behavior in race relations is being carefully watched everywhere in Asia.

Seventh. Asians view our current foreign policy as too identified with the interests of former colonial powers; they regard our protestations and anticolonialism as being frequently hypocritical.

Eighth. American personnel in Asia do not always have the personal qualifications necessary for the sensitive jobs they hold.

Ninth. The United States has not used its own prestige or influence to promote conciliation and mediation of Asian disputes.

Mr. President, from time to time I, myself, have spoken on many of these points. For instance, on January 16, 1956, at the Marshall College Forum at Huntington, W. Va., I proposed an 8-point Asian program. I ask unanimous consent that the press release I issued at the time be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY CALLS FOR NEW EIGHT-POINT ASIAN POLICY

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, Monday night called for a "new and imaginative" Asian policy, based on eight essential points:

1. The drawing of a military line against communism in Asia "which has the clear support of our European allies and at least the unspoken approval of the great majority of non-Communist Asians."

2. Reexamination of our assumption that all military allies should be accepted, regardless of the consequences.

3. Indentification of our interests with all free nations, rather than only with those who unquestioningly follow our lead.

4. Self-restraint in the statements of our responsible public officials.

5. Extension of our information services, stressing positive affirmation of our democratic faith and our working democratic system.

6. Strengthening of the morale of our Foreign Service, improving the strength and caliber of our representation in Asia.

7. A substantial, long-term economic aid program, preferably through the U. N., and on an intelligent partnership basis with the Asian peoples.

8. Recovery of our relationships with the key Asian nations of India and Japan, the "great hope for an effective counterbalance to China."

Warning that danger to American objectives and interests "is as great today in Asia as it was in Europe in 1947," Senator HUMPHREY told the Marshall College Forum at Huntington, W. Va., that he is disturbed by the "steadily growing power and prestige of Communist China, and by the gap which exists between the views commonly expressed in America and those held by other non-Communist peoples.

"The halting of communism and the development of wide areas of growing strength and stability in Asia is crucial to our position, not only in that part of the world, but also in the Middle East and Europe. It is crucial to the entire world power balance.

"Our diplomacy should have two objectives: First, to stabilize and extend the area of freedom, and second, to place on the Communists the responsibility for the cold war tensions that continue to exist.

"But recently, in an unimaginative and impatient way, we have increasingly adopted the attitude in our relations to the billion or more uncommitted peoples of the world, that 'if they are not for us they are against us.' At the very same time, the Communists have increasingly adopted the reverse attitude in their relations to the same billion or more uncommitted peoples. The Communists say, 'If they are not against us they are for us.'

"Lenin said long ago that 'for world communism the road to Paris lies through Peking and Calcutta.' Khrushchev and Bulganin are the most recent and most effective exponents of this approach. Today world communism is putting a new stress on the middle world which stretches across Asia from the Mediterranean to the Sea of Japan.

"Communist China's dynamic rate of development and her bitter antagonism to the United States make her at least as great a potential threat to peace and stability as the Soviet Union itself. She can appeal to other Asians on an anticolonial, antiwhite, antiwestern basis.

"Meanwhile the things Asians hear us say are largely of a military nature. Yet American atomic power, supported by a weak SEATO alliance whose only Asian members are Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines, will be woefully inadequate to cope with Chinese ambitions in Asia over the next generation. An American-dominated, American-managed military program in Asia, if that is all we produce, will inevitably amount to dead-end diplomacy."

After listing his eight points for a new Asian policy, Senator HUMPHREY concluded: "Japan and India between them have 455 million people, 20 percent of the world's population. From the point of view of manpower, this is the major Asian counterbalance to China's 580 million. With 75 percent of Asia's industrial output, millions of skilled and potentially skilled workers, and important natural resources, these two nations are the only effective Asian industrial counterbalance to China. In Gandhi, India has by far the most significant Asian spiritual and ideological counterbalance to communism.

"India and Communist China are now involved in an economic race which is terribly important in our future. China is conducting her economic development with forced labor and rigid controls. India is striving to conduct hers democratically, and yet compete with China for results in a similar period of time.

"Having sat through a bitter and futile partisan debate over who lost China, I for one have no interest in participating in another such debate 5 years hence over who lost India or who lost Japan. The great hope for an effective counterbalance to China in Asia is India and Japan, with American power in the background. Unless these two key nations remain independent and friendly to us, there is basically little future for the American position in Asia.

"Let us recognize this essential fact and act upon it."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, these principles, and others mentioned in Mr. Estabrook's report, cannot be repeated too often. This Congress and succeeding Congresses are going to be faced with the need for the development of a broad and imaginative policy toward Asia. What Mr. Estabrook says is unalterably true:

The key to stability in Asia is economic, and in a nutshell is in the development of a middle class. This is the real meaning of American economic efforts, and these are far more important than armaments in determining the future of Asia.

When the countries of Asia are involved in the cold war, their economic development is retarded accordingly and the solution of international disputes which affect them is rendered impossible. The challenge to American policy is for this country to be mature enough to be content with neutrality on the part of Asian countries which have chosen free ways.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Estabrook's article to which I referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR STOCK LOW IN ASIA; DULLES HEAVILY BLAMED

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

How does the United States look in Asia? In 32,000 miles of travel through 18 countries of Asia and the Near East, I asked this question in seeking to obtain a better understanding of Asian views and problems.

Talks with presidents, prime ministers, and private citizens in these countries as well as with Americans overseas have led to certain broad conclusions. Aware of the dangers of superficial generalization, and aware, too, that there is no such thing as one single Asian point of view, I nevertheless list these conclusions for what they are worth:

MISSILE REVERBERATIONS

1. Sputniks I and II and Soviet missile prowess have caused a devastating blow to American prestige in Asia. Soviet prestige has risen accordingly. The fellow who said that the United States was not in a race with Russia for the earth satellite could not have miscalculated more grossly in terms of the psychological effect.

By the same token, the American propaganda response—as contrasted with what actually is being done to strengthen defense—appears panicky to many Asians. As one said, it looks like precisely what the Russians wanted and it accentuates their claim of superiority. The initial failure of project Vanguard fell with perhaps a worse thud in Asia than in the United States.

The net result is to cause questioning among America's allies and a more determined neutrality, intermingled with fear, among the neutrals. There remains a large reservoir of friendship for and admiration of the United States, but confidence has been shaken. In countries where there is a tradition of playing the winner, there are doubts as to whether the United States is the right horse to back. The one exception is India, where the Soviet success has created a certain sympathy for the United States as the underdog.

THE DULLES IMAGE

2. The policies of John Foster Dulles are under attack everywhere. In private conversation, it was hard to find any official who would defend the Secretary of State except out of politeness. The image held of him is of a man who thinks primarily in military terms, who would like to involve every part of the world in the cold war, who has little understanding of the feelings of neutral countries and who wants to sign everyone up on the dotted line.

This image does not hold for President Eisenhower, who is looked upon as a man of peace but one who has lamentably failed to lead. But the feeling against Dulles is strong. Regardless of whether the indictment is fair—and surely some Asians would blame him even for breathing—Dulles' unpopularity is an indisputable fact.

Particularly in question is the matter of absolute judgments. In many countries of Asia, especially those with colonial backgrounds, there is not the same good-versus-evil attitude toward communism as frequently prevails in the United States. People in these countries tend to admire the technological accomplishments of the Soviet and Chinese revolutions although they are repelled by the human cost.

In most Asian countries, there is sharp criticism of the rigidity of American policy toward Communist China. Many Asians with no particular sympathy toward Peking reject continued American recognition of Nationalist China as sovereign on the mainland as based on fiction. They know—and many of the leaders of Taiwan (Formosa) also know—that the Nationalists simply are not going to return to the mainland.

At the same time, because American policy has been stuck on the same note for so long, governments of countries where there are large Chinese populations are anxious not to have an abrupt change for fear that any additional prestige for Peking would create internal security problems for them. In most of these countries, however, there is recognition that the only way really to win the loyalty of the overseas Chinese is through a determined effort at assimilation with equal rights.

What would command a good bit of tacit support in Asia is a gradual modification of American policy in two respects: (1) The relaxation of restrictions on trade with Communist China so as to make them conform to the strategic restrictions on trade with the Soviet bloc; and (2) the seating of Communist China in the United Nations with the concurrent provision of a seat in the General Assembly for an independent Taiwan. Such a policy, which is sometimes termed a two-China policy but is better described as an independent Taiwan policy, would enlist considerable sympathy even though the governments of Indonesia, Burma and India are committed to the thesis that Taiwan belongs to the mainland.

THE REVOLUTIONARY TIDE

3. Many Asians feel that United States policy does not show sufficient understanding of the revolutionary feeling which has swept the continent. As one person put it, "You Americans are committed to the support of legally established governments. But the Russians and Chinese support popular aspirations."

Revolution is sometimes regarded as a horrid word in the United States even though this country is itself the product of revolution. What Asians mean by it is an effort to shuck off reminders of foreign rule and to chart a new course based on self-respect. The zeal varies in proportion to the amount of repression during colonial eras. It is the least where, as in most countries once under British dominion, there has been a conscientious effort to provide education and to develop a competent civil service.

Often the Communists appear to support the extremes of revolutionary and nationalistic feeling blindly to the disadvantage of fair or logical solutions—as in the Indonesian dispute with the Netherlands over West Irian (New Guinea) and the Indian dispute with Pakistan over Kashmir. Asians sometimes contrast this support, without too much regard for the alternatives with American support of Syngman Rhee in Korea, Chiang Kai-shek in Taiwan and the military dictatorship in Thailand—regimes which are looked upon as reactionary and antirevolutionary.

Perhaps understandably, the economic objectives are often described as socialism. Asian countries have had little experience with private enterprise of other than the explosive variety, and in many countries the government is the only major source of capital. What most Asians mean by socialism is some sort of welfare state. There often is a doctrinaire faith in slogans and in the views of the late Harold Laski of the London School of Economics. But this is more theory than practice. Most countries would be happy to settle for only a small portion of the economic benefits of American life and call them socialism.

MILITARY AID

4. Military pacts are poorly suited to the needs of south and southwest Asia, where conditions differ greatly from those in NATO. It may be that the creation of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) helped stem the Communist military advance, although this is debatable. It may also be that the Baghdad Pact strengthened the determination of the Moslem countries to resist Soviet pressure, although it rent the Arab world and may have presented the opportunity for Soviet leapfrogging. But what is altogether clear is that in most countries an exaggerated emphasis on military buildings merely diverts resources and attention from the economic requirements for real stability.

A particular case in point is American military aid to Pakistan. This caused an enormous amount of harm to American relations with India, probably far beyond any defense gain achieved in Pakistan. Certainly Pakistan, with a struggling economy, has not been made into a strong ally.

In India, the fear reaction has been out of all proportion to the cause; American military aid to Pakistan has been seized upon as a rationalization for Indian refusal to accept the U. N. resolutions on Kashmir and as a scapegoat for many of India's other troubles. The net result is that in both countries resources have been diverted to arms when the same resources could be devoted far more productively to satisfying some of the economic needs.

Patently, it is unrealistic to look upon most of the countries of Asia as potential allies in a military sense. Some of the governments with which the United States has alliances have little popular base, and to this extent the alliances are built on sand. In some countries, the military aid programs assumed by the United States appear interminable; there is no possible way in which impoverished governments can take over the burden.

Throughout most of free Asia, with a few conspicuous exceptions, the mere achievement of independence and a determination to remain independent is all that reasonably can be expected. It is foolish to think that countries on the borders of Communist China with mammoth internal problems will want to irritate their powerful neighbor by joining military pacts or shouting their anti-communism.

Most of these countries, nevertheless, have made a choice in an intellectual sense. They prefer the free way, and they will cling to it so long as they can make progress in satisfying their needs. The challenge to the United States in these countries is to help them untie their economic knots and increase their productivity without seeming to take over the countries themselves. This is a task for subtlety, not for an anti-Communist loyalty test.

In most of the countries, communism is a practical internal problem rather than an external ideological issue. A shift in Communist tactics is apparent in Southeast Asia. In Malaya, in Laos, and in Burma, particularly, Communist insurgents are coming out of the woods to lay down their arms and become nice, respectable fellows who seek recognition in political parties. Then they concentrate assiduously on subversion—in the schools, unions, and the like.

These tactics cannot be met by military means. They have to be met by the strengthening of internal security and intellectual defenses—by economic and political measures.

ECONOMIC AID

5. American economic help is the most important tool this country has, but it needs to be wielded skillfully so as not to develop satellite mentalities. Some countries such as India welcome a shift from grants to long-term loans, especially loans repayable in local currency. This is to be encouraged as a stimulus to responsibility. But there must be recognition also that in some other countries, notably those of what was once Indochina, there simply are not the resources at the present time to place aid wholly on a loan basis. A continuation of some grant aid will be necessary.

Of course, there is waste in American economic aid. Sometimes it is poured in too fast, and sometimes it is diverted by the various forms of squeeze which are endemic in Asia. Sometimes it makes too little headway against the increase in population—though in much of Asia, including India, the rate of increase is below that in the United States.

One of the most important ways in which the United States can help strengthen public administration in Asia is to persuade governments to raise the pathetically low salaries of civil servants. In many cases, this probably would save far more than the cost by reducing the temptation of corruption.

Technical assistance is the most valuable single aspect of American aid and produces the most long-term good. But it cannot be the whole program. Inevitably, American aid is in competition with Communist aid in some countries. This is not necessarily bad, but the peoples of the countries concerned need to see what the United States is doing. Mere talk by the Communists of building a hospital, for example, may tend to offset in public opinion more important but less visible American help. For this reason, some impact assistance is necessary.

The exchange program by which Asian leaders are brought to the United States for visits pays big dividends. Sometimes, however, these leaders are overwhelmed by the factories and assembly lines they see—overwhelmed with despair, because they know that they cannot hope for such developments in their own countries. The inclusion of visits to areas like Puerto Rico, where "Operation Bootstrap" has had such success in improving living standards in an underdeveloped economy, would be much more helpful for their immediate problems.

THE COLOR QUESTION

6. Questions of color and human dignity are at the root of many Asian reactions. The white man has large sins to atone for in Asia, and he will be expiating them for a long time. Even though there is hypocrisy in the way in which some Asians view their own discrimination problems and even though some still reflect the servant-and-master conditioning of colonial times, color sensitivity is everywhere.

The publicly expressed reaction to Little Rock was mild in some countries, and the incidents even brought calls in Japan and India for elimination of prejudices there. But it would be a bad mistake to think that such things do not matter. They matter greatly, and the United States got off easily.

The peoples of Asia belong to the colored races which make up well over half of mankind. These peoples do not understand the kind of insensitivity which seems to deny fundamental human equality. Some of them do realize that the United States is making progress toward its own expressed ideals, but this recognition is easily marred or set back by a series of headlines.

ANTICOLONIALISM

7. Many peoples of Asia feel that the United States is being untrue to its own traditions in failing to support them completely on what they regard as anticolonial

issues. This is not altogether or even largely a matter of logic; there is much emotion and fancy in it, and not a little color sensitivity in the feeling that the United States tends to side with the white nations. There was amazement when the United States opposed the course of white nations in the Suez invasion.

Sometimes this anticolonialism is carried to extremes of bitterness and does demonstrable damage to immediate interests, as in frightening away investment. Nevertheless, it is one of the fundamental factors in the revolutionary mood of Asia. Asians view colonialism as meaning the exploitation of darker peoples by white nations; they have no experience with Communist colonialism.

Such things as Dulles' unfortunate remarks to the effect that Goa is part of Portugal do the United States harm. Although there is no justification for the mistreatment of innocent Dutch residents of Indonesia, much of the Indonesian resentment of the Netherlands in the quarrel over West Irian is understandable in terms of the abuses and shortcomings of past Dutch administration of the East Indies.

Anticolonialism can be just as blind, of course, as the more extreme kinds of colonialism. The colonial records of European countries in Asia vary greatly, and old-fashioned colonialism is all but gone. Many of the abuses have been exaggerated and exploited by demagogs. Yet the bad and lasting effect of most colonialism, apart from any material achievements, is to dull self-respect. It is this which Asian countries are struggling to regain. Although they cannot reasonably expect that the United States will ignore other interests to support them in every dispute, they do look to this country to break frankly with colonial practices it does not like.

AMERICAN MISFITS

8. There are too many Americans in official positions abroad, and too many of them are unsuited for dealing with Asians. This assertion needs to be qualified. There are some exceptionally able American ambassadors in Asia, some commendably effective representatives of the United States Information Agency (and most of them are good) and some highly sensible and knowledgeable administrators in the economic aid program. But the bad apples taint the barrel.

Although some Americans in Asia live and work under conditions of genuine hardship, others never had it so good and act accordingly; they live on a scale far beyond what they could afford in the United States. Far worse is the arrogance of some. Something seems to happen to certain Americans when they get on the plane or boat; they develop an intolerance and an overbearing contempt for the "locals" and for people whose values differ from theirs.

In one country, an economic official addressed a letter to a cabinet minister which said in effect: "You will carry out such and such a policy or else." No sovereign government can put up with this sort of peremptoriness.

In addition to the abuses of bureaucracy and empire-building, there is the danger of loss of objectivity. Some Americans tend to identify themselves with particular governments or cliques and to become advocates instead of American representatives.

In Thailand, the September coup d'etat was predicted in advance but the report was quashed in the United States Embassy because a top official refused to believe it. The former Ambassador to Pakistan, who surprisingly was kept on in Karachi after his daughter married the son of President Mirza, went native even to the extent of having his family adopt Pakistani dress. Asians do not really respect such obsequiousness.

USE OF INFLUENCE

9. Although "strings" on American help are repugnant to Asian governments, this country could use its influence to press solutions to internal disputes in Asia. It is absurd, for example, to have President Rhee, of Korea, adamantly resisting any sort of accord with Japan over fishing rights when the United States is giving more aid to Korea than to any other country and at the same time is trying to promote an economically stable Japan. Korean bitterness at past Japanese repression is real, but the attitude summed up by the Foreign Minister is self-defeating: "The Japanese are getting arrogant again. They won't agree to our terms."

Obviously, the United States cannot be in the position of giving orders, but it can disabuse recalcitrant governments of the notion that it condones their intransigence. Friendly relations between the United States and Asian countries call for mutual support. It is dangerous to allow any government to get the idea that the United States needs it more than it needs the United States.

ONE COMMON CAUSE

In summary, free Asia is an exciting place, a continent of extremes of wealth and poverty and nationalism, of high aspirations and sometimes disappointing performance, of widely differing paces of development. The one common denominator is a fervent desire for economic betterment.

Each of the countries has individual problems. Indonesia is depressing because it is wasting its energies in a foreign quarrel and inviting a Communist takeover instead of concentrating on correcting its centrifugal tendencies through more autonomy and better government. Ceylon is worrisome because its economy is stagnating and there is little intellectual awareness of the danger of communism. India is perhaps the most impressive, not because its internal problems are not vast, but because it is doing a great deal to meet them.

There are more than three-fourths of a billion people in free Asia, exclusive of the Middle East. In the last analysis, people do count—in moral, spiritual, and physical terms. Either the countries of Asia will succeed in meeting their problems as free governments, in which case they will be on our side irrespective of alliances, or they will be seduced by the seemingly quicker authoritarian ways of communism with the forfeiture of the liberties they never have fully enjoyed.

The key to stability in Asia is economic, and in a nutshell, is in the development of a middle class. This is the real meaning of American economic efforts, and these are far more important than armaments in determining the future of Asia.

When the countries of Asia are involved in the cold war, their economic development is retarded accordingly and the solution of international disputes which affect them is rendered impossible. The challenge to American policy is for this country to be mature enough to be content with neutrality on the part of Asian countries which have chosen free ways.

The essential point, though perhaps obvious, has nowhere been better expressed than by Stephen Spender in his essay on why he left communism in The God That Failed. The only solution, he wrote is "for the peoples and nations who love liberty to lead a movement throughout the world to improve the conditions of the millions of people who care more for bread than for freedom; thus raising them to a level of existence where they can care for freedom. The interests of the very few people in the world who care for the values of freedom must be identified with those of the many who need bread, or freedom will be lost."

## CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, conservation of our natural resources is essential to the Nation's long-range security. We must not lose sight of sound conservation objectives under the pressures of emergency defense actions.

A very constructive article on this question written by John B. Oakes appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, January 5.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION: THE RECORD OF 1957—PUBLIC SHOWS GROWING INTEREST IN BASIC POLICY ISSUES

(By John B. Oakes)

If the year 1957 was marked by no major disasters in the conservation of renewable natural resources in the United States, it produced no sensational victories either. The best that can be said about the conservation year just ended is that along with the explosive growth of the pressures against the forests, waters, soil, wildlife, and the scenic values of our country, a public awareness of the issues involved seemed to be growing, too.

But if it is to be of any practical service, awareness has to be translated into action. The only way that conservationists—and the millions who do not even know what conservation is but instinctively sympathize with its goals—can make their voices heard is through organization, counter-pressures and votes. To accomplish conservation goals, political and moral leadership are also essential. In recent years there has not been much conservation leadership of any kind coming from the White House. However, since Secretary Seaton's appointment, things have been looking up considerably. Meanwhile, the voice of conservationists as citizens has become steadily stronger, and their effect has been increasingly evident at the polls. In Congress conservation is now a force to be reckoned with, and the number of Members of Congress genuinely interested in conservation is increasing.

IMPORTANT MEASURE

The most important single piece of conservation legislation considered last year in Congress is the Wilderness Preservation bill (S. 1176), on which hearings have been held in both Houses. This measure would establish as legally defined public policy the permanent preservation of the most important wild and still unspoiled areas under Federal control left in the United States. The bill would give a more solid base of protection to the little that remains of primeval America, perhaps 2.5 percent of the country's land surface. The pending measure has run up against strong bureaucratic opposition from the interested Government agencies such as the Forest Service and the Park Service that see in it some potential curtailment of their freedom of movement. No less formidable opposition comes from private interests that fear some of their exploitative privileges or prospects might be interfered with under the terms of the bill.

In addition to the Wilderness bill, there was also discussed a less controversial measure for an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review (S. 846), providing for a survey of the Nation's future needs and the lands still available for public recreation in the broadest sense. The Senate has already passed this bill, which has administration support.

Other significant conservation measures considered during the 1957 Congress include the following:

A billboard-control bill for the new Federal Interstate Highway System: Even the most watered down of the various proposals to restrict the billboard menace on roads paid for 90 percent with Federal funds failed to be reported out of Senate committee. The pusillanimity of Congress in the face of the strong tactics of a few Congressional spokesmen for the billboard industry and related lobbies was matched only by the weak-kneed attitude of the administration in its failure to push for effective billboard-control legislation.

Bruces Eddy Dam on the north fork of the Clearwater River in Idaho: Congress killed a preliminary appropriation for this structure, which would wreck one of the great wildlife and scenic areas of the Nation, and would do so before current surveys to establish the precise extent of the potential damage have been completed.

The Engle bill to curb military land grabs: This badly needed measure has passed both Houses in different form, and should become law at this session. Meanwhile, the armed services continue to try to muscle in on tempting tracts of public land, frequently land already set aside for conservation purposes.

Florida Key Deer Refuge: After years of effort, Representative BENNETT of Florida succeeded in getting a bill passed to set up a 1,000-acre refuge in the Keys for this rare mammal.

Dinosaur National Park: Two measures are pending to give the existing national monument—saved in 1956 from dam-construction after one of the toughest fights in conservation history—more secure status by turning it into a national park.

Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park: The 185-mile stretch along the Potomac River between Great Falls and Cumberland, Md., including the historic C. & O. Canal, would become a park under pending legeislation endorsed last year by the Interior Department.

Pollution control: After a close fight, Congress provided the necessary funds to carry through its second year the present long-term program of Federal aid to States in constructing sewage-treatment plants. On other appropriations, Congress was reasonably generous to conservation activities, including the National Park Service's ten-year development plan known as Mission 66.

OTHER HIGHLIGHTS

Of the many non-legislative developments in the field of conservation during the year, probably the most significant has been the constant pressure of urban expansion in general, and highway construction in particular, on valuable historic, scenic and recreational areas. The threat to historic buildings and sites has been felt in many States, especially in the east. The overflow of expanding cities in surrounding green areas, without any attempt to set aside small parks and woodlands, becomes with the passing of every year a more critical problem, which can be solved only by far-sighted planning and some thought for the health and welfare of future generations.

Another matter of increasing concern is the tendency of governmental agencies—notably the Department of Agriculture—to try to solve the problem of insect pests by broadside aerial spraying without adequate knowledge of the damage done to human and animal life in the process. The spraying of some 3 million acres in the northeast last spring to control the gypsy moth has now been followed by plans announced last month to spray from 20 to 30 million acres in the south with a deadly chemical to eradicate the fire ant. The protests against this kind of wholesale control program arise not from fanatics but from serious and experienced scientists who warn not only of the dangers to life but also of the likelihood that elimination of one insect pest by such artificial means may well create conditions for the upsurge of others equally or even more harmful.

## FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPITAL TIMES, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during this January the great liberal newspaper, the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times celebrates its 40th anniversary. I wish to take note at this time of the outstanding public service of this midwestern newspaper, which for two generations has been the rallying point for so much of the liberal leadership of the upper Midwest, and for years has been a spokesman for the forces for free inquiry, progress and humanitarianism.

The Capital Times' editor, William Evjue, is a man I am proud to call my friend. His leadership of this great American newspaper has been inspiring and dynamic. Under Bill Evjue the Times has broadened and strengthened its influence in American thought. It is a real pleasure and an honor to be able to add my voice to those legions of friends and admirers who join with Mr. Evjue and the staff of the Capital Times in celebration of this 40th anniversary of publication.

## NATIONAL YMCA WEEK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to the fact that this is National YMCA Week. During this week, millions of Americans affiliated with more than 1,800 YMCA's across the country are celebrating a worthwhile job truly well done.

Since 1844, the YMCA has been a pioneer in the cause of brotherhood and development of our youth—the spirit and mind of youth as well as physical well-being. The "Y" has become a unique and vital part of virtually every American community. It provides a home for some, help for many, and an interest for all.

The YMCA has served our fighting men during every war since the Civil War. It has contributed mightily to health and physical fitness programs and has contributed much to American sports and athletics, creating such games as basketball and volleyball.

The "Y" has also sponsored organized camping, water safety instruction, youth and government programs, and boys' work. From its leadership has come assistance in founding other groups such as the Camp Fire Girls and the Boy Scouts of America.

The YMCA has also pioneered such advances as the shorter workweek, night school education, and short-term community finance campaigns.

I am certain that all of us will join in a sincere "well done" to this excellent and improved organization, and we might also add, "Please keep up the good work."

## THE MONEY ECONOMY AND BUSINESS CONTRACTIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address delivered before the annual meeting of the American Economics Association at the Sheraton Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., on December 30, 1957.

The address was on the subject, The Money Economy and Business Contractions, and was delivered by Dr. Asher Achinstein, who is senior specialist in price economics of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Dr. Achinstein is one of the Nation's leading experts on business cycles, and is the author of the book Introduction to Business Cycles. He has also served as economic consultant to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and was associated with the Council of Economic Advisers under Dr. Arthur F. Burns.

We shall shortly receive the President's economic report, and must consider specific legislative proposals growing out of that report, as well as pending legislation affecting the national economy. Therefore, I believe Dr. Achinstein's thought-provoking paper deserves to be brought to the attention of Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MONEY ECONOMY AND BUSINESS CONTRACTIONS

(By Asher Achinstein, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

INTRODUCTION

Among the few well-founded generalizations of human behavior derived from the history of business cycles is that long periods of prosperity generate widespread optimism and periods of prolonged business contraction are dominated by a pessimistic psychology. There is plenty of evidence that economists have not been free from the influence of these psychological waves—in appraisals of the business outlook, in the assumptions underlying long-range projections, and even in the formulation of their theoretical models.

One manifestation of the general optimistic phase is the popular use of the "softer" expressions when referring to business downturns, such as rolling readjustment and business recession, rather than of terms with more omnious overtones like business contraction or depression. Moreover, the longer prosperity lasted, anyone referring to major business contractions was increasingly regarded as among those unforunates who had never recovered from the stagnationist philosophy of the 1930's as propounded, let us say, by Keynes, Hansen, or Schumpeter, or as among those who had fallen so far behind the times as not to have discovered with Sumner Slichter that the business cycle was largely a thing of the past. In recent months the signs have been multiplying that we have reached a turning point in the optimistic phase of the psychological wave that has accompanied almost two decades of more or less continuous business expansion. The very title of this session is good evidence that such a change has taken place.

As I understand my assignment from President Copeland, I am to consider whether in the future a business contraction substantially greater than, let us say, the kind we experienced in 1953–54, is likely in view of

the contracyclical tools that have become available and the structural changes that have taken place in the economy since 1929. While there is no specific time reference to this assignment, I need hardly add that there are implications to be drawn from this paper with respect to the level of business activity in 1958.

### CYCLICAL FLUCTUATIONS AND ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION

In one sense, the question posed by the title of this session is an easy one to answer. On the basis of the past behavior of the economy, the statistical odds are that in the future we are likely to experience a business contraction that is steeper than either of the two that has occurred since the Second World War, or of longer duration, or both. This disagreeable answer is based neither on a mechanistic view of historical development nor upon a lack of appreciation of the progress we have made in attempts to control those economic instabilities that play such havoc with human welfare. It is based on the assumption that the problems we have to deal with are deep seated and, with all our efforts, we have yet to learn how to deal adequately with them. The business cycle has been with us a long time whereas most of the measures for promoting stability on which we now rely date only since the great depression of the 1930's. Moreover, since then matters have been further complicated by hot and cold wars and perhaps by some institutional changes in recent decades which may even aggravate instability.

The problems are deep seated because cyclical fluctuations are rooted in our economic organization which operates in terms of a pecuniary logic as well as through industrial and technical processes. In the money economy producers and consumers are caught up in a network of price and financial relationships which have a powerful influence on the cumulative processes generated during business expansions and contractions and which have frequently determined whether contractions are mild or severe. Among the highly significant factors responsible for such steep declines as took place in 1920–21, 1929–33, and 1937–38 were: the speculative inventory and price developments in the expansion phase of the first post-World War I cycle; the speculative character of real estate and stock market credit and of foreign loans in the 1920's, together with the rapid expansion of consumer credit; and the unusually sharp rise of inventories in 1937, as well as the inability of financial institutions to make funds available to a prostrate construction industry because their portfolios were still bulging with an inheritance of sour mortgages and foreclosed properties from the 1920's.

### MINOR AND MAJOR CYCLES

In evaluating the influence of structural changes and the efficacy of tools to minimize instability it is necessary to refer, however briefly, to the distinction in the literature between minor and major cycles. The former is usually associated with inventory readjustments and the latter with fluctuations in the producer durable-goods industries and in construction. I believe it is not incorrect to assert that most business cycle theorists who emphasize the importance of the distinction appear to assume that different sets of causal factors are at play in minor and major cycles. There is no doubt that the cycles since World War I which were not mentioned in the previous paragraph and which manifested mild contractions in 1923–24, 1926–27, 1948–49, and 1953–54, mainly involved inventory readjustments. But this does not tell us whether the excessive accumulation of stocks originated only in sectors that supposedly have no influence on the course of the major cycle, or in sectors which supposedly do influence it. Certainly minor contractions usually also exhibit varying degrees of slackening in the durable goods and construction industries that are presumed to be "strategic" in the behavior of the long cycle.

The differentiation between minor and major cycles with a view to establishing different causal factors appears to run into difficulties when the attempt is made to apply the two-cycle hypothesis to the cyclical fluctuations of the past—let alone the much greater difficulties in employing the hypothesis for appraisals of current business conditions. Prof. R. A. Gordon, who has devoted a good deal of attention to the study of individual cycles since World War I, finds it necessary to speak of "hybrid" cycles with characteristics common to minor and major cycles, and also of "incomplete" major cycles with expansion phases that do not have a chance to culminate into major contractions.

In part, the difficulties, I believe, arise from three commitments: first, an analytic framework based on a fairly sharp separation between short- and long-term expectations which is then applied to historical experience on the assumption that short-term expectations dominate minor cycles and long-term expectations determine major cycles; second, a strong emphasis on the notion of a stock of investment opportunities which becomes exhausted for a considerable period because of the behavior of innovation and other exogenous technological factors; and third, on the realization however, that both short and long cycles are influenced by other elements of a monetary and financial character which do not fit in neatly either with the analytical formulation or with the classification of historical cycles.

Despite the ambiguities involved in tagging individual cycles, the attempt to treat several succeeding minor cycles as a unit of the expansion phase of a major cycle followed by a severe and long contraction phase during which minor cycles are absent can be a fruitful operational procedure. This approach has been used mainly by business cycle theorists who regard innovations and real new investment as the dynamic factors and consumption as the passive element. But this approach may be even more fruitful if greater emphasis is placed on the role of the consumer and of the financial institutions which influence the variability of his demand.

In considering the variability of consumer spending, I have in mind consumer durable good and residential construction. The latter is treated in our national accounting systems under the category of investment, and there are many who argue that consumer durables should be similarly handled. But I hold with those who find it more illuminating to view them both under the category of consumption, since, among other reasons, the motivations and influences that affect family decisions to purchase these goods are quite different from those which govern the investment decisions of business firms. These two sectors of the economy played a powerful role in the expansion phase of the major cycle in the 1920's and during the period since World War II. They contributed greatly to the deep and prolonged contraction of the 1930's. Their behavior may also determine to a considerable extent whether the late 1950's will experience a substantial business decline. Since World War II consumer expenditures for durable goods and housing have been nearly half again as large as business expenditures for plant and equipment. Moreover, their rate of growth has greatly stimulated outlays for commercial construction, plant and equipment, and expenditures for community facilities and services by State and local governments.

### THE CONSTRUCTION CYCLE

There is a large measure of agreement among investigators of cyclical fluctuations that the building industry in this country, and particularly residential construction, is characterized by long cycles with wide amplitudes and with a duration of about 15 to 20 years. It is also noted that the more severe business contractions have taken place during the downward phase of the long construction cycle. Despite frequent reference to these characteristics of the residential construction industry, one can hardly say that the causal factors for the long swings have received the careful study they deserve. The usual explanation which is largely in terms of population changes leaves much to be desired. This is an area which seems to cry out for an institutional study of the role played by the real-estate operator, builder, lender, consumer, etc., in creating housing booms followed by deep and prolonged slumps.

At the risk of sounding dogmatic because of brevity, I shall outline what appear to me to be the strategic variables that account for the long construction cycles of the past. The expansion phase of the long wave in new residential building is determined in large degree by the income factor, especially shifts in the distribution of income. The market for new housing falls within the middle and upper ranges of the income pyramid. The change in economic status which comes with a rise in family income is reflected before long in a determination to move into a new house and a new neighborhood. Such a change is an outward manifestation of one's higher standard of living in addition to the real benefits derived from a new dwelling. In this connection one can readily use the acceleration principle to account for the magnification of the upward movement in residential building. But a more realistic basis for the acceleration in the pace of construction is provided by the organization of the industry—the speculative character of real-estate activity, the optimistic proclivities of the builder, and the readiness of financial institutions to pump funds into construction. In previous major cycles, as the history of urban communities shows, the satisfaction of a spurt in housing demand was bound up with considerable land speculation in the outskirts of cities, especially after improvements in transportation facilities made new subdivisions feasible for development. Moreover, there is no industry which has been so dependent on outside sources for funds to carry out its operations so that the mortgage market and the monetary influences affecting that market have been powerful influences determining the level of building.

Wars, of course, have also greatly stimulated postwar housing booms. This is not only due to the backlog resulting from the curtailment of residential construction during hostilities, but also because war increases migration of families, adds other members of the household to the ranks of labor, lifts many persons into higher income brackets, and increases liquid assets due in large part to reduced spending for durable goods whose production is curtailed during wartime.

As the housing boom goes on its merry way more or less ignoring several minor business recessions, land and building costs rise substantially and the supply of new dwellings in certain price ranges becomes excessive. Both the limitations of the income pyramid and the more cautious lending policies of financial institutions, who really call the tune so far as decisions to launch new projects are concerned, become increasingly effective in curtailing the level of new building.

Once the housing boom comes to an end, why is there such a deep and lengthy slump in building? Granting that there has been a saturation of the market, the long time it takes for the industry to recover can hardly be explained in terms of a surplus

that must wait upon an increasing population to wipe it out. A more realistic account of the duration of the slump is the painful and long drawn-out process of downward revision of the overcapitalized properties and the other adjustments necessary to correct the excesses of the speculative real estate boom. Financial institutions, which are at the center of this prolonged struggle for recapitalization—what with defaulted mortgages, the taking over of foreclosed properties, etc.—have no incentive to supply funds for new construction that is in direct competition with the large number of existing dwellings whose capital values have meanwhile been dropping to depression levels.

Whether or not one accepts an interpretation of past housing booms based on income changes, speculative activity, and monetary influences, and of protracted periods of residential building slumps in terms of a drawn-out struggle for revision of capitalizations, or if you prefer, a struggle for liquidity, there is little doubt that a major business contraction is more likely in a period of declining building activity. Our construction statistics suffer from serious gaps and the data on housing starts probably understate the volume of completions during the past 7 years, but if the yearly figures of starts adequately measure the general direction, it appears that the peak of new dwellings may have been reached in 1950 and that the trend has been downward since then. This suggests that perhaps we have entered the contraction phase of another long residential building cycle. It is particularly important, therefore, to establish the extent to which the institutional changes which have occurred in this area since the mid-thirties are likely to moderate such a possible downward movement.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES AND GROWTH OF CONSUMER DEBT

The housing boom since World War II has not been characterized by the kind of speculative subdivision activity and reckless financing methods prevalent in the twenties, culminating in the collapse of the mortgage structure. Since the 1930's, the mortgage market has become much less vulnerable due to the widespread use of the monthly amortized mortgage, the insurance and guaranty programs of the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration, and because of the greater marketability of mortgages through the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. Furthermore, Federal Government insurance of deposits of commercial banks, savings banks, and of share accounts in savings and loan associations, has also greatly strengthened the ability of the money economy to withstand the cumulative processes of a business contraction.

All of these institutional changes substantially lessen the possibility of a downturn becoming deeper and longer than any experienced during the past decade. However, there are other developments, partly an outgrowth of the same institutional changes. The housing boom has produced a spectacular rise in mortgage indebtedness, having been fed by easy credit terms—ever lower downpayments and longer terms of maturity—in addition to the stimulus it received from the income and population factors. There are those who profess little concern about the record increase in the size of mortgage indebtedness. Easier credit terms have reduced the debt service to what amounts to rental payments under tenant occupancy—with the result that the growth of mortgage debt does not necessarily signify a particularly onerous burden on homeowners. Unfortunately, we do not have any satisfactory measures of the debt burden on the consumer. Comparisons of aggregates over a period of years, based on total mortgage debt outstanding and disposable income, do not tell us very much about the relative burden of the debt. What would be illuminating would be more adequate data on actual monthly payments for different income groups.

The crucial question with respect to debt burden is, of course, the impact on borrowers and lenders when a business downturn occurs and there is a sizable drop in employment and incomes. The good record of repayments and foreclosures during the recessions of 1949 and 1954 is encouraging, but this favorable condition took place when the building industry itself was an important factor in keeping the downturn mild and short. If the industry cannot be counted on to give the necessary push for an early business recovery because it is itself confronted by market and other conditions that limit its scale of operations, then the large volume of new dwellings financed in recent years on the basis of little or no downpayments, long maturities, and high debt-to-value ratios, can create difficulties for mortgagors and mortgagees which would aggravate a business downturn. A large part of the mortgage debt is not protected by Government insurance or guaranties. Moreover, as studies of the housing boom of the 1920's indicate, the longer the boom continues the greater the deterioration of the quality of the credit, so that there are greater defaults and foreclosures on loans made during the latter part of the boom than on those made earlier. The institutional changes introduced since the thirties should enable the mortgage structure to adjust itself more readily to declining real-estate values, increasing defaults, etc., and avoid making liquidity the overriding consideration with the customary adverse effects on the fortunes of the building industry. But there is still a time lag in the readjustment process—shorter though it may be—that could nevertheless result in a sizable curtailment of the volume of loans for new construction.

But what of the device of further easing of credit terms to give the necessary stimulus to residential building? Here the thought arises as to whether we have not come near to scraping the bottom of the barrel in the liberalization of terms under the FHA and VA programs. Then, too, there is a question whether these programs, which were so influential in directing the energies of the building industry toward providing single-family projects in our suburbs, are as likely to be so successful as they were in the past. As a result of the great number of such dwellings constructed since the war, the roads to suburbia are frequently clogged with autos moving bumper to bumper and suitable sites for housing development are meanwhile becoming scarcer—a situation which is not likely to be eased before the 1960's when our national highway program will have progressed much further. Moreover, although I have deliberately chosen to give the population factor a secondary role in the long construction cycle, it should be mentioned that the decline in household formation since 1950 may not be significantly reversed before the early 1960's.

Like the mortgage debt, the debt for consumer durable has grown in the postwar period at a greatly accelerated rate and for the same reasons—the increase in incomes, the greater equalization of incomes, and the progressive easing of terms. Maturities on automobile paper, for example, shifted from 12 months in the 1920's to 18 months by 1937, 24 months by 1952, and 36 months by 1955. We need not stop to consider the aggravating potentialities during a business downturn of the record increases in installment credit, since what was said about deterioration of credit and the debt burden in the housing area is also applicable to the durable goods field. Here too, there are limits to which maturities can be further lengthened to stimulate demand.

MONETARY POLICY

With respect to the influence of the rapid growth of installment credit on economic stability, one cannot fail to note an important structural change that has taken place in this area over the past three decades. In the 1920's, installment lending operations were virtually nonexistent so far as commercial banks were concerned. In recent years their installment business—the most profitable part of their lending operations—has exceeded that of any other financial institution, and it is estimated that, directly and indirectly, commercial banks have financed more than half of the total installment credit. It is difficult to see how this change can have failed to weaken the effectiveness of general monetary controls in restraining credit expansion by banks and by some of their strongest customers and most effective competitors, the sales finance companies.

Flexible monetary policy had been in eclipse for quite a long time before its revival in recent years. We are all aware of the mistaken monetary policies pursued in the late twenties and early thirties which contributed so much to the deepening of the depression. Certainly monetary authorities have learned many lessons since then, not the least important of which is that their actions must not aggravate cyclical fluctuations. Since steep and prolonged contractions have their origin in developments of the preceding boom, as well as in the kind of adjustments that are made in the early stages of the downturn, one must ask how efficacious has monetary policy been in restraining excessive expansion in the prosperity phase of the cycle? In this connection, the timing and vigor of action are important, as are the specific tools employed. No doubt the execution of monetary policy in the interest of economic stability is no easy matter. Part of the difficulty arises from lack of agreement as to what general credit policies are expected to accomplish. If there are differences in the views of economists on the objectives and efficacy of monetary tools, one should certainly view sympathetically the efforts of those in charge of monetary controls who have to steer a course amidst the "pressures" from bankers and businessmen, committees of the Congress, and the administration.

There are many who have expressed considerable satisfaction at the skill with which the Federal Reserve Board has employed flexible credit policies since, let us say, May 1953. There can be no doubt that the $1.2 billion increase in bank reserves through open market operations between May and July 1953, the reduction of reserve requirements in June, the lowering of the discount rate from 2 percent in February 1954 to 1½ percent in May, and the further reduction in reserve requirements in June, created a condition of credit ease which speeded up business recovery in 1954. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has in retrospect, expressed regret that the Board followed too liberal a policy in the first half of 1954. If a review of monetary actions in the recent past justifies any regrets, the failure to move more vigorously in early 1955 might be a more fitting basis for such feelings than the liberality of 1954. It is instructive to note that attention was called to the danger of excessive credit expansion early in 1955.

In this connection I should like to refer to an important difference between the 1920's and the 1950's, namely, the greater sophistication of the Congress on policy matters relating to economic stability. Since the Employment Act of 1946, the publications of the economic reports of the President and the hearings and publications of the Joint Economic Committee have had their influence on Capitol Hill. The monthly Economic Indicators, and that most valuable

compendium of statistical information provided by the appendix to the economic reports, are used intensively by committees and their staffs.

On March 8, 1955, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee started its 3 weeks of public hearings on the stock market. They were held at a time when there had been a continuous rise of stock prices for 18 months, with Standard & Poor's index of 480 common stocks rising by almost 60 percent since September 1953, and consumer installment indebtedness was moving forward toward the record rate of $2 billion reached in the second quarter of the year. During the course of these hearings, which received wide public attention, a number of prominent witnesses emphasized that there was increasing evidence of unhealthy speculative activity in the stock market and an undesirable expansion of mortgage and installment credit. The economic report of the President issued about 6 weeks earlier also had already cautioned that continued economic recovery must not be jeopardized by overemphasis on speculative activity, and that activities involving the discounting of a long future, as in the case of home purchases, or the pricing of corporate shares, might be carried to excess.

At the same time, there were other voices objecting to the effort to focus attention on the potentially dangerous developments in the field of credit. The Secretary of the Treasury, for example, emphasized instead the potential danger that any inquiry into the stock market might have on confidence. Such divergence of views must have made it more difficult for the monetary authorities to take vigorous action. In any event, the reserve board did not raise the discount rate until April 1955, and then only from 1½ percent to 1¾ percent, and there was no attempt to change reserve requirements, which had been progressively lowered from 24 percent in mid-1953 to 20 percent in mid-1954. The monetary authorities exerted pressure on the reserves of commercial banks through open-market operations, but the banks found other ways to supply funds—through sale of their securities and borrowing from the Reserve banks—to meet the continued demands of business and consumers.

DURABLE GOODS SECTORS AND ECONOMIC STABILITY

There can be little doubt that the great expansion of credit has been a major influence producing a bunching of expenditures on durable goods which is a potent force in aggravating instability. The production of 8 million cars in 1955 and a volume of housing starts which was close to the postwar peak reached in 1950, followed in the next year by a record rate of expansion in plant and equipment expenditures, resulted in great pressures on physical resources, a further rise in building costs, and in a growing shortage of loan funds that culminated in the highest level of interest rates in 25 years.

It has been frequently asserted in recent years that the economy has become more stable because business firms have come to rely increasingly upon long-range budgeting of capital expenditures and upon research outlays that tend to regularize the innovation process. Moreover, the consumer, accustomed to a higher standard of living, with greater determination to maintain that standard, more assured by larger liquid assets, and by the knowledge that he is the beneficiary of public and private unemployment compensation and old-age benefits, and that the greater power of unionism will hold the line on the price of labor, is more likely to maintain his customary expenditures. The strength of these structural changes in the face of the more persistent characteristics of the money economy has certainly not yet been tested. It would be folly, therefore, to minimize the fact that investment decisions are still governed by profit considerations, cost-price relationships, and psychological influences, and that consumers are still likely to curtail spending when fixed commitments loom more burdensome with a decline in incomes and when employment prospects become dimmer. It is the postponability of durable goods, whether producer or consumer, which makes for more violent fluctuations, and that must still be reckoned with as a fundamental characteristic of our economy. If there is a marked decline in both of these sectors—due to an autonomous shift in consumer demand and to a temporary saturation of the stock of durable goods—the downward readjustment of incomes, prices, and capital values becomes more drawn out, and the stimuli for expansion in other sectors of the private economy become weaker. To be sure, such a contraction will be cushioned by the automatic stabilizers, the higher floor provided by the size of Government expenditures and by the improvements introduced into our financial structure in recent decades. We can also count much more on Government determination to pursue monetary and fiscal policies to speed up recovery. But these tools are not likely to be adequate when the durable goods and construction industries show sizable contractions. If these conditions should prevail in the near future, then a decline substantially greater than any we have had in the postwar period is likely.

One final word. In a period when we are beginning to adjust our thinking to the presence of the sputniks, expansion of our military programs may counteract contractionary tendencies. At the same time, we are beginning to recognize that we may be unable to meet our problems without some fundamental reassessment of our values—a reassessment which may not leave untouched those standards of consumption which have dominated our economy in the postwar era.

## THE GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, prepared by the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., dated January 15, 1958.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Go back to the free market. Time and time again, you've all heard that advice given to farmers in high-level speeches and high-sounding phrases, often from businessmen and business research groups. But, what about business? Does it practice what it preaches? Does it really believe in maintaining a free market? In past broadcasts, we've pointed out many, many examples to show how business is protected by law, how industry receives Government subsidies of various sorts, and how prices are determined by 2 or 3 companies, in which any resemblance to a free market is strictly a fairy tale.

For the latest example, we go, today, to that great winter vacation spot, Miami Beach, Fla. There, the National Automobile Dealers Association is holding its annual convention. And, what do you think has a top place on its agenda? We'll let the Wall Street Journal tell us. It says, "The National Automobile Dealers Association is preparing to display its legislative muscle once more. Its objective: A change in the antitrust law to permit the reestablishment of a device known as territorial security or service responsibility," the newspaper explains.

Do those descriptive phrases sound like a move to stifle competition Oh, no, says the retiring president of the association, one Frederick M. Sutter, by name. He says it is "a concept within which the automobile dealer says to the customer, 'It is our bounden duty to protect you.'" Sounds like quite a deal, doesn't it—a big brother dealer all your own, just to protect you. But, the newspaper comments that no matter what you call it, this scheme sets up geographical limits for each auto dealer and prescribes penalties he must pay for stepping outside his bounds to make a sale. You, as a customer, must buy from your local dealer. The others won't talk turkey.

The news report says there's a difference of opinion among the auto dealers on the merits of the plan. But one thing is clear—the executive vice president of the association has decided that some form of protection is desired by members—and he's out to get it. Where will the leaders of this drive for auto-dealer protection look? To Washington, of course, says the Wall Street Journal. In 1956, the dealers went to Washington, too, and then they got a law putting a curb on the manufacturers' power to cancel franchise agreements.

Dealers backing the new protection plan even have an organization of their own. They call it the Authorized Dealer Survival Association, and they're going to keep right on fighting for protection, and that means working for laws to give it to them.

Don't let anyone fool you into believing that only farmers go to Washington to work for laws to protect them from the free market. They're latecomers, indeed, in that effort. But, most farmers have long understood that farm prices are made in Washington.

## OUR INCOME TAX SIEVE—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, an article from the Washington Daily News entitled "Our Income Tax Sieve."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR INCOME TAX SIEVE

(By Jack Steele)

A Pennsylvania dairy owner and his wife went on a safari to Africa.

Their lion hunt, with stopovers in London and Rome, took 5 months and cost $16,818. They charged it all to the dairy as a business expense.

Their reason: They took films on the trip which later were shown to customers to help advertise their milk.

The Internal Revenue Service disallowed the deduction and slapped them with a $7,305 tax bill. But the couple appealed to the United States Tax Court and won.

The court ruled that the safari was an "ordinary and necessary" business expense which had given the dairy good advertising at low cost and was tax deductible.

So other taxpayers had to pay nearly half of the cost of the milkman's lion hunt, by making up the taxes he avoided.

Other taxpayers also had to make up several hundred thousand dollars in taxes avoided by a popular TV comedian.

CAPITAL GAINS: 25 PERCENT VERSUS 90 PERCENT

The comedian formed a company to produce his show—with himself as the major stockholder—and then sold it to a TV network for more than $2 million. The Tax Court ruled he only had to pay a 25-percent capital gains tax. If the network had paid him directly, his tax at ordinary rates would have run close to 90 percent.

The same was true with a famous movie producer who got a big cash settlement from his studio when he retired. The revenue code said such payments should be taxed as ordinary income. But Congress passed a

special bill so the producer could report his as a capital gain—at a tax saving of nearly $3 million. Later in this series these two Hollywood cases will be discussed in greater detail and the persons identified.

The lion-hunting milkman, the TV comedian and the movie magnate all avoid part of their income taxes. What each one did was perfectly legal.

Their cases are only three out of many thousands which might be cited to illustrate how taxpayers can use gimmicks and loopholes in the tax laws to cut their income taxes.

They also indicate how:

Our Federal income tax system has become a chaotic mess.

Congress has riddled the tax laws with exceptions, exemptions and special benefits which are unfair to millions of other taxpayers.

These preferences have eroded the tax base so that many billions of dollars of income completely escape taxation each year.

They also have made the Revenue Code so complicated and illogical that only a handful of tax lawyers know what it means.

These legal tax-avoidance devices—along with the high tax rates they help make necessary—are causing a steady increase in tax dodging, cheating, and evasion.

And, worst of all, they have blocked tax rate cuts which would benefit all taxpayers equally.

Such criticisms of the income tax system are being voiced today by an impressive array of tax experts. They include law school professors, economists, and former Treasury officials who may be the only Americans left who can understand our tax laws and judge them impartially.

Pressure for basic tax reform is growing. To find out why, I have spent many weeks studying the tax laws and interviewing scores of tax authorities.

On the basis of this inquiry, these enumerated conclusions seem inescapable:

1. OUR TAX LAWS ARE GROSSLY UNFAIR

The keystone for a fair income-tax system is that taxpayers with similar incomes should pay similar taxes.

This is far from true today.

Individuals or companies with equal incomes pay widely differing taxes, depending in part on how they earn and spend their money.

*Individual examples*

The big trouble is that we have several income-tax systems. This is shown by the wide variation in the taxes paid by the following persons, each with an income of $100,000 a year:

A single man who earns all his income in salary pays $65,928.

A single man whose income comes from oil royalties pays $42,829.

A married man who earns all his income in salary pays $52,056.

A single or married man whose income is in capital gains pays $25,000.

And a single or married man whose income is all in interest on state or local bonds pays no taxes at all.

*Group inequalities*

These are by no means all the inequities in the income tax laws, which also discriminate among many groups of taxpayers. Here are a few samples:

Individuals whose incomes are in wages or salaries pay higher taxes than those who deal in securities or investments.

Older people pay less taxes than most younger taxpayers.

Renters pay more taxes than home owners.

Unionized workers get tax advantages over the unorganized and self-employed.

Inventors are taxed less than writers, artists and musicians.

*Business inequalities*

Tax inequities hit businesses as well as individuals. For example:

Big companies often pay relatively less taxes than smaller ones.

Co-operatives pay less taxes than other businesses with which they compete.

Oil and insurance firms get big tax windfalls.

2. HIGH TAX RATES MEAN LITTLE

The income tax is based on another principle—ability to pay. Thus the revenue code provides graduated tax rates which rise steeply from 20 to 91 percent.

Congress voted the high top rates in a soak-the-rich mood during World War II. Never daring ether to repeal or enforce them, it has simply undermined them.

It has loaded the tax laws with escape clauses which enable persons with high incomes to avoid the high rates. And wealthy taxpayers have shifted much of their income to forms taxed at lower rates.

So the high surtax rates simply do not mean what many people believe or pretend they do. The 91 percent rate applies only to net income over $200,000 ($400,000 for couples). Actual rates for all income are much less because of the lower rates which apply below the top brackets and exemptions, deductions, and loopholes.

Recent studies of the 1954 tax returns—the latest available—reveal some startling facts.

The actual average tax rate paid by all taxpayers with net incomes of $100,000 and over in 1954 was only 48 percent.

And, if capital gains and other income excluded from net income had been counted, the average rate for those in the $100,000 and up brackets would drop to only 37.5 percent.

Yet the rate specified in the tax tables for $100,000 of net income is 67.3 percent.

3. THE TAX LAWS ARE HOPELESSLY COMPLEX

Tax differentials cause most of the complications in the code. Each gimmick adds a line or more to the tax return forms.

Here's just one sample. The retirement income credit adopted in 1954 saves elderly taxpayers $140 million a year. But it added half a page to the tax forms and nearly a page to the instructions. It is so complicated only a retired person would have time to figure it out.

Today few individuals who have income from any sources except wages or salaries can make out their own tax returns. Big businesses have to hire batteries of accountants and lawyers—and shape most of their business decisions to fit the tax laws.

4. TAX EVASION IS INCREASING

There are no reliable figures on the amount of tax cheating. Expert estimates range from $3 billion to $10 billion of taxes evaded each year.

The revenue service made its last big study of evasion in 1948. Its findings, applied to today's income levels, put the tax cheating at $3 billion a year.

But recent statistical studies indicate that more than $26 billion of income is unreported. At average rates, this would mean nearly $7 billion in taxes evaded. And this does not include additional billions which may be chiseled on exemptions, deductions and expense accounts.

Revenue officials insist there is no proof that tax cheating is on the increase. Most tax authorities disagree. They cite many signs that "beating the tax collector" has become a fashionable game with some taxpayers. And they note that the man who is caught cheating a bit on his taxes suffers little social stigma.

Congress has insured that getting caught at tax evasion is partly a matter of luck. Only 2 million of the 60 million taxable returns filed each year are audited. Many corporate returns also escape auditing.

For years Revenue Commissioners have assured Congress that better enforcement would bring in $20 in taxes for every dollar spent. But Congress has withheld the funds needed to hire more revenue agents.

It might be, as former Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews once suggested, that the people would demand repeal of the income tax within a year if Congress ever voted enough funds for its all-out enforcement.

5. TAX REFORM OFFERS HOPE OF RATE CUTS

For 15 years Congress has been giving tax relief in little bits and pieces to special groups of taxpayers. The resulting leakage in tax revenues and erosion of the tax base—as well as rising Government costs—have barred general tax-rate cuts.

Experts estimate that tax-rate cuts ranging from 25 to 33⅓ percent would be possible now if Congress stopped this practice and rolled back some of these preferences and special benefits.

---

## ADVERSE IMPACT ON OREGON BUSINESS OF HIGH RATES OF INTEREST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few economic subjects are more vital to Oregon than the decline in employment and payrolls of its crucial lumber industry.

Certain Oregon bankers have attempted to make political capital out of this decline, which has meant suffering and adversity for many Oregon families.

A more statesmanlike attitude has been taken by Mr. H. M. Phillips, vice president and investment director of the First National Bank of Portland, in an address on January 7 to the Kiwanis Club of Salem. According to a news account in the Salem Statesman of January 8, 1958, Mr. Phillips attributed the economic slump in Oregon to "a slowdown in home construction in the United States caused mainly by tight money." The same issue of the Salem Statesman, which is edited by ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, contained a thoughtful editorial entitled "Paper Mills for Oregon." This editorial stresses a point of view which I have long advocated; namely, that one of the best hopes for taking up the slack in lumber employment in Oregon lies in the use of such surplus timber as lodgepole and jack pine for pulp and paper production.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story from the Statesman and the editorial by ex-Governor Sprague appear in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of those Members of the Senate who have shared our concern over the economic difficulties now confronting the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the news story and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salem Statesman of January 8, 1958]

BANKER EXPLAINS HOW OREGON ECONOMY HIT BY TIGHT MONEY

A slowdown in home construction in the United States caused mainly by tight money was blamed yesterday for bringing on Oregon's economic slump.

H. M. Phillips, vice president and investment director of the First National Bank of Portland, spoke to members of Salem Kiwanis Club on Oregon—"Today and Tomorrow."

Home construction accounts for three-quarters of Oregon's lumber output, and less construction means less lumber sold, he pointed out.

The lumber industry provides $1¼ billion of the State's $3¼ billion yearly income, he said, and when it suffers, so does Oregon.

National fiscal policy, as expressed by the Federal Reserve System, and the high debt level have tightened credit and made home financing more difficult and more unattractive to investors, he said.

More and more individuals are against going further into debt to build, he added.

Phillips predicted that the westward shift in population would gradually bolster Oregon's prosperity.

Despite the slump he expressed satisfaction in the State's lumber field, pointing to steps being taken to provide sustained forest yields and more efficient use of waste products. Oregon also has good wate. and power resources and a stable dependable labor market, he said.

To offset the banana republic effects of a one-industry State, Phillips urged more work to bring in industrial expansion.

"We need an operating environment, laws, and fair and equitable tax structure," he said, "of interest to business."

He blamed taxes—which take nearly one-third of the State's individual income—for a part in the recession.

---

PAPER MILLS FOR OREGON

One of the best prospects for early industrial expansion in Oregon is in the manufacture of pulp and paper. We have the largest stores of timber, the principal ingredient of pulp from which paper is made, and at proper locations an abundance of water and electric energy. Some such projects are being made already for production—a kraft paper mill set up by Georgia-Pacific at Toledo, and an insulating board mill near Klamath Falls, by Johns-Manville Corp., which will use jack pine of the high plateau for raw material.

Other projects are hanging fire. International Paper Co. which bought Long-Bell, definitely plans to erect 1 or 2 mills in Oregon, and communities from Reedsport to Klamath Falls via Roseburg and Grants Pass are bidding for site selection. Powell River Paper Co., which now controls Brooks-Scanlon of Bend, has been studying possible locations for a pulp-paper operation, but has announced no choice. Bend is hopeful that the plant will be located in its vicinity.

At present there is some over-capacity in paper manufacture, also in the production of cellulose pulp for rayon. But such is the steady growth in demand for paper products there is no alarm over the present surplus capacity. It takes about 2 years to erect a plant and iron out its bugs, so corporate interests study prospects for the future not the present. It is the long-range view for instance which prompts Crown Zellerbach to bargain with Newfoundland for timber for a newsprint mill there. It figures the present oversupply of newsprint is temporary and expects to find a market in the eastern part of the country for the output of a Newfoundland mill.

Oregon communities are a bit impatient, but decisions will be announced before long on pending projects, and others will spring up to take care of the growing needs of an increasing population.

---

## COMMUNIST SUPPORT OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE UNREST

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, my duties and responsibilities as a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act and Internal Security have made me keenly alert to what is transpiring in Egypt, Indonesia, and particularly among our neighbors south of the border. The current issues of our newspapers are full of the unrest in Guatemala and Venezuela. Hundreds were reported killed in Venezuela only yesterday.

Someone recently said that if the Free World were denied the oil from the Middle East and also deprived of the oil reserves in Venezuela, we would be crippled beyond our comprehension. While we in the United States have a bountiful suply of oil, we still must depend upon our foreign reserves to supplement our needs and those of the Free World allied with us.

We must be constantly on the alert to prevent the Communists from making inroads into the free and democratic nations of the world. The Communists, of course, believe in confiscation and its twin evil, nationalization. My dear friend, John Peurifoy, did much in his lifetime to straighten out the affairs in Guatemala. He was helping in the same manner in the Far East at the very moment of his unfortunate and untimely death.

News accounts reporting events throughout Latin America reflect the gaining momentum of Red activity within the sovereign states of our neighbors.

The growing unrest, turmoil, confusion, and bloodshed is undoubtedly caused in part by their own domestic issues and local problems. To the extent that they are indigenous or domestic and confined to a particular country, then they are problems of that country which must be solved within their own national framework by responsible political leadership. Political maturity has come to Latin America and with freedom from foreign agitation the people of South and Central America are prepared to handle their own domestic difficulties.

These are areas of politics in which the United States has no proper concern and in which we have no desire to interfere. However, we do want to know, and we do want to interfere if this hemispheric unrest is caused or supported by Communists or by Communist money from within the United States. Our difficulty today is that we, the American people, do not even know the facts with regard to the communistic activities within our own country which are directly affecting the stability of government in many of the countries of South and Central America.

I was pleased to learn from the President's message to the Congress that there is an increasing awareness within the present administration of the communistic economic offensive which has been and is being directed against Latin America. I join with the administration in its efforts to recognize the serious nature of this problem and to defeat this effort of Russia.

In like manner, I ask that the administration join with the Internal Security Committee of the Senate and lend its support to the investigation which we now have under way. We will welcome support and cooperation from any source which will assist us in determining what is going on within our own country which is designed to foment unrest and turmoil within Latin America.

I urge vigilance in our affairs with the states of Latin America. Today we are relatively secure in that area, it was only yesterday that we were relatively secure in the Middle East. We must profit by our Middle East experience and we must always remember that Latin America represents Russia's most coveted territory.

The Internal Security Committee intends to do its part in this important work; we hope for assistance and cooperation from all who are able to provide it.

---

## OPPOSITION BY NEBRASKANS TO PROPOSED RAIL FREIGHT INCREASES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for the past several days I have been receiving letters and telegrams from Nebraska wheat growers and hay dealers setting forth their opposition to the railroad freight rate increases requested by railroads under ex parte 212. The views of the wheat growers are best set forth in a statement of objections which has been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission by the Nebraska Wheat Commission, and which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIONS TO RAILROAD FREIGHT RATE INCREASES REQUESTED BY RAILROADS UNDER "EX PARTE 212"

(By Leslie F. Sheffield, chief, Nebraska Wheat Commission)

1. Railroad freight increases proposed mean a direct out-of-pocket cost to Nebraska farmers.

(a) Freight increases automatically result in a reduced price for agricultural products.

The price received by a farmer for a bushel of wheat at his local country elevator is determined by the price at the terminal market less the transportation to that market and less the handling and profit charge by the country elevator. As a result, the cost of transporting that bushel of wheat to market is paid by the farmer and any increase in the transportation cost is automatically reflected to the farmer and paid by him.

Since there is no correlation between the price received by the grower for a bushel of wheat and railroad freight rates, this means that any further increase on freight rates for wheat shipments will be absorbed by the farmer and consequently, he will receive that much less for a bushel of wheat.

Based on the average railroad movement of wheat shipments in Nebraska over the past 10 years, the proposed 3 percent increase on freight rates on wheat alone would add approximately $450,000 annually to the freight bill for shipping Nebraska wheat to terminal markets. As pointed out in the preceding paragraph, this additional cost would have to be absorbed by the growers and this would be a direct out-of-pocket cost.

Since the prices received by farmers for other agricultural products are similarly affected by increases in freight rates, this

means that the proposed increase of 3 percent on freight rates for agricultural products will automatically deduct the total amount of the increased freight rate from farm income in Nebraska.

(b) Freight increases on manufactured goods shipped into Nebraska must be paid by the buyer of these goods.

Since the prices paid for manufactured goods must of necessity include the costs of shipping the product from the factory to the buyer, any increase in the freight costs must be absorbed in the prices paid for the manufactured products. Only a very small percentage of the total manufactured goods used or consumed in Nebraska are processed or manufactured within this State, consequently the purchaser of these products must pay any increases in the costs of transporting the many manufactured goods which are shipped from factories, mostly in the eastern United States, to cities and towns within the State.

Any increases in rail freight rates are doubly disastrous to our Nebraska farmers who not only will receive less for their agricultural products because of the increased freight rates; but who also will have to absorb the increased freight rates on all manufactured products which they must buy. In each case, any increase in freight rates means a direct out-of-pocket cost over which the farmer has no control, because he must ship his agricultural products to market and he has to buy manufactured products required in his farming operation.

2. Proposed rate increase under ex parte 212 is at a crucial time for farmers who are caught in a cost-price squeeze.

The rate increases proposed under ex parte 212 is at a very crucial time for farmers who are caught in a cost-price squeeze. The December 15, 1957, Agricultural Prices Report, issued by the State-Federal Division of Agricultural Statistics, 208 Post Office Building, Lincoln, Nebr., carried the following summary table:

*Summary table*

| Indexes (1910-14=100) | Dec. 15, 1956 | Nov. 15, 1957 | Dec. 15, 1957 | Record high | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Index | Date |
| Prices received | 235 | 242 | 242 | 313 | February 1951. |
| Parity index [1] | 290 | 298 | 299 | 299 | December 1957. |
| Parity ratio | 81 | 81 | 81 | 123 | October 1946. |

[1] Prices paid, interest, taxes, and wage rates based on data for the indicated dates.

Although the parity ratio is unchanged at 81 for the 3 dates shown, it readily can be observed that the parity index at 299 for December 1957 is at a record high. This means that farm costs for Nebraska farmers are at a record high, whereas the prices received for their agricultural products stand at an index of 242 or a parity ratio of 81.

With farm costs expected to remain high and to increase as labor, machinery, and other cost items go up in price, while the prices farmers receive for their products are expected to continue to decline, it is readily apparent that this is a time when farmers cannot afford to be doubly penalized by increases in freight rates.

3. Wheat already is paying more than its fair share of costs involved in its transportation by railroads.

The following statistics on rail revenue received from wheat shipments in comparison to the out-of-pocket costs for transporting wheat are taken from statement No. 5-57 "Distribution of the Rail Revenue Contribution by Commodity Groups—1955" prepared by the Cost Finding Section, Bureau of Accounts, Cost Finding, and Valuation, Interstate Commerce Commission:

| | Railroad transportation | |
|---|---|---|
| | United States to United States | West to West |
| Out-of-pocket costs | $854,748 | $655,077 |
| Contribution in rail revenue | 1,049,293 | 906,148 |

These statistics were obtained through a 1 percent waybill study and for those commodities studied, wheat had one of the highest ratios for revenue received to out-of-pocket costs.

The Report on Freight Commodity Statistics for 1956 issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission revealed that for the Class I railroads of the United States, the rail revenue received for transporting wheat was the highest of all products of agriculture. Total gross revenue for wheat rail movement on Class I railroads in the United States for 1956 was $234,258,449 compared to the total gross revenue for all products of agriculture of $1,184,011,584.

4. Transportation costs of moving wheat to export is the principal determining factor in making up export wheat shipments.

The principal determining factor in making up export wheat shipments is the transportation cost of moving wheat from interior points to ports of export. Grain export firms in making up wheat export shipments must know what the cost of the wheat will be delivered to the port.

Since wheat is exported under the United States Grain Standard, an exporter who is loading a cargo of No. 2 hard red winter wheat for export will purchase that wheat at the lowest possible price delivered to the port elevator. In making up his cargo, one carload of No. 2 wheat which meets the requirements of his cargo is just as satisfactory as another. Since the 5 States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado all produce hard red winter wheat, wheat of No. 2 grade is available in each of these States. However, in making up his cargo, if the exporter can obtain all the carloads of No. 2 hard red winter wheat from an interior Texas point at a cost of $2 per bushel and a freight cost of $.15 per bushel to the port elevator, then this exporter obviously would not be interested in purchasing wheat from McCook, Nebraska, at a price of $1.90 per bushel when the rail freight charge to gulf ports is now $.52 per bushel. The difference in the cost of the wheat delivered to port from the Texas point of $2.15 compared to the cost of the McCook, Nebraska, wheat delivered to port at a cost of $2.42 is obviously too great to permit movement of the Nebraska wheat to export in any substantial quantity in normal trade channels.

Truck and barge competition in moving wheat to export have resulted in reduced rail rates to meet the competition in those areas where truck and barge movement have become factors in transporting wheat to export. However, in Nebraska there is no suitable river transportation available to result in any appreciable barge movement of wheat and to date only a very small volume of truck movement of wheat to export has materialized because of the distance involved and the problem of obtaining backhauls.

The end result of this situation is that other wheat-producing areas will become more competitive than Nebraska because of lower freight costs resulting from increased truck and barge competition with the railroads, whereas, Nebraska wheat will be priced out of the export market because of the high cost of transportation to export. Add to this the fact that each percentage increase in freight rates puts the area of longest haul at an increasingly greater disadvantage than the area of shorter haul, and the penalty of a 3 percent increase proposed under ex parte 212 becomes more obvious.

5. Exceptions to proposed increase under ex parte 212 for wheat from Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, and Texas to Texas gulf ports (appendix V, page 13, class 1) is discriminatory to Nebraska.

In appendix V, page 13, of ex parte 212, under class 1, wheat from Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, and Texas to Texas gulf ports for export is listed as an exception to the proposed increase. Inasmuch as the wheat produced in the five States of Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, and Colorado is all of the hard red winter variety and is therefore subject to the same markets and prices, all States in this region should be treated the same in the establishment of rates.

This request by the railroads under ex parte 212 for excepting only a portion of the hard red winter wheat region to the proposed increases for wheat shipments to Texas gulf ports is discriminatory and prejudicial. If any States in this hard red winter wheat region are excepted from the proposed increases, then Nebraska and Colorado should also be excepted from the increases on wheat shipments to Texas gulf ports.

6. Any further increase in rail freight rates for wheat will result in a further shift to truck transportation.

During the past 2 years, the railroads in the western territory have received the following freight rate increases for wheat: March 1956, 5 percent; December 1956, 5 percent; August 1957, 4 percent. Each of these increases have stepped up the shift from rail to truck movement of wheat and other grains.

One large grain and milling firm in Nebraska which prior to the increases in 1956 received the great majority of its wheat by rail until these increases has recorded a steadily increasingly percentage of its total wheat receipts by truck. In the months of January and February 1957 this firm received over 400,000 bushels of wheat from western Nebraska and eastern Colorado. Prior to the 5 percent increase in rates on December 28, 1956, most of this wheat was received by rail. At an average rate of 25 cents per bushel this means a loss to the railroads of over $100,000 in rail freight revenue in just 2 months' time for wheat receipts at just one firm. In December 1957, this same firm received over 210,000 bushels of wheat by truck or over 50 percent of the total receipts by truck from the area where trucks are competitive. Multiply this by other grain firms receipts by truck and it becomes apparent that each percentage increase in freight rates will be more than offset by the decline in total rail revenue from wheat caused by a further shift from rail to truck movement.

Unless the railroads make themselves competitive with the trucks from the standpoint of both rate and service, then the time may soon arrive when not only will trucks be moving most of the grain, but the entire concept of grain marketing may be changed. The Nation's grain markets today provide a valuable service to farmers, grain merchants, processing firms and the consuming public; however, their effectiveness is tied directly to the volume of grain handled. Since truck shipments bypass the major grain

markets, the welfare of the Nation's grain markets is dependent upon maintaining rail movement of the majority of the Nation's grain. Consequently, the matter of keeping rail freight rates competitive with rates on other methods of transportation takes on an entirely different perspective which involves everyone from the grower to the consumer.

Competition forces shippers of any freight commodity to use that mode of transportation which provides the most satisfactory services at the most reasonable costs. If trucks provide the transportation service for a particular commodity at a rate which is lower than the rail rate and the accompanying transit privileges, then competition will force a diversion in the movement of that commodity from rail to truck. This is exactly the situation which exists today in the transportation of wheat and any further rate increases will speed up this shift to truck movement.

7. Efforts by Nebraska and Kansas Wheat Commissions to develop additional Foreign market outlets for wheat would be jeopardized by additional freight increases.

The Nebraska and Kansas wheat commissions are undertaking joint activities and projects in European and South American countries in attempts to develop additional foreign market outlets for our hard red winter wheat. One of the most serious problems involved in these activities is the high cost of transporting wheat from Nebraska and Kansas to the ports. Rail transportation costs from shipping points in these two States to gulf ports presently constitute approximately 25 percent of the total cost of the wheat at its original shipping point. If the transportation cost goes up through rail freight increases as proposed for wheat under ex parte 212, then the possibilities of moving wheat from Nebraska and Kansas to export at prices competitive with Canadian wheat on the world market certainly will be lessened. Any further curtailment of our export market for wheat will add to the wheat surplus problems and will have a depressing effect upon agriculture in both Nebraska and Kansas.

8. Reduction in free time for railroad cars at export will further depress prices farmers receive for wheat.

The proposal by the railroads under section (a), page 6, appendix II of ex parte 212, whereby the free time permitted for railroad cars at export will act as a depressing influence on the prices paid to growers for wheat. Export grain firms in assembling wheat for a cargo shipment for export normally receive carload shipments from widely separated areas and the length of time required to move these cars from various points to export varies considerably. As a result, it is impossible to assemble the 175-200 carloads of wheat required for one cargo of wheat and to have these cars inspected, reports on inspection, and unloaded within four days time. Another important variable is the uncertainty in the arrival time for ships which are scheduled to transport the cargo.

This reduction in free time for railroad cars at export would result in greatly increased car demurrage charges which would be reflected back to the producer in the price which export grain firms would be willing to pay for wheat for export. Since exports constitute from 30 to 50 percent of the total production of wheat in most years, this represents a substantial portion of the wheat market.

9. Provision for refund in event no increase or lesser increase be allowed after proposed rates under ex parte 212 in effect is completely unsatisfactory from standpoint of producer.

The proposal by the railroads that ex parte 212 be permitted to go into effect on February 1, 1958 "without suspension but subject to the condition that refund be made in the event that, after full investigation, no increase, or a lesser increase than set forth in the schedules, is allowed with respect to particular rates", is wholly unsatisfactory from the standpoint of producers.

If the increase under ex parte 212 goes into effect on February 1, 1958, then the price a producer receives for a bushel of wheat will immediately reflect the freight rate increase but if these increases were later disallowed, there would be so many complications in computing the refund on grain shipments involving transit that the refund could never be reflected or repaid back to the producer. This procedure would be so cumbersome that any advantages of such refunds would be far outweighed by the many disadvantages. The costs involved in administering such refunds would be prohibitive and since the grower, who really pays the increased freight costs for shipping his produce, would not benefit from any refunds, this procedure would be completely unsatisfactory from the producer's standpoint.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a letter dated January 14, 1958, from Mr. I. L. Watson, secretary of the Elkhorn Valley Hay Dealers Association, concisely states the views of Nebraska hay producers regarding this problem. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INMAN, NEBR., *January 14, 1958.*

Senator CARL T. CURTIS,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR CURTIS: On behalf of the Watson Hay Co. and the Elkhorn Valley Hay Dealers Association, I am writing you protesting the advance of $1 per ton freight rate on hay as proposed in tariff and increased rates and charges X-212 to become effective February 1, 1958.

This is the third freight-rate increase we have had in less than a year. The overall average increase in X-212 is around 3 percent but for some reason hay seems to be carrying a much larger increase than other commodities. This means an advance in freight charges on hay from stations on Northwestern Railway, Bassett through Inman, to Omaha, Nebr., of 19 to 23 percent, instead of average 3 percent.

Nebraska, being one of the largest producers of prairie and alfalfa hay, always has a big surplus to ship out. This is certainly going to affect the economy of our State. We realize that the railroads are in bad shape, but don't believe they are going to better themselves by pricing their services out of the market.

Would appreciate anything you can do for us before the Interstate Commerce Commission on these rates.

Very truly yours,

I. L. WATSON,
*Secretary, Watson Hay Co., Elkhorn Valley Hay Dealers Association.*

## THE DOMESTIC JEWELED WATCH INDUSTRY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, last year I informed the Senate of the rapidly deteriorating state of the domestic jeweled watch industry. You will recall that the domestic companies filed an application with the Office of Defense Mobilization more than 2 years ago under that provision of the Trade Agreements Act which was enacted by Congress in 1955 specifically to prevent skills and plant capacities essential to the national defense from being seriously injured by imports. It saddens me to report to the Senate today that the employment of production workers in the domestic watch industry has sunk even lower than it was a year ago. In 1956, there were 3,955 production workers in our domestic watch plants. Today, there are only 2,803. Can the Members of the Senate view this continued and rapid layoff of production workers with complacency? These highly skilled workers have repeatedly been found to be essential to the Nation's mobilization base. And, when you realize that the watch industry is heavily involved in the missiles program because of the important contribution these skills are making, you will be even more concerned. And despite this alarming trend, the Office of Defense Mobilization has still not made its findings in the watch case. I am afraid that this is another case of relief delayed being the same as relief denied.

But this is not the worst of the bad news. Last week the 850 employees of the Elgin National Watch Co. at its Lincoln, Nebr., plant were told that the plant is being shut down. The Elgin Co. announced that it is being forced by imports to cease watchmaking operations at the Lincoln plant. It is consolidating its watch operations at its Elgin, Ill., plant. While the Elgin Co. will continue to manufacture jeweled watches, neither it nor the Nation will any longer have available the capacity of the Lincoln plant. How much longer are we going to tolerate these conditions which fly directly in the face of the policy the Congress put into the Trade Agreements Act to safeguard our vital defense industries?

## SPECIAL AID TO SMALL BUSINESS IN DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the current rise in unemployment throughout the Nation strengthens the arguments in favor of special financial aid to small businesses located in labor surplus areas. An effective, yet inexpensive means of helping those communities hit by economic reverses would be to provide low-interest, long-term loans to the small businesses in the area. Last year I introduced a bill (S. 244) to make such loans available through the Small Business Administration. Today the need for this program is even greater than a year ago.

The precedent for this program was set in 1955 when SBA was authorized to make liberal-term loans in areas suffering from natural disasters such as flood or drought. The similarity between such natural disasters and economic disaster is obvious and the need for assistance is just as great. Under this program those areas defined by the Labor Department as having a substantial labor surplus would become eligible for those loans to be granted for periods up to 20 years at not more than 3 percent interest. According to the latest reports areas in 23 States are now so classified by the Labor Department. In Maine such hard-hit communities as

Saco, Biddeford and Sanford would benefit under the provisions of S. 244. To aid in curbing economic difficulties and to sustain smaller businesses in this area, this new category of disaster loans should be adopted. The value of this program cannot be questioned and it is my hope that it will be made a part of the small-business legislation to be enacted during this session.

## RECLAMATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND NAVIGATION PROJECTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on August 28, on behalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, Senate Resolution 148 was reported favorably to the Senate with perfecting amendments. Both committees recommended that the resolution, as amended, be passed.

Minority views were filed from each committee. All appear in Senate Report No. 1154.

A principal objective of the resolution is to facilitate consideration of Reclamation, flood control, and navigation projects referred to our committees for authorization recommendations. Favorable comments on this objective of the resolution in this respect were received from practically all executive agencies concerned, including the Comptroller General and the Bureau of the Budget.

The resolution seeks a full disclosure from executive agencies of background information on such items as cost allocations and benefit-cost ratios.

Experience of our committees shows that complete information as to alternative methods of cost allocations is essential to full consideration of all factors.

Our committees seek the approval of the Senate of our efforts to improve procedures. Consideration of pending legislation will be expedited by having the information requested included in the comments of executive agencies.

Other phases of the resolution are designed to elimnate what appears to be unnecessary delays in the executive agencies in forwarding to the Congress reports required by law.

Approval by the Senate of the resolution will be a forward step and of great assistance to our two committees.

## THE FARM ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, almost every magazine and newspaper today has some article concerning the farm economic situation. Many people looking merely at gross farm income assume that farmers are doing very well not realizing, of course, that farm operating costs have risen sharply year after year.

Mr. President, one of the best editorials I have read on the farm situation appeared in the January 16 issue of the Minot Daily News published at Minot, N. Dak. I ask that this be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM COSTS RECORD

Occasionally some brave soul comes forth with the statement that, with wheat at $2 a bushel, plus here and there a premium, along with pretty good prices for beef, to all of which certain Government subsidies are added, the North Dakota farmer has little reason for complaint.

Of course, it matters not the least what the farmer receives unless his operating costs, as well as capital investment, is considered at the same time.

It does not take a long-haired economist to know what is going on right in our midst.

There is just no solution for the little fellow, and that includes, of course, the young chap who wants to get started in farming—the fellows this State badly needs to bolster its citizenship.

Time was when a young man who could muster $500 for a secondhand tractor was in business. He might find a small farm to rent and be on his way. A few head of cattle, hogs, and turkeys supplemented his income.

But it doesn't work today. The turkeys have to be sold in competition with the fellow who raises and finishes 10,000. His few head of beef cattle are sold in competition with the rancher raising several thousand.

One catch is that one man can feed 250 head of cattle with use of power machinery, as well as 10 or 15. And labor cost is a major item.

A man operating 3 or 4 sections can skim off a little from each acre, to total a pretty good return, where the small farmer just can't make it go, even though he donates his labor.

Farming has become big business, which requires a big investment and a lot of credit.

Senator-Farmer MILT YOUNG has developed some cost figures the farmer is confronted with, which give or take a few dollars either way, appear to be pretty sound. It might be well to clip this table and have it readily available for the enlightenment of those who have been looking just at the income totals.

The Senator has not mentioned the inflation spiral that is reflected in food and clothing, items that are just as realistic for the farm family as for those on a weekly payroll in town.

Here are the figures that show a 10-year increase in machinery cost up to 64 percent:

| Commodity and unit | Average prices paid by farmers | | Percent increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Average 1947–49 | September 1957 | |
| Gasoline, tank truck, per gallon | *Cents* 21.9 | *Cents* 27 | 23 |
| Tractor, 30–39-horsepower | $2,100 | $3,000 | 43 |
| Tractor plows, 3-bottom | 269 | 400 | 49 |
| Disk harrows, tandem | 202 | 301 | 49 |
| Manure spreaders | 332 | 513 | 55 |
| Grain drills, 20-tube | 475 | 754 | 59 |
| Combines, self-propelled, 12-foot | 4,310 | 6,140 | 42 |
| Corn picker-huskers, 2-row | 1,210 | 1,980 | 64 |

## ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR KNOWLAND AT WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address delivered by the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], at Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., on January 11.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OMICRON DELTA KAPPA ANNUAL TAP DAY LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY, LEXINGTON, VA., SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1958

Mr. President, faculty, students, and friends of Washington and Lee University, there have been many developments that have taken place in the world since I first accepted the invitation of your organization to attend this meeting today. The invitation was extended in February of 1957 and accepted in early March.

The names of the great Americans associated with this university are a heritage of our entire Nation. The activities and character of these Virginians are a source of pride and inspiration of every American across this wide land of ours.

The placing of Sputniks I and II into their orbits has had a tremendous impact in this country and throughout the world.

It has presented a challenge to this country and to the Free World and has underscored the fact that the Soviet Union has a long-range-missile capability which must not be underestimated.

The challenge facing this country is to make sure that we overtake the Soviet lead in the missile field and that we retain a deterrent power in our Strategic Air Command that would effectively persuade the Soviet Union that they cannot commit aggression against us without suffering devastating counterblows.

An additional challenge, however, is to do this job while we maintain our free-enterprise system and a solvent Federal Government.

It is important that we face up to the problems ahead of us without either fear or complacency.

The fact that the Soviet Union has gained an ascendancy in the earth's satellite field and an apparent lead in the long-range missile field does not eliminate the defensive power of the United States in our Strategic Air Command, our superiority in atomic weapons and the capabilities of our Navy, Army, and our allied forces abroad.

However, a grave threat would be involved if the Soviet Union continued to enjoy a leadership in outer space or in missile research development and production.

The Nation has a right to expect that the administration and the Congress will work together in accomplishing our objective and that solutions be reached on the basis of what is essential for the preservation of our Nation and the security of the free world, rather than on any narrow partisan bickering.

Since shortly after the close of World War II it has been apparent to the people and the governments of the Free World that the Soviet Union was not prepared to let up on its pressures to extend, by one means or another, the power and influence of their international Communist conspiracy.

Even those who had been hopeful at first that there would be a change of policy with the death of Stalin have come to recognize that the shifting of personalities by natural death, violent liquidation, or enforced removal to subordinate positions does not change the basic long-term strategic objectives of the Kremlin.

Not only is this made clear by the writings and statements of the Soviet leaders, present and past, but by whole series of deeds.

In my judgment, we dare not ignore this record if we are to preserve the future of our own Republic and to assure the survival of freedom elsewhere in the world.

It was only recently that Khrushchev in one of his franker moments and with his

usual nondiplomatic approach said in referring to those who believe in free institutions:

"We will bury you."

This is not a major departure from long-established Communist doctrine. In 1901, some 16 years before the Russian Revolution, Lenin said:

"We have never rejected terror on principle, nor can we ever do so. Terror is a form of military operation that may be usefully applied, or may even be essential in certain moments of the battle."

Some years later in 1923 Stalin added his contribution to the Communist doctrine in the following language:

"To choose the victim, to prepare the blow with care, to slake an implacable vengeance, and then to go to bed—there is nothing sweeter in the world."

These statements, among vast numbers of others that could be documented, taken together with the long record of the Soviet Union in violating its treaties and agreements with non-Communist powers certainly should put the Free World on notice that a Soviet agreement is not worth the paper upon which it is written.

Despite a massive Soviet propaganda buildup that is growing in volume regarding their peaceful intentions the following facts cannot be successfully disputed:

1. The Soviet Union has violated every international agreement or treaty it has had with a non-Communist power whenever it suited their national interests. These include its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China.

2. The Soviet Union to date has been unwilling to agree to any effective inspection system that would give equal protection to the Free World.

3. If our atomic defensive capability was eliminated the Soviet-Communist strength in conventional forces would be sufficient to overwhelm Western Europe, the Middle East, and Asia.

4. There has been no reliable information indicating any change in long-term Soviet-Communist strategy—the destruction of human freedom everywhere.

5. Despite the well-advertised smiles of Khrushchev in the summer of 1956, the inherent totalitarian blood lust of the Soviet Communist system was demonstrated by the ruthless crushing of freedom of Hungary in November of that year.

No prudent persons can ignore these facts.

The Communist bloc may be likened to an arsonist. With stealth and a penny box of matches, they could destroy a great metropolitan area were it not for an extensive and expensive fire-alarm and fire-fighting system.

There have been suggestions made that the full air inspection suggested by the President be modified so that in exchange for our air inspection over Siberia that the Soviets be allowed to inspect Alaska and all of the United States west of the Mississippi.

As an American, a Westerner, and a Californian, I must in candor state that such a "compromise proposal" does not appeal to me. It sounds too much like a Communist recipe for rabbit stew of equal parts—1 horse to 1 rabbit.

As long as the menace of international communism exists we must maintain a strong national defensive force in the air, on the land, and on the sea.

We also need to constantly encourage our allies abroad to face the facts and carry their fair share of the defense burden. This Nation cannot and should not be expected to do the job alone.

It is time for us to rededicate ourselves to a renewed faith in our free way of life.

We must not take our constitutional form of government or our free enterprise system for granted. Neither fall into the category of something that can be locked in a safe-deposit box and kept forever secure. Each generation must be prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to maintain them that our Founding Fathers were prepared to make in the first instance.

Other nations have been or now are larger in land area, in population, and in natural resources. Yet they have not been able to give to their people the freedom and the standard of living Americans have enjoyed.

As important as is the productive capacity of our Nation and its military strength, these are not the factors which alone could preserve our freedom or enable us to maintain a free world of free men. The inner strength of America has not been its great cities, its huge industrial plants, its extended transportation systems, or its variety of natural resources, as important as these are.

The factors which made America an inspiration to the rest of the world grew out of our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the spiritual values which the Founders of our Republic recognized and by which they were guided.

We have recognized that there is a higher moral law to which governments are also accountable. We have humbly acknowledged the divine inspiration which has made and preserved us as a Nation.

We have read of and been inspired by the action of George Washington in kneeling in prayer during the dark days of Valley Forge.

The priceless ingredient for our people has been our constitutional form of government which guarantees our religious personal and economic freedom.

America is still the authentic revolution. The flame of freedom which was struck at Concord and Lexington still is an inspiration to the enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

But it is also an ageless lesson that no outsiders can win independence for a people. They must be willing to pay the price in blood and resources to gain their own freedom.

We do recognize, however, that when freedom is destroyed anywhere a bit of freedom is destroyed everywhere.

Nations can die while delegates talk. During the 1956–57 Hungarian struggle the General Assembly of the United Nations passed 10 resolutions in 76 days of debate. All that while freedom was being strangled to death in Hungary. With callous indifference the Soviet Union placed itself above the higher moral law of God as well as above its obligations under the United Nations Charter.

This presents the issue: Are the obligations and the mandates of the United Nations to be applicable to the democratic nations but not to the totalitarian powers? To the law-abiding but not to the outlaw nations? To the small and weak countries but not to the big and strong? What kind of justice is this? Are we building on quicksand? What kind of a foundation is this for constructing a system of international law and order based on justice?

We serve no useful purpose if we hide the facts. To the contrary, by ignoring them and failing to seek remedies we may endanger the safety of this Republic and free men everywhere.

For many decades the men in the Kremlin have preached the doctrine that the free world contains the seeds of its own destruction. It is far more likely, I believe, that the Communist world contains the seeds of its own destruction.

Hungary was but the latest in the indications that, even under totalitarian police rule and the brainwashing of a whole generation, the spark of freedom still lived and was capable of lighting a fire that endangered the whole monolithic structure of Communist tyranny.

After the Hungarian experience how much reliance can the Soviet Union place in the armed forces of the other captive nations if freedom is ever within their reach? How can they have faith in Communist indoctrination when young students were the leaders of the Hungarian rebellion?

International communism which 40 years ago imposed its will upon the people of Russia has in the meantime, by conquest, subversion, and international blackmail, extended its power to where over 900 million people are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Probably not as much as 10 percent of that number can be considered hard-core Communist Party members.

Never before in history have so few imposed their ruthless totalitarian will upon so many human beings.

They will be relentless in seeking to destroy our institutions. Fortified by our faith in God, we must be determined that our way of life will be preserved.

I believe we are at one of the great crucial turning points of history.

History will judge us on how we of our generation met the great problems, international and domestic, which confront our generation. There has never been a time in our history when it was more important that we as Americans regardless of our party differences subscribe to the pledge of Thomas Jefferson when he said:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

## THE TAFT MEMORIAL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a letter from the Architect of the Capitol addressed to me, and copy of the Senate resolution and various documents showing that all requirements prerequisite to commencement of erection of the Taft Memorial have been met.

There being no objection, the letter and documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
*Washington, D. C., January 17, 1958.*

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: You will remember that some time ago we agreed that during this session of Congress there should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a copy of the Senate resolution authorizing the erection of the Taft Memorial and documents showing that all requirements prerequisite to commencement of erection have been met.

In order that you might have this information available for insertion in the RECORD, I am enclosing the following material:

1. Copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, 84th Congress, agreed to by the Senate on July 22, 1955, and by the House on July 25, 1955, which authorized the erection of the Taft Memorial and set forth certain conditions to be met before construction could begin.

2. Copy of Senate Report No. 1065, 84th Congress, accompanying Senate Concurrent Resolution 44.

3. Copy of letter of October 11, 1955, from Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, approving the design of the Memorial.

4. Copy of my letter of December 7, 1956, to the architect for the Taft Memorial, Mr. Douglas W. Orr, approving the design, plans, and specifications for the Memorial.

5. Letters of October 3, 1957, from Robert V. Fleming, treasurer, the Robert A. Taft

Memorial Foundation, Inc., concerning estimated expenditures and funds available for erection of the Memorial.

6. Copy of letter dated October 8, 1957, from the senior vice president and cashier of the Riggs National Bank, Washington, D. C., certifying that sufficient funds are available to insure completion of the Memorial.

7. Copy of my letter of October 9, 1957, to the president of the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc., certifying that all requirements of Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, prerequisite to commencement of erection, have been met.

If there is any other information that you think should be included, please let me know.

Sincerely,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
*Architect of the Capitol.*

---

[S. Con. Res. 44, 84th Cong., 1st sess.]

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation is authorized to erect on the Capitol Grounds, and present to the Congress of the United States, a memorial bell tower of appropriate design dedicated to the memory of Robert A. Taft. Such memorial shall be equipped with bells and shall be erected on the site described as square 633 on the drawing of the Architect of the Capitol. Such site is located just below the Fountain Plaza area, and lies between New Jersey Avenue on the east, Constitution Avenue on the south, C Street on the north, Louisiana Avenue diagonally on the northwest, and First Street on the west.

SEC. 2. The design and plans for the erection of such memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, with the advice of the Commission on Fine Arts, and such memorial shall be erected without expense to the United States.

SEC. 3. The authority granted by the first section of this act shall cease to exist unless (a) within 1 year after the passage of this concurrent resolution the plans for such memorial have been presented for the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, and within 3 years after such approval, the erection of such memorial has commenced, and (b) the Architect of the Capitol finds that, prior to the commencement of the erection of such memorial, sufficient funds are available to insure its completion.

SEC. 4. After the completion of the memorial according to the approved plans and specifications, it shall be accepted on behalf of the people of the United States by the Congress and thereafter shall be maintained by the Congress as part of the Capitol Grounds.

---

[S. Rept No. 1054, 84th Cong., 1st sess.]

MEMORIAL TO ROBERT A. TAFT

(Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, submitted the following report to accompany S. Con. Res. 44:)

The Committee on Rules and Administration to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) to erect on the Capitol Grounds a memorial bell tower in memory of Robert A. Taft, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

This concurrent resolution would give to Congress as a gift from the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc., of Washington, D. C., a memorial bell tower erected in the memory of the late Senator from Ohio. Designed by one of the Nation's foremost architects, the carillon would be a simple marble shaft, of clean lines, rising 100 feet over an attractive base and fountain. In accordance with the concurent resolution the site would be on that part of the Capitol Grounds bounded by New Jersey Avenue on the east, Constitution Avenue on the south, C Street on the north, Louisiana Avenue diagonally on the northwest, and First Street on the west.

The amendments inserted in the concurrent resolution by the Committee on Rules and Administration correct the spelling of one word, and also add to the description of the memorial site.

The Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc., was formed on July 13, 1954, as a nonprofit organization to perpetuate the high standards and ideals and public service exemplified by the late Senator from Ohio.

It has a board of trustees of 100 men and women in the various walks of life and is representative of the entire Nation. The chairman is the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, and the honorary chairman is the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States.

The foundation has a three-point program:

1. A physical memorial to be erected on the Capitol Grounds in Washington.

2. A Robert A. Taft Institute of Government.

3. A program of scholarships, fellowships, and research grants.

A recent action taken by the board of trustees was to propose that the foundation give to the Congress of the United States and to the people of this country a bell tower or carillon in memory of Senator Taft. This tower is expected to cost between $1 million and $1.2 million. The foundation will bear all expenses connected with the project.

The memorial will have a base or platform of about 55 by 45 feet in area, and about 15 feet high, surrounded by a low hedge and benches at the corners. Extending 12 feet beyond this platform on each of the 4 sides will be a water basin with a series of spraying jets. Pavement of platform would be done with marble strips set in pebble concrete. Walks leading to the platform will be provided with steps in two tiers, to give it a gradual approach.

The rectangular tower will be 11 feet thick, 32 feet wide, and 100 feet tall. At its base, in low relief, will be a sculpture of Robert A. Taft and a scroll. The shaft and the sculpture is to be of Tennessee pink marble; the walls of the basin and of the platform of carnelian Minnesota granite. Twenty-five bells will be placed in the upper part of the shaft, which will have bell-tone openings between supporting marble piers. The mechanism for playing this carillon manually or automatically will be in a room inside the bottom of the shaft. The site will be suitably landscaped.

The whole is a design of Douglas W. Orr, noted architect of New Haven, Conn., and a member of the Commission of Fine Arts.

At the present time there are a number of small memorial plaques on the Capitol Grounds, especially those located at the bases of memorial trees, which have been placed there by informal arrangement. The only statue on the grounds is that of Chief Justice John Marshall on the West Plaza, unveiled on May 10, 1884. Formerly, the heroic statue of George Washington by Horatio Greenough sat for more than 60 years before the Capitol on the east front before it was removed to the Smithsonian Institution in 1908. A third memorial, raised in memory to the naval dead of the Tripolitan War, sat as the center of a large pool on the west front of the Capitol from about 1832 to 1860, when it was removed to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md. (See appendix E (3).)

From the first, Congress has always reserved to itself the placement of monuments on the Capitol Grounds. Under the statute (40 U. S. C. 162) there can be no change in the architectural features of the Capitol Grounds without the approval of Congress. In requiring, however, that the Architect seek the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the committee was of the opinion that this should be done in order to effect harmony in the designs of memorials within the District of Columbia, and that Congress should desire such advice. No precedent is being established thereby, nor is the Architect of the Capitol bound by the advice of the Commission.

APPENDIX A. LETTER FROM THE HONORABLE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AND HONORARY CHAIRMAN OF THE ROBERT A. TAFT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, June 21, 1955.*

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
*The Vice President, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I understand that Mr. Herbert Hoover has written you on behalf of the board of trustees of the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc., offering to the Congress and to the people of the United States a monument to be erected on the Capitol Grounds to commemorate the late Senator Taft.

I realize that the Congress has exclusive jurisdiction over the Capitol and its Grounds, but I do hope that the Congress will be favorably disposed to the acceptance of this memorial. I believe that a monument to Senator Taft would do much to help perpetuate the high ideals, sound principles, and dedicated service which he exemplified throughout his public career.

With cordial regard.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

APPENDIX B. LETTER FROM THE HONORABLE HERBERT HOOVER, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE ROBERT A. TAFT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

JUNE 20, 1955.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
*Vice President of the United States,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc., was formed on July 13, 1954, as a nonprofit organization to perpetuate the high standards and ideals and public service exemplified by the late Senator from Ohio. It has a board of trustees of 100 men and women in the various walks of life, and is representative of the entire Nation.

The foundation has a three-point program:

1. A physical memorial to be erected on the Capitol Grounds in Washington.

2. A Robert A. Taft Institute of Government.

3. A program of scholarships, fellowships, and research grants.

The necessary action has been taken by the board of trustees in connection with the erection of a bell tower or carillon which the board desires to give to the Congress of the United States and to the people. The foundation will bear all expenses connected with this project. We have seen the preliminary plans and sketches of this proposed memorial and the board of trustees of the foundation feels that the form of the design endeavors to interpret the man whom it commemorates in that it is a monument of simplicity, yet of dignity and strength. The trustees feel that the monument will be in keeping with the dignity and beauty of the existing monuments in Washington.

The trustees of the foundation have taken their action on the recommendation of a subcommittee on the physical memorial consisting of Representative Clarence J. Brown, chairman, Senator John W. Bricker, Senator

Styles Bridges, Mrs. Katharine Kennedy Brown, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Ambassador Homer Ferguson, Senator Walter George, Senator William F. Knowland, Senator Eugene D. Millikin, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, and Senator H. Alexander Smith. The cost of this monument would be met by the foundation, which plans to solicit general contributions from the public at large. It is the foundation's wish that Congress accept this monument as a gift and that it arrange for a suitable site on the Capitol Grounds.

Throughout his career Senator Taft exemplified the highest standards of integrity and probity in public life. He was a champion of American ideals and traditions, while at the same time he was a supercraftsman in the application of principles in the practical operation of government. His living example, consequently, was a tremendous influence for good citizenship and good government. This foundation seeks to keep alive his memory as an enduring inspiration for generations to come, and this monument will serve as a visible reminder of the simplicity and greatness of the man.

The above-mentioned subcommittee, after viewing several sites and consulting with the Architect of the Capitol and a member of the Commission of Fine Arts, has recommended the following site: Square 633 on the drawing of the Architect of the Capitol, located just below the Fountain Plaza area, lies between New Jersey Avenue on the east, Constitution Avenue on the south, Louisiana Avenue diagonally on the northwest, and First Street on the west.

We enclose a certified copy of the resolution of the executive committee formally offering to the Congress this monument to be erected on the Capitol Grounds at no expense to the United States Government. Authority was given by the board of trustees to the executive committee to take this action at a meeting of the board of trustees on January 8, 1955. We also enclose a photograph of the architect's sketch of the memorial which portrays the monument on the recommended site.

It is our hope that the Congress of the United States will take the appropriate steps to accept the gift from the foundation.

Sincerely,

HERBERT HOOVER, *Chairman.*

APPENDIX C. RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ROBERT A. TAFT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC., ON MAY 25, 1955

*Resolved*, That pursuant to the resolution of the board of trustees adopted January 8, 1955, the executive committee determines that the conditions set forth in said resolution have been fully complied with, and that it is the unanimous opinion of the executive committee that the foundation proceed to erect the memorial according to the sketches submitted, using the materials and having the description and dimensions as follows: Base 55 by 45 feet surrounded by water basin, shaft 11 by 32 by 100 feet. On the base low relief sculpture of Robert A. Taft and scroll. Shaft and sculpture to be constructed of Tennessee pink marble, walls supporting platform and the basin to be constructed of carnelian Minnesota granite. Twenty-five bells to be placed in upper part of the shaft; that the estimated cost of between $1 million and $1,200,000 is hereby established as the approximate budget for the erection of the memorial; that Ben E. Tate, chairman of the ways and means committee of the foundation, be and he is hereby authorized to formulate plans to secure the necessary funds to erect said memorial; that the president be and he is hereby authorized to appoint other members of the board of trustees to serve as members of a finance committee to execute said fund-raising program, and shall designate one as chairman; that pursuant to said resolution of the board of trustees that the subcommittee for the physical memorial continue to supervise all the necessary actions in connection with the erection of the physical memorial; that said subcommittee is hereby authorized to secure definite plans and specifications and contracts, and is further authorized to modify the above description, dimensions, and materials as may be necessary to carry out the intent of the resolution for the erection of said memorial.

*Resolved further*, That no later than June 25, 1955, the chairman of the foundation be requested to transmit to the Congress of the United States the offer of a gift to it of the physical memorial to be erected on the Capitol Grounds without cost to the United States Government, substantially in the form as described herein, and to recommend that it be located on the following described site: Square 633 on the drawing of the Architect of the Capitol, located just below the Fountain Plaza area, lies between New Jersey Avenue on the east, Constitution Avenue on the south, Louisiana Avenue diagonally on the northwest, and First Street on the west; that said offer shall be made in the form of a letter to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives and attached thereto shall be a copy of this resolution and a photograph of the architect's sketch of the memorial.

*Resolved further*, That if and when the Congress accepts said offer of the foundation and upon the approval by the subcommittee of the plans and specifications, and the Architect of the Capitol, or by whomever person or persons required by the Congress to do so, the finance committee shall proceed to secure the necessary funds for the erection of said memorial and upon certification that sufficient funds have been either collected or pledged, and certification that all conditions set forth by the Congress have been complied with, B. CARROLL REECE, president of the foundation, on behalf of the foundation, shall enter into the necessary contracts and agreements for the erection of said memorial.

*Resolved further*, That anything in this resolution to the contrary notwithstanding, the wording of the scroll and the sculpture which is to be a part of said memorial shall be submitted to the executive committee for approval before submitting said sculpture and scroll to the designated representatives of the Congress for final approval.

*Resolved further*, That, in accordance with the statements made by the president, the substance of these resolutions shall be transmitted to the board of trustees as soon as possible.

APPENDIX D. APPLICABLE STATUTES—EXCERPTS

*(1) Public buildings, property, and works (40 U. S. C.)*

§ 193a. United States Capitol; area comprising; jurisdiction.

The United States Capitol Grounds shall comprise all squares, reservations, streets, roadways, walks, and other areas as defined on a map entitled "Map showing areas comprising United States Capitol Grounds," dated June 25, 1946, approved by the Architect of the Capitol and recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 127, page 8, and the jurisdiction and control over the United States Capitol Grounds, vested prior to July 31, 1946, by law in the Architect of the Capitol, is extended to the entire area of the United States Capitol Grounds as defined on the aforementioned map, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be responsible for the maintenance and improvement thereof: * * *

§ 162. Architect of Capitol; powers and duties.

The Architect of the Capitol shall perform all the duties relative to the Capitol Building performed prior to August 15, 1876, by the Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds, and shall be appointed by the President: *Provided*, That no change in the architectural features of the Capitol Building or in the landscape features of the Capitol Grounds shall be made except on plans to be approved by Congress. * * *

*(2) Commission of Fine Arts*

§ 104. Commission of Fine Arts.

A permanent Commission of Fine Arts is created to be composed of seven well-qualified judges of the fine arts, who shall be appointed by the President, and shall serve for a period of 4 years each, and until their successors are appointed and qualified. The President shall have authority to fill all vacancies. It shall be the duty of such Commission to advise upon the location of statues, fountains, and monuments in the public squares, streets, and parks in the District of Columbia, and upon the selection of models for statues, fountains, and monuments erected under the authority of the United States and upon the selection of artists for the execution of the same. It shall be the duty of the officers charged by law to determine such questions in each case to call for such advice. The foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply to the Capitol Building of the United States and the building of the Library of Congress. The Commission shall also advise generally upon questions of art when required to do so by the President, or by any committee of either House of Congress. * * *

APPENDIX E

*Background on other Capitol memorials*

(1) Statue of Chief Justice John Marshall [1]

The seated statue of Chief Justice John Marshall located upon the west plaza of the United States Capitol was unveiled on May 10, 1884. Chief Justice Marshall died in Philadelphia on the 6th of July 1835, and on the 7th day of July of that year, at a meeting of the bar of Philadelphia, resolutions were offered setting forth the grief of the bar at the death of the late Chief Justice and expressing a sense of the great public loss sustained and recommending to the bar of the United States cooperation in erecting a monument to the memory of the Chief Justice at some suitable place in the city of Washington. On the 10th of August 1835 a circular letter setting forth the purpose of collecting funds for erecting a monument was sent out to members of the bar in different sections of the country.

It was the purpose of the committee having in charge the collection of funds to be devoted to the erection of a monument to Chief Justice Marshall to limit the amount of subscriptions to the sum of $10 from each individual, and as the sum thus received failed to reach an amount considered necessary the receipts were carefully invested in the name of trustees of the Marshall Memorial Fund, so that in the year 1882 the sum thus invested had grown to an amount approximating $20,000.

At this time it was felt that the bar might be disposed to use this sum and such other moneys as might be subscribed and complete the project. Congress, however, supplemented the effort of the bar of Philadelphia by the enactment of the following legislation:

*"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives do appoint a joint committee of 3 Senators and 3 Representatives, with authority to contract for and erect a statue to the memory of Chief Justice John Marshall, formerly of the Supreme Court of the United States; that said

[1] From Arts and Artists, p. 486.

statue shall be placed in a suitable public reservation, to be designated by said joint committee, in the city of Washington; and for said purpose the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." (Approved March 10, 1882.) (Stat. L., vol. 22, p. 28.)

William Wetmore Story,[2] son of Justice Story, was selected as the sculptor of the memorial and was paid approximately $40,000 for his work.

The program upon the date of unveiling consisted of music by the Marine Band; prayer, Reverend Doctor Armstrong; music; address, the Chief Justice; music; oration, William Henry Rawle; music; benediction.

The statue is of bronze with marble base. The statue weighs approximately 2 tons and the marble base without brick backing about 10 tons.

(2) Statue of Washington

(By Horatio Greenough)

This statue was placed in the rotunda of the Capitol in 1841. It soon became apparent, even to the artist himself, that the center of the rotunda of the Capitol was not a fit resting place for the statue and Greenough wrote a letter to the committee of Congress asking its removal to a more suitable place, complaining that the light in the rotunda was defective and that in it the statue could be not be seen to advantage.

By appropriation of $5,000 in 1844, Congress authorized the removal of the statue to the grounds east of the Capitol, where it remained until 1908, when it was transferred to the Smithsonian Institution.

(From H. Doc. No. 45, August 4, 1841; also p. 101, Art and Artists of the Capitol:)

1832, February 18: The House of Representatives adopted a resolution;

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be authorized to employ Horatio Greenough, of Massachusetts, to execute, in marble, a full length pedestrian statue of Washington, to be placed in the centre of the rotunda of the Capitol; the head to be a copy of Houdon's Washington, and the accessories to be left to the judgment of the artist."

1832, February 23: The Secretary of State, by direction of the President, addressed to Mr. Greenough a letter of instructions for carrying into effect the resolution of the House.

1833, March 30: The Department of State, at the direction of the President, accepts the offer of Mr. Greenough dated July 8, 1832, to execute the work in 4 years for $20,000 to be paid in installments of $5,000 each.

1832, July 14: An appropriation of $5,000 was made "to enable the President of the United States to contract with a skilful artist to execute, in marble, a pedestrian statue of George Washington, to be placed in the center of the rotunda of the Capitol;" and several appropriations were made at succeeding sessions in furtherance of the same object.

May 27, 1840: By resolution of Congress, it was directed "That the Secretary of the Navy be authorized and instructed to take measures for the importation and erection of the statue of Washington by Greenough."

In pursuance of this authority, the Navy Department held a correspondence with Commodore Hull, commanding on the Mediterranean station, who entered into an agreement with the owners, or master, of the ship *Sea* for the transportation of the statue to the United States. This ship, with the statue on board, arrived in this city on the 31st ultimo and now lies at the navy yard.

July 31, 1841, statue arrived in Washington.

(From H. Doc. No. 53, August 16, 1841:)

August 13, 1841: C. K. Stribling, commanding the Navy Yard, Washington, gives a receipt to Capt. J. A. Delano, master of the ship *Sea*, for the statue of Washington.

The exact date of erection in the rotunda is not found in the files.

The statue was modeled in Florence, Italy, and the sculptor wrote to the Secretary of State March 12, 1841, that the work had occupied his entire attention during 4 years and 5 months in its execution; the time passed in making journeys, and otherwise employed with reference to it, had been nearly 1 year. He gave a detailed account of expenses incurred in modeling the statue during 1834–35 and 1836; also an account of expenses incurred in finishing in marble the statue including the purchase of the block and the transportation of the monument to Leghorn, 1839, 1840, 1841.

The statue is of marble, length 10 feet 6 inches. Height 10 feet 6 inches, width 6 feet 6 inches, and weighs somewhat under 20 tons.

(From H. Rept. No. 219, February 22, 1843:)

January 1843: The sculptor presented a memorial to Congress, praying for the removal of the statue from the rotunda to the ground in front of the western facade of the Capitol.

(P. 103, Art and Artists of the Capitol:)

Civil and Diplomatic Expenses Appropriation Act, 1844: "For the removal of the statue of Washington from its present position and permanently placing the same on a proper pedestal and covering it temporarily in the enclosed and cultivated public grounds, east of the Capitol directly in front of the main entrance and steps of the east front of the Capitol, as suggested by the report of the Joint Committee on the Library and in the letter of Mr. Greenough dated February 3, 1843, referred to and reported by said committee in connection with the memorial of Horatio Greenough, under the direction and supervision of the said Greenough, the sum of $5,000" (Stats. L, vol. 5, p. 642).

1908: Public Resolution No. 26 (60th Cong., 1st sess.) provided for removal and transfer to the custody of the Smithsonian Institution, and in the Deficiency Act approved May 30, 1908:

"Washington Statue: For transfer of the marble statue of Washington by Greenough from the plaza in front of the Capitol to the Smithsonian Institution under the direction of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, including the construction of a foundation and a marble base, $5,000" (Stat. L., vol. 35, p. 492).

1908, November 21: Removal completed.

(3) Naval or Tripoli Monument

"The year 1808 marked the arrival in Washington of a work of art known as the Naval Monument (by Micali of Leghorn, Italy), purchased by officers of the United States Navy to memorialize the losses of the Navy at Tripoli.

"The monument was brought to this country on the frigate *Constitution* and by act of Congress, approved March 13, 1808 (Stat. L., vol. 2, p. 476), the duties were remitted.

"This monument was erected at the Washington Navy Yard and remained there during the time when the yard was burned to prevent it falling into the hands of the British and some years later was removed from the Navy Yard to the west front of the Capitol, where it was located in a large pool, of which it formed the center."[3]

United States Statutes at Large, volume 4, page 462: "For rebuilding and removing the monument erected in the Navy Yard at Washington by the officers of the American Navy, to the memory of those who fell in battle in the Tripolitan War, a sum not exceeding $2,100, to be expended under the orders of the Secretary of the Navy." (Approved March 2, 1831.)

United States Statutes at Large, volume 4, page 580: "That for the purpose of paying the workmen for renewing the inscriptions, and giving uniformity of color to the naval monument, its ornaments and statues, recently removed from the Washington Navy Yard to the Capitol Square, a sum not exceeding $200 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." (Approved July 14, 1832.)

"The monument remained in this location until the year 1860, when it was taken down and reerected in the grounds of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, where it still may be seen."[4]

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
*Washington, D. C., October 11, 1955.*

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN,
*Chairman, Physical Memorial Subcommittee, Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on October 6, 1955, the drawings of the carillon tower, which your committee has commissioned Mr. Douglas Orr to design to the memory of the late Senator Robert A. Taft, were presented by the architect for the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission is glad to have the opportunity to express its opinion and highly commends the design for the memorial which, in its judgment, splendidly solves the requirements.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. FINLEY, *Chairman.*

---

DECEMBER 7, 1956.

MR. DOUGLAS W. ORR,
*New Haven, Conn.*

MY DEAR MR. ORR: Reference is made to Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, 84th Congress, agreed to by the Senate, July 22, 1955, and by the House, July 25, 1955, which provides as follows:

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation is authorized to erect on the Capitol Grounds, and present to the Congress of the United States, a memorial bell tower of appropriate design dedicated to the memory of Robert A. Taft. Such memorial shall be equipped with bells and shall be erected on the site described as square 633 on the drawing of the Architect of the Capitol. Such site is located just below the Fountain Plaza area, and lies between New Jersey Avenue on the east, Constitution Avenue on the south, C Street on the north, Louisiana Avenue diagonally on the northwest, and First Street on the west.

"SEC. 2. The design and plans for the erection of such memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, and such memorial shall be erected without expense to the United States.

"SEC. 3. The authority granted by the first section of this act shall cease to exist unless (a) within 1 year after the passage of this concurrent resolution the plans for such memorial have been presented for the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, and within 3 years after such approval, the erection of such memorial has commenced, and (b) the Architect of the Capitol finds that, prior to the commencement

---

[2] For Biography of W. W. Story, see p. 374, Arts and Artists.

[3] From Art and Artists of the Capitol of the United States, Fairman, pp. 14, 98.

[4] United States Statutes at Large, volume 12, page 83: "For the removal of the naval monument from the west front of the Capitol to the grounds of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, $1,500." (Approved June 22, 1860.)

of the erection of such memorial, sufficient funds are available to insure its completion.

"SEC. 4. After the completion of the memorial according to the approved plans and specifications, it shall be accepted on behalf of the people of the United States by the Congress and thereafter shall be maintained by the Congress as part of the Capitol Grounds."

Pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the foregoing resolution, plans for the Taft Memorial, prepared by you, were submitted to the Architect of the Capitol for approval, June 15, 1956—more than 5 weeks prior to the expiration date required for such submission under the provisions of said section 3.

Drawings for the proposed memorial having been submitted by you to the Commission of Fine Arts and the Commission having highly commended the design for the memorial as splendidly solving the requirements, and minor modifications having been made by you in such plans to conform to requirements of the Architect of the Capitol, the design, plans and specifications for the erection of such memorial, as finally considered, are hereby formally approved by the Architect of the Capitol pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the foregoing resolution.

Sincerely yours,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
*Architect of the Capitol.*

---

THE ROBERT A. TAFT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.
*Washington, D. C., October 3, 1957.*

Hon. J. GEORGE STEWART,
*Architect of the Capitol,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. STEWART: I refer to my telephone conversation with you relative to your certificate which is required before work can commence on the Robert A. Taft Memorial.

I desire to advise that firm bids for this work have been received and that the budget of expenses, including bells, bronze casting of the statue, and fees of the architect, engineers, landscape architect, sculptor and bell consultant, together with other estimated expenditures, including a reserve for contingencies of $50,000, total $719,500.

In order that you may issue your certificate, I am writing you as treasurer of the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation that there is on hand in the Riggs National Bank $600,000 U. S. Treasury bills plus cash totaling $125,000, or a total of $725,000. The United States securities are held in safekeeping and the cash is on deposit for the account of the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Construction Account, and funds are for the cost of construction and will not be used for any other purpose than for the construction on the basis of the bids and estimated expenditures hereinbefore outlined.

For withdrawal purposes this account is under the control of two signatures of the Honorable B. Carroll Reece and Honorable I. Jack Martin, countersigned by myself as treasurer or Mr. John M. Christie or Mr. Norman D. Morgan, assistant treasurers.

It would seem to me, therefore, that with this letter you have sufficient assurances to justify you to issue the certificate as these funds will be held by the Riggs National Bank only for the purpose of construction of the memorial until the work has been completed.

Yours very sincerely,

ROBERT V. FLEMING,
*Treasurer.*

THE RIGGS NATIONAL BANK,
WASHINGTON, D. C.,
*October 8, 1957.*

The Honorable J. GEORGE STEWART,
*Architect of the Capitol,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. STEWART: I, J. C. McCormack, senior vice president and cashier of the Riggs National Bank of Washington, D. C., a national banking association organized and existing under the laws of the United States of America, hereby certify that the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc., construction account was opened with this institution on October 3, 1957, with an initial deposit of $125,000, and the balance in the account as of this date is $125,000, and that we are holding in safekeeping for the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc., construction account $600,000 United States Treasury bills, $300,000 maturing November 7, 1957, and $300,000 maturing December 19, 1957.

Very truly yours,

J. C. MCCORMACK,
*Senior Vice President and Cashier.*

Attest:

NEIL H. WHEELER,
*Assistant Cashier.*

---

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
*Washington, D. C., October 9, 1957.*

Hon. B. CARROLL REECE,
*President, Robert A. Taft*
*Memorial Foundation, Inc.,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you with reference to S. Con. Res. 44, 84th Congress, agreed to by the Senate on July 22, 1955, and by the House on July 25, 1955, which authorized the erection on the Capitol Grounds of a bell tower of appropriate design dedicated to the memory of Robert A. Taft.

I now find that there are sufficient funds available in the Riggs National Bank of Washington, D. C., for the completion of such a memorial.

I am happy to certify that all requirements of S. Con. Res. 44 prerequisite to commencement of erection have been met, and trust that work on this beautiful memorial may be started at an early date.

Sincerely,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
*Architect of the Capitol.*

---

## THE EXCHANGE PROGRAM WITH PERU

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two clippings, from newspapers in Peru, concerning the recent inauguration of an exchange program with that country. These clippings were in Spanish, and I have had translations made by the Library of Congress.

I hope my colleagues will take the trouble to read this further evidence of the effectiveness of the exchange program. Of all the activities in which this country has engaged in the foreign field, I am convinced that this one returns more solid and lasting benefits than any other relative to the investment. In view of the fact that the administration has lowered by a substantial amount the request in this year's budget, this matter requires our earnest attention.

There being no objection, the translations of the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULBRIGHT COMMITTEE WILL SPEND EIGHT MILLION IN PERU ON EDUCATION

Approximately 8.5 million soles will be invested by the Fulbright committee [in Peru] in the next 2 years, thus giving reality to several educational exchange programs between Peru and the United States and translated into 95 fellowships being granted to professional men of both countries.

In announcing the plans for 1958 and 1959, the executive secretary of the Fulbright committee in Peru, Eduardo F. Indacochea, said that they would be fully operative by that time and that the projects for the coming year would start functioning within the next 2 months.

"The 1958 program," he said, "includes such interesting and useful projects as advice concerning the establishment of the school of medicine at Trujillo (a United States specialist will come here for that purpose); a course in Anglo-American law at San Marcos; research in geophysics, volcanology, and hydrology in the Arequipa region; a postgraduate course in vegetal physiology at La Molina; a chair of quantitative (space) physics at San Marcos; a course in virus study [research?] at the school of medicine, and special courses in technical and physical education in official institutions, all of them under the direction and guidance of distinguished United States specialists."

During 1958 a total of 45 fellowships will be granted; 23 will go to United States scientists and teachers, and 22 to physicians and full professors going to the United States to perfect their knowledge. (These include five fellowships for Peruvian teachers to attend the seminar on educational development which will be held at the University of Puerto Rico in October.) This entire program will represent an investment of 4 million soles.

As we know, the exchange will be effected by American citizens coming to [Peru to] study, teach, carry on research, or any other educational or cultural activity, and by Peruvian citizens going to the United States for specific study and investigation. "The financing," Indacochea said, "will be taken care of by United States Government funds and in local money (soles in our case) by virtue of special conventions." "It is not," he added, "a propaganda or technical assistance program. It is simply one of educational and cultural exchange."

But the program drafted by the Fulbright committee will reach its peak in 1959, as an investment of 4.3 million soles has been earmarked for that period. It comprises 50 fellowships (25 for Peruvians and 25 for Americans) and provides a project for medical education under which 5 professors of medicine of United States universities will be giving regular courses in physiology, pharmacology, anatomy, and biophysics at the 4 [sic] schools of medicine which by that time will have been made operative at Arequipa, Trujillo, and Lima.

For 1959 plans have also been made for projects in archeology and anthropology; short-term courses on various aspects of the culture and life in the United States, and a program of teacher training with the participation of the Escuela Normal Superior [teachers' college] and the National Institute of Education of San Marcos University.

Indacochea said in closing: "We believe that the Fulbright program in its first 3 years of application (it started limited operations this year with a budget of 1,700,000 soles and only 10 fellowships) will mean positive benefits for our country."

---

FULBRIGHT COMMITTEE: CULTURAL EXCHANGE

The United States will invest in the coming year through the Fulbright committee the sum of eight million soles in a broad cultural exchange program, which will include the coming to this country of United States experts and technicians and the granting of special scholarships for Peruvian specialists for travel to the United States in order to perfect their education. In both cases the program will directly benefit our country. The visiting scientists and experts will have

to be outstanding personalities; they would give lectures or courses in their respective specialties in the centers of higher education.

The program of the Fulbright committee includes—and this is a fundamental aspect—an allocation of funds for the establishment in due course of the projected Medical School of the University at Trujillo. This newspaper has repeatedly stated, relative to the schools of medicine of Trujillo and Arequipa, that the fundamental problem is the achievement of a high level of teaching efficiency, if necessary, through the contracting of foreign experts. The Fulbright committee affords a means of achieving that end, since its plan provides for the coming to our country of a United States expert for the specific purpose of participating in the establishment of the school of medicine at Trujillo.

Without any rhetorical designs, it may be held that a plan of cultural exchange such as that put into effect by the Fulbright committee can but produce enormous mutual benefits.

(Source: La Prensa (Lima, Peru), November 30, 1957.)

## INVESTMENTS FOR FREEDOM

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, recent events show that the economic development of the uncommitted countries of the world requires our earnest attention. We are competing with the Soviet bloc for the minds and hearts of men. Nations which recently emerged from colonialism wish to enjoy the benefits of modern industrial development. They are proud and sensitive. If they establish free enterprise economies, they will enjoy the benefits of an industrial society and retain the human values which we treasure. If they accept aid from the Communist bloc, we know that they will lose their freedom. A recent study by the State Department shows that during the past 2½ years the Soviet Union has made commitments to 10 underdeveloped nations to provide them with approximately $1½ billion in economic aid.

In addition to direct aid from the Soviet Union, proposals have been made in the United Nations to establish a special United Nations fund for economic development popularly known as SUNFED. The U. N. Economic and Social Council in the 1957 summer session recommended that the General Assembly establish this fund. This proposal was opposed by the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada. I thoroughly support this stand by our State Department. The establishment of a United Nations fund would make our economic aid available to all countries—those already embracing communism as well as the uncommitted nations. Furthermore, this fund would make it possible for Soviet technicians to be sent into uncommitted countries with the aid and support of the American taxpayer.

I do not know who first proposed SUNFED. However, Walter Reuther is one of its strongest supporters. In March of 1956, he proposed that the United States contribute an amount equal to 2 percent of our gross national product for a period of 25 years to SUNFED. That would involve an expenditure of $8 billion a year at the present level of gross national product. Over the 25-year period, Mr. Reuther is proposing that we agree to give away $200 billion.

On October 28, 1957, Dr. Leland I. Doan, the president of the Dow Chemical Co., of Midland, Mich., addressed the Economic Club of New York on the subject, "Investments for Freedom." The occasion was a unique one, as Dr. Doan occupied the same platform as Aneurin Bevan, a leader of the British Labor Party and one of the severest critics of the foreign policy of the present British Conservative Government. Dr. Doan stressed that there are limits which we are fast approaching on governmental aid by the American taxpayer. However, he stressed that there is a vast potential of untapped economic resources. This can be obtained by encouraging more private investment.

Dr. Doan said:

> There are distinct advantages in this approach. For one thing, we can be sure such capital would serve a sound economic purpose. No businessman would invest it otherwise. For another, private enterprise will automatically supply its own technical assistance, and they will be technicians grounded in the principles of freedom not in those of communism.
>
> Private enterprise will also tend to take with it American standards of education, health, housing and other aspects of our culture, and by experience and instinct will tend to elevate, rather than depress, the status of the worker. Thus we shall be reaching and benefiting very directly some of the masses whom we desire to help.

I completely endorse the views expressed by Dr. Doan. If private enterprise is to perform successfully, the Congress must continue to promote such investment.

Dr. Doan further said:

> Our own Government could take some steps to encourage investment abroad. It could, for example, extend the concept of the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation to the rest of the free world. It can understandably be argued that tax concessions on foreign investment are illogical when we are so heavily taxing the income from our domestic investments. On the contrary, by encouraging private investment such concessions should be expected to reduce the need for governmental aid, thus reducing the overall load on the taxpayers. And, of course, one may well ask: If such a policy is good for the Western Hemisphere, why not for the rest of the free world?

There is a close parallel between Dr. Doan's proposal and President Eisenhower's views on the role of private investment. In his state of the Union message he said:

> To help bring these multiple benefits, our economic aid effort should be made more effective.
>
> In proposals for future economic aid, I am stressing a greater use of repayable loans, through the Development Loan Fund, through funds generated by sale of surplus farm products, and through the Export-Import Bank.
>
> While some increase in Government funds will be required, it remains our objective to encourage shifting to the use of private capital sources as rapidly as possible.

I believe Dr. Doan's suggestions will help implement President Eisenhower's program, and in order that Dr. Doan's thoughts may aid us in our consideration of this problem, I ask unanimous consent to include his address in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### INVESTMENTS FOR FREEDOM

(By Leland I. Doan, president, the Dow Chemical Co.)

In being briefed for this very pleasant and challenging mission I was told that I was at liberty to be as controversial as I wished. This gives me some comfort, for while I do not come here for the purpose of being controversial I should hardly expect my remarks to be accepted without critical evaluation. And it would indeed be surprising if, for example, your distinguished guest, Mr. Bevan, were in accord with all of them. In any event, you will understand that such opinions as I express are simply based on what appears logical and practical to me as a businessman.

October has been a history-making month in some quite diverse matters. Milwaukee took the series away from the Yankees and the Russians won the race to outer space.

It also witnessed the arrival in our midst of a most lovely and gracious lady from Britain who gained a host of American friends and admirers.

Apart from all the specific questions and counterquestions which sputnik has raised it has served to shrink our globe still further and focus our attention even more completely on the complexity and urgency of the world's problems. The overriding one, of course, is that of differing ideologies and whether or not they can be compromised so as to enjoy a peaceful coexistence.

It would appear that the world's most basic root of unrest is the great disparity in the conditions under which men live. The most obvious is physical well-being, followed by such things as freedom from oppression, desire for self-expression, identity, equality, and so on. While the mechanism of war may be political, it springs from human factors.

As we look about our world we see have's and have-not's. We see some countries whose people have a high degree of physical well-being, relatively high cultural advance, and many such spiritual nourishments as freedom, identity and opportunity.

We see other nations where the average level of material well-being would be regarded here as gross poverty, where culture has lagged and where individual freedoms and opportunities are minimal. And, of course, we see all degrees and combinations of economic, cultural, and political conditions. We see freedom here, regimentation there, serfdom in another place. We see freedom with relative poverty in one place and relative prosperity with regimentation or a high degree of statism in another.

Such circumstances just naturally breed fear, unrest, suspicion, jealousy, and all the other emotions which lead to conflict between men and between nations of men.

Thus, we come to the general recognition that foremost among the world's needs today is that of bringing about a greater degree of equality among its people—of helping the have-not's to attain a status more comparable to that of the have's. And, of course, there is equally general recognition that such a project requires the investment of capital, resources, and technical knowledge.

The big questions, however, are: "How should these objectives be approached? By what means can they best be accomplished for the greatest good to all people?"

On these there is a great divergence of opinion between individuals, between organizations, and between nations. It is these avenues to development which I should like

to explore. And I trust you will bear in mind that this is so complex and many-faceted a subject that numerous angles or related matters will have to be ignored or taken for granted.

There are differing political philosophies regarding this problem. There is the answer of communism. This is not only a possible answer, it is so effective an answer to sheer economic development that it is our chief worry. In case we were not sufficiently aware of it, we needed only sputnik to underline Russia's ability to supply the technology. And one might note here parenthetically that she is graduating technical people at a more rapid rate than we—thus creating a vast pool of technical-assistance personnel who will carry with them the doctrines and propaganda of communism wherever they go. Further, she has indicated a willingness and ability to supply capital and resources, if need be, in large quantities.

Communism has one other asset in approaching the problem. It is quite willing to use force—to bring about change by decree.

And, of course, that is one of our big quarrels with communism and the Communist approach. It subjugates the individual to the state. The state becomes supreme, arbitrarily deciding what is good and what is not good for its subjects.

We have similar objections to less extreme forms of statism because they tend to diminish the dignity, the freedom, the opportunity of the individual.

We still believe firmly in the better mousetrap and the right of the individual to decide whether or not he will buy it. Within the framework of public safety and decency we endow the individual with the right to determine his own courses of action. Through his decisions in the market place he determines who shall succeed and fail, and he stands as a constant challenge to business and industry to build the better mousetrap.

We believe our economic vigor is due to the fact that we have elevated and unshackled the individual, have confronted him with unlimited opportunity and challenged him with responsibility.

It is natural, then, for us to believe that a similar formula is in the best interest of other peoples of the world. Thus we should like to see assistance to the less developed countries based upon principles of democracy and freedom.

Herein lies a pitfall in that we often tend to be overly self-righteous. We become so convinced that our ways of doing things are superior that we are unsympathetic to, or at least mystified by, people who do not accept them with eagerness and alacrity.

Many countries are sincerely interested in American methods, but we have to bear in mind that they may have markedly different cultures, mores and traditions which may not be compatible with some of ours. In short, while they may be interested in learning from us, they do not necessarily desire to be like us.

Also there are frequent limitations of resources, trading areas, educational levels and other factors which militate against the adoption of some of our economic practices.

Our mass market has in itself been unique, and only now do we see prospects of a similar mass market developing in Europe under the program outlined for the European Economic Community. If successful, this should alleviate many of Europe's traditional economic ills, and we can be sure it will have potent influences on our own economy.

In all, we need to approach the problem of aiding the less developed or less industrialized countries with a great deal of understanding and, conversely, bend every effort to improve their understanding of us.

The history of our Nation has been a history of investments for freedom. Our ancestors invested a lot of blood, sweat and tears because they wished to be free—and a lot more to carve a civilized nation out of a wilderness. Twice in this century we have gone into tremendously costly wars to defend our own freedom and uphold the rights of others against aggression.

Since World War II we have distributed billions upon billions of dollars in foreign aid. There has been some humanitarianism in this, and possibly some economic self-interest, but basically these also have been investments for freedom, fortifying both our own and that of the recipient countries against the spread of communism.

In fact, after years of this, we are now beginning to face up to the fact that while a tremendous need for assistance still exists—and will continue to for many years—we cannot feasibly go on bleeding ourselves forever. Our resources, while great, are not without limit, and neither is the patience of the American taxpayer.

The sharp reduction in the amount last authorized for foreign aid clearly shows that Congress is not disposed to continue so expensive a program. There is a growing sentiment for tax reduction, and from a standpoint of practical politics foreign aid is a more likely place to reduce the budget than domestic welfare programs, the benefits of which are much more evident to the voters and taxpayers.

So there is an understandable disposition to reduce foreign aid as such in the face of a continuing need on the part of less developed countries for assistance in elevating their economies. Is this bad? Are we in danger of thereby losing additional areas of the world to communism? It depends on many things, but I do not necessarily think so.

State-to-state aid, of the type we have been extending, is a direct and convenient means of supplying capital and has a number of advantages. It can be directed arbitrarily where need is greatest irrespective of normal economic forces. It can, if desired, be used for political leverage. The recipient government can control its use—direct it, for example, into needed public works, transport systems and other facilities essential to a healthy economy.

Such aid, however, is not without weaknesses. It may be too subject to vagaries of politics at either end of the line. It may be channeled into projects which have more prideful appeal than economic validity. Or it may even be channeled into the recipient country's general budget.

A further grave weakness is that it often fails to materially benefit the masses of the population whom we wish to benefit and with whom we wish to make friends. It has in some cases only served to aggravate an already undesirable situation—to call upon an old phrase, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Such are some of the pitfalls of state-to-state aid when viewed in terms of our desire to improve the condition of the world's less fortunate people.

Now we are being asked to participate in a gigantic project of multilateral aid which would be even more fraught with hazard. It is called the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development or, in the nomenclature of the age, SUNFED. I might add that the word "special" was added after the need for some initial letter preceding the "U" became painfully obvious.

SUNFED is a scheme devised by the United Nations Economic and Social Council which would call for voluntary contributions from various nations with distributions from the pool controlled by the U. N. In the initial stages the thinking was that contributions would be made as funds were released through disarmament, but as enthusiasm gathered the sentiment shifted to one of, "Why wait for disarmament? Let's do it now."

So by vote of ECOSOC the General Assembly of the United Nations will be asked this fall to set the machinery in motion.

This is no small program. Some have estimated that to support adequately such a program would require as much as $10 billion a year—extended over a period of decades.

The United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States have stood firmly against any early establishment of such a program and voted against the ECOSOC recommendation to the General Assembly.

Let us assume for a moment that we were to participate in such a program—and we would, of course, be expected to contribute heavily.

First, we would presumably have only one vote in determining the distribution of the funds. We would have no effective power to channel our investment in the directions we most desired or even to insure that it would benefit only nations friendly to the United States. This is an important consideration so long as a state of cold war exists.

Second, our contribution, being in readily convertible currency, could be spent anywhere in the world. There would be no need on the part of the recipient country to spend it for American materials and American technicians. In fact it could as readily buy materials and hire its technicians from Iron Curtain countries. Thus we could indirectly be strengthening Iron Curtain economies and helping to spread Communist propaganda into new areas.

The Russian contribution, on the other hand, would obviously be in rubles spendable only within the Soviet Union and its satellites.

There are two considerations, but I think these two should be sufficient to warn us away from any such plan. Yet there are those among us who seem totally unconcerned over such obvious dangers.

In March of 1956 Walter Reuther proposed that the United States contribute an amount equivalent to 2 percent of gross national product to such a program for a period of 25 years. Currently that would be $9 billion a year and that figure presumably would rise. His proposal included these points:

The 2 percent contribution over a 25-year period to be made without qualifications.

The program to be administered through the United Nations and multilateral agencies.

Economic aid from the world fund to be available to uncommitted as well as committed nations.

The following month, in addressing the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Adlai Stevenson proposed that all our foreign aid be channeled through the United Nations.

Perhaps these gentlemen wish to appear humanitarian and global in their thinking. Humanitarianism and global thinking are necessary and desirable, but I submit that the globe is not at this time one big happy family and we can ill afford humanitarianism in a form that may betray our own welfare and security.

Now, I presume we will find it necessary to continue some governmental foreign aid for some years to come, and we should most certainly keep it under our own control. There is need, however, to reduce it as much and as quickly as possible, and I am of the opinion that if we can bring about the right set of conditions private capital can take over a large part of this development job with advantage to itself and benefit to the host countries.

There are distinct advantages in this approach. For one thing we can be sure such capital would serve a sound economic purpose. No business man would invest it otherwise. For another, private enterprise will automatically supply its own technical

assistance—and they will be technicians grounded in the principles of freedom, not in those of communism.

Private enterprise will also tend to take with it American standards of education, health, housing, and other aspects of our culture, and by experience and instinct will tend to elevate, rather than depress, the status of the worker. Thus we shall be reaching and benefiting very directly some of the masses whom we desire to help.

Finally, since these investments will be economic and self-sustaining, we can gradually eliminate state-to-state aid as private capital takes over, thus reducing the burden on the American taxpayer.

Just last week, in San Francisco, Vice President NIXON discussed this approach, and I agree in principle with most of what he said. It is necessary, of course, to recognize that this is not a simple and easy approach. You cannot force private investment in any given direction—whether it be Indonesia or the State of Ohio. You can, however, create conditions which will attract it.

United States policies control some of these conditions, but to a far greater extent they are dependent upon the policies and attitudes of the recipient countries. Some countries, such as Canada, The Netherlands and Venezuela, have found that large amounts of American capital can be attracted by establishing favorable investment climates. This does not seem to be generally understood by the less developed countries where the need for American capital is great.

Our own Government could take some steps to encourage investment abroad. It could, for example, extend the concept of the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation to the rest of the free world. It can understandably be argued that tax concessions on foreign investment are illogical when we are so heavily taxing the income from our domestic investments. On the contrary, by encouraging private investment such concessions should be expected to reduce the need for governmental aid, thus reducing the overall load to the taxpayers. And, of course, one may well ask: If such a policy is good for the Western Hemisphere, why not for the rest of the free world?

Another potent inducement would be tax policies which would allow for the rapid recovery of investment before normal taxes were to apply. The host country would offer something similar to a certificate of necessity for tax relief, and this, in turn, would be honored by the United States Government.

Another stimulus over which we have some control would be an improved insurance plan for overseas investors against such hazards as devaluation, war damage, and so on. Our present plan is helpful but it does not cover all of the hazards inherent in foreign investment.

The greatest responsibility, of course, lies in the recipient countries themselves. And it must be recognized that in some cases the basic instability of the government, or of its international relationships, is a strong deterrent to American investment. However, minimum favorable conditions would include:

Guaranties that properties will not be expropriated or nationalized without fair compensation to be paid promptly and in a freely convertible currency.

No restrictions should be placed on the remission of earned income in freely convertible currencies, or, similarly, upon the recovery of one's initial investment through sale of properties.

No arbitrary or discriminatory laws should place burdens upon a foreign company which are not imposed upon domestic firms and, of course, the laws regulating domestic firms should be fair and just.

Such guaranties would do much to eliminate the hazards and headaches which now deter private investment in many parts of the world. Conversely, of course, American capital should not expect any special privilege simply because it is American capital. And it should further welcome the participation of capital from the host country.

Assuming foreign investment can be encouraged, we should also see to it that our tariff structure is such that it does not encourage American capital to go abroad simply for the purpose of exploiting relatively lower labor costs and importing back into the United States products which otherwise would be made here.

I oppose such practices because they tend to depress American wage levels and, in a sense, represent the exportation of jobs. Our objective should be to elevate the standards of other countries, not to reduce or freeze our own.

As the world's standards of living become more equalized the world's trade barriers can gradually be reduced and possibly, one day, eliminated.

Meanwhile, however, we should recognize that encouraging an extensive program of foreign investment implies the need for a reappraisal of tariff and trade policies to protect our domestic investment and the living standards of our own people.

Our Trade Agreements Act was first placed on the statute books in 1934 and has been extended upon each expiration with few changes. Twenty-three years have elapsed since this basic legislation, yet there is a tendency to disregard the many changes in the intervening period which affect the operation of American business.

Since 1934 we have had the Wagner Act, the Social Security Act, the Walsh-Healy Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, the Miller-Tydings Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Taft-Hartley Act. All of these, in one way or another, have tended to increase the cost of American production.

In the light of these and other influences which have come upon the scene, it seems to me our Trade Agreements Act is about due for a long and thoughtful look and perhaps a complete overhaul.

There is no single and easy road to a more equalized and happier world. The great bulk of responsibility for development and progress must rest within the various countries themselves. What I have suggested here could at most be but a small ingredient. Sometimes, however, as with a catalyst, a small amount of something can have a tremendously stimulating effect.

With encouragements and safeguards such as I have outlined, I believe private American capital could become a more potent force for good, helping to build a more global prosperity on a sound and economic basis.

It is a distinct objective, but we shall only reach it sooner if we soon take the first steps.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10146) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the week of January 26, 1958, through February 1 as National Junior Achievement Week.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 10146) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## HEALTH FOR PEACE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower cited the cooperative effort embodied in the 5-year plan to wipe malaria from the face of the earth. The President then went on to say that "we would be willing to pool our efforts with the Soviets in other campaigns against the diseases that are the common enemy of all mortals—such as cancer and heart disease."

On Sunday, January 12, in its lead editorial, the New York Times hailed the President's proposal as "a different kind of war." The Times editorial urged that we carry on a cold war in which the Russians could be our allies—a war against malaria, cancer, heart disease and the other universal killers of mankind.

In the New York Times on January 18 another editorial entitled "Health for Peace," concluded with these words regarding the President's proposal:

> These are all things that can be done readily and effectively with no revolutionary changes in our philosophy or our modes of approach. What is needed is to get our sights up. Health for peace can be a standard to which all men of goodwill can repair.

Dr. Howard Rusk, the distinguished associate editor of the New York Times and world authority on rehabilitation, devoted an entire column to the President's proposal on Sunday, January 12. He described the President's international health crusade as a bold proposal that should capture the minds and hearts of mankind throughout the world.

Dr. Rusk wrote:

> There are two significant aspects to these new proposals by the President. The first is that he should place such great emphasis upon them in such an important statement as his state of the Union message.
>
> Second, for the first time, our Federal Government has indicated in a positive way our willingness to enter into cooperative research efforts against two of mankind's greatest killers on a partnership basis with the Soviet Union.

The articles I have cited are merely samples of the enthusiastic reaction to the President's proposal. However, the enthusiastic editorial salutes had hardly subsided when the President presented his budget for fiscal 1959. To my utter consternation, I found that the President had cut the budgets for cancer and heart research below the level appropriated in fiscal 1958.

Cancer offers a striking example of the unfortunate contrast between word and deed. In the state of the Union message, the President is asking us to pool our efforts in a broadened fight against cancer, yet in his budget message he is cutting back our own domestic fight against the disease.

In 1958 cancer killed 1 man, woman, or child every 2 minutes. During every 2 minutes that the Senate has been in session today, a man, woman, or child in the United States has died from cancer.

According to a recent study by the American Cancer Society, cancer eventually strikes 2 out of every 3 American families. Unless we step up our medical research offensive against the disease, 40 million people now alive in this country will be disabled by cancer.

Comparatively speaking, we spend only pennies in the research fight against cancer. During the current year, it is estimated that the Federal Government will put only about $45 million into the research fight against cancer. This breaks down to about $1.75 per American now alive who will die from cancer. Furthermore, the funds we spend for cancer research are only a fraction of the several billion dollars in losses which cancer causes to our economy every year.

On a number of occasions I have emphasized the fact that many scientists have come before the Senate Appropriations Committee and assured us, in the most conservative terms possible, that cancer as a killer of mankind could be wiped from the face of the earth if we invested enough money in an all-out research offensive against it.

I am likewise deeply disappointed that the President has seen fit to cut the budget estimate for the National Heart Institute.

Heart disease killed more than 800,000 Americans last year, and accounted for more than 50 percent of the total deaths in our country. It is estimated that about 10 million Americans are currently suffering from diseases of the heart and circulation.

The damage to our economy caused by heart disease is staggering in its impact. Estimates presented to the Senate Appropriations Committee at hearings last May indicate that heart disease causes a $3 billion annual loss to our economy.

Yet, for research against this killer of our people and this crippler of our economy, the Federal Government last year spent less than $30 million—less than $3 per person afflicted with the disease.

Over the past 5 years, many of the Nation's most distinguished heart specialists have appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee, at their own expense, giving the facts that demonstrated the inadequacy of the sums recommended and allocated by the Eisenhower administration to research against heart disease. For example, in May 1955, Dr. Paul Dudley White, who attended the President during his unfortunate heart attack, appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee and stated that "the United States is one of the most unhealthy countries in the world today, in large part because of this serious threat of coronary heart disease."

The grim realities with which we are confronted in the vital field of health are the compelling reasons that I strongly propose that we initiate a dynamic program of health for peace. As a part of this program, I suggest, first of all, that the President submit to Congress a substantial supplemental budget increase for research against cancer and heart disease during fiscal 1959. I further suggest that the President submit to the Congress during this session a long-range research program against these two diseases. This type of proposal would be similar in manner to the 1954 proposal for a 5-year program stepping up each year the sums available for vocational rehabilitation. In each year since 1954 the Congress has appropriated the increased sums called for in the 5-year program.

Second. I propose that the United States expand its participation in the international programs dedicated to fighting these diseases. In the article to which I have referred previously, Dr. Rusk pointed out that "the World Health Organization's budget of only $13,500,000 is far too small for it to undertake even token projects in basic or clinical research in such diseases as cancer and heart disease."

Last year, less than 1 percent of our mutual-security budget was devoted to health. We have reason to believe that, if we devoted a larger percent of the program to health, we would more effectively gain the friendship and gratitude of the peoples we seek to help.

Third. I propose that we take the initiative in planning international research attacks on cancer and heart disease. For example, there is an international conference on cancer scheduled for this July in London. I propose that we send an official governmental delegation of leading scientists and Members of Congress to initiate a worldwide research attack against this insidious disease. The incidence of cancer is rising in all parts of the world and humanity must unite and pool its scientific efforts to turn back the tide.

Fourth. I propose an official exchange program between Russian and American scientists working in the fields of cancer and heart disease. In the last year, we have had informal visits of a few Russian doctors to this country and a few of our doctors have visited Russia in an unofficial capacity. I think these visits should be formalized. As a start I propose that our Government invite 10 Russian doctors—5 specialists in heart disease and 5 specialists in cancer—to come to the National Institutes of Health here in Washington and sit down with a comparable group of distinguished American doctors to plan a joint pooling of research efforts against these diseases.

Fifth. I propose that we initiate plans for an international clearinghouse of medical research information, not only on cancer and heart disease, but on all the major illnesses which plague humanity.

I propose an official program of exchange between Russian and American scientists working in the fields of cancer and heart disease. If this can be done within the present mechanism of the World Health Organization, it should be proposed by the American delegation at the World Health Assembly here in the United States in May of this year.

Time does not permit a full discussion of the tremendous advantages our country can gain in leading an all-out attack against these universal diseases. We must not forget that there is an underprivileged two-thirds of the human race which is afflicted by the ravages of disease. Every 60 seconds, 20 people somewhere in the underprivileged two-thirds of the world die from malaria, tuberculosis, or intestinal infections. Twenty persons in that area died while I have spoken this one paragraph.

In the field of diseases, our world has become very small indeed. In this modern air age, a traveler can pick up an infectious disease in India and can spread it to many points in the United States. Diseases such as Asian influenza, starting in one country, rapidly moved to our country. These deadly diseases know no territorial boundaries; they know no people of any particular nation. They spread from one nation to another. Our only safety lies in prevention of disease at the source. For the first time in the long history of man, we now have the technical knowledge we need in order to do the job against many of these diseases. The campaign against malaria is a dramatic example of a pooled effort to wipe out this scourge of mankind. In the past few years we have reduced the number of persons suffering from malaria from 300 million to 200 million, and deaths from malaria have dropped from 3 million to 2 million a year. Furthermore, the campaign against malaria has been remarkably inexpensive. At a cost of approximately 20 cents per capita, we have wiped out malaria in many parts of the globe.

These campaigns have paid off magnificently, not only in increased health, but also in greatly increased productivity. World Health officers in Bengal found that, with malaria under control, the farmers in that area were able to produce 543 pounds more rice per acre. In the Philippine Islands, a 2-year campaign against malaria became the key factor in the economic rehabilitation of the islands.

Our public health workers superbly demonstrated what could be done against disease at the close of World War II. When that war ended, epidemics of malaria, smallpox, typhus, and tuberculosis paralyzed wide areas of the European Continent, making economic recovery virtually impossible. In 3 years, our public health workers and the native health personnel turned the tide. By 1948, death rates in Western Europe were the lowest ever recorded. We know that no other type of assistance pays richer dividends in gratitude and friendship than our investment in fighting disease, protecting the health, and lengthening the life spans of afflicted peoples.

The constitution of the World Health Organization reminds us that the enjoyment of the highest standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of all human beings. Here is a wonderful opportunity for the free world. If we are to win the peoples of the world over to our side, what better way is there than by offering them the priceless boon of health and long life? Communism

breeds in disease, poverty, and human suffering. We must strengthen the diseased and afflicted peoples, so they can stand up and make a free choice between democracy and Communist despotism.

Mr. President, we now have within our grasp the building of a united front of the peoples of the world against the universal diseases which know no geographical boundaries. But we must act, and act boldly, now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the complete editorial entitled "Health for Peace," which was published in the New York Times of January 18.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH FOR PEACE

President Eisenhower has made an appeal to this Nation and to others that more of our resources and skills be mobilized in a more vigorous campaign for health. This is part of the whole program of waging peace and of turning strength into constructive channels.

There are some things that can be done immediately. The first, obviously, is the earmarking of a more substantial part of our foreign-aid fund for definite health objectives. Up to this point, it must be confessed, not as much as 1 percent of our total aid funds has gone specifically for this fight for the sick and the crippled.

Beyond this there is a need for prompt and coordinated planning. This means the enlargement of the scope of some of the projects that are already in being and the extension of techniques that have been proved and lessons that have been learned to much wider fields. The good work that has been done thus far in malaria control, for example, should be promptly extended to a global attack upon tuberculosis. The therapy is already developed. All that is lacking is the organization to put it to use.

This broader scope in our efforts, however, should go beyond the mere appropriation of money or the application of developed techniques. It should embrace the use of our understanding of the human aspects of our global health for peace offensive. This means a new impetus for research in the disease field. On the human side, also, we need a broader exchange of both scientists and students. This is not expensive in proportion to the enormous benefits that can be gained.

These are all things that can be done readily and effectively with no revolutionary changes in our philosophy or our modes of approach. What is needed is to get our sights up. "Health for peace" can be a standard to which all men of good will can repair.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, in regard to the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] on the budget for the Public Health Service, from which remarks we learn that the Senator from Alabama is of the opinion that the President's solicitude is not matched by the budget estimates for this purpose, I point out to the Senator that for the fiscal year 1958 the Senate Appropriations Committee, without regard to the budget estimates, added very, very substantial sums for the items for the Public Health Service, for explorations in the cardiac and in the cancer fields.

So I think the budget submitted for fiscal 1959 is quite in line with that of 1958 as it originally came before the Congress.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF WORKING UNCEASINGLY FOR LASTING PEACE AND THE DIGNITY OF MAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have received a letter from a 24-year-old housewife of Lindenhurst, Long Island. Although I am a new Member of the Senate, I ask the indulgence of the Senate in order that I may read the letter to the Senate at this time. Senators have been talking about crises; and here are the people, epitomized by this letter—which is not long—speaking in terms of what is in their hearts:

LINDENHURST, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.,
*January 6, 1958.*

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
*New York City, N. Y.*

DEAR SENATOR: I am a mother, 24 years old, with 2 very young sons and I feel I must write you because I am so very confused and frightened by current events. I may not make sense at times, but then—can a parent think straight when he looks upon his child's face, with so much innocence there, and then foresees a future of terror and destruction?

I am neither a Republican or Democrat, as I vote for the man I feel most fit to serve his country. I voted for you for that reason and now I, as an American, am asking you "What is happening and what can we do about it?" If money can bring the defense needed to protect my children's lives then I am willing to be taxed more, and more, until perhaps, with God's mercy, there will come a night when I may sleep unafraid, safe, and once again secure.

It appears to me there is so much talking being done in our Halls of Congress and very little action. We have committees for everything and yet how much is accomplished by them? When Pearl Harbor was attacked we rallied, because we were at war, well we are at war today to prevent war—why can't this be realized? Everyone is shouting we are too complacent—I am not and neither are my friends and neighbors. At get-togethers over coffee women no longer discuss their hairdos or latest styles, they talk of missiles and sputniks and war. Please tell the Members of Congress that they have the people's support—if they must tax us more let it be done—don't let money stand in the way of our children's futures. Don't let party politics come before defense which means our very existence. Don't be afraid of losing a vote if in your heart you feel you are right. No one, who can be called a true American, who has children, could in his heart cry out against what our Government feels must be done.

I know when I see my child, sleeping in his bed, safe and secure I say to myself "What is his future?" He knows not the meaning of war, or satellites, or bombs, or death. I will do anything in my power to protect that innocence, sacrifice anything so that someday I may say to him "My son, here is your world, your future is safe and you are free as God meant you to be." I do not believe that God in Heaven meant man to live in fear, in underground shelters, nor to destroy himself, but I believe He has finally made us realize what freedom is, and how we must fight to save it. For if as some believe, war is inevitable let us be prepared to the fullest, to salvage humanity as best we can and pray to our Father in Heaven that we win and to also remember, "It is better to die on one's feet than live on one's knees."

Very truly yours,
Mrs. WALTER F. KENNEDY.

I had the permission of Mrs. Kennedy to read her letter to the Senate.

I was pleased to reply to her as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1958.

Mrs. WALTER F. KENNEDY,
*Lindenhurst, Long Island, N. Y.*

DEAR MRS. KENNEDY: Thank you so much for your very moving letter. You reflect the views of millions of young American mothers and fathers who share your deep worry over the precariousness of the peace and your strong determination to do whatever must be done, by the citizens and the Government, to keep our Nation strong for defense and to work unceasingly for lasting peace and the dignity of man.

You may be sure that the issues of security and freedom are paramount in my mind as the No. 1 obligation in representing my constituents. I am taking the liberty of including an address I am making in San Francisco that spells out my specific recommendations in detail, but I did want to write you this personal and solemn note.

I, too, have small children. As a parent as well as your Senator, your sincere words went to my heart. I know the resources of mind and spirit of the American people as you typify them in your letter. We will unite to do whatever must be done to meet the challenge and we will willingly pay the cost of winning the right to freedom and human dignity.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
*United States Senator.*

Mr. President, if anything was ever needed to spur men to great actions, it is a feeling of this kind, which is deep in the hearts of the people of our country. I consider it a great honor to read this letter to the Senate of the United States.

## FINANCIAL PLIGHT OF AMERICAN RAILROAD INDUSTRY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when I was in my home State for 3½ months this past autumn, many executives, employees, and stockholders of America's railroads discussed with me the financial plight of these carriers. I met with members of railroad brotherhoods who are alarmed over the future of their jobs. A distressingly large number of Oregon railroad workers already have been hit by layoffs.

This is why I recently addressed a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON], urging early hearings on the problems of the railroads. He is to be commended for his characteristically prompt and effective action. I have been pleased to note a statement of last week by the chairman of the subcommittee studying the difficulties of the railroads, the able Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], to the effect that he believes Congress must take early steps to preserve the railroad industry and thus strengthen the country's economy. I am gratified that this attention is being accorded so immediate and urgent a problem.

Because the railroads' plight is now an issue confronting all of us, I believe the Senate should see a thoughtful editorial on the subject which was published January 16 by one of America's foremost daily newspapers, the New York Times, under the title "Can Railroads Be Saved?" I ask unanimous consent, Mr.

President, that this editorial appear in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN RAILROADS BE SAVED?

The Senate subcommittee hearing in Washington on problems of the railroads, held under the chairmanship of Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, has produced some gloomy testimony from road presidents. The condition is precarious; bankruptcy is around the corner; the roads are being nibbled to death by overregulation. Subsidized competition, declining freight traffic, heavy loss on passenger service, bargain rates to the Government for carrying mail, increasing labor costs, restriction of mergers—these are among the bases of complaint by a sick industry.

The day has long passed when the railroads could be regarded as a sinister, malevolent monopoly. Trucks, buses, pipelines, airplanes, the private automobile have changed that. Government, by building streets, highways, limited-access superhighways, bridges, tunnels, airports, terminals, and by providing other forms of tax subsidy or favored treatment, has put the railroads in their place, which is now the bottom of the heap.

Can the railroads be saved at all? Are they today's anachronism, surviving as a vestigial tail of transportation? The answer must depend largely on railroad management and ownership itself. But if it seems to the Smathers committee, as it seems to us, that public interest absolutely requires the healthy survival of the railroads, then Government must give the railroads a chance to fight on even terms for their lives.

It might begin with a reduction of regulation, a drastic reduction. There is, now, a double or triple jeopardy, costly, frustrating, and time-consuming. It starts with the Interstate Commerce Commission, trickles down through State regulatory bodies and finally into local government. Prices are fixed, in peace as in war. Government would not presume to tell a retail merchant that he could not close a branch store that was failing to produce profit, or diversify into other forms of business. Government has no hesitation to insist on continuation of highly unproductive railroad service or restrict diversification and merger.

Certain tax relief is possible. While the railroads, on a national basis, emphasize the end of subsidy to competitors rather than subsidy for themselves, cities and metropolitan areas—pondering what dire consequences would follow abandonment of local railroad commuter services—will have to face up to subsidy or, at the very least, a generous curtailment of taxation exacted of railroads. This process has begun; it is merely an extension, which seems somewhat novel because the railroads are privately owned, of what New York City does with its own railroad, the subway system. Here the taxpayer carries the whole load of capital construction and equipment purchase.

We have a curious situation. The public interest demands that the railroads not go out of business. Yet government, representing the public, fails year after year, hearing after hearing, to advance a positive program; it continues a policy of negation through regulation. If the railroads are really doomed by progress, then why not try letting them, for once in their long history, have their own way, their last chance to compete as they will in a free enterprise system? If this took them along the road to suicide, then at least government would not be to blame.

## THE MARVELOUS EFFICIENCY OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is one figure in the President's economic report that should be burned into the consciousness of every citizen who believes in the American dream. On page 108, table E–1, of the economic report it is stated that man-hour productivity of the American farmer has increased since 1947 by more than 80 percent. In that same table, Mr. President, is the further fact that in this identical period man-hour productivity in all other industries increased by less than 30 percent.

The heart of the American dream, Mr. President, is that in this great system of economic freedom of ours anyone who works very hard, who applies his intelligence, and who produces more, will win his reward.

The facts are clear, Mr. President. The farmer has increased his productivity nearly three times as fast as the rest of the American workers. He has used his ingenuity, his capital, his brainpower and musclepower to achieve a marvelous improvement in efficiency. Under the American dream his reward should have shot up for this great contribution. Instead it has dropped. It has fallen fast and hard and far. The farmer's reward for by far the greatest efficiency improvement in our economy has been a sinking cut in his income since 1947 by 35 percent.

At the very time the farmer's income has dwindled, the income of virtually everyone else in the economy has pushed ahead rapidly. The great injustice in American economic life today, Mr. President, is that the farmer, who is working longer hours than anyone, and with such a rapidly increasing efficiency, is receiving less than half the total per capita income of those off the farm.

Mr. President, this is why it is so imperative that this session of Congress enact a farm law that will work. This gross injustice to American farmers must not continue.

Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

## THE AMERICAN ECONOMY STANDS STILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, every American must look with deep concern at the tragic revelation in the President's economic report that last year our country's industrial production failed to increase at all. Table I on page 10 of this report discloses that the United States enjoyed a more than 4 percent average annual increase in industrial production since 1947–49. But last year there was no increase whatsoever.

At a time when we are engaged in a race for survival with the Soviet Union, this stagnation is alarming. Reliable estimates indicate that while we were standing still last year, industrial production in Soviet Russia continued the headlong expansion which has been so much more rapid than ours ever since 1945.

Mr. President, the Free World must base its fight for freedom squarely on the productivity of the American economy. None of us doubts that America's free economic system can outproduce Soviet Russia. But it will take leadership that insists on moving forward and moving steadily and swiftly. There is nothing in the President's economic report to indicate that there is any understanding of the immensity and urgency of the challenge our economy faces.

It is time that American leadership faces up to this paradox of idleness by more than one-third of our steel industry, nearly half of our auto capacity, and more than 4 million productive American workers at the very time when we confront our sternest military and economic tests.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

## FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPITAL TIMES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Capital Times has been the crusading and independent voice of Wisconsin's progressive people now for 40 years. I am greatly impressed by how widely throughout the Nation the Capital Times is read and respected. To a remarkable degree, the reputation and the spirit of Wisconsin are represented in the public mind by this outstanding newspaper. Nowhere else in the country does there survive any other newspaper that so well exemplifies the golden age of personal journalism—of outspoken independence, of crusading zeal, of courageous devotion to the public interest—which has been all but submerged in the present day's mode of big business commercialization of the news and big business saturation of the editorial page.

My own regard for the Capital Times is exceptionally intimate and particularly high. It was the reputation of this outstanding newspaper that drew me to Wisconsin. As a former reporter on its staff, and as a daily reader in its home community, I learned to value its unique contribution. As a candidate for high State office in several hard-fought campaigns, I have been privileged indeed to have its tremendously significant support. In my successful campaign for the United States Senate, it was the only daily newspaper in Wisconsin that supported me. I confidently hope that in the resurgence of Wisconsin's great progressive tradition, that I believe is certainly at hand in this year of 1958, the Capital Times will continue to blaze the trail ahead to the great reforms which are needed to maintain the faith and the morale of progressive public servants, and to furnish the public understanding without which great public accomplishments are not possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from Labor, the

publication of railroad brotherhoods, entitled "40 Years of Crusading," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTY YEARS OF CRUSADING

Crusading daily papers are rare in this country, and those which survive 4 decades are rarer still—but there's one which has just celebrated its 40th birthday and bids fair to go on for many years more. That's the Capital Times of Madison, Wis., edited by William T. Evjue, who himself not long ago celebrated his own 75th fighting year.

In the birthday issue of the Times, Evjue graphically recalled the hard struggle in getting the paper started and in keeping it alive. He tells graphically, too, of the waves of hysteria and bigotry which buffeted the Times through the years.

The paper was launched in December 1917 as a champion of Senator "Old Bob" LaFollette and his progressive Republican movement. LaFollette was then being denounced as disloyal and pro-German because he opposed America's entry into World War I.

Evjue recounts how from the first issue the paper faced an advertising boycott; its newsboys were hounded on the streets and threatened with jail; some supporters who pledged funds to finance the paper ran out, all because the paper was friendly to "Battle Bob."

"I have not in my lifetime seen anything to compare with the hatred inspired against LaFollette," Evjue writes. "People whose battles he had fought with every ounce of his boundless energy and passion for justice turned against him."

Evjue then tells how the advertising boycott kept going for a year, but the paper, with a mounting circle of stanch friends, kept afloat.

By February 12, 1919, it had attained 10,000 circulation (today it has over 45,000). Evjue reproduces in the Times a colorful hand-written letter he received from "Old Bob" LaFollette a few days later.

"It was fitting," LaFollette wrote to Evjue, "that you should cross the 10,000 mark on Lincoln's birthday. In its field the Times is a daily emancipation proclamation."

LaFollette went on to point out that "the enemies of democracy are entrenched in every community; they speak through Presidents and Cabinets; they rule in Congress; they are in the pulpits; they control the press." Then "Old Bob" closed with a plea to go on with the fight against reaction. That fight has made great gains, but Tories are still in most places of power.

Evjue then recalls that the real vindication for LaFollette came in 1922 when he won reelection to the United States Senate by the greatest margin ever accorded a statewide candidate up to then. This, says Evjue, convinced him that the people can be temporarily swayed by hysteria and fear, but they will eventually return to sound reasoning that have given democracy its real strength.

(A greater vindicaton came in May this year when "Old Bob" was among five noted Americans nominated for the United States Senate's Hall of Fame.)

Evjue closes by pointing out that "a crusading newspaper always has to take it on the chin because in serving the public interest it must expect to incure the enemity of special interests."

"During the past 40 years," he concludes, "these special interests have used the labels of pro-Germanism, pro-Romanism, and pro-communism in seeking to destroy this newspaper. But the demagogs who raised these issues have gone into political oblivion. Meantime the Capital Times continues its fight for good government, the public welfare, freedom for American citizens and the right of every citizen to the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness."

## PROTESTS AGAINST CUT IN MILK PRICES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, dairy farmers in Wisconsin and throughout the Nation are stunned by the cruel order of Secretary Benson to slash their milk prices on next April 1, which has been followed up with the recommendation of President Eisenhower in his farm message for authority to let Secretary Benson cut milk prices even further in subsequent years.

Farm people have been writing and telegraphing me in great numbers to protest against this unnecessary and unjustified action by the administration. I believe that these messages contain much information that should be brought to the attention of each Member of the Senate. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that these messages which I have received from major farm organizations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 17, 1958.*

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

The Wisconsin Independent Milk Producers Association, representing most of milksheds supplying Milwaukee and Chicago, worried over dairy situation and market outlook for producers, request your undivided effort toward satisfactory dairy program and suggest it is high time United States follows lead of other countries, notably Dominican Republic, in fostering sound dairy industry based upon strong Holstein-Friesen bloodlines and broad use of dairy products. The Dominican Republic has solved agricultural problems worthy your study and attention.

CHARLES DINEEN,
*Secretary.*

---

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 21, 1958.*

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

For your information, the following telegram was sent to Senators YOUNG, THYE, and MUNDT:

"In view of the great harm already inflicted upon farm families and Main Street businessmen by the agricultural policies of this administration since 1953, which has drastically reduced the net income and purchasing power of farmers, and in view of the recently announced policies of President Eisenhower in his farm message to reduce price supports below the disaster level, and in view of the misinformation which Secretary Benson attempted to spread before your committee last week, we, the undersigned, sincerely believe that you, the Republican members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, by reason of your successful support of Eisenhower's reelection in 1956, have a moral responsibility to keep faith with your constituents by interceding with the President and informing him of the true facts and situation in agriculture and persuading him to revise his policies to avoid certain disaster in one of America's major industries. We request that you urge the President to immediately use his executive authority to rescind the order cutting wheat supports 22 cents per bushel on the 1958 crop and the order cutting manufacturing milk 25 cents per hundredweight to take effect April 1, 1958. In the event of the President's refusal, you should not only immediately initiate support legislation to reverse these cuts and to prohibit any further cuts in price supports on any farm commodity, but you also should join in initiating and supporting broad legislation to restore a fairer share of income to farmers. The need is urgent and immediate. The responsibility is yours as much as it is the President's."

M. W. Thatcher, General Manager, Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.; Thomas H. Steichen, General Manager, Farmers' Union Central Exchange, South St. Paul, Minn.; Glenn J. Talbott, Chairman, National Farmers' Union Executive Committee, and President, North Dakota Farmers' Union, Jamestown; Paul W. Opsahl, President, South Dakota Farmers' Union, Huron; Leonard E. Kenfield, President, Montana Farmers' Union, Great Falls; Kenneth W. Hones, President, Wisconsin Farmers' Union, Chippewa Falls; Edwin Christianson, President, Minnesota Farmers' Union, St. Paul; Glenn A. Long, Manager, Farmers' Union Marketing Association, South St. Paul.

---

FOND DU LAC, WIS., *January 16, 1958.*

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Our State board of directors, in session today, January 16, 1958, were stunned by President Eisenhower's message on agriculture wherein he recommends that dairy support minimums be lowered to 60 percent of parity and wherein he considers dairying along with peanuts, tobacco, and the other basic commodities. At present parity figures, the President's proposal would permit the lowering of 3.95 percent milk to about $2.40 per hundredweight. This could cost Wisconsin dairy farmers another $95 million per year in dairy income in addition to the $45 million cut Benson has announced for the next production year.

We urge that you use every possible means to institute a $3.50 per hundredweight mandatory minimum dairy support price, and that legislation for self-help be enacted at as early a date as possible that would legally permit dairy farmers to conduct their own dairy support and stabilization program.

The President's request for authority to cut dairy farmers returns when at the same time he recommends legislation to increase Government employees wages, foreign-aid costs and defense spending is incomprehensible. American farmers who produce food are this administration's forgotten class.

We want to visit with you on this serious matter next week.

WM. C. ECKLES,
*General Manager, Pure Milk Products Cooperative.*

---

MARINETTE COUNTY
POMONA GRANGE, No. 27,
*Wausaukee, Wis., January 15, 1958.*

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
*United States Senator,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: At a recent meeting of our Marinette County Pomona Grange, which embraces Marinette and Oconto Counties, a discussion centered around milk prices, parity, and Secretary Benson. All seemed to think that lowering the parity from 82 to 75 percent on dairy products would prove disastrous to the dairy farmer in Wisconsin. Our solid membership petitions you to use your influence in every way possible to fight these price-support cuts.

Very truly yours

Mrs. PEARL BAYLESS,
*Secretary.*

BONDUEL COOPERATIVE LIVESTOCK SHIPPING ASSOCIATION,
*Bonduel, Wis., January 17, 1958.*

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The annual meeting of the Bonduel Cooperative Livestock Shipping Association was held on January 10, 1958, at Bonduel, with a membership of 400 farmers. During the course of the meeting, the members voted that the directors should formulate the following resolution and forward a copy to you.

Bonduel, being a dairy community, receives about 90 percent of its income from the sale of dairy products.

Any lowering of the parity price of dairy products would greatly curtail the buying power of our farmers. It would force some of the smaller farmers to find work in nearby cities to bolster their dwindling income, and even force some to sell their farms.

We request you to do everything in your power to retain the present level of parity (90 percent) and to support us by voting against any lowering of the parity level.

Yours for better farming.

NORMAN BURMEISTER,
*Secretary.*

---

RICHLAND COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION,
*Richland Center, Wis., January 16, 1958.*

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
*United States Senator,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: The Richland Cooperative Electric Board, at its last meeting, directed me as secretary to write to you and ask for your assistance in reversing the order of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, under which dairy price supports will be cut to the minimum level under present law. Wisconsin farmers are already eating into their depreciation and other reserves to keep going, and the action of the Secretary in pulling the rug out from under them will result in complete bankruptcy for many of the hard pressed farmers.

National Milk Producers Federation has estimated that dairymen will lose about $250 million in income next year as a result of the Benson cut. Experience has plainly demonstrated that previous cuts by Secretary Benson have not resulted in any decrease in surpluses, and have not improved the prices of milk and dairy products in the market place. At a time when reliable reports indicate that Wisconsin dairy farmers are earning an average of only 43 cents an hour, for working time last year, we cannot find language strong enough to condemn this unfortunate action in further depressing farm income.

We call upon you to give us every assistance possible in securing a reversal of this unfair order.

Very truly yours,

THERON M. JANNEY,
*Secretary.*

---

## FAILURE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION TO PROTECT VETERAN BORROWERS ON MORTGAGES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss another situation wherein the Veterans' Administration failed to recognize any responsibility to protect the veteran and sat idly by and allowed him to be taken advantage of by the lender.

On September 12, 1949, Mr. Charles T. Armbruster, a veteran, and Margaret C. Armbruster, his wife, purchased a home at 7 Gordon Place, Scranton, Pa., purchase price $2,800. They were granted a loan of $2,800 to finance this transaction by the Polish National Union of America in Scranton, Pa., with the Veterans' Administration issuing a guaranty of 50 percent of the loan—or $1,400.

On August 3, 1949, Mr. William C. Winstone, a private fee appraiser designated by the Veterans' Administration, had appraised this property on an as is basis for $2,500. On August 9, 1949, Mr. Winstone advised that he had made a typographical error and changed the as is reasonable value to $2,800, which new valuation covered the amount of the mortgage.

The cost of the property was listed as $2,800, plus $300 deemed necessary for repairs, plus $118 representing closing costs. Thus the veteran's cash outlay was $418 for repair and costs; and the mortgage, $2,800.

After living in this home, 7 Gordon Place, for about a year they were advised that an error had been made and that they had been deeded 5 Gordon Place. Upon being notified of this mistake, a new deed and a new mortgage were executed correcting the error.

From March of 1950 until November of 1952, payments of $20 per month were made, and then the veteran became unemployed. In 1953 they offered the property for sale with the G & G real estate company located in the First National Bank of Scranton, requesting that the property be sold for enough to cover the mortgage price.

On March 2, 1954, they received a letter from Attorney Alphonse C. F. Kenowski—exhibit No. 1—stating that he had before him the bond and mortgage executed as security for the $2,800 loan due the Polish National Union of America, with instructions from the bank to sell the property by sheriff's sale unless payment was made. In this same letter he pointed out that the additional costs involved through the sheriff's sale would be at least $400 and suggested that these additional costs could be saved if Mr. and Mrs. Armbruster would be willing to execute a deed for the property to the holder of the mortgage, the Polish National Union Bank.

The attorney was promptly notified that they would be glad to sign the deed, and on March 12, 1954, they received a second letter from the same attorney, Mr. Kenowski—exhibit No. 2—enclosing the deed and requesting that they sign and have it properly notarized. In this same letter the attorney promised:

> After this is done there will be no further debts or obligations due from you to the Polish National Union of America.

This deed was promptly signed and returned as requested.

On March 26, 1954, Mr. Kenowski—exhibit No. 3—acknowledged receipt of the deed properly signed; however, he said that before the bank could record the deed it would need a certificate showing that the notary public who acknowledged the signatures was duly qualified as a notary. This certificate certifying the eligibility of the notary public for attachment to the deed was promptly returned, and the veteran by so doing had every right to feel that this closed the transaction.

On August 4, 1954, 4 months later—exhibit No. 4—Mr. and Mrs. Armbruster received a letter from the Veterans' Administration demanding immediate payment of the full mortgage. They stated that the mortgage was in default, and unless it was promptly paid they would foreclose on the property. This letter from the Veterans' Administration included the warning that:

> Unless you are able to make satisfactory arrangements for curing the default, you will lose your property and your credit standing in your community will be seriously affected.

This was over 4 months after the veteran had deeded the property to the Polish Union Bank on the basis of its promise that by so doing they would be relieved of all further debts from the bank.

The bank and the Veterans' Administration, further ignoring the transfer and acceptance of the above-mentioned deed, on September 10, 1954, had this property sold at sheriff's sale. The Polish National Union of America, the mortgagor, was the buyer of the property at the price of $549.49. The costs of the sheriff's sale were listed as $443.90. These costs added to the original mortgage, plus back interest and taxes, brought the total indebtedness of the veteran to $3,784.29, against which was applied the $549 received for the property. Thus the Polish National Union now had two deeds for this property—one from the veteran and one from the sheriff—and a full mortgage claim against the veteran and the Veterans' Administration for their part of the guaranty.

Proof that this property's valuation had not deteriorated is evidenced by the fact that on December 20, 1954, the Polish National Union Bank resold the property for $3,500—Deed Book No. 517, page 559, Lackawanna County, Pa.

The bank then called upon the Veterans' Administration for a payment of the original 50-percent guaranty, and this Government agency gratuitously wrote them a check for $1,381.09.

The Veterans' Administration is now proceeding to file a claim against the veteran for the collection of this $1,381.09 and is completely ignoring the veteran's agreement with the bank's attorney that his debt to the bank was paid in March 1954 when he gave the bank a deed to his property.

I am requesting that the appropriate Senate committee give attention to the question as to whether this is an isolated case or a common practice which is being followed.

Also, in view of the facts surrounding this case I do not think the Veterans' Administration was justified in paying the bank since the bank already had title to the property originally insured. Therefore, I am requesting that the Veterans' Administration again reexamine this case to see if the bank rather than the veteran, is not the one to be billed for the $1,381.09.

I ask unanimous consent that insertions labeled 1, 2, 3, and 4, the correspondence to which I have referred, be incorporated in the RECORD, at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT No. 1

KENOWSKI & KENOWSKI,
*Scranton, Pa., March 2, 1954.*

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES ARMBRUSTER,
*Wilmington, Del.*

DEAR SIR AND MADAM: I have before me the bond and mortgage executed by you as security for a loan in the sum of $2,800 due to the Polish National Union of America.

I am instructed to issue immediate execution on said bond and mortgage and have your property at 7 Gordon Place sold by the sheriff. Of course this procedure will add additional costs in the sum of at least $400, thereby increasing the debt on the said property to that extent.

If you desire to save these additional costs, will you execute a deed for the said property to the Polish National Union of America? If you are willing so to do, kindly advise me by return mail and I shall send you a deed for your signatures.

Thanking you for your kind cooperation in the premises, I am,

Yours very truly,

ALPHONSE C. F. KENOWSKI.

EXHIBIT No. 2

KENOWSKI & KENOWSKI,
*Scranton, Pa., March 12, 1954.*

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES ARMBRUSTER,
*Wilmington, Del.*

DEAR SIR AND MADAM: In accordance with your letter of March 10 last, I contacted Harry Gordon and received from him your deed and have drawn a new deed from you to the Polish National Union of America.

You will please sign your names on the second page thereof, opposite the spaces pencilled with an X, then have a notary public acknowledge the said deed and attach thereto a certificate showing his power to take acknowledgements and return the same to me. After this is done there will be no further debts or obligations due from you to the Polish National Union of America.

Thanking you for your kind cooperation in the premises, I am,

Yours very truly,

ALPHONSE C. F. KENOWSKI.

EXHIBIT No. 3

KENOWSKI & KENOWSKI,
*Scranton, Pa., March 26, 1954.*

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES ARMBRUSTER, Sr.,
*Wilmington, Del.*

DEAR SIR AND MADAM: Receipt of the deed to the Polish National Union of America is hereby acknowledged. However, before I can record the deed I must have a certificate showing that the notary public who acknowledged your signatures is duly qualified as such.

Will you therefore see the notary public and ask him to give you such a certificate and then send it to me and I shall attach it to the deed.

Thanking you for your kind cooperation, I am,

Yours very truly,

ALPHONSE C. F. KENOWSKI.

EXHIBIT No. 4

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
REGIONAL OFFICE,
*Wilkes-Barre, Pa., August 4, 1954.*

Mr. CHARLES T. ARMBRUSTER,
*Scranton, Pa.*

DEAR MR. ARMBRUSTER: We have received advice from the lending institution that your loan, as described above, is in default and that it intends to foreclose the mortgage on your property unless satisfactory arrangements are made for taking care of the past due payments at an early date.

We are sure that you recognize the importance of your taking care of the delinquent payments on your loan without delay. First, unless you are able to make satisfactory arrangements for curing the default, you will lose your property and your credit standing in your community will be seriously affected. In addition, if the Government is required to pay a claim on the loan, any amount paid to the lender in your behalf will represent a debt which you owe the Government. Afterward, any compensation or pension which you may be receiving or to which you may be entitled in the future could be withheld in whole or in part until the debt was satisfied.

If you are interested in saving your property, you are urged to see your lender immediately and to make arrangements to bring your account up to date. If you are unable to work out a plan with the lender which will save your property and you believe that the advice of this office will be of any assistance to you, we will be pleased to discuss your problems with you at your convenience. An appointment for this purpose may be obtained by writing this office at the above address or telephoning number VA 3-1131, extension 273. This office is open every day from 8:30 a. m. to 5 p. m. Monday through Friday.

Very truly yours,

B. S. HARRIS,
*Loan Guaranty Officer or Designee.*

## LOOPHOLE IN INCOME-TAX LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH LOAN-FINANCED PLAN FOR INSURANCE CREDITS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which I prepared for release last Monday, but which was not delivered in the Senate because the Senate adjourned out of respect to the memory of a departed colleague. This statement describes a major loophole in our income-tax laws by reason of the possibility of an individual arranging a substantial insurance credit with an insurance company through a loan-financed plan.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

Today I wish to discuss a major loophole in our income-tax laws through which it is possible for an individual in the upper income tax brackets to work out an arrangement with an insurance company through a loan-financed plan, thereby building up a substantial insurance credit with a negligible downpayment, with the carrying costs being financed largely through tax-exempt savings.

I will cite one hypothetical case showing how a taxpayer in the 50-percent bracket can with a nominal downpayment utilize this loan-financed plan and with a negligible comparative cost pyramid his small cash outlay into a substantial insurance annuity.

The key to this plan is the conversion of interest-tax credits into tax-exempt savings, and as a taxpayer approaches the higher brackets the loophole becomes progressively more advantageous.

This procedure is referred to in insurance circles as the loan-financed insurance and annuity plan and operates as follows:

The essential feature of this loan-financed insurance and annuity plan is an arrangement which will permit the policyholder to deduct the interest on borrowed funds while there is a simultaneous tax-free buildup of earnings on the reserves behind the policy. Under such arrangements it is contemplated that the purchaser will pay all, or substantially all, of his premiums by means of loans obtained from a bank or the issuing company against the cash or loan value of his contract, with no plan for liquidating the indebtedness thus incurred except on the surrender or maturity of the policy.

Depending on the interest rate on the borrowed money, the taxpayer's tax bracket, and the contractual rate of increase in the cash value of the policy, the purchaser of the plan gets a tax saving which reduces the net cost of his outlay and may furnish him a substantial tax profit at the expense of the revenues. In some cases, these plans become virtually self-sustaining after the first one or two premiums and are advertised as being of negligible cost to high-bracket purchasers.

Under the typical bank-loan plan an individual will purchase a life insurance or endowment policy, perhaps paying the first premium in cash. Usually by prior arrangement he then assigns the contract to a bank as collateral for loans with which to pay future premiums as they fall due year by year.

The purpose is to convert the carrying of life insurance, partly if not entirely, into deductible interest payments, thereby substantially reducing the net outlay to be paid by people with substantial incomes.

*Bank-financed life insurance*

[Age: 45. $100,000 ordinary life plan. Annual premium: $3,503]

| Year | Total death [1] benefit | Bank loan | Net protection | Total cash value of policy [2] | Total collateral required [3] | Gross interest at 5 percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | $100,000 | $3,563 | $96,437 | $1,400 | $2,163 | $178.15 |
| 2 | 100,500 | 7,126 | 93,374 | 4,484 | 2,642 | 356.30 |
| 3 | 101,100 | 10,689 | 90,411 | 7,536 | 3,153 | 534.45 |
| 4 | 101,900 | 14,252 | 87,648 | 10,319 | 3,933 | 712.60 |
| 5 | 102,800 | 17,815 | 84,985 | 13,278 | 4,537 | 890.75 |
| | | | | | | (2,672.25) |
| 6 | 103,800 | 21,378 | 82,422 | 16,216 | 5,162 | 1,068.90 |
| 7 | 104,900 | 24,941 | 79,959 | 19,338 | 5,603 | 1,247.05 |
| 8 | 106,200 | 28,504 | 77,696 | 22,508 | 5,996 | 1,425.20 |
| 9 | 107,600 | 32,067 | 75,533 | 25,870 | 6,197 | 1,603.35 |
| 10 | 109,200 | 35,630 | 73,570 | 29,392 | 6,238 | 1,781.50 |
| | | | | | | (9,798.25) |
| 15 | 118,300 | 53,445 | 64,855 | 47,998 | 5,477 | 2,672.25 |
| 20 | 128,900 | 71,260 | 57,640 | 68,073 | 3,187 | 3,563.00 |
| | | | | | | (37,411.50) |

[1] Policy amount, plus dividend additions.
[2] Includes guaranteed cash values, plus cash value of dividend additions.
[3] Total cash value of policy less bank loan.

The table above summarizes an example of a bank-financed life-insurance plan on $100,000 ordinary life coverage for an individual aged 45 at an annual premium of $3,563.

You will note that the plan, financed at a gross interest rate of 5 percent, would result in interest payments and deductions of $37,411.50 over a 20-year period.

For an individual in a 50-percent tax bracket the net interest cost would be $18,705.75. For this cost plus the deposit of additional collateral of $3,187 the insured would have built up a total death benefit, including accrued policy dividends, of $128,900 which would be entirely tax exempt. The net insurance protection after subtracting the $71,260 bank loan against the policy would amount to $57,640.

Although this is a comparatively conservative type of bank-loan plan, it illustrates how advantageously the interest deduction on such loans can be used to finance a tax-exempt benefit.

To relieve further the policyholder utilizing this bank-loan plan of any risk resulting from an uncertainty about the future interest rate charged by the bank and the personal liability of the policyholder for his loan, plans have been developed for direct-with-insurance-company loans.

Such a plan is described in some of the advertising circulars distributed by the insurance companies. One circular entitled "Application of Tax Savings in Reduction of Life Insurance Costs," which has come to my attention, carries this quotation:

"It has been proven possible for individuals or corporations to own life insurance under the direct-with-insurance-company loan plan without any cost whatever if the policy is held for a sufficient length of time. The cash value of the contract increases and ultimately reaches the point where the owner may recover his initial outlay for the first annual premium, and also the total net cost of his interest payments after tax credits."

The Treasury Department has recognized this plan as a glaring loophole in our revenue code and in a letter dated November 21, 1957, stated that they would recommend to both the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee that corrective legislation be enacted.

I urge that both committees and the Congress give prompt attention to the need for this legislation.

## PROCEDURES FOR REPORTS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 148) to prescribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

## UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE MAJOR EMPLOYMENT CENTERS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday the Department of Labor released its regular bimonthly summary of unemployment in the major employment centers of the United States.

The report draws a picture of an unemployment situation that is already extremely serious, and that is getting worse. Let me quote from the report:

Unemployment rose to above year-ago totals in nearly all of the 149 major centers regularly surveyed by the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies. In some areas, joblessness has reached the highest level for this time of the year since the business downturns of 1949 and 1953–54.

In 40 of the 149 surveyed areas, labor-market conditions softened in the past 2 months to an extent warranting a change in the area's previous Bureau of Employment Security classification according to relative adequacy of labor supply. With unemployment nationally already averaging approximately 5.2 percent of the labor force on a seasonally adjusted basis in December and still rising in many areas as 1958 began, 21 centers edged over into the group D (substantial labor surplus) category in January. Classification in this grouping reflects an unemployment level of 6 to 9 percent, with this situation expected to continue for the next few months. In addition, two areas previously classified in group D—Erie, Pa., and Muskegon, Mich.—were reclassified to the E category to indicate further increases in already high unemployment totals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of the areas of substantial labor surplus in the United States, as taken from the Bureau's report. They number 118 areas in 26 States and Puerto Rico and are the areas with unemployment over 6 percent. I regret to say that 14 of those areas are in my own State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS, JANUARY 1958

MAJOR AREAS

Connecticut: Bridgeport, Waterbury.
Indiana: Evansville, South Bend, Terre Haute.
Kentucky: Louisville.
Massachusetts: Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford.
Michigan: Battle Creek, Detroit, Grand Rapids, Muskegon.
Missouri: Kansas City, St. Louis.
New Jersey: Atlantic City, Newark, Paterson, Trenton.
New York: Utica-Rome.
North Carolina: Asheville, Durham.
Ohio: Canton, Lorain-Elyria, Youngstown.
Oregon: Portland.
Pennsylvania: Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton.
Puerto Rico: Mayagues, Ponce, San Juan.
Rhode Island: Providence.
Tennessee: Knoxville.
Washington: Spokane.
West Virginia: Charleston, Huntington-Ashland, Wheeling, Steubenville.
Wisconsin: Kenosha, Racine.

SMALLER AREAS [1]

Alabama: Jasper, Talladega.
Connecticut: Danielson.
Illinois: Canton, Harrisburg, Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, La Salle, Litchfield, Mount Carmel-Olney, Mount Vernon, Springfield.
Indiana: Michigan City-La Porte, Muncie, Richmond, Vincennes.
Kansas: Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons, Pittsburg.
Kentucky: Corbin, Frankfort, Hazard, Madisonville, Middlesboro-Harlan, Morehead-Grayson, Owensboro, Paintsville-Prestonsburg, Pikeville-Williamson.
Maine: Biddeford-Sanford.
Maryland: Cumberland.
Massachusetts: Marlboro, Milford, North Adams, Pittsfield, Southbridge-Webster.
Michigan: Bay City, Benton Harbor, Jackson, Marquette, Monroe, Port Huron.
New Jersey: Bridgeton, Long Branch.
North Carolina: Fayetteville, Kinston, Mount Airy, Rocky Mount, Rutherfordton-Forest City, Shelby-Kings Mountain, Waynesville.
Ohio: New Philadelphia-Dover, Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Springfield.
Oklahoma: McAlester.
Pennsylvania: Berwick-Bloomsburg, Clearfield-DuBois, Lewistown, Lock Haven, Pottsville, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, Uniontown, Connellsville.
Rhode Island: Newport.
Tennessee: LaFollette-Jellico-Tazewell.
Texas: Texarkana.
Vermont: Burlington, Springfield.
Virginia: Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Radford-Pulaski.
West Virginia: Beckley, Fairmont, Logan, Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, Welch.

[1] These areas are not part of the regular area labor market reporting and area classification program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, 6 percent has usually been accepted in this country as the point beyond which unemployment should not be allowed to climb without immediate and effective action.

As it happens, this bimonthly report appears 3 days after the economic report of the President, which by law is supposed to contain the administration's recommendations for accomplishing the objective of "maximum employment." I have looked through the economic report in vain for the measures which are going to accomplish a reversal of the trend toward rising unemployment. What is proposed there is, in my judgment, quite inadequate.

One measure that is referred to favorably in the economic report is an area redevelopment bill. I welcome that endorsement by the President, even though he fails to back up his recommendation with a specific allocation of money in the budget, as he did last year, and even though the administration bill would be far less effective than the bill (S. 964) introduced by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] with many cosponsors.

We all hope for an upturn which will take most of our 118 areas out of the category of substantial labor surplus. But for those communities that remain as heavy unemployment areas, enactment of this bill is needed as one essential weapon in our arsenal of measures with which to do battle against the poverty and suffering which always arise from persistent unemployment.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

## THE GAITHER REPORT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this morning we have learned from the newspapers that the Gaither Report will not

be made available by the President to either the Preparedness Subcommittee or to the people of the United States of America.

I do not question the constitutional authority of the President of the United States to make the decision that he will not make public this critical report which is so badly needed by the people and by the Congress. Undoubtedly he has the constitutional right to rely on the doctrine of separation of powers, and not to make the report public.

However, I seriously question his judgment, if not his right. I suspect that the failure to make public even the conclusions of this report will return to haunt the administration for many a long day.

It so happens that the withholding of the conclusions of the Gaither Report has been only partially effective, because in the brilliant article written by Chalmers M. Roberts, and published in the Washington Post of December 20, 1957, the substance of the report has already been made available.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the article by Mr. Roberts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRET REPORT SEES UNITED STATES IN GRAVE PERIL—ENORMOUS ARMS OUTLAY IS HELD VITAL TO SURVIVAL

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The still-top-secret Gaither Report portrays a United States in the gravest danger in its history.

It pictures the Nation moving in frightening course to the status of a second-class power.

It shows an America exposed to an almost immediate threat from the missile-bristling Soviet Union.

It finds America's long-term prospect one of cataclysmic peril in the face of rocketing Soviet military might and of a powerful, growing Soviet economy and technology which will bring new political, propaganda, and psychological assaults on freedom all around the globe.

In short, the report strips away the complacency and lays bare the highly unpleasant realities in what is the first across-the-board survey of the relative postures of the United States and the Free World and of the Soviet Union and the Communist orbit.

To prevent what otherwise appears to be inevitable catastrophe, the Gaither Report urgently calls for an enormous increase in military spending—from now through 1970—and for many other costly, radical measures of first and second priority.

Only through such an all-out effort, the report says, can the United States hope to close the current missile gap and to counter the worldwide Communist offensive in many fields and in many lands.

Established as the first, overriding priority is the revitalizing of the American retaliatory offensive force, as principal deterrent to an all-out Russian attack.

To meet all kinds of military threats, the report states, there must be:

A rapidly rising military budget through 1970, reaching in the years 1960 and 1961 a peak outlay of about $8 billion a year in additional expenditures over and above the current $38 billion defense outlay. Another $5 billion a year, for several years, for a civilian shelter program, is recommended on a second-priority basis.

A sweeping reorganization of the Pentagon command system and of the current roles and missions of the armed services, both of which are regarded as completely outmoded in this nuclear age. A Budget Bureau study of such changes is already under way.

A much-increased preparation to fight limited wars—seen as the more likely kind of conflict, especially in the Middle East and Asia, providing the massive offensive capability is created.

These key recommendations were among those presented to President Eisenhower at an extraordinary National Security Council (NSC) meeting on November 7, 4 days after the launching of the second Soviet sputnik. The committee report, 6 months in the making and completed about the time of the first sputnik launching, was unanimous.

At that dramatic NSC meeting, with some 45 persons crowded into the White House broadcast room, two of the President's most valued friends in the financial world—John J. McCloy and Robert Lovett—pledged to Mr. Eisenhower the complete backing of the American financial community if he would approve the program proposed.

McCloy and Lovett, both Republicans who held high posts in past Democratic administrations, expressed their conviction that the American public would shoulder the burden and accept the responsibilities of such major increases in the budget. They said also that the American economy was capable of carrying the load.

The report makes clear, specifically or by obvious implication, that there can be no thought of a tax cut, that the debt ceiling must be lifted promptly, that possible tax increases ought at least to be explored.

The President, as a result of the Gaither report, has begun to change his thinking. But he indicated at that NSC meeting and in subsequent conversations a nagging fear that the American people would balk at paying the bill, even though he said he personally would like to do the things called for in the report.

Some participants in the meeting even felt the President also was fearful that publication of the gloomy findings in the report would panic the American people into going off in all directions at once.

Many of those who worked on the report, prominent figures in the Nation's business, financial, scientific, and educational communities, were appalled, even frightened, at what they discovered to be the state of the American military posture in comparison with that of the Soviet Union.

The Committee, therefore, divided its recommendations into short-term and long-term proposals, some with top priority, others with lesser priority.

OFFENSIVE POWER STRESSED

Basically, the report put its prime military emphasis on offensive power as the best defense. Its second emphasis was that the United States must insure its own air and civilian defenses in view of what the committee discovered to be the technical strength of the Russians for offense.

Many of the short-term proposals discussed by the Committee already have been put in motion by the President; such steps as a costly further dispersal of the Strategic Air Command's bombers. Others in the longer term category are expected to be acted upon; a better—and extremely costly—alert system which could warn against missiles, a capability now wholly lacking; a pooling of allied scientific brainpower and an improvement in American scientific education; increased emphasis on various airborne and short-range nuclear weapons. The earlier Cordiner Committee recommendations for pay increases to prevent the alarming loss of skilled Armed Forces personnel was considered so obvious a necessity that it was not directly touched upon.

One of the recommendations in this area, on which the Gaither Committee was particularly emphatic, was the allocation of a great deal more money—the exact amount was not specified—to basic scientific research and development. The Committee, with a heavy scientific weighting in its outlook, was fully sympathetic to complaints of military research and science leaders that their funds had been unduly cut in the recent period.

AID, SHELTER NEEDS SEEN

As to long-term steps, aside from the massive military boost, the Committee recommended:

An increased foreign-aid program, especially economic aid for the underdeveloped nations. But no specific figure was recommended.

A civil defense shelter program at a cost of around $5 billion a year for 4 or 5 years. The shelters would be designed to save lives against the perils of radioactive fallout and only incidentally to help the Nation's industry recuperate after an enemy attack.

The shelter program was given a second-level priority and the billions of dollars it would cost would be over and above the huge military budget increase of up to $8 billion a year. If all the varied proposals of all categories of priority were in fact accepted by the President and the Congress, the budget would have to soar far, far above the current level of around $72 billion.

HUGE EXPENSE CALCULATED

In fact, it was roughly calculated by some, though not in the report itself as presented to the President, that to do all the things necessary (including a multi-billion-dollar antimissile-missile program which was considered) could cost an additional $20 billion or more a year on an average over the period through 1970. But the Gaither Committee avoided any such total calculation in its report.

In considering a shelter program, there was much discussion of whether Americans would even heed air-raid warnings and use such expensive means of protection. And it was felt that even if a perfect air-defense system were created, only a hypothetical possibility, fallout would spread over great areas because of enemy use of dead-man fuses to set off nuclear explosives, even if the plane or missile carrying them was shot down.

Moreover, there was a strong belief that no shelter construction could be built to withstand a near hit by a multimegaton nuclear bomb.

SHELTER PLAN REVISED

Accordingly, the Committee did not recommend the 40- or 50-billion-dollar shelter program designed to protect against blast. Instead, it called for a $5-billion-a-year program to erect shelters against radioactivity. The thought was that once a bomb had hit, those who survived would have a few hours time to seek protection against the ensuing radiation poison, and would go to the shelters.

Curiously, the Gaither Committee grew out of the shelter problem. Last spring the Federal Civil Defense Administration came to President Eisenhower with a proposal for a shelter program costing some $40 billion or more.

The President threw up his hands, said he could not understand how a shelter program fitted into the whole defense picture and asked for an NSC study on that. But as the Committee was gathered together, the members realized they could not answer his question without considering the much broader picture. They first began considering deterrents to war in general, finally broadened their study to an across-the-board basis. They stopped short, however, of considering specifically such major foreign policy questions as the American policy toward German reunification or toward Red China.

One of the reasons for emphasizing the offensive, with shelters in a secondary priority, was the psychological effect on America's allies. Here the foreign-aid picture also was considered.

BASES LINKED TO FOREIGN AID

The late Frank C. Nash, who had made a year-long study for the Pentagon and the State Department of American bases and forces abroad, told the Gaither group foreign bases were necessary for advanced American military forces and missiles.

He told them frankly that the facts of international political life are such that if America expected to get missile bases abroad, it would have to pay for them—in increased foreign aid.

Further, the Committee accepted the fact that for other military, political, psychological and moral reasons, America must maintain its allies. It cannot revert to the Fortress America concept. Accordingly, increased foreign aid, both economic and military, is recommended as essential to the maintenance of the American alliance.

PENTAGON CHANGES INVOLVED

As to the Pentagon command structure and the roles and missions assigned to the various services at Key West in prehydrogen bomb 1948, the Gaither Committee avoided recommending any exact solution, such as a redivision of forces into strategic and tactical commands.

It appears, though it could not be confirmed, that the Committee felt that the Secretary of Defense must be given an improved setup with a major paring down of the many assistant secretaries and joint committees. It also appears, though this likewise is unconfirmed, that the Committee felt that the Secretary's personal staff should control certain operational commands, which would perform missions now divided among the competing services.

Some of these steps would require Congressional changes in the National Security Act and other laws; others could be ordered by the President under present law.

That the President is concerned over the roles and missions problem is indicated by the fact that he has asked not only the Budget Bureau but also his Science Advisory Committee, headed by I. I. Rabi, for their views on military organization. Their recommendations are still secret, if in fact they have been reached as yet.

Basic to the military discussions in the report is the belief that there has been no real unification of the services, that unified commands have in fact worked in only rare cases.

One special area of Committee concern in terms of needed service unification is the Continental Air Defense Command.

STATISTICAL TABLES SECRET

The Gaither report contains a number of tables of relative strength of the two opposing forces, and the projection of these forces, to America's catastrophic disadvantage, if no remedial steps are taken. These tables, and others estimating United States capabilities to do the various things proposed, are the most secret parts of the report. They would not appear in any sanitized version of the Gaither report which would be given to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which has asked for the document.

The reason that the proposed military budget curve would go up so swiftly, if the report's recommendations are carried out, and then possibly drop back to some degree, is because of the overlapping period of manned aircraft and missiles. Gen. Curtis LeMay, Vice Chief of the Air Force Staff, on Tuesday told the Senate committee that present plans call for continuing medium B-47 bombers in service until 1970, the last year covered by the Gaither report. But there is hardly more than hope that the new, much higher defense budget could be appreciably cut after the proposed 1960–61 peak.

DIVIDED ON SPACE CONQUEST

The 1960–61 date appears to be the earliest estimate by the committee of when the United States could close the missile gap. The short-term measures are designed to use every available means of protecting the United States and the free world until American missiles match Soviet rocketry.

The Gaither report did not deal with the problem of outer space, the multi-billion-dollar question of what the United States should do in the race to the moon and to Mars, on which committee members appear to be divided.

What the ultimate effect of the Gaither report will be will depend first on the President and then on the Congress and the public. At the time it was initiated, official and public complacency was widespread. Even after the committee had reached the point of unanimous agreement that billions more must be spent, the atmosphere was not conducive to their ideas.

The committee went to work at the time of President Eisenhower's dictum that no more than $38 billion would be spent for military purposes. Former Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson was slashing military spending to stay within the limit.

The Budget Bureau and the Pentagon budget officers were adamant in resistance to spending above that sum. The influence of former Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey, architect of that policy, still prevailed. In fact, during the Gaither Committee deliberations, Humphrey returned on one trip to Washington to campaign among his former associates against any change in military spending figures.

Not only was the economy ax in full swing at that time but Treasury Secretary Robert Anderson was reported to be consulting with some of his civilian advisers on a tax cut—trying to decide whether it should be in the $2.5 billion, the $5 billion or the $7 billion range.

ALERTED BY SPUTNIKS

Sputnik came at the right moment, as far as the Gaither Committee was concerned. In some Members' opinion, Sputnik and its succeeding Muttnik "saved" the Gaither report—as, they hope, the Russian satellites may save America by alerting it to its peril.

The President's state of the Union and budget messages to the Congress next month and the Congressional responses will tell whether the Gaither report, plus the sputniks, have changed the national course.

One of the subjects which had lengthy committee consideration was the relative growth of the American and the Soviet economies. Here there was a detailed examination of the relationship of the proposed budget increases to the current econmic recession. The committee, incidentally, started on the premise of a recession, not of further inflation.

The conclusion was that the proposed additional expenditures would come at a fortuitous moment in the American economy. Economists generally agree that the gross national product, the sum total of all goods and services in the Nation, should normally increase by about 3½ percent per year over the long run. But this is not now occurring and the Treasury is entering a period of declining revenues. Hence the new expenditures should get the gross product back to the normal growth rate, in turn generating revenue for the Treasury which could pay for most of the additional military expenses that the committee recommended. And a controlled economy could be avoided.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK SPECULATIVE

Much here is in the speculative realm. The committee assumption, however, was that the increased spending would fit the economic picture with benefit both to the economy and the national defense, with no more than limited tax rises at the most. Hence the reference only to exploring tax increases.

Committee members were impressed, and unfavorably, by the long-term Soviet rate of industrial growth, estimated to be about twice the American rate over the past 25 years. This growth, admittedly based on a less mature industrial economy and apparently beginning to slow down, permits the Kremlin to devote about 25 percent of its production to the military, compared to only 8.7 percent of American production so committed. The Soviet gross national product is only about one-third that of America. In another 10 years, it is estimated to reach about one-half the American figure, because of a faster rate of growth.

It is estimated, for example, that if the United States added about 10 percent to its defense commitment, in terms of gross product, the Soviets would have to raise theirs by one-third and do so in a nation already on the meagerest ration of consumer goods.

---

GAITHER TASK COMPLETED BY OTHERS

The Gaither report takes its name from H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., San Francisco lawyer and former head of the Ford Foundation, who was its initial chairman.

Gaither became ill, however, and the report was completed under the direction of two other members. These cochairman were Robert C. Sprague, of the Sprague Electric Co., and William C. Foster, of the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp.

As listed by the White House, the other members of the Committee were: James P. Baxter, of William College; Robert D. Calkins, of Brookings Institution; John J. Corson, of McKinsey & Co.; James A. Perkins, of the Carnegie Corp.; Robert C. Prim, of Bell Telephone Laboratories; Hector R. Skifter, of Airborne Instruments Laboratories; William Webster, of the New England Electric System; and Prof. Jerome B. Wiesner, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The group had an advisory panel of 11, and 5 others who assisted the panel, the White House said.

The advisory panel included: Adm. Robert C. Carney (retired), of Westinghouse Electric Co.; Gen. James H. Doolittle (retired), Shell Oil Co.; Gen. John E. Hull (retired), Manufacturing Chemists Association; Mervin J. Kelly and James B. Fisk, of the Bell Telephone Laboratories; James R. Killian, Jr., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and since named the President's scientific and technological adviser; Ernest O. Lawrence, University of California Radiation Laboratory; Robert Lovett, of Brown Bros. & Harriman; John J. McCloy, Chase Manhattan Bank; Frank Stanton, Columbia Broadcasting System, and I. I. Rabi, Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

Assisting the panel were: Paul H. Nitze, of George Washington University; Col. George A. Lincoln, United States Military Academy.

Also listed as assisting in the work of the Committee were Gen. James McCormick, Jr., president, and Albert G. Hill, vice president and director of research, of the Institute for Defense Analysis.

A number of other persons not listed by the White House also were called in for advice from time to time. The Committee also had the assistance of numerous officials in the Government.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the importance of the article arises from the fact that it is well known by many Members of this body, including myself, that this newspaper account accurately and clearly states the major

findings and conclusions of the Gaither report. That report should have caused this administration to have a far greater sense of urgency than it presently gives any indication of having. I hope that all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will take the time and the effort to read this newspaper account, so that they, too, may have an understanding of the very critical situation which confronts our country, and which I must say in all good conscience the President's budget does so little to remedy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I, for one, believe that the President of the United States not only has the authority to withhold the Gaither report, but also has done a wise and discreet thing in so doing. The very fact of withholding it has already provoked much discussion, and is an indication of what would happen if an unevaluated report on a subject of such peculiar importance were made public.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

## PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make one comment on the subject of Presidential disability. If the program dealing with Presidential disability fails, it will not be the fault of the President of the United States, for with complete and uninhibited candor he has asked for the enactment of such legislation. The challenge and the responsibility are now on the doorstep of the Congress.

## NATIONAL SECURITY AND POLITICS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, some events which occurred earlier this week have confused the situation regarding a change in the way of a real spirit of unity toward national security, and given rise to serious concern over what the present administration regards as the most crucial issue confronting us.

Is it meeting a grave world challenge, as most of us thought, or just trying to perpetuate Republicans in office?

Most of us, regardless of political affiliation, came to the present session of the 85th Congress deeply concerned about worsening trends in international affairs, and determined, I am sure, as statesmen and Americans all, to put our country's security above all else.

Unfortunately, and regrettably, the wave of Republican oratory earlier this week has clouded and distorted that objective—and given the American people good reason to be confused and concerned.

No one has ever accused me of lacking partisan spirit and fervor. I believe in the two-party system. I believe in spirited partisan debate as the lifeblood of progress and political responsibility. Yet there are times when irresponsibility must be avoided, and partisanship put into proper perspective in relation to the problems confronting us.

If there has been serious concern felt by Democrats that our national leadership has not been all that it could or should be, that concern reflects an attitude of the American people—not just a partisan gloating that our political rivals are failing. The price of failure of leadership is too serious for any of us to take satisfaction in that happening.

Rather than take any satisfaction in this administration's shortcomings, as we saw them, we Democrats set about the business confronting all of us as Americans to rally together toward shoring up our strength and wiping out our weaknesses. We were not alone. Many prominent and influential Republicans shared our concern, and shared our determination to do something constructive about it.

That is the tenor on which this session of Congress opened. That is the tone set so ably by our majority leader in conducting the Preparedness Subcommittee inquiry into our military posture.

When the President outlined his objectives to us in his state of the Union messages, Democrats were among the first to laud the objectives—and pledge support in trying to implement them.

When the President sent us a budget that we felt failed to properly implement those objectives, some of us were openly critical—but for constructive purposes of serving national security, not for partisan purposes of just making a whipping boy of the GOP.

Yet the GOP has apparently embarked upon a course of political survival first, national security second.

I have no intention today of arguing with the blatantly false propaganda of Republican orators throughout the country last Monday night. My only purpose is to ask what purpose such narrow partisanship serves toward rallying our Nation to meet the challenges confronting us.

It is regrettable that while the President of the United States is talking in Chicago about taking national security out of politics, his trusted assistant, Sherman Adams, is staking out the low road of political campaigning by deliberately inciting and inviting bitter partisanship.

It is only about 15 feet from President Eisenhower's office in the east wing of the White House to the office of Sherman Adams. In view of the President's Chicago remarks, I respectfully suggest that he get up out of his chair and walk the 15 feet to inform Mr. Adams of his desires. And while he is at it, if he really wants national security to be kept from becoming a partisan issue, he might suggest that his three service Secretaries have more important matters to attend to than making partisan fundraising addresses in behalf of the Republican Party.

Quite frankly, I respect President Eisenhower's request that national security not become a partisan matter, yet I respectfully suggest that he at least withhold his request until his own fellow partisans have debated this matter out enough among themselves to know just where his own party stands.

Perhaps Vice President NIXON is right in explaining why the Republicans could indulge in political activity despite the troubled times, but let us not have it right for the Republicans and wrong for the Democrats.

As a sheer matter of political judgment, I must question the wisdom of Republican leaders using fund-raising dinners to attack the patriotism of any who criticize the administration's security efforts, when some of the President's most severe critics on this score have also been among the Republican Party's biggest contributors.

I can understand Mr. Adams' sensitivity to criticism. Yet I suggest he look carefully as to where it is coming from.

The report on 1956 general election campaigns from the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate's Committee on Rules and Administration lists Laurence and Nelson Rockefeller as having made 26 separate contributions to the Republicans, totaling more than $60,000. Yet I seem to recall that they have been to the forefront as critics of this administration's security efforts.

John A. McCone gave $7,500 to the Republicans, according to the same report, yet he too has been quite vocal about our glaring weakness—military organizational weaknesses.

Let me list a few more names. Gen. Lucius D. Clay gave $2,500 to the Republicans in 1956, and his wife $3,000. Justin W. Dart gave $3,000. Oveta Culp Hobby gave $1,000. Henry Luce gave 14 contributions totaling $23,000, and his wife added another $1,500. Thomas B. McCabe gave $11,500.

Yet all these are members of the Rockefeller brothers panels that brought out the critical report on Eisenhower defenses.

Big Republican contributors, mind you, Mr. President—not Democrats.

It must have given the GOP treasurer quite a start to have the patriotism of such contributors resoundingly attacked by Sherman Adams.

If we Democrats are supposed to withhold any appraisal of our strength or weaknesses, in the name of unity, I hope at least the administration will be willing to let its own Republican contributors speak out in behalf of national security and survival.

Actually, this issue does transcend partisanship—but it does not transcend critical debate.

I know of quite a few Republican Congressional leaders dissatisfied with the status quo. Must they too be silenced under this administration's mandate challenging the patriotism of critics?

Does the President fear the scrutiny of our citizenry? Does he fear the future spotlight of public attention? What does he seek to hide?

Far from being a partisan Democratic approach, any objective reader of the daily press knows that there is a long list of key national leaders including columnists, commentators, editors, educators, businessmen, and public officials who have openly stated that national security under our system of government requires public debate.

Yet we cannot have such debate in a constructive form so long as the patriotism of those seeking to get at the truth

is challenged by blind partisanship of Sherman Adams' demagoguery.

The criteria must be what best serves national security, not what best serves this administration, the Republican Party, or the Democratic Party.

Once again, this administration has failed to exemplify leadership in that direction.

It has weakened its own hand, in trying to protect itself. It has weakened its own chances of gaining bipartisan support for the tasks ahead.

How helpful was Sherman Adams' talk to those of us on this side of the aisle who must bear the brunt of efforts to rally votes for economic aid to our allies? How helpful was it to those of us who must try to save the reciprocal trade program?

These are the questions the President must answer to his own conscience, and to the American people. They are not partisan questions. They are serious questions affecting our security.

Mr. President, I am glad to note that by and large the American press has recognized the seriousness of this regrettable Republican partisan error. Perhaps there has been no better supporter of the Eisenhower administration than the Cowles Publications, of Minneapolis. Yet on the morning after Sherman Adams' talk in Minneapolis, the Minneapolis Tribune lead editorial was entitled "Questionable Tactics."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONABLE TACTICS

With Congress in the hands of the Democrats, it is surprising that the Republicans used their campaign dinners Monday night as the occasion for bitter attacks on the opposition party. Sherman Adams, the President's assistant, joined in the partisan attack here in Minneapolis. We think the GOP used questionable tactics, to say the least.

A certain amount of partisanship is expected, of course, at any party gathering for the political faithful. The illusion has to be maintained, apparently, that the Republicans are united and only the Democrats are divided; that any administration successes have come from the solid support of the Republicans in Congress, and that any failures have resulted from the opposition of the Democrats.

But in view of the challenges of Sputniks I and II and the intercontinental ballistic missile to the United States—and the need for Democratic support for the President's own program—we wonder whether it was necessary for the President's No. 1 assistant to question not only the intelligence and wisdom of opposition leaders but also their loyalty and patriotism.

Consider for example, Adams' intimation that the Democrats were responsible for Pearl Harbor, "the scientific catastrophe of losing our atomic secrets," the "Red invasion of Korea," the "handcuffs put on our conduct of that war," the "tragic loss of China," and "the surrender of positions of freedom throughout the world."

He doesn't quite repeat the McCarthy charge that the Democrats were guilty of "20 years of treason," but he certainly approaches it. And the point is whether the Democrats, who control Congress, and who are being asked to put through the Eisenhower program in a bipartisan spirit, really will be able to dismiss partisan attacks such as that launched by Adams. Frankly, we doubt that they will do so.

Adams' speech was noteworthy, too, for what he did not say as well as for what he said. President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union address and his budget message, made it clear that the administration considers the expansion of the economic-aid program as a major goal. Yet this issue wasn't even mentioned by Adams.

Nor did the Presidential assistant call for support for other Presidential programs, such as extension of the Trade Agreements Act, scientific cooperation with our allies, expansion of research, or even the "works of peace" proposed by Mr. Eisenhower. Yet all of these programs need more public support.

Summing up Adams' speech, we wonder whether his concern about electing a Republican Congress in 1958 did not blind him to the need for Democratic as well as Republican support for the President's program in the current session of Congress. Whether it did or not, we're sure the Democrats will enlighten him on the subject in the days to come.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, similar views were expressed by the Washington Post in its editorial of Wednesday, January 22, entitled "The GOP's Two Faces." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks, together with a column of the same day by Marquis Childs entitled "Adams Sets Tone for GOP Attack."

There being no objection, the editorial and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOP'S TWO FACES

Just as President Eisenhower was telling his Republican audience in Chicago that national security is not a partisan matter, in Minneapolis his assistant Sherman Adams was energetically contradicting him. Whereas the President's speech was mostly good-natured and inoffensive if dripping with platitudes, Mr. Adams engaged in a cheap and meanly partisan attack which is certain to do what the President said he did not want. It is hard to believe that there is no communication between two parts of the White House.

Mr. Adams charged that the attitude of persons who criticize defense preparations as inadequate is mostly "dictated by political expediency." He tagged the Democrats for "the military catastrophe of Pearl Harbor," the theft of atomic secrets and "the tragic loss of China"—and he compounded these exaggerations with the sleazy trick of remarking that "we do not need to bring up" such matters.

Let it be acknowledged that in the question of defense responsibility there are some skeletons in the Democratic closet, including inadequate preparation in the missile field. But this business of assigning blame for past mistakes is pointless; it merely distracts attention from the current challenge. The Democrats can charge with equal validity that the Republicans lost part of Indochina and have been in the process of losing Egypt and Syria. When Mr. Adams throws cuts in last year's defense budget at them, they can ask pointedly who invited them to cut the budget, then criticized cuts, then blocked the expenditure of funds after some of them had been restored.

Now, political rallies are the normal occasion for partisan oratory, for fulsome eulogies and claims of monopoly on virtue, and there is nothing inherently reprehensible in this in a democratic system. The Democrats are not exactly shrinking violets at such business, either. But there are limits beyond which this sort of hyperthyroid hyperbole can be carried without injuring national unity on essential matters, and when political figures of either party engage in politicking at the expense of the national interest they deserve to be slapped.

Political rallies do not have to be this divisive. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge delivered a good-tempered speech in Washington reciting the Republican boasts but not narrowly. Vice President NIXON made a speech in New York which, if not gentle with the Democrats, avoided the meanness of Mr. Adams. Mr. Eisenhower's own remarks were unexceptionable except for his allusion to the Korean war and his statement that no other war has been allowed to take its place—as if the Democrats would have sought any different objective.

Perhaps it was inevitable in a Congressional election year that defense would become a matter of partisan debate, although this will not help the sober resolution of difficult problems in a time of national peril. What the administration cannot do is maintain a pose of high principle with Mr. Eisenhower trilling like a lark while Mr. Adams simultaneously sweeps the gutter.

By the way, who, if anyone, is Mr. Adams' boss?

---

ADAMS SETS TONE FOR GOP ATTACK

(By Marquis Childs)

Republican orators around the country, working hard with statistics and quotations supplied by the Republican National Committee, were out to prove Monday night that the blame for the lag in the development of missiles rests squarely on Harry S Truman.

The same figures and the same quotations appeared in most of the speeches released in advance. And the theme, which will be heard again and again and again as the Congressional campaign approaches, is that the Eisenhower administration has done everything possible to make up for the delay and indifference of the Truman administration.

In short, on the perilous issue of the Nation's security we seem likely to get this fall an old-fashioned pot-and-kettle contest as to which is the blacker. It is not a prospect that holds out any conspicuous hope for unity on what must be done to catch up with Soviet Russia's lead.

The figures used in a number of the speeches delivered on the fifth anniversary of the President's first inauguration were intended, as Secretary of Commerce Weeks put it at a Republican fund-raising dinner in Tulsa, Okla., to curl your hair. From 1943 through 1952, $3.5 million was spent on long-range ballistic missiles, while from 1953 through 1958 more than $3.8 billion was spent.

The quotation used by speaker after speaker is by Wehrner von Braun, missile authority who directed the development of the Army's Jupiter missile at the Redstone Arsenal in Alabama. Von Braun is quoted as having said in answer to a question as to why Russia leads in outer space:

"The main reason is that the United States had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. These 6 years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, are irretrievably lost."

But with the zeal that might have been expected from the man closest to the President and perhaps the most dedicated worker in the administration, Sherman Adams goes further than the others. In his dinner speech at Minneapolis he took the whole litany of denunciation, blaming the Democrats for the military castrophe of Pearl Harbor, the Red invasion of Korea, the plight of our defenses when the invasion began, the handcuffs put upon our conduct of that war, the tragic loss of China

and the surrender of positions of freedom throughout the world.

In other words, the Assistant to the President blames the Democrats for everything that happened while the Democratic Party was in control of the national administration, and that is standard political practice. But if this is to be the rule, then a Republican administration that happens to be in power when the missile lag came to public notice—regardless of where the fault really lies—will get the blame for it.

Adams, however, supplies a lead that, when all the slambanging over who did or didn't do what on missiles is over, will very likely set the tone of the Republican campaign this fall. He hails President Eisenhower as one who more than any other man in our time can achieve a genuine peace and save humanity from the holocaust of nuclear war.

Other speakers took the familiar line out of the campaigns of 1952, 1954, and 1956 to add up the casualties of World War II and Korea—462,000 of our sons killed, 744,000 wounded in wars under Democrat administrations. In other words, the Republican Party is once again to be represented as the party of peace and the Democratic Party as the party of war.

Speaking in Yakima, Wash., Secretary of Agriculture Benson said in his prepared text: "We are not lost in the abyss of a bloody, hopeless war which neither side could win, as we were only 5 years ago."

This same strategy did not work in 1954, although the national committee spent large sums in several States to blanket radio and television outlets with spot advertisements of Democrat wars and Democrat casualties. Perhaps this time, against a greater longing for peace and an end of tensions, it will do the job.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, even the New York Times showed concern over the Eisenhower-Adams "high road-low road" campaigning with an editorial yesterday entitled "Politicking With Defense." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with articles by political writer James Reston, of the New York Times, January 20 and 21, on the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 22, 1958]

POLITICKING WITH DEFENSE

A headline on the front page of this newspaper yesterday read: "Eisenhower Urges 1958 Campaign Ban on Defense Issues." In the adjoining column the headline of another story read: "Adams Rakes Democrats: Pearl Harbor to Missiles." The two headlines expressed with precision the sense of the respective articles, which must have left a good many Americans wondering just who is directing Republican Party policy.

If Sherman Admas were some maverick GOP politician or even a representative of the strongly anti-Eisenhower extreme right wing of the party one might more easily understand his bitterly partisan Minneapolis speech, in which he suggested that the Democrats were responsible for everything from the fall of Adam to the rise of the sputnik. But Sherman Adams is no maverick and no anti-Eisenhower man. He is the President's own super chief of staff. Yet the contrast between the President's expressed desire to take the defense issue out of politics and Mr. Adams' obvious intention to put it into the middle of politics is too obvious to be overlooked, and too mysterious to be explained.

Not that Mr. Adams is the only sinner in this direction. The Democrats, headed by the always irrepressible Harry S Truman, began weeks ago to make the defense of the country a political issue. They have no more right to do so than the Republicans. Instead of recriminating about the past, a past in which both Democrats and Republicans have been grievously at fault, both parties would do far better for themselves and for the country by turning their attention to what has to be done to insure national security in the future. There is plenty of room for argument here, but at least the argument would be constructive, not backward looking and destructive.

---

[From the New York Times of January 20, 1958]

POLITICS AND SECURITY: AN EVALUATION OF REPUBLICAN PROSPECTS AND THE PART DEFENSE ISSUE WILL PLAY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—Fasten your seat belts, folks, the big political battle of 1958 is on.

The Republicans tonight started their sixth year in office with the loudest counter-attack since the last presidential election. The theme: We're in pretty good shape, and if we aren't, blame the Democrats.

President Eisenhower, in Chicago, insisted that United States security, and the differences over it, must be kept out of politics, but from all over the country came news of his principal lieutenants blaming the missile lag on the Truman administration.

"Our first objective—security and a just peace—is not a partisan or political matter," said the President. "Americans must never and will never let the issue of security and peace become a pawn in anyone's political chess game."

The Assistant to the President, Sherman Adams, however, insisted in Minneapolis that it was a partisan and political matter. He not only blamed the Democrats for the missile problem of today, but he also scorned them for Pearl Harbor, the tragic loss of China, the surrender of positions of freedom all over the world, for stumbling into the Korean war unprepared, and for not being able to fight that war effectively or end it.

OTHERS FOLLOW ADAMS' LINE

If there was ever any genuine chance of keeping politics out of the defense question—and there wasn't much—this has undoubtedly ended it.

While the President was calling for a political truce, the Republican National Committee was pouring out texts of GOP speeches following the Adams' line rather than the President's.

This is a bold, and in some ways, a hazardous strategy, for it opens the President to the charge that many of his own principal associates, including his principal aid, Mr. Adams, will not follow his lead. And it has already infuriated many Democrats whose support is essential if the Eisenhower legislative program is to get through the Congress.

There are now 49 Democrats to 46 Republicans in the Senate, with 1 seat vacant. Of the 32 Senate seats at stake in next November's election, 12 are held by Democrats and 20 by Republicans.

Five of the twelve Democratic seats are in sure Democratic territory—Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—and the other seven are generally rated as favoring the Democrats or even.

In contrast, the Republicans seem sure of only 3 of the 20 Senate seats at stake this year—Nebraska, North Dakota, and Vermont. And even some Republican political experts fear that the House, where the Democrats now hold a 34-seat margin, may go Democratic by a much larger margin in November.

CHANGES ARE NOTED

Since the last election three major political developments have occurred: the President's popularity, as measured by the Gallup poll, has dropped 10 points but is still measurably higher than anybody else's; the administration, strong with the people on defense and foreign policy questions in 1956, has been put on the defensive in these fields by the political and scientific achievements of the Soviet Union; and the economic boom has visibly leveled off.

Confronted by the problem of raising more funds for national defense, the administration has taken a calculated risk of considerable political significance. In his budget message, the President called for a sharp reduction of the Federal public assistance grants to the States, starting in 1960.

Though it seems unlikely that Congress will go along with these requests, the Republicans nevertheless have acquired a new political burden. They must now carry the charge that they are trying to cut away many of the gains made by the people in the fields of old age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the needy blind, and to the permanently and totally disabled.

DEBATE PICTURE CHANGES

Thus two major changes have taken place in the political debate between the major parties: The Democrats have an issue in defense—they said there "was no mileage in this" in 1956—and they have been given new ammunition for their favorite argument, namely, that they are the party of the dispossessed and the poor.

This situation may explain the tone and vigor of the Republican counter-attack tonight, but it is interesting that the man who took the lead on all those issues that anger the Democrats the most was not Vice President NIXON but Mr. Adams.

Mr. NIXON in New York, took a few broad swipes at the opposition, and argued for vigorous campaigning, but Mr. Adams took over the low road, combining satire and mockery with appeals for "moral fiber."

Where the political battle will go from now on nobody knows, but the chances are it won't be up.

---

[From the New York Times of January 21, 1958]

THE ADAMS ONSLAUGHT: A COMMENT ON REASONS FOR SHARP ATTACK AS EISENHOWER URGED NONPARTISANSHIP

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 21. — Sherman Adams, the Assistant to the President, was the main topic of conversation in Washington today.

Why, the politicians were asking, did he go to Minneapolis last night and make a sharp political attack on the Democratic Party's defense record precisely at the moment when President Eisenhower was in Chicago appealing to everybody to keep politics out of the defense debate?

There were two popular interpretations of this odd incident, both of them probably wrong.

The first was that both the President and his chief of staff knew precisely what the other was doing and took different tacks as a political tactic to appeal to the two wings of the Republican Party.

The second was that Mr. Adams, with the President's knowledge and approval, was getting himself better known among the Republican politicos in order to see whether there was any support for his becoming a presidential candidate in 1960.

Most explanations of political conduct here, however, are usually simpler than the dramatic and complicated theories widely published. The simple fact in this particular case seems to be merely that Mr. Adams was sore at the Democrats.

He has been sitting around in his inaccessible office for weeks listening to the Democrats berate the Republican defense record. He thinks the opposition has been unfair. From the first sight of the Soviet satellite, he has taken the line that the United States was not involved in this "outer-space basketball game," as he once called it, and that everybody is getting too emotional about the whole missile race.

ADAMS HAS FIERCE LOYALTY

Mr. Adams has two well-developed qualities; a fierce loyalty to the President, and a bad temper. Both were involved last night in Minneapolis and when these two qualities combine, he runs to sarcasm and verbal aggression.

The Democrats do not especially resent the charges that they have a responsibility in their 1945–53 record for the missile shortage. This comes under the general heading of hard but fair political debate. But they resent two things:

They feel that Mr. Adams shoots from ambush in that he cannot be questioned by the Congress or the press, as the President and the Cabinet can.

And they resent his revival of the old fighting implications that the Democrats were responsible for Pearl Harbor, for the scientific catastrophe of losing our atomic secrets, for the Communist invasion of Korea, for the tragic loss of China, and for limiting the area of the Korean war.

It is this latter point that is hard to explain. For James C. Hagerty, the President's press secretary, said today that Mr. Adams knew what was in the President's speech, and presumably this included knowledge that the President was asking for a moratorium on partisan approaches to the defense debate.

Nevertheless, he raked up many of the charges that envenomed the whole political atmosphere here during the hey-day of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

There is an interesting paradox in all this, Mr. Adams has, for 5 years, played the role of the "anonymous man" in the White House. He has refused to answer question from Congress on the ground that he was acting on behalf of the President. He has rejected in the sharpest terms assertions that he was the powerful head of a palace guard that often exercised Presidential powers.

The official line has been that he was merely an objective servant who kept his own opinions out of things and merely presented all sides of a question to the President for his decision.

LEAVES ANONYMOUS ROLE

In recent months, however, he has been leaving the anonymous role and coming into the open, not to make general policy statements, but to whoop up the faithful at political rallies, scorn the opposition, and then retreat once more into the White House.

This sharp contrast between the role of the private adviser and the political provocateur is what has raised the question of his political ambitions. He has always refused to discuss this question, and his associates deny that any such ambitions exist.

But the mystery remains. He is, without doubt, the most powerful White House adviser since the late Harry Hopkins in the Roosevelt administration. Mr. Hopkins, too, denied for years that he allowed himself to think of seeking the Presidency, but in the end, he did think of it, and was encouraged by Roosevelt to do so.

Maybe the parallel is not exact. Mr. Adams' friends deny that it is. They also deny that he and the President entered into a high-road, low-road arrangement to appeal to the two wings of the Republican Party.

The President may not have approved Mr. Adams' text, but Mr. Adams ignored the President's advice.

And this has thrown him into the thick of political controversy, just at the time when most observers here believe that the President is delegating more authority to him all the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article on the same subject by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BAD BLUNDER

(By Walter Lippmann)

By his Minneapolis speech on Monday, Governor Sherman Adams has made more difficult the delicate situation in the President's office. The situation is delicate because the diminished strength of the President has made necessary an unusual, almost certainly an unprecedented, delegation of powers to the White House staff of which Governor Adams is the chief. The flat contradiction between the Adams speech and the President's own speech that same evening raises the question of how faithfully the President's will is being carried out by those to whom his powers are delegated. For on an issue of national importance Governor Adams was in open contradiction with the letter and the spirit of the President's speech.

If that can happen publicly, what goes on in the privacy of the President's office? This is a fair question, and it is a necessary one. For the Government of the United States is today being carried on under a special dispensation which can work only if there is a general and complete confidence in it. There must be confidence that the officials who exercise the President's powers are men who know him so well that they can act as he would act if he had the time and the energy to do the whole work of his office.

Were this complete confidence seriously broken, there would be a demoralizing political uproar about who exercises power and who can be held accountable.

The outward evidence of the country's confidence has been that Congress, the press, and the public have accepted the theory that Governor Adams and his assistants are confidential agents of the President, who cannot be questioned by committees of Congress or in press conferences. This immunity rests on the principle that their relations with the President are confidential, and that their acts are to be treated as being his acts. For these acts, the President is accountable to the people. But his agents are accountable to him.

This is a complex and subtle theory which we have developed to meet an unusually difficult situation. It is not easy to keep believing it in the face of the known evidence about the President's absences from the White House, and the many evidences that he is not always well informed. Yet we have all wanted to believe in the theory since, given the facts about our constitutional system, we have no better choice than to believe it.

But the country will not go on believing it if it turns out that the confidential agents of the President are playing politics on their own, and contrary to the President's own political beliefs. The moral of it is that in the position he occupies, and with the immunity which he claims, Governor Adams should not make speeches at all, should nourish no political ambitions of his own, and should acquire, or at least simulate, what used to be called a passion for anonymity.

On the substance of the question, which is whether defense is a legitimate party question, the answer, I believe, is that here honesty will prove to be the best policy. Thus, it is the duty of the Democrats in Congress to examine the administration's defense proposals in the light of the best intelligence available and of the testimony of experts. It is not only their right but their duty to decide whether the administration's program is adequate and how it could be improved. The Democrats will be expected to come forward with their own program of amendments which Congress can then debate.

It is when we come to the post mortems for our having fallen behind in the race of armaments that an ugly partisanship will show itself. The country will do well to be very skeptical and very suspicious of all attempts to fix the blame on one party or the other. There have been too many Democrats and Republicans involved in the complicated history of the missiles and other strategic weapons to justify any verdict that one or the other party is guilty.

If there is to be an inquest, and there is much to be said for having one, it should not be made by a Congressional committee, composed of men among whom many must run for reelection in the fall. The inquest should be conducted in a judicial spirit by some kind of panel or commission which inspires general confidence and is composed of men who personally have nothing to gain and nothing to lose by the outcome of the elections.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while I am enough of a political realist not to expect the President or Mr. Adams to realize the error of their ways enough to apologize to the Democratic Party for aspersions against the patriotism and loyalty of a party in which a majority of the American people has shown its confidence in the last two Congressional elections, I do suggest that the least they could do would be to explain to their own big Republican contributors that it is all right for them to keep criticizing the administration's failures—so long as they keep contributing.

---

## THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes to bring to the attention of the Senate certain encouraging developments affecting the American Merchant Marine.

On August 30, 1957, I made a brief statement pointing out the vital necessity for continuing and expanding our shipbuilding and ship-operating programs. Today, I am happy to note that the President's budget message and his state-of-the-Union message together show a constructive approach toward the fulfillment of these programs.

The request for $160 million for shipyard subsidies, when approved by Congress, will mean that the long-range ship replacement program entered into by both Government and industry will continue as planned. The $120 million requested for operating-differential payments will insure shippers of our agricultural and manufactured products of regularly scheduled continuous access to the markets of the world, and will provide a consistent access to the raw materials which are in short supply—or nonexistent—in the United States.

In order to carry out the President's safety-through-strength policy, a strong, active, American-flag merchant fleet is

essential. I am confident that the Congress will approve the President's budget requests so that this Nation will fulfill its responsibilities to its friends and allies by guaranteeing to them and to the citizens of the United States continued existence of a strong and adequate merchant fleet.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for Mr. Eastland), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William P. Rogers, of Maryland, to be Attorney General.

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Nelson P. Rose, of Ohio, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

Tom B. Coughran, of California, to be Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and

John S. Patterson, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Gerard C. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador;

Robert McClintock, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Lebanon;

Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya;

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen;

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of Maryland, to be the representative on the executive board of the World Health Organization;

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Manager of the Development Loan Fund in the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State; and

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Director of the United States Information Agency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

## INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert M. McKinney, of New Mexico, to be the representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Julian B. Baird, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Tom B. Coughran, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of A. Gilmore Flues, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Sumner G. Whittier, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## EXPLORING THE NEW AREAS OF STATESMANSHIP

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in the speech which Secretary Dulles delivered at the Press Club last week, I find new grounds for hope that an area of constructive statesmanship is at last opening before us. It is true that the body of the address repeated our besetting faults. A section of the problem of armament control was offered the Soviet Government as a challenge to its sincerity. This, of course, is not the way in which successful negotiations are begun in private life between two parties each of whom holds a strong position. Neither is it the way in which we can carry on international negotiations with any hope of success, where the other party holds so strong a position as does the Soviet Government.

Whether in private or in governmental negotiations, the constructive course is to find the area of mutual self-interest. With the Soviet Government there is no other effective method to use, if we are sincere in our search for armament control. Mutual self-confidence is out. There is none, except as it grows in the fertile soil of successful negotiations based upon mutual self-interest. It is useless to demand a show of sincerity by the Russians before beginning discussions. Should we not rather cease to impose on others impossible requirements of confidence and sincerity and demonstrate our own sincerity by proceeding from the practical base of mutual self-interest?

In his Press Club speech Secretary Dulles made the suggestion that an international commission be established to supervise all outer space exploration and make certain that it be devoted to the interest of science and humanity rather than to military purposes. In so doing he repeated his urgent suggestions of last July.

This is not the only forward look by the administration, for the President's letter to Bulganin proposed joint negotiations to the same end. Furthermore, we may confidently hope that the President's open-skies proposal made at the Geneva Summit Conference is still open.

In the Congress, as well as in the administration, the same wise foresight has appeared. Notably, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] saw in mankind's new celestial frontier the opportunity of adding a new dimension to freedom—and with it the very real prospect of reaching our goal of total peace.

Here, then, we have a positive indication of the prophetic vision of our political leadership. Can the vision be made real? I believe, Mr. President, that there are reasons for believing that we can make the vision real.

In the first place, we start with a clean slate so far as space is concerned. It is true that sputnik gave to the Soviets the psychological advantage of surprise, but we may be sure that their scientists and engineers have no doubt of our ability to equal and exceed that achievement in a very short time.

It may be argued that the opportunity for international agreement on atomic-energy control was even greater, since we held a near monopoly on that development when it was still new. Yet the Soviet Government, itself engaged in atomic development, turned down our proposals. This, in my judgment, does not make sure that new proposals for

space control will meet with the same fate. There is a healthy regard in Russia for the certainty of annihilation in case of an atomic war, and space-navigating proficiency multiplies the danger a thousandfold.

Furthermore, it is highly probable that the Russians have a better concept of our progress and capabilities in this field than do the American people. Our Euro-Asian friends cannot be sure of being the first to occupy space in some practically effective way. Therefore, agreement on the basis of mutual self-interest is by no means impossible. Let us give it a try.

Where shall we begin? Shall we start at the moon and work down, or shall we start at the earth and work up, even though our destination is the moon and points beyond?

Mr. President, it is my suggestion that we revive the President's open-skies proposal as the first step. Here is mutual advantage—plus. No one who has visited the missile centers of this Nation can escape the conviction that we are near to the launching of a satellite, manned by a willing and intelligent observer and reporter, who will be returned safely to earth. Even before that time we may have General Shriever's satellite carrying a recoverable capsule with its observations and reports intact. Let us proceed with all diligence to develop these and other means of occupying space effectively, depositing the records with the United Nations, and thus being the first to practice open skies for peaceful purposes.

It may be that our bargaining position is even better than this. It should not surprise us to learn some fine day that we are already taking pictures from the air, by means unrevealed to us common folk. It may be that our Soviet friends know this but cannot stop it. It is just as possible that the Soviet Government is now doing the same thing. I have no information on these matters, but such confidence have I in scientific achievement and practical skill that such a development would not at all astonish me.

Mr. President, let us not bungle this opportunity. Let us not approach it in any spirit of moral superiority, but on the basis of self-interest. Let us follow where the President pointed and led the way. Let us see what can be done with open skies.

From there we can go upward to space exploration and control, and outward to the control of land, sea, and air armaments—all without adding to the tensions of our atomic age. Let us make it a new Elizabethan age of exploration instead, but without any attempt at exclusive occupation. For space cannot be exclusively occupied.

Let us get going.

## JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) was read, as follows:

Whereas it was the initiative, the sense of individual dignity, and the determination to mold their own futures that motivated those who founded this Nation; and

Whereas Junior Achievement, Inc., through its learning-by-doing program, is inculcating those ideals in American youth by helping them to set up and operate their own small-scale business enterprises; and

Whereas their experience in running Junior Achievement companies will provide these young people with a heightened understanding of the privileges and duties of citizenship and better prepare them to assume the responsibilities of community leadership; and

Whereas thousands of American businessmen voluntarily give unstintingly of their time, their counsel, and their experience for the benefit of the members of Junior Achievement; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning January 26, 1958, and ending February 1, 1958, will be observed as National Junior Achievement Week: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 26, 1958, through February 1, 1958, as National Junior Achievement Week and urging all citizens of our country to salute the activities of Junior Achievers and their volunteer adult advisers through appropriate ceremonies.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, except for the dates specified, this resolution is identical with House Concurrent Resolution 73, which was unanimously agreed to by the Congress on January 17, 1957.

Its purpose is to request the President to designate the week of January 26 to February 1, 1958, as National Junior Achievement Week. At the present time legislation is pending before the Judiciary Committee which will make Junior Achievement Week an annual event, to be designated by the President. Because the Judiciary Committee has not had an opportunity to report that proposed legislation, it is necessary to consider the present resolution, providing for this year's celebration only.

Junior Achievement is a program through which young people are given an opportunity to take on real responsibilities early in life. Running small-scale business enterprises, tackling everyday problems with the help of their adult advisers, they are prepared for an active role in the economy. I think it is fitting that we recognize this fine program again this year, and give it our unanimous blessing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that we fully concur in the purpose, the spirit, and the objective of the resolution.

## CONTROL OF ADVERTISING ALONG INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to ask my friend from Oregon a question. I know of the outstanding effort he and some of his colleagues made during the last session of Congress to have the committee report a bill which would protect the Federal interstate highways from the unrestricted construction of billboards and other unsightly devices.

I know it failed by one vote last summer to be reported by the committee.

Accordingly, when the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] introduced a new bill, which would have the same effect, I hoped that that bill, as was true of the other bill, would be passed, so that we could eliminate the unsightly roadside menaces on our interstate highway system.

My question is: Does the Senator feel there is some chance at this session of having such proposed legislation reported by the committee, and is he continuing his splendid and earnest efforts in the campaign against those unsightly menaces?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator wish me to yield to him?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to comment briefly on this undertaking.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be pleased to yield to the Senator from Vermont if he desires to make some comments on the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLANDERS. On the question of controlling billboards along the system of the Federal national highways, I wish to refer briefly to a similar campaign in my State for controlling billboards along our highways outside communities which have self-government.

It was to a great degree successful. I believe that anyone who drives through the State of Vermont will appreciate what has been done.

The suggestion has been made, as I understand, that this matter should be left to the States, rather than be handled by the Federal Government. Unless there is a clause in the Constitution which makes it unconstitutional for the Federal Government to control the margins of these highways within a State, I certainly will support by voice and vote, so far as I am permitted to do so, any undertaking to control the billboards along the new system of national highways.

I should like to ask those who have had legal training, of which I have not had the advantage, to give such assurance as they can that there is no constitutional obstruction in the way of such legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I comment on the statement of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Although I do not pretend to be a great constitutional lawyer, I do not have the slightest doubt that both

the bill introduced at the last session by the Senator from Oregon and the one introduced this year by the Senator from Connecticut would be upheld by any court as fully constitutional.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of both the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Vermont.

In answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I shall outline the situation very briefly. Ever since 1955, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the junior Senator from Oregon have been attempting to bring about some control and regulation of billboards along the 41,000 miles of our interstate highway system. On one occasion we succeeded in adding a billboard control provision to a bill which reached the Senate floor. Unhappily, that provision was eliminated on the floor of the Senate.

Last year, in 1957, the junior Senator from Tennessee and I worked extremely hard in the Committee on Public Works in trying to report from the committee a measure which would provide protection for the roadside beauty along the new roads that will cost the American motoring public upwards of $40 billion. Again, unfortunately, we failed in committee, by a vote of 7 to 6.

Now certain Members of the Senate, I may say at the 11th hour, after we have lost a great deal of precious time, have come forward as champions of billboard control. They are welcome, of course, and we are delighted that they have come into the fold. I might say, however, that their allegiance to our cause would have been more useful a substantially length of time earlier in our fight.

Already we have lost very valuable time—months, and even years—and as we stand here on the floor of the Senate today, the various States of the Union are locating their rights-of-way for these interstate roads. As these roads are laid out, the billboard companies, or the so-called outdoor advertisers, acquire so-called grandfather rights for the signs that are being put up to shut out the beautiful scenery—mountain, valley, hill, tree, and dale—from the view of the people who drive over those roads.

For example, one of the men who now comes forward as a champion of a billboard-control bill, cast one of the decisive votes last year which resulted in the defeat of the Gore-Neuberger billboard-control measure by a vote of 7 to 6 in committee, and thus kept the bill from being reported.

However, I wish to say, speaking for myself—and I feel sure that I am authorized to speak also for the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—that we will try again this year to succeed in the cause for which we have been working for 3 years.

The belated adherents to whom I have referred do not include either the Senator from Pennsylvania or the Senator from Vermont. I know that the State of Vermont, which the Senator from Vermont, in part, so ably represents in the Senate, is one of the few States which have tried to control signboards along highways, and that he is devoted to this cause. Of course on many occasions I have had reason to know of the allegiance of the Senator from Pennsylvania to this effort.

It makes no difference to me whose bill passes to control signboards along the highways. I am not interested in credit or glory or renown. I believe that when the Federal Government is putting up 90 cents of every dollar which is spent on the roads, and when we realize that this will be the greatest highway network ever built by any country in the world, we owe at least a little bit to the motoring public of today and tomorrow. We must do what we can to prevent these roads from being plastered with signboards from the Gulf of California to the lovely States in New England which the Senator from Vermont in part represents in the Senate.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I trespass once more on the time of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to relate an experience my State has had in connection with this matter. First, however, I should like to inquire as to the width of the strip which will be acquired for the purpose of these highways. Can the Senator from Oregon enlighten us on that point?

Mr. NEUBERGER. At the moment I am not qualified to tell the Senator from Vermont the exact width of the interstate highways. However, they are all virtually to be built to four-lane standards, as the Senator from Vermont realizes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is my understanding, if I may make this statement at this time, that the bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] would make impractical the erection of signs within 660 feet of any interstate highway. That provision was added as an inducement, in a certain sense, to States to adopt appropriate legislation, by giving them additional financial assistance if they enacted that type of legislation, rather than attempt to hammer down any Federal standard. We at the Federal level can give an inducement to States by making it worth while to take such action.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the provision in our bill—and I believe there is a similar provision in the later bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]—stipulates that a State which is willing to agree to control signboards along a particular stretch of highway, instead of receiving 90 percent of the funds to build that highway, will collect from the Federal Government 90¾ percent. In other words, such a State will receive 90 percent, plus three-quarters of 1 percent more as a bonus or reward for controlling signs along a particular portion of road.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator. I might observe that the success of the campaign in Vermont was due to a decision of the State Supreme Court to the effect that the value accruing to a property holder with reference to the location of a signboard was not a value inherent in the property, but was derived from the location of the highway, and the location of the highway was determined by the State; therefore, the State had jurisdiction over whatever equities the property holder had with relation to the erection of highways and signboards. I do not know whether that situation applies to other States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am aware of the successful campaign that has been carried on in Vermont to protect the lovely scenery in that State.

Mrs. Neuberger and I, when we were members of the Oregon Legislature, made a similar effort in our State. I regret to report that it was not successful, although we tried to the utmost of our capacity and ability to make it successful.

But the proposal which the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and I have sponsored for a number of years—and I understand it is virtually similar in the bill sponsored by the able senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]—uses the carrot rather than the stick method with the States. Instead of penalizing States which do not control billboards, the proposal which we have been advancing and sponsoring offers a bonus of an additional three-quarters of 1 percent from the Federal Government as a reward for protecting the scenery along the roads.

Mr. FLANDERS. I congratulate the Senators on their efforts. I wish to do anything within my power to translate those efforts into completed legislation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The support of the distinguished Senator from Vermont is welcome, and the support of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] likewise is welcome and appreciated.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I am happy to know he is going to continue his efforts, which I hope this time will be successful.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We certainly share that hope.

---

## IDAHO POWER CO.'S BROWNLEE DAM PROJECT ON SNAKE RIVER

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Idaho Power Co.'s Brownlee Dam project on the Snake River will be operational this September.

This large storage dam will contribute 360,000 kilowatts of needed power to the Pacific Northwest power pool and will make available to the downstream areas of the Columbia River a million acre-feet of flood-control storage this coming winter.

In addition to its outstanding achievement of completing the world's second largest rock-fill hydroelectric dam in record time, Idaho Power Co. also has started construction on the second of its three-dam project units, Oxbow Dam.

This construction and its importance to the Pacific Northwest is described by Idaho Power Co.'s president, T. E. Roach, in a series of articles in the

Christian Science Monitor. In view of the still-continuing interest of the Congress in this valuable multiple-purpose, partnership water resource development project, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the first two articles of the current series published in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 14, 1958]

IDAHO POWER DUE TO LEAP WITH COMPLETION OF BROWNLEE DAM—FIRM TAKES GIANT STEPS—OXBOW UNIT UNDER WAY

(By T. E. Roach, president, Idaho Power Co., written for the Christian Science Monitor)

(How the Idaho Power Co. has kept pace with the new economic pattern that has developed in its territory in the postwar period and its plans for further expansion are told in a series of four articles by T. E. Roach, president. These articles were written in response to an invitation from the Christian Science Monitor.)

BOISE, IDAHO.—Brownlee Dam, first of three Idaho Power Co. hydroelectric projects licensed by the Federal Government for construction in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River, goes into operation in September 1958.

Its completion will have historic economic and engineering significance to the Pacific Northwest, for it will mean:

1. That Brownlee alone, with its initial installed generating capacity of 360,400 kilowatts of power, will nearly double the company's existing capacity.

2. That a sizable increment of electric power will become available to an area threatened by an acute shortage of power.

3. That to provide this much-needed power, the second largest rock-fill hydroelectric dam in the world and the largest in the United States will have been built in record time. Ordinarily, a dam of this magnitude would have required at least 18 more months to complete.

Brownlee alone will not solve the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest. Idaho Power is already at work on the second of the three dams—the Oxbow project, downstream from Brownlee. But Brownlee does symbolize the determination of this company to fulfill its responsibilities as a regulated public utility to the people of the area it serves.

The company's accomplishments of the past should be reviewed as a guide to the future.

ECONOMIC CHANGES

Idaho Power Co. was organized in 1916 with the merger of 5 operating companies, remnants of some 50 power-producing enterprises which came into being late in the 19th century and early in the present century. At the time of its organization, Idaho Power started with an investment in plant account of about $23 million and a total generating capacity of 20,340 kilowatts. Today the company's electric plant totals more than $187 million and its present generating capacity amounts to 375,000 kilowatts.

The company's growth was steady but unspectacular during the first 30 years of its operation. During World War II Idaho Power's supply in terms of generating capacity was not only adequate to meet the needs in its operating area, but provided an excess which could be exported to its neighbors in the Pacific Northwest, where mushrooming war industries had caused a power shortage.

With the cessation of hostilities it became obvious that economic changes were taking place. New agricultural processing plants were established; more lands were being brought under irrigation through use of electric pumps; manufacturing industries moved in; phosphate production was stepped up to provide more fertilizer for expanding agriculture. The Atomic Energy Commission was eyeing southern Idaho as a site for a huge nuclear reactor testing station. Mining was on the upswing, with the development of Idaho's great cobalt deposits just getting under way.

Abundant electric power was a must. To meet the responsibilities of supplying electric power for this area's growth, the company launched a $100 million postwar construction program. Within 6 years it had built 6 new hydroelectric dams and powerplants on the Snake River, and virtually quadrupled its kilowatt generating capacity. In addition, new transmission lines and substations were constructed to deliver the new electric power throughout the company's service area.

PLANT SWALLOWS POWER

That program marked the real beginning of multiple resources development of the Snake River.

What has brought about this tremendous postwar growth of the company? It is the new economic pattern shaping up for the Snake River Valley of southern Idaho and eastern Oregon, served by Idaho Power Co. It is a change which promises great economic advances. Before World War II the region was known primarily for its agricultural crops raised on irrigated lands, and for the production of livestock. With this change in the economic pattern, the region presents a wholesome, balanced economy of agriculture, commerce, and industry.

A dramatic illustration of the change which has taken place is found in the Westvaco elemental phosphorus plant at Pocatello, which today imposes a power demand about equal to the entire system load of Idaho Power about 10 years ago.

This change is further emphasized by the fact that the increase in use of electric services in Idaho Power Co.'s area for the past 15 years has been greater, percentagewise, than any other area in the entire Pacific Northwest, not excluding territories served by Federal agencies.

Even before that program of expansion was completed, the company recognized that there would be no tapering off in the need for more power. On June 23, 1947, Idaho Power filed application with the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit to commence development of the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River.

Today Idaho Power faces another decade of expansion which dwarfs that of the past.

TEN-YEAR EXPANSION PLAN

Under the second 10-year expansion program, which begins with construction of Brownlee Dam, we anticipate trebling the company's existing generating capacity. This program envisions investment of $260 million from 1956 through 1965, of which $160 million will be required for the three Snake River hydroelectric projects and related transmission facilities.

Although Idaho Power moved as swiftly as it could legally do so, the roadblocks put in its way by public-power advocates over the years have proved costly in terms of delayed electrical energy to the Pacific Northwest, which has long beeen hungry for more power.

Only by purchasing sizable blocks of steam-generated power from Utah has the Idaho Power Co. been able to maintain its position of never permitting its customers to experience a power shortage in the 41 years of its operation.

Brownlee will provide immediate insurance against an economic breakdown through lack of adequate power.

REGION BURGEONS

The area served by the company is still burgeoning. The plateau of demand for power is still out of sight, beyond the horizon.

In the last 7 years, irrigation pumping alone has converted more than 265,000 acres of sagebrush land to agricultural production. New agricultural processing plants are under construction. Westvaco and Idaho's own Simplot interests have greatly expanded the production of phosphate fertilizers and elemental phosphorus due to the availability of power. Cobalt mining has become big business, as Idaho has one of the two established large cobalt deposits in the Nation. And the Atomic Energy Commission is operating a nuclear reactor station where the first prototype of the atomic submarine was born, and where existing new peacetime atomic uses are being developed.

With it all, the people of the area have achieved a high electric living standard. The average home on the Idaho Power system uses 6,600 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually, more than double a national average of 3,000 kilowatt-hours of residential consumption. Moreover, the company has made electric service available to almost 100 percent of the farms in its area. These farm homes enjoy modern living by utilizing electric service to a greater extent than do city dwellers. Farm home use in Idaho average almost 8,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

Idaho Power has provided that electricity at a cost to consumers 35 percent below the national average. Only once in its 41-year history has it had to seek an increase in rates. That was in 1952. Since 1934, the company had made 12 voluntary rate reductions.

That has been our contribution to this area of the Pacific Northwest. As we have said, the end is not in sight. We look toward an exciting future.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 15, 1958]

MORE ELECTRIC POWER ON WAY FOR CRITICAL PACIFIC NORTHWEST AREA—IDAHO POWER SPEEDS SNAKE RIVER PROJECT

(By T. E. Roach, president, Idaho Power Co.)

(Construction of the huge new Brownlee Dam to provide additional power for the rapidly growing territory served by the Idaho Power Co. is described by T. E. Roach, president of the utility, in the second of this four-article series written at the request of the Christian Science Monitor.)

BOISE, IDAHO.—The Pacific Northwest is a critical defense area.

It is the site of aircraft factories, shipyards, atomic energy installations, aluminum and chemical plants, large basic metal industries such as lead, zinc, a Navy yard, a naval gun plant, Army posts, and Air Force bases.

All of these and many other industrial operations are dependent on electric power for their very existence. In Idaho Power Co.'s own service area—a 20,000-square-mile area of the Snake River Valley of southern Idaho and eastern Oregon—there are elemental phosphorus plants, atomic energy installations, a major Strategic Air Command base, a naval gun plant, as well as food processing plants and a highly productive market-basket type agriculture, which are all of vital importance to the national security. These, too, are dependent on electrical energy.

Yet, the Pacific Northwest is one of the few areas of the country which lack a safe reserve of electric power. Worse than that, it suffers from periodic power shortages. A perfect example is what occurred last January.

As the result of a sudden spell of freezing weather, Columbia River streamflows were reduced to a point where the resultant power production curtailment forced the Bonneville power system to discontinue all interruptible industrial loads. Result: Alcoa Aluminum dropped two potlines; Reynolds Metals dropped two potlines, and Kaiser Aluminum had to shut down three lines in one plant and curtail operations in another. This sort of thing can happen again and again. The situation cries out for more power, and in a hurry.

More power is on the way. Idaho Power will have it available next year. Brownlee Dam is rising at the upper end of Hells Canyon, the deepest gorge on the American Continent. Idaho Power is building it. The first of its four generators will be in operation by late next summer. Before the end of 1958, Brownlee will be completed with a total initial generating capacity of 360,400 kilowatts of electric power.

SIGNIFICANT TO REGION

This is of utmost significance to the entire Pacific Northwest as well as to the company's customers in the Snake River Valley. Idaho Power Co. is a member of the northwest power pool. It has already completed its transmission lines from Brownlee to tie in with the pool's network.

Brownlee is the first of three hydroelectric projects licensed by the Federal Government for construction by Idaho Power Co. in the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon. Rising 395 feet above bedrock, Brownlee will be the second largest rockfill .m in the world, exceeded only by a one-foot-higher dam in Japan. It will be one of the 15 biggest dams of all types in the United States.

This project is being built for Idaho Power by Morrison-Knudsen Co. in record time for a dam of this magnitude. Construction is now at a peak, with nearly 1,700 workers on the job, utilizing $6 million worth of heavy dam building equipment. On some phases of construction, work continues on a round-the-clock basis. On others, two 10-hour shifts daily are employed.

Immediately after the Federal Power Commission cleared the way by issuing Idaho Power Co. a license to build the three dams on the Snake River, the company signed an $87 million Brownlee-Oxbow construction contract with Morrison-Knudsen.

The race was started—a race against a threatening power shortage. Not in all the years since Idaho Power was organized in 1916 had it ever permitted its customers to experience a power shortage, nor will they suffer one now.

CONSTRUCTION STARTS IN 1955

The construction crews arrived in the remote canyon in November of 1955. They had built roads as they pushed toward the construction site so that materials, equipment, and more men could be mobilized. A campsite was cut out of the steep slopes of the canyon. Living facilities, warehouses, and shops were erected. Then they turned to attack the main task—to build a dam 395 feet high, 1,360 feet wide, and a quarter-mile thick at its base, one that would impound 1,500,000 acre-feet of water in a 57-mile reservoir.

Since that day, the construction crews have expended 4,500,000 man-hours of labor to the $83 millio- Brownlee project and to preliminary work on the nearby Oxbow project, second of the dams to be built.

Brownlee construction is on schedule today. It is over 72 percent completed.

The dam itself is taking shape with over 5 million cubic yards of rock in place. A wide wall of impervious clay, which forms the core of the dam, has already risen 295 feet above the foundations.

Excavation for the spillway is already completed. Pouring of its concrete covering started early in December. The 4 penstock tunnels, burrowed through 525 feet of solid rock, are completed and being lined with the steel tubes through which powerful jets of Snake River water will flow to the 4 turbines.

Construction has been started on the powerhouse which will rise to a height of 90 feet. The switchyard from which power will be channeled where needed is virtually complete. Much of the road relocation work has been completed and a new railroad bridge for the Union Pacific's mainline relocation is but one span from completion.

TRANSMISSION LINE EXTENDED

A 42-mile-long 230,000-volt transmission line between Brownlee and Baker, Oreg., has been completed to connect with a previously built line to LaGrande, Oreg., a terminus of the northwest power pool network. Another 230,000-volt transmission line 100 miles long is being constructed between Brownlee and Boise.

To provide for distribution of the increased power supply, Idaho Power is completing a $1,500,000 addition to its substation at Boise and is building a $4 million substation at American Falls, Idaho, to serve the eastern side of the company's transmission system.

Permanent housing has been built for the operating force both at Brownlee and at Oxbow. Schools have been erected not only to provide for children of the construction workers but to serve the families who will live in the permanent operators' villages.

With a population of better than 1,000, it is the largest community in Hells Canyon. Every facility is afforded the residents, including a supermarket, a barber shop, a post office, garage and automobile service station, water and sewage disposal.

Idaho Power makes television available to trailer town by relaying programs from Boise stations through rebroadcasting equipment set up on the heights of the canyon. Church services are held in trailer town school.

Around the bend of the river from trailer town, the work goes on—night and day—to bring ample electric supplies for the bright future of an ever-growing region.

---

## THE ADMINISTRATION'S FARM PROGRAM

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on January 16, 1958, Congress received from the President of the United States his recommendations for improving our present agricultural programs.

The recommendation which perhaps has generated the most controversy is that asking Congress to vest in the Secretary of Agriculture greater administrative discretion in setting price support levels on the basic commodities and dairy products. As Secretary Benson told the Senate Agriculture Committee last Friday:

Rather than determining price supports for the basic commodities by formula between 75 and 90 percent of parity, price supports should be determined administratively in a wider range from 60 to 90 percent of parity. This range should also apply to dairy products.

In the same testimony the Secretary of Agriculture listed the following reasons why, in his judgment, this recommendation should be enacted:

The suggested changes are needed for the following reasons:

1. Agricultural products are likely to continue to be abundant and cannot be successfully priced as if they were scarce.

2. Support levels computed under the present formula have stimulated production, priced us out of the market, and aggravated farmers' marketing problems.

3. Controls have not been effective in reducing over-all agricultural production despite the severe restrictions they impose on farmers' freedom to produce and market.

4. The concept of adjustment through effective production control is impractical, as evidenced by a series of legislative and administrative actions.

5. Farm people have not received the benefits from existing programs that they expected. On the contrary, existing programs have had many adverse effects.

(a) Necessary adjustments have been impeded during a period when the general state of the economy would have facilitated them, although the intent was to ease the adjustment from wartime to peacetime conditions.

(b) They have made little or no contribution to the problem of low-income farmers in whose name farm programs are frequently defended.

(c) They work against the long-run interest of the family type farm, insofar as they inhibit the flexibility in operation and adjustment in size needed to make family farms efficient. Good farmers find it difficult to maintain satisfactory incomes with their acreage curtailed. They need to adjust the scale of their operations to take advantage of advancing technology in agriculture.

(d) They raise the price of land to young farmers who are just starting out, since the worth of allotments tends to become capitalized into land values. A windfall profit to one generation becomes an overhead cost to the next.

(e) Statutory exemptions extended to growers in minimum-sized categories have required tighter restrictions on moderately larger and more efficient farms.

(f) Production on acres diverted out of the basic crops has complicated the marketing problems of other farmers who produce nonbasic products.

(g) They had led to criticisms against farm programs because of the high costs.

What additional evidence is there to support the Department of Agriculture in this matter? There is this, as the Secretary told the Senate Agriculture Committee last Friday:

Realized losses under program primarily for the support of farm prices and incomes was $3.25 billion in the 1957 fiscal year, far above the $1.9 billion cost in 1956. These amounts, of course, did not go entirely to farmers. Substantial amounts have had to be charged for storage, transportation, interest, and administration. Part of these costs represent economic, military, and other activities abroad. Some of these activities might have been undertaken entirely apart from our surplus-disposal operations.

Over 80 percent of the price support and stabilization costs in 1957 period was concentrated in three crops (wheat, cotton, and corn) and butter and manufactured dairy products. About one-half was incurred in two crops—wheat and cotton.

These heavy costs would be justified if they led to a solution of the agricultural problem. However, they have not. Price supports at the levels now required by law have continued to generate surpluses which must be disposed of at a heavy loss and which continue to depress farm prices and incomes. This is one of the reasons why we are requesting further changes in legislation.

As evidence of the fact that there is wide support among the American people of this administrative farm program, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 3 newspaper editorials devoted to this

subject be printed at this point in the RECORD. They are of recent date, and were published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, the Washington Post, and the Washington Sunday Star, respectively.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Salt Lake Telegram of January 17, 1958]

COURAGE IN FARM LEGISLATION

The farm program President Eisenhower submitted to Congress yesterday reflects the courage and integrity that the public has expected from this administration.

It reflects courage because it is politically risky. The powerful farm bloc is attempting to reunite itself to fight just such a program. The administration will have a hard time holding onto the gains it has already made in farm legislation, much less go as far forward as the President proposes.

It reflects integrity because it is so obviously heading in the right direction, despite the tremendous pressures that are building for going the other way.

Paradoxically, the American farm problem has been created by the very elements of which America is so proud—that is, technological skills and ingenuity in making the best use of land and labor. Thus, despite more than a decade of trying to get land out of production, surpluses still spill out of our granaries. The surpluses come from the same technology that has made American production so vast and powerful in other fields, and which has, in fact, created such wealth in this country.

It would be criminally foolish, in our opinion, to try to hold back just such progress on the farms of the country. Secretary of Agriculture Benson's program, endorsed by the President, is aimed at helping the country adjust to the technological farm revolution rather than resist it.

By lowering the price support floor to 60% instead of 75% for basic crops and raising acreage allotments, the program would tend to remove the Government still further from the farm picture. By eliminating the silly "escalator" clause requiring supports to go up as surpluses go down, it would make possible much more effective cuts into our surpluses.

The other major proposal relates to the soil bank. Here again, the emphasis is on easing the effect on the individual of what President Eisenhower called the "irreversible" technological revolution in agriculture.

The soil bank has been given a bad name since its enactment in 1956, because a number of abuses have been exposed. The administration's new program would eliminate the source of virtually all the abuses disclosed so far.

It should be remembered that the soil bank has consisted of two parts. The "Acreage Reserve" program has been a temporary, year-to-year retirement of croplands. The field could lie idle one year while the farmer collected his fee from the Government, then be planted the next. The long-range conservation effect of such an arrangement was nil. Under political pressure from both parties, it became almost a relief program and became, in the eyes of the public, almost a fraud.

President Eisenhower proposes eliminating this part of the program. We agree with him completely.

He proposes, instead, strengthening the other part of the program, the so-called "Conservation Reserve." This requires the land to be retired, not year-to-year, but from 3 to 10 years. Moreover, trees, grass, wildlife cover or water-storage must be installed on the land, making it truly a conservation program and, indeed, a true "soil bank."

This part of the program has not been promoted much. Still, under it, 4,474,925 acres of the new Great Plains dustbowl have been signed up under the "Conservation Reserve." Grass and shelterbelt plantings will save millions of acres of priceless land that otherwise might "blow." It will leave them undamaged and ready for future use, either in an emergency or to feed some future population.

The administration has marked out for itself a real fight with these farm proposals. It is by no means assured of winning. But it is right, and we have the feeling that in the long run being right is more important than being popular.

---

[From the Washington Post of January 18, 1958]

DISENGAGEMENT IN FARMING

President Eisenhower has requested further withdrawal of the Government from farm controls and the maintenance of prices. The administration recognizes the failure of its acreage reserve plan as well as price supports to bring about the reduced production essential to boost agricultural prices anywhere near the parity level. So it is falling back upon less spectacular measures aimed at specific problems, with greater reliance on the forces of supply and demand so far as the larger commercial farms are concerned.

Even the present flexible price supports, which may range from 75 to 90 percent of parity, have contributed to surplus production. Under the present law, the escalator clauses encourage the piling up of new surpluses as soon as existing surpluses are reduced. If the law of supply and demand is to operate as a real regulator of production, these impediments will have to be modified.

The President seems to assume that the country's 2,100,000 commercial farms, which produce 90 percent of all the food and fiber marketed in this country, can generally take care of themselves. The current program would help this group largely through marketing loans, increased movement of farm surpluses abroad and stepped-up research to encourage greater industrial use of farm products. For the other 2,700,000 farmers, who have relatively little to sell, aid of a quite different type is contemplated. The expansion of the conservation reserve of the soil bank will be of interest chiefly to marginal farmers in this category. Those who are producing little for market will be encouraged to place their whole farms in the conservation reserve and to find jobs elsewhere. This is a salutary trend, as the Committee for Economic Development recently pointed out.

The question here is whether the $450 million requested by the President for the conservation reserve is sufficient. Congress may well decide to increase this sum and to liberalize the terms under which farmers may place their land in storage. The Department of Agriculture may also find it desirable to extend to the whole country the experimental arrangement under which farmers in 4 States may offer their entire farms to the soil bank on a biding basis for periods of 5 to 10 years.

Of special interest also to the small farmer who has little to sell is the rural development program. The President has pledged increased emphasis on this effort to train farmers for part-time industrial jobs, to locate industries in rural areas, to enhance efficiency and to improve water, land and timber resources in backward areas. Certainly much can be done under this program to help the lowest-income farmers who are most in need of assistance.

Many Congressmen have already indicated their displeasure with the Eisenhower-Benson program, but there seems to be little prospect of a Congressional plan being worked out and enacted. In the absence of any reasonable alternative, we think Congress would be well advised to let the administration put its program into effect. The President's new requests are a logical extension of the policies now being followed. If Congress can do better, it is, of course, welcome to try. But little could be said for leaving in effect a law that now satisfies neither the executive nor the legislative branch.

---

[From the Washington Star of January 19, 1958]

FARM FIREWORKS

President Eisenhower's recommendations for farm legislation hardly had reached Capitol Hill when the predicted fireworks over this controversial subject broke out. And on the basis of 1 day's hearings before the Senate Agriculture Committee it is obvious that more heat than light will be shed on the problem in the period immediately ahead. It is not, of course, an unprecedented situation and all the necessary elements for political passion are readily available.

There is, to begin with, a farm problem—in the sense that the farmers, applying vastly improved production methods and despite controls, have been producing more than markets can absorb. Neither Government price supports nor surplus disposal programs have been fully effective to a point where overall farm income has been able to keep pace with the general rise in prices which the farmer has had to pay for the other essentials of living. The marginal farmer—usually the home farmer—has been hit hardest; the commercial farmer, best able to invest in modern equipment and employing greater acreage, has fared best. In terms of political influence, however, the home farmer represents approximately 2.7 million families—and the temper of general unhappiness was reflected in much of the 1956 vote against the Republicans as the party in power. As Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson is the whipping boy and it is no surprise that farm-bloc members from both parties have jumped to the attack. Indeed, only a Democrat, Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, was moved to protest against the assault on Mr. Benson in the first day's hearing.

In brief, the President has proposed a greater freedom for the farm economy—fewer and less restrictive controls and reduced financial propping. He has asked for a wider range on price supports, with a lower permissible minimum, and outright abandonment of the escalator clause which has required higher supports whenever surpluses were reduced—a self-defeating formula that automatically provided incentive for new surpluses. He has proposed, also, that acreage controls be liberalized.

Underlying the President's plea is the philosophy that the Nation should find ways to utilize abundance, rather than striving unsuccessfully to create scarcity. It is his argument that legislation originally devised to meet depression needs, revised in wartime and revised again in a period of tense peace, has become outdated and ineffective. There is considerable evidence to support that theory. But with Congressional elections coming up again this fall, the prospects are not good, unhappily, for any material reduction in the most direct forms of Government assistance to the still politically powerful farm population.

---

## THE PRESIDENT'S 1958 ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in my opinion this year's Economic Report of

the President is one of the most straightforward and analytical documents of that type ever presented to the Congress.

It is straightforward in that the President pointed out that the current rate of economic growth—not economic activity in general—"would clearly be unsatisfactory as a continuing condition." When it is realized, however, that the economy achieved a phenomenal 7.2 percent increase in real output of goods and services in 1955, followed by a 2.7 percent increase in 1956, the average of recent past years, it was not unlikely that readjustments had to be made in 1957, and that the rate of economic growth would slow down somewhat.

Since 1958 is again an election year, I believe it important that the American people, before passing judgment upon the economic performance of this administration, consider carefully the President's sage observation:

> Because our economy responds to forces and conditions that are continually changing in intensity and character, economic growth will inevitably proceed at a somewhat uneven pace. The high rate of economic growth that occurs when ground lost during a recession is being recovered cannot continue indefinitely. When economic resources are close to being fully used, even though there may be slack in some sectors of the economy, expansion normally proceeds at a slower pace. Efforts to accelerate growth under these conditions may succeed only in generating inflationary pressures.

Whether or not 1957 as a whole met all the objectives of the Employment Act cannot yet be determined. The forthcoming hearings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, however, will shed light upon this matter.

But it can be said that 1957, in spite of strong inflationary pressures throughout most of the year, and a modest decline in economic activity during the fourth quarter, was a prosperous and good year. This the President's report does make very clear. Record levels of production, employment, and personal disposable income were established.

The unfavorable feature of the economic performance, despite stringent monetary controls and a sensible fiscal program, was an inability to maintain a stable price level. Although the gross national product at $434 billion was up $19 billion over 1956, and represented a 5 percent money increase, the net gain in real terms was only 1 percent.

Mr. President, under these circumstances, I feel impelled to point out, as the President phrased it, that:

> The conclusion is inescapable that, if we are to have orderly and adequately rapid growth in the economy, our wagemaking and pricemaking arrangements must produce results consistent with a reasonably stable price level. They must do so within a free competitive economy. Freedom, including economic freedom, requires self-discipline. If important groups ignore this truth, the alternatives are either an economy damaged by inflation or controls that are incompatible with our free competitive institutions.

Government certainly can help by following sound countercyclical monetary and fiscal policies and programs. This the administration initiated last year, but the Federal program obviously is not adequate by itself. Self-discipline, as the President's report indicates, must govern the participants who make the millions upon millions of economic transactions which take place every year.

The performance by the agricultural sector of the economy in 1957 still left much to be desired in terms of price and income improvements. For this reason, I was pleased to note that the President's report contained a recommendation that Congress approve legislation providing for an annual survey of farm operators to provide data on farm income by economic classes.

This recommendation is embodied in S. 405, which I first introduced in the 84th Congress and again in the last session, because it had failed to come before the House of Representatives for floor action. Until such data is made available and widely distributed among the people and Members of Congress, we are not likely to develop farm programs which treat effectively the different problems confronting the owners and operators of our large and small commercial farms as well as our part-time farms. I am hopeful that the House will take favorable action upon S. 405, since the Senate again passed the bill by unanimous consent last session.

In closing, let me say that I was happy to note the optimistic tone of the President's observation that:

> As we look ahead in 1958, there are grounds for expecting that the decline in business activity need not be prolonged and that economic growth can be resumed without extended interruption.

---

## OUR CURRENT CRISIS—AND THE NEED FOR EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—

> If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it.

When Abraham Lincoln spoke those words in his house-divided speech, a century ago, the Nation was fast drifting toward the abyss of a tragic and disastrous war. Lincoln sensed that a policy of Presidential firmness and candor might foster a national self-awareness—the indispensable preliminary to any saving act of Government. But, President James Buchanan, a tired and amiable man with tired policies, continued to spread the contagion of his own confusion over the land.

Today, what was true in 1858 is again true, but on a vastly larger scale, and in a vastly more menacing form.

The then issue of slavery has changed into the global conflict of cold war: A war in which military strength, or weakness, is a consequence rather than a cause of how things stand on the economic, political, educational, and cultural sectors of the battlefront. Meanwhile, one unnerving similarity to the America of a century ago remains in being: It is that the peril of the Nation increases daily because of the way the incumbent administration has dulled, and continues to dull, the Nation's awareness of the danger it faces—the danger that is posed by two leading questions:

How strong is the Soviet Union today?

How strong is it likely to be tomorrow?

When Sputniks I and II rang out with alarming answers to these two questions, the national will of America was poised to rally around the Presidency. Indeed, that is the traditional American reaction to a national emergency—as can be recalled from personal experience when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, and when the Communists attacked Korea. In 1941, and again in 1950, the American people expected the President of the hour to proclaim the formidable truths of what the Nation faced, however unpleasant. He was expected to frame, to win approval for, and to execute the measures for overcoming the emergency. And Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, each in his own way, did just that.

No less was expected of the Eisenhower administration—if the emergency implications in Russia's scientific achievements were to be met and mastered. Yet months dropped away, and what we received instead was the same bland diet of sugar-coated half-truths that has made us fat and immobile in the past 5 years; 5 years when we should have been muscular, resilient, and ever on the move scouting the terrain ahead.

In the passing months, if there was any informed public discussion on the highest matters of state since the first earth satellite was launched, no thanks were due to administration sources. They were due, rather, to the aroused energy of individual Members of the Congress or of private persons. The highest officials of the administration, for their part, continued in their old ways.

They made their own inner councils the judge, the jury, and the repository of the records of their own actions, never taking the people into their full confidence. If they asked for support for this or that measure, they withheld a disclosure of the facts material to an informed public discussion of the merits of the proposal, or they so distorted the meaning of the facts as to make them a caricature of the realities they are meant to stand for.

As an example of this, the Gaither report, developed for the express purpose of evaluating our strength relative to that of the Soviet Union, was suppressed on the ground that its unpleasant truths might cause the people to panic. But in the next breath, Mr. Hagerty, the President's press secretary, assured the Nation that the report does not say that the

United States is weak now. If so, we are left to conclude that the report was not released because the Nation might panic from joy over the evidence of our strength. What a fantastic, dreamlike performance it has been.

Nor has the case changed very much for the better since the President's state of the Union message was delivered. The message, to begin with, is merely a printed catalog of good intentions. It is not the specifics of any action program. The experiences of the past 5 years should teach us by now that we would be well advised to withhold any hosannas about a proposed program until we see it in concrete form, and until we see whether the administration is willing to go the limit in fighting for its adoption. For the evidence of the past is that this administration has a chronic habit of not following through.

Anyway, from what administration sources have already put out about the details of their space-age program, it is, at bottom, a program calling for a minimal instead of a maximum effort on the part of the United States. For the ruling principle to which it is tailored—as administration sources have made clear in conferences with Congressional leaders—is this: That the Soviet Union—our challenger—is a warped society, wracked by internal strains, and fated for an early and inglorious collapse. In the circumstances, all we have to do is the very little that is required to keep our own motors idling until the inevitable crackup occurs to the Soviet Union.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, is it not true that from time to time some of us have been advised by administration sources, particularly by the Secretary of State, that we can almost expect the Soviet Union to crack up any day?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In his testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations 2 years ago, that was clearly the implication to be drawn from his testimony. I shall refer to that in the next paragraph of my prepared statement.

Mr. LONG. My impression of the Secretary's statement at that time was to the effect that the fact the Soviet Union had lasted that long was a cause for wonder.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator's statement is well taken.

It is worth remembering that the doctrinal line here was laid down by the administration less than 2 years ago. Shortly after the 20th Soviet Congress, that is, we were told by Secretary Dulles that the Russian system was a failure; that they were reexamining their creed from A to Z; that the Soviet Union was making no progress in penetrating the Middle East; and that all in all, their policies had miscarried. Since this was said, any fact, however, random, has been seized by administration sources and woven into the design if it can be made to fit the doctrinal theory of Soviet weakness.

Thus we are told that so much of the Soviet effort has gone into heavy industry and so little into consumer goods that its economy is out of balance; that its people are dissatisfied and will become disaffected. After all, they have only 100,000 automobiles a year, compared to our 6 million. It is suggested, furthermore, that Russian intellectuals cannot be regimented and controlled forever; that their demands for freedom may cause the government to turn its attention to some solution of Russia's internal troubles, thereby halting the push toward external aggression and subversion. Additionally, it is suggested that the proof of internal political tension and instability is to be found in the dismissal of Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich, and Zhukov. Each of these men represent sources of power that Khruschchev has alienated—so the argument goes—with the result that they are now merely biding their time for a disruptive counterattack on his present rule.

It is neither pleasant nor popular to contest this theorizing. The man who does so, by pointing to the facts of Soviet strength, risks every manner of false charge. Inevitably, it will be said of him that he has lost faith in America; that he is an apologist for the Soviet way of doing things; that he wants America to make itself over along Soviet lines; or that he means to panic America into a preventive war designed to smash the Soviet Union before its power increases any further. Nevertheless, precisely because I feel that the stuff of greatness has not gone out of the bones of America; precisely because I feel that our democratic society is equal to the emergency it faces, provided it knows what it is dealing with, let me here try to sketch the character of Soviet strength, and the specific areas of weakness in the American establishment, for the tests ahead.

I would admit straight off that the Soviet system may, in fact, have to be altered. In the long run, it may even collapse. But, as the saying goes, in the long run too, all of us shall be dead. Anyway, what counts most of all in the life of nations, is the pace and timing of events. And right now, when the world all around us is being hammered into new shapes, nothing on the line of vision points to a collapse of the Soviet system. True, the Soviet ideology has been, can be, and may be further repudiated by events. But the Soviet power system is something else again. Within, and external to, Russia, that power system may continue to justify its legitimacy in ideological terms. In point of fact, however, it does not need an ideology to sustain itself. As a power system pure and simple, it has powerful and measurable resources at its disposal.

For one thing, the Soviet Union itself represents a land mass 3 times as large as the United States, with enormous natural resources of every kind, and with a population of more than 200 million inhabitants. Moreover, in recent decades, its natural resources have been increasingly exploited at a rapid pace; and its industry—especially its heavy industry—has been developed enormously. If there are any signs of strain here, we would be closer to the truth of the matter in viewing them as the strains of growth instead of decline.

Secondly, it is true enough to say that the people of the Soviet Union lack consumer goods: automobiles, refrigerators, television, and fine clothes. But it does not follow from this that they are without enough to eat, or that they are lacking in warm clothes and shelter. What actually has happened is that the Soviets have devoted the materials and efforts, which might have made automobiles and other luxuries, to the development of rockets, satellites, jet planes, basic research, and, above all, education. And, as it happens, the latter activities have a far greater meaning in terms of national strength, than does the availability of luxurious consumer goods. Certainly the Persia of Xerxes was far more splendid in ornamentation than Sparta and Athens. But who won the battle of Marathon?

As for the dismissal of four of the most important party officials in the Soviet Union, on what grounds can this be construed as a sign of an imminent collapse? The fact that the deadly contest for topmost control over the intricate Soviet apparatus was waged at this time with little violence, and apparently no bloodshed, points more to the self-confidence and strength of the regime than to its weakness.

Again, relatively bleak internal conditions of Russia may, in fact, have the effect of inducing the people of the Soviet Union to work all the harder. In the case of the young, especially, it may induce them to exert every effort to achieve an excellent education—this, because they know that if they remain uneducated, they are doomed to live at a bare subsistence level.

It is, in fact, precisely in the field of education and basic research that the Russians have apparently made their greatest progress. Why should this be so? How is it that they recognized some years ago that trained minds were indispensable to modern technology, modern weapons, and modern methods of subversion? How is it that they had the vision to upgrade the pay and status of educators and scientists to a level just below that of the ruling hierarchy itself? It may be that the scholar in the field of history or politics is restrained by Communist dogma. But it seems fairly clear that the Communists have had the good sense to give way whenever there is conflict between their doctrines and the physical sciences. Witness the results they have achieved. On the other hand, there is little evidence that the scientists and professors are unhappy with their lot in the Soviet Union. Very few, if any, of them are found among the refugees who seek asylum in the West.

So once again the question intrudes itself: Why is it that Soviet leaders, for all their roughness and brutality, have had the shrewdness to recognize the supreme importance of education? Why is it that a system of government which we are told has many inherent weaknesses and is threatened by present internal stresses and strains, has had the foresight to take the long view and to devote a major effort to education? This

determined and successful drive by the Russians to cultivate to the utmost the intellectual powers of their people is the most serious, the most difficult, challenge of all to meet. It will require leadership of the highest order, with vision and persistence over the long term. Our people, and our political leaders, react promptly and decisively to a challenge requiring a short term, tangible solution, such as more missiles or submarines. They have been somewhat less successful in pursuing long-term policies, thoughtful and discriminating in concept, and intangible in character.

The question intrudes itself, and we can answer, in part, that the Soviets inherited from the old czarist government a tradition of intellectual excellence and scientific curiosity going back to Peter the Great and the founding of the Academy of Sciences at a time when America was still a wilderness inhabited by savages. Yet the greater part of the answer, so it seems to me, lies elsewhere. It lies in the fact that the principal rulers of Russia are professionals who have spent their entire lives in governmental affairs Their past and their future, their personal fortunes as well as their political positions, are identified with the strength and success of the government of Soviet Russia. The facts here are documented by Milovan Djilas, who, in his recent book, The New Class, emphasizes the proprietary nature of the relationship of the Communist Party with all the resources of Russia.

To repeat, the members of the Communist Party, and especially the leaders of the party and the rulers of Russia, own the place. None of them regard their sojourn in Moscow as a temporary sacrifice to the public welfare. They hope and expect to be in Moscow for a long time. They have no comfortable corporate berths to which to retire. They are interested in strengthening the power and endurance of their government because it is the same as strengthening their own power. In other words, there is an identity of interest between the government, as such, and those who control and operate it. And as they have every reason to take the long view in matters of national policy, they have every reason to encourage Russian scientific and technological developments—since it will be the new class itself which will get the first benefit from what that science and technology produces.

Here it may be argued that as the numbers of Russian scientists and technicians increase, they will impose their humanizing demands on the power group in control of the Soviet apparatus; and by forcing changes in their policies, bring the cold war to an end. Maybe so; and indeed, let us fervently hope so. Yet there are two answers to this argument.

One is, that the prospect it holds forth is not an immediate prospect. If it materializes at all, it will be at some point in the distant future, which leaves unanswered the immediate problem of how the rest of the world is to survive until the so-called contradictions in the Soviet system exert their full force.

The second answer is that the analogy of what happened in Germany on two occasions undercuts the assumption that the increase in the number of scientists and technicians within a country necessarily means that the country in question will be directed into the paths of peace. On two occasions in the 20th century, German scientists and technicians, certainly among the best in the world, did not stay the agressive march of Kaiser Wilhelm or Adolf Hitler. With rare exceptions, the German scientists and technicians underwent no crisis of conscience as they became the executive agents of what the Kaiser and the fuehrer meant to do.

On the grounds just set forth, then, it does not seem that we ought to count on any easy salvation such as might be produced by Russian internal developments. If we are to survive as a nation and as a democratic society—and if the West is to survive with us—it will be through what we do, and therefore force the Russians to do, and not through what the Russians on their own do or fail to do.

Where, then, do we now stand?

Fat, rich nations—like fat, rich old men—are prone to overestimate their powers. They tend to believe that they are entitled to the admiration and respect of others because of their wealth, or, at least, that money will purchase the subservience of less fortunate people. The employees of the rich men can scarcely be expected to tell their employer the truth about his public relations, and thereby put their own jobs in jeopardy. So, in a democracy, elected officials dependent upon the approval of their constituents for political life, are equally unlikely to draw comparisons with foreign powers which are unpleasant to the voters. The rare, very rare, exception which proved the rule was Churchill, at the time of the German attack, when he promised his people only blood, sweat, and tears; but even then the evidence of their dire predicament was too obvious to be denied or suppressed.

Right now, even in the hour of our so-called awakening to danger, the evidence offered by the administration that it is alive to the most difficult of all the challenges we face is discouraging in the extreme. There is little doubt that we will meet the immediate problem of missiles and satellites. But the real challenge we face involves the very roots of our society. It involves our educational system, the source of our knowledge and cultural values. And here the administration's program for a renaissance of learning is disturbingly small minded.

There are many important aspects of our policies which need overhauling, of course, such as the military organization, our tariff or reciprocal trade program, our mutual assistance effort, but all of these are secondary in importance to our educational program. The heart of the contest with the Soviet Union is education. As Mr. Walter Lippmann put the matter in a brilliant article on January 2:

> The challenge is not whether we can maintain or restore the balance of military power, necessary as it is to do that. The challenge is whether we can restore the intellectual greatness of the West, if not to its old preeminence, at least to a new equality.

Yet, as things now stand in America, there is no particular incentive for young people to exert themselves to achieve excellence in intellectual attainment. Our students can leave school with a minimum of learning and still be reasonably sure of a life of relative ease and luxury. Truckdrivers, bricklayers, and factory workers often receive a higher income than do professors; an Elvis Presley makes more than the President of the United States. Of a piece with this, there is no particular prestige attached to intellectual attainment in America. A man's success or status is measured, not so much by the ideas he may have developed or his service to the community. It is measured, rather, by the size of his house, the number and the vintage of the cars he owns, and where he spends his vacation.

Indeed, during the recent McCarthy era, the prestige of educators and intellectuals generally sank to an alltime low. The free discussion of ideas, the basis for our strength since the days of the Revolutionary War, was stifled. Security was substituted for scientific research. Discoveries which were made were locked in safes instead of becoming available as stimuli for new discoveries. Some of the best minds in the land were expelled from Government service, and a suspicion of educated people was spread throughout the land as if they were enemy aliens. The big doubt came to full flower in an orgy of flamboyant newspaper and television spectacles. Yet the McCarthy era was but the culmination of the long period of neglect of education, going back for many decades. It was the result, not the cause, of our anti-intellectualism—an outlook that was the very opposite of the highly educated men who were the Founding Fathers of America.

There will be those among us who will say, "But education takes too long and we do not have the time; our efforts must be devoted to missiles and outer space." This is truly the counsel of despair and disaster. The start toward improvement in education must be now; it should have been yesterday. Our most pressing short-range objective should be to start now on our long-range programs. The administration's proposal of a scholarship and counseling program of $250 million a year for 4 years is a step in the right direction, and I approve it. To that proposal, there should be added an additional authorization for $500 million a year to be distributed in accordance with the formula of Senate bill 472, approved by the Senate by a vote of 58 to 22 in 1948. This would make a respectable start toward our goal.

I should like to digress for a moment to invite attention to what has happened this year in connection with the national budget. As I have said, I approve of the $250 million a year which is proposed for a scholarship program, but I do not approve of the deletions and reductions in this year's budget as compared with last year's budget—of $93 million of Federal aid to impacted areas;

$9.2 million for the exchange of persons program under the Smith-Mundt authorization; the $2 million decrease in the appropriation for the Library Services Act; and the $451 million in school construction funds, which is abandoned in this budget. I assume the request for a school-construction program was left out because of what happened to the school-construction measure in the House, but I should like to encourage the administration to continue some effort to procure comparable funds—if not in that exact bill, in a bill such as I mentioned, which the Senate passed in 1948.

There is an item about which I have just heard on which I wish to compliment the Navy. I have heard, unofficially, that the Navy will announce in a short time a scholarship program covering approximately 500 persons, to be chosen from Navy personnel. I approve of such a program. However, when we add up all the figures, we find that, the assistance to education program that was announced, of $250 million a year, is a recommendation of only about half of the amount which was included in last year's budget for education. Therefore I do not consider it to be very rapid progress in improving education in this country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the remarkably fine address he is making. I wish to ask him this question: Regardless of how good a scholarship is—and I certainly support it and believe it is good—if we depend solely upon that program, are we not begging the real question so far as developing a truly effective educational program in this country is concerned?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. The really deplorable conditions in education exist in the elementary and secondary levels. To superimpose a scholarship program on top of that situation is not a very satisfactory answer. I say that because the people who will come up and be eligible for the scholarship program, by and large, will be ill equipped to benefit from it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has had a remarkable career in his short span of years. He was president of one of the fine universities in this country, and he has always been interested in educational problems. I should like to ask this question of the distinguished Senator: Does he not feel that, if there is a strong basic educational program in the country, we will get the scientists and physicists and all the other people we need?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely correct. Actually, if time were not involved, I would say it would be a mistake to start as the administration does. However, I will go along with the program and support it because, first of all, it is the only one that we will have before us; and, secondly, because time is important, if we are to supply the scientists and other trained people in the various fields. However, I believe it is a mistake to divert our attention from the problems of our elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This thought occurs to me: What will we do with the scholarship winners? Let me say that that thought comes home to me in a very practical way. Down in my State we have our A. & M. College, which is generally known as Auburn. It has a very fine engineering school. Yet only recently a couple of the engineering divisions of that school lost accreditation for the reason—and this is the only reason—that they had more students than they had facilities to take care of those students.

I ask this question: Is it proper for a State-supported institution to get to the point where it must turn away applicants simply because it does not have space enough in order to qualify for accreditation?

I may say to the distinguished Senator that the same threat, or at least the same condition, prevails in our State university, which likewise has a very fine school of engineering. Perhaps the same condition obtains in many other parts of the country, where schools are overcrowded already and are finding it difficult to meet the demands made upon them, and find themselves sadly lacking in facilities, with inadequate faculties, and with faculties inadequately paid.

Therefore, are we not simply begging the real question and piling up our troubles if we are willing to rest on this program alone?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly agree with the Senator. He has stated the situation very well indeed. I think it would be a great tragedy if we were to permit this opportunity to pass without doing something much more fundamental than merely adopting the scholarship program of the administration.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to comment on the brilliant address being made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I commend him for expressing his thoughts on this very critical subject. I wonder whether the Senator would agree with this analysis, to which I have given some thought:

The highest priority for bringing American education back at least to a state of parity, if not the leadership which we stand in danger of losing, lies, regrettably, in the teaching profession itself. In other words, we must start with the kindergarten and work upward to the teacher of the graduate students. It will be impossible to rehabilitate the teaching profession with the resources available at the local and State levels. Of course money alone cannot cure the situation, but, at the same time, we must realize that without money it cannot be done at all.

The next priority lies with brick and mortar. It was very sad indeed to hear the President give up the program for school construction and college construction. We must realize that the days when it sufficed to have Mark Hopkins on one side and the student on the other side was sufficient; that can no longer be the case in days of chemistry and physics and the other sciences which require elaborate laboratories and other aids.

The third priority is one which is also the first priority. In other words, the school program of the administration, which I, too, endorse, will merely substitute one bright student for another bright student, by making it possible for a boy to go to college who could not otherwise go to college, and by replacing another boy who might not be as bright and who cannot get in because there is not room for him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has stated the situation very well. I sincerely believe that should be the order of priority over the long view. The earlier we get to it, the better; there is no time like the present, of course.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to address my question through him to the Senator from Alabama. Frankly, I am dismayed by the condition which our friend from Alabama describes exists in his State college, particularly with respect to its lack of facilities. I say that because certainly there is a State legislature in Alabama and it has bonding power and taxing power. Does the Senator now come here and confess that, because of the State's own failures in the educational field, the Federal Government should pick up the load? Is that it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama, and then I shall make a comment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What else is there to be gathered from the Senator's observation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say this to the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I am confident that our State legislature will cure the situation so far as it exists at the present time. However, what I have said is an indication of what is happening all over the country. Boys and girls are clamoring to get into colleges. We simply are not able to keep up the facilities and to maintain the teacher levels that we ought to maintain in order to take care of them. I may say, with reference to my own State, it will do those things that are necessary to be done to maintain adequate school facilities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to comment on that same question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I shall have another question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. Before the Senator continues, I should like to say that just within the last few days I reviewed the debate which took place on the floor of the Senate in 1948. I wish to pay tribute to the late Senator Taft for the brilliant way in which he led that particular debate. He had sponsored the bill at that time. That was in the 80th Congress, and he was chairman of the Committee on Education and Public Welfare. Knowing the Senator from Illinois, I am sure he will be more

persuaded by the words of Senator Taft than he will be by me.

I shall refer the Senator to that debate for the precise answer, but I think I can give him the substance of it in a few words.

Senator Taft pointed out that he had had reservations about the Federal-aid-to-education bill and had voted against one bill of which, I believe, I was a cosponsor in 1945 or 1946. But he had, in the meantime, considered it further, and he so stated in the course of the debate. In addition there were also some amendments pertaining to the formula by which the money was to be distributed among the States, and those amendments appealed to him also.

But he said that many of the States, because of the economic condition of the country, simply did not have an adequate tax base to produce the necessary money. He spoke at some length about this. The Senator from Illinois knows that Senator Taft was a man of some understanding of the conditions in this country. He developed that thesis, I thought, in an unanswerable manner.

Many of the States—I do not wish to speak for Alabama, but I can speak for my own State—do not have adequate resources to bring the standards of education up to what they should be. If my memory serves me correctly Arkansas at that time spent a larger percent of its total income for education than did many States with higher incomes, a greater percentage than was the case in States like New York, Connecticut, and others. The formula which Senator Taft and his colleagues developed took cognizance of that fact.

So there is a reason why this particular matter is beyond the resources of many of the States—not all of them, but many of them. But even some of the rich States have within them areas which are incapable of maintaining an adequate standard of education.

I also commend the Senator's attention to what Senator Taft said about this being a national matter—that is, a matter of national importance—and not simply local. He did not mean to have the Federal Government supplant the States in the assumption of responsibility for education. What he said was that the Federal Government ought to back up the States with supplemental aid in their educational efforts.

We do not say that the Federal Government should step in and assume the primary responsibility. The proposal which was made then, and which I am making now, would not do anything of that sort; but it would enable the weak spots to be brought up to the minimum and would improve their quality.

One other observation, aside from the actual tangible effect: If Congress would do something which even recognized the importance of education as such, and recognized the importance of the teaching profession; if we were to give a little sign that we think it is important, it would provide a most beneficial shot in the arm, so to speak, to the teaching profession. It would achieve the purpose about which the Senator from Pennsylvania asked the question—How are we going to get good teachers? The teachers have the impression—and correctly so—that Congress cares nothing about teaching, although it cares about other things. The Senator from Illinois must know that there is not much incentive to enter the teaching profession today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said:

With regard to the question the Senator from Illinois has raised, there is a passage shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1948, volume 94, part 3, page 3348, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the point where I referred to the justification for Federal aid to education. I do it for the very reason that the Senator from Illinois and other members of his party have raised the question. This is a classic justification for such aid, from the mouth of one of their distinguished predecessors, Senator Taft. I think it is an excellent way to put it, one with which I agree, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD. I have marked the passages for the reporter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Mr. President, I do not think I can exaggerate the necessity of education. Primary education lies at the basis of all forms of republican government. A government depending on the making of decisions by the people and depending on their intelligence can exist only if the people have some ability to understand the problems of government which are presented to them. Unless there is a satisfactory educational basis, there cannot possibly be hope for success in any democratic form of government where the people are expected to rule and to decide the questions which are placed before them.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The problem confronting us and the real objection to this bill, the point which troubled me and troubled others, is in connection with the question of what educational function the Federal Government has, and why the Federal Government is asked to participate in education. I quite agree that the primary obligation to educate children is in the States and local communities. Under our constitutional form of government, they have the primary obligation. I think the Federal obligation is a secondary one. It is one to back up the States, if I may use that expression, where it is necessary to back up the States. The difficulty with our tax system is that the States have limited powers of taxation, and that, particularly in the poorer States, they have very limited sources of taxation.
>
> Today the States are exercising every power they can exercise. They have sales taxes, they have every form of tax they can think of. They are digging into all kinds of sources of taxation, and still the States today are raising about $12 billion, while the Federal Government is raising $45 billion. That is because, very simply, a State has no access to the principal sources of taxation. The States cannot successfully impose a personal-income tax of any considerable amount. They cannot successfully impose a corporation tax of any considerable amount. I served in the State Legislature of Ohio, and the moment we got our income tax a little higher than the surrounding States, all the wealthy people moved to other States. There is competition for wealth. It is possible for States to get up to somewhere around 5 percent of income perhaps, and that is about as high as it is possible to go if the State is to keep its citizens. In the same field, in relation to corporations, the moment taxes on corporations in Ohio became higher than the taxes in Pennsylvania, every new steel plant was built in Pennsylvania instead of being built in Ohio. I think the actual result shows very clearly that the States do not have access to those particular sources of taxation. That applies to all States, but, of course, it applies particularly to States which are far below the average level where, even if they could tap the sources within the State, they would be very inadequate for the purposes for which it is necessary that the State act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have a comment to make, and then I should like to ask a question. In the earlier part of the Senator's speech I thought there was some reflection, inferentially, upon the President's leadership. Is it contended that the President has abandoned the aid-to-education program, or that he has not recurrently asserted his interest in it and sought to get action in the House of Representatives, and that the House failed to pass a bill? Is that the record, or is it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows as well as I do what the vote was in the House of Representatives. The bill lost by six votes. Some of the principal leaders who participated in the defeat of that bill were from the State of the Senator from Illinois.

It was generally believed—and I am inclined to believe so too—that the President did not assert his full power in an effort to have the bill passed. These are things that I cannot prove. But the Senator knows that the Senate twice passed the bill to which I referred, but it never passed the House.

There is a responsibility of the administration, and especially the President, in my view, to use every power at its command to obtain action in the House.

I did say, and I shall elaborate upon it if the Senator wishes, that the President did not give priority to the matter of education. Last year's budget carried twice as much money for education as does the budget for this year. The President is proposing to eliminate completely aid to impacted areas. This has been one program which has escaped the pitfalls which have hampered other programs. The administration voluntarily says, "We are going to abolish it." It is a progressive abolition policy. For the first year, $93 million is deleted; then it is anticipated that the program will be completely eliminated within 3 or 4 years. I think that is a great mistake.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply want to say—and I think I may reveal this—that at a number of conferences late last year, when certain individuals tried to dissuade the President from emphasis on the aid to education program, he asserted, over and over again, that he had made assurances to the country, and he meant to redeem the pledge, if it was humanly possible to do so. But he could do so only if Congress gave him the authority and the money; and Congress failed to do so.

I think there is a limit beyond which a leader does not have to go, and come humbly, with his hat in his hand, and

say to Congress, which is under the control of the opposition party, and say, "Please, sir," in order to get his program under way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That defeat of the bill by six votes in the House took place prior to sputnik. It took place last summer. The new budget was submitted to Congress last week. Why did not the President include the same item in the budget and give it another chance? It is my impression that if a bill could be passed by the House, it could be passed by the Senate. I am judging by past actions. The Senate passed the other bill to which I have referred twice, but the House did not. I feel we should not give up so easily, especially since the bill was defeated in the House of Representatives by a very narrow margin. I think the Senator will agree with me that the two sputniks have aroused the country. I think the President gave up too easily. Why did he not come up with perhaps a comparable bill? I would not insist on the exact bill, but something comparable as to amount. That is the only point I make. I do not see why the President should give up so easily.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The same persons who were in the House of Representatives during the first session, last year, with few exceptions, are still there.

Second, I think my friend from Arkansas should not forget that the real aegis for the economy drive in the appropriation bills came from his side of the aisle last year. The President certainly would not be unmindful of the difficulties he is up against when they cut the funds for the United States Information Service, for the military, and all along the line, in the hope that a great economy record could be built up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Illinois is opening up a new and entirely different subject, which I think is a very interesting one. The Senator will remember that the Executive himself invited Congress to do so; and then, in the very crucial moments, when they were in conference on various occasions, so I am told—I was not on the particular conference—said, "It is quite all right; we do not need the money."

But this involves a subject which I think our side would be perfectly willing to debate at the proper time. However, I think the Senator is bringing in subjects other than education, in this particular instance. There is no question about what the administration has done for education in this year's budget. That is a matter of record, not of opinion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, the addresses made by the Senator from Arkansas—and this one in particular—are always very constructive and profound in thought and purpose.

The Senator from Illinois has opened up a Pandora's box of trouble—I should say trouble for himself and his associates—which we will get at in due time.

I would only say for the RECORD that the chief fiscal officer of the Republican Eisenhower administration was one George Humphrey—that is, curlyhaired George Humphrey, the one who wanted to tell Congress to cut the budget, lest it lead to fiscal irresponsibility, inflation, and all the other horrors of the mystical world he was outlining.

Second, I should like to have the RECORD also note that in the House, on the Federal aid to school construction bill, the Democratic majority substituted the Eisenhower education bill. The bill which was reported, known as the Kelley bill, was subsequently amended, so that the administration bill was the measure before the House.

The same 80 Republican Members who voted for the so-called Powell amendment, to load that bill down with the most controversial of all controversial material are the same 80—80-plus—who turned around, after they had the Powell amendment loaded onto the bill, and killed the bill. That is the fact of the matter.

I should say to the Senator from Arkansas that the interest he has expressed in the impacted areas proposed legislation is one that is close to my heart. It so happens that in the 81st Congress the junior Senator from Minnesota and the late Senator Taft of Ohio were the cosponsors of proposed legislation for Federal aid to impacted areas. We thought that bill at least would provide some help to the school districts and to the States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say it has been a lifesaver to many districts in my State and in other States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; all over the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And it has already provided an opportunity for literally thousands of students who otherwise would not have had it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now we are going to step up the program. But the very administration which recommends a cut in the aid for impacted areas, now recommends a $2 billion increase in the defense program. This means, again, a shift of personnel and additional loads upon communities. Yet the administration is withdrawing that support.

But I still say that all of this is on the periphery, compared to what the Senator from Arkansas has pointed to. The truth is that the lack of emphasis upon educational standards and upon educational needs and intellectual standards in the Nation is such that now we are reaping this terrible harvest, and that is why we are not able to meet the Soviet threat in the intellectual areas, because we have been concentrating upon hardware, rather than upon economic needs and educational needs.

So if anything is discouraging to me, it is the fact that with all that the Senator from Arkansas is pointing to—all that needs to be done, and should have been done—what little appreciation there is today of these needs exists because the Soviet has driven us to it. I wish that sometimes we Americans in this decade would do something just because it was the right thing to do. I regret that now we are going to enter upon a field of Federal scholarships because if we do not, the big Communist bear will get us.

I believe we should have scholarships, even if there never had been a Communist. I believe it would be a good idea to improve our educational institutions, even if Karl Marx had never lived, and even if Khrushchev had never participated in the CBS television program which was broadcast across our Nation.

I am happy to note that the Senator from Arkansas has been a source of inspiration for good. In the Senate he has fought the good fight for better education; that has been his consistent position throughout his public service. He has consistently fought for better education, for the Fulbright Act, and for the exchange bills. Yet he knows that every time his exchange program has been under consideration, he has had to fight like a tiger for the authorization and appropriation of the necessary funds. I think that is indicative, again, of the depth of the problem.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his kind words. I agree with him. I think these are things which we should do, regardless of what the Russians are doing. This is something we should have done a long time ago. As I tried to make plain earlier in my remarks, our deficiencies go back many years; they are not just of recent origin. These are things which we should do as a nation, regardless of our relations with Russia.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a brief question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas this question: What is the present position of the administration? It seems to me there has been some criticism of the Democrats because they said the President did not back up his words about aid to education. The one who, in this colloquy, appears to be the spokesman for the administration has indicated that he appears to be opposed to education. I should like to understand what the situation is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator was referring to me.

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes; I was.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from Michigan will just take the trouble to examine the files in the document room, he will discover that the junior Senator from Illinois has introduced proposed legislation on this subject.

Mr. McNAMARA. I was making reference, not to the files in the document room, but to the colloquy we just had on the subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, I did not know that ever came up. I was simply referring to the first part of the Senator's speech, and said that I thought there was a reflection on the President for not exercising leadership in this field; and I was simply pointing out where the real impediment lay.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator correctly interpreted the first part of my remarks. My intention was to point out the lack of affirmative and positive

leadership on the part of this administration.

In the announcement of the scholarship program, which I favor, the Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare emphasized that this was a temporary program and had within it its own termination date. That seemed to me to show, again, that they do not take this matter seriously.

As I have said, I had a long conference with Secretary Folsom. I have the highest respect for him. But I would say that they still do not have a firm determination and a real conviction on the subject of education.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not disagree with the main thesis of the speech of the Senator from Arkansas. I believe that the military crisis we face will be solved. The long-range problem is whether the steps necessary to raise the educational standards of our country will be taken. That decision may well determine the future direction of our national life. In the main, the educational problem will be decided locally. But leadership and emphasis must come, and can come, also from the Federal level.

I am glad the Senator from Arkansas has raised this great issue.

I must say that I am sorry that he has marred the great thesis of his speech by raising the partisan issue of whether this administration has given to Federal aid to education the necessary support. After making that criticism, I suppose I am going to fall into the same error. The Senator has been talking about what happened in the House of Representatives.

I happen to serve on the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and I know what happened there. In 1948, when I was a Member of the Senate, a bill to provide aid to teachers was passed. There was very little partisanship at that time. On this side of the aisle the leadership of the late Senator Taft was chiefly responsible for the passage of the bill. He was aided by distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle; and the bill was passed.

In 1953 and 1954, I served on the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Together with other Senators, I introduced a school construction bill. The bill was reported from the committee, but we never were able to have it brought before the Senate for action. The record shows that, again and again, consideration of the bill by the Senate was objected to by Senators on the other side of the aisle. They stated that they would oppose having the bill considered by the Senate.

Last year school-construction bills were before our Senate committee. They never were considered, and no hearings were held although efforts were made along that line. I know the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is chairman of the committee, has been one of the leaders throughout the years in the field of education, and I do not believe this to be his fault, but I must say the record will show that last year there were no hearings held, and no efforts made by the majority of the Senate to pass an educational bill.

I return now to what I think was the main thesis of the Senator's speech. I may say that, as for myself, I will support the educational program placed before Congress by the President. It is a necessary program. I hope that sometime during this session, at this time when people are concerned about our national situation, we may develop additional ways and means of shaping the educational system of this country, of raising the standards of teachers, raising the standards of high schools and primary schools, and so assuring a better education for citizens of this country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator that before he came to the floor I had a good deal to say about the 1948 bill. We passed that bill twice. The principal reason why the Senate did not act last year or the year before was that there was no point in continuing to pass bills and getting nothing done in the House.

Mr. COOPER. I cannot accept that thesis. The Senate has its responsibility.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know the Senator is very conscientious in that regard, but I am confident that is the truth of the matter. I know there was a question as to how much energy or determination the administration used in efforts to get the bill passed in the House.

Mr. President, I have only a few more remarks to make.

To those who wish to delay, think for a moment how different our situation would be today if the House of Representatives had accepted the Senate education bill in 1948. Consider how far the Russians have traveled during those 10 years.

Not only should we provide more money for education as a whole, but we should also reform our basic ideas about elementary and secondary education. We must emphasize the rigorous training of the intellect, rather than the gentle cultivation of the personality, which has been so popular in recent years.

If we are to play the role of a leader among nations, in truth, if we are to retain our independence, we must have men and women who can read, write, and speak effectively and who understand thoroughly the world in which we live. Courses in life adjustment and coed cooking will not do the job. Mathematics, languages, the natural sciences, and history must once again become the core of the curriculum, and a way must be found to induce the students to study, preferably by inducing a desire to learn. Intellectual discipline is essential to our purposes.

The recent statement by Dr. W. O. Roberts, of Colorado University, that 80 percent of the college students in America should be sent home may be an overstatement, but it should not be dismissed without consideration.

Are there any indications that we have drawn the moral of the story?

A few days ago, a leading newspaper carried side by side two stories that answer the question in the negative. In one story, Professor Rabi, Chairman of the President's Scientific Advisory Council, said that he expects a "tremendous and explosive development in Russian physics during the next 10 years. Without a conscious effort on our part, their number of trained scientists will soon dwarf ours." He continued:

> Few high-school students (in America) now have a chance to get the grounding necessary to produce a civilized scientist. We have got to go back to repair the damage to our educational system before we can go ahead.

And he concluded:

> The absence in America of an effective means to institute a national educational policy with a system of incentives for high academic achievements was probably a major cause of the apparent Soviet advantage.

Adjoining this was a story bearing the headline "Ike Restricts Role of United States in Education." The text underneath concerned a letter written by the President to a conference of educators at Defiance College. The letter "stressed his belief that the major burden for producing more science and mathematics teachers rests primarily on nongovernmental programs." Thus, by means of this letter, we have an apparent rejection of the "national education policy with a system of incentives for high academic achievement" to which Professor Rabi rightly attaches so much importance.

The matter just set forth emphasizes a dilemma which inheres in our institutions, the escape from which will tax our wisdom and self-discipline. Historically and traditionally as a nation, we have emphasized the freedom of the individual, especially his freedom from governmental interference or oppression. This freedom from governmental oppression was one of the primary, if not the primary, purpose of the Founding Fathers in fomenting the Revolution and in constructing the Constitution. The protection of this freedom required the weakest possible central government consistent with the maintenance of internal order and the creation of an army and navy in time of war. In order to prevent the accumulation of arbitrary power by a popular leader, the Constitution distributed the various powers of government among the three primary branches and between the Federal Government and the States.

A logical, but not inevitable, result of the division of governmental powers is the nonprofessional character of the highest officials of our executive branch. For a weak government does not need professionals to run it. In fact, anyone who has experience and knowledge of governmental procedures—so the fear speaks, when it finds its voice—might be able to generate enough power to infringe on the liberty of the people. Not only have our highest officials been amateurs in governmental affairs; very often they have also been very able and dynamic leaders of big business who tra-

ditionally have regarded the Government as a kind of antagonist, always exacting taxes and occasionally, in wartime at least, subjecting them to painful regulations. Such men are the last on earth to wish to enhance in any way the powers of the Government which they temporarily serve, and with which they will soon resume their battle in the business arena.

None of these observations, I hope, need lead to the conclusion that the Soviet system is necessarily superior to our own, nor that we must emulate the Soviet Union in order to maintain our superiority. On the contrary, if we lose our liberties, by imitation or by conquest, we have lost all worth striving for.

We have failed, as a people, to educate ourselves to discriminate between that which is true and that which is false, to develop within ourselves that sense of direction and of values which a self-governing people must have to choose wisely among leaders and policies.

The confidence of the American people in their leaders has been shaken by recent developments. But of even greater danger to our future is the serious erosion of respect for our strength and judgment which has taken place among our allies of the Free World during the past several years. We are called upon by the challenge from Moscow to demonstrate the validity of the concept of democratic self-government, of government by the people. It is a challenge requiring the best that is in us; requiring an effort on the part of all 172 million of us, an effort which can be called forth only by a leadership with vision, with determination and strength to follow through. An uncertain sound from the trumpet will not do.

If we are to do the things upon which our future depends, we must understand better than in the past our relationship to our Government. We must view the Nation not as a series of compartments neatly dividing domestic from foreign affairs; or the interests of businessmen from the interests of farmers and laborers; or the interests of government officials from the interests of the electorate. We must view the Nation, its problems and resources, as one great whole. And in this view of things, we must understand that it is only as we are ready to sacrifice portions of our personal egoisms for the sake of the Nation—year in and year out—that we have a chance of surviving as a society, not by luck but by our own efforts.

The Government is not "they." The Government is "us."

Mobilizing and focusing power in a democracy is surely difficult, and some may say impossible in this type of crisis. But we can never know it is impossible unless we try it, and it is a fact that we have not tried.

The lesson of sputnik, to me, is not merely that we have fallen behind in a significant scientific field, important as that may be. What is more significant is that we have failed to appraise honestly and dispassionately the strength of our adversary and the weakness of ourselves. Either we have failed in this appraisal, or, if not, we have been so blind and satiated with our luxury and our slogans that we are unwilling to admit that which reason tells us must be true.

Whether it is a failure of knowledge or of will, it has, so far, been a failure to cultivate properly the very element on which our society fundamentally rests—the proper education of its people.

If our own choice is for the good life, while we remain indifferent to the rigorous conditions on which the good society can be attained, then our leadership will itself beguile us by promises of a good life. But if we ourselves acquire wisdom, if we ourselves become concerned about the good of the whole, then sooner or later the kind of leadership we cast up will itself mirror our own resolution to get on with the job and stay at it.

Where are we? We are in serious trouble.

Whither are we tending? We are tending toward national disaster—unless important and drastic changes of policy in many aspects of our domestic and foreign affairs make a true revival of learning the wheel that makes all the other wheels turn.

Do we have time? We will never have more time. Long years ago it was said: "Civilization is a race between education and catastrophe."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express my great admiration for the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT). I congratulate him on the very farsighted, constructive, and eloquent speech he has just delivered in this historic Chamber.

The Senator from Arkansas is one of the great educational leaders of this Nation, and before he came to this Chamber he had distinguished himself in that field. His intimate knowledge of that profession no doubt has impressed him with its many needs. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas on the portions of his speech which I heard, and to state that I have had an opportunity to read most of it, although I have been busy in committee hearings all day.

I am delighted that the Senator from Arkansas has asserted the leadership he has here on the floor of the Senate today.

I expect, before I take my seat, to ask the Senate to consider a resolution continuing the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, as set up by this body. This morning that committee, made up of four Democrats and three Republicans, met with three of our other colleagues from the minority side of the Senate Armed Services Committee, thus making a total of six Republicans and four Democrats, and unanimously agreed to a statement in the nature of an interim report. In one place that statement repeats and reemphasizes what the Senator from Arkansas has so well said; namely, that the start toward improvement in education must be now—in fact, it should have been yesterday.

In our bicameral legislative system we do not always get everything we want, but I believe there is little doubt among those who are informed that had our colleagues in another body seen fit to have acted on an education bill there would have been prompt action by this body. I predict such action in the present session of Congress, this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to thank the Senator from Texas for his kind words with regard to the junior Senator from Arkansas. The Senator from Texas has always been most helpful in matters of this kind. I know that has been true in the past, and I am sure it will be true in the future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a few remarks?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also wish to commend and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for the leadership he has undertaken in bringing to the attention of the Senate and of the people of the country the great educational needs which confront us at this particular time.

As the majority leader has stated, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has a long and outstanding record in the field of education, and has kept alive his interest during his service in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. I am delighted that the Senator from Arkansas saw fit to make this speech this afternoon and to lay the facts on the line. I was particularly impressed with his statement that "What is more significant is that we have failed to appraise honestly and dispassionately the strength of our adversary and the weakness of ourselves."

I think that tells the whole story.

I know we are indebted to the Senator from Arkansas for taking the lead this afternoon, and I hope he will continue his efforts in the difficult months ahead.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator very much for his very kind words.

---

## INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO DEFENSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1203, Senate Resolution 212.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 212) was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) pay, promotion, retirement and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) selective service;

(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) ammunition depots;

(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) conservation, development and use of naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves;

(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to state that this is the normal annual resolution from the Committee on Armed Services, which vests in that committee authority to investigate various matters in the Defense Establishment. The resolution provides funds for such work. The resolution was unanimously reported for the Armed Services Committee. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. It has been cleared by the leadership on both sides of the aisle. Both the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration when it was under consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, merely for the record I shall state the resolution has the full concurrence of the Members on this side.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask about the next order of business. Is it contemplated to call that up for consideration also?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The next order on the calendar?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was wondering why we are taking up the resolution at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We are taking up the resolution because I desired to file a report and because I had been able to get the resolution cleared by all concerned. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has no question about this resolution. If the Senator from Alabama has objection, of course I would not want to proceed with it ahead of the Senator's resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no objection. I simply wanted to know what was planned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator have an objection?

This resolution has been cleared with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. He desires to make certain statements on the subject. I have not cleared the other measures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no objection. I merely wished to know when the other measures might be expected to be reached.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall bring them up at the earliest possible date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 212) was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the action by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

## PROCEDURE FOR CERTAIN REPORTS ON DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 148, Calendar No. 1188.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 148) to prescribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

---

## ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ELLENDER ON TUESDAY NEXT TO DISCUSS DEFENSE, AID, AND TRADE PROGRAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of Senators that the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will address the Senate on Tuesday next in a statement of some 3 or 4 hours, in which he will review his study, which was undertaken during the time Congress was in recess, of our defense, aid, and trade programs.

I should like all Senators to be on notice that the Senator from Louisiana desires recognition early on Tuesday. At that time he will make a statement of considerable length. I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized immediately after the morning hour on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## STATEMENT BY PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement which I should like to present to the Senate, if my colleagues will indulge me.

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee today concluded its current series of hearings into the satellite and missile programs with the adoption of a unanimous statement, in the nature of an interim report.

That statement expressed the sense of unity that the committee has as to the urgent need for strengthening our country's defenses. It expressed the kind of unity which I believe Americans desire.

We tried to state the facts which give cause for foreboding and the facts which give cause for hope. We stated those facts not as members of political parties but as servants of the Senate reporting to the Senate and to the people of the Nation.

Our country is entering a new period of history in which the total resources of America must be brought to their greatest development. No segment of our economy or of our life must be ignored or neglected.

Our programs, our policies and our practices must all be in good working order. A full national effort is required and this can be achieved only by people working together.

The goal is not merely to imitate some Soviet missile or some Soviet achievement. This attitude could lead us into a hypnotic trance in which we would forget that our true strength is our freedom.

That is a fundamental which we must not forget.

We would lose much more than we would gain if we tried to match totalitarian accomplishments by adopting totalitarian methods and values.

Our need to mobilize today flows from a necessity of forging ahead to broader frontiers of freedom—not merely from the need of catching up with the Soviets.

We must not fail because we sell short the potential of a free society. We must succeed by unleashing our minds, unleashing our capacity, and moving forward with the great force, vigor, and imagination of which we are capable.

I believe that spirit dominated the deliberations of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

I do not mean that we are in agreement on every point presented to us in some seven-thousand-odd pages of testimony. The members of the subcommittee will differ on many specific points. But we see the dangers before us through the single perspective of Americans determined that freedom shall survive.

I wish to express my deep appreciation to the majority and minority members of the subcommittee. Without their wholehearted cooperation, the enterprise in which we have engaged would not have been possible.

I wish to express my great admiration and respect for our counsel, Mr. Edwin L. Weisl, who gave freely of his great talents and energies to bring about this report; to his associate, Mr. Cyrus R.

Vance, and to the many other staff members who contributed to the report.

For the benefit of the Senate, I wish to read the committee's statement, which is brief. Let me say, as I think I stated earlier, that there were 10 members present, all of whom approved this statement.

Approval of the following statement was voted by the members of the Senate Preparedness Committee: Senators JOHNSON (chairman), KEFAUVER, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, and Senators BRIDGES, SALTONSTALL, and FLANDERS. In addition, the other members of the Senate Armed Services Committee who were present at the meeting—Senators SMITH of Maine, CASE, and BUSH—indicated their approval of the statement.

We have now concluded our current set of hearings. On behalf of the subcommittee in consultation with other Members, I am making a brief statement.

No responsible civilian or military leader in the Government can do aught but face with deep foreboding the current prognoses of the outcome of general thermonuclear war. The subcommittee feels that the problems involved in this hearing are of immediate urgency to our Government and our people.

For the past 110 days, this subcommittee has been engaged in an unusual enterprise. It is a review of the Nation's present and future defense posture in the light of a rapidly evolving science and technology.

The subcommittee has heard some 70 witnesses. About 200 experts have been interviewed. Questionnaires have been sent to leaders of science, education, industry, and government. Some 7,000 pages of testimony are before us.

This inquiry has been one of the most thorough in my memory. It had to be because the subject matter did not permit anything except a careful, prudent, thorough approach. I believe both majority and minority Members will agree with that point.

In the course of our investigation, I hope we have been able to present to our people important facts. I know that it has been an educational process for me, and, I believe, for the other members of our group.

We began with a simple—but revolutionary—fact. It was that for the first time in all history, a man-made satellite was placed into an orbit around the earth.

There were many who realized that this was an inevitable development of the march of science. But the circumstances under which it happened were startling and brought into sharp focus facts which had been known previously but not fully appreciated.

We had expected to be first with this achievement. In fact, we have yet to prove second—although our own achievement in this field is not very far away. The winner was the Soviet Union.

From the beginning, however, it developed that there was much more at stake than the prestige of being first.

There is no evidence that the satellite is a weapon now.

But it has two important implications.

First, it demonstrates beyond question that the Soviet Union has the propulsive force to hurl a missile from one continent to another.

Second, the Soviet Union has gathered basic information about outer space.

These two facts raised a number of disturbing questions. We set out to explore those questions and determine the answers. On the basis of sworn testimony by top scientists, leading industrialists, and Government and military officials, it can now be said:

First. The Soviet Union leads the United States in the development of ballistic missiles.

Second. The Soviet Union leads the United States in number of submarines, which raises the possibility of attack with modern weapons or missiles—although the indications are that we are ahead in the production of atomic submarines.

Third. The Soviet Union is rapidly closing the gap in manned air power—and, at present rates, will surpass this country in a comparatively short time.

Fourth. The Soviet Union has a system which enables it to develop new weapons in substantially less time than the United States.

Fifth. The Soviet Union has led the world into outer space.

Sixth. The Soviet Union is producing scientists and technicians at a rate substantially greater than is our country.

These facts do not give cause for comfort. But we do not consider them a cause for despair or hopelessness. We regard them as a challenge to all Americans.

There is nothing in the record to indicate that America has lost its vitality or its capacity to produce in time whatever we need to retain our present power to strike devastating blows—blows of almost total destruction—at any aggressor.

The facts which we have been investigating are the facts of the future. And while the future is very close—extremely close—it is still under our control.

There is no point in arguing that things might have been different had things been done differently in the past. Everybody on this committee is willing to concede that point.

The past is already for historians. Let us seek solutions so that the future may be written by Free World historians.

Since sputnik I was put into orbit, and this inquiry began, the Secretary of Defense has taken the following actions:

Overtime restrictions have been removed from the ballistics programs and some of the other high priority programs.

Basic research projects have been restored to former levels.

The Army has been ordered into the satellite program.

Production of the Thor and Jupiter missiles has been authorized.

The development of the Atlas missile has been stepped up.

Development of the Polaris missile system has been accelerated.

The Army has received a go-ahead for developing a new, solid fuel missile.

An advanced research project agency has been authorized.

An office of Director of Guided Missiles is now in being.

Development of antisubmarine warfare capability has been stepped up.

Steps to disperse the Strategic Air Command are under way.

The Air Force has been authorized to go ahead with an early warning program against missiles.

The Army has been assigned the task of developing an antimissile system.

The Secretary of Defense has appointed consultants and has promised to come to Congress as soon as possible with recommendations to improve Defense Establishment through organizational changes.

I may say, for the information of the Senate, that the Secretary of Defense told us yesterday that he was hopeful he would be in a position to make positive recommendations within the next few weeks, perhaps by late March or early April.

These steps are admittedly only a beginning. There are many steps still to be considered. And it is heartening that the Secretary of Defense is keeping an open mind on those steps and has pledged decisions and greater actions when such actions are necessary as soon as possible.

The committee has received many urgent recommendations. The principal areas covered, though not necessarily in the following order of priority, upon which decisive action must be taken are:

First. Modernize and strengthen the Strategic Air Force.

Second. Step up the dispersal of SAC bases.

Third. Put more effort into developing antimissile missiles.

Fourth. Improve our early warning system for manned aircraft and accelerate the development of an early warning detection system for ballistics missiles.

Fifth. Modernize and strengthen ground and naval forces.

Sixth. Provide an adequate airlift for ground troops.

Seventh. Pour more effort into our antisubmarine program.

Eighth. Step up production schedules of Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, and accelerate the development of Titan.

Ninth. Reduce lead time in the development of weapon systems by cutting down on decision time and by simplifying procurement procedures.

Tenth. Provide for a freer exchange of scientific and technical information between the nations of the Free World.

Eleventh. Start work at once on the development of a rocket motor with a million-pound thrust.

Twelfth. Give serious attention to the question of shelters and stockpiles for civil defense.

Thirteenth. Reorganize the structure of the Defense Establishment.

Fourteenth. Provide increased incentives for the retention of trained personnel in the military services.

Fifteenth. Accelerate and expand research and development programs, provide funding on a long-term basis, and

improve control and administration within the Department of Defense or through the establishment of an independent agency.

Sixteenth. Put more effort in the development of manned missiles.

Seventeenth. Accelerate the development of the Polaris missile system.

The recommendations will all receive the careful consideration of the committee. They will be evaluated in the light of facts—carefully, thoroughly, and prudently.

There is another point I should like to make. The responsibilities of this subcommittee are limited to defense. But we have reached a stage of history where defense involves the total effort of a Nation.

We have been led into fields which will have to be explored by others with proper jurisdiction and with greater background. But these fields are related to our principal responsibility—the defense of our country.

There is, of course, the highly important field of education, to which the able junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has referred so eloquently and at length this afternoon. It is obvious that all our plans for the future will be frustrated if we do not foster the training of our children along broad lines through greater concentration on science and mathematics without neglecting the humanities.

We can produce the weapons of survival with what we have now. But the missiles which are so dreaded today may prove obsolete almost as soon as they become realities.

There can be no adequate defense for the United States except in a reservoir of trained and educated minds.

Even more important, however, is the fact that there can be no security for the United States or any other country in weapons. The most accurate and destructive missile yet conceived can bring us nothing but a stalemate.

We prefer a stalemate to defeat and slavery. Let there be no mistake about that.

I am happy that the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is on the floor, because I want him to follow the last lines of this intermediate report.

But the same forces, the same knowledge and the same technology which are producing ballistic missiles can also produce instruments of peace and universal cooperation.

We are engaged in a race for survival and we intend to win that race. But the truly worthwhile goal is a world of peace—the only world in which there will also be security.

The immediate objective is to defend ourselves. But the equally important objective is to reach the hearts and minds of men everywhere so the day will come when the ballistic missile will be merely a dusty relic in the museums of mankind and men everywhere will work together in understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am happy to yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy indeed that I was in the Chamber this afternoon when the majority leader made his intermediate report. I know it would have been a temptation for anyone in the Senator's position to have delivered a very pointed and even a caustic report, which would have been interpreted by some as partisan.

It would have been possible for the majority leader and the majority members of the committee to have assessed political blame.

I believe the majority leader, in his report, has relied upon the intelligence of the American people as to where any blame or fault may lie, and as to whether the recommendations which have been placed before us are sound and adequate.

I wish to commend the Senator from Texas and his committee. The intermediate report should be classified as "must" reading for every citizen of this Republic. It will also be reassuring, I am certain, to our allies, because it demonstrates the active, alert, keen, and dedicated interest of one of the coordinate branches of the Government, namely, the Congress, along with the executive branch of the Government.

I add these few words: Just as the Subcommittee on Preparedness is in the process of reviewing our basic military needs and our defense needs, so the entire area of American foreign policy will come under review, and needs to, in the same spirit, I may say, of constructive proposals and careful evaluation. When we find weaknesses and mistakes, we must correct them, instead of abusing one another. Where we see need for progress and new proposals, we must have the boldness to undertake them and carry them out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so at that point, I should like to congratulate the committee of which he is a member for such worthy objectives and such high motives and such desirable proposals as he has enunciated, in an effort to seek the truth and in order that the United States may be worthy of the leadership of the Free World, in which we take so much pride.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am of the opinion, I may say to the Senator from Texas, as I conclude my remarks, that the American people are so deeply concerned about the future of their country and about their present condition, that they will look with a certain amount of disdain and justifiable disgust upon Congress if our efforts to study the defense and foreign policy posture of our Nation, and if our efforts to strengthen both our military and foreign policy program, are treated in too rabid and partisan a manner.

Needless to say, there will have to be discussions, and in some areas disagreement. I believe we must be able to disagree in such a manner as will enable constructive alternatives to be offered.

I have spoken on occasion, very bluntly, concerning the foreign policy of our country. I shall do so in the future. I shall not chastise those who are in charge of it, but rather I shall offer what I hope will be fruitful and constructive suggestions to those who will continue to have responsibility.

I hope the Senator from Texas, the majority leader, will permit me to associate myself with the worthy objectives which have been expressed here today in the interim report. I am not a member of his subcommittee. I can say that the concluding paragraphs of that report are, of course, the spirit of the Nation and the hope of mankind.

It is my intention, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, to present to the Senate next week a statement of what I believe has been going on in this very difficult, complex, uncertain, and as yet, fruitless field, and to offer some constructive suggestions in that particular area.

I would only say that the hope of disarmament, or the hope which the Senator from Texas outlines, is possible only if this Nation can survive, because it is a truth that the leadership of free men rests in the Government of the United States and in this Chamber.

If this Government and this Nation are in peril, and if by any unhappy set of circumstances we should be weakened or destroyed, then I honestly believe that the hope for a world in which freedom can live will have been lost.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am indeed appreciative of the contribution which my able friend from Minnesota has made to the discussion. I am delighted that he should feel justified in associating himself with the statement made by the entire membership of our subcommittee.

I should not want this opportunity to pass without the Senator from Minnesota being informed that in the days ahead, when he travels down the rugged, rough road looking for peace, he will have my prayers and my support because, Mr. President, if the only thing we have to look forward to is the spending of $40 billion or $50 billion a year to negate the expenditures of another great power we will, at best, be letting it all go down the drain.

Somehow, somewhere, the great minds which have done so much to bring us modern implements, great adventures in science, and great discoveries, must be able to find a solution whereby men can live in the world together. If not, the road ahead will not be a very happy one.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to add my words of appreciation to those of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota concerning this message of great importance from the Subcommittee on Preparedness. I express my admiration for the wonderful work which has been done by the subcommittee, particularly by its chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, of whom we are so proud.

I particularly commend him, not merely for the report upon the present state of our defense and about what has not been done, but, more than that, for the inclusion in the report of a set of present objectives, without awaiting the final report, to give America some goal toward which to work in preparation for the long pull.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend for his complimentary statement. He is always generous and kind to me. He knows I reciprocate his admiration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in congratulating the distinguished majority leader upon the responsible attitude he has shown, not only in conducting the hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness, but also in being able to cause members holding diverse views to issue a unanimous report. This is another indication of the sense of responsibility which the distinguished Senator from Texas has shown, not only since he has been the leader of the majority party in the Senate, but also in the days when he first became a Member of the Senate.

It is a pleasure, in view of what has happened in recent days, to see that this sense of responsibility is still paramount. I am hopeful that the nonpartisanship—or, as one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle referred to it a short while ago, the unpartisanship—on the part of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness will be the norm rather than the exception in the days ahead as the subcommittee undertakes to continue its hearings. The country can be confident that a good job has been done and that the unanimous recommendations of the subcommittee will have good and lasting results.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend from Montana.

---

## A CHALLENGE TO THE AMERICAN EDUCATION SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I find myself in the happy position of following in the footsteps and under the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who this afternoon made an outstanding speech on the condition of the American educational system. I am delighted that the Senator from Arkansas made the speech which he did.

In supplementing what he has said, I wish at this time to introduce a bill which would amend Public Law 507 by giving the National Science Foundation an expanded role in granting scholarships for study in the sciences and linguistics.

Mr. President, the second session of the 85th Congress is confronted with some of the most difficult and momentous problems in the history of this Nation. They are problems and issues which will affect the stature and future of the United States, both at home and abroad.

I speak of civil rights, the missile and defense program, foreign aid, reciprocal trade, resources development, a new farm program, and a program to strengthen and regain our technological and scientific supremacy. It is the latter of which I would like to speak today.

Several months ago we found ourselves second to the Soviet Union in the race for technological supremacy in the field of missiles and rockets. The Russians have put two satellites into outer space; they have announced that they have put the first atomic-powered ocean vessel into operation, and are boasting of greater things to come in satellites. And in spite of the fact that our missile and rocket programs have been speeded up to a crash basis the United States has not yet fired its first small satellite into outer space. All in all it has been a serious blow to our security and prestige throughout the world.

Why did it happen and most important of all how can we regain our superiority?

There are a number of reasons why we find ourselves in this spot but that is not the issue I am concerned with today. Today my only concern is how can we prevent the reoccurrence of this situation. One solution is through a sound and thorough program for training increased numbers of scientists, language specialists, technicians, and engineers, and seeing that their talents are being put to use. We must place a renewed emphasis on basic research. Basic research is the root of all of the great advancements being made in science; humanitarian and military.

The most important consideration in the Soviet Union's ability to surpass us in certain areas of science, languages and technology is the Russian educational system. I want to make it perfectly clear at this point that we as a free Nation should not adopt a dictatorial method as is done in Russia. But their recent achievements have underscored the need for a review of our educational system. We need a renewed emphasis on science and linguistics in our classrooms but this should not be done at the expense of other areas in our education. However, the Soviet Union's substantial lead in numbers of scientists, engineers, and language students must not be allowed to continue.

The young Russian student is given practically no chance to select his own courses. They are chosen for him. In this country our students have a wide choice, limited only by the facilities and staff of each school. All that is required is that they meet basic requirements. Too often experience shows that American students take the easy way out. We cannot force our students to take linguistics, science and engineering courses but we should provide incentives that would spark their interest. This requires new teaching methods, new and improved facilities, more adequately trained instructors in our schools, financial aid at the high-school and college level in this age of ever-increasing costs and a future of greater stability and respect for those in the scientific fields.

By the time a student in Russia has finished his 10th regular school term, he has had 4 years of chemistry, 5 years of physics, 5 years of biology, and 10 years of mathematics.

Soviet students get little chance to examine important problems with a critical eye, or to make up their own minds on issues that may arise. Although this is a major fallacy in the Russian education system it has produced an abundance of capable scientists and engineers who in turn have made it possible for the Russians to make such tremendous advances in missiles and rockets.

Allen Dulles, Director of the CIA, estimated some time ago that during the 10-year period, 1950 to 1960, the Soviets would graduate 1,200,000 in the sciences, while the United States would graduate 900,000. There may not appear to be such a great difference on the surface but it is vitally important to remember that the vast majority of the Russian scientists are being utilized for research and defense efforts directed by the Soviet Government. In the United States our scientists, engineers and technicians go into private industry, devoting many of their talents to peacetime and semiluxury purposes, some are working for our defense effort and others are completely lost in areas where their capabilities are not being used. In Russia the scientists enjoy a great deal of respect in society. In this country they do not universally enjoy such a position.

According to information compiled in a report released in March of 1956 by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the American secondary-school system, as of 1936, was characterized as yielding to no other in the broadness of its democratic pattern and our methods of teaching science on the secondary-school level were more original, varied, and skillful than those in vogue in either France or Russia at that time.

Today the American school system enrolls more than 90 percent of the children from 7 to 16 years of age—a figure exceeding that attained in any other country. However, during the years since 1936, the teaching of the physical sciences in the American secondary schools has suffered a steady decline. Physics and chemistry are now frequently elective 1-year laboratory courses and stress is laid on physical rather than on mathematical thinking. Whether as a corollary or as a cause, the teaching of mathematics at the secondary school level has also declined. To meet this situation many colleges have adjusted their science courses to meet the high-school offerings.

Where does the responsibility rest for this lag in our scientific and engineering program? There is no one person or organization that can be blamed. It is a combination of factors. There is inadequate training and discipline in high schools. Most of our colleges have failed to expand the use of their facilities and to encourage students to complete their courses. Deficiencies in our military draft policies as they affect our college students are an important consideration, for many talented students are placed into routine positions in the armed services where their talents are not utilized.

I think most everyone will agree that ever since the end of World War II the American way of life has required less raw manpower and the demand for technicians, engineers, and scientists has been swiftly increasing. Unfortunately our production of these people in these fields has not met the change.

Prior to the Korean war we had an over abundance of scientists and engineers. But the Korean conflict and the boom in electronics, nuclear energy, and guided missiles transformed the picture.

The industrial ratio of engineers to factory workers, which stood at 1 to 250 in 1900, increased to 1 to 60 in 1950 and is rising with every new automation process. In some industries today, the ratio is as high as 1 engineer for every 10 employees.

As never before in our history this Nation's security rests in the hands of its scientists and engineers in the technological frontlines of scientific progress. Nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, intercontinental guided missiles, supersonic jetplanes, radar-warning nets, these are the complex instruments upon which depends our ability to preserve peace and to resist aggression if it should come. To develop these instruments and weapons and to improve them, we need men and women of the highest caliber in both theoretical and applied mathematics, physics, chemistry, and related fields. Basic research is vital to all progress made in these scientific fields.

The United States requires 30,000 to 35,000 new engineers annually; the new production burdens of the cold war require another 3,000 to 4,000 a year. But in 1954 accredited United States schools graduated only 22,000 engineers. At the same time, the Soviet Union graduated more than 53,000. In addition, Russia is graduating far more men in the subprofessional fields of engineering, in the technical areas that are so vital in a technological age. The Russians who produced only about 9,500 engineers in 1928 are now graduating engineers at a rate 2½ times greater than the United States.

In the past several years warnings have been sounded by prominent scientists, educators and statesmen both here and abroad. Despite the numerous speeches, statements and magazine articles which have painted such a dismal picture, very little has been done to remedy the situation. It took the Russian sputniks to really arouse Americans to this challenge. We must plan now for the present and the future in regaining our complete mastery of the sciences.

I have expressed my views on the shortage of scientists and engineers here in the Senate on several occasions. I have been concerned about this shortage for some time and it is one of the gravest problems that now faces the Congress.

On June 22, 1956, I addressed the Senate on this issue and recommended a 6-point program to meet the shortage of scientists and engineers. I am today restating these six points, because I feel that they would go far in improving the situation.

First. An expanded Federal scholarship program for college and graduate students in the natural sciences and engineering. In order to insure an adequate number of trained personnel in the service of the Federal Government in highly technical and skilled fields I suggest that the Government, under a scholarship program, select a number of high school students each year who have shown special scientific interests and capabilities and underwrite their education. In return these students could be required to put in a period of service after graduation which would be in some way beneficial to our national security, in the military or industry.

Second. Reemphasis on science and mathematics instruction in the high schools of the Nation. This must be a cooperative move between the local school districts and the States' departments of education.

Third. Increased salaries for high school and college instructors.

Fourth. A Federal grant-in-aid program to the States for science and mathematics teachers in the high school somewhat similar to existing Federal aid for certain agricultural and vocational training in the secondary schools.

Fifth. A revised selective service program, making allowances for students and graduates pursuing a career in the sciences and engineering.

Sixth. An improved public relations and security program for scientists, engineers, and technical personnel.

Seventh. This is an additional point. Increased salaries for scientists and technicians in the employ of the Federal Government so that the temptation to go out into private enterprise will be lessened. This has been partially met by the recent salary increases for scientists as announced by the Civil Service Commission.

This is a cooperative program. We need the help of the States, local and county school officials, and the general public. But the Federal Government must take the lead in meeting the crisis, nothing else will do. Only the Federal Government has the resources and prestige to produce the new emphasis that is needed on the training of qualified young people in the engineering and scientific fields.

In order to keep ahead in the worldwide race of technological advancement, the United States will need a vast and continuing supply of first-rate scientists and engineers. The proposals that I have made will, in my estimation, help to regain American stability and supremacy in the sciences, which will be so necessary in the years to come.

There are a number of things that this legislative body can do.

We can expand and appropriate sufficient funds for the summer training program for high school science and mathematics teachers under the direction of the National Science Foundation.

We can revise our selective-service laws so that consideration is given to those talented in the sciences and engineering. Military service should be secondary to the completion of college work in these instances. While in the armed services their talents should be put to good use.

We can amend our income-tax laws giving parents an additional exemption while sending their children to schools of higher education. This would be of great help in this age of ever-increasing tuition and living costs.

We can enact Federal-aid legislation which would help high schools and colleges improve and add additional laboratory facilities in their science departments.

Finally, we can and must enact a broad graduate and undergraduate scholarship program in the sciences and engineering. An expanded Federal scholarship program would do much to increase our supply of these professionals.

At the present time the Federal Government's role in promoting the education of potential scientists and engineers is generally limited to the National Science Foundation.

The foundation's fellowship system is the most direct means of augmenting the Nation's scientific manpower resources. By awarding fellowships for predoctoral study also, the foundation offers to an average of 600 selected students a year the opportunity to undertake at institutions of their choosing, the advanced training necessary for a career in research.

The foundation has a fine record but its role in the scholarship field is limited. The number of scholarships should be increased and funds should not be limited to predoctoral and graduate work. Direct assistance to students studying in the sciences and mathematics below the graduate level is necessary in order to increase the number of adequately trained scientists and engineers.

A nationwide testing program in our high schools at the sophomore level would be an important start in seeking out the potential student applicants for scholarships to study science and engineering in college. The States' departments of education could play an important part in this phase of the program.

I have sent to the desk legislation which would amend Public Law 507 giving the National Science Foundation an expanded role in granting scholarships for study in the sciences. This independent agency is in the best position to put such a program into operation. It is already in operation and my proposal would expand its activities and make available sufficient funds for such a scholarship program. Funds would be made available on an annual basis and could be adjusted to the needs of the Nation.

This is one of a number of proposals which will be submitted to Congress this session. There are those who advocate the appropriation of funds under the Health, Education, and Welfare Department for an elaborate scholarship program. There are those who suggest the formation of a National Science Academy along the line of our military academies. And there are those who would prefer a much more limited program of assistance. This is one of the greatest issues before Congress this session and it is imperative that something be done soon to turn back the tide of Russian supremacy in numbers of scientists and engineers.

A scholarship program of grants will be branded by some as a subsidy. But we should not let this deter us; we subsidize our merchant marine and our airlines for defense purposes and we subsidize our farmers. Why then, should we not subsidize the education of our

talented youngsters. It, too, would be in the interest of our country.

The entrance of the Federal Government into the area of aid to education is not without precedent. There has been a Federal-State cooperative program of vocational education since 1917 and it has proved to be highly successful. The Smith-Hughes Act provides for cooperation between the Federal Government and the States in the promotion of vocational education of less than college grade.

Federal funds are available for allotment to the States for agricultural education, distributive education, home economics education, and trade and industrial education. Federal funds are used to stimulate and assist the States in making adequate provisions for such training.

In 1946 the George-Barden Act was enacted to further develop the vocational education program.

The Government cannot legislate scientists into being and we cannot conscript students into these vital fields. We must adhere to the voluntary principle, so important to the American way of life, but I believe, we can attain this goal with the proper incentives.

Occasionally we find people who fear that such a program as I have suggested will create an excess of science personnel. A statement made by John R. Dunning, dean of the School of Engineering at Columbia University is appropriate to refute this position. He stated in a recent New York Times magazine article that "The emphasis on science and mathematics which we need so urgently for defense will be needed anyway, if we are ever to find replacements for our dwindling supplies of fuel and ore, or use our arts of automation to relieve our people of menial repetitive labor. What is military technology today is a higher and more dignified standard of living tomorrow."

The proposal, Mr. President, which I have introduced for appropriate action is not the final answer to the problem that confronts us. It is my hope, though, that what is being offered will be of use to the committee which will consider this proposed legislation, and out of this and other proposals made, a worthwhile solution will be found to overcome our deficiencies in school facilities, in properly qualified teachers, and in the fields of science, technology, and linguistics.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to say that the increased emphasis on training technical and scientific personnel is a matter of national survival and the betterment of future generations. This is a challenge which Congress alone can meet satisfactorily.

The bill (S. 3119) to amend the National Science Foundation Act in order to revise the authority to grant scholarships and fellowships under the provisions of such act, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks today on the subject A Challenge to the American Education System, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD portions of a letter sent to me by an old friend, Mr. Sid Groff, of the Montana School of Mines, Butte, Mont.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is considerable controversy over the failure of our schools to turn out the number of scientists that the Soviet system appears to do. Frankly, I agree with the Vice President on this issue—in that it would be a mistake to go whole hog for scientific training. I would think that the dropping of the Freudian and Dewey educational concepts, and the installations of compulsive and challenging course-work at lower levels would largely take care of the situation. Get at them young—for I doubt if most scientists are created in college—rather I would think that the ideas and desires and abilities were aroused in grade-school and high-school. Along with this, of course, is selection of better teachers, and providing them with a decent scale of living. To sum all this up, I think our modern school system is not challenging enough (too many easy ways out), and there are too many poor teachers in the system (those with ability and initiative go to better paid jobs). The general population should be made to realize that the teacher spends more time with the budding citizen than anyone except the parents, and in many cases even more time than the parents. There is also a tendency in education institutions to insist on an overwhelming amount of course work in education subjects, to the relative neglect of the basic material that the teacher is going to actually be teaching. What good does it do—if the teacher is an expert in education and doesn't handle his or her subject with adequacy and in a stimulating manner?

Probably there is an over emphasis on theoretical science in this country. What I'm getting at is that at this time we need a cool-headed practical science outlook. In other words another Thomas Edison, whose genius was not in theory at all, but in the practical application of what the theorists came up with.

## MONTANA'S GROWING CONTRIBUTION TO THE ARTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the State of Montana is a relatively young State, and its contributions to the arts have been somewhat limited. However, in recent years Montana has come into its own.

We have several wonderful museums which are continually expanding and growing in stature. Montana has claim to one of the Nation's most famous western artists, Charles Russell. A number of promising artists are now at work in the State, and our contributions to the field of literature are considerable. The Montana State Historical Society publishes one of the finest quarterlies of its kind, entitled "Montana, the Magazine of Western History," devoted to western folklore and history.

Mr. President, the September 8, 1957, issue of the New York Times Book Section contains J. Donald Adams' report on Montana's contribution to the arts. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEAKING OF BOOKS

(By J. Donald Adams)

For the past week or so I have been cruising again about Wyoming and Montana. Homeward bound, I watched, from the train window, the Yellowstone snaking eastward on its widening way to join the Missouri. No river save the Missouri itself is as rich in Western history. Countless Indian migrations traced it westward. For many nights its banks were lit by the campfires of Lewis and Clark. Custer rode up them with his 7th Cavalry toward the fatal encounter with the Sioux and Cheyennes on the hills above the Little Big Horn. Up and down across the Yellowstone moved John Colter and Jim Bridger and a legion of trappers and mountain men.

Not even Texans can be condescending about Montana. The distance across its northern counties almost equals that between Chicago and New York. "Montana, High, Wide and Handsome" was the title chosen by the late Joseph Kinsey Howard for his excellent book about the State; the three familiar adjectives were never more fittingly applied.

Of all the Rocky Mountain States, if we omit New Mexico and Arizona, Montana has made the finest regional contribution to the arts of painting and writing. Colorado has one good poet in Thomas Hornsby Ferril, and a promising magazine in The Colorado Quarterly; Wyoming, unfortunately, has yet to make herself felt in the creative arts; Idaho can boast only that Ezra Pound was born there, and that its Caxton Printers at Caldwell publishes valuable Americana; Utah, that it was the birthplace of Bernard De Voto and Mahonri Young.

All over Montana interest in the arts is mounting. Up at Browning, on the edge of Glacier National Park, where I went to watch Indian dances, and to see old friends among the Blackfeet and their Canadian cousins the Blooda, there is a remarkable museum devoted to the culture of the Plains Indians; down in Missoula, creative activity bubbles at the University of Montana; over in Bozeman, the arts are lively at Montana State College. When the visitor moves on to Helena, a State capital whose main street bears the factual name of Last Chance Gulch, he will find that the State Historical Society is doing fine things in constructive commemoration of the old West.

In saying all this about Montana, I feel like a heartless ingrate to say so little about its southern neighbor, for it was in Wyoming that I once had the most amazing fishing in my life, in Wyoming that I first got on familiar terms with a horse, and that I came to appreciate fully the depth of our injustice toward the American Indian. It was also in Wyoming that I witnessed the most profoundly moving religious ritual I have ever seen—the sunrise ceremony of the Arapaho sun dance.

But it is Montana's growing contribution to the arts on which I wish chiefly to report. Five years ago the State historical society opened its museum in Helena, featuring splendidly executed dioramas of Western history and housing, besides a fine collection of the paintings and bronzes of Charley Russell, the Montana cowboy whose work as an interpreter of the old West outdistanced, in the opinion of many, that of Frederic Remington. At about the same time, the society founded Montana, the Magazine of Western History, which is doing much the same thing, in a more limited field, as American Heritage. Another recent undertaking is the society's Montana Heritage Series—pamphlets which are maintaining a high level of quality. I have just been reading one of them—Verne

Dusenberry's moving account of the Northern Cheyenne, that most hapless of the Plains tribes, whose troubles seem never to cease.

It was my good fortune on this trip to be given a copy of Magpie's Nest, a collection of the poetry of Jason Bolles, one of the most promising of Montana writers, who unfortunately died some years ago at the age of 42. Several years back I reprinted one or two of his pieces in the poets' column; others appear there today. I regret that space forbids inclusion of one of his longer narrative poems. Several of them have a Robert Frost-like quality, with the difference, of course, that Bolles found his material, not in the New England hills, but in the high country of Montana. The Indians, in whom he was greatly interested, replaced Frost's Yankee farmers.

Bolles also attempted, with some success, a few Amerindian poems in which he tried to bridge the gulf between primitive attitudes and his Anglo-Saxon heritage. One regrets that he did not have a longer span of life in which to develop his gifts. Even so, he left a small body of distinctive verse which drew veracity from the region he knew and loved so well. To forestall inquiries, it is my unhappy duty to add that Magpie's Nest is no longer in print.

---

## OUR CURRENT CRISIS AND THE NEED FOR EDUCATION — COMMENTS ON SPEECH OF SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was indeed intrigued by the very scholarly address of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Not the least interesting, of course, was the very first portion of his address, in which he quoted what I believe is the first sentence Abraham Lincoln uttered, in Illinois, in his celebrated "House Divided" speech.

Also, in the second paragraph, the Senator from Arkansas made an allusion to former President Buchanan; the Senator used a very enchanting phrase when he spoke about "continued to spread the contagion of his own confusion over the land."

One thing that has always interested me is the pattern of human behavior which repeats itself year after year and decade after decade and generation after generation.

It was about 100 years ago that our country was confronted with the issue of survival. The question was whether the United States of America would survive as a free, united country. That issue finally had to be resolved by bloodshed. But some very fascinating things happened before that issue was finally resolved.

The Congress then had a Committee on the Conduct of the War; and, on occasions, nearly 100 years ago, the committee undertook to tell the Commander in Chief how he should conduct the war.

At that time there were groups of Congressmen who called for what they denominated a "bold, determined, forward, successful policy in winning the war." There were clamorings for leadership. There was clamor for a policy.

Nearly 100 years ago one of the leading editorials in the New York Times bore, in large type, the caption "Wanted, a Policy."

In New York there was an editor named Horace Greeley, who wielded a trenchant pen indeed, and often assailed the then President of the United States for what Mr. Greeley called the slowness of the war effort.

There were Congressional committees which, according to the biography of Edwin Stanton, then the Secretary of War, were looking for "smells." Our country was having General trouble 100 years ago. Gen. George B. McClellan, who was nicknamed by some in that generation "Mac-poleon," was made the General in Charge of the Army. If one bothers to read the history of that time, he discovers that hardly a day went by that McClellan was not clamoring for more troops, more money, more supplies, more equipment, more of everything. One hundred years ago Generals were resigning. And, as our distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], has said, an ex-President was around, to advise and comment. I prefer the language used by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas, when he said, "A tired and amiable man with tired policies continued to spread the contagion of his own confusion over the land."

In the face of all those difficulties—in the face of desertions from the Army and shaky credit that gave the Secretary of the Treasury no end of difficulty—there was a President of the United States, from my own State, a Commander in Chief, who held the ship of state to a steady course, with a firm and a calm hand. And when it was all over—having absorbed all the shocks, all the abuses, all the criticisms—we remained a free, united, prosperous country; and the issue of survival—which placed our country in jeopardy then—was successfully resolved.

Today is approximately 100 years later. Almost 100 years have gone by since Lincoln, the first President of my party, was the President; and now we have President Eisenhower. But the pattern of behavior is pretty much the same. Human behavior in every generation has been pretty much the same. We have done some work here because we have been dissatisfied with what has been going on; and I pay testimony to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], because I believe he has kept it at a high level. That has not always been true, either on his side or on my side.

But generals resign today, as they did 100 years ago, for reasons best known to themselves. Whether the reason could be frustration, whether it could be failure to secure the coveted fourth star, whether they did not get the assignment they wanted, I do not know, nor do I pass judgment.

I only say it happened 100 years ago when our country was in jeopardy; and it happens today, almost 100 years later, when we so trippingly with the tongue lay ourselves to phrases about concern and catastrophe, danger, and disaster, and all the rest.

Today there are editors and columnists and commentators, as there were 100 years ago, who raise pretty nearly the same cries. There are cries for leadership. Such a cry is contained in the speech to which I refer; and I raise the question with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I merely wish to thank my kind and fine friend for his generous reference to me. Through my association with the Senator—previously in the House of Representatives for many years, and more recently in the Senate—I know the fine contributions he has made in his long career of public service. And I believe he feels, as I do, that we are much more interested in where we are going than in where we have been.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true, and I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I must leave the floor, and I apologize to the Senator from Illinois. But I thank him for permitting me to interrupt him at this point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have been glad to yield.

Mr. President, when I heard, during the speech of the Senator from Arkansas, the allusion to former President Buchanan, as "a tired and amiable man with tired policies," who "continued to spread the contagion of his own confusion over the land," I thought of an ex-President who is around considerably today. I never found it in my heart to dislike him. I do disagree with him. He is probably the most uninhibited ex-President we ever had; and in that delightful condition of lack of inhibition he holds court in a New York hotel lobby, and there he supplies all the answers for the space age and for the missile era. It is all very delightful. But I have often wondered whether that was not the invitation to some of the partisan utterances which have been made.

I think this gives me a good chance to make a parenthetical observation regarding the statement made by our distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who took some exception to the speech made in Minneapolis by Sherman Adams, the Assistant to the President.

Mr. President, I once lived in Minneapolis for a considerable time, as a student. I know the town and I know the people; and it intrigues me now when some take such violent exception to what Mr. Adams said.

It was only a little while ago that he was considered by some as a sinister, slinking, Machiavellian sort of person who talked in dark corners, in whispers, and whose principal design in life, according to his critics, was to keep people from reaching the President of the United States. He was considered by some persons as one of the allegedly stealthy, silent, quiet, sinister persons, who was working his supernatural magic upon someone at the very head of Government.

But when he gets on an airplane and goes forth into the country, to lift his voice where all can hear, then he is suddenly regarded as a hydraheaded

monster about whom something must be done because he has injected a partisan note.

But, Mr. President, I wonder whether it was not our sometimes delightful friend from Missouri, the ex-President, who opened the doors, who widened the portals, in the first instance, because I thought we were rather circumspect in preserving an unpartisan attitude in the interest of the survival of our country.

But here this pattern unfolds, a pattern so identical with the one which confronted Abraham Lincoln nearly 100 years ago; and even as Abraham Lincoln maintained a steady hand upon the tiller and brought our country through that hour of jeopardy, so another President, Dwight Eisenhower, has very calmly given direction to the ship of state. He has not gone so fast as some persons would like, but, Mr. President, he has never gone backward. That is something to remember. In all this frantic search for advanced weapons, new guns, greater engines and instrumentalities of destruction—if that should be mankind's lot—we must remember that the President has vowed to himself and he has manifested to the country, that peace and disarmament will not be the first casualties.

When I hear these allusions to deep concern, to catastrophy, to danger, to lack of leadership, and all the rest, I only say that pattern was manifested, in the history of this Republic under the first Republican President, almost 100 years ago, even as it is being duplicated today, even to the resignation of frustrated generals. But under the President's calm and dedicated leadership, America will come through.

I do not believe there is any lack of confidence in Dwight Eisenhower. I do not agree with the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on page 9, wherein he says:

> The confidence of the American people in their leaders has been shaken by recent developments.

I do not agree at all. My mail does not show it. My conversations with people do not show it. My fraternization with my own people back home does not show it. Because a few columnists, a few commentators, or even a few Senators, lay their tongues to that kind of language, that does not mean the United States of America and the generality of the people have lost interest, have lost confidence in a kindly, humble, steadfast leader named Dwight Eisenhower, who, even as Lincoln took us through an hour of jeopardy 100 years ago, will take us through this hour of jeopardy and threat to our survival 100 years later.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

---

## NATIONAL AIR POLLUTION CONFERENCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, 3 years ago the 84th Congress finally responded to a stream of appeals which had been mounting in urgency, number, and variety for nearly a decade by enacting the Air Pollution Act, Public Law 159.

From this act, which I had the honor of introducing, many helpful and beneficial results have flowed. The law authorized a five-year program of Federal assistance to States, counties, municipalities, and other public agencies endeavoring to identify the causes, ascertain the scientific effects, and prevent the occurrence of smog and other dangerous and distressing fumes and odors which plague many metropolitan areas of our Nation.

I am proud to have played a part in focusing the attention of the Congress and of the executive branch of our Government on the smog problem. It now has become widely acknowledged that there is a need for Federal participation in attacking this blight.

Now, at nearly the half-way mark in the campaign, it is obvious there is a need for more vigorous action, possibly along different lines from those followed in the past, to counter this public health menace.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has just announced that a national air pollution conference will be held next November. I desire to commend the officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, particularly those in the United States Public Health Service, which carries out the functions of Public Law 159, for this forward-looking action.

The war against air pollution is well under way, Mr. President. It is being waged on many fronts. Battles are going on in laboratories and research institutes, in hospitals and in industry, and, I may add, in agriculture. With the Federal Government playing a vital role as supplier of munitions and active partner in formulating strategy, our Nation can be thankful that considerable progress has been recorded in attacking the sources and winning a number of skirmishes.

In the last three sessions, the Congress has been generous in supplying the Federal arsenal for this war. We have voted a total of almost $8 million—the appropriations under Public Law 159 were $1,190,000 for fiscal year 1956, $2,740,000 for fiscal year 1957, and $3,995,000 for fiscal year 1958 in which we currently are operating—and the President has requested $3,860,000 for the fourth year's activities in this program.

I am taking the time of the Senate, Mr. President, to discuss this subject because a significant point seems to have been reached in this war. The problem is indeed one of national importance, not merely a local or a sectional difficulty or inconvenience. Experience definitely has proved that smog is a product of industrialization and motorization and urbanization which have marked the growth and the progress of our Nation.

The efforts of scientists and researchers and the experience of control authorities now have demonstrated some ways in which the smog enemy may be dealt with. They also have revealed that certain aspects are not susceptible of handling successfully on strictly local, municipal, community, or State levels. The activities of more than 10 years show clearly that concerted additional effort on a national scale must be made if we are to accomplish all of which mankind is capable in eradicating aerial sewage from our country.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to become provincial for a moment, but only for purposes of illustration.

Largely because it is an American characteristic to make fun of other peoples' difficulties and discomforts, the entire Nation knows that one of the front lines in the war against smog; I might even say the most active theater of hostilities—is in my native State of California.

The costly toll of air pollution first was felt in the heavily populated and fast-growing metropolitan area of Los Angeles. However, due to physical phenomena—the geography and unusual meteorological influences—the threat of serious injury and damage from smog also has been observed in other sections of my State. Indeed, scientists now warn that the conditions which have caused such discomfort, inconvenience, monetary loss, and suffering on the Los Angeles Basin are liable to develop in every thickly settled area along the whole Pacific seaboard and even in California's lush central valleys.

In the Los Angeles metropolitan area, the longest, the most aggressive, and the broadest campaign has been conducted against smog. Through investigation, research, experimentation, and trial-and-error approaches, a good many results have been accomplished. The emission of fumes and particles which are a basic ingredient of smog has been materially reduced by various measures. The uncontrolled outdoor burning of trash and rubbish, whether in public dumps or backyard incinerators, has been outlawed or stringently regulated. At substantial costs, numerous industries have installed apparatus and equipment, even reconstructed buildings and other installations, to reduce the output of noxious gases and dangerous chemicals from generating plants, oil refineries, chemical and metal factories, and other operations.

I might observe, parenthetically, the people have done this without any particular incentive under the tax laws. They have done it because they wanted to participate in a highly vital program.

The way has been pointed out for other communities to take effective steps to eliminate a number of the factors which cause smog. I should like to advise my colleagues that our people in California have been quick to profit from and to act on the experiences of Los Angeles. In the San Francisco-Oakland region, the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District now functions in six separate counties and recently began enforcing a stringent, far-reaching regulation controlling outdoor burning in the considerable territory where it has jurisdiction. Steps to create similar regulatory and enforcement agencies have been taken in other sections of California, including San Diego.

But as encouraging as these accomplishments and efforts may be, the stage has been reached now, Mr. President, where the strategists and the commanders in the war against smog have discovered they require more assistance. For that reason a request was made to appropriate Federal officials to convene a national air pollution conference of the sort Secretary Folsom and Surgeon General Burney have just announced will be held in November.

The purpose of this conference will be to deal with air pollution problems which cannot be solved on local levels. The meeting will be a fortuitous opportunity to explore with industry means of further reducing pollution, to appraise what all agencies of Government have been doing, to see what yet needs to be done, and to mobilize all the weapons and vehicles available to score victory.

One of these phases which I believe will and should receive attention involves the last remaining uncontrolled source of pollutants which, under certain conditions of weather and terrain, produce eye-smarting, lung-irritating haze, clouds, and blankets of smog. This is the internal combustion engine.

All of us in this body realize the tremendous increase our Nation has seen in numbers of motor vehicles and in their use. That is why the Congress 2 years ago authorized our 13-year Federal interstate highway program. That is why the President took the lead in summoning a national highway safety conference. The time now has arrived when we should probe into what may be the effect of motor vehicles and their exhausts on public health.

I joined public officials from the Los Angeles metropolitan area and my colleagues in Congress from California in urging the call for a national air pollution conference. I hope there will be the most widespread participation in such a meeting from both Government and industry to exchange experiences, pool ideas, and devise cooperative means of stamping out the remaining sources of smog.

Lest my colleagues think I am begging for Federal support for what is essentially a local situation and a local problem, let me cite briefly a respected authority to emphasize my warning that smog is such a serious menace that it warrants attention anew on a nationwide scale. One of the Nation's most capable smogfighters is Dr. Lauren B. Hitchcock, for several years president of the Air Pollution Foundation of Southern California. He has sounded an alarm in these words:

> But no city has unlimited clean air and in every city, smog production is rising rapidly. We who are fighting smog are convinced it's only a matter of time until a good many cities have crossed what we call the smog threshold. There is mounting smog in New York, in Detroit, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, Louisville, Des Moines, New Orleans, San Diego, Cincinnati, and many others. Chances are that unless something is done, most of our cities will be breathing badly polluted air within a decade or two. They will have crossed the smog threshold.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I wish to alert my friends from less thickly populated, less industrialized communities and States. Those who are fortunate enough to enjoy living in what is called the country should not be blind and deaf to appeals for help in eradicating smog. Let them be forewarned by a report from the California State Department of Public Health which only 1 year ago declared that smog from metropolitan centers was causing measurable damage to agricultural crops in 13 county areas bordering the heavily populated and industrialized communities. Even more alarming is the fact that 44 different kinds of crops were damaged. These facts prompted an assembly committee of the California Legislature to warn our people of California as follows:

> Further, smog from major metropolitan areas is known to travel into the rural areas and smaller cities and town at a considerable distance from the major smog-producing areas of the State. Those areas where smog has been a problem in the past are continuing to increase in size and there is definite evidence of air pollution in new areas.

Here I wish to observe, Mr. President, that when I introduced the original anti-air-pollution bill in this Chamber, Senators who came from widespread areas of the country were very glad to join with me in sponsoring it, and to help it receive the approval of the United States Senate.

As our population grows, as our motor vehicle numbers increase, as our industry fans out, there well may be no escaping air pollution and smog by fleeing to the suburbs.

The knowledge gained and progress made in finding ways of ending smog will not stamp out this menace to our Nation until every possible resource is brought into use in the air-pollution war.

I very much hope, as I have said, that the conference which is scheduled for a subsequent date this year will produce realistic results and will give to the Congress and the Federal Government its own considered judgment as to what, if any, further Federal legislation may be indicated in this all-important field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the text of a letter which I previously wrote to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as the text of his letter in reply to me, and, in addition, a statement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There being no objection, the letters and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1958.

The Honorable MARION B. FOLSOM,
*Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SECRETARY FOLSOM: Responsible public officials of the Los Angeles metropolitan area who have been most intimately concerned with the air-pollution problem have communicated with me about their hope that a national conference can be held in the near future to consider ways of stepping up efforts to reduce and eliminate smog in the heavily populated communities of our Nation.

I enthusiastically concur in the suggestions which have been submitted to you by these officials and I earnestly recommend that action be taken as soon as possible to hold a meeting for this purpose.

I believe that the attack on the smog menace can be intensified and made more effective through a discussion and consultation by representatives of the various Federal agencies working under the Air Pollution Act (Public Law 159) which I had the honor of sponsoring in the 84th Congress, the officials of State, county, and local governments and agencies concerned with the problem, representatives of scientific and research institutions, and leaders of various industries which have interests of different sorts in this important question.

As I am sure you realize, the pace has been set for local efforts to identify and remove sources of air pollution by the State of California and agencies in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. For approximately a decade, vigorous research has been carried on, police powers invoked, educational campaigns conducted, and other measures taken to protect our people against the blight and menace of smog.

In recent years, the Federal Government has rendered valued assistance in these efforts and has contributed toward the progress so far made in cleaning the atmosphere in many sections of our Nation. Much, however, still must be done before the problem is solved.

The achievements in the Los Angeles metropolitan area demonstrate what can be done toward reducing discharge of pollutants from industrial plants, public utility plants, uncontrolled burning, and other sources within the control of community, county, and State authorities.

There remain some stubborn problems which require and deserve attention on a much broader scale. Foremost among these is the part played by motor vehicles and internal combustion engines in the emission of unburned hydrocarbons, chemicals, and fumes. This phase of the question of how to eradicate smog is engaging the attention of many individuals and organizations but, I am convinced, needs more aggressive efforts, on a considerably broader scale, if satisfactory results are to be obtained. I feel that a national conference such as has been suggested to you could be extremely helpful in directing and inspiring efforts toward this particular problem.

The act under which the Federal Government is assisting in the attack on smog was for a specified period of 5 years. I believe early consideration should be given the matter of deciding what role the Federal Government should play at the end of that period. At such a national conference, valuable opinions could be solicited for the guidance of the executive branch of the Federal Government and of the Congress regarding continuance and possibly expansion of the current program.

I am gratified to learn that you, the Surgeon General, and other officers of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are favorably inclined toward the idea of a national air pollution conference. Much good would come, I am certain, from a meeting of the sort proposed.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*United States Senator.*

---

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*Washington, January 20, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I appreciate so much your thoughtful communication of January 10, 1958, with respect to the air pollution problem generally and the endorse-

ment of the idea of a national conference later this year. It is very helpful to have your advice. You will have been advised, I am sure, of the fact that the Surgeon General is calling such a conference for November of this year. The enclosed press release provides some detail on it.

In view of the advanced research and control operations underway in Los Angeles and elsewhere in California, the Public Health Service is working in close collaboration with the air pollution control officials of your State. Accordingly, we were very pleased to meet with representatives of the Los Angeles area on January 9 and to have their views with respect to the conference.

Passage of the Air Pollution Act of 1955, which you sponsored, provided a means to focus national attention and effort on a problem of increasing significance in all major metropolitan centers of the country. Your continuing interest and support are most gratifying.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
*Secretary.*

---

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
*Washington, D. C.*

A national conference to study the growing problem of air pollution in urban areas will be held next fall, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom, announced today.

The conference, which will be held in Washington, D. C., is tentatively scheduled for the week of November 15, 1958, and is being called by recommendation of Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Mr. Folsom said.

The purpose of the conference will be to bring together leading authorities to consider the many legal, medical, industrial problems involved and to pool the experience already obtained by such cities as Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and others in combating air pollution.

Legislation enacted in 1955 authorized the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to carry out a 5-year program of research and technical assistance to the States on the growing air pollution problem.

The Surgeon General, who will preside over the conference, said that it had been under consideration by the Service for some time and would provide a valuable opportunity for assessment of progress in mid-point of the 5-year program.

---

## OUTER SPACE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH PEACEFUL APPLICATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have introduced today a bill—S. 3117—to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide for outer space development through the peaceful application of atomic energy, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced is not to be regarded as the final form of a bill which the Congress should consider in this field. It has been introduced after consultation with the leadership, but that does not imply that the leadership, the Senator from New Mexico, or any other Member of the Congress is committed to the exact language of any portion of the bill. If hearings are to be held either by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or any other committee, there must be some bill on which to hold hearings. The bill has been introduced today for the purpose of developing the desired text. It is in compliance, I believe, with the prior announcements of the President, the statements of the Secretary of State, and the very fine address by the able majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas].

A very interesting article was published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 18, 1958. The article, which is entitled "The Assault on Outer Space," was written by William H. Stringer, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor. Two paragraphs of that article, I think, are particularly interesting now. I read them:

Meanwhile, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, in a move typical of his wide-ranging senatorial leadership, has taken a slightly different tack, and urged the administration to invite all members of the United Nations to join in the active conquest of space as an outpost of peace.

While Secretary Dulles has emphasized primarily supervision of outer-space usage, so as to maintain its peaceful character, Senator JOHNSON has urged that the conquest of space be made an actual joint venture of mankind, with joint research and development. This is probably a possibility implicit in the Dulles proposal, but the Texas Senator has stated it affirmatively.

I like this article by Mr. Stringer. He has caught the real essence, I think, of the proposal made by the majority leader, that this problem be stated affirmatively to the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mr. Stringer printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Yesterday an article entitled "The Challenge of Outer Space," written by Dorothy Thompson, was published in the Washington Evening Star. She says, among other things:

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's proposal seems to me far more imaginative, because it is affirmative. He has urged the administration to invite all members of the United Nations to come together in a joint enterprise for the active conquest of space as an outpost of peace.

I like the continued emphasis upon an affirmative approach. Yesterday hearings continued before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for perhaps six hours. We heard witness after witness outline the possibilities of interplanetary travel—trips to the moon, and trips to various planets, all involving enormous development, and all involving the peaceful conquest of outer space and the possibility of using it as an adjunct for peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the excellent article by Dorothy Thompson entitled "The Challenge of Outer Space."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to refer to another bill. I regret the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is not present in the Chamber. However, I feel certain that he would not object to the remarks which I am about to make.

In a story which appeared recently in the press with respect to proposed legislation which was about to be introduced by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], there was a statement to the effect that they intended to introduce a bill calling for a widespread reshuffle of the Government's civilian scientific agencies, and that they proposed to establish a Department of Science with a Secretary of Cabinet rank.

The news story stated:

Further, it would junk the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy in favor of new House and Senate standing committees on science and technology.

I have known the able Senator from Minnesota for a long time. He and I have discussed reactors, particularly the reactors to be built by the rural cooperatives in his State of Minnesota. I know that he felt that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had tried hard to be of great benefit to the people of his State. Therefore, I consulted him and asked him if his bill did, in fact, propose to junk the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I was happy to have him assure me that the bill meant exactly what it said, and that while the committee would be carried forward under a new name, the provision in the bill was that the members of the existing committee would be members of the new committee. He stated that he was merely proposing to continue the Joint Committee on a different basis.

I stress this point because I am happy to say that I think these proposals to move forward in the conquest of outer space should appeal to all Members of Congress, and that they should approach the problem with a recognition of the things which have been done and the things which should be done if we are to utilize outer space to the greatest possible advantage.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to have the RECORD show that here is one more Republican who salutes the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico, particularly for the effective fashion in which he has cared for the public interest in connection with his chairmanship and his other work on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from California very much for that statement.

One of the things which I think we need to do is to inform ourselves on what the Russians are saying about outer space. Perhaps we have not always done

all we could to keep up with translations of statements by Russian scientists.

A Russian named A. A. Blagonravov, a member of the Academy of Sciences and a lieutenant general of artillery, who was in Washington at the time of the launching of sputnik, has written an article which was published in Soviet Aviation for December 29, 1957. This article is, I think, typical of most Russian articles. It is very flattering to Russian scientists—perhaps not unduly so in some respects, but pretty lavish in certain others.

Among other things the article has this to say:

> Soviet science is making new conquests one after another. The first-in-the-world atomic powerplant was followed by the largest synchrophasotron—

Probably the statement of the Russian scientist is correct. He continues:

> "Tu-104" plane was followed by new passenger airliners: "AN-10," "11-18," and "Tu-114"; intercontinental ballistic missile was followed by artificial earth satellites which opened a new era in the history of mankind—the era of conquests of interplanetary space.

These are the Russian programs. The Russians are interested in the conquest of interplanetary space, and if we do not wish to have another upset such as we had when the sputniks first went into the air, when people were a little disturbed and alarmed, we must get our particular activity going in the field.

The Russian scientist then asks:

> What can be said in regard to the future of Soviet science?

While I do not intend continually to give publicity to all the fine things he says about Russian scientists, I invite attention to the following paragraph:

> Finally, the future of Soviet science is closely connected with the conquest of Cosmos. Soon will appear new artificial earth satellites, and then the first rockets (unmanned at the beginning) will blast away to the moon and other planets. As predicted by Tsiolkovskiy, Soviet man will become a "citizen of the universe." New, even more enticing scientific problems are looming ahead.

The conquest of the moon is a most interesting project for us, and certainly for the Russians. The other day I noticed a statement as to how easy it would be to put a rocket on the moon. I had made the statement that it would not be easy to put a manned space vehicle on the moon and have it return. I hope we will shall not become confused by statements concerning two separate undertakings.

I believe it may eventually be possible to reach the moon with a chemically fired rocket, but I do not believe it will be possible—at least with our present knowledge—to reach the moon with a manned space vehicle and return it to earth using anything other than nuclear power. That is why I am extremely concerned that nuclear power be utilized in a peaceful manner for these purposes.

I do not intend to place in the RECORD all the statements made by Secretary of State Dulles at his press conference on Friday, January 17. I only say that many of the things which he stressed can be most easily developed in the fashion I have suggested in the bill which I have introduced today.

He compared the launching of space rockets with development of the atomic bomb. He stressed that we are in an era of great new developments. He said that in this era, great new developments could perhaps go uncontrolled for 10 years, but that, as in the case of atom bombs, there must come a time when they will have to be brought under control. I quote the Secretary of State:

> There would, I suppose, need to be some kind of an international commission, presumably and preferably under the auspices of the United States, which would have the task, perhaps comparable to the task of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which has a task of assuring that the nuclear material that it disposes of, at least, shall be used only for peaceful purposes.

I have tried to put most of the text of the press conference of the Secretary of State in the RECORD, because he does deal with the extreme importance of seeing to it that we move forward.

I have tried to consider this subject and to weigh it and decide in my own mind whether the military should continue to have the greatest control in the development of missiles for outer space, whether the Atomic Energy Commission might preferably take it over, or whether it should be under the control of a wholly independent and separate agency.

As I said in the beginning, it may be decided by some Members of the Senate that the matter should be left in the hands of the military, while other Members of the Senate will feel that it should be left with a wholly independent agency.

For the present I have come to the conclusion that the first suggestion, at least, should be that we proceed with our existing laboratories and the personnel of the Atomic Energy Commission, with its existing facilities for contracting, so that this work may go forward rapidly. In that fashion I believe we can save perhaps several years, and I think it is very important that we save as much time as we can.

Therefore, Mr. President, although the bill was introduced after consultation with the leadership, it does not bind anyone to any particular course.

In the hearings by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy within the past few days, much has been said about weather control. Prior to his untimely death, Dr. John von Neumann, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and probably the world's greatest mathematician at the time of his death, referred many times to an article he had written which had been published in Fortune magazine, predicting the possibility of weather control.

The development of an earth satellite, particularly the development of a satellite large enough to carry a television camera into outer space to scan the surface of the earth, would make it possible, in terms of weather prediction, for a whole section of the earth to know in advance whether there would be floods or a drought.

Therefore, in satellites orbiting around the earth, we have a possible step toward weather control, about which people have joked for many years, and which now may be brought about.

The presence of Soviet satellites in orbit suggests the early advent of space vehicles—manned or unmanned craft capable of propulsion over large distances in outer space. The inevitability of such vehicles is becoming quite evident and we must assume that such achievement occurred to the Soviets some time ago. The presence of an animal in one satellite gives rise to such assumption. From the standpoint of military advantage and national prestige it seems imperative that we start a research and development program to attain space vehicle capability by at least the middle 1960's. This is an arbitrary date and national interests could well dictate speedier completion if Soviet intentions were known.

It is hardly arguable that we have the scientific and technical capacity for such a task and still meet other programing. The central point seems to be the policy direction of a program and under what jurisdiction it could be accomplished.

The President, as principal foreign-policy spokesman for the Nation has set the policy direction in his letter to Premier Bulganin of January 13. He proposed that outer space be used only for peaceful purposes and denied to the purposes of war. It follows then that it would be contradictory of purpose to have the space vehicle developed by a military agency because the most sincere intentions could be clouded by the genesis of the research.

Our able majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], has also called for United States control of space and its ultimate dedication to peace through a United Nations agency.

The concept of civilian control of energy and forces, military in origin but of great national and international importance, was debated and secured with the passage of the first Atomic Energy Act. This national decision in 1946 has been of great value to the Nation not only in accomplishment, such as the huge weapons stockpile, the hydrogen bomb, the *Nautilus*, and a large civilian power reactor, but in practice it provided the proper basis from which an atoms-for-peace program could be launched. The needs for civilian control of the atomic energy and for outer space are alike in terms of the search for peace. Furthermore, the prospect of better accomplishment in civilian hands is inviting.

The current Congressional hearings on military preparedness have shown repeatedly the inherent difficulties within the Department of Defense on major research and development projects, particularly in the missile program.

Assuming then that policy and promised accomplishment dictate the assignment of the space vehicle project to a civilian agency, the choice would be between a new or an existing agency.

The advantages of a new agency could be in the desirability of fresh approach and new administration to cope with a unique problem. A new agency lives in a fresh political climate free from the disputes of other years, and it could prosper in this climate. In addition, the

policy for space for peace would be fostered by removal from any association with the military or with weapons research present in some existing agencies.

The disadvantages may be these: Time, which may be of the essence, would be lost in staffing and in building facilities. Short of an expensive crash effort, up to 2 years could be lost, assuming the need for new laboratory facilities. There would be competition for scientists and engineers and while this shortage is not severe today there is no abundance of top people. The scientific explorations could cross the lines of authority of existing agencies and without the strongest of administration this could prevent the free flow of information, particularly if there was a conflict of information categories under security laws. In this, it is enough to say that in interagency matters priority is of little meaning.

One problem today is that we have so many executive agency committees and other groups in scientific and technical affairs and the creation of a new agency would seem to lead to additional confusion and possibly rivalry.

The alternative is placing jurisdiction in an existing civilian agency. There may be several from which to choose but the Atomic Energy Commission appears to be the most logical choice. The AEC nuclear rocket project—Project Rover—provides a basis for further efforts at large scale nuclear propulsion. There is ample scientific evidence that nuclear propulsion offers the best hope for propulsion of a space vehicle with its powerful and long-lived fuels and tremendous power potential. But even without this, an assignment to the Commission is tempting because it is a going agency and has the best laboratory complex in the Nation, perhaps in the world. These laboratories, range from the reactor and weapons centers to the medical facilities at Brookhaven, N. Y. The service functions of the Commission could service an additional project without much additional expense, and savings would result from this choice as compared to using a new agency.

There may be a disadvantage in the presently controversial aspects of the Atomic Energy Commission's role in power reactor development and in other things. On balance, though, the one compelling argument for assignment to the AEC could be the existence of the very excellent AEC laboratories. At locations such as Los Alamos and Livermore many hundreds of the Nation's best scientists have made outstanding contributions and have a stake in the surrounding communities. Their accomplishment merits assignment of tasks which could assure the future of their laboratory.

For the most part the laboratory facilities would require little modification in the early stages and perhaps this would be true later. Many of the types of personnel and facilities required for advanced types of propulsion, such as ion propulsion, are already in abundance at AEC laboratory installations. Physicists and mathematicians have the computer facilities and other tools which are equally adaptable to atomic as to space projects. Accelerator, electronic, and reactor facilities are also a normal part of such laboratories.

While there is controversy over the best method of attainment, the overall developmental record of the AEC is good and for the most part we have surpassed the Soviet, up till the present, with atomic development.

The record of the AEC includes the building of the H-bomb, developments for a nuclear Navy, a diversified family of weapons, as well as important peacetime accomplishments of developing a broad and diversified small-scale power technology.

If it might be said that the AEC has no direct experience in space matters except for the Rover and related projects such information could be obtained from an advisory body.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would be the watchdog committee of the Congress over such an enterprise were it assigned to the AEC and here the experience of its committee members would be of great value. The committee has been intimately acquainted with broad scientific projects over the years in its studies of atomic research, development, and production. It made an outstanding contribution to the hydrogen bomb decision.

I might say at this point that we have constantly stressed the fact that, although a scientific advisory committee recommended to President Truman that he should not go ahead with the development of the hydrogen bomb, and although the Atomic Energy Commission voted not to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy battled on behalf of the H-bomb until President Truman decided to work on it against the advice of the scientists. Even then we achieved it only a few months ahead of the Russians. I can speak freely, because at the time this fine accomplishment took place I was not a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The joint committee also pushed for the building of the *Nautilus*. It has made a careful study of radioactive fallout and a host of other things, and I hope it will be equally effective in pushing for an outer space program.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I have introduced the bill and have suggested that the Atomic Energy Committee should handle the operations under the proposed legislation.

EXHIBIT 1

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as "the Outer Space Development Amendment of 1958."

SEC. 2. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by redesignating chapter 19 as chapter 20, and inserting a new chapter 19, reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 19. OUTER SPACE DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 241. Purpose and policy: It is declared to be the purpose and policy of the United States—

"(a) To achieve the development and control of outer space for peaceful purposes by the United States and all friendly nations working cooperatively to promote scientific progress and the security and welfare of all nations and peoples of the earth.

"(b) To accelerate the civilian development of outer space propulsion, including appropriate energy-producing reactors and engines, vehicles and platforms, and all other related components and activities.

"SEC. 242. Program:

(a) The Atomic Energy Commission is authorized and directed to exercise its powers in such a manner as to accelerate research and development on outer space propulsion, including appropriate energy-producing reactors and engines, space vehicles and platforms, and all other related components and activities.

"(b) There is hereby established within the Commission a Division of Outer Space Development which shall administer the Commission's activities under this act. The Division shall be under the direction of an Assistant General Manager who shall be appointed by the Commission upon the recommendation of the General Manager.

"(c) The Commission, to the fullest extent practicable, shall utilize existing atomic energy laboratory installations, and other Government installations, personnel, and services, provided that the Commission shall retain full authority for the planning, direction, and overall budget control for such programs and projects.

"SEC. 243. Outer Space Advisory Committee: There is hereby established an Outer Space Advisory Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) which shall be composed of seven members appointed from civilian life by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and advising the Commission, the President and other Government agencies, the Congress and the public as to the adequacy of proposed programs and the status and results of projects undertaken to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 244. International Laboratory for Outer Space Propulsion: The Commission, with the general policy guidance of the State Department, is authorized and directed to undertake to negotiate and execute an agreement with cooperating nations for the establishment of and participation in an International Laboratory for Outer Space Propulsion.

"SEC. 245. National Laboratory for Outer Space Propulsion: In order to carry out the purposes and policy of this act, and consistent with the provisions of section 242 (c) and 244, the Commission is authorized to establish a National Laboratory to serve as a domestic center for research and development on outer space propulsion and related activities."

SEC. 3. Section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended in the following particulars, as follows:

(a) At the end of the first, fourth, and fifth sentences add the following: "and outer space propulsion."

(b) In the sixth sentence following the words "atomic energy" add the following: "or outer space propulsion."

SEC. 4. The sum of $50 million is authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to finance initial operations and construction to carry out the provisions of this amendment.

---

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 18, 1958]

THE ASSAULT ON OUTER SPACE

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—A reporter who lived through the postwar days of the launching of the Lilienthal-Acheson-Baruch proposals for international control of atomic energy is inclined to wonder these weeks if a similar great endeavor is not again developing.

This time, imagination is suddenly stirred by proposals for internationalising the use of outer space rather than the use of atomic energy. And they envisage just as mammoth and precedent-breaking an assault on new horizons as did the Baruch plan.

And again, as in 1946–47, the outcome may depend on the Soviet Union and the mood of the leaders in the Kremlin. The Baruch plan failed.

The American proposal is taking shape under several hands. President Eisenhower, in his letter to Soviet Premier Bulganin, proposed joint negotiations to assure that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes. Secretary of State Dulles, in his National Press Club speech, suggested that an international commission be set up, presumably under United Nations auspices, to supervise all outer-space exploration and make certain that it be devoted to the interests of science and humanity rather than military purposes.

Meanwhile, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, in a move typical of his wide-ranging senatorial leadership, has taken a slightly different tack and urged the administration to invite all members of the United Nations to join in the active conquest of space as an outpost of peace.

While Secretary Dulles has emphasized primarily supervision of outer space usage, so as to maintain its peaceful character, Senator JOHNSON has urged that the conquest of space be made an actual joint venture of mankind, with joint research and development. This is probably a possibility implicit in the Dulles proposal, but the Texas Senator has stated it affirmatively.

Under this concept various nations undoubtedly would pursue their own space projects. But a U. N. organization would coordinate the careful research and breathtaking adventures.

Surely the United States, in these developing ideas, has got hold of something which should grip the world's attention. Secretary Dulles says mankind is facing an opportunity which is almost staggering in its possible implications. Senator JOHNSON comments on the opportunity of adding a new dimension to freedom—and with it the very real prospect of reaching our goal of total peace.

The great question, of course, is whether these bold ideas will end in failure, as did the attempt to control the A-bomb in its infancy. Failure is not inevitable. The very subject matter carries a more hopeful connotation.

The first use of atomic energy was for war, at Hiroshima; the first thrust into outer space was a peaceful mission, via Sputnik I. Thought readily conceives of space conquest as satisfying mankind's vast desire to know rather than as a mere sideshow to developing gigantic missiles. Moreover, mankind has learned through hydrogen-bomb tests how horrendous war would be with the weapons of tomorrow, and is more ready to turn from them.

Any agreement that outer space be penetrated only for peaceful purposes would of course rule out the big missiles, the ICBM's and IRBM's, which fly beyond the atmosphere in their trajectories. Supervision—inspection—should not be an insuperable problem. Today's easily detected cumbersome missiles may soon develop into the easily concealed Polaris type, with its stable solid-fuel propellant. But long-range radar, strategically placed, should be able to spot any rocket firings not vetted and approved by the proposed U. N. agency.

The subject isn't likely to lie dormant from here on. President Eisenhower's letter proposed to Moscow that a technical committee might even now commence discussions on the feasibility of controls.

How will Moscow respond? The first Soviet reactions reportedly are negative. A Soviet official commented to this correspondent that since space conquest is in its earliest childhood, there is no need yet to discuss joint efforts or controls. The Soviets believe themselves to be well ahead in the missile race. They may also believe that mankind's future belongs to communism—so why stoop to compromise?

Yet the Kremlin has recently displayed a healthy respect for the perils of hydrogen warfare. And these perils would be multiplied in an uncontrolled rivalry for outer space and new missiles. Moscow has not by any means delivered its considered or final judgment.

As for Washington's responsibility, the challenge is whether the administration and Congress have the wisdom and resourcefulness to make the space plan more than merely a Dulles démarche—to press the project in the forums of the world, and to allocate the billion dollars a year adjudged necessary for vigorous research and progress toward the conquest of this new frontier.

---

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 22, 1958]

THE CHALLENGE OF OUTER SPACE: JOINT CONQUEST, NOT EAST-WEST CONTROL, HELD BEST HOPE OF GAINING COOPERATION

(By Dorothy Thompson)

In two previous columns I have tried, rather feebly I fear, to suggest two conditions likely to determine whether a civilization will flourish or wane, giving place to another; that to flourish it must release continuing dynamism, demanding perpetual research in pure science, plus ever higher integration of effort.

The great problem of politics is to discern what is implict in the times, in order "to check what wants checking and supply what wants supplying." The words are Walt Whitman's. He attributed this function to the poet, and not incorrectly, for discernment requires imagination. A great civilization must display imagination, literally the power of projection.

In putting into orbit man's first earth satellite, the Russians displayed enormous imagination, as well as technical mastery.

Sputnik appeared as a Russian contribution to the International Geophysical Year, during which the scientists of 67 nations are intensively exploring earth, sea, and sky to add to mankind's knowledge.

The little earth satellites did not make their appearance in menacing guises, as instruments of war. The fission of uranium and release of the atom's power was an equally great scientific and technical masterpiece, but it was achieved during total war; its first use was for destruction, and from Hiroshima to this moment the very words "atomic" and "thermonuclear" evoke less hope than despair.

The Western—and especially American—reaction to the space satellites was not to greet the achievement in the frame of its contribution to geophysical explorations, but immediately to associate it with a lead in the most terrifying (and ingenious) of weapons: the intercontinental missile. The picture immediately projected in our minds was of great regions of the world being destroyed without warning at the push of a few buttons. So again the grandeur of the achievement was eclipsed by fear, and an intensification of efforts to create bigger and better war instruments.

Yet the implications of these instruments are clear to all. Their purpose is not to add to mankind's knowledge of earth, sea and sky—though, in the course of creating them, knowledge will accumulate. But the end purpose of that knowledge is destruction, of incalculable capacity and results.

The long-range, intercontinental missile would pass through outer space. So now the proposal has come from the President and Secretary Dulles that outer space be internationally controlled, under a convention that it will not be used for war purposes. But the difficulties of control are admitted, and meanwhile there is no letup in plans to create missiles which "successful" control would entirely eliminate.

The proposals appear to have been made rather hastily; the press is speculating that they are partly for propaganda value, and the likelihood of the Russians joining in is discounted.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's proposal seems to me far more imaginative, because it is affirmative. He has urged the administration to invite all members of the United Nations to come together in a joint enterprise for the active conquest of space as an outpost of peace.

This is humanly discerning. Time and again all of us have observed how fear and hostility fade when opponents engage on some common enterprise of lofty and adventurous quality. The President realized this when he suggested a joint international campaign against malaria. But the cynical ask why anyone should be concerned about malaria if he's likely to be blown into kingdom come. The issue is too serious for such timid beginnings.

The Russians—and especially their scientists, who have great influence in the U. S. S. R.—are more likely, I think, to welcome Senator JOHNSON'S suggestion for active, constructive, scientific cooperation in the common passion for knowledge and discovery, than the negative proposal for controlling the essentially incontrollable.

Perhaps the first men to reach the moon will be a Russian and an American together. On that day the cold war would, we think, be ended in mutual respect and a worldwide burst of joy.

---

## STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on January 7 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, JANUARY 17, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a year ago, in testifying before your committee, I reported that "This is the first time in many years that a Secretary of Agriculture has been able to come before your committee and report such favorable development."

I am happy to be able to report to you now that in 1957 we again have had a number of favorable developments in agriculture including these:

Prices received by farmers have been running 3 percent above a year ago.

Realized net income for the second year in succession was above 1955 levels.

CCC's investment in farm products owned and under loan is expected to drop to about $6.8 billion on June 30, 1958. This will bring the total reduction since the holdings of June 30, 1956, to about $1.5 billion. While the size of reduction is significant, it tells only part of what we have done, because in this same period the steady acquisition of new surplus stocks under price support served to keep CCC inventories at high levels.

Movement of surplus agricultural commodities from CCC stocks into consumption reached an all-time high in the 1957 fiscal year. In that year, we moved out of CCC inventories commodities with a total cost value of $4.2 billion.

Exports of agricultural commodities in fiscal 1957 reached an all-time record high level of $4.7 billion with new records being achieved by major crops.

These improvements are gratifying to us in the Department. However, they still do

not represent all the changes we feel necessary so that farmers of the Nation can participate fairly in our dynamic and prosperous economy. Our primary effort, and to this task I am wholeheartedly devoted, must be to improve farm income. That is why I am appearing before your committee today to recommend certain further legislative changes which we feel are desirable if constructive use is to be made of the abundance of American agriculture and if farm incomes are to be increased.

THE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

If we are to be of any real help to farmers, however, we must face up to certain unpleasant facts. One of these is the fact that our price-support program, which was written to cope with a depression, changed to help fight a war, and relatedly revised again somewhat in an effort to meet the needs of peace, has not solved the farm problem. And it has been an expensive effort.

Realized losses under program primarily for the support of farm prices and incomes was $3.25 billion in the 1957 fiscal year, far above the $1.9 billion cost in 1956. These amounts, of course, did not go entirely to farmers. Substantial amounts have had to be charged for storage, transportation, interest, and administration. Part of these costs represent economic, military, and other activities abroad. Some of these activities might have been undertaken entirely apart from our surplus-disposal operations.

Over 80 percent of the price support and stabilization costs in 1957 period was concentrated in three crops (wheat, cotton, and corn) and butter and manufactured dairy products. About one-half was incurred in two crops—wheat and cotton.

These heavy costs would be justified if they led to a solution of the agricultural problem. However, they have not. Price supports at the levels now required by law have continued to generate surpluses which must be disposed of at a heavy loss and which continue to depress farm prices and incomes. This is one of the reasons why we are requesting further changes in legislation.

We must modify our price support program so it can deal effectively with the technological revolution in agriculture to which our farmers are trying to adjust. Specific recommendations will be included in the farm food and fiber program which I shall outline in this testimony.

COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

Another of the hard facts which farmers are facing today and which we must face if we are to help them is the fact that despite improvement in farm prices and farm income, the cost-price squeeze still is a major problem in agriculture.

We are making strong efforts to cut down farm surpluses which have accumulated as a result of the rigid price support programs required by law. We are emphasizing the search for new and expanded markets for farm products. We are taking strong measures to balance production against effective demand. But that robber of net farm income—rising costs—has not been conquered. Nor can farmers or Government alone do it.

It is not for me to say what labor or industry should do at this juncture, but as a spokesman for agriculture in the Federal Government, I will say that I am deeply disturbed by any action which adds one penny to the production costs of farmers at this time.

Increases in wages and profits are justified to the extent that they represent compensation for increased productivity or efficiency. Certainly the benefits of greater efficiency and productivity should be shared by all. These are fundamental concepts which if violated must result in higher costs and prices. These factors are especially important today.

All of us must join in the battle against rising costs. There are many weapons which can be used to fight these rising costs. Some of these are the maintenance of a sound responsible monetary policy, sound farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperatives, and improved efficiency, particularly in marketing and distribution. We will never attain satisfactory farm prosperity, however, by increasing gross income if rising costs are allowed to siphon off all gains.

SURPLUS DISPOSAL OPERATIONS

We must face also the realization that we are still holding price-depressing stocks of farm goods in disturbing quantities despite outstanding successes in disposing of surpluses.

In testifying before your committee last year, I went into considerable detail in indicating the results of our disposal operations. I should now like to bring those figures up to date.

During the 15-month period ending September 30, 1957, the latest period for which information is available, surplus commodities with a cost value of $5.3 billion were moved out of CCC inventory. These brought total disposals since 1953 up to $11.6 billion. Since 1953 the rate of disposal of agricultural products has increased each year.

Four commodities or commodity groups accounted for nearly 80 percent of the total distribution of CCC surplus farm products during the 15-mouth period. These commodities were cotton, $2 billion; wheat, $1 billion; corn, $600 million; and dairy products, $400 million.

While much attention has been focused on sales for foreign currencies under Public Law 480, it still is not generally realized that most of our commodities have been moved by sales for dollars. Since July 1, 1953, 60 percent of our disposals have been for dollars, 12 percent by donations, 12 percent by barter, 11 percent by sales for foreign currencies, and 5 percent by other transfers and section 32 transactions.

More about our Public Law 480 sales efforts and our donation programs will be said later. Even as we point with pardonable pride to these accomplishments, however, we must, with equal candor, admit that as of December 31, 1957, we still had on hand surplus stocks with inventory value of $4.8 billion, and more will be acquired during 1958.

Obviously, there is still more to be done—both in the field of the removing of surpluses and in preventing their further accumulation.

A PROGRESS PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE

These are some of the unpleasant facts our farmers are facing today. And if we are to help them in making necessary adjustments we must face these facts, too.

We must consider the dynamics of today's agriculture—the accelerating sweep of technological change is mounting to sunburst proportions. Farm production per man-hour has doubled in the last 15 years. There has been more change in agriculture within the lifetime of men now living than in the previous 2,000 years.

Changes of such magnitude place great stress on our farm people and on the social, political, and economic institutions which serve them. Far-reaching adjustments are being made which involve the lives and hopes of 20 million men, women, and children on the family farms of America. We must see that our farm families are helped rather than hurt by these inevitable changes.

The scientific revolution in agriculture is cumulative and irreversible. It need not be feared. In recognition of this basic fact, we must:

Utilize more completely the abundance our farm people are now able to produce;

Find ways of further expanding outlets for the increased production;

Provide adequate price protection for our farm people;

Preserve and strengthen our free institutions.

These changes have affected individual farmers differently. Those on the 2.1 million commercial farms which produce nearly 91 percent of our total farm dollar output have problems far different from those who live on the 2.7 million farms which produce only about 9 percent.

(Appendix A shows a further breakdown of farm output comparisons.)

Sound agricultural legislation must consider the problems of farmers in both of these categories.

President Eisenhower in his budget message and in his agriculture message has outlined a proposed farm food and fiber program. I shall review the major parts of this progressive farm program and discuss them with this committee in the hope that they may be enacted into law this year. Some of the components are budget matters; others are proposals for essential forward-looking legislation.

I believe that action taken along the line of these recommendations will aid agricultural adjustment, provide more freedom for our farmers, and raise the levels of income.

Briefly stated, the proposed farm food and fiber program includes 15 important recommendations. They are:

1. The conservation reserve program of the soil bank should be strengthened, and the acreage reserve program terminated after the 1958 crop.

2. Authority to increase acreage allotments for cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco should be provided.

3. Acreage allotments for corn should be eliminated.

4. The escalator clauses in the basic law should be abolished.

5. The overall range within which price supports may be provided should be substantially widened by authorizing supports at a range of 60 to 90 percent of parity.

6. Price supports for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop.

7. The membership of the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board should be enlarged and the Board's responsibilities increased.

8. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act should be extended.

9. Research efforts aimed at increasing industrial uses of farm products should be expanded.

10. The National Wool Act should be extended.

11. The special milk program for schools and other institutions should be continued.

12. The sources of funds for the Rural Electrification Administration should be broadened.

13. State participation in programs to relieve the effects of drought or other natural disaster should be required.

14. Conservation accomplishment should be improved by restricting cost-sharing to those practices which achieve longer lasting conservation benefits and do not so materially contribute to increase production.

15. An increased emphasis should be placed on our rural-development program.

Let us now consider these components of the proposed farm food and fiber program separately.

1. The conservation reserve program of the soil bank should be strengthened, and the acreage reserve program terminated after the 1958 crop.

The conservation reserve has shown promise in retiring marginal acres from crop production, in aiding the cause of conservation, and in retiring whole farms from production when the operators choose to do so.

Accomplishment of the acreage reserve in production was hampered in 1956 by late enactment and by the inclusion of measures intended more for relief than for

adjustment. The 1957 program succeeded in reducing wheat production by about 175 million bushels, cotton by about 2 million bales, and corn by about 225 million bushels.

However, in 1958 the acreage-reserve program will be reduced in effectiveness by the legislatively imposed $3,000 limitation on the extent of participation.

In addition, the legislative changes herewith recommended for 1959 provide for elimination of corn-acreage allotments and authorization of increasing allotments for other basic crops under certain specified criteria. We should not provide for an acreage-reserve program on the one hand and an expanded acreage allotment on the other.

We should, therefore, shift emphasis within the soil bank from the short-time approach of the acreage reserve, aimed at reducing surpluses of the basic crops, to the long-term approach of the conservation reserve, aimed at overall production adjustment.

A conservation-reserve program of $450 million is recommended for the 1959 calendar year.

This recommended shift in emphasis would aid the small farmer, who would be able to retire his entire farm from production if he wished. It would also aid the large farmer, who would benefit pricewise from the production adjustments which would ensue.

An expanded conservation reserve can be an effective instrument of adjustment if it is accompanied by needed changes in price supports. It should not become merely a means of offsetting the production stimulus supplied by price supports held continually at incentive levels.

2. Authority to increase acreage allotments for cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco, should be provided.

Under present legislation, acreage allotments and price supports for the basic crops are determined by statistical formulas. Under these formulas, the permitted acreages are sharply restrictive. Allotments for certain crops may have to be reduced even further under present law, despite growing evidence that acreage restrictions have not brought about needed adjustments.

Authority should be provided for the Secretary of Agriculture to increase acreage allotments by up to 50 percent above the levels determined by existing formulas, in accordance with the criteria set forth in appendix B.

The law already specifies that the Secretary may provide price support at levels above those determined by formula, and this authority has been used. Authority of this type in the case of tobacco is being utilized. The law should also provide authority to increase acreage allotments when the mechanistic statistical formula yields results clearly contrary to the general interest.

However, any acreage increases must be related to price adjustments designed to permit the growth of markets needed to absorb the higher production.

3. Acreage allotments for corn should be eliminated.

It is proposed that acreage allotments beginning with the 1959 crop be eliminated. Acreage allotments have not been effective in reducing corn acreage and production. As a result, the carryover of corn as of October 1, 1957, is at a record high in excess of 1⅓ billion bushels.

During the last 20 years the commercial corn area spread from 566 counties in 12 States to 932 counties in 26 States. The legal requirements have forced a steady expansion in the extent of controls to which farmers are being subjected.

Farmers have voted to eliminate corn acreage allotments both with their corn planters and in the referendum held in December 1956. In this referendum over 61 percent of the corn farmers voting indicated their preference for a program of the type recommended in the attached bill. Only 14 percent of the 1957 production in the commercial corn area was eligible for price support because relatively few farmers complied with allotments.

Removing corn allotments will be a forward step in the direction of more freedom for farmers. Price supports would be provided at a level between 60 and 90 percent of parity for corn using the eight guidelines now provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949 for the nonmandatory nonbasic commodities.

4. The escalator clauses in the basic law should be abolished.

This is essential. This law requires that price supports be raised as the surplus is reduced. This means that incentives are provided to build new surpluses as soon as present surpluses start to decrease. This keeps farm people continually under the shadow of price-depressing surpluses.

Since our surplus-disposal and soil-bank programs have been effective in reducing surpluses, these escalator requirements are already operating to build more surpluses. Elimination of these escalator clauses is necessary if these programs are to achieve their purpose.

5. The overall range within which price supports may be provided should be substantially widened.

Presently, price supports must be provided for most types of tobacco at 90 percent of parity and for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, and dairy products between 75 and 90 percent of parity. This range is too narrow to permit the expansion of markets needed to absorb the increased production which our farms will likely produce.

Rather than determining price supports for the basic commodities by formula between 75 and 90 percent of parity, price supports should be determined administratively in a wider range—from 60 to 90 percent of parity. This range should also apply to dairy products.

The criterion for determining the specific support level for dairy products could well continue as at present; namely, a level which will assure an adequate supply. The criteria for determining the specific support levels for the six basic crops should be the same as now apply to almost all other farm products, some 250 in total. (See appendix C.)

As background for this discussion, a review of some of the history of price supports is included in appendix D.

6. Price supports for cotton should be based on the average quality of the crop.

The price support for cotton should be based on average grade and staple the same as for all other crops. This would be an additional step in placing cotton in a better competitive relationship with foreign cotton and synthetic fibers. It would also eliminate the differences in handling supports for cotton as compared with other crops. The net effect of this provision on support levels is an oversupport of 1.1 cents per pound.

The present law requires Middling ⅞-inch to be used as the standard grade for determining parity and price supports. Only about 5 percent of the crop, however, is now of this specification or lower. Obviously, Middling ⅞-inch is not a representative quality for American upland cotton.

The lack of demand for these shorter, less desirable, staple lengths at prices equal to or above their loan rates causes them to go under loan and eventually into Government warehouses. Currently too large a proportion of the CCC stocks is in these low quality cottons, difficult to market and expensive to store. As these lower grade cottons back up in carryover stocks they tend, under present law, to reduce the allotment for all cotton producers.

Furthermore, if we are to develop a continuing expanding export market we should not encourage the production of these less desirable qualities. Rather, we should try to keep the United States in the forefront as a source of quality products competitively priced.

7. The membership of the Commodity Credit Corporation Advisory Board should be enlarged and the Board's responsibilities increased.

There is no desire on the part of the present Secretary of Agriculture to expand his discretionary authority beyond what is needed for sound operation of programs. However, there is a recognized need for additional administrative discretion in establishing price-support levels and acreage allotments.

Therefore, it is proposed that the present law relating to the CCC Advisory Board be amended to provide that specific duties of the Board shall include (1) making recommendations to the Secretary as to acreage allotments, and the levels of price support for mandatory and nonmandatory commodities, and (2) requiring the Secretary to consult with the Board in establishing price supports and acreage allotments.

In addition, to make the Board more representative, provision should be made for an increase in the membership of the Advisory Board from five to seven. Members should be appointed by the President as at present but with confirmation by the Senate. Not more than four members should be of the same political party.

8. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act should be extended.

It is recommended that Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, be extended for 1 year to June 30, 1959, and authorization be provided for an additional $1.5 billion for Title I sales for foreign currency.

A large part of the progress made in reducing surpluses has resulted from programs carried out under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. This act, passed at a time when the net inflow of commodities into Government storage was at a high level, has helped to put these commodities into consumption channels in a constructive manner.

Public Law 480 exports have made a major contribution in the attainment of an all-time high in total United States agricultural exports of $4.7 billion in 1956–57. In 1956–57 they accounted for these parts of total exports: wheat, three-fifths; rice, four-fifths; vegetable oils, about one-half; cotton, about one-third; corn, two-fifths. More detail regarding Public Law 480 exports and donations is included in appendix E.

Authority for foreign currency sales under title I expires on June 30, 1958, and the present authorization of $4 billion for title I programs will probably be completely committed early in 1958. Authority for title II famine donations expires on June 30, 1959, but unexpended funds still are expected to be sufficient to cover needs in 1958 and 1959.

Large quantities of surpluses have been moved during the past few years under special programs such as Public Law 480, but there is still a large surplus problem. There is need, therefore, for continuing titles I and II of Public Law 480 to help move these large agricultural surpluses, for it is more desirable to encourage increased consumption of this abundance, rather than to have it remain in or enter into storage at heavy cost.

The $1.5 billion increase in title I is intended for programing over an 18-month period and would help overcome program difficulties (inability to adequately meet requests, erratic use of shipping space, less efficient management of commodity inventories) that have resulted from more limited extensions. At the same time it would not result in acceleration of the present program. This level would not displace normal United States dollar sales.

In requesting this increased authorization we are asking primarily for the opportunity to use commodities already paid for under the price-support program, or which other-

wise would be acquired under such operations.

This act should not be considered a permanent part of the farm program. Therefore, we have limited our extension to 1 year. This will facilitate the periodic review by Congress of program results in the light of our agricultural situation, and in terms of the needs abroad.

9. Research efforts aimed at increasing industrial uses of farm products should be expanded.

During fiscal year 1958 and fiscal year 1959, we have taken or will take the following steps to place greater emphasis on utilization research:

1. Completed the realinement of the Agricultural Research Service, initiated in fiscal year 1957, in which the importance of utilization research was recognized by placing it on an equivalent organizational level with our production research.

2. Strengthening of basic research in the utilization research divisions.

3. Recommendation of a fiscal year 1959 appropriation of about $21 million for utilization research in the United States, representing an increase of $5.8 million over the amount made available in fiscal year 1958. Concurrently, recommendation of a fiscal year 1958 allocation of $2,000,000 and a fiscal year 1959 allocation of $5,000,000 from Public Law 480 funds for research in foreign countries on selected phases of our utilization research program. The total of about $26 million requested for utilization research in fiscal year 1959 represents an increase of more than 70 percent over the present level of the utilization research program. Included with increases in the past few years this request, if approved, would represent an increase of 174 percent over fiscal year 1953 for utilization research.

Our utilization research in the United States would be concentrated on our commodities in surplus, namely cereals, cotton, fats and oils, and dairy products, as well as on the development of uses for new crops. More details as to how these funds will be used is contained in appendix F.

10. The National Wool Act should be extended.

In the National Wool Act of 1954, Congress determined "that wool is an essential and strategic commodity which is not produced in quantities and grades in the United States to meet the domestic needs and that the desired domestic production of wool is impaired by the depressing effects of wide fluctuations in the price of wool in the world markets. It was declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security and in promotion of the general economic welfare, to encourage the annual domestic production of approximately three hundred million pounds of shorn wool, grease basis, at prices fair to both producers and consumers in a manner which will have the least adverse effects upon foreign trade."

The National Wool Act has been operated as an incentive payment program to expand wool production without (1) raising the tariff or otherwise adversely affecting trade with friendly countries, (2) increasing the cost of wool to consumers or adversely affecting the competitive position of wool, and (3) having the Government in the wool merchandising business.

Under this act the incentive price for shorn wool is established each year at such level as the Secretary determines to be necessary to encourage an annual production of 300 million pounds. The incentive price for each of the 4 years of the present program has been 62 cents per pound.

This legislation is scheduled to expire at the end of the 1958 season. We recommend that it be extended in its present general form.

11. The special milk program for schools and other institutions should be continued.

We are recommending a 2-year extension in the special milk program to increase fluid-milk consumption by children in schools, summer camps, and child-care institutions. This will extend the present annual authorization of $75 million through June 30, 1960. This program is making an outstanding contribution to the expansion of markets for fluid milk. Equally important, it is providing more children with more milk—a very real improvement as far as their dietary needs are concerned.

During 1957, participating children consumed 1.8 billion half pints of milk, a 29-percent increase over 1956, and expenditures totalled $61 million. An additional 1.8 billion half pints of milk were consumed under the national school lunch program. So, as a result of the two programs, children consumed 3.6 billion half pints of milk last year.

Authorization should also be continued for milk programs which presently serve the veteran's hospitals and the military service. More detail on these worthwhile programs is included in appendix G.

12. The sources of funds for the rural electrification administration should be broadened.

The President in his budget message referred to the recommendations to open up new sources of loan funds to finance the REA electric and telephone programs. This will enable the sound needs of these rural systems to be financed adequately and the purposes of the Rural Electrification Act to be accomplished through the appropriate use of Federal and private funds. This broader authority will permit meeting the needs of farm families while recognizing the increasing demands for these services by rural nonfarm consumers.

Estimates of capital funds needed to finance the growing demand for electric power in rural areas indicate that dollar requirements during the next generation will far exceed the $3.5 billion loaned by the Federal Government through REA during its first 22 years of operation. The proportion of nonfarm use will undoubtedly continue to increase. (See appendix H.)

The magnitude of these capital requirements and the change in the character of the services to be rendered under the expanding system emphasize the desirability of finding an adequate source of funds other than primary dependence on the Federal Treasury.

Initial sponsorship of REA programs by the Federal Government is in keeping with the historical practice of helping to provide needed services that could not be had through private initiative and resources alone.

Historically the Government has progressively stepped aside when such projects have reached a state of maturity sufficient to enable them to move ahead soundly with their own ownership, management, and financing.

The REA system has arrived at a state of maturity that permits the development of a permanent financing plan which will adequately provide for its future capital requirements and effect an orderly transition from Government to private financing.

Legislative recommendations will be made to the Congress to enable the systems to secure from private sources the additional loan funds needed for the sound improvement and expansion of the system in the years ahead. These proposed legislative changes would permit private loan funds to be used through an insured loan program or by a subordination of the Government's security position where that would be feasible and desirable.

This does not mean that the REA is to be without adequate funds. The President's budget message contains recommendations for further substantial Federal loan funds in 1959—$150 million for the electric program and $56 million for the telephone program. This is in addition to the unused balances from 1958 of $25 million on the electric program and $12 million on the telephone program.

There are undisbursed loan commitments of about $770 million that have been made to various REA borrowers. These funds are available to finance REA approved construction plans to further extend the services of these specific borrowers or to firm up their facilities to handle increased consumer requirements.

13. State participation in programs to relieve the effects of drought or other natural disaster should be required.

Legislation embodying the principle of State participation has already passed the Senate in the form of S. 304.

In past years virtually the full cost of the drought relief program has been carried by the Federal Government. If the States were to participate financially funds would be distributed more equitably, more economically, and more efficiently. This participation should equal at least 25 percent of the cost.

Increased rainfall in the Great Plains has made possible the termination of the drought relief program. Changes could now be made with a minimum of difficulty to existing programs.

14. Conservation cost-sharing should be in support of those practices which achieve longer lasting conservation benefits.

The budget proposes the continuation of the Agricultural Conservation Program of cost-sharing payments to farmers who carry out approved soil and water conservation measures on their farms. Authorization of funds is sought for a 1959 crop year program.

This reduction of $125 million below the present level of $250 million is proposed because of the general necessity to allocate expenditures only to the most essential needs so as to permit major effort in the national defense areas. We believe that by careful administration, the lower authorization will be sufficient to give attention to the most urgent problems of conserving agricultural resources. It is contemplated that the Department's total conservation effort will continue to be maintained at a substantial level.

The manner in which we intend to operate with these funds is indicated in appendix I.

15. An increased emphasis should be placed on our rural development program.

In close cooperation with the States, we have considerably strengthened and expanded the rural development program. As you know, this program is a Federal, State, and local effort to improve opportunity among the 2.5 million farm families who receive little income from farm marketings.

Rural development has three basic aims:

1. To strengthen and expand industry in underdeveloped rural areas and widen the range of off-farm opportunities.

2. To help families who want to stay in farming gain the tools, land, and information that will permit them to farm successfully.

3. To help all people in these areas arm themselves with adequate training and good health.

Since my last meeting with this committee, six additional States and Puerto Rico have come into the rural development program, making a total of 30 States where the work is going forward.

Personnel have been assigned especially to increase educational services on small farms; to help local citizen committees in organizing and planning development projects; to increase soil, water, and forest protection, administer credit programs, and conduct farm surveys.

No development in agricultural policy in recent years, I believe, holds greater long-term importance than the effort our departments and agencies are making on many fronts to strengthen, modify, and redirect educational and service programs in order to provide practical help and guidance for small farmers and their families. Provision has been made in the budget for these activities

which are a part of the continuing programs of the agencies involved. (See appendix J.)

CONCLUSION

The shortcomings of our past programs are quite clear. We have tried to legislate prices artificially, without full consideration for the inevitable forces of supply and demand. We have tried to control production artificially, without full consideration for the efficiency and ingenuity of our farmers. In other words, we have lacked realism.

Our farm programs—no matter how desirable in objective—have failed to get the job done. And that is why our energies are now devoted to the search for better measures to assure the sound future of agriculture.

The essential objective of preserving our traditional freedoms underlies the need for redirection of program efforts. Farmers, possibly more than any other group, value the right of individual decision and initiative. At times they may have to sacrifice what may appear to be short-term advantages in order to insure these rights for the future.

No one wants less effective programs for farmers. On the contrary, we must replace policies and programs which have failed with measures which will assure the American farmer his rightful place in the abundance of our free economy.

I have great optimism about the future of agriculture. This optimism originates from the fact that, in the final analysis, farmers will have to make up their minds which way they want to go. They will decide whether they want more freedom—more flexibility, more right of individual decision, more opportunity to make sound adjustments in line with their great efficiency, or whether they prefer more and more regimentation—more and more restrictive controls.

Farmers are independent, intelligent people. Their thinking is based on the true values of rural life. I am confident that they will make the right decisions when all the facts are available to them.

The forward looking realistic program which we have submitted to this committee represents proposals for action we feel are essential to the economic health of agriculture. The responsibility for implementing them rests with this committee and the Congress. We have presented them early in the session so that action can be taken in the first months of this session. The Department stands ready to help our committee in every possible way.

---

APPENDIX A

PER FARM PRODUCTION TABLE

The 1954 census listed a total of 4,783,018 farms. The figures below show how widely these farms varied as to value of market sales, hence income.

| | Number of farms | Percent of total farms | Percent of total dollar output | Percent of acres used |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. Commercial farms having market sales of: | | | | |
| $25,000 or over | 134,000 | 2.8 | 31.3 | 22.4 |
| $10,000 to $24,999 | 448,945 | 9.4 | 26.9 | 20.8 |
| $5,000 to $9,999 | 706,929 | 14.8 | 20.5 | 19.0 |
| $2,500 to $4,999 | 811,965 | 17.0 | 12.1 | 14.1 |
| Total, over $2,500 | 2,101,839 | 44.0 | 90.8 | 76.3 |
| II. Small full-time commercial farms having market sales of: | | | | |
| $1,200 to $2,499 | 763,348 | 16.0 | 5.7 | 8.8 |
| Less than $1,200 | 462,427 | 9.7 | 1.4 | 3.9 |
| Total, less than $2,500 | 1,225,775 | 25.7 | 7.1 | 12.7 |
| III. Part-time, residential, and other farms | 1,455,404 | 30.4 | 2.0 | 11.0 |

As a guide to public policy, the chief significance of these figures is the fact that the 44 percent of our farms make up the efficient commercial farm class, produce 90.8 percent of all farm products that go to market. The remaining 56 percent of farms do not have the same problems as commercial farmers. They produce only 9.2 percent of marketed farm products. Thus, it is impossible to provide them with adequate net income by means of price supports. An effective program must recognize the basic differences in these various groups.

---

APPENDIX B

CRITERIA FOR INCREASED ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

If the Secretary determines after investigation that such increase is necessary in the interests of the welfare of the agricultural economy—

1. to avoid hardships to producers of the commodity,
2. to meet potential market demands for the commodity,
3. to avoid undue restrictions on marketings,
4. to prevent disruption in the orderly marketing of the commodity,
5. to insure adequate farm income,
6. to make allowance for statistics of the Federal Government more recent than those used in the original determination of the marketing quota or acreage allotment, or
7. because of any combination of these factors.

Section 312 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, provides that the Secretary may increase the national marketing quota for tobacco above the formula determination by not more than 20 percent if he determines that such increase is necessary "in order to meet market demands or to avoid undue restrictions of marketings in adjusting the total supply to the reserve supply level." This authority has been used for a number of years.

---

APPENDIX C

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING SUPPORT LEVELS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES

These involve consideration of:

1. The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor;
2. the price levels at which other commodities are being supported and, in the case of feed grains, the feed values of such grains in relation to corn;
3. the availability of funds;
4. the perishability of the commodity;
5. the importance of the commodity to agriculture and the national economy;
6. the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation;
7. the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets; and
8. the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

---

APPENDIX D

HISTORY OF PRICE SUPPORTS

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which is still basic legislation (except for the price-support legislation) authorized CCC to make loans on agricultural commodities, including dairy products, and directed CCC to make loans on wheat, cotton, and corn at levels between 52 and 75 percent of parity. In 1941, new legislation required peanut supports at levels between 50 and 75 percent of parity.

With the advent of World War II, Congress passed three acts (the act of May 26, 1941, the act of July 1, 1941—the so-called Steagall amendment—and sec. 8 of the Stabilization Act of 1942) to encourage increased agricultural output by minimizing the price risk involved in expansion during wartime. Under these laws, as amended, the basic commodities (corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts) and 14 others on which production increases had been requested were required to be supported at not less than 90 percent of parity for the war period and 2 years thereafter. (Initially—1941 crops—support was required at 85 percent of parity for the duration of hostilities, and this level was raised and the period lengthened beginning with 1942 crops. Cotton was required to be supported at slightly higher levels from 1944 through 1948.)

This was a significant change because it was the first time Congress had required support at a level as high as 90 percent of parity. This requirement (which ended with the 1948 crops of the basics and on December 31, 1948, for nonbasics) was extended for 1 additional crop year—1949—with some modifications in levels for some nonbasics by title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948. Title II of that act also reintroduced the idea of flexible price supports at between 60 and 90 percent of parity, but these provisions did not go into effect because they were superseded by the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The suggested changes are needed for the following reasons:

1. Agricultural products are likely to continue to be abundant and cannot be successfully priced as if they were scarce.

2. Support levels computed under the present formula have stimulated production, priced us out of the market, and aggravated farmers' marketing problems.

3. Controls have not been effective in reducing overall agricultural production despite the severe restrictions they impose on farmers' freedom to produce and market.

4. The concept of adjustment through effective production control is impractical, as evidenced by a series of legislative and administrative actions.

5. Farm people have not received the benefits from existing programs that they expected. On the contrary, existing programs have had many adverse effects.

(a) Necessary adjustments have been impeded during a period when the general state of the economy would have facilitated them, although the intent was to ease the adjustment from wartime to peacetime conditions.

(b) They have made little or no contribution to the problem of low income farmers in whose name farm programs are frequently defended.

(c) They work against the long-run interest of the family-type farm, insofar as they inhibit the flexibility in operation and adjustment in size needed to make family farms efficient. Good farmers find it difficult to maintain satisfactory incomes with their acreage curtailed. They need to adjust the scale of their operations to take advantage of advancing technology in agriculture.

(d) They raise the price of land to young farmers who are just starting out, since the worth of allotments tends to become capitalized into land values. A windfall profit to one generation becomes an overhead cost to the next.

(e) Statutory exemptions extended to growers in minimum-sized categories have required tighter restrictions on moderately larger and more efficient farms.

(f) Production on acres diverted out of the basic crops has complicated the marketing problems of other farmers who produce nonbasic products.

(g) They had led to criticisms against farm programs because of the high costs.

In the case of tobacco the combination of support at 90 percent of parity plus drastic cuts in acreage plus the working of the

modernized parity formula has resulted in the price of tobacco being about twice as high, relatively, as prices of other farm products. The most recent price index for tobacco is 466. For all farm products it is 242. The price of tobacco in a given year becomes an element in the formula which determines the price the next year.

The following shows the parity price effects of the present tobacco program:

| | Parity | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | January 1956 | January 1957 | January 1958 (estimated) |
| Burley | 52.0 | 56.6 | 60.0 |
| Flue cured | 53.4 | 55.8 | 60.0 |

This upward movement in parity is several times faster than the index of prices paid. As a result, like a multistage rocket, the support price keeps working higher and higher.

Thus, we are tending to price ourselves out of the world market on which 40 percent of flue-cured sales depend (7 percent of burley). This may force a further cut in allotments unless the law is changed.

## APPENDIX E

### PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAMS

In programing an additional $1.5 billion in Public Law 480 funds, we would continue to emphasize shipments to underdeveloped countries or countries in severe balance-of-payments difficulty. This program policy is now being followed for several reasons: (1) Large scale consumption increases are readily obtainable in these countries; (2) these countries lack the resources to buy our commodities and sales on a regular commercial basis usually are not possible; and (3) these markets offer a ready outlet for our surpluses with the least interference with normal commercial markets. Although these program policies minimize the effect of title I sales on other world suppliers, a careful analysis of the impact of the proposed programs on other suppliers is made and frequent consultations are held with other exporting countries on the general trend of the program as well as specific country agreements. In general, foreign governments have come to understand and accept that surplus disposal under title I is being managed in a manner to avoid injury to competing exporting countries.

EXHIBIT I.—*Approximate quantities of commodities under title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed from beginning of program through Dec. 31, 1957*

| Country | Wheat and flour | Feed grains [1] | Rice | Cotton | Tobacco | Dairy products [2] | Fats and oils [3] | Poultry | Dry edible beans | Fruits and vegetables [4] | Meat [5] | Hay and pasture seeds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Thousand bushels* | *Thousand bushels* | *Thousand hundredweight* | *Thousand bales* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand hundredweight* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand pounds* | *Thousand hundredweight* |
| Argentina | | | | | | | 219,169 | | | | | |
| Austria | 3,497 | 10,285 | | 70.3 | 6,090 | | 33,064 | | | 1,969 | | |
| Bolivia | 2,412 | | 228 | | | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | [6] 85,091 | 369 | | | 121 | 7,035 | 50,918 | | | | | |
| Burma | | | | 125.2 | 2,772 | 9,682 | | | | 1,579 | | |
| Chile | 8,651 | | | 50.9 | 400 | | 84,738 | | | | | 9 |
| China (Taiwan) | | | | 35.6 | 2,000 | 5,062 | 10,811 | | | | | |
| Colombia | 6,890 | | | 59.8 | | | 21,503 | | | | | |
| Ecuador | 1,130 | | | 6.0 | 856 | | 30,193 | | | | | |
| Egypt | 10,645 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finland | 4,558 | 1,581 | | 41.2 | 11,829 | | | | | 10,720 | | |
| France | | | | | 7,716 | | | | | | | |
| Germany | | | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| Greece | 17,939 | 8,871 | | | | 29,783 | 79,051 | | | | | |
| Iceland | 284 | 616 | | 5 | 392 | | 1,130 | | | 8,483 | | |
| India [7] | 123,519 | | 4,409 | 500.0 | 6,000 | 14,770 | | | | | | |
| Indonesia | 2,889 | | 5,632 | 244.5 | 23,037 | | | | | | | |
| Iran | 5,227 | | | | | 1,622 | | | | | | |
| Israel | 14,788 | 16,019 | 7 | 19.9 | 841 | 60,170 | 34,200 | | 37 | 882 | 40,000 | |
| Italy | 887 | 3,924 | | 453.8 | 11,798 | | 257,652 | | | | | |
| Japan | 31,030 | 12,058 | 2,142 | 317.0 | 9,839 | | | | | | | |
| Korea | 5,507 | 13,181 | 3,469 | 49.9 | 12,667 | 1,288 | 3,125 | | | | 19,842 | |
| Mexico | | 20,501 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Netherlands | | | | 1.8 | | | | | | | | |
| Pakistan | 39,770 | | 9,043 | 189.5 | 5,317 | 9,257 | 24,183 | | | | | |
| Paraguay | 994 | | | | | 933 | 3,126 | | | | | |
| Peru | 7,186 | | | | | 154 | 7,964 | | | | | |
| Philippines | | | 357 | 32.7 | | 10,540 | 4,125 | | 7 | | 1,867 | |
| Poland | 14,808 | | | 197.9 | | | 42,317 | | | | | |
| Portugal | 3,879 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain | [8] 2,446 | 6,808 | | [9] 221.9 | 11,388 | | 562,806 | | | 66,667 | 72,649 | |
| Thailand | | | | | 5,332 | 1,957 | | | | | | |
| Turkey | 33,685 | 13,563 | 220 | | | | 115,576 | | | | 16,604 | |
| United Kingdom | | | | | 47,196 | | | | | 34,534 | | |
| Yugoslavia | 79,540 | | | 210.4 | | | 192,117 | | | | | |
| Total | 507,252 | 107,776 | 25,507 | 2,828.8 | 165,591 | 152,253 | 1,777,768 | 3,000 | 44 | 124,834 | 150,962 | 9 |

[1] See the following:

| | *Thousand bushels* |
|---|---|
| Corn | 56,815 |
| Oats | 5,806 |
| Barley | 33,143 |
| Grain sorghums | 12,012 |
| Total | 107,776 |

[2] See the following:

| | *Thousand pounds* |
|---|---|
| Condensed milk | 7,054 |
| Dry whole milk | 3,869 |
| Nonfat dry milk | 58,680 |
| Evaporated milk | 22,425 |
| Butter | 29,308 |
| Cheese | 13,604 |
| Butter oil | 593 |
| Butter oil and/or ghee | 10,470 |
| Ghee | 4,249 |
| Whey | 2,001 |
| Total | 152,253 |

[3] See the following:

| | *Thousand pounds* |
|---|---|
| Cottonseed oil and/or soybean oil | 1,107,731 |
| Cottonseed oil, soybean oil and/or lard | 256,255 |
| Linseed oil | 12,490 |
| Lard | 224,920 |
| Tallow and/or grease | 176,372 |
| Total | 1,777,768 |

[4] See the following:

| | *Thousand pounds* |
|---|---|
| Austria: | |
| Canned fruit and fruit juices | 42 |
| Dried fruit | 1,927 |
| Burma: | |
| Canned fruit and fruit juices | 769 |
| Dried fruit | 810 |
| Finland: | |
| Dried fruit | 9,800 |
| Fresh pears | 920 |
| Iceland, fresh citrus fruits and juices | 8,483 |
| Israel, dried prunes | 882 |
| Spain, potatoes | 66,667 |
| United Kingdom, fruits, fresh and canned | 34,534 |
| Total | 124,834 |

[5] See the following:

| | *Thousand pounds* |
|---|---|
| Philippines, variety meats | 1,867 |
| Israel, frozen beef | 40,000 |
| Korea, canned pork | 19,842 |
| Spain: | |
| Canned hams | 2,571 |
| Salt hams | 2,149 |
| Frozen beef and variety meats | 67,929 |
| Turkey, frozen beef | 16,604 |
| Total | 150,962 |

[6] Includes 55,869,000 bushels under fiscal year 1957 program to be shipped over a 3-year period.

[7] 3-year program except rice, which is a 1-year program.

[8] Wheat to be sold to Spain for resale to Switzerland for financing procurement of Swiss goods by Spain.

[9] Includes 15,400 bales cotton linters.

Once and for all I should like to eliminate the notion in the minds of some people that this is a giveaway program.

The foreign currency sales, under title I of the act, have helped not only our farmers. They have been a positive factor in advancing United States interests abroad. People in many less-developed countries are better fed and clothed because of these operations. At the same time, we are using a considerable part of the sales proceeds for development purposes in these countries which will contribute further to their well-being. One of the outstanding conclusions of my recent overseas-trade trip is the reservoir of good will created by this program. In addition, funds are used for market-development work abroad to increase future sales of American farm products. Part of the local currency is being used for defense and United States operating expenses abroad. We are developing a program to use the $5 million of foreign currencies for utilization research abroad.

*Donation programs*

American farm surpluses which cannot be moved through commercial channels are being used constructively through large-scale donation programs at home and abroad. We are trying to move these commodities out of storage as fast as consistent with good administration and in a manner least disruptive to normal markets in order to reduce storage costs, prevent waste and remove their price depressing effects.

In this country, at the present time, we are donating surplus foods to over 12 million children participating in school-lunch programs, 1.4 million needy persons in charitable institutions and over 3 million persons in needy families. In addition these foods are used from time to time to alleviate suffering during natural disasters. The commodities available for donation at this time consist of nonfat dry milk, cheese, butter, flour, cornmeal and rice. However, at one time or another over the past several years, as a result of surplus removal and price-support programs, one or more of these domestic groups have received dried beans, beef products, pork products, poultry and poultry products, cottonseed oil, and fresh fruits and vegetables.

The use of these foods as an adjunct of the national school lunch program has been most constructive in both improving the nutrition of our children and in teaching them good eating habits that will build increasing markets for our agricultural production. We believe that all recipients have benefited materially from these donations.

After making certain that all requests in this country are met first, we have been donating large quanties of food out of CCC inventories to United States voluntary agencies for distribution to needy people in nearly 100 other countries around the world. Last year these foreign donations amounted to more than 1¾ billion pounds, costing CCC over $300 million. The foods currently available for foreign donation, after meeting domestic needs, are nonfat dry milk, cheese, flour, and cornmeal. Over the past years we have also donated dried beans, rice, butter, and cottonseed oil.

During my recent trip around the world I saw widespread needs for food. I also saw dramatic evidence of the effects of our sharing America's abundance through the donation of our surpluses. While I was in Japan I visited a school-lunch program where, in addition to a bowl of stew, they were serving a large bun, made with good American, 72-percent-extraction wheat flour, and a big bowl of reconstituted American nonfat dry milk. In addition to assisting that country to start a nationwide school-lunch program to improve the nutrition of their children, our commodities were helping to develop eating habits that may mean future markets. I also visited refugee centers in Hong Kong and Pakistan and saw our food helping to meet the direst need. All around the world our milk and other foods are being used to supplement health and feeding programs for children, pregnant and nursing mothers, victims of tuberculosis and leprosy, as well as just feeding hungry people.

While we must press forward in every way to develop sufficient markets for our farm production, we must be grateful for this opportunity of sharing our abundance with our neighbors.

EXHIBIT II.—*Commodity composition of programs under title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed from beginning of program through Dec. 31, 1957*

[In millions of dollars]

| Country | Wheat and flour | Feed grains | Rice | Cotton | Tobacco | Dairy products | Fats and oils | Other | Market value | Ocean transportation [1] | Market value including ocean transportation | Estimated CCC cost including ocean transportation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Argentina | | | | | | | 30.4 | | 30.4 | 0.7 | 31.1 | 33.5 |
| Austria | 5.9 | 14.7 | | 10.6 | 3.8 | | 4.4 | [2] 0.3 | 39.7 | 3.5 | 43.2 | 62.3 |
| Bolivia | 4.8 | | 1.5 | | | | | | 6.3 | .5 | 6.8 | 9.1 |
| Brazil | [3] 144.9 | .6 | | | .3 | 2.2 | 7.9 | | 155.9 | 24.0 | 179.9 | 296.6 |
| Burma | | | | 17.5 | 2.1 | 2.0 | | [4] .2 | 21.8 | .9 | 22.7 | 32.2 |
| Chile | 14.2 | | | 7.3 | .3 | | 14.9 | [4] 4.4 | 37.1 | 3.1 | 40.2 | 98.7 |
| China (Taiwan) | | | | 5.0 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.0 | | 9.2 | .6 | 9.8 | 12.5 |
| Colombia | 13.4 | | | 9.5 | | | 3.6 | | 26.5 | 2.7 | 29.2 | 40.0 |
| Ecuador | 2.2 | | | .8 | .7 | | 3.8 | | 7.5 | .6 | 8.1 | 10.0 |
| Egypt | 17.0 | | | | | | | | 17.0 | 2.5 | 19.5 | 36.5 |
| Finland | 7.7 | 2.4 | | 6.8 | 7.0 | | | [5] 1.2 | 25.1 | 2.1 | 27.2 | 37.8 |
| France | | | | | 4.5 | | | | 4.5 | .1 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Germany | | | | | | | | [5] 1.2 | 1.2 | | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Greece | 30.5 | 10.5 | | | | 3.8 | 13.7 | | 58.5 | 7.8 | 66.3 | 97.7 |
| Iceland | .6 | .7 | | .1 | .4 | | .2 | [6] .5 | 2.5 | .3 | 2.8 | 3.6 |
| India [6] | 200.0 | | 26.4 | 70.0 | 6.0 | 3.5 | | | 305.9 | [7] 60.2 | 366.1 | 561.0 |
| Indonesia | 5.0 | | 35.8 | 36.0 | 15.0 | | | | 91.8 | 6.9 | 98.7 | 154.9 |
| Iran | 9.5 | | | | | .8 | | | 10.3 | 2.6 | 12.9 | 21.0 |
| Israel | 25.5 | 18.8 | .5 | 3.4 | .6 | 14.7 | 5.1 | [8] 10.4 | 79.0 | 8.3 | 87.3 | 135.1 |
| Italy | 1.5 | 5.5 | | 65.3 | 8.9 | | 42.4 | | 123.6 | 4.5 | 128.1 | 165.4 |
| Japan | 48.6 | 15.2 | 13.7 | 52.8 | 7.7 | | | | 138.0 | 13.4 | 151.4 | 207.3 |
| Korea | 8.7 | 15.3 | 24.5 | 9.8 | 6.6 | .4 | .5 | [8] 8.0 | 73.8 | 8.5 | 82.3 | 97.6 |
| Mexico | | 26.6 | | | | | | | 26.6 | 1.6 | 28.2 | 65.6 |
| Netherlands | | | | .3 | | | | | .3 | [10] | .3 | .4 |
| Pakistan | 66.4 | | 58.7 | 20.0 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 3.5 | | 167.0 | 19.1 | 186.1 | 293.1 |
| Paraguay | 1.7 | | | | | .4 | .5 | | 2.6 | .4 | 3.0 | 4.3 |
| Peru | 12.0 | | | | | .1 | 1.0 | | 13.1 | 1.3 | 14.4 | 23.4 |
| Philippines | | | 2.5 | 4.9 | | 1.1 | .5 | [11] .6 | 9.6 | .7 | 10.3 | 15.1 |
| Poland | 25.6 | | | 31.5 | | | 3.6 | | 60.7 | 4.7 | 65.4 | 90.7 |
| Portugal [12] | 6.3 | | | | | | | | 6.3 | .9 | 7.2 | 13.5 |
| Spain | 4.6 | 9.4 | | [13] 32.9 | 6.2 | | 98.4 | [14] 18.9 | 170.4 | 13.9 | 184.3 | 205.6 |
| Thailand | | | | | 3.9 | .5 | | | 4.4 | .2 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Turkey | 58.0 | 15.7 | 1.4 | | | | 16.2 | [15] 4.4 | 95.7 | 15.9 | 111.6 | 158.3 |
| United Kingdom | | | | 33.0 | | | | [16] 2.2 | 35.2 | .4 | 35.6 | 35.6 |
| Yugoslavia | 137.2 | | | 32.6 | | | 26.0 | | 195.8 | 34.6 | 230.4 | 356.1 |
| Total agreements | 851.8 | 135.4 | 165.0 | 426.1 | 113.4 | 35.7 | 277.6 | 48.3 | 2,053.3 | 247.5 | 2,300.8 | 3,343.2 |

[1] Includes only ocean transportation to be financed by CCC.
[2] Fruit: Dried, fresh, and juices.
[3] Includes $110 million under fiscal year 1957 agreement to be shipped over a 3-year period.
[4] Hay and pasture seeds.
[5] Poultry.
[6] 3-year program except rice, which is a 1-year program.
[7] Includes $6 million estimated for ocean freight differential for which no rupee deposits are required. The balance, $54.2 million, only, is reflected in the currency use table XII.
[8] Dry edible beans $0.3 million; chilled or frozen beef, $10 million; dried prunes, $0.1 million.
[9] Canned pork.
[10] Less than $50,000.
[11] Variety meats, $0.5 million; dry edible beans, $0.1 million.
[12] Wheat to be sold to Spain for resale to Switzerland for financing procurement of Swiss goods by Spain.
[13] Cotton linters, $0.3 million.
[14] Hams, $1.6 million; salt pork, $0.4 million; potatoes, $1.4 million; frozen beef, $15.5 million.
[15] Canned and frozen beef.
[16] Fruits, fresh and canned.

EXHIBIT III.—*Planned uses of foreign currency under title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed from beginning of program through Dec. 31, 1957* [1]

| Country | Total amount programed (market value including ocean transportation) | Market development | Purchase of strategic material | Military procurement | Purchase of goods for other countries [2] | Grants for multiple trade and economic development | Loans to private enterprise | Payment of United States obligations [3] | Loans to foreign governments | International education exchange | Translation and publication | Information and education |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Million dollars* | *(104 a) million dollars* | *(104 b) million dollars* | *(104 c) million dollars* | *(104 d) million dollars* | *(104 e) million dollars* | *(104 e) million dollars* | *(104 f) million dollars* | *(104 g) million dollars* | *(104 h) million dollars* | *(104 i) million dollars* | *(104 j) million dollars* |
| Argentina | 31.1 | 0.6 | | | [4] | | | 9.8 | 20.0 | 0.7 | | |
| Austria | 43.2 | 1.0 | | | 3.1 | | | 12.1 | 26.3 | | .1 | .6 |
| Bolivia | 6.8 | .3 | | [4] | | | | .7 | 5.4 | .2 | | .2 |
| Brazil | 179.9 | 2.7 | | 2.0 | | | | 22.3 | 149.4 | 2.1 | .5 | .9 |
| Burma | 22.7 | .5 | | | [4] | | | 4.1 | 18.1 | | | |
| Chile | 40.2 | .8 | | .1 | | | | 6.4 | 31.7 | 1.2 | | |
| China (Taiwan) | 9.8 | .7 | | 4.0 | | | | 3.4 | | .8 | | |
| Colombia | 29.2 | .8 | | .1 | [4] | | | 4.7 | 22.2 | .6 | [4] | .8 |
| Ecuador | 8.1 | .4 | | | | | | .8 | 6.3 | .4 | | .2 |
| Egypt | 19.5 | .5 | | | | | | 4.6 | 13.6 | .8 | | |
| Finland | 27.2 | .5 | | | [5] 13.0 | | | 13.0 | | .3 | .3 | .1 |
| France | 4.6 | 1.6 | | | .8 | | .6 | .6 | | 1.0 | | |
| Germany | 1.2 | 1.1 | | | | | | .1 | | | | |
| Greece | 66.3 | 1.9 | | | | 7.5 | 2.9 | 14.4 | 37.5 | .6 | | 1.5 |
| Iceland | 2.8 | .1 | | | | | | .4 | 2.2 | .1 | | |
| India, 3-year program | [6] 360.1 | 4.0 | | | [5] 5.0 | 54.0 | | 61.2 | 234.1 | 1.8 | | |
| Indonesia | 98.7 | 1.0 | 2.0 | | | | | 16.1 | 79.0 | .6 | | |
| Iran | 12.9 | .2 | | 6.9 | | | | 3.2 | 2.5 | .8 | | .3 |
| Israel | 87.3 | .7 | | | [4] | | 8.7 | 19.6 | 58.3 | | | |
| Italy | 128.1 | 2.7 | | | [5] 10.0 | | | 26.3 | 88.1 | | | 1.0 |
| Japan | 151.4 | 3.3 | | [4] | 11.0 | | | [7] 25.7 | 109.3 | 2.1 | | |
| Korea | 82.3 | .5 | | 66.1 | | | | 14.2 | | .9 | | .6 |
| Mexico | 28.2 | 2.5 | | | | | 7.1 | 2.9 | 13.6 | 1.2 | | .9 |
| Netherlands | .3 | .3 | | | | | | [8] | | | | |
| Pakistan | 186.1 | 2.4 | | 79.3 | | | 16.4 | 28.7 | 54.4 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 |
| Paraguay | 3.0 | .2 | | | | | | .4 | 2.2 | .2 | | |
| Peru | 14.4 | .9 | | .1 | | | | 2.1 | 10.4 | .5 | 1 | .3 |
| Philippines | 10.3 | .8 | | 2.1 | | | | 1.4 | 5.2 | .8 | | |
| Poland | 65.4 | | | | [4] | | | 65.4 | | | | |
| Portugal | 7.2 | .3 | | | | | | 3.1 | 3.5 | .3 | | |
| Spain | 184.3 | 3.0 | | | | | | 66.2 | 113.0 | 1.1 | .5 | .5 |
| Thailand | 4.6 | .7 | | | | | | .8 | 2.1 | .6 | .1 | .3 |
| Turkey | 111.6 | .6 | | | | | | 51.2 | 55.5 | 1.4 | .1 | 2.8 |
| United Kingdom | 35.6 | .3 | | [4] | | | | [7] 35.3 | | | | |
| Yugoslavia | 230.4 | 1.0 | | 88.9 | | | | 51.8 | 88.4 | | .3 | |
| Total agreements | [6] 2,294.8 | 38.9 | 2.0 | 249.5 | 42.9 | 61.5 | 35.7 | 573.0 | 1,252.3 | 23.2 | 3.3 | 12.5 |
| Uses as percent of total | 100.0 | 1.7 | .1 | 10.9 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 25.0 | 54.6 | 1.0 | .1 | .5 |

[1] Amounts shown on this table are subject to adjustment when actual purchases and allocations have been made. Amounts are in dollar equivalent at the deposit rates of exchange.

[2] Amounts shown in this column indicate a specified amount in the agreement for this use. Footnote 2 only shows an unspecified amount for possible procurement for third countries. A footnote and an amount indicate more than one agreement including both specified and unspecified amounts.

[3] In order to provide flexibility in the use of funds, many agreements provide that a specified amount of local currency proceeds may be used under secs. 104 (a), (b), (f), (h) and (i). In some instances, possible uses under sec. 104 (d) are also included in this category. Therefore, estimates based on the best information now available are indicated above under subsecs. (a), (b), (h) and (i). Balances not otherwise distributed are included under subsec. (f). This distribution is subject to revision when allocations have been completed.

[4] $50,000 or less.

[5] Total market value differs from total in table II by the $6,000,000 estimated for ocean freight differential in the Indian agreement for which no rupee deposits will be required.

[6] The Japanese agreement for the July–June year 1955–56 provides for the use of $8,100,000 and the U. K. agreements provide for approximately $35,100,000 under subsec. 104 (c). However, since in return for this currency use, these countries will construct and make available to the U. S. Armed Forces an equivalent value of dependent housing, the amounts are shown under 104 (f).

## APPENDIX F

### INCREASED UTILIZATION RESEARCH

Our utilization research under Public Law 480 foreign currency funds in foreign countries would be concentrated on developing and broadening the foreign market for our agricultural commodities. As you know, there are limitations in various countries to the fuller use of some of our products. Even though our exports of soybeans are at the highest level in history, there is a feeling by some users abroad that United States soybeans are difficult to process to the special types of food products preferred in these countries. As another example, the use of chemical additives for the preservation of some of our commodities and their products is meeting objection in foreign countries. In a number of instances, foreign food laws do not permit chemical additives in food products. We believe that intensive utilization research can discover means for solving these problems so that limitations on the use of United States agricultural commodities in foreign markets will be lessened or removed. By having the countries' own scientists solve these problems, we believe the adoption of such new knowledge by their own users would be speeded and additional markets for our farm products would be opened.

These research programs will be carried out under contract or grant arrangements, and will be carefully coordinated with research undertaken by the Department within the United States. Our plans include sending a member of our research staff to a number of foreign countries to survey the potentialities and to assemble information which will serve as a basis for future negotiations on specific projects.

Our utilization research in the United States would be generally directed to problems associated with commodities in surplus, namely, cereals, cotton, fats and oils, and dairy products, as well as on the development of new crops and new uses for present farm products.

## APPENDIX G

### SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Even though schools were hard hit by the flu this fall, milk consumption was up about 10 percent during the first 4 months of the fiscal year. We also expect larger operations in the institutional outlets next year, as these groups learn more about the program and as we iron out some of the administrative problems encountered in the first year of the institutional operations. If the present trends continue, 1958 expenditures could be in the neighborhood of $70 million.

Also, the consumption of fluid milk by the military personnel and veterans' hospitals patients has been greatly increased through a special program in which CCC is paying about half of the cost of milk purchased by those agencies over and above their normal purchases. Last year, CCC paid $16,356,000 of such cost. Milk consumption by the military personnel expanded substantially. In addition, during calendar 1957, CCC donated 23 million pounds of butter and 2 million pounds of cheese to these agencies for use above their normal requirements.

These programs are carried out under the authority contained in the 1954 and subsequent amendments to the Agricultural Act of 1949 for CCC to buy milk and dairy products for price support and to donate these products to military agencies and veterans' hospitals for their increased use. The authority to donate dairy products is scheduled to expire December 31, 1958. The Department of Agriculture recommends that the authority be extended for 2 years through December 31, 1960.

APPENDIX H

REA SERVICES

REA financed electric systems are adding 100,000 new consumers annually. Nonfarm users outnumber farmers nearly 3 to 1 among these new consumers.

REA financed electric systems have made significant financial progress.

Their aggregate gross revenues increased 53 percent between 1952 and 1956—from $321 million to $491 million.

Their net margins increased from $24.5 million in 1952 to $69.4 million in 1956.

Their aggregate net worth climbed from $169.9 million to $378.3 million—from 8 percent of their assets in 1952 to 13.5 percent in 1956.

There is a good repayment record on the nearly $3.5 billion loaned—approximately $930 million in principal and interest. The borrowers' payments against loan maturities were 99.985 percent of the total amount which had become due by December 31, 1957. In addition, the borrowers had at that time a balance of payments in advance of the due date amounting to about $117 million.

Actual loan losses during the life of the program have been less than $50,000. Only a very small number of electric borrowers now are delinquent in loan repayments.

These accomplishments reflect great credit to the rural men and women who are largely responsible for making this outstanding record.

---

APPENDIX I

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The 1959 agricultural conservation program will give particular attention to those conservation measures which are of major importance to farmers in making a transition from cropland to grass or trees. Also, the program will give attention to the problem of continuing in protective cover land which otherwise might be shifted to a more intensive use.

Adjustments will be made nationally to direct the program away from practices contributing most to immediate increases in agricultural production. In view of the various programs designed to limit production, this step is entirely logical. The program will be operated at the local level on the basis of achieving the most urgently needed conservation which, in the judgment of local people, can be obtained under the circumstances that exist on their individual farms and ranches in 1959. While the program generally will be directed to practices with longer lasting benefits and which are not frequently repeated as a necessary part of farming, the policy will be to provide a program of sufficient scope and flexibility to deal with acute local problems. These conservation problems vary as to kind and intensity not only State by State but even as between counties within a State.

The reduced program fund will be distributed among the States on the basis of the same conservation needs formula as used in past programs. Therefore, the reduction in program level would be approximately the same in all States.

---

APPENDIX J

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The 5 Federal departments (Departments of Commerce, Interior, Agriculture, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Small Business Administration) participating in this program have taken significant steps to improve their regular services for rural people in underdeveloped areas and to direct such services more intensively toward overall economic and social betterment.

We recently completed a series of regional conferences for agency workers and rural lay leaders in 13 States, with the objective of improving programs in rural areas, especially in the field of industry development, employment, education, welfare and on-the-farm counseling. These meetings took place at Lexington, Ky.; Shreveport, La.; Fort Smith, Ark.; Athens, Ga.; and Asheville, N. C.

I want to clearly emphasize that the Rural Development Program is not separate from our regular activities improving living standards in underdeveloped rural areas. Nor is it limited in scope and objectives to specific areas. This program is one method, among many, of supplementing and redirecting the work of our agencies in order to gain more effectively the fundamental objective—area economic development.

A second principal aim of the program is encouragement of farm, business, civic, and church leaders in many different areas to undertake locally-directed area economic improvement.

We intend to accomplish the rural development job principally through a redirection of services already in the field, with emphasis on new methods and new approaches.

Educational and service programs, not only in agriculture but in other fields as well, must be adapted to help rural people take advantage of opportunity in an expanding economy which is rapidly changing the face of both rural and urban America.

---

APPENDIX K

OVERSEAS TRADE TRIP

On November 16, I returned from a trade trip around the world. On this trip I was accompanied by five Department officials, specialists in the various programs.

The purpose of the trip was to observe at first hand the agricultural and economic development of the countries visited, to meet government officials and trade groups in the interest of further expanding commercial exports of United States farm products, and to observe the results of the various programs under which our agricultural products are moving abroad.

We visited 12 countries and Hong Kong in just over 3 weeks. While our time in each country had to be limited, we have come back with some clear impressions and conclusions.

It was apparent to me that many of the nations we visited are making substantial progress in strengthening their economies. This is a factor of great importance in the future foreign demand for our agricultural products.

In several countries where the greatest progress has been made and industrialization is on a high level, there are encouraging market opportunities for dollar sales of our farm products. At every opportunity we stressed that the best interest of our country and that of the free world lies in preserving and strengthening normal commercial trade. As a means of bridging the gap of temporary financial difficulties, however, we also emphasized our dollar credit and barter programs.

In addition to the markets in the more industrialized areas, there are good potential markets for the products of American soil in the so-called underdeveloped areas. We witnessed the vigor and determination with which the people and the governments of these countries are attacking their basic economic problems and attempting to raise their living standards. Into these areas we are effectively moving large quantities of agricultural products under title I, Public Law 480, and receiving payment in foreign currencies; $1.2 billion of these foreign currencies are being loaned back to those governments to help finance part of the local cost of economic development projects. We are also making donations and gifts for relief assistance. We noted the great need for additional food in much of the world and the great shortage in the purchasing power of many people. As the economies of these countries improve, opportunities for moving larger amounts of United States farm products through commercial sales should increase.

We are also using much of the sales proceeds received under Public Law 480 to pay costs of our Government operations in these countries and to strengthen the defenses in the free world.

I was gratified to find that the abundance of American agriculture is contributing to the solution of some of the most fundamental problems in many countries. We Americans can be thankful we have agricultural abundance rather than scarcity. This permits us to maintain a high standard of living at home and makes it possible to help those countries who have a difficult choice to make between using their slender foreign exchange resources in basic economic development programs or meeting the needs of great segments of their population for more food, clothing, and other necessities of life.

We are helping to meet this dilemma through Public Law 480 and the other measures we use to move our agricultural products into consumption in other countries. The world, however, must recognize that these assistance programs are temporary and that normal commercial sales through private trade is the goal which we are continuing to achieve. Until we attain a balance between our production and effective demand, we should, however, continue to use some of our excess production to meet emergencies, to assist in effectuating our foreign policy, and to build goodwill and understanding.

The natural flow of our farm products abroad for cash will always be an important element in the income of the American farmer. Our best salesmen are the importers, processors, and consumers abroad who rely upon our standards of quality, continuous product availability, and the banking and other services this country can provide. We are helping to strengthen the future demand for American farm products through specific market-development activities, using many of the merchandising techniques that have been so successful here at home in these projects.

As everyone knows, we have very large supplies of most all of the basic agricultural products and our production again this year has been very large. We shall continue to do everything practicable to prevent these supplies from disrupting world markets and depressing prices to farmers at home and abroad.

---

## PROPOSED COMMISSION ON FEDERAL AND STATE JURISDICTION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the profoundest issue touching on free government in the United States is as old as the Founding Fathers and the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and as new as tomorrow's decisions of the Supreme Court.

The issue is the maintenance of our constitutional equilibrium, the preservation of that system of checks and balances which has up to now been the principal guaranty of our heritage of freedom.

This system—and consequently our freedom—is now imperiled by two factors:

The first is the growing centralization of power in the Federal Government at the expense of the rights and integrity of the 48 States—the Federal usurpation of States rights.

The second factor is the usurpation by one of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government of powers rightfully belonging to the other branches—the mounting violation of the principle of separation of powers.

If these trends are permitted to continue unchecked, the ultimate losers will be the people of this country.

The gainers profiting from this development, as centralization and encroachment win the ascendancy, will be those in Russia and elsewhere who are looking confidently for the transformation of America into one form or another of the total state. I might remind Senators that only last June Mr. Khrushchev hopefully predicted a United States which in another generation or two would be a twin sister to the Soviet Union. He said:

> And I prophesy that your grandchildren in America will live under socialism.

The Soviet leaders have been reasonably correct in their boasts. Are they this time?

Let me make it clear at the beginning, however, that I am not trying to sound the alarm against the imminent communization of America. It is just this sort of exaggeration that has so successfully beclouded attempts at serious discussion of this issue in the past. Let us at the outset get rid of the notion that those who hold my views believe that communism has already hammered its way into the White House and is now galloping up Pennsylvania Avenue like a cavalry charge, about to inundate the Congress.

It is not any Moscow-directed conspiracy promoting the communization of our Government that I mainly fear.

Nor do I fear that we will ever fall into quite the same sort of totalitarianism that was exemplified by Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy.

Then what is it that I fear?

What I fear is what is already visible. What I fear is the creation, subtly, law by law, decision by decision—almost imperceptibly—of the uniquely American version of the total state.

What I fear is this peculiarly American version of total or near-total Federal power.

The fact that so much of this dangerous growth has been built up, if not in accordance with a scrupulous regard for the Constitution, at least in accordance with the forms of law, is what makes the danger so difficult for many to perceive and to realize. The fact that such-and-such an act is passed by the Congress; the fact that the act is signed by our duly elected President; the fact that our Supreme Court, our highest judicial body, declares it constitutional—these give the amorphous growth of central power and the consequent weakening of States rights the marking of an American product.

But let us bear it in mind, Mr. President, that totalitarianism in a red, white, and blue package is still totalitarianism.

Before I set forth my specific proposition, embodied here in my proposed resolution, let me, at the outset, plead with all sincerity, that it is my purpose to bring this problem out for discussion and—eventually—decision, on the highest levels of statesmanship. Let me, to begin with, plead that we store away in the attic of forgotten recrimination the worn and beaten weapons of sectionalism that obscured and confused and distorted debate of these issues in the past.

I hope that I can convey something of the gravity of this question of States rights. I believe that the time has come for serious examination of the internecine struggle among the branches of the Federal Government to encroach on one another's prerogatives. All that I seek is to open wide a reasonable but vigorous and definitive path to the discovery of the facts, with a view to having the Congress then operate on those facts legislatively, as the facts indicate.

### THE STATE-FEDERAL PROBLEM

First, the matter of the relationship of the States to the Federal Government. Let me interject here, for the benefit of those who may be recalling that several commissions and bodies have already been set up to study this problem, that the Commission which I am proposing here would, as I shall explain in a moment, proceed upon a completely different approach from that followed by these other bodies.

President Eisenhower put the problem very well in his address to the governors' conference at Williamsburg last year, and I should like to quote him briefly:

> Our governmental system, so carefully checked, so delicately balanced, with power fettered and the people free, has survived longer than any other attempt to conduct group affairs by the authority of the group itself. Yet a distinguished American scholar has only recently counseled us that in the measurable future, if present trends continue, the States are sure to degenerate into powerless satellites of the National Government in Washington.
>
> That this forecast does not suffer from lack of supporting evidence all of us know full well. The irony of the whole thing is accentuated as we recall that the National Government was itself not the parent, but the creature, of the States acting together.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Four years ago at your Seattle conference—

I am still quoting from the President's address—

> I expressed the conviction that unless we preserve the traditional power and responsibilities of State government, with revenues necessary to exercise that power and discharge those responsibilities, then we will not preserve the kind of America we have known; eventually, we will have, instead, another form of government and, therefore, quite another kind of America.
>
> That conviction I hold just as strongly today.

In order to make a start toward remedying the situation, the President called for the creation of a Joint Federal-State Action Committee, whose purpose was to make a study looking to the transfer of certain limited powers back to the State governments.

This Joint Federal-State Action Committee was not the first body set up to study problems of Federal-State relationship. In addition to valuable studies made by the Council of State Governments, by university groups, and by private individuals, there was the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, also a project of President Eisenhower's. This Commission made a 2-year study of our Federal system, reporting to the President in 1955, and said to have been "the first official undertaking of its kind since the Constitutional Convention in 1787."

The Commission, under the chairmanship of Mr. Meyer Kestnbaum, submitted its report with the hope that the latter would "be regarded as the beginning rather than the end of a contemporary study of the subject of intergovernmental relations, and that it will stimulate all the levels of government to examine their respective responsibilities in a properly balanced Federal system."

I am very glad that the Commission termed its report only a beginning and that it urged further study of the problem.

I say this because, in my opinion, despite the valuable research done by this Commission, its conclusion—which I shall quote briefly in a moment—contains a major fallacy, a fallacy which my resolution is designed to avoid.

This fallacy is one which also shows up in the report of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee as well as in many of the private reports on this subject. The fallacy lies in the fact that these various reports are fundamentally in error in their basic approach to the problem. They approach the question of Federal-State jurisdiction primarily from the standpoint of policy, rather than from a constitutional standpoint.

This is the great distinction between that which I am proposing and those studies which have been made up to now. My resolution, it will be noted, emphasizes that the study shall be made of "the respective powers of the Federal Government and the State government under the Constitution" and of "the respective powers of the three branches of the Federal Government under the Constitution." The reports resulting from these previous studies, on the other hand, have, as I have said, based their recommendations largely on considerations of policy—principally administrative efficiency and economy.

Let me illustrate what I mean by quoting a few short passages from these reports.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations insisted that these Federal-State problems are today political, rather than constitutional, in that:

> The limits of the delegated and implied national powers fix the maximum range of national action. The existence of such constitutional bounds is probably more important than their exact location for the

purpose of maintaining the Federal nature of our governmental system. * * *

Under current judicial doctrine, there are still limits on the coercive powers at both levels, but the national powers are broad and the possibilities by means of spending are still broader. * * * Which level ought to move? Or should both? Or neither? What are prudent and proper divisions of labor and responsibility between them? These are questions mainly for legislative judgment, and the criteria are chiefly political, economic, and administrative, rather than legal.

The Honorable John H. Stambaugh, a staff director of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, recently explained the approach of the committee as follows:

The only consideration before the committee is whether a given function can logically be assumed completely at the State and local level and be carried on with even greater effectiveness than under present arrangements. Local control and local decisions over as many of these programs as possible are desirable and necessary. Many of these programs can be enriched by the diversified administration of State and local governments; can be handled more effectively and responsively; and the States should and can obtain resources to finance these programs.

In a similar vein, a member of the House Government Operations Committee's subcommittee on intergovernmental relations applauded the committee's recommendations that certain functions be returned to the States, and here again policy considerations were stressed: "It's the thing to do," said Representative HOFFMAN. He declared that the States will get better results and better construction for less money if they handle their own programs.

As a final illustration of what I call the policy—as opposed to the constitutional—approach, I should like to quote a few sentences from a volume of very interesting essays on the subject, "The States and the Nation", by Leonard D. White—Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1953:

These essays are not a study of constitutional law. I consider the constitutional issue settled conclusively against the States. The National Government can now go a long way under the interstate commerce clause and the general welfare clause; and by grants-in-aid it can buy whatever additional authority Congress believes desirable. The future of the States rests, not on constitutional protection, but on political and administrative decisions * * *. The issues of the future in this area are consequently political and administrative in nature.

Mr. President, the matter of considering the constitutional issue settled conclusively against the States and resting the whole future of the States on administrative policy and political decisions, rather than on constitutional protection, is, in my opinion, a very dangerous procedure. I cannot overemphasize how strongly opposed I am to any such approach to this problem. I should almost prefer that no commission at all ever be set up to study Federal-State relations, rather than that one should carry out its study from this approach, for this policy approach confirms the States, at the outset, as mere subdivisions of an all-powerful Central Government. This approach accepts the idea that the States, constitutionally, have no case; that there are no such things as States' rights; for, if certain powers and functions should be assigned to the States, purely on a policy basis, is it not then clear that the National Government could, at its whim, take back these functions and powers from the States, for reasons—or excuses—of policy?

We should encourage the transfer back to the States of certain functions now performed by the Federal Government. On this point, most of those who have studied the matter seem to be in agreement; but the principal reason for doing so should not be the question of policy—as Mr. Stambaugh, for example, urged, because it is "desirable," because the "programs can be enriched," "can be handled more effectively and responsively." He is right, of course, in that it is desirable from a policy standpoint: These programs can be handled more effectively and more responsively by the States. But the real reason why we should assign these functions to the States is that in so doing, we would be restoring the balance prescribed by the Constitution.

Any division of State and Federal powers that exists merely at the whim or sufferance of the National Government is of no lasting significance. True, the administration of these governmental functions by the States, instead of by the Federal Government, might—in most cases, definitely would—work out better, from a policy standpoint; but as far as affording any real protection to the basic rights and freedoms of the individual citizen—which is, in the long run, the policy consideration which should be paramount over all others—as far as protecting these rights is concerned, such an approach is worthless, because the States' powers and functions would be predicated, not on constitutional right, but on mere considerations of administrative policy or economy. In other words, they would be held only at the sufferance of the National Government.

WHY STATES RIGHTS?

This brings us to the heart of the matter, to the compelling reason why we must protect and restore the powers of the separate States, as we are commanded to do anyway by the Constitution. This brings us, indeed, to considerations of policy—not short-range, relatively unimportant details of administrative efficiency, but long-range, fundamental policy—in short, the basic, practical, human consideration which makes it so necessary, so vital, that, in this question of Federal-State relationship, we adhere to the course which the Constitution prescribes.

I refer, Mr. President, to the matter of individual rights—civil liberties. I refer to those basic human freedoms, individual liberties, which Western man has for so many centuries bled and suffered and struggled to secure. Basically, these are the fundamental liberties at stake in the question of States rights. It is essential that we look at States rights in a dispassionate way; that we see the principle of States rights in perspective. For many years the issue at stake has been beclouded, because many people tended to dismiss States rights as being simply a cloak for southern separatist aspirations, or a device to facilitate the exploitation of racial minorities. This is false, and false to the core. States rights is an enduring and valid principle which transcends the issue of race, and which has existed since long before there was a South.

For States rights is but the American term for the principle of local self-government, a principle with which the peoples of Ireland and of Finland, of Czechoslovakia and of Poland, and of Hungary are tragically familiar, and for which over the centuries they have fought and struggled and died.

The right of local self-government is as old as history itself. It is a fundamental and inalienable human right. It existed prior to the advent of written constitutions, and in Europe and most other parts of the globe it exists today independently of constitutions. Even though, in many quarters, the exercise of the right has been ruthlessly suppressed by Red force, the right itself still exists, and some day will be reasserted by the subject peoples.

In the establishment of our Union, we recognized this right of self-government; we incorporated it in our written Constitution, and we gave it its American name of States' rights. Through delegation by the States of certain of their powers, the right of local self-government was voluntarily limited to some extent, it is true—in certain specified particulars. But, on the other hand, the basic right itself was formalized; that is to say, it was formally recognized by the Constitution; and, lest there should have arisen any possible shred of doubt about it, the Founding Fathers took pains to reaffirm the principle in the 10th amendment:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

It has become the fashion, in late years, to ignore the 10th amendment, to dismiss it—as one Justice did—as a "mere truism." But every day events point more and more clearly to the compelling necessity for us—if we are to remain a free people—to reexamine this amendment and to rededicate ourselves to the principle of States' rights—local self-government—which it guarantees, for, in the long run, individual rights depend squarely on States' rights, upon the concept of local self-government. Far from being antithetical to each other, as certain parties have tried to portray them, the one principle depends upon the other.

It is unfortunate that so many of those who have labored so zealously in behalf of the cause of individual rights and civil liberties have done so, not merely in neglect, but often in actual derogation, of the rights of the States. In order to obtain some temporary and

usually illusory advance in the field of individual rights (generally where a minority group complication is involved), these "human rights" advocates have sought to curtail and cut down the powers and rights of the States and, in fact, to reduce the States to meaningless administrative subdivisions. In so doing, they are actually doing the worst possible disservice in the long run to the cause of human rights; for, at the expense of the States, they are helping to build up a vast concentration of power in Washington.

They are creating a centralized governmental apparatus against which the States first, and later the individual citizen, will be completely powerless. And when that day arrives—and, Mr. President, if we do not halt and reverse this trend in our Government, it will not be long in arriving—human rights, minority rights, individual liberties will be in the most mortal danger they could ever be in. When all power is concentrated in the Central Government, without effective State governments existing as a check, the end is near for the rights of the individual. When the principle of States' rights—local self-government—goes down the drain, individual rights will follow close behind. In our American system, the surest bulwark of individual liberty is the principle of States' rights.

The Founders knew this, and that is why they established this right of local self-government as one of the twin pillars of their carefully-devised system of checks and balances. They deliberately set up this system of checks and balances, and made States' rights one of its two bulwarks, in order to prevent the rise of a centralized and tyrannical power-apparatus, before which the individual citizen would be helpless.

PROBLEM OF THE THREE BRANCHES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The other major device set up by the Founders in their establishment of the checks and balances system—and this is the second matter with which the Commission here proposed would deal—was the principle of separation of powers; that is, the independence of the three branches of the Federal Government. States rights alone is not enough. It is necessary that within the Federal Government itself there be a strictly maintained balance among the three branches, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. This balance can be maintained only by an unceasing and unyielding resistance to any and all attempts on the part of any one branch to usurp powers rightfully belonging to one of the other branches. In addition to marking the constitutional line between Federal and State powers, it would be the proposed Commission's function to study and locate and set forth the proper boundaries of these three Federal branches. And again, of course, to establish their respective jurisdictions under the Constitution, and not simply to determine what boundaries might be most expedient from a policy standpoint.

The pressing need of keeping these three branches within their proper bounds I shall not elaborate on to any great extent. I think that this need is obvious and clear to most, if not all, of those present. This body in particular should be well aware of certain trends which in recent years have seriously threatened the balance. I will not detail the rash of Court decisions which have caused concern in this body, among northern, southern, and western Members alike, as well as among members of the American bar and among private citizens. Suffice it to say that a dangerous trend is in motion and that this time, fortunately, a large body of responsible opinion seems at least to have perceived the danger.

I believe that there is an increasing awareness on the part of Members of both Houses of the dangers inherent in this growing imbalance within the structure of the Federal Government. If in this address I dwell in more detail on the State-Federal problem, it is only because I feel that Congress is perhaps less aware of the danger there, or less concerned over it, and not because I attach any less importance to the problem of the balance of the three Federal branches. Indeed, in view of the steadily shrinking power of the States, it is more imperative than ever that the principle of separation of powers among the three Federal branches be scrupulously preserved.

FINAL WORD ON THE STATES' RIGHTS PROBLEM

But to return once more to the States' rights half of the problem. Some will point out that the States themselves are in large measure responsible for their present weakened position; that the State governments themselves are willing parties to the present trend; that far from making any serious effort to reverse the trend, State officials continue to seek more and more Federal grants and handouts which they know full well will result in increasing Federal control; and these people may take the view that since the States apparently are unwilling to save themselves, why should we, the Congress, initiate any move to save them?

With the first part of that argument I find myself in at least partial agreement. It is quite true that some of the blame for their present plight rests with the States themselves. For one thing, the lure of Federal money has often been too strong for the States to resist. State political leaders, eager to boast of extra services provided, yet desirous of keeping State and local taxes down, have been all too willing to turn to the Federal Treasury—and, in so doing, to hitch ever more tightly to their States the reins of Federal control.

It is also true that, by neglecting certain fields in which large segments of their populations wanted governmental action taken, the States made very easy the task of those who were seeking to centralize power in Washington at the expense of the States. President Eisenhower put this very well in his Williamsburg speech, if I may quote him further:

> The tendency of bureaucracy to grow in size and power does not bear the whole of the blame for the march of political power to Washington. Never, under our constitutional system, could the National Government have siphoned away State authority without the neglect, acquiescence, or unthinking cooperation of the States themselves.
>
> The Founding Fathers foresaw and attempted to forestall such a contingency. They reserved to the people, and they reserved to the States, all power not specifically bestowed upon the National Government.
>
> But, like nature, people and their governments are intolerant of vacuums. Every State failure to meet a pressing public need has created the opportunity, developed the excuse and fed the temptation for the National Government to poach on the States' preserves. Year by year, responding to transient popular demands, the Congress has increased Federal functions. So, slowly at first, but in recent times more and more rapidly, the pendulum of power has swung from our States toward the Central Government.

Those were the words of President Eisenhower.

Like the President, I agree that the States themselves deserve much of the blame; I agree that the States seem little disposed to take any effective action to resist Federal encroachment, by rejecting further Federal financial aid. But even if the States apparently cannot or will not help themselves, it does not follow that this Congress should stand aside and watch the dissolution of our Federal form of government. The very fact that within the States themselves there are so many factors and currents—social, economic, and especially political—which tend to invite Federal encroachment, makes it doubly necessary that steps be taken now to preserve the balance intended by the Constitution. We are not interested in preserving States rights just because we wish to do a favor to State governments as such. Nor are we interested in the preserving of a political tradition merely for its own sake. The Congress should be interested in preserving States rights because the preservation of States rights is essential to the maintenance of our Federal form of government, and is therefore, vitally necessary to the well-being of the people of the United States.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I hope that in this brief talk I have been able to convey some sense of the urgency which I feel in regard to this matter. I hope that I have been able to make it clear why a survey of the boundaries of State and Federal jurisdiction is needed. I hope that I have been able to point out with sufficient clarity what I think is the basic fallacy involved in the previously-undertaken studies of Federal-State relationship—namely, the emphasis on considerations of policy rather than on constitutionalism. I hope, therefore, that Senators will agree that this proposed Commission on Federal and State

Jurisdiction is a vital necessity to the preservation of our Federal form of government and of our free institutions. I hope that Senators will support the joint resolution.

Much has been said on the floor during the past few days about the dangers facing us from abroad. Let us face firmly and resolutely this foreign threat; but at the same time let us look to the preservation of our freedom at home.

In taking every step necessary to maintain, or to restore, our system of checks and balances, let us all bear in mind these words of our first President, George Washington, spoken in his Farewell Address:

> The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country, and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. Let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) to establish a Commission on Federal and State Jurisdiction, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

---

## DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE HENRY SMITH, OF WISCONSIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

*Resolved*, That a committee of 11 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn of the passing of my friend, LAWRENCE HENRY SMITH, a Representative in Congress from my State.

I first became acquainted with LAWRENCE back in the early 1930's, when we were together in service group work. LARRY was one of those fine, clean, Christian characters who live to the full the light they possess.

LARRY was born in Racine, Wis., in September 1892. He obtained his education in the public schools of Racine and at the Milwaukee University School. Later he took additional courses, for 2 years, in the Milwaukee State Teachers College, and then enrolled in Marquette University, graduating from its law school in June 1923.

After he graduated from law school, he opened a law office in his hometown of Racine, where he continued the practice of law until he came to the House of Representatives, in 1941, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Representative Bolles.

During World War I he served in Europe in the infantry of the 32d Division, as a first lieutenant. I had a brother who was a captain in that division.

In 1938 and 1939 he was Commander of the American Legion Department of Wisconsin.

He was president of the Racine County Bar Association. Since the special election in 1941, he has been reelected in every election since that time. When he passed away, he was a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

He was a hard worker. He was a man of character, forthright and sincere. With those qualities, of course, he had a multitude of friends. That was indicated by the fact that the people of his District reelected him back to the House of Representatives time and time again.

Surviving him are his wife, Eleanor, and three children. By his family, friends, and associates, indeed by all who knew him, he will be sorely missed.

I join with all who knew him in expressing to Eleanor, whom I also knew throughout the years, and to his fine family, my heartfelt sympathy at his passing.

Mr. President, I now desire to yield to my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] who wishes to speak concerning the death of Representative SMITH.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I join with my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in expressing my deep sympathy to the family and associates of the late Representative LAWRENCE SMITH. Although I knew him but briefly, and we were of opposite political faiths, LAWRENCE SMITH's long career, not only as a Member of Congress since 1941 but in public life for many years before that, always set a high standard of integrity and devotion to duty. The people of his Congressional District, who chose him nine times to represent them, will note his passing with sorrow, as will his colleagues here who knew and respected LAWRENCE SMITH for his conscientious attention to the business of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and of the House. Wisconsin and the Nation have lost an able public servant.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire now to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for 8 years I sat next to Representative LAWRENCE SMITH on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I learned to know him exceedingly well through working with him very closely.

Although his views on foreign policy differed from mine in many respects, few members of the committee held views more sincerely than did LAWRENCE SMITH. No one appreciated more keenly than I his patriotism and the lofty moral tone of everything he did and said in the House.

I join with my colleagues in the Senate and with my colleagues in the other body in extending my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to his wife.

LAWRENCE SMITH was a gentleman of the finest strain which our country is capable of producing. His memory will, for me, be ever fresh.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 244) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints, as the committee to attend the funeral of the late Representative, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Pursuant to the fourth resolving clause of the resolution, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, Thursday, January 23, 1958:

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, vice Lester D. Mallory.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Thailand, vice Max Waldo Bishop.

John Wesley Jones, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Libya, vice John L. Tappin.

Lester D. Mallory, of Washington, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala, vice Edward J. Sparks.

Edward J. Sparks, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela, vice Dempster McIntosh.

Clifton R. Wharton, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania, vice Robert H. Thayer.

James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece, vice George V. Allen.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America:

Frank A. Waring, of California.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Samuel D. Boykin, of Maryland.
Edward C. Crouch, of the District of Columbia.
Graham R. Hall, of Arkansas.
John F. Killea, of Texas.
Walter W. Orebaugh, of Oregon.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America:

Donald A. Dumont, of New York.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John Miles, of Illinois.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, the secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James G. Byington, of Connecticut.
Harold A. Chastka, of South Dakota.
Mrs. Alice T. Curran, of New York.
Clyde E. Holmes, of Washington.
Wallace Irwin, Jr., of New York.
Benton D. Morgan, of California.
Jameson Parker, of the District of Columbia.
William J. Stibravy, of New Jersey.

For appointment as Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Mrs. Margaret Rupli Woodward, of the District of Columbia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Stephen Duncan-Peters, of New York.
Miss Elizabeth McGrory, of California.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Paul J. Hoylen, of Maryland.
Andrew I. Killgore, of Alabama.
Anthony E. Starcevic, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Maurine Crane, of Utah.
Dudley E. Cyphers, of Florida.
Eric W. Fleisher, of Maryland.
Wane B. Gentry, of Washington.
James M. Hall, of Washington.
Miss Roberta L. Meyerkort, of Mississippi.
Miss Ruth G. Michaelson, of Michigan.
Philip M. Nagao, of California.
Gabriel J. Paolozzi, of Nevada.
Paul Sadler, of Tennessee.
Mrs. Helen S. Steele, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Terrell E. Arnold, of California.
David P. Banowetz, of Louisiana.
Harry E. Bergold, Jr., of New York.
Miss Emma Bernardon, of New York.
Jay H. Blowers, of Florida.
James Bernard Bockian, of New Jersey.
Miss Helen Brady, of Pennsylvania.
William E. Breidenbach, of New York.
Peter S. Bridges, of Illinois.
Miss Lucy Therina Briggs, of Maine.
Jere Broh-Kahn, of Ohio.
Carroll Brown, of Alabama.
Eugene B. Bruns, of Maryland.
Jerald G. Clemans, of California.
John R. Clingerman, of Michigan.
Emmett M. Coxson, of Illinois.
William F. Crary, of Florida.
Robert R. Dennis, of Pennsylvania.
Francis De Tarr, of California.
Miss Helen Marie Donovan, of New Jersey.
Miss Suzanne E. Dress, of Pennsylvania.
Robert W. Duemling, of California.
William L. Dutton, Jr., of Iowa.
Richard A. Dwyer, of Indiana.
Miss Phyllis E. Elliott, of Missouri.
Ollie B. Ellison, of Illinois.
Raymond C. Ewing, of California.
Miss Anne Ladd Frederick, of Massachusetts.
Howard V. Funk, Jr., of New York.
Herbert Donald Gelber, of New York.
Terry G. Grant, of Illinois.
Kurt F. Gross, of Wisconsin.
Miss Thurza Maureen Harris, of Kansas.
James R. Holway, of Illinois.
James F. Hughes III, of New York.
David Korn, of Missouri.
David C. Lacey, Jr., of Ohio.
George M. Lane, of Massachusetts.
Frederick H. Lawton, of New Jersey.
Melvin H. Levine, of Massachusetts.
William H. Luers, of Illinois.
Edward J. Malonis, of Massachusetts.
Wade H. B. Matthews, of North Carolina.
James A. Mattson, of Minnesota.
John C. Monjo, of Connecticut.
John T. Morgan, of Illinois.
Miss Dorothy H. Myers, of Maryland.
Richard A. Neale, of California.
George Clay Nettles, of Alabama.
George W. Ogg, of Virginia.
Oscar J. Olson, Jr., of Texas.
James R. Panks, of Washington.
Thomas J. Pape, of Texas.
Edward L. Peck, of California.
Neale J. Pearson, of Florida.
Lawrence Pezzullo, of New York.
Homer R. Phelps, Jr., of New York.
Martin Polstein, of New York.
William H. Price, of Florida.
Frederick S. Quin, of New York.
William E. Rau, of Missouri.
Thomas J. Riegert, of Ohio.
John T. Rogerson, Jr., of Florida.
John Hall Rouse, Jr., of Maryland.
David D. Schobe, of Illinois.
Walter John Silva, of Massachusetts.
Clint E. Smith, of New Mexico.
Donnell D. Smith, of Rhode Island.
David C. Sperling, of Connecticut.
Linwood R. Starbird, of Maine.
Ronald Lewis Steel, of Illinois.
Donald C. Tice, of Kansas.
Blaine C. Tueller, of Utah.
Leonard B. Weddle, of Indiana.
Albert W. Whiting, of Kansas.
Stephan Charles Williams, of New York.
Herbert Gilman Wing, of Pennsylvania.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Thomas J. Barrett, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Stephen P. Belcher, Jr., of Vermont.
Robert C. Benedict, of California.
Richard C. Brower, of Minnesota.
Marvin A. Derrick, of California.
Homer G. Gayne, of the District of Columbia.
John L. Hedges, of Illinois.
Orton W. Hoover, of Iowa.
Rolf Jacoby, of New York.
Richard B. Joyce, of Missouri.
Robert G. Mahon, of California.
Paul R. Phillips, of California.
Robert L. Walker, of Montana.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Chester R. Chartrand, of California.
Robert W. Crawford, of Ohio.
David J. DuBois, of New York.
William J. Hood, of Maine.
Roderick W. Horton, of New York.
George O. Kephart, of Maryland.
Max W. Kraus, of Maryland.
Vincent M. Lockhart, of Texas.
Thomas Polgar, of Virginia.
Arthur F. Rall, of New York.
Paul L. Springer, of Virginia.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Walter L. Campbell, of California.
Richard J. Cleary, of Massachusetts.
William H. Dunbar, of the District of Columbia.
Ralph J. Katrosh, of Virginia.
William C. Rogers, of Kentucky.
R. Harden Smith, of Maryland.
George W. Steitz, of New York.
Robert D. Wiecha, of Michigan.
Throop M. Wilder, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Lewis P. Achen, of Montana.
Burnett F. Anderson, of the District of Columbia.
Charles J. Beckman, of Arizona.
Alfred V. Boerner, of Maryland.
William B. Bromell, of Virginia.
Willard F. Burke, of Massachusetts.
James B. Burns, of Pennsylvania.
Michael C. Capraro, of New York.
Walter T. Cini, of New York.
Francis G. Coleman, of Pennsylvania.
Francis L. Coolidge, of the District of Columbia.
J. Edmund Crowley, of Virginia.
Robert K. Davis, of California.
Paul E. Eckel, of Maryland.
Sam A. Edwards, of Connecticut.
William T. Ellis, of Virginia.
Jack M. Forcey, of California.
Leonard C. Gmirkin, of Ohio.
Rolfe A. Haatvedt, of Iowa.
Virgil L. Harris, of California.
Henry D. Hecksher, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Louise M. Hoppy, of Oklahoma.
Earl H. Link, of Pennsylvania.
Edward A. Marelius, of Colorado.
John H. Martinsen, of Washington.
Clyde R. McAvoy, of New York.
Laughlin Phillips, of the District of Columbia.
Joseph W. Reidy, of Illinois.
John J. Shea, of New York.
Arnold M. Silver, of Massachusetts.
Michael F. Taylor, of Virginia.
Edward O. Welles, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

W. Wendell Blancke, of California.
William O. Boswell, of Pennsylvania.
John H. Burns, of Oklahoma.
Prescott Childs, of Massachusetts.
Edward C. Crouch, of the District of Columbia.
Francis Deak, of the District of Columbia.
Robert F. Hale, of Oregon.
Morris N. Hughes, of Nebraska.
Eric Kocher, of California.
Robert G. Miner, of New York.
Charles P. O'Donnell, of Illinois.
William J. Porter, of Massachusetts.
Edward E. Rice, of Wisconsin.

Harold Sims, of Tennessee.
John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia.
Carlos J. Warner, of Maine.
Murat W. Williams, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1 and to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Daniel V. Anderson, of Delaware.
Wilson T. M. Beale, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
William Belton, of Oregon.
W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia.
Carl H. Boehringer, of Arizona.
William C. Burdett, of Georgia.
William I. Cargo, of Maryland.
Ralph N. Clough, of Washington.
William A. Crawford, of Pennsylvania.
Richard H. Davis, of New York.
Fulton Freeman, of California.
Edward L. Freers, of California.
Martin J. Hillenbrand, of Illinois.
Arthur G. Jones, of Virginia.
J. Jefferson Jones 3d, of Tennessee.
Edmund H. Kellogg, of Virginia.
Peyton Kerr, of Virginia.
Nat B. King, of Texas.
William L. Krieg, of Ohio.
William Leonhart, of West Virginia.
Edward P. Maffitt, of Missouri.
Edwin W. Martin, of Ohio.
Robert H. McBride, of Michigan.
Jack D. Neal, of Texas.
Joseph Palmer 2d, of California.
Stuart W. Rockwell, of Pennsylvania.
Terry B. Sanders, Jr., of Texas.
Joseph W. Scott, of Texas.
Richard M. Service, of the District of Columbia.
Harold Shullaw, of Illinois.
Wallace W. Stuart, of Tennessee.
David A. Thomasson, of Kentucky.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Robert W. Adams, of Texas.
William C. Affeld, Jr., of New Jersey.
W. Stratton Anderson, Jr., of Illinois.
H. Kenneth Baker, of Maryland.
William Barnes, of Massachusetts.
Arthur E. Beach, of Missouri.
Robert M. Brandin, of New York.
Herbert D. Brewster, of Minnesota.
Stephen C. Brown, of West Virginia.
Willard O. Brown, of Texas.
Findley Burns, Jr., of Minnesota.
Kenneth A. Byrns, of Colorado.
Donald B. Calder, of New York.
Thomas Patrick Carroll, of New York.
Don V. Catlett, of Missouri.
Albert E. Clattenburg, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Charles Philip Clock, of California.
Miss H. Alberta Colclaser, of Ohio.
William E. Cole, Jr., of New York.
John F. Correll, of Ohio.
Robert F. Corrigan, of Ohio.
Philip M. Davenport, of Maryland.
Rodger P. Davies, of California.
Henry Dearborn, of New Hampshire.
Samuel De Palma, of Maryland.
Thomas P. Dillon, of Missouri.
Perry Ellis, of California.
Jack M. Fleischer, of Wisconsin.
Richard Funkhouser, of California.
Daniel Gaudin, of Pennsylvania.
Forrest K. Geerken, of Minnesota.
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of California.
Joseph N. Greene, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Paul L. Guest, of California.
John E. Hargrove, of Mississippi.
Franklin Hawley, of Michigan.
Frank Snowden Hopkins, of the District of Columbia.
Charles E. Hulick, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Ralph H. Hunt, of Massachusetts.
Paul C. Hutton, of Colorado.
Alfred le S. Jenkins, of Georgia.
John M. Kennedy, of Virginia.
Roy I. Kimmel, of New Mexico.
Spencer M. King, of Maine.
William Kling, of New York.
M. Gordon Knox, of New York.
Abe Kramer, of California.
Eldred D. Kuppinger, of Ohio.
Nathaniel Lancaster, Jr., of Virginia.
Gilbert E. Larsen, of Illinois.
James H. Lewis, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas H. Linthicum, of California.
Aubrey E. Lippincott, of Arizona.
William L. Magistretti, of California.
Abram E. Manell, of California.
Donald B. McCue, of Virginia.
Robert G. McGregor, of Massachusetts.
Francis E. Meloy, Jr., of Maryland.
Lee E. Metcalf, of Texas.
Howard Meyers, of Maryland.
Charles P. Nolan, of Massachusetts.
Julian L. Nugent, Jr., of New Mexico.
Albert E. Pappano, of Ohio.
Paul H. Pearson, of Iowa.
Oliver A. Peterson, of Maryland.
Richard I. Phillips, of California.
George W. Renchard, of Michigan.
W. Garland Richardson, of Virginia.
Thomas C. M. Robinson, of Iowa.
Leslie L. Rood, of New Jersey.
Edward J. Rowell, of California.
Albert W. Sherer, Jr., of Illinois.
Thomas W. Simons, Sr., of the District of Columbia.
Walter Smith, of Illinois.
Byron B. Snyder, of California.
Paul J. Sturm, of Connecticut.
James W. Swihart, of Massachusetts.
John D. Tomlinson, of Illinois.
Richard E. Usher, of Wisconsin.
Joseph J. Wagner, of New York.
Herman Walker, Jr., of Maryland.
Andrew B. Wardlaw, of South Carolina.
Philip P. Williams, of California.
David G. Wilson, Jr., of Oregon.
Charles D. Withers, of South Carolina.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Albert S. Watson, of Connecticut.
Stanley Wilcox, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

Hugh G. Appling, of California.
Philip Axelrod, of Delaware.
Taylor G. Belcher, of New York.
Harry H. Bell, of New Jersey.
Robert S. Black, of the District of Columbia.
Gray Bream, of Wyoming.
William T. Briggs, of Virginia.
Philip H. Chadbourn, Jr., of California.
Stanley M. Cleveland, of New York.
A. John Cope, Jr., of Utah.
Thomas J. Corcoran, of New York.
Alexander J. Davit, of Pennsylvania.
Richard C. Desmond, of Ohio.
Robert Donhauser, of New York.
Thomas A. Donovan, of North Dakota.
John Warner Foley, Jr., of New Hampshire.
Herbert Gordon, of New York.
Roger L. Heacock, of California.
John Calvin Hill, Jr., of South Carolina.
Robert B. Hill, of Massachusetts.
Oscar C. Holder, of Louisiana.
Miss Dorothy M. Jester, of California.
Thomas M. Judd, of Maryland.
Max V. Krebs, of California.
Weldon Litsey, of Texas.
Duncan A. D. Mackay, of New Jersey.
Martin G. Manch, of Virginia.
Grant V. McClanahan, of Missouri.
Thomas D. McKiernan, of Massachusetts.
Joseph A. Mendenhall, of Maryland.
Harold M. Midkiff, of Florida.
Robert W. Moore, of Iowa.
R. Kenneth Oakley, of Oklahoma.
Eugene L. Padberg, Jr., of Texas.
Ellwood M. Rabenold, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Reed P. Robinson, of Utah.
Joseph W. Schutz, of California.
Frederick D. Sharp 3d, of Maine.
Merlin E. Smith, of Ohio.
Ernest L. Stanger, of Utah.
Charles G. Stefan, of California.
Robert A. Stevenson, of Florida.
Galen L. Stone, of Massachusetts.
John L. Topping, of New York.
Raymond A. Valliere, of New Hampshire.
Herbert E. Weiner, of New York.
Jackson W. Wilson, of Texas.
Robert M. Winfree, of the District of Columbia.
Robert W. Zimmermann, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Arthur S. Abbott, of Illinois.
Harold Aisley, of Maryland.
Joseph A. Angotti, of West Virginia.
Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., of Massachusetts.
John Campbell Ausland, of Pennsylvania.
John A. Baker, Jr., of Connecticut.
Harris H. Ball, of California.
Harry G. Barnes, Jr., of Minnesota.
John L. Barrett, of Texas.
Carl E. Bartch, of Ohio.
Williams Beal, of Massachusetts.
William E. Beauchamp, Jr., of New York.
Alf E. Bergesen, of New York.
Slator C. Blackiston, Jr., of North Carolina.
John Q. Blodgett, of Maryland.
Archer K. Blood, of Virginia.
Mrs. Elizabeth C. Bouch, of Oregon.
John M. Bowie, of the District of Columbia.
Vincent S. R. Brandt, of Rhode Island.
Miss Elizabeth Ann Brown, of Oregon.
Emerson M. Brown, of Michigan.
Robert R. Brungart, of Maryland.
Thompson R. Buchanan, of Maryland.
William A. Buell, Jr., of Rhode Island.
Miss Patricia M. Byrne, of Ohio.
Robert W. Caldwell, of North Carolina.
Paul C. Campbell, of Pennsylvania.
William A. Chapin, of Illinois.
Christian G. Chapman, of New York.
Carroll E. Cobb, of Colorado.
Richard H. Courtenaye, of California.
W. Kennedy Cromwell 3d, of Maryland.
Charles T. Cross, of Virginia.
John B. Crume, of Kentucky.
Phillip B. Dahl, of Illinois.
Miss Frances M. Dailor, of the District of Columbia.
Hampton Davis, of California.
Arthur R. Day, of New Jersey.
Mario R. DeCapua, of Connecticut.
William B. deGrace, of Massachusetts.
Paul W. Deibel, of Ohio.
Morris Dembo, of New York.
Edward J. Dembski, of Colorado.
John B. Dexter, of Maryland.
James A. Dibrell, of Texas.
Richard H. Donald, of Connecticut.
Anthony J. Dreape, of New Jersey.
Walter H. Drew, of Colorado.
Adolph Dubs, of Illinois.
Michael J. Dux, of Florida.
Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., of California.
Miss Virginia Ellis, of the District of Columbia.
Warrick E. Elrod, Jr., of Illinois.
Mrs. Elizabeth L. Engdahl, of New Hampshire.
Charles W. Falkner, of Oregon.
John M. Farrior, of North Carolina.
Harry Feinstein, of Georgia.
Benjamin A. Fleck, of Pennsylvania.
Robert C. Foulon, of Illinois.
A. Eugene Frank, of Illinois.
Harry George French, of Wisconsin.
Donald A. Gaiduk, of California.
John N. Gatch, Jr., of Ohio.
Norman W. Getsinger, of Michigan.
John I. Getz, of Illinois.
Russell L. Gibbs, of Michigan.
Justie E. Gist, of Iowa.
Culver Gleysteen, of Pennsylvania.
John G. Gossett, of Oklahoma.
Miss Betty C. Gough, of Maryland.
Pierre R. Graham, of Illinois.
Lindsey Grant, of New York.

Lawrence E. Gruza, of Connecticut.
James C. Haahr, of Minnesota.
Andrew E. Hanney, of Massachusetts.
Joseph A. Harary, of New York.
Miss Margaret P. Hays, of Texas.
Robert Whitcomb Heavey, of California.
Richard M. Herndon, of Pennsylvania.
Martin Y. Hirabayashi, of Maryland.
Robert S. Hoard, of California.
John H. Holdridge, of California.
Jerome K. Holloway, Jr., of Maryland.
Robert B. Houghton, of Michigan.
Robert B. Houston, Jr., of Missouri.
Thomas D. Huff, of Indiana.
Elmer C. Hulen, of Kentucky.
Mansfield L. Hunt, of Maine.
Milan W. Jerabek, of Maryland.
Robert C. Johnson, Jr., of New Jersey.
Charles M. Johnston, of Maryland.
James R. Johnston, of Ohio.
Curtis F. Jones, of Maine.
William Kane, of Virginia.
Warren A. Kelsey, of Massachusetts.
Bayard King, of Rhode Island.
David Klein, of Kansas.
Joseph B. Kyle, of Virginia.
Lowell Bruce Laingen, of Minnesota.
Mason A. La Selle, of Colorado.
Chase E. Laurendine, of Alabama.
Donald A. Lewis, of New York.
Herman Lindstrom, of Florida.
Harry M. Lofton, of South Carolina.
Earl H. Luboeansky, of Missouri.
Basil F. Macgowan, of Tennessee.
Dayton S. Mak, of Iowa.
Philip W. Manhard, of Florida.
Doyle V. Martin, of Oklahoma.
Glenwood B. Matthews, of California.
James A. May, of California.
James H. McFarland, Jr., of Michigan.
Robert A. McKinnon, of Michigan.
Kermit S. Midthun, of Michigan.
Daniel W. Montenegro, of New York.
Sam Moskowitz, of Missouri.
Grant E. Mouser 3d, of Ohio.
Franklin H. Murrell, of California.
Jacob M. Myerson, of the District of Columbia.
E. Jan Nadelman, of Virginia.
Joseph P. Nagoski, of Tennessee.
Joseph W. Neubert, of Washington.
Daniel O. Newberry, of Georgia.
Cleo A. Noel, Jr., of Missouri.
Douglas B. O'Connell, of New York.
John F. O'Donnell, Jr., of Massachusetts.
John F. O'Grady, of Massachusetts.
Robert L. Ouverson, of Minnesota.
William V. M. Owen, of the District of Columbia.
Carvel Painter, of Wisconsin.
Stephen E. Palmer, Jr., of New York.
Chris G. Petrow, of Massachusetts.
Harry F. Pfeiffer, Jr., of Maryland.
Harry M. Phelan, Jr., of Tennessee.
Wendell A. Pike, of Washington.
Ferdinand F. Pirhalla, of Pennsylvania.
Richard A. Poole, of New Jersey.
Paul M. Popple, of Illinois.
Francis C. Prescott, of Maine.
Lewis M. Purnell, of Delaware.
Jack R. Queen, of Ohio.
Lawrence P. Ralston, of Connecticut.
John P. Reddington, of New York.
Larry W. Roeder, of Missouri.
Frederick L. Royt, of Wisconsin.
James R. Ruchti, of Wisconsin.
David T. Schneider, of New Hampshire.
Robert M. Schneider, of Iowa.
Cabot Sedgwick, of Arizona.
Peter A. Seip, of Iowa.
Albert L. Seligmann, of Virginia.
Melvin E. Sinn, of Virginia.
Matthew D. Smith, Jr., of South Dakota.
Richard E. Snyder, of New Jersey.
Karl E. Sommerlatte, of Florida.
C. Melvin Sonne, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
William F. Spengler, of Wisconsin.
Daniel Sprecher, of New York.
Thomas C. Stave, of Washington.
Kenedon P. Steins, of the District of Columbia.
Robert W. Stookey, of Illinois.
DeWitt L. Stora, of California.
Lee T. Stull, of Pennsylvania.
Kenneth P. T. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
Jack A. Sulser, of Illinois.
Kingdon W. Swayne, of Pennsylvania.
Charles R. Tanguy, of Maryland.
Herbert B. Thompson, of California.
David R. Thomson, of California.
Miss Ruth J. Torrance, of Virginia.
Theodore A. Tremblay, of California.
Edward J. Trost, of New York.
Thomas T. Turner, of Washington.
Philip H. Valdes, of New York.
Theodore A. Wahl, of New York.
Peter C. Walker, of New York.
Milton C. Walstrom, of the Territory of Hawaii.
Herbert S. Weast, of California.
Sidney Weintraub, of New York.
Robert W. Weise, Jr., of Minnesota.
Alfred W. Wells, of New York.
Karl F. Weygand, of Massachusetts.
Mrs. C. Carey White, of Arizona.
Orme Wilson, Jr., of New York.
Wendell W. Woodbury, of Iowa.
Charles G. Wootton, of Connecticut.
Arthur I. Wortzel, of New Jersey.
Frederick S. York, of New Jersey.
Harry R. Zerbel, of Wisconsin.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas M. Gaffney, of Massachusetts.
Arthur V. Metcalfe, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Robert E. Barbour, of Tennessee.
Hubert H. Buzbee, Jr., of Alabama.
Oscar H. Guerra, of Texas.
Malcolm P. Hallam, of South Dakota.
Andrew I. Killgore, of Alabama.
George R. Phelan, Jr., of Missouri.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Gloria E. Abiouness, of Virginia.
Karl D. Ackerman, of Oklahoma.
Richard H. Adams, of Texas.
Arthur P. Allen, of California.
Robert N. Allen, of Oklahoma.
Henry T. Andersen, of Connecticut.
Daniel N. Arzac, Jr., of California.
James H. Ashida, of Washington.
Robert A. Aylward, of Massachusetts.
Miss Mildred J. Baer, of Maryland.
Robert J. Ballantyne, of Massachusetts.
George M. Barbis, of California.
Malcolm R. Barnebey, of Texas.
Robert S. Barrett IV, of Virginia.
Raymond Bastianello, of Texas.
Raymond J. Becker, of California.
Philip B. Bergfield, of California.
John A. Billings, of Missouri.
Robert A. Bishton, of Maryland.
Richard J. Bloomfield, of Connecticut.
Miss Helen M. Bonnell, of Michigan.
Lewis W. Bowden, of the District of Columbia.
William G. Bradford, of Illinois.
John A. Brogan III, of New York.
William R. Brown, of Ohio.
Harrison W. Burgess, of Virginia.
Frank N. Burnet, of Alabama.
Robert L. Burns, of the District of Columbia.
Robert T. Burns, of Indiana.
Charles T. Butler, Jr., of Indiana.
Pratt Byrd, of Kentucky.
Alan L. Campbell, Jr., of North Carolina.
Roy O. Carlson, of Illinois.
Maxwell Chaplin, of California.
Arnold K. Childs, of Ohio.
Miss Virginia Whitfield Collins, of Florida.
Thomas F. Conlon, of Illinois.
John S. Connolly, Jr., of Virginia.
Eller R. Cook, of Florida.
Ray H. Crane, of Utah.
Joseph H. Cunningham, of Nebraska.
Everett L. Damron, of Ohio.
Miss Lois M. Day, of Ohio.
John M. Dennis, of Pennsylvania.
Walker A. Diamanti, of Utah.
Thomas I. Dickson, Jr., of Texas.
Miss Hazel C. Dougherty, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Dorothy J. Dugan, of New Jersey.
Gilda R. Duly, of New York.
Chester G. Dunham, of Ohio.
William B. Edmondson, of Nebraska.
Alfred J. Erdos, of Arizona.
Elden B. Erickson, of Kansas.
Miss Barbara C. Fagan, of New York.
Michael A. Falzone, of New York.
Gordon R. Firth, of New York.
Richard V. Fischer, of Minnesota.
Robert M. Forcey, of California.
James B. Freeman, of Ohio.
William Lee Frost, of Connecticut.
Alexander S. C. Fuller, of Connecticut.
Fred J. Galanto, of Massachusetts.
Samuel R. Gammon III, of Texas.
John L. Gawf, of Colorado.
Charles A. Gendreau, of Minnesota.
H. Kent Goodspeed, of California.
Miss Shirley M. Green, of Missouri.
Clifford H. Gross, of New York.
Pierson M. Hall, of Kansas.
Donald S. Harris, of Connecticut.
William C. Harrop, of New Jersey.
Russell C. Heater, of California.
Mrs. Hallye A. Heiland, of California.
Robert T. Hennemeyer, of Illinois.
Frederick A. Hill, of California.
Benjamin C. Hilliard III, of West Virginia.
Edward C. Howatt, of Virginia.
Robert A. Jackson, of Michigan.
John W. Jelich, of New York.
Kempton B. Jenkins, of the District of Columbia.
John M. Kane, of Illinois.
George R. Kaplan, of Massachusetts.
Edward P. Kardas, of Pennsylvania.
John Edward Karkashian, of California.
Lawrence J. Kennon, of California.
C. Dirck Keyser, of New Jersey.
Edward L. Killham, of Illinois.
Leslie A. Klieforth, of California.
Kenneth W. Knauf, of Wisconsin.
John F. Knowles, of New Jersey.
Paul H. Kreisberg, of New York.
John Krizay, of Maryland.
Henry A. Lagasse, of New Hampshire.
Lyle F. Lane, of Washington.
Paul Baxter Lanius, Jr., of Colorado.
Edwin D. Ledbetter, of California.
Samuel W. Lewis, of Texas.
Charles E. Lilien, of Illinois.
John A. Linehan, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Alan W. Lukens, of Pennsylvania.
John G. MacCracken, of Virginia.
Timothy M. Manley, of Connecticut.
S. Douglas Martin, of New York.
Nicholas V. McCausland, of California.
Edward S. McClary, of California.
Miss Margaret J. McClellan, of Pennsylvania.
Harry R. Melone, Jr., of New York.
Franklin L. Mewshaw, of New York.
Miss Colette Meyer, of California.
Dudley W. Miller, of Colorado.
William A. Mitchell, of Maine.
George C. Moore, of California.
Benjamin R. Moser, of Virginia.
Edwin H. Moot, Jr., of Illinois.
Robert L. Mott, of California.
Charles Willis Naas, of Massachusetts.
Richard D. Nethercut, of Florida.
Michael H. Newlin, of North Carolina.
Donald R. Norland, of Iowa.
Anthony F. O'Boyle, of Pennsylvania.
Richard W. Ogle, of Indiana.
James M. E. O'Grady, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Mary W. Oliverson, of Oklahoma.
Hugh B. O'Neill, of Connecticut.
Frank V. Ortiz, Jr., of New Mexico.
Richard B. Owen, of Michigan.
James B. Parker, of Texas.
Russell R. Pearson, of Minnesota.
George W. Phillips, of Florida.

Richard St. F. Post, of Connecticut.
Arthur W. Purcell, of Massachusetts.
Peter J. Raineri, of New York.
Jess F. Reed, of Washington.
James F. Relph, Jr., of California.
Robert A. Remole, of Minnesota.
G. Edward Reynolds, of New York.
Charley L. Rice, of Texas.
Miss Martha Jean Richardson, of Illinois.
Ralph W. Richardson, of California.
Lucian L. Rocke, Jr., of Florida.
Robert H. Rose, of Utah.
Samuel O. Ruff, of North Carolina.
James T. Rush, of Rhode Island.
Leo J. Ryan, of Florida.
William E. Schaufele, Jr., of Ohio.
Kennedy B. Schmertz, of Pennsylvania.
Richard R. Selby, Jr., of New Jersey.
Robert G. Shackleton, of Ohio.
Miss Anna E. Simmons, of Texas.
Herman T. Skofield, of New Hampshire.
Robert F. Slutz, Jr., of Ohio.
Miss Cora M. Smith, of Vermont.
Miss Jean V. Smith, of Minnesota.
Michel F. Smith, of Texas.
Joseph F. Starkey, of Washington.
Lawrence L. Starlight, of New York.
Francis R. Starrs, Jr., of California.
William A. Stoltzfus, Jr., of Minnesota.
Thomas E. Tait, of New Jersey.
Jean R. Tartter, of Massachusetts.
Charles William Thomas, of Illinois.
William W. Thomas, Jr., of North Carolina.
Arthur T. Tienken, of New York.
William D. Toomey, of North Dakota.
Rene A. Tron, of New York.
Allen R. Turner, of Missouri.
Richard D. Vine, of New York.
Robert T. Wallace, of Florida.
Mrs. Marjory M. Wallis, of California.
Robert B. Warner, of Michigan.
Robert H. Wenzel, of Massachusetts.
Lewis M. White, of New York.
Charles L. Widney, Jr., of Georgia.
Miss Helen B. Wilson, of California.
Miss Eugenia Wolliak, of Connecticut.
Miss Julia L. Wooster, of Connecticut.
Robert C. Wysong, of California.
Amos Yoder, of Nebraska.
Robert D. Yoder, of Pennsylvania.
Carlos M. Yordan, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
Miss Jane B. Young, of the District of Columbia.
Dan A. Zachary, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Gori P. Bruno, of New York.
Dale W. Field, Jr., of Iowa.
Miss Wilda Mitchell, of Nebraska.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Craig Baxter, of Ohio.
Joel W. Biller, of Wisconsin.
Wesley D. Boles, of California.
Donald W. Born, of Massachusetts.
Merritt C. Bragdon, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Arthur E. Breisky, of California.
Marshall Brement, of Maryland.
Hugh K. Campbell, of Ohio.
Frank C. Carlucci, of Pennsylvania.
Edward J. Chesky, Jr., of Kansas.
Don T. Christensen, of California.
Herman J. Cohen, of New York.
Allen C. Davis, of Tennessee.
John G. Day, of New York.
John L. De Ornellas, of Alabama.
Willard A. De Pree, of Michigan.
C. Edward Dillery, of Washington.
Robert S. Dillon, of Virginia.
Richard W. Dye, of New York.
Harland H. Eastman, of Maine.
Miss Sharon E. Erdkamp, of Nebraska.
Fred Exton, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Donald C. Ferguson, of California.
Lewis P. Fickett, Jr., of Maine.
Miss Catherine M. Frank, of Connecticut.
Gerald A. Friedman, of Florida.
Robert K. German, of Texas.
Miss Joan Gillespie, of Connecticut.
Wever Gim, of Utah.
Maynard W. Glitman, of Illinois.
Roderick N. Grant, of California.
William B. Grant, of Massachusetts.
Charles W. Grover, of New York.
Harold E. Grover, Jr., of Florida.
John E. Guendling, Jr., of Indiana.
Miss Theresa A. Healy, of New York.
Lambert Heyniger, of New York.
Wallace F. Holbrook, of Massachusetts.
William A. Ispirian, of New York.
Ralph T. Jans, of Michigan.
Lee R. Johnson, of Ohio.
Ernest B. Johnston, Jr., of Alabama.
Adolph W. Jones, of Tennessee.
Miss Helen E. Kavan, of Ohio.
Robert V. Keeley, of Virginia.
Charles S. Kennedy, Jr., of California.
James A. Klemstine, of Pennsylvania.
Albert A. Lakeland, Jr., of New York.
Peter W. Lande, of Massachusetts.
Samuel Lee, of the Territory of Hawaii.
Louis J. Link, of Kansas.
Jay H. Long, of California.
John M. Lord, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Stephen Low, of Ohio.
Walter H. Lubkeman, of New York.
David A. Macuk, of New Jersey.
James W. Mahoney, of Indiana.
Herbert S. Malin, of Connecticut.
Charles E. Marthinsen, of Pennsylvania.
J. Thomas McAndrew, of New York.
Franklin O. McCord, of Iowa.
Stuart H. McIntyre, of Oregon.
Frazier Meade, of Virginia.
Byron B. Morton, Jr., of New Jersey.
Robert H. Munn, of California.
William C. Nenno, of New York.
Gerald F. Nollette, of Washington.
Jay R. Nussbaum, of New York.
Gerald R. Olsen, of Michigan.
John Patrick Owens, of the District of Columbia.
David W. K. Peacock, Jr., of New Jersey.
Miss Mary Hoxton Pierce, of Florida.
Arthur C. Plambeck, of Illinois.
David R. Raynolds, of Connecticut.
Ernest G. Reeves, of Texas.
Owen W. Roberts, of New Jersey.
Stephen H. Rogers, of New York.
Edward M. Rowell, of California.
Glenn R. Ruihley, of Ohio.
Charles E. Rushing, of Illinois.
Miss Edith M. Scott, of the District of Columbia.
Peter Semler, of New York.
George B. Sherry, of Maryland.
Joseph G. Simanis, of Connecticut.
William N. Simonson, of Virginia.
Clyde H. Small, of California.
Jackson L. Smith, of Florida.
Charles R. Stout, of California.
John Sylvester, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
George H. Thigpen, of the District of Columbia.
David B. Timmins, of Utah.
Donald R. Toussaint, of California.
Frank G. Trinka, of New Jersey.
Frank M. Tucker, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
James R. Wachob, of Oregon.
Edward T. Walters, of Texas.
Miss Suzanne White, of Illinois.
Frontis B. Wiggins, Jr., of Georgia.
John E. Williams, of North Carolina.
Richard L. Williams, of Indiana.
Miss Suzanne S. Williams, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Anthony C. Albrecht, of Virginia.
J. Bruce Amstutz, of Massachusetts.
Oler A. Bartley, Jr., of Delaware.
William M. Beck, of Illinois.
David A. Betts, of New York.
H. Eugene Bovis, of Florida.
Everett E. Briggs, of Maine.
Bazil W. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Charles R. Carlisle, of Florida.
Gordon Chase, of Massachusetts.
Robert D. Collins, of California.
Miss Marguerite Cooper, of California.
Richard S. Dawson, Jr., of California.
Miss Stella M. Deinzer, of New York.
Lloyd L. DeWitt, of California.
Robert W. Drexler, of Wisconsin.
Miss Regina Marie Eltz, of Alabama.
Robert L. Flanegin, of Illinois.
Robert L. Funseth, of New York.
Paul F. Gardner, of Texas.
Marion L. Gribble, of New York.
Charles R. Hartley, of the District of Columbia.
Edgar P. Henderson, Jr., of Indiana.
Roger P. Hipskind, of Illinois.
Thomas J. Hirschfeld, of New York.
Edward Hurwitz, of New York.
George W. Jaeger, of Missouri.
James T. Johnson, of Montana.
Robert M. Kline, of Connecticut.
Tadao Kobayashi, of the Territory of Hawaii.
Robert Gerald Livingston, of Connecticut.
Peter P. Lord, of Massachusetts.
James Gordon Lowenstein, of Connecticut.
Jack F. Matlock, Jr., of Vermont.
Robert Marden Miller, of California.
Jay P. Moffat, of New Hampshire.
John L. Offner, of Pennsylvania.
Mark S. Pratt, of Rhode Island.
Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia.
Cecil S. Richardson, of New York.
Miss Ann C. Roper, of Ohio.
David E. Simcox, of Kentucky.
William Slany, of the District of Columbia.
Daniel P. Sullivan, of Virginia.
Roger W. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
D. Dean Tyler, of California.
William Watts, of New York.
William B. Young, of New Hampshire.
Albert L. Zucca, of New York.

Jay R. Grahame, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 8, a vice consul of career and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Theodore S. Mandeville, Jr., of Ohio.
Richard D. Van Winkle, of the District of Columbia.
Robert Wilbourn, of Texas.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Justin E. O'Donnell, of Pennsylvania.
Graham D. Renner, of California.
John Sherry, of Maryland.
Louis J. Toplosky, of New Jersey.
Steve Washenko, of Virginia.

### United States District Judge

Julius H. Miner, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice John P. Barnes, retired.

### United States Judge for the District Court of Guam

Eugene R. Gilmartin, of Rhode Island, to be United States judge for the District Court of Guam for the terms of 4 years, vice Paul D. Shriver, term expired.

### United States Attorneys

Lester Shields Parsons, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

George M. Yeager, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for the term of 4 years for division No. 4, district of Alaska, vice Theodore F. Stevens, resigned.

### United States Marshals

Pervie Lee Dodd, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of

Alabama for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

Herbert Barnes, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years, vice Clarence H. Spence, term expired.

Harry Jennings, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

Paul Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

Harold Sexton, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon for a term of 4 years (reappointment).

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be Interstate Commerce Commissioners for the terms indicated:

Anthony F. Arpaia, of Connecticut, for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964 (reappointment).

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964 (reappointment).

Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1959, vice Owen Clarke, resigned.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1961 (reappointment).

IN THE COAST GUARD

Capt. Richard M. Ross for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Alvin H. Giffin | Peter J. Smenton |
| James A. Alger, Jr. | Thomas R. Midtlyng |
| Albert J. Carpenter | John B. Oren |
| Willard J. Smith | Harry E. Davis, Jr. |
| Emmet T. Calahan | Joseph Howe |
| John H. Forney | George W. Holtzman |
| Eugene A. Comn, Jr. | William W. Childress |
| David O. Reed | John H. Wagline |
| Edward W. Laird | John J. Hutson, Jr. |
| Verne C. Gibson | Robert E. McCaffery |
| Charles R. Monteiro | Albert E. Harned |
| Hugh D. Wear | Richard F. Rea |
| Daniel J. Lucinski | Louis M. Thayer, Jr. |
| Hubert R. Chaffee | |

The following-named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Daniel C. Dickert | Albert Frost |
| Lloyd R. Morrison | William F. Adams |
| Cyril L. Heyliger | William F. Rea, III |
| Frank F. Elliott | James L. Lathrop |
| Henry C. Keene, Jr. | Vincent J. Cass |
| Ellis L. Perry | Austin C. Wagner |
| Loy W. A. Renshaw | Stephen G. Carkeek |
| Cecil E. Meree, Jr. | Norman L. Horton |
| Clyde L. Olson | Henry A. Pearce, Jr. |
| Joseph G. Bastow, Jr. | William A. Jenkins |
| Bob Kirsten | John Natwig |
| John B. Speaker, Jr. | Roy M. Hutchins, Jr. |
| Louis F. Sudnik | John F. Thompson, Jr. |
| William E. Chapline | |

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Stephen Varanko | Donby J. Mathieu |
| John R. Mackey | David W. DeFreest |
| Joseph F. Furlough, Jr. | Robert L. Lawlis |
| | James W. Dodson |
| Ottis H. Abney | George D. Winstein |
| Curtis H. Jurgens | William W. Richter |
| Allen E. Armstrong | John A. Corso |
| Charles D. Budd | William H. St. George |
| Howard A. Linse | George T. Treffs |
| Harry E. Chapin | Robert J. Bloxsom |
| James McMenamin | Joseph W. Finnegan |

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Jack A. Howell | Arthur W. Gove |
| Russell P. Combs | George J. Weidner |
| William E. Heath | Carl E. Rodehau |
| Justin J. Bonanno | Raymond W. Bernhardt |
| Lenard Fielding, Jr. | |
| John F. O'Connor | Edward S. Davis, Jr. |
| Richard A. Bauman | Robert C. Pittman |

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Domenic A. Calicchio | James N. Schenk |
| William Drew | John H. Guest |

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 8298 and 8299, title 10, United States Code. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*First lieutenant to captain*

CHAPLAIN

Rathjen, David E., 32432A.
Kiryluk, Nicholas T., 32433A.

*Second lieutenant to first lieutenant*

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Higgins, Donald D., 32497A.
Hankins, John W., 32498A.
Rosenthal, Harry, 32499A.
Slagel, Ronald V., Jr., 32500A.
Aaron, Robert V., 32501A.
Mugford, Frank M., 32502A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Lot Ensey, United States Navy, to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years with the rank of rear admiral.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Thursday, January 23, 1958:

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Robert M. McKinney, of New Mexico, to be the representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Julian B. Baird, of Minnesota, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

Tom B. Coughran, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

A. Gilmore Flues, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Sumner G. Whittier, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1958

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 26:3: *"Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee."*

O Thou whose name is love and in whom we find that perfect love, which casteth out all fear, help us to meet our daily duties and difficulties with faith and fortitude.

Grant that in these strange and strenuous days we may never lose heart or hope.

Humbly we confess that we are frequently more conscious of our problems and perplexities than we are of Thy gracious providence and Thy peace which passeth all understanding.

We thank Thee for Thy servant, one of our colleagues, who now dwells with Thee in eternal blessedness. Give unto his bereaved family the consolations of Thy grace.

Thou didst not lose him in giving him to us. So we have not lost him by his return to Thee, for what is Thine is ours always.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## INVITATION TO MEMBERS TO DEBATE FOREIGN POLICY ON MONDAY, JANUARY 27

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the shape of United States foreign policy is a matter of vital importance to every Member of the Congress, to every person represented by us here, and, in fact, to all the peoples of the world.

America's standing in the world community is under constant challenge, and not only from the Communist countries. Long-term pressure on the United States as guardian of the Free World and leader in the struggle for peace has been enormously intensified by the success of Russian sputniks and ballistic missiles, and the apparent growing effectiveness of Communist diplomacy in many parts of the world.

Some of our best friends have added to the pressure. They look to the United States not only for armed might, but for energetic leadership in the policy field—for creativeness, ingenuity, positive new ideas, ability to adapt to new situations, to get out of the rut and back on the road.

In the House we debate foreign policy matters often, but in the context of considering specific pieces of legislation. With many of my colleagues, I believe that the House can profitably spend more time discussing the broad, overall aspects of foreign policy, as the other body so often does.

On next Monday afternoon, January 27, under special orders obtained by myself, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], we shall have 2 hours to discuss our foreign policy. We

cordially invite all Members to participate. Indeed, we want to get the ideas of everyone.

Countless questions can be raised. Among the most important, we think, are:

Should the United States not consider, with our allies, proposals for a troop disengagement in Middle Europe?

How effective are our military and economic assistance programs? Are we overemphasizing military aid? Is our economic assistance going for the right kinds of projects? Is Congress able properly to judge the worth of assistance programs in view of the "secret" label applied to the 80 percent of our aid program which is either military assistance or defense support?

Are we starving our most effective programs of technical assistance, while pouring more and more into military hardware that frequently offends those whose friendship we seek? Should we give greater attention to cultural and educational exchange programs with all nations?

What have we to offer that the Communists do not? Are we getting through to the people we want to reach?

My colleagues and I do not pretend to have all the answers to all these questions. But we hope through an exchange of ideas and discussion on the floor to develop a record that may lead to a new approach in foreign policy. Again I invite all Members on both sides of the aisle to join in our discussion Monday afternoon.

## PRICE SUPPORT ON WHEAT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced an emergency measure to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from slashing the price support on wheat 22 cents a bushel. This bill would simply maintain the Government support on wheat at $2 a bushel for the 1958 crop. Should Mr. Benson's price-cutting order on wheat as well as dairy products be successfully maintained, it will result in a drop of a quarter of a billion dollars in the upper Midwest region. The wheat farmers of this country have faithfully cut their production a tremendous amount throughout the past 5 or 6 years. Mr. Benson's reward now is to further slash the price on a much lower production figure. I submit that this is not an act of good faith on the part of the Secretary. This drastic cut which Mr. Benson is dictating will have a profound effect not only on the farmers but on the entire economy of this Nation. It is only wise and just, I believe, at a time when unemployment is extremely high that we maintain the purchasing power of farmers. To allow it to drop will only further compound this most serious problem.

## THE ROSE—NATIONAL FLOWER OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to make the rose the national flower of the United States. To mark the event every male Member of the House of Representatives received a single rose for his lapel and our lady Members received a rose corsage.

The United States is the only major Nation in the world without a national flower. The vast majority of Americans is partial to the rose. A Gallup public opinion poll indicated that the rose is favored over any other flower by a margin of 19 to 1.

The rose is the oldest flower known to man. Fossil remains of roses judged to be some 35 million years old have been found by geologists. The rose has been honored by civilizations since the dawn of recorded history and as long ago as 4000 B. C. the Greek poetess Sappho named it the "Queen of Flowers," a title which it still bears.

America today is believed to be the largest producer of roses in the world. Leading growers estimate that more than 40 million American gardeners grow and display roses each year. They also point out that four States—New York, Iowa, Georgia, and North Dakota—and the District of Columbia, already honor the rose as their official flower.

The rose has played an important part in human culture since ancient times. It is known in religion, art, literature, heraldry, and a host of other fields.

National Rose Week, inaugurated in 1954, is now an official annual event. Cities and towns all over the United States join in honoring the Queen of Flowers during this special observance.

I am introducing the bill at the request of Pennsylvania gardeners and rose lovers and I expect the bill to receive wide support from garden clubs, women's organizations, horticultural societies and rose lovers everywhere.

A vase of yellow roses was presented to the Speaker in honor of the Yellow Rose of Texas. Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has been presented with a vase of white roses. A vase of red roses were sent to Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower.

The text of my resolution follows:

Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States

Whereas the rose is universally regarded as a symbol of peace in a troubled world; and

Whereas the rose is internationally recognized as the badge of courage, loyalty and devotion; and

Whereas the rose is known to be the favorite of the American people by a margin of almost 20 to 1; and

Whereas several of the States of the Union already honor the rose as their official flower; and

Whereas the United States is the only major power in the world that lays claim to no national flower: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That the flower commonly known as the rose is hereby designated and adopted as the national flower of the United States, and the President is requested to declare such fact by proclamation.

## A NATIONAL LOTTERY WOULD END CONFUSION

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in view of the complete confusion that appears to exist here in the Nation's Capital, I don't blame our hard-pressed American taxpayers if they are finding it more and more difficult to understand what is going on here in Washington.

In answer to our taxpayers' plea for immediate tax relief, we offer inconsistent and incongruous statements and speeches which are enough to create more confusion than they would find in Times Square on New Year's Eve.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to illustrate each successive act of confusion which has placed our overburdened wage-earner in a state of total bewilderment.

Act of confusion No. 1: In hitting our taxpayers with a staggering peacetime spending budget of almost $74 billion, we destroyed all hopes for present and future tax relief. But we assured our taxpayers who are pleading for a tax cut that there will be no new taxes proposed.

Act of confusion No. 2: We added fuel to the fire by telling the workers in this country that because of the urgent need for the expenditures of additional billions of dollars for defense we might have to do some deficit spending. Although we know that deficit spending in the past has been one of the main causes for our devalued dollar, we reassure our taxpayers that this action would be better than raising taxes.

Act of confusion No. 3: Our Secretary of the Treasury tells our American taxpayers that because of the current business recession a tax cut is possible only if the recession deepens. This viewpoint adds to the perplexity because it does not conform with the ideas expressed by our former Secretary who opposed cutting taxes to brake a recession. Certainly a tax cut to the 4 million unemployed is no comfort. If anything, it is like tossing a punctured life-saving tube to a drowning man.

Act of confusion No. 4: The White House informs the people that it would rather have a budget deficit than ask for a tax increase if the recession worsens.

Act of confusion No. 5: Today, this Congress is asked to raise the national debt limit by $5 billion because of the necessary increase in defense spending. To the confused taxpayer we say: It is better at this time to raise the debt ceiling rather than to raise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, why all this confusion? We can avoid all of this perplexity and

solve all of our financial woes if we display enough courage and enact a national lottery bill.

A national lottery would provide $10 billion a year in additional revenue to our Government Treasury which would take care of all of our fiscal problems and at the same time ease the heavy unconscionable burden borne by our American taxpayers. How much longer are we going to confuse our taxpayers?

## TAXING INCOME OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight tonight, January 23, 1958, to file a report on the bill H. R. 10021, a bill to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## NATIONAL WOOL ACT

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 10049, to extend the National Wool Act for another 4-year period.

The National Wool Act of 1954 set up a goal for national security of 300 million pounds annual production of domestic shorn wool. Up to 70 percent of the funds from import duties are used to make incentive payments to wool producers, when the price level drops below the established incentive price.

Our domestic wool industry was in serious trouble at the time the Wool Act was passed.

Domestic wool production is a vital element of our defense posture. Its unsurpassed warmth, as well as its moisture absorbent qualities, flame resistance, and other characteristics which cannot be duplicated, make it essential in time of war.

The principal areas from which the United States imports its wool are Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and South Africa. All of these countries lie in the Southern Hemisphere. They are located from 6,000 to 11,000 miles from the United States, and highly vulnerable sea lanes must be used to transport the wool. The new Soviet submarine threat makes it more important to have a domestic supply of a vital commodity, such as wool, than at the time the Wool Act was passed.

At the time the Wool Act was passed, our sheep population had severely dropped 45 percent, from 49 million in 1949 to approximately 29 million in 1957. Yet, in spite of this serious drop in sheep population, wool tariff cuts had allowed foreign wools to capture the American markets, so domestic wool piled up in Government storehouses. By 1955 more than 160 million pounds of wool were under the control of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Under the Wool Act the CCC has been able to dispose of all its wool holdings, and the domestic wool industry has started to recuperate and lay the foundation for growing to the military defense target of 300 million pounds of domestic production. In the 35 States not drought-ridden production increased by 5.7 percent. However, in the 13 drought-ravaged States, production dropped 3 percent. The Nation is now virtually free of the drought. Consequently, a continuation of the incentive-payment program should bring a wool-production expansion in all regions of the country.

## RAISING THE DEBT LIMIT IS AN INVITATION TO SPEND MORE MONEY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just as a surplus of cash in one's pocket or in the bank tends toward unwise spending, so ever raising the limitation on Federal spending tends to loosen the Federal purse strings.

The Defense Department has unobligated $8.1 billion.

The echoes of the President's warning that, if wages and prices are increased and Federal spending continued at the present or an accelerated rate, we would go into a tailspin that would end in a disastrous depression, have not yet died away.

We are told that additional billions must be appropriated to meet the challenge of the sputnik—to provide other munitions of war, including more submarines, aircraft, missiles, anti-missile missiles—and the Congress will vote billions for those purposes because it has no adequate, accurate knowledge of just what is needed, hence must rely upon our experts.

All right, we can go along with requests for funds for necessary purposes, but there is no reason why sputnik should open the door for unlimited appropriations.

But one thing is sure, our natural and scientific resources being limited, and they are, we cannot avoid economic disaster—and that means not only a slackening of business, of production, an increase in unemployment, but in the end a lessening of our ability to provide the means to protect ourselves—if we grant every request for more money.

So it is that, when the President asks the Congress to increase the wages of Federal employees, to appropriate billions for worthy but not absolutely necessary projects, and to raise the debt limit so that we may borrow the money to do unnecessary things, I am compelled to vote against authorizing an increase in our national debt limitation.

We are now paying $7.5 billion annually in interest. Our national debt is larger than the national debt of all other countries.

One sound, sensible answer to our problem is to quit borrowing money in order to implement new, additional social reforms, to more wisely spend what we have.

It is not only absurd, but it is ridiculous that we are so lacking in common sense and sound business practices that the richest, the most productive nation in all the world must borrow money, pay $7.5 billion interest annually. And that in peacetime. Spenders can always find excuses for an ever-heavier burden upon the taxpayer.

The thing for us to do is to put our house in order; conduct our national affairs as the average thrifty, industrious American carries on his own business. Our national income is sufficient not only to insure our national security, insofar as money can do so, but, if wisely used, to enable us to maintain a sound domestic economy.

## COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] to recommit the bill (H. R. 9955) providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

The Clerk will again report the motion.

The Clerk reported the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 115, nays 275, answering "present" 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—115

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Dorn, S. C. | Minshall |
| Abernethy | Dowdy | Moulder |
| Adair | Fino | Murray |
| Alexander | Fisher | Neal |
| Alger | Flynt | Nimtz |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Fountain | Norblad |
| | George | O'Hara, Minn. |
| Andrews | Griffin | Patman |
| Ashmore | Gross | Poff |
| Aspinall | Gwinn | Polk |
| Avery | Haley | Robeson, Va. |
| Baring | Harden | Robsion, Ky. |
| Baumhart | Harrison, Nebr. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Beamer | Harrison, Va. | Scherer |
| Bentley | Harvey | Schwengel |
| Berry | Hays, Ohio | Scott, N. C. |
| Betts | Hemphill | Scrivner |
| Bosch | Henderson | Shuford |
| Bow | Hoeven | Siler |
| Bray | Hoffman | Simpson, Ill. |
| Broomfield | Jackson | Smith, Calif. |
| Brown, Ohio | Jensen | Smith, Kans. |
| Brownson | Johansen | Smith, Va. |
| Budge | Jonas | Springer |
| Byrd | Jones, Mo. | Tewes |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Kitchin | Thomas |
| Cannon | Knox | Thompson, La. |
| Cederberg | Krueger | Thomson, Wyo. |
| Chiperfield | Laird | Tuck |
| Church | Latham | Van Pelt |
| Collier | Lennon | Weaver |
| Colmer | McCulloch | Wharton |
| Cramer | McMillan | Whitener |
| Cretella | McVey | Whitten |
| Cunningham, Nebr. | Mack, Wash. | Williams, Miss. |
| | Mason | Willis |
| Dawson, Utah | Matthews | Wilson, Ind. |
| Dennison | Michel | Winstead |
| Derounian | Miller, Nebr. | Withrow |

NAYS—275

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Addonizio | Curtin | Hébert |
| Albert | Curtis, Mass. | Herlong |
| Allen, Calif. | Curtis, Mo. | Heselton |
| Allen, Ill. | Dague | Hess |
| Anderson, Mont. | Davis, Ga. | Hiestand |
| | Davis, Tenn. | Hill |
| Anfuso | Delaney | Hillings |
| Arends | Dellay | Holmes |
| Ashley | Dempsey | Holt |
| Auchincloss | Denton | Holtzman |
| Ayres | Devereux | Horan |
| Bailey | Diggs | Hosmer |
| Baker | Dingell | Huddleston |
| Baldwin | Dixon | Hull |
| Barrett | Dollinger | Hyde |
| Bass, N. H. | Donohue | Ikard |
| Bass, Tenn. | Dooley | James |
| Bates | Dorn, N. Y. | Jarman |
| Becker | Doyle | Jenkins |
| Beckworth | Durham | Jennings |
| Bennett, Fla. | Dwyer | Johnson |
| Bennett, Mich. | Eberharter | Jones, Ala. |
| Blatnik | Edmondson | Karsten |
| Blitch | Elliott | Kean |
| Boggs | Engle | Kearney |
| Boland | Evins | Kearns |
| Bolling | Fallon | Keating |
| Bolton | Farbstein | Kee |
| Bonner | Fascell | Keogh |
| Boykin | Feighan | Kilburn |
| Boyle | Fenton | Kilday |
| Breeding | Flood | Kilgore |
| Brooks, La. | Fogarty | King |
| Brooks, Tex. | Forand | Kirwan |
| Brown, Ga. | Ford | Kluczynski |
| Brown, Mo. | Forrester | Knutson |
| Broyhill | Frazier | Lafore |
| Burleson | Frelinghuysen | Landrum |
| Bush | Friedel | Lane |
| Byrne, Ill. | Fulton | Lankford |
| Byrne, Pa. | Garmatz | LeCompte |
| Canfield | Gary | Lesinski |
| Carrigg | Gathings | Libonati |
| Celler | Gavin | Long |
| Chamberlain | Glenn | Loser |
| Chelf | Gordon | McFall |
| Chenoweth | Granahan | McGovern |
| Christopher | Green, Oreg. | McIntire |
| Clark | Gregory | McIntosh |
| Clevenger | Griffiths | Machrowicz |
| Coad | Hagen | Madden |
| Coffin | Hale | Magnuson |
| Cooley | Halleck | Mahon |
| Corbett | Hardy | Mailliard |
| Coudert | Harris | Marshall |
| Cunningham, Iowa | Haskell | Martin |
| | Healey | May |
| Metcalf | Reece, Tenn. | Steed |
| Miller, Calif. | Reed | Sullivan |
| Miller, Md. | Rees, Kans. | Taber |
| Miller, N. Y. | Reuss | Talle |
| Mills | Rhodes, Ariz. | Taylor |
| Mitchell | Rhodes, Pa. | Teague, Calif. |
| Montoya | Riehlman | Teague, Tex. |
| Morano | Riley | Teller |
| Morgan | Rivers | Thompson, N. J. |
| Morris | Roberts | Thompson, Tex. |
| Moss | Robison, N. Y. | Thornberry |
| Multer | Rodino | Tollefson |
| Mumma | Rogers, Colo. | Trimble |
| Natcher | Rogers, Mass. | Udall |
| Nicholson | Rogers, Tex. | Ullman |
| Norrell | Roosevelt | Utt |
| O'Brien, Ill. | Rutherford | Vanik |
| O'Brien, N. Y. | Sadlak | Van Zandt |
| O'Hara, Ill. | Santangelo | Vinson |
| O'Neill | St. George | Vorys |
| Osmers | Saund | Vursell |
| Ostertag | Saylor | Watts |
| Patterson | Schenck | Westland |
| Pelley | Scott, Pa. | Widnall |
| Perkins | Scudder | Wier |
| Pfost | Seely-Brown | Wigglesworth |
| Philbin | Selden | Wilson, Calif. |
| Pilcher | Sheehan | Wolverton |
| Poage | Shelley | Wright |
| Porter | Sheppard | Yates |
| Powell | Sieminski | Young |
| Preston | Sikes | Younger |
| Price | Simpson, Pa. | Zablocki |
| Prouty | Sisk | Zelenko |
| Rains | Smith, Miss. | |
| Ray | Stauffer | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—37

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barden | Holland | Morrison |
| Belcher | Judd | Passman |
| Buckley | Kelly | Pillion |
| Burdick | Lipscomb | Rabaut |
| Carnahan | McCarthy | Radwan |
| Dawson, Ill. | McCormack | Rooney |
| Dies | McDonough | Spence |
| Grant | McGregor | Staggers |
| Gray | Macdonald | Wainwright |
| Green, Pa. | Mack, Ill. | Walter |
| Gubser | Meader | Williams, N. Y. |
| Hays, Ark. | Merrow | |
| Holifield | Moore | |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Moore against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mrs. Kelly against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Spence with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Meader.

Mr. BOLAND changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. McFALL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DAGUE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MACK of Washington changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 328, nays 71, answered "present" 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—328

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Addonizio | Derounian | Kee |
| Albert | Devereux | Keogh |
| Allen, Calif. | Diggs | Kilburn |
| Allen, Ill. | Dingell | Kilday |
| Anderson, Mont. | Dixon | Kilgore |
| | Dollinger | King |
| Anfuso | Donohue | Kirwan |
| Arends | Dooley | Kluczynski |
| Ashley | Dorn, N. Y. | Knox |
| Aspinall | Doyle | Knutson |
| Auchincloss | Durham | Lafore |
| Avery | Dwyer | Landrum |
| Ayres | Eberharter | Lane |
| Bailey | Edmondson | Lankford |
| Baker | Elliott | Latham |
| Baldwin | Engle | LeCompte |
| Barrett | Evins | Lesinski |
| Bass, N. H. | Fallon | Libonati |
| Bass, Tenn. | Farbstein | Lipscomb |
| Bates | Fascell | Long |
| Baumhart | Feighan | Loser |
| Becker | Fenton | McCulloch |
| Beckworth | Fino | McFall |
| Bennett, Fla. | Fisher | McGovern |
| Bennett, Mich. | Flood | McIntire |
| Bentley | Fogarty | McIntosh |
| Betts | Forand | Machrowicz |
| Blatnik | Ford | Mack, Ill. |
| Blitch | Forrester | Madden |
| Boggs | Fountain | Magnuson |
| Boland | Frazier | Mahon |
| Bolling | Frelinghuysen | Mailliard |
| Bolton | Friedel | Marshall |
| Bonner | Fulton | Martin |
| Bosch | Garmatz | May |
| Bow | Gary | Metcalf |
| Boykin | Gathings | Michel |
| Boyle | Gavin | Miller, Calif. |
| Brooks, La. | George | Miller, Md. |
| Brooks, Tex. | Glenn | Miller, N. Y. |
| Broomfield | Gordon | Mills |
| Brown, Ga. | Granahan | Minshall |
| Brown, Mo. | Gray | Mitchell |
| Brown, Ohio | Green, Oreg. | Montoya |
| Broyhill | Gregory | Morano |
| Budge | Griffin | Morgan |
| Burleson | Griffiths | Morris |
| Bush | Gubser | Moss |
| Byrd | Hagen | Moulder |
| Byrne, Ill. | Hale | Multer |
| Byrne, Pa. | Halleck | Mumma |
| Canfield | Hardy | Murray |
| Carrigg | Harris | Natcher |
| Cederberg | Haskell | Nicholson |
| Celler | Hays, Ark. | Norblad |
| Chamberlain | Hays, Ohio | Norrell |
| Chelf | Healey | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Chenoweth | Hébert | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Chiperfield | Herlong | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Christopher | Heselton | O'Hara, Minn. |
| Clark | Hess | O'Neill |
| Clevenger | Hill | Osmers |
| Coad | Hillings | Ostertag |
| Coffin | Hoeven | Patman |
| Collier | Holifield | Patterson |
| Cooley | Holmes | Pelly |
| Corbett | Holtzman | Perkins |
| Coudert | Horan | Pfost |
| Cramer | Hosmer | Philbin |
| Cretella | Huddleston | Pilcher |
| Cunningham, Iowa | Hull | Poage |
| | Hyde | Polk |
| Curtin | Ikard | Porter |
| Curtis, Mass. | Jackson | Powell |
| Curtis, Mo. | James | Preston |
| Dague | Jarman | Price |
| Davis, Ga. | Jenkins | Prouty |
| Davis, Tenn. | Jennings | Rains |
| Dawson, Ill. | Johnson | Ray |
| Dawson, Utah | Jones, Ala. | Reece, Tenn. |
| Delaney | Karsten | Reed |
| Dellay | Kean | Rees, Kans. |
| Dempsey | Kearney | Reuss |
| Dennison | Kearns | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Denton | Keating | Rhodes, Pa. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Riehlman | Sheppard | Trimble |
| Riley | Sieminski | Udall |
| Rivers | Sikes | Ullman |
| Roberts | Simpson, Pa. | Vanik |
| Robison, N. Y. | Sisk | Van Zandt |
| Robsion, Ky. | Smith, Miss. | Vinson |
| Rodino | Smith, Va. | Vorys |
| Rogers, Colo. | Staggers | Vursell |
| Rogers, Fla. | Stauffer | Walter |
| Rogers, Mass. | Steed | Watts |
| Roosevelt | Sullivan | Westland |
| Sadlak | Taber | Whitener |
| Santangelo | Taile | Widnall |
| St. George | Taylor | Wier |
| Saund | Teague, Calif. | Wigglesworth |
| Saylor | Teague, Tex. | Willis |
| Schenck | Teller | Wilson, Calif. |
| Scherer | Tewes | Withrow |
| Scott, Pa. | Thomas | Wolverton |
| Scrivner | Thompson, La. | Wright |
| Scudder | Thompson, N. J. | Yates |
| Seely-Brown | Thompson, Tex. | Young |
| Selden | Thomson, Wyo. | Younger |
| Sheehan | Thornberry | Zablocki |
| Shelley | Tollefson | Zelenko |

NAYS—71

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Gwinn | Neal |
| Abernethy | Haley | Nimtz |
| Adair | Harden | Poff |
| Alexander | Harrison, Nebr. | Robeson, Va. |
| Alger | Harrison, Va. | Rogers, Tex. |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Harvey | Rutherford |
| Andrews | Hemphill | Schwengel |
| Ashmore | Henderson | Scott, N. C. |
| Baring | Hiestand | Shuford |
| Beamer | Hoffman | Siler |
| Berry | Holt | Simpson, Ill. |
| Bray | Jensen | Smith, Calif. |
| Breeding | Johansen | Smith, Kans. |
| Brownson | Jonas | Springer |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jones, Mo. | Tuck |
| Cannon | Kitchin | Utt |
| Church | Krueger | Van Pelt |
| Colmer | Laird | Weaver |
| Cunningham, Nebr. | Lennon | Wharton |
| Dorn, S. C. | McMillan | Whitten |
| Dowdy | McVey | Williams, Miss. |
| Flynt | Mack, Wash. | Wilson, Ind. |
| Gross | Mason | Winstead |
| | Matthews | |
| | Miller, Nebr. | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—28

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barden | Kelly | Passman |
| Belcher | McCarthy | Pillion |
| Buckley | McCormack | Rabaut |
| Burdick | McDonough | Radwan |
| Carnahan | McGregor | Rooney |
| Dies | Macdonald | Spence |
| Grant | Meader | Wainwright |
| Green, Pa. | Merrow | Williams, N. Y. |
| Holland | Moore | |
| Judd | Morrison | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr Rooney for, with Mr. Passman against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Dies against.

Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Barden against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Spence with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Grant with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to an increase of $5 billion in the public debt limit today just as I was when a similar measure was approved over 2 years ago.

The whole purpose of limiting our national debt is so that we can control our spending and the responsibility for spending properly rests with the Congress, not with the executive branch of the Government. There can be no control or restraint on spending as long as we are content to make borrowing easier.

Such a debt extension, I feel, should not be granted—

First. Until all agencies of Government are directed to freeze any and all unobligated funds, as of the date, so that a close reexamination of expenditure requirements can be made. A good example of what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the $3.1 billion of unobligated funds for foreign-aid spending.

Second. Until we have evidence of a realistic dollar saving reorganization of the Defense Department which now is spending more than half of each tax dollar.

Sputnik is serious, but we should keep our equilibrium and not lose our heads. Going further into debt before it is necessary is only giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire if the bells in the Old House Office Building were in working order during rollcall No. 5, on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not there, so he cannot say.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I know that I did not hear them, and I know two other Members did not hear them. I should like to announce at this time that had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on General Education have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 316)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

There are submitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress, recommendations for amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act and for additional legislation to provide greater protections for the rights of individual workers, the public, and management and unions, in labor-management relations.

I

No labor-management relations legislative program today can ignore the disclosures of corruption, racketeering and abuse of trust and power in the labor-management field. Many of these disclosures have been made in Congressional hearings and in investigations by grand juries and local law enforcement agencies. In the various States vigilant attention by law enforcement officials, and public interest in the effective enforcement of existing laws against criminal activity, are doing much to eliminate many of the evils and abuses which have occurred. Union officials—most of whom are decent, honest Americans—are also doing much to eliminate the few in the ranks of organized labor who are corrupt. However, the importance to American workers and to the public of preventing the impairment of the individual rights of employees and the fact that voluntary action is inadequate in this respect have become increasingly evident. In order to protect the basic rights of the individual worker and to maintain the integrity of trade unionism itself, action on the part of the Government is needed.

The American public is in need of reassurance:

1. That the funds which are set aside for the benefit of working men and women in health, welfare and pension plans are accounted for.

2. That the moneys which are contributed by workers to union treasuries are being used solely to advance their welfare.

3. That organizations in which working people associate together voluntarily to improve their status through collective action will be administered in such fashion as to reflect their will.

4. That working people are more fully protected from dealings between representatives of labor and management which have the effect of preventing the full exercise of their rights to organize and bargain collectively.

5. That the public is protected against unfair labor and management practices within the collective bargaining relationship which give rise to the exercise of coercive power by one as against the other tending to impede the peaceful development of that relationship, or which infringe the legitimate rights of innocent third parties.

The Secretary of Labor has recommended to me a comprehensive program of legislation which, if enacted, will, I believe, give that reassurance to the American public. His recommendations constitute the program of this administration in the labor-management field,

and the administration urges the Congress to enact legislation:

1. To require the registration and detailed annual reporting to the Department of Labor, with appropriate disclosure, of all plans which provide health, welfare or pension benefits to working men and women, whether administered by employers, by unions, or jointly by both. The administration made specific legislative recommendations in this respect in 1956 and 1957.

2. To require:

(a) That all labor organizations, having members employed in industries affecting commerce or which receive benefits of tax exemption under the Internal Revenue Code, including regional and local conferences and councils, shall:

(1) File with the Department of Labor detailed annual financial reports, which shall be available for public examination.

(2) Maintain proper financial books and records open to the scrutiny of all of their members.

(b) That officers of such labor organizations who handle union funds be held to the highest degree of responsibility for the funds committed to their care by union members; and that the members of such organization be given an unequivocal right to sue in Federal or State courts to enforce these responsibilities. This would not supersede existing State statutes or judicial remedies.

3. To require that all labor organizations:

(a) File annually with the Department of Labor detailed information as to their constitutions, bylaws, and organizational structure and procedures.

(b) Show by appropriate reporting that their members have the right and opportunity to elect and have elected at intervals of not more than 4 years their local officers directly by secret ballot and their national officers either directly by secret ballot or through delegate bodies elected directly by the membership by secret ballot, with due notice of any election being given to the members. The Department of Labor would be authorized to make full public disclosure of these reports.

4. To require:

(a) That all employers report to the Department of Labor all financial dealings with labor organizations or their representatives either directly or through a third party, but exempting those employer payments specifically authorized by law or reported under other requirements of law; to require that all labor organizations and representatives of labor organizations report to the Department of Labor all such financial dealings with employers either directly or through a third party; and to authorize the Department of Labor to make full public disclosure of these reports.

(b) To prohibit by the application of appropriate civil and criminal laws financial dealings between employers and labor unions which operate to impair the rights of working people to organize, to select their bargaining representative, or effectively to bargain collectively; specifically to amend the Taft-Hartley Act to prohibit payments made to employee representatives by employer agents or representatives, as well as those made directly by employers, except as authorized by law; to cover employer payments to an employee representative other than a representative of his employees; to prohibit payments over and above payments for regular job duties made by an employer, his agent, or representative to an employee or group or committee of employees to influence other employees in the exercise of their right of self-organization or the selection of a bargaining representative; and to make it clear that employer payments to trust funds for apprenticeship and training purposes are not prohibited.

5. For effective administration of this program of reporting and disclosure of general union funds, conflicts of interest, union organization and structure, and also the program for reporting and disclosure of welfare and pension plans, the administration recommends that there be created in the Department of Labor a Commissioner of Labor Reports, who would be responsible to the Secretary for the performance of duties under the new legislation. The Commissioner should be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. In the administration of these reporting requirements the Commissioner of Labor Reports would be empowered through authority derived from the Secretary of Labor to:

(a) Make full public disclosure of all information contained in the reports;

(b) Seek injunctions against violations;

(c) Investigate reports of violations of the reporting requirements, including the accuracy of reports filed, and charges that union election or procedural practices are not in accordance with the reporting requirements; and

(d) Issue subpenas for the production of all appropriate books and records and compel testimony by witnesses.

6. In order to insure the effective enforcement of this program, the administration recommends that the following criminal and administrative sanctions be enacted into law:

a. Criminal:

(1) The embezzlement of general union funds, false statements or entries, or willful destruction of books should be made punishable as a felony.

(2) The Criminal Code provisions relating to filing of false information should be made specifically applicable to these reports.

(3) The failure of an employer or a union to file required reports should be made a misdemeanor.

(4) A new bribery section should be added to the Criminal Code making it a felony for an employer, or his agent or representative, or any union official or representative, to make or receive any payments to influence improperly the actions of the other in labor-management matters. To facilitate prosecutions of violations of this section, there should be included a provision for immunity to witnesses.

b. Administrative:

At the present time any labor organization covered by the National Labor Relations Act is denied access to its processes if it fails to file financial and organizational reports. This should be continued. In addition subject to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, including judicial review, for the willful failure to file true and proper reports the administration recommends that:

(1) All labor organizations and employers be denied all rights or privileges available to them under Federal labor-management relations laws.

(2) All labor organizations be liable to revocation of any outstanding certification as bargaining representative under any law of the United States.

(3) All labor organizations be liable to the forfeiture for an appropriate period of tax exemptions available to them under the Internal Revenue Code.

7. Certain provisions of the National Labor Relations Act afford opportunity for labor or management to coerce the other, often with detrimental effect on individual employees, innocent third parties, and the general public. The administration recommends that the ambiguities and inequities that exist in these provisions be removed by amending them as follows:

(a) Amend the secondary boycott provisions of the act to make it clear that they prevent—

Direct coercion of an employer to cease doing business with another;

Coercion of employers by inducement or encouragement of individual employees to refuse to perform services;

Coercion of secondary employers who do not come within the act's definition of "employer"; and

Coercion of employers to enter into or to enforce agreements to cease using the products of, or to cease doing business with, another person.

To further amend the secondary boycott provisions to make it clear that they do not prevent—

Activity against a secondary employer who is performing "farmed out" work in behalf of a struck employer; or

Activity against secondary employers engaged in work on a construction project with the primary employer.

(b) Amend the act to make it an unfair labor practice for a union, by picketing, to coerce an employer to recognize it as the bargaining representative of his employees or his employees to accept or designate it as their representative where—

The employer has recognized in accordance with law another labor organization;

The employees, within the last preceding 12 months, have rejected the union in a representative election; or

It is otherwise clear that the employees do not desire the union as their bargaining representative.

(c) Amend the act to eliminate the statutory prohibition which bars economic strikers who are not entitled to reinstatement from voting in representation elections.

II

In addition to the above the administration recommends that several other changes be made in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. Some of

these changes have been proposed before, some are new, but all are intended to strengthen and improve the act where experience has shown that correction is needed. These proposals are as follows:

1. Amend the act to eliminate the jurisdictional gap referred to in recent Supreme Court decisions by authorizing the States to act with respect to matters over which the National Labor Relations Board declines to assert jurisdiction.

2. Amend the act to authorize the Board, under appropriate circumstances, to certify as bargaining representatives, without a prior election, unions acting in behalf of employees primarily engaged in the building and construction industry.

3. In view of the enactment of the Communist Control Act of 1954, amend the act to eliminate the provision requiring the filing of non-Communist affidavits by officers of unions seeking to use the act's processes.

4. Amend the act so that parties to a valid collective bargaining agreement may not be required to negotiate during the life of the agreement unless it provides for reopening or the parties mutually agree to its being reopened.

5. Amend the act to make it clear that when the Office of the General Counsel becomes vacant the President may designate some other officer or employee to serve as Acting General Counsel during the vacancy.

These legislative recommendations are designed to benefit and protect the welfare of American workers and the general public, to curb abuses, and to provide greater harmony and stability in labor-management relations. They take into consideration the fundamental principle that an effective right to organize and bargain collectively is an essential part of this Nation's free and democratic society.

I urge that the Congress give speedy consideration to these proposals.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 23, 1958.*

---

## SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL—1958

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10146) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10146, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] had remaining 1 hour and 47 minutes; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] had remaining 2 hours and 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, last summer this House reduced appropriations for our own military programs by $2½ billion. It also reduced the military programs for our allies by three-quarters of a billion dollars or thereabouts.

These reductions, it will be recalled, were made despite the opposition of the President, of the Secretary of Defense, of the Chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and of the Secretary of State. The atmosphere has now changed.

The country is alerted to the growing danger which confronts us, and the Congress will of course respond to the demand for effective action.

### THE DANGER CONFRONTING AMERICA

To play down that danger is, in my judgment, unwise. The people ought to have the facts. But, Mr. Chairman, to paint a false picture of weakness and disunity in America is, in my judgment, highly dangerous, and a disservice to the Free World. There has been far too much of this.

It tends to shake the confidence of our allies. It tends to undermine the courage of neutral nations. It plays directly into the hands of the Kremlin. It tends to invite the catastrophe which the world seeks to avoid.

What is needed, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, is less hysteria, cooler appraisal of the facts; and, above all, insofar as it is humanly possible, a united front regardless of political affiliation, in the interest of national security and world peace.

In principle, Mr. Chairman, that united front ought to include the administration, the Congress, the press, and the people.

### OUR MILITARY POWER

During recent years we have built tremendous military power in this country of ours. It is greater today than it has been at any time in our history. It is increasing steadily. It is in addition to the military power of our allies.

President Eisenhower, with his vast and successful military experience, in his message on the state of the Union here on January 9, stated to the entire world that—

> "As of today" we have the necessary power to "present to any potential attacker who would unleash war upon the world the prospect of virtual annihilation for his country."

Then he added:

> Every informed government knows this. It is no secret.

Mr. Chairman, the world should know that this is the fact. It should also know that as long as present conditions prevail we intend to retain that position, cost what it may.

Given that power, we can hope to find the roads that lead to world peace. Without it, we cannot hope to do so.

Mr. Chairman, the danger which confronts us is not so much a danger of today as a danger of tomorrow. United action is called for at this time, however, because what we do or do not do today will determine our position tomorrow.

### BALLISTIC MISSILES

Recent developments have focused the attention of the world on the scientific and technological accomplishments of the Communist Government of Russia.

They have made clear the vital importance of stepping up some of our military programs, particularly in the field of ballistic missiles.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend expert knowledge in the ballistic-missile field.

I have lived closely, however, now for years with the activities of the Department of Defense.

I have recently visited with other Members of this Committee the principal production and test facilities in this field from coast to coast, as well as the Air Force ballistic missile headquarters on the west coast, the Army missile agency at the Redstone Arsenal in Alabama, and the missile test range at Cape Canaveral in Florida.

Along with my colleagues, I have had briefings in this field by top civilian and military officials both in connection with the trip and in connection with this bill.

I have learned enough to know, Mr. Chairman, that much of what the public has read and listened to in the last 3 months has been greatly exaggerated, unwarranted by the facts, politically motivated and, in my judgment, harmful to our position in the world.

The President also said, and I quote:

> At the moment the concensus of opinion is that we are probably somewhat behind the Soviets in some areas of long-range ballistic missile development. But—

He adds—

> it is my conviction based on close study of all relevant intelligence, with the best information that scientists can bring to me, that if we make the necessary effort we will have the missiles in the needed quantity and in time to sustain and strengthen the deterrent power of our increasingly efficient bombers.

The necessary effort must and will be made.

Whatever our position at the moment may be, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, it is well to assume as a basis of policy that we are not ahead in this race. That assumption carries with it the best possible assurance that no stone will be left unturned in securing the necessary quantity and types of missiles at the earliest possible moment.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that, personally, I am very much encouraged by what I have seen and heard during the last few months.

If we are not further ahead at this time, the main reason, in my judgment, has been very simply stated by the Director of the Development Operations Division of the Redstone Arsenal, probably our top expert in this field, Dr.

Wernher von Braun, when he said on November 10 last year—and I know that many of you are familiar with the quotation:

> The main reason is that we had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. These 6 years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, are irretrievably lost. Our dilemma is not due to the fact that we are not working hard enough now, but that we did not work hard enough during the first 6 years.

His conclusion is concurred in by Dr. Edward H. Teller, who developed the hydrogen bomb. On November 25, 1957, he said:

> In 1946, right after the end of the war, we could have said let us develop ballistic missiles. Well, we did go into the development of ballistic missiles, but at an exceedingly slow and small rate * * * years later we * * * determined to start a very vigorous program on the guided missile, on the ballistic missile. * * * It has been an excellent and excellently managed program but it came too late. The Russians have started on their ballistic missile program, from all we know, right after the war, and they kept at it.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to a table appearing on page 370 of the hearings, showing the amounts made available in this field in each and every fiscal year from 1945 to 1958, inclusive, which under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD:

*Department of Defense, obligational programs for missile systems,[1] fiscal years 1947–59*

[In millions of dollars]

| | IRBM and ICBM program | Long-range surface-to-surface missile program | Surface-to-surface missile program | Grand total, all missile programs |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1946 and prior | (2) | 7 | 19 | 70 |
| Fiscal year 1947 | (2) | 6 | 20 | 58 |
| Fiscal year 1948 | (2) | 10 | 36 | 81 |
| Fiscal year 1949 | (2) | 12 | 45 | 98 |
| Fiscal year 1950 | | 16 | 65 | 134 |
| Fiscal year 1951 | 0.5 | 70 | 186 | 784 |
| Fiscal year 1952 | .8 | 103 | 240 | 1,058 |
| Fiscal year 1953 | 3 | 179 | 406 | 1,166 |
| Fiscal year 1954 | 14 | 213 | 350 | 1,067 |
| Fiscal year 1955 | 161 | 330 | 559 | 1,470 |
| Fiscal year 1956 | 515 | 519 | 902 | 2,270 |
| Fiscal year 1957 | 1,365 | 1,587 | 1,908 | 4,470 |
| Fiscal year 1958 (preliminary total) | 2,070 | 2,248 | 2,600 | 5,060 |
| Funds available | (1,387) | (1,565) | (1,980) | (4,377) |
| Supplemental appropriation request | (683) | (683) | (683) | (683) |
| Fiscal year 1959 (projected) [3] | 1,941 | 2,086 | 2,610 | 5,729 |

[1] Program data contained in this table cover the developmental and capital costs involved in missile programs, i. e., the cost of bringing missile systems to an operational status plus the costs of procuring missiles for operational purposes. These figures include all procurement, construction and research and development funds directly associated with missile programs. These figures do not include military pay, operation and maintenance costs for operational missile units and sites and include only those shipbuilding and aircraft costs directly associated with providing missile capability.

[2] Excludes $2.3 million programed in fiscal year 1946–49 for the Air Force MX–774 ballistic missile research program, which was a procursor to the Atlas ICBM.

[3] Based on fiscal year 1959 budget request. Does not include Advanced Research Projects Agency programs.

NOTE.—Each successive classification is contained within the broader classification in the following column.

You will note that the figures support the foregoing conclusion.

From fiscal 1945 to 1953 the total made available for the entire period amounted to about $6.6 million. In each and every year since that time there has been substantial increase until in the fiscal year 1958 the total amounted to just over $2 billion.

Despite a slow start, Mr. Chairman, we have made tremendous progress since fiscal 1954.

For more than 2 years we have had what Dr. Von Braun characterizes as "an all-out crash program difficult to substantially accelerate."

Real acceleration is now possible, largely due to very recent scientific breakthroughs and technological developments.

Only recently we have seen the Air Force missiles Thor and Jupiter ordered into production for operational use. We have also seen the Navy Polaris program advanced some 27 months.

We are confronted by a tough job, Mr. Chairman, a tough job of vital importance, but it can and will be done.

SLASH IN 1958 APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the action taken by the Congress last summer, the action which resulted in a reduction in our military appropriations to the extent of $2½ billion, of which over $800 million were taken out of "no-year" funds.

The impact of that action, Mr. Chairman, is not spelled out in detail in these hearings, which obviously deal with only a very few items in the defense picture.

Even if we look only at the few items carried in this bill, however, Mr. Chairman, it will be noted that the record indicates that as the result of the action taken, the Navy lost not only a seaplane tender but a guided-missile frigate to which it attached great importance.

It lost among other things some $44,317,000 in ordnance for guided missiles.

It states that the Navy canceled the Triton missile toward the end of the summer, a very promising missile as a follow-on to the Regulus II missile, because of lack of funds. It also appears that the Navy has borrowed substantially to help out its Polaris program from such programs as the Tartar program, the Talos program, and other programs of equal urgency, and that it is imperative to repay the amounts borrowed out of the bill now under consideration lest those programs be badly crippled.

Mr. Chairman, I do not subscribe to what has been said in regard to excess funds. It is absolutely clear to my mind from the record, first, that the unobligated balance which is to be carried over into fiscal 1959 will, as of June 30th next, amount to some $3 billion less than the balance carried over the year before into fiscal 1958.

It is equally clear that ever cent of the total, including the amount carried in this bill, will, on June 30, 1958, be legally committed or earmarked and required for items to finish specific projects such as ships, aircraft, and construction, which are now actually under way.

The $900 million which has been referred to is a part of this picture.

Under our present system of financing, unless funding in full is put into effect by earmarking the funds to cover the entire cost of a project, the project just does not start.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I am a little bit shocked at the gentleman's statement that he does not believe the Defense Department has funds that are excess to the fiscal year 1958 when the testimony, which is printed and which is quoted in the committee report, shows very clearly, for example, in aircraft and related procurement, that there are $569 million that are not used, and Secretary McNeil says that those funds could be transferred to the necessary programs and the supplementary budget request could be reduced by those sums. Of course, Congress would have to approve those transfers. I think the gentleman and all members of the subcommittee will be compelled to agree that the funds provided last year are not all being utilized and that there are excess funds that will not be used until the new fiscal year and they are being applied to the 1959 budget. That is so clear and noncontroversial, I regret to see my friend cloud the issue. I hope he does not.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In reply to my good friend from Texas, I will say that the statement he has just made could be made in any fiscal year under our present requirements for the full funding of our long-range programs. His statement is limited to the fiscal year 1958. In other words, it ends on June 30, 1958. But, we have obligations for ships, for all sorts of long-lead items, and there must be money over and above that to be used in fiscal 1958 or in any fiscal year under our present policy.

Mr. MAHON. It is clear we have to have large unobligated balances, but by our action last year we reduced somewhat the large unobligated balances.

But the testimony clearly shows that while we will still have a large unobligated balance, and much of it is required, there is at least $889 million, according to Secretary McNeil—and I could read that statement from his testimony—of funds which are not required for the fiscal year 1958 and would not have been requested for the fiscal year

1958 had it been known that they would not have been required.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. They may not be required for fiscal year 1958 expenditure but they are required in the fiscal year 1958.

Mr. MAHON. I think that is not a correct statement.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sorry to disagree with my good friend, and I would like to conclude this aspect of my statement by quoting from Assistant Secretary McNeil, at page 31 of the hearings.

He gives the total unobligated funds as of June 30, 1958, and indicates that about two-thirds of these funds will be legally committed as of that date. Then he goes on to say:

The balance is reserved and will be committed after the first of the year for items to finish specific projects—ships, aircraft, and construction that is under way. Unless funds are available and reserved to complete approved programs and items, we get in the position of partial financing and installment buying, which is bad.

I know that my chairman does not believe in installment buying or partial financing.

Mr. MAHON. No. But if the gentleman will yield further, there is a key word there. These are funds which are not required. They are being reserved to apply to the next year, the fiscal year 1959 budget. You might say, maybe we should give the services $10 billion and they could plan for the use of it and reserve it for the fiscal year 1959 or the fiscal year 1960 and thereafter. But the implication of Mr. McNeil's testimony is so clear; and when we get back into the House I shall ask for permission to revise and extend my remarks and put his statement in the RECORD at this point.

In order to make my point clearer and having received unanimous consent to do so, I insert in the RECORD a statement made by Assistant Secretary of Defense McNeil before the committee on January 15, and which will be found on page 315 of the printed hearings as follows:

On the basis of the planned obligations against currently available fund resources—and excluding for the moment the pending supplemental—we would expect to have a total unobligated balance of $7.8 billion to be carried over into fiscal year 1959. This unobligated balance of $7.8 billion, including reimbursements to be received subsequent to June 30, 1958, from orders on hand as of that date, is earmarked for the completion of programs already under way or approved by the Congress or already applied as a credit to the fiscal year 1959 request. The amounts applied as a credit to the fiscal year 1959 requests are $569 million in the case of the Air Force, $205 million in the case of the Army, and $125 million in the case of the Marine Corps.

The above quote makes clear the point that the Department of Defense has on hand the large sums stated during 1958 which will not be used in 1958. They are excess to 1958 but they are being used as a credit on the 1959 request. If Congress desired, most of these excess funds could be applied to the supplemental bill. This would, of course, require an increase in the 1959 budget. No one in the Pentagon, in my opinion, will challenge this statement.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the point that the gentleman from Massachusetts and our distinguished chairman were discussing, I refer to the testimony in the hearings at page 332. While it applies to this request, it certainly applies to the preceding one. At that time I pointed out to Mr. McNeil, who was the witness, that we were going to have more than $1,280,000,000 in carryover funds marked "unobligated"; so why, then, was it necessary to have a supplemental? And to that Mr. McNeil replied:

In the first place, two-thirds of the unobligated balances are committed. These funds cover items for which procurement directives have been issued, and even though we cannot record the transactions as legal obligations, the procurement is in process. We would not in any case transfer those funds from one account to another under such conditions.

If that is the situation so that we need a supplemental bill or money at this time, it would certainly apply to last year also, would it not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I assume it would—the present system may be right, it may be wrong, but as long as it is in effect, we must have funds available and reserved to complete approved programs and items now under way, as Secretary McNeil expresses it.

THE BILL UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mr. Chairman, more specifically in respect to the bill, it will be found that it carries a total of $1,260,000,000 in new funds plus about $150 million in transfer authority.

The fiscal 1959 bill, the consideration of which is to start almost immediately, requests a further increase of from $2.5 to $3 billion in various high-priority areas and contemplates an estimated expenditure overall in the missile program of $5,729,000,000.

Broadly speaking, this bill calls for the acceleration of work in five vital areas.

There is $218.6 million to accelerate the Strategic Air Command's alert and dispersal programs and the tanker redeployment base program.

There is $334 million to accelerate three Air Force ballistic-missile programs, the Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter.

There is $350 million to accelerate one Navy ballistic-missile program, the Polaris.

There is $358 million to accelerate the work on the ballistic-missile detection system and essential development of SAGE.

The bill also provides for the transfer of $10 million and other available funds to permit a new agency, the Advanced Research Projects Agency in the Department of Defense, to take complete control of and develop and accelerate as rapidly as possible all projects in the antimissile missile field, in the outer space field, and such other projects as may be subsequently turned over to this Agency.

There are transfers provided of $100 million to the President's Emergency Fund, of $20 million to accelerate the Redstone follow-on solid propellant missile and of $20 million to accelerate the Army "second generation" divisional and corps-type missiles.

Essentially, Mr. Chairman, this bill is the first installment of the 1959 budget. It is made now to permit acceleration in high priority areas, an acceleration which is largely possible as a result of technological progress of very recent date.

It is made fundamentally to purchase 6 months of precious time.

To defeat the bill would simply be to throw that time away.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary McElroy, in whom I have the greatest confidence, has told your committee that in his judgment as of the date of his testimony, which was just about 2 weeks ago, the amount carried in this supplemental bill is sufficient.

He has also indicated that there are various further items under immediate and detailed consideration by the Department, and that he will not hesitate to come here at any moment to ask for the acceleration of further items when and if it appears that it is desirable to do so.

I know the Congress will cooperate in every way with any such submission by giving it immediate consideration.

CONCLUSION

The dollars and cents involved here, Mr. Chairman, are not as important as usual. If the items were not here they would be before us in the big bill for fiscal 1959. There will be ample time in connection with the detailed consideration of that bill to make any necessary adjustments. From the taxpayer's viewpoint it should make little or no difference.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will pass and I hope that it will pass unanimously, as an indication to the world of our unanimous determination to meet any challenge which may be presented by the Communist Government of Russia in its search for world domination.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, eventual passage of the supplemental defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1958, we can predict with certainty will meet with approval of all of us, concerned with the acceleration and improvement of our national defense.

Its approval by the Congress will mark the end of the somewhat casual, leisurely pace which characterized progress in some aspects of our defenses, particularly in the field of missiles, rocketry and interplanetary research. It should give our people a renewed feeling of assurance and we hope, pride that we are not content to be second rate in comparison with any other nation.

It is highly commendable that the funds asked in this bill are really an advance installment on our defense budget for 1959. Making this money available to the Department of Defense will speed vital, high-priority defense projects, which could have been delayed for months, or possibly a year.

The commendation is due to the far-seeing Members of Congress who saw and proposed this shortcut.

Personally, this so-called supplemental defense appropriation bill is of immense satisfaction. It is indicative of the status, prestige and growing importance of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and the Redstone Arsenal, which are located at Huntsville, Ala. The Redstone Arsenal has a crucial, life-or-death role in our national defense and it already has made notable advances.

When it was assigned to rocket and missile development in 1949, Redstone Arsenal was given one of the greatest scientific challenges of our age.

That its skilled and dedicated personnel have met the enormous tests given it is readily evident, for Nike, Honest John, Hermes, Corporal, Redstone, and Jupiter are already historic names, associated closely with the Huntsville facility.

Redstone Arsenal is the control center for the Army's activities in the guided-missile and rocket-weapons field. Its objective is not only to do the basic research and development, but to train the personnel who will maintain and use these weapons.

The Redstone really is an intellectual powerhouse, which generates activity around the country. Missiles are not manufactured there, but only designed, developed, and tested. After a project is fully developed, it is given to private industry for actual manufacture, using an amazing number of materials and engaging the brains and brawn of thousands of workers in many industries.

Passage of this bill asking advance funds for missiles and rockets development not only will aid national morale, but certainly will have a tonic effect on the 15,000 or so employees of Redstone Arsenal in giving them another assurance that their efforts are not only vital to all of us but also appreciated.

The outstanding scientists and the highly competent managers of the Redstone Arsenal can take this Congressional action as personal applause for their fine accomplishments.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I listened very attentatively to the comments of my colleague who just completed his presentation. As a result of his discussion, I think there are some comments that I might make which would have a clarifying effect. For example, in discussing the reductions made in the fiscal year 1958 budget he referred to the cut of $70 million in shipbuilding and conversion, Navy. The committee reduction was $70 million, including the conversion of a seaplane tender for the P6M seaplane which had not been flown successfully then and has not been successfully flown to this date. Second, to make up the remainder of the reduction, the Navy chose to defer a DLG, that is, the guided-missile frigate, rather than some other ship of lesser priority or use of unobligated balance.

As a result of this decision, the Navy now has $58 million uncommitted which it will apply in the fiscal year 1959 budget for the procurement of electronic equipment.

The $58 million which the Navy chose to withhold from the fiscal year 1958 program and apply to the fiscal year 1959 program exceeds the total estimated cost of the DLG deferred by the Navy.

Furthermore, with reference in general to the reductions that were made, there was not one man from either side of the aisle who sits on our committee and who was present at the hearings who was not told by the then Secretary of the Treasury that while it was a good budget, it could be cut and that it was within the purview of the Congress whose privilege it was to do so.

Prior to that time, throughout the press of the entire country, he had been quoted as saying that the budget ought to be cut or we might suffer a so-called hair-curling episode. I listened very attentively to the comments of my colleague about cooperation and what should be done by the Congress. I assume his purpose was to convey to all of us the expression of a great spirit of cooperation and that we should not become involved in political controversy which would mislead some of our associates throughout the other portions of the world. I think that was a very splendid and constructive admonishment. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that he should take that portion of his speech and send it to Sherman Adams.

Mr. Chairman, the President invited Congress to cut the budget.

When Congress did cut the budget, the President cut it further by withholding funds. For example, Congress cut the Air Force nonballistic missile program $75 million, but the Air Force cut it $100 million or $25 million more than Congress did.

The Navy has not been able to place three of the nuclear guided missiles submarines funded in fiscal year 1958 under construction principally due to the expenditure limitations placed on the Navy by the President.

Now, with reference to the ordnance appropriation mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. Committee action last year was based on use of unobligated balances and increased MDAP reimbursements. The committee used as a basis for their action the testimony of the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance. The committee report on this point is quite clear, and is as follows:

> When the committee believes that some reduction can be made in the conventional ammunition programs including ammunition support funds, the reduction is primarily based on the unobligated balances available in this appropriation item including MDAP reimbursements and the history of poor past performances in achieving the obligational rates justified to the committee. * * * On page 783 of the committee hearings Admiral Withington, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, estimated that $10 million of such anticipated reimbursements will be available as a result of the sale of such items which do not require replacement in kind. * * * Congressman SHEPPARD asked the following question which the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance answered:
>
> "Congressman SHEPPARD. On this basis, how firm is the estimate of unobligated balances for the end of fiscal year 1958 of $39.5 million?
>
> "Admiral WITHINGTON. I think this is low. It is unrealistic to assume that all our money will be apportioned to us. I cannot predict how much higher the figure will be."
>
> The committee sees no reason to disagree with the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance relative to this unobligated balance and the anticipated reimbursements from sales to the MDAP program and has made appropriate reductions in the budget estimates.

Any reduction in even the Terrier missile program was a result of departmental decisions and not based on committee action, since the committee suggested reductions only in the conventional ammunition programs.

The amount of funds available for direct obligation in this account in fiscal year 1958 is $7 million greater than that anticipated in the President's budget prior to the Congressional reduction of $70 million. Anticipated MDAP reimbursements are $23 million greater than anticipated in the budget. Twenty-three million dollars is reserved for carryover into fiscal year 1959 in this account, exclusive of other unobligated balances uncommitted and evidently not necessary for the fiscal year 1958 program.

At no time in the debate on the House floor on the fiscal year 1958 Defense Department appropriation bill did anyone on either side of the aisle propose increases in the ordnance appropriation. The gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] did propose an addition to the shipbuilding and conversion appropriation, but this was overwhelmingly defeated by a majority of Members from both sides of the aisle.

The final action on the fiscal year 1958 appropriation bill was the conference report on the bill. After long and deliberate conference action this report was formulated and reported to the House signed by every member of the conference committee except the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and that included the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and his Republican colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has so aptly stated now is the time to lay aside party politics and get on with these essential programs. The President has asked for this same type of action. The Democratic Party in the Congress is willing to give him just that type of action. Let us hope his own party in the Congress and those in his official family will change their present positions and be willing to implement his request.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to emphasize that we are not being asked by the Department of Defense to put back money that Congress eliminated from the fiscal year 1958 budget. Those funds are not in controversy insofar as the development of this emergency pro-

gram goes. I do not think we should lose sight of that.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. During the period from 1945 to 1949 when the ballistic and guided missile program was operating, to which the gentleman from Massachusetts referred, under the jurisdiction of the Army, the Army Chief of Staff in those 4 years who did not make any additional requests was the distinguished General Eisenhower.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would be good enough to yield, I think if you look at the testimony in the military appropriation committee's hearings for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948, and there are copies of those hearings here, you will find that the then General Eisenhower, now President Eisenhower, gave forceful and effective testimony urging that the Congress should not, under any circumstances, lose sight of the fact that we needed missiles in the future as quickly as possible and that funds in those budgets were necessary for research and development in the modern weapon fields. The funds which were sought then for research and development were to be used for the initiation of our supersonic, long-range missile programs.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Then, of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is aware, based upon the statement he makes in the same record, that all of the existing operational guided missiles, without exception, were created, established, researched, and developed and made operational during the same period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the President, in his state of the Union message, received one of the biggest bursts of applause with this statement:

> Another requirement of military organization is a clear subordination of the military services to duly constituted civilian authority.

A military force without discipline is noneffective and little better than a mob. A military force infiltered by insubordination is without adequate discipline. Any person, for reasons best known to themselves, in or out of Congress, who incites insubordination or goads a witness into, or close to, insubordination is doing this Nation a disservice. To infer that our military forces are split by dispute and dissension undoubtedly results in some comfort to an enemy.

It is perfectly proper to have any military officer give his views and opinions, but for political prophets of gloom and doom to go further and to shove him into the political arena and "egg him on" to such a point as to be in open conflict over a decision which his military and civilian superiors has made, helps no one and cannot help but convey to the world the inference that we are hopelessly divided and that we are helpless to deter attack. We are not hopelessly divided. We are not helpless. We are strong. There is no reason for us to cringe in fear. And we are far more united than many would make it appear.

A military organization to be effective must have one head. Our Constitution makes that one head the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. The President "calls the shots," those subordinate to him have the duty of carrying out his direction.

A successful football team can have only one quarterback. It is his job to call the plays. Three or four other team members think they could do better. Ten or twelve players over on the bench are quite confident that they could "call 'em better." Thousands in the stands, and viewing TV, know they could call much better plays.

A quarterback has the duty and responsibility of directing the strategy of the game. The team members, if they are to be winners, must carry out the play to the best of their ability whether they agree or not.

As important as this is in football, it is all the more important in our military activities.

There is no place for party politics in our military program and thus our military leaders should not be drawn into party politics. That is no place for them. So, let us forget party politics and continue giving this country the best possible, adequate defense at the lowest cost possible. And just remember, never in our history has Congress ever, even during wars, given the military every dollar someone wanted. If we had granted every military request, our national debt would now be at the trillion dollar mark. If we are to listen to every military complaint about not getting as much as he asked for we can never finish our hearings and we will accomplish nothing.

Furthermore, if we jump every time Russia "pops off," they control us. We should control ourselves. Let us chart our course, then pursue it.

Congress has been asking for decisions and actions. You are getting them.

Secretary of Defense McElroy, who has been praised by our subcommittee, has made decisions. In fact, he has taken 14 steps toward continuing our military supremacy:

First. Removal of overtime limitations on top priority programs.

Second. Restoration of basic research programs.

Third. Army authorized to proceed with launching a satellite by use of a Jupiter-C test vehicle. Both Vanguard and Jupiter satellite programs assigned top priority.

Fourth. Authorized production and operational development of both Thor and Jupiter missile systems.

Fifth. Acceleration of the Atlas program.

Sixth. Acceleration of fleet ballistic missile weapons system—Polaris—for fiscal year 1958 supplemental appropriation.

Seventh. Army authorized to proceed immediately with the development of a solid propellant missile as a replacement for the Redstone.

Eighth. Establishment of the Office of the Director of Guided Missiles.

Ninth. Establishment of the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

Tenth. Increased antisubmarine capability for fiscal year 1959 budget; also acceleration of research and development of antisubmarine warfare.

Eleventh. Strategic Air Command alert, dispersal, and relocation of tankers to northern bases.

Twelfth. Air Force authorized to proceed with program to install an early warning system for detection of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Thirteenth. Defined Army and Air Force responsibilities and reemphasizing the urgency for the development of defense against the ICBM. Top priority confirmed for anti-ICBM and military satellite projects.

Fourteenth. Appointment of full-time special assistant and group of consultants to advise the Secretary as to the organization of the Defense Department.

Mr. Chairman, as far as the Soviet satellites are concerned I see no reason why any American—and we are all anti-Communist—should build up the Russian ego by adopting their name for it. Sputnik as you know, means fellow traveler. I think it would be much better to talk about the Soviet satellite and forget about the other word.

But my guess is that these Soviet satellites will probably cost the taxpayers of the United States far more dollars than they cost the Russians, and practically every move that is going to be made to spend more and more will probably have a Soviet satellite under the program as a lever to raise it.

We should not let these satellites cause us to rush pell mell into a spending spree, because an ill-conceived program could be costly. At the same time there is neither room nor time for complacency or resting on our efforts and depending on what has already been done. But as the President has assured the country, we will continue to build our strength so we may continue to keep America strong—stronger than Russia.

Every dark cloud has a silver lining if you just look for it. The Soviet satellite is not as dark as some people have painted the project. It, too, has a silver lining. The Soviet satellite may be the thing that has cost Russia more trouble than they ever dreamed of, because the satellite has aroused the thought of the American people and the Members of the United States Congress. We know, as we have demonstrated time and time again, that an alert, aroused United States can, and will, use its scientific and productive genius to keep us ahead of the Russians in our defense efforts and keep us so strong that our power of devastation will be such that Russia cannot afford to accept the losses we can inflict if Russia ever dares to attack us.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the subcommittee, said something yesterday about the days being gloomy, and the gloomy prospects. Yesterday was a gloomy day in more ways than one; the skies were heavy, our hearts were heavy because we had lost one of our most valuable Members. But I cannot share with him the gloom that our chairman shares. I am far more optimistic. I am not the least bit gloomy about the prospects and the strength of our defense. I told you a year ago, two years ago, and three and more years ago, that I think we should stop worrying about Russia attacking the United States, and that I have not, and tonight will not, lose one wink of sleep because of fear of a Russian attack on us.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I said in my opening remarks yesterday that the atmosphere was heavy and the sky was dark, and paraphrasing an old hymn that I know the gentleman is familiar with I said: "We meet amid encircling gloom." I also stated I was not superstitious and that it was not, after all, an ill omen. I do not want to be misunderstood.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am delighted that the chairman is taking a more pleasant outlook on the matter today than he did yesterday. As a matter of fact, some people have been talking about certain progress that has been made, but it is interesting to know that in 5 years this Nation has made not only as great but greater advance in our missile program than Russia has made in the past 12 years. They had a need for it. Their situation militarily is nothing like our own because they are completely surrounded and we are not. I do not mean by that that we should underestimate the ability of the Russians because their ability is great and gray matter in a Russian skull works just as well as the gray matter in an American's skull. They are as smart, they are as capable. There is no boundary on knowledge. What they can learn we can learn and what we can learn they can learn, and as an old song stated, "What they can do we can do better."

Mr. Chairman, the committee report which has been prepared is a very good one. I am not going to go into it in great detail, but if you really want to know why this $1,300,000,000 has been asked for at this time and the purposes for which it is to be used, all you need to do is turn to page 11 and you will see it spelled out in full, perhaps too fully. We tell too much. There are too many facts in these brief hearings here, there is too much in the report, there is too much in the papers. One of the Tass newspaper reporters is eligible to sit up in the press box above us. They do not have to have a far-flung intelligence service because they can pick up the newspapers and the scientific magazines, our committee hearings, and we tell the whole story to them. We tell them the mistakes we make. They avoid them. They can save time. Russian agents have been busy in this country, and are still busy in this country, men who will take whatever they can get in the way of military secrets and see that they get back immediately to their superiors.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on one or two things. You have heard mentioned ARPA. It is not very good to just mention alphabetical agencies because even we on the committee are sometimes confused. ARPA means Advanced Research Projects Agency. I share some of the views of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] on this. I hope, I trust, and I think perhaps under the new Secretary of Defense it will accomplish the purpose for which it is designed; namely, to have in one place an agency that will go into all of these programs we have been talking about, the anti-missile-missile, the space flights and the flight to the moon, man-made missiles which are still in the realm of the future. But if this agency acts as it should—I hope it will, I am sure that it will—then in the fields I have mentioned in which all of the services are now busy and taking part, the Army, Navy, Air Force, substantial progress will be made. All three services are talking about anti-missile-missiles and space flights. This agency should avoid the Thor-Jupiter conflict and get on with the job and not have so many go in so many different directions on the same program. Thereby, we will conserve the use of our scientists, engineers, and our production facilities.

As far back as 10 years ago when we were talking about the scientists and they were saying, "We are going to the moon," all I asked them was: "Why and when?" Why and when, that is all, because they will do it. But, of course, the cost of the ticket for a trip to the moon is measured in billions of dollars and not mere thousands.

Now, much has been said about satellites and there has been some comment about our own satellite program. I would like to point out and make definitely clear again, as I have tried to do so many times, that our satellite program is not a military undertaking. Our satellite program is simply a civilian scientist undertaking as a part of our contribution to the International Geophysical Year. And, it just happens that that was the most convenient way that the National Science Foundation could get some funds to go into this particular activity. And, they did not give it any particular stress. I have read all the hearings on IGY; that they have gone to the Committee on Independent Offices about their International Geophysical Year and the satellite program, but they never gave it any big headline, and I never heard of any Member of the Congress up to recently that did, either. It was not stressed last year. As a matter of fact, if you go back to the proceedings here on the floor of the House of Representatives when that bill was up last year, it was not even mentioned by anybody.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Certainly, I must.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman from Kansas, who has an established reputation for fairness, not regret the statements that have been made that Congress has in the past cut the funds for the satellite program? Now, that is as completely in error as anything could be. Would the gentleman like to join with me in condemning that misstatement?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I cannot agree with the gentleman, because if I read the report of the independent offices for last year, and I have, and if I read the debates that took place on the floor of the House, the national science fund was cut $25 million, and if I am not mistaken, that had something to do with their satellite program. Perhaps not. But, they got their funds from the Navy; they got funds for it from the President's emergency fund, and I do not think, as far as I can recall, any specific cut which specifically states that we are cutting the IGY civilian scientist satellite undertaking, or any reduction which would hold back the satellite program.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that Admiral Bennett and Dr. Hagen came down before our subcommittee on defense appropriations and said, "We want you to let us have something in the area of $35 million for the project"?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Something like that.

Mr. MAHON. And did we not give them every cent of it?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes. But they never stressed the importance highly. They talked about it, sure, as an interesting scientific exploration into outer space.

Mr. MAHON. They did not realize that it was going to rock the world and fire the imagination of the American people.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Neither did I and neither did you nor any other Member.

Mr. MAHON. Neither did I and neither did you. Probably somebody in or out of the Government should be assigned the task of evaluating things of this kind.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I expect probably you are right. I have suggested facetiously but with a little bit of seriousness behind it, maybe this Government should set up a rumor factory, and I expect you heard me say in committee we could take a couple of men from this tall-tale club up in Wisconsin, the Paul Bunyan group, and a couple of men from Texas, put them in a room, and we could start turning out rumors that would drive the Russians nuts.

Mr. MAHON. Let me ask the gentleman this. It has been said that in the supplemental bill last year, that the committee of which he is a member, the Committee on Appropriations, cut funds for the satellite program.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not recall any item for the earth satellite in that construction bill.

Mr. MAHON. That was in the $35 million we were talking about a few minutes ago.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That was a transfer, as I recall it.

Mr. MAHON. A transfer of funds.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The transfer granted is where they got the money, and that is where the Navy comes into it, because

the Science Foundation knew the Navy could get the dough and they could not.

Mr. MAHON. But it has been said that in that bill we did cut the funds for the satellite program. That is not correct, if it has been said.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not recall that that was said. But let me continue. Another thing that should be thoroughly understood by all is the fact that when the IGY satellite program was undertaken, it was undertaken with the distinct understanding that it should not delay our military missile program as much as a single day. And if it had interfered, if the satellite had delayed the missile program by as much as a single day, if you think there has been some squawk about what has or has not happened, the comparison would be that of a whisper to a shout.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I must yield to the gentleman from California, yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Taking all of this discussion together, some of it good and some of it bad, in the final analysis, after the Congress has made appropriations in whatever amount, we have people at the Pentagon who are there for the purpose of deciding what should be done in these guided-missile programs, is that not the fact?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Why, certainly. It seems a rather simple thing to some people to get these guided missiles into the air. One man says that the Titan is the one; the other says the Atlas; but in the Pentagon we have men who are recognized in the field of knowledge, in the field of science. They know more about it than I do by far. It is their job, it is their responsibility, and it should be, to decide scientific programs. We are not in a position to make these decisions. There have been many decisions made that I have not agreed with. But that has been true all my life, and even though most of my future is behind me, as time goes on there will be many more decisions made, even in our own subcommittee, with which I shall not agree. But when a decision is made, then let us go on from there.

Another question was asked and that is this. If these things about which we are talking here today are so important, why have they not come before us sooner? As a matter of fact, you will recall that we had our appropriation bill up last year and we adjourned shortly before Labor Day. The reason these programs were not in sooner was because we have just convened this month. Many of the things that happened during the past 4 or 5 months since we adjourned, made it possible for them to see that now the program was realistic, and that they should go ahead and advance with it. There would have been no factual reason 6 months ago for us to have given any additional money for the Polaris missile for submarines. But now they have made a scientific breakthrough; now it is a reality. The same thing is true of the other missiles, the Jupiter, the Thor, the Atlas, the Titan, and many others.

Let me say here that with the new change in the subcommittee setup I suppose that we would do well to complete our hearings on the military program by Thanksgiving. Of course, we shall move faster than that, if we can. But I was about to say that before we report a bill for appropriations for the fiscal year 1959 for the defense program, our scientists, and our production men probably will come through with other breakthroughs which will justify the Department of Defense coming before us and asking for money for those programs, to expedite them. And we shall do it, because speed and progress is what you have been asking for, and that is what you are going to get.

Perhaps that will answer the question as to why these programs were not suggested sooner.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly what I was trying to get at. First of all, I want to commend the very able presentation of the gentleman from Kansas. But did I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] that the $1.5 billion approximately provided in this bill is a down payment or an installment on the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. That the regular appropriation bill will be reduced in the amount of this bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is correct. What we are doing in substance, as you have been told several times, is buying time so that we can get on to some of these programs 6, 9, or 12 months ahead. These items would have been included in the fiscal year 1959 program, so it is just a question of whether you are going to give them $1.3 billion right now to get on with the job, get these things built, or wait until August, or later before making the funds available. You are buying time, and it is a purchase that is very well made.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think it ought to be made clear that this $1.3 billion has already been reflected in the budget for fiscal 1959, so the budget as submitted in the dollar amount cannot be further reduced another $1.3 billion. It has already been reduced.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I have covered in at least part the salient points. We are buying time for these various programs. The financial picture, the numbers and all, have been clearly given to you by the other members of the committee. It is all set out very clearly in the committee report. I cannot agree with all of that report because I cannot agree with the statement in the committee report that our vast superiority has receded. I do not think it has. But I do agree that our military superiority overall is greater than that of Russia. They do have a bigger army, more men, no question about it. They have had it ever since 1946. So, that is no reason for alarm. They do have more submarines of various types. Many of them are for their own defense. It is nothing new. That force has been there for some long time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is quoting words from the report which I wrote with my own hands.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I still cannot agree with it.

Mr. MAHON. I stated that after World War II, or words to that effect, we were vastly superior to the Soviet Union in military strength. We had the atomic bomb and they did not, and so forth. The point that we were trying to make was that this gap between the Soviet Union and the United States has been narrowing, and our relative position has receded.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I know, but when a man is at the bottom of the hill he has no place to go but up. When we get to the peak, he is going to start catching up if he keeps climbing; sure.

Mr. MAHON. It just so happens that the Soviet Union is ahead of us in some of these space areas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And we are ahead of them in other space areas.

Mr. MAHON. They are ahead of us in the number of airplanes, fighter aircraft, and so forth.

Mr. SCRIVNER. They have had a need for more fighters because they had a greater threat against them. They still have a greater threat because our Strategic Air Command today can visit all the death and destruction that is necessary to deter war. It is so great that the Russians do not dare accept that cost of that devastation.

Mr. MAHON. The object of our program is to have something more effective when the Strategic Air Command loses its maximum effectiveness.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. When it begins to lose in importance we will have something to take its place.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is why we are going to have missiles. It is to augment the Strategic Air Command and the Tactical Air Force. If it is not going to help, we have no business spending the money.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The statement was made that we were ahead at the end of World War II, but with regard to missiles we were starting out both even because we both captured V–2's and some German scientists, did we not?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, we did. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons, perhaps, that Russia is ahead of us in submarines is that the Russians got the German submarine pens, they got the German submarine scientists, they got the plans and blueprints for the snorkels, 36 of them, and the 6 that were completed were divided between us, England, and France. But that is past history. I am not so much concerned about the

past as the future. You remember Kettering of General Motors said, "It is not the past that concerns me so much; what I am concerned about is in the future, because that is where I'll spend the rest of my life."

Let us look ahead and quit looking back. We will accomplish more and get further. I do not agree with all this language, but the chairman does point out that even though there are fields of disagreement, whether we think one way or think the other we realize we must maintain our superior defense position if we are to remain at peace. That is one of the reasons we are here today, buying time for $1,270 million. I hope, as has been expressed here on the floor of the House, that this bill will be completed today. It should receive a unanimous vote which will get it on its way to be sent to the other body and let them act on it expeditiously so that the Department of Defense can get on to the job preparing this much-needed program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I suppose the gentleman saw in yesterday morning's papers the statement of the Secretary of Defense that 25,000 people would be added to the payroll of the Department of Defense.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; and that is a comment that has not been verified.

Mr. GROSS. The question I wanted to ask the gentleman is whether there is any money in this bill to pay for those people to be added to the Department of Defense, or to be restored.

Mr. SCRIVNER. No. The purposes of the money in this bill, as I said a while ago, are set out on page 11. That answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this is not a crash program in any sense. It is a very moderate approach to the correction of a dangerous situation—Soviet superiority in certain advanced weapons and in some phases of scientific achievement. And I tell you these exist. This is not a large expenditure as modern defense expenditures go, but the hearings before you will show repeated testimony that a greater expenditure at this time is not justified—the state of the art of American know-how is not sufficiently advanced for the Department of Defense to ask for more money.

Very probably more money will be added by the Senate, and the House may agree to it. But the amount of money before you is all that the Air Force and the Navy say that they can properly use now. The Army testified they needed more money. That is included. But, I should point out that none of the money which is included for the Army was cleared by the Bureau of the Budget or by the Department of Defense. This committee took arbitrary action because we felt their case justified it. But all of the services have stated they will come back to the Congress when they can show definitely a need for more funds in these important fields.

I think that is assurance enough to go on, certainly for the time being.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question about the wisdom of the action that is requested now. I consider it essential. We are not in a helpless position, but we are behind in critical areas of defense and we must catch up. Any official in a position of responsibility in our Government who orders less than an all-out effort in these critical areas fails in his duty.

Now, how did we get ourselves into a situation of this kind? I am not going to try to assess the blame, although that is becoming a popular pastime just now. What is more important is for us to pull together and get our ox out of the ditch.

I want to state very positively I am disappointed with the delays in pushing ahead after the present situation became known. I am seriously concerned with what appears to be a lack of information in the high places in our Government on what is happening in the world. We have a very costly intelligence system. Its expenditures have almost no Congressional screening or control. Yet it apparently has not been capable of obtaining comprehensive, up-to-the-minute information for our Government on world events. On every major crisis we appear to be the last to find out what is going on.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman might agree with me that perhaps there is certainly more than a grain of truth in what appears to be the assertion of Mr. Allen Dulles, the Director of Central Intelligence. It is indicated in the morning paper that he has reported many things to the Government with respect to the peril which has confronted us, but the people responsible for decisions have not been willing to listen to him and take action as a result of what he has reported. That was the import of what I read in the morning paper. But it seems to me there is a lot of truth in that, because I think the Intelligence Service has made many reports which have gone unheeded, and therein lies a danger. I understand Mr. Dulles in the future is to polish these presentations up and add charts and red arrows indicating the danger areas. Maybe that will enable us to interpret his reports more carefully. I believe the CIA has done a better job than it has received credit for.

Mr. SIKES. I do not know whether the major crises that have occurred in recent years have been reported to the people in high places in our Government or not. I have evidence they were not. But if our officials knew of those grave conditions, then they failed to impart their knowledge to the Congress and to the American people, and they failed to take advantage of repeated assurances that the Congress will give all the help it can by legislation or by appropriation. I cannot believe that has always been the case. If they knew of these things I say again there was no inkling to the Congress from the agencies of the administration of the impending breakthrough by the Russians in the satellite and missile fields as late as August 30, 1957, when the Congress was still in session. That was just a little more than a month before the first sputnik was launched. Yet even after it was launched there appeared to be little apprehension among Government officials of the seriousness of Soviet progress.

I call attention to the fact that 45 days after the first sputnik was launched, when this committee met to seek the facts on the missile program, the full go-ahead on our missile and satellite program still was entangled in the Pentagon maze. The services then had not been told to go ahead and expedite this program as fast as they could. Now, 3 months later, we have this moderate request for funds. The Pentagon tells us that the state of the art will not permit a proper and orderly use of additional funds. That does not speak very well for the state of the art in this country when you consider that all we hope to do at the moment is cut down the lead which the Russians appear to have; when you consider that Congress repeatedly has voted the money requested for research and development, and that is where know-how originates.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course the gentleman is aware of these fantastic and sometimes arbitrary and absurd performances at the Bureau of the Budget, getting in the way of the Secretary of Defense and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, even exercising what amounts to a veto over the acts of Congress.

Mr. SIKES. I am fully aware that the Bureau of the Budget has frequently impeded Congressional attempts to bolster the national defense.

You have already learned what this bill contains and I shall not detail it again. I do not need to tell you in the House of Representatives that morale is down in this Nation, or that our prestige is down abroad. I do not need to tell you that America must move ahead, must recapture the initiative; cannot afford to be second best. The race is to the strong. Russia knows our weaknesses. The world knows our weaknesses. Perhaps the American people know them least of all, but the American people want action today.

The Congress today must base its action on the information given to us by those who are considered experts. We have depended on these sources of information in the past and sometimes they have been inaccurate. We have no other choice but to follow the best advice we can get. We can however insist that every possible step be taken without interservice bickering and jealousy to put America out in front in the shortest possible time.

I said this is not a crash program. I believe there should be a crash program where there is a sufficient knowledge to justify working around the clock to improve our defense posture. This appropriation bill will help. It will not do all of the job or even a substantial part of it.

This much is sure, we cannot match Soviet military forces man for man or even weapon for weapon. Theirs is a controlled economy which can ignore domestic civilian needs; our economy

cannot and would not, except in direct emergency. We must therefore rely principally upon one or more major deterrents to war which the Soviets fear so greatly they will not risk conflict.

We must follow through to the perfection of those deterrents to aggression as fast as we can with every action and every dollar that is needed to insure that America goes out in front and stays in front just as long as danger threatens.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as we all will recall, last May there was a considerably different atmosphere in this Chamber when we were considering the fiscal 1958 military appropriation bill. The atmosphere, in my opinion, is infinitely better today than it was, for example, on May 29 of 1957. Perhaps the situation is something like the oft-quoted comment in reference to the weather: If you do not like the weather, wait a minute. If you do not like what the Congress did in May, June, July, and August of 1957 in reference to military appropriations, if you will wait a minute I think perhaps some errors may be remedied and changes made.

It is not often I disagree with my very good friend and extremely able colleague, the gentleman from Florida, in reference to military appropriations, but I think it is fair and proper to say in light of what he said just a minute ago that in this supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Defense, there is over a billion dollars for ballistic missile detection systems, the acceleration of the Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter ballistic missiles program and the acceleration of the Polaris ballistic missile submarine program. This bill does provide for the urgent acceleration of those programs. I think it is also fair and proper to say that within the last week or two decisions have been made which give to the Army the authority to proceed more rapidly with their Nike-Zeus program, which is an anti-missile missile program. In addition, the Air Force has been told to proceed in the same way with their part of the anti-missile missile program, the radar detection system. I personally feel these programs are proceeding well and rapidly.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I have the very greatest respect for my able and distinguished colleague from Michigan. He and I have worked very closely together for years for a stronger defense and I respect him in every way. However, I do want to quote to the gentleman a statement by Secretary McElroy supporting my position. I refer to a statement on page 2 in the report which accompanies this bill.

The report says:

> This is not in any way a true 1958 supplemental. It does not represent resubmission of requests for purposes heretofore budgeted and denied either in fiscal 1958 or any prior year.

At the same point Secretary McElroy is quoted as saying:

> The programs covered by the supplemental request are all part of the 1959 budget but have been advanced into fiscal year 1958 in order to get them under way as quickly as possible.

Then, further, the statement of the Comptroller of the Department is quoted from page 314 of the hearings:

> As indicated earlier in these hearings, this supplemental request does not include any amounts for programs previously submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1958.

I believe this makes the situation perfectly clear.

Mr. FORD. I would like to respond to the gentleman's statement. It is absolutely proper and accurate to say that there are no programs in here which were submitted in the regular 1958 military budget. There is no doubt about that. These are new programs. However, I think it should be said that to the extent of $303,500,000 out of the $1,260,000,000, we are being asked in this appropriation bill to replenish accounts which were reduced by the Congress in the last session.

Let me point them out. In the last session the Congress cut the Navy shipbuilding and conversion account—I want to be fair and accurate—to the extent of $70 million. In this supplemental appropriation bill we are being asked to replenish that account to the extent of $296 million.

In the Navy account, procurement of ordnance and ammunition, the Congress in the last session cut it $80 million. In this supplemental appropriation request the Congress is being asked to replenish that account to the extent of $31,800,000.

In the Air Force procurement other than aircraft account, last year the Congress cut it $53,500,000. In this supplemental there is a request to the extent of $360 million for this account.

In the Air Force military construction account in the last session the Congress cut it $100 million. In this supplemental bill there is a request to replenish that account to the extent of $520 million.

I want to reemphasize that although these are new programs, we are being asked as a Congress to replenish these accounts which the Congress cut last year. If Congress had not reduced the funds in these accounts in the last session, the Navy and the Air Force in these accounts would have had more obligational authority available for the new programs submitted in the supplemental bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not sure whether they are included in the figures you have just given, but it is true, is it not, that a substantial portion of these funds are to be used to replenish the accounts for the Tartar and the Talos and other programs of that kind against which borrowings have been made in the current fiscal year?

Mr. FORD. Certainly in the case of the Navy, as I understand the testimony, all of the Navy program here submitted to us has already been moved ahead and obligations have been made, so all we are doing by this particular supplemental, as far as the two Navy accounts are concerned, is to replenish the accounts so that they may proceed with other programed projects that are urgent.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I realize that the gentleman from Michigan voted for many of the cuts that were made last year in the defense bill.

Mr. FORD. He also, if I might say, opposed many.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Michigan opposed many of them. But, it is perfectly clear, and I believe we all agree, that the Defense Department has not come back and said, "We asked you for money for the Polaris submarine and we asked you for money for the Air Force Alert, we asked you for money to expedite the missile program, and you did not give it to us, and we now again ask you for it." They did not do that. Is it not true that the Defense Department came before us and said, "Gentlemen of the committee, we have some new projects never before presented to the Congress, and we need the financing." Should we have financed these projects before the Defense Department knew there were any such projects in the making? It seems to me, if we want to cast away every vestige of control of the purse, we should give them these blank checks and say, "If you dream up some project, you will have the excess money from which to finance it." I realize there are many who say we hurt the Defense Department last year by cuts, and everybody in the House knows we did not, because ceilings were imposed by the Bureau of the Budget and the services could not spend the money we gave them. Does the gentleman not know that there is $569 million in the aircraft and related procurement account of the Air Force that is not being used and is being applied as an excess against the 1959 budget?

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman would let me take my time—and I know he is not the kind that imposes on others—I would like to discuss that particular point to which he refers. He made a statement in the bill's debate yesterday which I think ought to be explained. It relates to what the gentleman has just said. On page 741 of the RECORD for yesterday, the gentleman from Texas said this:

> It is unmistakably clear and now undisputed from any responsible source that last year Congress gave the Department of Defense several hundred million dollars more than is being used for this year's operation. The amount as given by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNeil, is $899 million.

Now, I am afraid that the gentleman's remarks of yesterday, which I have just quoted, could lead to an erroneous impression. I know that he has been in the forefront for as long as I can remember for a sound and constructive policy of full funding. As a matter of fact, last May 15 the chairman, the gentleman from

Texas [Mr. MAHON], wrote to Mr. Wilson, then Secretary of Defense, and said this on behalf of the committee in reference to the problem of full funding:

> Certainly the practice of partial funding under appropriations provided on a fully funded basis is not in accord with the present understanding between the committee and the Department.

Now, it is my belief—and I think it is substantiated by the testimony—that the statement made by the gentleman from Texas, which I quoted in the testimony yesterday, is not accurate, if we really believe in the policy of full funding. Now, if we are going to disregard the policy of full funding, which I am sure he does not agree with, and which I do not agree with, then his statement could possibly create the wrong impression.

Let me just proceed for a minute. On page 316 of the hearings Mr. McNeil, in his prepared statement, said:

> Unobligated balances carried over into fiscal year 1959 would total $8.1 billion—that is, after taking into account the $326 million that would be in the commitment status from the supplemental—$5.5 billion of which would be legally committed and $2.6 billion would be reserved for completion of programs under way.

The $569 million to which the gentleman refers in the Air Force account, the $205 million to which he refers in Army P. and P., and the $125 million to which he refers in one of the Navy accounts—I believe it is a marine account—are all within the $2.5 billion which, according to the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, is needed for full funding. And I refer to a further statement that he makes at page 315:

> Such earmarking of funds to complete approved programs is essential in order to implement the full-funding principles which this committee has advocated.

Let me go a little further. At page 9 of the hearings you will find this statement by Mr. McNeil, the Comptroller of the Department of Defense:

> It is unobligated, but with minor exceptions it is all earmarked to complete ships, aircraft, or bases, and so forth. It gets back to this basic question: Are we going to go on a partial financing basis, or are we going to continue to fund ships, aircraft, and other programs completely in line with the policy of this committee and the Congress?

It is also true in the testimony—and it runs throughout a number of pages—that to go along with the idea that they had or have too much money in the Department of Defense, we have first to assume that every Department recoupment and every interagency reimbursement that they forecast would come due on July 1, 1958. The facts are, as my chairman knows, that those recoupments and those reimbursements from the MDAP account come into being over the 12-month period. If we were not going to make any new obligational authority available here, rely on what the chairman has inferred might be done and go back to the unsound partial or installment funding program, the least we would have to do would be to give transfer authority over some of the accounts which are overfunded, if you believe in installment buying. However, if you believe in full funding, as our chairman does—and it is the right thing—there are no excess funds in this bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. Surely.

Mr. MAHON. I am shocked and disappointed at my friend's statement, because if there is anything true about the hearings, in my judgment it is that the hearings so clearly point out that we could very well, instead of appropriating $1,200,000,000 here, transfer, say seven or eight or nine hundred million dollars, probably more safely $700 million in available excess funds, and make up the rest by cash appropriation in this bill without in any way jeopardizing the full funding principle. If we wanted to throw overboard full funding we would have about $30 billion plus that could be used in that kind of operation. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will remember that last year we reduced the budget for Army procurement by half a billion dollars. The President stated that the Army people would like to have that but it would not make much difference, if we wanted to cut it out it would be all right. That is my understanding of excess funds. If we cut it out the President said it would be all right. We did and we still have excess dollars yet in that account.

Mr. FORD. Assuming all the reimbursements from MDAP come into being, and they do not all come into being on July 1, 1958.

Mr. MAHON. The point I make is that if you departed from full funding you would have about $30 billion plus additionally that you could use to finance the Department of Defense without any new appropriations now. But without resorting to full funding the evidence is abundantly clear and fully substantiated in the hearings that you could deny about six hundred or seven hundred or eight hundred million dollars in this supplemental bill if you wanted to, give the services transfer authority, and proceed with full funding. If they were going to commit these funds, if they were going to obligate these funds such as the $567 million in the Air Force procurement fund, if they were going to obligate these funds during this fiscal year, of course they would have to have the money. But what they are doing is keeping them in excess, and next year they would have it in the 1959 budget. So the full funding principle is not in this picture. I wish my friend from Michigan would reread the hearings, because the point he made cannot be substantiated, in my judgment.

Mr. FORD. I am sorry to disagree with my chairman, but I have read and reread the hearings and I am thoroughly convinced that my position is correct and that his is in error.

If I may turn to another part of the bill and I think it is important to do so. In the hearings our chairman got into a subject which I am sure will be debated back and forth across the country from now until next November. The subject was brought up some time in late August by several newspaper columnists and perhaps some people in the Congress. The problem relates to the alleged slowdown in the authority to obligate funds for the research and development programs of the three services. The allegation has been made that on August 17 the Department of Defense by an order slowed down, hampered, and hindered the research and development programs of the three services to the extent of approximately $150 million. The chairman, as I said, brought the matter up in the committee hearings, and I was delighted that he did because there had been a tremendous amount of misinformation spread from one end of the country to the other on this subject matter.

Those who are interested in reading certain parts of the testimony can refer to pages 319, 321, 373, and 345 of the hearings. However, on page 319 of the hearings our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] brought up this problem and Mr. McNeil, Comptroller of the Department of Defense, said:

> As to the research category, it was never intended by the Secretary of Defense that there would be any withholding, for the year as a whole, of any research funds as appropriated by the Congress last year. Secretary Wilson did ask or instruct that the Army, Navy, and Air Force take their research programs and go through them and take out 10 percent, with the idea that when the 10 percent had been taken out, as he said, "We are hoping we will sort out any dry holes we are digging," and the 10 percent thus made available would then be applied to research efforts that either had not been in the original program and looked more promising, or to research we were planning to finance under procurement.

Let us get the chronological history of this situation. Last year the President asked, for Army research and development, $400 million. He asked for $505 million for Navy research and development. He asked for $661 million for Air Force research and development. Rightly or wrongly, depending on how you felt, this subcommittee, the full committee, and the House of Representatives confirmed reductions in the President's research and development program as submitted to the extent of $8 million for the Army, $10 million for the Navy, and $12 million for the Air Force, a total of $30 million. The other body raised the amount to the President's budget figure. In conference we restored the full amount of the President's research and development budget request to the total of $1,566,000,000. On August 2, 1957, the military appropriation bill for fiscal year 1958 became law—incidentally, over 30 days after the fiscal year began. In order to keep the Department of Defense going during the first month of the fiscal year, while Congress had not completed action on the military appropriation bill, we gave them authority to obligate one-twelfth of the smallest, that is the lesser amount, which had been made available by either body of the Congress in any account. So in the month of July in research and development for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, because of House action, they could obligate one-twelfth of the lesser or reduced figure. On

August 17, this directive from Mr. Wilson's office became effective. What did it do? It gave to the Army, Navy, and Air Force the right to obligate 90 percent of the total amount that Congress had made available—90 percent of $1,536,000,000. You could do an awful lot of research on $1,400,000,000. In other words, in the first 45 days of the fiscal year the Army, Navy, and Air Force got 90 percent of their total funds for the full year. There was no order precluding them from the possibility of having the remainder of the 10 percent before the end of the fiscal year. All that Mr. Wilson was trying to do was to get the three services to review their research and development programs and, perhaps, to reprogram, if they found some research and development programs which were not proceeding satisfactorily or which were for one reason or another unproductive.

You know, Mr. Wilson, as Secretary of Defense, must have been reading the debates in the House of Representatives last year on May 29 with reference to research and development when he issued that order. I would like to read some excerpts from the debate on that day, because I think they are pertinent and because they coincide precisely with what Mr. Wilson decided to do in research and development. As you may remember on May 29, I offered an amendment to increase the research and development appropriations for the Army by $8 million, to restore back what the subcommittee cut below the President's budget. During the course of the debate, my real good friend, our chairman, the gentleman from Texas, had this to say in opposing the amendment restoring research and development funds. I quote:

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, after meeting for 4 months, sat down and marked up the bill and agreed on cutting research and development a little bit in the Army, a little bit in the Navy, and a little bit in the Air Force in an effort to get more efficiency and economy in the program.

Then, he goes on to say:

We have been so kind toward research and development that some have tried to make a grabbag out of it. That is exactly the situation I am inclined to exclaim, "Oh, what crimes have been committed with the taxpayers' money in the name of liberty and in the name of research and development. This is such a popular area."

Then, he goes on to say later:

I agree with Mr. James M. Bridges, who was director of electronics in the office of an Assistant Secretary of Defense speaking in Washington on the 22d of May, who said: "If this country is to stay ahead in weapons' development without going into bankruptcy, we must find ways to be more economical in the conduct of our program."

Then, after that quote, our chairman says:

Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield since I have been quoted?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I want to say I find no fault with those words, and I am sure they are quoted not out of context.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman can be sure I have tried not to do so.

Mr. MAHON. I find no fault with the statements I made at that time. I was saying at that time in effect that many crimes have been committed in the name of research and development, and that if the taxpayers knew how many crimes were committed, they would probably be very disturbed. But there can be no crime committed in the name of research and development if we are really doing the essential thing. We were complaining last year because they were taking research and development dollars in the service to crash automobiles to try to do something about traffic accidents. That is important but we should not have to do such things in a defense bill. Then the Army had a project study on sleep. There were people in the Government who probably needed that research program, because they were asleep to the dangers that were about us at the time.

Mr. FORD. All I am saying to my distinguished chairman is that Mr. Wilson, when this order was written on August 17, must have just a day or so before read the statement of my chairman who urged on May 29 precisely what the August 17 directive ordered.

Mr. MAHON. What the Secretary of Defense did was to cut back research and development funds by 10 percent, as the gentleman has so well pointed out. He said later after the Soviet satellite that they would be released. Really what the Secretary of Defense was doing was trying to keep the Department of Defense from spending forty or forty-two billion dollars that had been given to the Department to expedite these defense procurements. The Secretary of Defense, after clearing with the Bureau of the Budget, was compelled to cut down defense spending. He said we ought not to have to do it, but he did it by reason of the orders he received from the Bureau of the Budget and higher authority. So the reason we gave too much for the Department of Defense last year for the program was that our Defense Department was held back as the result of a budgetary order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. May I say in addition that during the debate on this issue of whether or not we were going to increase Army research and development, as I had suggested on May 29, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] had something to say about research and development. As I say, he and I have worked long and hard together, and seldom do we disagree. But I think that his statement on the floor of the House on May 29 is also in support of the decision made by Mr. Wilson on August 17.

The gentleman from Florida's statement is as follows:

I make that statement frankly and freely. I felt that a small reduction in research and development service areas would require economic belt tightening all the way along the line. I would not vote for cutting research and development excessively, but I do not rule out the possibility of wide reprograming, which will eliminate unnecessary and obsolescent projects.

That is precisely what Mr. Wilson's order of August 17 had in mind. On October 25 this order was rescinded. It is interesting to note the impact of that order from its inception to its conclusion. If you will turn to page 345 of the hearings, you will find a statement by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force as to whether or not this order by Mr. Wilson had any adverse impact. The Army and the Navy say it had none. The Air Force says, with a long and rather windy explanation, that it could have, that it might have, and so forth. But they say the reduction had no effect on the ballistic missile program. So on the missile program this order as far as the Air Force was concerned had no adverse impact. It may have had in some, temporary and insignificant impact on their other research and development programs; armywise and navywise, no.

It is also important to take a look at the Army research and development program to see how their rate of obligation stands. If you will turn to page 375 of the hearings you will see what their obligation rate has been from July 1 of this fiscal year and what it will be to June 30 at the end of this fiscal year. It shows that $459,900,000 will be obligated, which is $59 million more than the Congress gave them in the area of research and development. This greater figure is possible because of certain transfers into the account from the emergency fund and the greater use of unobligated funds from fiscal year 1957.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I have listened with a great deal of interest to this explanation of what has been called in the newspapers, arbitrary administrative restrictions on defense funds. Would the gentleman not admit that it did eliminate overtime in missile plants?

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will turn to page 345, as I have indicated, he will see that as far as the Army and Navy are concerned it indicates there was no adverse impact on their research and development program. In the case of the Air Force there was for a limited period of time, a reduction, as I understand, from either 3 or 2 shifts or from 2 to 1 shift. The pertinent part of that Air Force statement seems to indicate that as far as ballistic missiles are concerned there was no adverse effect.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I am disturbed, as I think the American people are, by the confusing statements that come out about our defense. I have a newspaper article before me from the New York Times dated January 13, 1958. Overtime restrictions still exist. I quote an article by Milton Beeker in which he says:

Because of restrictions on overtime at the Air Force missile base center, activities at Canaveral tend to slacken over weekends. Since launchings require many hours of preparation even before the start of the final countdown, most of the rockets have been fired on a Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday.

So, overtime restrictions must affect Army and Navy, too, because the Vanguard and the Jupiter C are certainly not in the Air Force operations. They are Navy and Army; are they not?

Mr. FORD. The Jupiter-C program is an Army research and development program. The Navy Vanguard is in the Navy research and development, as I understand it. I think the testimony, as far as I can assess it, shows there is no restriction on research and development overtime at the present time and has not been since about October 25, 1957. As far as I can recall that was the testimony before our committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that in my judgment our subcommittee has done a very good job in trying to get at the facts as set forth in the hearings. I personally think we have done the right thing in reporting the bill as it is. I am particularly pleased to know that we took some affirmative action of our own as far as the Army was concerned; it was necessary and essential. It simply means that we do not have to put up new money but take unused money from their military personnel account to handle the follow-on for the Redstone missile and the second generation missiles such as Lacrosse, Little John, and the Sergeant. I think the Committee of the Whole can very well endorse the bill as it has been prepared by this subcommittee. It is a good bill. I personally favor it in every provision that is before us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 5, noes 110.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have served on this committee for a number of years. I have listened to the testimony of witnesses from the various departments in our Defense Establishment. As some of you may recall, trying to learn as much as I could I went to Russia in 1956, spending my time with our own people from our own Embassy and traveling over the country. I have made every effort to make myself as well informed as possible, but with all of that effort I am not prepared to say just how great the Russian threat is. I simply do not know. My speech here today is not to minimize in the least the dangers of Russia and Russian aggression; but it is to speak a word of caution, that we do not let our fear of Russia make us destroy ourselves at home.

First, may I say to you, it is in the record of these hearings that the successful flight of the satellite was not unexpected to the United States. The surprise lay in the fact that it was a number of weeks, or a few months, earlier than might have been anticipated. I think the record is clear that prior to the satellite's launching the military people in our Government made the determination to devote most of our energies and attention to the missile program, and the prime endeavor was toward getting the missile to come down at the proper place without disintegrating. In other words, decisions were made with full knowledge of the likelihood of the successful Russian satellite. I think, looking back, that our folks now realize we may have underestimated the psychological benefits the Russians might get throughout the world in successfully launching the satellite. Be that as it may, that has passed. The tragedy, as I see it, and the danger, as I see it, second only, if second at all, to the Russian threat, is what we are doing to ourselves because of Russia. We are judging our defense not by the wisdom with which we spend. We are judging our defense by how much money we appropriate and how much money we spend, as well as by how large a backlog of orders we give certain corporations in certain States.

I returned here in December 1957, right after the satellite had been successfully launched by the Russians; and one of the first things to meet my eyes was an article in the Christian Science Monitor, which everybody knows is a stable and conservative newspaper. It was said in that article that in view of the slight downturn in business the Government was going to pump prime by putting out more defense contracts. Now, is that a way to make a determination as to how to meet the Russian threat? Is promoting business what we use as the determining factor?

I turn to the U. S. News & World Report and see the headline "Big spending. Lift for business." In the next issue: "The new Congress. Pump priming." And, in another issue it says: "$2.5 billion for missiles. More to come. Who gets it?" Then it lists the companies which will profit by such spending.

You will recall that last year I pointed out the Defense Department spent $50 billion with 10 corporations in 5 years, and their stocks increased in value from an average of $58 per share to $149 per share in that period.

We had a candidate for national office insist as one reason to support him and his party was that if he and his party were elected, contracts would be given to American Motors so it would not go under and may I say if we are spreading the pie, American Motors is entitled to its share. But what a way to run a railroad!

I have not seen the Gaither Report; but from what the newspapers are reporting the Gaither Report says that what we need in defense is to spend $8 billion more money each year.

They say Russia is way ahead of us with scientists. From all the information I have been able to obtain, after going there, that simply is not so; but I am not arguing that issue. What do the American people offer to do about it? Have you read anywhere about any educational organization advocating that we should review the curriculums of our schools and give attention to science and mathematics and get down to brass tacks? Oh, no. According to the press, they want $4.5 billion extra appropriations so we can train some scientists to meet Russian claims. And thus it goes. The satellite will be used ad infinitum for obtaining everything from a to izard.

We have a new Secretary of Defense, and he seems to be a most admirable gentleman. I have been very much impressed with him. But what do we see him do? One of the first things in this effort to keep up with Russia and to meet the Russian threat is indicated on the front page of yesterday's paper. I read:

> Defense Department to hire 25,000 more civilian aides.

Yes; and since 1950 the total number of civil-service employees in the military department has increased from 753,000 to 1,160,000. I know that the Department has been before this committee, and before the Congress, requesting funds which would permit them 61 super grades, so they could get folks with special training; and Congress approved that. Do you know what they did in the Defense Department after they got the 61 special people? Because they had an expert at the top of a section, they raised the grade of everybody in the section; and it is costing us $880,000 a year. This bill is asking for 19 more people of that kind, and for every one of them they will raise everybody from the bottom to the top at great expense.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. It is 25 additional.

Mr. WHITTEN. I believe the gentleman is correct. Here is the situation. As you know, I have differed with this full-funding proposition. It is my view that if you give anybody all the money for any project which requires at least 6 or 8 years to complete, it is much harder to ever cancel such project, however obsolescent it may become, than if you make payments on it, as they need the money, and review the project each year incident to providing them the money for it. Such expenditure is always in somebody's district. I lost that fight. The folks on the committee did not agree with me. But I would like to point out this. Our military decision, if it proved bad on the satellite, was not so because of any question of money. It was a question of deciding from a military-defense standpoint to spend our money on missiles and things of that sort instead of spending our money and giving our time and attention primarily to the satellite.

If you believe in full funding, to have provided for transfer of funds, as I urged, instead of providing additional money as this bill does, would not have affected the principle. It is testified that on July 1, 1958, the Department

will have $8 billion not contracted nor even obligated. Now, I am for the extra emphasis that is in this bill; make no mistake about that. It was my personal opinion that we should give them transfer authority and tell them to use some of the $8 billion, which would in no way endanger full funding. They will not have funded it to any particular thing on a contractual basis by July 1, 1958, according to the testimony.

I am not even saying that we should cut out part of the $8 billion; but in our hearings on the regular bill we could have determined whether to put back what I would have borrowed from such $8 billion for our immediate need. Since we will be having our hearings and will bring out the regular bill prior to that time, it was my thought we should let them use some of that carryover of $8 billion between now and July 1, 1958. Then instead of passing judgment on the programs involved in the bill before you, with which we all agree, programs which I would have met with part of that $8 billion, the question of restoring the $1,200,000,000 to the $8 billion carryover would have been based on the lesser priority programs which have not been of sufficient importance or, for one reason or another, have not even gotten around to being contracted for and will not be by July 1958.

Of course, you can see why the Department of Defense would not be for that. Somebody might cut out some of the frills—so they make their pitch on the high-priority items.

No; the tragedy is that every time you have a satellite, they do not redirect their efforts in the spending; they use it as an excuse to get more and more money appropriated.

The new Secretary has already got himself on the Pentagon team. He asked us personally to help him with the little matter of raising pay. Everybody in the Pentagon is willing to do his part, due to Russia's threat, but the Secretary says "for an increase in pay." Here is the schedule of what he wants you to do in the next 3 years.

The Secretary asked us to at least partially meet the Russian satellite threat by raising the salary of an admiral from $1,406 to $1,685 per month, and of a vice admiral from $1,400 to $1,685; and so it goes down the line through the Air Force and the Army, though I may say he would leave the private's pay where it is.

With this constant spending we are doing, and with the cost of inflation, I am sure you will have to do something along that line for it is a vicious circle—the more we spend the cheaper the dollar, the cheaper the dollar the more we spend. Raising pay does not contribute a whole lot toward meeting the satellite threat; neither does giving them $1,200,000,000 more to protect their carryover funds add one iota to real defense or toward meeting the threat of the satellite either, in my judgment.

No, I do not profess to have gained any military secrets by my trip through the central part of Russia, but everything I could see was completely opposite to what our folks in the Pentagon had made me believe. With such experience one cannot help but wonder about the military aspects of it. Be that as it may, if the Russian threat is as serious as anybody in this House or the biggest general with the most stars in the Pentagon says it is, if it is that serious, is it not time we kept our economy on a stable basis, so that when the time comes we will have a sound economy and a sound United States of America with which to fight? Is it not time we cut out some less essential things?

We did cut out some things last year; $300,000 was requested by the President for a home for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As I said last year, the Hindenburgs at the height of Prussian Germany never asked for a finer castle than was recommended in that bill. Let us not get into an argument about who held down what in the way of money. I will say that last year, when we went to conference with the Senate we had in our hands a letter from the Bureau of the Budget, the President's right arm, saying that the level of spending he was going to permit would not use up all the money in the House bill. In order to get an agreement with the other body, we agreed to $600 million more than the House figure, at least that much more than could have been spent in the Bureau of the Budget's announcement of the spending plan. The tragedy of it is we had to give them the money, and so help me God, afterward the committee agreed as to who was going to get it, for a further backlog of contracts in the States and districts of some of my good friends. I tried to get them to flip a coin if that was the way they were going to appropriate money.

It is serious when we use defense as a means to pump prime no matter whose district it may be in. It is putting our economy on a shaky basis, and it seriously weakens our chances of meeting a real war. May I say with all the sincerity of my heart, we are a greater threat to ourselves because of the fear of Russia than Russia is to us. If this thing is as serious as it is said to be, let us start looking to how much defense we are getting for the dollar instead of judging defense by how many dollars you give the Department for a home for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or to increase the grade of all civilians on an average of two grades in the last 2 years.

Yes, it is time that we put the interest of the United States first; and the first place to do that is here at home, so that we get some defense for the dollar. If every time you see a new wrinkle on the Soviet sun you want more spending, more money, instead of thinking about how you might shift what you are already spending it for—you are going about it the wrong way. We are making our dollar cheaper and cheaper, to the point that our folks lose confidence in it. I would like to remind you that 2 years ago, that great leader and fine Member, the head of the Armed Services Committee, in presenting the public works bill which amounts to about a billion dollars every year, mostly spread over the country—told us in the House, "My friends, there is something in this bill for every Member."

And sure enough, when you read the requests for military construction, they had them listed by States so you could see every Member had a monetary interest in passage. Under this full funding, that my friends believe in so much, every time you try to cut any of them out, Mr. Chairman, I get calls saying, "Did you know that is in my district?" I had them in the last few days. No; I am kind of walking alone. I cannot work my side of the street. I do not even have anybody on my side of the street to work with. But, I plead with you to think about it. It is high time that we began to look after keeping a sound and secure country and getting a dollars' worth of defense for every dollar spent. Again, as I told you last year, in the Air Force they had so much money they set up a group of officers and men to try to see how much money they did have in how many different accounts. This is a matter of record. They called it "Operation Smokeout." Then, when they did find out how much money they had that they did not know they had, they recovered it to their own use and called it "recoupment." I have not been able to bring this up to date; but last year at the time this bill was up, they had already recovered from themselves in excess of $1,300,000,000, which until "operation smokeout" they did not know they had so far as use was concerned. To put it in a nutshell, Mr. Chairman, because we have Federal spending tied in with "pump priming" and tied in with our domestic economy, we look at how much money we appropriate and tell the people, "We are safe because we are spending the money, even increasing it." Certain Democrats are saying in the press, "Why, we are going to look after you and that is why we ought to have a Democratic President, because we will spend $2 or $3 billion more for defense"—as though that in and of itself would provide safety. And the Republicans top that here today by saying that they would already have been spending more money except for the Democrats. The Republicans are saying "Congress cut out essential money last year." That is incorrect but it shows what the country is up against from some party leaders in both parties. I was somewhat surprised at my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, GERRY FORD, one of the finest men I have ever known, holding my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] responsible for the actions of Mr. Wilson, the Republican head of the Department of Defense. It so happens I agree with Mr. Wilson that the soundness of our economy is a major part of our defense. I join with him in most of the things he did. I hope that I may have expressed myself a little less brusquely than was his custom sometimes. However, I want it understood that I admire his courage because he had an awareness of the necessity of starting to get things done at home. But, let us get down to my main worry. As a retired admiral expressed it to me: Here is the way you are handling your defense—because we know the Russians have a good football team, we are trying to surround the perimeter of the football field with good football players and

the primary reason for that is that everybody gets a cut out of the salaries of such extra football players—labor, industry and Congressional Districts. In the process, we have our economy and our domestic programs caught in defense spending, and if you know your history such a situation contributed greatly to leading Germany into two world wars and Japan into one. I hope that we are smarter than they are. But, it appears to me we are on the road and perhaps running a little faster at this state of the game than they were. We need defense, but we must judge our defense by the wisdom with which we spend rather than how much we spend.

I repeat, if the danger from Russia is as great as many believe, we had better put first things first; and above all we must make our defense decisions on defense needs rather than on a pump-priming basis.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I feel as though I have some special right to come down here into the well of the House and talk to this committee on this problem—not much more than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]—but between the two of us, I think we have much more right to come in on this than all the rest of you put together. Every year that a defense bill or a supplemental appropriation bill for defense has been here before us, I have been pleading with you not to cut these defense funds for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force and not to substitute what I recognize ordinarily as your brilliant judgment on other matters for the judgment of people who know more about this subject than all of us put together. In your individual capacities you said, "No." So you have been cutting away year after year. I said you were wrong then and I say now you were wrong as of that point.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I was interested in your last remark.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, it is a great thing not to say "You are wrong now."

Mr. NICHOLSON. We have got a thousand generals. Do you think any of the genrals have been retired when someone else has not taken their place?

Mr. FLOOD. I think somebody has. I do not know that it makes any difference or not.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Do you think we need more generals?

Mr. FLOOD. I know that the generals, like Tennyson's Brook, go on forever. But that is another picture.

The gentleman from Kansas, my dear friend, Mr. SCRIVNER, drew an analogy of a football team with reference to confusion allegedly existing at the control level in the Pentagon and the defense generally. Now, there must be something wrong down there. The President insists that there is. Everybody agrees something should be done about it. In my poor way I conclude something is wrong down there. What it is is not clear, but I am sure there is something. The gentleman from Kansas thinks the quarterback should be left alone. Maybe there is something wrong with the coach. Maybe he should be taken out. Maybe the coach made a mistake. Maybe the master's touch has gone. Then the team might be all right but even the grandstand does not like it. The team does not like it. The junior varsity does not like it when they know the first string quarterback is on the bench and the third string quarterback is running the team and doing a bad job.

Now the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] indicated that Mr. McElroy, the new Secretary of Defense, by the way, for whom I have a great regard—let me tell you, you have not got to this fellow yet down there. So far they have not brainwashed McElroy. So far he is doing all right. I hope they will not get to him. So far they have not put a glove on him. He is doing a good job. Mr. SCRIVNER said Mr. McElroy did 14 good things. The first 10 things he did was to reverse the palpable errors of judgment committed by his predecessor, Mr. Wilson. Mr. McElroy deserves great credit. We have three problems that we are concerned with: Maintaining the force strength of our existing Defense Establishment. That is the present problem. We must increase it. And mark this, not in direct ratio to the Russian increase, but we must not only increase our own farther and faster than we have gone, but certainly to increase the ratio of our speedup faster than the Russian ratio to their present strength and development, but we must go beyond that, go twice as fast as the Russians are going in the next 10 years.

Third, we must go into the satellite and space program. There are three things. When my friends over here say, "We are strong today," that is right, but who said we are not? We can devastate Russia today with our bombers. We can kill 70 million Russians with our bombers in 12 hours. That is right. But the Russians can kill 70 million Americans in 12 hours. Does that make you feel any better? It is a great way to look at it.

Now, we have got a bad time coming. Fear. But do not say this country is quivering and shaking with fear; that is not true. Everybody got all upset there for a while. So did you, and so did I; but not naked, stark, panic, hysteria, and fear. Do not destroy this debate with that kind of charge; it is not so; it is not the fact. Some few people, yes; nearly all, no. So do not pretend to set up a premise to knock it down for some other purpose that those were facts; they were never facts.

But if you or the American people do not have a little commonsense fear in the bottom of your belly about the situation in this world today, that it does not affect this debate that we are engaging in, does not deal with the existence of the United States of America as a nation upon the face of the earth, then you are crazy, because it does.

Am I afraid? Yes, sir; I am afraid. You sit in this subcommittee as long as I have and hear the testimony and know the things that we know, and if you are not afraid in some way—oh, I admit this is a relative term—you ought to have your head examined.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, but my remarks were not directed to him.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman from Kansas has sat on this committee a good deal longer time than has the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I am not afraid and never have been afraid.

Mr. FLOOD. Not afraid. Play The Star-Spangled Banner. Is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am in favor of that.

Mr. FLOOD. All right; then you will stand up again, so will I.

Let me say this: That there has been talk about in the cloakroom that perhaps an amendment will be offered to increase the 3 Polaris weapon missiles system up to 10. Mr. Chairman, I have, when I thought the situation warranted it, introduced amendments dealing with defense measures when there was not a handful of support for it on both sides of the aisle. I asked the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke; I asked Secretary Gates; I asked Admiral Raborn, in charge of these programs; and every professional, scientific, and expert witness: Do you need any more Polaris weapons? What more do you need? If it is money you want, if that is all you want in this urgent supplemental bill, then you ask for it, and I think you will get it. Can you use any more? Can you build any more any faster? Where can you build the ships? Can you get the material with which to build them?

Now, Mr. Chairman, unless somebody wants to get his name in the paper, there is no need to amend this bill to raise from 3 to 10 the number of Polaris submarines. I like to have my name in the paper as well as anybody and I would like 10 submarines as well as anybody if I thought the national welfare in this urgent supplemental bill warranted them. It does not. Now, if I do not think so, then none of you should think so—in our comparing of records here.

The bill is all right; leave it alone.

Let me point out to you that I found it necessary, however, to insist that the Army be recognized in this bill. When this bill came to the Congress there was not a dime, there was not a request for the United States Army. Let me tell you, 2 years from today you people will be wondering how many battalions are left after everybody is even Steven on missiles and bombers, and you are at a standoff and war breaks out in a dozen "cancers" throughout the world. Then you will come back and ask Jim Gavin "How many battalions have you got, Jim?" And you will not like the answer unless you change your mind very soon. Mark what I tell you. With God's help and that of the 11th Pennsylvania District I would like to be here to point that out to you 2 years from today. Remember, you cannot run the show without the Army. This next war you are talking about is going to be over in 30 minutes. That war did not happen. The

third world war never took place because of your bombers, and the fourth world war will not take place because everybody will have missiles and, outside of panic or insanity, which could happen, that will not happen. But the conventional warfare, whatever that means, will be going on, according to the Bible, until the end of time. I do not think even this committee can improve upon that document.

Now, boasting is an American trait and habit throughout the world. You and I do it as Americans. It certainly irritates a lot of people. Boasting of your pride and your power and your strength is not going to solve this problem for neutral nations or those on our side, or you either. That is like whistling while going past a cemetery when you were a kid.

I can think of General Darius, a great Persian, who sat with his captains boasting of their might and their history and their great future the night before Alexander the Great massacred them at Issis. All through history I can think of warnings about the barbarians from the north. There is trouble with the tribes in the north, the hungry, fighting, savage, terrible northern tribes. Oh, I can think of some fat Roman merchant who sat in luxury in the baths of Caracalla laughing about these rumors. Rome has been great for a thousand years. We have always got away with trouble. We have had trouble but it always came out all right. This is Rome. I am a Roman citizen. He was so proud. That was the night before Attila destroyed him at the Baths of Caracalla and sacked Rome.

Well, Mr. Chairman, history is full of the stories of great nations who rose and fell. That is history. History is the story of the rise and fall of great, proud, luxurious, fat nations. It is so from the dawn of history.

I just recite these pages out of an abundance of caution. They kind of frighten you but, remember, at the end of World War II, I was in Russia, so was the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], so was a Member of the other body, then a Member of the House, Mr. MUNDT.

Russia was desolate, destroyed, almost wiped off the map at the end of World War II. They had suffered twelve million casualties, starving, dying. The United States of America was the wealthiest, the most powerful, the richest, the greatest Nation in the world. Russia had no air force. We had the greatest. Russia had no Navy. We had the greatest. Russia had no submarines. We had many of them. Russia was poor and weak. She had no atom bomb. We did. That is 12 years ago. No nation in the world has gone as far or as fast, including this nation, as the Russians in those 12 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in those 12 years these atheistic, communistic barbarians are almost even with us. Nobody says the Russians are ahead of us. That is nonsense. The Russians are not ahead of us. The Russians are not more powerful than we are if you are talking about 3 o'clock this afternoon. No. If that is what you are worrying about, forget about it. But, she is getting ahead of us in ratio with her acceleration of development and speed. She is in a hurry. They, in Russia, these atheistic communists, have a mark on the wall as a target. They know where they are going. Oh, they may get off the path; the dramatic personnel may change from year to year, but they get back on the track to their goal. However, their goal is world conquest. It will never change; never. So we have got something to worry about.

Mr. Chairman, the general budget will be for the fiscal year 1959. It will terminate on July 1, 1959. General LeMay, Deputy Chief of Staff for Air, the great "iron pants," square-jawed Air Force general, Curtis LeMay—and there is none greater—in the hearings, if you read them, said to me: On July 1, 1959, the Russian Army will be four times bigger, more powerful, better equipped in hardware than ours will be. General LeMay said that the Russians will have 700 submarines July 1, 1959. We will have 200. Some of those Russian subs will have what we call Polaris sub weapons systems July 1, 1959, and some of those Russian subs will launch guided missiles from off the sea in 1959, and July 1, 1959, the Russians will have ICBM operational, and the Russians now have operational IRBM. They are intermediate range ballistic missiles, up to 1,000 miles, zeroed on all our bases except Rota Air Base and Cadiz Naval Base in the south of Spain, and our airbases in north Africa. Everything else is zeroed. The Russians have their IRBM today operational up to 1,000 miles. Now, that is what will happen July 1, 1959. And, if you want to hide, you better hide between July 1, 1959, and July 1, 1960, because these Russians will be ahead of you in everything. LeMay told me that the Russians will have more bombers, better bombers, more fighters, better fighters. We are talking hush, hush, about an X–10 exotic fuel chemical bomber. LeMay told me the Russians are flying one now, mockup only, but they are flying a mock-up job. You think we have no problem? I, with all of you, will not mouth platitudes of my patriotism, my Americanism, my faith, and my belief. It should not be necessary to mention in this House. We all have a right to equality in these things and we all are equal as Americans.

But, I am not writing an editorial, Mr. Chairman. I am reciting the facts. What will happen July 1, 1959, even if you spend every dollar you can get, even if you have every factory working at the height of its production, even if you do everything in the world that the great United States of America can do? By July 1, 1959, you are not going to look so good. I am not talking about today and how strong you are today and how powerful you are today. I know as much about that as you do, and it is true. But, I speak of 3 years; I speak of 5 years. Even if you have missile equality, you do not have satellite equality and will not unless we go faster then we are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am overwhelmed; I am practically speechless.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman is, then he is for the first time in my knowledge.

Mr. FLOOD. You know, for the first time the gentleman is expressing a majority opinion.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. I know his sincerity; I have never doubted it.

Mr. FLOOD. May I suggest the gentleman just ask me the question.

Mr. SCRIVNER. But I have read these entire hearings and I cannot find where General LeMay said what the gentleman said he said.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will bring it down here, I will show it to him.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have the hearings right here.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman and I went all through that in the hearings.

Mr. SCRIVNER. He did not mention figures at all.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. It is in the hearings and I submit, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee should read the hearings and equate this dispute between the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] and myself.

Mr. Chairman, I point out to you—and I would be the last to point this out as I close my remarks—that mere money, I am convinced—and that is the first time I ever devaluated money by calling it mere—but mere dollars, even American green dollars, will not be enough to do this. We have a standard of values that we must maintain.

I can think of another era in history, Mr. Chairman, when the shoe was on the other foot, when my country was the poor, weak, unclothed, starving barbarian from the north and I can think of the Hessians drinking and dancing in my home State when Washington and his ragged Continentals crossed the Delaware on the ice, because they were desperate and they were fighting for something. They had courage and hunger.

We all know the fight game. Did you ever see a club fighter who was hungry? That is an old expression in the fight game—"that kid is hungry and he will fight," for $25 a night. But something happens to the fat champion. And it is not just his legs that go bad. That is an old story. The guts go bad. He has eaten too high on the hog. My southern friends appreciate that expression.

And I can think of another time in our history when we were in the same position of the underdog, at Vincennes. My friend remembers when the Americans with Clark waded through flooded forests up to their armpits, in ice-cold

water, to attack the British, dancing and drinking, fat and lazy, proud and old and careless.

I am not presumptuous or impertinent enough to think that I am telling you anything. I am just thinking out loud and saying out loud what you think and feel.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a supplemental bill, not technically, but in a sense actually. The men who know say that this is all they need for this job. They came to our committee and said, "We have time for sale. Do you want to buy any time for the safety of this Nation?" We said, "Yes, how much do you want for it and what do you have to sell?"

And they said, "We will sell you 6 months for $1.2 billion. That is all we want." We gave it to them.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of orderly procedure, in the interest of proper fiscal responsibility, in the interest of the national welfare, I submit this bill should pass as presented by the subcommittee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the last speaker, the brilliant and colorful gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], says he is scared. My very good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], says he is not afraid. Frankly, I do not suppose there is as much difference, except rhetorical, about the way these gentlemen feel about the present situation as their oratory might indicate. But speaking for myself, at least, I am very easily scared, and I am always scared of overconfidence. So I think there is no doubt about the urgency of our consideration of this bill.

However, there is no more urgency with respect to it, in my opinion, than with any other measure that involves our national defense and safety. This is not abnormal because such urgency has existed for many years and it is likely to continue to exist in the foreseeable future or at least as long as there is a cold war.

However, there is no occasion for hysteria or for anything approaching a panicky attitude in our consideration of this legislation or in evaluating our defense posture.

Historically, we know only too well that violent switches from too little and too late to abundance and then cutting back too much has cost us millions and billions of dollars and some very anxious moments over the years. We must not let that occur at this time or ever again. As a matter of fact, the prime reason for this supplemental request is not adverse developments, but, on the contrary, I believe it is because of progress made in the ballistic-missile art that was not foreseen or believed possible 6 months ago, when the Congress passed the current budget. It is these favorable developments rather than the Russian successes in outer space that have made the speedup here not only desirable but, I believe, necessary in our national interest.

As has been pointed out in recent months, our scientists have solved problems of vital importance and have developed a reentry cone that makes it possible to bring a missile back through the atmosphere to a target. We have no certain knowledge as to just what our potential enemy's capabilities may be in that particular filed.

We have developed a solid-fuel propellant that is available in quantity or can be produced in quantity and at a reasonable cost. That is a development the importance of which can hardly be overestimated. It not only makes possible the launching of ballistic missiles from the sea, but it greatly simplifies the operations of missiles on land and will materially reduce the risk to personnel and the amount of equipment and other things required in using fuels of other types.

Of course, we should press on rather than lapse into complacency, but we should press on with renewed confidence rather than trepidation. We should look for every possible improvement in our system and organization, but we should make these changes with the utmost caution. We should realize that we have a good, going concern now. We must be sure we do not cripple or distract it while seeking means to improve it.

Likewise, we must not forget the desirability of a balanced budget or tax reduction. Those things are just as important now as they were a year ago, when we were talking so much about them. It is still as necessary to avoid waste and get as much value as possible from each defense dollar as it was last year.

There is no occasion for being stampeded into any allout crash programs at this time. Let us be sure we make haste, but make it intelligently.

We have had some discussions about last year's appropriation. It is water under the dam now. It is not too useful, in my opinion, to try to figure out responsibility for errors if they were not too serious and if they can be corrected. I agree with almost all of my colleagues, if not all of them, that there is no place for partisan politics in matters affecting our national safety. Last year I supported a larger defense budget but I doubt that the reduced figures have had a crippling effect. However, the history of the last few months discloses one serious error, in my opinion, committed by the Congress last session. There were slowdowns and there were cutbacks in numerous important defense areas, if not in the ballistic program, made necessary because of the failure of the Congress to raise the debt ceiling. I am happy that this body so far as it is concerned has corrected that situation today by passing a measure that will prevent the repetition of that error where it appears that rising expenditures and the Treasury cash position early last year, caused serious and costly cutbacks and loss of time. My colleagues, I think we have a good bill here. I am delighted that it has been considered in the calm atmosphere that has marked the debate thus far. This bill should be passed as quickly as possible. But, in so doing, let us remember that we are not in a situation of crisis. The fact is that we are in very good shape as of right now. The main think we have to do is to be sure that we continue this way.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] stated practically the exact thought I wished to present. He spoke about the Army. I am for this bill, Mr. Chairman. I am for anything that will strengthen the defense of this great land of ours. I take this time today to call to your attention something very important and that is an opinion borne out by the Secretary of the Army and other Defense officials who are experienced in military ways and whose opinions in such matters are highly regarded. The Secretary of the Army and other military experts have thought that less than a million men in the Army at this time was too small a number. However, the Secretary of the Army did ask for 929,000 men just 71,000 short of the million mark. But, we have not seen fit to approve that figure and in fact, it has been cut down even further to almost 700,000 men. We have cut the appropriation below the danger point. We have cut more than $250 million below the danger point. I say, if we can spend money on the foreign aid programs surely we can put a little more money into this essential program and have an Army that we know will be able to take care of this great country of ours in time of need. There are those who say, "There is no danger." My friends, experts in military affairs have told us we have been in danger for several years. Some say, "No, we do not need an Army of this size." Some say, "We only need missiles." My good friends, let me call your attention to this one thing. If the time should come when we are at war and the Russian bombs should fall on this great land of ours, and you find the cities devastated and see the dead by the untold thousands, you will certainly need an Army. You will wonder where the foot soldier is when such a time comes. You will not be able to send out to care for the dead, the dying, the sick and the wounded at that time. You will not be able to take care of them because there will not be the foot soldier who can be depended upon to go out and care for them and clean up after the battle. I say to you—before it is too late, let us give the Army the 929,000 men they request. Let us give them $250 million more and cut it off foreign aid.

I am of a somewhat suspicious mind when it comes to the safety and welfare of our Nation, because the United States is the greatest country in the world and belongs to its American citizens—I want to keep it that way.

Our satellite and missile programs are most assuredly an important segment of our defense program and must be considered a basic part of our system; yet, we should not allow ourselves to be stampeded into a hastily, ill-planned program which will play directly into the hands of those who would destroy our way of life.

Political propaganda, being what it is, can be used to sway the thinking of the public and guide our citizens into a frame

of mind which can be best utilized for the end to be accomplished. I fear the newly emphasized missile program is being used to create a basis for the neglect of the backbone of the defense of our Nation—its Army. Talk goes on for a vast and expanded missile program, all of which is well. But not at the expense of cutting our Army to the danger point. Wars are won by teamwork—the man at the gun and the man behind the scene. It is dangerous to the security of our Nation to put all our eggs in one basket, and sacrifice one part of our basic defense system for the benefit of another.

I am not satisfied with the political implications surrounding this entire situation. For several years now, we have had what was considered to be an adequate missile program. Those who are charged with maintaining and developing our defense program have been aware of the importance of missiles, and they have been aware, also, of the missile development program in foreign nations. It is rather difficult for me to believe that our missile defenses have been neglected to the point where we are in a completely secondary position. The Republicans in control are not too happy about their chances for the next Presidential election, nor are they happy about this year's Congressional elections. To assume the role of hero and savior of our country, by staging a comeback after a supposed flaw or weakness in our defenses, as has been shown to the public, is not exactly a newly devised scheme to win popularity and votes. I am bound to view with a political eye the announced tremendous expansion of personnel in our Defense Department with emphasis on the missile program.

I am not altogether happy with the fact that the United States seems to be devoid of scientific minds. I do not look with enthusiasm upon the supposed necessity of going to alien lands for scientific minds to explore and develop the missile program for the defense of our own United States. It may be true that greater attention should have been given toward boosting scientific development and making it easier for our promising youngsters to pursue a training which would academically equip them to work in the missile development program.

Particularly I view with alarm what is happening to our Army. An expanded missile program is essential but let us bear in mind that such a program is projected into the future and we have a dangerous current situation with our enemies remaining strong and arrogant. By all means we should retain adequate military strength while building up the new missile program. Even now we are in the process of cutting our Army below the danger point.

During these times, when war could occur at any moment, when the security of this great country hangs in the balance, to my way of thinking it is foolhardy and almost criminal for the Congress of the United States to sit idly by and let the Bureau of the Budget or any branch of the Government cut the Army to the danger point. I dare say that there is not an Army officer in this country who would agree that the Army should be cut below a million men. It is the duty of the Bureau of the Budget and all other agencies created by Congress to assist the Congress in doing its work.

I do not like to think of permitting the destruction of our Army. We all remember after World War II, when our training camps and forts were permitted to deteriorate, only to have been reconstructed later at a cost of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

It may be argued, because of the missile program and the threat of attack by missiles, that we do not need the Army. I do not believe there will ever come a time when foot soldiers and other ground troops will not be called upon to bear the brunt of any war that may be fought now or hereafter. There are ground attacks to be considered, there are service forces such as supply and communication to be considered, our military police, our occupation forces, and the many other segments concerned with war which cannot be replaced by machines.

Should we be attacked, we would need a large and well-equipped standing Army here at home for protection purposes alone, to say nothing of the need in the event we again were called upon to fight overseas. So, I appeal to you, my colleagues in the Congress, to study this program and study it well and hard, using your best judgment in not permitting the Bureau of the Budget or any other agency created by the Congress to dictate your thinking on this all-important matter. Let us go along with the Secretary of the Army and restore the $250 million that will be needed and give him the right to recruit the necessary men to bring our Army to the required standard of not less than 929,000.

This might be a good time to point out that a situation exists in Army practices which not only works a great hardship on the officer or serviceman concerned, but also has a tremendous adverse affect on the morale of existing and prospective service personnel. I refer to the practice of discharging military personnel who have devoted many years to a military career and who are only a few years short of retiring. I have had many constituents, who are officers, call on me protesting their fate. These men have been encouraged all along to make the Army their career, and they have worked hard to serve our country to the best of their ability in whatever capacity that might be assigned to them. Then after as many as 17 or 17½ years of service and within 2 or 3 years of retirement, they are being discharged from service. To me it is grossly unfair for the Government to encourage men to enter military service and make a career of it. Yet that same Government finds it necessary to discharge those still qualified men against their wishes.

Let us not be caught short again. We have been caught short before in disaster, and may I say that in my humble opinion it has cost us many lives—many men and also many dollars. We will not have time if a war comes now with the present atomic missile weapons of war. May I repeat, we will not have time to prepare for war as we have in the past. We will have to be ready on the spot to begin immediately to defend our country and repair damage done by the enemy's bombs and if we do not have the manpower in our Army to do this, then again our people and our great country will have to suffer for the shortsightedness of the Congress of the United States.

We are today, through our foreign-aid program, aiding others to bolster their economy and their power of defense. It certainly will be a sad thing if we spend our money building for other countries the things that they need to defend themselves and care for their people and then in the end find that we have bled ourselves white helping peoples in foreign nations and have neglected the most vital thing—being prepared to defend ourselves in an emergency. Nine hundred and twenty-nine thousand men for an Army—to care for as large a country as the United States. We certainly are not, in my opinion, using good judgment. Some of the people who are advising the Congress to cut down on the Army are merely men who know nothing about anything except figures. And all you hear is cut, cut, cut. I, too, want to reduce taxes; I, too, want to operate as cheaply and economically as we possibly can, but there are many other places where waste and extravagance are being practiced which could and should be stopped. It will do no good to save $250 million by cutting the Army to the danger point and then spending an equal amount or more on foreign aid.

The Secretary of the Army submitted a logical and necessary request to the Bureau of the Budget, which Agency saw fit to remove $250 million.

My colleagues, I cannot urge you too strongly to give this matter serious consideration and vote to restore this sum so that our basic defenses will not be impaired and we will not be playing into the hands of those who would weaken and destroy us.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a few questions with reference to page 5 of the bill, section 601, and the creation under the terms of this legislation, of 15 positions in the professional and scientific service and 10 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, or any other member of the committee, what representation was made to the committee that convinced them that there should be legislation in an appropriation bill creating these 25 professional and supergrade positions.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I commend him for having looked up this thing which appears on page 5 of this bill. Secretary McElroy has set up this Advanced Weapons Research Agency in the Department of Defense, to assist him in the contest for the weapons of the future—space weapons, military satellites, and so forth. He hopes to use this agency to press forward the position of the United States. Whether this new agency is going to fulfill the hopes of the

Secretary or not, I do not know. I have my doubts about it. But in this scientific field, where we deal with earth satellites, rockets, IRBM's and ICBM's, and so forth, we need the best brains that money can buy. If the Secretary is able to get these people, I do not think pay should be a limiting factor. I can imagine that if there were some way of buying brains it would be well to pay almost any price for such people in this Agency. We have gone along with the Secretary on this project, hoping that it would succeed. That is about the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question—I am not in disagreement with the need for the proper kind of people, but I would like to ask the gentleman if his committee was told whether there were available, under Public Law 313, any vacant spaces?

Mr. MAHON. That is my understanding. If there is any other member of the committee who has different information, I would like to hear it. We have the testimony in the hearings, but I do not have it before me.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the 10 supergrades which would be established, did the gentleman's committee hear any testimony from the Civil Service Commission as to the availability of supergrade positions?

Mr. MAHON. We did not.

Mr. GROSS. Now, here we are again—the Committee on Appropriations coming before Congress authorizing supergrades and professional positions as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] said a little while ago, it ought to be clearly understood by the House that the creation of supergrade jobs through 1956, has caused upgrading to the extent of an increase of more than $800,000 in the Federal payroll.

I do not mean to infer for one minute that all our troubles with scientific, technical, and supergrade allocations stem from the Appropriations Committee or the gentleman's subcommittee. I have a high regard for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. He is a hard-working, conscientious Member of Congress, and I can appreciate the difficulties he encounters in bringing to the floor this kind of legislation.

Will the gentleman say that there might be spaces available and held by the Civil Service Commission now?

Mr. MAHON. I am not qualified, to be perfectly honest with my friend, I am not qualified to comment on it. I certainly know that President Eisenhower through the Bureau of the Budget sent up this request and we heard a lot of testimony about various aspects of the bill. We wanted to get it to the floor as soon as we could. My position was that the Secretary said he needed certain people and we gave him the people.

Mr. GROSS. This sort of legislation ought to come through the proper legislative committee; it ought not to be tacked to an appropriation bill.

Would the gentleman be surprised were I to tell him that only this afternoon I was advised that the Civil Service Commission now has available 22 vacant supergrade spaces?

Those spaces might well take care of the requests in this legislation.

Mr. MAHON. If the Civil Service Commission can establish that this need does not exist I would certainly be willing to consider it further.

Mr. GROSS. The Civil Service Commission has the power if this is an emergency and if they have spaces available, to meet these requests.

Mr. MAHON. The legislation with respect to this new Agency, as the gentleman knows, was approved by the House in a bill from the Committee on the Armed Services, brought in by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] a few days ago.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman that I understand that Defense Secretary McElroy is sending a letter to the Speaker of the House asking for a large number of professional spaces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MAHON. I yield the gentleman 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would offer an amendment to strike this out. The proper legislative committee can take care of this request.

The gentleman well knows that last year I made a point of order against provisions in appropriation bills creating supergrade jobs. I came to the conclusion then that either the Appropriations Committee was being mislead in these applications for supergrades, or else we on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, particularly the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee where we are trying to hold down this upgrading, were being hoodwinked.

Mr. MAHON. May I say to my friend from Iowa that this matter was presented to us as one of great urgency. We did not want to hamstring this new Agency which apparently is so vital to our future. The committee took the position that we wanted to get going.

In view of questions which have been raised by the gentleman from Iowa I shall get in touch with the Secretary of Defense and with the Civil Service Commission and with the other body if this language remains in the bill, and take every precaution to see whether the language is required to meet the demands of this new Agency or else that steps are taken to try to remove it from the legislation. That is the best I think that could be done at this point. I certainly would not be willing to sponsor an amendment to defeat the program which is presented to us or be charged with defeating it by striking out this language which has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will yield, but first let me say to the gentleman that earlier this afternoon he made one of the finest speeches that has been made in the House in recent years. His is a voice in the wilderness now, but it will be heard and appreciated fully some day.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to thank my friend for his very gracious statement. Let me say that in my opinion the subcommittee was unaware of the effect of this type of legislation where supergrades are given. I personally am opposed to doing it in these various appropriation bills. It was news to me to learn, as I tried to say a while ago, after these things had been done I find from investigations by the Civil Service Committee that all the people who have already been working in the military and who may happen to have one of these fellows at a top position in the section, have been promoted and nobody has advised our committee of it. Your own tabulation from the regular committee that should handle it shows we have built up the cost $880,000 per year by it and nobody in the Congress has known it because all they asked for were the supergrades and once they got them they raised everybody else.

Mr. GROSS. As long as there are spaces available in the Civil Service Commission the Defense Department ought to go there first. If they are justified in upgrading these people, I am sure they will get sympathetic treatment.

Mr. WHITTEN. And there is no need to carry the rest of them either.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into an intricate examination as to who is to blame for anything. The only thing I can say, and I think that we ought to have it in mind, is that our defense picture is not as bad as some people have given us to understand. I am going to call some witnesses to prove that statement.

First, I am going to call General LeMay. On page 139 of the hearings General LeMay stated:

> General LEMAY. I think all the previous testimony here and in the Senate has indicated that the Russian Army is bigger than ours. I do not say better; I say bigger. They have more submarines than we have. It is on the record that we expect their striking capability in the air to pass ours sometime in 1959. And I do not think we can deny it here, since it has been said on the record before. Whether that means we feel we can be defeated or not, I am not ready to say that we can be defeated.

Then going over to page 149 we find the following:

> General LEMAY. What I tried to say was that all of this did not add up to disaster. If a potential enemy is stronger than you are in every field, I think it would be foolhardy to think that you are going to have an easy time defeating him. I still believe that, but I do not believe we are facing complete disaster, because we do have strong forces, and while adding them up numericalwise side by side the picture may not look very good, it looks better when you add up complete combat capability.
>
> Mr. SCHEVNER. Let us add up that complete combat capability and put it out where everybody can see it.

General LEMAY. I think as of now we have military superiority over the Russians.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do too.

General LEMAY. I think it is largely due to the nuclear striking power we have in the Strategic Air Command. I think that advantage will last at least to the middle of 1959.

Remember this. The deterrent force upon which we are placing so much dependence is only a deterrent force if the enemy thinks it is, not if we think it is.

It is my belief that the enemy will not consider as a deterrent a force which he considers weaker than his force. He may consider that even a force weaker than his can inflict more damage on him than he wants to accept. In that case it still has some deterrent value. However, I think that we would be gambling more than we should with the security of the country if we should assume that a weaker force will deter him from attack.

Then, there is Admiral Burke, the old salt, head of Naval Operations. Admiral Burke testified on page 261:

Today, tomorrow, or—no, I was thinking more of a few years from now. We can destroy her today. We can destroy her 10 years from now.

Mr. FLOOD. With bombers?

Admiral BURKE. With bombers, with missiles.

Now, that is some of the testimony on that subject, and many of the different witnesses have covered that situation. I could name some of them, but it is not necessary at this time.

The situation that we are confronted with is this: We have been asked for this supplemental legislation. It covers funds for a great many things that were not developed far enough when the Military Establishment came before us in the springtime to recommend them nor was there an appreciation amongst our people of the necessity for it. The development of the different missiles that we are working on has made marked progress. It has even made marked progress as late as the time we were holding the hearings.

Now, it is hardly a fair thing for us, when we are presented with requests to develop projects that the Defense Establishment has developed with its research work upon all these different missiles, the guided missiles, the anti-missile missiles, and all that sort of thing, to lay down on the job and fail to go ahead and provide the additional things that they ask for, for the development of those missiles. Now, I can see that if we were going to remain dead and the Congress was not going to meet its responsibility today and in the days to come, that we would be in a pretty bad fix, maybe soon but surely in a little while, and for us to say that Russia could run all over us, to my mind, is a great mistake and it is wrong and it is not something that the best military people tell us could be done. We might even persuade Russia that she was strong enough to run all over us if we carry that too far. That is the thing that I would be afraid of.

That is the thing I would try particularly to avoid. I have a list here of a number of these missiles, but I am not going to read it. There are 8 or 10 of them of one kind or another in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Particularly there is the Polaris missile which they are developing at the present time and wish to have submarines built to carry and to discharge them. Those will cost $300 million practically. There is the development of the radar screen to give us warning when missiles might be approaching. There is work on the DEW line up in the north, in Canada, and the SAGE line, that will have to be done toward completing this job. All in all, for all those things, including the sites for the launching of the missiles, there is involved $520 million for public works. There is over $300 million for some of the Navy items.

To my mind this bill needs to be passed and I think we ought to pass it here today, get it over with and meet our responsibilities.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, as we discuss the bill to make supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense, here are some observations that I would like to make. It was gratifying to hear the chairman of the committee indicate that this bill for supplemental appropriations does not come as a result of an economy vote of last year in which I and a great number of the Members of this House participated, but that the bill comes because of the developed need for an advanced program in the missile field which has become evident in recent months with the revelations of the scientific and military activities of Communist Russia.

In fact, the chairman of the committee pointed out in his very able remarks that through our appropriations of last year we actually provided more money than the military could absorb. I hope that that is so. This is a new program, coming to the floor as a supplemental measure so as to advance its time schedule. The people of my District, just as the people of every other Congressional District throughout the country, are alarmed, concerned, and agitated over their conceptions and sometimes misconceptions of our true military status. That they should have misconceptions is not at all unexpected because I suggest that we in the Congress also had some misconceptions with regard to the Armed Forces of the United States.

As in most of the countries of the world, in most of the periods of civilization, the military arm is a mighty one and often vies with the rest of the Government in the matter of direction of policy. The Pentagon, the military arm of the United States, is a powerful influence upon what is done in the Congress and throughout the executive branch of the Government.

We in Congress have witnessed that strength and determination of policy in many ways. For instance, because we have observed at times waste and extravagance in the matter of supply, procurement, and general operations, we have made legislative suggestions of economy and have discovered that, instead of a concerted effort to economize by removing such extravagances or duplications or waste effort that the matter was handled more or less summarily by an across-the-board reduction in military activities. The military arm of the Government alone has the peculiar knowledge of what it needs in order to operate efficiently. It is extremely difficult for the layman, indeed, for Members of Congress to analyze these requests and to argue with them. Therefore, we who are not members of the Armed Forces Committee and who are not members of the Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, must rely upon the recommendations that are presented to us by these committees. It is my sincere hope that these committees will continue to examine thoroughly into every nook and cranny of our far-flung Defense Department, question thoroughly every recommendation that is made and to insist upon justification of every item that is contained in such recommendations as the military make and to provide the Members of Congress with adequate facts to convince us of the justice and necessity for the appropriations.

Neither we, nor the membership of the two committees which deal with such matters, must permit ourselves to be snowed under by the great public relations and public opinion strength that the Pentagon has at its disposal. It would be interesting to see how the proposal to make changes in the administration of the Department of Defense will be resisted by the old guard of the Pentagon. It is my prediction that unless both the administration and the Congress adopt a very determined attitude that changes are necessary, that changes must be made, and that the changes be such that the desired results will be obtained, that in 1959 we will see a military structure changed very little from the 1958 version.

We find ourselves in the military position we hold today largely because human nature is what it is. Once we were a weak and struggling Nation, threatened by the overwhelming power of the giants of the world. We had determination born of necessity to overcome those obstacles and grew to become the Nation we are today. Once having attained that position, it is only human nature to rest on one's oars. This we did following World War II. Who could believe that the necessity existed to become stronger than we already were. We were the Nation that won the war. We were the Nation that possessed the atomic bomb. We had no need to do anything more than maintain a mild interest in scientific advancement and remain strong. Not so, the other nations of the world. Possibly the atomic bomb in our hands together with the military might that we displayed in Europe was a challenge. I recall a day or two before V–E Day, Allied forces had the opportunity to capture rocket-launching sites on the Baltic Sea. It was interesting to note the rather unique installations where the Germans had launched their V–1 and V–2 rockets; but the fact that there were

military secrets infesting the place, and the scientists who had performed those miracles of jet propulsion and guided missiles, interested us very little. Not so with the Russians.

It now appears that their haste to move westward was that they might overrun those installations and scoop up secrets and scientists alike. We had the atomic bomb—a step or two away was the hydrogen bomb—and we had planes of the conventional type that could carry them. To gain the advantage, the Russians resorted to two courses of action. They borrowed by one method or another all of the secrets on the atomic development that we had, thus saving the painstaking efforts of years. They borrowed the secrets of the Germans, again saving themselves the painstaking efforts of years. We continued to rest on our oars until we were rudely jolted to the realization that our supremacy was being challenged. The jolt was climaxed with the successful launching of an earth satellite.

Though we had advanced in seven league boots in many scientific fields which have brought comfort, pleasure and meaning to the lives of our citizens in terms of automobiles, television sets, and automatic washers, flu shots and polio shots and miracle drugs and in so many other ways that the populations of the Iron Curtain countries will not enjoy, yet we were still in second gear in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles and movements into space. Perhaps the jolt has been a good one. We know that this legislation before us is a result. From it, we will obtain greater military strength. From it, we will obtain the power to deter others from making foolhardy military moves and from it will come scientific achievements and advancements in the civilian field which will bring greater comforts of life to our American populace.

There is nothing insurmountable about the position we find ourselves in today when we compare the relative position of our country in the 18th century with that of the other nations of the world and what then appeared to be our chances for survival and growth and development, with the relative position of our Nation and the other nations of the world today. Any man among us today who adopts a defeatist or pessimistic attitude about America's future, has lost the patriotic determination that made us a great Nation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the committee on this bill and I shall do it strictly on faith. However, I am much concerned about certain statements and promises made by the President in his state of the Union message and some confusion that apparently has recently developed.

UP THE HILL AND DOWN THE HILL

Mr. Chairman, the President made a good state of the Union speech on January 9. He marched straight up the hill and urged prompt action on his number one point to obtain safety through strength; namely, the reorganization of the Department of Defense.

The President listed eight items requiring prompt action. He added the word "prompt" to his prepared speech. He said that action on the eight points was not merely desirable—but imperative.

The President also said that "soon my own conclusions—on reorganization—will be finalized" and "I shall promptly take such executive action as is necessary and, in a separate message, I shall present appropriate recommendations to the Congress."

The President was loudly applauded by the Congress and the country for these statements.

But, 6 days later at a press conference, the President appeared to go back down the hill in a disorderly rout and stated that while he had strong personal convictions on the subject, other people had ideas also and that—

I am certainly hopeful that it goes in the direction of what I believe, but I would be the last to ask for a detailed organization in which I believe because I think, say, organization has got to be effective after there has passed from the scene a man who happens to have particular strong convictions in the matter.

The President also stated at his press conference:

I am trying to put before the Congress a plan which I think will be effective, and certainly in the discussions and many conferences that will go on in the formulation of the plan that I have in mind, there will be a good deal of argument, no question about it, and my views will certainly be expressed to the very best I can; and, as I say, if the trend and tendency is not in that direction then I couldn't possibly have anything to do with it.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that a press conference is not a good place for a clear and convincing expression on a complex and controversial subject such as the reorganization of the Department of Defense. It is possible that the President did not correctly convey the impression he wanted to give at his recent press conference and that a further explanation will be forthcoming shortly.

We certainly have not yet had clarification. In a political speech last Monday the President indicated he was going to personally handle Defense Department reorganization, but yesterday Secretary McElroy said he is appointing a committee to investigate and advise. The Secretary said there is a target date for action, but refused to disclose what it is. Is this another vacuum?

I am hopeful that in the near future the President will carefully analyze what he desires to say and do on this subject and once again march up the hill with an action program that he is willing to support in the strongest possible way.

CONGRESS AND THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in order to make more complete and meaningful the RECORD of today, I wish to submit this further statement.

In the course of the debate on the supplemental defense appropriation bill today many statements and inferences have been made that have distressed me. I have tried earnestly to present the true facts to the House; I am greatly disappointed by those who have distorted the picture and sought to leave an impression which, in my opinion, is not compatible with the facts.

It has been inferred that the action by Congress last year in reducing the defense budget slowed down the defense program and made necessary this supplemental appropriation bill. It has been inferred that there are no excess funds held by the Defense Department. These inferences cannot be supported with facts. They cannot be left unchallenged.

The Defense Department has not asked for one dollar to restore funds for programs that were reduced by Congress last year. If the defense cuts last year were so bad, why has not the Defense Department requested funds to restore these cuts for the programs which it is claimed were reduced last year?

I should now like to quote from the committee report on the pending bill which has been submitted to the House over my name.

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Members of the House should clearly understand what this bill is and what it is not.

First, as to what it is not. It is not in any way a true 1958 supplemental. It does not represent resubmission of requests for purposes heretofore budgeted and denied, either in fiscal 1958, or any prior year. As Secretary McElroy stated (hearings, p. 13):

"Mr. MAHON. You are not going back in this supplemental and picking up things that were denied financing in the past, as I see it; you are looking forward?

"Secretary MCELROY. That is correct. The programs covered by the supplemental request are all part of the 1959 budget but have been advanced into fiscal year 1958 in order to get them underway as quickly as possible. That is the reason it is a pretty simple story."

This is made equally clear in the statement of the Comptroller of the Department (hearings, page 314):

"As indicated earlier in these hearings, this supplemental request does not include any amounts for programs previously submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1958. From a practical standpoint, the supplemental request represents that part of the fiscal year 1959 program which it is felt should be funded during the current fiscal year in order to accelerate the high-priority programs which have been outlined to you in some detail during the past week."

Corroborating statements by other officials will be found throughout the printed hearings.

Now, as to what the bill is. It is an advance installment on the fiscal year 1959 program presented in the budget a week ago yesterday. The estimates on which the bill is based were lifted out of the 1959 budget. Except for it, the defense dollar budget for 1959 would be just that much higher. It was submitted, and is so proposed, as necessary to accelerate and expand certain high priority programs in the interest of shortening the time by which our military capabilities will have been advanced so as to more arrestingly deter war and more swiftly and devastatingly respond to any attack. In short, it is to buy time. The fiscal year 1959 is still over 5 months away.

The committee will have the 1959 appropriation requests under consideration for a period of months beginning next Monday, January 27, at which time total funding requirements and availability will of course be thoroughly explored. In view of this, and the fact that the present bill covers items merely lifted from the 1959 budget of nearly $40 billion in which the aforemen-

tioned unprogramed funds have been applied as a discount, the committee has decided to grant the supplemental in the form of new appropriations as the President recommends. This is somewhat contrary to the normal procedure where unprogramed funds are available, but in this instance it is a matter of six of one and a half dozen of another.

DELAYS IN DEFENSE PROGRAM

Now I want to make it clear that there have been many slow-downs, cutbacks, and delays in defense programs during this fiscal year. I am going to list some of them. These cutbacks were made, not by the Congress but by the Bureau of the Budget and the Defense Department with the approval of the President. They were not made because of lack of funds. The Defense Department has had available to it during this fiscal year for expenditure about $70 billion. Much of this money is for long leadtime items which cannot be produced this year, but the Defense Department, if it had been permitted to do so, could have expended during this fiscal year as much as $42 or $43 billion in carrying out various defense programs. The money has been provided by Congress. It is available to the Department of Defense. The Army, Navy, and Air Force have been prohibited, not by Congress but by the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, from spending funds in excess of about $38.8 billion.

I would like to list some of the slowdowns which have been ordered in our defense program by the Department of Defense.

Perhaps the most significant of these orders, in the light of subsequent developments, was the cutback in production of ballistic missiles. Information given the committee last November 21 here in Washington by Air Force officials discloses that the effect of the August directive to cutback production of the Thor intermediate range ballistic missile—IRBM—resulted in several months delay in the initial operational capability of this missile. It cutback the entire IRBM production program for the Air Force. In the words of a high-ranking officer of the Air Force, this restriction "seriously delayed the activation date of operational squadrons."

Additional orders of significance were the directives to reduce research and development programs by 10 percent and maintenance and operation expenses by a flat 3 percent.

Looking back at the pre-sputnik record for new starts on military construction projects it will be seen, using the Air Force as an example, that only about $5 million had been obligated by the end of September from a total of nearly $1,500 million available for obligation on new projects.

I am very certain that there are many orders not yet fully explained which have had drastic effects on our defense programs, such as the delay in the ballistic-missile program. It has been reported that ships in the Navy 1958 shipbuilding program have been delayed up to 6 months due to expenditure limitations.

A number of the orders and directives were announced publicly. It will be noted that some of the orders precede the beginning of fiscal year 1958. The services quit spending money which Congress had made available to them for fiscal year 1957, as well as the slowdowns effected during 1958. Some of these publicly known orders by date are listed below:

PARTIAL LIST OF DELAYING ACTIONS

March 12: Memorandum to service Secretaries directing a 12-percent reduction in military and civilian personnel in the Washington, D. C., area.

May 22: Memorandum to service Secretaries freezing $500 million of the 1957 funds available for major procurement and production, research and development, and military construction. This memorandum also directed the military departments to submit a detailed plan by June 12 showing how they propose to stay within the $38 billion 1958 expenditure estimate.

June 19: Department of Defense directive to effect an immediate, continuing, and sharp curtailment in use of overtime in the performance of all kinds and types of Department of Defense procurement contracts, including production, research and development, and construction.

June 26: Announcement by the Department of the Navy curtailing the development and procurement of the W2V–1 long-range, early-warning aircraft, and the A4D–3, an improved carrier attack model.

June 28: Classified letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to all Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, requesting that all agencies in the executive branch keep the rates of commitments, obligations, and expenditures for fiscal year 1958 at or below the level for the fiscal year 1957, to the extent feasible. The letter directed that (1) as a general rule, requests for apportionment and allotments of funds shall be based upon holding obligations to absolute minimum levels; (2) in the case of those appropriations that are for major capital outlay and development—construction, procurement, research, etc.—the requests for apportionment and the allotments should reflect the postponement of a significant part of the obligations planned in the budget for 1958.

June 28: Memorandum from Secretary of Defense to service Secretaries stating that pending apportionment of funds for fiscal year 1958, obligations may be made for only essential operating expenses on an austere basis and that no obligations or commitments for procurement and construction should be made without specific approval by the Secretary of Defense.

July 11: Announcement by the Air Force that as a result of a review of current projects which might be modified or canceled in the light of present and anticipated budget and expenditure levels, the further development of the Navaho missile was being discontinued.

July 1: Letter from Assistant Secretary of Defense, properties and installations listing military installations and activities which have been programed for deactivation during the period beginning July 1 and ending December 31, 1957.

July 16: Memorandum to service Secretaries directing a 100,000 reduction in military personnel made up of 50,000 Army, 25,000 Navy and Marine Corps, and 25,000 Air Force.

July 26: Announcement by the Department of the Air Force of planned production stretchouts in Century series fighter aircraft.

August 5: Announcement by the Department of the Navy of plans for inactivation of 60 ships now operating in the Pacific and Atlantic fleets as necessary adjustments within the operating forces to permit the most effective employment of personnel and funds which will be available to the Navy during fiscal year 1958.

August 6: Memorandum from the Secretary of Defense to the three services freezing civilian employment and directing that to accomplish the expenditure objectives for fiscal year 1958 civilian force levels must be reduced.

August 12: Announcement by the Department of the Air Force that it was taking steps to cut back its payroll expenditures for civilian personnel by approximately 5 percent by the end of October, and stating that at the same time it is requesting contractors, except for ballistic missile work, to make corresponding cuts in expenditures.

August 13: Directive issued by the Secretary of Defense reducing established percentages for progress payments for new procurement effected on and after September 1, 1957.

August 14: Announcement by the Department of the Navy that it was taking action to reduce the number of civilian employees by approximately 18,000, the majority by October 31, 1957, and the balance spread over the remainder of the current fiscal year.

August 15: Announcement by the Military Sea Transportation Service of plans to inactivate 15 MSTS tankers made possible by the anticipated decrease in military petroleum shipments resulting from Department of Defense economy measures.

August 16: Announcement by the Department of the Navy stating plans to discontinue male recruit training at the Navy Training Center, Bainbridge, Md., as a necessary adjustment to permit the most effective employment of personnel and funds during fiscal year 1958.

August 20: Announcement by Marine Corps suspending the enlistment of men under the 2-by-6 program as a reduction in the recruiting program necessary to meet the lower strength requirement recently ordered by the Secretary of Defense.

August 21: Announcement by the Department of the Air Force of the cancellation of the development of the XF–103 all-weather interceptor aircraft.

August 21: Announcement by the Department of the Navy that it was making certain changes in the future production rates of a large number of new model aircraft and missiles as a result of increasing costs, technological advances and budgetary limitations.

August 23: Announcement by the Department of the Army regarding reductions in civilian personnel and in Army activities, installations and units consistent with the 50,000 reduction in Army military strengths to be effective January 1, 1958, and the limitation on Army expenditures for fiscal year 1958.

LETTER FROM ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

In order to clinch the point that these delays were the handiwork of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, and not of Congress, I wish to quote a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, addressed to me, August 14, 1957, which is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
*Chairman, Department of Defense, Subcommittee, House Committee on Appropriations.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your inquiry concerning the effect on the defense program of Congressional action on the fiscal year 1958 defense budget request.

The adjustments required in the programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1958 are essentially those necessary to hold expenditures for the current fiscal year to $38 billion, the expenditure estimate contained in the President's budget submitted to the Congress in January.

It is possible that when the final program decisions for the current fiscal year have been made, we may find that Congressional action on the Department's requests for new

obligational authority for that year may affect certain programs in a minor way. Conversely, we may later find that in a few instances a small amount of the new obligational authority provided by the Congress for fiscal year 1958 in the annual appropriation accounts cannot be utilized effectively. All the funds provided in the no-year account, in my judgment, can be properly and advantageously utilized in reestablishing the long lead time programs on a fully funded basis.

The real problem posed by the action of Congress on the 1958 budget is that the appropriation of slightly less than $36 billion, including transfers, in support of a current program of $38 billion requires the utilization of essentially all of the carry-over obligational authority which might otherwise have been available as a credit against the fiscal year 1959 request. While this action does not materially affect defense programs in 1958—it will require a budget request for 1959 of at least $38 billion to support a continuing program of this magnitude. This will create a psychological problem inasmuch as it will appear to the public as a substantial increase in the defense budget, whereas in fact the level of the program would in that case remain the same.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. McNEIL.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to my extension of remarks in the September 3, 1957, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains many references to the defense budget and the action of Congress thereon.

Mr. DOYLE. I am in support of the purposes and objectives of H. R. 10146. Before I briefly mention some of the reasons I am in support of this bill, I wish to cordially compliment the Mahon subcommittee on appropriations, from which subcommittee this bill emanated. I compliment them upon their promptness and vigilance in the best interests of our Nation's national defense for convening as promptly as they did as a subcommittee and bringing forth this informative subcommittee report as containing the necessary strategic information and clear-cut analysis of why we needed this supplemental $1,260 million in new appropriations at this time, together with the $110 million additional authority to transfer between already existing appropriations.

First. The committee report and this debate, has made clear, that this amount is already encompassed as part of the budget for the fiscal year 1959 and that when we vote this very large amount today, it is not an amount in addition to, or duplicate amount of, any items in the 1959 budget which the President recently submitted to us. Therefore, our worthy subcommittee has made it crystal clear that as far as they now have any idea, we will not be asked again to appropriate any part of these funds. The ultimate result of our approving this bill today, is that it amounts to taking these sums out of the 1959 budget and advancing it into the 1958 budget, in order that we can save important time in the best interests of the national defense and security of our beloved Nation. As a lawyer, I would say that time being the essence, we therefore must take notice of that element in the present defensive situation as between a possible aggressive Soviet community and defensive security of ourselves and of our sworn allies. This Congress was asked by the President of the United States on January 7 for additional funds and for our immediate consideration of his request. This vital bill now before us is our early compliance with the request of our Chief Executive and our Commander in Chief. The subcommittee began hearings the day after the President's request. Certainly it could not have commenced hearings on the President's request any sooner.

Second. Without being able to here relate anything of what I have heard these last several days as a member of the Armed Services Committee in our closed and executive committee hearings from our Military Establishment, I wish to frankly say, however, that I would feel most uncomfortable, most unhappy, and most dissatisfied with myself, if I should vote against this bill. It is unnecessary for me to here take your time to do more, than refer you to the crystal-clear arguments and reasoning yesterday and today ably presented to us by these, our fellow colleagues, on both sides of the political aisle. They had sat for many days, questioning the well-qualified witnesses before them. The hearings of the subcommittee will reveal in their printed report before us, valuable data. It consists of some 389 pages.

Third. Because it is now evident that the Soviets began to put top priority emphasis on the development of guided missiles of much military equipment so much earlier than we did; and, because it is manifest that we must not fall further behind in this essential new missile weapon, we must take every reasonable and necessary step to provide these funds as soon as possible. The lack of them could mean not only our being pressed into an unwanted and unsought corner as a second-grade and second-class nation, but it could mean a national defeat and destruction by reason of an unanticipated military attack from the Communist world.

Several days ago this House unanimously approved the establishment of the new Advanced Research Projects Agency in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, for purposes of research and development. This bill will make the following sums available now instead of a year from now, for this established research and development agency. I repeat that time is of the essence. Here is the program that the committee recommends to us:

| | |
|---|---|
| Strategic Air Command dispersal and alert program | $218,600,000 |
| Ballistic-missile detection system | 329,000,000 |
| Acceleration of the Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter ballistic-missile program | 333,400,000 |
| Acceleration of the Polaris ballistic-missile and submarine program | 350,000,000 |
| Construction of additional SAGE communication centers | 29,000,000 |
| Total [1] | 1,260,000,000 |

[1] In addition transfer authorities of $150 million.

When I extemporaneously speak here so emphatically in support of this present bill, it must not be taken as any lessening of my well known position, that world conditions which will insure an enduring world peace, is the most important achievement presently before the people of the world. But, I believe that experience and history also loudly tell us, that we cannot logically expect to be in a continuing position to vigorously and conscientiously urge upon the rest of the world world peace, if we allow ourselves to become weak and inefficient in military strength. We cannot claim and demand conditions of world peace from a position of military weakness. This should be as clear as crystal to us. When we know the frequently stated positive declarations of Soviet communism which is now in unquestioned control of the Soviet Union and its hundreds of millions of satellite people, that Soviet communism is determined to conquer and control the policies and people of the world. I, of course, realize that by subversive infiltration and subversive activities Soviet communism has already come to dominate hundreds of millions of people who were captured by such subversive methods. My service of several years on the House Un-American Activities Committee has been a source of such information as to foreign countries and also, makes me say, that we must not let our guard down domestically, against those subversive persons and programs dominated from Moscow, which would uproot and destroy our constitutional, representative form of government. Can there be any question but that this subversive activity is part and parcel of the cold war to meet which, we are passing this bill today? I have not and will not today, nor any time, so vote as to take a chance against the security of the people of my Nation and their destiny. Nor, Mr. Speaker, against all we Americans hold dear. I believe it means an unbalanced budget, which I regret. I also believe it means no reduction in taxes for a long time. I regret this also. But, I will not gamble with survival. That to me, is a paramount issue at this time. It is involved in the possibilities of this bill.

The President's state of the Union message made it clear, that there must be effective direction and coordination in our military department. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee for several years, I was pleased to see the emphasis on that point. This bill gives additional funds and additional necessary authority. The breakdown of the funds in this bill, takes care of immediate emergencies which have developed in the missile research and development field in the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. If you have not already read the report of the Mahon subcommittee on this bill, I urge you to do so before you vote. Having already done so myself, and from what I had already learned of our national emergency in the field of our national defense, growing out of the speedy and comprehensive Soviet progress in these fields, I find it my bounden duty to speak these brief words and support of this bill. I do hope that it will have unanimous approval. Such a vote would be understood throughout

the world as a renewed and repeated declaration by the American people that we will not surrender our security nor our freedoms either now, nor in the days of our grandchildren; nor in the days of our grandchildren's children; nor ever, in the history of mankind.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10146) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 0, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—388

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Bolling | Colmer |
| Adair | Bolton | Cooley |
| Addonizio | Bonner | Corbett |
| Albert | Bosch | Coudert |
| Alexander | Bow | Cramer |
| Alger | Boykin | Cretella |
| Allen, Calif. | Boyle | Cunningham, Iowa |
| Allen, Ill. | Bray | Cunningham, Nebr. |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Breeding | Curtin |
| Anderson, Mont. | Brooks, La. | Curtis, Mass. |
| Andrews | Brooks, Tex. | Curtis, Mo. |
| Anfuso | Broomfield | Dague |
| Arends | Brown, Ga. | Davis, Ga. |
| Ashley | Brown, Mo. | Davis, Tenn. |
| Aspinall | Brown, Ohio | Dawson, Ill. |
| Auchincloss | Brownson | Dawson, Utah |
| Avery | Broyhill | Delaney |
| Ayres | Budge | Dellay |
| Baker | Burleson | Dempsey |
| Baldwin | Bush | Dennison |
| Baring | Byrd | Denton |
| Barrett | Byrne, Ill. | Derounian |
| Bass, N. H. | Byrne, Pa. | Devereux |
| Bass, Tenn. | Byrnes, Wis. | Diggs |
| Bates | Canfield | Dingell |
| Baumhart | Cannon | Dixon |
| Beamer | Carrigg | Dollinger |
| Becker | Cederberg | Donohue |
| Beckworth | Celler | Dorn, N. Y. |
| Bennett, Fla. | Chamberlain | Dorn, S. C. |
| Bennett, Mich. | Chelf | Dowdy |
| Bentley | Chenoweth | Doyle |
| Berry | Christopher | Durham |
| Betts | Church | Dwyer |
| Blitch | Clark | Eberharter |
| Boggs | Clevenger | Edmondson |
| Boland | Coad | Elliott |
| Bolling | Coffin | Engle |
| Bolton | Collier | Evins |
| Bonner | Colmer | Fallon |
| Bosch | Cooley | Farbstein |
| Bow | Corbett | Fascell |
| Boykin | Coudert | Feighan |
| Boyle | Cramer | Fenton |
| Bray | Cretella | Fisher |
| Breeding | Cunningham, Iowa | Flood |
| Brooks, La. | Cunningham, Nebr. | Flynt |
| Brooks, Tex. | Curtin | Fogarty |
| Broomfield | Curtis, Mass. | Forand |
| Brown, Ga. | Curtis, Mo. | Ford |
| Brown, Mo. | Dague | Forrester |
| Brown, Ohio | Davis, Ga. | Fountain |
| Brownson | Davis, Tenn. | Frazier |
| Broyhill | Dawson, Ill. | Frelinghuysen |
| Budge | Dawson, Utah | Friedel |
| Burleson | Delaney | Fulton |
| Bush | Dellay | Garmatz |
| Byrd | Dempsey | Gary |
| Byrne, Ill. | Dennison | Gathings |
| Byrne, Pa. | Denton | Gavin |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Derounian | George |
| Canfield | Devereux | Glenn |
| Cannon | Diggs | Gordon |
| Carrigg | Dingell | Granahan |
| Cederberg | Dixon | Gray |
| Celler | Dollinger | Gregory |
| Chamberlain | Donohue | Griffin |
| Chelf | Dorn, N. Y. | Griffiths |
| Chenoweth | Dorn, S. C. | Gross |
| Christopher | Dowdy | Gubser |
| Church | Doyle | Hagen |
| Clark | Durham | Hale |
| Clevenger | Dwyer | Haley |
| Coad | Eberharter | Halleck |
| Coffin | Edmondson | Harden |
| Collier | Elliott | Hardy |
| Colmer | Engle | Harris |
| Cooley | Evins | Harrison, Nebr. |
| Corbett | Fallon | Harrison, Va. |
| Coudert | Farbstein | Harvey |
| Cramer | Fascell | Haskell |
| Cretella | Feighan | Hays, Ark. |
| Cunningham, Iowa | Fenton | Hays, Ohio |
| Cunningham, Nebr. | Fisher | Healey |
| Curtin | Flood | Hébert |
| Curtis, Mass. | Flynt | Hemphill |
| Curtis, Mo. | Fogarty | Henderson |
| Dague | Forand | Herlong |
| Davis, Ga. | Ford | Heselton |
| Davis, Tenn. | Forrester | Hess |
| Dawson, Ill. | Fountain | Hiestand |
| Dawson, Utah | Frazier | Hill |
| Delaney | Frelinghuysen | Hillings |
| Dellay | Friedel | Hoeven |
| Dempsey | Fulton | Hoffman |
| Dennison | Garmatz | Holifield |
| Denton | Gary | Holmes |
| Derounian | Gathings | Holt |
| Devereux | Gavin | Holtzman |
| Diggs | George | Horan |
| Dingell | Glenn | Hosmer |
| Dixon | Gordon | Huddleston |
| Dollinger | Granahan | Hull |
| Donohue | Gray | Hyde |
| Dorn, N. Y. | Gregory | Ikard |
| Dorn, S. C. | Griffin | Jackson |
| Dowdy | Griffiths | James |
| Doyle | Gross | Jarman |
| Durham | Gubser | Jenkins |
| Dwyer | Hagen | Jennings |
| Eberharter | Hale | Jensen |
| Edmondson | Haley | Johansen |
| Elliott | Halleck | Johnson |
| Engle | Harden | Jonas |
| Evins | Hardy | Jones, Ala. |
| Fallon | Harris | Jones, Mo. |
| Farbstein | Harrison, Nebr. | Karsten |
| Fascell | Harrison, Va. | Kean |
| Feighan | Harvey | Kearney |
| Fenton | Haskell | Kearns |
| Fisher | Hays, Ark. | Keating |
| Flood | Hays, Ohio | Kee |
| Flynt | Healey | Keogh |
| Fogarty | Hébert | Kilburn |
| Forand | Hemphill | Kilday |
| Ford | Henderson | Kilgore |
| Forrester | Herlong | King |
| Fountain | Heselton | Kirwan |
| Frazier | Hess | Kitchin |
| Frelinghuysen | Hiestand | |
| Friedel | Hill | |
| Fulton | Hillings | |
| Garmatz | Hoeven | |
| Gary | Hoffman | |
| Gathings | Holifield | |
| Gavin | Holmes | |
| George | Holt | |
| Glenn | Holtzman | |
| Gordon | Horan | |
| Granahan | Hosmer | |
| Gray | Huddleston | |
| Gregory | Hull | |
| Griffin | Hyde | |
| Griffiths | Ikard | |
| Gross | Jackson | |
| Gubser | James | |
| Hagen | Jarman | |
| Hale | Jenkins | |
| Haley | Jennings | |
| Halleck | Jensen | |
| Harden | Johansen | |
| Hardy | Johnson | |
| Harris | Jonas | |
| Harrison, Nebr. | Jones, Ala. | |
| Harrison, Va. | Jones, Mo. | |
| Harvey | Karsten | |
| Haskell | Kean | |
| Hays, Ark. | Kearney | |
| Hays, Ohio | Kearns | |
| Healey | Keating | |
| Hébert | Kee | |
| Hemphill | Keogh | |
| Henderson | Kilburn | |
| Herlong | Kilday | |
| Heselton | Kilgore | |
| Hess | King | |
| Hiestand | Kirwan | |
| Hill | Kitchin | |
| Hillings | Kluczynski | |
| Hoeven | Knox | |
| Hoffman | Knutson | |
| Holifield | Krueger | |
| Holmes | Laird | |
| Holt | Landrum | |
| Holtzman | Lane | |
| Horan | Lankford | |
| Hosmer | Latham | |
| Huddleston | LeCompte | |
| Hull | Lennon | |
| Hyde | Lesinski | |
| Ikard | Libonati | |
| Jackson | Lipscomb | |
| James | Long | |
| Jarman | Loser | |
| Jenkins | McCulloch | |
| Jennings | McDonough | |
| Jensen | McFall | |
| Johansen | McGovern | |
| Johnson | McIntire | |
| Jonas | McIntosh | |
| Jones, Ala. | McMillan | |
| Jones, Mo. | McVey | |
| Karsten | Machrowicz | |
| Kean | Mack, Ill. | |
| Kearney | Mack, Wash. | |
| Kearns | Madden | |
| Keating | Magnuson | |
| Kee | Mahon | |
| Keogh | Mailliard | |
| Kilburn | Marshall | |
| Kilday | Martin | |
| Kilgore | Mason | |
| King | Matthews | |
| Kirwan | May | |
| Kitchin | Meader | |
| Kluczynski | Metcalf | |
| Knox | Michel | |
| Knutson | Miller, Calif. | |
| Krueger | Miller, Md. | |
| Laird | Miller, Nebr. | |
| Landrum | Miller, N. Y. | |
| Lane | Mills | |
| Lankford | Minshall | |
| Latham | Mitchell | |
| LeCompte | Montoya | |
| Lennon | Morano | |
| Lesinski | Morgan | |
| Libonati | Morris | |
| Lipscomb | Moss | |
| Long | Moulder | |
| Loser | Mumma | |
| McCulloch | Murray | |
| McDonough | Natcher | |
| McFall | Neal | |
| McGovern | Nicholson | |
| McIntire | Nimtz | |
| McIntosh | Norblad | |
| McMillan | Norrell | |
| McVey | O'Brien, Ill. | |
| Machrowicz | O'Brien, N. Y. | |
| Mack, Ill. | O'Hara, Ill. | |
| Mack, Wash. | O'Hara, Minn. | |
| Madden | O'Konski | |
| Magnuson | O'Neill | |
| Mahon | Osmers | |
| Mailliard | Ostertag | |
| Marshall | Patman | |
| Martin | Patterson | |
| Mason | Pelly | |
| Matthews | Perkins | |
| May | Pfost | |
| Meader | Philbin | |
| Metcalf | Pilcher | |
| Michel | Poage | |
| Miller, Calif. | Poff | |
| Miller, Md. | Polk | |
| Miller, Nebr. | Porter | |
| Miller, N. Y. | Powell | |
| Mills | Preston | |
| Minshall | Price | |
| Mitchell | Prouty | |
| Montoya | Rains | |
| Morano | Ray | |
| Morgan | Reece, Tenn. | |
| Morris | Reed | |
| Moss | Rees, Kans. | |
| Moulder | Reuss | |
| Mumma | Rhodes, Ariz. | |
| Murray | Rhodes, Pa. | |
| Natcher | Riehlman | |
| Neal | Riley | |
| Nicholson | Rivers | |
| Nimtz | Roberts | |
| Norblad | Robeson, Va. | |
| Norrell | Robison, N. Y. | |
| O'Brien, Ill. | Robsion, Ky. | |
| O'Brien, N. Y. | Rodino | |
| O'Hara, Ill. | Rogers, Colo. | |
| O'Hara, Minn. | Rogers, Fla. | |
| O'Konski | Rogers, Mass. | |
| O'Neill | Rogers, Tex. | |
| Osmers | Roosevelt | |
| Ostertag | Rutherford | |
| Patman | Sadlak | |
| Patterson | Santangelo | |
| Pelly | St. George | |
| Perkins | Saund | |
| Pfost | Saylor | |
| Philbin | Schenck | |
| Pilcher | Scherer | |
| Poage | Schwengel | |
| Poff | Scott, N. C. | |
| Polk | Scott, Pa. | |
| Porter | Scrivner | |
| Powell | Scudder | |
| Preston | Seely-Brown | |
| Price | Selden | |
| Prouty | Sheehan | |
| Rains | Shelley | |
| Ray | Sheppard | |
| Reece, Tenn. | Shuford | |
| Reed | Sikes | |
| Rees, Kans. | Siler | |
| Reuss | Simpson, Ill. | |
| Rhodes, Ariz. | Simpson, Pa. | |
| Rhodes, Pa. | Sisk | |
| Riehlman | Smith, Calif. | |
| Riley | Smith, Kans. | |
| Rivers | Smith, Miss. | |
| Roberts | Springer | |
| Robeson, Va. | Staggers | |
| Robison, N. Y. | Staufer | |
| Robsion, Ky. | Steed | |
| Rodino | Sullivan | |
| Rogers, Colo. | Taber | |
| Rogers, Fla. | Talle | |
| Rogers, Mass. | Taylor | |
| Rogers, Tex. | Teague, Calif. | |
| Roosevelt | Teague, Tex. | |
| Rutherford | Teller | |
| Sadlak | Tewes | |
| Santangelo | Thomas | |
| St. George | Thompson, La. | |
| Saund | Thompson, N. J. | |
| Saylor | Thompson, Tex. | |
| Schenck | Thomson, Wyo. | |
| Scherer | Thornberry | |
| Schwengel | Tollefson | |
| Scott, N. C. | Trimble | |
| Scott, Pa. | Tuck | |
| Scrivner | Udall | |
| Scudder | Ullman | |
| Seely-Brown | Utt | |
| Selden | Vanik | |
| Sheehan | Van Pelt | |
| Shelley | Van Zandt | |
| Sheppard | Vinson | |
| Shuford | Vorys | |
| Sikes | Vursell | |
| Siler | Walter | |
| Simpson, Ill. | Watts | |
| Simpson, Pa. | Weaver | |
| Sisk | Wharton | |
| Smith, Calif. | Whitener | |
| Smith, Kans. | Whitten | |
| Smith, Miss. | Widnall | |
| Springer | Wier | |
| Staggers | Wigglesworth | |
| Staufer | Williams, Miss. | |
| Steed | Willis | |
| Sullivan | Wilson, Calif. | |
| Taber | Wilson, Ind. | |
| Talle | Winstead | |
| Taylor | Withrow | |
| Teague, Calif. | Wolverton | |
| Teague, Tex. | Wright | |
| Teller | Yates | |
| Tewes | Young | |
| Thomas | Younger | |
| Thompson, La. | Zablocki | |
| Thompson, N. J. | Zelenko | |
| Thompson, Tex. | | |
| Thomson, Wyo. | | |
| Thornberry | | |
| Tollefson | | |
| Trimble | | |
| Tuck | | |
| Udall | | |
| Ullman | | |
| Utt | | |
| Vanik | | |
| Van Pelt | | |
| Van Zandt | | |
| Vinson | | |
| Vorys | | |
| Vursell | | |
| Walter | | |
| Watts | | |
| Weaver | | |
| Wharton | | |
| Whitener | | |
| Whitten | | |
| Widnall | | |
| Wier | | |
| Wigglesworth | | |
| Williams, Miss. | | |
| Willis | | |
| Wilson, Calif. | | |
| Wilson, Ind. | | |
| Winstead | | |
| Withrow | | |
| Wolverton | | |
| Wright | | |
| Yates | | |
| Young | | |
| Younger | | |
| Zablocki | | |
| Zelenko | | |

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—40

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Dies | Lafore |
| Ashmore | Dooley | McCarthy |
| Bailey | Fino | McCormack |
| Barden | Grant | McGregor |
| Belcher | Green, Oreg. | Macdonald |
| Blatnik | Green, Pa. | Merrow |
| Buckley | Gwinn | Moore |
| Burdick | Holland | Morrison |
| Carnahan | Judd | Multer |
| Chiperfield | Kelly | Passman |
| Pillion | Sieminski | Westland |
| Rabaut | Smith, Va. | Williams, N. Y. |
| Radwan | Spence | |
| Rooney | Wainwright | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Judd.
Mrs. Kelley with Mr. Lefore.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Merrow.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Wainwright.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at the point in the RECORD prior to the reading of the bill for amendment and that they may be privileged to include brief excerpts in those remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the week of January 26, 1958, through February 1 as National Junior Achievement Week.

## A FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIP FUND

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to you today about my bill, H. R. 390, which would provide for the establishment of a Federal scholarship fund to enable needy but scholastically qualified students to pursue college, postgraduate, and professional education. In so doing I would like to call the attention of the House to the appalling wastage of human resources involved in our Nation's present failure to make it possible

for those thousands of high-school graduates who have high and even outstanding ability to pursue their education up to the very limits of their capacity.

It has been estimated by the President's Commission on Higher Education that out of every thousand children finishing the fifth grade together, 900 have the ability to go through high school, yet only 403 do so. Out of that same thousand finishing the fifth grade, it has been estimated that 320 have the ability to go through college, yet only 70 do so. Thus, every year we are failing to train 55 percent of those who ought to finish high school and 76 percent of those who should finish college.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that this is a luxury we can no longer afford. It is in fact a standing reminder of the shortsightedness of this the richest Nation on earth. We who hold the birthright of democratic traditions must recognize that adequate educational opportunity is not merely one of democracy's obligations but rather that it is a necessity if we are to keep America strong and free. We simply cannot afford to let our best minds lie fallow.

Perhaps the No. 1 reason why so many of these young people of excellent ability do not go to college is because of a lack of adequate personal funds to finance this education. Today, this gap can no longer be filled by the private and charitable funds that are available for scholarship and loan purposes. Authorities on financing a college education are agreed that to maintain a student body of first-rate ability, financial assistance of some nature would have to be awarded to between 35 and 40 percent of the total student body. How many of our colleges can boast of this high a percentage?

Not only are the scholarships presently available to few in number but the stipends which many contain are similarly inadequate. Some of these are as low as $5 to $10 a year and many are for only $100 or less. Only in the more financially secure institutions like Princeton, Harvard, and Yale are scholarships available in considerable numbers which cover at least half of the cost of such education.

I am therefore urging consideration of this bill, which I hope will to some extent help to provide a means whereby those well-qualified but needy students may secure that added educational training so necessary to our Nation's well-being. In essence, this bill is intended to give every qualified student the opportunity to obtain the financial assistance necessary to attain a college education if he so desires. It provides for no Government subsidy but rather establishes a central loan fund to which the individual student on his own initiative and through his own State administrative agency may apply.

Under this bill each State is free to choose whether to participate in the Federal scholarship fund program or not. If it chooses to do so it then contributes proportionately to the maintenance of the fund. Initial selection of the recipients of all loans is also left to the State administrative agencies established for this purpose with the proviso that no State shall make any discrimination in its selection because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The bill further provides that each student selected to participate in the program may choose his own course of study at the institution of his choice thus taking advantage of the student's natural inclinations and motivations. Likewise, the bill contains what I consider to be adequate safeguards to prevent the Federal Government from regulating or interfering with the courses of instruction or the administration of our colleges and universities.

The loans provided for under this program are of two amounts. For those engaged in primarily undergraduate-type studies, $1,000 may be borrowed annually for a period of 4 years. For those engaged in postgraduate and professional study, the sum of $1,500 may be borrowed annually for a like period. In neither case may the amount borrowed exceed the cost of tuition by a certain specified amount and in both cases these loans must be repaid at 1 percent interest annually over a 10-year period following the completion of the studies undertaken. Both type loans are made subject to the individual student's demonstrated financial need and both are contingent upon the satisfactory progress of the student in pursuing his studies.

Since I realize that both time and study will be needed to initiate and perfect any such scholarship program, I have provided that $5 million be appropriated initially by the Federal Government for this fund followed by $10 million for the succeeding year and then such sums as may be necessary to fulfill the provisions of this act.

The contribution to be made by the States who have elected to participate in the program will vary on an annually determined sliding scale but in no case will they exceed 10 percent of the aggregate amount of advances made to students from that State during the preceding calendar year.

In conclusion, I need not remind the House that the Soviet Union is currently graduating nearly three times the number of engineers that are coming out of our technical schools. If we hope to keep pace with the tremendous technological development currently taking place within the Soviet Union—and indeed we must—then we must be willing to pay the cost of this development. Not only is this program essential for our national security against the external menace of the Soviet Union but it is perhaps more important for the intellectual and spiritual growth of our democracy itself. We in this country have, indeed, placed all our faith, placed our hope, upon the education, the intelligence, and the understanding of our people. We have said that ours is a government conducted by its citizens, and from this it follows that the Government will be better conducted if its citizens are educated. We have bet all our chips, if you please, on the intellectual improvement of our people.

I sincerely urge necessary action during this session to consider the various legislative proposals for Federal aid to students for higher education. A subject so vital certainly merits the attention and consideration of the Congress.

---

## EDUCATION FOR A STRONGER AMERICA—AN EIGHT-POINT PROGRAM

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for consideration of the Congress a comprehensive eight-point legislative program for improving education, designed to perfect our national security and to fortify America's world leadership responsibilities.

The program which I propose includes suggestions for Federal assistance for elementary and secondary-school construction, 50,000 annual college scholarship grants, 5,000 fellowship grants and a fellowship-loan fund for post-college research and study, Federal grants for construction of State and municipal colleges and college research and laboratory facilities, grants for developing pilot teaching programs, revision of our tax law so as to permit parents to take reasonable deductions for children attending college, assistance for adult education, and creation of a commission for investigating National, State, and local educational policies, methods, and procedures.

I realize that the problems we face in the field of education are highly complicated and many faceted, and require accommodation to our system of Federal-State relations. It is my hope, in view of the gravity of our present situation, that political motives will be laid aside in the formulation of a sound and vigorous educational policy for a stronger America.

The program which I propose requires substantial outlay, for the tasks which we face in the field of education are gigantic, and they suffer from long years of neglect. The rewards, both social and economic, of an adequate educational program are great. Money alone, of course, will not suffice to do the job which needs to be done. Just as important are leadership, integrated planning, and revising our attitudes in the home and in the local communities toward education.

I have in mind the essential preoccupation with our multi-billion-dollar defense program and our growing budget, but proven areas of large-scale economies exist through which we can save large sums of Federal money, more than sufficient to pay for the educational program which I propose. One of these areas has to do with the Hoover Commission reports, which have been allowed to gather dust despite the conservative estimates that more than $1 billion annually could be saved by systems of centralized purchasing and the adoption of modern tested methods of administration. Another has been highlighted by

the Cordiner report—report of the President's Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation, made May 8, 1957—whose findings are to the effect that an integrated program of training and compensation in the armed services, by decreasing highly wasteful turnover and other inefficient practices "will make possible annual savings and gains of several billion dollars within a few years." My bill, H. R. 9977, introduced January 14, 1958, is designed to adopt the Cordiner report. H. R. 9977 is similar to a bill—H. R. 9979—introduced by Mr. VINSON, chairman of our Committee on Armed Services. The President has expressed approval of the Cordiner report, at least substantially, and has urged its adoption. A third field for economy will, according to reliable information and Congressional committee investigations, come from cutting down on manpower and weapons expenses now caused by interservice rivalries and failure to keep pace with the mechanization process.

Major emphasis of my proposed legislative program is placed on developing the physical sciences, mathematics and engineering, and basic research in these fields; foreign languages, and history is also a substantial objective of my proposed program.

We face a colossal national task in the field of education resulting from long years of lazy approaches and outright indifference to the basic obligations which have been thrust upon us by world events. The Russian satellites have spotlighted our failures, and marked out our duties from which we cannot shrink. Improvement of training in mathematics, science, and engineering is, of course, a primary duty of American educational policy, but our world leadership also requires a vast improvement in knowledge of foreign languages, history, and international affairs. Teaching of Russian has been almost wholly ignored, and as a result we lack sufficient personnel and programs to translate Russian scientific and other documents which may be of importance to us. Two-thirds of Russia's college students are learning the English language. A language contains subtleties which afford clues to valuable understanding of folkways and points of view. In propaganda, and communications generally, these may be very helpful to us. We have failed also to afford sufficient opportunities for learning the languages of Asia, Africa, and the Near East, areas of growing importance to the success of our international relations.

The current crisis in international affairs is the outcome of a struggle between the Free World whose peoples look to our country for leadership, and the unfortunate victims of the international gangster conspiracy whose leaders in Soviet Russia are engaged in relentless, often subtle, and always persistent quest for world domination. This unrelenting Soviet conspiracy is sought to be furthered by attempted leadership in the scientific revolution which began with the release of atomic energy. The Nation has been shocked to learn recently that the Soviet Union has made substantial strides in the field of education, and that we cannot boast a superiority in this vital field. Today, for example, Russia has more scientists, engineers, and technicians than the United States, and is graduating more than twice as many each year. In our country, by contrast to Russia, 24 percent of our high schools offer no geometry, 23 percent offer no physics or chemistry, and the number of students who have elected to study these and related subjects have declined: whereas 56 percent of our high-school students studied algebra in 1900, only 25 percent did so in 1955; whereas 27 percent studied geometry in 1900, this had declined to 11 percent in 1955. There are no electives in the Soviet 10-year schools, which have been described by informed Americans as models of efficiency.

We would be traitorous to our traditions of freedom if we aped the Soviets in their rigid and inhumane educational system.

The Soviets inherited from Czarist Russia an authoritarian but competent system of education to which only a small minority of the people had access. Following their advent to power in 1917 the Communists instituted a number of departures from the czarist system but in the 1930's returned to its methods and maintain them today. They have, however, been made more accessible to the people; illiteracy has been drastically reduced. The purposes of education in Soviet Russia are to serve the state, not as in America to liberate the individual; people are educated in Soviet Russia to inculcate them with enthusiasm for Soviet imperialism and to develop state-needed skills.

Our free society is a source of strength and I have unshaken confidence in its correctness and its eventual world victory. We must, however, know the facts as they are, face them, and direct our energies and our resources to remedy imperfections which interfere with the full utilization of our national reservoirs of greatness.

The Russian sputniks were not the result of superiority in the Soviet system of education or science research—singleness and concentration of material and effort at the expense of other scientific activities were undoubtedly the basic reasons. But if the educational and research facilities of the Soviets are equal to the kind of project evidenced by the sputnik, they are capable of other things, and we have to advance our own plans to a more alert and expanded set of plans and actions.

American scientific and cultural talent is underemployed, partly perhaps as a result of a persistent anti-intellectual outlook which we have curiously inherited from frontier days. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, has recently decried our attitude toward science and education.

The relative strength in fundamental research of the European countries—

He states—

is the result of their general respect for learning, for teaching, and for fundamental research, an attitude which we as a people have never had to the same degree.

The legislative program for education recently presented to the Congress in the President's disappointing 1958 budget message has a characteristic common to so many policies of the Eisenhower administration—it gives partial recognition to a problem but fails to perceive its magnitude. The budget proposal appropriates $140 million for the National Science Foundation for 1959—$58 million for basic research and $82 million for science education—and an appropriation of $145.5 million to finance the first year of a 4-year temporary program for assistance in support of science and education. Federal assistance for elementary and secondary school construction is abandoned.

The President's budget message insofar as it dealt with education carried forward a seven-point plan prepared by Secretary Folsom of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which the President approved in a statement made December 30, 1957. I shall refer to the President's program at various parts of my remarks, to indicate its gross inadequacy and failure to come to grips with the expanding crisis in American education.

Testifying recently before a subcommittee of our House Committee on Government Operations, Dr. Waterman of the National Science Foundation revealed that the President's proposed budget cut in half the Foundation's program for construction of research facilities, and denied to the Foundation 20 percent of the funds requested for basic research. Cutting funds for basic research is dangerous business, since basic research, which explores the fields of pure science for knowledge that may not be needed immediately, is the stuff from which sputniks come; it has never been truer than it is today that future battles of Waterloo will be won on the playing fields of Eton.

The Congress, it is clear, will have to take the initiative in the present national crisis in education, since the President has refused to carry it. It will be impossible to effectuate an adequate educational program of school construction, scholarships, assistance for research laboratories, and improving the recruitment, training and retention of teachers, if the limitations of the President's proposals are accepted.

I do not favor Federal control of education. Direction and supervision of personnel, curriculum and programs of instruction are primarily a responsibility of the States. Particularly in the field of higher education, moreover, tremendous contributions have been made by private institutions. No interferences with these institutions are intended or suggested in my proposals. Indeed, it is my hope that increased Federal concern for education will encourage comparable improvement in the private colleges and universities, and that they should receive a share of the Federal grants wherever possible.

The issue of Federal controls, however, is too often used as an argument against all Federal assistance, in disregard of the nationwide critical classroom shortage and the shocking failure of the

States to relieve it adequately, and without regard also for the existing and growing crisis in higher education. We have engaged in a number of forms of Federal assistance to local education, and none of them has led to Federal controls: for example, substantial aid to land-grant colleges, the school lunch program, assistance for vocational education, and huge grants for both the construction and the operation of schools in federally affected areas.

My legislative proposals are as follows:

First. A $3 billion matching-basis appropriation for local public elementary and secondary school construction, to be given to the States in 5 annual instalments of $600 million. My bill H. R. 9731 was introduced for this purpose on the opening day of our present 2d session of the 85th Congress, January 7, 1958. This temporary program designed to meet the mounting classroom shortage is similar to the bill introduced in 1957 by the late Representative Augustine B. Kelley. The Kelley bill was defeated in the last session of the present 85th Congress, but I believe that the recently revealed inadequacies of our educational facilities and Russia's satellites have awakened the Congress to the need for reexamining and improving our national educational policies and facilities throughout the country for our growing population.

My bill H. R. 9731 differs from the Kelley bill in that under H. R. 9731 a $3 billion appropriation would be made, whereas the Kelley bill, as reported to the House by our Committee on Education and Labor, called for a $1.5 billion appropriation.

H. R. 9731 also differs from the Kelley bill in that it contains a prohibition against school segregation on account of race, creed, color or religion. Antisegregation provisions have been tacked on to previous education bills as floor amendments, but I believe that meeting the problem head-on in the original bill is a more forthright way of going about the problem which should help the bill's progress in the Congress by removing political bickering over it in its preliminary stages. The national policy for education must clearly assure an opportunity for educational advancement for all persons regardless of race, color, creed or religion. Our Supreme Court has so held, and our traditions so dictate.

H. R. 9731 strikes at a basic shortcoming in American education—the serious lack of adequate classrooms for public elementary and secondary school education.

Here, at the bottom rung of our educational ladder, we find a persistent defect which frustrates our ability to go forward not only in the fields of mathematics and the social sciences but also in research and higher education generally.

Based on an investigation conducted among State educational agencies by our Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it was estimated by Mr. Folsom, Secretary of the Department, that the national classroom shortage at the start of the 1957 school year amounted approximately to 159,000 classrooms. In testimony given by Mr. Folsom to a subcommittee of our Committee on Education and Labor in 1957, he noted that the States have been increasing the annual rate of classroom construction from 9,000 classrooms in 1946–47 to 63,000 classrooms in 1956. But he pointed out that even if this annual rate were increased to an all-time peak of 69,000, as some have hopefully predicted, the States would barely be able to keep pace with the new needs developing each year, leaving untouched the emergency resulting from the shortage of the existing estimated 159,000 classrooms.

Under our traditional system of education, the construction of public elementary and secondary schools is given over to local school districts—of which there are approximately 63,000 in the 48 States—which issue bonds to secure the needed money. The money to pay the school construction bonds is derived from taxes levied on property located in the school district.

Those school districts which are rich in property get along nicely, and commonly have fine schools to show for their property wealth.

But in thousands of poorer local communities the school districts lack sufficient property for issuing bonds to finance necessary school construction. The revealed national classroom shortage means not only overcrowding but also the complete absence of school facilities. Of the 31.5 million children in our public schools in 1956, there was no room for 2.3 million. Children have half-day schedules because of lack of facilities. This is a substantial source of illiteracy in our great and rich country.

Some people tell us that the Federal Government should not intervene in the field of education, that the matter should be left to the States. But an examination of State assistance made in 1956 by the United States Office of Education revealed that no State assistance whatever is given to local districts for schoolhouse construction in the following 18 States: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

In most of the remaining States, moreover, little more than token assistance for this purpose is given. Plans for State aid to education such as the highly developed system in New York give local assistance for operation of schools as distinguished from their construction.

My bill H. R. 9731 sets forth an emergency program designed to meet an emergency situation. The formula for allocations to the States takes into account not only the school-age population within each State, but also the efforts which it can be expected to make, and contemplates that within a State the money can be allocated to local areas where the greatest classroom shortage exists.

We have had abundant experience with large-scale Federal assistance not only for the construction of schools but for their maintenance and operation. I refer, of course, to Public Laws 874 and 815, which apply to federally affected areas. These laws, first enacted in 1950, and annually extended since then, were based on the view that the Federal Government should share the cost of education in areas where, because of Federal activities such as military installations or other Federal projects, population increases take place which are beyond the financial ability of local school districts to absorb. From 1950 through fiscal year 1958 a total of more than $618 million was appropriated under Public Law 874 for assisting maintenance and operation of schools, and a total of about $800 million under Public Law 815 for assisting in the construction of school facilities.

As I have stated, the programs of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 extended substantial and continued Federal assistance not only for school construction but also for their maintenance and operation. The 3,000 local school districts which received assistance under these laws made contributions for these purposes under formulas established in these Federal laws. Significantly, no outcry has been heard against these laws, or that they brought about Federal control of education. Indeed, a study made public last year by Teachers College, Columbia University, among school districts receiving Federal aid under Public Law 874 concluded that: "Federal control over school personnel, the curriculum, and institutional programs had not accompanied the distribution of funds." These laws broke valuable ground in showing how the Federal Government can cooperate with the States in improving our educational system. My bill, H. R. 9731, like the Kelley bill, extends this successfully tested method of Federal-State cooperation.

It is, therefore, regrettable that the President abandoned the Federal school construction program in his 1958 budget message to the Congress. The abandonment is not easy to understand since everything that has happened in the world since the President professed his support for the program in 1957 would point to the necessity for its more genuine and wholehearted support today in expanding form.

This is what President Eisenhower stated last year:

> Of all the problems in education "one is most critical." In 1955 and again last year I called attention to the critical shortage of classrooms in many communities across the country. With Federal help the States and communities can provide the bricks and mortar for school buildings and there will be no Federal interference with local control of education. * * * The need for Federal assistance in eliminating this shortage is not theory but demonstrated fact.

I have emphasized the words "most critical" which the President used in 1957 because I do not understand that the events since 1957 have obviated the need for dealing with this most critical classroom shortage—on the contrary, the proven need is greater, the crisis more intense. The budget is substantially taken up with a program for science-oriented higher education, but I am at a loss to understand how such a program can succeed where its roots—primary and secondary schools—have

been shown to be seriously imperfect and are nevertheless wholly ignored.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot ignore, we cannot be indifferent to, the revealed shortcomings in our system of primary and secondary school education. They are too enormous. With the growth of population they will inevitably become more critical. They are a fertile source of illiteracy, a source of national shame. Our self-respect and our world leadership responsibilities dictate that they be eradicated.

Second. A program for 50,000 annual college scholarship grants, to be awarded to winners of national competitive examinations. The minimum scholarship amount would be $500 yearly for a 4-year period, but this could be increased to $1,500 for needy students. My proposal contemplates that the examinations be given and that the program be administered jointly by the National Science Foundation and Office of Education. The top 20 percent of the scholarship winners would be awarded a scholarship without regard to the State in which they reside; the remaining scholarships would be awarded in each State in proportion to its population. Recipients of scholarships would be free to attend institutions of their own choice.

Substantial educational programs, particularly in the field of higher education, are now conducted by business and labor organizations, and foundations, and other private persons and groups. These persons, foundations, and organizations have been doing a magnificent job, and I hope they will continue to operate and expand. They have, moreover, as exemplified by the manifold activities and substantial expenditures of the Ford Foundation, pointed the way for needed governmental action. The problem which the Nation faces has gigantic national dimensions, requiring national action.

Proposals for establishing a program of Federal scholarships are not new. In 1947 the President's Commission on Higher Education recommended such a program. In 1949 and 1950, former President Truman urged Congress to establish a program of general scholarships and fellowships, and for this purpose he included an item in the national budget for the fiscal year 1951. On April 19, 1956, President Eisenhower created the President's Commission on Education Beyond the High School, composed of 33 distinguished persons and headed by Devereux C. Josephs, an outstanding American who has made enormous contributions to the cause of better education. In its second report, made in July 1957, the Josephs committee flatly stated:

> Present available scholarships are grossly inadequate. The total available—roughly $60 million per year—is about one-tenth of what would be required to provide, say, a $750 scholarship for 4 years to some 200,000 of the ablest and neediest high-school graduates annually.

Having regard for the enormity of the problems we face in the field of education, and the grave consequences of our continuing to ignore them, my proposal for 50,000 annual college scholarships will be seen to be a modest one. Nor is the suggested amount of the scholarship award more than meager—a 1953–54 estimate of average annual cost of higher education was $710, exclusive of the student's living cost. A recent survey conducted at the request of the National Science Foundation showed that about 150,000 above-average high-school students in our country do not go to college because they lack financial means.

To put the matter another way, current studies reveal that fewer than half of our country's youth who graduate from high school with a scholastic standing in the top 25 percent of their classes later graduate from college, and lack of money is the main reason for their not attending or dropping out of college.

The National Society for the Study of Education has understated a truth in its observation: "The majority of gifted and superior children come from nonprofessional classes and from families of modest income." In a number of States less than 50 percent of elementary school teachers have 4 years of college preparation.

Among the greatest resources of our Nation are the talents of our gifted youth. Yet existing programs for helping our competent young people to secure a college education, admirable as they may be as far as they go, and recognizing that they have been increasing in the last decade, do not remotely go far enough. According to the most recent study—1957—by the Office of Education, 1,562 reporting institutions offered 237,370 scholarships worth $65,736,950. The average per-student scholarship, accordingly, was somewhat less than $300. This average has little if any meaning, however, in view of the variety in the kind and amount of the scholarship, and the fact that the term "scholarship" as used in the report includes loans and institutional employment opportunities.

State-financed scholarships for higher education have likewise failed to make anything more than a slight dent. The largest and most generalized State-supported scholarship program, that of New York State, provides scholarships for about 5 percent of the high-school graduates in the State. No scholarship program whatever is financed by the following 10 States: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Nevada, and Texas. The national policy for promoting higher education ought not be subject to local inadequacies or indifference by the States—the gifted youth is entitled to an opportunity to fulfill his capabilities without regard to the accident of his being born in one State or another.

The President's proposal for 10,000 annual scholarships for the next 4 years is, therefore, wholly insufficient, and giving over to State boards the administration and awarding of the scholarships, as the President proposes, is unwise and may frustrate the scholarship program altogether. Leaving administration to State agencies weakens the national policy by undue diversification in its execution and dilution of its purposes in the many States where indifferent or wholly inadequate educational agencies exist.

There are also practical considerations. If administration is given over to the States, enabling legislation will have to be passed in each State. This will be time consuming, it may take several years to get the necessary legislation passed in some States, others may require constitutional amendments to participate in the national program, and still others may simply refuse to pass the enabling legislation.

The scholarship examinations ought to be given nationally. In this way we could test the efficiency of State systems instead of being limited by them. As Prof. Arthur Bestor, of the University of Illinois, founder and former president of the Council for Basic Education, has recently stated:

> If Federal funds are to go into educational testing, I believe that they should go for building up an independent nationwide system of examinations that would test, by a common standard, the results of the operations of our 48 separate State school systems.

In this way we would get a picture of the Nation's educational resources. A well-developed Federal education agency ought to have purview over all educational matters, with regional offices located throughout the United States charged with the responsibility for carrying out the Federal purposes.

As a corollary of this view, scholarship winners ought not wholly be apportioned among the States according to their population, since this will probably result in denial of scholarships to brighter students in some places to make room for those who got lower averages but reside in areas where fewer students competed or the average I. Q. is lower. It is, therefore, my hope that an acceptable compromise would lie in excluding the top 20 percent of scholarship winners from the rule of apportionment among the States.

The Nation is not without experience in the field of direct Federal grants for higher education. Whatever the theory under which these grants were made, they proved the seriousness of American youth and their desires and capability for learning. The National Youth Administration in the 1930's made substantial grants for college and graduate students; at its peak in 1936–37, $16,225,994 was spent in assisting 180,900 students. As of July 1956, 2,300,000 students had attended or were attending colleges and universities under the veteran education benefits provisions of the GI bill.

Nor need we lay aside the billions of dollars spent by the Federal Government as part of its military training—a substantial number of these dollars could be saved by mitigating illiteracy which the Armed Forces are obliged to combat, and by an integrated program of Federal assistance in the field of higher education, particularly in the fields of the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

Third. A program of 5,000 annual fellowship grants and a $1 billion revolving low-interest loan fund for graduate study.

The national need for general education predominates among the considerations which dictate the creation of scholarships for college study. The situation is somewhat different in connection with postcollege study, though often it is difficult to draw lines; approximate areas rather than rigid lines of demarcation are suggested. Speaking generally, though, governmental intervention in postcollege study or training is most justified for developing nationally needed skills.

I contemplate that fellowship grants for postcollege study will be readily made in fields where the need for research is demonstrated or where critical shortages of skills exist: teachers, scientists, mathematicians, engineers. The shortage of teachers is a national scandal. It prevents full utilization of existing educational facilities, and frustrates our plans to expand these facilities for accommodating our growing population.

The President's proposal is that the Federal Government award 1,000 graduate fellowships in the first year of a 4-year program, and 1,500 in each of the succeeding 3 years, to encourage the more able college students to become college teachers. This is good as far as it goes, but it shows an unduly modest appraisal of the need, and its restriction to teacher training is not warranted; indeed, its adequacy is contradicted by the need for research and training in other proven fields which are bound up in the national interest.

My thought is that qualified people whose area of study or competitive standing is not such as to justify a fellowship grant should not be denied the opportunity of pursuing graduate study for developing skills or pursuing higher forms of learning. For this purpose I have proposed a low-interest loan fund for graduate study. It is regrettable that the President has not included any loan-fund program in his proposals for education.

We are not without experience in the field of Federal fellowship grants. National Science Foundation fellowship awards and grants, for example, are expressions of national concern for advanced scientific study. So also are Fulbright scholarships for study in foreign countries. From modest beginnings in 1948, the number of these scholarships has increased to about 4,500 annually; from the beginning of the Fulbright program through December 1955, about 25,000 Americans were enabled to study in many foreign lands, and the cost of the studies to the American people has been relatively small because of the predominant use of foreign currencies obtained through counterpart funds in paying for the scholarship grants.

The Fulbright grants are a part of our international educational exchange program by which students from foreign countries are enabled to come here for study and research. This has helped immeasurably in strengthening international understanding. We would do well to expand substantially the exchange of students between our Nation and Asian countries. Of the 40,666 foreign students who attended our schools during the 1956–57 academic year, 31 percent were from the Far East.

A modest though increasing regime of institutional fellowships, loans, and assistanceships are provided by our institutions of higher learning. Whereas in the academic year 1949–50, 265 colleges and universities awarded 13,659 fellowships having a total value of $9,266,966, 330 institutions reported to the Office of Education 24,885 fellowships in the academic year 1955–56, which had a value of $18,239,150.

The low-interest loan fund for graduate study which I propose is intended to point up the fact that as a nation we have been content to go along with less than half measures in developing and exploiting our great resources of talents and abilities. A large number of our people have had to work at tasks below their aptitudes for the lack of training. This will no longer do.

Fourth. A $1 billion program of Federal grants for construction of State and municipal colleges, and college laboratory and other educational facilities.

Like my bill, H. R. 9731, for Federal aid for elementary and secondary school construction, the proposed college assistance would be given on a matching basis by the States, and would prohibit discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or religion. Selection of proposed construction plans submitted by State or local authorities would be made jointly by the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation, guided by Congressionally established standards which would take into account factors such as population requirements in the 18–24 age group, existing college facilities, local financial ability, and local efforts in the field of higher education.

Our already overcrowded colleges and universities, whose laboratory and other educational facilities are in a state of appalling disrepair and obsolescence, will have to handle twice as many students by 1970. The great need for construction of college facilities may be gleaned from the recent report of a Columbia University faculty committee, which recommended that Columbia should spend $100 million for building expansion.

There is an unbelievable lack of undergraduate schools in science and engineering. From these facts the shocking inadequacy of the President's proposal on the subject seems clear, for it appropriates no more than $125,000 in Federal money a year on a 50–50 matching basis, and limits this money to graduate schools.

In the next decade college enrollments are expected to increase at a faster rate than either elementary or secondary school enrollments, because the size of the 18–24 age group will increase about 61 percent as compared with an estimated total population increase of about 20 percent. The States have a heavy responsibility for expanding the facilities for higher education which normal population requirements will bring about, and which may be expected to increase through the expanded scholarship and other educational programs which are contemplated. The rate of college attendance among those in the 18–21 age bracket has been increasing steadily. In 1900 it had risen to 10 percent, in 1950 it was nearly 30 percent, and today it stands at about 33 percent.

I do not know that the States will fully measure up to their responsibilities. In 1957 the voters of New York State, by a majority of more than 1 million votes approved a $250 million bond issue for strengthening and expanding the State university. I cannot report comparable activity in any other State.

Increasing financial support for higher education by State and local governments should be pressed with all energy. But Federal assistance is imperative. This was recognized by the Josephs committee, whose report stated:

> The committee also recognizes, however, that some of the present forms of Federal support must also be continued and certain new forms provided. In the competition for State dollars, education is presently at a severe disadvantage in relation to such other claimants as hospitals and highways for which the Federal Government matches State appropriations at attractive ratios.

Apparently impressed by the widening gap between our country's need in higher education and its efforts, the Association of American Colleges recently renounced its traditional opposition to direct Federal support.

We already help to finance the construction and repair of colleges and college facilities through our Federal tax deduction laws, but this does not insure that the money will be given where it is needed most. A program of direct Federal assistance, closely defined so as to prevent Federal control, would afford a better means of relating improvement in college plants to the public interest.

Fifth. A $100 million fund for grants for development of pilot programs for evolving new teaching and research methods, particularly in the fields of the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

The fields of education have been radically altered, particularly in the physical sciences, as a result of atomic energy. And our world leadership responsibilities have resulted in burdens which we have not fully comprehended in foreign languages, diplomacy, and knowledge of foreign affairs. Persisting in accustomed teaching methods in these circumstances is folly. We do have in some areas of our highly diversified educational practices, some experience which may be drawn upon for general acceptance.

Developing new teaching methods, particularly in the fields of the physical sciences, is a national problem and, therefore, a national responsibility requiring the development of full-scale pilot programs. The proposed $100 million grant, if put to proper use under the joint sponsorship of the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education, could result in substantial savings through increased efficiency, and would also constitute an invaluable guide for local educational systems each of which would otherwise be obliged to expend substantial sums of money for this purpose.

Sixth. Permitting parents to take a reasonable income tax deduction for student college expenses.

In view of other Federal tax deduction policies, the refusal of the Federal Government to allow a tax deduction for student expenses is little more than captious. It costs about $700 yearly to maintain a college student exclusive of clothing, transportation, or other allowances. A $1,250 annual overall expense would be a fairer estimate. This may come to a total of as much as $5,000 for 4 years of undergraduate study for one child.

I have therefore introduced a bill, H. R. 10030, on January 15, 1958, to allow a taxpayer to deduct such expenses in calculating his Federal income for tax purposes. In 1944 our tax law was revised so as to permit a taxpayer to take a $600 annual deduction for dependents over 18 years of age who were continuing their schooling at the taxpayer's expense.

This is entirely inadequate. We allow deductions for medical expenses because we recognize that unduly large doctor bills may constitute an income drain too substantial for the taxpayer's ability to absorb. And by allowing deductions for charitable contributions, the Government in effect recognizes that payments for education may be subtracted from income taxes provided these payments are for other people's children. This is paradoxical. Why not allow a reasonable deduction to a taxpayer for money spent in educating his own child?

Seventh. A $100 million appropriation to help defray the cost of local programs for adult education.

Millions of adults are now frustrated in their efforts to continue their education, either as a means of enriching their lives or to gain occupational advancement. It has been estimated that in 1955 more than 49 million adults participated in adult educational programs sponsored by university extension and evening college programs, religious institutions, health and welfare agencies, private correspondence schools and other agencies, including the agricultural extension program. This is a remarkable expression of a desire for learning which should be encouraged.

The existing programs are noteworthy, but they are insufficient. We need a reappraisal and enlargement of opportunities in the field of adult education, both for the national good and the requirements of adult individuals. A large part of the present problem in adult education is the result of our failure to extend educational opportunities for adults during the period of their childhood and youth. There will be less need for huge expenditures in adult education if the job of education is adequately done in the elementary and secondary schools and in the colleges.

Eighth. Establishment of a Federal Commission to investigate our educational system.

The proposed commission would inquire into all possible aspects of National, State, and local educational policies, procedures, and shortcomings, and would include in its assigned mission a searching inquiry regarding the training and compensation of teachers, Federal-State relations, the integration of secondary-school education with college programs, our tax policies insofar as they relate to education. The proposed commission would be given subpena power to make its hearing inquiries more effective, and would be authorized to make recommendations regarding matters falling within its jurisdiction.

Widespread criticism has been expressed that the United States Office of Education is understaffed, insufficiently financed, and that it is not adequately organized to do an effective or even a barely necessary job in the various fields covered by the subject of education.

Congress has the primary responsibility for curing this untenable situation. We simply have got to realize that next to national defense, education is a front-line national responsibility and is a means of strengthening our national defense. What we need is development of integrated policies under integrated agencies equipped to snap a program of action into effect when necessary.

But what can we think when, in the first session of our 85th Congress, the Congress rejected the funds for the Josephs committee on higher education recommended by our Appropriations Committee? As a result, this highly important committee was obliged to terminate its work and to finalize its second interim report though much essential work needed to be done.

Within the framework of its financial and organizational capabilities and limitations, the Office of Education has been doing a magnificent job of informing the American people of various facets of the educational problem both in this country and abroad. Should not the Office of Education be given funds sufficient to place it on a par, organizationwise, with the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics? That Bureau's studies and publications provide meticulous and up-to-date information on wage rates, union-management practices, and labor standards which are a source of national pride.

Our complex educational system requires that at least a comparable mission be performed by our Office of Education. There is not, as was pointed out by the Josephs committee, a single educational system but a variety of institutions and methods—State, local, and Federal; public and private; military and civilian. Despite all the programing which in our present hour of need we espouse, we simply do not have enough facts, and our great Federal Government has a plain obligation to obtain and publish the facts, regarding possible alternative methods for improving our educational system.

The President stated, in his 1958 budget message to the Congress, that:

> The budget provides increases in 1959 for the Office of Education for studies of educational organization, methods, and curricula in other countries, for expanding research in cooperation with colleges, universities, and State educational agencies, and for the dissemination of information on the organization, financing, and operation of education both to the education profession and to the general public.

The amount of the increases was not specified, but in view of the gross inadequacy of the President's educational program generally, there is little basis for believing that the increases will suffice to do the job that needs to be done.

Much more, there runs through the President's budget message a disparagement of Federal intervention in education which is discouraging, an implied expression of the belief that what the States do in the field of education is substantially nobody's business but their own. Hence the abandonment of Federal assistance for local school construction despite the nationwide classroom shortage. The defect in national educational leadership will not be reached by the Office of Education under thinking such as this. Nor, in view of the President's unwillingness to assume proper Federal responsibilities in the field of education, can we find any substantial encouragement in the President's meager State-slanted matching programs for aptitude testing, vocational guidance, and teaching of science and languages.

The defect of which I speak is so pervasive that, in the minds of some of us, nothing less than a select committee of the House and the Senate is capable of remedying it, using the subpena power wherever necessary and examining all possible aspects of the problem in major areas of the country. I should like to say a few words about some of the dimensions of the problems to which I refer.

The first of these has to do with teacher recruitment and teacher salary. What good will our plans and financial outlays for training in science and engineering do if we lose the struggle to find new teachers? We need to recast the outlook of too many persons in relation to the teaching profession, restore its dignity, improve the conditions of teaching, and increase teacher salaries substantially. The estimated national average salary of teachers in public schools for the school year 1957–58 is $4,520, and 20 States pay an average salary of less than $4,000. Median salaries for college teaching at large universities in 1956 were $4,000 for instructors, $4,900 for assistant professors, $5,700 for associate professors, and $7,000 for full professors.

Accordingly, a full-scale study exposing local variations and the penurious practices generally, and particularly in relation to the faculties of colleges, seems desirable. The Federal Government can do a good deal of prodding in this area among State legislators, other State officials, and among private educational institutions.

The present low salaries of elementary and secondary schoolteachers and college faculty members are a positive inducement for talented persons to seek employment in the more highly paid private industries. Teacher salaries should be raised and the dignity of the teaching profession reestablished so that the teaching profession will be able effectively to compete with private industry for skilled and competent persons.

The King-Jenkins bill—H. R. 4662—would permit teachers to deduct up to $600 for so much of their tuition and

other expenses as is in excess of normal living costs and incurred in pursuing advanced educational objectives relating to their professional qualifications. At present a teacher cannot deduct these expenses unless he would have lost his position if he had not take the courses. Perhaps H. R. 4662 may be too broad, but the proposed Commission would be in a position to cut it down or define it so the deduction could at least be taken where the teachers' field of activity is bound up in the public interest.

A second main problem has to do with the relation of education by the military to civilian institutions of learning. A great measure of integration can be accomplished here, resulting in saving money by avoiding duplication. It has been reported, for example, that the military spends about $300 million annually in educating the illiterate. Should not this be related to a Federal program for aiding the financing of local elementary and secondary school construction?

A third of the many problems which require investigation has to do with our physical plant for higher education and the adequacy of laboratory and research facilities. The voluntary and informal systems of reporting which now take place are not adequate for evaluating the measures which must be taken to meet the deepening crisis in higher education facilities. Here a large number of private institutions, whose existence deserves protection and encouragement, stand alongside State and local colleges and universities in postures of complement which require greater understanding before needed action and programs for financial assistance are developed. The $4.5 million contribution recently made by the Ford Foundation for developing improvements in constructing schools and colleges is a token of the kind of leadership which is necessary for moving forward in establishing adequate educational facilities.

A fourth major problem touches on teaching curriculum and methods. Federal intrusion is not contemplated, certainly Federal direction or control is not the aim. But will it be denied that the Federal Government has a legitimate interest in lending whatever advice or encouragement it can for the more effective training of scientists, engineers, and technicians whose skills are called upon for the national defense? Supporting pilot programs in various educational methods or educational procedures is, therefore, a basic responsibility of the Federal Government in the new significance which education has assumed in our atomic age.

A fifth problem of national concern has to do with basic science research. We have fallen behind alarmingly here, a fact whose seriousness is underlined by the highly and increasingly complicated character of necessary defense weapons and radar-impacted war communication procedures. Money alone will not cure the existing evil. Integration of activities is just as important.

Increasing the grant to the National Science Foundation for basic research as proposed in the President's 1958 budget message from $38 million in 1958 to $58 million in 1959 is only a partial meeting of the need. Basic research is now conducted by the Government through the Bureau of Standards, the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Department of Defense. The obvious need to correlate basic research, which the President failed to reach in his budget message, would be a major preoccupation of the proposed Federal Commission on Education.

Lack of integration is not limited to the executive and administrative branches of our Federal Government. It extends to Congressional procedures as well. Our House Committee on Education and Labor deals only with a part of our national educational problems. Bills having to do with the National Science Foundation go to our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Tax incidents of education are referred to the Ways and Means Committee. Our Committee on Government Operations is now considering a proposal to establish a scientific research reserve fund. On Wednesday, January 15, 1958, the House adopted, as an amendment to the bill we passed for financing Air Force construction, a proposal to create within the Department of Defense an Advanced Research Projects Agency to engage in basic and applied research for developing weapons systems. Basic research, and the national education problem generally, ought to be pulled together in the interests of economy and efficiency. The present regime of things, with its manifold diversification, is open to improvement.

I mention the enumerated problems merely as an earnest of the vast fields of scrutiny which face us. Other fields abound, such as the possible revamping of college training and the greater utilization of the 2-year community colleges, the disorganized and uncoordinated relationship between the secondary schools and the liberal arts colleges, and the development of cooperating procedures between the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation. The suggestion that these fields be given over to study by a Federal commission is based largely on the view that a commission would be a more suitable vehicle for effectuating long-range plans and has a more permanent form than a Congressional committee. My mind is open, however, on the question whether a select committee of the Congress should lay the foundation for the suggested commission's activity.

Nature, in one of its enigmas, grants to the child an extraordinary capacity to learn but commonly denies it adequate powers to discern the importance of learning for a happy and successful life. In some children, aptitude or aggressiveness in academic directions or wellsprings of competition give drive to the learning process. But in the course of living most children depend upon training, discipline, and understanding which are the everlasting responsibilities of elders and the teachers they engage. Widespread dissatisfaction has been expressed with the ways in which we have been discharging these responsibilities. Improvements in teaching particularly the physical sciences and mathematics, without neglect of the social sciences and the humanities, must be pursued relentlessly. Teaching fads must be distinguished from meaningful innovations which help not only in the learning process but in the lifelong pursuit of learning.

I do not say that education is a necessary corollary of wisdom or causes wisdom to exist, for human beings cannot be typed, they have a vast array of attitudes and aptitudes and they take different paths to reach fulfillment. But while intuitiveness and practical sense are still highly essential for competence and especially leadership, it will not suffice to expect, or to adopt as our national point of view, that nuclear skills can develop without training or education, or that national preeminence in the humanities or the social sciences will come about except through persistent and widespread opportunities for education.

Developing inquisitive minds and building genuine public respect for learning in general and scientific research in particular are for America today more than gratification of a desire for national learning and culture—these are the bedrocks of our Nation's security and a condition of its leadership in the Free World.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader what the program for next week will be?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, responding to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, may I say that Monday is District Day. There is no business for that day. On Tuesday, the bill H. R. 8381—the tax bill, Technical Amendments Act of 1957—will be called up.

On Wednesday there will be no business.

On Thursday, the bill H. R. 10021—the extension of life insurance tax formula—will be called up for consideration.

There are, of course, the usual reservations that any further program will be announced later, and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 58), authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the week of January 26, 1958, through February 1, as National Junior Achievement Week.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it was the initiative, the sense of individual dignity, and the determination to mold their own futures that motivated those who founded this Nation; and

Whereas Junior Achievement, Inc., through its learning-by-doing program, is inculcating those ideals in American youth by helping them to set up and operate their own small-scale business enterprises; and

Whereas their experience in running Junior Achievement companies will provide these young people with a heightened understanding of the privileges and duties of citizenship and better prepare them to assume the responsibilities of community leadership; and

Whereas thousands of American businessmen voluntarily give unstintingly of their time, their counsel, and their experience for the benefit of the members of Junior Achievement; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning January 26, 1958, and ending February 1, 1958, will be observed as National Junior Achievement Week: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 26, 1958, through February 1, 1958, as National Junior Achievement Week and urging all citizens of our country to salute the activities of Junior Achievers and their volunteer adult advisers through appropriate ceremonies.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, while I am conscious of the need to curtail nonessential expenditures, certain facts have come to my attention which lead me to the conclusion that additional funds are necessary if the United States Coast Guard is to continue to fulfill its sea-rescue mission on the Great Lakes and other waterways over which it has jurisdiction.

I am sure that you are aware of the tremendous increase in recreational boating that has taken place in recent years. Since 1947, the number of pleasure craft in operation has nearly tripled, from 2½ million in 1947 to more than 7 million today.

I have been particularly interested in collecting facts relative to the situation on the Great Lakes. Here, as elsewhere, there has been a boom in pleasure boating. According to Coast Guard estimates, the number of small craft in the harbor fleet at Toledo, Ohio, increased from 7,500 in 1950 to 16,950 in 1957. During this same period, the harbor fleet at Cleveland increased from 10,000 to 22,600; the fleet at Ashtabula from 5,000 to 11,300; the fleet at Marblehead from 7,500 to 16,950; the fleet at Fairport from 2,500 to 5,650; the fleet at Lorain from 5,000 to 11,300; and the fleet at Erie from 5,000 to 11,300.

In light of this estimated increase of more than 200 percent in the size of the harbor fleets at the principal port cities on Lake Erie, it is not surprising that the incidence of assistance calls and rescue missions by the Coast Guard has more than doubled during this same period. Unfortunately, the Coast Guard was unable to furnish me with comparative figures for 1950 and 1957, but the table below for the years 1953 and 1957 clearly reflects the sharp increase in the scope of rescue operations by the Coast Guard for the Lake Erie port cities listed above.

*Comparative incidence of Coast Guard assistance calls*

| | 1953 | 1957 | Percentage increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| Toledo | 80 | 182 | 225 |
| Cleveland | 86 | 204 | 240 |
| Ashtabula | 24 | 57 | 240 |
| Marblehead | 73 | 194 | 270 |
| Fairport | 30 | 29 | |
| Lorain | 64 | 103 | 160 |
| Erie | 70 | 98 | 140 |

According to Coast Guard statistics, then, we find that the number of pleasure craft at the principal Lake Erie ports has more than doubled since 1950 and that since 1953 the incidence of assistance calls to the Coast Guard has also doubled at most of these ports. The most incredible fact of all, however, is that, with only a single exception, there has been no increase in the number of Coast Guard personnel at any of these Lake Erie ports. The one exception is Marblehead, where the complement of enlisted men has increased from 13 in 1948 to 15 in 1957. Since 1950, the following authorized personnel complements have been maintained: Toledo, 26; Cleveland, 39; Ashtabula, 11; Erie, 16; Lorain, 13; Fairport, 12.

The above facts clearly bear out the recommendations of the study of recreational boating safety conducted by the House Committee on Merchant Marine, of which I am a member. As on Lake Erie, the committee found that the Coast Guard is undermanned for the responsibilities which have increased so greatly in recent years.

Because the safety of life and property are at stake, and because Coast Guard personnel in many areas are performing beyond reasonable limits of endurance, I respectfully urge this body to support additional funds sufficient to assure fulfillment of the important rescue mission for which the United States Coast Guard is responsible.

## DICTATOR JIMENEZ

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, everyone in the freedom-loving world, and particularly we here in the House of Representatives of this truly democratic government, have been following closely the news reports of the last 24 hours with reference to the overthrow of the notorious Dictator Jimenez in Venezuela.

Time and again down through the years of his ruthless dictatorship in the freedom-loving neighbor of ours to the south, Venezuela, the minions of the dictator mouthed platitudes of adherence to democratic principles which were as false as only a dictator of a friendly people can be false. From Caracas news releases, broadcasts of all kinds cluttered up the press and our desks in Washington.

There is no doubt, of course, that the State Department knew better than any of us the true state of facts in this brave South American country, but for reasons I have been able to well understand, spokesmen for our Department of State have persisted in heaping praise upon the Dictator Jimenez and his ill-omened regime.

We who know the chain of events, know that not only was the Dictator Jimenez overthrown, but also was overthrown certain well-known oil companies, who with their dollars maintain their domination and prestige of a false government in a betrayed nation.

Much of the atmosphere in Washington reeks with oil—much of this residual fuel oil is dumped in the United States from Venezuela through a discriminatory, unfairly, and improperly rigid quota system sponsored and insisted upon by our Department of State at the behest of the dominant Venezuelan oil interests.

Now that the farce and sham of the dictator Jimenez is unmasked and the true nature of his administration revealed, and the financial interests of the American oil companies responsible for his conduct is made clear, let us hope the new government in Caracas will truly represent the people of that sorely tried country, restore the liberties for which so many Venezuelans have suffered and died through the centuries, renounce their false friends, whose oily hands helped to enslave them, develop their God-given natural resources for the general welfare of their country, and advise our Department of State that the hypocrisy of that Department's official statements with reference to Venezuela and the Jimenez regime are no longer welcome, and that it is not the desire of a friendly Venezuelan Government and people to be a party any

longer to take advantage of a vicious and unfair residual fuel oil export quota system to America, as set up by the United States Government, with the approval of the State Department, which does the Government and the people of Venezuela no good, and has, in their fair name, fattened the purse of Venezuelan traitors and false American friends, and damages the welfare of the true friends in the United States of their Republic.

## ROBERT BURNS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much honored today to address the Congress in memory of the birthday of the great Robert Burns and to include in my remarks a very inspiring article by my valued friend and esteemed neighbor, James Cameron Duncan, entitled "Scotland—Land of Burns," which recently appeared in the Clinton Daily Item.

Mr. Duncan has long been an admirer and biographer of Robert Burns. For many years, he has taken great pains to celebrate the birthday of the great Scottish poet, sometimes in connection with large formal celebrations and in later years on his own.

His devotion to the immortal Burns is just as strong today as ever and Mr. Duncan seems to have absorbed the spirit and the ageless liveliness of the man whose delightful poems are household words throughout much of the world.

Robert Burns has been memorialized in many ways and by many people, but by none have his praises been sung more loudly, more impressively, or more wholeheartedly than by Mr. Duncan.

I can vividly and appreciatively recall the days of my early youth when the Scottish clans, of which Mr. Duncan is past chief, used to hold lusty celebrations of birthdays of Robert Burns. With the passing years, the young generation has not, unfortunately, kept up this beautiful folk custom and we miss the bagpipes, the kilts, the sword dances, and the beautiful Scottish melodies, many of them with words by Burns, and the spirit of Celtic gaiety and enthusiasm invariably associated with these events.

Chief Duncan, speaking for the clans of past and present, raises the proud historic voice of Scottish independence of the spirit and love of Burns, clear-sounding and ringing with the unquenchable fervor of old.

I think it is most fitting today that the Congress of the United States should pause for a while to commemorate the blessed memory of Bobby Burns and join with Mr. Duncan in paying our reverent tribute to the fabulous bard of Scotland, who brought and still brings such pleasure and inspiration to the people.

May Chief Duncan, with his dauntless spirit, continue for years to come to carry this illustrious banner high and pay his able, touching, annual tribute to one of Scotland's noblest sons, and one of the world's most beloved poets.

Mr. Duncan's brilliant, moving words, coming as they do so sincerely from a great Scotsman and a great American, give meaningful significance to Robert Burns' birthday, and I am gratified and proud to request that his stirring remarks be inserted in the RECORD.

Long live the memory and the works of Scotland's great poet, Robert Burns.

[From the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item of January 21, 1958]

SCOTLAND—LAND OF BURNS

Robert Burns was born on the 25th of January, 1759.

I count it a great honor and privilege to have the opportunity of responding to such a toast. It grips the heartstrings. It makes the pulse beat faster, it lifts the head of a Scot higher and makes his eyes glisten with the tears that only an exile can know. It is a royal toast.

There's magic in the words, music in them and romance—"Scotland—the Land O' Burns!" What a name to conjure with! How sweet it sounds in the ear of the son of Scotia so far from home and his kinfolk! At the mention of the name he wants to shout or perhaps he is hardly able to check a tear. How he loves that little country that gave him birth! Let not our American friends feel that such expressions of devotion dispute our gratitude or love for this land of our adoption for I should be the last to be ungrateful.

"The Land O' Burns"—Scotland! We salute the land of our nativity. At the very sound of thy name we travel far across the tumbling waters of the great Atlantic, and in fancy return home to Scotland, to a Scotland in homely gracious mood and with a smile of her lips, a welcome in her eyes, a scone on the griddle and a kettle on the hob.

We came back to Scotland with her warm firesides, the splendor of her high teas and the friendliness of her Doric and braid Scots. My! What pictures are culled from the pages of the past. What fond scenes return wistfully and tinted in love and longing to stir our hearts and make them wondrous soft and warm! We see ruined kirk yards where shrubs and weeds put apart the stones, dark brown and black peat bogs with their pools of jet on whose bosom the sun sparkles like a myriad of diamonds * * * windswept moors with heather slanting, and bare hills silent and majestic.

We love Scotland in the sunshine and we love her in the rain. We love her hills, now and again rearing their heads above the blankets of mist and pushing the shrouds down to roll wet among the heather while whitewashed cottages nestle fondly in their protecting shelter and surround themselves with flower-filled gardens bright in the mist and colorful even in the rain. Her low stone houses are lovingly tucked away from the storms and the wind unpotently shudders at the doors and throws handfuls of sleet against the glass.

We can see oh how clearly her hills folded one against the other in every shade of brown and blue stone dykes running up and down rabbit holes and clumps of ferns, green grass and sheep grazing as though they, too, were proud of their nativity. Fir trees marching down in their companies to the edges of the brown-tinted lochs in whose deep shadows are locked the secrets of romantic and stirring past and the wavelets lap the rocks and whisper of "Black Rodericks," "Rob Roys," and "Fair Helen's."

Oh for Scotland's stone houses, grey and cold outside, warm and cosy within. Oh for her drizzles and her mists and her fogs, her love songs and her poetry, her firesides and her winter aykes, her gingles and nooks, her huts and bens. The Land O' Burns! Not far from the Brig O' Doon an Auld Clay iggin lying against the road! Let us suffice that I hint to her great literature, one has only to mention Scott, Robert Louis Stevenson, Carlyle, Barrie, Buchan and immediately there marches in review a host of immortals whose names are written large and indelibly on the pages of letters.

Likewise, whether in poetry, philosophy, in art, in medicine, in theology, invention, science or statesmanship, Scotland has not withheld her gifts but lavished them upon a world that has not been slow to recognize the genius of the Sons of the Land of Burns.

This Scotland has bred a courage, a dour stubbornness, that knows no defeat, that has stained the battlefields of the world with rich celtic blood and never was there a battle of any importance fought by the armies of Great Britain in which the brunt was not borne by the kilted regiments of the Highlands or the Stocky "bonny features" of the Lowlands of the Land of Burns."

This Courage was fostered by the difficulties of wresting a living from a hard soil and an unkind climate. These qualities of mind and heart Scotland has been glad to contribute to the world and the world is richer because there was North of the Tweed a land in which Robert Burns was born.

## RECENT SUPREME COURT DECISIONS—A CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, many members of this body, many substantial citizens of this country, and many very able practitioners before the bar, as well as law enforcement officials, have been quite concerned in recent months and years over certain decisions made by the United States Supreme Court.

I have, from time to time, expressed my belief with regard to the functions of the United States Congress made up of representatives of the people of this great Nation in this high legislative tribunal and its duty to manifest an awareness of the actions on the part of the Supreme Court when those actions are subject to question. I acknowledge that it is the responsibility, under our form of government and under our constitutional makeup, to act as a legislative check on the judicial actions of the Supreme Court when within our constitutional authority we are empowered so to do.

It is eminently true that the Supreme Court has power to interpret the laws as passed by Congress and to protect thereby the constitutional rights of the individual citizen as well as the collective rights of all the people of this country. On the other side of the coin it is equally true, and I am sure it was the concept of the framers of our Constitution that the legislative body, through Congress, has the duty, when a Supreme Court interpretation is handed down or a Supreme Court decision is rendered, to consider most carefully those decisions and to make a determination as to whether further legislation is needed in order to accomplish the legitimate legislative purpose of the law under question, and if it is the opinion of the majority of the Members of Congress that the Supreme Court did violence to the law involved or the intention of Congress inherent in

the law involved, then it is clearly the duty of Congress to amend or clarify that law in order that the constitutional power of Congress to legislate in that particular field should be fully carried out and the general public protected as Congress had intended. Of course this is a duty and a responsibility of Congress and I believe it to be a responsibility of equal import to that of the Supreme Court in its function of interpreting the laws as passed. Of course, it was never contemplated that the Supreme Court should, through decisions, become a law-making body.

Within the above fundamental concepts of our Government, Congress thus very definitely has a responsibility, one which in my opinion must constantly be fully asserted in order that the legislative branch of government might carry out its full responsibilities.

Many serious questions have arisen in recent years as to whether the Supreme Court was injecting itself into the law-making or legislative field that exclusively belongs to Congress, secondly, as to whether the Supreme Court was erroneously interpreting the intention of Congress with regard to a number of legislative acts that were passed, third, as to whether the Supreme Court was placing an unwarranted and unbalanced emphasis on the rights of the individual under our Constitution as compared to the collective rights of society or all of the people of the country to protection, specifically against criminals, Communists, and others who do violence to the public welfare and good, fourth, as to whether the Supreme Court was, by its decisions, undermining the 10th amendment to the Constitution or the reserved powers of the States provision in the Constitution. By merely citing these as some of the questions that have been raised indicates the seriousness of what appears to be some of the trends in the more recent decisions of the Supreme Court, and would further clearly indicate why many of us are concerned about some of these trends.

Not since the tidelands oil decision a number of years ago, in which Congress reversed the opinion of the Supreme Court by legislation, has Congress shown so much concern about a group or series of decisions of that Court, as was evidenced during the first session of the 85th Congress. During that session acting upon my bill and those of many of my colleagues the Jencks FBI files case was clarified, and properly so, by almost unanimous action on the part of Congress. This deliberative body showed its wisdom and its willingness to acknowledge the constitutional rights of the individual in legislating, by passing a bill that fully protected his rights, but still recognizing the fact that the FBI is one of our chief law-enforcing agencies and must be able to protect its informants and its rough working notes and uncorroborated evidence free from inspection by the defendant, and further that the Court should retain some authority in determining what evidence should be made available to the defendant as it relates to evidence presented by the United States Government. I might add that this was done over the strenuous opposition of one of our more liberal news columnists, a matter which I reported during the consideration of that legislation last session.

In further reaction by Congress to the series of decisions of the Supreme Court, particularly in the last October term of court, Congress appointed for one of the few times in legislative history, and the first time in recent history, a special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee for the purpose of inquiring into a series of Supreme Court decisions and determining what, if any, legislative action would be justified. That resolution establishing the special subcommittee to study Supreme Court decisions reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That a special subcommmittee, consisting of five members of the Committee on the Judiciary, be constituted and authorized as a matter of the highest urgency to conduct an inquiry, take evidence, and make findings and recommendations, legislative or otherwise, to this committee at the earliest practicable date, with reference to those questions raised by decisions of the Supreme Court, handed down at the last session of the Court, which affect (1) the power of Congress to investigate, (2) Federal laws relating to subversive activities, and (3) the enforcement of Federal criminal laws.

Thus, historical action was taken by Congress last session showing the concern of many Members over recent Supreme Court decisions. The Jencks decision was clarified and partially overcome by the enactment of legislation, and a special subcommittee is presently actively studying Supreme Court decisions and the subject matter assigned to it, and as the ranking minority member of that committee, I am sure we will have proposed legislation available for the full Committee on Judiciary, together with other recommendations in the near future, at least on some of these decisions, having held hearings during the recess in an effort to expedite our work.

It might also be well to note at this point that on July 3, 1956, the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably H. R. 3, commonly known as the Smith bill, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions on the effect of acts of Congress on State laws, the question of Federal preemption of State statutes. The committee reported out legislation in this field which would have at least overcome the *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* (350 U. S. 497) decision dealing with sedition, where the Supreme Court had ruled that the mere existence of Federal statutes on the subject matter of sedition implied that Congress intended to preempt this legislative field to the exclusion of State statutes on the same subject matter. In that case the Court stated:

Taken as a whole they (the Federal statutes) evidence a Congressional plan which makes it reasonable to determine that no room has been left for the States to supplement it.

The proposed legislation resulting from this decision would have required "that Federal statutes hereafter enacted on the question of subversive activities or sedition should not prevent the enforcement in the courts of any State of any statute of such State prescribing any criminal penalty (in this particular field) except to the extent specifically provided by any statute on the same subject matter."

Similar legislation is presently before the full Committee of the Judiciary this session and I trust that our committee will report out constructive and effective legislation in an effort to clarify this field of the preemption of State statutes by Federal statutes, as it is imperative that the States not be hampered in carrying out their legitimate constitutional functions from a legislative standpoint as a result of this decision standing without further clarification. Under the supremacy clause of the Constitution the Supreme Court has previously—before the Nelson case—laid down the rule that the courts look to the purpose and scope of Federal legislation to determine as a matter of fact that there is such a conflict or likelihood of conflict, that the State law must be overridden by the Federal, as was decided in the Cloverleaf case. Of course the Nelson case expanded this rule of interpretation substantially, the Court lifting itself up by its own bootstraps, establishing the doctrine which I have called implied implication of Congressional intent to preempt. I have introduced legislation in this field, H. R. 9100, which provides in effect that "no future act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates to the exclusion of any State law on the same subject matter, unless such act specifically states such intent." It further provides that with regard to prior acts of Congress they shall not be construed to preempt State statutes "unless (1) there is such a direct and positive conflict between the express provisions of such act and such State law that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together, (2) there is positive evidence that Congress clearly manifested an intention so to supersede such State law."

My objective in introducing this legislation which is a modification of the Smith proposal in H. R. 3 was to have before the Judiciary Committee a possible substitute proposal, although I am not unequivocally wedded to any particular terminology so long as there is accomplished the objective of defining the limited field of Federal preemption of State statutes as was contemplated under the supremacy clause of the Constitution and as was vastly broadened by the Supreme Court in the Nelson case. I trust Congress will act on this legislation this session.

To return to the subject matter of the jurisdiction of the Special Subcommittee of Judiciary To Study Supreme Court Decisions, let me very briefly state what some of those decisions are and their effect. It is worthy of note that a number of decisions from lower courts, as well as actions on the part of law enforcement officials during the recess period have very clearly shown the effect of some of these decisions which present further concrete evidence that legislative action is necessary, evidence

which was not previously available to Congress.

Those cases which our committee has under consideration at this time are as follows:

Andrew R. Mallory versus United States of America; Clinton E. Jencks versus United States of America; Shirley Kremen, Samuel Coleman, Sidney Steinberg versus United States; Oleta Yates, Henrl Steinberg, Loretta Stack et al. versus United States; John T. Watkins versus United States; Paul M. Sweezy versus State of New Hampshire; Ralph Konigsberg versus State Bar of California; Delvoille Theard versus United States of America; Rudolph Schware versus The Board of Bar Examiners of State of New Mexico.

To discuss these cases very briefly and to indicate the problems that arise as a result of them and the need for Congressional consideration by this subcommittee and possible Congressional action I will indicate briefly what those decisions held and some of the unfortunate factual situations and lower court interpretations that have resulted from those decisions.

At the outset I indicated that many outstanding law enforcement officials were concerned about these cases. During the recess the Committee on Internal Security of the National Association of Attorneys General, as an example, made the following observation:

In this particular field (communism) and in all other appropriate fields we urge upon you further the restoration of a reasonable balance of power between our respective State and Federal Governments and finally we urge, insofar as it is within the power of the Congress to do so, the need for clarifying the procedures for criminal law enforcement in the Federal courts and for restoring to the States the right to regulate procedures in their own courts.

Some of these appropriate fields as listed in this statement are as follows:

1. The powers of investigation of Congressional committees.

2. The powers and procedures of the Department of Justice in conducting prosecutions before the Federal courts.

3. The adequacy of existing Federal legislation, and even the powers of Congress itself to adopt such legislation, for the punishment and prevention of subversive activities.

4. The punitive and investigatory powers of the separate sovereign States against subversive activities, and against subversive organizations.

5. The power of the State and Federal agencies to rid their payrolls of subversives.

6. The power of State supreme courts to determine qualification of persons who shall be admitted to practice before the bar of such courts as lawyers and advocates.

7. The power in both State and Federal courts to follow procedures which fully correspond with the reasonable demands of fair play in the prosecution and conviction of criminals without having the convictions upset on technicalities.

Starting with the Mallory case, it is ruled in effect that a person who was held for 7½ hours between his arrest and his arraignment and during that period had voluntarily confessed to the crime of rape that his voluntary confession would be considered as involuntary and therefore inadmissible evidence solely because of his retention for a period of 7½ hours between arrest and arraignment there being no element of coercion involved. This arose as a result of a very strict interpretation of rule 5–a of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that provides "an officer making an arrest under a warrant issued upon a complaint or any person making an arrest without a warrant shall take the person arrested without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States."

Based upon that rule of criminal procedure the Supreme Court ruled the evidence inadmissible and the result was that the conviction was reversed and remanded by unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court and the result of the remand was that it was impossible for the retrial to be held and the man is scot free today.

Thus the result of this case was that a convicted rapist was permitted to go free, and of course the concern of many people in addition to that one unsavory result was the very broad and loose language used by the Supreme Court which makes it almost impossible for law enforcement officials, subsequent to that decision, to determine what their rights and what their powers are in carrying out their law enforcement functions during this period between arrest and arraignment.

The results of the Mallory decision have been many and varied and certainly indicate that it has caused the law enforcement function of the police authorities to be substantially hampered. I refer to the following article that appeared in the Evening Star which very clearly shows the effect of this decision in the Washington area:

MALLORY CASE MATCHES SPEED AGAINST JUSTICE

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Six months of law enforcement here under the Supreme Court's Mallory decision have plunged police and prosecutors into a race against the clock, a survey showed yesterday.

The Supreme Court in June reversed the death penalty rape conviction of Andrew R. Mallory on the ground that his confession should not have been admitted at the trial because he was held too long—7½ hours—between arrest and arraignment.

The clock-watching began because the Supreme Court ruled that a prisoner should be arraigned after his arrest "as quickly as possible." Prisoners, said the high court, should not be taken to police headquarters "to carry out a process of inquiry that lends itself, even if not so designed, to eliciting damaging statements to support the arrest and ultimately his guilt."

FACTOR PREDOMINATES

Time has become the predominant factor—how much time can be consumed in questioning a suspect before arraignment.

After arraignment, police lose custody of the prisoner. A case where the marshal did return a prisoner to police after arraignment is now being debated in the court of appeals. Police can question prisoners at the jail, but only if the prisoners consent. By that time, however, police say, prisoners have the full benefit of advice from their jail companions and questioning is nonproductive.

What has happened to District law enforcement in the first 6 months under the Mallory ruling?

1. At least five men have been charged with crimes they didn't commit.

2. Two convicted murderers have seen their convictions reversed and the Government cannot try them again.

3. Eighteen defendants have raised the "Mallory question" in the court of appeals. The question: Should their confessions of guilt have been admitted at their trials? The box score: The 2 murder cases reversed; 5 convictions affirmed because the court ruled the Mallory rule did not apply to them; 11 cases pending, including the carnal knowledge conviction of Mallory's nephew.

4. The Mallory issue has cropped up at least two dozen times in District court trials, with varying results, depending on the facts and the judges' different interpretations of what the Mallory decision means. In only three cases have the judges permitted juries to hear written confessions of guilt.

5. The prosecutor has been allowed to bring in oral admissions in nine cases but the judge has excluded them in four others.

EVIDENCE BARRED

In one case, a women who had been beaten and robbed in her own home was barred from testifying that the defendant confessed his crime to her at police headquarters. She was barred from saying he admitted the robbery while begging her not to prosecute. The prisoner's argument to her: He had saved her dog from being harmed by his fellow robber.

In another case, an FBI agent was not allowed to testify to a prisoner's admissions to him, although the agent had duly warned the prisoner that anything he said might be used against him.

And late last week, a judge cited the Mallory rule in barring incriminating statements made by a defendant within a half hour after his arrest.

6. Some District court judges, following a 1952 rule of the court of appeals, still tell juries they must scrutinize with care and caution any oral admissions made by the defendant to police. They don't give that warning on written confessions.

Since written confessions are being ruled out, commented United States Attorney Oliver Gasch, this caution from the judge about oral admissions "may assume great importance in the minds of the jury."

7. The United States Attorney's office has been accepting pleas of guilty to lesser offenses and dropping counts in indictments, rather than risk going to trial and freeing men who have admitted their guilt but may have been held more than a few hours while making the admissions.

Last week, two housebreakers who had been caught in the act and admitted a series of other housebreakings were allowed to plead guilty to 3 counts of a 13-count indictment.

POSITION EXPLAINED

Said Mr. Gasch: "A review of our experience discloses that no reliance can be placed on confessions believed to be completely voluntary if a delay between arrest and arraignment, comparable to the delay in the Mallory case, has taken place. This has resulted in our willingness to accept pleas to lesser included offenses and to dismiss certain counts in the indictment.

The prosecutor said his office still adhered to the rule of thoroughly screening cases at the municipal court and grand jury level and insisting on trials whenever indictments are returned, but he added:

"Under the Mallory doctrine, we have been forced to recognize that a substantial number of counts, good in fact are nonetheless not good in law."

8. In the uncertainty over what to do when a prisoner is arrested at night and promptly confesses, police and Federal

agents have been waking up one prosecutor a minimum of five times a week. Assistant United States Attorney Frederick Smithson, who rarely gets an uninterrupted night's sleep now, says he gives this advice: If you need the statement, I'll wake up a judge. If you don't need the statement, stop talking to the defendant, put him in a cellblock and wait for morning.

9. As recently as a few weeks ago, the court of appeals asked Mr. Gasch to submit a statement regarding the general applicability of the Mallory rule. Mr. Gasch told the court he couldn't generalize about the rule. He stated:

"There is no doubt but that this decision of the Supreme Court has had a tremendously restrictive impact upon arrest-arraignment procedures. I would find it difficult, at this time, to state with any degree of explicitness how this doctrine might be regarded as generally applicable. I would be prepared, however, to state my view as to its application to a given set of facts."

If Mr. Gasch can't make a general rule, neither can the police. Deputy Chief E. E. Scott, chief of detectives, said each case is being handled individually, based on the facts involved, with supervising officers calling the shots. Their basic problem: Time versus the public interest.

These four cases from police records show how the question of time resulted in a criminal charge against five innocent men:

Case 1. On December 30 the day after three gunmen invaded a private home and robbed the occupants, Defendant A was picked up. He admitted being at the home, denied taking part in the robbery and said Defendant B had been with him.

Defendant B, promptly picked up, said he had been with Defendant A the night before but claimed they had been together at a party. At a quickly called lineup, the robbed homeowner identified Defendant A but explained that he had not seen the second and third men. His guests had, but they could not be located immediately.

Police were told not to take any more time and the prisoners were taken before United States Commissioner James F. Splain, 3 hours and 15 minutes after their arrest.

INVESTIGATION CONTINUED

Detective Sgt. Mark W. Gray and Precinct Detective David H. Gould continued their investigation. They cleared Defendant B and picked up another suspect who not only admitted the crime but named the third man. By that time, however, the third man—alerted by the publicity of the arraignment—had fled town.

Detective Gray's report to his superior: 'It is the opinion of the reporting officer that if he had had sufficient time to investigate (Defendant B's) whereabouts and other evidence rather than arraign him immediately, he would not have been charged with this crime."

Case 2. On December 21, a southeast liquor store was robbed by four men. A witness said he thought he knew two of them, described by a nickname and a scar. They were picked up with two others, identified in a lineup on this case and two other cases.

Police tried to get a committing magistrate to arraign the quartet before dawn on a Sunday morning but Commissioner Splain told them to wait until Monday.

TWO ARE CLEARED

Police kept on working to find the gun and the rest of the money. They found another man who cleared two of those arrested and led them to the money and the gun. The two innocent men had been charged—after being positively identified—and if Commissioner Splain had come to court on Sunday, they would have been arraigned.

Case 3. On November 19, a suspect was picked up because he exactly answered the description furnished by a woman who had been beaten, raped, and robbed in her Massachusetts Avenue apartment. He said he had been working at a hotel dinner at which the victim had been a guest. Police, reasoning he could have followed her home, asked him where he had been later in the night. He said he had been in a bar with a friend, whose name and address he gave police.

Police questioned the alibi witness, who said he had never heard of the suspect. The victim, meanwhile, positively identified the suspect. He was then charged with rape, robbery, and housebreaking and rushed to arraignment.

The next day, the alibi witness came to headquarters to give a written statement as instructed by police. He then said the suspect's story was true, that they had been together. He had denied being in the bar, when first questioned, because he didn't want his wife to know it. Police then located bar employees who said the suspect was definitely in the bar with his friend.

Case 4. On September 13, a 7-year-old girl said her uncle Bill had attacked her on August 31. The child was examined and showed an injury.

Police arrested the uncle, who insisted he had been framed but the child and her mother stuck to the story. He was charged with carnal knowledge and arraigned.

Continuing their investigation, police learned the child had been injured in a fall several years earlier. They finally located the doctor who had then treated her. The case was dropped with this notation: "Further investigation reveals that defendant did not commit the offense."

DILEMMAS CITED

Police squad chiefs, who have to decide whether to rush a prisoner to arraignment or spend more time on the investigation, cite these dilemmas:

In a housebreaking case, where the prisoner's method of operation duplicates many other cases in the same area, do you question him long enough to recover the stolen property or do you rush to arraign him immediately?

The people whose houses have been rifled want their property back, but if police take the time to ask questions that will lead to the property, the court may rule the prisoner was held too long between arrest and arraignment, and all his admissions may be barred.

A man arrested on July 13 was not arraigned till the next day. Meanwhile, he had not only signed a statement but had told police where to find thousands of dollars' worth of property in a series of housebreakings in the District and Maryland. In one case alone, police recovered $900 worth of furs, jewelry, and cameras. The prisoner led them to pawnbrokers and told them where they could locate a great cache of loot in Pennsylvania.

Said the prosecutor, dubiously: "We may be able to go to trial, but it's a tough case. Of course, we won't be able to use his statement."

In a rape case where the alleged victim tells the nearest policeman that a man running down the street raped her, should detectives take the time—sometimes hours—to make sure she is telling the truth, while the accused waits, or should he be arraigned immediately? Detectives working on sex cases are among the most concerned that innocent men—accused and identified by the alleged victims—will have to be charged and arraigned before police complete their investigation.

In robbery and safecracking cases, police face a double problem. Usually more than one offender is involved and usually the case in which the prisoner is caught is only one of a number. Should they take the time to question the prisoner about his confederates? Should they take the time to locate all the complaining witnesses in closely related cases to see if they can identify the prisoner? The more time they take after a prisoner has made his admission, the less are their chances of getting a case that will stand up in court.

In a murder case, such as the unsolved rape-murder of 8-year-old Valerie Lee, police have long since run out of all clues that might lead to physical evidence or witnesses. One detective put the police quandary this way:

"Suppose we now get an anonymous call that the man we want is the redhead with the scar sitting on the third stool from the end in Joe's Bar. We spot him and ask the bartender who he is. The bartender never saw him before.

"If we put him under surveillance, he'll either spot us and run or we'll lose him in downtown traffic. Can we take the chance of letting him run loose, particularly when he might kill somebody else while under surveillance. So we'll pick him up and start asking him where he was on the day of the murder, where he lives and where he works. Our job has just begun. But if he says anything, we won't be able to use it in court. We may get a written confession, but the jury will never see it."

CONFESSIONS WITHHELD

Mr. Gasch, too, made the distinction between cases where there is plenty of evidence and the ones where police have nothing but a confession.

"It should be observed," he said, "that most cases involve substantial evidence other than written confessions. My men have been able to present such cases successfully even though they have been instructed to withhold the introduction of confessions.

"In certain serious cases involving crimes of violence, there has been a lack of other evidence, with the result that our ability to go forward with the prosecution of the serious crime has been thwarted."

Now pending in the House Judiciary Committee is a bill introduced by Representative KEATING, Republican, of New York, which would return District law enforcement to the rule previously set by the court of appeals here. The Keating bill provides:

"Statements or confessions or other evidence shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other judicial officer."

Mr. KEATING yesterday issued a statement declaring that failure to enact a law clarifying Federal arraignment procedures will hamstring effective enforcement of the law.

"The time is overdue for resolving this enigma," Mr. KEATING declared. "It is high time we take the handcuffs off the police and put them on the criminals where they belong.

"Otherwise, we allow a field day for criminality and invite anarchy on our streets."

HERE'S EXAMPLE OF RUSH OVER MALLORY DEADLINE

Here's a typical example of police clock-watching under the Mallory decision, as reported by Probational Detective Douglas M. Smith of the Robbery Squad:

3:30 p. m.—Saturday, October 19—Man arrested in a gun assault on a cab driver.

4 p. m.—Suspect had admitted and been identified in seven Northeast holdups, attempted robberies and assaults.

4:22 p. m.—Detective tried and failed to reach United States Commissioner James F. Splain.

4:34 p. m.—Tried and failed to locate a judge or Assistant United States Attorney Frederick Smithson.

4:50 p. m.—Reached Chief Judge Leonard P. Walsh of municipal court at his home and

was told to find a prosecutor for the arraignment, that Judge Walsh would stay home awaiting a return call.

5 p. m.—Called home of Principal Assistant United States Attorney Edward Troxwell, where Mrs. Troxwell said her husband was expected shortly.

5:15 p. m.—Mr. Troxwell returned call and instructed police to get a deputy United States marshal to court for the arraignment.

5:20 p. m.—Called United States Marshal Carlton Beall, agreed to have a deputy in court.

5:21 p. m.—Called Judge Walsh and said arraignment was set up.

5:22–7:10 p. m.—Went to court, conferred with Mr. Troxwell, made out papers and swore to them.

7:10 p. m.—Defendant, represented by counsel, arraigned. Held for the grand jury under $25,000 bond.

Detective Smith's comment: "As can be seen from this timetable proper interrogation, written statements, etc., were impossible to obtain."

The District Council on Law Enforcement, together with the United States attorney's office in the District of Columbia, made a study of State laws with regard to the rules applied in the States concerning confessions and found that in nearly all of the States the jurists could hear confessions in State courts that would be barred from being heard in the District or other Federal courts in the country, as a result of the Mallory decision and other Supreme Court decisions bearing on this issue. I quote a second article contained in the Evening Star on this subject which is most revealing and indicative of the justice being handed out in the Federal court as compared to that being meted out in the State courts. Of course, this inconsistency certainly deserves consideration of Congress, and I quote that article for its value in making that consideration:

STATES USE DATA BARRED HERE BY MALLORY RULING

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Juries can hear confessions in State courts that they are barred from hearing in the District or in any other Federal court in the country.

This sharp contrast between law enforcement in the States and the District was revealed yesterday in surveys made of State laws and decisions by the United States attorney's office here and the District Council on Law Enforcement.

In the States, if the judge finds the confession was made voluntarily, the jury gets to hear it, even if the prisoner was held for many hours or even days before he confessed.

In the District, the question is no longer whether the confession was voluntary but how long the prisoner was held between arrest and arraignment. A District court judge here recently barred a confession made half an hour after the prisoner's arrest.

A man who commits a murder in the District and confesses a few hours later can be pretty sure the confession he poured out to police will never reach a jury's ears.

If the same man committed the murder in Silver Spring or Arlington the jury would hear the confession, as long as it was voluntary, even if he confessed 3 days after the arrest. Both States have just such cases.

The surveys were prompted by the Supreme Court's Mallory decision of last June. The court ruled that a prisoner must be brought before a committing magistrate as quickly as possible and should not be questioned at police headquarters to get damaging statements, even if that were not the purpose of the questioning.

This has been interpreted by the courts here as virtually barring any headquarters questioning and as narrowing the Supreme Court's earlier McNabb decision. In the landmark 1943 McNabb decision, which reversed a conviction because of delayed arraignment, the prisoners were held for days and the court discussed coercion. In the Mallory case the prisoner was held for 7½ hours, and no claim of coercion was made.

State courts don't have to follow the Supreme Court's ruling in the earlier McNabb case or the recent Mallory case because no constitutional question was involved in the High Court's rulings. The Supreme Court made it clear that it was interpreting the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, which apply exclusively to district court here and the other Federal courts.

To clarify what confessions should be barred in Federal courts, bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate providing that delay between arrest and arraignment should not be the sole reason for excluding a confession at a trial.

SURVEY NOTES PRINCIPLE

United States Attorney Gasch said yesterday that studies of State laws and decisions showed that virtually all follow the same principle as proposed in the pending bills.

One of the surveys quoted this conclusion by a justice of the Illinois supreme court.

"Thus far," he wrote, "there has been no disposition on the part of the States to adopt the McNabb rule. State courts have been unwilling to disregard evidence of guilt in order to enforce police compliance with statutes requiring prompt arraignment."

The surveys backed up his conclusion. Even in the States—including Maryland—where there are laws spelling out speedy arraignment, the courts have ruled that though the prisoner's detention may violate State law, juries can still hear a confession—as long as it was given voluntarily.

CONCLUSIONS LISTED

The Council on Law Enforcement Survey of the States reached these conclusions:

1. To the extent the question has been expressly raised, the States have uniformly rejected the McNabb rule for excluding confessions—the rule narrowed by the Mallory decision. The States permit the use of confessions made to police during or as a result of illegal detention before arraignment, unless the confession is shown to be involuntary.

2. State laws which require the accused to be brought before a committing magistrate within a fixed time or within a reasonable time after arrest, do not alter the policy of admitting voluntary confessions even though the detention was too long to be legal.

3. Evidence of unlawful detention before arraignment can be taken into consideration by the court in determining whether the confession was voluntary but is not automatic grounds for excluding a confession.

TYPICAL ATTITUDES

These rulings from State courts are typical of the attitude of the States toward confessions:

Colorado, "We cannot believe that the Supreme Court of the United States * * * intended to lay down a hard and fast rule that no confession obtained from a suspected criminal, following his arrest and prior to arraignment, can be received in evidence against him."

California, "Since the McNabb case, the State courts that have had occasion to reevaluate their test of admissibility as it applied to a confession made during illegal detention continue to treat delay in arraignment as only one of the factors to be considered in determining whether the statement was voluntarily made. Apparently none of the States following the rule excluding illegally obtained evidence have adopted the rule of the McNabb case; and we are not disposed to adopt it."

OTHER VIEWPOINTS

Florida, "It is not amiss to point out that we have refused to apply the doctrine of the McNabb case in this State."

New York, "The question is whether protection for the individual would not be gained at a disproportionate loss of protection for society."

The New York comment came in ruling on a first degree murder case where the prisoner was arrested at 7:30 a. m. one day, made an oral confession at 5:30 p. m. the same day, was questioned on succeeding days by the prosecutor and finally put his confession in writing 4 days after his arrest. The court said his confession was properly admitted into the evidence since it was made voluntarily.

Many of the State rulings have followed the same line as the court of appeals here did for some 5 years—before it was upset by the Supreme Court in the Mallory case. This interpretation of when confessions should and should not be admitted in evidence follows the principle that if the delay could be shown to have caused the prisoner to confess, it should be excluded. But delay alone, ruled the court of appeals here before the Mallory reversal, is no automatic reason for excluding a confession.

CONNECTICUT VIEW

Connecticut takes that view. In a case which the Supreme Court refused to review in 1950, the Connecticut court ruled that the fact of illegal detention at the time a confession is made does not render it inadmissible unless that fact is causally connected with the securing of a confession.

Maryland had a case of illegal detention. A murder suspect was not only illegally detained in view of State laws for prompt arraignment but was held for 3 days before he confessed. The court ruled that the confession was admissible as long as it was made voluntarily. The court added that unless the facts of a case show that the illegal arrest in itself constituted such duress as to make the confession involuntary, the court must apply the same rules to the admissibility of the confession as it would where the arrest and detention were legal.

VIRGINIA EXAMPLE

The Virginia courts have taken the same view. A man was arrested on suspicion of killing his daughter's illegitimate child. He was held for 5 days without a formal charge. He was questioned twice before he went to the scene of the crime, where he orally admitted his part in the crime. Then he was charged and made a written statement. The court admitted the confession because it was given voluntarily notwithstanding that the oral admissions were given while he was illegally detained.

Utah considered what was best for proper prosecution in a murder-auto-theft case where the suspect was arrested on a Friday, confessed to the auto theft on a Saturday, confessed to murder on Sunday and reenacted the murder on Monday. The court held the confessions were admissible and said it was necessary for proper prosecution to take the prisoner back to the scene to determine which of two counties was the actual locale of the shooting.

CONFESSIONS SIGNED

In an Iowa case, a prowler was arrested in an area where a number of housebreakings had occurred, as well as a rape in the course of a housebreaking. In the police car after he was picked up, the prisoner said he had had something to do with the burglaries and the rape. Throughout the day after his arrest, he was questioned about the housebreakings and signed a confession to them. On the following day, he signed a confession to the rape case. He was brought

before a committing magistrate 3 days in all after his arrest. The court held that there was justification for illegal detention because of the number of cases involved. The confessions were allowed in evidence.

Like the Supreme Court, the States have shown wariness of third-degree tactics, undue pressure, threats and promises. They have repeatedly emphasized the voluntariness of a confession, but they have not made delay alone or even illegal detention the sole yardstick for barring a confession.

I think these two articles, together with evidence before our subcommittee, indicate clearly the need for legislative action in this particular field.

So far as the Jencks case is concerned, I have previously considered it in my discussion and Congress took action on it last session, so far as it relates to criminal law enforcement, and should it present a problem on the civil side, of course, our committee will consider that aspect of it.

The Kremen case has to do with the law of search and seizure, this particular search and seizure being by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Supreme Court reversed the conviction of the three petitioners, who were convicted of the crime of comforting and assisting a fugitive from justice, on the basis that certain contents of the home where the parties were found were illegally seized, and even though only a portion of these contents were so illegally seized, the entire contents were ruled as having been illegally seized, and the convictions were set aside.

In effect the validity of the seizure was tested on the basis of the quantity of the items seized and the Court found that the quantity was too great to be justified under the circumstances and the entire conviction was reversed.

A minority opinion by Justices Burton and Clark indicated that they did not believe the test should be the quantity of items seized and also that only a small part of the items listed by the Court as seized were admitted into evidence and that those actually admitted into evidence would have resulted in harmless error in that there was ample evidence of guilt otherwise.

The Yates case, of course, is one of the most significant cited in the October term of Court, 1956, in that it dealt with the construction of the Smith Act, or the Anti-Communist Act. The result of it was the interpretation of the act which now legalizes the forming of organizations to teach and advocate or encourage the overthrow or destruction of the Government of the United States by force or violence—to legalize those efforts—and, secondly, to legalize the teaching of the overthrow of the Government by force and violence so long as such teachings do not incite to action. The Court, in that case, ordered five of the convicted Communist defendants acquitted on the facts and decreed new trials for nine others, after making a complete review of the facts in the case, constituting itself jury as well as judge.

Of course, it was clearly the intention of Congress that Communist cells formed subsequent of the formation of the party or organization of the national party in this country should be illegal and subject to the Smith Act. This decision that does violence to Congressional intent clearly necessitates legislation action, and the subcommittee has this matter under consideration.

I have introduced legislation which clarifies this definition of "organize," in H. R. 8925, which provides: "the term 'organize', with respect to any society, group, or assembly of persons, includes the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons. This will have the effect of clarifying what Congress meant with regard to organization of the Communist Party and will make such organization illegal in the future.

The Court in the Yates case also laid down a new doctrine of abstract violence the result of which makes it perfectly legal to advocate and teach and conspire with others for the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence so long as the persons listening are not incited to action or the action proposed is in the indefinite future.

Thus it is seen that through this decision the Supreme Court has legalized the organizing of Communist cells and new Communist groups within the United States and also has legalized the teaching of the overthrow of the Government, both of which do violence to the Smith Act and the clear intention of Congress. I believe it is evident from a brief discussion of this case that legislative action is justified. This case is being very seriously considered and studied by this special subcommittee and of course the committee is acting very cautiously and only after lengthy hearings in making its recommendations to the full committee with regard to all of these decisions. This is particularly true in the Yates case, where there was a very strong dissent by Justice Clark in which he states he thought that the Dennis case merely held that a charge was sufficient where it requires a finding that the party advocates the theory that there is a duty and necessity to overthrow the Government by force and violence—not as a prophetic insight or as a bit of speculation, but as a program for willing adherence and as a policy to be translated into action as soon as the circumstances permit. This was the concurring opinion in the Dennis case, which was relied upon in the Yates decision. He also differed with the strained construction concerning the definition of organize as set out in the majority opinion, about which he himself states: "This construction frustrates the purpose of the Congress for the act was passed in 1940 primarily to curb the growing strength and activity of the party."

As evidence of public interest on this decision I embody herein the following resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Miami, Fla., as follows:

A RESOLUTION

*Be it resolved by the Kiwanis Club of Miami, Fla.:*

SECTION 1. That it does deplore the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, by which supporters of the Communist movement in our country were either freed or given new trials, as one which gives aid and comfort to a political movement in the United States which seeks the overthrow of our democratic system; and which opinion, coupled with prior but recent decisions, reflects a trend in said Court toward a liberalism which we hold to be adverse to the best interests of our Government and people.

SEC. 2. That the secretary be instructed to deliver copies of this resolution to the district committee on resolutions, to the other clubs of the Florida Kiwanis district, and to members of the Florida delegation in the Congress.

This brings us to the Watkins case. In that case Watkins appeared as a witness before the House Un-American Activities Committee when the committee was investigating Communist infiltration in labor unions. Two persons had stated, and incidentally under oath, that Watkins, who was a labor union official, had helped to recruit them into the Communist Party.

Watkins denied that he had ever been a card-carrying member of the Communist Party. He did acknowledge that he freely cooperated with the party, he identified some persons as Communists, but he refused to give identification regarding certain other people. He did not plead the fifth amendment as a basis for this refusal but challenged the committee's jurisdiction, saying: "I refuse to answer certain questions that I believe are outside the proper scope of your activity." He was found guilty of contempt of Congress as a result of this refusal and the full bench of the court of appeals affirmed the conviction, but the Supreme Court set it aside.

Of course, since this decision was rendered it has now become a practice for many of the witnesses to invoke the Watkins ruling before Congressional committees that are carrying on the legitimate investigative function of Congress, a function which is essential for Congress to carry out its responsibilities in the field of legislation, and the only manner in which Congress can determine where the laws already passed are having the desired effect, and second, whether new laws are required in the public interest. The effect of witnesses taking or claiming the first amendment—that is the freedom of speech—which the Supreme Court established—is that the Supreme Court said that the freedom of speech amendment to the Constitution carried with it an implied freedom of silence. Thus this so-called freedom of silence under the first amendment is being used about as often as the fifth amendment against self-incrimination to prevent Congress from getting information which it needs to carry on its responsibilities.

Some time ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I reviewed this case and its possible implications, many of which are coming into play at this time very pointedly and before the different committees of Congress, and I repeat a portion of that statement to indicate what some of the problems are that arise within the field of Congressional investigation as a result of the Watkins decision. I quote from my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, volume 103, part 8, page 10188, in which I stated:

I would like to cite a few examples of what could possibly result in the field of Congressional investigations, as I interpret the decision.

First. It could possibly place on Congress the burden of proving that the terms of the charter of the committee or the statements of the chairman preceding the questioning would reasonably establish to the satisfaction of any witness the pertinency of each and every question on which the witness might claim the first amendment which would be an almost impossible burden.

Second. It could possibly strike down the broad authorizing or chartering provisions of committees and thus limit measurably the scope of their investigations on the technical grounds that although the investigation would be within the power of Congress to conduct unless every phase of the investigation is spelled out, the witness would not be put on adequate notice of the pertinency of any question asked by the committee and on which he claimed the right to refuse to answer because of the first amendment.

Third. It could possibly be construed to require preliminary control by Congress of its committee activities to the extent of requiring specific enumeration of every facet of any problem to be investigated or that might arise during an investigation even though the history of the investigative process has shown that Congress cannot foresee the new fields often uncovered as the result of hearings and that must be exhausted if the public welfare is to be served.

Fourth. The practical effect could possibly be that most future witnesses before Congressional committees could only be voluntary because the compulsory subpena procedure would be completely outmoded and the witness could refuse to appear on the basis that he believed his first amendment constitutional rights were being prejudiced because he wasn't advised adequately of the questions to be asked and the pertinency thereof; or upon appearance could raise the same question and refuse to answer.

Fifth. It could conceivably require that any committee lay a foundation of a more specific nature than the charter granted by Congress in order to establish the pertinency of every question asked in order to prevent a witness from claiming the right of silence which is surely an impractical burden.

Sixth. It could possibly require these committee restrictions as suggested in 1, 2, 3, and 5 above even when the rights of the person testifying are not involved but rather the rights of third persons whom the witness has been asked to identify as in this case and even though it is well settled that one cannot invoke the constitutional rights of another;

Seventh. It raises doubt about the fact that a Congressional committee is acting within the scope of its authority with reference to any given question upon which the first amendment is claimed on the basis that an insufficient foundation of relevancy of the question involved has been laid unless it appears clear on the record or in the charter powers of the committee that the specific facet of the investigation being challenged is spelled out in the record and that it doesn't violate anyone's private affairs.

Thus, a mere statement of some of the possible implications of the decision that, I am sure points up its dangers.

Also the Court overlooked completely in its reasoning the fact that every contempt action by a committee must be ratified by the body of Congress under whose authority the committee operates, the facts fully debated, the relevancy of the question upon which the refusal to answer gives rise to the contempt, the pertinency of the question to the investigation involved and of the question asked as well as the validity of the grounds for refusing to answer the question—and only after the passage of a resolution by the respective House or Senate after full debate and determination if the committee was acting within its charter and preliminary (broad) authority can the committee acquire needed authority to bring a court action through the Attorney General for contempt of Congress. I fail to understand how the Court, under the separation-of-powers doctrine, can inject itself into this matter in this instance on the facts and overturn the findings and policy determinations as they relate to the previously determined relevancy and pertinency as made by the Congress. Although broad investigatory powers are often granted, many protections against the abuse of the contempt power of Congress are provided. It is interesting to me that this phase of practical legislative process apparently escaped the Court—and indicates further the impracticality—due to lack of understanding of some of the problems of Congress and its workings—of the proposals made by the Court in this case.

In connection with this, of course, last year the Congress did vote in contempt of Congress a couple of witnesses before the committee, including Hartman, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities was careful to instruct the witnesses at great length as to the relevancy of the questions and the powers of the committee, and possibly this will serve as a test case for the Supreme Court to render a more realistic and definitive decision.

Legislative consideration of this matter is essential and our committee has it presently under study. Thus we have the decisions of the Supreme Court which are before our subcommittee in the field of communism and criminal law enforcement which merit the very serious consideration and sound, constructive efforts to plug some of the legal loopholes that have been established contrary to the best interests of the general public within, of course, the limitations of our Constitution and within the limitation of the powers that Congress has as a legislative body.

Now, very briefly, I wish to discuss those cases that were assigned to our committee that deal with the subject of States rights or the powers of the States as they relate to our State legislative as well as the investigative powers.

The first of these cases is the Sweezy case, which applied the Watkins case to a State proceeding. The State of New Hampshire had authorized an investigation into subversive activities within the State in connection with carrying out the statute which the legislature had passed in 1951 for the purpose of controlling sedition and subversive organizations and persons and also establishing a loyalty program. The legislature had adopted a joint resolution relating to the investigation of subversive activities and the attorney general was authorized to make these investigations.

The attorney general called Sweezy as one of the witnesses and during the first hearing he refused to disclose his knowledge of the Progressive Party in New Hampshire or persons with whom he was acquainted in that organization and claimed the first amendment based upon the Watkins case theory as his justification for refusing to answer. A second investigation was held and the petitioner refused to answer questions concerning the Progressive Party and its predecessor, the Progressive Citizens of America, as well as certain subject matter contained in a lecture delivered to a class of a hundred students in the humanities course at the University of New Hampshire. Sweezy in this instance again pleaded the first amendment and his right of silence thereunder, and of course the Supreme Court upheld this right. This was done despite the fact that this was a State legislative investigating authority, after the State court had found him guilty of contempt of the legislature.

The Court based its decision upon the following reasoning: "Our conclusion does not rest upon a separation of the powers of a State legislature to conduct investigations from the responsibility to direct the use of that power insofar as that separation causes a deprivation of the constitutional rights of individuals in a denial of the due processes of law," and the Court went on further to find that Sweezy had been denied due process of law and therefore the conviction was reversed. In this opinion Justices Frankfurter and Harlan agreed with the result that the case should be reversed but for a different reason.

Justice Clark wrote a minority opinion dissenting. The State court had made a finding of fact according to Justice Clark to the effect that the attorney general was directed by the legislature to inquire as he did, as a matter of fact, and therefore the question of being beyond the scope of the investigating authority of the legislative resolution should not be, from a factual standpoint, subject to review by the Supreme Court. He states: "We are bound by the State court findings. We have no right to strike down the State action unless we find not only that there has been a deprivation of Sweezy's constitutional rights, but that the interest in protecting those rights is greater than the State's interest in uncovering subversive activities within its confines. The majority made no such findings."

Justice Clark goes on to point out that the Court, in effect, blocks New Hampshire's effort to enforce its own laws and it was Clark's opinion that the Pennsylvania against Nelson decision left open the legitimate powers of the State to control subversive activities leveled against the interest of the State as compared to subversion against the Federal Government.

Thus it is seen that the Supreme Court applied the doctrine of the Watkins case in State legislative investigations as well as Federal, despite the fundamental concept of our Constitution that the State should have full authority to carry out its own laws and to hold its own investigations, and that decisions of the State supreme court should be final on the questions of fact raised as to whether the questions asked are relevant to the investigation. This finding is necessary of course before the Watkins doctrine can be employed and the constitutional rights of the witness can be raised.

The other series of cases with which the special subcommittee is concerned

as it affects powers of the States are those dealing with the admission of certain individuals to the practice of law within the State of California, as in the Konigsberg case, the State of Louisiana, as in the Theard case, and the State of New Mexico, as in the Schware case.

The petitioner, in the Konigsberg case graduated from the law school of the University of South Carolina in 1953 and 4 months later passed the bar examination and the State committee of bar examiners held hearings with regard to his moral character and refused to certify him to practice law on the grounds that he had failed to prove, first, that he was of good moral character; and second, that he advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States or California by unconstitutional means. Konigsberg appealed to the courts and the State supreme court upheld the committee by turning down a petition for review. The United States Supreme Court reversed the California findings and Justice Black in writing the opinion stated:

> There is no evidence in the record which rationally justifies a finding that Konigsberg failed to establish his good moral character or failed to show that he did not advocate forceful overthrow of the Government. Without some authentic reliable evidence of unlawful or immoral actions reflecting adversely upon him, it is difficult to comprehend why the State bar committee rejected a man of Konigsberg's background and character as morally unfit to practice law. As we said before, the mere fact of Konigsberg's past membership in the Communist Party, if true, without anything more, is not an adequate basis for concluding that he is disloyal or a person of bad character. A lifetime of good citizenship is worth very little if it is so frail that it cannot withstand the suspicions which apparently were the basis for the committee's action.

Justice Harlan in a strong dissent stated a very sound position, which is as follows:

> 1. The record, in my opinion, reveals something quite different from that which the Court draws from it; (2) this case involves an area of Federal-State relations—the rights of States to establish and administer standards for admission to their bars—into which this court should be especially reluctant and slow to enter. Granting that this area of State action is not exempt from Federal constitutional limitations, see *Schware* v. *Board of Examiners*, decided today, I think that in doing what it does here the court steps outside its proper role as the final arbiter of such limitations, and acts instead as if it were a superstate court of appeals.

Thus, in the Koningsberg case the Supreme Court affirmed the petition of Koningsberg contending that the Board's action in the State of California deprived him of rights secured by the 14th amendment to the Constitution, the due process clause.

In the Theard case the Supreme Court of Louisiana disbarred the petitioner, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana struck him from its roll of attorneys and the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit affirmed that order.

The Supreme Court in this opinion reversed the decision of the court of appeals which had the effect of permitting the complainant to practice in the Federal courts, the Supreme Court finding that the disbarment within a State court does not necessarily result in disbarment by a Federal court and that therefore the Supreme Court has power to look into the conditions that qualify the State court judgment. The court found we do not think the principles of right and justice require a Federal court to enforce disbarment of a man 18 years after he had uttered a forgery when concededly he was suffering under an exceedingly abnormal condition, some degree of insanity. The Supreme Court thus remanded the case for the appellate court's decision and disposition under the Court's rule of Federal disbarment that the Federal court does not disbar except upon the conviction that, under the principles of right and justice, the Court is constrained so to do. This decision, of course, had the affect of permitting the Federal court to review the facts and circumstances surrounding the decision of the State court upon which the State disbarment was based, and could lead to the result that the complainant would be able to qualify to practice before the Federal court but not the State.

The third case in this series is that of Schware against Board of Bar Examiners of State of New Mexico, and in that case the question presented was whether Schware had been denied a license to practice law in New Mexico in violation of the due process clause of the 14th amendment, the same question as raised in the Koningsberg case.

In this opinion Justice Black rendered the decision and the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the State court of New Mexico. The bar examining group elicited evidence that Schware, at the age of 18 in 1932 had joined the Young Communist League, he making application for the bar in 1954. Schware admitted that he was a Communist between 1932 and 1940 and the State Supreme Court of New Mexico placed heavy emphasis on this point in denying his application to practice law. Schware had also been found to have used a number of aliases and have been arrested a number of times, as well as having been a member of the Communist Party, and the State of New Mexico took the position that even though standing alone any one of these might not be grounds that standing together the exclusion was not unwarranted. Thus the Supreme Court completely reviewed the evidence and reversed the State supreme court on the evidence, declaring on the evidence that the due process of the complainant had been denied.

Thus it can be seen by a discussion of this series of decisions that these matters require immediate Congressional action and I trust the subcommittee, on which I am the ranking minority member, will, after due consideration bring forth sound and constructive legislation.

It is essential that Congress assert its full legislative power and responsibility in recapturing any of its lawmaking authority that might have been usurped by the Supreme Court, to correct misinterpretations of the intent of Congress where that has occurred, and to reassert its intended legislative prerogatives to strengthen our criminal laws, our anticommunistic statutes, and to establish a pattern consistent with the 10th amendment in future State and Federal relationships.

This can and must be accomplished at the earliest possible time, within Congress' prescribed legislative functions under the Constitution, obviously without violation of individual rights but with adequate protection of the rights of the people as a whole and the general welfare. This is the challenge to Congress—I trust it will be accepted this session—it must be accepted.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Florida for bringing this matter before the House and pointing out to the House the importance of the matter that he is discussing. I make this observation not as a lawyer, but as a layman, if you please. I would further like to point out to this body and to the gentleman's constituents in the State of Florida that it was the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] who took the floor last summer to protest the inaction by the Committee on the Judiciary in bringing about legislation to protect the FBI files following the Supreme Court decision last June 6 known as the Jencks case. I think this is particularly significant together with his being appointed as ranking minority member of such an important subcommittee, particularly since the gentleman from Florida is a relatively new Member of the House, and is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary without much seniority, yet it seems to be his responsibility to search out these difficult matters and make rather complete analyses and studies of them, and present them to the House in the manner which he is now doing this afternoon.

I certainly want to express my personal appreciation for the service that the gentleman from Florida is rendering.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Kansas very much for his kind remarks.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. HENDERSON. I, too, would like to express my admiration for the fine presentation that the gentleman from Florida has made and for the work that he has performed both on the floor of the House and in his committee.

Many people from my district in Ohio have talked to me with reference to the many recent decisions of the Supreme Court. Particularly they have expressed concern over a case which I believe is the Nelson case, which more or less has indicated that action by the States is not warranted where the Federal Government may seem to have assumed to have preempted the field. I still feel that in this country of ours there is ample room for the operation of both State governments and the Federal Government; that the two should continue and should exist side by side, one supplementing the other, and not forgetting the admonition which

is contained in our Constitution that the rights which people have not granted to the Federal Government they have reserved unto themselves and unto the States.

I again express my appreciation to the gentleman for bringing this matter to our attention. I, too, as have many other Members, have introduced legislation which would be designed to supplement the decisions of the Supreme Court. It is our responsibility in that balance of power between the executive, the judicial, and the legislative, to exercise our will so that one or the other of any of the three may not become too strong.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his interest in the subject. I know he will pursue it as assiduously as he has other matters previously, during the balance of this session.

I want to review the cases which were involved, and I will do it briefly, and then extend my remarks. In particular, the effect of these decisions has been demonstrated, even during the recess, since the decisions were made, and new evidence has been presented to our special subcommittee.

I want to start with the Mallory case. It provides, in effect, that a person who is arrested and held for a period of 7½ hours between his arrest and arraignment, even though the confession received from him is wholly voluntary, without any coercion, the mere fact that he was held for a period of 7½ hours in and of itself constitutes coercion and makes the confession inadmissible in evidence. Mallory was permitted to go scot-free, when the Supreme Court remanded the case for a new trial. No new trial was possible without the confession.

In the Watson case, another case also decided in the District of Columbia, which is one of the pieces of evidence of the effect of this Mallory decision which arose during the recess, a twice-convicted rapist was permitted to go scot-free as a result, first under the Mallory decision, that his confession was nonadmissible. They went back and tried him on other physical evidence which arose out of the confession, that is, physical evidence; and the Supreme Court found the physical evidence which arose as a result of the confession itself was also not admissible, applying the "poisoned fruit of the poisoned tree" doctrine and let him go free again. So that is how broadly the Mallory doctrine has been extended. I say, based on those circumstances and many others, the Congress should take action in attempting, to some extent, to reinstate the commonsense rule of evidence and give adequate elbow room for the law-enforcement officers to work, to weed out the innocent and to properly investigate those cases, which is essential if the general public is to be protected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman going to comment on the Green case?

Mr. CRAMER. I had not intended to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like the gentleman to yield to me for a comment on the Green case, if he would be so kind.

Mr. CRAMER. I shall be delighted to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One other question, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have had a number of bills, some of them before the Committee on Education and Labor on Federal aid to education—I am serious now, have you thought of introducing legislation which would provide for education of the judges from the practical standpoint that the effect of these decisions is the releasing of these criminals? The Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court are turning loose these habitual criminals and someone, someone should set those courts wise as to the practical results which follow their decisions. It might be well to include that editorial from the Star last night which gave another freed criminal's record, that of Dallas Williams.

Mr. CRAMER. I will be delighted to, I say to the gentleman from Michigan.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

SOCIOPATHIC JUSTICE

Everyone knows that justice is blind. But the case of Dallas Williams raises a suspicion that justice, in Washington, may also be suffering, figuratively speaking, from a mental disease or defect.

The best way to get into the case of Dallas Williams, who is a free man in this city today, is to take a look at his criminal record. The following is from an opinion by the United States Court of Appeals:

"The prosecutor told the court at the opening of the trial, 'This man (Williams) has the worst criminal record for violence I have ever seen.' We are informed by the Government that he was convicted of attempted robbery in 1933; twice of assault and battery in 1934; of manslaughter in 1936; of assault and battery with intent to kill in 1940 and in 1941; of shooting with intent to kill in 1942; of assault with a pistol in 1944; of assault in 1945; of assault with intent to kill, assault with a dangerous weapon and carrying a dangerous weapon in 1949. In 1952, 12 days after he was released on bail to await his second trial for the present (the 1949) offense, he threatened someone with a pistol and was convicted of that offense. While on bail before his fifth trial in 1956, he committed another crime involving a pistol and was convicted of that crime a month after the present conviction. William told one of the court-appointed psychiatrists who examined him in 1953 that he had spent about 20 of his 39 years in jail."

But he is not in jail today. This charming fellow is loose in Washington, and he probably will remain free unless or until he commits another crime.

How is it possible that a man with such a record is not either in jail or in a mental institution? Well, it's a long story, but we'll try to tell it as briefly as possible.

The case which has just resulted in his release began when he shot a man on September 26, 1949. He has been tried five times for that offense. Two trials ended in mistrials and three in convictions. For one reason or another all three convictions were reversed on appeal. The latest reversal came on November 1, 1957, when Judges Bazelon, Fahy, and Washington held that Williams had been deprived of his right to a speedy trial.

In all of this time there was a serious question as to Williams' sanity, and the appellate judges, although they dismissed the charge against the man, were not at all anxious to see him released. So they suggested that the Government might seek to have Williams committed to a mental institution in civil, as distinguished from criminal, proceedings.

United States Attorney Oliver Gasch took the hint and asked Chief Judge Laws of the District court to send Williams to St. Elizabeths Hospital. Judge Laws was sympathetic, wanting to protect the public, and on January 7 he ordered Williams committed pending a report on his condition from the Mental Health Commission. However, there was one important hitch.

Ten days prior to this the prosecutor, as he had to do, had asked two Government psychiatrists to examine Williams. They agreed that, as of that time, the man was not insane. One of the doctors warned of the potential danger to the community if Williams should be released. The other went even further. He said: "At present there are no symptoms, singly or in the aggregate, which would justify a hospital commitment for this man. However, it should be kept in mind that he is, potentially, definitely dangerous to others, and once released, is likely to repeat his patterns of criminal behavior, including homicide."

Judge Laws ordered a temporary commitment. But Williams' lawyers, Nestor S. Foley and George Rublee II, doing their duty as defense counsel, went before Judge Keech to challenge the legality of the commitment. In the absence of an accusation that Williams was insane at the time, they said, he could not be lawfully committed. Reluctantly, Judge Keech agreed, and ordered Williams released.

The United States attorney went back to the court of appeals, before the same panel of judges, asking that they reverse Judge Keech. The appellate judges refused, however, because there was no verified allegation that Williams now is insane. They suggested that the prosecutor might try all over again, although they did not explain how or why. For the United States attorney cannot accuse Williams of insanity at this time if the Government's own psychiatrists say that he is sane.

So this, in summary form, is the case of Dallas Williams. He is a free man today—despite his shocking criminal record, despite the fact that he pleaded insanity as a defense at his latest trial, despite the warning from the doctor that, if released, he may go out and kill someone. Is this a record, and a prospect, which suggests that justice is functioning rationally and impartially in the District of Columbia? We do not think so. For justice is supposed not only to safeguard the interests of an accused person, which has been amply done in this case. Justice is also supposed to concern itself with protecting the public interest. And that has not been done in this case.

It is not our purpose to attempt to fix responsibility on any individual for the release of this dangerous man. Perhaps it should be pointed out that Williams, with time off for good behavior, would have been released this coming September if he had been sent to jail to serve his sentence after his first conviction in this case. And he would be just as dangerous in September as he is now.

The essential point, we think, is that there is something seriously wrong with a system of justice which frees a man with Williams' incredible record. This is an offense against society. If an individual were to commit such an offense he surely would be entitled to plead, under the Durham insanity rule, that he was suffering from a mental disease or defect, or what the psychiatrists now describe as a "sociopathic" personality. Justice, as justice has functioned in this case, must be suffering from some equally serious disability. There may be those who will think that this is carrying a figurative analogy a bit too far. If so, we suggest that they go back and reread the third paragraph

of this editorial and then ask themselves: By what rational process of justice has Dallas Williams been turned loose?

Mr. CRAMER. I am as concerned as you are, obviously, as a member of this subcommittee, and on the evidence before us as to the effect of these decisions on criminal law enforcement, the effort to stamp out the Communist conspiracy in this country, and the question of the rights of the States under the 10th amendment to the Constitution. The effect of these decisions in all those fields is adverse, and I think legislative action is essential.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would this be a good place to put in the Green case and make a statement about it?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In that particular case the defendant was charged, in one word, with arson. Under the code here it is a first-degree murder charge if, without knowledge of the defendant, there is another person in the house which is burned and death results. He was also charged with murder in the first degree, under the code. The jury in the district court convicted him of arson, and the judge having given instructions about second-degree murder, they convicted him not on the first-degree murder charge but on the second-degree murder charge. The case then went to the circuit court of appeals, three judges sitting. They said that the first trial in the district court was all wrong, that there was not any room for any instruction about second-degree murder, that if he was to be convicted at all it should have been on the first-degree murder charge.

After he was convicted of first-degree murder in the district court on the second trial the court of appeals sustained it, but then it went to the Supreme Court, and then the Supreme Court reversed it on the ground of double jeopardy.

Now I am wondering what the prosecuting attorneys and the juries are going to do. Here is this fellow turned loose. He was convicted of arson, and the fire which he started resulted in the death of this woman, but the Supreme Court says "No, he has been tried once and acquitted of that." He goes scot free.

Mr. CRAMER. And I say to the gentleman that fits into the general pattern of discussion with regard to the rights of individuals, as compared to protection of general rights of society, and that the Supreme Court is going to have to give equal weight to the latter as it does to the former.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. I am especially interested in this subject, having introduced a bill, H. R. 679, a duplicate of H. R. 3, which the gentleman has mentioned. I commend very highly the presentation made by the gentleman from Florida. I think it is very timely, urgent, and important. I know a number of bills have been introduced on this doctrine of preemution. I have studied a number of cases involved.

I introduced a subsequent bill, H. R. 6567, which has the approval of the American Bar Association. It is practically the same as H. R. 3. I take it that same bill would meet the gentleman's approval.

Mr. CRAMER. I believe legislation of that nature is essential, and I congratulate the gentleman from California for his work and interest in this matter, he having discussed this with me on many occasions. I have introduced a bill myself slightly modifying the one the gentleman introduced, a matter which I previously discussed.

I am hopeful that the committee at this session will take action on it. In the last session there was a bill reported out, but it dealt only with the Nelson case, not with the general subject of preemption of State statutes by Federal law. I appreciate the gentleman's interest and I wish to congratulate him. I think this is a matter of extreme concern to all the people of this country.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is there any question in the gentleman's mind that the Congress has the right and the responsibility to enact legislation that will have the effect of correcting the decisions of our judicial branch?

Mr. CRAMER. As I have previously stated, I think it is the duty and the responsibility of Congress within its constitutional authority to review the decisions of the Supreme Court and its interpretations of the laws as passed by the Congress; also to make certain that the Supreme Court does not usurp the law-enactment authority and power of Congress, and that it is its duty to do so and its responsibility. That is why I think the formation of this committee is timely under our constitutional powers and it should go forward with this work.

Mr. HENDERSON. It should be one of the missions of this Congress?

Mr CRAMER. Yes. The Congress does not hesitate to criticize the executive branch of the Government any time Congress disagrees with the executive branch. I can see no reason why constructive criticism of actions taken by the judicial branch and legislative action within the power of Congress to legislate under the Constitution should not be equally well taken.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to say that I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman on this important subject and at this point I should also like to say to the membership of the House that for 2 years it was my pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] who is giving us this dissertation as a member of the Public Works Committee. Both he and I were freshmen, but I found out as we were considering a most important internal-improvement bill in Congress at that time—the National Defense Highway Act of 1956—that we were fortunate to have a man of his caliber and his ability to think and to figure out answers to the difficult problems of our committee. May I say to the membership of the House further that at least in one significant instance he was responsible for plugging up some shortcomings in legislation then under consideration and suggest a provision for advance purchase of rights-of-way that will save the people of this country several hundred millions of dollars. I was glad to see him appointed to also work with another committee and it seems sort of fortunate he did find a place on the Judiciary Committee where he could delve into this subject that is so important to our country and to its future. I want to commend him for the contribution he is making and assure him of my support in his effort. I fervently hope with him and many others that the Committee on the Judiciary will act promptly and give us an opportunity to correct some of these very obvious injustices that have come about through the rulings of our courts. I commend him highly and wish him success in his objective of getting corrections in our basic laws in this regard.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. May I say that I, too, have enjoyed and will continue to enjoy sitting with the gentleman on the Public Works Committee. I look forward to serving with him and I want to commend him for the service he is rendering.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would like to add my voice to those who have commended the gentleman from Florida for this timely, scholarly, and helpful report on a most serious subject.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. HENDERSON. Another question I had in mind; Is work being done to legislatively supplant the decision in the Yates case?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. That matter is under active consideration by our subcommittee. Legislation, as I say, has already been proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], by myself, and by other members of the Committee on the Judiciary that would have the effect of redefining the language to include the organizing of present-day cells of Communists as well as other types of Communist organizations throughout the country. Secondly, on the question of inciting to action, that is a more difficult question which we have under active consideration. We are starting hearings on that in the very near future to see what legislative action can be taken and not run afoul of the constitutional rights of freedom of speech declared in that particular case.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman tell us how we can be helpful to the Committee on the Judiciary; how we can blast this legislation out?

Mr. CRAMER. I suggest to the gentleman that he will be notified of the hearings before our subcommittee and

we will be delighted to hear him as well as his suggestions as to how the Yates and other cases can legislatively be overcome.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When are you going to have your hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary? Day after day these criminals are being turned loose. Just the other day the circuit court of appeals sent a case back and in effect told the district judge to send the fellow to jail. All right. He did. Then the circuit court of appeals, when the case got there on a writ of habeaus corpus, turned him loose.

Mr. CRAMER. Although the subcommittee was not established until late last session of the 85th Congress, we are already in the process of drafting legislation in regard to the Mallory case, after holding lengthy hearings, and we are holding hearings on these other cases, and I am sure action will be taken expeditiously. That is what I am working for as ranking minority member of that committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know there are many Members on the floor or in the House who want to be helpful if they can get it out and get action. For example, many of us have wives here. They walk up and down the street, as do you and I, and over here, even near the Congressional Library not too many years ago a woman was assaulted at dusk. What you said earlier about the courts protecting the rights of the citizens while ignoring the rights of the community is all too true. You talk about civil rights. Apparently the Court seemed to think these fellows' rights ought to be safeguarded in every way, their constitutional privileges stretched in every way. Now, three people were assaulted last night, viciously. How long does that have to go on, or do we have to arm ourselves?

Mr. CRAMER. I am as concerned as the gentleman is, and we are holding hearings constantly, and legislation will be reported out soon. The reason I am laying this foundation is to advise the House what work is being done and the problems involved in the legislation presented before the subcommittee in the hope that the members will take an active interest in this matter, the full committee will report legislation out, and let Congress work its will.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to add my word to that which has been given, if it is of any help at all to the committee, that the people I am in contact with are highly concerned both about the present legislative situation and about the necessity for earnest consideration of new legislation to do something about these decisions, and I hope your committee will take that into consideration, that the public does want something done.

Mr. CRAMER. I am thoroughly aware of the position of the gentleman's constituents. That position is the same as in my district. Knowing of the considerable public concern our committee is carrying out its instructed duties of proceeding expeditiously.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, the courts are turning these criminals—and they are confessed criminals—loose. They have been convicted, but the Court says that in some way some technical rule has been violated and they are turning these fellows loose just as fast as the prosecuting officers and the police can send them to jail.

How long is the chairman of the gentleman's committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] going to continue by inaction to protect those fellows? That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that last year I was very much concerned about there having been no action with regard to these decisions. Finally this subcommittee was appointed and I think we will get action this year, at least reports from the subcommittee to the full committee will be made shortly. Whether or not legislation will get out of the full committee is a question which that committee will have to decide.

In closing, let me say to the Members of the House that I trust this session of Congress will accept this challenge. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has pointed out, it is urgent that that challenge be accepted, that we do not overlook this essential legislation in the maelstrom of other legislative matters with which we are all concerned, such as our defense. This involves the very sinews and the very vitals of our country and of our people.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

---

## FARM PROBLEMS IN 1957 DUE TO EXCESSIVE RAINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Missouri). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. A widespread, ruinous catastrophe has been the result of continuous excessive rains during the planting, growing, and harvest seasons in many parts of the Nation in 1957. As a result, the crops were planted over as many as three times before a good stand was obtained. The wet growing season added to the plight of the farmer by heavy pest infestation. This made it necessary to poison the crops a number of times, running the cost exceedingly high. Taking into account the increased cost of labor, equipment, repairs, fuel, initial outlays for machinery, taxes, and other costs, it has been said that the 1957 crop year was one of the most expensive—if not the most expensive—in the history of farming in the Middle South area, and other areas were also adversely affected.

An announcement was made yesterday by the officials of the Department of Agriculture that Public Law 38, originally enacted in 1949, was being liberalized in this extreme emergency. The Department has given sympathetic consideration to the plight of not only the farmers, but the business concerns of the broad territory affected and is fully aware of the need for credits, as well as to provide funds for the payment of interest, taxes, and personal property depreciation allowance. It has been determined by the Department that in addition to the requirements for crop loan purposes in 1958, it was felt that the disaster was of such severity that advances should be made to pay existing taxes, interest, and up to 15 percent depreciation allowance on the farmers' personal equipment. The Department has the grateful thanks of not only the producer, but private lending institutions in the communities affected, for stepping in and recognizing this problem and drafting regulations with such elasticity as would to a good degree meet at least some of the needs. It is necessary, however, to enact legislation, in addition, to the extent to which the Department has gone in order that adequate funds may be made available to meet the great needs and requirements of such a severe and deplorable disaster. A separate and distinct loan to refinance all existing debts, affording the farmer up to 5 years to liquidate, is what is needed.

It is the purpose and intent of all of us who are interested in solving this problem that the farmer continue to till his soil. In order to do this he must, of necessity, have his chattels; that is, tractor, combines, and other implements, available to him for use in the 1958 crop year.

Although the losses were great in the making of the 1957 crops and, as a result, heavy debts hang over these farmers, it may be very difficult to obtain nondisturbance agreements from the holders of the mortgages on the farmers' implements and equipment unless such creditor or creditors are paid a sufficient amount on the past-due indebtednesses as would put them in a position to in turn meet their own obligations. In so many instances the holder of implement notes has hypothicated these instruments with lending institutions who are pressing for payment. The open accounts owed by these same farmers is another most serious factor. These debts are real. They exist in large quantities. That is a phase of the issue that must be solved by legislation.

The area affected includes Arkansas, Mississippi, southeast Missouri, western Tennessee, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Florida, Minnesota, and other States. The Representatives from all of these States have to a person worked tirelessly on this problem in an effort to assist in every way possible the disaster victims in their particular Congressional Districts. Meeting after meeting has been held.

Every one of these Members has attended or had a representative from his or her office present on each occasion.

At this point, I would like to incorporate some figures relative to the crop losses of 79 major crops in some of the States in which the disaster occurred. They are as follows:

*Disaster data on selected States (as of December crop estimates, 1957)*

| | Cotton ginned (running bales) | Total value on 79 major crops | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Year | Amount |
| Arkansas: | | | |
| 1955 | 1,568,159 | | |
| 1956 | 1,368,625 | 1956 | $458,946,000 |
| 1957 | 806,248 | 1957 | 389,542,000 |
| | | | −69,404,000 |
| Florida: | | | |
| 1955 | 14,763 | | |
| 1956 | 9,178 | 1956 | 459,338,000 |
| 1957 | 6,786 | 1957 | 425,466,000 |
| | | | −33,872,000 |
| Louisiana: | | | |
| 1955 | 564,136 | | |
| 1956 | 568,047 | 1956 | 209,863,000 |
| 1957 | 310,025 | 1957 | 228,490,000 |
| | | | −41,373,000 |
| Kentucky: | | | |
| 1955 | 6,957 | | |
| 1956 | 7,384 | 1956 | 430,556,000 |
| 1957 | 3,331 | 1957 | 378,745,000 |
| | | | −51,811,000 |
| Minnesota | | 1956 | 881,361,000 |
| | | 1957 | 771,840,000 |
| | | | −109,521,000 |
| Mississippi: | | | |
| 1955 | 1,940,186 | | |
| 1956 | 1,572,907 | 1956 | 425,208,000 |
| 1957 | 943,530 | 1957 | 335,981,000 |
| | | | −89,227,000 |
| Missouri: | | | |
| 1955 | 396,473 | | |
| 1956 | 438,891 | 1956 | 644,008,000 |
| 1957 | 148,831 | | 508,107,000 |
| | | | −135,901,000 |
| Tennessee: | | | |
| 1955 | 564,086 | | |
| 1956 | 515,830 | 1956 | 337,776,400 |
| 1957 | 341,235 | 1957 | 292,241,000 |
| | | | −45,534,000 |
| Texas: | | | |
| 1955 | 3,810,990 | | |
| 1956 | 3,499,625 | 1956 | $1,125,741,000 |
| 1957 | 2,739,046 | 1957 | 1,250,445,000 |
| | | | +24,704,000 |
| Total estimated 1957 loss on 79 major crops in selected States | | | 576,643,000 |

An article written by Gerald L. Dearing, cotton editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, dated November 16, 1957, gives vital information concerning the cotton situation in the mid-south territory. Cotton requires a long growing season; warm nights are necessary for the bolls to grow and mature. Mr. Dearing stated that the growing season for the 1957 cotton crop in the Memphis area was 30 days shorter than the average growing season. This condition created smaller yields. Mr. Dearing brought out in his article some pertinent facts with reference to the excessive number of days of rain occurring throughout the year, which was most harmful to cotton growth, progress, and turnout. Mr. Dearing's article is set forth below in its entirety:

COTTON COMMENT—LOOK AT THE WEATHER RECORDS REVEALS CONDITIONS THAT MADE FOR SORRY COTTON CROP THIS YEAR—IT MAY BE THE WETTEST YEAR IN HISTORY

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

Everyone knows that the weather is responsible for the conditions of the cotton crop and the harvest, but just what was different this year than other years?

We asked Ted Trapp with the Weather Bureau at Memphis for some figures.

In the first place the growing season was 30 days shorter than average, 201 days compared with a normal 231 days between frosts. The last killing frost in the spring came on April 9, and the first in the fall on October 28. It is the shortest growing season since 1934, when it was 185 days. Only 4 years in the past 85 that records are available have had shorter seasons. The shortest, 184 days was in 1893. The longest, 290 days in 1931.

FROST DATE GIVEN

The normal spring last frost date is March 20 and the average first fall frost date is November 6.

Cotton is a plant which requires warm weather to make it grow. This year there were only 4 days—all in July—when temperatures were above 95 degrees. This compares with 1956 when the total was 32, spread over 3 months; or 1954, which had 12 such days in June, 28 in July, 25 in August, and 11 in September for a total of 77. Other years have shown high temperatures from May through September.

This year, through October, 164 days were cloudy and 82 partly cloudy, and only 58 days have been clear. The 85-year average is 92 cloudy, 92 partly cloudy, and 120 clear.

In only 2 months were the percentages of sunshine possible above normal, July saw a sunshine percentage of 75 percent compared with a 73 percent normal and August saw 76 compared with 73.

RAINS FREQUENT

From January 1 through October 31 it has rained on 155 of the 304 days. During the growing season of cotton the days of rain were: April, 18; May 13; June, 17; July, 15; August 11; September, 17, and October, 12.

Last year there were only 105 days of rain to October 31. The volume of rains also has been a factor, since heavy rains keep the fields wetter and prevent working.

This may be the wettest year in history. Through midnight Thursday night the precipitation at Memphis has been 68.43 inches. Only 2 years exceed this figure, either for the 11-months' period or for the full year.

The 1957 year, at 10½ months ranks third. For the 11 months in 1882 the rainfall was 69.27 inches, and for 1877 it was 69.06 inches. This is the wettest year since 1882 or in 75 years.

WETTEST IN 1877

The year 1877 was the wettest full year, even though at the end of 11 months it was in second place. The total for the year was 73.50 inches.

If it rains no more this year, 1957 will be the third wettest year in history. The previous third was 1890 with 68.28 inches, a mark surpassed this year by mid-November. Normal rainfall for the rest of this year will set a new rainfall record and make it the wettest year in history.

Temperatures this year ranged below normal, especially in October, when it was most needed to develop the late cotton.

So 1957 has seen a short growing season with a late spring frost and an early fall frost; cooler than normal temperatures; fewer days of high temperature; fewer hours of sunshine; rains on half the days and at a record-setting rate.

The Department of Commerce weekly weather and crop bulletins reflect the scope and intensity of the most unusual and deplorable crop year of 1957.

The national summary for the week ending February 4, 1957, states in part:

Devastating floods in southeast Kentucky, southern West Virginia, southwestern Virginia, and portions of Tennessee caused the loss of more than a dozen lives and millions of dollars in damages. The floods were the highest in 100 years at numerous points, and the waters rose many feet over any floods previously experienced by residents.

The weather and crop bulletin for the week ending April 1, 1957, states:

Precipitation March 1957: From 2 to over 4 inches of moisture fell over the Texas Panhandle and practically all of Oklahoma, Kansas, southeastern and extreme southern Nebraska, Missouri, and Arkansas, and generally somewhat greater amounts over the region from middle and eastern Texas eastward over the Gulf and South Atlantic States. The totals were more than twice the normals in the upper coastal area of Texas, the Amarillo-Dodge City-Goodland area of the western plains, and the eastern portions of Washington and Oregon.

The national summary for the week ending May 6, 1957, further illustrates the disastrous weather and crop conditions:

Cotton: In most of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Arkansas, and southern Missouri soil preparation and cotton planting several weeks late due to prolonged heavy rains.

For the same week, the special telegraphic summaries on States reports:

Arkansas: Only small amount of cotton planting; a few fields up to good stands.

For the week ending June 3, 1957, the bulletin states:

Floods: Rainfall was recorded daily throughout the past week in the central and southern Great Plains region. Most rivers remain at high levels and rather widespread flooding is still reported on major streams in central and eastern Texas, Arkansas, and eastern Oklahoma. Brief but locally excessive showers on Saturday and Saturday night, June 1, produced flooding again on the Arkansas River tributaries.

In their telegraphic summary for the same week, the bulletin reports:

Arkansas: Greatest weekly total rainfall—13.85 inches at Camden * * * bottomlands wet or under water * * * general rain halted activities.

The following week, the National Summary reports:

Floods: Serious flooding continues on the Red River below Shreveport * * * In the Arkansas River drainage a cloudburst occurring Saturday night over the headwaters of the Spring River near Pittsburg, Kans., produced flash flooding from Quapaw, Okla., downstream to the confluence with the Neosho River near Miami, Okla.

Cotton: In Arkansas, planting which is about 85 percent completed and replanting made some progress on well-drained land late in the week, but rain occurred again at the end of the period in this State and in Missouri * * * the most critical concern (in Texas) is for the late-seeded cotton in the low plains, north-central, and northeastern portions where the crop is 2 to nearly 4 weeks late. Much cotton is yet to be planted in the northeastern portion of this State and over one-half in Oklahoma.

The State summary for the same period has this to say with respect to crop conditions in Arkansas:

Crop late and there is great need for favorable weather.

The National Summary for the week ending July 1, 1957, continues to outline the serious consequences of the 1957 crop year:

Floods: Floods highlights of the week were the continued serious flooding on the lower Minnesota River near St. Paul, Minn., and the near record flooding on the Crow River north of Minneapolis, Minn. * * * serious flooding on the Saline River and considerable overflow on the Solomon River * * * Heavy rains extending northward through Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and portions of Ohio and western Pennsylvania caused serious flooding especially on the Kaskaskia River in east-central Illinois and on the Sangamon River in the Illinois River drainage in Illinois.

Cotton: The crop suffered wind and rain damage in Louisiana and Mississippi and to a lesser extent in Tennessee, Alabama, northern Georgia, and some adjacent areas, as hurricane Audrey struck the Louisiana coast on the 27th with winds up to over 100 miles per hour, and rainfall to over 8 inches, and moved with decreasing intensity northeastward over Louisiana, Mississippi, and middle Tennessee.

Again for the week ending July 8, 1957, the National Summary stated:

Floods: Flooding was still in progress on the upper reaches of the St. Francis River in southeastern Missouri and northeastern Arkansas. Light lowlands overflow was still reported in Colorado along the Arkansas River.

Cotton: Moderate to heavy rains on a day or two at the beginning of the period in Missouri, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi and until about Wednesday in Georgia and southern South Carolina hampered boll-weevil control and cultivation.

The National Summary for the week ending August 5, 1957, reported:

Weekly precipitation totals were moderate to heavy mainly in the lower, eastern middle and southern upper Mississippi Valley; lower lakes region; extreme Southeast; Texas-Oklahoma Panhandle; and isolated locations in the West. * * * Heavy hail, rain, and strong winds caused an estimated $1 million damage to crops in Lac qui Parle County, Minn.

Arkansas: All stations reported rain during week, except Flippen * * * greatest total, 1.58 inches at Pine Bluff. * * * Craighead County reports rain damage to stalks and foliage.

The National Summary for the week ending September 9, 1957, from the paragraph, Weather of the Week, I quote:

Weekly precipitation amounts were moderate to heavy in extreme northwestern Washington, eastern Texas and throughout Louisiana; southeastern Kansas, northeastern Oklahoma, southwestern Missouri and northern Arkansas; eastern sections of the Dakotas, central Minnesota, and northern Wisconsin and Michigan; and northern portions of the New England States.

On page 5, the percentage of normal precipitation, summer—June to August—1957, showed that in many areas of the Nation the precipitation for the 3 months was 150 to 200 percent of normal.

Special telegraphic summaries reporting from Arkansas stated as follows, and I quote:

Early cotton opening rapidly, picking general; late continues blooming and fruiting heavily, needs warmer weather. Insects a problem, and insecticides being applied at regular intervals.

The Weekly Weather and Crop Bulletin National Summary for the week ending September 2, 1957, showed a map on page 4 which reflects that more than twice as much as normal rainfall was recorded for the month of August 1957 in various States of the Middle West and Florida.

The summary for the week ending October 7, 1957, showed an interesting chart on page 5 reflecting that in the Southern and Midwestern States there was 200, 300, to 400 percent of precipitation in comparison with the normal precipitation for that month—September 1957.

The summary for the week ending November 4, 1957, had a paragraph on cotton on page 2, part of which I would like to quote:

Picking generally made slow progress in the Tennessee-southern Missouri area during the week, due to light to moderate rains on about 3 days.

The summary for the week ending November 11, 1957, special telegraphic summaries from Arkansas, stated in part as follows:

Heavy rainfall fell on Friday and thereafter little harvesting of farmwork possible. Cotton picking slowed and some complaint of bolls rotting.

The Summary for the week of December 9, 1957, on that portion under the title, "Effects of Weather on Crops and Farm Activities," for cotton, contains the following information: "Many fields did not become dry enough for machines in this region (northeastern Louisiana, the delta district of Mississippi, and in Arkansas, southeastern Missouri, parts of Tennessee, and some adjacent areas) and the moderate to heavy rains from Friday to Sunday will cause further delay. The crop shows the adverse effects of wet weather."

The Summary for the week of December 2, 1957, showed in a chart on page 4 that the Middle South area received 12 inches of rain during the month of November.

I would like to place in the RECORD at this point some figures released by the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, on cotton ginned in Arkansas prior to December 1, 1957, compared with 1956:

COTTON GINNED PRIOR TO DECEMBER 1 IN ARKANSAS: CROPS OF 1957 AND 1956

Preliminary figures by counties for cotton ginned from the crop of 1957, with comparative figures to the same date for the crop of 1956, were released today for Arkansas, by the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce. Cotton ginnings by States were released on Monday, December 9, 1957.

[Quantities are in running bales. Linters are not included]

| County | 1957 | 1956 |
|---|---|---|
| The State | 720,269 | 1,323,495 |
| Arkansas | 4,536 | 6,611 |
| Ashley | 17,783 | 28,302 |
| Bradley | 1,344 | 2,724 |
| Calhoun | 1,300 | 2,574 |
| Chicot | 18,273 | 34,050 |
| Clark | 814 | 2,742 |
| Clay | 19,186 | 30,822 |
| Columbia | 3,349 | 4,949 |
| Craighead | 38,002 | 75,715 |
| Crittenden | 50,909 | 105,660 |
| Cross | 21,804 | 40,450 |
| Desha | 22,809 | 46,529 |
| Drew | 4,851 | 11,301 |
| Faulkner | 4,512 | 9,318 |
| Greene | 16,705 | 35,114 |
| Hempstead | 3,344 | 6,736 |
| Independence | 571 | 3,138 |
| Jackson | 25,072 | 40,871 |
| Jefferson | 42,946 | 63,559 |
| Lafayette | 8,151 | 9,411 |
| Lawrence | 11,626 | 18,322 |
| Lee | 37,952 | 54,464 |
| Lincoln | 17,975 | 28,064 |
| Little River | 1,736 | 3,487 |
| Lonoke | 44,090 | 63,728 |
| Miller | 2,851 | 5,388 |
| Mississippi | 91,978 | 198,119 |
| Monroe | 27,729 | 31,676 |
| Nevada | 851 | 2,439 |
| Phillips | 44,090 | 79,183 |
| Poinsett | 45,722 | 93,574 |
| Prarie | 3,433 | 6,052 |
| Pulaski | 4,220 | 8,945 |
| Randolph | 7,386 | 11,481 |
| St. Francis | 41,154 | 75,444 |
| White | 6,646 | 14,862 |
| Woodruff | 19,569 | 29,805 |
| Yell | 3,216 | 8,529 |
| All other | 10,178 | 20,207 |

Also, I would like to include a report prepared by the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, on 1957 cotton ginnings prior to December 13, 1957, and comparative statistics to the corresponding date in 1956 and 1955:

REPORT ON COTTON GINNING

Number of bales of cotton ginned from the growth of 1957 prior to December 13, 1957, and comparative statistics to the corresponding date in 1956 and 1955:

| State | Ginning (running bales—linters not included) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 [1] | 1956 | 1955 |
| United States | [2] 9,200,665 | [2] 12,815,385 | [2] 13,713,519 |
| Alabama | 521,049 | 743,010 | 1,026,770 |
| Arizona | 559,295 | 707,003 | 824,264 |
| Arkansas | 806,248 | 1,368,625 | 1,568,159 |
| California | 1,438,749 | 1,397,338 | 1,023,975 |
| Florida | 6,786 | 9,178 | 14,763 |
| Georgia | 387,227 | 575,060 | 686,782 |
| Illinois | 837 | 2,424 | 1,477 |
| Kentucky | 3,331 | 7,384 | 6,957 |
| Louisiana | 310,025 | 568,047 | 564,135 |
| Mississippi | 943,530 | 1,572,907 | 1,940,186 |
| Missouri | 148,831 | 438,891 | 396,473 |
| New Mexico | 181,505 | 273,188 | 227,891 |
| North Carolina | 230,080 | 352,581 | 351,166 |
| Oklahoma | 204,571 | 251,198 | 434,395 |
| South Carolina | 341,235 | 515,830 | 560,970 |
| Tennessee | 371,254 | 523,136 | 564,096 |
| Texas | 2,739,046 | 3,499,625 | 3,810,990 |
| Virginia | 7,056 | 9,990 | 10,079 |

[1] The 1957 figures include estimates made for cotton gins for which reports were not obtained in time for use in the preparation of this report. Figures on cotton ginnings prior to Dec. 13 were collected by mail and reports were not received for all cotton gins at which cotton had been ginned.

[2] Includes 230,756 bales of the crop of 1957 ginned prior to Aug. 1 which was counted in the supply for the season of 1956–57, compared with 404,845 and 313,958 bales of the crops of 1956 and 1955.

The statistics in this report include 54,589 bales of American-Egyptian for 1957, 40,061 for 1956, and 29,279 for 1955.

The statistics for 1957 in this report are subject to revision when checked against the individual returns of the ginners being

transmitted by mail. The revised total of cotton ginned this season prior to December 1 is 8,034,771 bales.

CONSUMPTION, STOCKS, IMPORTS, AND EXPORTS—UNITED STATES

Cotton consumed during the month of November 1957, amounted to 656,205 bales. Cotton on hand in consuming establishments on November 30, 1957 was 1,442,047 bales and in public storage and at compresses, 11,330,443 bales. The number of active consuming cotton spindles for the month was 18,133,000. The total imports for the month of September 1957, were 31,122 bales and the exports of domestic cotton, excluding linters, for October, were 483,654 bales.

Certain correspondence which I have received from the Congressional District that I am privileged to serve follows.

A letter from Mr. Frank Hyneman, president, Trumann National Bank, Trumann, Ark.:

TRUMANN NATIONAL BANK,
*Trumann, Ark., January 15, 1958.*

Hon. E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Have just returned to the bank from Lions Club where I saw Earl Moon and he told me you called him this morning. Earl suggested I write you a letter and explain, as much as possible, our situation in eastern Arkansas. No doubt, you have talked to J. W. Kirpatrick and he has explained the different problems to you.

At the bank here, our crop collection loans lack about 20 percent being paid. Of course, you know that is not good and in addition to that, the farmers that couldn't pay the bank or even in some instances if he did pay the bank in full, he is not able to pay the implement dealer or the ginner from whom he has purchased cotton seeds, bean seeds, fertilizers and poisons. Then, too, I am sure you realize that the items mentioned above are essential to the farmer but he cannot go to the ginner or seedsman or implement dealer and obtain credit this coming Spring. In fact, as you know, the merchant himself cannot carry those accounts and continue to work with the farmer.

Earl mentioned to me the fact that you might try to get an appropriation or something to work through PCA that would enable the farmers to pay the different merchants. That is probably well and good. However, my thinking off hand is if you could get some means to help the business man to obtain a loan for those accounts and probably work them out over a 5-year period, I think this would be even a better solution in the overall picture, as well as the PCA cooperation.

Just to give you an idea of the collections at our gin, I will tell you that we lacked approximately $100,000 collecting our accounts up to what they normally are each year. Naturally, this works a hardship on that particular corporation. If I can be of any assistance to you in any way, please do not hesitate to advise.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

FRANK HYNEMAN,
*President.*

I would like to include a most significant letter from Mr. Luther Sigman, of the Sigman Gin, Vanndale, Ark.:

SIGMAN'S GIN,
*Vanndale, Ark., January 15, 1958.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you with regard to the financial plight of the cotton farmers and secondary financing groups (cotton ginners, etc.) as a result of excessive rain, floods, and the early freeze this past fall.

Took, to begin with, our crop was about 55 percent of normal for the county. There are a number of farmers that were washed out completely, and then those that made, maybe, 5, 10, or 20 percent of a crop, having had the full year's expense put into the crop. These people have put up as security everything that they have and in many cases have borrowed full value on their equipment. As you know, this places these people and their lenders in a position of difficulty for the coming crop year. All of this you no doubt are familiar with. The point is this: we are badly in need of extending the disaster-relief program that we now have in Cross County to a financing program for these hard-hit people, which will take up their principal mortgage indebtedness and place it on a 3- to 5-year pay-back plan along with the current crop loan. This type of plan is not unreasonable for our good farmers who have been helpless victims.

I join many others from your district in urging your serious and prompt efforts in getting a program of this sort available through our local FHA office. We understand that the Administrator of the FHA in Washington can authorize such a plan.

We hope to hear from you soon, and with every good wish to you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER SIGMAN.

A telegram from Mr. LeRoy Carter, Lambrook, Ark.:

ELAINE, ARK., *January 14, 1958.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Hope you may see your way clear to work for the passage of Eastland bill which would loan money to farmers to pay their 1957 crop debts. You know something must be done to help them. The present FHA and disaster loan does not go far enough in Phillips County around Lambrook area which is probably hit harder than any place in our State. There will be many farmers who must give up their land and lots and go search for factory work. Would appreciate it if you would give me your idea on what chances such a bill might have in passing and how soon.

LEROY CARTER,
*Lambrook, Ark.*

A telegram from Mr. J. H. Holland, president, Delta Farmers Service Co., Marion, Ark.:

MARION, ARK., *January 10, 1958.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Urge that you give your support to bills introduced by Senator EASTLAND giving financial relief to business and farmers in the rain-stricken areas. Gross income from cotton in Crittenden County is considerably under one-half of normal. Some Federal assistance would help us to recover from this serious blow.

J. H. HOLLAND,
*President, Delta Farmers Service Co.*

A telegram from Mr. Robert F. Howe, Southern Implement Co., Inc., Helena, Ark.:

HELENA, ARK., *January 8, 1958.*

Hon. E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Please use all influence to see that amendment to pay a reasonable portion of existing indebtedness is included in disaster law. Many farmers, especially the smaller ones, will be unable to operate since implement dealers are financially unable to carry delinquent implement notes, and banks will not do so unless some reduction is made. Understand that payoff percentage in 1950, when the FSA made this type loan coupled with a production loan to be paid back over a 3-year period, was over 95 percent.

SOUTHERN IMPLEMENT CO., INC.
ROBERT F. HOWE.

A telegram from Mr. S. J. Howe, Wabash, Ark.:

HELENA, ARK., *January 9, 1958.*

Hon. "TOOK" GATHINGS,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Appreciate your efforts on disaster loan legislation. If passed, could save economy of Phillips County.

S. J. HOWE.

WABASH, ARK.

A copy of a letter written to Senator FULBRIGHT by Louis G. Nash, Delta Implement Co., Blytheville, Ark.

Subject: Small Business Administration.

DECEMBER 20, 1957.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: I have noticed with interest your proposal of an amendment to the Small Business Administration law.

I do not think this is exactly what we need. We need a bill to help refinance our farmers in handling their open accounts, and notes, and this loan made direct to farmer with a provision that he has 1 to 3 years to pay it back, as it is going to take the farmers from 1 to 3 years to recover from 1957. We should have a setup where Planter's Production could handle this additional money or through the banks. I would not want to see this handled through FHA, as from our experience, it is not at all satisfactory and their attitude is not good toward the implement dealer or whomever the farmer may owe. If the lending agency should be Planter's Production or the bank, they would be responsible for the collection. If this money is appropriated, it should take care of the farmers' implement notes, open accounts, and other indebtedness.

We finance most of our notes through local banks and we do carry some ourselves and this would give them relief also. We are having to renew a great many notes and when 1957 installments are carried over with some spring payments and the balance of 1957 due in 1958, along with their 1958 maturities, the farmer has 2 years' notes to meet in 1 year and its going to be impossible for them to pay. The implement dealers are not going to be able to pay off the banks.

I also think if this money can be made available at once, that it will stimulate business and the implement dealers can employ more people as the implement dealers have had to lay off a lot of employees and are going to have to lay off more if the farmer does not get relief. I do not see how some farmers are going to be able to operate, as most of them owe us and other implement dealers and we can extend them no further credit.

If there is any way that I can help, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Best wishes.

Yours very truly,

DELTA IMPLEMENT CO.,
L. G. NASH.

(Copies to Congressman E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Mid-South Farm Equipment Association, Harvey Adams, Arkansas Agricultural Council.)

The next letter gives specific information with reference to the severity and acuteness of the financial hardships suffered by the flood-stricken cotton farmers in Poinsett County, Ark., in support

of legislation to amend the Small Business Administration Act:

TRUMANN IMPLEMENT CO.,
*Trumann, Ark., December 19, 1957.*
Representative E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS,
*Capitol Building, Little Rock, Ark.*

DEAR SIR: I am a small business located in Poinsett County in the heart of the disaster-stricken midsouth farming territory. I am deeply interested in the amendment to the Small Business Administration law that Senator JAMES EASTLAND and Senator BILL FULBRIGHT are proposing in Washington.

This amendment would make it possible for farm-equipment dealers to secure loans from the SBA to take care of the normal excess of open accounts over and above the same accounts receivables of a normal period. Due to the disastrous crop that we have suffered this year I am holding an excessive amount of open accounts and notes receivables that I am not able to collect. At the end of October I had in the amount of $19,089.73 in accounts receivables and $21,281.68 in notes receivables. At the end of November, we should have collected nearly all of this in a normal year, but we had $17,558.02 in accounts receivables and $16,501.84 open in notes receivables.

As you know by your recent visit to the Trumann Lions Club meeting, that we are making or have made only a half crop in this area. Cotton is bringing only about 20 cents per pound and most of the beans are ruined. We, the farm-equipment dealers, and small-business men are left holding the bag, in other words.

For these reasons I certainly want to urge your support to Senator EASTLAND'S amendment to the SBA law.

Sincerely yours,

EARL MOON.

Yesterday I received an informative telegram from the president of the Arkansas Farmers Union and the president of the Poinsett County Farmers Union, regarding the need for emergency loans and refinancing of the 1957 debts. This wire is set forth below:

HARRISBURG, ARK.

Hon. E. C. (TOOK) GATHINGS,
*New House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

As you are well aware the need is most urgent for additional adequate farm-credit facilities in our State of an emergency nature. To alleviate the financial disaster to our farmers climaxed by weather conditions of 1957, financiers approach the critical point of having to foreclose on farm equipment and other securities. We urge you to make every effort possible to bring about legislation which will make loan funds available through Farmers' Home Administration to relieve farmers from this chaotic condition and to make possible the refinancing of chattels with longer term credit. It is exceedingly important that the facilities and trained personnel of Farmers' Home Administration be utilized in this emergency financing so as to make adequate credit available without discrimination. As you know, FHA officials are well informed as to the seriousness of the situation since they, along with the Civil Defense Administration, made the original survey and compiled the data which was the basis for declaring this an emergency area. We feel assured that you will do all that you can.

ROBERT W. DOWNS,
*President, Arkansas Farmers Union.*
LESTER L. TERRELL,
*President, Poinsett County Farmers Union.*

Emergency loans have been made over a period of many years. The authority for these loans is contained in the following acts, to wit:

Act of 1944, Public Law 140; loans to farmers; 1943 floods; made $15 million available.

Act of 1945, Public Law 307; loans and grants to farmers; same as previous act, but made available the $13 million not spent under Public Law 140.

Act of 1946, Public Law 52; reappropriation to loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation—Appropriation Act of 1946.

Act of 1946, Public Law 82; reappropriation under title "Loans, Grants"; 1945 flood damage; $2 million.

Act of 1948, Public Law 785; loans to farmers, 1948 floods; $6 million.

Act of 1949, Public Law 71, extended Public Law 785 through June 30, 1950.

Act of 1949, Public Law 38, expanded coverage to include "all natural disasters" rather than just "flood and windstorm."

Act of 1951–52, Missouri floods handled under ACP and soil-conservation programs with regular FHA programs.

The cost of all programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration throughout the years is small—almost an insignificant amount. On Friday, January 15, 1958, in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Credit, Mr. Charles Barnard, Budget Director for the Farmers Home Administration stated that, "As of June 30, 1957 repayments on emergency FHA agricultural loans amounted to 91 percent. On maturities in their accounting reserves, the FHA estimates that their losses on all loans will amount to about 4.5 percent. In other words, the FHA expects that repayments on all FHA loans to amount to 95.5 percent."

These farmers are the best people we have in the communities. They are sound farmers—they ask no gift—they only ask an opportunity to continue in the farming business and also that they be given up to 5 years to pay the losses which were suffered in the disastrous year 1957.

As an indication of the seriousness of the economic plight of farmers in the vast region beset by floods, excessive rains, and other damage from the elements, the farmers are making a run on the soil bank acreage reserve. This is most unusual since heretofore the allocation for these counties has been undersubscribed. There is a reason for this sudden change of attitude. That reason is debt—heavy back debts hanging over these farmers. They are desperate. Their creditors are pressing them. They want to pay their obligations. They want the peace of mind that goes with such an effort. Many of those who desire to place their acreage in the soil bank feel that it will be difficult to obtain crop production loans for the 1958 crop-year.

Many of these producers are attempting to put their allotments in the acreage reserve and in turn agree that whatever is realized from the Government in the form of a payment should and would be credited on their notes and open accounts which were due in the fall of 1957 and were not paid due to crop failure and loss of quality and grade due to unusual weather conditions.

Today an appeal is being made to Assistant Secretary Marvin McLain and the Director of the Soil Bank Division of the Department, Mr. Howard Doggett, to make new allocations in the counties that have been designated as disaster counties. It is a matter of utilizing existing funds to meet the needs that are present.

These people are not desirous of planting less acreage; they would like to plant even more than their allotment. They are driven to this most heartrending course or decision that at least part payment may be made on their 1957 losses. That decision means, in many instances, that the farmer will leave the farm and seek employment in the towns and cities.

Yesterday I received a telegram from Mr. Allen B. Helms, president of the Crittenden County Farm Bureau, on this subject. The telegram reads as follows:

MARION, ARK., *January 21, 1958.*

E. C. GATHINGS,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Due to acute financial conditions a great number of Crittenden County farmers feel that they need to place the limit of their cotton acreage in acreage reserve phase of soil bank. Local ASC office are advising that this program is limited due to the shortage of available funds. Please use your influence in making it possible for all our farmers to take advantage of this program.

ALLEN B. HELMS,
*President, Crittenden County Farm Bureau.*

The following telegram has been received from outstanding farmers, businessmen, and civic-minded citizens:

HELENA, ARK.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Urgent need for additional soil bank funds for Phillips County farmers. Farmers not yet signed should not be penalized. Request your assistance.

GEORGE GOLDSMITH.
DAVID SOLOMON, JR.
F. F. KITCHENS.
JOHN H. WOODS.

An appeal has been made by me to the Soil Bank Division of the Department of Agriculture to transfer funds from States that will not require all of the funds allocated to them so that these applicants can go into the bank this year.

---

## JAMES GORDON STEESE: SOLDIER, ENGINEER, SCHOLAR, EXPLORER, AND STATESMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Missouri). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, former President Theodore Roosevelt once said that the only adequate compensation for the tribulations incident to public office is the occasional opportunity to render an important public service. The truth of this statement Members of the Congress will appreciate.

In viewing my own legislative career, I count as among its most gratifying

experiences those in connection with the problems of interoceanic canals—services that brought about close associations with many leaders, in and out of Government service, who, during construction of the Panama Canal or its subsequent operation, have contributed greatly to an important chapter of American achievement and world history.

Started early in 1949 in the 81st Congress, when the late distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia, designated me as chairman of a special subcommittee to investigate the operations of the Panama Canal, this interesting but difficult task opened up a long chain of events that has never ended.

When first seeking reliable background information for that study I was fortunate in knowing well former Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California, an extraordinarily able naval officer and student of Panama Canal problems, who arranged with the Secretary of the Navy for a presentation in the Navy Department on interoceanic canal questions. Public mention of this presentation was previously made by me in a eulogy of Representative Bradley in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, 1955.

Accompanying Captain Bradley on that occasion was Gen. James Gordon Steese, of Mount Holly Springs, Pa., an eminent engineer and former business executive with extensive Panama Canal experience, both construction and operating.

Masters of their subjects, these two leaders, with the aid of terrain models of the Panama Canal and schematic diagrams, described its key problems with such forthrightness and vigor that I shall never forget: Captain Bradley, the operational; and General Steese, the engineering.

The lessons I learned that day proved to be of immeasurable value. They helped to clear away the fog of confusion that then featured so much canal debate and aided greatly in placing the 1949 study on a path that overcame obstacles. That inquiry culminated in the first reorganization since 1914 of the Panama Canal enterprise pursuant to Public Law 841, 81st Congress, approved September 26, 1950, which placed the Panama Canal on a self-sustaining basis.

It can now be revealed that one of the principal consultants of the subcommittee in preparation of its report and findings was General Steese. Many of his constructive suggestions were embodied in its recommendations, House Report 1304, 81st Congress. In fact, for formal testimony before the subcommittee, started on June 6, 1949, General Steese was chosen as the first witness. (See House hearings on Panama Canal tolls, March 14–June 14, 1949, pp. 3 and 96.)

In the years that followed, General Steese and I kept in close touch. A man of high intelligence, commanding personality, and vast background, he grew in stature on closer acquaintance. In due course, the story of his life slowly unfolded. I shall summarize some of its highlights, especially those related to the Panama Canal in which he was so greatly interested.

A cadet at West Point during the stirring days of the Panama Revolution of 1903, the acquisition of the Canal Zone in 1904, the "battle of the levels" of 1905–06 to determine the type of canal, and the starting of large-scale construction, young Steese naturally aspired to be associated with the majestic project. Visiting the Isthmus for that purpose, he interviewed Col. George W. Goethals, then chairman and chief engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, and thus secured the first significant assignment of his engineering career.

A careful student and keen observer with an insatiable thirst for knowledge and with the capacity to understand and appreciate the problems thus presented, Lieutenant Steese became well grounded in the subject of interoceanic canals—engineering, geological, administrative, and political. A firm believer in personal examinations in the field as prerequisites for logical engineering decisions, he developed a love for exploration and a lifelong interest in the canal at Panama. Among his finest and strongest characteristics were those of candor and independence.

After leaving canal service his assignments while on the active list of the Army expanded greatly the range of his experience and professional associations. Eventually reaching Alaska, he became a recognized authority on the problems of that Territory and made important contributions toward its development in the building and operation of the Alaska Railroad and in construction of highways, one of which is named in his honor—the Steese Highway.

Retiring from active service in the Army in 1927 as the result of an injury, he was promptly employed in executive capacity in the oil industry. With service in this field, abroad and at home, he rose rapidly to high position in the business world but never lost interest in the Panama Canal, which he repeatedly visited.

It is, I believe, noteworthy that his travels gradually included all the oceans and continents except the Antarctic making him one of the most extensive travelers of this generation. These enabled him to observe the more important ports and canals of the world. Thus, the pattern of his experience served to supply a profound insight into the practical needs of the navigator as well as the engineer in the design of works affecting navigation, and to emphasize the Panama Canal as a key transportation utility for the economic transit of vessels. These features, he often stressed to me as basic in dealing with canal problems.

Notwithstanding an unusually busy life, much of it on the frontiers, he found time to read voluminously, publish numerous papers, give lectures, attend international conferences, and to take a tireless interest in fostering his first alma mater—Dickinson College of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, from which he graduated in 1902 before going to West Point.

In 1941, as the United States verged toward involvement in World War II, the Army recalled General Steese to active duty with assignment to the Panama Canal—the scene of his youthful endeavors.

Serving in a variety of capacities including that of engineer of maintenance—now called lieutenant governor—during what is today recognized as the most critical period in the history of the Panama Canal, he gained the additional benefit of service in its permanent operation organization.

These years in the Isthmus, 1941–47, covered preparation of the canal for war, World War II, and demobilization, all of which introduced difficult problems of many types that served as challenges. Among his experiences in 1943 was close observation of the development in the canal administration, as the result of war operating experience, of the Terminal Lake—Third Locks Plan and its review by canal authorities.

Throughout this last canal assignment General Steese was ever on the alert for men of inquiring mind, especially among young engineers and officers, to whom he devoted many hours of thoughtful instruction and exploration. Always interested in their professional betterment, he sponsored the formation of professional engineering societies and encouraged discussions dealing with canal problems in fundamental ways.

Finally leaving canal service in 1947 and retiring from the Army a second time, he had already become a tradition on the Isthmus. Thus, in 1949 when, as previously stated, I first met General Steese, he was preeminently qualified to act as a consultant for the subcommittee of which I had the honor to be the chairman.

When discussing basic canal issues, it was but natural that he should have stressed the 1943 Terminal Lake—Third Locks Plan for the operational improvement of the Panama Canal as the first major contribution to the waterway since the decision in 1906 to relocate the Atlantic Locks from Bohio to Gatun to form Gatun Lake.

Notwithstanding his strong advocacy of the Terminal Lake Plan as the only logical solution of the canal problem, he never failed to include adequate descriptions of what may be termed as the 1947 Sea-Level Tidal-Lock Plan, with thoroughly objective comparisons.

Of all his clarifying explanations, his most telling points concerned questions of security and national defense, injected into the canal situation pursuant to Public Law 280, 79th Congress, after the startling advent in 1945 of the atomic bomb. In these, he constantly reiterated that the defense of any canal is not a question of inherent characteristics that could conceivably be included in constructional design but a matter that depends on the combined military, naval, and air might of the United States, coupled with its industrial capacity. The problem of modernizing the Panama Canal, which he never failed to stress, consists of a combination of factors: capacity, engineering, functional, construction, and diplomatic to get the best

operating waterway that is economically feasible.

In many statements to the Congress, my colleagues and I have repeatedly reflected the sagacious thoughts of General Steese derived from a lifetime of study, travel, and observation. There is no doubt in my mind that his statesmanlike views were major factors in the restoration of sound thinking about Panama Canal planning and that they contributed greatly in the avoidance of precipitate and unfortunate action that otherwise might have occurred.

Still later, 1955–56, when a determined effort was made by the directorate of the Panama Canal Company to abandon the Panama Railroad, General Steese again came to the aid of the Congress with thoughtful and equally courageous statements that materially assisted in preserving that vital rail link.

After his second retirement from the Army in 1947, General Steese did not settle down to a life of ease but, despite the growing infirmities of advancing age, extended the range and intensity of his travels with the enthusiasm of youth, concentrating on Africa, which he visited in extensive manner at least eight times. Alert to major developments in the many regions visited and possessing the capacity for vivid description, he was an inspiration to all who knew him well.

Thus, his injury in an automobile accident and death 2 days later on January 11, 1958, in Banqui, French Equatorial Africa, in the vast continent that he had explored in such great detail and knew so intimately, injected a dramatic but tragic note at the end of a remarkable career. I am sure that all my colleagues in the Congress who knew him will agree that in his death the Nation has lost not only one of the greatest experts on Panama Canal problems but an outstanding explorer, scholar, and statesman.

It is indeed historically fitting that I may conclude with the eloquent elegiac poem from the gifted pen of Maurice H. Thatcher, former distinguished Member of this House from Kentucky, and sole surviving member—1910–13—of the Isthmian Canal Commission. He watched, with great interest and understanding, the career of General Steese from its start in the Canal Zone during the construction of the Canal, until its end in Africa. Thus, he epitomizes, in most admirable and effective manner, the life, character, and achievements of General Steese.

JAMES GORDON STEESE: A TRIBUTE

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

Within the compass of these petty lines
Only the briefest mention can be made
Touching the splendid deeds and brave designs
Of him to whom this tribute now is paid.
If there be lacks in phrase or amplitude—
These may be cured when all is well pursued.

* * * * *

James Gordon Steese, during his long career,
Spent in a skilled and practiced engineering role,
Wrought nobly in our growing hemisphere—
In tropic Panama and nigh the Pole.
The great trans-Isthmian Link proclaims his praise,
And in Alaska his monuments upraise.

His limpid thought, his judgment quick and true;
His wisdom, courage, and his faith and hope;
His forward look to what is yet to do;
His breadth of mind; his vision, poise, and scope,—
Attest his worth and make his stature plain:
Not soon, indeed, we'll see his like again.

As soldier, planner, builder, patriot,
He was distinguished, fearless, and distinct;
In every labor which befell his lot,
He won renown; with all his name is linked.
His life shall prove inspiring decades hence,
And time shall yield posthumous recompense.

Altho high honors in ample numbers came
To him at home and from abroad, he wore
Them all in modesty. He was the same
Whate'er the restless tides of fortune bore.
In every facet of his character
There gleamed a jeweled light which nought could blur.

He was a bold adventurer, and o'er
The rounded Earth—and quitting all of ease—
He traveled oft. His thirst for more and more
Of vital knowledge he ne'er could quite appease.
At last his greatest venture was to die,
And find his rest, beneath an Afric sky.

* * * * *

For such a man our gratitude ascends,
As incense, rich, to deck his memory;
We're honored as we honor all that lends
Itself to honor and to probity.
This epitaph is writ for all to read:
"Yet shall he live because of thought and deed."

In order that the record of General Steese may be accessible throughout the Nation, especially to historians and writers, under leave to extend, I quote his biographical sketch in Who's Who in America, volume 27, 1952–1953, pages 2312–13:

Steese, James Gordon (stēs), civil engr.; b. Mt. Holly Springs, Pa., Jan. 21, 1882; s. James Andrew and Anna Zug (Schaeffer) S.; A. B., Dickinson College, 1902, A. M., 1906; B. S. (st honors), U. S. Mil. Acad., 1907; studied U. of Calif., 1908; grad. U. S. Engr. Sch., Washington, 1910; Sc. D., U. of Alaska, 1932; unmarried. Commd. 2d. lt. engrs., June 14, 1907; promoted through grades to col., June 18, 1918; brigadier general and adjutant general Alaska N. G., 1926–27; retired Oct. 1927. Asst. engr. San Diego and San Francisco bays, Calif., 1907–08; asst. engr. Panama Railroad Co. and Panama Canal, 1908–12; chief engr. 5th (expeditionary) Brig., Tex., 1913; instr. and asst. prof. engring. U. S. Mil. Acad., 1913–17; spl. rep. of gen. mgr., West Md. Ry., June-Sept., 1916; organized O. T. C., Ft. Riley, Kans., and instr. Engr. O. T. C., Ft. Leavenworth, Kan., 1917; asst. chief of engrs., U. S. Army, 1917–18; detailed on General Staff and chief of section, Sept. 1918-June 1920; spl. mission to Adriatic and Balkan countries, 1919; pres. Alaska Road Commn., 1920–27, also chief engr., 1924, 27; dist. and acting div. engr. for rivers and harbors, Alaska Dist., 1921–27; cons. engr. Dept. Commerce, 1921–27, also for Ty. of Alaska, 1921–23; mem. spl. commn. to investigate Russian, Japanese, and Am. fur seal rookeries, June-Sept. 1922; dir. pub. works, Alaska; 1923–27; chmn. Alaska R. R. 1923–24, also chief engr., Mar.-Oct. 1923; with Gulf Oil Corp. as gen. mgr. foreign subsidiary co., 1927–32; chmn. bd. and pres. Guajilio Corp. and affiliated cos., 1932–41; pres. Slate Creek Placers, Inc., 1936–41; recalled to active duty, Corps of Engrs., U. S. Army, detailed as asst. engr. of maintenance, Panama Canal, and asst. to 2d v. p. Panama Ry. Co., Jan. 1941-Mar. 1946; asst. to Gov., Panama Canal and asst. to pres. Panama Ry. Co., 1946–47; cons. engr. N. Am. Car Corp. since 1947. Brig. gen., a. d. c., Alaska Nat. Guard, 1935–37. In charge Pres. Harding's tour of Alaska, 1923. Trustee Dickinson College since 1919, Amelia S. Givin Free Library since 1921. Fellow Royal Geog. Soc. (London), Am. Geog. Soc., A. A. A. S.; mem. Am. Soc. C. E. (life), Soc. Am. Mil. Engrs., Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Sigma, Am. Legion. Decorated Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit (U. S.); Distinguished Service Medal, 2d class (Panamanian); Officer, later Comdr. Order of Prince Danilo I, and silver medal for bravery (Montengrin); Croix de Guerre, 2d Class (Grecian); Officer of Public Instruction (French); Khamés de l'Ahal Saxaoul, French Sahara; Knight of Order of Compassionate Heart, Comdr. Imperial Order of St. Nicholas (Russia); Interallied Victory Medal, American Defense Medal with star, and American Theatre Medal (U. S.); specially commended in Senate and House of Rep. of United States, and salary raised by spl. act of Congress, 1926; mil. road from Fairbanks, Alaska, to Yukon River at Circle officially named Steese Highway by War Dept. Del. U. S. Govt. to XIV Internat. Navigatn. Congress, Cairo, Egypt, 1926 (sec. Am. sect.), XV Internat. Navigatn. Cong., Venice Italy, 1931, XVI Cong., Brussels, Belgium, 1935, XVII Cong., Lisbon, 1949; del Internat. Geog. Congress, Paris, France, 1931, XVI Con., Lisbon, 1949; del. U. S. Govt. to 5th Internat. Congress of Surveyors, London, Eng., 1934 (chmn. Am. section), to Internat. Geog. Congress, Warsaw, Poland, 1934 (pres. sec. I-cartography), to 4th Internat. Congress and Expn. of Photogrammetry, Paris, France, 1934 (declined), to Second World Petroleum Congress, Paris, 1937, Internat. Geog. Congress, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 1938. Republican. Episcopalian. Mason (33°), Elk. Clubs: Army and Navy (Washington); West Point Army Mess; University (N. Y.). Author of numerous articles in tech. periodicals and daily press. Home: Army and Navy Club, Washington, D. C. Office: care North Am. Car Corp., 231 S. La Salle St., Chicago 4.

## SATELLITES FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago on December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower appeared before the United Nations General Assembly and captured the imagination of the world with a stirring proposal for the peaceful use of atomic energy. This atoms-for-peace plan was implemented last year with the formation of an International Atomic Energy Agency.

The President's message at that time constituted a ray of hope for peace-loving millions in what was then called the atomic age. Here was a call for peace from the world's foremost statesman. Here was evidence that at least one nation wanted to devote to peaceful purposes the most destructive weapon ever perfected by man. Here was hope that total annihilation could be avoided through peaceful cooperation.

Much has happened since that time. Atoms for peace has worked. But the atom as a war weapon already is almost obsolete. We have moved from the atomic age to the hydrogen age to the space age—all within the short span of 4 years. Never before have conditions

changed so rapidly, affording man so little time for adjustment. Horrible weapons capable of destroying entire populations can be sent thousands of miles in a matter of minutes. Earth war is being superseded by the concept of space war. We ask ourselves what lies ahead besides utter chaos.

Can the current trend toward war be redirected toward peace? This question is the most important ever posed in the history of the world. As the leader of the free world, our role is paramount. What constructive action can we take? Certainly we can and must continue to build bigger and more powerful missiles to blast an aggressor from above. We must build underwater craft capable of striking from below. But is this the ultimate answer. Of course not. We are building missiles and submarines, but the enemy is building them faster. We are creating a striking power able to destroy the enemy, but how can we avoid being destroyed ourselves?

No; the ultimate answer does not lie in an arms race to oblivion. True, we must continue to increase our defensive strength and offensive striking power until an alternative can be found. To display weakness would be to invite destruction. But true and lasting peace has never been built on the shifting sands of military power. The two concepts—peace and military power—are antithetical.

President Eisenhower recognizes the necessity of an alternative to the arms race which may some day lead to total war. He pleaded for peace at the Geneva Conference of 1955. He continued disarmament negotiations with Russia even after the Communists showed the world that they were interested only in making more bombs and more propaganda. He has now met the space-age challenge by calling upon Russia to dedicate space to the peaceful uses of mankind. In a letter to Soviet Premier Bulganin, the President has asked:

> Can we not stop the production of such weapons which would use, more accurately misuse, outer space? Should not outer space be dedicated to the peaceful uses of mankind and denied to the purposes of war?

The answer to that question is obvious. Space not only should be devoted to peace. Space must be devoted to peace. The question, of course, is how can this be accomplished? Many proposals have been offered for international agreements for the peaceful use of space. But I think most of them have been too broad and sweeping to stand much chance of implementation in the face of Russian intransigence. I believe the President should take the same approach he used in his atoms-for-peace proposal. Mr. Eisenhower did not maintain the inflexible position in that proposal that all nations must agree to stop producing atomic energy for war purposes. Rather, he recommended that at least some of this power potential be devoted to peaceful uses beneficial to mankind. Why could not Mr. Eisenhower make the same type of proposal in relation to the conquest of space? Instead of seeking agreement for the cessation of all war-oriented efforts on missiles, satellites, and related space vehicles, he could call for the devotion of satellites to peaceful purposes.

This, then, is my suggestion—that President Eisenhower go before a special session of the United Nations with a single proposal. This proposal would call for an international agreement, similar to the International Atomic Energy Agency, to cooperate in the development and launching of earth satellites, and to share in the information obtained therefrom, for the mutual benefit of all in the conquest of space. This proposal could appropriately be called "satellites for peace."

If we study the language of the President's atoms-for-peace proposal, we find that much of it—with minor changes—is just as appropriate today as it was in 1953, and could be used to present the proposal I have suggested. For example, Mr. Eisenhower declared:

> I know that the American people share my belief that if a danger exists in the world it is a danger shared by all, and equally, that if hope exists in the mind of one nation that hope should be shared by all.

Today a danger exists that has increased a thousandfold since December 8, 1953. Today that danger is shared by all without exception. But now even as in 1953, a hope still exists—not only in the United States, but also in many other nations of the world. It is the hope that man can somehow substitute peace for international turmoil and crisis. We would like to think that this hope is shared by Russia as well. The Russian reaction to a satellites-for-peace proposal would show the world whether the Communists truly do want peace, as they have so often claimed.

Up to this point almost every attempt by the United States to obtain Russian cooperation for peace has failed. The Communists have refused to accept a realistic disarmaments plan. In fact, now they refuse even to negotiate. Under these circumstances it would be suicide for the United States to suspend unilaterally missile development and hydrogen-bomb testing.

If disarmament is impossible to effect, then we must look for a simpler path which ultimately may lead to the road to peace. This is why I suggest satellites for peace. It is a beginning—a small beginning, but it could foster better things. Actually, it already has a basis in the International Geophysical Year program, under which scientists of many nations are working together to learn more about earth and space. The earth satellite is an important phase of their cooperation. Russia has not shared all of her satellite knowledge, but she has given American scientists some data.

IGY ends in December of this year. We need some type of agreement to pledge even greater cooperation in the satellite undertaking. The United States has not yet formally suggested such an agreement. The President indicated in his 1957 state of the Union address a willingness to enter into "any reliable agreement" which would "mutually control the outer space missile and satellite development." But Mr. Eisenhower did not make a distinction between missiles and satellites. This distinction is important, as I shall point out. Then, shortly after the President's message, our representative in the United Nations said that:

> The first step toward the objective of assuring that developments in outer space should be devoted exclusively to peaceful and scientific purposes would be to bring the testing of such objects under international inspection and participation.

But here again the reference was to earth satellites, intercontinental missiles, long-range unmanned weapons, and space platforms. It is extremely doubtful that a comprehensive agreement of this kind can be obtained under existing conditions, although we should continue to seek such an agreement.

In the meantime, we should distinguish between earth satellites and ballistic missiles. The missile, an extension of a long-range gun, should continue to be subject to general disarmament negotiations. But the satellite, which spends its time in an orbit, is entirely different. Its development has not yet been oriented predominantly to war purposes, making it a logical starting point for an international agreement. Such an agreement should be proposed now, however, before military aspects of satellite development take precedence over the current emphasis along peaceful lines. Because earth satellites will not be vital to national defense for some time to come, a system of international cooperation and even control might have enough time to take hold before they become primarily military weapons.

International cooperation and control obviously would be difficult to obtain once the satellite is regarded as an important military asset. Yet it is at that stage—when the satellite is militarily dangerous—that international control is most necessary. Why wait until it is all but impossible to achieve such control? "Satellites for peace" should be proposed while most feasible. That time is now. Such an agreement could be highly important as a precedent leading to the eventual control of all outer space for peaceful purposes.

It might be argued that even the "satellites for peace" proposal is too comprehensive for general acceptance. Perhaps this is why the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, in its report Strengthening the United Nations, suggested that the United States seek only the international registration and verification of satellite flights as a short-run policy. But I think we should go further than the Commission has suggested. The cooperation of all nations in the peaceful development of these satellites would be far more substantial, and would set an important precedent. The registration and verification of flights would naturally be included in such cooperation.

The United States hopes to launch its satellite soon. The time is ripe for giving serious thought to an international agreement along the lines I have suggested. We must not overlook any possibility of easing the tension which

exists today in this race to obliteration. If "satellites for peace" is such a possibility—and I think it is—then we should propose it to the world.

## THE LATE HONORABLE LAWRENCE H. SMITH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Missouri). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was in the House restaurant when the angel of death hovered over the restaurant and God took the soul of our late colleague, LAWRENCE SMITH, to be with Him. It was a wonderful way for LAWRENCE SMITH to go. He died in the service of his Government. He served his country in peace just as he served so gallantly in the war with all that he had of his love and his devotion. It is terribly hard for his family to spare him and for us here in the House to spare him. Here we knew him and loved him. I had many talks with him on matters of mutual interest. I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with him for a while. I always admired his courage. We did not always agree, but he always had the greatest possible faith that he was right and was so gentle with others in their right to their views. He had faith in God and faith in America and faith in the things that he fought for and stood for in this Congress. If he had stood alone in every measure, he would still have voted as he thought right no matter how many were against him. My deepest sympathy goes to his beautiful wife who was one with him and to his splendid son and daughters and relatives. He and his wife were constantly together in veterans' affairs and in every other great work. The last time I saw them both together, we spoke of his son, the son who was so very badly injured in the World War and who gave so much for us. All three worked constantly for the veterans. It was always: "What can we do for those who have suffered and for those who have given so much and those who have paid such a tremendous price?" My sympathy goes to the Members of Congress from Wisconsin and to all of the people of Wisconsin who have lost such a great statesman, a great hero, and a great man. My heart aches for all of us here in the House who will miss his wise counsel and his tremendous kindness. Mr. Speaker, let the tremendous amount of work that he did and the sacrifices that he made serve as a warning to those Members of the Congress who are working too hard today under such terrific pressures and anxieties. Let it be a warning to them not to overdo because it can happen to us. I am going in a few moments to see all that is earthly that is left of him before his wife and colleagues take him back to Wisconsin for burial. His spirit will live on. His kindnesses and his words and thoughts and deeds will be a benediction to us always.

## WE SHOULD IMMEDIATELY START BUILDING 100 NUCLEAR-POWERED ATTACK SUBMARINES AT THE RATE OF 20 PER YEAR

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the most serious military threat to our national safety is the large Soviet submarine fleet already in being.

A very few of these Soviet submarines equipped to fire missiles can place most of our seaboard cities and other large cities not too far from the coast in danger of being completely destroyed in the event of war.

In this regard I quote from the recent Rockefeller report:

> The Soviet Union now has the second largest Navy in the world and since World War II has produced more vessels of every type, except aircraft carriers, than the United States.

The Soviet Union has long concentrated on submarines.

A fleet of well over 400 is already in operation.

This number is greatly in excess of the German force which severely menaced Allied surface shipping during the early years of World War II.

There is no doubt about the capacity of the U. S. S. R. to develop naval atomic powerplants, or to adapt ships and submarines to launch short- and medium-range missiles: In fact, Soviet leaders have pointedly discussed the vulnerability of the United States in such attacks.

The magnitude of the threat becomes clear when it is realized that 43 of our 50 largest cities and 85 percent of our industry are located within 500 miles of our coasts.

Missile-launching submarines are the Soviet equivalent of our overseas air bases.

No longer is the ocean our protector. In fact, the ocean now becomes the hiding place for the most serious threat to our safety.

The task of combating the Soviet submarine menace in the event of war would be a difficult one.

This is our Navy's most vital and important defensive mission.

At the outbreak of World War II, Germany had 57 submarines of which 22 were oceangoing.

Before the war was over, 40,000 men lost their lives and 14 million tons of Allied shipping went to the bottom of the sea.

It took us 4 years to combat the German submarine menace.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. Can the gentleman tell the House how many submarines, if he is permitted to do so, are in the service of the United States Navy at this time?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. There are about 119 submarines in the active fleet at the present time and most of these 119 submarines are what we call snorkel types of modern submarines.

Mr. AVERY. Would the gentleman be at liberty to disclose to the House the number of submarines that are nuclear-powered?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. None of the 119 submarines that are on duty with the fleet are nuclear-powered submarines. We do have, however, 19 submarines nuclear powered, either operating, under construction, or authorized. To break down those 19, we find that 3 of them are actually active today with the fleet. Fifteen others are under construction or have been authorized and should be in service by the end of 1960.

The bill which was passed by the House today included three submarines that will be equipped to launch the guided missile Polaris. I understand that the appropriation for fiscal 1959 will call for 1 guided-missile submarine and 4 attack submarines.

In this age of advanced missiles the submarine is even a more powerful weapon.

Not only does it threaten our ability to control the seas, but it now has the ability to destroy our cities and our industrial might.

The knowledge that the Russian submarine fleet is nearly 10 times as large as was the German submarine force at the outbreak of World War II should stir us to action now, rather than waiting for destruction.

For survival we not only must be able to control the surface of the sea but the waters beneath.

Disaster could be the only result from our failure to do so.

Fortunately we have in our arsenal a weapon which if produced in sufficient numbers could deter the large Soviet submarine fleet—the nuclear powered submarine.

The best way to destroy a submarine is with another submarine.

In this regard the nuclear submarine has no peer.

As Admiral Rickover testified the other day, if the Soviets were to start building nuclear powered submarines at a fraction of the rate they have been building conventional submarines we would lose our present lead in submarine nuclear propulsion by 1961.

He urged, and I strongly agree, that we immediately build large numbers of attack submarines which could sink Russian submarines.

To get started on this effort now, I have introduced this date a bill authorizing the construction of 100 nuclear powered attack submarines during the next 5 years at the rate of 20 per fiscal year.

If we started now, I am confident that these ships could be completed in 1961 and 1962.

If we built them on an accelerated basis with top priority, and I propose that we do so, I am confident that they can all be completed before the end of 1961.

From my own investigations I have determined that these 100 ships could be built with our present facilities at the rate of 20 per fiscal year.

No retooling would be required.

Further the nuclear reactors and components could be built within the present industrial capacity which has been built up by Admiral Rickover and his organization for naval reactors work during the past 8 years.

Failure to immediately start constructing these attack submarines is a national admission that we do not intend to protect the lead we now have in the nuclear submarine field.

We have no other recourse in the light of this known threat but to immediately construct these vessels.

## THE ADMINISTRATION'S MONETARY POLICY

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the administration's monetary policy is a huge flop. I refer to the administration's idea that a modern economy with all its complexity could be regulated by the use of monetary policy alone, that is by manipulating interest rate and supply of loanable funds available to banks.

I rejoice that one district of the Federal Reserve has reduced its rediscount rate to 2¾ percent from the previous 3 percent. I expect other districts of the Federal Reserve to follow suit momentarily. That is good.

The economy needs this, but in point of fact this is not enough. The rediscount rate should never have been raised to the 3 percent and 3½ percent. This was a substantial factor in the present recession. It should now be lowered below the present 2¾–3-percent figure.

The 1953–54 recession was of about the same or slightly less intensity than that into which our economy is presently sliding. At that time the rediscount rate was 1½ percent, or about half the present rate of 2¾–3 percent.

The Eisenhower administration has worked together with the reactionary elements on the Federal Reserve Board to apply the above-mentioned policy.

This policy was never effective in combatting inflation; it did bring about a tremendous increase in the cost of financing the national debt, and the substantial economic recession now deepening. However, reducing the rediscount rate will help restore prosperity. The money charge for financing the national debt is about $7.9 billion this year. The yearly cost of financing the national debt has risen about $2 billion since the administration came into power.

A second thing which the administration-Federal Reserve hard money policy has done has been to raise banking profits and insurance company profits to an all time high. This was particularly apparent in the recent refinancing of the national debt. In that instance, Government securities which had cost the taxpayers about 2½ percent were raised to 3⅞ and 4 percent on selected issues, most of which were owned by banks and insurance companies. Here are the flaws in the policy: it is costly, as shown by the tremendous rise in the cost of financing the national debt; it discriminates between small and weak borrowers and large corporate interests; it is ineffective; and it is not only potentially dangerous, but has actually been one of the principal contributing features to the present depression striking large segments of the economy and which has put out of work about 3.7 millions of workers.

Unless this hard money policy is relaxed further, at once, the probability is that the depression will worsen substantially before Fall. Already 5 to 7 million unemployed are predicted for later this year.

A well known and respected economist recently said that never had a recession struck the American economy which was so easy to correct. He referred to the possibility of Federal action in this field.

The only guise under which the administration has retained this hard money policy has been the claim that it would counteract inflation and that it would halt the spending on which inflation was blamed. It is interesting to note that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board himself admitted that this policy had been ineffective. He said:

> The economy has been undergoing a capital gains boom and the capital industries as well as industries requiring heavy capital investment are generally characterized by large-scale enterprises.

This means simply this, the big industries have been expanded tremendously; no one denies that. The little industries and the small businesses have been unable to expand and have been unable to get risk capital and short term capital just to carry them over tough times. The high interest, hard money program of this government has made things equally impossible for farmers. It is very interesting to note that the inflation this policy was to control persisted at a time when there was unemployment, and substantial surplus industrial capacity.

A very grave warning to the people of this country should be the fact that depressions and substantial periods of economic hardship in this country have always been preceded by periods of extremely high interest rates.

The present administration has deliberately fostered these high interest rates, perhaps as a payoff to certain supporters. Large corporations and big industries do not suffer under such monetary policy. These corporations can finance from earnings as they have been during the last few years. They can and do pass higher interest charges along to the customer. Such a thing cannot be done by the little fellow.

The President and the Federal Reserve Board must act to further reduce this rediscount rate. No denial by the administration will suffice to disprove the fact that this is an administration-Federal Reserve policy. The two have been working hand in hand to bring about high interest and a reduced amount of loanable funds available. Unless this policy is changed forthwith, the number of unemployed in this country is going to rocket above the 3.7 million at which it is presently, and higher than the 5 million plus forecast by the administration for later in the year. Forty-five major industrial centers are already classed as areas of substantial unemployment with 6 percent or more of the worker force unemployed. My own city of Detroit is among them, with 8 percent or 123,000 out of work. Worse, 200,000 or 6.8 percent of all the workers of Michigan are unemployed. Other States and cities are similarly affected.

This should be in and of itself adequate warning to bring further action now.

## THE EFFECT OF THE BUDGET ON SOCIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there were many of us who were deeply disturbed at the proposals contained in the President's budget as they affected Federal programs relating to the welfare of the people. Over the years these programs were established as a result of a vigorous and nationwide demand that the Federal Government assume its rightful role in promoting the general welfare of the people—all of the people and not a select few.

The Eisenhower budget represents a frontal attack upon these groups. Its true import has been clearly summed up by Mrs. Katie Louchheim, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in a statement issued on January 14.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Louchheim's statement be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The statement by Mrs. Louchheim follows:

> The biggest missile the Eisenhower budget proposes to launch is aimed directly at the American people—into the heart of their health, welfare, and education programs.
>
> The President has literally declared war on the social legislation that has been the hallmark of our modern democracy. He has withdrawn his support from the modest overall education effort he suggested last year and he is asking Congress to enact legislation cutting into vital health and welfare programs.
>
> His proposals mean reduction of hospital construction, reduction of disability pensions for veterans, reduction of health insurance for Federal employees. And while no specific proposals are announced, indications are that there will be cutbacks in Federal funds to States on assistance to the needy aged,

dependent children, the blind, and the totally disabled as well.

In his budget, the President has either completely abandoned programs such as assistance to mentally retarded children, children with hearing and speech defects, and juvenile delinquents, or he has adopted the National Association of Manufacturers and chamber of commerce line of "return it to the States and localities"—a line which when properly translated, means kill the program.

The President completely ignores the challenge of the growing suburbs when he proposes cutbacks affecting housing, sewage disposal, and education projects. He strikes at the cities with further limitations on vital slum clearance and urban-renewal planning.

A 2½-percent increase in defense spending at this time does not justify an attempt to turn the clock back a quarter of a century.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. SANTANGELO) for the balance of the week on account of death in the family.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, for 20 minutes today.

Mr. REUSS, for 60 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. REUSS), for 30 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. UDALL (at the request of Mr. REUSS), for 30 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. HALE, for 30 minutes today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes on Wednesday next.

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes on Tuesday next.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes on Monday and Tuesday next, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming, for 1 hour on Wednesday next.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 20 minutes on January 27.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHANSEN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BREEDING and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous material.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES (at the request of Mr. FORD).

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCINTOSH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKWORTH.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1503. A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1504. A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1505. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report showing the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government for the quarter ending December 31, 1957, pursuant to section 8031 (c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1506. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of surplus property disposed of during the past year by the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1507. A letter from the Chairman, United States Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 23d Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1508. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the anthracite experiment station operated by the Bureau of Mines at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1957, pursuant to the act of December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1056); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1509. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on claims for damages caused to inhabitants of the United States by fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods, pursuant to section 2 of the act of Congress approved August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 728); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1510. A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report concerning positions in grades GS–16, 17 and 18, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1511. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard, which have been settled by the Treasury, pursuant to section 646 (b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8361. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 439. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 483. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10021. A bill to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957; without amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 10223. A bill to enable former owners of certain property in Hardin County, Ky., to repurchase lands sold by them to the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ADAIR:
H. R. 10224. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Academy of Science and Technology; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANFUSO:
H. R. 10225. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:
H. R. 10226. A bill to amend section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code to limit the use of the Armed Forces to enforce Federal laws or the orders of Federal courts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10227. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the calling of the National Guard into Federal service except in time of war or invasion or upon the request of a State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BREEDING:
H. R. 10228. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:
H. R. 10229. A bill to establish a Commission on the Establishment of a United States Academy of Science; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRD:
H. R. 10230. A bill to establish a program of economic relief for distressed areas through a system of loans and grants-in-aid; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COAD:
H. R. 10231. A bill to maintain the price of basic agricultural commodities at a level of equal relationship to the current income needs of the producer and to protect the economic foundation of the United States and the primary market for manufactured products in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORRESTER:
H. R. 10232. A bill to authorize the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of information intercepted in national security investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:
H. R. 10233. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HÉBERT:
H. R. 10234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent the imposition of more onerous recordkeeping requirements with respect to trade and business expenses of employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:
H. R. 10235. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10236. A bill to require labor organization reports, to insure disclosure of certain labor organization information, to define certain duties and responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to provide further safeguards for workers against improper activities in the conduct of labor organization affairs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. K[illegible]AN:
H. R. 10237. A bill to amend certain subsections of subchapter B of chapter 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:
H. R. 10238. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. R. 10239. A bill to amend certain subsections of subchapter B of chapter 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 10240. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:
H. R. 10241. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agriculture Act of 1949, as amended, relating to the price support on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:
H. R. 10242. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Fair and Exposition, to be held in July 1959 at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:
H. R. 10243. A bill to amend the Clayton Act so as to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies by providing that violations of the Robinson-Patman Act shall constitute violations of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:
H. R. 10244. A bill to facilitate the application and operation of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. PFOST:
H. R. 10245. A bill to add certain lands located in Idaho to the Boise and Payette National Forests; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:
H. R. 10246. A bill to provide that the amount of social security benefit based on disability will not be reduced by any benefit awarded under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or Armed Forces based on disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:
H. R. 10247. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:
H. R. 10248. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:
H. R. 10249. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR:
H. R. 10250. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:
H. R. 10251. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to permit the institution of actions for damages for violations of the Robinson-Patman Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10252. A bill making an appropriation for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:
H. R. 10253. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct 100 nuclear-powered attack submarine vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:
H. R. 10254. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:
H. R. 10255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose import taxes on lead and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLAY:
H. J. Res. 512. Joint resolution to establish the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:
H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to designate the first day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:
H. J. Res. 514. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:
H. Res. 451. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior and all departments of Government to protect Alaska-spawned salmon; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:
H. R. 10256. A bill for the relief of Leonora Holmes Mola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:
H. R. 10257. A bill for the relief of Jolanda Ferretti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:
H. R. 10258. A bill for the relief of Alberto Altarach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:
H. R. 10259. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Baseggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:
H. R. 10260. A bill for the relief of Natale H. Bellocchi and Oscar R. Edmondson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:
H. R. 10261. A bill for the relief of Karnail Singh Mahal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:
H. R. 10262. A bill for the relief of Kurt Rietmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:
H. R. 10263. A bill for the relief of Francis M. Haischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:
H. R. 10264. A bill for the relief of Pastor Baltazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:
H. R. 10265. A bill for the relief of George Kharouf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

365. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Otis Loper, Weldon, Tex., seeking a redress of grievance relative to requesting an investigation of a court action taken against him, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-eight Questionnaire on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT**
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today announcing the results of a recent questionnaire of voter opinions in Florida's Second Congressional District, as follows:

| | Percent | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | No opinion |
| Do you favor a law or constitutional amendment allowing States to have segregated schools for children of parents who so request, if integrated schools of same quality are provided for children whose parents request integration? | 79.6 | 15.3 | 5.1 |
| Do you favor stepping up aircraft-rocket-missile phases of the United States defense effort, even if it means higher taxes? | 77.1 | 15.3 | 7.6 |
| Do you favor using Federal funds to give scholarships to United States boys and girls who want to be educated as scientists and engineers? | 73.6 | 20.1 | 6.3 |
| Do you favor the "tight-money" policy which is used on the theory that it will curb inflation? | 34.7 | 46.1 | 19.2 |
| If the United States takes in more money than it spends, would you want to reduce taxes instead of reducing the national debt? | 43.3 | 48.6 | 8.1 |

This questionnaire was in the form of a self-addressed postal card enclosed in an annual report sent on January 2, 1958, to all registered voters in Duval and Clay Counties, which counties comprise the district. Over 20,000 replies have been received and several thousand additional replies may be expected, but the additional replies would not be numerous enough to change the results.

One hundred and fifty thousand questionnaires were mailed, and of these 10,000 were returned for inadequate addresses. About one of every seven voters contacted has replied on the questionnaire.

I deeply appreciate the cooperation of so many citizens of our district in making their views known on important questions before our country today. The results of the questionnaires were very interesting and will be very helpful in understanding the thinking of the people of our district. I make the results available to other Congressmen as an indication of American sentiment today.

Although the questionnaire had no designated space for comments, many constituents did comment, and the following are some samples:

On the first question:

No; the 10th amendment says schooling is a thing of the State not the Federal Government.

No; obey the Constitution and abolish segregation.

No; no integration at all.

No; segregate by sex, instead.

Yes; during a reasonable period of time, 10 or 15 years.

Yes; I favor segregation, period, but if this is the best we can do; yes.

On the second question:

Yes; we want a sputnik but not at the expense of wasting a lot of money. We should not get hysterical.

Yes; for submarine launchers of missiles.

On the third question:

Yes; for those who cannot afford it.

Why not a loan?

Yes; if they will enter United States Government service; otherwise not.

No; keep the Federal Government out of schools.

Yes; if in public schools only.

Yes; if it is done in same manner as GI schooling—all schools including private and church schools.

Yes; for postgraduate work only.

No; United States needs more statesmen, has plenty of scientists.

On the fourth question the only comment was:

Boy, we've got it.

On the fifth question:

Yes; if the economic condition of the country is favorable; if business is off, cut taxes.

No; half and half.

Two commented on this:

Yes, that will be the day; and no, that will be the day.

## Tribute to Former Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EDWARD MARTIN**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on October 16, 1957, at Columbus, Ohio, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce devoted its 64th annual banquet program to honoring the Honorable George M. Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury, for his distinguished career in business and Government.

In praising the public service of Mr. Humphrey during his nearly 4½-year tenure as Secretary of the Treasury, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce cited his influence for the national welfare in many historic achievements. These included:

First. The fight against deficit financing.

Second. Balancing the budget for three successive periods, thus keeping the Nation's economy remarkably stable during a period of heavy inflationary pressure.

Third. Removal of wage and price controls.

Fourth. Holding the rising cost of living to 3 or 4 points in 4 years.

Fifth. Formulating the fiscal policy that resulted in recordbreaking peacetime prosperity.

Sixth. Recodification and modernization of the Federal tax laws, the first of its kind since 1876.

Seventh. The reduction of taxes amounting to $7½ billion.

Both of our distinguished colleagues from Ohio, Senator Bricker and Senator Lausche, as well as the distinguished Governor of Ohio, the Honorable C. William O'Neill, joined in paying tribute to the guest of honor and his accomplishments.

Mr. President, because the honors conferred upon Mr. Humphrey were so richly deserved and so eloquently expressed, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Senator Bricker, Senator Lausche, Governor O'Neill, and also the response by the former Secretary of the Treasury.

In connection with this request, I submit a statement from the Public Printer estimating the cost of such insertion in the RECORD at $189; but, by reason of its importance, I nevertheless ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN W. BRICKER, SENIOR UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OHIO

It is a great honor and privilege for me to say a few words tonight about our distinguished friend, George Humphrey, and his accomplishments as Secretary of the Treasury. George Humphrey was the chief architect and engineer of the conservative economic policies pursued by the Eisenhower administration.

When George Humphrey assumed direction of the Treasury Department in 1952, a series of scandals had virtually destroyed public confidence in its Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Treasury, instead of setting prudent monetary, credit and fiscal policies for the entire executive branch of the Government, was then engaged in underwriting the deficits generated by the uncoordinated and reckless spending of individual departments and agencies.

To restore absolute personal honesty and integrity in the handling of billions of tax dollars, and to bring fiscal order out of chaos, obviously required talent of a high order. President Eisenhower chose well when he selected George Humphrey to set aright the fiscal policies of our Government.

HUMPHREY PRINCIPLES CREATE PROSPERITY

We are now in a position to assess the results of George Humphrey's administrative and fiscal know-how.

For the fiscal year 1953 the budget resulted in a deficit of $9.4 billion; for fiscal 1956, and for the third year in a row, it will result in a surplus. When George Humphrey took office in 1953, the Federal debt was 89 percent of our national income—in December 1956 it was only 70 percent.

In addition to ending budget deficits and applying budget surpluses to the national debt, the Treasury under his direction succeeded in holding down bank-held debt, in reducing the floating debt, in selling more

E and H savings bonds, and this is most important, in encouraging individual savings.

I might say in passing that when those individual savings reach the capital investment in our country, one of the very obvious holes that is causing the inflation at the present time will have been plugged up.

The end result is our unparalleled prosperity. And here it should be noted that the personal income of individuals rose from $272 billion in 1952 to an estimated $340 billion for 1957.

INFLUENCE EXTENDS BEYOND TREASURY

Administrative and fiscal know-how are rare talents, and more rarely still combined in one man, but these qualities do not begin to explain George Humphrey's success in Washington. He was able to transcend the specialized nature of his job. He had an integrated view of the whole range of governmental problems, foreign as well as domestic, legislative as well as executive. This ability to see all of the forest, without neglecting the many trees entrusted to his care, was reflected in that good sense, reasonableness, candor, and consistency of view which made his advice and counsel the most sought after in Washington.

Another precious ingredient in George Humphrey's makeup is his contagious confidence and his ability to impart that confidence to others. It is not only confidence in himself, but confidence in the future of this great country of ours and, in particular, confidence in the ability of free, competitive enterprise to provide higher standards of living for a growing population.

His philosophy of economic freedom caused him to press boldly and vigorously for the elimination of price and wage controls which, early in 1953, were stifling our economy. His moral philosophy committed him to a relentless, and on the whole, successful fight against inflation, for he knows that deliberate inflation is a form of legalized theft and that the primary victims are those who must live on relatively small and fixed incomes.

SECRETARY PERSONALLY ESTEEMED

George Humphrey's personal popularity in Washington was the more amazing in view of the job he held. A good Secretary of the Treasury must say "No" to the plans of his colleagues in Government much more often than "Yes." If he adheres to his convictions, he must bring to mind Sir Walter Scott's story about his father. When breakfast was served Sir Walter's father would taste the porridge and say to his children, "Aye, bairns, 'tis good porridge—too good," then he would pour water into the porridge so that it might conform more nearly to the Scottish virtue of frugality.

As President Eisenhower's chief fiscal adviser, George Humphrey had to recommend the scaling down of many programs which, even though admirable standing alone, were inconsistent with the administration's larger fight against inflation. Nevertheless, he was able to win the affection and esteem of those whose plans he was compelled to thwart.

A political sixth sense was another rare ingredient in George Humphrey's unqualified success as Secretary of the Treasury. No member of the President's Cabinet enjoyed a better relationship with Members of Congress. We could talk with him because he knew as well as any of us the "art of the possible" and the line of demarcation between reasonable compromise and surrender of principle. Although he always knew what was best as an abstract proposition, he always knew when to yield a foot to prevent the loss of a yard.

A PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

Now that George Humphrey has retired from Government service it is very hard for me to sum up his invaluable contributions to the Nation or adequately express the sense of loss in Washington.

But I want to say this personally, and I say it advisedly, he has been throughout his whole term the strongest man in this administration.

The best I can do is to borrow a phrase from the 13th Chapter of the Book of Matthew and merely say that to President Eisenhower and to the Congress, George Humphrey was what he has always been to his many friends in Ohio, namely, "A pearl of great price."

---

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE FRANK J. LAUSCHE, JUNIOR UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OHIO

Mention was made a moment ago about a Democrat being here. And I want to confess to you that it's rather a little difficult for me to talk, but that difficulty is substantially removed when I am called upon to say a word covering my understanding of the work done by our guest of honor, George M. Humphrey.

In my judgment, nobody in the Senate, or in the House of Congress, or in the administration office, or connected with industry and finance, did more to crystallize the judgment and the thinking of the people in the United States about the problem of excessive spending, and the impact of inflation in our country, than George Humphrey.

It is so simple on the floor of the Senate for my colleagues on my side of the aisle, and frequently on the other side of the aisle, to talk about excessive spending in Government—the damaging fact of inflation—and yet, when bills come before the Congress which would help remedy the condition, they vote in the exact opposite of the word spoken. I've seen it happen and operate in the Senate.

COURAGEOUS LEADERSHIP EXTOLLED

Now, my word to George Humphrey: George, thanks to you for your great leadership in the executive branch of the Government. You, when others were merely speaking, had the courage to take a course intended definitely to combat the evil hanging over the economy of the people of our country.

On the floor of the Senate, day after day, I heard words of condemnation against you. And as I listened I said to myself, "Those very tongues that are speaking in condemnation of George, were every day advocating the passage of bills tending to extravagant spending and having a definite influence lifting, or cheapening the dollar." I thought of you while I was in that Senate.

I watched what you were doing, and I said to myself, "George is trying to do alone what 165 million Americans ought to be doing." And I think there is more truth to that than the bare statement reveals.

You did a great job, you did it at a crucial hour of our country's history, and I think that when the story is told about the administration of 1952–1960, you will be described as the strong man in the Eisenhower administration. Your contribution was magnificent.

CONTRIBUTIONS MERIT TRIBUTE

You earned the tribute that was paid to you in Cleveland, and the tribute that is being paid to you here tonight.

And finally, not as a public official but just as plain American, thanks to you for your courage and your sagacity and devotion to your country. I don't believe the present administration would have succeeded in the degree that it has, if it hadn't been for you.

Figuratively I present you with a laurel tonight, and I express to you my gratitude for your great work. Congratulations.

---

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE C. WILLIAM O'NEILL, GOVERNOR OF OHIO

George Humphrey, as Governor of Ohio—on behalf of your thousands of friends of Cleveland and all across the State—for them I would like to say "Welcome; welcome back to Ohio." We're glad to have you.

George Humphrey, of course, represents the very best in public service. Twice this week I've talked to convocations at colleges—at Denison and Keyon—about young people in public service, and there is no man I know of who would be a better example for young people to follow than George Humphrey.

I had one personal experience with him and his wife which indicated to me how deep the affection for him and Mrs. Humphrey is in Ohio, beyond the business people who appreciate his sound principles and his devotion to the free enterprise system.

PERSONAL POPULARITY ATTESTED

I rode with the Secretary of the Treasury and his wife in the parade from the Public Square in Cleveland to the airport when the President was in Cleveland during the last campaign. And to my amazement all along that trip, through the downtown section, after we crossed the bridge and out through the West Side—all the way to the airport—George, on that day thousands of just ordinary Ohioans were yelling to you—not to me, the candidate for Governor. They didn't even know who I was. To you, it was, "Hi, George." "There's the Secretary." "Hi, Mr. Humphrey."

Just ordinary, average, good Americans who believe in the things that George Humphrey stands for; who love him for his determination; for never losing sight of his objectives, but standing firm against any and all opposition.

OHIO WILL BE LISTENING

They paid their tribute in their simple, friendly salute to a great man in a typical American way. George, the reporters in Washington have often said, "When Mr. Humphrey has something to say, it will be worth listening to."

May I say to you that in Ohio—now that you're back in business and in public affairs—whenever you have something to say we'll be listening also, and following your advice.

God bless you.

---

RESPONSE BY GEORGE M. HUMPHREY, FORMER SECRETARY, TREASURY OF THE UNITED STATES, BOARD CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL STEEL CORP.

I am not only thankful to all of you people for this wonderful tribute, that has been given to me here tonight, but I am thankful to be an American, just a private citizen, living here in the Middle West, where the fruits of freedom are so obviously abundant; the great industries, the rich land, the new homes, and all the material well-being of the great mass of the people that appears on every side.

And I'm thankful for our stalwart citizens who have received the great gift of individual liberty and the freedoms guaranteed to us by our Constitution from their forebears, and are determined to retain them, to protect them, and to pass them on to their children.

This is a fast-moving world. It grows smaller every day. The great protection of our two broad oceans has already been reduced to only a few hours, and bids fair in the near future to bring most of the rest of the world only minutes away.

The tremendous strides of science, not only at home but abroad, are rapidly changing our geography, and with it our relations with the rest of the world. But with all this change, human beings and human nature are still pretty much the same, with similar aspirations, hopes and fears, and largely motivated by the same deep emotions.

Our greatest problem is how and under what circumstances can great numbers of people best live peacefully and prosperously together.

AMERICAN PRINCIPLES ENCOURAGE INDIVIDUAL

What kind of a system of government is best adapted to promote their continually improving standards of living?

Today we have two great ideologies competing for preference. The principles involved are as old as the ages. They are not especially different than the old question of how to get the best out of a donkey, whether with a carrot or a stick.

Communism is based on the principle of the stick, with direction for the masses wholly from a small top command, with the prison camp and living death for the disobedient.

Here in this country, we believe in the dignity of the individual and his freedom of thought and action. We believe in the effectiveness of the carrot, in individual reward for individual endeavor, and for freedom protected for every man to enjoy the fruits of his own effort; to rise to any heights that his talents and industry will take him, just so long as he does not interfere with the equal rights of others.

IMPEDIMENTS TO RUSSIAN PROGRESS

Now progress is being made under both systems. The wonder is not that in Russia they are making so much progress. The wonder rather is that they have not made more. There, 250 to 300 million people are living on the greatest land mass on this earth, in a temperate zone, with great rivers and inland seas, rich lands, and an abundance of some of the world's greatest natural resources.

Long before the Communists seized power, the Russians produced great musicians, great artists, great scientists and technicians. They had a respected place in the world.

Apparently all that is impeding more rapid progress now in raising the low levels of living of the great masses of their people is the form of government they are held under.

In this country, on the other hand, where there is preserved to the people the greatest individual freedom on earth, we have the highest level of living for the greatest number of people that has ever been known, spiritually free to worship and think as they please, and with material benefits that are the wonder of the rest of the world—more homes, more food, more clothing, more jobs, more pay, more cars, more conveniences of every kind, more widespread education, more leisure than ever has been dreamed of before.

CAUTIONS AGAINST HASTY ACTION

The sputnik has shocked some of us out of smug self-satisfaction into realization that scientific achievement is not confined to our own shores. But the real danger of the sputnik, as I see it, is that some too-eager people may now demand hasty and sensational action, regardless of cost and relative merit, in an attempt to surpass what the Russians have done.

Without in any way deprecating Russian progress or power, let's never lose our sense of balance and proportion, and let's always keep in proper perspective the real objective we are trying to preserve. It is our inheritance of individual freedom that is our priceless possession, and it is our solemn obligation to preserve and pass it on.

We must be prepared to protect it militarily, of course. But military strength requires the maintenance of economic strength. The victorious military force is always the one that receives the maximum of supplies and support from home, the superior endurance of which always ultimately determines the victor.

FAILING ECONOMY PERIL TO FREEDOM

A balance between military expenditures and the strength of the economy to support it adequately, and concurrently with the needs of the people, must be maintained. A failing economy would mean the loss of our freedom, with the enemy never firing a shot, just as effectively accomplished as by an all-out attack.

We face a great threat here in America as well as in many other places in the world, the threat of inflation and its destruction of all that we hold dear.

Inflation and the destruction of its money preceded the Communist control of China. It has injured many other countries in the world. It currently presents a most serious problem in France, and recently there has even been pressure on the pound. Within the past few days the Communists have used the destruction of its currency to tighten their grip upon East Germany.

A rapidly rising cost of living beyond control and a continued rapid decline in the value of the dollar could create imbalances in our economy with consequences that would be serious for all of us.

The greatest spur to the pressures of inflation is excessive Government spending. The greatest deterrent to incentive for maximum individual initiative and effort is excessive taxation, and one of the greatest pressures pushing up the cost of living is excessive taxation which is buried in the cost of everything we buy.

FUNDAMENTALS OF STRONG ECONOMY

The age-old precepts of a balanced budget, living within our means, and putting some savings by, are fundamental to the continuing maintenance of our strong economy.

Savings buy the tools that make the jobs that produce the material benefits we all enjoy. Without savings, to provide continually improving tools of production, ever increasing the productivity of human effort, the progress we have made in the past cannot be continued.

Without reduced taxation, the spur of reward for maximum human effort will be less and less effective.

Without control of increasing costs and of inflationary pressures, our money will further depreciate in value; and without sound money, our free competitive economic system can be very seriously impaired or entirely destroyed.

NEED FOR TEMPERATE PUBLIC SPENDING

It is up to you—it is up to all of the people of this country—first to do your own part, to temper your own demands both in prices and wages and purchases and for expenditures by governmental agencies, and see that others do likewise, and then to exert sufficient pressure on your representatives in Government to maintain a proper perspective and balance the cost of our military strength and other governmental expenditures with gradual but continual tax reduction, thus helping both to reduce the cost of living and to increase the reward for ever increasing individual productivity.

In this way, the maintenance of a strong economy will be assured on the basis of old-fashioned principles, which neither a sputnik nor a weekend trip to the moon can ever destroy.

I thank you from the bottom of our hearts for this wonderful tribute.

---

## Ukrainian Independence Day

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable day for Ukrainians everywhere; it is their independence day, the 40th anniversary of that great event which took place on January 22, 1918, even when part of Ukraine was still under alien rule. So many world-shaking events have occurred since that time that we are inclined to forget that important event. It is true that many revolutionary and startling events have altered many things in this world, including man's attitude toward these events, but man himself has remained remarkably unchanged and especially so in his appreciation of freedom and in his willingness to fight and die for it. This is well illustrated by the history of the Ukrainians.

The Ukrainians have endured the oppressive yoke of Russia's ruthless regime, both the Czarist autocratic type and the Communist totalitarian type, longer than any other people. For more than 300 years they have suffered under Russian tyranny and unfortunately they are still suffering under it. But through all these vicissitudes and hardships they have steadfastly clung to their national ideals, and even at the risk of their very lives, have succeeded in keeping these ideals alive. In 1918, when they saw their chance of attaining their independence, they proclaimed it and set up the Ukrainian Republic. Even though they were to lose this most cherished prize in the fall of 1920 under the onslaught of the Red Army, still that day retains its solemn national significance. And its celebration still remains the symbol of freedom and independence. Some 40 million Ukrainians cannot celebrate their sacred national holiday, their independence day, in their homeland, but we in the Free World do it in due solemnity and thus echo their suppressed but undying love for freedom and independence.

---

## Statement by the Honorable John Lesinski, of Michigan, Commemorating the Anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of January 22, 1863

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, commemorating the anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of January 22, 1863, when a group of Polish patriots rose up in arms against their Russian oppressors, I should like to pay tribute to the courage and fortitude of these heroic peoples. Americans of Polish descent can justly be proud of their forebears and of the people in present-day Poland. The Polish people of today are true sons of their ancestors, for they have not lost their fierce desire for independence nor their unyielding will to resist any and all who enslave them. We have seen this evidenced by the Poznan uprising in October 1956,

when the Poles turned once again against Russian oppressors.

Today, we in the free nations of the world have a big stake in the preservation and continuation of Polish culture, for therein lies a potential strength to assist in the never-ceasing battle against the tentacles of Communist domination. Poland has need for economic assistance to maintain her strength. Economic aid to Poland, and to the other enslaved nations, is a sound investment, for any financial aid will result in better food and clothing, desperately needed housing, and more consumer goods. Strong, healthy Poles, continuing their thousand-year tradition in a firm stand on the side of freedom against tyranny, are a great asset to the Free World. Poland's weakness only creates a vacuum for the Russians to spread into.

To those who protest that aid should not be extended to Poland because she is still a communistic country, I point out that Poland is not in the Communist bloc by her own free choice. All Poles hope for genuine free elections and a non-Communist form of government, and to that end, they should be encouraged and supported by the free nations of the world.

Once again, as I did in July 1956, I call upon the United States to extend aid judiciously to the countries behind the Iron Curtain so as to strengthen and secure their economies and eventually lead us into a world in which all peoples will be able to enjoy the freedoms and liberties they seek under governments of their own choosing.

I am glad to note that the President and the Secretary of State have finally agreed that there should be a modification of the veto power in the United Nations and that the satellite nations of Eastern and Central Europe should be allowed to choose the form of government under which they want to live. Having been an advocate of these measures for many years, I am heartened by the administration's formulation of a policy, long overdue, which is definitive and forward looking. Let us hope that actions follow their words.

## A Salute to a Brave People on the 40th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as long as brave men live the idea of freedom will not die. And today—on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence—I salute those brave men and women who dare so much to keep alive the spirit of freedom—so that one day the Ukraine may again be free.

January 22, 1918, was a day of great rejoicing and celebration for the Ukrainian freedom-loving people. It was their day of independence—the day in which this nation of some 40 million God-fearing people proclaimed the birth of their republic. And its people could be justly proud of their distinctive national history. But it was not to be too long before this nation was to feel the tyrannical terror of communism. Famine and genocide swept the land of these proud people. And despite their courageous resistance the Communist rulers took over. Yet the spirit of freedom has never been crushed—nor the hope of freedom been extinguished. For today it burns fervently in the breasts and hearts of these brave people.

So on this the 40th anniversary of their day of independence, I join with my Ukrainian-American friends, and with all people in whom the idea of freedom still lives, in the prayer that the light of independence will in a not too far off day shine on the people of the Ukraine.

## Proposed Reduction of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY**
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the possibility of a renewal of warfare in Korea is of interest to all Americans. Our country suffered more than 150,000 casualties in the Korean war and we are still definitely committed to resist any attack the Red Koreans and Red Chinese might make in this area. Since we are committed to defend South Korea against Communist aggression, we certainly should encourage any other force that would deter or resist such an attack.

The armed forces of the Republic of Korea are a bulwark against Communist aggression, and I have been disturbed to learn that the administration has urged the Korean Government to reduce the size of its forces by 100,000 men. The ROK forces are among the strongest and best equipped in Asia. Since 1953, this Korean Army, together with our small number of men there, has been sufficient to deter the Communists from attacking as they did on that fateful day in June 1950.

We know that North Korea has been building up her armed might, both in equipment and manpower. We cannot know if further aggression would have been attempted had the forces in South Korea been less; but it seems that any material lessening of the forces there might be inviting Communist attack. Should we take such a gamble at this time? I would certainly object, as I believe most Americans would, to sending more troops to Korea to replace the Korean forces which we are suggesting be disbanded. I believe the average American would prefer that Koreans defend their homelands, as they are very willing to do, rather than have Americans perform that duty for them.

During a visit to Korea last summer I talked with many military men, both American and Korean. It was the unanimous opinion of those I talked with that the size of the Korean Army should not be reduced unless more modern arms were provided to compensate for the loss in manpower.

Some people maintain that it is not necessary for South Korea to maintain her present strong armed forces because any war in Korea would immediately develop into an all-out atomic war. That is something we cannot know, but there are good reasons to believe that such might not be the case. A new war might be similar to the last one in which Russia remained so far behind the scene that she did not become actively connected with the military operations. In the event hostilities do occur in Korea, the United States perhaps will have to make a decision as to whether the war will be fought out as a "brush war" or whether it will be an all-out atomic war. That would be a fateful decision for our country to make, and our actions now may save us from having to make such a choice.

I firmly believe that if we allow Korea to maintain her present strong military forces, at least until she has sufficient modern arms, there will be no outbreak of war in this area. Let us not allow another Korean war to start when the Korean people and government want to maintain an armed force of sufficient strength to deter such an attack.

## Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Andrews Sabres

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ROBERT HALE**
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call attention to letters written by the Vice President and by the national commander of the American Legion on the 25th anniversary of the Andrews Sabres, a drum and bugle corps sponsored by the Harold T. Andrews Post 161 American Legion in Portland, Maine. These young people have made a fine record and we believe they are fitting themselves to be outstanding citizens.

The letters follow:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
*Washington, December 10, 1957.*

The ANDREWS SABRES, HAROLD T. ANDREWS POST, No 17, AMERICAN LEGION,
*Portland, Maine.*

*To the Andrews Sabres:*

It is a pleasure to join with your many supporters in offering congratulations on your 25th anniversary.

Throughout our Nation's history, drum and bugle corps have played an important part in community life. No parade or patriotic occasion is complete without such a company to lift the spirits of the viewers.

The Andrews Sabres have made a distinguished record during the past 25 years,

both locally and nationally, in which all of you can justifiably take great pride.

Best wishes to all the members for continued success and happiness in the years ahead.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

---

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
*Indianapolis, Ind., December 18, 1957.*

Mr. WILLIAM M. FOX,
*General Manager, the Andrews Sabres Junior Drum and Bugle Corps, Harold T. Andrews Post, No. 17, the American Legion, Falmouth Foreside, Maine.*

DEAR COMRADE FOX: Word of your unit's 25th anniversary as an American Legion junior drum and bugle corps, which reached me today, occasions this letter of congratulations and best wishes.

Twenty-five years of continuous service to your community, State and Nation is a record few of our junior corps achieve. It is also a record which deserves a sincere word of gratitude from those whom you have helped, and from the organization you have served so generously during all these years.

On behalf of the 3 million Legionnaires who make up the organization I am privileged to lead, congratulations to the Andrews Sabres on their outstanding record of service. It is my sincere personal hope that your silver anniversary year will be highly successful.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. GLEASON, Jr.,
*National Commander.*

---

## Wheat Prices and the 1958 Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today calling for a $2 per bushel price support level for the 1958 harvest of wheat.

The measure provides for amending the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to the effect that notwithstanding any other provision of the law the level of price support for the 1958 harvest of wheat shall be not less than $2 per bushel.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I strongly protested Secretary of Agriculture Benson's April order dropping wheat price supports by 22 cents per bushel, to $1.78 for 1958. Although I am fully aware that under present law where the net supply of wheat is more than 130 percent of the normal supply, Secretary Benson may cut wheat supports to the lowest level possible, 75 percent of parity, I am unalterably opposed to this action which can result only in bankrupting the Nation's commercial wheat producers.

It was not too long ago, in 1946 to 1948, when the price of wheat was $2.25 per bushel and a wheat harvesting combine cost the farmer approximately $2,500 to $2,700; now that same combine sells for about $7,000—and, in comparison, all other farm machinery—and the price of wheat has plummeted down to $1.78 per bushel for the 1958 crop, and may slip even more, to around $1.50 per bushel, or about 60 percent of parity if Mr. Benson has his way.

Mr. Speaker, with the prices paid to the wheat farmer continually declining and with the prices paid by the wheat farmer climbing steadily, this Congress and this administration had best place a more realistic price floor under this country's wheat production, lest we see the wheat farmer of this vast Nation at the point of economic disaster.

---

## Improvements of Operation in Cleveland VA Regional Office Saves Money Without Sacrificing Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration can well be proud of the work being done by its Cleveland regional office. I want to share a summary of the regional manager's annual statement with the membership of the House. It should be a stimulant and a challenge to all departments of our Government.

Cleveland is particularly proud of the 1957 record of the VA regional office as its own William Holsinger manages the vast operation. The area under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office includes some 38 northern Ohio counties, wherein reside more than 715,000 veterans.

Although the number of awards for compensation and pensions has increased from 67,298 on January 1, 1950, to 79,814 as of January 1, 1958, the number of employees of the regional office has been reduced from 1,414 to 609 during this period. In 1950 the annual budget outlay for the office personnel was $7,150,598 whereas this year it is $3,138,031. These real savings have been brought about by improvements in operation and the application of modern business methods. Efforts toward further economies are continuing.

Quality of service has not been sacrificed for economy, however. The volume of work accomplished by the Cleveland office in behalf of our veterans last year is indeed impressive. The office approved vocational training and education for 22,108 veterans, approved 8,147 GI loans—net dollar value in excess of $104 million—arranged for 134,150 medical examinations and treatments, and 8,023 dental treatments. In addition more than 174,000 veterans visited the regional office and its branches to seek information and discuss problems, and an average of 96,019 beneficiary checks were issued each month.

This is a real record of achievement and the hard-working men and women in the Cleveland regional office have every reason to be proud of their endeavors.

## West Indies Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the notable and internationally gratifying progress which the West Indies has accomplished toward federation, in view of the resolution of the fundamental difficulties—constitutional, social, economic—in the interest of independence, in view of the importance of the major questions brought to a happy conclusion, the problem of location of the capital of the West Indies Federation, important as it is, would seem to be proportionally inconsequential. It is, however, a question of considerable importance from two points of view. First of all, to the West Indies components of the Federation the decision upon Trinidad as the proposed capital was not an easy one. After the decision had been made by a commission created for the purpose, clearance of that hurdle led only to another one. It was discovered that the site chosen was that occupied by the United States under a 99-year agreement with the United Kingdom. Not only was this an international agreement—entered into in 1940 and made effective 1941—of major importance to the Western Powers during World War II, it was and is now of major importance strategically. The Inter-American Defense Board would be as dismayed to see the base disappear as would the United States, were Chaguaramas Naval and Air Station to make way for the Federation capital.

It has been proposed by Mr. Norman W. Manley—Chief Minister for the colony of Jamaica and mentioned as possible Prime Minister for the West Indies Federation—that the United States make a gift to the new country of the site of the base. He suggests that St. Lucia offers a splendid natural harbor needed in the pincers area essential to Western defense.

The present base is used to control the path of enemy submarines in the Caribbean directed toward the Panama Canal. It is situated off the coast of South America at such a point as to be an anchor in the United States and Western Hemisphere defense system. In World War II this base, Chaguaramas, was used as a staging point for convoys of tankers with oil and fuel from Venezuela and refineries in Aruba, a Dutch island to the west. It could be used for such a purpose should a new emergency develop. It is a logistic support point for fleet movements to and from the North Atlantic and to the Panama Canal and was used in the war as a base for new ships on shakedown cruises. Chaguaramas is important as a refueling center. This fact was demonstrated during the recent Suez crisis when naval reinforcements were rushed for the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and to the Persian Gulf. It likewise provides logis-

tic support for vessels rounding Cape Horn on the way to or from the Pacific as well as for ship operations in the South Atlantic.

At the base work is in progress on a guided missile tracking station as a part of the South Atlantic testing range. This station, which is being installed by the United States Air Force, is a part of a network along a 5,000-mile range extending from Patrick Air Force Base in Florida to Britain's Ascension Island in the middle of the South Atlantic. Chaguaramas offers a natural deep water harbor which allows cruisers, destroyers, and small craft to tie up in base docks while battleships and aircraft carriers can anchor near shore in a small bay that can easily be closed by antisubmarine nets. For all these reasons the United States finds it difficult not to oppose the West Indian suggestion that it evacuate Chaguaramas.

This base was developed from a swamp by the United States Navy. It is now a park-like area surrounded by scenic beauty and offering manmade comforts. It has proved important to the economy of the island of Trinidad. The base employs about 1,000 local workers and has a worker payroll of $578,000 annually. "It is believed that the Trinidadians would be unhappy to see the base moved, politics notwithstanding"—New York Times, August 11, 1957, page 33. The base is considered to be worth $100 million, the amount invested by the United States Navy. Although it is now a deactivated antisubmarine base maintained by 15 officers and 180 men, it is considered possible to reactivate it upon short notice.

At the London Conference on the subject, July 16–23, 1957, it was decided that a four-party commission for fact finding purposes be constituted. It consists of representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States, the West Indies Federation, and Trinidad. The commission convened on January 13, 1958, and is still in session. It is purportedly studying all aspects of the Chaguaramas question and is to remain in operation until a final report is made to the respective Governments.

Uncle Sam would find it difficult as well as expensive to change this vital Caribbean base. A major source of gratification has been the apparently excellent relationship between the base personnel and the Trinidad population.

To replace this base would not only cost the United States much more than $100 million and probably $300 million, but due to the time element, leave the defense not of the United States but the West Indies Federation itself exposed for several years while a new base is being built. I, therefore, would like to suggest the following:

First. That the United States Government immediately offer to build for the West Indies Federation a capital anywhere they desire in the Trinidad area. This would give the West Indies Federation a designed capital rather than using the present make-shift buildings of the United States naval base. It would allow the defenses of the United States to be maintained without any break at this most crucial moment and it would probably cost the United States of America much less. It would preserve the jobs of the 1,000 native West Indians now working at the base and would provide jobs for thousands more constructing the new Federation capital.

Second. There is no recourse but for the United States to evacuate the base which I am positive will engender a grave and serious ill will on both sides which we do not desire and at this particular moment should be avoided at all costs.

Third. I most seriously recommend that the United States Congress immediately concern itself with the proper changes of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act so that the unjust cost and discriminatory measures of that act concerning the West Indians be changed.

## Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, on His Bill To Increase the Salaries of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H. R. 10240, to strengthen and liberalize the pay structure for 500,000 employees in the postal field service. This bill will bring the postal pay system into line with current practices in major elements of private industry. One of the most serious problems in maintaining efficient postal service is inadequate pay coupled with very limited opportunity for advancement. The postal service not only is losing valuable employees but cannot offer adequate incentives to bring good potential new people into the service.

My bill will correct this condition by making two major changes in the schedules of salaries of postal employees. The first change is a salary increase of approximately 15 percent in the rate of entry into service. New clerks and carriers will enter at $4,220 in place of the present $3,660 rate. Carriers and clerks make up almost two-thirds of all postal employees.

The second feature of my bill is its introduction into the postal salary schedules—for the first time in any Government activity—of the modern concept of providing a real incentive through early advancement to higher salaries. Under my bill an employee who serves 6 months at the initial salary rate will receive a $325 raise, if he is a carrier or clerk, and be placed in the second salary step. Thereafter, upon completion of each year of satisfactory service, he will move successively upward by $125 raises until he reaches $5,020 at the end of the third year.

This is a tremendous improvement over the present system which is already outdated. Presently, a carrier or clerk begins at $3,660 and, after each year of satisfactory service, gets a $125 raise until he reaches a maximum of $4,410 after 6 complete years. My bill in addition preserves the present plan of further increases for length of service which can add $375 more to the top salary of a clerk or carrier who has a certain period of total service. The bill provides rules for converting employees from the old to the new pay schedule in a manner which will preserve and protect seniority rights of all employees.

Comparable benefits are granted for 30,000 rural carriers and all postmasters in post offices of the fourth class, thus rounding out a vastly improved postal pay plan which has strong support from postal employee organizations and many Members of Congress.

## Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainians are one of the oldest, largest, and most gifted national groups in all of Europe. They have been among the bravest who have fought for their individual and national freedom. For centuries they have suffered unspeakable hardships under alien regimes, yet they have never abandoned their aspiration to be free and independent. Under the ruthless, callous, and almost inhuman Austrian and Russian autocracies they succeeded in maintaining their spirit of independence and managed to safeguard many of their cherished national and cultural traits. They never gave up hope for freedom from the clutches of those detested autocratic regimes.

For centuries their sole national goal had been to attain national political independence. And in 1918 they had the opportunity. When the Russian autocracy was overthrown and the Austrian monarchy was about to share a similar fate, the Ukrainians felt free to declare their independence. At once they tried to consolidate their power and strengthen the newly proclaimed Republic. But they were not fortunate and powerful enough to succeed in their effort. Before they had the chance to enjoy the fruits of freedom they were fighting for the life of their national independence on numerous fronts—against the Poles, against the Czechs, and of course against the deadly Russian Communists. At last overwhelmed, they surrendered their independence and their country to the Red Army in November of 1920. That was the untimely end of the independent Ukraine.

Since then, for more than 37 years some 40 million Ukrainians have been living under Communist tyranny. Their beloved homeland has become a vast prison camp where they have little more freedom than a man in jail. There the

Ukrainians are denied all the freedoms they have regarded as their birthright. They are not even permitted to celebrate their independence day. But we in the Free World, and particularly in this country are proud to celebrate the 40th anniversary of this memorable day. Our most ardent hope is that the time will come when Ukrainians in Ukraine will be free to celebrate this holiday in their beloved homeland as free and independent citizens.

## Is the Lid Off?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], has been performing a valuable service to the taxpayers in its efforts to curtail unnecessary filling of Federal job vacancies.

Through the largely nonpartisan efforts of this subcommittee progress has been made, though by no means as substantial as the situation warrants. In some instances the efforts of the subcommittee have been frustrated by the double talk and evasions from within departments and agencies. In some instances the best the subcommittee has been able to do is to fight a vigorous rearguard action.

Currently there are indications that the lid is off so far as Federal employment is concerned.

Because of two current striking examples of this trend, I have taken the action described in the following statement which I made public today and which is included here under permission to extend and revise my remarks:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

I have today requested the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to call subcommittee hearings at the earliest possible date for a thorough inquiry into startling increases in Federal employment in the Defense Department and the International Cooperation Administration.

Defense Secretary McElroy yesterday announced plans to employ 25,000 additional personnel. While I favor all effective action to step up national defense, I believe a sudden increase in personnel of this size calls for very thorough and specific explanation and justification.

In subcommittee hearings last November we learned of a 30 to 40 percent increase within a year's time in employment in the International Cooperation Administration—the foreign-aid Agency. The State Department witness before us at that time advised he was unable to report on this Agency's employment picture and I then urged a thorough inquiry into this matter upon the reconvening of Congress.

There is real danger, in my judgment, that the empire builders will exploit the present situation to recklessly expand Federal civilian employment, already well over the 2,300,000 mark.

I intend to press for action on scheduling of early hearings at an executive session of the subcommittee called for Friday morning, January 24.

## Civil-Rights Legislation in 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when I returned home in September, I had the honor to make a speech on the civil-rights legislation which finally was enacted by Congress last year. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the comments which I made on last September 17 before the Anti-Defamation League.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION, 1957

(Speech by Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, United States Senator, before Pacific Southwest Board, Anti-Defamation League, of B'nai B'rith, in Los Angeles, September 17, 1957)

The legislative record of the first session of the 85th Congress now is complete and already has been subjected to appraisal by the people of this Nation from President Eisenhower down.

Whether or not the accomplishments give cause for overall satisfaction, the Congress in 1957 accomplished something that has not been achieved for close to an entire century. The first session breathed life into two vital provisions of our Constitution, the 14th and 15th amendments, which have been little more than pious declarations since their adoption nearly 90 years ago.

As all of you are aware, the Congress so recently adjourned passed the first civil-rights bill in modern American history, implementing those two amendments which were direct result of the tragic and lamentable Civil War. This new act may not be acceptable to its opponents and unquestionably falls short of the desires of its supporters. Yet I believe that this measure represents true, substantial progress and, I submit, will be deemed by historians of the future a material achievement.

The history of civil-rights legislation is a long and tortuous one. It dates far back of 1957. I am not so idealistic as to believe that this measure is a final guaranty that all rights bestowed by our Constitution will be fully enjoyed by all of our people. The reaction of elected officials and citizens in some of our States clearly indicates that the fight to stamp out discrimination will go on, that delaying actions have just begun in some quarters, that evasive tactics are being devised, and that subterfuges and roundabout methods may be employed to perpetuate practices and customs which Congress has emphatically shown a majority is determined to wipe out.

The campaign to assure full enjoyment of civil rights began in the Reconstruction Era. The objectives of that campaign were set forth in three approved constitutional amendments designed to raise the Negro from slavery to citizenship. That campaign has continued as immigration brought other groups of foreign born to our shores and resulted in virtual colonization of some cities, counties, and States by large numbers of residents from other lands. Today the phrase "civil rights" has broad significance and the problem of assuring their enjoyment unfortunately is presented over wide areas of our Nation.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 is a determined, laboriously fabricated effort to give reality to the basic American principles of the Declaration of Independence. This legislation was enacted in harmony with self-evident truths that all men are created equal and are endowed with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Furthermore, it is in complete accord with traditional constitutional practice, for the Congress was given the responsibility of adopting "appropriate legislation" for the enforcement of the 13th amendment abolishing slavery, the 14th amendment known as the "due process" amendment which assures equal treatment for all citizens, and the 15th amendment forbidding denial of the right to vote.

I am sure you are familiar with their substance. However, I wish to quote them briefly, because I believe firmly that the new civil-rights legislation is neither unconstitutional nor a fearsome new extension of Federal powers as was emotionally alleged in the Congress. I differ diametrically with the opponents of this bill on this score.

The heart of the 14th, or due process, amendment, is the statement that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States * * * are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

The 15th amendment is an unequivocal guaranty which leaves no doubt of the intent of its authors. It asserts "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 is a long stride toward preventing abridgement of the privileges and immunities referred to in these two firmly entrenched articles of our American charter. As an unhesitating supporter of that legislation I maintain it is wholly consistent with the ideals of our Constitution. How else, I ask, can we avert in the future shameful incidents such as occurred as recently as 1956 when in certain sectors of the Nation voting rosters and registration lists were arbitrarily purged of names of citizens solely by reason of their race?

Despite the alarms and apprehensions of the diehard faction which fought this 1957 act to the final rollcall, the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is simply a reasoned attempt to enforce the 14th and 15th amendments and to give substance to the guaranties of rights entrusted to the protection of the Federal Government. This law creates no new crimes. Neither does it add new punishments or sanctions. All we seek to secure is equal protection under our Constitution, the supreme law of the land, through a more effective and reliable procedure.

I should like to recall for you that efforts to provide more certain enjoyment of civil rights have been made almost constantly since 1890. Over that span of time, every civil-rights bill up to 1957 has been killed by resort to an undemocratic method, a repugnant device, of talking such proposals to death. The shoals of Senate filibusters repeatedly wrecked measures approved by the House of Representatives or, in a few rare instances, brought to the floor from a Senate committee. The formidable weapon of unrestricted wholly unrelevant debate killed measures for supervision of elections,

to stamp out lynching and to abolish poll taxes.

During the postwar years, sentiment for meaningful guaranties of civil rights reached such proportions that effective enforcement no longer could be denied by a small, die-hard minority. For within the past two decades, America has shouldered arms to end the menace of malevolent dictatorships and has participated in a cold war to halt enslavement of independent nations by the insidious tentacles of Godless communism. Inevitably, our people awakened to the tremendous moral implication of racial discrimination and oppression within our own borders.

Our Nation has approached the goal of equality as closely as is possible through administrative and judicial routes. We have wiped out discrimination in the armed services, within the civilian departments of the Federal Government, and among employees of Federal contractors. In a series of monumental decisions, the Supreme Court has eliminated the double standard among our people in such fields as public education, transportation, and housing. The next move obviously was up to Congress and I am proud to have been one who saw that it was made boldly and successfully.

Incidentally, I should like to note that I have been an earnest, a sincere believer in civil rights legislation throughout my lifetime. My support of the bill just enacted was no belated affectation. I was a cosponsor in the 84th Congress and again, early in the most recent session, of a variety of bills designed to assure full freedom of the ballot, to provide protection against discrimination and intimidation, and to establish enforcement machinery in the Justice Department. I joined in proposing several bills because I subscribe without reservation to the heart-warming declaration in the 1956 Republican platform, which said:

"The Republican Party points to an impressive record of accomplishment in the field of civil rights and commits itself anew to advancing the rights of all our people regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"Segregation has been ended in the District of Columbia government and in the District public facilities, including public schools, restaurants, theaters, and playgrounds. The Eisenhower administration has eliminated discrimination in all Federal employment.

"Great progress has been made in eliminating employment discrimination on the part of those who do business with the Federal Government and secure Federal contracts. This administration has impartially enforced Federal civil rights statutes, and we pledge that we will continue to do so. We support the enactment of the civil rights program already presented by the President to the second session of the 84th Congress."

This plank, parenthetically, had a counterpart—perhaps not quite as positive in all aspects—in the Democratic platform of last year. That great party, which for generations has been torn and divided by the issue of equality for all citizens, laid the groundwork for bipartisan action with the following statement:

"We are proud of the record of the Democratic Party in securing equality of treatment and opportunity in the Nation's Armed Forces, the civil service, and in all areas under Federal jurisdiction. The Democratic Party pledges itself to continue its efforts to eliminate illegal discriminations of all kinds in relation to (1) full rights to vote, (2) full rights to engage in gainful occupations, (3) full rights to enjoy security of the person, and (4) full rights to education in all publicly supported institutions."

Thus, in conformity with the foregoing pledges to the American people, a majority of both parties in both Chambers of Congress discharged a longstanding debt to our present and future citizens.

I am not so starry eyed, so sanguine as to believe that the Civil Rights Act of 1957 means an automatic end to discrimination. This is no more likely to happen than has been immediate, universal acceptance of the Supreme Court's unanimous ruling against segregation in public educational institutions. The job is only partially finished, as far as Congress is concerned.

In this connection, I am unswervingly persuaded that the Senate of the United States must repudiate the repulsive device of a filibuster. When the time comes to close loopholes which may be discovered in the Civil Rights Act of 1957, an uncompromising minority must not hamstring the legislative processes.

Even though the last session saw only a last-ditch, vest-pocket, one-man attempt to block action through a 24-hour day and night talkathon, I shall continue to demand and to work for a practicable cloture rule which will protect full debate, but prevent filibustering. I feel today as I did shortly after first taking my seat in 1953, when I supported a change in the rules so that after full discussion, Senators would be required to vote. From the small handful of us who opposed the filibuster 4 years ago, our ranks grew considerably when the roll was called on the same question this last January. While we did not achieve a majority, we numbered 38 votes for a rules change, against 55 who opposed a change. In the not too distant future, I feel assured, this undemocratic anachronism will be wiped away by a bipartisan majority of United States Senators.

Even before the 1957 civil-rights bill was signed by President Eisenhower, thought was being given in many quarters about ways of frustrating or evading it. Therefore it appears worthwhile to review this bill.

In original form, submitted by President Eisenhower after being prepared by his Attorney General, the measure had four separate and different sections. All who followed its course through Congress—which I assume means all of you here—and who particularly observed the weeks of the Senate debate realize what emerged was vastly different in several regards. One major feature—section III—was removed entirely and the provisions designed to bring compliance with court orders were materially altered.

The first part of the bill, which drew little attention, provided for creation in the executive branch of the Government of a Commission on Civil Rights and set up a new office of Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights in the Department of Justice. Both of these features were similar to the provisions and purposes of two proposals on which my name appeared as coauthor in 1956 and 1957.

The heavy artillery was brought to bear against sections III and IV, especially in the Senate where the far-reaching changes finally were wrought in the administration's plan. Before the shooting and shouting in the Senate, this four-section bill was studied carefully by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, and received a favorable report. After being recommended for passage, the measure was subjected to exasperating delay in the House Rules Committee, where 22 witnesses endeavored to bottle it up forever. Ultimately the measure reached the House floor and following about 2 weeks' debate, was passed intact by a decisive vote of 286 to 126.

Meanwhile, a filibuster of sorts was raging off the floor of the Senate. A time-consuming, pettifogging series of hearings and then discussions went on in the Judiciary Committee, obviously designed to wear out, to exhaust, and to discourage the advocates of meaningful legislation. The Senate committee proceedings were ominous and provided full justification for steps taken later to obtain consideration on the Senate floor.

In reply to protestations of opponents that great progress has been made in providing equal treatment, Warren Olney, a native Californian who has been serving throughout the Eisenhower administration as an Assistant Attorney General, punctured arguments that enforcement measures are unnecessary. In testimony before a Senate subcommittee, he revealed a miserable situation in several sections of one American State where Negro citizens had been stripped, clearly, fraudulently, and arrogantly, of their right to vote. The Department of Justice, aided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation documented again and again in various areas, instances where citizens—Negroes—were prevented from registering to vote, or were frustrated in their attempts to register through shabby and contemptible tactics by local registration officials, or, after registering, were prevented from voting through sham challenges which made a mockery of constitutional guaranties.

You will recall that in both Chambers of Congress the hottest emotions were worked up about the question of trial by jury for persons accused of denying civil rights. There is grave doubt that all of the emotion was generated by concern for a traditional American method of dispensing justice. But without commenting on the motives of those who advocated a jury-trial amendment, I wish to recall what happened in Louisiana when our Federal law enforcement authorities acted to see that justice was done. A Federal grand jury heard evidence from three parishes, returned no indictment, and reported it did not desire to hear further testimony. The Justice Department calculates, despite this turn of events, that in Ouachita Parish alone "there were in excess of 3,600 Negroes voters deprived of the right to vote in the general election of November 6."

In spite of 2 weeks and almost 1,000 pages of hearings, liberally filled with information of this type and other testimony about beatings and intimidation, the Senate Judiciary Committee gave no intention of reporting remedial legislation. In fact, no civil rights bill has emerged from that committee since 1950.

Therefore, the fight took an unusual turn. As soon as the House placed its stamp of approval on the bill, a unique and extremely well-managed parliamentary maneuver saved the legislation from being sent to oblivion in the hostile Senate Judiciary Committee. My two colleagues from California, Vice President NIXON and Minority Leader KNOWLAND gave the majority of the Senate a square and fair chance to dispose of the issue. Senator KNOWLAND moved to take the bill up directly for debate. That was a crucial moment. And after a sharp debate, climaxed by a courageous ruling by the Vice President, Senator KNOWLAND's motion was carried.

The importance of this parliamentary feat should not be underestimated. Even though many Senators feared to utilize this little known rule of procedure, the decision to proceed without further committee consideration meant that the whole debate would take place in the Senate itself. The Senate thus effectively thwarted any attempts to bury the bill in committee. The Senate made sure the entire Nation knew through day-to-day reports how the opposition conducted itself, what amendments and alterations were proposed and by whom.

While passions were unstirred, the most vigorous discussion was accompanied, in my estimation, by exaggerated fears and unwarranted apprehensions. The strongest assaults on sections III and IV raised specters of armed Federal troops invading quiet communities and medieval penalties being handed out by judicial tyrants. Opponents of

the bill as presented unjustifiedly argued that the proposed law provided new and inhuman punishments and set forth a wholly new type of offenses.

The net effect of section III—while finally stricken on a vote which I vehemently opposed—would have been to enable the Attorney General to institute a civil action or proceeding for preventive relief on behalf of an injured party. It merely strengthened enforcement possibilities of the earliest Civil Rights Acts, which are and for long years have been sections 1980 and 1343 of the Revised Statutes. In simple language, section III meant that a person with a real grievance no longer had to wait for an offense to be committed before asking for governmental aid. This feature would have prevented violations in advance instead of requiring a delay until the violations occurred and the damage had been done. The purpose was merely to afford preventive relief.

The question before the Senate was simple, in my estimation. It was: Should the United States Government be authorized by Federal court through equitable action to prevent the violation of any person's civil rights? It was possible of only one answer. Do not forget that a whole multitude of rights stem from the United States Constitution. All are equally precious, equally cherished. Federal law establishes basic constitutional rights of our people and then seeks to protect each citizen in the enjoyment of those rights. Title III did not enlarge the field of civil rights. On the contrary, its sole and only purpose was to provide an additional remedy, one neither novel nor fantastic, by which the rights might be assured.

There are worthy precedents for taking such action as was proposed in section III. One notable case occurred in our own State. The Supreme Court, in a decision rendered more than 70 years ago in *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* held it was a violation of the 14th amendment—the very feature of the Constitution at issue in the recent debate—to administer an ordinance regulating laundries in such a way as to discriminate against Chinese laundrymen.

In the Senate debate, I referred several times to a letter which Attorney General Brownell wrote Senator CASE of New Jersey and me when we first became aware of the fight brewing against section III. The chief law officer of the Federal Government assured us there was no hidden purpose in that feature of the proposed law. He told my colleague and me: "Suits for preventive relief under the proposed legislation will be governed by the traditional rules of procedure which have always applied to such suits." He said further, "these procedural protections are ample to protect all legitimate rights of the defendant." Furthermore, Attorney General Brownell noted, the appeal procedure was available so that any aggrieved defendant could take his case to the highest tribunal in the land.

Despite these assertions, opponents won this round and so this civil-enforcement method was withheld from our Government. In fairness, I must acknowledge that many sincere civil-rights advocates were disturbed lest a flood of lawsuits and time-consuming appeals would injure, rather than improve, race relations.

After this skirmish, opponents of the bill tried to pull its remaining effectiveness. Their fire was directed at the feature which gives the Attorney General power to intervene directly and seek injunctions in instances where the right to vote was in jeopardy.

The right of franchise, the right to cast a ballot, is one of the most jealously guarded and most basic of all American rights. It lies at the very heart of democratic government. It is fundamental. Yet the commotion raised over procedural means of protecting it swelled to tremendous proportions and, I fear, actually obscured the real issue.

A veritable mountain of misinformation was built up around the so-called jury-trial amendment offered to section IV. I listened intently to all the debate but still feel the southern emphasis on the so-called constitutional right to trial by jury was irrelevant and unwarranted.

Our Constitution, in article II, section 2, guarantees that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury." And articles VI and VII of the Bill of Rights provide for jury trials in all criminal prosecutions and in all civil cases where the value in controversy exceeds $20. All of us believe in this.

But—and this is the crux of the matter—the cases that would arise under this procedure are not criminal cases. They are cases in equity—an entirely distinct type of legal proceeding—which could arise only after a civil action had been filed, an answer made, a hearing held, and testimony adduced. A right of appeal was preserved. When, however, the order of the court became final, a breach of it, a violation of it, a disregard of it, could, and should, subject the defendant to a hearing before the court to determine, by evidence, if the defendant had treated the court's order contemptuously, and, if so, what penalty against the defendant the court determined to assess. Punishment, by fine or jail sentence, could arise only after the defendant had flouted an order of a Federal court, and then, not simply by way of punishment, but also by way of compelling the defendant to comply.

For centuries the structure and independence of the judiciary have required the power of enforcement of decisions legally reached. Inherent in English common law and practice, this power to "punish by fine or imprisonment at the discretion of said courts all contempt of authority in any cause or hearing of the same" was conferred upon all elements of our American judicial system by the Judiciary Act of 1789. The Supreme Court in a controlling decision declared that existence of the power to punish contempt "is essential to the preservation of order in judicial proceedings * * * and consequently to the due administration of justice."

The debate on this score was not without touches of irony. Some Senators who were most fervent advocates of jury trials in contempt cases arising under the Civil Rights Act come from States where there is absolutely no provision at all for jury trials in State court contempt violations. There are only five States in the whole Nation where trial by jury is specifically granted in contempt cases, and in even those five it is hedged and limited by restrictions and circumstances. In every other State—North, South, East, and West—a court's power to uphold its equity judgments is unfettered and unhindered, as, to many of us, it should be.

Besides a continual harping upon the constitutional right to jury trial—which I maintain was and is quite irrelevant—some of the supporters of the jury-trial amendment were guilty of distortion and misinterpretation. Their references to procedures under the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914 confused and bewildered many laymen. The Clayton Act is far from comparable. Suffice to say, almost every conceivable strategem was used, intentionally or mistakenly, to implant a fear in the Congress and in the country that the constitutional right of trial by jury was in danger of being lost. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Out of the furore over this feature of the bill came one commendable addition, one distinct improvement. In order to insure fairer composition of juries trying contempt cases, under their amendment, opponents made a progressive concession. They agreed to a further amendment providing that potential jurors were not to be excluded from lists of juries on grounds of race. This theoretically should insure a more representative cross section of the community. Whether it will secure more effective punishment of civil-rights violators is, at the very least, problematical. At any rate, a majority of the Senate adopted the amendment authorizing jury trials to determine whether a Federal court's order had been broken, before a defendant could be found in contempt of court. As I say, this amendment also provided that the race of a citizen shall not be grounds for his exclusion from a jury panel.

In roughly 30 days, the Senate threshed out these issues and ultimately passed the first civil-rights bill ever to escape a filibuster by the resounding vote of 79 to 18. The rollcall was almost universal acknowledgment of national responsibility.

The fight did not end with that crucial tally. In fact, new and ominous signs of bitterness and prejudice flared as the measure approved by the Senate was returned to the House for consideration of the sweeping revisions and far-reaching changes. For the first time, the spirit of conciliation, the desire to face the problem in statesmanlike fashion, threatened to break down. An impasse seemingly had been reached and the gains almost within our Nation's grasp appeared in grave danger of being lost in acrimony and jealousy.

To end the deadlock, a novel formula was devised in the nature of a compromise in the jury-trial features. This final amendment limited the punishment which might be imposed by a judge in the absence of a jury. This device cleared the way for final passage in the House, by the larger vote of 279 to 97, and after the vest-pocket one-man filibuster in the Senate the perfected bill was approved by a decisive count of 60 to 15.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 carries immeasurable significance. Its passage, climaxing vigorous debate and difficult negotiations, marks a new era, one of national responsibility, and approach to higher morality. It is a demonstration of practical idealism. In a world divided into two hostile camps, in a civilization threatened by ceaseless Communist blows against freedom, we have reinforced the dignity of citizenship, under the American constitutional system.

The 85th Congress will be remembered for its forward progress in the field of civil rights. In a very real sense, it met the challenge, enunciated almost half a century ago by a great leader of his generation:

"This is not a day of triumph; it is a day of dedication. Here muster, not the forces of party, but the forces of humanity. Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try?"

---

## Michael Donohoe

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I report the recent death of a good friend of mine who was a Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania, from 1911 to 1915. He was the Honorable Michael Donohoe, a neighbor whom I knew all my life. He was an

ardent Democrat and a tireless worker for the welfare of the people of his district, which was the same district I now represent. He was very active in the civic and political affairs of Philadelphia, a man highly respected and beloved by all who were privileged to know him. He was born in Killeshandra, Ireland, February 22, 1864, and attended the national schools and also a private classical school in his native village. At the age of 20 he obtained a teacher's certificate and taught as principal of a national school for 2 years, then resigned and came to Philadelphia in 1886. He had a lively interest in Irish literary, historical, and cultural activities for many years, and was president emeritus of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

We in Philadelphia shall miss this distinguished gentleman who has left his mark on our society, and I extend sincere condolences to all the surviving members of his fine family.

## Pay TV—It Would Break a Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT J. McINTOSH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present an article from the Washington Sunday Star of January 12, 1958, by the Honorable CHARLES E. POTTER, Senator from the State of Michigan, entitled "Pay TV—Would It Be a Boon or a Betrayal?" as follows:

(By Senator CHARLES E. POTTER)

In a recent public appearance, I was asked to clarify my position on subscription (or pay) television. I said this:

"I'm opposed to any form of television that will cancel the promissory note of the Federal Government, signed when it established by law and by regulation, that television would be free. This note was made out to the American people, who invested billions of dollars in receivers on the basis of it."

I have not changed my mind.

It is important that everyone who owns a television set understands thoroughly the precise effect of pay television, if it should be authorized. It would mean that at certain hours of the day on certain channels which now can be tuned in at will, the nonsubscriber would get a scrambled, or unintelligible, signal. If he wished to receive the program clearly, he would have to pay—by a coin in a slot, by a charge on his telephone bill, or by some other means.

This is like buying a refrigerator and being required to drop a coin in the slot before you can open the door and get something to eat.

FREE FARE WAS ASSUMED

The American people bought television sets on the assumption that they would receive a selective assortment of information and entertainment, produced through free competition, free of charge.

Proponents of various pay-TV systems make much of the contention that, once in business, they would be able to supply new types of programing presently unknown to our advertising-supported system. We have asked them to be specific. It is difficult, however, to obtain definitive replies.

One hears instead general promises of "superior" motion pictures, sporting events, educational features, and the like. Let's look at them, one by one.

We view motion pictures on television now and it is true that some of them are deplorable. In many instances, this is because they were produced years ago. Unquestionably their quality is improving.

We view all types of sporting events. Who could have lived through any one of the holiday bowl games or World Series baseball contests without attesting to the superb quality of television coverage?

Certainly networks and individual stations go to prodigious lengths to produce varied educational and public service features. Coverage of national elections, the Presidential inauguration, discussion programs, and a vast array of news and special events productions are examples.

Furthermore, the Government has reserved frequencies for educational, noncommercial use. I support that action in the confident expectation that it can, after experimentation, suggest ways of easing our critical educational problem.

There are, without doubt, many things about modern television one might wish to improve. One could step up the quality of some of the productions or do something about excessive commercialism.

But any system that utilizes for profit the allocated channels necessary to full, competitive, free service—even to a fractional extent—is, in my opinion, contrary to the public interest. If I thought for one moment that the people of the United States were being denied a service that could be supplied by pay TV on broadcast frequencies, I would willingly withdraw my objections.

The fact is that the various pay-television schemes run absolutely counter to the basic theory of the legislation which established America's broadcasting system. They propose, in effect, to usurp some of the limited free time now available and supplant it by a sort of domestic slot machine operation which would require the people to pay for something they are now receiving without charge.

A TREMENDOUS INVESTMENT

It is estimated that the total contribution of American citizens to our free system of television, through purchase and maintenance of sets, runs to $17 billion. Nearly $200 million has been invested by business and much more by individuals, through their talents and skills, in building a system which today stands alone as the greatest system of free broadcasting in the world.

Any disturbance of that pattern, which is based on our traditional free concept toward all public media, jeopardizes the entire structure. This holds true even if it were limited to use of existing channels part of the time on a charge-per-customer basis.

On the one hand, therefore, we have a system of television which, like all thriving, dynamic entities, is open to certain criticisms—in this case, advertising excesses or program formats. On the other hand, the system has been indorsed overwhelmingly by the American public at large. Forty million households enjoy free television in the United States and the number is growing constantly.

Should there be a system of pay-TV, the promoters, by charging, let us say, $1 per set for a feature that normally would reach 13 million sets, could obtain more revenue than such a feature normally would cost to produce on a network.

In other words, pay-television could survive on approximately 5 percent of that total audience which, in effect, means that 95 percent of the present audience would be outbid.

It is conceivable, therefore, that some of our finest programs could be siphoned off free television, thus denying existing service to present free-set owners rather than supplementing that service. What would become of the thousands of national and local advertisers who employ television to move goods and services, and what economic repercussions would ensue, can only be imagined at this point.

A VITAL PROCESS

But there is another and more vital consideration. The fact that we have enjoyed such a phenomenal growth of television in the United States is directly related to the willingness of business to invest funds in what at one time appeared to be an unsure future. That investment enabled networks and local stations to extend in depth and scope their coverage of news events. The American people are among the best-informed in the world because of our free communications media, and television is not the least among them.

I, for one, don't want anything to interfere with that process. Pay television very well might, for it would usurp free time to feed specialized programs, as yet undefined, to those who can afford to drop a coin in the slot.

The Federal Communications Commission has authorized tests of the pay-television system. There is grave doubt as to the Commission's authority, under law, even to authorize tests, since one must assume they would be conducted on existing facilities licensed to broadcast under the free system.

Whether the FCC is acting with authority or not, however, I believe that the Congress—the elected lawmakers directly responsive to the people's wishes and interests—should examine this entire question thoroughly.

## Fortieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join many of my colleagues in marking the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence. The Ukrainian people are still unbowed after years of Russian exploitation, tyranny, and murder. They still yearn to celebrate independence of Russian Communist control.

Millions of Ukrainians have been deported to slave labor camps by the Soviets in an effort to quell the spirit of independence and nationalism. Millions more have been starved to death or murdered; yet the Ukrainian hope for freedom still exists, and courageous men and women stand up to the Russians.

It is a sad thing indeed that Ukrainians must celebrate their independence day while under the military domination of the Kremlin. It is my wish, and I am sure the wish of Americans in every part of the Nation, that the people of the Ukraine will one day be able to have real independence to celebrate. Student unrest, sabotage, and outright defiance of Russian rule have been reported from the Ukraine during the past year. We in America are happy

to know that the spirit of freedom is still cherished by the Ukrainian people despite their years of suffering and deprivation due to Soviet control.

We send our greetings to the Ukrainian people on this important day and our prayers that this people will soon be able to know freedom and independence again.

## Address by Senator Kerr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by my senior colleague, the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, at the 37th annual meeting of the American Petroleum Institute in Chicago, Ill., on November 11, 1957.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT S. KERR BEFORE A GENERAL SESSION DURING THE 37TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE, IN THE CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 11, 1957

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am highly honored to be invited to address you today. I am happy to appear on the same program with your outstanding president, Frank Porter. I cherish him. He is a longtime friend. I honor him as a great American. I pay tribute to him as probably the greatest Oklahoman the Bronx has ever produced. He tells me that it was Brooklyn instead of the Bronx, but to me that is a distinction without a difference.

He has ably filled the office of president of your organization since April of 1950. It also delights me to be this close to your chairman of the board, Jake Hamon, the second member of the nationally famous Ardmore kids. He just may be the greatest Texan that Oklahoma has produced.

It had been my intention to devote the time assigned to me today to a discussion of issues directly affecting the oil industry which will confront us in the next session of Congress. In view, however, of other matters of compelling importance, to which I shall address myself in a little while, I will abbreviate the remarks I had intended to make.

You know that Congress has twice—once in 1950, and once in 1956—passed amendments to the Natural Gas Act. We must, if possible, do so again in 1958. It was never the intent of Congress that the cold, dead hand of Federal control be used to shackle either the production, or producers, of oil or gas in a free America.

There is no choice between the political parties on their voting record in the passage of these bills, or in the matter of their veto. Both bills were passed with bipartisan support. The vetoes were equally bipartisan and equally unjustified.

If this great industry is to produce the ever-increasing quantities of natural gas needed for the continued growth of our economy in peace or war, we must not only again pass such an amendment to the Natural Gas Act, but it also must become a part of the law.

You know that the depletion factor provided in the Internal Revenue Code for more than a quarter of a century has been under attack for many years, and will be under attack again next year. Every effort should be made to nullify this attack, and, if the truth is adequately presented and fairly considered, the attack will be repelled.

Much credit is due to those in this industry who have looked for and found additional oil reserves outside the boundaries of our country, and have made them available to supply any need for crude oil in our country which cannot be met by our domestic production. It is necessary that access to this foreign production be kept and preserved. It is just as necessary that an environment be provided and maintained in which our domestic producers can continue to prosper and meet their huge responsibilities by helping to guarantee an adequacy of oil for our country. A way must be found, and by men of good will shall be found, to achieve both of these necessary objectives.

Ours is a Government of, for, and by the people, and that means all of the people—farmers, workers, small-business people, big business, oil business, professional people, and men and women in every phase of our great American industrial economy.

The right of petition to your Congress is guaranteed to you by the Constitution, the same as it is to all other groups in America. You owe it, not only to your Representatives in Congress, but to yourselves to see to it that adequate information is always available to them. Thus only, can you hope to receive equal and just treatment from the Government in which you have such a great interest, and toward the expenses of which you make such substantial contributions in the form of taxes.

I know some of you say you will have no part of politics. Let me remind you that you can make it your business to keep out of politics if you choose, but nothing you can do will ever keep politics out of your business.

Therefore, if you do not see to it that your representatives are informed about the needs and equities of your business, who do you think will do this for you? There are too many well-intentioned but uninformed people in Washington, including some in the Congress, who have long made a whipping boy of the oil industry. This is injurious both to you and to our country. Your continued patient and intelligent effort will enlighten them and serve you well.

As a Senator from Oklahoma, I have been aware that agriculture is Oklahoma's greatest industry. As such it is entitled to full equity and justice before the law. I am equally aware that the oil and gas business is Oklahoma's second largest industry, and is just as much entitled to the same kind of equity and justice before the law as is Oklahoma's great agricultural industry.

I remember that it was my privilege to speak to you at your meeting here 8 years ago.

Many elements of our environment are the same today as then, but there are also many differences, and upon a proper understanding and evaluation of those differences depends the future, not only of your industry, but also of your country, and of the free world.

Here are just a few of those differences: The daily average domestic production of crude oil for that year, 1949, was 5,046,400 barrels. For 1957, it is 7,268,900 barrels. Daily average import of crude and refined products in 1949 was 645,400 barrels; in 1957, their average is 1,541,800 barrels.

In 1949, the United States Treasury was paying approximately 1 percent on 90-day bills and 1-year certificates, and a little less than 1½ percent on notes. Our long-term bonds were selling at a premium so as to yield approximately 2.2 percent. Today the Government is paying 3.57 percent on 90-day bills and 4 percent on 1-year certificates and notes. Our long-term bonds are now selling at about 14 percent below par, or on a basis to yield 3.88 percent.

In fiscal 1949, we spent $13 billion on national defense; in fiscal 1957, we spent in excess of $43 billion on national defense.

Since 1950, the rate of industrial growth in Russia has been just about double that of our own. The most significant fact in this connection is that during the past 2 years, while their rate of increase has continued unabated, our level of industrial production has been practically at a standstill.

In 1949, the combined military strength of the United States was greater than that of any other nation on the earth; today, we have been reduced to second place as a military power in the world.

In 1949, the United States was the undisputed leader of the world in scientific knowledge, indutsrial production, position, and prestige. The last few weeks have demonstrated that in some of the most important and vital fields of scientific knowledge and progress, we are no better than a poor second today.

On October 4, the Russians launched Sputnik No. 1, a satellite weighing 184 pounds, which has now traveled around the world nearly a thousand times at 18,000 miles per hour in an orbit as far out as 560 miles.

On November 3, the Russians launched Sputnik No. 2, a satellite weighing more than half a ton, which is now traveling around the world in an orbit ranging as far out as a thousand miles from the surface of the earth. And what have we, who call ourselves the greatest nation in the history of the world, done in this field thus far? We are still talking about getting to launch a satellite that weighs 6 pounds.

The Free World has been shocked by these developments. The American people and our Defense Department have been rocked back on their heels. We have been caught short in the cold war in which we have been engaged now for more than a decade.

The rockets which launched these satellites had to be far more powerful than any that we have designed, or yet seriously worked on.

Thus, it is perfectly clear that Russia is far ahead in the development and production of the intercontinental ballistic missile, the most decisive weapon yet conceived by the mind of man.

Yet, a more tragic fact is that they are getting further ahead of us in this regard daily. It has been authoritatively stated that if the Russians were to stop now in both the improvement and production of their intercontinental ballistic missiles, it would take us, at our present rate of development, 2 years to get to where they are now.

Unless we move vigorously and rapidly to close that gap, achieve equality, and reestablish our superiority, the whole future history of our country will accordingly be determined, not by us, but for us.

This set of facts has shattered the concept which others have had as to our position of superiority in the field of scientific progress and achievement. It also shocks us into a sober realization that we would be kidding ourselves if we do not immediately recognize that we are today face to face with the gravest situation in our history.

An attitude of complacency at this time is an invitation to national suicide. We cannot, like an ostrich, stick our head in the sand to hide from the truth, with our tail feathers flapping in the breeze.

Yet, Clarence Randall, Special Assistant to the President (on foreign affairs), is quoted recently as having released from the White House, this statement: "Sputnik No. 1 is a silly bauble." He further said he was gratified the Russians had beaten the United States in the launching.

And, on October 8, our then Secretary of Defense, Charles Wilson, called it "a nice scientific trick." He further said: "I would

not say this country is doing all it could (in the satellite and missile fields), but it would be pretty unpopular to increase taxes."

Just recently, Secretary of State Dulles made the understatement of the year. In reference to the Russian satellites he said, "It looks as though in some respects they are somewhat ahead of us." Then he went on to shock reporters with this statement: "I don't think we want to have an unbalanced society of the kind that they have."

Of course, we don't want an unbalanced economy. Only those of little confidence would think we would have to have an unbalanced economy to keep pace with Russia in any vital field of endeavor. Only a few Russians and no Americans believe they can outdo us in any necessary effort.

If that kind of complacency is permitted to determine the actions of our Government, it means we are playing Russian roulette with our national existence.

We must face up to the fact that the launching of these two satellites by Russia, evidencing as they do the superiority she has achieved in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles, confronts our country with a graver danger than the one we faced after Pearl Harbor.

After Pearl Harbor, there was no complacency, high nor low. There was no official facade of unconcern or disdain. Neither was there panic. Nor should there be either of these today.

After Pearl Harbor everyone knew we were in a shooting war, but we also knew that we had what it would take to win. Today, we must realize we are in a cold war, now becoming more deadly than the shooting war forced upon us at Pearl Harbor, and we must have the same response and action, high and low. If we do this, we can find great comfort in the certain knowledge that we still have what it takes to win.

After Pearl Harbor, we knew that we had weapons which were as good as those of the enemy, that we were capable of producing better weapons than the enemy, and that we had only to develop the facilities with which to produce them.

Today, we are confronted by an enemy with superior weapons which we do not have and which we do not yet know how to produce.

During and since World War II, we have demonstrated that the ability to build the greatest military power in the world depended upon research, yet we have now permitted a godless nation, and one that was far behind us in the field of scientific ability, progress, and research to go around us and ahead of us in the development of the decisive intercontinental ballistic missile.

When we met here in 1949, we had more scientists, and we trained more scientists than Russia. Today, she is graduating from 2 to 3 times as many each year as we. We have watched Russia develop a program whereby their youth have had every encouragement to become scientists. We have provided neither adequate encouragement, nor incentive, nor proper reward to our own youth to do so.

We have also failed to encourage or reward adequately our teachers. In Russia, the profession of teaching is most highly honored and paid. The professor is respected by all and paid accordingly. Over there they often receive many times as much pay as the plumber. Over here they rarely are paid as much.

According to the United States Office of Education, in 1950, the United States graduated 53,000 engineers from our colleges and universities, while Russia produced only 32,000. But in 1956, we graduated only 26,000, while Russia's output rose to 71,000. In other words, Russia is now training over twice as many engineers as they did 7 short years ago, and we are producing less than half as many as we did at that time.

Your great industry has proven the value of scientists and engineers. You have learned the value both of quantity and of quality, and certainly the only thing more important than numbers is the quality and individual ability of those making up the numbers.

In the fourth century, the Roman Emperor, Constantine, The Great, wrote: "We need as many engineers as possible. As there is a lack of them, invite to this study, persons of about 18 years, who have already studied the necessary sciences. Relieve the parents of taxes and grant the scholars sufficient means." That advice was not heeded, and the Roman Empire fell.

The brutal but smart Russian dictators have heeded it and vastly expanded it. Thereby, they have surged ahead of us in the scientific fields in which they have chosen to make their greatest effort and threaten us in others. We who claim to be the world's most modern and most civilized nation have permitted barbarians to utilize the wisdom of antiquity, to maneuver a nation of peasants into a position of technological superiority.

Nearly 2,000 years ago, Jesus of Nazareth said, "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make ye free."

As never before, we must know the truth, and we must face up to it if we would continue to be free.

Now the President spoke to the American people last Thursday night to reassure us and give us the picture of our position in the field of guided missiles and satellites. He gave us many previously published facts, and some facts concerning our military strength which had theretofore been treated as top secrets. We were, of course, happy to get this information.

However, it was far from reassuring to me when he said that the Russians "quite likely" are ahead of us in some missiles and "special areas," and that it is entirely possible that "we may fall behind on an overall basis in the years to come."

I was also disappointed after he made these admissions to hear him say that he could meet this crisis merely by the appointment of another Presidential Assistant, even though he named one of the ablest scientists in America.

He already has half a dozen scientific agencies to advise him. They include the National Academy of Sciences, the President's Advisory Committee on Science, the President's Advisory Committee on Organization of the Government with a division of scientific research, the Interdepartmental Committee on Science, as well as the Atomic Energy Commission.

In addition to these, there are approximately 60 different Government sponsored agencies and committees or other groups carrying on some types of scientific activities. It is fine to add the illustrious Dr. Killian to his group of scientific advisors, but what he must do is to mobilize, and centralize, and utilize the brainpower and manpower he now has subject to his direct control. He must smash the walls of secrecy between the different branches of the military services now going their separate ways in search of a common goal. He must realize that even the different branches of the Defense Department must "hang together" or that we all, will "hang separately."

I was sorry that he didn't even mention any United States earth satellite program. The American people are entitled to know what our plans are in this respect.

He said, "What the world needs today even more than a giant leap into outer space is a giant step toward peace." We all need and want that, but, unfortunately, we are living in the same world with Russia and they have already made a giant leap into space. Before we can hope to take the first step toward a just and abiding peace, we, too, must prove to the world that we, also, can leap into outer space—and do it mighty soon.

Somber as are the facts with which we are confronted today, we know that America has the strength, the physical, mental, and spiritual resources, and the ability, to regain the ground we have lost. But we must ask ourselves two questions:

1. Can a free people continue to meet the challenge of powerful dictatorships which are determined to conquer the world?

2. Do we have the fortitude to pay the price to guarantee our continued security, even if it takes "blood and sweat and tears" for years to come?

The answer is "Yes"—it comes like rolling thunder from 173 million Americans. We are determined to reestablish our position of equality, and superiority, in military strength and power to any nation, or group of nations in the world.

To achieve these aims we can do no less than did the embattled Founders of this Republic, who in their great Declaration of Independence declared: "And for the support of this declaration with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Under God, we of this generation must renew that pledge today; we must unite as we have never united before, not only with each other, but with our allies. We must bring about the full mobilization of our abundant spirtual, mental, and physical resources.

The President of the United States, great patriot that he is, must call upon the Nation for its greatest effort. The people are crying for bold and courageous leadership. He must provide it. He must order full steam ahead for a united and mobilized nation. He must outline our objectives and give us a safe timetable for their achievement.

He must use the full power of his office to smash the barriers of inertia and complacency.

The people want him to, and expect him to do this, and, regardless of party affiliation, they will support him wholeheartedly in such an undertaking.

It is apparent that there have been faults and mistakes by those in high places, but we cannot win the future by rehashing past errors. The great Churchill once said, "If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."

Under God we must develop and maintain an undying resolve that we will prove worthy of our free way of life by sustained, and continuing, all-out effort to do this job no matter what it may cost.

We cannot afford and we will not do less than our best until this job is done.

## Voting on Defense Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I must admit to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that their leaders in the last several days have confused me considerably. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the majority leader of the Senate is quoted as counseling Democrats to ignore attack by Republicans on the Democratic defense record. The question in my mind

is: Does this imply that the Republicans should ignore the numerous recent Democratic attacks on the Republican record?

Our esteemed majority leader in the House, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, says the Democrats have never put national security into politics. I would suggest that I wish this were true but I have recollections of two recent Democratic Presidents who probably would not share this view and I would cite a Presidential campaign speech made in 1944 in Bremerton, Wash., which set the tone for numerous attacks on those who had not voted to "fortify" Guam.

The Speaker of the House, for whom we all have the deepest affection, is quoted in the press as raising the question of whether the President thinks "he can pass his program through Congress without any Democratic votes." I am certain that our esteemed Speaker knows the President has had experience for the last 3 years in this problem field, but I think it would be most reassuring if the implications of the statement I have just quoted were cleared up. I am sure that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to vote on the defense matters in the best interests of this country and I am sure that is what the Speaker wants them to do. I think we all have the right to examine the record of either party but when we cast our votes on matters affecting the national security, Republicans and Democrats alike put the welfare of this country above any partisan or personal interest.

## Wisconsin's Outstanding Record of Tree Planting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last year our Nation established a record of which we should all be proud. During 1957, more than one billion trees were planted in our country as part of a great continuing program of reforestation. This exceeds the 1956 record by more than 200 million trees. This program is carried out through cooperative efforts of Federal and State Governments and private industry—particularly the paper, lumber, and power industries who are the biggest users of our forests.

This record of tree planting is but one facet of the overall program of conservation and education on forest utilization now conducted in this country. I am proud of the part my own State of Wisconsin is playing in this gigantic job of rebuilding our forests.

Last year, more than 39 million trees were added to the forests of Wisconsin. Of the 1,170,000 acres planted in trees during 1957, more than 39,000 were in Wisconsin—11,000 acres more than in 1956.

I send to the desk now a statement which I have prepared, elaborating on this subject, and an interesting article on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

BACKGROUND

Through apathy, waste, and ignorance of proper procedures, the once great forests of our country were until fairly recently threatened with large-scale destruction.

As demands for more and more lumber, paper, and other wood products increased, the source of supply—trees—diminished at an alarming rate. Only in the past two decades have constructive, scientific programs of reforestation of any magnitude been put into effect.

An excellent example of such programs is to be found in Wisconsin. The original forests of my State ranged over 30 million acres. They were said to contain over 200 billion board-feet of timber. In 1899 the sawmills of Wisconsin led the world in lumber production.

However, by 1930, less than 40 years later, the annual production was less than one-tenth of that in 1899. Fires, and other destructive forces, coupled with wasteful practices, had virtually wiped out the great forests of the northern part of the State. The outlook for continuation of this vital resource was grim. This was a time for action.

Now let us contrast the previous situation with the current excellent condition of our forests.

I quote now from an editorial by John Beale, Wisconsin State forester, in a recent issue of the Northeastern Logger, a magazine devoted to the timber industry:

WISCONSIN PROGRESS

"The people of the State of Wisconsin have a peculiar ability to see things eye to eye in an uphill pull. In no other area of public affairs has this been more apparent than in forestry matters. Fires were controlled, zoning ordinances passed, and a forest tax law enacted. * * * Sound forest management practices rapidly took hold—1.4 million acres of national forests—over 2 million acres of county forests—over one-third million acres of State forests—over three-fourths million acres of certified industrial forests—an active farm forestry program. As management practices improved, the need for an accurate up-to-date evaluation of the forest resources of the State became apparent.

"The Wisconsin Forestry Advisory Committee, a citizen-industry group, advisory to the conservation commission, recommended that the State undertake a comprehensive forest inventory of 32 northern and central counties. Joint industry-county-State-Federal conferences produced a workable arrangement. The survey was financed jointly by the State, the counties concerned, and the forest industries. The conservation department conducted the survey and the United States Forest Service cooperated on national-forest lands and provided technical assistance through the Lake States Forest Experiment Station. This survey is nearly complete and plans have been made to inventory the balance of the State.

"Problems in forest soils, insects, tree diseases, and genetics brought forth a cooperative research arrangement between the University of Wisconsin and the conservation commission. The need for improved forest insect control brought together the thinking of industrial groups, the conservation commission, the State Department of Agriculture, the United States Forest Service, and the University of Wisconsin. Result—the Wisconsin Forest Pest Control Act of 1955.

"Down through the years, however, a special kind of cooperation has marked the progress of Wisconsin forestry. The conservation commission has consistently sought the opinions of interested groups in its approach to forestry problems and the response has always been immediate and constructive.

"Through a spirit of mutual self-help, Wisconsin is rapidly producing well-managed new forests and stable, progressive forest industries."

PAPER INDUSTRY'S ROLE

When speaking of forest products, we naturally think of lumber. However, few of us stop to realize that the United States is virtually a paper-borne Nation.

Almost everything we do involves the use of some paper product. Every day we are discovering new uses for paper. To its great credit, the wideawake paper industry maintains extensive laboratories for research and development for paper products. Each new product means that more trees will be needed.

Is private initiative proving adequate to its public as well as private responsibilities?

Let us have the facts speak for themselves:

In 1957, 86 percent of the new trees planted in our country were planted on private lands—those owned by paper, lumber, power, and other industries which use trees as a raw material. Only 14 percent of the new plantings in 1957 were on public-held lands. Twenty years ago only 26 percent of the trees planted were on privately-held land, while 74 percent were on public land.

In Wisconsin, a spectacular increase in private land planting was achieved in 1957. Eleven thousand more acres of trees were planted on private lands in 1957 than 1956.

These figures speak eloquently for the industries which use our forests. The pulp and paper industry, the lumber industry, the power companies, and other forest users now realize that good forestry is good business. It benefits not only their own industries, but the community and Nation as a whole.

STATE NURSERIES

Another example of Government and industry cooperation in the program of reforestation is to be found in the program of State nurseries, financed jointly by the Federal Government, the various State governments, and by the private tree planters of the States who purchase their raw stock from the nurseries.

The State nursery program has been singularly successful in Wisconsin. In 1957, 31 million trees were produced by these State-operated nurseries in my State. In Wisconsin the private tree planters carry the largest share of the expense of maintaining this program.

TREES FOR TOMORROW

Further interest in the reforestation program was generated in 1944 when 13 farsighted paper mills and 5 power companies, representing the bulk of the paper and power-producing capacity of Wisconsin, joined in sponsoring a program called trees for tomorrow.

Mr. Folke Becker, president of the Rhinelander Paper Co., of Rhinelander, Wis., and president of the trees-for-tomorrow program, recently outlined the program's objectives:

"(1) The distribution of 500,000 free trees each year;

"(2) the machine planting of another million trees for landowners who buy their planting stock from the State;

"(3) the preparation of forest-management plans for 20,000 to 25,000 acres of privately owned woodlands;

"(4) the operation of the trees-for-tomorrow camp 8 months of the year during which 3,500 people study resource management; and

"(5) a continuing program of research."

This broad-visioned program has been of great service to Wisconsin in rebuilding our forests and in educating the public on conservation.

FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY

The State of Wisconsin rightly takes pride in the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service which is located in Madison.

Through the past 48 years this Laboratory, which I have been pleased to discuss on many occasions on the floor of the Senate, has had as its objectives: To aid in protecting and enhancing the value and utility of forest products; to eliminate waste and reduce costs in logging, in manufacture, and in the use of wood products; to increase the serviceability of forest products to the consumer; and develop new and useful products from wood.

The basic product of this Laboratory is practical and useful information which will enable the grower, harvester, manufacturer, and user of wood products to grow, harvest, manufacture, and use wood more profitably and satisfactorily. It is estimated by the Forest Service that as much as $70 of savings to industry and consumers is realized from every research dollar currently spent at this laboratory.

THE JOB YET TO BE DONE

We cannot definitely measure the size of the job which is yet to be done, and the rate of progress toward the achievement of total needed acreage. Not all of the acres planted will develop into a stand of timber. Neither does the area in need of planting remain constant, because logging, fire, disease, and changing land values all add to—or subtract from the plantable areas. In addition, the demand is, of course, variable, especially with our growing population.

However, we are making significant progress, as indicated by the 1957 figures. I am pleased to say that Wisconsin realistically recognizes the fact that there is still need for improvement. It is estimated that 50 million trees will be produced in the State nurseries next year, an increase of 19 million over last year's record.

One particular phase of the program which is adding to our understanding and thoughtful utilization of forests is that which has recently been undertaken by the Milwaukee city school system, the Milwaukee County public schools, and the Waukesha County schools. The following heartwarming article from the January 4, 1958, edition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer tells of the great interest generated by this public-school program.

---

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer of January 4, 1958]

KIDS LEARN A LOT BY PLANTING TREES

"It gives youngsters a feel of the land." That's the way Max von Dahlen, district forester for the Kettle Moraine State Park, sums up the school forest program.

There are several school forests scattered through the park. The Milwaukee school system, the Milwaukee County public schools, and the Waukesha County schools all have their own forest plots in the park where grade and high school youngsters have planted pine seedlings.

"The school forests lie on the steeper slopes where it is difficult or impossible to use tree-planting machines," explains von Dahlen.

EACH SCHOOL HAS DAY

"We schedule a day for each school. It gives the students an opportunity to feel that they have a part in the conservation program. But more important, it gives them a new appreciation of the value of forests to Wisconsin."

The first plantings in the Waukesha County school forest were made by the students of nearby Palestine Grade School back in 1951.

"It's all part of our overall conservation program here at the Palestine School," says Mrs. Bessie Holsinger, teacher of this small rural Waukesha County grade school.

"We take up soils in our map project," Mrs. Holsinger explains. "By the end of the project the students have a good idea of the various types of soils and how they can best be used.

"And that, of course, is where the school forest comes in. Many soils are ideally suited only for growing trees."

On tree-planting day the parents are invited to come along. All take the bus over to the school forest where the youngsters divide up into groups. They generally plant from 1,500 to 2,000 trees in the morning.

In the afternoon the foresters take the youngsters on a trip through the park area.

There's no doubt about it, the school forest has given the children and parents of this community a new appreciation of Wisconsin forests.

"We want our students to feel that they are not out there just to scratch and hoe in the soil," says Robert Wheeler, instructor in biology at the Waukesha High School. "We want them to get the feeling that they are a part of a great reforestation program."

The Waukesha High School has its own school forest in the State park.

The tree planting at Waukesha High School is preceded by a 6-week training course in biology—in water, wild life, soil, and forestry conservation.

Out of 550 to 600 sophomore students, 50 students are selected according to their interest in conservation.

"We planted our first trees in 1939," says Wheeler. "One of the most interesting parts of the trip is to go back and look at the first plantings made in 1939. The trees are now 15 to 18 feet tall."

The Waukesha students make a combination excursion out of the trip. The students plant 2,000 to 2,500 trees in the morning. In the afternoon they split into teams for hiking.

On the trip the foresters and biology instructors point out how to identify some of the more important kinds of trees. Here the students can graphically see the relationship of vegetation and soil—topsoil making in action.

OVER 300 SCHOOL FORESTS

School forests are not limited to the Kettle Moraine State Park. All over Wisconsin school pupils are planting trees in their own school forests—over 300 of them in all.

In a few years Wisconsin will have many beautiful, productive planted forests—the Kettle Moraine State Park alone has planted a thousand acres—many of the trees of which were planted by school youngsters.

But more important, the school forest program has planted in the minds of Wisconsin young people the great importance of Wisconsin woods and forests.

---

## Resolution To Use the Postal Motor Fleet for Emergency Civil Defense Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution today expressing the sense of the Congress that my plan be placed in effect by the Post Office Department and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. The chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has informed me that he will ask reports on my resolution immediately and at the same time request that the reports develop rather completely the prospects for placing this program into effect at the earliest possible date.

For the past year I have been working out a plan to establish a civil defense first aid program using as many as possible of the nearly 30,000 motor vehicles operated daily by the postal service. Evidence that we see on every hand of the increasing threat of potential enemies to our national safety makes prompt action on such a program imperative.

Under my plan, within minutes after an enemy attack on our vital industrial and governmental centers a well-trained cadre of skilled postal employees would swing into vigorous action as an integrated part of our national civil defense first aid program. These employees are a corps of capable and dedicated public servants with proved capability under fire. They are ideally suited to meet emergencies through careful training and long experience in their essential daily task of moving the United States mails under all possible conditions. They will be a most effective adjunct to our regularly constituted police, fire and civil defense forces.

In developing my plan I have received a report from the Federal Civil Defense Administrator in line with my suggestions. However, the report indicates that thus far attempts to utilize postal facilities and personnel are limited to the local level, that is, through mutual arrangements between local civil defense committees and local postmasters for first aid service. I understand that some communities have worked out such arrangements.

In my judgment, this problem surpasses anything that should be treated as a local problem. We are confronted with the need to prepare in advance of emergencies for which there will be no time for preparation when they occur. The adaptation of postal vehicles and the training of postal personnel for emergency first-aid purposes, so as not to interfere with their basic function of transporting the mails, require careful advance planning and regulation at the national level. Only in this way will we be able to derive the full benefit of having such facilities and personnel where they are needed and when they are needed in an emergency. The postal vehicle fleet is the most mobile unit in the world. The great value of first aid is to be first in point of time. This means being ready, willing, and able to serve in thousands upon thousands of places within minutes after an enemy strikes.

I believe that a minimum of 10,000 postal vehicles will be found upon survey to be adaptable for installation of emergency equipment of the type I have discussed with the Post Office Department and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Such a fleet of emergency-equipped vehicles undoubtedly

would triple available mobile first-aid facilities and ambulance space in cities where we have postal motor vehicle units. We now have Government-owned units in 3,263 cities. One hundred such cities—with total population of over 50 million—are the heart of our industrial complex. Most of these cities would be critical targets in the event of enemy attack.

First-aid equipment for postal vehicles and training for postal employees, moreover, would have a real and continuing practical value in time of peace. They would be available for immediate aid in emergencies resulting from natural causes such as floods, hurricanes, and other forces of nature, as well as industrial accidents, that might paralyze important areas and temporarily weaken our ability to withstand an enemy attack.

---

## Address Delivered by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, at the Eisenhower Dinner in Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a speech I delivered at Detroit, Mich., on last Monday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, EISENHOWER DINNER, JANUARY 20, 1958, DETROIT, MICH.

It is a real honor for me—an Arizona Republican—to address you Michigan Republicans tonight: In some ways, it is like a pilgrim returning to an ancient temple of the Republican faith, although it must be said that this ancient temple has been somewhat defiled of late in Michigan by local heretics.

Just about a hundred years ago, now, the party was born right near here, in Jackson, Mich. (although I hear some good Wisconsin people do not quite agree with this). The ancestors of some of you here tonight created this great party. Your fathers fought in the battles, did much of the thinking, had a great part in the programs that made the Republican Party a great force in America, and in world affairs. There are men here tonight with us who are carrying on this great tradition in national affairs, and in State government. Men like Charlie Wilson, Art Summerfield, Wilber Brucker, and my distinguished colleague in the Senate, CHARLES POTTER.

Michigan has been, and still is, a rich source of leadership for the Republican Party.

And, some of the most important, the deepest springs, from which the party has drawn its spiritual strength has been from those not elected to public office, nor even officials of the party organization, but rather those who have stood behind the organization and those elected year in and year out, during the lean years as well as the good years. And men, like Don Ahrens here, who have stepped forth in a crisis to take on a heavy responsibility because of their deep convictions, and their patriotism.

All these great resources you have here in Michigan, the birthplace of the Republican Party. You have a great tradition, great leadership resources; you have the political leaders and you have the dedicated supporters.

What, then, has happened to the Republican Party in Michigan? Why do I hear people in States thousands of miles from here talking of Michigan politics as though there was something unhealthy here, something that ought even to be quarantined.

They are not talking about the Republican Party when they talk this way. Still more surprising, I have found that they are not usually talking about the Democrat Party either.

The Democrat Party has great political traditions in America. There have been great political leaders who were Democrats.

Why, I even have a brother who is a Democrat.

Yes; and I respect his political opinions. In fact, I am inclined to believe most of you here tonight would respect his political viewpoint, too.

What is it, then, that people across this country are talking about when they speak of the political blight that has come upon the State of Michigan?

I have found that they are always talking basically about the same thing: they are talking about a small group of men, most of whom do not bother to deny that they are Socialists, or have been Socialists.

They are talking about how this small group of men has taken over a large labor organization and has transformed this labor organization into a political party.

Across this country I have found many, many people, Republican and Democrat alike, who are looking toward Michigan with deep misgivings. They fear that what is happening here is all too much like what happened about 50 years ago in England when seasoned political bosses from the labor unions moved in behind the facade of the Liberal Party, and took it over.

In England, ambitious Socialist union leaders took over the internal organization of the Liberal Party, piece by piece, while maintaining the outside appearance and even the name of the old party, intact.

Yes—they kept the name of the old, respectable party while they gradually transformed its program into socialism. Finally, they dropped the dead shell of the past, having digested the vitals from within.

A steep decline in the British economy followed swiftly.

Now, how about Michigan?

Two years ago, three CIO union men—three rank-and-file members—came down to see me in Washington. Loyal union members, they were worried that the political ambitions of their union leaders were endangering the legitimate economic objectives of the union. They were particularly strong in their condemnation of the Michigan CIO union leaders for diverting their union dues money into an enormous slush fund to control Michigan politics.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, they invited my attention to their problems. These union men brought with them an amazing document—an official study of the University of Chicago, which was written by a research assistant of the National PAC—the political action arm of the CIO.

This document, written by a CIO expert named Calkins, tells the story of the growth of the CIO union power inside the Democrat Party of Michigan and how the seizure of this party machinery was first decided upon and how it was carried out.

It began one evening in Detroit, early in 1947, when the president of the State CIO council met secretly with some discontented Democrats. According to the Calkins study, the decision was made there, at that meeting, to seize control of the Democrat Party of Michigan.[1]

It is no news to you here tonight what happened as a result of this secret meeting. In 1948, the CIO-PAC moved in on the grassroots level of the Democratic Party. According to the PAC expert, the move was made with the personal approval of Walter Reuther.[2]

In August 1948, Walter Reuther took off the mask of union leader for a moment and showed the politician which has always been the reality underneath. In the official publication of his union he made clear that collective bargaining for his members was only a secondary matter for him as a union leader. He said (and I quote) "political action * * * shall have first call upon my time and energy as president of the international union" (end of quote).[3]

Walter Reuther, by his own statement, sees himself primarily as a politician. The union appears to be merely a convenient steppingstone.

The year 1948 was enormously successful for the CIO politicians in Michigan. They elected a governor. But, they did not let him get the foolish idea that he might be in control of the party.

In the spring convention of the Democrats in 1949, the New York Times reporter says it was Gus Scholle, director of the State CIO, rather than the Governor, who was the real head of the State Democratic convention.[4]

You see, I have developed a special interest in what has been going on here in Michigan. I think the visit by the three rank-and-file Michigan CIO union men did more than anything else to help me understand the power and political ambition of Michigan's CIO leaders. I received a little extra education when one of the Reuthers made a trip all the way out to Arizona and made a violent attack on me in my home State. This was very educational.

In 1950, I understand the traditional Democrats made a last vain attempt to take back their party from the CIO politicians of your State. The Calkins investigation shows how this last attempt was smashed by equipping each of the Wayne County district conventions with small squads of men ready to use force to prevent the regular Democrats from regaining power. The leader of the armed squad which took over the Democrat convention in the 15th district told Calkins he was equipped with 6 men, 20 clubs and 2 pistols.[5]

As the terrorists completed their final outrages on the dying remnants of the old party, George Fitzgerald, Democrat national committeeman said, and I quote his comment to the newspapers: "I have just watched socialism take over the Democratic Party by Communist processes."[6] Mrs. Nellie Riley, former Democrat National Convention delegate, warned, and again I quote: "Socialists are in complete charge of the Democratic Party machinery."[7]

The Democrat national committeeman subsequently refused to attend the State convention of his own party, saying he refused to attend a convention the delegates to which had been picked, and I quote his statement to the newspaper: "With storm troopers guarding the doors and the chairman presiding with a baseball bat."[8]

---

[1] Calkins, CIO and Democratic Party, p. 115.

[2] Calkins, op. cit., p. 116.

[3] President's Column in United Automobile Worker, August 1948.

[4] Calkins, op. cit., p. 120.

[5] Calkins, op. cit., p. 121.

[6] Calkins, op. cit., p. 122.

[7] Calkins, op. cit., p. 123.

[8] Calkins, op. cit., p. 123.

There is a final item needed to complete the full picture of the extent of control of the Michigan Democrat Party by the CIO politicians.

Who finances the party?

By 1950, the treasuries of the CIO unions were supplying about two-thirds of all the campaign costs of statewide Democrat politicians, including Governor Williams, according to the Calkins-University of Chicago investigation.[9] The Michigan CIO unions, in that year, contributed $200,000 directly to the statewide Democrat candidates in the State of Michigan, according to this same study.[10]

By 1950, the CIO politicians had completed their conquest of the Democrat Party of Michigan.

This is how the Democrat Party died in Michigan. It was replaced by something else which has retained only the name—"Democrat."

Underneath the Democrat label here in Michigan there is something new, and something dangerous—born of conspiracy and violence, sired by Socialists, and nurtured by the general treasury of the UAW-CIO.

This is the pattern of political conquest. This is the pattern of men whose conscienceless use of violence and money to achieve political power belies the soothing, well-worded statements in favor of democratic processes which they produce, at regular intervals, for public consumption.

It is a pattern which must not be permitted to spread across our country. Honest and alert union men who fear the results of this misuse of their unions for political purposes have written me letters in the thousands. Union members from the Michigan CIO have come, as I told you, all the way to Washington to see me as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor to ask for relief from the political misuse of their dues money, and for protection for their union against the political ambitions of their leaders.[11]

For this subversion of one of the great historic political parties of America is not only a threat to the citizens of Michigan and to the country as a whole, it constitutes especially a basic threat to the civil rights of every union member.

Michigan, and especially Detroit, is almost entirely union shop.

I understand that almost every workman in this State is required to join a union and pay dues in order to hold a job.

So, almost every man must join.

Now, we come to the second step—the allocation by the union of a percentage of every member's dues for the purposes of political action.

So, we find that the workman not only must join the union to hold a job almost everywhere in Michigan, but he also is required to support with his dues money any political candidates and political programs chosen by the union leaders. It is quite simple. He stands helpless before a contract entered into by the employer and the union leader which requires the employer to fire him if he refuses to pay his dues, or any part of them.

It comes to this. In order to hold almost any job in Michigan, a workman must, in effect, support financially whatever candidate or program the union leader chooses, or face discharge by his employer. By this arrangement, the employer automatically sells each workman into political bondage to whatever union leader holds the labor contract.

Of course, Reuther will say that he allows union members to request in writing diversion of the part of their dues used for political action to some other organization which carries on what he calls "citizenship" activity.

When a man's job depends on remaining in good standing in his union, he is not going to jeopardize his position by announcing his disagreement with the leaders' policies.

Now, I think that unionmen should take an active interest in political action, but on a purely voluntary basis, and I would favor any individual member contributing his time or money to the party of his own choice—not necessarily that of his union leaders.

By 1950, then, the plan of the UAW-CIO developed at the secret meeting in 1947, had been accomplished. By 1950, they had a governor. By 1950, they owned and operated the shell of a political party, taken over and manned with their crew and fueled with dues money, from the general treasury of the UAW-CIO.

Now, let us see what great things these men have accomplished for Michigan, since they took over. If Michigan is a testing ground for the Nation, let us see what wonderful things are in store for the whole country, if they should be able to extend their power that far.

Since the union politicians are supposed to be working for the economic betterment of their members and, they claim, for the community as a whole let's look at the economic record. Let's look at the year 1950 and see what has happened by 1956.

As we look over the States of the Union we find this period, 1950 to 1956, has been generally an era of great expansion. Of all the 48 States, 46 have shown an increase in the number of factory jobs available. The whole Nation has shown a substantial increase.

Let me put a plug in here for my home State of Arizona. Our increase in factory jobs in this period has been over 130 percent.[12]

There were only two States that showed an actual loss of factory jobs between 1950 and 1956.

In the whole industrial Middle West there has been only one State that showed an actual loss of factory jobs, in this period of great expansion throughout the rest of the country. It was your State of Michigan.[13]

Michigan, alone, of the great industrial States went backward while the whole country moved forward.

Now, your State has been known to us out in Arizona, and across the country, as a dynamic, efficient, progressive State, with a great economic past, and a greater economic future to come. You have great natural advantages here. You have the great resources, the power, the skilled men. You are close to great natural markets. You have in greatest abundance that increasingly rare and important resource—water.

In Arizona, we have many of your natural resources but not quite as much water. We do not have as great a market right within our own State.

But there is one other item we don't have—we don't have Walter Reuther.

In our State of Arizona, there is general respect for the job many of the union leaders are doing. They don't always agree with me, nor I with them, but we try to go ahead and each do our own job.

Now, what has happened in Michigan? Your State has not lost any of the great resources, the great economic advantages it had 10 and 20 years ago. What is wrong with this State is not economic. It is political.

This cancer in the economy of Michigan is artificial. It is politically created.

And because it is political, and only political, you men and women of the Republican Party are faced with the greatest challenge in the history of your party. With the Democrat Party of Michigan destroyed from within, your party now provides the only rallying point for Republicans and Democrats alike, who want to restore a healthy political climate to Michigan.

"Climate" is the word I keep hearing. Everyone talks about the bad climate in Michigan. They are not talking about the weather.

Just a few days ago in Columbus, Ohio, there was a meeting of industrial development people and manufacturers from the five neighboring States of Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan. At this meeting there was a good deal of discussion of the bad business climate in Michigan.

The representative of one of the greatest industrial organizations in America told how industry is searching all over the United States for good plant sites. In Ohio his company has built no less than 19 new plants in the last 5 years. In Michigan, they have built only one; and, he said, they are not planning to build any more in Michigan.[14]

How many tens of thousands of jobs for Michigan workers have been lost by this one industrial decision alone? This is the gift of the UAW-CIO politicians to their membership; the loss of tens of thousands of jobs in one company alone. How many hundreds of thousands of jobs have been destroyed for Michigan workers during the last 6 or 7 years, no one can say. This is the great boon the UAW-CIO politicians have brought to their members; this is the great boon they wish to bring to the country as they extend their political ambitions beyond this testing-ground State.

Let us not make the mistake of believing the propaganda that industries are leaving Michigan or, staying out of Michigan just because of wages. My State of Arizona ranks among the top 10 States in the country in factory wage[15] scales, and we in Arizona are at the top of the list for increase in factory jobs between 1950 and 1956. The State of Ohio, which is gaining so heavily at the expense of Michigan, is certainly no low-wage State. In fact, Ohio stands third in the Nation in its scale of factory wages.[16]

Now, let's look at how these union politicians operate. How have they made Michigan an unhealthy place for incoming industry as well as industry which has been here for years?

One recent incident will illustrate the whole pattern of political corruption.

Less than 2 months ago, your State labor commissioner, John Reid, was replaced by a UAW-CIO politician. When asked, by a reporter from the Detroit News why the Governor had replaced him, he described himself (and I quote) as "a victim of the UAW-CIO's reach for power in Michigan government."[17] He went on to say, "The real truth is that the UAW wanted to use the safety inspectors of the State labor department to harass employers. I wouldn't go along."[18]

Mr. Reid, at 74 years of age is described as a man with a lifelong record as an AFL labor man.[19] This is his statement. What could

---

[9] Calkins, op. cit., p. 130.

[10] Calkins, op. cit., p. 131.

[11] See The Rank and File Union Members Speak Out on Political Action. Published by Republican State Central Committee, Michigan.

[12] U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings, May 1955 and June 1957.

[13] Same as 12.

[14] Williams Called Bar to Industry by G. E. Executive, Detroit News, January 10, 1958.

[15] State Agencies in Cooperation with U. S. Department of Labor Statistics, 1958.

[16] Same as 15.

[17] Muller, Will, Victim of UAW Power, Says Fred Williams' Aide, Detroit News, November 24, 1957.

[18] Muller, Will, op. cit., Detroit News, November 24, 1957.

[19] Same as 17.

better describe what is meant by a "bad business climate" in Michigan. What could better describe the evil political root of Michigan's economic sickness.

It is political. Underneath, Michigan has the same great economic advantages it always has had.

The bankruptcy the present Governor is bringing upon the State can be cured—politically. The perversion of the State government to serve a special interest can be cured—politically.

This is the challenge you men and women of the Republican Party of Michigan are facing.

This is the challenge for all—Republicans and Democrats alike—who need a rallying point for a great united effort to stop the unnatural economic decline of this great State.

"United" is the word. Those others—those who have captured the Democrat Party in Michigan—they are united. There is almost complete silence in their organization. But it is the silence of a graveyard. The internal opposition is dead.

Once in a while there is a splash as one of the last few surviving administrators with integrity is thrown overboard—as in the case of the AFL's John Reid. But otherwise—there is silence.

On our side, we do not want or expect this kind of unity. We encourage healthy, continuous, internal criticism.

But let's not overdo this. Let's not luxuriate in it.

I have not always agreed with the national administration in what they have proposed. I have not hesitated to speak out clearly and without qualification on such occasions of disagreement.

Our great party has vitality because we encourage internal criticism. But this characteristic of our party can cause great problems, if it should deteriorate into a factionalism from which only the opposition gains.

Self-discipline and restraint are the necessary characteristics of free men. Discipline imposed from the outside is the characteristic of a slave or Socialist state.

Before we criticize our own people too strongly, let us remember clearly what is the alternative.

Here in Michigan, the alternative to the Republican Party is a strange and menacing phenomenon, new on the American scene—a group of union elite politicians masquerading as a political party.

I am here tonight because I do not want to see this Socialist-labor thing spread to the rest of the country, and the place to cure it, at this point, is here in Michigan.

And, as we look at the national scene, let us not spend too much of our time in criticism of our own party. Let us remember the great accomplishments of this administration.

Let us remember first and above all that we are at peace.

The Republican administration came into power with a war inherited from the previous administration. That war is ended.

Since the war ended, this Republican administration has preserved peace in the face of some of the most trying and difficult situations ever experienced by the country.

Under this administration, the country has developed in the Strategic Air Command the strongest retaliatory weapon ever seen in the world's history.

Let us not forget that there have been very substantial tax reductions since this administration took office, and this in the face of ever increasing military demands.

Let us remember that this administration has taken the Government out of more than 1,000 businesses.

Let us remember this positive side of the ledger, too. And let us remember especially what the alternative is to this administration.

You here in Michigan, above all, have learned the hard way, what the alternative is. Let us never forget that the same men who have brought the great State of Michigan to its knees economically, have used this State as a testing ground. They are looking across this country for new and bigger conquests. Yes, they have plans for this country.

Here in Michigan, you are in the front line trenches. We from the rest of the country are looking to you. For what happens here, can happen to the whole country.

We look to you, men and women of the Republican Party of Michigan.

## Thomas W. Sheppard of Tyler, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Thomas W. Sheppard, formerly of Tyler, Tex., was this month presented the Navy Meritorious Public Service Citation for his outstanding contributions in the guided missile field by Rear Adm. Frederic S. Withington, Chief of the Navy Bureau of Ordnance.

Sheppard, whose folks live in Smith County, Tex., was one of five staff members of the Applied Physics Laboratory of the Johns Hopkins University, to receive the second highest award that can be bestowed by the Secretary of the Navy upon a civilian.

The Navy cited Sheppard for his exceptional services to the Department of Defense in the field of missile technology.

Mr. Sheppard has been closely associated from the beginning with the development by the Johns Hopkins University applied physics laboratory of the Terrier guided missile from an experimental test vehicle to a tactical weapon which has been evaluated to be a significant improvement in naval air defense and is now in service use on board fully operational units of the fleet. He was in complete charge of all ground and flight testing during the critical phase of the missile development. He conceived the testing methods that have become standard and also contributed many essential ideas to the missile design. He developed the ingenious method of testing missiles on shipboard which is standard practice today. In recognition of his significant contribution to the air defense capability of the Navy, this citation is approved this third day of December 1957.

The young engineer played an important role in the development of the Terrier guided missile. Developed at the applied physics laboratory, through assistance of the Tyler engineer, the Terrier is now the chief armament of the new fleet of guided missiles ships of the Navy. It was for the Terrier that the world's first guided-missile ships, the U. S. S. *Boston* and U. S. S. *Canberra*, were commissioned.

The Terrier, Tartar, and heavyweight Talos missiles were all developed at the applied physics laboratory with significant contributions of Mr. Sheppard. It was also at this laboratory where the proximity (VT) fuze, classed second to the atomic bomb in World War II, was developed.

Sheppard is a graduate of Tyler High School. He also attended Tyler Junior College.

I quote from Presentation of Navy Distinguished Public Service awards and Navy Meritorious Public Service Citations by Rear Adm. F. S. Withington, United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, January 10, 1958.

"For exceptional services to the Department of the Navy in the field of missile technology. Mr. Sheppard has been closely associated from the beginning with the development by the Johns Hopkins University applied physics laboratory of the Terrier guided missile from an experimental test vehicle to a tactical weapon which has been evaluated to be a significant improvement in naval air defense and is now in service use on board fully operational units of the fleet. He was in complete charge of all ground and flight testing during the critical phase of the missile development. He conceived the testing methods that have become standard and also contributed many essential ideas to the missile design. He developed the ingenious method of testing missiles on shipboard which is standard practice today. In recognition of his significant contribution to the air defense capability of the Navy, this citation is approved this third day of December 1957."

## Columbus Day a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to declare October 12 of each year to be a legal national holiday to be known as "Columbus Day."

Already today Columbus Day is observed as a holiday in 26 States, as follows: Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Texas. This constitutes more than a majority of the States celebrating this holiday.

Nearly 5 centuries have passed into history since that day in 1492 when Columbus discovered the Western Hemisphere and inaugurated a new era in human affairs. From that day on civilization moved forward on the road of greater freedom, opportunity and achievement.

All of us recall from history the many difficulties encountered by Columbus, the many delays, mutiny and threats against his life. His unconquerable spirit made it possible for him to carry on. Faith in divine guidance helped him to pursue steadfastly on his chosen course until he was rewarded by the sight of the New World's shores.

Columbus possessed the same sort of faith which sustained the early settlers of our Nation, the same faith which inspired the authors of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. This is the sort of faith that is so desperately needed in the world today in our search for new discoveries—plus the indomitable courage and the vision of a Columbus. In the perspective of history, we recognize Columbus as truly a dedicated man, who inspired countless generations and will continue to inspire others as long as America remains the symbol of liberty and the moral leader of the Free World.

In the 465 years since the discovery of America by Columbus the world has gone through periods of war and peace, famine and plagues, good years and bad, tremendous scientific progress, and events that shook the world to its very foundations. It is difficult to evaluate the advancement which stretches between the sailing ships of Columbus, the hand printing press and the crude oxcart of his day, with such present-day phenomena as missiles and sputniks, lightning-fast printing presses, and our streamlined automobiles. One miracle after another in scientific development have hurdled mankind across the centuries.

Today, nearly five centuries after Columbus, we still ponder the future of mankind. We still search for new horizons and new hopes for a better life. We seek to ascertain our responsibilities in a world of confusion and continuous struggle. There is turmoil in Asia. There is unrest in Africa. The Middle East is a veritable powderkeg. While colonialism of the Western type is rapidly being eliminated in those areas, the Communist brand of colonialism is making heavy inroads by subversion, by inflaming racial prejudices, and by spreading hatred of America.

As we turn toward Europe, we find that our allies there remain loyal to us despite Russia's recent attempts to break up the Western Alliance. I am particularly proud that Italy, the land which gave birth to Columbus, is today one of our stanchest and most loyal allies and partners in the common struggle against communism. From the boot of Italy our Strategic Air Command can strike at any point in Europe, the Middle East, and large sections of Asia and Africa, if this should become necessary.

It is strange how fate has shaped the destinies of these two countries, the United States and Italy, since the days of Columbus. The land where stood the cradle of Columbus and the land which has achieved such greatness because of his discovery, today stand shoulder to shoulder in a common struggle for the survival of the Free World. What can be more meaningful for the future? If Columbus were alive today he would surely rejoice at this close and friendly relationship between these two nations.

When we look at the world of today, we must ask ourselves: Is this the kind of world envisioned by Columbus? We know that he wanted to prove the world was round. We know that he wanted to establish trade routes to Asia. We also know that he was a great dreamer; hence, he must have been dreaming of a happier world, of a mankind at peace, of justice and righteousness, and of human dignity for all.

Despite the great advancement since the days of Columbus, we still have a long and hard road to travel before we reach the goal envisioned by him. It is not only the problems of today which confront us, we must also consider the problems of tomorrow, for that is the world in which our children are destined to live. This requires dedicated men in public life, who must have the vision and the courage of Columbus, some of his skill and foresight, and above all a great faith in order to be able to meet head on the unknown dangers of tomorrow.

It is for this reason that the observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday would serve both as a reminder and an inspiration to the people of America and the Free World—a reminder of the great obstacles he encountered and how he overcame them with fortitude and perseverance, and an inspiration of his great faith and achievement for us to cope with the problems of our day.

In proposing that October 12 of each year be declared a national holiday, I am not interested in establishing just another occasion to celebrate. I visualize Columbus Day as a day when we should rededicate ourselves to achieve the kind of world envisioned by Columbus, a world at peace, striving to better life and not to destroy it. Columbus Day should be a day on which the record of the life of Columbus and his achievements in the face of dire consequences should be told and retold so that it would inspire us in our own efforts, give us utmost confidence in the destiny of our Nation, and renewed faith in the future of all mankind. It should, likewise, be a day of worship so that together we may pursue a steady and determined course in the path of peace and righteousness until we reach the shores of the New World of Tomorrow.

In this way, I am certain, Columbus Day will have real meaning. In this spirit, it will be observed by all the people. It is perhaps a belated recognition of Columbus, but very timely for a great Nation to recognize its great discoverer.

## Subscription Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which, if enacted, would prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from granting to anyone the right to charge viewers for programs carried over the airwaves. Specifically, this sets out to prohibit subscription television, or pay TV.

Subscription television—or pay TV or toll TV—refers to any of the various methods by which a television viewer would be charged for watching certain programs. The proponents of these devices can make them sound very attractive, promising new types of and generally improved television programming, and the absence of "commercials" or sponsors' announcements. In the long run, however, I fear it would cause every family to pay for all the programs it watches, and I imagine there would be a return to commercials, too. The net result would be to require the public to pay for what it now receives free, with the many talked-of improvements of very doubtful practicality.

The hearings held last month before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in connection with the 3-year tests of pay TV which have been authorized by the FCC, developed some very valuable information on this subject. The weight of the evidence, it seems to me, is preponderantly against pay TV. Opinion polls have shown an overwhelming public aversion to paying for television programs, and this has been the sentiment of my constituents as reflected in their letters and conversations with me.

This is not a small problem. Forty-three million American homes have television sets. The average family watches television more than 35 hours a week. In addition, television has become increasingly important as a means of disseminating news and information, and the economic impact of its advertising is difficult to measure.

There are parties on both sides of this argument that have large investments to protect, and while the Government should be considerate of these investments, the question should be resolved in terms of public interest, not private interest. The airways belong to the public, and their continued use to bring television programs to the people without charge must be safeguarded. The FCC recently authorized pay TV tests in 20 major cities for a 3-year period, to determine facts upon which to base a final decision on licensing such operations. I believe the Congress itself should exercise authority in this matter, because it is a new concept of broad national interest. Television has become an important part of our way of life, and we are anxious to see that it is operated so as to provide maximum benefit to the public and the Nation.

## This Congress Should Enact Immediately the Military-Pay Bill Now Pending Before the Senate and House Armed Services Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, now that President Eisenhower has spoken on the subject, Congress is expected to approve legislation providing for the

increased efficiency and the technological advancements necessary in this nuclear age to enable our Armed Forces to attain a position of superiority over any potential enemy.

This objective is wholly dependent on the quality of our military personnel—on their leadership, their professional talent, and their technical proficiency. The No. 1 problem in the Armed Forces today is not confined solely to equipment or manpower but includes the retention of the kind of quality personnel whom we need to give life to our defense, to activate our warning systems, to man our planes, ships, and guns, and to keep those weapons systems in operating condition. Because that particular phase is an acute and compelling problem, I am taking this time to discuss the means of providing a solution.

In March 1956, the Secretary of Defense appointed the Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation to advise him concerning the adjustments to military compensation that were needed in order to attract and retain the competent personnel required by our defense activities. Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric, was appointed chairman of the Committee. The Committee was composed of men chosen for their experience and outstanding qualifications for investigating such a complex situation and for developing a solution.

The Committee traveled extensively to observe for itself the conditions as they exist. It collected and considered previous studies made on military personnel problems by such as the Hook, Womble, and Hoover Commissions. Opinion surveys were conducted. The Committee made a comprehensive examination of a wide scope of Department of Defense personnel and related problems. Data was gathered from a variety of other sources and then all of the information was carefully collated, correlated, and analyzed before the Committee drew its conclusions.

What the Committee developed and recommended was a dynamic program of legislative and administrative measures suitable to attract and retain the combat leadership, scientific, professional, technical, and management skills required by our Armed Forces today and in the future. The report was presented to the Secretary of Defense early in 1957.

The Committee claimed that six major results could be achieved if its proposals were adopted. They are:

First. About a 15-percent improvement in the combat capabilities of the United States Armed Forces, without a significant change in the budget.

Second. Savings and gains up to $5 billion a year by 1962—or sooner—in the cost of national defense.

Third. Sharp reductions in training accidents now, and in military and civilian losses in the event of war.

Fourth. Reduction in the number of military personnel required to produce a given level of national security.

Fifth. A long-term solution to the basic manpower problems of the armed services.

Sixth. Improved attraction, retention and motivation of the professional and technical civilian personnel in the Department of Defense.

It appeared during the first part of 1957 that Congressional approval could be obtained on the Cordiner report which would place in effect a modern compensation plan to pay military personnel what their services are actually worth and thereby improve the effectiveness and economy of national defense.

It was a source of keen disappointment that delay was encountered in obtaining wholehearted support for the Cordiner proposals on the grounds that progress in adopting them should be in piecemeal fashion as opposed to approving them in their entirety.

During the month of May 1957, Senators SYMINGTON and GOLDWATER introduced S. 2014 to implement the Cordiner recommendations. Following the introduction of legislation in the Senate, on May 15, 1957, I introduced in the House H. R. 7574 for the same purpose.

The Cordiner report attracted nationwide attention with the result that the California and Texas State Legislatures memorialized Congress to enact legislation embodying the Cordiner philosophy and proposals. In addition, the 1957 Governors' Conference adopted a resolution urging revision of the military compensation method on the basis of the Cordiner Committee suggestions. Similar resolutions were adopted by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other civic and professional organizations. Newspapers and editors around the country called upon Congress to act on the Cordiner report and the serious personnel retention problem.

On August 21, 1957, in the closing hours of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, the Military Pay Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee held a hearing on S. 2014. The subcommittee members heard the testimony of only one witness, Mr. Cordiner, who said that the existing system of compensation in the armed services "encourages mediocrity and discourages ambition and outstanding performance." He also said that in this age of radically accelerating technological change, it was absolutely necessary that we have a professional defense force rather than one composed of partially trained personnel serving on active duty for limited periods. Mr. Cordiner concluded:

> It is not a question of whether military personnel receive a pay adjustment. It is a matter of national survival.

After sputniks I and II began orbiting overhead and there was visible evidence of the technological strides of the U. S. S. R., our Nation as a whole realized the necessity of taking a searching look at our national-defense structure and the capability of the United States to formulate a sound national policy for an advancing technology.

Speaking on the subject at Oklahoma City, November 13, 1957, President Eisenhower said:

> The military services are underpaid. We must be fair with them. Justice demands this, but also compelling is the factor of efficiency in our defense forces. We cannot obtain and retain the necessary level of technical proficiency unless officers and men, in sufficient numbers, will make the armed services their careers.

The recently released Rockefeller Brothers Fund report contained several recommendations for correcting the inadequacies of our current force levels. Among the recommendations was this one:

> Present pay scales be raised to retain the skilled officers and men necessary to an effective and economic Military Establishment.

During the hearings held by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S Preparedness Subcommittee, the witnesses have unanimously called for, among other things, strengthening our Strategic Air Force and accelerating and expanding our research and development program. To me, these mean solving the personnel retention problem of the Armed Forces.

In his state of the Union message on January 9, 1958, President Eisenhower called for Congress to demonstrate its great ability as the Legislature of a free government to strengthen our Defense Establishment. He said, and I reiterate, "through increases in pay and incentive, we must maintain in the Armed Forces the skilled manpower modern military forces require."

Recently, President Eisenhower sent to the Congress a military pay bill based largely on the Cordiner Committee recommendations, including several new provisions. With this bill before Congress, there is no excuse for any further delay in dealing with the military pay problem.

## Inflation and Growth—Address by Senator Bennett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 23, 1958*

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, inflation is one of the most serious problems confronting our country. It is a subject of vital interest to every American, and particularly to those in the low income brackets and those depending upon fixed incomes.

On November 14, 1957, our distinguished and able colleague, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] delivered a comprehensive address on this subject, before the Chicago Economic Club, which should be read by every American.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION AND GROWTH

(Speech by Senator BENNETT before the Chicago Economic Club, November 14, 1957)

Growth is the secret of life and its ultimate, eternal purpose. The urge to grow is life's most compelling drive, and the innate

powers through which we build, create and grow are our supreme endowments. Blessed with freedom—the optimum climate for growth—in fewer than 200 years we have become the richest, strongest, most economically successful people in the world, with ever widening horizons and the promise of a further, everquickening pace of growth.

Today our whole philosophy of growth is being questioned. The Communists declare that they have found a better way, and that the future will be theirs. Denying God and any thought of spiritual endowment, rejecting private ownership and enterprise, seeking to destroy all basic human freedom, they expect to overmatch our growth and with a system built on force and slavery submerge us into insignificance. So, at this time most of all, our growth must not lose its momentum—as their sputniks will—and faltering, fall behind. If there is any way by which we can sustain and build our power to grow we should use it now. Whatever would impede or weaken it must be rejected.

It is against this background that we should weigh the relation of inflation to growth. There are those who feel that inflation is a kind of satellite of growth—which we can accept without concern. Others are beginning to advocate inflation as a desirable, or even necessary, ingredient of growth—something to be endorsed and sustained as a deliberate policy of government. Because we have been living with inflation the problem is current and immediate—and in no sense academic. In the hearings of the Senate Committee on Finance—and in the recent writings of some economists—a serious attempt has been made to win support for the idea that policies designed to stop inflation and restore price stability are actually hindering our country's economic growth. These questions, having been thus raised, must be examined, and the truth established, not only for economists, professional or amateur, but also, and particularly, to the satisfaction of the average citizen, who is frequently bombarded with appealing economic nonsense designed to win his vote.

Therefore tonight I propose that we investigate this claim that inflation is a necessary ingredient of economic growth. After reviewing the arguments—stated or implicit—which are advanced in support of this contention, it will be well to sketch the elementary economic framework within which growth proceeds and then to discuss the dynamics of inflation and appraise their contribution to the process.

Before we discuss the arguments for inflationary growth let's take a few moments to review the history of prices in America, for a misunderstanding of this history may—and probably has—predisposed some people to an unthinking acceptance of the proposition that inflation has been an established pattern in this country since its start and is one of the reasons why we have enjoyed remarkable growth for 170 years. If this is true; if our present status as the greatest industrial power of all time has been achieved or materially aided by inflation, we would be forced to give some serious attention to the claim that a continuation of the present inflation is not only inevitable but desirable.

What are the facts? Recognizing that data on prices and output for the early years of our history cannot be very precise, we nevertheless have access to carefully prepared measures of these economic factors. For this period of time an excellent measure of our economic growth is a national income series prepared by the National Industrial Conference Board in 1939. The earliest year for which the tabulation is available is 1799, at which time national income was estimated at $677 million. By 1930 it had reached $72 billion, or more than a hundredfold increase in a period of 130 years.

Now what about prices? One of the best measures we have, published by the Department of Commerce, is the Wholesale Price Index for all commodities, using a 1910–14 base of 100. In 1799 this index stood at 126. In 1930, after more than 130 years of remarkable growth, the Wholesale Price Index was still 126. In other words, there had been no sustained and continuing increase in the general level of prices during the entire period.

I do not want to be understood as saying that prices remained the same during all these years. On the contrary, they fluctuated considerably, particularly during war and postwar times. Prices always change during such periods and since these fluctuations are mentioned most frequently in the textbooks and in the popular journals they have become fixed in the public mind. There is no dramatic value to descriptions of periods of price stability, so the fact that prices have been stable or declining for the major part of our history is usually overlooked. This unusual truth can be demonstrated with just a few illustrations.

As a result of the War of 1812, the Wholesale Price Index shot up to 182, but by 1819 it was back down to the 1799 level. From that date until the Civil War—a period of more than 40 years during which there was dramatic economic growth, as the Middle Western and Plains States were rapidly settled—the Wholesale Price Index fluctuated between 75 and 115.

Of course during the Civil War there was another great advance in prices but in 1874 the price level had again returned to the 1799 level. From that time until World War I prices never exceeded that level, only going higher after the war began. Finally, I might cite the 1920's, during which time the automobile industry revolutionized the American economy, a decade when prices were stable or edging slightly downward.

Lest there be any feeling that I have chosen a base year (1799) of exceptionally high prices, I might mention that I had the entire period—consisting of 132 years from 1799 to 1930—broken down into 4 periods of 33 years each and had the average price index computed for each period. Average prices were higher during the first period, 1799–1831, than during any of the three succeeding periods.

Thus we see that so far as the historical record is concerned there is no reason for us to believe that inflation is an essential ingredient of economic growth.

Now let us turn to the arguments advanced to support the proposition that some inflation is necessary to support economic growth today. These arguments fall generally into one of two categories: first, some inflation is inevitable and any attempt to stop it will lead to an interruption of growth; second, even if growth can be obtained under relatively stable prices, still more and faster growth can be secured by permitting or encouraging inflation.

The essentials of the first type of argument can be presented as follows: it is assumed that certain groups—particularly labor unions—have enough power to permit them to improve their positions relative to the rest of the economy. It is argued that there is no way in which this process can be halted, short of severe unemployment, and therefore it is best to adopt a monetary policy which will permit the process to continue. Put another way, it is assumed that since these particular inflationary pressures will not be denied it is far better that we adjust our thinking and policy to take account of this fact.

Frankly, I cannot take this contention very seriously. If it is indeed true that our economic system is unable to operate unless we acquiesce in a policy of deliberate inflation, then I say it is high time we take a new look at that economic system. If unions, for example, have achieved a position which has effectively destroyed the flexibility of our labor supply and given us instead a continuous situation of labor scarcity, regardless of the level of economic activity, then we do not get to the root of the problem by tinkering with the money supply.

The second argument on behalf of inflationary growth can be summarized as follows: a process of continual inflation will bring into productive use economic resources—both human and physical—which will not be utilized so long as there is price stability. Such an argument is indeed a strange one!

In the first place, we are asked to take on faith—or on the basis of some very dubious statistics—the claim that great increases in output will come forth if only we accept inflation. Frankly, we do not know just how much additional output would be forthcoming—but I suspect it would be mighty small. For we do know that under price stability we can have full utilization of all resources—1952 to 1956 is an example—and that there will be little or no slack in the economy. We know that great growth can occur in periods of price stability. Can the new inflationists point to any period in our history during which the Nation did not enjoy substantial economic growth when prices were stable?

I think you will agree that although answers to these arguments for inflation come immediately to mind—and I am sure that I have suggested only a few—it is not enough for us simply to react to the arguments advanced. If we are at all concerned with the proposition we must conduct a thorough inquiry into the nature of growth and examine all facets of the role inflation will play. Accordingly, at this point I should like to move to the second part of this discussion which, as I mentioned earlier, will be concerned with the framework within which sound economic growth really develops.

Our first need is for a few definitions. Starting with inflation, we find that it is a phenomenon of money. If we did not use money we could have no inflation. Any basic economics text or any good dictionary will tell us that: "Inflation occurs when there is a disproportionate increase in the supply of money relative to the amount of goods and services available, always resulting in a rise in prices."

Next, since inflation is a phenomenon, or a disease, of money, let us stop to remind ourselves of the functions of money. These are three: To serve as a measure of value, as a store of value, and as a medium of exchange.

Next we must have a definition of growth. Generally speaking, growth means an increase, which may be expressed in many ways: In size, quantity, quality, complexity, strength, or what have you. Since this is an economic discussion, we will talk of growth first in economic terms. In this context I choose to regard it as an increase in real national product, thus ignoring any effect of price changes. Because our population continues to grow in number every year, we cannot consider as growth an increase which merely matches the growth in population but provides no increase in standard of living for each individual. Therefore, by economic growth, I mean an increase in the real national product which, continued over the course of time, will continue to bring an increasingly better life for every citizen.

Any definition of growth that considered only its economic aspects would be tragically incomplete, so to it must be added moral and spiritual progress, measured in such spiritual values as confidence and security, from which the ultimate human satisfactions spring.

Finally, to set the stage for the discussion to follow we should review some of the elementary principles of growth. For the moment, we can keep money out of the picture and ask ourselves how growth must

take place in real terms. The first and most obvious thought is that real growth depends upon a continuing increase in the capacity for production. In our highly technical society this depends largely on the production of even-better tools, machines, factories, heavy equipment, and all of the other implements needed for production including an ever-widening research program to establish new directions of growth. While we may think of our personal progress in terms of consumption and consumer goods, these would not be forthcoming if we did not add continually to or improve the supply of what we call capital goods. Thus if the Nation is to have growth a sustained and, if possible, increasing portion of each year's output must consist of capital goods.

If we look at this basic process from the point of view of the individual, we can now bring money back into the picture. That portion of our income which is not used for consumption purposes we call savings. These savings represent dollar claims against resources and when they are placed at the disposal of the capital goods industries they enable those industries to produce the necessary implements of economic growth. In a free society like ours the decision as to how much of our money will go into consumption and how much into savings is essentially a voluntary one; each of us makes it for himself. By placing part of our incomes in savings banks, in insurance policies, in equity shares, in bonds, or in some other form of investment we create the lifeblood of production and therefore of growth.

A word should be said about the nature of our investing institutions. Not only do they seek out the areas for which the need is greatest—since it is in those areas in which lending opportunities are most attractive—but they are careful to determine that the need is real. The long experience of their managers, as well as their commonsense, assures us that these funds are rarely diverted into speculative, ill-conceived projects.

Having established our economic framework, I now turn to the final, and most important, subject: the effect which inflation, if accepted as a continuing policy, will have on economic growth.

Under normal circumstances we expect economic growth to be financed by real savings. By real savings is meant that portion of income not used for consumption purposes which will effect an equivalent transfer of resources to productive uses. Under this process, funds which individuals and companies place in investment outlets flow out again to those parts of our economy where the need is greatest. And this need is a reflection of the demands of consumers, exercising their free choice in the marketplace. Economic growth which, at root, is directed by the people is the kind of growth which can occur only in a free society. It is this kind of growth that is peculiarly American—and which is under ideological attack by communism.

How does this process change when we bring inflation into the picture? Put most simply, when growth occurs during inflation, part of the Nation's output of capital goods is financed by inflation and part by real savings. The inflationary part works very simply. Additions to the money supply are placed at the command of individuals and companies and are used to bid away resources from other uses. This, after all, is the historic fact of inflation: to transfer command of purchasing power from one sector of the economy to another. In a way it resembles the taxing process, except that the transfer is less obvious and to some, unfortunately, it is invisible. Instead of individuals actually handing over purchasing power, the transfer is effected through the marketplace by bidding up prices until one segment of the economy—the savers and fixed income groups—find that although they still have, or are receiving, the same number of dollars, those dollars represent claims to a smaller amount of resources.

If inflation can, in fact, stimulate some economic growth, is the price we pay sufficiently small to justify that growth? With this question we touch the crux of the problem. Here the facts are clear, the proof indisputable: it is that the price is far too high.

Consider first what happens to the usefulness of money. By changing the purchasing power of money, continuous inflation destroys its accuracy as a measure of value and distorts the worth of comparative dollar figures. Inflation dissipates the value stored in money saved or invested in credit instruments. At some point, money even loses its value as a medium of exchange. For example, at the war's end the Germans abandoned their money and used cigarettes for currency.

Perhaps all of these statements with respect to money have been made so often that we have ceased to realize what they actually mean. In particular, let us consider what happens when money can no longer serve as a store of value. The search immediately begins for substitutes and part of the output of the country is devoted to producing these substitutes—a complete economic waste.

Even a partial analysis of what this development would mean to our economy would consume more time than we could possibly give to it tonight. I would only observe that the entire investment and consumption process must inevitably be altered as this new element enters into every economic discussion and men must always ask: "What will serve best as a store of value and how much should I obtain?"

Most of the things seized upon as the instruments best suited for this function—cigarettes, a metal, inventories, or what have you—it will be far more expensive to produce than money, will enjoy none of the advantages of money since it will be subject to deterioration or obsolescence, and its production must introduce an element of distortion into our entire productive process.

There is another facet to this question of the kind of output we can hope to secure once growth is to depend, even in part, upon inflationary financing. Under such a process much depends on who has first access to the newly created money. History has shown that it is frequently the less efficient producers.

When inflation is rampant both lender and borrower throw caution to the wind. Speculators achieve a position of prominence. You can find excellent and tragic examples of this right here in Illinois. In 1837 the State of Illinois instituted a massive program of internal improvements, calling for the construction of eight railroads and the improvement of six rivers. Much of the money expended was secured in the form of new banknotes or credits provided by the State Bank of Illinois at Springfield and the Bank of Illinois at Shawneetown.

Only a portion of one of the railroads was ever completed—and then at a much later date. All of the other projects were abandoned. The net result, therefore, was that resources were diverted from productive uses by making large amounts of new money available to the State, but there was no corresponding increase in productive capacity. Looking back, this development might seem inevitable in pioneer days, when men were excited over the vision of boundless opportunities and speed was considered to be the primary criterion of economic development. It is not the way in which we must proceed today.

To summarize, we might indeed get some increased physical output under inflation—but most probably of a completely uneconomic nature. And we cannot even begin to measure the effect of the distortions which will necessarily be involved, distortions which may bring a drop in output even if inflation proceeds slowly.

Earlier we suggested that growth cannot be measured by physical output alone; that we must also take into account moral and spiritual progress. We are thus entitled to go beyond questions of output and efficiency and inquire into the economic morality of the process of inflationary growth.

What the advocates of inflation do not make clear is that its stimulation is that of a narcotic, and therefore is essentially evil. Being a narcotic, it counterfeits health and prosperity, as it did at first for the Germans in the twenties. As a narcotic it is not only habit forming but it requires ever larger doses to produce the same stimulation. Like all narcotics it distorts one's judgment and sense of values. Its motives are immoral, its process a form of theft, and its whole program essentially dishonest. It must inevitably destroy the faith people have in their government, without whose acquiescence and active participation it could not exist.

The mechanics of inflation are also part of this moral question. As I have already noted, inflation performs the function of transferring purchasing power from one group to another. If it did not do this—if all incomes and all savings were immediately revalued as prices rose—it could play no part in the plans of the new inflationists. This transfer process has been kept conveniently obscure by the inflationists but we at least know this much, even without their help: that so much of growth as is financed by inflation will be paid for primarily by the saver and by fixed income groups. And we also know that the transfer will be involuntary. Resources are literally stolen from those who have no way of protecting themselves, leaving them no claim to future output, nor even the satisfaction of knowing that, if the levy had been in the form of a tax, others would also be sharing the burden. How do we measure growth when it is based on theft?

There are some who would have us compound this felony by making inflation a deliberate policy of Government. In other words, theft is no longer to be inadvertent but planned. Even worse, it is not to be admitted.

For a policy of inflationary growth to work it would of course be necessary to hide the fact of what was happening, for once it was understood that a real levy was being made, there would be understandable, and probably successful, attempts to adjust incomes to keep pace with prices. Accordingly, government would have to adopt a policy of deliberate hypocrisy, urging people to save, or at least not to seek higher salaries and wages, while at the same time it would be placing the major burden of the inflationary growth process on those public spirited individuals who followed its advice, as well as on those individuals who were in a position to do nothing else.

In considering this process I find it difficult to improve on the comment made recently by Malcolm Bryan, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, in a recent talk here in Chicago:

"If a policy of active or permissive inflation is to be a fact, then we can secure the shreds of our self-respect only by announcing the policy. This is the least of the canons of decency that should prevail. We should have the decency to say to the money saver, 'Hold still, little fish. All we intend to do is gut you.'"

But announced or not, such a policy could not operate for very long in a free society.

Finally, I think the assumption that inflation can be established and maintained at a fixed rate deserves close scrutiny. Its proponents maintain that this is possible, so long as the Federal Reserve uses its powers to that end. Parenthetically, it is interesting to observe that this desire to limit the inflation to 2 or 3 percent per year must

mean that a more rapid inflation is undesirable in their eyes. Although as ordinary mortals we cannot be expected to possess the remarkable insight which tells the new inflationists that 3 percent is good but 5 percent bad, we can at least wonder out loud why, if a little inflation is clearly preferable to a lot of inflation, should not price stability be preferable to a little inflation?

The suggestion that the Federal Reserve will be able to establish and maintain a proper rate of inflation is patently absurd. In the first place, it is logically inconsistent to argue that because of economic rigidities, political pressures or what have you, the Federal Reserve cannot follow a policy directed toward securing price stability and, at the same time, maintain that it will be able to hold the line at an inflation of 2 or 3 percent per year. Commonsense would suggest that, once adopted, the need for ever-increasing doses of inflation will be obvious.

We cannot afford to overlook the fact that a policy of inflation will set in motion powerful forces directed toward more and more, faster and faster inflation. From the individual's standpoint inflation encourages, even compels, increases in consumption and corresponding decreases in savings. In periods of inflation we know that money spent today will buy more than money spent tomorrow, and money saved or loaned will buy less when we get it back. Therefore we spend it now. When inflation forces prices up we must spend more and more for life's necessities, and thus will have less and less to invest, if we even want to.

As consumers become increasingly aware of the prospect of continuing inflation and step up their expenditures accordingly the effect will be to increase their bids for resources. At the same time inflationary financing of capital goods expenditures will also lead to bids for resources, often the same resources. This is the heart of the all-too-familiar wage-price spiral.

Even the new inflationists fear a runaway inflation, as well they might. History is well scattered with illustrations of what happened when the stimulus of inflation was accepted to support growth. For example, at the beginning of the German inflation of the 1920's, there was a real increase in output and, as a matter of fact, there is indication that the German boom did not even slacken during the worldwide depression of 1921. But let me quote from a book by Gustav Stolper called German Economy, 1870–1940 and published in 1940. He says:

"Only very slowly did German industry and trade realize that the flowering of business in the inflation boom had been only imaginary, since reproduction costs always exceeded selling prices, stocks kept dwindling, and plants were worn down. In addition, owing to the dominant position of the producer over the consumer both at home and abroad, the incentive to technical progress disappeared. Gradually it was realized by everybody that the industrial boom was fed chiefly by a waste of substance, money was no longer able to fulfill its proper function. Finally, disturbance in all parts of the economic mechanism had become so serious that, despite a further rise in prices, industrial unemployment began to grow."

Let me repeat the last sentence, "Finally, disturbance in all parts of the economic mechanism had become so serious that despite a further rise in prices, industrial unemployment began to grow." Here we have the inevitable and final price of inflation: the cessation of all economic growth, growing unemployment, and the breakdown of society. For Stolper could have gone on to point out that the ultimate result of that particular inflation was Hitler and World War II.

Is sound, sustained and continuing growth necessary for the United States? Yes; not only for its material benefits and deep spiritual satisfactions for us and our children, but at the price of victory in the race of survival against the rising strength of the Communist threat. Is inflation necessary or desirable for economic growth? No; it will weaken, and might actually destroy it. What will be its effect on spiritual growth? Being essentially immoral—a form of theft, a confidence game whose victims are the patriotic and the poor—it cannot be condoned, either by the individual or the Government. How can we protect our future from the siren song of easy money, in which the current inflationary threat is presented? To do this we must have the determination to learn and spread the truth, and the spiritual courage to apply it to our own economic decisions. I hope all the resources of this great economic club and of its members can be devoted to this vital task. Thank you.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1958

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, in the limits of our finite knowledge, seeing at best as through a glass darkly, we turn in our perplexed and deep need to Thee, whose dwelling place is light without the shadow of our earthborn clouds. From all the phantoms of brutal hate which devastate our worn and torn world, for this hallowed moment we would still our souls in the calm assurance that at the heart of the universe goodness reigns. In that faith send us forth without fear or favor to do the right as Thou dost give us to see the right, firm in the conviction that these clouds are lies, and that the blue sky is the truth. Following the gleam of this confident assurance—

God save America 'mid all her splendors;
Save her from pride and from luxury.
Enthrone in her heart the unseen and eternal;
Right be her might, and the truth make her free.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 23, 1958, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 73)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the 43d annual report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 27, 1958.*

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. In connection therewith, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN RETIRED PERSONNEL TO ACCEPT AND WEAR DECORATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF ANTHRACITE EXPERIMENT STATION, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Anthracite Experiment Station operated by the Bureau of Mines at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON REVOLVING CREDIT FUND TRANSACTIONS, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of revolving credit fund transactions, Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DAMAGE CLAIMS, LAKE OF THE WOODS, MINN.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims for damages caused to inhabitants of the United States by fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods, Minn. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Two letters from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED LABOR REPORTS ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require labor organization reports, to ensure disclosure of certain labor organization information, to define certain duties and responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to provide further safeguards for workers against improper activities in the conduct of labor organization affairs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REVISION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY LAWS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require the attainment of a minimum age, and the qualifications of citizenship and of residence of Judges of the Supreme and Interior Courts of the United States

*"Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress is hereby memorialized to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in accordance with article V of the Constitution, to provide as follows, to wit:

" 'No person shall be a judge of the Supreme or any inferior court of the United States who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years, been 7 years a citizen of the United States, and been 14 years a resident within the United States'; be it further

*"Resolved*, that copies of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to the clerk of the Senate and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider the Brush-Fort Morgan area in the State of Colorado as the future site of the Air Training Command, now located at Fort Warren in the State of Wyoming, in the event the present location of the Air Training Command is converted to the furtherance of the missile program

"Whereas it is currently rumored that the Air Training Command now located at Fort Warren in the State of Wyoming, is to be moved, and the present site of the training center converted to the furtherance of the missile program; and

"Whereas the Brush-Fort Morgan area of the State of Colorado would be ideal for the new location of the Air Training Command because of these factors:

"The area has an unlimited water supply for domestic purposes, and unlimited electric power is available;

"The climate is perfect practically the year around;

"The area is served by two mainline railroads;

"Highways 6 and 34 for east-west bound travel and highway 71 for north-south bound travel pass through the area, all of said highways being paved and of national prominence;

"The area now has substantial landing fields to serve aircraft, and because of its terrain, could provide additional fields to serve any type of plane that might be used by the Air Training Command;

"Excellent hospital facilities and churches of many denominations are available in the cities and towns throughout the area;

"It is located within approximately 2 travel hours from the city of Denver, and yet is not so closely adjacent to any strategic installation as to invite bombing in case of war hostilities; and

"Being located in the South Platte drainage area, it is beyond question one of the most productive and beautiful locations in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 41st General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein*, That it respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to consider the Brush-Fort Morgan area of the State of Colorado as the future site of the Air Training Command now located at Fort Warren in Wyoming, in the event that the present location at Fort Warren is in the future converted to and used for the carrying out of the missile program; be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"FRANK L. HAYS,
*"President of the Senate.*
"LUCILE L. SHUSTER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*
"CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
*"Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"ROBERT S. EBERHARDT,
*"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."*

## THE LATE SENATOR MATTHEW M. NEELY, OF WEST VIRGINIA—RESOLUTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Marion County Bar Association, of Fairmont, W. Va., relating to the late Senator Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia. Without objection, the resolution will lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL—SENATOR MATTHEW MANSFIELD NEELY

We are here today to write the final pages in the record of our appreciation of the character and services of Senator Matthew Mansfield Neely. It is with heavy hearts that we mark the passing of our friend and neighbor.

Senator Neely was a typical American. He worked on a farm as a boy while attending a country school, walking more than a mile each day. When working at a variety of odd jobs to pay his way through school, little did he realize that some day he was to hold every elective office within the gift of the people of West Virginia to which he aspired—Congressman, United States Senator, and Governor of West Virginia. Such a thing could happen in no other country. But this is America—that is democracy—and Senator Neely perfectly personified the typical American youth with an indomitable courage that brings success in a land of opportunity. No wonder that neither selfishness nor greed found refuge in his brimming heart or his avid mind. With this wholesome background, the heritage of many great Americans, he developed simplicity of manner, and a genuine eagerness to help others, a strong foundation on which to build a useful career.

It was truly said of Matthew Mansfield Neely that "no man, living or dead, in the history of West Virginia, has left his mark so deep so many places, and in so many fields of activity." Yet with it all he never lost the common touch; he was as proud of his origin as he was of his ultimate destiny.

He was a positive man, not afraid to express his views forthrightly and courageously. His likes and dislikes among men were definite and pronounced. He liked a good fight and never retreated from what he believed to be right. Life was to Senator Neely a match-

less, romantic adventure. He lived it freely, fully; a "gentleman unafraid," he faced death, as he had always met life, with a smile.

The outbreak of the Spanish-American War found him enlisting at the first call for volunteers. After that war he served 11 years in the National Guard where he received the rank of major, and for many years he was familiarly known as "Major Neely."

At West Virginia University he won the gold medal award for being the best cadet in the University Cadet Corps, and represented the university in many oratorical contests. He was a brilliant student and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa national honorary fraternity.

In 1902 he began his career as a lawyer at the Marion County bar where he was a practicing attorney for 55 years. He was as successful as a lawyer as he was in politics. He was saturated with the idea that rules of law should be applied in such a way that the results would be beneficial to the people. An abstract system of law had no appeal to him. He often pointed out that the law was meant to serve and not to rule the institutions which it sheltered. In presenting a case to the court, he pointed out the life story of the litigants and the motives which prompted the controversy. He prepared his cases thoroughly, first becoming familiar with the facts, and then he reached into the realm of legal principles to choose therefrom one or more which, when applied to the facts, would produce just and beneficial results—much as a skilled mechanic would reach into his tool box for a tool made for the specific work at hand. Clients recognized his sound judgment and sought it. Large business learned the value of his experience and broad vision, and knowledge of public affairs, and made use of them.

The style of his speeches was uniform throughout his long career. He was a student of the Bible and quoted from it and the great works of literature in the courtroom and in the political arena. His remarks were always grammatically correct, and clothed in language that any person could understand. He respected the courts and was zealous of their good name. He took little time to play and far too few moments of relaxation. He had an intellectual hunger which carried him to far ends of knowledge and culture. Studious and devoted to the task at hand, he cared little for formal social life or frivolity. He could teach us better things, and did.

Senator Neely's first venture into politics was in 1908 when he was elected mayor of Fairmont on a "dry" ticket. Later he served as clerk of the house of delegates, then was elected to Congress in 1913. In all, he served 5 terms in the House of Representatives, and 5 terms in the Senate, a record unique in American history. Even before the New Deal era, he urged old-age pensions, and protection for organized labor. He championed the Railroad Retirement Act and battled for many social reforms which we now enjoy. While he was generally found on the side of the coal miner and organized labor, he won the admiration of the coal operators in helping to create the National Bituminous Coal Commission, and to end freight rate differentials on coal shipped to the Great Lakes.

The poor and unfortunate found in him an honest, sympathetic, and courageous representative, and their confidence was never misplaced. He had a firm determination always to help the little fellow, and would stand up against any influence or pressure, in order to do so. He was respected, loved, and trusted by his constituents. The people of West Virginia exemplified their respect and trust by their votes of confidence in his stewardship and in his political responsibility.

He had a keen respect for and interest in the welfare of our farm people. He was the unofficial mayor of Washington in his position as chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee. He was prominent in the fight for better social security, rural electrification, and unemployment compensation.

He is solely responsible for the erection of the present United States Court House and Post Office here in Fairmont, and for making Fairmont the headquarters for the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia.

The achievements of Senator Neely are so numerous and so imposing that but to review a few of them is to wonder at the magnitude of the spirit which evoked them.

He was a devoted husband and father, and firm in his religious principles. Senator Neely was a big man in the finest and truest sense of the word, and his passing is mourned by the great leaders of our Nation, regardless of political affiliation. The honors which came to him never abated his love for West Virginia and its people—an affection which was returned in kind.

As to a man of such quality no one will pause to debate his character, his fidelity, or his exceptional worth.

He is gone, and while the west is still aglow with his radiance, it is well for us to pause and take count of our own selves. He has a lesson to teach us if we care to stop and learn. His high place in the history of our State and Nation is secure. His tired body now rests in the long sleep which it has so well earned, worn out in public service: Be it

*Resolved*, That the members of the Marion County Bar Association record our high appreciation of his great qualities of mind and heart, our full recognition of his great public service, and our deep gratitude for the luster that he shed by his life and character upon the profession which he so adorned.

That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to his widow, his sons and his daughter, and that the same be presented for record to the circuit and criminal courts of Marion County, the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia, the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, and to the clerk of the Senate of the Congress of the United States of America.

A resolution adopted by the Bar Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1165) to provide for the procurement of judge advocates and law-specialist officers for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Mary Lawler, of Pocono Pines, Pa., relating to working conditions at the army signal depot at Tobyhanna, Pa. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Proceso B. Yepez, of Leyte, Philippine Islands, relating to his claim for a disability rating; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Joint Committee on the National Capital, New York, N. Y., signed by Harlean James, secretary, favoring the enactment of House bills 9239, 9510, and 9595, and Senate bill 2283, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

The petition of Daisy C. Clark, and sundry other citizens of the State of Montana, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Golden Gate District of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, at San Francisco, Calif., relating to the encroachment of the judiciary upon the legislative functions of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Englewood, N. J., favoring the enactment of a constitutional amendment to prohibit nonresident State income taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Atwater Elementary School District, Atwater, Calif., relating to Federal aid to education in certain federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Lodi, Calif., District Chamber of Commerce, favoring the construction of the Trinity project by private enterprise; to the Committee on Public Works.

## FUNDS FOR SAN JOSE MISSION, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the San Jose Mission at San Antonio, Tex., is a national historic site under the National Park Service.

The San Antonio Conservation Society, which made a gift of a large part of the restored area of San Jose Mission to the State of Texas, recently adopted a resolution urging that the sum of $45,000 in the national parks budget be used to carry out necessary work at the mission.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1958.

The following resolution was unanimously passed at our regular meeting on December 5, 1957:

"Whereas the San Jose Mission is an important part of the American heritage and represents a great part of the culture of the Southwest; and

"Whereas the San Jose Mission is a national historic site under the National Park Service and is the only national site in the entire Southwest; and

"Whereas the San Antonio Conservation Society made a gift of a substantial part of the restored area of San Jose Mission to the State of Texas in order to have it made a national historic site; so, therefore, be it

*"Resolved*, That the San Antonio Conservation Society urge the Honorable PAUL KILDAY, Representative from this District, to endeavor to include the sum of $45,000 in the 1958 national parks budget to be used in the necessary work to be done at San Jose Mission, national historic site, in San Antonio, Tex."

## THE WASTE OF HELIUM—RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AMARILLO, TEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, directors of the Amarillo, Tex., Chamber of Commerce recently adopted a resolution calling attention to what they see as alarming waste of helium, an essential strategic material for the defense of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas helium has become an essential strategic material for the defense of our Nation and is destined to become more important in the development of missiles, and

Whereas 90 percent of all helium today being produced in America goes directly or indirectly to defense agencies of the Federal Government; and

Whereas supplies of helium in America today are extremely limited, with 60 percent of the entire free world production coming from the vicinity of Amarillo, Tex., and it is well recognized that present reserves of natural gas in this area will be exhausted in 20 to 30 years; and

Whereas proponents of this resolution desire to point to the alarming waste of helium presently being carried away in natural gas pipelines and burned as fuel: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Amarillo Chamber of Commerce urge the United States Bureau of Mines, the Department of the Interior and all other agencies interested in the defense of our country to take all steps necessary to capture and conserve this rare product as quickly as possible for future needs of our Nation.

Adopted this 22d day of December 1957, by the board of directors, Amarillo Chamber of Commerce.

JACK LACY,
*Executive Vice President.*
S. T. CURTIS,
*President.*

## RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF HOPKINSVILLE, KY.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Hopkinsville, Ky., relating to the natural gas industry. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution opposing bills H. R. 6790 and H. R. 6791 in the Congress of the United States of America and directing that this resolution be spread on the minutes of the proceedings of the Board of Common Council of the City of Hopkinsville, Ky., and that copies of said resolution be distributed among certain Members of the United States Congress

Whereas a great majority of the people dwelling in the cities of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the city of Hopkinsville, Ky., in particular, and many living in rural areas, are dependent on natural gas as fuel; and

Whereas this gas originates in some instances, in gas wells, but in most cases, as a byproduct, formerly a waste, of oil wells; and

Whereas, during the years of World War II, more advanced methods of transportation of gas over great distances were developed, making it possible and profitable to bring this product to markets far removed from the source while providing said markets with a volume of the product far greater than had hitherto been available, and

Whereas, the carriers or newly formed pipeline transportation companies, acting as wholesalers for gas that they purchased from the oil wells, in many cases for less than 1 cent per thousand cubic feet, assisted local retailers, with the help of the oil industry, to promote the sale of gas for space heating, that the greater volume of gas made available from the oil wells might be absorbed, and

Whereas, consumers in the cities of Kentucky in general, and of Hopkinsville, Ky., in particular, as well as in rural areas, being lured by initial low cost fuel, converted from other forms of space heating, at great cost and sacrifice, often financed out of meager savings, but more often by credit extended on future earnings, and

Whereas, in a very short time the oil producers completely dominated the space heating fuel industry, making consumers economic captives, and virtual prisoners of a monopoly into which they had been baited by low costs at the source but which costs began to rise after the market was established and completely dominated, and

Whereas, at present, the consuming public is protected by the Federal Power Commission against excessive rates designed to support unfair and exorbitant profits at the source or wellhead, and from the same evils that might arise from pipelines or carriers, who act as wholesalers in interstate traffic; the same protection being afforded the consumer against local distributors or retailers, by various State agencies, known in Kentucky as the Public Service Commission, and

Whereas, these same agencies, viz; the Federal Power Commission and the Kentucky Public Service Co., also assure the producer, the wholesaler and the retailer, a fair return on investment, and

Whereas, there is presently before the Congress of the United States, bills H. R. 6790 and H. R. 6791, known as the Harris-O'Hara bill, designed to relieve the producers of natural gases of any regulation at the wellhead or source; and

Whereas should there be no regulation at the source of wellhead, control would be destroyed entirely between the producer and the consumer, for the Federal Power Commission, the Kentucky Public Service Commission and like agencies or commissions in other States, would have no choice but to pass increases in costs at the source or wellhead to the wholesalers and the retailers, and such increases would all be paid solely by the consumer, thus destroying the intent and purpose of the aforementioned public agencies; and

Whereas in view of the rapid rise in the price of the product, after the markets were established and controlled by the oil industry and before the American cities opposed them in the Federal Power Commission, and considering that an unbridled market would spell economic disaster to many consumers and could conceivably create economic havoc, not only in Kentucky, but throughout the Nation as well: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, by the Common Council of the City of Hopkinsville, Christian County, Ky.—

SECTION 1. That in the interest of the public welfare in general, and the people of the city of Hopkinsville, Ky., in particular, that this resolution does oppose bills H. R. 6790 and H. R. 6791, and will use every fair, just, and moral means at its disposal, granted by the laws and constitution of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and the laws and Constitution of the United States of America, to so oppose them; and does hereby urge and request all those representing this Commonwealth in the Congress of the United States of America, to do likewise; and

SEC. 2. That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the proceedings of the Board of Hopkinsville Common Council of the City of Hopkinsville, Ky., and that copies be made with the signature of the mayor affixed thereto and the seal of the city imprinted thereon, and that said copies be sent to: The President of the United States; Hon. John Sherman Cooper, United States Senate; Hon. Thruston B. Morton, United States Senate; Hon. Noble J. Gregory, United States House of Representatives; Hon. J. M. Robinson, Jr., United States House of Representatives; Hon. Frank L. Chelf, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Brent Spence, United States House of Representatives; Hon. John C. Watts, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Carl D. Perkins, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Eugene Siler, United States House of Representatives; Hon. William H. Natcher, United States House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be in full force and effect when passed, published and recorded according to law.

F. ERNEST LACKEY,
*Mayor, City of Hopkinsville, Ky.*
W. H. HIGHTOWER,
*City Clerk.*

## RESOLUTIONS OF VEGETABLE GROWERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received from Joseph S. Shelly, executive secretary, Vegetable Growers Association of America, a letter dated January 14, enclosing a copy of its policy resolutions adopted at the 49th annual convention held in December 1957 at New Orleans, La.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the attached resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1958.

DEAR SENATOR: The Vegetable Growers Association of America is pleased to present to you this copy of its policy resolutions adopted at the 49th annual convention, held in December 1957 at New Orleans, La.

These resolutions are the result of the considered judgment and consideration of the membership from the 45 affiliate associations.

It is the hope of the membership that these resolutions will be of value to you in arriving at your decisions on these national problems of vital interest to the Nation's vegetable growers.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH S. SHELLY,
*Executive Secretary.*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY MEMBERS OF THE VEGETABLE GROWERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, DECEMBER 1957, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

VEGETABLE GROWERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA POLICY RESOLUTIONS

FOREWORD

The Vegetable Growers Association of America is a national organization of vegetable growers. The association is composed of 45 affiliated organizations.

The general membership is solicited for policy recommendations and suggestions. These suggestions may come directly from individual members or from affiliated associations.

These proposals are assembled by the resolutions committee and presented to the official delegates at the annual convention for discussion and consideration. Final adoption must be by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast.

A policy declaration not included or repeated remains an effective policy for the ensuing year after adoption.

These resolutions represent the Vegetable Growers Association of America's policy on national issues. They provide the framework within which the association operates. They are the window through which others observe us. Through our united efforts I am certain we can make a contribution to

the vegetable industry, our traditional free-enterprise system, and our democratic way of life.

DECEMBER 1957.

PAUL B. RUETENIK,
*President.*

POLICY RESOLUTIONS

*1. Subsidies and price supports*

We are opposed to Federal subsidies to any segment of the national economy, including Government price-support programs for agriculture. Such handouts add to the staggering burden on the taxpayer, encourage inefficiency, increase costs to the consumer, make necessary a nonproductive Federal bureaucracy to spin out endless regulations and controls, and eventually stifle individual freedom and responsibility.

We urge all Americans to steadfastly oppose the creeping socialism implicit in any subsidy program and the steadily increasing subordination of the individual to the state.

We specifically point to the glaring failure of Federal agricultural programs, costing an estimated $5 billion annually, to do anything but poison the wellsprings of agricultural free enterprise.

*2. Diverted acres*

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the basic commodities have for years been dumping huge acreages of prime agricultural land into production of nonsupported commodities. The subsidized competition from these diverted acres is particularly harmful to vegetable producers who must market highly perishable commodities on a supply-and-demand basis.

American vegetable growers do not fear honest competition, but federally subsidized competition from acres released into vegetable production from the basic commodities is unfair and ruinous and a gross violation of justice and equity.

To correct this vicious situation, and to restore vegetable growers and all other producers of unsupported crops the fundamental American right to compete in an honest market, it is vital that all acreage diverted in past years through the operation of acreage allotments and quotas be removed from economic production and planted to nonharvested, nongrazed soil-building crops. The basic commodities must accept this as a fair penalty for their dependence on Federal handouts.

*3. The soil bank*

The soil bank as now operating is more of a politically inspired relief program than a surplus reduction plan. The soil bank law continues the preoccupation of the Congress with the alleged basic commodities, the "sacred six" of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco, in spite of the fact that only 25 percent of the national farmers' income is derived from these political favorites.

If the soil bank is to be a genuine remedy for chronic overproduction and for the improvement of farm income, and if it is to lead to the gradual elimination of Federal price supports and controls, then it must deal realistically with the specific problem of excess agricultural productivity. The present law encourages the shifting of destructive surpluses from one crop to another through diverted acres.

The soil bank must be amended to strike at the roots of chronic overproduction by retiring surplus producing land from all crops and placing this surplus land in a bona fide soil fertility stockpile.

*4. A prosperous agriculture*

We do not consider it an obligation of the Federal Government to guarantee the prosperity of agriculture or any other segment of the economy. A strong and healthy agriculture cannot be developed by a system of price manipulation which leads to production and market controls, limiting of individual freedoms, stifling of managerial ability, and curbing of individual initiative. A prosperous agriculture cannot be built on a static parity concept whose deceptive objective is to maintain the status quo. Prosperity in agriculture cannot be secured through curbs on production and regimentation by the Government.

We favor a policy permitting managerial decisions which will provide the fullest and most effective use of efficient self-adapting decision making. Policies which are flexible, permitting changes in the effective supply and demand situation, will promote domestic consumption and a healthy flow of the benefits of free enterprise.

We oppose any direct payment plan as a solution to agricultural problems.

*5. Marketing agreements*

With an increasing interest in marketing agreements and where it appears that a considerable segment of the growers of any given commodity in a homogeneous producing area desire the adoption of such an agreement, this association will make available its staff and facilities in affording information and assistance to the local State member associations in establishing the proper contacts and procedures with the United States Department of Agriculture.

We believe these marketing agreements should be confined to local, State, or compact regional producing areas of the specific commodity.

*6. Federal land reclamation*

In the face of a farm commodity surplus situation of disaster proportions our Federal Government continues to add to the tax burden, by spending enormous sums of the taxpayers money on reclaiming additional agricultural lands. With one arm our Federal bureaucracy pours out billions to cure agricultural overproduction while with the other it busily piles up more farmland to produce more farm products to produce more destructive surpluses. The first arm now labors mightily to suppress this new surplus, while the second lustily digs new ditches and piles up new dams, and so on around the brainless and vicious circle.

This situation is absurd on its face, and the Congress should take immediate steps to end the creation of new farmlands at the Federal expense until population increase makes it necessary.

*7. Natural resources*

Soil and water resources are our Nation's most valued assets. It should be our long range national policy to promote the wise utilization of these basic resources. Wherever possible, we believe these programs should be administered by State or local governing bodies, avoiding possible duplication.

A sound and long-range improvement program of our land resources is imperative to any sound permanent farm program. Such programs are vital to the entire Nation. We believe that the Federal Government, through its various agencies, should encourage, advise, and demonstrate proper land use as a means of increasing farm income.

Adequate water supplies are essential to the economic development of agriculture, industry and municipalities. The water needs of each should be carefully considered. Water use has more than doubled per capita in recent decades. Where needed, State laws should be revised to reflect present day needs and establish water rights and ownership. Water needs increase but not the supply of water.

*8. Farmer cooperatives*

Farm cooperatives for purchasing supplies, selling commodities, and offering services have for many years made a vital contribution to the agricultural industry. In many instances they have been of value in alleviating the effects of the cost-price squeeze. We urge our membership to fully explore the possibilities of utilizing cooperatives in their farm operation and to meet competition in the marketing field. We object to the efforts of certain groups to curtail agricultural enterprises by legislative action.

*9. Importation of infested plants and plant products*

We urge continued vigilance and adequate enforcement of laws requiring rigid inspection of imported plants and plant products to prevent the introduction of destructive plant pests. Better inspection of the baggage of incoming passengers arriving by air and by water is essential.

The fire ant, the Mediterranean fruitfly, and the witch weed offer conclusive proof of the necessity for vigilance and dramatically illustrate the penalty for failure.

*10. Control of predatory birds and animals*

The red-winged blackbird, grackle, starling, cow bird, and other birds are becoming very destructive to vegetable crops in an increased number of vegetable-producing areas. The tremendous and excessive population of these birds with their insatiable appetites cross State and area boundaries in their migration. We, therefore, petition the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior to plan and execute an adequate study of the movements and habits of these and other birds so that those flocks guilty of this destruction can be reduced to normal numbers. We further petition the Congress of the United States to provide funds so that such a plan can be made operative.

San Juan rabbits can become a major pest in this country as they have become in Australia. Recent importation for sportsmanship purposes endangers vegetable crops, since the San Juan rabbit seems to prefer vegetables to other vegetation. They should be immediately eradicated.

*11. Potato and onion futures*

Onions and potatoes, by their very nature, are unsuitable commodities for futures trading. Such futures trading has in the past worked severe injury to farmers, and we do not believe that any corrective actions by the mercantile exchanges or the Commodity Exchange Authority can make a basically unsound situation healthy.

We strongly support legislation by the Congress to prohibit futures trading in these commodities entirely.

*12. United States standards and grades for vegetables and potatoes*

We encourage wider use of United States standards and grades for vegetable products as a means of marketing better quality vegetables and increasing consumption. Whenever and wherever possible, we recommend the use of these established grades and standards in the marketing channels. Vegetable packages should be clearly marked by count, or weight, and sold in standard containers.

We urge continued vigilance and prosecution by the United States Department of Agriculture Regulatory Service of individuals who intentionally misbrand and misuse the United States Department of Agriculture grades or standards.

We urge a program of farmer education in the packing and marketing of their produce to take advantage of the demands of their particular markets.

The United States Department of Agriculture should give adequate notice of proposed grade changes to all segments of the industry affected. All such proposed changes should be made only after a public hearing has been held on the proposals. Grower groups and individual farmers seldom can afford the high-priced legal talent necessary to voice their objections in written briefs. We, therefore, regard public

hearings, including the right of cross-examination of testifying United States Department of Agriculture officials, as essential to a proper expression of grower opinion.

*13. National potato grade labeling and marketing agreement*

We are opposed to a national grade labeling bill or a compulsory national marketing order for potatoes or any other commodity. There are sufficient regional differences in production and in marketing to make any such universal approach grossly unfair to one or more producing regions. The Congress has wisely recognized the principle of regional differences in the present marketing agreement law.

There is ample legislative authority now in force to make any national grade labeling law redundant. The Perishable Agricultural Commodity Act and others give ample authority to the United States Department of Agriculture to control any misbranding practices. In the interest of the honest producer and dealer we urge effective enforcement of existing law, and not mere multiplication of legislative authority.

Needless legislation, such as a national potato grade labeling act, results in costly duplication of enforcement efforts, multiplication of a stultifying bureaucracy, and further progress down the road to socialism.

*14. Agricultural research*

This association acknowledges its indebtedness to research for providing the solutions to many of its problems and recognizes that this work must continue and be increased if we are to have the answers to new problems when they arise. Therefore, we urge that a greatly expanded program of fundamental and applied research be undertaken by all governmental and private institutions engaged in research of interest to vegetable growers, handlers, processors, marketers, and consumers. We commend the Federal Government for increased evidence of cooperation between the various departments in the interest of growers and users of vegetables and for the increased cooperation between the research agencies of Federal, State, and private interests.

We urge Congress to increase available funds for this work as authorized under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

*15. Weed control*

Increasing costs of production, coupled with declining income, in vegetable crops emphasizes the importance of the savings to be made by using new chemical weed control methods. Advances in the field of chemical weed control research have already produced practical field methods of weed control which have brought major savings to the industry and helped in alleviating the pressure of high production costs. This weed control research should be expanded and intensified as rapidly as possible to insure the continuation of progress in this field. This need is made critical by the lack of available hand labor and the introduction of mechanical harvesters in many crops.

*16. Marketing*

We believe efficient marketing is essential to successful agriculture and that proper marketing facilities tend to bring better returns to the grower and better distribution to the consumer because of less waste of time, labor, and produce. We approve legislative principles which encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities and means of financing through a market mortgage insurance fund.

We further urge the Congress to study and consider legislation which will prevent practices of featherbedding labor racketeering which impede the free flow of agricultural products and add unnecessary costs which tend to widen the price spread.

*17. Modern terminal market facilities*

We believe that future progress of American agriculture is greatly dependent on the construction and efficient operation of modern terminal marketing facilities. To this end we offer our services to our member organizations in promoting such vital facilities and their efficient utilization.

*18. Agri-business training*

With the ever increasing expansion of agriculture, both off and on the farm, there is a shortage of highly trained persons in the essential skills required of this technical industry. We urge that all agricultural organizations and related industry, along with our land-grant colleges and other institutions of higher learning, formulate an active recruitment program and objective training curriculum.

*19. Federal encroachment on the rights of the State and of the individual*

The Federal Government, through the actions of the Congress, administrative bodies and the courts, has for many years been extending its power into fields properly belonging to the several States.

The individual finds himself more and more circumscribed in his actions by Federal laws, rules, and regulations. We must call a halt to this gradual erosion of the constitutional rights of the individual and of our 48 sovereign States.

We support the principle that State laws should continue to be final in State courts except in the case of direct conflict between separate provisions of a Federal and a State law. We must arrest the creeping control and subordination of our State, county, and municipal governments by the enormous weight of the Federal power.

We charge our directors, officers, and executive employees to work for these objectives.

*20. State agricultural stabilization and conservation committees*

We believe that State agricultural stabilization and conservation committees should be elected by the farmers of their State and not appointed by Washington. The appointive power leads to a subservience on the part of many agricultural stabilization and conservation committees to the authorities in Washington and leads the committee, in some instances, into actions that do not serve the best interests of their people.

We believe that State agricultural stabilization and conservation committees should be elected by the farmers of their State in the same way that local agricultural stabilization and conservation committees are presently elected.

*21. Capital gains tax*

More and more farmers, truck gardeners, and nurserymen in many metropolitan areas are being compelled to sell their lands because of economic reasons over which they have no control; that such sales are, in effect, involuntary because they are the result of increasing taxes and many complications arising in the areas due to residential, commercial, and industrial developments, making it impossible to continue their agricultural pursuits.

Most of these farmers are neither trained nor experienced in any other endeavor and it is necessary for them to purchase other farm lands so that they may carry on their life work and provide for themselves and their families.

Because of this condition over which they have no control, they are obliged to go out of the rapidly expanding area and buy larger farms, certainly not as conveniently located to the markets, which cost as much or more than the amount received from the sale of their original lands.

It is impossible in most instances to effect a trade or exchange, and, therefore, they are required to pay a tax on the capital gain resulting from the sale and this places them at a very serious economic disadvantage because they must either reduce the amount of the land required or assume a mortgage or other obligation in order to effect the purchase.

It is our opinion that under these circumstances the farmer is in the same position as an owner whose land has been condemned or who sells his home, but the farmer is not permitted to reinvest the proceeds of the sale in a substitute farm or to transfer the cost of the original farm to the acquired farm and is not exempted from the payment of a tax as are the owners of condemned lands or homes.

We urge that the Congress of the United States consider legislation to extend to the owners of land used by them in agricultural pursuits and which they have been compelled to sell because of economic conditions arising in these areas be given the privilege of (a) reinvesting the proceeds of the sale in the purchase of other similar lands, (b) transferring the cost of the land so sold to the land acquired, and (c) postponing the payment of any capital gain tax which otherwise might be due on the sale of the farm.

*22. Minimum wages and hours*

The purpose of the Fair Labor Standards Act is to provide minimum wages and standards for employment. We support the agricultural and seasonal exemptions of the act and oppose any changes in these exceptions.

We recommend a clear definition by the Congress of the "area of production" to include all counties in which the commodities are produced on a commercial basis.

*23. Agricultural transportation*

Modern, efficient, and economical transportation is essential to the production and marketing of fresh and processed vegetables. The agriculture exemption provisions of the Motor Carrier Act provides the necessary flexibility of movement and rates so essential to efficient and rapid movement of perishable vegetables. We are opposed to legislation which will further restrict exemptions. We are opposed to legislation which would require the registration of all motortrucks which cross State lines.

We urge the repeal of the 3-percent transportation tax, a wartime measure and very discriminatory in its effects.

*24. Labor racketeering*

We urge effective enforcement of the Hobbs Anti-Racketeering Act and amendments to improve its effectiveness.

From the evidence revealed in Congressional labor investigations we urge amendments to the Hobbs Act which would prohibit the extortion of truck unloading fees.

We believe labor unions should be subject to the country's antitrust acts.

*25. Roadside areas on interstate highways*

The new interstate highway system provides a splendid opportunity to make available fresh home-grown fruits and vegetables to consumers through the development of controlled roadside areas offering these products. We recommend that such roadside areas be developed through the cooperation of the various State departments of agriculture and the Federal agency involved. Provisions should be made for these areas to be available to local producers of farm produce exclusively.

*26. Foreign trade*

A healthy exchange of goods and services between nations is highly desirable and is beneficial economically and politically to the nations involved. We believe that an active foreign trade, based on the principles of free enterprise, should be encouraged, but with due regard to the protection of our own national interests. We would look with concern on any legislative or administrative action which would tend to increase import competition with domestic perishables.

We look with suspicion on any transfer of authority over import regulations and tariffs by membership in any supra-national organization, such as the general agreement on tariff and trade and the organization for trade cooperation. We object to the constant interference of the United States Department of State in foreign trade matters. We believe that regulation of our foreign commerce is the constitutional obligation of the legislative branch of the Government, and we, therefore, favor exclusion of any executive department, including the President, from regulatory authority in the field of foreign trade.

Specifically, we favor return from the President to the Congress of the obligation to approve or disapprove all recommendations of the Tariff Commission made under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act. We recommend that the Congress establish explicit guidelines to govern decisions of the Tariff Commission with respect to import quotas and that such decisions of the Tariff Commission on import quotas shall be final and operative unless disapproved by Congress.

Our association must be vigilant to prevent unfair trade practices on the part of foreign competition, particularly in the field of perishable agricultural commodities, where questionable practices such as the absence of or improper labeling of fruits and vegetables which are repacked can cause great damage to domestic producers in a very short time.

*27. Public finance*

Economy in Government cannot be overemphasized. It is the key to lower taxes, reduced debt and a stable fiscal policy. Excessive financial demands by the Federal Government are a menace to a stable economy. Citizens, as well, should be reasonable in their demands for public works, Government subsidies and handouts. These excessive demands can only serve to fan the flames of inflation.

We urge continuance of a balanced budget and a program of debt retirement.

We favor legislation for improved Federal budget control and processes which will curtail unnecessary budgetary expenditures and insure maximum control of governmental expenditures.

*28. Expanding government*

Few citizens have not in one way or another felt the impact of Federal Government control. Current evidence points to a continuation of this trend. For those who hold dear the principles of a democratic free enterprise and a minimum of Government control, the present trend holds little encouragement. Each request for Federal assistance at the State or local levels invites more extensive control.

We urge all persons and organizations to lend their support to legislative and other measures which will revert this trend.

RESOLUTIONS OF APPRECIATION

*1. Acknowledgments*

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance contributed by Dr. Julian C. Miller and the staff members of the Louisiana State University and the Agricultural Extension Service, the Louisiana Sweet Potato Growers and others from Louisiana who worked so diligently in planning and conducting this convention.

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance and cooperation of the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce and the management of the Jung Hotel for their assistance in making this convention a success.

*2. Advertisers and exhibitors*

The Vegetable Growers Association of America appreciates the support of our advertisers and exhibitors who have contributed to the success of this convention.

*3. Press, radio, television, and other media*

The Vegetable Growers Association of America expresses its thanks to the press, radio, television, and other media for their wide coverage and publicity given to the activities and convention of the association during the past year.



## RESOLUTION OF POST 301, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Fort Totten Post, No. 301, of the American Legion, relating to the transfer of a certain building known as the West Side Day School, located on the Devils Lake Sioux Indian Reservation, to that post.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF FORT TOTTEN AMERICAN LEGION POST, NO. 301

Whereas during the year 1957, the Fort Totten American Legion Post, No. 301 was duly organized and is in existence at the present time; and

Whereas the membership of said post is comprised largely of enrolled Indians of the Devils Lake Sioux Indian Reservation; and

Whereas the post is entirely without funds or assets; and

Whereas the said American Legion post properly functioning will be of great value to the members in assisting in the welfare of Indian Veterans on the reservation and making available to them means of recreation and will be conducive to promoting the general welfare on said reservation; and

Whereas there is a schoolhouse on said reservation known as the West Side Day School, which has not been put to any use for the past several years, and the said building would make an ideal building for the said American Legion post to conduct its meetings and activities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Fort Totten American Legion Post, No. 301, at a meeting duly called on the 9th day of December 1957*, That the Indian service be requested to transfer to the said American Legion post the building on the Devils Lake Sioux Indian Reservation known as the West Side Day School and that the said Indian service also transfer to said post a suitable real-estate site near the agency, upon which to place said building.

ALFRED MCKAY,
*Commander.*
D. E. GARCIA,
*Adjutant.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1249. A bill for the relief of Martha A. Calvert (Rept. No. 1189);

S. 1942. A bill for the relief of Bela Kiraly (Rept. No. 1190);

S. 1943. A bill for the relief of Norma Josephine Hodges Dowd (Rept. No. 1191);

S. 1961. A bill for the relief of Maria Van Arendon (Rept. No. 1192);

S. 2060. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Biro (Rept. No. 1193);

S. 2064. A bill for the relief of Marie Ethel Pavlovitch and daughter, Dolly Hester Pavlovitch (Rept. No. 1194);

S. 2147. A bill for the relief of Chong Sook Rhee (Rept. No. 1195); and

S. 2301. A bill for the relief of Genevieve M. Scott Bell (Rept. No. 1196).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution providing additional funds for the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems (Rept. No. 1197);

S. Res. 208. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate certain specific matters under its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1198);

S. Res. 210. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ a temporary additional clerical assistant;

S. Res. 222. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures by the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field (Rept. No. 1199);

S. Res. 230. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 1207);

S. Res. 231. Resolution to investigate the administration of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 1200);

S. Res. 232. Resolution to make a further study of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act (Rept. No. 1201);

S. Res. 233. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage (Rept. No. 1202);

S. Res. 234. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 1203);

S. Res. 235. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 1204);

S. Res. 236. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Patent Office and review statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights (Rept. No. 1205);

S. Res. 237. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency in the United States (Rept. No. 1206);

S. Res. 239. Resolution to investigate problems arising by escape of refugees from certain foreign countries under Communist domination (Rept. No. 1208);

S. Res. 241. Resolution continuing temporarily the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations and increasing the limit of expenditures (Rept. No. 1209); and

S. Res. 246. Resolution to pay certain funeral expenses of the late Senator Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia.

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 221. Resolution continuing the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and increasing the limit of expenditures (Rept. No. 1210);

S. Res. 223. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make additional expenditures and perform certain acts (Rept. No. 1211);

S. Res. 229. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters under its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1212);

S. Res. 238. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to the improvement and strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code (Rept. No. 1213); and

S. Res. 240. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ 2 additional professional staff members and 2 additional clerical assistants on a temporary basis (Rept. No. 1214).

Br Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1578. A bill for the relief of Hovhannes H. Haidostian (Rept. No. 1215);

S. 2087. A bill for the relief of Eva Lichtfuss (Rept. No. 1216);

S. 2256. A bill for the relief of Luz Poblete and Robert Poblete Broaddus, Jr. (Rept. No. 1217); and

S. 2346. A bill for the relief of Lucy Hedwig Schultz (Rept. No. 1218).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1979. A bill for the relief of Barbara Hollinger (Rept. No. 1219);

S. 2187. A bill for the relief of Josef Winter (Rept. No. 1220);

S. 2196. A bill for the relief of Annadore E. D. Haubold (Rept. No. 1221);

H. J. Res. 417. Joint resolution for the relief of Mrs. Sabastiano Poletto, Hideo Konya, Edward H. Turri, and Mario Guiffre (Rept. No. 1222);

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1223);

H. J. Res. 435. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1224);

H. J. Res. 436. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1225); and

H. J. Res. 437. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1226).

## EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY PERSONNEL BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported on original resolution (S. Res. 250) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and employ temporary personnel, and submitted a report (No. 1227) thereon, which resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions, specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally;

(6) presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958 to January 31, 1959, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 252), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 85th Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

## EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY STAFF MEMBERS AND ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 253), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from March 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ 4 additional staff members and 2 additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

## ADDITIONAL CLERK HIRE BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 254), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1957, as amended.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 3125. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 3126. A bill to create a Department of Science and Technology; to establish National Institutes of Scientific Research; to authorize a program of Federal loans and loan insurance for college or university education in the physical or biological sciences, mathematics, or engineering; to authorize the establishment of scientific programs outside of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3127. A bill for the relief of Bernard P. Oxman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3128. A bill to amend section 802 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 3129. A bill for the relief of Natividade Agrella Dos Santos;

S. 3130. A bill for the relief of Georgios Papaconstantinou; and

S. 3131. A bill for the relief of Amile Hatem and Linda Hatem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3132: A bill for the relief of Clifford L. Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3133. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GREEN (by request):

S. 3134. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to provide salary increases for Foreign Service personnel equitable to those being otherwise provided for civil service and other officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3135. A bill to exempt a portion of the wages payable to any person from levy for satisfaction of delinquent taxes owed to the United States by such person; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3136. A bill for the relief of Fouad (Fred) Kassis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 3137. A bill for the relief of Mathilde Gombard-Liatzky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3138. A bill to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons of Indian blood whose ancestors were members of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians and to provide for per capita distribution of funds arising from a judgment in favor of such Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (by request):

S. 3139. A bill to repeal the act of July 2, 1956, concerning the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the Village of Carey, Ohio; and

S. 3140. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for training of employees; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

S. 3141. A bill to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and improvements thereon located within the area of New York Avenue and F Street and 17th and 18th Streets NW., in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3142. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the last two above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3143. A bill to repeal Public Law 85-24 (relating to the prohibition of payment of pensions to persons confined in penal institutions); to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3144. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3145. A bill to continue the special-milk program for children in the interests of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools; and

S. 3146. A bill making an appropriation to carry out the National School Lunch Act during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3147. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on wheat; and

S. 3148. A bill to extend the accelerated brucellosis control program under section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 for 2 additional years; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3149. A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3150. A bill to amend section 111 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, relating to the availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to the States for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of Federal-aid highway projects, in order to limit the application of such section to cases in which the law of a State requires it to pay such costs; and

S. 3151. A bill to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3152. A bill to further amend section 331 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended, relating to rules of practice and procedure prescribed by the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3153. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; and

S. 3154. A bill to recognize waiver of benefits payable under a private or public retirement plan for the purpose of meeting annual income limitations for disability or death pension; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 3155. A bill to permit certain educational organizations to import free of duty scientific and laboratory apparatus for educational or scientific purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. FLANDERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FLANDERS (for himself and Mr. BRICKER):

S. 3156. A bill to provide for the expansion of certain programs for advance education for teachers in science, and for the establishment of certain programs for advance education for teachers in the humanities; and

S. 3157. A bill to establish a Federal scholarship program in order to assist promising students to obtain college and university undergraduate educations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 3158. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a teacher to deduct from gross income up to $800 a year of expenses incurred by him to further his education; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3159. A bill for the relief of Urbano I. Guerrero, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3160. A bill for the relief of Jose Jesus Munoz-Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3161. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of James P. Walsh"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for amounts paid by a taxpayer in obtaining a college education or in providing a college education for his spouse or dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported and referred as indicated:

## KRAEMER MILLS, INC.—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. POTTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 249), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 3054) entitled "A bill for the relief of Kraemer Mills, Inc.," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 250) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and employ temporary personnel, and submitted a report (No. 1227) thereon; which was placed on the calendar.

(See the resolution printed in full which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## OPPOSITION TO PAY TELEVISION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BUTLER, LAUSCHE, PAYNE, POTTER, and SMATHERS, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution declaring that it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Communications Commission should not, without specific authorization by law, authorize or permit any television broadcasting station to impose a toll or other charge on the general public for the privilege of viewing television programs received over television sets located in the home.

The question of whether the Federal Communications Commission presently has the legal authority to authorize subscription television is in doubt. While the Commission maintains that it has such authority under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, the question has not been resolved by the courts; nor has Congress passed explicit legislation to settle the issue one way or the other.

There is one extremely important reason why it is unwise to permit the Commission, through Congressional inaction, to proceed with its plan to authorize toll TV on a trial basis. The installation of a toll TV system requires a high initial investment. Estimates of the cost of the decoding apparatus that must be attached to each receiving set run from $45 to $100 a unit. It is easy to imagine the cries that would arise from investors in toll television if such a system, once started, later was found not to be in the public interest.

There are a number of reasons to believe that the ultimate decision would be that toll television is not in the public interest and the millions invested would go for naught.

If we could be assured that toll television programs would replace the worst of our present programs, it would be a great blessing. But we must face the fundamental truth that there are only 24 hours in the day, and only about 3 of that number can be classified as prime viewing time. During the same evening hours when our commercial broadcasters now make their best efforts to please the mass audience, toll TV would send out its best programs.

Thus toll television would compete directly with, and in some cases completely black out, the free television programs that give our commercial stations their best source of revenue and indirectly support the full morning-to-midnight service to which the public is now accustomed.

The ultimate result of such competition may well be the destruction of our free television system and its replacement with something not nearly so good.

Mr. President, about 47 million television sets are in operation in the United States today. If there is any reason at all to believe that the owners of these sets are to be assessed substantial sums

for continued service, it behooves Congress to move to protect the public.

The immediate need is to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from setting forth on a course of action from which there may be no turning back. In time, I believe, Congress must make the final determination.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the junior Senator from South Carolina would not object, I should like very much to be a cosponsor of the resolution which he has just submitted, because I find there is great interest in this subject in my State of Kansas. As a matter of fact, over the last 2 days I have received more than a thousand letters on this subject. If the Senator has no objection, I should like to be a cosponsor.

Mr. THURMOND. I would be pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Kansas join as a cosponsor of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will be included as a cosponsor of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 251), submitted by Mr. THURMOND, for himself and other Senators, was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Communications Commission should not, without specific authorization by law, authorize or permit any television broadcasting station to impose a toll, fee, subscription, or other charge, directly or indirectly, on the general public for the privilege of viewing television programs received over television sets located in the home.

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported the following original resolutions, which were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 252. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

S. Res. 253. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ certain temporary staff members and assistants; and

S. Res. 254. Resolution to authorize additional clerk hire for Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above resolutions printed in full, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## DAIRY STABILIZATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, at the request of the National Grange and the National Milk Producers' Federation, a bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce. I ask that it lay on the desk until the end of the day on January 29, so that any of our colleagues who are interested may associate themselves in its sponsorship, and that it then be referred to its appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3125) to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this bill is known as the Dairy Stabilization Act of 1958. It is the outgrowth of months of negotiations among interested dairy and other farm groups in an attempt to obtain the maximum unity on a new, long-range approach to sounder legislation for the dairy industry.

The National Grange is to be commended for taking the lead in this effort, under way for the past year. William Pearson, master of the Minnesota State Grange, was chairman of the National Grange Dairy Advisory Committee that pioneered work on this legislation, with able help from Bill Knox of Hoard's Dairyman and officers of the National Milk Producers Federation. It has the wholehearted endorsement of the federation, the largest organization of dairy producers in this country. It has been approved by the National Conference of Commodity Organizations which the National Milk Producers Federation helped organize in a constructive attempt to gain greater cooperation between various commodity groups on new farm legislation. It has also been approved by the National Farmers Union as a desirable objective for study by appropriate committees of the Congress.

It is for that purpose that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and I are introducing this measure. We are not claiming its authorship, nor endorsing every comma, crossed t, or dotted i in the proposed legislation. We support the principle of trying to unite the dairy industry toward developing a better program for stabilization of dairy income and dairy supplies, and want to see that the recommendations of these groups are given serious study. We recognize that several alternative proposals of a similar nature have been drafted and are before the Congress, and are glad they have been offered—including measures by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and Representatives LESTER JOHNSON of Wisconsin and COYA KNUTSON of Minnesota in the other House. We believe submission of these measures to our Senate and House agriculture committees offers an opportunity for comparing them together and working out an effective program all dairy groups can support.

Let me make clear that introduction of this more comprehensive measure in no way lessens the determination of myself, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, and the some 22 other Senators who have joined us in sponsoring previous stop-gap legislation of insisting upon emergency action to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from further cutting dairy support prices on April 1 of this year, regardless of what is done about new legislation for the future. That is of first priority. However, we want to show our good faith in offering constructive alternatives for the future while seeking to protect dairy income now. It would be well indeed for the Secretary of Agriculture—and the President of the United States—to rescind the announced plan for cutting dairy supports April 1 until Congress has had an adequate opportunity to review these alternate proposals the dairy industry itself is proposing for a better stabilization program.

I want to make it clear as well that our proposal is not to try to jam anything down the throats of dairy farmers that they themselves do not want. The proposal we have introduced includes a provision for a dairymen's referendum to determine whether dairy farmers prefer the new stabilization approach of a self-help nature or whether they prefer continuation of the past price-support program which Secretary Benson is seeking to undermine.

I would respectfully suggest that the Secretary of Agriculture should not object to permitting such a referendum, in view of his repeated insistence that he is only trying to do what he thinks is right for the farmers. If that is so, he should welcome the advice and counsel of the farmers themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of principal provisions of the dairy stabilization act I am proposing at the request of interested farm groups be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the bill itself.

There being no objection, the summary and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED DAIRY STABILIZATION ACT OF 1958

1. A comprehensive, national dairy policy would be established, commensurate with the importance of dairying in the national economy.

2. As a part of the policy declaration, the criteria for price stabilization would include not only an assurance of adequate supplies of milk and dairy products for consumers, but a fair return to producers—taking into consideration investment, risk, and the labor of the producer and his family.

3. A Federal Dairy Stabilization Board of 15 members would be appointed by the President from nominees selected by milk producers in 15 Federal dairy districts. Each district would select three nominees.

4. A Federal Dairy Advisory Committee of 12 nonproducer members would be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to advise the Stabilization Board.

5. The Stabilization Board would support milk and butterfat prices to producers at levels to be established and announced annually by the Board.

6. The Stabilization Board would buy and sell domestically produced milk, butter, cheddar cheese, nonfat dry milk solids, and other dairy products at such prices and in such manner as would enable it to stabilize prices to producers at the established levels and avoid disruption of regular commercial marketing channels.

7. The cost of operating the program would be paid by milk producers and importers through marketing assessments:

(a) Whenever the cost of operating the program can be financed with a single assessment of 25 cents or less per hundredweight of milk (or milk equivalent) marketed, such a single assessment would be used.

(b) Whenever the cost of operating the program would require an assessment of more than 25 cents per hundredweight, then an alternate method would be used, employing the assignment of marketing allotments to individual producers, a nominal assessment

on all milk and butterfat marketed, and a supplemental assessment on marketings of milk and butterfat in excess of allotments.

8. For the marketing year beginning April 1, 1959, prices of milk and butterfat would be supported at 90 percent of parity, using the manufacturing milk parity equivalent formula originally used under the Agricultural Act of 1949, and the marketing assessment to producers would be 25 cents per hundredweight of milk or milk equivalent. Thereafter, decisions with respect to price support levels, the use of marketing allotments, and the amount of marketing assessment or assessments would be made annually by the Board.

9. All dairy marketing assessments withheld from money otherwise due milk producers would be remitted by processors or handlers to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Returns would be filed and remittances made monthly in accordance with rules prescribed by the Commissioner.

10. The operations of the Board would be subject to review and challenge by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent any possibility of unreasonably high prices to producers for their milk and butterfat.

11. A referendum of milk producers would be conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture on September 8, 1958, to determine whether dairy farmers favor a dairy stabilization program operated by a Federal Dairy Stabilization Board in accordance with the provisions of this act, or continuation of the present type of price-support program operated by the Secretary. If a majority of producers voting favored the dairy stabilization program, it would go into effect on April 1, 1959.

---

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Dairy Stabilization Act of 1958."

LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

SEC. 2. Milk and dairy products are an important source of the Nation's total supply of food for domestic consumption and for export. They are marketed on nationwide markets, and substantial quantities thereof, in both raw and processed form, move in interstate and foreign commerce. Recurring seasonal and periodic surpluses and shortages, impaired purchasing power and financial instability of milk producers, unnecessarily high prices to consumers for essential foods, disorderly marketing practices, economic strife, and congestion in storage, transportation, processing, and other handling facilities adversely affect farm credit, disorganize and disrupt the agricultural and general economy of the United States, impinge on the public welfare, impair the national security, and burden interstate and foreign commerce. The production and marketing of milk and dairy products is affected with a public interest, directly affects the welfare and security of the Nation, and is attended with substantial and far reaching consequences to interstate and foreign commerce. All marketing of milk and dairy products is either in the current of interstate or foreign commerce or directly affects such commerce. That part which enters directly into the current of interstate or foreign commerce cannot be effectively regulated without regulating also that part which is marketed within the State of production. The intrastate production and marketing of milk and dairy products is in competition with the production and marketing of milk and dairy products for interstate and foreign commerce.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress (a) to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; (b) to promote the effective merchandising of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; (c) to develop an improved, orderly, and stabilized market for milk and dairy products which are marketed in interstate or foreign commerce, or so as to effect such commerce; (d) to protect the security and welfare of the Nation by maintaining adequate domestic production and supplies of milk and dairy products and by keeping the national agricultural resources permanently productive and reasonably adjusted to current demand; (e) to stabilize the prices of milk and dairy products at levels which will assure adequate supplies of milk and dairy products and provide a fair return to the producers of milk and butterfat commensurate with the cost of production, taking into consideration the investment and risk involved, and the labor of the producer and his family; (f) to protect the interest of consumers by maintaining a stabilized, continuous, and adequate supply of milk and dairy products at fair prices; and (g) to provide a self-financing system of price stabilization and production adjustment for milk and dairy products.

GENERAL DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The terms "interstate commerce" and "foreign commerce" include the movement of milk and dairy products in commerce between any State or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof, or within the District of Columbia, or between any Territory or possession which is included within the operation of this act by the action of the Board and any place outside thereof, or within any such territory or possession.

(b) The term "affect interstate or foreign commerce" means, among other things, to burden, obstruct, impede, or otherwise affect interstate or foreign commerce, the free and orderly flow thereof, or the production, storing, processing, marketing, or transportation of milk and dairy products for or in such commerce or after transportation therein.

(c) "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and any Territory or possession of the United States which the Board determines should be included in the operation of this act. The term "States" includes any State, the District of Columbia, and any Territory or possession which the Board includes within the term "United States." The provisions of this act shall apply to the United States as herein defined, except that the powers and authority of the Board may be exercised in other areas and in foreign countries in connection with the sale or other disposal of milk, butterfat, and dairy products.

(d) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture, "Department" means the United States Department of Agriculture, "Board" means the Federal Dairy Stabilization Board, and "Advisory Committee" means the Federal Dairy Advisory Committee.

(e) "Person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, trust, estate, or any other business entity.

(f) The terms "milk", butterfat", and "dairy products" mean milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat, respectively, including any classification, type, or grade thereof; together with such combinations and byproducts thereof, and such products manufactured wholly or in part thereof, as may be designated by the Board.

(g) "Marketing year" means the 12-month period beginning April 1 of each year.

(h) "Estimated supply" for any marketing year shall be (1) the estimated carryover at the beginning of such marketing year; plus (2) estimated production for market in the United States during such marketing year, less the estimated surplus to be acquired by or charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation during such marketing year as a result of diverted acres; plus (3) estimated imports into the United States during such marketing year, less the estimated surplus to be acquired by or charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation during such marketing year as a result of imports. Estimates for marketing years may be based on statistics or estimates for calendar years, or, in the discretion of the Board, calendar-year estimates may be used in place of marketing-year estimates.

(i) "Carryover" shall not include the estimated surplus milk or dairy products owned or controlled by or charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or to be acquired by or charged to it, under this act before the beginning of the marketing year for which "carryover" is to be estimated.

(j) "Estimated demand" for any marketing year shall be (1) the estimated consumption in the United States during such marketing year; plus (2) estimated exports during such marketing year; plus (3) an allowance for carryover. In determining estimated demand, estimated disposals of surplus milk or dairy products by Commodity Credit Corporation, or by the Board outside of the ordinary channels of domestic or foreign trade, shall be excluded.

(k) The "allowance for carryover" shall be determined by the Board. In making this determination, consideration shall be given to the need for maintaining an adequate, dependable, and continuous supply of milk and dairy products. The Board shall take into consideration any abnormal conditions present or likely to prevail, contingencies related to national security and world supplies, and trends in the production, marketing, and utilization of milk and dairy products.

(l) "Milk producer" means any person engaged in the production of milk or butterfat for market. A milk producer to be eligible to serve as a member of the Board, or to vote for nominees for appointment to the Board must be engaged in the production and marketing of milk or butterfat in commercial quantities.

(m) "Commodity Credit Corporation" shall include the Commodity Credit Corporation as now or hereafter constituted and any successor or other Federal agency authorized to perform similar services.

FEDERAL DAIRY STABILIZATION BOARD

SEC. 5. There is created in the Department as an independent agency and instrumentality of the United States a Federal Dairy Stabilization Board consisting of 15 members to be appointed by the President after receiving nominations from milk producers as hereinafter provided. Only persons who are milk producers, or who are officers of dairy cooperative associations which meet the requirements of the Capper-Volstead Act (7 U. S. C., secs. 291–292), or who are officers of federations or marketing agencies in common owned and controlled by such cooperatives, shall be eligible to serve on the Board. Not less than 11 of the 15 members of the Board shall be milk producers. The temporary impairment of this ratio by the death, resignation, disqualification, or removal of producer members, or for other causes, shall not affect the authority of the Board to act.

SEC. 6. In order to secure appropriate regional representation on the Board, the United States shall be divided into 15 Federal dairy districts to be designated by the Secretary. In designating such districts, the Secretary shall give consideration to (1) complete geographical representation of the United States and (2) the importance of dairying in each district.

SEC. 7. Each Federal dairy district shall be assigned one place on the Board. The milk producers in each district shall by ballot select three nominees for the place on the Board assigned to their district. Each milk producer shall be entitled to submit one name for nominee for the place on the Board to be filled from his district. The three candidates receiving the highest number of votes for nominee for each respective place on the Board shall be nominees for appointment to such place. The

Secretary shall conduct all elections for the selection of such nominees, prescribe such rules and regulations as he may consider necessary in the administration of the duties assigned to him under this act, determine all questions involving the qualifications of such nominees, members of the Board, or milk producers, resolve all tie votes for such nominees, and certify such nominees to the President. The decision of the Secretary in all such matters shall be final. The three nominees so selected for each place on the Board shall be received and considered by the President in making appointments to the respective places on the Board for which such nominees were selected. In making appointments to the Board, the President shall give due consideration to securing an equitable representation of the various forms in which milk and its products are sold.

SEC. 8. The first appointments to the Board shall be equally divided between 2-, 4-, and 6-year terms, respectively, as designated by the President; and thereafter each member shall be appointed for a term of 6 years. Terms of Board members shall be based on calendar years and shall expire on the 31st day of December of the last calendar year of the appointment. Each member shall hold office for the term of his appointment and until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have taken office. Board members may be removed for cause or ineligibility by the President. Vacancies on the Board may be filled for the unexpired terms by appointment by the President, taking into consideration the nominees from which the original appointment was made, or, in the discretion of the President, in the manner herein prescribed for the appointment of members for a regular term. Vacancies on the Board shall not impair the power of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, except that in no event shall the Board be empowered to act unless eight or more places on the Board are filled. Each member of the Board, other than the Secretary or the Secretary's representative, shall receive a per diem of $50 for each day's attendance at meetings of the Board and while traveling to and from said meetings, but not to exceed a total of $2,500 in any 1 year, together with actual, necessary travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of his official duties without regard to other laws with respect to allowances which may be made on account of travel and subsistence expenses of officers and employed personnel of the United States. The Secretary, or an official of the department designated by him, shall be an ex officio member of the Board. He shall meet and confer with the Board but shall not be entitled to vote.

SEC. 9. The Board shall meet annually on the second Monday in January and at other times upon call of the Chairman. In addition, special meetings of the Board may be called at any time by a majority of the members of the Board in office, or by the Secretary. The Board shall meet at least once in each calendar quarter of each year.

SEC. 10. The Chairman of the Board shall be selected by the Board. He shall hold office for a term of 2 calendar years and until his successor shall have been selected and shall have taken office. Vacancies in the office of the Chairman of the Board shall be filled for the unexpired term by the Board.

SEC. 11. A majority of the members of the Board in office shall constitute a quorum, and action may be taken by a majority vote of those present at any regular or special meeting at which a quorum is present. The findings and determinations of the Board made under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive. The Board may adopt, alter, and use an official seal which shall be judicially noticed. It may adopt rules and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and its powers may be exercised.

SEC. 12. The Board may sue and be sued in the same manner, in the same courts, and to the same extent that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sue and be sued; and the laws, rules, and decisions applicable to suits by or against that Corporation shall be applicable to suits by or against the Board. The Board shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the Commodity Credit Corporation.

SEC. 13. The Board may select an executive committee of five from among its members and delegate to it any power or authority of the Board, except the power to set price stabilization levels, the amount of the marketing assessment herein provided for, or the total quantity of milk and butterfat which may be marketed under marketing certificates. Not less than 3 of the 5 members of the executive committee shall be milk producers. The temporary impairment of this ratio by the death, resignation, disqualification, or removel of producer members, or for other causes, shall not affect the authority of the committee to act. Members of the executive committee shall be paid their actual, necessary travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their official duties, without regard to other laws with respect to allowances which may be made on account of travel and subsistence expenses of officers and employed personnel of the United States and, in addition to their compensation as members of the Board, may be paid a per diem in such amounts and for such days as the Board may prescribe. Vacancies on the executive committee may be filled by the Board. Vacancies on the committee shall not impair the power of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the committee provided a quorum remains. Three members of the committee shall constitute a quorum. The Chairman of the Board shall be a member of the executive committee and its Chairman. Meetings of the executive committee may be called by the Chairman, a majority of the members of the committee in office, or by the Secretary. The Secretary, or an official of the Department designated by him, shall be an ex officio member of the executive committee. He shall meet and confer with the executive committee but shall not be entitled to vote or to receive expenses or per diem.

SEC. 14. The Board may enter into and carry out such contracts or agreements as are necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business. State and local laws or rules shall not be applicable with respect to contracts or agreements of the Board, or the parties thereto, to the extent that such contracts or agreements provide that such laws or rules shall not be applicable.

SEC. 15. The Board may, either directly or through such corporations, stabilization corporations, brokers, agents, or persons as it may designate, acquire, hold, store, warehouse, manufacture, process, service, package, advertise, sell, and transport, or otherwise acquire, handle, or dispose of, milk and dairy products in raw or processed form, or in the form of warehouse receipts, or contracts to buy or sell, and may contract for plants, facilities, and services needed to accomplish such purposes.

SEC. 16. The Board shall have the power to acquire, hold, improve, repair, modify, encumber, lease, use, and dispose of real or personal property, or any right or interest therein which may be necessary or appropriate to the conduct of its business.

SEC. 17. The Board may borrow money and pledge as security any assets which it may have, including dairy products. It shall be entitled to borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to loan to it, without security, such amounts as the Board may deem necessary to carry out effectively the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That the total amount of all money borrowed from the Commodity Credit Corporation and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $350,000,000. The Board may borrow money from any other source of credit available to it upon the security of the dairy products acquired by it or on the security of other assets or by unsecured loans, and may issue notes, bonds, and other obligations. Other than the authority to borrow from the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Board shall have no authority to obligate the United States, and none of its notes, bonds, or other obligations shall be guaranteed by or collectible from the United States. Judgments and other claims against the Board shall be enforced only against the assets of the Board in the same manner as if it were a corporation, and no liability for the debts or actions of the Board shall exist against either the United States or any member, officer, employee or agent of the Board in his individual capacity.

SEC. 18. The Board shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid. It may make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Board or of the accounts of its officers, employees, agents, and contractors.

SEC. 19. The Board may make such loans and advances of its funds as are necessary in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 20. The Board shall have such other powers as may be necessary or appropriate for the exercise of the powers vested in it and the effective performance of the duties imposed on it by this act.

SEC. 21. The Board shall pay interest to the Commodity Credit Corporation on all money owed to that Corporation at such rates as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to represent the cost of money to the Government, taking into consideration the terms for which such amounts are loaned to the Board.

SEC. 22. The Board is authorized to use in its business all funds or other assets in its possession, including net earnings and borrowed money.

SEC. 23. The Board may appoint such committees and officers and employ such personnel as it may deem necessary for the conduct of its business, fix the amount of and pay their compensation, define their authority and duties, and delegate to them, or to such corporations, stabilization corporations, brokers, agents, or persons with whom it may contract, such of the powers vested in the Board as it may determine, except the power to determine price-stabilization levels, the amount of the marketing assessment herein provided for, or the total quantity of milk and butterfat which may be marketed under marketing certificates. All such committees, officers, and employees, including the executive committee, shall be subject to the general supervision and control of the Board. The Board may require and pay for bonds for employees, officers, agents, or contractors. None of the officers, members, or employees of the Board shall be subject to the Federal laws and regulations relating to the employment, compensation, classification, discharge, or leave, travel, and subsistence allowances, of Government employees, except such regulations relating thereto as may be prescribed by the Board. Subsequent amendments of such laws or regulations shall not affect this exemption, unless such amendments shall specifically so provide.

SEC. 24. The Board may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a compensated or uncompensated basis, the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the United States or of any State or of any political subdivision of any of the foregoing.

SEC. 25. The Board may, in the conduct of its business, utilize on a contract or fee basis any corporation, stabilization corporation, association, agency, person, commodity exchange, broker, or trade facility.

SEC. 26. The Board shall at all times maintain complete and accurate minutes and books of account. It shall file annually with the Secretary a complete report of the business of the Board, a copy of which shall be submitted to Congress. The financial transactions of the Board shall be audited annually by a certified public accountant, or firm thereof, in accordance with generally accepted principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. Copies of the audit report shall be submitted to the Secretary and to Congress.

FEDERAL DAIRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 27. The Secretary is authorized and directed to appoint a Federal Dairy Advisory Committee of 12 members which shall confer with and advise the Board concerning the dairy stabilization programs herein authorized.

SEC. 28. In making appointments to the Advisory Committee the Secretary shall give equitable recognition to representation of (1) manufacturers, handlers, and distributors of milk and dairy products; (2) consumers; (3) other agricultural commodities or programs that may be affected by the operation of the dairy stabilization program; and (4) other interests which the Secretary determines are directly concerned with the operation of this act.

SEC. 29. Membership on the Advisory Committee shall be for a term of 3 calendar years, expiring on December 31 of the last year of the term. Each member shall hold office for the term of his appointment and until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have taken office. Members of the Advisory Committee may be removed by the Secretary with or without cause. Vacancies may be filled by the Secretary for unexpired terms. Vacancies on the Advisory Committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to meet and perform the functions of the Committee. Original appointments shall be equally divided between 1-, 2-, and 3-year terms, as designated by the Secretary. The Secretary, or an official of the Department designated by him, shall be an ex officio member of the Advisory Committee. He shall meet and confer with the Committee but shall not be entitled to vote.

SEC. 30. The Advisory Committee shall meet annually on the second Monday in January and at other times upon call of the Chairman of the Board.

SEC. 31. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee shall be selected annually by the Committee.

SEC. 32. A majority of the members of the Committee in office shall constitute a quorum, and resolutions and recommendations may be adopted by a majority vote of those present at any meeting at which a quorum is present.

SEC. 33. Members of the Advisory Committee, other than the Secretary or the Secretary's representative, shall be compensated and reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other expenses from the funds of the Board for attendance at meetings of the Advisory Committee at the same rates and in the same manner that members of the Board are compensated and reimbursed for attendance at meetings of the Board.

PRICE STABILIZATION

SEC. 34. The Board is authorized and directed to stabilize prices of milk and butterfat to producers. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the amounts, terms, types, and conditions of the stabilization operations of the Board, and the extent to which such operations are carried out, shall be determined by the Board.

SEC. 35. Stabilized prices to producers for milk and butterfat shall be provided by the Board at levels to be established and announced annually by the Board. In determining stabilization price levels, the amount of the marketing assessment, and the prices at which various dairy products will be bought or sold, in any marketing year, the Board shall take into consideration (1) the declared policy of this act, (2) the nutritional value of milk and dairy products and the importance of such essential foods to the health and general welfare of the Nation and to the national defense, (3) the estimated supply of milk and dairy products for such marketing year, (4) the estimated demand for milk and dairy products for such marketing year, (5) the price support level for feed crops which affect the cost of milk production, (6) the estimated costs of producing, processing, and marketing milk and dairy products, (7) the relationship which the price of milk and dairy products bear to prices for other foods and to hourly returns for labor, (8) the hourly returns for the labor of dairy farmers and their families, (9) estimated returns to farmers from alternative crops and commodities, (10) the general economic condition of dairy farmers and the effect of such condition upon the economy of rural communities and of the Nation as a whole, (11) the need for maintaining a reasonable relationship between the prices that farmers receive and the cost of the things that farmers buy, and (12) other economic conditions which affect the market for milk and dairy products. In making such determinations, the Board may hold such public hearings, with notice, and utilize such studies as it considers necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. The stabilization levels shall be established as of the beginning of the marketing year and shall be on an annual basis. They shall be announced as far in advance of the marketing year as is practicable. The stabilization levels so announced by the Board shall not thereafter be varied before the close of the marketing year for which they are applicable, except that in emergency cases, after a public hearing, with notice, the Board may redetermine the stabilization levels if it finds that conditions have materially changed since the announcement was made. A reasonable time, taking into consideration the character of the emergency, shall be allowed by the Board before any redetermined stabilization levels are made effective. The Board's finding and the record of the hearing shall be available to the public.

SEC. 36. Appropriate adjustments and variations may be made by the Board in the stabilization prices for different products and for differences in grade, type, quality, location, season, and other factors. To determine the stabilized price level for any marketing year, the stabilized prices to producers for all commodities prescribed under this act for such marketing year shall be reduced to a common factor, such as milk equivalent, and averaged.

SEC. 37. In order to stabilize prices for milk and dairy products, the Board is authorized and directed to establish and maintain a surplus holding pool. The Board shall remove from the ordinary and usual channels of domestic consumption milk and dairy products which are not absorbed in such channels at the prevailing stabilization price levels. In order to accomplish this objective, the Board shall stand ready and willing at all times to purchase domestically produced butter, cheddar cheese, and nonfat dry-milk solids, together with such milk and butterfat and such other dairy products or byproducts as the Board may by order designate. Such purchases shall be at price levels which the Board determines will return to producers on a general average basis the prevailing stabilization levels for milk and butterfat. Appropriate adjustments and differentials may be made between terminal markets, and between such terminal markets and country locations. The Board shall give due consideration to historical and established differentials in determining such adjustments and differentials. Purchases may be made either in terminal markets or at country locations, or both, with appropriate adjustments and differentials as above provided. The Board may prescribe the terms and conditions under which it will make such purchases. The specific purchases to be made and the types and grades to be purchased shall be in the discretion of the Board. The Board may take physical possession of any milk or any dairy products acquired by it or operate through the use of contracts or warehouse receipts in its discretion. It may operate on the commodity exchanges to whatever extent it deems appropriate. It may make its purchases and sales and perform its other functions through its own staff or through such committees, corporations, stabilization corporations, agents, brokers, or persons as it may designate.

SEC. 38. The Board may sell any milk or any dairy product owned or controlled by it at any price not prohibited by this section. In determining sales policies for any milk or any dairy product intended for use in the ordinary and usual channels of domestic consumption, the Board shall give consideration to the establishing of such policies with respect to prices, terms, and conditions as it determines will not discourage or deter manufacturers, processors, and dealers from acquiring and carrying normal inventories of such commodities. The Board shall not sell any milk or any dairy product for use in the ordinary and usual channels of domestic consumption at less than the current stabilization price therefor. The foregoing restriction shall not apply to (a) sales to prevent deterioration or spoilage or to rotate stocks, (b) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against any person for wrongful act or violation of contract, (c) sales for export, (d) sales for use in connection with special promotional programs to increase consumption, (e) sales for new, secondary, or byproduct uses, (f) sales for feed, and (g) such other sales as the Board finds and determines will not interfere with the purposes of this act. The Board may, in its discretion, give away, barter for domestic or foreign assets, or sell at reduced prices or for foreign currency, any milk or any dairy product in its possession or under its control where the use to be made of it is not in the ordinary and usual channels of domestic consumption, including sales or gifts to the armed services, for school lunches, for school milk programs, to charitable institutions, to governmental agencies, or institutions, to educational or research institutions, for domestic relief, for foreign relief, for export, and to such other agencies or for such other purposes as the Board determines will not interfere with the purposes of this act.

SEC. 39. The Federal Government and the various agencies and instrumentalities thereof, in connection with programs sponsored by the Government or supported in whole or in part by Government funds which call for the distribution of food, shall give due consideration to obtaining milk and dairy products from the Board. Agencies of the United States Government in connection with relief or other distributions or the procuring of materials, equipment, supplies, or services in foreign nations, are directed to cooperate with the Board in the disposal of milk and dairy products by barter or exchange for foreign assets or currencies, and in the utilization of foreign currencies.

SEC. 40. The Board is authorized to promote and develop new and expanded outlets for milk and dairy products.

SEC. 41. The operations of the Board in connection with acquiring, transporting, holding, storing, manufacturing, processing, handling, selling, and disposing of milk and dairy products may be conducted through regular commercial channels, and due consideration shall be given by the Board to dislocating or disrupting as little as possible, consistent with the purposes of this act, the usual and customary channels of trade. Nothing herein contained shall prevent the Board from conducting such operations itself or through a corporation, stabilization corporation, broker, agency, or person.

SEC. 42. After the effective date of this act, surplus milk or dairy products shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of in the ordinary and usual channels of domestic trade by the Commodity Credit Corporation or by any other Federal agency without the express consent of the Board. The purpose of this provision is to segregate the surplus milk and dairy products held by the Commodity Credit Corporation on the effective date of this act or subsequently acquired by it under this act.

SEC. 43. In any marketing year in which surplus milk or dairy products are acquired by the Board and in which milk or dairy products are imported into the United States from any foreign country, the Board shall be entitled to turn over to the Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal as surplus in accordance with the provisions of this act an amount of such surplus dairy products which shall not exceed the equivalent of the total amount of such imports, as determined by the Board, or, with the consent of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Board may dispose of such surplus dairy products for the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation. All loss sustained by the Board in removing from the domestic market surplus milk and dairy products in an amount equivalent to such imports shall be repaid to the Board by Commodity Credit Corporation. The Board may exclude from the operation of this section any imported dairy products which it determines are not competitive with domestically produced milk, butterfat, or dairy products.

SEC. 44. In any marketing year in which surplus milk or dairy products are acquired by the Board and in which the total domestic production of milk or butterfat is increased due to diversion from the production of any other crop or commodity, including livestock, the production of which is controlled or regulated under any Federal agricultural program, the Board shall be entitled to turn over to the Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal as surplus in accordance with the provisions of this act an amount of such surplus dairy products which shall not exceed the equivalent of the total amount of such increased milk and butterfat production, as determined by the Secretary, or, with the consent of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Board may dispose of such surplus for the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation. All loss sustained by the Board in removing from the market surplus milk and dairy products in an amount equivalent to the volume of such increased production due to diversion shall be repaid to the Board by Commodity Credit Corporation. Such losses shall be charged by Commodity Credit Corporation to the price-support programs of the crops from which such diversion occurred.

REVIEW BY THE SECRETARY

SEC. 45. The operations of the Board shall be subject to the supervision and control of the Secretary to the following extent and in the following manner. Whenever the Secretary shall certify to the Board that there is reason to believe the operations of the Board have resulted or will result in prices to producers for milk or butterfat or both which are unreasonably high when considered in connection with the purpose of this act, he shall, unless prompt action is taken by the Board to remedy the situation, cause a hearing to be held within the Department for the purpose of determining such fact. Reasonable notice of such hearing shall be given, and all interested parties shall be given an opportunity to appear and present evidence, statements, and arguments relevant and material to the issues involved, all of which shall be made a part of the record of the hearing. The Secretary may prescribe rules and regulations governing such hearings.

SEC. 46. If, on the basis of the record of such hearing, the Secretary determines that the operations of the Board have resulted or will result in prices to producers that are unreasonably high, when considered in connection with the purposes of this act, he shall by order prescribe the stabilization price levels which he determines would not be subject to such objection.

SEC. 47. If the Board shall fail or refuse within a reasonable time to take effective action to bring the stabilization price levels in line with the levels ordered, the Secretary may petition the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for a decree directing the members of the Board to take action or to cease and desist from the taking of certain actions as the case may be. The court shall have jurisdiction to enter a decree affirming, modifying, or setting aside the order of the Secretary, or to enter such other decree as the court may deem equitable. The orders of the court may be enforced by contempt proceedings. Any order issued by the Secretary as above provided may be appealed by the Board to the said court and shall thereupon be subject to review by the court.

MARKETING ASSESSMENT

SEC. 48. The cost of operating the stabilization program and of regulating the marketing of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, or so as to affect such commerce, as herein provided, shall be paid by the milk producers and importers marketing milk, butterfat, or dairy products in such commerce, or so as to affect such commerce, in proportion to the milk, butterfat, and dairy products so marketed by them. Thus the cost of developing and maintaining an orderly, stabilized, and improved market will be charged directly to those using the improved market and sharing in its benefits and to them only; and the amount paid by each will be directly related to the use made of the improved market. Marketing assessments in amounts sufficient to cover the costs of the program, as determined by the Board in accordance with the estimated requirements of the program for each marketing year, are hereby assessed against and shall be collected from each producer and importer who sells milk, butterfat, or dairy products in interstate or foreign commerce or so as to affect such commerce. The marketing assessments shall be established on an annual, marketing year basis. They shall be announced by the Board as far in advance of the beginning of the marketing year as is practicable. The assessments so announced shall not thereafter be varied before the close of the marketing year for which they are applicable, except that in emergency cases, the Board may redetermine such marketing assessments in the same manner that stabilization price levels may be redetermined in emergency cases. Every person purchasing milk, butterfat, or dairy products from a producer (except purchases by consumers for other than commercial uses), shall withhold from the purchase price an amount equal to the marketing assessment and shall remit the same to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. For the purposes of this section, milk, butterfat, or dairy products delivered by a producer to a cooperative association of producers shall be subject to the marketing assessment upon such delivery. Returns shall be filed and remittances made monthly by such purchasers in accordance with rules prescribed by the Commissioner.

SEC. 49. Producers holding licenses or permits issued by Federal, State, or local agencies authorizing them to sell milk, butterfat, or dairy products directly to consumers shall file returns and pay the marketing assessment on all sales made by them to consumers for other than commercial uses.

SEC. 50. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall collect the marketing assessments provided for herein and shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to accomplish that purpose.

SEC. 51. The collection of the marketing assessments shall be enforced in the same manner that the collection of the taxes on employees under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act is enforced, and the remedies, penalties, and punishments provided by law or regulations for enforcement of such employee taxes shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, be applicable to the collection and enforcement of the marketing assessments.

SEC. 52. There is appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, an amount equal to the marketing assessments collected under the provisions of this act. Such sums shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Board only to accomplish the purposes and policies of this act and for the administrative expenses of the Board. The sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this act until expended. All sums collected by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under the provisions of this act shall be credited as received to a special account without fiscal year limitation set up for the use of the Board. Such funds, including any other funds of the Board, borrowed or otherwise, which may be in any such special account, shall be available for use by the Board in carrying out the purposes and policies of this act and for the administrative expenses of the Board. The Board may expend such funds for such purposes, at such times, in such manner, and in such amounts, consistent with the provisions of this act, as the Board finds will effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 53. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed upon request of the Board to establish one or more special accounts without fiscal year limitation for the use of the Board.

SEC. 54. All imports of milk, butterfat, and dairy products shall be subject to the collection of marketing assessments at the same rates as those collected from domestic producers. The Secretary of the Treasury shall collect the marketing assessments on imports at the time of importation. The laws and regulations applicable to the import tax on sugar imposed by section 4501 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with this act, be applicable to the collection of the marketing assessments on imports. All funds so collected shall be credited as received to the special account of the Board and shall be available for use by the Board in the manner and for the purposes above mentioned. Rules and regulations governing the collection and payment of such fees shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

MARKETING ALLOTMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 55. The provisions of sections 55 through 63 shall be applicable only to marketing years when a marketing allotment program is required or in effect under this act.

SEC. 56. In the event the marketing assessment established by the Board for any marketing year would exceed 25 cents per hundredweight of milk, the Board shall set up and put into effect for such year a mar-

keting allotment program operated and financed in the manner hereinafter authorized.

SEC. 57. The Board shall establish a base for each producer desiring to market milk or butterfat. Bases shall be assigned to producers, including partnerships, corporations, or other business entities, and not to herds or farms. The Board shall provide by rules or regulations for the transfer of bases in whole or in part, for the assignment of bases to new producers, for the equitable adjustment of bases to avoid hardship, for such other adjustments consistent with the objectives of this act as the Board deems appropriate, including adjustments for deficit production areas, and for such other matters as may be necessary or appropriate to set up and operate effectively and efficiently the programs herein authorized. In allocating such bases the Board shall take into consideration historical production, trends, abnormal production during the historical period, and such other factors as may be appropriate to carry out such allocation in an equitable and practical manner. Bases established by the Board shall continue in effect from year to year until terminated by the Board, but such bases shall be subject to modification and adjustments from time to time by the Board.

SEC. 58. Persons required to withhold and report marketing assessments shall make such additional reports as the Board may prescribe by rule or regulation relating to the volume of milk marketed by each producer. The Board shall have authority to make such investigations, inspections, and audits of the records of any such person as may be necessary to enable it to carry out and enforce effectively the objectives of this act.

SEC. 59. The Board shall estimate and announce annually, as far in advance of the beginning of the applicable marketing year as is practicable, (1) the estimated supply for such marketing year; (2) the total quantity of milk and dairy products which can be marketed during such marketing year at prices equal to or above the stabilization price levels for such year; (3) the total quantity of milk and dairy products which can be sold or otherwise disposed of at prices less than the stabilization price levels for such year but which will provide a net return above the cost of handling; (4) the total quantity of milk and dairy products to be sold, donated, or otherwise disposed of during such year at a net loss below the cost of handling; (5) the amount by which storage stocks, reserves, and set-asides will be increased or decreased during such year; (6) the value of the milk and dairy products in items numbered 1 through 5 above including negative values where applicable; and (7) such other matters as the Board deems appropriate to carry out the objectives of this act. The estimates of the Board may be varied before the close of the marketing year for which they are applicable in the same manner in which announcements of stabilization price levels may be varied.

SEC. 60. The Board shall annually allocate to producers holding bases established by the Board the available markets for the applicable marketing year. Such allocations may be expressed in terms of percentage of base.

SEC. 61. The Board shall provide for the issuance of marketing certificates covering the marketing allocations of each producer.

SEC. 62. The Board may establish one or more marketing assessment rates for milk or butterfat marketed in any marketing year when a marketing allotment program is in effect. Such rates may be varied as between milk or butterfat marketed under marketing certificates and that marketed without such certificates.

SEC. 63. Marketing allotment programs set up by the Board shall be suspended or terminated by the Board whenever the marketing assessment established by the Board for any marketing year would not exceed 25 cents per hundredweight of milk. If for any subsequent marketing year such assessment would exceed that amount, then a marketing allotment program shall be operated for each such marketing year.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 64. The latest available statistics of the Federal Government shall be used in making the findings and determinations required to be made under this act. Such statistics and other information of the Federal Government, and of its departments and agencies, as may be necessary or appropriate to enable the Board to carry out effectively the purposes of this act, shall be made available to the Board.

SEC. 65. Office space for the central office of the Board shall be provided by the Department of Agriculture, if the Board requests the use of such space.

SEC. 66. The provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.); section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), as amended; the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (41 U. S. C. 35–45); section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22); and sections 431 and 432 of title 18 of the United States Code (18 U. S. C. 431, 432) shall not be applicable to contracts, purchases, sales, or payments made under this act.

SEC. 67. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person, circumstance, commodity, or product is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this act and the application thereof to other persons, circumstances, commodities, or products, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 68. All milk and dairy products held by or for the Federal Dairy Stabilization Board and all other assets of the Board, including borrowed money, shall be deemed property of the United States and shall be exempt from Federal, State, and local property taxes, except that real estate owned by the Board shall be subject to nondiscriminatory State and local real-estate taxes. The income, obligations, contracts, and transactions of the Board, including purchases and sales made by or for the Board, shall be exempt from all Federal, State, and local taxes, licenses, and fees. All activities, contracts, transactions, and operations of the Board, its members, executive committee, officers, employees, and agents which are authorized by this act shall be exempt from Federal and State antitrust laws.

SEC. 69. No member of the Board or of the Advisory Committee, nor any other person employed or acting in any official capacity in the administration of this act, shall speculate, directly or indirectly, in milk, butterfat, or dairy products, or in contracts relating thereto, nor shall any such person accept or receive any benefit or gain from any such speculation by others or own or have any beneficial interest in any stock or other membership interest in any organization engaged in any such speculation. Normal business operations connected with the production, manufacturing, storing, and effective merchandising of milk and dairy products, whether hedged or not, shall not be considered speculative within the meaning of this section. No member of the Board or of the Advisory Committee, nor any other person directly or indirectly connected with the Board or its activities or who shall have access to the files or information of the Board, shall divulge any information concerning the Board or its activities, which the Board shall have classified as confidential. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 70. The general penal statutes relating to crimes and offenses against the United States, its property, contracts, employees, and operations shall apply with respect to the Board, its property, contracts, employees, and operations to the extent that such application is not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 71. The price support operations of the Secretary under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to milk, butterfat, and dairy products shall be suspended during the entire period that stabilization operations are carried on by the Board under the authority of this act.

REFERENDUM OF MILK PRODUCERS

SEC. 72. On the second Monday in September 1958, a referendum shall be conducted by the Secretary to determine whether dairy farmers favor a dairy stabilization program operated by the Federal Dairy Stabilization Board as herein provided or a price support program operated by the Secretary under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing such referendum and shall determine all questions relating thereto. He shall promptly determine and announce the results of the referendum. Producers eligible to vote for nominees for appointment to the Federal Dairy Stabilization Board shall be eligible to vote in such referendum. In any election or referendum conducted under the authority of this act, the Secretary shall consider the vote of any cooperative association of milk producers bona fide engaged in marketing milk, butterfat, or dairy products for producers or the vote of the producers who are members of, stockholders in, or under contract with, such cooperative association.

SEC. 73. If a majority of those voting in the referendum provided for in the above section favor a price support program operated by the Federal Dairy Stabilization Board as herein provided, then the stabilization operations of the Board and the collection of the marketing assessments shall begin April 1, 1959. The price support operations of the Secretary under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall thereupon be suspended as provided in section 71 of this act.

SEC. 74. If a majority of those voting in the referendum above provided favor a price support program operated by the Secretary under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, then the Secretary shall continue to make available to producers price support for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat under title II of said act, and the provisions of the Federal Dairy Stabilization Act of 1958 shall cease to be effective.

SEC. 75. The decision of the Secretary in all matters relating to the referendum above provided shall be final.

SEC. 76. In order to provide a definite program for the purpose of such referendum, the Board is directed, in the event the dairy stabilization program herein provided is approved and notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, to support prices to producers for milk and butterfat for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1959, at 90 percent of the parity price therefor, using the manufacturing milk parity equivalent formula originally used under the Agricultural Act of 1949, and the marketing assessment for such marketing year shall be 25 cents per hundredweight of milk or milk equivalent. Thereafter the stabilization levels and the amount of the marketing assessments shall be determined annually as herein provided. The provisions of this act relating to variations in annual stabilization levels and marketing assessment rates in emergency cases shall be applicable to the stabilization levels and marketing assessment rates prescribed in this section.

SEC. 77. Dairy stabilization programs operated by the Federal Dairy Stabilization Board shall be subject to a referendum to determine whether such programs shall be

continued or terminated, if 10 percent or more of the milk producers eligible to vote in referendums under this act shall petition the Secretary in writing for such referendum. Upon receipt of a qualified petition, the Secretary shall conduct such referendum and determine and announce the results thereof.

SEC. 78. If a majority of those voting in the referendum provided for in the above section favor a price support program operated by the Federal Dairy Stabilization Board, then the stabilization operations of the Board and the collection of the marketing assessments shall be continued. If a majority of those voting in the referendum provided for in the above section favor discontinuing the stabilization operations of the Board, then the Secretary shall make available to producers price support for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949. Upon the reinstitution of such price supports by the Secretary, the stabilization operations of the Board shall cease and no further marketing assessments shall be collected. All assets of the Board shall be transferred to the Secretary for liquidation. Any assets remaining after the payment of all obligations of the Board shall be available to the Secretary for use in connection with such price support operations.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as senior Senator from the No. 1 dairy State in the Union, I am happy to join in cosponsoring the bill to establish a self-help program for the dairy industry. As stated by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the purpose of the bill would be to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk to the public, and to establish an improved price-support program for dairy farmers.

Additional objectives of the proposed legislation would be to (a) provide a fair return for dairy farmers; (b) establish reasonable prices for consumers; and (c) relieve the Federal Government from the burden of a costly price-support program.

As my colleague has pointed out, this proposed legislation represents a major breakthrough in the dairy industry's effort to provide a better price-support program for our dairy farmers. For years the dairy industry has attempted to design such a program. Regrettably, until now, it has been difficult to gain broad support for any specific program.

This self-help program has now gained the wide support of a number of farm organizations. The National Milk Producers Federation, the National Grange, as well as a number of individual dairy experts, deserve particular commendation for their contributions to the formulation of this legislation.

NEEDED: IMMEDIATE ACTION

There will, of course, be problems to be resolved that may require changes and modifications of the bill. Finally, and most important, the plan would be subject to approval of the farmers themselves in a referendum.

I am deeply disturbed, however, by a recent announcement by our esteemed colleague, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In effect, the chairman stated that the committee would prefer not to handle farm legislation this session on a commodity-by-commodity—I believe he termed it "piecemeal"—basis.

Now, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations and the Judiciary Committees, I fully appreciate the tremendous workload borne by our colleagues on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee. However, I believe the Congress and the country should welcome, rather than "turn thumbs down on" this pioneering effort of the dairy industry to finance its own price-support program.

I therefore respectfully—but strongly—urge that hearings be held on this self-help plan.

Mr. President, we recognize that all dairy problems cannot be resolved by a single economic, or legislative, action.

The problem is complex. The answers must be appropriately diversified.

I have prepared a supplemental statement on the self-help plan and other aspects of the dairy situation. I request unanimous consent to have the statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The Congress should act early on the self-help plan.

The main features of the program are:

1. It establishes a price support program largely financed by the dairy industry itself, to provide a fair return to the dairy farmer.

2. It creates a Federal Dairy Stabilization Board of 15 members appointed by the President and selected by milk producers in Federal dairy districts.

3. The criteria for price stabilization would include not only an assurance of adequate supplies of milk and dairy products for consumers, but a fair return to producers—taking into consideration the investment, risk and labor of the producer and his family.

4. The cost of operating the program would be paid by milk producers and importers through marketing assessments:

(a) Whenever the cost of operating the program can be financed with a single assessment of 25 cents or less per hundredweight of milk (or milk equivalent) marketed, such a single assessment would be used.

(b) Whenever the cost of operating the program would require an assessment of more than 25 cents per hundredweight, then an alternate method would be used. This would involve the assignment of marketing allotments to individual producers of a nominal assessment on all milk and butterfat marketed, and a supplemental assessment on marketings of milk and butterfat in excess of allotments.

5. For the marketing year beginning April 1, 1959, prices of milk and butterfat would be supported at 90 percent of parity. According to estimates, this would amount to about $3.86 per hundredweight for 3.95 test milk. The manufacturing milk parity equivalent formula would be the one originally used under the Agricultural Act of 1949.

6. After March 31, 1960, the price support level would be redetermined annually by the Stabilization Board.

7. The marketing fees would be remitted by processors or handlers to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in accordance with rules prescribed by the Commission.

8. The decisions of the Stabilization Board would be subject to review and challenge by the Secretary of Agriculture.

9. The Stabilization Board would buy and sell domestically produced milk, butter, cheddar cheese, nonfat dry milk solids, and other dairy products at such prices and in such manner as would enable it to stabilize prices to producers at the established levels.

10. A referendum of milk producers would be required to determine whether (a) dairy farmers favor a dairy-support program operated in accordance with the provisions of this act, or (b) continuation of the present type of price-support program. The referendum would be conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture on September 8, 1958—if the measure were enacted this session. If a majority of producers favored the new self-help program, it would go into effect on April 1, 1959.

MAINTAINING PRESENT LEVEL—OR HIGHER—PRICE SUPPORTS

Until Congress and our dairymen have had a chance to act upon the self-help plan, I believe that the price support of dairy products should be kept at the present level—or higher.

Regrettably, legislation has been recommended to the Congress to drop the bottom out of the dairy price-support program by lowering the flexible range from the present 75 to 90 percent down to 60 to 90 percent.

If enacted, this would be a serious threat to the economic life of the dairy farmer—especially the small, family-type dairyman.

Slashing price supports to 60 percent would cost United States dairymen over $1 billion annually. In Wisconsin alone, we could expect dairy income to decrease over $100 million per year.

According to preliminary calculations, the 60 percent support level could drop milk prices to producers to around $2.37 per hundredweight for 3.95 test milk, or $2.10 for average test.

The Congress, I believe, should definitely not lower the price support floor from 75 to 60 percent of parity.

SLASHING DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS WOULD MEAN GREAT LOSS TO FARMERS

Immediately following the unfortunate action by the Secretary of Agriculture recommending lowering parity from the present 82 percent of parity to 75 percent on April 1, 1958, you will recall that I protested—urging that the proposed slash of price supports be canceled.

According to estimates, this action alone would cost upward of $250 million for the Nation's farmers. For Wisconsin, the toll is expected to amount to $43–$46 million annually. Hard hit by low income in comparison to rising costs, the farmer simply cannot stand this kind of slash in income.

The lower parity level, of course, would be reflected in the support prices of butter, cheese, and/or dried milk. Thus, there would be wide repercussions in the whole dairy industry.

To forestall such action, Congress should take immediate action on S. 2924. This bill, which I have cosponsored, would cancel Secretary Benson's order to slash price supports of dairy products to 75 percent of parity on April 1, 1958, the beginning of the marketing year.

This legislation would (a) raise the price support levels for the marketing year April 1, 1958, to March 31, 1959, from $3.25 per hundredweight to $3.50 per hundredweight. This lift would help our dairy farmers get on their feet; (b) it would establish a fairer base period—July 1946 to December 1948—for determining the level of dairy-price support. This was a base period free of both controls and price-support inventories. By contrast, the current formula is based generally on average prices over the preceding 10-year period. The net effect is that the program, as now administered, does not provide real parity for the farmer. Instead, it results in a growing unfavorable imbalance between farm costs of operation and the selling price of milk and other dairy products.

ACTION NECESSARY ON BOTH S. 2924 AND SELF-HELP PLAN

Now, some may ask: As a cosponsor of legislation to counteract proposals to slash

price supports, isn't Senator WILEY inconsistent in also sponsoring the self-help bill?

No; definitely not.

First of all, the Congress needs time to study this self-help legislation. However, even if this new legislation were enacted early, it would require a farm referendum to be held on the second Monday in September—the 8th—1958.

Meanwhile, it is important to maintain a dairy-price support at a fair level.

THREE-STEP DAIRY PROGRAM

We cannot, of course, put all our eggs in one basket—that is, the price-support program. Instead, we need a diversified approach to resolving the dairy problems. For example, there are additional steps which need to be taken to brighten the outlook for our dairymen. Among the objectives we must work toward are:

*1. Better consumption*

(a) If each person were to drink one additional glass of milk a day in this country, there would be no problem.

(b) If each person were to eat as much cheese per capita as they do in Europe, there would be no surplus cheese.

*2. Better distribution of milk and its products*

(a) We will soon be able—because of the discovery, by the University of Wisconsin, of a method of shipping fresh concentrated milk—to send milk anywhere in the world. This is a fine example of research that pays off.

(b) We need a stepped-up program of sales and promotion, since many sections of our country hardly know the value of good cheese, and other dairy products.

*3. Further utilization*

(a) Through chemistry we should find uses for the constituents of milk and its products—not simply for food, but for other uses.

(b) Cheesweet—a wonderful Wisconsin candy made out of 40-percent processed swiss cheese—exemplifies what I mean by further utilization. But chemistry will find other uses.

*4. Legislation*

Of course, we cannot, by legislation, cure economic ills, any more than we can cure physical ills by legislation. But we can, by Congressional action, provide a shot in the arm until the right kind of economic measures are put into operation.

The objective is to provide the farmer with his cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

ENACT LEGISLATION FOR WILEY RESEARCH LABORATORY

I also have a bill, S. 1699, pending before the Senate Agriculture Committee to establish a Dairy Research Center at Madison, Wis. Day by day, I believe it is becoming more and more apparent that this laboratory is necessary.

We know, of course, that fine research programs are being carried out across the country by the dairy industry, colleges, and universities, and by the Department of Agriculture.

Regrettably, however—and we must face these facts squarely—not enough new ideas and new products are being developed to sufficiently increase consumption and utilization.

As possible, we need a greater effort to correlate and utilize—rather than often duplicate—basic and general research. This, of course, is the steppingstone to advanced research for finding new uses and products from the basic components of milk.

FINE WORK OF UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

As I mentioned, however, I am particularly pleased that one of the most recent, important discoveries was made at the University of Wisconsin. The development of sterile, concentrated milk is a wonderful example of the kind of product that is badly needed. According to preliminary estimates, the milk can be shipped long distances, without refrigeration, at prices low enough to attract consumers. This is particularly important to Wisconsin, since a large share of our milk, or milk products is sold outside the State.

CUTS WOULD AFFECT ECONOMY OF WHOLE COMMUNITIES

This, then, is a brief résumé of problems and challenges facing the dairy industry.

The improving of the dairy program, of course, is in the interest not only of the dairy farmer, but of the whole economy.

We recognize that reduced farm income is also felt directly in the businesses, industries and services depending on the buying power of the farmer.

---

## THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Science and Technology Act of 1958."

Mr. President, Russia's advances in recent months in space-science make it imperative that we strengthen the Government's civilian scientific program, particularly in the basic sciences; that we step up the development of scientific manpower; and that we expand our programs in fundamental scientific research, if we are to meet the Communists' challenge for scientific and intellectual leadership of the world.

This bill, which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished Senator from Texas, and I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, are today introducing in the Senate is, in my judgment, a dynamic step toward the achievement of those goals.

The fundamental purpose of the bill is to completely reorganize the civilian science functions of the Government to bring about a coordinated basic scientific program in the national interest.

The objective is to provide the Congress with the means of taking action to meet the urgent need for a greatly expanded program of research, education, and technological development, which is imperative if the United States is to maintain its position of leadership upon which the hopes of the Free World depend.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate will note that the declaration of policy set forth in title II of this bill states that the United States Government shall provide for creative scientists both the necessary facilities and the proper environment so essential to the conduct of basic research. In my opinion, the concept expressed in this title of the bill goes to the very heart of the matter of our growth and survival as a nation.

In essence, this bill would: First, create a Cabinet Department of Science and Technology in which would be coordinated the civilian scientific functions of the Government; second, provide for a scientific scholarship program; and third, establish national institutes for scientific research in the basic sciences, each of which I will discuss briefly for the edification of Senators subsequently in my remarks.

The bill I introduce today was prepared by the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations under the direction of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and myself. Its provisions are tentative, since they have not been fully considered by all members of the Committee on Government Operations, and are subject to action by the committee, following hearings, through amendments, deletions, or the addition of new provisions or titles.

This bill, as presently drafted, contains four titles, Mr. President. Its objective is to insure that consideration be given to the development of a coordinated program covering all Government civilian scientific agencies, activities and functions.

Certain aspects of the bill, particularly titles III and IV, may be considered by other Congressional committees which may have jurisdiction over these matters. Some members of the Committee on Government Operations, including myself, have already sponsored proposals dealing with the development of civilian science activities in the field of education, which have been referred to other committees. Therefore, consideration will be given, after hearings have been held before the Subcommittee on Reorganization, which I intend to schedule shortly, to deferring action on those titles dealing with scientific education and the use of counterpart funds. This would permit the appropriate jurisdictional committees to give consideration to those proposals, as well as to related bills already referred to them.

The bill, Mr. President, would authorize the appropriation of $580 million over the next 8 years to establish a Federal-State program of scholarship loans for the education of students beyond the secondary school level in the physical sciences, biological sciences, mathematics and engineering. The loans, not to exceed $1,500 per student, per academic year, for not more than 5 years, would be made from a revolving fund established in the Treasury, which also would be used for insuring loans made from private sources.

To encourage State assistance in making student loans, the bill would also authorize direct grants up to $200,000 to any one State in any fiscal year to meet operating expenses of nonprofit corporations chartered for the principal purpose of making loans to qualified students. The program, which would be directed by the Secretary of the proposed Department of Science and Technology through a Bureau of Student Loans, would be directed toward providing educational assistance to students in the fields of physical and biological sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of Science and Technology to use counterpart funds to establish programs outside the United States for collecting, collating, translating, abstracting, and disseminating scientific and technological information, including the conducting of cooperative programs in basic and applied science and research between the United States and other nations.

Under the provisions of this proposed legislation, Mr. President, the following existing Government organizations would be transferred to the Department: The National Science Foundation—for administrative purposes—the Patent Office from the Department of Commerce, as well as all functions of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to the Patent Office; the Office of Technical Services of the Department of Commerce, as well as all functions of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to that Office (including functions vested in the Secretary of Commerce relating to the dissemination of technical information); the National Bureau of Standards from the Department of Commerce, as well as all functions of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to that Bureau; the Atomic Energy Commission (for administrative purposes), which would be known as the Atomic Energy Administration of the new Department; and the following functions of the Smithsonian Institution—the Division of Astrophysical Research, the Division of Radiation and Organisms, certain functions relating to the Canal Zone Biological Area, and certain functions relating to the exchange of scientific publications being administered through the International Exchange Service. Any other functions of the Smithsonian Institution determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to relate primarily to scientific research also would be transferred by the bill.

Functions transferred from the Office of Technical Services would be administered through a component of the new Department to be known as the Bureau of Technical Services. The Bureau of Technical Services also would have the responsibility (a) to develop a complete science information program, utilizing all facilities of the Federal Government now vested in agencies which operate related programs; (b) to acquire, in cooperation with other public or private agencies, scientific literature, both from foreign and domestic sources; (c) to establish necessary facilities within the Bureau, or in other public or private agencies, to collate, declassify, translate, abstract, index, store, retrieve, and disseminate information essential to the development of scientific and technological programs as may be determined to be in the national interest and consistent with security requirements; and (d) to encourage the elimination of duplication of effort through the integration and coordination of functions vested in the Bureau and in other agencies.

The Bureau also would have the responsibility (a) to develop mechanical aids for collating, translating, abstracting, indexing, and rapidly retrieving scientific and technological information under the control of the Federal Government, and to coordinate such data as may be available from other sources; (b) to establish rules and regulations governing the distribution of publications as may be necessary to assure maximum utilization, including the assessment of such fees as may be deemed appropriate; and (c) to undertake through the facilities available to the Secretary, including educational or research institutions and private laboratories, the establishment of such additional services as may be required to further scientific, engineering, and technological research and to aid in the development of inventions, discoveries, products, processes, and techniques.

All functions of the National Bureau of Standards would be administered by the Secretary of the new Department. A separate component would be established to administer certain laboratory functions being carried out by the Bureau of Standards at Boulder, Colo. As stated previously, the National Science Foundation and the Atomic Energy Commission would be transferred to the new Department, where they would continue to exercise their present functions, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Science and Technology.

The research institutes which the Secretary of Science and Technology would be authorized to establish or support would include basic and applied research in the fields of mathematics, engineering, the physical and biological sciences, and, as deemed appropriate, the social science. Such research centers would be operated largely by private, nongovernmental institutions, on a nonprofit basis, with financial support from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent that staff memorandum No. 85–2–2 prepared by the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations dated January 10, 1958, which provides additional information relating to the proposed Cabinet Department, the scholarship program, and the national research institutes, be incorporated at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1958

The following is a brief analysis and explanation of the bill prepared by the staff, as set forth in the committee print dated January 8, 1958.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This title proposes to create a Department of Science and Technology. The functions of the National Science Foundation and other Federal civilian science agencies operating on a governmentwide basis would be transferred to the new Department. The NSF would continue to operate under its existing authority, but would be subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary. If approved, the NSF and the AEC, proposed to be incorporated within the new Department, would receive Cabinet level representation.

The Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, which would be transferred to the new Department, would be elevated to a Bureau of Technical Services. All existing authority vested in the OTS would be transferred to the new Bureau, with additional broad authority to establish a central agency for gathering, collating, translating, abstracting, indexing, storage, retrieving, and full utilization of all available scientific data and techniques.

The Patent Office and the National Bureau of Standards would also be transferred from Commerce to the new Department, with all existing authority. An additional provision is included to set up the Boulder Laboratories as a separate component, outside the National Bureau of Standards, since these laboratories have now become an operating agency and should be set up independent of the NBS.

The proposed transfer of the Atomic Energy Commission to the new Department would not alter its present functions, but would change it from a commission to an administration, for coordination within the departmental structure under the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

Title I also provides that all operating functions of the Smithsonian Institution be transferred to the new Department, leaving it only supervision over the museums and the Washington Zoo.

It will be necessary for the committee, following hearings, to make some determination as to what other Federal agencies should be transferred to the new Department, such as the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Weather Bureau, Airways Modernization Board, Coast and Geodetic Survey (Commerce), Geological Survey (Interior), and, possibly, some other science functions performed by agencies now operating within the Departments of Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and certain other science functions now vested in independent agencies.

TITLE II—NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

This title is designed to encourage the establishment of scientific research centers for the conduct of basic and applied research by making available adequate financial support necessary to attract, and utilize to the fullest possible extent, the most talented, qualified and creative scientists in the Nation.

It would authorize the Secretary to establish or support one or more scientific research centers in the physical and biological sciences, mathematics, and engineering, and, as may be required, in the social sciences. Such research centers would be operated largely by private, nongovernmental institutions, on a nonprofit basis, with financial support from the Federal Government. However, the Secretary would be authorized to establish and operate certain types of applied scientific research centers, either directly or on a contract basis through nongovernmental organizations, whenever the national interest required and sufficient economic incentive does not exist for the undertaking of such research by nongovernmental organizations without governmental support. Provisions have been included to avoid duplication of existing available research facilities, and to require the Secretary to report annually to the Congress with respect to the research institutes supported or established, the nature of the programs undertaken, and the cost of such programs.

TITLE III—SCHOLARSHIP LOANS

This title directs the Secretary of Science and Technology to establish a program to assist individuals to obtain an education beyond the secondary school level in the physical and biological sciences, mathematics or engineering. It further provides for the creation, in the Department of Science and Technology, of a Bureau of Student Loans.

According to the terms of the bill, a special fund to be known as the Federal Education Loan and Loan Insurance Fund would be established in the Treasury, to be used as a revolving fund for insuring private-loan sources. The loans could not exceed $1,500 per student for any academic year of education, and could not be made for more than 5 such years of education. These figures are suggested merely as a base, upon which the committee will be able to make its own determination as to the total annual amount of the loan and the extent of coverage.

To encourage State assistance in making student loans available in the fields of the physical and biological sciences, mathematics or engineering, this title authorizes the Secretary to make direct grants up to $200,-

000 to any State in any fiscal year. These grants would be kept in a separate fund, under the control of the State agency charged with chief concern over institutions of higher education, and would be made available to help meet organization and operating expenses of nonprofit corporations chartered for the principal purpose of providing loan programs for students of the State to participate in the loan program.

For direct-loan purposes, the draft bill tentatively provides, subject to final committee determination, that there shall be appropriated to the fund $40 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958. For 1959, the figure would be $60 million; for the fiscal year 1960 the sum of $80 million; and for each of the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1964, the sum of $100 million annually, making a total eventual revolving fund of $580 million in 8 years. The loans would bear interest at 2 percent a year or "such higher rate as shall be fixed by the Secretary"; it is contemplated that the rate would be equal to about one-half the going rate of commercial loans. The Secretary would be authorized to make up the difference in interest needed to obtain the loans to the colleges and universities allocating such loans. No interest would accrue prior to the commencement period of repayment or 1 year after ceasing full-time study, whichever would come sooner. The borrower would have 10 years in which to repay (unless he is employed by the Federal Government and conforms to other provisions of this title).

Provision is made for the distribution among the States of loans and loan insurance by the Secretary in accordance with such formula as he determines from such information as may be reasonably available to him (1) to be best suited for the purposes of the Science and Technology Act, and (2) to recognize the needs of each State based, among other criteria, on the number of students graduating from secondary schools, the number of young people in selected specific age categories between 17 and 21, the per capita income in such State, and the burden which the State is bearing in higher education through facilities, direct assistance, or otherwise.

The bill stipulates that loans shall be used only to defray costs which are incurred while pursuing a full-time course of study in the fields of physical and biological sciences, mathematics, and engineering; and in order to be eligible for them, applicants first must be accepted by a recognized institution of higher learning.

The title further provides that the Secretary may cancel payment of any loan to any individual recipient who, upon completion of his course of study, accepts full-time employment in the Federal Government in the fields of the physical or biological sciences, mathematics, or engineering. Such loans may be canceled at the rate of $1,500, plus any accrued interest, for each year in which the recipient is employed in a full-time position in the physical or biological sciences, mathematics, or engineering in any agency of the Federal Government or project or program designated by the Secretary.

The title provides for Government insurance on loans made to students by private sources, including universities and colleges. Administration of this program would be largely concentrated in the institutions themselves. The loan-insurance plan provides for payment to financial institutions and institutions of higher education of 90 percent of any losses suffered on loans.

TITLE IV—OVERSEAS PROGRAMS

This title would authorize the Secretary to establish cooperative programs outside of the United States for collecting, translating, abstracting, and disseminating scientific and technological information and to conduct and support other scientific activities. In carrying out the purposes of this section, the Secretary is authorized, in cooperation with governmental and other agencies, both of the United States and other countries, to use counterpart funds available for expenditure by the United States. The requirement for repayment out of appropriations by agencies using counterpart funds for the purposes of the act is waived.

The committee may wish to give consideration to extending this provision, if approved in principle, to cover other counterpart funds where needed. The utilization of these funds would require the country in which such funds are available to agree to support the programs to which allocations are proposed to be made. It might be feasible, in certain instances, to extend the authority for the actual construction of basic and applied science and research laboratories and other facilities in the countries in which the funds are available in order to utilize fully the potential benefits of the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent that the statement which the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has prepared in connection with the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH TO ACCOMPANY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1958

It is a high honor to me to be coauthor, with the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, of the Science and Technology Act of 1958. Our thanks are due the staff of the Government Operations Committee for its dedicated work in drafting this bill to carry out ideas and ideals that a number of us have expressed so many times in public speeches.

One-half of the high-school graduates who finish in the top 30 percent of their classes never go to any college in America today. This great reservoir of human resources now lost through their financial inability to go to college, would be tapped and trained for the advancement of this Nation and of all mankind.

This bill would not interfere with or curtail any educational services or functions.

We are not forgetful of the equal importance of the humanities in a balanced education. This bill would provide only about 25,000 scholarships at one time in the limited fields mentioned. There are 1 million able students who will never be financially able to go to college. This bill will not cure America's lag in educational opportunity for its youth; it is a modest beginning that proposes to help us stop the gap in the shortage of training of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers.

This bill in some respects complements the bill I introduced in this body a few days ago, for an extension of the educational provision of the GI bill of rights, to present-day veterans. The GI bill is not limited to science or engineering, but includes education in the humanities as well.

Mr. President, insofar as education is concerned, this bill is a little timid step toward opportunities for all our youth. America should do more.

It cannot afford to do less. The challenge of the times is before us; let us step forward to meet new conditions with new ideas, new resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the education aspects of the bill I introduced today are merely the latest in the series of proposals I have made in the general field of education and student aid. During the last session I introduced S. 869, S. 870, S. 868, and S. 871. Three of them are pending in the Labor Committee, and one in the Finance Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bills be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 869. STUDENT AID ACT

(a) Federal scholarships of $1,000 a year, administered through State educational authorities by United States Commissioner of Education with advice of a National Council on Student Aid, to minimum of 40,000 needy students annually from top echelons of high-school graduating classes.

(b) Grants of not more than $500 per scholarship student to participating colleges and universities to aid in expanding facilities and meet costs of educational services beyond portion covered by tuition fees.

(c) Long-term, low-interest loan program for college students, authorizing insuring up to $25 million in loans each year with maximum of $1,000 to any one student in any academic year and $4,000 total maximum outstanding loan to any one student. Repayment would not begin until 4 years after completion of full-time education, with up to 6 years allowed to repay the loan. Interest fixed at not more than 1 percent above the rate of average Treasury obligations. Special feature would be loan write-off incentive to encourage graduates to enter the teaching profession, with a specified amount of the college loan to be forgiven for each year of teaching.

---

S. 868. EDUCATION TAX CREDIT ACT

Income-tax credit for tuition or fees, permitting any individual to charge off 30 percent of the cost of tuition and fees paid for education of himself, or any other individual, against his net income tax, such credit not to exceed $450 in any taxable year.

---

S. 871. YOUTH CONSERVATION ACT

(a) Establishing a Youth Conservation Corps Commission made up of Director of National Park Service, Chief of United States Forest Service, Administrator of Soil Conservation Service, and an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the latter as chairman.

(b) Commission to make a survey of the current use and adaptability of our natural resources program in federally owned lands with a view to the training and utilization on a continuing basis of a corps of young men performing healthful outdoor work in conservation projects such as forest stand improvement measures, forest insect and disease control, park construction and improvements, wildlife cover improvement, public recreational facilities construction and improvement, and other related occupations in the public interest; and formulating, designing, and operating a number of pilot Youth Conservation Corps projects employing a maximum of 500 boys of good character between 16 and 19 in groups of no more than 50, organized in camps or on an individual basis, as models for later expansion into a continuing program. Compensation to be on the basis of no less than $75 per month plus room and board during either summer periods or year-round enrollment.

(c) Commission to submit recommendations to Congress on January 1, 1959, based on survey and experience with pilot projects, including suggestions for cooperation with State agencies for State-land projects if deemed feasible, and also including suggestions as to the advisability of linking this program to conservation training in general and recruitment for Federal conservation services in particular. Provides $1 million

appropriation to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for purposes of act during 1958.

(d) Providing grants to States to establish and strengthen programs for control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, beginning with a $5 million total for fiscal 1958 and rising to $10 million annually by fiscal 1960, allotted to States on the basis of number of children with a minimum allotment of $50,000 annually. Another $5 million set aside for grants to States and colleges and universities for training personnel for juvenile delinquency programs, and $1 million authorized for research grants for developing and demonstrating new techniques in the control of delinquency.

---

S. 870. SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ACT

Authorizing Federal financial assistance to build schools, but leaving responsibility for actual construction with State and local school authorities acquainted with local needs. Requires State plans to be approved by United States Commissioner of Education to insure Federal funds will go where most needed in each State. Funds to be distributed to States according to number of persons 5 to 17 years of age in each State. States and local school districts would be required to match Federal funds. Open authorization, with annual amount to be determined by Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have introduced today's bill in an effort to supplement other proposals in the field of education, and to provide an overall package proposal in the critical areas of our scientific and technological deficiencies. I hope that the appropriate committees will consider these and other related bills with a view toward speedy action.

Mr. REVERCOMB subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] introduced the Science and Technology Act of 1958. I think it is very timely that the bill be introduced at this time.

I have had occasion to examine the draft of the bill prepared, as the Senator explained, by the committee staff. I have some question concerning the wisdom of certain parts of the bill. I make special reference to those provisions now contained in the bill, with respect to the appointment at Cabinet level of a Secretary of Science, for instance, and I likewise refer to the provision which would do away with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I think it is entirely timely that a bill upon this subject be considered by the Senate and by the Congress, and that it be sent to the committee upon which I serve for study and for a reporting in proper time for consideration upon the floor.

I make these remarks, Mr. President, because I did not sponsor the bill or join as one of its cosponsors, for the reason that there are parts of the bill which I think should be very thoroughly considered before action is taken upon the bill.

---

## SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS FOR FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. The bill provides salary increases and certain related improvements for Foreign Service personnel. The upward salary adjustments made by means of the bill were prepared by the State Department, and are based on the same formula for salary increases as proposed by the executive branch for the large majority of other Federal employees. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and an explanation of it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3134) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to provide salary increases for Foreign Service personnel equitable to those being otherwise provided for civil-service and other officers and employees of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. GREEN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, 79th Cong.) as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 412. There shall be the class of career ambassador, the class of career minister, and eight numbered classes of Foreign Service officers. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be $21,000. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be $19,500. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the eight classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1, $17,000, $17,500, $18,000, $18,500, $19,000;
"Class 2, $14,000, $14,500, $15,000, $15,500, $16,000, $16,500, $17,000;
"Class 3, $11,500, $11,900, $12,300, $12,700, $13,100, $13,500, $13,900;
"Class 4, $9,700, $10,000, $10,300, $10,600, $10,900, $11,200, $11,500;
"Class 5, $7,950, $8,200, $8,450, $8,700, $8,950, $9,200, $9,450;
"Class 6, $6,550, $6,800, $7,050, $7,300, $7,550, $7,800, $8,050;
"Class 7, $5,450, $5,600, $5,750, $5,900, $6,050, $6,200, $6,350;
"Class 8, $4,750, $4,900, $5,050, $5,200, $5,350, $5,500, $5,650."

SEC. 2. Section 415 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 415. (a) There shall be 10 classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum salaries of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1, $11,500, $11,900, $12,300, $12,700, $13,100, $13,500, $13,900;
"Class 2, $9,700, $10,000, $10,300, $10,600, $10,900, $11,200, $11,500;
"Class 3, $7,950, $8,200, $8,450, $8,700, $8,950, $9,200, $9,450;
"Class 4, $6,600, $6,800, $7,000, $7,200, $7,400, $7,600, $7,800;
"Class 5, $5,900, $6,100, $6,300, $6,500, $6,700, $6,900, $7,100;
"Class 6, $5,250, $5,400, $5,550, $5,700, $5,850, $6,000, $6,150;
"Class 7, $4,500, $4,650, $4,800, $4,950, $5,100, $5,250, $5,400;
"Class 8, $4,000, $4,150, $4,300, $4,450, $4,600, $4,750, $4,900;
"Class 9, $3,600, $3,750, $3,900, $4,050, $4,200, $4,350, $4,500;
"Class 10, $3,400, $3,500, $3,600, $3,700, $3,800, $3,900, $4,000.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, the Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, fix the salary or compensation at lesser rates of salary than those prescribed by this section for the applicable class of officers or employees who are employed locally abroad and who are not available or are not qualified for transfer to another post or posts."

SEC. 3. Section 625 of such act is amended (1) by striking the word "Foreign" contained in the phrase "work of the Foreign Service" in the first sentence, (2) by striking the first word of the second sentence "The" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "Without regard to any other law the", and (3) by striking the phrase "a Foreign Service officer or a Reserve officer, in any class," from the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "any such officer."

SEC. 4. Section 642 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 642. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service shall receive an increase in salary at periodic intervals to the next higher salary rate for the class in which he is serving.

"Without regard to any other law the Secretary is authorized to grant any such officer or employee additional increases in salary within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee who has achieved the maximum salary rate prescribed by section 415 for the class in which he is serving may be granted an additional in-class salary increment from time to time in recognition of longevity and proficiency in the Service. Each such salary increment shall be equal to the maximum step rate increment of the applicable class and no person shall receive more than four such salary increments while serving in the same class."

SEC. 5. (a) Foreign Service officers presently serving in the class of career ambassador and the class of career minister shall receive the salary rates prescribed for career ambassadors and career ministers, respectively, by section 412 of such act, as amended.

(b) Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled rates provided by section 412 of such act, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding scheduled rate as provided by such section, as amended, except as provided in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

(c) Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the rates provided for class 8 by section 412 of such act, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled rates for class 8 as provided by such section, as amended, which provides a salary increase to such officers in an amount not more than $300 per annum, except in the case of an officer receiving basic compensation at the first step rate of the class who shall receive the basic compensation provided by the first step rate of the new schedule of rates for class 8 authorized by this act.

(d) Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at the sixth or seventh step rate as provided for class 1 by section 412 of such act, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the maximum scheduled rate for class 1 as provided by this act.

SEC. 6. Foreign Service staff officers and employees receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled rates provided

by section 415 of such act, as amended, shall be transferred to the new classes established by section 415 of such act, as amended, and shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act, as follows:

| *Present class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended* | | | *Corresponding new class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by this act* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Class | Step | Rate | Class | Step | Rate |
| FSS-1 | 5 | $11,965 | FSS-1 | 5 | $13,100 |
| | 4 | 11,665 | | 4 | 12,700 |
| | 3 | 11,345 | | 3 | 12,300 |
| | 2 | 11,020 | | 2 | 11,900 |
| | 1 | 10,700 | | 1 | 11,500 |
| FSS-2 | 5 | 11,020 | FSS-2 | 7 | 11,500 |
| | 4 | 10,700 | | 7 | 11,500 |
| | 3 | 10,440 | | 6 | 11,200 |
| | 2 | 10,185 | | 5 | 10,900 |
| | 1 | 9,925 | | 4 | 10,600 |
| FSS-3 | 5 | 10,150 | FSS-2 | 5 | 10,900 |
| | 4 | 9,895 | | 4 | 10,600 |
| | 3 | 9,635 | | 3 | 10,300 |
| | 2 | 9,380 | | 2 | 10,000 |
| | 1 | 9,120 | | 1 | 9,700 |
| FSS-4 | 5 | 9,300 | FSS-2 | 1 | 9,700 |
| | 4 | 9,040 | FSS-3 | 7 | 9,450 |
| | 3 | 8,785 | | 7 | 9,450 |
| | 2 | 8,525 | | 6 | 9,200 |
| | 1 | 8,270 | | 5 | 8,950 |
| FSS-5 | 6 | 8,725 | FSS-3 | 7 | 9,450 |
| | 5 | 8,470 | | 6 | 9,200 |
| | 4 | 8,210 | | 5 | 8,950 |
| | 3 | 8,015 | | 4 | 8,700 |
| | 2 | 7,825 | | 3 | 8,450 |
| | 1 | 7,630 | | 2 | 8,200 |
| FSS-6 | 6 | 7,960 | FSS-3 | 3 | 8,450 |
| | 5 | 7,765 | | 2 | 8,200 |
| | 4 | 7,570 | | 1 | 7,950 |
| | 3 | 7,380 | | 1 | 7,950 |
| | 2 | 7,185 | FSS-4 | 7 | 7,800 |
| | 1 | 6,990 | | 6 | 7,600 |
| FSS-7 | 6 | 7,320 | FSS-4 | 7 | 7,800 |
| | 5 | 7,125 | | 6 | 7,600 |
| | 4 | 6,935 | | 5 | 7,400 |
| | 3 | 6,740 | | 4 | 7,200 |
| | 2 | 6,545 | | 3 | 7,000 |
| | 1 | 6,355 | | 2 | 6,800 |
| FSS-8 | 6 | 6,680 | FSS-5 | 7 | 7,100 |
| | 5 | 6,490 | | 6 | 6,900 |
| | 4 | 6,295 | | 5 | 6,700 |
| | 3 | 6,100 | | 4 | 6,500 |
| | 2 | 5,905 | | 3 | 6,300 |
| | 1 | 5,715 | | 2 | 6,100 |
| FSS-9 | 6 | 6,045 | FSS-5 | 3 | 6,300 |
| | 5 | 5,850 | | 2 | 6,100 |
| | 4 | 5,655 | FSS-6 | 6 | 6,000 |
| | 3 | 5,460 | | 5 | 5,850 |
| | 2 | 5,270 | | 4 | 5,700 |
| | 1 | 5,075 | | 2 | 5,400 |
| FSS-10 | 7 | 5,615 | FSS-6 | 5 | 5,850 |
| | 6 | 5,425 | | 4 | 5,700 |
| | 5 | 5,230 | | 3 | 5,550 |
| | 4 | 5,035 | FSS-7 | 7 | 5,400 |
| | 3 | 4,910 | | 6 | 5,250 |
| | 2 | 4,780 | | 5 | 5,100 |
| | 1 | 4,650 | | 4 | 4,950 |
| FSS-11 | 7 | 5,000 | FSS-7 | 7 | 5,400 |
| | 6 | 4,870 | | 6 | 5,250 |
| | 5 | 4,740 | | 5 | 5,100 |
| | 4 | 4,610 | | 4 | 4,950 |
| | 3 | 4,480 | | 3 | 4,800 |
| | 2 | 4,355 | | 2 | 4,650 |
| | 1 | 4,225 | | 1 | 4,500 |
| FSS-12 | 7 | 4,570 | FSS-8 | 7 | 4,900 |
| | 6 | 4,445 | | 6 | 4,750 |
| | 5 | 4,315 | | 5 | 4,600 |
| | 4 | 4,185 | | 4 | 4,450 |
| | 3 | 4,055 | | 3 | 4,300 |
| | 2 | 3,925 | | 2 | 4,150 |
| | 1 | 3,800 | | 1 | 4,000 |
| FSS-13 | 7 | 4,165 | FSS-9 | 7 | 4,500 |
| | 6 | 4,035 | | 6 | 4,350 |
| | 5 | 3,905 | | 5 | 4,200 |
| | 4 | 3,775 | | 4 | 4,050 |
| | 3 | 3,645 | | 3 | 3,900 |
| | 2 | 3,520 | | 2 | 3,750 |
| | 1 | 3,390 | | 1 | 3,600 |
| FSS-14 | 7 | 3,775 | FSS-10 | 7 | 4,000 |
| | 6 | 3,645 | | 6 | 3,900 |
| | 5 | 3,520 | | 5 | 3,800 |
| | 4 | 3,390 | | 3 | 3,600 |
| | 3 | 3,260 | | 2 | 3,500 |
| | 2 | 3,130 | | 1 | 3,400 |
| | 1 | 3,000 | | 1 | 3,400 |
| FSS-15 and below | All step rates | | FSS-10 | 1 | 3,400 |

SEC. 7. The class and salary adjustments made pursuant to sections 5 and 6 of this act shall be made effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1958.

The explanation presented by Mr. GREEN is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

TITLE IV. CATEGORIES AND SALARIES OF PERSONNEL

*Part B—Salaries*

Foreign Service Officers

Existing legislation

SEC. 412. There shall be [10 classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister]. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be [$20,000]. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be [$17,500]. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the [other] classes shall be as follows:

Class 1: [$14,600, $15,000, $15,400, $15,800, $16,200, $16,600, $17,000.

Class 2: $12,600, $12,900, $13,200, $13,500, $13,800, $14,100, $14,400.

Class 3: $10,600, $10,900, $11,200, $11,500, $11,800, $12,100, $12,400.

Class 4: $9,000, $9,250, $9,500, $9,750, $10,000, $10,250, $10,500.

Class 5: $7,400, $7,650, $7,900, $8,150, $8,400, $8,650, $8,900.

Class 6: $6,100, $6,300, $6,500, $6,700, $6,900, $7,100, $7,300.

Class 7: $5,100, $5,250, $5,400, $5,550, $5,700, $5,850, $6,000.

Class 8: $4,300, $4,450, $4,600, $4,750, $4,900, $5,050, $5,200, $5,350].

Proposed legislation

SEC. 412. There shall be the class of career ambassador, the class of career minister, and eight numbered classes of Foreign Service officers. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be $21,000. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be $19,500. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the eight classes shall be as follows:

Class 1: $17,000, $17,500, $18,000, $18,500, $19,000.

Class 2: $14,000, $14,500, $15,000, $15,500, $16,000, $16,500, $17,000.

Class 3: $11,500, $11,900, $12,300, $12,700, $13,100, $13,500, $13,900.

Class 4: $9,700, $10,000, $10,300, $10,600, $10,900, $11,200, $11,500.

Class 5: $7,950, $8,200, $8,450, $8,700, $8,950, $9,200, $9,450.

Class 6: $6,550, $6,800, $7,050, $7,300, $7,550, $7,800, $8,050.

Class 7: $5,450, $5,600, $5,750, $5,900, $6,050, $6,200, $6,350.

Class 8: $4,750, $4,900, $5,050, $5,200, $5,350, $5,500, $5,650.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to adjust the rates of pay for Foreign Service personnel in accordance with the President's proposal for increasing the salaries of Federal personnel. The adjustments to the rates of the Foreign Service salary schedules are equated as closely as possible to the adjustments proposed for comparable salary levels of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

The classes of career ambassador and career minister are a part of the Foreign Service officer career system and are comparable, both in rank and in type of positions occupied, to chief of mission positions in the diplomatic service. The career ambassador designation is awarded only to officers who have served with distinction for a number of years as chiefs of mission and/or in top-level positions in the Department. At the present time there are only two career ambassadors. The career minister designation is awarded only to outstanding officers, the majority of whom have served and are serving as chiefs of mission, classes 1 through 4, or in positions of Assistant Secretary or the equivalent and above. As a result, the majority of these officers are receiving the salary rates for the positions they occupy, and their salaries, therefore, are already at $20,000 or above.

The adjustments to the rates of the Foreign Service officer classes, as stated above, are equated quite closely to the adjustments in the comparable salary levels of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. However, because the Foreign Service officer career system (promotion-up and selection-out) makes it impracticable to have any appreciable overlapping between consecutive classes in the Foreign Service officer schedule, and because of the necessity to stay within the ceiling prescribed for the general schedule, the salary range of class FSO–1 has been reduced from 7 to 5 step rates. Similar to the improvements in the within-grade increase plan of the general schedule, some improvement in the within-class step rate plan of the Foreign Service officer schedule has been accomplished. In addition, the step rates in class FSO–8 have been reduced to seven to make it consistent with the number of step rates in the other classes of the schedule. There are no FSO–8 officers serving at the present entrance rate of this class.

Foreign Service Staff Officers and Employees

Existing legislation

SEC. 415. There shall be [twenty-two] classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum rates of salary of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

Class 1: [$10,700, $11,020, $11,345, $11,665, $11,965.

Class 2: $9,925, $10,185, $10,440, $10,700, $11,020.

Class 3: $9,120, $9,380, $9,635, $9,895, $10,150.

Class 4: $8,270, $8,525, $8,785, $9,040, $9,300.

Class 5: $7,630, $7,825, $8,015, $8,210, $8,470, $8,725.

Class 6: $6,990, $7,185, $7,380, $7,570, $7,765, $7,960.

Class 7: $6,355, $6,545, $6,740, $6,935, $7,125, $7,320.

Class 8: $5,715, $5,905, $6,100, $6,295, $6,490, $6,680.

Class 9: $5,075, $5,270, $5,460, $5,655, $5,850, $6,045.

Class 10: $4,650, $4,780, $4,910, $5,035, $5,230, $5,425, $5,615.

Proposed legislation

SEC. 415. (a) There shall be 10 classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum salaries of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

Class 1: $11,500, $11,900, $12,300, $12,700, $13,100, $13,500, $13,900.

Class 2: $9,700, $10,000, $10,300, $10,600, $10,900, $11,200, $11,500.

Class 3: $7,950, $8,200, $8,450, $8,700, $8,950, $9,200, $9,450.

Class 4: $6,600, $6,800, $7,000, $7,200, $7,400, $7,600, $7,800.

Class 5: $5,900, $6,100, $6,300, $6,500, $6,700, $6,900, $7,100.

Class 6: $5,250, $5,400, $5,550, $5,700, $5,850, $6,000, $6,150.

Class 7: $4,500, $4,650, $4,800, $4,950, $5,100, $5,250, $5,400.

Class 8: $4,000, $4,150, $4,300, $4,450, $4,600, $4,750, $4,900.

Class 9: $3,600, $3,750, $3,900, $4,050, $4,200, $4,350, $4,500.

Class 10: $3,400, $3,500, $3,600, $3,700, $3,800, $3,900, $4,000.

Foreign Service Staff Officers and Employees—Continued

Existing legislation

Class 11: $4,225, $4,355, $4,480, $4,610, $4,740, $4,870, $5,000.
Class 12: $3,800, $3,925, $4,055, $4,185, $4,315. $4,445, $4.570.
Class 13: $3,390, $3,520, $3,645, $3,775, $3,905, $4,035, $4,165.
Class 14: $3,000, $3,130, $3,260, $3,390, $3,520, $3,645, $3,775.
Class 15: $2,810, $2,875, $2,935, $3,000, $3,130, $3,260, $3,390.
Class 16: $2,615, $2,680, $2,745, $2,810, $2,875, $2,935, $3,000.
Class 17: $2,420, $2,485, $2,550, $2,615, $2,680, $2,745, $2,810.
Class 18: $2,230, $2,290, $2,355, $2,420, $2,485, $2,550, $2,615.
Class 19: $2,035, $2,100, $2,165, $2,230, $2,290, $2,355, $2,420.
Class 20: $1,840, $1,905, $1,970, $2,035, $2,100, $2,165, $2,230.
Class 21: $1,645, $1,710, $1,775, $1,840, $1,905, $1,970, $2,035.
Class 22: $1,455, $1,520, $1,585, $1,645, $1,710, $1,775, $1,840].

No existing provision.

Proposed legislation

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, the Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, fix the salary or compensation at lesser rates of salary than those prescribed by this section for the applicable class of officers or employees who are employed locally abroad and who are not available or are not qualified for transfer to another post or posts.

From time to time it is in the Department's interest to employ in lieu of a local (alien) employee for a local employee position an American citizen at a Foreign Service post who has resided in the locality for many years, who may be married to an alien and frequently possesses dual citizenship, or who

TITLE VI. PERSONN

In-Class Promotions of Foreign S

Existing legislation

SEC. 625. Any Foreign Service officer or any Reserve officer, whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the [Foreign] Service and who shall have been in a given class for a continuous period of 9 months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year, receive an increase in salary to the next higher rate for the class in which he is serving. [The] Secretary is authorized to grant to [a Foreign Service officer or a Reserve officer, in any class,] additional increases in salary within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.

Section 625 has been revised in order to reaffirm the Secretary's authority to grant additional in-class increments in recognition of especially meritorious service (in the light of the Fringe Benefits Act). While cash awards provided for by the Fringe Benefits Act may in general serve well in providing rewards for especially meritorious or superior service, they are not as appropriate as in-class increases awards for officers of the Foreign Service. Frequently the needs of the Service require an officer to serve for protracted periods of time in positions classified several levels above their personal rank. In many such cases officers have distinguished themselves in the performance of their duties and it is considered

In-Class Promotions of St

Existing legislation

SEC. 642. [In-class promotions of staff officers and employees shall be granted in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.]

No existing provision.

Paragraph (a) of section 642 has been revised to clarify the present provisions for periodic in-class promotions for Foreign Service staff personnel. In addition, it provides the Secretary with the same authority to provide for staff personnel in-class increases as a reward for meritorious service as that contained in section 625 relating to such meritorious in-class promotions for Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers.

The principal purpose of new section 642 (b) is to authorize the Secretary to establish

The present Foreign Service staff schedule consists of 22 classes, the majority of which overlap in consecutive classes by at least 50 percent. Classes 15 through 22 have not been used at all for some time. Inasmuch as alien employees are used extensively for the performance of routine duties at Foreign Service posts, there are few cases where United States citizen employees are required for the level of duties represented by class 14, there being only 4 Foreign Service staff resident employees in these classes at the present time. Consequently, one of the purposes of the revision in this section is to eliminate the unnecessary and unused classes in the present schedule and otherwise improve the pay structure. The proposed 10-class schedule provides the needed improvements in the schedule and at the same time provides Foreign Service staff officers and employees with an upward salary adjustment equivalent to the presently comparable grades and salary rates of the general schedule for civil-service employees. This proposed schedule is specifically designed to provide a more adequate promotion ladder for these employees, including equitable and appropriate salary adjustments when promotions to the next higher class are awarded. As a consequence, a staff officer or employee will usually receive more than, and in any case not less than, the equivalent of a within-class step increase at the time of a class promotion. This proposed 10-class schedule has several other features:

(a) The rates of the top three Foreign Service staff classes are the same as the rates contained in classes 3, 4, and 5, respectively, of the Foreign Service officer schedule. This provides equitable salary treatment for personnel serving at this officer level and will facilitate the conversion of staff corps officers at these levels who may qualify in the future for lateral entry into the Foreign Service officer corps.

(b) It consolidates overlapping classes, eliminates overlapping at the upper levels, and improves the step-rate increment plan.

(c) It provides reasonable rates at the entrance level of new class FSS–10 (present class FSS–14), which will make this lowest class usable for some recruitment purposes in the future.

(d) Although considerable consolidation and readjustment of class and step rate relationships are involved, conversion to the proposed 10-class Foreign Service staff schedule requires that only 4 of the present 14 classes have to be split between 2 of the new classes. This is the minimum class splitting possible and is necessary to preclude making excessive or too small adjustments to individuals presently paid at certain step rates.

(e) The conversion of present officers and employees to the 10-class schedule results in all officers and employees, except those in present classes FSS–1 and 2, having more favorable class number designations; e. g., present class 8 will be class 5, etc.

As a consequence of the integration program and the resulting expansion of the Foreign Service officer category, the staff category will becoming increasingly a specialist-technical-clerical corps. Its importance in the effective functioning of the Foreign Service, however, is not to be underestimated. Reasonably rewarding career opportunities must be provided to attract and retain competent personnel. For some years to come the Department must continue to retain, make effective use of, and provide reasonable incentives for those staff officers who, because of age or other equally valid reasons, are unable to qualify for lateral appointment as Foreign Service officers. This group of loyal and devoted officers will decrease gradually as a result of normal attrition and it can be anticipated that a correspondingly lesser proportion of the staff category will be required in future years in the upper salary brackets of the proposed staff corps salary schedule. However, it is even more important that provision be made for staff officers and employees who serve as highly skilled specialists and technicians performing functions essential to the Service and who choose the Foreign Service as a career.

New paragraph (b) of section 415 would authorize the Secretary, by administrative action, to prescribe lesser rates of salary than those stipulated in the FSS statutory salary schedule in the case of United States citizen employees who are employed locally in foreign areas for service at a particular post and who are not available or who are not qualified for transfer to other posts of duty.

is otherwise not qualified for a regular staff corps appointment. The purpose of this provision, therefore, is to enable the Secretary to more nearly equate salaries payable to such staff personnel to rates prevailing in the locality.

---

EL ADMINISTRATION

ervice Officers and Reserve Officers

Proposed legislation

SEC. 625. Any Foreign Service officer or any Reserve officer, whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service and who shall have been in a given class for a continuous period of 9 months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year, receive an increase in salary to the next higher rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law the Secretary is authorized to grant to any such officer additional increases in salary within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.

---

that an in-class promotion is more desirable and acceptable under these circumstances than a cash award would be. Further, there are a number of unusual and difficult foreign languages which, owing to their uniqueness, are not offered on a formal training basis; however, officers frequently, upon their own initiative, undertake the study of, and become proficient in, such languages. It is considered that the award of a meritorious in-class increase for such an accomplishment better serves the interests of the Government because it provides a continuing and more desirable incentive for the undertaking of such voluntary and specialized study by members of the Foreign Service.

---

aff Officers and Employees

Proposed legislation

SEC. 642. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the service shall receive an increase in salary at periodic intervals to the next higher salary rate for the class in which he is serving.

Without regard to any other law the Secretary is authorized to grant any such officer or employee additional increases in salary within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.

(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, any staff officer or employee who has achieved the maximum salary rate prescribed by section 415 for the class in which he is serving may be granted an additional in-class salary increment from time to time in recognition of longevity and proficiency in the service. Each such salary increment shall be equal to the maximum step-rate increment of the applicable class, and no person shall receive more than four such salary increments while serving in the same class.

---

a system of longevity pay increases for staff personnel. The principle and the practice of longevity pay is well established in Government and in industry. The work performed by the staff corps personnel is highly essential and important to the effective functioning of the Service; however, in the majority of the cases, the nature of the duties and the qualifications required therefor impose automatic limitations on the promotional opportunities in the staff corps. In addition, as a consequence of the Secretary's integration program, promotional opportunities in the staff corps cannot be as attractive as formerly; however, most staff officers performing in Foreign Service officer positions who qualified for lateral entry were integrated into the Foreign Service officer corps. Longevity pay is not pertinent in the case of Reserve officers whose tenure is limited to a period of 5 years, and it is not consistent with the promotion and selection-out provisions applicable to Foreign Service officers. A longevity pay system for Foreign Service staff corps personnel, however, will meet a definite need in providing an incentive for qualified and experienced employees to continue in the Service throughout their working careers and thus provide these highly essential skills to the Service with a minimum of turnover and cost.

The proposed revision would authorize the Secretary to grant a longevity salary increment from time to time on the basis of significant longevity landmarks in terms of the total years of United States Government service rendered by an employee, provided his record of performance is sufficiently superior to merit the award of such increment. In other words, it is not intended that longevity increments would be awarded automatically on the basis of satisfactory service, but rather the purpose of the plan is to recognize longevity in combination with proficiency in order to provide a stimulus for long-service employees to continue to excel in the performance of their duties as well as to continue in the Service.

It is contemplated that the Secretary will establish by regulation the eligibility periods for longevity increments under this plan. In all probability these eligibility periods would be established as a minimum of 10 years of service for the first such increase, 15 years for the second, 20 years for the third, and 25 years for the fourth. Achievement of such longevity increases will have a continuing prestige value as they will signify the years of service as well as the fact that the employee has continued to perform his duties in a highly satisfactory manner. After experience with this plan it may be determined that different years of service landmarks might be desirable; for example, 12 years' minimum service in lieu of 10, etc.

Further, provision will be made that employees who have already served 15, 20, or 25 years of service at the time they achieve the maximum step rate of a given class will be eligible for consecutive longevity increases on an annual (or possibly biennial) basis until they reach the longevity increase appropriate for or related to the number of years of service they have completed, provided they have continued their proficiency in the performance of their duties. In this way, some employees with many years of service already completed and who have been paid at the maximum step rate of their present class for a year or more would, at the time of the enactment of this provision, become immediately eligible for a longevity increase and might continue to be so eligible for subsequent longevity promotions on an annual (or biennial) basis; for example, an employee who has been at the maximum step rate of his class for a year and has completed 20 years of Government service could receive 3 longevities on an annual basis (provided his proficiency in the performance of his duties continues) until he reached the 20-year longevity rate, at which time he would begin a 5-year waiting period for the last one.

TEMPORARY PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Foreign Service officers presently serving in the class of career ambassador and the class of career minister shall receive the salary rates prescribed for career ambassador and career minister, respectively, by section 412 of such act, as amended.

(b) Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled rates provided by section 412 of such act, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the corresponding scheduled rate as provided by such section, as amended, except as provided in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section.

(c) Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the rates provided for class 8 by section 412 of such act, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled rates for class 8 as provided by such section, as amended, which provids a salary increase to such officers in an amount not more than $300 per annum, except in the case of an officer receiving basic compensation at the first step rate of the class who shall receive the basic compensation provided by the first step rate of the new schedule of rates for class 8 authorized by this act.

(d) Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at the sixth or seventh step rate as provided for class 1 by section 412 of such act, as amended, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this act at the maximum scheduled rate for class 1 as provided by this act.

The temporary provisions proposed above provide for an orderly and equitable conversion of Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers from the rates of the existing salary schedule to the proposed new rates of the salary schedule. Each officer will receive a salary increase approximately equivalent to other Federal personnel receiving a comparable salary rate but will not change class or step rate with the exceptions of officers in present class FSO–8 and a few Reserve officers who are now paid at the sixth and seventh step rates of present class FSO–1.

SEC. 6. Foreign Service staff officers and employees receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at one of the scheduled rates provided by section 415 of such act, as amended, shall be transferred to the new classes established by section 415 of such act, as amended, and shall receive basic compensation, on and after the effective date of this act, as follows:

| *Present class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended* | | | *Corresponding new class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by this act* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Class | Step | Rate | Class | Step | Rate |
| FSS–1 | 5 | $11,965 | FSS–1 | 5 | $13,100 |
| | 4 | 11,665 | | 4 | 12,700 |
| | 3 | 11,345 | | 3 | 12,300 |
| | 2 | 11,020 | | 2 | 11,900 |
| | 1 | 10,700 | | 1 | 11,500 |
| FSS–2 | 5 | 11,020 | FSS–2 | 7 | 11,500 |
| | 4 | 10,700 | | 7 | 11,500 |
| | 3 | 10,440 | | 6 | 11,200 |
| | 2 | 10,185 | | 5 | 10,900 |
| | 1 | 9,925 | | 4 | 10,600 |
| FSS–3 | 5 | 10,150 | FSS–2 | 5 | 10,900 |
| | 4 | 9,895 | | 4 | 10,600 |
| | 3 | 9,635 | | 3 | 10,300 |
| | 2 | 9,380 | | 2 | 10,000 |
| | 1 | 9,120 | | 1 | 9,700 |
| FSS–4 | 5 | 9,300 | FSS–2 | 1 | 9,700 |
| | 4 | 9,040 | FSS–3 | 7 | 9,450 |
| | 3 | 8,785 | | 7 | 9,450 |
| | 2 | 8,525 | | 6 | 9,200 |
| | 1 | 8,270 | | 5 | 8,950 |
| FSS–5 | 6 | 8,725 | FSS–3 | 7 | 9,450 |
| | 5 | 8,470 | | 6 | 9,200 |
| | 4 | 8,210 | | 5 | 8,950 |
| | 3 | 8,015 | | 4 | 8,700 |
| | 2 | 7,825 | | 3 | 8,450 |
| | 1 | 7,630 | | 2 | 8,200 |

| *Present class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended* | | | *Corresponding new class and step rate of sec. 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended by this act* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Class | Step | Rate | Class | Step | Rate |
| FSS-6 | 6 | $7,960 | FSS-3 | 3 | $8,450 |
| | 5 | 7,765 | | 2 | 8,200 |
| | 4 | 7,570 | | 1 | 7,950 |
| | 3 | 7,380 | | 1 | 7,950 |
| | 2 | 7,185 | FSS-4 | 7 | 7,800 |
| | 1 | 6,990 | | 6 | 7,600 |
| FSS-7 | 6 | 7,320 | FSS-4 | 7 | 7,800 |
| | 5 | 7,125 | | 6 | 7,600 |
| | 4 | 6,935 | | 5 | 7,400 |
| | 3 | 6,740 | | 4 | 7,200 |
| | 2 | 6,545 | | 3 | 7,000 |
| | 1 | 6,355 | | 2 | 6,800 |
| FSS-8 | 6 | 6,680 | FSS-5 | 7 | 7,100 |
| | 5 | 6,490 | | 6 | 6,900 |
| | 4 | 6,295 | | 5 | 6,700 |
| | 3 | 6,100 | | 4 | 6,500 |
| | 2 | 5,905 | | 3 | 6,300 |
| | 1 | 5,715 | | 2 | 6,100 |
| FSS-9 | 6 | 6,045 | FSS-5 | 3 | 6,300 |
| | 5 | 5,850 | | 2 | 6,100 |
| | 4 | 5,655 | FSS-6 | 6 | 6,000 |
| | 3 | 5,460 | | 5 | 5,850 |
| | 2 | 5,270 | | 4 | 5,700 |
| | 1 | 5,075 | | 2 | 5,400 |
| FSS-10 | 7 | 5,615 | FSS-6 | 5 | 5,850 |
| | 6 | 5,425 | | 4 | 5,700 |
| | 5 | 5,230 | | 3 | 5,550 |
| | 4 | 5,035 | FSS-7 | 6 | 5,400 |
| | 3 | 4,910 | | 6 | 5,250 |
| | 2 | 4,780 | | 5 | 5,100 |
| | 1 | 4,650 | | 4 | 4,950 |
| FSS-11 | 7 | 5,000 | FSS-7 | 7 | 5,400 |
| | 6 | 4,870 | | 6 | 5,250 |
| | 5 | 4,740 | | 5 | 5,100 |
| | 4 | 4,610 | | 4 | 4,950 |
| | 3 | 4,480 | | 3 | 4,800 |
| | 2 | 4,355 | | 2 | 4,650 |
| | 1 | 4,225 | | 1 | 4,500 |
| FSS-12 | 7 | 4,570 | FSS-8 | 7 | 4,900 |
| | 6 | 4,445 | | 6 | 4,750 |
| | 5 | 4,315 | | 5 | 4,600 |
| | 4 | 4,185 | | 4 | 4,450 |
| | 3 | 4,055 | | 3 | 4,300 |
| | 2 | 3,925 | | 2 | 4,150 |
| | 1 | 3,800 | | 1 | 4,000 |
| FSS-13 | 7 | 4,165 | FSS-9 | 7 | 4,500 |
| | 6 | 4,035 | | 6 | 4,350 |
| | 5 | 3,905 | | 5 | 4,200 |
| | 4 | 3,775 | | 4 | 4,050 |
| | 3 | 3,645 | | 3 | 3,900 |
| | 2 | 3,520 | | 2 | 3,750 |
| | 1 | 3,390 | | 1 | 3,600 |
| FSS-14 | 7 | 3,775 | FSS-10 | 7 | 4,000 |
| | 6 | 3,645 | | 6 | 3,900 |
| | 5 | 3,520 | | 5 | 3,800 |
| | 4 | 3,390 | | 3 | 3,600 |
| | 3 | 3,260 | | 2 | 3,500 |
| | 2 | 3,130 | | 1 | 3,400 |
| | 1 | 3,000 | | 1 | 3,400 |
| FSS-15 and below. | All step rates | | FSS-10 | 1 | 3,400 |

The temporary provisions proposed above provide for an orderly and equitable conversion of all personnel paid in accordance with the present rates of the Foreign Service staff salary schedule to the new classes and rates of the proposed Foreign Service staff schedule. The upward salary adjustments involved equate closely to those received by other Federal personnel receiving comparable salaries. While the conversion plan necessitates new class designations in most all cases, only 4 classes had to be divided between 2 new classes and the large majority of personnel will receive a higher class number by virtue of the reduction in the total number of classes in the schedule.

SEC. 7. The class and salary adjustments made pursuant to sections 5 and 6 of this act shall be made effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1958.

The purpose of this section is self-evident.

*Estimated cost of proposed bill*

| Item: | *Estimated per annum cost* |
|---|---|
| 1. Salary increases for Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees (secs. 5 and 6) | $7,584,635 |
| 2. Estimated cost of adjustments in post allowances resulting from salary adjustments | $100,000 |
| 3. Estimated cost of adjustments in hardship post differentials resulting from salary adjustments | 350,000 |
| Total | 8,034,635 |

Comment: These estimated costs are based on salary adjustments for all officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the Department of State, and officers and employees of the United States Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration, who are paid in accordance with the schedules prescribed in sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, or a total of 12,636 personnel as of November 1, 1957.

## CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO VILLAGE OF CAREY, OHIO

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the act of July 2, 1956, approved by the Congress on recommendations of the Committee on Government Operations authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio, in an amount equal to the fair market value of such property.

The bill is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services, who has informed the Senate that the village council has notified the GSA that the village of Carey is no longer interested in acquiring the property for the purpose for which it was originally intended to be used, and that until the act authorizing the specific sale of this property is repealed, the GSA is not in a position to dispose of the property to other persons.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the General Services Administration, addressed to the President of the Senate, which sets forth the need for this legislation, be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3139) to repeal the act of July 2, 1956, concerning the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by this agency, to repeal the act of July 2, 1956, concerning the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1958.

The act of July 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 486, ch. 496) requires that the Administrator of General Services shall convey to the village of Carey, county of Wyandot, State of Ohio, all right, title, and interest to the real property described in the act, upon the payment by the village of Carey of an amount equal to the fair market value of said property at its highest and best use as determined by the Administrator of General Services as of the date of such conveyance.

By letter dated August 9, 1956, the city manager of the village of Carey was notified by GSA that the fair market value of the property referred to in the preceding paragraph had been established at $11,000 and was requested to submit a formal offer to GSA in this amount.

By letter dated June 3, 1957, Representative BETTS of Ohio forwarded to GSA a copy of a resolution of the Village Council of Carey, Ohio, which provided that the purpose for which the village of Carey desired to purchase said real estate no longer exists and that it no longer has need therefor.

This agency can make no other disposition of this property until the act of July 2, 1956, is repealed. If the act is repealed, the property would be screened with other Federal agencies as excess property and, if no Federal requirement is found, could be disposed of as surplus property in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

The enactment of this legislation would not increase the expenditure of Federal funds.

For these reasons, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
*Administrator.*

## AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, RELATING TO TRAINING OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit herewith, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the Administrator of General Services to assign certain scientific, technical, professional and administrative officers and employees of the General Services Administration for instruction, education, or training by public or private agencies. The Administrator would be authorized to pay the whole or any part of the salaries of such trainees, costs of their transportation, and per diem in lieu of subsistence, as well as tuition and other expenses, but the bill requires that any such trainee shall reimburse the Government for any such expenses upon failure to complete any assignment made under this authority.

This bill was referred to the Committee on Government Operations by the President of the Senate, and is being introduced in accordance with the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the GSA legislative program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from the Administrator of General Services,

including a section analysis and statement of justification outlining the need for and the effect of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3140) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for training of employees, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is hereby transmitted, for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, which would permit specialized technical training of GSA personnel. Also enclosed are a sectional analysis of the draft bill and a more detailed statement of justification outlining the need for and the effect of the proposed legislation.

This proposed legislation would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by—

(a) amending the title of section 208 to reflect that this section provides for training as well as employment of personnel;

(b) striking the references in section 208 to certain titles of the act; and

(c) adding a new subsection which would grant authorization for training of officers and employees of General Services Administration by public or private agencies, institutions of learning, laboratories, or industrial or commercial organizations.

This new subsection will fulfill an urgent need of this agency to keep its employees abreast of current developments in order to perform its required functions. Approximately $167,000 annually would be devoted to training under this authorization, but this would not be an increase in the budget, and no additional appropriations would be required. There is a restriction in the proposal that only one-half of 1 percent of eligible personnel will be trained during any fiscal year. The amendment also contains a provision that, in the event any employee does not satisfactorily complete the training course such employee will be required to reimburse the Government for expenditures made.

This agency urges prompt and favorable consideration of the draft bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
*Administrator.*

---

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Subsection (a). Modification of title of section 208: Subsection (a) would amend section 208 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by changing the title thereof to reflect the purpose of the new subsection. This would show clearly that section 208 not only deals with the authority of the Administrator to employ personnel, but likewise sets forth his authority and responsibility for the training of such personnel.

Subsection (b). Elimination of restrictive language: Subsection (b) would amend section 208 by striking out all references to the titles of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, under which the Administrator is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of personnel. The references to the particular titles neither enhance nor diminish the authority of the Administrator to appoint personnel and fix their compensation. Title VII was added to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, on August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 721), but is not mentioned in section 208. It appears clearly from an examination of the act above referred to, with its amendments, that the Administrator of General Services is vested with authority to appoint and fix the compensation of personnel. A repetition of this language in section 208 appears to be surplusage.

Subsection (c). Authorization for training: This new subsection vests authority in the Administrator of General Services to designate certain officers and employees to receive training which will be beneficial to the Government. Such officers and employees are limited to scientific, technical, professional, and administrative personnel, who will be recommended by their immediate superiors subject to final determination by the Administrator as to their assignment for training.

This new subsection stipulates that upon the findings outlined above, the employees referred to may be assigned for instruction, education, or training, by public or private agencies, institutions of learning, laboratories, industrial or commercial organizations. Experience has shown that in order to perform the functions required under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, it is essential that officers and employees of General Services Administration must keep abreast of current trends in their fields which necessitates training outside of the facilities of General Services Administration.

This subsection requires the Administrator of General Services to issue regulations controlling this proposed training program. These regulations will state, in detail, under what circumstances training may be obtained and will be guarded with adequate restrictions and limitations. Such regulations will be designed to secure the best service for the Government and at the same time protect the Government's interest.

Provision is also made that should any officer or employee of General Services Administration fail to meet the standards of the training program to which such employee is assigned, he will be required to reimburse the Government for any funds expended relating to the course of training. A limitation is placed upon expenditures by a provision that not more than one-half of 1 percent of eligible GSA officers and employees shall be designated for training duty during any fiscal year.

---

JUSTIFICATION

The General Services Administration is responsible under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, for the efficient performance of a variety of essential Government-wide functions. These include: Procurement, supply and maintenance of real and personal property; procurement of nonpersonal services such as transportation and utilities; disposal of domestic surplus property; promotion of the utilization of excess property; and sound records management.

To carry out such diverse responsibilities, it is necessary to employ specialists in many fields. Some of these persons are technicians who operate or maintain intricate mechanisms or complex electronic equipment; some are service and industrial specialists who work closely with other Federal agencies and private organizations, others may be planning or administering complex and costly operations for the Federal Government. In one respect they are alike. It is important to GSA that they know everything about their specialties that can be of use to them in their work.

The major ingredient in the success of any continuing program is a well-trained staff. GSA has been unable, because of lack of specific authorizing legislation, to provide for the basic continuing training needs of our qualified employees. "Basic continuing training needs" means the training necessary to keep an employee proficient in his field in order to do the most effective job possible by making available to him the latest information on recently developed theories, techniques and equipment.

Although GSA's in-service training is being strengthened, such training cannot meet certain special needs.

GSA should be able to send its employees to Federal and non-Federal facilities for training required in their work whenever:

1. The per capita costs of in-service training would be excessive.

2. The personnel, technical skill, or equipment required to give the training within GSA are lacking.

3. The training with the Federal or non-Federal facility is more effective.

Listed below are some examples of the types of training which are currently considered essential to the efficiency of GSA operations, but in which GSA cannot participate because of the present lack of specific authority. It is noted that some of this training is performed by other Federal agencies, but also cannot be used by GSA because of a ruling by the Comptroller General which says "the fact that the instruction is to be given by a Federal agency does not authorize the application of a different rule." (15 Comp. Gen. 585.)

Industrial College of the Armed Forces: The Comptroller General has ruled that GSA lacks the authority to send one supply specialist to the economic mobilization course of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. This 10-month training is conducted by the Department of Defense under the supervision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The course provides top level, specialized training in economic mobilization for war. Instruction is integrated with the curriculum of the National War College to include those elements of national policy, and political, international, and other forces bearing directly on national defense and emergency mobilization. Strategic and tactical requirements are related to economic potential.

There is no other institution in the United States, private or governmental, giving similar training. Since the major civilian agencies of the Federal Government, including GSA, have been assigned extensive duties in war emergency supporting functions, they must be currently familiar with the changing requirements for military and civilian defense. GSA's mobilization responsibilities are in the fields of emergency procurement, national industrial reserve, space utilization, and personal property management.

Contract termination: University of Virginia, Judge Advocate General's School. GSA, which contracts for hundreds of millions of dollars worth of materials and supplies for the Armed Forces and for the civilian agencies, should send at least one representative to this course each year.

Introduction to the management sciences: College of Engineering, University of Michigan. This course is designed to acquaint employees with the techniques which have recently been developed to yield a more scientific approach to the problems of management decision. The course covers: the digital computer and its use; implications of techniques of probability and statistics for

solving problems in which only partial information is available; the new method of linear programing. The course would be particularly valuable in the field of inventory control in which mathematical and statistical approaches are being developed.

Structural design for dynamic loads: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass. The imminent possibility that GSA be required to execute designs for protective construction and must at all times be ready to advise on such matters, makes it almost imperative that we have a structural engineer versed in structural design for dynamic loads. The MIT course covers the following subjects: Earthquake-resistant design, blast-resistant design, structural vibration due to steady or gust winds or moving traffic loads, and design to resist impact.

Fellowships: An employee of GSA who shows outstanding ability to a degree that a private organization grants him a fellowship should, we believe, continue to receive his Federal salary during his period of study, especially if his personal or family commitments on the one hand, and the amount of fellowship grant on the other, are such that he cannot otherwise afford to accept the fellowship. The benefits accruing from such fellowships in the form of increased efficiency, morale, and prestige for the Government far outweigh the actual salary cost. We believe we should be authorized to allow employees to take full advantage, without monetary loss to themselves, of such opportunities as are offered by the Littauer and the Guggenheim fellowships.

The average course mentioned above covers a 3- to 6-week period. The General Services Administration has no desire to further the general education of its employees, to help degree seekers, or to bolster the effectiveness of unqualified or inept employees. The Administrator shall prescribe stringent regulations to assure that outside training paid for by the Government is directly related to the improvement of GSA operations.

Availability of training opportunities is a powerful recruitment incentive. In many instances competent people will not accept positions which offer them no opportunity to keep abreast of new developments. This is particularly true in professional and technical occupations in which there are shortages. Experience shows that outside training opportunities facilitate recruitment and reduce turnover.

Establishing need: The regulations issued by the Administrator would preclude the provision of outside training for employees in any field in which the Director of Personnel determines that it would be feasible to recruit trained personnel from private life, make use of trained personnel already in GSA, or in the in-service training facilities of GSA.

Limitations: The following limitations would also be imposed by regulation:

1. The training would be limited to specialized personnel in the journeyman levels and above in Wage Board positions, and Grade GS–5 and above in the General Schedule.

2. Employees who have served less than 1 year with GSA would not be eligible for more than 6 weeks of outside training.

3. Provision for outside training would under no circumstances be used as a basis for waiving qualification requirements for original employment.

4. No employee would receive more than a total of 12 months of outside training in any 10-year period of service with GSA.

5. Institutions or courses which have proved to be ineffective in the past, lack facilities for adequate instruction, or are uneconomical from the standpoint of cost or distance in relation to the length of the course, would not be approved.

Limitation on expenditures: The bill expressly provides that the amount of outside training in any fiscal year shall not exceed one-half of 1 percent of the total man-years of specialized GSA employment in GSA during that year.

---

## ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills which would authorize the acquisition of certain land in the District of Columbia by the General Services Administrator, and to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes.

These bills are being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the GSA legislative program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the full texts of letters from the Administrator of General Services, addressed to the President of the Senate, which set forth the purpose of the legislation and the need therefor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3141) to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and improvements thereon located within the area of New York Avenue and F Street and 17th and 18th Streets NW., in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3141 is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by this agency, to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and improvements thereon located within the area of New York Avenue and F Street and 17th and 18th Streets NW., in the District of Columbia.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1958.

The act of March 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 149, ch. 58) as amended, extends the area within the District of Columbia within which sites may be acquired and constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 630, ch. 380), as amended, and authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury (authority now in the Administrator of General Services) to acquire for the use of the United States, by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, any land and buildings, including property belonging to the District of Columbia, which he may determine should be acquired within the area defined therein.

Square 170 is an essential part of the current northwest development plan of this agency for construction of Federal buildings. Acquisition of the properties in this square is in the best interest of the Government in order to (1) forestall further commercial development incongruous to the surroundings and (2) assure consummation of this agency's plans for the area.

The entire square is zoned first commercial. This zoning will permit the erection of office buildings, hotels or apartment houses.

The New York Avenue frontage, including the historic Octagon House at the corner of 18th Street and occupied by the American Institute of Architects, the Lemon Building, the Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital and Nurses Home, and the Allies Inn, has undergone little recent development.

The F Street frontage on the north side of the square has undergone considerable change. Several of the old 3-story row-brick dwellings have been demolished and their sites used for parking lots. A few of the old brick dwellings remain, principally in the northwest corner of the square along 18th and F Streets. A 6-story office building, used by the Government, and a 3-story detached dwelling, remodeled as a private office building, are located on F Street about midway of the square.

In the general area within a distance of 3 or 4 blocks are located numerous Government agencies. The White House is 1 block east of the square. The Federal Government has offices in the Executive Office Building (old State Department Building) at 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue, and in the buildings of the General Services Administration at 18th and F Streets and the Department of the Interior at 18th and E Streets. Construction of a building for the Civil Service Commission at 19th and E Streets has been authorized.

The act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896, ch. 803) provided for the establishment of a modern, adequate and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, and further provided that all hospitals participating in such center shall be required either to convey to the Government the land and buildings held by them or to sell the same and turn over to the Government the proceeds thereof. The new hospital center, located on the grounds of the United States Soldiers Home, is nearing completion. The land and buildings on lots 828 and 829 of square 170 (Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital and Nurses Home) will be conveyed to the Federal Government when the facilities are vacated, in partial exchange for the site of the new hospital center.

One of the oldest and most historic buildings in the country—the Octagon House—is located on the properties owned by the American Institute of Architects and has recently been established as a museum. The remaining buildings on these properties have been modernized and are used as administrative headquarters of the American Institute of Architects. Therefore, the Government is excepting these properties and the improvements thereon from its request for acquisition authority.

The probable cost to the Government of the acquisition of these properties is estimated to be $1,900,000. This represents the market value of all the properties and improvements thereon located in square 170, exclusive of lots 828 and 829, the land owned by the American Institute of Architects and the improvements thereon.

For these reasons, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
*Administrator.*

The bill (S. 3142) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the Act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644),

and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 3142 is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith, for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by this Agency to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the Act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes.

These proposals are a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1957.

Section 1 is intended to improve the administrative and financial management of Federal building sites, including improvements thereon, by authorizing negotiation of their outleasing until the property is needed for construction purposes. Extension and revision of existing authority is proposed providing uniform treatment of building sites.

Under section 1, whenever the Administrator of General Services acquires any building site in connection with a construction program and finds that the site is temporarily not needed for the purpose, he is authorized to lease out the site, including improvements thereon, at fair rental value, until the property is needed for construction purposes. Rentals received would be made available for necessary preservation and improvement of the property.

Similar authority has been in effect under section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 634), particularly as amended by section 402 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 199; 40 U. S. C. 345).

Section 1 would modify and extend such current authority to building sites acquired under other construction programs administered by this Agency, in addition to the Public Buildings Act of 1926 program, in the interest of uniformity of treatment. It would clarify the purposes for which rentals might be employed (by adding operation, protection, demolition, and improvement of the property).

It would also modify present negotiation authority, now limited by the 1926 act to building site residential property of a rental value under $1,200 per annum, by permitting negotiation of leases of any building site property to the former owner from whom the Government acquired the property or his tenant where the lease is executed incident to or in connection with acquisition of the property. This will provide needed flexibility in the interim disposal of property and facilitate its management pending need for physical possession for construction purposes.

Under section 2, it is intended to repeal that portion of the Act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), which requires that the commercial rentals received from lease of space in the Lafayette Building, 811 Vermont Avenue NW., in the District of Columbia, shall be deposited into a fund and shall be available to pay the cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair of the leased space and that the unobligated balances of rentals shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts. The General Accounting Office recommends this action.

On June 30, 1949, section 102 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377) transferred all authority and responsibility vested in the Federal Works Administrator to the Administrator of General Services.

Subsequently, a buildings management fund was established in GSA, pursuant to statutory authority by the act of July 12, 1952 (66 Stat. 594), for the purpose of financing all buildings management operations performed by GSA. This amendment provided, however, that the Buildings Management Fund would not be available for expenses relating to the Lafayette Building space leased for commercial purposes.

As a result, expenses related to the Lafayette Building space occupied by Government agencies are financed by the buildings management fund, while expenses related to the space leased for commercial purposes are financed by the fund for the maintenance of the Lafayette Building.

It would be efficient, practical, and result in a reduction of the administrative workload to require all activities of the Lafayette Building to be financed within the buildings management fund. Expenses applicable to the commercially leased space are paid initially from the buildings fund, which requires billings and collections between the two funds. Under the provisions of this proposed legislation, these functions would be handled in one fund, and complete information relative to the expenses of all buildings management operations by GSA, as well as the commercially leased space in the Lafayette Building, would be available from the records of the buildings management fund.

Sections 3 and 4 of the draft bill are technical amendments necessary to effectuate the purposes of sections 1 and 2.

The enactment of this proposed legislation would not increase the expenditure of Federal funds.

GSA urges prompt and favorable consideration of this draft bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
*Administrator.*

## PROTECTION OF VETERANS FROM LOSS OF PENSION BECAUSE OF CERTAIN OFFENSES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3143) to repeal Public Law 85–24 (relating to the prohibition of payment of pensions to persons confined in penal institutions), introduced by Mr. LANGER was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to repeal a law enacted some time ago, which provides that if a veteran commits a crime—even a misdemeanor—he loses all of his pension. My bill would remedy that situation. The veteran might have a wife and children who would lose their means of support.

## IMPROVEMENT OF MINNESOTA RIVER AT MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn., for flood-control purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3144) to authorize certain improvement of the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn., for flood-control purposes, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the reason I introduce this bill is that it refers to a public project of a flood-control nature. The bill would authorize certain improvements on the Minnesota River at Mankato and North Mankato, Minn., for flood-control purposes. Although this project is included in the omnibus bill which has been passed by this body and is now before the House of Representatives, it is urgent that it be considered separately and immediately.

I have just returned from North Mankato, where I met with a delegation of local citizens. A new highway has been planned through the city, and construction is about to begin. Because of an enlarged right-of-way many businesses must move into North Mankato. Those businessmen are not willing to reestablish their businesses in North Mankato unless this flood-control measure is assured.

I also point out that the actual construction of the highway is closely tied to the flood-control project, and the two should be undertaken simultaneously. It is my understanding that the proposed highway may serve as a portion of the necessary dike in this area. The Minnesota Highway Department has been patiently considering its decision on this long-proposed legislation, but feels that it must now proceed with construction. Therefore I urge that this bill be favorably considered.

## MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes to continue the milk program for children, in the interest of improving nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools. I have prepared a brief statement, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD in connection with the introduction of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3145) to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the statement submitted by Mr. THYE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

Last Thursday, when I was out of the city, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, called my office to ask me to join him in sponsoring legislation which would clarify the position of the special milk

program in the Department of Agriculture budget picture. In that I was not able to join Senator AIKEN in sponsoring his bill last Thursday, I am now introducing a similar bill as an indication of my unqualified support for his proposal.

During the first session of this Congress, I took this matter to the floor of the Senate and pointed out that the 1958 fiscal budget for the Department of Agriculture was not entirely composed of aids to the farmer. At that time, I was very disturbed when I noted the general comments referring to the $4.9 billion budget for farm subsidies. The truth of the matter is that much of the Department of Agriculture budget is devoted to programs which are not primarily aids to the farmer. In my remarks of last year, I referred specifically to the school milk program as one of these items.

The bill which Senator AIKEN introduced last week and the bill which I now introduce both provide that the amounts expended under the school milk program are not to be considered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the price-support program. It is not proper nor is it fair to the farmers of our Nation when costs of a program to improve the nutrition of schoolchildren is referred to as a financial loss figure in reporting the expenditures of price-support programs in the agriculture budget.

## SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM IN MINNESOTA

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill proposing to make an appropriation to carry out the National School Lunch Act during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. I have prepared a brief statement on the bill; and I also have received a letter signed by a number of students of the Badger Consolidated School, at Badger, Minn. I ask unanimous consent that my statement and the bill, and also the letter from the consolidated school district at Badger, Minn., be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD, as requested, together with the statement and letter.

The bill (S. 3146) making an appropriation to carry out the National School Lunch Act during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760) during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, $125,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said act.

The statement and letter presented by Mr. THYE are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

I offer for introduction a bill which would increase the appropriation of funds for the school-lunch program from the present $100 million to $125 million during the next fiscal year.

When the school-lunch program first began, the Federal Government's share in a type A lunch was 9 cents per lunch. This has been reduced to 3¼ cents in some cases. At the same time, the contribution of Commodity Credit Corporation surpluses does not provide a sufficient amount of protein commodities such as meats. When this protein requirement is not met by donations, the local district is faced with increasing its expenditure for school lunches in order to maintain the minimum balanced lunch. The only other alternative is to raise the price to the student whose parents are often in no financial position to bear the increased cost. The greatest benefit derived from this school-lunch program is that it provides a warm lunch to students whose parents are in the lower income brackets. Very often, the school lunch provided at low cost is the only warm, balanced meal which some of these students have during the day.

Mr. President, I believe there is no better way for Government money to be spent than to furnish a balanced lunch to children at noon. It improves the health and general well-being and actually provides a better learning situation—a hungry student is not an efficient student. In this sense, and in other respects, the health and welfare of our youth are of prime consideration in the defense and welfare of our Nation.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received be printed in the RECORD, including the names of the school superintendents who signed the letter. This letter addressed to me and signed by 15 superintendents emphasizes the concern which has been brought to my attention.

BADGER CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL,
*Badger, Minn., January 23, 1958.*

HON. ED J. THYE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR THYE: It was unanimously agreed at a meeting of the district No. 82 superintendents held on January 23, that you support an effort to increase Federal aid to the community school lunch program from $100,000,000 to $125,000,000 or $130,000,000.

Increasing costs of operation plus the ever-increasing participation has raised the local effort to a point that is now placing the program in jeopardy.

It is further requested that the Department of Agriculture continue to make available United States Department of Agriculture commodities, particularly those of high protein content which have long been the backbone of our community school lunch program.

Very truly yours,

Roy J. Anderson, Stephen; Arthur Solheim, Lake Bronson; Robert Prickett, Middle River; John P. Halvorson, Newfolden; S. J. Sonju, Kennedy; Alvin L. Arneson, Lancaster; Harry Salisbury, Hallock; John K. Hansen, Warroad; R. J. Halvorson, Roseau; Leone M. Oscutt, Strandquist; Ralph Larson, Argyle; C. Theodore Hermes, Humboldt; George L. Olson, Williams; Russell Lund, Badger; Laris E. Allen, Greenbush.

## COSTS OF RELOCATION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES UNDER HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would clarify the intent of Congress with respect to the payment for costs of relocating public utilities along the rights-of-way of the new highway system.

This bill is being introduced because of the report of Secretary Weeks before the Subcommittee on Roads that the costs of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 did not anticipate that the Federal Government should pay for 90 percent of all the costs of relocation.

Secretary Weeks said, "The amount of funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 was not determined upon the basis of assuming the general obligation to pay the cost of relocating utility facilities within the highway rights-of-way. If Federal-aid funds continue to be available to reimburse the States for the cost of relocating utility facilities, Federal expenditures for that purpose will increase substantially, with the result that correspondingly less will be available for the construction of highways."

I assured the Secretary at the time he came before our subcommittee that I would introduce legislation which would clarify this matter. This bill does so. It provides that the States which are required to pay for the costs of relocation under State laws would be able to get 50 percent of the funds from the Federal Government rather than 90 percent. This bill limits the payment for cost of relocating utilities to those States which have laws requiring them to pay such costs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3150) to amend section 111 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, relating to the availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to the States for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of Federal-aid highway projects, in order to limit the application of such section to cases in which the law of a State requires it to pay such costs, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## REVISION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY LAWS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States.

This legislation is recommended by the Department of Commerce and would revise and reenact into a single law the existing provisions of the original Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916 and subsequent amendments, including the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Secretary of Commerce Weeks has advised that this bill makes no changes in existing law except for purposes of clarification and organization and to conform with established administrative practices.

Secretary Weeks further advised that, "No substantive changes of law have been made in the proposed legislation with the exception of certain minor changes and additions, principally in areas of administration, which are in line with existing practices and procedures. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it would interpose no objection to the submission of the proposed bill to the Congress for its consideration and would favor its enactment."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3151) to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC AND LABORATORY APPARATUS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we all feel an especial concern with the level of scientific training being received by the youth of America today. This includes not just the great technical universities of the Nation, but also the public schools upon which the universities depend for a flow of properly prepared students.

One of the real difficulties in running elementary- and intermediate-science courses is the problem of adequate laboratory and demonstration equipment. The use of good apparatus for lecture demonstrations and laboratory work is vital in supplying well-trained scientific manpower. A few of our great universities can afford to buy the best regardless of cost. The great mass of our public schools from which the college students come cannot.

There is widespread dissatisfaction among physics teachers with the high cost and lack of improvement in quality of educational scientific equipment produced in this country. So say the American Association of Physics Teachers, the National Science Teachers Association, the American Council on Education, and others.

There is a sound reason for this. Buyers for educational institutions constitute only a small and progressively smaller portion of the total business of the apparatus industry. Figures given me indicate that their share of the market has shrunk in the last few years to under 10 percent. So, scientific supply houses have increasingly turned away from serving the educational market and concentrated on commercial and governmental buyers.

Some excellent and less expensive educational apparatus is being produced abroad. However, it is effectively being kept from our own schools by an import duty of up to 50 percent. This tariff is not only higher than for most other merchandise imported into this country; it is also far larger, I am told, than the corresponding import tariff in any other country in the world. Most countries feel that nothing must be allowed to prevent their having the best scientific apparatus, even if it is foreign made.

The larger imports of scientific equipment for educational uses which would result if the tariff were lowered for this type of buyer alone would not have a dangerous effect on the total United States scientific-apparatus industry because over 90 percent of their business is with other types of buyers. At the same time, a far greater quantity and a better quality of equipment would be within reach of the schools of America.

Upon the education of our scientists may rest our future. We simply cannot afford to compromise with it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit certain educational organizations to import free of duty scientific and laboratory apparatus for educational or scientific purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3155) to permit certain educational organizations to import free of duty scientific and laboratory apparatus for educational or scientific purposes, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## DEDUCTION OF TEACHERS EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Russians' earth satellites have given us definite evidence of their advancement in certain highly important fields of science. This has caused grave concern in the United States over both the quantity and quality of scientific manpower being trained by our educational institutions.

There are a number of legislative proposals to meet this problem. Some favor creating new programs and expanding existing scholarship and fellowship programs in the hope that an appropriation of money will improve our Nation's available supply of scientifically trained personnel in future years.

One program involving over a billion dollars in appropriations for scholarships and fellowships has been suggested with approval in high places. Others—variations on this proposal—will appear in the near future.

I do not believe that the approach to our problem lies in mass production of science graduates. The answer must lie in more intense application of the students themselves during the time spent in college and the more thorough instruction of those qualified to pursue a scientific career.

Often these days in discussions of crowded conditions that exist in schools throughout the land, the solution offered is to provide additional Federal funds to be spent for construction of additional facilities, classrooms, equipment, and so forth. But I am enough of a fundamentalist to believe that the results of instruction depend more on the character, ability and devotion of individual teachers than on the physical equipment and classroom facilities provided. Certainly the teacher must provide the leadership in any improvement of our educational system.

I believe we are losing sight of the fact that the quality of instruction depends largely upon the experience and training of teachers, and for the most part, the existing force of educational manpower must be relied on for any increased emphasis on training of scientific personnel. Every effort must be made to retain the right people, the dedicated and well-qualified teacher, in the teaching profession.

Through the years, teachers' salaries have lagged and are lagging behind compensation for other professions and vocations.

For example, the average annual salary of elementary and secondary public schoolteachers combined for the term 1956–57 was $4,055. In comparison, the average annual income per person employed in manufacturing durable goods during 1956 was $4,368. Undoubtedly, efforts must be made to raise the salary level of schoolteachers so they can afford to follow this high calling.

First, and in the meantime, there is certain relief which will not involve any appropriation for increased salaries or otherwise but which should—within the next few years—pay off handsome dividends in terms of increased qualifications of members of the teaching profession who desire to continue their education—their own professional training.

Because of the low salary level and confused, inconsistent rulings by the Internal Revenue Service on the deductibility of continuing education undertaken by teachers, there is little incentive for the teacher, once licensed, to pursue his education to his full capacity.

Of course, they must meet requirements for continuing education which continues beyond the professional licensing in order to maintain their professional standing. Attendance at a summer school session once every 3 years is generally required. This burden the teachers have accepted, although a tremendous financial secrifice is involved. The real advancement, progress toward attaining graduate degrees, incurs serious tax consequences, however, thus penalizing ambition at the very level where it should be most encouraged.

Our tax treatment of schoolteachers has contributed to the almost universal teacher shortage and to the grave questions now confronting us as to the adequacy of preparation of our youth for the challenges of this technical 20th century world.

I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assure tax deductibility for schoolteachers' educational expenses.

The annual revenue loss is estimated to be—at the highest—$18,372,734, but I believe that the Nation's benefits to be gained by passage of a bill assuring tax advantages for continued education of our teachers would be many times greater than this theoretical figure of loss.

I would not limit these benefits to teachers of science, for the early years of the child's education are very important. It is here that, beside the three R's, and the process of learning how to learn, the basic principles of character and citizenship are established and flourish.

It is in the grades that the knowledge of government and pride in our Nation's history are absorbed by our youth. It is here that they grasp the fundamentals of the individual's responsibility to his society: the respect for government, respect for law, and respect for the rights of others. The most modern school building in the Nation, with the most elaborate equipment, cannot serve to impart a single one of these concepts to a

single student. These fundamentals must come from the teachers, supplementing the guidance and instruction received in the homes and churches. The degree to which they are instilled in our young people depends in large measure on the training and experience of the individual teacher. We should all help our teachers accomplish this most important task.

Everyone agrees something must be done to help our schools, and I believe nothing better can be done to help our school system and the educational profession than to provide this widow's mite of tax relief to the most overburdened and underpaid professional in our society: the American schoolteacher.

Although revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, I introduce this measure in the Senate to bring this problem to the attention of the Senate and to add my support to the movement to remove this inequity from our tax laws.

The bill would, for personal income tax purposes, authorize deductions up to $800 per taxable year for licensed teachers' further educational expenses paid out of the teacher's pocket, whether these expenses were voluntary or required by employment. It would not affect the status of tax-exempt scholarships nor GI bill benefits. It would place the teacher on a par, for tax purposes, with other professional groups.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3158) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a teacher to deduct from gross income up to $800 a year of expenses incurred by him to further his education, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO DEDUCTION FOR AMOUNTS PAID IN OBTAINING A COLLEGE EDUCATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the light of recent Soviet scientific achievements it is obvious that the battle for educational superiority is on. It is a battle which must be won by us if we and the Free World are to continue to survive. I am confident, with all of our shoulders to the wheel, that we will win this battle.

Recognizing that we have come upon perilous days, it is obvious to all of us that we cannot afford at this time, without jeopardizing our own national security, any general tax-relief program. However, I feel that there are limited fields in which relief can and should be granted in furtherance of our all-out effort to wage a campaign of peace. In my opinion, tax relief for parents sending their children to colleges is one of them. We all know that soaring costs of living are placing a heavy burden on parents throughout the country who are exerting every effort to provide their children with a higher education. It is a backbreaking effort on the part of many of them. Some have already reached the point where they are no longer able to carry on this effort. I feel that it has reached a point where tax relief is now both necessary and desirable because in encouraging parents to provide higher education for their children we are making a great contribution to, and investment in, the security and welfare of the United States. It is an investment which will pay off dividends now, and continue to pay off dividends in the future. In addition, it is a means by which all of us can indirectly assist in winning the battle for educational superiority, a battle which must be won if we are to achieve scientific supremacy.

To accomplish this objective, I am introducing, at this time, proposed legislation which would allow a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid by him in providing a college education for his dependents. Since this legislation is directly related to our overall program which must be undertaken in the field of education, basic research, and a speedup on a top priority basis of our missile and satellite programs, I sincerely trust that it will be acted on promptly and favorably by the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3162) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for amounts paid by a taxpayer in obtaining a college education or in providing a college education for his spouse or dependents, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## EXTENSION OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT OF 1949—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, on August 27, 1957, I introduced the bill (S. 2861) to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954. At that time, 43 Members of this body joined me as cosponsors of the bill. During the recess, several other Senators indicated a desire to be associated as consponsors of the bill. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when Senate bill 2861 is next printed, the names of the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON] and the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER] be added to the list of cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, last week I made an address to the National Wool Growers Association convention at Phoenix, Ariz. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION, PHOENIX, JANUARY 22, 1958

Never before in our history has a national enterprise suffered such terrific jolts in so short a period of time as did the wool industry in the 10 years before the enactment of the wool bill. The sheep population of the United States dropped from nearly 50 million in 1943 to 26 million head in 1953, and during the same period our wool production dropped from 379 to 226 million pounds a year. For a good many years after the end of World War II our economy consumed twice as much foreign wool as domestic wool, but for the past several years we have been consuming slightly more foreign than domestic wool.

The population of the United States increased from 80 million people in 1884 to more than double that amount in 1954, but it is significant to note that we have only half as many sheep now as we had then.

Livestock is the basic industry of the western empire and the economy of our part of the country depends to a large extent upon a thriving and prosperous livestock business. Grass is the main crop raised on the 800 million acres of the western prairies and, by the way, our section represents more than one-third of the area of the entire United States. That broad expanse of rangelands in the mountain west is suitable largely for grazing purposes. The conversion of grass into food and fiber represents an important contribution to our national economy.

I need not tell this group that the sheep industry was in a mighty bad way before the Wool Act was put on the books. Strange as it may seem, the sheep industry suffered two of its worst blows during and shortly after World War II and both at the hands of the Government itself. The Office of Price Administration froze the price of wool at 41 cents per pound at Pearl Harbor and kept it right there during the course of the entire war. At the same time the operating expenses of every sheep outfit in the land increased by leaps and bounds and the woolgrowers of the country were at their wits' ends trying to make both ends meet, and mind you nearly every other industry was rolling in high profits. To make matters even worse, the tariff on wool was reduced by 25 percent in 1948. And let me remind you that 25 years ago the tariff afforded the woolgrowers protection equivalent to 77 percent of the price they got for their wool compared to only 17 percent today.

When this administration came into power 5 years ago, it was generally agreed that our domestic wool industry was at the crossroads and that it would take drastic action to keep it from being completely wiped out. The program in effect before the enactment of the wool bill was not only exceedingly cumbersome but extremely costly to the Government. From 1952 to 1954 the support was through loans at 90 percent parity and that sent the wool directly from the sheep's back into storage and the end result was to create a floor under the prices of wool produced in other countries which was mighty fine for foreign producers but of no help whatsoever to our own growers. Before that, the wool was supported through direct purchases. Neither method worked effectively. In each system, the Commodity Credit Corporation participated in operations normally carried on by the trade. The end result of that program was to stockpile our domestic wool in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation while foreign producers captured the American market practically in its entirety. The growers of this country found themselves producing not for

sale but for storage, and worse yet the mounting stockpile which they were piling up in the hands of the CCC was bound to exert a depressing influence on the market for a long time to come.

President Eisenhower recognized the desperate condition confronting our wool growers and 6 months after he took office he asked the Department of Agriculture to submit a report on the sheep industry. In addition, the President directed the Tariff Commission to investigate the effects of imports on the domestic wool price-support program.

The Department of Agriculture conducted a searching inquiry into the complex problems confronting the industry and submitted its special report to the President entitled "Achieving a Sound Domestic Wool Industry." The report outlined the factors responsible for the decline in our domestic wool production, and indicated the steps necessary to correct the situation.

The Tariff Commission reported to the President in February 1954, that "it is clear that comparable foreign wools laid down in the United States, duty paid, have generally been available below the sale and loan prices of domestic wools and that the production goal for wool set by the Congress cannot be achieved without resorting to measures outside the framework of the present price-support program for wool."

The Commodity Credit Corporation had built up a stockpile of 150 million pounds of wool under the Government price-support program. Even with high price supports, the sheep industry was dying a slow death and it seemed the height of folly for the Government to acquire all of the domestic wool produced and store it all over the country and, at the same time, permitting our domestic market to be taken over almost entirely by foreign producers. It was clear that the proper kind of relief under a price-support program was utterly impossible. Many of us contended that an adequate tariff to compensate for the difference between the high domestic cost of production compared to the low foreign cost based mainly on cheap labor was the proper approach. State Department officials have always violently opposed a high tariff and some of our people felt that a high tariff would adversely affect the competitive position of wool with synthetics. It was necessary, therefore, to work out special legislation designed to meet the specific problem confronting our wool growers which was created largely by national tariff policies which the State Department insists is essential and imperative to international good will. Everyone agreed that it would be eminently unfair to call upon our wool growers to stand the brunt of policies which would affect our sheep industry so disastrously in order to achieve benefits for all of the people of the country. In other words, no one could expect the wool men to foot the bill for a program that the State Department was putting over intended for the good of the entire country.

Wool and sugar are the two major agricultural commodities in which our country is deficient in production. We have separate legislation for both sugar and wool, and that is precisely as it should be. Both face heavy import competition. Legislation and programs for commodities produced in surplus simply do not operate satisfactorily for commodities such as wool and sugar. We were indeed in a mighty difficult position, and we were very fortunate when President Eisenhower agreed to support the legislation now known as the Wool Act of 1954. Without his active support the bill would have withered on the vine.

The wool industry was deep down in the dumps for a long time after the end of the war, while our national income at the very same time rose to record levels. The present level of production is about one-half of our consumption for military use alone during World War II. It is significant to note here that during the entire 1930's our domestic production supplied about three-fourths of our total apparel wool requirements, while it furnishes less than half today. The foreign wool on which we must rely to supply our deficit needs in times of emergency must be transported over sea lanes five to eight thousand miles long. It would be extremely dangerous for our national security to depend largely upon such imports shipped over such extended supply lines in periods of emergency.

Under the provisions of the Wool Act, the incentive price for shorn wool is established at such level as the Secretary determines to be necessary to encourage an annual production of 300 million pounds after consultation with producer representatives and after taking into consideration the conditions affecting sheep production. The law provides that the incentive price set by the Secretary shall not exceed 110 percent of the parity price. The payment rate for shorn wool is the percentage required to bring the national average price received by all growers during the marketing year up to the incentive level established by the Secretary of Agriculture. The growers sell their wool in normal marketing channels. The payments are made at one percentage rate, the percentage required to bring the national average price for wool sold in the free market up to the incentive level. This one rate is applied to the net sales proceeds received by each grower in order to determine the amount of his incentive payment. By making the payments on a percentage basis, growers are encouraged to improve the quality and marketing of their wool and to obtain the best price possible since the better price he gets for his wool the greater his incentive payment.

Expenditures authorized under the Wool Act are paid from a fund accruing from 70 percent of the specific duties collected from duties on foreign wools imported into this country. This foreign wool is sold in competition with wool produced by our own growers. It should be pointed out that under the Wool Act the tariff on competitive foreign wool is called upon to do double duty. In the first place, the tariff affords a small measure of protection to the domestic producers and, in the second place, it provides the funds necessary to give the grower the incentive payment that keeps the industry on a solvent basis.

In his message to the Congress 4 years ago when the wool bill was up for consideration the President suggested that "wool payments be taken from general revenues within the amount of unobligated tariff receipts from wool." In the course of the hearings on the bill assurances were given by the Department of Agriculture that the present tariff on wool would be continued without change during the life of the Wool Act.

Wool payments are made only to bona fide producers, and applications for payments must be supported by account sales covering the transaction for which the incentive payment is requested. The incentive payment for shorn wool has been established at 62 cents per pound, grease basis, for each marketing year of the program to date. Payments have been made to growers in every State of the Union, and thousands upon thousands of small growers have been helped materially under the provisions of the Wool Act. The act provides that the price of wool shall not exceed 110 percent of parity. It should be pointed out here that the payments have never been set at the full 110 percent of parity. It is true that during the first 2 years of the Wool Act that the wool payments were at 106 percent of parity. However, during the 1957 marketing year, which will end on March 31 next, payments are just about even with parity. The 1958 incentive level which will go into effect on April 1 of this year will reduce the payments to 95 percent of parity inasmuch as the effective parity price for shorn wool for this year is a trifle over 65 cents per pound. As I said before, the incentive level has been set each year at 62 cents per pound.

The funds for payments under the Wool Act are limited to 70 percent of the specific duties collected on imports of wool and wool manufactures and available from January 1, 1953. By the beginning of the first year of the incentive program about $68 million had been accumulated and provided a backlog of funds available for payments in succeeding years. Payments under the act totaled $58 million the first year and $53 million the second year, while accumulations to the fund from the tariff receipts amounted to $31 million the first year and $28 million the second. Accordingly, the payments the first 2 years exceeded the tariff income by $52 million and reduced the backlog by that much. It appears now that the backlog available for payments may be completely exhausted by the end of the fourth year. I base this assumption on the possibility that the average price received by growers in the free market for the 1957 marketing year holds around 50 cents. Three million dollars in payments must be made under the Wool Act for each cent the national average price drops below the incentive level established by the Secretary.

The Wool Act went into effect under rather adverse circumstances. In the first place, a corrective movement was under way in the world market which caused a reduction in world prices, and in the second place, the Commodity Credit Corporation had accumulated a stockpile of 150 million pounds of wool which served to depress wool prices in our country. The return to a free market after prices had been supported for a good many years also had an adverse effect on wool prices. In addition, most of the larger wool-producing States were struck by a drought that extended during the first few years of the Wool Act. As a consequence, the sheep population as a whole has not increased since 1955. While it must be admitted that increased operating costs and inadequate prices for sheep products contributed to the drop, yet it can be said without fear of contradiction, that the major factor in the reduction in the sheep numbers was the prolonged and devastating drought covering the range States of the western empire.

The stockpile of wool in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation has now been liquidated. The last wool was sold only last month. I want to pay tribute here and now to the Secretary of Agriculture and to others high in the administration for their splendid efforts in disposing of a considerable quantity of the stockpile wool through trades with Turkey. The removal of the depressing influence of these stocks has tended to make wool prices in this country reflect world supply and demand conditions to a much higher degree than was possible during the first years of the present program when prices in this country were slow to respond to rising world prices. As I indicated heretofore, the fund to provide the incentive payments under the Wool Act may be insufficient to cover the annual payments after next year.

The simplest way to assure adequate funds to finance the payments under the Wool Act in the years that lie ahead would be to amend the act by including ad valorem duties as well as the specific duties on imports of wool and wool manufactures. The action can be fully justified on the ground that the demand for raw wool in this country is being restricted to a large degree because of the increased imports of wool

manufactures such as wool fabrics. The total duties collected on wool and wool manufactures, including ad valorem as well as specific duties, from January 1, 1953, to March 31, 1957, amounted to $295 million compared to $183 million for specific duties alone. Thus, by making 70 percent of the ad valorem duties, as well as the specific duties, available for payments under the act, the fund would be increased by about 60 percent.

When the wool bill passed the Senate in 1954, it did not have a termination date, but the House committee inserted a 4-year limitation in the bill, but the report made it clear that the House committee did not mean that the wool program should be of a temporary nature but, on the contrary, it indicated that it felt strongly that the program would provide a permanent solution to our wool problems but that the Congress should take a look at the way the act was working out every few years.

Without a question of doubt the incentive payment program under the National Wool Act has restored initiative and enterprise to our domestic wool industry. It is encouraging the development of a sound domestic industry and laying the basis for increased production of wool important for national security and for our general economic welfare. It is providing the necessary price assistance to our domestic woolgrowers without involving the Government in the wool merchandising business.

Experienced observers in the livestock field maintain that the Wool Act saved the wool industry from complete liquidation and offered the necessary incentive to encourage the woolgrowers of the country to continue their operations. There are many favorable factors operating to the advantage of the growers at the present time. Adequate, if not abundance of, moisture has returned to the range in almost every wool-producing State.

As I have indicated before, the Wool Act has operated under rather adverse conditions, and a few people have expressed disappointment with the results obtained. Some people have pointed out that the Wool Act is costing more than was anticipated at the time of its enactment. That is true largely, in the first place, because of the fact that the world market dropped sharply shortly after the Wool Act was placed on the books and, in the second place, as I pointed out before, the stockpile in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation had a damaging and adverse effect on our domestic market.

Also, one would be less than frank if he did not point out that there is some objection to section 708 of the Wool Act which provides the authority for the growers to organize and conduct advertising and sales promotion programs for the industry's products and to finance such programs by deductions from their payments. As a result of deductions authorized under programs approved by growers in a referendum, the American sheep producers council was organized and intensive advertising and sales promotion for both wool and lamb are under way. The council conducts advertising and sales promotion efforts financed by the growers designed to increase returns from the sale of their products in the free market and thereby lessen the amount of payments required under the act. About $3 million has been available to the council to carry out its program during each marketing year, but it seems to me that it is, as yet, too early to measure the effectiveness of the program and the benefits accruing therefrom to the industry.

It is a trifle early to measure the full effectiveness of the incentive program toward encouraging a larger production of shorn wool in accordance with the intent of the act. It seems to me that the operation of the Wool Act and moisture conditions are entitled to equal consideration for the decided improvement in the wool industry.

Only a few days ago the Wyoming State administrative officer in charge of the wool program reported to me that the average price received by producers on sales reported by the end of last December is 12.7 cents per pound higher in the 1957 marketing year compared to the previous marketing year. Furthermore, he stated that the records indicate that small farm flock producers report a larger gain in average price than the State average. He stated that this represented a major change from previous years. He feels that the Wyoming record speaks well for the way the Wool Act is working out. I am sure other States could make a similar report. That there is little opposition to the Wool Act on the whole is clearly indicated by reason of the fact that 45 Senators joined with me last summer in the introduction of my bill, S. 2861, extending the Wool Act for another 4 years. I may say to you that Senator COOPER of Kentucky, Senator MORTON of Kentucky, Senator CAPEHART of Indiana, and Senator JENNER of Indiana, only last week asked to be included as cosponsors of the bill. President Eisenhower, in his budget message sent up a week ago, and also in his farm message to the Congress a week ago, recommended the extension of the Wool Act. Secretary of Agriculture Benson in his report on my bill, S. 2861, to the Senate Committee on Agriculture recommended in strong language the extension of the Wool Act. The Secretary appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and testified in support of the Wool Act. In his report on my bill, the Secretary made this significant statement:

"Wool is one principal agricultural commodity in which our country is deficient in production. The act was developed to handle the special problem of price assistance for domestic wool growers without: (a) adversely affecting foreign trade, (b) adversely affecting the competitive position of wool with imported wool and other fibers, and (c) having the Government in the wool merchandising business. The payment program under the act is an alternative to supporting wool prices by loans or purchases or by raising the tariff to protect domestic growers' prices against the lower prices of imported wools. Support by loans and purchases resulted in domestic wools accumulating in the hands of the Government while mills looked to imported wool for an increasing share of their requirements. Raising the tariff to obtain higher prices in the domestic market would adversely affect foreign trade and also the competitive position of wool with other fibers."

As you know, Secretary Benson appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture last Friday. It was the stormiest session that ever beset a Cabinet officer in a committee hearing that I have witnessed since I first went to Congress 15 years ago. Some of the Senators referred to the fact that wool is given preferential treatment over other farm commodities. There seems to be a feeling in some quarters that the wool bill will not receive separate consideration but will be included in the overall farm legislation. In the course of my interrogation of Secretary Benson, I brought out that we produce only about a third of the wool and sugar that we consume in this country and, therefore, both were different than all other farm commodities and, as such, should be given separate consideration. Many of the Senators who had so kindly joined as cosponsors on the bill have requested Senator ELLENDER to set the hearings on the wool bill for February 3 or shortly thereafter. That bill should be enacted into law early this year so the growers can make their plans accordingly. It has proved to be the most effective and practical measure to solve the problems confronting the sheep industry. I might add a word of caution that it is extremely important that your association do everything within its power to lend assistance to the passage of this mighty important piece of legislation through the Congress as early as possible.

A review of the economy of the Western States indicates that the sheep and wool industry stands third in economic importance in Wyoming and Nevada; fourth in New Mexico; fifth in Idaho, Utah, and Montana; sixth in Arizona, Colorado, Oregon, South Dakota, and Texas; ninth in California; and 10th in Washington. That record indicates clearly the tremendous importance of this great industry to the economy of the western empire and, in fact, to the country as well.

Without a question of a doubt the Wool Act saved the sheep industry from complete liquidation. The bill extending that act is sound and proper legislation and in my judgment the bill can be—it must be—and it will be enacted into law.

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORTS ON WHEAT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 23, 1958,

The name of Mr. SYMINGTON was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3091) to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support on wheat, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators) on January 23, 1958.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Address delivered by him at the annual convention of the American Road Builders Association, in Washington, D. C., on January 20, 1958.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "United States Policy at the United Nations on Africa," written by him and published in the magazine Africa Today on January 27, 1958.

Article entitled "What Hope for Disarmament?" written by him and published in the New York Times magazine of January 5, 1958.

Article written by him entitled "A Pattern for Peace in the Middle East," published in the Progressive magazine.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. NEUBERGER):

Statement by Senator NEUBERGER concerning production of zirconium for atomic purposes and articles entitled "Albany's Large Zirconium Industry Outgrowth of Experimental Plant," published in the Portland Oregonian of January 19, 1958.

## NOTICE OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK HEARINGS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on February 3, 1958, at 10:30 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, on the proposed increase of $2 billion in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

All persons who wish to appear and testify at this hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible.

## ADDRESSES BEFORE THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of addresses delivered in New York City earlier this month by foreign correspondents of the National Broadcasting Co. before the Foreign Policy Association.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### WHOSE U. N. IS IT?

(By Chet Huntley)

Implicit in that question—Whose U. N. is it?—is our difficulty. We are not sure. Does it belong to humanity, to the people of the world? Is it the property of the governments, the diplomats, or is it up for grabs by anyone who wants to use it?

The U. N. is our Bali Ha'i—a lovely, gleaming, and inspiring institution, standing there just offshore, with the peoples of the world constantly trying to reach it.

The U. N. was built and organized to serve a world as envisioned in 1945. It didn't turn out that way. The U. N. is thus the symbol of our hopes. It bids us to keep on trying. It reminds us what could be and what might be.

But governments, diplomats, and just people do reach this Bali Ha'i of ours and with mixed results. The most noble achievements have been by those who have come to the U. N. in behalf of the children of the world, in behalf of the health of the world, in behalf of improved agriculture, world literacy.

In the area of peace and security, outside of undeniably thrilling and noble performances in Korea and more recently in Gaza, we have been forced to pursue security under articles 51 and 52 of the U. N. Charter, which permit outside alliances.

But the governments and diplomats continue to come to this Bali Ha'i with their grievances, their problems, their hatreds, their nationalistic ambitions and grand objectives. The U. N. has been handed, in its young life, the most impossible batch of problems and special interests that ever befell an institution.

The U. N. is going to be no better than the governments that comprise it and the diplomats who frequent it: and in this respect the U. N. suffers.

To be sure, every propaganda gambit of the Soviet Union has to be answered immediately; but I am not sure that we should use the U. N. for that purpose. It might be wiser should the United States make and repeat a positive declaration that it will spare the U. N. that burden and that will it give the lie to every piece of Soviet propaganda in a separate publication which will be available to the delegates at the front door. We are frequently asked why we don't carry more U. N. news. We do heed the U. N. when it deals with substantive issues, but when it's engaged in propaganda we stay away. We are not in the propaganda business.

I am not sure that we are wise in employing our delegation to beat the lounges and the anterooms perpetually for votes on every impending resolution. The exercise has frequently turned the U. N. into a national political convention and it only attaches importance and some calamity to the inevitable day when we are going to be outvoted on some issue. It seems to me that our diplomats have become overly obsessed with the game and the form and the intrigue and have lost track of the substance. I would offer as an example the tragic hairsplitting that began when the General Assembly attempted to define aggression and was forced to give it up and acknowledge failure. As one international jurist told me, an elaborate definition of aggression was never necessary. All that was necessary was a declaration that the perpetrators of aggression would be tried and punished or acquitted for lack of evidence. And it was this same man, a judge from the Netherlands, who presided over the war-crimes trials in Tokyo, who has been turned away for 8 years at the U. N. airly dismissed, as he insisted that the laws under which the German and Japanese war criminals were tried and punished must be codified, else the allied nations had indulged in pure murder. He has found the diplomats too busy with the game to undertake that one bit of labor which, if not adopted by the U. N., cries out for the support of the enlightened nations.

In the area of peace and security, I do believe that the U. N. would serve better as a Bali Ha'i where the best diplomatic talent we have might go and work quietly and patiently at the task of tearing down the cold-war structure piece by piece and bit by bit. I don't think it's going to be done in eloquent speeches in plenary session, nor in grand package-deal resolutions, nor with propaganda, nor in vying for the delegate votes of Nepal and Ghana.

---

### WHAT SECURITY IN THE ATOMIC AGE?

(By Joseph C. Harsch, NBC news senior correspondent in Europe)

At the NATO conference in Paris last month the British kept saying: "The problem is political and economic, not military." And again, their spokesmen repeatedly asserted that NATO did not need more arms nearly as much as it needed more political cohesion, and more economic interdependence.

This British position seemed to cause a bit of confusion. Mr. Dulles was talking about bases in Europe for our prospective new intermediate range missiles. The British would reply obliquely that NATO had all the military power it could use for some time to come. Which point of view was right, and what lies behind the apparent conflict?

I have heard it said by someone who should know what he was talking about that in the event of a nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union, our casualties, even if we won, would run between a minimum of 20 million and a maximum of 80 million.

Suppose we take the optimistic low figure of only 20 millions. That is not precisely security for the United States. We would get small consolation out of winning a war in which we suffered 20 million casualties. I suppose, conceivably, our weaponeers will come up with an antimissile missile which might ward off such a blow. But there might be an answer to the antimissile missiles.

In this game, there is little chance for the kind of military security we once enjoyed in the prerocket age. In World War I, the most our enemies could do to us was to threaten to cut the line of supply between our home base and our troops overseas. In World War II they could do no more.

We have lived in a privileged sanctuary from the time we resolved our differences at home with the Indians, the British, the French, the Mexicans—and the Confederacy. We have had enemies since then who could contest the range of our influence beyond our shores—but could not seriously hurt us at home. Those days ended decisively with the long-range rocket and the nuclear bomb. We will never again be able to enjoy absolute physical security. Anyone willing to pay the price could hurt us desperately.

How then do we seek what relative security is possible? We could be relatively safe if we had no enemies. There are only two ways of getting rid of enemies.

One is by defeating them, decisively, in war. That way is closed to us as a way we could choose of our own volition. It might be forced upon us by the action of others, but no government in its right mind would choose war at the price of at least 20 million American casualties.

The other way then, the only way that in reality is open to us, is the way of attempting to come to terms with our adversaries. That means political action.

There are two kinds of political action involved. One is defensive—that is, political action to maintain and strengthen our system of alliances to the end that we do not face our antagonist in isolation. The other is offensive. That would be political action to reduce the number and seriousness of issues outstanding between us and our adversaries.

At the present moment there is no serious dispute within our alliance system over the importance of the defensive type of political action. We want better political relations with our allies, and happily, they want better political relations with us. The immediate question is whether the alliance, or its members, should engage in offensive political action—that is, in action aimed at reducing the number and intensity of issues between ourselves of the West and the members of the Communist bloc. Such action could never give us the absolute security we enjoyed before the days of rockets.

So far as anyone can see, we will always in the future be in physical danger. At least in theory, we can hope to limit and contain that danger by political action—provided we are willing to deal with the Russians—and they with us.

---

### UNITED EUROPE: PARTNER OR RIVAL?

(By Frank Bourgholtzer, NBC News, Central European correspondent based in Vienna)

This subject—a United Europe and what it would mean for us—is a very great challenge indeed, and it has been a glorious dream for centuries. I am compelled to say, however, that I don't believe it is a problem that will make spectacular advances in 1958.

This is not to say that some forms of cooperation—forms that have eventual unity as a part of their prospectus—won't make some progress.

But the divisive forces in Europe, even limiting the discussion to Western Europe, which is beginning with an artificial entity, still are too great to permit more than the first steps of the various plans for unity.

At this moment, the issue of unity is most importantly centered on the plans for a common market—and an alternative, or extension, plan known as the free-trade area.

The French, whom I came to know as Paris bureau chief a few years ago, are most interested in the common market. The British, whom I've covered as a sort of guest correspondent on such occasions as their last coronation, their last election, and so on—have a great fear of the common market and instead are pushing the idea of a free-trade area.

Now, both these ideas are basically encouraging to those who want European unity. They are schemes for meshing the economies of the European nations—to pool, in effect, the strengths of the various nations and break down the divisions, as represented by tariffs.

But as it has worked out, the common market is very advantageous for the French—in prospect; and the free-trade area

is very advantageous for the British—in prospect. The two members of the entente cordiale have almost come to blows—verbally, anyway—in arguing the merits of one proposal as against the other.

The result has been to slow down acceptance of either.

This is the current example. We have had others. The European Defense Community was the big unity idea when I was in Paris. I came to the idea cold, as a newly arrived correspondent from America. By the time I had indoctrinated myself, I came to the conclusion that if I were a Frenchman, I would have to oppose the EDC. Therefore, it was no surprise to me when the French Parliament killed it.

The champions of United Europe, so far, have been classified as dreamers, and in many ways impractical dreamers. They have a modified success to point to in the European Steel and Coal Community. They have prospective successes to point to in the common market notions and the atomic energy pool. But these are years—many years—from real activation. That is why it is necessary to say that as a practical policy problem for 1958, the question of a united Europe does not seem destined for much success.

However, as a concept, it remains eminently worth considering. Today, for example, we find stimuli to European unity from a most unexpected source—that is, the sting of American foreign policy.

I was not at the NATO meeting in Paris last month, I was in Warsaw, seeking how the other half of Europe lives. But it was clear, even from that distance, that the members of NATO, except for America, were caught in a "field," if I may use an electromagnetic example. I understand everyone is a high-fi fan and familiar with those things in America. The NATO members were suspended in a magnetic "field," so to speak—reacting both to the forces from America and the lines of force emanating from Moscow.

We have seen the efforts of our European partners to either take the initiative in foreign policy or to needle the United States State Department to move in a certain direction. European unity has been attempted by many paths. Charlemagne—Carl der Grosse as the Germans call him—was the first man to achieve it, Napoleon did fairly well at it for a while. Hitler had it almost made. Now we are seeing attempts toward it on a voluntary, rather than a compulsory, basis * * * attempts that slide back almost two steps for every two steps forward.

It is at least conceivable, however, that a noticeable step toward this unity may be taken unwittingly: in the impulse of our European partners to control an American policy that they do not altogether trust.

---

CAN WE DEAL WITH RUSSIA?

(By Irving R. Levine, NBC news, Moscow)

Ever since the first Soviet sputnik began its methodical course around the world Soviet propaganda organs have accentuated their tone of boasting and arrogance. This would indicate that Russia's first step in the door of the space age will make it even more difficult than it has been in the past to deal with Russia. The beep-beep of Soviet diplomacy now would seem to decode itself into a language of no compromise, of supreme self-confidence, even of threats.

However, the sputniks' radios spoke on two frequencies, and similarly there is more than Russia's propaganda voice to listen to for a reply to the question "Can we deal with Russia?"

Even the most docile Russian can detect an annoying disparity between the dazzling sputniks in the sky and the austerity on the ground. A young Russian whom I congratulated on the earth satellites brushed it off by saying: "Think how many stomachs they could have filled." This was just a manner of speaking, because nobody is going hungry in Russia these days. But there are cruel shortages. Worst of all is the housing shortage. With six families often sharing a single kitchen great strains develop. One Russian told me that relations had so degenerated in his apartment unit that each housewife was tying down pot covers on the stove to guard against hostile neighbors contaminating the borscht.

Russia's leaders recognize that mass education—besides creating sputniks—has created a powerful desire for a more luxurious life. Although Nikita Khrushchev has no electorate to answer to, he must be more conscious of public opinion than Stalin was. Khrushchev has to be because he lacks Stalin's total control of party, police, and army.

However, it is no easy matter for the Soviet leaders to be responsive to needs of the people. Russia has limited resources. Russia produced only 51 million tons of steel last year—less than half America's production. Russia was able to produce sputniks by ignoring kitchen sinks.

In a sense, the sputniks have created opposite problems for the Kremlin and the White House. Washington must find ways to finance our admission into the space age. The problem of Russian leaders of giving Russians more will be as difficult as that confronting America's leaders of giving Americans less.

It will take a long period of peace for the Soviet economy to develop from one of scarcity to one of surplus, to an economy that can produce refrigerators as well as rockets.

Nikita Khrushchev needs peace for other reasons, too.

Khrushchev must realize that only when Russia has a missile stockpile will its intercontinental missiles have decisive military significance. Now, Russia can still be devastated from American bases. And by the time Russia has a stockpile it will have lost (let us hope) any missile monopoly. Russia's leaders must at least consider the probability that the United States will have its own stockpile. The memory of war is deep among the Russian people who lost seven million kin in the last war. If Khrushchev were to follow a policy obviously leading to war he might generate a revolution of lethargy and resentment among the people. What's more important it might create the very issue around which Khrushchev's formidable opposition could rally to force him out of power.

Russia's need for peace is being reflected in the Kremlin's repeated calls for conferences with the United States and other western powers. It would be a mistake to expect too much from negotiations. For example, the Russians show no signs of yielding on the German issue, or on the Middle East, or on disarmament. But, there may be common ground for dealing with Russia on questions where our self-interest coincides. Fortunately, it is to the mutual self-interest of Russia as well as of the United States that peace be preserved.

In seeking an answer to the question, "Can we deal with Russia?" the question naturally arises, "Can we trust Russia?" Recent history has provided the answer. But, in the matter of dealing with Russia to preserve peace the most important consideration may be that Russia needs peace. That fact alone makes it feasible to negotiate with Russia—in the U. N., through diplomatic channels, and in summit meetings.

Negotiations and keeping strong need not be mutually exclusive. One need not preclude the other. Surely a nation can keep its guard up and continue developing missiles while never closing the door to negotiations aimed at avoiding the use of those missiles.

MIDDLE EAST: NEW UNITED STATES RESPONSIBILITY

(By Welles Hangen, NBC News, Cairo)

For the first time in history, the Middle East has become a primary area of responsibility and concern for the United States abroad. As one Arab said, "You're in so deep it would take a drilling rig to locate you."

The Eisenhower doctrine is nothing less than a declaration of continuing United States involvement in the quicksand of Middle Eastern politics. Its an open-end promise by this country to underwrite any Arab regime that asks for our help in resisting what it labels Communist subversion or aggression.

Only now are we beginning to realize how limitless is our commitment under the doctrine and how limited are its prospects of checking the subtle kind of subversion by persuasion that the Communists and their allies are practicing in the Arab world today.

The price of meeting the doctrine's promises is constantly going up. Today King Saud demands jet fighters for Saudi Arabia's fledgling air force; tomorrow it will probably be medium-range rockets.

The medieval Imam of Yemen is likely to be asking for the same thing from the Russians one of these days. Let's hope he doesn't point them the wrong way or let some camel driver fire them by mistake.

But the cost and danger involved in handing out Eisenhower doctrine aid are not the only things we have to consider. The real problem is how key areas of the Middle East like Egypt and Syria are to be deflected out of the Soviet orbit before they burn up as independent states.

Both these states have rejected the doctrine. Now we are trying to quarantine them. An American diplomat in Cairo told me recently: "You remember how we once worked to get the Egyptians into some kind of anti-Communist military alliance. Now we'd be delighted to settle for their being simply and genuinely neutral."

So, although the Eisenhower doctrine sets big new tasks and responsibilities for the United States in the Middle East, it hasn't stopped the gradual downgrading of our hopes in the Middle East—a kind of devaluation of American objectives for the area. Where once we hoped to create a tight NATO-like defense network—called the Middle East defense organization or the northern tier or what have you—we're now happy to give aid and comfort to Arab countries if they simply agree to stay independent of Moscow without joining any military pacts.

The downgrading of American hopes is, I submit, a direct outgrowth of the poisonous Palestine problem. A new initiative is needed in three directions: First, the ill-conceived armistice line should be rectified to correct such obvious inequities as the partition of a village from its farmland. Second, Israel should offer to repatriate a sizable number of the Palestine Arab refugees in order to destroy what is now the most destructive political shibboleth in the Arab world: "No resettlement outside Palestine." Israel and the world can be confident that very few of the refugees would actually choose to remain in Israel once they saw their farms and homes in other hands and realized how different things had become. Finally, the U. N. police force that's now successfully keeping the peace on the Egyptian-Israel armistice line should be extended to patrol all Arab-Israeli frontiers.

Our final suggestion to meet the dilemma of mounting American responsibilities and dwindling American influence in the Middle East: I think it's absolutely essential that we stop giving aid to individual Middle Eastern potentates and start giving it to the region as a whole just as we did under the Marshall plan in Europe. But there should

be an essential difference: Our contributions to a Middle Eastern development fund and whatever Western Europe is willing to put in should be matched by Arab money, mostly oil revenue.

This joint development pool should be administered largely by Arabs, using both Arab and Western money to raise Arab living standards from their present medieval rut. It would avoid the stigma of western imperialism. It would give Arabs and westerners a sense of partnership in progress and might help to leave the Russians out in the cold.

---

AWAKENING AFRICA: PROMISE OR THREAT

(By Edwin Newman, NBC News, Rome)

The question, "Awakening Africa: promise or threat?" pretty well answers itself. Awakening Africa is both. The promise is that it will become a free and prosperous area that sides with us, or at worst is neutral. The threat, as you might expect, is more many sided. First, it is that countries will come into being that are politically and economically unable to carry on and will break up in chaos and even civil war. Ghana and Nigeria are examples. Second, it is that racialism and nationalism will feed each other, and a sort of antiwhite bloc will result. The third, of course, is that these emerging countries will come under the influence, maybe the domination of Russia.

It is typical of our times that what might happen that we would like can be said in one short sentence, while what might happen that we would not like takes three.

So far, it must be said, there is no real evidence that the Russians are hard at work in black Africa. They did set up a hospital some years ago in Ethiopia. The British had evidence that some of the leaders of the Mau Mau uprising in Kenya had been trained in Moscow. There is a suspiciously large Russian diplomatic mission in Libya. And trade missions from, of all places, Bulgaria, are turning up in a few African countries. But on the whole the Russians have done very little. It might be argued that they haven't had to; they are doing pretty well without it. However, it would be far too optimistic not to expect them to increase their efforts very soon. As a matter of fact, one reason Anthony Eden wanted to unseat President Nasser of Egypt was that he believed the Russians would make their grand scale effort in Africa through Nasser. He didn't suggest that Nasser would cooperate knowingly; he did believe that Nasser would be, at best, the unwitting instrument.

Certainly, the outlook for Russia is not unfavorable. In Kenya, the African political leaders have largely stopped cooperating with the government; they want more representation and they are complaining about Kenya being the site of a new British military base. Nigeria and Ghana show some signs of not being able to hold together, and Ghana is taking on rather an authoritarian air. In the Central African Federation, the Africans believe their rights are not being respected. South Africa is wearing its usual tragic look.

If you look north, to the Arab section of Africa, there are no very convincing signs of stability, either.

This is not a cheerful prospect, and you must add to it the disability under which we labor and which may be summed up as Little Rock. But it is not entirely gloomy. Even Little Rock has a silver lining of sorts. The reason is that so many Americans are Negroes, and so many American Negroes have connections in Africa. Ghana, for example, has all kinds of business, personal and educational ties to Negroes in the United States. That gives us a tremendous advantage there, and one we do not even have to make a conscious effort to use. If American Negroes are satisfied with life here, Ghana will quickly enough get the idea.

It is also true, I believe, that the British are giving ground pretty sensibly and tactfully in the areas of Africa still under their rule. They are certainly open to criticism, but you cannot help wondering what the position would be if someone else were in their place.

Of course, we are being confronted and will be confronted with demands for economic aid that are gigantic. There is a limit to what we can manage, and it won't do any harm if that is known.

As for what we can do in other fields, that is limited, too. We can help our friends with advice as well as money. We can educate as many of their people as they want to send us. We can make investments in Africa. We can avoid what probably would be the mistake of trying to tie these new countries into military alliances. We can provide the best example possible. But in the last analysis, what happens to the emerging countries of Black Africa will depend in the main on themselves. There is no substitute for a great leader who is there when he is needed. Whether Africa will produce such leaders we do not yet know.

---

WHAT UNITED STATES ECONOMIC POLICY FOR SURVIVAL?

(By Leif Eid, NBC news, Paris)

I know that you appreciate the difficulty of any assessment of America's economic survival problem from a distance of several thousand miles. This is particularly true at a moment of hesitation like the present, before we know even the size of the effort we must make.

The Soviet economic threat is already serious. We must assume that in future years it will become even more serious; that the rulers of the Soviet Union will try to match, and surpass, us in economics as well as in the military, policies, and science.

This country's first duty, as I see it, is to remain strong, to increase production. We cannot afford a depression. A sharp drop in activity here would send a paralyzing shock through the entire free world, demoralizing prices, markets, and standards of living. It would give the Soviet Union the opportunity of penetrating the uncommitted nations with their instruments of barter and economic aid. It would increase pressure among allied peoples for more trade with the Soviet bloc.

I have heard much talk here about the need for a rigid austerity program for the United States. To my mind this is nonsense, and self-defeating nonsense. It would do us no good to stop making butter and automobiles to produce the intercontinental missile. Only a limited portion of our productive resources can be used right now in the development of the new weapons. We may find it necessary to increase this portion, but it certainly cannot be done overnight. If we try, we would be defeating our own ends. Economic policy is certainly not less important than diplomatic or military policy in waging the cold war. Less production here would sap our economic foreign policy.

It may be a little less butter and more guns, but it still will be guns and butter if we are to survive. So long as activity here remains high, it yields us a margin that we can devote to such programs as foreign aid. It also acts as a centripetal force, drawing in raw materials and semi-finished and finished goods from farms and factories the world over. This is an obligation that will not be met by sending a satellite into the outer space. Men must eat before they can enjoy that spectacle.

How to pay for the increased effort? Certainly we cannot afford more inflation. Money there must be, and more of it probably; but creating more money is not the way. We may have to go without a tax cut. I don't think the Americans would balk at even a small tax increase to protect their way of living.

It goes without saying, also, that we cannot afford to weaken the alliance by introducing new and divisive economic policies. Our allies already complain about the difficulty of exporting to the United States. If we fail to renew the Trade Agreements Act, or hedge it with fresh restrictions, as some groups are advocating, there will be a wave of resentment against us.

Men can reconcile themselves to the vicissitudes of natural domestic competition. They do not take easily to another country's changing the rules of trade.

We cannot solve our own economic problem by making the foreigner pay the bill. Within the realm of the possible, we should try to liberalize, rather than restrict, the rules of international trade.

It may be difficult to do much about this in 1958, but America's economic survival problem will not be solved this year nor for many years to come. It will require a sustained effort.

---

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES TRADE WITH RED CHINA?

(By James Robinson, NBC News, Tokyo)

If I were a businessman, I believe my instincts would be to look upon the 640 million Chinese as potential customers. And right now, I would be considerably concerned, because my rivals in England, Japan, France, and Germany are in Communist China, exploiting the market for what it is worth.

Now, if I were a Washington policymaker, I would be tremendously worried for the future with regard to China. As you know, the Chinese have embarked on a vast industrialization program. The Peking regime is attempting to convert its agrarian economy into at least a semi-industrial economy. The United States trade embargoes are forcing Red China into the Soviet bloc, most especially Russia, for assistance in this undertaking.

I suppose it is valid to believe that Peking, being Communist-ruled, naturally would lean to other Communist nations for this assistance. But I do know that many Red Chinese engineers are dissatisfied with Russian equipment. By the way, most of the top cadre of Chinese engineers are American-trained, hence they are aware of and appreciative of our industrial ingenuity. Even Premier Chou En-lai admits this. Chou has told me that his country would welcome American technicians and engineers. He added: "We would pay for this help, too."

But what is happening is that Russia is supplying China with basic industries. Once China's basic industrial plant is established, she is forever tied with the Soviets for such obvious things as replacement parts, tooling, and so forth. This will give Russia considerable mastery over the Chinese for possibly generations to come. China has strongly indicated she does not relish the thought of being so oriented to the Russian bloc. But at present, what else can she do?

Historically, the Chinese have always detested Russia. But at the same time, it must be remembered that they have had no particular love for the West. It might seem contradictory, but China, while accepting Russian help, also is in the process of ridding her country of many Russian technicians and administrators.

But the Peiping regime is having economic problems. It has had 2 years of not very good harvests, with the prospect that this year's also will be only mediocre. With hundreds of millions of mouths to feed, plus using food for barter and exchange to finance

the industrialization of the country, China is indeed in economic trouble.

Here, again, China has only Russia to turn to. It is interesting to know that Russia has not given China outright aid grants such as in our foreign-aid programs. Altogether, the Soviet Union has loaned its neighbor around half a billion dollars. This is being repaid, and with interest.

Russia has utilized the last ruble from these loans. For Moscow has insisted that Russian-made equipment and Russian engineers be the terms of business. This, again, gives our arch rival an independent hand in tying China to the Communist empire. Many sound, non-Communist businessmen and economists—English, German, and Japanese—have told me that if the United States suddenly opened up the trade doors with Communist China, the Moscow-Peiping axis would be seriously, possibly even permanently, disrupted.

I frankly do not know if this would be true. But I do know that it is true that our present trade embargoes force China even closer into the Soviet bloc.

## TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMITH-MUNDT ACT, AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this morning, at the White House, there were held ceremonies commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Smith-Mundt Act. That act was passed in 1948, and has done a great deal to promote exchanges between the United States and foreign countries. I believe the administration is to be commended for its initiative in arranging for a celebration of the 10th anniversary of this event.

I fear that in recent years we have tended to overlook the fact that the original proposal for exchange programs came from the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in 1946. The 10th anniversary of the Fulbright Act would have been celebrated on August 1, 1956. As I recall, no such celebration was arranged, although I am happy to note that Senator FULBRIGHT, along with Senators SMITH and MUNDT, were present and were given acclaim by President Eisenhower this morning.

I do believe the record should be set straight, however, and attention should be drawn to the fact that the nonpartisan educational exchange programs got their start in 1946. Indeed, the Smith-Mundt Act which was passed during the Republican 80th Congress, was proposed by the Democratic administration. The fact that it became law during the 80th Congress is attributable to the leadership which Senators SMITH and MUNDT gave as chairmen of their respective subcommittees during consideration of the Truman administration's proposal.

I should like also to draw attention at this time to the fact that the administration is today signing, with representatives of the Soviet Union, an agreement calling for various types of exchanges in order to promote mutual understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union.

I am reminded, in this connection, of the fact that the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas, on last June 8, delivered in New York a speech entitled "The Open Curtain." During that speech the majority leader called for an open curtain between the United States and the Soviet Union. He asked that arrangements be made for weekly appearances on Soviet and United States radio and television. He asked why we should not allow labor leaders, industrial managers, farmers, scholars, and professional men to be exchanged between the two countries. The majority leader's remarks were well received, and I am delighted that the administration has now been able to conclude an agreement making possible many of these exchanges.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], when he commented upon the 10th anniversary of the Smith-Mundt Act, and also the significant role played by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in the establishment of these programs of educational exchange.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the cultural exchange programs, which have been negotiated between the United States and the Soviet Union, and which I trust will soon be negotiated with other Iron Curtain countries, were indeed recommended in a very comprehensive program by the majority leader in his address of a year ago in New York City, as well as by other Members of the Senate. I personally have urged and supported an agreement on cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I believe that exchanges with Soviet parliamentarians would be helpful. I recognize that the Soviet parliamentarians are not elected in the sense of a freely constituted election. Nevertheless, if members of the Soviet Parliament—their Supreme Soviet—visit the United States, they could contribute to a better understanding between our two countries. It surely would be interesting for Members of the Congress of the United States to visit in the Soviet Union if for no other reason than to have the opportunity of on-the-spot observation and, occasionally, of on-the-spot opportunity to reply to unfair or uninformed criticism. We must seek ways and means to broaden the contacts between the peoples of the world, particularly the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. We have nothing to fear in such exchanges. We have much to gain and learn. I congratulate the State Department, and Ambassador Lacy in particular, for the successful negotiations on cultural exchanges with Soviet Russia.

I am of the opinion that cultural exchanges even at the parliamentary level could be helpful, and at least would contribute to a better understanding. I support such a proposal.

## DEVELOPMENTS IN THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on several occasions during the past year I have sought to alert the Senate and the American people to the dangers created by the apparent determination of the American automobile industry to force down the throats of the buying public wider, longer, more expensive models each year.

These gargantuan monsters have created serious problems:

First. They are too big, too fast, too powerful, are rapidly making obsolete our highways, and are endangering human life and limb.

Second. They are enormously wasteful of raw materials, such as iron ore, nickel, and petroleum, which we should be conserving in the interest of national security.

Third. They are rapidly becoming too expensive for the average American to buy and maintain, and the day may be at hand when they have priced themselves out of the market.

Fourth. Unless American manufacturers meet the public demand for smaller, cheaper cars, European imports will take over a steadily increasing share of the domestic market, with serious effects upon employment in American automobile plants and in the hundreds of small businesses throughout the country which are their suppliers of parts and equipment.

Fifth. One of the unhappy consequences may be a march on Washington by the American manufacturers, reversing their traditional position for "freer trade," and demanding high tariff barriers. This would be the most frustrating blow which could be inflicted upon our European allies in the field of international trade.

Mr. President, I was delighted to note in the New York Times of January 20, 1958, an article reporting that the mayors of communities in the New York metropolitan area have called to the attention of the five leading automobile companies the adverse economic effects, upon cities and regions, which result from current automobile size and design.

One of the mayors' complaints concerned the shrinkage of parking space. This is a problem which comes close to home for the Congress, because parking facilities in the Capitol area are becoming more and more inadequate. Of interest to Senators will be the fact that in the new Senate Office Building, now nearing completion, it has become necessary to reduce the number of parking spaces in the garage, to compensate for the growth in size of automobiles since the plans were first drawn.

Mr. President, I hope the automobile industry will pay heed to the complaints voiced by the mayors and many others, and will reverse the silly trend toward bigger models every year.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the New York Times printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, together with an article entitled "The Small Car: Value Is Gaining on Glamour in the Auto Market," which was published in Barron's Weekly of December 23, 1957.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 20, 1958]

SHORTER CARS ASKED BY REGION'S MAYORS

Mayor Wagner has appealed to the automobile industry to help relieve traffic con-

gestion by manufacturing shorter and narrower cars.

The request was made on behalf of the Metropolitan Regional Conference, of which the mayor is chairman. The conference consists of the top elected officials of the immediate New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area.

In letters made public yesterday, the mayor told the heads of five leading automobile companies that the long, wide cars now being turned out take too much curb parking space, shrink the facilities of parking lots and garages, force relocation of parking meters and increase congestion.

The mayor's letters were sent to George Romney, president of American Motors Corp., L. L. Colbert, president of Chrysler Corp.; Henry Ford 2d, president of the Ford Motor Co.; Harlow H. Curtice, president of General Motors Corp.; and Harold Churchill, president of the Studebaker-Packard Corp.

The letters implemented a resolution adopted by the conference at its recent meeting in Newark. The heads of the five companies were told that Mayor Charles S. Witkowski, of Jersey City, chairman of the conference committee on traffic and transportation, would be glad to discuss the problem with them or their representatives.

"We are aware of the economic stake that the automobile industry has in the design of its cars," Mayor Wagner wrote. "We ask that the industry begin giving thought to the economic problems of cities and regions that result from automobile size and design."

The mayor said that the present trend toward longer and wider cars had produced the following results.

"Available parking curb space has shrunk in our cities.

"In the past 10 years the average parking lot has lost 15 percent of its usable space while prewar garages have lost 40 percent.

"In some communities parking meters installed a few years ago in concrete at distances 20 feet apart are no longer adequate for handling passenger cars."

"Traffic jams and congestion on the highways and streets of our tristate region have become more intense."

The mayor's letter said that the conference hoped that the automobile manufacturers would take into account "the tremendous burdens placed upon our local traffic facilities by larger automobiles."

Data compiled by the conference showed that the average width of 4-door sedans increased from 71 inches in 1938 to 78 inches in 1958. In the same 20-year period the average length of the same type of car increased from 193 to 212 inches. About 80 percent of American automobiles, the conference found, were 4-door sedans.

Most of the cars used by New York City officials and those of many cities in the conference area are four-door sedans of the current longer and wider design.

---

[From Barron's Weekly of December 23, 1957]

THE SMALL CAR: VALUE IS GAINING ON GLAMOR IN THE AUTO MARKET

One of the least prepossessing aspects of the business scene of late has been the mounting tendency in some quarters to trifle with the tenets of the marketplace. In particular, Madison Avenue and others of like pinstripe have chosen to reject the classic concept of the economic man, a rational being who bases his choices on the hard scrutiny of relative values: Instead, at the urging of their motivational researchers and other experts on human behavior, some sellers have begun to regard their customers in a wholly different light, as weak-willed and frivolous creatures, foolishly prone to impulse-buying and helplessly responsive to a battery of hidden persuaders. More and more, the consumer has come to be viewed as someone to be manipulated, rather than someone to be served.

Like many other great delusions, this mischievous idea has flourished during exuberant prosperity, when the living is easy and whims can be indulged. How it will fare in harder times, after the surfeit of honey has given way to relative scarcity, remains to be seen. In any case, the masters of the conditioned reflex in merchandising—who might be called the Pavlov school of economics—can draw scant comfort (but possibly some wisdom) from what currently is taking place in one of the biggest United States marts of all, the automobile showroom. For the public is proving alarmingly indifferent to the lure of Detroit's sleek, powerful—and increasingly costly—models. Contrariwise, with growing enthusiasm it is turning to the small, unadorned but economical vehicles offered today chiefly by one domestic and a spate of foreign manufacturers. After a decade of razzle-dazzle and trading up, in short, the automobile for many again has become no more than a means of transportation, a matter of dollars and cents. Value is gaining on glamour in the new car field.

This dramatic shift has been in the making since 1955, when the United States auto industry, sparked by heavy demand, progressively easy credit and a hot race between two of the big three, rolled out and sold a recordbreaking 7,200,000 units. During the past 2 years, however, the going has grown rougher. Thus in 1956, while business as a whole was surging to fresh peaks, automobile sales declined to less than 6 million. This year brought no pick-up. Automotive circles, to be sure, tended to blame the lag on the excesses of 1955; when the new models came out, so the reassuring forecasts ran, paid-up owners of shabby 1955's would flock to buy. Unhappily, these high hopes have been dashed. Far from spurting since early fall, when the 1958's were unveiled, sales if anything have fallen off. As a consequence, production of most makes now is running well behind previous estimates, as well as last year's results. Indeed one company has halted the assembly of two medium-priced lines until early in January.

Thus, for the first time since World War II, much of Detroit apparently has run out of gas. Its plight, however, has not been shared by Paris, Birmingham, or Wolfeburg, where such articles as Renault's Dauphine, the Austin, and the Volkswagen are assembled. On the contrary, manufacturers there and elsewhere have been kept busy turning out small, inexpensive cars for a United States market which is growing by leaps and bounds.

To illustrate, in 1955, halcyon year for the domestic industry, fewer than 60,000 foreign cars were sold in this country. Last year sales jumped to more than 95,000 and this year, despite the lull in demand, the figure well may double. Nor can the influx be viewed as a hit-and-run affair. From their permanent beachheads in the big coastal cities, the importers lately have been fanning out into the most remote hinterlands. Indeed, the distributors of one foreign car, the Volkswagen, have achieved what might be considered the ultimate accolade of United States commercial success—they have been charged with violating the Federal antitrust laws.

The shift in consumer preference, moreover, shows signs of rewarding the only domestic auto maker, American Motors Corp., which has staked its entire future on the cheap car. The company, which once turned out a full line of Nashes and Hudsons, now produces only the Rambler, with a wheel base—and a price tag—well under those of any other United States model. Spurred by the mounting popularity of all small cars, sales of the Rambler (and its imported counterpart, the Metropolitan) have risen sharply. Hence, after running at a heavy loss for years, American Motors lately has turned the corner. For the first time since 1954, when it was organized, the company currently is well in the black. Early next year it will take the wraps off the Rambler American, a new and even smaller vehicle. By sometime in the sixties, its president boldly predicts, the small car will have captured half the United States market.

Be that as it may, Ramblers and foreign cars combined today account for over 5 percent of total United States volume, a figure which might be expected to interest the Big Three. Indeed, the latter have become increasingly interested. Both General Motors and Ford, which happen to be large producers of small cars in Great Britain and on the Continent, lately have begun to import English Fords, Vauxhalls and Opels for sale in this country. In so doing they are paying belated tribute not to styling or performance, but to such workaday virtues as efficiency and economy. Whatever its defects or lacks, the small car is a reliable and sturdy conveyance. It is, moreover, considerably cheaper than the standard United States make, both to buy and to operate. Plainly, on a growing number of motorists, whether happy or otherwise, cost and upkeep have exercised their own powerful brand of persuasion.

Thus, after a long psychic joyride, the public again is getting its feet on the ground. Here is a turn of events with great significance, not merely for Detroit, but also for the rest of the country. The market economy, after all, can flourish only as producers and consumer, in the main, reach wise decisions regarding spending and investment. Such decisions, in turn, must be based on a healthy respect for the mechanism of price and value. During the recent inflated prosperity, that mechanism somehow got out of kilter. Now, as the triumph of the small car suggests, it is being restored to working order. The change may be painful, temporarily at least, for some. In the long run, however, it is bound to be good for everyone.

---

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR KENNETH D. McKELLAR

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, a few days ago in this Chamber there were numerous expressions of sorrow over the death of our distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Kenneth D. McKellar.

I regret that I was unable to be present and to participate in the tributes of praise and honor which were paid to this great American statesman, who represented his State of Tennessee in the Senate for more than 35 years.

I desire at this time to associate myself with the sentiments which were voiced here with respect to Senator McKellar's splendid qualities and his outstanding service to his State and the Nation.

It was my good fortune to serve as a member of the Commission on the Renovation of the White House under the chairmanship of Senator McKellar. In carrying out the duties and responsibilities of that undertaking, Senator McKellar gave the same dedicated service and able leadership that made him such a powerful figure in the Senate. I was deeply impressed by his fine appreciation of historic values and the traditions that center about the Executive Mansion.

Senator McKellar was a courageous and uncompromising fighter for the principles to which he gave his wholehearted allegiance and support. There were times when we were divided in our

opinions, but there never was any question as to his honesty, his sincerity, or his unswerving devotion to the public welfare.

I am proud to honor his memory, and extend to the members of his family my deepest sympathy.

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of the late Representative Augustine B. Kelley, a distinguished public servant, whose untimely death on November 30, 1957, came as a severe shock to the people of Pennsylvania and to the Nation.

Congressman Kelley represented the 21st District of Pennsylvania and was serving his 9th term when he passed away.

In his public career and in his private life, Gus Kelley, as he was affectionately known to his constituents and friends, exemplified all that is best in patriotic American citizenship. While we differed politically, I had the highest admiration for him as an able, hard-working, conscientious legislator, whose paramount concern was to advance the welfare of his fellow men.

He was a successful businessman, a devoted family man, and a man of deep religious convictions. He served his country and his church with humility and true reverence for the spiritual values that are sacred to every faith and creed.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which he loved so much, has suffered a severe loss in the passing of Gus Kelley. To his widow and to all who were near and dear to him I extend my deepest sympathy.

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JERE COOPER

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing deep regret and sorrow over the great loss which our Nation has suffered in the death of the late Honorable Jere Cooper.

I have read the tributes which have been paid in both Houses of Congress to his greatness as a statesman and patriot. I know there is little I can add, except to say that I regarded Jere Cooper as one of the ablest Members of Congress and one of the outstanding Americans of our time.

Few men have had such a thorough understanding of the complex problems involved in the tax legislation and the other important issues that came before him as chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. As a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, I had the high privilege of close association with him, and I learned to place a high value on his clear thinking, his sound judgment, and his inspiring example of complete dedication to the national welfare.

I honor Jere Cooper as a valiant soldier who fought in war and peace for a better, stronger America. He will be sadly missed in the years ahead. My deepest sympathy goes out to his family in their tragic loss.

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I regret so much that circumstances beyond my control made it impossible for me to be present on Monday, January 13, when Senators on both sides of the aisle expressed their congratulations and good wishes to our beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I am, therefore, extremely happy at this time to join in the tributes of honor and esteem which were paid to Senator RUSSELL on the 25th anniversary of his distinguished service in the Senate. It is a sincere pleasure to state my complete accord with the high praise which was given his magnificent record of achievement.

I have long admired Senator RUSSELL as a great statesman and patriot whose heart and soul are imbued with love of our country and its sacred ideals. One of the most delightful of my experiences in the Senate, as well as the most rewarding, has been the privilege of our friendship and association. For this I am truly grateful.

Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to offer my warmest congratulations to DICK RUSSELL, with my hope and prayer that his dedicated service in this body may continue far into the future as an inspiration to his colleagues and to all Americans.

## ANTITAX AMENDMENT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Union Leader of January 20, 1958, entitled "Antitax Amendment," pertaining to a constitutional amendment provided for in a joint resolution introduced by my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and myself which forbids one State to tax the income of a nonresident earned within its border.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTITAX AMENDMENT

Taxation without representation is tyranny.

That basic fact sparked the American Revolution. And, translated into the present, it is the basis for the sturdy opposition against Massachusetts levying an income tax on New Hampshire residents who earn their living in the Bay State.

Up to this time, the particular revolt has been hampered by lack of Federal interest. Only a day or two ago, however, a New Jersey Representative considered entering a bill in Congress to overcome this tax hardship. His interest, of course, was not primarily in the Massachusetts-New Hampshire situation, but his attention nevertheless had a bearing on the local problem.

Now comes action from Senators BRIDGES and COTTON, who will offer a bill proposing a constitutional amendment forbidding one State to tax the income of a nonresident when that income is earned within its borders.

Changes in the Constitution are made slowly—sometimes. At other times, however, there is real speed in remedying a wrong. The amendment repealing the prohibition amendment, for example, was transmitted by Congress to the Secretary of State in February 1933 and went into effect in December of that very year. It must be that the Bridges-Cotton proposal also will have popular appeal. It deals with taxes and with lessening the taxing power of State government. That fact is unique in itself.

## JOINT UNITED STATES-U. S. S. R. AGREEMENT ON EXCHANGES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the joint United States-U. S. S. R. communique on agreement on exchanges which was signed at 3 o'clock this afternoon; a statement which was issued by the Department of State; and a letter of understanding concerning the United States-U. S. S. R. agreement on radio-TV exchanges.

I believe all Members of the Senate will be interested in reading the full text of this material.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT UNITED STATES-U. S. S. R. COMMUNIQUE ON AGREEMENT ON EXCHANGES

JANUARY 27, 1958.—The United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics announced today that an agreement on exchanges had been reached. The agreement was signed by Ambassador William S. B. Lacy, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, for the United States, and by Georgi N. Zaroubin, Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for the Soviet Union. The agreement undertakes to provide for exchanges in such mediums as radio and television broadcasts and showing of films, as well as to arrange over the next 2 years for wide exchange in the cultural, technical, and educational fields. In the academic area, exchanges of graduate students, instructors and professors of the universities of both countries will take place for the first time. Exchange of scientists for purposes of lecturing and research are to be worked out by the respective Academies of Science. In medicine and agriculture there are multiple exchange visits covering a 2-year period. Other exchanges are to take place between athletic teams, while outstanding entertainment groups and artists are to visit each other's country.

Some of the exchanges are to begin in the near future. With respect to others—such as direct air flights between New York and Moscow—there was agreement "in principle" and further discussions will be held.

This agreement is regarded as a significant first step in the improvement of mutual understanding between the peoples of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and it is sincerely hoped that it will be carried out in such a way as to contribute substantially to the betterment of relations between the two countries, thereby also contributing to a lessening of international tensions.

The text of the agreement follows:

"AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS ON EXCHANGES IN THE CULTURAL, TECHNICAL, AND EDUCATIONAL FIELDS

"By agreement between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, delegations headed on the Soviet side by Ambassador G. N. Zaroubin and on the United States

side by Ambassador William S. B. Lacy conducted negotiations in Washington from October 28, 1957, to January 27, 1958, with regard to cultural, technical, and educational exchanges between the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A. As a result of these negotiations, which have been carried on in a spirit of mutual understanding, the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to provide for the specific exchanges which are set forth in the following sections during 1958 and 1959 in the belief that these exchanges will contribute significantly to the betterment of relations between the two countries, thereby contributing to a lessening of international tensions.

*"Section I. General*

"(1) The visits and exchanges enumerated in the following sections are not intended to be exclusive of others which may be arranged by the two countries or undertaken by their citizens.

"(2) The exchanges provided for in the following sections shall be subject to the Constitution and applicable laws and regulations in force in the respective countries. It is understood that both parties will use their best efforts to have these exchanges effected in accordance with the following sections.

*"Section II. Exchanges of radio and television broadcasts*

"(1) Both parties will provide for an exchange of radio and television broadcasts on the subjects of science, technology, industry, agriculture, education, public health, and sports.

"(2) Both parties will provide for regular exchanges of radio and television programs, which will include the exchange of transcribed classical, folk and contemporary musical productions on magnetic tape and records; the exchange of filmed musical, literary, theatrical and similar television productions.

"(3) For the purpose of strengthening mutual understanding and developing friendly relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, both parties agree to organize from time to time an exchange of broadcasts devoted to discussion of such international political problems as may be agreed upon between the two parties. The details of the exchanges shall be agreed upon at the working level.

"(4) Both parties will provide for an exchange of samples of equipment for sound-recording and telecasting and their technical specifications.

"(5) Both parties will provide for an exchange of delegations of specialists in 1958 to study the production of radio and television programs, the techniques of sound recording, the equipment of radio and television studios, and the manufacture of films, recording tape, tape recorders, and records.

*"Section III. Exchange of groups of specialists in industry, agriculture, and medicine*

"(1) Both parties agree to provide for an exchange of delegations in 1958 in the fields of iron and steel, mining (iron ore), and plastics industry. Both parties agree as to the desirability of arranging additional exchanges in industry during 1958–59.

"(2) Both sides will provide for the exchange of delegations of specialists in agriculture, the American side receiving during 1958–59 nine delegations of Soviet specialists in the following fields: mechanization of agriculture, animal husbandry, veterinary science, mixed foods, cotton growing, agricultural construction and electrification, horticulture (including vegetable growing), hydroengineering (irrigation) and reclamation, and forestry, lumbering and millwork. In 1958–59 the Soviet side will receive 9 American delegations of specialists in the following fields: the study of agricultural crops, veterinary science, soil use, and the use of water resources (irrigation and drainage), mechanization of agriculture, agricultural economics (excluding distribution of agricultural products), cotton growing and plant psysiology, sheep raising, biological control of agricultural pests, and forestry, lumbering and millwork.

"Details of the exchanges will be agreed upon by representatives of the Embassy of the U. S. S. R. in the United States and of the Department of State of the United States.

"(3) Both parties agree to provide for the exchange in 1958–59 of 8 medical delegations of 5 to 6 specialists for periods of 2 to 6 weeks to become familiar with research and achievement in the following fields: new antibiotics, microbiology, physiology, and pharmacology of the nervous system, radiobiology, biochemistry, metabolic diseases, endocrinology, community and industrial hygiene.

"Both parties recognize the desirability of providing for an exchange of delegations in the field of the manufacture of medical apparatus and instruments.

"(4) Both parties agree in principle to provide for an exchange in 1958 of delegations of specialists in fisheries.

*"Section IV. Visits by representatives of cultural, civic, youth, and student groups*

"(1) For the purpose of establishing contacts, exchanging experiences, and becoming more familiar with the public and cultural life of both countries, the Soviet side will arrange to invite to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics during 1958 groups of American writers (5–6 persons), composers (5–6 persons), painters and sculptors (3–4 persons). In 1958, the United States side reciprocally will arrange to invite similar Soviet groups to visit the United States.

"(2) Both parties will provide for the exchange in 1958–59 of delegations of representatives of youth and delegations of women in various professions.

"(3) Both parties agree to provide for an exchange of delegations of student and youth newspaper editors in 1958–59.

"(4) Both parties will promote the development and strengthening of friendly contacts between Soviet and American cities.

*"Section V. Exchange of visits of delegations of deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. and Members of the United States Congress*

"The proposal to exchange delegations of deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. and Members of the United States Congress will be subject to further discussion between the two parties.

*"Section VI. Joint conferences of U. S. S. R. and United States organizations*

"The desirability of agreement to hold joint conferences of interparliamentary groups in 1958 and 1959 or meetings of representatives of the Soviet and United States associations for the United Nations and UNESCO is a matter for the organizations concerned.

*"Section VII. Cooperation in the field of cinematography*

"Recognizing the importance of developing mutual cooperation between the U. S. S. R. and the United States in the field of motion pictures, both parties have agreed to the following:

"(1) To make provisions for the sale and purchase of motion pictures by the film industries of both countries on the principles of equality and on mutually acceptable financial terms. Toward this end, not later than January 1958, Sovexportfilm will enter into contact with representatives of the motion picture industry in the United States, to be approved by the Department of State of the United States, for the purpose of the sale and purchase of films in 1958.

"(2) To arrange for the holding simultaneously in the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America of film premieres (Soviet films in the United States of America and United States films in the U. S. S. R., respectively), inviting to these premieres leading personalities of the film industries of both countries.

"(3) To carry out in 1958 an exchange of 12 to 15 documentary films in accordance with a list to be mutually agreed upon by the two parties. On the U. S. S. R. side the exchange of documentary films will be carried out by Sovexportfilm, such films to be recorded in the English language, and for the United States of America by the United States Information Agency, such films to be recorded in the Russian language.

"(4) In the second half of 1958 to provide for carrying out for a period of up to 1 month an interchange of delegations of leading motion picture personalities, scenario writers, and technical personnel to be approved by each side for the purpose of becoming acquainted with experiences in the production of motion pictures in the respective countries.

"(5) To recognize the desirability and usefulness of organizing joint production of artistic, popular science and documentary films and of the conducting, not later than May 1958, of concrete negotiations between U. S. S. R. film organizations and United States film companies on this subject, such United States companies to be approved by the Department of State of the United States. The subject matter of the films will be mutually agreed upon by the two parties.

"(6) To recommend to the appropriate United States organizations the making of arrangements for the holding of a Soviet Film Week in the United States in 1958 and to recommend to the appropriate motion picture organizations of the Soviet Union the making of arrangements for the holding of a United States Film Week in the Soviet Union in 1958, and to envision the participation in these film weeks of delegations from each side numbering 3 or 4 motion picture personalities for a period of 2 weeks.

"(7) To recognize the desirability of producing feature films, documentary films, and concert films for television or nontheatrical showing in the United States by Soviet motion picture organizations and the producing of similar films by appropriate United States organizations for television or nontheatrical showing in the Soviet Union. Additional concrete negotiations on this question will be carried on between the Soviet Embassy in the United States of America and the Department of State of the United States.

"(8) To designate a standing committee of 4 members, 2 from the Soviet Union and 2 from the United States, the powers of which will be for a period of 1 year and which will meet once in Moscow and once in Washington during that year to examine problems which may arise in connection with the implementation of the provisions of this section. The authority of this Committee may be extended by mutual agreement.

*"Section VIII. Exchange of theatrical, choral, and choreographic groups, symphony orchestras and artistic performers*

"(1) The Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will invite the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra to visit the Soviet Union in May or June 1958 and will send the ballet troupe of the Bolshoi Theatre of the Soviet Union, numbering 110 to 120 persons, to the United States in 1959 for a period of 1 month.

"(2) The Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the basis of an existing agreement with Hurok Attractions, Inc., and the Academy of the National Theatre and Drama, will send two Soviet performers—E. Gilels, pianist, and L. Kogan, violinist—to the United States in

January to April 1958, and will invite two American soloists—B. Thebom, vocalist, and L. Warren, vocalist—to visit the Soviet Union.

"(3) The Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will send Soviet vocalists I. Petrov, P. Lisitsian, and Z. Dolukhanova, as well as I. Bezrodni, violinist, and V. Ashkenazi, pianist, to the United States and will invite R. Peters, vocalist, L. Stokowski, conductor, and others to visit the Soviet Union.

"(4) The Ministry of Culture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in accordance with an agreement with Hurok Attractions, Inc., will send the State Folk Dance Ensemble of the U. S. S. R. to the United States in April to May 1958, and will consider inviting a leading American theatrical or choreographic group to the Soviet Union in 1959.

"(5) The Soviet side will send the Red Banner Song and Dance Ensemble of the Soviet Army or the Choreographic Ensemble 'Beriozka' to the United States in the fourth quarter of 1958 and invite one of the leading American choreographic groups to visit the Soviet Union.

*"Section IX. Visits by scientists*

"(1) The Academy of Sciences of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the National Academy of Sciences of the United States will, on a reciprocal basis, provide for the exchange of groups or individual scientists and specialists for delivering lectures and holding seminars on various problems of science and technology.

"(2) The Academy of Sciences of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the National Academy of Sciences of the United States will, on a reciprocal basis, provide for the exchange of scientific personnel and specialists for the purpose of conducting joint studies and for specialization for a period of up to 1 year.

"(3) The details of exchanges mentioned in paragraphs (1) and (2) will be agreed upon directly between the presidents of the Academy of Sciences of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the National Academy of Sciences of the United States in Moscow in the early part of 1958.

"(4) The Ministry of Health of the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics will send in 1958 to the United States a group of Soviet medical scientists (3-4 persons) for a period of 2 to 3 weeks to deliver lectures and exchange experiences and will receive a similar group of United States medical scientists to deliver lectures and exchange experiences at the institutes of the Academy of Medical Sciences of the U. S. S. R. and at medical institutes in Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev.

"(5) In 1958 the Ministry of Agriculture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will, on a reciprocal basis, invite United States scientists to visit the U. S. S. R. for the purpost of delivering lectures and exchanging experiences in the fields of biology, selection, pedigreed stockbreeding, agrotechny, mechanization of agriculture, stockbreeding, and others.

*"Section X. Exchange of university delegations*

"(1) Both parties will provide for the exchange in 1958 of 4 delegations of university professors and instructors for a period of 2 to 3 weeks in the fields of natural sciences, engineering education, and liberal arts, and the study of the systems of higher education in the Soviet Union and the United States, each delegation to consist of from 5 to 8 persons.

"(2) Both parties will provide for an exchange of delegations of professors and instructors between Moscow and Columbia Universities and Leningrad and Harvard Universities. Further exchanges of delegations of professors and instructors of other universities of the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A. shall be decided upon as appropriate by both parties.

"(3) Both parties will provide for an exchange of students between Moscow and Leningrad universities, on the one hand, and United States universities, on the other, amounting to 20 persons on each side for the period of the academic year 1958–59. For the academic year 1959–60, the number will be 30. The composition of the student groups shall be determined by each side.

"(4) Both parties will provide for an exchange of delegations of educators (8–10 persons) for a period of 30 days in the latter part of 1958.

*"Section XI. Exchange of individual athletes and athletic teams*

"Both parties will provide for an exchange of individual athletes and athletic teams and in 1958–59 will provide for the holding of the following contests in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and in the United States.

"(1) Basketball games between representative men's and women's teams to be held in the Soviet Union in April 1958.

"(2) Basketball games between representative men's and women's teams to be held in the United States in 1959.

"(3) Wrestling matches between representative teams to be held in the United States in February 1958.

"(4) Wrestling matches between representative teams to be held in the Soviet Union in 1959.

"(5) Track and field contests between representative teams to be held in the Soviet Union in July 1958.

"(6) Track and field contests between representative teams to be held in the United States in 1959.

"(7) Weight-lifting contests between representative teams to be held in the United States in May 1958.

"(8) Canadian hockey games between representative teams to be held in the Soviet Union in March-April 1958.

"(9) Chess tournaments between representative teams to be held in the United States in 1958.

"The details of these exchanges of athletes and athletic teams as well as financial arrangements for these exchanges shall be discussed between appropriate Soviet and American sports organizations.

*"Section XII. Development of tourism*

"Both parties will promote the development of tourism.

*"Section XIII. Exchange of exhibits and publications*

"(1) Both sides agree in principle on the usefulness of exhibits as an effective means of developing mutual understanding between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States. Toward this end both sides will provide for an exchange of exhibits on the peaceful uses of atomic energy in 1958.

"(2) Both parties will promote the further development of exchange of publications and various works in the field of science and technology between scientific institutions and societies and between individual scientists and specialists.

"(3) Provisions will be made for the Central Scientific Medical Library of the Ministry of Health of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and corresponding medical libraries in the United States to exchange medical journals.

"(4) Both parties will promote the exchange of curricula, textbooks, and scientific pedagogical literature through the appropriate agencies of higher and secondary education and directly between educational institutions.

"(5) The Ministry of Health of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will arrange to make available in 1958 from 8 to 10 medical films for presentation in the United States. On a reciprocal basis, the United States will arrange to make available the same number of American medical films for presentation in the Soviet Union.

"(6) The Ministry of Agriculture of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Department of Agriculture of the United States are prepared to exchange in 1958 films on such agricultural subjects as stockbreeding, mechanization of agriculture, construction and utilization of irrigation and drainage systems, protection of plants from pests and blights, and fight against erosion.

"(7) The representatives of the Soviet and American sides, having exchanged their views on the problems of distributing the magazines USSR in the United States and Amerika in the Soviet Union, have agreed on the desirability and necessity of promoting the distribution of these magazines on the basis of reciprocity. Examination of measures taken by both parties to achieve this end will continue at the ambassadorial level.

*"Section XIV. Establishment of direct airflights*

"Both parties agree in principle to establish on the basis of reciprocity direct airflights between the United States and the Soviet Union. Negotiations on terms and conditions satisfactory to both parties will be conducted by appropriate representatives of each Government at a mutually convenient date to be determined later."

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*January 27, 1958.*

With reference to the agreement on exchanges entered into with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics today, it was noted that, on the United States side, the exchanges will, for the most part, be carried out by private persons and organizations. In the United States, private persons cannot, of course, be directed to participate in such activities. During the course of the negotiations the various persons, firms, and corporations concerned with the proposed exchanges were consulted, and they have expressed their willingness and desire to participate. The agreement is entered into subject to the applicable United States laws and regulations, including the availability of funds.

---

LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING CONCERNING UNITED STATES-U. S. S. R. AGREEMENT ON RADIO-TV EXCHANGES

JANUARY 27, 1958.

Identical letters relating to paragraph (3) of section II of the United States-U. S. S. R. agreement on exchanges were exchanged as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1958.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: With respect to paragraph (3) of section II of the agreement signed this date, it is the understanding of both parties to the agreement that the texts of such broadcasts shall be exchanged in advance and discussed at the working level. In the event that either party shall consider that the effect of any such broadcast will not contribute to a betterment of relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the exchange of such broadcast shall not take place.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. B. LACY.
(GEORGI N. ZAROUBIN).

(His Excellency Georgi N. Zaroubin, Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.)

(His Excellency William S. B. Lacy, Department of State.)

---

## SOIL BANK PAYMENTS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on January 16 of this year the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] placed in the RECORD a copy of

an article appearing in Look magazine entitled "Fraud, Graft, and Folly in the Farm Program." Because of the title of this article, it could lead readers to believe that farmers mentioned in Arizona as participating in the soil bank program were guilty of some criminal action. Nothing could be further from the truth. These men acted in accordance with the law and under the terms of legislation passed by Congress, which laws the Secretary of Agriculture is required to administer.

Because of the inclusion of these Arizona farmers in this article and the inferences that can be drawn, I ask unanimous consent that an article that has been prepared to answer this Look magazine story be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In its issue of October 1, 1957, Look magazine ran an article entitled "Fraud, Graft, and Folly in the Farm Program," which made certain statements about stabilization and other programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture. Most of the items to which the article referred had been previously covered in Congressional hearings and were a matter of record. The following summary includes the essential facts with regard to each of the major points discussed in the Look article. In each case the charge is stated briefly, followed by the facts.

SOIL BANK

1. Reference is made to the fact that a producer put cotton acreage in the soil bank in Arizona, and then planted even more cotton in another county. By leaving out some of the essential facts, and quoting Mr. Harris, the article left the impression that this was normal procedure—that there were no safeguards in the program to check this sort of activity.

The facts: The record shows that Mr. Jack A. Harris put about 1,660 acres of Pima County, Ariz., land in the 1957 cotton acreage reserve program of the soil bank. This was land with an established cotton acreage allotment, based on past production history for that farm. Taking these acres out of production furthered the production adjustment objective of the acreage reserve. The action was in accord with legislative and program provisions. It properly qualified for soil bank payments of a little more than $200,000, on the basis of a payment rate of about 15 cents a pound for the normal yield. There was no maximum limit on size of possible acreage reserve payments under the 1957 program.

However, when Mr. Harris produced 4,639.5 acres of 1957 cotton on land in another county in Arizona he was very definitely "outside" program regulations. There was no cotton allotment for this land. The cotton produced is subject to a marketing quota penalty, based on 18½ cents a pound for the normal yield of the farm. The official notice of marketing quota penalty has been mailed from the county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation office. The total penalty based on a normal yield of 1,125 pounds of cotton per acre amounts of $965,595.84.

(NOTE.—This amount has been paid by Mr. Harris.)

This large penalty was not mentioned at all in the article. When it is considered, the whole operation appears in a quite different light. It does not appear very attractive for a producer to earn payments based on 15 cents a pound for not growing cotton on one farm, and then incur penalties of 18½ cents a pound for growing it on another farm. There is no justification for the inference that a producer could profit substantially by this sort of attempted program evasion.

By legislative and administrative action, program provisions have been tightened even more for 1958. There will be a limit of $3,000 on acreage reserve payments which can be earned by any one produced on one farm. Violation of acreage allotment provisions for the crop on one farm will disqualify a producer for acreage reserve participation on any other farm he operates. And, as was true this year, production outside acreage allotments will not count in establishing future allotments—no "production history" is earned by any such excess plantings.

2. Two cases are mentioned where men leased farmland from areas in Kansas controlled by military agencies, and then earned payments under the 1956 acreage reserve of the soil bank for "not growing wheat." The impression was given that idle land was leased from one Government agency with the intent of immediately putting part of it in the soil bank at a profit—a sort of "current" operation which should have been prevented.

The facts: In both cases, and before the soil bank was even proposed, the farmland in question had been leased for 5-year periods. In one case, in Ellsworth County, the land was leased from the Kanopolis Dam and Reservoir area for the period from August 1, 1955, to July 31, 1960. In the other case, in Saline County, the land was leased from the Camp Phillips Airbase for the period from August 1, 1953, to July 31, 1958.

In both cases, there were established wheat acreage allotments which the producers were entitled to use. The wheat allotment was 112 acres on the Ellsworth County tract; 59 acres on the Saline County tract.

When the producers put these wheat allotment lands in the soil bank for 1956, thereby taking them out of production, they were making the same contribution to needed wheat production adjustment which was made by other farmers who took part in the program. They were entitled to payment on the same basis as others. They were operating the farmlands under term contracts which did not bar them from producing wheat, or putting allotment land in the soil bank.

In accordance with a Presidential memorandum of May 21, 1956, any leases of farmland by agencies of the Federal Government since that date include a prohibition against the production on that land of any price-supported crops which are in surplus supply. Such land would not be eligible for the soil bank acreage reserve.

3. Reference is made to an instance in Butler County, Ky., where land listed by a producer as farmland for inclusion in the 1956 corn acreage reserve of the soil bank was found to be covered with brush. The article says that it was ruled that the producer could qualify for acreage reserve payments if he cleared off the brush.

The facts: When this case was investigated by the Department in the spring of 1957, it was detemined that the producer was not entitled to compensation, and that he would be required to return the full amount of any payment he had received erroneously under a local interpetation of the regulations. The entire payment of $99.96 was refunded by the farmer on July 17, 1957.

4. It is stated that some farmland owners in Kentucky who had jobs in town had "no intention" of planting a crop that year, but that "when the Soil Bank arrived they got paid for their lack of intentions." The article goes on to compare this with a suburbanite collecting money for "promising not to grow corn on his lawn."

The facts: Such a producer would have to have an established acreage allotment, based on recent production history, to be eligible to take part in the acreage reserve and be entitled to the normal payment. In fact, part-time farmers have been encouraged to take part in the soil bank as a contribution to needed production adjustment. There is no valid comparison with owners of city lawns. Obviously, there would be no basic crop production history of basis for program participation.

DROUGHT AID PROGRAM

The article mentions reports that there were irregularities in the use of special aid extended by the Government to farmers and ranchers who were hit hard by the severe drought of the 1953–56 period. Scattered examples are listed in such a way as to give the impression that misuse of aid was very widespread, that many received aid who were not entitled to it, and the Department of Agriculture was slow or reluctant in taking steps to prevent or penalize violations of program regulations.

The facts: Virtually all of the instances mentioned in the article were previously reported to Congressional committees on the basis of information supplied by audit and investigation services of the Department itself. The information was part of the printed record of hearings held by these committees.

The Department, of course, knows that there are likely to be some irregularities and misuses in programs which involve millions of dollars in public funds. It therefore is constantly on the lookout for evidence of fraud, conversion, or other action which would hamper the proper conduct of its programs. It sets up safeguards, and takes action promptly when indications of irregularity are found. This includes the reference of more serious cases to the Department of Justice for appropriate action.

The size of the drought emergency programs is indicated by the fact that a total of 2,800,000 individual purchase orders for feed grain were issued to farmers and ranchers during the past 3 years. There was also a large volume of similar orders under the hay and roughage program. To check these big operations, audits and investigations were initiated both by agencies in the Department and by administrative offices in the States. These audits and investigations go on continuously. They have uncovered some instances where emergency purchase orders were used to get something other than the eligible feed, and some others where individuals should not have been granted the special aid. Action has been prompt in these cases, and in the meantime few if any distressed farmers and ranchers have been denied needed assistance.

The article makes a special point of drought assistance extended to the King Ranch in Texas, implying that this violated a requirement that a producer must show financial need to be eligible. The fact is that King Ranch received feed under the drought program only in 1953, when financial need was not a condition of eligibility. As the drought developed that year, a special program was put into effect quickly to help farmers and ranchers get supplemental feed supplies. The objective was to avoid forced liquidation of breeding herds. The supplemental supplies were made available to cover essential feed requirements for periods of only 30 days, or less. King Ranch requested, and received, assistance in getting cottonseed pellets on the basis of the need for 30,000 head of cattle. There were more than 50,000 head on the ranch at the time. The ranch paid $35 a ton for the pellets, or about $33,000 for a little less than 1,000 tons.

Under the more fully developed drought relief programs which were in effect during the 1954–56 period, a certification of financial need was required for eligibility to receive emergency feed grain purchase orders, which would cover part of the cost of commercially bought feed supplies. King Ranch requested no assistance during these years.

BURRUS MILLS

The article refers to storage of Commodity Credit Corporation grain in tents by Burrus Mills, Inc., of Dallas, Tex. After reporting that this type of tent storage did not work out satisfactorily, and that there was substantial deterioration of the grain in store, the article states erroneously that the cost to taxpayers was "large but undetermined."

The facts: There was an extremely tight storage situation for wheat in the spring of 1954. Burrus Mills, a financially responsible company with many years successful experience in handling grain, proposed at that time a plan under which it would store surplus CCC wheat in specially designed tent facilities.

CCC agreed to the proposal with the provision that the wheat be stored under the full protection of the uniform grain storage agreement. This agreement, which is standard for all commercial storage of CCC grain, requires the warehouseman to insure redelivery of the full quantity, grade, and quality of grain which was deposited for storage. With these guaranties, a total of 37 million bushels of wheat was placed in the special tent storage at two locations: Fort Worth, Tex., and St. Joseph, Mo.

By the spring of 1956, it became apparent that Burrus Mills could no longer maintain the quality of the wheat in store. Steps were taken immediately to start removing the CCC wheat from the tent facilities and to protect the interests of the Government. Much of the wheat was exported for feed use, to avoid undue impact on the domestic market. All sales of the deteriorated wheat for export have been made at the full world price for the quality of wheat sold. Burrus Mills has been held liable for the full difference between the actual export sales price and the export value of the grade and quality of the wheat originally deposited by the Government for storage in the Burrus facilities.

At no time has Burrus Mills questioned its liability to the Government. While unfortunately the loss to its stockholders will be substantial, taxpayers will suffer no loss as a result of the tent storage operation. The Government is adequately insured against loss by first liens on all plants, facilities, and equipment owned by the company in the United States.

The article states that "The Agriculture Department thinks it lost $8 million" on the tent storage operations. This is wrong. The Department does not think it will lose anything. After applying to the Burrus Mills indebtedness a total of $4.7 million in withheld warehouse earnings, it was estimated that the company would still owe CCC about $8 million. As explained above, the Government is fully protected and expects no loss at all.

GRAIN BINS

The article mentions defective grain bins purchased by the United States Department of Agriculture in 1954.

The facts: In the spring of 1954, it became apparent that the Department would have to find storage space for nearly 400 million bushels of 1953-crop corn to be taken over under the price-support operation. When it was found that commercial storage in this huge amount would not be available, the United States Department of Agriculture added to its emergency bin-type storage capacity about 55,000 CCC-owned grain bins with a total storage capacity of about 206 million bushels.

All of the grain bins purchased by USDA in 1954 were covered by manufacturers' warranties against defects. During the 1-year period covered by the warranty, a number of the bins of one manufacturer were found not to be up to standard. As soon as inspections of bin sites by USDA officials turned up the defective bins, the defects were called to the attention of the manufacturer involved for corrective action. To guarantee the Government full protection against loss, the manufacturer extended from a 1-year period to a 4-year period the warranty on all of the 8,960 metal bins he had supplied. The manufacturer also posted an additional surety bond for $1 million.

Thus, USDA's investment in these bins is not in any way in jeopardy. The manufacturer under the extended warranty has agreed to undertake any repairs necessary to assure that all such bins will be grain-tight, weather-tight, and structurally sound. Total loses of grain to date, as reported by field offices, amount to only $16, which has been paid by the manufacturer. Removal of grain from defective bins to date has cost $1,410, which also has been paid by the manufacturer. The bins are being rechecked periodically to make sure that the defects are corrected and that any new ones that might develop are repaired.

SPECIAL DURUM WHEAT PROVISIONS

The article refers to the fact that in North Dakota farmers were permitted to increase their acreage of durum wheat under special legislative provisions, while at the same time farmers could collect payment under the Soil Bank for reducing their acreage of spring wheat. Speaking of "conflicting bounty laws," it implies that there was no logic or reason in the two programs involved.

The facts: North Dakota produces two classes of wheat, with very different end-uses. Hard red spring wheat is used primarily for bread flour; durum what is used primarily for flour to make macaroni and spaghetti. In 1956, the year in question, there was a surplus of hard wheat but a severe shortage of durum wheat.

There was therefore no real contradiction in programs aimed at cutting the surplus of one crop, through the Acreage Reserve of the Soil Bank, while at the same time encouraging an increase of another crop, through the special Durum Wheat Act allotment plan. And there was no real contradiction in permitting a farmer to take part in both programs in the same year. By reducing his acreage of hard red spring wheat, he was helping to make needed downward production adjustments. By taking advantage of increased allotments for durum wheat, a special crop, he was helping meet a serious shortage.

GRAIN TRADERS

The article says that grain traders sometimes blend high-quality Government grain with inferior stocks of their own, and as a result the Government is "forced to take a lower price abroad. Grain operators profit. Taxpayers lose."

The facts: The statement overlooks the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation, as required by law, operates through private trade channels insofar as practicable. Except for the rare instances where a foreign government insists on buying directly from CCC, all sales of CCC grains for export are made to private United States exporters who, in turn, sell the grain abroad. Hence, any decline in quality resulting from a blending of grain sold by CCC with other grain owned by the exporter would be at the exporter's expense, not CCC's or the taxpayer's.

The Department requires each warehouseman to maintain the quality of any CCC-owned grain he stores. The grain is stored commingled for reasons of practicability, but the warehouseman is required to move out of storage, when CCC so orders, grain of the same quality CCC put into storage. Thus, any deterioration in quality during storage is at the warehouseman's expense.

In instances where the Department uses "fobbers," who act as agents for CCC in moving grain forward to or in storing it at port, a continuing check is maintained to see that no unethical practices are followed. In the instance cited in the article, the Department itself initiated an investigation when a probable "conflict of interest" was suspected.

COTTON TRADERS

The article says that "traders as well as farmers are in a position to turn a fast buck," implying that the Department sanctions this or is indifferent to it. Cited is a Justice Department indictment against certain cotton traders.

The facts: The Department is constantly on the alert against any attempt to "turn a fast buck" in connection with its programs. It was on the alert in this instance.

In April 1955, the Commodity Credit Corporation received copies of circular letters issued by Wolf & Co., Cotton Exchange Building, New Orleans, La., in which the company announced that it would calculate bids on CCC cotton for its customers at the minimum CCC sales prices and that it would guide its customers' bidding and keep them from bidding on any cotton on which bids had already been submitted.

Since it appeared that this would tend to prevent competitive bidding on CCC cotton in violation of the Antitrust Act and other statutes, the Department of Agriculure promptly brought the matter to the attention of the Department of Justice.

Following an investigation by the FBI, a criminal indictment under the Antitrust Act was returned against Morris Wolf, John E. Godchaux (an employee of Wolf & Co.), and certain of the cotton firms and individuals for whom Wolf & Co. acted as agent in the purchase of cotton from CCC. A civil action was also instituted. At the present time, these cases are still pending.

DRIED MILK FOR FEED

The article refers to a large loss incurred by the Department in selling surplus nonfat dry milk (dried skim milk) for animal feed.

The facts: The sale of nonfat dry milk for animal feed in 1954 was part of an overall effort to find useful outlets for the huge surpluses of agricultural commodities acquired under price support activities.

Early in 1954 the Government had accumulated a record large inventory of nonfat dry milk—much more than could be donated for human consumption through every available outlet. At the same time a serious shortage in commercial high-protein feeds was developing and threatening to put a serious price squeeze on livestock producers. Realizing that the surplus nonfat dry milk in Government hands was a tremendous potential reservoir of perfectly acceptable protein-feed supplement, the administration quickly developed a program to fill the protein feed void and at the same time move a surplus commodity for which insufficient outlets were in sight.

The program was highly successful. The price at which the dry milk was sold to feed manufacturers was comparable to market prices for other protein feed supplements such as soybean and cottonseed meal; and market price data indicate that mixed feed prices declined during the summer of 1954 coincident with CCC's sale of nonfat dry milk for feed use. Since this occurred at a time when the general protein supply situation was such as to bring about an increase in feed prices, it's hard to see how feed manufacturers could have made a "windfall of $10 million" on the CCC sales, as charged in the article.

To prevent impairment in the price support program for milk and butterfat which might have resulted from the large CCC sales of nonfat dry milk for feed, the Department also made available in 1954 a nonrecourse loan on whey products. Whey products are used for feed supplement, and the availability of low-cost dry milk would otherwise have caused processors to reduce their purchases of liquid whey from cheese factories. This in turn would have reduced

the prices paid to producers for milk. The $3 million cost of the whey price-support program was less than the additional cost which CCC would have incurred in prolonged storing of the large stocks of nonfat dry milk sold for feed.

The sale of nonfat dry milk for feed cleared the way for CCC to hold its inventories at reduced levels. Since mid-1954 all possible human food uses have been amply filled from the more than 2 billion pounds of nonfat dry milk purchased since then. The sales-for-feed program accomplished a twofold objective of (1) reducing Government stocks of nonfat dry milk to manageable levels and (2) stabilizing mixed feed prices at a time when livestock and poultry producers were facing a difficult cost situation due to tight protein feed supplies. Further, all this was accomplished at less than the average loss the Government takes in disposing of nonfat dry milk acquired under the mandatory price support operation.

CHEESE SALE

The article refers to the payment of over $2 million to some of the Nation's leading cheese companies in what it calls a weird transaction.

The facts: Early in 1954 the Department announced that dairy price supports would be lowered on April 1, 1954, because of a lack of balance between production of milk and consumption of dairy products.

In anticipation of this reduction in the price-support level, processors began stripping their inventories by selling dairy products to CCC. This indicated the possible development of an absurd situation in which there would be huge stocks of dairy products in Government hands and yet actual shortages at consumer levels. Also, it appeared that processors would start discounting milk prices paid prior to April 1 to avoid possible inventory losses later.

To meet this situation, the Department modified its dairy purchase and sales operations. Under this modified plan anyone who offered dairy products, including cheese, for sale to CCC at the March support prices would be permitted to hold the products in their own warehouses pending completion of a contract to buy the products back from CCC in April at the lower April support prices. The objective of this plan was to effect a smoother transition to the lower April price-support level (1) by preventing an emptying of consumer channels with a resultant loss of consumption of dairy products, and (2) by assuring producers of the full March level of support right up to the time that the level went down on April 1. This temporary plan provided for holding the stocks acquired by CCC in March in position to move rapidly into commercial consumption channels, at the same time relieving CCC of unnecessary paperwork and transportation and storage costs during the period.

Whether this method of combining a purchase and sale in one contract in the interest of reducing paperwork met the technical requirements of a purchase of dairy products by CCC, and sale by CCC back to the seller, is now being tested in several court cases.

It did have these important economic benefits: (1) No shortages of cheese or other dairy products showed up in consumer channels during the early part of April 1954; (2) producer prices stayed at the support level in March 1954; (3) CCC disposed of many millions of pounds of cheese at a very small loss as compared to losses on other dispositions of cheese.

POLITICAL INFLUENCE

The article reports that a State political committee endeavored to influence the appointment of local Department of Agriculture employees. It also says, with obvious disapproval, that a motel operator was appointed to a position as farm office manager, apparently referring to the managers of county agricultural stabilization and conservation offices.

The facts: County office managers must meet minimum standards established by State ASC committees with the approval of the Department. They apply to all counties in a State, and in no cases do the standards require political affiliation. The county managers are selected and employed by the county ASC committee, which is composed of three farmers, who are elected by their neighbors, and the local county extension agent, who serves as an ex officio member.

Ownership or operation of a motel, a farm, or other business enterprise would not in itself disqualify one for service as a county manager or indicate that he was not fully competent to handle the job. In fact, his business experience might well add to his qualifications.

ILLINOIS SCHOOL-LUNCH DISTRIBUTION

The article stated that some Federal farm funds wind up in the school-lunch program, both in surplus commodities and in money to deliver the goods to the States. Thereafter, the States assume the cost of distributing the food within their borders. Investigation by Chairman Fountain's subcommittee, prompted by a Chicago Sun-Times exposure, turned up this story in Illinois: James W. Dunbar, Republican probate clerk of Sangamon County, also headed a trucking firm, Dunbar & Co. He got an exclusive contract from his good friend, Vernon L. Nickell, Illinois superintendent of public instruction, to distribute Government surplus commodities to schools and State institutions. Dunbar's trucking outfit, which had been losing money, suddenly prospered. By its own reckoning, it made $396,000 in 29 months of distributing school-lunch supplies, but the subcommittee said profits "greatly exceeded" that amount because of questionable items charged off as business expenses. Travel charges against school-lunch distribution totaled $66,707, said the committee, including $555.90 for rail tickets and a chartered plane for a fishing trip by Dunbar, Nickell, and Harold A. Wolfe, Illinois school-lunch director. Dunbar explained: "It was about the only time we could sit down and talk about the school-lunch program and get their different versions of it."

Other expenses included two round-trip air tickets to Florida, $1,344 for football tickets, and other sums for liquor.

"Inordinate profits of Dunbar & Co.," said the subcommittee, "constituted the major portion of the excessive cost of distributing donated commodities in Illinois." The State of Illinois indicted Dunbar and three others, but a panel of judges quashed the indictments.

The facts: This account states the significant fact about the Illinois distribution operations—then proceeds to ignore this fact that it has already stated:

Surplus foods are donated to eligible recipients under a cooperative arrangement between the Federal Government and State governments whereby the States arrange for all distribution within the State.

The Department ships the commodities in carload lots, freight prepaid, to receiving points designated by the State. Title to the commodities passes to the State upon their arrival and acceptance at the delivery point. The States have full responsibility for arranging for all distribution within the State.

The contract between the Department and State distributing agencies provides that the State agency "accept responsibility for the distribution or use of (any surplus) commodities—and provide or cause to be provided proper facilities and arrangements for the acceptance and distribution or use of such commodities."

The contract with Dunbar & Co. was made by the State of Illinois, within the area of its responsibility, stated in the cooperative agreement.

Although this contract was the State's responsibility, the Department attempted to persuade the State to modify certain arrangements. Here is the record of the Department's efforts in that regard:

In June 1952, when the State department of public instruction entered into the contract with Dunbar & Co., the Department expressed concern over the rates to be charged recipients for delivery of commodities. Assurance was received that the rates were set on a temporary basis, and were to be reviewed after operating experience had been gained.

Periodically, the Department further questioned the rates being charged by Dunbar & Co. under its contract, and the State obtained some reductions, although insufficient reductions.

Continuing its interest, the Department undertook a special survey of rates charged by Dunbar. This survey was completed on February 25, 1955. It indicated that the rates charged were excessive.

The Department informed the State of the survey results, and requested the State to provide a specific plan providing for either: (1) a reduction in the rates charged to a reasonable level, or (2) development of an alternative method of distributing commodities within the State that would provide for reasonable charges to recipients.

The State requested Dunbar & Co. to reduce rates, Dunbar refused, and the Illinois-Dunbar contract was terminated as of April 1, 1955.

On August 10, 1955, completing the Department's efforts to develop satisfactory distribution of surplus commodities in the State of Illinois, the State agency entered into a contract with another commercial trucking company providing for substantially reduced charges.

FARMER REACTION

The magazine article stated that "Many farmers don't like the mess any more than the taxpayers. (As if in frustrated reprisal against a system nobody really understands, an enraged Georgia farmer recently bit the left ear off a Government credit agent who had come to talk about the farmer's loan.) But while the system exists, people will take advantage of it."

The facts: FHA borrower Abner W. Wheeles, Rochelle, Ga., obtained his first loan from this Agency in 1953. Mr. Wheeles still owes amounts on two loans received from the Agency.

County FHA Supervisor Ray Stephens, headquartered at Rochelle, Ga., was making a regular farm visit to the Wheeles farm on July 25, 1957, in connection with servicing the loans owed the Agency. Borrower Wheeles became enraged when the supervisor arrived at his farm and spoke very unkind words to Supervisor Stephens. Borrower Wheeles immediately attacked Supervisor Stephens by delivering a severe blow on his head with his fists. A scuffle between the two men ensued and during the scuffle, borrower Wheeles bit and with his teeth completely tore off Supervisor Stephens' left ear.

FARM LOAN SERVICING

The article pointed out that "Around the Nation, lucrative legal aspects of farm loans were switched from Government to private attorneys, with Republican lawyers getting the gravy."

The facts: On September 20, 1954, the Farmers' Home Administration issued and published regulations covering the making of soil and water conservation loans based upon the recently enacted amendment to the Water Facilities Act. Most soil and water loans were to be secured by liens on the farms in connection with which the loans were to be made. Such loans would vary in

size and would need to be closed as expeditiously as possible. Because of these facts, the Agency adopted a policy of designating local private attorneys, wherever feasible, to perform the title clearance work and to represent the Agency in the closing of such loans. This policy made it possible to close many loans in a shorter period than would have been possible under other methods, and also enabled many borrowers to obtain the benefits of the loans at less cost.

From September 20, 1954, until June 30, 1956, this method of handling the title clearance work was only used in connection with the soil and water conservation loans. Based upon the experience by the Agency under this policy for this type of loan, the same general policy was adopted on June 30, 1956, for all of the real estate loans made by the Agency.

A revision of this title clearance policy is now being prepared for issuance by the Agency which will give the recipients of real estate loans an option as to the method to be used in obtaining title clearance. The cost of title clearance services and the amount of time involved in obtaining this type of service vary greatly throughout the country. The revised policy is being adopted to permit more local flexibility in connection with the title clearance work so as to permit borrowers to choose the method most beneficial to them.

MONTANA FHA CHAIRMAN

Reference was made to the effect that "in Montana, Carl O. Hansen, State Farmers Home Administration boss, was forced to resign amid conflict of interest charges. Hansen bought wool on a commission basis for a private firm while directing the State FHA office. An assistant on the Government payroll helped Hansen with the private wool purchases."

The facts: Mr. Carl O. Hansen did resign as State director of the Farmers' Home Administration on March 21, 1956, and such resignation was immediately accepted by the then Administrator of the Agency. This action took place during the time when an investigation was being conducted because of information the Department had received regarding possible "conflict of interest" in connection with State Director Hansen.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in an effort to ascertain the extent to which payments had been made to farmers in other States, particularly the State represented by the senior Senator from Montana, I have obtained information relative to agriculture payments in that general area, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list of payments was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

List of people in Montana who received soil-bank payments in excess of $50,000, none.

List of people in Montana who received CCC payments in excess of $50,000:

*Wheat loans, 1956 crop*

| | |
|---|---|
| Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin, Mont | $312,998.02 |
| Bill McCarter, Galata, Mont | 124,146.35 |
| McNutt Bros., Eugene, Oreg | 122,641.57 |
| E. G. Onstad, Carter, Mont | 102,740.19 |
| Donald Meyer and John Meyer Inverness, Mont | 102,023.00 |

(Figures on 1957 crop will not be available until June.)

*Wheat loans, 1955 crop*

| | |
|---|---|
| Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin, Mont | $456,650.83 |
| E. G. Onstad, Carter, Mont | 185,033.12 |
| Elton Good, Floweree, Mont | 115,115.81 |
| McNutt Bros., Eugene, Oreg | 106,065.60 |
| Meyer & Meyer, Inverness, Mont | 95,325.86 |

*Wheat loans, 1954 crop*

| | |
|---|---|
| Campbell Farming Crop, Hardin, Mont | $430,691.00 |
| H. B. and Allen Kolstad, Chester, Mont | 224,003.00 |
| Bill Frazer and H. B. Kolstad, Chester, Mont | 115,649.00 |
| McNutt Bros. (operate farm in Liberty County, Mont.), Eugene, Oreg | 100,714.00 |
| Floyd Warren, Inc., Hardin, Mont | 73,522.00 |

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this is not to be construed as an indictment of these individuals, any more than I think the Look magazine article should be construed as an indictment of the Arizona farmers, but I think it is an excellent way in which to point out the improbability of correcting economic trouble with political action.

Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

---

## AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Open Letter to the Congress," appearing in Flying magazine of January 1958, written by Gill Robb Wilson.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS

My soul writhed with indignation when, following World War II, the free nations defaulted their mission to humanity and permitted the Soviet Union to set up satellites of the Balkan countries, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and China, and this fundamentally because the spokesmen of constitutional government led by American policymakers did not comprehend the significance of the air environment which at the time was almost exclusively theirs to command.

It required no gift of prophecy to foresee the evolving result. And already this visionless attitude has delivered over to the Soviet the opportunity to set up additional satellites of such significance as to introduce man to the frontiers of his universe.

Having lived to see this day, I well may live to see the ultimate cumulative effects of this astigmatism in tragic climax unless American leadership comes to look with the eye of moral responsibility upon the air environment in which the fates of peoples and nations will be forged henceforth for centuries.

Year after year and decade upon decade, I have pled and warned that the air environment is more than an area of mechanical contrivance for telescoping distance and compacting time. It is a measure of the imaginative will and dedication of a people to project their ideas and ideals. If these ideas and ideals are no longer a great motivating force in their lives, the fact is quickly evident in their apathy toward opportunity to project them. And, of course, such a condition is accurately indicative of the decline of any nation as leader of civilization.

Our enduring danger is not communism per se. Communism, with its vast cynicisms for the dignity of the human being and its disregard for the deeper instincts of society, had but one purpose to serve—revolution. But society cannot live continuously on revolution. Already Mr. Khrushchev has had to portray Stalin and his revolutionary regime as devils, and to cast the Molotov coterie and even Zhukov into outer darkness. He had no other choice—either that or disavowal of communism as a productive ideology, an untimely action. Already, the blood, sweat, and tears or revolution had become a surfeit. A Communist leader today must promise to people peace, prosperity, and prestige just as must the spokesman of any other political formula.

The leadership of the United States had an unparalleled opportunity to contain communism in its revolutionary context, where it would wither as provenly unproductive of anything but ceaseless toil, endless frustration, and constant fear.

This golden opportunity for American statesmen lay in the air environment where continuous and unmatchable American achievement could markedly stalemate anything achieved in the name of communism. Every free thinking man knows that Soviet technological triumph is not the product of Marxism but that it can and is made to appear so by a controlled propaganda. (Actually the Kremlin took the free enterprise tenet of incentive reward for the individual who makes good on his opportunity, and turned it against us in the name of communism.)

But American leadership has adamantly refused to recognize the air environment for what it is—the frontier of modern statecraft, the portal to fresh intellectual horizons, the atmosphere of a better human destiny. Having all the proven physical possibilities to make the globe manageable and disciplined for a united human family, the air environment still could not be envisioned by our leaders as the one essential area in which the United States must be superlatively progressive. As a result the blind have led the blind into a ditch. Red leaders, seizing this situation in the name of communism, have bridged the chasm between where their cruel and bitter ideology stood as a tool of revolution, to attain a psychological plateau where it now stands, although in false colors, as a political system capable of offering its people the scientific and intellectual leadership of civilization.

Today the Soviet satellites are the cocks crowing up the sun of the cosmos as man mounts the ramparts of the universe. Concurrently, evidence denies the American potential to forge its mission to civilization in this vaster environment. Only reorientation of American statecraft and a consequent rebirth of national character could contrive this miracle and I see no stirring consciousness of such necessity.

This is a bitter realization. With a myriad others, I had hoped that our own people and Government would lead the nations into the new environment. I had trusted that our constitutional Republic and free people would design their unborn something better than a second rate fate. Self-government is the most desirable of all social systems. Freedom is the greatest of all boons. But these jewels are available only to those who cherish them. And although we Americans have shown an amazing capacity to rise to emergency, this capacity diminishes sharply in the dynamic air environment where the pace of history too is supersonic.

From present evidence it seems questionable that our tragically abused Western experiment with self-government will survive the turn of the next century. The pattern of decline and fall which has brought all former empire to its knees is becoming vividly apparent in the tapestry of our national life. The very concept of nationalism appears fragmented by our divisive forces. Our advances into too many fields of human progress lately have been forced upon us by circumstance rather than elected by the dynamic of our own vision.

Where dire necessity has forced some notable phase of technological superiority such as the long range bomber, the atom bomb,

the jet engine, the supersonic aircraft, and guided missile, we have sat on the accomplishment until our lead time was dissipated in each successive case and fresh emergency was created—the Soviet achievement of power to hoist the intercontinental missile and the earth satellites being the latest example in point.

In view of these evidences of an habitual pattern of expediency in such a fundamental as defense, we are now forced to consider the possibility that our Government has become both bureaucratic to the point of ineffectiveness and helplessly vulnerable to the divisionary effects of politics.

The unhappy evidence is voluminous and progressive. No political administration can escape its indictment. Furthermore, we the people, are a party to it—palsied patriotism, materialistic self-interest, class antagonism, intellectual apathy. We deserve little.

But inspiration and vision should come from the top, and our statecraft has not been inspiring or effective for many years. In fact, it has been impoverished in spirit, wavering in judgment and barren of vision. Though the blood of the citizen has purchased victory that the land might be secure, our leaders have been unable to capitalize on the sacrifice. Even peace has eluded them. Though the young pilots and the artisans and scientists have stood ready to exploit the universe for the national security, the Government does not take advantage of their readiness. Though the airmen, the trail blazers of the air environment, again and again have demonstrated their adequacy as an instrument of national policy, the Government refuting the evidence, has compromised with its mortal enemies—murderers, assassins and atheists though they be—and actually set them up in business—Germany, the Balkans, China, Korea, the Northern Pacific, and now the Near East.

All of this has transpired impartially during successive political administrations to the point where the gravest danger faced by the United States has become public loss of confidence in Government. Nor can this circumstance be ameliorated by avoidance. It must be met head on or not at all. And not to meet it is to court intellectual anarchy.

Mark this. The burden of public concern is not that the Soviet aggressor achieved an immediately decisive weapon in this intercontinental missile and satellite. Knowledgeable people understand full well the timing of transition between manned airpower and effective pushbutton war. The great concern is that the enemy achieved these competitive goals as the result of his timely educational program, his accurate viewpoint on the significance of the air environment, his policy of incentive for the industry and science which must create the tools of the new environment, and within a framework of noncompetitive military services. All of this is in direct contrast to our own activity in these respects. And to confirm the public concern is the fact that the Soviet attained these goals in the face of continuous American complacency; that the enemy made a revolutionary breakthrough at a time of deliberately curtailed American effort; and that the administration of the American effort is so hopelessly mired in duplication, waste, and extraneous considerations that no amount of budget could adequately serve the lead time of national security.

We must view this current crisis in defense affairs against a broader context than its economic factors alone, vital as they are, for though we give full acknowledgment to them, we find no logic in Government's formula for economy.

Government's prelude of propaganda to recent curtailment of defense funds was qualitative superiority. In presenting this thesis the spokesmen contrasted the effectiveness of our modern weapons systems to that of predecessor systems. A supersonic bomber with a hydrogen warhead has greater devastating power than a former Wing of B–29's and, since there are only so many enemy targets to be saturated, we would need only so many bombers—that sort of thing. The intent was to prime a favorable atmosphere for stretchout and curtailment of quantity. Actually, the only sound estimate of adequate quantity is based on comparison with enemy capability. More important to knowledgeable people is the fact that in advancing qualitative superiority as a substitute for quantitative supremacy Government was depending on the most speculative, elusive, and intangible factor that could be considered. And, sure enough, the recent revelation of Soviet technology has knocked the qualitative superiority thesis into a cocked hat. Its enduring damage was that Government espoused it seriously and caused speculation about the reasoning power of our defense philosophers.

When the full extent of the defense curtailment was activated, its blight fell immediately on the aircraft industry, traditionally the victim of various political moods and now dealt a blow of unparalleled proportions. Since this industry is the prime source of tools for the air environment, the swift and undoubted weakening of its structure calls the judgment of Government to sharp account. Whether there was intent to throw this industry into nationalization or depress it for capture by other interests, or intent to create an atmosphere for the greater participation of general industry in the air defense field, is subject to controversy. But there can be scant controversy that these effects are the result. That Government will save in long-range expenditure for airpower by disruption of the aircraft industry is too illogical to be debated.

But perhaps it is futile to discuss such detail when the entire matter traces to the fact that no national administration ever has grasped the significance of the air environment. Nor, perhaps, should I be using the term "air environment" without more explanation.

In earlier periods of history, military power was restricted to the bridging of land masses alone. Nations were competitive in terms of armies. Power was exercised in the environment of land geography.

Then came the age of seafaring. Nations became competitive in overseas discovery and conquest. The environment of a nation's strength was a blending of armies and navies. But whether the strength involved was in terms of land geography or ocean geography, it was in the environment of surface activity. This pattern was static over many centuries and strong organic military establishment developed as its expression. As the industrial revolution matured, the Military Establishment gathered vast economic, social, and political influences around themselves. In time the term "the military mind" came into use. The military mind was not the mind of the soldier or sailor. It was the self-interested static mind of all the influences gathered in the old military complex.

Then suddenly, within a handbreadth of time as military evolution is measured, came the radical and unprecedented new environment—the environment of the air. It ran headlong into the complex of interests which comprised the traditional environment. When Government was forced by irrefutable evidence to recognize air potential, the traditional establishment and all of its allied interests attempted to contain it. The hope was vain. Its ferment burst out of the old wineskins despite all that bureaucracy and its customers could do.

Eventually, in World War II, the environment as the decisive area of action was so exemplified that the traditional combination of interests which formed defense bureaucracy had to be extenuated to make place for it. Its power was such that two of its strikes, as at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, could make unnecessary the clash of vast conventional armies. Its ascendancy over surface naval power was such that ships dared not put to sea without its protection. So a new National Defense Act was contrived to make place for airpower. Against this act, I and many other railed unavailingly.

And what was the result? The result was a hydraheaded compromise of military, industrial, and political influences which assigned airpower a role—which it later refuted in Korea—but denied that national destiny almost solely rested with the new environment.

The result was an economic monster whose hunger devours the national income without assuring the national defense.

This intellectual travesty is represented to the American people as balanced power. In some respects, it is indeed balanced. It is balanced politically, balanced to usurp military leadership by secretarial bureaucracy; balanced to consume the taxpayer; balanced to generate unrelenting interservice bitterness; balanced to compromise every known tenet of military command; balanced to swallow the talents of great officers in all services; balanced to require conscription; balanced to waste manpower; balanced to assure the Soviet lead time in technology to the point that American conquest probably eventually will be accomplished without a shot in self-defense.

But insofar as being balanced for the prevention of war; or balanced to secure the most defense for the least cost; or balanced to maintain a firm air defense industry, or balanced to lead the United States into the cosmic phase of the air environment, no contrivance was ever more ill fitted to its mission. And not until Government focuses defense in the air environment with all else in the perspective of support will order come out of chaos.

The American people have fondly believed that the Nation stands well in comprehensive airpower. This too is a delusion. If war were to be fought today, the gaps in American airpower in such fundamental respects as logistic capability would shock the citizens to their heels. Maintenance of global airbases by air transport under war conditions would be impossible to all existing civil and military transport combined.

True, some hold that war with atomic weapons would be concluded before the necessity for logistic supply of global airbases became necessary. And it would be if war were a game of chess or an exact science. But it is neither. It is a study in errors. If there is war, it will be awful and punishing to all concerned but it will not necessarily be short in duration nor will its aftermath of policing be less onerous than its conflict. Furthermore, the survival and relief of the civil population in actual atomic war would require air logistics to a degree almost beyond calculation. But there are no funds to develop air logistics because defense funds are consumed out of air environment by compromised political and military policy. Certainly this does not fit into the party line of the Air Force any more than it adapts to the party line of any other branch of service, but I am not interested in party lines. None of them has prevented the present situation and none of them has that capability under present defense organization.

Nonetheless, let it be noted that the dedication of the man in uniform represents today the best cross section of intellectual integrity and national devotion to be found in all the United States. The great preponderance of men and officers in all military services are as fully frustrated as is the cause they serve. The national defense as constituted and administered is a torture of their morale and a distraction of their devotion, the Army man, the Navy man, and the Marine no less than the man in Air Force blue.

There are thousands of officers and men in every service who would sacrifice their careers at a moment's notice if thereby they could serve their country as did Butler of the Marines, Simms of the Navy, MacArthur of the Army, or Mitchell of the Air Corps. Within weeks, I have had certain of them ask if I could assist them to bypass the bureaucracy so that they might lay scientific suggestion on the desk of leadership. In cold realism I had to warn them that individual action is not the answer to our confusion; that the system must be changed; that the summit is well insulated from such as I; and that the country needs them too much to have them needlessly sacrificed. Incidentally, these were not Air Force officers.

What now can be done to deliver the American people and the cause of constitutional Government to a more certain future?

Nothing can be done short of a rebirth of national character. It requires time to make amends for the years of visionless education which have cursed our masses to mediocracy. How does one restore overnight the political sanity of a republic that, bastardized into constitutional socialism, bids competitively in the franchise market place for the favor of self-seeking minorities, wealthy patrons and class-conscious demagogs? How does one inspire a national conscience that sits in conference with despots and compromises with the bloody handed to escape the ordeal of defending freedom? How does one protect the innocent and punish the evil in a system of law that practices the techniques but not the spirit of justice? How does one reason with a public mind that classes the years of youth devoted to service of country as lost years?

I am not even sure anything can be done because there are none so sightless as the willful blind. Despite the fact that the air age self-evidently opened windows to fresh scientific exploration, revised the pace of responsibility for good or evil, radically changed the relative stature of nations and made civilization thrice sensitive to its moral and spiritual concepts, we airmen have been just "aviation enthusiasts"—an epithet rather than an encomium.

So I have no illusions—only cold hard comfortless fact to lean upon. It may be too late to arrest the declining light of the American mission to humanity. Government is too unwieldy for action, too preoccupied by politics, and the citizenship is too fragmented by lesser loyalties and too welded to special interests to use the franchise for dedicated purpose. I and mine are committed to share the common fate of all. But we do not have to like it. And at least we are privileged to walk with our eyes open. And maybe that is enough.

On the other hand, the enemy at our throats may make vital blunders. If we are ready to take advantage of them, as he was in turn of our visionless policies, the tide might flow again to our future. And of course there is always to be considered the inscrutable patience of God. On the thesis that we are not scrubbed by the latter and that the Soviet is not all wise, we can base our hopes and find motivation to seek rebirth of the Republic. Such a project is vast and time consuming but certain initial moves can be made.

In the first place the leaders must get up and lead. In the second place the unseemly jousting for partisan advantage in the face of national crisis must be subverted. And in the third place the people must be taken into the confidence of the Government. "Little business" especially among other vital segments of our national economy has long felt exiled. This is intolerable in view of the fact that the Soviet Union is an industrial giant rivaling America. Government must give fresh regard to incentive for free private enterprise. It is not healthy that most of our industry finds scant enthusiasm for doing business with Government because it has no confidence that Government has business sensibility.

But in any case, whatever the first successive steps may be, the main theme must be to create an atmosphere in which the Nation can be put confidently to work in a spirit of determined unity.

I am not so naive as to lay out on a piece of paper a program for the Congress. The Congress knows full well what steps can be taken to eliminate waste and duplication and to bring responsibility back of technological research. There is no lack of brains and experience in the Congress to assure adequate defense at a cost the Nation can afford. The will of the Congress rather than its ability contains the key to the situation. And that will must focus on the air environment for there and there only lies possibility of recovery for the stature of the Nation.

It can and will be denied by many that the Soviet satellites indicate a background of industrial, educational and scientific power superior to our own. But "by their fruits ye shall know them." And Soviet fruits have been ripe and abundant. How quickly they caught up on the long-range bomber, the atom bomb, the supersonic fighter, the guided missile, the jet transport. So, not in itself but in its connotation, the Soviet satellites are the gravest of warnings against excuse or complacency.

Whatever is done immediately in countermeasure to the Soviet technological achievement must be of such practical nature as to seize the offensive from the enemy. Many avenues might suggest themselves while the satellites are still in a speculative stage as a military achievement.

One such would be a crash program to make the supersonic nuclear-powered bomber operational. Although no indication has come through at this writing, it seems reasonable to judge that the satellites have been hoisted by at least an initial application of nuclear power. A truly operational stable of unlimited range, high performance, manned bombers would swing the military balance of power sharply to their possessor and go far to stalemate the possibility of war for a reasonable stretch of time in case their operator were a free nation.

I do not think it wise to speculate openly on various possibilities but they exist in the air environment and lack only funds and sound organization to bear fruit. I mention the nuclear-powered bomber only because I am confident the Soviet satellite has connotations of Red exploration in that direction.

Now I wish to assure the reader that I have no pleasure in setting our present critical situation against a background of deteriorated national character, nor do I have aught but good will and sympathetic hope for those who bear the heavy responsibilities of our fate. Out of the history of many nations and peoples who have risen and fallen in their day, I can see how difficult it has been for our own leaders and people to turn away from a trusted and proven environment to pioneer in the new and strange. I can see how kindly motives and a sense of good will have wrecked the checks and balances of a Republic in the name of democracy, although there never was a successful democracy in all time and there never will be. I can see how the passion for peace, just like the passion for conquest, contributes to tragedy worse than war—slavery and the death of the spirit and darkness of the mind.

So, I have no alternative but to lay the cards face up on the table and read the spots as they lie. It is a time for a free man to stand up. Certainly recrimination of any is furthest from my intention. It is even probable that, if my confreres and I have lived our mature lives in the air environment and had been more articulate and less selfish competitively, we would have had better audience.

But regret over the dereliction of others or of ourselves is now alike unproductive. The entire regime of freedom is at stake and nothing less than a soul searching of our national character will serve as a turning point to retrace to where this beloved land stands once more with its mission to civilization renewed and its strength mightily repaired.

God help us all to help ourselves.

GILL ROBB WILSON,
*Editor and Publisher.*

---

## STUDY AND RESEARCH IN ANTARCTICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the National Science Foundation last week gratifyingly announced that it will participate in a continuing program of study and research in Antarctica. The National Science Foundation studies will continue, following termination of the International Geophysical Year in December 1958.

This announcement mentions that the NSF is but one of many agencies which will conduct continuing Antarctic programs. I ask today: "What are these programs? By which agencies? On how large a scale? And who is doing the coordinating?"

I firmly believe it is time for our Government to make coordinated, concrete plans for permanent protection of its own national interests in Antarctica.

Up until now, there have been rumors regarding many future programs, but few actual plans have been announced. It is time for a careful program of action on this subject in order that we may be able to act promptly and decisively in our own national interest for permanent occupancy and development of strategic areas of this continent.

I therefore respectfully urge members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to begin hearings on my bill, S. 2189, calling for creation of the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission. This Commission would be responsible for planning the operation of all future activities by the United States in Antarctica—and for that matter, in the Arctic areas.

Many vital factors other than scientific research must be considered. Among these are:

First. We must determine our position regarding United States Territorial claims in the Antarctica. This decision on territorial rights has been postponed for years.

Second. We must try to deter Russia from taking over strategic areas of the continent.

Third. We must capitalize on the mineral deposits and other strategic values of the Antarctic.

In the event of war, there is always a possibility of the destruction of the Panama Canal by enemy attack. This makes the maintenance of an open waterway around Cape Horn vital to our national security. One Russian submarine base properly located, without deterrent from the United States, might well close this vital route.

Fortunately, the United States has had outstanding Antarctic experts who have

devoted virtually their lifetimes to our interests in this area and in the Arctic.

Washington will have the opportunity to pay tribute to one such leader when the Board of Trade holds a civic testimonial luncheon for the famous Finn Ronne on his return early in March. I shall have more to say later on about this fine occasion.

For the moment, let me just say that Captain Ronne is the commander of Ellsworth Station and the scientific leader of the station—the only such individual to serve in this dual capacity in the Antarctic. This courageous son of Norway, long since an honored citizen of our own land, symbolizes the many valiant leaders of Viking and other extraction, who have written epics of daring in the frozen regions. The welcome home to him will be a greeting as well to Admiral Dufek and all the other Americans serving in the Antarctic.

But in the meantime, time is of the essence for Congressional action. A piecemeal approach—on-again, off-again—will no longer suffice.

Someday, we may wake up and find ourselves as badly embarrassed over Russian polar exploits as we were embarrassed over the sputniks.

That must not happen.

Fortunately, since 1928, the United States Navy has been alert. To the extent of its authority, it has spearheaded our Government's operations in Antarctica. On December 7, 1957, Comdr. Paul H. Frazier, of the Navy, delivered an address outlining the Navy's role in the current international geophysical year program.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Commander Frazier's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NAVY'S ROLE IN THE IGY UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC PROGRAM

(Address by Paul W. Frazier, commander, United States Navy, delivered December 7, 1957, for the Association of American Geographers, Middle Atlantic Division, Washington, D. C.)

The International Geophysical Year which commenced on July 1, 1955, is the third such Geophysical Year in the history of the world. The first such year was in 1882; the second, in 1932. The results of these first 2 Geophysical Years had a distinct impact on the world of science and, in turn, affected each one of us in our normal way of life.

Each Geophysical Year has been greater in scope, as the tools by which we learn became more accurate and we had more knowledge on which to base our findings. To date, we have spent approximately $32 million in building bases for our scientists in the Antarctic. We have done this in the most remote area on the face of the earth.

The values of the Antarctic are not readily apparent, but values do exist. We know that there are minerals of all types present in the Antarctic, but we do not know to what extent. No large strikes of oil or minerals have been made that will open the continent to speculators and miners. All that we can say at the present time is that we do not know what is there. However, we cannot afford to say that a continent the size of the United States and Europe combined has no economic value because we do not know that it does or does not.

The Antarctic Continent, serving as a scientific platform, is of extreme value to the International Geophysical Year. The earth is under study by some 40 participating nations. Of these 40 nations, 12 have built 46 stations in the Antarctic. All of these nations recognize the future potential of the Antarctic.

Scientific areas in which intensive investigations throughout the world are now underway: Aurora and airglow, cosmic rays, geomagnetism, glaciology, gravity measurements, ionospheric physics, meteorology, oceanography, seismology, solar activity, longitude and latitude determinations, rocket exploration of the upper atmosphere, and satellite exploration of the upper atmosphere.

During the winter of 1954–55, the USS *Atka* made a voyage to survey the ice conditions adjacent to the Antarctic Continent, and to find a favorable coastal site for establishing a base station. The 1955–56 mission, called Operation Deep Freeze I, was organized to install the Little America Station and to transport equipment and supplies for the construction of 2 forward stations, the Pole Station at the South Pole and Byrd Station in Marie Byrd Land at 80 degrees south, 120 degrees west. United States achievements include a logistic facility station at McMurdo Sound and stations on the Knox coast and on the edge of the Weddell Sea, as well as a station at Cape Adare occupied jointly by New Zealand and the United States.

In the Antarctic, observers are studying the timing, the rapid changes, and the geographical location of the Aurora. They are breaking the light into its component colors, using spectroscopes and other equipment.

Some cosmic-ray studies are being carried out continuously aboard ships en route to Antarctica and off the coast. At Little America, two telescopes are furnishing continuous records. Balloons are frequently carrying special cosmic-ray instruments.

The United States IGY geomagnetic program calls for systematic measurement of magnetic variations at a large number of locations, including each of the stations in Antarctica.

About a tenth of the earth's land surface is covered by ice. Of this ice, the glaciers located in Greenland and Antarctica have a very strong influence on the weather at remote parts of the earth. The IGY problem includes an unprecedented thorough exploration of the physical aspects of the Antarctic ice sheet and its extension into the ocean and the shelf ice.

Scientists are covering very wide expanses of territory in the Antarctic. Holes are being drilled down to a record depth of 1,000 feet and snow samples taken, temperatures measured, and the age of the various ice layers estimated.

In the Antarctic, radar-like soundings are recording, in detail, the heights and movements of the electrified layers of air above the earth's surface, as well as their radio-reflecting properties. The unusually large and sudden changes during periods of disturbances are being studied by all stations, very closely coordinated, not only within the Antarctic but stations throughout the world. At Byrd Station, accurate recordings are being made of atmospheric noise or radio static at several radio frequencies.

A complete surface and balloon weather observation program is being carried out for all the United States stations in the Antarctic. Weather information is being obtained from the earth's surface up to as high as 100,000 feet or more.

In addition to a comprehensive meteorological program of surface and upper air observations, a significant part of the United States IGY activities in the Antarctic is the operation of a weather central. During 1957–58, this unit is functioning as collection center for weather information from whaling vessels, expedition ships, aircraft, Antarctic stations and traveling parties, ocean islands, and stations in Africa, South America, Australia, and New Zealand.

A small, but pioneering, program of rocket exploration is under way for the Antarctic region. It is being carried out by means of rockoons from aboard an icebreaker en route to Antarctica and off the coastal ice shelf. These rockets reach an altitude of 60 miles and carry instruments for experiments in geomagnetism, cosmic rays, and Aurora.

Earthquakes and earth motions are the concern of seismologists. During the IGY, there will be at least three fixed seismic stations at United States sites. In addition, seismologists are working closely during the summer with glaciologists in estimating the thickness of the Antarctic ice through observation of artificial earthquakes.

The scope of the third Geophysical Year commencing in July, when compared to the first two, is tremendous. The results will be in basic scientific findings and will be priceless when applied to our present-day knowledge. These data tend to advance our scientific knowledge toward even greater things than they have developed or discovered in the past 75 years.

The scientists, of course, chose the location of these bases. It was our job to put the bases where they wanted them. Our initial effort at base building took place in the Ross Sea during Deep Freeze I, when we built Little America Station and McMurdo Sound air operating facility. These bases served as staging areas for the construction of Byrd Station and South Pole Station. Byrd Station was a tractor-train operation with air support, while the South Pole was an air-drop mission entirely.

The first problem was finding an airstrip site on ice at McMurdo Sound. The icebreakers *Edisto* and *Glacier* pentrated the icepack of the Ross Sea and marked an airfield on 12-foot-thick bay ice in McMurdo Sound. Navy wheeled aircraft then flew in from New Zealand and landed without incident. Aircraft from the airfield on ice fanned over the continent on exploratory flights.

The entire materials for the South Pole Station were off-loaded and stored at McMurdo Sound for an early start during Deep Freeze II. The Air Force Globemasters loaded the material and commenced air dropping it at the South Pole before the arrival of ships.

Little America off-loaded was accomplished over the bay ice of Kainan Bay, being hauled 5 miles from the ship side to the base site.

A reconnaissance party set out with light vehicles to lay a safe trail from Little America to Byrd Station. After the heavy tractor train left Little America for Byrd Station, we suffered another casualty. A heavy caterpillar tractor fell into a crevasse and carried the driver to his death. This trail was abandoned and the construction of Byrd Station was postponed until Deep Freeze II.

The *Glacier* completed a reconnaissance trip around the Antarctic Continent to survey base sites while the other ships proceeded home. Deep Freeze I was completed. Two bases had been built and the materials for two more safely landed. An airstrip had been located that was suitable for the operation of heavy aircraft.

Deep Freeze II commenced when Admiral Dufek landed at McMurdo Sound in a Navy plane, in October 1956. Following him a few days later, were the other Navy planes that were used for lifting personnel to the South Pole and Byrd Station. One of these planes crashed on landing and four men were killed.

The Air Force landed the following week in Globemasters and commenced packaging the material for dropping at the South Pole, by parachutes.

Admiral Dufek landed at the South Pole. The Air Force Globemasters then commenced dropping materials for the South Pole base. The base was completed within a few weeks and scientific studies begun.

An Army-Navy trail party flew to Little America and began the trip to Byrd Station, marking a safe trail over the ice for the heavy tractors and sleds that followed. This trail party used a crevasse detector developed for just such an operation. The crevasse detector proved its worth along with air reconnaissance of the projected route.

Byrd Station was commissioned on New Year's Day, 1957, and is now making scientific investigations in that area.

Cargo for South Pole and Byrd Stations was off-loaded at McMurdo Sound for air drop during Deep Freeze III, before ships could penetrate the heavy ice of the Ross Sea. Other new bases were constructed at Cape Hallett, Knox Coast, and Weddell Sea. One man was lost through the ice of McMurdo Sound while driving a weasel. Deep Freeze II cost five lives.

Deep Freeze III, essentially a resupply mission, is now in progress. Present plans call for an end to Antarctic scientific operations, on the conclusions of Deep Freeze IV.

## FOREIGN SERVICE PAY-RAISE BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to endorse the action and the sentiments of my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GREEN], in introducing a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

The purpose of this bill is to provide salary increases for Foreign Service personnel, comparable to those which are being recommended by the administration for civil-service, and other officers and employees, of the Federal Government.

Over the course of the years it has been my pleasure to visit many American embassies and consulates throughout the world. The places which I have toured represent only a fraction of the 300 foreign areas at which our Foreign Service personnel are stationed.

I have always found in the personnel whom I have seen, however, a dedicated corps of expert individuals who are, in a very real sense, soldiers of peace. These men and women, carefully selected, carefully trained, carefully given posts of increasing responsibility throughout the world, should not be forgotten by the Congress at a time when we are planning pay raises for other Government personnel.

Rather, these Foreign Service employees should hear, via press and radio, that the Congress of the United States has them very much in mind. They should hear that the Congress is proud of their efforts and that the Congress has been glad to provide for them the pay adjustments and belated benefits which are to be granted to other civilian Federal personnel.

The Foreign Service officers are manning the front lines in the cold war which rages throughout the world. Through their efforts, in large part, we will be able, I believe, to prevent the cold war from becoming a hot war.

At innumerable hardship posts, they are sacrificing in order that this Nation might endure; in order that other nations might continue to enjoy their independence; and in order that all men might enjoy the good things of life.

I urge, therefore, that this pay-raise bill be given prompt and careful attention.

It is only logical that this be done, considering the fact that this 2d session of the 85th Congress will enact many important bills in the foreign affairs program. If these bills are to be successfully carried out, then the very least we can do is to assure ourselves that we will have available the outstanding leadership and superior performance of our career officers and employees throughout the world.

This bill is an act of justice and it is an act of gratitude. It should be passed.

## DAIRY SUPPORT PRICES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated January 13, 1958, which I received from Mr. John Gunderson, president of the Peoples State Bank of Cambridge, Minn., dealing with the question of dairy support prices.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLES STATE BANK OF CAMBRIDGE,
*Cambridge, Minn., January 13, 1958.*

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. THYE: I am in receipt of your recent kind letter, specifically outlining your stand with reference to the dairy support prices. I was quite frank, Senator, in my former letter and I am greatly pleased that you have taken the stand that you have with reference to this matter.

I have noted many favorable comments in the papers of our State, supporting you in your definite desire to at least maintain our present dairy support prices. They are most certainly low enough compared with manufactured items, which our farm population must purchase. To say the least, it is not equitable.

With reference to the foreign trade, I am still of the opinion that if Russia would pay us in gold for agricultural products, including our dairy and corn surplus, we should sell it to them. If we do not do so, other countries, likely Canada or Argentina, will soon do so. Having the military organizations that both Russia and China possess, there is, in my opinion, little hope for conversion of the general public in those countries. The poor people of those countries are the ones most likely to suffer and I do not believe that famine should be added to their difficulties. I rather believe that the general populace of the two countries would appreciate American foodstuffs. It will take much more than our disposition not to trade with these countries to eliminate the communistic principle, and the military abilities that they possess.

Yours truly,

JOHN GUNDERSON,
*President.*

## THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, during the past week many fine tributes have been written and spoken about former Representative August H. Andresen from Minnesota's First Congressional District. They reflect the affection which people from all over the State have for him.

I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 15; an editorial from the Northfield News of Thursday, January 16; and a column from the Northfield News by another famous Minnesota citizen, Herman Roe.

There being no objection, the editorials and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 15, 1958]

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

Representative August H. Andresen was not only the dean of Minnesota's Congressional delegation. He also was one of the bulwarks of the farm bloc in Congress, and his rasping yet friendly voice often was the most persuasive one when the House was considering farm legislation—and especially so when the bills affected the dairy industry.

He never achieved his great ambition to become the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, although he was the ranking Republican during his last two terms in Washington. His defeat in the 1932 at-large election of Minnesota's Congressmen kept him from his goal when the Republicans last controlled the House in 1953–54.

He did achieve another legislative ambition, however. First elected to Congress in 1924, he served under Presidents Coolidge and Hoover and, in recent years, often had said that he hoped to be able to serve under another Republican President before he retired. That ambition was fulfilled with the election of President Eisenhower in 1952.

His long but unsuccessful fight to prevent repeal of the Federal tax on oleomargarine, his blue cheese amendment that banned imports of some dairy products, and his opposition to many forms of international cooperation often resulted in criticism—but little from his own District. He felt he reflected his constituents' views and apparently his votes—as well as his hard campaigning and his efforts to keep in touch with the people back home—explained his success at the polls.

Not even his critics questioned his honesty, his integrity and his devotion to his job and to the people of the district. His district, the State and the Nation will miss him.

[From the Northfield News of January 16, 1958]

THE GENTLEMAN FROM MINNESOTA

August H. Andresen had been a Member of Congress so long, when he died unexpectedly in Washington Monday night, and had reached a position of political invincibility which seemed to make assured his continuance there for at least another decade, that his departure from the scene will seem to many as marking the end of a political era as far as the First Congressional District of Minnesota is concerned. While a Republican is quite likely to succeed him in the special election which must now be called, although he may possibly have a different approach and different political philosophy from that exemplified by the late Congressman, the change will be more significant from a personal point of view than from a political one.

In fact, the sense of personal loss which many in Northfield community, as a typical example of the entire District, feel in Congressman Andresen's death is a key to his political success as measured by his election to Congress 16 times, but even more a tribute to his own personal interest in the people of his District. Mr. Andresen was a true conservative in politics, almost an old-line Republican, and a stanch party man, often as impatient with the frills of the liberal

elements in his party as he was with tendencies which he believed inherent in the opposition. But when it came to a personal interest in the people of his District, or when he sought to represent them as individuals in their contacts with their Govment, he rarely thought of their political affiliations but only that they were his constituents and he wanted to serve them. So it is not surprising that through the long years of his tenure many thought of him as a personal friend.

That Congressman Andresen was a man of highest integrity is well known. That he adhered steadfastly to the political principles in which he believed is a matter of record. That he understood agriculture, although he was a lawyer, and served with distinction as a ranking member of the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is one of the constructive phases of his career. That he represented his District well, both as an advocate of its interests and as a servant of its people, is obviously reflected in the repeated votes of confidence which he earned.

It is no reflection on his predecessors but merely an indication of the passing years, to say that many voting citizens in Rice and Goodhue Counties have never known another Congressman, for Mr. Andresen was originally elected to the House of Representatives in 1924 from the old Third District. When the State was reapportioned in 1934 and he ran for the first time in the First District, never thereafter to be defeated, these two counties had then been added to that District. Congressman Andresen often said, and there is much to sustain his proud view, that he represented the finest Congressional District in the United States. Certainly it would be difficult to find anywhere else such a group of 12 homogeneous counties, with the economic balance that exists here, and the cultural and human resources that are so apparent, which could more nearly qualify as an ideal Congressional District. A good Congressman from a good district was what Mr. Andresen wanted to be, and what he was.

Often in the years during which he has been our Congressman the editorial columns of the Northfield News—a newspaper nurtured in the traditions of another of Minnesota's great Representatives in Congress, the late Joel P. Heatwole of Northfield—have contained words of appreciation of August Andresen. They reflect, in part, the personal friendship and goodwill of the present publisher and the present editor, but even more they expressed the feelings of the people of Northfield community. And from Northfield, which was always close to the heart of our Red Wing neighbor and statesman, we are glad to say again, in memory of a faithful public servant—"Well done."

---

[From the Northfield (Minn.) News of January 16, 1958]

MEMOS FROM THE PUBLISHER'S NOTEBOOK

(By Herman Roe)

A FAREWELL TRIBUTE TO AUGUST ANDRESEN

Minnesota's First Congressional District has suffered a great loss in the death of August H. Andresen, its veteran representative in Congress.

He was the dean of Minnesota's delegation in Congress, where he served with distinction for more than three decades.

He had won recognition from his colleagues in Congress for his industry, his ability, and his good judgment.

For his devoted and faithful service on behalf of his constituents, irrespective of party affiliation, he was rewarded by the voters at 16 biennial elections by large majorities, which indicated an endorsement of his record.

The dairy farmers of the First District have lost a champion who carried on an aggressive fight to protect their interests whenever legislation was pending affecting their industry and agriculture in general.

Through his many years of service on the important Agriculture Committee he had reached top rank and played a prominent role.

While legislation relating to agriculture was Congressman Andresen's chief interest, he was always active on behalf of servicemen in the Armed Forces. This group has lost a good friend and advocate.

Labor, business, education, and other groups found in him a Representative in Congress keenly interested in their problems.

August Andresen was not the showy, spectacular type of Congressman. He laid no claims to being an orator. He was not a glib promiser who catered to groups whose demands resulted in raids on the Federal Treasury.

For 40 years it was my privilege to be one of August Andresen's intimate friends and advisers.

The News office was usually his first port of call when he visited Northfield. He enjoyed coming to Northfield, was fond of our college city. Justly so, because in successive elections Northfield voters gave him larger majorities than any city in the First District, usually a 3 to 1 majority over his opponent.

The newspaper publishers and editors in the First District had no special claim on Congressman Andresen. * * * He had friends and supporters in all lines of business, in the professions, on the farms; but he made it a point to cultivate the friendship of the press.

August and his wife Julia usually attended the annual meetings of the First District Editorial Association. The death of his life partner from cancer in May 1957 was a great loss and no doubt hastened his death. At the meeting held last year in Owatonna he was alone. The date was October 11, his birthday anniversary.

Due to an important engagement, I could not attend the Owatonna meeting. I called Don Reigel, publisher of the Steele County Photo News, requested that he order a birthday cake to be presented to Mr. Andresen as a surprise happy birthday greeting at the evening banquet.

On his last visit to Northfield before leaving for Washington, he expressed his appreciation for the birthday cake. "That was the most pleasant surprise I have had in years."

He inquired solicitously, "How's Ella?" My wife's parents and his parents were friends in Red Wing in the 1880's. He expressed his concern when told that she was not in her studio at the music hall at St. Olaf College, instead was ill at home with the flu.

The following day a florist delivered at 5 Walden Place a dozen beautiful red roses with a wish for speedy recovery from Congressman Andresen. A typical and thoughtful gesture by a dear friend.

---

## INDIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday marked the eighth anniversary of the birth of the largest democratic nation in the world, India. This historic event was achieved by peaceful means, under the leadership and inspiration of one of the greatest men the world has ever known, Mohandas Gandhi. He accomplished the independence of his country through passive resistance instead of the alternative course of bloody insurrection and mob violence.

Gandhi's philosophy was not a negative one. During the process of nonviolent revolution, he encouraged his people to prepare themselves for the responsibilities of self-government. He demonstrated to the world that man's faith in the goodness of men is a more potent force than the most devastating weapon of destruction. Certainly in India there is a lesson for other nations still striving for self-realization in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds. In our world today where internal revolt can erupt into greater and more widespread conflicts, we should pay particular attention to India's nonviolent course.

We can see in today's democratic India much of the philosophy that guided our own country in its earliest days. India's neutrality should be respected and we should offer our hand freely, and without strings attached, to give the assistance which India so desperately needs at this point in her history. Our abundance of food and fiber, our technical know-how and, more important, our moral support should not be withheld. We should give to India as unstintingly as we received help from other nations during the first years of our Republic. We share India's great confidence in herself as a free nation and we hope that the vision of Gandhi of an India strong, and with an educated and informed populace, free from internal and religious strife, will continue to be an inspiration to the peoples of Asia and Africa.

We hope that India will remain our friend, because a strong India in the Asiatic world will be a stabilizing force. I look to India as a bulwark of democracy in Asia, and as such she deserves all of the effective economic and technical assistance we are able to offer.

We expect great things of the new India and by the strides that country has made in the last decade, I do not doubt that India and her leadership will fulfill this promise of greatness.

---

## WOLVES AND SHEEP

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, our chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, wrote his weekly column, Spires of the Spirit, under the heading "Wolves and Sheep."

It is a column which deserves the attention of every Member of the Senate, particularly because there is going on at the present time in some church circles in America, on the part of very sincere members of the ministry, a considerable discussion of the problem of how best to attain the peace.

I believe our chaplain does very well point out, as many of us have said so many times, that we must keep ourselves in a position of strength and seek to attain peace through strength.

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed at this point in the RECORD in my remarks. I particularly stress the concluding portion of Dr. Harris' column:

In the light of that realistic diagnosis let us read again with even greater emphasis the New Testament lesson for today—the words of Jesus of Nazareth who raised His voice against crying peace, peace when there is no peace. "Remember you are as sheep in the midst of wolves."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

WOLVES AND SHEEP

Weekly throngs pass through church portals to water the delicate plant called reverence and to acknowledge their allegiance to the Christ of whom they sing, "All hail the power of Jesus' name." Many decades ago a famous French philosopher crossed the Atlantic and sought an answer to the question "Wherein lies the greatness and genius of the young Republic?" He surveyed her vast and varied expanse of territory, her industry and commerce, her matchless Constitution and her democratic Congress. In none of these factors did he find the answer. Then comes this stirring verdict, "Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand her genius and power." Still, in this 20th century, the greatness of America is in her churches and temples, erected on her ancient spiritual foundation.

That being true, it is of course to be expected that the foul system whose main aggressive objective is to sabotage the United States of America, which is the chief obstacle to her sinister plottings for world domination, would not in its global strategy overlook the churches. The Soviets are shrewd enough to attempt to use the mighty force of organized religion in America as a potent ally in its spurious peace proposals. And with sorrow it must be acknowledged that in many cases the plan is succeeding. From their regimented regime where is denied to their millions the truth about the rest of the world, the Soviets are shipping vast consignments of the livery of heaven with which to serve under the Stars and Stripes, the devil of tyranny. Who wears it? Often unknowingly, church leaders—those who plead that we trust the untrustworthy foe, that we literally turn the other cheek to highwaymen who would stab the heart with a dagger, who, in perilous times advocate adjustments and compromises which lead straight to ultimate surrender. Often misled individuals with the best of intentions quote misinterpreted slogans from the New Testament. They need to be reminded of a ringing warning from the Master of Men whom the Kremlin conspirators scorn and deride. It ought to be inscribed for this day in letters of fire over the pulpits from which some of these deceived prophets speak and over the church councils in which they sit. It is a word to be read and pondered by all church leaders who are allowing themselves to be the mouthpieces for those in favor of lowering the American shield of defense. Would that all such would really listen to One whose name they bear as He says solemnly, "You are as sheep in the midst of wolves—be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves." The supersalesmen for the Marxist fallacies are seeing to it that the admonition to be harmless as doves is duly emphasized. However, camouflaged Soviet peace doves are far from harmless. The advice about being as wise as serpents in a world where the fashionable clothing for wolves is imported sheepskin is largely ignored. May the God of Truth raise up for this day of destiny church leaders who know not only theology, but also something of biology—enough to recognize the subtle and cunning ways of marauding bears and who are not deceived by white sheepskins pulled over the fur of black and ravenous wolves.

As I muse this winter day with my study windows framing the growing Washington Cathedral, symbol of the Church Militant, before me is the statement of a religious leader occupying a conspicuous post in cooperative Christianity, assuming to speak for many denominations in this hour when our very national survival is at stake with time lost which only haste and sacrifice can retrieve. He issues his proclamation when America must go from strength to strength, and speak from strength, if any negotiations are to be anything less for us than a tragic mocking Waterloo. This leader dares to say, "The church is charged with the responsibility of awakening public opinion to the utter folly and futility of spending billions of dollars on a system of defense that never in this world can defend us." From such a source that sort of talk is indeed a big boost to the dedicated men on Capitol Hill who, under fearful tension, are determined to defend all that America means by both spiritual and material might. This preacher who claims to speak for organized Protestantism adds, "The gospel of Jesus Christ knows nothing of 'retaliation'." Well, then, the policemen on the nearby corner and everywhere else, ready to give their lives to retaliate against hoodlums—those soldiers of the peace who guard our homes and dear ones from the aggression of thugs and robbers—had better be called off. Their role is irreligious. Let the gangsters have their way. What a travesty of the Christian religion. Here is my hands is a publication edited by religious leaders in America, but its unsuspected sheepskin carries a line which the morally bankrupt masters of the Kremlin would not want to change in any particulars. It quotes, approvingly, the boss of the Moscow den of thieves as he says, in effect, "now that we have a predominance of deadly arms so that we can enforce our desires and designs on the rest of the world, if you in so-called free nations go on arming and joining together to defend your liberties it can only lead to a new and bloody war." This article then goes on to speak with obsequious respect of the "Soviet peace offensive." After that, how refreshing to read, in an English paper which speaks for the people called Methodist in that valiant land, "The western nations have sought to come to terms with Russia on this very matter of atomic missiles and have been rebuffed because Russia refuses to accept the one condition that would make agreement a reality. Until Russia is ready to do this its protestations about bad faith are nothing but the rankest hypocrisy." Then, a real church leader in England says what a great many church leaders in America, we are grateful to record, are also saying, "All the most recent propaganda including the showers of letters has, under a very flimsy facade of reason and sincerity, had one outstanding purpose—to put the Western nations in the wrong, and to set forth Russia as the kindly and peaceable though misunderstood victim of evil rulers of other countries. But when we remember—and they must not be forgotten—Hungary and Poland, the Latvian countries and Bulgaria, the assumption by Russia of the role of the injured innocent induces an almost catastrophic feeling of nausea." In the light of that realistic diagnosis let us read again with even greater emphasis the New Testament lesson for today—the words of Jesus of Nazareth who raised His voice against crying peace, peace when there is no peace. "Remember you are as sheep in the midst of wolves. Be ye therefore as harmless as doves but as wise as serpents."

---

## THE OREGON SHEEP INDUSTRY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter which I received from the Governor of the State of Oregon, in which the Governor discusses the sheep industry in our State, and asks for my support of S. 2861.

I should like to read one paragraph from the letter, and then I shall ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed at this point in my remarks:

On behalf of the sheep industry in Oregon, I urge each of you to place emphasis on the passage of S. 2861 in order to extend the period for recovery and adjustment and to take whatever steps are necessary to insure favorable action in the House.

I have made it clear to the Governor that I have for a long time been a supporter of the objectives of S. 2861, and that I shall be pleased to support it again this year.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
*Salem, January 23, 1958.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR WAYNE: Since the passage of the original National Wool Act in March 1954, Oregon's sheep industry has shown definite and measurable signs of stabilization and strength. During the past 4 years wool and lamb production has not only held its own but has increased moderately. Price levels have been generally satisfactory under the act's incentive payment program, coupled with the national check-off plan which provides market study and promotional funds for lamb and wool products.

We have seen the decline in sheep numbers from a high point in 1931 of 2,679,000 head to a low point of 672,000 following World War II in 1951. Nationally, sheep numbers declined 45 percent between 1942 and 1954. The drop in Oregon was more pronounced and amounted to over a 50-percent reduction. In 1942 Oregon recorded 1,637,000 sheep and lambs—in 1954, 811,000. During that period, as you know, Federal price controls placed a ceiling on receipts to growers while costs of operation rose 65 percent—an impossible squeeze on any business.

The number of sheep shorn in Oregon began to increase in 1954 and the whole industry has been in a stronger position since then. This program has really only begun to pay off and more time is needed under the plan. Dollars derived from new wealth are involved here, as indicated by the following: In 1942, 1,637,000 sheep and lambs yielded $7,606,000; in 1954, 811,000 grossed $7,852,000; in 1955 and 1956 gross returns were $8,803,000 and $9,155,000 respectively; 1957 data will show a continuing increase.

On behalf of the sheep industry in Oregon, I urge each of you to place emphasis on the passage of S. 2861 in order to extend the period for recovery and adjustment and to take whatever steps are necessary to insure favorable action in the House.

I am sure you will agree with me that it is just as important to preserve and strengthen our present industries and sources of new wealth as it is to develop new payrolls by other means. The sheep industry in Oregon, we believe, has seen its most drastic declines and is now well on the way, aided by the provisions of the National Wool Act, to a brighter future.

The trend in recent years has seen a shift of production from eastern Oregon rangelands to western Oregon farms and ranches. This can mean a stronger wool and lamb industry throughout the entire State because of the added diversification it brings to smaller farm units.

I hope you will find it possible to make these viewpoints a matter of record with the appropriate committees.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. HOLMES,
*Governor.*

## UNEMPLOYMENT IN OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a news item entitled "Eight-Year Mark Set by Jobless." The article discusses the growing unemployment situation in the country. It is of particular interest to the State of Oregon, because we have the highest unemployment rate in the nation.

The Oregon delegation is conscientiously seeking to do what it can to remind the administration about the importance of the administration's proceeding to give our State some relief by bringing to an end the unfair discrimination which it has been practicing upon Oregon for some time in respect to Government contracts and Government installations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHT-YEAR MARK SET BY JOBLESS—UNITED STATES UNEMPLOYED 5.2 PERCENT OF LABOR FORCE

WASHINGTON, January 14.—Unemployment last month climbed to 3,374,000—the highest for any December since 1949—the Government reported today.

This also was the greatest number of jobless persons since February 1950, when there were 4,684,000 unemployed.

The total was nearly 200,000 greater than the November figure of 3,188,000 and 660,000 greater than December 1956.

The figure for last month also represented the highest rate of joblessness in 3 years.

The monthly report on the United States labor force by the Departments of Labor and Commerce showed a December unemployment rate, adjusted for seasonal swings in jobs, of 5.2 percent of the Nation's labor force.

The December rate was the highest since the 5.4 percent of November 1954. The November 1957 rate was 5.1 percent.

The report showed a total of 64,396,000 persons employed during December—about the same as December 1956. The greater number of unemployed last month, compared to December 1956, is accounted for by the increase in the total labor force.

For example, the total labor force last month was 70,458,000 compared to 69,855,000 for December 1956. On this basis, the number of persons with jobs last month dropped nearly 500,000 from November.

The report attributed the increase in unemployment to "further sharp cutbacks in manufacturing and construction."

It said there was a "marked increase in unemployment among adult men."

The report noted that the total of employed persons was boosted during December by pre-Christmas employment, but said State unemployment figures, which do not usually include temporary Christmas workers, moved up by 500,000 to total nearly 2 million in mid-December.

The report showed nonfarm employment at 59,012,000 and farming jobs at 5,385,000. Both figures are lower than November.

Unemployment insurance totals rose in all States during the month. Biggest increases were 63,000 in New York, 49,000 in Pennsylvania, 46,000 in California, 33,000 in Ohio, and 25,000 in Michigan.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for not more than 5 minutes by way of a tribute to the late Senator Neely, but I shall withhold my request until the leaders of the Senate complete some important items of business. Then, at a later time, I shall make the request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. First, I should like to announce that the certificate of appointment of the Senator-designate from the State of West Virginia is before the Senate, and that the Senator-designate is ready to present himself at the bar of the Senate.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Flanders | McNamara |
| Allott | Frear | Morse |
| Anderson | Fulbright | Morton |
| Barrett | Goldwater | Mundt |
| Beall | Green | Murray |
| Bennett | Hayden | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Hennings | Pastore |
| Bricker | Hill | Payne |
| Bridges | Hruska | Potter |
| Bush | Humphrey | Proxmire |
| Butler | Ives | Revercomb |
| Byrd | Javits | Robertson |
| Carlson | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Carroll | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Case, N. J. | Kefauver | Scott |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kennedy | Smathers |
| Chavez | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Church | Knowland | Sparkman |
| Clark | Kuchel | Stennis |
| Cooper | Langer | Symington |
| Cotton | Lausche | Thurmond |
| Curtis | Long | Thye |
| Dirksen | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Douglas | Malone | Wiley |
| Dworshak | Mansfield | Williams |
| Eastland | Martin, Iowa | Yarborough |
| Ellender | Martin, Pa. | Young |
| Ervin | McClellan | |

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

## SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I send to the desk the certificate of appointment addressed to the President of the Senate of the United States from the Governor of the State of West Virginia, and duly certified by the secretary of state of West Virginia, appointing JOHN D. HOBLITZELL, JR., to be a Member of the Senate of the United States. I ask for the consideration of the certificate; and I ask that the oath of office be administered at this time to Mr. HOBLITZELL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate of appointment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
*Charleston.*

*To the President of the Senate of the United States:*

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of West Virginia, I, Cecil H. Underwood, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint JOHN D. HOBLITZELL, JR., a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Matthew M. Neely, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Cecil H. Underwood, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston, this 25th day of January, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-eight.

CECIL H. UNDERWOOD,
*Governor.*

By the Governor:

HELEN HOLT,
*Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The certificate will be placed on file. If the Senator-designate will come to the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Thereupon, Mr. HOBLITZELL, escorted by Mr. REVERCOMB, advanced to the Vice President's desk; and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President. [Applause, Senators rising.]

## PORT OF PORTLAND, OREG.—SWAN ISLAND INSTALLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the port of Portland, Oreg., faces a very serious problem that has a direct bearing upon the important ship-repair industry of the Portland area.

One of the key facilities at the port's Swan Island installation is the Navy drydock YFD-69. The drydock is now under lease to the port, and the lease extends to December 31, 1959. The drydock is one of a very limited number in the United States that can accommodate large vessels, especially tankers now plying the Columbia and Willamette Rivers.

The port of Portland, with good business foresight, wishes to plan ahead for several years in order that it may give the maximum service on an impartial basis to the ship-repair industry of the area. Therefore, it has asked the Navy Department to enter into prompt negotiations for a new 5-year lease upon terms and conditions that will be satisfactory and fair to the Government and to the port. It is not asking for bargain-basement rates; it is willing to pay a reasonable rental.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Ships has announced that it cannot negotiate a new lease at this time, and it appears that the Bureau will not put the lease up for competitive bids until the present

lease expires. Obviously, this creates an impossible situation for the port, and I fail to see what benefits the Government can hope to gain by such delay.

Mr. President, in order that the port of Portland may know exactly where it stands with reference to its future use of the drydock, my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and I have written to the Secretary of the Navy asking him to review the drydock problem.

I ask unanimous consent that our letter of January 14 addressed to Secretary of the Navy Gates be set forth at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1958.

Hon. THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
*Secretary of the Navy,*
*Department of the Navy,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time a very serious problem has confronted the port of Portland with reference to future use of the Navy drydock YFD-69. We believe the matter is of sufficient magnitude to warrant your personal consideration.

Since 1949 the port has leased the drydock from the Navy Department and has operated it at Swan Island, Portland, as the principal facility of the port's new ship-repair yard.

The present lease will expire on December 31, 1959, but in order that plans may be made for operation of the ship-repair yard with maximum efficiency in the years ahead, the port desires to negotiate a 5-year extension of the lease beginning January 1, 1958, at terms agreeable to both the port and the Navy.

In November 1957, the Bureau of Ships advised that a new lease could not be negotiated with the port of Portland. Instead, it indicated that the YFD-69 would be leased on the basis of competitive bids when the lease of the port of Portland expires.

We urge that the decision of the Bureau be reviewed by your office at once because, if it stands, we feel that the Government, the port of Portland, businessmen, and employees of the Portland area will all be the losers.

It would be decidedly in the interest of the Government, if the drydock in question were to remain at the port of Portland installation.

The defense importance of the YFD-69, at its present location, is fully known at your office. It is the one large drydock located between Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay. If it were to be withdrawn from its present location, a serious gap would exist in our ability to repair essential ships in time of war on a lengthy stretch of the Pacific coast.

The presence of YFD-69 in Portland assures the maintenance of a sound ship repair industry during a time of emergency. So long as the drydock is operated at the Swan Island yard, ship repair employers and employees alike have assurance of a reasonable quantity of work. This means that highly competent ship repairing firms and skilled employees will be readily available to assist our military shipping facilities in case of defense emergency. Its removal from Portland would substantially reduce the standby force of essential employers and workers.

At its Portland location, this Navy drydock serves all of the ship repair industry of the area on an impartial basis as contrasted with the exclusive use arrangement that would result from a lease to a private ship construction and repair contractor. This means that numerous ship-repair firms will have the profits upon which to pay Federal, State, and local taxes. Likewise, employees in the industry with steady work will be steady taxpayers.

We cannot overemphasize this last point. Unemployment in Portland is at a very high rate and studies are now under way to determine whether Multnomah County can be classified a labor surplus area. If this Navy drydock is removed, the unemployment situation in this part of the State will be intensified severely.

If the Navy were not to continue the lease of the drydock at its present location, the Government would be put to the expense of removal, and if the removal involves any substantial distance, the cost of transfer of the facility would, in all likelihood, involve a good many thousands of dollars—so much in fact, that a new lease which would absorb the cost of transfer might be difficult to obtain.

Furthermore, the advantage of having this facility in fresh water, as contrasted with a salt-water berth, is worth a great deal of money in terms of maintenance. This deserves consideration in connection with the overall problem.

The port of Portland stands ready to negotiate a new lease upon reasonable rates and upon terms deemed fair to the Government and the port. Therefore, we feel that the request of the port is one that should be reviewed by your office at the earliest possible moment.

If the Navy Department should conclude, however, that its decision not to negotiate a lease must stand, then we ask your favorable consideration of the issuance of an immediate call for competitive bids for a new lease.

If the decision of the Bureau of Ships is affirmed, the only alternative for the port will be that of arranging for the construction of a new drydock. However, we feel that the taxpayers should not be saddled with another serious financial burden during these troublesome times, particularly when a reasonable alternative appears possible. Accordingly, we hope and we urge, upon review, the Department of the Navy will take action to modify the decision of the Bureau of Ships and that it will decide favorably with respect to the request of the port of Portland. We feel that it would be in the national interest to do so.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senator.*
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senator.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we feel that in this case a matter of national as well as local importance is at stake. The problem deserves the very serious consideration of the Secretary of the Navy.

## OREGON OPERATIONS OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, toward the close of the last session I received from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management a letter regarding the Bureau's operations in Oregon. Although several months have passed since I received the letter, I believe the information it contains is still worthy of study. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of July 22 to the Director and his reply of August 12 be inserted in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 22, 1957.

Mr. EDWARD WOOZLEY,
*Director, Bureau of Land Management,*
*Department of Interior,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. WOOZLEY: On July 18, 1957, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 9, pages 12068–12069, a report that the Comptroller General made for me on paper work in the Forest Service.

I asked for this study because a number of lumber operators voiced complaints on the amount of time your employees devote to what they termed nonproductive paperwork. However, the Comptroller's report is encouraging.

Would you please, at your convenience, prepare a statement for me stating the type of data of road construction that will be afforded to timber purchasers and the type which you consider confidential in nature. It is my hope that in considering this request you will make careful review in order that the maximum information useful to bidders in arriving at a proper estimate of their cost for road construction will be made available.

Let me take this opportunity to again express my pleasure that the Comptroller General found your operation in such good order.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

---

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
*Washington, D. C., August 12, 1957.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I appreciate the comments in your letter of July 22, 1957, regarding the Comptroller General's recent laudatory report of our achievements in minimizing nonproductive paperwork. It is my feeling that we have been equally successful in minimizing nonproductive efforts in many of our other activities.

I am pleased to inform you as to the type of data on road construction that is afforded to prospective purchasers of Bureau timber and the type of data considered confidential in nature.

It is our practice to make available to prospective purchasers of Bureau timber the maximum information on road construction and other matters which might be useful to them in preparing bids. Generally, the road construction data made available to prospective timber purchasers include a map showing the location of the road to be built, detailed standards and specifications of the road, including right-of-way clearance, useable width, grades, curves, surfacing, turnouts, drainage ditches, culverts, and bridges. Detailed cost estimates of clearing and grubbing, and grading and surfacing by hundred-foot stations are also available, along with information as to location of borrow pits which might be used for sources of road construction material. The volume and value of merchantable timber along the right-of-way which might be cut or damaged during the road construction, plus estimated costs for logging and transporting such timber to the nearest utilization center are available. Any special conditions of construction, maintenance, or use of the road or right-of-way, including known use fees, where the road crosses private lands and any special requirements imposed by the land owner as a condition of granting the right-of-way are also available.

Generally only such information as may have been obtained in confidence from land-

owners and private road owners is considered confidential and not available to prospective timber purchasers. Such information normally includes data regarding the financial affairs of the land or road owner, regarding existing or pending negotiations for sale of such private property, references to such information in preliminary reports of appraisers who estimate the value of rights-of-way or roads, and similar references obtained from records of other public agencies. Any or all of these may be used in the preliminary analysis and evaluation of road costs. The final data based on such preliminary analysis are available to prospective timber purchasers.

If you require any additional information regarding this matter I will be glad to provide it.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD WOOZLEY, *Director.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe these letters will enable my colleagues and others interested in our forestry program to have the entire picture. Once again, I wish to say that the Bureau of Land Management is doing a commendable job in its operations in Oregon.

To back this up, I wish to insert in the RECORD a recent release by the Department of the Interior on the program accomplishments of 1957. In doing so, I should like to call attention to the Bureau's announcement that in 1956 it sold 569,779,000 board-feet of timber in Oregon. In 1957, sales went up to 674,421,000 board feet. For 1958, the Bureau plans to sell 833 million board-feet in 278 sales. These sales will average 3 million board-feet each, and are geared to meet the needs of small lumber operators.

I hope the Bureau's estimate of future sales proves to be correct. For my own part, I serve notice that I intend to protest the budget cut of over $360,000 in the Bureau's forestry funds. I fail to see how this program, which is economical in operation to the taxpayers, and is so beneficial to the Treasury, can be aided by such a curtailment of funds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Bureau's release of January 16, 1958, summarizing its work in Oregon for 1957, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT SUMS UP OREGON WORK FOR 1957

Virgil T. Heath, State supervisor of the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon, reported today on the agency's activities for 1957.

Heath said the Bureau of Land Management manages and protects approximately 16 million acres of Federal land in Oregon. The area is divided into 10 districts. Timber sales, access road construction, reforestation, and forest inventory in the five forest (O. & C.) districts in the 18 western counties, and range management, development, and protection in five grazing districts of eastern Oregon are, in addition to the keeping of all public-land records, the principal jobs of the Bureau.

Revenue from timber sales in 1957, reflecting the depressed lumber market, was below that of 1956. Tabulations show that 771,281,000 board-feet were offered for sale by the Bureau of Land Management and 674,421,000 board-feet were sold. The sales returned $19,230,329.87 for the O. & C. counties and the Federal Treasury. This is compared with 569,779,000 board-feet sold in 1956 for $20,372,634.66. The per thousand board-feet average in 1957 was $28.71. In 1956 it was $36.34.

Sale of timber from public-domain lands in the grazing districts and on the fringes of the O. & C. districts totaled 37,961,000 board-feet and brought $717,180.06, an average of $18.70 per thousand.

Heath said that in 1958 Bureau of Land Management plans to offer for sale 833 million board-feet of stumpage in 278 separate tracts. This amount represents the annual allowable cut on the lands, plus salvage timber and tracts which did not sell in 1957.

Good progress was made in other activities. The following access road projects were completed: 91.4 miles of surfacing, 20.6 miles of grading and 2 major bridges. Under construction were: 13.2 miles of grading, 4.1 miles of surfacing and 2 major bridges. Emphasis was placed on the timber reinventory to have the job completed before 1960. Results of the 1957 inventory boosted the annual allowable cut on O. & C. lands by 31.5 million board-feet.

Contracts were let for planting 9,690 acres of cutover or burned over forest land, and for aerial seeding of 4,300 acres. Some of these contracts will not be completed until the spring of this year. Additional contracts for planting and seeding will be let in the near future. The Bureau of Land Management has contracted for approximately 16 million seedlings (young trees) from the United States Forest Service and a private nursery, which will be delivered for planting during 1958 and 1959.

After public hearings, at which lumbermen and other interested persons expressed their opinions, a decision was made to discontinue the controversial marketing area requirement of O. & C. timber sales. The regulation had been in effect for many years and required that stumpage sold in the marketing area must be at least manufactured into rough lumber before it could be transported from the area.

While the Bureau of Land Management was disposing of an old regulation, it was starting a new service for the public. Microfilming of the survey field notes for the 18 northwest Oregon counties was finished in 1957, and the project will be completed for all Oregon counties during 1958. Oregon will thus become the first State in the Nation to have its entire land survey on compact, permanent microfilm. Copies of the film will be on sale by the Bureau of Land Management to interested parties.

During 1957 in the 10 Bureau of Land Management districts of Oregon, 2,175 livestock operators grazed 371,000 head of cattle, 4,317 horses, and 197,000 sheep, for which they paid $196,000 in grazing fees and leases.

Work done on the public domain grazing lands to improve the stock ranges and increase the carrying capacity for livestock and wildlife consisted of the following: chemical brush control on 2,134 acres; chemical weed control on 1,634 acres; sand dune control on 80 acres; 100 miles of range fence built; 60 reservoirs, 20 springs, and 6 wells developed to provide additional water for livestock and wildlife; 48 miles of truck road constructed; 3 bridges and 7 cattleguards built on range roads; 7,750 acres of Bureau of Land Management range was seeded to crested wheatgrass and 21,830 bushels of wheatgrass seed was harvested from 1,200 acres of Federal land. The harvested wheatgrass will be used to seed other areas of Federal range and will greatly increase their grazing capacity.

John C. Hunt, Bureau of Land Management fire-control officer for Oregon, reports that 1957 was the worst fire year in the grazing districts since 1942. Hunt said the district range managers, their staffs, and the per diem guards controlled 171 fires on Federal, private, State, and county lands. A total of 45,000 acres were burned by the 107 man-caused and 64 lightning fires. Cost of fire suppression and prevention in the grazing districts was approximately $186,000.

The fire-control chief said that the 12,000-acre blaze in mid-August which wiped out the famous early-day mining town of Malheur City near the Malheur-Baker county line was the largest fire in the State in 1957. The Bureau of Land Management waged a night and day battle against the range conflagration with 200 men, 2 planes spraying chemical and water on the rapidly spreading front of the fire, a dozen bulldozers and several tank trucks, before it was brought under control.

Four fires outside the districts on public domain lands protected under contracts by the State and the United States Forest Service burned 6 acres. Fire damage on Bureau of Land Management and private lands was estimated at $96,000, and the cost of replacing burned improvements and reseeding burned areas at $103,000.

In the O. & C. districts there were 40 fires that burned 1,100 acres of Federal land, causing damages estimated at $32,680. The forest districts are all under contract protection to the Oregon State Department of Forestry, private forest protection associations, and the United States Forest Service. Total contract protection for the forest districts cost Bureau of Land Management $520,000 in 1957.

## THE ECONOMIC SITUATION OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the administration's trickle-down theory, as it applies to lower income groups, is well known. We are also aware of the failure of these groups to benefit from the profits big business has achieved in the last 5 years.

We have had another problem resulting from another administration theory, which is known as Wilson's law. Roughly translated, it states that what is good for big business is good for America. This statement of the law is dedicated to the former Secretary of Defense, who left the Eisenhower team to go to more fertile fields.

We have watched Wilson's law in operation; and I think it is now known that it has led to the establishment of another theory, designated as the trickle-up theory. This theory manifests itself clearly after small businesses are snuffed out by the giants. We are beginning to learn that it is not possible to stifle and kill off small business without ultimately affecting big business. Let me say respectfully that in the Republican Party there are many who are making a studied effort to ignore this hard fact.

The trickle-up theory shows that after enough small businesses are killed, big business starts to feel the pinch. A good example is a situation in Oregon. Our lumber industry has been hard hit by the administration's tight money policies. A number of small sawmills and plywood plants have been forced to close, because of the consequences of the tight money program on housing construction.

The Simpson Logging Co. has announced it is closing two plants, that employ 725 men, because of a lack of current orders. The company has announced a 1-week shutdown of its Oregon plants.

The trickle-down program, after inundating so much small business, is beginning to back up. It is finally trickling up to the big boys. As always, however, the working men and women of America are the ones who suffer most. This is the real tragedy. I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper story of this closing be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my statement. This item appeared in the Oregon Journal of January 11, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal of January 11, 1958]

TWO PLY PLANTS CURTAILING OUTPUT; 700 FACING LAYOFF

The Simpson Logging Co. announced Friday that two of its plywood plants are temporarily curtailing production and about 700 employees will be out of work for maybe a week.

Harold Johns, sales manager for the company, said the firm's Plylock plant in St. Johns will be partially down for a few days. E. P. Reiten, personnel manager, said 300 or 400 employees would be out of work. The plant employs about 450.

The company's Albany plant also will be curtailed. How many employees will be out of work was not determined. The plant employs 275.

Reason for the curtailment, said Johns, was lack of volume and a slack in demand from customers.

Reiten said the employees "probably will be called back when orders permit us to operate again. It could be January 20."

This is another in a series of plywood layoffs in the last 5 months. New plants have flooded the market with plywood and the price has fallen to a postwar low.

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MATTHEW M. NEELY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now renew my request to speak for not more than 5 minutes in tribute to the late Senator Matt Neely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few minutes ago, all of us were proud to join in honoring the seating of a new Senator from West Virginia, one of the most distinguished citizens from that great State. For some time I have planned to pay this tribute today. I am sure that West Virginia's new Senator will be pleased to have me say these few words about my very dear friend, Senator Matt Neely.

Mr. President, in the words of Job, chapter 30, verse 31, today "My harp also is turned to mourning, and my organ into the voice of them that weep," as I give this brief tribute to Matthew Mansfield Neely, late senior Senator from the State of West Virginia, to whom as man, friend, preceptor, and fellow political warrior I owe a debt of gratitude that cannot be repaid.

Since he was first elected to public office as mayor of Fairmont, W. Va., in 1908, Matthew Neely's energies, his intelligence, and his facile tongue have been devoted to furthering the political and economic freedoms of all Americans. Although his forebears were among the Revolutionary fathers, and his maternal grandfather served the Union, only to perish in Andersonville prison, Senator Neely was one politician who never needed to call down the heroism of his ancestors in his own behalf. His reputation among the great liberals of the 20th century is well fixed in American history. The workingman, the housewife, the struggler against prejudice and injustice—all found a champion in Matthew Neely.

It is said that a man is known by the company he keeps and by those he chooses to emulate and admire. In 1942, Senator Neely paid tribute to Senator George Norris at a testimonial dinner. "Thomas Jefferson," Senator Neely said, "Abraham Lincoln, William Jennings Byran, 'Battling Bob' La Follette, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and George Norris constitute the most brilliant stars in the brightest constellation of America's humanitarian statesmen." Surely Senator Neely deserves to be included among them in the pages of this country's history. I believe he will be.

There is one certain test, Mr. President, and it is an acid one, of a man, and it is the degree to which he is capable of arousing devotion and loyalty in those who work for him. Measured by this standard, Matthew Neely stands paramount. The devoted service given him by Leo Casey, chief clerk of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, was a dedicated and moving demonstration of the love and affection he evoked from those close to him. Evelyn Nolan, his personal secretary; and George Arnold, his administrative assistant, have also borne witness, through their unstinting service, to the high quality of greatness that he so well exemplified.

I expect that his friends and colleagues will remember Matt Neely best for his unquenchable zeal and penetrating phrase for exposing the hypocrisy in American life—not just in politics, I may emphasize, but in all American life.

Candor in politicians is not always counted as an asset by some, but Senator Neely's life exemplified the fact that truth eventually emerges from even the most carefully contrived welter of misrepresentation and accusation. He might well say with Caesar—and I have no doubt that the quotation was included in his well-furnished store of Shakesperian learning—

There is no terror, Cassius, in your threats;
For I am arm'd so strong in honesty,
That they pass me by as the idle wind
Which I respect not.

That Senator Neely was a deeply religious man was brought home again to me upon the occasion of one of my visits with him at the hospital, when, in speaking of his illness, he likened himself to King Hezekiah, and he quoted the first two verses of chapter 38 of the Book of Isaiah. I remember the incident well, because at that time he said to me, "Wayne, I do not know if I will be back with you in the Senate." Then he called my attention to this great, old biblical story, and quoted the following from the Book of Isaiah:

In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz came to him, and said unto him, Thus sayeth the Lord, Set thine house in order: for thou shalt die, and not live.

Then Hezekiah turned his face to the wall, and prayed unto the Lord.

Senator Neely then told me the old Bible story about King Hezekiah praying for more time to complete his unfinished work.

The additional 15 years of the Biblical story was not granted to Senator Neely to complete his work. In the largest sense, his work to achieve justice, to eradicate from our society the evils of sickness and economic insecurity, and to bring to the afflicted compassion is never completed. Each of us, Mr. President, should count ourselves most fortunate, if when the time comes, it can be said of us that we had accomplished a small portion of the great legislative work that stands as the enduring tribute to Matt Neely. I thank God for the life of Senator Matt Neely.

## INDIA'S REPUBLIC DAY AND ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Sunday, January 26, was India's Republic Day, and marked the 8th anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic of India. India became independent in 1947, but it was not until January 26, 1950, that India's constitution was adopted.

Although India had struggled to break the bonds of colonialism, it was a mark of the tolerance and wisdom of her people that they chose to remain within the British Commonwealth. Through a constituent assembly, which deliberated for months, the Indian people chose democratic institutions, as representative government, parliamentary system, an independent judiciary, and free elections, all of which are foundation stones in the structure of free government. And, it may be noted that the Indian constitution draws from American thought and experience, in its incorporation of the federal-state concept.

In the years that have passed since independence there has been a resurgence of creativeness, energy, and action in India. I use the word "resurgence" correctly, for long before European civilization existed or America had been discovered, a high order of art, industry and commerce had been attained in India.

So today I am sure that I speak for all of us when I extend every good wish to India and its people on Republic Day.

But I take this opportunity to speak of a matter that is immediately before our Government. It is a matter on which I spoke in the Senate on Thursday, January 16, and about which I speak today for emphasis.

The Department of State has announced that it desires to assist India in meeting its current economic problem, which is its need for foreign exchange.

The Department has indicated that it is considering a loan to India of the sum of approximately $225 million, through the Export-Import Bank, through the Economic Development Fund, and through the supply of surplus grains under Public Law 480.

I understand that an Indian delegation will arrive in the United States this week for consultation on the subject.

The Department of State is to be commended, and indeed, our Government has shown its friendship and interest in India's economic advancement throughout the years. But I should like to point out, that $250 million will not do the job. I think it would be agreed by all who are familiar with the subject that at least $500 million will be needed within the year if India is to succeed in maintaining the core of its second 5-year plan.

I hope that during the consultations which will soon begin between our Government and representatives of the Government of India, credit from the Export-Import Bank will be increased, additional funds may be provided from the Economic Development Fund, either from appropriations for fiscal year 1958, or fiscal year 1959, and that additional grain surpluses may be made available to reach the $500 million that is needed.

Senators may ask—and no doubt the question will be asked—why I make this suggestion. There are many reasons why I should like to see India's second 5-year plan successfully carried out. I should certainly like to see the strongest democracy in the West assist the new and great democracy in the East in the effort it is making to achieve economic progress. No democratic country in the world—and no country in the world, unless it is Russia—is making from its own resources an effort of the magnitude of that of India to advance industrially and economically.

As for myself, I would help India because of its great effort, and because it is seeking to raise the standard of its people through voluntary means. I do not argue that matter today, as I did not when I addressed the Senate on January 16. I make my argument upon the ground of our own national security. I am convinced that the chance for a democratic Asia rests upon the success of a democratic India. I do not believe that India will fail, but I make this proposition to the Congress and to the people of our country, contemplate, if you will, the effect upon the position of the United States and its future security if democratic government in Asia should fail. This is a problem for the future, concerning the security of the United States, but it may be decided by our action now.

If we are willing to advance the very large sum of $225 million, then I say we should make available the amount which is actually needed to maintain the core of the second 5-year plan. That amount will certainly total $500 million during this year.

I suggest that the loans from the Export-Import Bank be increased beyond $125 million. Their loans to India have not been large. I suggest that larger amounts of our surplus grains be made available. And I have suggested that we could consider transforming the wheat loan of 1951, which calls for repayment in dollars, to payment in rupees, to conform with our present policy of Public Law 480 sales of grain surpluses. If this is done it would extend the credit of India in the World Bank by approximately $100 million.

These suggestions I have made do not call for new appropriations by the Congress, but their total effect could equal the sum of $500 million.

The President of the United States in his great state of the Union message emphasized the necessity of strengthening free countries throughout the world as a matter of our own national security. My judgment is that India presents a concrete test. The people of the world are waiting for creative efforts by the United States toward meeting the problems which we face in the world today. Everyone knows that they are not military problems alone but economic problems as well.

Mr. President, I seize this occasion to say to the Senate—and I hope to both Houses of Congress—that in this crucial time, we can aid India, and at the same time act for our own best interests and the interest of democratic institutions everywhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of January 26, 1958, entitled "India's Republic Day."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA'S REPUBLIC DAY

Today is the eighth anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic of India. On January 26, 1950, the Indian Constitution was formally adopted and a new and different government took form. India had been independent since 1947, but there was the desire to create something apart from what had seemed, at first, the easiest course.

What was accomplished is one of the most interesting and gratifying developments in political history. How was it possible for an independent republic to remain within the framework of the British Commonwealth? At first it seemed a contradiction in terms. Flexibility and good sense in both India and Britain solved the problem. The Commonwealth could remain, and the crown would be its symbol, not its sovereign. Thus a republic could be instituted and at the same time old and valuable ties could be retained. The same pattern has been followed, with similiar success, in Pakistan.

These 8 years in the Republic of India have not been easy. The problems that requ'red the attempt at solution were enormous. Many of them remain, and an Indian mission is now en route to this country to enlist our help in the solution of some of them. It deserves, and should have, a friendly reception.

What is most important, however, is the element of growth. A republic such as that of India represents an effort to meet political needs with new instruments. It can do so without discarding what has been proved to be good, such as the Commonwealth association. At the same time, it can have the sense of political freedom and independence. This is valuable to it, and on this day our congratulation and good wishes go out to India with the hope that the high aspirations can be realized.

---

## WALTER REUTHER—ECONOMIC DEMAGOG

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Reuther is a many-faceted individual who delights in espousing his own special brand of economic philosophy. His most recent pronouncements have been given wide coverage. I have characterized his misguided notions as economic hogwash in an article printed by Human Events newsletter of November 2, 1957, which, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER REUTHER—ECONOMIC DEMAGOG—THE TRUTH ABOUT WAGES, PRICES, AND INFLATION

(By Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland)

The well-worn legend that businessmen have been reaping excessive profits is once more abroad in the land. As usual, the charge is advanced by some leaders of the labor union movement—particularly by CIO President Walter Reuther. Reuther's accusations, and the facts concerning the wage-price spiral of the American economy, need to be examined carefully.

Let us inspect the cold statistics compiled by the Department of Commerce. In 1947 corporate profits before taxes were $29.5 billion. In 1956 they totaled $43 billion—an increase of $13.5 billion. This increase, however, was only 9.2 percent of the total increase in the national income. This is not a very big slice of the larger pie which our free enterprise economy created during this 10-year period. I refer to corporate profits before taxes deliberately, because Walter Reuther insists that this is the correct measure of corporate profits.

In a recent press release (sent to every Member of the Congress) Reuther said: "Corporation profits taxes are designed to be paid out of corporation profits and not out of the consumer's pocket. If Congress intended to raise the revenue involved from consumers, it would have levied a tax on them, rather than on corporate profits. Profits taxes are definitely not a cost like labor and material costs which have to be met whether or not there is a profit. Profits taxes are paid only if a profit is actually made."

All business costs, of course—including a return on capital, as well as taxes, labor costs and materials—must be paid by the consumer if a business is to remain solvent. We can therefore dismiss Reuther's statement as pure propaganda.

In 1947 corporation profits after taxes were $18.2 billion. In 1956 this figure had risen to $21 billion, an increase of only $2.8 billion. The increase in profits after taxes accounts for only 1.9 percent of the $146.4 billion increase in the national income. On this basis, net profits are not high enough—Reuther to the contrary notwithstanding.

But what share of the national income did employees receive? The Department of Commerce shows that in 1947 employees received $128.8 billion, including employer payments for social security contributions and other benefit programs. By 1956 these payments had grown to $241.4 billion, an increase of $112.6 billion.

In short, these increased labor costs absorbed 76.9 percent of the entire increase in

national income during the decade. This is clearly the area where attention should be concentrated. Some people forget that the compensation of employees is not only income to the employees, but also a cost to the employer. It must be recovered in the price charged the consumer or we shall have neither employers nor employees.

Consider these significant facts: An examination of distribution of the increase in the national income through this decade shows that for every additional dollar of corporate profits after taxes, employees receive an additional $40. Furthermore, labor's share of the total national income rose from 65.3 percent in 1947 to 70.3 percent in 1956.

On the other hand, corporate profits after taxes dropped from 9.3 percent of the national income in 1947 to only 6.1 percent in 1956.

If all corporate profits before taxes in 1956 had been paid as additional compensation to employees, their total income would have been increased by less than 18 percent. However, if there were no corporate profits, the Government would have received $22 billion less from corporate income taxes. With the existing level of Government expenditures, higher personal income and consumer excise taxes would have been required. Since income taxes in the upper brackets have already reached the point of diminishing returns most of this increase would of necessity have been imposed on lower bracket taxpayers.

All of this goes to show that the profiteering legend will not stand up as an explanation for the inflation that besets our economy. Let us turn, therefore, to the activities of the labor leaders, such as Reuther himself, and see if we can discover an answer there.

Next year the contracts between the United Automobile Workers and the producers in the automotive industry will expire. Reuther is attempting to appear as the champion of the consumer in preparation for new negotiations. He seeks to involve the President and the Congress of the United States in support of his proposal that the "biggest wage increase in the history" of his union could be met without inflationary price increases if the profits of the automobile manufacturers were lowered. I can testify to the elaborate material Reuther's press agents send to every Member of the Congress.

Reuther has proposed that the three leading producers reduce the average wholesale price of their 1958 models by $100 per car. While he demands that the manufacturers make a specific reduction in the selling price of their product, he does not propose any reduction in wages.[1] On the contrary, all that he offers in return for an immediate price reduction is a very vague promise that he won't demand as much as he might have asked if the manufacturers had not complied with his request. This is hardly a quid pro quo.

In rejecting Reuther's proposal, Henry Ford II said: "Thus, having poured gasoline on the fires of inflation you now stand by and tell us how to fight the blaze. In return you say you will consider using less gasoline next time—or maybe only kerosene."

Reuther's concept of bargaining, I believe, imposes a threat to the maintenance of a competitive economy. In the first place, his proposal was addressed to the three leading manufacturers in the automotive industry, who—he says—account for 97 percent of that industry's production. He implies that successful producers can pay wages higher than other firms which are making lower profits or are actually operating at a loss. He suggests that wages should be set to produce what he considers a fair return to the stockholders. Reuther's plan envisions participation by labor and the public in determining wage, price and profit policies. Obviously this theory is not compatible with a competitive economy.

Reuther has also indicated that he will request a 4-day week with no loss in take-home pay, together with "substantial economic concessions including more for pensions, more for insurance, hospital and surgical benefits, and more supplementary unemployment pay."

A 4-day week? While economists may not agree on the rate at which national productivity increases, their individual estimates all fall within a range of 1 to 4 percent annually.

A 4-day week with no loss in take-home pay—and no increase in costs—would require a 25 percent increase in productivity. No one even suggests that this is immediately possible.

If the same production is to be maintained, industry must pay time-and-a-half for the fifth day. A 4-day week with no loss in weekly take-home pay would require a 25 percent increase in hourly wage rates. Time-and-a-half for the fifth day results in a total increase of 37½ percent in average weekly wages.

Reuther follows a familiar pattern. He always initiates negotiations with the most profitable firms in the industry. He discusses their ability to pay and presents elaborate statistics to show that they earn a higher rate of return on their investment than the average manufacturer. He attempts to marshal public opinion in support of this position. His pleas are directed to community leaders—including the clergy, educators, legislators, and the executive branch of the Government.

If history repeats itself, however, and Reuther succeeds in securing concessions from the three leading firms, he will then approach the remaining companies with whom the UAW has contracts, including hundreds of suppliers to "the big three," and demand identically the same concessions on the basis that the new agreement has established a standard for the industry. He cannot do otherwise, as members of his union employed by other companies who are paying the same dues and living and working in the same communities expect the union to secure comparable benefits for them. Furthermore, since all union leaders compete against each other for power within the framework of the AFL–CIO, every other trade union leader must obtain comparable concessions to retain the support of his members. And so, the chain reaction begins.

Reuther is concerned with ability to pay only at the start of a new series of demands. If he succeeds, the usual evolution of price increases for all industry must take place. The average earnings of manufacturing corporations, to which he refers, of necessity include a few of the most successful firms as well as the many firms which make lower profits or operate at a loss. If wages are based on the ability of the most successful firms to pay them, average profits will soon fall to a level so low that they will jeopardize the survival of many others. This, in turn, will destroy the high living standards enjoyed by American labor.

While Reuther cites the rise in total profits, he fails to point out the tremendous increase in assets. They constitute additional plant and equipment as well as added working capital to employ more members of his union.

Reuther sent me tables showing the increase in profits for Ford and General Motors over a 10-year period. He did not relate them to an increase in the assets of these 2 companies of almost $6 billion. He failed to mention that these additional assets had made it possible to increase total payrolls by almost $2.4 billion. He significantly did not note an increase in corporate income taxes of almost $830 million.

Businessmen should be especially alarmed by Reuther's attitude as to the reinvestment of earnings by industry. The material which he sent me said: "Furthermore, we pointed out that the increase in the net worth of all three of these companies represents in the postwar period largely profits that have been plowed back into the companies. It is an investment, involuntarily contributed by consumers through prices set arbitrarily and unnecessarily high without giving the consumer any equity in companies and paying them any return on their investment."

The concept that a consumer should receive an equity from the company from which he has bought a product has been voiced by Reuther on previous occasions. This, too, is part of his program to modify American capitalism as we know it.

He shows that the reinvested profits of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler totaled more than $3 billion, but that there was a new investment of only a little more than $421 million. His theory of bargaining suggests no return should be allowed on these reinvested profits.

Unfortunately, inflation has reduced the purchasing power of the profit dollar; hence, much of the reinvested earnings have been used to replace wornout facilities rather than to expand them.

Here is one striking illustration of this fact: The Thompson Products Co., of Cleveland, made a study of the cost of replacing a lathe purchased in 1942. The original lathe cost $12,000. Under the tax laws, it was depreciated over a 14-year period, so that in 1956 the company had $12,000 set aside to purchase a new lathe. In addition, it also realized $1,000 when the old lathe was sold. This gave them a total of $13,000. However, the lathe which cost $12,000 in 1942 was selling for $35,000 in 1956. Meanwhile, technological improvements in lathes had been made. Thompson Products found it necessary to buy an improved lathe at a cost of $67,000. Therefore, the company found itself with only $13,000 to buy a $67,000 piece of equipment. Where did it obtain the extra money?

The additional $54,000 was secured from reinvested earnings. In order to accumulate this amount after paying taxes, the company first had to make a profit of $112,000. To secure the funds merely to replace a piece of equipment, the Thompson Products Co. was required to sell $1,250,000 of its products. This is the process which Reuther castigates as a compulsory investment by the consumer.

The CIO leader, who now claims to be a moderate and a supporter of free enterprise, voices another dangerous concept. In commenting on Ford's reply to his proposal, Reuther said: "By calculating profits as a percentage of total assets Mr. Ford, in effect, was claiming the right to make a profit not only on his own company's investment but also on other people's money." Reuther apparently believes that if you borrow money to use in your business, you should not earn a profit on it. Naturally, no businessman borrows money unless he believes he can earn a profit by so doing. Anyone who objects to these profits does not believe in a free enterprise.

Reuther's repeated attempts to secure participation in the pricing decisions of American business strike at the fundamental principles of a competitive economy. His recent maneuver is just another version of an old Reuther plan.

Late in 1945, one of the bitterest strikes in our history was waged over the issue of the responsibility of management to determine its pricing policies, in terms of the economics of a competitive market, without consultation with the union. It is significant that Reuther then also suggested a $100

[1] George Romney of American Motors countered Reuther's proposal by suggesting that it would be acceptable if a corresponding cut in labor costs were made. Reuther is still studying that proposal.

price reduction coupled with a 30 percent wage increase. The strike was finally settled with no yielding by management of its fundamental responsibilities.

Reuther then told a press conference: "The whole question of ability to pay was merely a public relations job on our part. It was used to put the company on the spot so that they would have to talk economics or be over a barrel."

From my close observation of Reuther's political interests, I am convinced that he regards the bargaining table as a platform for the acquisition of political power. His statements clearly show that if he were in a position of greater political power, he would attempt to destroy competitive capitalism.

Before the advent of pattern bargaining, lower prices for all Americans were the result of improved technology and increased capital investment. Every individual had an opportunity to advance further through experience and the development of superior skill. In recent years, however, national productivity has been preempted by certain union agreements. Labor costs have outdistanced national productivity, thus forcing prices to rise.

As a result, Government employees, retired people and farmers have suffered a great disadvantage. The efforts of these groups to equalize their position with organized labor has placed additional demands on budgets at all levels of Government. Increased labor costs require additional appropriations for Federal expenditures on defense materiel, one of the largest items in the Federal budget. Similarly, the budgets of local and State governments have been strained to equalize the compensation of firemen, policemen, and schoolteachers. With limited tax resources some have pressed for Federal aid to education and other grant-in-aid programs to States and local communities.

Meanwhile, price increases for manufactured goods have depressed the parity index for farm products. This automatically results in great expenditures by the Federal Government under our price-support programs. The harassed taxpayer is thus denied needed relief.

This is the deadly circle of inflation and economic intervention by government; it must be broken. After careful study, I have concluded that the first step in reversing this dangerous trend is to make it impossible for any group to exercise monopoly power.

In 1890, Congress passed the Sherman Act, the first great piece of legislation to control monopolies. It has given the Department of Justice effective means to disperse concentrated business power, and it has been used on many occasions. I am confident that the President, the Attorney General, and the courts have adequate power to deal with industrial concentration. Furthermore, the Congress is always ready to consider additional legislation to prevent business monopoly.

Neither the courts nor the executive branch, however, have effective weapons to deal with concentrated union monopoly power. Under section 6 of the Clayton Act, which was approved in 1914, most activities of labor unions are specifically exempted from the antitrust laws. It is my considered conviction that we must now establish equality of treatment before the law for all organized groups—labor as well as business—in our economy. During the early days of the labor movement, there may have been some justification for labor unions receiving special treatment under the antitrust laws. Today, they have great financial resources and exercise vast political and economic power. Special treatment is no longer justified.

Accordingly, I intend to support legislation when the Congress reconvenes to eliminate this discrimination by amending section 6 of the Clayton Act.

All my efforts will be directed to preserving a competitive economy providing maximum freedom for labor and capital. This is the way to produce continued gains in real income for everyone.

## DISTRIBUTION OF SOIL BANK FUNDS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned over the procedure which the Department of Agriculture has used in allocating funds for the acreage reserve phase of the soil bank. Instructions were handed down from the Washington office to the effect that applications for the 1958 program would be accepted from January 13 to March 7 and that funds would be adequate to cover all cotton acres offered for the acreage reserve. However, on January 16, only 4 days after the initial opening of the program, abrupt notice was given by the Washington office to discontinue accepting applications.

This came as a shocking surprise to farmers who wanted to sign up for the program and had been assured that the program would be open until March 7. This drastic action is directly contrary to prior assurances they had received from Washington.

The Department of Agriculture has complicated this situation by again instructing State committees to allocate county funds to farmers on a first-come first-served basis, without adequate safeguards to protect other eligible farmers who filed later within the authorized period. Under this procedure, farmers filing applications after their county quota has been reached cannot participate in the program unless unused funds from other States or counties are made available at a later date.

The unfavorable weather that prevailed in many southeastern States last year has resulted in disastrous crop losses, and thousands of farmers have made application for the soil bank in desperation. I have received numerous letters and telegrams from outstanding leaders in Mississippi expressing concern over this serious problem. In my State, 45,500 agreements to rent acreage under the acreage reserve program were received during the first 4 days farmers could sign up. These covered 378,000 acres at an estimated value of $28,839,000. The entire State allocation is only $20,480,000, and the State office estimates that it would take a total of $40 million to cover accepted applications and other requests now pending. I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD, a table which has been furnished me by the State ASC committee, giving a county breakdown of the county soil bank participation during the first 4 days of the signup period and the county allocations. I shall also ask to have printed 3 or 4 letters which I have received emphasizing the seriousness of this situation at the county level.

I have urged the Secretary of Agriculture to review State allocations and give special consideration to those States adversely affected by crop failures and to work out a more adequate formula for distribution which will be fair and in line with commitments and assurances given by the Department of Agriculture that all farmers who desire to do so would have a chance to participate.

The effect of what has happened is the working of a grave injustice to many individual farmers, as well as the following of a pattern that is in effect unfair and unjust. It is not in keeping with the spirit and understanding on which the appropriation was made, is contrary to the intentions of Congress, and should be corrected administratively at once. But I point out to the Department of Agriculture that it is their duty to formulate a sound, fair plan, and if legislation is necessary to carry out such a plan, they should call on the Congress for such legislation. Certainly action is demanded, and time is short.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks four brief letters on this subject which are very much to the point and which sum up the situation adequately. These letters have been received from persons who are affected by this adverse action.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. JOHN STENNIS,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: I am writing you requesting that you exert every effort in order that the soil bank acreage reserve allocation be increased for the State of Mississippi. The reasons for this request are as follows:

1. The announced signup period for soil bank contracts was January 13 through March 7, 1958. During the first 4 days of this signup period 577 contracts were signed, amounting to $189,000. In addition thereto there are 221 farmers on the waiting list, which comprises another $70,000.

2. According to the present allocation estimate, Tishomingo County will receive only enough money to take care of 260 farm contracts or approximately one-third of the farmers who at the present time desire to enter acreage reserve contracts.

I trust that you will exert every effort in order to secure additional funds for the acreage reserve allocation for the State of Mississippi.

Thanking you for your kind favors to agriculture in the past and with kind personal regards, I am

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

DE KALB, MISS., *January 17, 1958.*

Senator JOHN C. STENNIS,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: I am writing you with reference to the soil bank program. In 1957 all farmers in Mississippi who wanted to rent their cotton acreage to the Government were allowed to do so. One week prior to the beginning signup date for the 1958 program I had a conference with the man in charge of the ACP office in Kemper County (Mr. Caruthers) and he gave me the information on the 1958 program as given him by the State office in Jackson, Miss., to the effect that the signup date was January 13 to March 7 with a $3,000 limit to the farm or farmer, and that a man could sign up his entire acreage allotment if he desired.

Up until last night I had passed that information along to my farmers through adult classes (Thursday night) and on Friday morning the signup has been discontinued by the State committee, saying the allotment of money is gone.

Now as I see it, something is wrong. If we didn't have enough money to have a program, to give every man who wanted to rent his land to the Government an opportunity, then we should have only let them either rent a small percentage or not have a soil bank program at all.

It is very hard for the county committee and the Government representative to administer these programs let alone when things turn out like this.

The people are very much disturbed over the situation, and I wanted to let you know and maybe there is something that can be done about it. Definitely I think every man in the State who wants to rent his acreage should be allowed that privilege or no one, just not the few who managed to get in the front of the line, when they had been told that they could rent all of their acreage if they wanted to, and that they had until March 7 to sign up.

Sincerely,

E. W. PICKETT.

---

DE KALB, MISS., *January 22, 1958.*

DEAR JOHN: For your information: We have just this morning gotten the information on the status of Kemper County in the cotton program of renting acres to the Government.

In 1957 there were 440 farms that signed rental agreements amounting to $139,000 that was in force for the year.

At the time they stopped them from signing agreements for this year's program, 337 had signed agreements amounting to $150,000, with 400 farmers' names taken wanting to sign agreements. The amount of the agreements signed was $150,000. This morning we received notice that Kemper County was allotted $100,000, which is $29,000 less than was allotted last year and means that one-third of the amount of money signed in contracts will have to be canceled. This is one of the biggest messes that I have ever seen as the farmers were told that they had until March 7 to sign agreements and that the amount of the county's allotment would be whatever they signed up and this was put out from Washington.

In looking over the list we are not in near as bad a shape as most of the hill counties in the State.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

---

GRENADA, MISS., *January 22, 1958.*

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: Just wanted to tell you of a mess the United States Department of Agriculture has us in. We were following the soil-bank idea in good faith. Now with less than one-half money we are stopped dead.

This area was badly hurt by the excessive rains in 1957, so we are in bad shape. We don't know who we can rely on for farm view.

Yours with highest regards,

HARRY PARKER.

---

DUFFEE, MISS., *January 25, 1958.*

Senator JOHN C. STENNIS,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing you concerning the cotton acreage. Will you please fight for money enough for all the farmers that rented their acreage last year? This is the most unfair thing I've ever heard of. I just can't believe you and our other lawmakers will let them put this over on us depressed farmers. Please stand up for us.

Sincerely yours,

G. A. ESTES.

Mr. STENNIS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I wrote to Mr. Benson on February 5, 1957, with reference to the administration of the soil-bank program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
*February 5, 1957.*

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am greatly concerned over the present method of distribution of the soil-bank funds on a first-come first-served basis. I strongly believe that this procedure will result in inequities and unjust treatment of many of our cotton farmers.

I understand that present regulations provide that soil-bank funds allocated to counties will go to farmers who file their applications first, without adequate safeguards to protect other eligible farmers who file later. Under this procedure, farmers filing applications after the county quota has been reached cannot participate in the program unless unused funds from other counties are made available at a later date. (Reallocation of unused county funds is extremely uncertain and could be delayed to such an extent that this part of the program would be ineffective.)

There is justification for a reasonable deadline for filing applications, but I do not believe that Congress intended this program to operate in such a way as to completely disqualify an eligible farmer solely because he was not one of the first to file an application.

I have already received several letters from Mississippi farmers which cause me great concern over the effects of this method of distribution of soil-bank funds to all farmers and particularly over the impact on small- and medium-sized farmers who may file applications late due to conditions beyond their control.

I certainly hope that you will reappraise the present regulations and adjust this program so as to give more equitable treatment to all farmers. I strongly feel that the first consideration should be given to farmers who make application for at least 10 acres or for their full allotments in cases of less than 10 acres, and the balance of the county fund would be made available to all other applicants on the basis of a specific formula. This procedure would certainly be in line with the provision in the present law which assures producers a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in the acreage reserve program.

Your consideration of this request at the earliest possible date will be greatly appreciated.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STENNIS,
*United States Senator.*

---

## EFFECTS ON CONTINUOUS REPROGRAMING OF DEFENSE SCHEDULES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, rerecently there has been much news about labor in the public press.

We have heard also a great deal about what harm continuous reprograming of defense schedules does to such segments of our economy as industry and finance, but we have heard very little about what these changes and cutbacks and cancellations do to the lives of the working people of the country.

Seldom has that problem been presented better than in a thought-provoking address made this month to the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences by Mr. A. J. Hayes, international president of the International Association of Machinists.

The first recommendation of the 17 recommendations made in the statement released by the chairman of the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee was to modernize and strengthen the Strategic Air Command.

The sixth recommendation was to provide adequate airlift for ground troops.

Based on these recommendations, it is interesting to note there is not 1 cent for airplane production in the fiscal year 1958 supplemental budget now before the Congress.

Nor has there been any restoration in the heavy reductions in plane schedules made in 1957, the year of sputnik.

In view of these facts, it is interesting to note the following paragraph in the address by Mr. Hayes:

> In spite of the demonstration of Soviet progress to which we were all treated last October 6, we have continued to hold fast to our program of cutbacks, cancellations, and stretchouts in our most vital industry. As a result governmental spending has been reduced and the taxes of some are perhaps less than they would otherwise have been, but we also squandered our force of skilled technicians in the aircraft industry, and we have slowed the pace of our scientific and technological progress.

As we all know, unemployment is growing steadily, throughout most of the country.

This is unfortunate on any basis, and would seem especially so if at the same time we are not doing what nearly everybody now thinks we should do—produce more of the airplanes and other manufactured units considered essential to our security.

In that connection, Mr. Hayes says in his talk:

> But there is also a loss in time—the time it will take to recruit and retrain a new skilled production force once our aircraft and missile program gets into high gear again. With the progress made by the Russians, every day we have is precious. We have already wasted 3 months. For how many more months will we allow what's left of the skilled labor force in the aircraft industry to evaporate because of a budget and a debt ceiling geared to presputnik thinking?

I am impressed with the statement, "with the progress made by the Russians, every day we have is precious."

For some reason, many do not realize that the one priceless asset which, once lost, can never be regained, is time.

Another interesting part of this talk reads as follows:

> There is still another loss—a loss which can be directly measured in dollars and cents. During the coming year the people of this Nation will be required to pay millions upon millions of tax dollars for the recruitment and retraining of new workers to take the place of those who have been so casually dropped during the past year. At this time, money is probably the least of our considerations. The Russians are spending 25 percent of their gross national product on implements of war, while we, during the last 5 years, have gradually decreased our spending from 13 to 9 percent of our gross national product. I mention this loss in money, though, because it demonstrates the inherent wastefulness of an uncoordinated, start and stop, on-again off-again policy in aircraft and missile development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking address by one of the elder statesmen of the trade-union movement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVING THE MUSCLE THAT MAKES THE MISSILE

(Address by A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, at the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, Washington, D. C., January 14, 1958)

To establish a frame of reference for the remarks that will follow, let me tell you that our union, the International Association of Machinists, represents more than 300,000 workers in the aircraft industry. As such, we are not only the largest union in the industry, but the most widespread and diverse. Our membership includes all of the many kinds of unskilled, semiskilled, and highly skilled production-line workers who make missiles, rockets, and airplanes for our Nation's defense.

I understand many—in fact, most—of you are engineers, physicists, and scientists of one kind or another. As such, you are primarily concerned with problems arising out of the aeronautical, structural, propulsive, and astrophysical phases of airpower. Well, we in the I. A. of M. are concerned with these things, but we are also concerned with the welfare of the production and maintenance workers, the men whose skill and training are needed to translate your drawing-board inspirations into finished realities at airbases and launching sites.

It might be said that our members—the machinists and journeymen of the production lines—are the muscle that makes the American missile. As their collective-bargaining representative, the I. A. of M. is always sensitive to programs and policies that affect the industry. Today, however, we are more deeply concerned than ever. But we are concerned with more than the welfare of our members. We are concerned with the welfare of this Nation.

And even though I have been introduced to you as a trade union official, let me say that, since the problems I want to discuss tonight affect not only every employee in the industry, but every citizen of the United States, I would like to speak not as a partisan, or as a trade union official, but as an American citizen.

The events of the past 3 months point clearly to one salient fact: The safety—indeed the survival—of the American people will depend on research, development and production in the aircraft industry. And to clarify that point, let me say at the outset, I am using the term "aircraft industry" in its broadest sense—as a generic term that includes not only the construction of frames and engines for piloted craft, but the development of rockets and guided missiles as well.

I don't have to tell you men that this Nation is in mortal danger today. You, above all, are in a position to know it. And in spite of the large doses of soothing sirup that have been emanating regularly from the White House, I think the American people know it too.

Because we are—for the first time in our history—looking down the wrong end of a gun barrel—I think the time is past for polite phraseology and pious platitudes.

And so tonight I intend to be absolutely frank as I discuss the manpower policies that have demoralized—and that are still demoralizing—the skilled work force on which aircraft production depends. I feel strongly about these policies, not only because they have caused personal misery and unemployment for tens of thousands of workers, but, more importantly, because they have wasted men and production skill at a time when this Nation needs these resources more than ever before.

So don't expect me to pull any punches here tonight. On the other hand, let me assure you I am not joining any witch-hunt. I am not looking for a scapegoat. I don't agree with the host of editorialists, commentators and columnists who think we can solve our problems with a sacrificial offering. I noticed that the Gallup poll carried this attitude to the people last month when it asked—whoever it is that it asks these things—who should be blamed for letting the Russians get ahead of us in developing missiles and rockets.

I thought, as I scanned the results, that both the question and the answers were as fruitless as they were futile. This is the time for foresight, not hindsight. We have a need for action—not scapegoats and sacrificial offerings.

This has been the measure of our need ever since the night of October 6, 1957, when the shadow of Sputnik I first fell across our land. That was a stunning blow to our complacency and smugness. It should have been the signal for a fresh start. The Government had a duty—then and there—to tell the people that we have all been mistaken as to the potential of Russian industry and the potency of Russian science. That, while we were perfecting bigger and better tail fins for our automobiles and concentrating on balanced budget—they were perfecting bigger and better tail fins for an ICBM and concentrating on balanced sputniks.

Instead, what we got was an attitude of business as usual. And, as you well know, business in the aircraft industry has been even worse than usual this past year. Ever since the present defense budget went into effect, we have been operating in low gear. Almost 70,000 of our best craftsmen have been thrown out of work because of cutbacks, layoffs, and stretchouts.

This has been a particularly bad year for them, for the industry, and for the Nation. But instability is not new to aircraft production. Insecurity in employment has practically become the trademark of those skilled production workers who try to stick it out while the Government fluctuates between boom one year and bust the next.

In fact, ever since the end of World War II the industry has been in a constant turmoil of hiring and furloughing, training and retraining, rehiring and refurloughing workers in the aircraft industry.

It would appear that it has been Russian policy—not ours—that has governed the scope and extent of research, development, and production programs leading to American airpower. For example, after World War II we dismantled much of our production capacity in the industry. Then a few years later we practically had to start from scratch for a new buildup. During Korea we intensified our programs. Later we slacked off again. Over the past 6 months we have practically come to a standstill in many plants. Tomorrow it appears we will be going full blast again.

The worst of it is that through it all we have sadly neglected the research and development aspects of airpower. We have expended more brains and energy in developing and marketing new kinds of spray-on deodorant than we have in fashioning the weapons of survival.

For example, it seems strange to me that a nation which prides itself on its technological genius should have to go outside its own borders to purchase turbojet planes for its passenger airlines.

But I suppose that is the inevitable consequence when neither the Government—which purchases about 90 percent of the output of the aircraft industry—nor the industry itself—put enough emphasis on basic research and development.

Inadequate appropriations on the part of the Government—and a reluctance to reinvest profits on the part of industry—have borne a bitter fruit: America is close to becoming a second-class power in the aeronautical sciences.

In spite of the demonstration of Soviet progress to which we were all treated last October 6, we have continued to hold fast to our program of cutbacks, cancellations, and stretchouts in our most vital industry. As a result governmental spending has been reduced and the taxes of some are perhaps less than they would otherwise have been, but we also squandered our force of skilled technicians in the aircraft industry, and we have slowed the pace of our scientific and technological progress.

For that has been the consequence of the layoffs, firings, and cutbacks that have riddled the industry this year. The damage has been extensive and cannot be repaired overnight. Skilled aircraft mechanics—like heroes—are not born—they are made. They are made of the stuff that comes only with months and years of training, experience, and study. But a lot of this skill—more than the Nation could well afford—went out the window permanently during the past year.

I've been very close to this problem. I've witnessed—at first hand—the disillusionment and disintegration of morale that has scarred the industry.

I have talked to people out of the locals at Douglas, at Republic, and at many other plants. I have read the bitter letters that skilled technicians have written to my office. And I know that there are thousands of men who are sick at heart and who cannot understand the reasons for this kind of treatment at the hands of their Government.

Many have told me that they were specially recruited to work in aircraft centers and that they moved hundreds and even thousands of miles to do so. They uprooted their families, took their children out of school, sold their homes, and paid their own moving expenses in order to go to the big centers of production. Millions of tax dollars were spent to give them further specialized training.

These are the workers who were laid off before sputnik—who continued to be laid off after sputnik—and, most tragically, are still being laid off today. At Republic, on Long Island, men with 10 to 15 years of seniority are on the streets looking for work.

In plants in the South and on the west coast it is almost as bad. This is a terrible—and in many instances a permanent—loss of men and skill. For, let me assure you that a lot of these men do not intend to come back when they are again needed, as we know they most certainly will be. Their letters tell me they have had enough insecurity and instability in employment.

The loss of these men is a direct loss to the Nation. I have already indicated how it is a loss of learned skill.

But there is also a loss in time—the time it will take to recruit and retrain a new skilled production force once our aircraft and missile program gets into high gear again. With the progress made by the Russians, every day we have is precious. We have already wasted 3 months. For how many more months will we allow what's left of the skilled labor force in the aircraft industry to evaporate because of a budget and a debt ceiling geared to presputnik thinking?

There is still another loss. A loss which can be directly measured in dollars and cents. During the coming year the people of this Nation will be required to pay millions upon millions of tax dollars for the recruitment and retraining of new workers to take the place of those who have been

so casually dropped during the past year. At this time, money is probably the least of our considerations. The Russians are spending 25 percent of their gross national product on implements of war, while we, during the last 5 years, have gradually decreased our spending from 13 to 9 percent of our gross national product. I mention this loss in money, though, because it demonstrates the inherent wastefulness of an uncoordinated, start-and-stop, on-again-off-again policy in aircraft and missile development.

It should be obvious by now that the economy measures conceived are in fact not economy measures at all but are instead a very dangerous gamble.

Labor skill is a commodity that is rare and precious to any nation. And this is particularly true to our own Nation. Contrary to popular belief, we simply do not have a limitless supply of skilled workers. In fact, we do not even have a limitless supply of workers. The Soviet Union has always outnumbered us in quantity of labor. But heretofore we have been able to offset their superiority in numbers with our superiority in skill. Now they are rapidly closing the gap. And we must, if we are to compete, make the best use of the labor supply we have. We are handicapped by the fact that American birthrates fell steeply during the depression years of the 1930's. This means that we have fewer young men in their twenties today who are available to train for the skilled jobs that are required to sustain increasingly complex industrial processes.

The Government has recognized and acted upon the necessity of conserving and stockpiling vital materials, metals, and chemicals. At the same time we know that industry, including many aircraft concerns, has tended to hoard engineers beyond current needs and in anticipation of future requirements. These are wise precautions. Vital materials, engineers, and scientists will all be needed, and quickly, when our missile programs begin to get off the ground again. But no more so than technicians and journeymen. Each of these components is needed to complement the others.

Try as I may, I can find no suitable explanation for the Government's indifference and industry's apathy with respect to skilled labor. All I know is that indifference and apathy have been traditional, and continue to exist at a time when it is dangerous to maintain such a tradition.

About a year and a half ago I was invited to speak at the 10th convention of the Air Force Association in New Orleans. At that time I heard one speaker after another refer to the urgent need for scientists, engineers, physicists, astronomers, mathematicians, and practically everything else except—and what a big exception it was—skilled production-line workers. It seemed apparent that I was the only one in the room who recognized that all these professional and academic talents would be an exercise in futility unless they were supplemented by competent journeymen, machinists, and craftsmen—the guys on the production line who swing into action after the scientists and engineers have completed their computations and experiments. The guys who can machine cold, unformed metal to exact dimensions and minute tolerances.

I recalled this incident again recently when I happened to read a statement by Gen. John B. Medaris, who is, as you know, the Chief of the Army's Ballistic Missile Agency. This statement concerned the failure of a test Redstone missile. General Medaris tried to take the onus off the Army's scientists by saying that this particular missile misfired because of a faulty soldering connection.

But what are the true implications of that admission? Simply this—that all the education, brains, and academic theory the Army could marshal was nullified by the lack of skill of someone, somewhere on the production line.

Now the question is, What can we do to conserve our force of skilled labor, and to insure that American industry will have a constant and ever-ready reservoir of trained journeymen for the future? If we stockpile chemicals, materials, engineers, and physicists, is it any less essential that we stockpile production-line skill?

I think a lot of people—both in and out of Government—are beginning to realize that we must. A number of proposals have been made over the past few months which call for shorter hours supplemented by on-the-job training, relocation pay, industrywide job placement centers, unemployment benefit differentials for workers with special skills, and a Federal policy of channeling new contracts into those areas that have facilities and skills that are being wasted—as those on Long Island are now being wasted. A proper combination of these possible solutions will at least minimize the adverse effects of our past and present policy of outright layoffs in any slack period.

These are some of the things that Government can do. But industry also has a duty and responsibility to its own and the Nation's future which it is not now fulfilling. And I'm speaking now of all industry—not just the aircraft industry. In many of the most highly skilled classifications—as for example in laboratory mechanics and mechanic air instrumentation—there simply are not enough young men being trained to even take care of future normal replacement needs. In other words the old skilled journeymen are dying off faster than young men are being trained to replace them. Many of my management friends recognize this problem—but practically all of them seem to be depending on someone else to do something about it. Last year the Bureau of Apprenticeship surveyed 143 plants that employ 90 percent of the workers in the aircraft industry. They found that less than one-third of these plants were investing in the future through formal apprentice training programs.

Something has got to be done—and soon—both by Government and by industry. We must recognize first that until we stabilize employment in aircraft production we will go on dissipating and wasting the skills of our labor force.

And second, we must condition ourselves for a long-term effort. We are going to need skill and training in our labor force, not only next year but 5 years and 10 years from now. This will be true whether the cold war continues, whether it erupts into a hot war, or whether we can find some basis for peaceful coexistence with the Communist world.

For even if we can look hopefully to an era of peace, we know that we are entering a new age of exploration beyond our atmosphere—an age in which the aircraft industry will play a greater role than ever before.

So, whether we have war or peace, we are going to continue to need journeymen, technicians, machinists and plenty of other skilled and semiskilled "muscle" on our production lines.

In closing, let me express once more my deep concern that we have already wasted 3 months since the first sputnik came soaring out of Russian skies. I think that the American people are not too soft to make the sacrifices they may have to make to insure the survival and safety of this Nation. So far, however, it appears that mercenary considerations have had priority. Let us fervently hope that we do not drift aimlessly much longer. The philosophy of the balanced budget and the artificial debt ceiling has no place in a world which is being circled every 96 minutes by a Russian satellite.

The challenge of sputnik is—and should be recognized as—the primary challenge facing the American people today. The survival of our democracy and our freedom—in fact the survival of civilization—depends on how well we can mobilize our resources and our skill for the monumental task of regaining the lead we once had in the aeronautical and atomic sciences.

We have the facilities and the workers needed for that task. All that remains is an intelligent program of action that will put them back to work.

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION (H. DOC. NO. 318)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President has transmitted to the Senate a message on education. I am informed that a similar message has been sent to the House and read in that body.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the message be laid before the Senate, that its reading be dispensed with, and that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate the message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see proceedings of the House for today.).

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BARING, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. DAWSON of Utah were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. BOGGS, of Louisiana, as a member on the part of the House on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. GREGORY, of Kentucky, as a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AN EXCHANGE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has called attention to an extremely important event which should take place today. It is the signing of an exchange agreement between the East and the West.

The terms of the agreement are not yet known. But it is to be hoped that it will provide for frequent exchanges between American and Soviet leaders, with the people of both countries having direct access to the different points of view.

For nearly 4 months, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee has been conducting hearings into our missile and satellite programs. Those hearings have impressed all the members with the urgent necessity of stepping up the tempo of our defense program.

But we have also been impressed with an equally urgent point. It is the vital necessity of finding a way in which we can live in this world without resorting to arms or even to an arms race.

As we said in our unanimous statement, there can be "no security for the United States or any other country in weapons." The best we can hope from the ICBM or any other weapon is a stalemate.

We must have these weapons because a stalemate is better than defeat. But we would be deluding ourselves if we thought that they will bring us anything beyond that.

True security will come only when war is no longer an instrument of national policy.

I try to be a realist about such things. I have little faith in outlawing war as an instrument of national policy merely through pacts of renunciation—either acts of aggression or of specific weapons.

All of us recall the period that preceded World War II when nonaggression pacts were fashionable. As a general rule, their meaning was simple. Two nations would agree not to fight each other so they could combine their strength against a third.

The few melancholy exceptions consisted of pacts which were honored in the breach and quickly renounced.

I do, however, have a great deal of faith in efforts to outlaw war when they are accompanied by positive steps to bring people together in cooperation.

When people work together to face a great challenge, they tend to lose their suspicion of each other. They become absorbed in the task before them—and fighting as an instrument of policy fades from the picture.

It is for this reason that I believe the current situation affords us such a great opportunity. There are positive steps which we can take in concert with the other nations of the world to face the great challenge presented by outer space.

These steps cannot be taken overnight. They will require long and careful preparation. And part of that preparation must be to bring the people of the world to a point where they can at least talk to each other.

The agreement which, I am informed, may be signed today will not by itself break down the barriers of suspicion and distrust. It will not solve the problems of a war-weary world.

But it is an essential first step—the beginning of a beginning. And as such it is one of the most important events in many years.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board; and

George Brecher, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thorsten V. Kalijarvi to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert McClintock to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald R. Heath to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Homer M. Byington, Jr., to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Malaya.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Mann to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerard C. Smith to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dempster McIntosh to be Manager of the Development Loan Fund in the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George V. Allen to be Director of the United States Information Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nelson P. Rose to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William P. Rogers to be Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tom B. Coughran to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jesse P. Wolcott to be a member of the Board of Directors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John S. Patterson to be Deputy Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. H. van Zile Hyde to be Representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

---

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

---

## PROCEDURES FOR REPORTS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 148) to prescribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on August 28, 1957, on behalf of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works, Senate Resolution 148 was reported favorably to the Senate with perfecting amendments. Both committees recommended that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to.

Minority views were filed by each of the committees involved. All appear in Senate Report No. 1154.

A principal objective of the resolution is to facilitate the consideration of reclamation, flood control, and navigation projects referred to our committees for authorization recommendations. Favorable comments on this objective of the resolution in this respect were received from practically all the executive agencies concerned, including the Comptroller General, and the Bureau of the Budget.

The resolution seeks a full disclosure from the executive agencies of background information on such items as cost allocations and benefit-cost ratios.

The experience of our committees shows that complete information as to alternative methods of cost allocations is essential to the full consideration of all factors.

Our committees seek the approval of the Senate of our efforts to improve procedures. The consideration of the proposed legislation will be expedited by having the information requested included in the comments of executive agencies.

Other phases of the resolution are designed to eliminate what appear to be unnecessary delays in the executive agencies in forwarding to Congress reports required by law.

Approval by the Senate of the resolution will be a forward step and will be of great assistance to our two committees.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the chairman of my committee, the able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], in offering Senate Resolution 148. If there is to be no extensive discussion of it, I shall merely ask permission to have my statement printed at this point in the RECORD, based on my experience as a member of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and my long-time service on that committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ANDERSON

I favor Senate Resolution 148, as amended. My position is based on my experience as chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and long-time service on this major committee of the Senate. I trust that the Senate will agree to the resolution.

First, the resolution is a simple, clear-cut outline of concise information the executive agencies would be requested to furnish the Senate in connection with reclamation, flood control, navigation, and multiple-purpose projects proposed for authorization by the Congress. Even the Bureau of the Budget advised that the additional information called for by the resolution could provide a useful supplement to that provided under existing procedures.

The committees of the Senate concerned must have a full disclosure of all essential material related to proposed water and land project authorizations. The executive agencies are generally cooperative, especially when they are interested in a proposed development, but they have their own selective ways of presenting material. Frequently essential information or alternative methods of cost allocations and benefit-cost ratios are omitted from reports on projects in the first instance and there are delays in getting the data required.

All of the information pertinent to a project proposal should be furnished at one time in accordance with the outline in the first section of the resolution. Since the executive agencies must consider alternative cost and benefit approaches in their studies, the Congress is entitled to the same information in order that the committees concerned may pass intelligently on the feasibility of a proposed project.

As to the need for these data, as I have indicated, I speak from my own experience as chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for the last 3 years and as a member of the committee for several years previously.

A further need for the resolution was highlighted at hearings on S. Res. 148. It developed that executive agencies, particularly the Bureau of the Budget, had been sitting for many months on nearly a dozen reports on watershed protection and flood prevention projects recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture. Most of these reports, I understand, have now been sent to the Congress, probably as a result of the comments at the hearings of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Section 3 of the resolution requests that these reports be delivered to the Congress "not later than 3 months after approval by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Similarly, section 2 requests that reports on projects proposed for authorization under the Flood Control Act of 1944 be delivered to the Congress not later than 6 months after they have been submitted to the governors of the affected States for comment. This section will be notice to the States that prompt reviews of the reports is desired.

Section 4 of the resolution is designed to avert confusion in project cost allocations after authorization. The provision is that it is the sense of the Senate that legislation authorizing multiple-purpose projects should specify the cost allocation method, period for repayment of the power investment, period of repayment of power costs, and the formula for determining the interest rate. Further, it provides that the construction agency shall report the allocation of costs of any major facility in a multiple-purpose project in accordance with the criteria in section 1 of the resolution. If the power marketing agency is other than the construction agency, the comments of the marketing agency are to be included.

I assure the Senate that the cooperation of the executive agencies concerned as requested in the resolution is essential to the effective functioning of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as the chairman has indicated. The majority of our colleagues on the Public Works Committee concur in this view but, of course, they can speak for themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senate is proceeding with the consideration of Senate Resolution 148?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I understood some interim matters were to come before the Senate first. A number of Senators who are interested in the resolution are not on the floor, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Flanders | McClellan |
| Allott | Frear | McNamara |
| Anderson | Fulbright | Morse |
| Barrett | Goldwater | Morton |
| Beall | Green | Mundt |
| Bennett | Hayden | Murray |
| Bible | Hennings | O'Mahoney |
| Bricker | Hill | Pastore |
| Bridges | Hoblitzell | Payne |
| Bush | Hruska | Potter |
| Butler | Humphrey | Proxmire |
| Byrd | Ives | Revercomb |
| Carlson | Javits | Robertson |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Case, N. J. | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kefauver | Scott |
| Chavez | Kennedy | Smathers |
| Church | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Clark | Knowland | Sparkman |
| Cooper | Kuchel | Stennis |
| Cotton | Langer | Symington |
| Curtis | Lausche | Thurmond |
| Dirksen | Long | Thye |
| Douglas | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Dworshak | Malone | Wiley |
| Eastland | Mansfield | Williams |
| Ellender | Martin, Iowa | Yarborough |
| Ervin | Martin, Pa. | Young |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). A quorum is present.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There have been various reports as to whether or not the Senate would proceed to consider the pending resolution, or whether it would be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of certain finance bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is Senate Resolution 148, Order No. 1188.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no objection, if it would please the minority leader and his colleague from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and at the same time accommodate the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to the Senate proceeding to consider certain finance bills, and returning to the consideration of the unfinished business later in the day.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is an agreeable procedure so far as we are concerned.

## AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1939 WITH RESPECT TO DECEDENTS ADJUDGED INCOMPETENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1205, House bill 5938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5938) to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia give a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this bill passed the House unanimously, and was unanimously agreed to in the Senate Finance Committee.

In the case of individuals who became incompetent before April 2, 1948, and did not regain competency before their death, it was, of course, impossible for them to change their wills to qualify for the marital deduction allowed by the Revenue Act of 1948. This bill would correct this by allowing the marital deduction in the case of such individuals if, in fact, within 6 months after a decedent's death, the spouse's interest could no longer be cut off. Thus, if the spouse's interest was actually distributed to her within 6 months of the decedent's death, the marital deduction therefor will be allowable.

This bill will be applicable only in the case of individuals who, first, became incompetent before April 2, 1948, and did not regain competency before their deaths; second, who died between April 2, 1948, and August 16, 1954; and third, whose estate tax returns are not closed to further assessment or refund as of the date of the enactment of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## USE OF CORPORATION PROPERTY BY A SHAREHOLDER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1206, House bill 7762.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7762) to amend section 223 of the Internal Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will my friend, the Senator from Virginia, make a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this bill likewise passed the House unanimously, and was unanimously agreed to in the Senate Committee on Finance.

Section 502 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 already provides for years ending after December 31, 1945, and before January 1, 1954, that personal holding company income does not include rents for the use of property of a corporation where the lessee uses the property in the operation of a bona fide commercial, industrial, or mining enterprise. This bill makes this same rule applicable to years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies. Somewhat similar treatment presently is available under the 1954 Code for years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN COLLECTED TAXES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1207, House bill 8865.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8865) relating to the administration of certain collected taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Virginia give a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a small minority of employers and collection agents have failed to collect and pay over trust fund moneys representing income, social security and excise taxes withheld or collected. The amount of delinquent withheld income and social security taxes alone amounted to over $279 million as of December 31, 1956. This amount represented an accumulation of delinquent accounts over a 6-year period and approximates one-fifth of 1 percent of the total of these taxes collected over that period. Criminal and civil penalties under existing law have proved to be of limited usefulness or ineffective.

H. R. 8865 is designed to secure greater compliance on the part of employers and others who are charged with the duty of paying over to the Government trust fund moneys withheld from employees or collected from customers. This bill provides that a person who is required to collect, account for and pay over any such taxes and who fails to do so can by a notification from the Internal Revenue Service be instructed to collect such taxes which become collectible after delivery of such notice and deposit such taxes, not later than the end of the second banking day after any amount of such taxes is collected or withheld, in a special trust account for the United States Government. Persons who failed to comply with this provision after the notification required by the bill would be subject, after conviction for a misdemeanor, to a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both. Exceptions from such penalties are provided to cover the cases where, first reasonable doubt existed as to whether the law required collection of the tax or who was required by law to collect the tax; and second, where lack of compliance was due to factors beyond the notified person's control. The bill specifically provides that a lack of funds existing immediately after the payment of wages (whether or not created by the payment of such wages) is not to be considered circumstances beyond the control of the person.

For example: an employer subject to the requirements of the bill has gross payroll requirements of $1,000, with respect to which he is required to withhold an assumed amount of 10 percent, or $100 of taxes. If such an employer had on hand only $900 and paid out this entire amount in wages, withholding nothing, the fact that he was then short of funds would not relieve him of the penalty imposed by the bill. In such a case the employer should withhold and deposit the appropriate amount, $90, from the $900 and pay out only the balance of $810.

The bill also provides that a delinquent will be relieved of the additional duties imposed by the bill when the Secretary or his delegate is satisfied that he will

henceforth comply with the law and regulations with respect to the withholding and collection of such taxes.

The bill is prospective only. Notification may be made under the bill, in the case of withheld income and employment taxes, only with respect to pay periods beginning after the date of enactment of the bill; and, in the case of excise taxes, only with respect to taxes imposed after the date of the enactment of the bill.

This bill was unanimously ordered reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and is strongly urged by the Treasury.

I may say at this point that there has been considerable abuse in connection with employers collecting social-security taxes from employees and not paying them in promptly to the Government. The purpose of this bill is to correct that situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the bill impose a penalty on the employer if he does not pay?

Mr. BYRD. He is required to place the money in a special trust fund; and, if he does not put it in that fund, he is penalized. He is not penalized in the case of an ordinary collection, but, if the Department finds him delinquent, it may require him to place the money in a special trust fund.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I join the Senator from Virginia in urging enactment of the proposed legislation. The need for it has been clearly demonstrated. Let me say to the Senator from Virginia that the $280 million representing delinquent accounts accumulated over the past 6 years does not take into consideration $140 million which had been written off during the same period as uncollectible. Certainly these funds which are collected by employers from employees should be regarded as trust funds and under no circumstances should the employer divert them to his own use. I join in urging the enactment of this bill which gives the Department additional enforcement powers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## CERTAIN RESTRICTED STOCK OPTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1208, House bill 9035.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9035) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this bill also was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives and received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Finance.

Under present law a decedent's gross estate includes the estate tax value of an unexercised stock option, but does not permit a new or stepped-up basis for this option for income tax purposes. However, if the option had been exercised immediately before death, the stock obtained would have received a new basis equal to the estate tax valuation. H. R. 9035 is intended to accord essentially the same tax treatment for the case in which the estate exercises the option as where the employee exercises the option during his lifetime.

Two examples will illustrate the general nature of the problem:

First. An option is granted to purchase at $95 stock then selling at $100. The employee exercises the option when the stock has a value of $120 and dies. The value of the stock for estate tax purposes is $120. If, thereafter, the executor sells the stock at $120, there is no capital gain.

Second. Assume the same facts as in example 1, except that the option has not been exercised at the time of the employee's death, although the stock is still worth $120. In this case the unexercised option is included in the decedent's gross estate at a value of $25, the difference between the option price and the value of the stock at that time. Subsequently, the executor exercises the option to purchase the stock at a price of $95 when the stock was worth $120. Ultimately, the stock is sold for $120. Under present law the estate must pay a capital gains tax upon the $25. Under the bill the basis for the stock is the $95 paid in cash for the stock plus the $25 representing the value of the option at date of death.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## REFUND OF ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAXES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 1209, H. R. 8216.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8216) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "September 30, 1957," and insert "April 30, 1958,"; on page 3, line 1, after the word "before", to strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958,"; in line 3, after the word "on", to strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958,"; in line 4, after the word "after", to strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958,"; in line 5, after the word "before", to strike out "September 30, 1958" and insert "April 30, 1959,"; at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "October 1, 1957" and insert "May 1, 1958,"; in line 21, after the word "on", to strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958," in line 23, after the word "on", to strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958,"; and, on page 6, line 5, after the word "before", to strike out "October 1, 1957" and insert "May 1, 1958".

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this bill also was passed unanimously by the House and was unanimously approved by the Committee on Finance.

The bill would add a new section 6423 to the code to provide that refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes generally are not to be made unless the claimant establishes that he bore the ultimate burden of the tax or that he unconditionally repaid the tax to the person who bore the ultimate burden. This is the rule that has been in effect generally with respect to excise taxes. This provision places refunds of taxes on alcohol and tobacco on the same basis. The purpose of these limitations is to prevent the taxpayer from realizing a windfall gain from a refund or credit where someone else actually bore the burden of the tax because the price charged for the taxed article, service, or facility included the tax.

Your committee has amended the bill as it passed the House to advance the effective date of the bill and the time for filing claims for refund. The effective date of the bill has been advanced from October 1, 1957, to May 1, 1958, in order to provide the Internal Revenue Service with adequate time to prepare regulations under the new provisions. Similar changes have been made in the time for filing claims for refunds in order to accord taxpayers with sufficient time to comply with the provisions of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

## RECONSIDERATION OF VOTES BY WHICH CERTAIN BILLS WERE PASSED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the following bills were passed:

Calendar No. 1205, H. R. 5938, to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948.

Calendar No. 1206, H. R. 7762, to amend section 223 of the Internal Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies.

Calendar No. 1207, H. R. 8865, relating to the administration of certain collected taxes.

Calendar No. 1208, H. R. 9035, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee.

Calendar No. 1209, H. R. 8216, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

---

## SMALL-BUSINESS DISASTER LOANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1210, S. 2920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2920) to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority and minority leaders of the Senate for their prompt action in scheduling consideration of S. 2920. This bill is designed to meet an emergency need for small-business disaster loans, and I hope that the Senate will act swiftly.

S. 2920 would give the Small Business Administration authority to make disaster loans to small businesses in areas of the country inundated by excessive rainfall during the 1957 harvest season, millions of dollars in crops have been lost, and small businesses serving the cropless farmers are severely pressed. These small-business men need loans to extend the due dates of accounts receivable, to replenish stocks for the 1958 season, and in many cases to refinance unsold inventory. In the great agricultural regions of the country, a crop loss not only prostrates the farmer but paralyzes trade and commerce which accompany normal production and marketing of the crop.

During 1957, excessive rainfall made it necessary for the Department of Agriculture to extend emergency credit to farmers in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Texas. While loans to farmers enable them to begin production of new crops, this help does not relieve the financial strain on local businessmen who sold to farmers on credit or who failed to move an inventory because farmers had no money. S. 1920 is designed to provide credit for these small businesses which were indirectly, but severely, injured by the disastrous rainfall.

Under existing law the Small Business Administration can make disaster loans to victims of floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, earthquakes, forest fires, and other sudden natural catastrophes; and to small businesses suffering economic injury because of drought. S. 2920 broadens this authority to include excessive rainfall among the disastrous conditions which may create a need for small-business disaster loans.

These loans can be made for terms up to 20 years and bear a maximum interest rate of 3 percent. As of December 31, 1958, the loan authorization had an uncommitted balance of about $76 million. This balance exceeds the total of all Small Business Administration disaster loans made since 1953. The Banking and Currency Committee determined, therefore, that there is no present necessity for increasing the disaster loan fund.

This amendment to the law may not generate a great volume of loans. One of the principal values of the change is that businesses in these areas, and their creditors, will receive assurance that Small Business Association loans are available. In many instances the mere knowledge that credit is available may be sufficient to forestall foreclosures and the seeking of judgments by creditors. A chain reaction of lawsuits and foreclosures could cause further damage to localities already depressed by the crop loss.

Mr. President, S. 2920 is an emergency measure which should be passed without delay. This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I urge favorable action by the Senate. In urging prompt action on S. 2920, I do not wish to imply that this bill will solve the problems of farmers in these disaster areas. The Senate must still act directly on the farmers' problems, and this question is now under consideration in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I was not present, I am sorry to say, at the meeting when the committee considered the bill, but I believe I sent my proxy to support the measure. Did the Director of the Small Business Administration testify favorably on the measure?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He testified. However, he did not come to support the bill. He said he could live with it. I took that to mean that the Director meant to say the bill had not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. However, the bill does not require any increase in the authorization, and no one believes it will. Therefore we felt quite justified in proceeding with its consideration even though it had not received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

I understood the position of the Director of SBA to be more or less a neutral one in this case. I say that for this reason. He is unable to draw any logical or any reasonable distinction between a situation created by drought, which was taken care of by Congress last year or the year before, and a situation which is created by excessive rainfall. By all accounts, they are practically the same situation. Both of these situations should be distinguished from the situation which occurred in the Senator's part of the country, in which the destruction was caused suddenly by a flood. We took care of that situation.

I can testify myself—and there was much testimony by people from this area—that the destruction under the peculiar conditions which arose this year in this delta area is just as great as if it had happened suddenly. It rained all the time, and the area was flooded with rainfall, instead of by a broken dam.

In much of the area the rainfall, which normally averages around 40 inches a year, was as high as 80 inches. In the Boot Heel area it amounted to as much as 100 inches. It rained all fall in most of this area, and caused tremendous losses. The loss would have been much less if the area had been devastated at the beginning of the season. The serious losses occurred in the fall because the people in the area had invested the cost of planting and cultivating and fertilizing and insecticizing.

I could not overemphasize the seriousness of the losses. Many persons testified that in their 40 or 50 years of living and farming in this area, they had never seen anything comparable.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Who determines what is excessive rainfall? Who determines that fact?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The President or the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BUSH. In other words, the disaster is determined by the President, the same as under the existing law. This would simply be another cause for him to consider whether a certain place was a disaster location.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator from Arkansas will permit me to say so, I think we should support the bill. This is a field in which the Small Business Administration has a very special usefulness. In the event of disasters, they cooperate with the local banking authorities very, very closely. Their work is done pretty much at the local level, in

cooperation with all the local citizens. The experience concerning loans of a disaster nature has been, I believe, very satisfactory. I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his support.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the bill apply only to floods which took place in 1957, or is it to be permanent legislation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is to be permanent legislation, but we had in mind the present disaster situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the explanation, I had the impression that the bill applied only to the 1957 floods.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I am sorry if I did not make that point clear. The bill is an amendment to the permanent legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. And is to be permanent legislation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Could the Senator from Arkansas tell me what discussion took place to prompt this statement in the report:

> Disaster loans bear a maximum interest rate of 3 percent.

Was there much discussion concerning the placing of a maximum percentage rate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the rate under existing law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I understand that; but in view of the discussions on the floor in the last session that maximum rates of interest should not be fixed, but that rates should be governed generally by the rate which the Government pays for money, was there any discussion which might give us an indication that in the future we might expect the interest rates on loans to be regulated according to the interest rates which are paid by the Government? I think the Senator knows what I am driving at.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The question of interest rates arose last year in connection with college housing loans. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] introduced a bill which would deal with loans made by practically all the agencies. I have received information from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the Bureau is in the course of preparing data which will further refine that problem.

The reason for the introduction of the pending bill is that we are dealing in this instance with serious disasters. For many years it has been thought to be justifiable to make a special concession in this class of cases. In a sense, there is an element of charity involved. The loans contemplated are not business loans. The regular business loans of this agency bear interest of 6 percent.

The old RFC had regular interest rates for business loans, but offered special rates for disaster loans.

In many of the cases of disasters in the past, the experience with the repayment of disaster loans has been better than the Senator might expect, both in the SBA and the old RFC.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Will there be a retroactive cutoff date beyond which an application for a disaster loan will not be considered?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It will depend upon the disaster declaration. Authority to make loans will begin as of the date of enactment and will deal with the conditions growing out of disasters of the kind we have been discussing. I am not aware that disasters of this kind were declared prior to 1957.

Mr. McNAMARA. I was concerned with a specific situation in my State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There was no testimony or evidence given on that point; no one mentioned it. If a case arises in Michigan this year, the bill will apply.

Mr. McNAMARA. But as to anything which occurred 2 years ago, the bill would not apply at this time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not unless the occurrence was declared a disaster, and small businesses can show substantial economic injury.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2920) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

---

## PROCEDURES FOR REPORTS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 148) to prescribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is recognized.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield for that purpose?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARROLL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield, in order that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry, and perhaps make a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will state it.

Mr. COTTON. Do I correctly understand that if at some time during the consideration of the pending committee amendments, they are agreed to, that will preclude the subsequent offering of amendments from the floor, before final action is taken on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised, first, that after the committee amendments are agreed to, they will not be subject to amendment, although the portions of the resolution not touched by the committee amendments could properly be amended following adoption of the committee amendments.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, if the resolution reaches the stage of final adoption, it is my desire to offer several amendments to different parts of it. If the committee amendments had previously been agreed to, the amendments to which I have referred would in some instances affect the language thus written into resolution by means of the committee amendments.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that, even if the committee amendments be agreed to, later I may be permitted to submit my own amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that a complete substitute could be offered, after the committee amendments had been agreed to; or the committee amendments could be agreed to en bloc, by unanimous consent, and the resolution as thus amended could be treated as original text, subject to further amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Then, Mr. President, I request that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, with the understanding that the resolution as thus amended shall be treated as original text, so that subsequently Senators may offer amendments to the resolution as thus amended by the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments, as agreed to, are as follows:

On page 3, line 5, after the word "Agriculture", to insert "including enough of the information enumerated in subparagraphs (1) to (10) inclusive to show why each alternative was dropped in favor of the recommended plan"; in line 8, after the word "to", to insert "the"; at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "each potential"; in the same line, after the word "project", to insert "recommended for authorization"; in the same line, after the amendment just above referred to, to strike out "in addition to a description of the project,"; after line 11, to insert:

"(1) Complete description of project, including an estimate of the economic life of the major project facility."

In line 14, to change the subsection number from "(1)" to "(2)"; after line 17, to strike out:

"(2) Benefit-cost ratio calculated from direct tangible benefits and costs."

After line 19, to insert:

"(3) Benefit-cost ratios calculated by using total tangible benefits and total tangible costs for 100 years, and for 50 years, except where the economic life of the major project facility is less."

In line 24, to change the subsection number from "(3)" to "(4)"; in line 25, after the word "computation", to insert "or other evaluation"; on page 4, line 8, to change the subsection number from "(4)" to "(5)"; in line 12, to change the subsection number from "(5)" to "(6)"; in line 19, to change the subsection number from "(6)" to "(7)"; on page 5, line 4, to change the subsection number from "(7)" to "(8)"; in line 9, to change the subsection number from "(8)" to "(9)"; in line 18, to change the subsection number from "(9)" to "(10)"; on page 6, line 5, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "59" and insert "58"; after line 10, to insert:

"SEC. 3. That reports on projects recommended for construction by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, should be transmitted to the Congress not later than three calendar months after their approval by said Secretary of Agriculture, and the officials of the executive branch responsible for such transmittal pursuant to said act be, and are hereby, requested to so deliver such reports not later than 3 months after their approval by said Secretary of Agriculture."

In line 21, to change the section number from "3" to "4"; in the same line, after the word "of", to insert "multiple-purpose"; in line 22, after the word "should", to insert "(1)"; in line 23, after the word "determined", to insert "the period of time allowable for repayment of the power investment, and the formula for determining the rate of interest on it that is to be returned; and (2) require that prior to the time that any major facility of such multiple-purpose project is placed in operation the construction agency shall report the allocation of costs in accordance with the criteria of section 1 of this resolution together with its recommendations and the comments of the power marketing agency if that be other than the construction agency."

On page 7, after line 7, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed to continue the study instituted pursuant to Senate Resolution 281, 84th Congress, and to recommend to the Senate as early as practicable in the 2d session of the 85th Congress such further measures as may be appropriate to provide for full and effective conservation, development, and utilization of the Nation's land and water resources."

So as to make the resolution read:

*"Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that procedures for evaluation of land and water resources projects should be improved, and that the agencies of the executive branch of the Government responsible for the preparation of reports relative to the authorization of land and water resource projects be, and are hereby, requested to furnish, in connection with such reports, the following information in addition to the data now presented in support of project authorizations:

"Information relative to alternative plans for the water resource projects that may reasonably be considered physically feasible of construction consistently with the advice of the Department of the Army, or the Department of the Interior, or the Department of Agriculture, including enough of the information enumerated in subparagraphs (1) to (10) inclusive to show why each alternative was dropped in favor of the recommended plan. With respect to the project recommended for authorization, the information should include, but not be limited to—

"(1) Complete description of project, including an estimate of the economic life of the major project facility.

"(2) Estimated costs of construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement, together with a plain and succinct statement of the basis upon which all such estimates are made.

"(3) Benefit-cost ratios calculated by using total tangible benefits and total tangible costs for 100 years, and 50 years, except where the economic life of the major project facility is less.

"(4) Description and, to the extent possible, computation or other evaluation of indirect and intangible net benefits including but not limited to (a) protection of life and property; (b) improvement of transportation; (c) conservation of water, soil, and forest resources; (d) wildlife conservation; (e) recreation; (f) abatement of pollution, including salinity; (g) control of sedimentation; (h) maintenance and enhancement of the agricultural, commercial, and industrial economy of the area affected.

"(5) Physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

"(6) Allocations of costs, to be calculated (a) by at least three methods, namely, the separable costs-remaining benefits method, the priority of use method, and the incremental cost method; and (b) on at least 2 time periods for amortization, namely, 50 years or the useful life of the facilities, whichever is the lesser, and 100 years or the useful life of the facilities, whichever is the lesser.

"(7) Description of the extent to which the Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and nongovernmental entities have evidenced interest in participating in the construction or operation and maintenance of the potential project, or in obtaining its benefits, including, in the case of electric energy, information relative to the preference status of governmental agencies, municipalities, and cooperatives; and the manner in which it is proposed to accomplish coordination and cooperation, and the estimated Federal costs of such participation.

"(8) Estimated schedules of repayments of reimbursable costs that would be within the estimated financial resources of the potential use area, such schedules to show also the deferred repayment of the portion of the costs allocated to uses that may be anticipated to develop in the future.

"(9) Probable effects of the potential project on State and local governments, including, but not limited to (a) the costs of local government services; and (b) the enhancement or reduction of tax revenues, together with the amount of potential tax revenue that would be forgone by Federal development in lieu of non-Federal development of the project. The estimated amounts of tax revenue enhancement and tax revenue forgone as a result of the project should be shown in calculations of project benefits and costs.

"(10) In support of proposed increases in the authorizations of appropriations for continuation of the construction of basin-wide projects, proposed schedules of investigations and construction should be supplied, including descriptions of the units to be undertaken, and deviations in schedules of construction supplied in support of prior authorizations.

"SEC. 2. That reports on surveys and investigations or project reports relative to the authorization of land and water resource projects should be delivered to the Congress not later than 6 calendar months after the date on which such reports are circulated to the Federal agencies and to the affected States pursuant to section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887). The agencies of the executive branch responsible for preparation of such project reports be, and are hereby, requested to deliver to the Congress such reports not later than 6 months after they have been submitted for comments to the governors of the affected States.

"SEC. 3. That reports on projects recommended for construction by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, should be transmitted to the Congress not later than 3 calendar months after their approval by said Secretary of Agriculture, and the officials of the executive branch responsible for such transmittal pursuant to said act be, and are hereby, requested to so deliver such reports not later than 3 months after their approval by said Secretary of Agriculture.

"SEC. 4. That authorizations of multiple-purpose water resource projects should (1) specify the method by which the allocation of costs shall be determined, the period of time allowable for repayment of the power investment, and the formula for determining the rate of interest on it that is to be returned; and (2) require that prior to the time that any major facility of such multiple-purpose project is placed in operation the construction agency shall report the allocation of costs in accordance with the criteria of section 1 of this resolution together with its recommendations and the comments of the power marketing agency if that be other than the construction agency.

"SEC. 5. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed to continue the study instituted pursuant to Senate Resolution 281, 84th Congress, and to recommend to the Senate as early as practicable in the 2d session of the 85th Congress such further measures as may be appropriate to provide for full and effective conservation, development, and utilization of the Nation's land and water resources."

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 148 is before the Senate for consideration at this time.

The resolution deals with the general subject of water-resource development. This resolution is a very important measure. It has to do with the establishment of standards for reclamation and other water-resource programs, and I think every Member of the Senate is interested, because the water-resource program is general to the entire country, not only to the arid West. Every section of the country will be affected by this measure, which deals with a subject very close to my heart. The area affected is one with which I have been intimately associated throughout my professional career, and during all my 11 years in Congress. I make that statement because what I propose to do may cause some persons to say that I am in opposition to the general purposes of the establishment of standards for water-resource and other reclamation programs. But that is not true, Mr. President; I am just as anxious as anyone else is to have established some standards which will apply to the executive departments having to do with water resources, and to guide them in measuring the type of

water-resource program that is reported to the Congress from the investigating agencies and the other agencies having to do with water development. I wish to have this background distinctly understood.

I was in favor of Senate Resolution 281, which set up this type of program for the Senate Committee on Public Works and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. By that means, they were directed to make studies and recommendations. I am very much in favor of that general objective. What I have to say at this time, I wish to have understood in view of the background I have just mentioned.

With this background, I am impelled to come before the Senate today in opposition to the pending resolution, which purports to contribute to a long-needed objective of Congressional action on long-range water policy legislation.

The fact is that Senate Resolution 148 is not legislation in response to the requirements of Senate Resolution 281 adopted July 26, 1956.

The two senatorial committees involved in this matter have full authority from the Senate to continue their joint study of the important field of water policy; and I and other colleagues on these committees are requesting that the Senate recommit this resolution, for further study by the Interior and Public Works Committees. This, I and my colleagues sincerely believe, is in the interest of sound water-resource policy.

Before proceeding further, I wish to remind my colleagues what the Senate directed the joint committees to do, on July 26, 1956. The five-section resolution was approved as follows:

> Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the stabilization of the national economy and the effectuation of the wisest, most orderly, and most economic utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation for the widest possible public benefit require that the Federal Government continue to exercise all of its constitutional powers not only to encourage but to participate in the conservation and development of such resources for all purposes, and that the continued nullification by the executive agencies of this fundamental and long-established national policy would constitute a usurpation of the legislative power.
>
> SEC. 2. That land and water resources development should be planned on comprehensive bases and with a view to such an ultimately integrated operation of component segments as will insure the realization of an optimum degree of physical and economic efficiency.
>
> SEC. 3. That the number of Federal agencies, offices, and organizations having to do with the planning and review of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should be reduced, rather than increased, and that technical and administrative routing and review procedures should be simplified and shortened in order to facilitate and to accelerate the submittal of reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects.

Mr. President, it is very important that we keep in mind that section 3 really states the objective of shortening the requirements and simplifying them, in the case of the standards which are to be reported to the Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah read again section 3 of that resolution?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. I now read it again:

> SEC. 3. That the number of Federal agencies, offices, and organizations having to do with the planning and review of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should be reduced, rather than increased, and that technical and administrative routing and review procedures should be simplified and shortened in order to facilitate and to accelerate the submittal of reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects.

With that objective I am in hearty agreement.

I now read section 4:

> SEC. 4. That reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congressional committees—

I specifically point out now that it is the Congressional committees of both Houses that have an interest in this matter—

> having jurisdiction of the subject matter, and that they should fully disclose the details and results of all studies and analyses of all potential utilizations, costs, allocations, payout, and benefits, both direct and indirect, made by all interested operating agencies.
>
> SEC. 5. That the preservation of the constitutional principle of separation of powers requires that any departure by the executive agencies from the observance and employment of the traditional policies, standards, procedures, and techniques reflected in and growing out of the settled administration of the large body of organic law governing the conservation and development of the land and water resources of the Nation be effected only after full examination and consideration by the Congress.

In fact, I find nothing in that resolution that is objectionable. I think it is highly desirable. I was one of those who supported it.

Now let me direct attention to section 4 of the pending Resolution 148, which the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have reported now to the Senate and urged that it be agreed to. This deals with reports to Congress on proposed water resource projects, the subject of most of Senate Resolution 148. The Senate directive in section 4 of the 1956 resolution—281—specified:

> That reports to Congress * * * should include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congressional committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter.

Once again I emphasize that particular requirement.

Instead of requesting approval of project evaluation projects approved by the committees of both Houses, the pending Resolution 148 requires approval of criteria approved only by the Senate Committee on Public Works and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As a matter of fact, from the reports submitted by the majority and minority, the approval is to be only by a majority of those committees. There ought to be a wider base of support than that, in my judgment, because, after all, such programs should be nonpartisan, and we all should be interested in developing the water resources of our country.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. In the event the House should deem it proper to adopt a resolution along the lines of the resolution before the Senate at this time, but in somewhat different terms, would not the departments themselves be in a position where they might have to make one report to the House and a different report to the Senate, and where there might be a conflict in the nature of the reports?

Mr. WATKINS. That could easily be the case. A number of departments in downtown Washington handle matters of this kind, such as the Army engineers, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture——

Mr. BARRETT. And the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. WATKINS. The Federal Power Commission; and other departments are involved. Since the House of Representatives has not been given an opportunity to speak, it may come up with an entirely different set of requirements that might cause confusion and embarrassment. Certainly the departments would want an opportunity to submit information. We do not know what the cost would be. We do not know what the burden would be upon those departments. I think, in the interest of getting something done that would really work, it would be a fine thing to consider this for some time and have a dry run on 2 or 3 plans to see what was entailed.

Mr. BARRETT. I know the Senator feels as I do, that this is a tremendously important matter, and certainly we ought to proceed with due caution in the premises. It seems to me that in a matter of this character, which involves such a fundamental issue as the control of projects that affect such a great portion of at least the western part of the country, it would be well to recommit the resolution and have the committee give further study to the question.

Mr. WATKINS. That is the view I have taken. I have talked to a number of Senators who feel the same way. We have taken that view, not because we are opposed to the purpose behind the resolution, but we would like to have an effective resolution that would do what we want it to do.

Mr. BARRETT. I agree wholeheartedly with the last statement of the distinguished Senator from Utah, and I certainly am not opposed to the objectives of the resolution. In fact, I am in favor of many of them. But I think we ought to take sufficient time to determine whether or not we are adequately protecting the rights of the States with reference to the control of their own waters. That has not been done.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator has raised a question which I had intended to refer to later, but we may as well discuss it now.

As I remember, the State departments of water, the State engineers of the Western States, have not been heard with reference to this resolution. As we all know, reclamation is one of the big water resource developments. There is a great deal of that yet to be done out west. The whole theory of the programs is one of cooperation with the States involved, because, under the theory of water rights and the right to use water, as pronounced by the Supreme Court, the States have that interest. They have the right to use and allocate the use of water, so far as concerns the 17 Western States, and they certainly ought to be heard in connection with this matter.

Mr. BARRETT. If the Senator will yield to me, it seems clear that if the engineers of the States of the West were called upon to comment on the proposal, they would want to add a new clause in section 4, requiring that no construction was to be carried out until there had been compliance with the laws of the various States of the West. That is a fundamental matter so far as the Western States are concerned. I certainly agree that they would insist on language that would protect the States of the West.

Mr. WATKINS. I am quite sure of that. I should like to point out to Senators from the Midwest, the East, and the South, that they should be vitally interested in this question, too, because there is not any doubt in my mind that States outside the reclamation States are going to find they have to meet the same problems the reclamation States have had, and that they will have to have water laws. They certainly would want to have criteria laid down to meet their situation. This is not an easy subject, because it has wide and far-reaching application all over the United States. The President has said, and I think rightly so, that one of the greatest problems before the country today is the proper use and the proper development of water resources. In many areas outside the 17 Western States there are no State laws with respect to the waters in the States.

Mr. BARRETT. If the Senator will yield to me, I think I can correctly state that he has noticed the trend throughout the country, in the States that have no such legislation, for legislation similar to that now on the books in the Western States. Many of those States are taking action along the lines of legislation in effect in the Western States with regard to reclamation. Certainly all the States in the country would eventually be interested in the problem.

Mr. WATKINS. I would think so. The proposal is to hold up the adoption of the resolution and to go ahead using the criteria now in effect. If the four committees of the Senate and the House want any explanation of how the program would work out, that can be obtained on a specific project.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is correct. It seems to me that inasmuch as Congress has, in the last 90 years, seen fit time after time to speak on the necessity for compliance with State water laws, and has urged the settlement of disputes between States by interstate compacts, and just 10 years ago provided, in the Flood Control Act of 1944, that agencies submit their plans to the States for review and then call upon the agencies to comment on the States' attitudes, it indicates clearly that Congress has stated time and time again that these matters ought to be so handled. But I find nothing in this proposed legislation which touches any of those important phases of our water law.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator is correct. I do not know how definitely we can tie in those rights with this particular resolution, but we certainly ought to see whether they do tie in. I think the officials from these States ought to be contacted and given an opportunity to present their views on this particular proposed legislation.

Mr. BARRETT. I agree.

Mr. WATKINS. So far as I can determine from the record, nothing of that kind has been done.

Mr. BARRETT. I agree with the Senator that although we may not be opposed to the resolution in its entirety, the resolution covers such a tremendously important issue that we ought to consider it for a sufficient length of time. We ought to give the resolution a great deal of study. The resolution indicates by its own terms that further study is needed.

It seems to me that the resolution, in the first place, ought to be a concurrent resolution. In the second place, the resolution ought to be given far more study than it has been given at the present time. All interested parties ought to be invited in and given an opportunity to present their side of the case. That should include representatives of the States.

Mr. WATKINS. I agree very fully with what the distinguished Senator has said. I think that can be done. There is nothing to be lost by holding this resolution through at least part of the present session, to give interested parties that opportunity, and to make a further study.

When I have finished my presentation I shall present a motion to recommit the resolution for the purpose of having the staffs of the committees prepare a synopsis of the information available relative to establishing the Federal water resources policy which will be adaptable to national coverage, with further instructions that such synopsis be brief, though comprehensive, and contain a summary of the objectives for establishing such a policy, and so on.

Mr. BARRETT. I wish to commend the Senator for his work on the resolution. I assure the Senator that I shall support him on the motion to recommit.

Mr. WATKINS. I appreciate the Senator's comment. I now proceed with my discussion. Furthermore, the resolution is an expression of only a majority of the 2 Senate committees 8 members of the 2 committees having joined in minority expressions of objections to this report. And I presume that other members of the two committees concerned will join in a vote for recommittal. At least I hope they will.

Senate Resolution 281 was given warm, bipartisan support and was approved, as I recall, without objection. I believe the same support could be given to legislation drafted in response to Senate Resolution 281, if an effort is made to elicit comment and support from all water-using organizations interested, and if the legislation introduced has firm bipartisan support.

I doubt that the National Reclamation Association has been asked for a comment on the resolution, though I do not know. I did not find that information in the RECORD. Organizations of that kind, and other organizations having to do with flood control, rivers and harbors development, and all organizations connected with water development ought to be permitted to give their views. Nothing will be lost while we are doing that. The program can go ahead under the old standards and can be discussed and approved, if Congress desires to do that. After we do obtain some standards, we should have standards which will be generally favorably received all over the United States. I think that can be accomplished without too much difficulty, if we give attention to that procedure.

It is my opinion that many organizations vitally interested in water resource development are not fully apprised of the nature and import of Senate Resolution 148. Furthermore, I fear that many such organizations are under the misapprehension that this is a joint resolution—as it properly should be—and think that they will have an opportunity to express their views to the House committees, which properly also should consider such legislation.

I hereby request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter dated January 24, 1958—1959. It is a communication from the American Farm Bureau Federation protesting against unilateral action by the Senate on this matter and urging further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Did I understand the Senator to say he desired to have printed a letter dated January 24, 1959?

Mr. WATKINS. No; 1958. I was mistaken. I was mixed up on the date, and I am sorry.

Mr. KERR. I did not understand the source of the letter.

Mr. WATKINS. The American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. KERR. May I see the letter?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator may see a copy of it. I do not know that I have the original here.

Mr. KERR. How is the Senator going to have it printed in the RECORD if he does not have it?

Mr. WATKINS. I have the original at the office. Wait a minute—perhaps I have it here. I can give the Senator a copy of it. I do not think the Senator would question that.

Mr. KERR. I would not question any statement the Senator made.

Mr. WATKINS. I hand the letter to the Senator. I think probably the Senator from Oklahoma has received a letter, too, as he will discover if he will check his files.

Mr. KERR. The American Farm Bureau Federation does not dictate my legislative policy.

Mr. WATKINS. They do not dictate mine, either, but they write to me. I give them the right to petition and express their views to me.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
*January 24, 1958.*

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: The American Farm Bureau Federation respectfully recommends your opposition to the enactment of Senate Resolution 148, which we understand will be considered by the Senate next week.

This resolution relates to the preparation of reports by executive agencies concerning the proposed authorization of land and water resource projects.

We are in accord with the stated objectives of Senate Resolution 148, "to improve the procedures for valuation of land and water resource projects and to provide a greater degree of Congressional control of resource development."

However, we believe that unilateral action by one House of the legislative branch is undesirable and would be premature at this particular time.

It is our understanding that the drafting of legislative proposals to implement the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resource Policy are nearing completion. In addition, a number of private organizations have under way studies and consideration of water policy legislative proposals along somewhat similar lines. It would appear desirable that Congressional consideration of such overall policies should precede the consideration of procedural details provided in Senate Resolution 148.

It is our recommendation that further comprehensive study of the whole question of policy and procedures which should be followed in the planning and development of water resource projects should be given by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs and the Senate Public Works Committees, pursuant to the authorization of Senate Resolution 281.

Very sincerely,

MATT TRIGGS,
*Assistant Legislative Director.*

Mr. KERR. I was greatly concerned when the Senator said it was a letter dated in January 1959. I became curious about how he had possession of it.

Mr. WATKINS. I regret to state that when I first looked at the date it looked to me as though it were the wrong date. Then I realized later I had made a mistake.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I understand correctly that the letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation expresses objection to a unilateral treatment of this subject, and in such expression contemplates if there is to be any treatment it should be by the House of Representatives and the Senate acting jointly, rather than on a one-sided basis?

Mr. WATKINS. That is what is stated. I shall quote from a part of the letter, if the Senator does not mind:

We are in accord with the stated objectives of Senate Resolution 148, "to improve the procedures for valuation of land and water resource projects and to provide a greater degree of Congressional control of resource development."

However, we believe that unilateral action by one House of the legislative branch is undesirable and would be premature at this particular time.

It is our understanding that the drafting of legislative proposals to implement the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resource Policy are nearing completion. In addition a number of private organizations have under way studies and consideration of water policy legislative proposals along somewhat similar lines. It would appear desirable that Congressional consideration of such overall policies should precede the consideration of procedural details provided in Senate Resolution 148.

It is our recommendation that further comprehensive study of the whole question of policy and procedures which should be followed in the planning and development of water resource projects should be given by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs and the Senate Public Works Committees, pursuant to the authorization of Senate Resolution 281.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the resolution shall be agreed to am I correct in my understanding that there will be one procedure controlling the various divisions and agencies of the Government in making their reports to the House of Representatives, and a different procedure and criterion for reporting to the Senate?

Mr. WATKINS. It would not necessarily follow that it would be different, but that would be possible. At the present time there is a procedure which has been in use for many years, applying to reports to both the House and Senate from the departments in connection with water legislation. If we adopt Senate Resolution 148 as amended, it will add to those requirements and modify them to some extent, unless the House adopts a similar resolution. If it were a concurrent resolution, the House could act upon it. If the House should act separately and establish its criteria, they might be different from the criteria adopted by the Senate. The result would be confusion, and a great deal more work in the departments downtown.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it a fair interpretation to make of the situation to say that if we desire uniformity of approach in the making of reports, it can be achieved with a greater degree of certainty if the problem is approached jointly, so that reports to both Houses of the Congress will be governed by a resolution adopted by both Houses than by this unilateral approach?

Mr. WATKINS. I think that is a sound statement. It would be much more desirable to have a concurrent resolution rather than a resolution adopted by the Senate alone.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I listened with interest to the description by the Senator from Utah, pointing out the disparity between the provisions of the resolution now pending before the Senate and the advice given to the committee in the original resolution. Do I correctly understand that the original resolution directed that ways and means be found to simplify and shorten the procedure, to the end that there might be greater expedition in the construction of the projects?

Mr. WATKINS. Section 3, which I read, had to do with simplification and shortening, in order to facilitate and accelerate the submittal of reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects.

If we can get the type of resolution which defines very clearly what we want, that will shorten the time required to work on the reports. That is why it is very important to have criteria and definitions established, so that there will not be argument downtown, as has been the case for many years, as to what the standards ought to be, and what certain terms mean—for example, "intangible benefits," "indirect benefits," and so forth. There has been quite a controversy over those various terms.

I was hopeful that when a request for a report was made, no matter whether it was made by the House or Senate, it would be very clear, and that we would have definitions which would not confuse the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, instead of simplifying and shortening the reports, the resolution which we are urged to vote affirmatively upon would complicate and make lengthier the eventual reports to be filed.

Mr. WATKINS. I believe that is correct. I may point out to the Senator that, in effect, the pending proposal calls for practically six different ways of doing things. There are 3 basic sets of criteria, which must be applied in connection with 2 types of program, namely, the 50-year program of payouts, and the 100-year program of payouts. So we would add to the work which those in the departments have had to do in the past in preparing reports.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the resolution before the Senate sets out in clear language the information which the Senate requests of the agencies of the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. WATKINS. It does not define some of the standards which are set up. For example, the resolution calls for three methods to begin with, and in addition, the computation must be made for two different time periods; namely, 50 years and 100 years.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator identify the part to which he refers?

Mr. WATKINS. It is incorporated in my speech. I have summarized the proposed amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the portion to which reference is made is found in paragraph 3 on page 5 of the report.

Mr. WATKINS. One method, used by Federal agencies for many years, is the separable-costs remaining-benefits method.

Mr. KERR. How did that method happen to be used by the Federal agencies?

Mr. WATKINS. It has grown up over the years, probably as the result of interpretations by the departments of legislation.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator point out the legislative enactment which fixes that formula?

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot at the moment, because I do not have all that information at my fingertips.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the Senator from Utah cannot do so because that formula does not exist in legislative enactments?

Mr. WATKINS. Let us assume that the Senator's statement might be correct. At least the method arises from interpretation by the departments of legislation which has been enacted at various times.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that it comes from Budget Directive A–47, issued in December of 1952?

Mr. WATKINS. I know what the Senator means. I have had some quarrels and arguments with respect to Budget Directive A–47; and I have had some views which do not coincide with the views of the departments, which are supposed to have adopted this method by some sort of interagency agreement.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact——

Mr. WATKINS. Let me finish.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the inter-agency agreement to which the Senator refers came about by reason of a directive of the Executive, and not by reason of legislative enactment?

Mr. WATKINS. I think President Truman probably did issue a directive on that subject.

Mr. KERR. Whether it was President Truman, President Roosevelt, or President Eisenhower, did the agreement of the executive agencies, namely, the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Army, and the Department of Agriculture, not come about by reason of an Executive directive, rather than a legislative directive?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not think there was any legislative directive that anyone could place his finger upon. However, I think even the administrative directive which was issued some time ago grew out of what the executive department understood was the deducible meaning of the legislation which had been enacted with respect to water resource programs.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, there is no abler Member of the Senate than the distinguished Senator from Utah——

Mr. WATKINS. I ask the Senator not to lay it on too thick.

Mr. KERR. No Member of the Senate has had a prouder record of work in behalf of public projects than the distinguished Senator from Utah.

No Member of the Senate knows more about the law on this subject than does the Senator from Utah. I believe that out of the broad knowledge he has on this subject he will admit that Directive A–47, a directive of the Budget Bureau under President Truman in his last month in office, and which was implemented by his Budget Bureau Director during the 5 years of President Eisenhower's administration, and the agreement of the three executive agencies—namely the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Army, and the Department of Agriculture—as to what would be the basis of justification, are both either contrary to legislative history or without basis of legislative authority.

That fact provoked the passage by the Senate of the original resolution to which the Senator from Utah has referred and the reporting by the committee of Senate Resolution 148.

Mr. WATKINS. Senate Resolution 231 was the resolution which I think was inspired by what the Senator from Oklahoma refers to.

I agree with certain features of budget directive A–47, but not all of it. I think it represents a wrong conclusion as to what we had done. The legislative history indicated the meaning of the legislation which we enacted in years gone by.

I think the situation needs to be corrected. I have no quarrel with the desirability of getting some kind of resolution. If the Senator from Oklahoma has listened to my remarks, he knows that. My argument is that there should be a concurrent resolution. Both Houses should consider the question. It should be studied to the point where we can obtain the views of the various voluntary, nonprofit water organizations over the United States which are interested and which have made studies. We should obtain the views of the State departments having to do with water resource development in the various States, particularly in the 17 Western States, where water is all important.

I think we should have all that information; and when we finally adopt a resolution, defining the criteria, it will have practically the unanimous support of all those interested in water development—officially and otherwise—over the country.

Mr. KERR. In the meantime, who has prescribed the specifications for the only reports a Congressional committee can get from an executive agency?

Mr. WATKINS. Oh, the specifications have been prescribed downtown, but I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that Congress is not entirely powerless under the type of directive to which he has referred. We can go ahead and we have gone ahead to authorize projects pretty much as we wanted to authorize them, whether they fit into that particular formula or do not fit into it.

Mr. KERR. But in the meantime, the specifications used by the executive agencies for reporting projects to Congress are not specifications—as the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] indicated a while ago—which are the result of action by both Houses of Congress. On that point I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that the specifications which are being used are without pride of ancestry, authenticity, or even parenthood of either House of Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. They are the offspring of the executive agencies—the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture, under the lash of the Bureau of the Budget. Those are the specifications which now control the information that is brought to committees of Congress by the executive agencies. Whenever we get their representatives on the stand and press them into a corner, they say, "These specifications are in accordance with a directive of the executive branch of the Government, No. A–47."

It is the purpose of the pending measure not to do away with the standard that has been set up by both Houses of Congress. In the first place, it consists of a request to the executive agencies of Government to give to our committees information with reference to proposed projects which those agencies now either fail or decline to give because of directives issued by the Bureau of the Budget.

In other words, the Senator from Utah is saying, "Let us not enact anything until we get both Houses of Congress to agree."

In the meantime we will be operating in a vacuum insofar as legislative authority is concerned, because that authority has been preempted by the executive branch of the Government, and because the executive branch of the Government has preempted the functions of Congress, and is attempting to come to Congress and to say to Congress: "This is the basis on which you can authorize projects, and on no other basis will we report to you."

I ask the Senator whether it is not true that the sole purpose of the pending Senate resolution is to give to Congress information which the committees of Congress can use, and to permit the committees to decide for themselves whether they wish to be limited, for instance, to what the Senator has objected to in the paragraph to which he has referred.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may I have an opportunity to say a word now?

Mr. KERR. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. I appreciate what the Senator has been saying. I can agree for the most part with what he has said. We are attempting to establish some kind of standards. All I wish to point out is that, if we have been operating in a vacuum since President Truman issued his directive, it must be remembered that we have done very well in authorizing projects. The Senate has twice passed an omnibus bill. One was vetoed, and the other lies dormant in the House.

If a bill provides almost any kind of criterion under which almost anything can be done by the Federal Government,

that bill ought to be vetoed. I say that with all due respect to the Senator and his colleagues who supported such a bill, and very effectively so.

Mr. KERR. And successfully so.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. With all due respect I say it ought to be vetoed again, if that is the case. What was attempted to be done in that bill was to provide an open door for approximately $8 billion worth of authorizations, to build higher dams on certain projects, for example; and by adding what we call a little increment of support, it would be possible to get water for cities and water for many other purposes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. WATKINS. I am trying to finish my statement. However, I yield again.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the Senator's position on the pending resolution is identical with the position he took on the bill to which we have referred, that he is opposed to it except on the basis that the Bureau of the Budget will accept and approve the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. No; that does not happen to be the fact. I can prove that that is not the fact.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. WATKINS. Will this be the last request?

Mr. KERR. Yes; if the Senator so desires.

Mr. WATKINS. I merely wish to finish my statement. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the Senator believes the best way to improve Directive 847 is to abolish it?

Mr. WATKINS. I believe we should get the right kind of proposal to put in its place.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation; not a question?

Mr. WATKINS. In just a moment. We can go ahead now, and we have done so. Weber Basin is one of the projects in connection with which we did not pay any attention to a situation such as Directive A–47 created.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation; not another question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that the Senator from Oklahoma and the Committee on Public Works and the Senator from New Mexico and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have spent nearly as much time studying the pending resolution as the Senator from Utah has spent in studying the Upper Colorado authorization; and, although the Senator from Utah did not participate in its consideration, he was, nevertheless, a member of the committee. Therefore, I wish to say to him, when he says to the Senate that the members of the committee who have brought the resolution to the Senate do not know anything about it, he is speaking only for himself.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not pretend to speak for anyone else but myself. The Senator's criticism is not justified and is uncalled for. It is not sound in fact. I am not doing anything he is charging me with doing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand the response of the Senator from Utah to the question of the Senator from Oklahoma, it is to the effect that he believes that the flood-control bill now pending on the House Calendar should be defeated. Did the Senator from Utah oppose the Flaming Gorge project in his State?

Mr. WATKINS. There is a vast difference in that connection. I was opposed to a wide open authorization in the flood-control bill. I have voted for flood-control bills for the last 10 years, as a matter of fact.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Including Flaming Gorge?

Mr. WATKINS. That is a different story.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; it is in Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. That involved reclamation and irrigation, not flood control. There is no flood-control feature connected with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But it is in Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. It happens to be in Utah. I voted for some projects in the Senator's State also.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Now the Senator asks that some money recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the Navaho Dam should go to Flaming Gorge. Is that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. I am opposed to that move on the part of the Bureau of the Budget. I do not believe it should be authorized. I think it is unwise, for several reasons.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he wish to finish his statement first?

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to say first that someone has suggested or said something about our perhaps conducting a filibuster. I wish to assure the proponents of the resolution that I do not have anything of that kind in mind at all, or that there is anything like that in the program so far as the opponents of the resolution are concerned. I wish to get to a vote on the resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I heard the Senator make some statement about giving an opportunity for persons to be heard on the subject. The Senator is a fine and valued member of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation; I am happy to testify to that fact. But I wish to say to the Senator that I conducted the hearings on this resolution. I hope the Senator did not mean to imply that I closed the hearings before everyone had a chance to be heard.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not imply that at all, but I said I did not think the State groups, water resource boards, and similar organizations had been represented.

Mr. ANDERSON. They were all given an opportunity to appear.

Mr. WATKINS. They may have been; but it is simply one of those things, as the saying goes. We did not get their cooperation. We did not have it. That is my judgment.

Mr. ANDERSON. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is present. He also is a very valuable member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and one whose judgment I prize very highly on the committee. He came to the hearings. If the Senator will look at the hearings, he will see the testimony given by the senior Senator from Wyoming. It was very, very short. He said he was not sure about the proposal. He wanted to be heard on it. His testimony was not exhaustive.

I am only trying to indicate that we were all trying to determine which way we should go. We questioned many witnesses, including witnesses from the Army. It seemed to me that everyone was in agreement that there should be a single standard, and that Congress ought to set it.

The only effort that I was making was to be certain that this resolution would do exactly what Congress thought it ought to do, what the original reclamation act provided should be done, and what the flood control laws provided should happen.

The only upsetting factor was the regulations which were issued by the Bureau, contrary to the policy established by the Congress. There was no authority to act contrary to the policy of Congress.

I hope the Senator from Utah will believe me when I say we were trying to keep the hearings open. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was before the committee for a long time. We entered into a discussion with representatives of the Corps of Engineers on the Missouri River project. We discussed a great many other things which were very interesting. But we certainly did not close the doors on this subject until there was not a soul left who wanted to be heard. We tried to keep the hearings open as long as possible.

Every State was afforded an opportunity to send its representatives. Representatives from the Bureau of the Budget were present, as were members of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. I am trying to think of whom the Senator from Utah would have liked to have present who was not there.

Mr. WATKINS. I believe that representatives of the State agencies, including the State engineers and members of the State waterpower boards, should have been present. I do not know what kind of notice was sent out concerning the hearings.

Mr. ANDERSON. Witnesses were present from a great many States. I would not, from memory, try to cite them all to the able Senator from Utah; I say only that there was a pretty fair representation.

Mr. WATKINS. There were some witnesses; there is no doubt about that. I simply happen to think that probably there were not enough present to enable the subcommittee to obtain a general consensus on the subject.

I point out to the Senator that he has mentioned something which I think is

important. A Congressional standard should be established, and it should be followed by the Department. One of the principal grounds for objection is that there is no Congressional standard. The resolution purports to be the views of the Senate only, not the views of the House. Why not send the resolution back to the committee and call upon it to report a concurrent resolution, so that when the final expression is made, it will be a resolution of the Senate and the House? Then it could be said that the House had had an opportunity to express itself.

I think the only way in which we will get anywhere in connection with these resource programs is to provide some acceptable, sound standard. We are having a difficult enough time as it is to obtain authorizations for these programs over the present opposition from the areas concerned. I think we do not realize that the opponents will probably be in at some later time asking for the same thing we are now proposing.

As to the motion I intend to make, it seems to me that the Senator from New Mexico could accept it. We have always worked together before. He may regard my proposal as "Monday morning quarterbacking."

Even though the Senator feels as he does, I think it would be wise to let the resolution go back to the committee in accordance with the motion I wish to make. Let the committee report a resolution upon which both Houses can act. Then we shall have something with which everyone in the world of water conservation can be satisfied, so far as that is possible.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator knows that all of us have scars which have come to us from long and bitter fights. I was very much interested in the small-projects bill. The Senate passed its bill. We tried to have the House pass the bill which the Senate passed. The Senator may remember that the House passed a bill which was quite different. In the committee of conference we were at swords' points, battling back and forth for months. It was my unpleasant task to be chairman of the conference committee.

Mr. WATKINS. I was a member of the conference committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator will remember very well that we were never able to have the resolution agreed to there. We were never able to reconcile the various points of view.

We ended by saying that if the Senate would pass a certain type of bill our work would be done. It required the hard work of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and many other Senators over many hours to have the bill passed.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator from New Mexico fearful now that we may encounter the same sort of situation in the House?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am fearful that if we were to try to ask the House to pass such a resolution at this time, the resolution would lie dormant there for several years. This resolution was cleared. The House did not want to act on it when we did. We felt that we still had the right to ask for these things.

Mr. WATKINS. I was chairman of a committee which tried to obtain from members of a House committee a statement as to whether they would agree to certain things which the Senate had agreed to.

Did the chairman of the committee try to obtain from the members of the House committee a statement as to whether they would ask for these things?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not say that I pleaded with the House committee members. I discussed with Members of the House the passage of this sort of resolution.

As the Senator from Utah knows, and as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] know, the House is in a little different position from the Senate.

In the House, at one time, there was an association of Rocky Mountain Representatives. There were 14 of us in all, from about 8 or 9 Rocky Mountain States. The New York delegation has 47 members; the Pensylvania delegation has 34 members.

In the Senate, we have parity, the two Senators from each Western State having just as many votes as the Senators from the most populous States. Therefore, it is a little easier to handle reclamation problems in the Senate than it is in the House.

I remind the Senator from Utah that for many years appropriation bills for reclamation projects came from the House of Representatives without providing a dollar for new projects. Then we appealed to our great friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], to restore those items in the Senate. Finally they were included in the bill as it came from the Senate.

That ought to indicate to the Senator from Utah, as it does to me, that there is a slightly different attitude in the House concerning reclamation projects.

That is why I recommended that this action be taken in the Senate, not in the House. I was not the author of the idea. The authors of the idea were the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR.] I was brought in because of my position on the committee. But I thought I recognized the soundness of what they were doing. In my opinion, this is the only way the work will ever be done. I think we are in a very bad situation.

Now I want the Senator to finish his speech.

Mr. WATKINS. I am perfectly willing to yield for a question. I had yielded for an observation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator has been more than generous, and I appreciate it.

Mr. WATKINS. I realize the existence of the situation which the Senator suggests. I tried to argue with some force, but apparently I did not use enough force or was not persuasive enough, because after the Senate had passed the small projects bill, the President said he would sign it on condition that an amendment be adopted. The Senate adopted the amendment, which sent the bill back to the House, and the House could, in effect, veto the whole program if it did not like it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was not a party to the promise which was made, but I was willing to help the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator certainly was. I feel that we made a mistake in adopting the amendment. I pointed out that the House had a different point of view, particularly in view of the fact that large numbers of House Members come from States which were not interested in the water programs which we have in the West.

We left it to a majority on that one committee to decide whether to veto the small water projects as they came up. I understand that now we are in extreme difficulty because the Department takes the view that there is not an unqualified authorization as yet; and until the program has gone through the additional process there will not be one. So we shall probably have a fight to get each of these projects authorized.

The Senator has been arguing for action in the Senate, and points out that the House might not go along with the action of the Senate. That points up the necessity of trying to establish some sort of harmonizing standard upon which we can all agree.

And I think we can do so at present, because I believe the climate today is different. I think the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate generally agree with the President, and that the water-resource development program is one of the greatest problems existing today in the country. I believe we can obtain that much now. I think it is worthy of an effort, before the Senate unilaterally attempts to establish one set of criteria because the Senate is afraid the House will not go along. The two Houses should act jointly, rather than establish two different sets of criteria. Yet Senators are admitting that, as the matter now stands, the two Houses would have two different sets.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was attempting to point out the problem which exists. I acted entirely in good faith in introducing the bill to attempt to carry out the program the President suggested. Even though I did not agree with what the President suggested, I supported his endeavor because I thought we had an obligation on which to make good. Then the measure went to the House of Representatives, where a different sentiment prevailed.

Mr. WATKINS. But my amendment, which would have avoided such a situation, was rejected. The amendment which was adopted placed the matter in the hands of the House of Representatives again, which can veto any one of the projects which comes up, if it wishes to do so. The House of Representatives now has that power, although it did not formerly have it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only say that this represents the most sincere effort I can make in an attempt to take care of that situation. The Senator from North Dakota had several projects in North Dakota—Elm River and Swan-Buffalo

Creek—which he simply could not get cleared, and one of those projects is still held up. It is for the Elm River. Then there was the Zuber Draw project, in New Mexico; and the Mill Creek project, in Wisconsin; and the Cowaselon project, in New York State. The Bureau of the Budget has decided that it will apply a standard different from the one the Congress of the United States applied and the President of the United States approved. The Bureau of the Budget is an arm of the same President of the United States who signed the bill under which these projects were submitted. But then the Bureau of the Budget reports, "This is not in accordance with the program of the President." Mr. President, nothing more ridiculous could possibly occur than for the Bureau of the Budget, supposedly an arm of the President, to send something back to Congress and to say that it is not in accordance with the program of the President, when the President himself has already submitted it in one form and the Congress had passed the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. But I have said that I am fully in accord with the provisions of Senate Resolution 281. I do not think we have yet complied with its provisions. We cannot say that Senate approval amounts to Congressional approval. I have the utmost of respect for my two colleagues. We have worked together for many years; I refer to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], with whom I have worked for many years on the Committee on Public Works, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], with whom I have worked ever since he has been a Member of the Senate. We have worked together on the Reclamation Subcommittee and on the full Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs. I have great respect for the views of these two Senators. But I plead with them to permit the Senate to work with the House of Representatives and devise a set of standards which can be sent to the executive departments, together with a statement that they are the standards the Congress wants. Let there be no controversy between the two Houses. Let the Senate make this effort. In the meantime, we can have reclamation projects approved. As a matter of fact, a number of them have been approved. No harm will be done by a little delay, insofar as getting projects approved is concerned.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Utah have before him a copy of Senate Resolution 281?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. I read it to the Senate a little while ago.

Mr. KERR. I know that. Let me ask what the resolution asks from the two committees.

Mr. WATKINS. Following the preamble, the resolution reads as follows:

> Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the stabilization of the national economy and the effectuation of the wisest, most orderly, and most economic utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation for the widest possible public benefit require that the Federal Government continue to exercise all of its constitutional powers not only to encourage but to participate in the conservation and development of such resources for all purposes, and that the continued nullification by the executive agencies of this fundamental and long-established national policy would constitute a usurpation of the legislative power.
>
> SEC. 2. That land and water resources development should be planned on comprehensive bases and with a view to such an ultimately integrated operation of component segments as will insure the realization of an optimum degree of physical and economic efficiency.
>
> SEC. 3. That the number of Federal agencies, offices, and organizations having to do with the planning and review of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should be reduced, rather than increased, and that technical and administrative routing and review procedures should be simplified and shortened in order to facilitate and to accelerate the submittal of report to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects.
>
> SEC. 4. That reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congressional committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter, and that they should fully disclose the details and results of all studies and analyses of all potential utilizations, costs, allocations, payout, and benefits, both direct and indirect, made by all interested operating agencies.
>
> SEC. 5. That the preservation of the constitutional principle of separation of powers requires that any departure by the executive agencies from the observance and employment of the traditional policies, standards, procedures, and techniques reflected in and growing out of the settled administration of the large body of organic law governing the conservation and development of the land and water resources of the Nation be effected only after full examination and consideration by the Congress.

I think the meaning was absolutely clear, namely, that the intent was that the criteria be obtained from both Houses of Congress, and that, in effect, a Congressional standard thus be established. In that connection, Senate action would amount to only one-half of the desired action.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Utah take the position that the resolution was addressed to these two committees of both Houses?

Mr. WATKINS. No; it was addressed to the agencies downtown; I refer to Senate Resolution 148.

Mr. KERR. But that is the result of Senate Resolution 281, is it not?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; and it is addressed to the Congressional committees, and we should have done what the resolution told us to do, namely, establish a Congressional standard.

Mr. KERR. I did not understand that Senate Resolution 281 was addressed to the House of Representatives.

Mr. WATKINS. It called for Congressional approval, not merely for Senate approval. There is a play on words. I do not think it can be said for a moment that Senate approval amounts to Congressional approval.

Mr. KERR. The Committee on Public Works accepted it from the Senate as a direction to bring back to the Senate suggestions to clarify what was needed in the way of information from the executive agencies downtown, for the Senate committees.

Mr. WATKINS. They did not go far enough. Of course, there is a difference of opinion. I think the resolution meant that there should be a concurrent resolution or a joint resolution, rather than a Senate resolution.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Utah will show me where the resolution uses the words "concurrent resolution" or "joint resolution," I shall appreciate it.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the language of the resolution clearly implies that.

Mr. KERR. But the resolution does not say so.

Mr. WATKINS. It says so by implication.

Mr. KERR. It says so only by implication, does it?

Mr. WATKINS. I think it refers rather strongly, all the way through, to Congressional action; and I think that, in effect, it calls for the establishment of standards for both Houses of the Congress, not for just one House or the other.

I believe that procedure of the type called for by the pending resolution would only lead to trouble in the future; that is my opinion.

Mr. KERR. Then does the Senator from Utah believe that the Senate committees should obtain only whatever information the House of Representatives thinks its committees should request from the executive agencies?

Mr. WATKINS. No, I do not believe that; but I honestly believe that the Senate should try to obtain the approval of the House of Representatives to some suggested standards or criteria, and should attempt to send that much to the executive agencies. If, after making that effort, it is found that Congressional approval cannot be obtained, then let the approval of the Senate alone be obtained. But the other procedure has not yet been attempted.

Mr. KERR. No; we are only trying to do what Senate Resolution 281 directed us to do, namely, to make recommendations in an effort to obtain the information which our committees want.

Mr. WATKINS. As I have said, I think Senate Resolution 281 certainly calls for Congressional standards, and that means action taken by both Houses.

In regard to the application of this resolution to water project approval, I wish to remind my colleagues that this resolution prescribes that hereafter no water project could be proposed to the Congress for authorization unless six different computations had been made from the basic cost evaluation data. This would include computations of cost evaluations by at least three methods: First, the separable, costs-remaining-benefits method—used by Federal agencies for many years; second, the priority-of-use method; and third, the incremental costs method. The last is not really a method at all. The second and third are seldom used by executive agencies today. In addition, these computations must be made for 2 different time periods—50 years and 100 years.

In my judgment, this compounding of cost evaluation and reporting methods would only delay and increase the costs and the redtape involved in processing water-resource projects, and would greatly delay the reports, which we would like to obtain much sooner.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to finish the presentation of my views, because other Senators will wish to speak; and I know the Senator from New Mexico will probably enlighten us in his own time, a little later.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Senate report does not indicate that any trial runs have been made to ascertain what increases in costs and personnel would be involved under such procedures, and what delays, if any, would result in project processing. It would have been a simple thing for the committees to request the agencies involved to make such an evaluation and to present the results of the study, along with the report on the legislation. But for some reason, unknown to me, the committees pushed through a report without such basic information, even though this matter has been under committee staff study for 3 years.

When I reviewed Senate Report 1154 in mid-November, I decided to make up for this deficiency by making such a request as an individual. But, apparently, the requirements of Senate Resolution 148 are so complicated or so vague, that neither of the two major Federal agencies primarily involved has been able to comply with my request to this day.

Only today I received a letter from the Department of Agriculture, but I have not yet been able to read it; it was called to my attention just as I entered the Chamber to make this speech. The Army Engineers have made a report, but the Department of the Interior has not.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, my letters to the three construction agencies, and a copy of the only reply received at the time I prepared these remarks. In addition, I request consent to have printed in the RECORD a preliminary reply from the Department of the Army explaining why that agency could not comply with my request; and a letter from Chairman MURRAY and Chairman CHAVEZ, disagreeing with the conclusions of the Department of the Army.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 26, 1957.

The Honorable FRED A. SEATON,
*Secretary of the Interior,*
*Department of the Interior,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SECRETARY SEATON: Senate Resolution 148, reported to the Senate floor by the Senate Interior Committee, sets up new requirements for reporting project data to Congress.

I should appreciate a report from your agency on the additional costs of making such reports, based upon a trial example run from a project which you have submitted or which you are preparing for submission. Please submit the trial example report in the form you are now using and in the form which would be required by Senate Resolution 148.

In addition to showing the extra costs for this example, also show the average number of such reports handled during a year and estimate the additional cost and additional personnel which would be required annually to handle such reports expeditiously in the event of the bill's passage.

Also I should appreciate a summarization of your Department's recommendations to Congress on criteria and procedures for water resources project evaluation since 1956.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

---

NOVEMBER 26, 1957.

The Honorable WILBER M. BRUCKER,
*Secretary of the Army,*
*Department of the Army,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SECRETARY BRUCKER: Senate Resolution 148, reported to the Senate floor by the Senate Interior Committee, sets up new requirements for reporting project data to Congress.

I should appreciate a report from your agency on the additional costs of making such reports, based upon a trial example run from a project which you have submitted or which you are preparing for submission. Please submit the trial example report in the form you are now using and in the form which would be required by Senate Resolution 148.

In addition to showing the extra costs for this example, also show the average number of such reports handled during a year and estimate the additional cost and additional personnel which would be required annually to handle such reports expeditiously in the event of the bill's passage.

Also I should appreciate a summarization of your Department's recommendations to Congress on criteria and procedures for water resources project evaluation since 1956.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

---

NOVEMBER 26, 1957.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Department of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SECRETARY BENSON: Senate Resolution 148, reported to the Senate floor by the Senate Interior Committee, sets up new requirements for reporting project data to Congress.

I should appreciate a report from your agency on the additional costs of making such reports, based upon a trial example run from a project which you have submitted or which you are preparing for submission. Please submit the trial example report in the form you are now using and in the form which would be required by Senate Resolution 148.

In addition to showing the extra costs for this example, also show the average number of such reports handled during a year and estimate the additional cost and additional personnel which would be required annually to handle such reports expeditiously in the event of the bill's passage.

Also I should appreciate a summarization of your Department's recommendations to Congress on criteria and procedures for water resource project evaluation since 1946.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

---

JANUARY 18, 1958.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: This is in reply to your letter of November 26, 1957, requesting that we submit estimates of the additional costs of reporting project data to the Congress in the form contemplated by Senate Resolution 148, such estimates to be based upon a trial example run.

Careful consideration has been given to the possibilities of undertaking such a trial run. We regret to report that it will not be possible to comply with your request until the intent of certain portions of Senate Resolution 148 have been more fully revealed. The major difficulty is that as the resolution now stands widely varying interpretations can be placed upon the requirement that additional information be furnished for all physically feasible alternative projects. This requirement could be construed to mean that each such alternative should be investigated as fully as the project finally recommended. Under this interpretation the cost of preparing project reports could be increased, in some instances, by several hundred percent, for there are often several physically feasible alternatives. On the other hand, if it is found possible to interpret the language of the proposed resolution as requiring for the possible alternative projects only sufficient information to demonstrate within reasonable limits the superiority of the recommended plan, the cost of reports would not be appreciably increased.

Obviously, if it is found possible to interpret Senate Resolution 148 as requiring only sufficient study of alternatives to establish that they are less desirable than the project recommended there would be no reason for this Department's making a trial run, as it is standard practice for the Corps of Engineers to investigate alternatives to this extent.

Your letter also requested a summarization of this Department's recommendations to Congress on criteria and procedures for water resources project evaluation since 1946. Until very recently the Congress has not attempted to specify criteria and procedures governing the technical aspects of project evaluation. Hence there was no occasion for this department to make such recommendations prior to the time the committees of Congress undertook the studies which led up to the development of Senate Resolution 148.

It will be understood, of course, that the agencies of the executive branch have for many years been studying the problems of project evaluation and that the results of these studies have been reflected in the reports submitted to the Congress. The most important studies of this sort are those which resulted in the publication in May 1950 of the interagency report Proposed Practices for Economic Analysis of River Basin Projects. Subsequent reports of this Department to the Congress recommending authorization of specific projects have conformed generally with the evaluation standards and procedures in the interagency report and, subsequent to December 1952, with the evaluation criteria established by Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A–47. This Department also participated in the studies which resulted in the December 12, 1955, Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. In this connection your attention is called to the fact that in a letter sent the chairman of the House Committee on Public Works on July 2, 1957, reporting on House Resolution 965, 85th Congress, this Department stated its belief that the policies recommended by that committee are sound in principle and deserving of careful consideration by the Congress.

Since the studies leading up to the development of Senate Resolution 148 were initiated this Department has submitted two statements dealing to some extent with procedures for project evaluation. In letter of November 26, 1956, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be found information on the procedures followed by the Department of the Army in carrying out its civil-works responsibilities. A letter dated July 9, 1957,

addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, contains the views of the Chief of Engineers on the adequacy of the information called for by Senate Resolution 148. Both of these letters have been published by the committees; the first in committee print dated January 4, 1957, and the second in committee print dated August 5, 1957.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
*Secretary of the Army.*

---

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
*January 23, 1958.*

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR ARTHUR: We appreciate your thoughtfulness in bringing to our attention the excerpt from the January 18, 1958, letter to you from Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker, relative to the reports that would be made pursuant to Senate Resolution 148.

It is reassuring that Secretary Brucker's letter confirms our understanding that the information requested by Senate Resolution 148 is regularly available to the Corps of Engineers. As Secretary Brucker states in the excerpt that you furnish, it is standard practice of the Corps of Engineers to investigate projects to the extent that provides the requested information about alternatives.

Possibly, the Department of the Army did not consult Senate Resolution 148 in the form that is reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works (S. Rept. No. 1154), with committee amendments. In reporting the resolution, a clarifying amendment was adopted that should not be susceptible of misinterpretation relative to the information requested regarding alternative plans. This language for section 1, shown on page 5 of Senate Report No. 1154, reads:

"*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the Senate that procedures for evaluation of land and water resource projects should be improved, and that the agencies of the executive branch of the Government responsible for the preparation of reports relative to the authorization of land and water resource projects be, and are hereby, requested to furnish, in connection with such reports, the following information in addition to the data now presented in support of project authorizations:

"Information relative to alternative plans for the water resource projects that may reasonably be considered physically feasible of construction consistently with the advice of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, or the Department of Agriculture, [including enough of the information enumerated in subparagraphs (1) to (10) inclusive to show why each alternative was dropped in favor of the recommended plan]. (Brackets added to identify the revised language.)"

Examination of Senate Resolution 148 in the form that it is reported to the Senate would have obviated any confusion in the Department of the Army as to the extent of the information requested. The language of the resolution quoted above, it seems to us, leaves no doubt that the information requested is what Secretary Brucker characterizes standard practice of the Corps of Engineers. This is to secure sufficient information on alternative plans so that meaningful comparisons can be made with the recommended plan. Assistant Secretary Aandahl's July 22, 1957 letter advises that comparable procedures are followed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Obviously then, no additional planning time or costs are entailed in Senate Resolution 148. Under the provisions of the resolution, the committees would be furnished with comparative analyses such as the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation employ regularly.

The objective of the sponsors of Senate Resolution 148 is to obtain for use by the committees of the Congress information which is generally available in the field offices of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and others. It is our desire to have an opportunity to consider plans which may be rejected by the agencies because of apparent unfavorable cost-to-benefit ratios which result from use of restrictive criteria as prescribed by Budget Circular A–47 and other administratively prescribed formulas. In other words, it is our desire to determine whether or not full potential use is made of a selected dam and reservoir site.

It is worthy of note that in the hearings on Senate Resolution 148 and in the reports on it, the agencies of the executive branch did not suggest that the requested information would require any significant increase in planning time or costs. On the contrary, the Bureau of the Budget advised, in its letter of July 8, 1957, printed in Senate Report No. 1154, page 19:

"Much of the information which would be solicited by the resolution is, of course, now available in the project reports submitted to the Congress. However, it appears to us that the additional information called for by the resolution could provide a useful supplement to that presented under present procedures."

We trust that you find this review of the effect of Senate Resolution 148 as reassuring as we do. Thank you for bringing the matter to our attention. In order promptly to dissipate any confusion that may be based on the earlier language of the resolution, we are sending a copy of this letter to Secretary Brucker.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.*

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works.*

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 148 deals with a complex subject, but I hereby offer in summary eight objections to the measure, which, I believe, are presented in understandable language.

I and my colleagues think Senate Resolution 148 should not be adopted because:

First. It fails to meet the obligation of the legislative branch to establish basic policy.

Second. It specifies certain procedures and technical methods which the testimony shows would not result in uniformity with respect to project evaluations among different agencies.

Third. If the requirements of item 6 in section 1 were carried out, there would be required at least 2 major calculations for 2 time periods of benefit-cost ratios and 3 major cost-allocation studies, or a total of at least 6 separate studies. This would further complicate rather than simplify information necessary to determine project evaluations. In addition, the agencies would require more time and money to conform to such requirements.

Fourth. We do not agree entirely that some of the additional sections added to the original Resolution 148 are in conformity with the intent of the reports of the agencies. I refer specifically to sections 3 and 4.

Fifth. Reports of the executive agencies suggested some fundamental changes, most of which are related to technical problems. If a careful review of these is not had and provisions made for these recommendations, the Senate might be placed in the position of giving wrong answers to technical problems.

Sixth. A resolution by one House of Congress is not a proper means for bringing about changes in policies and procedures.

It leads only to confusion, argument, and controversy, rather than to getting something we would like to get, a united program.

Seventh. The Congress is not prepared to act properly and with wisdom and deliberation in this, an important and difficult matter.

Eighth. According to evidence before the committees, there has been expressed disapproval of present cost-allocation methods for multiple-purpose water projects, but to select a method of cost allocation as the means of determining the cost-sharing policy of the Nation is clearly out of line as a matter of economics, if for no other reason.

The suggestions only touch on the high spots of this analysis.

Federal agencies have testified that they are in agreement on a specific method for the allocation of costs in multiple-purpose projects. Have we been shown that this agreement is an improper one and that its adoption was in error? I have no knowledge of it if there was such testimony.

I trust that most Members of the Senate will agree with me that further staff work should be undertaken in the manner suggested.

Mr. President, at this time I send to the desk and ask to have read the motion I now make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

I hereby move to recommit Senate Resolution 148 to the Committees on Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs, and that the committees instruct their legal and technical staff to together prepare a synopsis of the information available relative to establishing a Federal water-resources-development policy adaptable to national coverage; with further instructions that such a synopsis be brief, although comprehensive; that it contain a summary of the objectives for establishing such a policy; and that the staff, collectively, report to the committees, from time to time, on progress, on need for further instructions, and on the desirability for further Federal agency reports as well as reports from the affected States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to speak later on the motion, after I have heard from the opposition, if there should develop any opposition to the motion. I understand other Members of the Senate also intend to speak on the general proposition. I yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I want to assure my good friend from Utah there will be opposition to the motion, because this resolution—Senate Resolution 148—is submitted in direct compli-

ance with what the Senate ordered, and I hope there will never come a time when Senate committees cannot comply with instructions of the Senate without having improvements made upon them.

Senate Resolution 281 was submitted to the Senate and adopted. In compliance with the instructions of Senate Resolution 281, I tried my very best to conduct a hearing on this subject at the joint request of the committee's on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works. That hearing was held on August 15. Everyone who was interested and available was requested to testify. We wrote to others we thought might want to testify. We invited interested Senators to appear. We did our very best to do it in a fair and full manner.

What did Senate Resolution 281 provide? I now read from the Journal of the Senate, July 26, 1956, at pages 650 and 651. It reads as follows, skipping some words:

Whereas on January 17, 1956, the President of the United States transmitted to the Congress the Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, consisting of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture, designated by the President May 26, 1954, with a recommendation that "the Congress give prompt attention to its proposals"; and

There is a series of "whereas" clauses. Then follows this language:

SEC. 2. That land and water resources development should be planned,

And then there follow several statements of what we should do.

Finally we come to the direction which is contained in section 6 of Senate Resolution 281. I hope I may have the attention of the able Senator from Utah when I read this. I now read from section 6 of Senate Resolution 281, to which he has been referring:

SEC. 6. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed jointly to study, in consultation with other appropriate committees and executive agencies, and to design and to formalize a comprehensive and particularized set of standards and overall criteria for the evaluation of all proposed projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources, including attention to the several specific factors recognized in section 4 of this resolution, all to the end that the Congress shall fully exercise its constitutional powers, as reflected throughout the text of this resolution. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works are hereby directed to submit to the Senate, as nearly as practicable during the 1st session of the 85th Congress, a detailed report with respect to their implementation of this section.

If we could have done anything different from what the committee did, I should like to have somebody point it out. We were under instructions to report to the Senate. We did report to the Senate. The report was made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], because the final printing of it was completed a day or two after I had left for my home in New Mexico. This was prior to the adjournment of Congress by 3 or 4 days. I had gone through the report in advance. When it came time to report, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] submitted the report. We had done everything we had to do in compliance with the order of the Senate. I cannot understand the Senator from Utah complaining about it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The instruction did not say the committee had to report a resolution. It did not say "report a resolution."

Mr. ANDERSON. It stated, "with respect to their implementation." It did not say "report on the day of the week or on the weather."

Mr. WATKINS. It did not say "the Senate had to adopt a resolution."

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator tell me that the pending measure is not in full compliance with the language of the resolution?

Mr. WATKINS. The resolution is not. I pointed that out in my statement. I do not care to go over the argument now. Senate Resolution 148 has never been submitted to the States.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no requirement that the resolution be sent to the States. The language is that it be submitted to the Senate. If I had submitted it to the States before I submitted it to the Senate, the whole Senate would have risen and torn me to shreds.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the resolution and the doctrine in it should now be presented to all the States before we adopt it. That is in the interest of having a program in accordance with standards with which the States would be willing to live. It is highly important that they be given an opportunity to give their views. If we went ahead without giving the States an opportunity to give their views, we might be in a worse situation than what we now face.

I should like to point out also, in connection with this matter, that back in 1946 we had the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee make an economic analysis of the projects.

It was set up to report to the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee, composed of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army; Department of the Interior; Department of Agriculture; Department of Commerce, and the Federal Power Commission. The report is a report on the Proposed Practices for Economic Analysis of River Basin Projects. The foreword states:

In 1946 the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee appointed a Subcommittee on Benefits and Costs for the purpose of formulating mutually acceptable principles and procedures for determining benefits and costs for water resources projects.

After consideration of the benefit-cost practices currently in use and of an objective analysis of the economics of river basin projects uninfluenced by current practices and legal or administrative limitations, the subcommittee considered various approaches to the problem and presented its conclusions in this report, Proposed Practices for Economic Analysis of River Basin Projects. There are appended summaries of previous subcommittee reports on the qualitative aspects and measurement aspects of benefit-cost practices which were in use when the reports were issued.

At its meeting on May 25, 1950, the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee considered the report of the Subcommittee on Benefits and Costs and adopted it as a basis for consideration by the participating agencies as to application in their respective fields of activity in river basin development. The committee also authorized transmittal of the report to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission and arranged for reproduction of the report to facilitate consideration of the proposed practices by all concerned.

I desired to have that in the RECORD in connection with the statement about Budget Circular A–47, and when it originated. That, by the way, is one of the reports which I am sure the Senators are acquainted with.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. The Proposed Practices for Economic Analysis of River Basin Projects, to which the Senator from Utah has referred, in the judgment of the Senator from Oklahoma is a creature entirely of the executive branch of the Government; the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. The point is that the Constitution clearly states that is a matter for the Congress to determine. Any time we have to abdicate and let the Federal Power Commission take over, we ought to move out of these seats and let the Commission members sit in them.

Mr. KERR. And do the work. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I only wish to say that when we had this matter under discussion in the committee the two people who shouted the loudest about it were from the minority side. Now we have brought in the resolution to fulfill what they wanted, and four members of the minority say that it is no good.

Mr. KERR. Did the committee which the Senator from New Mexico had the honor of representing in part and the committee which the Senator from Oklahoma had the honor of representing in part, in the deliberations on this question, contemplate the possibility that the various States would be represented in the tribunal to whom the report was to be made, and to whom the resolution was to be reported?

Mr. ANDERSON. That would be true eventually, yes.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator from New Mexico contemplate the possibility that the State of Utah was represented here?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. Well represented.

Mr. KERR. And did the Senator from New Mexico——

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator will wait a minute, I should like to answer the first question more fully. The State of Utah is well represented, yes.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator from New Mexico presume that the voice of the Senator from Utah might be heard, representing such State?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, indeed. The Senator from Utah and I have worked

together on reclamation so long that I find it difficult to comment upon the fact that we have a difficulty over the present resolution.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator see in the press recently a statement attributed to a former President with reference to the man currently in the job, to the effect that he did mighty well in certain responsibilities and stations, when he was told what to do?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I saw that.

Mr. KERR. Does the thought occur to the Senator from New Mexico that the Senator from Utah, by quoting results of works brought about under that former President, which he now is sponsoring with such vigor, indicates that perhaps he wants the current occupant of the position, in the field of water resources, to let a preceding President tell him what to do?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not believe I would want to comment upon that one way or the other.

I do wish to point out that the Senator from Utah stated that the incremental method is really not a method at all. Perhaps that is so, but it is the method used in the Upper Colorado River storage project, in which the Senator is very much interested.

I also invite the Senator's attention to the fact that his colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] with whom I served in the House and for whom I have had the highest respect for many long years, commented upon the entire situation before the committee. I should like to read part of what the able Senator from South Dakota said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, from what page will the Senator read?

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to read from page 6 of the joint hearing before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Subcommittee on Flood Control—Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate on Senate Resolution 148. The Senator from South Dakota said when I was attempting to find if he desired to go back and cover everything:

> I am not sure if we are going to take the whole field of the existing statutes. I think that there is some clarification needed in existing statutes, as far as that is concerned, and the agencies might be forgiven for some confusion, because of a difference in language and a possible difference in interpretation, but I am sure if you were to ask an average Member of Congress he would say we should have a yardstick that was consistent with itself from the standpoint of the valuation of the project to the allocation of costs. Or if exceptions are to be made, that there should be a specific legislative exception for that.

I wish to pause there to say that I could not agree with the Senator from South Dakota more.

The Senator from South Dakota then went on to state:

> We found in some instances that there was a difference between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget. I think in the earlier years that we were considering here in this room, when you were presiding, Mr. Chairman, we found a difference of opinion between these two large agencies, and the Bureau of the Budget had recommended a solution, but there was nobody to be the referee with a final determination.

I have to say that was correct, because I had presided on the occasion when there was a difference of opinion between the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of Reclamation, and there was not any power on earth which seemed to be able to get them together. That was the function of the Congress.

The Senator from South Dakota then said:

> Now, there are different methods of approaching evaluation. It seems to me that the suggestion in this resolution for using all three methods, (1) separable cost-remaining benefits, (2) priority of use, and (3) incremental cost, is a good one, and all of those methods should be considered when projects are reported on.

I can only say this is a matter of individual judgment. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who served on the Committee on Public Works—and I think he served valuably—urged that this be done. There are reclamation projects in the Senator's State, and he knows that one cannot have two different sets of standards, with people saying, "This is not any good," or "This is fine," or "This one is not any good," using different standards to make the determinations.

So I say to Senators that I do not want anyone to believe that this is a partisan situation. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] went out of his way to say that the things in the resolution were good. The Senator had made a study of them, and knew them to be good.

On the next page of that same hearing is a matter which I should like to bring to the attention of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. There are listed some projects which it then appeared the Bureau of the Budget was holding up. Those projects are listed on page 7 of the hearings. Included with the various other projects is the Big Sandy Creek project in Colorado.

If I remember correctly—and my memory may be playing me a trick, but I do not believe so—while we were there and almost while we had the Corps of Engineers of the Army on the hot spot, a way was found to make it possible to approve the Big Sandy Creek project, and it did receive approval. I believe the Senator from Colorado will concede that the project has been approved. It was approved simply because we said, "It is not right to set up a standard which the Congress did not intend." So the project was approved.

We went to the other projects. Not all of them received approval, for reasons that could be explained, I am sure. There were four projects in Texas approved almost the next day. That is about the right average—one in the rest of the country and four in Texas. Nonetheless, that is what happened. The situation was rather serious.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] came in. He was disappointed. He said:

> I just read that the Swan Buffalo Creek project in North Dakota is among those that are tied up, as well as the Elm River project in North Dakota, and we are trying to find out why these cannot be blasted loose somehow. I tried to find out as to the Big Sandy Creek, and I admit complete, total, and utter defeat in trying to find why it is still held up.

I submit that a member of the United States Senate who is interested in a project has a right to have some sort of answer. Here we have the testimony of the Senator from North Dakota that he could not get an answer. He could not get his project jarred loose, and he could not obtain any answer as to why it could not be jarred loose. The Department absolutely refused to tell anyone why.

We do not believe that such arbitrary discretion is right. The law provides that the projects shall be submitted to the Congress through the Office of the President. It does not say that they are to be blocked by the Office of the President, or that they are sent there to be held up, with a refusal to answer any questions. The projects are sent to the Office of the President. The Office of the President may turn down a project, but if it does turn down a project, it ought to say why it turned it down, and what was believed to be unsound about it.

In the case of the Senator from North Dakota, he could not obtain any sort of answer as to why certain projects were held up. That is why, as we progressed with the hearings, we felt that this report had to be made.

I hope the Senate is ready to vote on the motion to recommit. The committee has done what the Senate told it to do. If the Senate wishes to recommit the resolution after we have done what we were told to do, I do not know what we shall do. I would almost say that the Senate was in contempt of the Members whom the Senate directed to do certain things, rather than the Members being in contempt of the Senate. If the Senate is to send something back to the committee after having told the committee to do something, I do not know what further we can do. We tried as hard as possible to establish some sort of evaluation, so that these questions might be submitted to the Congress, and Members of Congress might find out why their projects were being refused, if they were being refused.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the provisions of the resolution, in the first place, constitute, at the most, a request of the executive agencies for additional information on projects with reference to which the agencies are making reports to the committees?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is it not also a fact that the committee included these alternative methods of determining the cost-benefit ratio because of the arbitrary action of the executive branch in limit-

ing its reports to the committees to evaluation on the basis of cost-benefit ratio specifications which had been prescribed only by the executive?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And not in order to deprive the executive of any prerogative it may have. After it has submitted a report in accordance with the provisions of the resolution, it can still make its recommendation to approve or disapprove. However, in view of the fact that under the law its function is to investigate a project and report upon it to the committees of the Congress, the gist of this resolution is to request the executive departments to submit information on different bases of consideration than those to which the Budget Bureau has arbitrarily chosen to limit its reports.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not true that the departments, upon a request from either of the committees, would give it such information as it asked for, if they had such information?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is not true. I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would not mislead the committee. He said he had been trying to find out why he could not get his projects approved. The departments would give him no information whatsoever.

Mr. WATKINS. What about the committee? Did the committee ask for information and was it turned down?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not say that the committee was turned down. I do not wish to answer, because I do not remember whether we asked for answers that day or not. However, I know that the representatives of the departments did not volunteer any information.

Let me say to the Senator from Utah that when the Big Sandy project in Colorado was approved the departments did not give us a bit more explanation as to why they had reversed themselves than they had given previously. When they approved the four projects in Texas, they did not give any reasons. They said, in effect, "You can hush up a little. We have taken this much off your back."

I submit that we were entitled to more information than that.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that when a committee makes a request of one of the departments, it eventually obtains a report? That has been my experience. We get the report eventually. It may not come at the time we expect it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want it to come during my lifetime.

Mr. WATKINS. We finally obtained a report on the Colorado River storage project. It required 2 years, but it finally came in.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree that the Senator waited a long time, and I waited with him. I do not praise such action on the part of a Democratic officeholder any more than I would in the case of a Republican officeholder.

Mr. WATKINS. The administration of these programs has been absolutely nonpartisan or bipartisan. I believe that before we adopt a proposal of the kind set forth in the resolution, which apparently would establish tests which we would finally evolve, the subject should be given more study than we have given it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can tell the Senator how bipartisan or nonpartisan the executive departments have been. Two small projects went to the President of the United States, namely, the Weber project in Utah and the Vermejo project in New Mexico. They were on all fours. The President approved the Weber project in Idaho and vetoed the Vermejo project in New Mexico, from which am I to conclude that the action was nonpartisan?

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that the President wrote a veto message in connection with the Weber project, and finally approved it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. That was irritating, but it was all right. In the final analysis, we got the Vermejo project through.

We in the West have had to fight long and hard for these projects. That is why I say to the Senator from Utah that I believe this resolution is a step in the right direction.

Mr. WATKINS. I believe that the step in the right direction would be a much better step if we were to establish criteria which had been tried by some of the people who must live under this regulation, and whose projects will be affected by it. I believe that a resolution should not be adopted now.

Mr. ANDERSON. I mean to adopt the resolution now.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator is proposing to adopt it in too big a hurry, before it has been tested and tried.

Mr. ANDERSON. We held a long hearing. We allowed anyone to come before the committee and testify who wished to do so. We did not close the door on anyone.

Mr. WATKINS. There was no hearing on the amendment to Senate Resolution 148. There was a hearing on the other resolution, but not on this one. The proposed amendment to the resolution was written after the hearing.

Mr. ANDERSON. The text of Senate Resolution 148 was before us at the time of the hearing.

Mr. WATKINS. I thought the amendment was drafted afterward.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator will look at page 1 of the hearing, he will see that the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works jointly. Then I used this language:

At this point a copy of Senate Resolution 148 will be included in the record.

Mr. WATKINS. Were the witnesses asked about the provisions of that particular resolution?

Mr. ANDERSON. They certainly were.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. The resolution was amended after the hearing. That was the purpose of holding the hearing.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is all right; but the representatives of some of the States with whom I have been in contact did not understand that they were commenting on Senate Resolution 148. They were discussing the necessity of getting something done. If we had wanted to go into the merits of Senate Resolution 148 we could have done so.

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize the fact that as the son of a poor Swede, I may have some difficulty in understanding plain English. However, I thought I could read pretty well, and I thought I was to submit a report to the Senate of the United States. That is exactly what I have done in this situation. It is before the Senate, in full compliance with Senate Resolution 281.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On many occasions in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico and I have felt keenly the lack of dispatch with which agencies downtown have sent reports on legislation to committees of Congress. I can recall one Indian bill which we reported from committee with the aid of the Senator from New Mexico, in connection with which we ignored the fact that the Bureau of the Budget had not submitted a report, although the bill had been before the committee for many months.

Therefore, in general and in essence I believe that what the Senator from New Mexico is getting at, and what those of us who object to Senate Resolution 148 are trying to get at, is pretty much one and the same thing. Of course, I speak only for myself when I say that I believe the objections I have to the conclusions which Senate Resolution 148 seems to reach are that we have not pinned down the executive branch in the manner in which we would like to pin it down if we are to continue to operate under the assumption that we must have executive committee reports in order to legislate.

I do not believe Congress should necessarily be hidebound by that assumption, namely, that we must wait for reports by the Bureau of the Budget, by the Department of the Interior, and by other agencies of Government.

We now have before us in Senate Resolution 148 the recommendation that there be 6 different estimates on 6 different assumptions.

I do not feel that that is a sufficiently clear-cut expression by the committee. I believe that the bureaus concerned would perhaps confuse us more than help us under such a recommendation. We could reduce that confusion.

What I fear—and I am sure the Senator from New Mexico understands my feeling—is that we might have brought before us a great many cats and dogs which had been rejected by different committees of Congress. In other words, what I am trying to say to the Senator from New Mexico is that, in general, I

agree with what is sought to be accomplished by the resolution, but my personal feeling is that if we were to consider the subject a little longer and in greater detail, we could reduce it to specifics, and in that way get down to a resolution which would provide for the executive branch to give us what we want and when we want it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Arizona that we tried to do that. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we distributed copies of the resolution quite generally. We asked for a great many comments, and we received a great many comments.

The Senator from Utah wondered if we had the resolution under consideration in committee. Of course, we had it under consideration. We received testimony on it from a great many people.

What did we do? The original resolution stated:

> With respect to each potential project, in addition to a description of the project, the information should include, but not be limited to—
>
> (1) Estimated costs of construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement, together with a plain and succinct statement of the basis upon which all such estimates are made.

After we concluded a very careful consideration of the resolution, and after we had called upon the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget, we changed that language to read:

> (1) Complete description of project, including an estimate of the economic life of the major project facility.

That language was not drawn from thin air; it was drawn from long testimony before the committee, delivered by experts from the executive branch of the Government.

Are we to throw it all out?

The next provision, with reference to the estimated costs of construction, was left in the resolution, as it was stated originally.

The whole resolution was worked over in what I regarded as a very careful evaluation of the whole subject.

I say to the Senator from Arizona that if he understood the careful way in which we worked on the resolution, and knew of the number of days that we worked on it, he would not feel that the resolution should be returned to committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from New Mexico knows that the junior Senator from Arizona has the highest regard for the assiduous way in which the Senator from New Mexico applies himself. It is very difficult, indeed, for the Senator from Arizona to find himself in disagreement with his friend from New Mexico. I believe this is probably only the second time that I have had occasion to disagree with him.

What confuses me, and what confuses my people in Arizona who are concerned with water, is the fact that there are six different ways of reaching the estimates. I agree that it is necessary to pay attention to the Corps of Engineers of the Army and that it is necessary to pay attention to the Reclamation Bureau and its problems; however, I do not believe that it is wise to provide six different ways to get around this "pole." I think we could reduce the problem to a simple formula which would take care of the situation.

What I am afraid of—and this fear is expressed on behalf of the people in Arizona who are interested in water—is that we will find a way somehow of approving any project that might come up, regardless of whether it can stand on the old standards which have worked for many years.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Arizona believes it looks as though it ought to be possible to reduce the problem to a single, simple formula. I am reminded of a story, which perhaps is not a true story. It concerns a great monarch who asked his wise men to reduce all the wisdom of his kingdom to a single book. When that was done, they were asked to reduce it all to a single chapter; then to a single page; then to a single sentence; then to a single word. The single word was "perhaps."

I say to the Senator from Arizona that if we reduce this formula much further, all we will get is "perhaps."

We have tried to get the best from the Corps of Engineers, and the best from the Bureau of the Budget. They have said to us, "This is the best way we know how it can be done."

I say to the Senator from Arizona that if he knows of a better way, I would like to hear it. The Bureau of the Budget did not have any better way. Neither did the Bureau of Reclamation, nor the Corps of Engineers of the Army. Therefore we, with our limited wisdom, did not have it either.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not wish to draw out this discussion any further. I agree that the Senator's basis is a very valid one, and I am sure we are all trying to reach the same goal. That is one more reason why I think the subject ought to receive further consideration. However, I do not wish to labor the point. Therefore, with the Senator's consent I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point some brief remarks that I have prepared on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Is there any objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

The Congress is getting ready to raise the Federal debt limit to $280 billion. We are faced with the largest peacetime budget in the history of this Nation. Most of us are interested in economy in government. We have had the Hoover Commission, outside consulting firms, and Congressional committees spend many months trying to figure out ways and means of reducing cost of government.

One very real way of reducing costs of government is to eliminate unnecessary and unproductive work in the various agencies of government. This can be done without reducing services to people or diminishing our program of natural resource development. But instead of reducing work here we are with Senate Resolution 148 telling the two agencies responsible for most of our natural resource development that in the future, instead of preparing 1 estimate on the economic features of a project, they must prepare 6 different estimates on 6 different assumptions. That is a little worse than an order I saw the military put out during World War II. It said "in order to save paperwork in the future submit 13 copies instead of the presently prescribed 6." In addition to that, this resolution would require the reporting agency to throw in all of the intangible benefits it can think of and then get out the crystal ball and see if it can think of any future uses that might reasonably be anticipated to develop sometime during the useful life of the project, which may be one or two hundred years from now.

We would not be kidding anyone but ourselves with a resolution like that. All it means for us is to try to drag in for authorization some of the old "cats and dogs" that will not stand the light of inspection under sound economic analysis. Then we can tell our constituents that we got their project authorized. But what is the good of authorizing a project unless it has a good chance of being built.

According to my information we have enough projects already authorized to keep the Engineers busy for 17 years and the Bureau of Reclamation busy for 30 years at the present rate of annual appropriations. In addition to that we have good sound projects that have not as yet been authorized. If we are going to lend false encouragement to the people by opening up the floodgates and attempting to qualify for authorization any and every project that might be proposed, whether it is sound or not, all we will do is clutter up the field of resource development and delay projects that should be constructed.

As one of the strongest supporters in the Senate of land and water development, I readily admit that the Congress should spell out some land and water development policies instead of the piecemeal methods that have been used in the past. When that is done we will then be able to proceed in an orderly manner with some degree of uniformity in developing our land and water resources.

But these policies should be spelled out in law after full consideration by both Houses of the Congress and by the Executive. The many outside organizations vitally interested in this subject should have the opportunity of expressing their views. Senate Resolution 148 by its own admission under section 5 has not received proper or adequate consideration. It would have no force and effect of law. The other body has just as much right as we have to set up some standards they require, and their requirements might be contrary to those set up under this resolution. All we would do under this resolution is further confuse a subject that is already confused by inadequate and conflicting acts of the Congress.

There is no more important a matter the Congress is required to consider in our civilian economy than the proper beneficial development of our land and water resources. Why do we treat so important a subject in such an inadequate manner as is represented by the resolution under consideration. If our present method of treating with land and water development is inconsistent and inadequate—and I think it is—let's correct it, but let's correct it in the proper way. Let's prepare legislation that can be considered by the proper committees in both bodies after hearings at which the public and interested agencies of

Government have the opportunity to express their views. Then we can have a law—something to work with and work within.

Let us not go off with some half-thought-out resolution that has no effect of law and can only serve to further confuse the issue, and which places additional, unnecessary work on our Federal agencies.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Utah have referred to the six alternate ways in which the executive agencies would be requested to furnish estimates of the cost-benefit ratio of a proposed project. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is not a fact that they include, first, the methods which the agencies themselves, on their own initiative, have been using in submitting reports to Congress, and some additional ones which we in the two committees thought would be beneficial for Congress to have in order that it might consider the economic value of a project on the basis of information it had received as to a formula which the committees thought would be worthy of consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. It is very much in point with the comment the Senator from Arizona made. He does not want to see a bunch of cats and dogs dragged in. Neither do I. But the committee sat down and said, "These are things which the departments are now using. In addition, we think certain other things ought to be brought out." We, therefore, proceeded to list them. But the enumeration of that list does not mean that the lid will be taken off every sort of project; on the contrary, there must be a basis in law as a requirement for the submission of these items.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Oklahoma would agree with the Senator from Arizona that we would not want to open the door to authorizing any cat or dog, which is the phrase I believe he used, in the way of a project. But does the Senator from New Mexico agree with me that neither do we want to be limited to an arbitrary set of standards in fixing the value prescribed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and be unable to consider the evaluation of a project upon any other basis except the limited one arbitrarily fixed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I also want to say that that standard should not, properly, be used. The standard should be fixed by Congress, not by the Bureau of the Budget. We did not feel that Congress should abdicate this field and let the Bureau of the Budget set the standard. That would lead to certain general difficulties.

When General Itschner testified, we asked him about certain things. He said:

It is my opinion that this problem unavoidably requires a decision by higher authority as to whether Budget Circular A–47 applies or does not apply to work under both agencies.

Someone will have to resolve that question at some time. What was happening was that a project would be looked at by the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture representatives, applying certain definite tests for further activity of the soil, would decide that the project was not good.

Then someone would ask the Corps of Army Engineers to look at the project, and they, having a great deal of extra money for flood control, would say, "This project is all right."

People said that the answer depended on which door one entered. If he went to the Department of Agriculture, he would be turned down; if he went to the Corps of Army Engineers, his project would be accepted.

That is why we ought to have standards which apply equally. We are trying to accomplish that object. I was trying to establish a standard which was sensible and could be lived with.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Several times in his latter remarks the Senator from New Mexico said that Congress will exercise the function of laying down criteria which shall guide in the approval of these projects. It is upon that point that I am in difficulty. It seems to me that instead of Congress doing it, the Senate is trying to do it. From that standpoint, I should like to pose my question on the basis of Senate Resolution 281. The Senator from New Mexico read the resolution, but may I also read it? After the whereas clauses are set forth, it is stated:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the stabilization of the national economy and the effectuation of the wisest, most orderly, and most economic utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation for the widest public benefit require that the Congress continue to exercise all of its constitutional powers.

My question is, How is the direction of this resolution being carried out, that Congress shall exercise its constitutional powers, when only the Senate is doing it?

Mr. ANDERSON. All this resolution would do, so far as the Senate is concerned, is to say that when the material comes to us, we in the Senate will be able to require that the department submit the basis on which it approves or rejects a project. We think that is necessary. If the other House does not believe so, it has the right to shoot craps while deciding whether to pass the bill or not. But when the bill comes to the Senate, the Senate will try to ascertain whether the information is available from the department.

I hoped this might be done by the whole Congress. I hoped the whole Congress would establish the program. But if the Senator from Ohio had labored for as many years in this field as I have, I think he would come to the opinion that that is a forlorn hope. There is not great uniformity between the two Houses in the establishment of a policy of this kind. Therefore, all the Senate can do by this resolution is to try to say that it is the sense of the Senate that certain information should be supplied to the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the resolution does not say that. The resolution says that Congress shall fix the criteria and that it shall exercise its constitutional powers.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator has read from Senate Resolution 281, of the 84th Congress, which has already been passed. I am referring to Senate Resolution 148, of the 85th Congress, which is now before the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that.

Mr. ANDERSON. We would have been happy to have Congress set the policy. We would have been glad to have the House join with us in the passage of some sort of resolution. We ended with this one.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The point I am trying to make is that the committee has not conformed with the instructions given to it by Senate Resolution 281 of the 84th Congress. On that score, I should like to ask this further question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want the Senator from Ohio to pause there. I believe we have fulfilled the requirements set forth. The resolution, in the whereas clause, says that it is desirable for Congress to know certain things, but it directs the committee to report to the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I read section 4?

That reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congress.

The resolution does not say, "criteria prescribed by the Senate"; it says "criteria prescribed by the Congress."

Mr. ANDERSON. What the Senator has read is a statement to the effect that reports coming from the departments ought to contain certain materials prescribed by Congress. It does not say it is the duty of this committee to establish what those criteria shall be.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But we are doing it by senatorial control, not by Congressional control.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, we are not. We are not saying that Budget Directive A–47 shall be set aside. We are merely saying that when the information is furnished, it must be furnished in certain particulars. As a matter of fact, a law was passed in 1956 requiring the President to submit rules to Congress. Those have not yet been submitted. When they are submitted, Congress will consider them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am in the dilemma of seeing how the situation is being improved; but also how, instead of having confusion among three departments of the Government, there will be confusion by the Senate having one set of criteria, and the House having another.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not the purpose of the resolution to help get information to

the Senate committees, in order to assist them efficiently to deliberate upon these matters?

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly. We are not setting forth the criteria in this resolution at all. We are trying to say that in order to have the Department of the Interior carry out the resolution from which the Senator has been reading, the Department will submit certain things to us. When those things are submitted, we can then proceed to act upon them. One of the reasons why we did not act earlier is that there is a provision of another act, which I shall read. I think I have found it. It is in Public Law 566 and reads:

*Provided, further,* That prior to any Federal participation in the works improvement under this act—

That is a different act, the act which brought up this controversy—

the President shall issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this act.

When the Senate met this year it was faced with the fact that the President had never issued such rules and regulations. He has not done so to this day. So far as we know, he may not issue them until 1960, 1965, or 1970. We then simply said, "We have never tried to find out what ought to be in the rules and regulations," and we tried to do something about it. On a bipartisan approach, we said there were certain things which ought to be supplied to the Senate which will permit us someday to establish rules and regulations and bring about uniformity.

This resolution does not prescribe a single line of criteria; it simply sets forth the information that the Senate must have if it is to discharge its duties. That is all it does.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not wish to pursue this subject further. But I still do not believe there has been an answer to the question of how the committees feel that they have complied with the direction that they submit a report under which it will be certain that the Congress is doing the regulating, rather than to have the regulating done by the three executive agencies of the Government or by the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. The answer is that we never were directed to do that. If we had been directed to do it, we would have been wrong in taking this course. We were directed to hold certain things in mind, and while holding them in mind we were directed to submit certain things to the Senate. And we did.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But that is not the language of the resolution.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have been waiting for a long time to speak. But, first, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico. If he will indulge me, the question will be somewhat involved.

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly. The Senator from Colorado is a very able member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and is of great help to me when I have problems. I am glad to have him take as much time as he wishes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have learned not to argue too much with my friend, the Senator from New Mexico—whom I call, in a friendly way, "my country lawyer cousin"—because he greatly surpasses most lawyers in ability. I should like to call his attention to the all-persuasive—to me—language contained in Senate Resolution 281, to which we have been addressing ourselves. The Senator from Ohio reached the edge of it, although he did not quite get to it. Section 6 provides, I believe, something entirely different from what the Senator from New Mexico conceives it to provide. Section 6 reads as follows:

SEC. 6. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed jointly to study, in consultation with other appropriate committees and executive agencies, and to design and to formalize a comprehensive and particularized set of standards and overall criteria for the evaluation of all proposed projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources, including attention to the several specific factors recognized in section 4 of this resolution—

Now we come to the crux—

all to the end that the Congress shall fully exercise its constitutional powers, as reflected throughout the text of this resolution. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works are hereby directed—

And this is what the Senator from New Mexico was speaking of, and what he was acting on when he called the committee together, to hold hearings—

to submit to the Senate, as early as practicable during the 1st session of the 85th Congress, a detailed report with respect to their implementation of this section.

The implementation of this section is as follows:

All to the end that Congress shall fully exercise its constitutional powers, as reflected throughout the text of this resolution.

I am sure the Senator from New Mexico and his committee acted in the best of faith. The argument being made this afternoon is a peculiar one. I am sure there is very little difference between any of us as to what we are trying to accomplish. We are trying to pick up the reins, which all too long have lain over the dashboard. I am sure the Senator from New Mexico will agree with me as to that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. But it seems to me that the real force of the resolution lies in section 6, which says what the committee shall do; and it says that the committee shall implement "all to the end that Congress shall fully exercise its constitutional powers."

I myself have some slight reservations about some other things contained in the resolution. But this is really the point, in my opinion: If we proceed in this way, even though it be a matter of second choice or third choice, we can try to obtain a joint resolution or a concurrent resolution, whichever is indicated. Then, if that does not work, we can hold the question in abeyance, or can proceed unilaterally, if we must. I do not like to differ with my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico; but I believe that Senate Resolution 281 is very direct and specific in stating that these committees were to attempt to enable the Congress as a whole—not merely one branch of the Congress—to do this job.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the Senator from Colorado that he and I are not so far apart in our views of what the resolution provides. I know we were asked to prepare a complete recommendation to the Congress—particularized sets of standards and overall criteria for the evaluation of all proposed projects. That is not something which can be done in 30 days.

Mr. ALLOTT. No; it is not.

Mr. ANDERSON. We could not even get the President to submit to us what he thought he was supposed to do. I am not trying to be critical of the executive branch; it has problems, too. Until we know what the President's criteria are, under the resolution adopted in 1956, we have no basis upon which to decide what our own suggestions might be. We might decide to follow the President's criteria. We thought that until the President had submitted them, it would not be very courteous for us to tell him what he should put in them.

The first part of the resolution does state—I believe I can read it correctly, to my satisfaction, although I do not say my interpretation is the correct one:

That the Committee on Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works * * * are hereby directed to submit to the Senate, as early as practicable during the 1st session of the 85th Congress, a detailed report with respect to their implementation of this section.

All the implementation we felt we could give this section was to suggest that we be supplied with information as to the various yardsticks now being used, so the Congress could eventually set up yardsticks of its own.

If the Senator from Colorado feels that we should do at one and the same time all the things set forth in Senate Resolution 281 and be ready to do it in the first session, I would be happy to have him and his cohorts do it in the second session, because, frankly, my colleagues and I could not do it.

Mr. ALLOTT. We prefer to have the Senator from New Mexico do it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no; a burnt child fears the fire, and I would not attempt to do it again.

Mr. ALLOTT. But I sincerely call my colleague's attention to the fact—perhaps we lawyers are prone to strain at small points—that the resolution says, "a detailed report with respect to their implementation of this section."

That one section refers only to the development of land and water resources, and so forth, all to the end that the Congress may do it.

That is why I say that the direction given to the committees was to bring forth something on which Congress—not merely one branch of Congress—could act.

I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from New Mexico in yielding to me and in allowing me to

raise this point during the course of his own argument.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that no one was more disappointed than I that all these agencies could not get together. Time after time we suggested to the agencies that they try to get together and try to bring up a set of criteria which all of them were willing to use. But when they left, they were as much in disagreement as they were the first moment after they entered. Therefore, we thought that if we could have an opportunity to study this subject and to see what was there, we might make a move, finally, in the direction of seeing these criteria properly standardized.

In closing, all I can say to the Senator from Colorado is that it is not easy to get these groups together or to get agreement from them. We felt that there was a possibility that, with a start such as this, we might at least be able to have the land surveyed, and then see what the next step in the problem was.

If it were easy to do this, all the forces of the President of the United States would have been sufficient, so that he could have submitted the set of rules called for in the 1956 resolution. But the staff of the President's agencies could not do it; and if they could not do it, these Senate committees could not do it, either.

Mr. ALLOTT. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will not take anything that I have said as a criticism of either himself or of the committees.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course I do not.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the problems involved.

I should like to ask this question: What is wrong with submitting a joint resolution or a concurrent resolution—I am not quite sure which should be used, under the rules of the Senate—to the Senate and to the House, with the idea that if the House does adopt it and if the Senate also adopts it, then, instead of having three administrative agencies with separate rules, the Senate also having separate rules, and the House also having separate rules, we might at least bring the reins back onto the dashboard, where the reins would be in the hands of the Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is nothing wrong with submitting such a resolution, but that would change the proposal completely. That might be a good thing.

Mr. ALLOTT. Not in my opinion.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only say that generally there is a difference of opinion on reclamation matters, between the Senate and the House of Representatives; and probably there will continue to be. There was such a difference of opinion in connection with the Small Projects Act, and there have been similar differences of opinion with regard to many other acts.

We felt that the resolution called for a report to the Senate, and therefore we submitted whatever recommendation we could to the Senate.

We held hearings. As has been pointed out, this situation seemed to call for an entirely new code, under which all these projects might be considered. I found that there was no one willing to undertake that task.

When the able former Senator from Colorado, Mr. Millikin, was a Member of this body, we tried at one time to make some changes in the public land laws of the Nation. I do not have to tell the present senior Senator from Colorado that the then able Senator from Colorado was probably one of the greatest lawyers in the United States, and certainly one of the greatest lawyers in the United States Senate. We went as far as we could go. We discovered a conflict of interests between oil leases and uranium leases. We tried to provide for in rem procedures. The Senator said he did not like an in rem procedure. I did not know what it was, and therefore I liked it as well as any other procedure. The Senator came to it very reluctantly. He finally came to it because he could not find any other way of clearing up the title controversy. I think there would be much the same kind of difficulty if we tried to attack that problem now. Therefore, we require the agencies to tell us why they reject projects or why they approve projects. If we know why they reject or approve projects, perhaps we can lay down yardsticks for future projects that they may want to approve or disapprove.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield the floor?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. COTTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have been waiting all the afternoon for the opportunity to speak briefly on this pending matter from the standpoint of one who signed the minority views from the Committee on Public Works. Those minority views were signed by four Senators. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] could not be present this afternoon, and it seemed desirable to discuss some of the views held by the signers of our minority report.

I regret that the hour is so late, and I shall be as brief as possible, because it is my hope that the Senate will vote on this matter before it adjourns tonight.

Mr. President, we have listened to a great deal of discussion on whether the resolution should be directed to the Senate only or to both Houses of Congress. We have listened to a great deal of discussion as to whether the resolution carries out the instructions and the spirit of Senate Resolution 281, calling for the two committees to make a study and report. We have listened to a good deal of discussion about the problem of committees of Congress getting rapid cooperation from the agencies located in downtown Washington and from the Bureau of the Budget in getting reports on proposed projects.

Mr. President, for the most part, I signed the minority views and oppose the resolution for a more fundamental reason than those that have been discussed on the floor this afternoon. I am opposed to the resolution because, if I understand the English language correctly, looking at it any way one wants to look at it, and reading it from any page one wants to read it from, the resolution, if adopted, will place the seal of official approval by the Senate on, and will open the gates for, more uneconomic public projects and for an even larger and more spacious pork barrel than we have had in past years.

Please understand I am not suggesting for one fleeting moment that is the intent of the Senator from New Mexico or the Senator from Oklahoma or any of the Senators who have labored long and carefully and faithfully on this report.

I hasten to add, in fairness, that I think it should be said almost all of the provisions incorporated in the resolution can be found somewhere in the procedures and in the methods of some of the departments in downtown Washington. We find them in some of the reclamation projects of the past. We find them in the rather complicated system and criteria laid down from time to time by the Bureau of the Budget. Most of them will be so found. However, in the pending resolution we are attempting to codify and in a sense make official for the Senate of the United States a system which is bound to dilute and to weaken the standards by which we judge the proposed projects.

Let me go into that aspect of the problem for just a moment. The resolution permits, by inference, projects to be amortized for periods of both 50 or 100 years. It is possible that in the past there have been occasional, isolated instances of projects—I have been informed that is so—amortized on the basis of 100 years. But by and large, it is my understanding—and that understanding has been increased by reading the public reports and documents on the methods, criteria, and standards laid down by the Bureau of the Budget and other agencies and departments—that that is a longer period of amortization than has previously prevailed. That in itself, I submit, is a most dangerous provision. To be sure, it will be said it is merely a request for information on the basis of an amortization of 100 years; that the resolution is not laying that provision down as a law. But the fact remains it makes it official, it sets the standard, it sets the principle.

I suggest to you, Mr. President, that the time has not come for the Senate to require that procedure and to put its approval on that sort of standard, because it means that by extending the amortization for the period of an entire century, one would be able to reduce the year-by-year annual cost sufficiently so the benefits could well appear to exceed the cost, and make possible the kind of projects that, under the general rules practiced today, would never be allowed to qualify as public works projects.

It would mean, further, we would simply pass on to the shoulders of the taxpayers of succeeding generations the burden of uneconomic projects. That is precisely and exactly, in my opinion, what we would do if we were to cast our voices for the resolution in its present form.

Furthermore, along the same line, we should bear in mind that in the fast developing technological field, such as atomic generated electricity, it is hard enough to plan for half a century without being forced to plan ahead, and charge off costs, for a full 100 years.

While I am speaking of planning ahead, I cannot refrain from directing the attention of the Senate and the RECORD to subparagraph 5 of the resolution, with the committee amendments, formerly section 4. I would call it the crystal-ball section. It provides:

> Physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

If the useful life of a project work may be extended for 100 years, I submit that one would have to be the seventh son of the seventh son to prophesy:

> Physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

I understand that the language is 50 years or 100 years or the life of a project, whichever is less; but I understand it is contemplated that the cost of the project may be extended for 100 years.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator have any idea whether that is now being done?

Mr. COTTON. I am told that the 100-year period——

Mr. ANDERSON. No, I am not referring to the 100-year period. The Senator read a section of the resolution. Would the Senator want to assume whether that is now being done by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. COTTON. Does the Senator refer to attempts to project needs of the future?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. I think it is being done, but not for 100 years.

Mr. ANDERSON. No one has said anything about 100 years in the provision we are discussing, has he?

Mr. COTTON. Not in that section, but it is suggested in the resolution that we seek information on the basis of a 100-year amortization, which assumes we intend to act upon it. I read from subsection (3) on page 3 of the resolution:

> Benefit-cost ratios calculated by using total tangible benefits and total tangible costs for 100 years, and for 50 years, except where the economic life of the major project facility is less.

Again, on page 5, I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that it is stated:

> * * * such schedules to show also the deferred repayment of the portion of the costs allocated to uses that may be anticipated to develop in the future.

I submit that is another crystal ball provision.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator recognizes that the provision could not apply and does not apply to reclamation projects, does he not?

Mr. COTTON. I assume it would apply to power projects and flood control projects. I fail to see that it is restricted to such projects, however. As a practical matter, I assume it would be that type of project to which it would be applied.

Mr. ANDERSON. It so happens that a limit has been established for reclamation projects.

Mr. COTTON. Furthermore, I cannot help but suggest that there can be but one real effect of asking for information on three alternative methods of cost ascertainment, whatever may be the purpose. There are, of course, nine methods which have been devised and practiced from time to time. As I understand, the general procedure in the past few years has been confined largely to one of those methods.

Unles we wanted to provide in the resolution that one method should be used and that only such skeleton information as was necessary to show why the others were not used, specifically, would be submitted, it seems to me that the resolution, if followed, would delay and complicate the reports of the agencies downtown, which is exactly and precisely the thing I understand and have observed, and believe my distinguished colleagues are justified in trying to overcome.

I have observed, in my service on the Committee on Public Works, that many times reports have been slow coming in. I have a great deal of sympathy for some of the Members who represent sections of the country to which these projects are vital, since naturally they are impatient about the delay in submitting reports.

I venture to invite the attention of the Senate, while we are on this subject, to the situation we face at this critical time in our country's history. Reference has been made in the debate to the fact that an omnibus public-works bill passed the Senate last year and is now in the other body, but has not become law. Reference has also been made to the public-works bill which passed the year before last and was vetoed by the President.

It should be remembered that there is now a backlog of 470 authorized projects for rivers and harbors and flood control which have never been started. These 470 projects do not include any of the undertakings of the Bureau of Reclamation. They represent only the backlog of work of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to complete this statement, and then I shall gladly yield. These 470 projects will cost an estimated $8.3 billion to construct. At the current rate of spending for construction—about $500 million a year—it will take about 17 years to complete them. Work already authorized for the Bureau of Reclamation will take about 30 years to complete at the present spending rate.

The backlog of 470 projects does not include:

(a) Over 100 additional projects which would be authorized by passage of S. 497, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which passed the Senate last year and is now pending before the House. This bill, as approved by the Senate, contains 109 new projects and gives the Army engineers authority to plan 47 more.

(b) Projects now underway, which, according to material in the 1959 budget document, include work on 59 navigation projects, 101 for flood control and 20 multiple-purpose projects, for a total of 180.

The grand total is nearly 600 authorized projects not yet started, and nearly 800 still to be finished, including those under construction.

One reason for the Presidential veto of the rivers and harbors bill the year before last was the fact that 32 of the projects had not been authorized by the Bureau of the Budget.

I agree, Mr. President, that Congress—not the Bureau of the Budget, or the Army Corps of Engineers, or the Department of the Interior, or the Department of Agriculture, or any other agency—should, in the last analysis, determine the method of authorizing these public works projects. But I contend that such authorization should be done by a statute, passed by both Houses of Congress and signed into law, which would set up a general standard—not a standard for one project, for two projects, or simply for flood-control projects or multipurpose projects—setting forth reasonable minimum criteria to be satisfied before projects could be authorized.

If we pass the resolution, even though it represents the earnest and sincere work of our colleagues, and even though it has been prepared in an attempt to carry out the provisions of Senate Resolution 281, we shall simply delay achievement of the very object which should be our ultimate desire.

I fear that passage of the resolution will have two effects, Mr. President, both of which I deplore. First, it would open the way so that almost any project which is desired anywhere in the United States of America could be justified in some way under the criteria laid down. I am not blaming the committee for that result, because we find many things in the public reports on the various systems laid down by the Bureau of the Budget. However, that does not make it necessary for Congress to make the same error. Secondly, I think I am not entirely hypocritical in saying, although I do not happen to come from a State deeply interested in or having a large number of these projects, that I fear that by the passage of such a resolution we would contribute to the backlog of infeasible, uneconomic projects for which appropriations will not be made, so that our action will serve to clog and to hold up the cause in which every one of us believes, which is the cause of trying to preserve and conserve the water and land resources of this country, which is the very aim of the resolution.

I desire to mention one thing more, Mr. President. I should like to refer to

page 3 of the resolution, in section 4, where it reads:

Description and, to the extent possible, computation or other evalution of indirect and intangible net benefits including but not limited to—

I invite attention to that language, "including but not limited to." Senators can see it goes all over the spectrum.

The language then continues:

(a) protection of life and property; (b) improvements of transportation; (c) conservation of water, soil, and forest resources; (d) wildlife conservation; (e) recreation; (f) abatement of pollution, including salinity; (g) control of sedimentation; (h) maintenance and enhancement of the agricultural, commercial, and industrial economy of the area affected.

I cannot help but believe—and may I say parenthetically that I have nearly completed my statement, and what I am about to say is the essence of my opposition to this measure—that when we lay down the type of criteria which extend over all these subjects, the door is being officially opened by a formal action of the Senate of the United States for a system of authorizing public works projects without any real restraint or any really fundamental basic standard to be complied with, and that is a most undesirable thing to do.

Mr. President, I repeat that I am not blaming the committee for such a result, because I think every one of these items is already included. I wish to make that quite plain, in fairness to all concerned. All of these things are already included in the criteria of the Bureau of the Budget. But, after all, we have heard this afternoon that Congress should not surrender to the Bureau of the Budget or to any other agency downtown its basic and fundamental right to lay down the principles. Why should we proceed to enact formal approval of the mistakes of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. At the time I previously rose, the Senator had spoken about the fact that we were requiring additional information from the departments. Such information might be confusing and burdensome, with relation to all the different things we were asking for, I believe the Senator said.

Mr. COTTON. I said it might delay the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. It might delay it, yes.

The Bureau of the Budget, in reporting on the Senate Resolution 148, not Senate Resolution 281, on July 8, 1957, said:

Much of the information which would be solicited by the resolution is, of course, now available in project reports submitted to the Congress. However, it appears to us that the additional information called for by the resolution could provide a useful supplement to that presented under present procedures.

Would that persuade the Senator that perhaps the Bureau of the Budget feels there is something worth while in the resolution?

Mr. COTTON. After the things I have heard said this afternoon about the Bureau of the Budget and the way the Bureau of the Budget operates, with the confusion and the delay involved in the general approach to the subject by the Bureau of the Budget, I do not want to take their letter or their position as any argument. I want to see the Congress of the United States lay down its own criteria.

I say, quite frankly, that I do not expect that many of my western colleagues will care to join me in this approach, but I want to see the Congress of the United States narrow and make more definite and more restrictive the standards for public works, rather than attempt to include everything the Bureau of the Budget has included. Frankly, it is not much of an argument to me, to say that the Bureau of the Budget is so sweet and kind and full of loving light that when it gets a clearing from the committee it says, "Yes, we will go along."

Mr. ANDERSON. In that connection I remind the Senator what is said in the Bible:

Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.

That is exactly what we are trying to do; we are trying to get down to the point where the regulation could be effective.

The Bureau of the Budget is not being criticized for not having a firm position. It does have one. The situation is that the Bureau of the Budget has one, the Department of Agriculture has a second, and the Corps of Engineers of the Army has a third. As a result, people do not know what to do about their projects. They do not know to whom the projects should be submitted. We ought to establish one standard for all.

In its report the Department of the Army states:

The items of information which the agencies of the executive branch would be expected to provide pursuant to Senate Resolution 148 are generally consonant with the principles and procedures for formulating and evaluating water resources projects which have been evolved over the past several years through the cooperative efforts of the interested Federal agencies and which are currently in use by the Corps of Engineers in planning such projects.

Those are the principles which the Committee on Public Works uses every day. I do not believe the Senator from New Hampshire has tried to stop the committee from using them.

Finally, the Secretary of the Interior states in his report:

A large part of the information called for by Senate Resolution 148 is now regularly or often included in our project planning reports. The remainder can, we believe, generally be supplied. Undoubtedly, there will be occasion from time to time to supplement even this expanded list of items or to delete from it those which prove not to be worth while.

Mr. President, they recognized that the purpose of the resolution was to find out what information was being supplied and how it might be beneficial.

Mr. COTTON. I do not wish to take too much additional time, but, in reply to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I wish to say that I cannot, of course, comment on what may be the attitude of his distinguished committee, and of course I cannot speak for the committee of which I am a member.

However, I will say that I listened to the discussions within the Committee on Public Works, of which my friend the Senator from Oklahoma is such a distinguished and useful member. On both sides of the committee table there was considerable unrest and considerable dissatisfaction with the delays on the part not only of the Bureau of the Budget but of other agencies, in furnishing the committee with necessary information and necessary reports advising them on public works; and the committee insisted on including in the rivers and harbors bill of the year before last 32 projects which had never been approved. They felt justified in doing so because they had waited long enough for approval.

I am not criticizing the Bureau of the Budget in any way. Nor am I criticizing the intent or purpose of the resolution, or the motives of its framers. I am merely taking the position that I challenge anyone to read the resolution and, after doing so, turn away with the feeling that the resolution would really establish a standard which would apply only to projects which are practical and economically feasible in this country. On the contrary, the resolution includes all the various factors which have grown up through the years in the agencies downtown, and packages them together—recreation and wildlife and the future industrial development of any section of the country—and includes anything that is at all beneficial to anyone anywhere.

Almost anyone can come under the criteria set up in the resolution.

That is why I am constrained to hope that the resolution will be recommitted to the committees. I hope that we may eventually have a recommendation from the committees which will lead, not to handcuffs, nor to a narrow, hidebound standard, but to a reasonably restricted common standard, which will apply not merely to one project, to be used in reaching a decision with respect to each project suggested, but will apply to all projects, and will result in the establishment of a rule or yardstick which can be applied generally, and one which is economically wise.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the question was raised as to how much study and investigation we had given to this subject. I call to the attention of the Senate the memorandum issued by the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, under date of January 4, 1957, to the members of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works, in which they list the comments which had been received on Senate Resolution 281, from which Senate Resolution 148 was developed.

The memorandum shows that comments have been received from officials of the States of California, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Washington, and Wyoming. Comments also were received from the Upper Colorado River

Commission, composed of representatives of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Comments were also received from the following organizations: Arkansas Basin Development Association; Association of Western State Engineers; Connecticut River Valley Flood Control Association; H. C. Gee; Kaskaskia Valley Association; Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; McCall, Parkhurst, & Crowe; National Reclamation Association; Northwest Public Power Association; Water Resources Associated; Engineers Joint Council.

Mr. KERR. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his very frank, candid, and forthright statement on the resolution, and for his sentiments. I was impressed by the fact that the Senator from Utah, who made the motion to recommit, did so on the basis that the resolution should be recommitted until it could be made a joint resolution.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire very frankly said that it should be recommitted until the provisions were made more restrictive and less comprehensive, but I did not gather from his remarks that he felt that if that objective were achieved, it would be necessary to make it a joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

## RECESS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 28, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

**Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27, 1958:**

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Henry J. Cook, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky for a term of 4 years, vice Edwin R. Denney, resigned.

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Dewey G. Rushford
Steven L. Hollis, Jr

*To be lieutenants*

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.
Dale E. Westbrook

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Albert Larsen, Jr., effective February 9, 1958 | Paul L. Schock |
| | Richard P. Shoolbred |
| | Robert D. Frost |
| Herman H. Druebert | Charles E. Fuller |
| Charles I. Harding | Philip J. Taetz |
| James C. Sainsbury | Earl R. Scyoc |
| Victor V. Tilley, Jr. | Ogden Beeman |
| William M. Lee | Ronald D. Bernard |
| Arthur M. Cook | K. William Jeffers |
| Lawrence C. Haverkamp | Bernard L. Gabrielsen |
| | Oliver J. Weber |
| Thomas E. Simkin | Merlyn D. Christensen |

*To be ensigns*

Jerome P. Guy
Leroy L. Pate
George F. Wirth

## CONFIRMATIONS

**Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1958:**

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the country indicated:

Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, of New Hampshire, to El Salvador.

Robert McClintock, of California, to the Republic of Lebanon.

Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Connecticut, to the Federation of Malaya.

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Gerard C. Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Manager of the Development Loan Fund in the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Director of the United States Information Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Nelson P. Rose, of Ohio, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, to fill an existing vacancy.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William P. Rogers, of Maryland, to be the Attorney General.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Tom B. Coughran, of California, to be the United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years.

DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

John S. Patterson, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of Maryland, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I John 2:17: *He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.*

Almighty God, may our life and labors always be in accord with Thy holy will and well pleasing unto Thee.

Grant that each day we may have a vivid and vital sense of Thy divine counsel and companionship, inspiring our minds with understanding and our hearts with peace.

Thou art able to take and use our finite wisdom and frail human strength in fulfilling Thy blessed purposes for all mankind.

We are commending unto Thee the needs and longings of Thy children everywhere for Thy concern for them is far greater than our own.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 23, 1958, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 244

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Lawrence H. Smith, late a Representative from the State of Wisconsin.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Monday next.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of title 10, section 1056, of the United States Code, the Vice President had appointed the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] as members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

The message further announced that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] were appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] were appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy on the part of the Senate.

## SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN H. DENT, be permitted to take the oath of office today. The certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*The Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture has today considered the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication 1404 and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are: High Pine Creek, Ala.; Big Sandy Creek, Colo.; Abbotts Creek and Deep Creek, N. C.; Knob Creek and York Creek, Tex.

Copies of the resolutions are attached.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman.*

## APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., January 21, 1958.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, of the Committee on Ways and Means, has been designated as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to fill the vacancy created by the death of the late Chairman Cooper.

Sincerely yours,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
*Chairman.*

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the following member of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. GREGORY, of Kentucky.

## RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

JANUARY 22, 1958.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

I greatly enjoyed serving on this committee and am resigning only because the responsibilities of the position I now have do not permit me to continue to devote the time to the Joint Economic Committee that should be, and which I would like to devote to its work.

With highest personal regards, I am,
Respectfully yours,
WILBUR D. MILLS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 15, section 1024, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Economic Committee the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

## REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 73)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the 43d annual report of the Committee covering the fiscal year 1957.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 27, 1958.*

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO VARIOUS COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 452

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on the District of Columbia: ERWIN MITCHELL, Georgia.

Committee on Education and Labor: JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: VINCENT J. DELLAY, New Jersey.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: VINCENT J. DELLAY, New Jersey.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: ERWIN MITCHELL, Georgia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 318)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Education best fulfills its high purpose when responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves—when it is rooted in the home, nurtured in the community, and sustained by a rich variety of public, private, and individual resources. The bond linking home and school and community—the responsiveness of each to the needs of the others—is a precious asset of American education.

This bond must be strengthened, not weakened, as American education faces new responsibilities in the cause of freedom. For the increased support our educational system now requires, we must look primarily to citizens and parents acting in their own communities, school boards, and city councils, teachers, principals, school superintendents, State boards of education and State legislatures, trustees, and faculties of private institutions.

Because of the national security interest in the quality and scope of our educational system in the years immediately ahead, however, the Federal Government must also undertake to play an emergency role. The administration is therefore recommending certain emergency Federal actions to encourage and assist greater effort in specific areas of national concern. These recommendations place principal emphasis on our national security requirements.

Our immediate national security aims—to continue to strengthen our Armed Forces and improve the weapons at their command—can be furthered only by the efforts of individuals whose training is already far advanced. But if we are to maintain our position of leadership, we must see to it that today's young people are prepared to contribute the maximum to our future progress. Because of the growing importance of science and technology, we must necessarily give special—but by no means exclusive—attention to education in science and engineering.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the National Science Foundation have recommended to me a comprehensive and interrelated program to deal with this problem. Such program contemplates a major expansion of the education activities now carried on by the National Science Foundation, and the establishment of new programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have approved their recommendations, and commend them to the Congress as the administration program in the field of education. This is a temporary program and should not be considered as a permanent Federal responsibility.

PROGRAMS OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The programs of the National Science Foundation designed to foster science education were developed in cooperation with the scientific community under the guidance of the distinguished members of the National Science Board. They have come to be recognized by the educational and scientific communities as among the most significant contributions currently being made to the improvement of science education in the United States.

The administration has recommended a fivefold increase in appropriations for the scientific education activities of the

National Science Foundation. These increased appropriations will enable the Foundation, through its various programs, to assist in laying a firmer base for the education of our future scientists. More immediately, these programs will help supply additional highly competent scientists and engineers vitally needed by the country at this time.

1. Improvement of the subject-matter knowledge of science and mathematics teachers: First, the administration is recommending an increase in funds to support institutes sponsored by the Foundation for the supplementary training of science and mathematics teachers and a somewhat larger increase to support teacher fellowships. This will provide additional study opportunities to enable more science and mathematics teachers in our schools and colleges to improve their fundamental knowledge and, through improved teaching techniques, stimulate the interest and imagination of more students in these important subjects.

2. Improvement of course content: Second, the administration is recommending an increase in funds to enable the Foundation to stimulate the improvement of the content of science courses at all levels of our educational system. The efforts of even the most dedicated and competent teachers will not be effective if the curricula and materials with which they work are out-of-date or poorly conceived.

3. Encouragement of science as a career: Third, the administration is proposing an expansion of the Foundation's programs for encouraging able students to consider science as a career. Good teaching and properly designed courses are important factors in this regard, but there are other ways in which interest in these fields may be awakened and nurtured. The Foundation has already developed a series of programs directly focused on the problem of interesting individual students in science careers, and these programs should be expanded.

4. Graduate fellowships: Fourth, the administration is recommending an increase in the Foundation's graduate fellowship program. The enlarged program will make it possible for additional competent students to obtain better training for productive and creative scientific effort.

5. Expansion of other programs: The administration is recommending that funds be provided to enable the Foundation to initiate several new programs which will provide fellowship support for secondary school science teachers (during the summer months), for graduate students who serve during the school year as teaching assistants, and for individuals who wish to obtain additional education so that they may become high school science and mathematics teachers.

PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The education programs of the National Science Foundation deal exclusively with science education and operate mainly through scientific societies and science departments of colleges and universities. There is, however, an emergency and temporary need for certain additional Federal programs to strengthen general education, and also for certain Federal programs to strengthen science education in our State and local school systems. The administration is recommending legislation authorizing these additional programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a 4-year period only.

1. Reducing the waste of talent: High-quality professional personnel in science, engineering, teaching, languages, and other critical fields are necessary to our national security effort. Each year, nevertheless, many young people drop out of high school before graduation. Many able high-school graduates do not go on to college. This represents a waste of needed talent. Much of this waste could be avoided if the aptitudes of these young people were identified and they were encouraged toward the fullest development of their abilities.

The administration proposes, therefore, that the Congress authorize:

(a) Matching grants to the States to encourage improved State and local testing programs to identify the potential abilities of students at an early stage in their education.

(b) Matching grants to the States to encourage the strengthening of local counseling and guidance services, so that more able students will be encouraged to stay in high school, to put more effort into their academic work, and to prepare for higher education. The program also would provide for grants of funds to colleges and universities to permit them to establish training institutes to improve the qualifications of counseling and guidance personnel.

(c) A program of Federal scholarships for able high-school graduates who lack adequate financial means to go to college. The administration recommends approximately 10,000 new scholarships annually, reaching a total of 40,000 in the fourth year, to be closely coordinated with the testing and counseling programs. Scholarships should be allotted among the States on an equitable basis and awarded by State agencies on the basis of ability and need. Although it should not be compulsory for students to pursue a specific course of study in order to qualify, reasonable preference should be given to students with good preparation or high aptitude in science or mathematics.

2. Strengthening the teaching of science and mathematics: National security requires that prompt action be taken to improve and expand the teaching of science and mathematics. Federal matching funds can help to stimulate the organization of programs to advance the teaching of these subjects in the public schools.

The administration therefore recommends that the Congress authorize Federal grants to the States, on a matching basis, for this purpose. These funds would be used, in the discretion of the States and the local school systems, either to help employ additional qualified science and mathematics teachers, to help purchase laboratory equipment and other materials, to supplement salaries of qualified science and mathematics teachers, or for other related programs.

3. Increasing the supply of college teachers: To help assure a more adequate supply of trained college teachers, so crucial in the development of tomorrow's leaders, the administration recommends that the Congress authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide:

(a) Graduate fellowships to encourage more students to prepare for college-teaching careers. Fellows would be nominated by higher educational institutions.

(b) Federal grants, on a matching basis, to institutions of higher education to assist in expanding their graduate school capacity. Funds would be used, in the discretion of the institution itself, either for salaries or teaching materials.

4. Improving foreign language teaching: Knowledge of foreign languages is particularly important today in the light of America's responsibilities of leadership in the Free World. And yet the American people generally are deficient in foreign languages, particularly those of the emerging nations in Asia, Africa, and the Near East. It is important to our national security that such deficiencies be promptly overcome. The administration, therefore, recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be authorized to provide a 4-year program for:

(a) Support of special centers in colleges and universities to provide instruction in foreign languages which are important today but which are not now commonly taught in the United States.

(b) Support of institutes for those who are already teaching foreign languages in our schools and colleges. These institutes would give training to improve the quality and effectiveness of foreign language teaching.

5. Strengthening the Office of Education: More information about our educational system on a national basis is essential to the progress of American education. The United States Office of Education is the principal source of such data.

Much of the information compiled by the Office of Education must originate with State educational agencies. The administration therefore recommends that the Office of Education be authorized to make grants to State educational agencies for improving the collection of statistical data about the status and progress of education.

This emergency program stems from national need, and its fruits will bear directly on national security. The method of accomplishment is sound: The keystone is State, local, and private effort; the Federal role is to assist—not to control or supplant—those efforts.

The administration urges prompt enactment of these recommendations in the essential interest of national security.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 27, 1958.*

## WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that

withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, BARING, ASPINALL, SAYLOR, and DAWSON of Utah.

## POLLUTION OF AMERICAN STREAMS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message delivered in this Chamber last week made a number of points that disturb me. One that especially concerns me is his recommendation that Federal grants to combat pollution of our streams and rivers be dropped at the end of fiscal 1959.

This program that the President would bludgeon was passed by Congress and took effect in July 1956 as Public Law 660. This law provided for grants amounting to $500 million—but not to exceed $50 million in any 1 year—over a 10-year period to help State and local governments battle against the destruction of the Nation's most precious natural resource—water. This destruction results from the dumping into our streams and rivers of ever-increasing amounts of raw human and industrial wastes.

We have turned too many of our water courses into cesspools. But Public Law 660, authored by the farseeing gentleman from Minnesota [JOHN BLATNIK] has been the impetus for increased construction of sewage treatment plants and research in the complex problem of water pollution.

Even so, we have a $2 billion backlog in treatment facilities and our industrial expansion and population boom are making the situation worse. Yet, the President would have us halt this vital program.

The President's recommendation that the Federal antipollution program be halted stems from the report of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee, created last summer at his behest. The committee concluded, and I quote, "that local waste-treatment facilities are primarily a local concern."

This conclusion bears no relation to reality in many of our river and stream basins. We are now aware that untreated wastes spilling into the upper reaches of a river affect the quality of the water supply of communities all the way downstream. Out of this realization that the problem is frequently an interstate matter such organizations as the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission have been formed. In the first year of United States Public Health Service grants under Public Law 660, 30 Ohio Valley municipalities with a total population of 1,492,150 were approved for grants amounting to $3,763,118. The estimated cost in dollars of these projects was $16,943,150, so you can see that for every $1 of Federal money, local and State governments put up over $4.

The Joint Action Committee reported that the annual dollar volume of waste-treatment plant construction in recent years has been rising. In 1952, $176 million was spent; in 1953, $238 million; in 1954, $282 million, and in 1955, $249 million. It is significant to note, however, that in 1956—the year the program got under way—the expenditure volume jumped to $393 million, and in 1957, the first full year of program activity, the volume was estimated at $475 million.

It can be appreciated that the grant program—which between July 1, 1956, and December 31, 1957, offered $69.1 million to States and local governments—has been the vital spark that touched off the critically needed expansion of local sewage-treatment facilities. These grants generated over $300 million in construction projects.

It is important to also note that of the 828 projects for which grant offers have been made, 92 percent were for facilities in cities of under 125,000 population. Indeed, these communities had an average population of 9,077.

Without help, these small cities might have found it impossible to build treatment plants. They are caught in a vicious cycle. Many lack the necessary tax base to permit major capital construction. They want to bring in new industry to expand that tax base. But they cannot attract industry which requires a supply of pure water because of a lack of treatment installations.

The Joint Action Committee would have certain tax revenues now coming to the Federal Government go to State governments. With this revenue, the State governments would be able to carry on such essential projects as sewage treatment, according to the committee.

But the record shows that the States and local governments have not kept pace with the need. The only period in which construction of sewage-treatment facilities kept abreast with need was in 1933–39—the period of PWA and WPA. And our population and industry are vastly larger now than they were then.

History gives us no assurance that State legislatures would use new revenue to meet this responsibility.

How critical is this problem of water pollution? Last spring, D. R. Woodward, of the Department of the Interior, surveyed the Nation's water resource situation, looking ahead to conditions in 1980, in a thesis for the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

He emphasized the regional aspect of the pollution problem—a squandering of a resource because it limits the number of times water can be reused.

Of the New England States, Mr. Woodward says: "Pollution abatement is needed." In the Chesapeake Bay area, "Pollution abatement is a growing problem in this area." "Pollution control is absolutely essential to protect the Great Lakes supply," he reported. On the west coast, in the South Pacific area, he forecasts: "As full scale development takes place, pollution problems will become increasingly serious."

"We shall be forced in the future to be much more concerned with this problem than we are today," Mr. Woodward concluded.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to sound a warning that there are interests that would like to see this program, this crusade for clean streams, throttled. But not content with the President's recommendation that it be killed off at the end of the next fiscal year, they would prefer that Congress slash appropriations for the program for fiscal 1959.

If we do this, we will be defaulting on a pledge to the States and local communities of 10 years of Federal support—the support the record demonstrates was so essential. We will have turned back from the forward path we only recently began taking after a half century of watching our rivers and streams become open sewers.

## THE CHAPLAIN, REV. DR. BERNARD BRASKAMP

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been the subject of much favorable comment by my colleagues, and among many who watch from the galleries, that our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp, now prefaces each of his prayers at the opening of our sessions with some brief words of Scripture. In doing so he is following the custom of Edward Everett Hale, who was the distinguished Chaplain of the other body 54 years ago. Dr. Braskamp's prayers, delivered so eloquently and with such fervent sincerity, always are a source of great spiritual strength to us, and I am sure all my colleagues wish him to know our approval and appreciation of his revival of the custom of more than half a century ago of the renowned Edward Everett Hale.

## LEGISLATION TO INCREASE AUTHORIZATION FOR FOREST HIGHWAYS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Federal Highway Act as it relates to forest highways.

My bill will increase the authorization from $30 million annually to $50 million for fiscal years 1960 and 1961.

The Bureau of Public Roads estimates forest highway needs for the next 30

years is about $2.7 billion. At the current rate of progress, it will take 90 years to complete this 30-year program. In addition, the Bureau estimates now in use are out of date. All available information indicates an increase in road costs in the past several years. Even if the old estimates are correct, the authorization increase I propose will not bring the program up to its proper level in 30 years.

In addition, I am convinced that an up-to-date study of forest highways is needed badly. So my bill provides for such a study during the next 2 years.

Another provision of my bill is designed to correct a terrible situation. On November 5, 1957, while the Congress was in recess, the Department of Commerce, acting in concert with the Department of Agriculture, revised the forest highway formula which had been in use for 35 years to distribute these funds.

This action was taken without consultation with either the Congress or the affected States. For 35 years, 50 percent of the funds were distributed on the basis of the percentage of the value of the national forest in each State and 50 percent on the basis of the area.

However, the Department of Agriculture had reappraised our forests, increasing the value from $2.2 billion to $7.6 billion. The increase was not uniform among the several States. And if the old formula had been retained, use of the new evaluation would have done great damage to many States.

In order to minimize the loss to the individual States, the Departments revised the distribution formula, to one giving 75 percent weight to national forest area and 25 percent to value. This revision did tend to reduce the loss to some States; but 20 States still suffered cuts, while 22 received increases.

The following table shows the loss experienced by the listed States from fiscal 1958 to fiscal 1959:

| | |
|---|---|
| Colorado | $312,256 |
| California | 194,171 |
| Idaho | 171,587 |
| Wyoming | 158,692 |
| Arizona | 148,868 |
| Montana | 142,978 |
| South Dakota | 66,388 |
| New Mexico | 56,633 |
| New Hampshire | 41,046 |
| Minnesota | 34,254 |
| Vermont | 13,167 |
| Pennsylvania | 7,469 |
| Puerto Rico | 3,523 |
| Maine | 3,090 |
| Indiana | 2,818 |
| Illinois | 1,916 |
| Nebraska | 724 |
| Iowa | 310 |
| Ohio | 304 |
| North Dakota | 20 |

As you will note, Montana—with more than 16½ million acres in national forests—is scheduled to receive $142,978 less for forest highways next year than this. But our need for these highways has not decreased, it has increased. Not only do we have forest highways in need of improvement, but we also have hundreds of miles of roads which should be included in the forest highway system.

We are being discriminated against because of the recent and unrealistic evaluation of the worth of our forests. They were appraised as if they were being offered for sale as standing boards. The evaluation did not include such intangibles as the value of watershed protection. I remind my colleagues that the First District of Montana straddles the watershed of the Missouri River and of important Columbia River tributaries—that what we do with our national forests in Montana will be felt in New Orleans, La., and Astoria, Oreg.

The value of Montana's forests was reduced because in many areas we do not have roads on which to move timber to market. Inaccessible timber is worth less than timber which can readily be moved to market.

So Montana is to get less money for roads because we need roads. This, I assume, is also the case in other States.

The adjoining State of Idaho will get $171,587 less in 1959 than it got this year. One project alone in Idaho which is of great consequence to Montana is completion of the Lewis and Clark Highway. The cost to finish this one job is $8.25 million. How can we expect the early completion of this vital highway if Idaho must accept such a cut?

I submit that there is no reason why these 20 States should receive less money. Instead, I believe that if, as the Department of Agriculture maintains, use of the new evaluation would have had a far worse effect, Congress should have had a chance to review the matter.

I am asking for such a review. Pending its completion, I ask that the 1958 apportionment be retained for fiscal 1959. With the increase provided by my bill, the 22 States scheduled for increases will get them and more beginning with fiscal 1960. And the 20 States slated to be cut in fiscal 1959 will have their funds restored for that year. Beginning in fiscal 1960, they, too, will receive an increase.

This is demonstrated in the following tables. Table I lists the 10 States slated for the deepest cuts in fiscal 1959 and table II the States scheduled for the biggest increases. The column headed "Apportioned 1958" is also the amount proposed for fiscal 1959 by my bill.

TABLE I

| | Apportioned 1958 and proposed for 1959 by bill | Apportioned 1959 | Gain or loss 1959 | Proposed by bill for 1960 and 1961 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arizona | $1,688,596 | $1,539,728 | −$148,868 | $2,814,300 |
| California | 4,296,368 | 4,102,197 | −194,171 | 7,160,700 |
| Colorado | 2,154,398 | 1,842,142 | −312,256 | 3,590,650 |
| Idaho | 3,054,441 | 2,882,854 | −171,587 | 5,090,700 |
| Minnesota | 414,879 | 380,625 | −34,254 | 691,450 |
| Montana | 2,391,346 | 2,248,368 | −142,978 | 3,985,600 |
| New Hampshire | 160,310 | 119,264 | −41,046 | 267,180 |
| New Mexico | 1,202,119 | 1,145,486 | −56,633 | 2,003,500 |
| South Dakota | 235,032 | 168,644 | −66,388 | 391,700 |
| Wyoming | 1,379,738 | 1,121,046 | −158,692 | 2,132,900 |

TABLE II

| | Apportioned 1958 and proposed for 1959 by bill | Apportioned 1959 | Gain or loss 1959 | Proposed by bill for 1960 and 1961 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Washington | $2,085,098 | $2,498,417 | +$413,319 | $3,475,163 |
| Oregon | 4,132,640 | 4,306,115 | +173,475 | 6,887,734 |
| Nevada | 538,155 | 649,044 | +110,889 | 896,925 |
| Mississippi | 141,519 | 229,774 | +88,255 | 235,865 |
| Texas | 94,966 | 181,980 | +87,014 | 158,277 |
| Arkansas | 407,824 | 483,398 | +75,574 | 679,707 |
| Michigan | 321,916 | 370,668 | +48,752 | 536,527 |
| Wisconsin | 167,768 | 211,954 | +44,186 | 279,613 |
| Alabama | 85,906 | 124,403 | +38,497 | 143,176 |
| Alaska | 2,614,976 | 2,651,993 | +37,017 | 4,356,293 |

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], chairman of House Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, has introduced H. R. 9821, to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act of 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and has scheduled hearings beginning January 28. I look forward to working with the subcommittee to bring the important forest-highway program up to date.

## MORE SANITY IN FEDERAL HANDLING OF DEFENDANTS WHO CLAIM THEY ARE INSANE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the major responsibilities of Congress is that of constantly studying and improving the laws of the land. We are, in a sense, the Nation's Ministry of Justice.

The people look to Congress for corrective measures whenever it appears the laws are unwise, unjust, inadequate, or outmoded. And it is our duty to respond to these demands with constructive action when the need is shown.

Mr. Speaker, no area of the law today cries more for action by Congress than that dealing with the handling of the criminally insane. This is, of course, a most complex field, and one which requires both deep study and wide understanding. The tremendous advances in the fields of psychology and psychiatry, linked with new knowledge of basic causes of criminality and abnormal behavior must be matched by advances in our statutes. Unfortunately, the law has not completely managed to keep pace.

In recent years, we have witnessed a growing confusion among lawyers, criminologists, law-enforcement officials, psychiatrists, and the general public as to what happens or should happen when a person charged with a crime may be insane. The District of Columbia has recently become the nub of misunderstanding in this field.

Within the past week it was revealed that under the existing law it was impossible to retain in custody a man whom psychiatrists stated might commit homicide if released. This man, Dallas O. Williams, a resident of the District of Columbia, has a long criminal record. It includes convictions for manslaughter, assault with intent to kill, shooting with intent to kill, carrying deadly weapons, and threats with a pistol.

He is now at large, set free by a series of court decisions based on technicalities in the law. His freedom jeopardizes the safety of the whole community. It now appears the police and the psychiatrists are powerless to do anything unless or until this man again commits a crime. One wonders what explanation we can give to his next victim as to why such known lawbreakers—with acknowledged dangerous tendencies—are allowed to roam the streets of the city.

While the Williams case happens to affect the District specifically, other jurisdictions all over the country are also encountering problems in delineating this area of criminal responsibility. Other Federal courts, though they have not followed the lead of the District of Columbia bench, have nonetheless run into quandries in the application of the older rule of criminal insanity. The resulting turmoil demands the immediate attention of Congress.

It has long been obvious that a great—and I fear, growing—chasm exists between the science of law and the science of psychiatry. Our laws are based on the assumption of free will and individual responsibility. Psychiatry, in general, adopts a fatalistic attitude toward mankind and embraces a deterministic explanation of all human action. If we attempt to bridge this chasm without reconciling these conflicting assumptions, we may get a hodgepodge of law and psychiatry which is illogical under either discipline. It is of vital importance, therefore, that we understand the vocabulary of the law and psychiatry before we express any general conclusions about what must be done.

The situation which confronts us requires an immediate and comprehensive study by the House Judiciary Committee of the Federal criminal laws and procedures for handling insane defendants. I shall offer a resolution in the committee tomorrow to establish a special subcommittee to look into this or to have it done by one of the standing subcommittees. I first proposed such a study last December 22. The recent Williams and Leach cases and others make such hearings doubly imperative today.

Such an overall legislative inquiry would supply the basic data needed for intelligent consideration of all aspects of this many faceted problem. In my opinion the issues in this field are moral and social as well as medical and legal. We should explore in hearings the philosophical insights of criminologists, the practical viewpoints of prosecutors and defense lawyers, the experiences of prison wardens, psychiatrists, probation officers and some of the defendants themselves. We will want to examine the day-to-day application of the laws. With such a study as a basis for broad legislative action, we can avoid the inconsistencies and mistakes of the piecemeal approach.

A defendant's mental condition raises special problems at almost every stage of a criminal proceeding from the time of arrest until the moment of release, and thereafter in connection with parole or probation. Of course, the problem which has received most attention is the test which should be followed in the Federal courts in determining the criminal responsibility of a defendant suffering from mental illness.

Today, nearly all of the Federal and State courts still adhere to the right-wrong test announced in the M'Naughten case more than a century ago. Simply stated, it bases determination of responsibility on whether the defendant knew he was doing wrong in committing the alleged crime.

The Federal court in the District of Columbia is the only one which has substantially departed from the right-wrong test. In the District, under the Durham decision, a defendant must now be acquitted by reason of insanity if his crime was the product of a mental disease or defect, even if he knew what he was doing and that it was wrong. This decision has been the center of much litigation and controversy. Its ramifications should be closely scrutinized in the course of our study of the general subject.

While the test of criminal responsibility is important, it is only one of the many questions which deserves attention. Under present Federal law, for example, examination of a defendant believed to be insane is required only after a formal proceeding in court. Often the order for examination is delayed so long that psychiatrists are unable to determine the defendant's mental condition at the time of the offense. Provision for the prompt and automatic examination of defendants charged with serious crimes might well improve this situation.

We should also consider the desirability of mandatory commitment for defendants acquitted by reason of insanity. Whether these people are sent to hospitals or jails, the community must be safeguarded against a repetition of their offenses.

Effective rehabilitation is another problem. Our sense of social justice demands that we do all we can to assure maximum rehabilitation. In recent years doctors have experimented with surgery, the use of tranquilizing drugs, shock treatments, and blood chemistry analyses. It should be determined whether these new techniques are being adequately employed in our prisons as well as in our hospitals.

The District of Columbia's experience demonstrates the dangers of a case-by-case revision of the law in this field. These recent cases have made it painfully clear how widespread has been the confusion in the application of the new tests and procedures. In several cases retrials have been necessary because of the alleged errors in the trial judge's instruction to the jury. In more than one case the process of trial and retrial took so long that the court finally ordered the charges dismissed because the defendants were being denied their constitutional rights to a speedy trial.

The case-by-case approach to this subject thus introduces elements of uncertainty and hardship in the enforcement of the criminal law. Unfortunately, the victims of an offense are forcibly reminded of their ordeal at each retrial and defendants tend to become guinea pigs as the law gropes for solutions.

In some cases the instinctive sense of justice of the community is offended by the acquittal of persons whose only abnormality is a morbid propensity for crime. In a recent case in the District of Columbia, a defendant with a so-called antisocial (sociopathic) personality was acquitted by reason of insanity and committed to a mental institution. This same institution, as is the case with many of our mental hospitals, is so overcrowded that it is forced to turn away many law-abiding citizens with much more serious mental conditions.

Moreover, whatever the merits of the tests and procedures devised by the District of Columbia court, the fact is that no other court has chosen to follow its lead. The resulting situation raises a serious question as to whether justice is being administered in the Federal courts with an even hand. There is little justification for different tests and procedures in different Federal jurisdictions. Justice requires that defendants charged with Federal crimes be tried under the same standards and procedures in all Federal jurisdictions.

A comprehensive study of all of these aspects of the problem may disclose that our difficulties are largely practical and that what we need is better facilities or larger staffs for the care and the control of the mentally abnormal criminal. Or we may discover that the present laws are simply inadequate to deal with the complex and dynamic problems with which we are confronted. I suspect that we will find room for improvement in both our laws and their administration.

I further feel that the proposed committee study can do much to clear the air by establishing greater rapport among lawyers, psychiatrists, and the police. Their disagreements as to the meaning of the law today pose one of the main stumbling blocks to its proper enforcement. A meeting of the minds by means of these hearings can achieve much good.

Mr. Speaker, the price of crime is an expense the Nation can ill afford. A major portion of crime involves repeaters—criminals whose offenses have been detected but whose lawless instincts have not been curbed. Despite recent medical advances, there may be a need for more intensive research into the

basic causes of crime. The expense of such a program on the part of the Federal Government would be more than offset by the savings to the Nation from any major discoveries which would reduce crime.

It is my firm conviction that it should be Congress which should undertake this vital study of crime and insanity. This conviction is based not only on our responsibility to make sure that the laws are kept up to date to meet the demands of the citizenry, but also because of the urgency of the situation.

Men with known homicidal tendencies are today walking the streets because of legal technicalities and the confused state of the law. We must clear that law up as rapidly as possible.

Yet, at the same time, we should not try to change the law without thorough study and without hearing the views of all sides. Complete hearings, participated in by leaders in all the fields concerned, can supply the information needed to evaluate the state of the law. They can supply the knowledge and recommendations which the committee can sift to determine how—and if—and in what way, the laws must be changed.

Such an inquiry could, of course, be undertaken by some sort of a commission embracing medical, legal, and law-enforcement personnel. And various groups around the country, particularly in the legal profession, have done and are doing excellent work in this field.

But all such groups must, in the end, resort to Congress to actually put their ideas into statutory form. Thus, although the work which could be done by other groups would, is, and has been helpful, the House Judiciary Subcommittee can act directly to translate the work into laws.

The more expeditious—and equally thorough job—can and must be done by Congress. The study I propose can draw together the findings of all these other groups and translate them as rapidly as possible into the laws we need to bring order out of the confusion surrounding the question of criminal responsibility in the Federal courts.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that the response to my original suggestion for this study over a month ago has been most favorable. The Congressional-study idea has received widespread endorsement from many respected experts in the field.

Chief Judge John Biggs, Jr., of the third circuit, the author of a book on the subject of insanity and criminal law, expressed the hope that Congress will be induced to undertake a thorough study of this entire subject.

Rufus King, chairman of the section of criminal law of the American Bar Association, an outstanding leader in the criminal law field, has stated that "when the study gets underway, I am confident that we shall be able to cooperate and participate."

Prof. Herbert Wechsler, of Columbia University, chairman of an American Law Institute committee on the subject, wrote:

The matter seems to me one that is highly appropriate for legislative consideration and I am delighted to learn of your proposal to deal with it in these comprehensive terms.

Prof. David Curtiss, of the Cornell Law School, who is participating in a similar study of the laws in New York State, stated:

I am hopeful that your proposed study will materialize for I am confident that it could make a significant contribution to the administration of justice in this country.

Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, a pioneer in the field of psychiatry and the law, has written:

It seems to me that a study of Federal criminal laws and procedures relative to insane defendants would be helpful.

I am confident that this study will pave the way for a modernizing and humanizing of the law in this field without undermining the administration of justice and without jarring the fundamental concepts of the community.

---

## ADDRESS BY HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I include the following address made by me at the American Legion testimonial dinner in honor of Harry J. Crosson, manager, Veterans' Administration, of Philadelphia, Saturday, January 25, 1958, at the Sheraton Hotel, Philadephia, Pa.:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Crosson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, those of you who know me well will certainly understand when I say to you it is difficult for me to adequately express my very great pleasure in being here for this unusual occasion. It is an honor to have this opportunity not only to pay tribute but to be one of those to express appreciation and thanks to a great veteran, a fine gentleman, and a distinguished citizen.

As many of you are probably aware, always I have considered it an honor to be invited to any function or celebration involving the veterans of the United States. I suppose over the years and over these United States I have attended thousands of veterans' affairs. This occasion tonight, however, is unique. It is unique because the purpose is to pay our respects and extend our tributes not only to a very gallant veteran but to a man who has devoted his life not only to the veterans of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania but to the veterans of America wherever they may be. I am proud to be here and grateful that I can be.

It is not at all necessary for me to try to tell the distinguished audience of the great work of Mr. Crosson. You know it well. You know of the countless achievements he has accomplished for the veterans. You know of his fine reputation and of the high respect in which he is held by the people of this Commonwealth. On other occasions you have shown examples of this respect in the honors you have given to him. His character, his understanding, his fairness, his friendliness, and his work always will stand as an inspiration in the field of human relationships and Government administration.

Leadership like that of Mr. Crosson's is constantly needed all over our country. For many years now we have been living in a time of crisis. National and international crises have been so numerous during this time that as a people we have come to accept them in our daily lives. At this moment, however, the leadership of our Nation is faced with making far-reaching decisions, not only to completely protect our national security, but also to make certain that freedom will continue as a way of life on this earth. Right decisions are moulded from wisdom and experience.

Once General MacArthur said, "In war there is no substitute for victory." Mr. Crosson and every veteran here tonight and every veteran in the United States know the soundness of this statement of wisdom. The only way to make victory unnecessary is to make war unnecessary. The only way to prevent millions of American sons and daughters from becoming future veterans is to prevent war. In fact, in this nuclear age, the prevention of war is the only way to save this civilization.

To prevent war is not an easy task. It requires the marshaling of all of our skills into a completely cooperative effort. Statesmanship, diplomacy, science, military strategy, industrial capacity and power, transportation and communication, all must be carefully and adequately fitted together into a unified cooperative working system.

In this our time on this earth, no battle was ever won by one man. No battle was ever won by one weapon. No battle was ever won by one single strategic plan. Every horse on the team had to pull his share of the load. The prevention of war is the prevention of many, many battles. The prevention of war is the only way to prevent a tremendous increase of disabled veterans. To emphasize again this noble objective can only be accomplished by a unified country, by a greater joining together into a gigantic cooperative effort of all of our skills and energies.

Since sputnik I and II, all of us have observed many criticisms, not only of our military capabilities, but of our military organization. Based upon their own private information, self-established authorities in and out of Government would lead you to believe our defenses are inadequate, our military striking power is obsolete, our statesmanship is bungling, our scientific abilities are insufficient, in fact that this Nation stands on the brink of disaster. These self-established authorities will tell you that Russia is way ahead of our country in science, nuclear know-how, and military capability. They will have you believe that this great America of ours, which completely defeated two powerful enemies, one on each side of the globe, in World War II, is about to be squashed under the heel of Communist Russia's scientific military might. To every father and mother throughout these United States, to every young man and woman in this great country, to every single American, I tell you in all frankness, this just is not true.

We see headlines disclosing the views of some, demanding the setting up of a supermilitary dictator in the form of a Chief of Staff and a general staff military system. They proclaim, let one superman make all the decisions. We see statements that our Navy is no longer of any use, that there is no longer any need for our great Army. This, they proclaim, is the missile age and that the entire security of this Nation is wholly dependent upon missiles. With missiles, we do not need an Army and a Navy, according to their persuasion. Now I know, and I believe you know, this just is not true. It is very fuzzy thinking.

Our military organization, without a doubt, can be improved. Never in history has one been set up that could not be

improved. A supermilitary czar, having direction and control over our entire military forces, not only is unnecessary but unconstitutional. Under the Constitution of the United States the military leadership of the Nation is vested in the President, as the Commander in Chief. This power cannot be delegated without an amendment to the Constitution.

We need an army, a great army, possessed of the finest weapons for use in the air and on the land, to make it capable of successfully meeting any challenge. We are going to keep our Army and see that it is the finest in the world.

Never before in the history of this country or in the history of naval strategy has the sea, constituting seven-tenths of the earth's surface, been more important than it is at this hour, and will be in the years ahead. The vast oceans are of strategic importance now because of the tremendous significance of mobility in our defense and striking power. Because of this fact America must have control of the seas. This means the United States Navy is more necessary than ever before.

With the security of the Nation involved, we cannot depend upon foreign governments for missile bases, and regardless of the fact, if we could, I question very much the advisability of stationary fixed missile bases subject to one-shot annihilation. Compared to a mobile base, a fixed base can be easily destroyed. It is my view our missile bases should be mobile. We should be able to move these bases rapidly and quickly so that they can be in a position to strike anywhere in the world where striking is necessary. The great undersea and surface ships of the United States Navy make this mobility possible. In the possession of this mobility, our country possesses a power not possessed by Russia or any other country on earth. This power is a deterrent to war.

Now we hear a great deal about interservice rivalry. It is my view that this criticism is of very minor importance and is, in fact, very easily corrected. I am not speaking of service competition which, generally speaking, is beneficial. I refer only to interservice rivalry. As American people, we are concerned with only one thing at this time—it is our national security. Of utmost importance is the security of the United States of America, not the security of the Air Force, not the security of the Navy, and not the security of the Army. We are concerned with the security of this Nation. To achieve this security, it is the duty of our military leaders to use all the means necessary to achieve it regardless of whether the great volume of the military burden because of necessity falls in the area of one particular service. The professional members of our military forces owe their allegiance to the United States of America and not to any particular service. So I say to you, service rivalry to the extent it interferes with military capability of our Nation can be, and must be, stopped and ended.

If war is to come, and I pray it never does, of this we are certain: The sons and daughters of America that must fight that war must be equipped with finer, greater, and more efficient weapons than the enemy. As a Nation, we must never send any American out to meet the challenge of the enemy with an inferior weapon. There is no man or woman anywhere in the world who possesses a greater courage or greater bravery than does an American. But with courage and bravery must go the tools to do the job.

Since war, however, now represents possible annihilation for everyone concerned, our objective must be to prevent war. The formula for accomplishing this, I believe, is quite obvious. No nation in the world today is afraid of a war of aggression being started by the United States of America. On the other hand, every nation in this world fears the aggression of Communist Russia. In view of this situation, America must not make the mistake of trying to match Soviet Russia weapon for weapon in an arms race. On the other hand, America must produce that military capability which will be ready and in a position to destroy Communist Russia the moment Communist Russia begins an attack. Through the tremendous development of mobile air and missile bases, both undersea and on the surface of the oceans, this capability of annihilating any enemy can be accomplished. Again I say to you that never before in the history of warfare has the United States Navy been so important. This mobile capability of the United States is becoming greater and stronger every year.

No nation will start a war, not even Communist Russia, if in doing so it will suffer immediate devastating annihilation. Possessing the great mobile power capable of delivering such a dreadful blow, America can prevent the occurrence of total war.

In conclusion, I submit that the distinguished gentleman we honor tonight, as well as myself and other officials of the Government are deeply grateful for the supreme accomplishments of the American veterans. We are proud of them and grateful to them. As time goes on, however, it is our duty to take every necessary step to prevent the sons and daughters of today from being veterans of tomorrow. We must take every necessary step to preserve civilization and our free way of life. I believe our country is taking these necessary steps. With a unified country I say to you America cannot now be defeated.

Mr. Crosson, I salute you and your great work for the veterans of our country. As long as there are dedicated leaders in veterans' affairs like Mr. Crosson, our Government will meet its responsibilities to them. The grateful people of America will never permit their Government to forget those responsibilities.

## WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, for many years on January 29 we have set aside a certain time to show respect to one of America's greatest men, William McKinley. I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, as soon as convenient to the Speaker after the opening ceremonies, we may have 15 minutes to do that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

## WINNING THE RACE FOR SCIENTIFIC SUPREMACY

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Vannevar Bush, of MIT, said some time ago that he was not optimistic about the United States winning the race for scientific supremacy, but that he would be, if the American people were sufficiently aroused to the danger of their situation.

The people of America are sufficiently aroused now to go along with the President's determination to win this race for scientific supremacy and, in my opinion, they would go even further than the President suggests in his six recommendations and budget. These recommendations are: First, improve the subject matter knowledge of science and math teachers; second, improve course content; third, encourage teaching of science as a career; fourth, increase graduate fellowships; fifth, give more support to the National Science Foundation; and, sixth, reduce waste of talent of American youth.

In addition to his recommendations I strongly support his position that "Education best fulfills its high purpose when responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves" and that the bond between the home and the community, and private resources must be strengthened not weakened. His message affords little, if any, concern about Federal control.

In today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have been privileged to enclose a study made by my son, David R. Dixon, entitled "Congress and Student Aid." While this is a detailed study of the need for further assistance in Utah, where possibly that need is less than most any other State, it does provide the type of factual data that Congressmen need to have available.

## FUTURES TRADING IN IRISH POTATOES

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit futures trading in Irish potatoes.

Mr. Speaker, futures trading in potatoes was initiated by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange in January 1931, and by the New York Mercantile Exchange in December 1941. Virtually all of the trading in potatoes is done on the New York Exchange and is concerned primarily with Maine potatoes. The Chicago Mercantile Exchange has a futures contract for Idaho potatoes which has seen very little activity in recent years.

Potatoes were included in those commodities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commodity Exchange Authority in the general revision of the Commodity Exchange Act in 1936, and trading in potato futures has been under the scrutiny and regulation of the Commodity Exchange Authority since that time.

Since 1941, when the New York Mercantile Exchange initiated trading in potatoes, until December of 1957, 771,633 carlots of potatoes have been traded on this exchange. It is interesting to note that for the years 1955 and 1956, the volume has been 123,781 and 140,333 carlots, respectively, 1956 revealing an approximate increase of 12 percent over the trading in 1955. For the first 7 months of the trading period in 1957 the volume was 37,689, and the calculations for the other 5 months that normally carry the heaviest impact of trading are not available.

The Commodity Exchange Authority made one of its periodic surveys of the positions of all traders in potato futures on the New York Mercantile Exchange on October 31, 1957. This survey provides detailed information on the size and composition of the futures market for Maine potatoes at the close of the harvesting season, just prior to the maturity of the 1957 November futures—the first delivery month for potato futures in the 1957–58 marketing season. The following information represents an extract from this October 31, 1957, report, and it vividly points up the dynamic role played by speculator in futures trading on potatoes. I quote:

Of the 871 traders in the market on the survey date, 673, or 77.3 percent, were reported as speculators; and 198, or 22.7 percent, as hedgers. In the survey 1 year earlier, the proportion of traders classified as speculators was 62 percent, and hedgers 38 percent.

Speculators held the bulk of the long side of the market at the end of October 1957; there aggregate long positions amounting to 3,308 carlots, or 70.6 percent of the total open contracts. Speculators' total short positions were 1,991 carlots, or 42.6 percent of the total open contracts.

Positions classified as hedging accounted for the larger part of the short side of the market, amounting to 2,686 carlots, or 57.4 percent of the total commitments. Long positions reported as hedging totaled 1,374 carlots, or 29.4 percent of the long side.

The market composition thus reflected—speculators holding most of the long side, hedgers most of the short side—is fairly typical of futures markets. This pattern is particularly common in the early part of the marketing season when short hedging commitments against supplies are seasonally large, and speculators not infrequently carry the greater part of the long side of the market.

In the October 1957 survey, the relative proportion of the short side carried by speculators and hedgers, respectively, was similar to that shown by the comparable surveys in the 2 preceding years, being fairly close to 70 percent hedging and 40 percent speculative for each of the 3 years. On the long side, the distribution was roughly 30 percent hedging and 70 percent speculative in both 1955 and 1957, with 1956 showing a substantially larger proportion (52.8 percent) classified as hedging.

Potato producers have, for a long time, been concerned about the degree of influence which mercantile exchange activities—in New York and Chicago, but particularly New York—exert on the market price of the commodity they produce. These industry groups have, on many occasions, gathered together in well-attended meetings to express their concern and to explore the possibility of laying it to rest. This concern became so intensified in the State of Maine that, on May 5, 1955, I received a joint resolution from the State of Maine's Legislature, memorializing the Congress to effect an investigation of mercantile exchange operations.

In the interests of such concern, I, under date of May 12, 1955, directed a memorandum to the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, recommending that an investigation be instituted to determine the extent to which mercantile exchange activities influenced the market prices of Irish potatoes and onions.

On October 27, 1955, Chairman COOLEY appointed a Subcommittee on Futures Trading in Perishable Commodities. The chairman instructed this committee that it was not to devote its attention solely to the investigation of any alleged manipulation of the futures markets but, rather, to carry out a constructive study of the effect of futures trading on the supplies and prices of onions and potatoes.

The especially selected subcommittee conducted hearings at Presque Isle, Maine, on December 6 and 7, 1955; at Chicago, Ill., March 24, 1956; and in Washington, D. C., on May 16, 17, 18, and 22, 1956.

In its report of September 24, 1956, the subcommittee made the following recommendations:

First. That the mercantile exchanges and others primarily interested in the futures trading of these commodities move speedily and as effectively as is within their power to make such improvements in the operation of the futures markets as will demonstrate that futures trading in these commodities can be carried on without harm or detriment to the producers and handlers thereof.

Second. That the information which has been and is currently being accumulated by the Commodity Exchange Authority relating to the operations of the futures markets for perishable commodities, with particular emphasis on onions, be studied to determine the basic question of suitability of these commodities for futures trading.

Third. That producer organizations, marketing associations, and all others interested in the matter observe and consider current operations in, and use being made of, these futures markets in order to be of assistance to both the Congress and the Commodity Exchange Authority by making constructive recommendations and furnishing factual and objective material concerning both the beneficial and the harmful aspects of these markets.

Fourth. That in the absence of cooperative action on the part of the mercantile exchanges to effect adjustments which would make futures trading an indisputably constructive trade vehicle for onion and potato producers, and in the event any enhanced regulatory power of the Commodity Exchange Authority fails to promote clearly constructive futures market activity, the Committee on Agriculture should promptly consider legislation prohibiting futures trading in potatoes and onions.

It should be noted that since the conclusion of hearings on futures trading, the New York Mercantile Exchange has endeavored to restrict speculative activities in that market for Maine potatoes. As a most recent development this exchange imposed some significant restrictive provisions as related to the November 1958 contract: First, a provision for delivery of Maine potatoes at Boston, Mass., rather than at the Harlem River yards, New York. This is, in effect, an effort to discourage the accumulation of undesirable quantities and types of potatoes at the New York market; second, a provision that trading in the November 1958 contract shall cease at the close of the seventh business day of that month—this is an attempt to curtail the trading period in potatoes, for in other trading months, trading is permitted for approximately two-thirds of the month; third, a provision that no delivery notices shall be issued on the November 1958 contract until after trading therein has ceased. This would eliminate a practice on the New York Mercantile Exchange popularly known as getting behind the line, a maneuver wherein speculators avoid getting delivery on actual potatoes.

But a substantial number of potato producers are not convinced that such adjustments will entirely eliminate what is considered the basic evil of futures trading—market gyrations. In fact, at its November 1957 meeting, the National Potato Council—representing United States potato producers—endorsed the concept of prohibiting futures trading in potatoes with a vote reflecting a substantial majority.

The following represent some of the reasons why many potato producers recommend the prohibition of futures trading in Irish potatoes:

First. Dynamic fluctuations of the futures market have, in many instances, a detrimental effect on the cash price of potatoes, thereby causing injury to the producers of this commodity.

Second. Speculators' efforts are many times directed toward driving the price of potatoes down, making commodity prices show up in a dismal light.

Third. The highly perishable nature of potatoes militates against storage, prompting a constant supply situation that exerts uneven pressures on the market. The high rate of deterioration in this commodity performs as an ideal instrument for manipulators in the futures market.

Fourth. The record proves that a relatively small percentage of potato producers use the futures market for hedging operations; that the bulk of the trading in this commodity is of a speculative nature, being engaged in by persons who are neither producers nor consumers of the commodity.

Fifth. No matter how exchange officials endeavor to create rules for trading that would have the consideration of the potato grower, there can be no elimination of the speculative features which are so much a part of futures trading on highly perishable commodities and so detrimental to producers.

Sixth. The Commodity Exchange Authority, under existing law, is limited to disciplinary action with regard to market manipulation, being more spectacular in what it does not govern than in what it governs; hence, the exchanges are left with broad authority over their operations, and are permitted to make arbitrary determinations as to their operations which do not always contribute to the benefit of potato producers.

## CRIME IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, called attention to the fact that the courts have been turning loose a large number of criminals to prey on the citizens of Washington. The individuals to whom I refer have been several times convicted by juries, some of them later released because of technicalities to which appellate courts have called attention.

Earlier today I noted that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], was on the floor. I do not see him at the present time. However, I wish to join in the request of the ranking minority member that that committee bring out some legislation.

It is apparent, and we cannot get around it, that men who are guilty of crime and who have been convicted of crime are by order of some court day after day turned loose to prey on citizens here. Somewhat similar conditions exist to a lesser degree in other places. Whether the situation is due to the ignorance of the United States attorneys, who do not know how to present cases or, if that is not the trouble, whether it is due to the decisions of the Supreme Court or the lack of legal knowledge and commonsense on the part of the judges of the United States court of appeals, or a lack of information or just plain indifference or negligence on the part of the Congress, it is difficult to understand.

One thing is sure: The citizens of the District of Columbia are not receiving the protection to which they are entitled. Day after day, or, at least, night after night, people are being assaulted and robbed on some of the well-traveled streets of the city, and by individuals who have a well-established record of criminality, by individuals who do not—at least, on some occasions—deny their participation in the charged crime. What these individuals and their lawyers say is that they have not been convicted in accordance with the most technical rules laid down by the courts.

The circuit court of appeals on January 20, 1955, in *Everett D. Green* v. *United States of America* (218 Fed. 2d, p. 856 et seq.), said that, aside from the arson charge, Green, if guilty of any other offense, was guilty of first-degree murder:

> The first-degree murder section of the District of Columbia Code, set forth at length in footnote 2, supra, enlarges the common-law definition of that crime by adding thereto, inter alia, the unpurposed killing of another in perpetrating arson. So when the evidence at a trial tends to show the defendant committed arson and that the fire was the sole cause of the victim's death, the defendant is either guilty of murder in the first degree or he is not guilty.

When the case went back to the district court for a second trial, the jury agreed with what the circuit court of appeals had just said and convicted Green of first-degree murder. Then, when the case again went to the circuit court of appeals, 6 of the 9 judges on June 28, 1957, agreed with the jury and affirmed the conviction—236 Fed. (2d), page 708.

Then, when the case went to the United States Supreme Court, five of the Justices held, on December 16, 1957, that Green was entitled to a discharge because "a second trial of Green for first degree murder was contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the fifth amendment, which provides that no man should be twice put in jeopardy for the same offense."

Justice Frankfurter, writing the dissenting opinion, said that the approach of the majority opinion "misconceives the purpose of the double jeopardy provision, and without warrant from the Constitution makes an absolute of the interests of the accused in disregard of the interests of society."

The net result of recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court is that that Court insists that the right of the individual to what the Court conceives to be a fair trial under the Constitution—not under previous decisions of the Court—is absolute—over and above the constitutional right of the citizen to be protected in his person, to be secure in his right of property, which the Constitution states shall not be taken from him without due process of law.

As the Supreme Court has said, time and time again, there is under the Constitution no absolute right of the individual to do what he wishes—always every individual right is circumscribed and limited by the rights of others—by the right of the people generally to be secure in the rights granted them by the Constitution.

The citizen has a constitutional right to walk the streets of Washington and to carry with him funds for his current needs. The women of Washington have the right, a constitutional right, to use the streets and the public places in Washington, and on those streets and in those places to be secure in their person, to be free from assault or robbery. They have the right to carry with them and retain their pocketbooks. From a practical standpoint that right is not now theirs.

It is long past the time when, the courts not giving effective protection to those rights or needed assistance to law-enforcing officials—the police and the public prosecutors—the Committee on the Judiciary, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], should bring forth legislation protecting the constitutional rights of the average citizen, as well as protecting the constitutional rights of the criminal or the accused.

The Committee on the Judiciary does not need to hold further hearings. Its chairman, its ranking minority members, yes, every member on the committee, knows the situation here in Washington, for ample publicity has been given to it by the press.

What is the committee waiting for? Does it want citizens to arm themselves in violation of the law and so protect themselves from the vicious criminals who make the use of our streets hazardous?

It is just possible that, if members of the judiciary who have been giving such a liberal interpretation to the constitutional provisions, or members of the Committee on the Judiciary should—and we all hope that will not occur—have an assault or a robbery of some member of their own family, we would get a little more prompt action. We are all inclined to give quick relief when it affects us personally. What are we waiting for? For some Member or a member of a Member's family to be robbed or assaulted?

---

## A DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND RESEARCH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to combine all research and all supply functions in the Department of Defense into one department subject to the authority, control, and direction of the Secretary of Defense. This Department will be known as the Department of Supply and Research. The head of this Department will be appointed from civilian life by the President with the consent of the Senate and shall have status and compensation the same as the heads of other military departments. This Department will provide for purchase, inventory control, storage, and distribution to the military departments in the United States and overseas. It will carry on all research for military departments and will administer such further responsibilities and activities as the Department of Defense may delegate to it from time to time.

My reason for doing this is that in a budget of some $40 billion for military matters the American people are not getting full value for dollars spent. There is overlapping, there is waste, there is muddling, and confusion compounded.

This problem of efficient, expeditious procurement is complicated by an almost bottomless morass of redtape and reports to a number of competing Federal agencies. This was characterized the other day before a Senate committee by Donald W. Douglass, Sr., chairman of the board of Douglass Aircraft, in his statement where he said the most formidable obstacle to getting things done swiftly and efficiently is the time-consuming, agonizing process of waiting for official decisions. He further said that it took his firm alone over 400,000 man-hours a year of just filling out these complex reports for Government agencies. He was also quoted as saying:

> Another problem is the tedious time-wasting emphasis on monitoring. We estimate that increased technical manpower of 30 percent is needed to cope with these paperwork Government requirements.

What does this mean to the American people? It means this, that our vital missile programs are slowed by redtape, by competition between services, and by a tremendous number of competing agencies.

By combining this competition we could get our missile program into high gear at considerably less cost to the taxpayers. Another thing cited by Mr. Douglass was the case of the Nike-Zeus missile, which he said is now completely feasible. He added:

All we need now is the go-ahead signal to bring it to the same status that we have brought the (Thor) intermediate range ballistic missile. Nearly 2 years ago we felt this weapon was sufficiently feasible to warrant a go ahead but, so far, only a small fraction of the necessary funds has been made available.

To further exemplify this problem he said Thor production "can be accelerated to almost any degree which might be necessary."

Rear Adm. F. S. Withington, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ordnance, said in Detroit on January 15 that his biggest problem "is not money, but control of the money. Sometimes I don't think I am Chief of Ordnance but rather that some clerk in the Budget is. You can quote me on that." He said that holding up of money in the Bureau of the Budget interfered with the continuity of the missile program. In some cases money appropriated by Congress was held up by the Budget Bureau until the last day of the fiscal year, which is obviously most wasteful and inefficient.

My bill is consistent with the recommendations of the recent Rockefeller report, wherein the following language appeared:

The Secretary of Defense should be given authority over all research, development, and procurement.

One of the great difficulties besetting the administration in this present period of trouble is the lack of understanding between the basic relationship of strategy, technology, and supply. It is most probable that the next war will be lost in laboratories and on the drawing boards. Until the Secretary of Defense has maximum control over the direction of research, development, and procurement his role will be, in the language of the Rockefeller report:

Essentially passive one of arbitrating disputes formulated elsewhere.

Where so much depends on keeping up and staying ahead in the technological race it is essential that our weapons development reflect a clear sense of direction and not a series of compromises.

I recently introduced legislation to do away with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and in their place to establish one single Chief of Staff to have the responsibilities presently held by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This was to do away with the battling, muddling, and confusion that has reigned so long in the Department of Defense. This bill has the same purpose. It is my intent in offering this bill to do away with the vast confusion which exists in the departments of supply. For instance, I would like to cite certain things which have come to my attention with regard to the Department of Defense's procurement policies.

The Air Force canceled a contract for C–132 jet prop planes after $70 million was spent on it.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force all have separate carpenter squares; the Navy's costs $2; the Army's carpenter square costs $1.90; the Signal Corps, $2.10; the Army engineer's, $1.48; the Quartermaster Corps, 65 cents; and the Air Force, $1.40.

The situation got so bad that Congress passed a law requiring the Army, Navy, and Air Force to compile one catalog from which they would all order, instead of competing against each other and using separate catalogs. The law was passed July 1, 1952. The Defense Department had 300 people working full time in Washington, plus 3,000 working part-time in the field to compile a joint armed services catalog. Finally, after spending $87 million they produced the first edition, on food only, which is 40 pages long. At that rate it will take billions to complete the entire catalog. It is interesting to note that the Navy ordered 14,500 copies of this new catalog, the Army only 50 copies, and the Air Force none.

Navy jets in Korea were so bad that they were not put into operation where they would come into contact with the Russian Migs.

The Navy has enough anchors on hand to last it until the year 2005. The Army has enough of certain front axle parts for jeeps to last it until the year 2055. The Air Force paid 12 cents a pound for 10-penny nails, while the Navy paid 6 cents for exactly the same nails.

The Marines buy a combat boot for $16.80, the Navy buys exactly the same boot for $24.65. The Air Force dress shoe costs $7.19. An almost identical Navy dress shoe costs $6.08. The only real difference between these two shoes is the stitching on the heel. The Air Force bought 1,700,000 of these dress shoes on which it could have saved over $1,700,000 if it had bought the Navy shoe. The medical services paid $21.75 each for blankets, the Air Force, $14.15 and the Navy, $19.57.

On June 30, 1953, 37,000 assorted dry cell batteries which cost the Government $75,843.33 were sold by the Army for exactly $130. These batteries were left over from winter exercises of the previous 2 years. A House Government Operations Subcommittee said:

The subcommittee was astounded to learn of the laxness in computing requirements for the winter exercise.

In Exercise Snowfall, $311,835 worth of batteries were shipped to Camp Drum. Only 39 percent of this amount was consumed. For 2 winter exercises $1,186,799 worth of batteries were shipped in, 42 percent were used, 50 percent were returned to the system, 8 percent were disposed of by sales. Poor storage conditions resulted in tremendous loss to these batteries.

The Navy, in 1951, bought scores of thousands of dollars worth of forklift trucks from a company which had no previous experience in the manufacturing of this type of equipment. The equipment was useless and withdrawn from service.

The Army bought overcoats in 1946 to prevent appropriated funds from reverting to the Treasury at a time when there was no need for the coats. They later were found to be unsuitable, necessitating remodeling at a cost of $1 million.

The Air Force procured chain link fencing under defense priority, 60 percent of which was still unused 2 years later. Adm. S. E. Edson, Director of Procurement, Office of Naval Materiel, had this to say before a Government Operations Subcommittee:

I am simply astounded and amazed at the series of bad procurements that have been brought out in this testimony. It is simply not understandable to me how with all the checks and balances the Navy has that the matter has gone along and the complete consummation of procurement has taken place without the knowledge of higher authority. Now, whether there have been human failures, or the system, or both, certainly we, the Navy, are going to investigate and take corrective action.

The Air Force, on 1 occasion, built in excess of 200 three-story dormitories costing $400,000 each, over and above its need for structures of this sort. It was found that these structures would have no use in the foreseeable future.

The Navy bought millions of dollars' worth of Demon fighters which were found to be entirely unsuitable for military purposes.

A recent report of the House Committee on Government Operations gives a summary of the progress of the cataloging system which is going on in the Department of Defense at this time. No one knows how much it costs and apparently it is not going very well. Completion of the process now under way is expected by December 1958. The total number of conversions of nomenclature to a standard Federal system is 3,487,238; 3,128,613 separate items are identified in the military supply system; about 600,000 are thought to be different, new items which will be submitted by the military services for identification this year. Cataloging may reduce these to approximately 250,000 to 300,000 actually different items to which new stock numbers will be assigned. The different services are being assigned separate spheres of endeavor in standardization, and there is even squabbling as to who will standardize what.

Here is what Rear Adm. John E. Clark, Director of Guided Missiles in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, had to say in the February 25, 1957, issue of Aviation Week magazine:

Missile programs have failed completely in the area of dollar cost. Unit costs have risen even after the missiles have been placed in mass production, and this has never happened before.

Part of the blame—

Clark said—

was the military's outdated specifications and standards; delay in decisions, insistence on changes conspired to increase the cost.

The Navy has its Polaris missile, the Army now wants to develop a similar solid-fuel missile and will, no doubt, spend substantial amounts of the taxpayers' money in doing so, instead of

using the basic elements of the Polaris' mechanism.

The Navy now wants to move into the development of the atom powered aircraft in competition with the military. No doubt, again expensive duplications will occur which will cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and which will cost this country priceless time in our technological race with Russia.

It was recently found that the military department has tremendous stocks of both canned hamburger and catsup, far in excess of its needs in the foreseeable future.

Military land procurement and use is the most wasteful and shameful hogging and squandering of a priceless national resource. This was commented on extensively by the House Interior Committee last year when the committee found that the Army, Navy, and Air Force were competing to seize new areas at the rate of around 1,000 acres each hour every day. An example of competition in land use by the services was the Nellis-Tonopah Range that covers 3.5 million acres in southern Nevada. In 1953 and 1955 the Navy asked the Air Force to let it share the use of the range for bombing and gunnery runs by its test pilots. The Air Force refused both requests and testified before the House Interior Committee that the whole area, equal to a 1-mile belt from New York to Los Angeles, was overcrowded with Air Force planes and would be needed indefinitely. The committee directed the Air Force to produce a report showing how many planes used the range and on how many days a year. Redfaced Air Force witnesses came back with a new report, over half the vast range was no longer needed at all, and that by 1960 testing requirements of the new planes would make the entire area useless to the Air Force. When Congressmen called in the Navy to inform them that this range would be available to them, they found that the admirals no longer wanted it. The Navy now has spent $16 million on other and presently uncontaminated public lands 180 miles away, and informs Congress that the money will go down the drain if they are not allowed to use and contaminate 2.8 million acres more of the public domain. An interesting fact is that the Navy spent $10 million of this money on the new site prior to the 1953 refusal of the Air Force to let them use Nellis-Tonopah.

The Navy came to Congress saying that they wanted 639,000 acres near Fallon, Nev., to be seized by eminent domain, declaring that it contained only sagebrush and rock. A formal Interior Department survey showed the area encompassed 35 ranches that grazed 22,400 cattle and 14,000 sheep. It included over 17,000 mining claims in the finest Nevada habitat for antelope, mule deer, sagehens, and partridge.

Actually, the Defense Department does not even know what acreage it does own. It started an inventory of lands but last summer informed the House Interior Committee that this inventory was only 22 percent complete. The Air Force has the Wendover Bombing Range in Utah, which it has owned since 1942 but has never used. This area is 1,400,000 acres in extent. When asked why the Air Force has never used this land, the Air Force replied that the land was split in two by United States Highway 50, the Union Pacific and two pipelines.

The Air Force explained that it did not occur to them that they could own land under commercial split by a railroad, two pipelines and a main highway. In the midst of this last summer the Air Force, Navy and Army proposed to take on an additional 12,800,000 acres while declaring surplus 5,700,000 acres. The landholdings are presently equal to a belt of land 13 miles wide from coast to coast, to which the Air Force, Army and Navy propose to add an additional belt over 3 miles wide.

These are just a few astounding examples of waste and bureaucracy in the Military Establishment.

It is with great pleasure that I noted the other day that the House passed an amendment to the emergency military authorization bill combining all research facilities in the Department of Defense into one operation. This will reduce considerably the problems which exist in the Department of Defense insofar as duplication, overlapping and competition in the research field. However, unless research can be coupled to an intelligent, enlightened procurement system, this will only cure a part of the real difficulty and waste in the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that this bill will find early and favorable consideration. It will help us get missiles and antimissile missiles of the kind we require in the quantity needed as cheaply and as quickly as it can be done.

## LAWRENCE H. SMITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, again it becomes my very painful duty to record the passing, on Wednesday last, January 22, of yet another of our colleagues, the fourth already to leave us during the brief days of this session.

Lawrence Henry Smith, who represented the First District of his native State, Wisconsin, was born in Racine on September 15, 1892. Educated in the public schools of that city, he was graduated from the State Teachers College at Milwaukee; obtained his degree from the Marquette University Law School in 1923, and was admitted to the Wisconsin bar the same year. Meanwhile, during World War I he served as first lieutenant of Infantry in the 32d Division, and in the years following the war served as commander in the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion; national executive committeeman of the Legion, and national child welfare chairman of that body.

After the war and his admission to the bar, he commenced the practice of law in Racine. His eventual election as president of the Racine Bar Association testifies to the esteem in which he came to be held by the members of his profession. But he did not confine himself to professional duties alone. As a director of the YMCA, president of the Lions Club, and a Mason, he displayed that broad and philanthropic interest in the life of the community which we look for in the highest type of citizen.

The time came at last to make his entrance on the national scene when he was chosen at a special election, held in August 1941, as Representative of the 1st Wisconsin District in the 77th Congress. From then on until the end he served in our midst, becoming eventually a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. A firm opponent of governmental extension into domestic and overseas fields which he deemed foreign alike to our national traditions and our constitutional system, he won the respect of all no less for his consistency than for his inflexible honesty in defense of principles which were, to him, sacred and immutable. To his widow and the three children he left behind him, this House will join with me, I know, in extending our profound and heartfelt sympathy.

Long ago Theodore Roosevelt wrote:

> Clean politics is simply one form of applied good citizenship. No man can be a really good citizen unless he takes a lively interest in politics from a high standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind, Lawrence H. Smith nobly exemplified that ideal held up by a great leader of his party. Let that be his epitaph as we bid him farewell.

To his loved ones left behind I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

## JOHN FOSTER DULLES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, President Eisenhower, in his press conference, spoke of our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, as the "wisest, most dedicated man I know" and as one who has greater knowledge in the field of foreign affairs than any other man. In view of the storm of criticism that has been leveled at Mr. Dulles during the past few weeks, in view of the fact that he has been described as the second most unpopular member of the President's Cabinet, I feel that some of these charges should be viewed in their true perspective. That is my purpose in addressing the House this afternoon.

I understand that three of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Arizona, and the gentleman from California, have special orders this afternoon, following mine, to discuss foreign-policy matters as well. I expect those Members of the House who are able to remain during that time will not only spend an interesting afternoon but will, I hope, be given every opportunity to participate in the debate. I certainly concur with the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin the other day when he indicated that we in the House should not leave it entirely to the other

body to discuss the broad, overall aspects of foreign policy.

When the foreign policy of the administration is attacked, whether at home or abroad, these attacks are obviously directed against the Secretary of State as much as any other man. Let us recall for a moment the background qualifications of this man who, I am told, has had a lifelong ambition to attain his present position. Let us remember that, ever since the Hague Peace Conference of 1907, over 50 years ago, his entire life has been centered around the study of and participation in international affairs and foreign policy.

He was an adviser to President Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, he was a member of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference on International Organizations in 1945, he has been a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly four times under previous administrations, he served as adviser to the Secretary of State four times at meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers at London, Moscow, and Paris. He also negotiated and signed the Japanese Peace Treaty in 1951. It is clearly evident, therefore, that when John Foster Dulles took the oath of office as Secretary of State 5 years ago last Tuesday, his previous service to this Government, almost entirely under Democratic administrations, more than qualified him for his present high position. Not only has he more experience in the field of foreign policy than any other major-power statesman now active but he has also had more experience in negotiating with representatives of the Soviet Union. It is important to keep this fact in mind.

I do not hesitate in saying that I have not agreed with all aspects of our foreign policy at all times. But, if certain persons ever wish to make a partisan question out of the foreign policy of our present administration, I am more than ready to meet them on their own ground. I might remind the House that I resigned from the United States Foreign Service 8 years ago, largely over basic disagreements with the way our foreign policy was being conducted at that time. Were I in a similar position today, such basic disagreements would no longer exist.

Just a week ago, Mr. Dulles' immediate predecessor, Mr. Dean Gooderham Acheson, charged that the present world crisis "is due as much to the inaction of this administration as to Soviet actions." Now Mr. Acheson is a foreign policy adviser to the Democratic Party, whether self-appointed or not, I do not know. I should be grateful to my Democratic colleagues who are following me this afternoon if they could straighten me out on this point. In other words, is Mr. Acheson speaking as a private individual, is he speaking for the Democratic Party, or just for whom is he talking?

In that connection I would like to read a brief letter which I received this morning in the mail from John A. Stewart, of Saginaw, Mich., dated January 24, 1958:

> I think it is nauseating to hear Dean Acheson criticizing the President's foreign policy. If there was anybody who had no foreign policy, it was Acheson and little Harry, and I think of Acheson as the meat grinder. He and Harry got us into the Korean war and then kept us from winning it and sent our men over there to be thrown into a stalemate where they weren't permitted to advance or do anything to protect themselves, were just there until they were blown up by the Commies and I still think of it as Operation Meat Grinder and Acheson the grandest grinder of all. He's got the blood of many thousands of fine young American boys on his hands and I would think he would hide his head in shame the rest of his life instead of criticizing anybody else's policy, especially one who stopped the senseless war that he and his pal, little Harry, started.
>
> This may sound very vituperative but it is the way I feel every time his name is mentioned.
>
> JOHN A. STEWART.

But, in any event, it seems strange for Mr. Acheson to accuse the administration and Mr. Dulles of inaction. The House will no doubt recall that, with regard to China, he himself advocated a policy of inaction, of letting the dust settle before doing anything about it. Talk of inaction comes with poor grace from one under whose tenure of office and that of his democratic predecessors we lost all of Eastern Europe as well as China to the Communists. The only positive actions during that time which enabled us to save Western Europe were enacted by the Republican-controlled 80th Congress.

On the contrary, since Mr. Dulles has been Secretary of State, what positive accomplishments in the cold war does the present administration have to its credit—this administration which Mr. Acheson says has been so inactive? We did the best we could with a bad job which we inherited in Korea and saved half of that country for the free world. Likewise we inherited a situation in Indochina where the entire country was swarming with Communists and today we find Vietnam firmly on our side, Laos and Cambodia likewise adopting an anti-Communist attitude and the Communists confined to the north and east parts of what was Indochina. Elsewhere in the Far East the Communists have not advanced a step further into free world territory and, specifically as at Formosa, have been prevented from doing so by bold and positive joint action on the part of the administration and the Congress.

In the Middle East, the present hot spot of world affairs, we took positive action to keep the Reds out of Iran. The Eisenhower doctrine which was proclaimed a year ago has not only reduced the menace of Communist penetration in that area but has given the anti-Communist Arab nations real support in their efforts to preserve the freedom and independence of their own countries. The Soviet Union has concentrated its own efforts on this part of the world but so far has only gained any advantage in Syria and Egypt.

Even in these two countries there are positive and encouraging signs that the moderate elements are beginning a program of resistance to further Communist gains. The final story in Syria and Egypt has certainly not as yet been written.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that just before the session started this noon, I read on the news ticker that these two countries are very close to a union with each other. My personal opinion is that this union will go far to keep both Syria and Egypt from further Communist infiltration and Communist domination, by permitting them to operate under one government. Whether it is a good thing or not for the entire Middle East is another question, but I think it will be a real deterrent to further Communist penetration of this area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the Suez Canal episode of some 15 months ago. The action which our Government took on that occasion must certainly have represented one of the most difficult foreign policy decisions which the President and Mr. Dulles have been called upon to make since they have been in office.

It was a hard and painful thing to do to oppose three good friends of ours such as the United Kingdom, France and Israel in the United Nations. But we are a government and we are a people pledged to the settlement of disputes by peaceful methods, whenever and wherever possible. We have to admit that the joint British-French-Israeli action at Suez was in violation of both international morality and justice. No matter how close our friendship, we could not condone their invasion of Egypt at the same time we were condemning the Russians for their brutal aggression against Hungary. To have done other than we did would have been to share with the Soviets the label of the greatest international hypocrites of the 20th century. It is only by a firm and undeviating adherence to the standards of international morality that we continue to merit the leadership of the free world in our struggle against imperialist Communist aggression.

While I am on the subject of morality, let me refer once again to the much-maligned Mr. Dulles. In addition to his superb diplomatic background, the Secretary has always been prominent in religious matters and in 1940, for example, served as chairman of the Federal Council of Protestant Churches. For a man like Mr. Dulles, whose entire life has been imbued with deep convictions in the highest traditions of our Christian religion, it is only to be expected that he should adhere to such standards in the conduct of foreign affairs and should demand the adherence to such standards on the part of other countries. I cannot understand those, either at home or abroad, who criticize him for excessive moralizing. I am sure that no Member of the House would demand that we adopt different rules for the conduct of the foreign policy of this country.

In this connection, I should refer to a letter dated last November 22 addressed to the President by six Members of the House, all belonging to that party presently in control. This letter made certain suggestions in the field of foreign affairs with a purpose of relaxing tension and mitigating hostility as well as increasing our strength. Speaking of the necessity for achieving unity within

the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the letter said:

> We must overcome the doubts about our desire for peace aroused by the rigidity of our foreign policy and its tendency to antagonize our friends by its moralistic preachments.

I challenge any of the gentlemen who signed this letter or any other Member of the House on the other side of the aisle to say here and now that he believes that the United States policy toward its Western European allies should be marked by a departure from the standards of morality and should instead adopt an amoral line.

Communist moral standards are self-confessedly governed by the ends of their own foreign policy. Otherwise international morality has no place in the Soviet Russian lexicon. I do not believe that any of the gentlemen who attacked our administration's foreign policy for its moral preachments would suggest a deviation by this administration from a firm and unwavering adherence to what we know to be in accordance with the highest standards of truth and righteousness. I can safely predict that, as long as Mr. Dulles remains our Secretary of State, our foreign policy will continue to be conducted on the highest moral plane and if anyone on the other side of the aisle wants to make a partisan issue of this fact he is more than welcome to do so.

The House has also noted that the letter signed by some of my colleagues on the other side criticized "the rigidity of our foreign policy." Presumably, this refers to the position of our Government in respect to possible negotiation with the Soviet leaders and specifically concerning the so-called summit meeting. At this time, I think I should read Secretary Dulles' answer to such criticism directly and I refer and quote below certain paragraphs taken from his address before the National Press Club here in Washington on January 16:

> Given the intensive nature of the present struggle, what place is there for negotiation? First of all, let me say emphatically that there is a place for negotiation. Negotiation is one of the major tools of diplomacy. It would be the height of folly to renounce the use of this tool. This administration has not done that in the past and does not intend to do it for the future.
>
> We must, on the basis of past experience, assume that negotiation with the Communists, if it is to bring acceptable results, will be a long, hard task. I have often engaged in that work and have spent many days personally participating in high level face-to-face negotiations with the Soviets. I have had considerable education as to their methods. * * *
>
> I believe that there should be, and will be, further negotiations with the Soviet Union. There are many areas where there could be dependable agreement in the common interest. Also I believe that the Soviet rulers, and I know that we, do not want our two nations to drift so far apart that there is increased danger that the cold war will turn into a hot war. * * *
>
> President Eisenhower's letter to Chairman Bulganin should dissipate once and for all any impression that the United States does not want to negotiate, or is afraid to negotiate with the Soviet rulers. The truth is quite the contrary. We do want a summit meeting, provided the proper conditions obtain.
>
> We do not, however, want a summit meeting which merely represents another episode in the cold war, and which would be held under circumstances that would carry great peril to the free world.
>
> There are, I know, many who feel that the cold war could be ended and the need for sacrificial effort removed by a stroke of a pen at the summit. That is the kind of illusion that has plagued mankind for a long time. Actually, peace is never achieved in that way, and nothing could be more folly for us than to put on the belief that all our danger could be ended by peaceful platitudes proclaimed from the summit by heads of government.
>
> The expansionist goals of the Communist parties, and the exploitation of the subject peoples for military and economic aggressive purposes, will not be altered by one iota by generalities uttered at a summit conference. But with the free peoples it is different. Their governments cannot make the necessary efforts except as the people themselves feel the need to work and sacrifice for the security of their nations and of their ideals. A summit conference which diverted the free nations from doing what is necessary for their security, without any comparable change in the Sino-Soviet bloc, could be a great, indeed, a fatal, disaster.
>
> Equally, it could be a disaster if the Free-World leaders at such a conference felt that, to avoid the danger inherent in a platitudinous declaration of peace, they had to go to the other extreme and break off in an atmosphere of hostility. That could intensify the cold war and make more likely that it would turn into a hot war.
>
> For these reasons, it is essential, as President Eisenhower pointed out, and as Mr. Khrushchev once himself agreed, that any summit meeting should be well prepared. There should be assurance that significant topics will be discussed, and that there is a good prospect of arriving at significant agreements which will be fulfilled.
>
> The way to such a meeting was clearly pointed out by President Eisenhower in his last week's message to Chairman Bulganin. It is now for the Soviet rulers to make clear whether or not they want a summit conference which will genuinely promote the cause of peace and justice in the world. We do.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and also for the constructive thing he is doing this afternoon in exposing some current issues of foreign policy and giving Members on both sides a chance to join in.

I rise at this time because the gentleman, I think, did not quite understand the meaning of a 2-word phrase used by myself and 5 of my colleagues on this side in our letter of November 22, 1957, to the President, which the gentleman from Michigan just referred to. We, it is true, criticized Secretary Dulles in that letter for what we called moralistic preachments. Surely the gentleman recognizes the broad and basic difference between moral action, between keeping one's word, between dealing fairly with people, between dealing with people on the basis of sympathy and understanding, the difference between such moral action and moralistic preachment.

As examples of moralistic preachment, which I think we can do without in our foreign policy, as opposed to moral speech and moral action, were such things as Secretary Dulles' statement in days gone by that we should liberate the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe by such devices as air drops. I think that kind of preachment is moralistic because it raised hopes among the enslaved people of Hungary and other nations which we had neither the ability nor, I fear, the intention of filling. I think, too, we should consider the statement of Secretary Dulles that we must engage in an agonizing reappraisal of whether our allies are worth the alliance at a time when France was struggling with the question of whether it should join with the European Defense Community. I suggest that the more we emphasize true moral action in our foreign policy and the more we forget about moralistic preachment, the nearer we will be to our goals of foreign policy.

On the second subject mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan, in connection with the letter of myself and my colleagues on the question of Mr. Dulles' rigidity, we did, indeed, make that criticism, I thought, constructively in our letter of November 22, and no one is happier than I that President Eisenhower, in his recent letter to Bulganin, and Mr. Dulles at the Press Club talk to which the gentleman from Michigan has just alluded, displayed, I thought, a good deal less rigidity and a good deal more flexibility, which I consider a forward step, and if our words had something to do with that, I, for one, would be very proud.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. Surely. I will be happy to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Now we have heard a definition of what is meant by "moralistic," which was never heard of before on land or sea or heaven or earth. We all know what the criticism means when foreign officials talk about Dulles' moralistic views. They mean that when the clutch comes, to be willing to "rise above principle" and to sacrifice principle for expediency. Everybody knows that. We know what they mean abroad and what many of our friends at home mean by talking about the rigidity of our Secretary of State. That means that he has been stubborn and steadfast in many situations when they were ready for appeasement. Now, we have in this country those of the opposing party who criticize him for inaction and then those who claim that he travels too much. We have those who say he talks too much and then those who claim he does not say enough, that there is too much secrecy. Then we have those at home and abroad who criticize his rigidity. But in a world where many leaders in other governments are confused and scared and wobbling, and when we have some people like that here in our home ranks, it seems to me that the position of our Secretary of State, with apologies to Kipling, might be described this way:

> If you can keep your head when those about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you,
>
> If you can keep your faith when small men doubt you and make allowance for their doubting, too.

Then your name is Foster Dulles. If devotion to commonsense and moral principles is rigidity, then thank God for Foster Dulles' rigidity.

If the gentleman will indulge me another moment, I have been studying the Rockefeller report on the problems of the United States defense. In the foreword by the overall panel is this statement. Speaking of the period of change and difficulty in which we now live they say this:

Our problems, therefore, require for their solution not only great effort and skill, but even more importantly, steadfast conviction.

If there is anyone in our country who combines great effort, great skill, and steadfast conviction more than our Secretary of State, I do not know who he is. And if that is rigidity I say again, thank God for that kind of rigidity in our great Secretary of State.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contribution of my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe we in the United States should continue to encourage the people behind the Iron Curtain, not only in Russia but in the satellites. I am sorry there is any inference here from the other side that we should not be by our words encouraging the various people in the satellites toward liberation and freedom. There is a place where action is very difficult, but in the meantime any one of us who stands for principles certainly stands for the freedom of these various peoples; and just to stop talking, for us to stop pressing at the United Nations level, for our Secretary of State and our good President to stop saying that we in the United States are for that liberation, it seems to me would be a great disaster.

So I hope the administration stands firm on that question, and stands firm and rigid in saying that these people behind the Iron Curtain must be liberated.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield briefly; but I should like to remind the gentleman that he and others of his colleagues have quite a bit of time set aside for them, so I hope he will not take too long at this time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I shall try to make my comments very brief.

I simply want to point out that while I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], I think he will perhaps also agree with me that if we misled people into taking actions which unfortunately were proven to be ill considered and which cost a great many lives and which they took in the mistaken belief that we would affirmatively come to their assistance, because of some things that were said on an official and semiofficial basis, then I think it is time to recognize that we must be very careful in urging liberation. We must be very sure that we do not have people risking their lives unless we are committed to a policy of doing something about it. Unfortunately, in the case of Hungary I think history will show that we misled those behind the Iron Curtain, and unfortunately it cost so many human lives.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield so that I may reply to the gentleman from California?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman that we in the United States both officially and as private citizens must see that we in no way mislead these people behind the Iron Curtain so that they might take action to their detriment and thereby cause many deaths; but I might say to the gentleman that under the leadership of the Honorable EDNA KELLY, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe made a special trip to Europe early this year and checked that program right straight through.

I for one was interested to see whether Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, or any of our stations in any way had led the Hungarian people to feel that we in America would come with armies, with military force, to their defense.

I was unable from any testimony taken to find that there was in any way any affirmative misleading by the United States, either the Government or any official or even Radio Free Europe or the Voice of America, in encouraging the Hungarian people to take action in the belief that we, the United States, or our allies would immediately respond with arms.

May I finish on this, that we were very careful to check through, and we found there were many stations operating without license and surreptitiously, many of them unidentified, that were encouraging those people at that time. I want to say to my good friend from California that there was that encouragement, but none of it could our committee trace to the United States Government agencies, Radio Free Europe, or the Voice of America.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In regard to the gentleman's defense of Secretary Dulles, as far as the Secretary is concerned there would not be much difference between the gentleman's state of mind and mine. As I said a week ago last Sunday on a television program, I think the Secretary is correct in our policy in relation to a summit meeting, that negotiations should be carried on through the Ambassadors first and the Foreign Ministers before the President meets with any of the top leaders of the Soviet Union, so that there would be a reasonable assurance of success and it would not be propaganda used by the Soviet Union. I also at that time expressed my respect for Secretary Dulles because I am firmly convinced that he has as profound a knowledge of the evilness of the Communist mind as anyone in the administration. If it were not for him we would probably be much further advanced along the line of recognizing Red China than we are and probably we would be tied up with some disarmament program that we would find a year or two from now would be to the disadvantage of our country.

For a long while I have been of the impression that there has been an attempt by certain groups to undercut him, and I said so on the floor of the House some months ago. So on the question of Secretary Dulles, I may not agree in complete detail with the gentleman's remarks, but with the substance of them I personally agree. I am speaking only for myself.

The gentleman referred to the Suez Canal and rather severely criticized our allies, Britain, France, and Israel. Again, I am a lonely fellow, and I have a habit of expressing my views. Frequently through the years I find on many occasions that I am rather alone. As the gentleman knows, on two occasions in the House when the Suez situation arose I stated that I thought Britain, France, and Israel did the right thing. I am sorry they were not successful, because we would then have been able to negotiate from a position of strength rather than a position of weakness. In the gentleman's criticism of Britain, France, and Israel, does he condone or approve of the action of Nasser in violating the international agreement, which was the origin and the cause of the situation that later arose?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman answers that, will he yield to me for just a second?

Mr. BENTLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 60 minutes. On the other side they have 2 hours. Are we going to hear the gentleman from Michigan talk, or not?

Mr. FULTON. We will get the gentleman some more time.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Michigan will yield to me, I do not recognize the ability or the power of the other gentleman from Michigan to rebuke me when the gentleman from Michigan who has the floor has yielded to me. He knows that unlike my friend from Michigan, he and I think very closely together on foreign affairs.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the distinguished majority leader, and preface my remarks by saying that for him I have always had the deepest respect and indeed admiration. I should like to go further and say that both in his official and personal capacity he has been very kind and helpful to me many times on subjects of foreign policy in which we find ourselves in deep and close agreement.

Now, on this question of the Suez Canal, of course I do not condone the action of Nasser in seizing the canal. That was a clear violation of international law. But I am wondering if my friend would say that we in the United Nations should not have taken the position we did in condemning the attack on Egypt which, though it may have been the best thing to do from a practical point of view, nevertheless was not in accord with the policy of settling disputes by peaceful

means, which the United Nations have undertaken to preserve.

I wonder if the gentleman would think we would have been before the eyes of the world in a stronger position to condemn Soviet aggression in Hungary if we had condoned the tri-power aggression against Egypt.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am frank in stating I think we made a mistake in being on the side of the Soviet Union in connection with condemning Britain, France, and Israel. Even if our Government did not agree with what they did, the relation of friendship ought to have prompted our Government to at least remain silent rather than going out and publicly repudiating three nations that are friendly to us. The gentleman asked me the question so I am responding to the gentleman's question. Instead of publicly repudiating three of our friendly nations and destroying the influence of two of them in the Middle East, namely, Britain and France, as a result of which we had to step in in that area with the Eisenhower doctrine that this Congress passed—the gentleman will not deny that that was a probably natural result, because we could not leave that important area of the world completely devoid of any Western influence so that the Soviet Union might take over any area as a result of nonresistance. So, as a result of what we did, we had to follow it up with the Eisenhower doctrine in our own national interest. I think, first, we made a mistake in going in there. And, secondly, if the present administration felt that Britain and France should not have moved, the least they could have done is to have acted in accordance with the close relationship of friendship and not repudiated them openly and publicly.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, because the distinguished majority leader has mentioned the attitude of the Secretary of State with respect to Red China——

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that I am only expressing my own views.

Mr. ADAIR. I understand that.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I say, I am only expressing my own views and not the views of all of my colleagues on this side.

Mr. ADAIR. I will say then to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think this ought to be brought to the attention of the House because it is such a basically important aspect of our foreign policy that repeatedly, through the years, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has taken a position against the recognition of Red China. It is important, it seems to me, to recall that our position is in agreement with the position of the Secretary of State in that respect.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the people of America are pretty unanimously in accord with that position. Now may I ask one question about Vietnam?

Mr. BENTLEY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, had confined himself to discussing Secretary Dulles. My friend indicated that the action with reference to South Vietnam had been a Republican action. In the first place, it was an American action. The gentleman will remember a couple of years ago when General Collins came back for the purpose of removing Ngo Dinh Diem as head of the South Vietnam Government. The gentleman remembers that; does he not? And it was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House both Democrats and Republicans strongly conveyed to him and to others that we vigorously opposed it. I was there at the time and I was very proud of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs both Republicans and Democrats, on that occasion because I think it was the turning point which resulted in Diem continuing as head of the South Vietnamese Government. Will the gentleman sharply disagree with that statement?

Mr. BENTLEY. No, of course I would not disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, when he makes that statement. I would point out that when the Republican administration took over in 1953, the Communists were all over Indochina—north, south, east, and west, and today, 5 years later, the Communists are confined in the northern and eastern part of the country in North Vietnam and the rest of the country is strongly on the side of the Free World, which I say is a positive accomplishment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I am sorry I must decline to yield. I would like to go on. I will try to yield to the gentleman later, but I would like to make a few more remarks if I may.

We were talking, of course, about the question of the summit meeting. I think it appropriate to quote here a couple of paragraphs from the President's letter to Bulganin which officially sets forth the administration position concerning the summit meeting:

> I have noted your conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that you attach great importance to personal contact between statesmen and that you for your part would be prepared to come to an agreement on a personal meeting of state leaders to discuss both the problems mentioned in your letter and other problems.
>
> I to believe that such personal contacts can be of value. I showed that by coming to Geneva in the summer of 1955. I have repeatedly stated that there is nothing I would not do to advance the cause of a just and durable peace.
>
> But meetings between us do not automatically produce good results. Preparatory work, with good will on both sides, is a prerequisite to success. High level meetings, in which we both participate, create great expectations and for that reason involve a danger of disillusionment, dejection and increased distrust if in fact the meetings are ill-prepared, if they evade the root causes of danger, if they are used primarily for propaganda, or if agreements arrived at are not fulfilled.
>
> Consequently, M. Chairman, this is my proposal:
>
> I am ready to meet with the Soviet leaders to discuss the proposals mentioned in your letter and the proposals which I make, with the attendance as appropriate of leaders of other states which have recognized responsibilities in relation to one or another of the subjects we are to discuss. It would be essential that prior to such a meeting these complex matters should be worked on in advance through diplomatic channels and by our Foreign Ministers, so that the issues can be presented in form suitable for our decision and so that it can be ascertained that such a top-level meeting would, in fact, hold good hope of advancing the cause of peace and justice in the world. Arrangements should also be made for the appropriate inclusion, in the preparatory work, of other governments to which I allude.

In this question of meeting with the Soviet leaders, about which the administration has been accused of having taken too stubborn and unyielding a position, let us return for a moment to the Geneva Conference in 1955, the only such occasion during our present administration. Under previous administrations, we had many prior conferences with representatives of the Soviet Union. It is fair to say that at some of these conferences we were woefully unprepared and there were others in which our negotiators either displayed unjustified overconfidence in their personal power of persuasiveness or they were inadequately briefed for discussion with their Communist opposite numbers.

Since the Eisenhower Republican administration has been in office we have met once with the top Soviet Russians—in the summer of 1955. At that conference certain agreements were reached with the Soviets which have not been kept by them. But at least we came away from Geneva without having negotiated agreements concerning third countries behind their backs. At Geneva we did not dispose of other peoples' territory without their consent. Most important of all, from the standpoint of our own national security, we came home from Geneva with our shirts and pants, to say nothing of our self-respect, still intact.

Reviewing the entire history of our previous agreements with the Soviet Union, we have finally learned that such agreements are only kept by the Communists when it is to their own advantage to do so or when they have been forced by ourselves or other countries to keep them. The Korean armistice agreement is one of the most recent examples of such duplicity. The Communists have remained on their side of the armistice line because of our and allied military power in that area. Other portions of the agreement, however, which related to the equipping of troops in both North and South Korea have been violated by them so many times we have finally denounced those parts of the agreement ourselves. Personally, I would feel that this would give us ample precedent to take similar action on those earlier agreements which have been likewise violated by the Russians again and again.

Referring to one of the most famous of those earlier agreements, the Yalta Pact, there has been, and probably will continue to be, a great deal of discussion as to whether or not it was a sound agreement and only had unfortunate results because of Soviet treachery. So far as I am concerned any agreement that disposes of the territory of other peoples without their knowledge, participation, and consent is both unconscionable and dishonest, and this would apply to both Poland and China insofar

as their countries were affected by the Yalta Pact.

I now want to say a final word about another basis for the criticism of Mr. Dulles. He is criticized on the grounds of his so-called unpopularity in other countries. I was just furnished the text of a television program of yesterday in which a Member of the other body, not still of course in the Senate, is quoted as making this statement about Mr. Dulles:

I think, frankly, that Mr. Dulles, however good he may be, is not going to help our foreign policy. I think the people in many countries have lost confidence in him; I would like to see him replaced.

I think we can honestly say that a good deal of hysteria both in the United Kingdom and France arose over that unfortunate incident.

I would like again to remind the House that Mr. Dulles made the following statement when he appeared before the National Press Club recently, and I quote:

We do not run the foreign policy of the United States with a view to winning a popularity contest. And we have to do things which we know are not going to be popular. But we have not done, in my opinion, anything for which we are not respected, and I prefer being respected to being popular.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country might have just cause to be more concerned about a Secretary of State who is too popular abroad. After all, the Secretary of State works for the best interest of our own people, first and foremost, as well as striving to secure and maintain a just and lasting peace. Where the best interest of this country coincides with the best interest of our friends and allies we, of course, are popular and deservedly so.

Going back to Mr. Acheson, and his charge of inaction against this administration, our record of positive accomplishments is too long to be enumerated here but I would be remiss if I did not refer to the President's recent letter to Bulganin and his proposals to, first, abandon the use of the veto power in the Security Council for the pacific settlement of disputes; second, proceed vigorously to bring about the reunification of Germany by free elections and to foster conditions under which the peoples of Eastern Europe could exercise the right of free choice of the form of government under which they would live; and third, dedicate outer space to the peaceful uses of mankind and deny it to the purposes of war. Those are positive offers of accomplishments which we are willing to make jointly with the Soviet Union and to abide by them in good faith, provided that the Communists would agree to do likewise. With those proposals, which I regard individually and collectively as masterpieces in the twin fields of diplomacy and propaganda, I consider that this administration has certainly regained the initiative which we may have lost temporarily to the Soviet sputniks.

It should, of course, be realized, Mr. Speaker, by all of us that to the average American citizen the details of foreign policy are essentially of a somewhat vague and remote concept. I have said it before and I say it again, for the average citizen of this country who is not versed in foreign affairs the foreign policy of his Government is tested on only one count: Does it bring war or peace? On that basis, there is no question that the foreign policy of this administration compared with the foreign policy of others must be judged successful by an overwhelming number of the American people.

In concluding my remarks about Mr. Dulles, I am aware that some who now approve of him will claim that he has changed, that he is, for example, much more willing to negotiate with the Communists now than he was earlier. Perhaps he has set down his conditions for a summit conference in more detail than was the case earlier. But I insist that Secretary Dulles' basic views with regard to international communism, with regard to the conduct of the cold war by this Government and its allies, and most of all his insistence upon the highest principles of international morality and justice are the same views and standards which he possessed and displayed when he took over the conduct of our foreign policy 5 years ago.

Now I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

I am quite interested to know why in the course of the gentleman's remarks he refers to things he thinks some of us are going to say later, and why his remarks are so defensive.

I would like to point out that before the President went to Geneva he had the support of a large group from this side of the aisle for which he thanked us, and I am a proud possessor of a personal letter from the President thanking me for joining with Senator WILEY, a Republican, in suggesting the expansion of the agenda at Geneva to consider person-to-person exchanges. I think the gentleman will agree that that is one positive thing we came back with in our pants pockets. I am proud to be the coauthor with Senator HUMPHREY, of the Humphrey-Thompson Act which makes permanent a great program that has been initiated under President Eisenhower—the President's Emergency Fund for Cultural Exchange. I think, however, without being vindictive or casting false accusations, that there is always an area for criticism in connection with foreign policy. If the gentleman will listen to the remarks which I hope to make later, I have things to say commending the administration's exchange programs and aid programs. As long as the gentleman's attitude seems to be that we will have certain tests to determine who supports who, let us wait and see where most of the votes come from for the President's reciprocal trade program and for his other programs.

I will address one specific question, if I am not intruding on the gentleman's time. The gentleman criticizes the Democrats for the loss of China, then he criticizes the Democrats for the Korean war and said it was immoral or wrong to lose China and that the Korean war was a mess. Yet he seems to take some pride in the fact that only half of Indonesia was given away. I would like to have him explain that.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Our Government did not join in the agreement at Geneva where half of Vietnam was given away. One of the reasons was the so-called moralistic stand of our Secretary of State and of our Government that we were not going to be a party to the division of Vietnam.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would like to add one thing more. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from New Jersey and his remarks. I have not had the benefit of knowing what remarks he and his colleagues are going to make today, but I appreciate the contribution he has made in the past on foreign policy on a bi-partisan basis. The gentleman will not deny that he was one of the six Members who signed the letter of November 22d in which our foreign policy was criticized in several respects. It is as to those criticisms I have been addressing myself this afternoon.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. If the gentleman will yield, I will not deny that, but I might call attention to the fact that anyone who is interested in this subject knows that the greatest supporters among the leading columnists in the United States have been saying for a long time that our policy is too rigid and has been too moralistic, in the context that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] explained and that the appearance of Mr. Dulles at the National Press Club was an indication that he is becoming less rigid.

Mr. BENTLEY. I strongly feel that the action of Secretary Dulles and what he determines as to our foreign policy is not based on what columnists may say in the newspapers.

Mr. VORYS. It is perfectly clear that the object of the Secretary of State in his Press Club speech was to remind them where he had been standing all along.

Mr. BENTLEY. That is exactly right. Let me conclude.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the question of the conduct of our foreign policy and the actions of Secretary Dulles will not be made a partisan issue during this Congressional session and ensuing political campaigns. I sincerely believe that all of us should endeavor to work in harmony for the best interest of our country in the field of national security and international peace. I should add that whenever proclaimed spokesmen of the opposition party, such as Mr. Acheson, or any of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, attack the administration or the Secretary of State on these grounds which have been mentioned this afternoon, I can say positively that they can be answered, they should be answered and they will be answered.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. First of all, I should like to commend the gentle-

man from Michigan for a very forthright, dignified, and able presentation of a very vital subject. I think the discussion we will have here today demonstrates once again the potential danger if we should inject too great a degree of partisanship in foreign policy matters.

I, myself, feel very strongly that Secretary of State Dulles has done a job of inestimable value to this country. I regret very much any tendency on the part of individuals in this country to respond to what foreign nations may feel about him and thereby try to make Mr. Dulles a scapegoat. It seems obvious to me, as the gentleman from Michigan has pointed out, that the national security of this country depends on how ably our foreign policy is carried out. Secretary Dulles is doing a fine job and deserves the support of both political parties.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his fine presentation this afternoon on this very important subject. I, too, have been concerned about the attacks that have been made on our Secretary of State, particularly by some of the foreign press. I believe that a true test of a successful foreign policy is whether it keeps peace or results in war for this country, and I think that the test over the 5-year period since Secretary Dulles has been Secretary of State clearly indicates that it has kept the peace for the United States, and I certainly feel that he should be commended, and I am grateful to the gentleman from Michigan for his fine review of the Dulles record.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his able and constructive address this afternoon. He has brought together some things that need to be said and repeated again and again about our foreign policy and about our Secretary of State. I particularly want to commend him on what he has said about a summit conference. I was one of those who opposed having our President go to the Geneva Summit Conference in 1955, because I remembered so vividly the disastrous effects of the Yalta Summit Conference and the Potsdam Conference. However, I am in accord with the proposal for a summit conference which is now made because it means that we will have no summit conference except on terms and under conditions that absolutely bar the possibility of our sacrificing security for promises that can be broken with impunity. The gentleman has hammered home that the position of our Government, and our Secretary of State will be rigid and inflexible in the terms and conditions that are necessary before any other summit conference is held. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman for the scholarly job that he has done in presenting this matter to the House today. I think some of us, particularly those on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, are aware of one aspect of the work of the Secretary of State; and that it is his desire to keep that committee—and I presume also the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate—closely advised as to things he has done and conferences he has held. It seems to me that this speaks well for the attitude of the Secretary and bespeaks further his desire to have the executive and the legislative branches of our Federal Government work closely together. That is one thing, particularly, in which the Secretary has been outstanding.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank my friend from Indiana.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his very fine remarks this afternoon. I was particularly impressed with one statement in his remarks when he said that we can judge our foreign policy solely by its results.

The average citizen of the United States certainly cannot be fully aware of all the intricacies that are involved in dealing with foreign-policy affairs. But certainly they are directly affected by the results of these policies. We, as Republicans, I believe, may certainly stand up and say that the results of the policies as set forth by the Secretary of State have been very, very fruitful to date.

Permit me to say this further. I have listened to and read in the papers remarks of the former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson. I believe it would be much more helpful to the people of the United States if he were a little bit more concrete in his specifications, as to what he would do if he were presently the Secretary of State. It is another thing to use foreign affairs for partisan purposes, and it appears very emphatically that is what he is doing. It seems to me that those who will follow the gentleman from Michigan today should come up with some very concrete, some very definite proposals as to what they would have done in like situations.

I want to say also that I recall a recent article by David Lawrence in which he set forth the fact that if you have to have enemies, you ought to have John Foster Dulles' enemies. As far as I am concerned, I believe he has done a tremendous job as Secretary of State. We ought to keep this on a nonpartisan plane, but whether it is or not, the Republican record is clear.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word of commendation of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] for the fine statement which he has made, I agree with him thoroughly when he said that perhaps it is a good thing that the Secretary of State of the United States does have certain enemies. We certainly might have cause for worry if everybody loved our Secretary of State because that might mean he was doing a fine job for the rest of the world but perhaps not such a fine job in our own interests.

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Michigan on his scholarly dissertation this afternoon and for emphasizing and recalling to our minds that we must judge the success of the Secretary of State in the job he is doing and the success of the foreign policy of the country by whether we are at war or at peace. As the gentleman from Michigan has stated, in the conduct of our foreign policy the Secretary of State is not engaged in a popularity contest but is representing the United States and often we have had to do things which he knows are not going to be popular in other parts of the world but in doing those things, we have not done anything for which we are not respected and between the two it is preferable to be respected rather than popular.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

---

## GETTING OUR FOREIGN POLICY OFF DEAD CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UDALL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I shall make and that similar permission be granted to those to whom I may yield during my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleague from Michigan, Mr. BENTLEY, will listen for a few moments. Unfortunately, I was not able to particpate in the debate today. I did hear a few remarks after coming to the floor which I should like to have corrected, if possible. I should like to know if anyone on this side of the aisle criticized our Secretary of State or the Presdent of the United States—I mean personally. Were there any remarks by anyone on this side of the aisle?

Mr. BENTLEY. I will say to my friend from New York that this letter of November 22 criticized our policy on

the ground, as I have said, of its rigidity and its moralistic preachments. Although the letter is addressed to the President, I would assume the criticism of the policy must inevitably refer to both the President and the Secretary of State.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. But personally there was no mention of the Secretary and the President?

Mr. BENTLEY. Not in the specific letter, no.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Or today on this floor. I just wanted that corrected.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would have to read the record, I may say to the gentlewoman from New York, but my impression was that there has been some criticism of the Secretary for what he did in the past with respect to this excessive moralizing and excessive moralistic preachments.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I accept that. Now, can the gentleman answer another question? One of our colleagues, I understand, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], referred, and again I am only quoting secondhand, to our committee when we were in Europe last spring, referring to the fact that there was no evidence that the United States in any way aided or gave hope to the Hungarian revolution. Is that correct? There was mention of it.

May I say that as far as I am concerned it was probably not intentional, but that as a result of broadcasts out of Austria or out of Paris words were picked up which at that time were being said in the United Nations and which, taken out of context, did give hope to the people in Hungary. Am I correct?

Mr. BENTLEY. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania made some such statement. Again, I would have to see the record, because I was a member of the study commission in Germany and would not know about specifically investigating that question. As far as any fault for encouraging the Hungarian people to revolt against hopeless odds is concerned, I think the blame is on both sides of the aisle. I have read the platforms of both political parties. I have read speeches by members of both political parties in the past. I would say the encouragement has certainly not been all on one or the other side of the aisle. I think it has spread across.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman. It is unfortunate that many of our remarks here on this floor and many of the articles that are written, much that has been written in the press, are misunderstood in the other countries and, therefore, words are taken out of context, both at the time debate is going on in the United Nations and words appearing in articles. I refer to one in particular, in the Saturday Evening Post. In that article words were written to the effect that we would come to their aid, and then the context was taken from the debate in the United Nations. So I do not believe we should have any Member say there is not a little degree of responsiblity.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentlewoman.

May I say in this connection that I have heard from many free Hungarians that remarks of Mr. Dulles about "liberation by air drop" did add to the feeling on the part of those people in Hungary behind the Iron Curtain that this country would take some affirmative action if revolt were to start. I can remember that just a year ago that very courageous free Hungarian, that gallant lady, Mrs. Anna Kethly, told me right here in the Nation's Capital that the remarks made by high administration figures in the years following 1953 had contributed to the state of mind in Hungary that this Nation would do something on the great day when liberation might start.

However, my main purpose, Mr. Speaker, in being here this afternoon is to present some constructive ideas for the future of our foreign policy. I thought that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] made a most interesting and lively address. However, it is not my purpose, and I am sure it is not the purpose of my colleagues here today, to castigate Mr. Dulles or the administration in any partisan political sense. So, I think, to a degree, the gentleman flees when no man pursueth.

I am going now to try to answer the suggestion of the other gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG]. We here on this side are presenting a few constructive proposals so that we may talk about them here and subject them to the clash of debate.

Russia's technological advance, translated into military strength, political aggressiveness, and economic rambunctiousness, is having its impact upon us. Our defenses are receiving the concentrated attention of the appropriate committees of Congress, and are being acted upon with speed. This Congress has made it clear that we want to go ahead with an accelerated rearmament program.

In contrast, our foreign policy remains on dead-center. It is well to prepare for the worst, but it is necessary to work toward the best with equal zeal. In the quest for peace, every Member of Congress has a deep responsibility.

It is well to remember that we probably will not be involved in large scale warfare during the years that lie immediately ahead, but that we shall be hard pressed by the Russians in many other ways. We must be prepared to hold our own in the competition, or we shall see large parts of the world gobbled up by the Communist offensives in trade, diplomacy, and technology.

Congress will be called upon at this session to legislate on many aspects of our foreign policy. We will be asked to redefine the methods by which we share our scientific and military secrets with our allies. We will be asked to vote upon a $3-billion program of military assistance, and thus indirectly to evaluate our alliances. We will be asked to consider a program of economic and technical assistance, and thus to give purpose and direction to our foreign policy.

I hope that each of these pieces of legislation, when they reach the floor, will be subjected to the fullest possible debate. Meanwhile, it has seemed to many of us a useful thing to explore where we are going in the world in broad terms, unrelated to any specific legislation. Some of my colleagues and I intend this afternoon to discuss some of the major problems of our foreign policy and to offer, in all humility, some possible solutions to our problems.

I shall concentrate on three major questions:

First. As we strengthen our armaments in Europe, can we not at the same time evolve a stance for the West which offers some hope of peaceful disengagement?

Second. Does our emphasis on military assistance tend to make it an end rather than a means, and what can we do about it?

Third. Are we wise in downgrading the technical assistance side of foreign aid?

1. DISENGAGEMENT IN EUROPE

At the NATO Conference last December, the administration offered our European allies a much expanded shopping list of American secrets, missiles and even nuclear weapons. In working toward an adequate ground defense in Europe, the administration at last seems to realize that massive retaliation is not the complete answer to the problem of deterring Communist aggression. Now that the Soviets have the power to destroy Washington, our threat to bomb Moscow in retaliation for some local aggression in the Middle East or Asia may not be taken seriously. Adequate ground strength is necessary in order to constitute a real deterrent to Russian aggression.

Necessary though it may be to share our atomic secrets and weapons with our allies, without adequate precautions such a move will have two fateful consequences. Still another step away from conventional weapons increases the chances that any war at all in Europe will be a nuclear war. The yawning chasm that divides Europe will therefore become deeper. The goal of relaxing the tensions between East and West will be pushed even further out of reach. Secondly, placing the atomic weapon in the hands of more countries increases the number of those who can eventually trigger the atomic war we seek to avoid.

Because the proposal to share atomic secrets and weapons marks a great divide, it must be considered not in isolation but in the context of the whole of our foreign and military policy. As we rush onward with the arms race, we must try equally to relax the tensions in Europe which make the arms race necessary.

What is needed is a policy for the NATO allies which will demonstrate that while we are preparing for the worst, we shall never cease hoping and working for the best.

I believe that such an alternative possibility lies in the disengagement of Soviet and NATO troops which now confront each other from opposite sides of the Iron Curtain through the heart of Europe. The possibilities of such a disengagement proposal have been discussed here many times before. On

March 16, 1955, 16 other Democratic Members and I spoke of the advantages which might ensue to the Western cause if President Eisenhower were to say to the people of Europe and to all the world:

West German rearmament is underway, because Russia leaves the West no alternative. But if you agree, and if Russia will carry out her part of the bargain by withdrawing to her historic borders, we will welcome a unified and independent Germany; a free Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States, each independent but part of a larger central European community based upon a respect for human rights; and all without the capacity to make aggressive war.

Again, in December 1956, shortly after the Hungarian revolt had shown how shaky was the Soviet hold on the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe, 12 Democratic Members of this body—HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, CHARLES A. BOYLE, JOHN D. DINGELL, TORBERT H. MACDONALD, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, HENRY S. REUSS, GEORGE M. RHODES, PETER W. RODINO, JR., JAMES ROOSEVELT, B. F. SISK, FRANK THOMPSON, JR.—wrote the President suggesting some concrete goals for United States policy in revolution-torn middle Europe based on our own revolutionary ideals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

1. Life: To bring an end to the threat of war in central and eastern Europe. A road toward that goal: creation of a demilitarized area, without the capacity to make aggressive war, for 1,000 miles from the Rhine to Russia's historic boundaries, with the demilitarization and the security of the area guaranteed by the East and West.

2. Liberty: To free the peoples of central and eastern Europe from foreign occupation or domination; to confirm their right to free elections, free speech, free worship, the civil liberties, protection for minorities; and at the same time to guard against the rebirth of totalitarianism from any quarter. A road toward that goal; embedding these human rights in the constitutions of the liberated states, with an international guaranty of their preservation.

3. The pursuit of happiness: To hasten the economic and social progress of the liberated areas, and to provide an alternative to the old nationalistic rivalries for territory and resources. A road toward that goal: encouraging (by such steps as economic aid under international auspices) regional federation and economic integration in central and eastern Europe.

If accepted by the Russians, an offer to withdraw troops and create a demilitarized zone between the Rhine and Russia would greatly increase the chances of peace by widening the area where a mistake could be made without the catastrophe of all-out nuclear war. To those who say that Russia would reject such a proposal, I would answer that the scientific and administrative minds which sent sputnik into orbit should also be able to grasp that such a proposal could be Russia's best assurance against the military threat of a rearmed central Europe. Only by making such an offer can the West encourage such new thoughts to enter the Kremlin's monolithic structure. Moreover, making some such disengagement proposal, even though the Russians reject it, is, I believe, necessary if the NATO alliance is to go forward toward rearmament with any kind of unity.

I believe that a proposal along these general lines would be useful. In making it, I am speaking only for myself. Likewise, those who have joined with me from time to time in making the proposal are speaking only for themselves. We are certainly not suggesting that these ideas are held by everybody but Secretary Dulles, or even that they are held by all Democrats.

Such a disengagement differs, for example, from the stimulating proposals recently made by Mr. George F. Kennan. He talks of the withdrawal of British and United States Armed Forces from the continent of Europe, and the separation of Germany from NATO, in consideration for a Russian troop withdrawal.

I believe, on the contrary, that our forces are needed on the continent, particularly in France and the low countries, to thicken the western European defense on the ground, and as a pledge of our solidarity with our NATO allies. I also believe that there is nothing inconsistent in a reunited Germany, with a self-imposed limitation on its armed forces, remaining a member of NATO.

The proposal I have been making is likewise unacceptable, apparently, to another leading Democrat, though for different reasons. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, like present Secretary Dulles, flatly opposes the West's attempting to secure German reunification and liberation of the enslaved nations by a demilitarization agreement.

Now, I yield to no one in my admiration for Mr. Acheson and Mr. Kennan. They are, both of them, brilliant men, able men, patriotic men, men of vast experience in foreign affairs. Yet I cannot help but feel that both Mr. Kennan and Mr. Acheson have put themselves on record a bit too firmly and inflexibly. I suggest that we in the Congress are lucky enough to have something that Mr. Acheson and Mr. Kennan do not—the opportunity for full debate on the floor of the House, debate where all of us can throw out our ideas to be examined, torn apart, reconstructed, shaped, sharpened and polished by dialog with our colleagues.

If Mr. Kennan were a Member from Pennsylvania, as he might have been, and Mr. Acheson a Representative of the District of Columbia in this body—and who would be a better one when home rule for the District comes true?—the marvelous vehicle of debate would, I am sure, with all of us participating, narrow the differences between them, and between us and each of them, and produce a stream of new ideas that no one person had in the beginning. Because we debate, we have an advantage. We should do more of it. The collective ideas expressed here represent the considered thinking of many. They can form the basis for a new approach to foreign policy with more certainty than can the views of any one person.

Those of us who have been advocating the idea of a fresh diplomatic initiative from the West have until very recently had no encouragement from the administration. Secretary Dulles, citing the long record of broken Russian promises, has opposed any such proposal, in plain disregard of the fact that the proposal calls not for mere paper promises but for observable physical action. But now, happily, our ideas—or at least somebody's ideas—appear to have borne fruit. In his letter this month to Premier Bulganin, President Eisenhower has apparently overruled Mr. Dulles and has offered in essence the above proposal. After stressing the need for reunification of Germany by free elections, and for self-government for the countries of Eastern Europe, the President said:

The United States is prepared, along with others, to negotiate specific arrangements regarding force levels and deployments and broad treaty undertakings, not merely against aggression but assuring positive reaction should aggression occur in Europe.

To this the President, in my opinion rightly, added the thought that a summit conference would be useful when, and only when, the West had arrived at an agreed point of view on such a proposal, and negotiations forecast some possibility of success.

If these words mean anything, and I hope that they do, they mean that the United States will urge its NATO allies, including West Germany, to prepare with us a Western position regarding the demilitarization of middle Europe as a means to reunify Germany and to bring freedom to the enslaved nations. Here at last is at least a hint of American leadership. Let us pray that the President will assign to the task of carrying it out men who believe in it.

Let us now proceed to the second point.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point, or would he prefer to wait until he has finished his prepared statement?

Mr. REUSS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Before the gentleman leaves the first point I would like to ask my colleague from Wisconsin a question. He, incidentally, is making a fine contribution I think to the legislation which we must carry on here through the fact that he has taken this time and allowed us to join in with him in debating this very important subject. As to the peaceful disengagement part of the plan, does the gentleman have any idea, first, as to the likelihood that the Russians might accept such a thing; and second, as to the sanctions which might be employed if such a plan should be put into effect to make sure that the Russians did not cheat on us? The gentleman said, and I think it is true, that there have been many agreements the Russians have made which have been broken. We have no way I know of of making sure this agreement, if made, would not be broken, that across the line there might be divisions—they might be guided missiles, and so forth—ready to remilitarize this particular zone at any given time. I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten us on some of the practical means of accomplishing the things he suggests.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. As to the first question asked by the gentleman from Arizona, would Russia buy this? No one can tell. It is true that in November 1956, no doubt frightened by the

realization that Hungarian guns could point east as well as west, Bulganin did write the President a letter in which he stated that he would like to talk about this sort of thing. However, the point is not whether the Kremlin at this moment would be prepared seriously to consider such a proposal, which I consider advantageous to the West as well as in Russia's true national interest, but whether the making of such a proposal would not gird up the lagging spirit of the NATO alliance, so that we could go forward sure that while we are arming to the teeth, we also have left no stone unturned in our effort to see whether it is not possible to turn aside the arms race which seems to be leading nowhere.

Secondly, I think it is very important that we have a proposal in being so that everybody in the world can paste in his hat some sense of where the West is going. Ultimately we might lead people in Russia who are ambitious for power and have a little truer concept of where the real interests of Soviet Russia lie to get their word in. There is such a thing as public opinion in Russia, though it is not the same kind of public opinion we have. The gentleman from Arizona, who has had the advantage of visiting Soviet Russia, would tell us, I am sure, that the Russians are people, they are subject to the same emotions and drives as the rest of mankind. If the West demonstrates its willingness to offer a proposal which is fair and just, it might be that ultimately some force in Russia would come into being that would consider such a proposal.

Let me get to the second point raised by the gentleman, and if I have not answered him I will yield again.

The second question was, in effect, What about the Russian record of broken promises? How can you trust the Russians? To that I would say if we were talking about a paper pact, the sort of mutual nonaggression pact which Prime Minister Macmillan proposed the other day, I would agree that such a pact would not be worth the paper it was written on because it has no enforcement provisions, it has no sanctions wrapped up in it.

What I am proposing here today, and what has been proposed earlier on the floor of the House by myself and some of my colleagues, is that Russian troops withdraw to Russia's historic borders, leaving Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and the other occupied countries; that an international system of inspection be set up in that whole vast area; that the armaments of those countries be confined to what is necessary for border defense, domestic policing, and so forth, and not be such as to be capable of aggressive warfare. This is a proposal susceptible of real down-to-earth finite inspection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to point out that the President of the United States has asked the Russians any number of times to enter into a scheme for disarmament and for policing of atomic weapons by the use of inspection methods. Thus far the Russians have been completely unwilling to do any such thing. Does the gentleman have any reason to believe in the satellite areas there would be any more willingness on the part of the Russians to enter into such a scheme as there would be in the other schemes offered?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. The previous disarmament discussions have centered on degrees of disarmament in Russia itself by the Russian armed forces and within this country by our own Armed Forces.

While not suggesting for a moment that those discussions are not profitable and were not sincerely undertaken by our administration, nevertheless they differ vastly in kind from a proposal that there be a degree of demilitarization in these areas of central and eastern Europe where Russia now has found to its cost that she is not in complete control and only by military repression can she maintain her sway. I therefore think this is a vastly different matter.

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TEWES. This matter of discussing our present policy always seems to come back, particularly from the other side of the aisle, as some proposals which are so much better than those that are being followed at the present time, and yet when we begin to analyze those proposals they almost generally come back to what we are doing now.

Mr. REUSS. I could not agree with the gentleman more. I think that it is a happy augury that after 3 years of sounding off in the wilderness on this side, just 2 weeks ago, on January 10th, in his letter to Premier Bulganin, President Eisenhower, in the passage just quoted, seems to have seized the essence of what we are suggesting. I, for one, will promise my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, that I will give the President full and unstinted support in his efforts to carry out that suggestion. And, if my remarks are construed as an endorsement of that passage, and as approval of the President for what he has done, that is exactly the truth. We rejoice that the President said that.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOYLE. Permit me to go on record as favoring the proposals delineated and outlined by the great Congressman from Wisconsin, HENRY REUSS, who has been in the forefront of the fight requesting a program seeking a positive approach to foreign affairs. When our group early in 1955, took the floor of the House some 3 years ago, we were hoping that in the area of foreign affairs we might be able to locate common ground that admitted at least a limited agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. The approach to finding areas of agreement in the delicate field of foreign affairs is a lot like trying a lawsuit. When the judge at the threshold of a case calls in the respective sides he does not try to litigate all of the issues, but rather explores the issues that are both germane and that admit of agreement and stipulation.

In the total picture, if we are going to adopt a foreign policy that is clear, concise, consistent, and courageous, generally speaking any number of nations will have certain areas wherein common ground exists for compromise, association and agreement. It is not necessary to go back and review what our statements were 3 years ago. They were directed toward exploring the possibility of finding a peaceful solution in the arms race. Today the substantial evidence of the alleged recent shift in the two-nation comparison of military capital would almost seem to indicate a continued need along this line in American foreign policy. The threat of immediate retaliation from nearby air bases was one thing when only the United States had the A-bomb or when we had a wide margin of superiority in thermonuclear weapons. It is something different when the Soviet Union appears to have intermediate missiles to knock out all our forward bases in the case of a hypothetical surprise attack. In the light of nuclear developments, conventional warfare is synonymous with total annihilation.

Due to the fact that my Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations is now wrestling with the military budget I cannot stay for all of this debate. Nothing that we are doing here indicates that we are not going to continue to make America strong and continue to have her recognize her role as the number one nation in the world.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin in again shouldering the responsibility of bringing this to the attention of the Congress. Today we are not arguing the philosophies of individuals apart from Dulles or Acheson. I rise merely to inquire if there is not some common area or some common agreement that points the way to future opportunities and future hopes for all mankind, because today the hope is that somewhere the United States will bring into play new American initiatives for peace which are plainly and unmistakably the requirement, the demand, and the essence of foreign policy.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

### 2. DEEMPHASIZING MILITARY AID

Let me now turn to a second great question: Does our emphasis on the military security of the underdeveloped countries, rather than on their economic, political and social development, advance or retard our national interest?

Our aid program should aim primarily at helping people to develop their agriculture and industry, so that their rising expectations may be at least in part fulfilled. Then, as they get hope for the future, they are more likely to develop an attachment to free institutions. As best we can, we want to project to them an image of America that is generous and understanding—the America of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln.

This image of America simply isn't coming through to the people of Asia and the Middle East. More than three-fourths of our aid program for the last few years has been in military hardware and in "defense support". In the Presi-

dent's budget message this month, of the total request of $3.9 billion, $2.7 billion was for military aid.

Now, I believe that military aid is a necessity for many countries along the Communist perimeter. They need arms as a deterrent to open Communist aggression, and to protect against subversion at home. Military aid should be a shield behind which countries can develop themselves.

Instead, however, military aid has all too often become an end in itself.

I know that many Members feel, as I do, that Congress every year has been voting billions for military assistance without the benefit of full and open Congressional debate. As you know, the administration every year classifies as "secret" all the important details of military assistance—this three-fourths of our foreign-aid program. Thus the important policy questions each year—how much individual countries get, why they get it, and what they do with it—are never debated at all.

Let us look at some of the questions that are never even debated here. Is it true that our military have overloaded certain countries with military equipment which they are unable to use? Is it true that this military hardware is lying around instead of being recaptured and redistributed to other countries? Is it true that the huge size of some of the armed forces we are supplying is based on political motivation rather than on military considerations? These are the sober findings of the Comptroller General of the United States in his report of September 23, 1957. Yet we cannot debate these matters fully, because the administration pulls the veil of secrecy over them.

Or let us go a little further. Is the 600,000-man army of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek needed for the defense of Formosa, with a population of 10 million? Are the hundreds of millions of dollars we spend every year keeping 80,000 Chinese Nationalist troops on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu a sensible expenditure of funds? Would not the money better be spent on our own missile program? Is supporting the army of Laos, a country which recently took the Communist opposition into its government, a good bet? Does it make sense to maintain an army of 150,000 men in Vietnam, with a population of 12 million and an average annual income of only $116, at the expense of a native program of land reform? Who is the Pakistani navy, supported by this country, supposed to frighten—the rulers of the Kremlin, or the Government of India? Is it wise to send rifles to King Saud of Saudi Arabia to be used against our British allies in neighboring Oman? Or to send American planes to Spain to be used against the Arabs of Morocco?

I don't know the answer to all these questions. And the reason I don't know is that we in Congress are never allowed to debate them. Nine-tenths of the "secret" classification which the administration puts on its military assistance program is as silly as its continued classification of a World War II report on the bow and arrow as secret. I notice that the administration has retained Mr. Eric Johnston to popularize its aid program. I suggest as a first step that the administration stop kidding Congress, the American press, and the American people, and let us see what we are voting on. Let the administration this year, for the first time, tell every word of the military aid story that can be told without violating genuine security precautions. If it does, nine-tenths of its classified material can be declassified. And this House, for the first time, will be able to place military aid in its proper perspective.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is dealing with an important and very perplexing problem. That is, how much secrecy there should be in legislation dealing with military questions. As the gentleman knows, the entire Manhattan project was voted for by Congressmen who did not know it was going on. Since that time we have heard from the small group who knew about it. What a dreadful responsibility they carried when there was a question as to whether the whole thing might not fail and we might have wasted billions of dollars devoted secretly to that project. Yet I think the gentleman would probably agree we have had a justified measure of secrecy.

Mr. REUSS. I agree entirely on that.

Mr. VORYS. Now, in the field of military aid, the gentleman says that nine-tenths of the information could be made public. I presume that that is not meant to be a figure given with mathematical precision.

Mr. REUSS. It is my judgment, from having seen the secrets and having, after the fact, felt that about nine-tenths could be made public. As the gentleman knows, much of this material is subsequently declassified and it is not due to any special privilege that I get to see it.

Mr. VORYS. I believe the substance of what the gentleman said, and I want to be correct, is that all military information should be revealed except that which is required to be kept secret by military considerations. The idea of the fellows over in the Pentagon as to what this exception is differs from the gentleman's idea of it and differs repeatedly from mine. However, I wish the gentleman would comment on this: In order to bridge this gap, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has hammered away insisting that as much information as possible be made in full. There was one year in which we were able to give the amounts that were to go to the European countries, to make them public in our reports. But this past year we have had the secret books here at the committee table throughout the days of debate and repeatedly announced that any Member of Congress was welcome to see those books. The gentleman says that, although he is not on our committee, he has seen these figures, as he has had a right to. I am sure he has not disclosed any information that would be of value to our enemies. But does not the gentleman feel that, if we make available to all Members of Congress this information but do attempt to preserve the sort of secrecy the military people feel should be preserved, that is just about the best we can do about it?

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for asking his clarifying question. My answer is, "No," sir. I do not think it is the best we can do about it. I do not think we should always accept as gospel the classification which the military gives a given article of information, because so often supposed political considerations color their judgment.

As to anything of the character of the Manhattan type of project, anything that has to do with weapons or major strategy, anything which could give the slightest possible aid or comfort to our enemy, as the gentleman well knows I yield to no man in my insistence on secrecy. However, we have gotten into the habit of accepting the military's value judgment as to what is classified and what is not. It is not enough that any Member may go and read the books containing the arcana, which are lying readily available. I myself have done that and found myself many times fairly bursting with a question to ask involving those matters, but have not been able to ask it. Thus the clash of debate on the floor, which incidentally right now as we talk is producing an interchange which may clarify our ideas, has no opportunity to operate. I ask the administration, and I would ask it were it a Democratic administration, to review some of these examples of what I call excessive classification, classification that has no real bearing on military matters but which I strongly suspect is sometimes designed to keep the people of this country from finding out what is going on.

I might add one more thought, that there is a weapon in the Congressional armory that might conceivably be used. Under rule 29, as the gentleman well knows, the House sitting as the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, may proceed in executive session. If the administration does not take a more realistic view of what are the real secrets which ought to be kept and what are the political and economic judgments which ought to be debated on the floor, I think it may well be that some of the Members may have to consider whether it would not be worthwhile to invoke rule 29, so that the whole House may see how silly and untenable some of these classifications are.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Will the gentleman indulge me a question further because he is touching on a problem that we face constantly—he is touching on a problem that representatives of free governments face all over the world, and that is: How are you going to preserve necessary secrecy and, yet, give the people and the people's representatives sufficient information so that they can debate and decide intelligently. But one of the reasons for secrecy in these military programs, and at times in the other aid programs is the jealousy between some of our dear allies. That if country A knows that country B is getting more jets than country A, we are in a

hot diplomatic situation—not with prospective enemies—but we are in a three-cornered argument between two of our dear friends and our Government. Now, that, the gentleman may well say, is a political consideration——

Mr. REUSS. I do say that.

Mr. VORYS. But would not the gentleman agree that it is a valid consideration which we must consider? When I say we, I mean not only the Department of State and not only the Pentagon, but Members of Congress.

Mr. REUSS. No, I would not agree. I think the public interest in full and fair debate outweighs the marginal and questionable political considerations involved. I think it may be a useful thing if at the beginning of a full, fair and open debate, all the Members of Congress made it very clear that anything that was to be said about a specific allotment to a country was not binding; and that no countries should have their duck dinner before the duck was shot. Before the debate was concluded, I think it could be made clear that we were not making any final determinations.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would like to make some observations. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that we have too much secrecy. Some 3 or 4 years ago, when I was meeting with the atomic scientists at the University of Chicago, I said: "Now, suppose you all took a plane and you went to see Joe Stalin and you told him everything that you know, would you be giving him any information that he does not already possess?" They said, "Well, Dr. Urey is not here. Shall we take him along?" I said, "Yes, take him along and take Dr. Allison, the head of the nuclear studies at the university."

Then, they said, "No, there might be a few little details, but in general, there would be no information that we possess now that he does not possess." I think we do have too much secrecy.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is on another subject that I wish to address myself. This debate today, I believe, serves a very useful service. I think it would be well if we had more of these debates on the matter of foreign policy. But, with reference to the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that there is to be such a full debate in this Chamber so that any Member of this body could ask questions on any one of these points, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is losing sight of the fact that we are operating in a body of 435 Members. All of us have to keep ourselves restrained. If we all asked questions, if we all sought to participate in the debate, our sessions would never end. So, I think we all feel that when there is a matter under discussion in this Chamber, unless we feel that we have some information that will render a contribution to the debate, we should remain silent unless we are especially prepared on the subject. In other words, we operate, as we all know, through committees.

On the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I have been a member for only a brief period, I try to conduct myself as I have, as a new member, in listening rather than talking. But on that committee are members of every line of thought. I think matters are pretty well gone into in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as I am sure they are on all of the other committees. So if there are questions that should be asked and answers given to them, they should be given to the House that we might be able to work out some little better way where those who have questions to ask might feel that they would be answered.

I know the gentleman does not wish his remarks to be interpreted as trying to keep certain things secret. We have a large membership, and I am sure that on all of these matters we do the best we can.

I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] for having this special order today. I hope he will have other special orders as we go along so that we may have hearings where we have time and opportunity for a full discussion and the answering on the floor of any questions that are in the minds of Members.

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. TEWES. Is the gentleman not overlooking an important fact in his discussion of the advisability of secrecy concerning these matters? I share with him the same ideals concerning security and the desirability of avoiding as much as possible disclosing secrets. However, I think the gentleman started the discussion by asking some questions, and said he did not know the answers. Is it not possible he does not know the answers because he, like myself, is not a military expert? He is not qualified to answer those questions. Only military people are able to answer those questions, and they desire, on account of strategic situations, to keep the information secret. So that if it were made available to the gentleman and to me, we would not be able to give an intelligent and professional decision.

Mr. REUSS. I cannot agree with the gentleman there. While I admit that my military experience was at a very low level, consisting largely of holding the general's horse, I still was close enough to the high military to realize that they are not always infallible. In a civilian society I think it is important that the basic power of decision be vested where the Constitution vested it, and that is right here in the Congress.

Now I must decline to yield for a moment or else I will not be able to take up my third point.

The last point that I want to talk about this afternoon has to do with technical assistance to underdeveloped areas.

### 3. UPGRADING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The point 4 program was proudly proclaimed 8 years ago. Because of inadequate support, it has never really gotten off the ground. Today, in all of Asia and the Middle East there are only 712 United States "shirtsleeve ambassadors" at work.

I firmly believe that our point 4 program can be the most effective thing that we do. It is America working toward village democracy, toward social progress, toward expanding productivity. It takes place out in the countryside, not in the nations' capitals. It engages the support of Americans who want to learn the country's language and know its people. Because point 4 activities depend upon the consent of village people, they are not the kinds of things that totalitarians do very well. Technical cooperation rather than military hardware or even grandiose political-economic projects is the one kind of program which we do best and the Communists do worst.

The American people would get a great lift if they could see some of their shirtsleeve ambassadors in action. In Cambodia possibly the best-loved foreigners in the country are the American schoolteachers who are training the Cambodians to open village schools. In Formosa American technicians are helping put into effect a land-reform program that is a model for other parts of Asia. In Vietnam, where the departing French failed to leave behind a civil service, point 4 technicians from Michigan State University are patiently creating a cadre of trained native civil servants. In the Philippines American technicians are working hard at the barrio program to train villagers in the rudiments of democratic organization—how to dig a community well, built a school, or treat a malarial swamp.

You would have thought that the administration's reaction to sputnik and to the vastly accelerated Communist foreign-aid program would have been an upgrading of the point 4 approach. Instead, the International Cooperation Administration has just announced that it wants to cut the number of American technicians abroad to the minimum. And whereas last year the administration requested, and Congress authorized, $151 million for United States technical assistance, this year the administration has reduced its request to $142 million.

This is going straight in the wrong direction. There may well be plenty of places to cut in the military aid program, if the administration would only let Congress debate it. If there are too many official Americans in the capitals of these countries, it is because the military assistance program and its defense support has mushroomed. The administration is firing on the wrong target.

What we need is an expansion, not a contraction, of the point 4 program. What we need is not misguided threats to cut down the number of American point 4 technicans, such as the administration has been making, but a recruitment program which will inspire young Americans to serve their country in far-off places as shirtsleeve ambassadors.

These, then, are some concrete suggestions for getting our foreign policy off dead center. Let us end the paralysis in NATO by accepting the suggestion of Chancellor Adenauer that we must both "arm and negotiate." Let us end unnecessary secrecy in the multi-billion dollar military assistance program, and let it stand up to debate on the floor. Let us do our best to see that point 4, crushed to earth, can rise again.

You will notice that I have not called for the resignation of Secretary Dulles. The President has just gotten through telling us all that he thinks the Secretary is the wisest man he has ever met. All we ask is that the Secretary apply his wisdom, and develop some creative ideas for meeting the problems that confront us.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, there are several questions I wish to ask my friend and colleague from Wisconsin; the first has to do with his opening statement in which he seemed to imply that there has been a marked change in the position of the State Department as regards a summit conference with the Russians.

Mr. REUSS. I did not make any such implication.

Mr. LAIRD. Has there been any change in the recent Bulganin letter?

The position of the Secretary of State as regards a summit meeting has not been recently changed to my knowledge.

Mr. REUSS. Thou sayest.

Mr. LAIRD. And that has been his position for a good many months.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman must have a pipeline to the Secretary that is not open to the ordinary citizen.

Mr. TEWES. How about the blue sky proposal?

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman has no pipeline. In connection with the statement made by the gentlemen that the foreign aid military budget is not openly and freely debated, I do not know what the situation is in the Foreign Affairs Committee, but I can tell the gentleman that on the Appropriations Committee the requests are freely and openly debated country by country, defense project by defense project, weapons, munitions, all the way down the line. They are freely and openly debated in our committee.

Mr. REUSS. I appreciate that.

Mr. LAIRD. I am sure if we conducted all that debate on the floor of the House, the bidding between countries would cost the American taxpayers many millions of dollars; and I certainly think that we cannot afford this type of bidding in our foreign assistance program at the present time.

Mr. REUSS. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in economy in our Government.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman's comments on technical assistance interested me, not because of my disagreement with what he said but because of a misunderstanding as to the amounts involved. The request this year is for $164 million of which, looking at the budget docket, they say:

> This increase will help to broaden the scope of multilateral cooperation through a new program for regional surveys of resources and for regional training institutes approved last December by the United Nations General Assembly.

So that we are to have more technical assistance and it is proposed that more of it be by general multilateral rather than bilateral.

Mr. REUSS. If I may interrupt the gentleman right there, because I really must ask for a little definition of that which is subsummed under the $164 million technical assistance request. If that $164 million is all for technical assistance, it is technical assistance on a most Pickwickian basis. If you read the fine print, you will find that a lot of this is for U. N. regional surveys. I am for regional surveys, but they are not shirtsleeved Americans out there in the rice paddies, they are not American schoolteachers, they are not American county agents helping backward people to develop themselves. I will stand or fall on my analysis of the current budget: that whereas last year the administration asked for $151 million of United States technical assistance, this year they have reduced that to $142 million. I think it is a crying shame that is so in view of this sputnik challenge.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. COFFIN. On the point of this technical assistance, I commend the gentleman for his emphasis in that department. I think the gentleman from Ohio is not against this kind of assistance. But I do want to call to the gentleman's attention the fact that in the U. N. it was our country that made the proposal through our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that we increase the fund from $30 million to $100 million and that he would be willing to recommend to this body that we increase our percentage from 33 percent to 40 percent.

Mr. REUSS. I am heartily back of him in that.

Mr. COFFIN. If that happens, it is my understanding—I may be mistaken—that this additional money will come out of the $154 million that the gentleman from Ohio talked about. I may be in error but it is my understanding increased multination technical assistance will reduce—perhaps a more substantial reduction—2 or 3 times our contribution here last year, so that our unilateral programs will be cut severely and I understand our own people in that department are very unhappy about the prospects.

Mr. REUSS. Let us try to reduce their unhappiness.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. May I say at the outset that this discussion today is a healthy one and I may say it is healthy whether you are on the Committee on Foreign Affairs or not. I happen to be a member of that committee. We talk about moralistic preachments. It seems to me the gentleman's first proposition for peaceful disengagement is just that, a moralistic preachment. As a practical matter it is quite impossible.

Mr. REUSS. What is impossible about it?

Mr. CEDERBERG. We cannot get the Russians to agree.

Mr. REUSS. If it is such a good proposal and so much to our advantage, as the gentleman suggests, that the Russians will surely reject it, then it cannot possibly hurt for us to go along with the deeply held beliefs of many of our allied peoples.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I find nothing wrong in making the proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

---

## FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, may I first commend those who have taken time to speak today and have entered into this debate. I am happy to see that it is generally recognized that it is a contribution to the understanding of those Members of the Congress who feel that they must have as much information as possible before they vote on the foreign policy programs that will be before us shortly. I would particularly like to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], for being here and for giving us the benefit of his comments as we have proceeded in the debate. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] made a very valuable contribution, also. Not in the sense of contention I think it is well to point out that there are some things which perhaps are misunderstood and need a little bit of clarification. For instance, those of us who signed the letter to which the gentleman referred, I think were referring to some very specific things. For instance, we were referring to the fact that we wondered where our country was at the time that Egypt was building up on the Sinai desert a large accumulation of Russian-fed, Communist-trained men and weapons to be used, as the documents have well proved, in an aggressive campaign against Israel. There seemed to be no comment from us at that time, although we were not slow to join in condemning retaliatory measures taken by Israel, taken against those who were conducting the Fedayeen raids against Israel. I think, too, we were referring to the policy of accepting from the King of Saudi Arabia a condition which would deny some of the people of certain religious faiths in our country the right to serve in the American Armed Forces overseas where they directly came into contact with Saudi Arabia. That, it seems to me, violates every moral principle and something on which we should have in the first place stood our ground and refused to give 1 inch in accepting.

In talking about partisanship on our question of foreign policy, I think it is well for us to point out that we, who are Democrats, as far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned, have the responsibility to try to make constructive criticisms to improve the foreign policy of our country. I think it is important to note that there have been times in our history, such as in World War II, when a Democratic administration took into the Cabinet of

the President, two leading Republicans in order to give it a nonpartisan aspect. Such has not been deemed necessary at the present time, by the present administration, and I am not blaming them. I think they have their right to that decision, but I do think it emphasizes the fact that we do have a duty and a responsibility to our country, if we believe that our foreign policy can be improved, both as a party and as individuals to make that position known.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. It seems to me that calling in Senator George and our former colleague from South Carolina, the beloved chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Richards, and the recent candidate of the Democrat Party, Mr. Stevenson, all of those being examples of where Democrats have been called in to advise and serve within the past year, is a fairly good record.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, I think that the recent excursion into the administration of the former Democratic candidate for President was hardly bringing him into the inner councils. I admit he was allowed to nibble on the edge, but he was definitely excluded from anything but nibbling, and that was, incidentally, why he felt he could not go to NATO.

Mr. VORYS. The other two certainly were in the inner councils and had the rank of ambassador under this administration. It seems to me that is a good example of what the gentleman suggests.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If I may suggest, I think the record should be kept straight. Our former colleague was invited in to sell a policy of the administration in the Middle East, which he dutifully went and did. And after having not made policy, but simply carried out a policy, he was allowed to go on his way. He was not invited to remain and to continue to advise on policy matters.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, when I had the previous special order some time ago I asked some questions and I do not know whether they were answered because I had to be absent through most of the special order of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. But the question in which I was very much interested and very anxious to have an answer to was, when a week ago the former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, was speaking and criticizing the administration, whom is Mr. Acheson speaking for? Is he speaking for the Democratic National Committee? Is he speaking for the Democratic Policy Committee? Is he speaking as an individual or just whom is he representing? I wonder if the gentleman can give me any light on that?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I cannot give the gentleman any light on that. I suggest that if the gentleman wrote a letter to Mr. Acheson, I am sure he would be glad to tell him whom he is representing.

Mr. BENTLEY. The gentleman does not think he is representing his party in any sense of the word?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. So far as I am concerned, he was not representing me. He did not ask me what my views were, and so far as I know, none of my colleagues. But I think he is entitled to speak. I thing the gentleman will agree that he has a degree of background which would entitle him to give his opinion to the American people.

Mr. BENTLEY. I notice that he gave his remarks in a press conference following a meeting of the Democratic Advisory Committee or the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am afraid I do not know exactly when he made his comments.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] in who is speaking for whom, it might be advisable for him to tell us whom Sherman Adams was speaking for in Minneapolis a few days ago when he charged that the Democratic Party was responsible for the Korean war and for the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to say, in that particular respect, I do not know how many people Governor Adams was speaking for, but he was speaking for me.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Did I understand the gentleman from Michigan takes the position that the Democratic Party is responsible for Pearl Harbor and for Korea?

Mr. BENTLEY. If the gentleman would like me to elucidate that point on the time of the gentleman from California, I should be happy to.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman said that he agreed with Governor Adams. I should think he would be glad to say yes or no to my question.

Mr. BENTLEY. I did.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want very briefly to try to sum up some of the feelings which I gathered during a recent visit in the Middle East. Primarily I think that those who have been there will agree with me when I say that we have the definite impression that the prestige of the United States has never been lower than it has recently been in the Middle East. I think this is reflected not only on the part of those who are there in an official capacity, but also those who are there in business capacities. There must be a reason for it, and the reason I think is because of the inconsistency of our foreign policy in the Middle East. In the Middle East we take the position of neutralism. We are unwilling to offend those on the side of the questions that are debated between Israel and the Arab States for fear of offending one side or the other but especially the Arabs. All this does not square with our insistence in the rest of the world that there can be no neutralism, that you must either be against communism or you must be for communism. We lose no opportunity to urge all nations to join the battle on one side or the other.

I think, too, that the other reason for bewilderment and loss of prestige of the people of the Middle East toward our country is largely because we talk about freedom and we are talking to people about defending a free world, when in actuality that is an empty platitude to these people who have never enjoyed the blessing of freedom and who have no incentive to rise up in its defense.

Our policy in the Middle East, it would seem to me, has been largely built around military necessity. We believe that the idea of having military bases there is more important than the fundamental proposition of winning the hearts and the minds of the people so that they may join us from conviction and not just from military necessity.

I think it cannot be gainsaid that we have not had in the Middle East a bold program around which perhaps all of the people in that area could rally and instead of that they have seen us give arms and give encouragement to rulers in an area where there can be no question that the rulers have not been operating for the fundamental benefit of the people over whom they rule.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I should like to ask the gentleman one question along this line as long as we are discussing the Middle East, and it has to do again with our good friend, Mr. Acheson. When he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs about a year ago in connection with our hearings on the Eisenhower doctrine he indicated in his prepared statement grave and serious doubt in his own mind as to the wisdom of this Government's having participated in the establishment of Israel as an independent nation. I was so interested that I questioned him when it come my turn to make sure that was what he meant. At greater length he repeated that there was doubt in his own mind as to the wisdom of whether we should ever have been responsible for the creation of Israel in the Middle East. I should like to ask my friend from California to join with me in my 100-percent disagreement with Mr. Acheson's statement at that time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I most certainly join in disagreement with it. I believe in recognizing Israel, being the first nation to do so, in helping in the United Nations to pass the United Nations Resolution, which of course was passed by an overwhelming majority of the nations of the world, that we did strike a blow for democracy and freedom, and that we did the right thing and the just thing. I hope that our present policy, which seems to indicate that perhaps we have a little doubt as to whether we did the right thing, is also wrong, and that

the time has come to drop that neutralism and to come out and support what I think is our best ally by all odds in the Middle East. I hope the gentleman will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. BENTLEY. I certainly do, and I do not think the present administration has expressed the doubt that Acheson had.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I call the attention of the gentleman to this unfortunate speech which was made on December 11 in my home State of California, published in the Department of State's Bulletin on January 20, which gives it, of course, added emphasis, because this is a publication which gives the aura of authority and respectability. In the speech, Mr. Edward M. J. Kretzmann, Public Affairs Adviser in the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, declared categorically, and I am going to quote it:

> The official United States attitude toward the Arab-Israel dispute is one of sympathetic impartiality, which means we are neutral.

I hope the gentleman will join me in urging the Department of State not to let officials of our Government make those statements and then print them in the Bulletin of the Department of State where they get official recognition all over the world.

May I go on from there and simply say that I think if we would perhaps in this session of Congress urge that the whole question of military aid and nonmilitary aid in the Middle East be separate and that we get a good look at the issues there and have it very carefully explained, perhaps we would come up with a more realistic and a much more fundamental foreign policy in the Middle East.

I am sure that many Members of this House will agree that there can be no certainty when we ship arms to any country in the Middle East that those arms will not be used for purposes which are abhorrent to the American people in view of the expressed statements of the rulers of those countries to whom many of these arms are being shipped.

I hope we can find a way to gear, perhaps, our economic aid to a policy which will try, as far as possible, to eliminate all of the arms race in the Middle East and to bear down upon the fact that when we send arms to an area which is obviously torn by dissent, we are only helping to build the possibility of at least a local outbreak of war with the possibility that it might—or with the extreme possibility, perhaps, that it might easily erupt into a world war. I hope then that we will look over that position and, perhaps, decide whether we would be stronger if we were to take a greater direct responsibility against aggression in the Middle East rather than rely on the kind of policy that we have had in the past. I believe such a policy would be doing more to put a damper on any possible aggression whether it be from Russia or whether it be on the part of one country against another country in the Middle East.

I hope that we will go forward with a realistic and forceful examination of what we can do in the way of eliminating disease and eliminating ignorance, and build the kind of economic program which people can see and feel and which people can know will have a direct bearing upon the future of their children. If we build that kind of program, I have no fear that the penetration of the Russians into the Middle East can be very successful on an economic or social basis of any kind. I would hope that we will see that kind of program coming up from the President in the presentation of foreign policy when it comes before this body.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I am glad that the gentleman from California has suggested that we separate our economic aid and our military aid, particularly in the Middle East. I am concerned about some of our economic aid in the Middle East and in other areas of the world from a little different standpoint. I feel that we are building more multipurpose dams, for instance, in those areas than we are building in our own country. Just last summer before the Congress adjourned, a committee of this House issued a report and it was printed by the committee in which they said:

> The military force objectives presently approved for United States support in certain allied countries are not always realistic in terms of the responsibility of the country, manpower, and financial capabilities and are not always mutually acceptable to the countries concerned and are not always motivated by military considerations.

Then the report also said:

> In addition, these objectives are fiscally infeasible.

Now, like the gentleman from California, I have always supported foreign aid. I have supported all increases when they have been suggested on the floor of the House, but it becomes very difficult for me to go along with the present program of no new starts in reclamation and no new starts in the development of multipurpose dams, and then to find that some of this economic aid abroad is being given for projects that are fiscally infeasible projects which could not be authorized by a legislative committee of this Congress.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to my good friend, I quite agree with him. I think we must only deal with feasible projects. I also agree with him that charity begins at home. Keeping America strong, is the only way that we are going to be able to fulfill these responsibilities which are thrust upon us in our position of leadership in the world.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly agree with the majority of the things that the gentleman from Montana has said about reclamation. Certainly, it behooves us to do what we can to build up the areas of the West and do it as rapidly as possible. However, I would like to take issue with the gentleman when he said that there have been no new starts. Perhaps, the gentleman did not mean during this entire administration. I would like to point out the Upper Colorado River project which I am sure the gentleman who has the floor does not sympathize with, and which has been authorized during this administration, as have other projects.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I wonder if I could ask the gentleman to be good enough to postpone that argument since it is a little extraneous to the subject that I want to discuss.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would point out to the gentleman that it was not my argument.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may clarify my statement?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I said that the administration program for this year in the new budget is a program of no new starts in reclamation or multipurpose projects. Of course, the gentleman knows that I supported the Upper Colorado River project.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on one other thing. I am sure those of us who have been in the Middle East and studied it at all, have been distressed by the continued existence of the Arab refugee problem which exists there. Having visited there, I want to emphasize that now is the time, if these roughly 1 million refugees are not going to become the breeding place for saboteurs and for all kinds of terrorism, now is the time for a concerted effort to go forward with a plan that would eliminate the existence of these refugee areas. We must recognize in this country that this cannot be done by "striped pants" diplomacy. We can only get it done if we work without fanfare, if we come forward with a realistic program to provide jobs for those people, which are attractive enough to take them away from the horrible position in which they live. We must recognize that neither the Israelis nor the Arab countries are going to back down in their position that this is not their responsibility or their fault. I think we have proven already, through the operation of some of the projects in Iraq, that the unpublicized program that can be carried out with force and determination is the basis upon which this problem can be dealt with in cooperation with the United Nations. I want to urge my colleagues at every possible opportunity to urge the Department of State to come forward with such a rounded program in cooperation with representatives of the United Nations, that this sore upon humanity may be eliminated, with the obliteration of these refugee camps. I think we will see the day of realistic discussion of peaceful negotiations and resolution of the other issues in the Middle East.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As the gentleman knows, we have a substantial sum of

money, I think $65 million that has been authorized for some years for the purpose of settling the refugee question, and we have been unable to spend it because we have never gotten an agreed plan. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the United States should proceed to attempt to solve the whole refugee problem and accede to the proposition that neither the Arabs nor the Israelis are going to accept any responsibility? Is that what the gentleman said?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, sir. Let me make clear what I stated. I said that neither the Arabs nor the Israelis are going to sit down and acknowledge that this is their fault that this refugee problem exists. I am sure that a great many of the Arab Nations would be willing to undertake their share in the solution of the problem, but they are not going to stand by and formally admit, in treaty form, that this is the result of their particular action, whether military or economic.

Mr. VORYS. I am glad to have the gentleman's amplification.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is not only our responsibility. We cannot go it alone. But because we probably have the greatest stake in it, we do have the obligation to lead the way. I am simply urging that we change the effort we have made in the past for formal declarations—change that toward informal efforts that will lead to specific programs, tying them in with our economic aid problem, which will bring about results in actually moving those people.

I think the gentleman knows that perhaps 80,000 people went from these refugee camps to Iraq at the time certain projects were undertaken in that area.

It was not done in formal announcements or by formal treaties, and I think it is that kind of program we need today.

Mr. VORYS. I think the gentleman will agree that if such informal activities as the gentleman recommends are now going on and since he recognizes that they are going on without fanfare and undue publicity, whether it would be helpful to call too much attention to them at this moment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, sir; but I want to say to the gentleman that I was dismayed to learn from the UNRA representatives in the Middle East that they had never been approached, that not even a beginning has been made on such a program.

Mr. VORYS. My information is at variance with the gentleman's.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be happy to discuss it with the gentleman and give him such information as I have.

I now yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have prepared some remarks on the question of our economic aid and investment programs in the underdeveloped areas. I ask unanimous consent to extend them at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I would like to say to the gentleman from California that I very heartily endorse his statement here today as to the necessity of stepping up our economic and technical assistance programs in the Middle East and perhaps scaling down some of the military assistance that we have been sending to that part of the world. In this connection I wish to ask our friend from California if he feels that the military aid we have sent to the Middle Eastern states and particularly those along the northern tier would in any way prove to be a deterrent against Soviet military invasion if the Soviets should decide on such a course?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say to the gentleman from South Dakota after talking to military men in the area as well as military men here at home that the agreed upon answer to that question is that the military aid we have sent would not be sufficient to stop any invasion whether it be Russian, Turkish, or any other well-organized military unit. Therefore, in actuality what we have done thus far is more for political purposes, as I believe was brought out earlier in the debate. I come back to what I said earlier, imposition of a real arms embargo in the Middle East would enable those countries that have so much to do for the basic welfare of their people, to spend their time, their money, and their efforts working for the improvement of the people in the area rather, to often unfortunately this military buildup, in effect, only serves to keep a particular ruling party in power and to suppress the great majority of the people.

Mr. McGOVERN. Will not the gentleman agree that it is unrealistic to talk about building a framework of military strength on a foundation of disease, ignorance, and poverty? It seems to me that these are the real problems of the people of the Middle East.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I agree with my friend absolutely. I note that he comes from a somewhat agricultural State. One of the things we can do for betterment of the situation in the Middle East, and in Asia too, is a greater use of our surplus agricultural crops. I believe if we had a real program it would not only build up the strength of the people there but also would be good propaganda for us, propaganda which could be used much more effectively than many things we are now doing. If we do not go forward with a real program to use our agricultural surplus to feed people who are hungry, to give them an opportunity today to build their strength, we will miss one of our best weapons in the effort to wage total peace. If we did that I think we would have demonstrated the real answer to what the Russians so often talk about, but which they also do very little about.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think such a program would go far to prove that the food abundance we enjoy in the United States is not a curse, that it can actually be our greatest weapon in our effort for peace. We will not have met the test of statesmanship until we figure out some plan for using this surplus of food to cancel out some of the surplus of empty stomachs that exists in the world.

There is one other question I would like to direct to the gentleman from California: Has it not been true that in some cases the military assistance we have sent to the northern tier of states, to members of the Baghdad pact, has actually causesd some other potential friends in the world to take funds away from economic and technical development and allocate them to military weapons which they felt were necessary in order to counter some of the military aid given to their neighbors?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman and agree with him. I can cite one specific instance, that of Israel where she feels, because of aid given to her neighbors, given in pursuance of a policy of neutralism which still denied arms to Israel, that she has to use an unwarranted proportion of her resources to build up her military strength. We cannot blame them, because we, in effect, at least, are doing something to make that necessary. I think the gentleman's concept of it is correct.

Mr. McGOVERN. Chester Bowles, former Ambassador to India, has reported that American military aid sent to Pakistan in 1956 prompted the Government of India to withdraw $100 million from its second 5-year plan and allocate it to military orders placed with the French and the British.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is a most important matter of policy. There is much more in my heart and mind to say, but I shall reserve it for a later time. Again let me thank all those who have participated today. We are fulfilling our duty to search for ways to keep America strong, to conserve our resources and use them to the greatest effect in advancing our leadership for peace with justice in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

---

## UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID AND INVESTMENT IN THE UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

### A. THE CHALLENGE OF THE SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today there are extensive Soviet economic aid projects in 2 Middle Eastern countries—Egypt and Syria—and in 7 South Asian countries—India, Burma, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, Nepal, and Cambodia. The Soviets are helping to build a steel mill in India,

bridges in Egypt, a cement plant in Afghanistan, a sugar refinery in Ceylon, a tire factory in Indonesia and a hundred other projects designed to raise the living standards in these 9 underdeveloped areas. In the past 2½ years the Soviet Union has extended a total of $1.5 billions in credits for economic aid, half of which has been obligated and approximately 15 percent actually spent.

The Soviet Union is an Ivan-come-lately to the economic aid idea. The United States has engaged in substantial economic aid since the end of World War II, although it must be said that only a small fraction of our total aid program has been devoted to the economic and technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. The great bulk of the billions we spent before the Korean war was for postwar reconstruction in Europe. After the Korean war most of our aid was defense support, largely in Formosa, South Korea, and Indochina.

In my remarks this afternoon I am concerned only with foreign aid designed to increase the economic capacity of underdeveloped countries and thus raise their living standards.

If one were concerned only with raising living standards, the problem would be much simpler than it is. But economic aid has become a weapon in the global struggle between Communist tyranny and western democracy. All men of good will want to see the peoples of India, Egypt, and Indonesia have a decent living standard. We welcome any genuine efforts from any source to help to erase man's ancient enemies of poverty, disease and illiteracy. We would not object to aid from the Soviet bloc to underdeveloped areas if it were not for the unpleasant fact that her economic offensive is usually, if not always, followed by political penetration or subversion. We have seen this process take place within the past 2 years in both Egypt and Syria.

Consequently the new Soviet economic offensive which includes low-interest loans, technicians, and trade agreements must be viewed with alarm. It is entirely possible that this new program, which utilizes the resources of the entire Soviet bloc, may succeed in winning Asia for international communism. If this dire prospect should come to pass no superiority in missiles or atomic submarines could save us. In short, the Communist economic challenge to the security of the free world is every bit as real as the Soviet military challenge. To fail in either contest would be to invite failure in both.

The entry of Russia into the economic aid picture has had interesting repercussions in American domestic politics. Some of the earlier Republican foes of substantial economic aid, such as Vice President NIXON, are now beating the drums for it. President Eisenhower in his recent state of the Union message castigated aid opponents who call it a giveaway program, and asserted that we "cannot afford to have one of our most essential security programs shot down with a slogan." Secretary Dulles has repeatedly declared that we could lose the struggle with the Communists without a shot being fired.

We can be grateful for the new interest of the administration in economic aid. President Harry Truman saw the significance of aid to the underdeveloped areas 8 years ago, long before the Soviets got into the act. If it took a Soviet sputnik to make some people recognize the necessity for adequate defense, I suppose a dramatic Soviet economic offensive was needed for them to recognize the value of a program which we Democrats have supported all along.

B. OUR PRESENT AID AND INVESTMENT PROGRAM

During the last 2 years there has been in America an increased recognition of the importance of the economically underdeveloped and politically uncommitted nations of Asia and the Middle East. At least this is true among students of world affairs, some political leaders, and the administration itself. At the same time I believe it is correct to say that the popular support for foreign aid has been declining seriously. I will deal with the problem of popular support in a few minutes.

Many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have been among the staunchest supporters of the President's foreign aid program in the past. I find much to praise in the administration's present program and in its proposals for the forthcoming fiscal year.

Our Government today engages in three kinds of aid to underdeveloped areas—direct technical assistance, outright grants, and investment loans. I think each form of assistance has a proper role to play. Our own bilateral point 4 program involves some 700 American technicians. The United States is also providing 50 percent of the budget of $30 millions for the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance. Last December the UN General Assembly voted to enlarge its technical assistance program to $100 millions and our Government offered to double it present contribution, raising it to $30 millions. I am encouraged by this increasing interest in multilateral technical aid. This is not to say that our bilateral effort should be decreased or even maintained at its present modest level. I believe both approaches are necessary.

The new trend toward helping underdeveloped countries primarily by long-term, low-interest loans, rather than by direct grants, has been accelerated by the stepped-up Soviet economic offensive whose major instrument is also loans. The United States is a very active participant in various loans-for-economic-development programs, both bilateral and multilateral. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as of May 1957, had outstanding loans to 32 nations totaling slightly more than $1.3 billion. Approximately 70 percent of the capital for the bank has come from the United States.

Last year the administration asked Congress to establish a new development loan fund of $2 billion and requested an initial appropriation of $500 million and authorization for the second and third years of $750 million each year. Congress appropriated only $300 million for the first year and authorized a second appropriation of $625 million. This year the administration has decided to ask only for the $625 million already authorized.

On December 16, 1957, President Eisenhower announced at the Paris NATO meeting that he would ask Congress to add $2 billion to the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank, a United States loan agency whose loans make an important contribution to economic development abroad. During the past fiscal year the Export-Import Bank had its most active year in its 24-year history. It approved 182 loans totaling over $1 billion for 36 different countries, some of which were in the underdeveloped category.

Many exponents of development loans have recently criticized our Government for charging interest rates which could not compete with those of Soviet loans. Our rates in the past averaged about half that much. Therefore, I welcome the announcement from the International Cooperation Administration the other day that development fund loans from now on will normally bear an interest rate of 3½ percent. Interest rates on loans made to profitmaking enterprises, the announcement said, will generally be the same as those charged by the Export-Import Bank, which presently range between 5½ to 5¾ percent.

The administration announced earlier this month that it is prepared to lend India approximately $225 million "from the currently available resources of the United States Export-Import Bank and the development loan fund." Present plans call for the bank to supply $150 million and the loan fund $75 million. The State Department added that the United States was "considering, on an urgent basis, further measures to assist India in meeting its present grain shortage." Officials conceded that the unusual step of announcing a loan figure before there was any agreement on specific projects to be financed was prompted by the Soviet economic offensive in India and elsewhere. Credits extended to India by the Soviet Union total $257.8 million.

C. IS IT TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE?

The administration's aid program for underdeveloped areas deserves support. But does it go far enough? Does the American response measure up to the Soviet challenge? Perhaps our steps in the right direction are being taken on an escalator of history moving more rapidly in the opposing direction.

I support the administration's program, as far as it goes, but I believe we should launch a bolder and more dynamic program. If we can spend $40 billion for defense, and this is certainly necessary, we surely have the capacity to outmatch the Soviet economic offensive in Asia and the Middle East. It is strategically wise and morally right that we attempt to relate our wealth to the poverty of peoples in other lands and that we do this in a way that respects their right to chart a genuinely independent course in domestic and foreign policies.

If our aid program is not what it should be the blame must be shared by Congress and the administration. Both

branches of Government have been too timid and unimaginative. Our timidity and lack of courage is one of the main reasons for the general public's disenchantment with the foreign-aid program.

The other day Walter Lippmann said something which every lawmaker and every administrator would do well to ponder. He said that if you want public support for a Government program, make it big, bold, and imaginative—appeal to the public's sense of responsibility and willingness to sacrifice. In attempting to second guess the public, political leaders often sell them short. In a time of crisis the challenge is great and the opportunity is great. This is certainly true of foreign aid. I am convinced that the people back home, as we call them, will gladly support a dynamic and creative program which will serve not only the interests of the underdeveloped countries and of the United States but of international peace and security as well.

D. TOWARD A DYNAMIC AND RESPONSIBLE AID PROGRAM

As we enter into the foreign aid debate in the coming weeks, I would like to submit several ideas and proposals for consideration:

First. The United States Government should take the initiative in promoting the economic development of the uncommitted countries of Asia and the Middle East. Mr. Truman did this in 1949 when he launched his point 4 program. The point 4 idea captured the imagination of millions of people. But it was never given wings. We have responded at last, but only after the Soviet Union goaded us into action. Our lack of leadership was dramatically illustrated last December by the Asian-African People's Solidarity Conference in Cairo which gave the Soviet bloc, at least temporarily, a great propaganda, if not a political, advantage in many countries whose respect we covet. At this Conference the Soviet Union made further promises of economic aid and insisted that no political strings would be attached. We sat back chewing our fingernails while the Communists ran the show. "What we should have done," declared Senator HUMPHREY, "was to have sponsored such meetings ourselves at which we could discuss the mutual benefits to the underdeveloped countries and the West of a comprehensive-aid and development program."

Second. The United States must be prepared to think of foreign aid as a permanent element in its foreign policy. In order to sell foreign aid to Congress the administration in the past has been tempted to pretend that it was an emergency program of short duration. The American people thought of it as such, and were confused when the temporary emergency continued year after year. Both administrators and lawmakers need the candor and courage to tell the public that economic aid will be an essential, indeed vital, aspect of our international policy for the foreseeable future.

In a survey conducted by the Committee for Economic Development, a private American business research group, more than one-third of some 48 authorities in this country and abroad said the United States would have to face up to the problem of aiding underdeveloped countries for at least two more decades. The specialists who made this judgment came from many free-world nations and represented diverse economic and political viewpoints—Washington Post, Sunday, December 29, 1957, A1 and A15.

Third. All aid designed for economic development should be separated from military aid or defense support. Military aid is necessary and it must be justified on military and security grounds. Economic aid must be justified both economically and in terms of its contribution to the overall objectives of United States foreign policy. A number of independent studies made of our foreign-aid program last spring recommended that the requests and appropriations for these two types of assistance be separated. This the administration has not done. If the requests to Congress are separated, each program can more easily be considered on its own merits. Congress and the American public are not so immature that they need to have technical assistance hidden like a bitter pill in a spoonful of defense-support jelly.

Even more important is the international impact of having military and technical aid tied together. The recipients of our aid are proud people who recoil at the suggestion of political subordination in their relations with more powerful nations. They do not want aid with political or military strings attached. If one takes Soviet aid offers at face value, they often appear to be more attractive to India and Burma and other neutral countries than our offers. I am convinced that genuine efforts to stimulate economic development will pay off politically, even if there are no implicit or explicit political commitments made. What we want is not unwilling allies pushed prematurely into a military pact, but truly independent countries economically and politically strong enough to stave off Soviet penetration or any other undemocratic threat.

Fourth. Our aid program should be as free from waste and corruption as humanly possible. I have the impression that our program has in the main been efficiently and honestly run. But the recent report of the House Government Operations Committee, suggesting that billions of dollars worth of our aid has been wasted, is disquieting to say the least. It would appear that most of this waste was connected with the military aid program, rather than with technical assistance or development loans. The report charged that military aid was sometimes given for political reasons. Acknowledging that political considerations may be important, the report implied that there could be a more efficient expenditure of funds without denying any legitimate political factors in the country receiving aid—New York Times, January 17, 1958, page 2. Even a little waste or a little corruption is too much. It is wrong in itself and it stigmatizes a basically sound program with a bad name.

Fifth. In addition to Government loans provided through bilateral or multilateral channels, I believe we should do everything possible to attract more private American investment in underdeveloped areas. This will stimulate our economy and the economy in which investment is made and will encourage healthy trade between the two.

Sixth. Our Government must develop clear priorities in its aid program. America is very wealthy, but we do not have the resources to aid economic development in all countries which need it. Even if we should increase substantially our grants for direct technical aid and contributions to our development loan fund, we still have to turn down many worthy projects in different Asian and Middle Eastern countries. How shall we decide what projects and what countries to support and what to turn down? It seems to me that this answer must be made in the light of our overall foreign policy goals. One of these goals is to strengthen the free world against Soviet penetration and another is to help create an international climate conducive to the growth of democratic government. In many cases these two political goals of the United States mesh in with an economic-political desire of an uncommitted country for industrialization. It would seem, then, that those countries where we can pursue these complimentary goals should receive high priority rating in our program.

If this is true, I believe India merits our most careful attention. China has cast her lot with the Communist world. India is still independent and neutral, but I believe when the chips are down she will stand firmly with the democratic West, that is, if she can remain politically and economically strong enough to withstand Communist penetration. India is crucial in Asia. If India goes down, all Asia may go down. And if Asia is lost, the cause of freedom itself may be lost.

One final word. You may have gathered by this time that I believe in economic aid to the underdeveloped countries. I do indeed. But I want to make it clear that I do not look upon foreign aid as a panacea, a magic key to the solution of all our international problems. Aid is one vital element in our overall foreign policy. It is not a substitute for military assistance, defense alliances, missiles, or atomic submarines. Nor is it a substitute for diplomacy or our information program. If properly used, foreign aid can be a valuable supplement to all the other instruments of a sensitive and responsible foreign policy dedicated to our national security and to international peace.

---

## WORKS OF PEACE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that some of the most able Members of the Congress are devoting their finest energies to the cause of peace. It is, of course, necessary that we should be considering prob-

lems that relate to our material standard of living. But our chief responsibility in this hour is to work for the salvation of our civilization.

Humanity is in deadly peril and time is fast running out.

We have all been shocked by the launching of the Soviet earth satellite. But if we respond only by a frantic effort to build a bigger sputnik, we have missed what could well be our final challenge to save ourselves from destruction.

Given the current context of the cold war, we may find it necessary to accelerate our satellite and missile programs. No man, however, should delude himself with the notion that bigger and better sputniks will insure our survival. If history has any validity at all it literally thunders that the continuing competition for more advanced weapons can only insure that the science of killing will be executed on a grander scale. Since the day when men battled each other with clubs, the alternatives to peace have steadily become more frightful. The survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki know something of the awesome spectacle of modern man's inhumanity to man. But the techniques of death have gone so far beyond the A-bombs of 1945, that no one of us can grasp the catastrophic proportions of warfare today or tomorrow. We all know in our serious moments that the two greatest powers in the world are preparing for the type of war that neither side can possibly win. There can be no victors in any such war—only a few bewildered survivors wondering what happened to civilization just when it had unlocked the secrets to vast new potential blessings for humanity.

The devastating alternatives to peace today demand that we work for world peace with at least as much imagination and sense of urgency as we now bring to the preparation for war. We must literally wage totalitarian peace. We must be willing to examine and reexamine every phase of our foreign policy. There is a crying need for the kind of critical discussion of our foreign aid programs that my colleagues are engaged in this afternoon. We must be flexible, too, in exploring every possible approach to settling our many differences with the Soviet Government. Knowing that the eyes of the world are focused on us, we must make our policies and programs here at home square with the ideals that we most want the world to emulate abroad. We must, in short, utilize all the physical, mental, and spiritual resources at our command both at home and abroad to move the world toward peace rather than war.

Recently the entire world applauded President Eisenhower's eloquent words when he asserted that America's answer to Soviet total cold war must be the waging of total peace. Men everywhere cheered his proposal for works of peace. But one wonders if the President's subsequent request for a $40 billion arms budget is to be the substance of our total peace effort in this fiscal year. Where are the works of peace?

I believe that the American people are willing to make whatever sacrifice they are called upon to make for peace. The people will support the President and the Congress in an imaginative works for peace program. Americans have always been eager to share our material and spiritual substance with the world.

Unfortunately, in the post-World War II era, the image of America which the world has seen has not been very close to the American dream. With powerful social revolutions convulsing much of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, we have allowed ourselves to become identified with those who seek to freeze the status quo. To the restless millions of vast areas of the globe, the status quo means the strangling of their hopes for land reform, hospitals, schools, and national integrity.

What irony—that this Nation, born of revolution and dedicated to lifting the lot of the common man, should have been linked in the mind of the world with the same forces against which our own revolution was launched. The world is hungry for the spirit of Tom Paine, Jefferson, and Lincoln, but, somehow, we have held up instead the image of fortress America.

While on a brief study tour of parts of the Middle East last spring, I found more than one sensitive native who told me that American foreign policy seems to be based largely on our desire to arm other nations so that they can defend our military positions abroad. We have been willing, it seems, to prop up governments that ignore the basic needs of their own citizens, if only those governments gave some promise of meeting our short-range military and diplomatic objectives. These impressions are highlighted by the uncomfortable fact that more than 80 percent of our entire foreign assistance program is devoted to military items.

Chester Bowles, former Ambassador to India, has pointed out that our military aid program has, in some cases, heightened international tensions while hampering constructive social and economic developments. For example, in 1956 American arms shipments to Pakistan prompted India to take $100 million from her second 5-year plan for economic development and place it in military orders with the British and French.

Furthermore, such military alliances as the Baghdad Pact have provided little real military strength. Some of our most qualified observers believe that the Baghdad Pact nations, in spite of American arms, would offer little resistance to Soviet military aggression. It is more likely that the pact has provided an additional incentive to the Russians to accelerate their own efforts to build up military allies in the Middle East. I am convinced that the ensuing arms race between Russia and the United States as they seek to equip their respective allies, is adding considerably to the danger of a war to the death between the Arab States and the State of Israel.

Most of the people of the world are not looking primarily for military hardware. They are hungry, sick, or illiterate. They yearn for better and happier standards of life. It seems to me that any program of foreign assistance by the United States must be tested primarily on the question of how effectively it enables the people of the undeveloped areas to build up the kind of society where those better standards of life are possible.

The yearning for more food, better medical care and basic education will not be met by sputniks. It will not be satisfied regardless of how many cast-off guns and tanks we send in the name of "aid" to the trouble spots of the world.

Is not the hour at hand for us to offer something deeper and finer than guns and military pacts to the people of the Middle East, Asia, and Africa?

We have in this country the greatest food-producing system in the world. Why could we not propose a world food bank in cooperation with Russia and other nations to use some of our agricultural abundance in relieving world hunger and starvation. The Biblical sage has written: "Cast thy bread upon the waters for thou shalt find it after many days."

Humanity everywhere is afflicted with such diseases as cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, yaws and belharzia. Why not an international effort to wipe out these ancient curses through a greater pooling of medical knowledge, techniques and drugs?

All of us are concerned about the inadequacies of our educational program. Would not the schoolchildren of America and the world profit from a much broader exchange of teachers and students between the nations of the world?

These are just a few of the works of peace that we ought to be implementing with all possible speed.

They must be accompanied by renewed efforts to negotiate our differences with the Soviet Union. All programs for peace depend upon persistent and continuous negotiation efforts by the two great powers. Such efforts will be far more difficult than launching a rocket to the moon. They will not be brought to fruition by a hasty summit conference. But long-suffering, patient efforts to find areas of accommodation with the Soviets offer our only hope of survival. We will never accept basic Russian assumptions about the nature of life and they give no indication of embracing our philosophy of life. But we must learn to live and compete peacefully in this age of the satellite, or else this satellite on which both Russians and Americans live will be transformed into a hell where no man can exist.

---

## FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it has been a most useful occasion this early in the session to have a symposium discussion of foreign policy. It is often commented that the voice of the House on foreign policy matters is a very weak one. As I listened to the remarks this afternoon of colleagues on both sides of the aisle, it occurred to me that—borrowing a line from Julius Caesar—if we are indeed weak "The fault

lies in ourselves, and not our stars," because the House has the capacity to exercise a broad influence in foreign policy. One reason we have not done so is that we have been too reticent and we have not exhibited the quality of thinking that we can display when we address ourselves to a particular problem.

Indeed, I would like to invite our colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, whose special domain this is, to come and debate their problems with us. I think they are too reluctant in that regard. We like to hear from them when foreign-aid bills are on the floor, but also we would be delighted to have them lead us in serious debates at other times as well.

In the discussion of our differences on foreign policy, the comments of our colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] have been both constructive and timely, and I hope they will provoke much thought in our body. It does seem to me that we can, if we will only exert ourselves, exercise a much greater influence within the Congress and the country on these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I have just a few comments to make. I have been here only 3 years, but looking back over that short period it seems to me there have been some profound changes which have occurred foreign-policy-wise, and in the position our country occupies with regard to the rest of the world. Three years ago the common statement that we heard during defense debates was that our military forces were second to none. Although that still is our announced objective, we are quite willing to concede today that we are trying to catch up in certain fields, and the general estimate now is that we are very much nearer a military stalemate than we were 2 or 3 years ago.

Likewise it is plain that we have lost that military predominance which gave us a position of paramount strength in the past. There is the fact, too—as a result of development of the intercontinental ballistic missiles—that our country now is much more of a prime target than was the case a few years ago. And in the field of weaponry, absolute weapons are much more absolute today than they were 2 or 3 years ago.

These facts all have significance and bearing, it seems to me, on our position in the world today and the nature of our basic problems.

There is also the fact—and this has been pointed out—that in some respects time may be working against us instead of for us. Certainly a case can be made out that in the field of overall economic strength, and from the standpoint of the intellectual capacity of our country, we may be growing weaker when we compare our performance against that of the U. S. S. R.

Now, it seems to me, along with our discussion of the lag in the field of missiles we might profitably discuss whether there is a lag in adjusting our thinking to these new realities. In the long run that may be more important than regaining parity in the missile field.

It is my own opinion, that the people are probably ahead of Congress—and a fortiori they are ahead of Mr. Dulles—in adjusting their outlooks toward these new realities. I think the people have a more balanced and broader attitude toward the problem of peace than we find prevalent in Congress and in Washington. And I think that should give us pause.

When I hear spokesmen in Congress—or our military people—talking about winning a thermonuclear war, I wonder if they are not thinking still in terms of the last war. I recall a comment that someone made recently that if offered the choice he would rather have his country lose a conventional war than win a thermonuclear one. He explained that in the first instance he at least would be alive to endure the defeat, while in the other he would in all probability not have an opportunity to rejoice in the victory.

I also believe that we are bedeviled today by outmoded slogans and postures that may have been appropriate 3 or 4 years ago, but are quite inappropriate today. I have no harsh words today for Mr. Dulles, but I think that one of his troubles is that the slogans he promulgated a few years ago, the postures he took then, are now hopelessly out of date. I think that is the reason our allies seem to find him lagging in leadership capacity today.

Now, I am troubled, too, and wonder at times if we have grasped the primary challenge today to the Congress and the country. The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee issued a report a few days ago concerning our military weapons, and referred to the "race for survival" in the military field. It seems to me we are in danger of misappraising the world situation and, just as some people apparently have ignored some of the reports and warnings of the CIA in recent months, I think our peril is that we might fail to understand the kind of world we live in.

As the President's special message on education was delivered today, I wondered again about this particular problem, because unless I am mistaken the challenge to our society today and to the world is not primarily a military challenge—although none of us underestimate the importance of military matters—but it is a challenge to our total society and to our total capacity as a people. The truth is that the education program submitted by the administration is a retreat from the position taken last year. In 1957 the President did send up a general program of aid to education. The program presented today, however, is not only smaller moneywise, but it is a specialized program. I am disturbed by the fact that we do not have a national policy in the field of education, and that we are facing the challenge to intellectual achievement with peripheral programs and a peripheral response. This, when Dr. Teller and others have been saying to us that over the long haul, in the next 10 or 15 or 25 years, what we do in developing the minds and intellectual capacities of our people may be far more important in the "race for survival" than anything else we undertake.

I also sense in the programs the President has presented a lack of the Spartan note, or a call for sacrifices. We are pretty much going down the same road we have traveled before, with perhaps some extra effort. But if the real challenge, as some of our scientists are telling us, is in the field of intellectual achievement—and we have seen how the Russians used their satellites as an instrument of national policy—I say we had better start adjusting our thinking to the realities of 1958.

There is one other matter I would like to discuss. With all our talk about negotiating, if we are going to get ourselves in a frame of mind to negotiate we must make some adjustments in our basic attitudes. The truth of the matter is that any negotiation worthy of the name always involves give and take. Of course, our diplomats are fond of telling us that we must only negotiate from "positions of strength." As any lawyer knows, the other negotiator always wants the same tactical advantage. And the sad truth is that, if we wait to sit down until each side believes it occupies a position of strength, we may never sit down at all.

Therefore, it seems to me that we must adjust our basic frame of reference and basic attitudes if we expect to negotiate seriously in the months ahead.

I have no illusions about the chances of our sitting down today and working out any general master agreement of settlement with the U. S. S. R. Obviously, that is not feasible, nor is anyone proposing it in this discussion. Yet, in the past, some of our people have held the view that there was an irrepressible conflict, and that we could not live in the same world with these people and could not work out adjustments and accommodations with them. But do not the new realities now dictate that we adjust our thinking and change these attitudes? Because if, indeed, anyone believes there is an irreconcilable or an irrepressible conflict, I think he should advocate a preventive war as the obvious and logical next step.

It seems to me we can learn a good bit on this score from some of our neighbors. We had one a few months ago who won the Nobel prize. Let me read a statement from him. I refer, of course, to Mr. Lester Pearson, of Canada, and quote part of the speech he gave when he accepted the Nobel prize last fall:

> The stark and inescapable fact is that today we cannot defend our society by war since total war is total destruction, and if war is used as an instrument of policy eventually we will have total war. Therefore, the best defense of peace is not power, but the removal of the causes of war and international agreements which will put peace on a stronger foundation than the terror of destruction. * * * What is needed is a new and vigorous determination to use every technique of discussion and negotiation that may be available, or, more important, that can be made available, for the solution of the tangled, frightening problems that divide today, in fear and hostility, the two power blocs and thereby endanger peace. We must keep on trying to solve problems, one by one, stage by stage, if not on the basis of confidence and cooperation,

at least on that of mutual toleration and self-interest.

So what do we suggest? The burden of my remarks is not to pose specific solutions. I think my colleagues have adroitly done that. But we can agree, perhaps, that Mr. Dulles may be quite right in suggesting that the Russians are traveling the wrong road when they suggest that meaningful agreements might emerge from a summit conference. We might agree, too, that traditional methods of diplomacy—local agreements to ease local tensions—might offer more hope than a summit conference. Therefore, I think it is incumbent on each of us to help to mold public opinion so that reasonable compromises will be upheld.

We must realize that when we talk about a compromise we necessarily assume that it involves a quid pro quo. Therefore it is probably inevitable that the party that does not control the Executive will criticize what we give, and that the party in power will praise what we gain. But that is part and parcel of it. I think we should try in a mature way to see to it that the people of our country understand this whole process.

I wish to commend again the specific proposals put forward by my colleagues today. And I wish to commend those who have had the patience to sit through this discussion this afternoon and to participate in it. Personally, I believe that these are some of the House's finest moments.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman.

I of course concur not only in his remarks but in the ideas expressed so clearly and sincerely by the preceding speakers.

I should like to paraphrase what that great genius of a man by the name of Dr. Albert Einstein said, a genius who ushered the entire world through the door into the atomic age in which we now live; not just America or Russia but the whole world. This genius was so great in stature, so far beyond the comprehension of most of we ordinary mortals, that it should be the good fortune of each and every one of us merely to be able to say that we lived and walked on the face of the earth at the same time this giant of an intellect was with us. For they do not come once every 100 years or even every 200 years; but perhaps only once in every three or four hundred years. This phenomenal mind, this tremendous intellect, which helped unlock the doors through which passed the whole world into the atomic era, made, in effect, this statement before he passed away not long ago. He said, "Everything in the world has changed except our mode of thinking."

I should like to dwell on that thought for a moment or two and stress this one thing: First of all, before we can discuss this whole problem of defense, security, of how to get along in the world, we must understand what the atomic age is. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is not 1 out of let us say every 50,000 of our own citizens in America, the best informed, with the finest means of mass communication, of mechanized distribution of knowledge, that knows what the atomic age means. It means the release of a power of unbelievable magnitude. Yet something really understood by so few.

One thing that really gave me a jolt when I was home on a 12 weeks' speaking tour last fall was that in speaking not only to a whole variety of groups, but even to students in high schools, junior colleges, and universities I found out of several thousand students not one who could even guess closely at the magnitude of the destructive capability in a hydrogen bomb. I only dwell on this one single point because I cannot understand why so many know so little about something that has been talked about as much, has been publicized as much and written about as much, and even televised live on television as was the hydrogen bomb test explosion, and the gentleman from California now occupying the chair [Mr. HOLIFIELD] knows far more than any of us who have spoken here this afternoon about the capability of that awful weapon. Let me quickly give you these comparative facts. In World War II—and I operated for some months in heavy bombardment—the biggest bomb you were able to carry was the blockbuster. That came toward the latter part of the war. It weighed 10 tons. There were 10 tons of TNT. It took 1 big 4-engined plane to take it up in the air with 10 men in that airplane. There you had in one bomb 10 tons—of TNT. A few months later in August of 1945 came the first atom bomb, the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT—1 airplane, 4 engines, and 9 men in the crew—1 bomb. Now, you had in 1 plane 2,000 times the destructive force of the World War II bomb of a few months earlier. Then came the hydrogen bomb. This is what not only astounded me but appalled me—how very few people know or fully realize the fantastic power in one hydrogen bomb. The hydrogen bomb is roughly equal to fifteen and maybe twenty million tons of TNT. It is carried in 1 airplane by 3 men. Possibly, now it may be carried in a missile with no wings, no tail and no men—just the missile. Fifteen to twenty million tons of TNT is equal to several times all the TNT bombs dropped by all the combatants in World War II, friend and foe alike or, in other words, at the bombing rate which prevailed in World War II, if all the air forces of all the combatants, friend and foe alike—Germany, Italy, Japan, America, Britain, France, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa—were to bomb 1 city for 16 years, it would not quite do the damage that 1 blast in 1 searing three-millionths of a second would do. People do not seem to know that. Why do I emphasize that? Because the minute you understand this unbelievable, awesome power, and accept that as a fact; and then take a look at some of our concepts which before the atomic age had validity, you will now realize how many of these concepts are neither realistic nor applicable in this new era.

Now, suddenly many of our concepts no longer hold. If you think it is easy to give way to old concepts, let me remind you that the Greek philosopher, Aristotle, was one of the great minds of his time. He was a great creative, stimulating and provocative thinker. But when he wandered off into the field of science, he got a little bit lost because he engaged into the field of science not by experimentation but by what is called deductive reasoning. He would point to 2 stones on a table and say, "This stone weighs 2 pounds and the other stone weighs 1 pound. Now, anyone can see that because this 2-pound stone is twice as heavy as the other 1-pound stone, it will fall twice as fast or fall twice as far in the same length of time." That simple statement was accepted as scientific truth by all of the scholars, researchers, professors and learned writers for 1,000 years. Then came a young man named Galileo, climbing up the winding stairs in the Leaning Tower of Pisa, and probably yielding more to whim, but most likely also thinking somewhere along this line in the back of his mind, as they do in basic research, he began as many of us do when we lean over the ledge from the top of a high building or peer down a deep well or mine shaft to drop pebbles, note the silence and then hear the plunk as the pebble hits the ground or plunks into the water. He dropped a larger pebble, then a smaller pebble, and he discovered that they all took the same length of time to reach bottom, regardless of their weight. From then on, a new scientific fact was proven, and the old one, always completely false, but which had prevailed for 1,000 years, was disproven and discarded.

Now, what are some new concepts arising from man's fantastic capacity to destroy which he now has. The big one is that now no one can win a war. It is a fact. Our military leaders, our own President, the Russian leaders have said, in effect, "No one can win a war." This is a simple but startling statement, for never in the history of mankind has there been a time when no one could win a war. As a matter of fact, someone always won the war sooner or later. Winning wars never solved any long-term problems. It usually created more in the long run. Have an all-out war now, and you cannot tell the difference between the victor and the vanquished. There most likely cannot be a "Pearl Harbor." We may be destroyed and yet within hours later the would-be aggressor could also be destroyed from bases outside our continental borders. In this atomic age there can be no neutrals—I mean, being neutral no longer can guarantee them escape from dangerous, radioactive, poisonous fallout. There is no place to hide. You can go into the depths of the darkest jungle in Africa and even there every bit of protoplasm is subject to destruction from radioactive fallout. The gentleman in the chair [Mr. HOLIFIELD] knows that from information which he has made available repeatedly to the Congress and to the

American people, and he has performed a splendid service.

Today there can be no real defense, unless we burrow deep into the ground, and that at best would provide only partial protection for our people. More, bigger, and better missiles cannot give us any defense; it does, however, give us deterrence, which may be a sort of defense for a time, but in case of actual all-out war, the missiles give us offensive or destruction-inflicting capabilty but cannot defend or protect our own cities from also being destroyed by the enemy. So there is no real defense. We are, therefore, improving our offense, to give us deterrence. I agree we need deterrence as a temporary expedient to deter anyone who may have any notions of destroying us. All we can do is assure them that "we will destroy you if you destroy us." But such mutual deterrence will in itself give us no peace, not even peace of mind; nor does it give us any real security nor insure us against destruction. So while we must keep our deterrent capability at its greatest level of effectiveness, likewise must we realize that this is only a temporary holding action, to hold the line in the military arena of conflict in which we now find ourselves—but then our big challenge is to shift our long-range push into another arena—that of technical assistance, economic aid, and human relationships and understanding, as the only course which can give us hope to bring about relative stability in the troubled, unsettled, and even turbulent areas of the world, and from there to push on toward winning the peace. As I said earlier, wars have always been won by someone or other sooner or later in time; but never before has mankind been able to win the peace. Now, in the atomic age, man for the first time can no longer win a war; but out of this grave threat I see our greatest opportunity, for now man cannot only win the peace for the first time in the history of mankind, but I believe he will have to win the peace if for no other reason than it may be his only recourse to survival itself. I am rather hurriedly and perhaps in too general a manner trying to point out the need for a more realistic appraisal of things in a world now in which everything has changed except our mode of thinking.

We have heard much talk about the need for accelerating the training of more and better scientists. My special love in my student days was science, and I majored in mathematics and chemistry and physics, so I have a little notion of what goes into the making of a scientist.

It seems to me, however, that the most accelerated, the best motivated, and the most active people in our society are the scientists. It seems that the rest of us are the ones who should be accelerated, and I mean really accelerated, A: first to learn a little more about what is going on in the laboratories and the minds of the scientists; and B, to learn not so much about the atom itself as about man himself and human understandings and interrelationships.

How can those of us who live in a democracy harbor prejudice and hatred, build up hatred to the point where one person personally bludgeons a fellow American citizen with his bare hands, draws blood, and would bash his head in? What is the cause or the source of that violence? If you do not understand what makes it in our own communities, how then can we hope to expect to understand the enraged, frustrated, starving, unreasoning mobs that roam the Middle East and China. Scientists know a lot, it has been said, about what goes on in the heart of the atom, a lot more about that than most of us know about what goes on in the heart of a man which motivates the fierce passions and violent retaliations that peoples inflict upon each other.

Over the weekend the President announced that great strides had been made in controlling hydrogen power. There is no insurmountable problem to that; the scientists will lick that problem sooner or later; there is no trouble about controlling the hydrogen atom; the problem is how to control man.

My friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] mentioned John Foster Dulles. I have great admiration for the gentleman from Michigan.

I will have a great deal more to say on this subject at a future time, for today I have taken too much of the gentleman's time already, but let me say just this about war. There cannot be any victor; war is no answer. The only course we seem to be pursuing now is to prepare for war, a war in which there can be no victor but which can only be mutual suicide.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to speak for 10 additional minutes. I have the last special order, and I do not object.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to me during that 10 minutes?

Mr. UDALL. It is certainly my intention to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman from Texas and will conclude hastily. He has been most generous with his time. I say that 10 years from now, if we continue at our present rate of spending for arms, we can look back, see what we have spent in the last 10 years, yet we will have less defense, security, and more threat of war than we have now.

The answer is to align ourselves with the hopes and aspirations of the majority of that two-thirds of the world who live in a poverty too abject to describe. In many parts of the world the poverty we are talking about, and a number of us have seen it, in misery and wretchedness, goes beyond description. Scientists will tell you there are more people living in greater misery today than inhabited the earth 2,000 years ago.

In Paris in the last century we saw the great contradiction of stone walls being unable to protect against the needs and the outcries of an abused peasantry. The Bastille fell; and the modern weapons we are forging can no more protect us and save us from destruction than stone walls could save Marie Antoinette. Of all the nonsense when the President of the United States with the experience that President Eisenhower has had abroad, gets up and tells the people of his country, my country, your country, that we have to catch up to the Russians. Since when did the Russians set the criteria up to which we are to catch up, when all we have to do is to turn around and shift from the military area to the economic and to human relationships and say, "All right, Russia, you have done it scientifically. Congratulations. You invested heavily in that project and now you have it. We congratulate you. Now you do something for your people and when you have done that join us in helping two-thirds of the people of the world with deeds." Of course, we can take the lead.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generous time the gentleman from Arizona has allotted me.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for a most sobering and impressive contribution. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered if we might not do the cause of peace a great service if at some future time a hydrogen-bomb test were conducted in the presence of all members of the parliaments of the United Nations countries, and their ministers and executives who deal with human affairs and make international policies. I think under those circumstances perhaps we could get a better quality of negotiating and a more serious approach to the overriding problem of peace.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman. Like other Members of the House, I, too, have enjoyed the inspiring address of the gentleman from Minnesota. I am a little sorry he did not take it on his own time because I think it would be worthy of a separate special order. If he feels inclined to continue his remarks in the future and secures a special order, I will be glad to be here and discuss the merits of Mr. Dulles, our foreign policy, or anything else with him.

I would like to go back to the time when the gentleman from Arizona was speaking and call attention to one thing he said and which I know he would not want to have misinterpreted. That was the point at which he spoke about the necessity for a compromise, or for accommodation or give and take, and I think he even used the word "appeasement." He talked about a future summit conference. I am sure the gentleman from Arizona did not want his remarks to be taken in the sense that in almost any area of negotiation we might be inclined to give and to take, but that there are things like the right of the German people to have their own gov-

ernment, the right of the people of Eastern Europe to have self-government of their own choice, and things like that. I hope he will agree that there can and should be no compromise on issues like that.

Mr. UDALL. I had hoped that my remarks would not receive any broader construction than I intended. I simply expressed the general idea that in any general negotiation, if it has any meaning, unless it is a dictated negotiation, there is give and take. I do not think I used the term "appeasement" nor did I intend to inject it at all. There are certain things that, out of principle, you cannot yield upon; otherwise you may yield so much that the cause of peace itself will be lost.

Mr. BENTLEY. I wanted the gentleman to clarify it because I did not want his remarks to be subject to misinterpretation.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I feel that everybody must admit that the gentleman from Minnesota made a very fine statement and that probably he has come the very closest to what we are trying to aim at and to hope for through the things we have been saying. Half of the world's population today is uncommitted. They do need our help in economic assistance so they can rise above the misery that they now live in, because, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] said, there is no hope of victory. I was inspired and hopeful in one of the President's recent addresses—it was in his state of the Union address—when he threw the gantlet down to the Soviets and said "Let us get together and wipe malaria, heart disease, and cancer off the face of the earth." Four days later the tranquilizer wore off when the budget message came in and not 5 cents in it for malaria research and not 5 cents more in it for cancer and heart research than in last year's budget. And, if by some chance the Soviets accept that challenge and agree to work on it and, as the President said, go beyond that and work on other things, we are going to have to rush back in here with a supplemental appropriation in order to do the thing which the President has challenged the others to do. We have today seen a message go to the Congress on education—100 percent for science, mathematics, but nothing for the humanities. We could achieve technological superiority which is greater than anyone ever imagined, and still, if we do not have people educated to understand human beings, it would be an empty victory. Suppose, for instance, some Soviet biologist comes forward next month with a discovery in biology as startling as was the sputnik breakthrough. Would we then have a message asking us to educate 40,000 biologists in the next few years? We should educate the whole man. I agree as far as the President's education message goes, but it is not bold enough. It is not imaginative enough, and it is not comprehensive enough, because if we do not educate our people to understand other people, their hopes and their aspirations, then all of the scientists in the world cannot save us.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for the statement he made and just impose to make one remark. The gentleman from Arizona said that this might turn into a matter of our society versus theirs. The gentleman from Wisconsin earlier said that we will fight the Russians in trade and technology, probably not in war, and the gentleman from Minnesota, in his very eloquent speech, came along with about the same idea of "war is useless." I hope that these gentlemen are right. I thoroughly believe that, as for as this world is concerned, war must be a thing of the past. I hope the Russians believe the same way. I am only pleased that we have come so far in our society that we are able now to point to the time when responsible society can no longer accept the idea of a war; that we can point to the probabilty that the Russian nation, predatory though it be, now feels that it cannot win a war without itself being destroyed.

This is due to two things: First, our deterrent power, even though it has been oft maligned the last few weeks; and, second, the strong allies which our equally oft maligned diplomacy has given us. This is why our society may vie with theirs in leadership, moral and political, in production, and in providing the good things of life to our respective citizenry. We are glad for this state of affairs. In a true struggle such as this, free men will always win.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentlemen from Arizona and Minnesota for their absorbing remarks. I agree implicitly that there is no alternative for peace in the world today. The vast amounts of money which we and other nations are devoting to devising ever-ghastlier means of destroying humankind at best serve only to create a deterrent—a deterrent based upon the fear which all of us share of setting off the total annihilation which is now at our disposal.

This is the avenue to neither peace nor security. Yet, lacking an affirmative policy for true peace and security, it is all that we have.

Mr. Speaker, the impact which recent Soviet technological achievements have had on the American scene continues to be beyond calculation. We are still caught in a backwash of confused reaction with everyone agreed that we must marshal our forces. But we still have no discernible direction or national policy to guide us.

This, of course, is the price of complacency. Instead of being given factual information upon which public opinion depends, the American people have instead been spoon-fed an assortment of half-truths and distortions, the soothing syrup upon which false hopes are based.

It has often been said that we can lose the cold war without the firing of a shot, and I can think of no greater contributing factor to such a fate than the deliberate and willful withholding of information from a free people.

In the state of the Union message we were told by our President that "we are probably somewhat behind the Soviets in some areas of long-range ballistic development." But the secret Gaither report, the Rockefeller report, and the sworn testimony of many witnesses before Congressional committees indicates that there is no "probably" about it—and that the fact of Soviet superiority goes even beyond long-range ballistic missiles. Unless we understand this fact, we simply will not be able to grasp implications which are every bit as important and are already beginning to cast their ugly shadows.

We must anticipate, as has been suggested earlier, that the phenomenal scientific and technological advances which the Soviets have made will be used as a backdrop for tremendously increased economic and political warfare by the Russians outside of the Communist orbit.

Those who think that sputnik can be answered merely by an increase in our defense expenditures by $2 billion or $3 billion are guilty of the most dangerous kind of delusion. It takes no great insight to know that one of the main objectives of the Soviet Union is the establishment of close economic and political ties with non-Communist countries, particularly the underdeveloped countries which today hold a balance of world power.

What I am saying is, of course, that the job of protecting our national security goes much further than the successful development of modern weapons. It requires a readiness on the part of free people to do battle in the political field, the economic field, and even the cultural field—wherever the shadow of imperialistic communism threatens free people. And for lasting security, it requires at the same time a genuine and realistic effort to work toward effective disarmament and peaceful solutions to the global problems which confront us.

I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that our country has the inherent strength to tackle this job successfully. But this strength cannot be dissipated as it has so dangerously been in the past by denying the American people full access to accurate information concerning their national and international affairs. There has never been a time when accurate information has been more essential to the preservation of our democracy.

The attitude of the present administration, I regret to say, fails to recognize the importance of this fact. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a real question as to whether or not our top administration officials are themselves well informed.

I call attention to the front-page story which appeared in the Washington Post

last Thursday over the byline of a reliable staff reporter, Warren Unna. Mr. Unna reported that—

President Eisenhower has ordered the Central Intelligence Agency to append maps and red arrows to its daily digests if CIA expects them to be read.

According to Mr. Unna's sources, CIA Director Allen W. Dulles complained to the President that there was little use of having a large Government Intelligence Agency, devoting its full energies to appraising foreign intelligence, if policymakers within the administration were ignorant of its findings.

The President is said to have complained that the reports were "far too ponderous to read"; and that there should be headline summaries and briefer text discussions with red arrows and maps appended to make the reading matter more palatable.

The President is reported to have assured Dulles that when these steps were taken, orders will be given for the administration's top 25 or 30 policymakers to read the daily intelligence reports on a regular basis.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first of such reports. All of us have heard about Allen Dulles' statement before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last November to the effect that Russian advances in missiles and satellites had long been predicted in CIA's daily intelligence summaries.

While it is true that Press Secretary Hagerty has denied much of what Mr. Unna reported in his story, the fact remains that there is little indication of awareness on the part of our top administration officials. What we do know for certain is that Congress has not been given benefit of information available to these officials through our complex information-gathering and intelligence sources.

It hardly need be said, Mr. Speaker, that such information is absolutely necessary and fundamental to timely enactment of legislation which is responsive to the demands of our Nation's progress and security.

Two years ago, for example, I introduced a bill calling for establishment of a national scholarship program for college students pursuing scientific and educational careers. This bill received an adverse report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and, therefore, no hearings were scheduled. Today, of course, the administration is beating its chest for just such a program. Why is it that administration leaders, until only a few months ago, consistently opposed such legislation? Going one step further, why did the President or his immediate deputies not advise Congressional leaders of the urgent need of undertaking the program which we today recognize as being necessary for our national survival?

Is the explanation—as suggested by Mr. Unna—that top administration officals simply found CIA reports too dry or too long to wade through—and were therefore unaware of the situation which we today view with such alarm? The only other explanation is that top administration officials knew the facts but deliberately withheld them from Congress and the American people.

Whichever the reason, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that there has been a serious failure of Executive responsibility.

It is impossible to imagine a more complete breakdown then the one which has withheld critically important CIA information from the Congress of the United States.

One question which we must answer is whether the legislative branch must continue to depend upon the goodwill and confidence of the executive branch as a prerequisite to obtaining CIA information. This situation has already led us beyond the point of absurdity. It is for this reason that I again suggest the necessity of establishing a joint House–Senate Committee on Foreign Intelligence. I hope that I can look for the support of my colleagues here today on legislation which I shall introduce later in the week to achieve this purpose.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to again commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the positive contributions they have made toward a better understanding of the position of our country today. In the candor of today's discussions rests the hope of tomorrow's solutions.

## A BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE ANTITRUST LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 20, 1958, the Supreme Court of the United States in a decision involving cases which had been brought by small-business men against the nationwide big businesses operated by the Carnation Co. and Safeway Stores, Inc., by a vote of 5 to 4, held that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act cannot be used by small-business men as a basis for proceedings against the big businesses who discriminate in price to the destruction of small and independent business enterprises.

The effect of that decision is to limit the use of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act to criminal cases instituted by the Government.

Section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act provides:

It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to be a party to, or assist in, any transaction of sale, or contract to sell, which discriminates to his knowledge against competitors of the purchaser, in that, any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge is granted to the purchaser over and above any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge available at the time of such transaction to said competitors in respect of a sale of goods of like grade, quality, and quantity; to sell, or contract to sell, goods in any part of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by said person elsewhere in the United States for the purpose of destroying competition, or eliminating a competitor in such part of the United States; or, to sell, or contract to sell, goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisonment not more than 1 year, or both.

In the cases which were decided by the Supreme Court last Monday, small business concerns: namely, the Nashville Milk Co. and Vance, had proceeded against Carnation Co. and Safeway Stores, Inc., on the charge that the latter had discriminated in price and in that connection had made sales at unreasonably low prices for the purposes of destroying competition.

While the decision of the Supreme Court in the Carnation Co. and Safeway Stores, Inc., cases affected only section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, nevertheless small business concerns will be affected seriously and adversely by the decision. It is now clear that small businessmen will not be permitted to proceed under section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act in the future in an effort to protect themselves from the devastating effects of monopolistic price discriminations such as are made unlawful only by the terms of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The ruling of the Supreme Court means that under the existing law small and independent business concerns will not be permitted to use section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act in procedings against unlawful selling at unreasonably low prices even though such practices result in the creation of monopolies. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1958, I introduced a bill, H. R. 10243, which would remedy that situation. It would amend section 1 of the Clayton Antitrust Act so as to provide that the term "antitrust laws" as used therein would be taken to include section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. In that way monopolistic discriminations in price and other similar unlawful restrictions and monopolies prohibited by section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act would be placed in the same status as other monopolistic practices now prohibited by the Sherman Antitrust and the Clayton Antitrust Acts. The provisions of the bill are as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the first paragraph of the first section of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (15 U. S. C. 12), is amended by inserting immediately before "and also this act" the following: "section 3 of the act entitled 'An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes,' approved June 19, 1936."

The bill I have introduced provides for nothing more than what many understood the Robinson-Patman Act provided for when it was overwhelmingly passed by the Congress in 1936. For example, our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], now the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, stated his agreement with that view. In a discussion of that section on the floor

of the House, the following exchange of remarks took place:

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. If a vendor is found guilty of discrimination as provided in this bill, is he subject to the aggrieved party for damages or has he committed a crime and subjected himself to penalty?

Mr. CELLER. If he violates the Borah-Van Nuys provision or the other provision of the bill he is subject to penalties of a criminal nature and has committed an offense.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Would he also be liable for triple damages?

Mr. CELLER. And he would also have to respond in triple damages under the provisions of the Clayton Act. Anyone aggrieved can sue. (80 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9420.)

As noted, section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act was an amendment authored by Senators Borah and Van Nuys. Therefore, I personally did not take the position that they intended their amendment to apply as an amendment to the Clayton Act. However, I made it clear on more than one occasion that the definition of antitrust laws as set forth in section 1 of the Clayton Act should be amended so that there would be no question about section 3 being thus embraced as a part of the antitrust laws.

The ruling of the Supreme Court last Monday in the Carnation Company and Safeway Stores, Inc., cases makes it imperative that we act without delay to accomplish what I have so often heretofore recommended. We must act to save from destruction thousands of small and independent businessmen. Big business is now free to discriminate by selling at unreasonably low prices in some sections of the country while holding their prices high in other areas. In doing that, they destroy the little fellows and create monopolies to the detriment of consumers.

Mr. Speaker, we are now receiving complaints from small-business men. The complaints are coming in from Texas, Kansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Illinois, and many other States, to the effect that large nationwide distributors of milk are engaging in the practice of price discrimination to eliminate their small, local independent competitors. Recently, your House Small Business Committee held a hearing in Dallas, Tex., and heard testimony from small-business representatives that large nationwide distributors were discriminating in price. In that connection it was shown they had just been selling milk in Dallas at prices as much as 18 cents per gallon below cost while holding the price high in other areas. It was alleged that such discriminations were being practiced to eliminate small-business concerns who had undertaken to sell milk to consumers in Dallas at nondiscriminatory prices lower than the prices which had been charged consumers in the area by the large nationwide distributors. It was alleged that such discriminations were being practiced to eliminate the small distributors and that the large nationwide distributors would then proceed to charge the consumers in Dallas a high noncompetitive and monopolistic price for milk.

The hearings were held in Dallas on December 30 and 31, 1957. Since that date, we have received numerous complaints from other small-business concerns about similar practices involving some of the same large nationwide distributors in milk. One of the complaints we have is to the effect that in one important area the nationwide distributors had cut the price of milk to 14 cents per half gallon. In that area, the farmers who produce the milk cannot afford to sell it for less than about 45 cents per gallon. Thus, the small distributors are complaining that under the pressures of those monopolistic practices, they are going broke and will be compelled to quit business.

This matter is urgent. It demands serious and immediate consideration. The law must not be left as it is at present providing that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act can be used only in criminal cases prosecuted by the Department of Justice.

It is common knowledge that the Department of Justice has not enforced and has no intention to enforce section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act as a criminal law against predatory pricing practices.

In 1954 the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws made a report in which it was acknowledged that:

Although Congress authorized the Department of Justice and local United States attorneys to enforce section 3, public enforcement organs have largely forsaken this law. * * *

The Government's reluctance to enforce section 3 has relegated its enforcement to private treble damage litigants.

Mr. Speaker, thus it is shown that section 3, on the one hand, stands unenforced by the only Government agency with authority to enforce it and, on the other hand, has now been made otherwise unenforcible. Even those victimized as a result of its violations are denied the right to proceed under it.

Small-business men throughout the country are looking to us now to help them on this matter. H. R. 10243 provides a means to help remedy this situation. I earnestly urge that it be taken up, considered, and passed without delay.

---

## RAISING THE PRIVATE DEBT LIMIT—THE BANKERS' PLAN VERSUS THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there seems no longer any doubt that the Federal Reserve Board is about to reduce reserve requirements of member banks. The signs are clear. A longtime observer of the banking trade can read these signs as clearly as the old-fashioned seaman can read the signs that a storm is blowing up at sea.

The only questions remaining open are the exact timing when the Federal Reserve Board will act and, what is of more interest in financial circles, the exact amount of new money which the Board will allow the private commercial banks to create.

The Wall Street Journal of last Tuesday carries a feature article by one of its staff reporters, Mr. John A. Grimes, which gives a very clear account, and I think an accurate account, of the way this matter is shaping up. Mr. Grimes said:

The Board already has decided, informally if not by actual vote, to free more funds for lending. Right now, officials are working on a precise formula for lowering reserve requirements at banks in different-sized cities.

While the exact timing of the forthcoming move can't be pinpointed, officials say it can be expected within the next few months. It could come much sooner if the Board agrees quickly on a specific plan.

As to the timing when the Federal Reserve Board can act, of course, no one can say with certainty. Mr. Grimes has said that it is expected, though not certain, that the drop in reserve requirements will be timed to coincide with an offering of securities by the Treasury. And he adds:

The Treasury offering would give the banks an at-least-temporary outlet for their suddenly inflated supply of credit. Later, if the hoped-for rise in business loan demand materialized, the banks could sell Treasury securities to raise funds.

I fully agree that all of the signs are adding up to a substantial reduction in reserves to be made on or about the time when the Treasury offers new securities under the increased debt limit. Last week when we debated the debt increase bill, some of the Members objected to a suggestion I made for having the Federal Reserve System buy the new securities, and they objected for the reason, they said, that this would require the Federal Reserve System to create $5 billion of new money which, my friends pointed out, would be inflationary. I tried to point out at that time that the alternative to my suggestion would be that the Federal Reserve Board would allow the private commercial banks to create new money with which to buy the bonds, and, furthermore, the Board would most probably allow the banks to create a great deal more new money than it actually needed to buy $5 billion worth of securities. In either case, furthermore, whether the Federal Reserve Board created the new money, or the private banks create the new money, the money will be created on the credit of the Nation. The principle is exactly the same and the mathematics are exactly the same. The only differences are, first, selling the new securities directly to the Federal Reserve System would have saved the Government $163 million a year in interest charges; and second, the Federal Reserve Board will allow the private banks to create a much larger amount of new money than the Board would have created in buying the new securities.

### BANKERS' LOBBY

The reason for allowing the banks to create more money than is needed to buy the new securities is that this will be merely one step in a long-term program to bring about a new standard, and a new low in reserve requirements. The bankers' lobby has been pushing this program and become more and more demanding. It has been working on all fronts, exerting its influence through all the channels of public opinion, and,

of course, the bankers usually get these days whatever they go after.

My best guess is that the amount of reserves which the Federal Reserve Board will free in its next announcement, will be in the neighborhood of $1.2 billion. This will allow the private commercial banks to create up to $7.2 billion of new money.

My estimate is based, first, on the expectation that reserves of the central city reserve banks—that is the banks of New York and Chicago—will be cut from the present 20 percent of demand deposits down to a level of 18 percent of demand deposits. According to Mr. Grimes' report in the Wall Street Journal, these benefits for the New York and Chicago banks appear already to have been decided upon, and the holdup now is that the Board has not quite decided on the benefits for the reserve city banks and the country banks. My own guess is that the Board will ultimately decide that it would not look right to reduce reserves of the New York and Chicago banks without making some reduction for the other banks, and thus it will probably reduce the other banks by 1 percentage point.

Required reserves are the percentage of a bank's deposits which it must keep in reserve, to meet possible depositors' demands for their money. Most of the deposits are, of course, demand deposits and the principal agitation is directed at reductions of required reserves on demand deposits. At present, required reserves at the New York and Chicago banks are 20 percent of demand deposits; required reserves at reserve city banks are 18 percent of demand deposits; and required reserves at country banks are 12 percent of demand deposits. Required reserves against time deposits are 5 percent at all banks.

The fact that required reserves are higher at the reserve city banks than at country banks, and even higher at the central city banks, is traditional and for sound reasons. One of the reasons has to do with the fact that country banks habitually redeposit a large proportion of their deposits with the reserve city banks, and the reserve city banks in turn redeposit a large portion of their deposits with the central reserve city banks. Different percentages of required reserves for the three classes of banks are provided for in the statute, which specifies both the maximum and the minimum required reserves which the Federal Reserve Board may set for each class of bank.

THE BANKERS' $63 BILLION PROGRAM

The American Bankers Association has in operation a plan for reducing required reserves at all banks to 10 percent of demand deposits and to 2 percent of time deposits. The plan calls for reductions in successive stages, but to achieve the ultimate goal of 10 percent for demand deposits and 2 percent for time deposits within 5 years. The plan is fully set out in the February 1957 issue of Banking, which is, of course, the official journal of the American Bankers Association. The plan was drawn up by the ABA's economic policy commission. The nub of the plan is set out in summary form in the issue of Banking I mentioned as follows:

What the commission's study proposes:

Reduce reserve requirements to 10 percent for demand deposits and 2 percent for time deposits.

Make these requirements uniform for all Federal Reserve member banks.

Include vault cash as part of legal reserves.

Give the Reserve Board discretionary authority to raise the reserve percentage for demand deposits to 12 percent or to lower it to 8 percent.

Set a tentative target date of 5 years for the accomplishment of these changes, with provision that the Federal Reserve Board have full authority to extend the target date by a year at a time if in its judgment such extension proves desirable.

To achieve the ultimate objective of this plan will, I might point out, require new legislation. New legislation will be necessary because the percentages of reserve requirements which the ABA expects to achieve are considerably below the minimums specified in the law, in several instances.

MONEY CREATED ON CREDIT OF THE NATION

But I believe the Members may be interested in these reductions in reserve requirements, even before they reach the level where new legislation will be required. The point is that when the Federal Reserve Board takes an action which allows the private commercial banks to create new money, it is, in effect, Congress that is acting to create the new money. Or to state the matter more precisely, when the private commercial banks of the country create new money, they are creating this money on the credit of the Nation and they are using a delegation of power which is assigned and reserved to Congress by the Constitution. The Constitution states that Congress shall have the power to issue money and to regulate the value thereof.

FOR CENTRAL RESERVE CITY BANKS

The greatest amount of steam is now behind a reduction in reserve requirements for the New York and Chicago banks, a reduction from 20 percent to 18 percent of demand deposits. To cite an example, there is a report in this month's issue of Banking that one of the committees of the New York Chamber of Commerce—the quite influential committee on finance and currency—recently passed a resolutiton calling for this reduction. This resolution proclaims that, and I quote, "such a move would create credit resources for the communities served by the central reserve city bank"; then the resolution estimates, correctly, that the proposed reduction will free "some $500 million" of bank reserves as a base for loans in two cities, Chicago and New York City.

Let me invite the Members' attention, for a few moments, to the ways in which money is created, and to what this one-half billion dollars of reserves which the bankers expect to "free" will mean to the banking communities.

FRACTIONAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The System has a variety of ways for putting new money into the banking system. The most important way, in practice, is by purchasing Government securities, through its open market account. Then there are several minor ways by which the System puts new money into the private banks, such as through loans to its member banks. But a major portion of the money in existence at any one time is created by the private commercial banks. This comes about as a result of the fractional reserve system under which the commercial banks operate.

The justification for the fractional reserve system, according to the theory, is that the supply of money automatically increases or decreases with the demand for money. Within broad limits the banks may increase the money supply, so long as acceptable creditors are willing to borrow at the rates being charged.

In actual practice, furthermore, such a multiplication of deposits, to about the full maximum, has been the case over the past few years. In other words, the banks have had little or no free reserves—reserves against which further loans could be made—in this period.

In reality, 3 different classes of banks have different minimum reserve requirements. For very good reasons having to do with the way country banks deposit funds with Reserve city banks, and Reserve city banks deposit funds, in turn, with the so-called central Reserve city banks, Reserve city banks are required to maintain a higher percentage of reserves than country banks, and central Reserve city banks are required to maintain a higher percentage than Reserve city banks. No class of bank has a requirement of exactly 16 percent. Giving due weight to where the deposits are, however, the average works out to 16 percent.

The proposal which is being pushed at the moment is, as I have indicated, to reduce reserve requirements only for the banks in New York and Chicago. These are, of course, the biggest and most powerful banks, run by the smartest and most influential bankers. But the present proposal is only one step in the American Bankers Association long-run campaign to keep reducing all reserve requirements—with an ultimate objective of 10 percent.

BANKS FREE USE OF $63 BILLION MORE MONEY

Recently I wrote Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board and asked him what reducing required reserves to 10 percent would mean in terms of expansion of bank-created money. Using bank deposits as of October 1957 as a basis for his computation, Chairman Martin replied, on November 22, as follows:

If required reserves against demand deposits were reduced to 10 percent, the amount of required reserves so released ($6,345 million) would permit at that level of required reserves a potential increase in loans and investments of member banks of up to 10 times that amount, or $63 billion. At the end of September 1957, loans and investments of member banks totaled $139 billion.

In other words, when required reserves are reduced to below 16 percent, the banks may then create money at a ratio greater than $6 to each $1 of reserves freed for lending. At the required reserve rate of 10 percent, the potential increase in bank loans and in-

vestments is 10 to 1. So, if and when the bankers' lobby achieves its goal, the banks may create another $63 billion on which they will collect interest rates and loan fees.

Now we come to the question of how the Federal Reserve System might meet this problem.

The private commercial banks are not, of course, the sole creators of money. The Federal Reserve System also creates money; and it has a variety of ways of regulating and limiting the amount of money which the private banks may create. In practice the most usual and the most important way by which the Federal Reserve System adds to, or subtracts from, the money supply, is through the operations of its Open Market Committee in New York. When the Open Market Committe buys securities of the Federal Government from the banks, it creates money and adds to the credit supply in the commercial banks. Conversely, when it sells Government securities, it contracts the money supply. The Open Market Committee does not, incidentally, buy or sell Government securities in direct trades with its member banks; it buys and sells to a selected group of big securities brokers who, in turn, buy or sell the securities to the member banks. But the result is the same, insofar as they affect the money supply. When the Open Market Committee buys Government securities, the banks then have an increase in deposits, which they may pyramid into larger amounts of loans—at the present rate of 6 to 1.

HIGH-POWERED DOLLARS

So, whether the Federal Reserve System frees bank reserves by lowering reserve requirements or by buying Government securities, the effect on the money supply is the same. The reserves freed by either method constitute what are called high-powered dollars for the reason that the banks are free to multiply and proliferate these dollars.

BANKERS WANT TO CREATE MONEY AND KEEP THE GOVERNMENT SECURITIES, TOO

There is, however, an important difference between the two methods of adding to the money supply, insofar as the private bankers are concerned. If the Federal Reserve purchases Government securities to make available to the banks a given amount of reserves, then the banks may lend these reserves at a rate of about 6 to 1. But when the Federal Reserve System "frees" the same amount of reserves by lowering reserve requirements, this means that the banks can do the same thing, and, in addition, keep the Government securities and collect the interest on these securities as well. In other words, a given increase in the money supply means a great deal more to the bankers if the latter method is used, because the bankers collect more interest as a result of this method, and, of course, the taxpayers lose the difference.

Now we might consider one other way which the Federal Reserve System has for controlling the amount of money in the banking system, after which we can appraise the present posture of the system and see what it is likely to do.

FEDERAL RESERVE SUGGESTS INTEREST RATES

The Federal Reserve Board can, within limits, regulate the extent to which a given amount of reserves are multiplied and proliferated by the commercial banks, by suggesting to the banks the level of interest rates which the bankers should charge on their loans. As I have already indicated, the supply of money in the private banking system is determined, within limits, by the demand for money. Thus, high-interest rates tend to choke off the demand for money, and when creditors do not borrow, the supply of money does not increase.

The Federal Reserve Board suggests to its member banks changes in the interest rates, by announcing changes in the Federal Reserve "discount" rate. The discount rate is, of course, the rate which the Federal Reserve banks charge member banks on their direct borrowing from the Federal Reserve banks. In theory, of course, Federal Reserve direct lending to its member banks is another way by which the System may add to or subtract from the money supply. But in practice the volume of such direct lending which the Federal Reserve banks do at any one time is without respect to the System's current monetary policies, or its current objective to increase or decrease the money supply. Furthermore, the Federal Reserve credit made available in this way is relatively small. For example, at the end of October 1957, only $710 million of Federal Reserve credit was outstanding through direct loans or discounts to member banks. This compared with $23.2 billion of Federal Reserve credit outstanding through holdings of United States Government securities and more than a billion dollars outstanding through what is called Federal Reserve float. The $170 million of Federal Reserve discounts and advances may also be compared to an approximate $139 billion of member bank loans and investments outstanding as of the end of October.

Nevertheless, the Federal Reserve discount rate is a matter of considerable importance, because, in practice, this rate is a kind of a signal which indicates to the member banks what the Federal Reserve's general policy currently is, in making credit available through operations of the Open Market Committee. When the Federal Reserve System raises the discount rate, this is a signal to the private banks that the System is going to follow, for some unspecified period to come, a policy of credit tightness. The banks can take this to mean that the System is going to go slow and resist adding to the money supply either by purchasing Government securities, or by lowering reserve requirements. It is thus a signal to the private banks that, with the demand for credit running heavy, they may safely raise their interest rates to their borrowers.

Over the last several years the Federal Reserve System has been through several cycles, first of tightening credit and loosening credit again. In this it has shown a tendency to raise interest rates at times when it wished to tighten credit, and to lower reserve requirements—to the special benefit of the banks—whenever it wished to loosen credit. Since the beginning of 1953, reserve requirements have been changed only downward, never upward.

Thus, in July of 1953, after its credit tightening began to be reflected in a business slump, the Board lowered reserve requirements. It lowered requirements for the New York and Chicago banks 2 percentage points, and lowered requirements for the reserve city banks and country banks each by 1 percentage point. Then in June of 1954, with business recovery still lagging, the Board lowered requirements for the New York and Chicago banks by another percentage point. And in the following month, July 1954, the Board made another reduction of 1 percentage point for all classes of banks.

In its prolonged program of tightening credit, beginning in 1955 and running through November of last year, the Board did not, however, raise reserve requirements again. Rather, it made 7 successive increases in the discount rate, as a result of which this rate was increased from 1½ to 3½ percent. Then, on November 15 of last year, after the business slump was getting out of hand, the Board gave a signal that it was going to ease credit. It announced a reduction in the discount rate from 3½ percent down to 3 percent. This is the signal to bankers that the System is about to take some other action to implement its change in policy. As yet, however, the System has done little if anything to bring on an actual easing of credit. The question now is, What will it do—which method will it use? Will it buy Government securities to increase the money supply, and thus save the Federal Government interest on those securities? Or will it again lower reserve requirements so as to allow the banks to create the money and keep the Government securities, too?

It would be nice, of course, if the Federal Reserve System would allow private banks to create $3 billions more money in the way which gives the banks the most profits—assuming, of course, that the bankers need an additional subsidy from the taxpayers. But a great deal more is involved than a question of giving the bankers a further subsidy. Lower reserve requirements involve a huge gamble with our whole economic system. Just as a given amount of reserves snowballs to increase the money supply when the level of business is going up, so too, when temporary setbacks occur in our economy, the effect of the fractional reserve system is to snowball and multiply the difficulties. This system has in the past brought on panics and triggered depressions. I am not opposed to the fractional reserve system; it serves our economy well. What I am calling the Members' attention to, however, is a matter of degree. The point is that the further reserve requirements are reduced the greater, also, is the weakening of the safeguards against the banking system triggering a general recession.

We hear a great deal these days about the so-called automatic stabilizers in our economy which were enacted in the

New Deal years. Among these "stabilizers," of course, are unemployment insurance and Federal deposit insurance. But all of the stabilizers taken together do not make our country depression-proof. Indeed, the safeguards set up for the banking system are extremely weak. FDIC reserves, in truth, amount to only $1.44 for each $100 of deposits in the insured banks. Such reserves are adequate to cover isolated bank failures; but they obviously could not cope with the difficulties which are likely to arise in a general recession. More than that, the ratio of the bankers' own money now in the banking system is well below the 10 percent which has been traditionally regarded as the minimum for safety.

In short, the proposal to make a further reduction in required bank reserves is, as I see it, a proposal to play Russian roulette with our whole economy. I am opposed to it.

---

## TRINITY RIVER PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I testified before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of the proposal to develop Trinity River power by a partnership between the Federal Government and private enterprise. I should like to repeat my testimony today.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, recently I introduced H. R. 10005, to authorize the partnership approach to the power aspects of the Trinity River project in California. My bill is identical with H. R. 6997 and H. R. 7407 which were introduced last year by my colleagues from California, HUBERT SCUDDER and JAMES UTT.

On previous occasions I have made it quite clear that I favor joint development of Trinity power facilities, but since I am also the author of legislation to authorize the San Luis project which would provide supplemental water supply for the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, and my own district, I want to make it very plain that I am convinced that partnership on Trinity will actually be a decided boon to the San Luis project.

The act which authorized the Trinity River project (Public Law 386, 84th Cong., 1st sess.) specifically makes it an integral part of the Central Valley project. It is important that this fact be borne in mind.

Congress, in its wisdom when it authorized the Central Valley project (Public Law 392, 75th Cong., and Public Law 868, 76th Cong.), specifically provided that the Central Valley project was to be "for the purposes of improving navigation, regulating the flow of the San Joaquin River and the Sacramento River, controlling floods, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof, for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands and lands of Indian reservations, and other beneficial uses, and for the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings and in order to permit the full utilization of the works constructed to accomplish the aforesaid purposes."

In other words the legislation specifically provided that revenues from power of the Central Valley project were to be used to financially aid and assist the water features.

As this committee well knows, the law which authorized the Trinity River project and made it a part of the Central Valley project, has this provision:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to continue to a conclusion the engineering studies and negotiations with any non-Federal agency with respect to proposals to purchase falling water and, not later than 18 months from the date of enactment of this act, report the results of such negotiations, including the terms of a proposed agreement, if any, that may be reached, together with his recommendations thereon, which agreement, if any, shall not become effective until approved by Congress."

In keeping with this directive from the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior made a very careful and comprehensive study of the possibility of selling falling water to a non-Federal agency rather than having the Federal Government build the power facilities. According to the Secretary, ample opportunity was given to all prospective preference and nonpreference purchasers of falling water and that only the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. indicated any desire to do so. The offer of the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. was thoroughly studied by the Secretary and he concluded, "I find the proposal of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to be acceptable generally and recommend approval by the Congress."

The Secretary, in his report and recommendation to the Congress which is contained in House Document No. 94 (85th Cong., 1st sess.), found many reasons for taking this action. I am going to refer first to the added surplus to the Central Valley project which would occur from joint development, since I have referred above to this feature of the legislation which originally authorized the Central Valley project. The Secretary stated in his report that "under the joint plan of development proposed by the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. the payments by the company to the United States would cause the estimated surplus (of the Central Valley project) * * * to be somewhat over $165 million greater than it would be if the power facilities under the Trinity River Division were to be constructed by the Federal Government. * * * If it is assumed that the San Luis project is constructed by the Federal Government, then the advantage in the surplus credited to the project as a whole would be $124 million under joint development."

The Secretary evidently was familiar with the language in the original Central Valley project authorizing legislation to the effect that power revenues were to aid and assist irrigation because he pointed out in his report:

"Under the present Central Valley rate structure Trinity power facilities, if built by the United States, would require substantial assistance from other project revenues in order to meet repayment requirements Joint development under the proposed agreement would convert Trinity falling water into a substantial net asset of the project."

In other words, under all-Federal development Trinity power is a drain on the water and power facilities of the Central Valley project, which runs counter to the authorizing legislation, and only under joint development authorizing partnership as provided in my bill does Trinity comply with the law authorizing the Central Valley project.

Certainly this added surplus created by joint development would be most helpful to the San Luis project both in meeting annual costs and in making water as cheap as possible to San Luis water users.

Aside from these important and over-riding facts, Trinity partnership offers several other definite advantages to the San Luis. The Secretary pointed out in his report on Trinity:

"In my opinion, it appears clear from the report of the Commissioner that joint development would provide substantially more funds for potential irrigation and multipurpose development in the Central Valley project area. This means that the power resource of the Trinity River division under joint development would provide the greater benefit to the project area and to the Nation as a whole. This is consistent with my view that our water resources should be developed in the manner best suited to comprehensive use of those resources.

"I am also conscious of the fact that the basic purpose of the reclamation program is the development of irrigation water supply and the reclamation of land. Electric power is generated as an incident to the basic purpose of the program. It seems to me that the development of the power resource of the Trinity River division under a joint proposal such as that offered by the company would mean that power would become a better partner of irrigation development in the Central Valley project area than under all-Federal construction."

Certainly the San Luis project can qualify to share in the increased advantages which would accrue to the Central Valley project as a result of joint development. As a matter of fact, it seems rather inconsistent to me to support the San Luis project and at the same time oppose the partnership development on the Trinity.

There is still another major factor—and in view of the present budget situation it might be the most important factor—which makes Trinity partnership advantageous to San Luis. Obviously, if the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. builds the power facilities instead of the Federal Government, there will be a saving of some $56 million in project costs. On this point the Secretary in his report had the following to say:

"It should be noted also that the Commissioner's report states that the capital investment of the United States would be reduced by $55,500,000. This represents an immediate lessening of demands on the Federal budget in the next few years, or this sum could be diverted to the construction of other needed reclamation projects."

According to latest estimates, the San Luis project will cost $305 million. The saving on Trinity of $55,500,000 represents over 18 percent of the total cost of the San Luis. The saving on power facilities of the Trinity would provide sufficient funds to build a forebay to the San Luis Reservoir which would permit greater use of off-peak pumping energy which in turn would materially reduce operating costs of the San Luis unit and, what is of more immediate interest to my district, this $55.5 million saving resulting from partnership on Trinity would provide sufficient funds for facilities of the San Luis project to serve lands in Alameda, San Benito, and Santa Clara Counties. It hardly seems necessary to dwell further on the advantages of joint development on Trinity which would be available and accrue to the Central Valley project generally and the proposed San Luis project in particular.

Those who oppose the Trinity partnership plan will counter my argument with the allegation that cheap Federal power produced at Trinity is essential to the successful operation of the San Luis project. In using this argument they are forgetting one important fact: If my information is correct the Trinity project was originally justified on the basis of expected revenue for power of approximately 4.4 mills. It is also my understanding that opponents of Trinity partnership propose to dedicate Trinity power to

San Luis at a rate of approximately 2.5 mills. This is a rate juggling which amounts to destroying the feasibility of one project to make another one acceptable. It is deceitful to justify a project on one rate, get it under construction, and then change the rate to justify another. Whatever advantage would accrue to the San Luis project from all Federal Trinity power would be taken from Trinity. The situation would be exactly the same as robbing Peter to pay Paul, or transferring money from one pocket to the other and telling yourself you had twice as much as when you started.

Aside from all of the above-named advantages of partnership development it seems to me it behooves all of us to take a broadgage view of the present budget situation and wherever possible ease the strain of Federal spending so that as much funds as we can possibly afford can be diverted to our defense effort.

I could not help but think as I read recently in the Washington papers about the contract recently awarded the Chrysler Corp. to produce 1,500-mile-range Jupiter missiles that it just so happens that the savings of joint development on Trinity would be more than enough to finance this entire contract. It seems that we should all be giving thought to matters like this.

The Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, according to the press, recently stated:

"It is my hope that we can save enough out of nonessential items to make up for the increase in defense spending and still keep a balanced budget."

Certainly Federal spending for Trinity power facilities is nonessential simply because others are willing to put up the money and at the same time produce greater return to the Federal Treasury.

I am not unmindful that there are those who feel that the Federal Government has an obligation to build power facilities solely for the purpose of supplying so-called cheap Federal power to the so-called preference customers. On this subject the Secretary had the following to say:

"A vital part of the company's Trinity proposal is its offer to extend this contract for the 50-year life of the Trinity agreement, with amendments which are more favorable to the Government than the existing contract. It is my understanding that the Commissioner's estimate of 470,000 kilowatts (with San Luis) of capacity for preference customers is contingent on the company's willingness to offer the same integration with the company's system in the event its Trinity proposal is not accepted. The company offers to firm up a preference customer load of 450,000 kilowatts, with or without San Luis. If it appears desirable to devote more of the project revenues to the purchase of firming energy, or to raise rates somewhat, the supported loads under joint development could be increased above the amounts indicated by the Commissioner's report."

Thus under the offer of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. the Government could serve loads up to 450,000 kilowatts, whereas even assuming certain favorable conditions the Government could not supply more than 470,000 kilowatts after meeting the requirements of San Luis. Therefore, it can be safely said that the Government could, if it so chose, serve practically as many preference loads as would be possible under the all-Federal development of Trinity. It seems, therefore, that the choice again is whether we want Federal plants to be constructed at a cost to the Federal taxpayer to serve a privileged few, or whether we prefer to accept joint development and permit the benefits to flow to the water users, the taxpayers and all people generally.

So far I have made no mention of the taxes which would accrue to the Federal Government in the case of joint development. According to the Secretary $135 million in taxes would be paid by the company to Federal, State, and local governments. About $70 million of this would accrue to the Federal Government which would largely, if not completely, offset any penalty that would accrue to Federal agencies as an improbable result of having to buy more power from the company under joint development than would be the case under all-Federal development of Trinity power facilities.

When you add to this Federal tax advantage the more than $65 million which would accrue to the State and local governments as a result of partnership development, the overall advantages of the provisions of the Secretary's recommendations and of my bill become more and more apparent.

Those who are opposing this project have made reference to the losses to Federal agencies as the result of their inability to get Federal power under joint development. I have already pointed out that by accepting the company's offer to firm up to 450,000 kw., the Federal Government can serve almost as much load as would be possible under all-Federal development of Trinity. Probably the biggest Federal load in California is the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory which is located in my district. This laboratory uses large blocks of power but on an intermittent basis and it is a load difficult to serve except from an integrated system such as the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The fact is that the Government is now supplying only 50,000 kw. of their total requirements and has refused to increase this allocation to Ames even though they have since allocated 7,500 kw. to the city of Roseville.

An early improvement in Federal spending and taxing methods is imperative if the administration is to inspire any public confidence in our economy. The new demands for a $2 billion hike in our defense budget; supplementary funds for civilian programs; new demands of new interest groups involving increased Federal, State, and local spending—how are these contradictory needs to be reconciled with the basic principles of sound economy? And the basics of sound economy mean reduction in nonessential Government spending and an equitable tax structure. At present, we cannot claim fame from either.

Adoption of the Trinity partnership plan would be an initial positive step toward both goals. Adoption of the all-Federal plan to operate the Trinity power system would continue the "dead center" state we find ourselves in today, with more nonessential Government outlays and stiffer tax burdens. Let's see how.

The public power opponents of the partnership proposal maintain that their way alone can provide cheap power. This is true, but only the few get the advantage of cheap power—the few so-called preference customers who represent only 7 percent of the power users in northern California. The remaining 93 percent are asked to foot the major part of the preference groups' bill, although they receive no direct benefits whatsoever.

It is fallacious to assume that the Federal Government can give something for nothing. Its services including hydroelectric power have a cost, and that cost is borne by the taxpayers—66,005,000 self-supporting, gainfully employed Americans. The public-power advocate in effect asks for a tax hike in championing his case for Trinity. For there is no good genie around ready to fill up the Federal Treasury.

On the contrary, the Treasury is an empty purse, with a debt of over $270 billion. It obviously can't give anything to anybody without first taking it away from someone else. Again we retrace our circle back to the taxpayer.

On the other side of the coin, we have a proposal for development of Trinity power which would serve three major purposes in firming up our economy: (1) first eliminate another waste in nonessential spending, (2) create $310 million worth of benefits for the public, and (3) constitute a step toward tax improvement in the form of savings and lightened tax load. Americans everywhere should have a broader understanding of the partnership principle, whether applied to power development or any other field. It is a major economic asset, as the case at Trinity shows.

Private construction of the Trinity powerplants would alone save the Government an immediate cost of $55,500,000, meaning $55,500,000 retained by the taxpayers. The Government also stands to get over $4 million yearly over the 50-year contract period for P. G & E.'s use of the falling water. That is a net gain of $165 million to the Government over what its own power operation could produce. Then it can also expect a tax revenue amounting to $83 million extra over the total repayment period. Nor does this tax revenue include the additional $62,600,000 more in payments to State and local governments. With State and local spending hitting all-time highs, is it not about time that new sources of outside revenue were tapped, as offered through the Trinity partnership plan? Again, the taxpayer gets the brunt of heavy indebtedness at the grassroots level. It is to his interest to demand new revenue creators.

Residents of Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties in my District may not know it, but the final outcome of the Trinity partnership proposal affects their home base. The Trinity River project is far from being an isolated water project in northwest California. What happens to the development of hydroelectric power at Trinity will indirectly influence our own water supply as well as our wallets.

First, let us take a look at the water situation in Santa Clara County. Latest census figures show that Santa Clara leads the Bay area in population increase over 1956 totals, to be exact a 50,700 increase. This will mean a greater demand for water which is in short supply, and getting shorter. The fact that the city of Sunnyvale was rejected recently as a site for $40 million of industrial development for lack of industrial water is no consolation. Not only is our local agriculture hit by low water levels, but industrial development can be stunted by a lack of this basic resource.

We in Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and San Benito need water desperately as the evidence proves. And we will need it at the most reasonable price to the farmer and water user. Joint development of Trinity can provide these needs.

It would mean: $55,500,000 in immediate savings to the Government through private construction of powerplants; $165 million in additional revenue from sale of falling water; $145 million in tax payments to Federal, State, and local governments; $83,040,000 to the Federal Government, $7,310,000 to California, $55,345,000 to California counties.

Now, what do all these figures mean to my District? The extra money available through partnership would go a long way toward financing local water projects. For example, the Corps of Engineers San Lorenzo River project, just started in Santa Cruz County, will take another $1,233,000 in Federal support after 1958. Also, we have the proposed San Luis project sorely needed on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley and my District. This will take another $305 million outlay if authorized.

The initial partnership construction savings of $55,500,000 could pay for 55 San Lorenzo River projects, while a total of $248,040,000 in revenue to Federal coffers

would take care of the major chunk of San Luis.

The point is that partnership would create the funds necessary to carry on these local projects of ours. And everything proves that the maximum contribution to San Luis would be made under this plan.

Can we say the same for the all-Federal plan for Trinity power? I'm afraid not. Federal control of Trinity power would actually be a deficit operation, since other CVP projects would have to make loans to Trinity. What would this mean other than draining the allotments for other irrigation works and making them more expensive in the long run. Certainly, San Luis water would be more costly not only in water prices, but in stiffer loads on the taxpayer.

Tenth District constituents do have a big stake in Trinity. They will be the ones paying these water prices and taxes on new projects.

To refuse approval of the Trinity partnership proposal is to subsidize a few power users at the expense of many. It would be a giveaway in the worst sense. It would defeat the purpose of the Central Valley project to subsidize water development.

Speaking for my constituents who need help in developing a source of water and speaking for fair treatment of the entire Nation rather than a favored few I sincerely hope the bills introduced by Congressmen SCUDDER, UTT, and myself will be favorably considered.

I thank you.

## LITTLETON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a statement made by Merrill E. Cobb, superintendent of the Littleton Public Schools, Littleton, Mass., before the Committee on Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the statement just referred to follows:

JANUARY 23, 1958.

Mr. MCCORD,
*Clerk of Committee,*
*Committee on Education,*
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. MCCORD: The following information is submitted for consideration by your committee relative to the extension and modification of Public Laws 815 and 874.

The information contained in this report is presented as evidence of the undue hardships being imposed upon small, rural communities located within commuting distance of Federal properties relative to the cost of educating the federally connected pupils.

The town of Littleton, Mass., is located some 30 miles northwest of Boston and within easy commuting distance of Fort Devens in Ayre, Mass., and Hanscom Field, in Bedford, Mass. The population of the town is approximately 4,500 people. The town is predominately residential with some farming but little or no industry. The only local source of revenue for the support of education is the real-estate tax.

The current school enrollment in Littleton is 915 pupils. Of this number, 200 or 22 percent of the total are federally connected pupils or pupils whose parents reside in Littleton but are employed on or assigned to Federal installations within commuting distance.

The per pupil cost of education for the 1956–57 school year in Littleton amounted to $250.57. The per pupil net cost to the town, from local taxation, for this same year was $172.67. The total cost to the town of educating the 172 federally connected pupils for this same year was approximately $30,000. The town received approximately $16,000 under subsection 3c–1 of Public Law 874 for these same pupils based upon average daily attendance.

In terms of housing, Littleton was forced into a 2-platoon system for 2 full school years for grades 7–12 while waiting the completion of a new $1,500,000 high school. Preliminary plans are now under way for construction of a new 8-room elementary school. The estimated cost of this project is $450,000. An application under Public Law 815 is pending on this project which would provide approximately $50,000 toward the total cost. The school-building program in Littleton has resulted in a net debt of $1,472,000. Littleton now has the highest per capita indebtedness of any town in Massachusetts.

The Federal aid which Littleton received under Public Law 874 is only a fraction of the real cost of educating our federally connected pupils. It does, however, provide partial relief to the local taxpayer. Federal aid which is pending under Public Law 815 is also a fraction of the real cost of providing classrooms for these pupils.

While the existing Federal aid is inadequate, it is unthinkable that the Congress could justify a modification or termination of present laws so that the full burden of educating federally connected pupils, which is a direct result of activities of the United States Government, would be borne by local taxpayers.

A statistical summary for the past 5 years is presented below:

| Year | Total enrollment | Federal pupils | Percentage of total | Total cost per pupil | Total cost to town | Tax rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | *Per thousand dollars* |
| 1953–54 | 571 | 63 | 11 | $197.41 | $75,770.75 | $35 |
| 1954–55 | 665 | 111 | 16 | 201.94 | 88,251.70 | 40 |
| 1955–56 | 730 | 158 | 21 | 229.81 | 123,746.13 | 47 |
| 1956–57 | 810 | 172 | 21 | 250.57 | 175,375.78 | 63 |
| 1957–58 | 915 | 200 | 22 | 338.53 | 212,005.53 | 66 |

NOTE.—Tax rates are based on assessed valuation per $1,000. Assessed valuation on real estate is approximately 35 percent of market value.

Estimated Public Law 874 receipts for 1958 totals $16,148 or approximately 34 percent of the actual local cost of educating the 200 federally connected pupils.

Respectfully submitted.

MERRILL E. COBB.

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. After further examination of the President's message and the recommendations made therein, the Chair believes that the proper committee to which to refer the President's message is the Committee on Education and Labor instead of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because on the Science Foundation no new law is suggested, simply more appropriations. The other part of the President's message deals with education. Therefore the Chair is going to change the reference of the President's message and whatever bills are introduced on that subject, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Saturday's Washington Post and Sunday's New York Times carried news articles which included my name and that of my wife in a list of people who own, directly or indirectly, television stations. I understand that the news articles gave as their origin a list published in Broadcasting magazine, issue of January 7, 1957.

I wish publicly to announce that this is not true. Neither Mrs. Holifield nor I own a television station, nor do we own any stock in television stations now or at any time in the past.

I was highly complimented at being placed in such a high level of economic society. Of course, I do not know why the error was made, but I wanted to announce publicly that it is an error.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), until Thursday, on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 20 minutes, on Thursday, January 30, vacating special order entered for today.

Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 60 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. DENNISON (at the request of Mr. GRIFFIN), for an hour, on Monday and on Tuesday next.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Monday and Tuesday next, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. MAGNUSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WRIGHT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. ALGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHANSEN and to include his weekly letter to his constituents.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL in two instances; Mr. SPRINGER; and Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. VORYS).

Mr. GWINN in two instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 28, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| John J. Heimburger | Counsel | $7,418.22 |
| Mabel C. Downey | Clerk | 7,418.22 |
| Francis M. LeMay | Staff consultant | 6,808.86 |
| Lydia Vacin | Staff assistant | 3,843.54 |
| Pauline E. Graves | do | 3,792.18 |
| Betty M. Prezioso | do | 3,381.12 |
| Gladys N. Ondarecho | do | 3,124.26 |
| Alicia F. Shoemaker | do | 3,051.42 |
| Jerry Max Perry | do | 1,240.98 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $50,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 4,402.15 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 6,994.13 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 11,396.28 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 38,603.72 |

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE FUND)

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession (standing or select committee) | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Richard F. McIlwain | Director, surveys and investigations staff. | $6,068.02 |
| Robert E. Rightmyer | Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff. | 6,195.78 |
| M. Alice Ruml | Stenographer | 2,524.80 |
| Lillian M. Mackie | do | 2,524.80 |
| John J. Donnelly | Consultant | 9,000.00 |
| George Y. Harvey | do | 1,500.00 |

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Agriculture, Department of: Dorick, Stanley J. | Investigator | $2,660.33 |
| Gross, William J. | do | 4,484.00 |
| Sherman, John I. | do | 3,559.34 |
| Army, Department of: Roseman, Harvey. | do | 2,366.26 |
| Atomic Energy Commission: Bolson, James I. | do | 3,460.44 |
| Moore, John R. | do | 4,813.19 |
| Budget, Bureau of the: Newman, Richard. | do | 931.82 |
| Central Intelligence Agency: Duro, Richard. | Clerk-stenographer | 532.72 |
| Commerce, Department of: Brinkman, Harry R. | Investigator | 1,990.44 |
| Hansen, Morris | do | 555.39 |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation: Bennett, Carl L. | do | 4,454.64 |
| Bowers, Hollis W. | do | 3,416.67 |
| Carlson, Howard A. | do | 3,779.43 |
| Hair, Harold H. | do | 4,603.50 |
| Haynes, Robert H. | do | 4,148.67 |
| Jenkins, Thomas J. | do | 4,512.53 |
| Lewis, Paul Harlan. | do | 2,813.73 |
| MacDonald, Albert G. | do | 2,630.04 |
| Miller, Richard A. | do | 4,446.37 |
| Murphy, Robert M. | do | 4,421.57 |
| Nugent, James E. | do | 5,368.77 |
| Reiser, Robert E. | do | 3,166.07 |
| Ruhl, John A. | do | 4,421.57 |
| Scott, Ralph D. | do | 3,348.00 |
| Shannon, Andrew J. | do | 4,347.13 |
| Vahey, Eugene W. | do | 3,175.49 |
| Virden, Samuel E. | do | 4,421.57 |
| Contribution to retirement fund. | | 3,803.03 |
| General Services Administration: Robinson, Melville C. | do | 4,880.80 |
| Interior, Department of: Edwards, Percy L. | do | 3,982.13 |
| Gilbert, Fred | do | 4,442.31 |
| Lacasse, E. C. | do | 4,511.62 |
| Miller, Donald H. | do | 4,034.65 |
| O'Neil, Robert S. | do | 3,217.89 |
| International Cooperation Administration: Eldridge, David N. | do | 3,473.38 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission: Pittman, John I | do | 3,077.20 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Cushman, Ralph R. | do | 5,096.37 |
| State, Department of: Minor, Charles W. | do | 4,437.03 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority: Cowser, Joyce W. | do | 3,860.62 |
| Grandy, Rodney L. | do | 4,442.20 |

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—CON.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Veterans' Administration: Jones, William F. | Investigator | $4,064.95 |
| Veterans' Canteen Service Field Office: Oselin, Harry. | do | 3,570.86 |
| Travel and miscellaneous expenses. | | 82,327.40 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $500,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | |
| Amount expended from Dec. 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 263,686.62 |
| Total amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 263,686.62 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 236,313.38 |

CLARENCE CANNON,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Corhal D. Orescan | Clerk and staff director. | $7,418.22 |
| Kenneth Sprankle | do | 7,418.22 |
| Paul M. Wilson | do | 7,418.22 |
| Jay B. Howe | Staff assistant | 6,808.86 |
| Ross P. Pope | do | 6,808.86 |
| Robert M. Moyer | do | 6,808.86 |
| Carson W. Culp | do | 6,808.86 |
| Samuel W. Crosby | do | 6,808.86 |
| Frank Sanders | do | 6,288.66 |
| Eugene B. Wilhelm | do | 6,288.66 |
| George S. Green | Clerk to minority | 6,437.28 |
| E. L. Eckloff | Clerk to majority | 6,325.80 |
| Robert P. Williams | Editor | 5,917.14 |
| Robert L. Michaels | Staff assistant | 5,322.60 |
| G. Homer Skarin | do | 4,727.94 |
| Earl C. Silsby | do | 4,564.44 |
| Lawrence C. Miller | Assistant editor | 3,723.66 |
| Francis G. Merrill | Staff assistant | 3,552.42 |
| Samuel R. Preston | Junior staff assistant | 3,124.26 |
| Donald F. Berens | Clerical assistant | 2,524.80 |
| Randolph Thomas | Janitor-messenger | 1,678.02 |
| John C. Pugh | Consultant | 1,461.00 |
| Julia M. Elliott | Clerk-stenographer | 2,610.42 |
| Mary A. Vaughn | do | 2,610.42 |
| Betty G. Coil | do | 2,610.42 |
| Phyllis N. Troy | do | 2,610.42 |
| William J. Neary | do | 2,610.42 |
| Shirley Rae Cooley | do | 2,610.42 |
| Catherine D. Norrell | do | 2,610.42 |
| Annette Lee | do | 2,610.42 |
| Donald L. Bernard | do | 2,610.42 |
| Edward Ricci | do | 2,610.42 |
| Molly O. Day Saguto | do | 2,610.42 |
| Rose Marie Kline | do | 2,610.42 |
| Margaret B. Linton | do | 2,610.42 |
| Silas Taber | do | 2,610.42 |
| L. Margaret Murray | do | 870.14 |
| Margie H. Trew | do | 2,610.42 |
| John G. Clevenger | do | 2,610.42 |
| Gladys Kolmehl | do | 2,610.42 |
| Frank B. Melchoir | do | 2,507.64 |
| Frank Mentillo | do | 2,353.80 |
| Lenore Cummings | do | 2,353.80 |
| Robert V. V. Rice, Jr. | do | 2,010.96 |
| Josephine Birdsall | do | 2,610.42 |
| Harris H. Huston | Staff assistant | 794.37 |

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Donald R. Bridges | Clerical assistant | $1,392.22 |
| Patricia Anne Happenberger | Clerk-stenographer | 1,740.28 |
| Lucille K. Brand | do | 1,839.72 |
| Robert Cope, Jr | do | 733.12 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $435,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 181,818.65 |
| Total amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 181,818.65 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 253,181.35 |

CLARENCE CANNON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 1, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Robert W. Smart | Chief counsel | $7,400.00 |
| John R. Blandford | Counsel | 7,366.00 |
| Charles F. Ducander | do | 7,366.00 |
| Philip W. Kelleher | do | 7,366.00 |
| Janice G. Angell | Committee secretary. | 3,509.59 |
| Berniece Kalinowski | Secretary | 3,309.59 |
| Oneta L. Stockstill | do | 3,209.87 |
| L. Louise Ellis | do | 3,209.87 |
| Marie M. Abbott | do | 2,811.66 |
| James A. Deakins | Bill clerk | 2,811.66 |

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL OPERATING PURSUANT TO H. RES. 67 AND 68, 85TH CONG.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| John J. Courtney | Special counsel | $7,418.22 |
| Edward T. Fogo | Staff assistant | 5,173.98 |
| Lloyd R. Kuhn | do | 4,014.84 |
| Raymond Wilcove | do | 7,013.22 |
| Robert N. Tyler | do | 4,014.84 |
| Dorothy Britton | Secretary | 2,781.72 |
| Jane Wheelahan | do | 2,610.42 |
| Ethel L. Mott | Clerk | 2,610.42 |
| Adeline Tolerton | do | 2,610.42 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $150,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 37,434.18 |
| Amount expended from January 1957 to June 1957 | 37,434.18 |
| Total amount expended from July 1957 to December 1957 | 41,848.55 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1958 | 70,717.27 |

CARL VINSON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 7, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Robert L. Cardon | Clerk and counsel | $7,418.22 |
| Orman S. Fink | Professional staff | 7,418.22 |
| John E. Barriere | do | 7,418.22 |
| Helen E. Long | Deputy clerk | 3,980.58 |
| Mary W. Layton | Assistant clerk | 3,980.58 |
| John M. Devlin | Editor | 4,951.08 |

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 86, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Eleanor Hamilton | Research assistant | $3,000.06 |
| Alberta Masumian | Secretary | 3,021.48 |
| John J. McEwan, Jr | Housing economist | 7,418.22 |
| Grady Perry, Jr | Clerk | 3,552.42 |
| Robert R. Poston | Chief Counsel | 7,418.22 |
| Betty B. Ridgell | Secretary | 3,329.76 |
| Annie Louise Odum | Research assistant (to Aug. 31, 1957). | 801.64 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $100,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 27,346.56 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 41,875.07 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 69,221.63 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 30,778.37 |

BRENT SPENCE,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 2, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| William N. McLeod, Jr. | Clerk | $7,403.34 |
| Wendell E. Cable | Minority clerk | 6,808.86 |
| Ruth Butterworth | Assistant clerk | 4,031.94 |
| Dixon Davis | do | 2,698.44 |
| George McGown | Research analyst | 3,723.66 |
| Margaret S. Rogers | Assistant clerk (July 1 to 31). | 463.62 |
| Leonard O. Hilder | Investigator (appointed Sept. 1, 1957). | 3,350.24 |
| Ann L. Puryear | Assistant clerk (appointed Aug. 1, 1957). | 2,418.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $7,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 543.75 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 225.82 |
| Total amount expended from Feb. 7 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 769.57 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 6,230.43 |

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 8, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Fred G. Hussey | Chief clerk | $7,418.22 |
| Russell C. Derrickson | Chief investigator | 7,418.22 |
| Charles M. Ryan | General counsel | 7,129.73 |
| Kennedy W. Ward | Assistant general counsel. | 7,418.22 |
| John O. Graham | Minority clerk | 7,418.22 |
| Kathryn Kivett | Assistant clerk | 3,226.98 |
| Jeanne Thomson | Assistant clerk (minority). | 3,226.98 |
| Gloria Ann Baysden | Assistant clerk | 3,226.98 |
| Elizabeth R. Myers | do | 3,226.98 |
| Clara Barnes | do | 813.06 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $125,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 14,034.43 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 34,338.31 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 48,372.74 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 76,627.26 |

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 9, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Boyd Crawford | Staff administrator | $7,418.22 |
| Roy J. Bullock | Staff consultant | 7,377.36 |
| Albert C. F. Westphal | do | 7,377.36 |
| Dumond Peck Hill | do | 6,808.86 |
| Franklin J. Schupp | do | 5,502.84 |
| Sheldon Z. Kaplan | Staff consultant (resigned; July 1957 only). | 1,224.60 |
| June Nigh | Staff assistant | 3,723.66 |
| Winifred G. Osborne | do | 3,638.04 |
| Helen M. Mattas | do | 3,638.04 |
| Myrtle M. Melvin | do | 3,638.04 |
| Helen L. Hashagen | do | 3,638.04 |
| Mary Louise O'Brien | do | 3,549.56 |
| Robert J. Bowen | Clerical assistant | 2,747.45 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $75,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 4,036.93 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 10,865.31 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 14,902.24 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 60,097.76 |

THOMAS S. GORDON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| | |
|---|---|
| Expenses July 1, 1957, through Dec. 31, 1957: | |
| Full committee | $3,561.39 |
| Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee | 46,569.32 |
| Military Operations Subcommittee | 35,302.44 |
| Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee | 23,421.87 |
| Public Works and Resources Subcommittee | 34,242.26 |
| International Operations Subcommittee | 24,556.11 |
| Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee | 41,564.97 |
| General Government Activities Subcommittee | 26,593.92 |
| Special Donable Property Subcommittee | 16,186.90 |
| Special Government Information Subcommittee | 36,002.61 |
| Salaries, full committee, July 1-Dec. 31, 1957: | |
| Christine Ray Davis, staff director | 7,418.22 |
| Orville S. Poland, general counsel | 6,872.22 |
| James A. Lanigan, associate general counsel | $7,310.46 |
| Martha C. Roland, staff member | 6,002.58 |
| J. Robert Brown, staff member | 5,694.18 |
| Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member | 3,997.74 |
| Ann E. McLachlan, staff member | 3,389.70 |
| Mona Keating Henderson, staff member (July 1-Dec. 15, 1957) | 2,981.66 |
| Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff member | 6,808.86 |
| John Philip Carlson, minority counsel | 6,002.58 |
| Full committee | 3,561.39 |
| Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman: | |
| Elmer W. Henderson, counsel | 6,065.76 |
| Orville J. Montgomery, associate counsel | 6,002.58 |
| William A. Young, professional staff member | 5,694.18 |
| Victor G. Rosenblum, special counsel | 6,002.58 |
| David Glick, legal analyst | 4,507.26 |
| Morton C. Pollock, legal analyst | 4,006.26 |
| Earle J. Wade, clerical staff | 3,766.50 |
| Lawrence P. Redmond, clerical staff | 3,740.82 |
| Edith T. Carper, research analyst | 3,021.48 |
| Clara K. Armstrong, minority, clerical | 3,051.42 |
| Expenses | 710.48 |
| Total | 46,569.32 |
| Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman: | |
| Herbert Roback, staff director | $7,418.22 |
| Earl J. Morgan, investigator | 5,025.36 |
| Carey Brewer, professional staff member | 5,025.36 |
| John Paul Ridgely, investigator | 4,515.42 |
| Robert J. McElroy, investigator | 3,809.34 |
| Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer | 3,381.12 |
| Catherine L. Koeberlein, clerk-stenographer | 3,038.58 |
| Expenses | 3,089.04 |
| Total | 35,302.44 |
| Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman: | |
| James R. Naughton, counsel | 5,508.42 |
| Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member | 5,471.22 |
| Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer | 3,038.58 |
| Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer (Oct. 1-Dec. 31, 1957) | 1,262.40 |
| Nancee W. Black, clerk-stenographer (July 1-Aug. 31, 1957) | 813.06 |
| Expenses | 7,328.19 |
| Total | 23,421.87 |
| Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Earl Chudoff, chairman: | |
| Arthur Perlman, staff director | 7,310.46 |
| Phineas Indritz, counsel | 6,002.58 |
| Miles Q. Romney, professional staff member | 5,025.36 |
| Irene Manning, clerk-stenographer | 3,081.42 |
| Joan D. Heinly, clerk-stenographer | 2,426.28 |
| Milton K. Cummings, consultant | 202.23 |
| Expenses | 10,193.93 |
| Total | 34,242.26 |
| International Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr., chairman: | |
| John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel | $6,000.00 |
| Richard P. Bray, Jr., counsel | 5,842.80 |
| Walton Woods, investigator | 5,471.22 |
| Maurice J. Mountain, consultant | 461.34 |
| Phyllis Semour, clerk | 3,381.12 |
| Angela C. Hall, clerk-stenographer (July 1-Aug. 31, 1957) | 841.60 |
| Expenses | 2,558.03 |
| Total | 24,556.11 |
| Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman: | |
| Curtis E. Johnson, staff director | 6,511.62 |
| Jerome S. Plapinger, counsel | 6,808.86 |
| Hal Christensen, associate counsel | 4,646.22 |
| Jerome N. Sonosky, associate counsel | 3,723.66 |
| Stanley T. Fisher, accountant-investigator | 5,099.70 |
| John L. Anderson, investigator | 4,515.42 |
| Elizabeth Heater, clerk-stenographer | 3,381.12 |
| Ann Dominek, clerk-stenographer | 2,961.54 |
| Ella G. Roller, consultant | 2,075.00 |
| Expenses | 1,841.83 |
| Total | 41,564.97 |
| General Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman: | |
| Edward C. Brooks, Jr., staff director | 6,214.38 |
| William E. Townsley, counsel | 6,065.76 |
| Vernon McDaniel, associate counsel | 3,937.80 |
| John E. Moore, investigator | 4,237.50 |
| Irma Reel, clerk | 2,867.34 |
| Expenses | 3,271.14 |
| Total | 26,593.92 |
| Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman: | |
| Ray Ward, staff director | $6,808.86 |
| John W. McGarry, associate counsel | 4,006.26 |
| Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer | 3,038.58 |
| Barbara McLaughlin, clerk-typist | 1,505.94 |
| Expenses | 827.26 |
| Total | 16,186.90 |
| Special Subcommittee on Government Information, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman: | |
| Samuel J. Archibald, staff director | 6,808.86 |
| John J. Mitchell, chief counsel | 6,697.38 |
| Paul Southwick, professional staff member | 5,508.42 |
| Helen Beasley, stenographer | 3,241.26 |
| Catherine Hartke, stenographer | 3,241.26 |
| John B. O'Brien, Jr., legal research analyst | 2,550.00 |
| William S. Fairfield, consultant | 2,975.00 |
| Robert Coll, investigator (Nov. 12-Dec. 31, 1957) | 1,157.98 |
| Expenses | 3,822.45 |
| Total | 36,002.61 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | 575,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 246,963.80 |
| Balance unexpended July 1, 1957 | 328,036.20 |
| Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 288,001.79 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 15, 1958 | 40,034.41 |

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 14, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Julian P. Langston | Chief clerk | $7,418.22 |
| Majorie Savage | Assistant clerk | 6,437.28 |
| Jack W. Watson | do | 5,322.62 |
| Lura Cannon | do | 4,564.44 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $5,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | $1,159.83 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 1,213.20 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 2,373.03 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1958 | 2,626.97 |

OMAR BURLESON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY FEDERAL PRINTING AND PAPERWORK

JANUARY 7, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| John F. Haley | Staff director | $6,065.76 |
| Philip B. Billings | Legal counsel | 5,694.18 |
| J. H. McWhorter | Technical advisor | 5,694.18 |
| Asselia S. Poore | Research analyst | 3,295.50 |
| Winifred C. Allen | Clerk | 1,712.83 |
| Ann Tibbitts | do | 664.00 |
| Rose M. Slusarz | Stenographer | 1,247.70 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $75,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 22,076.72 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 30,141.21 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 52,217.93 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1958 | 22,782.07 |

OMAR BURLESON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

SPECIAL ELECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

JANUARY 10, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from August 22 (date activated), 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Still, Samuel H. | Chief counsel | $4,043.84 |
| Kenny, Lucille Orr | Research analyst | 1,510.74 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $50,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | None |
| Amount expended from Aug. 22, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 6,882.50 |
| Total amount expended from Aug. 22, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 6,882.50 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1958 | 43,117.50 |

OMAR BURLESON,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 4, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Professional staff: | | |
| George W. Abbott | Counsel (to Sept. 30, 1957). | $3,404.43 |
| Sidney L. McFarland. | Engineering consultant | 6,262.68 |
| John L. Taylor | Territories consultant. | 6,262.68 |
| George H. Soule, Jr. | Minerals and lands consultant. | 6,262.68 |
| Clerical staff: | | |
| Nancy J. Arnold | Chief clerk | 5,545.56 |
| Nelda Boding | Clerk (to Dec. 31, 1957). | 3,552.42 |
| Gertrude S. Harris | Clerk | 3,552.42 |
| Laura A. Moran | do | 3,552.42 |
| Eve F. Twomey | do | 3,209.88 |
| Barbara A. Peters | Clerk (to Sept. 30, 1957). | 1,262.40 |
| Madlyn Smyth | Clerk (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957). | 1,776.21 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $57,500.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 7,503.30 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 14,493.22 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 21,996.52 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 35,503.48 |

CLAIR ENGLE,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 6, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Clerical staff: | | |
| Elton J. Layton | Clerk (retired effective Nov. 1, 1957). | $4,933.32 |
| W. E. Williamson | Clerk (from Nov. 1, 1957). | 2,466.66 |
| Kenneth J. Painter | 1st assistant clerk | 5,396.94 |
| Marcella M. Fencl | Assistant clerk | 3,595.20 |
| Georgia G. Glasmann. | Assistant clerk-stenographer. | 3,296.50 |
| Mildred H. Lang | Clerical assistant | 3,181.42 |
| Roy P. Wilkinson | Assistant clerk | 2,781.70 |
| Professional staff: | | |
| Andrew Stevenson | Expert | 7,400.00 |
| Kurt Borchardt | Legal counsel | 7,400.00 |
| Sam G. Spal | Research specialist | 7,400.00 |
| Martin W. Cunningham. | Aviation consultant | 7,400.00 |
| Additional temporary employees (H. Res. 99, amended; H. Res. 152, amended): | | |
| Barbara S. Dearing | Clerical assistant | 2,610.42 |
| Mary Ryan | do | 2,995.80 |
| Glenn L. Johnson | Printing editor | 4,515.42 |
| Joanne Neuland | Clerical assistant (from Aug. 5, 1957). | 2,501.67 |
| Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety): | | |
| Henry A. Barnes | Consultant (reimbursement for actual expenses). | |
| Nancy M. Henderson. | Research analyst | 5,025.36 |
| Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight: | | |
| Bernard Schwartz | Chief counsel-staff director (from Aug. 1). | 6,181.85 |
| Baron I. Shacklette | Chief investigator | 7,400.00 |
| Oliver Eastland | Assistant chief investigator (from July 24). | 5,679.58 |
| | Investigator (from Aug.1). | $5,002.15 |
| Joseph P. O'Hara, Jr. | Attorney (from July 24). | 5,235.58 |
| Stephen J. Angland | Attorney (from July 8). | 3,858.71 |
| Joseph T. Conlon, Jr. | Attorney (from July 25). | 5,202.24 |
| Francis X. McLaughlin. | Attorney (from July 26). | 5,168.89 |
| Mary Louise Ramsey. | Attorney (from Sept. 1). | 3,355.40 |
| Herbert M. Wachtell. | Attorney (from Aug. 26). | 2,437.21 |
| Paul S. Berger | Staff coordinator | 5,694.18 |
| Herman Clay Beasley. | Administrative assistant (from Oct. 1). | 1,497.90 |
| Mildred B. Lenhardt. | Clerical assistant | 2,995.78 |
| Helen Kayser | Clerical assistant (from July 22). | 2,662.93 |
| Elizabeth Ruth | Clerical assistant (from Oct. 9). | 1,025.36 |
| Mary Bastianelli | Clerical assistant (from July 8). | 2,879.3 |
| Helen Hotchkiss | Clerical assistant (from July 7). | 706.56 |
| Rhoda Watkins | Consultant (per diem-actual expense basis) (no salary). | |
| Walter M. W. Splawn. | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $350,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 11,840.00 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 93,323.92 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 105,164.52 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 244,835.48 |

OREN HARRIS,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Bess E. Dick | Staff director | $7,418.22 |
| William R. Foley | General counsel | 7,418.22 |
| Walter M. Besterman | Legislative assistant | 7,418.22 |
| Murray Drabkin | Counsel | 4,564.44 |
| Walter R. Lee | Legislative assistant | 7,418.22 |
| E. Willoubhby Middleton, Jr. | Associate counsel | 6,808.86 |
| Violet Benn | Clerical staff | 4,509.93 |
| Anne J. Berger | do | 4,564.44 |
| Lola Bikul | do | 4,151.88 |
| Frances Christy | do | 4,359.48 |
| Helen Goldsmith | do | 3,980.58 |
| Velma Smedley | do | 4,564.44 |
| Mary D. Weil | do | 3,438.25 |

SALARIES PAID JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1957, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 107 AND H. RES. 125, 85TH CONG.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Leonard Appel | Assistant counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | $5,694.18 |
| Robert E. Bauman | Messenger | 1,755.84 |
| Lucille E. Brooks | Clerk-stenographer | 3,980.54 |
| Gertrude C. Burak | do | 2,809.66 |
| Garner J. Cline | Assistant counsel | 3,723.38 |
| Laurie L. Coleman | Clerk-stenographer | 3,867.34 |
| Eisenberg, Milton | Associate counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | 2,334.78 |
| Eisenberg, Roberta | Clerk-stenographer | 3,209.58 |
| Herbert Fuchs | Assistant counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | 5,471.22 |
| Constance Glagols | Clerk-stenographer | 560.54 |
| Kenneth R. Harkins | Counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | 7,254.72 |
| Michael Kelemonick | Clerk-stenographer | 2,867.34 |
| Herbert N. Maletz | Counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | 7,254.72 |
| Elizabeth G. Meekins | Clerk-stenographer | 3,209.58 |
| Samuel R. Pierce, Jr. | Associate counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | 3,404.43 |
| Julian H. Singman | Assistant counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee. | 5,471.22 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and revision of the laws: | | |
| A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year): | | |
| Unexpended balance June 30, 1957 | | $31,519.16 |
| Appropriation received July 1, 1957 | | 100,000.00 |
| | | 131,519.16 |
| Expended, June 30, 1957-Dec. 31, 1957 | | 26,585.40 |
| Balance, Dec. 31, 1957 | | 104,933.76 |
| B. Revision of the laws: | | |
| Appropriation received July 1, 1957 | | 16,500.00 |
| Expended, June 30, 1957-Dec. 31, 1957 | | 7,418.22 |
| Balance, Dec. 31, 1957 | | 9,081.78 |
| C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year): | | |
| Unexpended balance June 30, 1957 | | 2,764.01 |
| Appropriation received July 1, 1957 | | 100,000.00 |
| | | 102,764.01 |
| Expended June 30, 1957-Dec. 31, 1957 | | 107.42 |
| Balance, Dec. 31, 1957 | | 102,656.59 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | | 190,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures for period Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | | 130,882.18 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | | 59,117.82 |
| H. Res. 125 adopted Feb. 7, 1957 | | 190,000.00 |

EMANUEL CELLER,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JANUARY 6, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946,

Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to January 6, 1958, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| John M. Drewry | Chief counsel | $7,451.64 |
| Bernard J. Zincke | Counsel | 6,957.48 |
| Charles F. Warren | Assistant counsel | 2,512.68 |
| Robert H. Cowen | do | 533.56 |
| W. B. Winfield | Chief clerk | 4,855.38 |
| Frances Still | Assistant clerk | 4,253.82 |
| Ruth E. Brookshire | do | 3,381.12 |
| Edith W. Gordon | Secretary | 3,381.12 |
| Vera A. Barker | do | 3,381.12 |
| Shirley Schwartz | Minority clerk | 4,066.20 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $50,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 988.85 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Jan. 6, 1958 | 18,017.00 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1957, to Jan. 6, 1958 | 19,005.85 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 6, 1958 | 30,994.15 |

HERBERT C. BONNER,
*Chairman.*

---

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Frederick C. Belen | Chief counsel | $7,418.22 |
| George M. Moore | Counsel (July 1 to Sept. 15, 1957). | 3,042.92 |
| Charles E. Johnson | Counsel | 7,143.24 |
| Henry C. Cassell | Clerk | 6,808.86 |
| Weldon T. Ellis, Jr. | Professional staff member (July 1 to Oct. 6, 1957). | 3,631.39 |
| John B. Price | Assistant clerk | 3,809.34 |
| Lillian Hopkins | do | 3,723.66 |
| Lucy K. Daley | do | 3,452.42 |
| Elsie Thornton | Secretary | 2,824.50 |
| Blanche Simons | do | 2,824.50 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $50,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 6,736.22 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 11,173.64 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 17,909.86 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 32,090.14 |

TOM MURRAY,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 8, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Margaret R. Beiter | Chief clerk | $6,808.85 |
| Richard J. Sullivan | Chief counsel | 6,808.85 |
| Robert F. McConnell | Counsel | 7,399.98 |
| Joseph R. Brennan | Engineer-consultant | 6,808.85 |
| S. Philip Cohen | Staff assistant | 3,809.34 |
| Helen M. Dooley | do | 5,322.62 |
| Helen A. Thompson | do | 4,172.60 |
| Louise B. Cullen | do | 3,766.50 |
| Anna McHale | do | 1,505.94 |
| Ester M. Saunders | do | 2,096.62 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $125,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 12,842.26 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 37,896.22 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 50,738.48 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 74,261.52 |

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON RULES

DECEMBER 18, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Thomas M. Carruthers. | Clerk (standing committee). | $5,694.18 |
| Barbara M. Thornton | Assistant clerk | 3,723.66 |
| Jane W. Snader | Minority clerk | 4,151.88 |

HOWARD W SMITH,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 9, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Standing: | | |
| Donald T. Appell | Investigator | $6,140.02 |
| Richard Arens | Director | 7,399.98 |
| Juliette P. Joray | Recording clerk | 4,802.44 |
| Isabel B. Nagel | Clerk-stenographer | 3,295.50 |
| Rosella A. Purdy | Secretary to counsel | 3,963.45 |
| Standing—Continued | | |
| Thelma I. Scearce | Secretary to investigators. | $3,963.45 |
| Frank S. Tavenner, Jr. | Counsel | 7,399.98 |
| Anne D. Turner | Chief of reference section. | 4,727.94 |
| Lorraine N. Veley | Clerk-stenographer | 3,124.26 |
| William A. Wheeler | Investigator | 5,991.42 |
| Investigating: | | |
| Alice W. Anderson | Information analyst. | 3,184.20 |
| Margaret B. Attinello. | Information specialist. | 3,295.52 |
| Karl Baarslag | Special consultant (resigned Aug. 15, 1957). | 1,535.01 |
| Beatrice P. Baldwin. | Clerk-typist | 2,267.88 |
| Thomas Q. Beesley | Editor (appointed Oct. 16, 1957). | 834.35 |
| Frank J. Bonora | Investigator | 4,237.50 |
| Jeanne M. Cassebaum. | Clerk-typist | 1,814.04 |
| Raymond T. Collins. | Investigator | 3,873.54 |
| Patricia R. Crovato. | Clerk-typist | 1,908.24 |
| Anniel Cunningham. | Information analyst | 3,092.10 |
| Barbara H. Edelschein. | Editor | 2,696.04 |
| Elizabeth L. Edinger. | do | 3,124.26 |
| Emily R. Francis | Clerk-typist (appointed Oct. 1, 1957). | 907.02 |
| Helen M. Gittings | Research analyst | 3,809.31 |
| William F. Heimlich. | Special consultant | 6,065.76 |
| James C. Hogan | Clerk-typist (appointed Oct. 1, 1957). | 919.86 |
| Lillian E. Howard | Research analyst | 3,616.65 |
| W. Jackson Jones | Investigator | 4,951.08 |
| Olive M. King | Editor | 3,693.72 |
| Maura Patricia Kelly. | Research analyst (appointed Aug. 19, 1957). | 1,838.94 |
| Stephen V. Kopunek. | Clerk-typist | 2,222.94 |
| Gwendolyn L. Lewis. | Administrative assistant to director (appointed June 17, 1957). | 5,175.98 |
| Regina McCall Wilt. | Clerk-typist | 1,839.72 |
| Mary B. McManus | Special consultant | 3,252.72 |
| Jeanni M. O'Neill Winston. | Assistant chief of reference section. | 2,867.34 |
| Joseph P. Orsulak | Clerk-typist (resigned Oct. 6, 1957). | 954.23 |
| Alma T. Pfaff | Clerk-typist | 2,096.64 |
| Katharine Phillips | Switchboard operator. | 2,107.32 |
| Maureen Roselle | Information analyst | 2,485.57 |
| Louis J. Russell | Investigator | 4,951.08 |
| Dolores F. Scotti | do | 3,723.66 |
| Josephine E. Sheets | Clerk-typist | 2,439.18 |
| Lela Mae Stiles | do | 2,499.12 |
| Cele F. Sweeney | do | 2,439.18 |
| Eleanor Ann Tehan | Clerk-stenographer (appointed Aug. 19, 1957). | 1,838.94 |
| Max Truitt | Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 15, 1957). | 909.27 |
| Vera L. Watts | Clerk-stenographer | 2,901.60 |
| Richard S. Weil | Research analyst | 4,149.90 |
| Billie Wheeler | Clerk-stenographer | 1,678.02 |
| George C. Williams | Investigator | 5,266.89 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $305,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 145,258.98 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1957 to Jan. 1, 1958 | 147,361.74 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1957 to Jan. 1, 1958 | 292,620.72 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 12,379.28 |

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 9, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Standing committee staff: | | |
| Oliver E. Meadows | Staff director | $7,418.22 |
| Edwin B. Patterson | Counsel | 7,418.22 |
| George W. Fisher | Clerk | 7,418.22 |
| J. Buford Jenkins | Housing consultant | 6,511.62 |
| Paul K. Jones | Assistant clerk | 5,322.60 |
| Helen A. Biondi | do | 4,151.88 |
| Alice V. Matthews | Clerk-stenographer | 3,638.04 |
| George Turner | Assistant clerk | 3,509.58 |
| Harold A. L. Lawrence. | Professional aide (minority). | 7,418.22 |
| Ida Rowan | Clerk (minority) | 6,808.86 |
| Investigating staff: | | |
| Adin M. Downer | Staff member | 5,322.60 |
| Joanne Doyle | Clerk-stenographer | 2,524.80 |
| Jean Johnson | do | 2,524.80 |
| Paul Smiley | Investigator | 2,873.76 |
| Davis Grant | do | 7,202.70 |
| Frank Ikard, Jr. | Supply clerk | 206.06 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $75,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 17,524.88 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 26,254.87 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 43,779.75 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 31,220.25 |

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

DECEMBER 31, 1957.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| | |
|---|---|
| Full committee: | |
| Leo H. Irwin, clerk (C) | $7,399.98 |
| Thomas A. Martin, minority adviser (P) | 7,399.98 |
| John M. Martin, Jr., assistant clerk (P) | 7,068.94 |
| James W. Riddell, professional assistant (P) | 6,994.62 |
| Loyle A. Morrison, professional assistant (P) (from Aug. 1, 1957) | 6,166.65 |
| Gerard M. Brannon, professional assistant (P) (from Oct. 1, 1957) | 2,928.84 |
| Frances C. Russell, staff assistant (C) | 4,674.78 |
| Susan Alice Taylor, staff assistant (C) | 4,482.72 |
| Virginia M. Butler, staff assistant (C) | 3,706.56 |
| Grace G. Kagan, staff assistant (C) | 3,706.56 |
| Irene Wade, staff assistant (C) | 3,706.56 |
| Virginia Brannock, staff assistant (C) | 3,616.62 |
| Frances E. Donovan, staff assistant (C) | 3,616.62 |
| Harriet I. Lane, staff assistant (C) | 3,295.50 |
| Margaretta G. Pestell, staff assistant (C) | 2,404.92 |
| Sybil D. Burd, staff assistant (C) | 3,616.62 |
| Expenses, full committee | 61.20 |
| Excise Taxes Subcommittee, Hon. AIME J. FORAND, chairman: | |
| Jack Poe, consultant | 7,104.98 |
| Hughlon Greene, messenger | 2,447.70 |
| Walter Little, messenger | 2,447.70 |
| Expenses | 1,903.37 |
| Total | 13,903.75 |
| Foreign Trade Policy Subcommittee, Hon. HALE BOGGS, chairman: | |
| Loyle A. Morrison, staff director (to July 31, 1957) | 1,233.33 |
| Mydr Rashish, economist | 6,511.62 |
| Mary C. Idle, staff assistant (C) | $3,021.48 |
| Elma Udall, staff assistant (C) | 2,850.20 |
| Expenses | 7,765.01 |
| Total | 21,381.64 |
| Internal Revenue Taxation Subcommittee, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman: | |
| June Kendall, staff assistant (C) (from Dec. 16, 1957) | 313.88 |
| Expenses | 12,514.77 |
| Total | 12,828.65 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $250,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 55,155.92 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 48,175.24 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1957, to Dec. 31, 1957 | 103,331.16 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 146,668.84 |

WILBUR D. MILLS,
*Chairman.*

---

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 15, 1958.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Bryan H. Jacques | Staff director | $7,403.34 |
| Everette MacIntyre | General counsel | 7,403.34 |
| Wm. Summers Johnson. | Chief economist | 6,808.86 |
| Victor P. Dalmas | Adviser to minority members. | 6,808.86 |
| Irving Manes | Assistant counsel-investigator. | 6,808.86 |
| Justinus Gould | do | 5,322.60 |
| Marie M. Stewart | Clerk | 2,960.35 |
| Jane M. Deem | Administrative assistant-clerk. | 3,552.42 |
| Joseph Marshall | Research analyst | 1,588.44 |
| Julius E. Allen | Economist | 2,501.61 |
| Frances K. Topping | do | 4,014.84 |
| Lois E. Allison | do | 1,559.01 |
| Clarence D. Everett | Investigator | 3,552.42 |
| Katherine C. Blackburn. | Research analyst | 3,423.96 |
| Margaret Fallon Palmer. | do | 3,295.50 |
| Judith Reinitz | Research assistant | 2,606.04 |
| Milton S. Fairfax | Secretary | 3,723.66 |
| Dorothy F. Councill | Stenographer-secretary. | 2,970.12 |
| Ila D. Coe | Stenographer | 2,970.12 |
| Clara G. Romero | do | 2,970.12 |
| Mildred C. Darrow | Secretary-stenographer for minority. | 2,952.96 |
| Mary Vance Wilson | Stenographer-secretary. | 1,485.06 |
| Anna A. Holovach | Stenographer | 599.05 |
| Robert E. Essex | do | 654.67 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $225,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 100,757.07 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 103,458.13 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1957 | 204,215.20 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1957 | 20,784.80 |

WRIGHT PATMAN,
*Chairman.*

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1512. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, relative to a proposal by the Department of the Navy to transfer a 40-foot motorboat, hull No. 15514, now located at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va., to the Lake Sinclair Power Squadron of Milledgeville, Ga., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1513. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the 19th Semiannual Report on the educational exchange activities from July 1 through December 31, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1514. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1515. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign-language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1516. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1517. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1518. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to require labor organization reports, to insure disclosure of certain labor organization information, to define certain duties and responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to provide further safeguards for workers against improper activities in the conduct of labor organization affairs"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1519. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Mrs. Viola H. Montgomery, which, when executed by the superintendent, Muir Woods National Monument, will authorize her to operate a lunchroom, soft-drink counter, souvenir, stationery, and photographic shop for the public at Muir Woods National Monument, during a 2-year period beginning January 1, 1958, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1520. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of re-

volving credit fund transactions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 10 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984, 986; 25 U. S. C. 470); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1521. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1522. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise the Federal-aid highway laws of the United States"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1523. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1524. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act pertaining to network broadcasting. (Rept. No. 1297.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9700. A bill to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10266. A bill to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10267. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 10268. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10269. A bill to amend section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to the price support on wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10270. A bill to provide that all procurement and research for the Department of Defense shall be conducted by a single agency in that Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 10271. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide for outer-space development through the peaceful application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 10272. A bill to require labor organization reports, to insure disclosure of certain labor organization information, to define certain duties and responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to provide further safeguards for workers against improper activities in the conduct of labor organization affairs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10273. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10274. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 10275. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a fishery extension service in the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior for the purpose of carrying out cooperative fishery extension work with the States, Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 10276. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of postal and other Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 10277. A bill to reduce from 15 to 13 inches the minimum width of paper in rolls which may be imported into the United States free of duty as standard newsprint paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 10278. A bill to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 10279. A bill to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 10280. A bill to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 10281. A bill relating to the inspection and certification of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10282. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in potato futures in commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 10283. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H. R. 10284. A bill to authorize the granting of mineral rights to certain homestead patentees who were wrongfully deprived of such rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 10285. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 10286. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1287. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 10288. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 10289. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10290. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 10291. A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1953, creating the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 10292. A bill relating to the inspection and certification of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 10293. A bill to establish a national scientific research reserve fund; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 10294. A bill to give all producers of commodities eligible for inclusion in the 1958 acreage reserve program an opportunity to participate therein; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 10295. A bill to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 10296. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. J. Res. 515. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the United States with respect to the payment of bribes and kickbacks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. Res. 453. Resolution providing for printing as a House document the publication, Adverse Effects of the Expanding Activities of the National Government on the Private Economy and Federal System; the Case for Free Enterprise and Local Self-Government; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 454. Resolution requesting certain information from the Secretary of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Res. 455. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior and all departments of Government to protect Alaska-spawned salmon; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 10297. A bill for the relief of the Chicago School of Automotive Trade, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 10298. A bill for the relief of Stefano Viti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 10299. A bill for the relief of Max Magder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. R. 10300. A bill for the relief of Vukasin Krtolica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 10301. A bill for the relief of Nielsen L. Pollard and Elsie M. Pollard, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 10302. A bill for the relief of Gerald M. Brierre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 10303. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Mazzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Address by Senator Chavez Before the American Road Builders' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ**
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered on January 20 to the annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR CHAVEZ, CHAIRMAN, SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, AT 56TH CONVENTION OF AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, JANUARY 20, 1958, AT 10 A. M.

I am very happy to have the opportunity to speak to you folks during your 56th annual convention. I want to repeat what I have told you before. I want to congratulate you on your long record of accomplishment in improving services and facilities which mean so much to our Nation's economy and strength. Your association represents many fields of industry which contribute not only to the roadbuilding program but also to the production of modern facilities and equipment for the construction of many of our public-works projects. These projects involve navigation improvements on our rivers and harbors, flood-control reclamation developments, the construction of public buildings, and water- and sewage-treatment facilities. The continued expansion of all of these projects is essential to our way of life.

I am extremely proud to be chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee which handles the authorization for a great many of our public-works projects. I am also proud to be a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and in my position as chairman of the Defense Subcommittee I am concerned with a great many endeavors which are designed to improve our defense system.

The Federal-Aid Highway System is an important part of our defense system. In other words, whenever we improve our economic strength by improved transportation facilities, we in turn automatically improve our defense position. The secondary highway system provides the feeder lines for goods and products which find their way onto the primary and Interstate Highway System. These products then are delivered to all parts of our Nation. In addition, the Interstate System will provide means of moving men, defense equipment, and commodities required in this complex economy of ours.

I am pleased to learn that the highway-construction program has began to roll. I, along with a number of my colleagues, naturally feel that greater progress should be made. This feeling, I am sure, applies just as much to the States in which the roads are to be built as it does to the Bureau of Public Roads, which has the responsibility for administering the highway program.

I am very much interested in the secondary highway system. It is my hope that this program can be accelerated and that the network of secondary and county roads can be properly integrated and tied into the primary and Interstate System.

In an effort to accomplish my purpose in assuring integration of the systems, I introduced Senate bill 1146 which would provide for a National Advisory Committee of County Officials to facilitate coordination of highway systems. It is my understanding that the Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads has taken some steps in this direction through authority which he now has. I would like to see this program implemented so that there can truly be coordination among county, State, and Federal organizations in the planning and construction of our system of roads.

As you probably know, this is the year when the Roads Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee is going to be extremely busy. We must consider legislation to authorize the extension of authorization of Federal aid to the primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions. We must also consider forest highways, forest roads and trails, public lands roads, Indian roads, and other similar segments of our road system. The committee must take a very close look at the cost estimates which have been submitted under the provision of section 108 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

We will also take a very careful look at the reimbursement study which was submitted under the provision of section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 which was made to determine which highways, whether toll or free, completed or put under construction between August 2, 1947, and June 30, 1957, might be eligible to be considered for reimbursement.

I am very hopeful that the vehicles' size and weight study can be completed at an early date so that recommendations can be made to the Congress with respect to maximum vehicle dimensions and weight.

The highway safety study is an extremely important study which is being made to determine what action can be taken by the Federal Government to increase highway safety. This study is not due until March 1, 1959. It is my hope that all the talent available can be used in completing this study and making recommendations for ways and means of at least reducing the horrible toll of lives on our highway system.

You folks can well see that our committee does not cease to be interested in legislation upon its enactment into law. We feel it is our responsibility to be continuously watchful of the execution of any authorized projects resulting from legislation handled by our committee. The Public Works Committee will be on the alert not only in protecting the Nation's taxpayer from being gouged by dishonest right-of-way speculators but also will do everything possible to maintain a reasonable rate of progress on completing the Interstate System. As you people know, there is nothing more uneconomical than a program of construction which is piecemeal or which is constantly being stopped and started.

I believe we are in a fortunate position insofar as the highway program is concerned because our foresight in establishing the highway trust fund gives us a basis upon which to determine what our annual highway-construction program can be. We are not in so fortunate a position with respect to projects involving the utilization and development of water resources and public buildings. These programs are being continuously kicked around and there is no uniformity of progress. Whenever budget cuts appear necessary these are the projects which are decelerated or cut out entirely.

Last but not least, by any means, there is our inter-American highway program. I am informed that excellent progress is being made in the completion of this system. I am also informed that at the present time this highway which begins at Laredo, Tex., and extends 3,175 miles to Panama City, is passable at all times from Laredo to San Isidro, Costa Rica, except for a few miles in Guatemala near the Mexican border. I also understand that in addition $10 million is needed to complete surfacing through the Central American countries.

In closing, I would like to say that I always enjoy appearing before this fine group of people and I wish you great success in your endeavors. I want you to know our committee is always happy to receive your suggestions on ways and means of carry-

ing out or accelerating the highway program in our country which means so much to our economic strength. We need missiles, planes, guns, tanks, all the implements of defense, but we must not forget that in order to produce these implements, we must maintain and strengthen our economy through the construction of needed highways, water resources, flood-control and navigation projects, and other such improvements. We must not unbalance our economic strength by neglecting to make improvements which are basic in providing foods and services to our people.

## United States Policy on Africa at the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the recess I wrote an article entitled "United States Policy at the United Nations on Africa" which appeared in the January-February issue of Africa Today.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES POLICY ON AFRICA AT THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

From time to time there has been a moderate amount of talk in the administration circles about the need for a new approach to Africa. Vice President NIXON, after his whirlwind tour of Africa last spring, especially urged that a new policy be adopted of sympathy and support for African peoples.

As a former delegate to the United Nations, I know that the views of individual delegates do not always coincide with the official view prepared under State Department auspices. Nevertheless, our official position at the United Nations on key African issues has given little cause for hope that any such fresh approach is being formulated, much less implemented. This year, as in the past, we have once again lost a great opportunity to make it clear to the world through the United Nations that we really believe in freedom and the self-determination of peoples.

ALGERIAN DEADLOCK

The most that can be said about Ambassador Lodge's statements on the Algerian question is that there was a slight improvement over last year. This time the United States took a more middle-of-the-road position on international conciliation, in contrast to the strong support given to the official French position by us during last year's debate.

In stating that the United States looks with favor upon the offer of good offices from the Moroccan and Tunisian Governments to mediate between France and the Algerian nationalists, we took a big step forward. But in voting against the 17-power Asian-African resolution by supporting and actively promoting the Canadian amendment to this resolution, we once more threw our influence against the Asian-African group. Among other things, this led to a futile deadlock in the first committee and the later adoption of a rather meaningless resolution by the full assembly.

The only policy which has made sense to me in the past and continues to make sense to me today, is the active involvement of the United Nations in the Algerian situation by a request for a cease-fire and the creation of a commission for conciliation. Every informed observer agrees that Algerian independence sooner or later is inevitable. Meanwhile, the long-run security of the entire Western World is jeopardized by continuing a futile colonial war. Our NATO friends can best be strengthened by facing realities on Algeria rather than fostering illusions.

SOUTH AFRICA AGAIN

Every year several issues arise in the United Nations out of the harsh and tragic racial policies of the South African Government. Usually our Government loses the opportunity to make it clear where we stand on the racial question by simply stating that what happens in the Union of South Africa is a domestic issue and none of the rest of the world's business.

This year we had slight encouragement with the acceptance by our Government of a position on a three-man commission set up to try to persuade South Africa to accept United Nations supervision over Southwest Africa. South Africa has never recognized that the United Nations should succeed the League of Nations as the international trustee of the 450,000 people who live in this part of Africa. This is in direct violation of an advisory ruling by the World Court that United Nations supervision should be accepted.

But on the issue of apartheid our representative failed to get up on his feet before the nations of the world to point out that we in the United States, administratively, legislatively, and judicially, have recently launched a new effort to eliminate segregation in a wide variety of fields from schools to public transport. We might have made it perfectly clear that we believe in putting one's own house in order first on this matter, but that deliberately putting it in disorder by cultivating racism, whether under Hitler or as apartheid, is an evil humanity will not tolerate.

COLONIAL ISSUES

The most important new colonial issue to come up before the United Nations during this past General Assembly meeting was that of the Cameroons. There is evidently a growing restiveness among the peoples of this area, jointly supervised under trusteeship by Great Britain and France.

There are reports of growing violence, perhaps abetted by Communist agitation. But several petitioners who appeared before the fourth committee were not Communists and spoke of a widespread popular demand to unify the two Cameroons and to gain independence. The details of this request are dealt with elsewhere in this issue of Africa Today.

It is very difficult to take action without a full command of the facts. Why the United States could not have supported the sending of a special commission of inquiry to the Cameroons is difficult to grasp. In large measure because we opposed this course, the fourth committee was deadlocked and took no positive action whatsoever. The representatives of the African people were again forced to return with empty hands.

There were other instances of colonial issues where a positive direction from the United States might have made the difference. The attitude of our State Department in supporting Portugal's refusal to submit information on her non-self-governing territories is one of those great mysteries of policy seemingly so impossible to unravel or understand. Meanwhile, under handicaps like this, it is going to be very difficult to offset the propaganda campaign the Communists have now launched in Cairo with the establishment of the African-Asian Peoples Solidarity Council.

I like to believe the Free World has constructive alternatives, but we will need to move fast.

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly newsletter of January 25:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The debt limit is now $275 billion. Should we increase it $5 billion? Despite an average cash balance of $4 billion, fluctuations of receipts and expenditures may cause a dangerously low balance in the year ahead.

Arguments for: (1) Greater flexibility in refinancing and debt management will thus be permitted, resulting in savings; (2) when bills are owed, they must be paid; (3) it would be dangerous, somewhat ridiculous, to let the Federal Government run low or out of cash; (4) further financial hardship will result if postage rates are not raised as planned to produce $700 million income, also anticipated agricultural cuts of $300 million must be realized, and other budget items.

Arguments against: (1) Statutory debt limit is intended as a brake or restraint on Government spending; (2) $74 billion is enough, even too much, to spend already, and this provides just that much more; (3) refusing the increase will force reevaluation of planned expenditures and result in economies.

This was a tough decision. Fiscal responsibility could be argued either way. A Congressman's question to himself: Am I wrong? In one sense, I was being consistent, having voted for the economies that, if passed, would have eliminated any need for this debt increase. The outcome—$5 billion increase passed 328 to 71 after the attempt to reduce it to $3 billion failed 114 to 274, in which I joined.

The supplemental defense appropriations bill passed unanimously. The $1,260 million provided for: The dispersal and alert program of our retaliatory air force, $218 million; detection systems for spotting enemy missiles, $358 million; acceleration of ballistic missile programs, Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter, $333 million; acceleration of submarine and submarine Polaris missile program, $350 million. Many Congressmen, including myself, are studying the missile programs which involves classified and secret information. Our Nation is going ahead full speed, and we must. Some critics of the administration appear intent on solely playing politics. This solves nothing and obscures the facts.

Congressman VURSELL, of Illinois, observed, "If we are behind Russia in our rocket and missile programs, it is because former President Truman, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, and others who are criticizing President Eisenhower, preferred peanuts to missiles when they were in power from 1947 to 1952. The record will show during those years they gave the peanut growers of southern States a total subsidy of $117.7 million and appropriated less than $1.7 million for development of intermediate and long-range ballistic missiles—less than 2 percent

for missiles and more than 98 percent for peanuts. Now they are asking the people to trust their leadership and judgment over that of President Eisenhower."

What are the facts? Is it true: (1) That Generals Eisenhower and LeMay and others testified of urgent need for rocket and missile programs in 1947? (2) That $75 million appropriated by Congress for missiles was impounded by President Truman in 1949, thus stopping missile development? (3) That Russia seized 400 German scientists at the end of World War II, together with missile factories, blueprints, missiles, and got a 7-year head start on us? (4) That our missile program really started with this administration? The answers to these are "yes" on the record, this and much more. These facts should warn those who are solely politically motivated that it is time to make a positive, not destructive, contribution even when partisan.

Our Federal civilian payroll is growing. Despite 275,000 employee drop in 1953–54, the cost trend shows fiscal 1954—$9.4 billian, 1955—$9.6 billion, 1956—$10.5 billion, 1957—$11.2 billion. Is there an upper limit?

The President's economic report follows the budget, spelling out clearly big Federal Government. The fallacy that many nurture, it seems to me, is that big Government spending is economically stimulating, when in truth it is largely nonproductive and depressive. Further, in so many instances, Government spending and the heavy tax burden kills incentive and shackles the inventive genius of our people, as though we intended to penalize initiative and strangle free enterprise. Specifically, Government loans are of this nature and they are discriminatory. (Who gets them? Did you? No, Joe did, and you're paying for it. So, in fairness, a loan to everyone or to no one.) The report shows increased Government direct and guaranteed loan authority: (1) Small business and disaster loans; (2) chronic unemployment area loans and grants; (3) underdeveloped countries' loans; (4) Export-Import Bank, etc.; (5) suggested FHA loan increase up to $30,000. A host of welfare activities are also in the report. And critics of the administration are demanding much more.

## Zirconium for Atomic Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has prepared a statement concerning the development of zirconium for atomic purposes which, together with an article on this subject which was published in the Portland Oregonian of January 19, 1958, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZIRCONIUM FOR "NAUTILUS" AND OTHER ATOMIC PURPOSES PRODUCED AT ALBANY, OREG.

(Statement by Senator NEUBERGER)

I have told the Senate in the past of the remarkable discoveries made in the vital field of metallurgy at the United States Bureau of Mines Laboratory in Albany, Oreg. These findings have resulted in a major zirconium industry at this Willamette Valley community, in the plant of the Wah Chang Corp. and in that of Oregon Metallurgical Corp.

Zirconium produced at Albany helped to send the fabulous atomic submarine *Nautilus* to sea on a voyage of 60,000 miles. At one time the pilot plants at Albany were shut down. I am proud that I could team with the late Gov. Paul L. Patterson of Oregon, in 1955, to help open up these plants to their present prosperous and useful status, with nearly 500 Albany residents employed at such valuable and productive work.

In the Oregonian of Portland for January 19, 1958, a thorough and informative analysis of the Albany zirconium industry was published under the byline of Staff Reporter Paul Hauser. Because Wah Chang and Oregon Metallurgical are major suppliers of the Atomic Energy Commission and their subcontractors, I believe many Members of the Senate will be interested in Mr. Hauser's article, which was headlined, "Albany's Large Zirconium Industry Outgrowth of Experimental Plant."

---

[From the Oregonian of January 19, 1958]

ALBANY'S LARGE ZIRCONIUM INDUSTRY OUTGROWTH OF EXPERIMENTAL PLANT

(By Paul Hauser)

Had it not been for circumstance and a little push at the right time, Albany, Oreg., would be as far away from zirconium as A is from Z.

As it is, zirconium is a household word in Albany and the town is known to the Atomic Energy Commission principally as the place where a good share of the zirconium metal essential in atomic reactors is produced.

Nearly 500 Albany residents work in the plants of the Wah Chang Corp., which reduces zirconium ores into metal, and the plant of Oregon Metallurgical Corp., which forms the zirconium sponge into ingots and molded shapes. Two years ago neither of the companies was in operation in Albany. Oregon Metallurgical Corp. had not yet been formed and Wah Chang Corp., long active in the rare metals fields, was aware of Albany only as the site of the Northwest Electro Development Experiment Station of the United States Bureau of Mines.

SALE SMART

"The smartest thing the Albany Chamber of Commerce ever did was when it 'sold' old Albany College to the Bureau of Mines," Roy Collins, manager of the Albany branch of the United States National Bank, observed recently.

Collins, immediate past president of the chamber of commerce and professionally a careful observer of his town's economic pattern, believes the metals industry that has grown up because the Bureau of Mines did move onto the old Albany College campus, plus the additional payroll of Western Kraft Corp. at its new paper-from-woodchips mill, has been a lifesaver.

It was location of the Bureau of Mines Metallurgical Laboratory at Albany—and its own 285 employees and $1,500,000 payroll are important—that started the whole chain of circumstance that has boosted Albany out of the ordinary and added a stable industrial payroll to its essentially agricultural economy.

Albany's Bureau of Mines operation is an outgrowth of construction of Bonneville Dam. In 1942, shortly after power began to flow from Bonneville's generators, Congress authorized an electro development laboratory in the Northwest "to study the application of electrical energy to the processing of minerals of that region."

Spokane had been mentioned as a likely site, but Albany had available the vacant campus of Albany College, which in 1940 moved to Portland and later became Lewis and Clark College.

M'NARY HELPS

We didn't have any money, Collins recalled recently, but we raised a little and sent a man back to Washington, D. C. Senator McNary worked with us and we finally got the laboratory for Albany.

In 1945, not long after the laboratory was established, research was started toward finding a more economical method of producing zirconium metal which could be worked and rolled and molded. The available process of producing the metal was limited to small quantities and the cost was prohibitive for most uses. In 1943 the going rate per pound was $630 and a representative sale amounted to eight one-hundredths of a pound.

To the laboratory at Albany had come as a consultant a noted European metallurgist, Dr. W. J. Kroll, of Luxembourg. Dr. Kroll had already developed a process for producing titanium metal in commercial quantities. Titanium and zirconium had certain properties that were similar and it was decided to try variations of the process that had worked on titanium on the reduction of zirconium from zircon-sand concentrates from the Oregon coast.

Not long after the research project was started AEC scientists came to a conclusion from theoretical studies that zirconium would be a good bet for use in atomic piles and in powerplants using fissionable fuels.

AEC ADDS SUM

The Albany laboratory, with the AEC providing the funds, went rapidly to a pilot-plant operation and then to production. Because of the urgency of the AEC's need for zirconium that could be rolled into sheet metal, the Bureau of Mines found itself outside its ordinary role of research and development. The Albany station became the world's largest producer of zirconium metal. It turned out more than 1 million pounds of the metal before the first private production, using the process developed by the Bureau at Albany started.

That could have been the end of zirconium for Albany, for the Bureau of Mines plant, on which $3 million had been spent, was shut down in 1955 after a plant of the Carborundum Co. at Akron, N. Y., reached full production.

NEEDS INCREASE

The AEC found it needed more zirconium than it had planned, however, and a year later, in May 1956, the Bureau of Mines Albany plant was reopened with Wah Chang Corp. assigned to operate it.

Wah Chang (the Chinese name means fortunate enterprise) started dealing in metals in 1914, importing tungsten concentrates from the Far East. It had become one of the leading producers and processors of tungsten metal. Its research and development of titanium processes and research with zirconium led to its selection to be the private contract operator of the Government plant at Albany.

Moving into Albany, the Wah Chang Corp. took a look around and apparently liked what it saw, for a few months after it was awarded the AEC contract for 2-year operation of the Bureau of Mines plant it started building its own facilities on a 45-acre site north of Albany. In a few months all of its Albany operations will be located there as an integrated metals plant, an approximate $4 million investment.

What did Wah Chang find in Albany beside the readymade production plant of the Bureau of Mines and a nucleus of trained workers?

LABOR READY

One of the main considerations, according to Stephen Yih, general manager of Wah Chang's Albany operations, was the discovery of an adaptable, intelligent labor force, easily trained for the complicated and careful oper-

ations necessary in producing metals to the rigid specifications of the AEC.

"Here you can take a man from a farm or from somewhere else where he has had no factory experience and train him in a week. We've found the people hard working, ambitious, and ready to learn. It's extremely important in our operation."

Although circumstance played a great part in Albany getting a metals industry in the first place, the community of Albany has done much to keep it.

"It's a very progressive small community," said Yih. "We have had lots of experience at different plant locations. Here we have found the people most understanding and most cooperative, ready to sit down and discuss problems and help work out a solution."

Another factor that has pleased Wah Chang in Oregon has been the high quality and fast delivery of special devices it ordered fabricated by Oregon manufacturers for its new plants.

PROGRESS SEEN

Because of this and cooperation it had from other sources, the company has made a record in building a plant and getting it in full operation inside of 6 months.

Anticipating a continuous demand for zirconium (there is no stockpile of the metal), Yih believes Wah Chang will be a permanent industry in Albany. The company is preparing to produce other reactive metals for commercial use and in 4 or 5 years, according to Yih, should have a diversified operation not dependent on Government contracts.

Oregon Metallurgical Corp. was formed primarily by Albany and Eugene capital to work with the metals made available by the processes developed at the Bureau of Mines station, taking advantage of the know-how developed there. Stephen Shelton, who had been director of the Bureau of Mines station, became general manager.

Now engaged on a $4 million contract to turn out zirconium ingot for the Westinghouse Electrical Corp., Oregon Met.'s Albany plant employs 125 people and has a monthly payroll of about $60,000. It also does special laboratory and shop services work for Wah Chang Corp.

A pioneer in casting the rare metals, titanium and zirconium, Oregon Metallurgical anticipates that this part of its business will increase greatly as commercial application of the corrosive-resistant metals grows.

GROWTH AHEAD

Western Kraft Corp., whose mill in Albany started operation in September 1955, is more akin to the traditional agricultural-lumber economy of the Willamette Valley than Albany's new metal plants. It, too, is a happy new resident.

"I can't say enough good things about the community of Albany," said Neil Duffy, Western Kraft's resident manager. "They make us feel a wanted industry. Such an attitude helps us."

LABOR PRAISED

Like Yih, Duffy praised the quality of Willamette Valley labor. The company now employs 140 hourly workers, and most of them were trained on the job.

Looking forward to growth, the city of Albany is ready for it.

Last year the city put in 6 miles of streets and 12 miles of sewers, most of it in an undeveloped area in the south end of town. Now there's room for 200 houses to be built there with streets and sewers all in.

"We're proceeding on the basis that we're going to grow within the city limits," said City Manager Bill Bollman. "I think it's significant that the property owners were willing to go ahead on the basis that growth will take place."

"If things break like people say they will next year," said Mayor W. L. Fitzpatrick, a retired utility executive, "we're ready for it."

## Allied Dependability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the President and Secretary of State tell us we must extend aid to our allies and to neutral free nations lest they become satellites of Russia.

This has been American policy since the advent of the cold war following World War II.

In spite of U. N., NATO, SEATO, and the Baghdad Pact and after United States spending $70 billion, the temper of these favored nations has grown to be more lenient toward the aggressive habits of the Communist regime and more convinced of their political and economic inability to resist. Not only that, but they express more freely their national distrust of the American policy.

Furthermore, while we have taxed our citizens excessively and incurred an unprecedented national debt, practically every nation we have favored has unwisely permitted its financial position to be dangerously depleted through liberalization of its social welfare programs—a position that, if anything, has left it less able to carry its just portion of any allied effort toward combating aggression.

With the exception of Western European nations, we have witnessed a growing tendency on the part of some of our former friends and many reputed neutrals to play America against Russia, waxing both warm and cold as we watch and outbid or delay aid, while Russia with her Communist infiltrators succeeds in gaining a strong foothold in their government machinery, awaiting the opportune time to take over.

We have seen the Indonesian Government's collapse at the hands of the Communists. Burma and Thailand are dangerously threatened while Vietnam hangs by a string. India's financial position is reputed to be at the breaking point with Communist influence reported to be gaining by the day. Egypt, with Russian help, defies the Western World. Syria is becoming a strategic stronghold threatening our Arab friends in that region.

France is on the verge of losing her hold in north Africa, while the Scandinavian countries closely related geographically to the Great Bear fear outright cooperation with the West.

We may as well be realistic in planning our financial outlays to nations whose questionable loyalty is apt to be determined by their estimate of the potential dangers they might suffer in any war between two powerful nations. History is replete with vacillations and reversals of alinement when the national interest takes precedence over everything else.

In view of the uncertainties of dependable allies in any world conflict, the United States is apt to overestimate her physical and military capacity to finance questionable nations. The dangers of overindulging our finances, our resources, and manpower could reduce us to the same economic vacuum Great Britain found herself in at the end of World War II, and without a friend strong enough to come to our rescue.

This means we must resolve to keep our own house in order. The only way our democracy can compete with Russia's potential to make war is to bring our people to realize the necessity of voluntarily making some of the sacrifices that people of the Iron Curtain countries are compelled to make. This will test the loyalty, the patriotism, and the moral fabric of the American people.

The first step must begin with our national policymakers by convincing the rank and file that all waste, extravagance, and fruitless spending will be eliminated. They must show themselves a willingness to make personal sacrifices. Highly paid administrators and military leaders in the higher ranks should recognize their obligations to stand in the forefront in our fight against inflation rather than demand pay increases. How else can they expect to dissuade labor leaders from pressing for increased wages at every turn in the road? Loyalty and patriotism are not measured in terms of the money involved.

Next, the people themselves must accept the burden of cost imposed on them whether it be increased taxes, personal sacrifice, or both. The Nation can no longer afford the dual dangers of deficit budgeting and inflation.

That our best protection against war lies in the creation and maintenance of strong defensive capabilities, there can be no doubt. That a determined citizenry convinced that they are not being gypped by reckless administrators and profiteers will bear their taxload even at the sacrifice of personal longings cannot be doubted.

Realizing that our national strength and standing among nations of the world rests upon our ability to shun further involvement in national debt and its sequel, unbridled inflation, we must resolve that come what may we will build an adequate defense system on a pay-as-we-go basis as the only way we can avoid bankruptcy.

We can be no stronger abroad than we are at home. Without strength and financial solvency our days as a world power are numbered.

## Federal-State-Local Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members of the House, I should like to insert in the RECORD a copy of a press release which was sent last week to the wire services and to daily newspapers throughout the country.

The press release follows:

Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, said today that the subcommittee will hold public hearings in Washington next month to hear representatives of nongovernmental organizations and individuals having a particular interest in and knowledge of Federal-State-local relationships. The hearings are planned as part of an extensive study of intergovernmental relations being carried out by the subcommittee. The subcommittee heard testimony from more than 150 witnesses, including governors, legislators, mayors and other State and local officials during regional hearings in 9 cities last fall. Federal officials will be asked to testify later this year.

Congressman FOUNTAIN said the subcommittee "is seeking evidence bearing on two broad questions: first, whether the existing division of responsibility between the national and other levels of government is proper and satisfactory, and, second, whether and by what means intergovernmental cooperation can be improved in the grant-in-aid programs and their operation made more efficient and economical." Those wishing to present their viewpoint on these questions should communicate with James R. Naughton, counsel, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., not later than January 31.

In addition to Representative FOUNTAIN, members of the subcommittee are: ROBERT E. JONES, Democrat, of Alabama, HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, OVERTON BROOKS, Democrat, of Louisiana, CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, FLORENCE P. DWYER Republican, of New Jersey, ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, EDWIN H. MAY, JR., Republican, of Connecticut. Representatives WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the full committee, and CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, are ex officio members.

## Pay TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to discuss a bill I have introduced which would reassert the right of the American people to the radio-television wavelengths.

It is my understanding that when the Federal Communications Act was first passed it was based on the concept that the airwaves belonged to all the American people. The Communications Commission was created to guard those airwaves. It is their prime concern to protect the interest of the American people in this vitally important heritage.

On the whole, I believe the Commission has acted wisely and done well. But at present there is a threat that it may be acting outside the interest of the American people as a whole, and in the interest of a selfish few. I refer to the proposal to establish subscription television, the so-called pay-as-you-watch TV system.

The large corporations which advocate subscription television maintain their plan would improve television programing. I doubt if this is true; but even if it is, who would benefit from this improved programing? I submit it would be the fortunate few who can afford the added cost. And it would be at the expense of the many whose ownership of the airwaves has never before been disputed by act of Congress or court writ.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would once again reserve the airwaves for the American people and would bar the Commission from granting television licenses when the applicant contemplates charging a fee.

It is time the American people once again took control over that which is theirs by right.

## The Nation's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include a copy of my weekly newsletter "Keenotes" which was issued today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The Nation's economy is precariously balanced. Although official Washington is reluctant to discuss the economic situation in realistic terms, there is no denying the fact that the country as a whole is suffering a recession.

Call it what you may—a leveling off at a high plateau, a breathing spell, a readjustment, or any of the other mysterious terms economists love to use—these facts are clear:

Unemployment has increased to about 4 million and the length of the workweek—which determines take-home pay—has grown steadily shorter.

The average manufacturing worker made $1.13 a week less in December 1957 than he did a year earlier.

Industrial output in December stood at 136 percent of the 1947–49 average, down from 139 in November and 147 in December 1956.

Housing starts in December were only 62,000, the lowest monthly figure since before the Korean war.

These and other pessimistic indicators do not add up to a depression. They do, however, clearly indicate that something is wrong with the economy. If the storm signals, so clearly hoisted, are ignored, the economy will run into extremely rough seas.

Basically, the country is in a strong economic position. All signs point for a continued expansion over the long pull. Despite 4 million unemployed, about 65 million people are gainfully employed. Each 3 years the population increases about 1 million people, which should add in the years ahead to the demand for all kinds of goods and create new jobs.

But for the man out of a job, or the worker cut back to 3 days a week, the present depressed conditions are of more importance than the bright outlook for the future. These men find it hard to understand how the cost of living can increase 3½ percent during a year when they cannot find work or when they suffer layoffs.

There are some indications that the administration is becoming concerned. If this concern is not translated soon into fiscal policies that will check and reverse the downward trend in business, we could be in for serious trouble before the end of the year.

No longer is unemployment the concern of just a few isolated areas. Workers in many industries all over the country now find themselves in the same unfortunate situation as many coal miners in West Virginia. The Government has thus far refused to support measures to meet the needs of economically depressed areas, such as I proposed in H. R. 1949.

The neglect of this serious problem has been extremely costly, not only in terms of loss of purchasing power to communities but in suffering and hardship for thousands of families.

A recession may, to Government officials, be merely a set of statistics or lines on a chart. But to men out of work, and to their families, it is a deep personal tragedy, a shameful waste of human resources.

I hope the neglect of our depressed areas, which have festered on the economic system during the country's greatest prosperity, will not be repeated in attacking the wider, more basic economic problems now facing the country.

If the administration fails to take bold action to meet the developing economic crisis head on, the results can be tragic and of lasting consequences. We cannot hope, in a depressed economic climate, to maintain pace with the Russians in the struggle for supremacy.

## Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Ukrainian independence was proclaimed at Kiev 40 years ago, but permanent freedom could not then be achieved. Forces from which the Ukrainian people could not protect themselves have temporarily crushed freedom in the Ukraine which now lies behind the Iron Curtain, a victim of despotism.

Americans view the present plight of the Ukrainian people with sadness. Our Nation has traditionally stood for the concepts of freedom and humanity. In recent years, as the threat of Communist enslavement has grown, we have extended a helping hand to others.

Americans have a special feeling for the Ukraine, because our land has been enriched by the coming to its shores of many sons of the Ukraine who have settled here, have prospered, and have made their contribution to our common life. Sons of the Ukraine has brought to this land their special talents and cultural backgrounds, and have proved themselves fine citizens.

Lovers of freedom look for the day when the Ukraine will achieve the independence which her people long have cherished.

## New Federal Aid Bill, 1958 Variety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I have just concluded a brief study of the new billion-dollar legislation proposed, drafted by and sent to the Congress by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This is its so-called educational program for 1958. It is about the 40th annual legislative program from the United States Office of Education.

The audacity of this bill is dumbfounding. Let us examine just a few of its misleading provisions:

To begin with, this is no scholarship bill; the Federal scholarship program is nothing more than a smokescreen. This is a teacher-pay bill and should have been labeled as such.

More than 75 percent of the funds provided by this bill goes directly into teachers' salaries. Its real title should be the "Teacher Pay Bill of 1958, and Its Vote-Getting Possibilities."

TEACHERS' SALARIES

More than three-quarters of the money authorized by this measure is to be doled out to the States to pay salaries of high school mathematics and science teachers. Up to $150 million per year is to be spent directly by the Federal Government—to be matched by the States in the usual grant-in-aid fashion—to employ additional science or mathematics teachers, or to increase the salaries of those already employed.

Just to make sure that the Federal Government gets credit for this, the States are warned not to approve any program to increase the pay of their teachers prior to July 1, 1958. The bureaucrats do not want to miss out on controlling the salaries paid by the States.

If the State of Virginia, whose legislature is in session right now considering the request of her new Governor that teachers' salaries be increased, should approve his program, Virginia would in effect throw away her share of the Federal dole proposed in this bill.

So, not only are we asked to put more than a half-billion dollars of Federal money into paying high-school teachers' salaries over the next 4 years, but the States are asked to drag their feet and suspend any increase that any State may now be considering until the outcome of this legislation can be determined.

For what it is worth to these States, if I have anything to do with it, the States should go on functioning and disregard this demoralizing offer. They should plan their own programs.

THE 4-YEAR MYTH

We are told by the President, in his message to Congress, that these new proposals to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are for a 4-year period only.

Yet, section 121 of the proposed bill by HEW authorizes appropriations for each of the 4 fiscal years ending with June 30, 1962, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, for a total period of 7 years, through June 30, 1965.

In section 401 again the program is not for 4 years only but the authorization is for this fiscal year, and each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years for a total of 6 years, through June 30, 1964.

FOREIGN-LANGUAGE VACATIONS

Would you like to learn a foreign language at Federal Government expense, with allowances for your dependents, traveling expenses anywhere in the world, and get paid for leaving your present job and going to school abroad?

It is possible under the HEW bill to do just that.

Title III authorizes the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts with institutions of higher education to operate institutes for advanced training of foreign language teachers, or to establish centers to teach such foreign languages as may be needed by government, business, industry, or education. People who attend such centers must give reasonable assurance—whatever that means—that they will be available for teaching such foreign languages; under these conditions such students will be paid for going to school and given an allowance for dependents and for travel to and from their homes, as well as the cost of schooling itself.

It is not until you get to the final pages of this bill that it is discovered that the term "institution of higher education" includes any "institution not located in any State." The United States Office of Education is certainly getting ready for world government on a big scale.

DICTATING TO THE STATES

For many years the United States Office of Education has been annoyed that so many of the 48 State offices of education fail or refuse to answer HEW questionnaires the way HEW thinks they should be.

For example, my State of New York refused to answer a questionnaire sent to get the facts on so-called classroom shortages. Of course this did not really bother the Office of Education too much; it simply supplied its own estimate of shortages for the nonreporting States, such as New York.

The State of North Carolina also refused to send in a figure as high as was wanted in Washington. So, pressure was brought to bear to have the figure of classroom shortage increased.

The most recent figures on teachers, pupils, classrooms, and so forth, show that a good many States just do not answer the questions. There are many States who do not want Federal aid to education and are not going to be a party to the assembly of fake statistics designed to stampede the Congress into passing it.

This bill is designed to bribe the State offices of education to cooperate in dreaming up statistical data. It provides money to be doled out to States who do give the United States Office of Education the answers they want.

This is contained in title V, which provides up to $50,000, to be spent by each State to collect, analyze, and report statistical data to Washington. This money may be paid "only if the State has provided reasonable assurance that the State educational agency will comply with requests of the Commissioner for information," or—and here is ironclad control—"on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section." From these Commissioner's decisions there is no judicial appeal.

So this is it. The Commissioner gives, and the Commissioner takes away.

CONCLUSION

Last week I stated my conviction and I repeat it again—that whatever is wrong in public education, it is not lack of money. I proved it from the record of what has been spent for public education as compared with all other nonmilitary expenditures, such as construction, income, salaries, wages, and so forth.

Suppose we may need more mathematics and science teachers years hence—and that has not been proved. Suppose we may need more foreign language teachers sometime—and that has not been proved.

There is nothing in this bill that cures our present crisis. Like most preceding United States Office of Education proposals, it creates another crisis—Federal control.

---

## H. R. 10426, Re Increasing the Permissible Time Between Advance Purchase of Rights-of-Way and Construction Under Section 110 of Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, From 5 to 7 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 10426 to amend section 110 (a), "advance rights-of-way acquisitions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956." Under the provisions of this bill amending the present act permission would be granted to extend the period of time in which actual construction is required to be started from 5 years to 7 years after purchase of rights-of-way.

Experience has shown that additional time is justified and needed between the purchase, not only for construction of the Interstate System but also on primary, secondary and rural and urban highways, of rights-of-way and actual construction.

The present section 110 (a) provides that a 5-year period is the outside limit of time between the fiscal year in which a request for reimbursement of the cost of acquired rights-of-way is made and commencement of actual construction.

Under the present provisions the States are seriously hampered from purchasing rights-of-way unless construction is definitely programed to begin within the 5-year period. In many States such as Florida, where the cost of rights-of-way is daily increasing and plans for substantial highway construction are being made far in advance of the actual beginning of work this provision is not as fully helpful as was intended.

The provision for advance purchase of rights-of-way and reimbursment by the Federal Government of their share of these costs was written into the Highway bill of 1956 as the result of my amendment offered in the Committee on Public Works and contained the provisions of a bill which I introduced in the House. This section acknowledged the very realistic problem of acquiring rights-of-way well in advance of construction—permitting more long-range planning, providing for purchases at less cost and authorizing for the first time the use of funds well in advance of construction by the States in order to acquire needed rights-of-way.

The State Road Department of Florida, through its chairman, Wilbur Jones, advised the Florida delegation, and reaffirmed this advice in writing, that "the extension of time would be of material help in Florida, where costs of rights-of-way are mounting at an alarming rate." He further pointed out, "the Department would be able to acquire needed land in many areas without the pressure of getting construction under way in all areas within the present deadline of 5 years."

I believe that the amendment offered by me today would further carry out the intent of Congress under section 110 (a) which for the first time provided for advance purchase of rights-of-way, the wisdom of that legislation having been proven manifold—and the estimate of savings under this provision being as high as 10 percent of the total cost of highway programs throughout the country. This proven value should justify extension of the period from 5 to 7 years in order to make this important provision even more workable and useful.

## The President's Recommendations on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to sponsor the recommendations of the President in his message to the Congress today pertaining to education.

As a former superintendent of schools, I believe this is the soundest legislative approach yet made to meet our needs in education.

Personally, I would like this bill to become a topic of conversation at the breakfast, lunch and dinner table in every home in America so that not only the parents but their children, the students themselves, will realize the responsibilities and challenges which lie ahead. Whether their aptitudes are in science, engineering, languages, or in related cultural subjects, this new program contains great promise for them.

The people will then know that we are interested in them and in their children, not for today alone but for the years to come, and they will be willing to cooperate with us in what we are attempting to do in this bill—to open a door that will give the students of America the opportunity to pursue their education in fields for which they are fitted and by which they can meet the challenge to the future security of our Nation.

The administration, as well as the Congress of the United States, realizes that no longer can we afford to fail to utilize the full potential of our youth in America.

You, my colleagues, know that I share your concern that Federal legislation pertaining to education should not carry with it the threat of Federal control. The provisions of this bill eliminate the possibility of Federal control. They do, however, provide the instrument for the departments of education of the States and Territories and for our local school systems to participate in an enlightened program that will be welcomed in every American home—not by any directive from Washington, but as a means of encouraging them to strengthen their own school curriculums.

The bill embodies seven key features:

First. It authorizes matching grants to encourage the early identification of the aptitudes of our children—the teachers, scientists, engineers, and statesmen of tomorrow.

Second. It provides, also on a matching basis, for improved counseling and guidance in those courses of study which will lead to the fullest development of the abilities needed to assure the Nation's future progress.

Third. It establishes a State-administered scholarship program for able boys and girls who graduate from high school and who need assistance in order to go on to college.

Fourth. It authorizes assistance to State and local school systems in strengthening the teaching of science and mathematics—subjects vital both to understanding of the era into which we have entered and to developing the advanced scientific and engineering skills necessary to our national security.

Fifth. It recognizes the importance of modern foreign languages to our responsibilities abroad by providing for the improvement of language teaching methods and for the establishment of centers for training in the many languages little known in this country which are spoken by hundreds of millions of the world's people.

Sixth. It provides for expanding the graduate schools of our colleges and universities as the principal source of the fully prepared teachers who will be needed in rapidly increasing numbers if the quality of higher education is to be maintained in the face of sharply expanding enrollments.

Finally, it provides for improving and expanding our factual knowledge about the status and progress of American education in meeting the needs of national security.

I ask not only the Congress of the United States, but all the people, to get behind this great program to stimulate education in America. This is not a partisan bill but rather an opportunity on a united front to call forth and to utilize the abilities and talents of our boys and girls, our young men and women, and to give them the understanding needed for the challenge of the new age in which we live.

## A Pattern for Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the recess period I wrote an article for the November 1957 issue of the Progressive magazine entitled "A Pattern for Peace in the Middle East."

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PATTERN FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY)

When I returned from my trip to the Middle East last spring I reported to my colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the Middle East urgently needed a regional development agency. I felt that such an agency might work a revolution in this disturbed and distressed area—a revolution which would strike a hard blow at the region's worst enemy, poverty, and thus help to ward off the threat of communism. Events in Syria during the last few months have again underlined this urgent necessity.

Because the West lacks such an instrument, for cooperation and progress, we have stood helplessly on the sidelines, watching Syria arrange for large loans and other economic favors, as well as the acquisition of weapons, from the Soviet Union.

The Eisenhower administration has not found an effective reply to Syria's pro-Kremlin course. It is floundering in the search for a positive and effective solution because it does not understand the needs and hopes of the peoples in the Middle East, and is therefore unable to respond to them.

Last spring I wrote in my formal report: "To put it bluntly, our policy has concerned itself too much with kings and oil, too little with people and water." It is because of this preoccupation with monarchs and material wealth that the administration has been unable to anticipate and avert the Syrian alinement with Moscow. Once more it has shown itself incapable of effective response. It resorts to inadequate and feeble gestures which may only make conditions worse.

Communism cannot subvert or dominate a healthy society. But the Middle East is not a healthy society. It suffers from economic and political ailments which have created imbalance and instability, and have rendered

the region extremely vulnerable to Communist penetration.

These abnormalities can be listed:

1. The terrible poverty of the great mass of peasants and workers, as contrasted with the enormous wealth of the landlords and kings.

2. A similar disparity in wealth between the oil-producing States and the have-not States which lie between the oil producers and their markets.

3. The mass homelessness of the Palestinian Arabs.

4. The inability of middle class and educated Arabs to find useful occupations and careers in a stagnant society.

These four economic disabilities combine to make for political instability.

Because economic independence lagged behind political advance, because sovereignty in itself did not bring sustenance, representative democracy and the political institutions cherished in Western society have failed to attract the Arab peoples. Governments have belonged to kings or military juntas, who have held power by repressive force, whipped up exaggerated nationalism, and incited the hungry and the dispossessed to blame their misery on foreigners. There has been no lack of scapegoats—many of them with a legitimate share of responsibility. There were the retreating British and the French. We Americans have inherited much of the enmity formerly directed at them. Last, but not least, there are the Israelis who have twice bested the Arabs in battle.

In addition to poverty and political instability, the Middle East is tormented by intraregional conflicts. There are the family feuds and interstate rivalries within the Arab world. Overshadowing these is the continuing war against Israel.

These conflicts have led to a disastrous arms race, which is consuming the energies and impairing the development of both the Arab peoples and Israel. To this arms race both the United States and the Soviet Union are contributing recklessly.

Finally, the region is desperately afraid of involvement in the cold war. Thus, it suffers from two kinds of insecurity: the psychological insecurity which arises from the frustrations of environment; and the military insecurity which results from the proximity of powerful nations capable of swallowing up the entire area.

Here, then, is a sick society afflicted with a whole complex of serious ailments: poverty, refugee homelessness, the Arab-Israel conflict, an arms race, and the direct threat of invasion. We must find answers to each of these problems, if we can.

There is no easy way to make poor people richer, particularly if they live in barren countries. There are few areas in the world where people produce and earn as little as do the poverty-stricken masses in the Arab states. Even in the wealthy oil-producing areas the tremendous royalties are reserved for the rulers and little reaches the ruled. Here is a situation made to order for the Communists.

The oil-producing countries are naturally allned with the West because we provide them a market. But the oil flows through the territory of the neighboring "have-not" countries. Oil pipelines from Iraq and Saudi Arabia pass through Syria. Oil tankers from Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf must go through the Suez Canal in Egyptian territory. The "have-not" nations receive a relatively modest sum for transit fees. The contrast in income is huge. No one has precise figures, but it has been estimated that the 10 million people who live in Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and the Persian Gulf states have a total oil income of close to $1 billion a year. The "have-not" nations of the Arab world, with about 30 million people, take in only about $30 million. This disparity is exploited by Moscow, which has made headway in the Middle East because it understands that the greatest weakness in the area is the tremendous gulf between the "haves" and the "have-nots." The Soviet Union doesn't need Middle East oil, but, if it can exercise control over the flow of oil to Europe, it can shake the economies and undermine the defenses of the continent. Little wonder the Soviet Union has applied itself so assiduously to the courtship of Egypt and Syria.

It isn't necessary to use epithets to measure the current ideological temperatures in these countries. One doesn't have to say that they have become satellites in order to assess the extent of the danger which has arisen because of their close association with Moscow. I am sure that both Syria and Egypt will stoutly deny that they are agents of the Kremlin.

I did not reach Syria on my trip. But I did have a long talk with Colonel Nasser in Cairo and from what I saw and heard, I am sure that Nasser is not a Communist. I am equally sure that he is unduly naive about the menace of communism both inside Egypt and in the entire Middle Eastern area. Like Syria, Egypt is prepared to aline itself with the Soviet Union whenever it will serve temporary advantage. But apparently neither country is aware of the fact that the Soviet Union may be using it rather than vice versa.

It may be too late to win these countries away from their present Soviet orientation. They may not be redeemable until they have learned the hard lessons of life with the Kremlin. Yet I for one still believe that the situation is redeemable, particularly if we would use our influence and capacity as well as the prestige of the U. N. to create the Middle East Development Agency to which I have referred.

Divided though the Middle East may be by the personal animosities and ambitions of rulers, and torn though it may be by the dissensions inherent in the East-West struggle, it may begin to prosper if it transforms itself into a working-cooperating-community.

A Middle East development agency as I see it would consist of the nations of the region, and, in addition, other nations which want to contribute their capital and skill. It could undertake and manage development projects itself. It could carry on scientific research, basic engineering surveys, draw up overall regional development plans, and provide long-term technical assistance. This instrument would be a means by which the wealthy oil states could help their neighbors and thus put oil revenue into productive uses which would benefit the entire area rather than pander to private pleasure.

It could make the most of the region's precious water resources, work out a solution to the Arab refugee problem by promoting the Jordan River development plan, and help farmers settle on new land that would become available under their irrigation schemes involving the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Nile.

A regional agency is essential because the major rivers, like the oil lines, cross state boundaries. One of the reasons why the Aswan Dam project could not go forward as originally projected was the fact the waters flow through several countries—not just Egypt.

Intraregional conflicts and boycotts now hamper free trade and impede the prospects of development throughout the Middle East. Were such an agency to be established, all nations could assist it. The young and sensitive sovereignties of the Middle East would not feel that they are deprived of their new independence. Moreover, establishment of such an agency would be far more significant in repelling the current Communist offensive than the melodramatic flight of Globemasters and Boxcars carrying rifles and jeeps for the arms race.

A Middle East development agency would also be available to help work out a solution to the Arab refugee problem. We can no longer afford to temporize with the plight of these hapless people who live on bare subsistence levels in wretched camps maintained by the U. N., rootless, jobless, disillusioned, and embittered. These refugee camps have become hotbeds of political intrigue, deliberately fomented by Communists and anti-Western agitators.

A dispassionate review of the history of the Palestine conflict must lead to the observation that there would not have been a single refugee if the Arab States had accepted the U. N. partition resolution of 1947 and had agreed to the establishment of an independent Arab state as well as the state of Israel. Up to now Arab leaders have done little or nothing to assist their fellow Arabs in the refugee camps, lest they lose political leverage over Israel.

Today the United States is increasingly blamed for the plight of these unfortunate refugees in an obvious effort to exonerate others from their own responsibility. Actually, America has done far more than anyone else to alleviate misery and has been most generous in offering to help both the Arab States and Israel to bring about refugee resettlement. But recriminations over the past will not solve the problem. We need a new effort to bring about the resettlement of the Arab refugees in lands where there is room and opportunity for them. Nothing is more absurd and harmful to the refugees themselves than to continue to insist that Israel should repatriate a large number of immigrants whose whole indoctrination for the past 10 years has been one of hatred for the Jewish state.

Moreover, from my visit to the refugee camps, I am convinced that any large scale repatriation to Israel would be against the best interests of the Arab refugees themselves, half of them are now under 15 years of age. This means that despite the professional Arab insistence on repatriation, half of the refugees have no roots in Palestine at all, and probably have little interest in going there. Israel should be prepared to take back a token number of Arab refugees—she already has close to 200,000 Arabs within her borders—and to pay compensation for abandoned Arab lands. But the major hope for resettlement of any substantial number lies in Iraq, which desperately needs people and which has the land and the water and the oil to feed them and to put them to work. Syria also has land available if she could be induced to recognize that the refugees would be an asset.

But the most critical area is Jordan, where many of the refugees are now concentrated. They are a continuing threat to the stability of that country, a threat far more serious than the possibility of an attack by Syria. We have been aiding Jordan, but I believe that we have been aiding Jordan in the wrong way. Shipments of arms, however dramatic and impressive, and however they may please Jordanian soldiers and officers, will not bring about the stability that Jordan needs, because arms do not solve the real problems. One of these is to resettle the refugees.

Apart from those that can be moved to Iraq, there are some 200,000 Palestinian Arabs who could be settled in the Jordan Valley if we could induce Jordan to go ahead with the imaginative Jordan Valley development proposal upon which Ambassador Eric Johnston has labored so capably in recent years. Bear in mind that technical and engineering agreements for the sharing of the resources of the Jordan River were reached by Ambassador Johnston in his negotiations with both Israel and the Arab States. That agreement, unfortunately, was vetoed at the last minute by Syria at a meeting of the Arab

League in Cairo 2 years ago, when the Russians first began their arms shipments to Egypt.

It is tragic waste to stand still. We know the problem, and we know the solution. Only political expediency stands in the way. Instead of appropriating large sums of money every other year to pay for relief which simply perpetuates the miserable status quo of the refugee camps, we should begin to insist on the resettlement of a large number of these refugees in a logical and humane way. For this we need a new U. N. Good Offices Commission which could deal with this problem effectively.

We have lived with the Arab-Israel conflict for so long that we have come to take it for granted. From my talks with both Israelis and Arabs I believe there is not a single problem between them that could not be reconciled if the parties seriously sat down across the conference table in direct negotiations. The experience of U. N. mediator Ralph Bunche in negotiating the armistice agreements at Rhodes in 1949 demonstrated that agreements can be reached and that Israel and the Arab States can put their signatures to the same piece of paper.

But in recent years the administration has taken the position that we should not try to push the Arab States into negotiations for a settlement. We have bowed to the Arab position that the Arab States may continue to be belligerents and remain openly and officially at war with Israel, despite their obligations under the U. N. Charter to settle their disputes peacefully. The Arab strategy has always been clear. Conceding that they could not defeat Israel in battle, they have felt that they might strangle Israel economically. They have persisted in a boycott and a blockade and have refused any kind of negotiation.

Unfortunately, the Arab States have come to believe that the present boundaries between them and Israel are temporary, and that if they hold out long enough they can secure territorial concessions. We ought to make it clear as a matter of basic policy that the 1949 U. N. armistice boundaries constitute inviolable political boundaries, subject to change only by the joint agreement of the states concerned. If we can, at the same time, disabuse Arab leaders of the notion that they may some day pour hundreds of thousands of Arab refugees back into Israel, they may come to recognize that continued hostility to Israel is inimical to them as well as to world peace.

Negotiations looking toward a peace settlement should be instituted as quickly as possible. The good offices of other Mediterranean nations might be useful—particularly Greece and Italy.

Meanwhile we should try to maintain the present calm on Israel's frontiers by continuing the life and functions of the U. N. emergency force. The UNEF has worked a revolution—in a way highly gratifying to every friend of the U. N. It is established on the Gaza strip. It has deterred the activities of the fedayeen who used to cross the frontier to commit acts of sabotage and terror. Another unit, stationed at Sharm-el-Sheikh on the Straits of Tiran, has guaranteed the international character of that waterway, and ships have been going through the Gulf of Aqaba linking Israel's expanding port of Elath with the coast of east Africa and the Orient. As a result, the West has an alternative route across Israel which can bypass the Suez Canal if and when it should become necessary to do so.

Obviously, the UNEF has been a force for peace, and it would be tragic if it were dismantled or its effectiveness impaired in any way during the present session of the U. N. I hope that all parties will accept a continuation of the UNEF in its present positions without disturbance and debate. If Egypt insists on the withdrawal of UNEF, then we may be in for a new round of conflict in the Middle East.

Naturally, when we see the Soviet Union pouring arms into the Middle East, we are tempted to demonstrate to our friends that we can do as well as the Kremlin. But is it really in the best interests of the people of Jordan to rush rifles and guns and ammunition to their army? Is it in the best interests of the Free World? Jordan is vulnerable to Syrian intrigue because it lacks stability. We should be taking measures to stabilize the economy and the regime by removing the causes of instability: poverty, the homelessness of Arab refugees, and the failure to exploit properly what little resources there are.

We should not be drawn into an arms race with the Soviet Union in the Middle East because the masters of the Kremlin have large amounts of surplus equipment, and they aren't particular where they put them since their purpose is disorder. They will dispose of these arms wherever they are best calculated to create tension and conflict.

We are in a far better position to compete with the Soviet Union in a program to furnish economic assistance and to stimulate economic development. As the wealthiest and most productive power in the world, we can win that kind of race, and, if we choose this weapon, we will be using our own resources to the best advantage.

It is tragic to feel we have to keep shipping arms to the Arab States even from the standpoint of the Arabs themselves—because it diverts them from economic development and peace. Certainly, it is tragic too from the standpoint of Israel. I had a long visit with Prime Minister Ben-Gurion during my journey. He is typical of his country. He is a man of courage, religion, intelligence, and determination, and he has a sense of humor. He expresses no fear of his neighbors, but he believes that Israel cannot realize her potential until there is peace.

On the basis of the past record, there is no immediate danger that the arms we ship to the Arab countries will be used against Israel tomorrow. But, if the Soviet Union keeps on sending arms into Egypt and Syria and if we continue to arm Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia, we are forcing Israel to put the brakes on its own spectacular development program and expend large sums to buy weapons.

We must somehow halt this arms race. The situation is so dangerous in the Middle East that we should make an attempt to persuade the Soviet Union and other powers to join with us in a genuine arms embargo in this critical area. Even if we fail, we should not, as a consequence, feel that we are compelled to imitate the Soviet Union. If the Soviet Union persists in shipping arms to Egypt and Syria, these countries will be the victims and will pay a heavy price, because none of these underdeveloped states can minister to the economic needs of their people and simultaneously finance a military program.

If we send no arms, would we then leave these countries defenseless? Would we be giving the Soviet Union the green light for expansion? By no means.

That leads me to my last point. I doubt greatly whether the arms we send to these countries would make an iota of difference in resisting external aggression if that should come. The only effective deterrent to Communist aggression, and to the more immediate menace of subversion, is to reassure, in meaningful ways, all the countries of the Middle East that want to remain a part of the Free World that we are determined to assist them in resistance to communism.

What the Middle East needs is a firm security guaranty from our own country which will contain none of the ambiguities and semantic qualifications of the Eisenhower doctrine. Let the Russians understand that we mean business. We shall work for peace. But we shall fight to defend it, wherever it may be threatened.

I talked to many Arabs on my journey and I am convinced that thoughtful Arabs are not impressed by the image of America which we have created by our past policy. If they fail to recognize the implications of the struggle between tyranny and freedom as we understand them, it is partly because we have failed to give them a true picture of America's greatness, its humanity, its understanding, its love of liberty. Too many people in the Middle East have come to think of America as a colossus, fighting desperately to maintain its position against international communism, a giant on the defensive, using its resources not in constructive programs for economic development and human betterment, but in the rental of advance military bases and the hiring of poorly paid foreign troops. This distorted image of America is one that we should seek to dispel by a constructive and progressive foreign policy which offers our friends food and fiber and a true partnership in democracy.

We have far too long pursued a policy of drift and improvisation. We have alienated our friends and we have not retarded our enemies. It is later than we realize in the Middle East. If we are to maintain any influence, if we are to hold our friends, and if we are to recapture the initiative and gain new friends, expanding the forces of freedom and mobilizing men and women everywhere in democracy's cause, we must formulate and implement a policy which truly comprehends the dimensions of our interests in the Middle East and responds realistically to the needs and aspirations of the region's peoples.

---

## MacArthur's Counsel Needed on Grave Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a weekly letter which I have sent to my constituents in which I cite a statement made in this House by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON]. In this letter I also raise the question as to why the counsel of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has not been sought with reference to our current critical defense problems. My weekly letter follows:

A blunt warning was given the Congress and the Nation the other day. I am not sure how much publicity it has received back home.

Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, told the House:

"Our allies have escape clauses in their treaties. All overseas airbases from which our retaliatory Strategic Air Command operates are located on sites and under leases subject to revocation without notice. With few exceptions our allies are leaving the back door open and at the first alarm will get out so precipitously they will carry the doorjam with them."

This statement comes from the chairman of the powerful House Committee on Appro-

priations, responsible for initiating all appropriations for defense and foreign military aid.

These vast appropriations finance defense programs and strategy based very largely on the concept of collective security and interdependence which regards allies as indispensable to our security and which apparently stakes our security and survival on the ability and reliability of our allies.

The October 25, 1957, Declaration of Common Purpose, issued by President Eisenhower and the British Prime Minister, clearly states this philosophy:

"The arrangements which the nations of the free world have made for collective defense and mutual help are based on the recognition that the concept of national self-sufficiency is now out of date. The countries of the free world are interdependent and only in genuine partnership, by combining their resources and sharing tasks in many fields, can progress and safety be found."

This deep and serious cleavage of opinion raises two crucial questions in my judgment.

In the dark days of Dunkirk, when that era's version of collective security collapsed, Churchill and the British Chiefs of Staff based their decision to go on alone on an already prepared military report bearing the discreet title: "British Strategy in a Certain Eventuality." Is there, today, an equivalent "American Strategy in a Certain Eventuality"?

And, in view of the acknowledged urgency of our entire defense situation, which is prompting all-out Congressional hearings in both the House and Senate to which several World War II military commanders are being called as expert witnesses, why has no move apparently been made to include General of the Army Douglas MacArthur among these witnesses?

No one man's wisdom or judgment is the final or infallible answer to our problems.

But General MacArthur's vast military experience and proven military genius should offer something of immense value to the counsel which Congress seeks and so desperately needs. And General MacArthur's experience in Korea with some of the more obvious weaknesses, perils and frustrations of collective security should make his testimony on the possibility posed by Chairman CANNON particularly pertinent and important.

## Steelworkers Example of Excellent Labor Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, we hear considerable criticism nowadays, especially from certain quarters, of labor unions—criticism often not based on fact but on prejudice. This has become so extreme and irresponsible that some people—including, I am sorry to say, Members of this Congress—have been seeking to tar all unions with the same brush because a few have been exposed for the wrongdoing of their officials.

In this atmosphere, it becomes all the more important that the good work of the majority of good labor unions be given recognition and praise. That is why I wish to call to your attention a recent remarkable undertaking by one of the most responsible, as well as one of the largest, unions in the Nation—the United Steelworkers of America. This union has just recently completed here in the Nation's Capital a most impressive demonstration of rank-and-file participation in the operations and policies of the organization.

Under the leadership of the steelworkers' president, David J. McDonald, more than 2,500 presidents of local unions, large and small, from all sections of the country, met here during the first 2 weeks of January in a series of 4 conferences for the purpose of studying and discussing their common problems and formulating their future progress.

This is not the first time that the steelworkers, since Mr. McDonald became president, have held such meetings for the exchange of views between the top leadership and rank-and-file members. In previous years they have held sessions called Operation Sound Off, at which elected representatives from the mills, the mines, and the factories were encouraged to sound off on their complaints or their problems or their suggestions. Last year this was broadened to include the presidents of all local unions, who met with top officials and their advisors in a series of five regional conferences.

The latest series of conferences recently concluded here represented an improvement on the previous year in that the conferences were set up on an industry basis. The result was a set of 4 conferences, each of 2 days' duration, for members of the United Steelworkers in basic steel and such related industries as iron ore mining; in nonferrous metal industries, including aluminum; in industries engaged in various fabricating lines; and in the field of machinery manufacturing.

Every one of these sessions was presided over by the steelworkers' president, Dave McDonald, and the other chief officials. The arrangement of conferences by industry made it possible for the sessions to concentrate on problems and programs peculiar to their own operations. The steelworkers' union possesses a remarkable staff of experts and specialists on such problems, and these able advisers brought the conference delegates up to date on these matters and answered their many questions. Besides the general meetings, there were many extra meetings for smaller groups with especially pressing problems, and the various specialists were also available in their offices between sessions to answer the questions of any individual or group.

The result of all this is that those who attended the conferences were able to return to their homes and to their jobs better informed for their duties and responsibilities as local union officials. And the top national officials of the steelworkers, in return, were more fully informed of the needs and aspirations of their membership.

This, I submit, is a splendid example of responsible, forward-looking union leadership—and it is typical of the kind of leadership which has made the United Steelworkers as fine a labor organization as exists anywhere in the free world. The union's top elected officials—Mr. McDonald as president, Mr. I. W. Abel as secretary-treasurer, and Mr. Howard R. Hague as vice president—all deserve high praise for the example they set. They, and the United Steelworkers as a whole, are an outstanding example of those sound, responsible unions which—in spite of the much-publicized wrongs of a few—make up the vast majority of labor unions in this country.

It would be amiss if, in reporting this recent set of steelworkers' conferences, I did not take note of the fact that in his opening address to the meetings Mr. McDonald made a searching analysis of our present economic slump and called for prompt legislative action to turn the tide toward the path of economic prosperity. Most of the members who attended the conferences reported their fellow workers were suffering from layoffs or shorter workweeks. Mr. McDonald's address on that subject, I am informed, has been mailed to every Member of this body and of the Senate. I commend it to your earnest study as a well-reasoned answer to the present economic situation.

## Let's Look at Russia Honestly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress is now concerning itself with a critical examination of our national defense position. This critical examination was brought about by the spectacular success the Russians have had in launching two earth satellites—a feat which indicates they have mastered some important phases of propulsion required for accurate, controllable, intercontinental ballistic missiles. Accordingly, the Senate Preparedness Committee has called for an all-out effort to overcome these Russians gains and to return the United States to a position of unquestioned supremacy in the field of national defense. This all-out effort will add additional billions of dollars to our already high cost of national defense. No sane person fails to recognize the need for this all-out effort, no matter how costly. The American people have completely rejected the idea that adequate national defense is too costly to acquire and maintain.

However, we must not confine this critical examination to our military or to our efforts in the field of scientific endeavor. We must look into every phase of our national policy having to do with the threat posed by the Russian attempt to subjugate all the nations of the Free World.

It will do us little good reorganizing our national defense establishment, including the development of new types of defense weapons, unless we have a national policy which permits the full utilization of all our national strength. We need a complete overhaul of our political and diplomatic approach to the Russian problem just as much as we need a

stepping up of our military capabilities of defense.

I have proposed a program in the field of political and diplomatic preparedness which I set forth in an address to the Ukrainian Association of Washington, D. C., commemorating the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian national independence. The program I propose will not cost additional billions of dollars; it will not even cost one additional penny of the taxpayers' money, but I believe if the policy I advocate is adopted, it will be as powerful a deterrent to world war III as our program of military preparedness should be. I hope that Members of Congress and the Eisenhower administration will give my proposal careful attention because it offers great promise in bringing about an era of genuine peace, which is the hope and prayer of all Americans.

Under leave previously obtained, I include my address delivered Sunday, January 26, to the Ukrainian Association of Washington, D. C., titled "Let's Look at Russia Honestly":

This occasion in which we commemorate the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian national independence provides an opportunity for us to examine the importance of the historic struggle of the Ukrainian people for their national independence and the bearing this struggle has upon our own survival as a civilized nation. You and I know the facts about this unrelenting struggle of the Ukrainian people which, after 250 years of Russian occupation, resulted again in their national independence in 1918. All of us gathered here are keenly aware of the manner in which the Red Russians once again occupied Ukraine by the tactics of diplomatic deceit, infiltration, and the use of the newly organized Red Army of the Bolsheviks. You and I also know that the Ukrainian people have never given up their fight against the Russian imperialists and that today the aspirations for national independence are, if anything, stronger than they were 40 years ago. For my part, I say Ukrainian people will never give up their fight for national independence and they will be satisfied only when this historic goal is rewon.

To understand the true meaning of Ukrainian Independence Day, one must understand the real meaning of the 40th anniversary being celebrated this year by the people of Moscow. I speak of the 40th anniversary of the October revolution through which the Bolsheviks took over control of the capital city of the then crumbling Russian Empire. Without an understanding of the real significance of the Bolshevik takeover of power in Russia, it is impossible to understand the real meaning of Ukrainian Independence Day.

The Russians and their collaborators are this year putting on gigantic celebrations of this 40th anniversary. They are, by their usual methods of deceit and propaganda, attempting to create the illusion that this is the 40th anniversary of the Soviet Union and that it is also the 40th anniversary of the triumph of communism in that geographical area which was once the empire of the Russian Czars. By this propaganda maneuver the Russians are attempting to sweep under the rug the great and inspiring chapters of national independence which was won by the people of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, Azerbaijan, Idel-Ural, and even Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The Russian celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Communist takeover of Moscow is being presented to the people of the world as the unbroken wave of the future. Accordingly, it is against the rules laid down by the Russians to even talk about those gigantic breaks in the wave caused by Ukrainian national independence and the national independence of the many other nations they now occupy.

The cold facts are that the Russians and their collaborators should be celebrating this year the 40th wedding anniversary of historic Russian imperialism and the propaganda appeals based upon the unworkable theories of Marxism. For hundreds of years before 1918 Russian imperialism had lacked a philosophical appeal that could influence the civilized people of the world.

Russian imperialism, up to 1917, had been regarded by the thinking people of the world as feudal and on the whole expressive of the barbaric influence of several hundred years of occupation of Russia by the Mongol Khans. This realistic understanding of Russian imperialism stood as a mighty barrier to the expansionist dreams of the Czars, from Peter to Nicholas. Russian expansionism was, during that period, largely confined to tactics of intrigue, deceit, and armed occupation of nations too weak to defend their borders and national interests against the military might of the Russian Czars.

The political wedding in Moscow 40 years ago gave the Russians a new weapon in their age-long dream of world conquest. That was the powerful weapon of Communist propaganda. The record shows that the Russians attach as much, if not more, importance to their propaganda mission as they do to the capabilities of the Red army. The theory of Marx, which up till then, had been confined to the darkened beer halls and attics of Europe, were dressed up by the Russians and disseminated in every known language of the world. This propaganda painted the Soviet Union as a paradise—a place in which all human problems had been solved and in which utopia had been attained. The people of the civilized world were inundated with propaganda tracts calculated to paint in the minds of the readers mankind's dreams fulfilled. Meanwhile the Russians established an Iron Curtain through which only the proven collaborators in the outside world were allowed to pass. Thus the truth about life in the reconstructed Russian empire and the terrible tyranny exercised by the new Russian aristocracy to keep the empire together were little known to the people of the civilized world.

This is why the Russian imperialists had so many collaborators and adherents spread throughout every country of the civilized world—people who had never visited the Russian Empire but who were motivated strictly by the philosophical appeals predicated upon the unworkable theory of Karl Marx. In other words, the Russian imperialists had constructed a great number of Trojan horses in every field of human endeavor in the civilized countries of the world. Some of these Trojan horses have been exposed and disposed of, but some of the Trojan horses remain fixed to the body politic of western civilization.

One of those Trojan horses is the camouflage thrown around the real nature of the Communist threat to the freedom-loving people of the world.

For a great many years the United States and other countries of the free world made a great effort to expose the harsh realities of life under communism. The earmarks of communism were established in the minds of most of the people in the still free world as mass arrests, imprisonment without a formal charge being made, search and arrest without warrant, deportation to the frigid areas of Siberia, execution without trial, mass murder including the planned starvation of over 3 million Ukrainians during the period 1932–33. During this time efforts were made on the part of the more informed leaders of the Free World to identify the Russians as the power behind the tyranny of communism. Not much was accomplished in fully identifying the Russian hand in this criminal conspiracy, but in any case, communism, the new propaganda weapon of the imperialists, was fully exposed and thereby discredited.

At about the time communism was being fully exposed in its cold realities, a new terminology entered the worldwide propaganda war which has taken the curse off communism and provided a new camouflage for the work of the Russian imperialists. This new terminology no longer refers to the Russians or to communism, but rather to the "Soviets." Pro-Russian elements in the Free World coined such high-sounding terminology as "Homo-Sovieticus" which is Latin for Soviet man. The same propaganda elements went so far as to speak of a "Soviet civilization" of "Soviet science" and more lately there is great talk about "Soviet intentions." By this devise the pro-Russian elements in this country and elsewhere in the Free World have created the dangerous mirage that the Russian people have no responsibility for the infamous crimes against humanity perpetrated during the last 40 years under the guise of communism and that somehow communism has reformed and a new Soviet society has emerged. This so-called Soviet society is credited with no guilt for the past. This is the new tailored suit put upon the same old tyranny in order to make more endless and useless conferences with the Russians seem worthy of the try.

This, in my considered opinion, is the greatest propaganda victory in history—even greater than the psychological victory won by the Russians through the launching of their sputniks.

The argument is advanced that if we talk about Russian imperialism or Russian colonialism or properly implicate the Russians in the Kremlin drive for world conquest we will somehow embitter the Russian people and turn them against us. This suggests that the Russian people are not in concert with the Kremlin drive for world conquest, that they are not the hard core of the Red army and that by some mystic phenomena they are our allies. There is not one single fact or substantial event in history to support the contention that the Russian people are opposed to the world wide schemes of the Kremlin or that they will cooperate with the people of the Free World in preventing future Communist aggression.

The record of 40 years of marriage between Russian imperialism and Communist ideology does not carry one significant event of opposition by the Russian people to the aggressive plans and actions of their leaders. On the contrary, the record clearly shows that in periods of extreme peril to the empire, the Kremlin leaders have appealed to the Russian people to continue their support and have praised the Russian people as the superior people of the modern day Russian empire. I refer to the appeals made by the dictator Stalin during the course of World War II. I refer to the appeals made to the Russian people by the Kremlin leaders on the occasion of the death of the dictator Stalin when the fear of internal revolution breaking out in the non-Russian nations of the empire shook the Kremlin to its very foundation. I also refer to the internal struggle now going on within the Communist Internationale between the Russian Communists and their non-Russian collaborators who are showing strong signs of resenting the monopoly of leadership the Russians have upon the Communist conspiracy.

Some self-acclaimed experts, whose knowledge of the Russian problem is overly influenced by a reading in the Russian language of Crime and Punishment and The Brothers Karamazov even suggest that we can count on the Russian people to fight for their own freedom. These so-called experts seem not to be aware of the fact that never in history have the Russian people been free nor have they experienced individual liberty or government under law. Throughout their entire history they have

experienced nothing but the tyranny of dictators, desecration of individual dignity, and human degradation in which the daily struggle for survival kept them at least 100 years behind civilized mankind. These terrible facts are compounded by an Iron Curtain which has surrounded the Russian people for 300 years, thus keeping from them the benign influence of democratic political developments in the outside world. People who have never known individual liberty, dignity of the person, and the basic human freedoms of democracy cannot be expected to fight for these goals. People fight and cause revolutions for human goals they have experienced or have been the heritage of their forefathers. That is why there have been widespread freedom uprisings in the Ukraine, Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Georgia, Turkestan, the Caucasus, and other non-Russian nations of the empire. If the Russian people had had a chance at any point in their history to see first hand the developments taking place in the world as a whole, there would be an outside possibility that they would have caught the spark of individual freedom and dignity. If this had occurred the course of history would likely have been altered and we would not today be engaged in a struggle for survival with the Russian imperialists.

It is against this background that we must examine the prospects of Ukrainian national independence in the future. It is also against this background that we, as Americans must examine the task that lies ahead of us if we are to preserve our free way of life.

We must eliminate the latest Russian camouflage thrown upon the English language. We must stop talking about the faceless, inanimate Soviets, and begin to talk about the Russians and the Russian empire. We must speak out vigorously in support of the many non-Russian nations within the U. S. S. R. who have in recent history known the blessings of individual liberty and dignity and who, therefore, try to cooperate with us in stopping future Russian aggression and in preventing the catastrophe of world war III. If we remove from the English language all the latest terminology of Russian camouflage we will be able to communicate with the American people, and then with all the people of the Free World in a language they will understand and in a language that will permit them to identify the true nature of the threat which hangs over all the nations of the world.

I believe with you that Ukrainian national independence is as certain as my belief that day follows night. My interest is in advancing that happy day because in so doing I know I will be reducing the prospects of war and advancing the cause of peace.

So, to this enthusiastic gathering to commemorate the Ukrainian independence, I recommend that a diligent effort be made to throw off this greatest Russian trojan horses—the opiate of Homo-Sovieticus—so that we can come to grips with the real problem of our times. When we accomplish this task we will have given the Russian people a real opportunity to disassociate themselves from the conspirators in the Kremlin, an opportunity which must be afforded them.

I also recommend that the United States adopt a positive policy toward the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the absence of which has, to date, been responsible for much of our troubles in the world arena. That policy must reflect an understanding of the basic nature of Russian-Communist imperialism. It must also recognize the right of all nations to a free and independent status. It should tell the people of all the nations of the world, including the Russians, that we Americans will cooperate with them and lend them assistance in the winning and maintaining of this free and independent status.

Such a program of action as I recommend will not cost additional billions of dollars. All it takes is knowledge of the truth and a determination to stand by those great moral and political principles upon which our American way of life is founded. Unless we do adopt such a policy, I fear that the billions of dollars we now must appropriate for national defense will have been wasted and a third world war inevitable.

We Americans are now undertaking a critical review of our leadership in the cause of human freedom. It appears we have fallen behind the Russians in some important phases of military preparedness. But no one seems to recognize how far behind the Russians we are in political action. The recommendations I have advanced today are an effort to direct attention of the American people to this serious gap in our overall effort against the Russians.

Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations of the vastly expanded Russian empire will not be free and independent until the Russians are given their national independence. That goal must form the basis for the long-overdue, positive American policy toward the U. S. S. R.

## Conserving Our Soil and Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, "Conserving Our Soil and Water Resources" is the title of an essay judged best from a record number submitted by grade and high school students in the 120 Kentucky soil conservation districts. The essay was written by David Baldock, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Baldock, of Route 3, Bowling Green, Ky. This young gentleman is a resident of my own county of Warren in the Second Congressional District. The 28,512 essays submitted surpassed by 3,000 the number in the 1956 contest, and represented the largest participation of the contest's 14-year history. This, along with the fact that David is only 15 years of age and a sophomore at the Warren County High School, gives him ample reason to be proud of his achievement.

In the Second Congressional District of Kentucky we have intelligent, energetic young men and young women who belong to the different farm organizations such as the Future Farmers of America, Future Homemakers of America and 4–H Clubs. Over the years these young men and women have received many awards for their many accomplishments. We are justly proud of our future farmers and homemakers. In addition to David Baldock, winners in this annual Soil Conservation Essay Contest from the Second District of Kentucky were:

Belinda Freeman, Scottsville, Allen County, Ky.; Martha Butler, Hardensburg, Breckinridge County, Ky.; Wilbur McCoy, Morgantown, Butler County, Ky.; Walter Powers, Stanley, Daviess County, Ky.; Bernard Madison, Rocky Hill, Edmonson County, Ky.; Anna Oller, Leitchfield, Grayson County, Ky.; Ann Snyder, Hawesville, Hancock County, Ky.; Jane Bennett, Hebbardsville, Henderson County, Ky.; Cathy Ray, Hanson, Hopkins County, Ky.; Barbara Reynolds, Beech Grove, McLean County, Ky.; Kenneth Overhults, Equality, Ohio County, Ky.; Carroll Wells, Franklin, Simpson County, Ky.; Joe Sprague, Sturgis, Union County, Ky.; Sandra Thornton, Alvaton, Warren County, Ky.; and Roderick Tompkins, Slaughters, Webster County, Ky.

These young people are the recipients of benefits gained from instruction received not only at home from their parents, but from our county and home demonstration agents, our agricultural teachers, and last but not least from the outstanding accomplishments of the extension department of our University of Kentucky which have been passed along throughout the counties in our State.

Next to our children our greatest asset is probably water. Soil and water conservation means as much to Kentucky as to any State in the Union. The people of Kentucky generally are aware of the need for a complete soil and water conservation program. Our young men and women interested in agricultural pursuits have been well instructed along these lines. This award is an indication of the fine work being done by our Soil Conservation Service in Warren County under the leadership of Joe W. Little, and by other leaders throughout the Second Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, we are exceedingly proud of the development of such fine, intelligent and well instructed young people as David Baldock. The contest of which he was the winner is sponsored by the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., the Louisville Times, Station WHAS in cooperation with the Conservation Association and the State department of education. These organizations are indeed to be commended for such sponsorship, and their interest in furthering the needs of agriculture.

## The Donable Surplus Property Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1955, the President signed H. R. 3322 which I introduced and which became Public Law 61. I introduced this bill in order to increase and improve the donable surplus property program for education and health. It was my belief at the time, and events have proved this to be true, that everything reasonable should be done to make surplus property available for education and health purposes. At that time it was apparent that much more could be done to help these institutions through the donation

of property which was being sold at giveaway prices on the open market.

At the time of the passage of Public Law 61 the amount of good, usable surplus property that was being transferred for education and health purposes had been reduced to a comparative trickle.

It is gratifying to note, however, that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the General Services Administration, the Department of Defense and the State agencies are cooperating in an admirable way and the volume of surplus property going to worthwhile institutions has been steadily rising. I am advised that for the period July 1957 to December 1957 the allocations of surplus property for education, health and civil defense purposes has been as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| July | $21,743,226 |
| August | 22,375,419 |
| September | 21,654,791 |
| October | 22,916,944 |
| November | 22,760,487 |
| December | 24,349,959 |
| Total for the period | 135,800,826 |

I am also gratified at the constructive attitude taken by the agencies which are responsible for the donable program. The following correspondence between myself as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare illustrates this point:

NOVEMBER 12, 1957.

Hon. MARION B. FOLSOM,
*Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In 1955 Congress unanimously passed H. R. 3322 which I had introduced in order to make property surplus to the Federal Government's needs available for useful and necessary educational and health activities. The President signed the bill on June 3, 1955, and it is now known as Public Law 61.

I have been greatly encouraged at the increasing amount of surplus property which has been made available for public purposes as specified in the act. Reports indicate that the annual volume of property transferred under present procedures is in the order of $240 million. I believe, however, in view of current needs, especially those emphasized by the Russian technological developments, that a careful reappraisal of the existing program is needed. Apparently a large volume of potentially valuable educational-type property is still being sold at a small dollar return.

It has been brought to my attention that the amount of useful and needed property, particularly for educational purposes, might be substantially increased if (a) a new definition were made of reportable and nonreportable property; (b) the screening period were increased in order to enable donees a greater period of time in which to examine and select property; (c) the handling charges for miscellaneous and indirect overhead were minimized; and (d) the donees and their agents received maximum advance notice as to types, classes, and special items of property to be declared excess to the Federal Government's requirements. There may be other steps which could be taken to improve the program.

I suggest that the interested Federal, State, and educational agencies which are concerned with the program make an immediate reevaluation based upon current national and international conditions with a view to improving it within the scope of existing legislation. Recommendations for changes in the basic legislation if required, would also be in order for early Congressional action.

I would appreciate your comments on the above suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*Majority Leader.*

---

SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*Washington, January 3, 1958.*

Hon JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: As a result of your letter of November 12, 1957, containing certain suggestions that may improve operation of the donation program for health and educational activities, a meeting was held in the Office of Assistant Secretary, Mr. Edward Foss Wilson, on December 12. Present at this meeting were Mr. C. D. Bean, Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration; Mr. L. C. Tuttle, Director, Utilization and Sales Division, Federal Supply Service; Mr. Vincent Tolino, representing Mr. Perkins McGuire, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics); Mr. Ray Ward of your office; and Messrs. Chester B. Lund and W. T. Frazier of this Department.

The four suggestions made in your letter were discussed in that order:

(a) Redefinition of reportable property:

The General Services Administration representatives stated that they had recognized this problem and had taken action, beginning in July 1957, to add several categories of property, such as trucks, earth moving, construction and materials handling equipment that meet defense replacement standards to the reportable category. They further stated that their regulations were being amended to make 36 additions to the reportable list, including such things as communications equipment, electrical and electronics equipment and components, medical and dental equipment and supplies, and additional classes of metalworking equipment.

Following a discussion of the problem created by deletion of items by General Services Administration from lists of nonreported property submitted by State agencies for approval, Mr. Bean indicated that he was issuing an administrative order to his regional offices that, together with the above additions to the reportable category, he hoped in a short time would eliminate at least 80 percent of the problem. Everyone agreed that this would be highly desirable.

It was agreed that General Services Administration and the Department of Defense will continue to review the reportable and nonreportable requirements and will make changes to fit expanded or changed programs.

(b) Increased screening period:

It was generally agreed that a period of 10 days technically allotted for screening and selecting property is too short and that since steps have already been taken, in May 1957, to increase this to a 15-day period for property held by the Department of Defense this arrangement should be continued at least for the next several months when this question will be reexamined.

(c) Minimizing care and handling charges:

It is understood that a ruling by the Comptroller of the Department of Defense that the sales proceeds fund authority contained in the DOD appropriation did not include donations has caused some military bases to place handling charges on donable property. There were also indications that complaints had been received because the method of establishing such handling charges was not uniform among the various military services.

Mr. Tolino advised that the Department of Defense is aware of this problem and would take the matter up with the proper officials in an attempt to solve it. He agreed to advise us at a later date as to the outcome of his efforts.

An opinion was expressed that the problem could be eliminated if the language of the DOD Appropriation Act were changed and it was the recommendation of the group that this be done.

(d) Maximum advance notice of property to be declared excess:

General Services Administration representatives pointed out that in the case of property reportable to GSA, their regional offices make excess reports available to this Department and appropriate State officials simultaneously with offering it for Federal screening. This means advance notice of reportable property which may possibly become surplus is given as much as 125 days before property is determined surplus.

In the case of property nonreportable to GSA but reportable to the Interservice Material Utilization Agency (formerly Material Dedistribution Division), this Department and appropriate State officials receive the internal Department of Defense screening lists about 45 days before property becomes excess to DOD.

It was also pointed out that from time to time large accumulations of specialized items are phased out of Department of Defense and arrangements for special advance notice will continue to be made to afford this Department the opportunity to evaluate the property. Recent examples are machine tools and airplanes.

The subject of the desirability of obtaining scientific materials and equipment for schools and colleges was discussed and representatives of this Department agreed to see if a sampling of school requirements in this connection could be obtained. It would be helpful in locating and donating these items.

In view of the administrative action that has been or is being taken by General Services Administration and the Department of Defense in furtherance of your suggestions, it was generally agreed that there would be no need at this time to improve the scope of existing legislation except the wording of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act. Representatives of this Department advised me that they were very pleased with the spirit of cooperation of the other Departments.

Mr. Ward was very helpful in the discussions and we appreciate your thoughtfulness in having him available for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM, *Secretary.*

---

## India Celebrates the Eighth Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Republic, January 26, 1958

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I returned from the historic Bandung Conference, I announced my intention of addressing the House of Representatives each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations on friendly terms with the United States. January 26, 1958, marked the eighth anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic of India. In recognition of this great occasion, I wish to send my

heartiest congratulations to the people of India, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, and His Excellency Gaganvihari L. Mehta, Ambassador of India.

India became master of her own destiny on August 15, 1947. Speaking from the ramparts of Delhi's ancient Red Fort, Prime Minister Nehru rightly declared freedom is not produced by magic and India's freedom had been earned. When Britain turned over control of India, the battle closed with dignity, grace, and friendship. For Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, father of the Indian nation, this date was a moment for prayer and contemplation. For he knew that political freedom was only the beginning of the longer, harder journey. The discovery that Mr. Gandhi made in those first exciting moments of independence has only been made by his fellow countrymen as every passing year sees them working harder. Despite all the good will of the friendly free world, it is for India to work and sweat and build.

Upon the achievement of independence, one of the first tasks to which India addressed herself was to enshrine in a constitution the principles and ideals which had inspired the nation in its struggle for freedom. A Constituent Assembly had been convened in 1946.

In August 1947, this assembly became a sovereign body and assumed full powers as the Parliament of India. By the end of 1949 it completed its deliberations and produced an agreed constitution. On January 26, 1950, India's new constitution, the first charter of her freedom, came into force. On that day India became a sovereign democratic republic.

In her short period of freedom, India has made great strides in the sphere of material progress at home and in enhancing the prestige of the nation abroad. A decade has passed in which a century of experience has been crowded. Realizing that freedom brings responsibilities and burdens and that they have to be faced in the spirit of a free and disciplined people, the Indian people have shown considerable enthusiasm in doing their part.

Freedom's upsurge as unleashed on this memorable day has maintained its tempo and India has put behind it an almost uninterrupted decade of constructive national endeavor. Mountains have been tunneled, rivers harnessed, and floodwaters controlled. Jungles have been cleared and new cities have sprung up where once there was only the silence of a barren land. Nuclear energy has made its first appearance in this legendary land of elephants and bullock carts. The hewers of wood and the drawers of water have begun to make and propel locomotives, automobiles, and aircraft. An Indian woman, whose grandmother never thought of leaving her kitchen, became the President of the United Nations General Assembly.

But there is still hunger and poverty in India. There still is inequality and injustice. But despair has been banished. Gone is belief in the ancient adage that man was born only to suffer. In 1947 political freedom was the end in itself and there was very little talk of any other kind of progress. In 1958, in the teeming bazaars the talk is that there is not enough progress. Instead of a single new township, Indians now demand a hundred. For every one dam and powerhouse that is going up, they want a dozen. They no longer are content just to make automobiles, they want to own them. Nor will they bow to the ground, as formerly, in front of wealth and power.

If August 15, 1947, and January 26, 1950, opened a new era, they also ended an old one. India is a young nation which has passed through many trials and tribulations during this infancy of her freedom. India is facing up to the hard work of nation building. In the words of Prime Minister Nehru:

> There is no resting for any one of us until we redeem our pledge in full, until we make all the people of India what destiny intended them to be.

Once again I extend to India my sincerest greetings and pray that the coming year may bring her greater happiness, joy, and prosperity.

---

## A Plan To Encourage Study and Achievement in the Natural Sciences at the Secondary School Level

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been shocked and alarmed by recent disclosures that Russia not only is closing the scientific gap which long existed between our two countries but, in terms of graduates in the scientific and technological fields, actually is outstripping us.

This bodes ill for the future. It indicates that, unless we can discover means to stimulate and encourage the development of the inherent intellectual capacities of our youth, another generation might awaken to a world in which complete scientific mastery would lie in the hands of a godless colossus.

It could be fatal for unchallenged scientific supremacy to fall to such a nation, devoid of the humanities and the sense of decent restraint which, in the interest of the future of mankind, must be the inseparable companions of scientific discovery.

It therefore devolves upon us to discover and develop the means, within the framework of our traditional democratic society, to accelerate scientific inquiry among our youth to the end that we may keep pace and either retain or regain the leadership in this vital field.

I have introduced a bill (H. R. 9939) which proposes one approach to the realization of this goal. This bill is proposed neither as a final panacea nor as a finished product. My expectation is that, at best, it may provide a new and useful skeleton idea upon which the appropriate committees and the Congressional leadership may superimpose the details of administration which would make it both practical and workable.

Copies of the bill and of this statement have been supplied to the leadership and the committee members in the House and Senate in the hope that the contribution of this thinking may prove helpful and constructive. The initial reaction has been very encouraging.

As Admiral Rickover stated recently in his address to the Edison Foundation—

> Let us not lose our heads and despair of American technological competence as it is today. The real danger lies somewhat in the future and can be averted if we will act.

Following is a brief statement of the problem and how I believe at least one portion of its solution might effectively be approached.

THE PROBLEM

Verifiable reports have made us aware of enormously increased emphasis upon basic scientific studies in the Soviet public schools and of rapidly increasing numbers of scientists and engineers being graduated annually by Soviet colleges. One major aspect of this achievement, when compared with our own situation, is the deadly serious manner in which the Russian teenager has been induced to regard his studies. The reports disclose that the Soviet student in the secondary schools is frequently studying until late at night and 6 days each week to master the 4 years of advanced mathematics, physics, chemistry, and so forth, which are required of him.

While it is true that these schools are regimented, totalitarian and humorless, we would make a serious mistake to underestimate their efficiency. It is by means of these mental sweatshops that Russia has, in just 30 years, emerged from almost 75 percent illiteracy—about equal to Indochina—to one of the two really great powers on earth. The illiteracy rate in the Soviet Union today is estimated to be between 2.5 percent and 5 percent which does not compare badly with our own rate of about 2.5 percent today.

We would not imitate their basic educational system which is shaped solely in the interest of the state and in complete disregard of the needs of the individual child, but only at our peril would we ignore the basic fact that Russia has made the rewards of intellectual accomplishment so attractive that her youth are working with extreme diligence to keep up with an extraordinarily difficult curriculum. They have managed to provide incentives which induce all their children to stretch their intellectual capacities to the utmost.

As of the present moment, our reservoir of technicians and scientists is larger than theirs, but while our public schools appear to be decelerating in this field and emphasizing such things as ballroom dancing and driver education, the Russians are gaining by leaps and bounds. In the past year, Soviet college graduates in the technological, scientific, and engineering fields exceeded ours by almost two to one.

THE AIM

Our aim in light of this situation must be twofold. First, we must manage to stimulate and encourage more studious application to scientific studies in our public schools and to do this within the basic framework of our democratic school system.

Secondly, we must contrive a means of locating the gifted students with inclinations in this direction at a relatively early age and provide an early method of challenging their latent interests and channeling their energies into projects and courses of constructive study.

We would lose the fundamental thing we seek to protect if we were merely to mimic the Soviet method of dangling material financial reward in the faces of relatively impoverished students and ordering them to exert their utmost energies. To achieve these aims in the traditional American way, we must cause the scientifically inclined student to want to achieve by creating a program in which he can experience the thrill of achievement and find prestige in the eyes of his contemporaries.

THE METHOD

In devising a workable method to realize this aim, it seems to me that we can build upon our own experience. In the vocational-agriculture program, we have successfully challenged and stimulated many hundreds of thousands of American youngsters to achievement which they otherwise would not have attained.

In essence this proposal is simple. It would provide for the scientifically adapted students in all the communities throughout our Nation the same essential type of program which was provided for the depression-stricken farm youngsters in our agriculture communities as early as 1936 by the vocational agriculture and home economics legislation.

The vocational-agriculture program has worked with considerable success through some 10,000 secondary schools in the small cities and agricultural areas throughout the United States. It has given the farm-oriented youngster a pride in self-improvement, a sense of belonging, and a program in which he and his friends may work together and experience the real fun of accomplishment on after-school projects which they themselves have selected with the approval of their vocational-agriculture instructors.

In this way, this familiar program has stimulated youthful achievement and demonstrated the actual pleasure of accomplishment to the youthful mind by lifting this level of activity above the often dull and prosaic level of classroom assignments. Under this program, local clubs have been sponsored in which teen-age youngsters have found acceptance in the eyes of their fellow students by outstanding accomplishment. Fairs have been sponsored at which the students from different schools have proudly displayed their projects. At these fairs a sense of healthy interscholastic competition has been developed, and the youngsters have known the thrill of representing their schools in such competitions.

That the program has found acceptance with the students themselves is known by anyone who has had close association in the rural communities of our Nation and seen the youngsters proudly wearing the jackets and displaying the emblems which they have won by their own achievements.

I would envision a similar program to avail the Nation of the scientific interests of our youth by similarly encouraging local clubs of Future Scientists of America—FSA—along the general patterns that the Future Farmers of America—FFA—have so successfully developed.

If interscholastic competitions should result at science fairs throughout the Nation, studious youngsters might begin to know the thrill and the incentive which today impel most American boys to want to develop skill and mastery in such sports as football, basketball, and so forth.

To put it simply and perhaps a bit facetiously, I believe we need to develop a climate in which cheer leaders for sliderule teams would not be so far-fetched a notion as it would appear to be today.

THE COST

There are in the United States presently some 25,000 secondary schools in which such a program could conceivably find acceptance. In a scientific program of this type, city schools of course would be equally as receptive as the rural schools.

An annual appropriation of some $75,000,000, as a suggested figure, would provide an average of $3,000 in Federal matching funds for each of these 25,000 secondary schools. As in the case of the vocational agriculture and home economics programs, these funds would be matched by local and State contributions.

The relatively small cost of such activities, when gaged in the number of youngsters they reach and influence, is seen by the following figures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, which relate our Federal vocational agriculture and home economics expenditures to the amount of local contributions that have thus been stimulated:

| | |
|---|---|
| Vocational agriculture: | |
| Federal Government cost | $12,667,686.10 |
| State and local | $43,990,467.38 |
| Percent of local participation | 77.6 |
| Number of schools in program | 10,118 |
| Home economics: | |
| Federal Government cost | $8,368,692.00 |
| State and local | $44,893,266.61 |
| Percent of local participation | 84.3 |
| Number of schools in program | 11,619 |

It seems to me that a Federal contribution made in this manner for this type of program could go farther and accomplish more in desired results than most of the other expenditures which are being contemplated presently to achieve the same general end.

I do not despair of the idea of providing scholarships for worthy students to pursue additional studies in our colleges and institutions of higher learning, but it occurs to me that perhaps we need to begin at an earlier level in their education and find some workable means of discovering and stimulating the intellectual curiosity and developing the intellectual capacities of our youth.

Numerous college professors have pointed out that a fundamental handicap exists in the need for more and better basic training in these fields before students reach the college level. As a matter of fact, some educators have seriously questioned whether there would presently be enough high school graduates with both the interest and the qualifications to avail themselves of the number of scholarships being proposed.

Another major handicap which this kind of program could help to correct is the great difficulty most secondary schools now experience in keeping qualified science teachers. As in the vocational agriculture program, a part of the Federal matching funds could be used to supplement the slender salaries of competent, trained science instructors.

Today, of the college graduates trained to teach scientific and technological studies, 54 percent never enter teaching at all. An appalling number of the 46 percent who do make a start in teaching leave the profession within a very few years, lured by the more attractive salaries available in industry for developers of better cigarette filters and designers of bigger auto tail fins. To provide the teacher of vocational science a bit better salary and a modicum of the prestige enjoyed by athletic coaches might begin to counteract this discrepancy.

If this basic idea should provide some small contribution to the thinking of the national leadership in this important problem which we all face, I shall feel that it has been amply worth the effort.

---

## Federal Longshore Safety Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of the House, a recommendation made by Mr. Eisenhower in his economic report. In discussing the need for continuing action to safeguard personal welfare, the President again advocated intensified efforts to develop and enforce adequate safety standards aimed at reducing the grim toll of occupational accidents. The President then went on to note:

**A special responsibility of the Federal Government in this area of personal welfare could be discharged more fully if legislation were enacted enabling the Secretary of Labor to prescribe and enforce safety standards for longshoremen. Enactment of such a law is recommended.**

Not only do I subscribe to the overall recommendation of the President, but as

one who comes from a major port area, Seattle, Wash., I am particularly gratified by his request for legislation to establish an enforceable safety program covering longshoremen and related maritime workers. I would like to discuss this subject briefly and commend its early consideration by the House.

For many years longshoring has ranked, along with mining and logging, as 1 of the 3 most hazardous occupations in the country. Statistics assembled by the Department of Labor reveal a shocking number of accidents and deaths each year. In his annual report for the fiscal year 1956, the Secretary of Labor disclosed that a total of 69,755 work injuries had been tabulated under the Longshoremen's Compensation Act. These injuries not only required the payment of many millions of dollars for compensation and medical treatment, but likewise accounted for an undetermined and staggering cost in human suffering.

To explain the accident picture in longshoring more simply, I will cite some information brought to my attention. In a meeting of some 2,000 longshore workers, all those who at some time had suffered an injury were asked to raise their hands. Hardly an arm remained down. Need any more be said.

It is true that over the years a great deal has been done to improve safety standards in maritime cargo handling. The Federal Government, the States, the employers and unions—all have cooperated in a variety of programs and joint actions to reduce accidents. In some areas, particularly on the west coast, as I am informed, some improvement has been brought about. But the fact remains, as shown by the figures, that the full answer has not yet been developed.

One of the main gaps in waterfront safety is found in existing Federal law, which has jurisdiction over cargo handling aboard ships and ship repair work in drydocks. The present safety provisions applying to these operations are embodied in section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. What we find is that the Department of Labor, which administers this law, can only recommend or advise when it comes to safety regulations. The Department has no power to enforce safety standards.

I am a firm believer in the utilization of persuasion, education, and voluntary methods of enforcement in this field. But experience in the longshore industry, as well as in industry generally, shows that such an approach cannot cope fully with the problem of safety. Some form of enforcement must be applied to control the few who so often refuse to abide by voluntary regulations.

In this connection, it should be pointed out that most of our United States flagships adhere to high standards of safety in their gear and other cargo-handling equipment. But the same cannot be said for many foreign ships that utilize our ports. These, I am informed, are the worst offenders. Reports establish that many of these foreign ships are old and rundown, with gear and facilities that cause a wide variety of accidents.

What is even more to the point is the fact that our Government is helpless when it comes to foreign cargo ships. To the best of my knowledge, no safety regulations, with respect to cargo handling, can be enforced. This is one of the significant and important gaps in existing programs applying to the waterfront.

The States can, of course, meet a part of this problem. They can exercise jurisdiction over the docks, over the piers. For example, my own State of Washington has put into effect one of the finest maritime safety programs to be found in the country. But that program stops at the water's edge, at the gangplank. And, unfortunately, statistics indicate that some 60 percent of longshore accidents occur aboard ship.

As I understand it, what the President urges is that effective safety standards for longshoremen and ship-repair workers, such as we now have in the State of Washington, be extended from the dock to embrace work performed on ships or in drydocks. With this recommendation I strongly and heartily concur.

It is my intention to see that legislation in line with the President's recommendation is considered as quickly as possible by the appropriate committee of the House. I shall also do everything possible to speed such legislation along, to the end that an adequate and enforcible Federal longshore and ship-repair safety program is approved by the 85th Congress.

This is an area of personal welfare which deserves the earnest attention and support of every Member of the House.

---

## National Self-Determination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago aboard ship in mid-Pacific, a British fellow passenger made a statement with which I was then in no state of mind to agree.

In substance, he said "Great Britain is finished as an empire and as such the keeper of world peace. Henceforth, the status of empire will have to pass to the United States of America."

Reminding him that America was committed to world peace with no desire nor interest to become an aggressor, the idea of world empire was foreign to her philosophy. He insisted that the peace of the world could be maintained only when the peacemaker can control the economy of areas where disturbances originate.

As we review the world situation at the end of World War II when the adamant American policy of national self-determination gave promise of reality as a result of American armed might, and realizing how helpless these small nations have been in controlling their economies without the grinding hand of a stronger power, one wonders if the Englishman's prediction was not without considerable merit.

Even at the expense of reversing our principles of self-determination, had we exercised a semblance of direction over the small countries where we had established military bases, the spectacle of witnessing so many helpless nations drift into the Iron Curtain orbits could have been prevented.

Will the welfare of the world's people during the next century be determined by the strength of empire or by general recognition of the principle of human rights? This is the question that confronts the world today.

The principle of human rights in reality began to spread to remote parts of the world with the American Declaration of Independence and America has steadfastly adhered to this philosophy in peace and in war, finally witnessing its culmination at the end of World War II when the death knell of colonialism sounded. Most small nations had at last reached the goal of self-determination.

The end of European colonialism found most of the dependent peoples unprepared by training and experience to form dependable governments or to establish stable economies.

To fill this vacuum the two leading world powers took opposite positions—the one seeking empire with its attendant economic and political control—the other with its humanitarian philosophy endeavoring to support weak nations to establish independence and self-reliance.

This great and fearful Red empire which has subdued every adjacent neighbor to a point where they cannot call their national souls their own, has moved rapidly to a position of world power where only the United States stands across the abyss between and expresses its determination that individual liberty shall endure in the world.

It is a tribute to the inherent, basic strength of the United States that it has been able to spend $52 billion in bolstering the faltering economies of many of our neighbors in order that the walls of the citadel of individual freedoms have been braced and propped up against the storm from without.

Yet, even the expenditure of money is not enough.

By being strong, we will inspire strength among our friends. By precept of thrift and courage we will gain respect. To be honored abroad we must let it be known that at the basis of our aid is the recognition that, under the Communist empire, national honor disappears and only racial and individual debasement results.

Twelve years after World War II we see the world divided between two philosophies with Western democracy pitted against communism. Then, the United States was tentatively allied with Western Europe and Russia setting the pattern of government for China. In both hemispheres exist many smaller nations striving for self-determination with insufficient understanding or appreciation for either philosophy. Unable

to form stable governments or build an economy without direction and aid from more powerful nations, they have no alternative than to fall easy prey to outside influences. With no designs of empire, America extends aid with no strings attached. Our aid is freely accepted but no obligation is given in return. It is as if a banker would loan money to another with no consideration for collateral to a creditor who first ignores then learns to hate the hand that gave aid.

To preserve friendship we continue our generous handouts while little by little we lose our influence.

Not so with Russia. She recognizes the Britishers' conviction that empire building succeeds only through exercise of control.

The Western World's philosophy is based on Christianity, but the millions of oriental peoples have never known anything but force or subtle weapons to conquer by subversion.

The empire builder, with complete control of the lives and fortunes of her people, has, at the expense of her masses, concentrated on scientific progress to the end that she is now in position to challenge the world by hurling threats of destruction against her adversary.

The other, enjoying a life of luxury, steeped in complacency, erroneously trusting dollar diplomacy and little concerned about her national safety, suddenly realizes the embarrassing fact that power, prestige, and world influence is waning.

Does this mean that arbitrary force on the part of nations once more assumes the role of balance of power? That military threat will continue to destroy all hope of underprivileged peoples for the privilege of self-determination? Is the American ideal so faithfully adhered to and defended by the blood of her heroic sons destined for extinction? And is America's own survival being threatened by a philosophy whose advocates far outnumber us in area and population?

---

## Will Congress Wake Up the Military?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, will the Congress wake up the military?

We are spending more and more for less and less defense; and, if the present trend is continued, it looks like America will repeat the ancient error of always preparing for the next war in terms of what was needed for the last war. And the ancient error seems to persist especially in military defense measures.

If we would just face up to reality in the matter of defense we can improve our defense, make America impregnable to attack by making any attack so costly as to be an act of suicide and, at the same time, save a minimum of $10 billion per year.

My authority for this is a most distinguished retired general, a veteran ground officer whose experience includes a lengthy period as General MacArthur's chief planner during World War II. His name is Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers and his views on national defense should be must reading for every Member of the House concerned as we all are over national security and economic stability.

I. FOREWORD

The successful launching by the Russians of their earth satellites has aroused the American people to a realization that we may not after all be winning the armaments race and that we may be in mortal danger that Russia will surpass and eventually overwhelm us.

The American people are entitled to know the facts and to be assured that, regardless of past mistakes, we are going to follow the course in the future that will enable us either to avoid war or to win the war if it comes.

Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, United States Army, retired, has made a most searching and masterly analysis of this subject in a book entitled "Wings for Peace," published by the Henry Regnery Co. Every American who values his safety and his freedom should read this book and should demand that those who are determining our policy tell the people whether General Fellers is right, and if not right, declare in what respect he is wrong with a full statement of their reasons.

General Fellers has also written an excellent article on this subject in Human Events for October 12, 1957. On Veterans Day, 1957, he made a further valuable contribution to the thought on this subject in an address delivered before the American Legion at Fort Wayne, Ind.

In the following pages I have sought to summarize some of General Fellers' more important conclusions and have quoted a few of the more important passages in his book and in the Human Events article.

II. CASE PRESENTED BY GENERAL FELLERS

The next war, if it comes, will be settled in the air, not on the ground or at sea.

It will be settled by the destruction of one side's means of waging war—its fuel, aircraft and war industries. This will be accomplished by the use of, first, long-range bombers equipped with atomic and hydrogen bombs; and, second, intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Nation that is superior in these means of attack will win the war.

If we gain and maintain that superiority in a decisive degree, knowledge of that fact by Russia will constitute the strongest possible deterrent to the starting of another war.

Neither a superior Army nor a superior Navy can provide us with an adequate defense.

The traditional Army mission—to destroy the enemy land army—and the conventional Navy role of blockade cannot be decisive against the Soviets. The Red army in Eurasia is too formidable; the Soviet Union is not vulnerable to blockade.

The combined armies of our allies and ourselves are hopelessly outnumbered by those of the enemy, which has a population four times as great as the population of our own country and of our allies.

While we are superior to the Russians in naval power, except as to submarines, the Navy cannot perform the essential task of destroying Russia's means of waging war.

Fortunately, while in combat aircraft the Red air force, which is thoroughly modern, is nearly three times the size of the United States Air Force, our Strategic Air Command is superior to that of the Red air force. But sworn statements of Generals Twining and LeMay have disclosed that between 1958 and 1960, unless our present air program is greatly expanded, the Red air force will have gained the air advantage.

The meaning of our drift into second place militarily—and that is precisely where we are drifting—is terrifying. Once the Kremlin dictators gain air and missile supremacy, they will be free to pursue their announced goal of world domination. Today Britain could be utterly destroyed by Red bombers and H-bombs. As a consequence, of necessity, her policy is not to permit the gap to widen between her and the Soviet Union. Soon, unless we greatly expand our aim and ICBM program, we shall be in the same unenviable position as is Britain. Should this tragic situation eventuate, it will be the end of liberty everywhere. The Soviet satellite, as it encircled the globe, has sounded our last warning. But there is yet time to prevent disaster if we act intelligently now.

Despite these obvious truths our country is still pursuing the now obsolete method of trying to restrain the enemy by use of ground forces. The line which we and our NATO allies are planning to hold in Europe cannot possibly be held if the Russians decide to attack.

Should Russia strike Western Europe, our present strength would enable us to do little more than make a token contribution to our obligation to come to the military aid of our allies. Our six divisions stationed in Germany would turn out to be merely pump-priming with human lives. In a matter of weeks they would either be dead or on their way to Siberia. What would happen to our three-quarters of a million dependents and non-combatants who are quartered with them leads only to terrifying conjecture.

Only by the adoption of a new strategy, which will either deter war or destroy Russia's war potential if war comes, can we keep our treaty obligations.

Our present strategy contemplates using literally millions of American youth as ground-troop reinforcements to NATO on the battlefields of Europe. Should war come and these American reinforcements be sent, our losses will far exceed those of both World Wars.

The tragedy of this loss is accentuated by the realization that the ground operations on the European Continent cannot prevent atomic air assaults on America and Europe. In fact, NATO forces fighting the Red army on the ground in Europe no longer would keep war there. In the future war could be brought to America from the sky.

The United States and not Western Europe is the obstacle that stands in the way of Russia's accomplishing her purpose to dominate the world. It is reasonable to conclude that Russia will bypass Western Europe and launch her attack directly on the United States.

The attack on the United States from the sky would undoubtedly not be via Western Europe. It would be over the polar cap. This route offers a much shorter distance to the important industrial targets in the United States. For example, from our Rapid City, S. Dak., Air Force base over the North Pole to Novo Sibirsk, the Detroit of Russia, is only 4,800 miles. Via Europe the distance is 7,020 miles.

Because the Kremlin reckons largely in terms of force, we must have superior military might if we are to avoid war. The United States and the Allies do not now possess this superior military strength. It is probable that, if war comes, we shall not be given time to prepare fully. It may start with a series of atomic explosions over our industrial areas. Should this catastrophe come, we are inadequately prepared to defend against it or strike back decisively.

Nevertheless, our leaders have tried to carry out our foreign policy just as if we did possess the military strength to back them. It is not surprising that adversaries have called our bluff.

Despite the $111.5 billion obligated for military purposes since the Korean war started, our military structure today is an all-purpose conglomerate. It reflects the roles and missions required of it in the last two World Wars. It is not designed to perform the major military roles essential to our survival during the early phases of a world war III.

The grim facts are:

A third of our military might is committed to the NATO defenses in Europe.

Another third of our Armed Forces is tied down in the Korean war of attrition.

The remainder of our forces is either at home or scattered about the world.

The Kremlin could scarcely do a better job of diffusing our strength than we have done ourselves. This is not astonishing, because it has been done largely according to the Kremlin plan. By reacting defensively to its every move, we have yielded the initiative and done whatever the Kremlin wanted to make us do.

Should war come, on no front can we meet a major threat. Yet, in the next war, we will face the supreme challenge to our survival.

In preparing for this challenge we dare not waste another moment. The task is great but not insuperable.

No claim is being made here that air power is a self-sufficient power capable of singlehanded victory in a global war, but it is the only weapon we have which can knock out Russia's war potential. Neither the Army nor the Navy, nor the two working together with close air support, can do this. Strategic airpower is our only weapon which can strike deep into enemy territory and destroy the Red Strategic Air Force before it is able to unleash its full weight against our own industry and population centers. It must not be frittered away in futile ground support of NATO's initial defense.

This ground support role for our strategic air arm would be the most wasteful assignment possible. In fact, the Red Air Force would promptly destroy it. Moreover, there is no suitable target for the strategic air arm in the battle area, or even in the enemy forward areas.

The cold facts are, we have not even planned to build sufficient airpower to defend our industry, our bases, our allies, or our ground forces. Even with our allies we cannot match the Red army.

Russia's hope of victory in a world war lies in the ability of her long-range bomber force to destroy American industry. Our plan to meet the Red forces, man to man on the ground, is a madness which will lead to the greatest catastrophe in our history. We could not win.

In supporting satellite wars and defense programs, our Government has resorted to deficit spending. Possibly more than anything else, Stalin hoped for the collapse of capitalism. We must not be maneuvered into spending ourselves into destruction.

The American people provide the sons and treasure to contest this rising Red threat. Theirs is the right to demand that their sons be equipped without delay with the most effective and deadly weapons to deter war or to win if war comes. This demand for a new defense program must come from the people speaking to their newly elected representatives in Washington. The time is now.

The American people must demand this new and better way to meet the menacing Red threat. The solution, it must be pointed out by the people, does not lie in desperate combing of the world for allies to contribute masses of men to join America's youth in old-fashioned combat.

The solution we seek already lies within us.

It lies in our genius for production and in our spiritual strength. The creation of the necessary military might to meet the Red threat is the most complex and baffling problem our leaders have ever encountered. But our leaders, at last, have the ability to resolve complicated problems into simple ones. And the solution to our defense is just as simple as the story of David and Goliath.

Were the Air Force permitted to bomb industrial sources of Red supplies, the flow would then quickly disappear.

Air power employed in close support of ground troops and in interdiction of supply routes cannot destroy the source. It can at best influence the local battle at the moment. No matter how many troops may be killed or captured on the line of battle, Communist manpower, being virtually unlimited, can always be driven forward to replace the losses. Airpower employed against munitions manufacturing plants can destroy the source and thereby influence the entire war effort of the enemy. Once sources of supply are destroyed, the more enemy troops at the front depending on these sources, the better it is for us.

Nothing in war is quite as helpless as a vast army cut off from its source of supply.

Destruction of enemy supply sources—his true war potential—is the role of strategic air power. We cannot win against Russia without this strategic defense. With adequate, fully committed strategic air power, the great Red army, no matter where it may be, will eventually disintegrate and die like a melon on a rootless vine.

The best defense of Paris and Chicago is our ability instantly to destroy Moscow. It is this certain retaliation in the form of total destruction—not men lined up like ninepins along the Rhine—which is the true deterrent to war.

Were we to build American global air supremacy, with primary emphasis on strategic long-range atomic and hydrogen assault, our threat against Russian aggression would be of the greatest possible magnitude. Air supremacy cannot provide a physical barrier against a ground invasion of Europe, the Middle East, or any other land area contiguous to Russia, but it can destroy Russia's power if she elects to make the invasion.

Our policy, therefore, should be to develop the most powerful Air Force in the world and to invent, and to amass the greatest supply of, the most effective intercontinental ballistic missiles of any nation. At the same time we should drastically reduce the Army-Navy budget, which is being largely spent on things that would not enable us to win the next war, and we should also discontinue further foreign aid.

The program above outlined would not only provide the only possible means of avoiding war or winning the war if it comes, but it would be far less costly. It would cost $10 billion less than the present program, made up as follows: On the Army-Navy budget, save $9 billion; on foreign aid, save $5 billion; on Air Force budget, increase $2 billion; on research and development, spend $1 billion; on ICBM, spend $1 billion. Total saving, $10 billion.

With reference to foreign aid:

Whatever may or may not have been its merit in the past—the stark reality is foreign aid cannot materially strengthen our strategic air and ICBM development. Air power is an entity. It cannot be parceled out among allies without decreasing its potency. No European ally needs, or is it endeavoring to produce, the ICBM. Since the peace of the free world, and victory if war is forced upon us, rests on American air and ICBM supremacy, foreign aid can now safely be discontinued. At the moment there is some $10 billion in unexpended foreign aid which would cushion the shock of the cut.

This program should enable us to avoid the danger of spending ourselves into bankruptcy and thereby becoming an easy prey to the Russians.

The cost of supporting NATO is prohibitive. Moreover, as already pointed out, reliance upon NATO as a means of defense is wholly illusory.

There are certain other dangers in the present situation that can and must be avoided. Advantage must not be taken of the fear that has been aroused in the American people to plunge the country into still further wasteful and unnecessary spending and to embark upon a program for international or world government.

---

## Military Hardware and H. R. 8002

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent release by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report relating to H. R. 8002, the accrued expenditures bill, the following statement was made as an example of a situation the bill would prevent:

For fiscal 1953 Congress appropriated $12.5 billion for guns, tanks, and other military hardware in Korea. The war ended within a month of the new budget year. Years later in May 1957, the Army was still spending the remainder of the $12.5 billion without any further Congressional review.

A national newspaper chain has picked up this statement and reprinted it in editorials in its newspapers throughout the country, including the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

The implications of this brief charge are: First, that in fiscal 1953 Congress appropriated $12.5 billion for guns, tanks

and ammunition to fight the Korean war; second, that for at least 4 years thereafter the Army continued to spend this money to buy guns, tanks and other military hardware ordered for the Korean war even though the war ended within a month of the start of the fiscal year; and third, that all this was done without further Congressional review.

If these implications were in fact true, then, indeed, this would be a sorry state of affairs demonstrating enormous waste, and immediate steps should be taken to correct such a practice.

But the plain facts are that none of these implications is true. This charge is a good example of the kind of misinformation put out by the supporters of H. R. 8002 which has confused objective discussion of the issue.

The reference in the quoted statement to "guns, tanks, and other military hardware" apparently refers to the budget account for the Department of the Army entitled "Procurement and Production." This is the account set up for the purchase of such items as tanks and combat vehicles, artillery, small arms, noncombat vehicles, radio, radar, and other communications equipment, ammunition and guided missiles, heavy construction equipment, bridges, generators, liaison aircraft and transport helicopters. The items in this account often are referred to as "military hardware."

To understand how this account is handled in the annual budget process, several things should be kept in mind. First, the articles and equipment classified under the heading of Production and Procurement are what are known as long-lead-time items. You can't run out and buy them at the neighborhood hardward store. In many cases several years will elapse between the time the Army decides to order equipment in this category and the time the last unit is delivered. First, the Army must enter into a contract with a supplier, either on the basis of advertised bids or negotiation. Then the supplier must retool, sign up subcontractors, acquire inventories of needed materials and hire the necessary additional workers. Finally, once production has started, the supplier will deliver the finished product at a monthly rate over a period of many months or even years.

An appropriation has two functions. First, it conveys authority to contract; second, it carries the authority to disburse the cash under the contract as the units are delivered. When Congress appropriates money for 100 Sherman tanks, for example, it appropriates the estimated total cost of the tanks. This sum is added to the procurement and production account on the books. Now, the Army has the authority to go ahead and enter into a contract with a supplier for the tanks and to pay for them as they are delivered, even though the last tank may not be delivered under the contract until several years after the appropriation. This means that although an appropriation is made in 1 fiscal year for a long-lead-time item, the actual cash expenditures under that appropriation will be spread out over a period of several years.

In any given year the money available for Army procurement and production is made up of, first, unexpended balances of prior appropriations, and second, new appropriations. Furthermore, during any fiscal year most of the expenditures made from the account are chargeable to appropriations from prior years.

With this background in mind, let us take a look at the three implications of the charge made by the citizens committee:

Charge No. 1. That, in fiscal 1953, Congress appropriated $12.5 billion for guns, tanks, and ammunition to fight the Korean war.

The appropriation for military hardware for fiscal year 1953 was $2.7 billion, not the $12.5 billion asserted in the statement.

There was, however, an unspent carryover of $9.8 billion from earlier appropriations. This, added to the $2.7 billion in new money, gives a total of $12.5 billion, apparently the figure referred to in the quoted statement.

By lumping the large carryover with the new appropriation, the statement is deliberately misleading, because it ignores the significant difference between the two kinds of credits to the account. The new appropriation looks 1, 2, 3, or even more years ahead, whereas a carryover represents programs laid down in earlier years—in this case, the years in which we were fighting the Korean war and desperately needed the guns, tanks, and ammunition.

Charge No. 2: That for at least 4 years thereafter the Army continued to spend this money to buy guns, tanks, and other military hardware ordered for the Korean war, even though the war ended within a month of the start of the fiscal year.

The citizens committee seems to be confused, because the Korean war did not end in fiscal year 1953, but in fiscal 1954. Fiscal year 1954 ran from July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1954. The truce agreement ending the Korean war was signed on July 27, 1953, which was 1 month after the start of fiscal 1954.

Assuming that the citizens committee actually intended to refer to fiscal 1954, the year in which the war ended, let us take a look at the figures for that period.

The Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate, and the House and Senate themselves, met early in 1953 to consider the military appropriations for the fiscal year which would start on July 1. At that time the truce negotiations were still under way, and it was uncertain when the fighting would stop. Meanwhile, guns, tanks, and other military hardware were rolling off the production lines, and suppliers were showing up with due bills to be paid out of appropriations made in 1951, 1952, and 1953.

At that time the best estimate of the unexpended carryover for procurement and production with which the Army would start the new fiscal year was $12 billion. To this the Congress added $3.2 billion in new appropriations giving a total available for fiscal 1954 of $15.2 billion.

Within a month after the new fiscal year started, the truce agreement was signed. The Army, with the blessing of Congress, acted immediately to close off the pipeline. Where contracts had not been let, negotiations were called off. Wherever possible, contracts already underway were either terminated or production schedules stretched out over longer periods of time more consistent with peacetime needs.

The net result of these activities was that the procurement and production account piled up large balances from outstanding appropriations which were not obligated or expended. At the start of fiscal year 1955 the unspent balance was $11.5 billion; fiscal 1956, $8 billion; fiscal 1957, $5.6 billion; fiscal 1958—our current fiscal year—$4.1 billion—estimated.

Testifying before the House Appropriations Committee in March 1956 Brig. Gen. Richard D. Meyer, from the office of the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, summarized the process by which these balances were created:

> As this committee knows, these large unobligated balances are a result of four circumstances:
>
> First, the end of the Korean war early in fiscal year 1954. It was therefore unnecessary to obligate funds the Congress had made available to support that war.
>
> Second, the decision in fiscal year 1954 to stretch out into the future much of the then financed production delivering at the high rates necessary to support Korean operations.
>
> Third, the termination of production of many other items to prevent overstockage once the Korean war requirement no longer existed. This resulted in a substantial recovery of funds already obligated.
>
> Fourth, reimbursement to the Army account resulting from the normal sale of stocks to the foreign-aid program and to other military services.

When the Appropriations Committees met early in 1954 to review the military hardware account, they had, theoretically at least, two choices. One would have been to wipe from the books all of the appropriations attributable to Korean war needs and start afresh with new appropriations. The other was to leave the existing appropriation accounts on the books but direct that this money be devoted instead to the new demands of the postwar period. They chose the latter course.

This process might be compared to the situation of a small fishing-tackle company which negotiates a loan from the local bank to finance the manufacture of trout flies. The bank sets up an account on its books in the name of the company. After a short period, before much of the money is spent, the trout mysteriously disappear from the nearby lakes and streams and the demand for flies drops off. So the company goes to the bank and requests permission to use the money to make bass plugs—the bass grew fat on the young trout—and the bank agrees. The bank does not go to the trouble of canceling out the balance of the existing account only to open a new account in the same amount in the name of the same company. It leaves the account as it is, but authorizes the expenditure of the funds for a new purpose.

In much the same manner as the bank, Congress kept the account entiled "Procurement and Production, Department of

the Army," but sanctioned the spending of the money for different purposes.

For the next 4 years—fiscal years 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958—Congress did not appropriate one additional cent of new funds to the procurement and production account. It insisted that the Army use up the funds already there. In fact, the President requested an additional appropriation of $583 million for fiscal 1958 which Congress denied.

In the eyes of the citizens committee, this is a dreadful waste of taxpayers' money. To me, it just seems like fiscal common sense.

During those 4 years the money was not used, as the citizens committee implies, to buy ammunition and other equipment ordered for a war that was over. Instead, the money was used to produce the military hardware that was needed for the postwar period, including, for example, the Nike Ajax and Nike Hercules guided missiles now deployed or ordered to defend our country from airplane attack, and the Army's Redstone missile, which formed the basis for the launching of the first American satellite. None of these missiles was known at the time of Korea.

Charge No. 3: That all this was done without further Congressional review.

The quoted passage, and other literature put out by the citizens committee, states that once Congress appropriates money for long-lead-time items, it has no power to review the program each year thereafter and make appropriate changes in amount or direction, or if it possesses this power, that it does not exercise it.

Any careful study of appropriation committee reports and hearings and appropriation acts readily reveals that this statement simply is not true. Each year the Appropriations Committees spend many weeks going over in great detail what the Army has done with the money previously given it, as well as over proposed future programs. Congress has considerable power of review, readjustment, and rescission over appropriations for long-lead-time articles and uses it.

As a matter of fact, Congress has at least three distinct powers of review and utilized them all with respect to the military hardware account in the years from 1953 to 1958. These powers are the following:

First. Congress can rescind a previous appropriation. In the fiscal 1955 appropriation act Congress rescinded $500 million of previous appropriations for Army procurement and production.

Second. Congress can transfer a previous appropriation from one major account to another. For fiscal 1956 Congress transferred $485,077,000 from Army procurement and production to Army military construction, and transferred $255 million to Air Force military construction.

Third. Congress can and often does reprogram funds from one purpose to another within the same account to meet changed conditions. As indicated by the discussion above, the funds available in the procurement and production account were shifted to new uses, including the production of guided missiles.

The statement of the citizens committee compounds so many inaccuracies and half truths that it gives a completely misleading picture of the budgetary process.

These inaccuracies can be summarized as follows:

First. The appropriation for fiscal year 1953 was $2.7 billion, not the $12.5 billion asserted. The statement ignores the significant difference between a new appropriation, which looks several years ahead, and the unspent balance of prior appropriations.

Second. Between 1953 and 1958 the funds in the Army's procurement and production account were spent for postwar needs, including the production of the Nike and Redstone missiles, and not to fulfill Korean war orders, as implied in the statement.

Third. Contrary to the statement, Congress did, in fact, review the military hardware account each year, rescinding some of the earlier appropriations, transferring a portion to other military accounts and reprograming the remaining funds to meet changed conditions.

The budgetary processes of the Federal Government are highly complex. Undoubtedly there is room for improvement; indeed, efforts are continually under way to improve fiscal and accounting procedures. But I do not believe that there is any quick, magical solution to the problem. And I think it further is obvious that the kind of distorted oversimplification I have discussed above only serves to obstruct the intelligent exploration of effective improvements.

---

## What Hope for Disarmament?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the recess period I wrote an article entitled "What Hope for Disarmament?" expressing my views on the disarmament question.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article, which appeared in the New York Times magazine section on January 5, 1958, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HOPE FOR DISARMAMENT?

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

The combination of Soviet achievements in missiles and Soviet obstinacy toward disarmament has left the world facing the gloomy course of a stepped-up armaments race that could go on interminably. Within a few short months newspaper headlines have veered from hopes for an agreement on arms control to emphasis on increased missile and antimissile production. As a result, at the Paris, NATO conference our closest allies urged us to join in new efforts to halt the arms race.

We are confronted today with a series of crises. It is not only that the Soviet Union is challenging the technological and military superiority of the United States. We must also recognize that the race for more deadly and destructive weapons is getting out of hand, so much so that even if we expand our annual defense budget by several billion dollars we shall not gain much in the way of increased security.

With considerable effort we probably can regain our lead in missiles, rockets, and other weapons. But this lead may also be illusory—a Pyrrhic victory whose very process of achievement may squelch our search for positive approaches to peace, may weaken our endeavors to curb the weapons of war, and may cause us to lose our sense of perspective. We must not let our fixation on security through more and bigger armaments lead to a stage where arms alone would control our policy, for this would invite our ultimate destruction.

No longer can the weapons race be viewed simply as a military or political issue. In fact it is now undeniably a great moral issue. The time has arrived to apply public conscience to military strategy and political diplomacy.

The United States and its allies must free themselves from the sterile course of allowing the Soviet Union to call each play on the world scene. To do this requires more than an expanded defense program. It demands, first, pointing the finger of world opinion at the Soviet Union to fix responsibility for the breakdown and current Soviet boycott of negotiations on armaments control. We now have a unique opportunity to mobilize world opinion and in this task to aline ourselves particularly with the neutral nations on the newly expanded United Nations Disarmament Commission.

At the same time, it is essential to make the United States position clear. This must include a determined willingness to reexamine our own proposals and to make those constructive changes which are safe and reasonable.

If we can conduct a peace offensive along such lines, the Soviet Union may be led to see the futulity of its course of boycott and blackmail. We must anticipate that negotiations on arms control will be resumed. When they are, the United States must be better prepared to deal with the Kremlin at the conference table. Of what does preparation consist?

At the outset it consists of evaluating our past position in light of the changing definition of disarmament.

Today, disarmament has meaning only if it is defined in terms of five key words: strength, understanding, limitation, inspection, and control.

Strength is the continuing prerequisite for effective bargaining, the one persuasive catalytic agent without which negotiations are futile. Understanding signifies broader and better public conception of the difficulties and complexities involved in disarmament in a nuclear age. Limitation, inspection, and control are the essential features of an effective system, without which disarmament is a mirage.

In the context of this definition of disarmament it is essential to look at and examine our past mistakes as we prepare to deal with the disarmament discussions of the future.

PAST MISTAKES

One of our principal mistakes has been to allow the Soviet Union to assume a public-relations posture of being more for disarmament than the United States.

Our first-step disarmament proposals, in fact, had much more disarmament in them than the Soviet proposal of suspending tests of nuclear weapons. The United States proposed going farther, to prohibit the production of nuclear material for weapons purposes—a proposal which would have been far more effective than the Soviet proposal

in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world. Yet, in our explanations of United States policy, we seemed to be reluctant to emphasize that we were willing to accept greater control over nuclear weapons than the Communists.

In addition to our apparent inability to communicate to the rest of the world the essence of our disarmament proposals, we have also failed to challenge the sincerity of what the Soviet Union was propounding—cessation of nuclear weapons tests. It is one thing to espouse the principle that the tests should cease, as the Soviets have done. It is quite another to work out, to the satisfaction of all parties, the necessary details of an agreement.

Never once has our Government said to the Soviet Government: "Let us see what you really mean when you advocate the cessation of nuclear weapons tests along with an inspection system to insure that the ban on tests would be observed." We should determine for ourselves as well as the rest of the world the extent of Soviet sincerity or hypocrisy on the test ban issue. I know of no military reason why it is necessary to couple a ban on tests with the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear material for weapons purposes. Yet, on this issue, our policy has seemed incapable of sufficient modification to challenge the real intentions of the Soviet Union.

Genuine exposure of the weakness of Soviet propaganda is essential. All too often, however, at the U. N. and elsewhere, our spokesmen have been preoccupied with rebutting preposterous Soviet accusations. We have neglected to devote greater or even similar energy to making an affirmative case.

Today we have an unmistakable opportunity to make such an affirmative case now that the Soviet Union is rejecting the offer of NATO to resume negotiations and is also refusing to participate in the U. N.'s only disarmament body.

Probably another mistake we have made was to ask too much for a first-step agreement. We still seem to be infected by some of the utopianism of an earlier period.

To insist, all in one inseparable package, on a system of aerial and ground surveys to prevent surprise attack, suspension of nuclear tests, cessation of nuclear explosives production, reduction of armed forces and armaments, along with the various kinds of inspection systems required to insure compliance with these measures, is merely inviting frustration.

A report of our 12-member Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, issued unanimously, warned that all of the inspection systems required for these various measures might, when added together, be so extensive as to be impractical or unacceptable.

An additional error, perhaps the most serious one committed, was that we violated the principle of negotiating for disarmament from a position of relative military strength. The result was that the position of our negotiators was weakened.

While the U. S. S. R. was making naval sallies into Middle East waters, funneling arms into that area, hurling threats of nuclear annihilation at our allies, and announcing boastfully its achievement of an intercontinental ballistic missile, we were lowering the ceiling on our defense expenditures, cutting back or pulling back our Armed Forces, and curtailing or slowing down our military aircraft and missile programs.

It is difficult to see how we could have presented a strong negotiating front to the Soviet Union when we were so busily engaged in unilateral disarmament. Now that the Soviet Union's hand has been strengthened by its spectacular success in launching space satellites, with all that the sputniks imply as to its achievements in science and military technology, we are even further impelled to show that we have the defense capabilities to give momentum to our diplomacy.

What further evidence do we need to prove that there must be better coordination between our defense and disarmament policies? Although our defense policy is now under sweeping criticism, the danger is still great that the administration has not shaken off the budgetary delusions that have almost let us slip into disaster. There is perhaps even greater danger that it will lose sight of disarmament goals in the fever of rearmament.

Finally, there is the elementary point that effective diplomacy requires a negotiator who commands the substantial and undivided support of the administration which appoints him. The extent of the support of the President's disarmament assistant, Governor Stassen, in the White House, the State Department and the Pentagon was in doubt throughout the disarmament talks.

This was not necessarily as much his fault as the President's. Here, as on other occasions, White House indecision exhibited itself. Mr. Stassen's role in London was plagued from the beginning because of the President's chronic inability to take out a consistent course, to choose among strongly divergent views in his official family. The effect abroad was one of confusion and cross-purposes, hardly conducive to profitable negotiations.

But we must not let the specter of past mistakes obscure the fact that progress has been made.

PROGRESS TO DATE

A survey of a dozen years of negotiations on disarmament in the United Nations reveals the contrast between the position now and what it was in 1946. A decade ago we were striving for total and comprehensive structures of international control over atomic and other arms, which were almost utopian in terms of what was politically possible. Today, we have learned that the centuries-old practices of sovereign states and the forms of security which they consider fundamental cannot be recast overnight.

During the past decade, despite continuing controversy, progress on certain principles of future agreement has apparently been achieved, even though an agreement itself has always been frustrated.

On the critical subject of inspection, for example, significant advances in principle have occurred. In 1946, the Soviet Union simply cold-shouldered the idea. Gradually the U. S. S. R. moved on to acceptance of periodic inspection, and by 1954 had agreed to continuing inspection. In 1955 the Soviet leaders themselves suggested a system of ground inspection, and more recently they acquiesced in principle to inspection by aerial surveys and inspection for observance of a suspension of nuclear weapons tests.

It is against this background that the current status of the disarmament negotiations must be assessed. The agreements and differences between the two sides as they were hammered out at London, and in the recent post-NATO exchange of positions by Washington and Moscow, are rather clear cut.

The western nations have taken the position that nuclear-bomb tests should be ended and that the atomic powers should pledge not to manufacture any additional bombs in the future. The Soviet Union demands merely, "Stop all nuclear tests!"

Both sides agree that there should be some reductions of armaments and armed forces, but the western nations say any important cutbacks should be made only after important political questions (such as that of Germany) have been solved. Both sides also agree in principle to a system of aerial and ground inspection to prevent surprise attack, often referred to as the open-skies plan, but they do not agree on the areas where it should be inaugurated.

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

In addition to reviewing the past to determine mistakes as well as progress, we must be aware of and observe certain cardinal principles.

Before we can expect to reach any agreement with the Soviet Union on control or limitation of arms we and our allies must possess sufficient military strength and political solidarity to give compelling weight to our diplomacy. The rules in Moscow revere and live by power and force, and reject the moral standards of good faith and respect for the pledged word which are our guiding principles. Therefore, any agreement with the Soviet Union must rest upon more than pledges. It must be backed up by hard, workable, effective guaranties and inspection to assure all parties that the promises will be kept.

Moreover, the problem of disarmament is not one that can be solved apart from the broad political issues of our time. Disarmament is not a political wonder drug for a sick world. Change is now the order of human existence, and if disarmament were to become merely a means of freezing the status quo, then it would be doomed to failure. There are revolutionary forces on the move in the world. They must have a means of expressing themselves or explosions will inevitably result.

Hence what is required is a method of limiting or eliminating violence as a means of change. Mankind must devise methods of peaceful, social, economic, and political change in the world or the prospects for disarmament will be remote.

This means that we must face the situation confronting us as realistically as possible. I do not think we can expect to achieve a comprehensive disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union, encompassing large-scale reductions in modern weapons and armed forces, until progress has been made on some of the outstanding political problems confronting the major powers. The trend and pressures evident at the Paris NATO session have served to underscore this point in many ways.

In my opinion these problems include especially the division of Germany, the current crisis in the Middle East, and the issue of Communist China. United States policy on these problems must undergo the most careful reexamination.

Despite the lack of progress hitherto on these questions, I believe we should continue to offer to negotiate with the Soviet Union through the United Nations for a limited and partial arms control agreement. We should do so, not grudgingly as we appeared to do at the Paris NATO conference, but earnestly, urgently and hopefully.

In pursuing these negotiations, it is essential that our negotiators as well as the entire executive branch maintain a steady, nonemotional outlook.

In negotiating for disarmament our preparations must deal specifically with the most crucial aspect of a disarmament agreement, the nature of an inspection system.

The western powers and the Soviet Union both propose inspection as a means of insuring that disarmament measures will be carried out, but neither side has published in detail its concept of what it would consider necessary for adequate inspection of any particular type of disarmament.

In its recent report, the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee strongly recommended that the executive branch, if it had not already done so, should draw up blueprints for the various kinds of inspection now under consideration.

The launching of the Soviet sputniks has, of course, thrown fresh complexities into the inspection problem. We must now grap-

ple with the difficulties of detecting rocket and missile launching sites, some of which may be mobile or concealed underground. Moreover, the possibility of using reconnaissance satellites carrying photographic or television equipment may soon render obsolete present proposals for aerial surveys by conventional aircraft.

In any event, it is clear that some types of inspection may require many innovations in our traditional concepts of such things as sovereignty, business privacy, and military secrecy. It is essential, therefore, that they be understood by, and have the backing of, the people of the United States and other countries that would be affected.

We must also be prepared to test and use some of our disarmament proposals in areas where tension exists.

We should consider, as a pilot project, open-skies aerial and ground inspection over border regions of various Middle Eastern countries. Since many of the Middle Eastern states supported the open-skies plan in a United Nations resolution, they might now be asked to set up a pilot mutual inspection system to be conducted by themselves or by agreed upon outside parties. Such a project could do much to relieve current tensions in the Middle East caused by fear of military attack.

Neither singly nor together will these points provide a key that will in one motion unlock the door to an arms limitation treaty. But the record thus far shows that some progress can be made, and offers reasonable grounds for hope that international tensions can eventually be reduced through an enforceable international covenant to limit and control the implements of war.

## Supreme Court Decisions: Why Congress Is Justifiably Concerned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 27, 1958*

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to offer for the consideration of my colleagues a very astute and to-the-point address by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], chairman of the Special Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee appointed to study Supreme Court decisions, of which I have the privilege of being the ranking minority member.

This address was delivered before the meeting of the Associated General Contractors in Memphis, Tenn., January 31, 1958—interestingly enough the same date that the United States served notice on the Soviet Union, with the successful launching of the free world's Explorer satellite, that communistic domination cannot outstrip technologically—or in any other field of endeaver—our free-enterprise system under a government of freemen. On this same day, my distinguished chairman was informing the Associated General Contractors in convention that our subcommittee is working diligently to make sure that the Communist conspiracy within this country shall not succeed, and to make sure that the legislature carry out its duty, within its constitutional power to do so, of shoring up the dike of anticommunistic and criminal laws when that dike is unduly weakened by broad, sweeping decisions of the judicial branch.

I recently addressed the House on a similar subject concerning the work of our subcommittee and trust my colleagues will consider seriously the observations of my chairman and myself on this important subject. Our subcommittee is doing monumental and historical work and we are fortunate to have a man of the stature and legal ability of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] as chairman.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS BEFORE THE MEETING OF ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS IN MEMPHIS, TENN., JANUARY 31, 1958

Win the cold war we must, but what will it profit the United States if we gain international prestige and suffer the loss of our fundamental rights?

We now find ourselves bordering on hysteria because of the repercussions of the launching of earth satellites. The flight of these satellites seem to be carrying the American mind into a field of fancy and fantasy. The American mentality is being geared to scientific crash programs, intercontinental ballistic missiles and other outer space gadgets. We read of estimates running into billions of dollars for these new defense programs. Arguments are advanced to revise our educational system with all the emphasis being placed on scientific research.

In the midst of all this furor, I cannot help but think that the American people are being weaned away from the pressing problem of erosion of fundamental individual liberties and the reduction of the doctrine of States' rights to mere shambles. Some people at times speak with more reverence about the United Nations, the NATO agreement, and the Baghdad Pact than they do about our Constitution.

Our generation has seen the evolution of the doctrine of national supremacy as a paramount factor in Federal and State relationships. This development has drastically changed the former equilibrium between State and Federal power. Equality which once was the keystone of our federalism has been torn asunder and the pendulum has swung far to the Federal side of the balance of these powers. We are now under almost complete predominance of Federal authority. Our American economy and our social life are being subjected to daily Federal regulation and control.

Some people forget that our Constitution itself faced rejection if the first 10 amendments had not been incorporated into it. They forget that by virtue of these first amendments, which we know as our Bill of Rights, ours is a Government of delegated powers and that all powers not delegated to thet Federal Government are reserved to the States and the people. As a consequence fields that were once purely within State competence are now being preempted by Federal rule. State soverignty is being reduced to a mere shell. And our once-vaunted Constitution of Rights has been replaced by a Constitution of powers.

This evolution of Federal supremacy was nurtured and fostered by ambitious men and bureaucrats, in the past, but more recently the program has been advanced by judicial decrees.

Recent decisions of the Supreme Court are putting to a new test the fundamental principle of separation of powers among the three branches of our Government. These decisions are causing grave concern to the American Bar Association, the Association of Chief Justices of the States, the Association of Attorneys General, and other legal organizations. But more importantly, the people themselves have become aroused by their impact on almost every facet of their daily lives.

Since we will be hearing about these decisions more and more in time to come, I thought it would be well for me to discuss with you as leaders in your respective communities, and in a non-legal way, some of the most serious and far-reaching questions raised by the new pronouncements of the Supreme Court. Some of these strike at the legislative powers of Congress, while others impede the executive branch of the Government in the enforcment of our laws; some of them ignore the reality of the world-wide Communist conspiracy, and still others have the effect of concentrating more and more powers in the Federal Government at the expense of the reserved rights of the several States.

I want to discuss some of the specific cases recently decided by the Supreme Court, but before doing so, I think it would be refreshing for you and me to ponder over the fundamental problems involved, because fundamentals are at such a premium these days.

What distinguishes our form of government and a democracy from a totalitarian, a communistic, or a dictatorship state? The answer is really very simple and we run across it in our daily lives without even thinking in terms of law.

Our Founding Fathers erected constitutional walls separating the powers of government into three branches, namely: the legislative branch, which is charged with making laws and nothing else; the executive branch, which is charged with enforcing the laws and nothing else; and the judicial branch, which is charged with interpreting the laws and nothing else. This doctrine of separation of powers is also commonly referred to as the principle of checks and balances.

Now in our turbulent history these constitutional walls separating the functions of our Government into three coequal and independent branches have been put to severe stresses and strains by the executive and legislative branches; but never before by the judicial branch. This was due to the personality of our leaders because we certainly have had political and intellectual giants at the head of our Government from time to time in the past.

For example, no one would accuse rough and tumble Andrew Jackson of having a negative personality. Because of his strong will and determination, he at times would reduce the Congress to a subservient legislative branch; and once, when the Supreme Court handed down a decision which he thought interfered with his own powers, he rose up in wrath and roared like a lion, "It's their decree; let them enforce it."

And we have seen the pendulum swing the other way, when Congress became the dominant branch. Thus, following his assassination, Abraham Lincoln was succeeded by Andrew Johnson, who was one of the most noble champions of Constitutional law ever to preside at the White House, and who was properly depicted by Senator JOHN KENNEDY of Massachusetts as one of the 10 outstanding men in our history in his recent book entitled "Profiles in Courage. But, on the House side, we had Thaddeus Stevens, who was bent on treating the South as a conquered province following the War Between the States and on making shambles of the powers of the executive branch of the Government. It was this same Thaddeus Stevens who once said, "I know this law is unconstitutional, but before a test case can reach the Supreme Court the damage will have been done."

And we all remember that Teddy Roosevelt could speak softly and walk with a big stick.

On the other hand, we almost reached perfection in the application of the principle of separation of powers under Woodrow Wilson, who always appealed to the rule of reason.

Finally, we all lived in the era of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Whether we liked him or not, and without knowing what the historians will say about him later on, we must certainly admit that he was the most brilliant political strategist ever elected by the people. Because of his penchant for personal power, it seemed at times that Congress was supine to his will. But he overstepped proper bounds on at least two occasions. On one occasion the people of Georgia repudiated his effort to purge their late and great Senator George; and on the second occasion Congress in one of its finest hours rejected his plan to pack the Supreme Court.

In our democracy, however, the ultimate powers of Government reside in the people and when their President, their Representatives or their Senators no longer reflect their will they have the right to vote them out of office. Bu this is not so with the members of the Supreme Court because once appointed they serve for life unless impeached for high crimes or misdemeanors. One reason for this distinction is this. Congress alone can appropriate money, which is another way of saying that it has the compelling power of the purse. The President of the United States is the Chief Executive, and in a way he may be said to have the power of the sword. Because of these tremendous powers it was felt that the President and Members of Congress should submit themselves to the people periodically. On the other hand, as substantially expressed by Madison, the Supreme Court has one single solitary power and that is the power to pronounce an honest judgment.

But while Federal judges are free from passing popular control, and properly so, the Founding Fathers very deliberately applied the principle of checks and balances in their appointment. Thus the President nominates them but they can only be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

In retrospect, I think it is fair to say that the Senate has not exercised all of its powers under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution. To be sure, we have seen a Senator block the appointment of a Federal judge now and then on the ground that the applicant was personally obnoxious to him. I would like to see the day come, however, when the whole Senate would say, "Mr. President, your nominee is an honest and respectable man and he is not personally obnoxious to any of us. We say to you, however, sir, that we cannot approve him because we do not believe he has the judicial experience, the temperament and the requisite qualities to be a member of the highest court of the land." And I predict that in view of some of the recent shocking decisions of the Supreme Court, this course will be followed by the Senate in the future.

But what about the present time? The trend of the decisions which I will now discuss indicates that the Supreme Court is fast becoming the dominant branch of our Government. This is something that has never happened before. Peculiar circumstances require special action. And so for the first time in our history, a special subcommittee was appointed to study the questions raised by recent decisions of the Supreme Court, with authority to make legislative recommendations, and I have the privilege to serve as chairman of that subcommittee.

The action taken by the Congress last year, on the recommendation of my subcommittee, in correcting the decision of the Supreme Court in the famous Jencks case, proves that if we have the will to do it something can be done in this broad field of judicial encroachment on the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

Now, bearing these fundamentals in mind, let's take a look at the record, as Al Smith used to say.

This man Jencks was a union official and a Communist. He was found guilty of perjury by a jury of his peers. During the course of his trial he demanded the right to inspect confidential FBI reports, but the Government refused to submit them in the interest of national security. Jencks, of course, took an appeal, and the Surpeme Court held that the Government had to either exhibit the confidential FBI reports or turn him loose. Rather than permit him to rifle FBI files, the Government let him go.

As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I say to you that nothing would please a hard-core Communist more than to become a so-called martyr for the cause of the Communist conspiracy in exchange for an opportunity to lay his filthy hands on secret FBI files. We corrected that decision during the closing days of the last Congress by simply requiring that pertinent reports in any particular case must first be submitted to the presiding judge, who thereupon can separate the material from the immaterial and order the production of only those portions of general reports that have truly a legal bearing on the case. In other words, we simply restored the lower judges into their traditional role of impartial umpire between the Government and the people on the one hand and persons charged with violation of our laws on the other.

A man by the name of Mallory raped a woman in the basement of her own home. Now, the most serious of all crimes, those that are carefully planned, such as premeditated murder, robbery, and rape, are never committed in the open. The police have to do the best they can through the heretofore well recognized process of interrogation and elimination. As usual, there were no witnesses to this particular crime and Mallory took the further precaution of disguising himself. And so, following usual practice, the police questioned Mallory. Seven hours went by between his arrest and his arraignment before the Commissioner in the District of Columbia. During that time he was fed, talked freely, and confessed his crime.

The confession was free and voluntary, and what is more it was truthful. Mallory was regularly tried and was found guilty. The Supreme Court held that the confession was void, not because it was induced by threat or violence, or involuntary for any reason, but solely because the confession was made before he was brought before the Commissioner for formal arraignment. Under this brand new concept of the administration of justice, a confession or any incriminating statement made by a person who has actually committed a crime before he is formally arraigned cannot be admitted in evidence, even though it is free, voluntary, and truthful. For all intents and purposes this decision practically prohibits the time-honored process of interrogation, and in effect puts the handcuffs on the policeman instead of on the criminal. In any event, Mallory was turned free and foot-loose on the streets of Washington. And incidentally, since the Supreme Court set him free, Mallory committed a vicious assault on a person who tried to befriend him, and in addition to being a confessed rapist is now a fugitive from justice in connection with his other crime.

Now let us go to another case, this one in the field of Congressional investigation. The leading case is *Watkins* v. *The United States*.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has been set up as a standing committee of the House since 1934. It is specifically authorized to conduct investigations as to the extent, character and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; and the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda which is instigated from foreign countries and which attacks the principle of the form of our Government as guaranteed by the Constitution. The investigations of this committee were largely responsible for the adoption of some of our most important laws dealing with our national security, such as the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, and the Foreign Agents Registration Act. No court, up until the Watkins case, had the temerity to challenge its authority or the legislative purpose of its investigations.

Watkins refused to answer certain questions before the committee. The House of Representatives, without a single dissenting voice, voted to cite him for contempt and recommended prosecution. He was tried and found guilty by a jury of his own peers.

The Supreme Court held, however, that neither the House resolution creating the committee, nor the remarks of the chairman during the investigation, nor the nature of the proceedings themselves, could have made it clear to Watkins what the question under inquiry was, and one more character was set free.

Here we find the Supreme Court not only hamstringing a committee of Congress but in a very real sense intruding itself in the legislative field, which is the business of Congress and not of the courts.

And if evidence is needed to demonstrate that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty in dealing with the Communist conspiracy, then let me say this. In the short space of a generation, and without firing a single shot, this evil force called communism has already engulfed one-third of the earth's surface and 40 percent of the world's population.

We appropriate between $35 million and $40 million per year for national defense and security. National defense and security against whom? Who are the troublemakers? The Communist conspiracy, of course. Now does it make any sense for the military people to tell Congress, "We need $38 billion in order to halt the Red menace," and then for the Supreme Court to tell Congress, "But you cannot investigate the Red menace because that does not involve a legislative purpose"? No; it does not make any kind of sense, either common, book, or horse.

And here in passing let me touch on the enormity of this problem as indicated by the figure of $38 billion. Have you any conception of just what that means? Reflect for a moment on this statement, namely: That since the birth of Christ, time has not as yet ticked off 1 billion minutes. Take your pencil and figure it out.

The famous or infamous case of *Yates* v. *The United States* involved a national security law known as the Smith Act. In that case a group of vicious enemies of our Government were tried and convicted for conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence, but the Supreme Court let five of them go scot-free. The majority of the members of the Court arrived at that conclusion by assuming the role of jurors instead of judges and by disregarding the very purpose of Congress in adopting the Smith Act in the first place. And you do not have to take my word for this.

On the point that the Supreme Court acted as a jury instead of judges, Justice Clark in his dissenting opinion said:

"This Court should not acquit anyone here. In its long history I find no case in which an acquittal has been ordered by this Court solely on the facts. It is somewhat late to start in now usurping the function of the jury."

And on the proposition that the Court disregarded the intent of Congress, Justice Clark had this to say: "This construction frustrates the purpose of the Congress, for the Smith Act was passed in 1940 primarily

to curb the growing strength and activity of the Communist Party."

And more recently, a United States circuit court of appeals said that in view of the Yates decision it felt duty bound to free some more known Communists, who had been convicted under the Smith Act, but the court of appeals came right out and warned the people that the Yates decision "had made shambles of the Smith Act."

In another dissenting opinion in the Jencks case, to which I previously referred, Justice Clark said, "Unless the Congress changes the rule announced by the Court today, those intelligence agencies of our Government engaged in law enforcement may as well close up shop for the Court has opened their files to the criminal and thus afforded him a Roman holiday for rummaging through confidential information as well as vital national secrets."

When a justice uses such strong language in referring to the opinion of his brethren, and when a court of appeals feels compelled to abide by but expresses open hostility to a Supreme Court decision, don't you think it is time to sit up and take notice?

But let us move on to another case, this one involving States rights.

Raphael Konigsberg applied for admission to practice law in the State of California. He related everything that was good and sad about his past but he simply refused to answer any questions or to talk about his past Communist activities. He made some pious reference to constitutional provisions protecting one's beliefs and associations. In the ultimate, he simply took the position that to inquire into his past Communist activities was none of the business of the bar examiners. The Supreme Court of California held that the State of California, in its sovereign capacity, had the right to decide who could practice law there. The court concluded that Konigsberg did not make out a case of good moral character and refused him a license to practice law.

The Supreme Court reversed the decision of the highest court of the State of California. Despite all the ramifications of the case, the net result is that the Supreme Court is now undertaking to regulate the legal profession in the several States. What next—the medical profession, the accounting profession, the engineering profession, and all others? Is it the business of the Federal Government to regulate the professions, or is this not a matter for the States? The question answers itself.

I think I have cited enough cases to show that we are drifting farther and farther away from the moorings of our Constitution. This is a challenge not only to Members of Congress but to all men of goodwill who believe in our form of Government and democratic institutions. We must not only stem the tide of Federal supremacy. We must return to fundamental constitutional principles. We must repair whatever damage that has been done to the constitutional walls separating the powers of our Government into three dignified branches. And then we must restore to our people the system of government devised by our forefathers.

Those, I think were the mature and humble thoughts of Chief Justice Hughes on the occasion of the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the first meeting of the Congress, and whose words I quote in closing:

"We come from our district departments of government activity to our unity of aim in maintaining our form of Government in accordance with our common pledge. We are here not as masters, but as servants, not to glory in power, but to attest our loyalty to the commands and restrictions laid down by our sovereign, the people of the United States, in whose name and by whose will we exercise our brief authority."

Yes, we must win the cold war, but what will it profit the United States if we gain international prestige and suffer the loss of our fundamental rights? I hope I have made you think about it.

---

# SENATE

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1958

*(Legislative day of Monday, January 27, 1958)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all being, throned afar, Thou who art the center and soul of every sphere, yet to each loving heart how near; nearer than the hands and feet that serve us, nearer than the problems that front us, nearer even than the comrades who walk beside us. In spite of our frailty and fallibility, speak to us and through us, that to this tangled world Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done.

Grant us Thy truth to make us free,
And kindling hearts that burn for Thee,
Till all Thy living altars claim
One holy light, one heavenly flame.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 27, 1958, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time Senators may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—SESSION ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that we anticipate that there will be a session of the Senate tomorrow, if that is agreeable to the distinguished minority leader.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia;

Charles W. Yost, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Syria; and

Christopher H. Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a total of 29,083 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, many of which are recess appointments. Included in this group are 144 promotions of flag and general officers. I ask that the names of the flag and general officers be printed on the Executive Calendar.

Included also are the names of 28,939 nominations for temporary and permanent appointment and promotion in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Of this number 2,229 are in the rank of colonel and below in the Army, 17,010 in the rank of major and below in the Air Force, 7,637 in the rank of captain and below in the Navy, and 2,063 in the rank of colonel and below in the Marine Corps. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Thomas John Hall Trapnell, United States Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr., Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Transportation,

United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Charles Richard Hutchison, United States Army, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. George W. Mundy, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Rear Adm. Eugene J. Peltier, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy;

Edward C. Kenney, and sundry other officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Wayne R. Loud, and sundry other officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

David M. Shoup, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general;

Carson A. Roberts, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general;

Randall M. Victory, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

John P. Condon, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

Bertrand T. Fay, Marine Corps Reserve, for temporary appointment to the grade of major general;

William W. Stickney, Marine Corps Reserve, for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

Carlton A. Fisher, Marine Corps Reserve, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, United States Marine Corps, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general;

Gen. Ray A. Robinson, United States Marine Corps, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of lieutenant general;

Lt. Gen. Robert E. Hogaboom, United States Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while so serving;

Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, and Vice Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while so serving;

Vice Adm. Byron E. Hanlon, and sundry other officers of the United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving;

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy;

Vice Adm. Roscoe F. Good, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of vice admiral; and

Maj. Gen. Thomas Morgan Watlington, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Margaret M. Fallon, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Lee B. James, and sundry other officers, for appointment and promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Theodore F. Beeman, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps; and

Hershell L. Abbott, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

## NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is my intention that all Senators who care to submit insertions for the RECORD may do so; but thereafter, before the Senate proceeds with further business, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF MOTORBOAT TO LAKE SINCLAIR POWER SQUADRON, MILLEDGEVILLE, GA.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Navy Department proposed to transfer a 40-foot motorboat, located at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va., to the Lake Sinclair Power Squadron of Milledgeville, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

USE OF NAVAL VESSELS TO DETERMINE EFFECT OF NEWLY DEVELOPED WEAPONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of newly developed weapons upon such vessels (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Acting Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental or research work, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council, for the period January 1–June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the period July 1–December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, MUIR WOODS NATIONAL MONUMENT, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit at Muir Woods National Monument, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2734, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED TRAINING SCHOOL FOR IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for a training school and other facilities for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO CONCEALMENT OF ASSETS IN CONTEMPLATION OF BANKRUPTCY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Small Craft Harbors Commission, State of California, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds to permit a final survey report of Port San Luis Harbor by the Corps of Army Engineers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of L. M. Ellithorpe, of Long Beach, Calif., relating to increased deductions in certain income taxes for the benefit of the unemployed; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Newport Beach, Calif., favoring the recognition of Orange County, Calif., as a metropolitan area; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Hugh Wilson, of Port Arthur, Tex., relating to a new system of public transportation in the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper

*"To the President, Congress, and the Departments of State and Interior of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The mining of copper is one of Arizona's chief industries, an industry so great that in point of copper production Arizona leads all of the States of the United States, and, in fact, is responsible for approximately 50 percent of all copper mined in the Nation.

"The copper mining industry gives employment to many thousands of miners, artisans, mechanics and craftsmen, whose welfare and prosperity is in very large measure dependent upon this major activity; indeed, the economic welfare of the State is vitally affected by the status of the mining industry.

"There are, in addition to the properties now being worked, great areas and bodies of copper ore in the State which are susceptible of development, to the enrichment of the State and the Nation.

"Should the price of copper be allowed to be determined by foreign countries with low-wage standards and high-grade deposits, the result would be a general shutdown of our mines, and a consequent deterioration of the industry both by the heavy damage to the mines and disbandonment of working organizations.

"Should the Nation suddenly be caught without the foreign supply, and should atomic warfare break out overnight, as indeed may well be the case, the copper shortage and the disbandonment of the skilled labor and management so necessary to produce copper might well mean the ultimate defeat of our Armed Forces.

"The possibility of the collapse of the copper mining industry is not a remote circumstance since, with the high cost of labor, increased taxes, higher freight rates and other cost handicaps, domestic producers cannot stay in business competition with the low-wage production from foreign countries.

"It is therefore of major importance, not only from the standpoint of simple economics, but from the standpoint of survival, that the price of copper be maintained on a basis which will insure an active industry with normal production, fair profits, steady employment and a good standard of living for workers in the industry, and from which would result a continuation of the benefits which accrue to the national security and the State's economy by reason of the industry.

"This can only be insured through the medium of an adequate import tax on raw copper to equalize the difference between the cost of producing the metal in this country and in the copper producing countries of South America, Africa, and elsewhere.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona (the House of Representatives concurring), urgently requests:

"1. That a 4-cent-per-pound tariff be reinstated on all foreign copper.

"2. That the peril point per pound of copper produced be set at 30 cents and the 4-cent-per-pound tariff be maintained until such time as the price of copper reaches or exceeds 30 cents."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF WEST VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, by request I present, for appropriate reference, House Concurrent Resolution 3, adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relating to the importation of foreign commodities to the detriment of numerous small industries in West Virginia.

This is a question of concern, not only to my own State, but also to many other sections of the country. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*To Whom It May Concern:*

This is to certify that the following house concurrent resolution was regularly adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia on January 15, 1958:

"House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action so as to afford protection to certain small industries of West Virginia;

"Whereas West Virginia manufacturers of pottery, glass, ceramics, and clothespins, and numerous other small industries are competing constantly with imports of foreign commodities; and

"Whereas said foreign commodities, because of the low cost of foreign labor and the use of inferior material, are sold at such low prices that the aforesaid West Virginia manufacturers are unable to compete with them without some means of protection; and

"Whereas the import of said foreign commodities is presently permitted virtually without restriction and without protection to the aforesaid small industries; and

"Whereas the present influx of foreign commodities is causing irreparable damage to the aforesaid small industries and can only result in their eventually being driven out of business which would foster increased and widespread unemployment in West Virginia: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take immediate action to afford relief and protection to the aforesaid small industries of West Virginia, through regulation by tariffs and through such other means as are available to the Congress for the accomplishment of said end; and, be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Given under my hand, this the 15th day of January 1958.

C. A. BLANKENSHIP,
*Clerk, West Virginia House of Delegates.*

## EQUAL RIGHTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State, Inc., favoring an amendment to the Constitution, relating to equal rights. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has long been a stated policy of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., and of its component State federations to lend their efforts toward bringing about the enactment of an equal rights amendment to the Federal Constitution; and

Whereas such an amendment, titled "Senate Joint Resolution 80," was presented to the 1st session of the 85th Congress, subsequently received a favorable report from the Senate Judiciary Committee, and is now on the Senate Calendar to be called up for a vote, but has not yet been reported on by the House Judiciary Committee: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State, Inc., assembled in Utica, N. Y., January 18, 1958, for its regularly scheduled semiannual meeting, reaffirm its approval of and support for this amendment, and express its sincere commendation to the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 80, and to the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee for their efforts in behalf of this legislation; be it further

*Resolved*, That said board of directors strongly urge the leaders of both Houses of Congress to lend their efforts toward the passage of this amendment, without qualifications, restrictions, or amendments; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 80, to the chairmen of both Senate and House Judiciary Committees, to the majority and minority leaders of both Houses of Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives from New York State.

Presented by the State resolutions committee:

MILDRED E. HOOVER,
*Chairman.*
DOROTHY B. WELLS,
*Vice Chairman.*
LUCILLE BARRY.
EVELYN HARRINGTON.
MARY J. MULÉ.
LENA RUPPERT.
LENORE TRAVER.

Approved by board action at Utica, N. Y., January 18, 1958.

## AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Federation of

Jewish Women's Organizations, Inc., of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to revise the immigration and nationality laws. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION OF JEWISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
*New York, N. Y.*

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

Whereas the provisions in the immigration laws continue to operate inequitably and the basic inadequacies remain unaltered; and

Whereas we fervently hope that our country will adhere to our tradition of granting asylum and giving hospitality to a just share of those unfortunate, despairing, homeless people who need a haven from oppression and who want their children to grow up in a freedom-loving country; and

Whereas the revision of this law will bring hope to thousands of refugees, expellees, escapees, and other homeless persons: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, in convention assembled on the 15th day of January 1958, urges its legislators to support vital changes in our immigration and nationality laws, to achieve the elimination of discriminatory quotas; provide a realistic, humane and flexible admission policy; and provide equal protection under the law to native born and naturalized citizens except where immigration or naturalization was secured through actual fraud: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the proper Government authorities.

Mrs. IDA COOK FARBER,
*President.*

## SUPPORT PRICE ON MILK PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Ellisburg local of the Dairymen's League, Ellisburg, N. Y., favoring the continuation of dairy price supports. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELLISBURG LOCAL OF
DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE,
*January 20, 1958.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has announced plans to reduce the support price on milk products to 75 percent; and

Whereas no such announcement has been made for other farm products; and

Whereas the dairy interest is developing a self-help plan to relieve burdensome surpluses: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Ellisburg local go on record as favoring the continuance of dairy supports at present levels until the dairy industry has time to put its self-help program in effect.

ROY BELLINGER.
HARRY EASTMAN.
KENNETH M. OTIS.
G. M. EASTMAN,
*Secretary.*

ELLISBURG, N. Y.

## CONTROL OF ANIMAL DISEASES—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, during the first session of this Congress, I introduced Senate bill 2192, a comprehensive animal disease control bill, the purpose of which is to improve the joint livestock disease prevention, control, and eradication program. This bill serves the need for clarification and extension of the authority vested in the Department of Agriculture in its working relationship with the several States in the control of animal diseases. My proposal is now pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I ask unanimous consent that resolutions in support of S. 2192 adopted by the American National Cattlemen's Association and the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks and that they be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT OF MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, AUGUST 5 AND 6, 1957, OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS, SECRETARIES, AND DIRECTORS OF AGRICULTURE

The several States are responsible for the prevention, control, and eradication of livestock diseases at the State level. There is a close working relationship between the States and the United States Department of Agriculture. There is also need for clarification and extension of authority to be granted to the United States Department of Agriculture.

The executive committee of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, at its meeting held August 5, 1957, carefully reviewed Senate bill 2192 and believes its enactment would improve the joint livestock disease prevention, control, and eradication program: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the executive committee of the National Association of State Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture*, That we recommend the passage of Senate bill 2192.

Motion carried unanimously.

GEORGE S. MCINTYRE,
*Secretary.*

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE 61ST ANNUAL CONVENTION, AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, OKLAHOMA CITY, JANUARY 6–8, 1958—ACTION ON PENDING LEGISLATION BILL S. 2192 (THYE)

Whereas because of the enormous trade and travel with foreign countries where dangerous animal disease, not found in this country, abounds; and

Whereas the problem of rabies in livestock is a matter of increasing concern of livestock men because of danger of spread from wildlife: Be it

*Resolved*, That this association recommend enactment of bill S. 2192, which would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to (1) protect against importation of foreign animal diseases, (2) take immediate action for the eradication of dangerous diseases, such as foot-and-mouth disease, in case of an extraordinary emergency, and (3) cooperate with the States in the control and eradication of communicable diseases such as rabies of livestock.

## FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR CONTROLLING STREAM POLLUTION—RESOLUTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in December I received a copy of a resolution which has been adopted by the Common Council of the City of Ontario, Oreg. This resolution is an affirmation supporting the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 660, 84th Congress, by which "the Surgeon General is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters and for the purpose of reports, plans and specifications in connection therewith." The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers oppose these grants, and now the President has yielded to this opinion and his recommendation, if followed, would substantially reduce the assistance contemplated when the President originally signed Public Law 660.

I am sure the members of the Ontario Council are just as strong advocates of self-reliance and local resourcefulness as are those who would eliminate Federal assistance for construction of sewage disposal plants and similar municipal projects. However, as the city fathers of Ontario, Oreg., are the ones at the point of need, they have the practical aspect of the problem to solve—actually providing the projects and facilities that residents of a community must have. As they have pointed out in their resolution, the Federal grants received by municipalities for assisting in the construction of sewage-disposal works further the public interest by reducing, if not eliminating, stream pollution. Controlling stream pollution is equally a matter of importance to all levels of government—municipal, county, State, and Federal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the excellent resolution of the Common Council of the City of Ontario, Oreg., printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On motion of Don Benson, city councilman, seconded by C. R. Van Patten, the following resolution was adopted, to wit:

"Whereas the Common Council of the City of Ontario, Malheur County, Oreg., a municipal corporation of approximately 4,700 persons, has learned of the efforts of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to limit or do away with the Federal assistance and benefits to municipalities in financing sewage disposal works under the provisions of Public Law 660; and

"Whereas the said common council feels that said Public Law 660 is a good law which has been of great benefit, not only to cities in assisting with their sewage disposal problems, but also to the general public in controlling stream and river pollution, and that said law should not be restricted or done away with, and that the 10-year period contemplated by the law is an appropriate length of time, and that the Congress of the United States should implement said law by annual appropriations and should extend the benefits of said law rather than to restrict the same: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Ontario,* That it be noted of record as supporting Public Law 660 and opposing any legislation which would restrict or eliminate any of the beneficial provisions of said law. That said common council is in favor of continued appropriations by the Congress of the United States to make possible further financial assistance to cities in the field of sewage disposal; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the city recorder to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Oregon and to the various committees in the Congress of the United States before which any legislation may be considered with reference to sewage disposal or stream pollution."

Passed and adopted by the Common Council of the City of Ontario on the 2d day of December 1957.

Approved by the mayor of the city of Ontario this 2d day of December 1957.

EARL BOPP, *Mayor.*

Attest:

ELDON S. MILLS,
*City Recorder.*

## RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON DIVISION OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of the major achievements in conservation of natural resources in the State of Oregon are due to the leadership and foresight of the members of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America. This group was one of the first to undertake the Red Hat Day program as a means of calling attention to safe handling of firearms by hunters. The program of the Oregon division was eventually adopted on a national basis.

I cite this example of the work done by the Oregon Izaak Walton League members because it shows the effectiveness of their undertakings. The league has also played a leading role in establishing sound conservation policies. The official viewpoint of the Oregon league is developed at annual conventions where policy matters are thoroughly discussed and studied. As a result of these discussions the league is able to develop a surprising degree of unanimity on many of the complex problems connected with management and use of land, water, and wildlife resources. I support the league's present opposition to Nez Perce Dam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some of the resolutions adopted at the November 1957 convention of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF OREGON DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE

KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION LAND DISPOSAL

Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted Public Law 587 which provides for the termination of Federal control and supervision over the trust and restricted properties of the Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Band of Indians; and

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., is of the opinion that Public Law 587, dealing with the Klamath Indian Reservation, is so worded as to jeopardize orderly distribution and continued sustained-yield management as well as other factors of multiple use of these lands and waters despite the intent of Congress as expressed in Report No. 248 of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day November 1957, recommends to the Congress of the United States that section 5 of Public Law 587 be amended to assure continued sustained-yield management and multiple use, including retention of the marshland as is for use of migratory waterfowl on the Pacific Flyway, for maximum public benefit of the lands and waters contained in the Klamath Forest property; be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America send copies of this resolution to the director of the Oregon Game Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the members of the Oregon Congressional delegation.

NEZ PERCE DAM

Whereas certain interests advocate the construction of a dam in excess of 700 feet in height on the Snake River immediately below the mouth of the Salmon River, to be known as the Nez Perce Dam; and

Whereas other interests advocate the construction of a dam about 675 feet high on the Salmon River about one-half mile above the mouth, to be known as Lower Canyon Dam, and another dam on the Salmon River 660 feet high about 100 miles above the mouth, to be known as Crevice Dam; and

Whereas other interests advocate the construction of a dam about 580 feet high on the Grande Ronde River, a tributary of the Snake River in Washington State, to be known as Wenaha Dam; and

Whereas a significant portion of the salmon run of the Columbia River enters the Snake and spawn in the Salmon River in Idaho, and the Grande Ronde River also supports anadromous fish; and

Whereas dams of such heights across streams present an impassable block to anadromous fish, and there is no way at the present time of passing anadromous fish up and down stream by structures of such heights; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has authority to license power projects on the Snake River, the Salmon River and certain tributaries of both, and has indicated in the licensing of dams on the Cowlitz River in Washington State and in other ways that the commission will license projects in advance of the determination of ways of successfully passing anadromous fish up and down streams by high structures: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957,* That this convention express its opposition to authorization or licensing for construction of Nez Perce Dam on the Snake River, of Lower Canyon and Crevice Dams on the Salmon River, and of Wenaha Dam on the Grande Ronde River, unless it can be shown that the salmon runs entering the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers will not be injured, or that other structures in the Columbia and Snake Rivers have eliminated the runs of salmon entering the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers, or unless it can be shown that other methods can successfully sustain the volume of anadromous fish necessary to the commercial and sports fishery below the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Federal Power Commission; the North Pacific division of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army; the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense; the Oregon Congressional delegation; the Washington State Congressional delegation; the Idaho Congressional delegation; the Oregon Water Resources Board; the Washington State Game and Fish Commissions; and to the Oregon Game and Fish Commissions; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Oregon, Washington and Idaho State Congressional delegations are hereby requested to seek legislation that will defer authorization of any projects affecting the anadromous fish runs on the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers and will suspend the licensing authority of the Federal Power Commission over dams affecting the anadromous fish runs on the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers until it is shown that the volume of anadromous fish can be sustained either by passage past high dams or by other methods, or the anadromous fish runs have ceased due to other causes.

NATIONAL YOUTH CONSERVATION LEAGUE

Whereas in our country there are 52 million nonproductive acres of forest land as a result of fire, poor cutting practices, natural catastrophes and abandonment of land cleared for agriculture; and

Whereas there are additional millions of acres of watershed, range, and other lands upon which many types of conservation practices are needed to increase forage, wildlife and water production as well as to improve their value for recreational purposes; and

Whereas there is a vast storehouse of unused human energy in the form of teen-age boys suitable for employment in these productive, useful conservation tasks: Now therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, recommends to the Oregon Congressional delegation the enactment of appropriate legislation establishing a National Youth Conservation League for the employment of youths in tasks designed to improve and develop all the natural and human resources of the United States, its Territories and insular possessions; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America send copies of the resolution to the members of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

RECREATIONAL USES OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Whereas the recreational use of the national forests of the West continues to grow; and

Whereas the national forests are becoming increasingly important in the West from the standpoint of providing recreational facilities, including camping and hunting and fishing; and

Whereas there is a definite need for the repair and maintenance of existing recreational facilities and a growing need for additional camping and recreational areas: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957 does hereby commend the Department of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States for their appropriation of over $7,500,000 for recreational needs on national forests; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Oregon division urges the enactment of legislation which would assure sufficient moneys each year to maintain, carry on, and expand the recreational and wildlife habitat needs within the national forests; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Oregon Congressional delegation, the chairman of the House

Committee on Appropriations, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

WENATCHEE RIVER DAM (WASHINGTON)

Whereas according to information and belief, the proposed Wenatchee River Dam, Washington, will be used to produce electrical energy for peaking purposes, and that there is no present need for such electric peaking plant; and

Whereas at the time of construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, it was found not feasible to provide fish passage facilities over the Grand Coulee Dam, which resulted in permanent destruction of large spawning areas above the Grand Coulee Dam; and

Whereas the Federal Government, acting through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in cooperation with the Department of Fisheries and Game of the State of Washington, transferred the fish runs from the Columbia River at Grand Coulee Dam to the Entiat, Wenatchee, Methow, and Okanogan Rivers, and that hatcheries were built at Leavenworth, on the Wenatchee River, and on the Entiat and Methow Rivers to supplement the runs in the area of the proposed Wenatchee project. That all of these fish conservation measures were done at the expense of the Federal Government to repair damage done to the Columbia River fishery by construction of the Grand Coulee Dam. That construction of the proposed Wenatchee project would severely damage or destroy this conservation program and that licensing of the proposed project would be in direct conflict with the previous intent of the Federal Government to maintain the affected area as a spawning and rearing area; and

Whereas the anadromous fish populations of the State of Washington constitute its second most valuable natural resource and source of natural food supply. That the fresh water spawning and rearing areas within the State which are suitable for the production and propagation of anadromous fish have been reduced to a critical point by past and current construction of dams and other factors, and that continued encroachment upon these natural spawning and rearing areas will endanger the commercial fishing industry and sports fishing in the State of Washington; and

Whereas the spawning and rearing areas upstream of the proposed dam are extremely important for the production of chinook salmon, sockeye salmon, and steelhead; that Lake Wenatchee, which is upstream of the proposed dam, is the major sockeye producer in the United States; that the dam as proposed by applicant will result in total destruction or serious impairment of approximately 20 miles of spawning area from the dam to the confluence of the Wenatchee River with the Columbia River and seriously impair or destroy all spawning and rearing areas upstream of the dam site; and

Whereas the area above the proposed project has steadily increased in production since the time of transplanting when Grand Coulee Dam was being constructed; that it is anticipated that the proposed means of handling upstream migrants submitted by applicant will result in nearly a total of the chinook run and as much as two-thirds loss of the sockeye run in this area; that no suitable means of transporting downstream migrants has been tested and found to be satisfactory; and that applicant has not proposed any known satisfactory means of transporting the downstream migrants past this dam; if no successful means of passing downstream migrants is provided, a 90-percent fatality of all downstream migrants passing through the proposed tunnel can be anticipated; and

Whereas the proposed dam is contemplated as peaking plant, which will result in large flows of water from the powerhouse to the confluence of the Wenatchee River with the Columbia River, alternating with a drastic reduction in flow of water; that this extreme peaking condition will result in a mortality of eggs in the spawning area from the powerhouse to the mouth of the Wenatchee River and in entrapment of spawning and rearing salmon: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That in view of the foregoing, the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, finds that the proposed project is not in the public interest in that any anticipated benefits from the building of this peaking plant will be far outweighed by damage to the natural resources of the State of Washington, and that the State division is opposed to the project; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Federal Power Commission be so advised.

SALMON RIVER WITHDRAWAL

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America is vitally interested in the proper protection, utilization, and conservation of our natural resources; and

Whereas the chinook salmon and steelhead trout resource of the Pacific Northwest forms one of our principal recreational and commercial sources of natural foods and economic wealth; and

Whereas more than 50 percent of the spring chinook in the Columbia River system spawn within the proposed withdrawal area; and

Whereas the commercial fishery and the sport fishery of the Pacific Northwest are vitally dependent upon the protection of the salmon and trout spawning, incubation, and rearing areas in the Columbia Basin and other regional stream systems; and

Whereas considerable sums of money have already been expended in protecting and assisting the anadromous fish runs at various dams and water-development projects; and

Whereas the perpetuation of our fishery resources in the Pacific Northwest must be maintained at their highest sustained yield of productivity: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, Do find that the request by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the withdrawal of some 31,000 acres of land in the upper reaches of the Salmon River area in Idaho is in the public interest and should be granted in behalf of protection for the anadromous fish runs of the Columbia River; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the members of the Oregon Congressional delegation.

AMENDMENT OF COORDINATION ACT

Whereas the Coordination Act of 1946 (Public Law 732) provides for the evaluation of effects of planned water development projects upon fish and wildlife resources and public recreation; and

Whereas, opportunities to enhance wildlife and recreational values or mitigate losses thereof are not adequately practiced by constructing agencies for want of authority or directive, and

Whereas, the many public and private water development projects in the northwest are seriously jeopardizing fish and wildlife resources and recreational values: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, That the Congress of the United States amend the Coordination Act in a manner that will assure protection of wildlife and recreational values affected by water development projects; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the Oregon Water Resources Board, the Secretary of Agriculture and the members of the Oregon Congressional delegation.

KLAMATH BASIN WATERFOWL REFUGE

Whereas the present status of public lands within the lower Klamath and Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges is insecure, and

Whereas this lack of security precludes maximum development and utilization of the wildlife and recreational potentials of said lands, and

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League and other conservation organizations have repeatedly urged the Secretary of Interior to secure those values by delegating responsibility for the development and administration of those lands to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and permanently withdrawing them from entry, and

Whereas the Secretary of Interior has caused thorough studies of the Klamath Basin to be made and has that information available as a basis for a decision: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, respectively urges the Secretary of Interior to render a decision without further delay that will fully meet the requirement of the Pacific Flyway waterfowl resource as it currently uses the Klamath Basin and provide security for future development and use of the wildlife and recreational potentials of the public lands in the Klamath Basin; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the regional director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Portland, Oreg., the State game commission, and the Secretary of Interior.

MAINTENANCE OF FISH STRUCTURES ON COLUMBIA RIVER DAMS

Whereas the United States Government, through the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers, has constructed more than 40 dams on the Columbia River watershed; and

Whereas an agreement has been entered into between the United States and the several States concerned in the Columbia Basin regarding the construction of fishways, salmon hatcheries, and other facilities to provide for the passage of fish, resulting in the completion of many of these projects and the planning of others; and

Whereas the maintenance of these structures will result in a continuing cost that has not been provided for in the original agreement; and

Whereas the several States concerned, through their legislatures, have petitioned the President and Congress of the United States to recognize the permanent maintenance of these structures as a Federal responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to recognize the permanent maintenance and operation of these facilities as Federal responsibility and to appropriate moneys for their continued operation and maintenance on a permanent basis; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Idaho Congressional delegation.

BILLBOARDS

Whereas the new Federal freeway program brings into focus a highway hazard and nuisance which has long vexed the American public—namely billboards along our highways. The motorists whose gas taxes pay for these highways are entitled to protection from the annoyance, exploitation, and hazard from this form of advertising. Permitting them to be made a captive audience is contrary to the principles of free American democracy. Billboards frequently obstruct and disfigure the view of our fair land, and

deprive the motorist of his right to an unobstructed view of the natural scene; and

Whereas action should be taken at once before billboards are erected on new freeways. It will never again be as easy to protect our freeways and the motoring public from this growing nuisance as it is now. Legislators should not be deceived by the persuasive propaganda of high-priced lobbyists interested only in exploiting the rich gold mine presented gratis to the billboard industry, unless Congress and motorists whose money builds the freeways gives the protection to which they are entitled: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, That it urge Congress to keep all freeways in the Nation free of billboards of every kind. (Save only signs necessary for roadside business, and these to be within 1 mile of the entrance of such business and to conform to standard highway sign pattern and size): Now, therefore, be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads and to the members of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

STANLEY JEWETT

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America has in the past honored some of its outstanding deceased members; and

Whereas the late Stanley Jewett was not only a longstanding and loyal member of the Izaak Walton League but one of the recognized authorities in conservation work and many of the bounties that we enjoy today are the result of Stanley Jewett's dedicated work of the past: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, That funds be appropriated sufficient to provide a suitable plaque in memory of the greatest contributions made to our organization and to wildlife resources in general by the late Stanley Jewett, and that said plaque be erected and dedicated by the Oregon division at a suitable and proper place, preferably in the wildlife refuge.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 5809. An act to authorize construction of a United States Ship Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor (Rept. No. 1229).

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 6078. An act to provide for the erection of suitable markers at Fort Myer, Va., to commemorate the first flight of an airplane on an Army installation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1228).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H. R. 9739. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1231).

## REPORT ENTITLED "GROWTH AND EXPANSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND ITS METROPOLITAN AREA" (S. REPT. NO. 1230)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 172, 85th Congress, from the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, I submit a report entitled "Growth and Expansion of the District of Columbia and Its Metropolitan Area." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 3163. A bill to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening and counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3164. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that a bona fide resident of a State may not be denied assistance under the applicable State plan solely because of his failure to complete a minimum period of residence in such State; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 3165. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. PASTORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 3166. A bill to provide for exclusion from the mails of mail violating certain State laws dealing with improper solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3167. A bill providing for the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital in the State of New York especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3168. A bill for the relief of John Haskell Chesshir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3169. A bill to amend section 552 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended, relating to the salaries of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3170. A bill for the relief of Paul Christian Davidson and Timothy John Davidson; and

S. 3171. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to permit certain adopted children to be naturalized without complying with the residence and physical presence requirements of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3172. A bill for the relief of Ryfka Bergmann;

S. 3173. A bill for the relief of Frisco Di Fiumeri;

S. 3174. A bill for the relief of Ilva Ghiloni;

S. 3175. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Fazio; and

S. 3176. A bill for the relief of Teofilo M. Palaganas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3177. A bill authorizing the modification of the Crisfield Harbor, Md., project in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3178. A bill for the relief of Johann Baptist Krebs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3179. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3180. A bill to establish a United States Department of Science and to prescribe the functions thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WILEY):

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to designate the first day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION PROPOSALS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill implementing the education proposals made by President Eisenhower in his special message of yesterday.

This is one of the most important pieces of proposed legislation to come before the Congress at this session. The time has now come to remedy certain deficiencies in education which can no longer be ignored without seriously jeopardizing our national security. Prompt action must be taken if the schools are to provide the Nation with the technical, intellectual, and moral resources needed to meet the Communist challenge in the years ahead.

The President's program is a sound, realistic plan for action. It would mobilize our national brainpower more effectively, stimulate more talented students to become scientists, and alleviate the critical shortage of college teachers and language experts.

These steps are clearly in the interest of national security, and it is my hope that the bill carrying out the President's program will receive strong bipartisan support. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie at the desk through Monday of next week, in order that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is not my purpose here to give a detailed description of the bill. Instead, I wish to call attention to a thorough analysis which has been prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and I ask unanimous consent that the analysis be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF EDUCATION PROPOSALS

The bill, entitled the "Educational Development Act of 1958," is divided into five titles.

Title I would provide assistance to the States in the early discovery of student aptitudes and the maximum development of these aptitudes during high school through improved counseling and guidance services. It would also provide an incentive to able students in need of financial assistance therefor to continue their education at institutions of higher education through provision of a limited number of undergraduate scholarships.

Title II would provide assistance to State educational agencies to strengthen their supervisory, teacher-training, and related activities in support of science or mathematics instruction in public elementary or secondary schools. It would also provide, through grants to the States, assistance to local educational agencies to expand and improve science or mathematics instruction in their public secondary schools.

Title III would authorize assistance in the expansion and improvement of the teaching of modern foreign languages through arrangements with institutions of higher education to establish institutes for advanced training of foreign language teachers and through assistance to institutions of higher education to establish centers for teaching rare foreign languages.

Title IV would provide assistance to institutions of higher education for the establishment of new programs of graduate education and for expansion of existing programs, including fellowships, with preference for individuals interested in teaching at institutions of higher education.

Title V contains definitions and other general provisions. It would also authorize grants to assist State educational agencies in improving and strengthening State educational statistics and information.

The programs authorized by the bill would be for a period of 4 years beginning July 1, 1958, except that scholarships awarded under title I and graduate fellowships awarded pursuant to title IV during the 4-year period would continue beyond that period to permit completion of the undergraduate or graduate training.

The programs authorized by the bill would be applicable to the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

The bill would be administered at the Federal level by the Commissioner of Education.

TITLE I—IDENTIFICATION OF APTITUDES AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

*Part A—Testing and counseling and guidance*

Allotments

The appropriations for each of the 4 years of this program would be allotted among the States in two ways:

1. Each State would first be allotted an amount equal to $1.25 multiplied by the total enrollment in grades 9 to 12, inclusive, in public and private nonprofit schools in the State.

2. The balance of the appropriation each year would be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative public school enrollments in grades 9 to 12, inclusive, but with a minimum of $5,000.

Matching and Expenditures Covered

A State's allotment for each year would be available for paying one-half of the expenditures (under the State's approved plan) for—

(a) Testing of students in public or private nonprofit elementary or secondary schools and maintenance of cumulative test and other pertinent educational progress records for public-school students.

(b) Salaries of additional supervisors of counseling and guidance personnel and salaries of additional counseling and guidance personnel, and training of counseling and guidance personnel and of teachers who engage part time in counseling and guidance work (including those who are preparing for employment in counseling and guidance).

Payment of salaries under item (b) above would be available only for personnel who are engaged exclusively or primarily in counseling and guidance of students in public secondary schools (and their supervisors) and who are fully certified for such work by the State.

State Administration

The administration of this program in the States would be by the State educational agencies under plans approved by the Commissioner. However, in any State in which the State educational agency could not lawfully make payments to cover the cost of testing in private schools, the Commissioner would reserve from the State's allotment an amount equal to $1.25 multiplied by the enrollments in such private schools in grades 9 to 12, inclusive. The amount reserved would be available for payment of one-half of the expenditures incurred under arrangements made by the Commissioner for testing of the students in the private schools, up to a maximum Federal payment of $1.25 multiplied by the number of students enrolled in such private schools in such grades.

A State plan for testing and for counseling and guidance of high school students would be approved by the Commissioner if it met certain conditions set forth in the bill. One of these is provision for administration of the plan by the State educational agency. Also, a State must have some programs for the testing of students, for the maintenance of testing and other student records, and for strengthening counseling and guidance of students; and these are to be set forth in the State plan, along with the methods of doing the testing, maintaining the records, and strengthening the counseling and guidance. The testing program so included must provide for testing during each year of at least all students in grade 9 or all students in a lower grade and all students in grade 11 or all students in grade 12. The plan also must set forth the minimum qualifications for counseling and guidance personnel. Finally the plan would have to include provision for adequate accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures and for the making of necessary reports to the Commissioner.

Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes

The Commissioner would be authorized to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education for operation by them of short term and regular training institutes to improve the qualifications for counseling and guidance work of personnel in the public or other nonprofit secondary schools engaged in such work (full time or part time). Personnel attending such institutions would receive stipends, including allowances for their dependents and for travel to and from their places of residence.

Appropriations

While no specific sum is authorized to be appropriated, the order of magnitude of program costs which the Department believes to be necessary is reflected in the cost table accompanying this submission and goes from an estimate of $17,275,000 in the first year to $26,300,000 in the fourth year.

*Part B—Undergraduate scholarships*

Appropriation Ceilings

The appropriations for carrying out this program would be limited to $7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, $15 million for the next fiscal year, $22,500,000 for the third year, and $30 million for the fourth year.

For the fifth, sixth, and seventh years appropriations would be authorized to cover the cost of scholarships to enable recipients selected during one of the first 4 years to complete their course of study.

Allotments

The appropriations for the first fiscal year of the program would be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative numbers of public or private nonprofit high school graduates.

For the next 3 years the Commissioner would first allot funds among the States for continuing payments to scholarship recipients during the preceding year. The remainder of the appropriations would be allotted among the States on the same basis as is provided for the first fiscal year of the program.

The appropriations for each of the last 3 years of the program would be allotted among the States for continuing payments to scholarship recipients during the preceding year.

State Administration

A State desiring to participate in the scholarship program could do so by establishing a State commission on Federal scholarships (or designating an existing agency to serve as its commission) and submitting a State plan complying with the requirements described below.

The selection of individuals for scholarships under this program would be made by State commissions on Federal scholarships in accordance with the approved State plans.

In connection with his review and approval of a State plan, the Commissioner would provide technical assistance and advice to promote effective coordination between a State's scholarship program and its testing and counseling and guidance programs.

The Commissioner would approve, for purposes of participation in the scholarship program, any State plan which—

(a) Provides for administration by the State commission;

(b) Provides for selection of scholarship recipients and determination of the amount

of scholarships in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria, established by the State commission and found by the Commissioner to provide reasonable assurance of selection on the basis of ability to pursue a college course of study successfully, but with preference being given to those with good preparation in or high aptitude for mathematics or science, as well as reasonable assurance that only individuals in need of financial assistance to continue their education at institutions of higher education will be selected, that the amount of the scholarship for those selected will be based on financial need, that the maximum scholarship allowable under the plan will be $1,000, and that reasonable opportunity for selection will be afforded eligible applicants in foreign countries. The existence and extent of an applicant's need for financial assistance would be determined without regard to the expenses of attendance at the college chosen by him.

A State's plan would also have to provide for certification of new recipients and of the continued need of individuals previously selected from that State, for adequate accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures, and for making necessary reports to the Commissioner.

Federal funds to pay one-half the necessary cost of administration of the State plans approved under this part of the bill would be authorized.

Eligibility for and Award of Scholarships

An individual would be eligible to apply for a scholarship in any State if (a) he is living in the State (or, if not living in any of the States is domiciled in such State), and (b) he has a certificate of graduation from a secondary school meeting State requirements or has attained an equivalent level of educational advancement.

The Commissioner would, within a State's allotment available for the purpose, award scholarships to individuals certified to him by the State commission. Applicants who were rated, on the basis of ability, above the last applicant receiving a scholarship and who failed to receive one solely because of lack of financial need would be awarded appropriate certificates by the Commissioner.

Duration of Scholarships

A scholarship awarded under this program would be for the period necessary to complete the recipient's work for his first bachelor's degree. No scholarship, however, could extend for more than 4 academic years.

Continued eligibility of an individual awarded a scholarship would depend on his continued financial need, determined annually by the State commission, and his continued full-time enrollment at an institution of higher education and maintenance of satisfactory standing there, although certain absences for vacations, military service, or other good and sufficient reasons would not disqualify him.

Courses of Study Covered

Scholarships awarded under this program could be for any course of study leading to an undergraduate degree at any institution of higher education, selected by the recipient in any of the States or in a foreign country. Institutions of higher education in a foreign country would, however, have to be approved by the Commissioner.

Adjustment for Other Federal Educational Assistance

The Commissioner would, by regulations prescribed after consultation with the other Federal agencies concerned, provide for adjustment (including complete withholding where appropriate) of scholarship payments to avoid duplication of educational assistance available under programs administered by such other Federal agencies.

TITLE II—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE OR MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

*Part A—Strengthening supervisory, teacher-training, and related activities of State educational agencies*

Appropriation Ceilings

Appropriations authorized to carry out the purposes of this part would be limited to $15 million annually for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

Allotments

Allotments of the appropriations among the States would be based on their relative public school enrollments in grades 1 to 12, inclusive, but with a minimum of $5,000.

Matching and Expenditures Covered

A State's allotment would be available for paying one-half of the expenditures under expansion and improvement programs (included in the approved State plan) and one-half of the necessary cost of administration of the State's approved plan.

State Plans

The Commissioner would approve, for purposes of this title, any State plan which—

(a) provides for administration by the State educational agency;

(b) sets forth the expansion and improvement programs to be carried out under the State plan. These programs must include programs for expansion or improvement of (i) supervision by the State agency of public school science or mathematics instruction, (ii) studies and demonstrations to modernize public school science or mathematics curricula, instructional materials, and equipment, and (iii) preservice undergraduate teacher-training and training to improve qualifications of science or mathematics teachers. The State may also include programs for expansion or improvement of other activities of the State agency in support of science or mathematics instruction in public schools.

The State plan must also show the methods for carrying out programs under it and provide for adequate accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal procedures and for the making of necessary reports to the Commissioner.

In the case of existing programs carried on by a State educational agency only the portion of the program which the Commissioner of Education finds is an addition to or an expansion of that program will be deemed to be an "expansion or improvement program" that may be included under the State plan.

*Part B—Strengthening science or mathematics instruction in public secondary schools*

Appropriation Ceilings

The amounts authorized to be appropriated for purposes of this part (for grants to States to assist local educational agencies to expand and improve science or mathematics instruction in public secondary schools), would be limited to $150 million annually for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1959, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

Allotments

The appropriations for each fiscal year would be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative public school enrollments in grades 9 to 12, inclusive.

Matching and Expenditures Covered

The State's allotment would be available for paying one-half of the expenditures under local educational agency programs approved by the State agency under its approved State plan.

Federal payments under this part, however, could be made with respect to local educational agency programs in any State only if the State has a plan approved under part A of this title of the bill and such plan—

(a) Sets forth minimum qualifications for science or mathematics teachers which are required to be met by teachers whose compensation is paid or increased under such a local educational agency program;

(b) Sets forth criteria, standards, and procedures to be followed by the State educational agency in approving programs of local educational agencies. Such programs may be for (i) employment of additional qualified science or mathematics teachers, (ii) increasing the rate of pay of science or mathematics teachers or increasing the amount of their pay to reflect additional work (increases pursuant to laws passed prior to July 1, 1958, would not be counted), (iii) science or mathematics laboratory and related special equipment and minor remodeling of space used for such equipment, or (iv) expanding or improving science or mathematics teaching in public secondary schools through any activities or expenditures not involving the salaries of science or mathematics teachers, the provision of equipment, or capital outlay. Only that portion of an existing program which the State educational agency finds is an addition to or an expansion of such program could be considered a program for "expanding or improving science or mathematics teaching in public secondary schools."

Science or mathematics teachers whose compensation could be paid or increased under programs approved by the State educational agency for purposes of this part would be only those engaged exclusively or principally in teaching science in public secondary schools or in supervising such teachers in public elementary or secondary schools. Secondary schools, for purposes of this program, would not include any education beyond grade 12.

TITLE III—FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Foreign Language Institutes

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to arrange for the establishment and operation by institutions of higher education of short-term and regular-session institutes for modern foreign language teachers, supervisors, and teacher-trainers, who are in service or preparing for service in public or private nonprofit elementary or secondary schools or institutions of higher education. The institutes would provide advanced training, with special emphasis on the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials.

The Commissioner could also pay stipends, including allowances for dependents and travel, to individuals attending any such institute.

Foreign Language Centers

The Commissioner of Education would also be authorized to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education covering one-half of the cost of establishment and operation by them of centers for teaching rare foreign languages—foreign languages which are needed by Government, business, or industry, or education and for which adequate instruction is not readily available.

The Commissioner would also be authorized to pay stipends, including allowances for dependents and for travel, to persons taking advanced training, at short-term or regular sessions of domestic or foreign institutions of higher education, in a foreign language needed by Government, business, or industry, or education, but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients will be available for employment for teaching a foreign language at an institution of higher education.

Research and Studies

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized, directly or by contract, to study the need for increased or improved foreign language training, conduct research on more effective foreign language teaching methods,

and develop specialized foreign language teaching methods.

Advisory Committee

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to appoint a twelve-member National Advisory Committee on Foreign Languages to advise on matters of policy or general administration under the title.

Duration

As in the case of the other programs authorized by the bill, the programs under this title would be authorized for the 4-year period ending June 30, 1962.

Appropriations

While no specific sum is authorized to be appropriated, the order of magnitude of program costs which the Department believes to be necessary is reflected in the cost table accompanying this submission and goes from an estimate of $1,284,000 in the first year to $2,514,900 in the fourth year.

TITLE IV—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

Eligible Programs

Grants would be authorized to institutions of higher education with respect to programs of graduate education which require for admission a bachelor's, master's, or professional degree, and which lead to a Ph. D. or equivalent degree.

Amount of Payments

The annual grant to an institution could not exceed 50 percent of the costs of expanding old or instituting new graduate programs, including additional or increased faculty salaries, and other costs (including overhead and equipment) attributable to establishing new programs or expanding existing programs, although an institution could, instead of receiving such grants, elect to receive not to exceed $500 per fellow awarded a fellowship pursuant to this title of the bill. The payments for these costs for new or expanded programs to any institution for any fiscal year could not, however, exceed $125,000; nor could they (or the alternative grants of $500 per fellow) be made for any period after June 30, 1962.

Grants to institutions under this title would also be available for costs of fellowships for students enrolled in new graduate programs or whose enrollment in a graduate program constitutes an increase in enrollment.

Fellowships

Fellowships paid for from grants to institutions under this title would be awarded by the institutions under approved criteria providing a preference for individuals interested in teaching in institutions of higher education. The amount of the fellowships would be set in accordance with regulations.

A fellowship would be for the length of time required to complete the graduate course of study involved, but with a limit of 3 academic years.

Advisory Committee

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to appoint a 12-member National Advisory Committee on Graduate Education to advise on matters of policy or general administration under the title.

Duration

As in the case of other programs under the bill, a 4-year program would be authorized by this title although fellowships awarded during the 4 years could extend to June 30, 1964 (subject to the 3-academic-year limitation).

Appropriations

While no specific sum is authorized to be appropriated, the order of magnitude of program costs which the Department believes to be necessary is reflected in the cost table accompanying this submission and goes from an estimate of $7,800,000 in the first year to $21,600,000 in the fourth year.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Improvement of Statistical Services of State Educational Agencies

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to make grants covering one-half of the cost of State educational agency programs to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of State and local educational statistical data and the methods and techniques for collecting and processing such data and disseminating information about the condition and progress of education in the State.[1]

The total of the payments to any State for these purposes for any fiscal year would be limited to $50,000.

These grants could be made to the States only for new programs or additions to or expansions of existing programs.

Withholding of Funds and Judicial Review

Notice and opportunity for hearing would be required before grants to a State could be withheld under title I or title II of the bill for failure to comply with the required provisions of approved State plans under those titles. Any State dissatisfied with such withholding action could obtain judicial review thereof in the Federal circuit court of appeals.

Cooperation Between Federal Agencies

Provision has also been included in the bill for consultation and cooperation with other Federal agencies having educational programs, with a view to better interchange of information and development of policies and procedures which will strengthen the programs and objectives of the educational institutions involved. In addition, the existing authority of other Federal agencies would be preserved, but they would be directed to exercise their existing functions in a manner which will assist in carrying out the bill's objectives.

Exemption From Conflict-of-Interest Laws of Members of Advisory Committees

The bill would exempt any member of the two advisory committees provided for under the bill (titles III and IV) from operation of the conflict-of-interest laws, except for prohibition against participation, within 2 years after his appointment ends, in prosecution of any claim against the United States on any matter with which he had any responsibility as such a member.

Additional Professional Positions

Ten additional positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 would be authorized.

Studies and Technical Assistance

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to make studies and reports, disseminate information, and render technical assistance to States and public or other nonprofit organizations and institutions in matters related to the purposes of the bill.

Definitions

Definitions of a number of terms used in the bill are included. These terms are Commissioner, State, State educational agency, local educational agency, institution of higher education, the number of individuals enrolled in grades or schools, elementary school, secondary school, nonprofit, and public school.

Miscellaneous

The Commissioner of Education would also be authorized to utilize (and pay for) the services or facilities of other Federal or non-Federal agencies and institutions and to delegate any of his functions under the bill (except making regulations) to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

---

[1] While no specific sum is authorized to be appropriated, the order of magnitude of program costs which the Department believes to be necessary is reflected in the cost table accompanying this submission and goes from an estimate of $1 million in the first year, to $2 million in the fourth year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3163) to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PURTELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I am sorry I was not present in the Chamber when the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] made his remarks upon introducing the bill relating to education. I ask that these very brief remarks be printed after his remarks in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply wish to commend the Senator for introducing the bill relating to education. I hope the bill will have the very careful consideration of the present Congress. I understand the bill is not necessarily in final form and that amendments or suggestions for improvement can be made at any time.

I make these remarks because I have sat through long hearings on military preparedness, under the chairmanship of our able majority leader, during the months of December and January. Many, many witnesses who testified emphasized the necessity for increased opportunities for our young people in this country to obtain a better scientific education, a better mathematical education, and a better education in physics. They stressed the point that our security in the days to come will depend upon our obtaining a greater number of people educated in the sciences. I understand that is the purpose of the Senator's bill. I am glad he has introduced it. I hope it may be favorably acted upon in some form before Congress adjourns.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his words in support of the proposed legislation which I have introduced, in the light of the President's message on the subject of education yesterday.

## ABOLISHMENT OF STATE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS AS A CONDITION FOR THE RECEIPT OF FEDERALLY SUPPORTED PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to put a stop to State requirements as to residency as a condition of extending federally supported public assistance payments to persons who have newly taken up residence in any State. Such requirements, Mr. President, have proved to be a literal death sentence in the case of at least one helpless little child in my home State of Wisconsin. They have certainly inflicted senseless and cruel hardship upon many others throughout those States which mistakenly establish such heartless barriers to our mercy and our compassion.

This bill is a companion to H. R. 9832, which was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 8, 1958, by the Honorable HENRY REUSS, the brilliant and conscientious Representative of the Fifth Wisconsin District. I warmly commend Mr. REUSS for his prompt action to correct the hardship imposed by such residency requirements upon some of our most needy and unfortunate citizens. I am most happy to join and support him in this move to correct this situation.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Federal social-security law allows the States to impose residence requirements in administering old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the disabled, and aid to dependent children. These are the programs which receive the major portion of all Federal funds for public assistance.

The present law allows the various States to discriminate against certain citizens and residents of the United States, in the granting of Federal funds. This is as unsound legally as it is improper morally. Very substantially as a result of such discrimination against 1 unfortunate family in Wisconsin, a 1-year-old baby girl died of pneumonia recently in a cold, unheated flat in Milwaukee. The child's death was attributed to malnutrition and neglect. Although her family's condition was known to welfare officials, nothing was done in time to save this child's life, because the family had resided in Wisconsin for less than the year's time required under the residency law enacted by the State government in 1957.

Mr. President, the case against residence laws is stated ably and eloquently by Mr. Wilbert Walter, director of community services of the Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council. I ask unanimous consent to have this brief statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST RESIDENCE LAWS

(By Wilbert Walter, director of community services, Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council)

It has been frequently said that money has no heart. The recent death from pneumonia of a 1-year-old girl in an unheated flat in Milwaukee is a good example of this theory.

The cost of welfare for nonresidents of Wisconsin last year on a per capita basis was less than a penny a person to the citizens of this State; yet the argument of higher taxes caused by outsiders coming to our State was used to ram this harsh, restrictive, un-American law through the last regular session of our legislature.

Ours is a dynamic, expanding economy. New plants are built on land that only yesterday grew corn or potatoes. Other plants move to get closer to their raw materials or their markets. Plant dispersion and decentralization are commonplace today in industry. The resultant movement of workers to new job locations is a natural consequence of the relocation of industry. Unfortunately, every worker who comes seeking a job does not find one. That's when the talk starts about the outsiders who are coming into a community to get on relief.

Let's be clear about one thing—people just don't go where they don't think they will be better off. Nor do they come to get on relief. They come to work. They uproot themselves, leaving behind friends, relatives, and a place in the scheme of things in the hope that in another community they will find employment at decent wages and working conditions. Frequently, the specific cause of their migration is a poster or a handbill or a newspaper ad telling in glowing terms of the job opportunities in a given place and with a given company. Frequently, representatives of industry and employment agencies encourage the migration of workers from rural to industrial communities. Once the worker and his family arrive in the new community they are on their own. If the breadwinner is lucky enough to land a job, everything is fine. If he does not, then he is among the dispossessed of the land. He frequently has no legal settlement and therefore is ineligible for even a meager public-assistance grant. In a word, the worker is frequently made to shoulder the total cost of industry's irresponsibility in recruiting its manpower.

The residence laws are odious to organized labor for another compelling reason. Workers, like all others in America, have always felt free to move on to some new place. This is part of the drama of our not-too-distant past. This is part of our democratic heritage. The restrictions on free movement inherent in residence laws are harmful both to the individual and to society. Moreover, they create a distinction among citizens which is biased against the economically disadvantaged. Our concept of democracy has room for only one class of citizenship—first-class citizenship.

It might be well for us to restate in broad terms some objectives of the American labor movement.

First, labor wants gainful and full employment. There is no substitute for steady work at a living, saving wage under safe and human working conditions.

Second, we believe that underpinning our efforts for full employment must be a broad social-insurance system which will offer protection to the aged, the widow, the dependent child, the disabled, the sick, and the unemployed. This is the Government's responsibility to those who are unable, for whatever reason, to provide for themselves a decent standard of living.

Third, we will support those voluntary and public-welfare services that serve human need, and we will join with other citizens' groups toward making these services fulfill their functions more adequately.

Fourth, we believe that public-welfare services should be available on the basis of need. There should be no arbitrary restrictions based on race, creed, residence, or citizenship.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3164) to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that a bona fide resident of a State may not be denied assistance under the applicable State plan solely because of his failure to complete a minimum period of residence in such State, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

---

## AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to permit greater exchange of military information and materials with our allies.

This bill has been drafted and is being proposed by the administration, and was forwarded by a letter dated yesterday, January 27, 1958, from Mr. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, to the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Mr. DURHAM has announced that he is referring the matter to the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation, of which I am chairman, for appropriate hearings and recommendations to the full committee.

In his state of the Union address, President Eisenhower asked for prompt action by the Congress in considering these amendments. I think it is clear that the Joint Committee and the Congress are acting promptly.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation, I have requested representatives of the following agencies to testify before the subcommittee in executive session, as follows:

Wednesday, January 29, 1958, 2 p. m., Atomic Energy Commission; Thursday, January 30, 1958, 10 a. m., Department of State; 2 p. m., Department of Defense and CIA.

If necessary, further meetings of the subcommittee will be held in executive session on Friday to consider the bill further.

I plan to schedule and announce public hearings also on this bill sometime within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. President, the amendments proposed by this bill are far reaching and are directly related to the security and welfare of our country and the free world. Since the proposed bill was received by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy late yesterday afternoon, I have not had sufficient time to review it in detail. I introduce it at this time in order that it may receive early consideration. I can assure my colleagues in the Senate that my subcommittee, and all the members of the full Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, will study all the matters raised by this bill very carefully and will make a full report to the Congress prior to floor debate. In order that all Members of Congress and the public may know the purpose of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter dated January 27, 1958, from Mr. Strauss to Mr. DURHAM together with annex A and annex B to the letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and attachments will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3165) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The letter and attachments presented by Mr. PASTORE are as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
*Washington, D. C., January 27, 1958.*

Hon. CARL T. DURHAM,
*Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.*

DEAR MR. DURHAM: In the President's meeting with Congressional leaders on December 3, 1957, the major aspects of the President's proposed legislative program for the forthcoming session of Congress were outlined. During this meeting, it was pointed out that certain changes were necessary in the Atomic Energy Act to achieve desired national objectives. In his message on the state of the Union, the President said that a most significant aspect in our strength lies in the fact that we are not acting alone but in concert with a worldwide community of friendly and peaceful nations. He emphasized as one major action item, the necessity that Congress enact legislation to enable us to exchange appropriate scientific and technical information with friendly countries.

The current Atomic Energy statute, enacted on August 30, 1954, carried authority for certain military cooperation with friendly nations and regional defense organizations. The statute, drafted at a time when atomic development of other nations was not as far advanced as at present, wisely set forth certain restrictions on the degree of cooperation permissible.

Since enactment of the 1954 statute the world situation has changed materially. We have been made increasingly aware of the fact that the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom have achieved a significant nuclear military capability. Therefore, the restrictive provisions of the act, though appropriate at the time of their enactment, are now unduly restrictive in the face of the present world situation.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permits the communication of information relative to atomic energy in the fields of planning, training in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons, and in the evaluation of the atomic weapon capabilities of potential enemies, but with the proviso that such cooperation "will not reveal important information concerning the design or fabrication of the nuclear components of an atomic weapon." Under this authority agreements for cooperation have been negotiated with three nations * * * the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, as well as with NATO. The act also permits the communication of information concerning military submarine propulsion reactors and military power reactors and appropriate agreements have been negotiated with the United Kingdom and Canada. However, no special nuclear material may be furnished another nation for military purposes because the statute requires a guaranty that any material furnished under an agreement for cooperation not be used for any military purpose.

The cooperation which could be achieved under the provisions of the present statute, though limited, has benefited the over-all defense posture of the free world. There is now a need for broader exchange of information on the part of the United States and its allies than is possible under the present act. Such broadening of the present authority would permit more beneficial use of, and development of, our military nuclear capabilities. It would permit overall more economical use of scientific and engineering talent and funds. It would serve to increase the collective preparedness of the United States and its allies.

In summary:

A. It is recommended that the Atomic Energy Act be amended to permit the following additional military cooperation when the President determines that the actions concerned will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security:

1. In the field of information:

(a) The communication to friendly nations or defense organizations of additional design information necessary to permit essential training and planning by our allies.

(b) The communication to friendly nations or defense organizations of additional atomic weapons design information necessary to make any delivery systems manufactured by our allies fully compatible with our atomic weapons.

(c) The exchange with friendly nations of information that will improve the receiving nation's atomic weapon design, development, or production capability.

(d) The communication to friendly nations or defense organizations of information necessary to military applications of atomic energy in addition to weapons or military reactors.

2. In the field of materials and equipment:

(a) The transfer to friendly nations of special nuclear material for manufacture into atomic weapons or for other military uses by the receiving nation.

(b) The transfer to friendly nations for military applications of utilization facilities (such as nuclear propulsion and powerplants) and necessary nuclear fuels.

(c) The transfer to friendly nations of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons to improve the receiving nation's state of training and operational readiness.

B. In addition, modification of the current Atomic Energy Act is recommended to permit the purchase of special nuclear materials, particularly plutonium, under long-term contractual commitments.

C. Further, it is recommended that sections 142c and 142d be amended so that the Department of Defense must participate in the declassification or removal from the restricted data category information which relates primarily to military applications of atomic energy.

The recommended amendments to the Atomic Energy Act are attached as annex A. The principal amendments to each section are mentioned below and all amendments are identical in annex B.

A. Amendments to section 144:

With respect to increased cooperation with our allies in the field of information, it is recommended that section 144b of the act be amended and new sections 144c and 144d be enacted.

1. The amendment to section 144b would expand the areas in which cooperation by the Department of Defense with another nation or regional defense organization may be authorized by the President to include specifically: (a) training of personnel in the employment of and defense against other military applications of atomic energy in addition to atomic weapons; (b) evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of other military applications of atomic energy in addition to atomic weapons; (c) development of compatible delivery systems for atomic weapons; and (d) other military application of atomic energy. Military reactor research, development, or design and atomic weapons research, design, development, or production information are excepted from area (d).

2. The recommended new section 144c would permit the Commission, when authorized by the President, to exchange any atomic weapon information with an ally provided that any information communicated is necessary to improve that nation's design or production capability while that nation is making substantial and material contributions to the national defense and security. It is not the intent of this new section to promote the entry of additional nations into the atomic weapons field. Authority would be provided, however, if any ally had made substantial progress in the development of nuclear weapons and met the other requirements of the act, to make unnecessary a wasting of precious scientific talent and funds by such an ally to duplicate weapons achievements already available to the United States. It is intended by the use of the word "exchange" that there be an exchange of information but that the exchange need not be equivalent in amount or value, or that it take place simultaneously with the receipt of information.

Section 144c also specifically provides for communicating design information concerning military reactors to our allies. In the future, information on military reactors normally would be communicated under this new section rather than under section 144a.

3. It is recommended that the first proviso of section 144b be deleted. This proviso prohibits communication of atomic weapons design and fabrication information except in certain specified areas and then only if "in the joint judgment of the Commission and the Department of Defense such data will not reveal important information concerning the deisgn or fabrication of the nuclear components of an atomic weapon." In lieu of that proviso, the amendments to section 144b and the new section 144c provide that the cooperation and communication could take place whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security. In implementation of this provision it is not expected that the President personally will consider each proposed action under an agreement for cooperation. Instead, an Executive order will be recommended to the President establishing procedures whereby the President would authorize proposed communications only after joint review by the Department of Defense, the Commission, and other interested agencies, and would authorize such communications in the absence of the President's personal approval only where the Department of Defense and the Commission agree that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

4. The recommended new section 144d would make it possible for the President to authorize agencies and persons other than the Department of Defense and the Commission to communicate restricted data under any agreement for cooperation provided the restricted data has been determined to be proper for communication under an agreement for cooperation made pursuant to sections 144a, b, or c. This new section would expressly authorize the President to designate another Government agency to communicate restricted data in the performance of its duties. It is the intent that information transmissible under this subsection would be only that specific information determined as transmissible under sections 144a, b, or c.

B. Amendments to section 91 (sections 92 and 123):

With respect to increased cooperation with our allies in the field of materials, it is recommended that a new section 91c be added

to the act and that sections 92 and 123 be amended.

1. Under the recommended new section 91c, the President may authorize the transfer, by sale, lease, loan or donation to a friendly nation of: (1) non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons to improve that nation's state of training or operational readiness; (2) utilization facilities for military applications; and (3) nuclear materials for military utilization facilities or atomic weapons.

Under this section non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons, military reactors and nuclear materials could be furnished to our applies when in accordance with the terms and conditions of a program approved by the President. It is anticipated that under this authority non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons might be furnished to selected allies where such transfer was necessary to improve their state of training and operational readiness. Nuclear components would be retained in the custody of the United States. Military reactors could be made available to our allies for both military propulsion and power purposes. In addition, materials for military reactors and for manufacture into atomic weapons could be made available to our allies. It is not intended that manufactured nuclear components of weapons could be transferred under this amendment, nor that we promote the entry of additional nations into the field of production of nuclear weapons.

2. The amendment to section 123 removes the requirement (with respect to transfers under section 91c) that the receiving nation guarantee that materials furnished not to be used for weapons or other military purposes. However, a safeguard in connection with transfers of materials is provided in that portion of the recommended section 91c which states "whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the transfer of the proposed non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons, utilization facilities, or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security." In implementation of this provision it is not expected that the President personally will consider each proposed action under an agreement for cooperation. Instead, an executive order will be recommended to the President establishing procedures whereby the President would authorize proposed transfers only after joint review by the Department of Defense, the Commission, and other interested agencies, and would authorize such transfers in the absence of the President's personal approval only where the Department of Defense and the Commission agree that the proposed cooperation and the transfer of the proposed non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons, utilization facilities, or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

3. The amendment to section 92 is technical and is designed to exclude actions taken by the Department of Defense under section 91, as amended, from the prohibitions in section 92.

C. Amendment to section 55:

The amendment to section 55, which supersedes legislation proposed to Congress last summer, would authorize the Commission to enter into contracts for terms up to 15 years for the procurement of special nuclear material, particularly plutonium, from sources outside the United States, provided that the President had approved a program for such purchases. Plutonium obtained by the United States from foreign sources without limitation on its use would be utilized to the military advantage of the United States and could contribute to the stockpile of nuclear weapons in United States custody in allied countries. This amendment would also provide a means for the United States to encourage the development, construction, and operation of nuclear powerplants abroad and it is necessary to accomplish the Commision's objectives with respect to purchases of foreign reactor products. This amendment would authorize entering into purchase contracts in excess of appropriations or funds currently available only when it is estimated that payments under a contract to be executed would not exceed the amounts received or to be received from existing arrangements for foreign distributions of source and special nuclear material under the act plus $200 million. Receipts would be placed in a separate fund and remain available for purchase commitments. Such appropriations as may be required, within the authorization provided, would be requested from time to time if this becomes necessary to meet disbursements.

D. Amendments to section 142:

The recommended amendments include expanding sections 142c and 142d so that restricted data relating primarily to the military application of atomic energy, rather than primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons, may be declassified only by joint action of AEC and DOD, or may be removed from the restricted data category and safeguarded as defense information only by joint action of the AEC and DOD. These amendments are consistent with the increased military usage of atomic energy for purposes other than weapons and with the action taken in the 1954 act to give the DOD a voice in control over some weapon information that is primarily of military importance. Any additional information that may be removed from the restricted data category and safeguarded as defense information will continue to be subject to the same restrictions that are applicable to restricted data in connection with foreign transmission.

I believe the amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 recommended herewith would make possible the increased cooperation with our allies that is now essential to our collective security. In view of the importance of this legislation I recommend its early consideration by the Congress.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
*Chairman.*

(Enclosures: 1. A bill; 2. Proposed amendments to Atomic Energy Act of 1954.)

---

ANNEX A

A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 55 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 55. Acquisition: The Commission is authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire any special nuclear material or any interest therein outside the United States.

"(a) Any purchase contract made under the provisions of this section may be made for such period of time as the Commission may deem necessary: *Provided,* That a program for purchases of such special nuclear material or any interest therein is approved by the President: *And provided further,* That no contract for the purchase of such material or any interest therein, other than uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, shall be made for a period in excess of 15 years.

"(b) Any purchase contract under subsection (a) may be made in excess of appropriations or funds currently available where it is estimated by the Commission, at the time any purchase contracts are executed, that amounts paid and to be paid under purchase contracts will not exceed $200 million plus the amounts received and to be received from then existing arrangements for distribution or transfer of source and special nuclear material pursuant to sections 64, 54, or 91c (3); all receipts from the distribution or transfer of source and special nuclear material shall be placed in a separate fund, which is hereby established and which shall remain available without fiscal year limitation, for purchases under this subsection.

"(c) Any contract made under this section may be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes as amended, upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing by the Commission that advertising is not reasonably practicable.

"(d) Partial and advance payments may be made under contracts authorized under this section."

SEC. 2. Section 91 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The President may authorize the Commission or the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the other, to cooperate with another nation and, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 57, 62, or 81, to transfer by sale, lease, loan, or donation to that nation, in accordance with terms and conditions of a program approved by the President—

"(1) nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons to improve that nation's state of training and operational readiness;

"(2) utilization facilities for military applications; and

"(3) source, byproduct, or special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, or use in atomic weapons or utilization facilities for military applications,

whenever the President determines that the proposed communication and the transfer of the proposed nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons, utilization facilities or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123."

SEC. 3. Section 92 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 92. Prohibition: It shall be unlawful, except as provided in section 91, for any person to transfer or receive in interstate commerce, manufacture, produce, transfer, acquire, possess, import, or export any atomic weapon. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to modify the provisions of subsection 31a or section 101."

SEC. 4. Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 123. Cooperation with other nations.—No cooperation with any nation or regional defense organization pursuant to sections 54, 57, 64, 82, 91, 103, 104, or 144 shall be undertaken until—

"(a) the Commission or, in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91c or 144b and to be implemented by the Department of Defense, the Department of Defense has submitted to the President the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with its recommendations thereon, which proposed agreement shall include (1) the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation; (2) a guaranty by the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards as set forth in the agreement for cooperation will be maintained; (3) except in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91c a guaranty by the

cooperating party that any material to be transferred pursuant to such agreement will not be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purpose; and (4) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material or any restricted data to be transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party, except as specified in the agreement for cooperation;"

SEC. 5. Section 142c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In the case of restricted data which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine to relate primarily to the military application of atomic energy, the determination that such data may be published without constituting an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security shall be made by the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly, and if the Commission and the Department of Defense do not agree, the determination shall be made by the President."

SEC. 6. Section 142d of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Commission shall remove from the restricted data category such data as the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine relates primarily to the military applications of atomic energy and which the Commission and Department of Defense jointly determine can be adequately safeguarded as defense information: *Provided, however,* That no such data so removed from the restricted data category shall be transmitted or otherwise made available to any nation or regional defense organization, while such data remains defense information, except pursuant to an agreement for cooperation entered into in accordance with section 144."

SEC. 7. Section 144b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The President may authorize the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Commission, to cooperate with another nation or with a regional defense organization to which the United States is a party, and to communicate to that nation or organization such restricted data (including design information) as is necessary to—

"(1) The development of defense plans;

"(2) The training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy;

"(3) The evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy;

"(4) The development of compatible delivery systems for atomic weapons; and

"(5) Other military applications of atomic energy, except that with respect to this subcategory, restricted data concerning research, development, design, or production of atomic weapons or concerning research, development, or design of military reactors shall not be communicated,

whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation or organization is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123."

SEC. 8. Section 144 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In addition to the cooperation authorized in subsections 144a and 144b, the President may authorize the Commission, with the assistance of the Department of Defense, to cooperate with another nation and—

"(1) to exchange with that nation restricted data concerning atomic weapons: *Provided,* Communication of such restricted data to that nation is necessary to improve its atomic-weapon design, development, or production capability; and

"(2) to communicate to that nation restricted data concerning research, development, or design of military reactors,

whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123."

SEC. 9. Section 144 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The President may authorize any agency of the United States or person to communicate in accordance with the terms and conditions of an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsections 144a, b, or c, such restricted data as is determined to be transmissible under the agreement for cooperation involved."

---

## ANNEX B

### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

(Deletions are enclosed in black brackets, additions are indicated by italics.)

SEC. 55. Acquisition: The Commission is authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire any special nuclear material or any interest therein outside the United States [without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing by the Commission that advertising is not reasonably practicable. Partial and advance payments may be made under contracts for such purposes].

*(a) Any purchase contract made under the provisions of this section may be made for such period of time as the Commission may deem necessary: Provided, That a program for purchases of such special nuclear material or any interest therein is approved by the President: And provided further, That no contract for the purchase of such material or any interest therein, other than uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, shall be made for a period in excess of 15 years.*

*(b) Any purchase contract under subsection (a) may be made in excess of appropriations or funds currently available where it is estimated by the Commission, at the time any purchase contracts are executed, that amounts paid and to be paid under purchase contracts will not exceed $200 million plus the amounts received and to be received from then existing arrangements for distribution or transfer of source and special nuclear material pursuant to sections 64, 54, or 91c (3); all receipts from the distribution or transfer of source and special nuclear material shall be placed in a separate fund, which is hereby established and which shall remain available without fiscal year limitation, for purchases under this subsection.*

*(c) Any contract made under this section may be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing by the Commission that advertising is not reasonably practicable.*

*(d) Partial and advance payments may be made under contracts authorized under this section.*

SEC. 91. Authority:

* * * * *

*(c) The President may authorize the Commission or the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the other, to cooperate with another nation and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 57, 62, or 81, to transfer by sale, lease, loan, or donation to that nation, in accordance with terms and conditions of a program approved by the President—*

*(1) nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons to improve that nation's state of training and operational readiness;*

*(2) utilization of facilities for military applications; and*

*(3) source, byproduct, or special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, or use in atomic weapons or utilization facilities for military applications,*

*whenever the President determines that the proposed communication and the transfer of the proposed nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons, utilization facilities or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: Provided, however, That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123.*

SEC. 92. Prohibition: It shall be unlawful, *except as provided in section 91,* for any person to transfer or receive in interstate commerce, manufacture, produce, transfer, acquire, possess, import, or export any atomic weapons [, except as may be authorized by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 91]. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to modify the provisions of subsection 31 a. or section 101.

SEC. 123. Cooperation with other nations: No cooperation with any nation or regional defense organization pursuant to sections 54, 57, 64, 82, *91,* 103, 104, or 144 shall be undertaken until—

(a) the Commission or, in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection *91c* or 144b *and to be implemented by the Department of Defense,* the Department of Defense has submitted to the President the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with its recommendations thereon, which proposed agreement shall include (1) the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation; (2) a guaranty by the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards as set forth in the agreement for cooperation will be maintained; (3) *except in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91c* a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material to be transferred pursuant to such agreement will not be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purpose; and (4) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material or any restricted data to be transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party, except as specified in the agreement for cooperation;

SEC. 142. Classification and declassification of restricted data:

* * * * *

(c) In the case of restricted data which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine to relate primarily to the military [utilization] *application* of atomic [weapons] *energy*, the determination that such data may be published without constituting an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security shall be made by the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly, and if the Commission and the Department of Defense do not agree, the determination shall be made by the President.

(d) The Commission shall remove from the restricted data category such data as the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine relates primarily to the military [utilization] *applications* of atomic [weapons] *energy* and which the Commission and Department of Defense jointly determine can be adequately safeguarded as defense information: *Provided, however,* That no such data so removed from the restricted data category shall be transmitted or otherwise made available to any nation or regional defense organization, while such data remains defense information, except pursuant to an agreement for cooperation entered into in accordance with [sub]section 144[b].

SEC. 144. International cooperation:

* * * * *

(b) The President may authorize the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Commission, to cooperate with another nation or with a regional defense organization to which the United States is a party, and to communicate to that nation or organization such restricted data (*including design information*) as is necessary to—

(1) The development of defense plans;

(2) The training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons *and other military applications of atomic energy*; [and]

(3) The evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons *and other military applications of atomic energy;* [.]

*(4) The development of compatible delivery systems for atomic weapons; and*

*(5) Other military applications of atomic energy, except that with respect to this subcategory, restricted data concerning research, development, design, or production of atomic weapons or concerning research, development, or design of military reactors shall not be communicated,*

*whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security,* while such other nation or organization is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: [Provided, however, That no such cooperation shall involve communication of Restricted Data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons except with regard to external characteristics, including size, weight, and shape, yields and effects, and systems employed in the delivery or use thereof but not including any data in these categories unless in the joint judgment of the Commission and the Department of Defense such data will not reveal important information concerning the design or fabrication of the nuclear components of an atomic weapon. And] *Provided* [further] *however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123.

*(c) In addition to the cooperation authorized in subsections 144a and 144b, the President may authorize the Commission, with the assistance of the Department of Defense, to cooperate with another nation and—*

*(1) To exchange with that nation restricted data concerning atomic weapons, provided communication of such restricted data to that nation is necessary to improve its atomic weapon design, development, or production capability; and*

*(2) To communicate to that nation restricted data concerning research, development, or design of military reactors,*

*whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: Provided, however, That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123.*

*(d) The President may authorize any agency of the United States or person to communicate in accordance with the terms and conditions of an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsections 144 (a), (b), or (c), such restricted data as is determined to be transmissible under the agreement for cooperation involved.*

---

## IMPROPER SOLICITATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to backstop State laws dealing with improper solicitation of contributions for charitable organizations.

Many States, notably New York, have made great strides ahead in protecting their citizens against victimization from unscrupulous charity solicitors. However, the States themselves are impotent to guard against charity "boilerrooms" operating by mail who move from State to State with their operators.

Philanthropy has been ranked the Nation's fourth largest industry, following manufacturing, agriculture, and wholesale and retail trade. Americans contribute between four and five billion dollars annually for charitable purposes. Yet, in the State of New York alone, I found as attorney general that more than $25 million a year is estimated to be siphoned off by out-and-out charity rackets. On this basis, charity rackets may well take as much as $250 million a year from the public. It is very much in our national interest to encourage charitable contributions, and our Federal tax laws rightly favor it as one of the fine expressions of a free society. The way to encourage contributions is to give the utmost protection against fraud and sharp practices in solicitations.

The bill provides that once a person or organization has been convicted within the past 5 years and subsequent to passage of the legislation of fraudulent charitable solicitation under any one of the existing laws in 26 States and the District of Columbia, the Postmaster General may stamp "fraudulent" on mail addressed to the violator from any point within the United States and return it to the sender, and may also stop payment of postal money orders to the convicted charity racketeer.

The Congress late last year enacted charity legislation to apply to the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act—Public Law 85–87. This bill is a further step in the protection of the individual citizen and in Federal recognition of the fraud in charity solicitations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3166) to provide for exclusion from the mails of mail violating certain State laws dealing with improper solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

---

## PROPOSED HOSPITAL ON ELLIS ISLAND, N. Y., FOR TREATMENT OF DRUG ADDICTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital on Ellis Island, in New York Harbor, especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to narcotics.

Then senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and I, joined by our colleague in the other body, Representative ANFUSO, of New York, are urging the mayor of the city of New York and the Governor of the State of New York to make such agreements as are practicable for all parties with the authorities of the United States in order to bring about this highly desirable reform.

We point out in our communication to the mayor and Governor that it is possible to devote to 100-percent public benefit this very valuable facility, provided suitable arrangements are made for its operation.

We also point out other States in the Northeast are similarly interested with us in New York, and that this represents an interesting opportunity for an interstate compact.

We have an estimated 20,000 reported addicts in the New York area—that is, in the whole complex of States which represent that area—in addition to thousands of unknown narcotics victims. We feel the establishment of a narcotics hospital on Ellis Island would be extremely humanitarian and would present a very useful opportunity to utilize this very valuable piece of real estate to the greatest advantage.

I emphasize that nobody knows better than the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and I the practical problems which are involved, the expense, and other arrangements which need to be made. We only lend our aid to those problems. We wish now to make it very clear that we think everyone is acting in the desire to do the greatest good, in terms of our city and State of New York,

in this whole matter; but we point out that our desires and our willingness to do the right thing in this regard will not be enough, because we have certain deadlines to meet with respect to the sale of the property under the law. Therefore, we must activate ourselves to make the best financial proposals we possibly can make on that subject.

I hope this may prove to be a model of unpartisan cooperation in the way we work out a use for Ellis Island in New York Harbor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3167) providing for the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital in the State of New York especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted tc the use of habit-forming drugs, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN ADOPTED ALIEN CHILDREN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, according to the Immigration and Naturalization Act, as amended in the first session of this Congress, certain specified citizens of the United States are declared exempt from the normal rule requiring 2 years' residence for an adopted child in this country in order that the adopted child gain full citizenship. The adoptive parents exempted by the amendment adopted last year are: First, members of the Armed Forces; second, persons in the employ of the United States or of an American institution of research recognized as such by the Attorney General, or of an American firm or corporation engaged in the development of foreign trade or commerce of the United States; third, employees of a public international organization in which the United States participates by treaty or statute.

These categories of individuals were provided an exemption from the normal 2-year residence requirement because it is often not possible for them to provide legal custody of an adopted child while resident in the United States for a full 2-year period. The nature of their employment dictated that they be given special consideration.

I would like to point out at this time that there is another category of individuals who should have been included in this amendment to the Immigration and Naturalization Act. I refer to the missionaries who are sent by our churches to bring American culture to foreign lands. It is quite common practice to provide these missionaries with a 1-year furlough period in the United States from time to time. Because of this reason they are unable to complete citizenship requirements for adopted children in accordance with the general 2-year residence rule.

Mr. President, these people are cultural ambassadors of the United States as well as being spiritual ambassadors of their church organizations. It is fitting that they should be included in the exemption from the 2-year rule. I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to allow adopted children of our missionaries to be naturalized in accordance with the amendment adopted in the first session of this Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3171) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to permit certain adopted children to be naturalized without complying with the residence and physical presence requirements of such act, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by it title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in the financing of public-school construction. I am hopeful that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am a member, will consider this measure and the growing problem it is designed to meet. This committee is under the leadership of the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

This bill, which is modeled to a large extent after the bill reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor last session, emphasizes the traditional concept of State and local responsibility, strongly forbids any Federal control, requires maximum effort on the part of the States and local school districts and recognizes that the emergency role of the Federal Government is a temporary one. It provides for a minimum program designed to give assistance to those areas in most critical need of help, through matching grants totaling $300 million a year for 5 years, allocated according to the size of each State's school-age population, and supplemented by Federal purchase of school bonds and loans to State school-financing agencies. The $300 million figure is a rockbottom minimum, which is set that low only on the assumption that other pending measures will make additional funds available to our hard-pressed schools.

Three hundred million dollars is, quite obviously, the minimum figure. I believe it should be more. But I am introducing the bill as reported by the House, in the hope that in our concentration today on scholarships, which I do not really think represent the primary need in education, we will not lose sight of the necessity for developing facilities on the public school and college levels, which I believe in the next 10 years will be the major crisis facing education.

### THE NEED

Since the school construction bill failed in the other House last year, we have had additional opportunities to realize the urgent need for this program. In September, when school opened, the classroom shortage was obvious to even the most doubtful. Enrollment in our already overcrowded schools had increased by 1.5 million, to a level of well over 33.5 million boys and girls. Official Office of Education figures, which most experts deem to be on the conservative side, showed our Nation's schools to be short 140,400 classrooms now—that another 44,000 will be needed next year to take care of still higher enrollments—and that another 14,000 to 20,000 are needed each year to replace outmoded and obsolete buildings, firetraps, and health hazards. School enrollment having already increased some 50 percent in the last decade, it is significant to note that the largest increase this year was concentrated in the elementary schools, a warning to the Nation that this need must be met for many years to come. Already, nearly a million boys and girls are being deprived by the classroom shortage of full-time schooling, and hundreds of thousands more held back in classes of unwieldy size.

In October, the advent of the space age awakened all Americans to the critical importance of improving our educational system from the bottom up. And at year's end, the difficult fiscal position of the State and local authorities—who are spending at the rate of nearly $3 billion a year constructing some 70,800 classrooms without eliminating the shortage—made it clear that the Federal Government, with its far greater as well as more effective means of raising public revenues, could not avoid its responsibility to meet this nationwide problem.

I am aware of the fact that Massachusetts does not need this program so much as some other States. But I am also keenly aware that Massachusetts is not an island unto itself, and that its progress, its peace, its prosperity, and ultimately its survival depend upon the wisdom and enlightenment of the public-school graduates in every part of the country. Similarly, those who do not send children to public schools have a direct stake in and a responsibility for improving the educational opportunities and standards of all citizens.

### CAN THE PROBLEM BE DEFERRED?

The President, who together with other administration spokesmen thoroughly documented 1 year ago the urgent need for Federal action on the growing classroom shortage, has decided this year to abandon the school construction program. It is, he asserts, merely being deferred in favor of a new postsputnik emphasis on educating scientists.

But how can the solution to a critical problem which increases in magnitude each year be deferred, as though the overflow children could stay at home until their case comes up for consideration again? The school population 1 year from now will be even greater; more old schools will be condemned, obsolete, or rendered unusable; and State and local authorities will be even more hard pressed to finance additional classrooms. Congress cannot ignore or forget the classroom shortage by deferring action on it. We can only worsen it.

### MORE SCHOLARSHIPS OR MORE CLASSROOMS?

The administration's program and other new proposals in the field of education are intended to increase the production of American scientists to offset the Russian lead in this area. I welcome these proposals and share their objective. But scientifically inclined students do not spring up overnight to apply for

special college scholarships or even to receive improved high-school instruction. Additional aptitude tests may identify more such students but they will not produce them. The real shaping of the scientific mind, as Dr. Teller and others have emphasized, begins on the grade-school and junior high-school level—before the student is 12 years old, according to Dr. Teller. Yet this is the very kind of careful, thorough instruction that suffers most in an overcrowded classroom too jammed to permit any individual assistance. It is necessarily neglected in schools operating on a part-time shift that permits no extra effort for talented pupils. It is the kind of instruction that is not usually available to students collected in outmoded, unequipped, or dangerous classrooms. It is not enough merely to increase through scholarships and fellowships the number of poorly trained high-school graduates who go on to our already overcrowded colleges. We shall not measurably improve the production of scientists at the college level, in short, unless we begin at the bottom instead of the top.

Moreover, even in the high schools, the improved teaching of science and mathematics expected to result from the new administration proposals will not fulfill its goals without additional classroom construction. Of what avail are new techniques and better materials in a classroom too crowded to enable concentration, too unsafe to permit various experiments, too unsightly to attract good teachers? We shall compete with the Russians in science education at the graduate level only when we solve the classroom shortage at every public-school level.

Finally, are we concerned only with the production of scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and foreign-language specialists? Recognizing our serious handicaps in those areas, are we not in equally urgent need of improving the education of all Americans—the diplomats and politicians who must make the hard decisions of the cold war, the judges and educators and writers who must carry on the American way in its hour of greatest challenge, the citizens of every occupation and status who will decide, in the last analysis, whether we stand or fall as a nation? More and better educated scientists cannot alone save the United States today. All American education is in crisis. This bill is aimed at attacking that crisis at its roots. Let us hope it is not already too late.

I think it is high time, after almost 10 years of consideration of this vital matter by the Senate and the House, that we enact at this session of Congress a bill which will not only direct immediate attention to the production of scientists, engineers, and mathematicians, but also will improve the educational standard of all Americans. This is vitally important for the successful operation of a democratic state.

I introduce the bill for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3179) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on January 23, 1958, I introduced, for myself and other Senators, the bill (S. 3070) to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] may be added as additional cosponsors of the bill the next time it is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, it was

*Ordered*, That Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

That Mr. HOBLITZELL be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on the District of Columbia and to service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently I received from the Advocate, the official publication of the archdiocese of Newark, N. J., and the diocese of Paterson, an editorial entitled "The State of the Union," which appeared in that publication under date of January 16. It is a very fine analysis of the President's state of the Union address, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be published in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF THE UNION

Thursday, January 9, was a day of great personal triumph for Dwight D. Eisenhower. By his fine appearance, by his forceful, alert delivery of his address to the Congress, by his easy, confident manner, he gave evidence to a questioning Nation and world of his physical fitness, of his recovery from the illnesses that have recently interfered with his normal routine. For that answer to a question that was real, though rarely asked outright, we congratulate him, and join in the deep satisfaction that must be his.

Far more, however, than the state of a man's health was at stake on that Thursday. For the man who spoke was not simply Dwight D. Eisenhower, but the President of the United States, delivering his state of the Union message. It was a message upon which a great deal depended, because it was a message given in a time of doubt, of fear, even of panic on the part of some faint hearts. It was a message which, in the circumstances, had to replace doubt with knowledge, fear with confidence, panic with courage.

This, we believe, the President did, and did well. It was a message which created confidence in the ability of our Nation to meet the dangers of the present time; it was a message which provided the Nation with the inspiring leadership of a Chief Executive who knew well the problems of the day and was prepared to cope with them.

A study of the message reveals its outstanding characteristic to be balance. It recognized, for instance, the threat posed by Soviet military and scientific advances, but did not ignore the equal—perhaps even the greater—danger raised against us by Communist economic penetration into many areas of the globe.

While the President realistically assessed the Soviet threat as "total cold war," he recognized that we must in return "wage total peace," utilizing to the utmost "the spiritual, military, and economic strength" of the free world.

Mr. Eisenhower did not minimize the Soviet military threat; neither did he underestimate our own military situation, with powerful armaments still capable of deterring Soviet aggression, and soon to be augmented with still more advanced weapons; with friendly nations of free men as our allies, as against the captive and sullen nations that make up the Soviet system of alliances.

The President's message, while asserting the present adequacy of our military forces, emphasized the urgent need of increased defense efforts, including the elimination of "harmful rivalries" among the branches of our Military Establishment, and making the fullest use of the versatility and intelligence of our free workers, the imaginativeness and resourcefulness of our businessmen, the adaptability of our economic system.

In urging the necessity of a billion dollar Federal expenditure for improvements in education and scientific research, Mr. Eisenhower gave assurance of concern for the maintenance of local control of education, and for the avoidance of undue stress on the physical sciences at the expense of other branches of learning. He bespoke the importance of the role of private industry, schools, and colleges—and resurrected from the dim past the figure of the student with his bag of books and his homework.

While assuring the Nation that all necessary military, educational, mutual aid, and other expenditures will be made, the President pledged reduction of all nonessential spending. Only thus can our economy survive; only thus can we frustrate the oft-repeated prophecy of the Communists that America will be led to spend itself into ruin.

In his call to all other people, especially those of the Soviet Union, to unite in the performance of great works for peace, the President was looking beyond the purely military or economic; he was opening up the happy vista of a future in which all men of all nations will work together to conquer war, hunger, disease, and thus to improve the earthly lot of all men of all nations.

One sad feature of imbalance marked the President's address, an imbalance quite unexpected in a message of such importance. Far too much space was devoted to what we, our people and our allies, can do; far too little reference was made to our need of the guidance and power of Almighty God. Let this be our role now—to make up for this neglect by our prayers and sacrifices, to assist our President by bringing God into our every enterprise as we buckle down to the defense of our way (may it always be God's way) of life.

## ECONOMIC PROBLEMS FACING BIDDEFORD AND SACO, MAINE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the January 1958 issue of Textile Labor contains an excellent article entitled "A Tale of Two Cities," written by Burt Beck. The article describes the economic problems facing the twin cities of Biddeford and Saco, in the State of Maine, and presents one of the best cases I know for speedy enactment of area-assistance legislation to help economically distressed areas which cannot solve their own chronic unemployment problems. The need for enactment of an area-assistance program is urgent. I should like particularly to call this article to the attention of my colleagues on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee who are members of the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee, which currently has all of the area-assistance bills pending before it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with a copy of a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee on January 22, 1958, urging early action on area-assistance legislation.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### A TALE OF TWO CITIES

(By Burt Beck)

This is a story of economic disaster in one American community. It happens to be about the twin towns of Biddeford and Saco, in Maine, but it could be about any one of the hundreds of textile towns, mining villages, or farm-machinery and ordnance centers that have been left stranded when their prime industries gradually or suddenly collapsed.

The twin cities sit astride the Saco River, and the historic falls of that river provide the power that initiated the area's industrial development more than 3 centuries ago. One of the prime industries was cotton textiles.

When Admiral Perry sailed to Japan in 1854 to open the doors of that country to foreign trade, he carried, as samples of America's finest products, textiles made in Biddeford. From this famous textile area have poured uncounted millions of yards of textile fabrics, to all corners of the world.

Textile machinery, shoes, ships, sewing machines, machineguns, bricks, nails, airplane parts, men's collars—all of these have been turned out by the skilled craftsmen of Biddeford and Saco.

Today the area is rapidly becoming a deserted village. A typical headline in the Biddeford Journal proclaims: "Unemployment in Biddeford-Saco Area Takes Jump."

Michael Schoonjans, TWUA's international representative in the Biddeford-Saco area, is understandably concerned about the situation. To Mike, the unemployment figures are not statistics; behind each number is an unemployed worker, in most cases the chief breadwinner of the family.

"A few years ago," said Mike, "we had 7,000 members in the Biddeford-Saco joint board. Today, we have less than 3,500. The decline in textile manufacturing also hits all the other workers in town."

For concrete evidence of this, it took only a visit to the Biddeford office of the Maine employment security commission and a talk with Manager Francis M. Coughlin.

The last week for which he had figures at the time of this interview, was the week ending December 14, 1957. The report showed that there were 1,252 claims for unemployment benefits, and what was even more alarming, 561 people had already exhausted their benefits and were consequently ineligible for further compensation until April.

Unemployment in Biddeford-Saco has not increased gradually. Only a few years ago, practically the entire labor force was employed In 1953, a survey of 10 of the larger employers showed that 9,616 men and women had gainful employment. By 1956 the figure was down to 7,636, but the bottom really dropped out in 1957, when unemployment rose 22.2 percent. For one thing, the Bates Mill closed up and over 1,400 jobs were lost. One of the large shoe companies shut its doors and another 325 jobs went down the drain. These plants did not move away, they shut up shop. Only one new industry has moved in—a cabinet manufacturer employing 30 workers.

Biddeford and Saco, instead of the bustling communities they were until recently, have started to take on the characteristics of a ghost town. You see as many men and women on the business streets—and mostly middle-aged and older men and women. The younger people have left to find jobs elsewhere.

Arthur Maxwell, president of one of the largest banks in the area, is confident about the future. He thinks that the bottom has been reached and, although it may take a few years, things will pick up.

"If some sort of plan can be drafted to redevelop depressed areas we can come through this with flying colors. It will take hard work," he maintained, "and we'll need help in attracting other industry, but we can do it."

Most of the civic authorities share Maxwell's cautious optimism. The mayor of Saco, Peter A. Garland, is of the opinion that something must be done along the line of encouraging new industry.

"We've laid the groundwork by starting an industrial development committee," he declared. "Now we need help. We're contacting certain manufacturers, but until these things bear fruit some of the assistance contained in the area redevelopment bill would give us a terrific boost."

The outgoing mayor of Biddeford, Albert C. Lambert, and Carl Swanson, secretary of the Biddeford Industrial Development Commission, were also confident that the Biddeford-Saco area could make a comeback.

"We've got the skilled manpower," said Mayor Lambert, "and we've got wonderful industrial sites. All we need now is the third ingredient—industry."

"Our citizens have their roots in this community," chimed in Swanson, "and they don't want to move away unless they have to. Even when the kids leave the nest to find jobs elsewhere they come back as often as possible. Why, on a long holiday weekend most of the autos have out-of-State licenses."

While the outlook, according to the officials, has its bright side, the current picture is bleak.

Item: Many midtown stores held their year-end sales prior to Christmas, instead of after the holiday season, as was the usual custom.

Item: For the first time in quite a few years the Community Chest drive will fall short.

Item: Breaking and entering, especially into food stores, has now become a fairly common notation on official police records.

Item: City welfare aid doubled from July to November, and many more cases were expected by the overseer of the poor, Mrs. Annette Gagne.

"Right now, nothing short of area redevelopment assistance, as proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, will help us and other depressed sections," is the way Mike Schoonjans summed up the situation. "There are a lot of people here who are too young to die and not old enough for social security. They want to work, and this sort of program could provide the work for them."

---

JANUARY 22, 1958.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
*Chairman, Production and Stabilization Subcommittee, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR PAUL: Recent sharp increases in unemployment in my own State of Maine and across the Nation have focused attention once again on the grave and pressing situation existing in those areas of our country plagued by continuing high levels of unemployment. In periods of slackening economic activity these areas suffer even greater economic hardships.

In Maine the unemployment situation is approaching a critical stage with a 7.7 percent insured unemployment rate for the first week in December. In the comparable period of 1956 this rate was 4.7 percent. The Saco-Biddeford-Sanford region of Maine has been classified as an area of substantial labor surplus by the Labor Department for more than 2 years and in the past year the closing of a major textile mill in Saco intensified this already serious problem. In December the national unemployment rate reached 5 percent of the labor force with major layoffs reported in practically all basic industries. Under such conditions the chronically distressed areas are hit even harder than before.

No one can seriously question the value of a program of assistance for these distressed areas aimed at helping them attract new industries and thereby boosting employment. Since this problem is national in scope it is well within the realm of the Federal Government to take the necessary action. Recognizing this fact, the Eisenhower administration has proposed a program of assistance for these labor surplus areas and requested the Congress to enact it into law. Last week the President in his budget message repeated his request for Congressional approval of the program. You have developed comprehensive legislative proposals in this problem yourself.

As you know, I was an early supporter of aid for distressed areas and have continued to urge approval by the Congress of a domestic point 4. The bills containing all of the various proposals for assistance to distressed areas are now before your subcommittee for consideration. It is my hope that at an early date a comprehensive program for assisting these areas will be recommended to the full Banking and Currency Committee for action so that this legislation can be approved by both Houses of Congress early in the present session.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
*United States Senator.*

---

## FRED C. REYBOLD

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, last Saturday, it was again my pleasure, as it has been on numerous occasions in the past, to attend the annual winter meeting of the Del-Mar-Va Press Association. This is an organization made up of editors and publishers of the various newspapers, both weeklies and dailies, published throughout the peninsula which comprises the State of Delaware and parts of Maryland and Virginia.

The Del-Mar-Va Press Association has been meeting regularly for about 45 years, and the gatherings always produce provocative and helpful discussions on the broad subject of news coverage and the service of newspapers to their respective communities.

At the meeting this past Saturday, the principal speaker was a young man of 84 years of age and himself a newspaperman of much merit. His name is Fred C. Reybold, and for the information of the Senate, I might say that his brother, Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, was for many years the distinguished Chief of the Corps of Engineers.

I was particularly impressed with the humor and sagacity of Mr. Reybold's remarks, and felt that they would be of interest to the Members of the Senate and to the many other individuals who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I therefore ask that at this point in my remarks the text of Mr. Reybold's brief address be printed in the RECORD, together with an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Delaware State News entitled "Newspapermen's Newspaperman," which is in the nature of a tribute to Mr. Reybold.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY FRED C. REYBOLD

There is a reason for the publication of every newspaper, conducted by proper persons, each meeting the requirements by varying public tastes.

I find it impossible to lay down any single rule for all newspapers. They are the most thoroughly individual propositions in the world. It cannot be said that they all lean one way or another, but it can be said that, taken altogether, they fairly approximate the prevailing styles of thought. And if a majority of them incline to support established institutions, it is because a majority of the people of America do.

A paper should be a persistent and courageous champion of every good and righteous cause and the relentless foe of every evil thing. No newspaper can ever be sufficiently clever to fool the people. There is no neutral ground betwen right and wrong. The best that money can buy is never any too good for your readers. Try to see how much you can give them and how little you can take from them. Class will tell, and as has been said a thousand times, "There is no substitute for brains."

A newspaper cannot please all readers, but it must be honest and fearless.

First of all a newspaper must have the respect of its employees and newspaper men and women are, as a whole, honest, fair, and sincere.

A tricky, dishonest newspaperman is soon found out—and it ends his career.

The day of romance in the newspaper world is far from dead, with the passing of the Benjamin Franklins, Horace Greeleys, Charles Danas, James Gordon Bennetts, and other famous editors whose rise from the ranks has always been an inspiration to those in journalistic pursuits, every now and then, one is inclined to think that those days—to use a trite phrase, "Are gone forever." But as years pass on, it is proven that the pen is mightier than the sword today.

Few have ever stopped to estimate what it would cost to publish a newspaper if each publisher were obliged to maintain correspondents in all parts of the world and pay the cable and telegraph tolls on the news sent to the newspapers. The total would be so large that no individual newspaper would be able to meet the expenses.

But the news that you get in your newspaper comes from all over the world. And that news should be accurate so far as possible. We are indebted in a great part to the Associated Press and the United Press in giving us that news.

There are more than 3,200 members and subscribers to the services of the Associated Press, and the United Press Association is serving 2,229 newspapers and 2,061 radio stations.

I challenge any man in the world to show that any item of news sent out by the Associated Press has been doctored or distorted for personal interests. There may be errors, news may be dishonestly reported to the Associated Press representatives, but so far as the Associated Press organization is concerned, every news story is carefully scrutinized with the sole view of giving unbiased information to the public.

The Associated Press reports are, of course, supplemented by the great newspapers, by cablegrams, and special reports of their own. The news should tell the exact truth so far as possible. I know all newspapers are very careful to be sure of the accuracy of news. But despite all the care taken by those who conduct the newspapers to keep them reliable and honest, there are many persons who question that reliability and that honesty.

One time Horace Greeley stopped the press of the New York Tribune after it had printed one copy of the paper, and then the printers pulled out an item from the forms and set in another. That one copy of the Tribune was wrapped and mailed to the mother of the man who had gone wrong. The paper had to print the story of his wrongdoing, but Greeley knew his mother, and that mother cared. That one copy did not contain the story of the man's disgrace. The world cannot always be so considerate. The man whose mother cares must learn to care for his mother enough to let her read the papers as they come out.

It is said that on the battlefield no bullet ever strikes a man but it goes farther and strikes the heart of a woman somewhere.

Of course, it takes money to run a modern newspaper, for anyone who knows anything about the newspaper business knows that a newspaper would not run very far without money. What is not widely known is that putting a paper across is a science requiring real genius. The man to do it may be one who has never been to college nor written a line of editorial copy himself. He must have a backbone and say farewell to "friends." The road is uphill all the way. Much of the burden bearing has to be done by proxy and a rallying center created for a bunch of loyal subordinates who will stick to the ship and go through storm and stress to the bitter end, which, when reached, is sometimes suddenly revealed as a snug harbor inside the bar.

If the larger newspapers, however, neglect any field of public interest, competition will be resumed, new papers will spring up, for the public must and will be served.

I will tell you how I feel about personal journalism. There is no man big enough to arbitrarily dictate the policy of any metropolitan newspaper. It is a work for many minds and the best minds that can be brought together.

The way to run a newspaper is the way to run anything in business; try to serve your clientele with the best talents and be honest in all things.

Every phase of endeavor is now moving toward amalgamation. The mounting costs of getting out a newspaper today, together with the rising wages in the mechanical department, make it impossible to publish newspapers in big towns in small units.

New York has continued longer in its multiplicity of newspapers than any other big city in the country. Chicago, that once had 5 or 6 morning papers, has now returned to 2. St. Louis with 4 or 5 at one time finally came down to 2. After struggling along with 2 for 10 years, one had to go by the board, and merged with the other. Now in the great city of St. Louis there is only one. The same is true of Denver, New Orleans, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Detroit, and so it goes.

There are more inaccuracies in newspapers of today than in the old days. The telephone has done more to spoil good reporting than anything else. I always tried to get my men to go out and talk to the principals face to face. Real stories are brought in by personal observation.

Men aren't really trained today. They don't have to beat their way up.

I wouldn't trade my experience for any readymade job in the world.

No, the way to improvement is forward, not backward. I am utterly unable to be downhearted over the prospects of journalism in America. The genius of a free people will not let it wither. If we read aright the destiny of our country we shall continue to be its chroniclers; if not, better men will succeed us. But in any event the profession goes marching on.

Now if any of my friends here today ever expect to get into the newspaper field, keep the corners of your mouth turned up always, and think and work, work and think, and read this verse from Kipling every morning:

"And they asked me how I did it,
And I gave 'em the Scripture test,
You keep your light so shining
A little in front o' the next.

"They copied all they could follow
But they couldn't copy my mind,
And I left 'em sweating and stealing
A year and a half behind."

Once a newspaperman—always that. Such is the alluring fascination of this work.

I thank you.

---

[From the Delaware State News of January 27, 1958]

NEWSPAPERMEN'S NEWSPAPERMAN

Fred C. Reybold is 84 years of age.

But you would never think it if you had been one of the distinguished guests or a member of the Del-Mar-Va Press Association meeting at the Dover Hotel on Saturday.

Reybold was the main speaker at the annual convention. And the talk he gave made us realize that we are indeed fortunate to be journalists. Rich with humor, filled with well related reminiscences, his speech was an inspiration to all those present.

Starting back in 1893 on the Philadelphia Record. this native Delawarean soon made a name for himself in the business of reporting news. Later he came back to Wilmington where he became a part owner and editor of the Every Evening which later merged with the Journal.

What was most interesting about the talk given by Reybold, in addition to the anecdotes which he told so well, was the challenge he hurled at the newspapers of today. He has real faith in their ability to do a job. But he emphasized that the job cannot be done by lazy people who are not aware of the importance of what they are doing.

By custom his talk was held to 29 minutes. But President Dan Tabler was able to get Reybold on his feet again to tell a fascinating story of how he covered the story of a ship filled with refugees from an earthquake in Jamaica coming up the Delaware Bay shortly after the turn of the century.

One part of the talk, which Reybold had prepared for delivery, was on how to run a newspaper. His obvious dedication to the importance of press freedom to America was truly impressive. In fact, United States Senator J. ALLEN FREAR, who was present at the meeting, asked for a copy to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Newspapers are important only to the extent they do their job—of keeping the citizens of a democracy informed. Reybold, with his four score and four years, gave his fellow journalists great inspiration and much to think about.

This gentleman is a newspaperman's newspaperman. May he live many more useful and fruitful years.

## WHY THE FEDERAL LOTTERY PROPOSAL OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET IS FUNDAMENTALLY UNWISE AND UNSOUND

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to state for the RECORD my emphatic opposition to the recent proposal of Budget Director Brundage that we rely upon a Federal lottery to collect funds for the United States Treasury.

This suggestion is inherently wrong for three basic reasons, in my opinion:

First. It would tap the pocketbooks of our citizens, not on the fair basis of ability to pay but merely based upon who was the victim of a gambling neurosis.

Second. It inevitably would encourage State and local governments to depend upon a similarly unsound method of filling their coffers.

Third. It would have an unfortunate impact upon the Nation's standard of living, because many of those pouring their incomes into the Federal lottery might be the heads of large families with only limited financial means.

As I see it, Mr. President, a form of Federal lottery would put the imprint of the United States Government on legalized gambling. The prestige of Congress and the White House then would back such a proposal. Once the Federal Government had endorsed this kind of operation for raising Federal revenues, how could we censure any States or localities which followed suit by legalizing slot machines, roulette wheels, pinball machines, or dice games? Gambling is gambling. How are we going to draw the line?

Every study ever made of legalized gambling has demonstrated an adverse impact on the general economy of the area. Family savings are drained by men who cannot resist the lure of a lottery or a slot-machine handle. In his book, Gambling: Should It Be Legalized? Mr. Virgil W. Peterson, director of the famous Chicago Crime Commission, has shown that "gambling is injurious to the morals and welfare of the people." This makes all the more inexplicable that a man so highly placed in our National Government as the Director of the Budget would suggest the collecting of Federal revenues with a national lottery. How can a minor hoodlum or corrupt magistrate now be assailed for voicing a similar proposal, when it has come from an office as influential as that of the President's Budget Director?

I am disappointed that Percival F. Brundage, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, recommended Federal lottery bonds to help collect revenues for the Treasury rather than proposing fairer and more equitable means. I would have preferred to hear the head of our Budget speak out in favor of abolishing depletion allowances for a few favored industries or in favor of reimposing the excess-profits tax on the manufacturers of armaments and munitions—a tax which the Republican national administration unwisely permitted to expire.

So that Members of the Senate may be familiar with the unhappy proposal made by the Director of the Budget, I ask that a New York Herald Tribune article of January 27, 1958, describing his unfortunate recommendation, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET HEAD SUGGESTS FEDERAL LOTTERY BONDS—WOULD LIKE TO TAP GAMBLING MONEY WITH BONUS ISSUE; DOUBTS APPROVAL

WASHINGTON, January 26.—Percival F. Brundage, Director of the Budget, said today he would like to find some way of tapping the money Americans spend on gambling. He suggested experimenting with a bond issue that would bear a redemption bonus for the lucky.

Mr. Brundage made the comments on the NBC television show "Youth Wants To Know" when asked if he thought a national lottery would solve all the problems of keeping the Federal budget in balance. His initial answer was "No; it would not, and that besides he did not think a national lottery a practical proposal."

BRUNDAGE EXPLAINS

After making this remark Mr. Brundage paused for a moment of reflection. Then he added: "But I hate to see all the benefits of the gambling that's done going to the underworld."

Pressed to elaborate, Mr. Brundage said:

"I wouldn't mind experimenting with a bond issue with a redemption bonus or something like that."

Then he laughed and added:

"But I don't think the Secretary of the Treasury would approve."

His apparent reference was to the British bond lottery. By this system bonds are sold to the public at $2.80, each of a short redemption period. When the numbers are called some holders receive as much as $2,800 interest—others, the majority, receive only their money back.

APPROPRIATION FEARS

Speaking on the present budget, Mr. Brundage said he feared Congress will appropriate more money this year than has been requested by the administration. He said the budget is sound, well balanced, and big enough to meet the Nation's defense needs as it stands, but that "Congress may throw some money into specific, earmarked areas where we might find later that we could better have spent the money elsewhere."

Explaining that he never knew a scientist who was satisfied with the amount of money provided for projects, he said that the $73,900,000,000 budget gives ample flexibility to take care of emergency defense needs. Of this sum, Mr. Brundage said, $500 million is to be used, if necessary, to explore breakthroughs in weapons development. Another $2 billion was flexibly arranged, he said, to be shifted as needed to any defense project. Some Senate Democrats have said they intend to have $2 billion earmarked specifically for missile development.

Mr. Brundage reiterated the administration's stand that the 1959 budget can be balanced without any tax increase and that the current business slump is not so serious as to cut the Government's anticipated receipts below budget estimates.

## UNITED STATES-SOVIET AGREEMENT PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN EXCHANGES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, announcement was made yesterday of the signing of a United States-Soviet agreement providing for cultural, technical, educational, and sports exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States and for exchanges in radio, TV, and film, subject to reciprocal veto. This agreement is tangible recognition of the basic fact that peace between nations must be firmly based upon understanding between peoples.

If I may have the attention of the distinguished majority leader, who is present on the floor, I should like to compliment him and applaud his initiative in having originally suggested the mutuality of broadcast exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union and upon the occasion of the famous CBS telecast last year. I feel that kind of action, and the actions of others of us who have been working in this field, are a proper basis for what is needed.

I have mentioned this before, and my reason for calling the attention of the majority leader to it now is that I think he is entitled to hear our thanks for what he did, and I express the hope that we in the Congress may also make our contributions in this matter.

I have a resolution relative to the subject pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I imagine there are other resolutions to the same effect, all with the purpose of having affirmative action taken in regard to what has been done in the executive department.

In addition to the statement of the distinguished majority leader on policy, it seems to me that if we think through how we in the Congress can have our weight and our authority and prestige in this field of world peace, directly leveled at the issues which involve us and the Russian people, it will be most helpful.

I respectfully lay this matter before the majority leader, knowing his views on the subject only too well, and calling it to his attention.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, let me say the Senator's interest and encouragement has been a source of stimulation to me. I thank him for his most thoughtful references to me. I recall with a great deal of pleasure my visit to the great city from which he comes on the occasion when I made certain observations. Naturally I am very pleased the Senator has concurred in some of the views I have expressed, and I trust that the action of the executive department may be in keeping with some of those views.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I hope very much we may have the earliest possible action by the Committee on Foreign Relations on my own resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, as well as other resolutions, which will place the weight of the Congress behind this whole effort toward mutual exchanges. My resolution applies particularly to students and professors. This is an area to which the President referred yesterday. I hope very much we may have Congressional action and Senate committee action equivalent to the very distinguished proposal of the majority leader.

The people of the United States have already demonstrated their receptiveness to giving fair considerations to what the Russians have to say. This is indicated by the millions who viewed the Khrushchev telecast last year, by the demonstrated appreciation of Russian cultural offerings in the arts, such as pianist Gillels, violinist Oistrakh, and by the Bolshoi Ballet; the free and wide circulation of pronouncements of Soviet leaders, such as that given the December letter from Premier Bulganin to President Eisenhower; by the acceptance by American newspapers of in-tourist advertisements urging visits to the Soviet Union, by the hundreds of Americans who went as tourists to the U. S. S. R. last year; and by the open and friendly reception given the limited number of Soviet delegations visiting the United States during recent years. I would hope that the Russians will permit "Visit U. S. A." ads in Pravda and Izvestia as we have in recent months welcomed such Soviet advertisements in American papers.

The Congress last year, by enactment of section 8 of Public Law 85-316, paved the way for removal of the nettling fingerprinting requirement which had proven such a hindrance to visits to the United States from abroad, especially from areas behind the Iron Curtain.

The path of progress for peaceful understanding lies before us. A look at a world map will remind us that the Soviet Union is a close neighbor, separated only by a few miles of the Bering Strait from United States territory; Washington is closer to Moscow by jet airliner than it is to San Francisco by train or highway. Our ties of peace with the people of Canada and Mexico have been forged by understanding; Americans working and visiting in Germany and Japan have won the confidence of these nations and assured their intentions of peace and friendship toward us more firmly than did years of war.

But the Congress has a role, too, in this endeavor. In the satellite nations behind the Iron Curtain in Europe lies a great reservoir of regard and respect for the United States. American customs, fashions, and music are avidly copied by the peoples of the satellite nations; American political freedom and economic progress continue to serve as an inspiration and a goal. Bonds of blood and relationship exist strong between Americans and Poles and Czechs; Americans, Hungarians, and Rumanians; and between Americans and others in the Communist bloc.

On August 4, last, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, designed to implement the reciprocal cultural exchange program between the United States and the Communist bloc nations of Europe under the provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, particularly with respect to student's exchange at the suggestion of President Eisenhower. This measure is presently pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations and I hope for early action on it by that committee.

The Senate will have an opportunity to ratify the recently concluded United States-Soviet agreement. The Congress, speaking as it does in our Republican Government for the entire people of the United States, should also not only endorse the stated objectives of the agreement but also its basic objections, strengthen them and open the way for their expansion, when desired, and of their effective implementation. The physicists speak of the conservation of matter—the indestructibility of chemical elements. We must not overlook the conservation of ideas—the indestructibility of man's aspirations for freedom and the "pursuit of happiness." It is we, not communism, who must serve as the inspiration to the peoples of the world. To gain appreciation for our showcase of democracy it must be viewed; to gain circulation for our ideals, they must be exported. The interexchange agreement concluded yesterday after 2 years of extended negotiations marks an opportunity for assuring the peace, an opportunity which it is incumbent upon us to exploit to the fullest. I hope that we shall have early action on Senate Concurrent Resolution 44.

## PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am sure that the mail, in recent days, has been bringing to every Senate office a steady shower of letters vehemently protesting the administration's action in cutting the dairy support price. The farmers who produce the milk and cream are generally too busy to engage in letter-writing campaigns. But the Secretary of Agriculture certainly stirred up a campaign when he announced, in December, that beginning April 1, 1958, support levels for both manufacturing milk and butterfat would be dropped to 75 percent of parity. With one exception, my mail contains only letters of agreement with S. 2924, the bill relating to price support on dairy products, in which I joined as 1 of 17 cosponsors with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who introduced the measure. The individual voices of dairy farmers are swelling now with the chorus of farm groups whose resolutions are beginning to arrive. I am sure copies of the resolutions are also being delivered to the office of Mr. Benson. I urge him to study these protests carefully. I hope he will thoughtfully consider the unanimity of the opposition and rescind the cut in supports scheduled to become effective April 1, 1958.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution passed by the Farmers' Union and local dairymen of Milton-Freewater, Oreg., at a joint meeting held January 9, 1958, and a December 19 resolution from the Oregon Trail Grange, of Nyssa, Oreg.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG.,
*January 10, 1958.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Congress,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: At a joint meeting of Farmers Union, and local dairymen on January 9, it was unanimously voted to adopt the following resolution:

We, as members of Twin City local Farmers Union, and dairy grade A milk producers, have voted to go on record as opposing the parity support price cut, that Secretary Ezra Benson has proposed to put into effect on April 1, 1958.

CHESTER A. FERGUSON,
*President, Twin City Local No. 292.*
MABEL KNOSP,
*Secretary.*

---

OREGON TRAIL GRANGE, No. 687,
*Nyssa, Oreg., December 21, 1957.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The Oregon Trail Grange at a meeting December 19 went on record as being opposed to a reduction in the subsidy to the dairy industry.

Sincerely yours,

F. R. RUNCORN,
*Secretary.*

---

## LET US BUILD SCHOOLS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, of all the messages sent to the Congress by the President, the education message delivered yesterday is by far the most disappointing.

It is, in fact, the poorest excuse of a Presidential education message that has yet slithered out of the White House.

From the very first sentence, the President virtually apologizes to the American people for interfering in their God-given right to send their first-class children to second- and third-class schools.

He gives national security as his excuse for the Federal Government's taking an emergency role.

The program that follows is a hodgepodge of penny-pinching acknowledgments that certain problems do exist in education.

I think it is significant that the President refuses to claim this little gesture as his own. He tells us that it was recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the National Science Foundation, and that he approved it. Perhaps the President is ashamed to claim the program for his own—and he should be.

The foremost problem the President completely and deliberately overlooked was the vital need for assistance to States in school construction. I say it was a deliberate oversight, because the President's memory is not that short.

Last year, in his 1957 education message, the President said:

> Of all the problems, one is most critical. In 1955, and again last year, I called attention to the critical shortage of classrooms in many communities across the country. * * * I again urge the Congress to act quickly upon this pressing problem.

A year ago the President said classrooms were scarce, and he remembered he had said the same thing in 1955 and 1956.

What has happened in the past 12 months to cause the President to ignore his own warnings of the past 3 years? I do not know what caused the President to change his mind, but I know nothing has happened to change the critical shortage of classrooms.

I think this year we must reverse the procedure. Let Congress send an education message to the President. Let us send him an education bill and demand his signature. Let it include the matters he suggests to meet the national security interest, but let it also include a frontal attack on the classroom shortage with a Federal-aid program.

## THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 23 I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, calling his attention to the fact that the President has again failed to request sufficient funds to permit the school lunch program to keep pace with our growing student population.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of the RECORD at this point my letter of January 23 to Senator RUSSELL.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 23, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman, Agriculture Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the President's budget I note that the request for the whole school lunch program has remained at $100 million for fiscal year 1959, despite a steadily increasing number of children of school age, and an increasing participation of school children in the program.

According to figures furnished me by the United States Office of Education, there will be an estimated increase of American school children enrolled in the fall of 1958 of 3,142,000 more than were enrolled in the fall term of 1956. That is an increase of approximately 7.7 percent.

According to the Department of Agriculture, the participation of school children in the school lunch program will rise by an estimated 2,145,000—or 20 percent more than the number participating in the fiscal 1957 program.

Yet we see the President requesting an increase of only one-fifth of 1 percent over the appropriation for fiscal 1957, and no increase whatsoever over last year's appropriation.

It is simply incredible that the President would not see fit to request an amount which would permit this great humanitarian program to function at least on the same per capita level as 2 years ago. The results of appropriating only $100 million, as the budget requests, will of course, be to cut the 1957 program by 20 percent. More specifically, I am attaching for the information of the agriculture subcommittee a discouraging report prepared by Mr. A. R. Taylor, the director of the Minnesota community lunch program detailing the severe cutbacks in Federal assistance to Minnesota's school lunch program already taking place. Numerous Minnesota school district superintendents have also brought this acute situation to my attention.

In the interest of at least holding the line on this magnificent program, I strongly urge the appropriation for this program of $120 million for the fiscal 1959 program—an increase over the budget request of $20 million.

I consider this program of great importance to our farm economy and of critical importance to the health and well-being of our young people. Knowing of your deep interest in the welfare of our farming population, and of our Nation's school children, I sincerely hope that you will do everything possible to secure the subcommittee's recommendation for an increase in the budget request.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call to my colleagues' attention the fact that it is not necessary to introduce special legislation for this purpose, but I did wish to alert them to the fact that I have requested an additional amount of at least $20 million for the fiscal year ending in June 1959. Surely every Member of the Senate will wish to join me in this effort to boost the program back at least to the level of 2 years ago.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter I have just received from Donald H. Dunham, of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, supporting my effort to increase the amount requested for the school lunch program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETIREMENT, SAFETY, AND INSURANCE DEPARTMENT,
NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D. C., January 27, 1958.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I certainly wish to indicate our stand on behalf of your drive to restore the Nation's school lunch program at least to the level it was operating on last year. Our association is truly a farm organization representing over 3 million rural farm families. We are contacting Senator RUSSELL to do everything possible to secure the subcommittee's recommendation for an increase in the budget request for the school lunch program.

I consider this program of great importance to our farmer members and the continued health and well-being of the young people of our membership.

Very sincerely yours,

DONALD H. DUNHAM,
*Department Director.*

## URGENT NEED FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN FIELD OF HEALTH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few tasks before us are more urgent than that of providing adequate appropriations and levels of pay for the men and women who are engaged in medical research. Upon their success depends whether or not we shall find answers to the grim riddles of cancer, heart disease, blindness, and other plagues harassing the human race.

I have been disappointed to note that the administration's budget does not recommend increases in the funds for the National Institutes of Health, although the research demands upon this great institution are larger and more numerous than ever before.

In my own State of Oregon, great advances in medical research have been attained at the University of Oregon Medical School, at the University of Oregon itself, at Oregon State College, at the University of Oregon Dental School, and at other institutions—both public and private—which receive grants from the National Institutes of Health.

In the Sunday Journal of Portland for January 5, 1958, my views on this vital subject were developed at substantial length. I wish to thank the editors of the Journal for the opportunity thus afforded me, because of the critical importance of this topic. I likewise would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that, in this article in the Journal of Portland, I have emphasized the great contribution made to medical research generally, and to the National Cancer Institute in particular, by two Members of the Senate with far wider influence and prestige than I possess. These Members are the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. All of us in the Senate—and indeed all members of mankind everywhere—are indebted to them for the effective and persistent effort they have waged to place at the disposal of medical researchers the funds essential to their life-and-death task. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my article from the Journal of January 5, 1958, entitled "$40 Billion for Arms—Why Not $500 Million for Cancer?—Let's Halt Cancer—Now," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTY BILLION DOLLARS FOR ARMS—WHY NOT $500 MILLION FOR CANCER?—LET'S HALT CANCER NOW

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

If the United States Government can invest over $40 billion in weapons of war, why not appropriate a stake of at least $500 million in the war against the most merciless killer of all—cancer? I ask myself this question a hundred times when I pour through the vast volume known as the President's budget.

My dominant interest as a United States Senator is not in public power, as many people undoubtedly believe. It is in a sweeping crash program of Federal support for medical research in general and into the causes and possible cure of cancer in particular. I am most proud of the fact that, in the 3 years that I have served in the Senate, I have had some slight role in increasing funds for the National Cancer Institute from $21 million to $56 million.

Yet even this sum is but a token. It takes $1 million repeated 1,000 times to make just $1 billion. While we will spend $10 billion on naval vessels which soon may be obsolete, we invest merely a fraction of this in the National Cancer Institute.

Americans spend annually $15 billion on liquor and tobacco. They pay $27 billion for automobiles. They spend $3.2 billion for TV and radio sets. But for cancer research their Government puts up only $56 million. Consider that 2½ times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were slain in action on all our worldwide battlefronts.

In 1 year, cancer claimed nearly 10 times the number of Americans who perished during 3 years of Korean fighting. At the present frightening rate, 40 million Americans are destined to have cancer and approximately 26 million of these will die from it.

My wife, Maurine, and I shall never forget the grim but stirring day we spent visiting the Jimmy Fund Building of Children's Hospital in Boston, where more children are be-

ing treated for cancer than any other place on earth.

There we were shocked to learn from Dr. Sidney Farber, the great pathologist of Harvard Medical School, that more children under 14 die of cancer than of any other disease. Indeed, during the last year prior to development of the Salk vaccine, polio killed 579 children but cancer took 3,761.

Our interest centers now in the verdant countryside of Maryland near Washington, D. C. There, at Bethesda, a stately and imposing hospital towers above a cluster of pillared buildings. This is the National Institutes of Health, founded a decade ago by our Government to sponsor research into the deadliest diseases which plague mankind.

Seven separate branches comprise the national institutes. These conduct research into extraordinary cases from all over the land, who are treated investigatively at the huge hospital. Treatment is free. It is the most elaborate and painstaking which money can buy—money paid in taxes by you and me. It is undertaken in the hope that some discovery or breakthrough will be attained which then can help to treat millions of other cases elsewhere in our country.

The national institutes also sponsor generous grants to clinics, medical schools, research laboratories and doctors in all 48 States. The grants are approved by boards consisting of famous medical authorities like Dr. Farber, Dr. Isador Ravdin of the team who operated on President Eisenhower; Dr. Shields Warren, Dr. Stanley Sarnoff and many others.

Although I have been criticized as an advocate of socialized medicine because of my active support of the national institutes, the basic fact remains that 65 percent of the funds available to the national cancer institute are earmarked for grants to non-Federal investigators or private institutions.

For example, during the fiscal year 1957, a total of 6,452 such research grants were made by all the institutes throughout the Nation, disbursing a total of $82,000,000. Oregon's research allotments were divided as follows by the seven major categories of the national institutes:

| | |
|---|---|
| National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic diseases | $149,623 |
| National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness | 96,704 |
| National Institute of Dental Research | 32,392 |
| National Institute of Allergy | 37,728 |
| National Cancer Institute | 210,833 |
| National Heart Institute | 105,777 |
| National Institute of Mental Health | 41,220 |

This compilation will serve to indicate the impact of the program on a State the size of Oregon, which contains almost precisely 1 percent of the national population. By far the bulk of the funds granted to this State have gone to the University of Oregon school at Portland—a total of 31 grants amounting to $475,108 in value.

Next has been Oregon State College with 18 grants totaling $138,514. University of Oregon at Eugene has received 8 grants aggregating $66,636, while all the Oregon funds from the National Institute of Dental Research have been assigned to the University of Oregon Dental School.

One of the most substantial grants made to a single project in Oregon has been that for $74,511 to the university's medical school for a study of tissue culture and metabolism in leukemia, which is the deadly cancer of the bloodstream. This undertaking has been supervised by Dr. Edwin E. Osgood, head of the school's division of experimental medicine.

It is typical of the allotments made by the National Cancer Institute. When Maurine and I were at lunch with the famous researchers on the staff of Children's Hospital, we learned their high opinion of the research qualifications of Dean David W. E. Baird, Dr. Frank B. Queen, Dr. Osgood, and others on the faculty of Oregon's Medical School.

But is enough being done? The total budget of all the National Institutes of Health for the present fiscal year amounts to $241,163,000. This seems like an immense total to the average taxpayer. Yet contrast it with nearly $8 billion for carrying the national debt, $5 billion for the Department of Agriculture, that $15 billion for liquor and tobacco, and $3 billion for movies and sports admissions.

As these words are written, a letter comes to my desk from H. J. Rand, president of the Rand Development Corp., a private research organization. In support of my bill for $500 million for the National Cancer Institute, Mr. Rand writes that he believes a major breakthrough has been made.

"It only requires money and time to exploit this breakthrough. I would estimate that four times the amount of funds could be used in this project without straining our facilities. A major amount of the invaluable time of key research personnel is spent in fund raising. Even work at the National Cancer Institute is being retarded by lack of funds. I suggest that a Senate investigation might bring these facts into the open."

Dr. Isador Ravdin, himself a celebrated surgeon, has said that surgery and X-rays may have reached their zenith in the treatment of cancer—that the dominant hope for a genuine discovery now rests in what is known as chemotherapy This means some compound that may retard the wild growth of malignant cells. It also means the expenditure of enormous amounts of money.

We were told at Children's Hospital that, a decade ago, the youngster suffering from leukemia survived an average time of 4 to 6 weeks after diagnosis. Now survivals at the hospital average from 16 to 20 months. The difference is caused by compounds which retard but, alas, do not halt the sinister disease.

Dr. Farber told us that some 30,000 mouse tests annually are used to determine the value of such compounds. He showed Maurine and me samples of mice in which cancers have been planted and then made to disappear completely, all by result of chemotherapy.

Unfortunately, the compounds retain many toxic properties and cannot be risked on human patients. "But we ought to be making not 30,000 tests a year," said Dr. Farber, "but 300,000 tests or even 3 million."

This sense of urgency lies behind the thinking of Dr. Farber, Dr. Shields Warren, and others that Federal cancer research funds should be on a continuing basis. By this they mean the money should hold over from year to year. Budgets for cancer investigation, they claim, cannot be handled on a fiscal-year basis. It must be known far in advance that funds will be available for lengthy programs. Skilled researchers must have some permanence of tenure.

My bill provides that the sum of $500 million for cancer study shall "remain available until expended." The purpose of this provision is to let the medical boards of the National Cancer Institute know that they do not have to spend the money at an unwisely fast rate, if sound proposals for research seem lacking. I am confident that the bulk of the grants would continue to go to medical schools and other non-Federal outlets.

Happily, this need for more extensive governmental financing of cancer research is not a partisan issue. And why should it be? Cancer is no respecter of political parties or of pocketbooks.

In my efforts to expand funds for the National Cancer Institute, I have found complete support and agreement from two Members of the Senate with far wider influence and prestige than I possess.

One is Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine, the only woman Member of the upper Chamber of Congress. She has long argued for greater encouragement for medical research. The other is LISTER HILL of Alabama, descendent of a long line of illustrious physicians and himself named for the noted British surgeon, Sir Joseph Lister. Mrs. SMITH is a Republican and Senator HILL a Democrat, and that is as it should be.

I am certain the sum of $500 million, to be disbursed by medical researchers in pursuit of a single disease, undoubtedly sounds like a lot of money to a citizen struggling with his income-tax return.

Yet Dr. Queen at the University of Oregon Medical School pointed out recently that the cost of cancer in Oregon alone each year totals $143 million and in the State of Washington some $217 million. In two States of comparatively small population, cancer thus costs over a third of a billion dollars annually.

Today we look back with compassion on the era of the frontier, when scarlet fever or diphtheria were most of the time fatal maladies. These diseases now respond to vaccines and protective serums. Will a future generation regard with equal pity our own staggering mortality from cancer? Some of America's greatest medical researchers have told me that such sympathy may possibly be avoided if a genuine "crash" program of basic research is financed and supported.

I am certain many readers of this article wonder why such splendid nongovernmental groups as the American Cancer Society and the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund are not adequate to finance all the research that is needed. These organizations do splendid work. They command the allegiance of outstanding and unselfish people. It was a great honor recently for me to be asked by the Runyon Fund to present a $15,000 donation for cancer-research projects to Drs. T. B. Fitpatrick and H. S. Mason of the University of Oregon Medical School.

But the sheer magnitude of the cancer problem calls for governmental funds on a vast scale. To date the Damon Runyon Fund, dedicated to the gifted author who died of cancer of the throat, has disbursed $11,345,378 in all 48 States and 18 foreign countries for cancer investigations. This must be compared with the $56 million spent in a single year by the National Cancer Institute and with $500 million which leading researchers look upon as a goal.

One further thought occurs to me, in advocating an accelerated program of study in this life-or-death field. Millions of Americans are troubled over Russia's startling new ascendancy in the realm of space conquest. They worry about our prestige and standing internationally. They wanted the United States to thrust a bigger and heavier satellite even farther into the unknown reaches of the universe.

But what if America, instead of doing this, could announce some day that at last a genuine breakthrough had been made in the study of human cells running rampant and that the terrible riddle of cancer had been solved?

Another moon to match the travels of sputnik or a compound to halt the ravages of cancer—which of the two announcements would make the name of America blessed among all the peoples of the earth?

## THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND THE GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the spring of next year, one of the great maritime milestones of this country will

occur when the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway is officially opened.

Our pleasure in dedicating this great engineering artery into the heart of the North American Continent will be dampened, so to speak, by but one thought: The seaway—for the immediate present—will really be only half a seaway. The reason will of course be that 27-foot deep-draft shipping can be accommodated only as far as Lake Erie, until connecting channels to the upper Lake States are deepened and improved.

Under the circumstances, it becomes imperative that funds be allocated to complete these channels by the earliest possible date.

In all of our advance planning to date, 1962 has been the target deadline for the completion of the channel work. This is not an early target by any means.

But now, we learn that because of the pressure for overall economy in civilian-type expenditures in the next fiscal year's budget, there is going to be a slowdown or, some might call it, a stretchout in the present channel improvement plans.

My purpose in speaking today is to point out, however, that the channel work is a capital improvement of interest to 30 million people. It is no ordinary river and harbor project. Channel funds cannot be considered in the same class as an appropriation to improve some harbor, say, in the gulf, or on the east or west coasts, or even a Great Lakes port itself.

On the contrary, the channels are the indispensable second half of the entire vast project, a second half which makes the first half expenditure completely sound.

Remember, we of the upper Lake States will still be cut off, so to speak, from deep-draft shipping until the channels are improved.

Up until now, we have been limited in our commerce basically because of the inability of deep-draft navigation to get through the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Now, that is being taken care of by seaway construction. But we have also been limited from deep-draft shipping because of the impassability of the present upper channels to deep-draft shipping.

Speed, therefore, is of the essence in completing the seaway.

The case for it can be summarized:

First. America is facing a dip in her economy. Channel construction funds will help generate economic activity, directly and indirectly. Channel funds will help open up the great market of the upper Lake States to increased employment, increased commerce.

Second. Completion of the channel work is an act of elementary justice for the upper Lake States. It is these States which the record will show—fought longest, hardest and most consistently for the seaway, in the 30-year battle for it.

The very least that they can expect is that they shall receive the benefit of the seaway at the earliest possible date.

Third. Uncle Sam cannot fully realize his own overall investment in the International Rapids section until the full 2,300-mile seaway is opened to deep-draft shipping.

I send to the desk now two items: The first is an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, issue of January 24, which emphasizes the importance of completing the Great Lakes connecting channels. The second is an excellent summary of the progress on the main seaway construction job itself. This summary was presented by the information officer of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Mr. Edward R. Place, at Nashua, N. H., earlier this month. Mr. Place's speech documented the tremendous interest throughout the Nation and abroad in this great overall project. I ask unanimous consent that both these items be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 24, 1958]

### DEEPEN LAKES CHANNELS SOON

A good example of false economy is the proposed slowdown on deepening connecting channels between the western Great Lakes as part of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

There are 130 miles of connecting channels, including the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, Detroit River, St. Marys River, and the Straits of Mackinac—joining Lakes Erie, Huron, Michigan, and Superior. They are to be deepened to 27 feet. Now ships calling at Milwaukee are limited to 21-foot channels incoming and 25-foot channels outbound on their way from Lake Erie to Lake Michigan.

The seaway is due to be completed in 1959. It will provide a minimum 27-foot (instead of the present 14-foot) route into Lake Erie. The channel deepening project was scheduled to be completed in 1962. But under the budget plans of President Eisenhower annual expenditures for the channel work would be cut almost in half, forcing a stretchout of the work to 1965.

As it is, Milwaukee will not get the full benefits of larger shipping that the seaway will make possible at the time the seaway is finished. If the President's proposal is adopted, Milwaukee will not get full benefits for as long as 6 years after the seaway completion.

It wouldn't make sense to go to the expense of running water pipes into a home and then decide to save money by not providing faucets for 3 years. The channel expenditures are going to be made as part of the capital improvements program. The way to get the most benefit out of the seaway is to start using it as soon as possible. If larger shipping is blocked from Lake Michigan it is bound to restrict not only the benefits lake ports hope for but the amount of tolls which are to go toward paying seaway costs.

The seaway is being built. The channel work is an integral part of the seaway development. The wisest economy would be to push the work as rapidly as possible and to get the project into business. It's false economy to postpone the day when the seaway can realize its full potential.

---

### WORLD SPOTLIGHT ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(Address by Edward R. Place, information officer, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, at Unitarian-Universalist Church, Nashua, N. H.)

Forty-one years after the initial St. Lawrence Seaway power bill set off a long series of vigorously fought debates in the United States Congress, extending between 1917 and 1954, partial navigation of the fabulous international waterway is only 6 months away. Today the project is about three-fourths completed.

From where we sit at the United States seaway headquarters offices in Washington, it can be said that the world spotlight is on the seaway. It may astonish many of you, occupied as you are with family, occupational, and community responsibilities, that the realization of a bold century-old dream is so near at hand.

Those of you who have not had leisure time to visit the seaway work sites during the past 3 years of earth-moving and construction miracle may with good reason wonder why all roads in the universe lead to Montreal, and Beauharnois, Cornwall, and Massena, Iroquois, and Welland.

During the course of my remarks this evening, I will report on various aspects here and abroad of interest and enthusiasm which appear to be portents for the seaway's success to a degree surpassing even the wildest hopes of generations of dedicated advocates from both sides of the Canadian-United States border.

My presence here as a representative of the Seaway Corporation, in response to your kind invitation of many weeks ago, proves to me that Nashuans, along with many other New Hampshire and New England citizens, have adopted a sensible and practical Yankee attitude toward the seaway. You accept the seaway power project as a nearly accomplished fact, and you want to know how you can best take advantage of the new power for manufacturing goods and the improved navigation facilities for moving goods.

In a recent address before the World Affairs Council in Milwaukee, Seaway Administrator Castle declared that all who are engaged in transportation services will share the benefits from the increasing import-export trade, of Canadian ore discoveries, along with laboratory research for new products, population growth, and industrialization in the Great Lakes Basin and St. Lawrence Valley.

"With all these favorable factors and trends so plainly evident today," he said, "no crystal balls are required to recognize that the St. Lawrence Seaway facilities will prove to be a great stimulus to our national economy. Instead of being a threat to other areas and other types of transport services, we believe the seaway should prove to be a boon to all services and to the country as a whole."

The seaway is an outstanding example of international cooperation in which two countries are together developing a project of great magnitude which will promote trade for their mutual benefit and that of other countries. These facilities will, therefore, contribute to the furtherance of the security and economic stability of the Free World.

The northern tip of New Hampshire is, roughly, 100 miles from the St. Lawrence River in Canada. Nashua, being in southern New Hampshire, is, of course, much farther removed. Even though New Hampshire is not 1 of the 8 States bordering on the seaway and the Great Lakes, or even 1 of the 9 States that are said to be directly tributary—that is, States from which trade can be expected to flow across the Great Lakes States to make use of the seaway—it cannot be assumed that the seaway will benefit only 17 States and less than half of our population.

The economy of the United States is so interdependent, with the welfare of citizens of one State depending upon the welfare of citizens of another State, that it is impossible for so large a segment of our economy to receive benefits without the good effects spreading to all of our citizens and to every State.

I would not venture to tell you that Nashua's manufactures of textiles, shoes, wood products, tools, hardware, and machinery will boom the moment the first ship passes through the Long Sault Canal and the new 80-foot seaway locks next July. On the other hand, you should not be discouraged

from exploring the benefits to business and trade through cheaper transportation costs the seaway will provide.

As a native New Englander, I have previously been given the opportunity to tell the seaway story in nearby Keene, in Portland and Presque Isle, Maine, and in Bennington, over in Vermont. It may interest you that Maine's potato farmers are intrigued with the idea of getting a highway for truck transports cut from Aroostook County through the Wilderness to serve as a link to the port of Quebec and Great Lakes markets for their spuds, via the seaway. As previously said, all roads—and, I might add, rails—lead to the seaway, now or eventually.

Winter has halted, or slowed down, the work on the billion-dollar seaway-power project, and the St. Lawrence River is closed to navigation until the ice breaks up in the spring. The combined working forces are far below summertime peak employment of around 15,000. Most of the contracts are on schedule.

In the International Rapids section the United States seaway project is in good shape. The Long Sault Canal, a big ditch 10 miles long, with a bottom width of 442 feet and a minimum depth of 27 feet, was virtually completed during December. The canal excavation contracts called for moving of 17 million cubic yards of earth and rock, while the two lock excavation contracts required moving more than 5 million cubic yards of material, a total of over 22 million cubic yards. Eisenhower lock was over 92 percent complete and Grasse River lock over 85 percent complete on December 1, 1957. More than 1 million cubic yards of concrete were placed in these massive structures, each of which will raise and lower ships 45 feet.

United States seaway facilities will open next July for 14-foot draft ships. This is necessitated by the raising of the power pool for generation of hydroelectric power. Some 38,000 acres will be inundated, forming a huge seaway lake and flooding out the existing Canadian 14-foot canals westward from Cornwall, Ontario. All river traffic in the International Rapids section would be blocked by the St. Lawrence power dam and Long Sault spillway dam unless the Long Sault Canal were completed, thus providing a bypass for ships around the power structures. St. Lawrence cargo volume now amounts to some 12 million tons annually.

During 1958, the Seaway Authority of Canada will concentrate upon completion of its four new seaway locks, St. Lambert and Cote Ste. Catherine above Montreal and the upper and lower locks located in the Beauharnois Power Canal. Canada's fifth lock at Iroquois was completed last fall, and a successful test run took place on November 22. Both the United States and Canada will continue dredging between Montreal and Lake Ontario, and Canada will complete the deepening of its Welland Ship Canal, connecting Lakes Ontario and Erie. Together the United States and Canada are building a high-level suspension bridge with 120-foot clearance for vessels, preliminary to tearing down the present span between Rooseveltown, N. Y., and Cornwall Island. During 1958 the Seaway Authority will occupy its new headquarters building at Cornwall and the Seaway Corporation will move into its new operations building at Massena.

In the spring of 1959, the stage will be set for oceangoing ships up to 27-foot draft to utilize the vastly modernized St. Lawrence Waterway, and engage in greatly expanded commerce and trade with St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes ports. Thus, one of the world's greatest engineering feats will have been accomplished and a mighty dream will have come true.

It is anticipated that the bigger ships from foreign lands as well as United States and Canadian fleets, representing over 80 percent of the world's cargo vessels, will commence using the completed Montreal-to-Great Lakes Seaway in early April 1959. It is likely that the gala international ceremonies marking this historic event will be held over until balmier weather in May or June for the convenience of Britain's charming Queen Elizabeth, who has already announced her intention of participating in the seaway opening along with President Eisenhower, in whose first administration the Seaway Act was passed. Millions of Americans and Canadians will celebrate the realization of the fourth seacoast which will transform the Great Lakes into the world's eighth sea, sometimes referred to as America's Mediterranean.

By 1962, the connecting channels of the Great Lakes will be deepened to 27 feet from present depths of 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound, and the way will be cleared for a channel with a minimum depth of 27 feet all the way from the Atlantic to Duluth, Minn., and Port Arthur, Ontario, on Lake Superior. An incomparable inland waterway, 2,342 miles long, will bring ships flying the flags of a hundred nations into the heartland of our continent, making great seaports of inland ports and enriching the economy of the United States and Canada beyond measure.

There are heartening reports that ships especially designed for the seaway trade are being constructed in foreign shipyards. For example, two new passenger-cargo vessels being built by the Fjell-Oranje Line for Great Lakes service will be streamlined ships of about 9,000 deadweight tons with first-class accommodations for 100 passengers. The vessels are scheduled for delivery in the spring of 1959. The ships will operate from Rotterdam, the Netherlands, and probably English Channel ports to Montreal and Chicago.

Interest of European shipping officials in the seaway is indicated by the fact that Mr. Charles Sartori of the Hamburg Chicago Line and Mr. H. Steuch, general manager of the Baltic and International Maritime Conference, came over to attend and make constructive statements at the users' conferences conducted by the Seaway Corporation last September in Washington and Chicago. They also attended a similar conference in Ottawa, Canada.

The Seaway Corporation has been pleased to escort foreign shipping officials on inspection tours of the seaway construction area, among them a distinguished group from Norway.

Travel writers tell me that cruise promoters in France are considering the idea of transatlantic seaway excursions, providing tourists with a floating hotel while enjoying the sights and attractions to be found in such cities along the seaway route as Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Duluth.

Potentialities for use of the scenic seaway for passenger ships are so challenging that Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, a coauthor of the Seaway Act, once proposed that they pay a toll of a dollar a head to help pay for seaway construction costs. However, the law as written now provides that the seaway be self-liquidating and self-sustaining through tolls to be paid by shippers during the next 50 years.

Among hundreds of seaway film showings which our information office has arranged during the past year in response to requests, there have been a number in European countries sponsored by miscellaneous organizations, including the Manchester Ship Canal Co. in England. Other requests have come from Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Cuba. I may say that the Seaway Corporation has produced two films in the Fourth Seacoast series and will produce three more.

One of the best of the non-Government films on the seaway construction is Caterpillar Tractor Co.'s the Eighth Sea, which has been viewed by many hundreds of thousands throughout the United States and Canada and abroad.

It has been estimated that construction equipment being used by contractors on the seaway-power project is valued at around $75 million, and the opportunity to watch these monster machines at work from public overlooks provided by the seaway and power entities has attracted a million or more tourists to the vantage points erected for seaway superintendents. Administrator Lewis G. Castle of the Seaway Corporation has often predicted that the seaway will equal or surpass Niagara Falls as America's No. 1 tourist attraction.

Le Vie Del Mondo, an Italian magazine published by Touring Club Italiano—a magazine very similar to our National Geographic—last September published an 18-page article on the seaway. Our press releases go to many countries, embassies, overseas shipping lines, and foreign publications, helping to focus the world spotlight on the seaway.

Last season the State Department sponsored a seaway tour, in cooperation with the Seaway Corporation, for 4 professors and 19 students from Guatemala University of San Carlos. Students were all members of the school of engineering graduating class.

From Japan came an inland-waterways group of 16, a party of 12 industrialists, and a smaller group of civil engineers and steel-company executives. Twelve engineers from Formosa made up another group touring the seaway project. Members of the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce and manufacturers came from Scotland. Four engineers came from India. Officials of Germany's Kiel Canal, 20 students from England's Imperial Defense College, and other foreign delegations too numerous to mention inspected the seaway last year. We are preparing to welcome a group of Turkish public-utilities executives from Istanbul.

Distinguished Americans who recently toured the seaway include former President Herbert Hoover; Senator Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Gov. Vernon W. Thompson, of Wisconsin; Admirals Hopwood, Libby, and Burrowes, of the United States Navy; and a host of others. Chicago businessmen and industrialists filled a boat to capacity and inspected the seaway from afloat and ashore. Milwaukee industrialists chartered a plane for a 3-day seaway inspection trip arranged by Milwaukee Association of Commerce. Hundreds of buses stream to Massena and Cornwall with their loads of engineers, businessmen, school teachers, students, etc., for a look at the seaway. A large-scale tour for college engineering students is being organized for early April by a Milwaukee school official.

All roads lead to the seaway as the world spotlight plays on the greatest construction show on earth.

Is it any wonder that traffic and parking have become major problems for Massena, whose housing problem was already made critical by the influx of seaway workers? A new hotel and 53 trailer courts, at last count, have helped to ease the housing situation in the seaway's gateway city on our side of the border, while its industrial growth is assured by the new plants now under construction by the Reynolds Metals Co. and General Motors, and by the expansion of the existing plants of the Aluminum Company of America.

For generations the St. Lawrence Seaway was a favorite question for college debating teams, as well as a subject for themes, term papers, and the like. Very likely some of you folks here tonight will recall writing compositions on the seaway during your school days.

Today America's educational institutions are playing an important part in spotlighting the seaway power project.

In our colleges and universities, interest in the seaway is not confined to professors of economics, international law, political science, history, engineering, geology, agriculture, geography, transportation, and marketing. Students by the hundreds on campuses all over this country and Canada, as well as famous universities abroad, are researching and writing about the seaway. A student in Belgium actually visited our offices for a series of exhaustive interviews after corresponding with us for about a year.

In recent months, selected groups of Goucher College and American University students, accompanied by their professors, visited our Washington offices for a give-and-take discussion of the seaway project, following film showings and educational talks by several of our officers.

Indiana University's School of Business has published a valuable study on the effects of the seaway on grain movements and other agricultural products. Fenn College of Cleveland has prepared a study of the impact of the seaway on the port of Cleveland. Harold M. Mayer, associate professor of geography at the University of Chicago, has written a 283-page book-length study entitled "The Port of Chicago and the St. Lawrence Seaway." Marquette University has sponsored a comprehensive seaway forum. Many university law and engineering journals are featuring seaway articles. Recently Syracuse University professors published a book entitled "The New St. Lawrence Frontier."

Prof. Sargent Russell, of the University of Massachusetts, made research studies for a report by the New England Governors' Committee on Public Transportation. The report, entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway and New England" was published in two parts. Professor Russell also has prepared a recent seaway study for the United States Department of Agriculture, entitled "Potentials of the St. Lawrence Seaway for Marketing United States Agricultural Commodities."

United States Military Academy cadets hold the unofficial collegiate championship for seaway literary efforts, on the basis of largest number of requests received from any single educational institution for our information materials to be used in writing theses. Students of Kent State University in Kent, Ohio, have been next most prolific in writing on various aspects of the seaway. Currently, several Harvard College students are doing research preparatory to writing papers on the seaway, possibly as a consequence of recent publication by the Boston Globe of a series of eight articles by Otto Zausmer, describing a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence voyage aboard a Dutch freighter.

College students are not alone in burning the midnight oil on seaway studies. Hundreds of grade and high-school students have written us for assistance on seaway projects of one kind or another. Several classes have collaborated on designing seaway exhibits, and one schoolboy has built a truly remarkable scale model of the seaway power project in the International Rapids section, complete even to running water.

One of the earliest and most profusely illustrated books on the seaway is "Billion Dollar Story," on which the editors of the Massena Observer have collaborated. We know of a dozen books on seaway history now being written, several to be used as school textbooks.

Recently off the press is Lowell Thomas' Story of the St. Lawrence Seaway, published by Henry Stewart, Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y. One sentence from Mr. Thomas' book provides a happy thought on which to close: "The seaway and power scheme is now one more powerful link in the chain of Canadian-American friendship."

---

## CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDRESS IN LITTLE ROCK, ARK., BY PALMER HOYT OF DENVER, COLO.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the courageous figures in American journalism today is my devoted friend, Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post, of Denver, Colo. He is a great editor because he is not afraid to champion unpopular causes. Typical of this able person in our fourth estate was his recent pilgrimage to Little Rock, Ark., where he spoke in favor of an enlightened attitude on civil rights and in opposition to the use of armed force to oppose civil-rights verdicts of a unanimous United States Supreme Court. It was characteristic of Palmer Hoyt that he took this stand in the presence of Governor Orval Faubus of Arkansas who had employed the National Guard to defy the Supreme Court and the President of the United States. To the credit of Governor Faubus, he listened courteously to Mr. Hoyt's address.

Mr. Hoyt likewise was true to his own beliefs when he praised two other valiant editors, J. N. Heiskell and Harry Ashmore, of the Little Arkansas Gazette, who have dared to print the news and to oppose the use of armed force during the Little Rock school-integration crisis.

It is easy and simple to speak in favor of school integration and orderly processes in a northern city. It requires far sterner stuff to do this in the South, whether you are a politician or an editor. We of the North too often fail to recognize this. We frequently are too hard on southerners in this regard. Palmer Hoyt's speech at Little Rock, Ark., to the Arkansas Press Association on January 10, 1958, was in the best tradition of such valiant figures in American journalism as William Lloyd Garrison, Elijah Lovejoy, and William Allen White. The following brief tribute to Mr. Hoyt appeared in the Pendleton East-Oregonian of January 18, 1958:

Ep Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post (his first newspaper job was on the East Oregonian), has been praised and condemned for statements he made at an Arkansas State press association banquet on the problems that grew out of integration at Little Rock high school. Our only comment is that it took courage to discuss the subject in Arkansas and when you're looking around the newspaper world for a man with courage you need look no farther than Ep Hoyt.

Inasmuch as I have referred extensively to the address in Little Rock by Palmer Hoyt on January 10, 1958, it is my belief that Members of the Senate will be interested in this outstanding speech, in which Mr. Hoyt has emphasized the unfortunate impression created overseas when "the armed power of an American State was involved to prevent nine Negro children from obtaining an education."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoyt's address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN TRAGEDY IN THREE PARTS

(Speech by Palmer Hoyt, Arkansas Press Association, Little Rock, Ark., January 10, 1958)

Mr. President, Governor Faubus, members of the Arkansas Press Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be here tonight to talk to such a distinguished group of fellow newspapermen. And I am happy to have, at long last, the opportunity to meet one of America's most controversial figures—your own Governor, the Honorable Orval Faubus.

My father was a Baptist preacher, and I was brought up on the Bible.

One of my favorite Bible stories was that of a gentleman, name of Daniel, who, with a little urging, sauntered into a lions' den one day.

As a child, I used to wonder how old Dan felt when the gate clanged shut and he found himself alone with those lions.

Now I know. Because here I am. I'll have to agree that you are a nice-looking bunch of lions. Furthermore, I doubt if Daniel had the pleasure of being introduced by the head lion.

But even so, it occurs to me that, lest I be devoured, I had best make my position clear.

You know, first, that I am a newspaperman. As such, over a period of almost four decades, I have worked for better human relations but I have learned that good human relations cannot be legislated. They are the product of time, education, and effort.

Some of you may look upon me as a "damnyankee." May I say, parenthetically, that I was 26 years old before I knew "damnyankee" was only one word.

A few of you, and I hope it is only a few, may regard me as a carpetbagger.

I would be less than realistic if I didn't concede that newspapermen, damnyankees and carpetbaggers, all three, seem at the moment to be fairly unpopular in this great commonwealth.

Before embarking on my main thesis tonight, may I say—this I do believe: No man can reflect upon the incident known as "Little Rock" without feelings of compassion for the people intimately and personally involved. A community within the Nation that is troubled by internal dissension, harassed by external critics and humiliated by civil disorder is no less a sorry spectacle than a nation itself in the grip of civil war.

Let the millions of Americans outside of Arkansas ask themselves if they, under similar provocation from within or without, could comport themselves with greater poise or restraint.

I shall not presume to levy judgment upon your gracious Governor, Orval Faubus. What transpired here, after your school board set in motion a gradual program of integrating your public schools, has been exhaustively discussed by Arkansas' own press.

The facts have been widely and painfully appraised.

And, it seems to me that Little Rock's Arkansas Gazette, under the guidance of my friends, J. N. Heiskell and Harry Ashmore, reported accurately on the news of conditions within this city when the Arkansas National Guard was called into action. It is my personal view that the Gazette's editorial position has reflected great journalistic statesmanship. I have noted that the same is true of some other Arkansas papers.

It is not for me, as a newspaperman, damnyankee, carpetbagger, or whatnot, to evaluate the motives of any party to this case. I am, as you will see, less interested in motivation than in effect.

I have accepted your president's invitation to speak to you as a fellow American, and as

such to point out what seems to me to be certain inescapable facts and conclusions.

The first is, that you and I and all of us in the Free World are in a mess. If we don't do something about it soon, there will be no laws to squabble about and no way of life to preserve.

The second point is that we have all—our leaders and ourselves—had a hand in making this mess. We have been complacent about our ability to defend ourselves; selfishly materialistic and appallingly unconcerned with the consequence of our behavior upon the rest of the world—particularly the effect on the minds of men.

Suddenly we are awakened by the beeping of satellites, the flash of rockets not our own, and the unpleasant sound of angry words of men who do not love us.

And this is the background against which we may be on stage and performing an American tragedy in three acts.

As I have said, all 3 acts concern all of us, but 1 of them concerns you especially.

What are the acts of this unfolding, this implied tragedy?

The first is the effect and the impact of such episodes as the Little Rock case on our own respect for law and on our leadership of the free world.

The second act involves the economic challenges raised against the American people by the evil, if dedicated, geniuses in the Soviet Union.

The third act, and perhaps the climax of our tragedy, is built around the fundamental question of survival. Survival against internal economic collapse; survival against the threat of thermonuclear war or international blackmail in the age of the rocket, the missile and the platform in outer space.

The order of the acts is not accidental. Let me illustrate. Not long ago, I had dinner with Robert MacNeal, president of the Curtis Publishing Co., who had recently returned from India and Pakistan.

He had been in those countries after sputnik had been launched by the Soviet Union.

I asked Bob MacNeal what the newspapers of India and Pakistan said about this Russion scientific achievement—how were they taking it?

"Oh, they were impressed," he replied, "but the headlines were still devoted to Little Rock, not to sputnik."

Mr. MacNeal's observations have been substantiated repeatedly by American and foreign—friendly foreign—newspapermen.

Why Little Rock?

Why Little Rock of all places?

Arkansas has been associated in the minds of most Americans with moderation—with hard earned and solid progress in human understanding and economic recovery, with statesmanship on the national scene.

Yet the world believes that the armed power of an American state was involved to prevent nine Negro children from obtaining an education.

And bear in mind what an education means to the world's backward millions struggling for human identity, and bear in mind that of the world's 2½ billion people, two-thirds have colored skins.

The world believes that this action was so acceptable to the people of an American State that it took not alone the persuasive power of the courts, but the repressive power of superior armed force as well to reverse it.

I'm not here tonight to argue with you whether those nine Negro children should be in that school or when. In the light of the present world crisis, that question is incidental.

The rest of the world is not going to wait around for us to make up our minds where we stand on integration.

The people of the rest of the world are making up their minds right now, whether to stand with us Americans or against us.

And it makes a lot of difference to the uncommitted people of the world where we—the American Nation—as the strongest remaining free nation—where we stand on integration.

These uncommitted people say to us, "How can you Americans, who claim to man the very citadel of democracy and equality, how can you insist on maintaining second-class citizenship? Do you Americans believe what you preach—or don't you?"

Unfortunately, we cannot answer them with "yes, but * * *."

We cannot say to them, "Yes, but not now."

The other side is talking about right now and serving notice that there isn't time to pause and ponder. That there is time only to pick the winning side.

We cannot say to them "Yes, but there are some difficult legal questions involved."

Admittedly there are, and in those years when we had time to debate them, they were interesting.

Take the question of States rights for example.

To what extent are we, a single nation, bound to a single destiny; and to what extent are we a collection of 48 commonwealths, free to go our own separate ways and determine our own destinies?

Despite the millions of words that have been written on the subject, and the tragic lengths that men at times have gone to in disputing the issue, the concept of a nation made up of self-determining units set upon separate and divergent courses could not and cannot be made to work for very long.

Recently I read of experiences of the officers of the Confederacy even as they fought for the concept of State supremacy in the Civil War. They, who had written into the preamble of their constitution the words "We the people of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character." They themselves were to experience the frustrations described by A. M. Houser, in his new book, Lincoln's Education, from which the following quote is taken. I quote:

"The officers of the new Confederacy had scarcely taken their seats before their chickens, led by State sovereignty and strict interpretation, began coming home to roost. It seemed impossible for them to make an order or pass a law but some court, commonwealth, or individual would declare it unconstitutional; therefore null, void, and of no effect.

"States claimed a right to withhold or withdraw their troops. Some organized a State militia, the members under their exclusive control and exempt from conscription by the general government.. One Christmas present received by the Confederate Government, in 1863, was a letter from Governor Vance, of North Carolina, threatening to collect his militia and levy war against the Confederate troops.

"A citizen of North Carolina, arrested by order of the Secretary of War, was rescued and set free by this militia. Some Confederate States passed exemption laws which rendered great bodies of men free from conscription by the general government.

"In 1863, it was estimated that one-half of all those available for military service either could not be found or had been exempted from service. The Confederate Congress repeatedly—twice in one week—refused the President permission to declare martial law. No Supreme Court was established, so each local judge decided the Constitution and laws in accordance with his own beliefs or prejudices."

That, my friends, is a matter of history.

When the concept of one Nation, under one flag, and cemented together by a single constitution, was affirmed in the blood of the Gray and the Blue, we as a people then started on the rocky road of making that Constitution work. The Constitution was amended and interpreted many times in the light of changing conditions, new challenges, and the added enlightenment of education.

We have had many contests, bitter, grueling and costly, over the implications and impact of the basic law. And foremost among the points of conflict has been the 14th amendment provision that: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

Some of my friends in the South argue that the 14th amendment was never properly ratified. But they do not argue it too seriously. Even such an able exponent of the southern cause as James Jackson Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader, admits that by tacit acquiescence over a period of 90 years the 14th amendment has been recognized as a valid part of the Constitution. That acknowledgement, one might say, is a forward step.

If the 14th amendment is a valid part of the Constitution, there remains the argument over what it means. Sixty-two years ago when the United States Supreme Court first considered the amendment in connection with segregation, it held in effect that if Negroes were provided with facilities equal to the facilities provided for whites there would be no violation of privileges of citizens of the United States.

After that decision, the South breathed a sigh of relief. Its way of life had been saved. The Supreme Court was praised as the protector of States rights. Negroes could be kept in their place which was not described specifically but turned out to be a place somewhat inferior to that reserved for citizens of lighter skin.

After half a century of operation under the doctrine that separate facilities were equal facilities, the Supreme Court took another look at the entire problem and decided, unanimously, that it had been wrong.

The Court found in effect that separate facilities cannot be equal facilities. It decided that the mere fact of separation does things to people.

The court order against segregation brought it as many brickbats as the 1896 decision upholding segregation, had brought it flowers. Some, who were unacquainted with the fact that judicial history is marked by frequent reversals of earlier opinions, wanted to make it illegal for the Supreme Court to change an opinion once made.

They would require the Supreme Court to be all-wise and infallible the first time around.

Some have wanted Congress to take away certain appellate powers of the Supreme Court—appellate powers in school segregation cases, for example. I wonder if they have considered the consequences of that proposal? The Constitution says the judicial power of the United States shall extend to cases arising under the Constitution.

If the Supreme Court were denied the authority to decide constitutional questions, those questions would still have to be decided. In that event, the lower courts—either the United States district courts or the circuit courts of appeal—would become the final arbiters of what the Constitution means.

If there were no Supreme Court of final appeal, the Constitution would mean one thing in Iowa, something else in Florida, and something else again in California. United States citizenship would not carry the same privileges and immunities in the East, the West, the North, and the South.

A better pattern for anarchy and the breakdown of law could not be imagined.

Some complain that the Supreme Court based its school desegregation order on modern theories of sociology rather than on law.

If that is true, could it not also be true that the 1896 decision, approving separate but equal facilities, was based on out-moded theories of sociology in that day?

Court decisions must be based on the facts as well as the law. In 1896, the Court took it for a fact that separate facilities for Negroes and whites would turn out to be equal facilities. A half century of experience showed the fact was otherwise—the earlier decision, based on a false premise, was held to have been wrong.

So I suggest that law may be rooted in workable human relations as well as human relations may grow in the soil of the law. And we should remember that our existence as a free people rests on respect for law.

Some southern newspapers have referred to the Little Rock incident as a local problem.

If I can bring any message to you, the newspapermen of Arkansas, it would be that you must not, you dare not adjudge Little Rock to be a local issue.

Little Rock, Ark., whether you or I like it, has become an outpost in America's cold war struggle. A struggle against alien forces who would enfold behind the iron curtain the billions of off-white people who populate the earth. Little Rock is an outpost just as surely as are our Strategic Air Command bases on the periphery of the Soviet empire—standing out there between us and possible death by blast and by radiation.

Four years ago, American prestige abroad was shaken by our internal crisis over McCarthyism. People throughout the world were shocked by evidence that in the America of the Bill of Rights—symbolizing to all that men dream of human dignity, fair play and due process of law—those great principles were being trampled by the same people who conceived them and brought them such glory.

We learned then, as we never appreciated before, that we cannot talk and write one way in the United States and act another—if we are to hold the leadership of the free world.

We cannot fight in the cold war of ideas with alibis and rationalization of our own progress.

We must fight the war of ideas with the truth of our own slowly improving behavior. And behavior that suggests contempt for law and stubborn opposition to equal rights among persons of all colors, hands over weapons of murderous potential to our enemies. Such weapons could help bring about our downfall in act I of Little Rock and Human Relations.

How are we to overcome the potentials of failure in the second act of the American tragedy—possible defeat in economic competition—the bread-and-butter aspects of our way of life?

Lenin once predicted that the United States would drown itself in a sea of red ink.

We have done much to give the lie to that prediction. While we are not depression proof, we have demonstrated that we can successfully survive crises to which other nations have succumbed. But today no intelligent person can discuss American economics save in terms of reference to the flanking cold-war movement of Soviet competition.

Barbara Ward, British author, and one of the great authorities on world affairs, recently put together some significant words on this subject. Writing in the New York Times magazine, Barbara Ward said:

"Khrushchev has issued his challenge in the very field in which the West—above all, America—is best fitted to respond. In some measure, he admits it. The concrete aim he sets the Communist world is to surpass American standards within the next decade. In a very real sense, the material aim of the Communist world revolution is to achieve the American way of life.

"Who, then, are better placed than the Americans and their allies to meet and reverse that challenge? Who are better placed to set their incomparable economic and technical organization to work to raise world standards and to expand their own wealth so that the challenger limps behind, his goal of parity always eluding him, his figures for steel and power, his statistics of living space and family budgets, his offers of aid and capital always and easily out trumped by the expanding resources and matching generosity of the free peoples?

"This surely is a competition into which our competitive society can enter with zest and confidence. We are being challenged to do exactly what we are best fitted to do by training and temperament and tradition. It is as though the Russians, instead of issuing a challenge at their national game of chess, had offered to take the Americans on at baseball. Production, expansion, productivity, technology, inventiveness, rising standards for all—could the free nations, with America at their head, be asked to achieve anything more congenial to their national genius, anything more profoundly in tune with their ways of thought and life?"

How will we answer Miss Ward's question? This economic competition is our game all right. But when we look around at the way some of our leaders are calling the signals we must wonder sometimes whether our side really wants to win. If we don't accept the challenge of our competitors for worldwide economic leadership, we will lose by default. We will lose the game and much more. And this would be the second act of the tragedy.

Finally, to the third act, foreign relations or man and the missile. This act could be the climax to our tragedy: our exposure to blackmail, if not extinction, by failing to meet and to overtake Soviet military and scientific competition in the manufacture and use of rockets, missiles, and the conquest of the wild, black yonder of space.

Through the long years of American mastery of machines, we of the United States have believed in our superiority in all things technological as we have believed in God himself.

Reports and rumors of Russia's great advances in machines and missiles were ignored, or laughed at. From the highest places came assurances of our mastery and our might.

Then came the day. The day not soon to be forgotten. It was sputnik day, October 4, 1957. Many of our leaders made fun of it. One said: "An interesting bauble." Another said: "What's a piece of iron in the sky?" And another said: "Sputnik has no military significance."

Our people were troubled. Their worry was not substantially eased by pronouncements from the men in the Government.

For 3 months now, we have been witness to incredible disclosures of our interservice rivalries, our muddled defense structure, the revealed frustrations of top military men and scientists who have become sickened by the red tape, the waste of energy and money, the absence of any sense of national urgency at the top of our Government.

Our people were not relieved of worry by the first postsputnik meeting of the National Security Council. After 2 hours of discussion, the Council announced that nothing much could be done until the rivalry was settled between the Army's Jupiter and the Air Force's Thor. This, the National Security Council suggested, might take 6 months.

Many people shuddered. With a world smoldering—we, the supposed leaders of the free world and civilization's last, best hope—must await the decision in a foot race between two of our service hosecarts before we could hope to put the fire out.

Our people were not relieved when the President later took to the air to allay the public's fears and referred to alleged rivalry between the services, and told of our current manufacture of 37 different General Motors missiles by three services and their satellite contractors.

After sputnik came muttnik, and we learned that this space traveler, the size and weight of a Volkswagen, was propelled upward by a rocket thrust of 1,200,000 pounds. There is no American scientist who has or will testify that our own rocket thrust as yet developed is more than half of that.

More recently the country has been warned by the Rockefeller and Gaither reports. These are chastening manifestos of humiliation to a people who prided themselves, in blind complacency, of being first with the best.

Are we reacting now with the directness, speed, imagination, and foresight for the future as the people so obviously desire? Let's hope the answer will be positive, demonstrated action by the President and the present session of Congress. If it isn't, then this will be the third and final act in our American tragedy.

The settings for the three acts I have outlined are in Arkansas, in the concrete canyons of our financial centers, and in the feverish atmosphere of our National Capital.

We in America will leave our own records for others to measure in literature, in remnants of culture and, perhaps, if all does not go well, in radioactive dust.

Let's go back some 60 million years to the dinosaur, the huge reptile that ruled the then world. The dinosaur ranged far and wide. One of his favorite areas was Colorado and his bones are to be found in our plains and mountains.

The dinosaur was mighty, and his will prevailed. But one day he disappeared.

Why?

He could not adjust to his changing environment.

And so may it be with modern man.

And so with us. Ask yourself:

Can we adjust to our changing environment?

From the beginning of time, the ages of life on this earth have been revealed and identified by fossilized evidence. The bones, for example, of the Java man, the Neanderthal man, or China man have told us much about the evolution of humankind.

Assuredly we are not unaware of the weaknesses of those prehistoric men, weaknesses which left them prey to the environment of their own times.

If in the last half of the 20th century we contribute to the disintegration of our own civilization, our failure may, from the perspective of history, be ascribed to at least three monumental defects in our character:

First, failure to accommodate ourselves to the challenges of human relations;

Second, failure to make our economic way of life work;

Third, failure to protect ourselves against the barbarism of modern aggressors.

In such an event, may not future students of our age find in the fossilized remains of our civilization remnants they may choose to call the Little Rock man, the Wall Street man, or the Washington man?

It is for us to decide.

If this tragic scenario I have outlined is not enacted, it will be because you—the newspapermen of Arkansas, and others like you the country over—see clearly and act courageously in this time of local, national, and international trial.

## PROCEDURES FOR REPORTS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 148) to pre-

scribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Goldwater | Morse |
| Allott | Gore | Morton |
| Anderson | Green | Mundt |
| Barrett | Hayden | Murray |
| Beall | Hennings | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hill | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Hoblitzell | Pastore |
| Bricker | Hruska | Payne |
| Bridges | Humphrey | Potter |
| Bush | Ives | Proxmire |
| Butler | Javits | Purtell |
| Byrd | Jenner | Revercomb |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Case, S. Dak. | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Kefauver | Scott |
| Church | Kennedy | Smith, Maine |
| Clark | Kerr | Smith, N. J. |
| Cotton | Knowland | Sparkman |
| Curtis | Kuchel | Stennis |
| Dirksen | Langer | Symington |
| Douglas | Lausche | Thurmond |
| Dworshak | Long | Thye |
| Eastland | Malone | Watkins |
| Ellender | Mansfield | Wiley |
| Ervin | Martin, Iowa | Williams |
| Flanders | Martin, Pa. | Yarborough |
| Frear | McClellan | Young |
| Fulbright | McNamara | |

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], are absent on official business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). A quorum is present.

Pursuant to the order entered on Thursday, January 23, 1958, the Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

## REPORT BY SENATOR ELLENDER TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: A REVIEW OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was delighted to note in the press this morning that the present administration is finally putting into effect some of the programs which I have been advocating to the Secretary of State and the President for the past 3 years. If one will examine my reports during 1955, 1956, and also the report I am presenting today to the Committee on Appropriations, it will be noted that I recommended and emphasized the great importance and value of an exchange program between our country and the Soviet Union.

Before I report to the Senate in detail on my most recent trip to Russia, I should like to review briefly some of the places which I visited.

On an easel in the rear of the chamber is a map showing the vast U. S. S. R., which, by the way, covers about one-sixth of the earth's surface. During the last 3 years I was able to visit what I regard as the most important industrial and agricultural areas in Russia.

I did not go to Russia as a tourist; I went there as an American citizen, in order to learn all I could about that country, our foremost adversary in the cold war. I had no difficulty whatever in visiting the various points I desired to see.

I was not followed around by any kind of Gestapo or secret police. I was permitted to take pictures of whatever I desired, with few exceptions. They were railroad bridges, airfields, and, of course, military installations.

I have in my office today more than 22,000 feet of 16-millimeter motion picture film which I took during 1956 and 1957. These movies were taken by me, at my own expense, and were processed at my own expense. The film I have is, of course, available for the use of the Members of the Senate—in fact, I should like to have it used all over the country, in order to better acquaint people of the United States with conditions behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in Russia.

It is my firm belief that if the people of the United States knew more about the Russian people, and if the people of Russia knew more about us, the great race in armaments could be ended.

Today there is fear on the part of the East and fear on the part of the West. Unless and until this fear is dispelled—unless and until confidence is restored between the peoples of East and West—disarmament and peace—for which all of us aspire—will never become realities.

Mr. President, my report contains, as I have stated, certain recommendations for improving our foreign policy position. These recommendations are simple. There is nothing complex about them. But, I sincerely believe that if they were put into effect, we could create a climate in which confidence could be restored between the people of the United States and the people of Russia.

On my first trip to Russia, I entered by way of East Germany. I went first to Poland, and then to Moscow. I visited in and around Moscow over an area approximately 100 kilometers in radius. I visited factories and farms—state farms as well as collective farms. Then I traveled to Kiev, thence to Odessa, and from Odessa, to Bucharest, Rumania.

In 1955, while in Moscow, I spoke with Anastas Mikoyan, Russia's No. 3 man, and the Politburo expert on trade and economics. He urged me to visit Russia again; he said I would be permitted to go wherever I desired—to make my own itinerary. That is exactly what I did in 1956. The map displayed in the rear of the Chamber shows the areas of Russia which I visited that year.

I entered Russia by way of Leningrad, visited in and around that city, and took photographs of factories, people on the streets, public markets, and so forth. Then I went to Moscow. While I was in Moscow, I again visited factories, farms, stores, and businesses in that entire area.

I traveled by automobile from Moscow to Yalta, on the Black Sea—a distance of almost 1,000 miles. I stopped at Kharkov, after motoring there by way of Tula, Orel, and Kursk. I visited many villages along my route and talked to the people working in the factories and on the farms.

I spent a few days in the Crimea, and saw the people of Russia at play.

From Yalta I went to Rostov by car. In order to go there, I had to retrace my steps since there is no direct road from Yalta to Rostov on the Don. I also traveled by automobile to Stalingrad, from Stalingrad, I flew to Moscow.

From Moscow, I flew over the Ural Mountains to Kazan, thence to Chelyabinsk, the Pittsburgh of Russia.

I flew over the so-called dry lands by way of Atbasar, Karaganda and Balkhash. Then I proceeded to Alma Ata, which is near the Chinese border. I spent considerable time inspecting the surrounding area.

From Alma Ata, I traveled to Tashkent. In that area, cotton is produced in large quantities and I was told that production is between 7 million and 8 million bales.

From Tashkent, I flew to Termeg and then crossed into Afghanistan.

During my trip that year I was able to talk to Mr. Khrushchev for over 2½ hours; the subject matter of my conversation was submitted to the committee as a part of my report last year. It was also made available to the State Department. Without going into detail concerning that conversation, it generally covered Soviet-United States relations. Mr. Khrushchev was very much interested in the visit I was going to make in his country, and he asked whether I had included Siberia in my itinerary.

I told him that I had not; I said Russia is a very large country, and that I did not think I would have time to visit Siberia. As it was, I spent over 1 month in Russia in 1956. But I said to him that if he would give me a raincheck, so to speak, I would like to see Siberia the following year, that is, 1957.

So, Mr. President, last year I returned to Russia by way of Polend, from Copenhagen, Denmark. I saw much of Poland.

From Warsaw, I flew to Vilna, Lithuania, and then to Moscow. From Moscow, I flew to Gorky, on the Volga River, from Gorky to Kazan, also on the Volga River, from Kazan I flew to Irkutsk, with two stops en route. Irkutsk is located about 41 kilometers from Lake Baikal, one of the largest inland freshwater lakes in the world. I traveled all

over that area by automobile; I also traveled on Lake Baikal by boat.

From Irkutsk, I proceeded to Novosibirsk, which is a great industrial center in Siberia. From that city I went to Barnaul, a great agricultural center, and then to Omsk, to Sverdlovsk, and to Kuibyshev.

From Kuibyshev, I flew to Kranodar, then Tbilisi, and finally Baku. I got out of Russia by way of Iran.

Mr. President, as I believe my colleagues will agree after the outline I have presented of the places I visited in Russia, I have seen the most important industrial and agricultural centers of the Soviet Union. I could describe in detail what I saw in these various places, but I will not undertake to do so at this time. Senators will find on their desks copies of my report, in which I have incorporated a diary kept by me on a day-to-day basis while in Russia. Many of the things I saw are described by me in that diary.

Mr. President, before describing some of the things I saw in Siberia, in particular, during my most recent visit, I should like to give a short background sketch of Russia, covering the period prior to the 1917 revolution through 1957.

An understanding of this background is necessary if we are to properly evaluate the present situation in the Soviet Union. I believe that with this background, Senators will conclude, as I have, that the Russian people are not well informed about our way of life. I believe they will also agree that the way of life which now has developed in Russia is a better one than the Russian people have ever had before, at any time in their history, although it is far inferior to our own.

In 1957, as in 1956, my conversations with the people of Russia were facilitated by my having at my side an official of the United States Embassy at Moscow who spoke and understood the Russian language. Besides making it easier for me to discuss America with the Russians I spoke to, the fact that the translations were made in the presence of a fellow American and with his help, assured me of maximum objectivity.

Almost uniformly, I found improvements in Russian conditions as contrasted with my findings of 1956, and the year before, 1955. As a matter of fact, some of my previous estimates—particularly with respect to Russia's agricultural potential—had to be modified in the light of my trip through Siberia.

This enormous area, which most of us consider the world's icebox—a huge prison camp, a vast waste of barren land—is actually becoming Russia's breadbasket. While the climate is somewhat more severe than that of our own upper Middle West, the area has proven itself capable of producing some fruits, much livestock and dairy products, and a large variety of root crops and grains. Yields of grains are high, although methods of planting, cultivating, and harvesting are obsolete by our own standards.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of my findings on this visit was change, and, with respect to the various goods and services available to the Russian consumer, the change was invariably for the better. Also, people are more talkative—they were more prone to assert themselves. Generally speaking, I found a much higher degree of contentment among the peoples of Russia than on my previous visits. In addition, I found considerable national pride, a pride which was visibly increased when the people learned of the successful firing of the first space satellite. I was in Russia when the event occurred and the news was made public, and there was much jubilation among the Russian masses.

Thus, in prefacing any account of my journeys through the Soviet Union, I feel it important to impress upon the Senate my three major impressions of post-satellite Russia.

First. There is an atmosphere of confidence.

Second. There is apparent domestic contentment, but a rising curiosity about America and an urge to forge ahead of us.

Third. There is a growing belief among the Russian people that their system is superior in all respects to ours in the West.

These three factors must certainly receive primary consideration in any policy our Government undertakes vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. But in considering these factors, they must be read against a background of Russia as it stands today compared with the pre-Bolshevik Russia of the czars.

Only by measuring present-day conditions in Russia by the comparative yardstick of conditions as they existed a quarter century ago can any proper perspective concerning this vast nation be attained. In addition, the conditions existing in the Soviet Union under communism and the Government's abolition of private property are important circumstances to be weighed before reaching any conclusion concerning future policies toward that country.

In Russia, the Government is supreme. Nothing else matters—only the Government. Every square inch of land belongs to the Government. All commerce and industry are Government controlled. Under no circumstances is an individual able to go into business for himself, not even as a barbershop owner or a taxi operator.

Instead, all crafts, in fact, all businesses, are incorporated into state managed entities where everyone works together for what Soviet leaders declare to be the common good of the state. Revenue-producing investments by the individual of any of his surplus funds are limited primarily to state institutions that lend money.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Someone has asked if the Russians ever pay taxes. My impression is that there are no taxes in Russia, because everybody works for the Government; the Government takes just what it wants.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct to a large extent. However, there is a small charge, in the nature of a tax, imposed by the unions to pay the recreational expenses of some of their members. The funds so derived finance rest trips for special workers. I saw many of these workers at play in Yalta while I was there in 1956.

There is also a small charge levied, sometimes as much as 5 percent of a family's salary, in order to permit the family's children to attend kindergarten, so that the mother and father can work.

There are taxes of that kind, but there are very few, if any, taxes imposed on the people of Russia for the purpose of running the Government. After all, the Government owns everything in Russia.

I continue with my observations concerning the background of and conditions in Russia.

The money deposited by an individual bears a small rate of interest, depending on the length of time it is left on deposit. This type of social and economic organization exists through all strata of Russia.

Under such a controlled system, in which the welfare of the individual is evidently sacrificed to the good of the state, Russia has been able, within a short span of years, to pull itself up from a weary, downtrodden nation, wracked by internal strife and bearing the heavy burden of a hungry, desperate class of peasant serfs under the old czarist system, to its present leadership of obviously high technological development.

Many Russian people today may have only black bread, cabbages, beets, potatoes, and a pot of tea—but today it is enough to fill their stomachs. To a hungry population, the mere advance of a crust of bread is an accomplishment—and one which, whether or not we agree with the manner in which it is done, must be recognized as a form of progress.

From the days of 1916, when almost all of Russia hovered together in abject poverty, in hunger, in a state of serfdom, while serving a fantastically rich nobility, the older people of Russia today can see visible signs of their march forward—toward national pride, better living standards, and industrial development—a march which today places them among the vanguard of the world's nations.

The younger people, who have known nothing but communism in their lifetimes, and who have had no opportunity to observe any other form of government, glory in their country's progress—and in the corresponding rise in the welfare of their fellow countrymen.

This, above all, we must recognize. And in that recognition we must, I believe, abandon the approach of some who, because they dislike or perhaps fear communism—indeed, I am sure they abhor this system of government as I do—will not hear or even listen to the spoken words of its accomplishments.

The mark of an intelligent soldier is to recognize the capabilities of his opponent. To mock a foe is to mock yourself.

Communism will not vanish because we ignore it. Neither will it disappear because we vilify it. It exists. It is functioning.

It has brought a new way of life to a people once left far beyond progress in the wallow of inner conflict. It has pro-

vided a better standard of living—no matter if we care to dismiss it as still far below our own—for an entire nation of people.

Of course, in the U. S. S. R. there is nothing remotely resembling the freedom of individual choice, action, and enterprise which we in the United States enjoy today. However, it must be recognized that in the Soviet Union, such freedom has never existed. Russian history bears ample witness to the lack of what we regard as basic principles of freedom. Under the czars, which is the period with which the typical elder or middle-aged Russian compares his life today, there was no freedom of the press, no freedom of expression, no freedom of economic choice for the average Russian. Opposition to the then existing government was ruthlessly ferreted out by a secret police whose methods were not basically different from those used by the Communists.

Perhaps the most astonishing accomplishment of the Russia of today is its rapid transformation into an industrial empire. That the tremendous growth of Russia's industrial economy has been reached in the short span of one generation testifies to the hard work done by the Russian people. To those who would dismiss, or soften the impact of this achievement by merely pointing out that it was accomplished by a ruthless leadership holding the combined noses of an entire people to the Marxist grindstone, it again must be remembered that compulsion is nothing new to the average Russian. Under the Communists, he exchanged the compulsion of the czarist aristocracy for the compulsion of a totalitarian state. The only change in the picture, insofar as Ivan is concerned, is that at least part of the nation's increased wealth has trickled down to him instead of all of it remaining in the pockets of a very few persons of supreme social status.

In other words, in assessing the present temper of the Russian people—not their present leadership, but their people—we must always bear in mind that there are no shades of gray in the picture of Russian development since 1917. Instead, there is only absolute contrast between the days prior to the October revolution and those now upon the colossus of Europe and Asia. The term "capitalism," as applied by the Communist leadership in describing the United States, does not reflect the system which our country actually enjoys today, but instead is used as a synonym for the system prevalent in Russia during czarist times. By insisting that all economic systems are either capitalistic—that is, czarist—or Socialist—that is, that now in effect in the Soviet Union—the Soviet leaders have been able to keep their people convinced that the Russian system today is the ultimate of perfection.

The Western World is now at a great disadvantage in waging a positive campaign to change this unbalanced and untrue picture laid before the Russian people, because there are not words available to convince them of the progress we have made, of the abundance we enjoy. To the average Russian, a system which would prove more beneficial than the one under which he now lives is inconceivable, simply because he has no knowledge of anything other than absolute exploitation under the czars compared with a much better way of life under communism.

As it stands, then, we must realize that the Russian people—as of this day, at least—are apparently well content with their way of life. The individual may not have progressed much, by our standards, but he has progressed—he is much better off than he has ever been.

Mr. President, I have read an extract from my report covering the background of conditions as I found them in the Soviet Union. I believe that background shows clearly the fact that as of today there has been no adequate way for us to inform the Russian people concerning our way of life—the way of the life of the people of the Western World.

The simple program which I have been advocating for the past 3 years stresses filling that great gap in our foreign policy. Since 1955, I have urged our Government to undertake an exchange program between the United States and the U. S. S. R. of people from all walks of life—teachers, students, legislators, in fact, as I repeat, people from every walk of life. That is one way by which I sincerely believe we can make it possible for the Russian people to learn more about us, thereby creating a climate of confidence in which the seeds of lasting peace may be nourished. Confidence is necessary on both sides of the Iron Curtain if we are ever to achieve any permanent peace.

Mr. President, I would now like to describe generally conditions as I found them in Siberia.

I have asked many people in our country what their ideas of Siberia were—what it looks like—and invariably I received answers such as "an icebox," "a prison camp," "a barren area where nothing grows."

I have also asked people here what they think the people of Siberia look like. Most of them answered: "Aren't they Mongolians?" "Aren't they Eskimos?" "Aren't they people of the yellow race?"

I have not found one single, solitary person—one who has not been to Siberia—who was able to give me a near description of what Siberia or its people really looks like.

Of course, I, too, was very much surprised when I visited Siberia. I did not think I would find great industry, tremendous water resources developments, or flourishing agriculture.

Today Siberia is the granary of Russia. There is as much food produced today in Siberia as in almost any other area of Russia. It even exceeds the production of the Ukraine.

In Siberia I saw wheatfields containing not hundreds of acres but thousands of acres—acres which produce as much as 30 bushels of wheat. Some of the land, of course, was less productive.

As an example of the tremendous growth of Siberia, Novosibirsk, almost in the center of this productive area of Russia, was just a little trading town of about 5,000 people in 1905. When the Trans-Siberian Railroad was routed through Novosibirsk, the population increased to 60,000. Today over 800,000 people live there.

The same is true with respect to Irkutsk, on Lake Baikal, of Omsk, and of Sverdlovsk, on the eastern slopes of the Ural Mountains. The population of those cities has quadrupled during the past generation.

What caused all of those people to move to those cities? The answer is very simple. The Russians have developed their Siberian industry more rapidly than I have ever seen industry develop anywhere else. They have also been rapidly exploiting the hydroelectric potential, in which Siberia is wealthy.

I visited one of the big foundries in Novosibirsk, and saw a plant manufacturing hydroelectric turbines which will produce 200,000 kilowatts. The largest turbine in the United States will produce 105,000 kilowatts. I saw foundations being laid in Novosibirsk for a plant to produce turbines of 300,000 kilowatts capacity.

The Lake Baikal region is the source of much of Siberia's wealth. Before I visited that region I thought Lake Baikal was surrounded by desolation, where little or nothing grew. I was mistaken. I found that Lake Baikal is surrounded by forests.

In addition, 363 rivers or creeks flow into Lake Baikal, yet it has only one outlet, the Angara River. That situation is a natural for hydropower development and the Russians are putting it to full use. I visited one hydroelectric plant on the Angara River which, by the end of this year, will produce more than 800,000 kilowatts.

About 300 miles north of that site, near Krasnoyarsk, another hydropower plant is being erected, which will produce 3.2 million kilowatts, almost double the capacity of the largest we have in our own country. It is there that the 200,000 kilowatt turbines to which I alluded earlier are to be placed.

The Angara River flows into the Yenisei River, which in turn flows into the Arctic Ocean.

On the Yenisei River, not very far from Krasnoyarsk, a survey is now being made into the possibility of erecting a facility which will produce 3.6 million kilowatts, again almost twice as large as the largest in our own country, Grand Coulee.

This water resources development is being greatly expanded. With the increased availability of electricity to power industry, more and more people are moving to the area. In addition, great coalfields and many gold mines are found around Irkutsk. All natural resources in that area are being developed. Hence, as a result of this development—along with the increasing availability of coal and water power—Siberian industry is rapidly growing.

I might say that the people who are moving into that part of Russia are the same kind of people as those who made America great—they are pioneers. They are willing to work. One does not find any Mongolians or halfbreeds

there. The people are all of European stock, who have migrated to Siberia before and since the revolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator for the statement he is making to the Senate, and, through the Senate, to the American people. In particular I wish to express my deep thanks to him for his reference to the hydroelectric power development in Russia, because it stresses what so many of us have stressed, that the energy of civilization is the energy of power which man can develop from the natural resources which God has given us.

The emphasis which the Senator from Louisiana has just placed upon power development in Russia illustrates very well why some of us have fought so long and so hard in the Congress over the years for the maximum development of the great energy resources of America. We have a dramatic illustration, from the lips of the Senator from Louisiana, that the future of our civilization is dependent upon our not wasting our electric-power resources. However, it is important that we have full development of such resources, and not underdevelopment of the river basins of America, if we are to keep abreast of Russia in the great contest of 100 years before us, between freedom on the one hand and Russian totalitarianism on the other.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I am greatly indebted to him. He is performing a great service here today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator, I am in complete accord with what my good friend from Oregon has said.

What I have said about power development is only the beginning. I have not touched upon the facilities on the Ob River, just north of Novosibirsk, where a great facility is being erected which will produce 800,000 kilowatts. Two more facilities are scheduled to be built on the same river.

Inasmuch as we are discussing hydroelectric power, I would like to touch briefly upon dams being built on the Volga River. I visited six of those huge dam sites. In order to increase the volume of water in the Volga River, the Russians are now in the process of diverting into the Volga two rivers which now flow into the Arctic Ocean. When the hydropower facilities on the Volga and its tributaries are completed, the Volga River alone will produce 65 billion kilowatts a year. Think of that—65 billion kilowatts a year.

Few of us knew about those projects. The trouble was, as my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] pointed out last week, that the people of this country were kept somewhat in ignorance of what was going on. They were told, "Let Russia alone, and sooner or later she will collapse." From what I saw, the Russians are not about to collapse. I would say they seem to be on the march.

The people of Russia are becoming more and more educated. As I shall point out, the expanding educational system will probably sound the death knell of communism as it now operates in the U. S. S. R. For one thing, the Russian people are thinking for themselves more and more.

There is a great surge toward decentralization today in Russia. Senators have read about it. I discussed the subject last year with Mr. Mikoyan. During my conversation with him, as my diary will show, I expressed surprise that Russia's sixth 5-year plan had not been announced, and I told him that I was curious to learn why that was. He said, "Senator, we presented the sixth 5-year plan to the people of Russia, the local oblasts, republics, and so forth, but they refused to accept it."

Why do Senators think they refused to accept it? We can read between the lines. The previous 5-year plans had promised the Russian people more consumer goods—a promise which did not come true. Instead, Russia's resources were devoted to preparing for a war which I hope will never come.

The people of Russia want more consumer goods. They desire a greater voice in the operation of their own Government. Believe it or not, that is a fact.

Recent issues of the Washington Post have contained an Alsop column, along with a news story to the effect that collective farms in Russia were now to be permitted to own farm implements. Similar articles appeared in other newspapers.

In Russia there are two kinds of farms, collective and state. There are no privately owned farms. A state farm is owned and operated by the government. The people who work on it are paid a salary, and, I might add, they are pretty well paid.

Collective farms are operated by a certain number of families. Some collectives may have as many as 500 families operating them; others may have as many as a thousand. These people agree to work together and divide the profits. As I pointed out in my reports of 1955 and 1956, and as I repeat in my current report, the people who operate these collectives do not like the idea of having to go to the Government, to what they call the machinery tool stations—which are operated by the government—to get implements with which to cultivate and harvest their crop.

This is only a natural development. An MTS may serve as many as five or six collectives. But it has turned out that some collectives have been able to get the necessary implements from the station, whereas others could not. That caused a great deal of dissatisfaction among the farmers, to the point where Mr. Khrushchev announced, only 2 days ago, that collectives would be permitted to own their own tools, tractors, plows and so on. That announcement was the end result of a gradual process, and it certainly did not come voluntarily from the Moscow level. It came about because the people demanded it.

It is the Russian educational system—the rising level of Russian education—the tendency of the Russian people to think for themselves, to assert themselves—that is bringing a growing change. The announcement of the new farm equipment ownership policy is just one small example of this change.

My good friend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has spoken of the Russian educational system. He has referred to the efforts made by me, by the late Senator Taft, and others, in trying to have a decent aid-to-education program placed on the statute books.

Because of that failure, we now find that there are serious defects in our own educational system.

I wish to say, without fear of contradiction, that if we disregard the teachings of atheism and communism in the Russian schools, we can learn a great deal from the Russian school system.

There is no such thing as an elective course in a Russian high school. In our schools, of course, a student can elect many such as cooking, interior decorating, driver training, and others. Many of these so-called electives are of little value; most are chosen by students because they provide an easy way to obtain credits.

In Russia, on the other hand, courses are prescribed. There no—or, at least, only a few—electives are available in the secondary schools. Today compulsory education through the high-school level prevails in Russia in cities of 5,000 and over; in the country and in cities below that population education is compulsory up to the seventh grade. Plans are under way now, I was told, to get more teachers and more schools so that there will be universal secondary education throughout Russia.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will be happy to yield in a moment. Students in Russia enter school at the age of six. They begin studying fundamental mathematics in the sixth grade, chemistry in the sixth grade, and physics in the seventh grade. They study those subjects until they graduate.

They must take a foreign language, either French, English, or German. However, the study of one foreign language is compulsory.

In general, school pupils in Russia must follow a prescribed course of studies. There is no wide selection of easy courses, such as we have in our own country.

Before a student graduates he is given every opportunity to make up his mind as to what profession he would like to follow.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would hope to ask the Senator a question, if I might, with particular reference to what he is saying about the Russian educational system.

Before stating my question, I should like to say that the Senate is very fortunate that one of its Members has had access to Siberia. I recently read a book about American history, which explained that one of the reasons our country had such fortunate relationships with France, which was the dominant power

in Western Europe during the 19th century, was that leading Americans, like Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, had the opportunity of becoming personally familiar with the French people.

During the Second World War, I was stationed at Whitehorse, in Yukon Territory, and at Fairbanks, in Alaska, and I remember how surprised I was to note how proficient in mechanics and piloting airplanes and servicing vehicles the Russians were. These Russians had come from Siberia to take delivery of our lend-lease bombers in that distant realm in the Far North. Their skill confirms what the Senator has told us today.

This is the question I should like to ask of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is making such an informative talk to the Senate. Mrs. Neuberger told me that she had breakfast this morning with two outstanding educators from our State, who related to her how difficult it often was to attract able, intelligent, idealistic, and educated people into the teaching profession, because of the comparatively small financial rewards, and, frequently, the very low prestige which the teaching profession enjoys in certain parts of our country. What is the status of the teachers in the communities of Russia which the able Senator visited?

I ask this question not only from the standpoint of comparative salaries and standards of living, but as to the favorable recognition which teachers receive and the prestige which they are accorded. In other words, I refer to the general atmosphere which might induce an outstanding person in the Soviet Union to enter the teaching profession.

Mr. ELLENDER. Teachers, as a rule, are well paid. Many receive the equivalent of as much as 700 or 800 dollars per month. The teaching profession is considered one of the noble professions. Teachers are given good facilities in which to work. Of course, the buildings do not compare with ours by any means. However, when one goes through the school laboratories, one is very much impressed. They have all kinds of modern equipment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from Louisiana say that relatively, from the standpoint of contrast and comparison, a teacher in Russia is paid more and receives more recognition, with relation to the other people in a particular community in Russia, than is the case of a teacher in our own country?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would say so.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, there is a greater inducement to a young person in Russia to go into the teaching profession than there is in our country?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, because they have certain incentives, one might say. Teachers study at higher institutions at government expense. They are then assigned to positions according to what they have studied, and according to the level of knowledge obtained. In other words, they are given full opportunity to practice their profession, in the same way that a doctor or member of any other profession is treated.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is that not a salient lesson to us in our country?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said a little while ago, if we leave out the teaching of communism and atheism in Russian schools, we could learn a great deal from the school system in Russia. That applies not only to the schools themselves, but to what the schools teach, and also to the teachers themselves.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished Senator. Recognition of teaching is a vital matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course there are some schools in Russia which are still on a par with our little red schoolhouse of old and which one still sees even in some parts of our own country. The development I have referred to does not take place to the same degree all over Russia, but it is there, and the products—the graduates—of the school system are in evidence. They are now becoming the leaders in Russia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator gets off the subject of education, and before I ask him the question I have in mind, I wish to join in complimenting him upon the very fine report he is making and on making available to the Senate and to the country the benefit of his experiences. I think this is something of which we need a great deal more. The Senator from Louisiana is to be commended for having taken so much trouble and for having devoted so much of his time, when the Senate is in adjournment, to accumulating this knowledge. I think what he has done is highly commendable.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. As my good friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] said to me, "That is plenty of work beyond the call of duty." But I am glad to do it, because I do not know of an area of the world with which the people of America are less familiar. The more we know of it the better off we will be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. I think this is a subject of which we all need greater knowledge, if we are to follow a wise course.

On the subject of education, I wish the Senator would develop, from his knowledge of the situation, this thought: I have seen it reported that the Russians are quite selective in the way they apply education. In the earlier stages of primary education they will give everyone an opportunity. But about the 6th or 7th year they begin to test the youngsters. Those who show an ability to go ahead and acquire advanced knowledge in the sciences or the languages are given the opportunity to go further. But the Russian educational system is quite ruthless in eliminating from higher education those who are not able to acquire it, and those persons are then sent off to the technical or vocational schools. Would the Senator develop that thought?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to do so. The Senator has anticipated me.

After a child reaches, let us say, the 5th grade, or when he is about 10 or 11 years old, he is given an opportunity to join the Pioneers. This organization maintains camps and clubhouses. When I first asked our officials about Pioneer camps, I was told that they are institutions where children are taught communism and atheism. That may be so; I will not deny it. But the Pioneer camps are also educational institutions. They are made up of many clubs and subclubs in which the children learn botany, zoology, physiology, music, and art, among other things. Lectures are given to Pioneer clubs by doctors, chemists, physicists, and representatives of other professions. Through these clubs, interest in special fields is developed.

If a child shows interest and proficiency in a certain subject, he is given an opportunity for further study in that field. If a child appears to be proficient in medicine and wishes to become a doctor, he is shown how a hospital operates. If he shows an aptitude for mechanical engineering, he is taken to a factory where large engines are made, and so on.

A child is given every opportunity to determine for himself what his field of future study may be. He is given an opportunity to make up his own mind not only in the Pioneer camps, but even at school. He also gets advice from his parents and his teachers.

After a Russian high school student selects a profession, he is given certain tests. If these tests indicate proficiency in the chosen field, the student is sent to college. Some continue in medicine, some in chemistry, some in physics, some in the other professions or sciences. In other words they are given the opportunity but must pass tests in order to qualify for further education.

In response to a question I asked in practically every secondary school I visited last year, I was told that only from 35 percent to 40 percent of the students who graduate from them go on to higher educational institutions. Those who do have all their expenses paid. The students do not have to worry about tuition. They do not have to worry about money to pay for their lodging and board. The government furnishes that to them.

What happens to the others—the 60 percent or 65 percent—who do not go on to the higher institutions? They work in the factories and the fields. However, their education has not ended. Connected with Russian factories are institutions—schools—which teach employees more about the work they are doing.

It often turns out that a youth rejected for college training at the secondary school level, later shows proficiency in engineering or medicine, let us say, after he goes to work in industry or agriculture. If this is the case, he is given an opportunity to continue his studies in an institution of higher education.

It has been said that the Russian children are arbitrarily forced into a profession. Certainly, much persuasion is used, but I saw no evidence of force being used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is about to leave this subject, I wish to comment on another matter. A moment ago the Senator mentioned that the schools expose the students to the arts. Did the

Senator visit the Bolshoi Theater in Moscow, and will he comment upon the quality of the arts which have been developed, such as the ballet, or the music, or any of the other activities in Russian art? Would he mind commenting upon whether there is anything in Washington as good as the Bolshoi Theater?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was my privilege in Moscow to see a performance of the Swan Lake ballet. I was enthralled with the fine performance I saw and the beautiful music I heard.

Even in Siberia, the arts are stressed. I attended three or four operas, in Omsk, and in Novosibirsk. There I heard the finest kind of music and listened to the finest of singers. I remember attending one performance of the light opera, Odessa. It was simply magnificent. The musicians, actors, and singers were all trained in Moscow and were given the opportunity to further their studies at the great conservatories which are located throughout Russia.

The Russians are very proud of their highest scientific institute——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Academy of Science?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Academy of Science. I visited the building which houses the academy's central office in Moscow, 2 years ago. I also visited a branch of it in Novosibirsk during my recent trip.

We must watch Novosibirsk. In my opinion, Novosibirsk is going to become one of the greatest industrial centers of the Soviet Union.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield briefly, once more?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to recall that the Senator from Louisiana was a cosponsor of Senate bill 472, in 1948, and was a member of the committee which reported it, as I recall. That bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 58 to 22, but it failed of passage in the House. We have lost 10 years on that program. It was a program for general assistance. It was not confined either to science or to buildings, but it was for general assistance to education. The Senator from Louisiana was eminently correct then, as the evidence has proved.

This other thought occurred to me: In the last year there was on foot a movement, which I thought would succeed, to erect an opera house in the Nation's Capital, so that in that field the United States would make progress, similar to that made by Russia. But what happened to that attempt? By a narrow margin, the site for it became controversial; and now nothing is being done; and apparently there is no hope for our country even to enter into that field with any assistance from the Federal Government.

I submit that is a rather discouraging record in those two fields. Does not the Senator from Louisiana agree?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to take the position that the United States should emulate Russia in all the things that Russia does. But I return to the proposition I first enunciated when I initially suggested an exchange program in 1955.

When I said a few nice things about what I saw in Russia at that time, I was vilified; called pro-Russian and pro-Communist—just because I told the truth about what I found in Russia, and so informed the people of the United States.

Today, I am proud to say that the administration is at long last following some of the suggestions I first made in 1955, which I repeated in 1956, and which I emphasize again today. I am beginning to believe that the work I have done is starting to pay dividends. However, I do not want any credit; I just want to help my country. I do not want to see us continue the policy which has brought little, if any, success, so far as our relations with Russia.

I wish to discuss one other method the Russians employ in encouraging their people to work hard, propaganda.

The people of Russia are kept constantly informed of developments in their country, and thus they become interested in them. The people of Russia are given credit for what they do. They are also rewarded in many ways. For one thing they are paid fairly well, depending on their capabilities. I found when I visited some of their collectives, for example, that a tractor driver could be paid the equivalent, in American money, of $700 or $800 a month.

But, most important, propaganda within Russia is constant and very effective. Wherever one goes the radio constantly blares out the accomplishments of various regions. The Russian Government stimulates competition between the people of various areas. The people are told: "Look at what the people of Moscow did. Consider what the people of Novosibirsk have done. Just see what the people of Sverdlovsk have been doing. Cannot you exceed those goals?"

In that connection, let me refer specifically to one such example of propaganda which I saw myself, dealing with the huge dam at Kuibyshev. When that project got under way, the people of the locality were called together and were told what was to happen. They were told what they could expect, and were informed that the project was their own. The Russian propagandists took motion pictures of the people who visited the site. Other motion pictures were taken when the river was closed, when the turbines were installed, and when the first power was produced.

These pictures were made into a complete motion-picture film, distributed throughout the Soviet Union, and used by the Russian leaders as an example of what people working together under socialism could accomplish.

In addition to this form of propaganda, the Russian Government also lavishes praise upon the country's workers. Medals, certificates and other awards are made to outstanding workers. I saw many of them proudly displaying their decorations. In all the factories, one sees photographs of the most proficient workers on the walls—a veritable honor roll. All the workers work hard because they desire to have their photographs included in the display—to have their names on the honor roll.

The recognition given individuals for accomplishments is not confined to industry. Agriculture workers, too, receive awards. For example, while in Siberia, I saw some of the finest wheat that I have seen anywhere in the world—just as good as any wheat we have in the United States. It was developed in Siberia, for use in Siberia. It cannot be grown successfully south of Siberia, but it is well adapted to the weather and conditions existing in Siberia.

Motion pictures were taken of the efforts to develop this new type of wheat, and, like the pictures of progress on the dam at Kuibyshev, were shown all over Russia. While I was in Moscow, I also saw some motion pictures of the progress being made with apple growing in Siberia. Imagine how difficult it must be to grow apples in Siberia, where the temperature drops to as low as 30° or 40° below zero. In Siberia, apple trees grow horizontally, instead of vertically. At any rate, whenever a development of the kind I have discussed is achieved, it is recorded on motion picture film, and this film is shown to all the people of Russia, to inform them of the progress which has been made, to make the Russian people feel that they are part and parcel of all these developments and this progress, to stimulate them to more and more hard work.

Mr. President, I could speak for many hours on the things I saw in the Soviet Union, but I shall not do so. My report, a copy of which is on each Senator's desk, contains detailed information on my journey through Russia, as well as my findings of conditions in the Near East, certain Iron Curtain countries, and France

At this time I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that appendix B of my report contains a complete history of our foreign-aid programs, including the amounts of money spent, and how these funds were spent. Appendix C is a history of our information program.

I believe this information will be of value and help to the Senate.

At this time, Mr. President, I turn to certain conclusions I have reached as a result of my most recent trip through the Soviet Union, with special reference to what I believe should be a "new look" at our foreign policy.

Since 1948, the year the Marshall plan began, our Nation has spent over $50 billion ostensibly to roll back the Red tide of communism. Initially, these expenditures were designed to restore the war-ravaged nations of Western Europe, in order to place them in a position to be of aid to the Free World should the Soviet Union attempt an armed aggression. Later, when proposed goals were reached, and even surpassed, the program was transformed from one of rehabilitation into one of development and mutual defense. Huge amounts were supplied to a host of coun-

tries to help build armies, for capital development, for technical aid.

I specifically refer to appendix B.

Viewed in the light of these vast expenditures, the record of achievement thus far is a dismal one.

Europe, fully restored to economic health, and enjoying unprecedented prosperity, still leans on the United States for participation in her home defenses—still refuses to bear her fair share of the Free World's burdens, particularly in the Middle East, Southeast Asia, Formosa, and South Korea.

Many other nations which we have assisted lavishly in the past are either actively practicing or moving in the direction of neutralism, if not outright alinement with the Soviet Union.

A few make no bones of the fact that they pursue a policy of pitting the United States against the Soviet Union in order to obtain the maximum aid from both countries.

Russia and her satellites—who are our avowed opponents in the global cold war—are not weakening, nor do their policies seem to suffer defeat or even frustration as a result of the heavy-spending approach we have used in the past. On the contrary, some of our advisers contend that the Russians are making gains in the Middle East, in Southeast Asia, in Africa, and even Latin America.

They are increasing their domestic agricultural and industrial bases, as my report amply demonstrates.

Their technology is constantly improving. Sputniks I and II offer abundant proof of this.

In almost every imaginable way, by almost any comparison that might be made, the United States today is in a much less favorable position in its international relationships—and particularly in its competitive position with the Soviet Union—than it was in 1948, despite the expenditure of over $50 billion of our dwindling national wealth.

As I have often stated, our country cannot continue on its present course without inviting not only ultimate international defeat, but national disaster.

Our present policy involves the continued expenditure of gigantic sums for foreign-aid purposes—over and above funds appropriated for the maintenance and modernization of our own Armed Forces—large appropriations for an Information Service; continuation of an almost unbearable and destructive tax rate that threatens to destroy initiative; the constant threat of near stagnation in the proper protection and preservation of our precious natural resources; and the promise of continued neglect of other vital areas of our national economic progress, particularly public power, housing, commerce, and others.

The recommendation I have advanced for the past 3 years is reemphasized at this time, that is: The time has come for us to take stock and to take a new look at our foreign policy.

Given a continued or heightened cold war of indefinite duration, the pursuance of our present policies must eventually result in the strangulation of our free-enterprise system, either by a continued decline of individual initiative and increasing reliance upon Government control and regulation of the economy, or eventual collapse of our total economy under the pressures of constantly growing Government spending and a swelling debt load.

Either of these alternatives would be disastrous.

The first would represent an easy default victory by state socialism over the forces of free enterprise, the second would carry with it the full realization of a basic tenet of Marxist communism, namely, that given a long-term crisis to face, the free enterprise—capitalistic—nations must fall of their weight.

The three visits I have made to the Soviet Union, the impressions I have gained during them, and the information I have gathered, have resulted in the following suggestions, which I offer for the consideration of the Senate—indeed, for the consideration of all our people.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the United States reexamine its approach to the waging of cold war. Recognizing that our actual adversary in this conflict is the Soviet Union, I recommend that this reexamination be undertaken in the light of the following, the implementation of which will help to dispel the fear of each other prevailing among the peoples of the East and the West, and restore mutual confidence, which is necessary if we are to achieve a lasting world peace.

First. Our information program directed to the Iron Curtain, and particularly to the Soviet peoples, should be expanded. In this expansion, all propaganda in its traditional forms should be abandoned. Instead, a positive approach should be applied uniformly. No reference to communism per se should be permitted. Accurate, factual reporting of the news and conditions in the Free World must be stressed. Every effort should be made to objectively depict the enormous advantages of our way of life, without disparaging the system presently in effect in the Soviet Union or behind the Iron Curtain.

Second. An expanded and realistic exchange-of-persons program between the Soviet Union and the United States should be inaugurated at once. This expansion can be achieved with no additional cost, by simply discontinuing many so-called information programs operated elsewhere that are unnecessary. As detailed in the body of my report, I am convinced that most of the peoples of the Soviet Union are sincere in their belief that the form of government and the economic system under which they live are second to none. This conviction flows from their inability to compare their present-day living standards, industrial and agricultural techniques, cultural progress, and technological development with anything other than those existing within the Soviet Union's borders in prior times. By exchanging delegations, from every walk of life—scientists, technicians, workers, farmers, students, legislators—the people of Russia would have the opportunity to see at first hand the boundless advantages which a free-enterprise system, founded on the bedrock of representative government, has to offer. In this program, however, extreme care must be exercised. Under no circumstances should a bona fide exchange program be permitted to become a means for infiltration of our borders by Soviet agents.

As I said previously, Mr. President, I am glad to note that the administration has at last seen the light, but the program announced yesterday is too small. The State Department desires to exchange 5 United States students, let us say, or 5 professors, or 5 technicians, if Russia does the same thing. I would go much further. I want a large group of Russian people to come here, to see what we have, to grow envious, so that the dissatisfaction about which I have been talking can grow so large that their leaders will either change their ways or the Russian people will change their leaders.

Third. With the change of emphasis in our cold-war policy toward the Soviet Union outlined in recommendations 1 and 2, designed to dispel the fear which exists between the peoples of the United States and the U. S. S. R. and to create a climate of confidence, should also come increased willingness upon our part to meet as often as possible with leaders of Iron Curtain countries, or the Soviet Union. Despite the record of broken promises which prior Soviet leaders have left in the wake of prior talks, our failure to join and participate in top-level conferences—even summit conferences—provide powerful ammunition for the Soviet propaganda machine.

It eases the task of Red information agencies to picture the United States to the people of the Soviet Union—along with other lands throughout the world—as unwilling to discuss peaceful solutions of world problems.

The committee is well acquainted with the desire of all Americans to attain and maintain a lasting world peace, a peace security in dignity and made lasting through mutual trust. However, our Government's failure to show a willingness to confer with Soviet leaders on the peaceful solution of world tensions is being broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the world as indicative of our aggressive intentions. With a weapon such as this at the command of expert Communist propagandists, we are constantly losing ground in our effort to maintain sympathy for and understanding of our international objectives.

Fourth. I recommend that our policy of attempting to create full-fledged modern armies in small underdeveloped countries be terminated, and that our assistance be confined to a realistic technical aid effort. This move would be designed to create a broad base of trained native peoples, a base which would attract private investment capital, or which—at the very least—could properly utilize any government-to-government capital which might later be made available for development purposes. An approach of this type would strengthen the economic stability of the country,

while at the same time allowing the country to maintain its prestige and self-respect by standing on its own feet.

By encouraging underdeveloped countries to maintain military forces far beyond their capabilities to support, we are actually creating conditions tailor made for the advance of communism.

As the Comptroller General noted in his report to Congress on an examination of the military-assistance program on March 31, 1957, the extension of arms aid to a number of nations has not always been motivated by purely military considerations, nor has the impact of this aid been properly evaluated in advance, or in conjunction with, its availability:

> The military-force objectives presently approved for United States support in certain allied countries are not always realistic in terms of recipient country manpower and financial capabilities are not always mutually acceptable to the countries concerned, and are not always motivated by military considerations. (Report, supra, p. 2.)
>
> * * * * *
>
> In a number of countries the United States has programed and is delivering military equipment in excess of that which can be effectively absorbed and utilized by the recipients at their existing stage of development. The recipients either have not been able to use the aid furnished because of their financial and economic incapacity and their manpower limitations or they have not desired to use the assistance for the purposes intended by the United States. (Report, supra, p. 3.)

Mr. President, in every report I have made for the past 4 or 5 years I have pointed out the fact that we cannot continue to affix large armies upon the economies of small countries, armies that are dependent upon us for their existence. I think it is high time we stopped that procedure. Whenever we impose upon small countries, countries which are just starting, the burden of providing funds in order to maintain large armies, they are unable to do anything else. There is no money left to develop their economies—to give their people a better way of life. If we do not grant them aid, they become angry with us. Yet, if they try to maintain large armies, they cannot supply the needs of the people of the country. That, as I said, brings on communism, or perhaps some other kind of ism.

As it now stands, the hasty application of great amounts of economic and military aid to newly independent, underdeveloped nations is often working to our extreme disadvantage.

First, in those nations whose economies are not sufficiently developed to maintain a military force of the capabilities desired by United States advisers, the gap in national income created by heavy military expenditures is sought to be filled by America extending so-called defense support assistance.

As administered in the past, this type of economic aid has frequently failed to trickle down to the masses. In a number of countries, particularly in the Middle East, and Southeast Asia, living standards remain visibly unchanged for the great majority of people despite large United States expenditures there by way of defense funds. There are, in these countries, two economic strata—the very rich, and the miserably poor.

The latter are, without exception, the object of constant Soviet propagandizing. United States policies, requiring the maintenance of large standing military forces, are blamed for low living standards. Capitalistic America is also blamed for lining the pockets of the rich while caring little for the poor.

In these same countries, as the body of my report demonstrates, the wealthy pay little or nothing in the way of income taxes, or, for that matter, all taxes as compared to us.

Mr. President, most Americans do not mind paying their just share of the taxes imposed by our Government provided they believe the money thus paid is put to good use.

But such is not always the case. For example, when I visit a country such as Iran, Lebanon, France, or Italy, where I know some people make as much as 4 times the income I make, but pay only 5 to 12 percent of their income in taxes, my blood boils. But what makes me really angry is the fact that the money which I pay in taxes—and I am frank to admit that I am in the 69-percent bracket—and that which is paid by other citizens, is used to give aid to those countries. They would not need help if only their governments imposed realistic taxes, and forced those who are able to pay to do so—just as is done here in the United States.

Thus, as the whole burden of defense and economic growth in a given nation may be ours, so is the blame for that nation's poverty heaped upon our shoulders.

Fifth. I again recommend, as I have for the past 3 successive years, that immediate steps be taken to solve the Arab-Israeli dispute. Unless and until this is done, the Middle East will remain an open, festering wound—one which poses a constant threat of infection to the entire world.

Our attempts in the past, through military and economic assistance, to appease both sides in the hope that the problems will solve themselves have not worked and will never work. That part of the world offers the U. S. S. R. a great opportunity to keep its propaganda machine almost constantly at work in its efforts to keep the world in turmoil.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to relate an experience of my own that bears on this subject. I had not been out of Russia more than 10 hours when I happened to meet one of the leaders of a Middle East country I visited. He said, "Senator, have you heard the latest?"

I said, "No; what is it?"

He said, "Do you know that today in Syria there are more than 2,000 Russian technicians, busily engaged in assisting the Syrians, and that war is imminent? Do you know that the Syrian Government has given to the Russians not only naval bases, but airbases?"

I was very concerned, and I asked, "Where did you get your information?"

He said, "From our representatives in various countries of the Middle East."

I said, "Are you certain of it?"

He said, "I am positive."

I got the same story from some leaders of other countries I visited. I told them, "If the condition is as serious as you say, I want to visit Syria and see for myself," especially since I had been there during every year for 4 years previously.

I asked our Embassy in Damascus to make appointments for me with all the leaders of any consequence in Syria. President Sayed Shukri el Kuwatly got out of a sickbed to talk with me. The President of the Syrian Parliament, H. E. Akram Hawrani, the most influential man in Syria, saw me. I saw the head of the army. I saw the head of the Ministry of Agriculture. The prime minister was away somewhere, but I saw his assistant.

Every one of them vehemently denied that Russia had anything like 2,000 technicians there, or that Syria had given bases of any kind to Russia.

After seeing these people I talked with our own Chargé d'Affaires, and our own attachés in Syria. They all said, "Senator, there is no basis for the statement that there are 2,000 Russians here, and that bases were given to Russia. We do not know anything about that." Yet that rumor was being spread all over the Middle East. Even the press of this country was filled with statements to the effect that war was imminent between Russia and the United States over what might happen in Syria. It would not take many such rumors to spark serious trouble. Mr. President, I repeat, that unless and until the Arab-Israeli question is settled, there will be the festering sore to which I refer—a sore which will bring much trouble in the future. It will require a great deal of courage to bring about a settlement, but it must be done.

I believe such a settlement could be based upon limiting Israel's borders to the 1947 United Nations Resolution, a limitation upon immigration into Israel, and policies designed to create and foster cooperation between Israel and the Arab countries. In this connection, let me read from my observations last year concerning the Middle East. I read from page 455 of Senate Document No. 31, 85th Congress, 1st session:

> I left this troubled area convinced of one thing, and that is that it will be impossible to establish a self-sustaining State of Israel. Particularly is that true if the minimum goal of not less than 2,500,000 inhabitants is to be reached. Should the population remain at 1,500,000 to 1,600,000, as is now the case, then this tiny little land might eventually become self-supporting. Even with that alternative, however, it would require an investment of many, many millions of dollars to build a sound economic base. As for sustaining a population of two and one-half to four million without foreign subsidies, this is seeking the impossible. If Israel's population ever reaches that point, world Jewry must be made to understand that it must continue to subsidize Israel heavily and indefinitely.
>
> It is heartwarming to note the progress being made in Israel, although at high costs. Because of an inadequate background in technology, the populations in the neighboring Arab countries are not as well developed for survival in today's atomic age as are the Israeli. What the Middle East needs is the promotion of a political climate under which the Arab and Jewish popula-

tion could cooperate to raise living standards and develop the economy of the area. If, as I contend, Israel cannot become a self-sustaining state to take care of displaced Jews, it might be well to explore the possibility of reducing the area of the present state to the size proposed in the 1947 United Nations resolution. To this end, fixed boundaries should be promulgated, and any additional Jewish immigration should be channeled into Arab lands, conditioned, of course, upon their being permitted to live in peace there. I feel that if only this could be achieved the Arab and Jewish populations, by working together, could achieve an unprecedented economic development. In other words, the technological training of the Jewish immigrants should be used as a nucleus around which to build a highly developed Jewish-Arab economic sphere of influence.

I cannot overemphasize the necessity for some early solution to the present difficulties in the Middle East. As I warned the committee in 1954, the Middle East is the most volatile place on earth—it, and it alone, offers the greatest likelihood as the source of world war III.

There is no possibility of lessening the dissension by extending assistance to both the Arabs and Israelis. We are beginning to be hated by the Arabs, and will undoubtedly be despised by the Jews if we refuse to further help them economically and militarily. It is time for the Jewish people of America and of the world to realize the complexities of the problems involved and the difficulties inherent in achieving a solution. It must be borne in mind, too, that comparatively few people of Jewish faith are involved, in contrast to the vast numbers of Arab people. A solution built around the continued existence of the State of Israel—but a state required to remain in fixed boundaries—and designed to promote cooperation between the Jews and people of the neighboring Arab countries must be achieved. What the Arab leaders fear most of all is that Israel will expand and eventually take them over.

I am convinced that these views are especially pertinent today.

While I am convinced that the implementation of these recommendations would result in a much higher degree of success than a continuation of our present policies, it is not my view that they will work miracles overnight. On the contrary, the New Look I have advocated should take place concurrently with the maintenance of a strong defense by the United States. We must not lower our guard. A modern, efficient Defense Establishment is the best guaranty we have against any attempt on the part of would-be world conquerors to follow the path of aggression instead of peaceful international competition.

In essence, the burden of my recommendations involves the maximum use of the single greatest resource our Nation possesses—not dollars, but the tremendous abundance of both material and spiritual advantages which freedom has to offer.

America is the world's greatest showplace for the accomplishments of a free economy dedicated to providing a free people with the highest standard of living in the world.

With such an exhibit of the fruits of our labors, it should be readily apparent that, in comparison with our growth over the relatively same period of time, Russia's advance has been accomplished despite, rather than because of, the dictates of Socialist theories, and perhaps owes its success more to the hard work of her people than to any tenet or theory set forth by Lenin, Marx, or Stalin.

Let us open wide the doors to our showplace; let us welcome all who would come to see—to compare—to imitate.

Let us lay the foundation for trade and a restoration of commercial contacts between the east and the west.

Let us not apologize for our abundance, but, rather, let us display it to the peoples of the world as an example of what hard work can achieve for all who are willing to work.

Let us be honest enough to caution those who are to choose between socialism and freedom that such miracles are not wrought overnight, but must come gradually and through self-help.

Above all other things, let us not fear an honest competition with Soviet communism.

The approach I have outlined involves only the realization that it is time for our country to choose a more advantageous ground upon which to wage this most crucial battle of the cold war.

We have been confronted in recent years by what amounts to nothing more than an all-out effort on the part of the Soviets to defeat the democratic nations by peaceful means. Rather than see victory go to them by default, I urge our Government to pour its full effort into a massive fight for the minds of men—all men, everywhere.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana has just delivered a very powerful and important speech on Russian-American affairs. The significant thing to me is that he was permitted to make that speech today without interruption from either side of the aisle. Had he undertaken 2 years, 4 years, 6 years, 8 years, or 10 years ago, to make such recommendations as he has submitted, and to make the statements he has made concerning European and Russian affairs in particular, he would have been challenged before he reached his first recommendation.

The fact that his speech has been attentively received today indicates that we are really making progress.

I was particularly interested in what the Senator said about our constant attacks on communism as such getting us nowhere, and the recommendation that, instead of continuing such attacks and concentrating almost 100 percent on such attacks, we should endeavor to "sell" America.

A month ago I had occasion to visit some of the small American countries. I visited the USIS libraries in those countries. Their materials were worn out. They did not have enough material to work on. Those people were eager to obtain the material from our American libraries. In one of them 40 percent of all the material was in circulation at all times.

The thing which impressed me was that the material which seemed to be in greatest demand did not appear to be what might be considered propaganda material. It consisted of books and periodicals which dealt with everyday life in the United States. That was the material which was in demand. I believe that the same situation is true in other parts of the world.

The Senator from Louisiana has performed a valiant service, and I hope that other Members of the Senate, whether they agree with his recommendations in every detail or not, will give them the consideration they deserve.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator. I would say, however, that the recommendations I have just submitted were first enunciated by me 2 years ago, in 1956, based on my inspection during 1955.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Louisiana is contributing another vital chapter to the reports which he has been making for several years on his inspection trips to foreign countries. Having traveled with him in the fall of 1956 for about 3 weeks in the Pacific area, I am fully aware of the diligence and fairness with which he discharges his duties in trying to get factual information concerning the extremely expensive program of foreign aid.

I should like to ask the Senator whether in these many contacts and observations in the recipient countries it has been possible for him to reach any conclusions as to whether the spending of billions of dollars for military and economic aid has resulted in engendering friendliness and understanding among the peoples who have received those benefits from us, or whether there is actually discernible hostility, if not actual resentment, on the part of many of those nationals, because they fail to understand properly the motives of our foreign aid program. Will the Senator from Louisiana give us some conclusions on that particular point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I covered that issue at great length in my 1956 report. As it has often been said, it is impossible to buy friendship. I found instances of that in many places, but let me be specific. This past year, when I left Russia, I went to Tabriz, the second largest city in Iran. In Tabriz I found poverty the like of which I have never seen anywhere else, yet in that country we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to assist people.

I came to a school which we had built in Tabriz. Tax money from the Senator of Idaho and money from myself was used to build a high school there. It was quite large, and could take care of four or five hundred students.

I was shown the school by our ICA representative in that area, and I learned that we had erected the building 3 or 4 years ago. The condition under which we built it was that we would help to furnish money for the teachers for 2 years—then Iran would take over. At the time of my visit, the 2 years had passed.

I never saw such a disorganized school. Most of the teachers had gone away. The principal was mad as a hornet at us, and he said to me, "Senator, why don't you get your Government to keep

on sending money for our teachers?" There, in the principal, we have one angry person, and he is spreading his anger around. We find that situation all over the world. I found an even more distressing situation while in Tabriz, however.

I was taken to a rug factory, where 800 people were employed. Of the 800, 600 were children ranging in age from 8 to 14. The owner of that factory was violating the laws of Iran by employing those children, but he was not in the factory. He had left when he heard that I was coming there.

I could not get permission to visit the factory, but I did see some of it—including one area where little children, little hands, were tieing knots in rugs, to the chant of a big fat Persian.

Imagine that, Mr. President.

The owner is a rich man. He has a large factory, and his home is beautiful. I would wager that, although his income is probably 3 or 4 times mine, he does not pay more than about 8 or 10 percent of his income in taxes, while, as I have already said, I am in the 69 percent bracket. It makes me mad, and I think it makes our people mad, to think that we are paying high taxes to help countries which could well afford to help themselves if only the rich paid a fair tax rate. If Iran collected a proper tax from people like the wealthy rug merchant in Tabriz, it could pay teachers to use the school we built for the people of that country.

Democracy cannot be made to work in a country like that, where the government either refuses or is incapable of making the wealthy pay their just proportion of taxes, so that the poor can obtain a better way of life.

What would happen today if people in our country who were able to pay, paid only about token amounts of the income tax imposed by law?

The conditions I have referred to are not peculiar to Iran. One can find them in any country whose government is either incapable of making its people bear a just proportion of taxes, or refuses to do so.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for the informative and enlightening address he is delivering today. It is one of the most interesting addresses I have heard in the Senate since I have been a Member of it. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he believes, because we have given foreign aid by billions of dollars to countries overseas, that when the showdown comes those countries will necessarily be with us because of that aid, or whether he believes they will go along with whoever they think will win, or will be neutral.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has posed quite a question. Let me answer it with a specific instance. The Senator knows that soon after NATO was established and we became a member of it, the force necessary to defend Europe was fixed at 66 military divisions, 30 of which were to be active divisions. Of this 30, we were to furnish 5½.

With all the money that we have given to Western Europe, after putting those countries back on their feet, after helping their recovery to a point where they are better off today than they have ever been, on the western front today we have, as I recall, only 12 active divisions. Five and a half of those active divisions are made up of American soldiers.

We also find that the NATO countries are still withdrawing their forces. France withdrew a great many troops and sent them to North Africa. We read last week that the British are going to reduce their armed forces by two-thirds. In addition, she is reducing taxes. Yet we in the United States are spending more and more on defense, including aid to these allies.

That, I believe, is indicative of what we can expect if our present policy is followed. Let me remind the Senator that Europe is no isolated example. Who is carrying the load in southeast Asia? Who is carrying the load in Formosa? Who is carrying the load in South Korea? We are.

That is why I say that unless we adopt a new policy—unless we take a new look we are in for further failures. We cannot continue along the road we have been traveling and maintain our way of life.

Mr. THURMOND. Merely because we have helped these nations with billions of dollars does not necessarily mean that they will stand with us if a showdown comes. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course. I can assure the Senator of that.

Mr. THURMOND. It is a matter of survival for them, and they will go with whoever they think will be the winner, or remain neutral. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. We have no guaranty that we will not find ourselves alone, I can assure the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to join with my colleagues in complimenting the distinguished Senator from Louisiana upon the very concise, excellent talk he has given us today concerning his recent trip to Russia, Europe, and Asia.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to law, the Speaker had appointed Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas; Mr. RABAUT, of Michigan; Mr. MILLER, of Maryland; and Mr. WAINWRIGHT, of New York, as members, on the part of the House, of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to law, the Speaker had appointed Mr. RILEY, of South Carolina; Mr. FRIEDEL, of Maryland; Mr. ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; and Mr. OSTERTAG, of New York, to be members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. GARY, of Virginia, and Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, to be members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. YOUNG, of Texas, and Mr. FINO, of New York, to be members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. ROGERS, of Colorado; Mr. MAGNUSON, of Washington; Mr. CHENOWETH, of Colorado; and Mr. SCRIVNER, of Kansas, to be members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York, as a member of the National Monument Commission, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948;

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; and

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee.

## FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the courage and spirit of the people of the Ukraine are foremost in our thoughts as we join with them in celebrating the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian independence day. After centuries of foreign rule, the intrepid people of the Ukraine finally expressed the eternal yearning of free man everywhere, and a new nation was born when the Ukrainian national council at Kiev proclaimed the independence of the country. Unfortunately, in 1920 this nation became one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism.

Despite years of enslavement, however, these people, who for such a brief period enjoyed freedom, have kept the spark alive. It remains for us in the free world to encourage and support their aspirations in full recognition of our common cause. Let us not forget that the strivings of the valiant Ukrainians, as well as those of the other Soviet enslaved people, are a part of the same effort in which all the people of the free world are engaged.

Today more than ever we are reminded that the struggle between tyranny and freedom will be won in the hearts and

minds of men. No group, in my opinion, better exemplifies the tenacity and adherence to principles of freedom than the valiant Ukrainians.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Goldwater | Morse |
| Allott | Gore | Morton |
| Anderson | Green | Mundt |
| Barrett | Hayden | Murray |
| Beall | Hennings | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hill | O'Mahoney |
| Bible | Hoblitzell | Pastore |
| Bricker | Hruska | Payne |
| Bridges | Humphrey | Potter |
| Bush | Ives | Proxmire |
| Butler | Javits | Purtell |
| Byrd | Jenner | Revercomb |
| Carroll | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Case, S. Dak. | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Kefauver | Scott |
| Church | Kennedy | Smathers |
| Clark | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Cotton | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Curtis | Kuchel | Sparkman |
| Dirksen | Langer | Stennis |
| Douglas | Lausche | Thurmond |
| Dworshak | Long | Thye |
| Eastland | Malone | Watkins |
| Ellender | Mansfield | Wiley |
| Ervin | Martin, Iowa | Williams |
| Flanders | Martin, Pa. | Yarborough |
| Frear | McClellan | Young |
| Fulbright | McNamara | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

---

## PROCEDURES FOR REPORTS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 148) to prescribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works with certain instructions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not know how long it is intended to continue the debate on the resolution. So far as those of us who favor it are concerned, we shall be very happy to have a vote on it in a short time.

In the course of the debate yesterday on Senate Resolution 148, questions were raised as to whether or not this proposal had been considered by the Western States and other western reclamation interests. The proceedings of the National Reclamation Association, at its conventions at Salt Lake City in 1956, and at Phoenix, Ariz., in 1957, have been reviewed. The record shows that at both conventions the procedures for the evaluation of land and water resource projects were discussed at length by the water policy committee of the association.

This water policy committee is composed of a representative from each of the 17 Western States, and it has the advice and counsel of State engineers and other spokesmen of the water interests of each State. If there is any organization that can speak for the water interests of the Western States—even though we may not always agree with their conclusions—it is the National Reclamation Association and its Water Policy Committee, which reflects the views of the organized western water interests.

The present chairman of the water policy committee is Mr. Hugh Shamberger, State engineer of Nevada, who is exceedingly well qualified for this position.

At the Phoenix convention of the National Reclamation Association in November 1957, the following comment is made on Senate Resolution 148 and printed in a pamphlet labled "The Voice of the West," embodying the resolutions and report of the water policy committee of the Association, approved by 17 State caucuses and adopted by the National Reclamation Association at its 26th annual meeting at Phoenix, November 6 to 8, 1957.

The cover of that publication reads:

> The voice of the West—Resolutions and report of water policy committee, approved by 17 State caucuses; adopted by the National Reclamation Association, 26th annual meeting, Phoenix, Ariz., November 6–8, 1957.

It was my happy privilege to be asked to deliver an address upon that occasion, and to see several Members of the Senate present at that time.

The comments with relation to Senate Resolution 148 are as follows:

> PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS
>
> The water policy committee in its 1956 report commented at length on the problems and proposals involved in Senate Resolution 281 of the 84th Congress, 2d session.
>
> After hearings and considerable staff work, Senate Resolution 148, responsive to the directions in Senate Resolution 281, was introduced in the 1st session of the 85th Congress and referred to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works.
>
> The principal purpose of Senate Resolution 148 is to provide full information to the Congress on land and water resource projects. Thus, Congress will be able to make the necessary decisions on resource policies and will be saved from abdicating that constitutional responsibility by default. Adequate information, as provided in Senate Resolution 148, should lead to a more intelligent evaluation of the land and water development projects.
>
> After a careful review of the policy questions involved in Senate Resolution 148, the Water Policy Committee expressed general approval of this measure. If the provisions of the resolution were to be enacted into policy procedures, the presentation of proposals to the Congress from the Departments of the Army, Interior, and Agriculture would be consistent, the data on projects would be presented in a more complete manner, and the possibility of unwarranted delays in the presentation of proposals would be minimized.
>
> Senate Resolution 148 is commended to the membership of the National Reclamation Association for careful study.

I point out that members of the water policy committee were not at all confused. They saw that the purpose was to provide full information to the Congress on land and water resources projects; and they stated:

> After a careful review of the policy questions involved in Senate Resolution 148, the water policy committee expressed general approval of this measure.

That is in line with what I tried to say yesterday. We studied this question as carefully as we could, and tried to make sure that what was offered to the Senate for action was proper.

It was stated yesterday that this measure should be in the form of a joint resolution. I believe that when the actual criteria are established, they should be in the form of a joint resolution. No one contends differently.

This resolution comes to the floor of the Senate in response to the Senate's own request for information. The Senate asked that the question be studied, and that a report be submitted to the Senate.

I hope the motion to recommit will not again throw this question into controversy, involving long continued arguments. We have considered the question. An opportunity was extended to any Member of the Senate to attend the hearings when they were under way. The hearings were finally concluded, and the report was submitted.

The hearings were on Senate Resolution 148, and not on some extraneous matter. Therefore I hope the proposal to recommit will not be agreed to, because it could only be construed as a motion to kill the entire study, which was undertaken after earnest solicitation on the part of any people who are very much interested in the water problems of the United States.

I hope the motion to recommit will be rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion of the Senator from Utah to recommit Senate Resolution 148 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works. I do so for several reasons.

First, the action of the two committees is not in conformity with the directions contained in the resolution, which committed this question to those committees for study and report.

Second, the resolution now pending before the Senate, if adopted, would constitute unilateral action on the part of the Senate, without concurrent action by the House, on a question which, in the committing resolution, was repeatedly described as a responsibility of the Congress.

Third, I support the motion to recommit because, in my opinion, this resolution would dilute the criteria for establishing the financial feasibility of a public-works project to the point where the most fantastic and extravagant projects contemplated for conservation of water would come within the definition of a financially feasible project.

With respect to my first reason, under Senate Resolution 281, the Senate assigned this subject for study by the two committees which I have identified. I submit to my colleagues that if one reads the resolution, he must reach the

conclusion that the Senate, when it passed Senate Resolution 281, contemplated that the Congress would fix the criteria upon which the financial feasibility of a public-works project should be determined.

To support that proposition I wish to read from section 1, as follows:

That it is the sense of the Senate that the stabilization of the national economy and the effectuation of the wisest, most orderly, and most economic utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation for the widest possible public benefit requires that the Congress continue to exercise all of its constitutional powers—

If the pending resolution is adopted, it will not place the authority in Congress, but will constitute an action unilaterally by the Senate, not joined in by the House.

Secondly, I now read from section 4, as follows:

That reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congress—

I now wish to read what in my opinion most forcefully points out that when Senate Resolution 281 was adopted it was intended that the recommendation made by the two committees should be acted upon by the Senate and House of Representatives, not by the Senate alone.

I now read the concluding paragraph of Senate Resolution 281:

SEC. 6. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed jointly to study, in consultation with other appropriate committees and executive agencies, and to design and to formalize comprehensive and particularized sets of standards and overall criteria for the evaluation of all proposed projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources—

I omit reading a few words, and resume my reading—

all to the end that the Congress shall fully exercise its constitutional powers—

I submit that the language in Senate Resolution 281 clearly declares that this disputed subject should be settled by Congress, not by the Senate alone.

So much for that phase of my support of the recommittal motion.

I now come to what I believe to be the more fundamental objection to the pending resolution. There are now about $8 billion worth of backlogged public-works projects on the shelves. Last year we passed a bill authorizing the construction of $1,500,000,000 worth. That bill is now pending in the House. The quantity of the work that is backlogged is reflective of the fact that with respect to the "porkbarrel" projects, authorizations were given for public works as to which there is hesitancy about going forward.

The pending resolution contains one very interesting paragraph. It states what the criteria shall be. In paragraph 3 it provides:

Benefit-cost ratios calculated by using total tangible benefits and total tangible costs for 100 years, and for 50 years, except where the economic life of the major project facility is less.

There is justification, I believe, in asking: Why is it directed—and if not directed, at least implied—that the studies should be made on the basis of a one hundred-year amortization of the cost? I believe I know the answer to that question. It is that if it is found that a project cannot be declared financially feasible on the basis of a 50-year amortization, it is to be suggested: "Look at it from the standpoint of 100 years."

In the bill we passed last year, there were included $1 billion worth of projects declared to be financially infeasible, or not to have been studied to the extent where a report could be made recommending that a particular project be built.

If this is to be the criterion, if this is to be the mode of determining financial responsibility, I submit that the most fantastic projects will be made to appear financially feasible by spreading the cost of amortization over a 100-year period, instead of a 50-year period.

In my judgment, this is a most important piece of proposed legislation, and it cannot be looked upon merely as an innocent request for information from the various divisions and departments of government. In effect, it will become a directive, and projects which it will be possible to amortize in 100 years will be declared to be financially feasible, even though, if they could be amortized in 50 years, they would have to be declared infeasible. Those are the reasons why I believe the pending resolution should be recommitted.

If the resolution were recommitted, what damage would be done? The committee would continue its study, and there would probably come out of the committee a joint resolution in which the House would concur. If that is done, Resolution 281 will have conformity; otherwise, it will not.

I do know that there is complaint that the President vetoed the public works bill 2 years ago. More power to him. I hope, if the one we passed last year comes before him from the House, he will veto that one, too. I cannot understand how he could avoid doing it, when we recognize the fact that there are $1 billion worth of projects in it which have not been adequately studied or have been declared to be financially not justified.

Those are my reasons for supporting the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] that the resolution be recommitted.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have been quite interested in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio with reference to the resolution. I wish to express to him my deep appreciation for the frankness with which he has stated his position. The great Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who submitted the motion to recommit and sponsors it on the floor of the Senate, is one of the ablest advocates of conservation in the Senate. He has as proud a record of service in behalf of conservation of water and development of soil resources as any Member of the Senate.

I am convinced of his sincerity of purpose in sponsoring the resolution, and that it is his desire to do what he believes will be helpful to the cause of conservation. I respect him and honor him for that attitude.

It is quite apparent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has no such purpose. He supports the resolution because he thinks if it is adopted it will hinder and impair and slow down water conservation and the development of soil resources in the United States. He has made it quite plain that he is not trying to develop a better method than the one now in use to bring about the objectives of Senate Resolution 281. He has made it quite clear that he wants to do what he can to kill or impair the objective of Senate Resolution 281, of 1956, under which the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported S. 148 to the Senate.

I think it is quite significant that the distinguished Senator from Ohio knows more about what is in Senate Resolution 281, which was passed before his arrival here, and which was considered for months by Republicans and Democrats alike in the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, than do the members of those committees; when the fact about the business is that it was evident on the floor yesterday that the distinguished Senator from Ohio did not even know what was in Senate Resolution 148.

I say to the Senator that the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held joint and separate hearings on the resolution, in a sincere effort to carry out the objectives of Senate Resolution 281 and to implement its spirit, which is to bring about a more effective program of conservation of the total soil and water resources of the Nation.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio decries the fact that there is a backlog of authorizations. He took the same position on the floor last year when the Senate passed the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. As I recall—and I want the Senator to correct me if I am mistaken—he and his distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] jointly sponsored an amendment to the bill for a project in his State, and the Senate accepted it. Then the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio voted against the bill. If I am in error, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oklahoma has stated the proposition correctly. When the bill came before the Senate, it involved expenditures of $1,500,000,000.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is mistaken. The bill did not involve an expenditure of a single dollar. It was not an appropriation bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator may make the best of that point, but he cannot change the substance of what we are talking about. The Senator from Oklahoma may pick on commas and periods, but the substance of what I have in mind will not be changed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I am convinced of the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill provided for $1,500,000,000 worth of projects, $1 bil-

lion of which were declared either to be financially not feasible or not to have had studies completed to the point where the engineers could make recommendations upon them. While the bill was pending, the junior Senator from Ohio reported that all the agencies of government had recommended a $13 million harbor project.

Mr. KERR. Whereabouts?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In Cleveland.

Mr. KERR. In what State is that?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was declared to be financially feasible and that it could go forward. I said I would join in approving the project, but that I would vote against the bill.

May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma what amount of projects relating to his State, and which were not financially feasible, were contained in that bill?

Mr. KERR. Not one dollar.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was a rather substantial amount, as I recall.

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator from Ohio that if a full and comprehensive knowledge of the economic feasibility of the projects in that bill were to dawn upon him at this moment, I should fear the result of the impact of the truth of it on the psychology of the Senator from Ohio.

There was not a project contained in the bill which had not been declared economically feasible, and with a very high cost-benefit ratio, in the State of Oklahoma. The projects in that bill which were located in the State of Oklahoma had been approved by the interagency committee established in 1950 by legislation. The Corps of Army Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, the Public Health Service, and representatives of eight States, had labored to bring to Congress the report of the economic feasibility of those projects.

The statement by the Senator from Ohio about the nonfeasibility of the projects in Oklahoma is just as erroneous as was his statement that there was a billion dollars worth of projects in the bill which had been declared to be infeasible by the administration.

The junior Senator from Ohio is a great man and a fine man, but I say to him that it is beyond the realm of legislative omniscience to be able to speak familiarly of matters with which one has had so slight and fleeting an association.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Opinions may vary as to the virtues of the resolution, although I myself do not think the resolution calls for anything which any committee of Congress having responsibility in this field might not ask for on its own initiative. The purpose of the resolution, as I understand, is to bring about some uniformity in the making of the reports which we receive, and to get the agencies to use the same yardstick when they allocate costs as when they measure feasibility.

One little point came up in the colloquy between the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Ohio, which I think should be clarified in the interests of accuracy. If I understood him correctly, the Senator from Ohio was acting under the impression that the omnibus flood control bill which was passed by Congress 2 years ago contained projects totaling about $1,600,000,000. I thought I understood the Senator from Ohio to say that more than $1 billion of them had not been found to be feasible or had not passed review by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. KERR. That was the remark the Senator from Ohio made, and with reference to which I said his statement about the Oklahoma projects was just as incorrect as the other one.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will stand to be corrected on whether the amount was $500 million or $1 billion. I am sure it was at least $500 million; I think it was $1 billion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My recollection of the matter is that the Senator from Ohio had the figures turned around. I have just consulted with the clerk of the Committee on Public Works, and he tells me that that is correct. Something more than $1 billion worth of projects had been approved and found to be feasible; that they had gone to the Bureau of the Budget and had been reviewed by the Corps of Engineers.

So something more than $500 million of projects had not completed all the processes of review. However, many of the projects were under review at the time.

When the Senate passed the bill last year, the processes had been completed on more projects, so that something in the neighborhood of $200 million worth of projects were all that had passed all the several steps of review.

So at first, instead of there being $1 billion worth of projects which had not been found feasible, it was $1 billion plus which had been found feasible, and $500 million on which reviews had not yet been completed.

When the bill was passed last year, studies on something more than $1,400,000,000 of projects, or approximately that amount, had been completed, and the reviews had found them to be feasible.

The amount which now is under review is in the neighborhood of $200 million. It may be that since the report was made last summer, the review of some more of those projects may have been completed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for giving us the specifics on the question to which he has addressed himself. What he has stated shows the enormity of the error of the Senator from Ohio, when he said that when the bill was passed last year, $1 billion worth of the projects involved in it had not been found to be economically feasible.

The point I was making, Mr. President, is that the action of the Senator from Ohio is calculated to slow down water and soil conservation and development. I referred to his action in connection with the omnibus bill of last year as another evidence of that attitude. It is one to which he is entitled, and I honor him in the exercise of his choice and his privilege and his right to decide as he wishes. But I think other Senators, in contemplating his support of this motion, are entitled to know that it is consistent with the record he has made here in opposition to soil- and water-conservation projects, not in support of them.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe I understood the Senator from Ohio to take the position that he believed he was laying down a new yardstick to be used when the Congress wishes to measure irrigation projects in terms of 50 or 100 years.

Would it help the Senator from Oklahoma if I were to remind him that there are irrigation projects which now have a 100-year pay-off period? One is in Oregon; another is in South Dakota; another is in Colorado. Whenever an irrigation project which has been entered into in good faith is found, because of soil conditions or because of a change in the water supply, to require action by the Congress to extend pay-out periods Congress can act; and the Congress has acted.

I applaud the fact that when the Congress has found it necessary to do so, it has extended the pay-out period on these contracts for irrigation, even up to 100 years.

It is still within the realm of contemplation that other projects may get into pay-out trouble, just as these three projects did, and other pay-out periods may need to be changed.

Although that may be pointed out as a defect, I thought it was a recognition that Congress had been wise in doing these things previously. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma believe that to be so?

Mr. KERR. Entirely so, and I thank the Senator from New Mexico for that observation, because I think it points up the fact that the pending resolution is not based upon a desire or an effort to change the criterion controlling the Congress. This measure simply seeks to require the Government agencies to bring to our committees additional comprehensive information, not controlling on them, but in order that it may be available to them, and through them, to the Senate, whereby a broader scope of information may be available to us.

It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Ohio is afraid to have the members of the Senate committees obtain comprehensive information about a project, lest perchance they might find a basis to justify its authorization.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. With reference to this criterion, I say to the Senator from

Oklahoma that I make the flat statement—and I do not think anyone will contradict it—that Senate Resolution 148 does not change one criterion or any set of criteria. No one can possibly prove to the contrary.

Furthermore, the newly numbered section 4 contains some language different from the original language of the original resolution. That new language was suggested by the Comptroller General of the United States. To say that someone who is trying to expand the program has included such language is simply not to speak in accordance with the facts. The Comptroller General of the United States, well within his rights, said they would like to have included a provision for the period of time allowable for review of the power investment and things of that nature; and we wrote that provision into the resolution, in response to the request of the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. KERR. And consistent with the principle of seeking to establish a means whereby more complete information could be made available to the committees, with reference to matters under their consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. In just a moment.

Mr. President, at this time I yield first to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who for some time has been seeking recognition; and thereafter I shall yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the 75- and 80-year amortization period applies in a substantial degree to irrigation projects, but that there has been a rather uniform 50-year limitation in the case of power projects and water projects. My position is——

Mr. KERR. At this point, will the Senator from Ohio permit me to correct him? The irrigation projects are water projects.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. KERR. And often they are power projects.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is true. But in calculating the time in which the cost of a water pumping station or a power generating station can be amortized, the conclusion is reached that such stations have a life of 50 years. The life of the irrigation projects runs to 65 or 75 years.

I submit the proposition that the language contained in the section I read will make it possible to extend the period beyond 50 years in amortizing those projects, which in the past have uniformly been held to be payable in 50 years.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio could not be more completely mistaken.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President at this point will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senator from Ohio could not possibly be further from the facts of the matter.

The reclamation law provides for a 40-year repayment period, plus 10 years, which have been added in order to get the projects under way. Generally speaking, our reclamation projects have a 50-year life. But water projects where power is created do not have that. As a matter of fact, when the central Arizona project was under consideration by the Senate, and since that time, it was pointed out that by means of the construction of certain dams—and the Glen Canyon Dam will be one of them; the Bridge Canyon Dam would be another, if it were added—the life of Hoover Dam would be extended another 100 years.

My personal guess is that the Hoover Dam will be in operation 300 years, and probably more than that. We do not have any limitation in that respect. It will pay out much sooner than that. But the great dams of the Pacific Northwest—among the most wonderful works I know of—will go on and on, far beyond the 50-year or 65-year or 80-year period.

For the life of me, I do not see what is wrong with allowing Congress to find out what can be expected to happen in those 100 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at this time will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe we can meet this issue very squarely if the Senator from Oklahoma will answer 1 or 2 simple questions.

First, is any Member of Congress bound to cast his vote for some project in the future, by anything that is included in this resolution?

Mr. KERR. Not remotely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is any policy in respect to the manner in which future projects will be built declared in the resolution?

Mr. KERR. No. I say to the Senator from Wyoming that the policy declared in the resolution is that we request the agencies of the executive branch of the Government to give us information on alternate plans of cost-benefit ratio, without approving any or without disapproving any and without making any remote effort to bind this body, or any Member of it, as to what it or he should do with reference to any of those proposals.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that all that is done by means of the resolution is to request information?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Wyoming is eminently correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And if the request is complied with, such information will be submitted without entailing any obligation upon either the executive branch or the legislative branch?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is there any member of the Committee on Public Works or of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs whose vote on any future project will be controlled by anything contained in this measure?

Mr. KERR. Not remotely; nor do the proponents of the resolution seek such control. The resolution expressly disclaims any such purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that, without this resolution, Congress in the past has extended the repayment period on reclamation projects?

Mr. KERR. Up to 100 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that there is nothing in the resolution which would increase the powers of Congress or lay any compulsion on any Member of the Senate or of the House to vote in a particular way?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. The sole purpose of this resolution is to bring more light, more information, to our committees, to enable them the better to serve us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Supplementing the point which was made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that we are now being told by experts in our Engineering Corps that, because of great improvements made in modern construction techniques, the life expectancy of a typical power dam today is equivalent to 150 years, instead of 50 years?

Mr. KERR. As a minimum, yes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Granted that some Members of the Senate may not be as enthusiastic as are others about the development of natural resources or the conservation of water resources or resources of soil, is there any logical reason why even those who are less enthusiastic should not wish for, and perhaps be benefited by, the additional information for which this resolution would call?

Mr. KERR. I think the answer to that question is decidedly in the negative, Mr. President, because if this resolution is accepted in spirit by the executive, and if, in response to it—if the Senate should agree to it—the executive accedes to our request for information, which is the extent of the resolution, Congress will be provided with more comprehensive information about a project. If there were anything about the project which would indicate it should not be authorized, those who sought to oppose the authorization would have an equal opportunity with those who favored it to be armed with more complete information about the project than is the situation under the present policies of the executive departments or the present practice in their associations and relations with the committees.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that those of us who reported this resolution favorably had in mind, not the promotion of arbitrary decisions, but enabling the Congress of the United States to detect arbitrary decisions if such decisions should be made?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct, whether an arbitrary decision was favorable or unfavorable.

Mr. GORE. Or based upon facts of which the Congress was advised or unadvised. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that we had in mind the laying of full facts before the Congress in order that the committees of Congress and the Congress itself might make decisions in light of the full facts?

Mr. KERR. In the light of more complete and fuller facts. The Senator is eminently correct. I sincerely hope the motion——

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator has indicated, if I understood him correctly, that nothing in Senate Resolution 148 lays down or attempts to lay down any policy on the part of Congress; that it is purely concerned with obtaining necessary information from the agencies regarding proposed projects.

I call the Senator's attention to page 6 of the resolution, section 4, which, if I read it correctly, does not refer to reports or information from downtown, but provides that "authorizations of multiple-purpose water resource projects" shall include and shall specify certain things.

I am not indicating that that is not a desirable thing, but is that not laying down a policy for Congressional action, at least so far as the Senate is concerned?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to answer that question?

Mr. KERR. Yes. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. That provision was put in the resolution at the request of Mr. Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States. I do not think it lays down any policy. The Comptroller General felt he needed to have that information. I would not want to deprive him of it. Joseph Campbell is a very fine Comptroller General, and we thought we should pay attention to his request.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say further, in that regard, that at the conclusion of section 4 of the resolution, to which the Senator from New Hampshire has referred, it is specified that additional information shall be contained in an authorization. The only policy contained in this resolution is that more complete information be made available, and I think the provision is consistent with that purpose.

Mr. COTTON. That section certainly goes beyond a request from committees of Congress for information from executive agencies of the Government. It declares what should be specified in authorizations, which are acts of Congress. I am not suggesting that this provision is not desirable, but I think it goes beyond the question of merely seeking information for the committees of Congress. I will take the Senator's judgment on that point, because he is better versed in these matters than I am.

Mr. KERR. My judgment is that this paragraph lays down the policy that, information should be contained in the authorization for a project as to which method is to be used in the allocation of costs or how the allocation of costs shall be determined. In other words, the policy is that such additional information shall be contained in the authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the genial Senator from Oklahoma will modify his answer to the question suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, because I believe the provision goes a little further than requiring information to be provided. It does declare the policy of the Senate to be that authorizations should specify the method by which allocation of costs shall be determined. I think such a requirement is highly desirable. We have had many examples of cases in which one agency of the Government has reported on the feasibility of a project on one basis, using one yardstick; and then, after the project has been constructed, we have found that another agency has used a different yardstick for allocating costs. The Comptroller General was eminently correct in suggesting that Congress should specify that in the authorization of the project the method by which the allocation of costs should be determined should be stated, and not left subject to conflict or quarrel between the various agencies.

Mr. KERR. I agree with what the Senator has said with respect to what the paragraph contains, but in order for me to agree with the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire, as I understood his statement, I would have to agree that the principle is laid down as to which method should be used. The paragraph does not lay down the principle of the method by which allocation of costs shall be determined. It lays down the policy that the method which at the time is in the mind of the Congress shall be stated in the authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I can see the Senator's distinction.

There is one other provision in section 2, which I think goes beyond the question of merely getting information.

It is provided in section 2 that the reports by the Federal agencies should be sent to the Congress not later than 6 months after they have been submitted for comment to the governors of the affected States. That is merely an expression of policy, but it is an important expression of policy so far as the Senate is concerned.

In section 3 it is declared that the policy of the Senate would require that the projects recommended for construction by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act should be transmitted to the Congress not later than 3 calendar months after their approval by the said Secretary of Agriculture.

Both of those items deal with furnishing information to the Congress, and in that respect they come within the answer of the Senator from Oklahoma, but they do declare a policy. That policy is that instead of permitting the reports to kick around for many months, we should hear from the agencies within 6 months in a case in which reports have been submitted to the governors of the States for comment, and within 3 months after the Secretary of Agriculture has made up his own mind that he should report.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from South Dakota agree with me that, even on the basis upon which he has called the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the question, the entire resolution is still in the form of a request and does not purport to assume the dignity of a directive?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true. What we are considering will not be a law, but merely an expression of the Senate.

Personally, I welcome a resolution such as this, which would bring about some uniformity among the reports submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Committee on Public Works. There are too many times when the Committee on Public Works has received the viewpoint of the Corps of Engineers and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has received reports from the Department of the Interior. In some instances those reports relate to the same project.

Probably the most patent illustration occurs with respect to my own State and the other related States in the Missouri Basin, where we have the great Missouri River, which involves projects being constructed both by the Corps of Engineers and by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Missouri River runs through many States. The Missouri Basin projects involve the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, and Missouri. All those States are affected by the Missouri River. Some of the States have projects under the Corps of Engineers, and other States have projects under the Bureau of Reclamation. Some States have projects involving both agencies.

We now have a situation in which there is no clear definition as to the responsibility so far as power is concerned. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] conducted some hearings, at which time many witnesses appeared and testified before the committee. One witness had one point of view with respect to how power should be paid for, or what should be covered with respect to repayment to the Treasury. Another witness had other views. When representatives of the two agencies appeared before the committee we found a divergent point of view as between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation as to what was the responsibility of the power users in paying for the power.

The Comptroller General did not have any firm idea on the subject. An effort was made to look into the precedents, and different reports were found on different bills. Finally, by a very complex construction which related clause (a) in one report to clause (b) in some other report, or to some interpretation

given by the Comptroller General with respect to some other project, an effort was made to "hatch up" a basis for fixing the repayment responsibility.

All that section 4 would provide is that it shall be the policy, so far as the Senate is concerned, that when a report is made to the Senate it shall include a recommendation as to the allocation of costs and the method of repayment which is to be followed. Presumably if the Senate fulfills its responsibility it will write into the legislation, either specifically in the act or in the report accompanying an authorization, the method which is to be followed or the principle which is to be followed in the allocation of costs. That is highly desirable from the standpoint of the Comptroller General and from the standpoint of the United States Treasury.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. It was my privilege to work side by side with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] as well as with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the other members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the hearing, in drafting the language of the resolution. I say to the Senator that on the basis of the long and friendly and cooperative association we have had on the Committee on Public Works I know in my own mind that there could be no difference between the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Oklahoma as to thought and attitude with reference to the resolution and what it contains.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. The question upon which I was attempting to obtain information has perhaps now been forgotten by the Senator, because of what has intervened.

I wish to say first to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I agree completely with him and with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that the objective suggested in section 4 is a desirable objective. My question, however, was as to whether section 4 laid down a policy of the Senate. That was a preliminary to another question which I should like to ask the distinguished Senator.

My next question is not asked in any sense in an argumentative way, but is asked because it is the crux of the whole question which concerns so deeply the Senator from New Hampshire.

I know the Senator from Oklahoma always speaks very eloquently and very sincerely. The Senator has stated in the past few minutes, and has further emphasized to the Senate, that the resolution we are considering, with all that it contains relative to the method of computing costs, relative to the time of amortization, relative to the consideration of future development in years ahead—and all the other things that are included in the resolution—has no real effect on any action of Congress in the future and cannot change such action, because it is merely a resolution to enable the Senate to obtain from the agencies downtown, such as the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, the information which the committees want and which the Senate needs.

I should like to ask what might occur as a result of the action of the Senate of the United States on this resolution. Assume for the sake of argument—which I am not quite ready to concede in entirety—that what the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said is correct—that there is nothing new in the resolution, that every one of these criteria has already been used and laid down by various agencies, and that the resolution does not add a thing. When the Senate acts to approve this resolution, I believe the Senator from Oklahoma will agree, it will take a formal action to approve various criteria. The various criteria will be given a seal of approval, a force, and a potency which will be referred to by Senators on the floor and in committee, and by Representatives in the other body in the years to come, as indicating, when a project is under consideration for approval, that the Senate of the United States in Senate Resolution 148, adopted way back in 1958, laid down a policy and by inference, at least, gave its approval to the criteria set forth in the resolution with respect to the information requested. Does the resolution not have some potency in that respect?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate the question of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. In the statements I have made with reference to my interpretation of the resolution I have tried to speak factually and sincerely. I must submit to the distinguished Senator that I would hesitate to answer the question he addressed to me as to what effect the resolution might have on actions of Senators in the future in speeches they might make on the floor of the Senate in favor of or against any proposed authorization.

I believe my distinguished friend will recognize that, fertile as is the imagination of both the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Oklahoma, it would put them to a greater strain than probably they should be subjected to at this late hour of the day to attempt to specify the reaction which Senators in future years might have to this resolution.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to direct one more brief question to the Senator from Oklahoma.

If what he says is true, and if it is stretching our imagination too far——

Mr. KERR. I did not say the resolution would stretch the imagination. I said that I would have to stretch my imagination in order to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. COTTON. If it strains our imagination too far to picture what might be the potency of this resolution in the minds of future Senators, I invite the Senator's attention once more to the middle of page 4, and the criteria in section 5.

The resolution provides that information should be furnished regarding the "physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works."

That is the one section with respect to which I find it difficult to believe—and I have searched rather conscientiously in connection with this question—that it is not an addition to what has been previously laid down by the departments downtown as criteria. When we consider that some of these projects may extend over a period of 100 or 150 years in the future, as has been stated on the floor of the Senate, I ask, How about the strain on the imagination of the people downtown, who must advise the Senate on that particular section?

Mr. KERR. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I thought paragraph 5 was a very useful paragraph in the resolution. As the Senator has just stated, it would result in a request from the Senate to the agency affected to provide the committee with information as to the physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

I do not believe that such information would be a burden or a liability to the committee. I do not think it would involve undue hardship on the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation to make such a study of the usefulness of the project as would enable it to give the committee a picture of the physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

I take it that the word "capacity" means storage capacity, for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

I believe that such information would be helpful.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that if that is the paragraph in the resolution which has placed such a heavy burden upon his mind and created concern to such an extent that he is greatly worried as to the result our action today might have upon the minds of Senators in the future, I ask him this question: If the sponsors of the resolution were to agree to ask unanimous consent to delete that paragraph, would that obviate the Senator's opposition to the resolution, and let us get on with the business of the Senate?

Mr. COTTON. I shall permit Senators to get on with the business of the Senate in just a moment.

My answer must be "No." It is the steadfast opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the passage of this resolution, with all the criteria which are laid down in it—and there is scarcely any restriction to such criteria—involves a very great many contingencies. If such criteria were fol-

lowed—and the dignity which would be given to them by passing the resolution today would mean a strong argument that such criteria should be followed—my imagination is not vivid enough to imagine any project in any part of the country which is beneficial to anyone, which could not be justified by some part of the resolution.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator. I was of the opinion that the elimination of the paragraph referred to would not obviate his opposition. I thank him for making it plain that in reality the basic difference between the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Oklahoma can be found in this colloquy, in that the Senator from New Hampshire might be seeking a checkrein, as the President said the other day, while the Senator from Oklahoma might be seeking to apply a stimulant to the conservation program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know whether this is the answer to the question, but I do know what was in the minds of some of those concerned with the resolution.

Some time ago a bill was passed providing for a dam in the State of Idaho, known as the Palisades Dam. At that time careful regard for the people of that area might have contemplated that future needs might require the construction of another dam, the Burns Creek Dam. Nothing of that nature was included in the report. Sometimes the Bureau of Reclamation includes such observations, and sometimes it does not.

This year both Senators from Idaho came forward with the Burns Creek project. It was a reasonable project. The bill was passed by the Senate. It is held up in the House of Representatives—I hope for only a short time.

It is anticipation of future needs that is contemplated here. I see nothing wrong with anticipation of future needs. I hope the people will not worry because once in a while the Government does look ahead.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I simply do not see on what basis any Member of the Senate can oppose the pending resolution.

Very simply stated, the resolution merely indicates it to be the sense of the Senate that two committees, the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, ought to receive certain information with respect to projects embodied in bills which are referred to either of them.

The resolution is but an indication of the type of information which is necessary to enable members of each of those committees to reach an honest judgment as to what to do with projects embodied in bills which come before them.

During the days I have had the honor and pleasure of serving in the Senate, I have been a member of the Committee on Public Works and of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe that each of them is a great committee. I believe that each of them has outstanding Members of the Senate on its roster. As one of the newcomers, I have been most pleased at the care with which each piece of legislation coming before either committee is weighed and with respect to which final determination is made, for or against, when the vote comes.

I congratulate the members of the committee who, in their capacities as chairmen of these two committees, responded to what the Senate told them to do, and did a good job, as did the chairmen of both subcommittees.

I believe that enough has been said by many Members of the Senate with respect to the wording of the resolution, and I shall not detain the Senate, other than to say that thus far no one has denied that the resolution would simply attach the dignity of Senate approval to a Senate resolution designed to meet the needs of two committees in an extremely important field.

Among Senators who oppose the resolution are men for whom I have the greatest respect. A very dear friend of mine, a man whom I respect, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], delivered a speech against the resolution yesterday and then made a motion that the Senate recommit it.

Yesterday, when he discussed the pending resolution, he said, in part, "It fails to meet the obligation of the legislative branch to establish basic policy."

The simple answer is, that in this resolution, we are not trying to establish basic policy for Congress. What we are endeavoring to do is to demonstrate to every appropriate agency in the executive branch that the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate have the right to receive and must receive, if the resolution is adopted, the type of technical, specific data and information which the resolution will require.

Very quickly I wish to say that in the report which accompanied the resolution, Major General Itschner, Chief of Engineers of the Army, said, in part:

> The items of information which the agencies of the executive branch would be expected to provide pursuant to Senate Resolution 148 are generally consonant with the principles and procedures for formulating and evaluating water-resources projects which have been evolved over the past several years through the cooperative efforts of the interested Federal agencies and which are currently in use by the Corps of Engineers in planning such projects. It is gratifying that the findings of the committees are in such close agreement with these practices.

I do not find very much in these comments to oppose the resolution.

Speaking for the Department of the Interior, Mr. Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, said, in part:

> A large part of the information called for by Senate Resolution 148 is now regularly or often included in our project-planning reports. The remainder can, we believe, generally be supplied. Undoubtedly, there will be occasion from time to time to supplement even this expanded list of items or to delete from it those which prove not to be worth while.

Here, too, does it not appear that the Department of the Interior offers no basis for opposition?

On what basis do the appropriate agencies of Government today make comments concerning proposed pieces of legislation introduced in the Senate which find their way into either one of those two committees? Certainly not by law. There is no law on that subject. It is by a decision on the part of the executive branch of the Government. When the executive branch of the Government determines to change the basis or a criterion, it does so. And it has done so on many occasions in the past.

Thus we have the perfectly ludicrous situation of a project being determined feasible on the basis of one formula, one day, but measured on an entirely different basis subsequently, when the executive branch changes the basis for reporting. We who sit in judgment in the Senate ought to be able to say: We want the same type of information in 1958, in 1959, in 1960, and thereafter, until we ourselves determine that a different type of information is necessary or required.

It seems to me that if we reject the resolution, we will in effect be tying at least one hand of each of the two committees, and depriving both committees of the additional dignity which the pending resolution, if it were approved, would give to the requests that come from both of the committees when they sit in judgment on public project bills.

I conclude by repeating, that to me there is no logical basis for the Senate to refuse to approve this resolution, simply designed to promote the efficiency of two of the most important committees of the Senate.

I do not believe that we ought to sit idly by and do nothing until we are able finally to mesh our approach to a problem with that of the House of Representatives. The Senate sees many things in a different light from the House of Representatives. The Senate passes legislation upon its own ipsi dixit. The House, on the other hand, passes legislation on its own judgment and in accordance with the way it looks at things. To me, it is clear that we should approve the resolution and defeat the motion of my good friend the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who heads the minority members on the Committee on Public Works who do not agree with the report of the committee, is not present. I therefore ask that the minority views of those members of the Committee on Public Works be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Senate approval of Senate Resolution 148 in its present form is highly undesirable for a number of important reasons:

1. It could lead to further delay and postponement in the construction of the enormous backlog of projects now authorized but not built.

2. It would seriously weaken and undermine the economic standards necessary to the proper evaluation of the Nation's land and water resources projects.

3. It could lay the groundwork for opening the floodgates of the Public Treasury to unessential, wasteful, and unjustified projects.

4. It could provide Congress with a confusion and multiplicity of plans and alternatives that could clog the pipelines of progress on genuinely needed legislation.

5. Senate committees already can request the same information from Government agencies as is contained in Senate Resolution 148.

The stated objectives of Senate Resolution 148, with which we agree, are to improve the procedures for evaluation of land and water resources projects, and to provide a greater degree of Congressional control over resource development. Adoption of the resolution, however, will only worsen, instead of improving, the present situation. These minority views may be the foundation for saying we are not in favor of public-works programs. Such an assumption would be an erroneous one. We are interested in promoting and furthering a sound and wholesome public-works program which will merit the approval of citizens and taxpayers.

I. The most pressing problem in the water-resource development field, and the one which contributes most to loss of control by Congress, is the tremendous backlog of projects already authorized. There is now a backlog of about 470 active projects for rivers, harbors, and flood control, authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers, which have never been started. These projects, in addition to some 400 now being built, will require an estimated $8.3 billion to construct. At the current rate of spending ($495 million in fiscal year 1958) it will take almost 17 years to complete them. It will take the Bureau of Reclamation more than 30 years to build its presently authorized backlog at the current spending rate. It is apparent that enough work is on hand to last a long, long time without looking for additional ways to justify more projects.

II. The real purpose of the resolution is to dilute the careful standards of projects evaluation that in the past have screened out the unfeasible, uneconomic projects. New projects can be found which meet our present careful and long-tested standards of acceptance. By relaxing these standards, added projects can secure approval; but such relaxation of standards would lead to authorization of unessential and wasteful projects.

Friends of public-works and resource-development programs, whether they be conservative or liberal in their thinking, and regardless of their political affiliation, are interested in sound and acceptable programs. Volume should not be one of the factors involved. Acceptance and approval of such projects are not measured by the taxpayers in terms of volume. The test is a more practical one of cost and feasibility.

Some of the ways in which the resolution would undermine sound economic standards in evaluation of proposed projects and lay the groundwork for unessential and unjustified projects deserve special mention:

The resolution (sec. 1 (5) (b)) would require computation of amortization upon the basis of 50 years, 100 years, or the useful life of the facilities, if less. The use of a 100-year amortization period would result in reducing annual fixed costs, and thus increase chances for annual benefits which exceed yearly costs. Writing off the cost of a project over a 100-year period will put a major share of the bill on the taxpayers of succeeding generations. This is not the heritage which we should be proud to bequeath to our children.

The resolution requests Government agencies to submit information on indirect and intangible benefits which may become part of the criteria in determining the feasibility of projects. If benefits arising from a project are greater than its cost, we have a basis for saying the project is justifiable and economically sound. The danger signal goes up on those borderline projects where there is doubt whether the benefits will justify the cost. The indirect and intangible benefits, which at best are likely to be vague, will then be considered. Such vague standards could be the determining factor in putting the stamp of approval on many a project. Indirect and intangible benefits can be so broadly defined and far reaching that even the remotest possible benefit can be used as the standard of project evaluation.

Recreation benefits are among the indirect and intangible benefits on which information would be requested by this resolution. A bill now on the Senate Calendar, S. 1164, would make recreation considerations a direct, calculable benefit in evaluating projects. Some of the objections to that are pointed out in the minority report on the bill. They are equally applicable here. The resolution lays the groundwork for putting the Federal Government in the recreation business. It could also lead to an unwarranted expansion of Government participation in a host of fields.

Furthermore, all States do not equally share the benefits of land- and water-resources projects. Expansion of this program as contemplated in the resolution is likely to result in projects so local in nature as to arouse criticism and overwhelming opposition from people in other sections of the country.

The resolution calls for information on "future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such projects works." This could lead to imposing on the taxpayers of tomorrow for something we have no way of knowing whether they will want or need. It could make a crystal ball as important as his slide rule to a project-development engineer.

The resolution also requires information on three methods of cost allocation. Current policies seek to secure a fair apportionment of the cost of projects among the various uses rather than to give preferential treatment to one use against another. A single method, the separable costs-remaining benefits method is generally accepted by all major agencies involved in water-resource development as being most equitable. The majority has given no reasons for requiring costly calculations on the basis of two additional methods, out of the nine available, despite their effect on the Treasury. The implication of this would be that the majority desires to approve projects on an incremental cost basis which would greatly expand the nonreimbursable Federal contribution to many projects.

III. We also question the vehicle chosen to accomplish the objectives of the majority. This resolution will not be sent to the House for its approval and yet its purpose is to aid Congress, not just the Senate. If the House of Representatives were to approve a resolution on a similar subject, but different in its terms and directions, the Government agencies would then be confronted with submitting different, and potentially conflicting, information to the Senate and House. There is no need to dwell on the difficulty Congress could have in evaluating, and properly authorizing a project in such a situation.

EDWARD MARTIN.
NORRIS COTTON.
ROMAN L. HRUSKA.
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not intend, at this late hour, to make any extended remarks on the resolution before the Senate. What I have heard convinces me that, if there had been any flaw in the case we made yesterday, for recommittal that weakness has now been fully taken care of by the discussion we have had today. As I understand now, the disclaimer that no policies are sought to be established made in answer to the questions of the Senator from Wyoming by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] put the case for the resolution practically out of court. That is true notwithstanding that in section 4 of the amended resolution, at page 6, it is provided: "That authorizations of multiple-purpose water resource projects should, first, specify the method by which the allocation of costs shall be determined."

Let us stop and look at the word "authorizations." Only Congress makes authorizations. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about authorizations which Congress makes, and will make in the future.

If there is any policy declaration in the Resolution 148, it is certainly in that sentence. In other words, with respect to any future authorization acts we pass authorizing multiple-purpose water resource projects, we "specify the method by which the allocation of costs shall be determined, the period of time allowable for repayment of the power investment, and the formula for determining the rate of interest on it that is to be returned; and, second, require that prior to the time that any major facility of such multiple-purpose project is placed in operation the construction agency shall report the allocation of costs in accordance with the criteria of section 1 of this resolution, together with its recommendations and the comments of the power marketing agency if that be other than the construction agency."

If I understand the meaning of that language and its legal effect—and I have had some experience in the legal field, as my colleagues have been kind enough to mention—it means that an attempt is made in section 4 to lay out a course of action the Senate is supposed to follow with reference to water resource development projects. Senator KERR's disclaimer contradicts the plain language of the resolution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. We do not have any real power to bind any future Congress, or any future Senate, because any Senate can change that language. However, if that is not a declaration of policy, I have never read one. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As the Senator knows from my observations, I think that is a declaration of policy, so far as that is concerned. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah if he does not think it is a good policy. Does not the Senator believe that Congress, in making authorizations, should specify the method by which the allocation of costs should be determined?

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator not think so?

Mr. WATKINS. I will ask the Senator to wait just a moment. I was only referring to what the section means. I say that actually declares a policy.

What is contained in that policy declaration requires a great deal of study. I doubt, as a matter of fact, that the resolution contains everything that

should be contained in such a policy, because in my 11 years in the Senate, I have found it very difficult to find a formula that will fit all projects, because most projects must stand on their own feet; and, necessarily, there will have to be different types of formulas applied to different projects. That is one reason why we have never had any hard and fast formula with respect to all projects.

At one time we authorized the Secretary of the Interior to go ahead with a certain class of projects, by allowing him to say: "This project comes within the law," and permit him, on that basis, to build it. Later we took that power away from him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator rather——

Mr. WATKINS. Just a moment; I will ask the Senator to let me finish. We thought it was not right to set up the same kind of standard, when projects differed materially.

The Colorado River has a different set of circumstances. The Columbia and other rivers have circumstances peculiar to themselves. It is difficult to establish any particular formula that will fit all water resource developments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the able Senator from Utah think that when a project is authorized, Congress exercises its judgment, in authorizing the project, in specifying the time for repayment of costs from revenues, such as the sale of power?

Mr. WATKINS. I should say that probably many of those things should be specified, but we usually do so without any direction in advance from the Senate. When all is said and done, the Congress in being at this time will fix the terms of a bill under which a project will be authorized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But Congress has not always done so in the past. That is why the Comptroller General wanted this provision included. There have been times when Congress has not specified the method by which the allocation of costs should be determined. There have been times when Congress did not specify the time allowable for repayment. There have been times when Congress did not spell out the formula for interest.

Mr. WATKINS. We cannot bind future Congresses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, we cannot bind them, but we can declare it to be a policy that instead of legislating so loosely, as we have with respect to some projects in the past, future authorizations should spell out these requirements.

We should not be legislating on some obscure report on a bill. We should not throw upon the Comptroller General or the Bureau of the Budget the burden of determining the basis of feasibility and the intent of Congress as to how much should be repaid. Those factors should be contained in the authorization. That is a sound declaration of policy.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator think those are the only factors which should be contained in authorizing legislation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know whether they are all, but I think those ought to be included.

Mr. WATKINS. Do we not exclude under rules of construction ordinarily applied all matters not mentioned in a section which attempts to name specific requirements?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. Congress can specify in the legislation, but it should not overlook these things, as it has done in the past.

Mr. WATKINS. My point is that the Senator has made it clear that he agrees with me. After all has been said and done, after the colloquy between the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], they gave a policy declaration quite to the contrary.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think we do; and I have so said consistently during the debate.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it is a very unwise thing to go ahead and try to put a limitation on us now, to a certain extent, so far as we think we can do it without study by a committee. We probably ought to provide for more critera than are contained in the resolution. Remember this has to do with authorizations.

I shall not attempt to meet all the arguments which have ben made. I thought the statement last night made it rather clear that the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have the full power now to get, by resolution of the committee, any information which is needed from the executive agencies. No matter what is required, it is within the power of the committees to get it. They do not have to come before the Senate, get a resolution of the Senate, and try to bind some Senate in the future on an authorization to get information, if that is the sole purpose of the resolution.

I have been a Member of the Senate for 11 years. I have not yet seen a time when a committee which had asked for information about a specific problem or a specific bill did not get whatever information the departments already had on the subect. I have never seen that happen. I asked a question on that point last night, but I did not get an answer which indicated that the committees had ever been refused information which they wanted.

It seems to me that what we are attempting to do is rather unwise. My friends were somewhat naive last night when they said that one of the main reasons we must pass the resolution is that we cannot get the House to take similar action. We will not send a joint resolution to the House because the House will not agree with us.

We must remember that any legislation which is to be passed by Congress must have the approval of the House as well as of the Senate. We cannot get into a hassle with the House by saying to them, in effect, "You people will not go along with us on any reasonable program, so we are going to have one of our own." That seems to me to be unwise, from the standpoint of authorizing water conservation and development projects in the future. We have got to get along with the House. It seems to me that this resolution will be considered more or less a slap in the face by the House; it will be something gratuitous; something we should not do.

After all has been said and done, I do not think any work has been done to get the House to go along with the Senate on this particular type of resolution. That is one reason why I think it is entitled to further study.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] stated that if we do not pass the resolution, the proposal will simply die. But we still have the obligations as are set forth in Senate Resolution 282, to discharge.

This is what the motion which I offered would direct the committee to do:

> That the committees—

I am referring to the two committees already named—

> instruct their legal and technical staff to together prepare a synopsis of the information available relative to establishing a Federal water resources development policy adaptable to national coverage;

That takes in a wide territory, when one is talking about developing a water resources policy adaptable to national coverage. That is what I should like to see us develop. My motion continues:

> with further instructions that such a synopsis be brief, although comprehensive; that it contain a summary of the objective for establishing such a policy; and that the staff, collectively, report to the committees, from time to time, on progress, on need for further instructions, and on the desirability for further Federal agency reports as well as reports from the affected States.

I should like to go one step further and suggest that after we shall have gone into this subject a little further we shall try, if we possibly can, to prepare a statement for circulation to the States and the State water departments as to the national policy. Then, when we have established a policy, it will be one which people can live with and can support.

I think that what we will get as a result of the disclaimers made here will be largely a gesture which will not mean anything, except as to one matter which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has mentioned. If I interpret rightly what has been said, there is not any agreement among the committee members that this is the meaning of this particular resolution. There is a dispute as to what it actually means. One declaration is that there is not any policy being established; the other is that a policy is being established.

The record has been made. So far as I am concerned, I thought it was my obligation as a Senator and as a member of the committee to call this point to the attention of the Senate, and particularly to the attention of those who are interested in some kind of water-resource development. I want to cooperate with them. I have offered what I consider to be constructive suggestions. I think we shall ignore the resolution, if it should be adopted—and it may be adopted—whenever a large project

comes along that does not fit the formula we have adopted. There is no sense in passing a resolution if we cannot live with it.

All I am asking for is a better study. I have looked through the record of the hearings which were held before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Senate Resolution 148. The hearings lasted about 2 hours. Very few witnesses appeared. Some Senators appeared, and some statements were submitted.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on this question, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not been ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit. [Putting the question.]

In the opinion of the Chair, the "noes" have it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 148), as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment to the preamble, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the preamble by adding at the end thereof the words "and for clearance pursuant to the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666, as amended)."

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to, and the preamble as amended was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 148), as amended, including the preamble as amended, is as follows:

Whereas the sense of the Senate, stated in Senate Resolution 281, 84th Congress, is that the Congress will continue to exercise its constitutional powers to encourage the comprehensive conservation, development, and utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation, and that reports to the Congress in support of authorization of such projects should (a) include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congress, and (b) fully disclose the results of studies and analyses of the potential utilizations, costs, allocations, pay out, and benefits, both direct and indirect; and

Whereas pursuant to said Senate Resolution 281, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works jointly have reported to the Senate that, in order to evaluate projects proposed for authorization, certain information is needed in addition to that regularly submitted by the executive branch in support of proposed projects, such information being related to selection of plans of development, costs, benefits, reimbursements, or contributions required of local interests; and

Whereas such information is needed also for consideration by the Senate in connection with legislation to establish policies and criteria regarding allocations of project costs, and for evaluations of project benefits, which policies and criteria the Comptroller General of the United States, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Army have recommended should be established by the Congress; and

Whereas the program for conservation, development, and utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation is impaired by delay in the delivery to the Congress of reports on projects proposed for authorization and for clearance pursuant to the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666, as amended): Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that procedures for evaluation of land and water resource projects should be improved, and that the agencies of the executive branch of the Government responsible for the preparation of reports relative to the authorization of land and water resource projects be, and are hereby, requested to furnish, in connection with such reports, the following information in addition to the data now presented in support of project authorizations:

Information relative to alternative plans for the water resource projects that may reasonably be considered physically feasible of construction consistently with the advice of the Department of the Army, or the Department of the Interior, or the Department of Agriculture, including enough of the information enumerated in subparagraphs (1) to (10) inclusive to show why each alternative was dropped in favor of the recommended plan. With respect to the project recommended for authorization, the information should include, but not be limited to—

(1) Complete description of project, including an estimate of the economic life of the major project facility.

(2) Estimated costs of construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement, together with a plain and succinct statement of the basis upon which all such estimates are made.

(3) Benefit-cost ratios calculated by using total tangible benefits and total tangible costs for 100 years, and for 50 years, except where the economic life of the major project facility is less.

(4) Description and, to the extent possible, computation or other evaluation of indirect and intangible net benefits including but not limited to (a) protection of life and property; (b) improvement of transportation; (c) conservation of water, soil, and forest resources; (d) wildlife conservation; (e) recreation; (f) abatement of pollution, including salinity; (g) control of sedimentation; (h) maintenance and enhancement of the agricultural, commercial, and industrial economy of the area affected.

(5) Physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

(6) Allocations of costs, to be calculated (a) by at least three methods, namely, the separable costs-remaining benefits method, the priority of use method, and the incremental cost method; and (b) on at least two time periods for amortization, namely, 50 years or the useful life of the facilities, whichever is the lesser, and 100 years or the useful life of the facilities, whichever is the lesser.

(7) Description of the extent to which the Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and nongovernmental entities have evidenced interest in participating in the construction or operation and maintenance of the potential project, or in obtaining its benefits, including, in the case of electric energy, information, relative to the preference status of governmental agencies, municipalities, and cooperatives; and the manner in which it is proposed to accomplish coordination and cooperation, and the estimated Federal costs of such participation.

(8) Estimated schedules of repayments of reimbursable costs that would be within the estimated financial resources of the potential use area, such schedules to show also the deferred repayment of the portion of the costs allocated to uses that may be anticipated to develop in the future.

(9) Probable effects of the potential project on State and local governments, including, but not limited to (a) the costs of local government services; and (b) the enhancement or reduction of tax revenues, together with the amount of potential tax revenue that would be forgone by Federal development in lieu of non-Federal development of the project. The estimated amounts of tax revenue enhancement and tax revenue forgone as a result of the project should be shown in calculations of project benefits and costs.

(10) In support of proposed increases in the authorizations of appropriations for continuation of the construction of basinwide projects, proposed schedules of investigations and construction should be supplied, including descriptions of the units to be undertaken, and deviations in schedules of construction supplied in support of prior authorizations.

SEC. 2. That reports on surveys and investigations or project reports relative to the authorization of land and water resource projects should be delivered to the Congress not later than 6 calendar months after the date on which such reports are circulated to the Federal agencies and to the affected States pursuant to section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887). The agencies of the executive branch responsible for preparation of such project reports be, and are hereby, requested to deliver to the Congress such reports not later than 6 months after they have been submitted for comments to the governors of the affected States.

SEC. 3. That reports on projects recommended for construction by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, should be transmitted to the Congress not later than 3 calendar months after their approval by said Secretary of Agriculture, and the officials of the executive branch responsible for such transmittal pursuant to said act be, and are hereby, requested to so deliver such reports not later than 3 months after their approval by said Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. That authorizations of multiple-purpose water resource projects should (1) specify the method by which the allocation of costs shall be determined, the period of time allowable for repayment of the power investment, and the formula for determining the rate of interest on it that is to be returned; and (2) require that prior to the time that any major facility of such multiple-purpose project is placed in operation the construction agency shall report the allocation of costs in accordance with the criteria of section 1 of this resolution together with its recommendations and the comments of the power marketing agency if that be other than the construction agency.

SEC. 5. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed to continue the study instituted pursuant to Senate Resolution 281, 84th Congress, and to recommend to the Senate as mental cost method; and (b) on at least two early as practicable in the second session of the 85th Congress such further measures as may be appropriate to provide for full and effective conservation, development, and utilization of the Nation's land and water resources.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that I voted against Senate Resolution 148.

## INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1204, Senate Resolution 209, to investigate the problems of American small and independent business. My purpose is to have the resolution made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 209) to investigate the problems of American small and independent business, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$90,000", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and Senate Resolution 272, 81st Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 29, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 27), 1958:

### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3304. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be colonels, Army Nurse Corps*

Bradley, Ruby G., N87.
Bryant, Ruby F., N79.
Haynes, Inez, N88.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps*

Benninger, Marion L., N1885.
Chapman, Gracie L., N2115.
Clark, Alice B., N1870.
Hogan, Mary I., N2117.
Kornfeind, Helen A., N105.
Lassiter, Janie L., N2041.
Park, Edna K., N1945.
Price, Ida G., N2353.
Ullom, Madeline M., N123.
Vlahovich, Fanny E., N2573.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Davis, Helen M., R10004.
Lee, Harriet S., M10001.
McDaniel, Myra L., J13.
Riley, Winifred G., R10071.
Robinson, Ruth A., J45.
Ryan, Barbara M., R10074.
Sheehan, Helen R., J46.
Snyder, Agnes P., M10003.
Tipton, Dorothy G., M10020.
Whitcomb, Beatrice, M10076.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be majors, Army Nurse Corps*

Adams, Melba L., N1424.
Adams, Phyllis W., N1019.
Agar, Bernice J., N2257.
Allebach, Cora L., N2175.
Allen, Gertrude F., N251.
Allen, Mayna R., N2106.
Amend, Rebecca V., N2417.
Anderson, Robena C., N2150.
Angell, Elizabeth E., N2325.
Ansley, Edith, N724.
Archer, Rubye W., N1634.
Artz, Elizabeth, N264.
Atwood, Dorothy M., N2144.
Autry, Della F., N2451.
Avery, Lillian V., N1037.
Ayer, Ida B., N2082.
Bacior, Agnes, N1530.
Backmann, Caroline M., N2241.
Baggett, Ella L., N2376.
Bailey, Margaret E., N2293.
Bair, Cecile E., N2232.
Baker, Catherine F., N2219.
Baker, Julia W., N1042.
Baker, Mescal, N109.
Baker, Nancy G., N611.
Baker, Nina M., N594.
Ball, Katherine, N358.
Barber, Pauline A., N128.
Barker, Mary R., N2382.
Barrett, Frances M., N730.
Barsh, Phyllis D., N1741.
Baskin, Johanna E., N2493.
Bauer, Anne N., N872.
Beck, Helen I., N2271.
Beedle, Doris I., N2235.
Beidle, Georgia V., N1282.
Bell, Mattie A., N694.
Belsit, Hazel, N2122.
Bender, Alice J., N2481.
Benedict, Maude B., N197.
Bennett, Anna R., N2407.
Benson, Jenevieve I., N2239.
Berg, Mary J., N2429.
Berkebile, Alma J., N2470.
Berry, Alice E., N1882.
Best, Bonnie J., N489.
Bevins, Loretta M., N1280.
Bilisky, Frances J., N758.
Bishop, Margaret N., N186.
Bitros, Minnie L., N691.
Bitter, Louise F., N1358.
Blatt, Margaret E., N583.
Blazetic, Gladys M., N2064.
Blossman, Inez H., N1273.
Blount, Jewell, N2327.
Bodis, Jeannette M., N2439.
Bodson, Goldie L., N1688.
Boles, Catherine G., N365.
Bonnet, Edith J., N1597.
Boone, Ada E., N1301.
Bourgeois, Emiline A., N2390.
Bowen, Geneva N., N1966.
Bowling, Pauline J., N578.
Bradsher, Marie E., N164.
Brandt, Bernice D., N2124.
Brandyberry, Marcella V., N618.
Brant, Esther E., N2288.
Brazeal, Lucy P., N842.
Breen, Edith R., N376.
Breen, Frances R., N2443.
Breneman, Ruth E., N1326.
Bresnahan, Margaret M., N132.
Breton, Margarita E., N2080.
Briggs, Dorothy P., N1651.
Briggs, Winifred M., N992.
Brookens, Treva B., N2130.
Brown, Helen E., N2558.
Browne, Hannah T., N2299.
Browning, Edna M., N1690.
Bryan, Mary C., N2094.
Burchfield, Muriel, N276.
Burkhead, Florence A., N1998.
Burleson, Gertie A., N2304.
Buro, Bessie C., N622.
Burrows, Mary L., N2152.
Burton, Ethel, N207.
Burts, Marjorie J. K., N2196.
Bustrann, Ruth, N936.
Butler, Monnie C., N1988.
Butler, Rose A., N590.
Butterworth, Virginia F., N2278.
Butts, Sara C., N297.
Byrd, Nelna M., N1051.
Cahill, Virginia F., N711.
Caldwell, Jeanette V., N2213.
Callentine, Helen L., N2187.
Candon, Marian W., N2381.
Cannoles, Margaret H., N1211.
Cannon, Margaret R. N2207.
Carsey, Mary J., N1429.
Carson, Lanetta I., N2238.
Casserly, Mary A., N1572.
Cavanaugh, Dorothy W., N2384.
Caylor, Jennie L., N1290.
Chadwick, Hazel C., N1289.
Chambers, Beatrice E., N107.
Chartrau, Dorothy M., N2099.
Chavez, Helen A., N1903.
Chrisman, Bertie L., N2395.
Cindric, Rose H., N1983.
Clark, Mary D., N755.
Clark, Mary E., N1295.
Clark, Mildred I., N608.
Clarke, Gertrude R., N2387.
Clarke, Lacadia M., N1132.

Clarke, Margaret G., N745.
Classen, Gertrude M., N2038.
Cleveland, Rita A., N2324.
Clymer, Barbara A., N409.
Coard, Louise M., N1577.
Coble, Frances J., N2253.
Coletti, Christine, N1642.
Collins, Esther R., N570.
Colyer, Betty L., N1206.
Comina, Marie A., N2406.
Connell, Florence T., N337.
Connor, Margaret E., N387.
Coover, Dora M., N1344.
Craig, Iris V., N2315.
Crate, Grace A., N1113.
Creaney, Tillie H., N2354.
Crittenden, Edna E., N2411.
Crosno, Gladys M., N2056.
Crossen, Flora B., N2397.
Croswell, Myrtle A., N2053.
Cullom, Barbara M., N1101.
Cully, Irene E., N614.
Cundiff, Helen E., N1670.
Cundiff, Virginia E., N850.
Cunningham, Eleanor R., N2408.
Cunningham, Dorothy M., N1390.
Curley, Ryta M., N2389.
Curran, Isabelle R., N1984.
Dalrymple, Elmira, N922.
Dalton, Helen D., N1886.
Davies, Robertine E., N1263.
Davis, Anna L., N732.
Davis, Caroline, N161.
Davis, Hazel D., N1013.
Dawley, Harriet A., N644.
De Frane, Georgia D., N701.
DeHaven, Grace I. B., N317.
De Pollo, Helen M., N2447.
Dean, Kathleen M., N1596.
Delaney, Grace, N454.
Dembeck, Helen C., N1222.
Dennis, Anna K., N1965.
Derryberry, Jewell, N214.
Dial, Evelyn E., N2444.
Dickie, June M., N2113.
Dickson, Grova-Nell, N484.
Diekroeger, Luella E., N1861.
Dietsche, Helen P., N665.
Dillemuth, Rachel E., N1576.
Dolan, Patricia P., N573.
Dolembo, Catherine M., N1927.
Doll, Helen L., N210.
Domert, Lydia M., N901.
Donahue, Dorothy M., N621.
Donahue, Mary S., N2090.
Donnedy, Madelyn P., N1220.
Donnelly, Eileen E., N175.
Donoghue, Rose A., N877.
Donovan, Mary E., N301.
Doody, Kathryn M., N338.
Dooley, Helen A., N2237.
Dorenkemper, Dorothy G., N577.
Dorset, Annie M., N225.
Douglas, Sadie B., N2394.
Dragolu, Victoria R., N2156.
Drake, Myrtie, N837.
Drakulich, Georgia F., N2046.
Drozd, Magdalene, N257.
Drumm, Judith M., N2467.
Duffy, Catherine E., N567.
Duley, Clara M., N1637.
Dumas, Mamie, N286.
DuVal, Helen G., N348.
D'Zurko, Anna, N2200.
Earle, Barbara E., N773.
Edenfield, Ruth, N2061.
Edenfield, Sammye, N740.
Edmund, Ingrid M., N2296.
Egan, Margaret M., N2058.
Ehalt, Alliene E., N2438.
Eidsaa, Alma O., N167.
Eilts, Allie M., N589.
Elliott, Dorothy V., N2245.
Enquist, Vera A., N2043.
Eskeldson, Marian, N1678.
Eubanks, Mildred, N2279.
Evans, Hazel L., N1404.
Fairley, Anna E., N1304.
Falcone, Gaeda N., N838.
Faulk, Eleanor H., N458.
Fay, Agnes I., N2012.
Feagans, Nellie I., N1547.
Fehr, Dorothy M., N1997.
Fell, Maxine H., N1425.
Fels, Dorothy B., N169.
Fennon, Isabel, N2371.
Fischer, Mercedes M., N2089.
Fisher, Lucille C., N1922.
Fisher, Ruth A., N350.
Flavelle, Elizabeth L., N1896.
Fleming, Janet M., N2055.
Fletterer, Florence L., N2428.
Flook, Margaret H., N702.
Flowers, Mary M., N180.
Folwell, Mary A., N2014.
Foor, Virginia E., N735.
Fore, Claudia L., N1131.
Foreman, Adele F., N2164.
Foster, Anne R., N655.
Fowler, Lucille I., N633.
Fowler, Mary M., N2484.
Fowlie, Gladys O., N2059.
Frandrup, Bernadine M., N2364.
Franklin, Loyce I., N2264.
Fraser, Mildred L., N624.
French, Irma J., N1009.
Frey, Irene, N603.
Fries, Josephine A. G., N1894.
Fuller, Anne L., N587.
Fullerton, Jeanne T., N674.
Furlong, Mildred M., N1401.
Fusi, Bruna G., N2182.
Fusselman, Gladys L., N1419.
Gaillard, Jeanne M., N1970.
Galvin, Mabel, N266.
Garniewski, Victoria J., N2318.
Gattis, Margaret L., N1245.
Gawarecki, Julia F., N2273.
Gayle, Mary H., N2034.
Gaylord, Tyyne N., N1964.
Geis, Rita M., N2087.
George, Anne, N1908.
Gianarakos, Anastasia E., N2005.
Gill, Marie A., N1971.
Gillard, Marjorie G., N991.
Gilligan, Ramona A., N1907.
Girard, Pauline H., N218.
Girarde, Lillian C., N172.
Goodrick, Dorothy S., N2375.
Goodson, Melrose C., N703.
Goodwin, Joyce, N1284.
Goodyear, Bess C., N2179.
Grass, Barbara A., N369.
Graves, Julia T., N2195.
Green, Josephine M., N2400.
Greenfield, Ruth L., N873.
Grenon, Jeannette D., N1002.
Grissom, Willie M., N1987.
Groh, Emma C., N1298.
Groh, Hortense S., N256.
Groh, Mary T., N2008.
Guest, Revella, N195.
Gunlogson, Alice, N2194.
Gustafson, Pauline A. C., N2148.
Hagler, Ethel I., N2007.
Hall, Edna F., N2284.
Hall, Ethel E. L., N2399.
Halonen, Alice M. S., N1001.
Hammarlund, Mabel, N2057.
Hardman, Mabel O., N853.
Hargrove, Edna, N1880.
Harkins, Anna DeL., N1416.
Harnett, Helen, N2151.
Harper, Dorothy B., N2178.
Harris, Frankie D., N579.
Hartley, Mary E., N1375.
Hartman, Lulu J., N1724.
Haselmire, Nora C., N643.
Hawkins, Dale A., N1129.
Haydel, Juanita E., N1900.
Hayenga, Virginia P., N1976.
Hayes, Katherine E., N688.
Hayes, Sally C., N1231.
Hays, Anna M. McC., N905.
Hayworth, Helen G., N2128.
Heath, Bernice I., N1385.
Heide, Nargith H., N1293.
Heinrich, Helen M., N203.
Heinz, Helen D., N2065.
Helm, Margaret C., N2401.
Hendrickson, Sylvia E., N2202.
Henley, Nellie L., N486.
Hennies, Elma E., N401.
Henry, Jonike E., N1065.
Hentges, Elsie M. C., N390.
Hergert, Ione E., N2363.
Herrin, Jane E., N303.
Hester, Sue I., N442.
Hill, Levenia E., N2062.
Hines, Mary L., N1974.
Hogan, Ann E., N1201.
Hogan, Gertrude P., N2225.
Honeycutt, Hazel V., N1913.
Hoppock, Eleanor M., N2377.
Horan, Leona E., N2431.
Horne, Elizabeth R., N1277.
Houck, Rose E., N2141.
Houseknecht, Luluah Y., N154.
Howell, Ann E., N985.
Hufcut, Vira B., N2243.
Huffman, Lessie P., N2228.
Humphrey, Josephine G., N2256.
Hyland, Ann T., N469.
Infosino, Lucy M., N861.
Ingram, Alberta T., N391.
Ingram, Lemma M., N698.
Ingram, Sallie H., N1302.
Jablunovsky, Velma V., N471.
Jackson, Margaret E., N918.
Jamison, Pearl E., N2009.
Jamula, Cecilia P., N485.
Janas, Bertha K., N481.
Jankoviak, Angeline P., N996.
Jankowski, Hendrina, N2385.
Jarma, Luciana, N2323.
Jayne, Harriet J., N708.
Jeffreys, Alice C., N1229.
Jelinek, Leda E., N437.
Jensen, Emilie K., N60.
Jentgen, Carolyn M., N584.
Johnson, Edna L., N1909.
Johnson, Gladys E., N2201.
Johnston, Pauline V., N2140.
Jones, Hazel M., N944.
Jones, Opal M., N2404.
Jones, Peggy G., N363.
Jordan, Mary C., N987.
Jordan, Mary E., N756.
Judd, Florence E., N232.
Jump, Katherine R., N341.
Kabana, Margaret A., N1661.
Kaiser, Emma S., N224.
Kammeraad, Angie C., N1529.
Kauffman, Kathren L., N2127.
Kauffman, Mildred B., N2274.
Keating, Marie A., N671.
Keefe, Mary E., N1451.
Kehoe, Lelia M., N1349.
Keith, Catherine C., N662.
Kemp, Leila, N379.
Kennedy, Marian C. I., N2487.
Kent, Isabel M., N1973.
King, Florence H. N2427.
King, Helen E., N2409.
King, Mary L., N321.
Kinnaird, Ruby L., N231.
Kinnison, Lois F., N245.
Kinsey, Nancy B., N2025.
Kirschling, Cecelia L., N1062.
Knapp, Ann E., N2249.
Knips, Alberta H., N971.
Koltvet, Anna, N119.
Koschmeder, Julia F., N2307.
Kossalka, Julia E., N1562.
Koziol, Jean B., N1603.
Kraft, Idelle D., N1056.
Kraftschenk, Dorothy E., N287.
Kramolis, Marie C., N2356.
Krchnavi, Elsie, N2188.
Kroll, Marilyn, N182.
Kronemeyer, Sylvia M., N461.
Krumanocker, Josephine M., N1045.
Krumperman, Lucile, N1338.
Kruse, Joyce J., N2210.
Kudletz, Rose, N1560.
Kuhn, Mary H., N1920.
Kuruts, Katherine R., N1274.
Kydd, Marjorie W., N324.
Laggan, Mary M., N1028.
Lamb, Elizabeth V., N399.
Landis, Helen M., N1299.
Lang, Thelma L., N1979.
Langdon, Hazel L., N2138.

LaPlante, Theresa S., N1917.
Lark, Martha L., N2418.
Laubacher, Harriet T., N1112.
Lavin, Marguerite M., N2071.
Lawrence, Caryl R., N1242.
Lawton, Elva J., N1978.
Lee, Mary E., N2118.
Leland, Helena M., N874.
Lenz, Adeline H., N625.
Lessard, Marcia M., N1079.
Lewis, Blanche Z., N714.
Lewis, Iva D., N1083.
Lewis, Luella R., N340.
Lien, Elsie M., N630.
Lieske, Beata M., N361.
Lillard, Erma L., N2276.
Lindau, Marjorie J., N2154.
Lines, L. Marguerite, N1219.
Linke, Jean M., N1992.
Linn, Edna J., N323.
Lionais, Irene, N1217.
Lipowski, Stella, N1967.
Little, Laura B., N1636.
LoCicero, Josephine A., N1296.
Lockwood, Esther M., N1281.
Lohman, Martha E., N1325.
Lohrmann, Agnes B., N1329.
Lohrmann, Imelda H., N1254.
Lokuta, Loretta L., N259.
Loman, Mamie V., N1014.
Lonchar, Helen T., N1012.
Long, Johnnie E., N1994.
Looper, Floy L., N744.
Lovin, Helen B., N2250.
Lozinak, Mary M., N2291.
Lucas, Virginia G., N1551.
Lund, Edythe M., N1977.
Lusas, Frances A., N1735.
Lyle, Shirley McC., N331.
Lyon, Irene, N2496.
MacDonald, Verna E., N2379.
Maher, Margaret L., N2319.
Mahn, Gertrude I., N752.
Mahoney, Elizabeth C., N1665.
Malerba, Agnes C., N1036.
Malone, Rhoda E., N364.
Manning, Ramona S., N446.
Mantor, Frances C., N813.
Marks, Alice S., N1418.
Martin, Mary L., N449.
Martin, Sarah N., N1532.
Martini, Marian E., N208.
Marwine, Beulah L., N2097.
Mason, Isabelle A. C., N148.
Massie, Myrtle D., N2446.
Massoni, Mary A., N927.
Mastroianni, Ellen, N2252.
Matheson, Marjorie, N928.
Matthias, Doris V., N2485.
Matthias, Edith F., N1980.
Maxeiner, Pauline G., N283.
Maxwell, Hazel M., N2010.
Maxwell, Mamie H., N2380.
Maxwell, Pauline E., N133.
McAndrews, Blanche M., N63.
McBride, Dorothy, N2004.
McCain, Ruby E., N252.
McCally, Mary J., N770.
McCally, Mildred A., N771.
McCarthy, Eileen L., N2143.
McClellan, Iola R., N278.
McCommons, Daisy M., N146.
McCord, Frances S., N2388.
McFadden, Martha A., N402.
McGill, Barbara R., N445.
McGuire, Venona M., N2136.
McMahon, Agnes, N1605.
McNeil, Esther, J., N2473.
McQuiston, Marian R., N1567.
McWatt, Elizabeth H. S., N2258.
Mears, Anne, N2456.
Melton, G. Elizabeth, N1918.
Menold, Mary V., N1202.
Messersmith, Betty E., N2142.
Meszar, Marjorie, N675.
Micklick, Irene E., N388.
Mikowski, Florence J., N1340.
Miller, Eileen A., N713.
Miller, Kathleen F., N1253.
Miner, Florence Z., N672.
Mire, Ouida R., N2461.
Mizelle, Margaret B., N2463.
Monette, Helen D., N900.
Monroe, Grace E., N563.
Monske, Freda L., N2135.
Montgomery, Vernie J., N1906.
Montgomery, Leona L., N1981.
Moore, Gladys, N239.
Moore, Jean, N2006.
Moore, Vivian M., N626.
Morris, Marie C., N2234.
Morris, Mary C., N2035.
Morris, Mary S., N346.
Morrison, Ida B., N1327.
Morse, Mary F., N860.
Morse, Mary F., N1417.
Moultrie, Mary L., N1985.
Murphy, Lenore L., N2131.
Murphy, Margaret M., N2137.
Murphy, Patricia T., N2107.
Murray, Dorothy H., N1294.
Musch, Myrtle M., N2372.
Myers, Lottie M., N2436.
Neal, Ida F., N2469.
Nearhood, Madeline L., N856.
Neisig, Nadine A., N1711.
Nelson, Edna M., N604.
Newell, Nelly, N885.
Newman, Mary E., N975.
Newton, Lucille, N134.
Nicholas, Hazel S., N2155.
Niles, Evelyn J., N1656.
Nolan, Charlotte L., N1551.
Nyberg, Alma M., N1552.
Nyez, Walburga G., N1236.
Oberg, Clara R., N2024.
O'Dwyer, Maureen P., N425.
Ogden, Lily M., N173.
Ognibene, Josephine M., N2289.
Olson, D. Marguerite, N1898.
Olszowy, Frances F., N1061.
Orbin, Mary J., N2476.
Orsini, Clara E., N2424.
Osborne, Naomi I., N1225.
Ouimet, Mary E., N1396.
Pace, Lucyle M., N1905.
Paetzold, Alma M., N886.
Pagano Philomena A., N354.
Page, Susie W., N1438.
Pagels, Elizabeth A., N2262.
Parker, Edna M., N271.
Parks, Jean L., N377.
Patterson, Evelyn M., N339.
Paul, Phoebe M., N353.
Paulson, Isabel S., N1376.
Pawlowski, Irene M., N1288.
Peacock, Leoleen I., N831.
Peake, Augusta K., N820.
Pearce, Marie L., N2212.
Pearce, Martha S., N2183.
Pears, Maria L., N2040.
Pearse, Mildred C., N1951.
Pecora, Florence M., N359.
Peene, Ava L., N663.
Pell, Thelma I., N2088.
Pensinger, Barbara H., N422.
Percival, Hazel, N696.
Perfett, Constance M., N2206.
Perreault, Marsciene A. B., N2396.
Pesci, Jane C., N2449.
Pesut, Elizabeth A., N258.
Peters, Marguerite L., N1975.
Pettengill, Alice E., N2101.
Pettibone, Margaret E., N1643.
Pfeffer, Henrietta H., N2413.
Phillips, Kathleen W., N2458.
Phillips, Rowella N., N1212.
Pinckney, Gladys H., N864.
Pirner, Hildegard A., N2285.
Pittman, Flora V., N367.
Plemon, Evonne L., N1860.
Plunkett, Ollie W., N2060.
Pollack, Julia R., N1571.
Ponticello, Rose L., N2197.
Popcke, June H., N1297.
Posey, Reber L., N1067.
Potochnik, Anna M., N2169.
Potter, Eleanor M., N2287.
Preecs, Ethelyn McI., N356.
Priddy, Lillian P., N1044.
Pritchard, Ruby E., N690.
Puckett, Martha A., N774.
Pugsley, Helen E., N1969.
Putnam, Helen P., N171.
Rabenold, Caroline L., N2374.
Rahm, Carolyn B., N1684.
Rakita, Helen J., N941.
Rancolita, Jean C., N253.
Rapp, Elizabeth F., N2366.
Rauktis, Helen D., N582.
Reed, Anna G., N2306.
Reed, Katherine C., N190.
Reed, Olie B., N1723.
Reeves, Ann, N974.
Regan, Margaret B., N2320.
Reutenauer, Marguerite C., N206.
Rheaume, Julianne M., N1553.
Richardson, Bertha D., N1208.
Richardson, Helen V., N407.
Rime, Mabel L., N1533.
Robertson, Mary M., N2432.
Robertson, Sue H., N1244.
Robinette, Arry I., N453.
Rodeman, Charlotte R., N601.
Rodenboh, Florence J., N723.
Rogers, Theda W., N444.
Romeo, Nina M., N1633.
Rosasco, Louise C., N2450.
Rose, Anne, N2190.
Ross, Edna E., N194.
Ross, Mary E., N1947.
Rourke, Rita V., N677.
Rundell, Lilla B., N2392.
Russel, Evelyn L., N661.
Russell, Katherine A., N2416.
Russo, Jean G., N2159.
Ryan, Phyllis, N869.
Ryden, Etta L., N2422.
Salisbury, Helen M., N978.
Sandberg, Wilma K., N248.
Sanderson, Helen F., N220.
Satterfield, Ruth P., N2168.
Saulnier, Dorothy N., N249.
Scheel, Charlotte M., N2445.
Schelper, Anna K., N414.
Schild, Laura B., N1652.
Schloemer, Beulah, N588.
Schnader, Helen J., N834.
Schuchmann, Amanda E., N2147.
Schwind, Evelyn E., N2410.
Scoffield, Afton M., N2254.
Scott, Frances M., N1986.
Sebelien, Bernice M., N242.
Sedor, Elizabeth F., N1972.
Sedor, Sophia D., N2079.
Seibert, Gertrude C., N255.
Self, Azile, N228.
Self, Gladys B., N2246.
Sellars, Jacqueline H., N931.
Serfass, Berneda A., N729.
Seymore, Dorothy L., N2268.
Shadewaldt, Ruth F., N673.
Shaw, Doris L., N2433.
Shepherd, Elizabeth E., N204.
Shorter, Frances V., N2294.
Siebert, Rita M., N2425.
Siems, Florence M., N934.
Simpkins, Martha A., N1265.
Sipple, Blanche I., N1204.
Sjoberg, Jeanette E., N2248.
Skadorva, Estelle M., N1923.
Skiba, Sophia C., N411.
Skinner, Jean E., N572.
Slaats, Alpharetta E., N684.
Slack, Ada L., N2222.
Smith, Estelle, N2193.
Smith, Frances K., N1271.
Smith, Geraldine S., N2084.
Smith, Mary B., N413.
Smith, Mary I., N1005.
Smith, Maude M., N1096.
Smithers, Florence R., N2158.
Smull, Helen K., N1993.
Snaadt, Corinne E., N932.
Snape, Connie, N1904.
Sodt, Marjorie E., N1676.
Sorini, Charlotte R., N2270.
Sorrells, Jessie A., N600.
Soto, Lila D., N1990.
Sox, Barbara C., N2105.
Spendlove, Venice, N1345.
Spivey, Eva K., N1897.
Stack, Helen A., N104.
Stacy, Elinor C., N2260.
Stafford, Margaret C., N2204.
Stark, Amelia, N656.

Steenburgh, Ruth M., N2075.
Stevenson, Eleanor M., N1921.
Stewart, Blanche McR., N2003.
Stievenart, LaVerne, N260.
Still, Alice E., N2052.
Stivlen, Sylvia M., N1432.
Stohl, Dora J., N2455.
Stokes, Martha E., N2491.
Stoltz, Ruth M., N586.
Stone, Katrine F., N2386.
Stout, Carrie P., N889.
Stringfellow, Violet G., N2430.
Stroemer, Ruth M., N2104.
Stuwe, Kathryne C., N296.
Sulkowski, Cecilia A., N1420.
Svedirsky, Alice H., N876.
Swan, Eleanor J., N1901.
Swanson, Ruth M., N2176.
Swenson, Alice O., N196.
Tannehill, Helen C., N2172.
Tate, Dorothy T., N2272.
Taylor, Alice C., N1915.
Taylor, Anna L., N2163.
Taylor, Elizabeth P., N2077.
Taylor, Inez A., N2160.
Taylor, Ruth P., N302.
Teague, Madge M., N201.
Teasley, Agatha B., N2162.
Tewell, Mollie A., N333.
Thatcher, Margaret K., N973.
Thexton, Margaret A., N1034.
Thompson, Ida M., N373.
Thornton, Joyce A., N267.
Thurness, Elizabeth J., N436.
Tinkle, Evelyn F., N199.
Tkacik, Mary C., N1659.
Tollefson, Margaret E., N329.
Toole, Lena A., N1891.
Toudouze, Mary P., N467.
Travers, Estelle M., N314.
Travers, Sadye T., N2478.
Treacy, Jeanne M., N2093.
Trimmer, Mildred L., N1911.
Turner, Mildred, N174.
Tyler, Anne A., N263.
Urette, Fanny, N2074.
Van Baak, Lois H. A., N127.
Vaughan, Mary E., N1669.
Via, Lera V., N712.
Viedt, Doris W., N731.
Villamaria, Amelia, N2259.
Votava, Mary T., N448.
Wagener, Mary M., N153.
Waite, Eileen M., N2096.
Waldron, Miriam E., N1202.
Walker, Ada M., N2480.
Wallace, Joella W., N355.
Wallner, Margaret D., N2145.
Walls, Nellie E., N2070.
Walsh, Margaret M., N2420.
Ware, Aquillya M., N2435.
Warren, Sarah E., N2322.
Watry, Clara K., N700.
Watson, Ruth V., N416.
Webb, Maxine E., N2267.
Webber, Rebecca, N2134.
Weinstein, Alice E., N976.
Weir, Reba B., N1881.
Werley, Harriet H., N1241.
Werner, Ida B. A., N1303.
Wertenberger, Irene, N468.
West, Martha M., N1230.
Whalen, Louise A., N1586.
Wheeler, Margaret H., N2068.
Whitcomb, Virginie G., N2240.
Wickensheimer, Virginia, N372.
Wilborne, Mary W., N1728.
Wilde, Elizabeth A., N2220.
Wilkinson, Jane A., N2186.
Williams, Agnes L., N1239.
Williams, Althea E., N2098.
Williams, Irma F., N830.
Williford, Sarah L., N1310.
Wilson, Claire A., N2495.
Wink, Alice R., N858.
Winkler, Harriet E., N2479.
Witczak, Ann M., N610.
Wuerdinger, Gertrude E., N385.
Yancey, Martha J., N2149.
Yeik, Irene L., N2383.
Yerger, Marguerite A., N555.
York, Jeraldine, N1929.
Young, Miriam E., N2081.
Younger, Mary M., N288.
Younger, Vera W., N2459.
Zais, Anne B., N227.
Zalesney, Nellie J., N1536.
Zuerner, Lurline V., N1673.

*To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Arduser, Helen M., M10097.
Ashton, Madge, M10117.
Bender, Catherine M., M10024.
Binning, Marcel, M10011.
Bradley, Ruth W., M10021.
Brice, Virginia N., R10049.
Brigham, Agnes A., M10100.
Coeling, Ethel W., M10104.
Cohen, Belle K., M10059.
Conlon, Marcella A., M10035.
Desmond, Isabelle M., M10010.
Dillon, Edna L., M10118.
Douglas, Marion D., R10076.
Duer, Pamela E., M10105.
Eisele, Mabel M., J1.
Ellinger, Ruth W., M10025.
Evans, Nannie R., R10019.
Fowler, Elizabeth, M10077.
Frost, Virginia L., M10022.
Haag, Lucille M., R10110.
Harman, Thelma A., R10092.
Hawkins, Jean M., R10093.
Haxthausen, Halleene M., M10110.
Hook, Gladys T., R10017.
Huston, Nancy L., R10015.
Johnson, Fuchsia L., R10023.
Klainer, Cecelia T., R10135.
Lawrence, Mary S., M10103.
Lipscomb, Mary, R10025.
MacKellar, Rose M., R10097.
Manchester, Katherine E., R10016.
Miller, Elsie K., R10043.
Miller, Jessie L., M10072.
Myers, Cordelia, J62.
Nachod, Elizabeth M., J50.
Nevels, Elizabeth M., R10087.
Newton, Edith, M10111.
Parker, Doris L., R10018.
Petersen, Elna C., R10132.
Radke, Margaret E., R10024.
Richardson, Velma L., R10014.
Rizzo, Corrine C., M10043.
Sargent, Lois H., J63.
Smith, Carolyn E., R10089.
Stange, Carol, M10058.
Steele, Mada, M10044.
Strickland, Ida R., R10112.
Stuart, Margaret, R10084.
Thornton, Margaret J., R10077.
Watkins, Annabel, R10033.
Whitehurst, Margaret E., M10075.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be first lieutenants*

Adair, Billy R., O77245.
Addison, Richard L., O73541.
Andrews, Donald G., O77254.
Applewhite, Ray, O74627.
Arciero, Robert G., O77255.
Awtrey, Sherry E., O77257.
Baker, Jack E., O77263.
Baldwin, Noland Y., O75141.
Barcelona, Charles B., O71640.
Bare, Frank L., O77264.
Beal, Bruce T., O78224.
Beaube, George P., O74635.
Bockman, Leonard I., O74641.
Bozmyski, Valentine W., O77276.
Bradberry, William N., Jr., O77278.
Bramlett, James T., O77281.
Broman, Ralph W., O78242.
Brooks, Leo A., O75154.
Bryan, Thomas F., O77288.
Bunyard, Jerry M., O77290.
Cameron, Duane G., O77300.
Campbell, William W., Jr., O71769.
Cardwell, Kenneth E., O77305.
Chapin, Gordon R., O77313.
Cleary, Arthur C., O74660.
Click, Edwin F., O77322.
Cole, Donald J., O77328.
Colson, Keith Q., O77330.
Cornell, Robert K., O77336.
Costino, Michel, O77338.
Crosby, Richard D., Jr., O77345.
Crouch, Harry C., O75168.
Cuba, Paul J., Jr., O71911.
Darling, Allan L., O77350.
Davis, Dwight A., O77352.
DeWitt, William W., O77353.
Dickinson, William G., O77358.
Dill, Bobby M., O77359.
Dimsdle, Arthur, O73317.
Dixon, Allen C., Jr., O77363.
Dunn, Earl C., Jr., O71784.
Engram, Edwin J., O74684.
Esplin, Willard B., O74686.
Falbo, John J., O77380.
Farrow, James H., O77382.
Felker, Dale R., O77383.
Fernander, Bobbie B., O77385.
Finehout, Arthur W., O77388.
Fuellhart, Joseph M., O77396.
Gabrielli, Robert J., O77398.
Garcia, Eliseo J., O72370.
Gminder, Russell, O77406.
Goldberg, Daniel J., O77407.
Gontarski, Joseph W., O77408.
Gosney, Robert R., O77410.
Grant, John C., O77415.
Green, David E., O74703.
Green, Donald J., O77417.
Greer, Richard B., O74704.
Hally, John E., Jr., O77423.
Halsted, Thomas A., O73339.
Hampel, Victor H., O77426.
Hess, Carl H., O77441.
Heuschkel, Donald G., O77443.
Higgins, Alan R., O74722.
Hilbert, Donald E., O77445.
Hilton, Maynard E., O77446.
Hissong, Fred, Jr., O71518.
Hock, Robert C., O77450.
Hoffman, William J., O74727.
Hornish, William E., O77458.
Hough, Henry A., O77460.
Hymes, Morris A., O72390.
Imholz, Robert E., O77472.
Jackson, Tracy H., O77478.
Jarrett, Richard S., O77480.
Johnson, Jack O., O77484.
Jones, Thomas S., 3d, O75220.
Jordan, Horace E., O77492.
Justiss, Robert E., O77493.
Kanamine, Theodore S., O77494.
Kelly, Edward J., 3d, O77499.
Kinney, Philip R., O74747.
Kolditz, Walter, O77512.
Komarow, Ronald M., O75383.
Krengel, Thomas F., O72339.
Lizardo, Alex R., O74922.
Lloyd, Joseph W., O77533.
Lloyd, Luther R., O77534.
LoRe, Jesse D., O71935.
Lowery, George B., O71828.
Lyles, Jesse D., O77545.
Lynn, Charles T., Jr., O78410.
Main, Robert G., O77552.
March, Miles B., O71936.
Marshall, Thomas W., 3d, O77557.
McLaughlin, Thomas J., O74772.
McLay, Orville K., O75019.
Mendenhall, Robert L., O74773.
Merrick, Philip B., O74775.
Miller, Raymond H., O72764.
Miluszusky, Raymond J., O77580.
Momeier, John L., O75255.
Moore, David R., O77589.
Morton, Bryan D., O72526.
Mueller, Frederick W., Jr., O71847.
Oakley, Howard H., O77605.
Oblock, Louis W., O71944.
O'Leary, Arthur J., O77608.
Osborn, Phillip C., O77613.
Palermo, Frank J., Jr., O74799.
Pattakos, Arion N., O72635.
Perrin, Everett L., Jr., O75264.
Perschetz, Gerald, O77622.
Pettit, Lewis W., O71855.
Philbrook, Wilbur W., Jr., O77625.

Phillips, Clyde W., O75267.
Pierce, Wilbur R., Jr., O71950.
Pratt, Willis G., O77627.
Pryor, James M., Jr., O72776.
Purdy, Harry E., Jr., O72380.
Quinn, James R., O75273.
Ragains, Robert L., O74813.
Rajski, Daniel J., O72398.
Randolph, James W., O77637.
Rapkoch, James M., O77638.
Regan, John P., O77641.
Reid, Robert L., Jr., O77643.
Rice, Harley E., O77648.
Rider, James D., O77651.
Rogers, Roland B., O74827.
Roop, John R. C., O77656.
Rose, Ronald J., O75280.
Rowe, Richard H., O77662.
Rutledge, Howard L., O77665.
Savoldi, William R., O75284.
Schaefer, Rolland M., O77670.
Schneider, Finis E., O77674.
Senay, David C., O71667.
Sessions, Jerrald M., O77681.
Seward, John M., O77682.
Sherron, Gene T., O74841.
Smith, John A., O74846.
Spry, Alfred E., O74853.
Stein, Albert E., O77703.
Stevenson, Thomas A., O74855.
Stone, Leon H., Jr., O77711.
Street, Clover B., Jr., O72359.
Strom, Roy M., O77713.
Sullivan, Roy P., O77717.
Swanson, Robert L., O75302.
Talbot, Bailey M., 4th, O71964.
Tandy, Donald P., O72794.
Terzopoulos, Nicholas, O77727.
Thames, Peter H., O71965.
Thompson, John U., O77732.
Tigh, Leland F., Jr., O77736.
Toner, Francis J., O77737.
Torbett, William C., 3d, O77738.
Trent, Warren T., Jr., O77740.
Tunmire, Dana, O74873.
Turner, Joseph E., Jr., O72381.
Valz, Darwin K., O77748.
Van Houten, William, 3d, O77750.
Van Pool, Jack L., O77751.
Walker, Robert L., O72801.
Wallace, Joel B., Jr., O72661.
Walther, Harry J., O71888.
Ward, Chester L., O71889.
Wharrie, Robert E., O72405.
Williams, Lawrence A., O74892.
Williamson, Rayburn L., O77780.
Wilson, Parks W., Jr., O74894.
Woods, Eugene R., O77793.
Zurbriggen, Donald J., O77801.

*To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps*

Albright, Ruth M., L516.
Shippee, Audrey B., L518.

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

Bullard, John W., O75337.
Evans, Billy W., O74943.
Glenn, Dwight W., O74945.
Hubert, Alexander A., O74950.
Isbell, Charles A., O71926.
Piper, Donald R., O74953.
Russell, James L., Jr., O74954.
Silvernale, Douglas J., O75428.
Stiles, Peter W., O74959.
Stover, James W., O75433.

*To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps*

Atchison, Juanita M., N2776.
Berg, Ellen M., N2777.
Geissinger, Amy D., N2793.
Mimms, Barbara N., N2771.
Rodgers, Elizabeth I., N2806.
Tiernan, Pauline E., N2751.

*To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Lawrence, Lucille G., R10167.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3292, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

Herr, Norman Phillip, O406323.

*To be majors*

Cipriano, Noel Joseph, O420564.
Haefele, Joseph Lynn, O284499.

*To be captains*

DeMund, Robert John, O1051536.
Miller, Hubert G., O1295925.

*To be first lieutenant*

Bartelle, Talmadge Lewis, O2273216.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

Schunior, George Emanuel, O294918.

*To be majors*

Alsup, E. Herschel, O406667.
DiFusco, Manrico Peter, O401935.
McCall, Robert George, O511766.
Urbine, Anthony Wayne, O1533462.
Van Gilder, Robert Ellis, O452294.

*To be captains*

Arima, James Kenichi, O2002390.
Avrett, Marion Edwin, O1686368.
Barker, Arthur Wilson, O2046881.
Beakes, Francis Cleveland, O1547529.
Brown, Dale Edward, O2051063.
Brumley, Robert Dean, O1541893.
Bunte, Albert George, O1540784.
Buto, Junichi, O379031.
Camp, Frank Rudolph, Jr., O992504.
Case, Vernon Ernest, O452162.
Cevey, Paul Edgard, O1544779.
Craig, Howard Hancock, O1321997.
Eddinger, Clyde Charles, O447312.
Fanning, William Edward, O2049542.
Fellerman, Erwin Kenneth, O1547289.
Garza, Rene Charles, O2050050.
Ginikowre, George James, O1582758.
Greene, Billy Chadwell, O1058814.
Haggerty, John Edward, O1533076.
Halladay, Theodore Joseph, O1534276.
Heady, Harold Thomas, O1101484.
Hemperly, Cecil Willis, O454117.
Hesford, Douglas, O1533577.
Holtwick, Philip Barrett, O2042978.
Hooker, LaRay Dennis, O2048017.
Hunter, Donald Homer, O529618.
Lada, John, O1541381.
Levardsen, Richard Williams, O1534073.
Linthicum, Seth Hance, Jr., O428336.
Loyd, Reginald Charles, O1997572.
Mihm, Homer Walter, O1541200.
Morgan, John Gerlach, O2047755.
Morris, John William, O1285627.
Newman, Forest Pike, Jr., O2047090.
Nystrom, Rudolph, Jr., O2050593.
O'Neill, William Brendan, O2046777.
Ostby, Wallace Leuman, O2051522.
Petrini, Bruno Anthony, O1533170.
Quigley, Calvin Carlyle, O1541195.
Ramsey, Foster Goodstein, O2027433.
Rand, Richard Stanley, O2011204.
Reinel, Anthony Adam, O1535064.
Rogers, O. B., O934874.
Rogers, Robert John, O2050935.
Ross, William Edward, O1542893.
Schongalla, William, Jr., O1534196.
Simmons, Tom Alton, Jr., O2047499.
Tarantino, Frank Salvatore, O454141.
Turk, Richard Peebles, O2049420.
Waterfield, William Mac, O2050998.
Williams, Lewis Henry, O968875.
Winkler, Harry Thomas, O2051380.

*To be first lieutenants*

Beauregard, Robert McKean, O1927596.
Clyde, Norman Eugene, O4006201.
Conley, Robert, O2271737.
Herwig, Lee Conrad, Jr., O4017056.
Rose, Gerald Sylvin, O2102749.
Stocks, Harold Womack, O4024259.
Weber, Charles Joseph, Jr., O1878379.
Woods, Clyde Thomas, O4001959.

*To be second lieutenants*

Amidon, Charles Donald, Jr., O4065811.
Darnauer, Paul Fredrick, O2284096.
Davis, Robert M., O4077196.
Dawes, Ronald Blaine, O2285084.
DePonte, Joseph Paul, O4064477.
Irons, Ernest Morton, Jr., O4025301.
Johnston, Laurence, O4025205.
Long, James Elton, O4048701.
Murrell, Dan Stewart, O4083511.
Neitzel, Richard Frank, O4060199.
Neugebauer, Donald Lee, O2277089.

The following-named officers for appointment as chaplains in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be captains*

Ciesielski, Francis, O933326.
Hickey, John Jerome, O962888.
Paznonskas, Leonard Jerome, O997017.
Waldie, Thomas Edward, O514642.

*To be first lieutenants*

Brooks, Porter Harrison, O1340051.
Madden, James Francis, O2263865.
Shevlin, John Gerard, O2274695.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3311, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be captain*

Mason, Harriet May, L704149.

*To be second lieutenant*

Adams, Doris Marie, L1010897.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

*To be colonel*

Lander, Quintin Scougall, O261015.

*To be lieutenant colonels*

Adams, Burr Elward, O316082.
Arvin, Paul Dennis, O292797.
Chrietzberg, William David, O304821.
Ewell, James T., Jr., O334235.
McDaniel, Wallace Allen, O361232.
McMains, D. M., O298618.
Richardson, Robert Ernest, O350316.
Sherlock, John Vincent, O378775.
Surdyk, Eugene Edward, O337702.

*To be majors*

Abarr, Robert Gene, O1041699.
Allen, William Martin, O1102601.
Armstrong, Robert Paul, O1292635.
Ashenbrenner, Peter Joseph, O362060.
Baker, Morris Lee, O339879.
Bennett, William, O1291565.
Berry, George Albert, Jr., O1574577.
Blackwell, Lotus Berry, O383372.
Brown, Lawrence Granville, O408164.
Buerger, Kenneth Grossjean, O1697907.
Burns, Oran Frank, O354709.
Burton, Lloyd Parsons, O1697917.
Byorum, Henry Moon, O346385.
Carpenter, Sidney Crider, O374015.
Cheatham, William Lucian, O352101.
Christin, Charles Alfred, Jr., O347151.
Clifford, John Woodrow, O1165168.
Coburn, Herbert William, O389793.
Coffin, Sanford, O1307511.
Collings, Kent Jennings, O1308106.
Conway, Marion Lee, O1165169.
Cook, Woodrow Wilson, O2055521.
Cory, Allan Murray, O317810.
Cougill, John Calvin, O327207.
Cowan, Ralph Howard, O452265.
Crea, Robert Donkin, O507808.

Cude, Harold Eugene, Jr., O367705.
Dallas, Thomas Spencer, O333507.
Dickson, Robert Stephen, 3d, O376992.
Dingle, Robert Seth, Jr., O328099.
Dodge, Harland Laurell, O392772.
Donaghey, James Calvin, O403711.
Duncan, Harry Norman, O365335.
Durand, William Harris, O1002618.
Durst, Richard Henry, O391387.
Eason, Sidney Seaborn, O365170.
Eddy, John Herman, O376397.
Edwards, Elmer Forrest, O419289.
Eichen, Harris Clark, O900008.
Evans, James Grady, O1284687.
Evans, John Thomas O343226.
Fink, Richard Arthur, O1041758.
Fiske, Robert Walter, O410381.
Frost, Thomas George, O452021.
Funke, Nathaniel Louis, O398401.
Gates, Quinten Lachester, O406663.
Gibson, Henry William, O1165293.
Goldenberg, Joseph, O565453.
Gregorie, James Bujac, Jr., O3[illegible]3649.
Gundlach, Philip James, O342498.
Harper, Garlyn William, O1645635.
Harris, Charles Eric, O749162.
Hillard, James Russell, O382798.
Holton, Russell Gilman, Jr., O464562.
Horloch, Fred Hugh, O1290604.
Horowicz, Leo Stanley, O362952.
Hranicka, Joseph Gosnell, O400169.
Hughes, William Edward, O407709.
Jackson, Bennett Lee, O316126.
Jackson, John William, O319576.
Jackson, Kingsbury Temple, O391677.
Jillson, Stuart Farnham, O341959.
Jones, George E., Jr., O324137.
Jordan, Woodrow Wilson, O390568.
Kampschroer, Felix, O1040253.
Kopischkie, Carl Edward, O346614.
Kovach, Frank Zboray, O407698.
Kuehlke, Christian Gotlob, Jr., O354079.
Kulp, James Minor, O325483.
Langham, Dwight, William, O367053.
Lieding, Robert Kenneth, O362730.
Lovell, William Frank, O1285449.
Lowe, William Hollinger, Jr., O1283278.
Lucas, William Ashley, O339661.
Luckenbach, Everett Alexander, O327765.
Mack, John Denis, O1002681.
Maerz, Richard Hugh, O396673.
Malone, William Frank, O361378.
Mangum, Claud Darwin, O1581948.
Mansfield, Herbert Viscount, O361345.
Marshall, Ben Fridge, O413260.
McAdams, James Orien, O404984.
McCaskill, John Calvin, O322335.
McFarland, Edwin Doudna, O483152.
McKerral, Howard Alton, O318711.
Medinger, John Norman, O1633406.
Meis, Emil Ferdinand, Jr., O339668.
Melcher, John Frederic, O319400.
Mellett, Earle Clayton, O329440.
Merlo, William Joseph, O1798376.
Merrick, Ralph Bernard, O391391.
Merritt, Charles Augustus, O1643124.
Moffett, Oren E., O1002819.
Molloy, William Thomas, O363930.
Morrisey, John Charles, Jr., O1288097.
Moss, Alfred Harold, O394280.
Moye, Ralph George, O328198.
Murphy, James Henry, O351306.
Murray, Douglas Brooks, O366936.
Nabors, George Allen, O1018843.
Nealon, Arthur Joseph, O456222.
O'Connor, James Francis, O398653.
Pahl, Irving Charles, O450625.
Panell, Marion Randolph, O366818.
Parker, Warne Richard, O1303534.
Parr, William Richard, O355684.
Parrish, Edward Lawrence, O394374.
Pate, Brantley Miller, Jr., O356081.
Porter, William Amos, Jr., O385725.
Pugh, Delmar Arthur, O1296578.
Raouis, Bernard H., O391025.
Rapp, Paul Chadwick, O1287059.
Reed, Gilbert Richard, Jr., O400215.
Reeder, Roger Earl, O328394.
Reinhard, Charles Arthur, O375508.
Reiter, Nathan Irving, Jr., O1994515.
Rice, John Lenheart, Jr., O386792.
Roberts, Robert Andrew, O361169.
Robichaux, Douglas Benedict, O365112.
Ruff, Henry, O384032.
Savan, Jules, O366147.
Scheftel, Lawrence Abraham Lowensohn, O373073.
Schmidt, Ronald William, O320294.
Sewell, Donald M., O391162.
Shaw, Stanley Hammond, O376448.
Smith, William Moffett, Jr., O341117.
Snow, Harold Eugene, Jr., O1633571.
Spagnolo, Joseph Anthony, O1038491.
Stoecker, John Van Dover, O453017.
Sunshine, George Philip, O450919.
Surface, Cress, Jr., O1053387.
Tankersley, Milton Jutson, O398981.
Thomas, Douglas Robert, O396347.
Tichenor, John Field, O454847.
Tjossem, Oliver Paul, O1166851.
Tompkins, Charles Henry, O1581428.
Trattner, Herbert Marvin, O1794884.
Traver, Paul Carlton, O342020.
Treneman, Robert Arthur, O343571.
Ulanowicz, Emil Michael, O396758.
Vail, Robert Edward, O1285522.
Van Wert, Robert Wayne, O1548157.
Vangen, Terrance Anthony, O1283873.
Vaughn, Jack Erwin, O1040634.
Vignes, Joseph Larose, O395132.
Von Sholly, Frederick William, O1557106.
Vuksich, Melvin Michael, O367837.
Wadsworth, William Franklin, Jr., O425139.
Ward, Ben Hunt, O465228.
Weaver, Earl John, O452654.
Westbrooke, Jack Griffin, O385837.
Wheatley, Melford Marcelle, O375943.
Whitney, Carl Everett, Jr., O398275.
Whitt, Ralph Lee, O452098.
Wilkins, Wallace W., Jr., O387709.
Williams, Ezra Max, O375357.
Williams, Thomas Calvin, Jr., O1296461.
Wingfield, William Benjamin, O327988.
Winterbottom, Frederick William, O388482.
Wood, Starling Witt, Jr., O375055.
Young, Leilyn Malhorn, O389005.
Zebrowitz, Morris, O375533.

*To be captains*

Abrams, Lester Winfield, O2037155.
Adamo, Pascal, O1822972.
Adinaro, Joseph Thomas, O1635235.
Aguilar, Arthur, O1582547.
Ahrenholz, Albert Francis, O1167716.
Akers, Walter William, O1846014.
Albanese, Archie Joseph, O1313363.
Allender, Nicholas Vickers, Jr., O1030541.
Anderson, David McClure, O1593433.
Anderson, Frank Ernest, O1285690.
Anderson, Russell Vernon, O1287813.
Applebee, John Elsworth, O1014618.
Applegate, William Gould, O1590965.
Arbuckle, Robert Charles, O1035310.
Armstrong, Russell Benjamin, Jr., O1639897.
Aston, David Thomas, O448981.
Baer, Malcolm Ridgely, O1287120.
Bagley, James Curry, O1285173.
Bahr, Herman Joseph, O1641984.
Bailey, Kenneth Lee, O495178.
Baker, Claude, W., O1289856.
Balaker, Basil Charles, O1104725.
Balmforth, Edmund Elliott, O2200103.
Banse-Fay, Frederick Vincent, O1332045.
Barnett, Clarence Charles, O1300439.
Barnhizer, Harry Joseph, O1573723.
Barone, Sandro Armando, O1334531.
Barrett, Frederick Taylor, O1651942.
Barton, Deforest Allen, O1337917.
Bauknight, George William O1286767.
Beahler, Lee Edward, Jr., O1106582.
Beaman, Milburn Frank, O1004734.
Beaty, Edward Robert, O1012384.
Becraft, Clarence William, O1335103.
Bell, Ernest Lee, O1283008.
Bell, Raymond Eugene, O1036753.
Bell, Thomas Lewis, O1946910.
Bender, Keith Gordon, O1041963.
Benge, Charles Johnnie, O1284085.
Benson, Robert Charles, O2055465.
Benson, Theodore Nelson, O516913.
Berg, Jacob James, O1062663.
Berger, Rayfield Robert, O1044759.
Berger, Roy Harold, O1036847.
Berkshire, Harry George, O2008606.
Berlin, Walter Irvin, O1292995.
Berridge, William Joseph, O1845339.
Berris, Michael Thomas, Jr., O1003669.
Berry, Fred Parke, O583061.
Bess, Victor Eugene, O1281482.
Betit, Joseph Washington, O2020705.
Bickford, Robert Joseph, O1797936.
Biersack, Christian Matthew, O1116331.
Bishop, Clarence Edwin, O1317261.
Bishop, John Henry, O1062468.
Black, Charles Samuel, O1117362.
Black, James Robertson, Jr., O2274638.
Blackman, Edward Bonner, O441493.
Blackwell, Roy Vail, O1585861.
Blair, Bruce Everett, O1583892.
Bohn, William Walter, O1109820.
Bolke, Francis Gene, O1043574.
Bond, James Joseph, O1044179.
Borges, Richard Anthony, O1948696.
Botchin, Philip, O456600.
Bowles, Alvin Hoyt, O1037405.
Bowman, Harvey Rowland, Jr., O1295988.
Bowman, Joseph Carlock, O1280922.
Boyd, William Edward, O1290536.
Boyer, Ray Yeager, O1573737.
Bradley, Robert Weston, O1329209.
Brady, Robert Walter, O1304636.
Brady, Walter, O1166912.
Branham, Milton Gelwicks, O1548654.
Brant, William Allen, O1048693.
Braun, William Francis, O1826122.
Brickell, Grant Rice, O1037413.
Bridenbaugh, Donald Davis, O1166234.
Brigandi, Joseph, O540530.
Britten, Roland Leon, O1551806.
Brooks, George, O450807.
Brown, David William, O1337539.
Brown, Guy Wilson, O1325975.
Brown, John George Carleton, O1010305.
Brown, Kitchen Neville, O1326134.
Brown, Lloyd Winfield, O1325122.
Brubeck, David Lindley, O392968.
Brugge, Robert Otto, O1118172.
Bryant, Oren Wayne, O520817.
Buckingham, James Stewart, O1186172.
Buckles, Ronald J., O372058.
Bullock, Baxter Mangum, O1799235.
Bunton, Raymond Barnard, O1104534.
Burch, Robert Leonard, O1334096.
Burgess, James Martin, O1327711.
Burke, Donald Dean, O1169445.
Burke, James Rogers, O2055215.
Burnette, Thomas Nelson, O1032195.
Burns, Patrick James, O1010461.
Burton, Edward Kearney, O1947471.
Bush, Leonard Raymond, O2000539.
Butler, David Clifford, O1293544.
Butler, Frank Lawrence, O1186504.
Cadmus, George William, O679826.
Callinan, Patrick Michael, O397053.
Campbell, James William, O1010317.
Cannon, Clinton Carlisle, Jr., O1548675.
Cantaral, Raymond Hugh, O1548676.
Carlson, Carsten Douglas, O1306812.
Carpenter, Clyde Pershing, O400802.
Carroll, Edward Francis, O2007004.
Carson, John Lee, O425262.
Cassell, John William, O870684.
Cassias, Clarence Eugene, O1183485.
Castrale, James, O1286438.
Catania, Alfred John, O1584371.
Caudell, Louis, O1306702.
Causgrove, Bernard Thomas, O1183325.
Cellucci, Loreto, O1634605.
Chase, Jack Powers, O1599099.
Cheek, Leon Blakely, Jr., O1165596.
Child, Thomas Waring, Jr., O1633116.
Christian, Averill Lee, O409721.
Christiansen, Donald Andrew, O1169897.
Church, Charlie Roller, O1290716.
Citrak, Michael, O2000516.
Clare, George Frederick, O1645170.
Clark, Stephen, O450107.
Clavio, James Dominic, O1556397.
Cline, Edbert Clayton, O465506.
Cloutier, Francis McCormick, O1638882.
Coates, Charles Everett, O1016737.
Coburn, Dick, O437068.
Coffey, William Wagner, O1280815.

Coggins, Clyde Alton, O1308604.
Collins, Gilbert Richard, O1012814.
Collins, Philip Russell, O1822963.
Colt, John Boyd, O1165600.
Colvocoresses, Alden Partridge, O390093.
Compton, Jack Emil, O1290902.
Cook, Bruce Kingsbury, O518863.
Cooke, Raymond Warren, O1172913
Coombs, Richard Brown, O1575878.
Cooper, William Reed, O1584076.
Copp, Duport Mauro, O1182088.
Corcoran, Edward William, O383431.
Corneli, Robert Wesley, O1183045.
Cortez, Clyde Amado, O1318385.
Costa, Leonard LeRoy, O1017590.
Costilla, Fred, O1998721.
Crain, Charles Lorand, O1297166.
Crane, Ray Thomas, O1589773.
Cranford, Jack, O1046403.
Curtis, Lawrence Brabson, O1575892.
Dague, Robert Victor, O1100067.
Dallinga, Hyrum, O1017302.
Dalton, Dermot Patrick, O1170697.
Dalton, Elvin, O1038952.
Davino, Louis, O1329331.
Davis, Charles Emil, O1322978.
Davis, Dale Ervin, O1579544.
Davis, Frank Brownie, O1015356.
Dayton, Kenneth Goodman, O1588514
Debyle, George Albert, O1536161.
De Rieux, Stanley Neil, O1634670.
DeSanto, Anthony Joseph, O1169925.
DeWitt, Richard Phillip, O1058225.
Dean, Gernard Daniel, O530000.
Derry, Hugh Augustin, O1645782.
Delaney, Edward Joseph, O1000734.
Dempster, Robert Nicol, O1341521.
Denhart, John Frederick, O922576.
Dewhirst, Sam Turner, O1635615.
Dezarn, Lowell Bernard, O1120006.
Dickerson, William Rowe, Jr., O1297172.
Dickerson, Roy Linville, O465087.
Dillon, Francis Henry, Jr., O538531.
Dillon, Paul Cox, O389623.
Dixon, Billy Lee, O1341644.
Dodd, William Ray, O1179371.
Dodson, Arthur William, O1290044.
Donaldson, Kenneth Colvin, O449156.
Doppel, Leroy, O1057721.
Dorr, Colgate, O558622.
Douglas, Wayne Minshull, O2042810.
Dover, Donovan Carl, O1043319.
Dowden, Richard Leon, O540478.
Downie, John William, O1295845.
Drake, Oscar, O1325482.
Drozd, Walter Marjan, O1045719.
Dul, Peter A., O1321110.
Dunbar, Philip H., Jr., O1184806.
Duncan, William Lyle, O1289880.
Dunlap, Jack Alexander, O1204635.
Dunlop, John, O2036904.
Dunn, Horace Bonsey, Jr., O1548201.
Dunn, Richard James, Jr., O1634702.
Dupart, William Louis, O1328682.
Durham, James Thomas, O1586548.
Dwyer, Robert Charles, O1844738.
Dye, Laverne E., O1016660.
Dye, Thomas Addison, Jr., O1030556.
Ecklon, Leland Christian, O1845030.
Eggleston, Edmond Overton, O1114469.
Eiler, William Robert, O2026311.
Eliasson, Arne Holger, O1061377.
Elkins, Robert Davis, O425497.
Elliott, John William, O663879.
Ellis, Walter Graham, O1020404.
Ellison, Milton Herbert, O885520.
Ellison, Paul Parks, Jr., O1335910.
Elwell Raymond Garrett, O1633831.
Emerick, James Clayton, O1332589.
Ensor, John Oscar, O1329340.
Erickson, John Donald, O1171135.
Etchemendy, Leon, O444709.
Evans, Edward Spaulding, O1294114.
Evans, James Anderson, Jr., O1634729.
Evans, Luther, Jr., O1040022.
Evers, Raymond Russell, O417491.
Farkash, Eugene Jack, O1633842.
Farnham, Kenneth Nathanial, O1080705.
Felch, Robert Irving, O412567.
Fell, Joseph Gerard, O1339712.
Field, David Dudley, O1586572.
Filby, Robert Arthur, O1997789.
Finlayson, Hugh Stewart, Jr., O553369.
Fischer, Leonard Jack, O1634750.
Fish, Frederick James, O1041760.
Fisher, Paul M., O1011309.
Fleck, Harold John, O1011737.
Fleming, William, Jr., O1588556.
Flynn, Joseph Vincent, O1325745.
Flynn, Thomas Beury, O1036524.
Foley, Francis Edward, O2200119.
Foley, Richard Francis, O1011943.
Ford, Clifford Haun, O521821.
Forrester, Charles Tucker, Jr., O1575935.
Forsyth, George Edward, O1588560.
Fourt, Herbert John, O1179070.
Fowler, Philip James, O1797984.
Fox, Archie Carl, O2027542.
Frame, Golden James, O1582729.
Franzak, Theodore Daniel, O1703949.
Freda, Thornton George Embree, O442456.
Freeman, Herman Oliver, O1557150.
Frol, Anthony Belmore, O540892.
Furr, James Homer, O1058519.
Furth, Norman Joseph, O1169969.
Gabella, George Theodore, O1013229.
Gaffney, Leo Francis, O1534490.
Gandy, William Frederick, O1107968.
Garr, Arthur Sylvester, O1119059.
Garrett, O. G., O1305568.
Gentry, Clarence E., O1118377.
Gettman, Richard Philip, O477012.
Gewinner, Marcus Napoleon, O1288887.
Giaccio, Albert Pascal, O413776.
Gibbs, Cyrus Leroy, O1178162.
Gill, Harvey Eugene, O544496.
Gillert, Gustav John, O2020719.
Gioia, Joseph Frank, O1178812.
Glaser, Robert Donovan, O1313594.
Glass, Malvin Franklin, Jr., O1037503.
Gleason, James Keith, O1640488.
Godfrey, Wayne Richard, O550633.
Goldrick, Robert Newton, O1639082.
Goley, Byron Haywood, O2036926.
Goodwin, Guy Russell, Jr., O337919.
Goodwin, James Maurice, O483712.
Gordner, Henry Louis, O1318782.
Goss, Donald Franklin, O1280910.
Gould, Harold Alan, O1101012.
Grandelli, Charles Michael, O1332596.
Graser, Harry Carl, O1593597.
Greene, George Victor, Jr., O1948141.
Greer, Herman Earl, O1179870.
Gregg, George Francis, O1059795.
Gresick, Bernard Alexander, O1012739.
Gribble, Lee Roy Waldon, O1637566.
Griffin, Robert William, O1287866.
Griffith, Robert Elmon, O1593600.
Gritz, Sidney, O1101467.
Grodin, Richard Adrian, O1295363.
Guiang, Marcelino Colorado, O1896858.
Guice, Billy Milton, O1303880.
Guild, Donald Edmund, O1012189.
Gursky, Alex Peter, O2025959.
Gwynn, John Edward, O1573247.
Gysin, Thomas William, O1057083.
Hack, Sidney, O1061413.
Hacker, Frederick, O1179876.
Haen, Clifford Leo, O439507.
Hagar, Bailey Warren, O442471.
Haight, Chauncy Price, O1171172.
Hale, Albert Carson, O1598405.
Hall, George Ross, O405726.
Hall, Ohio Columbus, O1051583.
Hallanan, George Henry, Jr., O454135.
Hamer, George Richard, O1697960.
Hamilton, Joseph, Jr., O1302647.
Hamilton, Robert Brendon, O1051584.
Hand, Clifton Earl, O1050699.
Hanna, Nathaniel Phillip, O466721.
Hanna, Thomas Gerald, O1171574.
Haralson, Browning Roy, O1332812.
Harbin, Darwin Dougherty, O1305578.
Hardin, George Blaine, Jr., O1287706.
Harrigan, Thomas York, O1823442.
Harris, Earl Donovan, O1634855.
Harris, Leon Milton, O1000577.
Harris, Neal Wesley, O391447.
Harris, Peter James, O1169560.
Harris, Roland, O571956.
Harrison, James Jacoby, O1316291.
Hartline, John David, O1637622.
Harvey, William Thomas, O1040935.
Hassinger, Robert Wayne, O1688340.
Hawk, Edwin Louis, O1649681.
Hawke, Willard Wesley, O1302462.
Hawley, George Richmond, Jr., O2012195.
Hayes, Lincoln Richards, O1041359.
Hayes, Stephen Hawley, O1591183.
Haymaker, Gerald LeRoy, O1041164.
Haynes, Chester Harold, O1308640.
Hearn, William Monroe, O1319207.
Hecklinger, Henry Donald, O1062380.
Helterbran, David Joseph, O1000782.
Henderson, John Ray, O405831.
Hendricson, Harold Maris, O1012772.
Henry, Charles Onis, O1293050.
Henry, John Frank, O377094.
Herrington, Rupert Cuthbert, O1589000.
Hessler, Robert John, O1292698.
Hetzel, Foster Greer, Jr., O1118387.
Higgins, Robert Francis, O1585617.
Hill, Ralph Edward, O1647081.
Himic, Steve Paul, O1296032.
Hinrichs, Frank Anton, O390975.
Hipley, Fred Francis, O1335788.
Hirsch, Edward, O437855.
Hisaka, Masakatsu, O1331946.
Hockaday, Spencer Thurston, O449046.
Hoffman, Robert Lee, O1176669.
Holt, Paul Ensley, O2020155.
Holt, Robert Bandy, O1288746.
Honeman, Donald Edwin, O456140.
Hooks, Walter Allen, O1000381.
Hopkins, Paul Everet, O1594242.
Hopkinson, Harry Lowe, O1035285.
Hopper, Harold Winthrop, O1031098.
Hosemann, Joseph Francis, Jr., O1048417.
Hostetter, Charles Alfred, O1039044.
Houston, Frank Wilmer, O2014907.
Howard, Hubert Carroll, O1000048.
Howard, John Andrew, O467323.
Howard, Norman Farlow, O1685646.
Hubble, James Everett, O2020646.
Hughes, Harold Lloyd, O1011453.
Hughes, Richard W., O1315447.
Hummel, Atlee Vorice, O1826008.
Hurd, James William, O1003763.
Hursh, Donald Gordon, Jr., O1591608.
Hyde, Thomas Irvin, O728214.
Hyndman, James Hugh, O1797467.
Ilston, William George, O452412.
Ireland, Robert Abner, Jr., O1551033.
Irish, Ralph Giles, O1642222.
Israelson, John Arthur, O1102127.
Jachens, Richard Charles, O1638994.
Jacks, John Lyles, Jr., O1588066.
Jackson, Charles Austin, O394902.
Jackson, Henry Taylor, O1341342.
Jacobs, Bruce Melburn, O1554213.
Jacobson, Arthur John, O1318044.
Jameson, Malcolm MacGregor, O400182.
Jardon, Eldo Beard, O1338241.
Jennings, Dan Duvol, Jr., O1283077.
Jewell, Jack Frederick, O1283969.
Jobst, John William, O1314785.
Johnson, James William, O962678.
Johnson, Richard Stephen, O1645700.
Jones, Cecil Reginald, O1336223.
Jones, Harold Irvin, O1297204.
Jones, Harry Lane, O2038882.
Jones, Homer Hardaway, O461025.
Jones, Hubert Rex, O1553481.
Jones, Murray Gillen, O1310604.
Jones, Robert Douglas, O1001817.
Judd, Donald Stowe, O1165747.
Jung, Gordon Clifford, O1333221.
Kantz, Robert John, O378459.
Karr, Guy Atchinson, Jr., O131408.
Kasdorf, Walter William, O1690748.
Katagiri, Taro, O1019927.
Kattner, Stanley James, O1579855.
Kay, Herbert Jack, O394936.
Kearins, Patrick Frank, O2046279.
Keefer, Robert Joseph, O447300.
Keet, Robert Tyler, O448790.
Keith, James Edgar, O468527.
Kelley, Peter E., O1322926.
Kelsey, Philip Richard, O1796965.
Kemp, Neal Raymond, O1031733.
Kennedy, Maurice Joseph, O1328044.
Kennedy, Richard Joseph, Jr., O1289271.
Kerker, Edward Lawrence, O435577.
Kern, William Russell, O1000142.
Kiernan, James Aloysius, O1313418.
Kies, Robert Herman, O1338609.

Kilbourne, Charles Alexander, O1307831.
Kim, Young Oak, O1309572.
Kimball, George Edward, O436358.
Klaver, Clarence Arie, O1646322.
Klundt, Roland Eugene, O2024460.
Knepp, Lester Johnston, O404220.
Knoeller, Frank Oiree, O1284716.
Knox, Thomas James, O398392.
Knudson, Wade Estrem, O754016.
Koehl, Leonard Henry, O2034889.
Kramer, David Oscar, O1341173.
Krometis, August Angelo, O1183908.
Kulhanek, Bernard Joe, O465939.
Ladson, Robert Nash, O374296.
Lambertus, Willard Leslie, O1290439.
Lane, Robert Wilson, O389069.
Lansford, Jack Perry, O1010516.
Lassiter, George Linvle, O1062772.
Laughlin, Lorenzo Dow, Jr., O1949831.
Lawless, Raymond Bernard, O1648208.
Lawless, Roger Edwin John, O455315.
Lecomte, Roger Laurant, O1540842.
Ledbetter, William Russell, O389559.
Lennon, Eugene Francis, Jr., O1036602.
Le Vant, William Spitzer, O536041.
Leonard, Robert Theodore, O1052860.
Leonard, Robert William, O1283451.
Lesniak, Walter John, O2035347.
Lewelling, Billy Reed, O1168777.
Lewey, Merle Creighton, O1641509.
Lewin, Edward Harrison, O1799460.
Lewis, Jack Keaton, O1535934.
Lind, Ralph William, O1015027.
Lindsey, Clifton Shelby, O377868.
Link, Roger John, O1640676.
Linn, William Erwin, O1169619.
Linrothe, Robert Nelson, O1177057.
Lipscomb, John Robert, O1997272.
Little, John Thomas, O887923.
Litton, Andrew LaRoe, O1951016.
Lockhart, Wilson Laverne, O1648360.
Lofland, William O., Jr., O1587419.
Logan, Douglas Kyle, O1340667.
Londner, Bernard, O1944514.
Long, William Fred, Jr., O453203.
Longbotham, Ralph Maynard, Jr., O1332982.
Loomis, Robert Kalman, O1170836.
Lopez, Fernando, O543714.
Lowe, Laddie Langford, O1557041.
Lowry, Leonard, O1302026.
Luick, Alton La Vern, O1582735.
Lumia, Salvatore Albert, O404788.
Lunceford, Roy Lorenza, O2037566.
Lyle, Paul Brown, O1170066.
Lytle, Elmer Edwin, O1167522.
Mabry, J. P., O1172153.
MacFarland, James Clark, O1576321.
MacIntyre, Ellsworth Thomas, O1578799.
MacKenzie, Douglas Alexander, O1305805.
MacLean-Kennedy, Donald Smith, O1688812.
Mader, William Peter, O1168350.
Madigan, William, O1032749.
Mahr, Warren Carney, O1338833.
Majeske, Arthur, O1174942.
Mangones, Robert Joseph, O1342092.
Marcelle, David Arthur, O397220.
Marin, Sebastian, Jr., O1327556.
Marks, Joseph Ward, O1288921.
Marksteiner, John Anthony, O2037629.
Marnoch, Gabriel Wilson, Jr., O518508.
Marshall, George Wilson, O1291850.
Marshall, Robert Bruce, O390594.
Martin, Doyne King, O1645179.
Martin, James Ellis, O1342093.
Martin, James Joseph, O1998114.
Martin, James Mahlon, O1823321.
Martin, Paul Edwin, O1339189.
Mathews, Morgan Howard, O743360.
Mattison, William Renhart, O396533.
Maxa, Rudolph Joseph, O1548102.
Mayer, Merle William, O1338258.
McAvoy, Donald Wayne, O454201.
McCaffrey, Donald Joseph, O1338259.
McCandless, Clarence Edwin, O1593067.
McClain, Wallis Eperson, O1010425.
McClellan, John Anthony, O1576351.
McClung, Boniface Dotson, O1316769.
McConnell, Donald Horace, O1100673.
McCoy, Joseph, O2006186.
McCue, Rufus Glenn, Jr., O1328276.
McDonough, Charles James, O1054705.
McHugh, John Joseph, O1590646.
McIntire, Ralph Walton, O1043166.
McKenna, Warren Earl, O2024336.
McKenzie, James Edward, O1283104.
McKenzie, William Edwin, O1318063.
McKiernan, John Thomas, O1639384.
McLaughlin, George Robert, O404264.
McLeod, Glenwood Paul, O1081485.
McMinn, John Henry, O1339901.
McNeil, William Edgar, O1341810.
McTague, Norman Scott, O1177085.
Melton, Charles Allen, O469856.
Menefee, Robert Gould, Jr., O1169649.
Mergler, Vernon Tilson, O1288270.
Merrell, J. Sterling, O453240.
Meyer, Warren Jay, O2037492.
Midgett, Garland Hugh, O1332398.
Miles, James Stewart, O442892.
Millar, Donald Bruce, O1046203.
Miller, Donald Edward, O1846036.
Miller, Francis Donald, O538342.
Miller, Frederic George, O1822169.
Miller, John Erven, O1288093.
Miller, William Bert, O1018307.
Miller, William Robert, O887374.
Mills, Edgar Frank, O1015941.
Mishtowt, Basil Illarion, O1284553.
Mitchell, Erwin McLeod, O803732.
Mitchell, Wyatt James, O956058.
Mittenzwei, Francis Xavier, O1004812.
Mize, James Clifford, O1176437.
Mock, Alfred James, O410520.
Monroe, Howard Eugene, O2206103.
Moon, Robert Stanley, O1283464.
Moore, Charles Elmer, O1329272.
Moore, Clarence A., O1014846.
Moore, Ernest Lloyd, O1699963.
Moore, Harold Lane, O1340794.
Moore, Robert Kenneth, O1181700.
Moranda, George Edward, O454886.
Morefield, William John, O1280555.
Morgan, John Pierpont, O1577593.
Morgan, John William, O1165918.
Morris, James Henry, O401525.
Morris, Robert Charnelle, O498281.
Morrow, Thomas Otto, O1172436.
Mosgrove, George Gordon, O1039809.
Mosser, Richard Bucks, O1649559.
Mumford, Elmer Stitt, O423485.
Munson, Orville Oscar, O1101594.
Munt, Francis Randolph, O1588765.
Murphy, James Malcolm, O1598848.
Muttoni, Donald Sylvester, O2018735.
Myers, Chester Lavern, O1645859.
Nash, Leonard Charles, O1100264.
Naughton, Francis Edward, O2288940.
Neitz, Ravellan Henry, O1578920.
New, Charles Joseph, O1032545.
Nicholson, Charles Albert, O497518.
Nicholson, Tom Mercer, O1639872.
Nielsen, Carl Harvey, O1330847.
Nietman, Charles Frederick, O1316191.
Nightingale, Gardner Swift, O1042897.
Nishimura, Bert Noboru, O398791.
Noll, John Valentine, Jr., O1045866.
Nolph, William Harold, O1057836.
Nottage, Paul Edward, O494665.
Novy, James Frederick, O888950.
Oakes, Edward Everett, Jr., O1281348.
O'Brien, John Ashley, O1001868.
Odom, Alton Chafin, O1321726.
O'Donohue, Thomas Joseph, O1051313.
Okawachi, Toru Michael, O1339304.
Okazaki, Saige, O935285.
Oliver, George Sylvester, O1312212.
Olsen, Raymond Malcolm, O2055312.
Olson, Clifford Arthur, O887474.
Olson, Harry Harper, O1557509.
Olszewski, Walter John, O1560445.
Orchel, Stanley, O1300699.
Orlando, John Anthony, O1308693.
Orr, Lawrence E., Jr., O438606.
Orrick, Richard Roscoe, O2024408.
Osburn, Wayne Edwin, O2020195.
Oswell, Gorman Stanley, O1169276.
Owen, Tom Hubbard, O555588.
Padgett, Jerry Ervin, O1646479.
Pagel, Willis George, O441284.
Pahl, Gaylord George, O1821762.
Pardee, Robert Everett, O1536371.
Parker, Brandon Lamar, O1334009.
Parker, Woodrow Wilson, O1286880.
Parks, Marion Wilcox, Jr., O1169279.
Patterson, Dallas Melvin, O408936.
Patterson, David Thomas, O1648659.
Patterson, John Allen, O1102417.
Paull, Joseph Kelly, O453881.
Pearcey, Harold Wilson, O1290652.
Pechacek, Melvin Lee, O2001025.
Pennington, William Yancey, O388688.
Pennino, John Langendorf, O425152.
Peoples, Robert Howarth, O518706.
Peterson, Palmer Adolph, O1018037.
Pfeiffer, John Victor, O1010407.
Phaneuf, Philip Edmond, O446670.
Philips, David Everitt, O1044063.
Phillips, Warren Byron, O447536.
Pickell, George William, O1297583.
Pierce, Walter Raleigh, Jr., O1337336.
Pietrzyk, Mitchell, O1062044.
Pilant, Joseph Lewis, O1054753.
Pinkstone, Hueston Longcor Joseph, O1548282.
Pooley, Nardeth Wayne, O2035492.
Post, Harold Nelson, O1580179.
Poteat, William Daniel, O953885.
Potter, Carleton Frederick, O1651395.
Potter, Jack Conrad, O1312794.
Poulin, Paul Raymond, O1638292.
Praeger, Herman Albert, Jr., O414085.
Prather, Eugene Calahan, O410184.
Prawitz, Leeland Robert, O465152.
Prewett, James Franklin, O1168870.
Price, Herbert Hickham, O415997.
Proudfoot, Robert James, O1558321.
Pye, William Sherwood, O1312107.
Quig, Clayton Anthony, O1291329.
Quisenberry, Joe Fowler, O1587555.
Radcliff, Joseph Anthony, O1309606.
Raleigh, Edward Coblentz, O1040459.
Ramsburg, Charles Everett, O1325108.
Rasula, George Arthur, O1323171.
Rateau, Munro Anthony, O1583543.
Rau, William Anton, O1011048.
Rawlings, Richard Jackson, Jr., O453593.
Ray, Charles Guthrie, O1324651.
Redding, William Vaughn, O456627.
Reeder, James Robert, O1284396.
Reese, Alfred J., Jr., O1341292.
Reeve, John Daniel, O1170934.
Reidenbaugh, Charles Henry, O1794987.
Reynolds, Chester Alexander, Jr., O1947811.
Reynolds, Clifford Henry, O2035145.
Reynolds, Eugene Franklin, O1946601.
Reynolds, Harry Edward, Jr., O1037684.
Rice, Delbert Edmond, O1535519.
Rice, Herman Richard, O1020242.
Richey, Ralph David, Jr., O1320480.
Riddler, Garth Arthur, Jr., O454840.
Riek, Justus Robert, O1314190.
Rimlinger, James Louis, O1305833.
Rippey, George Ellsworth, O387361.
Risen, Everett Lee, O1650714.
Robbins, Phillip Walter, O2006615.
Roberts, David Richard, O1308182.
Robertson, James Clifford, O1584805.
Robinson, Gerald Edward, O1080902.
Rock, Warren Vanderveer, O2048758.
Rogers, Joseph John, O1036358.
Rollison, Howard Elmer, O1045226.
Rood, Gordon Dunlop, O4010833.
Rosoff, Martin, O1285119.
Rowley, Hobart Laverne, O1174128.
Ruby, William Francis, O2032902.
Rudulph, Louis Frederick, Jr., O1640894.
Russell, Lester Franklyn, O1948216.
Rutledge, Walton Albert, O549633.
Sadove, Aaron Solomon, O1001044.
Sager, Perry Ashby, O1299477.
Samson, Jack, O1293841.
Sanders, Frederick Jefferson, O1287954.
Sanders, William Oscar, Jr., O2019653.
Sandsmark, Albert Ivan, O520263.
Scanlon, William Edward, O1324664.
Scherberger, Richard Jerome, O1647257.
Schmiedel, Robert Alfonse, O1550047.
Schneider, Richard Ernst, O662096.
Schofield, Frank Curtis, O2020841.
Schuknecht, Lloyd Charles, Jr., O1648145.
Schwank, Bernard Joseph, O1294026.
Scott, Harvey, O1014168.
Serbousek, George, O2017133.

Setzer, Allen Lee, O2036838.
Sevdy, Lawrence Martin, O1169331.
Shaper, William, O1576633.
Sheppard, Orval Hubertus, O1166604.
Sheriff, Herman Willard, O1036732.
Sherman, Frederick William, Jr., O1118807.
Sherman, Gerald, O386005.
Shroyer, James Lewis, O2015708.
Siegel, Leon Selwyn, O1650329.
Sillin, William Elwyn, O1010947.
Simmet, Kenneth Donald, O404005.
Sims, Howard Russell, O1547795.
Sims, Morton David, O2069400.
Sine, Robert Roy, O1323750.
Singleton, John Edwin, O1054414.
Sitler, Henry Oliver, O1580328.
Skaith, LeRoy James, O1314558.
Skapik, Richard Lee, O1325678.
Skelley, James Leo, O404213.
Skidmore, William Frank, O2033135.
Skiffington, Edward Henry, O441720.
Slate, Francis Taylor, O1295446.
Sly, George Washington, O1177980.
Small, Ballard Burton, Jr., O538082.
Smith, John Andrew, 3d, O535039.
Smith, Joseph Patrick, O449245.
Smith, Kenneth Joseph, O1648163.
Smith, Paul Eugene, O2033037.
Smith, Raymond Howard, Jr., O1058687.
Smith, Temple Christian, O1584939.
Smith, Wilbur Bell, O1826064.
Snyder, Arthur Frank, Jr., O1011877.
Snyder, Harry Alan, O385631.
Sobel, Harold, O455917.
Sollosi, John S., O410583.
Sovern, Charles, O1638562.
Sowers, Harold Norman, O1332328.
Sparano, James William, O2017470.
Spires, George Henry, Jr., O1012650.
Spittler, Charles Richard, O1338872.
Spitzer, Joseph Bernard, O1579163.
Sprague, Francis Ort, O1316682.
Stahelski, Anthony Francis, O1167648.
Stam, Charles William, O1291535.
Stankovich, Albert Anton, O1699987.
Starke, William Stewart, Jr., O1019080.
Starr, John Bernard, O447822.
Stephens, Travis Jimmie Lee, O1598251.
Still, Edgar Earl, O1171000.
Stilo, Frank Guy, O429738.
Stoffiet, Lawrence Merlin, O1014887.
Street, Harold Leroy, Jr., O1643374.
Strever, John Eberly, Jr., O1060987.
Sullivan, Daniel Edward, Jr., O1055168.
Sullivan, John Francis, O430034.
Sullivan, John Francis, O1574350.
Sutherland, Warren Freeman, Jr., O1114771.
Sutton, Jimmy Clarence, O2033102.
Svilar, Matthew, O1552604.
Sweeney, Francis Sherlock Patrick, O2000749.
Syverson, Douglas Wayne, O1304304.
Tabor, Harry Elsworth, O1638640.
Tadich, Dmitri Jovo, O1326118.
Tarnell, Benedict Alexander, O1290839.
Taylor, William Wesley, O1577940.
Telke, Frederick William, O1334648.
Tencza, Anthony John, O1297274.
Terry, Lawrence Duryea, O453069.
Terry, Walter Carl, O1596830.
Tessieri, Philip John, O452573.
Thomas, Charles Martin, O1106475.
Thomas, Eldridge, O1951064.
Thomas, Gordon Franklin, O387204.
Thomes, George Edward, O1949670.
Thompson, Alfred Francis, O497304.
Thompson, Benjamin Howard, O2026920.
Thompson, John Griffith, O1015715.
Thompson, John Raymond, O1171394.
Thornton, Samuel Beaver, Jr., O541583.
Thying, Lunsford, O1287788.
Tidler, Calvin Leroy, O2029757.
Tiller, Norman Layton, Sr., O1339826.
Tillotson, John Adams, O1015919.
Todd, Robert Grant, O1018380.
Tomme, Henry Henington, O2048175.
Toppin, Joseph Douglas, O1327684.
Torrence, Bryce Joseph, O1586976.
Towson, William Joseph, O1295316.
Trammell, Howard Aubrey, O1295797.
Tribble, Harold Carleton, Jr., O1042452.
Tryon, Frank Harold, O2017778.
Tuttle, Lawrence Dana, O1796380.
Uchima, Unkei, O1330879.
Uhland, Ray Gordon, O547792.
Ungerleider, Alvin David, O1322738.
Van Buskirk, Lawrence Edward, O1557230.
Van Hazel, George James, Jr., O1285089.
Ver Hey, William Jacob, O1690725.
Waldman, Myron, O1638733.
Walker, Marvin Albert, O1646905.
Walker, Robert George, O1171408.
Wallace, James Lewis, O1554110.
Walter, Jesse Lawton, O1010455.
Waltz, Floyd Randall, Jr., O390191.
Warner, Jack Winfred, O432904.
Warrick, Fred Allen, O1304298.
Wary, William Daniel, O1558359.
Washbourne, Kenneth Worth, O1845258.
Watson, Charles Leslie, O2017153.
Watts, Eugene Augustus, O374849.
Webb, Harold James, O1583819.
Webster, Donald Curtis, O1636792.
Weible, Oscar Joseph, O1329539.
Welch, George Peters, O412846.
Wendt, Irving Robert, O1332215.
Westman, John Phillip, O1326070.
Weston, John Moore, Jr., O1294755.
Whalen, Donald Edward, O374479.
Whalen, Thomas Francis, O1329772.
Whisler, John Larkin, O2025617.
Whitaker, Howard Kenneth, O1844534.
White, John Dalrymple, O2017625.
Whitlock, Charles Theodore, O1552825.
Wietcki, Donald William, O2019399.
Wilkin, John Marc, O1332454.
Wilkins, Robert Morton, O1823901.
Willets, Robert Taber, O1103468.
Williams, Charles Claude, O518771.
Williams, Jay Bass, O1298963.
Williams, Robert Harry, O531621.
Wilson, Albert Fielding, Jr., O1168525.
Wilson, Charles Edward, O2016325.
Wilson, Daniel Schlossberg, O1559279.
Wilson, Raymond J., Jr., O390461.
Wilson, Roy Lee, O1642730.
Wilson, William Vickers, O444693.
Wiltse, Woodrow Wendell, O537540.
Winder, William Joseph, O404523.
Winkler, Robert, O1288660.
Winsted, Ray Hamilton, O1013715.
Winstead, Richard Skinner, O1646715.
Woods, John Owen, O1012355.
Woodson, Eugene Albert, O1487784.
Worthing, Leigh Willson, O378316.
Wright, Lyle Henry, O1170608.
Wynne, Albert Knowles, O1061289.
Yount, James Francis, O1304302.
Yunck, Richard Theodore, O1338172.
Zanin, John Baptist, O1307610.
Zell, Quentin Le Verne, O404993.
Zolner, Charles Leroy, O1170613.
Zufelt, Dick, O1340526.
Zurek, Charles Michael, O1174486.

*To be first lieutenants*

Ackermann, William Anthony, O2265897.
Alexander, Lyle King, O4044204.
Amaki, Satoru, O4014562.
Apuna, Samuel Kamakaipolani, Jr., O1692467.
Arnold, Henry Raeburn, O1695171.
Arnold, Thomas Heaton, O1875479.
Bailey, Richard Redfern, O1928580.
Bain, John Ralph, O1940556.
Ball, Charles Field, Jr., O1891883.
Barksdale, Clifford Bailey, O4026423.
Barnes, Robert Stephen, O1930078.
Bauer, Daniel Henry, O4002335.
Bauerband, Edward Henry, Jr., O1882965.
Bellis, William Harry, O1931452.
Blanche, John Goodman, 3d, O1880674.
Blank, Jay Paul, O926215.
Blichmann, Donald James, O1930511.
Boster, Philip Leroy, O4026568.
Bostian, Robert Eugene, O1890598.
Boyle, Dean Gerard, O4002158.
Boyle, William Patrick, O4001588.
Brannon, William Weldon, Jr., O1937948.
Brenton, James Odell, O2104679.
Brinton, John Robert, O4006754.
Brocato, Cyrus Vincent, O2265298.
Brodeur, Alfred Francois, O4014926.
Burchell, Troy Doyle, O4024745.
Burkert, Alfred, Jr., O960093.
Callinan, William Francis, O4020716.
Campbell, Harold Thomas, O4012711.
Cannon, Archie Samuel, Jr., O2203137.
Challis, Arthur James, O1881557.
Chapman, Allen Ray, O1927480.
Churchill, Ralph Thomas, O1879660.
Clark, Dallas Wade, O4011960.
Coates, Fred Andrew, O4014798.
Corey, John Douglas, O1935626.
Cosgrove, William Charles, O4023843.
Cramer, Eugene George, O4013117.
Crisp, William Headly, O4011600.
Curtis, Robert Linwood, O2103038.
Daley, Edmund Koehler, Jr., O4033018.
Davis, Albert John, O4001633.
De Sonier, Harold Leo, Jr., O1925165.
Delaney, Robert Francis, O4036955.
Depue, Robert Hemphill, Jr., O4000515.
Dermatis, Walter George, O2028679.
Detwiler, Harvey Carl, Jr., O4001052.
Dews, Robert William, O997543.
Dietderich, Wallace Raymond, O2265762.
Doust, Arol Raymond, O4026933.
Drumm, Donald Raymond, O4001393.
Duffy, William John, O1924907.
Duncan, Jack Leon, O4026445.
Duran, John, O1927483.
Dyer, Gerald D., O4016728.
Ellis, Mike, O4023705.
Faubion, James Lorn, Jr., O4024471.
Fellows, Robert Louis, O4009512.
Ferullo, Generoso James, O4009343.
Finley, John Lovins, O1929715.
Foster, Edward Harold, O1916324.
Foster, Robert Walker, O2030499.
Frechette, Joseph Paul, O999645.
Freeman, William Curtis, O4024126.
Fricke, Charles Joseph, O2003851.
Fuerst, Werner Francis, O4011122.
Furlong, George Patrick, O4010251.
Gardner, William Sam, O4011798.
Gausvik, Donald Edward, O1926923.
Gavin, David Charles, O4029383.
Gazlay, John Collins, O4000848.
Gebelt, Henry Ferdinand Clark, O4010153.
George, Manuel John, O2004848.
Gillespie, Vernon Walter, Jr., O4030588.
Glenn, Stewart William, O4013980.
Goode, Ralph Wiley, Jr., O4002185.
Goodman, Frank Bernard, O2104302.
Goodman, Wilbur Garland, O4012228.
Gorden, Charles Frederick, Jr., O2030423.
Greeley, John Michael, O4016827.
Green, Alford Wayne, O1880918.
Grimes, Donald Baldwin, O2268911.
Hallenbeck, David Roth, O4000850.
Halsted, Robert Edward, O4006093.
Halvorson, John Andrew, O2021627.
Hannaway, Harold Charles, O4020060.
Harrison, Robert Charles, O1937180.
Hausman, Conrad Karl, O2263762.
Hill, Houston Chambers, O4024835.
Hoagland, David Ott, O4033594.
Hoey, Stanislaus John, O4029384.
Hoey, William Rodney, O1923575.
Holder, John Baker, O1880907.
Holland, David Kenneth, O2203207.
Holler, John Charles, O4019940.
Ingram, Harvie Thomas, O1932311.
Ivy, James Morrow, 4th, O1916232.
Jarvis, Ronald Joseph, O1885923.
Jones, Cecil Paul, O4029192.
Jones, George Erwin, Jr., O4005808.
Jones, John Ralph, O4006345.
Kause, Kaye, Donald, O4031957.
Kelly, William Jarmleh, Jr., O1701171.
Knight, Emmett Floyd, O4013949.
Knox, Robert Rodger, Jr., O4007137.
Kovach, James Henry, O2042005.
Kurtz, John Jacob, O1873774.
Lackey, Marvin Edwin, O1940544.
Ladner, Theron Gaston, O1877730.
Landau, Bernard Myer, O4016995.
Landkammer, Theodore Edward, O4027850.
Leisner, Herbert William, O1892140.
Leslie, George William, O4030682.
Leva, Neil I., O4006903.
Lewis, Thomas Milton, O4010015.
Mangold, Clarence Albert, Jr., O1939587.
Martin, George William, O1881347.

Matheney, Harold Dean, O2203859.
Maxwell, William Stephen, O1940398.
McCollum, Richard James Whitworth, O4019834.
McDuffee, David Perry, O1878550.
Mendenhall, Thomas Deal, O4027297.
Mikula, Joseph George, O4036780.
Miller, Harry William, 2d, O1877632.
Miller, Thomas Arlo, O4013102.
Minix, Thomas Ernest, O4011607.
Mino, Paul Lewis, O4033505.
Mix, James Edward, O4026514.
Morrill, Donald Prentiss, O1940766.
Murdoch, William Langmuir, Jr., O4009631.
Murphy, Clyde Lawrence, O4026868.
Myers, Sammy Don, O2002944.
Newbold, Robert Miller, O4004437.
Nolan, John Redner, O4012021.
Olsen, Edumund John, Jr., O4005024.
Openchowski, Kenneth Frazier Alexander, O4009716.
Osborn, Robert Bruce, O19931221.
Ottomeyer, Donald James, O1915405.
Page, Harold Ray, O2263014.
Page, Louis Vincent, O4038727.
Parchinski, Edward Stanley, O4037759.
Pascarella, Pascal William, O4019909.
Pfaller, Eberhard Wilhelm, O4010520.
Pole, Freddie Ray, O4026556.
Porter, Covington Baskin, Jr., O1940028.
Porter, Howard Carlyle, Jr., O1930831.
Potter, Floyd Eugene, O2208944.
Ralph, James Robert, Jr., O4006679.
Randels, Dale Kenneth, O1437580.
Reisling, Glenn Mickle, Jr., O4001711.
Rhoads, Arthur Abel, O1875948.
Ruiz, Ronald Robert, O4013669.
Schouman, Hazen C., Jr., O4010180.
Schult, Arthur Edmond, O1892751.
Schultz, Arthur Herman, O1933407.
Scott, Hugh Alan, O4001753.
Serio, Frank Elmo, O1924927.
Shaughnessy, Thomas James, O4016249.
Shinn, Charles Earl, O1887685.
Sinoff, Alvan Charles, O4007118.
Small, Eugene Fleming, O1890291.
Smith, Lawrence Ralph, O1886207.
Smith, Richard Hunter, O1932355.
Smith, Robert Winsor, O1876114.
Sorbo, William Paris, O2030495.
Spain, Harold Dean, O4024924.
Spegele, John August, O4037773.
Steckbauer, Curtis John, O4023861.
Stedman, William Richardson, O4002882.
Stephens, Richard Barber, O4015003.
Stewart, Israel Wagner, Jr., O4044409.
Stewart, Robert Roy, O4016737.
Stoll, Henry Rodney, O4038923.
Sullivan, William Francis, O4014684.
Sveiven, Desmond Dean, O2263664.
Swanger, Thomas Niel, O4009650.
Sweede, Jack Eugene, O1894202.
Taylor, James Richard, O2004242.
Thomas, John Donald, O4006475.
Thomason, David Arthur, O2028755.
Uhrig, Richard Anton, O4003100.
Valentine, William Lyle, O4032935.
Vosel, Donald Marvin, O4006077.
Voetsch, John Alexander, 3d, O4031850.
Walker, Joe K., Jr., O1894005.
Wallsten, Richard Edmund, O4027763.
Wash, William Bishop, O4001290.
Watts, James Robert, O4038424.
West, Kenneth Lee, O1889191.
Whaley, Zachary, O4019886.
Whitehead, Ruby Lee, 3d, O4002255.
Wilde, Forrest Bunnell, O4019235.
Williams, Billie Gene, O4005867.
Williams, James Elliott, O1928563.
Williamson, Thomas Lloyd, O4023417.
Wise, Lynn Julian, O4013850.
Wood, Hector, O4025080.
Wright, Elden Harvey, O4000661.
Wright, William Joseph, O2266299.
Wyatt, Lloyd Lee, O4013293.
Young, Clifford Edward, O1879320.
Zeleznikar, Louis Joseph, O4016690.
Zwicker, Ralph Lathrop, O1925002.

*To be second lieutenants*

Adsit, Charles Carroll, O4045729.
Adsit, John Miley, O4057763.
Allanach, Jack Walter, O4050619.
Allen, Wayne Cecil, O4029533.
Allison, Robert Hyer, O4066236.
Anderson, David Robert, O4028305.
Armstrong, Hart Reed, O4061485.
Arnold, Thomas William, O4029224.
Auth, Donald Leo, O4004306.
Baker, Richard Eugene, O4004886.
Bauer, Philip Otis, O4032474.
Bean, Robert Harold, O4030485.
Beckhoff, Otto Frederick, O4046603.
Bedsaul, Clare Donovan, O4010439.
Beers, Thomas Whitney, O4031034.
Bennett, Donald Gilman, O4031192.
Berg, Robert John, O4076655.
Berlioz, Francis Christy, O4064774.
Blank, James Nicholas, O4068916.
Boyd, William Albert, Jr., O4062819.
Bradshaw, John Edward, O4071225.
Brassert, Charles Alexander, Jr., O4074239.
Bray, Lynn Burnell, O4025570.
Brickman, Robert Lee, O2028549.
Brown, Edward Merwin, O4037788.
Brown, George Albert, O4030537.
Bruner, Robert Jewell, O4061530.
Bruno, Vito Joseph, O4037039.
Bryant, Lloyd Dean, O4057182.
Carey, Calvin Carleton, O4059260.
Cate, George Melton, O4071525.
Chamberlin, Michael Aloysius, O4052063.
Clark, Gary Lee, O4049050.
Cockrell, William Fred, Jr., O4063022.
Coe, David Hubbard, O4020015.
Collins, Marion Herbert, O4042974.
Collins, Patrick Warren, O4040894.
Collison, John MacLean, O4048405.
Cook, John Heber, O4047863.
Cook, Thomas Joseph, O4010403.
Correll, John Eli, O4018028.
Counihan, Jeremiah Michael, O4046370.
Cox, William Edward, O4046407.
Cramblet, Thomas Ralph, O4042458.
Crosby, Glenwood Leighton, O1874724.
Crum, Luther G., Jr., O4025634.
Davis, Thomas Griffin, O4042965.
Dean, Leon Clarence, Jr., O4028992.
Dedrick, Warren Frederick, O4047328.
Deetjen, Roy Frederick, O4060691.
Del Camp, Adrian LeRoy, O4074257.
Delaney, Donald Grant, O2028485.
Di Cenzo, Edward Francis, O1931740.
Disbrow, David Carlyle, O4040847.
Dixon, Malcolm Ray, O1936839.
Doiron, Nicholas H., O4052676.
Donohue, John Edward, O4010492.
Downey, Robert Haarer, Jr., O2275972.
Duffie, Richard Rankin, O4071663.
Duncan, Dewitt David, O4071630.
Edmiston, Charles H., Jr., O4044807.
Edwards, Emmet Dee, Jr., O1935229.
Estabrook, Robert Taylor, O4010888.
Evans, Walter Clifford, O4070162.
Eysaman, Kenneth John, O4052198.
Fallon, Peter Edgerton, O4035263.
Fern, James Richard, O4050070.
Flanagan, Carl Pultz, Jr., O4069158.
Frye, Ray Edwin, Jr., O4059282.
Gannon, Martin Anthony, O4036119.
Gibbons, Gerald George, O4040918.
Gilbert, George Washington, O4042542.
Golde, Walter Harold, Jr., O4042922.
Goodyear, Clyde Edward, O4035621.
Gorman, Jay Richard, O4057715.
Gotte, Jack Edward, O4041176.
Gramly, Pyne Arthur, Jr., O4025563.
Green, George Oran, Jr., O4017786.
Griffith, Gerald Sousley, O4044636.
Hall, Norman Monroe, Jr., O4017659.
Hancock, Don Fredric, O4042738.
Hangren, Richard Francis, O4030564.
Hanks, Willis Clark, O4028157.
Harnish, Albert Guilford, Jr., O4051428.
Hatcher, Walter Lee, O4041135.
Haupert, Cecil Alvin, O4025176.
Hayes, Franklin Dennis, O4061196.
Healy, Robert William, O4051836.
Herb, Charles Donald, O4032929.
Hix, Preston Duane, O4048299.
Hoffman, Robert Leonard, O4041253.
Holub, Donald James, O4032569.
Howard, Roger Earl, O4015909.
Howe, Robert Crozier, O4047832.
Huggins, Edward Bernard, O4042893.
Hurley, William Patrick, O4042274.
Husted, Frank Richard, O4053135.
Hyde, Jerry Leon, O4042518.
Janet, Stanley Andrew, O4039260.
Jenks, George Von, O4047663.
Jessen, Jon Robert, O4076396.
Jeter, Munford Scott, O4075414.
Johnson, James Harold, Jr., O4046805.
Johnson, Jesse Gene, O4059121.
Johnson, William Earle, 3d, O4058750.
Joiner, Carey Preston, Jr., O4075653.
Jones, Samuel Hugh, Jr., O4044429.
Keener, Eugene Franklin, O4010615.
Kelly, Alan Carlyle, O4033599.
Knoll, Bruce Frederick, O4056941.
Kuykendall, George Boles, Jr., O4071502.
Lamb, Donald Stuart, O4021070.
Lamey, Robert Eugene, O4034755.
Lathrop, Lloyd William, O4017557.
Laudati, Roger Carmen, O1889746.
Lawson, Lawrence Levern, O4025656.
Leger, Jean Constant, O4010507.
Lins-Morstadt, Juan Joaquin, O4010729.
Little, Warren Masters, O4074514.
Lodewick, Richard Ballard, O4056525.
Lorix, Richard Edward, O4031405.
Ludolph, Anthony Augustine, Jr., O4025085.
MacDonald, Donald Loomis, O4065321.
MacDonald, Frank Herbert, O4026647.
Major, Dorrance Davenport, O4010900.
Marhefsky, Louis Anthony, O4038964.
Mark, James Caylor, O4036273.
Marshall, Charles McLean, O4042817.
Marshall, Richard Hugh, O4062871.
Martin, Richard Carrier, O4036139.
Maupin, Joe Scott, O4010733.
Maynard, Eugene Earl, O4040209.
Meisel, Karl H., Jr., O4010860.
Mial, Robert Paul, O4010704.
Moorhead, Lisle William, O4035342.
Morse, James Whitcomb, O4025764.
Muck, Gilbert Paul, O4028108.
Mungovan, Robert Walter, O4006036.
Murphy, Thomas Joseph, O4036690.
Mushroe, Earl Edward, O4066201.
Nack, John Martin, O4051878.
Nolan, William James, Jr., O4049761.
Norris, James Byron, O4065979.
O'Bryan, William Patrick, O4053162.
O'Neil, Joseph Robert, Jr., O4045400.
Oyler, Leo Edwin, Jr., O4017681.
Pearlman, James Thomas, O4059493.
Perry, John Fincher, O4042725.
Pierce, Fred Washburn, Jr., O4040787.
Pisanelli, Ralph Anthony, O4004842.
Polashock, Michael Stephen, O4074421.
Powel, Ben F., Jr., O4044196.
Power, John Allen, O4044801.
Pruniski, Stephen Andrew, Jr., O2021498.
Rains, Robert Paul, O1925552.
Randall, Donald Autrey, O4044365.
Rigrish, Ernest Earl, O4036578.
Risteter, Vincent Andrew, O4023228.
Robb, Marion Glenn, O4025722.
Robinson, James Hill, Jr., O4051956.
Rosendahl, Richard Charles, O2269730.
Ross, Donald Howard, O4058762.
Ruffle, Ronald Harrison, O4037416.
Savard, Ronald Simpson, O4045085.
Savukinas, John Bernard, O4059360.
Schnabel, Robert Harold, O4029838.
Schwoppe, Edwin Gust, Jr., O4061147.
Secord, John Willis, O4026145.
Sedar, David Richard, O4040398.
Seguin, Raymond Joseph, O4037127.
Shows, Newton Wesley, Jr., O4048015.
Smith, Glenn Norman, O4032604.
Smith, Leland De, Jr., O4024503.
Smith, Robert Frazier, O4010529.
Smith, Thomas Arthur, O4030841.
Spilman, Charles Christopher, O4052528.
Stevens, Charles Thomas, O4057369.
Stevenson, Harry Knopf, O4034762.
Stricklin, Roger Brown, Jr., O4063690.
Swallow, Joseph Patrick, O4056934.
Taylor, Joseph John, Jr., O4031438.
Thomas, Billy Jack, O1941241.
Thomas, Daniel Harrison, Jr., O4044247.
Tindall, Asa Warner, Jr., O4042823.

Tucker, Llewellyn Bryant, Jr., O4010712.
Tyler, Charles Sumner, O4052755.
Verdin, Jimmie Wallace, O4062578.
Wall, Harold Robert, O4025484.
Wall, Kary Darrell, O4024804.
Walsh, Gordon Powers, O4010713.
White, Henry Leslie, O4050517.
White, William Thomas, Jr., O4063118.
Whiting, Jon K., O4050533.
Wickware, Argle Wesley, O2028358.
Willcox, Lester Andrew, O4048440.
Williamson, Robert Linn, O4041189.
Wilson, Richard Albert, O4025351.
Winnicki, Philip Walter, O4056506.
Witt, Harry Gene, O4056817.
Witt, Malcolm David, O2268583.
Works, Bobby, O4036313.
Wyatt, David Lee, O4010441.
Zimmerman, Fred Russell, O4029818.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress; title 10, United States Code, section 3291, as amended by Public Law 85-155, 85th Congress.

*To be majors*

Fitzpatrick, Jack C., MC, O63832.
House, Royce E., MC, O391211.

*To be captains*

Brookover, Ella L., ANC, N729025.
McConnell, Amy L., ANC, N792222

*To be first lieutenant*

Harrison, Richard E., MC, O5407610.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Blumenfeld, Stan, O4085213.
Bratcher, Dewey F., Jr., O5302761.
Campbell, James F., Jr.
Hamilton, David L., O5202698.
Kosmowski, Jerome A.
Kvederas, Robert A., O4085310.
Langan, Eugene W.
Lowe, John C.
Morgan, Clarold F.
Pompian, Richard O.
Roessner, Norbert J.
Rogan, Robert E.
Sanford, Brian W.
Whitehead, Richard K., Jr., O5302358.

The following-named officer for appointment as professor of electrical engineering, United States Military Academy, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 4333:

Cutler, Elliott C., Jr., O24649.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 27), 1958:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1961.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

For appointment:

*To be senior surgeon*

George Brecher

*To be senior sanitary engineer*

Lewis A. Young

*To be scientist*

Robert R. Omata

*To be assistant scientist*

Clarence J. Weinmann

*To be nurse officer*

Jessie M. Scott

For permanent promotion:

*To be assistant sanitary engineer*

Morton D. Sinkoff

For confirmation of recess appointment:

*To be senior surgeons*

Bohdan G. Giel — William F. Mayes

*To be surgeons*

Daniel M. Bloch — Thayer M. Mackenzie
Maurice F. Herring, Jr. — Alfred S. Nelson

*To be senior assistant surgeons*

Gordon Allen — Mark H. Lane
Clement P. Cotter — William C. Mohler
John L. Getz, Jr. — Joseph J. Noya
Lloyd Guth — Jacob Robbins
Martin D. Hicklin — William L. Walter
William M. Jackson — Harry W. Weller

*To be assistant surgeon*

John R. S. Remsberg

*To be dental surgeon*

John M. Frankel

*To be senior assistant dental surgeon*

F. D. Morse, Jr.

*To be senior sanitary engineer*

Thomas H. Seltzer

*To be scientist*

George E. Jay, Jr.

*To be assistant pharmacists*

Mark H. Barnett
Wesley R. Gladhart, Jr.
Paul J. Le Sage

*To be sanitarian*

Donald R. Johnson.

*To be senior assistant nurse officers*

Lucile G. Buderer
Harriett Hicok
Virginia D. Hines

*To be senior dietitian*

Janet E. Stroupe

For confirmation of recess permanent promotion:

*To be senior assistant dental surgeon*

Christopher E. Kennemer

*To be senior assistant veterinarian*

Paul Arnstein

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 6: 33: *Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.*

Eternal God, our Father, earnestly and humbly, we are beseeching Thee that the hours of this day may be filled with joyous and helpful service.

Thou hast made known unto us Thy great and beneficent purpose of establishing upon the earth a kingdom whose foundation stones are the virtues and principles of righteousness and justice, of love and friendship, of peace and good will.

We rejoice that Thou dost graciously condescend to use our poor human efforts and energies in building that kingdom and in breaking down the dividing walls between the nations.

Grant that here in this council chamber the Members of the Congress may be inspired with a vision of that glorious time when the King of Kings and Lord of Lords shall reign supremely in the mind and heart of all mankind.

To Thy name we ascribe the glory and the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948;

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; and

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8216. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2920. An act to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 58-27.

## TAXING INCOME OF LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. THORNBERRY from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 456, Rept. 1299) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957. After general debate, which shall be confined

to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] rise?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds upon which he claims the privilege.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this morning on page A628 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27, 1958, the following appears:

REPRESENTATIVE CANNON SETS UP A FAULTY FOUNDATION

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, Missouri, powerful chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, set up the foundation in 1950.

The Revenue Service held that the foundation's charter did not meet the requirements for tax exemption. So it disallowed CANNON'S deductions of his gifts and upped his tax assessment.

But the little bill to exempt CANNON'S foundation from the tax laws sailed through Congress in just 4 days. And it might have escaped notice had not T. Coleman Andrews, then Internal Revenue Commissioner, been angry at CANNON for his refusal to give the Revenue Service more money to enforce the tax laws.

Mr. Andrews mentioned the bill in a magazine article. He wrote: "It came as near to making suckers out of all the rest of us as any piece of tax legislation Congress ever enacted."

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that under the circumstances the charges and allusions made in the article just read by the gentleman from Missouri are a reflection on him to such an extent that he may claim the right of personal privilege.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, as will be observed, no charge is made that anything unlawful or unethical has been done in this connection. But the implication is that there was something questionable about it and Mr. Andrews is quoted as saying "it came as near to making suckers out of all the rest of us as any piece of tax legislation Congress ever enacted."

The newspaper from which the article is copied says "The Cannon Foundation bill did no great harm."

As a matter of fact the foundation has done no harm at all and its only crime has been to provide for annual scholarships of $500 to enable high school graduates—who otherwise would have to quit school and get a job—to continue their education by attending some standard college or university.

Scholarships from the foundation are limited to college freshmen. Every college has scholarships, fellowships, student funds, and local employments from which any worthwhile student can be financed for the last 3 years of his college course. But none of these are open to freshmen. A boy or a girl must be able to finance the first year in college and demonstrate their ability and their worth before these facilities are available.

The purpose of this foundation is to bridge the gap between the high school and the sophomore year and if the student has the capacity and has demonstrated his sincerity in his freshman year, the road to a college education and a life of greater service to the Nation is open to him.

In 1949 when the idea of establishing such a foundation was first entertained I took for granted it was merely a matter of filling out forms with the proper Federal authorities. With that in view I went down to the Treasury Department to see Secretary John Snyder, at that time Secretary of the Treasury. Secretary Snyder called in some of his assistants who said they had no knowledge of the establishment of foundations of any kind and advised me to apply to State officials in Missouri.

On my return home I called on Secretary Toberman, secretary of state, at Jefferson City and he told me that so far as he knew there was no recognized routine for establishing such a trust. As a result of my importunities the legislature of Missouri has since enacted a law covering the entire procedure.

Thereupon I visited Dr. McCleary, dean of the school of law at the University of Missouri, who said he was not acquainted with any forms for the establishment of such a foundation but cited decisions from the court reports of Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio, holding that any instrument purporting to donate funds as a public benefaction would be liberally construed.

Acting on this suggestion, and with no precedents of any kind, I drew up the charter and in the hurry of more pressing matters, laid it aside until November 17, 1950, when, without further study or consideration, I called in the trustees and made the first payment on the endowment.

As the whole subject had been exhaustively investigated and the instrument written a year earlier I neglected to give it any further attention and completely overlooked the amendment to the Internal Revenue Code in the act of September 25, 1950, which in the meantime had been enacted just a couple of months before, providing specific language for the purpose, "religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational purposes."

This was in 1950. Late in September 1955, 5 years later, the Bureau of Internal Revenue notified me that the instrument failed to comply with the language of the statutes.

Coming at this late date the effect was to destroy the foundation.

I consulted with the head of the legal advisory staff of the Treasury Department who drew up the bill which was enacted as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Cannon Foundation which was created on November 17, 1950, by a trust instrument executed by Clarence Cannon and Ida W. Cannon, of Elsberry, Mo., the principal office of which is at Elsberry, Mo., and the management and property of which is vested in and under the direction and control of a board of trustees consisting of the mayor of said city, the superintendent of schools, and others, and the beneficiaries of which consist of five churches situated in said city, and other beneficiaries, shall be deemed to be an organization (a) exempt from tax under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and (b) to which section 3813 (a) of the 1939 code and section 503 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is inapplicable.

SEC. 2. Contributions to the Cannon Foundation, referred to in section 1, shall be considered charitable contributions for purposes of section 23 (o) and (q) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 3. Sections 1 and 2 shall be effective for the taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949, and prior to January 1, 1956.

Approved August 12, 1955.

The bill was twice before the House and was amended in the Senate and signed by the President. Both Houses had opportunity to stop or further modify it had it been objectionable in any way.

It is a perpetual, irrevocable, charitable, educational trust and no one has received a penny from it, or can receive a penny from it, even for personal services, except high-school graduates unable to finance a college course.

The essential provisions of the charter are as follows:

Know all men by these presents that we hereby create and establish a permanent, perpetual, irrevocable trust to be known as the Cannon Foundation and endow it with the sum of $1,000 with the intention of adding to that sum in the future; the income from which said sum and from all accretions thereto to be employed in our native city of Elsberry and vicinity for certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational purposes hereinafter set forth.

The management and property of the said foundation shall be vested in and shall be under the direction and control of a board of trustees consisting of the mayor of the city, the superintendent of schools, the editor of any Elsberry newspaper published continuously the preceding calendar year, the worshipful master of New Hope Lodge No. 199, A. F. & A. M., the noble grand of Elsberry Lodge, No. 382, I. O. O. F., the president of AI Chapter of P. E. O., the pastor of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the pastor of the First Baptist Church, the pastor of the Sacred Heart Catholic Church, the pastor of the First Christian Church, the pastor of the First Methodist Church, and the members and secretary of the board of directors of the Bank of Lincoln County, all of Elsberry, Mo., of whom the eldest in years of age shall serve as president of the board of trustees of the foundation, the next eldest as vice president and the president of AI Chapter of P. E. O., ex officio, as secretary. The said officials shall serve as members of the board of trustees of the foundation during their official terms as current, inaugurated, and acting officers of their respective organizations as above designated. At the expiration of such term of office the incumbency of such member on the board of the foundation shall automatically and simultaneously terminate and the duly elected or appointed, and qualified, successor of such member to the position above designated shall simultaneously and auto-

matically succeed to such membership on the board of trustees of the foundation, incumbency on the board of trustees of the foundation to be coincident with their service in their said official capacity and not otherwise.

In the event of the discontinuance of any of the above designated constituent organizations, through extinction, merger, inactivity, or otherwise, representation of such organization on the board of trustees of the foundation shall cease and the membership of the board shall be correspondingly reduced. Such vacancy may be filled by the election of a similar and kindred organization to membership by the unanimous vote of all members of the board of trustees of the foundation by secret ballot but such vote shall not be taken in the absence of any member of the board of trustees and such election shall not be held in the absence of a vacancy.

A three-fourths majority of the members of the board of trustees of the foundation shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business and the decisions and acts of a quorum of the trustees of the foundation shall be and constitute a valid exercise of the authorities, trust powers and discretions hereby conferred on said trustees, and while proxies shall not be recognized, the decisions and acts of a quorum of said board of trustees shall constitute and be taken as the acts and decisions of the entire board of trustees.

The finance committee of the board of trustees of the foundation, which shall have immediate charge of all fiscal transactions of the foundation, subject to the approval and ratification of the board of trustees, and which shall make a stated report of the financial condition of the foundation to the board of trustees annually, or at any other time requested on petition signed by 25 citizens of the city of Elsberry, Mo., shall consist of the members and secretary of the board of directors of the Bank of Lincoln County, a banking corporation with offices at Elsberry, Mo., of whom the president of the bank and the secretary of the bank board shall serve as chairman and secretary respectively.

The members of the board of trustees of the foundation shall serve without remuneration, expense allowance or other compensation or emolument and, with the exception of the treasurer and assistant treasurer, no trustee shall be required to give bond or other security for the faithful performance of his or her duties.

No salary, fee or compensation shall be paid to anyone associated with the foundation or anyone else for any service, executive, clerical, or advisory, and if such service cannot be provided without expense to the foundation, such service shall be dispensed with. The thanks of all those interested is extended in appreciation of such public spirited service as may be rendered the foundation throughout its existence.

We hereby give to the said board of trustees full power and authority to manage, control, protect, sell, invest, reinvest and keep invested all monies, securities and other property it shall at any time receive under this trust, but such power shall be restricted at all times to such investments as are permitted by the laws of the State of Missouri for the investment of trust funds with the further restriction that the amount of the returns on an investment shall be subject and subordinate to the security of the investment. However, the board of trustees may purchase from the Bank of Lincoln County notes fully secured and of undoubted solvency but no loans shall be made, directly or indirectly, from the funds of the foundation to its officers or trustees or relatives thereof.

No portion of the principal funds of the foundation shall be expended for any purpose except for investment. The income realized from the investments of the foundation, shall be dispensed annually as herein provided. Should the principal funds of the foundation become impaired through losses, then no disbursements of any kind shall be made from income until the principal fund has been restored through addition of such income to the amount from which the loss was incurred.

The investment funds of the foundation shall be invested in unimpeachable real estate mortgages secured by deeds of trust accompanied by abstracts and insurance policies. No loans shall be made and no bonds, securities, notes or other investments shall be purchased for the foundation which have not first been submitted for examination to the cashier of the Bank of Lincoln County and after approval by him, approved by the unanimous vote of all members of the finance committee of the foundation. Lack of approval by any member of the finance committee shall serve to reject the proposed investment.

If any person, persons, organization or agency tender gifts or bequests to the foundation, power and authority is hereby conferred on the board of trustees to receive such bequests or gifts and apply them and the income therefrom to the purposes of this trust under the powers, authorities and discretions herein conferred and the income derived from such gift or legacy shall be administered and expended annually as herein provided.

A formal list of such donations, requests and contributions shall be maintained and the accumulated list of all contributions, with the names of the trustees of the foundation and other pertinent information, shall be printed and distributed every 10 years in pamphlet form, the cost of such publication to be defrayed by the sale of advertising space in such pamphlet.

The principal office of the foundation shall be at Elsberry, Mo. Stated meetings of the board of trustees of the foundation shall be held in January and May of each year, and special meetings shall be held on the call of the president or any 3 members of the board of trustees, on at least 5 days notice by the secretary, to all members. Meetings shall be held at such specific time and place in Elsberry, Mo., as shall be specified in the call for the meeting. In absence of such specification, the meeting shall be held on the first Thursday of the month and in the board room of the banking house of the Bank of Lincoln County. Meetings of the finance committee shall be held at the call of the chairman or at the request of any member of the committee following any regular meeting of the board of directors of the Bank of Lincoln County.

The agenda of the annual January meeting of the board of trustees shall include:

* * * * *

The agenda of the May meeting shall include:

* * * * *

Annual committees consisting of not less than three members each shall be appointed, and chairmen of such committees designated, by the president of the board of trustees at the annual January meeting as follows:

1. Committee on allocation which shall determine the amount, if any, to be allotted to the undetermined purpose award.

2. Committee on student award which shall recommend to the board of trustees three students who qualify for selection from which three the board of trustees shall designate by secret ballot the recipient of the student award.

3. Committee on distinguished citizen award. (This committee is not announced and its personnel is known only to the president who makes the appointment. If no award is recommended the identity of the committee is not made public. If an award is approved the names of the committee are announced simultaneously with that of the distinguished citizen receiving the award.)

4. Committee on undetermined purpose award which shall recommend to the board for its approval the religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purpose, project or program to which any income in excess of $500 shall be applied.

5. Finance committee which shall include the secretary and members of the board of directors of the Bank of Lincoln County.

At the annual May meeting of the board of trustees the total income from all investments of the foundation for the preceding calendar year, ending on the last 31st day of December, shall be computed and not to exceed $500 of the amount shall be allotted to a graduate of the Elsberry High School for the current year who agrees to matriculate at an approved college or university for a 4-year course the following September and to use the said $500 exclusively for educational purposes, to be selected by the board of trustees, designation to be announced at the annual commencement when other class awards are made.

The foundation may at such annual meeting designate the resident or former resident of Elsberry, Mo., or vicinity, who in the judgment of the board of trustees shall have rendered the greatest public service during the past year, provided such service is outstanding to be awarded at the annual homecoming or on other public occasion as may be determined by the board.

The remainder of the annual income of the foundation above and in excess of the $500, if any, shall be allocated to some religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purpose to be determined by the board of trustees but not to be added to the foregoing allocation and not to be devoted to the same purpose any 2 years in succession.

If any beneficiary shall not be in position to accept an allotment, or if in the judgment of the board of trustees no beneficiary qualifies for any particular year, or if the amount of the allotment shall be insufficient to adequately provide for an award in any particular year, then by direction of the board of trustees such allotment shall be held over for a year to supplement the amount of the allotment available for that purpose the succeeding year.

The allotments to high school graduates should be by check and the awards to distinguished citizens should be in the form of a citation by written or printed certificate which shall be provided without expense to or expenditure by the foundation. Such distinguished service may be contributed directly to the community or may be rendered through personal achievement in any field of endeavor which reflects credit on the community. It is not sufficient that it be good; it should be outstanding and the committee shall at the time the award is announced submit a written statement setting forth its reasons for making the award to the one selected.

Funds of the foundation shall be deposited in the Bank of Lincoln County, and its securities and other assets, and evidences of assets, shall be placed with the Bank of Lincoln County for safe keeping, without charge or expense to the foundation, and subject to the order of the treasurer and assistant treasurer who shall give personal bond in appropriate amount.

Funds of the foundation shall be disbursed only on check signed by the treasurer and assistant treasurer and countersigned by the three other officers of the foundation.

A written report shall be submitted by the treasurer at each stated meeting showing the investments, income therefrom and funds on deposit or in transit and such reports shall be entered on the minutes of the foundation.

A consolidated statement showing total receipts, total expenditures, total balances and total assets, signed by all members of the board of trustees, shall be published annually in a local newspaper provided such newspaper is in position to publish the statement as a matter of public interest. If any expense would be involved in the publication, then the statement shall be typewritten and displayed in the Bank of Lincoln County or other public place.

All books and records of the foundation shall be subject to inspection by any member of the board of trustees for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

* * * * *

Communities do not stand still. They progress or deteriorate. Progress requires organized programs, organized approach to basic community problems. There must be means of focusing general attention and effort on questions of community welfare. Any common purpose and interest such as that contemplated by the service herein provided should serve to crystallize community spirit and encourage community cooperation and secure benefits which cannot be measured in material values. To that hope this enterprise is dedicated.

If any legal question be raised at any time which results in invalidation of the trust herein proposed to be created or prevention of operation of the foundation hereby sought to be established, or diversion of funds and assets of the foundation, or other interference with its maintenance and operation for the purpose and in the manner herein provided, then and in such event, it is our will and desire that the entire amount of the assets of the proposed foundation and trust be delivered to the public library of Elsberry, Mo., and we thereupon, by testamentary disposition, give, devise, convey, and bequeath all sums, funds, properties, securities, investments, and assets herein mentioned or affected, to the governing board of the Elsberry Public Library, for the use of said library, in fee simple and forever.

In witness whereof we have hereunto signed our names and affixed our seals this 17th day of November 1950.

The names and addresses of the trustees of the foundation are:

Mayor of the city, Wayne Werges.

Superintendent of schools, Herman Purdin.

Editor of the Democrat, Sam Howard.

Worshipful Master of Lodge No. 199, A. F. & A. M., Stanley West.

Noble Grand of I. O. O. F. Lodge No. 382, Richard Husgen.

President of AI Chapter of P. E. O., Mrs. Eugene Duncan.

Pastor of Presbyterian Church, Rev. James Cannon.

Pastor of Baptist Church, Rev. D. R. Pickern.

Pastor of Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Reverend Father A. F. Wilmes.

Pastor of Christian Church, Rev. Oscar P. Campbell.

Pastor of Methodist Church, Rev. Orville Johnson.

Members of the board of directors of the Bank of Lincoln County, of Elsberry, Mo.

W. B. Ellis, J. B. Ellis, Clarence Cannon, Ida W. Cannon, A. L. Gladney, Charles W. Lahr.

J. Omohundro, J. B. Cannon, Dr. E. R. Whiteside, all of Elsberry, Mo.

Inquiries addressed to any member of the board of trustees will be welcomed.

## GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general subcommittee on education be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

## BAGHDAD PACT NATIONS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times carries an account of the Secretary of State's speech of yesterday to the Baghdad Pact nations. Excerpts from the Times article follow:

Secretary of State Dulles promised the Baghdad Pact nations today that "mobile power of great force" would be supplied by the United States in case of Communist attack.

He spoke as the Baghdad Pact nations opened the fourth ministerial meeting with appeals for more economic aid.

The Secretary of State did not answer the general Middle East demand to know whether the pact nations could hope in peacetime for further economic aid from the United States. * * *

The Moslem members of the alliance insist that more economic aid is vital.

Firoz Khan Noon, Prime Minister of Pakistan, summed up the views of the Moslem nations on the need for more economic aid today in these words:

"By launching its program of economic aid for underdeveloped countries, the Communist world has thrown a new challenge to the democracies and posed yet another problem. It is our hope that this challenge will be accepted so that it may be proved to the world that progress and development can be achieved within the framework of freedom instead of at the cost of freedom."

Mr. Speaker, the widespread poverty of the Moslem world is well known. Why, then, do we perpetuate the futile effort to pile up military arms on a foundation of economic misery? Will such an approach effectively counter the accelerated economic offers of the Soviet Union? Will such a lopsided arms program go to the heart of the real problems that afflict the people of the Middle East? Is the image of fortress America the image that we want to hold up to nations who are hungry for the spirit of Jefferson and Lincoln?

## PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the House Committee on Administration reports out resolutions by the full committee allocating funds for different committees of the House, those resolutions will come up. I am informed that the subcommittees of the Committee on House Administration have acted upon and recommended to the full committee, which will be brought up tomorrow, the following resolutions: Whether or not all of them can be acted upon in the full committee I am unable to say. However, each of the following that I can enumerate or such of them as are reported out by the full committee will be brought up tomorrow:

House Resolution 423, relating to the Government Operations Committee.

House Resolution 426, relating to the Un-American Activities Committee.

House Resolution 432, relating to the Judiciary Committee.

House Resolution 434, relating to the Select Committee on Small Business.

House Resolution 438, relating to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

House Resolution 443, relating to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

## AMENDING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 447 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and pending that yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 447 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 8381, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The resolution provides for a closed rule, waiving points of order and 3 hours of general debate. The only amendments that may be offered are those amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but such amendments will not be subject to amendment.

Last July the Rules Committee granted a rule on H. R. 8381 which provided for one exception to the usual closed rule. The exception permitted the offering of a motion to strike section 56 of the bill. Inasmuch as the Committee on Ways and Means has agreed to offer as a committee amendment a motion to strike this section, the Rules Committee has granted another rule, embodied in this resolution, which contains no exceptions to the usual closed rule ordinarily used in the consideration of revenue bills.

The bill contains 81 sections, most of which deal with the correction of inadvertent errors in the internal-revenue laws. The most significant changes in the bill are those concerned with correcting "unintended benefits and unintended hardships."

It is impossible to state what effect the bill will have on revenues. However, it is indicated that one-third of the sections of the bill will result in either current or eventual revenue increases and less than one-sixth are expected to result in revenue losses.

I urge the adoption of House Resolutiton 447 so the House may proceed to a full discussion of this measure for which ample time has been provided.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], has thoroughly explained this rule and its purposes. I do not believe it is necessary for me to take much time on it except to say this is a very technical bill to correct certain inequities in our present tax laws, to give tax relief where it is necessary and advisable and also to plug certain tax loopholes, as well as to make some technical amendments.

The rule is an open one and provides for 3 hours of general debate during which time the measure will be explained thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

House Resolution 314 was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8381, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as its name, the technical amendments bill of 1958, implies, this bill is a technical bill. It is concerned with unintended benefits and hardships in the income-estate, and gift tax laws. It also contains numerous highly technical provisions designed to clarify the statute, and remove obvious minor errors in the statute. The bill does not deal with tax-rate changes, and it is not concerned with excise taxes.

This bill was reported out late in the last session of this Congress but there was not an opportunity to consider the bill at that time. Work toward this bill was begun in July of 1956, when the Committee on Ways and Means established the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation, of which I served as chairman. This subcommittee was established to review existing income, estate, and gift tax provisions and to determine the substantive unintended benefits and hardships and technical problems needing correction. The subcommittee held public hearings in November of 1956. The hearings have been published and cover some 500 pages of testimony and statements. In addition, both the subcommittee and the Committee on Ways and Means have spent many days in executive session studying these problems before reporting out H. R. 8381.

This bill contains 81 sections. More than half of these sections deal with the correction of inadvertent errors in the internal revenue laws. These include inconsistencies in the statute as well as instances in which the language in the statute does not carry out the intention of Congress as clearly expressed in committee reports.

The more significant changes in the bill, however, are those concerned with unintended benefits and hardships. These relate to problems of revenue significance which have developed over a considerable period of time. I want to make it perfectly clear, however, that your committee recognizes that this bill by no means deals with all the unintended benefits and hardships in the tax laws needing attention. Reaching satisfactory solutions for some of these problems is a most difficult and complicated task and requires far more detailed consideration than it has as yet been possible to devote to them. The committee will continue to study these problems and as satisfactory solutions are found will report out legislation dealing with various inequities in the tax laws. In fact, the committee currently is receiving testimony in public hearings on revisions which may be needed in the tax laws. I should also mention that in three of the more complex areas, namely, the taxation of corporate distributions and adjustments, the income taxation of estates and trusts and the taxation of partners and partnerships, advisory groups of outside experts in these fields were appointed. These groups have quite recently submitted comprehensive reports for the study by the Committee on Ways and Means. The committee has asked for the views of the public and especially of those of the various professional groups on these advisory reports. Another advisory group made a report on tax administration which was considered at length by the subcommittee and will receive further attention by the full committee. Accordingly, this bill does not attempt to deal with the subject matter in the advisory group reports. Despite the limitations on the tax areas with which this bill is concerned, I believe that its enactment will represent a significant contribution toward the improvement of the internal revenue laws.

Although this bill is not designed as a revenue raising measure, it is expected that it will increase revenues somewhat. The relatively technical nature of most of the provisions, however, make it impossible to give any meaningful total revenue estimate. Moreover, a more important aspect of this bill is that it blocks incipient tax avoidance devices which, although not resulting in substantial revenue losses today, could in the absence of this bill be expected to account for a significant decline in future tax receipts.

Slightly more than half of the 81 provisions of this bill can be classified as technical adjustments. Of the remainder, approximately two-thirds represent provisions designed to foreclose substantive unintended benefits in present law. The other third are concerned with provisions which will be of benefit to taxpayers, most of them representing unintended hardships which this bill would remove from present law.

Among the more important unintended benefits which this bill will remove are:

First, the special benefits derived by holding various types of stock for only short periods of time around dividend dates.

Second, the double benefit from making gifts in trust to charity where remainders go to closely related persons.

Third, the special advantages from writing off bond premiums over relatively short periods where the bonds have early call dates.

Fourth, the advantages derived by part-time employees of exempt organizations from deferring tax on their salaries by taking it in the form of annuity contracts.

Fifth, the contention that the present definition of a dependent includes those living in the household of the taxpayer even though the relationship to the taxpayer is an illegal one.

Sixth, the conversion of ordinary income into capital gain income by purchasing bonds with coupons detached.

Seventh, the omission from taxable income of pre-1954 adjustments attributable to changes in methods of accounting initiated by the taxpayers, and

Eighth, double interest and charitable deductions with respect to the same amounts.

The provisions of benefit to taxpayers include:

First, the right to deduct as taxes amounts paid for municipal services in atomic energy communities.

Second, the revision of the prohibited transaction provisions as they relate to debentures of employer corporations held by pension trusts.

Third, the reconciliation of the provisions of the code with respect to fiscal-year taxpayers in transition years from the 1939 code to the 1954 code.

Fourth, the restoration of rights taxpayers had under the 1939 code with respect to the definition of mineral property, to the extent these rights were taken away from them under the 1954 code.

Fifth, the extension of the period of time for taking credit for State death taxes where the liability under the estate tax is not disputed and where reversionary interests are involved.

Sixth, provision for a 2-year carryback and 5-year carryforward of foreign income taxes which have not been credited again United States income taxes.

Seventh, the extension of the application of the pre-1952 rule in certain cases to prevent the pyramiding of taxes where lessees are required to pay the lessor's taxes.

I believe that something should be said about the effective dates of the provisions in this bill. In the case of amendments designed to correct technical errors and ambiguities, the effective dates generally refer back to the effective dates for the 1954 code. Those of a more substantive character, however, including even those of a technical nature, have been made effective as of November 7, 1956, or in some cases, as of some more recent date. November 7, 1956, was selected as the effective date for many of these provisions because this was the date when the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation first announced that many of these problem areas were under consideration. I recognize, however, that in view of the fact that this bill was not acted upon last year, some of these effective dates need to be reconsidered. I anticipate that this will be a matter to which the Senate Finance Committee will devote its attention.

At this point I should like to insert into the RECORD a brief explanation of each of the provisions of the bill. For those who are interested in more comprehensive explanations, I would like to refer you to our committee report. In the listing below I have grouped the provisions according to whether they appear to me to be substantive unintended benefits in present law which this bill would remove, or whether they are provisions designed to benefit taxpayers—primarily unintended hardships—or whether they are technical adjustments.

The substantive unintended benefits which this bill would remove are discussed below.

Section 2 of the bill merely provides that the same treatment is to be provided with respect to the retirement income credit in community-property and noncommunity-property States. This was intended in 1954, when this provision was adopted, as is indicated by the 1954 committee report which likens this provision to the social-security program. In this connection, it should be noted that the social-security programs do not distinguish between community-property and noncommunity-property States in the case of either the taxes to be paid or the benefits to be received. In defining earnings from self-employment, for example, the code provides that community income from business under community-property laws is to be attributed to the spouse exercising operation and control over the business, the same rule which, in effect, normally applies in common-law States.

The intent to follow social-security rules for the retirement income credit is shown by the general purpose statement in the report of your committee in 1954 on the retirement-income provision. This, in part, states:

> Under existing law benefits under the social-security program and certain other retirement programs of the Federal Government are exempt from income tax. Your committee believes that the tax-exempt status of such benefits discriminates against persons receiving retirement pensions under other publicly administered programs, such as teachers, as well as against persons who receive industrial pensions or who provide independently for their old age. Your committee has sought to adjust this differential tax treatment by extending a limited exemption, by means of a tax credit, to all forms of retirement income. In a number of respects, the exemption provision parallels the provisions applicable to benefits paid under the social-security program.

Other references in the committee report also add to this opinion that I have expressed, namely, that the retirement income credit was based upon the social security laws and therefore did not intend to distinguish between community property and noncommunity property States.

There are three principal areas of inequality in the case of the retirement income credit under present law. One of these is the earning test which must be met before retirement. The bill removes this inequality by making the retirement credit available only to spouses who were actually employed.

The second inequality of present law arises from the fact that pension income of the husband in community property States may in part be attributed to the wife. As a result, it is possible for both spouses to claim a credit each based upon $1,200 of retirement income. In a noncommunity property State the husband cannot attribute a work-connected pension to his spouse and as a result in such cases only one retirement income credit may be claimed. The bill provides for this problem by permitting work-connected pension or annuity income to be attributed only to the spouse who was actually employed.

Another area of inequality between community property and noncommunity properties States arises in the case of the application of the work test under the retirement income credit. This test requires the retirement credit to be reduced by the earned income in excess of $1,200 or $900 in the case of those qualifying under age 65 or no reduction in the case of those aged 72 or more. In community property States the earned income of the husband is divided equally between the two spouses while in noncommunity property States these earnings are attributed only to the husband. This variation in many cases works to the detriment of couples in community property States and in other cases to those in noncommunity property States. The bill meets this problem by attributing this work income only to the person actually employed and who renders the services.

Section 3: Dealers in tax-exempt securities presently in effect are writing off premiums on these securities against ordinary income even though not being subject to tax on the income from these securities where they dispose of the bonds within 30 days of acquisition and where the bonds do not mature until 5 years from the date of acquisition. The bill removes this treatment by deleting the 30-day and 5-year rules.

Section 4: The bill removes a provision whereby police officials may in effect exclude a subsistence allowance of up to $5 a day from their taxable income.

Section 5: The bill defines a dependent in such a manner as to give assurance that both a spouse's and a dependent's exemption may not be claimed for a wife. It also excludes from the definition of a dependent those living in the household of the taxpayer if their relationship to the taxpayer is an illegal one.

Section 9: Present law provides that both a charitable contribution deduction and an exclusion may not be claimed if the corpus of a charitable trust reverts to the grantor. The bill makes it impossible to avoid this provision merely by having the corpus revert to a person who is closely related to the taxpayer.

Section 10: Present law provides for a 2-year charitable contribution carryover, and a net operating loss carryback of 2 years and carryforward of 5 years. The bill makes its impossible for these two carryovers to interact in such a way as to give rise to a double deduction with respect to the same amount.

Section 11: The bill makes it impossible to claim both an interest and a charitable contribution deduction with respect to prepaid interest where property is donated to a charity. It also makes it impossible for a taxpayer to receive an interest deduction with respect to money borrowed to purchase bonds which in turn are donated to charity.

Section 12: Under present law premiums on bonds which are callable prior to maturity can be written off ratably against ordinary income over the period up to the earliest call date if this date is more than 3 years from the date the bonds were issued. If these bonds are not actually called at this early call date they can subsequently be sold and any gain realized treated as a capital gain even though deductions with respect to the same amounts have already been taken against ordinary income. The bill stops this avoidance device.

Section 14: Where a lessee makes improvements on property he has rented he generally can write off the cost of this improvement over the initial period of the lease, even though the life of the improvement may be substantially longer than this and although he may have the option to renew the lease. The bill in such a case requires the cost of the improvement to be spread over all of the periods for which the lessee can renew the lease, unless the life of the asset is less than this or unless the lessee can establish that it is more probable that the lease will not be renewed than that it will. An associated problem relating to leases between related parties is also dealt with in the bill.

Section 16: Under present law it is possible for corporations to buy and sell stock in periods around dividend dates and claim an 85-percent intercorporate dividend-received deduction with respect to the dividend income while deducting in full against taxable income corresponding loss on the sale of the stock. The bill eliminates this special advantage by denying a dividends-received deduction for dividend income where the stock is held for only 10 or fewer days; a 90-day rule is provided for cumulative preferred dividends. Also, this provision stops a similar avoidance device involving the 85-percent dividend-received credit where simultaneous long and short positions are maintained over a dividend date.

Section 19: It has been reported that certain tax-exempt institutions are paying some of their part-time employees all or almost all of their compensation in the form of annuities. This gives these employees a special advantage since the tax on this full amount can be deferred until they begin receiving their pensions. The bill limits to 20 percent the portion of the compensation, which, for tax purposes, can be treated as deferred income. It also deals with a similar problem relating to forfeitable annuities of tax-exempt organizations where the employee at some later time prior to retirement obtains a nonforfeitable right to these amounts.

Section 22: Present law provides capital-gains treatment for tax deferment for employees restricted stock options where the option price is within 85 percent—or 95 percent—of the value of the stock at the time the option is granted. So-called variable price options have unintentionally been given more favorable treatment. The bill restricts this capital gains and deferred tax treatment in the case of variable price options to those where the option price meets the so-called 85-percent test based upon the average price in the month in which the option is exercised. This limitation applies only where the option price is determined with respect to the value of the stock at any time before the option is exercised.

Section 23: Under present law income from installment obligations generally may be deferred for tax purposes until the obligations are collected. Usually where these installment obligations are transferred before collection, the unpaid balance is taxable at the time of this transfer. However, in limited situations, such as where these obligations are transferred to corporations controlled by the person making the transfer, the tax is further postponed until the transferee collects the installment obligations. Where the transferee is a life-insurance company no tax is collected because this is a type of income not taxable to life-insurance companies. The bill removes this unintended benefit by providing that where installment obligations are transferred to life-insurance companies, gain on the obligations is to be recognized. Related problems are also dealt with involving transfers of these obligations to partnerships of which a life-insurance company is a member and involving their transfer to companies which in the next year become life-insurance companies.

Section 24: If taxpayers change their method of accounting present law generally provides that certain adjustments must be made in the year of transition to prevent certain income from being taxed twice and other income from being omitted from tax entirely. However, it appears that under the 1954 code, to the extent these adjustments relate back to years before 1954, these adjustments are not to be made. The bill requires these adjustments, attributable to years before 1954, to be made if the change in method of accounting is initiated by the taxpayer. However, these adjustments if they require an increase in income may, for tax purposes, be spread out over a period of as much as 10 years.

Section 34: Because capital gain income of regulated investment companies can be passed on down to the stockholders and taxed only to them, it is possible for dealers in these securities to purchase stock of regulated investment companies just before a capital gain dividend becomes payable. They then may treat the dividend received as a capital gain while receiving ordinary loss treatment on any loss resulting from the sale of this stock. The bill provides that where a taxpayer holds such stock for no more than 30 days, instead of receiving ordinary loss treatment in the case of the sale of the stock, such a loss is to be treated as a long-term capital loss. A somewhat similar problem is also dealt with in the case of taxpayers other than dealers.

Section 41: Present law accords involuntary conversion treatment where the sale of broadcasting property is certified by the Federal Communications Commission as being necessary or appropriate to carry out its policies. On occasion, taxpayers have purchased additional facilities in anticipation of an FCC order to dispose of other facilities they already held. By so doing it was possible for them to obtain a tax deferment on the sale of the old facility. FCC by administrative action taken in 1956 restricted its certifications to those cases where the disposition of the property is required because of a change in FCC policy or rules. The bill changes the involuntary conversion treatment in present law to accord with this administrative action taken by FCC.

Section 42: Where bonds are issued with an artificially large discount and then redeemed at par, or a call price before their maturity date, the entire difference between the issue price and redemption price can be claimed by the corporation issuing the bond as a deduction against ordinary income, although the bondholder obtains capital gains treatment with respect to his gain in excess of the portion of the discount attributable to the period up to the time of the redemption—or sale prior to redemption. Since one taxpayer in this case receives a deduction against ordinary income, the bill provides that any gain, to the extent of the original issue discount, is to be treated as ordinary income at the time of the sale or redemption of such a bond.

Section 43: It has come to the attention of your committee that some taxpayers are creating artificial capital gains by buying bonds with detached interest coupons which are payable within 12 months from the date of purchase. Present law in such cases provides capital gains treatment with respect to the rise in the value of the bond which is caused by the passing of the period to which the detached interest coupons relate. The bill prevents this conversion of ordinary income treatment for gains attributable discounts arising from detached interest coupons whether or not the detached coupons are attributable to the period of 12 months or less after purchase of the bond.

Section 46: Present law provides capital gains treatment for an inventor who sells his patent to a corporation, if he—or a closely related person—does not own more than 50 percent of the stock of the corporation and otherwise qualifies for the special capital gains treatment for patents. The bill reduces the area in which the capital gains treatment is to be available by restricting it to those cases where the inventor sells his rights to a patent to a corporation in which he does not own as much as 25 percent of the stock. Other technical changes are also made in this provision.

Section 51: Present law provides that where taxpayers have received amounts from the United States with respect to claims against the Government which have remained unpaid for more than 15 years and which involve acquisitions of property by the Government, the tax is not to exceed 30 percent of the amount received. The bill makes this provision inapplicable with respect to claims filed after December 31, 1956, and makes the 30-percent limitation apply only in the case of the surtax with respect to amounts paid by the Government in 1957 and future years with respect to claims filed before 1957.

Section 52: Present law provides proprietorships and partnerships under certain conditions with the option to be taxed as corporations. Because of administrative problems the bill repeals this provision. It also provides flexible rules to provide that elections under this provision will not be binding for past periods.

Section 61: The bill, in order to obtain better reporting of taxable income with respect to income earned abroad, requires that in determining whether a

taxpayer has the $600 or more of gross income which would necessitate his filing a return, income earned abroad is to be taken into account, even though this income may be excludable income for tax purposes. It is expected that this, together with an expansion of the Treasury's information requirements with respect to income earned abroad, will lead to the more full disclosure of such income for tax purposes.

Section 64: This provision in general provides that more of the information which is presently filed with the Government by tax-exempt organizations is to be made available for public inspection. Subject to limitations as to the disclosure of information which might be harmful to the organization or national defense, the bill provides that the applications for exemption of educational, charitable, and religious organizations and other exempt organizations described in section 501 (c) and (d) are to be made available for public inspection along with supporting data presented by the organizations. The bill also provides that the annual information returns now filed by certain educational and charitable organizations, in the portion available for public inspection, the organizations are to show the total contributions and gifts they received during the year.

It should be made clear that this bill is not exclusively a revenue tightening measure. It also contains a substantial number of provisions designed to remove hardships or otherwise benefit taxpayers. The provisions which have this effect are described below:

Section 6: In Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., where practically all of the real estate was either purchased or leased from the Atomic Energy Commission, the persons so acquiring real estate are required to pay the Commission or its agent for services usually rendered by a municipality. These payments are not taxes, however, and, therefore, are not deductible for income tax purposes by the persons living in these communities. The bill treats payments of this type as if they were taxes and thus makes it possible for the residents of these communities to deduct these amounts in computing their income taxes.

Section 13: The net operating loss deduction under the 1954 code more nearly follows what has been referred to as the statute income concept rather than the economic income concept of the 1939 code. Present law provides that where a year begins in 1953 and ends in 1954 the allowable loss consists of a portion of a loss computed under the 1939 code rules, and a portion computed under the 1954 code rules, depending on the portion of the fiscal year falling in each of these 2 calendar years. This rule of proportion works under present law where the loss originates in 1 of these 1953–54 years, but it does not provide for a proportioning between the 1939 code and 1954 code rules where a loss is carried to, or through, 1 of these 1953–54 fiscal years. The bill extends this treatment to losses carried to, or through, these years.

Section 25: Present law provides that where a pension trust and certain other tax-exempt organizations makes loans without adequate security to the creator of the organization, such as an employer corporation, a prohibited transaction is deemed to have occurred and the organization loses its tax-exempt status. The proposed regulations have held that the purchase of debentures of an employer organization on an open market constitute a prohibited transaction because there is no collateral and, therefore, that there is not adequate security. The bill provides that the purchase of a debenture of an employer corporation by a pension trust is not to be deemed to be a prohibited transaction if certain specified conditions are met. These conditions are designed to give assurance that the purchase was made in an arm's length transaction at a fair market price; that not more than a quarter of the assets of the pension trust are invested in the bonds of the employer; that the trust purchases not more than 25 percent of any debenture issue of the employer; and that loans subsequently made by the employer will not be given more favorable treatment from the standpoint of collateral.

Section 31: Changes made in percentage depletion rates by the 1954 code were effective as of January 1, 1954, for calendar taxpayers, but in the case of fiscal year taxpayers they were effective only with respect to years beginning after that date. The bill equates the treatment of fiscal year and calendar year taxpayers by permitting the fiscal year taxpayer to apply the percentage depletion rates specified in the 1954 code to that portion of a fiscal year 1953–54 which follows December 31, 1953.

Section 32: The 1954 code defines the word "property" for purposes of computing the percentage depletion allowance in the case of coal and other mineral resources. This definition in the 1954 code was intended to be more liberal than the definition of property followed by the courts under the 1939 code. However, in certain respects it has not proved to be so. The bill, therefore, provides that a taxpayer may, if he chooses, elect to determine what constitutes a "property" as if the 1954 code definition had not been enacted and as if the 1939 code rules still applied.

Section 37: Present law limits the credit which may be claimed for foreign taxes to the same proportion of the United States tax—before the credit—which the income in the foreign country represents of the total income from all sources. This has not worked satisfactorily, however, where the same income is reported in different years for purposes of the United States and the foreign country's taxes. The bill therefore provides a 2-year carryback and 5-year carryforward for foreign taxes which cannot be claimed as credits against the United States tax because of the limitation.

Section 53: Under present law the time allowed for claiming a credit against the Federal estate tax for death taxes paid to States varies in certain cases according to whether a disputed amount was initially claimed, and then a claim for refund filed, or whether the case was taken directly to the courts without paying the disputed amount. The bill amends the statute to provide that credits for State death taxes can still be claimed if these taxes are paid within 60 days after the Treasury has notified the taxpayer of the disallowance of his claim for refund or within 60 days after a final decision by the court acting on such a claim.

Section 54: Present law provides for the postponement of the payment of Federal estate tax on reversionary or remainder interests until 6 months after the termination of any prior interest. State and foreign death taxes in such cases are allowed as credits if they are paid and credits are claimed for them within 60 days after the termination of the prior interest in the property. The bill permits the Secretary of the Treasury to extend these 6-month and 60-day periods for as much as 2 additional years.

Section 57: The bill provides that the mere designation of a survivor beneficiary in the case of qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans is not to result in the imposition of a gift tax if the survivor benefits are of such a nature as not to be includible in the employee's gross estate for estate tax purposes. Thus, the gift tax will not apply in such cases to the extent an annuity or pension under a qualified plan is attributable to contributions made by the employer. It will continue to apply, however, to the extent the annuity is attributable to contributions of the employee.

Section 72: Under present law situations can arise where, even though underpayments and overpayments of tax offset each other, the Internal Revenue Service collects more interest than it pays, or vice versa. With appropriate limitations where no interest is payable, the bill eliminates these erratic differences by terminating interest both as to overpayments and underpayments during any period of time to the extent these payments offset each other. This provision also provides for similar situations arising with respect to net operating loss carrybacks in transition years affected by the 1954 code.

Section 76: Existing law provides that no alien may leave the United States until he has procured a certificate indicating that he has complied with all the obligations imposed upon him by the income-tax laws. The bill provides that the Treasury Department may by regulations make exceptions to this rule. In addition, the bill provides that the payment of taxes not yet due, or furnishing of a bond with respect to these taxes, by a departing alien will not be required if the Treasury Department determines that the collection of tax is not jeopardized.

Section 81: For taxable years prior to 1952, the Internal Revenue Service provided that where lessees contracted to pay a rental to a lessor, plus any Federal income taxes of the lessor attributable to this rental income, any additional tax of the lessor paid by the lessee was not to be included in the lessor's income. However, for the period from

1952 until the adoption of the 1954 code, a pyramiding of the lessor's taxes was required in such cases. The 1954 code provided a new rule to the effect that the lessor is not to include in his income any income taxes paid on his behalf by the lessee but that these taxes also are not to be deductible to the lessee. The bill does not affect 1954 code rule but extends the pre-1952 rule to all years coming under the 1939 code; that is, it extends it to the years 1952 and 1953.

The technical provisions of the bill I shall refer to still more briefly. They are listed below.

Section 7: This provision deals with worthless securities and affiliated corporations and corrects a grammatical error.

Section 8: This provision deals with nonbusiness bad debts. It makes it clear that a business bad-debt deduction cannot be claimed for a debt which was not originally created or acquired in connection with a trade or business of anyone other than the taxpayer claiming the deduction.

Section 15: This provision relates to the income-tax deduction for medical, dental, and so forth, expenses of a decedent which are paid out of his estate in the year following death. However, to obtain this deduction a statement must be filed indicating that this amount was neither claimed nor allowed as a deduction for estate-tax purposes. The bill allows the income-tax deduction for these expenses so long as the statement filed indicates the deduction was not allowed for estate-tax purposes regardless of whether such a deduction was claimed.

Section 17: This provision relates to property received in a transaction described in section 358 where the transaction may be regarded as two separate exchanges. The bill provides that in such cases there is to be a reduction in the basis of the property received, to the extent of the amount of any loss recognized to the taxpayer upon the exchange.

Section 18: This section deals with the 1954 code rules relating to sales of stock to related corporations. These rules became effective as of June 22, 1954. The bill makes it clear that the 1939 code provisions are applicable in determining the extent to which property received on an acquisition of stock is to be treated as a dividend in the case of any acquisition of stock involving redemption through the use of related corporations if this occurred before June 22, 1954. The 1939 code provisions are also to apply to acquisitions of stock which occurred between June 22, 1954, and December 31, 1957, if the taxpayer was under a contract entered into before June 22, 1954.

Section 20: This provision relates to contributions of employers to employees' trusts or annuity plan, and corrects an error in punctuation.

Section 21: This relates to employee stock options granted by parent or subsidiary corporations. It provides that for the purpose of determining whether an individual is, or has been, an employee of a parent or subsidiary corporation of the corporation which granted an option—or issued or assumed such an option—the term "employer corporation" is to be treated as if it were the "grantor corporation"—or corporation issuing or assuming the stock option.

Section 26: This provision relates to the tax on corporations improperly accumulating surplus. It eliminates the possibility of any charitable contribution carryover above the 5-percent limit for purposes of the accumulated earnings tax, and also eliminates the possibility of any excessive deduction with respect to capital gains and the taxes on these gains.

Section 27: This section relates to the tax on personal holding companies. It makes it clear that for purposes of the personal holding company tax no carryover of charitable contributions is to be allowed. It also provides that the net operating loss deduction for personal holding companies is not to take into account the dividends received deduction and other deductions provided for corporations generally but not allowed in computing personal holding company income.

Section 28: This provision makes three changes in the tax on foreign personal holding companies. In general, foreign personal holding company income is included in the gross income of the United States stockholders. This provision, first, makes it clear that in computing this income no carryover of charitable contributions is to be allowed; second, prevents a double deduction for partially tax-exempt interest; and third, provides that the net operating loss deduction available in the case of foreign personal holding company income is not to take into account the dividends received deduction and other special deductions which are allowed in computing foreign personal holding company income.

Section 29: This provision relates to losses of banks with respect to bonds. It corrects an inadvertent error in the 1954 code by which bonds may be denied ordinary loss treatment with respect to retirements on mortgages and other evidences of indebtedness issued by corporations or governmental units without interest coupons and not in registered form.

Section 30: This provision relates to the depletion allowance in the case of estates and corrects the misspelling of the word "devisees."

Section 33: This section is concerned with the qualifications which must be met by investment companies furnishing capital to development corporations if these investment companies are to obtain regulated investment company treatment. This provision corrects a reference in the present code to "not earlier than 60 days" to "not less than 60 days." This language restores the 1939 code language which was inadvertently changed. A typographical error is also corrected in this provision.

Section 35: Under present law lump sum distributions under "trusteed" employee pension plans are subject to a 30-percent tax when received by a nonresident alien not engaged in a trade or business within the United States. Such payments also are subject to a withholding tax at their source. However, neither the 30-percent tax nor the withholding at source are applicable if the lump-sum payments are made under an "insured" employee pension plan. The bill provides the same treatment for payments made under an "insured" employee pension plan, as present law already provides in the case of lump-sum payments made under "trusteed" employee pension plans.

Section 36: Section 871 (a) of the code imposes a tax of 30 percent of the gross amount of certain items of income received by nonresident aliens not engaged in trade or business in the United States. However, if the individual's income from these sources exceeds $15,400, section 871 (b) provides that the alien is to pay the regular income tax if this is more than 30 percent of the gross amount received from the specified income sources. However, the 30 percent tax imposed by section 871 (a) is not reduced by the 4 percent dividends received credit or the $50 dividend exclusion, but this credit and exclusion are available where a 30-percent tax is applicable under section 871 (b). Thus, a lower tax may be achieved under subsection (b) than under subsection (a). The bill conforms the credits and exclusions available in the case of subsection (b) with those presently available in the case of the 30-percent tax under subsection (a). An amendment is also made to conform the tax treatment of partially tax-exempt interest for the taxes imposed under sections 871 (a) and 871 (b).

Section 38: In connection with an exchange of property described in section 1031—property held for productive use—section 1035—insurance policies—or section 1036—stock for stock of the same corporations—a taxpayer in addition to transferring property of the type permitted to be exchanged free of tax, may also exchange other property with respect to which the taxpayer will be able to claim a loss. The bill makes it clear that there is to be a decrease in the basis of the property received to reflect any such loss.

Section 39: In connection with the involuntary conversion provision, reference is made to the acquisition of control of a corporation holding property similar to that which was compulsorily or involuntarily converted into money. The 1954 code contains no definition of control of a corporation for this purpose. The bill restores the 1939 code definition which defines control as the ownership of stock possessing at least 80 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote and at least 80 percent of the total number of shares of all other classes of stock of the corporation.

Section 40: The section of present law providing that property acquired before March 1, 1913, is to have a basis at least equal to its fair market value as of March 1, 1913, inadvertently refers to only one part in subtitle relating to income taxes. The bill corrects this reference so that it refers to the entire income-tax subtitle.

Section 44: Section 1233 (a) of the 1954 code provides that a short sale is to result in a capital gain or loss only if

the property used to close the short sale is a capital asset in the taxpayer's hands. The rules in subsections (b) and (d) of this section which relate to the postponement of the beginning of the holding period and long-term capital loss treatment apply only if the short sale results in a capital gain or loss. The bill makes it clear that a dealer in securities may not avoid this holding period rule and long-term capital loss treatment by closing a short sale with property held for sale to customers instead of property held in his investment account. The bill also adds a new subsection to exclude hedging operations in commodity futures from the operation of the short sales provision.

Section 45: This provision rearranges and clarifies the existing tax treatment provided with respect to options to buy or sell. The bill provides that the gain or loss arising from an option to buy or sell property is to be considered gain or loss arising from property which has the same character as the property underlying the option. The section also adds certain clarifying exceptions with respect to the general rule for options: First, it is made clear that capital gains treatment will not apply to dealers in options where the options are a part of their inventory; second, it is made clear that the section does not apply to gains on the sale of an option in any case in which the income derived in connection with the option would, without regard to this section, be treated as ordinary income; and, third, it is made clear that the section does not apply to gain attributable to the sale of options acquired before March 1, 1954.

Section 47: Present law provides that under certain conditions real property which has been subdivided in order to be sold in separate tracts will not be considered property held for sale to customers, with the result that these sales will be eligible for capital-gains treatment. The bill makes it clear that this treatment is not to be available in the case of property previously held for sale to customers by the taxpayer nor is it to apply in the case of property sold in the same year in which the taxpayer is a dealer in real estate, whether or not the particular property in question was held for sale to customers.

Section 48: Under the 1939 code the provision relating to gains from the sales of certain property between spouses or between an individual and a controlled corporation did not apply to sales or exchanges made on or before May 3, 1951. This date which was unintentionally omitted from the 1954 code is restored by the bill.

Section 49: This section relates to certain adjustments to be made for closed taxable years. The bill makes it clear that in computing a refund or deficiency with respect to an adjustment in a closed year where the same item has been adjusted by agreement between the Government and the taxpayer in an open year, neither the Government nor the taxpayer may raise the unrelated adjustment in the closed year.

Section 50: In connection with the provision of present law relating to the computation of tax where a taxpayer restores a substantial amount held under claim of right it is not clear that if the tax for the year of restoration is computed by reducing it by the tax attributable to the item in a prior year, the deduction, which is not taken into account, is not to have any effect for purposes of the net operating loss carryback or carryforward. The bill makes it clear that the deduction is not to be taken into account in computing income except for the computations under the claim of right provision itself.

Section 55: This section relates to the exemption under the estate tax for the value of an annuity or other payment receivable by a beneficiary under an employee's trust or a retirement annuity contract. In the case of retirement annuity contracts reference is made only to those purchased by an employer under a nontrusted plan which "meet the requirements of section 401 (a) (3)." However, a qualified nontrusteed employee annuity plan must for income-tax purposes also meet the requirements of section 401 (a) (4), (5), and (6). The bill makes these qualifications also applicable in the case of section 2039 (c).

Section 58: This section relates to agreements entered into by domestic corporations for the purpose of extending old-age and survivors insurance coverage to service performed for certain employees of foreign subsidiaries. The bill corrects a typographical error in the heading of this provision.

Section 59: This section relates to the collection and payment of employment taxes with respect to Coast Guard exchanges. The bill corrects an erroneous reference.

Section 60: This section relates to acts to be performed by agents in the case of employment taxes. The bill corrects an erroneous reference.

Section 62: This provision relates to the limitation on the election to make a joint return after filing a separate return. The bill corrects an erroneous cross-reference.

Section 63: Present law provides that if an individual files his tax return on January 31—or February 15 in the case of farmers—of the succeeding taxable year the return will serve as a substitute for a declaration or an amended declaration required to be filed on January 15. The bill makes it clear that where the individual makes his return on a fiscal-year basis, appropriate dates having the same relationship to his taxable year are to be substituted for the reference to January 31, or February 15, as the case may be.

Section 65: This provision relates to address for notice of deficiency in the case of income and gift taxes. The bill corrects an erroneous reference.

Section 66: This provision amends the code to make it clear that the Secretary or his delegate may release property subject to special liens for estate and gift tax purposes if the liability with respect to these taxes has been fully provided for. This restores the 1939 code rule which was inadvertently omitted from the 1954 code.

Section 67: This provision corrects certain sections of the code by changing reference to "United States district attorney" to "United States attorney" to conform with presently established nomenclature.

Section 68: This provision amends a section of the code relating to the conveyance of title to correct a grammatical error in the heading of the provision.

Section 69: Present law provides that executors and corporations contemplating dissolution may request prompt assessment of any income tax due from a decedent or the corporation. Such assessment must be made within 18 months except in case of fraud, willful evasion, or failure to file a return. The bill also permits a later assessment where the assessment is based upon the omission of amounts representing 25 percent or more of gross income or upon a failure to file a personal holding company information schedule. The bill also makes it clear that a request for prompt assessment may be made not only by a corporation contemplating dissolution, but also by one in the process of dissolution or one which is already dissolved.

Section 70: The bill makes it clear that, where an organization in good faith determines that it is an exempt organization and files an information return, this return is to be deemed its return for purposes of the running of the period of limitation on assessments and collections not only where the organization is technically a corporation but also where it is a trust. This section of the bill also amends the code to assure the continuation of the 1939 code rule that a tax deficiency attributable to the application of a net operating loss carryback may be issued at any time prior to expiration of the assessment period for the year in which the loss was sustained.

Section 71: This section provides that the period for filing a claim for refund is to be 3 years from the time the return was actually filed rather than 3 years from the due date of the return, as presently provided. This section also provides that, where a return was filed after the due date, under an extension of time for filing, and a claim is filed within 3 years after the return was filed, amounts to be refunded include not only payments made within the 3 years preceding the date of the claim but also those made within 3 years plus the period of extension for filing the return. This section further provides that the special period of limitation for filing a claim for credit or refund with respect to net operating loss carrybacks in the case of individuals is to be extended from the 15th day of the 39th month after the end of the loss year to the 15th day of the 40th month after the end of such year.

Section 73: This section provides expressly that interest may be assessed and collected at any time during the period within which the tax to which it relates may be collected. This removes any basis for contending that interest, to be collectible, must be assessed within the limitation period for the assessment of the tax on which the interest has accrued.

Section 74: This provision amends the code to remove any basis for contending that the penalty for failure to file infor-

mation returns can be avoided by filing these returns after the due date. The application of this section has been limited to information returns for which a fixed due date is prescribed by regulations.

Section 75: This section makes it clear that in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, for purposes of measuring a deficiency in tax, the tax shown on a return is to be taken into account if the return was filed on the last day prescribed for filing, as well as in cases where it was filed before such date.

Section 77: This section makes it clear that the Government may make immediate assesment of a deficiency upon the filing of a petition by the taxpayer in a proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act even though approval of the petition is not required by that act. This provision also makes it clear that a petition for redetermination of a deficiency by the Tax Court is not to be filed after the filing of a petition by the taxpayer in a proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act where approval of the petition is not required by the act.

Section 78: This section amends the code to provide that wherever the use of registered mail is presently required, either certified or registered mail may be used. In addition, the Treasury Department is authorized to prescribe by regulations the extent to which the provisions of the code requiring prima facie evidence of delivery and regarding the postmark date, now applicable to registered mail, are also to apply in the case of certified mail.

Section 79: This section grants the Treasury Department the authority to utilize the service of Federal agencies and commercial organizations for the processing of microfilm and other reproducing materials. The actual photographing of the returns and other records will be performed only by Government employees. The Secretary of the Treasury in this connection will be required to issue regulations providing safeguards against unauthorized use of microfilm or other reproductions and unauthorized disclosure of information contained in these films or reproductions. The provision also provides that the microfilm and other reproductions are to have the same legal status as the original documents, and if properly authenticated are to be admissible in evidence as if they were in originals.

Section 80: The bill adds a new section to the code authoriizng the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe individual seals for district directors of internal revenue and for other officers and employees of the Department to whom functions of the Secretary are delegated. It also provides that judicial notice is to be taken of these seals if facsimiles are published in the Federal Register.

As time passes we feel certain that we will have further legislation of a corrective nature before the Congress and that we can offer solutions to some of the problems that presently exist and which are not dealt with in this bill.

Now I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding. I would like to know what is meant by foreign personal holding companies.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman has the report there?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. What page are you reading from?

Mr. GROSS. Page 75.

Mr. MILLS. And the gentleman wants to know what a foreign personal holding company is?

Mr. GROSS. That is right; will the gentleman explain the provision to be found on page 49 of the bill dealing with that subject?

Mr. MILLS. Let me explain section 28 of the bill first, then go back to the definition of personal holding companies.

Section 28: In general, the income of foreign personal holding companies is included in the gross income of the United States stockholders. Section 28 makes it clear that the adjustments to be made in computing undistributed foreign personal holding company income do not include a carryover for unused charitable contributions and prevents a deduction for partially tax-exempt interest from being taken once in computing the amount of foreign personal holding company income and again as a credit against tax by the domestic stockholder on his pro rata share of undistributed foreign personal holding company income.

A foreign personal holding company is the foreign equivalent of the domestic holding company with which I am sure the gentleman is quite familiar.

Mr. GROSS. No; I confess to the gentleman, I do not know what a foreign personal holding company is.

Mr. MILLS. A personal holding company is any corperation, with few exceptions, at least 80 percent of whose gross income consists of dividends, interest, gains from the sale of capital assets and similar investment income, and the stock of which is owned to the extent of 50 percent or more by 5 or less individuals.

A domestic holding company is so far as the personal holding company tax is concerned, is an incorporated pocketbook. So that it would be a foreign corporation incorporating the pocketbook of United States stockholders.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Are these foreign individuals?

Mr. MILLS. No. These are United States stockholders of foreign personal holding companies.

Mr. GROSS. The holding company exists in this country?

Mr. MILLS. No. It is a foreign holding company. It could exist in England, it could exist in France, but it has American stockholders in this country. We are trying to guard against a double deduction with respect to both a charitable deduction and a deduction for credit against the tax of the domestic shareholder. It is an incorporated pocketbook. That is just about the best definition I have ever heard of a personal holding company.

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything in this bill which would give employees of the United Nations or any similar organization preferential tax treatment?

Mr. MILLS. No; in this bill we try to stay as far away from the United Nations as we can.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad you did.

Mr. MILLS. If there is anything in here that has anything to do with the United Nations, it is there without my knowledge. I know of nothing in it that has anything to do with employees of the United Nations, the United Nations itself or even the principals of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. This is a complex bill and I wanted to be sure international organizations are not given more preferential tax treatment.

Mr. MILLS. I assure the gentleman there is nothing in here of a preferential nature for anyone.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to ask the gentleman briefly about section 3 of the bill, a section which I understand requires holders to amortize municipal bonds, and so forth. It is my understanding after talking to committee counsel, that this section was meant to close a loophole.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mrs. CHURCH. There are a considerable number in the Chicago area who feel that this new provision may impose a hardship on the entire industry. Can the gentleman inform me about that?

Mr. MILLS. In committee we became concerned about this matter, so by committee action a few days ago we adopted an amendment changing the provisions of section 3. That amendment will be offered as a committee amendment, which I think perhaps will be far more acceptable to those to whom the gentlewoman refers than the language in the bill and actually not bring about any unintended hardship, but will still close the loophole.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman is familiar with the situation that has arisen in connection with the Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railroad. The amendment the gentleman proposes will still leave them in a position where they will be forced to pay about $100,000 should this bill be enacted into law.

Mr. MILLS. They are included under the provisions of the amendment we will offer as a committee amendment under section 2 of that amendment which is not elective but compulsory.

Mr. AYRES. Even though they have sought relief in the courts, and the courts have ruled in their favor, they still will be forced to pay the $100,000, which it is estimated they would owe?

Mr. MILLS. They will be required to be treated as any other railroad will be

treated under the provision if they elect to come in under section 1.

Mr. AYRES. Under the provisions of that amendment, there is no way possible to exclude them? That would have to be done in the other body?

Mr. MILLS. It will have to be done in the other body, and while the gentleman is on his feet let me say that I hope the constituent to whom he refers will take advantage of an opportunity of stating its case when the matter is taken up in the committee of another body. Frankly, I was not in a position to go along with the case they presented, but upon consideration by another body there is always the possibility, of course, that the other body might find itself amenable to going along. Whether it will, I do not know, of course.

Mr. AYRES. I know the high esteem in which we hold the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. And I appreciate his comments here today and I want to make clear then that in your judgment it would be possible for the other body to give the Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railroad relief in this particular instance.

Mr. MILLS. I cannot go that far. I do not speak for the other body. I am suggesting that your constituents go to the committee in the other body and state your constituent's case to the other body so that it can be again considered over there in connection with this bill.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I would like to inquire, on page 82 of the report, dealing with the per country limitation on foreign tax credits, which are eliminated, apparently, by this change in the law, would that elimination of the per country limitation increase or decrease taxable revenues?

Mr. MILLS. I would have to say that the provision in the bill would decrease revenue in that particular instance, but only in a very limited way.

Mr. VANIK. What effect will it have on a company like the Saudi-Arabian Oil Co. with operations in Saudi Arabia?

Mr. MILLS. I do not think it has any effect. I know, in fact, that it has no effect.

I will say this, that those who proposed the amendment when it was offered in the Committee on Ways and Means, made a very, very strong case for this particular section. It does not in any way affect the matter that the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I call his attention to page 99 of the report and page 75 of the bill with respect to publicity of exempt organizations information. Would this restrict publicity with respect to tax exempt organizations, or would it provide for more publicity?

Mr. MILLS. No. The purpose is to provide for more publicity, I will say to the gentleman, and it came to us from other subcommittees of the House that had conducted studies of this matter such as the select committee which my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], was on, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], and I believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS]. There have been studies made by either the standing committees of the House or select committees, and all of them have pointed in the direction of more publicity to these matters, and we are endeavoring to carry out that objective here.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement in that regard.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the House will see fit to adopt the bill and the committee amendments which will be offered.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this august Committee, I support the favorable consideration by the House of Representatives of H. R. 8381. This legislation is designed to enact meritorious amendments in our Federal tax structure. The substantive amendments for the most part relate to the removal of either unintended benefits or unintended hardships with respect to taxpayers.

At the outset of the debate on this legislation I would like to call attention to the fact that some individuals because of misguided and unwarranted political motivations have asserted that the need for H. R. 8381 has been occasioned by the alleged existence of tax loopholes created by the 1954 code. I will categorically assert that nothing could be farther from the true facts in the matter. Of the 23 substantive unintended benefits that are corrected by this legislation only 4 of them had their genesis in the 1954 code. The remaining 19 tax loopholes originally became a part of our Federal tax structure through the 1939 code. Instead of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 creating tax loopholes the real fact is that one of the very significant improvements the 1954 code made over the 1939 code is that more than 50 tax loopholes existing in the 1939 code were corrected with the enactment of the 1954 code. I would call the attention of those persons who are interested in examining the record on this matter to my remarks in the House of Representatives on March 17, 1954, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 3, page 3425, wherein I list the more than 50 ways in which H. R. 8300 eliminated the opportunity for tax avoidance that was possible under the 1939 code. But, Mr. Chairman, regardless of the source of such tax loopholes, it is important that the existence of any loopholes be removed. This is important not only from the standpoint of preserving current revenues but also it is important to prevent the cumulative and growing exploitation of a loophole with even greater revenue consequences in the future.

The legislation, H. R. 8381, also would remove unintended hardships that were inadvertently imposed on our taxpayers. It is appropriate that such hardships also be corrected so as to avoid making the onerous character of our high tax rate structure even more of a burden on our American citizens.

In addition to the substantive changes that H. R. 8381 would make in our Federal tax structure, the bill also would make a number of technical and clerical changes. The legislation is before this distinguished committee today as the result of the very capable and conscientious efforts on the part of the tax staff of the Treasury Department and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, working under the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the view that H. R. 8331 should receive the favorable consideration of the Congress so as to strengthen our Federal tax structure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I favor the enactment of H. R. 8381, the Technical Amendments Act of 1957.

I was a member of the subcommittee, which, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Arkansas who is now chairman of the full Committee on Ways and Means, held public hearings on these matters in November of 1956, which have been published and which cover 500 pages of testimony and statements. In addition to the public hearings, the subcommittee and the full committee have spent many days in executive session studying these problems before reporting H. R. 8381.

As indicated in the title, the bill is intended to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes.

One of the unintended hardships corrected by this bill, and which is illustrative of the purposes of the bill, affects several thousand persons in Oak Ridge, Tenn., whom I have the honor to represent in this body.

I quote from the committee report:

SECTION 6—PAYMENTS FOR MUNICIPAL SERVICES IN ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITIES

The attention of your committee has been directed to a problem relating to persons in Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., who have acquired real estate from the Atomic Energy Commission. In these communities persons acquiring or leasing real estate from the AEC are required to pay the Commission (or its agents) for services usually rendered by a municipality and usually paid for by taxes. These payments would be deductible if they were paid as taxes to a municipality but are not deductible when paid to the AEC (or its agent). Since as a result of legislation passed by Congress (Public Law 221, 84th Cong.) these communities are likely to become municipalities within a period of 5 years, your committee sees no reason, during the transition period, why the residents of these communities should not receive deductions for income-tax purposes for amounts which generally are deductible as taxes in other communities.

Therefore, your committee's bill amends section 164 of the code by adding a new subsection (f) permitting the deduction for income-tax purposes for amounts paid AEC for municipal-type services by owners of real property within a community qualifying under section 21b of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955. An owner, for this purpose, is to include a person who holds property under a lease of 40 years or more from the AEC because prior to the passage of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, AEC entered into long-term lease arrangements with some of the families in

these communities, but required payments for municipal-type services from them at least equal to the payments required by those purchasing property. The term "owner" also is to include persons who have entered into contracts to purchase property under section 61 of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955.

This provision is to apply to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1957.

This provision is expected to result in a negligible revenue loss.

A provision of this bill of considerable importance to the mining industry is section 32.

SECTION 32—RETENTION OF 1939 CODE RIGHTS WITH RESPECT TO TREATMENT OF MINERAL INTERESTS

Section 614 of the 1954 code defines property for purposes of computing the percentage-depletion allowance in the case of mineral resources. This section permits a taxpayer owning interests in mineral resources to aggregate part or all of his operating mineral interests within an operating unit and permits him to treat such aggregation as one property. It also allows the taxpayer owning nonoperating interests in a single tract or in contiguous tracts, in hardship cases, to treat such nonoperating interests as one property. These combined interests are considered as one property for purposes of computing depletion, gain or loss on sale, etc.

Section 614 of the 1954 code was intended to liberalize the provisions of the 1939 code with respect to the definition of property. Some taxpayers have contended that the 1954 code section has deprived them of rights they previously had under the 1939 law, regulations, court decisions, or practices. Since, under the 1954 code, there was no intention to remove any rights which the taxpayers had, the bill restores such rights as taxpayers had under the 1939 code.

The bill accomplishes this by adding a new subsection to section 614 dealing with the definition of property. This subsection in effect provides that a taxpayer may elect to treat any property as if the present 1954 code definition of property had not been enacted and as if the 1939 code rules still apply. Thus, with respect to a property for 1954 and subsequent years, a taxpayer has two choices: he can apply the 1954 code rules, or he can adopt the 1939 code rules.

This provision is expected to result in a negligible revenue loss.

There are other inequities in the Internal Revenue Code which need and will receive attention by the committee. We are engaged now in rather extensive public hearings on many of these subjects.

Mr. Chairman, I assume the gentleman from Arkansas, when submitting committee amendments will either insert in the RECORD a statement or explain fully in detail the effect of the committee amendments.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. It is my intention to either explain the committee amendments or to insert in the RECORD an explanation of each committee amendment.

Mr. BAKER. I have had prepared by a member of our staff a very brief explanation of those committee amendments and their effect, which I have not had an opportunity to present to the chairman. I shall insert them or not as the chairman feels is advisable. If the gentleman will fully cover them, there is no point in my doing it.

Mr. MILLS. Of course the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] can insert anything in the RECORD he wants to insert in connection with the committee amendments. I shall put in the RECORD an explanation of each of those amendments, which has been carefully analyzed by our staff, for accuracy.

Mr. BAKER. Under those circumstances, I think it would be a duplication for me to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the enactment of this bill as a step in the right direction. We will continue to study this most complicated and important problem of removing unintended hardships and benefits and to make the internal revenue laws of the United States more fair and equitable to all taxpayers.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would like to find out if one thing is clarified in this bill. Under section 481 of the of the 1954 law there are 3,000 applications now pending for a change in the accounting methods, which the Secretary of the Treasury has seen fit to take no action on because of uncertainty. I notice that this bill has amended that section to provide that they cannot take into account the taxable years preceding the enactment of the 1954 code if the request is initiated by the taxpayer. Would this enable the Secretary of the Treasury to go ahead and consider and grant those applications, many of which are very meritorious?

Mr. BAKER. My answer is that it definitely would. If there is any doubt about it I would like to ask the chairman of our committee to state it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The purpose of the amendment is to create a situation wherein the Secretary will go ahead and grant these requests for changes in accounting methods.

Mr. BAKER. And very expeditiously, I might add. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I support the enactment of the legislation that is before this distinguished Committee today, H. R. 8381. This legislation as the distinguished members of the Committee on Ways and Means who have preceded me in this debate have explained has as its principal purpose the elimination of existing loopholes in our Federal tax structure and the meritorious removal of inequities in our tax laws that would have the effect of working an unintended hardship on certain of our taxpayers.

Because of our onerous tax rate structure, it is extremely important that no taxpayer have the tax rates applicable to his income made easier on him as a consequence of a loophole or more demanding of him as the consequence of an inequity. This bill will help to give effect to a philosophy that I have always had that no taxpayer should pay more tax or pay less tax than a fair and equitable application of the substantive provisions of the law requires.

I know that the membership of the House is aware of the tremendous difficulties that are encountered in developing tax laws that are relatively easy of understanding and totally equitable in their application. We still have a long way to go in achieving simplicity and there is also considerable room for improvement in achieving equity. By closing tax loopholes this legislation will have the effect of contributing to the day when tax reduction for all our citizens will be possible. This contribution comes from the fact that by closing these loopholes we are in effect safeguarding the Federal revenues.

I would like to commend the Treasury Department tax staff and Mr. Stam and his joint committee staff for the very able work they have done on this legislation. The bill has received careful consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means, and it is presented to the membership of this body for consideration at this time. In my opinion that consideration should be favorable, and I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage when the occasion arises.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, from time to time each of us may serve a subcommittee. I am sure that we all have experienced that with respect to certain types of legislation there are those individuals who do more than their share of the work and are really expert in their field. I take this time only with respect to this extraordinary technical bill—a bill that is admittedly difficult to understand, a bill that has required a great deal of research work in order to bring an answer to extremely difficult problems—I do want to commend from my side of the committee the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] for the extreme devotion and effort and skill that he exerted toward helping prepare this highly meritorious bill. I do not disparage the work done by others on my side of the committee, but I do give particular emphasis to the work done by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Having no other requests for time, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes in order that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] may ask a question.

Mr. GROSS. Is the Committee on Ways and Means taking any action to block the 27½-percent depletion allowance for the oil people?

Mr. MILLS. Not in this bill. I may advise my friend from Iowa that depletion and all other matters contained in

the Internal Revenue Code are constantly under study by the staff of our own committee and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

There is no plan presently before the committee to conduct hearings on that particular subject. Some references have been made to it, I may say, during the course of the hearings we are now conducting, but there is no intention at this time on the part of the Chair to go into that subject this year.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I hope the committee will not study the depletion allowance for the oil men so long that it becomes merely a mirage in the eyes of the committee. I hope something will be brought out soon.

Mr. MILLS. It has been under study for a long time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD].

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, before launching into a discussion of some of the provisions of H. R. 8381, I think that the Members of this House would be interested in knowing something of the bill's history. It is the product of the work of the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation on which I have the honor of serving, which is chaired by the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS of Arkansas. The subcommittee was organized by a motion and approved by the Committee on Ways and Means in the last days of the 84th Congress, with the broad purpose of investigating and studying the operation and effects of the internal revenue laws of the United States as to substantive policy, technical adequacy, and administration, and making recommendations with respect thereto. It was early decided that the subcommittee's work would have two major aspects, one involving an investigation of the technical adequacy and substantive sufficiency of our internal revenue laws, and the other concerned with the administration and enforcement of those laws.

The subcommittee decided in the fall of 1956 to limit its objectives to short-run accomplishments within the policy framework laid down by the framers of the 1954 code and in anticipation of the fact that the full committee would eventually hold general revenue revision hearings looking toward a major policy review of the whole Federal tax complex. With these limited objectives in view, the subcommittee released two documents in the fall of 1956 for public reaction and comment. The first was the so-called Subcommittee Print No. 1 released on October 24, 1956, which contained legislative proposals designed to correct a series of clerical and technical errors in the 1954 code. The other document released on November 7, 1956, contained a list of 28 substantive unintended benefits or hardships, some of which were important from a revenue point of view and presented a large litigation potential for the future unless corrected. Those proposals contained in Subcommittee Print No. 1 were classified as unimportant in revenue consequences, however, they covered errors which had become a source of irritation to both taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service.

On November 9, an advisory group was appointed for the purpose of assisting the subcommittee in its appraisal of the administration and reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service. Three other advisory groups, having jurisdiction over subchapters C, J, and K of the Internal Revenue Code, were appointed shortly thereafter.

Beginning in November, the subcommittee conducted public hearings on Subcommittee Print No. 1 and the November 7 list of unintended benefits and hardships. During the course of these hearings the interested public was given an opportunity to express opinions and make suggestions concerning the proposed legislative solutions contained in Subcommittee Print No. 1 and the list of unintended benefits and hardships. Immediately after the close of public hearings, the subcommittee began to meet in executive session for the purpose of laying down the policy guidelines necessary for the staff of the committee to predicate a draftsmanship upon, and the staff was instructed to prepare a bill incorporating the subcommittee's decisions and a report explaining the decisions for submission to the Committee on Ways and Means. Thus, when the 85th Congress convened, the Committee on Ways and Means had pending for its consideration a number of highly developed proposals for amending the internal revenue laws of the United States, and these proposals ultimately gave rise to H. R. 8381. It will be a monument of achievement to the subcommittee for years to come.

The Committee on Ways and Means considered the report and legislative drafts of the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation for 4 weeks and ordered H. R. 8381 favorably reported. The bill contains 81 sections which, in general, are applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954, the effective date of the 1954 code. However, many of these sections carry their own effective dates.

Because of limitations of time, I shall not endeavor to discuss more than a few of the more important sections of the bill. One of them is particularly interesting to Members of Congress from the West and Southwest who represent community property States.

Section 2 of H. R. 8381 should be of particular interest to all residents of community-property States, not so much because of revenue impact but because of the precedential character of its provisions, for this section of the bill, for the first time, differentiates between the treatment of residents of community-property States and residents of common-law States, specifically. The section deals with the computation of the retirement income credit under section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code and applies only to retirement income derived from a work pension or annuity resulting from the employment of one of the members of the marriage community. The section affects the computation of the retirement income credit in three major respects: First, qualification for the 10-year earned income test, second, application of the earned income limitation, and third, the number of credits which may be claimed on the basis of the same income. If the bill is enacted, with section 2 still in it, each spouse of the marriage community will have to qualify for the allowance of a retirement income credit by showing that he or she has received earned income of $600 per year for at least 10 calendar years preceding the taxable year for which the earned income credit is claimed, and will be required to apply the earned income limitation without regard to the amount of his or her earnings which, under community property laws, are attributable to the other spouse. For example, if the husband earns $2,400 of earned income, no retirement income credit will be allowable in his case since the $1,200 retirement income maximum must be reduced dollar by dollar by the amount of income earned by him in excess of $1,200. Under existing law no reduction is necessary because one-half of the husband's earned income, or $1,200, is attributable to his wife under community property laws. And, of course, under section 2 of the bill each spouse must qualify independently for the retirement income credit without benefit of the earnings of the other. That is, both the husband and the wife must have received retirement income in the taxable year as a result of services performed by each individually in order to qualify for retirement income credit.

As you in this House are aware, representatives of the community-property States are a minority in the House and in the Committee on Ways and Means. This fact alone lends special significance to the provisions of section 2 of the bill for, as I have said, it is indicative of things to come in the area of tax legislation which should cause all of you concern. Tomorrow your own institutions may be found in the minority. I was joined in separate views concerning section 2 by the Honorable CECIL KING, of California; the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana; and the Honorable HAL HOLMES, of Washington. I can assure you that no matter what happens on this provision here or in the other body, where I shall continue to work for its defeat, we will continue to work for an understanding of the problems of the community-property States and of their institutions of law, for I am sure that a proper understanding in the minds of our colleagues from common-law States will prevent further encroachments along the lines of section 2 of the bill.

To turn to other sections of the bill, all of you will remember the accolades with which section 1361 of the 1954 code was hailed. As you recall, section 1361 permits proprietorships and partnerships to elect to be taxed as corporations. Section 52 of H. R. 8381 repeals section 1361, effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1957. Our investigation in the subcommittee led us to believe that section 1361 serves no useful purpose and is, in fact, no more than a trap for the unwary. The regulations under this section have not been promulgated and in all probability never will be. Without the essential guidance

which taxpayers have a right to expect from the regulations, the section is no more than a breeding ground for litigation and dispute between the Internal Revenue Service and those taxpayers unfortunate enough to have elected to be treated under its provisions. In addition to repealing the section, effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1957, section 52 also gives validity to the Treasury's temporary rules by, in effect, making what the statute now states to be an irrevocable election revocable, by providing for the making of an election within the period ending before the last day of the 3-month period following the month in which regulations on section 1361 are prescribed and published in the Federal Register.

Three sections of the bill relate to the estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. Section 53 extends the period of limitations for filing claims for credit for State death taxes. Under existing law a credit is allowed for State death taxes which are paid within 4 years after the estate tax return is filed, but if an extension of time is granted in which to pay Federal estate taxes, the State death taxes need not be paid until after the period of extension. Similarly, in the case of a deficiency, State death taxes need not be paid until 60 days after the tax court's decision becomes final to be eligible for credit. However, if the estate tax is paid and then a refund claim is subsequently filed, no extension of time is now available for the payment of State death taxes. Section 53 of the bill would extend the time for payment of State death taxes so that, in the case of timely claims for refund or credit, State death taxes may be claimed if these taxes are paid within 60 days after the Treasury Department has notified the taxpayer of the disallowance of part or all of his claim or within 60 days after a final decision of a court on this claim.

Section 56 is of particular interest to tax practitioners because of the insight that it provides in judging the effectiveness of proposals to prevent abuses of the tax system. As you will recall, the Treasury Department appeared before the Ways and Means Committee during the consideration of H. R. 8300, the bill which became the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and advocated the repeal of the so-called premium payment test, under which life-insurance proceeds had been subjected to tax in the estate of the insured, even though he had given away all of the incidents of ownership but had continued to pay the premium. In the Senate Finance Committee, officials of the Treasury Department, with revenue considerations foremost in their minds, had a change of heart and asked that the premium payment test be left unchanged. H. R. 8300, as it went to conference between the two Houses and as it was enacted, provided for the repeal of the premium payment test. Since the enactment of the 1954 code, the Treasury Department has consistently advocated the reimposition of the premium payment test in its entirety. However, in the release of November 7, 1956—the list of unintended benefits and hardships—the Treasury suggested the "inclusion in the decedent's estate of the difference of the proceeds received upon death and the reserve at the time of death or possibly the cash surrender value at the time of death." This proposal was opposed in the public hearings conducted in November of 1956 by representatives of the life insurance industry, who pointed out that life insurance was, in fact, no different from any other property and should be the subject of an inter vivos gift, just as any other property is, without the imposition of estate tax. However, the Committee on Ways and Means, evidently because it feared the abuse of the existing provision, in section 56 of the bill, originally provided for partial restoration of the premium payment test, but limited the inclusion in the gross estate of the deceased, to the proceeds attributable to the premiums paid within the 5 years immediately preceding the decedent's death. This rule would have applied only to policies purchased within 5 years of the decedent's death, and those cases where the decedent owned the policy or had other incidents of ownership within 5 years prior to his death which within the 5-year period were transferred to other beneficiaries. The section would have been effective only with respect to life-insurance policies purchased after June 26, 1957. Wisely, I believe, the Committee on Ways and Means has here today offered a committee amendment striking section 56 from the bill. The section satisfied neither the proponents of the Treasury point of view nor those who believed the estate-tax treatment of life-insurance proceeds should remain in the posture provided by existing provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The provisions of section 56 were at best a compromise, the effectiveness of which were open to doubt from their inception. It should now be possible for the Committee on Ways and Means to take up the problem again with objectivity, and to ascertain the course of action which would be best pursued.

I could go on at length concerning the many other interesting provisions of the bill. However, limitations in time preclude a more detailed discussion of its provisions. I commend to you House Report 775, which contains an excellent explanation, both general and technical, of each of the provisions of the bill, and to the excellent summary of the bill's provisions made here on the floor today by my esteemed chairman, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS. This report has been reprinted in full by most of the tax services.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I want to express appreciation to my distinguished colleague for the splendid explanation of the sections of this bill covered in his discussion.

I am disturbed, of course, as the gentleman is, by section 2 of this bill, which, as he has pointed out, is an encroachment on the laws and institutions of the community property States. Section 2 does not belong in a bill of this nature.

I associate myself with my distinguished colleague from Texas in his opposition here to this section and with him and those who joined with him in filing separate views in the committee report, expressing valid reasons why section 2 should not be enacted. It should be eliminated from the bill before the bill is finally passed by this Congress.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the first paragraph on page 83 contains the sentence:

> Under present law a taxpayer may choose to use the taxes paid a foreign country as either a credit against his tax or as a deduction in computing taxable income.

Hearings before the other body last year disclosed that several of the American oil companies who were developing the oil resources for certain foreign governments in the Middle East persuaded such governments to designate royalty payments made by the companies to such foreign governments as taxes. For that reason, the companies were permitted to deduct the amount paid to such foreign governments from taxes due the American Government. Because of such deductions, as well as the use of the oil-depletion allowance upon their earnings in such foreign countries, there was no tax paid to the American Government covering such operations, even though the gross earnings were substantial.

I ask the chairman whether this is not the type of loophole that should be closed. Today, in this bill, the committee seeks to close a number of loopholes, yet this very flagrant loophole is not covered. I am sure the chairman has in mind the situation to which I refer.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is referring specifically to the Aramco case?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. Actually I have not had the opportunity yet to know all the facts regarding the tax status of that taxpayer. The gentleman from Illinois, I am sure, knows that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation instructed the staff of that committee to make a study of this situation and report back to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation with respect to the facts so that, since the Joint Committee is made up of the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means and members of the committee of the other body—so that the legislative committees could have an opportunity of determining whether or not legislation is needed. Frankly, I do not know what the facts are. I am awaiting the report of this staff and when it is given to us, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall go into it to determine whether, in my opinion, legislation is needed.

Mr. YATES. The hearings in the other body indicated that payments were being made to the foreign government as royalties. The next year, as a result of this amendment having been made to the tax law, the word "royalties" was taken out and the word "taxes" was substituted. As a result they were permitted

or the company was permitted a deduction of its tax. I think that is a grossly unfair situation. I hope the chairman will go into that matter.

Mr. MILLS. I assure the gentleman that when this report comes in, as an individual Member of Congress, I am going to look into it to see whether or not, in my opinion, any legislation is needed.

Mr. YATES. I hope the gentleman will go into it as chairman of the committee as well.

Mr. MILLS. It is hard to escape that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to protest as vigorously as I can the provision which repeals section 120 of the 1954 Code. That is the provision which permits police officials of State and local governments to exclude from taxable income subsistence allowances not in excess of $5 a day.

This provision was enacted just 4 years ago. I notice in the report on page 7 that this section is now being repealed because they say it is inequitable. I fail to see how the same reasoning which induced the enactment of this provision in 1954 is not applicable today to the circumstances and conditions as they now exist. This report says that while only two States, Georgia and Indiana, now have laws that enable police to obtain the benefit of this provision, that if all the other States adopted similar legislation it would amount to as much as $50 million a year. I think that is bad reasoning. If it was just in 1954, I think it is just today and the criteria and standards should not be how much money it is going to cost the Revenue Department, but rather whether the provision is just and equitable. I think it is just and equitable, and I would ask the committee, who under the rule can only offer amendments, to offer an amendment and strike out this section repealing section 120 of the Code of 1954.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I join in the request of the gentleman from Georgia to the committee. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia there was good reason for passage of this bill at the time, and there is no change in conditions since then.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, it is always a little difficult, I believe, to plead a special case, but I believe that a case can be made in opposition to both section 2 and section 14. Section 2, if the views as filed by members of the committee are valid, as I believe them to be, is rank discrimination. If our rules prevent, as they do, an attempt to alter this provision, I hope the other body will do so. Section 14 has to do with the depreciation of improvements on leased property in growing areas or areas of a very fast growing nature such as California. Future experience may show the difficulty of applying this provision, so I will ask in the House, which I believe is the proper procedure, to include the arguments made by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, respecting both sections 2 and 14, at the conclusion of my remarks at this time. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

The following is the statement of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce on sections 2 and 14:

STATEMENT ON SECTION 2

The Federal affairs and life insurance committees are concerned that Federal legislation should again attempt to dictate what is community income and what is not. This is clearly an invasion of the rights of the community property States which over the years have sustained their contention that half of community income belongs to the husband and half to the wife. Community property is an incident of the marital relation. It originates in and is regulated by State law. The extent of the interests in community property are determined only by State law. This is a fact which should not be ignored by the Congress for the purpose of levying taxes.

Under the change proposed, the Federal Government would attribute a fictional status to the interest of a husband and wife in community property and, in so doing, attempt to give legislative sanction to an unrealistic view of the community property system—a system which was old before Congress came into being. California's system is largely the result of Spanish law which governed the State before it was admitted to the Union.

When so-called individual income tax inequities between the community and noncommunity property States troubled the Federal tax levying authorities more than a decade ago, community property States strongly resisted the attempts of Congress to deny the tax advantages which resulted from their system of property ownership. The problem was solved through extension by Federal law (1948) to the noncommunity property States of the income-splitting privilege enjoyed by recipients of community income in community property States under their own laws.

When the Federal Government sought to tax all property in community property States to the estate of the husband upon his death, as was the practice in noncommunity property States, the compromise effected which arose from objections of the community property States, was the enactment in 1948 of marital deduction provisions to be applicable to property of married persons which is not community property.

If anything needs to be done about this problem, a better solution would be to extend the split-income advantage to the noncommunity property States rather than attempt to over-ride the settled law of the community property States.

A real danger in the present proposal is that the estimated loss to community property States is relatively small, and the provision is a part of an extensive bill devoted to a great many subjects—all important but few attracting much public attention—with the result that it may be difficult to enlist sufficient opposition to this section to prevent the establishment of a precedent endangering the whole community property concept as to rights in property. A breakthrough of the principle which the community property States have managed to keep intact until now could conceivably open the door to the destruction of all the tax advantages under the community property laws, leaving only the disadvantages.

The core of the problem is clearly expressed in the following statement contained in an amici curiae brief of the attorneys general of the community property States, filed with the Supreme Court of the United States (October term, 1945) in the case of *Joachim O. Fernandez, United States Collector of Internal Revenue, Appellant* v. *Samuel G. Wiener, William B. Wiener and Jacques L. Wiener, Appellees* (on appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, New Orleans Division) relating to the estate tax controversy:

"We revert to the Congressional concept • • • to the effect that in noncommunity property States, property acquired by the husband after marriage 'through his own efforts' is regarded as belonging to the husband. Translated, this means that the husband is the beneficiary of his wife's 'efforts' as well as of his own. Manifestly, such a system has its advantages—to the male population. Since the converts to the community property system have been few, it seems that those advantages are deemed to outweigh certain differences between community and noncommunity property States in respect of taxation. All the States can obtain the advantages, if any, of the community property system by adopting it. The remedy is in their hands, and the price is willingness to forego the advantages which the common law gives the sex which, if allowance is made for obstinate self-deception, is master only when its opinions are concurred in, and obeying, believes that it commands. In the absence of willingness to pay that price, it comes with ill grace for the noncommunity States, the majority through their lawmaking power, to enact legislation impairing the operation of the older and more equitable system.

"If Congress can validly enact such legislation, a long step has been taken toward obliteration of the autonomy of the States, and towards Congressional control over their institutions, customs, laws."

---

STATEMENT ON SECTION 14

The Federal Affairs Committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce contends that the proposed change is not realistic and could work a substantial hardship on commercial enterprises and industries in fast-growing areas such as southern California, where there have been and are likely to be rapid changes in the character of suburban areas in which they may locate. For example, assume that a businessman enters into a lease with a 20-year primary term with an option to renew for an additional 20-year period. Subsequent thereto he proceeds to construct substantial improvements on the leased property with the usual requirement that the leasehold improvements will become the property of the lessor at the termination of the lease. Under the proposed amendment to the 1954 code, the lessee will be required to amortize the cost of the improvements over a 40-year period, unless it can be shown that it is more likely than not that the lease will be terminated at the close of the first 20-year period. Of course, if the useful life of the improvements is less than the full term of the lease, depreciation can be computed by using the shorter period in determining the rate. If, at the end of the 20-year primary term, the lease is terminated, the lessee will be allowed to write off his unamortized cost at that time. However, he may not be able to obtain a full tax benefit at that time because of a reduced level of income. Moreover, he would have paid higher income taxes in the first 20-year period because of lower amortization allowances.

The committee is advised that there is a good deal of sentiment among members of the accounting profession that the proposed new subsection would be most difficult to comply with and could have many unfair effects upon business taxpayers.

This proposed addition to the Internal Revenue Code is a part of the "technical amendments" bill which has been reported by the House Ways and Means Committee and is on the House Calendar under a peculiar rule.

In clearing the bill for House action, the Rules Committee issued a rule that amendments to the bill on the floor would be barred with one exception: Representative CURTIS, Republican, Missouri, would be permitted to offer an amendment to delete from the measure a section which would tighten the estate tax treatment on certain life insurance policies. However, there are other parts of the bill to which objections have been voiced by several members of the House Ways and Means Committee, such as the proposed change affecting retirement income credits in community property States which is the subject of a separate report to the Board of Directors. Accordingly, efforts are being made to persuade the Rules Committee to reverse itself, and in the meantime, the measure remains on the House Calendar.

Financial writers have called attention to the far-reaching impact of this entire measure on a large number of taxpayers, stating that because of its technical provisions, it has attracted little public attention, being devoted to closing alleged tax loopholes and providing for the easing of a few tax hardships not intended by the Congress. The bill contains scores of items and covers such subjects as the tax treatment of bonds, pensions, annuities, partnership earnings, mineral properties and many other types of income and investments.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that I appreciate the intensive work and attention the Committee on Ways and Means has given the measure under consideration.

For want of information and in fear of the potential effect of the carryback and carryover of foreign tax credit provided by new section C of subsection 37 of the bill or section 904 of the internal revenue laws of 1954, I am constrained to oppose this section of the bill which provides for a carryback and carryover of excess tax paid to any foreign country by an American taxpayer.

In reading over the testimony before the subcommittee, I find no impelling reason why the foreign tax carryback and carryover privilege should be extended to the special group of taxpayers who are in a position to use it in their tax avoidance plans. It will result in a considerable loss to the Treasury.

I am particularly concerned that this section may have wider application and result in an even greater loss of tax dollars than we can today estimate.

It is my fear that somehow or another this section may prove extremely useful to American companies engaged in foreign oil development, such as the Arabian American Oil Co. operations in the Middle East.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, let us get the record straight. The gentleman was talking about section 37. We do not, in connection with section 37, repeal the per country limitation by any means. It is still in the law. That section does not affect that situation.



Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, with reference to section 4 about which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] spoke, I rise in opposition to that provision. I would like to point out some of the inequities which I believe the enactment of this provision would bring. In my own State of North Carolina at the last session of the General Assembly, the members of the State Highway Patrol were granted a subsistence allowance of $40 per month which under existing law would not be subject to taxation. In my own community, and in other communities throughout the country, I am advised that governing bodies of municipalities and other local and State agencies have enacted ordinances and regulations which put the police officers on a subsistence basis for a certain portion of their income. This was done by these agencies pursuant to the advice of competent counsel. The League of Municipalities, I am advised, in the State of North Carolina recommended it to the local governing bodies. As a result of that, I am told that the individual officers are now called upon to pay taxes upon subsistence money which they received from their employers. That was not because the police officer was trying to evade taxes, but because higher authorities of the community so decreed.

If we cannot eliminate section 4 from the bill as it is now written, I certainly hope and suggest that we make the effective date some date in the future in order that the police people in the Nation will not be penalized by any action that we take here. I urge that section 4 be deleted. If that is not deemed feasible the bill should be amended to extend the effective date until the end of the current year in order that hardship upon the individual police officers may be avoided.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to subscribe wholeheartedly to the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] with reference to the elimination of section 120 of the Revenue Code of 1954.

I realize it is futile to undertake to do anything about it on the floor. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] I think would concede that the Georgia delegation has been diligent in putting forward its position in this matter.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The Georgia delegation has been most diligent in making known its position on this matter to the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee. Everything that could have been done has been done by the Georgia delegation to enlighten us on this subject.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

We recognize that quite a hardship will be worked on many members of the Georgia State Patrol and other peace officers. There are many cases pending that will require many of those officers to readjust returns over a period of years and pay quite large sums of interest.

I regret very much that the committee has seen fit to do this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, of course no bill could come out of this committee which would meet with the approval of everybody. It is like your first visit to the dentist. You do not like it, but on the other hand it is as good a bill as anyone could draw, applying to all the public. The committee is to be commended. However, it seems to me there are two or three questions that might be answered.

Last week a Member of the other body went to Detroit and a Detroit paper, the Detroit Free Press, says he threw around several brickbats. Then a gentleman named Reuther, who acts for the UAW-CIO, handed back a like number of bricks and just as vigorously.

The editorial from the Monday, January 27, Detroit Free Press, captioned "Goldwater Versus Reuther," reads as follows:

GOLDWATER VERSUS REUTHER—LOUD AND LIVELY BUT LITTLE ELSE

If they grow, seeds planted here last week could give Michigan's 1958 political campaign its distinguishing characteristic—and an unfortunate one it would be.

Should it happen that way, voters will mostly hear about who runs the Republicans and who runs the Democrats, and is this good.

At the Wayne County Republicans' fundraising dinner, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER stressed the theme that it takes an extremely strong light to discern where Walter Reuther leaves off and Michigan's Democratic Party begins.

Mr. Reuther countered swiftly.

He declared that in Michigan the Republican Party is run by the big auto companies. This thesis he embroidered with several assertions represented as fact which are no more susceptible to proof than some of what Senator GOLDWATER offered as gospel.

Mr. Reuther delivered this up-the-Democrats, death-to-Republicans speech at the UAW special convention called to discuss matters of high-priority union interest. Conceivably a carper might say that, of itself, this platform's use for a strictly partisan outpouring confirmed what Senator GOLDWATER said about where the Democrats are run from.

Nor was anything taken away from this line of argument when Governor Williams came before the convention Friday to deliver a half-hour echo to Mr. Reuther's salvos at the Senator.

None of this detracts from Mr. Reuther's accuracy when he said that the auto makers have taken a role in the affairs of Michigan's GOP.

Whether they have had on its steering wheel the influencing hand which Mr. Reuther claims might be another matter. Not that perhaps they wouldn't like to, but on some days we get the feeling that this State's GOP has no steering wheel.

Nevertheless, it is not out of business. Mr. Reuther erred when he said that in Michigan the Republican Party has been repudiated. He can confirm his mistake in this respect by asking Governor Williams which party sends a majority to the legislature. Mr. Williams has that answer down by heart.

But whether one subscribes to Senator GOLDWATER or to Mr. Reuther, the fact is that last week neither of them produced anything but brickbats. Brickbat throwing makes a lively spectacle, but isn't the substance of which a political campaign should be made.

True, the extent to which a party is subject to some special control deserves more than passing mention. But in the last analysis the voter usually has to decide the truth in this respect by observation and his own perspicacity rather than by what he is told.

And, barring partisans with a high degree of emotional involvement, Senator GOLDWATER and Mr. Reuther are likely to find themselves boring people with their charges.

Mainly that is likely to be so because the average individual questions whether either big business or big labor should run the show in this country. Either way there is a concentration of power, and a too concentrated power no matter where it rests isn't good. That is coming to be increasingly understood.

If Michigan is to have a meaningful campaign it is up to both parties to spell out exactly how they see the problems and what they propose to do toward solving them.

Republicans and Democrats alike will betray the voter if in these times they give him no better material for his decision than emotionalist vilification.

We hope those seeds planted last week don't send up shoots. Should they produce the principal campaign crop, Michigan voters are going to be badly handicapped in trying to make any sort of intelligent verdict about the governing of their State.

Among other things, the Free Press states that—

Barring partisans with a high degree of emotional involvement, Senator GOLDWATER and Mr. Reuther are likely to find themselves boring people with their charges.

That may be true, but if it be equally true, as stated by the press, that every eighth individual in Detroit is on unemployment compensation, and if unemployment is to continue and the burden upon out-State taxpayers grows heavier, it is quite probable that citizens generally will be deeply interested in whether the charges made by the Senator are based upon fact, whether the policies suggested by Mr. Reuther to govern the motor industry be helpful or just another impracticable suggestion.

Note the paragraph from the editorial:

Republicans and Democrats alike will betray the voter if in these times they give him no better material for his decision than emotionalist vilification.

Certainly every sensible individual will admit that emotional vilification is entitled to but little, if any, weight. But how about the facts?

When opportunity offers, there will be presented to the House a factual statement of at least some of Mr. Reuther's activities, and, from that statement, it is my hope that at least the Members of the House who care to listen or to read it will be able to form an accurate judgment as to Mr. Reuther's record and the result of his past activities and of the present time.

Regardless of Mr. Reuther's beliefs, he is, like everyone else, responsible for what he does, and when the record is made clear it is just possible that some, at least, will concede that he does not possess a sound solution of the present economic depression.

But, for the present, skipping Mr. Reuther's record, will the chairman of the committee advise the House—if he has the information—whether it is better from a tax standpoint to go along with Mr. Reuther, the UAW–CIO, and the remedies suggested by Mr. Reuther as to how management should be exercised, a business operated, profits, if any, divided, or should the voters pin their faith to private enterprise, as carried on by the motor and other industries in Detroit.

Will the chairman advise as to the amount of tax paid by the UAW–CIO?

Mr. MILLS. Let me observe to the gentleman from Michigan that the members of the Ways and Means Committee always try to write tax proposals as far removed from brickbats as possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And no taxpayer thinks you make them small enough or few enough.

Mr. MILLS. I am certain most any taxpayer would welcome a reduction in his own tax.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Beyond doubt.

My question was: How much tax does the UAW–CIO pay? It is exempt; is it not?

Mr. MILLS. Unless they are engaged in some related activity, it is exempt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As far as I know, they do not manufacture automobiles. They do not create jobs. How much does the motor industry in Michigan pay by way of taxes, just approximately?

Mr. MILLS. I have forgotten the last figure or the year to which it was applicable, but it seems to me it would be in the nature of a billion dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then it would appear—and I do not ask for any reply from the chairman of the committee—it would appear as though it would be better for Michigan and the taxpayers generally to go along with industry even if it be the motor industry rather than with Mr. Reuther and the UAW–CIO—that is with Mr. Reuther's recent suggestion as to how the so-called big three should carry on their businesses. That is their way of creating and maintaining jobs and meeting payrolls, is it not? You need not answer. The answer, of course, is obvious to the worker who wants employment.

Sometimes when the President tells us that we are at the crossroads, that our future welfare and security is at stake, that a crisis or a great emergency exists, Mr. Reuther comes up with a solution. He has had several. Let me refer to just one before this last one. In his letter of July 15, 1950, to President Truman, while the program was then labeled one to stop aggression throughout the world, he suggested, and I quote:

For the next hundred years (1950–2050) the people of the United States through their Government pledge themselves to make available through the United Nations an annual sum of $13 billion.

In that statement he was a little kinder than usual to industry in that he did not suggest that it contribute the $13 billion per year. His thought then was to put the burden upon all of us.

It is just possible that the doubling of the number of foreign cars sold in this country during the past year may shake Mr. Reuther's confidence in some of his programs, that is, if he really has in mind the welfare of the automobile workers of this country.

The truth of the matter is that cars have grown so large and the price has gone so high that the motor industry, perhaps like the farmer, has created a surplus—today people either do not have the money to purchase the present output of the factories or they prefer a smaller car which can be operated at less cost.

Whatever may be the cause, the market for autos and kindred products seems no longer to be a seller's market.

If that be true, then it would seem to follow that neither the big three nor any other segment of the motor industry can, or will, be able to comply with Mr. Reuther's present demands.

In the past, many an independent citizen has not felt kindly toward the motor industry because he thought it was perfectly willing to meet any demand of organized labor so long as it could sell its product. Now it is just possible that the car market is saturated and, if that be true, turning management over to Mr. Reuther and his staff of experts will not solve or tend to solve the problem. We will all just have to sweat it out until acceptable cars can be manufactured and sold at a price which will at least pay operating expenses and some slight returns on the capital invested.

Have often wondered why it is that some of the people who, like Mr. Reuther, are in a position to collect through dues not only a $25-million strike fund, but, no doubt, a $50-million strike fund, and who have control of additional millions, do not establish an industrial plant—just one—and give us all a demonstration of how industry should operate successfully and at the same time meet demands similar to those made by Mr. Reuther. He always seems able to write a prescription but he has not, as yet, given us a practical demonstration of the effect of the use of his remedy.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for giving me this time. I wish to speak briefly in regard to section 31 of this technical amendments bill.

Section 31, page 42, represents 3 years of hard, tedious effort on my part to obtain for all producers of limestone and other minerals the same advantage of depletion allowances for income tax purposes. Heretofore, those paying taxes on a calendar year beginning late in the year have lost much advantage for tax purposes to those with taxable years beginning early in the year. This

amendment enables them all to receive the same benefits for mineral depletion.

I am happy, Mr. Chairman, that the great Committee on Ways and Means saw fit to include section 31 in this bill. I feel I should inform the House that this particular section was included in a previous bill which passed both the House and Senate. However, at that time it was in a bill containing many objectionable provisions with the resulting effect that no conference was ever called and, therefore, the bill died.

This bill is made up of highly desirable corrections and clarifications. I am sure that if it does not become cluttered up with a lot of undesirable amendments in the Senate, it will be signed by the President and become law. I hope every Member of this House will prevail upon their Senators to see that this bill is kept free of undesirable amendments which might bring about its death in the Senate or in conference or by a veto.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment to the bill is in order except amendments offered by the Committee on Ways and Means. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, there are committee amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MILLS: Page 4, strike out line 9, and insert: "from gross income; but such term does not include such an obligation if—

"'(A) it is sold or otherwise disposed of by the taxpayer within 30 days after the date of its acquisition by him, and

"'(B) in the case of a sale, the amount realized (or in the case of any other disposition, the fair market value of the obligation at the time of such disposition) is higher than its adjusted basis (computed without regard to this section). Determinations under subparagraph (B) shall be exclusive of interest.'; and."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, this is the committee amendment to which I referred in response to the question raised by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. I have a rather detailed explanation of the committee amendment which I do not think necessary to take the time of the Committee to go through. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in explanation of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

(The statement referred to follows:)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3

Section 3 deals with the amortization, by dealers in municipal bonds, of premiums on such bonds during the period during which they are held.

The premium on the bond is usually an offset to an excessive interest rate. If a municipal bond paying 6 percent matures in 1 year and if the ordinary rate of interest on such a bond is 3 percent the purchaser will pay about $1,030. If he holds it for a year he will receive $60 in tax-exempt interest and have what appears to be a loss of $30. Actually, of course, there is no real loss; he will have received a net $30 of tax-exempt interest. To prevent the deduction of such unreal losses section 171 (with respect to investors) and section 75 (with respect to dealers in such bonds) require, in general, that the premium be amortized ratably over the period held so that the basis at the time of sale or maturity will reflect the reduced premium and there will not be a loss to be deducted.

Section 75 of present law, however, provides that dealers are not required to amortize premiums on tax-exempt bonds if they are held less than 30 days. This exception was deemed necessary to eliminate excessive bookkeeping costs where the bonds were held (as is usually the case) for only a short period before they were sold. Also, under present section 75 amortization by dealers is not required where the maturity or earliest call date of the bond is more than 5 years later than its acquisition date. This exception was deemed reasonable because at that time most high-interest municipal bonds had short maturities of from 1 to 5 years.

Certain dealers in tax-exempt bonds have been taking advantage of these exceptions. They have been making a regular practice of holding high-interest exempt bonds for a little less than 30 days and then transferring them to other dealers who similarly hold them for a little less than the 30 days. Thus, each of the dealers involved in this practice reduces his tax by deducting the loss which results from the reduction of the premium during the short period held. Also, some of these high-interest municipal bonds have a maturity date of more than 5 years, and dealers are holding these bonds and deducting the artificial losses with respect to the reduced premiums.

To eliminate these evils section 3 of the bill eliminates both exceptions, so that with respect to all tax-exempt bonds, whether or not they were held for only a short period and whether or not the maturity date was more than 5 years later, dealers would be required to amortize the premium. Many dealers have objected, however, to the elimination of the 30-day rule, on the grounds that this will require a disproportionate expense for bookkeeping and recording of the amortization of the premiums on bonds held for a very short period of time. It was suggested that the exception be applied to a reduced holding period of, say, 10 days; but this would have merely mitigated and not eliminated the evil involved in the ring-around-the-rosie practice.

To eliminate the evil and yet not require an inordinate amount of bookkeeping expense by dealers who are not practicing tax avoidance it is proposed not to require amortization of the premium by dealers where the bonds are disposed of within 30 days at a gain; but to require the amortization where the bonds are disposed of within the 30-day period at a loss. A legitimate dealer who is not engaged in the tax-avoidance practice will, of course, ordinarily obtain a dealer's profit upon the sale of these municipal bonds. This profit would ordinarily be considerably greater than the artificial loss during a period of less than 30 days resulting from a decrease in the premium. Thus, under the suggested amendment the legitimate dealer would not ordinarily be required to amortize the premium. On the other hand, those dealers who are engaged in the ring-around-the-rosie procedure and are selling their bonds to other dealers would not, of course, obtain from those dealers the ordinary commercial profit. They would normally sell the bonds to the other dealer at a loss measured by the decline in the premium during the period of time that they held the bonds. By making it necessary to amortize the premium where the bond was not sold at a gain it is believed that this ring-around-the-rosie practice will be stopped.

There was no great objection to the elimination of the 5-year rule in section 75. Therefore, the proposed amendment to section 3 eliminates this 5-year exception, as does section 3 as it is in the bill.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to assure the Committee that it is the feeling of the Ways and Means Committee that in the closing of this unintended benefit we are proceeding along the lines which were pointed out to us by the organization known as the Investment Bankers' Association of America.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MILLS: Page 29, line 13, strike out "paragraph" and insert "paragraphs."

Page 29, strike out line 15 and insert "ments generally.—Except as provided in paragraph (5)—."

Page 31, line 20, strike out the quotation marks, and after line 20 insert:

"(5) Special rule for pre-1955 adjustments in case of certain decedents.—A change from the cash receipts and disbursements method to the accural method in any case involving the use of inventories, made on or after August 16, 1954, and before November 7, 1956, for a taxable year to which this section applies, by the executor or administrator of a decedent's estate in the first return filed by such executor or administrator on behalf of the decedent, shall be given effect in determining taxable income (other than for the purpose of computing a net operating loss carryback to any prior taxable year of the decedent), and, if the net amount of any adjustments required by subsection (a) in respect of taxable years to which this section does not apply would increase the taxable income of the decedent by more than $3,000, then the tax attributable to such net adjustments shall not exceed an amount equal to the tax that would have been payable on the cash receipts and disbursements method for the years for which the executor or administrator filed returns on behalf of the decedent, computed for each such year as though a ratable portion of the taxable income for such year had been received in each of 10 taxable years beginning and ending on the same dates as the taxable year for which the tax is being computed."

Page 32, line 2, after "paragraph (4)", insert "or (5)."

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, the amendment to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, this section has to do with this matter which was also discussed in general debate. Section 24 amends section 481 of the code to make it possible for the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to approve requests of taxpayers for a change from a cash to an accrual basis in computing income for taxation purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD an explanation of this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The explanation follows:

The proposed amendment would add an additional special rule to section 24 of H. R. 8381. Section 24 is an amendment to section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to adjustments required by changes in method of accounting. The proposed amendment is applicable to situations in which a change from the cash to the accrual method of accounting was made in returns filed on behalf of decedents by executors or administrators of decedents' estates on or after the enactment of the 1954 code and prior to November 7, 1956, if the change was made because the decedent's business involved the use of inventories. Under the amendment, such a change will be given effect in the computation of taxable income. In addition, a transitional adjustment in computing the taxpayer's taxable income will be required to be made under section 481, as it would be amended by section 24, but this adjustment will be limited under the special rule to be added by this proposed amendment if the net amount of the adjustment would increase the decedent's taxable income by more than $3,000. This limitation is based upon the tax that would have been payable on the cash method of accounting for the years for which the executor or administrator filed returns on behalf of the decedent, and the tax is computed in a manner to avoid excessive rates as a result of distortion of income due to death and the change in method of accounting. The date November 7, 1956, is the date taxpayers were put on notice by public announcement that changes in section 481 were under consideration by a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment relates to the application of section 481 of the code, as amended by section 24 of the bill, in situations in which a change from the cash to the accrual method of accounting was made in returns filed on behalf of decedents by executors or administrators of decedents' estates prior to November 7, 1956, because the decedent's business involved the use of inventories. Ever since the Revenue Act of 1918 the income-tax regulations had provided, as did the proposed regulations issued under the 1954 code on December 21, 1956, that in inventory cases the only proper method of accounting was the accrual method. Under the amendment, such changes will be given effect in the computation of taxable income and a limitation is placed upon the amount of tax attributable to the transitional adjustment. This limitation is based upon the decedent's cash basis income, and the tax is computed in a manner to avoid excessive rates as a result of distortion of income due to death. The date November 7, 1956, is the date taxpayers were put on notice that changes in section 481 were under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MILLS of Arkansas: Page 53, strike out line 20 and all that follows through line 23 on page 55, and insert:

"(a) Short sales made by dealers in securities: Section 1233 (relating to gains and losses in case of short sales) is amended by adding at the end of subsection (e) thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(4) In the case of a taxpayer who is a dealer in securities—

"'(A) if, on the date of a short sale of a security, substantially identical property which is a capital asset in the hands of the taxpayer has been held for not more than 6 months, and

"'(B) if such short sale is closed more than 20 days after the date on which it was made,

subsection (b) (2) shall apply in respect of the holding period of such substantially identical property. For purposes of this paragraph, the last sentence of subsection (b) applies and the term "security" has the meaning assigned to such term in section 1236 (c).'"

Page 55, line 24, strike out "(c)" and insert: "(b)."

Page 56, beginning in line 7, strike out "(d) Effective date: The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b)" and insert:

"(c) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a)."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has to do with the question of short sales made by dealers in securities.

Section 44 of the bill is concerned with the short-sales provision of existing law. Under existing law a short sale of property generally results in a capital gain or loss if the property used to close the sale is a capital asset. Moreover, if at the time of the short sale the taxpayer held substantially identical property to that sold short which he had held for less than 6 months, any gain from the short sale would be considered a short-term capital gain subject to the regular income-tax rates. In addition, the holding period of the substantially identical property he already held, would start anew generally at the time the short sale was closed. On the other hand if the substantially identical securities had already been held for more than 6 months at the time of the short sale and if the short sale results in a loss, present law provides that the loss is to be a long-term capital loss.

It has been possible for dealers in securities to avoid the ordinary income treatment of this short-sales provision by making and closing the short sale from their inventory accounts even though they held substantially identical property in their investment account at the time of the short sale. Since the short sale in this case does not involve capital assets, the holding period of the stock in the investment account is not terminated by the short sale. Thus, a short-term investment is converted into a long-term capital gain taxed at no greater rate than 25 percent.

Section 44 of the bill, as it is now, would stop the circumvention of section 1233 by dealers by making the provisions of that section apply to all short sales of "substantially identical" stocks and bonds whether or not such short sales were closed by the delivery of capital assets.

We have learned, however, that many legitimate and necessary short sales are made by dealers in securities in the ordinary course of their business. Odd-lot dealers of stocks sold on the stock exchanges, for example, frequently end the day short in many stocks which may be substantially identical to stocks also held by these dealers as investments. Also, dealers in the United States bonds, including some of the largest banks, indicate that they may make thousands of short sales of a particular issue in order to maintain a market, at the same time these dealers or banks have large investment holdings of these bonds.

As a result of this information which we have recently obtained, it is clear that, if section 44 were enacted in its present form, serious increases in tax might result to many firms as a result of their ordinary and necessary business activities. Each time any such firm made a short sale of bonds or stocks when it had held similar bonds or stocks as investments for 6 months or less, the previously accumulated holding period of the investment securities would be wiped out. If there were a number of related short sales, any gain on the ultimate disposition of the investment securities would as a result be a short-term rather than a long-term capital gain, even though the securities had been held for many years.

On the other hand, a problem would also arise where the investment securities were held for more than 6 months if the short sale resulted in a loss. Such a loss would be classified as a long-term capital loss which could not even be offset against gains resulting from similar short sales since these gains would result in ordinary income.

Since dealers in securities sell bonds and stocks worth many billions of dollars during the course of a year, if only a small fraction of the sales constituted short sales, the detrimental tax effects on the dealers would appear to outweigh the benefits accruing from the passage of section 44 in its present form.

The proposed amendment would make subsection (b) of section 1233, relating to the holding period for the property already held, apply where the short sale was made when the similar investment securities had been held less than 6 months, but only if the short sale was closed more than 20 days after it was made. It is believed that this will prevent section 44 from applying in the case of normal business transactions since the short sales in such cases are likely to be covered within the 20-day period.

It seems unnecessary to make subsection (d) of section 1233 apply to any short sales made by dealers in the ordinary course of their business. That subsection applies only to short sales made when the related investment securities have already been held more than 6 months. The proposed amendment

therefore makes subsection (d) inapplicable to such short sales.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an explanation of the last amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, we concur.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MILLS: On page 68, line 1, strike out section 56 of the bill, and renumber the remaining sections of the bill accordingly.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, the next amendment deals with the section of the bill to which the gentleman from Texas referred in his remarks that has to do with the treatment of the proceeds of life insurance for estate tax purposes. Under the Code of 1939 the proceeds of that life insurance were included in the estate of the deceased even though the right to the insurance had been irrevocably transferred to some person and so long as the deceased had paid the premiums on that life insurance.

In 1954 we enacted what was known as the waiver of premium payments provision in determining how the proceeds of life insurance for estate tax purposes would be treated and we said that so long as there was an irrevocable transfer of the right to the policy to some designated person, it would not be included generally in the estate of the decedent for estate tax purposes.

The Treasury in its appearance before the committee in connection with the hearings of 1953, as I recall, recommended the provision which is now in the law, but by the time the matter had gotten to the Finance Committee of the Senate, the Treasury had changed its position and opposed that provision. It was included in the list of items submitted to the late Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in 1956 by the Secretary of the Treasury and he asked that we do something about it.

The subcommittee labored with this matter for many days and the Committee on Ways and Means also labored with it for many days. We came up not with what the staff people had suggested as a solution—we turned that down—but we came up with what is in the bill in section 56 as a compromise. That section now says that if an individual dies within a period of 5 years from the time he makes his designation or transfer of interest, then the proceeds will be included in his estate for estate tax purposes. If he dies longer than 5 years from that period, then it will not be included.

I have reached the conclusion myself, and the technicians with whom I have discussed the matter on my staff and the Treasury have also reached the conclusion, that this is not an adequate solution of a very complex and perplexing problem. Therefore we are suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that this section be eliminated in order that we may have further opportunity to look at it and try to develop a more satisfactory solution.

Section 2042 of the 1954 Code provides that the proceeds of life insurance policies are not includible in the decedent's estate if they are not payable to his executor, and if prior to his death the decedent had transferred to others all the incidents of ownership in the policies.

Section 56 of the bill amends section 2042 to provide that the proceeds of life insurance will be included in the decedent's estate, even if he had transferred all incidents of ownership in the policies, to the extent that the proceeds are attributable to premiums paid directly or indirectly by the decedent within the 5-year period preceding his death, if the policies were purchased, or incidents of ownership transferred, during that period.

Section 56 represents a compromise solution to a difficult problem, about which there are many conflicting opinions. It is evident that it is not a satisfactory solution. The committee therefore thought it advisable to eliminate the section at this time so as to afford the Treasury and the staff an opportunity to further study the matter with the idea of finding a better solution. The committee therefore offers this amendment striking out section 56.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 95, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 81. Change from retirement to straight line method of computing depreciation in certain cases.

"(a) Short title: This section may be cited as the "Retirement-Straight Line Adjustment Act of 1958."

"(b) Making of election: Any taxpayer who held retirement-straight line property on his 1956 adjustment date may elect to have this section apply. Such an election shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe. Any election under this section shall be irrevocable and shall apply to all retirement-straight line property as hereinafter provided in this section (including such property for periods when held by predecessors of the taxpayer).

"(c) Retirement-straight line property defined: For purposes of this section, the term "retirement-straight line property" means any property of a kind or class with respect to which the taxpayer or a predecessor (under the terms and conditions prescribed for him by the Commissioner) for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940, and before January 1, 1956, changed from the retirement to the straight line method of computing the allowance of deductions for depreciation.

"(d) Basis adjustments as of 1956 adjustment date: If the taxpayer has made an election under this section, then in determining the adjusted basis of all retirement-straight line property held by the taxpayer on his 1956 adjustment date, in lieu of the adjustments for depreciation provided in section 1016 (a) (2) and (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the following adjustments shall be made (effective as of his 1956 adjustment date) in respect of all periods before the 1956 adjustment date:

"(1) Depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913: For depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913, on retirement-straight line property held by the taxpayer or a predecessor on such date for which cost was or is claimed as a basis and which either—

"(A) Retired before changeover: Was retired by the taxpayer or a predecessor before the changeover date, but only if (i) a deduction was allowed in computing net income by reason of such retirement, and (ii) such deduction was computed on the basis of cost without adjustment for depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913. In the case of any such property retired during any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1929, the adjustment under subparagraph shall not exceed that portion of the amount attributable to depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913, which resulted (by reason of the deduction so allowed) in a reduction in taxes under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or prior income, war-profits or excess-profits tax laws.

"(B) Held on changeover date: Was held by the taxpayer or a predecessor on the changeover date. This subparagraph shall not apply to property to which paragraph (2) applies.

The adjustment determined under this paragraph shall be allocated (in the manner prescribed by the Secretary) among all retirement-straight line property held by the taxpayer on his 1956 adjustment date.

"(2) Properly disposed of after changeover and before 1956 adjustment date: For that portion of the reserve prescribed by the Commissioner in connection with the changeover which was applicable to property—

"(A) sold, or

"(B) with respect to which a deduction was allowed for Federal income-tax purposes by reason of casualty or "abnormal" retirement in the nature of special obsolescence,

if such sale occurred in, or such deduction was allowed for, a period on or after the changeover date and before the taxpayer's 1956 adjustment date.

"(3) Depreciation allowable from changeover to 1956 adjustment date: For depreciation allowable, under the terms and conditions prescribed by the Commissioner in connection with the changeover, for all periods on and after the changeover date and before the taxpayer's 1956 adjustment date.

This subsection shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955.

"(e) Effect on period from changeover to 1956 adjustment date: If the taxpayer has made an election under this section, then in determining the adjusted basis of any retirement-straight line property as of any time on or after the changeover date and before the taxpayer's 1956 adjustment date, in lieu of the adjustments for depreciation provided in section 1016 (a) (2) and (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the corresponding provisions of prior revenue laws, the following adjustments shall be made:

"(1) For prescribed reserve: For the amount of the reserve prescribed by the Commissioner in connection with the changeover.

"(2) For allowable depreciation: For the depreciation allowable under the terms and conditions prescribed by the Commissioner in connection with the changeover.

This subsection shall not apply in determining adjusted basis for purposes of section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. This subsection shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning on or after

the changeover date and before the taxpayer's 1956 adjustment date.

"(f) Equity invested capital, etc.: If an election is made under this section, then (notwithstanding the terms and conditions prescribed by the Commissioner in connection with the changeover)—

"(1) Equity invested capital: In determining equity invested capital under sections 458 and 718 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, accumulated earnings and profits as of the changeover date, and as of the beginning of each taxable year thereafter, shall be reduced by the depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913, as computed under subsection (d) (1) (B); and

"(2) Definition of equity capital: In determining the adjusted basis of assets for the purpose of section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (and in addition to any other adjustments required by such code), the basis shall be reduced by depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913 (as computed under subsection (d)), together with any depreciation allowable under subsection (e) (2) for any period before the year for which the excess profits credit is being computed.

"(g) Definitions: For purposes of this section—

"(1) Depreciation: The term 'depreciation' means exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence.

"(2) Changeover: The term 'changeover' means a change from the retirement to the straight-line method of computing the allowance of deductions for depreciation.

"(3) Changeover date: The term 'changeover date' means the first day of the first taxable year for which the changeover was effective.

"(4) 1956 adjustment date: The term '1956 adjustment date' means, in the case of any taxpayer, the first day of his first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955.

"(5) Predecessor: The term 'predecessor' means any person from whom property of a kind or class to which this section refers was acquired, if the basis of such property is determined by reference to its basis in the hands of such person. Where a series of transfers of property has occurred and where in each instance the basis of the property was determined by reference to its basis in the hands of the prior holder, the term includes each such prior holder.

"(6) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

"(7) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

"SEC. 82. Amendments to 1954 code with respect to property acquired from retirement method corporation.

"(a) General rule: Section 372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to basis in connection with certain receivership and bankruptcy proceedings) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"'(b) Adjustment for depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913, in certain cases of property acquired from retirement method corporations.—

"'(1) In general: If the taxpayer has acquired property in a transaction described in section 373 (b) or 374 (b), and if any such property constitutes retirement-straight line property, then, in determining the adjusted basis of all retirement-straight line property held by the taxpayer on his adjustment date, adjustment shall be made (in lieu of the adjustment provided in section 1016 (a) (2) (A)) for depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913, on retirement-straight line property which was held on such date for which cost was or is claimed as basis, and which either—

"'(A) Retired before acquisition by taxpayer: Was retired before the acquisition of the retirement-straight line property by the taxpayer, but only if a deduction was allowed in computing net income by reason of such retirement, and such deduction was computed on the basis of cost without adjustment for depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913. In the case of any such property retired during any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1929, the adjustment under this subparagraph shall not exceed that portion of the amount attributable to depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913, which resulted (by reason of the deduction so allowed) in a reduction in taxes under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or prior income, war-profits, or excess-profits tax laws.

"'(B) Acquired by taxpayer: Was acquired by the taxpayer.

The adjustment determined under this paragraph shall be allocated (in the manner prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) among all retirement-straight line property held by the taxpayer on his adjustment date. Such adjustment shall apply to all periods on and after the adjustment date.

"'(2) Retirement-straight line property defined: For purposes of this subsection, the term "retirement-straight line property" means any property of a kind or class with respect to which (A) the corporation transferring such property to the taxpayer was using (at the time of transfer) the retirement method of computing the allowance of deductions for depreciation, and (B) the acquiring corporation has adopted any other method of computing such allowance.

"'(3) Other definitions: For purposes of this subsection:

"'(A) Depreciation: The term "depreciation" means exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence.

"'(B) Adjustment date: In the case of any kind or class of property, the term "adjustment date" means whichever of the following is the later:

"'(i) the first day of the taxpayer's first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1955, or

"'(ii) the first day of the first taxable year in which the taxpayer uses a method of computing the allowance of deductions for depreciation other than the retirement method.'

"(b) Effective date: The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, let me take just a moment to advise the membership of the Committee that this amendment is interpreted by the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means as legislating into law a settlement. Frankly, that is what I interpret it to be.

The amendment is applicable to taxpayers who have changed from the retirement to the straight-line method of computing depreciation for Federal income tax purposes for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940, and before January 1, 1956. It appears that the only taxpayers who made such a change during this period are certain railroad corporations.

For many years prior to 1942, class I railroads employed the retirement method of computing depreciation on their roadway assets for income-tax purposes and for Interstate Commerce Commission purposes. Roadway assets include buildings, bridges, tunnels, water towers, and the like, but do not include rolling stock or the roadbed or track. Under the retirement method, the original cost of an asset—less salvage value—is charged against income at the time of its retirement from use together with the cost of certain repairs and minor capital improvements. In 1942 the Interstate Commerce Commission ordered class I railroads to change, not later than January 1, 1943, from the retirement method of computing depreciation on roadway assets to the straight-line method. Under the straight-line method of computing depreciation the original cost of an asset is charged against income by means of annual deductions over its life.

Because of the Interstate Commerce Commission order, and because during the war these assets were needed and so would not be retired and charged against income, the railroads asked the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to permit them to change over, for Federal income-tax purposes, to the straight-line method of computing depreciation. Permission was granted, but only on the condition that the railroads establish a reserve of 30 percent of the cost of the roadway assets. The effect of requiring this reserve was to limit the remaining sum which could be recovered by depreciation to the cost of such assets reduced by the 30-percent reserve. Although the railroads objected strenuously, many of them ultimately agreed to the establishment of this reserve imposed by so-called terms letters. The changeovers to the new method of computing depreciation occurred generally in 1942 and 1943.

Since that time a number of court decisions have dealt with the tax effects of the retirement method of computing depreciation and with the tax effects in changing from this method. These decisions relate to a number of different issues. They involve widely varying factual situations and relate, of course, to a very complicated subject. In general, they have thrown doubt upon the validity of the 30-percent reserve requirement imposed upon the railroads under the terms letters. As a result of these decisions, the railroads and the Internal Revenue Service have been engaged in a continuing controversy over the tax effects of this change in method of computing depreciation. The proposed amendment is, in essence, a settlement of this controversy. We are, in effect, legislating into law this settlement.

If the Internal Revenue Service failed completely to sustain its position in court, it has been estimated that there might be a revenue loss of as much as $273 million—in refunds and interest—for the years 1943–55, and that, for the period 1956–95, there would be a total reduction in income taxes approximately $50 million greater than under the proposed amendment. If the amendment is adopted, the Government will pick up approximately $250 million which it would have lost if it failed to sustain its position in court, and, in addition, will pick up an additional $50 million by limiting the deductions for the years 1956–95.

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION

The first section of the amendment is elective. It is applicable only to taxpayers who changed from the retirement to the straight-line method for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940,

and before January 1, 1956. If any such taxpayer elects to be governed by this provision, the following general tax consequences result:

First, with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955, in lieu of a depreciation reserve determined under the terms letters—the 30-percent reserve—the taxpayer's reserve for depreciation will be determined by including only depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913, and by including depreciation computed on the basis of the 30-percent reserve requirement for the years after the changeover and before taxpayer's first year beginning after December 31, 1955.

The effect of this adjustment is to permit, for the future, a larger depreciation deduction than that permitted under the terms letters. However, the taxpayer is required to establish a reserve which takes into account depreciation sustained before March 1, 1913. It has been argued by the railroads that the court decisions do not even require this adjustment and, therefore, they look upon this provision as a concession upon their part.

Second, with respect to the period between the taxpayer's changeover date and the taxpayer's first year beginning after December 31, 1955, the taxpayer's depreciation reserve will be determined by the amount of the reserve prescribed by the Commissioner in connection with the changeover. The effect of this adjustment is, in general, to prevent any further dispute—in the case of an electing taxpayer—over the validity of the reserve requirement imposed by the terms letters for the period of years prior to this legislation. Accordingly, subject only to the exception mentioned next, taxpayers electing to come within this provision will not be permitted to file claims or suits for refunds for any of these years.

Third, the proposed amendment does permit a readjustment for purposes of computations under the World War II Excess-Profits Tax Act. The general effect of the adjustments permitted will be to increase the excess-profits tax credit and to decrease the income subject to the excess-profits tax.

The second section of the proposed amendment is not elective. It applies in the case of any taxpayer who has acquired property of a railroad corporation in a receivership or bankruptcy proceeding if the corporation transferring the property to the taxpayer used the retirement method of computing depreciation and the acquiring corporation—the taxpayer—adopts any other method of computing depreciation. The tax consequences of the application of this section are substantially the same as those described under the first section, except that no provision is made for refund of excess-profits taxes.

One witness before the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation represented a railroad which was not a party to the terms letters and is still on the retirement method of accounting for tax purposes. This railroad had obtained a court decision holding that it was not required to adjust the basis of its property for depreciation sustained prior to 1913. Concern was expressed that the proposed solution herein—the agreement on the part of other railroads to accept an adjustment to the basis of their property for depreciation sustained prior to 1913—would be forced upon a taxpayer by the Commissioner if that taxpayer in the future seeks to make the change from the retirement method of accounting. To avoid this result, it was suggested that the proposal be restricted to those railroads which were parties to the terms letters and, in dealing with future applications for changes in accounting method, the Commissioner be prohibited from requiring the taxpayer to make any adjustments to its property account for pre-1913 depreciation.

The Committee on Ways and Means believes that any such provision is unnecessary and that the concern of this railroad is unfounded since this section, by its terms, applies only to those taxpayers which made the accounting change between January 1, 1941, and January 1, 1956.

Your committee's amendment is not intended to supply authority to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to impose its provisions as a condition in permitting future changes in accounting methods by railroads presently on the retirement method.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the Chairman assure the Committee that there is still pending on this item a question with respect to the equity involved in that cutoff date?

Mr. MILLS. There very definitely is still pending the question of the equity involved in the cutoff date in the amendment; and we have instructed the staff people, as well as the Treasury staff people, to get together with the public utilities involved in an effort to try to work out a solution of the problem that faces them in the gentleman's State of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] for the diligence he has shown in pursuing the interest of his constituents in this matter.

Under the circumstances, I am going along with this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to three parts of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that these three amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "1957" and insert "1958."

Page 86, line 7, strike out "72" and insert "71."

Page 89, line 1, strike out "registered" and insert "certified."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, these clerical amendments speak for themselves. The first amendment is necessary to call the bill the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 instead of 1957 because it was reported in 1957 and it is being considered by the House in 1958.

The second amendment is a technical and conforming amendment made necessary by renumbering the sections of the bill following section 56.

The third amendment is a clerical change in the heading made necessary through permitting the use of certified mail as well as registered mail.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, we concur on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, there are no further committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 447, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Committee amendments. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues, the Honorable CECIL R. KING, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, the Honorable FRANK IKARD, and the Honorable HAL HOLMES, in taking exception to section 2 of H. R. 8381, and as specifically set forth by them under the separate views contained on page 108 of House Report No. 775, 85th Congress, 1st session, which accompanied the Technical

Amendments Act of 1957. These gentlemen are all members of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

The law has governed the marital relations and property rights of man and wife in the States of California, Nevada, New Mexico, Arizona, Idaho, Washington, Louisiana, and Texas since their admission to the Union, and which is derived from the Roman law thought by settlers of the named States to have been transported to our shores.

I need not belabor the fact that section 2 establishes a precedent that strikes at the heart of the community property law and I am sorry to see it incorporated in this bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that in the consideration of H. R. 8381, which is known as the Technical Amendments Act of 1957, we have to consider it under a closed rule, which in effect means amendments cannot be offered on the floor of the House to this important bill.

I am particularly disturbed because this bill under section 4 repeals section 120 relating to statutory subsistence allowance received by police and even makes it retroactive to taxable year beginning December 31, 1956.

This provision was originally designed to cover subsistence allowance of police only because it was thought they generally were required to make more trips away from their posts of duty than was true in other cases. I think this is particularly true of State highway patrolmen who usually have to cover 2 or 3 counties and whose posts of duty are always away from home.

Therefore, disallowance of this subsistence of $5 per day for tax purposes will work a real hardship on our State highway patrol and I only wish it were possible that an amendment could be offered which would exclude them from the effects of this bill.

In all fairness to the officers involved I feel that the effective date should not, under any circumstances, be retroactive.

I hope the committee will agree to exclude State highway patrolmen from the effects of this bill.

---

## THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I submit for consideration by this House a bill designed to clarify an issue that has arisen regarding the purpose and intent of the Robinson-Patman Act in a significant but neglected area of its operation.

As a member of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have been privileged to hear, from time to time, from many and diverse sources, a variety of comments and observations on the operation of the anti-price-discrimination law. Along with other Members of this House, I have endeavored, in the light of the testimony adduced, to offer such remedial legislation as is deemed necessary to make effective the aims and intent of the Robinson-Patman Act.

As the Members of this House well know, the original purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936 was to protect the independent merchant in the competitive race for survival. At that time, it will be recalled, small business was in serious straits. The price concessions and favoritism afforded the large buyer threatened the survival of the smaller concern, regardless of its efficiency. This was made abundantly clear by a series of investigations into widespread practices by large distributors who extracted from manufacturers and processors substantial buying preferences in the form of rebates, discriminatory discounts, false brokerage payments and similar unearned allowances.

A sizable group of independent small-business men state that it has become a common practice for the large manufacturers and sellers of consumer commodities to sell their products not only to wholesalers and other purchasers but also to certain favored direct buying retailers, all at the same price. They add that nonfavored retailers who cannot buy direct from the manufacturers or who are denied the right of direct purchase by the manufacturer, must, perforce buy from a wholesaler or jobber. Thus, it is stated that in order for the jobber to resell to the smaller independent retailer, he must necessarily establish a price higher than the price he pays the manufacturer. As a result his customer's cost of acquisition of the merchandise is necessarily higher than the cost at which that customer's direct buying retail competitor acquires the very same merchandise directly from the manufacturer.

Critics of this practice contend that a discrimination is thus created by the manufacturer who knowingly sells to the large retailer at a price lower than the lowest price at which a nondirect buying retailer must pay for the very same merchandise irrespective of quantities purchased. They point out that the remedy for this situation is available to the manufacturers. It lies in their recognizing the value of the function contributed by the different distributive levels in our economy and according a discount to their customers based upon their status in the economy of distribution.

On the other hand, some courts and administrative agencies of our Government have indicated that functional discounts are permissive but not mandatory. The present bill crystallizes the issue by providing that a manufacturer who does not accord a functional discount, where the failure to grant such discount injures competition at any level, would be in violation of the law.

I believe that placing this matter before the House will expedite a reexamination of the efficacy of the Robinson-Patman Act in this important area and result in a fair resolution of the small business complaints upon which this bill focuses.

## DETERIORATION OF INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our approach to the problem of blighted areas, that are usually found near the center of our older cities, has been one sided.

The replacement of substandard housing necessarily came first, but, in our preoccupation with it, we have ignored an attendant problem; namely, the deterioration of industrial and commercial properties in or near the same areas. The economic decline of such properties, and the consequent shrinkage of the tax base, has posed a serious problem for many communities.

A renovation or replacement is essential to put them to work again. We cannot always depend upon private enterprise to assume the responsibility and to solve this problem.

Integrated planning and action is required, in the public interest, and for this we need some assistance from the Federal Government.

In Massachusetts, for instance, we have various groups working on the problem of industrial redevelopment at the local and State levels. The necessary legislation has been passed to authorize community, regional and State groups, within their capabilities, to work for the renewal of deteriorating commercial and industrial areas. However, the Federal Government has not as yet joined the team. It is obvious that, without Federal help, in part, these redevelopment plans will not succeed.

To correct this oversight in Federal legislation I am introducing a bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize assistance thereunder for the commercial and industrial development of nonresidential areas. This is the same as section 306 of the Housing Act of 1957 as it passed the Senate but was later dropped out of the bill in conference. As it was approved by one House of Congress, there is substantial evidence that legislation of this type is necessary.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has since passed legislation to permit State participation in renewal projects that will include blighted commercial and industrial areas. But this State law will be inoperative until the Federal Government authorizes grants on a matching basis for this purpose.

Until the Congress acts on this, it is impossible to make headway on renewal programs that are vital to the economic recovery and progress of many communities.

While we concentrate on measures necessary to strengthen our national security against the competition of communism, we must not do it at the expense of our internal security. The economic problems of cities with obsolescent commercial and industrial areas, cannot be postponed. We cannot build up national strength through internal decay.

Slum areas—whether residential, commercial, or industrial—are cancerous. They spread, causing deterioration in surrounding properties, gradually threatening, unless "operated upon" in time, the economic health and life of the entire community.

Redevelopment is the only cure.

And for this purpose Federal assistance is essential.

## FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation enters its sixth year under a Republican administration, many of us are dismayed and concerned about the position of our country in the world today. We look back upon 5 years of platitudes and inaction—years during which we have seen our Nation's prestige in a continual decline, while the Russians have gained the edge in diplomacy, in military strength and in scientific advancement. After 5 years, the administration has failed to come forward with any progressive domestic and foreign policies and programs.

Of course, it is heartening to hear that we will wage total peace against total cold war; that we will build up our defensive strength to support the peace; that we will develop and sponsor economic-aid policies to bolster our allies and the free world. But where are the actions that should follow those words?

The free world which has always looked to the United States for leadership still does so, but murmurs of doubts are beginning to be heard. While the Soviet sputniks whirl around the earth, while the administration talks in soothing terms about our position of strength, while we continue to produce bigger and better automobiles and electrical gadgets, we still cannot get a Vanguard rocket off its launching pad. I think it is time the administration got off its launching pad. Reports are that the United States could have launched an earth satellite early in 1957, and I am sure that intelligence reports indicated that the Russians were ready to send their satellite into space. Why the delay on our part? As a result, the Russians have gained a tremendous propaganda advantage and our prestige has fallen sharply.

In other fields because of the foot-dragging by the administration, we are falling behind. Something must be done to regain the esteem with which other nations have viewed us.

One step to take, and one which I am glad to note is being advocated by the administration is to induce Russia to allow the satellite countries of Eastern and Central Europe to choose in free elections the forms of government under which they wish to live.

Another move would be to modify the veto power in the United Nations, thereby making that organization a more effective instrument in bringing about and preserving peace in the world.

Let us see action not only on those two proposals but also in other fields to show the world that our way of life brings strength and security to all mankind.

## THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, cognizant of the need for sustaining and safeguarding the American competitive system, the Congress of the United States enacted in 1936 what has become popularly known as the Robinson-Patman Act. This law has been exposed to all sorts of examinations and subjected to judicial review. Its constitutionality was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, and I, for one, share the view of a large segment of the American business community that the Robinson-Patman Act has rendered an inestimable contribution to our competitive system by protecting small business.

There is no need for me to enlarge upon the role of small business in a free democracy.

Among the most crucial problems confronting small business which stem from ambiguous phraseology in the act is the clouded status of the functional discount. It is the intention of H. R. 10305, which I have introduced today, to clarify that status and remove it from contention and misunderstanding.

What is a functional discount? A functional discount is the recognition of the unique services rendered by the wholesale distributors to more than 3 million independent retail outlets throughout the Nation by providing honeycomb distribution for manufacturers' products.

Distributing goods is only one of the wholesale distributor's irreplaceable functions. He also provides merchandising aids, surveys market potentials, delivers and transports goods, receives goods, assembles orders, breaks bulk, warehouses, stores reserves at strategic locations, selects merchandise, extends credit, and provides intensified market coverage to independent merchants lacking mercantile credit ratings.

These services are imperative to manufacturers if they are to achieve and sustain employment and national availability of their products. They are indispensable to the survival of the Nation's more than 3 million independent retailers who, together with their families, typify small business in this Nation.

The numerous manufacturers whose products are the independent retailer's stock-in-trade are not equipped or geared to sell directly to them. Moreover, few, if any, of these independent retail outlets have the mercantile ratings or finances, the time, the experience, the know-how or the opportunity to buy the necessary and farflung assortment of diverse products directly from the manufacturer.

Consequently, the small merchant is denied the privilege of purchasing directly from the manufacturer and must depend upon his wholesale supplier for his economic staff-of-life.

A profusion of economic studies and intensive market analysis attest to the fact that the so-called integrated sellers who perform both wholesale-retail functions are not necessarily more efficient nor more economical in their operation than the synchronized operation of wholesaler and retailer. Our Federal laws are based upon the principle that no business entity should be allowed to take unfair advantage of any other. Competition is encouraged with the proviso that it must be fair, with all parties having equal right to the rewards stemming from their labor.

Congress, in enacting the Robinson-Patman Act—and the record so states—was influenced by the fact that many manufacturers were bullied by large buyers into giving them lower prices than were granted to independent retailers. It must be emphasized that these lower prices are not granted to the big concerns because they are more efficient but solely and exclusively because of size.

The fact that the small merchant is vital to the manufacturer is more than demonstrated by the economic facts and figures of the market place. No product can achieve real success in the market place unless it is accorded pinpoint distribution and accessibility in the largest number of retail outlets. For example, cigarettes are available in more than 1,400,000 retail outlets; grocery products in more than 400,000 such outlets; and drug and proprietary medicines in over 55,000 distinct and different retail units.

Most manufacturers know that they cannot build a nationally known brand or product without the active assistance and faithful cooperation of the independent retailer and local wholesaler. Large retail stores are disinclined to gamble with their limited shelf space on a new product or brand. As a rule, they will only accept merchandise that has already had a market created for it. The manufacturer knows that he needs marketing help from a substantial portion of the more than 3 million small retail stores throughout the country. The direct-buying retailer alone cannot and should not handle all retail sales in this country.

Most manufacturers limit their sales to wholesalers and to direct-buying retailers. The independent entrepreneur buys from the wholesaler who in turn buys from the manufacturer. Simultaneously, the manufacturer sells directly to the large retailer who competes with the independent retailer.

Granting a functional discount under the Robinson-Patman Act has been an issue of perpetual controversy by the Federal Trade Commission and by the courts of this country. Most manufacturers take the position that the law does not require them to grant functional discounts to wholesalers. To bolster their position, they advance the invalid argument that a one-price policy is, by its very nature, nondiscriminatory.

An amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act along the lines of my bill, H. R. 10305, is vital to clarify the law's present meaning and conclusively stipulate that a functional discount must be granted to the wholesaler when the manufacturer does not sell direct to the retailer.

Successive administrations, the Congress of the United States, economists, and the public at large have been and continue to be apprehensive and concerned with the survival of the small-business man. The proposed amendment will go far toward encouraging small business and, to a marked degree, assure its survival.

## LABOR ARBITRATION UNDER FEDERAL LAW—A PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H. R. 10308, to amend the United States Arbitration Act so as to make that act expressly applicable to arbitration of employer-employee grievance controversies which arise under collective bargaining agreements in industries affecting commerce.

My bill also safeguards the jurisdiction of State courts in those States where by statute arbitration of disputes which may arise under such agreements—so-called grievance disputes also referred to in the field of arbitration as future disputes clauses—may be specifically enforced.

The present language of section 2 of the act excludes arbitration of employer-employee controversies, but the provision of the act to such effect has been rendered substantially meaningless by the recent holding of the Supreme Court in the case of Textile Workers Union of America against Lincoln Mills of Alabama, decided June 3, 1957, reported in volume 353 of the United States Supreme Court Reports, at page 448. H. R. 10308 is designed to make the holding of the Supreme Court more effective; at the same time, H. R. 10308 proposes that State courts shall continue to exercise their jurisdiction to enforce labor arbitration agreements, at least in those States where by statute specific enforcement of future disputes clauses in such agreements is authorized.

The Supreme Court held in the Lincoln Mills case that a Federal court suit may be brought under section 301 of the Taft-Hartley Act to enforce arbitration of grievance disputes under a collective bargaining agreement covering an industry affecting commerce. The Court also held that Federal substantive law, not State law, governs suits to enforce such agreements under the act.

The decision came as a surprise to many members of the bar because, as pointed out by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion, employment agreements are expressly excluded from the only Federal statute which directly deals with arbitration—the United States Arbitration Act, no mention of which was made either in the opinion of the Court written by Mr. Justice Douglas or in the concurring opinion joined in by Mr. Justice Burton and Mr. Justice Harlan.

The Court's opinion would seem, however, to carry out the declared interest of Congress in promoting collective bargaining and an important adjunct of such bargaining: an agreement not to strike. In construing section 301 of the Taft-Hartley Act which provides for Federal court suits for violation of collective bargaining agreements, the Court concluded:

> Plainly the agreement to arbitrate grievance disputes is the quid pro quo for an agreement not to strike. Viewed in this light, the legislation [sec. 301] does more than confer jurisdiction in the Federal courts over labor organizations. It expresses a Federal policy that Federal courts should enforce these agreements on behalf of or against labor organizations and that industrial peace can be best obtained only in that way.

Additional support for the Court's enforcement of arbitration may be found in title II of the Taft-Hartley Act dealing with conciliation of labor disputes. Section 201 (b) of this title declares it to be the policy of the United States that the settlement of union-management disputes "may be advanced by making available full and adequate Government facilities for conciliation, mediation and voluntary arbitration."

In the circumstances, and having regard for the widespread inclusion of provisions for arbitrating grievance disputes in collective bargaining agreements, the present express exclusion of employer-employee arbitration from the scope of the United States Arbitration Act is atavistic and indefensible. And the Supreme Court in the Lincoln Mills case has deprived the exclusion of meaning. For this reason alone the act should be amended so as to make its provisions expressly applicable to arbitration of union-management grievance disputes.

But there is an additional important reason for the amendment. The suit authorized by section 301 of the Taft-Hartley Act and extended to the enforcement of arbitration agreements in the Lincoln Mills case is a plenary suit, requiring time-consuming formal pleadings, and neither section 301 nor any other provision of the act contains provisions for administering all refusals to proceed to arbitration. There is no express authorization for staying court actions brought in disregard of agreements to arbitrate, nor for appointing an arbitrator where the parties have failed to name one or to provide a method of their own for doing so, nor for compelling attendance of witnesses at arbitration hearings. All these things are provided for in the United States Arbitration Act, which also authorizes expeditious and less formal summary proceedings for enforcing arbitration.

H. R. 10308 also provides for accommodating the labor arbitration process to our system of Federal-State relations. In holding that Federal substantive law, not State law, governs actions under section 301 to enforce arbitration agreements, the Supreme Court may well have indicated that State courts have no jurisdiction to enforce these agreements if they govern employment in an industry affecting commerce, at least where the union—as distinguished from the employee—or the employer brings the action. For it is not unreasonable to apply to the situation brought about by the holding in the Lincoln Mills case, the same doctrine of Federal preemption which the Supreme Court enunciated for the unfair labor practice provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in the Garner (346 U. S. 485) and Guss (353 U. S. 1) decisions.

A simple rule of Federal preemption is undesirable in the field of arbitration for two main reasons. In the first place, it might unfairly deprive a union of remedies where it seeks to enforce rights due employees whom it represents. In the Westinghouse case (348 U. S. 437), the Supreme Court, interpreting section 301 of the Taft-Hartley Act, held that a union could not sue an employer in the Federal court for vacation payments allegedly payable under a collective agreement to the employees whom the union represented. This presumably is a right which the employees could pursue, though they would be obliged to do so in State courts, since, under section 301 of the Taft-Hartley Act, only unions—or employers—can sue for breach of collective agreements.

H. R. 10308 would expressly safeguard the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce this right. The Lincoln Mills case read together with the Westinghouse decision probably allows recourse to State court arbitration for enforcing this right, but the matter ought not be left to surmise or implication. The States will continue to have responsibilities in labor arbitration despite the decision in the Lincoln Mills case, or under it, and if they are willing to assume them they ought to be allowed to do so.

Secondly, Federal preemption in the field of arbitration is unfair to those States which have pioneered in making labor arbitration effective and which now provide for specific enforcement of agreements to arbitrate union-management grievance disputes. Specific enforcement of future disputes clauses is now authorized by statute in 17 States: Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin. The statute in some of these States—Arizona, Michigan, New Hampshire, Oregon, Wisconsin, and possibly also Florida—excludes employer-employee arbitration, an exclusion which reflected early fears by union leaders that statutory provisions for enforcement of voluntary labor arbitration might lead to a system of compulsory arbitration. These fears have proven groundless; the arbitration of union-management grievance disputes has been brought about largely by union insistence, often against strong employer op-

position. Today both management and unions are generally agreed that arbitration is a desirable means for determining grievance disputes which cannot be adjusted in earlier stages of contractual grievance procedure.

Accordingly, the safeguard for the jurisdiction of State courts proposed in H. R. 10308 would apply to the following States: California, Connecticut, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington. Maine, which in 1957 passed a statute providing for specific enforcement of future disputes clauses in collective bargaining agreements, would also be included. Perhaps a byproduct of H. R. 10308 would be to encourage the remaining States to forsake their attitude of indifference or antagonism to labor arbitration. The States cannot rightly complain of Federal intervention in situations where they refuse to afford adequate procedures geared to the realities of modern collective bargaining. Where, however, as in the enumerated States, they have done so it is desirable that their jurisdiction should be safeguarded.

The United States Arbitration Act, as section 2 now reads, applies to transactions "involving" commerce, whereas the Taft-Hartley Act like the original Wagner Act extends to labor disputes in industries "affecting" commerce. There is scant judicial interpretation of "involving" whereas the words "affecting" commerce have been given meaning in thousands of decisions. Conformity requires that the scope of Congressional intervention in labor arbitration should be the same as that applicable to collective bargaining under the Taft-Hartley Act generally. H. R. 10308 amends the United States Arbitration Act so as to make it applicable to arbitration of grievance disputes in any industry affecting commerce.

Whether the proceeding be in Federal or State court, H. R. 10308 contemplates, in line with the decision in the Lincoln Mills case, that Federal substantive law should apply to enforcement of agreements to arbitrate union-management grievance disputes affecting commerce. The sources of the Federal substantive law were not explicitly set forth in the court's decision. The aim apparently is to use the policies of Taft-Hartley Act in general, section 301 in particular, and any other Federal statute, as guides for building the Federal substantive law. But the court also said:

> But State law, if compatible with the purpose of section 301, may be resorted to in order to find the rule that will best effectuate the Federal policy.

There is nothing new in giving over the interpretation or enforcement of Federal law to both Federal and State courts; section 303 of the Taft-Hartley Act does so at present.

The Supreme Court in the Lincoln Mills case left open the question whether specific enforcement may be had not only of undertakings to arbitrate grievance disputes under union-management agreements but also of "executory agreements to arbitrate." The phrase is not too happy and requires clarification, since the Red Cross Line case (264 U. S. 109) cited by the Court for the phrase involved arbitration of a dispute arising out of a charter party agreement. The situation there, in other words, was similar to that existing in the Lincoln Mills case.

Four main possible situations for labor arbitration are, first, submission of an existing incidental dispute, apart from any preexisting agreement; second, the future disputes clause or "grievance dispute" under a union-management agreement; third, a reopening clause, such as a provision for periodic reopening of wages under a long-term union-management agreement; fourth, a dispute as to what the terms of the union-management agreement should be, where the parties are unable to reach an understanding. The first and second types of situation, apart from their applicability to employer-employee relations, are dealt with in the United States Arbitration Act and are covered by the Lincoln Mills decision.

Apparently the phrase "executory agreements to arbitrate" is meant to apply to the third and fourth. Both are reached by the New York Arbitration Statute, the third by an amendment adopted in 1937, the fourth by a 1952 amendment.

Whether specific enforcement may be had under section 301, of arbitration agreements in the third and fourth situations, is now pending in the courts. H. R. 10308 does not extend to these situations; their implications on a national scale need to be clarified more fully, and consideration will have to be given to conflicting views about the desirability of judicially enforcing arbitration in these situations. An estimated 90 percent of collective bargaining agreements provide for arbitration of grievance disputes, whereas agreements to arbitrate new contract terms are rare. H. R. 10308, if enacted into law, as I hope it will be, should serve as a good basic beginning in the needed task of making our Federal laws on labor arbitration consistent and effective.

---

## AMERICANS IN NUCLEAR AGE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the time of the House today to read to my colleagues a statement signed by 36 distinguished Americans, including Dr. Jacob Weinstein, rabbi of KAM Temple; Dr. Louis L. Mann, rabbi of Sinai Temple; Dr. Harold Fey, editor of the internationally read Christian Century; Dr. Aaron Novick, professor at the University of Chicago, and others among my constituents.

The statement described as being for Americans in a nuclear age appears in the Chicago Sun-Times of November 24, 1957, in an advertisement headed "We Are Facing a Danger Unlike Any Danger That Ever Existed."

Among other signators are Dr. Preston Bradley, the famed pastor of the People's Church in Chicago and past president of the Izaak Walton League; Leo Lerner; the Reverend Hugh S. Mackenzie; Dr. John C. Bennett, dean of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary; Eleanor Roosevelt; Bishop Charles W. Brashares; Harry A. Bullis; Patrick E. Gorman, international secretary of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters; Ed Marciniak, associate editor of the Catholic publication Work; Dr. Edward J. Sparling; and our former colleague, Jerry Voorhis.

These distinguished men and women represent the thinking of many Americans. Certainly all Americans will join them in the hope and prayer that by a redirection of our energies, a rediscovery of our moral strength and redefinition of our purpose, mankind may indeed be within reach of the greatest era of human history on earth.

In order that all my colleagues may be fully informed of the thinking of 36 Americans of prominence and distinction in many fields, and representing large segments of our people, I am reading into the RECORD their statement, as follows:

### WE ARE FACING A DANGER UNLIKE ANY DANGER THAT HAS EVER EXISTED

(First of a series of statements for Americans in a nuclear age)

A deep uneasiness exists inside Americans as we look out on the world.

It is not that we have suddenly become unsure of ourselves in a world in which the Soviet Union has dramatically laid claim to scientific supremacy.

Nor that the same propulsion device that can send a manmade satellite into outer space can send a missile carrying a hydrogen bomb across the ocean in 18 minutes.

The uneasiness that exists inside Americans has to do with the fact that we are not living up to our moral capacity in the world. We have been concerned with bigger incomes, bigger television screens, and bigger cars—but not with the big ideas on which our lives and freedoms depend.

We are facing a danger unlike any danger that has ever existed. In our possession and in the possession of the Russians are more than enough nuclear explosives to put an end to the life of man on earth.

Our uneasiness is the result of the fact that our approach to the danger is unequal to the danger. Just in front of us opens a grand human adventure into outer space. But within us and all around us is the need to make this world whole before we set out for other ones. We can earn the right to explore other planets only as we make this one safe and fit for human habitation.

The sovereignty of the human community comes before all others—before the sovereignty of groups, tribes, or nations. In that community, man has natural rights. He has the right to live and to grow, to breathe unpoisoned air, to work on uncontaminated soil. He has the right to his sacred nature.

If what nations are doing has the effect of destroying these natural rights, then it becomes necessary for people to restrain and tame the nations. Indeed, the test of a nation's right to survive today is measured not by the size of its bombs or the range of its missiles, but by the size and range of its concern for the human community as a whole. There can be no true security for America unless we can exert leadership in these terms.

There is much that America has said to the world. But the world is still waiting for us to say and do the things that will represent our greatest strength. What are these things?

First, as it concerns the peace, America can say:

That we pledge ourselves to the cause of peace with justice on earth, and that there is no sacrifice that we are not prepared to make to create such just peace for all peoples;

That we are prepared to support the concept of a United Nations with adequate authority under law to prevent aggression, to compel and enforce disarmament, and to settle disputes among nations according to principles of justice.

Next, as it concerns nuclear weapons, America can say:

That the earth is too small for intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear bombs, and that the first order of business for the world is to bring both under control;

That the development of satellites or rocket stations and the exploration of outer space must be carried on in the interests of the entire human community through a pooling of world science.

As it concerns nuclear testing, America can say:

That because of the grave unanswered questions with respect to nuclear test explosions—especially as it concerns the contamination of air and water and food, and the injury to man himself—we are calling upon all nations to suspend such explosions at once:

That while the abolition of testing will not by itself solve the problem of peace or the problem of armaments, it enables the world to eliminate immediately at least one real and specific danger. The abolition of testing gives us a place to begin on the larger question of armaments control, for the problems in monitoring such tests are relatively uncomplicated.

As it concerns our connections to the rest of mankind, America can say:

That none of the differences separating the governments of the world are as important as the membership of all peoples in the human family;

That the big challenge of the age is to develop the concept of a higher loyalty—loyalty by man to the human community;

That the greatest era of human history on earth is within reach of all mankind. All that is required of us is to redirect our energies, rediscover our moral strength, and redefine our purposes.

SIGNERS

Dr. John C. Bennett, dean of the faculty, Union Theological Seminary.

Dr. Preston Bradley, Peoples Church of Chicago.

Bishop Charles W. Brashares, bishop, Methodist Church, Chicago.

Dr. Harrison Brown, professor of geochemistry, California Institute of Technology.

Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills Corp.

Norman Cousins, editor, the Saturday Review.

Dr. Paul Doty, chairman, Federation of American Scientists.

Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor emeritus, Riverside Church, New York.

Clark Eichelberger, director, American Association for the United Nations.

Harold Fey, editor, the Christian Century, Chicago.

Dr. Erich Fromm, psychoanalyst, author.

Clinton Golden, labor official.

Patrick E. Gorman, international secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union, Chicago.

Oscar Hammerstein II, playwright.

John Hersey, author, Hiroshima and the Wall.

Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester.

Gene Kelly, actor and dancer.

Leo Lerner, editor Myers Neighborhood Publications, Chicago.

Richard J. Livingston, Biehl-Livingston Bakery, Chicago.

Rev. Hugh S. Mackenzie, Congregational clergyman, Chicago.

Dr. Louis L. Mann, rabbi, Sinai Temple, Chicago.

Ed Marciniak, associate editor of Work, Chicago.

Arnold Maremont, civic leader, Chicago.

Lewis Mumford, author, The Condition of Man, etc.

Robert R. Nathan, national chairman, Americans for Democratic Action.

Dr. Aaron Novick, associate professor, Committee on Biophysics, University of Chicago.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union.

Clarence Pickett, executive secretary emeritus, American Friends Service Committee.

Eleanor Roosevelt.

Elmo Roper, marketing consultant and public opinion analyst.

James T. Shotwell, president emeritus, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Dr. Edward J. Sparling, president, Roosevelt University, Chicago.

Norman Thomas.

Dr. Paul J. Tillich, university professor, Harvard University.

Jerry Voorhis, executive director, Cooperative League of America, Chicago.

Dr. Jacob Weinstein, rabbi, KAM Temple, Chicago.

(The signers of this statement are acting in their individual capacity and not as representatives of organizations or as members of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.)

---

## NEED FOR REGULATING USE OF SUBLIMINAL PERCEPTION TELEVISION ADVERTISING

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I hate to add to the current troubles of the Federal Communications Commission. But I feel that it is my duty to inform the Members of the House of my to-date unsuccessful campaign to get the Commission to take action to protect the public from a new television-advertising technique, at least until such time as it can definitely be determined whether the technique is effective.

I refer to the so-called subliminal projection advertising, or sneak pitch, as I prefer to regard it. Using this technique, a television station flashes a slogan or advertising message on the television screen so instantaneously that the viewer cannot see it. The promoters of this technique, however, maintain that the message infiltrates the viewer's subconscious and is all the more effective because the viewer does not realize that he has been subjected to salesmanship or propaganda.

This technique should not be used until it is definitely determined by a controlled experiment whether or not it works. If it does not work, television stations should be so informed. If it does work, it should be strictly regulated, if permitted at all. Heaven knows, the blandishments of visible advertising are hard enough to resist. Contemplate, if you will, the effect of an invisible but effective appeal to drink more beer being poured into the subconsciousness of teen-age television viewers.

I first called this matter to the attention of the FCC in early October. At that time and again on November 5 and still again on December 17, I asked the Commission to advise stations against using this SP advertising technique until its effectiveness could be determined.

As I said in my most recent letter—as yet unanswered—the Commission should make its position clear.

I wrote—

> In the present limbo, television stations are not sure whether they can use subliminal advertising, but the public is not sure they cannot. I see no reason for extending this ambiguous situation when most of the television industry itself agrees that the process should not be used until it has been fully evaluated.

In defense of the FCC's inaction, I can say that the Commission has received assurance that it will not be used over the major networks. It does not have the assurance, however, that SP will not be used by independent stations. And because of the nature of the advertising, the viewer himself does not know when he is being subjected to it.

Now, apparently emboldened by the FCC's inaction, at least one independent station is going for sneak pitch propaganda. I submit for the RECORD a copy of an Associated Press story which appeared in the Alexandria, Va., Gazette, January 24.

Once again, I urge Members of the House and particularly those of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to join me in getting the FCC to take a definite position on subliminal perception advertising.

For the information of the House I also am submitting a chronological copy of my letters to the FCC and replies thereto.

[From the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette of January 24, 1958]

SUBLIMINAL PERCEPTION: LATEST METHOD OF COMMUNICATION

HOLLYWOOD.—Let's suppose, now, that in a couple of months some strapping young chap springs from his chair in front of the TV, grabs his coat and streaks downtown to join the Army—without knowing why.

Well, some people might say it was a simple case of subliminal perception.

This hard-to-pronounce combination is actually nothing more than a somewhat creepy device for sneaking things into your head without your conscious knowledge.

Television station KTLA here says that in 60 days or so it will become the first station in the country to undertake a planned program of subliminal communication.

To pull the trick off, the station will employ special transmitting equipment that will flash an image or a message across the screen. It will be on and off so fast that the home viewer won't consciously know he's seen anything. But, if it works, the flash will leave an impression in his mind.

Lew Arnold, KTLA's general manager, said the gimmick will be used at first only for public service messages. He elaborated:

"We'll flash on something like 'Join the Army' or 'Give to the March of Dimes.'

"The next step would be to promote our own shows. Then—and I have a feeling this is a long way off—we might go into the commercial end of it."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., October 5, 1957.*

JOHN C. DOERFER,
*Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DOERFER: Publicity has been given recently to a new device in television advertising—the so-called subliminal perception, usually referred to as SP, for brevity's sake.

Secret pitch perhaps would be more meaningful to the uninitiated. An advertising symbol or slogan is flashed on the television screen so instantaneously that the viewer cannot see it. Allegedly, however, the message infiltrates the viewer's subconscious, all the more effectively because the viewer does not realize he has been subjected to salesmanship.

A call to your Commission has disclosed that the Commission has no official knowledge of this new process and that there is some doubt whether the Commission would have the authority to regulate or supervise such advertising methods.

The purpose of this letter is to request that you look officially into the entire proposal under your general regulatory powers, determining whether controls are necessary and whether additional legislation would be required to provide such controls, if needed.

If this revolutionary advertising means is as effective as claimed, it offers some worrisome, if not frightening, aspects. Put to political propaganda purposes SP would be made to order for the establishment and maintenance of a totalitarian government. Even in the commercial usage for which it is intended, surely the potential customer has the right to know he is being advertised at. His prerogative of exercising buyer's resistance is as much an American tradition as the advertising industry itself.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
*Member of Congress.*

---

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
*Washington, D. C., October 10, 1957.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAWSON: This is with reference to your letter of October 5, 1957, concerning subliminal perception advertising. You request information concerning this matter.

You may be interested to know that I have referred this matter to the staff to determine whether this method of advertising may be adapted for use on television under our present rules and, if so, what further action on the part of the Commission may be necessary or advisable in handling this problem. I will advise you of the developments in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER,
*Chairman.*

---

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
*Washington, D. C., November 1, 1957.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAWSON: This is with further reference to your letter of October 5, 1957, concerning subliminal perception advertising, and to the telephone conversations between your staff and the Commission's staff concerning this subject.

Subliminal perception advertising appears to be a new technique concerning which the Commission has little information and no experience. According to the trade press, subliminal perception is described as "the faculty of absorbing fleeting visual information without being consciously aware of it." It is stated that the technique was tested by having the symbols of a nationally known soft drink flashed for one three-thousandths of a second once every 5 seconds during a dramatic film presentation in a theater. At this writing, there is some indication in the trade press that the above technique may have been used on television.

The Commission is, of course, interested in the above matter and its staff is accumulating pertinent available information on the subject. When sufficient data has been acquired, it will be studied by the Commission. Please be assured that the matter will receive the Commission's most careful consideration, consistent with its authority under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. As you may know, under existing law, the Commission does not determine the particular programs or types of programs to be presented over the air, the content of advertising copy, or the manner of its presentation. Indeed, under the provisions of section 326 of the Communications Act, the Commission is prohibited from exercising the power of censorship over broadcast material. Accordingly, the selection and presentation of program material, including advertising, is the responsibility of the individual station licensees. However, such licensees are required to operate in the public interest and periodically, usually upon application for renewal of license, the Commission reviews the overall operation of station licensees to determine whether their obligation to operate in the public interest has been met. If, for example, it were determined that a particular station had knowingly and deliberately engaged in fraudulent or deceptive advertising, or permitted its facilities to be so used, or to be used for some other unlawful purpose, a substantial question would be raised as to the station's continuing ability to serve the public interest. The Commission would consider such activities in the course of its licensing proceedings involving the station.

As we have indicated above, this problem is so new that specific data is not readily available and no conclusive information has been received upon which we can predicate an informed opinion. At the present time, we are unable to state whether controls over subliminal projection are necessary or whether additional legislation may be required in the event controls are needed. I am sure you will understand that, as additional facts are made known to us, we will be in a position further to evaluate the situation and to arrive at a definitive position. You may be sure that you will be advised of our ultimate determination.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., November 5, 1957.*

Mr. JOHN C. DOERFER,
*Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. DOERFER: Thank you for your letter of November 1 (reference 8420) advising me of the present status of your staff's investigation into the new television advertising technique, subliminal perception.

I can appreciate the difficulties of compiling substantial information about such a new and little-known process, and I commend you for the progress made so far.

However, I am concerned—as I am sure you are—at your finding that SP may already have been used on television. Reports reaching me indicate that the device is being perfected and actively promoted by at least two commercial firms. It would certainly seem anomalous to permit random usage of this device during the very time a study is being made to determine whether the public interest requires its regulation.

For that reason I strongly urge the Commission to protect the buying public against any possible advertising abuses by advising all television stations and networks that subliminal perception is under investigation and requesting them to forego its usage until a determination has been made. I am sure the stations would lend their cooperation in the public interest upon which their licenses are based.

The bulk of the mail which I have received has been in definite opposition to this type of invisible selling. I am convinced that the general public feels it is entitled to know when it is being subjected to advertising. If subliminal projection techniques are eventually allowed to be used at all, a minimum regulation should require prominent announcement during the program of products being so advertised.

Again let me congratulate you and the Commission staff on the energetic and direct way in which you have addressed this problem.

May I be advised whether you agree that the television stations should be asked to reject subliminal advertising pending your study?

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
*Member of Congress.*

---

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
*Washington, D. C., November 12, 1957.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAWSON: This is with reference to your letter of November 5, 1957, concerning subliminal perception advertising. In your letter you urge that, to protect the buying public from possible abuses by this advertising technique, the Commission advise all television stations and the networks that subliminal perception advertising is being investigated by the Commission and request the stations and networks to forgo its usage until a determination has been made.

As you are doubtless aware, the determination to take the action you recommend could be made only by all of the Commissioners. Accordingly, you will be interested to know that I have made arrangements to have your recommendation presented to the full Commission. I wish to assure you that the Commission will give careful consideration to the views you have expressed in your letter in arriving at a decision.

I appreciate your writing to me concerning this matter. You will, of course, be advised promptly of the disposition of this problem.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER,
*Chairman.*

---

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
*Washington, D. C., November 27, 1957.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAWSON: This letter concerning subliminal perception advertising is with further reference to your letter of November 5, 1957, and supplements the response thereto dated November 12, 1957. In your letter, you urge that the Commission advise all television stations and the networks that subliminal perception advertising is being investigated by the Commission and request that they forgo its usage until a determination has been made.

At the outset, it should be pointed out that on November 21, 1957, the Commission was advised that one station in Bangor, Maine, had tried the technique of subliminal messages with respect to station promotional announcements and hadn't been able to make them work. The Commission knows of no other television station which has engaged in subliminal perception advertising. As you

indicate in your letter, two companies are known to be promoting the above technique. They are the Subliminal Projection Co., Inc., and Experimental Films, Inc. Since the previous letter to you, we have communicated with the first-named firm and have been advised that there has been no demonstration of the technique on a television broadcast station; that the firm has used the facilities of a private closed circuit system for testing the technical operation of its apparatus; and that the firm is prepared to demonstrate the technique on a closed circuit system should the Commission so desire. This offer is being considered by the Commission.

We have also communicated with the local representative of the second company and are awaiting a reply to specific questions submitted to him for transmittal to the company.

As you may know, on November 13, 1957, the television code board of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters announced that it had recommended to its subscribers that any proposals to use the television medium in the process called subliminal perception be referred to the board immediately for review and consideration. The board stated that "experimentation or use of the process should not be permitted on the television broadcast medium pending such review and consideration." Additionally, we have communicated with representatives of each of the major television networks and have been advised that they have not used the above technique.

The Commission, at this time, with the exception of the unsuccessful attempt noted above, is not aware that subliminal perception advertising has been used by any television broadcast station. In view of this, and the fact that the Commission's consideration of this matter includes consideration of the extent of its statutory powers with respect thereto, it is believed that a caveat to the licensees may be inappropriate at this time. In this connection, we would like to point out that the Communications Act contains no provisions which deal specifically with subliminal perception. From present indications, however, it seems fair to say that reasonable protections may be available to the public under the general provisions of the act. For instance, by the Commission's licensing procedures the United States maintains control of and regulates radio transmission in the channels of interstate commerce. Various sections of the act, including section 303, make it clear that in exercising the power of control and regulation the Commission must be guided by public interest, convenience, or necessity. It would appear that the use of the subliminal perception technique may be subject to our control under such provisions of section 303 as subparagraph (b) on the nature of the service to be rendered by each station; subparagraph (e) on the type of apparatus to be used; subparagraph (g) authorizing studies of new and experimental uses; and subparagraphs (f) and (r), as well as section 4, subparagraph (i), giving the Commission wide authority to make rules and regulations in carrying out its functions and the provisions of the act.

As you may know, under existing law the Commission does not determine the particular programs or types of programs to be presented over the air, the content of advertising copy, or its presentation. Moreover, the act prohibits the Commission from exercising the power of censorship over broadcast material, which includes advertising. However, at this time it does not appear that the regulation of this particular technique would necessarily constitute censorship.

It may be pertinent to draw attention to section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which reads as follows:

"All matter broadcast by any radio station for which service, money, or any other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid, or promised to or charged or accepted by, the station so broadcasting, from any person, shall, at the time the same is so broadcast, be announced as paid for or furnished, as the case may be, by such person."

Undoubtedly section 317 would prohibit broadcasters from subjecting audiences to messages received from undisclosed sources.

We have attempted to discuss the question with you fully at this time even though the matter is in its formative stage. We are sure you will understand that as additional facts are made known to us, we will be in a position to further evaluate the situation and to arrive at a definitive position. You may be assured that you will be advised of our ultimate determination herein.

By direction of the Commission:

JOHN C. DOERFER,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., December 17, 1957.*

Hon. JOHN C. DOERFER,
*Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DOERFER: Recently I suggested that, in view of the widespread interest in, and the apparent imminence of, subliminal advertising, the Commission put the television broadcasting industry on official notice that this technique is being investigated by the Commission to determine what regulation may be needed in the public interest.

Your reply indicated that the Commission feels "a caveat to the licensees may be inappropriate at this time." You go on to say, however, that reasonable protections may be available to the public under the general provisions of the act.

It is true that a major part of the television broadcasting industry, including the major networks and the television code board, voluntarily have recognized the potential dangers of subliminal advertising. Nonetheless, my mail continues to reflect widespread public concern over this method of manipulating minds.

That these fears are not entirely baseless is implied in the enclosed article from the Wall Street Journal of December 5, 1957, concerning the reaction of one of the subliminal projection firms to the networks' ban on the secret pitch. I direct your attention to the quotation attributed to one of the company's vice presidents:

"We never tried to sell TV networks subliminal advertising. All we wanted was an industrywide test. But if they don't want to use it, we've still got plenty of interested independent stations."

In view of the concern over premature usage of this invisible selling method, it would appear timely to me for the Commission to remove the uncertainty by a definite prohibition against television use of subliminal advertising until your investigation has been completed and a final determination made.

In your letter of November 17 you point out that one of the available protections is section 303 of the Communications Act giving the Commission control over services rendered and apparatus used by stations. Another is section 317, requiring sponsor identification, which you say "undoubtedly would prohibit broadcasters from subjecting audiences to messages received from undisclosed sources."

Since the Commission does have this authority, I recommend that subliminal advertising be specifically prohibited for the duration of your present study.

In the present limbo, television stations are not sure whether they could use subliminal advertising but the public is not sure they could not. I see no reason for extending this ambiguous situation when most of the television industry itself agrees that the process should not be used until it has been fully evaluated.

May I be advised whether there is any reason why this definite prohibition should not be put into effect?

Kind regards and best wishes for a joyous holiday season.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
*Member of Congress.*

---

## SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP COMMEMORATING 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ANTHRACITE COAL MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the anthracite coal-mining industry, symbolized by the first successful burning of anthracite coal in an open grate by Judge Jesse Fell on February 11, 1808, in my home town of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

My bill provides that such a stamp shall be of such denomination and design, and shall be issued for such period, as the Postmaster General may determine.

A further stipulation provides that such a stamp shall be placed on sale at the origin of this great discovery, namely, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., 1 day before it is made available to the public elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, as you know the contributions made to this great Nation of ours by the use of anthracite coal, both in peacetime and in time of war, have been very great for the past century and one half.

In view of the historical importance and the benefits which have accrued to this country as the direct result of the discovery of anthracite coal for domestic and industrial utilization, I strongly urge that this legislation receive favorable consideration by the Congress so that such a stamp may be issued.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, such a stamp, in addition to the above-mentioned considerations, will also serve to fittingly recognize the part played by the thousands and thousands of miners who have spent their entire careers in the development and progress of the anthracite industry.

I fully realize that requests for the issuance of commemorative stamps are continually being made on behalf of other industries, professions, and specific groups, but I strongly feel that few, if any, industries are more deserving of proper and nationwide recognition than is the anthracite industry. Its history is impressive.

## BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, section 4355 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. RABAUT of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, Mr. WAINWRIGHT of New York.

## BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, section 6968 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RILEY, of South Carolina; Mr. FRIEDEL, of Maryland; Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; Mr. OSTERTAG, of New York.

## BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, section 9355 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. MAGNUSON of Washington, Mr. CHENOWETH of Colorado, Mr. SCRIVNER of Kansas.

## BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 1126c, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. YOUNG, of Texas; Mr. FINO, of New York.

## BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. GARY, of Virginia; Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey.

## NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 742, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Monument Commission the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. COFFIN, for 3 days, an account of official business of Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SHEEHAN, for 10 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FISHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT).

Mr. TUCK and to include a very able and timely address by Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, delivered before the General Assembly of Virginia at Williamsburg, Va., on last Saturday.

Mr. FRIEDEL and to include a telegram to the Secretary of the Navy, also a letter to Secretary Weeks.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and to include a telegram.

Mr. WIDNALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and to include a letter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZELENKO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, his remarks in Committee of the Whole and to insert material from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. COLLIER.

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2920. An act to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948;

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; and

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 29, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1525. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of newly developed weapons upon such vessels"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1526. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1527. A letter from the Acting Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report covering the contracts negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the period July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2304 (a) (11) and (16); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1528. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1529. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for a training school and other facilities for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 456. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 10021, a bill to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 10304. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 13), and for other purposes" and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 10305. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 13), and for other purposes" and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10306. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce from 15 to 13 inches the minimum width of newsprint rolls which may be imported into the United States duty free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 10307. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce from 15 inches to 13 inches the minimum width of newsprint rolls which may be imported into the United States duty free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 10308. A bill to extend the provisions of law relating to arbitration of contracts to labor contracts and to permit enforcement of such contracts in State courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 10309. A bill to authorize the use of additional funds for the 1958 cotton acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10310. A bill providing for the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital in the State of New York especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 10311. A bill to amend section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 10312. A bill to increase the annual-income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 10313. A bill to amend section 1331 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide for granting retired pay to certain Reserves who served on active duty during World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN (by request):

H. R. 10314. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 10315. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the anthracite coal mining industry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 10316. A bill to exclude Ottawa County, Mich., from the commercial corn producing area during 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 10317. A bill to authorize emergency refinancing loans to farmers in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 10318. A bill to authorize emergency refinancing loans to farmers in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 10319. A bill to amend the act of May 10, 1956, relating to inspection and certification of certain passenger-carrying vessels, so as to limit the application of such act to vessels carrying more than eight passengers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H. R. 10320. A bill to provide for additional charges to reflect certain costs in the acceptance of business reply cards, letters in business reply envelopes, and other matter under business reply labels for transmission in the mails without prepayment of postage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10321. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange lands comprising a portion of the Estes Park administrative site, Roosevelt National Forest, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 10322. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act (title 29, U. S. C.), as amended, for the purpose of prohibiting compulsory unionism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 10323. A bill to provide for a national dairy income improvement program and an adequate balanced and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10324. A bill to extend and expand the special milk for children program for an additional 2-year period, to extend the program of expanded milk for Veterans' Administration facilities and Armed Forces for an additional 2-year period, and to extend the brucellosis eradication program for an additional 2-year period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 10325. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10 percent increase in all monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10326. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize assistance thereunder for the commercial and industrial development of nonresidential areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10327. A bill to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 10328. A bill to enable the States of Washington and Oregon to open the new interstate bridge over the Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., constituting a portion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, as a toll-free bridge by providing for the reimbursement of such States for the Federal share of the costs of construction of such bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 10329. A bill to make unlawful the sale of merchandise on Sunday, to regulate the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 10330. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 10331. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the veterans' guaranteed home-loan program for 2 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 10332. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Highway Act to permit the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse the States for the United States pro rata share of the value of materials stockpiled in the vicinity of Federal-aid highway projects for use in the construction or reconstruction work involved in such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 10333. A bill to extend and liberalize the direct home-loan program for veterans, to extend the guaranteed home-loan program, to provide special assistance to paraplegic veterans under the direct home-loan program, to stimulate the making of direct farm-housing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10334. A bill to make certain assistance by a State, municipality, or other public body eligible as local grants-in-aid under section 110 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10335. A bill to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 10336. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. J. Res. 516. Joint resolution designating the 22d day in April of each year as National Prayer for Peace Day, requesting the President to issue a proclamation setting aside a period of such day for a nationwide prayer for peace, and declaring one-half of such day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. J. Res. 517. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of the Star-Spangled Banner as the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 457. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses incurred by

the House Committee on Armed Services in conducting the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 67; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 458. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the staff consultations entitled "The Ideological Fallacies of Communism"; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates in copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to consider the Brush-Fort Morgan area in the State of Colorado as the future site of the Air Training Command now located at Fort Warren in Wyoming; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 10337. A bill for the relief of Leon Fernando Wing Lum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 10338. A bill for the relief of Michael M. Milenkovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 10339. A bill for the relief of Capt. Arthur E. Buck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr HARRIS:

H. R. 10340. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Katharina Nachtigall Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 10341. A bill for the relief of Donald F. Darnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 10342. A bill for the relief of Suor Candida Ferrante Giuseppa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10343. A bill for the relief of Napoleon Martirez, M. D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 10344. A bill for the relief of Franja Ivanicek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

366. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city clerk, Englewood, N. J., requesting a constitutional amendment to prohibit the levying of income tax by one State on New Jersey residents working in New York, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## The Louisiana Yam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. T. A. THOMPSON**
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, our Louisiana yam is a sweetpotato, but the appellation of yam is applied to the scientifically developed sweetpotato which can be grown to perfection only in certain soil-rich areas of our State. This variety is distinguished from other sweetpotatoes by its moist texture, deep orange flesh, and coppery skin.

Currently, the Louisiana yam stands as the fourth major cash crop in the State, with approximately 35,000 families in Louisiana producing sweetpotatoes for the commercial market.

During the last decade or so, Louisiana has more than doubled its share of national yam sales, and almost doubled the percentage of its production sold and increased the size of its canning pack by more than 400 percent.

The spectacular growth of this industry is a prime illustration of what a farm group can do for themselves through industry teamwork, with the cooperation of the State and Federal Departments of Agriculture and the agricultural colleges of our State.

First, this vegetable was the subject of an intensive research program to adapt the Louisiana yam for commercial production. Next, the growers and shippers went to work and performed an outstanding job in marketing the Louisiana yam as a commercial crop on a national basis.

The use of such promotional tools as advertising, publicity, and merchandising carried the job one step further and sold Louisiana yams to buyers all over the Nation, and to the ultimate consumers, Mrs. Homemaker and her family.

The Louisiana yam has been bred particularly for the things a good cook looks for in a sweetpotato—vitamins, good size and shape, a moist, string-free texture, and an elegant flavor, a flavor you would really appreciate if you have ever tasted a golden yam pie.

The present day Louisiana yam would not have been possible had it not been for the horticultural achievements of Dr. Julian Miller, head of Louisiana State University's Horticultural Research Department. Through years of research and experimentation with mutations and cross pollinations, Dr. Miller was able to develop this prize yam.

The largest volume of yams is grown in southwestern Louisiana in the heart of the Cajun land of Evangeline. It is there that the descendants of the Acadians have created an agricultural paradise along the bayous.

And the work is not over; research is continuing, new marketing ideas are being tested and an even more rigid quality control is being worked upon.

Louisiana's yam industry is big—and now accounts for 40 percent of the sweetpotatoes sold in the United States—we hope to make it bigger.

## Federal Tax Law Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. O. C. FISHER**
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill (H. R. 9860) to amend our Federal tax laws to increase the amount of deduction allowed a working mother for the expenses of providing for the care of certain dependents. In addition, my bill would remove the harshly restrictive earnings limitation contained in existing law which denies or impairs the benefit of the provision if a married couple has a combined income over $4,500 per annum.

Mr. Speaker, present law permits a woman (or widower) to deduct babysitting expenses which she incurs so she can go out to work, provided that the baby is her child—or stepchild—and is either less than 12 years of age or is incapable of caring for himself, and provided that the expenses are not paid to a relative who is the dependent of the working mother. The present deduction is limited to $600 in any taxable year, and if the woman is married the deduction is allowed only if she files a joint return with her husband and is reduced by the amount by which their joint income exceeds $4,500.

My bill would more realistically increase the maximum amount of the deduction from $600 to $1,200 a year, and would eliminate the special restrictions on a married woman so that she could get the deduction regardless of whether or not she filed a joint return. In this respect she would be treated as any other taxpayer; she would have the option of filing a joint return or an individual return. The bill does not change the law in any way with regard to what constitutes a bona fide babysitter or in any other way except the ones I have mentioned. The only two changes would be to increase the $600 deduction to $1,200 and to strike out the $4,500 income limitation.

The present $4,500 limitation is, in effect, discriminatory against married women who have small children. There are few, if any, places where a working mother can hire a full-time babysitter to stay with her children 8 or 10 hours

a day without having to pay the sitter at least $100 per month. It can readily be seen that, if the husband is employed full time along with his wife, and their combined income does not exceed $4,500 per year, it would hardly pay the mother to spend $100 per month for a babysitter. There would be very little if anything gained by it.

It is in the interest, Mr. Speaker, of dealing realistically with the problem of giving fair tax treatment to deserving mothers who are forced to go out into the labor market that I have introduced this meritorious legislation. After all, it would seem that the cost of a babysitter under these circumstances is just as appropriate as any other business expense incurred by the taxpayer.

## Construction Contracts Let on Shakopee Watershed Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram which I received the other day marks the culmination of several years of combined effort on the part of a number of us who have been working on the watershed program in the Seventh District of Minnesota:

JANUARY 21, 1958.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

We are happy to inform you that we witnessed the letting of the contracts for the construction of the Shakopee watershed project this afternoon. Thanks for all of your assistance.

ALVIN PAYNE.
GEORGE GRUSSING.
A. I. JOHNSON.

That brief message, Mr. Speaker, told in a few words the dramatic results of these years of labor. The Chippewa River-Shakopee Creek project is under the original Andersen-Hope pilot watershed protection program which was the forerunner of the general program known as Public Law 566, and it represents the first construction beginning in my district under the pilot program.

It is difficult for anyone other than the people actually living in the Shakopee watershed to grasp fully the meaning of the announcement I received. Perhaps it would be worth a few minutes time to recount briefly the history of this community effort.

Nobody knows how much time and effort goes into the behind-the-scenes effort to get a watershed organized. Men like Alvin Payne, George Grussing, and A. I. Johnson give literally months of their time in little known and unpublicized work. When these men started on the overall Chippewa River tributaries and Hawk Creek watershed protection project there was very little public information on the subject. With portions of Swift, Chippewa, Kandiyohi, and Renville Counties involved, one can readily see what a task these men and their associates had before them in acquainting people with the provisions of the Andersen-Hope pilot watershed protection program and selling them on the benefits to be derived from a watershed.

The services of these men were uncompensated. Often at considerable personal sacrifice they traveled around the large area involved for meetings with both farm and city people to discuss plans and progress. I personally joined them when I could and we went from village to village where we met with groups of people who had gathered for the purpose of discussing the proposed watershed.

Look, for a moment, at the men who have been so directly responsible for the success of this undertaking. Alvin Payne is a farmer and businessman. He has for many years championed the cause of conservation and if there was ever any way of repaying him for his services he could no doubt retire on the proceeds. His has been a labor of love. Dedicated as he is to the interests of the land and the people on it, he has given freely of his time, genius, and effort.

George Grussing is also a businessman, farmer, and a member of the Minnesota Legislature. He has been equally generous with his time and talents, and I know that George has never failed to respond to an invitation or an opportunity to go any distance to talk watershed. It made no difference to him whether one man or a hundred would be there to hear his story—he always went.

A. I. Johnson, another businessman and member of the Minnesota Legislature, has been the third great pioneer in this effort. I have been to many meetings, both large and small, with A. I., and no man could have been more dedicated in his efforts to accomplish something for the good of his community. A busy man, speaker of the Minnesota House of Representatives, he has been unstinting in his efforts to promote this undertaking.

The association of these three men in this worthy effort tells quite a story in itself. As individuals they differ in many respects but they have one great common interest and that is the watershed and soil-conservation programs. They live in different counties and are of different political affiliation. Their mutuality of interest and their joint effort illustrate better than any words of mine the wholehearted manner in which people accept and promote a watershed undertaking.

I congratulate these men and all the people who live, farm, and do business in the Shakopee watershed. When we first started talking watersheds I told them that some day they would see and enjoy the benefits of our program. This is now assured by the letting of these contracts. This million-dollar project will still be bearing fruitful results generations from now.

It will be a monument to the labors of these men and many like them who have worked for so long on the project. Men like my good friend, Lew Tatge, who started the ball rolling on the water problems in the Chippewa River area many years ago. To my knowledge, Mr. Tatge has been working on this problem for at least 15 years and it must be a great satisfaction to him to see these contracts come into being.

## Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, Albert Gallatin has won a place in the affections of the American people close to that occupied by Madison, Jefferson and Washington. We honor his memory, and his many contributions to our Nation's liberty, when we celebrate the 197th anniversary of his birthday on January 29.

A voluntary exile from the autocracies of ancient Europe, he came to our shores to imbibe new ideas from the springs of liberty. He stayed to teach us many important things about the art of turning our democratic aspirations into a system of government which can keep men eternally free.

Throughout his life he fought for the constant betterment of institutions of knowledge to serve the American people. He was among the first to urge a system of universal, free, elementary education for our children. He was in the forefront of the movement to make our colleges put training in the sciences on an equal footing with the elements of classical education.

A few of the results of Gallatin's lifelong dedication to these aims are evident today in the model system of education which he helped bring to the State of Pennsylvania, and in the excellent scientific training which he recommended for New York University. The keen foresight Gallatin employed to look far beyond his own horse-and-buggy era will stand America in good stead in our own age of missile diplomacy.

Of equal importance in its application to today's problems is the fact that Albert Gallatin was also a lifelong champion of a policy to encourage the United States to create stable commercial relations with the rest of the world.

Because he trusted foreign trade as the most durable guaranty of peace, Gallatin implemented his theories by working for lower tariffs and by helping to conclude commercial agreements with the leading nations of the world.

When we celebrate this day we are reminded that there are still important ways in which we can serve America in the tradition of Gallatin. We can work harder to improve the level of education at home; and we can extend ourselves to mend our trade relations with our friends and allies throughout the world.

Recently our Government opened a program of commercial harassment of Switzerland, birthplace of Gallatin and source of his most important democratic

ideals. By raising tariffs and by increasing the obstacles to the importation of Swiss watches, we have entered on a policy which is not merely notorious, but which has undermined the faith of many other nations in the willingness of the United States to keep faith in matters of reciprocal trade. If we want to convince the world that we are again returning to the open, liberal trade policies of Gallatin, there is today no better place to begin than with improving our trade relations with Switzerland, his native land.

## Postal Pay and Rate Revisions Should Not Be Delayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, during the months I spent in my district following adjournment, I observed considerable evidence of hardship among the majority of the postal employees back home because of inadequate salaries to meet present-day costs of living. In the majority of the cases where postal employees have families to support and particularly those who are purchasing homes, they are forced to supplement the family incomes by securing employment for wives and in some cases through additional outside employment themselves.

I know from my personal experience that it is most difficult to fill vacancies which exist in post office jobs. With the present-day cost of living it becomes increasingly difficult to interest competent people in accepting the postal service as a career.

From time to time various legislation has been introduced to provide salary increases for postal employees. Furthermore, there have been repeated efforts to enact a sound personnel program for Federal service. In my opinion, such a program is a necessity to improve and maintain competent postal service, which we must all recognize as one of the most esential services which the Federal Government must offer. To achieve the maximum effect of such a program, we must analyze the basic needs of securing the type of personnel necessary, as well as maintaining the proper morale of the countless thousands of postal employees who have already devoted many years to Federal service. Notwithstanding my avowed policy of cutting Government expenditures, and the continued adoption of many of the Hoover Commission recommendations, I sincerely feel that the new proposed legislation for postal employee salary increases and postal rate increases should be expedited and enacted into law.

In addition to providing necessary relief for those presently employed in the Post Office Department, I feel that legislation that would afford postal employees a reasonable increase would improve the morale of the present employees and place the departments of many cities, towns, and villages throughout the Nation in a position to secure more competent personnel, which would result in improved postal service.

I am also of the opinion that a substantial savings can be effected in the general operation of the postal service through this program, as it would undoubtedly reduce the costly turnover of personnel leaving the postal service to secure jobs which offer more attractive salaries. Enactment into law of a bill incorporating such reasonable salary increases as present conditions deem necessary should be an early action in this session of Congress.

## The Wool Industry and the Geneva Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement before the Trade Policy Committee, Department of Commerce, recommending continuation and strengthening of the Geneva reservation, on January 27, 1958:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE TRADE POLICY COMMITTEE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, RECOMMENDING CONTINUATION AND STRENGTHENING OF THE GENEVA RESERVATION, JANUARY 27, 1958

Mr. Chairman, the woolen-worsted industry was fighting for its life in 1956, fighting against the steady rise of imports that threatened to price it right out of the home market.

Only the application of the tariff-rate quota under the Geneva agreement, granted it a temporary respite.

Unless this quota is continued, and strengthening, this important industry will be further undermined by unfair competition from swelling imports. As it is, this industry is barely holding its own and at a greatly reduced level of activity.

At the same time, there has been no narrowing of the vast gap between wages paid here in wool textiles, and those paid in the mills of our chief competitors, Britain, Japan, Italy, and France.

The wool manufacturers are not asking that imports be shut off completely. But they do insist that the competition they meet in the home market from goods of foreign origin, be equalized by proper tariffs. Otherwise, more mills will be forced into liquidation, with serious losses to investors, employees, and to the Nation's self-sufficiency in producing cloth for the needs of its own people.

There has been a decline of over 40 percent in our cloth production within 10 years. It cannot be forced into further contraction without very serious repercussions.

The tariff-rate quota on wool fabrics must not only be continued, but must be strictly adhered to. Under the Geneva reservation there is no elastic discretion. The language is clear. Once the decision is made, the remedy, including the breakpoint, is clearly specified. A 45-percent ad valorem duty must be assessed against woven wool fabrics entered in the calendar year in excess of 5 percent of the annual 3-year average of United States production of similar fabrics.

The trigger point is 5 percent.

The duty is 45 percent.

Not more or less.

There have been many complaints concerning the interpretation of what constitutes the United States production base.

In the wording of the reservation, there is nothing to justify the present inclusion of several classes of woven goods in the domestic production base against which the 5-percent tariff-rate quota is determined.

These are the classes of goods which should be eliminated: (1) Blankets and blanketing, (2) goods made for the Government, and (3) goods containing 25 to 50 percent wool by weight.

The imports of blanketing are presently not of significant volume. On the other hand, the inclusion of United States blanket production in the base for determination of the 5-percent breakpoint increased by about a million pounds the volume of goods that may enter at the cutrate tariff during 1957.

Goods made for the Government should be eliminated from the production base because they do not compete with imports in our civilian market.

Also, goods made here containing by weight 25 to 50 percent wool should be entirely eliminated from the United States production base because of their dissimilarity to imports.

Finally, the problem is to find a practical and realistic definition of "similar" in order that the relief clause may be invoked if particular kinds of fabrics are imported in volume greater than that contemplated. Failure to do so results in undue concentration of imports on certain categories of goods. And it drives our domestic producers out of market after market by a concentration on specific markets by the producers of low-grade foreign goods.

The administration is on record as saying that our foreign trade policy must not wreck our own enterprises or destroy the jobs of American workers.

We ask it to make good on that assurance by strengthening and extending the tariff-rate quota to save our hard-pressed wool textile industry from further losses.

## Tribute to Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in offering a tribute to Albert Gallatin, we pay our respects today to the memory of a man who laid the basic framework for policies which have helped to bring the United States to a position of unchallenged preeminence in the market places of the world.

Commerce with the world, friendly commerce with other nations as an enduring promise of America's peaceful growth, was the ruling principle of the life and work of Albert Gallatin, whose birthday 197 years ago in Geneva, Switzerland, we commemorate with pride today.

Acting as a legislator, as founder of the House Ways and Means Committee,

as Secretary of the Treasury to Presidents Jefferson and Madison, and as Ambassador to Great Britain and France, Gallatin worked unceasingly to promote America's trade partnership with the nations of the world. Within our own lifetime, we have seen the guiding principles of Gallatin reembodied in the reciprocal trade program of President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull.

This facet of the career of the great Albert Gallatin is of supreme importance to the people whom I represent in the city of New York. The proud position which my city occupies today as crossroads of the commerce of the world with the United States, is in no small measure attributable to the early foresight and perseverance of Albert Gallatin.

Because Gallatin was the son of Geneva's great watchmakers, he would also be proud to know that the city of New York has now become the center and capital of the Nation's tremendous watch-assembly industry, based on the unrivaled quality of jeweled-lever watches which the United States imports from Switzerland. This industry is most important for New York's economic welfare, because today many leading American companies, employing American capital and many thousands of American workers, are busily engaged there in assembling, preparing, and finishing jeweled-lever Swiss watch imports for distribution to millions of American consumers.

To New Yorkers, therefore, the maintenance of the liberal trade policies of the United States, in the tradition of Gallatin, Cordell Hull, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, is a matter of the keenest interest and importance.

We have been dismayed and concerned by the tendency of the present administration to yield to narrow, protectionist impulses, and to erect new barriers against our trade with the world. We viewed the action which the President took to raise tariffs and approve other barriers against America's importation of Swiss watches as unworthy of the United States and of the liberal trade traditions of Gallatin.

In the present state of world affairs, we do not think that the United States can long afford to yield to such regressive and destructive impulses in the conduct of our trade and foreign relations. It is our sincere hope that this present session of Congress will witness a return, in both principle and action, to the sound, liberal trade policies which Albert Gallatin bequeathed to the beloved country of his adoption.

---

## World Habeas Corpus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached copy of a letter to the editor of the New York Times.

The subject of habeas corpus has been brought to my attention and has attracted many others to its importance.

This letter was sent to the New York Times in the hope that this very estimable newspaper with its large circulation would publish it in an attempt to secure the thinking of many others in this important field:

WORLD HABEAS CORPUS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Each issue of our daily press makes it more apparent that our foreign policy requires a stronger personal appeal to the masses of individual men and women in the uncommitted nations of the world. The impersonal nature of reciprocal trade, economic supports, military aid, exchange professorships, and the like simply has not aroused the personal interest and individual feelings that are necessary to win and hold the individuals who, in the aggregate, make up the uncommitted peoples whose added strength the free world needs in its offenses against communism.

A positive program has been proposed which, if adopted, would provide that appeal to every individual, giving the American foreign policy that effective touch which is now lacking. That is the proposal of Mr. Luis Kutner, a well-known Chicago attorney and authority on habeas corpus and due process of law. He proposes that all world sovereignties establish an international court of habeas corpus vested with the majestic writ of personal authority to prevent the illegal detention of persons anywhere in violation of the well-known legal principles that compose due process of law. This idea is not a recent one. It was proposed by Mr. Kutner nearly 27 years ago, prior to the Nazi slaughter campaigns, and it has worked like a ferment in the minds of responsible men since it was first proposed. Due process of law, in layman's language, is fair play toward oneself and fair play toward the other person. Any act under color of law that wrongfully deprives a person of his liberty is a violation of due process of law.

Until recently, the international personality of the individual was not accepted. States only were held to be subject to international law. This is no longer the case. The Charter of the United Nations, a legally binding international treaty, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a declaration of enlarged principles of policy have moved toward vesting the human being with international personality and rights. Mr. Kutner proposes that the nations, using their respective constitutional methods, collectively establish, by a world treaty-statute, an international court of habeas corpus specifically empowered to issue its writ of freedom to insure all persons, everywhere in the world, the personal peace of personal liberty.

The law, as Judge Learned Hand has eloquently pointed out, is an evolving concept. It progresses. The bench and bar, in America and abroad, are striving to reach ever higher concepts of personal justice. The basic strength of our own Constitution is that it has application to the individual. The basic weaknesses of international concepts of justice are that they apply not to individuals but only to the states. The next logical step in the advance of world law is the protection of the individual, as a subject of international law under due process, by an effective world writ of habeas corpus.

As Prof. Marek St. Korowicz has said:

"The doctrine of international law should take into consideration the realities of international relations and should be in a precise relation to these realities. It is a well-established principle of international law that states may, by common agreement, recognize the international personality of individuals not only in their duties and responsibilities, but also in their capacity for international procedural action. The fact that the right of individuals to proceed before international bodies is almost nonexistent today in international law practice, does not exclude the creation of this right at any moment by agreement of states. Certain international duties and responsibilities of individuals have become a part of international customary law."

Mr. Kutner's proposals have enlisted the support of a great many persons of international legal authority and responsibility, including Quincy Wright, Myres S. McDougal, Telford Taylor, and Harold D. Lasswell. The great Dean Roscoe Pound of Harvard Law School has written approvingly to Mr. Kutner of his proposals:

"Your general proposition that the concept of the international personality of man is growing in acceptance and must make obsolete much of the reasoning based upon the idea of sovereignty seems to me well taken. * * * Why cannot a world law develop exactly as the common-law world has developed without any supergovernment? * * * You seem to me therefore to be moving in the right path in insisting upon a general principle of law rather than a sovereign political authority as the basis of a world legal order. Certainly not the least feature of the world legal order should be the securing of individual personality."

The promise of a totally free world and the weight of legal reasoning and logic are in support of Mr. Kutner's proposals. It is a plan which will appeal to the individuals of all nations, strengthen our own foreign policy, and will extend and strengthen the legal system of the Free World. When I was in the battle to free William N. Oatis, I welcomed the service of Mr. Kutner and became a stanch supporter when he sought to sue out the then unprecedented writ of habeas corpus in the United Nations in 1952 to free the Associated Press reporter who was wickedly and illegally imprisoned by Czechoslovakia. The proposed writ was hailed at that time on the floor of Congress as a world Magna Carta. While there was considerable debate whether the U. N. could legally entertain the action brought by Mr. Kutner, there ensued enormous pressures for its consideration. Before definitive action was taken to proceed with or dismiss Mr. Kutner's petition, Mr. Oatis was released, in my opinion, because of the gathering support for issuance of the writ.

Sooner or later, there will be other such cases. Sooner or later, the United Nations and others will have to face this issue squarely. Mr. Kutner proposes that all nations face the issue within their constitutional processes by working cooperatively to frame a world treaty statute creating an international court of habeas corpus vested with powers and authority to issue and enforce the international writ of habeas corpus.

I believe that the United States should take the leadership in stabilizing the lives of the entire human race. In my opinion this would provide the best test of our world concern and sincerity and eliminate frictions and distrust.

I hope that the great international peace societies and their committees of annual award will interest themselves in the idea of personal peace under due process of law and an international writ and court of habeas corpus. I am sure that Mr. Kutner and his colleagues would welcome the support of all men and organizations of good will in his venture to extend the majestic shield of habeas corpus over the individual person everywhere in the world.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. BEAMER,
*Member of Congress.*

## Waste in the Award of Government Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a matter which is of very great concern to the people of the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland, as well as to me as their elected representative.

Further, I feel that this should be a subject of concern to every Member of this House, since it certainly is not in the best interest of our country for the executive branch of the Government to deliberately waste millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' hard-earned money. This is particularly true at a time when everyone in the country should present a united front in conserving our financial resources in order to meet today's complex and costly armaments of defense.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the recent award by the Maritime Administration of contracts for the building of four freighters to the National Steel & Shipbuilding Corp., of San Diego, Calif., and the New York Shipbuilding Corp., of Camden, N. J. These awards were made despite the fact that the low bidder for these contracts—by several million dollars—was the Bethlehem Steel Sparrows Point Shipyard in Baltimore, Md. Two of the vessels allocated to the National Steel & Shipbuilding Corp., of San Diego, Calif., will cost at least $3 million more to the Federal Government than if the bid had been given to the Baltimore yard. Further, not only are the bids substantially higher, but the contracts were awarded to a company that never has built a large ship in its entire existence and lacks the necessary know-how that the Sparrows Point yard possesses.

It certainly appears that the awarding of these contracts to anyone but the low bidder is in direct defiance of established governmental policy. Not only is such action highhanded and arbitrary, but it is a shameful waste of needed money.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can legitimately ask the question, Does politics have anything to do with the decision of the Maritime Administration in awarding these contracts? Could the stiff compaign the Republicans are facing in California—the home of the Vice President and the Senate minority leader—have anything to do with the decision?

I have been wondering for some time why Maryland continues to receive such unfair treatment by the present administration. Could it be that Maryland does not have as many electoral votes as California? I should like to point out that since the present administration took control of the executive branch of Government, the Naval Recruit Command at Bainbridge, Md., has been closed; the Army Signal Depot has been shifted out of Baltimore, the Army Ordnance Depot and the Transportation Depot at Fort Holabird have been practically eliminated; the Office of Supervisor of Shipbuilding and Assistant Industrial Manager has been closed; ship repair work has been taken away from the excellent yards in Baltimore; Aberdeen Proving Grounds activities have been curtailed.

I have protested these actions time and time again to the various agencies involved. The following is a telegram I sent to the Honorable Thomas B. Gates, Secretary of the Navy, on July 10, 1957, protesting the closing of the Office of the Supervisor of Shipbuilding and Assistant Industrial Manager in Baltimore:

JULY 10, 1957.

The Honorable THOMAS B. GATES,
*Secretary of the Navy,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Since April 12, I have been in communication with the Department of the Navy regarding the lack of ship repair work in the Baltimore shipyards, and the subsequent loss of highly skilled civilian personnel in the Office of Naval Supervisor of Shipbuilding. Therefore, I was shocked to read in the press today of the proposed closing of the Office of the Supervisor of Shipbuilding and Assistant Industrial Manager in Baltimore. In view of my expressed interest in this problem, it is my opinion that courtesy requires that I be notified before the proposal was released to the press. On behalf of the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Maryland, I wish to register an emphatic protest against such a proposal. Such action would not only be a serious blow to the economy and well-being of a city which is the acknowledged leader in shipbuilding and maritime maintenance, but could very well have a detrimental effect on the economy and defense of the entire country. The closing of the Navy's Baltimore office is entirely unwarranted since we have ample and unexcelled facilities for the construction and repair of all types of oceangoing vessels. The Navy has been depriving Baltimore and Maryland of its fair share of our country's shipbuilding and repair work for some time and this action would make it appear that the Department is treating the second largest port in the country like a stepchild. I strongly urge that this proposal be rescinded without further delay.

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
*Member of Congress.*

On January 23, 1958, I sent the following protest to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, regarding this highhanded and arbitrary manner in which the maritime contracts were awarded:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., January 23, 1958.*

The Honorable SINCLAIR WEEKS,
*Secretary of Commerce,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Maritime Administration has just awarded contracts for the building of four freighters to the National Steel & Shipbuilding Corp., of San Diego, Calif.; and the New York Shipbuilding Corp., of Camden, N. J., despite the fact that the bids of the Bethlehem Sparrows Point Shipyard of Maryland were millions of dollars less.

I understand that the awarding of these contracts were under a clause, referred to commonly in shipping circles as "Clause 805," which permits the Government to arbitrarily grant a contract to a firm which did not even submit a bid.

I should like to call your attention to the fact that the bids of the Bethlehem Sparrows Point Shipyards were a total of several millions of dollars lower than that of the firms which were given the work. It is also a well-known fact that the San Diego yard has never built anything much larger than a tunafish boat, whereas the Sparrows Point concern and its predecessor company have been building oceangoing vessels since before the turn of the century. The Bethlehem Sparrows Point yard not only possesses the required technical knowledge, but also has available manpower and adequate facilities to properly construct better ships for far less cost.

Information was given me that the Bethlehem bid was bypassed because it was alleged to be nonresponsive, or in other words, certain parts of the bid did not comply minutely with the original invitation to bid. It seems to me that such a technicality is a mere excuse without substance of law, for if clause 805 permits the Government arbitrarily to grant a contract to a firm that did not even bid, there was no valid reason that these very minor and unconsequential points could not be negotiated under the terms of that same clause.

It is not only because of the very severe impact the loss of such contracts to the Greater Baltimore area would necessarily have by the loss of countless jobs and money to its people and industries, but even to a greater extent, the unnecessary expenditure of far larger sums of money to accomplish the same result, that it appears to me that a full explanation is required. Accordingly, I request that you please furnish me with full and complete information in detail regarding this matter as promptly as possible.

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

In spite of the many, many protests I have made to these actions, I receive only vague, noncommittal, and uninformative replies or excuses from the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to limit my activities in the matter of the maritime contracts to simply protesting and calling attention to the irregularities involved, since such action has not proved effective in the past. Within the next few days I expect to take steps designed to bring about specific corrective action.

## Speech of Katharine St. George, Member of Congress, Before the Women's National Republican Club's 37th Annual Luncheon at the Sheraton-Astor Hotel, New York City, January 25, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday our colleague, Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York, delivered one of the most forceful, constructive talks that I have heard. Clearly and intelligently she offered suggestions and programs that can effectively help to solve some of our immediate problems.

It should be called to the attention of the House that Representative ST.

GEORGE last year, on March 19 to be exact, offered a bill (H. R. 6164), to establish a United States Science Academy. This was not done after the rude awakening caused our people by Sputnik I and Sputnik II. The foresight of Representative ST. GEORGE should be commended in sensing the need and suggesting a method of frontal attack to improve our educational opportunities in science. I hope that early hearings will be provided and full consideration given by the House to her timely and enlightened proposal.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD the talk by Representative ST. GEORGE follows:

SPEECH OF KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB'S 37TH ANNUAL LUNCHEON AT THE SHERATON-ASTOR HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 25, 1958

This is a meeting of Republicans. It seems to me, therefore, that it is a good opportunity to discuss our problems and our future as a party.

Both our major parties today are divided and scared. We might as well admit it and then try to find constructive remedies, rather than cheerfully brushing the dust under the rug and proclaiming that everything is for the best in the best possible world and that all our geese are swans.

We Republicans can play an important role now if we will support our administration, the Eisenhower administration.

We nominated President Eisenhower in 1952, and again in 1956. We elected him by a tremendous popular majority, and the women of our country, many here today, played a big part in turning these two victories into triumphs. After election the President and his party kept their promises to the people: They restored peace; they reduced taxes; they tried to restore Government to the people by decentralizing it.

Now the President has labored to live up to the Republican platforms on which he ran, and I believe it has been a source of amazement to him that in some instances members of his own party have objected to measures that he has advocated that conformed to exactly what they themselves had advocated in 1952 at Chicago and in 1956 at San Francisco. For a man whose word is his bond, and who has been brought up on the West Point motto: Duty—Honor—Country, it must be somewhat of a shock to discover that most of these promises and ideals are today regarded as so much campaign oratory.

In our foreign policy this administration has set itself the task of maintaining peace. This our people wanted, and I believe still want.

There may be differences of opinion on our foreign policy and the conduct thereof, but the fact remains that we are at peace. And it is a fact of history that we went to war during the incumbencies of every Democrat President, starting with Woodrow Wilson.

It is also a fact that our party and the Eisenhower administration have not been infiltrated by any outside influence bent on changing the destiny of our country and its philosophy of republicanism based on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. There are such people abroad today, and we must stand watch and guard against them.

There should be a Republican position. It should be bold and tie in with the traditions and philosophy of the Republic. A wit in Washington recently said: "Happy New Year to all Republicans and Democrats, who are getting more alike every day, so that they will soon save us all the trouble of voting at all." This is a thought that is humorous, perhaps. But devastating if pursued.

Let me enumerate a few points to build on:

First. Fiscal solvency is essential to a capitalistic system. Our system up to very recently has been entirely a capitalistic or free enterprise system. Why should we be ashamed of this fact. The system has made this country great and it is only in that we have deviated from it that we have failed. Never forget that Lenin and Stalin said they would force us to ruin through bankrupting our economy, and that is just what the Kremlin is trying to do today. The country that has made the most startling recovery since World War II is unquestionably West Germany. How have they achieved this phenomenal prosperity that they now enjoy? Through adopting wholeheartedly the capitalist and free enterprise system which some of our people, notably in government, are trying to get rid of.

Second. We must stop allowing our foreign policy to be constantly criticized and torn down by the Democrats. What do they want? Let us ask them and see what they will answer. To hear them now you would think that they want to drop the bomb tomorrow. Certainly this does not jibe with their standardbearer who in 1956 wanted to put an end to all atom or nuclear tests of any kind.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, top United States authority on missiles, when asked how he accounted for the apparent ability of Soviet Russia to outstrip us in reaching into space, said: "The main reason is that the United States had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. These 6 years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, are irretrievably lost. The United States went into a serious ballistic missile program only in 1951, with the decisions to weaponize the Army's J. P. L. Corporal rocket and to develop the Redstone. Thus our present dilemma is not due to the fact that we are not working hard enough now, but that we did not work hard enough the first 6 to 10 years after the war."

I think all we need is remember these dates and occasionally mention them in mixed company.

Third. We must stand firmly against big government that leads inexorably to the monolithic state. The House Committee on Government Operations estimates that the United States Government now owns $64 billion worth of real estate and $186 billions in so-called personal property. In the continental United States the Government owns 409 million acres of land, and its total worldwide holdings amount to 772 million acres.

This, of course, means that the United States Government is the biggest owner of everything and, therefore, the greatest contractor for labor of all kinds in the world today. This trend the administration has tried to break down, but the bureaucracy is strongly opposed to Government getting out of business with the possible loss of some of their jobs.

There has been criticism in some quarters, and rather vociferous criticism at that, because the President was reported to have said that if a certain report were to be released in toto a lot of Americans would start running in all directions. Well, the fact of the matter is that a lot of Americans are running in all directions now. In fact, as our more literate forbears would have said, they are running around like chickens with their heads cut off.

We have suddenly become a Nation of experts in nuclear physics. At least that is true of everyone who can wield a pen or get behind a typewriter or get on a television screen with a nice clean-shaven face, a gray, or better, blue flannel suit, and proceed to explain just what mistakes the administration has made.

Have you ever wondered where these people were, and what they were doing, 2, 4 or 6 years ago? Apparently they only found out all these things after the Russians had launched Sputnik I.

I submit to you that all these voices crying out now, after the event, are not going to bring us to an intelligent solution. They are not going to, because they do not dare come out with the truth because that truth is unpalatable and will not make many votes for anyone in either party.

The truth is that we, the citizens, have and do demand butter ahead of guns. Because we love to get things from that nebulous old gentleman whom we picture as a doting old Santa Claus and call the Government, we seem to overlook the fact that anything the old gent gives us he first takes from us.

We howled when Khrushchev said our children would live under a socialist regime, probably because it was too true for comfort.

Now I would like to bring this whole matter down to you as individuals and members of one of our two major political parties. I want you to say to yourselves, what have I done personally for my country? This Government is still yours, if you exert the power you still have and play the part you can still play to build up a strong America.

First, what are you doing for education? Here is where our biggest failure is apparent. Why? Oh, not because we need bigger and more elaborate schools and more buses and more playgrounds. No. But because we must gear our educational program to promote and assist in every possible way the gifted and the intelligent.

The Russians have taken as a starting premise that all men are created unequal, as far as intelligence is concerned, and that higher education is only for the intelligent. We, through cheap degrees and mass college education, have simply impeded the progress of the scholar and scientist, and brought about the triumph of mediocrity.

We must also remember that the main thing education has to give is to teach discipline of the mind and body, and above all, in a free country, discipline of self.

If we will all start in now and overhaul the educational system in this country, toughen it up so that our children realize that nothing is achieved, even by a genius, save by hard unremitting work, we will go far toward recapturing our scientific preeminence in the world.

Much is going to be done at the suggestion of the President to put a scientific scholarship in the works. This is good, but we must go still further.

Last March, on the 19th day of the month, to be exact, I introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 6164, a bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Science Academy.

This Academy would be patterned on the service Academies at West Point, Annapolis, and Denver. The young men would be appointed by the President and Members of both Houses of Congress. But, and this is most important, they would have to pass a competitive examination before being admitted to the Academy. In other words, they would have to have real scientific ability and aptitude, and could not be appointed because they were someone's fair-haired boy or girl.

While they were at the Academy, their education would be entirely at the expense of the Government and they would receive an allowance, as do the cadets at the other three service Academies.

The one condition to be imposed is that these graduates must work as officers or employees of the United States for 5 years after graduation.

In this way our country would have a pool of young, specially trained scientists who could be called on to take their place, where

they truly belong, in the front line of scientific achievement for the preservation of our country and the development of her resources.

These young men can come from families of any economic group; they would all be on an equal plane and could direct all their energies and powers to pure science during their 4-year course at the Academy, and thereafter give their service, with pay, to their country for 5 years.

When I introduced this legislation it did not create a ripple of interest. I received a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that was anything but enthusiastic. It ended up by saying that in a case of national emergency the bill might have some merit.

Well, I submit to you that we are in a state of national emergency and that there is no time to lose. Everything must be done to foster scientific education in our country and among our young people. The time is now. The urgency is upon us.

And then we must teach patriotism. You and I must teach it, and we must insist on its being taught in our schools. Patriotism is like religion; it has to be taught.

Our past history must be taught. The philosophy that made this Government a republic, not a democracy, must be learned, and that is what our party must stand for.

If freedom is to continue in the world it can only do so through a strong two-party system. This is something neither communism nor national socialism—and they are twins—will ever tolerate. There are people today in our land who are familiarly and affectionately known as eggheads, who preach bipartisanship by the hour and who would be happy to see us fall into a one-party system ruled by a bureaucracy, forming a monolithic state. Beware of them for they are indeed wolves in sheep's clothing.

The day the Republican Party abdicates the basic tenets of its greatness, the doctrine of the Republic, and stands aside merely proclaiming that: Anything they can do, we can do better, the two-party system will have died in the United States of America. After this happens it will not be long before the Republic is nothing but a historic memory, as happened to Rome under the Caesars.

Many hundred years ago Cicero said: "It is due to our own moral failure and not to any accident of chance that, while retaining the name, we have lost the reality of a republic." This may well be said of us, and after this happens it will not be long before the Republic disappears even as a name and is replaced by a Caesar.

---

## Hon. Howard W. Smith Says Nation's Principles Are in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, our esteemed colleague, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, was the principal speaker at the joint session of the General Assembly of Virginia, held in the restored colonial capitol at Williamsburg on Saturday, January 25, 1958. The occasion was the regular biennial commemorative session in the restored hall of the House of Burgesses.

Judge SMITH's address was a memorable one. He gave timely and appropriate warning of the danger confronting the Nation because of encroachments upon our constitutional system. He denounced the invasion of States rights and other constitutional limitations by the Supreme Court of the United States. He stated that we should fearlessly press the doctrine of States rights and individual liberties, and firmly resolve to restore to our people their way of life and system of government devised by our forefathers and handed down by them to us.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following complete text of Judge SMITH's address:

ADDRESS BY HON. HOWARD W. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA, TO THE JOINT SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA AT THE COMMEMORATIVE JOINT SESSION HELD IN THE RECONSTRUCTED CAPITOL AT WILLIAMSBURG ON JANUARY 25, 1958

It is an inspiring event when the General Assembly of Virginia, pursuant to its usual custom, meets in joint session on this hallowed spot in the city of Williamsburg in the restored capitol of the Virginia Colony, to renew our inspiration and strengthen our resolve to preserve and perpetuate the great fundamental principles of free government enunciated and proclaimed here, in the trying days that preceded the American Revolution and the formation of the Union. This spot then represented the very heartbeat of the struggle for freedom and constitutional government by the American Colonies. Here Patrick Henry voiced his siren call for freedom. Here Thomas Jefferson proclaimed the principles of democratic government. Here James Madison lent his towering intellect to the plans for a new type of government—of, by, and for, all the people, and here other great intellects gathered and contributed their wisdom in the formative period of our Government.

Just as in those days the deliberations of the Virginia Legislature led and inspired the legislative bodies of the other Colonies in devising our system of government, you of the Virginia General Assembly of today lead and inspire other States in the current effort to maintain and preserve the principles first enunciated here. That you should have honored me with the invitation to address you today is a compliment far beyond my deserts or capacity, and I approach the task with a deep sense of humility and inadequacy.

On the walls of my office at the Capitol in Washington hang as my most prized possessions the portraits of the seven early Presidents of the United States from Virginia. Five of them came from the Congressional district which I have had the honor to represent for 27 years—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Taylor. All giants of intellect; all wholly dedicated and devoted to the basic principles of our Government. As we today ponder the trend of government in our country, I am impelled to wonder, if they are looking down upon us, what they must think of how the present generation is keeping the faith, is preserving the great heritage which they devised and bequeathed to us.

Shakespeare said: "Those who on glorious ancestors enlarge—produce their debt instead of their discharge."

We speak proudly of the great early Americans who founded our system of government; we erect imposing monuments to their memory, but this does not suffice, for when we invoke the spirit of the great architects of our system of government, we also remind ourselves of our duty to preserve our heritage from them with all the capacity, the power, and the courage, however meager it may be, with which God has endowed us.

It is my sad conclusion that the present generation of the American people has not kept the faith, has not fought the good fight to preserve for ourselves and future generations the precious heritage left us by those who have gone before. We have, with slight resistance, submitted to encroachments upon our constitutional system. We have seen the sovereign rights of local State government ruthlessly invaded. We have hesitated and vacillated in denouncing the invasion of States rights and other constitutional limitations by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Vast numbers of people, some in high places, have supinely submitted to the false propaganda that the Supreme Court is empowered to write the "law of the land," when our Constitution expressly entrusts that vital function of government to the Congress, for the simple reason that they are the elected representatives of the people.

Democratic government can only be preserved by strict adherence to constitutional provisions and limitations.

It is this subject I have chosen to discuss with you today, because there is no place on the globe more appropriate to the purpose than the spot where we stand, and no legislative body—State or National—more dedicated or more firm in its adherence to the principles upon which our Government is based.

It is salutary for all people to keep constantly in mind the historical setting in which our Government had its origin. The Thirteen Original Colonies regarded themselves each as a sovereign nation under the general Government of the British Empire. They had no voice in their general Government and no rights or powers that that Government was bound to respect. They had no representatives in the British Parliament and there were no restrictions on the arbitrary powers that could be, and were, exercised over their affairs. Our forefathers lived for generations preceding the Revolutionary War chafing under the series of arbitrary, and often tyrannical, conditions imposed upon them by the mother country. It was in the setting of these conditions and experiences that the framers of the Constitution gathered around the council table to write a charter of freedom—the underlying and overriding purposes of which were to preserve for all coming generations the freedom of the individual, the right of local self-government, and the sovereignty of each of the sovereign States then parties to the compact or those which might in future join.

No set of men ever gathered on the face of the globe more dedicated to their task, more imbued by bitter experience with the purposes sought to be accomplished. As the scheme and purpose of the document developed on the drafting board, long hours of debate and penetrating thought were devoted to its final draft, and yet when it was submitted to the States for ratification it was still inadequate to the great purposes for which it was designed, and after further consideration it was seen that amendment was necessary to insure to the States and to the people, the sovereignty of each State and the independent liberties of the individual. And so evolved immediately upon the adoption of the Constitution the first 10 amendments, known as the Bill of Rights.

The keystone of the Bill of Rights is the 10th amendment, which says: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

What that means and lucidly states, is that the Federal Government has no powers, can exercise no authority, except that which is expressly given to it in the Federal Constitution. In order to better insure the right of

the people and the States, the powers of the Federal Government were divided into three grand divisions, each independent of the other—the legislative, consisting of the Congress; the executive, the President and his departments of government; and the judicial, consisting of the Supreme Court and such inferior courts as Congress might provide. The 10th amendment applies with equal force to all three.

What this meant in simple terms was that the Congress should write the "law of the land." There has been much loose talk by the press and by people in high position about the law of the land. Those who speak of Supreme Court decisions as the "law of the land" have given scant consideration to the terms of the Constitution in that regard. The phrase, "law of the land," occurs only once in the Constitution.

I quote article VI: "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the land."

And to whom does the Constitution delegate the power to make the "law of the land"? I quote article I, section 1: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

These two sentences make it crystal clear that the "law of the land" must be made, and can only be made, by the Congress and not by judicial decision.

We should make no mistake in appraising the devastating effect of a deviation from this basic philosophy of our system of government. To put it plainly and bluntly, the Supreme Court has seized the power to write the "law of the land" contrary to and in defiance of the Constitution. A large segment of the public has acquiesced in the seizure, and the President, by employing the Armed Forces of the United States, has undertaken to enforce the false doctrine that the Supreme Court has the power to enact the "law of the land," notwithstanding the constitutional provision imposing that duty upon the Congress.

I say to you with all sincerity and with a deep conviction that unless the American people, through their representatives, demand and obtain a return to elemental constitutional principles and a containment of the Supreme Court to the functions delegated it by the Constitution, then we have lost the safeguard and guaranties of freedom and assurance of sovereignty of the States bequeathed us by our forefathers.

For as sure as we stand upon this hallowed ground, if the Supreme Court of the United States has the power to write the "law of the land" and the President conceives it his duty to enforce those decisions, then we are drifting into a dictatorship of the judiciary as powerful and as terrifying as any now existing in foreign lands.

If this doctrine can be used to enforce integration of the races in the Southern States, it can be used in a multitude of other instances, in any and every State of the Union, to destroy the liberties of the people and wipe out every vestige of State sovereignty. It is my fervent hope and prayer that some way, somehow, some voice more powerful and more eloquent than mine may be raised that will arouse the whole of the American people to the danger confronting them.

It is not a local question; it is not a southern question; it is not the explosive question of integration of the races; it is a basic question affecting the rights and liberties of every living American citizen and every unborn child.

One breach of the bulwark of constitutional government sets the precedent for others more far reaching, until, as time goes on, our children and our children's children will find that their forebears had frittered away their birthright of free government.

Let me illustrate by pointing out to you some other decisions of the Supreme Court in recent months. I will not go into the legalistic features of these decisions. Take the case of *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, a notorious Communist who was prosecuted for subversion and treason under a Pennsylvania law. The Supreme Court there held that the State had no power to punish an offender against its laws because Congress had enacted the so-called Smith Act dealing with the same subject. With one stroke of the pen it repealed all of the State laws that enabled the States to protect themselves and the Federal Government of which they are a part from subversion and treason, and this notwithstanding the fact that Congress expressly provided in the criminal code, of which the Smith Act is a part, that nothing in that act should prohibit the States from enforcing their laws on the same subject.

Take the Girard College case where Stephen Girard a hundred years ago set up a fund in trust to the city of Philadelphia for the education of "poor white children" and although our people have always enjoyed perfect freedom in the disposition of their property as they saw fit to such objects as they saw fit, the Supreme Court held that Negro children must also be permitted to share the bounty of this benefactor.

Take the case of *Cloverleaf* v. *Patterson* where the Health Department of the State of Alabama under its law undertook to inspect certain renovated butter which was being sold to citizens of Alabama, and was thought to be unhealthful. The Supreme Court by its decision deprived the State of Alabama of the authority to protect the health of its citizens against impure food because of the mere fact that Congress had enacted a Pure Food and Drug Act.

Take the case of *Guss Company* v. *Utah* where the company was being ruined by a strike that was unlawful under both the National Labor Relations Act and the State statute. The National Labor Board having declined to take jurisdiction and decide the case either one way or the other, the company proceeded under a similar State law. The Supreme Court held that this State law could not be enforced because Congress had passed the National Labor Relations Act. This left the company facing ruin with no remedy either by State or Federal law.

Take the case of *Schwartz* v. *New Mexico* where the State law prohibits a person from being licensed to practice law unless he were a person of good character. The authorities of New Mexico decided that a person with a record of subversive activities was one not of the type of good character that the State desired to license as a lawyer. The Supreme Court substituted its judgment of good character for the judgment of the sovereign State of New Mexico, in dealing with a purely local problem.

Take the case of *Slochower* v. *the City of New York*, where the legislature in enacting the city charter provided that any schoolteacher who in any hearing took advantage of the fifth amendment, automatically severed his employment with the city. Slochower pleaded the fifth amendment in a hearing and was discharged because in the judgment of the Legislature of New York, as expressed in the charter of the city, he was not the type of person desirable as a teacher of the youth of that community. The Supreme Court substituted its judgment as to the type of person whom New York should hire for the education of their youth, for the judgment of the State legislature.

I raise these questions regretfully with malice toward none. I pose them because I am deeply disturbed by the whole trend of the Federal Government and the apparent acquiescence of the public in a trend that constantly drifts us farther and farther away from the moorings of the Constitution. Most people will agree, certainly most lawyers agree, that recent decisions of the Supreme Court have seized legislative powers not delegated to it by the Constitution, and these decisions, irrespective of previous decisions of that tribunal to the contrary, are now readily accepted by the Executive, and largely by the public, as the "law of the land."

When the legislative fiats of the Supreme Court become the "law of the land" and the Executive accepts them as such and proceeds to enforce them with the mailed fist of the United States Army, do we not then have a judicial dictatorship as potent, as powerful, and as dangerous as any that now exists in other hemispheres?

It is no answer to say that the good judgment and sound thinking of our people and our officials will never permit it to go too far. We have seen these seeds planted in foreign countries and grow into horrors never before experienced in a civilized world. It is time that the people of this country, who in the end rule our country, should begin to think in terms of the fundamental underlying principles under which we live and which are clearly enunicated in our Constitution. The sovereignty of our States, the division of power between the legislative, executive, and judicial departments, and above all that simple statement in the 10th amendment reserving to the States and to the people all powers of government not specifically surrendered to the Federal Government.

Great nations have decayed and fallen in the past because its people, imbued with the pursuits of the moment, have become indifferent to the preservation of their liberties.

We must not be diverted by the thought that we are merely fighting the emotional issue of racial integration. That question is no more than a straw in the wind that points up and emphasizes the direction in which we are recklessly plunging. It pointedly illustrates what can happen when we are governed by the whims and fancies and personal predilections of nine men who discard the law as written for the law as they think it should be written, in order to give expression and force to their personal, sociological theories.

Public apprehension of the power that might be wielded by the Supreme Court is as old as the Constitution itself. Jefferson voiced it repeatedly, persistently and eloquently. As a result, certain safeguards were written in the Constitution.

Congress is given power to restrict the appellate jurisdiction of the Court at will and to an unlimited extent, as occasion may require. The time has come when the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson should be invoked. Congress has the constitutional power to act, the solemn duty to function in the crisis we confront. It should act with caution and restraint, and after thorough deliberation, but it owes a solemn duty to the American people to preserve their liberties, and to the sovereign States they represent to protect their integrity.

If Congress refuses or fails to act, the legislatures of the States have the express power to initiate a constitutional convention to propose amendments that would restore to the people of the sovereign States their right of self-government.

Let us fearlessly preach the doctrine of States rights and individual liberties to our neighbors and fellow citizens, North, East, and West. Let us review the history of the hardships, the oppressions and the dictatorship suffered by the American Colonies from which emerged our constitutional system of government that has served us so well in the past. Let us patiently, peacefully, but per-

sistently, seek the answer to our problems. Let us firmly resolve to restore to our people their way of life and the system of government devised by our forefathers. The power to do so lies in the will of the people, all the people, North, South, East, and West. The question lies far beyond the controversy over integration of the races. It is the choice between democracy and autocracy.

---

## The Task of the New House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 28, 1958*

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the first official meeting of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration will be held Thursday, March 20. This meeting will be both historic and unique. Historic because it is the first time in the history of the Congress or the Nation that such a committee has been appointed to investigate, study and recommend action that Congress should take concerning astranautics or interplanetary travel and communications and the exploration of the vast expanse of space between the earth and other planets.

It is unique because of the unusual responsibilities this committee is assuming in probing the mysteries of the vast unknown space and area between the earth and the other planets in the universe.

Since 540 B. C. the avid curiosity, the vivid imagination, and the insatiable desire of man has been to seek and find the relative position of earth to other planets, the distance between these celestial bodies, and the means of traveling to them and communicating with them, and the desire to find out if organic vegetable or animal life existed there. Perhaps every human being on earth has gazed into the starry heavens on a clear night and wondered what existed on the other worlds in the vast universe.

I recall the great excitement and wonderment that Halley's Comet stimulated when it passed over the earth a number of years ago, and the worry and concern some people felt that it might not pass over but might hit the earth, and if it did not, where did it come from, where was it going, and when would it stop.

We all have looked with amazement at an eclipse of the moon and have viewed with equal amazement the close proximity of Mars when at regular intervals it comes so close to the earth—36 million miles—that it appears as an orange ball in the sky instead of a twinkling star.

Thousands of volumes have been written containing vivid imaginative and presumptive views and opinions on how to reach the planets and of the conditions existing there such as atmosphere, temperature, pressure, gravity, and organic life.

It is conceded that organic life, both vegetable and animal, can and does exist and adapt itself and thrive under wide and varying conditions. This we know from various types of life in the ocean at various depths and temperatures. The same is true of animal life on the earth's surface at various heights, temperatures, and atmospheric conditions. Man has found a way to live and exist under all of these varying conditions on the surface of the earth, and to some extent under water.

We have made great progress in recent years in what man can do in going to great elevations at great speeds, but all within the life-sustaining atmosphere that surrounds the earth. We are now engaged in how we can exist and live in the vast stupendous outer space where no atmosphere exists and where man must carry with him his own life-giving environment in which he can exist. Once these difficult and complex problems are solved, man can then proceed to find a way to land and exist on some other planet than earth.

These are some of the vast and comprehensive responsibilities of the House Select Astronautics and Space Exploration Committee which is made up of the following Members of the House: JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, chairman; JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts; OVERTON BROOKS of Louisiana; LESLIE ARENDS, of Illinois; GORDON L. McDONOUGH of California; BROOKS HAYS of Arkansas; LEO O'BRIEN of New York; LEE METCALF, of Montana; WILLIAM NATCHER, of Kentucky; B. F. SISK, of California; JAMES FULTON, of Pennsylvania; KENNETH KEATING, of New York; and GERALD FORD, of Michigan.

PRESENT PROGRESS

Much progress has been made up to now. Man can now fly at more than twice the speed of sound. He has reached the height of 102,000 feet, nearly 20 miles, and returned to earth in a balloon—Maj. David Simons, USAF, during 1957. Captain Kincheloe, USAF, flew the Bell X-2 to an altitude of 126,200 feet, and plans are under way for Test Pilot Smith Crossfield to fly the North American X-15 rocket to a height of more than 100 miles and return to earth which will be the highest elevation that man has reached.

We have shot United States satellite Explorer No. 1 to an elevation of 1,587 miles which is more than 500 miles higher than Russian Sputniks I and II, and have obtained sufficient scientific information to believe that it is feasible for a man-occupied satellite to travel to and exist at that elevation, and we have shot the Farside rocket from a balloon at an elevation of 100,000 feet to an elevation of 2,400 miles.

Although much has been accomplished since man's curiosity about outer space and the planets was aroused, there is a great deal more to be done. The following is part of an article from a recent issue of the U. S. News & World Report:

Space flight by men, in vehicles that they can fly back to the earth at will, is within reach. It can be accomplished in the near future, Lt. Gen. Donald L. Putt, the Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff who commands development of new equipment, told a committee of Congress.

At least three types of manned vehicles now are in the works. Two have small wings and will reenter the atmosphere by gliding into it to keep from being burned up by friction. The third, still highly secret, will use a new drag concept to reenter directly.

Enormous satellites, weighing up to 2 tons, now are being built. Ground stations and equipment for them also are under construction. Total United States expenditure on this project, this year and next, is put at $150 million.

"The first of these huge military satellites," General Putt revealed, "is on schedule for a first launch date in the very near future." The satellites are designed to carry radar and camera equipment to scan military preparations behind the Iron Curtain.

First rocket to the moon will be fired this year, assuming that work begins on it within the next few weeks, the general said. Decision whether to spend money for this feat now is before Congress. The moon rocket is to carry instruments which will describe the moon's surface by radio.

All these space ventures add up to a United States contest with the Soviet Union.

Officials in Washington, relying upon intelligence information, say flatly that the Russians, like the United States, have had failures, both in missile tests and in satellite launchings.

One report is that Soviet missilemen tried—and failed—to put up a 1-ton sputnik at the same time the United States launched Explorer I.

United States officials believe the Russians have four major satellite projects planned for the next 6 months. Early on the list is an attempt to hit the moon. An attempt this year to launch and recover a satellite with a man in it is thought to be among the Soviet goals.

Ambitious projects are springing up in both nations. What seems clear is that, despite failures to date, there will be many more rocket launchings in the next few months—a huge expansion of attempts to explore space beyond the earth.

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

The following statement by Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, a pioneer in early aviation and a hero in World War II in his planned and successful attack on Tokyo from air carrier in the Pacific made this statement at the Aero Club of Washington, December 17, 1957:

There has been exploration since the beginning of mankind, since the beginning of curiosity. The airplane has made well known most of the remote spots on this globe, but exploration will continue.

The new exploration will be in science and in space.

We, as a nation, must have vision and must work hard if we are to be leaders in this new type of exploration.

I am a conservative, but I believe that before the end of the century the following events will occur and that they will occur more or less in the following order:

A rocket will go to the moon. Somewhat more propulsive power will be required than for an intercontinental ballistic missile or for a satellite, but the guidance in actually hitting the moon will be easier than hitting a specific target from 5,000 miles.

Scientific instruments will be landed on the moon. There is no atmosphere on the moon, so reverse thrust will be required in order that instruments may land on the moon lightly, softly. There may be deep dust on the moon, no one knows, so it may be necessary to send up several scientific instruments before one will operate.

A manned satellite will go around the earth and will return to the earth. This will lead to the possibility of transcontinental or transoceanic travel in half an hour. San Francisco to New York, New York to London, New York to Paris—in half an hour. The determinant as to whether people travel this fast will be not technology, but economics.

A trip around the moon and return; an opportunity, first to look at the far side with radar or television, unmanned, and then a trip around the moon and return to earth with a man aboard.

A man will be landed on the moon and brought back.

A space platform will be established.

Instruments will be landed on Mars or Venus.

A man or men will be landed on Mars or Venus and brought back.

If I weren't a conservative, I would say that before the end of this century two more events will take place: A permanent observation station on the moon, and interplanetary travel as a common thing.

This is only the beginning. What will happen next, I cannot even conceive. I am only sure that the rate of scientific progress will continue to increase.

The 8 or 10 things I have enumerated can be done. I am satisfied that before the end of the century—and maybe long before the end of the century—they will be done.

We, the United States of America, can be first. If we do not expend the thought, the effort, and the money required, then another and more progressive nation will. They will dominate space, and they will dominate the world. There is a nation with this ambition. We must not let it prevail.

THE LEGAL QUESTION

Among the many other problems in space travel and communication which the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration must attempt to solve will be the legal question of sovereignty, territorial rights, and jurisdiction.

This subject has been under consideration for several years. The following is part of an article on this subject from the March 1958 issue of the Air Force magazine:

Since the invasion of space first by Russian satellites and now our own, there is growing sentiment for some sort of system of international control, or demilitarization. President Eisenhower has made a serious proposal to the world that this be done, and other administration and Congressional leaders have done likewise. One proposal is that the United Nations form a special commission on space.

Without questioning the worthiness, or even the ultimate necessity, of such a move, there are serious questions of sovereignty and international law involved.

It can be logically argued that the International Geophysical Year marks the beginning of a new era in international law, holding that outer space is not a part of a nation's "airspace." This has been suggested by John Cobb Cooper, Canadian air-law expert and legal adviser to the International Air Transport Association. Cooper points out that neither the United States nor the U. S. S. R. asked permission to put satellites into space when they announced their IGY programs. The fact that no nation has protested the satellites' invasion of space, Cooper says, has already established a precedent for freedom of space. He interprets the present situation as follows:

That present national boundaries extend upward only to a point where the atmosphere ceases to provide lift for airplanes or balloons.

That outer space, which he defines as where there is not enough atmosphere to create drag or otherwise affect flight, is now beyond the sovereignty of any state or nation of the world.

That the fringe area between these two still awaits a definition of sovereignty through some sort of international agreement.

The desirability of a demilitarized space and its implications for a peaceful world is difficult to deny. But while the debate goes on, the United States cannot let space go by default to the Soviet Union.

It is worth pointing out here that although the United States should work hard to prevent a Soviet monopoly on space achievements, deep space itself could not be the site of battle, as man has always known it, between giant fleets or armies of opposing war vehicles.

Instead—as a battlefield—space would serve as the high ground for reconnaissance and missilery, as envisoned in the earlier suggestions of General Boushey.

As we approach the reality of space travel, the science-fiction buffs among us will have to leave much of our romance behind. For it would be difficult indeed, if not impossible, for great space fleets to meet in combat, unless they both left from the same place at the same time in the same predetermined paths. This is hardly likely. Otherwise moments after they had "passed" each other in space, they would be thousands of miles apart, and the weapons, again in the classic use of the word, they ranged at each other would be utterly useless.

This does not, of course, preclude combat in near space between orbiting satellites of opposing nations. It would be possible, indeed quite simple, to demolish or puncture a manned satellite with a missile fired into its orbit. And there could, of course, be combat on the moon, a battle to gain sole control.

Dr. Edward Teller gave a hint of that prospect during his testimony at a recent Congressional hearing. He was being asked why man would want to go to the moon. And he answered that it would be interesting to find out what was there.

Asked later what he thought we might find when we did get there, Dr. Teller answered, "Russians."

The United States must accept and mount the challenge to pioneer in the stupendous task of space exploration if we hope to overcome the Russian scientific advances. It will require great energy and the constant cooperation of our scientific manpower and industrial know-how, of which we have plenty to accomplish these objectives.

---

# SENATE

## WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1958

*(Legislative day of Monday, January 27, 1958)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all wisdom, away from the confusion of tongues we seek the quiet pavilion of prayer where the bewildering voices of the busy world and the clamor of wordy argument are hushed. When the reality behind all shadows—Thy presence beyond and in all things—captures our awareness, then our arrogance is rebuked and our pride is mocked, and we confess that our knowledge is only partial, and our judgment so fallible. May all narrow barriers be burned away that shut us out from fellowship and understanding with any of Thy other children. And may the decisions made here within these historic walls, in these crucial days, conform to Thy will, as to those who look and listen for Thy guidance are revealed the things which belong to our peace and to the peace of the world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 28, 1958, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Miss Marguerite Cooper, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 8 for promotion to class 7, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8216) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8381) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## NOTICE OF CHANGE OF DATE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS TO COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on January 23, 1958, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, gave notice that a public hearing had been scheduled for Monday, February 10, 1958, beginning at 2:30 p. m. in room 424, Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary upon nominations of the following to be members of the Commission on Civil Rights: John A. Hannah, of Michigan, John S. Battle, of Virginia, Doyle Elam Carlton, of Florida, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, of Indiana, Robert G. Storey, of Texas, J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois.

Since the time when the notice was originally given, the Office of the Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights has informed the Committee on the Judiciary that all of the nominees would not be able to be present on February 10, 1958.

Accordingly, at the request of the office of the Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights, the hearing has been rescheduled.

The rescheduled time of the hearing has been set for 2:30 p. m. Monday, February 24, 1958, in room 424, Senate Office Building, at which time persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent.

## EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE FILING OF REPORTS BY THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of reports by the Judiciary Committee now required by Senate resolution to be filed not later than January 31, 1958, be extended to February 11, 1958.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Thailand, vice Max Waldo Bishop.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Capt. Richard M. Ross for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard;

Alvin H. Giffin, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard; and

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, and Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioners.

Dewey G. Rushford and others for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably the nomination of Anthony F. Arpaia, of Connecticut, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964. This will be a reappointment.

It is a pleasure for me to make this report. Mr. Arpaia is known well and favorably for his excellent work on the Interstate Commerce Commission. He is a devoted, conscientious, and able servant of the people; and his duty has been performed in such a manner as to warrant his continuing service on this important Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

## UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Christopher H. Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be a representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

## THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. George W. Mundy, 358A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

## THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

## THE NAVY AND THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

## NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, THE AIR FORCE, THE NAVY, AND THE MARINE CORPS, FAVORABLY REPORTED AND PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, favorably reported and placed on the Vice President's desk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour, during which Senators may introduce bills and transact other routine business, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program, for the quarter ended December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCREASE OF LENDING AUTHORITY OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the president, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BALANCE SHEET OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a balance sheet of that company, dated December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SALINE WATER CONVERSION ACT OF 1952

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations of that Department under the Saline Water Conversion Act of 1952, during the fiscal year 1957; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on payment of claims paid on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel, during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that no change had occurred since January 1, 1957 in that Department, relating to positions placed in grades GS-16, 17, and 18; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the East San Gabriel Valley Planning Committee of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring the improvement of the Walnut Creek system for the control and conservation of flood waters for Los Angeles County; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Columbia Historical Society, Washington, D. C., protesting against any change in the east front of the Capitol Building; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment:

S. Res. 224. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters under its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 1232).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 207. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing (Rept. No. 1233);

S. Res. 214. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate certain matters under its judisdiction (Rept. No. 1234);

S. Res. 245. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Finance to expend an additional $10,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate during the 85th Congress;

S. Res. 252. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and

S. Res. 254. Resolution to authorize additional clerk hire for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 1235).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 253. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ certain temporary staff members and assistants; (Rept. No. 1236).

## EDITH B. PORTERFIELD

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 255), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Edith B. Porterfield, widow of Albert E. Porterfield, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 10½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3181. A bill to extend the program of expanded milk in Veterans' Administration facilities and in the Armed Forces for an additional 2-year period;

S. 3182. A bill to expand the special milk for children program and to give it permanent authorization by incorporating it into the regular school-lunch program in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in schools; and

S. 3183. A bill to extend the brucellosis eradication program for an additional 2-year period in the interest of protecting the public health and welfare; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3184. A bill to permit eligible veterans to commence institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 more than 3 years after their discharge or release from military service if facilities for such training were not available prior to the expiration of such 3-year period; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3185. A bill to promote the conservation of migratory fish and game by requiring certain approval by the Secretary of the Interior of licenses issued under the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3186. A bill to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

## RESOLUTION

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 255) to pay a gratuity to Edith B. Porterfield, which was placed on the calendar.

(See resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HENNINGS, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

## PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO INCREASE CONSUMPTION OF MILK AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am sending to the desk for proper reference three bills to continue and expand certain programs established by Congress for the purpose of aiding in the increased consumption of milk and dairy products by school children and in Veterans Administration facilities and the Armed Forces, and to provide protection for the health of consumers of dairy products.

The first of these bills would extend for 2 years the special programs for providing additional milk products through the Commodity Credit Corporation to enable the Armed Forces and the Veterans' Administration to utilize an increased quantity of dairy products in the interest of better nutritional standards.

These programs provide for increasing the supply of dairy products available to the Veterans' Administration and Armed Forces in periods when total supplies are abundant. Certainly, no one more deserves to enjoy a bonus of additional wholesome and nutritious dairy commodities when we have an abundant supply. My bill would add to the list of services eligible for receiving increased supplies of dairy commodities, the Coast Guard and the Merchant Marine Academy. The young men who serve their country in this way should be accorded the same treatment under this program as the personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. These latter are already eligible under the present program.

The second of these bills would make the special milk for children program, which is due to expire on June 30, 1958, into a permanent part of the regular school-lunch program. It would expand its scope sufficiently so that all school children in the Nation could look forward to sharing in the benefits of this vital program.

During the past 4 years, millions of children in schools, day nurseries, summer camps, and similar institutions have consumed additional milk under the special milk program. It has served to increase the nutritional standards for the Nation's children—surely a vital investment in the future strength and vitality of our country. It also expanded both the immediate consumption of milk, and future potential consumption by introducing many children to milk who otherwise might never become familiar with milk as an everyday beverage.

Despite this worthwhile accomplishment, far less than half of the school children of America have yet been able to participate in the school-milk program as it has been set up in the past several years. One of the biggest problems has been the inability of many schools to finance the special facilities and to pay for the necessary minimum administrative costs of carrying out a sanitary milk supply program in the school. My bill would provide additional financial help to local school authorities to enable them to meet some of these practical problems which too often have constituted a bottleneck in the past.

Transfer of the special-milk-for-children program to the school-lunch program would accomplish two important things:

First. It would give the special milk program the permanent status it deserves to have, thus permitting school officials to plan for a stable and continuing program of milk distribution;

Second. It would clearly identify this program as an aid to the nutrition of our children, and free it from any possibility of misrepresentation to the public as a subsidy to farmers under the price support programs. Unfortunately, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding in the public mind about the nature of expenditures for programs of this kind. These expenditures are reported by the Secretary of Agriculture as losses under the price-support program, which is certainly contrary to any realistic view. It would be just as sensible to report that expenditures for school books are losses on behalf of subsidies to publishers.

The third and final bill would extend the program for Federal support of the brucellosis eradication program for 2 more years. The drive to wipe out this costly and dangerous infection is gaining momentum. Nine States—including Wisconsin—have now achieved the status of "modified certified brucellosis-free." This means that less than 1 percent of their cattle and 5 percent of their herds are infected.

With victory in the fight to completely eradicate this disease now in sight, it is all the more prudent to keep the campaign going forward at full efficiency.

Despite the progress that has been made against brucellosis, it still accounts for annual losses of about $30 million to dairy producers.

I should like to emphasize the hazard to human health which this disease presents. The organism that causes brucellosis in cattle is responsible for undulant fever in humans. Undulant fever may be communicated by contact with diseased animals or animal products. Eradication of this hazard is very much in the interest of public health, as well as of dairy producers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

S. 3181. A bill to extend the program of expanded milk in Veterans Administration facilities and in the Armed Forces for an additional 2-year period;

S. 3182. A bill to expand the special milk for children program and to giv it permanent authorization by incorporating it into the regular school lunch program in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in schools; and

S. 3183. A bill to extend the brucellosis eradication program for an additional 2-year period in the interest of protecting the public health and welfare.

---

## EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS IN CONNECTION WITH ON-THE-FARM TRAINING

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which will remedy a very unjust situation in regard to the educational benefits under Public Law 550 for on-the-farm training.

A specific case was brought to my attention, and is similar to many others across the country.

Today a large investment is required to establish oneself in agriculture. When a man comes out of service, who is interested in going into farming, he very often does not have the necessary capital. In the specific case drawn to my attention, the young man went to work on the Iron Range in Minnesota so as to save enough for a downpayment or equipment and land. The State Department of Education inspected the farm and approved the training program set up for the veteran. This young man enrolled in an on-the-farm-training program, but was unable to commence training because the class was full at that time. Before a vacancy occurred in the class, the delimiting time had passed and, therefore, the Veterans Administration could not approve his application for benefits.

I should like to point out that on-the-farm-training is different from the other educational benefits because of the limited facilities available. In most instances, special instructors for this program have been set up who can spend most of their time traveling from farm to farm and giving the needed guidance. One instructor can have only a limited number of men under his supervision, and a vacancy does not occur until one of the class has finished his course. Therefore, the young man was prevented from obtaining his benefits because no other facility was available for this type of program.

I do not believe that it is the desire of the Congress to prevent men like this one, who have worked in order to secure the needed money for investment, from taking advantage of the benefits which are rightfully theirs, but who are unable to participate in a course because of conditions beyond their control. I am very hopeful that this bill will receive wide support and can be enacted into law so that this man, and the many others across the country who are in a similar position, will receive the benefits which the law provides.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3184) to permit eligible veterans to commence institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 more than 3 years after their discharge or release from miliary service if facilities for such training were not available prior to the expiration of such 3-year period, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 212 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), an eligible veteran—

"(1) Who, on or before the delimiting date for the veteran to initiate his program of education or training under subsection (a), has applied for enrollment in a course of institutional on-farm training which is thereafter approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of section 252, and

"(2) for whom facilities at an educational institution for such course of institutional on-farm training were not available at any time on or after the date of his application for enrollment and on or before the delimiting date for the veteran to initiate his program of education or training under subsection (a),

may initiate his program of education and training under this title (but only with respect to such approved course of institutional on-farm training) at any time

within 6 months after facilities at an educational institution for such course of institutional on-farm training become available for him, or within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection, whichever is the later."

---

## AUTHORIZATION FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE TO PROTECT MIGRATORY FISH AND GAME

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we of the Pacific Northwest face a major crisis with respect to resource conservation and development.

On January 20, 1958, the Federal Power Commission ruled that a high dam at the Nez Perce site on the Snake River, between Oregon and Idaho, would be feasible for construction either by the Government or by a private utility company.

In my opinion, a 700-foot dam at Nez Perce would be presently disastrous to the great Chinook salmon runs of the Columbia River Basin. This stems from the fact that the Salmon River of Idaho, principal spawning ground of these migratory fish, would be blockaded by such a structure. At the current time, Mr. President, no devices or methods have yet been conclusively tested which enable such salmon runs to survive Nez Perce Dam, either on their upstream or downstream pilgrimages.

Mr. President, those of us concerned about wildlife preservation can, in my estimate, prevent Congress from authorizing a Federal dam at Nez Perce. But what will prevent the FPC from licensing Nez Perce for construction by a private utility, by a public system, by a municipality, or by some syndicate of such groups—as at Priest Rapids on the Columbia River?

Already we have seen on the Deschutes and McKenzie Rivers of Oregon, and on the Cowlitz River of Washington, that migratory fish runs and outdoor values matter very little indeed to the Commissioners of the FPC.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill to give the United States Fish and Wildlife Service collateral jurisdiction in FPC decisions where rivers are involved with important fisheries resources.

Today, and for many years past, the FPC has had to consult the Corps of Army Engineers whenever the FPC licensed projects on rivers with navigable reaches. Surely, parallel participation in FPC verdicts ought to be required by the Fish and Wildlife Service where the streams at stake are the habitat of fish pilgrimages worth many millions of dollars, both from the standpoint of commercial and sports fisheries.

As I have said, Mr. President, the Federal Water Power Act now restricts the Commission's licensing authority by providing that "no license affecting the navigable capacity of any navigable waters of the United States shall be issued until the plans of the dam or other structures affecting navigation have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army." In the management of our Nation's water resources for their full multiple-purpose benefits, the continuance of major fisheries certainly deserve protection equal to that afforded the requirements of navigation. The bill which I am introducing merely extends the law so that no license shall be issued until the Secretary of the Interior, after consulting with the Fish and Wildlife Service, has determined that the dam and project works are not detrimental to migratory fish and to game and wildlife.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the bill to promote conservation of migratory fish and game by requiring approval of Federal Power Commission licenses by the Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3185) to promote the conservation of migratory fish and game by requiring certain approval by the Secretary of the Interior of licenses issued under the Federal Power Act, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the first sentence of subsection (e) of section 4 of the Federal Power Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That no license shall be issued until the plans for the project have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, as not being detrimental to the conservation of migratory fish and game."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Furthermore, Mr. President, many of us fear that the Federal Power Commission approval of the Nez Perce Dam could encourage Canada to take further action to carry out plans which have been discussed to divert the upper Columbia River into the Fraser watershed, thereby reducing the volume of water reaching generators on the United States side of the border.

The manner in which the Commission's decision favoring Nez Perce Dam may jeopardize our negotiations with Canada over the use of the upper Columbia is discussed in an article which I wrote for the Oregonian. I ask consent to include with my remarks this article of January 27, 1958, entitled "FPC Aid to Canadian Diversion," and an editorial on the same subject from the Vancouver (British Columbia) Province of January 15, 1958.

The Commission's decision has been the subject of considerable editorial comment in leading Pacific Northwest newspapers. They have been almost uniformly critical of the action taken by the Commission. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD thoughtful editorials from the Oregonian of January 22, 1958; the Pendleton East-Oregonian of January 24, 1958; the Astorian-Budget of January 21, 1958; the Oregon Statesman, the Oregon Journal, and the Eugene Register-Guard, all of January 22, 1958. The material in the Statesman is the personal column of its editor, Ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of January 27, 1958]

### FPC AID TO CANADIAN RIVER DIVERSION

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, U. S. Senator, Oregon)

WASHINGTON.—Not only conservationists but also advocates of Columbia River development should be profoundly disturbed by the recent Federal Power Commission decision, which declares that "fishery experts have made great strides" in enabling migratory fish to survive high dams like the proposed Nez Perce project.

This contention, which I regard as premature and unwarranted, is more than a threat to the salmon pilgrimages of the Salmon River watershed. It is a still greater threat to the actual survival and expansion of the Columbia River power system itself.

Let me explain precisely what I mean.

In May of 1955 the Canadian parliament authorized $250,000 for a study of proposed diversions that would pour much of the Kootenai River into the Columbia, and then divert some 15 million acre-feet or more out of the Columbia and into Canada's Fraser River system. Thus, a segment of the upper Columbia nearly equivalent to the whole flow of the Colorado would never reach United States generators. Because the Fraser reaches the sea in Canada, that nation could secure some 1,200 extra feet of head out of this vast volume of water.

Of course, the diversions would completely rule out any hope of ever building Libby Dam, and they would clamp a ceiling on future power production along the main stem of the Columbia River below the international border.

But opponents of the diversions always had one great ally—the approximately $30 million sockeye salmon runs of the Fraser. They insisted that tapping the increased flow of the Fraser with high dams would imperil, if not destroy, the fish migrations that are so important to both nations.

On the floor of Parliament, protection of the Fraser's fish has been one trump card of the Canadians hostile to diversion. But the Federal Power Commission seems determined to snatch that card away from them. In this effort, I regret to say, the FPC appears to be joined by those public-power advocates who contend that Nez Perce Dam must be built.

The leading Canadian advocate of diversion is Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, chairman of that country's side of the International Joint Commission. Appearing before the External Affairs Committee of Parliament in December, General McNaughton justified his support of diversion into the Fraser on the FPC examiner's report in the Middle Snake case, which was issued in July of 1957. General McNaughton said:

"That, gentlemen, is the opinion of the examiner of the FPC. It means that after many years of controversy and discussion of the question of whether dams are to be built in the upper waters of the Columbia and along the Snake and so on, the FPC decided that high dams would be built, and they put biologists and other fishery engineers to work to find ways to get a reasonable proportion of fish up and down, and they have expressed their confidence as to the progress and what could be done."

If the main Canadian proponent of diversion was able to take that position before a parliamentary committee merely on the strength of the ruling of an FPC examiner, imagine what prestige will now accrue to his side of the controversy with the entire Federal Power Commission of the United States now expressing faith that fish pilgrimages can be passed safely over high dams.

Of course, the FPC findings will likewise cut the ground out from under former Minister of Fisheries James Sinclair and other members of Parliament, who are the principal adversaries of diverting the Kootenai into the upper Columbia, and then the Columbia into the Fraser.

Our own international joint commission, which I do not exonerate from blame for precipitating the unfortunate diversion proposal, has been relying on the Fraser's sockeye runs to thwart this proposal. But can one agency of the United States Government blithely claim that methods are now at hand to get salmon runs over high dams on the Snake and Salmon Rivers, while another Government agency tells our Canadian friends that high dams inevitably will be fatal to salmon runs on the Fraser River? Canadians can read; they are literate people; this kind of doubletalk will not be popular with them, nor will it convince them to abandon diversion.

Many of the ardent proponents of Nez Perce Dam favor with equal ardor the expansion of power facilities on the main stem of the Columbia. It may be that such positions will prove to be incompatible. Diversion would permit Canada to tap for power a huge flow all the way to tidewater. Our country is asking Canada to sacrifice this, so that the Fraser's fish may be spared the jeopardy of high dams. But now the FPC assures us that the American cousins of the Fraser's sockeye horde can probably survive high dams on the middle Snake.

The phrase "you can't have your cake and eat it too" stems from the 16th century, but it is still pertinent.

---

[From the Vancouver (British Columbia) Province of January 15, 1958]

PERPETUAL VERSUS TRANSITORY RESOURCE

British Columbia's fishing industry will find great comfort in the Federal Government's decision against any immediate power development of the Fraser—the more so because it has been taken on reasoned long-term grounds rather than as a reaction to immediate political pressures.

It is worth requoting some of the remarks of the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. J. Angus MacLean, in the Commons last weekend.

He stressed the importance of the Fraser salmon runs because they could regenerate themselves forever if they were properly managed, whereas it may well be that the problem of providing more power on the Fraser from hydro sources is a passing one. There is a tendency in this direction already. There is a large thermal plant in the planning for the Vancouver area, and as time goes on other sources of power may be developed which will remove this threat to the fisheries completely.

That is the nub of the whole fish-versus-power argument. Fish—a valuable source of protein in a world that will need ever more of it in the future, and also the base of the established way of life of a substantial number of British Columbians—are there in perpetuity. But in an age in which power from atomic fission is already growing toward maturity and a vastly more abundant energy from nuclear fusion is approaching birth, dams may be transitory things.

It would seem the height of folly to kill off the perpetual resource for the sake of the transitory.

And, today at least, it would mean killing off the fish.

Mr. MacLean himself said: "There is a possibility—a lesser one, I think—that means can be found of having both fish and power on the same stream, but in large developments there is little likelihood of this being achieved in the near future."

By coincidence, at the same time the manager of the Grant County Public Utility District in the State of Washington was reporting that the cost of attempts to save the remaining fish of the Columbia might soon exceed the value of the fishery and that few of the fish were using the expensive works built to carry them past power dams.

---

[From the Portland Oregonian of January 22, 1958]

NEZ PERCE RULING CREATES NEW HAZARDS

The Federal Power Commission's unexpected denial of private utility licenses to build Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley Dams in the Snake River below Hell's Canyon raises some vital new problems. FPC simultaneously held that a high dam at the mutually exclusive Nez Perce site would be economically feasible either for private or Federal development.

Since there is absolutely no assurance that devices can be designed to pass small salmon and steelhead migrating downstream to the ocean over an 800-foot high dam in safety, the commercial and sports fishing interests of the Northwest and Nation will fight Nez Perce to the end. Such a dam, with its 200-foot drawdown, would doom a major portion of the multi-million-dollar spring Chinook salmon and summer steelhead runs into the Salmon River, Imnaha River and upper Snake River. It would close off the great Snake River spawning system as completely as Grand Coulee closed the upper Columbia.

The Federal Power Commission always has taken the position that power is paramount and fish are expendable. It has granted licenses, as for the Cowlitz, Pelton, and Brownlee Dams, on the unwarranted assumption that fishery agencies, confronted with a fait accompli, would rise to the occasion and conquer in a few months' time a problem not solved in years of study.

The public power proponents who are so joyful about the ruling against Pacific Northwest Power Co., a combine of four private utilities, do not include the fish conservationists. The latter saw the utility dams in the Snake above the mouths of the Salmon and Imnaha Rivers as much the lesser of two evils.

FPC also may be questioned on how it arrived at a conclusion that Nez Perce Dam would be economically feasible for private utility construction. This certainly has not been determined.

As listed by the Army engineers—but not yet authorized as a Federal project by Congress—Nez Perce might be built at an estimated cost of $430 million. Its 800-foot crest would back up the Snake River 64 miles to the base of Idaho Power Co.'s licensed but unbuilt low Hells Canyon Dam, and the Salmon River 60 miles. Although the figure of 6 million acre-feet is used by the FPC as potential storage, the Army engineers estimated that Nez Perce would have usable storage for flood control, power, and downstream regulation of 3,900,000 acre-feet. The installed hydroelectric capacity is estimated by the engineers at 1,627,000 kilowatts initially and 2,128,000 kilowatts ultimately.

Possibly, Pacific Northwest Power Co. might consider filing on the Nez Perce site if (1) Congress would put in a big share of the money for flood control and increased power benefits at downstream Federal dams, or (2) Congress would permit private power companies to be repaid for stored water beneficial to Federal dams below. The first means partnership; the second, a shift in Congressional attitude. Neither seems likely in a Democratic Congress.

Under the law, the Federal Power Commission is charged with recommending a project for Federal development if that is more feasible than a private application. The FPC apparently did not do this. It left the door open for a private bid on Nez Perce.

This newspaper, seeing no probability of successful fish passage over Nez Perce, has long advocated construction of a higher dam at the Pleasant Valley site to recover some of the storage lost when FPC licensed three lower dams of Idaho Power Co. in Hells Canyon and Congress failed to adopt a high Hells Canyon bill. Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton asked Congress last session * * * and this to provide funds to complete a study of feasibility of a high Pleasant Valley Dam.

FPC did not recognize this proposal, which would add 500,000 acre-feet to the Pleasant Valley storage. The private utilities declined to alter their application to ask for a high dam. Now, they could reconsider. But in view of FPC's decision favoring Nez Perce, it may be too late.

There is also in the Congressional works a proposal supported by Senators NEUBERGER, of Oregon, and CHURCH, of Idaho, for a moratorium on dam building in the Nez Perce-Pleasant Valley reach of the Snake, to give fishery experts time to work on the problem. That may be the logical result of the FPC decision. However, a moratorium wouldn't mean much to future Congresses. It would be honored only until support were marshaled for a Nez Perce Federal dam.

---

[From the Pendleton East Oregonian of January 24, 1958]

IT WILL BAFFLE THE HISTORIANS

If we had been betting on it we'd have thought it a cinch that the Federal Power Commission would decide that Nez Perce Dam on the Snake River should not be built. There are so many reasons for that decision.

Standing above all is the reason that Nez Perce Dam would virtually destroy fish runs in the Salmon and Snake Rivers. Research into the intricate problem of getting migratory fish runs past a high dam (Nez Perce would have an 800-foot crest) has not come up with something that meets the problem presented by Nez Perce.

There is another reason. When the FPC had to decide whether to permit a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon or three low-head dams constructed by Idaho Power Co. in that stretch of the Snake River it turned its back on the recommendations of its examiner and issued a permit to Idaho Power Co. That decision seemed to make it clear that the FPC thought storage on the Snake which a high Hells Canyon Dam would provide was, according to FPC thinking, unimportant.

Another reason was continued refusal by the Corps of Engineers to recommend construction of Nez Perce. Corps studies have said that Nez Perce is probably the best project in the Columbia Basin because of the great benefits—in particular substantial storage that would firm up the output of downstream projects—it offered, but the conclusion of the corps has consistently been that until the fish-movement problem was solved the dam should not be built.

While it was not a substitute for Nez Perce (no project in that area of the river could be) the FPC did have a way out of the mess it has created in the Snake River by permitting Pacific Northwest Power Co. (a combine of four private power companies) to build Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep Dams, upstream from Nez Perce, with the provision that the height of Pleasant Valley be increased in order to capture additional storage.

It seemed hardly possible that the FPC would add to the confusion it already had created on the middle Snake. But its decision of this week did exactly that. The decision will intensify the fight between the extreme conservationists who want no dams in the Columbia Basin because of the damage they do to fish, and the extremists on the other side who don't care what happens to the fish resource.

On top of this the decision said that Nez Perce could be built by either the Federal Government or private power companies. That will, of course, intensify the fight raging around the Eisenhower administration's partnership plan for water-resource development.

When historians study development of the middle Snake River and the Federal Power Commission decisions that affected that development they are going to have some trouble finding their way through the confusion. It's too much for us and we've been seeing it happen.

We're not at all sure about this most recent fiasco. At first look it appears to have some resemblance to something that a bush-league umpire does. If he calls a strike a ball and the pitcher complains he'll call the next ball a strike. Perhaps the FPC thought that the error at Hells Canyon could be erased by giving the complainants Nez Perce. If that was it we need a new umpire.

---

[From the Evening Astorian-Budget of January 21, 1958]

FPC Doesn't Care About Fish

The Federal Power Commission seems to have only casual interest in the problem of conserving fish runs of the Columbia Basin.

In its decisions regarding permits for power dams, it either ignores the protection of salmon runs or dismisses this as a minor matter.

It granted permits for dams on Deschutes and Cowlitz Rivers with total disregard of the fact these dams would destroy the two streams as spawning factors, and in the Cowlitz case, in defiance of a Washington law forbidding damming the stream.

The FPC now has denied permits for Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley Dams on the Snake River on the grounds that they would interfere with plans for higher Nez Perce Dam downstream.

Nez Perce Dam is opposed bitterly by both commercial- and sport-fishing interests because it would block major tributaries used by spawning salmon, but FPC evidently is ready to issue a permit for its construction.

The FPC dismissed the fishery problem at Nez Perce Dam with a passing comment that the "outlook is promising" for getting salmon past a high dam such as Nez Perce.

The FPC evidently made only casual, if any, investigation of this aspect of the problem, or it would have learned that fishery biologists are far from sure that the problem of getting fish past high dams is going to be solved.

The Snake and its tributaries are vital to preservation of the salmon runs of the Columbia, as they provide the major remaining spawning grounds for those races of salmon which go upstream to spawn. Loss of the Snake, through a blockade at Nez Perce Dam, could prove fatal to the commercial fishing industry and to the sports salmon fishery as well.

The FPC, which obviously doesn't care a hoot about the welfare of the fishing industry, is willing to risk that industry's very existence on a mere "promising outlook" that the high-dam problem will be solved. If the promising outlook doesn't materialize, it's no skin off the FPC's nose. Probably its members don't like canned salmon anyway.

There is something wrong with a setup that gives virtual dictatorial power over use of waters of the Columbia River Basin to an agency like the FPC which is concerned with only one aspect of use of the rivers—electrical power—and seems perfectly content to sacrifice any other interest that interferes with a development of the basin based solely on electrical power.

[From the Oregon Statesman of January 22, 1958]

(By Charles A. Sprague)

The decision of the Federal Power Commission rejecting the applications of the Pacific Northwest Power Co. for licenses to build two dams on Snake River throws development in that section of the stream into a tizzy. The applicant is a combine of private power companies serving the Northwest: Montana Power Co., Washington Water Power, Pacific Power & Light and Portland General Electric. The sites applied for were Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley, both below the Hells Canyon site now under license to Idaho Power Co.

The Federal Power Commission agreed with its engineering staff rather than its examiner. The former recommended denying the permits and substituting a giant dam at Nez Perce site below the junction of Salmon River with the Snake. The examiner recommended that the two-dam program of the power combine be approved. The Federal Power Commission rated the Nez Perce site as superior and indicated it could be developed either by private companies or the Federal Government.

The hitch on Nez Perce, whose advantages have long been recognized, both for power and for flood control, has been the impediment of a high dam to fish migration up the Salmon and Imnaha Rivers. The former is a principal spawning ground for the spring run of Chinook salmon. Recognizing this the Corps of Engineers has not pressed for a high dam which would halt fish migration. The only organized group promoting it is the Pacific Northwest Association of Public Power Agencies.

The Federal Power Commission seems to have tossed aside this objection to Nez Perce rather cavalierly. It comments that the "outlook is promising" for getting migrating fish around high dams; but it is still a grave question whether fish runs can be maintained in adequate size within reasonable expense. Its conclusion cannot be accepted as valid in the present state of knowledge of fish conservation. Perhaps the benefits of kilowatts and prevention of flood damage outweigh the value of the salmon runs, but the people are not ready to wipe out the salmon industry thus summarily.

There is one other alternative, proposed by the Reclamation Service and endorsed for study by Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton. This is a high dam at Pleasant Valley which would flood the Hells Canyon site. This would augment the water storage which the Corps of Engineers has been trying to provide. The current budget includes an item for a survey of this project. The FPC, however, ignored this alternate, throwing its favor to Nez Perce.

As for building at Nez Perce, who would undertake it? The PNPC has spent some $2.5 million in engineering surveys, economic studies, and legal expenses, including the cost of presenting its case in prolonged hearings before the FPC. This sum seems a total loss now. It will be reluctant to make a fresh outlay, particularly to incur the hostility of commercial fishing interests. The Federal Government at this juncture will hardly authorize a project of this magnitude, $430 million; and it seems beyond the financing capability of local PUD's.

So Northwest river development again is left in a tangle, with no early solution in sight. This supplies argument for a regional public agency, or at least for a regional planning agency which could coordinate basin development. Such are the ingrown rivalries that neither seems likely of early realization.

[From the Oregon Journal of January 22, 1958]

Stalemate on the Snake

The most predictable result of the Federal Power Commission's decision denying the Pacific Northwest Power Co. a license to build Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep Dams on the Middle Snake River is that there will be no development of any kind on that part of the Snake for many years to come.

It forces a revision of the 10-year power projection by Bonneville Administrator William A. Pearl which saw adequate supplies of power for the Northwest for that period. His estimates included the 1,183,000 kilowatts which would have come from these two dams.

The FPC's decision is based on the superiority of Nez Perce Dam, which would be located on the Snake below the confluences of the Salmon and Imnaha Rivers. Nobody questions the superiority of Nez Perce from purely an engineering standpoint. But no public agency or private company has so far proposed building Nez Perce because it would jeopardize 25 percent of the Columbia River's salmon fishery.

The present ruling would seem to contain an invitation for either the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, or the PNP itself to apply for construction of Nez Perce. The Army engineers are eyeing Nez Perce in their review study of the 308 report. The Bureau of Reclamation has been concentrating its attention on a study of a higher dam at Pleasant Valley. This decision may cause it to reverse its field. A spokesman for PNP once told us the company probably would have applied for a license to build Nez Perce except for the fish problem and might be forced to take the course if the Pleasant Valley-Mountain Sheep application were denied.

But one thing is sure: Whoever proposes to build Nez Perce, the commercial and sports fishing interests are going to fight it tooth and nail, and that is why we say it is going to be a long time before anything is built there.

It is true that studies are being made of ways to pass fish over high dams, and the FPC seems to be confident the solution is in sight, but no reputable fish biologist confirms this. Basically, the FPC probably has little regard for fishery values.

The loss of the kilowatts from Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep Dams is a particular blow to Oregon, because here was a potential source of power which would not be affected by the preference clause through which increasing kilowatts from Federal projects will be drained from our State to neighboring Washington. Nevertheless, for the overall benefit of the Pacific Northwest, this decision makes all the more imperative the speedy construction of John Day as a Federal project.

And the long postponement of any further development in the middle Snake adds urgency to some kind of settlement with Canada on developing the Upper Columbia, the best source of storage and power in the whole Columbia Basin.

---

[From the Eugene Register-Guard of January 22, 1958]

FPC Ignores Seaton's Sensible Plan

The Federal Power Commission, in denying a license to Pacific Northwest Power Co. for dams at Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep sites on the Snake River seems to have made a full circle.

The FPC refused a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon and granted licenses to Idaho Power Co. for three smaller dams in this stretch of the Snake. Now the FPC has recommended that the huge Nez Perce Dam, a project downstream from the confluence of the Salmon, Imnaha, and Snake Rivers, be

built either by the Federal Government or private companies.

The Nez Perce Dam, backing up 6 million acre-feet of water, would block fish runs that are valuable both commercially and sportswise to the Northwest. It is bitterly opposed by fishing interests and conservationists. The FPC says that methods can be devised for taking care of fish if the big dam is built, but this is doubtful.

In taking this action, the Power Commission has performed one beneficial act and also performed a bad one. It precludes construction of the two smaller dams proposed by Pacific Northwest Power, which is good, because these would not, in our opinion, meet requirements of sound development of the Columbia Basin. They would provide needed power, probably quicker than any other method, but they would not meet water-storage requirements. But proposing Nez Perce was poor, especially when the Commission ignored the most sensible proposal for this stretch of the Snake.

One year ago, in January 1957, Interior Secretary Fred Seaton, who has done more sound thinking on natural resources than most people in Washington, asked the FPC to delay action on the PNP license requests while the Government studied the feasibility of a high dam at the Pleasant Valley site.

A preliminary study convinced Mr. Seaton that a high dam (690 feet instead of the 534 feet PNP proposed) would be feasible, that it would produce 1,250,000 kilowatts of power, and that together with Brownlee, now under construction by Idaho Power, would give as much water storage as a high dam at Hells Canyon. It would preclude construction of Nez Perce which, in our book, should not be built.

A high Pleasant Valley dam would flood out the site of Idaho Power's small Hells Canyon dam, but this project has not been started as yet. It has even been suggested that Pacific Northwest Power get together with Idaho Power and construct a high dam at Pleasant Valley. This suggestion makes good sense, particularly for Oregon, which is served mainly by private power companies. But so far as there has been no inkling of any such action by the private firms.

In the meantime, we have another stalemate. Nez Perce will be fought bitterly; PNP has taken no action to construct projects that will meet overall basin needs, and the sensible proposal by Mr. Seaton remains dormant in the limbo of partisan politics.

## EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS UNDER DOMESTIC TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM - TANTALUM PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE ACT OF 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk through tomorrow, Thursday, January 30, 1958, so that other Senators may join as cosponsors, if they so desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 3186) to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## DAIRY STABILIZATION ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 27, 1958,

The name of Mr. PROXMIRE was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3125) to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. WILEY) on January 27, 1958.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Address delivered by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS before National Women's Democratic Club on subject Economic Realities and Administration Optimism, on January 27, 1958.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Address delivered by him on the subject Business and Propaganda, at Franklin Day dinner of Graphic Arts Association in Baltimore, Md., on January 16, 1958.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Statement by him on the 197th anniversary of the birth of Albert Gallatin.

## DANGERS TO THE ECONOMY OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST IN INCREASED TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, I proposed legislation for elimination of the 3-percent Federal tax on freight and the 10-percent Federal tax on passenger travel.

On March 27, 1957, when I made my statement on the Senate floor, I called attention to a great basic injustice in this tax which has been particularly hurtful to the economy of the West. I said at that time:

This tax is, in particular, a discrimination against the 11 States of the Far West. Those are the States which extend from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific coast. In effect, it is a high protective tariff against manufacturing and industry in the Western States.

Let me cite a few statistics which will demonstrate just how discriminatory this tax is against the Far West. Within 500 miles of Pittsburgh, Pa., is found 55 percent of the Nation's population. In addition, in the same area is an overwhelmingly greater portion of American industry and the consumer market. The State which I represent in part is from 2,000 to 3,000 miles from points within that circle around Pittsburgh. A carload of lumber produced in my State will be assessed freight charges of $675 for shipment from Portland, Oreg., to Pittsburgh. Transportation charges for the same carload of pine from forests in the South—from Georgia, for example—are only $410. Thus, the Federal excise tax on transportation collected from the Oregon lumberman is 40 percent greater than that paid by Georgia lumberman. The South, in turn, suffers under the levy with comparison to areas still nearer to large eastern markets.

I could go on and cite similar discriminations on canned goods, on farm produce, and other items produced in our Far Western States.

The 3-percent freight tax, in particular, acts to make the western product, whether it is fruit, vegetables, lumber, canned fish, plywood, or any other product, more costly in the markets of the East, where most of the American consumers live.

Today, the Interstate Commerce Commission is holding a hearing on Ex parte 212, which, if it goes into effect on February 1, 1958, as announced, will increase the freight charges, while at the same time it will compound the injustice this discriminatory tax already is inflicting with greatest intensity in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, to emphasize the severity of the threatened blow to the economy of my area which is inherent in Ex parte 212, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter of protest of January 28, addressed to Mr. Howard C. Freas, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I also request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following editorials which bear pertinently on this subject: An editorial entitled "Rail Problem More Than Rates," from the Oregon Journal of January 21, 1958; and an editorial entitled "Tax That Helps Nobody," from the Portland Oregonian of January 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
*January 28, 1958.*

Hon. HOWARD G. FREAS,
*Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN FREAS: I have had many strong-worded protests from the shippers in Oregon relative to the proposed increase in freight rates (Ex parte 212) to become effective February 1, 1958. The most strenuous protests have been voiced on the proposed increase in lumber rates. It is to this increase that I wish especially to call your attention.

Oregon's lumber industry, for several months, has been seriously depressed because of decreased housing starts resulting from the long-prevailing tight-money policy. But the situation in part, at least, has been caused by ever-increasing freight rates. Since June 30, 1946, to the present, depending on the kind of timber product shipped, freight rates have been granted by the Commission ranging from 110.3 percent to 122.4 percent.

Specifically freight-rate increases on products of Oregon's forests granted by ICC since June 30, 1946, to the present, are as follows: 110.3 percent, posts, poles, piling, ties, shingles, laths, box crate and cooperage material, plywood building woodwork, etc.; 117 percent, logs, fuel, and pulpwood; 122.4 percent, other products of forests, resins, turpentine, etc.; 122 percent (approximately), miscellaneous items.

Growing use of substitute and competitive building materials have also worsened the situation. A disturbingly high record of bankruptcies in Oregon, in the last year, includes a high proportion of businesses engaged in one phase or another of the lumber industry. The additional increase in freight rates on lumber of about 2 percent, now proposed to become effective on February 1, 1958, could contribute materially to the failure of many more firms engaged in the lumber industry. This excerpt from a letter of a small lumber dealer in Oregon points out clearly the financial disaster which is increased by excessively high freight rates.

"For example, our company shipped during the year 1957 approximately 700 carloads of lumber from the west coast to eastern markets. Assuming our volume of business will be equal in 1958, these increased freight charges could amount to an excess of $3,200 based on our 1957 shipments. When you compare this to the fact that our company after payment of all taxes, salaries, etc., netted slightly more than $2,000 for the year's efforts you can readily see that we can look forward to a net operating loss during the year of 1958 of something in the vicinity of $1,200. We point this out to illustrate how this one action on behalf of the Interstate Commerce Commission could affect our individual company and we believe other companies as well, for the methods of operation from one company to the next are very similar."

Filing of the increased rate was announced by the ICC the last week in December 1957 to become effective February 1, 1958. Obviously, this is not sufficient time to allow the lumber industry to study the proposed increase and prepare an effective case for presentation before the Commission. In view of this, I strongly urge that the Commission suspend the rates, in order that the lumber shippers may organize and properly present their case in a later hearing. In a letter to the Oregon delegation, Gov. Robert D. Holmes emphasized the inadequacies of the time allowed to file their protest. The Governor stated that "This order and the supporting statements of the railroads which, of necessity, have to be answered by the public by January 20, were not received by this office or any Pacific coast commission prior to January 6 or 7, 1958. This left exactly 6 working days in which to review voluminous statements of railroad officials and thereafter prepare evidence and exhibits in opposition to the proposed rail increases. It is utterly impossible for the Oregon Public Utility Commissioner's staff properly to prepare any type of responsible exhibits or evidence in this short space of time."

He further points out the adverse effects of this proposed increase, in his letter, when he stated:

"Proposed increases provide a flat 10 percent increase in log-hauling rates. Log hauling is nearly 100 percent intrastate commerce. No evidence or statements have been submitted by railroads in support of this increase. If these rates are approved in interstate commerce, the ICC may bring section 13 proceedings against Oregon to force a 10 percent increase in intrastate rates on log hauling in Oregon. At the same time, and this is important, no increase has been proposed covering log hauling within and between Southern States. This is the grossest kind of discrimination."

On January 22, 1958, Secretary of Labor James Paul Mitchell, announced that Oregon was a surplus labor area. Of the approximately 70,000 unemployed workers, a heavy percentage of them had been employed in the lumber industry. If the proposed increases in freight rates are allowed to become effective, the inevitable result can only mean a further decrease of lumber shipping, in Oregon, and another sharp increase in unemployment.

During the Senate hearings on the current condition of railroads on January 13–17, 1958, it was pointed out that the railroads were pricing themselves out of the market on many commodities. The proposed rate increase inevitably would become another case in point. Ultimately there would be an even greater decline in the movement of Oregon lumber with a consequent serious loss of freight revenue to be expected by the railroads. This would seem to be the inevitable result of a questionable rate increase, at this time.

In view of these inescapable conclusions, I reiterate my request that the proposed rate increase be suspended and sufficient time be given the shippers to prepare and present their case against the proposed increase.

I would invite your close study of the accompanying letters from Oreogn lumber firms and individuals which emphasize eloquently the points I have tried to summarize in my brief statement. Such study, I am sure, will prompt you to suspend the proposed increase and allow the shippers to prepare and present an orderly case in defense of their position opposing Ex parte 212.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senator.*

---

[From the Oregon Journal of January 21, 1958]

RAIL PROBLEM MORE THAN RATES

If the Interstate Commerce Commission allows the railroads to impose their February 1 rate increase of 2 percent on lumber and lumber products, it will be a discriminatory and below-the-belt blow at the Pacific Northwest.

It also will be a break from the traditional method of establishing new rates in a manner to cause the least effect upon long-established marketing methods.

There is little argument against the fact that railroads need either more revenues or decreased costs. Some increase in rates is part of the answer, as is the possibility of change in some of the antiquated and red-tape laws under which they are forced to operate.

Thought should be given to the other phases of the railroad's problem as well as the simple procedure of continuing to raise rates. A new rate boost is under discussion for next fall when another automatic wage increase becomes effective.

For long-haul areas such as the Far West, and especially for its forest industry which supplies a third of the Nation's lumber and the lion's share of all softwood plywood, flat percentage rate increases are dangerous and promise economic disruption.

Southern lumbermen, the West's heavy competitors in the populous Midwest and East, have a short haul and, on a percentage increase, save heavily in cash over the West.

Our lumbermen, who paid or were forced to charge customers $8.88 more than the South for hauling 1,000 board-feet of lumber into Chicago in 1946, now have a $12.38 disadvantage—more into the East.

Despite this, our lumbermen have indicated indirectly that they realize the dilemma of the railroads by asking an alternative rate increase—a holddown of 2 cents per 100 pounds (the increase on a long haul could not be more than that) in lieu of the flat 2 percent the railroads requested with tongue in cheek.

Such a holddown is based on the 2 percent increase southern lumbermen would pay from Hattiesburg to Chicago, thus maintaining at least close to the present relationship between southern and western rates.

At least the West, with an estimated 150 of its sawmills and several plywood plants closed by poor markets in the past year, would not be placed in a worse competitive position at a time when an added 25 to 41 cents per thousand board-feet transportation cost would have to be absorbed by the mills and would be enough to bring further closures.

In the meantime, railroad men in the past week have been testifying before Congress that they need better opportunity under law to reduce fares where they are in competition with trucks and other transportation methods. An official of one major western road testified that the rails "are not able to change [rates] rapidly enough to give the farmers the benefit of more efficient lower cost rail transportation," in referring to the hauling of farm products.

Important in the current upward pressure on rates, he pointed out that antiquated laws prevent diversification that has helped other industries meet competitive ills, tax structures prevent acquisition of sufficient capital to meet requirements of the present and immediate foreseeable future, the 3 percent excise tax on freight charges and 10 percent on passenger fares and myriads of other regulations leave the roads in a snarl of redtape and cost problems.

The 2-cent holddown rate increase would appear feasible as an emergency measure now, but let us also look into the other phases of the railroads' problems, too, for at least part of future answers. Their problem is a national one and among those deserving high priority.

---

[From the Oregonian of January 23, 1958]

TAX THAT HELPS NOBODY

In a statement submitted to the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, President D. J. Russell, of the Southern Pacific, made this comment, among others:

"One of the desirable changes in ICC policy under existing law would be for the Commission to permit the railroads to follow to a maximum degree their own managerial discretion in making rate adjustments. This would apply to both increases and reductions.

"In our western territory, well over 90 percent of our interstate freight traffic moves under individual commodity rates voluntarily established by the railroads on levels below the rates prescribed by the Commission. Southern Pacific and the other railroads have established these commodity rates over the years at relatively low levels to promote the movement of particular commodities between designated points and in order to meet marketing situations or competitive conditions."

In other words, the railroads are not charging western shippers all the ICC allows. The implication is that if the roads were released from some of the Government restrictions, which are helping drive business to other forms of transportation, they still would not bear down.

This would be more reassuring if, at the same time the railroads are appealing to Congress for more freedom of operations, they were not also attempting to obtain from the ICC another 2 percent increase in lumber freight rates. Such an increase would place western lumbermen at a further disadvantage in competing with southern mills in the eastern markets.

The railroads have made a strong case before the Senate subcommittee. Intercity freight traffic by rail dropped from 75 percent in 1930 to 48 percent in 1956. Intercity passenger business of the railroads in the same period declined from 15.6 percent to 8.08.

The lost business has gone to "subsidized" air, highway, and water transportation.

Among the things the railroads have asked are: Freedom to make competitive freight rates, without the long delays and sometimes refusals involved in ICC rate cases; a fair break with motor carriers in the matter of

exemptions from controls in transporting agricultural commodities; and freedom to engage in other modes of transportation.

Surface carriers are practically prohibited from engaging in any form of air transportation, said Mr. Russell. Rail carriers are severely handicapped in any endeavor to engage in highway and water transportation. There is no present danger that the railroads could obtain a monopoly in any other form of transportation, he declared. Instead, the principal opponents to the removal of legal restrictions in this regard are those who are at present entrenched in motor, air, or water transportation.

Not all will agree that there would be no danger of monopoly if railroads were turned loose to raise or lower rates at will and to enter without restriction into competition on the highways, the waterways, and in the air.

But one thing all appear agreed on: the 3 percent Federal excise tax on freight and 10 percent on passengers should be repealed.

The Union Pacific has reprinted a statement attributed to Edward R. Jelsma, Director of the ICC Bureau of Transport Economics and statistics, that the Government would gain rather than lose by removing these taxes. In 1956, the Government collected $450 million from the freight excise tax. But shippers deducted this from income as business expense and the net return to the Government was only $247 million. It is estimated that repeal of the tax would give railroads $861 million in business now handled by private transportation, which is untaxed. Income taxes on this would total $271,400,000. Along with taxes on revenues recaptured by other carriers, the Government might be $90 million a year better off without the excise tax than with it.

Whatever the railroads may obtain from Congress in legislation improving their competitive position, certainly the public can expect repeal of this tax which nobody wants and which is of little, if any, value to the Government as a revenue raiser.

## URSULINE DAY IN ILLINOIS—PROCLAMATION BY GOV. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the proclamation issued by the Honorable William G. Stratton, Governor, State of Illinois, proclaiming January 26, 1958, as Ursuline Day throughout Illinois. This is, indeed, high recognition of their activities in the field of Christian education.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY GOV. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

Whereas the convent of St. Joseph of the Ursuline Order of Nuns was established in Springfield 100 years ago for the purpose of bringing Christian education and culture into this community; and

Whereas the quality of their teaching was recognized by people of all religious denominations who were seeking the best in education; and

Whereas the Ursuline Nuns have continually improved, expanded, and made new additions to their educational facilities, and today Springfield Junior College stands as one of the finest coeducational institutions of higher learning in this State: Now, therefore,

I, William G. Stratton, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim January 26, 1958, as Ursuline Day throughout Illinois, and officially invite the attention of our citizens to the many worthwhile educational and cultural contributions of one of the first religious orders of women to establish themselves within the borders of this State.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the statehouse, in the city of Springfield, this 23d day of December 1957, and of the State of Illinois the 139th.

## NEED FOR INTERSTATE HIGHWAY BETWEEN PORTLAND AND SPOKANE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a direct highway link between Portland, Oreg., and Spokane, Wash., would be of great strategic and commercial importance. Such an addition to the Federal Interstate Highway System would provide a direct link with Portland of the giant Atomic Energy Commission's facilities at Hanford, Wash., and provide a direct commercial link with the inland empire area of eastern Washington, northern Idaho, and western Montana.

This proposed additional link in our Federal Interstate Highway System would mean the addition of some 125 miles of highway, following the present route of U. S. Highway 395, starting at Boardman, Oreg., on U. S. 30, serving the cities of Pasco and Kennewick, Wash., and running up to Ritzville, Wash., where it would connect with U. S. 10. Highways 10 and 30 are already part of the Federal Interstate Highway System.

Mr. President, last December 16, 1957, I wrote Mr. Bertram D. Tallamy, Federal Highway Administrator, and urged the inclusion of the vital highway link providing a direct water-level route between Portland and the inland empire in the Federal Interstate Highway System. The Portland Oregonian, in an effective editorial of December 21, 1957, stated the important reasons why such an addition should be made to the Federal Interstate Highway System.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of my letter of December 16 to Mr. Tallamy, together with the editorial of December 21 from the Oregonian.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *December 16, 1957.*

Mr. BERTRAM D. TALLAMY,
*Federal Highway Administrator,*
*Bureau of Public Roads,*
*Department of Commerce,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. TALLAMY: I am writing to you regarding a proposed extension of the Federal Interstate Highway System which would be of great strategic importance to our country and, at the same time, provide an important commercial link, uniting important parts of the population of the Pacific Northwest.

Officials of the Portland Chamber of Commerce and the Retail Trade Bureau have talked with me at some length regarding the desirability of providing a modern, Federal highway route between Portland, Oreg., and Spokane, Wash. This route would also serve the vitally and strategically important Hanford, Wash., atomic facilities of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Specifically, the added route would involve an additional mileage of about 125 miles, linking the present United States Highway 30 with United States Highway 10. I would suggest that the extension follow the route of the present United States Highway 395, starting at Boardman, Oreg., on U. S. 30, and serving the cities of Pasco and Kennewick, Wash., and running up to Ritzville, Wash., where it would connect with U. S. 10.

This proposed extension would provide a direct link between Spokane, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., and would connect the natural flow of commerce and traffic of the inland empire area of eastern Washington, northern Idaho, and western Montana with Portland and its water level route down United States Highway 30. The vital Hanford atomic works would be linked with Portland.

I hope that you and your associates in the Bureau of Public Roads can give serious and important consideration to this proposed addition to our Federal Interstate Highway System. I plan to discuss this matter further with you when I return to Washington.

With best wishes for the holiday season, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senator.*

[From the Portland Oregonian of December 21, 1957]

HIGHWAY QUID PRO QUO

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER should receive wholehearted support from the Portland-Vancouver area and other lower Columbia communities for his proposal that Portland and Spokane be linked by the Interstate Highway System. Senator NEUBERGER has written Bertram D. Tallamy, Federal highway administrator, asking that the Bureau of Public Roads give serious consideration to adding approximately 125 miles to the interstate network between Boardman, Oreg., on Highway 30 and Ritzville, Wash., on Highway 10.

Such a superhighway would have both strategic and commercial value. It would assist the natural flow of traffic along the Columbia River water-grade route between the inland empire and the lower river ports. It would link the Hanford atomic works with Portland.

It is hardly conceivable that the Bureau of Public Roads can refuse the request, since it recently added 132 miles in south-central Washington, connecting Ellensburg and Pendleton. This addition to the system had not even been requested by Washington highway officials. Military needs were given as the reason for that departure from the original plan. Defense of the country should demand as easy communication between Spokane and Portland as between Salt Lake City and Seattle.

Actually, both routes probably would have more commercial than military value. The one already established would facilitate Seattle's motor traffic with eastern Oregon, southern Idaho, and Utah. The Spokane-Portland link would give eastern Washington, northern Idaho, and western Montana freeway access to the easy, water-level route. If one road is to be built with 90 percent Federal aid, then, in all fairness, both should be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDRESS BY TURKISH AMBASSADOR BEFORE NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine and informative address by His Excellency H. E. Suat Hayri Urguplu, Turkish Ambassador to the United States, which was delivered before the New York Board of Trade on January 16, 1958.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend Ambassador Urguplu for his statesmanship and leadership in behalf of improving American-Turkish relations. He is new to our country but has already won many hearts for himself and his Government.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to be here with you. I am sincerely grateful to the directors of the New York Board of Trade for offering me this opportunity of addressing this gathering of such distinguished businessmen and personalities well known in the field of economics and finance.

I am a lawyer by profession and have made a career of politics and diplomacy. Therefore, in trying to explain to you Turkey's economic problems, difficulties, and their proposed remedies, I beg your indulgence if I do not talk to you in the language you are accustomed to in dealing with economic matters. For the same reason, I shall omit details and technicalities, and endeavor to draw a general picture.

If I am not discouraged in venturing into this unfamiliar field, it is because of one fact: During the 4 months that I have been in the United States, I have noted the quest of the Americans for truth and realities. I have learned that one of the many admirable characteristics of the American Nation is that it is receptive to new ideas. You listen to all views, even to criticism of your own affairs by others, with a maturity which surpasses tolerance. I, thus, take the liberty of talking openly and frankly to you.

As you know, Turkey is a fairly large country—about 300,000 square miles (294,500 square miles) in area. Our population is over 25 million, of which about 80 percent is rural and dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood. It is a country of varied climatic conditions, rich in natural resources, favorable to a large variety of agricultural products, cattle raising and fishing, with a potential mineral wealth, and a highly promising economic future.

About 15 different companies—many of them American firms—at present are engaged in the search for oil and the development of petroleum industries in Turkey. Since petroleum is plentiful in the general area, and since there are indications that it exists also in Turkey, we are confident that soon we shall have oil too in sufficient quantities.

The Turks are a modest, unambitious people, used to difficulties and hardships, uncomplaining, obedient, somewhat slow but hard working. They like the good and the new, adopt them easily, and yet are firmly attached to their traditions and country.

It would be an inexcusable omission for an Ambassador not to mention Turkish-American relations.

Up to the present time, there has been absolutely nothing to cast even the slightest shadow on the friendship between the United States and Turkey. This is a friendship based on mutual appreciation and respect and on legitimate common interests. We are continuing and closely watching over this deep-rooted relationship.

In addition, we are allies within NATO, and are working together in the committees of the Baghdad Pact. Thus our cooperation in the maintenance of world peace and security is complete.

The latest scientific and political advances of Russia have had no effects in Turkey. The Turks have been amazed to learn that they had produced a psychological shock here in this country and in the world. Even if these Russian successes should go further than the experimental stage, we are convinced that it is the human element, the historical worth and heroism of nations, which would be decisive in the end. We firmly believe that the American people are capable of closing every gap, and would show the heroism inherent in their history. We know that our future, the happiness and prosperity of both our nations, lie in our determination to maintain this unity of purpose unharmed.

Let me now turn to economic problems.

The Turks have been a fighting nation all along their history. We have had continuous wars for centuries. In the last 300 years, we have had 13 major wars with Russia alone, totaling some 57 years. We spent the remaining 243 years in an armed cold war, which is still continuing. If we add to this the other wars we have had, it is not difficult to see why Turkey remained an economically underdeveloped country.

Turkey maintained its political independence, in spite of the fact that some of these wars were lost. But, then, we have had to concede economic privileges to the victors. Some of our richest resources were turned over to foreign powers. They were used and fully exploited to our disadvantage. The Turks were excluded from their operation and economic administration.

When, shortly after the end of World War I, Turkey, under Ataturk, emerged from its war of independence, this situation was changed. The Turks, for the first time, assumed full charge of their national resources and economic affairs.

As a result of all these circumstances, we were some two centuries late in starting our economic development. It is only for the last, say, 25 years that we have been directing our energies toward that purpose. That is a very short time in the life of a nation, and it must be admitted that in our economic and industrial life we are yet very young and inexperienced. Thus, our actions in this field, as those of a very young person, may sometimes be rash, overconfident, and may contain a certain percentage of error.

But that is normal. There are countries and empires today which have had centuries of experience in trade and industry. They have large numbers of trained and experienced personnel, rich resources and accumulated capital, and they rule vast colonies still. In spite of all this wealth, these countries are striving still to solve very serious economic difficulties and are making every effort to obtain economic aid. Turkey's economic plight is not worse than theirs.

Now, to give you a general picture of Turkish economy, let me quote briefly from a report of the International Monetary Fund: "Until recently Turkey was essentially a self-sufficient and low income-producing economy, in which the majority of the population subsisted on the small produce obtained from the land by the hard work of a poorly nourished labor force, working with grossly inadequate tools. The volume of imports was small and was paid for by the exports of a few staple, semiluxury goods and some metals. There were few industries besides handicrafts, some textile, munition, and sugar plants, and a small steel plant were built in the thirties, and these, at least until 1946, were protected by severe quantitative restrictions. * * *"

What does this mean in actuality? Let us suppose that we are able to ride in a highly developed American sputnik over the Turkish skies, and looking down in our instruments can see through the walls and roofs the daily life of the Turkish people. Let us also concentrate on the peasants or 20 million people living in 40,000 rural communities.

We shall see that a very great majority of these people live in villages, where the problems of water and lighting have not been completely solved yet. The essential requirements of some of them are lacking still. Their standards of living are not anywhere near those of the American rural population, nor even those of the European peasant. At sunup, the Turkish peasant leaves for his field, together with his wife who works in the field also just as hard as a man, and together with his children, including his 4- or 5-year-old son to take care of the livestock.

Until sundown, he works and sweats over a soil which has been exhausted through at least file milleniums of actual cultivation, unaided by mechanical power, or by modern methods of irrigation, fertilization, improved seeds or insecticides. The returns of this extreme daily effort by the entire family are between 50 cents and a dollar. You may calculate that at the official or black-market rate; what difference does it make?

As I said, this is a realistic picture of over 40,000 communities in Turkey, where 20 million people live, including my own home village.

This is a major problem of Turkey which has been realized and efforts have been made from time to time to correct it. But the great Russian threat looming over us has compelled us to direct all the capabilities of the country to our security, to safeguard our very existence. We have had to maintain large forces under arms, feed and supply them. Thus, for the last 30 years, an average of 1 million people in their most active age was taken away from the productive labor force and was added on to the most expensive purely consumer group and this is continuing still.

I said most expensive, but this is a relative term and is only true within the framework of Turkish economy. The Turkish soldier who, as you all know, serves his country with the utmost self-sacrifice, and with enthusiasm, receives only 16 cents for 30 days as a nominal compensation. The means and facilities available for his food, clothing, and housing are equally very limited. (If I remember the figures correctly, it was disclosed at a recent Senate hearing that the annual maintenance cost of 1 Turkish soldier amounted to $136, as against some $5,500 for 1 United States serviceman.)

This general picture, naturally, brings us to Turkey's efforts for economic development.

The program which was followed for Turkey's recent economic development—again to quote the 1955 report of the International Monetary Fund—"consisted essentially of three basic points: (1) To utilize modern production tools and methods to speed up the expansion of production of agricultural produce, both by improvement in the yield of the area already under cultivation and by bringing under the plow lands which, because the existing equipment in the hands of the peasant was inadequate to cultivate them, had hitherto been used only as pasture; (2) to intensify the search for and to exploit the country's mineral resources with modern technical equipment, and, pari passu with the expansion of agricultural production, to improve public utilities necessary for agricultural and industrial development, such as electric power, harbors, transportation; (3) to encourage private enterprise in industry and trade and thus depart as speedily as possible from the previous statistic management of the economy."

This program was put into effect and vigorously pursued for the last 8 years. The

results obtained were phenomenal. Let me try to illustrate this point by giving you certain figures—for, I know that you like, and especially insist on figures:

These are comparative figures and clearly show the contrast between the year 1950 and 1957.

| | 1950 | 1957 |
|---|---|---|
| Total bank credits | $1,330,000,000 | $7,701,000,000 |
| Agricultural credits | 324,000,000 | 1,926,000,000 |
| Commercial credits | 681,000,000 | 2,000,000,000 |
| Industrial credits | 262,000,000 | 1,900,000,000 |
| Credits on real estate | 78,000,000 | 472,000,000 |
| Bank deposits | 989,000,000 | 5,331,000,000 |

These figures are significant, of course, because they show the increasing volume of economic activity. Other figures are equally significant.

| | 1949–50 | 1955–57 |
|---|---|---|
| Average agricultural production—tons | 9,118,000 | 19,613,000 |
| By value—liras | 856,000,000 | 7,470,000,000 |

Number of industrial workers: 1950, 71,033; 1957, 253,061.

Let me also give you some figures on governmental activities. To take one area; namely, that of public education.

| | 1950 | 1957 |
|---|---|---|
| Number of elementary schools | 12,511 | 19,769 |
| Number of secondary schools | 343 | 551 |
| Number of high schools | 59 | 100 |

I do not wish to go into further detail. The comparative figures for roads, harbors, dams, power stations, and other public facilities, are equally impressive.

All these naturally required considerable capital investment, and our resources were limited due to our large military expenditures. However, we invested what we could afford—and some say, what we could not afford—in trying to improve the plight of our people. Our requirements were, and still are, enormous. Our limited resources and capabilities evaporated as a drop of water in the desert.

Let me now turn to some specific criticisms of Turkey's economic development.

May I say at the outset that sincere and wholesome criticism does not irritate us. What is distressing is that sometimes these critical objections are repeated as slogans by everybody, whether or not they know and understand the real facts or not, and are used knowingly or unknowingly, to determine our economic expansion. And sometimes even persons who know Turkey and who, we believe, are friends of Turkey take up this chorus.

The most general and common of these objections that I have heard or read is to the speed of Turkey's expanding economy. It is said that Turkey is expanding its economy through artificial measures, at a speed beyond its available resources; that the development has not been carefully planned; and that errors have been committed in putting it into effect.

This is undoubtedly the least comprehensible objection to the economic policy of Turkey. For decades, Turkey's inactivity in the economic field, and its reluctance to initiate economic development had been a subject of criticism. We were told that although the basic factors of industry, such as coal, iron, and power resources like water, were plentiful in Turkey, we were unable to develop them. We were told that although Turkey was spared from the direct devastation of the second World War, we had been unable to develop economically and to come to the aid of the devasted countries. We were told by world-famous economic authorities: that Switzerland had only water, Germany only coal, and yet they were most highly industrialized countries; you have all of them and more, you have a large variety of minerals, various other raw materials; what is holding you from developing all these resources?

We are criticized because we have no plan. And yet, there was no plan in the American aid which has been largely instrumental in our development. No one told us that such and such an amount of aid would be forthcoming; that it would be spread over so many years; that we would plan its use together; and that we would then spend it according to this predetermined plan.

Now, I would like to ask those who object to the speed of our expansion: should we go back? Should we dismantle the few modest plants that we have been able to build through your generous aid; or should we leave them to crumble, before they are completed and have become fully productive? Our resources are expanding fast; our production is increasing rapidly. Should we stop that?

As I already admitted, we may have made some mistakes. But let me assure you, these are common mistakes and the responsibility is not ours alone. It is shared with you and it is our duty to work together to correct them. I have heard not one of my American friends claim that the aid program is working ideally. My best friends keep repeating sincerely that it would have been possible to put the program into better use and to obtain better results. The wisest course of action now is not to stop or to destroy, but to find and pinpoint our common mistakes and together try to correct them.

Furthermore, as I also mentioned, there are some great powers, rich countries with enormous resources, which have received and are receiving several times larger amounts of aid than Turkey from you. And yet they keep speaking of their economic crisis, and publicly repeat that they are ruined financially because of their high expenditures. They send high-ranking officials here to negotiate with your statesmen and to obtain further aid.

While we are spending our utmost efforts to correct our mistakes and to remedy our economic plight, I feel that we deserve some patience, tolerance, and understanding on your part.

Another common criticism which has been hurled at us is that we should devaluate, put an end to inflationary pressures and tighten our belt in order to develop a balanced economy.

Turkey is making constant efforts to improve its economic and financial situation. We have tried devaluation twice during the recent decades: Once in 1944 and again in 1947. During the last years also, we have adopted what might be called a multiple-rate system, consisting of a tourist and retention quota rate besides the official rate of exchange. But devaluation is not the answer. We have learned by actual experience that devaluation can only be a remedy if a country has large quantities of goods which it cannot export or consume on the internal market. That is not the case in Turkey. We have no surplus stocks to get rid of. There is plenty of demand on the internal market. Our problem is to increase production and devaluation does not help that. During the two previous occasions, its effect was that our staple products on the market disappeared within 1 week. Cotton, tobacco, figs, raisins, or minerals vanished completely, and prices rose to exorbitant levels. Everything went to the black market. We tried also the complementary method of complete or partial rationing, during the First and Second World Wars. We have learned, also by actual experience, that it is virtually impossible to apply an effective system of rationing in Turkey. The country is vast, production centers are very few, facilities for transportation or stockpiling are limited. Furthermore, the psychological characteristics and habits of the people are not favorable to the imposition of such a system, even if that were possible politically.

The high prices, which are attributed to inflationary pressures within the country, is the necessary price which we have to pay for the expansion of our economy, or the initiation of economic activity. It is the incentive that we have to provide, to put 20 million people to work economically, to induce them to adopt unfamiliar modern methods and to produce in a liberal economy of free enterprise. It is the only alternative that the West has to the methods of the totalitarian systems.

Rising prices are the necessary consequence of the facilities and plants which we have built, and which you have helped us build. It is the consequence of keeping large and consuming forces under arms, which we provide for our security and your own. May I add parenthetically that the Turkish land forces assigned to NATO are more than 24 divisions with 12 of them at the highest standards of preparedness. The Turkish divisions constitute some 28 percent of the total ground forces at present assigned to SHAPE or under the orders of your own General Norstad.

Under these circumstances, it is no longer possible to provide for the requirements of Turkey with a budget of 1 billion liras, as was the case in the middle forties. Our budget for this year has passed the 4 billion mark. And yet, just before the new year, almost 200 million liras were taken away and sterilized by the Central Bank. Is this the inflationary pressure that they are talking about?

May I say also a few words with regard to tightening our belts. I have tried to give you an idea of the living conditions and standards of the Turkish peasant and the Turkish soldier. And yet, they continue to live, work and serve with the highest degree of honor, self-sacrifice and courage. I can find no place for a new hole in their belts to tighten them. Most of them even have no belts. If anyone can find such a place for a new hole, without pushing them into further misery, let him show it to us.

We feel that it is our responsibility to provide for our people at least slightly better, but still very modest standards of living. We have not been able to give to our people yet one single lump of sugar a day, a suit of clothes, apart from his work clothes, which he can put on on Sundays and holidays, and one pair of shoes per year. We have not been able to do that yet, and we are working for it.

We have been criticized also that some of the factories and plants we built were not economical.

Let me point out first of all that a free society is not an economic machine. There are various other points, political points, social points, strategic points and others that have to be considered in reconstructing a country.

Just to take one aspect of it, we had very few industrial plants at the beginning of World War II. But, during the war, when we made them work 24 hours on 3 shifts, we learned their value. We know that, if a third war comes, the only assistance that a country could expect from its allies would be confined to some armed units and military materiel, to be airlifted overseas. Convoys carrying sugar, coffee, marmalade, textiles, shoes, or powdered eggs are now history.

Therefore, the line we have to take is clear: we must develop in peacetime the minimum means of production which would carry us through such an emergency.

Let me turn to my last point and discuss with you briefly our views on American aid.

I must say, first of all, that we are, as a nation, deeply grateful for the aid that we receive. We are also convinced that it is a wise investment of the United States, that it is being put to good use in Turkey, and that we deserve it.

I have been using the expression "American aid," for lack of a better term. The official wording is, of course, "mutual security." President Eisenhower, in his recent state of the Union message, called for the strengthening of mutual-security arrangements, and condemned the catchword: "giveaway" program. Secretary of State Dulles, in a speech he made in Chicago, on November 30, 1954, said: "In some cases, the local forces which seem necessary are larger than the local governments can support. If so, we help out. That, however, is not a 'handout.' It is something called 'foreign aid,' although I dislike that phrase. The correct and better phrase is mutual security."

Well, we feel the same way about the assistance that we receive. I am not, of course, talking about the military assistance, which is confined to military hardware and some supplies. That has very indirect and only negative repercussions on the economy, if any. I wish to limit myself to economic, or "defense support," assistance, as it is called. Let me mention some points with regard to the application of this program in Turkey.

Under this program and with the aid of American funds, a vast and very necessary system of highways was built. This, along with some other measures adopted, promoted economic activity in Turkey and brought the rural communities into direct contact with production centers and markets. Thus, the peasant was able to offer his produce to the market, and with the money he made, has entered into our economic structure as a consumer. Our difficulty starts there. When a rural population of 20 million entered the market as consumers, our internal production and stocks, and our imports were not sufficient to meet the demand. Our existing plants had to be operated at top capacity, on 2 or 3 shifts. The new industries which had been initiated had not, and have not, become productive yet. The machinery and installations of the existing plants depreciated rapidly. The wages and the demand for labor kept rising. Prices rose also. Demand and consumption increased rapidly and steadily.

To increase imports in order to meet the demand, we had to have more exports, and therefore, higher production.

But both in the agricultural and industrial sectors, production could not keep up with the tempo of the rising demand. It was not easy for the peasant to adopt new methods and techniques of scientific cultivation, of mechanized farming. As I have mentioned, the problems of irrigation, fertilizing, insecticides and seed improvement had not yet been entirely solved. These needed time. New industries also required time to become fully productive.

When this situation was coupled with the shortages of imported goods, which necessarily had to be restricted, the result was rising prices and the well-known difficulties which we are facing today.

In addition to consumer goods, we had to obtain from abroad the spare parts of our rapidly depreciating capital equipment, such as industrial machinery, railroad equipment, tractors, trucks, cars, etc * * * and some raw materials for our industry. We had difficulties there also due to our yet insufficient exports and foreign resources.

But spare parts and raw materials were essential to keep the economy going. So, we had to resort to long-term and medium-term foreign credits to obtain them, and through bilateral arrangements we had to earmark some of our future exports to the servicing of these credits. Our foreign-exchange receipts were thus further restricted. We did not receive the total counterpart of our exports, but had to allocate large portions of it to the repayment and servicing of our debts.

In addition, severe droughts and adverse weather conditions for the last 4 years, which have affected particularly our wheat-producing regions, have cost us at least $300 million of good foreign exchange.

In short, in spite of all these difficulties, as I have already pointed out, our production is rising steadily and rapidly. However, a much faster increase in consumption, has both caused rises in prices, and has restricted our export capabilities.

My intention in drawing for you this picture in some detail is that although we are doing our best to increase our production, we are still far from our objective, and that the aid we receive falls very short of our requirements. Particularly that portion of aid which should or could be used to increase our production is insufficient.

Let me illustrate this point. For instance, in the Adana area, we have built the Seyhan Dam which cost over $23 million. The dangers of floods were eliminated. The people of the region are grateful. But the funds required to complete the irrigation system, which is a much smaller sum, are not forthcoming. We have not been able to obtain the credit which we requested. As a result, the dam is only a wall for flood control, and one of the most fertile regions of Turkey is sufferng from lack of irrigation, which was at least provided irregularly by floods before the dam was built.

Such examples may be multiplied. Many projects, as for instance in electrification, or the exploitation of our minerals have not become fully productive because they are incomplete. Thousands of farm tractors, trucks or other means of transportation, and even some of our major industrial plants have remained inactive because we cannot get the spare parts required for their activation. Some of our industrial plants, even those set up by foreign private capital, are in serious difficulty because of the shortage of raw materials and spare parts.

Since this problem, for one reason or another, is not treated as a separate heading in the assistance we receive within the framework of the Turkish-American cooperation, we are unable to solve it satisfactorily. The aid extended to us does not follow a preagreed plan. It is released in amounts previously unknown, at irregular intervals, and allocated to definite sections. It is consequently impossible for the Turkish Government to plan ahead and to use it in the most needed areas. Thus, it is used for daily requirements which, at the time, seem to present the highest priority.

I have tried, earlier in my talk, to illustrate what we have been able to achieve in a very short time, by quoting certain figures. These figures show that we have not remained inactive, that we have worked for our development, and that we have been able to utilize properly the aid that we receive. May I also point out that it is not only criticism that we face. Several American missions, distinguished Senators and Congressmen or journalists, who visit Turkey, see the tangible results obtained, appreciate it and further encourage us. Their statements and views are public knowledge. Just to give you an example of these encouragements let me quote from an article by Mr. Sulzberger of the New York Times. In an article which appeared on September 25, 1957, Mr. Sulzberger writes about Turkey: "This land needs and deserves help from us. But to bulwark it for the long haul of a revived cold war, is it not logical to consider the desirability of increasing our nonmilitary assistance. * * * The economic bones of Turkey need more marrow. In no case is a bankrupt ally strong." There are many Americans, perhaps several among you, who feel the same way. I hope that I shall have the opportunity in the future of hearing the individual views of each one of you, and of listening to your criticism if you have any.

Let me thus turn to the amount of the so-called economic aid that we receive. To illustrate my point I shall give you some figures, comparing the amount received by Turkey—the largest country in Europe in area with 25 million inhabitants—with those received by some other countries: These are the totals received as economic aid during a period of 8 years, from 1948 to 1956, in millions of dollars:

| Country | Credits | Grants | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Turkey | $130 | $430 | $560 |
| United Kingdom | 384 | 3,444 | 3,828 |
| France | 225 | 2,966 | 3,191 |
| Italy | 95 | 1,517 | 1,612 |
| Western Germany | 17 | 1,530 | 1,547 |
| The Netherlands | 149 | 939 | 1,088 |
| Greece | 25 | 845 | 870 |
| Yugoslavia | 15 | 350 | 365 |
| India | 82 | 186 | 268 |

May I also remind you that some of these countries, in addition to the American economic aid, are receiving large amounts of aid from Communist sources.

These figures express my point very eloquently. I wish to add my personal opinion. Since this is not an aid extended for humanitarian purposes, but admittedly for mutual security, its basic principle should be changed. Its object should be adjusted to its intent, and it should be extended to selected allies on the basis of priorities and a graduated scale. Friends and allies should be treated on a different basis from foes and uncommitted countries. Only if the allies are strong can they do their share in emergencies and difficult times.

Before concluding, may I add that our objective is to so develop the country that we shall be able to do our share without foreign aid. In its long history, Turkey has never taken, but was always in a position to give to others; and we have always given. Fate has put us in a position today where we are obliged to take. Events are such that we sometimes have delays in the repayment of our debts. But no one, at any time, has lost money in Turkey.

We are confident of the future of our country. We are a nation which has seen many difficult days, and weathered many storms. The Turkish Empire was not built on aid. Nor do we face our present problems and difficulties in discouragement and despair.

But the Turks never forget a helping hand. Maxims and sayings express the experience and wisdom of nations. We have an old saying: "A cup of coffee makes friends for 40 years."

Let me assure you that when happier days come—and we are confident that they will come—we will never forget American aid. Thank you.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, while the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is in the Chamber, I should like to ask him a question, which was suggested to me by an item on the Executive Calendar for today, namely, the confirmation of the appointment of an Ambassador to the Republic of Syria.

According to news reports during the past few days—and I heard such a report on the radio this morning—Syria and Egypt are forming a single state. If I correctly understood the report over the radio this morning, the union is supposed to be consummated today.

I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations whether we will continue to send an Ambassador to Syria and another Ambassador to Egypt, and what will be the effect of the union of these two countries into one state under such circumstances.

Mr. GREEN. Well, I believe it would be indelicate, to say the least, for the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to discuss the rumored marriage of convenience before it has been officially announced; and I should think that it would be most difficult to trace down all the rumors which appear in the press.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I understand it is more than a rumor; it has been freely published, and it has been announced, whether officially or unofficially, that that union is to take place. Furthermore, I believe it was stated that the two countries were going to sign an agreement for such a union today. I am not sure about it, but I did hear something to that effect. In any event, it does raise an interesting question.

Mr. GREEN. It does.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not asking the chairman of the committee to give us a final answer, but I believe it does provoke some thinking on the part of all of us. I was particularly interested in the subject, because we have been called on today to confirm the appointment of an Ambassador to Syria.

Mr. GREEN. Perhaps we should appoint twins as Ambassadors to the new country rumored to be formed by Syria and Egypt.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will accept the answer of the distinguished chairman, even though he did not give me the information that I sought. I still believe it is something we should be thinking about.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I was particularly interested in the exchange of ideas between the distinguished Senators in relation to the situation in the Mideast. I believe it is a matter which calls for earnest consideration. I refer to the matter of Syria, far to the north, and Egypt, far to the south in the Mideast area, joining together. It means that we will have to keep our eyes open. I understand that they are not only going to join politically, but will also join their armed forces. We must make sure that they do not become the tool of the Kremlin. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Alabama brought up the subject.

## SENATOR PURTELL'S RECORD AS CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN CALENDAR COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, the Republican policy committee accepted with regret the resignation of the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], as chairman of the Republican calendar committee.

I believe it is only fitting that his colleagues on this side of the aisle for whom he has performed a most important service in his capacity as chairman express their appreciation of the work he has done.

Senator PURTELL's chairmanship reflected great credit upon himself and upon the Senate. BILL PURTELL threw himself enthusiastically into the great amount of work which this responsibility entailed, and the speedy and efficient progress of the calendar calls was impressive testimony to his diligent and most informed effort.

Senator PURTELL served on the committee with two other very able members of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. His chairmanship was marked with dignity, consideration for all the Members of the Senate, and outstanding service to the people of the country.

His genuine desire for cooperation, and his high integrity, have elicited complimentary remarks from the other side of the aisle on several occasions. I venture to state that as chairman of the calendar committee he has been held in as high esteem and in as high respect as any other Senator who has held the chairmanship of such a committee.

His performance has been in the highest traditions of the Senate, and he has established a most enviable record. I therefore wish officially to express my appreciation, as chairman of the Republican policy committee, for the value of his work and his efforts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire in paying tribute to Senator PURTELL for the outstanding work he has done for some considerable period of time as chairman of our calendar committee. It is difficult work, and it requires a great deal of attention to the details of proposed legislation. The Members on both sides of the aisle recognize the importance of the respective calendar committees, which now operate on both sides of the aisle. Certainly I know of no other Member of the Senate who has devoted more conscientious effort and work to his duties in this capacity than has the Senator from Connecticut, as indeed he has also to the standing committees of the Senate on which he serves as a distinguished member.

As minority leader of the Senate, I am glad to join with the distinguished chairman of the policy committee in expressing my deep appreciation for the work Senator PURTELL has done on that committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join with my distinguished senior colleagues in expressing appreciation for Senator PURTELL's work. As a lawyer I should like to say that, standing at the gates of the Senate Calendar, and in holding up what ought to be held up and in taking the responsibility for letting pass what ought to be passed, is no inconsiderable discharge of public duty in this Republic.

Not only the Senate, but also the country as a whole, must be grateful to Senator PURTELL for his stewardship, and I believe that as many Senators as can do so should join in expressing their appreciation on this occasion.

## MORE DEPRAVITY BY UNION GOONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the sanctimonious pose of some of the Nation's labor leaders is shattered when incidents such as one which took place recently in Toledo, Ohio, are spread upon the public record. I refer to a stench bombing episode, and other depravity, which, from all reports, were inspired and carried out by UAW representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that several articles appearing in the Toledo, Ohio, newspapers detailing this situation be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point so that Mr. Walter Reuther's self-serving pronouncements, now being advertised in the Halls of the Congress and the public press, can be put in proper perspective.

There being no objection, the news articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Toledo Blade of January 1, 1958]

STENCH VIALS LEAD TO ARREST OF PAIR—MATERIAL FOUND IN TRUCKS, CAR

Police arrested two union officials yesterday on a charge of possessing stench bombs after broken vials of the offensive liquid were found in two delivery trucks parked in the alley behind Lasalle's.

Booked at the Safety Building were Robert Adams, 40, of 5334 Bennett Road, whom police identified as an international representative of the UAW and Melvin Zimkowski, 46, of 2666 Laskey Road, who said he was executive secretary of the United Labor Committee.

Both men were released under bond of $1,000 each set by Municipal Judge J. Parker Edwards. A professional bondsman posted the bond.

Patrolmen Richard Parton and Leo Lisowski said they stopped the rented car in which the men were riding at Erie and Adams Streets, and found a number of stench vials packed in a rubber boot. Also confiscated, they said, were a dozen nail boards of the type used to puncture automobile tires.

Police said they investigated reports of a gas leak in the Lasalle's vicinity, scene of a department store strike. An Ohio fuel gas inspector also checked the area, but was unable to find any leak. He then found the stench material in the delivery vehicles.

The car in which the men were riding was rented by a Detroit firm to the UAW organization in that city, Detective Sgt. Fred Shea said.

[From the Toledo Blade of January 7, 1958]

STENCH BOMBS ARE SET OFF IN THREE LASALLE'S STORES—SULFURIC FUMES EMITTED FROM JARS IN TOLEDO, BOWLING GREEN, SANDUSKY

A wave of stench bombing broke out in Lasalle's stores in Toledo, Bowling Green, and Sandusky yesterday, with a total of seven homemade bombs being discovered.

Five of the bombs, emitting a strong sulfuric odor, were found in the Toledo store. The store protection staff located bombs on the 1st, 3d, and 7th floors in the afternoon, and two more were found last night in the basement.

MAN SMASHES JAR

Ernestine Urbaniak, store detective, told police she saw a man enter the store yesterday afternoon and smash a fruit jar against a counter, creating a cloud of sulfuric fumes.

He escaped through the Spitzer Arcade, she said.

At the same time the bombs were being uncovered in the Toledo store, Lasalle's branches in Sandusky and Bowling Green were undergoing similar treatment.

WOMAN FAINTS

In Sandusky a stench bomb went off at 2:05 p. m., causing one woman to faint and forcing customers from the two-story downtown building. The store was temporarily closed as firemen, using smoke ejectors, helped clear the building.

A similar bomb went off at about the same time in the Bowling Green store.

Police recovered several bombs and turned them over to the police laboratory for examination. They were of two types—fruit jars and small vials.

Lasalle's has been struck by the retail clerks union for 7 weeks.

RESCUE SQUAD FINDS BOMB BEHIND ERIE STREET

Rescue squad members, called to the 600 block of Monroe Street yesterday to investigate reports of gas leaks, found a stench bomb at the rear of 114 Erie Street.

Police Capt. Ted Kwiatkowski, head of the police laboratory, said the bomb was similar to those found in the Lasalle's store here, and contained some form of petroleum derivative in a fruit jar that gave off powerful odors.

---

[From the Toledo Times of January 7, 1958]

STENCH BOMBS REPORTED IN THREE LASALLE STORES

Stench bombs were discovered yesterday in Lasalle's stores in Toledo, Bowling Green, and Sandusky, a company spokesman said last night.

A man believed to have deposited 1 of the 3 devices found in the Toledo store was reported nearly apprehended by store detective Ernestine Urbaniak. She said the suspect carried a fruit jar containing foul-smelling liquid into the shopping area and smashed it against a counter. He escaped through the Spitzer Building arcade, she said.

Another identical stench-producing container was found on the seventh floor of the Toledo store, the spokesman said and a glass vial also giving off a strong tear-producing sulfuric odor was found on the third floor.

The company spokesman said investigation of the incidents, here and in the neighboring cities, has been turned over to police.

Retail clerks union members have been picketing the Toledo store for 7 weeks.

Seven stench bombs were discovered yesterday and last night in Lasalle's stores in Toledo, Bowling Green, and Sandusky.

A man believed to have deposited 1 of the 5 devices found in the Toledo firm was nearly caught by store detective Ernestine Urbaniak.

FRUIT JARS ARE USED

Four of the devices planted in the Adams Street building were made of fruit jars and a liquid which gave off a tear-producing sulfuric odor. Two of them were in a paper bag in the basement shopping area of the store last night, police said.

Earlier in the day two other jars were found emitting foul odors, one on the first floor, the other on the seventh, a company spokesman said last night. A vial producing the same effect was discovered on the third floor, he added.

TURNED OVER TO POLICE

He said the investigation of the incidents, here and in the neighboring cities, has been turned over to police.

Retail clerks union members have been picketing the Toledo store for 7 weeks.

[From the Toledo Blade of January 18, 1958]

MICE, PIGEONS TURNED LOOSE IN LASALLE'S—BIRDS AND RODENTS ARE GATHERED UP; OFFENDERS SOUGHT

Some women customers at Lasalle's were routed yesterday by white mice turned loose by unidentified persons.

At the same time, police said, 4 pigeons were released and added to the confusion by swooping in circles over the heads of shoppers.

Frank J. Baumgartner, acting police chief, said 35 mice and 3 pigeons were picked up. They will be held for safekeeping at the Toledo Zoo.

Patrolmen Richard Smythe and Al Scychowski said when they arrived at Lasalle's several women were running about in fright. The officers caught the mice and all but 1 pigeon with the aid of the store personnel.

Sgt. Vincent J. Kwapich said the fourth pigeon apparently flew out a window.

After being taken to the Safety Building in shoe boxes and paper sacks, the mice created a new emergency.

They started chewing their way out, and we had to put them in a tin bucket, the sergeant said.

If the offenders are caught, police said, they will be prosecuted for violating a city ordinance that prohibits throwing rodents or reptiles on private property, the offense, a misdemeanor, carried a penalty of $100 to $300.

The Retail Clerks Union is picketing Lasalle's.

---

[From the Toledo Blade of January 7, 1958]

STENCH BOMBS HIT THREE LASALLE'S STORES—FUMES RELEASED FROM GLASS JARS

A wave of stench bombing broke out in Lasalle's stores in Toledo, Bowling Green, and Sandusky yesterday, with a total of seven homemade bombs being discovered.

Five of the bombs, emitting a strong sulfuric odor, were found in the Toledo store. The store protection staff located bombs on the first, third, and seventh floors in the afternoon, and two more were found last night in the basement.

MAN SMASHES JAR

Ernestine Urbaniak, store detective, told police she saw a man enter the store yesterday afternoon and smash a fruit jar against a counter, creating a cloud of sulfuric fumes. He escaped through the Spitzer Arcade, she said.

At the same time the bombs were being uncovered in the Toledo store, Lasalle's branches in Sandusky and Bowling Green were undergoing similar treatment.

WOMAN FAINTS

In Sandusky, a stench bomb went off at 2:05 p. m., causing one woman to faint and forcing customers from the 2-story downtown building. The store was temporarily closed as firemen, using smoke ejectors, helped clear the building.

A similar bomb went off at about the same time in the Bowling Green store.

Police recovered several bombs and turned them over to the police laboratory for examination. They were of two types—fruit jars and small vials.

Lasalle's has been struck by the Retail Clerks Union for seven weeks.

---

## CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN EDUCATION—ARTICLE IN PARENTS MAGAZINE

**Mr. WILEY.** Mr. President, it seems certain that we of the 85th Congress are going to enact some constructive legislation to strengthen American education.

It is my earnest hope that, in the process of improving education, we will help American parents and teachers improve all phases of education. I mean not just engineering, not just science and technology—but education for the "whole" man; education in the humanities, in the liberal arts, in the "things of the spirit."

To strengthen American education will cost money. Exactly how much money will be spent, can be spent, should be spent, must be determined in the course of the detailed hearings which will be held here on the Senate side by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and in the counterpart Committee on the House side.

Since the Soviet sputniks, a great deal has been written about American education—its strength and its weaknesses.

One such article, which I have been pleased to note, is, in my judgment, one of the best. It was written by the education editor of Parents magazine, Mr. Fred M. Hechinger. It is published in the February 1958 issue of Parents magazine. This splendid publication goes out each month to 1¾ million American homes. Its publisher is Mr. George J. Hecht, who is also the chairman of the very fine organization, the American Parents' Committee.

This group has done yeoman work in spotlighting the needs of American children in all fields. In my judgment, we cannot have too much such civic enterprise by interested parents, educators, and other experts who devote whole lifetimes to fulfilling the needs of children.

Now, let me say that what we, in effect, need for America is not a so-called crash program in education. Of course, we need more scientists; and we need them as soon as we can get them. But we need to build solid foundations. Why? So that, in the years up ahead, from American high schools and colleges, will come an ever-increasing stream of youngsters able to fulfill all—I emphasize, all—of the needs of this world.

I should like to point out, incidentally, one of the most interesting points made in Mr. Hechinger's article. He quotes the famous scientist, Albert Einstein. He points out that Einstein "never entered a laboratory in his adult life." He indicates that Einstein was seeking the answer to the mysteries of the universe in the firm belief that there is logic and order and reason behind what appears, to superficial impression, as their opposites. He says that Einstein thought that God does not play dice with the universe. Out of such philosophy of order and purpose have come many great conclusions.

We need the very best thinking of which we are capable, as a people—thinking in every field of endeavor.

I send to the desk the text of Mr. Hechinger's article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and that it be preceded by a list of the worthy board of directors and the National Council of the American Parents' Committee.

There being no objection, the list and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE, INC.

OFFICERS

Chairman: George J. Hecht, publisher, Parents' Magazine, founder and secretary for 20 years of the Welfare Council of New York City, vice president, Social Legislation Information Service.

Vice chairmen: Dr. Martha M. Eliot, head, Department of Maternal and Child Health, Harvard University, former chief, United States Children's Bureau; Richard H. Wels, chairman, special committee on the improvement of family laws, New York City Bar Association.

Treasurer: G. Theodore Zignone, treasurer, Parents' Institute, Inc.

Secretary: Melvyn Gordon Lowenstein, attorney, New York, board member, Children's Village.

Executive director: Ada Barnett Stough, in Washington office.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Composed of the chairman, vice chairmen, secretary, and the following:

Joseph P. Anderson, executive secretary, National Association of Social Workers; David Baird, president, Baird Foundation and Lansing Foundation, New York; Bertram Beck, associate executive secretary, National Association of Social Workers; Philip Bernstein, executive director, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc.; Elliott Caplin, president, Toby Press, New York; Maximilian Elser, senior partner, Elser & Associates, New York; Mrs. Herbert P. Fisher, Hartford, Conn., vice president, Child Welfare League of America; Joel H. Fisher, attorney, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Roma Gans, professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University, board member, Citizens' Committee on Children of New York; Max Grant, president, Grant Money Meters Co., Providence, R. I.; Mrs. Luther Gulick, president, Consumers League of New York; Helen Hall, director, Henry Street Settlement, New York, chairman, National Association of Consumers; Mrs. George J. Hecht, board member, New York Society for the Orthopedically Handicapped, former president, Association of Neighbors and Friends of Hunter College; Gertrude Hess, executive secretary, Republican County Committee of New York; Sidney Hollander, chairman, Public Affairs Committee of the Family Service Association of America.

H. C. Honegger, honorary president, Pestalozzi Foundation of America, Inc.; Mrs. Henry A. Ingraham, board member, National YWCA; executive committee member, National Social Welfare Assembly; member, Board of Higher Education of New York City; Carlos L. Israels, New York attorney; chairman, executive committee, United Hias Service; J. Donald Kingsley, executive director, Community Council of Greater New York; Edgar Kobak, business consultant, New York; Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, co-chairman, National Mental Health Committee; Katherine F. Lenroot, former chief, United States Children's Bureau; Mrs. Bradford Leys, R. N., member, Rhode Island State Board of Education; director, Rhode Island State Nurses Association; Sol Markoff, general secretary, National Child Labor Committee; James Marshall, attorney, former chairman of the board of education of New York City; John McDowell, executive director, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers; R. Maurice Moss, associate director, National Urban League; George W. Naumburg, chairman of the finance committee, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, New York; president, Baron de Hirsh Fund; Mrs. Samuel I. Newhouse, wife of the publisher of a chain of 12 newspapers; Basil O'Connor, president, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis; former president, American National Red Cross; Melvin C. Pierce, chairman, child welfare committee, Department of Michigan, the American Legion; Beekman Pool, director, legislative information bureau, State Charities Aid Association, New York; Joseph H. Reid, executive director, Child Welfare League of America; Harold Riegelman, partner of Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, New York law firm; counsel for New York Citizens Budget Commission; Oscar V. Rose, superintendent of schools, Midwest City, Okla.; Richard C. Rothchild, writer, public relations counsel; Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College, New York; Mrs. J. Austin Stone, former chairman and present board member, Women's Joint Congressional Committee; Mrs. Kathryn H. Stone, Arlington, Va.; former vice president, League of Women Voters of the United States; L. Joseph Stone, professor of child study, Vassar College; Mrs. Alvin Thalheimer, former member of Maryland State Board of Education; Ira D. Wallach, president D. S. and R. H. Gottesman Foundation; Sloan Wilson, education editor of Parents' magazine and of the New York Herald Tribune; Mrs. Gertrude Folks Zimand, former general secretary, National Child Labor Committee.

NATIONAL COUNCIL

Mrs. Louis Azrael, board member, Hospital for the Women of Maryland; Edith Baker, former director of medical social work, United States Children's Bureau; Russell W. Ballard, director, Hull House Association, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Margaret Culkin Banning, author, Duluth, Minn.; Dr. Paul W. Beaven, Rochester, N. Y., past president, American Academy of Pediatrics; Leland E. Becraft, executive director, Community Chest of St. Joseph, Mo.; Joseph Bonapart, executive director, Vista Del Mar Child-Care Service, Los Angeles, Calif.; A. David Bouterse, executive director, Pennsylvania Citizens Association for Health and Welfare; Mrs. Winship Chick, chairman, Missouri Council on Children and Youth, board member, Missouri Association for Social Welfare; Edith Valet Cook, attorney, New Haven, Conn., director, Connecticut Child Welfare Association; Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, West Hartford, Conn., honorary president, General Federation of Women's Clubs; Dr. Hildegard Durfee, child psychologist, Brattleboro, Vt.; Mrs. Edwin W. Eisendrath, member of the executive committee, Illinois Commission on Children and Youth; Mrs. Frederick B. Forbes, Territorial Commission on Children and Youth, Honolulu, Hawaii; Mrs. Helen D. Gannon, executive secretary, Virginia Conference of Social Work; Dr. Edward Greenwood, chairman, National Advisory Council on State and Local Action for Children and Youth, Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.; Mrs. Tom Grier, executive secretary, North Carolina Conference for Social Service; Dr. William G. Hardy, director, Hearing and Speech Center, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md.; Dr. Dale B. Harris, director, Institute of Child Welfare, University of Minnesota; Dr. Harold C. Havighurst, dean, School of Law, Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. Marshall Hoppin, president, Alaska Crippled Children's Association; Robert L. Johnson, president, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Merrill Krughoff, director, Health and Welfare Planning, United Community Funds and Councils of America; Robert C. Lappen, member, Iowa Board of Control of State Institutions; Dr. William G. Lennox, director, the Neurological Institute of the Children's Medical Center, Boston, Mass.; Leonard L. Maire, superintendent of schools, Portsmouth, R. I.; Leonard Mayo, director, Association for the Aid of Crippled Children; Arthur P. Miles, director, School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin; Adele J. Minahan, executive secretary, South Carolina Conference of Social Work; Dr. Ralph H. Ojemann, Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, University of Iowa; S. Douglas Polhemus, executive manager, the United Fund of Greater Springfield, Mass.; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt; Dr. Robert R. Sears, executive head, department of psychology, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.; Stewart C. Smith, delinquency consultant, State Youth Development Council, Austin, Tex.; Mrs. Rolla A. Southworth, executive secretary, Florida Conference of Social Welfare; Mrs. Frederick Spiegel, board member, Infant Welfare Society of Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Benjamin Spock, author of Baby and Child Care; James H. Stone, president, Stone Oil Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Walter L. Stone, professor of sociology, Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.; Mrs. Harris H. Thomas, board member, New Hampshire Social Welfare Council; Mrs. De Forest Van Slyck, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Henry H. Welch, executive director, Welfare Council of Delaware; Elizabeth Wickenden, former Washington representative of the American Public Welfare Association; Philip H. Willkie, member of Indiana House of Representatives; Ellen Winston, commissioner, North Carolina State Board of Public Welfare.

---

HAS SPUTNIK TAUGHT US A LESSON?—THE PLIGHT OF AMERICAN EDUCATION AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

(By Fred M. Hechinger, Parents' Magazine's education editor, and past president of the Education Writers' Association)

Some day history will record that education in the United States was either saved or destroyed by sputnik, the Soviet Union's earth satellite. Which it will be—salvation or destruction—it is still too soon to predict. But it is safe to say that the impact of sputnik on the American school and university—for better or for worse—will be tremendous.

What is far more important, however, is the fact that, although the chain reaction has been set off by the Russians, it is now up to the people of the United States to control the direction of the future.

In broad strokes, the picture of past and immediate present is simple: American folklore has had it that the American school was, in every respect, vastly superior to the Russian school. Furthermore, it held that American know-how in science, industry, and technology had a monopoly of efficiency and power which no nation could ever challenge. (Some small dents were made in the fenders of that chromium-plated folklore when the British came up with the discoveries of radar and penicillin and when both the French and British overtook American jet aviation progress. In fact, the legend might already have been questioned earlier when a small army of European scientists helped substantially in the American success of harnessing atomic energy.)

During that period of our seemingly unquestioning superiority, American folklore ironically built up a popular feeling about men of the mind, which fluctuated between contempt and suspicion. The "brain trust" of the Roosevelt era became a hateful and derogatory term. The "brain" in teen-age lingo was used as a term of social ridicule. The "eggheads" were a group of American thinkers and politicians whose very title lost them the support of the American voting public.

In schools and colleges especially, where, after all, the brains of the future are either won or lost, the desirable goals in young Americans have become: (1) to be well rounded (which is another way of saying sufficiently dulled not to stand out either offensively or brilliantly) and (2) to be well liked (which is a key to amiable mediocrity).

Partly as a consequence of all this our schools, colleges, and universities have been given relatively little support compared to

their needs. At the time of the greatest economic prosperity in the history of our country, and probably of the world, our public schools were falling behind more and more seriously in providing enough classrooms for an unprecedented number of children. Since it was neither profitable nor particularly distinguished to enter the teaching profession, the deficit in the number of men and women who chose as their careers the development of young minds grew larger every year.

Like ripples in the water, these conditions have spread: They affected the graduate schools which offered their intellectual diet in return for economic austerity; they seriously cut the number of graduating scientists and engineers; they lured those who did graduate into the profitable rather than the inventive and adventuresome vocational slots.

The period was probably best characterized by the definition of the recent Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson when he said that pure research means "you don't know what you're doing." The period is equally dramatically symbolized by the defeat of a desperately needed Federal aid to school construction law and by the fact that the majority of American colleges and universities have been operating in the red, and that they are ill prepared to serve the increasing numbers of American youth who will seek higher education in the decades ahead.

Then suddenly appeared sputnik. Sputnik was, of course, not only a great achievement, but even more important, it was a symbol of the Soviet's rapid scientific program which is designed to gain military, economic, political, and social supremacy. The curtain suddenly falls on the scene of America's inadequate schools, inadequate teacher salaries and the folklore of the invincible American know-how.

As the curtain goes up on the scene of the future, many of the actors seem to have learned completely new lines. Many of those who had been laughing at the eggheads are now screaming for a crash program to manufacture a maximum number of eggheads. People who used to say comfortably and smugly that the Russian slave school couldn't ever be a threat to the free American school were, in effect, demanding that we substitute the Soviet education blueprint for ours. Sputnik has stampeded them into such talk.

Following sputnik, our papers have been filled with statements about Russian education—school 6 days a week; and for the ablest students who are not diverted at 14 into the labor reserve and technical schools, 10 years of mathematics, 4 years of physics, and 4 years of chemistry; government scholarships for all talented youth; and two and a half times as many engineers and scientists being graduated each year as in America. Accompanying such statements were pleas for a crash program of United States Federal aid for scientific and engineering education.

If the implications of the Russian scientific triumph are read accurately but without panic, then the sudden realization that education is the basis for all progress should at last give American schools the support they need.

This would mean adequate money for buildings, for teachers' salaries, for greater support of higher education, for educational research, and for experimentation. It would lead to a completely revised approach to the slice of the national wealth which the schools should, and must, demand. In the past it had been accepted as inevitable and necessary that the national defense expenditure be given top priority, frequently without concern about the overall budgeting of the economy. Now, it may be recognized that in an age of science and technology, where ideas are weapons, and weapons are ideas, education needs at least as much support as the manufacture of atom bombs, missiles, and rockets; for without education the atomic production lines will grind to a standstill and the laboratories will be empty of ideas.

Our entire concept of the role of education in American life must change. Even the added support of schools provided for in the Federal aid for school construction bill (that was beaten in the past session of Congress largely as a result of the efforts of certain big business interests, and of those who wished to try to speed school integration, by means of such legislation) is piddling. What is needed is:

1. Adequate financial support for school construction. This includes construction of enough schools to do away with all double sessions in all schools. Since a school building program, at best, is a matter of several years between the allocation of money and the completion of the actual buildings, emergency quarters in every available type of building—from private houses to public facilities—should be taken over at once in order to end double sessions now. Practically all educators are agreed that the most damaging roadblock to education is the part-time school. Not only is there a great deficit now in the number of schools, but our rapidly growing population requires a school building program of unprecedented size. Maximum local and State appropriations for that purpose must be supplemented by large-scale Federal aid, as it is for roads, hospitals, mental institutions, agricultural service stations, and forest fire stations. There can be no question about the need for action at once.

2. Far more money is needed to be able to pay the kind of teacher salaries which will reward excellence of instruction with the kind of pay that fits into the social and economic pattern of our society. We desperately need an adequate supply of qualified men and women to teach the sciences and mathematics in our schools. It is well and good to talk about the need for devoted men and women who will enter the teaching profession regardless of financial reward. But it is unrealistic to expect that there will be enough of them to man a mass-education system. Even more important, a society which, for better or for worse, will always consider a certain minimum standard of wealth as a mark of respectability and competence will never get away with a hypocritical attempt to make the teacher live outside those standards.

This should not mean that we can suddenly bribe a large number of young people to go into teaching by offering them high pay as a bait. Even if we could, we would almost certainly attract the least suitable kind of person. But we can put teaching on a competitive economic level which will permit teachers to support their families in a manner of professional respectability. Beyond this, we can—and must—make sure that outstanding service will be rewarded with outstanding pay so that the exceptional teacher will take his place among the outstanding stars of the other areas of American cultural, professional, and industrial life.

3. Money must be offered for education research and experimentation so that it will, for the first time in American history, be as easy to get answers on the facts of education as it has traditionally been to get the details on the growth of corn and the reproduction of hogs.

4. Everything else will be meaningless if a national network of scholarships and loan funds is not established to enable every talented boy and girl to climb as high as possible on the ladder of learning, research, and the general development of the mind. We need not only more scientists, but also more trained minds in the fields of culture, economics, and government.

But in rethinking the approach to student scholarships, the needs of the colleges and universities must be more realistically reconsidered than in the past. There is no gain in flooding the colleges with scholarship students under a financial arrangement which increases the school's deficit with the admission of each additional student. As long as tuition pays for little more than half of a student's education, a matching payment to the college, over and above the tuition scholarship, should be worked out.

So far only the financial impact of sputnik has been discussed. But nothing could be more desperately misleading than the idea that an outpouring of money can save the day. In the long run, the quality and the meaning of American education can only be determined by the people's attitude toward learning and toward the school.

No crash program and no amount of money can do anything about that. It's a matter of public attitude and feeling, a question of priorities and values. Translated into economic terms, it means that as long as parents complain about the high cost of their children's education while they accept, without too much grumbling, the expense of the new TV set and the necessity of the latest model of car, the place of the school on the list of national values will be inferior.

In more abstract terms, the national feeling will be reflected by the relative measure of esteem with which we look up to the thinkers as compared with the doers. It is well and good to turn to the eggheads for emergency help at the moment of desperate crisis. Fortunately, there have generally been enough eggheads around to patch things up and clean up the mess left by thoughtless doers. But for the future world that is only vaguely symbolized by sputnik, it won't be good enough to rely on the thinkers only as a last-minute fire brigade, to be locked up in the firehouse the minute the blaze has been put out. In fact, we are beginning to discover already that the intellectual fire-fighting equipment has become rusty from lack of use.

Finally—and most important—the impact of sputnik could be fatal to America if it leads to a blind imitation of the Soviet education system and to a one-sided, unbalanced support of science and technical education alone.

Never before in the history of the world has the realm of philosophy been as inseparably linked with the domain of science. In the days before World War II, German science and technology were probably as far ahead of the western democracies as Russia appears to be today. Yet, the stamina and integrity of the minds and hearts of the Free World, combined with a revival of productive capacity, overcame the handicap.

If we now pour money into science and technical education alone, we will walk blindly into self-destruction. Even the scientific mind itself—in an age of sputnik, of space concepts and of a rethinking of all the limitations of man—depends as much on an understanding of the arts, the philosophies and the intangible background of the cosmic order and human life, as on the test tube.

Einstein never entered a laboratory in his adult life. He was motivated by the apparently unscientific thought that "God does not play dice with the universe." Who is to say that it was not out of this unscientific, philosophical concept that his world-changing formula emerged or that he did not arrive at some of his most unsettling scientific theories while playing the violin?

A carefully planned program to educate the engineers and scientists that our defense forces and industry need so badly is, of course, vital. But it is even more important that American children should not grow up to be illiterate; that they get a good basic

education, which is so essential to our American democracy and to our economy. We can't have peace, prosperity, and progress without an educated citizenry.

None of this should give educators or the American public generally the comfortable excuse that no changes are needed or that all that is lacking is money. Many changes are needed. While the Soviet program of education must be avoided, this does not mean that the Russian achievement of excellence in instruction and toughness in the demands on the minds of able students should not be a lesson for the American school. It must be the supreme lesson. It must set American educators off on a new search for excellence—without giving up the great social achievement of the American public school in the service of society and democratic living. The two are not incompatible.

If we prove that they are not incompatible, then sputnik will have sent us off on a road that will give new meaning to popular government and make it invincible.

If, on the other hand, we rush off on the panicky assumption that our gains of freedom must now be sacrificed to the idea that we must shoot a rocket to the moon first, then we will have lost everything on earth that free man throughout history has so painfully and so gloriously struggled to achieve.

---

## SMITH-MUNDT ACT 10TH ANNIVERSARY WHITE HOUSE CEREMONIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD, I ask leave to have printed the text of the remarks made by those who participated in the observance of the 10th anniversary of the Smith-Mundt Act in ceremonies in the Cabinet room of the White House on Monday, January 27, as transcribed from a tape recording of the proceedings.

Mr. President, a lot of world history has been written since the 80th Congress enacted the Smith-Mundt Act. However, I remain as firm in my conviction today as I was back in 1947 when I first introduced H. R. 3342—which is now known as Public Law 402 of the 80th Congress, the Smith-Mundt Act—that the programs set in motion and made permanent activities by this act are America's best hope for peace and our most important weapons in winning the hearts and minds of men to the cause of permanent peace.

In fact, Mr. President, H. R. 3342 was not my first attempt to dedicate a part of the resources and talents of this great country to the waging of peace as an attractive and rewarding alternative to the waging of wars. As chairman of the special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee which heard the testimony on H. R. 3342 back there in 1947, I opened the hearings on my proposed bill by recalling that it was on March 1, 1943, that I first introduced the forerunner to the Smith-Mundt Act. On March 1, 1943, I introduced H. R. 2034 which first contained the basic features of the student and cultural exchange programs now incorporated in Public Law 402 of that highly constructive and significant 80th Congress. But in 1943, the war was on and the 78th Congress was understandably busy with more immediate and urgent problems.

So on January 24, 1945—in the 79th session of Congress—I introduced H. R. 1740 which again proposed the program of student, leader, and cultural exchanges contained in H. R. 2043 of the 78th Congress and expanded the program recommended in my earlier bill. The State Department gave a favorable report to H. R. 2043 but before hearings on it could be held, the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations came into being and spadework was begun on the creation of the United Nations. Consequently, I then introduced House Resolution 215 which did become law and set up our participation in what has become known as the United Nations Educational, Cultural, and Scientific Organization. In the introduction and presentation of these three bills, I had the able help and encouragement of Mr. Nelson Rockefeller who was then an official working with the State Department here in Washington.

By the time the 80th Congress convened, Mr. President, I remained convinced that America's participation in UNESCO would not adequately provide the type of foreign information program and educational, leadership and cultural exchanges required to enable us to wage peace with sufficient vigor and imagination to meet our country's needs. So once again expanding on the original program proposed March 1, 1943, I introduced H. R. 3342. With the encouragement of Mr. William Benton, by then an Assistant Secretary of State, the Department of State quickly wrote a favorable report on H. R. 3342 and it began its troubled and tortured trip through Congress until on January 27, 1948, it had finally passed both Houses and was signed into law by President Truman. The able leadership of Senator SMITH of New Jersey was largely responsible for Senate approval. I still have in my possession as a proud memento the pen which Harry Truman used in signing the Smith-Mundt Act into law.

Mr. President, more than 10 years ago I said and I still believe, "This program with its many activities in the creation of mutual understanding, and good will is America's best weapon for peace. As it succeeds, increasingly, the need for mighty armaments and the dangers of war will slowly but surely disappear."

Properly administered and adequately financed, I believe this great weapon for peace will in the long run do more to influence the course of human history than all of the sputniks and supersonic weapons of this missile age.

I now call attention to the statements made at the White House on Monday at the 10th anniversary ceremonies of the Smith-Mundt Act, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENTH ANNIVERSARY WHITE HOUSE PROGRAM COMMEMORATING SIGNING OF THE SMITH-MUNDT ACT

Mr. GEORGE ALLEN. Mr. President, this 10th anniversary of the Smith-Mundt Act is very significant for me since my own connection with our overseas information and cultural relations program began just 1 month after the Smith-Mundt Act was signed in January of 1948. I remember the report of the committee that Senator SMITH and Senator MUNDT, who was then a Member of the House of Representatives, took through Europe in 1947 to study the needs of a program of this kind. I will always find inspiration in the language they wrote into their report; that our operation was to safeguard the national security, advance the foreign policy of the United States, and to promote world peace. I have also had the privilege of working with the Fulbright program overseas. In fact, the phrases Smith-Mundt and Fulbright have been incorporated in most of the languages abroad. I remember when I was in Teheran hearing university students talking in the halls of the University of Teheran and they would speak together talking about their hopes of studying in the United States and they would say, "Walla walla walla walla Smith-Mundt," "Walla walla walla Fulbright." These names have become parts of the languages of most countries.

It's an honor, Mr. President, to be associated with you and with these distinguished Senators in today's observance of this anniversary. For myself and my colleagues in the USIA, I want to thank you and them for the support you have given us. Now I wish Senator ALEXANDER SMITH of New Jersey would say a word to us.

Senator ALEXANDER SMITH. Mr. Allen, Mr. President, my colleagues, it is a great honor to be here on this occasion and to have been a part of this great undertaking. It is a source of satisfaction to me that I was privileged 10 years ago to join with my good friend, Congressman MUNDT, now Senator MUNDT of South Dakota, in the introduction of the Smith-Mundt bill known as Public Law 402 of 1948. While our proposed legislation was being studied and debated, we jointly headed a mission of Senators and Congressmen which visited certain key countries in middle and western Europe in the summer of 1947. We then completed the legislation and it became law in 1948. Our basic premise was to publicize, by all available media of communication, to the peoples of the world the blessings of freedom and self-determination and the sacredness of the individual human being * * * our American heritage. One of our big objectives was the exchange of people, especially young people and students because of our sincere belief the surest road to world peace is for people to know and understand each other and to work together. And it was in this part of our objective that our good comrade in the Senate, Senator FULBRIGHT, joined us with his wonderful program of the Fulbright scholarships. This legislation has now become, I believe, an important bulwark of our foreign policy and our principal publicity weapon in the cold war. Thank you.

Mr. ALLEN. Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota.

Senator MUNDT. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. Mr. President, good friends, I brought along a few memorabilia, Mr. President, of this occasion of 10 years ago. I have a picture here of a distinguished young general testifying before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I thought you would like to take a look at that because I would like to say that your testimony, sir, was some of the most persuasive and powerful in getting a bill passed before the House of Representatives which was very difficult to have passed. Among other things you said, testifying that day, more than 10 years ago now, on what was then H. R. 3342, which I had introduced and what has become Public Law 402; you said then, and I know you believe now because I have heard you say it many times since: "There can be no absolute security for the United States until every

nation enjoys a comparable feeling of security. All that arms can do is give you a relative feeling of security, and I do not care how many guns and planes and ships you pool together but only as we can get a common basis of believing in each other, then you have security—then I can go fishing." Well, Mr. President, I do not know how much fishing you had a chance to do, in the meantime, but perhaps fishing would have been better and you might have had more opportunity to do it if we could have found a way in America to sell ourselves on the true importance of this great Voice of America program under the Smith-Mundt Act.

I suspect that during those 10 years which have passed we have spent in the neighborhood of somewhere near $500 billion in this whole area of defense and military preparedness. Something certainly nor far short of that, and, in the interim we have spent a woefully small part of our national resources in the direction of sustaining peace because as we sell the truth, we sell peace. I believe, Mr. President, and I believe that you believe, that if the time ever comes when we can spend a dime for this kind of program for peace every time we spend a dollar in the holding operation of military defenses that then indeed peace will be secure and enduring. I said when I introduced that bill over 10 years ago that this was to be a campaign of truth built on the old Japanese philosophy that the man you don't know is the man you don't like and that if we can come to know each other in the world we could come to like each other and avoid war. I believe that is eternally true and Senator SMITH and I, as Senators, I am sure, also believe with our illustrious predecessor, Daniel Webster, that there is nothing so powerful as the truth and this program is America's truth-telling program. As such, I am sure it moves in the direction of lasting peace. I sincerely thank you, Mr. President, for helping to start off on this 10 years ago.

Mr. ALLEN. Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, and Mr. Secretary, I feel it is a real privilege and honor to be permitted to participate in this 10th anniversary of the enactment of the Smith-Mundt Act. That act as you know and have been told here today, is the origin of the Voice of America, the basic law for the Voice of America and for other activities such as libraries. My own feeling is, however, that the authority for the exchange of students, professors, and leaders is the most efficient, most effective way to improve our international relations so it is in that connection that I have a very special interest in this program. I might also remind the audience here that early in this administration some friends of the President gathered together a fund and started the Eisenhower scholarships, and I think that also emphasizes the importance of this activity and more recently within the week we have read of negotiations for the institution of exchanges of various kinds with Russia, and Mr. President, I approve of that also and I hope that this kind of exchange program may be greatly enlarged in the future. I know that it has done much to improve our relations in the past and I think it can do even more in the future.

Mr. ALLEN. The Acting Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian Herter.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. President, distinguished gentlemen, on behalf of the State Department, I want to bear witness to the fact that these programs instituted first under the Smith-Mundt Act, then under the Fulbright Act, have been an extraordinary effective and important arm in our foreign policy. Certainly, they have contributed as much as any single thing to the dispelling of misunderstanding and the creation of understanding which, as has been so eloquently stated a moment ago, are the basis of peace, and for the future security of the world. The State Department is very proud of the position that it has filled in assisting in the administration of these acts. It is a great privilege to be allowed to bear testimony here today to the foresight of these distinguished Senators who made such a great contribution, not only to the United States, but to the whole world.

Mr. ALLEN. And now, Mr. President, before we ask you to be good enough to say a few words to us, I would like to present a living example of the exchange of persons that is being carried on under the Smith-Mundt program. We have the pleasure of having with us in Washington at the present moment, the director of technical education of the Nation of Ghana, Mr. Apaloo, who arrived in the United States about 1 week ago. He is studying our vocational education methods of training programs and hopes that he may be able to find experts in this field with whom he can work and take back their ideas to Ghana with him. Mr. Apaloo, director of the technical education of Ghana.

Mr. APALOO. Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. Secretary, when I first learned about my award in the educational exchange program, never in my wildest dream did it occur to me that I would find myself in the White House in such distinguished company today. I feel deeply honored and highly privileged to be able to say how much we in Ghana appreciate the opportunity of visiting the United States; not only to gain some experience in the fields in which we are working, but to meet people and get to know them. My words are inadequate to express how grateful we are for this opportunity to come here and meet Americans; living among them to learn more of the great contribution which America is making toward understanding toward the whole world. I feel myself highly privileged indeed to be here. Mr. President, I can assure you on my own behalf, and on the behalf of Ghanians in particular and in behalf of all in Africa, who do come here, that we shall tell all people when we go back of the wonderful trip to get here, the wonderful welcome we get, the nice people we meet. In closing, I thank you all very much indeed.

Mr. ALLEN. Gentlemen, the President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Allen, Mr. Apaloo, distinguished Members of the United States Senate, the Smith-Mundt Act was sponsored 10 years ago by my good friend Senator ALEXANDER SMITH and Senator KARL MUNDT who was then a Member of the House of Representatives. This act forms the basic legislation of our Government's overseas information and cultural exchange programs. These programs are an important part of our effort to convey to everybody in the world a simple basic truth: America wants peace.

I personally testified before KARL MUNDT'S committee, as he mentioned, some 10 years ago on behalf of this legislation. I believe in it then and I believe in it now.

Earlier, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT had sponsored legislation to use the proceeds from the sale of some of our war material overseas for educational purposes. I am pleased that Senator FULBRIGHT is also with us today and that the law which bears his name continues in force and vigor.

Even more than that, I most heartily endorse and support the sentiments that Senator FULBRIGHT has just expressed. I believe, with him, that the exchange of students—to include under proper arrangments exchange of students coming from behind the Iron Curtains—should be vastly expanded. In my opinion that program could have no other effect than to increase understanding and to make more secure the peace—a just peace, that we all seek.

Information and education are powerful forces in support of peace. Just as war begins in the minds of men, so does peace.

The program supported by you three gentlemen will help to bring about international understanding, which is the surest way I know to bring about the lasting peace which the United States has always sought.

I think it is a very important meeting when all of these Senators have come here today with Mr. Allen, each of them testifying before the American people and before the world of the value of the peaceful efforts of the United States in these important fields.

Mr. ALLEN. Thank you, very much, Mr. President.

---

## EXPENDITURES FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 209) to investigate the problems of American small and independent business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First I should like to make a brief statement regarding the resolution. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] desired to be present when we called up the several so-called money resolutions from the Committee on Rules and Administration dealing with funds for special committees or subcommittees, or additional funds for standing committees. Unfortunately, the Senator from Louisiana has been delayed in coming to the Chamber, although I have had word that he will be here very shortly.

In asking that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the resolutions, or at least some of them, I do so with full recognition of the desire of the Senator from Louisiana to be present. I wish to say for the benefit of the Senate that we did give him notice and did get in touch with him. Certainly, he may wish to file a motion for reconsideration, or he may wish to make a statement dealing with a particular resolution. Therefore, we will proceed with that full understanding.

The pending resolution, Calendar No. 1204, Senate Resolution 209, was submitted by myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Small Business. Its purpose is to obtain funds with which to continue the activities and functions of the committee over and beyond what is allowed under the regular appropriations.

The resolution as originally submitted called for $100,000, to operate until January 31 of next year. The Committee on Rules and Administration reduced the amount to $90,000. That is the amount in the resolution now before us. Our committee filed a budget statement, as is required under the rules of the Senate, showing just how it was intended to expend these funds. During the past year

we had $85,000. We ran completely out of funds and, in addition, had to rely on some of the funds regularly appropriated to the committee to carry us through the year, and we also had to limit the hearings on tax matters which we had scheduled throughout the country.

We had requests to hold hearings in many different places. We were unable to do so, simply because we did not have the money with which to operate. That is the reason why we are asking for the additional funds. The Committee on Rules and Administration saw fit to increase by $5,000 the amount we had last year, but not to give us the full $100,000. We could make very good use of the full amount. Our committee has been in existence since 1950, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, and I think the record of the committee over the years will show that the funds have been carefully and frugally handled. In most of those years we have been able to return substantial amounts. Last year was the only year, I believe, when we actually ran short of funds.

I assure the Senate we shall continue to act in such a way as to get the greatest value out of the dollars appropriated to the committee. With this brief statement, if there are no questions, I ask that the resolution be agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, may I inquire what became of Calendar No. 104, Senate Resolution 209?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that that resolution was agreed to while the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was acting as majority leader.

Does the Senator from Louisiana wish to have reconsidered the vote by which the resolution was agreed to?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not wish to have it reconsidered. I merely wish to ask if it involves the continuation of the same committee which has been in existence on a more or less temporary basis for many years?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that this particular committee has a permanent status, and operates on the basis of a standing committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I have in mind. I have been pointing out the fact that the Select Committee on Small Business has achieved a permanent status. Although it is not a standing committee of the Senate, it receives as much money as standing committees. In addition, it has been demanding and receiving from the Senate as much as $90,000 extra.

I should like to have the RECORD show, if possible, what has been done, and why it is necessary to continue this committeee.

I was a member of the Small Business Committee when it was first created. We got along with a small amount of money. But when it became more or less permanent—that is, when it was made a select committee—it entered the same category as the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and other standing committees, which receive a definite sum for their operations each year. We are also called upon every year to renew resolutions which have provided additional money, over and above this committee's regular allowance. This is another special, temporary committee which will never die unless something is done about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am quite certain that the Senator from Alabama has placed in the RECORD a justification for the resolution. If he has not done so, I assure the Senator from Louisiana that that will be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have such a statement placed in the RECORD in connection with our colloquy.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question relating to Calendar No. 1204, the small-business resolution.

The Senator from Louisiana asked the Senator from Montana a question while I was temporarily absent from the Chamber. The Senator from Louisiana desired to have certain information placed in the RECORD. I thought perhaps he had reference to a statement which I had made when the resolution was called up; but I find that the Senator from Montana got the impression that the Senator from Louisiana desired a statement of justification. I wonder if it might be well to place in the RECORD a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, transmitting the budget of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that that letter, together with the enclosure, be printed in the RECORD at the point where the colloquy took place between the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Montana.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
*January 10, 1958.*

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
*Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The authority of the Select Committee on Small Business to expend funds under Senate Resolution 42 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, will expire on January 31.

Within the next 2 or 3 weeks, the committee will submit to the Senate its eighth annual report. It is my belief that this summary of committee activities during 1957 offers persuasive evidence that the moneys made available to the committee by Senate Resolution 42 were well expended in terms of workload accomplishments. There also is no question in my mind that the additional funds provided by that resolution made it possible for the committee to discharge its responsibilities to the small-business community more effectively than would have been the case had additional funds been lacking.

Nonetheless, the problems of small-business men have in recent years become so numerous and pressing, that there remained some important problem areas to which the committee was unable to give its attention last year. For that reason, as well as because the current competitive climate has placed thousands of typical small enterprises at a grave disadvantage, I have introduced a resolution requesting additional funds slightly in excess of the amount specified under last year's resolution.

Awareness of the critical difficulties facing small, independent businessmen is widespread. Many unresolved problems confront them in the field of taxation, finances, Government procurement, and antitrust enforcement. The rate of small-business failures also reached a postwar high during 1957 and there is little evidence that this mortality rate will decline during 1958.

Indeed, many Members of Congress who conferred with small-business constituents during the recess have told me that without help from Congress and the executive branch it will become increasingly difficult for the average small manufacturer, retailer, or service-trade operator to run his business at a reasonable profit under prevailing competitive conditions.

The members of the Small Business Committee join me in the belief that the committee's efforts in behalf of independent business cannot be maximized unless supplementary funds are made available. I fully expect that, as in past years, all reports and recommendations of the committee to the Senate will be unanimous and will continue to reflect the objective and nonpartisan spirit which has characterized this committee since its creation in 1950.

Needless to say, I should welcome an opportunity to present a more detailed justification of this request for funds when your committee schedules action on our resolution.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SPARKMAN,
*Chairman.*

*Budget*

| Position | Number | Base salary (per annum) | Gross salary (per annum) | Total for period of budget (gross) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| STAFF | | | | |
| Legal and investigative: | | | | |
| Special counsel | 1 | $6,600 | $11,536.97 | $11,536.97 |
| Assistant chief counsel | 1 | 5,580 | 10,021.02 | 10,021.02 |
| Assistant counsel | 2 | 5,400 | 9,753.50 | 9,753.50 |
| Do | | 5,400 | 9,753.50 | 9,573.50 |
| Editorial and research: | | | | |
| Editorial director | 1 | 6,960 | 12,072.01 | 12,072.01 |
| Assistant director | 1 | 5,580 | 10,021.02 | 10,021.02 |
| Research director | 1 | 5,820 | 10,377.71 | 10,377.71 |
| Administrative and clerical: | | | | |
| Assistant clerk (file) | 1 | 1,800 | 3,679.42 | 3,679.42 |
| Stenographer | 1 | 2,340 | 4,604.26 | 4,604.26 |
| Do | 2 | 2,160 | 4,295.97 | 4,295.97 |
| Do | | 2,160 | 4,295.97 | 4,295.97 |
| Subtotal, staff expense | 11 | | | 90,411.35 |

*Budget*—Continued

| Position | Number | Base salary (per annum) | Gross salary (per annum) | Total for period of budget (gross) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ADMINISTRATIVE | | | | |
| Contribution to civil-service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid) | | | | $5,876.74 |
| Travel (inclusive of field investigations) | | | | 1,000.00 |
| Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees) | | | | 500.00 |
| Stationery, office supplies | | | | 600.00 |
| Communications (telephone, telegraph) | | | | 1,200.00 |
| Newspapers, magazines, documents | | | | 200.00 |
| Contingent fund | | | | 211.91 |
| Subtotal, administrative expense | | | | 9,588.65 |
| Total | | | | 100,000.00 |
| Less reduction voted by Committee on Rules and Administration Jan. 15, 1958 | | | | 10,000.00 |
| Total | | | | 90,000.00 |

Fund requested, S. Res. 209, $100,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which will be stated by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 13, after the word "exceed," it is proposed to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 209), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1211, Senate Resolution 208, authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate certain specific matters under its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 208 provides $50,000 for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for the 12-month period beginning February 1, 1958, to enable the committee to continue its investigation of the administration and policies of the postal system, as carried out by the Post Office Department; also the administration of the civil service merit system; and also the administration of the Federal employees group life insurance program, as carried out by the Civil Service Commission.

It will be noted that the committee has already been making these investigations. Last year, an interim report was filed on post office and civil service matters. Due to the late date that one investigation was started, $13,000 of last year's appropriation will be returned on January 31.

After full investigation, the committee has unanimously concluded these investigations should be continued. We have in mind a very serious look at the entire structure of the Civil Service Commission, and its relationship with the White House.

We are deeply concerned over the opinion of the present administration of the Civil Service Commission. We are concerned over the caliber of the appointments to this Commission.

The Senate committee has a responsibility in seeing that the civil service is kept strong for the protection of the 2½ million employees as well as America as a whole.

I assure the Senate that if all of the $50,000 is not needed, I will repeat what I am doing this year, and what I did last year: I will return the unneeded funds. Eighteen thousand dollars remained unspent at the end of the 84th Congress, and was returned; and $13,000 remains unspent at this time, and is about to be returned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the Senator from South Carolina also has a resolution which provides for more employees for his committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator from Louisiana has referred to it; I imagine it will be the next resolution to be taken up by the Senate. That resolution provides for one additional stenographer for the full committee. That has been the custom in the committee, under both the Democrats and the Republicans, for the last 10 years. We find it necessary, because of the extra workload of the general committee work.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning the necessity for it; I merely wished to ascertain whether that resolution will be brought up today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, it will.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are other funds, in addition to the amount covered by this resolution, being requested?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. These are all the funds that are being requested for the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the committee being operated within the regular allowance?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, both last year and the year before last the Senator from South Carolina requested additional funds, in order to operate some other subcommittees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Not in the last 2 years, but we did have some prior to that time.

The amount now being requested is about half the amount the committee had in 1953 and 1954, as I recall.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from South Carolina stated that a report was made as the result of the expenditure of a little less than $50,000 last year. Will that investigation lead to proposed legislation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We certainly hope so; and it led to some last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator feel that the work is not completed?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee unanimously feels the work is uncompleted. We are right in the midst of an investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are these studies connected in any manner with proposals to raise postal rates and salaries of postal employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Both of those questions are included in our studies. We hope to write off policy for the operation of the post office. We also hope to correct the direction of the path down which the Civil Service Commission is traveling. Many things need to be done to make this the best government in the world. The Government is only as good as its employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. Heretofore most of this work was handled by the regular staff of the committee. The subcommittee, for which there is now being asked the sum of $50,000, was created during the 84th Congress, in 1955. That year $75,000 was allowed. During the 2d session of the 84th Congress the committee asked for $75,000. The committee has spent $68,750. Now the committee is asking for a reduction in that amount, $50,000, to be specific.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator expect the investigation to be completed?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We are going to do our best to complete it this year. I will not promise that, however.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator may succeed in doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the Federal employee group life insurance program by the Civil Service Commission;

(2) the administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other agencies of the Government; and

(3) the administration by the Post Office Department of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) postal policy, (b) research and development, and (c) postal rates.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## MILITARY PAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there is a great deal of interest regarding the matter of military pay, and I should like to make a brief comment with respect to the Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Pay, of which I am chairman.

First, with regard to the subcommittee hearings, we plan to begin receiving testimony about the middle of February. A definite date cannot be given at this time, because of the number of developments which are pending. The administration's pay proposal was introduced January 23, 1958, as S. 3081. The Department of Defense has not yet compiled the detailed cost information, however, and it will be necessary to have this data at the time the hearings begin.

Next, it is my hope that our hearings can be held more or less concurrently with those of the House Armed Services subcommittee. There will be many witnesses, and if we could hear them immediately following their appearance in the House, our schedule should be much more timely and orderly. It is my understanding that Mr. KILDAY, chairman of the House subcommittee, plans to begin hearings about February 15.

Another development is the fact that the Department of Defense is considering the submission of separate legislation affecting promotion and retention, aimed at improving the quality of military personnel. As we all know, pay alone will not insure the quality of personnel needed by the Armed Forces. This separate package will be an important part of any pay plan, and the subcommittee will desire to know the administration's proposal regarding this problem.

Mr. President, I do not propose at this time to discuss the merits of the Cordiner pay plan. It is generally agreed that some increases should be enacted. I certainly share this view, and insofar as I am personally concerned, there are certain features of the Cordiner plan which appear to have merit. Other parts of the proposal are, however, controversial, judging from the mail and other comments I have received.

There is general agreement as to the problem, which is the fact that younger officers and skilled enlisted men are not remaining in military service beyond their obligated tours. The Cordiner Committee would meet this problem by leaving the pay rates for the lower officers and enlisted grades unchanged, but providing substantial increases for the upper officer and noncommissioned grades. At the same time, two new enlisted grades would be created and the present longevity system abolished. The new pay system would be based entirely on rank and length of service in the rank.

The Cordiner plan was proposed as being the basis for an improved management plan for all military personnel. The subcommittee will, of course, desire to know the details of the Pentagon's personnel management plan, part of which will be the legislation to which I have already referred. The ultimate value of the entire Cordiner approach will depend in large part on the way it would be administered.

Mr. President, I have discussed these points merely to emphasize that the entire military pay problem will require most careful hearings. The issues are detailed and complex and will affect our Armed Forces for years to come.

As the Senate knows, the subcommittee last August heard Mr. Cordiner testify in favor of his Committee's military pay plan which is contained in S. 2014, the bill of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. For our forthcoming hearings we shall also have the adminstration's pay proposal, which differs somewhat from S. 2014, although it does embody the Cordiner philosophy. I should also point out that the House Armed Services subcommittee may recommend legislation which will differ from that recommended by the Cordiner Committee as well as that recommended by the administration. I personally think it would be wise for the Senate to have the House approach to this problem before any final action is taken by the Senate. Mr. KILDAY, one of the ablest members of the House, has had long experience in the field of military pay legislation.

Mr. President, as soon as a definite date can be established, I shall make the proper floor announcement. The Senate can be assured that hearings will be scheduled as soon as the developments I have discussed have materialized to a point where we have sufficient factual information available.

## EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT BY THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1212, Senate Resolution 210, authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ a temporary additional clerical assistant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

## STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT AND WAR CLAIMS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1218, Senate Resolution 232, to make a further study of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the resolution. What good has come out of past studies and what is the necessity for increasing the allowance from $35,000, which was spent last year, to $50,000 this year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we are asking for the same amount that we requested last year. As to the good that has come from the study, we have passed several bills on the subject matter of vested assets. We have closed out the administration of World War I assets. We have a very complicated statute under study. We are dealing with legislation affecting confiscated properties worth approximately $600 million. There are many kinds of bills before the committee relating to the disposition of these assets. We are studying the problems to see how they can best be solved. We hope—I for one certainly hope—that the questions involved can be disposed of at this session of Congress. It will be noticed that money was returned by the subcommittee for last year's appropriations. The Senate authorized $50,000 last year for the

studies. It will be found that $21,000 of that amount was returned. It will also be found that the administration of the property by the Office of Alien Property is costing the Government at the rate of about $3 million a year. Since World War II more than $51 million have been spent in administering the property we vested during the war. We want to eliminate this expense as quickly as we can, in order to save the Government the money it must spend in administering these vested assets.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out to my good friend that the subcommittee has been working on the subject since 1953. As I have often stated on the floor, it seems that some of these temporary subcommittees become more or less permanent—they never seem to end. They always find more to do. What has this particular subcommittee accomplished during the last year? What good has resulted from its work? Has any legislation been recommended? In other words, what is the subcommittee's record of accomplishments?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Some of the assets were closed out. It must be remembered that some of the properties had been on our hands since the First World War. We passed legislation terminating that program. We are trying to dispose of the matters which have been pending since the close of World War II and get them terminated. I wish to give credit to the minority. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is on the subcommittee. It will be remembered that last year it was decided it would be well to provide additional funds so the minority could have representation on the staff. The minority never chose to place a man on the staff. That resulted in savings last year reflected in our reports. It will be noticed that the resolution provides that the minority may now have a professional staff member.

The Senator will remember that I stated last year it looked as if we were going to have more chiefs than Indians and more top people than people working down below. We have managed to operate with a small staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that it is not the Senator's purpose to employ the minority employee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is a matter which under the resolution is left entirely to the minority. It is the minority's prerogative to furnish its representation, not my own.

Mr. ELLENDER. At the moment there are five employees; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have had an average of only 3. The Senator talks about 5, but some of the employees are employed only for short intervals.

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator expect to conclude the work of the subcommittee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is what I stated just a moment ago. I certainly hope we can complete the work at this session.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope so, too.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senate will cooperate and will follow the proposals in my bill, S. 600, we can complete the work of the subcommittee this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is it the Senate is not doing that ought to be done?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me explain that. I want to correct that statement, for it is not something involving Senate action. I refer to action of the administration. The executive departments have not been uniform in their recommendations, particularly as to what bills they will approve and what bills they will not approve. It seems that the State Department and the Department of Justice have not at all times seen entirely eye to eye on the matter. I think and I am hopeful they will get together in the near future and submit to the subcommittee proposals which I may recommend to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Instead of the Congress being at fault, would the Senator say the executive department is at fault?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would in part say that. The Senator knows that when a department builds up a big staff it can always build up a lot of opposition to any suggested change. There were about 140 lawyers in the Justice Department alone advising us what we ought to do with the vested assets. That demonstrates for the Senator how much complication may arise or be involved in the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there anything the Senate can do to eliminate the necessity for all these extra employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We are doing our best; the legislation I propose will eliminate many of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us an idea as to how much it is costing the taxpayers to maintain this force under the executive department?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The force under the executive department?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can obtain for the Senator the exact figure, but it has averaged $3 million a year since 1943.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator refer to people who are employed in order to handle this matter?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. That figure does not include the lawyers who are employed for the different corporations out of Government in the enterprises under seizure which costs run into millions of dollars per year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the subcommittee submitted to the Senate any proposed legislation, any views, or any ideas?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have presented two bills. Senator DIRKSEN in the 83d Congress presented a somewhat similar measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the purpose of terminating the Commission, so that we can save the $3 million to which the Senator referred?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have made recommendations. I want the work transferred to another agency in order to close it out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has anything been done in that regard?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There have been some bills passed to reduce the amount involved, and that should also reduce the number of people who are employed in the administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. What became of those bills? Are they pending?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Some of those bills were passed, Senator. Some are still pending and we confidently hope to end the program before the Congress adjourns. The Congress passed some of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do hope that both this subcommittee and the groups under the executive departments will be able to complete the job and save the taxpayers in excess of $3 million a year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be a substantial saving.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We are awaiting proposals now from the State Department; until they submit them and we can reconcile our differences, the situation is rather difficult of solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and also the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider bills affecting said acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select 1 person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO ELEANOR J. KEEFER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1199, Senate Resolution 226.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 226) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eleanor J. Keefer, widow of John A. Keefer, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 7 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 226) was agreed to.

## PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO HESTER SCOTT WAILES AND MARY SCOTT GLASS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1200, Senate Resolution 227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 227) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Hester Scott Wailes and Mary Scott Glass, sisters of Louise S. Joubert, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum to each equal to 5¾ months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 227) was agreed to.

## PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO LUSANNAH CLARK RICHARDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1201, Senate Resolution 228.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 228) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lusannah Clark Richards, mother of Harriet C. Richards, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 228) was agreed to.

## EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS AND CONSULTANTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1202, Senate Resolution 213.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 213) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make certain expenditures and employ additional assistants and consultants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 213) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make certain expenditures and employ additional assistants and consultants, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000", and insert "$75,000", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if we could have an explanation as to the necessity for continuing the work proposed under this resolution. As I remember, during the 84th Congress, 1st session, a resolution was passed to finance a study of the proposed Federal highway program.

I understand that study has been more or less completed. Highway legislation has been enacted; the expanded Federal Aid to Highway Construction Act is on the statute books. Yet, more money is being demanded. It seems this subcommittee is following the pattern of many others, and will be continued. I should like to know why.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in the absence of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I should like to make a statement to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

The resolution would provide the sum of $75,000 to the Committee on Public Works for administrative expenses and salaries of additional assistants necessary to continue its studies and inquiries, especially in relation to the $37 billion construction program under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

I might say, Mr. President, to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, that the resolution was originally drafted to request the sum of $100,000, but that sum was reduced to $75,000 in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The chairman of the Committee on Public Works, as the Senator knows, is the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the necessity for a further study? Has not Congress enacted the law?

Mr. HENNINGS. The original study, Senator, has not been completed.

Mr. ELLENDER. The original study has not been completed, yet the law has been enacted. Why should we continue to study legislation which is now the law of the land?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am not a member of the Committee on Public Works. I will say that the resolution was reported unanimously by that committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know. All of the resolutions were reported unanimously.

Mr. HENNINGS. Some were not.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is never opposition. There seems to be virtual unanimity among committee members insofar as these resolutions are concerned.

I remember distinctly that this subcommittee was created for the purpose of making certain studies in connection with the highway bill which was then before Congress. We have passed the highway bill. Why is it necessary to make further studies?

Mr. HENNINGS. Perhaps we can shed some light on that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Public Works and the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Public Roads, possibly I can give a little information on the point which has been raised.

It is true that the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 launched the interstate program. The Senator from Louisiana

will recall that one provision of the act of 1956 was to require that the Bureau of Public Roads and the several State highway commissions should submit to the Congress a new estimate of costs for completing the system, which should be submitted by January 12 of this year, and that that new estimate of cost would, if approved by the Congress, be the basis for the apportionments to the several States in the succeeding 3 years.

Now, that estimate of cost has been submitted. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has been conducting hearings upon the status of the new highway program. Presently he has the staff at work analyzing these estimates of cost from the several States.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will that affect the present law? Is it the purpose of the subcommittee to make studies that may lead to further legislation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What are those studies?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This year the Congress will pass the Highway Act of 1958. The Congress passes a highway act every 2 years which becomes the basis for the apportionment to the States for the regular, primary, secondary, and urban systems of Federal aid.

This year, in addition to the responsibility under the biennial Highway Act, there is the responsibility of analyzing the cost estimates on the Interstate System. The act of 1956 provided that for the first 3 years the apportionments for the Interstate System would continue under the old formula, but because of a difference of opinion, or because of the conviction of the committee and of the Senate that the original estimate of costs was far out of line, with many variations between the different States, the Bureau was directed to make this new study. The estimates now submitted must be considered by the Congress in this session as the basis for the apportionments for the Interstate Highway System for the next 3 years.

The law provides that the estimates may be approved by the Congress by concurrent resolution; and until they are we have no basis for the apportionments for the Interstate System for the next 3 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator take the position that this subcommittee will have to be a continuing subcommittee to constantly scrutinize what the executive branch is doing in administering the Highway Act? That would seem to be what he is saying.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There would be some support for the proposition which the Senator has stated; but by law, this particular session of Congress has the responsibility of passing judgment upon these estimates of costs. There was a great variation in the estimates of costs originally. The Congress rejected them.

The Bureau has responded to the direction of the 1956 act in submitting these estimates. They are very thorough and detailed books. The book for each State would almost make a mountain. The books are very involved and detailed.

At the present time the regular staff of the committee and those who are employed under the authority of the resolution of the past are working with representatives from the Comptroller General's Office in making an analysis of the costs, in order that the committee may make a sound recommendation to the Senate with respect thereto.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean a determination as to whether or not the costs are too high?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What authority would Congress have in that area inasmuch as the administration of the law which we enacted is committed to the executive branch?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The law of 1956 provided that this Congress should consider these estimates to determine whether or not they would form a sound basis for making apportionments to the States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does that provision relate merely to this year, or does it apply to every year?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It relates to this year, and other future years.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I correctly understand the Senator, after this year there will be no need for this expenditure?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota would not wish to take the responsibility for making such a statement for the chairman or other members of the committee. By the terms of the 1956 act, this is the basic estimate of costs. Three years from now that subject is again to be examined, in the light of any changes in costs at that time. However, this is the basic estimate, and without it there can be no apportionment among the States. The validity of these estimates will determine how much shall be apportioned to the State of Louisiana, the State of Missouri, and every other State, for the Interstate System. The Subcommittee on Public Roads will probably want to look into the status and progress of the national highway program every year in an effort to expedite its prosecution and if possible assist in removing any obstacles that might be slowing down the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can see how this might well become another temporary but permanent subcommittee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The future, of course, is in the hands of subsequent Congresses.

Mr. ELLENDER. The situation to which I refer is not peculiar to this subcommittee. I have seen very few temporary subcommittees which did not become, in effect, permanent fixtures.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Very few committees have had placed upon them the degree of responsibility under a law enacted by Congress as that which rests upon the Public Works Committee, in this session of Congress, to make an analysis of the cost estimates in connection with a $37 billion program, and report to the Congress the precise basis upon which the Congress will make the apportionment to the several States of highway funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

---

## INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1216, Senate Resolution 229, authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters under its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 16, after the word "information," to strike out "which shall not exceed $180,000, shall be paid from" and insert "facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) minerals, materials, and fuels;

(2) irrigation, reclamation, and power development;

(3) public lands;

(4) Indians;

(5) Territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $180,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this resolution would authorize the expenditure of $180,000 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for investigation of the various problems coming within the committee's jurisdiction. This is the same amount that was appropriated last year, and it is necessary to have this amount in order to carry on the activities of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are there any other subcommittees of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for which money is asked?

Mr. MURRAY. No. This will take care of any subcommittees we have that are conducting additional investigations. The amount is $180,000, the same as last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are no additional requests on the part of the full committee, either.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. This committee has very wide jurisdiction, covering Indian affairs, mining, public lands, resources, irrigation, reclamation, Territories, and insular affairs.

I should take a trip to some of the island possessions every year, but I do not. I have not been to Puerto Rico or any of the other possessions in that part of the world, but I shall look into the subject and see if I cannot have a couple of nice trips arranged for myself, which will help the committee to handle its problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

---

## CONTINUATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1213, Senate Resolution 221.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 221) continuing the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, and increasing the limit of expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall discuss both resolutions, Senate Resolution 221 and Senate Resolution 222. Senate Resolution 222 calls for $20,000, and I assume that resolution will be called up next. Its purpose is providing for the necessary cost of operating the select committee during the past year.

When I appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration, in July, I believe it was, to ask for additional funds, some members of the Committee on Rules and Administration suggested that we possibly were not asking for as much money as we would find necessary with which to operate the select committee. I said at that time that we had operated as economically as possible, and, if necessary, we would return early in January and submit a resolution for any additional funds we might need.

In Senate Resolution 221 we are asking for the same amount that was authorized for the use of the select committee during the last year, the first year of the select committee's existence, namely, $500,000.

I know that figure sounds like a great deal of money. In a letter to the Committee on Rules and Administration I reported how the money was expended last year, and the amount of work the select committee had done. I may say that the task given the select committee is one of the most stupendous and most aduous and most difficult the Senate has ever given to any committee. We worked faithfully last year. We have tried to economize in the use of the funds. In no instance have I taken the committee to hold hearings in distant cities; all hearings have been held here in the Capital. I concluded that it would be more economical to bring witnesses here than to take the members of the committee and all the necessary members of the staff to other places to hold hearings. There is one exception to that; we had to hold an executive session in New York City on one day, to take some testimony which was important at that time, in order to forestall some action we thought was improper. The witnesses in that hearing subsequently were brought to Washington for public hearings.

As chairman of the committee, I took no vacation. We held public hearings every month until now. We have held public hearings on more than 100 days and heard more than 450 witnesses.

As a result of the hearings scandalous exposures have been made within both the labor and management fields, and actions have been taken by the AFL–CIO to expel some unions which are under corrupt leadership. I anticipate that other similar actions will be taken by the AFL–CIO, although I would not attempt at this time to identify the unions.

The record which the committee has made presents to the Senate and to Congress an irrefutable record, under oath, of improper activities, upon which the committees of Congress can begin to predicate remedial legislation. I would not say that all remedial legislation would now be supported by the record made by the committee. However, I anticipate that possibly by the end of another year the record will be so complete that possibly all remedial legislation which is indicated could be predicated upon the record of the hearings.

I might state, further, that we have received approximately 75,000 to 100,000 letters. Most of the complaints we have received are from union members and members of their families.

Notwithstanding the great expenditures, as viewed from the standpoint of the amount of money, as compared with the amounts appropriated to other committees for their work, it would be impossible for the select committee, working on the kind of schedule on which we have worked during the year, to screen and process and evaluate and investigate and report upon the complaints which the select committee now has, within a period of some 5 or 6 years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This committee was set up under a special resolution, which provided for equal representation from both sides of the aisle, and is under the able and distinguished chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas. I think I may say without fear of contradiction that the work he has done commands the confidence of the Senate and of the country.

I think he and his committee have performed useful service for the Nation in the work which they have carried on—and, I might add, for organized labor as such—in helping to uncover and to disclose those activities which are not in the best interests of the rank-and-file members of organized labor.

I think the Senator from Arkansas and his committee are laying a foundation for legislation which will protect the rank and file of the workers from the improper activities which have so far been revealed.

I hope the Senate may unanimously support this committee in its work. The committee, during the time it has been in existence, has spent its funds with prudence. It has carried on its work in the highest and finest traditions of the Senate.

Speaking as one Senator on this side of the aisle, I highly commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and his colleagues for the work they have done and are doing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished minority leader. I know that each member of the committee is grateful to him for his expressions of approval of and confidence in the work we are doing.

The annual report to the Senate, required by the original resolution, is now in preparation. About three-fourths of it, perhaps more, is completed at this time. I think it will be filed within the next 2 or 3 weeks. The committee will have to meet to go over it and try to resolve any differences, if there are any.

I hope—and I have reason to believe—that the committee will recommend some specific legislation based upon its work in the past year. Already a number of bills have been introduced by several Members of the Senate, bills in the nature of remedial legislation, as the need for such legislation was reflected by the record made by the committee.

I am confident that the record as made certainly warrants action at this session of Congress on some of the bills which have been introduced. I hope the Senate will at this session of Congress pass some of these bills or some other bills which will provide the kind of legislation which the record indicates is needed—as the distinguished Senator from California has said, needed to protect the workingmen of the country, the people who do the work, earn the money, pay the dues, and support the labor organizations.

I believe the committee has tried to operate bearing in mind the primary considerations of what is good, right, and proper practice with respect to the men

who work and who support these organizations. I hope that constructive legislation will result.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I join the distinguished minority leader in his tribute to the committee, and particularly as it concerns the work done by my good friend from Arkansas—much of which was beyond the call of duty. He has given unselfishly of his time and energy.

I have only one question to ask. As I recall, when the committee was created, the Senator from Arkansas thought its work could be finished in about 2 years. Does the committee intend to go further into the activities of labor organizations, or will the committee now look into the management side, as well?

Mr. McCLELLAN. We have requests to look into management. As I interpret the resolution creating the committee and conferring jurisdiction upon it, we go into management so far as management has relations with labor or employment. I do not think the committee was set up to investigate the SEC or some other phase which is covered by other committees. But where there are management-labor relations, this committee has jurisdiction. We have gone into one phase of management.

Mr. ELLENDER. My only reason for asking the question is that I recall reading a statement by the distinguished chairman of the select committee that in time the committee would investigate certain practices within management. Is it the Senator's view that besides investigating matters relating to labor, the committee will also look into matters relating to management?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have in mind some improper practices within labor itself which the committee would be interested to investigate, namely, the management of labor unions. We get into that field particularly in the misuse of union funds, and again in the lack of democratic processes within unions. Those are two aspects which are directly related to improper practices of labor, in which management may not be involved at all.

It is said that we are investigating labor all the time. First, we had the Shefferman case, the case of a middleman who was actually playing both sides against the middle. He was hired primarily by management to keep unions out of certain shops and to keep unions from organizing within the shops. We went into that matter thoroughly. That came out in our investigation of labor relations. It gave us a lead. Shefferman, as may be recalled, bought about $85,000 worth of goods or merchandise for Mr. Dave Beck, and the union paid Shefferman for it.

When we got into that field, we found some other practices of Shefferman, who was hired by management, which were highly improper from our viewpoint. We had a full hearing on the matter.

I feel sometimes that it is my duty as chairman to express my views as the hearings develop. At the conclusion of the hearings, the chairman paid his modest respects to some of the practices which had been revealed and to those who had participated in the improper practices.

We get into the management aspect of the question often through the "sweetheart" contracts, under which a crooked labor leader is paid off, or some arrangements are made which benefit both management and some labor leaders to the detriment of the men who work.

We have not tried to shield management. Any lead or suggestion that we get which indicates that management in this area is doing something wrong or improper will be investigated, the same as any other improper activity.

In many of the investigations, when we get away from the internal affairs of the union—the misuse of union funds, undemocratic processes, the filing of improper reports, and so forth—we then get into relations as between labor and management.

In most instances in which it is found that someone representing labor has done something wrong, particularly when collusion is involved, it is found that in that area someone representing management is equally guilty. So it is hard to separate the two. Even when we hold a hearing on union activities in one area or another area, management is involved, too.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 7 of the report, I notice an item of $35,000 for an accounting firm.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And on page 8, I find that the expenses—apparently for 11 months—amounted to $41,698.54. Does the committee employ only one firm; or do any of the persons employed—such as investigators or persons employed in any other capacities—do some of the accounting work?

Mr. McCLELLAN. They do some of it. But we employ one firm of accountants, with its staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. How is it paid?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is paid by contract at so much an hour; and the contract is approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the contract for a certain number of employees?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is for the hours worked. On 1 day, perhaps 2 will be working; on the next day, perhaps 3 or 4 will be working.

Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that the accounting firm——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am familiar with it; I had it do work for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Without the assistance of excellent accountants, it would be impossible for the committee to dig into the records and expose crookedness. Let me say that this accountant has been working for the permanent subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. He has been working on the Hill ever since I have been here; I know him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; and I do not think a better one can be found.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the amount requested for accounting also include travel expense?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is on a per diem basis or a per hour basis?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The contract price covers the travel and per diem.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

If I have ever performed any service over and above and beyond the call of duty, I certainly have during the last year, by giving this matter my constant attention. Sometimes I have had to do it to the neglect of my normal, regular duties, which should have received more of my attention. But this job must have constant supervision, daily, by means of daily conferences, if the work is to be done effectively and efficiently, and if the committee is not to throw away money. The committee will not throw it away if I can prevent it, and I think I can prevent it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Besides all the fine work that I know my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas, is doing, I know that he is attending very well to the interests of his constituency in Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I ask for consideration of the amendment reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 11, after the word "the", it is proposed to insert "chairman of the", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the select committee, authorized and directed to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities, established by Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, 1st session, agreed to January 30, 1957, as amended by Senate Resolution 88 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, agreed to February 7, 1957, is hereby continued. Any vacancy in the select committee so continued shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments were made under section 2 of Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, 1st session, as amended.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the select committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized, as it may deem necessary and appropriate to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department

or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and further with the consent of other committees or subcommittees, to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, as amended, the select committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959, on which date the select committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of Senate Resolution 74, 85th Congress, as amended, expenses of the select committee, under this resolution, shall not exceed $500,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 221), as amended, was agreed to.

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1214, Senate Resolution 222, increasing the limit of expenditures by the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the amount authorized in Senate Resolution 74, agreed to January 30, 1957, and Senate Resolution 166, agreed to August 26, 1957, 85th Congress (authorizing and directing the committee to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers to the detriment of the interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities), is hereby increased by the additional amount of $20,000.

## ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1215, Senate Resolution 223, authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make additional expenditures and perform certain acts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word "advisable", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $200,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am ready to answer any questions on the resolution. It authorizes the Committee on Government Operations to make additional expenditures and perform certain acts. This matter relates to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. This year we are asking for, I believe, $10,000 or $12,000 less than last year. Last year we had approximately $10,000 or $12,000 left over.

Mr. President, I think we obtained some excellent results by means of the money expended by the committee last year. I should like to point out that the committee pays for itself over and over, each year.

One of the major things the committee accomplished during the past year was that it obtained information that things were not going along properly in the Northeast Air Command. We investigated the matter, and found, I can say, that millions of dollars of waste was occurring by reason of having excess supplies shipped there and thrown on the beach and left to deteriorate. So much was on hand, that finally some of it was buried in the ground. We were able to recover some of it.

As a result of the pinpointing of this matter, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, under whose jurisdiction supplies come, has instituted—and it is now in process—an inspection and checkup on their bases everywhere in the United States, so as to make sure that these excess supplies are curbed, and thus that no waste occurs.

I can say without any reservation that one thing alone aside from the other things we have done, is calculated to save this Government millions and millions and millions of dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], for his courtesy in handling these resolutions, inasmuch as it is necessary that I return to the committee before 2:15 p. m. The select committee will resume hearings in the next few minutes. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much indeed.

## INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1219, Senate Resolution 234, to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, this matter relates to a standing subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

In 1957 the subcommittee conducted public hearings on 13 days, on 15 Senate bills, and also on a subcommittee print dealing with proposals to secure, protect, and strengthen rights of persons under the Constitution and laws of the United States. After considering the several bills before it, the subcommittee reported S. 83, with an amendment, by a divided vote, to the full committee, recommending that the committee consider the bill favorably, subject to further amendments or substitution. A minority subcommittee report, urging rejection of the bill, was also submitted to the full committee.

Mr. President, I may say that the proponents of this measure, as well as its opponents, had recourse to the staff and its assistants and research facilities.

The subcommittee held public hearings concerning State Department restrictions on travel abroad by accredited American representatives of United States news-gathering agencies, and also compiled a wealth of information concerning American passport operations and procedures; this material is ready for publication. Draft legislation has been prepared, to be circulated for cosponsorship.

Pending before the subcommittee are two bills, S. 921 and S. 2148, dealing with freedom of information in the executive branch of the Government. Hearings were scheduled last year, but had to be postponed. We expect Attorney General Rogers—who has given me his personal assurance that he will attend—to be the first witness to testify on the asserted

privilege of the Chief Executive to withhold information from the Congress and Congressional committees.

Granting, for the sake of argument, that this privilege may exist for the Chief Executive himself, I have serious, unanswered questions in my own mind as to the extent to which this privilege can be delegated to subordinate administrative agency employees.

In addition, this committee has investigated and undertaken to protect the rights of American servicemen tried in foreign jurisdictions under the status-of-forces agreements.

The committee has an average of over 100 letters a week directed to it; 300 telephone calls a week; service to Members of Congress, including interviews and conferences on individual problems referred to the subcommittee by Representatives and Senators, averaging 20 hours a week; research and legislative analysis averaging 80 hours a week.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is another one of those so-called temporary investigations that started out with an authorization of $50,000 during the 84th Congress, 1st session, and, in the 84th Congress, 2d session, it received over $91,000. The committee is now asking for $115,000. What is the purpose of the additional amount?

Mr. HENNINGS. This is the amount the committee has requested each time.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The committee is asking for $115,000 according to my information.

Mr. HENNINGS. Last year we asked for $115,000, too, but we received only $100,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee received $100,000 last year. Why does the committee seek $115,000 this year? Why cannot the committee do its work with $100,000?

Mr. HENNINGS. Because the workload is increasing.

Mr. ELLENDER. The workload? Does the Senator mean he needs more employees?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; to hold more hearings as necessary to the studies being conducted.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long will the work continue?

Mr. HENNINGS. This is a standing subcommittee. Matters affecting constitutional rights and the Bill of Rights are considered by the subcommittee. I do not think those questions will ever cease to plague us, whether anyone wants such matters to plague the committee or not. Being a standing subcommittee, we need the material to do the job.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the same argument we have heard before.

Mr. HENNINGS. It may be the same argument, but we have done much labor on the committee. Some of us have worked out of season, when others have been vacationing. The committee has heard matters having to do with the loyalty-security program. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana would approve of it if he were more familiar with the work of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I happen to be familiar with the work of the committee. I also happen to be the chairman of a committee. I happen to be chairman of a committee that does a great deal of work after the sessions of Congress, and we do not require large, continuing supplemental appropriations.

Mr. HENNINGS. I did not intend to question the Senator's diligence, his enterprise, and his output of energy. I merely point out that this committee has many, many functions, which are particularly important to the United States Senate, the Members of which constantly are directing inquiries to us, which must be answered, and which require much research. The Senator, being an able lawyer, knows those questions are not answered offhand or in curbstone fashion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to point out again to the Senate that the Judiciary Committee obtains more extra money from the Senate than any other committee, and probably as much as the combined total authorized for the standing committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. How much, in terms of the percentage of legislation brought to the Senate, does the Senator suggest emanates from the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, if one considers bills involving small claims against the Government, I suppose it is a great deal. I used to handle such matters with a $3,500 clerk at one time. The Senators themselves did the work. We had a committee that clicked. All of us investigated every claim. Now, since the Reorganization Act, the same work is costing the American taxpayers probably half a million dollars, because, aside from the amount of work done by the committee on these small claims, there is an additional sum paid to the Attorney General's office.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure the distinguished Senator is well aware that, unhappily, the Committee on the Judiciary exists as a justice-of-the-peace court on small claims. The committee must consider those matters, and we do not enjoy doing that work. We would like to find some way to get out of it if we could.

Mr. ELLENDER. Most of the work is done by clerks or lawyers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say I cannot imagine a more fertile field in which to save money than by having an adequate staff to handle claims.

Mr. HENNINGS. Having been on that committee 5 or 6 years, I know claims are scrutinized, and often rejected, all to the saving of the American taxpayer. Since the Committee on the Judiciary seems to be somewhat in issue here, I should like to point out that the last figure I have on the question shows that the committee reports 54 percent of the legislation before the Senate. The Senator has referred to little claims. We have to consider all of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from Missouri that it is my recollection that when I was chairman of the Claims Committee, before the Reorganization Act the committee used to report 54 percent of the bills before the Senate. We did it with one $3,500-a-year clerk.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is present, will confirm the fact that the committee works very hard. I point out to the Senator that consideration of claims sometimes consumes a large part of the work of the committee. The committee does look into the claims. It rejects many of them. Many of the claims are reduced. I think, all considered, the committee saves millions of dollars that might otherwise come out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. President, I point out again that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is present, and he will attest to the fact that we have suffered more, as a committee, under the reorganization than has any committee in the Congress, because we have been handed a great deal of tedious detail.

Mr. EASTLAND. And that we would like to get rid of.

Mr. HENNINGS. The committee has to handle claims amounting to less than a hundred dollars, and other such small matters. I think the chairman will agree with the statement I have made.

Mr. EASTLAND. Some of the claims may involve $1 million. The committee would like to get rid of the whole lot.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, to reduce the amount on page 2 of the resolution from $115,000 to $100,000. This would provide the same amount as last year. Will the Senator accept that?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; I will say, in reply to that statement, that we shall have a very hard time doing the work for the full amount of money.

May I ask one of the staff members how much we returned this year?

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be an even greater reason to have the cut applied, if some money was returned from the $100,000.

Mr. HENNINGS. We are returning about $25,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. I see.

Mr. HENNINGS. The reason for that, I might say to my distinguished friend, is that we are constantly being asked to hold hearings on various subjects, but it so happened that the chairman of the subcommittee had an illness which made it impossible to conduct some of the hearings which we had planned during the last session. For that I am responsible. Nonetheless, the staff has to be kept on a standby basis and has to be kept intact. I will say to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Louisiana, that we need every one of the staff.

Mr. ELLENDER. By providing $100,000, as was provided last year, Senator, the same staff could be employed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have the floor at the moment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Excuse me, Senator. I am sorry.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator said he asked for $100,000 last year, but returned $25,000, under the circumstances he indicated.

Mr. HENNINGS. We expect to return what we do not use this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why not make the sum the same as that provided last year? Why increase it over the amount authorized last year, of which some $25,000 was not spent?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the distinguished and able chairman of the committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator's subcommittee carefully studied the request, did it not?

Mr. HENNINGS. It did indeed.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Committee on the Judiciary carefully considered the request, did it not?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Committee on the Judiciary did, and so did the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was it not the unanimous judgment of those two committees and of the subcommittee that the money was necessary for the operation of this particular subcommittee?

Mr. HENNINGS. It was, indeed. The breakdown was just as complete as that offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, whose resolution seemed to meet with no opposition from the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

I think the work of the Constitutional Rights Committee, which involves the protection of our servicemen abroad and other items, is extremely important. We went into the trial in Japan, the Girard trial. We sent an observer to that trial to see that that soldier's rights were being adequately protected. Those cases come to our attention constantly. As to some of them, we must do considerable research to determine whether we should go ahead. On others we have to go ahead immediately.

I think the Senator will agree, since he is a great constitutionalist and a fine lawyer, that many of those items are of the utmost importance to the people of this country. Our committee is one of the few forums to which the people can turn when they cannot get action and cannot get what they desire from the Department of Justice.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us some of the specific achievements of this subcommittee, insofar as the Girard case was concerned? Have we not provided courts to do such work? Could it not be done by the Attorney General?

Mr. HENNINGS. We have no court in Japan. As the Senator well knows, the military service turned Girard over to the civilian court in Japan. We sent a member of the staff over there to observe and to determine the atmosphere surrounding the entire case. We were not interested in Girard as a cause célèbre, necessarily. We were interested in him as an American serviceman. We sent an observer over there to see what the atmosphere was surrounding the trial and what the judicial temperament was of the body which was to try him. The observer was sent for that purpose because we thought it was our duty to consider the matter.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. I submit the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the numeral and insert "$100,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I now ask for a vote on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 234) was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

---

## ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1228, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) providing additional funds for the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is this a resolution similar to the resolution which was adopted last year, for the same amount?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this represents simply a continuation of the resolution which was adopted a year ago. There were amounts unexpended. The resolution is continued in effect pursuant to the original resolution, until January 31, 1959.

Mr. ELLENDER. Without additional funds?

Mr. BIBLE. Let me clarify my statement. The original resolution was approved last August and $50,000 was authorized for the work of the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems. The request of the committee was for $80,000. The Committee on Rules and Administration cut the request to $50,000, based on the fact that a new request for funds had to be made by February 1 of each year.

The only difference between the amount requested originally and the amount requested now is a difference of $6,000. We estimated then the total cost of the study would be $80,000. To date we have spent $6,000. Therefore, there is a $6,000 differential, based on the experience of the staff of the committee for the past 2 months. We spent $6,000 in the past 2 months.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that of the amount appropriated during the last session of Congress only a little over $6,000 has been spent?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it correct then that if the resolution is adopted, the total amount to be expended will be about $86,000?

Mr. BIBLE. Instead of the originally contemplated $80,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the object of this study?

Mr. BIBLE. The District of Columbia Committees on both the House and Senate sides became convinced that there was a great and growing need for a study of metropolitan area problems, because of the peculiar position of the District of Columbia as a Federal city, being bounded on the north by Maryland and on the south by Virginia, with many overlapping problems, such as water pollution, problems of mass transportation, and problems of economic development.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it be within the jurisdiction of Congress to legislate beyond the confines of the District of Columbia?

Mr. BIBLE. The District of Columbia Committee would have no intent to urge Congress to legislate beyond the confines of the District of Columbia, but we did wish to see how these metropolitan area problems were affecting the Federal interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Senator expect to cure a problem if such is discovered?

Mr. BIBLE. I assume that by way of recommendation there might be something in the nature of suggested legislation looking toward a compact patterned possibly after some interstate compacts or interregional compacts, similar to those which various States have entered into, where 2 or 3 States have common community problems which overlap.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator of the opinion that he will have sufficient funds to complete the study if the sum he has requested is appropriated?

Mr. BIBLE. That would certainly be my hope. We are called upon to file a final report a year from now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Every resolution provides for that, but it seems that these resolutions come up every year.

Mr. BIBLE. I recognize the Senator's fears. I am very hopeful we will complete our labors by 1 year from today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems as authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 172, agreed to August 29, 1957, is hereby authorized to make expenditures from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, which shall not exceed $80,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

---

## ADDITIONAL STAFF MEMBERS AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1225, Senate Resolution 240, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ 2 additional professional staff members and 2 additional clerical assistants on a temporary basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Adminstration with an amendment, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(a)" and insert "(e)", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from February 1, 1958, through January 31, 1959, to employ 2 additional professional staff members and 2 additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand it, this resolution merely provides the committee with the same staff during this session of Congress as last.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

---

## CONTINUATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1226, Senate Resolution 241, continuing temporarily the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations and increasing the limit of expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much more money is involved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Thirty-four thousand dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much was spent last year?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The committee is turning back $13,000 out of approximately $40,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The report shows that $40,000 was allotted to the subcommittee for the period from August 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958. It is estimated that approximately $10,000 will not have been obligated by that time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from Louisiana that the proposed action is mandatory. This is the last 6 months of the life of this particular subcommittee. From that point on, the work will be done by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean the full committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the work will be done by the regular staff.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the intention is to continue the subcommittee for only 6 months longer, why is it necessary to provide almost as much money as the subcommittee had appropriated last year?

Mr. MANSFIELD. What we are asking for is a 5-month figure, in reality. At the end of the fiscal year the work of this subcommittee will be transferred. There is much investigation yet to be done in the particular field being studied, and it is hoped that there will be a substantial return to the Treasury at the end of the term, although we are not at all certain how much it will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the intention is to have the subcommittee continue for only 5 or 6 months longer, why not make the appropriation for only that period, so that we may know the subcommittee is coming to an end?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have made the request for that period.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may have misunderstood the distinguished Senator from Alabama. As I understand, he stated that the subcommittee spent $40,000——

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I read from the report:

Of the $40,000 allotted to the subcommittee for the period August 1, 1957, to January 31, 1958, inclusive, about $10,000 will not have been obligated.

The period involved is a little less than 6 months. About $10,000 will be turned back.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the $40,000 to which the Senator referred was for 6 months, and not for a year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry I misunderstood.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to have the record made absolutely clear. The distinguished Senator from Montana, in answering a question by the Senator from Louisiana, stated that after the end of the life of the subcommittee it was expected that the work of the subcommittee would be performed by the regular staff of the committee. I, for one, do not believe that we ought to be limited to the present staff of the Foreign Relations Committee in carrying on this additional work.

Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that this is one committee which has no additional employees, aside from the four which were provided for today. Two are staff members, and two are clerks. This committee carries one of the heaviest loads of any committee in the Senate. We limit our staff to that which is provided in the Reorganization Act, plus the 2 staff members and 2 clerks voted today in the resolution agreed to just ahead of this one.

I point out to the Senator from Louisiana that the Committee on Foreign Relations has an unusual record with reference to subcommittees. We have subcommittees from time to time, but they expire. For example, a special subcommittee was set up to study foreign aid. It has gone out of existence, or will go out of existence on January 31 of this year. We are not asking for the continuation of that subcommittee.

The subcommittee under discussion was a special subcommittee consisting of members of the Foreign Relations Committee, 2 members from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and 2 from the Armed Services Committee. When the question arose with respect to continuing that subcommittee, the Foreign Relations Committee voted to continue it, upon the express condition that at the end of the specified period of time the work would go back into the regular framework of the Foreign Relations Committee. Certainly as much of the work as possible will be done by the regular staff; but I believe it will be necessary to have a small additional staff—perhaps not more than two additional persons. I wish to have the RECORD clear in that regard.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to hear my good friend say that the Foreign Relations Committee works as hard as any other committee on the Hill. I presume it does. It is commendable to see that the committee is able to do its work with the addition of only 4 employees, in con-

trast to the Judiciary Committee, which spends more than $1 million over and above the amount which is regularly appropriated for the standing committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in all fairness, it should be pointed out that the great majority of the bills introduced in the Senate are referred to the Judiciary Committee, and that that committee has a great deal more in the way of proposed legislation to consider than any other committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly. However, we find that this year, last year, the year before that, and the year before that, most of the work of looking into bills concerning claims against the Government and concerning immigration matters was done by paid attorneys—not the committee. These attorneys are the ones who do the footwork.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What I said was not intended as any reflection on the Judiciary Committee. We all know the tremendous load it has to carry. However, I did think it was a good time for me to do a little boasting with reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the subcommittee on disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations (authorized by S. Res. 93 of the 84th Cong., 1st sess., agreed to July 25, 1955, and extended from time to time) is hereby authorized, under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to continue the functions authorized by Senate Resolution 93, agreed to July 25, 1955, only through July 31, 1958, at which time its records, duties, and functions shall be assumed by the Committee on Foreign Relations which shall give special attention to the subject of disarmament in such manner as the committee may determine.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the Committee on Foreign Relations, from February 1, 1958, through July 31, 1958, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the Committee on Foreign Relations under this resolution, which shall not exceed $34,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## PAYMENT OF FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MATTHEW M. NEELY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1227, Senate Resolution 246.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 246) to pay certain funeral expenses of the late Senator Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable Matthew M. Neely, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1250, Senate Resolution 233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 233) authorizing an investigation of the adminstration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the resolution requests an appropriation for the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. The request amounts to a reduction of $80,000 under the amount appropriated a year ago.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to say that we are indeed very happy that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has been able to effect economies and that, in being successful in cutting his cloth to the measure, he has been able to request $80,000 less than was appropriated last year.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, gave the Committee on Rules and Administration a detailed breakdown of the amount. I have served on the subcommittee myself, and know the importance of the work the subcommittee performs. We on the Rules Committee felt that the committee chairman should indeed be the recipient of the gratitude, applause, and approval of the Senate for what he has done, particularly the fact that he will be able to do it for less money this year than was available last year.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the very kind statements of my good friend the Senator from Missouri. I believe the subcommittee can be operated efficiently with less money, and I propose to do it. I am reducing the staff in a number of places.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select 1 person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $209,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1251, Senate Resolution 230.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 230) to investigate national penitentiaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries of the Committee on the Judiciary. The amount asked for is the standard amount appropriated each year. Usually, $4,000, or approximately that amount, of the appropriation is returned. The amount actually spent is used to defray the expenses of

the members of the subcommittee in visiting the national penitentiaries and reformatories. To the best of my knowledge, there have been no deviations from the amount used, and I doubt that more than $1,000 has ever been spent. Certainly that has been true since I have been a member of the subcommittee, for some 5 or 6 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] initiated this expenditure.

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe he did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1220, Senate Resolution 235.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 235) to investigate matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the resolution in the same amount as last year?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to say to my distinguished friend that the resolution calls for the same amount that was appropriated last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is for the purpose of considering naturalization and immigration bills. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder whether the committee is planning to consider any new methods of approaching the problems related to this subject, in order that it might relieve Senators of the great amount of work that is now done in this field.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would say that at one time we appointed a subcommittee which undertook to investigate the question whether we could avail ourselves of some other method of handling the work. However, insofar as some of us were able to determine by an examination of the law, we found that the cases involved, as the Senator no doubt knows, are cases of individuals who have been denied citizenship.

Mr. ELLENDER. Denied citizenship under existing laws, that is. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct. These are special, unique cases, which we get from day to day.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does it not mean, in effect, that more and more people are coming into the country? Why do we not make our present laws function, and permit immigrants to come in under regular quotas?

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the Senator—and I am sure he knows it already, and I certainly do not mean to burden the RECORD with an extensive discussion of the subject—that we do find special circumstances and special cases.

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the law, suspension-of-deportation cases, in which the Department of Justice has discretionary power, must still be referred to Congress. The committee must consider those cases.

Since the convening of the present session of the 85th Congress, there have been referred to the subcommittee a total of 302 cases involving suspensions of deportation and adjustments of status under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. That is just one item.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could that not be done by the Department of Justice?

Mr. EASTLAND. Because under the law those cases must come to Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; but Congress could change the law. Why has that not been done? Has the committee looked into the subject of changing the law?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; it has not.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the committee were to come before the Senate with such a suggestion, the law could be changed.

Mr. EASTLAND. That recommendation was made when the Immigration Act was passed, but Congress did not wish to surrender its final authority in such cases. Therefore, a provision was written into the law that the cases must be referred to the Congress for approval. We must live with it. I wish it were not so. We do not want it, but we must live with it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has any effort been made recently to resubmit the matter to Congress, to the end that more of those cases are handled by the Department of Justice?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; no such effort has been made.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the matter stands, then, a great many immigrants come into the country over and above the quotas established by law.

Mr. EASTLAND. This matter refers to people who are already in the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand, but some of them should not be in the country.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is one of the duties of the staff to review the cases.

Mr. HENNINGS. Many Members of Congress thought the matter should reside in Congress, in order that certain acts of grace and equity and justice may be given to people who have no other place or other forum to which to repair.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. Some of us do not believe in leaving everything to the Department of Justice or to a bureaucracy in determining some of these cases. We believe that Congress should pass on them.

Mr. EASTLAND. And Congress rejected such a change.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, Congress is acting as a court of equity.

Mr. HENNINGS. In a sense; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore we are acting in a dual capacity, in the capacity of a court and in the capacity of a legislature.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I will not object to the amount which is proposed to be provided for the activity involved. I do believe it is appropriate, however, particularly at the beginning of the session, to make a few observations about what I believe we ought to do with respect to the subject of immigration. If the distinguished chairman of the committee will allow me a few moments, I should like to address some inquiries to him, which, I am sure, as always, he will courteously answer to the best of his ability.

First I should like to make a general observation. I am deeply convinced that we are faced not only with the crisis of defense, in connection with which we must catch up in missiles and rocketry—and unquestionably we will—but that we are also faced with the crisis of our relations with the world. These relations not only go to weaponry, but also go to immigration.

There are tens of thousands of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, generally young and desirable persons, similar to the Freedom Fighters from Hungary. What they want to know before they escape, and after they get out, and what the legion of others who are left behind, who might want to escape, want to know, is what will happen to them when they get out. This depends very largely upon the direction the free world will take due to the leadership implications of the immigration policy of the United States.

I think that I and many others, in the United States, were deeply disappointed that Congress in the last session did not legalize the status of the Freedom Fighters, the Hungarian refugees who came to the United States. They still remain here, over 25,000 of them, as parolees.

A commission of the International Rescue Committee, a distinguished volunteer organization, has recently re-

turned from abroad, under the chairmanship of a man I know very well, Harold Zellerbach, president of the municipal art commission of San Francisco and a leading businessman. He came back and reported there were almost 200,000 refugees, many from Yugoslavia, who are living in camps in free Europe, very unhappy and frustrated in their desire to participate in the blessings of freedom, simply because there is no leadership in terms of the resettlement of those refugees.

So the second point is, What are we going to do about a permanent policy of the United States to give the leadership which has always been necessary to solve this problem, as it was in the case of the DP's and the refugees? What leadership will be given to bring about the resettlement of the persons who are escaping from behind the Iron Curtain because of persecution?

Finally, the McCarran-Walter Act itself is widely considered throughout the world as having many unjust and discriminatory features, particularly against persons whose skin is yellow or black. I hope we will take a look at that situation, not only in terms of whether our immigration law needs to be changed, but in terms of the very salient fact that this matter, too, represents a vital element in the present crisis in defense and the crisis of survival which the free world faces.

Under the McCarran-Walter Act, about 75,000 quota numbers are set aside for persons whose skills are needed in the United States. As a matter of fact, in the last year the Commissioner of Immigration, General Swing, reported that only about 5 percent of those numbers were used. In short, this does not represent any viable aspect of the law of the United States; it simply indicates the impracticability of the law, because of it thousands of immigrants who are desirable for our national interest, who could come in under the leadership role I have described, are barred from the United States.

In the light of those views, which I hold very deeply, and which I share, I believe, with others in the Chamber, I wish to address a few questions to the chairman of the committee. I do not want to detain the Senate or the chairman very long.

Can the chairman advise me as to a statement on page 3 of the justification in the report made to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which reads:

> The staff of the subcommittee—
>
> To wit, the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization—
>
> must continue to study the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to insure fair and effective interpretation and administration of that act.

Will the Senator advise me whether any reports are issued upon those studies, or whether any are contemplated?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; the last report was made on February 28, 1955.

Mr. JAVITS. Since that time there have been no reports, and special appropriations have been authorized for the work of the subcommittee. Can the chairman advise us when this subcommittee will report again?

Mr. EASTLAND. The subcommittee will report at the end of this session of Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. That is, on its staff studies?

Mr. EASTLAND. On the staff studies.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the chairman feel we might profitably have a report, let us say, in February 1958, which will be 3 years after the last report, and thus have available to us facts which might enable us to legislate?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think a staff report would do any good. The President of the United States made a number of recommendations last year. The committee held hearings, at which the Acting Attorney General of the United States appeared. We got together on an immigration bill which was enacted. It has been my intention to have further hearings held by the subcommittee this year.

Mr. JAVITS. Can the chairman give us any idea when it is actually proposed to put the question of further amendment of the immigration law on for hearing?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot speak, of course, for the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. We had some very serious trouble in getting an immigration bill out of the Committee on the Judiciary last year. But it has been my purpose to begin hearings on the President's recommendations, or to continue hearings on those recommendations. I make no agreement as to when.

Mr. JAVITS. None whatever?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know when they will be held.

Mr. JAVITS. Can the chairman tell us if it will be in a month or 2 months?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know. All I can tell the Senator, and what I do tell him, is that I am, in good faith, going to hold some hearings. That is all I can tell him.

Mr. JAVITS. Can the Senator tell us also whether there is any particular priority or urgency in respect to the regularization of the status of the Hungarian refugees who are in the United States on parole?

Mr. EASTLAND. That matter was under study last year. I certainly have no objection to adjusting the status of the Hungarians. But, as I recall, the Commission on Security said we should go slow until some security checks had been made of these people. That is the reason the matter was not moved more quickly.

Mr. JAVITS. It is my understanding—I got this only secondhand—that there was an excellent experience in terms of security concerning the Hungarian refugees; they turned out quite well.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator knows that when the Commission on Security makes such a recommendation, it has got to be very carefully considered. When such a recommendation is made, I am going to follow that recommendation.

Mr. JAVITS. I assure the Senator I shall make it my business, arduously, to go to work and track down the validity of that information.

Mr. EASTLAND. That was my information last year. The clerk of the committee, who is sitting here, says that that is the fact, and that it is in the report of the Commission on Security.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall do my utmost, if the Senator will allow me, to study that matter and to dispel the barrier, if it is one, to action upon this subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am not going to be a party now—I will be absolutely frank about it—to anything which will tend to bring Communist agents into this country or which will leave in this country Communist agents who are here.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think any of us, if the Senator will allow me to say so, wish to be a party to any such thing.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know the Senator does not; but we were criticized about the Hungarians. We were criticized by the Senator from New York when we acted in the utmost good faith on the recommendation of the Commission on Government Security.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator from New York to whom the Senator from Mississippi is referring is myself, the Senator from New York is only seeking information from the committee. Bygones are bygones. I am interested in what we are going to do now. I pledge myself to run down whatever may be the administration's barrier to which the Senator is referring.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall give the Senator from New York the citation.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be glad to receive it, of course, and to run it down to see whether it is valid, and shall advise the Senator from Mississippi.

May I ask the Senator what his ideas are on committee consideration of some permanent policy on escapees as recommended by the President?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as I have said, we shall be glad to consider it, and we are going to consider it. I have no firm, fixed ideas about it.

Mr. JAVITS. But the Senator from Mississippi is unable to advise us as to when; is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. But I have stated in good faith that we would in good faith go into it. At this time I am not going to announce hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, no Senator can do more than use his efforts—as I shall, and as I hope many other Members of the Senate will—to urge upon the country and upon the Senate and upon the majority leadership and upon the chairman of the Judiciary Committee the urgency, in the interests of the national security, of taking early action upon the matters I have discussed today.

I am deeply convinced that, in a package, they are as essential as is our massive effort to catch up in terms of the weapons race. If we do not expect—and certainly we do not—to resolve the conflict in the world by world war III, then our other means—by economic and technical assistance; by recognition of human

dignity, through enforcement of civil rights; and by immigration legislation which is just and fair, and takes account of what is taking place in the world, and takes account not only of our own strengths, but also of the weaknesses of our enemies, in terms of the things in which we believe and which we hold the most dear—that is the package—constituting, as I see it, the way by which we hope to avoid world war III. I shall do all that I can, and I deeply believe that many other Members of the Senate take the same position, in the belief that that is the package—one dealing with human values with weapons as our shield—by means of which we can negotiate for peace from a position of strength.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 235) was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select 1 person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## WITHDRAWALS OF LANDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5538) to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

## INVESTIGATION OF IMPROVEMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1223, Senate Resolution 238, to investigate matters pertaining to the improvement and strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$40,000", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the improvement and strengthening of the Federal Criminal Code, including ways and means of improving Federal law enforcement and administration of justice in United States courts through changes in and additions to existing laws and procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select 1 person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $40,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, does the resolution relate to the same subcommittee, which was created during the 84th Congress, for the purpose of making studies and investigations regarding narcotics? Does the resolution provide for a renewal or continuation of that subcommittee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. At that time the chairman was the distinguished Senator from Texas, now the Governor of Texas, Mr. Daniel.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the new title of the subcommittee is "Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and that was the title at that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the work the same? Was any more proposed legislation submitted to the subcommittee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Louisiana may recall that at the last session a good deal of time was devoted to the enactment of a bill, reported by the subcommittee, with respect to clarification of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Jencks case. By means of that bill, we gave protection to the files of the FBI from unnecessary raids by racketeers, but at the same time we preserved the rights of defendants to all information brought against them by the Government.

This subcommittee—which is composed of only 3 members, and has a staff composed of 3 persons—has a great deal of work to do. We are investigating searches and seizures in Federal cases, arrest and arraignments, firearms control, interception of telephonic communications, obstruction of justice statutes, perjury statutes, appeals by the United States, adequate counsel in criminal cases, disparity of sentences in criminal cases, credit for time already served when a person is convicted of criminal offenses, Federal criminal statutes, and related subjects.

I should like to point out that with the increased facility in transportation, the criminal racketeer today has opportunities which never existed in the days when many of the Federal criminal statutes were enacted.

The Judiciary Committee adopted the program of this subcommittee, and the Committee on Rules and Administration endorsed it, because of the conviction that there is great need for study of this matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out to my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, that—as I stated a moment ago—the subcommittee originated during the 84th Congress, and its function was to seek ways and means to control the illegal trafficking in narcotics, including marihuana and similar drugs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the investigation which we made at that time revealed the need of continued study.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the subcommittee has branched out into other things; that is exactly what has happened.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Louisiana well knows that crime in the United States is on the increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure that no one is more anxious than is he that the laws be closely examined, in order to make sure that, if we can improve the Federal Criminal Code, we do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree that crime is on the increase, but I doubt that the expenditure of $40,000, as proposed in this resolution, will appreciably reduce the American crime rate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On that point, I do not agree with the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

---

## INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1222, Senate Resolution 237, to investigate juvenile delinquency in the United States.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, this resolution relates to a special subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. The subcommittee has been engaged on its work for approximately 5 years.

During the past year, the subcommittee distributed approximately 10,000 copies of reports and printed transcripts of hearings throughout the United States. Of this number, 6,000 of the documents were Report No. 130, the so-called omnibus report of the committee. While we still receive numerous requests for this document, we have only a limited number left, and these are distributed to Congressional offices and professional organizations and agencies.

The staff of the committee has handled over 6,000 pieces of correspondence from a variety of professional and nonprofessional people and organizations concerned with this growing and pressing problem on our body politic.

The subcommittee has been asked to appear in a large number of the major cities of the United States.

We feel we are learning a great deal, as time goes on, about problems of the youth of the country.

We plan for a small staff of only seven people. We are asking only for $75,000.

Now, the following are proposed legislation before the 85th Congress:

S. 675, a bill to amend section 2314, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the transportation in interstate commerce of articles obtained by false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or through any scheme or artifice to defraud.

S. 980, a bill to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an aftercare posthospital treatment program for drug addiction and for other purposes.

S. 981, a bill to create an Advisory Committee on Drug Addiction in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We all know, only too well, what a problem marihuana and drug addiction presents in this country, particularly among our youth.

S. 982, a bill to establish a hospital of the Public Health Service in one of the Pacific Coast States, especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs.

S. 2558, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interstate traffic in switchblade knives and to prevent these instruments from getting into the hands of juveniles.

We all read accounts carried in the Washington papers and in our home newspapers of young men, and indeed young women, engaged in mugging activities and other assaults. Among the instruments used are switchblade knives, which many of us who have had anything to do with prosecution in criminal cases know are lethal, death-dealing instruments.

Also to be considered by Congress are:

A bill to amend the law dealing with indecent publications in the District of Columbia.

A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Juvenile Court in the District of Columbia," so as to provide for the appointment of a referee.

A bill to amend section 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia. This bill puts the director of social work under the judge.

A bill to provide assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption.

That bill relates to the so-called baby-adoption racket.

A bill to make uniform the law of reciprocal enforcement of support in the District of Columbia.

For the coming year the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency intends to continue its investigations and studies concentrating on the following areas:

Training schools: Evidence gathered by the subcommittee indicates that many State training schools for delinquent boys and girls indulge in practices that are inimical, certainly, to the boys and girls put in their care, and that some do not have adequate facilities for either rehabilitation or proper custody.

The committee plans to go more deeply into this situation in order to ascertain its pervasiveness. If called for, hearings will be held on the problem. During such hearings we could hear from persons concerned with this situation, including Federal Bureau of Prisons' inspectors who have been to training schools throughout the United States.

We also intend to look further into the induction policies of the Armed Forces. A questionnaire on the policies of the Selective Service System in regard to former juvenile delinquents has been developed and sent to all State Selective Service boards. Background material has been collected from officials of the Selective Service System, from the various Armed Forces, from civilian agencies that come into contact with the problem, such as juvenile courts, and from the several veterans' organizations. A compilation is also being made of some 250 questionnaires which were sent to juvenile courts requesting information concerning their practices, procedures, and philosophies on this subject.

We have recently held hearings in the city of New York having to do with a total community plan for the handling of juvenile delinquents.

Also, the committee intends to look more closely into the problems of probation, parole, and juvenile courts.

Also, the committee intends to go into the handling of delinquent and incorrigible children in the public school systems of the United States, which we know is a problem of great magnitude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I cannot help but express extreme disappointment that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate should come before the Senate and ask to continue the juvenile delinquency subcommittee. The subcommittee was organized back in the 83d Congress by former Senator Hendrickson, of New Jersey. The RECORD is replete with statements from him and from those who succeeded him that the end of the study was in sight.

Last year, when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] headed the subcommittee, he said—the statement is in the RECORD—that the money then being requested would enable the subcommittee to wind up its work. Yet, here we are again presented with a request for $75,000 to further study juvenile delinquency.

The Committee on Judiciary of the Senate has enough facts, enough material on hand, concerning juvenile delinquency to write and present almost any kind of legislation one can imagine, but the subcommittee wants to investigate further. I do not know what other facts can be ferreted out.

The question of juvenile delinquency can never be cured by simply holding hearings. The cure must begin in the home, and in the schools.

Yesterday I made a report on my visit to Russia. I wish to say that in that country juvenile delinquency is unknown.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have been there, too, Senator. As we all know, Russia is a monolithic state. We know that the iron hand of discipline, the iron hand of conformity, is laid upon every man, woman, and child.

Mr. ELLENDER. I disagree with the statement of my friend. Such is not the case. The fact of the matter is that children there are kept busy.

Mr. HENNINGS. Well, I saw it from different eyes than those of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps the Senator did, or, perhaps the Senator did not see as much as I did. I visited various cities. I visited schools. I visited homes. I believe I know what I am talking about.

Mr. President, we will never solve the problem of juvenile delinquency by continuing these investigations. I return to the proposition that we have enough facts, enough evidence on hand now, to draft legislation, if any be required.

The money requested is simply to be provided in order to keep on the payroll

the people who are now there, and for no other purpose.

Mr. President, this is a classic example of the fact that these subcommittees, once organized, never die. They are perpetuated.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I say to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that I know he is completely sincere, but the problem of the young people who are in trouble in the United States is an ever-growing and burgeoning one.

I have spent a good part of my life as a prosecutor. I spent 8 years, at least, in such work in a big city. I have spent a good many years as a member of the committee which my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], so admirably headed, to study the prisons, national penitentiaries, and reformatories.

We have seen the end product of juvenile delinquency. We have seen what happens to these youngsters after they have been misused, mishandled, or neglected.

Mr. ELLENDER. By whom? By fathers and mothers?

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish we knew.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is where the problem arises, with the fathers and mothers—in the home.

Mr. HENNINGS. Certainly, part of the problem lies with the fathers and mothers, but, clearly, they alone are not always entirely responsible.

Mr. ELLENDER. The problem arises in the home, and also in the schools.

Mr. HENNINGS. I say in all good spirit to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that I wish we could find one simple solution to this growing problem in the United States. We have the problem of gangs, the problem of youngsters murdering, assaulting, robbing, raping, and committing all manner of depredation and vandalism. I wish the answer were as simple as the Senator has stated. Unhappily, it is not.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. In just a moment I shall be glad to yield to my very good friend, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

We have found that communities throughout the land welcome this particular committee, when it comes for hearings, because they are then given the opportunity to spell out for the committee and for the benefit of the community the enormity of the problem.

There is an increase in juvenile delinquency in this country today; and if we permit that to continue we shall be weakening the very fiber and fabric of the United States.

The committee is a conscientious and serious committee. Certainly the resolution is not for the purpose of giving people jobs.

I am now glad to yield to my good friend, the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I ask my friend, the Senator from Missouri, if it is not true that the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover showed that a few years ago the people who were stealing automobiles were 21, 22, 23, or 24 years of age, and that as the years have gone by the age of the people involved has decreased, until 71 percent of all cars stolen today are stolen by boys and girls 17 or 18 years of age.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly correct. The Senator from North Dakota and I have visited the Federal reformatories and the State reformatories, and we have observed that these criminals are younger and younger as time goes on.

If one goes to Atlanta, if one goes to Leavenworth, or if one goes to some of the so-called big houses in this country, the maximum custody institutions, one will find—as some of us who have lived with this problem for many, many years have found—men who are hardened, professional criminals. And one will discover their problems all began when they were youngsters.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the home, as I have said.

Mr. HENNINGS. I agree with my friend, the Senator from Louisiana: Sometimes in the home. However, sometimes it was not in the home.

The solution is not always in the home. Churches can often make a contribution toward solution of the problem, and many have made a tremendous contribution. Sometimes the so-called social agencies, such as the YMCA and the Big Brother organizations, of which I happen to be a director, and other such agencies, can do a lot of good.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HENNINGS. The question is so very complex that one cannot say it is one thing or the other. There are broken homes, also, as the Senator from Louisiana well knows. Some of these youngsters do not have any homes. We have to consider many factors.

I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, is it not true that the testimony of District Attorney Keating of Denver showed that in 1 year 49 families in Denver alone were involved in broken homes, that 49 fathers skipped out to California and other States, and under the law they could not be brought back? I mention that, since the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has talked about fathers and mothers taking care of their children. We have been trying to get a runaway-father law for some time.

Mr. ELLENDER. That such a situation prevails is the fault of the local authorities. The point I am making, may I say to the Senator from North Dakota, is that these studies will not cure any evil which exists.

Mr. LANGER. Oh.

Mr. ELLENDER. The subcommittee has been studying this problem since 1953. It seems that the more the subcommittee studies it, the worse the situation gets. My good friend, the Senator from Missouri, just stated that as to thievery of automobiles in recent years, the age of the thief has been coming down. I read what Mr. Hoover said as to the fact that the people who are stealing are growing younger and younger.

The Senator and the committee have been studying this problem since long before Mr. Hoover made that statement. What good have those studies achieved? That is the question I am posing to the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. Would the Senator suggest that because the farm situation seems to be growing worse and worse, year by year, we should stop all activity as to studying agricultural conditions? Would the Senator suggest that, if floods are getting worse year by year, we should not make any studies of rivers and flood control?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend that I do not care how much the problem of juvenile delinquency is investigated, investigations alone will not cure the evil. The cure has to start in the home, in the school, and in the church.

Mr. HENNINGS. I agree with the Senator that we are not going to cure the evil.

Mr. ELLENDER. We never will.

Mr. HENNINGS. We hope to ameliorate and to lessen the evil. We hope to point the way in some of the cities by constructive investigations, rather than by sensational ones. We hope to point the way in some of the communities in order that agencies, such as the police departments, juvenile authorities, the courts and others, may find some pattern or some pilot manner in which to deal with these problems.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the American Legion and all the service organizations have endorsed this program?

Mr. HENNINGS. I think without exception all service organizations, including the American Legion, have endorsed it, and also the churches. I do not know of anybody who has suggested that the committee has not been doing constructive work.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that we appropriate a lot of money to study diseases of hogs, chickens, and cattle? We keep on appropriating money to study those diseases, yet if the argument of the Senator from Louisiana is correct we need not study the diseases of children. We do study the diseases of hogs, chickens, and cattle.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from North Dakota knows better than to make that comparison. I voted for all of the things the Senator is now talking about. What I am complaining about are studies made by subcommittees which do not bring any relief.

Why does the subcommittee not complete its investigation, draft legislation, and submit that legislation to the Congress? Once the legislation is enacted, then the subcommittee should be disbanded, in order to see how the legislation operates. As the matter now stands, all we seem to be doing is spending money to investigate a problem which we know exists, and about which the subcommittee has compiled a wealth of data.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator remember attending a single meeting when the committee had before it women doctors testifying about diseased children? Has the Senator ever gone out

to the National Training School for Boys to see those hundreds of boys?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I have not.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator ever been to the juvenile and youth institution, Englewood, Colo., to see those 200 boys?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I have not. Is that something the subcommittee ought to do?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly it is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean that?

Mr. LANGER. Every one of those boys is a citizen of the United States of America. They are all citizens. In time of war they will be called into service for the national defense. Of course it is the object of the Senate to protect those boys and to make good citizens of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I return to the proposition that we do not see eye to eye on the manner and method of treating juvenile delinquency. I go back to the proposition that the problem must be done in the home, and that holding hearings, hiring staffs, spending money will not solve the problem.

The Senator is aware that today we have many children who go wrong. Why is that? It is because their fathers and mothers do not take care of them as they should, and the children are treated as though they are not wanted. Certainly, an investigation will not help those children.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. We will never cure the evil by merely holding hearings and exposing the evil.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. It is true, is it not, that the divorce rate has been constantly on the increase? Divorce is increasing by leaps and bounds.

Mr. HENNINGS. I think we have found that broken homes represent a major cause of the difficulties of many young people. Many of them are not delinquent. They merely have no place to go. They need guidance. That is the purpose of many of the hearings. We aim to correlate and bring together many of the functions of the cities, towns, States, and other entities who are struggling with this problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have had some experience with this particular subcommittee, which held hearings in the State of New York, where we have as great a problem as exists anywhere in the country.

I had the honor of being the principal law-enforcement officer of my State. We had a very distinguished commission, presided over by one of America's outstanding businessmen, Mr. Thomas Watson, Jr., the head of the International Business Machines Corp. The commission made a study of what could be done about this problem.

The Federal Government is not doing nearly enough. I would agree with the Senator from Louisiana if we had appropriated the necessary money for Federal aid to enable the States and communities to deal with the problem of juvenile delinquency. But we are not appropriating the necessary funds. If we were doing so, Senators would have a right to complain and to say, "We have a program, and we have appropriated money, but we are not doing anything."

The subcommittee is attempting to do something constructive. At least, it is trying to place its finger on the causes of juvenile delinquency, and it is also endeavoring to bring information to the various States with respect to the experience of other States. In that respect, I think the work of the subcommittee is extremely valuable. The expenditure proposed for the purpose is minuscule.

As to the contention that the problem is not being materially arrested, of course, it is not. Indeed, our problems in connection with juvenile delinquency are increasing. But who is so omnicient as to say that if we were not busying ourselves with some remedies we would not have a worse problem than we now have?

All social movement is in the direction indicated by the work of the subcommittee. In New York we are experimenting with limited security facilities, analogous to the Civilian Conservation Corps. We are experimenting with guidance and counseling in the schools and courts. All this costs enormous sums of money. The States have fewer tax resources than has the Federal Government. We urgently need some Federal program to help in the fight on juvenile delinquency. The minimum essential is to have a Federal agency which can bring to one State information with respect to what is being done in other States to combat the fundamental causes of juvenile delinquency. Such an agency should serve on a national scale.

I should like to pay tribute to my colleague from Missouri. This subcommittee was the first national agency to point out the fallacy of the old idea that juvenile delinquency was the characteristic result of slum neighborhoods or of generally poor economic conditions. Studies proved that such factors were entirely unrelated to juvenile delinquency, and that the primary cause was broken homes. That condition can and does exist among the very rich and well placed. It definitely produces delinquents at least as bad as those produced at lower economic levels.

I hope we may proceed with this very constructive undertaking. I compliment my colleague from Missouri for the way in which the work has been carried on by him and his colleagues on the subcommittee.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the junior Senator from New York for his very generous expressions and contributions. In sum, he has stated that the work of the subcommittee has done much to dispel commonly held notions about the treatment of children in trouble, to prevent their getting into more trouble, and to salvage the youth of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 237) was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the other person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## ESCAPE OF REFUGEES FROM CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1224, Senate Resolution 239, to investigate problems arising by escape of refugees from certain foreign countries under Communist domination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last year $45,000 was appropriated for this purpose. Nearly $26,000 was returned. This shows that the committee was very economical. I promise that if this resolution is agreed to we shall be just as economical during the coming year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee

thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems in certain western European nations, and in certain Near Eastern, Middle Eastern, and Far Eastern countries, created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate takes a recess today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR EXTENSION OF SITE OF ADDITIONAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE UNITED STATE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 193, Senate bill 728.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 728) to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 and the property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 2, line 6, after the word "streets", to strike out "contained in said square 725 and all publicly or privately owned real property (including alleys or parts of alleys and streets); in line 17, after "1948", to strike out "squares 725 and" and insert "square"; in line 19, after the word "such", to strike out "squares" and insert "square"; on page 3, line 5, after the word "in", to strike out "squares 725 and" and insert "square"; in line 9, after the word "such", to strike out "squares" and insert "square"; in line 17, after the word "demolition", to strike out "and/or removal"; on page 4, line 1, after the word "in", to strike out "squares" and insert "square"; in line 2, after "724", to strike out "and 725"; and, in line 6, after the word "between", to strike out "Constitution Avenue" and insert "C Street"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in addition to the real property contained in square 725 in the District of Columbia heretofore acquired as a site for an additional office building for the United States Senate under the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1028), the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is hereby authorized to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, for purposes of extension of such site or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds, all other publicly or privately owned real property (including alleys or parts of alleys and streets) contained in square 724 in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That upon the acquisition of such real property by the Architect of the Capitol on behalf of the United States, such property shall be subject to the provisions of the act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718) in the same manner and to the same extent as the present Senate Office Building and the grounds and sidewalks surrounding the same.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act and of such act of June 25, 1948, square 724 shall be deemed to extend to the outer face of the curbs surrounding such square: *Provided*, That the north boundary of square 724 shall be deemed to extend to a point 4 feet south of the outer face of the existing south curb of D Street in said square.

SEC. 3. Any proceeding for condemnation brought under this act shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (16 D C. Code, secs. 619–644).

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any real property owned by the United States and contained in square 724 shall, upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the Senate Office Building Commission, be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol, and any alley, or part thereof, contained in such square, shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in accordance with any request therefor made by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of such Commission.

SEC. 5. Upon acquisition of any real property pursuant to this act, the Architect of the Capitol, when directed by the Senate Office Building Commission to so act, is authorized to provide for the demolition of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property.

SEC. 6. The jurisdiction of the Capitol Police shall extend over any real property acquired under this act. Upon completion of the acquisition of all properties in square 724, herein authorized to be acquired, the following streets shall become a part of the United States Capitol Grounds and as such shall be subject to the provisions of Public Law 570, 79th Congress, as amended: First Street Northeast, between C Street and D Street; C Street Northeast, between First and Second Streets; D Street Northeast, between First and Second Streets. Such streets shall continue under the jurisdiction and control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and said Commissioners shall continue to be responsible for the maintenance and improvement thereof, except that the Capitol Police Board shall have exclusive charge and control over the parking and impounding of vehicles on such streets and the Capitol Police shall be responsible for the enforcement of such parking regulations as may be promulgated by the Capitol Police Board.

SEC. 7. The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the bill now pending before the Senate was introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, for the purpose of acquiring all of square 724 and the remainder of square 725. Some objection was made to the bill as introduced and the committee limited acquisition to square 724. We are now proposing to acquire a little less than half of that block, with half of that land being unimproved property and the remainder proposed to be acquired is improved with structures that are not very valuable. Therefore, the cost, instead of being $4 million, will be a little less than $1 million.

To accomplish that purpose, it is necessary, first, to disagree to the committee amendments, so that I may then offer a complete substitute for the bill.

I therefore ask that the Senate disagree to the committee amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment I am proposing is at the desk. It is a complete substitute for the entire bill. I shall describe it very briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point, without its being read.

The amendment reads as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in addition to the real property contained in square 725 in the District of Columbia heretofore acquired as a site for an additional office building for the United States Senate under the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1028), the Architect of the Capitol,

under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is hereby authorized to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, for purposes of extension of such site or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds, all publicly or privately owned real property contained in lots 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 76, 77, 78, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 88, 89, 90, 91, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, and 824, in square 724 in the District of Columbia, and the portion of the alley or alleys in such square bounded on the west by lots 87, 48, and 803, except so much of such portion as abuts lots 839 and 80: *Provided*, That upon the acquisition of any such real property by the Architect of the Capitol on behalf of the United States, such property shall be subject to the provisions of the act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 718).

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act and of such act of June 25, 1948, the lots, alleys, and parts of alleys heretofore acquired in square 725, and the lots in square 724 authorized to be acquired hereunder, shall be deemed to extend to the outer face of the curbs of such squares.

SEC. 3. Any proceeding for condemnation brought under this act shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (16 District of Columbia Code, secs. 619–644).

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any real property owned by the United States and contained in square 724 shall, upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the Senate Office Building Commission, be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol, and the portion of the alley or alleys authorized to be acquired hereunder shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in accordance with any request therefor made by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of such Commission.

SEC. 5. Upon acquisition of any real property pursuant to this act, the Architect of the Capitol, when directed by the Senate Office Building Commission to so act, is authorized to provide for the demolition of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property.

SEC. 6. The jurisdiction of the Capitol Police shall extend over any real property acquired under this act, including the property in square 725 referred to in section 2.

SEC. 7. The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if S. 728 is amended to exclude all apartment, hotel and office building properties and 5 lots in miscellaneous locations in square 724, it is estimated that the remaining properties in square 724 can be acquired for approximately $965,000—on the basis of recent property acquisition costs in the vicinity of the Capitol Grounds.

Under the $965,000 expenditure, there would be acquired 78,545 square feet of land, with existing improvements, and this land could be converted temporarily into parking accommodations for approximately 285 automobiles.

The acquisition of this property at the present time would tend to prevent further assemblages of individual parcels of property in this square for the purpose of erection of costly private structures.

The property to be taken is vacant in part and in part improved by very old houses. The apartment buildings, hotels and one large office building are not to be acquired under the substitute.

The 78,545 square feet to be acquired under the substitute would be about 40 percent of the entire area in square 724. Moneywise the area being acquired would be less than 25 percent of the present estimated cost of the entire square.

The construction of the new Senate subway is to begin in a few weeks. That will eliminate the use of three streets on the Capitol Grounds, including part of Constitution Avenue, for nearly a year. As a result, over 200 parking spaces will be lost for that year. At the present time there have been issued twice as many parking permits for cars as the parking lot will accommodate. I refer to the lot located on square 723 on the northeast part of the Capitol Grounds. Holders of permits may park only on a first-come, first-served basis. Parking space is about the scarcest thing there is at the present time in the Capitol area. Some space must be available for tourists.

The situation is further aggravated by the fact that the Capitol telephone exchange has been transferred from the House Office Building to the New Senate Office Building, and the telephone operators, who have been parking on a House lot several blocks to the south of the Capitol should not be forced to walk that great distance at various hours of the evening and early morning. They should have a nearby parking lot, and the passage of the pending bill will help provide for that.

Many Senators will remember that the Veterans of Foreign Wars felt they had made a mistake in the acquisition of the lots located between the two hotels.

They have taken an option on other property nearby, but not in the square we are considering. They are very anxious to to acquire that property for a new national headquarters, and, as it appears obvious that Congress will need their present property ultimately, they desire to dispose of their present property now in order to receive the money for it, and to apply that money to the acquisition of the new site, on which they recently decided to build, and the acquisition of which will not in any way interfere with the future construction plans of the Senate.

Therefore, the present property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in square 724, may be built upon in the near future if Congress does not acquire it now, while it is vacant.

In connection with the bill, I believe it is appropriate to include, as a part of my remarks, a letter sent to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works by the Bureau of the Budget, recommending the bill as originally reported; also, a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works from the National Capital Planning Commission. Each of these bureaus indicates the high desirability of acquiring property near the Capitol for use of the legislative branch.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*March 19, 1957.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of January 18, 1957, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 728, to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 and the property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds.

We note that this bill has been revised to meet the objections raised by the District of Columbia on a similar bill last year. We also understand that this bill is favored by the National Capital Planning Commission. The Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of S. 728.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. JONES,
*Deputy Director.*

---

NATIONAL CAPITAL
PLANNING COMMISSION,
*Washington, D. C., February 14, 1957.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,*
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: The National Capital Planning Commission at its meeting on January 31, 1957, was pleased to consider your request for a report and comment on S. 728, introduced jointly by Senators HAYDEN and BRIDGES, to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 and the property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds.

The Commission believes that both these squares in their entirety should be added to the Capitol Grounds for the following reasons:

1. To protect the Old and New Senate Office Buildings from adverse or undesirable developments on adjoining properties or frontages.

2. To hold these properties in reserve for possible future expansion.

3. To save the added costs of future acquisition due to rising land values and inevitable improvements which otherwise would occur on these squares.

In this connection, there appears to be need for similar protection and reservation for future use through the acquisition of part or all of the square immediately east of the Supreme Court Building, as proposed in the Commission's long-range general plan for the area on both sides of the eastern axis of the Capitol, extending to Lincoln Square and beyond. Under the original plan of this city, the Capitol was built facing the level plateau to the east. This is the natural direction for expansion of the legislative establishment or for functions related to or harmonious with the legislative arm of the Government. A copy of the Commission's most recent version of the central area plan is attached.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of the above report.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN NOLEN, Jr.,
*Director.*

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am in favor of the amendment the Senator from Arizona has offered. It is the best we can do. There is also on the calendar Order No. 192, which I introduced for the purpose of acquiring the remainder of the block in question, behind the New Senate Office Building. I should like to inquire of the Senator if it is his desire that we take up that bill, too.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe we had better take two bites at the cherry. What I am seeking to have acted on is a matter of much urgency.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not opposed to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to see the parking spaces provided immediately. The other matter, with respect to acquiring the entire block, can wait for the time being. The same thing is true with respect to remainder of square 727 by the New Senate Office Building. In the end, it would be highly desirable to acquire all of both blocks; but what I am trying to do is to get about one-half of square 724 at this time. I pointed out that half of the land we wish to acquire is vacant property, and the remainder of that involved is improved only by very old dwellings, which can be acquired at a reasonable price. In that way we will get the land for less than if it is built upon, and temporarily we will have room for parking spaces.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason why I am interested in the property behind the new Senate Office Building is the very reason the Senator has outlined, namely, the providing of parking space. Aside from one building, the Belmont House, which we do not intend to touch, practically all of the land will not be needed for a long time. The rest of that alley is nothing more than ratholes and old houses. The sooner we acquire it, the sooner we will have ample parking spaces. I do hope we will take action on it during this session.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder whether I may ask some questions of the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I regret that I was not in the Chamber earlier when the distinguished Senator from Arizona spoke on the bill which he is sponsoring and the amendment which he is offering. I wonder whether the Senator from Arizona can assure me as to what is going to happen in connection with the so-called Belmont House, which is one of the most beautiful houses in Washington.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not included in the block we have under consideration. If the Senator will look at the plat I have before me, I can point out to him what we have in mind. I point to the Carroll Arms Hotel. I also point to the other hotel. Between the two buildings is the property owned by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which is vacant. The other property on the plat, on C Street, is vacant. The remainder of the property to be acquired is improved by buildings of low value, because they are old and antiquated. We do not propose to touch either hotel, and we do not propose to take the large office building. We are trying to get the land before values rise further and also to obtain some parking spaces, and get them quickly. In the block to the south of this block, square 725, on the southeast corner, the Belmont House is located. We are not taking anything in that block.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Belmont House is one of the oldest and most historic and most beautiful buildings in the city of Washington?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Arizona will spare that building.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am certainly doing that in this instance. It is not in the bill at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Arizona take a vow that he will spare it in the future?

Mr. HAYDEN. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to that. So long as the Woman's Party exists, I understand, that will be the case. I understand that after the Woman's Party goes out of existence the title will revert to the heirs of Mrs. Belmont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a very beautiful old building. Whatever may be the fate of the National Woman's Party, I certainly hope that the building will not be destroyed. The Senator from Illinois feels that such a beautiful building should not be torn down to provide parking space for fin-shaped automobiles which are far longer than they should be.

Mr. HAYDEN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now ask the Senator to turn from the aesthetic to the economic consideration. I understand an appropriation of $3,500,000 is asked for.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The amount is greatly reduced because the acquisition area is now much less. For the acquisition of the property covered by the amendment the amount is less than $1 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is still a large sum of money to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HAYDEN. I agree with that statement. However, if the Senator drives a car——

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not.

Mr. HAYDEN. If he drove a car, he would find that he would have to drive around a great deal and still not find a parking place.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask one further question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has provision been made for a sub-basement garage in the New Office Building?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. It will take care of about 175 cars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That will be added to the existing garage facilities, which provide for the parking of how many cars?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not remember.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be at least 100.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are about 2,000 employees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are 2,000 employees, but is there an obligation upon the Government to provide a parking space for an automobile for every employee of the Senate? I think this is a very questionable proceeding. How many automobile parking places would this acquisition provide for?

Mr. HAYDEN. Roughly, 235.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is well over $3,000 an automobile.

Mr. HAYDEN. We have two motives. I am convinced that the Senate will have to follow the same course which was followed by the House of Representatives, namely, to acquire property in order properly to conduct its business adjacent to the present location. The longer we put off this acquisition, the more the cost will be. This is an economy move, in that we are buying unimproved land and land improved by houses which cannot stand much longer, and are giving notice to the rest of the people in the block.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will my good friend from Arizona yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think we should accept the doctrine of the inevitability of the continuous expansion of the personnel of the Senate or of the space which we will set aside for our use.

I do not want to strain at minute details, but this is a million dollars. We are already providing space for 400 cars. There are 96 Senators. Let us say that every administrative assistant should have a place and that every secretary to a committee should have a parking place, and so on. I do not see why every stenographer should have a parking space.

I know the devotion with which the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from New Mexico labor on these matters. I know it must seem ungracious for me to come in at this late hour and raise an objection. But I simply say that I think this is a million dollars which could be better spent, or perhaps it would be better if it were not spent at all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A predecessor of my good friend from Illinois, former Senator Brooks, took part in the acquisition of the property now occupied by the New Senate Office Building.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the Senator whom I had the honor to replace; therefore, I am not bound by his acts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I simply make the point that had we acquired the entire block at that time, it would have cost us less than half of what we will now have to pay for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we buy it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, we are going to buy it eventually.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I vote "no."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 728) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN INSTALLATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calender No. 1254, House bill 9739.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is not the intention to have the Senate proceed this afternoon with the consideration of House bill 9739, which is extremely important.

Very thorough consideration has been given to the bill by the subcommittee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. At the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow, the Senator from Mississippi will be prepared to make the presentation in connection with the bill.

The bill and the report on it, as well as a transcript of the declassified testimony which has been taken, are available to all Senators.

I am extremely anxious to have the Senate act on the bill at the earliest possible time. In the bill, provision is made for implementing many of the recommendations made by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee in its recent interim report.

In addition, it is very necessary that this authorizing measure be passed before the Senate considers the supplemental appropriation bill, which now is being considered carefully in the Appropriations Committee. I am informed by the distinguished chairman of that committee that he anticipates that that measure will be ready early next week.

Therefore, I should like to have all Senators on notice that it is expected that on tomorrow the Senate will act on Calendar No. 1254, House bill 9739; and it is also expected that the Senate will take up the supplemental appropriation bill as soon as it is reported, and as soon as the report and hearings are available.

In addition, Mr. President, I expect that on tomorrow the Senate will take up Calendar No. 1252, House bill 6078, to provide for the erection of suitable markers at Fort Myer, Va., to commemorate the first flight of an airplane on an Army installation; and Calendar No. 1253, House bill 5809, to authorize construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor.

I rather think there will be a Senate session on Friday. If so, on tomorrow I shall announce any further measures which may be considered at that time.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

## RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no Senator desires to address the Senate at this time, I move that, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, January 30, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 29 (legislative day of January 27), 1958:

### UNITED NATIONS

Christopher H. Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the country indicated:

Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, to Yugoslavia.

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to the Republic of Syria.

### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Thomas John Hall Trapnell; O16782, United States Army, to rank as lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr., O18662, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Transportation, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

Temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

*To be major generals*

Brig. Gen. Charles Richard Hutchison, O16796.

Brig. Gen. Alva Revista Fitch, O18113.

Brig. Gen. Charles Greene Calloway, O17690.

Brig. Gen. Charles Edward Hoy, O18556.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Morgan Watlington, O16780.

Maj. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907.

*To be brigadier generals*

Brig. Gen. Norman Edgar Youngblood, O28996.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075.

Brig. Gen. Lyle Edward Seeman, O17082.

Brig. Gen. David William Heiman, O17094.

Maj. Gen. William Everett Potter, O17098.

Maj. Gen. Robert George Butler, O17191.

Brig. Gen. Legare Kilgore Tarrant, O17208.

Maj. Gen. Evan McLaren Houseman, O17307.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Thomas Nelson, O17303.

Brig. Gen. Alexander McNair Willing, O38619.

Maj. Gen. Louis Edward Cotulla, O29069.

Brig. Gen. James Harvey Cash 2d, O38628.

Maj. Gen. Norman Hayden Vissering, O41603.

Maj. Gen. James Dreyfus, O29117.

Brig. Gen. Alvin Galt Viney, O17511.

Brig. Gen. John Lloyd Person, O17517.

Brig. Gen. Philip Henry Draper, Jr., O17543.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Milton Colby, O17562.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Robert Mace, O17578.

Brig. Gen. William Darwin Hamlin, O17619.

Maj. Gen. Edmund Chauncey Rockefeller Lasher, O17624.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Reisner Ranck, O17647.

Brig. Gen. William Kerr Ghormley, O17674.

Brig. Gen. Robert Little Cook, O17675.

Brig. Gen. Lester Skene Bork, O17685.

Brig. Gen. Charles Greene Calloway, O17690.

Brig. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, O17706.

Maj. Gen. Hugh Mackintosh, O17716.

Maj. Gen. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., O17730.

Brig. Gen. Bruce Easley, O17735.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Norfleet Griffin, O17775.

Brig. Gen. William Arnold Carter, O18023.

Brig. Gen. Philip Campbell Wehle, O18067.

Maj. Gen. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, O18088.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157.

Brig. Gen. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213.

Brig. Gen. James Knox Wilson, Jr., O18218.

Maj. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232.

Brig. Gen. Theodore Francis Bogart, O18245.

Brig. Gen. Paul Russell Weyrauch, O18252.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Lucian Scofield, O29462.

Maj. Gen. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500.

Maj. Gen. Theodore William Parker, O18369.

Maj. Gen. William White Dick, Jr., O18384.

Brig. Gen. William Frew Train, O18415.

Maj. Gen. John Knight Waters, O18481.

Maj. Gen. Orlando Collette Troxel, Jr., O18487.

Brig. Gen. Francis Thomas Pachler, O18488.

Maj. Gen. Edwin John Messinger, O18503.

Maj. Gen. Edwin Anderson Walker, O18552.

Brig. Gen. William Rogers Woodward, O18582.

Brig. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095.

*To be brigadier general, chaplain*

Brig. Gen. Frank Alden Tobey, O41698.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

*To be major generals*

Brig. Gen. Louis Jacob Rumaggi, O14900.
Brig. Gen. Olaf Helgesen Kyster, Jr., O16830.
Brig. Gen. Mercer Christie Walter, O17151.
Brig. Gen. Ned Dalton Moore, O18212.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075.
Brig. Gen. William Arnold Carter, O18023.
Brig. Gen. Paul Amos Gavan, O17169.
Brig. Gen. John Frederick Bohlender, O17814, Medical Corps.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Fraley Van Natta, O17086.
Brig. Gen. Alvin Galt Viney, O17511.

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. Thomas William Mattingly, O20068, Medical Corps.
Col. Frank Sherman Henry, O18989.
Col. Kenneth Adelbert McCrimmon, O18336.
Col. Harold Walmsley, O18769.
Col. Howard Raymond Whittaker, O29408.
Col. George Thomas Powers 3d, O19137.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of Lee B. James et al., which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 16, 1958, and may be found in full in the proceedings of the Senate for that date, beginning with the name of Lee B. James, which appears under the caption of "Nominations" on page 563, and ending on page 572, with the name of Sidney R. Wynn.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. George W. Mundy, 358A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, to the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

The nominations of Margaret M. Fallon et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 13, 1958, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Margaret M. Fallon, which appears on page 303, and ending with the name of Tommy A. Tilley, which is shown on page 304.

The nominations of Hershell L. Abbott, et al., for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 13, 1958, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Hershell L. Abbott, which is shown on page 304, and end ing with the name of Winemiller, which appears on page 365.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Eugene J. Peltier, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years with the rank of rear admiral.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*To be rear admirals*

Edward C. Kenney, Medical Corps.
Lionel C. Peppell, Supply Corps.
Thomas A. Long

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion:

Wayne R. Loud, line.
Courtney Shands, line.
Herbert D. Riley, line.
Leonard B. Southerland, line.
Frank Virden, line.
Howard A. Yeager, line.
Joshua W. Cooper, line.
John E. Clark, line.
William A. Sutherland, Jr., line.
John S. Thach, line.
William D. Irvin, line.
Glynn R. Donaho, line.
Thurston B. Clark
James R. Lee
John Quinn
Harry E. Sears
William A. Schoech
David L. McDonald
William F. Raborn, Jr.
Charles E. Weakley
Henry S. Persons
Claude V. Ricketts
Roy L. Johnson
Joseph E. Dodson
Irwin L. V. Norman, Medical Corps.
Courtney G. Clegg, Medical Corps.
Hubert J. Van Feenen, Medical Corps.

IN THE NAVY AND THE MARINE CORPS

Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, United States Marine Corps, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general for a period of 2 years from the 1st day of January 1958.

Gen. Ray A. Robinson, United States Marine Corps, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of lieutenant general.

Lt. Gen. Robert E. Hogaboom, United States Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while so serving.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy.

The following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Byron H. Hanlon, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Ralph E. Wilson, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. John Sylvester, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. Herbert D. Riley, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Vice Adm. Roscoe F. Good, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of vice admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

For permanent appointment:

*To be major generals*

David M. Shoup — Henry R. Paige
Samuel S. Jack — Marion L. Dawson

For temporary appointment:

*To be major generals*

For permanent appointment:
Carson A. Roberts
James P. Berkeley
Donald M. Weller

*To be brigadier generals*

Randall M. Victory — Charles H. Hayes
Carson A. Roberts — Donald M. Weller
James P. Berkeley — William P. Battell
Wallace M. Greene, Jr.

For temporary appointment as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John P. Condon — Lewis J. Fields
Frank C. Tharin — Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.
Robert E. Cushman, Jr. — Paul R. Tyler
Richard G. Weede

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment:

*To be major general*

Bertrand T. Fay

The following-name officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment:

*To be brigadier general*

William W. Stickney

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Carlton A. Fisher

IN THE NAVY AND THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Theodore F. Beeman, and 2062 other officers for appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 13, 1958, and a complete list thereof may be found in the Senate Proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the caption "Nominations", beginning with the name of Theodore F. Beeman, which is shown on page 383, and ending with the name of Clarence A. Bowers, which appears on page 388, and

The nominations of James C. Biggers, and 7,636 other officers, for appointment or promotion in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 13, 1958, and a complete list thereof may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the caption "Nominations", beginning with the name of James C. Biggers, which is shown on page 366, and ending with the name of David M. Connor, Jr., which appears on page 383.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 27), 1958:

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER

Miss Marguerite Cooper, of California, for promotion to class 7.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, D. D., Temple Beth Israel, Hartford, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O God, author of all that is, who transcendeth space and time—and yet art nigh unto all that call upon Thee sincerely, humbly we bespeak Thy blessing upon these representatives of the people of this Republic. Sanctify their purposes as they serve their people and Thee and hallow their lives as they give of themselves in dedication.

Reverently, O God, we call unto Thee for Thy blessing to rest upon the Government of this Republic and upon all who govern by the consent of this peo-

ple. Strengthen and sustain their will to righteousness.

Give unto all of us, O God, the inspiration to goodness, the courage of righteousness, the daring of soaring hopefulness, the warmth of profound conviction, the humility of continuing faithfulness. Above all, O God, give us the assurance—at once comforting and challenging—that we are ever in Thy presence, that Thine eye is ever upon us and that Thine arm continues to guide us.

O Father, as we direct unto Thee "the fruit of our lips" and the meditations of our hearts, be pleased to "incline Thine ear unto us, to hear our words, and wondrously to show Thy steadfast love" unto all Thy children. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## THE LATE THOMAS JOHN BRIGHT ROBINSON

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce the death of the Honorable Thomas John Bright Robinson, former Representative from the Third Iowa Congressional District, which I now have the honor of representing. He passed away Monday at his home in Hampton, Iowa, of a heart attack at the age of 89.

Through the years, Mr. Robinson continued to have a deep interest in national affairs and the work of Congress, especially the House of Representatives where he served so ably for 10 years.

Mr. Robinson was elected to the 68th Congress and the four succeeding Congresses, serving from March 4, 1923, to March 3, 1933. An unsuccessful candidate for reelection to the 73d Congress in 1932, he returned to Hampton where he was engaged in the real-estate and mortgage-loan business.

Born in New Diggings, Lafayette County, Wis., August 12, 1868, he moved with his parents to Hampton, Iowa, in 1870, and attended the public schools there. He was active in agricultural pursuits and the banking business, serving as president of the Citizens' National Bank of Hampton from 1907 to 1923. He also served on the Hampton Board of Education.

He was a member of the Iowa State Senate from 1912 to 1916. During the First World War he was prominently identified with war activities in his home county. He was a delegate to many Republican State conventions.

A Mason, Mr. Robinson also was active in the work of the Methodist Episcopal Church, attending several national and international conferences of the church.

I extend my sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I knew the late Tom Robinson. He was one of the outstanding men of Iowa. He served well in the Iowa Legislature. He served with distinction in the Congress of the United States. Many of the older Members I think will recall a genial man, serious minded, diligent in his work. After he was out of Congress he devoted himself to the welfare of his fellow man and his community and State. He will be deeply missed in Hampton, Iowa. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to the family of this fine man.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman from Iowa in expressing deep regret at the passing of Tom Robinson. He was a Member of Congress when I first came to this body. He was a patriotic, devoted Congressman, a kindly man who had the respect of all who knew him. He served the State and the country well and his death is regretted by all who knew him.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Mr. Robinson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

## POLLS ON PAID TELEVISION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include related matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in October and November of this past year, four separate polls were conducted to determine what the public thinks about pay TV. The result of each is clear: That there is overwhelming grassroots public opposition to subscription television.

Thus, a mail poll conducted by TV Guide among its readers turned up these results: 43,361—96.65 percent—against subscription television, 1,527—3.45 percent—for it.

A special personal interview survey of 1,409 persons in 10 widely scattered cities, conducted by the Pulse for Broadcasting magazine, turned up these results: 939—66.6 percent—against subscription television, 470—33.4 percent—for it.

A mail poll conducted by KSBW-TV, Salinas, and KSBY-TV, San Luis Obispo, both California, turned up these results: 5,002 viewers against subscription television, 4 in favor of it.

A mail poll conducted by Senator WILLIAM LANGER among residents of Bartlesville, Okla., where a wire-movies system is operating, turned up these results: 1,930 against subscription television, 163 for it.

More recently, the people in east Texas were asked what they thought of pay TV: 66,705 objected; 2 were for. What Texans think about pay TV is graphically portrayed in an article appearing in the January 20, 1958, issue of Broadcasting magazine. This article reads:

SIXTY-SIX THOUSAND, SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIVE VOICES RAISED AGAINST PAY TV

When folks around Tyler, Tex., speak, they mean to be heard, Marshall Pengra can verify. The general manager and coowner of KLTV (TV) Tyler outlined the pay versus free TV situation and asked east Texans what they thought of pay TV, and 66,707 shot back replies (the early count last week contained only 2 pro-pay TV votes).

This is the number of individuals represented in more than 11,000 cards, letters, and wires and some 200 petitions, which KLTV has sent along to the House Commerce Committee for guidance in committee hearings on toll TV this week.

In a broadcast January 2, Mr. Pengra asked viewers for preferences among 4 kinds of television: free TV, closed-circuit pay TV, community cable TV, and broadcast toll TV. The 66,707, except for 2 mavericks, stood up to be counted for free TV.

They had been told by Mr. Pengra that KLTV was ready to pitch its lot with pay-see, contingent on some ifs—if viewers thought the system should be tried, and if it became a necessity for economic survival. He quoted statements by network heads that they would be forced to fall in line, if pay TV should become established.

The KLTV broadcast also incorporated a filmed panel discussion originally broadcast over KRON-TV San Francisco, featuring that city's mayor, city attorney, and newsmen discussing closed-circuit pay TV. After the KRON-TV film, Mr. Pengra showed how a local closed-circuit system, starting with baseball programs, might develop into a national toll system. He demonstrated the economic potential of pay TV with the figures from the Politz study on how many viewers are willing to pay to see the world series, boxing, and other shows on a subscription TV system.

Before asking viewers to vote on whether or not they wanted pay TV, Mr. Pengra asked them to write and urge Congressmen to support free TV, to notify city authorities about closed-circuit systems, and to refuse to pay any station or company for programs.

Encouraged by early and heavy response, Mr. Pengra went on the air 6 days later with a progress report. Last week he repeated the original discussion with a late report from Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, North Dakota, on his bill to ban pay TV.

But 66,707 signatures don't tell the whole story of the KLTV campaign. Local officials and leading citizens—publishers, mayors, bank presidents—have put themselves on record against toll television and are influencing constituents and customers to join them. They supplied quotes for Mr. Pangra's first followup broadcast.

The KLTV news staff in a continuing investigation of the subject turned up numerous applications for pay TV franchises on file with area city councils, including some station applicants. After KLTV publicized the fact, some of them publicly recanted and joined the chorus coming out of east Texas against the toll idea.

I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a telegram I received from the general manager of station KTVH in Hutchinson, Kans.:

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *January 27, 1958.*
The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*
As result of 3 explanations of current hearings on pay TV, KTVH has received approximately 3,000 individual responses—all opposed to pay TV except 1.
Respectfully,
HOWARD O. PETERSON,
*General Manager, KTVH.*

## INADEQUATE POLICE PROTECTION IN WASHINGTON

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is here this morning. I want to correct the remarks I made the other day. I neglected to say that part of our lack of protection was due to the ignorance or indolence of Members of Congress—say my own, I will leave out the others.

May I say to the gentleman that one of my co-workers last night was down in the parking lot south of the new House Office Building. She was afraid to get in her car, even though she had her young son with her, because of the loiterers around there.

We do not get anything much out of the Committee on the Judiciary on protection for the people of the District. I understand that committee wants to hold more hearings. I told the girls in the office to each buy a police whistle, I would pay for them. So if anyone hears that whistle, get down there and help them out—give them a little protection.

## PAY TELEVISION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am so glad the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has brought to the attention of the House a matter that I am sure is in all our minds. I refer to pay television.

I have received many protests in reference to pay television. I feel very strongly about it myself because some people can afford to pay for the shows they want to see. Others cannot. It would seem unfair to charge for shows, that those who could not afford to pay would see only second-rate television—it would be very undemocratic, in my opinion.

I introduced a bill today which I believe would be helpful. It is a companion bill to the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator LANGER.

## ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF WILLIAM McKINLEY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, most of the older Members will remember that about 20 years ago I, as one of the Congressmen from Ohio, asked the Speaker of the House for some time to pay our respects to one of the greatest men who ever lived in the United States. I refer to former President William McKinley of Ohio.

Mr. McKinley was born in Niles, Ohio, on January 29, 1843. He enlisted in the Union Army on June 23, 1861, as a private. I remember one of my friends telling me that Mr. McKinley was then a teacher in a little country school in Ohio. He gave up his job as a teacher, went to Columbus, Ohio, and enlisted in the Union Army when he was still a boy.

Mr. McKinley was elected to the 45th Congress in 1877 and subsequently elected to the 49th, 50th, and 51st Congresses. He was elected governor of Ohio in 1891 and reelected in 1893. He was elected President of the United States in 1896 and reelected in 1900. He was shot by a cowardly assassin in Buffalo on September 6, 1901, and died on September 14 of the same year.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you and the Members of the House what has moved us Congressmen from Ohio to observe the anniversary of McKinley's birth. McKinley was a great soldier, he was a great lawyer, he was a great governor of Ohio and he was a great President of the United States. But his real greatness and the real important service rendered by him to his country was that which he rendered as a Member of this House. I have seen the testimony of several men who lived at that time and they have always stressed the fact that McKinley's great days were spent as a Member of this body. I remember Mr. William Tyler Page, who was here for many years as an official of the House of Representatives, and he told me that McKinley sat over there in the middle of this room and that he was the most capable and competent of all the Congressmen that he knew. He was very loud in his praise of Mr. McKinley.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of President William McKinley, of Ohio, on this anniversary of his birth.

He was a good, kindly, godly man, a shrewd politician, a farseeing statesman. With these qualities, he served his day and age, and looked far ahead.

He was the advocate of a protective tariff in the days when our infant industries needed special protection. As chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, he was the author of the McKinley tariff bill.

Later, as President, he looked far ahead. On September 5, 1901, at Buffalo, N. Y., the day before he was shot, he said:

> Isolation is no longer possible or desirable * * * By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we shall extend the outlets for increasing surplus * * * We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing * * * Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. The period of exclusiveness is past * * * Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of our times, measures of retaliation are not. If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?

Mr. Speaker, these words of our martyred President might be a guide for us in this session of Congress.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my other colleagues from Ohio, and especially with the dean of our delegation, Mr. JENKINS, in paying a well deserved tribute to one of Ohio's most illustrious sons, William McKinley, who served as President of the United States. Ohio and Virginia have long vied with each other as to which State should be called the Mother of Presidents. We have given many illustrious men to the Nation from our Buckeye State but none greater than William McKinley.

As a very, very small child I had the opportunity to sit at a dinner table with William McKinley before he came to Washington, Mr. Speaker, and to hear him utter a little prayer before he partook of his food. He was, as has been said, not only a great man, but a man who walked with God, and who lived up to the principles in which he believed.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues. I think there are many lessons that can be learned from the life of William McKinley. Personally I have always been impressed with one outstanding characteristic, and that was that he approached all the problems of his day in a calm, cool, deliberate, and sober manner. I just have this observation to make, that I think in these days of stress and strain, when we are likely to be influenced by hysteria and by crises, we might well emulate that outstanding quality of McKinley's and approach our problems as he did in a cool, calm, and deliberate manner.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I share with one of McKinley's biographers a feeling of the significance of the fact that very early in his life, in fact, in 1867, the year in which he opened his law office in Canton, William McKinley

identified himself immediately with the Republican Party. Very early in life this great man found that he could lead a more useful life by choosing to identify himself with a political party. I mention this particularly because of the apparent reluctance of many young people to identify themselves with a political party.

Mr. Speaker, few have lost socially or economically by stalwart adherence to a political party, and by their loyalty they have gained much. William McKinley worked tirelessly in the campaigns for Grant and Garfield. His record in Congress was one which gained the admiration of all. He came to this Chamber from a Democratic district as an aggressive, uncompromising Republican, replacing James Garfield on the Committee on Ways and Means, and later becoming chairman of that committee as well as floor leader. So far as I know, he never sat in the middle aisle. The consequences of his adherence to his party cause increased his stature as a great leader.

He was a stanch advocate of the protective tariff. The result was the McKinley tariff bill. His fidelity to that cause resulted in his defeat in Congress. Following his defeat, the bill was repealed and following the repeal of the bill the panic of 1893 occurred. Many historians accredit that panic to the repeal.

His fidelity to cause, to the tariff and in other fields resulted in a reputation which led him to the White House.

As we consider our own devotion to cause and party we need remind ourselves of the stature of McKinley. As we consider the question of tariffs once again, we would do well to study the words of that great Republican President. The Nation needs men in Congress and throughout the land with the devotion, aggressiveness, and uncompromising nature of William McKinley, American, Republican.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say one further thing about Mr. McKinley. He was loved by the people for one thing that he did which was outstanding and showed the nature of this great man. The Capitol in Columbus fronts on a large hotel, the Neal House. Mrs. McKinley was an invalid, but every day as Governor McKinley went across the street to his office in the State capitol he would stop and wave to his wife. He did that for years and the people respected him for his kindness.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is well that we pause on the anniversary of the birth of a President of the United States and pay proper tribute to his memory.

President McKinley served our country in a most trying period of its history. I think it might well be said that he was President of our country during a turning point in the foreign policy of our country. During his time the Spanish-American War took place; the Philippines came under our jurisdiction, and were later given their independence by this Congress and the country. In doing that we carried out a pledge that we had made and showed the peoples of the world that the United States keeps its word, the greatest evidence of the noncolonial policy that could be given to the peoples of the world, if only they would heed it.

President McKinley served during that period and to me, as I view the history of that time, those years and the years which succeeded were a vital turning point in our history. More and more we participated in world affairs and I think it may safely be said that as a result of President McKinley's leadership America was brought out of its geographical, economic and political isolation and our country took its proper place not only in the world of that day but in the world of those years following the McKinley administration.

President McKinley was not only a great President, but a great American. Without regard for party, we respect each other and we respect the office of President of the United States, whoever might be the occupant of the office. When a man serves as President, he serves and acts as our President, he serves as President of the United States and President of all the people. William McKinley exemplified that to the highest degree humanly possible. It is a pleasure for me to join my colleagues from Ohio in participating in the exercises taking place today.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the Members from the State of Ohio and others who have paid these tributes to the memory of William McKinley. I recall the very day of his assassination. I was walking up the street to take the train to go down to the farm when it was announced that McKinley had just been shot in Buffalo. The whole town went into mourning as did the entire country. I would like to read something here that I think applies to William McKinley:

> Character is the invulnerable armor which will withstand every assault and march triumphant to the highest position of honor and trust within the gift of a grateful people.

I think the strong point of William McKinley was his character, the same as the strong point in Washington's life and his contribution to the building of this country was Washington's character. I am glad to say these few words about a great patriot, a great statesman, and a great American.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DENNISON].

Mr. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, among the noted sons and daughters that the State of Ohio has given to the service of the United States and the world, we remember and pay homage today to our 25th President and immortal son of Ohio—William McKinley. Throughout his 59 years of constant endeavor, throughout his public career, he had the respect, confidence, and affection of all people who came into contact with him.

William McKinley sprang from hardy Scotch-Irish, the same stock that was an important factor in the development of our Nation; and it imparted to him the qualities of force and determination mellowed by considerateness and reasonableness of mind. These characteristics, along with his belief that he belonged to a nation governed by the people, made an indelible impression upon his public career. From his election in 1869 as prosecuting attorney for Stark County, during his years in the Congress of the United States, his two terms as Governor of Ohio, and his Presidency, he believed in the people and sought to know them, and to guide, rather than to force, his policies.

Aside from his extraordinary ability as a leader of his nation, William McKinley had a personality that was natural and free from artifice, gentle but strong. As a public speaker he had few equals. His love of his fellow men, his broad, comprehensive views of man and his duty in relation to God enabled him to have charity for all. Religion was an important phase of William McKinley's life. As he yielded up his life which was taken at the hand of an assassin, President McKinley's last words will long be remembered: "It is God's way. His will, not ours, be done."

William McKinley's personal associates maintained for the rest of their lives an affectionate loyalty to his memory such as few American statesmen have inspired. And with his passing, the United States passed out of an era of its history.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS].

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I want to join with the Members of the House in paying tribute to the memory of President William McKinley. It was during his administration and in large part due to his vision that Hawaii became an integral part of the United States of America. The people of Hawaii are proud and happy that they were added to the United States of America at that time. They treasure the heritage that they have and the anticipation they have of statehood in the near future. The memory of William McKinley is honored in Hawaii by the largest high school in the Territory which annually graduates thousands of young people into our community and the country. We are indeed pleased to have this opportunity to join in paying homage to the memory of William McKinley, a man of vision and a fine President of the United States.

---

## WASHINGTON STATE SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 439) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any article which is imported from a foreign country for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "exposition") to be held at Seattle, Wash., from April 11 to April 20, 1958, inclusive, by the International Trade Fair, Inc., a corporation, or for the use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the exposition, upon which article there is a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff or customs duty or any fees or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

SEC. 2. It shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for in this joint resolution, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. All such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry under this joint resolution for consumption or entry under the general tariff law.

SEC. 3. Imported articles provided for in this joint resolution shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States.

SEC. 4. At any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered under this joint resolution may be abandoned to the United States or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such articles shall be remitted.

SEC. 5. Articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the exposition, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

SEC. 6. The International Trade Fair, Inc., shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under this joint resolution. The actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under this joint resolution, shall be reimbursed by the International Trade Fair, Inc., to the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Receipts from such reimbursement shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1524).

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 439, which was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], is similar to legislation enacted last year, which became Public Law 85–22, and in previous years, for the purpose of permitting articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff.

It has long been the policy of Congress to facilitate participation of foreign countries in international fairs and expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display to be entered free of duty, under safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury. This joint resolution follows the pattern of previous legislation unanimously approved by the committee and the House of Representatives.

The Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair will be held about 2 months from now and it is my hope that this legislation can be enacted into law expeditiously.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in urging the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with my distinguished chairman in supporting the favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 439 providing for the importation of articles to be exhibited at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair without payment of duty.

This legislation was sponsored by our esteemed colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. PELLY] and is similar to legislation that has previously been enacted by the Congress to provide for duty-free importation of exhibits at trade fairs. The customary safeguards against any possible abuse of this duty-free privilege are included in the legislation. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is to be commended for his very constructive and able interest in this matter.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in reporting favorably on this legislation.

---

## REFUNDS OF ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAXES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8216) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "September 30, 1957," and insert "April 30, 1958."

Page 2, line 25, and page 3, line 1, strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958."

Page 3, line 3, strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958."

Page 3, lines 4 and 5, strike out "September 30, 1958" and insert "April 30, 1959."

Page 3, line 7, strike out "October 1, 1957" and insert "May 1, 1958."

Page 3, line 20, strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958."

Page 3, line 22, strike out "September 30, 1957" and insert "April 30, 1958."

Page 6, lines 2 and 3, strike out "October 1, 1957" and insert "May 1, 1958."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has made a technical amendment to H. R. 8216 which passed the House on August 5, 1957, in the first session of this Congress. As Members of the House will recall, the provisions of H. R. 8216 were designed to impose conditions for the prevention of unjust enrichment in cases where refunds of the Federal excise tax on alcohol or tobacco were made. The bill requires a claimant of a refund for alcohol or tobacco taxes to show that he bore the ultimate burden of the tax or has refunded the amount of the tax to the person who in fact bore the ultimate burden.

As it passed the House, H. R. 8216 applied to any credit or refund made or allowed on or after October 1, 1957, whether in pursuance of a court decision or otherwise, and whether the claim arose on, or before, or after the enactment of the bill. Because it was not possible for the Senate to act on this measure in the first session of this Congress, the Senate has changed this date from October 1, 1957, to May 1, 1958. This change will provide the Internal Revenue Service with adequate time to prepare regulations under the bill and will accord to taxpayers sufficient time to comply with the provisions of the bill.

For these reasons, I move that the House recede and accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have concurred in the request of my esteemed colleague and chairman that the House

concur in the Senate amendments to H. R. 8216.

It will be recalled that this legislation passed the House last year to provide that a taxpayer seeking to obtain a refund or credit with respect to alcohol and tobacco taxes would be required to demonstrate either that he bore the burden of the tax or that he has made a refund of such tax to his customer. The Senate amendments to this legislation relate to the effective date of the bill and the date for filing claims for refunds. The effective date of the bill has been advanced from October 1, 1957, to May 1, 1958, and conforming changes have been made in the legislation so that there will be sufficient time accorded taxpayers to file claims for refunds.

This legislation would have the effect of correlating the refund procedures in the case of alcohol and tobacco taxes with the procedures applicable in the case of retail and manufacturers' excise taxes.

---

## EXPENDITURES INCURRED BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 423) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $725,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees within and without the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand the gentleman has a number of resolutions from his committee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, sir; we do. We are now considering House Resolution 423, with amendments.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to inquire how many of those resolutions are increases over last year.

Mr. FRIEDEL. We have six resolutions. There is only one that is an increase over the amount granted last year.

Mr. MARTIN. All but one are below? Which one is that which is above the amount last year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is the one we are considering now, House Resolution 423. This contains $25,000 more than we authorized at the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

Mr. MARTIN. And what is the reason for it?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Because of the increased workload. This past year, for the first time, the committee has gone into the financial operations of our Government in the European theater. They hope to save the Government a lot of money. So far in their report they show they have saved the Government over $2 million in the last year alone. They hope to show a saving of over $5 million each year.

Mr. MARTIN. What I am trying to point out is the fact that this is a year when we are going to have extraordinary expenses. Of course we want to keep expenditures down as much as possible. And I should think the last place that we should be increasing expenditures is in the committees of Congress.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The Committee on Government Operations asked for $725,000. Our committee amended it to read "$600,000."

Mr. MARTIN. This is the only one that asked for an increase?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is the only one that asked for an increase.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 2, strike out "(1) (h)" and insert "(8)".

On line 5, strike out "$725,000" and insert "$600,000"; and amend the title.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I was wondering if the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts is to be followed out; that is, to vote en bloc on all of these committee requests at once.

Mr. FRIEDEL. No.

Mr. MARTIN. That was simply to get the debate over.

Mr. WIER. You are going to take them up individually?

Mr. FRIEDEL. We will take them up individually.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Now, this is an expenditure for a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, to investigate the foreign giveaway program, and that is being increased, I believe the gentleman said, because of increased spending. Is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I will repeat what I said.

This past year for the first time the committee has gone into the financial operations of our Government in the European theater.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman said that the increased appropriations were necessary because we were spending more money.

Mr. FRIEDEL. No.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: In view of the administration's proposal for increased foreign spending, does it follow that the Government Operations Committee should get more money next year to investigate the giveaway program?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. The only reason I asked to be heard on this is that I served as chairman of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction respecting foreign spending. Actually we are not expanding our staff. What we want to do is to keep the present staff that is working on this subject.

Actually last year we worked for only 10 months because we did not get started until the first of March.

In order to maintain the work with the present staff we need an increase to take care of the full year.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, as long as this giveaway program is in operation we certainly should check up on it, but it is like a lot of other things around here. What we ought to do is get rid of it, then we would not have to spend this immense amount of money to check up on it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Can the gentleman answer what the appropriation is for the staff of the Committee on Appropriations? The amount they require? How many staff members do they have on that committee as compared with the number of staff members on the Committee on Government Operations?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I do not have the figures for the Appropriations Committee now, but I do have figures for the Committee on Government Operations, and they show there are 52 on the investigating staff and that there are 13 clerks.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand that the Appropriations Committee of the House has hardly any investigating staff at all. We depend on the Bureau of the Budget. I am thinking of the bill H. R. 8002. Without going into the merits of that it seems to me regardless of which approach we take we need to have more people in the committee to tell us what we are doing. As far as I can find out as of this morning they can only appropriate up to $500,000 in any 1 year with regard to this Government Operations Committee; and I certainly commend them on what they are doing. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, however, that we could cut it down and should. But I know that in this committee since they began stirring things up that since the 83d Congress for the 2 years they have had $510,050, and if this resolution passes they will go to $1,175,000 in this Congress. Has the committee taken that into consideration?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes; the committee has taken that into consideration. We have a report which shows that in the past year alone this committee, through their investigations, have saved the Government $2,568,000-plus, and they seem to feel that each year they will be able to save an additional $5 million.

Just as an illustration let me read one of the items: Utilization of tanks previously considered unserviceable—House Report No. 958. That is $500,000 on just one item alone.

Then to take another, analysis of the Virgin Islands sugar operations: On this they saved $165,000.

To take another one, insistence on settlement of a claim for defective electric conductor purchased by the Bonneville Power Administration from Alcoa—$330,000.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would suggest to the gentleman that I recall that although they had $500,000 for 2 years they saved a lot of money; but I do not think you can just say that all that saving was the result of an increased appropriation; it was saved because the Reorganization Act gave a lot of authority to the Committee on Government Operations. They in turn have to make a study.

Does the gentleman know how many investigators the Committee on Appropriations has?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I cannot answer that offhand.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Let me say to the gentleman from Wyoming that the Committee on Accounts does not have anything to do with the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations is practically autonomous. In the second place, the Appropriations Committee of the House acts before the fact. The concept of the Committee on Accounts is to act after the fact. The missions of the two committees are entirely different. It may be that the Appropriations Committee should have some investigators; however, I know nothing about their operations in that respect.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman. That is the point I wanted to make. I think that committee should.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee, I call up House Resolution 432, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 107 of the 85th Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $200,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$200,000" and insert "$160,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee I call up House Resolution 434 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 56 of the 85th Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the problems of small business, not to exceed $225,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such study and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of attorneys, investigators, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$225,000" and insert "$200,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee I call up House Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 64 of the 85th Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, and the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 65 of the 85th Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000, for the purposes of both investigations, additional to that authorized by House Resolution 143 and House Resolution 279 of the 85th Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Administration Committee I call up House Resolution 443 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved,* That the further expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 86, 85th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000 in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such studies, investigations, and inquiries, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$85,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## WHY SHOULD TEACHERS BE DRAFTED?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the current scientific struggle has properly pointed up to the American people the need for reexamining our educational structure and our educational systems. It is an established fact that we are falling behind in the development of scientists, engineers, doctors, and scholars in all fields. The causes are obvious—the shortage of schoolrooms, the shortage of teachers, the apparent lack of proper educational perspectives, and the misapplication or nonuse of untouched reserves of talent.

At this time I want to concern myself with the shortage of teachers, which is critical throughout the land. In my community I was recently shocked to learn that schoolteachers, including teachers of mathematics and the sciences, are being drafted.

In view of our teacher shortage, how ridiculous can we get, particularly when our Nation continues to draft teachers of mathematics and the sciences? In one Cleveland high school, three teachers of mathematics were recently called into military service—most likely for a service use unrelated to the teaching profession. A brief check indicates that 15 other teachers in the Cleveland area were recently called for military service.

These 18 teachers of my community, drawn into the military service, may seem like an insignificant number, but when we consider that under the period system every high school mathematics or science teacher may instruct 175 young people every day, the scholastic loss of 18 teachers in 1 community multiplies its adverse effect.

Under current regulations the draft of schoolteachers is not necessary and results from varying interpretations of draft laws and regulations in the several communities. There is therefore a critical need to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to specifically exempt teachers, particularly in critical subjects.

The Director of Selective Service has endeavored to foster a policy of liberality with respect to the teacher draft, but these policies have apparently failed to permeate the extensive draft structure. This is particularly true where teachers are registered for the draft in one community and employed as teachers in another. The local draft board with wide discretion frequently does not consider a teacher serving another community as a proper subject for draft or deferment.

It is urgently necessary for this Congress to amend the draft laws to provide a firm and uniform law relating to the draft and deferment of teachers needed in civilian training.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, contains no provision specifically for the draft or deferment of teachers. However, section 6 (h) of the act provides for the deferment of categories of persons whose activity or endeavor in civilian life is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety or interest.

Section 1622.20 of Selective Service Regulations instructs local draft boards that such activities should be disrupted as little as possible and that persons engaged in such activities be considered for deferment.

Section 1622.22 and section 1622.23 (a) of Selective Service Regulations set forth the standards of eligibility for consideration for deferment in class II–A.

In considering applications for deferment, local draft boards have available guides in the form of current lists of essential activities and critical occupations issued by the Departments of Commerce and Labor. Under the current lists, unchanged since March 1955, college, high school, and vocational schoolteachers in mathematics and the physical and biological sciences have been listed as being engaged in essential activities and critical occupations. In June 1955 the local boards were advised by National Headquarters, Selective Service System, to "give particularly careful consideration to the occupational deferment of any registrant who is qualified and who has been accepted for employment or is employed as a teacher in any of the fields of physical and biological science, mathematics, medicne or dentistry."

The selective service policy set forth in June 1955 and earlier has been broadened informally since that date. According to information obtained from National Headquarters, Selective Service System, the Director of Selective Service has, by various means, from time to time called attention to the shortages in all teaching fields, and has fostered a policy of liberality in considering teachers for deferment. It has been the practice of the national headquarters in cases involving teachers that when evidence is presented that replacements for them are not available, to recommend further consideration and either postponement until replacement is available, or deferment of these teachers in practically all teaching fields. This policy has been followed by many but not all of the local boards.

In the January 1958 number of Selective Service, a monthly publication circulated largely within the Selective Service System to provide, among other things, a method of keeping local boards and others abreast of developments in the manpower field, the Director of Selective Service wrote as follows:

> There is every indication that additional efforts will be made to increase the national supply of scientists and engineers. The Selective Service System need yield to none in what it has done in this field, but in the days ahead it must be even more careful in the consideration for deferment of registrants who are or give evidence of becoming qualified in this field. In addition, the Selective Service System must anticipate the pressures that will increasingly be placed upon the schools—colleges, secondary, and every grade—to train scientists and engineers. The problem of teachers, not only teachers of science and engineering, but teachers in general, is an unsolved one and the members of the Selective Service System must take every action within their power to assist in the efforts to provide more and better teachers.

Like other men with military obligation, teachers have the opportunity to discharge that obligation by enlistment in Reserve programs requiring 3 to 6 months of active duty, with satisfactory participation thereafter in the Reserve.

Also, college and vocational teachers in all critical occupations, and high-school teachers of mathematics, physical and biological sciences, are eligible to apply for enlistment in the critical skills Reserve program. Under this they serve only 3 months of active duty, and then may return to their community and occupation and may thereafter be relieved of participation in the Reserve training so long as they continue to be occupied in a critical skill. However, 3 months' service at a time other than the summer recess, could force a teacher to lose an entire teaching year.

The Selective Service System has made a diligent effort to preserve our teacher reserve and to prevent the unnecessary conscription of teachers. Although the number of teachers drafted may, indeed, be small, it is regrettable that any teachers should be subject to draft in the current educational crisis. It is practically impossible to determine the total number of high-school and college teachers who are now serving either voluntarily or involuntarily in the military Reserves. The supply of trained and skilled teachers is one of America's most strategic reserves, and the only way it can be fully preserved is by amendment to the draft laws which remove from local boards the discretion of drafting teachers in critical areas of education.

---

## OPERATION ABOLITION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, some several weeks ago, the House Committee on Un-American Activities released a publication entitled "Operation Abolition," which describes the campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Government security program. This campaign is spearheaded by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee—which has been cited as a Communist front—and its affiliate organizations. These organizations led by identified members of the Communist Party have scheduled a number of meetings across the Nation for the purpose of stimulating letters to the Congress opposing the work of the committee, the FBI, and the Government security program.

One of their principal objectives is to create the impression that the committee and its work are opposed by the rank and file of the American people.

The steady stream of regular correspondence received by the committee from all parts of the country demonstrates, however, that exactly the opposite is true. The work of the committee, as evidenced by the letters and telegrams, evokes overwhelmingly favorable response from the grassroots of America. We constantly receive expressions of support and commendation from every segment of American life: Government agencies, religious organizations, colleges and universities, newspapers, police and industrial security officers, industry, veterans' organizations and some ordinary citizens.

I recently made a sampling of the hundreds of letters which are received every week by the committee. Here are excerpts from typical letters:

An executive of a major defense industry:

> May I take this opportunity to commend the committee on the preparation of the reports which continue to expose those whose tendencies are adverse to our democratic Government.

The director of a theological seminary:

> These publications are a great help to us in the history, civic, and social study classes given at the seminary. Hence, we would appreciate it very much if you would continue to send them. And may I also take this opportunity to congratulate the committee on the fine work it is doing. Your task has been a thankless one; and one made doubly difficult by the senseless opposition you receive. Thus, I would like to assure you that there are many of us who are grateful to you for your work and who wish to give you every possible encouragement.

A leading aircraft manufacturer:

Please accept this letter as my expression of the request that I continue to receive committee publications. Committee publications and reports have been valuable to our security and investigative program.

A Midwest university official:

Would it be possible for you also to send me 500 copies of International Communism, the Communist Mind, your interview with Dr. Frederick Charles Schwarz. It looks like just the work needed to bring out for my students the philosophy of communism.

An Air Force intelligence officer:

These publications assist this organization in the accomplishment of its counterintelligence mission.

A Marine Corps officer:

The publications thus far received have greatly aided us in our task of exposing the methods used by the Communists and how they are dealt with.

A district Immigration Service director:

Your publications prove to be valuable references and are constantly used by our investigative branch.

A political science professor:

These publications are excellent in caliber and are invaluable as teaching aids and sources for undergraduate and graduate research.

The business manager of a major eastern university:

I use these publications regularly in my classes in political science. They have been helpful to us in developing university policy in re loyalty-oath legislation in the Pennsylvania General Assembly.

A midwestern attorney:

The committee has done a tremendous job in keeping the people informed as to the extent of Communist infiltration into government, education, industry, and entertainment fields. You can list me as a positive support of the committee and please advise if I can give any assistance.

A leading Catholic newspaper:

The committee publications are priceless—congratulations.

A public relations counselor:

Keep up your good work—the real citizens of this great United States are with you all the way.

An official of a committee for refugee aid:

Our American society and the culture which formed and animated it, owe you an unpayable debt of gratitude for exposing to public view those citizens and aliens engaged in subverting our civilization. Your publications are highly appreciated and indispensable. May your last appropriation be voted the year after Marxism is no more.

A State Department official:

Through the years the committee has done a magnificent work in making known facts concerning communism and its subversive activities. I wish to keep informed.

A New York attorney:

I would like to have these sent to my home address, so that there is less chance of their going astray. I find your materials invaluable in keeping abreast of the Communist threat of American freedom.

A defense plant executive:

These publications have been very well received and extractions from them have assisted in keeping the Communist menace in front of our personnel.

A motion picture studio:

Your publications are very important information in my security work.

A southern church leader:

The committee reports on un-American activities prove to be a valuable asset to my library. I, for one, feel personally that the greatest threat to the Christian church today is that posed by un-American ideologies of communism and its coconspirators of socialism and materialism.

---

## A SMALL-BUSINESS CAPITAL-BANK SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASHLEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to create a small-business capital-bank system. I am introducing it for myself and a number of other Members of the House who will be known as coauthors and cosponsors of the bill. Their names will be put in the RECORD later. Many of them will each introduce the bill.

This bill, if enacted into law, will make available to small business a source of equity and long-term capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources. It will transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, plus certain other funds out of surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks.

This bill contemplates that there will be a small-business capital bank in each Federal Reserve district; there are 12 of them. They will have offices and headquarters in the Federal Reserve bank buildings. Each bank will have a capital stock of $10 million. The capital stock is to be furnished exactly as the initial capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, from the surplus funds of the Federal Reserve banks.

In November last the House Committee on Small Business conducted hearings on the financing problems of small business. We had before us certain presidents of the Federal Reserve banks; and we received information from them that this transfer of funds could be made very easily, without any inconvenience or trouble to the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

The Federal Reserve has never wanted to administer that part of the law known as section 13 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, which was for the purpose of having the Federal Reserve System assist in financing small firms. Over the years the System has used that privilege somewhat, but very little, because they were really not in sympathy with it, at least as a function to be performed by the Federal Reserve banks. The Federal Reserve Board has recommended a provision in a bill that we are considering in the Committee on Banking and Currency, S. 1451, which has been passed by the Senate, that would repeal this section of the law. The Board wants to be relieved of this $27.5 million and the program that goes with it. Since the provisions for small business under the Federal Reserve Act are to be repealed, we are asking to set up these small-business capital banks, and we are asking that the $27.5 million, instead of going to the Treasury at this point, go into the operating expense accounts of these 12 small-business capital banks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman have a copy of that bill he can furnish me? That sounds like a vote getter. I would like to get in on it in some way. I would like to get those votes next year.

Mr. PATMAN. I shall furnish the gentleman a copy of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I can go along with the gentleman on this bill, I can get some votes.

Mr. PATMAN. It is not only the votes that are important, but service to the gentleman's constituents, which is more important. You get votes by serving your constituents. That is the reason why the constituents of the fine, able gentleman from Michigan send him back here every 2 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman repeat that?

Mr. PATMAN. That is the reason why the constituents of the fine, able gentleman from Michigan send him back every 2 years, because he is alert to their demands and wishes and needs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. The best vote-getting a Member can do is properly and honestly and sincerely serve his constituents. That is the best vote-getting proposition the gentleman can serve his constituents and by being for this bill, that will get votes, I hope it does.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will tell you frankly that the Republicans in Michigan are in trouble. Will this pull us out of this Williams-Reuther combination which is getting us all this unemployment?

Mr. PATMAN. This will not touch on anything but one problem and that is small business. That is all, but this one problem is a big one.

I think it is a very fair bill. It provides for a capitalization of $10 million, as I said, to operate. That capital will be transferred from the Federal Reserve. Remember this: this bill will not require the Government to borrow any money and pay any interest on it—not a penny. It will not cost the Government a penny. It will not increase the national debt

limit. So there is no reason why it should not be done. It is predicated upon the theory of the Federal land banks. The Federal land banks have all been paid out—they have paid back all capital the Government put into them. Associations of farmers now own those banks. The Government does not own any stock. That is exactly the theory of this bill. It is set up in a similar way. The borrowers will contribute by taking stock at 5 percent, just as they do in the Federal land banks; and it is contemplated that eventually the borrowers will pay every bit of the Government money back to the Treasury. It is contemplated that the banks will be owned privately and become definitely and distinctly a part of our private enterprise system.

But, this start is necessary. As it is now, there is no place for the small-business man to turn to get venture capital. The commercial banks of the country cannot offer it. The Small Business Administration cannot offer it. This sets up a source of such funds for small business.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. Of course, I am very much interested in this and we are all interested in small business and want to do everything we can for small business. However, would the gentleman elaborate on how we are going to pay this money back to the Treasury—under what interest terms and so forth?

Mr. PATMAN. A board is set up, I will state to the gentleman, comparable to the Board of the Federal land banks and comparable to other boards. The person who borrows money will pay interest and repay the principal under reasonable conditions and reasonable terms, just as borrowers from other agencies do. There is no free gift involved in this; there is no giveaway. Every person will pay his way, and that is as it should be. The people who borrow this money will pay interest and they will pay going rates of interest. The important thing here is that it will give small-business people a place to go where they can be considered for the kind of capital they cannot now obtain—equity capital and long-term loan capital. It gives them a place to go whereas they now have none.

May I say further to my distinguished friend that we are doing this same thing now for other countries and for people and corporations in other countries; but we are not doing it for our own people. For example, in Mexico, just below the Rio Grande, people there want to build a cement mill, they can ask the Export-Import Bank here in Washington for a loan; and if they make a good case they can get a loan of money, all of which comes from the United States Government. They can get the money from us to build a cement mill or almost anything else, in Mexico, in Spain, in Italy, in Germany and in dozens of other countries all over the world. But, a small-business man in this country cannot get one dollar of that money. Our people just this side of the Rio Grande in Texas who want to build a cement mill cannot go to the Export-Import Bank. And there is no place for them to go to get equity capital.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. In just what way will this supply the financing for small business that the Small Business Administration is not now doing and is not now equipped to do?

Mr. PATMAN. On long-term loans for equity capital and venture capital, the Small Business Administration under existing law cannot supply either equity capital or really long-term loans; and neither can the commercial banks.

I might elaborate further on what we are doing for outside companies. For example, the Export-Import Bank has loaned billions of American dollars abroad, and every penny of stock of the Export-Import Bank is owned by the United States Government.

We are making venture capital loans to small business in Canada, Mexico, South America—in all countries of the world, except the United States of America and of course, the Iron Curtain countries. The International Finance Corporation has been organized within the last 3 years. They go into other countries and make venture loans and supply equity capital. They take stock in the corporations to which they are furnishing money; but here—there is no place here for the small-business man.

Then you take the World Bank, which does much the same thing, most of that money is put up by the United States Government.

And in the last foreign aid bill, we approved another one, the development loan fund. They help concerns all over the world, but not here in the United States.

We are asking for a very modest start of $10 million capital stock for each of the 12 small-business capital banks.

Mr. HIESTAND. I understand that this plan will pay for itself and return money to the Treasury?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HIESTAND. Is it patterned after the bill which authorized the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. PATMAN. I would not say that. But it is patterned after comparable agencies that we have had in the United States performing similar functions—particularly the Federal land banks. I assure you that the terms are very reasonable. Our committee has been working on this for months, and I might say years; and last fall it was unanimously agreed by both the Democratic and Republican Members that we would at the earliest possible time get a bill prepared along this line for introduction. I am introducing it for myself, but other Members, whose names will be placed in the RECORD, will be coauthors and cosponsors of this bill. Many of them will introduce the bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to extend my congratulations to the chairman of the Committee on Small Business for the introduction of this bill, because, as he said, this is the culmination of efforts over a very long period of time, in which evidence has been gathered for the need, on the part of small business in this country, for this kind of assistance.

I would also like to say that on tomorrow I would be happy to be a coauthor of this bill. I think it not only accomplishes something specific for business, which today I think the record will show needs it more than any other segment of the economy of the country. But I think that my colleague from California [Mr. HIESTAND] will agree, after he has studied it, that not only does it cost the Treasury no money but it does the thing which the Small Business Administration admits it cannot do, which is to go in the money-raising business. They have testified before our committee many times in the past. It does another thing of great importance. It brings down to the local level the decision as to what the small business will be that is entitled to this assistance. In other words, the decision will not be made in Washington. It will be made right where the people are, next to the local methods of assistance that will be performed to operate under the terms of the bill. I simply want to say that I hope the Members of the House will become familiar with this bill and that it may receive very careful attention on the part of the committee to which it is referred, because never has the emergency been as great as it is now, to do something about the economy at home. It seems to me if we are going to spend billions of dollars in national defense, yet face the fact that perhaps we are collapsing in our economy at home, we are headed for the most serious kind of trouble we can get into. I think our chairman has led the way in pointing out one way to get America strong.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Under the Small Business Administration the proposed borrower, the American businessman, must show that he cannot borrow the money from banks, before he can qualify before the Small Business Administration.

Does that same provision apply under your bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; and I think it should. If they can get financing locally there is no need for them to go to an agency of this kind.

Mr. SANTANGELO. So that your bill has that same qualification?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SANTANGELO. This bill provides the same equity-risk capital for small business?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct. It provides for equity capital; and it provides for loans of a somewhat higher degree of risk, or for a longer term, than the commercial banks can usually make.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I would like to commend the gentleman for a very forward-looking bill. I think he is trying to help in a way which we can take to help make money available as risk capital.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all interested in helping small business. The question seems to be one of how to help them. I have been interested, as the gentleman knows, in a statement I understood he made in Dallas, which I believe he later corrected, to the effect that money that was lying around could be used to help small business without interest or at small interest.

Mr. PATMAN. That was an honest mistake made by the reporter, or a misunderstanding and I can understand how it came about. He asked me about the $10 million from the Federal Reserve bank capital which is to be transferred over without interest having to be paid on that by the Government. I stated that the Government would not have to pay interest on it. But the reporter got it confused. He had in mind that the borrowers would not have to pay interest. Of course, I did not have any such thing as that in my mind, and I am sure the gentleman understands that. What I said was that the Government itself would not have to pay any interest on it.

Mr. ALGER. Throughout there has occurred to me something the gentleman said at the beginning, that it would not cost the Federal Government anything, yet on page 13 of the bill I read something about $1,200,000,000 as the total obligation.

Mr. PATMAN. All of the Government money will be paid back, so it will not cost the Government anything. It will be paid back just like loans from the Federal land bank are paid back. It will not cost the Government anything in the end for it will all be paid back. It is comparable to the Production Loan Corporation operations. That is not costing the Government anything because it is being paid back. Furthermore, the money that will be used is not now earning any interest.

Mr. ALGER. I wish the gentleman would define for me a little more clearly what is meant by "equity capital."

Mr. PATMAN. Equity capital is venture capital. Small-business concerns cannot get that and they cannot get long-term debt capital.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman not believe that one way of helping the small-business man is to return some of his taxes?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, and I am for tax reduction. I have introduced a bill to carry out President Eisenhower's Little Cabinet Committee's recommendations and to give the small-business men tax relief. I hope the gentleman will support it. I myself am going to support any measure along that line whether I am the author of it or not.

I agree with the gentleman, that is one way of helping small business; but taxes are not the only problem of the small-business man. It is but one part of the problem.

Mr. ALGER. Is it not true that if we appropriate the Government's money to help the small-business man we must raise his taxes to pay back the loan we are extending to him?

Mr. PATMAN. Not in this connection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will yield, I think perhaps the gentleman from Texas, after he studies the bill a bit and understands what it actually does, will find that it sets up very much the same machinery which now exists for FNMA; in other words, FNMA raises the necessary money that is needed through the issuance of securities on the open market. I think you will find a very similar concept is set forth in this bill. This is not money which is taken out of the Treasury; this is not money for which you will have to raise taxes; this is purely investment and will be repaid, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has pointed out, from the earnings on the investments which are made in these companies.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield further. I somehow have an unreal feeling that we are obligating ourselves to the extent of $1,200 million when it could be handled in some other way.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman will find that the Government is not being obligated to $1,200 million. When FNMA raises money through the sale of its securities, it does not become an obligation of the Federal Government. It is the same here, and the difference between the $120 million of initial capital provided for in the bill and the maximum capitalization of $1,200 million is a provision for private capital to come into the system.

Mr. PATMAN. I think when the gentleman reads the bill he will want to become a coauthor of it. I do not claim to be the sole author of the bill, just because I am presenting it. Our committee has been gathering ideas from a large group. We have made studies. We have taken suggestions from people all over the Nation; from small-business men, from big-business men, and from Republicans and Democrats alike. What we have done is to put these ideas together. We think we have a good bill. It is something which has been very much needed for many years, but it is difficult to obtain money for small business. When a suggestion is made to appropriate $100 million for small business, people throw up their hands and say it would necessitate raising the debt limit; it would increase interest the Government paid; and the Government is already paying over $7,800 million in interest; and so the suggestion would not get anywhere. But I think in this bill we have a plan whereby we can get the money that is needed—listen to this, Mr. Chairman—get money that is idle and unused. We can convert this money over to capitalizing these banks without cost to the Government; and the Government will get every penny of it back, just as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation paid back.

Mr. ALGER. Will the gentleman tell us something about the small-business investment corporations, of which there may be one association in each State, and 25 or more firms in each association?

Mr. PATMAN. This is not restricted to States; these will be local organizations and people will have to get in it and cooperate and work shoulder-to-shoulder and put their money into it—put up part of the capital themselves, to be eligible for these loans.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman visualize this tying into the small banking system?

Mr. PATMAN. It will help the small banks because a lot of the banks will want to participate in these loans, which they may do. No loan will be permitted to be made under this plan if the local bank will make it. This is to be used only in the event a man cannot get credit from his local bank or other local financial institutions.

Why should we deny him that opportunity? Here is $120 million that is not used, it is idle. Nobody disputes that. It is not needed now at all. It is in the surplus fund of the Federal Reserve banks. It is Government money. Let us put it over into these capital banks, then, for operating capital and use the $27½ million that the Federal Reserve Board has asked the Congress to relieve them of the obligation and responsibility of administering. Now, then, since the Federal Reserve System does not want to help small-business people, let us prepare a place for them to go, where they can get good service and use the same money that the Federal Reserve System says they want to turn back.

Sometimes people in little towns want to get up a little industry, a manufacturing plant. They get together, they put up money of their own, but the local bank is unable to help them because of restrictions and limitations. It is handicapped, and you cannot blame the local bank. Congress has placed these restrictions on them. But these people should have some place to go. There is no place now to go, not in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, imagine, we have set up at least four different international agencies, providing them with United States Government money, and permitting these four agencies to go into all of the countries of the world, outside of the Iron Curtain, to make loans to individuals, to corporations, to partnerships, to cooperatives, or to any shape or form of entity; but here in the United States there is no place for a person to go to get that same service. Certainly, we want to correct that situation and it is not a compliment to Congress for it to continue.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Does the gentleman happen to have an item that appeared in the press today relating to the failures that are occurring in the United States? I think it would be of interest to the House to realize the seriousness of this situation in driving home the point he just made. If we are taking care of all the people outside the United States, we should begin to understand that there are a great many people, probably more than for many years, that need help. It would be of interest to refer to that article.

Mr. PATMAN. I have the New York Times of January 29; column 3 under the heading "Sidelights" says:

Business failures reached an 18-year high of 333 last week compared with 260 the pre-

ceding week and 258 a year earlier, according to Dun and Bradstreet.

There is where we are today. That was reported yesterday, the highest number of business failures in 18 long years.

Mr. HIESTAND. How does that compare percentagewise with the total number of businesses? Are there not a vastly greater number of businesses today? Is it fair to take the total figure without making a comparison?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have the time or the information to evaluate all those questions. But I think it is significant, and it should be alarming and disturbing that we have more business failures today than we have had at any time in 18 long years. Learning that, we should correct it.

Mr. HIESTAND. We admire the gentleman for his position in behalf of small business, and we are in complete sympathy with him. However, I do think when we quote these figures we should quote them percentagewise and proportionally, because sometimes figures in the number of failures do not reflect the true picture.

Mr. PATMAN. But this one fact is significant, it is impressive, it is shocking—more failures than we have had in 18 years.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman's bill, I take it, is somewhat similar to the agricultural bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, not the Farmers Home Administration, but similar to the Production Credit Corporation Act.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is what I mean.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, there are associations organized under the Corporation Act. We will have local associations organized under this, just like the local production credit associations are organized locally under the Corporation Act of the early thirties.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does the borrower have to prove that he is unable to get the loan from local institutions before he can apply for a loan?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; he must be unable to get it locally.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman gives it serious consideration. I would like for him to become a coauthor of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I feel it should receive the favorable consideration of the Members of the Congress. I hope it passes as other bills have passed here for small business.

Not only is the present failure record distressing, but we have some other records. In the last 2 weeks the Supreme Court has not dealt kindly with small business, from my viewpoint. On Monday a week ago, by a split decision of 5 to 4, the Court tilted the scales of justice against the small man. On Monday of this week in another 5-to-4 decision, it again tilted the scales of justice against the small man. This is a challenge to Congress. We must do something about it. We are doing something for businesses of all kinds and descriptions in every country of the world outside of the Iron Curtain, but there is not one place for the small man to get consideration for equity capital in the United States of America.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I regret not having heard all of the gentleman's speech, but I want to commend him on what I have heard. I know of the gentleman's very zealous advocacy for small business, and I also know of the plight the small-business men are in at this time. During the recess of the Congress the gentleman's committee held extensive hearings, and perhaps he has covered the subject, at which the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board testified, the members of the Federal Reserve banks throughout the country, and some of the top financial people around the Nation, and there was rather a unanimous view that small business is having a most difficult time in securing equity capital for expansion. We know that the taxload is heavy, and I know of the gentleman's interest in this matter. We had testimony from the Federal Reserve System which said that this plan could work and be effective in providing the capital which is needed. I commend the gentleman for endeavoring to help a very important segment of our economy, a segment which pays taxes, employs people, and is very important to our economy. This is the time that assistance is needed.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his flattering remarks. He is a member of the Small Business Committee and is due a lion's share of the credit for anything our committee may have accomplished.

While, as I have said, this is not my bill alone, I feel that I can invite all Members to join in introducing it. It is important for small business and for our country. We must pass it.

A BILL TO CREATE A SYSTEM OF SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS TO GIVE SMALL FIRMS ACCESS TO EQUITY AND LONG-TERM LOAN CAPITAL

Mr. Speaker, for almost 20 years now, I have listened to and read the advice of many thoughtful and experienced people on how to solve the problems of small business. On one point there has long been almost universal agreement: It is the point that small business of the United States is capital starved, and is becoming more so.

It is a sad but an undeniable fact that here in our great country where we have a capitalistic system which we are determined to see outperform and outlast all other systems, small business is denied access to all but the meager springs from which capital flows.

WE ARE NOT A CAPITAL-SHORT NATION

The United States is not a capital-short Nation, but just the reverse. In fact, many economists believe that a long-term weakness of our economic system is that it tends to create savings in excess of investment demands. But in any case, the country is able to invest, and in fact is investing billions of dollars abroad, through both public and private channels.

THE NEED IS FOR VENTURE CAPITAL

No, the problem is not a shortage of capital funds. The problem is a shortage of finance organizations gathering in the capital funds and making them available where needed. According to the theory of our capitalistic system, there is supposed to be a machinery in banking and finance which gathers together capital funds and brings them to a common meeting ground with industrial and commercial firms offering attractive investment opportunities. But as the students of this problem have long pointed out, insofar as small-business firms are concerned, this machinery is almost nonexistent.

This problem has been growing more and more acute. In recent decades we have all witnessed the trend toward more and more of the risk capital being drawn into the centralized financial markets, while small firms are being left more and more stranded. And while this trend has been increasing, other changes have been taking place which have both increased the capital requirements of all firms, small and large, and increased the small firms' need for some organized way of meeting these requirements. Technological changes have greatly increased the amount of capital equipment required for a successful firm, in almost all lines of business. And with the present-day tax structure, which allows few families to accumulate large personal fortunes, the small-business man must not only raise larger amounts of capital, but he must raise these funds from the savings of many more families than he can number among his personal acquaintances.

The country has a commercial banking system, of course, and on the whole a good one. But the main function of commercial banks is to make low-risk, short-term loans, such as are needed for seasonal or temporary additions to working capital. Commercial banks were never expected to supply funds for the permanent capital of business firms, and they are not by their nature suited to such financing. Substantially all of the funds in these banks are demand deposits, not depositors' savings, and actual capital paid in by bank stockholders averages less than 10 percent of deposits. Add to this the fact that commercial banking is done on a fractional reserve system, and it becomes plain why bank credit must be low in risk and high in liquidity.

In fact, both State and Federal banking laws rigidly limit the kinds of risk commercial banks can take, and the degree of liquidity beyond which they may not pass. These laws rule out investment in corporate stocks and they limit the number of years for which even the best secured loans can be made.

Where then is the progressive small firm with good profit prospects to obtain venture capital? Where also is the well-secured firm to borrow capital for expansion of fixed assets on a term of years reasonably commensurate with the value and expected life of its assets?

Where, in short, is the small firm to find the services which the centralized stock and bond markets provide for the big corporations?

"Not until Congress does something to fill this gap," all of the students of small business have told us, "will the fundamental problem facing small business be solved." How then to solve it?

PURPOSE OF SMALL-BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS

Today, I am introducing a bill which I believe will solve this problem. It will, I think, ultimately correct the erosion which the small business segments of our economy have long been undergoing.

This bill will create a system of regional capital banks and local investment associations which will bring to small firms a source of the kinds of capital that is needed. The system will make available sources of equity capital—that is, capital for purchase of the stocks of small firms having attractive stocks to offer. It will also make available sources of long-term debt capital such as the commercial banks and the Small Business Administration are not able to supply.

Furthermore, in creating such a system, the bill meets all of the hard conditions which the many thoughful and devoted free-enterprisers have said must be met by any such system that Congress might help to create.

This bill has many authors. In truth, it combines the thoughts of countless small-business men, big-business men, economists and other students of our economic system, both in and out of Congress. Furthermore, I have borrowed freely from the current ideas of many Members of Congress, both on the House and on the Senate side. It would be impossible to name all of the authors of this bill; but I expect that other Members of the House will join in supporting it. It presents a practical and workable program which can be adopted and put into effect promptly, and in the present business and political climate.

OBJECTIVES OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE ARE MET

Let me mention the main principles and objectives which the bill meets.

First, we have been told that any financial institution which Congress might help to create should be privately operated, with local business people making the business judgments about which firms merit investment, and under what conditions. The bill clearly meets this sound and basic objective.

Second, we have been told that any financial system which Congress might help to get started for this purpose should provide for investment of private capital and provide for an eventual full ownership by local people. The bill I am introducing clearly meets this objective.

Third, we have been told that to be attractive to private capital, and a sound investment for local citizens, the system should embrace an insurance principle, so as to pool and spread the risks of the different investors and the different communities. The bill clearly meets this condition.

FEDERAL LAND BANKS FOR FARMERS ARE SUCCESSFUL

The Members will be extremely interested, I think, in the fact that when we undertook to draft a bill which would meet major objectives I have outlined, we made an interesting discovery. We found that we were rediscovering and copying a system which Congress put into effect more than 40 years ago, when it established the Federal Land Bank System. The Federal Land Bank System has been highly successful. It has paid back all of the capital which the Government put into it, and these banks are now owned and operated by local associations of farmers. These banks have a record of financial success. Yet, when they were set up financing agriculture was considered to be the poorest kind of financial risk. Certainly, then, we have here a wonderful opportunity to set up for small business the kind of system which has been tested and proved successful for 40 years and through two long farm depressions.

THE BILL REQUIRES NO APPROPRIATIONS, NO INTEREST CHARGES, AND NO INCREASE IN FEDERAL DEBT

What, then, will it take to set up such a system of capital banks for small business?

Will it require an increase in the debt ceiling? No.

Will it require appropriations? No.

Will it require an added interest burden on the Government? No.

To provide the initial capital of the new banks, the bill will transfer certain funds already available in the Federal Reserve banks. These consist of—

First. Approximately $27½ million of what is known as section 13 (b) funds. These funds were made available in 1934, to help small business with direct loans from the Federal Reserve banks. The unused and uncommitted portion of these funds amounts to $27½ million and the Federal Reserve System wants to get rid of them. In fact, the Federal Reserve Board is now recommending that the Federal Reserve System be relieved of this program because the Board feels that the Federal Reserve System should operate strictly as a central bank and have no dealings with industrial or commercial firms.

Second. The bill would also transfer $10 million from the surplus reserve accounts of each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. These reserves are not the same as the reserves of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. They are separate from those. They are surplus earnings of the Federal Reserve banks from interest on Government securities, and they represent funds which are idle, unused, and unneeded in the Federal Reserve System. In fact, I have recently asked several officials of the Federal Reserve—including Chairman Martin—what these funds might be needed for, and not one of these officials has been able to suggest a likely use to which they might be put in the Federal Reserve System.

To repeat, the funds that would be transferred to form the initial capital of the Small Business Capital Bank System are already available. They are owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Government would not pay interest charges on the use of these funds. These funds are not now earning interest. Finally, to use these funds would not increase the Federal debt.

WILL CURE BUSINESS SLUMP WITHOUT INFLATION

Now about the question of inflation. Clearly, the Federal Reserve Board, the administration and the whole banking community think some immediate and substantial inflation is highly desirable. Furthermore, preparations are being made to reduce reserve requirements of the commercial banks, in the hope that increasing the money supply in this way will cure the business slump. Yet inflation of this kind will do little to expand business. What is needed to bring about business expansion is not more money in the commercial banks, not more bank credit, but more capital expansion—more use of investment funds. Increases in the money supply which bring about corresponding increase in production are not inflationary.

The system of small business capital banks provided for in this bill will bring about an expansion of business. It will bring about an expansion of production and productive capacity, and not an expansion of money bidding for the same amount of goods and services.

SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS WILL HELP THE PRIVATE COMMERCIAL BANKS

Finally, there is one other condition which we have been told must be met by such a system of small business capital banks as this bill would establish. The condition is that the Congress should not aid in establishing a system which will compete with private financial institutions. The bill meets this condition and more.

First of all, the Small Business Capital Bank System will not compete with the commercial banks. These banks will make available equity capital; the commercial banks do not supply, and do not expect to supply, any equity capital. The small business capital banks will also supply long-term debt capital, but this will be, again, capital for terms of years which the commercial banks do not and cannot expect to supply.

Furthermore, the bill specifically provides that a loan shall not be made except where the loan is not available on reasonable terms from private sources.

This bill will help and strengthen the commercial bank, particularly the local banks over the country. By helping to bring about strong and growing small-business firms over the country, the bill will strengthen the very lifeblood of the commercial banks. It will create a new and better demand for working capital loans, and an increased demand for all kinds of bank services.

THE SYSTEM WILL HELP STATE AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATIONS

In addition to these things, we have considered the State and local development associations that have been formed in recent years. These associations have been formed in several States in an effort to solve the very problem that makes

this bill necessary. Most of them have done fine work, and they have acquired valuable experience. Consequently, the bill provides for these associations to participate in the new system, but to retain their independence and have more resources to carry on the kind of work they are doing.

We consulted with a number of these associations and incorporated their ideas into the bill.

HOW THE SYSTEM WILL BE ORGANIZED

Coming now to the more specific features of the bill, let me outline the small-business capital system which it will create and show how this system will operate.

First, there would be established a Small Business Capital Bank Board as an independent agency of the Government of the United States. The principal office would be in Washington, and it would supervise and regulate the operation of a system of 12 small-business capital banks—one of which would be located in each Federal Reserve district.

The Board would consist of 13 members appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—1 from each of the 12 Federal Reserve districts and 1 at large. The Board members would devote full time to the duties of their offices and, as are members of similar boards such as the Federal Reserve Board, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and others, would be paid an annual salary of $20,000 per year. Each member would, as in the case of members of the Federal Reserve Board, serve a term of 14 years but could be removed from office by a showing of cause.

The Board would be authorized to establish and start the operation of the 12 small business capital banks. It would subscribe to $10 million of capital stock in each such bank. However, that stock would be retired when all of the authorized capital stock of each of the small business capital banks would be subscribed by the small business investment associations, the creation of which is provided for in the bill.

THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ASSOCIATIONS

Except for the capital stock of each of the small business capital banks initially subscribed by the Small Business Capital Bank Board, small business investment associations created in each of the States by small-business concerns would subscribe to the capital stock of the small business capital banks serving the area in question. Thus, provision is made for each of the small business capital banks to become fully privately owned by small business investment associations which, in turn, would be completely owned by small-business concerns.

Incidentally, the small business investment associations authorized in the bill, the establishment of which is provided for in the bill, would be patterned along the lines of the national farm loan associations and the production credit associations operating within the framework of the Federal land bank system and somewhat along the lines of the pattern of the building and loan associations operating within the framework of the Federal home-loan bank system.

Funds which would be used by the small-business capital banks in supplying capital to small-business investment associations for their use in making investments in small-business concerns would be secured from the Small Business Capital Bank Board. The Board would supply these funds through the purchase of debenture bonds from the small-business capital banks. The Board would secure such funds from private investors through the sale of its own debenture bonds on the open market. In such transaction, it would operate in much the same manner as the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA.

NOT OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The bill provides that the Board shall insert appropriate language in each of its obligations, clearly indicating that neither such obligation nor the interest thereon is guaranteed by the United States or constitutes a debt or obligation of the United States. Other language in the bill makes it clear that nothing contained in any of its provisions shall be deemed to impose any liability on the United States or on the Board or on any small business capital bank with respect to any obligations entered into on any securities issued by any of the small-business investment associations, the establishment of which is authorized through the provisions of the bill.

RECENT HEARINGS ON THE PROBLEM

The House Small Business Committee held hearings regarding the problems of small-business financing during November 1957. At the conclusion of our hearings in November, our committee, without dissent, subscribed to the statement that "we must develop more adequate sources of long-term loans and equity capital for small business." The more we study the matter, the stronger is our conclusion that we must act to provide more adequate sources for long-term loans and equity capital for small business.

THE PROBLEM IS UNIVERSALLY RECOGNIZED

Almost without exception, the witnesses who testified at the hearings held by the House Small Business Committee on the problems of small-business financing pointed to the immediate need for more adequate sources of equity and other long-term capital for small-business financing. They pointed out that while the large corporations have access to capital through large, well-organized, nationally known facilities, the small-business concern, in contrast, is without such facilities. The small concern must rely upon what it can retain from its earnings for investment in plant and equipment to meet the demands for survival, expansion, and growth.

Various proposals were advanced for the establishment of facilities for providing small business with equity and other long-term capital. A number of witnesses pointed to the proposals which had been made by Senator SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee in S. 2160 for the establishment of national investment companies to be capitalized by the Federal Reserve System. Others suggested the need for establishing small-business investment associations to work in close cooperation with financial institutions and with business enterprises in the particular areas in which they would be of service to small-business concerns and in providing such concerns with needed equity and long-term capital. In that connection suggestions were made for "the establishment of a Federal small-business system as a permanent source of equity and long-term funds for small business eventually privately owned and controlled and, as in the case of the Federal land-bank system, at no ultimate cost to the taxpayer"—page 61, record of hearings before the House Small Business Committee on the problems of small-business financing, November 1957.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE DIRECTED BILL BE PREPARED

At the conclusion of our hearings on the problems of small-business financing November 22, 1957, the House Small Business Committee directed that a bill be prepared that would provide for adequate sources of "long-term loans and equity capital for small business."

A carefully worked out bill was drafted and, as I said, I am introducing it to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term capital. As has been noted, it provides for a system of small business capital banks patterned somewhat along the lines of the Federal land bank system, thus the system of small business capital banks, while being chartered, sponsored, and promoted by the Federal Government, would nevertheless be a privately owned financial institution with no Federal Government ownership in the system.

The opportunities for securing the equity and other long-term capital which would be afforded by this bill are overdue. Often small business concerns have been promised that these opportunities would be opened up to them. They are needed urgently. Therefore, this bill should be taken up, considered, and passed without undue delay.

I am inserting herewith a copy of the bill H. R. 10345:

H. R. 10345

A bill to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, STATEMENT OF PURPOSE, AND DEFINITIONS

*Short title*

SEC. 101. This act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Small Business Capital Bank Act."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Title I—Short Title, Statement of Purpose, and Definitions*

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Statement of purpose.
Sec. 103. Definitions.

*Title II—Establishment of Small Business Capital Bank Board*

Sec. 201. Establishment of the Board.
Sec. 202. Membership.
Sec. 203. Executive Director.
Sec. 204. Seal.
Sec. 205. Provision of funds.
Sec. 206. Regulations.

*Title III—Organization of Small Business Capital Banks*

Sec. 301. Establishment of banks.
Sec. 302. Temporary management.
Sec. 303. Election of directors.
Sec. 304. Capitalization.
Sec. 305. Borrowing power.
Sec. 306. Use of banks' funds.
Sec. 307. Examination and reports.

*Title IV—Organization of Small Business Investment Associations*

Sec. 401. Organization of associations.
Sec. 402. Objectives.
Sec. 403. Articles of incorporation.
Sec. 404. Board of directors.
Sec. 405. Secretary-treasurer.
Sec. 406. Payment of expenses and salaries.
Sec. 407. Capital stock.
Sec. 408. Borrowing power.
Sec. 409. Investment by associations in stock of banks.
Sec. 410. Use of services of public agencies and private financial institutions.
Sec. 411. Disposition of funds held by associations.
Sec. 412. Examinations.
Sec. 413. Reports.
Sec. 414. Dissolution.
Sec. 415. Disclaimer of United States liability on association obligations and securities.
Sec. 416. Exemptions for association securities.
Sec. 417. Liability of associations for Federal income tax.
Sec. 418. State and local taxation of associations.

*Title V—Provision of Assistance to Small-Business Concerns*

Sec. 501. Standards of eligibility for assistance.
Sec. 502. Provision of equity capital for small-business concerns.
Sec. 503. Long-term loans to small-business concerns.
Sec. 504. Assistance through private investment companies and State and local development corporations.

*Title VI—Miscellaneous*

Sec. 601. Criminal penalties.
Sec. 602. Injunctive relief.

*Statement of purpose*

SEC. 102. (a) The Congress hereby finds that there is an increasing need among the small-business concerns of the United States for funds to finance their operations and to promote and facilitate their growth, expansion, and modernization; that this need must be met in the interest of a sound national economy; and that the loans which are presently available to small-business concerns from the Federal Government and from other public and private sources not only fail to meet this need but in fact, because of the burden of repayment over a relatively short period of time, frequently prevent such growth and expansion.

(b) It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this act to improve and stimulate the national economy in general and the small-business segment thereof in particular by establishing a program under which small-business concerns in the United States can be supplied with the equity capital and long-term loan funds which they need for the sound financing of their business operations and for their growth, expansion, and modernization.

*Definitions*

SEC. 103. (a) As used in this act—

(1) the term "Board" means the Small Business Capital Bank Board established by section 201;

(2) the term "bank" means a small business capital bank established under section 301;

(3) the term "association" means a small business investment association organized as provided in section 401;

(4) the terms "district" and "small business capital bank district" mean a geographical area coextensive with one of the 12 Federal Reserve districts created under section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act and existing on the date of the enactment of this act, except that the boundaries of such districts may from time to time be readjusted by the Board after the date of the enactment of this act to take into account more effectively the small-business needs of the country;

(5) the term "trading area" means a business community embracing an entire metropolitan area (as defined by the Board), or a geographical area embracing a number of municipalities when such a designation is determined by the Board to be necessary and appropriate in order to include all of an integrated business and commercial community; and

(6) the terms "State" and (when used in a geographical sense) "United States" include the several States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(b) (1) As used in this act, the term "small-business concern" means a business concern, incorporated or unincorporated, which is not dominant in a well-established industry or line of business, and which meets the more detailed standards and criteria prescribed by the Board under paragraph (2).

(2) As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this act, the Board shall prescribe detailed standards and criteria for the definition of the term "small-business concern", which standards and criteria may be based upon, but shall not be limited to, such things as number of employees, assets, volume of sales, and other factors related to the concern's relative position in its industry or line of business.

(3) The Board shall from time to time revise such standards and criteria to the extent necessary to take into account more accurately and realistically the relationship of small-business operations to the economy as a whole. Whenever such standards and criteria have been prescribed or revised with respect to any industry or line of business, the definition shall be published in the Federal Register, and for purposes of this act shall thereafter remain in effect with respect to such industry or line of business until subsequently revised and published by the Board in accordance with the same standards and procedures as those which were applicable when it was originally prescribed.

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANK BOARD

*Establishment of the Board*

SEC. 201. There is hereby established, as an independent agency of the Government of the United States, a Small Business Capital Bank Board. The principal office of the Board shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the Board may establish such district and branch offices throughout the United States as it deems necessary and appropriate.

*Membership*

SEC. 202. (a) The Board shall consist of 13 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 member from each of the 12 small business capital bank districts and 1 member at large. In making such appointments, the President shall have due regard to a fair representation of the public interest as well as of the particular interests and needs of small business and the special contributions which can be made by small-business concerns to the sound development of the national economy, and shall give particular consideration to persons who are experienced in small business and are familiar with its financing and other problems; and before appointing any member from 1 of such 12 districts (other than the first member so appointed) the President shall receive and consider any nominations for such appointment which may be submitted by small business investment associations in the district involved.

(b) Each member of the Board shall be appointed for a term of 14 years; except that (1) of the 12 members first appointed from the small business capital bank districts, 3 shall be appointed for terms of 3 years, 3 for terms of 7 years, 3 for terms of 10 years, and 3 for terms of 14 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of his predecessor's term.

(c) Each member of the Board shall be a citizen of the United States and (except in the case of the member appointed at large) shall have been a resident of the district from which he is appointed for not less than 10 years next preceding his appointment. No person shall be eligible for appointment as a member of the Board if, at the time his term of office would begin or within the 1-year period next preceding such time, he shall have been a director or salaried officer or employee of a small business capital bank or small business investment association. The members of the Board shall devote their entire time to the business of the Board and shall not engage in any other occupation or work during their terms of office.

(d) The annual rate of basic compensation of each member of the Board shall be $20,000.

(e) Each member of the Board, in addition to receiving compensation as provided in subsection (d), shall be reimbursed for necessary travel, subsistence, and other expenses actually incurred in the discharge of his duties as such member, without regard to any other laws relating to allowances for such expenses.

(f) As soon as practicable after the first members of the Board have been appointed as provided in subsection (a), the members shall meet, subscribe to the oath of office, and organize by electing from among the membership a Chairman and a Vice Chairman and by appointing (from within or without its membership) a Secretary. The Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Secretary shall be elected annually for terms of 1 year, and shall serve until their respective successors are elected and take office. The Chairman shall preside at all meetings and the Vice Chairman shall preside in the absence or disability of the Chairman. The Board may, in the absence or disability of both the Chairman and Vice Chairman, elect any of its members to act as chairman pro tempore. Seven members shall constitute a quorum of the Board for the transaction of business, and the Board may function notwithstanding vacancies provided a quorum is present. The Board shall meet at such times and places as it may fix and determine, but shall hold at least 12 regularly scheduled meetings a year; and special meetings may be held on call of the Chairman or any three members.

(g) Notwithstanding subsection (b), any member of the Board may at any time be removed from office for cause by the President or, if cause exists but the President does not act, by the Congress through impeachment proceedings.

(h) The Board shall adopt such rules as it may see fit for the transaction of its business, and shall keep permanent and complete records of its acts and proceedings.

*Executive Director*

SEC. 203. (a) The Board shall appoint an Executive Director, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board and shall, subject to the general supervision and direction of the Board as to matters of a broad and general supervisory, advisory, or policy nature, and, except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, be responsible for the execution of the functions of the Board.

(b) The Board shall fix the compensation of the Executive Director, but his annual rate of basic compensation shall not exceed $17,500. In addition to receiving such compensation, the Executive Director shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, or paid a per diem allowance in lieu thereof within the limitations prescribed by law, while away from his official station upon official business.

(c) The Executive Director shall comply with all orders and directions which he receives from the Board; but as to all third persons his acts shall be presumed to be in compliance with the orders and directions of the Board.

(d) The Executive Director shall appoint such officers, employes, and other personnel (including attorneys, economists, accountants, experts, assistants, clerks, and laborers) as may be necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties vested in the Board, and fix their compensation, in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949. All functions, powers, and duties of the Board, except those specifically reserved to the Board itself by this act, shall be exercised and performed by the Executive Director and may be exercised and performed by him through such officers, employees, or other personnel of the Board as he may designate.

*Seal*

SEC. 204. The Board shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

*Provision of funds*

SEC. 205. (a) The funds required for the operating expenses of the Board, and for its investment in the capital stock of the 12 small business capital banks under section 304 (a), shall be obtained as provided in this section.

(b) (1) Within 90 days after the enactment of this act, there shall be transferred to the Board from the existing accounts of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, under the direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, all funds heretofore authorized for loans to industrial and commercial firms under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act and not loaned or otherwise committed for that purpose, together with all the existing rights and liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks with respect to loans under such section 13b which are outstanding or with respect to which commitments have been issued, including the right to collect or receive (and to use as provided in subsection (a) of this section) any repayments of such loans which may hereafter become due. Effective 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act, section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act is repealed; but such repeal shall not affect the power of the Board to carry out, or protect its interest under, any agreement or transaction, theretofore made or entered into under such section, with respect to which rights and liabilities are transferred to the Board under this paragraph.

(2) Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act, there shall be transferred to the Board from the existing surplus accounts of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, under the direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the sum of $120 million. The amount which shall be transferred from the surplus account of any Federal Reserve bank under this subsection shall bear the same ratio to $120 million as the surplus account of that bank bears (on the date of the enactment of this act) to the total of the surplus accounts of all 12 Federal Reserve banks.

(c) Whenever the Board's investment in the capital stock of any small-business capital bank is retired as provided in section 304 (b), the proceeds from the retirement of such stock shall be paid over by the Board to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) In order to secure funds to be used in purchasing debenture bonds of banks as provided in section 305, the Board is authorized to issue and have outstanding obligations having such maturities and bearing such rate or rates of interest as may be determined by the Board with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be redeemable at the option of the Board at or before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations; but the aggregate amount of such obligations which may be outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $1,200,000,000. Such obligations shall be sold only to private investors, and the proceeds therefrom shall be used only for the purchase of debenture bonds of banks as provided in section 305. The Board shall insert appropriate language in each such obligation clearly indicating that neither it nor the interest thereon is guaranteed by the United States or constitutes a debt or obligation of the United States or of any agency or instrumentality thereof other than the Board. The Board is authorized to purchase in the open market any of its obligations outstanding under this subsection at any time and at any price.

*Regulations*

SEC. 206. The Board shall prescribe and publish such regulations (including regulations providing for the wide dissemination to small-business concerns of information concerning the benefits and objectives of the program established by this act, defining in detail the financial and operational relationships among and between banks, associations, small-business concerns, and other persons, and otherwise insuring that all possible assistance will be extended to small-business concerns under this act and that such assistance will be an effective means of promoting the purposes of this act), and take such other actions, as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out this act and in effectively exercising the functions expressly and impliedly vested in it under this act.

TITLE III—ORGANIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS

*Establishment of banks*

SEC. 301. The Board shall establish in each district a small business capital bank. The principal office of each bank shall be located (unless such location is rendered impossible by reason of adjustments in district boundaries made under section 103 (4)) in the city within its district where the Federal Reserve bank for such district is located, and such Federal Reserve bank shall make available without cost to the small business capital bank, in the Federal Reserve bank building, the quarters and facilities needed by such bank to carry out its functions under this act. Each small business capital bank shall include in its title the name of the city in which it is located. Subject to the approval of the Board, any bank may establish branches within its district.

*Temporary management*

SEC. 302. (a) Each bank shall be temporarily managed by seven directors appointed for terms of 2 years by the Board. Such directors shall be citizens of the United States and residents of the district in which the bank is located. They shall each give a surety bond, the premium on which shall be paid from the funds of the bank, and shall receive such compensation as the Board shall fix. They shall choose from among their number a chairman, vice chairman, secretary, and treasurer and may, subject to the approval of the Board, appoint and fix the compensation of such attorneys, economists, accountants, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees as they deem necessary.

(b) The temporary directors of each bank shall, under their hand, forthwith make an organization certificate which shall specifically state—

(1) the name assumed by the bank;

(2) the district within which its operations are to be carried on, and the particular city in which its principal office is to be located;

(3) the amount of the bank's authorized capital stock and the number of shares into which such stock is to be divided, and the increase in such stock which (under the regulations prescribed by the Board pursuant to section 206) may result from conversion of debenture bonds issued under section 305; and

(4) the fact that the certificate is made to enable small-business concerns to avail themselves of the advantages of this act.

The organization certificate shall be acknowledged before a judge or clerk of some court of record or notary public and shall, together with the acknowledgment thereof, be authenticated by the seal of such court or notary and transmitted to and filed in the principal office of the Board, where it shall at all times be open to public inspection.

(c) The Board is authorized to direct such changes in or additions to any such organization certificate, not inconsistent with this act, as it may deem necessary or expedient.

(d) Upon duly making and filing the organization certificate, the bank shall become (as of the date of the execution of such certificate) a body corporate, and as such, and in the name designated in such certificate, it shall have power—

(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

(2) to have succession until it is dissolved by act of Congress or under the provisions of this act;

(3) to make contracts;

(4) to sue and be sued, complain, interplead, and defend, in any court of law or equity, as fully as a natural person;

(5) to elect directors (subject to the provisions of section 303) and by its board of directors to elect a president and a vice president, appoint a secretary and a treasurer and other officers and employees, define their duties, require bonds of them and fix the penalty thereof, and dismiss any such officers and employees at pleasure and appoint others to fill their places;

(6) to prescribe, by its board of directors, subject to the supervision and regulation of the Board, bylaws not inconsistent with law, regulating the manner in which its stock shall be issued, held, and disposed of, its directors elected (subject to the provisions of section 303), its officers elected or appointed, its property transferred, its general business conducted, and the privileges granted to it by law exercised and enjoyed; and

(7) to exercise, by its board of directors or its duly authorized officers or agents, subject to law, all such incidental powers as

shall be necessary to carry out its functions under this act.

*Election of directors*

SEC. 303. (a) After the expiration of the 2-year term of the temporary directors of any bank appointed by the Board under section 302 (a), the directors of such bank shall be chosen as provided in this section.

(b) Each bank shall have seven directors who shall serve for concurrent terms of 2 years each. Five of such directors shall be elected by majority vote of the stockholders of the bank, and two of such directors shall be appointed by the Board.

(c) The annual rate of basic compensation of each director of a bank, and any allowances for travel, subsistence, and other expenses, shall be fixed by the Board. Each such director shall be a citizen of the United States and a resident of the district in which the bank is located, and shall have such other qualifications as the Board may prescribe.

(d) The directors of any bank first appointed under this section shall immediately take such action as may be necessary to terminate the period of temporary management of the bank and establish its permanent operation under its charter and bylaws.

*Capitalization*

SEC. 304. (a) Each bank shall be established with an authorized capitalization of $110 million, of which $10 million shall be paid-in capital subscribed for by the Board immediately upon the establishment of the bank and the remainder shall be provided by investments of associations under section 409 and of other financial institutions under section 504 (b).

(b) The stock subscribed for by the Board under subsection (a) shall be retired in full not later than the time when all of the remaining authorized capitalization has been subscribed and paid in.

*Borrowing power*

SEC. 305. In addition to its authorized capitalization, each bank shall have authority to obtain funds through the sale to the Board of its debenture bonds, which shall—

(1) bear interest at such rate, and contain such other terms, as the Board may fix;

(2) be callable on any interest payment date, upon 3 months' notice, at par plus accrued interest; and

(3) be convertible at maturity if not theretofore called, at the option of the Board, into stock of such bank at the rate of 1 share of $100 par value 7 percent preferred stock for each $100 (or fraction thereof) of the face value of the debenture bond or bonds converted; and the right of conversion may be exercised by the Board with respect to any 1 or more debenture bonds without exercising such right with respect to other such bonds held by it.

*Use of banks' funds*

SEC. 306. It shall be the primary function of each bank to use any funds available to it from its capital account or from any of its other accounts—

(1) to advance capital to associations in its district as provided in section 408;

(2) to advance funds to private financial investment institutions as described in section 504; and

(3) to make direct long-term loans to small-business concerns as provided in section 503.

*Examinations and reports*

SEC. 307. The Board shall from time to time require that examinations and reports be made (by the General Accounting Office) of the condition of all banks established under this title, and shall publish consolidated statements of the results thereof.

TITLE IV—ORGANIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ASSOCIATIONS

*Organization of associations*

SEC. 401. Corporations to be known as small business investment associations may be organized by small-business concerns desiring to take advantage of the provisions of this act. Not less than 25 such concerns shall be required to subscribe the articles of incorporation in order to form an association. One association may be organized in each State, but in no case shall more than 1 association be organized in any 1 trading area. Each association shall comply with all of the terms and conditions of this title, and shall be incorporated under the law of the State in which it is located.

*Objectives*

SEC. 402. Each association shall be organized to operate as a regulated closed-end investment company designed to provide necessary equity capital to small-business concerns within a particular community or trading area, and for such purpose it would be authorized—

(1) to raise capital in order to serve as a joint enterprise for the benefit of its stockholders as proprietors;

(2) to invest (and manage the investment of) the capital of its stockholder-proprietors in carefully selected enterprises with profit and growth potential;

(3) to furnish both management and investment counsel to those selected enterprises where needed; and

(4) to provide its stockholder-proprietors with specific and general investment information and objectives.

*Articles of incorporation*

SEC. 403. (a) The articles of incorporation of each association shall specify in general terms the objects for which the association is formed, the name assumed by the association, the area or areas where its operations are to be carried on, the place where its principal office is to be located, and the amount and classes of its capital stock. Such articles may also contain any other provisions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, which the association may deem it advisable to adopt for the regulation of its business and the conduct of its affairs, including provision for cumulative voting in the election of directors. Such articles and any amendments thereto adopted from time to time, shall be subject to the approval of the Board as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The articles of incorporation of each proposed association shall be forwarded to the Board for its consideration and approval or disapproval. In determining whether to approve the organization of the association and its proposed articles of incorporation, the Board shall give due regard, among other things, to the need for the financing of independent small-business concerns in the area in which the proposed association is to commence business, the general character of the proposed management of the association, and the number and volume of operations of other associations previously organized in the United States and in the region where the proposed association would be located. After consideration of all relevant factors, the Board may in its discretion approve the articles of incorporation and issue to the association a permit to begin business.

(c) Upon issuance to any association of a permit to begin business as provided in subsection (b), such association shall become and be a body corporate and as such, and in the name designated in its articles of incorporation, shall have power—

(1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;

(2) to have succession until dissolved by the vote of its shareholders owning two-thirds of its voting stock, or by act of Congress, or in the manner provided in section 414;

(3) to make contracts;

(4) to sue and be sued, complain and defend, in any court of law or equity;

(5) by its board of directors, to appoint such officers and employees as may be deemed proper, define their authority and duties, fix their compensation in cases where such compensation is approved by the Board as provided in section 404 (f), require bonds of such of them as it deems advisable and fix the penalty thereof, and dismiss any of such officers and employees at pleasure and appoint others to fill their places;

(6) to adopt bylaws regulating the manner in which its stock shall be transferred, its officers and employees appointed, its property transferred, and the privileges granted to it by law exercised and enjoyed;

(7) to establish branch offices or agencies, subject to the approval of the Board;

(8) to acquire, hold, operate, and dispose of any property (real, personal, or mixed), whenever necessary or appropriate in carrying out its lawful functions;

(9) to operate in such area or areas as may be specified in its articles of incorporation and approved by the Board; and

(10) to exercise all of the powers set forth in this act, and such other incidental powers as may be reasonably necessary to carry on the business for which the association is organized.

*Board of directors*

SEC. 404. (a) Each association shall have a board of directors consisting of 7 members, chosen as provided in this section, who shall serve for concurrent terms of 2 years each.

(b) The seven directors of any association who first take office after the approval of such association's articles of incorporation shall be appointed by the board of directors of the small-business capital bank for the district in which the association is located.

(c) At the expiration of the 2-year term of the directors appointed under subsection (b), and every 2 years thereafter, the directors of the association shall be chosen as follows: 5 shall be elected by majority vote of the stockholders of the association, and 2 shall be appointed by the board of directors of the small-business capital bank for the district in which the association is located.

(d) Any vacancy that may occur in the board of directors of an association through death, resignation, or other cause shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original election or appointment, and the new director thus chosen shall serve out the unexpired portion of the term. Until such election or appointment of a new director, the remaining directors shall have power to fill the vacancy for the time being by appointing a temporary director to serve until the next meeting of the stockholders, or until the bank for the district can act, as the case may be. All directors shall hold office until their successors are chosen and have qualified.

(e) The board of directors of each association shall from time to time elect a president and vice president from among its number.

(f) The directors of any association, and all officers thereof except the secretary-treasurer, shall serve as such without compensation unless the payment of salaries to them is approved by the Board. All directors and officers except the secretary-treasurer shall, during their term of office, be bona fide residents of the area within which the association is authorized to do business and shall be stockholders of the association.

*Secretary-treasurer*

SEC. 405. (a) The board of directors of each association shall choose, in such manner as may be deemed appropriate, a secretary-treasurer, who shall receive such com-

pensation for his services as such as the board of directors shall determine.

(b) It shall be the duty of the secretary-treasurer of each association to act as custodian of its funds and to deposit such funds in such bank as the board of directors may designate. He shall also be the custodian of its securities, records, papers, and certificates of stock, and all documents relating to, or bearing upon, the conduct of its affairs. He shall furnish a suitable surety bond to be prescribed and approved by the Board for the proper performance of his duties under this act, which shall cover prompt collection and transmission of funds. He shall make reports to the Board as required by it upon forms to be provided for that purpose. Upon request of the Board he shall furnish information regarding the condition of the association for which he is acting, and he shall carry out all duly authorized orders of the Board.

*Payment of expenses and salaries*

SEC. 406. The reasonable expenses of the secretary-treasurer of any association and his salary, and the reasonable expenses of the other officers and agents of the association (and their salaries when payable as provided in section 404 (f)), shall be paid from the general funds of the association, and the board of directors of the association is authorized to set aside such sums as it deems requisite for that purpose and for other expenses of the association. When no such funds are available, the board of directors may levy an assessment on the members of the association in proportion to the amount of the stock of the association held by each, which may be repaid as soon as funds are available, or it may secure an advance from the bank of its district, to be repaid with interest at the rate of 6 percent a year, from dividends belonging to the association. Each bank is authorized to make such advances and to deduct such repayments.

*Capital stock*

SEC. 407. (a) Each association shall have a paid-in capital and surplus equal to at least $500,000 before it may commence business. In order to facilitate the formation of such associations, each small business capital bank is authorized and directed, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to invest in the shares of stock of one or more associations, investing at least $250,000 in the shares of stock of each such association, but with a view to the ultimate disposal of such stock to private investors described in subsection (b).

(b) The shares of stock in any association shall be eligible at any time for purchase by any small-business concern located and doing business in the trading area in which such association is located.

(c) The aggregate amount of shares in any association or associations which may be owned or controlled by any stockholder, or by any group or class of stockholders, may be limited by the Board; and no one stockholder, other than a small business capital bank, shall at any time, own or control more than 10 percent of the total outstanding shares of any such association.

*Borrowing power*

SEC. 408. (a) Each association shall have authority to borrow money from the bank of its district and to issue therefor its debentures, bonds, promissory notes, or other obligations under such general conditions and subject to such limitations and regulations as the Board may prescribe.

(b) In addition to the borrowing authority provided by subsection (a), each association shall have authority to obtain funds from the bank of its district through the sale to such bank of its debenture bonds, which shall—

(1) bear interest at such rate, and contain such other terms, as such bank may fix with the approval of the Board;

(2) be callable on any interest payment date, upon 3 months' notice, at par plus accrued interest; and

(3) be convertible on any interest payment date prior to retirement or maturity, at the option of such bank, into stock of the association at the rate of 1 share of $50 par value common stock and 1 share of $50 par value 7 percent preferred stock for each $100 (or fraction thereof) of the face value of the debenture bond or bonds converted; and the right of conversion may be exercised by the bank with respect to any one or more debenture bonds without exercising such right with respect to other such bonds held by it.

(c) Each association shall also have authority to obtain funds from the bank of its district by transferring or obligating to such bank, under a proper power of attorney, its interest in and to any income debenture bonds or other bonds, mortgages, promissory notes, preferred stock or other capital shares of business enterprises, or other obligations or securities acquired and held by it in the performance of its functions under this act.

*Investment by associations in stock of banks*

SEC. 409. Whenever a bank advances funds to an association under this act, such association shall be required to become a stockholder-proprietor of the bank by investing in the capital stock of the bank in an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount of the funds so advanced.

*Use of services of public agencies and private financial institutions*

SEC. 410. (a) Each association may make use of advisory services of departments and agencies of the Federal Government which are available for and useful to industrial and commercial businesses, and may provide small-business concerns with consulting and advisory services on a fee basis and have on its staff persons competent to provide such services.

(b) When practicable the operations of an association may be undertaken in cooperation with commercial banks and other private financial institutions, and any investigations or other activities required in connection with its operations under this act may under regulations of the Board be handled through such institutions on a fee basis.

*Disposition of funds held by associations*

SEC. 411. (a) Subject to the supervision and direction of the Board, any small business capital bank is authorized to act as a depository or fiscal agent for any association.

(b) Any association may invest funds not reasonably needed for its current operations in direct obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

*Examinations*

SEC. 412. Each association shall be subject to examinations made under the direction of the Board by examiners selected or approved by the Board; and the cost of such examinations, including the compensation of the examiners, may in the discretion of the Board be assessed against the association examined and when so assessed shall be paid by such association.

*Reports*

SEC. 413. Each association shall make such reports to the Board, at such times and in such form, as the Board may require.

*Dissolution*

SEC. 414. Should any association violate or fail to comply with any of the provisions of this act or of regulations prescribed hereunder by the Board, it may be dissolved and all of its rights and privileges forfeited. Before any association shall be declared dissolved and its rights and privileges forfeited, however, the noncompliance with or violation of this act shall be determined and adjudged by a court of the United States of competent jurisdiction in a suit brought for that purpose by the United States at the instance of the Board or the Attorney General in the district in which the association is located.

*Disclaimer of United States liability on association obligations and securities*

SEC. 415. Nothing in this act or in any other provision of law shall be deemed to impose any liability on the United States, or on the Board or any small business capital bank, with respect to any obligations entered into or securities issued by an association.

*Exemptions for association securities*

SEC. 416. (a) Section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U. S. C., sec. 77c) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Commission may from time to time by its rules and regulations, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, add to the securities exempted as provided in this section any class of securities issued by a small-business investment association under the Small Business Capital Bank Act if it finds, having regard for the purposes of that act, that the enforcement of this act with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors."

(b) Section 304 of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 (15 U. S. C., sec. 77ddd) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Commission may from time to time by its rules and regulations, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, add to the securities exempted as provided in this section any class of securities issued by a small-business investment association under the Small Business Capital Bank Act if it finds, having regard to the purposes of that act, that the enforcement of this act with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors."

*Liability of associations for Federal income tax*

SEC. 417. (a) Section 851 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to general rule for definition of regulated investment company) is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or ", and by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) which is a small-business investment association organized under title IV of the Small Business Capital Bank Act."

(b) Section 851 (b) (2) of such code (relating to limitations applicable to definition of regulated investment company) is amended by inserting after "90 percent" the following: "(75 percent in the case of a corporation described in subsection (a) (3))."

(c) (1) The heading of section 851 (e) of such code (relating to investment companies furnishing capital to development corporations) is amended by inserting "or to small-business concerns" after "development corporations."

(2) Paragraph (1) of such section 851 (e) is amended by inserting after "generally available," the following: "or if such investment company is a small business investment association which was organized under title IV of the Small Business Capital Bank Act and which has not been exempted under subsection (f) from the limitations of subsection (b) (4)."

(3) The heading of paragraph (3) of such section 851 (e) is amended by inserting "in the case of companies furnishing capital to development corporations" after "status."

(d) Section 851 of such code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Exemption of small business investment associations from limitations of subsection (b) (4): If the Small Business Capital Bank Board determines that it is necessary and appropriate to the accomplishment of the purposes of the Small Business Capital Bank Act that any or all of the small business investment associations formed under title IV of such act be exempt from the requirements of subsection (b) (4) of this act, it shall certify such determination to the Secretary or his delegate and, in such event, the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) (4) shall not apply to such association or associations."

(e) (1) Section 852 (a) of such code (relating to requirements applicable to taxation of regulated investment companies) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The investment company taxable income of a regulated investment company which is a small business investment association organized under title IV of the Small Business Capital Bank Act shall, for purposes of paragraph (1), be increased by the amounts described in subsection (d) (3) (D) and decreased by the amounts described in subsection (d) (5) (B)."

(2) Section 852 of such code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Small business investment association reserve.—

"(1) Reserve generally: A regulated investment company which is a small business investment association formed under title IV of the Small Business Capital Bank Act may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, establish and maintain a reserve subject to the limitations provided in this subsection.

"(2) Limitation on reserve: The amount of the reserve shall not at any time exceed the lesser of—

"(A) 50 percent of the invested capital of the company as defined in paragraph (7), or

"(B) the accumulated earnings and profits determined as of the close of the taxable year.

"(3) Charges to reserve: The reserve shall be charged as of the end of the taxable year (whether or not such charge produces a minus amount in the reserve) with the following:

"(A) the net capital loss for the taxable year (as defined in section 1222 (10));

"(B) the net operating loss for the taxable year (as defined in section 172 (c));

"(C) the Federal income taxes attributable to the amount added to the reserve under paragraph (5); and

"(D) such amount as may be necessary by reason of the limitation provided in paragraph (2).

"(4) Mandatory additions to the reserve: There shall be added to the reserve as of the close of the taxable year the following:

"(A) an amount equal to the excess of the net capital gain for the taxable year computed without regard to section 1212 (relating to capital loss carryover) over the net capital gain for the taxable year; and

"(B) an amount equal to the excess of the taxable income for the taxable year computed without regard to section 172 (relating to the net operating loss deduction) over the taxable income for the taxable year.

"(5) Discretionary addition to the reserve: In any year in which an amount (other than the amount described in paragraph (4)) is added to the reserve, the company shall, in the computation of its investment company taxable income be allowed—

"(A) a deduction equal to such amount of the addition to the reserve as does not cause the aggregate amount of the reserve (including such addition) to exceed 20 percent of the invested capital of the company as defined in paragraph (7); and

"(B) the deduction for dividends received provided in section 243 but such deduction shall not exceed 85 percent of the portion of amounts added to the reserve under this paragraph which is not deductible from investment company taxable income under subparagraph (A).

"(6) Reduction of termination of reserve: In the event of a reduction or termination of the reserve in connection with a partial or complete liquidation of the company (or of any company to which the reserve has been transferred in an exchange upon which gain was not recognized by reason of any provision of this subtitle), the gain realized by a stockholder upon any such liquidation shall, to the extent of the pro rata share of the reserve, be considered as a gain from the sale or exchange of property held for less than 6 months.

"(7) Invested capital: For purposes of paragraph (2), the term 'invested capital' means the sum, determined as of the close of the taxable year, of—

"(A) the amount of money or property (included in an amount equal to its unadjusted basis without regard to the value of the property as of March 1, 1913, except that if such basis is a substituted basis, it shall be adjusted, with respect to the period before the property was paid in, by an amount equal to adjustments proper under section 312 (f) for determining earnings and profits) previously paid in for stock, or as paid-in surplus or as a contribution to capital, reduced by the amount of distributions not out of earnings and profits in the year of distribution and not out of accumulated earnings and profits; and

"(B) the amount of the outstanding indebtedness (not including interest) of the company which is evidenced by a bond, note, bill of exchange, debenture, certificate of indebtedness, mortgage, or deed of trust, except that indebtedness not represented by a bond or debenture shall not be included in excess of an amount equal to the average daily amount of indebtedness not so represented which was outstanding during the taxable year."

(f) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1958.

*State and local taxation of associations*

SEC. 418. Each association, including its franchise, capital, reserves, and surplus, its income, its real property, its tangible and intangible personal property, and its obligations (both as to principal and income derived therefrom), shall be subject to taxation, in the same manner and to the same extent as a State-chartered institution of similar character, by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority; and its real property shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements.

## TITLE V—PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO SMALL-BUSINESS CONCERNS

*Standards of eligibility for assistance*

SEC. 501. The Board shall promulgate standards to determine the eligibility of small-business concerns for the assistance provided by this act. In promulgating such standards, which may differ according to the type of assistance involved and any other relevant factors, the Board shall give consideration to—

(1) the need to promote the development and growth of small-business concerns so as to enable them to make their maximum contribution to productive investment and employment and to the economic stability and growth of the Nation;

(2) the need to make capital for such concerns more readily available in adequate amounts and on reasonable terms;

(3) the need to facilitate maximum participation of private financial institutions and investors in financing these concerns; and

(4) the need to supplement the existing facilities of banks and other private financial institutions through the program of assistance provided under this act.

*Provision of equity capital for small-business concerns*

SEC. 502. (a) It shall be the primary function of each small business investment association to provide a source of needed equity capital for incorporated small-business concerns which are located within its district, and which meet the standards of eligibility promulgated by the Board under section 501, by advancing funds to such concerns in the manner and subject to the conditions described in this section.

(b) Funds shall be advanced by an association to a small-business concern only through the purchase of debenture bonds (of such concern) which shall—

(1) bear interest at such rate, and contain such other terms, as such association may fix with the approval of the Board;

(2) be callable on any interest payment date, upon 3 months' notice, at par plus accrued interest; and

(3) be convertible on any interest payment date prior to maturity (unless previously called), at the option of the association, into stock of such concern at the rate of 1 share of $50 par value common stock and 1 share of $50 par value 7 percent preferred stock for each $100 (or fraction thereof) of the face value of the debenture bond or bonds converted; and the right of conversion may be exercised by the association with respect to any one or more debenture bonds without exercising such right with respect to other such bonds of the same concern held by the association.

(c) Before any funds are advanced by an association to a small-business concern under this section—

(1) the association may require such concern to refinance any or all of its outstanding indebtedness so that the association is the only holder of any evidence of indebtedness of such concern; and

(2) such concern shall agree that it will not thereafter incur any indebtedness without first securing the approval of the association and giving the association the first opportunity to finance such indebtedness.

(d) Without the approval of the Board, the aggregate amount of obligations and securities of any one small business concern which may be acquired and held by an association at any one time shall not exceed whichever of the following is the larger:

(1) $1 million; or

(2) 33⅓ percent of the combined capital and surplus of the association.

(e) Whenever an association advances funds to a small-business concern under this section, such concern shall be required to become a stockholder-proprietor of the association by investing in the capital stock of the association in an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount of the funds so advanced.

*Long-term loans to small-business concerns*

SEC. 503. (a) Each bank is authorized to make loans, in the manner and subject to the conditions described in this section, to incorporated and unincorporated small-business concerns which are located in its district, and which meet the standards of eligibility promulgated by the Board under section 501, in order to provide such concerns with funds needed for sound financing, growth, modernization, and expansion.

(b) Loans made under this section may be made directly, or in cooperation with commercial lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis.

(c) No financial assistance shall be extended under this subsection unless the fi-

nancial assistance needed is not otherwise available to the small-business concern on reasonable terms. No immediate participation may be purchased unless it is shown that a deferred participation is not available; and no direct loan may be made unless it is shown that a participation is not available. Any participation by a bank on a deferred basis shall not be in execess of 90 percent of the balance of the loan outstanding at the time of disbursement by the bank.

(d) The rate of interest for the bank's share of any loan made under this section shall be no more than 5 percent per annum, and shall not be more than the rate prevailing within the district where the bank is located if such prevailing rate (at the time of disbursement by the bank) is less than 5 percent per annum.

(e) Loans made under this section shall have a maturity not exceeding 30 years; except that a loan made under this section for the purpose of construction, conversion, or expansion of facilities may have a maturity of 30 years plus such additional period as is estimated by the bank making the loan to be required to complete such construction, conversion, or expansion.

(f) All loans made under this section shall be of such sound value, or so secured, as reasonably to assure repayment.

(g) Any bank which has made a loan to a small-business concern under this section is authorized to extend the maturity of or renew such loan for additional periods not exceeding 10 years if the bank finds that such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan.

*Assistance through private investment companies and State and local development corporations*

SEC. 504. (a) In addition to providing financial assistance for small-business concerns by advancing funds to associations and making long-term loans to such concerns as otherwise provided in this act, each bank, subject to regulations of the Board, is authorized to advance funds to investment companies (both open-end and closed-end) in its district which are in existence on the date of the enactment of this act, and to State and local development corporations in its district whether in existence on such date or formed after such date, on condition that such funds be used only to supply equity capital to small-business concerns in such district in a manner which will assist in carrying out the purpose of this act. Any funds advanced to a finanical institution under this subsection shall be in exchange for convertible debenture bonds of such institution having the same terms and conditions as the debenture bonds of associations described in section 408 (b), and funds may be so advanced without regard to the use and investment by such institution of funds secured by it from other sources.

(b) Whenever a bank advances funds to a financial institution under subsection (a), such institution shall be required to become a stockholder-proprietor of such bank by investing in the capital stock of such bank in an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount of the funds so advanced.

(c) A bank may acquire and hold stock in one or more financial institutions through conversion of the debenture bonds of such institutions under subsection (a), and a financial institution may acquire and hold stock of a bank under subsection (b), without regard to any limitation (in section 12 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 or in any other law of the United States) upon the right of such bank or institution to acquire and hold such stock or the amount of such stock which may be so acquired and held.

(d) As used in subsection (a)—

(1) the term "investment companies" means investment companies as defined in section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 which are subject to the provisions of that act; and

(2) the term "State and local development corporations" means enterprises incorporated under State law for the primary purpose of promoting and assisting the growth and development of small business concerns in the areas covered by their operations.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

*Criminal penalties*

SEC. 601. (a) The first paragraph of section 217 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "farm credit examiner," the following: "or of any small business capital bank or small business investment association."

(b) Section 218 of such title is amended by inserting after "National Agricultural Credit Corporations," the following: "or an examiner of small business capital banks or small business investment associations."

(c) (1) The first paragraph of section 221 of such title is amended by inserting after "United States," the following: "or a small business investment association or small business capital bank."

(2) The second paragraph of such section 221 is amended by inserting after "Congress," the following: "or any small business capital bank or small business investment association."

(3) The heading of such section 221 is amended by striking out "farm loan or land bank" and inserting in lieu thereof "farm loan, land bank, or small business."

(4) The table of sections for chapter 11 of such title 18 is amended by striking out "farm loan or land bank" in the reference to section 221 and inserting in lieu thereof "farm loan, land bank, or small business."

(d) Section 657 of such title is amended by inserting after "Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation," the following: "or any small business capital bank or small business investment association."

(e) Section 1006 of such title is amended by inserting after "Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation," the following: "or any small business capital bank or small business investment association."

(f) Section 1014 of such title is amended by inserting after "a Federal Reserve bank," the following: "or of a small business capital bank or a small business investment association."

*Injunctive relief*

SEC. 602. Whenever in the judgment of the Board any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act or of any regulation prescribed by the Board under this act, the Board may make application to the proper district court of the United States, or the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and such courts shall have jurisdiction of such actions and upon a showing by the Board that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

## ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting a petition from my constituency protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages. This petition was submitted by Mrs. Della Painter, of 1215 South Grevillea Avenue, Inglewood, Calif., and was signed by 80 constituents of the 17th Congressional District of California. The petition and signatures follow:

PETITION

To Congressman CECIL R. KING:

We, the citizens of the 17th District of California, again urge your support to remove the advertising of alcoholic beverages from our homes:

Mrs. Jennie L. Helmick, Mrs. Mildred E. Crocker, Mrs. Fern D. Veitch, Mrs. Bertha G. Hollister, Mrs. Maude E. Denning, Mrs. Florence M. Richardson, Mrs. Rhea E. Kellett, Mrs. Myrtle M. Toothaker, Mrs. Elizabeth Pryor, Mrs. Beverly Wade, Mrs. Ruth Fones, Mrs. Mary I. Jones, Mrs. Charlotte E. Kellett, Inglewood, Calif.; Mrs. Edith S. Kettering, Lawndale, Calif.; Mrs. Alice J. Jones, Mrs. Marjorie R. Koehler, Inglewood, Calif.; Bertha G. Lee, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Olive P. Frickstad, Mrs. Lillie M. Swanson, Inglewood, Calif.; Mrs. Elizabeth Taylor, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Edith C. Asire, Mrs. Lottie S. Huston, Mrs. M. Hazel Huebner, Edna F. Davisson, Paul G. Huebner, Inglewood, Calif.; W. E. Cartright, Van Nuys, Calif.; Mrs. Hazel N. Klinger, Mrs. Anna M. Horton, Inglewood, Calif.

Albertine Cunningham, Mrs. Edith M. Ockotzki, Mrs. Maybeth H. Baird, Mrs. Pearl K. Frantz, Mrs. Pearl G. Russell, Miss Pearl Precise, Miss Myrtle Precise, Mrs. Martha Jolley, Mrs. Alice A. Hedstrom, Mrs. Irene I. Anderson, Mrs. Alma Niederhauser, Mrs. Myrtle M. Pearce, Mrs. Alma R. Lee, Mrs. Ruth E. Laughlin, Mrs. Ada A. Maloney, Mrs. Beatrice E. Cratz, Mrs. Flo M. Jacobs, Mrs. Bess Gardner Fobes, Henry Stoody, Mrs. Cora M. Stoody, Inglewood, Calif.; Mrs. Hazel M. Carter, Redona Beach, Calif.; Miss Margaret Whitlock, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Dee Ida Moses, Mrs. Sarah S. Young, Mrs. Edith White, Mrs. Lydia Gee, Mrs. Carrie W. Peterson, Mrs. Eleanor Packard, Mrs. Anna M. Garoutte, Mrs. Ethel Montgomery, Mrs. Myrtle Shields, Mrs. Ada M. Golding, Mrs. Bessie S. Robertson, Inglewood, Calif.

Mrs. Anna S. Fine, Mrs. Beulah B. Forsythe, Mrs. Pearl Day, Mrs. Marjorie B. Vaughn, Mrs. Ruth W. Flagg, Mrs. Helen S. Robinson, Mrs. M. Englehart, Mrs. Stella C. Scofield, Mrs. Claudia Lehman, Miss Grace Ethel Morris, Inglewood, Calif.; Mrs. Louis W. Jones, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Norma E. Bowser, Mrs. Margaret M. Manor, Mrs. Laura Rosenbrook, Inglewood, Calif.; Mrs. Corda Depew, Mrs. Irene Dailey, Los Angeles, Calif.; Adelia M Boetel, Catherine Repass, Bertha E. Bland, and Louise C. Johnsen, Inglewood, Calif.

## RELIEF OF RAIN-DRENCHED AREAS OF THE COUNTRY

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, there are two bills that would be most desirable and necessary in arranging relief to the rain-drenched areas of the country should they be enacted. The first one that I would refer to is the Senate bill which would amend the Small Business Administration Act by authorizing loans

to business establishments in areas adversely affected by excessive rainfall. The SBA Act now provides that these loans may be made in drought-stricken areas. We seek to broaden this act. The other legislation would provide for refinancing debts incurred by farmers in 1957 which were caused by heavy and almost unprecedented rainfall during that year.

The disastrous crop year of 1957 has played havoc with farmers and business alike over a wide area. The crops were cut from 40 to 50 percent or more in many instances. As a result these producers were unable to pay their crop production loans and other obligations including such items as tractor fuel, repairs, fertilizers, food, and payments due on farm equipment as well as many others.

The general economy of the Nation is feeling the impact of this calamity. As a result there is a great loss in tax revenues to local and Federal Governments. The automobile and truck manufacturers sell less cars and trucks, and fewer employees are required in industry.

The passage of these two proposals will recharge the depressed financial condition now prevailing in the affected areas and would in a great measure stabilize the recession-riddled economy.

These people ask no gifts—they only ask us to accord them an opportunity to continue in business—they want credits over a period of time that is not now available to them from existing private sources. Emergency loans made by Farmers' Home Administration in past years have been successful loans, 95 percent or more have been collected—I hope early action will be taken on these meritorious proposals.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. RAINS), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness in the family.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. NATCHER), 5 minutes, on today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. MCGOVERN and to include related matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. MAY (at the request of Mr. UTT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter; Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter (at the request of Mr. NATCHER).

Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. HIESTAND in two instances.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 30, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1530. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a report by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems on its activities for the period January 1 to June 30, 1957, pursuant to section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (H. Doc. No. 319); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1531. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering claims paid during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1957, on account of the correction of military records of Coast Guard personnel, pursuant to title 10, section 1552 (f), United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1532. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1957, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1533. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1534. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of a balance sheet of Potomac Electric Power Co. as of December 31, 1957, pursuant to the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 974); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1535. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the seventh annual report concerning the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, as amended, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957, pursuant to Public Laws 874 and 815 of the 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1536. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a recently issued publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1956, Privately Owned Companies"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1537. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pertaining to the operations of the Department of the Interior during the fiscal year 1957 under the Saline Water Conversion Act of 1952 (Public Law 448, 82d Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1538. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on positions placed in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 under provisions of law other than section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 423. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 432. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 434. Resolution authorizing additional expenses for conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 56 of the 85th Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 438. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 64 and House Resolution 65; without amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 443. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses incurred by the House Committee on Banking and Currency in conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 86; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 10345. A bill to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such System all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus account of the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 10346. A bill to amend section 716 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 848, 84th Cong.), to provide indemnity protection in respect of the nuclear-powered merchant ship, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10347. A bill to amend section 73 (q) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to approve and ratify Joint Resolution 32, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1957, authorizing the issuance of $14 million in aviation revenue bonds; to authorize certain land exchanges at Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., for the development of the Honolulu airport complex, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DURHAM (by request):

H. R. 10348. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 10349. A bill to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 10350. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former naval industrial facilities at Centerline, Mich., to the State of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 10351. A bill to regulate certain internal affairs of labor organizations by providing processes and procedures for insuring democratic control of such organizations by the rank-and-file membership thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 10352. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide for outer space development through the peaceful application of atomic energy and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 10353. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10354. A bill to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for additional State and local taxes imposed for school purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 10355. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 10356. A bill to authorize emergency refinancing loans to farmers in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 10357. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10358. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10359. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 10360. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 10361. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 10362. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to restrict its application in the case of employees of organizations engaged in brand inspecting in connection with the livestock industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10363. A bill to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, relating to the trust funds of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 10364. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the compendium of papers collected for the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10365. A bill for the relief of Sheila Anita Daniel (Weekes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 10366. A bill for the relief of Francisco Siapa and Mrs. Michelina Siapa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 10367. A bill for the relief of Josephine Y. Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

367. By Mr. REUSS: Petition of Wisconsin County Boards Association that Congress include in the mileage comprising the National System of Interstate Defense Highways a north-south route connecting the control points of Milwaukee, Wis., and Iron Mountain, Mich., and east-west route connecting the control points of Iron Mountain, Mich., and Superior, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

368. Also, petition of Wisconsin County Boards Association that Congress remove certain limitations concerning the use of force account work under Federal aid secondary fund regulations; to the Committee on Public Works.

369. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Columbia Historical Society, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing vigorously the proposed extension and alteration of the historic east front of the United States Capitol Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

370. Also, petition of the lieutenant governor, Hi-Y legislature of the State of Texas, Beaumont, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the Congress to change the electoral college to the percentage basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Depletion Rate for Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I invite your attention to a statement made last week before the House Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Otto Gressens, executive vice president of Peabody Coal Co. and chairman of the National Coal Association tax committee. He urged that the depletion rate for coal be raised from the present 10 percent to at least 15 percent.

The inadequate depletion rate has for a long time hampered the coal industry's expansion program. The first official warning that coal would be called upon to provide a spectacular increase in the Nation's energy supply came from President Truman's Materials Policy Commission in 1952. The report stipulated that by 1977 the demand for coal would reach a level of more than 800 million tons annually—a sharp rise over the 490 million tons produced by America's mines in 1957.

Twenty years is a relatively short time for an extractive industry to prepare itself for an increase in capacity of approximately 60 percent. The program must get under way far in advance of the upward trend in coal demand. The matter of accumulating sufficient capital for the undertaking must, of course, precede the necessary investments in property and mining equipment. To continue to restrain the industry from undertaking this program could well result in a deficiency of fuel resources when they are needed; more than that, such restraint could result in a serious fracture in the mobilization base.

I feel that Congress would be particularly remiss to neglect the coal industry at this time. We must not overlook any means of providing new vigor for the industry and new hope for its labor force.

Whereas the mineable coal reserves in this Nation amount to well over a trillion tons—enough to last a thousand years at present rates of production—facilities for making this fuel available at places of consumption must be set up if the abundant reserves are to be of service value to us. When all recoverable reserves are taken from a mine, that mine is lost forever as a source of fuel supply. A closed mine provides no jobs and pays no Federal taxes. To open new mines is expensive, so coal companies must put aside enough money to be able to move to new locations when present operations are worked out.

Recognizing that natural resources are exhaustible, Congress adopted the depletion allowance principle to provide the money necessary to develop new properties. Coal has had its 10 percent depletion rate since 1951, but the replacement cost at mines has climbed from $3

a ton of annual capacity a decade ago to almost $10 today. This disparity, as pointed out by Mr. Gressens in his testimony last week, is in itself clear evidence that an adjustment is required.

I appeal to this Congress to look favorably upon my request for an increase in the depletion rate. I have this day submitted a statement to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means setting forth my views in respect to this important issue. I trust that a recommendation of this nature will be forthcoming from that committee in a very short time.

## Unique Antelope Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 4, 1958*

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a unique development in defense spending comes to light in the operation of an Air Force flight testing and production facility in California. This project, identified as Air Force Plant No. 42, is located at Palmdale in Los Angeles County just 60 miles north of the city of Los Angeles in the vast booming Antelope Valley.

In this unique project the Department of Defense has provided a jet aircraft center—a bargain from the taxpayers' point of view.

In this unique example of organizational ingenuity, the Department of Defense has brought together large, highly competitive aircraft-manufacturing companies: Convair, Lockheed, North American, Northrop and soon Douglas—to make use of flight-testing facilities on a joint occupancy basis resulting in savings of millions of dollars.

A unique management team: a committee of Defense Department and aircraft company personnel establish operating procedures for a single installation, thus insuring maximum utilization of expensive facilities which otherwise might have to be quadrupled.

This unique location in the great Antelope Valley, surrounded by desert and mountains, conforms to security defense standards and dispersal policies.

Unique weather conditions permit an average of 360 flying days a year, free of smog, fog, and overcast.

Uniquely designed for efficiency and maximum use, Air Force Plant No. 42 at Palmdale is self-contained, complete with utilities independent of any municipal system.

Unique planning, in cooperation with local civic leaders, assures safety and favorable community relations. A mile wide buffer strip surrounds the airport, zoned to permit complementary industrial development but to exclude high density commercial and residential buildup.

Unique in its airfield equipment, scientifically designed buildings, and runways more than 2 miles long, Air Force Plant No. 42 at Palmdale is the last word in efficiency in flight testing and assembling jet aircraft.

Unique in its location close to the great Edwards Air Force Base with its vast dry lakes, its equipment and scientific experimental facilities and relative convenience to the great airframe and parts factories of southern California, it is also convenient to the extensive scientific centers like Caltech and others. Adequate community facilities and housing at very reasonable costs have been installed together with schools, highway, rail, and air service.

This unique defense installation in the Antelope Valley constitutes a commendable military, industrial, and civic achievement in the interest of national security and is a tribute to the farsighted leaders in all three of these fields who made it possible.

## One Hundred and Ninety-seventh Anniversary of the Birth of Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE**
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today is the 197th anniversary of the birth of that great American statesman of Swiss origin, Albert Gallatin. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement in his honor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE

New chapters in the story of America are now being written by our Nation's leading historians, to take into full account the tremendous contributions to the Nation's tradition which came from the hand, the heart, and the mind of Swiss-born Albert Gallatin, one of the noblest of America's adopted sons, whose birthdate we celebrate again on January 29.

Born in 1761, and bred to the aristocratic tradition of ancient Geneva, Gallatin emigrated to the United States in his youth to become a deathless champion of the cause of democratic freedom.

As State legislator, Congressman, Senator, Treasurer of the United States under Jefferson and Madison, and trusted diplomat to the Court of Great Britain and the Republic of France, he lived a life of accomplishment almost without parallel in our history. He was the author and advocate of policies which enhanced America's educational system, which reformed our tax and budgetary policies, which first established America's policy of trade with the friendly nations of the world.

To me, the life of Gallatin has always been symbolic of the special virtues of the Swiss nation from which he sprung—their energy, intelligence, devotion to justice, to public welfare, and to the principles of democratic government. Those were the characteristics that made Albert Gallatin a leading American citizen in the perilous days of the infant Republic. And these are the same characteristics which place our present-day Americans of Swiss descent among the most useful and valuable citizens which our Nation numbers.

In counting some of the virtues with which nature and circumstance has endowed my home State of Wisconsin, I have always believed my State blessed by the fact that it was one of the favorite settling places for emigrants from Switzerland who came to the United States to seek new homes and new careers. Today, we can count many thousands of these Wisconsin citizens of Swiss descent in the cities of Monroe, New Glarus, Madison, Janesville, Kenosha, Eau Claire, Beloit, and Oshkosh.

## Economic Realities and Administration Optimism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER**
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 27 Mrs. Neuberger had the great privilege of introducing our outstanding colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the members of the National Womens' Democratic Club. In his address, Economic Realities and Administration Optimism, the senior Senator from Illinois provided an insight into our Nation's present and future economy which I feel will be of genuine interest to my fellow Members. As a member of the Joint Economic Committee and a former professor of economics, the Senator from Illinois is uniquely qualified to speak on this vital topic. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this significant address by our senior colleague from Illinois be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC REALITIES AND ADMINISTRATION OPTIMISM

(Address by United States Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, before the National Women's Democratic Club, Monday, January 27, 1958)

Almost precisely 4 years ago, after the administration's statistics showed that the Nation's unemployed had increased by 1½ million from November 1953 to January 1954 to a total, including layoffs, of over 3½ million, and that physical production in manufacturing had fallen by 7 points, I ventured to say that we were in an economic recession. Since the term "economic recession" means a decline in production and employment, this seemed to be only a moderate statement of fact. I was, of course, careful to add that we were not then in a depression, or a severe slump, and I specifically disclaimed any prediction that we would fall into one. I merely said that we should realize that we were in a recession; that we should be alerted to that fact; and that we should take pains to prevent it from turning into a depression.

But mild as this statement was, it threw our Republican friends into a paroxysm of anger. Mr. Leonard Hall, the then chairman of the Republican National Committee, promptly declared that I was a prophet of doom and gloom. Mr. George M. Humphrey became so enamored of this phrase that he used it on almost every occasion.

The then Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. JOSEPH MARTIN, went out on the dinner circuit to get some free meals and partaking of the abundant fare provided by the Union League Club of Philadelphia, identified me as one of the four horsemen of the Apocalypse who, as the readers of the Book of Revelation will remember, were to scatter hunger, disease, and war over the world. And so it went all through the winter, spring, and summer, although production fell off by 10 percent.

But while the hatchetmen and smearers were busy out front, the high command was worried, as Robert Donovan has shown in his semiofficial account of the Eisenhower years. The economic generals admitted in private what they denounced in public.

And now we are faced with a somewhat similar situation. Despite Mr. George M. Humphrey's defiant swan song of last summer, we did not do too well under the Republicans. Thus instead of the normal increase in physical production per man hour of something like 3 percent a year, the rise from 1955 to 1956 was only six-tenths of 1 percent. For 1957, the rise over 1956 was only 1½ percent or only one-half the normal rate. All this was noted last year by the keen eye of Leon Keyserling, but was ignored by the official soothsayers for the administration. France, Great Britain, and Germany have all, moreover, made much greater gains than we since 1952.

In other words, American industry for the last 2 years was really traveling on a production plateau, failing to make its customary progress.

But in the last 5 months, trouble has broken out very similar to that which occurred in 1953–54. The physical output of our factories and mines decreased by 9 points and 6 percent between last August and December, while the numbers of unemployed rose by at least 800,000 to a total of 3.4 million. This was the equivalent of 5.2 percent of the working force and if involuntary part time were included, this would raise the percentage of unemployment to well over 6 and probably close to 7 percent.

But this was for December, or a month ago. Since then, as all readers of business and financial journals and all watchers of employment lines know, layoffs and short time have increased. The new automobile models have not really caught on and the auto industry is closing down plants and laying off men for 1 and 2 days a week in what should be its busy season. Steel is down to 56 percent of capacity as compared with 97 percent a year ago at this time and car loadings are 13 percent less now than then. A further drop in production and an appreciable increase in unemployment is almost certain to be shown when the January figures are published.

Indeed, according to the highly conservative journal, Business Week, in its issue for January 18, another three-quarters of a million workers have lost their jobs since the middle of December, raising the total number of the unemployed to over 4 million, and lest the Republicans explode with an orgasm of anger over this statement, let them note that it does not come from me but from a weekly which has always been closely identified with them and whose editor and publisher, Elliott V. Bell, is a prize protege of Thomas E. Dewey. I shall watch with interest to see if Mr. Bell is labeled as a prophet of gloom and doom by his Republican friends.

Such are the sober facts. They should be known and faced because we can never solve any problem as long as those in power deny that it exists.

I suppose that it would again throw the Republicans into a paroxysm, and the administration into a temper tantrum to refer to the present trend as a recession. But if it is not this, will our Republican friends kindly tell us the term which would best describe what is and has been going on? For me, I know of no better description than that which I gave in 1954, and prior to that in 1949, as well.

And I would add that it is even more important now than it was then to prevent such a decline from turning into a depression. For more people would be affected and the human costs would therefore be even greater than then. Furthermore, Russia's great gains in the field of missiles and propaganda have already produced a great shift amongst our allies in favor of neutralism, and have caused more neutrals to incline toward Russia. An appreciable economic reverse in the United States will further damage our position abroad and this at a time when a further loss will be most serious.

Now I have never believed that we should necessarily always allow these slumps to cure themselves. Sometimes they snowball by setting into play cumulative forces of breakdown which progressively decrease employment, purchasing power, production, investment, all of which create still further unemployment and still less production, and so forth. We cannot treat these movements merely in terms of classical mechanics. They are frequently impetuous processes in which slight initial decreases help to create great ultimate differences.

And yet the Eisenhower administration in characteristic fashion ignores all this and looks at the current situation only through rose-colored glasses. In his economic report submitted a week ago, the President confidently asserted that this slump will be of short duration. He declared that "a considerable adjustment in inventories has already taken place" (p. IV). Businessmen, for example, are not only planning long-range capital investments, but are carrying them out at a high rate. Consumer purchases are continuing at a high level. Interest rates are falling and investment particularly by State and local governments will be stimulated. And at Chicago last week, the President urged his Republican listeners to be determinably optimistic and to stick their chins out. But when one turns to the statistics for the proof of these confident assertions, the supporting evidence is most dubious. Between August and December the much-vaunted liquidation of inventories amounted to only $400 million or less than one-half of 1 percent of the $91.3 billion in stock during the summer. Instead of investment for plant and equipment holding up, businesses in November and December expected to reduce this amount in the first quarter of 1958, by a rate of $2 billion less than during the last quarter of 1957. The indications are that even this figure is being scaled down in practice. And we should not forget that according to the National Industrial Conference Board, the authorizations for new investment by the 1,000 biggest manufacturing companies were 31 percent less during even the third quarter of 1957 than they were during the corresponding quarter of 1956. The Michigan consumers survey has just found that consumers are greatly reducing their plans for future major purchases. Facile optimists of the chins-out school need also to remember that the lamentable decline in per capita farm income which has gone on for the last 5 years shows no signs of improving and that failures by small business are still mounting. It is most interesting to see how from all this the administration extracts the confident belief that purchasing power will be maintained and investments increased.

It is not pleasant to recite these facts. It is much easier for the administration to continue its public Pollyanna attitude and to attack anyone who tries to tell the truth. But we have just learned from our fiasco with missiles that this is not the best way. In the long run, truth catches up with the Madison Avenue happiness boys even when they wear the disguise of economists.

After working through the budget figures, one finally discovers what the administration is really relying on to obtain a pickup in business. It is by increasing the orders for military hardware during the first half of this year. This is referred to by stating that "at the turn of the year, the economy was begining to feel the effects of an acceleration of the placement of defense contract awards, prompted by the need to move forward quickly with the programs essential to the strengthening of the Nation's defenses." From an examination of the budget figures, it is clear that from July 1956 to July 1957, the Government ordered and spent about a billion dollars a month on military hardware. Then the team of Humphrey and Wilson, who were more concerned about a balanced budget than about national security, cut this figure in half. George Humphrey, in his testimony of last summer, preened himself on this fact. Rockets, missiles, and aircraft had to bear the burden of this cut. It is now proposed to step up such orders for the first 6 months of 1958 by a billion dollars a month, or to a total of $1.5 billion for each of 6 months. Then for the year 1958–59, the outlays are to go back to the figures of $1.0 billion a month which prevailed before the Humphrey-Wilson cuts.

In other words, the administration is aiming at a one-shot stimulus concentrated on defense expenditures. The chin out boys believe they can at once provide for the national defense and ward off a depression by spending in the next 6 months what they improperly cut out during the previous half year, and that this one act of atonement will wash them clean of sin and solve all problems.

It may be that the one-shot stimulus of increased defense expenditures in the first 6 months of 1958 may bring a turn in the direction of the economic movement. We can only hope this will be true. But even if this should happen it would be done at the expense of a well-balanced economy. We could expect to see again a very uneven prosperity like that which we have experienced in the 1955–57 period. While we might see a temporary return to overall economic growth, an increase in the profits of big business, and speculative gains in the stock market, we should also have a continuation of the farm depression, a decline in small-business profits, a further decline in housing and slum clearance, an increase in the cost of living and the cost of credit and money, and a continuation of mergers and other trends toward monopoly and concentration. What we should want to see, therefore, instead of merely an upturn in the gross figures, is an across-the-board prosperity which would not benefit the few at the expense of the many.

There are several interesting implications about official Republican policy which are implicit in this and other administration moves. Despite all its protests, the administration now believes that an increase in Government expenditures, even if accompanied by the risk of a deficit, can have a stimulating and beneficial effect on the economy. What was anathema when advanced by the New Deal is now quietly practiced by the current Republican administration. But apparently the Eisenhower administration's outlays for armaments and possibly for roads are the only respectable forms of economic stimulation which they believe the Federal Government should carry out. Added school construction is being given up. Slum clearance and public housing is to be cut back. Interest rates on REA expansion lines are to be increased and hence discouraged. The prevention of

stream pollution is to be turned back to the States. There are to be no new starts on water projects, although some (although not all) are meritorious.

It is only just to conclude that the administration will not favor capital outlays merely because they will help the people. To pass muster, these projects must also be of direct and immediate aid to the big business interests of the Nation.

This impression is confirmed by other portions of the budget and by the economic program of the President. The administration also proposes to cut greatly the funds available for assistance to the needy, the aged, the blind, the severely crippled, and the dependent children; it is for lower prices and less aid for the farmers; it is, as I have said, for less slum clearance and fewer houses for the poor. Wherever there is any aid being given to the weak and poor, there the administration's economy ax is sharp and swinging, and I have fancied that I could see there a gleam of joy in their eyes.

But the administration is strangely silent about the subsidies given to shipbuilders and ship operators, and to the big silver miners, woolgrowers, and beet-sugar growers of the West. It has not a word to say about the interest-free deposit in the banks of Government money which has frequently risen to over $4 billion. It passes over in complete silence the unfair tax favors granted to the oil-and-gas industry through the 27½-percent depletion allowance, the favors given to the owners of stocks and bonds, as compared with wages and salaried workers, by not requiring the basic income tax to be deducted at the source and by the dividend credit law of 1954, the abuses in the capital gains tax and in a number of other taxes, all of which give unfair favors to specific groups in the upper income brackets, which are denied to others.

In short, where the wealthy and the powerful are getting direct or indirect subsidies from the Government, there the administration either looks the other way or is their eager defender.

Here, in fact, lies one of the major differences between the Republican and Democratic Parties. Ever since the days of Hamilton, the Republicans and their progenitors, the Whigs and Federalists have believed in using governmental power to help the wealthy and the powerful to gain more wealth and more power. They have assumed that this group would put economic resources to better use than would the middle and lower income groups, and that others should only share in the drippings which might ooze down to them from on high. Andrew Mellon openly proclaimed this in the twenties and Republican tax policy was then based upon it. While in recent years the Republican leadership has not been quite so blatant, it has not changed its policy, nor its spots. Purchasing power, according to them, must only be poured in at the top. The lower and middle income groups must not be helped directly, but only to the degree that those in the seats of the mighty believe to be prudent and, of course, then only as largess from their hands. In these respects, I see no difference between modern and old style Republicanism. The modern team is coming to look like the blood brother of Mark Hanna.

In contrast with this, the Democratic Party from Jefferson to Jackson and from Bryan until today has, in the main, followed a different philosophy. The Government, we have said, should concentrate its efforts in helping the lower and middle income groups, wage earners, farmers, clerks, salaried workers, housewives, and small-business men. They are the ones who most need help while the wealthy, because of their position, are best able to look out for themselves.

There is no question as to which policy is more ethical. It is ours. And similarly ours will produce a much sounder economy. For the Republican philosophy concentrates almost solely on production and pays little or no attention to consumption. And yet if the goods produced cannot be sold at the prices charged, then we have shutdowns and widespread unemployment. But if we build up consuming power and prosperity through the middle and lower tiers of society, we thereby provide the markets which will keep industry running and will help avoid the periodic shutdowns which have been and are one of the greatest weaknesses in our economy. In helping society as a whole, we help big business itself and indeed protect it from the consequences of its own selfishness and shortsightedness. Whereas the program of our opponents tends to favor only one class and a narrow one at that, we are a party of all classes insisting only on a program to serve the common good.

I suppose that in the back room the Republicans are readying up a tax program which they and their allies will try to put over if conditions get worse. One can already hear the rumblings of what it will be. It will concentrate on tax reduction for the upper income groups, for corporations and for the owners of stocks and bonds. An attempt will be made to sell this to the public on the claim that it will stimulate investment and effort and hence restore prosperity.

In other words, since the unfair tax provisions of the 1954 tax law, the accelerated depreciation, and the other Republican measures helped to overstimulate the capital structure of the country in comparison with consuming power or what could be sold at the prices charged, we are to be given more of the same. To cure the dog, he is to be given a heavier dose of what ails him.

It apparently never seems to enter the heads of our Republican friends that a wiser policy would be to balance consuming power with producing power and thus provide markets for the productive capacity which is available. This could be done by one or both of two methods: (1) Building up the consuming power of the people by appropriate tax revision concentrated on improving the status of the lower and middle income groups, by improving the position of the farmers and by socially necessary public works such as hospitals, schools, and housing for those who most need it, and (2) forcing the monopolies and price rings to reduce their unit prices in order to bring them within reach of the money incomes of the people. It is well to be thinking about these issues during the next few weeks as we watch with close attention what happens to production and employment.

In any event, let us look at both the present and the future fearlessly and realistically without being deluded either by an undue pessimism or a foolish optimism. Sometimes the professional optimists and the hucksters of sugared rose water get us into the most trouble.

---

## Business and Propaganda

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in these days of international, and sometimes domestic, tensions, one frequently has great difficulty in distinguishing propaganda from truth. On more than one occasion, I fear that unprincipled propaganda has been used to accomplish a special purpose. It was with this thought that I prepared a speech on the subject of business and propaganda, which was delivered on January 16, 1958, in Baltimore, Md., at the Franklin Day dinner of the Graphic Arts Association.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND PROPAGANDA

(Speech by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, before the Graphic Arts Association, Franklin Day dinner, Sheraton-Belvedere Hotel, Baltimore, Md., January 16, 1958)

We meet on the eve of the 252d anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. It is fitting that the Graphic Arts Association should commemorate his birthday.

Benjamin Franklin was a member of your profession. As a youth, he was apprenticed to his brother James, a printer, in Boston. At the age of 26 he was the sole proprietor of his own printing establishment.

His contributions to modern America are too numerous to list in a short address. They include the first public library, the first fire department, and the founding of the University of Pennsylvania.

Franklin was also one of our earliest scientists. Every child has read the story of his experiment drawing electricity from the clouds with his kite. Although he had little formal education, it is estimated that his writings include 30,000 documents.

While Benjamin Franklin engaged in many successful business pursuits and scientific endeavors, he still found the time to assume the burden of public service. He was twice the Governor of Pennsylvania. He was also the first Foreign Service officer of the United States. The Continental Congress entrusted him with the task of negotiating a treaty of amity and commerce with France. That was our country's first diplomatic act.

It is impossible to evaluate the contributions of such a genius whose efforts have contributed so much to the welfare of future generations. In my opinion, his greatest single contribution was his appeal to the Thirteen Colonies to adopt the Constitution of the United States. Although politics had marked his entire career, this plea was his only major political speech. When Benjamin Franklin emerged from Independence Hall after the Constitution had been written, he was asked, "What kind of a government have you given us?" He replied, "A Republic, if you can keep it."

This is the challenge which now faces us. Our Republic is under attack by forces both external and internal. Today we are the temporary guardians of the American heritage we wish to bestow to our children and grandchildren. It is our responsibility to give them the opportunity to live under a republican form of government.

Franklin firmly believed that "Right however opposed becomes right at last." Our citizens are confused by the propaganda which has flooded our land for many years. Your profession has the responsibility to set the record straight. You must assist all of America in securing a better or renewed understanding of the principles underlying our political and economic system so that Franklin's words "Right however opposed becomes right at last" will in truth be a reality in 1958.

Russia's successful launching of sputniks has forced a reexamination of many of our values and beliefs. In my judgment the American people are still able to outthink and outproduce the Russians or anyone else. However, this is no time for either complacency or panic. We must approach our

problems soberly and intelligently. The Russians have demonstrated their ability to master modern science; however, they are not supermen and their temporary lead in the field of rockets can be reversed with unselfish hard work, sacrifice, and patience.

In terms of long-range planning, Russia's scientific progress presents a bold challenge to our educators. Many have responded with suggestions to improve curricula and once more revert to the type of education most of my generation received when we were in school. Others are taking advantage of this new crisis as another excuse merely to demand more Government spending.

When I was in high school, every incentive was given the exceptional student to forge ahead of his fellows. My parents regularly received a report card showing the grades I had attained in the courses which constituted a basic education. They were also apprised of my performance in competition with my classmates. In more recent years our educational system has been greatly influenced by those who profess a belief in so-called progressive education. They regard marks and competitive grades as undemocratic. It is little wonder that our colleges and engineering schools have found it difficult to maintain high professional standards under such conditions.

Sputnik has awakened the American people to the fact that Russian students are well trained and contrary to Communist tenets are provided with every incentive for individual performance. Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University, recently focused attention on the deficiencies in our secondary education. He said not only could the pace of instruction be accelerated, but the content of the curriculum could be vastly increased. I shall quote directly from his statement:

"But this cannot be done as long as a silly theory of child development continues to force the schools to behave as if admission of failure were worse for the child than pretense of success.

"No matter how little Johnny does or how badly he does it, he will be promoted to the next grade in almost any American school system.

"Another roadblock in the path of educational thoroughness is the attitude of many educators toward the brighter students. In many cases, teachers feel it is 'undemocratic' to give the gifted youngsters greater opportunities by sectioning them in classes according to their ability.

"In fact, if the ablest students in some schools today are allowed to move at the pace of the average student they are lucky. It is far more likely that they will be required to proceed at the pace of the slowest."

Children who have never been allowed to admit failure are lost in a world where science rules. This attitude explains the Nation's frustration over the failure of a single test-firing of our satellite rocket.

Our schools must discharge a further responsibility. Every high-school graduate must have an appreciation of the economic facts of life. Very few Americans would admit a preference for socialism or communism in contrast with American free enterprise. Yet, many citizens do not appreciate the role of profits, investment, and competition in the operation of our economic system. This is not hard to understand when we know that some of our educators are themselves confused about how the American economic system really functions. Recently a questionnaire was submitted to a group of high-school seniors by Opinion Research, an organization skilled in measuring public opinion. Among other questions, they were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with this statement: "The fairest economic system is one that takes from each according to his ability and gives to each according to his needs." Approximately one-half answered in the affirmative. It is shocking that any high-school graduate would fail to identify this statement as a basic tenet of Marxian Communist philosophy.

In far too many cases some of our citizens have formed opinions about the American economy and the integrity of its leaders from statements by certain labor bosses and political demagogues. Let me make it quite clear I know the vast majority of men and women constituting organized labor are as dedicated to the perpetuation of the free-enterprise system as I am. If right however opposed is to become right at last, you have the responsibility to see to it that all of our citizens are given an opportunity to know the facts and to understand the ultimate consequences of the political decisions they endorse.

Our military security requires a strong domestic economy. We must produce a larger national income in dollars of constant value so that the increased burdens of defense can be borne without reducing the American standard of living. This will require hard work. We cannot afford to continue to generate inflationary pressures. Unions cannot force round after round of wage increases which greatly exceed the increase in the productivity of our economy without jeopardizing our security.

Some people forget that the compensation of employees is not only income to the employee, but also a cost to the employer. It must be recovered in the price charged the consumer or we shall have neither employers nor employees. An examination of the distribution of the increase in the national income through this decade shows that for every additional dollar of corporate profits after taxes, employees receive an additional $40. Furthermore, labor's share of the total national income rose from 65.3 percent in 1947 to 70.3 percent in 1956. On the other hand, corporate profits after taxes dropped from 9.3 percent of the national income in 1947 to only 6.1 percent in 1956.

If all corporate profits before taxes in 1956 had been paid as additional compensation to employees, their total income would have been increased by less than 18 percent. However, if there were no corporate profits, the Government would have received $22 billion less from corporate income taxes. With the existing level of Government expenditures, higher personal income and consumer excise taxes would have been required. Since income taxes in the upper brackets have already reached the point of diminishing returns, most of this increase would of necessity have been imposed on lower bracket taxpayers.

Corporate profits as presented by the Department of Commerce do not reflect the fact that depreciation charges in a period of inflation do not provide firms with sufficient cash to replace wornout equipment purchased before inflationary price increases took effect. Hence, most of the retained earnings of American industry have been used to replace wornout facilities rather than to expand them.

Mr. R. C. Tyson, chairman of the finance committee of the United States Steel Corp., in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly provided further confirmation of the fact that depreciation charges are not providing sufficient cash to replace industry's wornout facilities. He said:

"Few people realize the extent of the deficiency in depreciation. United States Steel has calculated the number of dollars of wear and exhaustion that would have been needed in each year since 1939 to equal in each year's dollars the portion of the buying power originally expended which was used up in the year's production.

"In every year since 1939, the wear and exhaustion recorded—including amounts not allowed for tax purposes as accelerated depreciation for the years 1947–52—failed to equal that needed for recovery of buying power. The 17-year aggregate deficiency was $904 million. The Federal income tax paid, as a result of treating this deficiency and the accelerated depreciation as income for tax purposes, aggregated $608 million, or 22 percent of the taxes paid. The $608 million for United States Steel and analogous amounts for all other companies, big and little, may be regarded as the hidden taxation of capital as it turns over through depreciation or, alternatively, as a hidden increase in the tax rate on true income. From the latter viewpoint it is highly inequitable, because it results in a higher rate for those industries or companies which require relatively heavier investment in longer term facilities than the average for all industry."

In an effort to obscure these facts, Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO accused the Department of Commerce of understating corporate profits by as much as $3 billion to $4 billion. His charge—and his all too clear purpose—was based on provisions in the Revenue Acts of 1950 and 1954 which permit accelerated amortization in an attempt to partially meet the inflationary impact on the replacement of worn-out facilities. This is but another example of propaganda to confuse the American public in understanding the competitive enterprise system. It must be remembered, however, that capital equipment in our heavy industries has a life span ranging from 20 to 50 years. No change in the tax laws effective after 1950 could alleviate the gross underdepreciation resulting from the great inflation which took place during the period between the start of World War II and 1950. Our business enterprises have in effect paid a capital levy in addition to an income tax on their earnings since World War II.

The antitrust laws were adopted to prevent any concentration of power which could restrain the growth and expansion of the economy through price-fixing agreements. In 1914 when the Clayton Act was adopted, labor was granted an exemption from the antitrust laws. Yet, labor costs are the principal factor in determining the prices of all goods and services. For months many labor leaders have criticized manufacturers for raising the price of their products at a time when sales were declining. Yet, in December, with rising unemployment, the leaders of organized labor announced their determination to press for higher wages, shorter hours, and expanded fringe benefits in 1958. If they impose higher costs on industry during such a period, it strongly suggests the presence of monopoly power which the American people have never tolerated.

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate is presently conducting hearings to study so-called administered prices. The term "administered price" implies that the producers in an industry have a large measure of discretion in establishing the price of their products.

Let us examine briefly the principal components of cost for any product.

Today, wages are administered under collective-bargaining agreements and in many industries they will continue to rise under long-term contracts regardless of economic conditions. The prices of purchased materials and services are certainly not administered by the buyer who incorporates them in his product. Transportation costs are controlled by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Even depreciation costs are set by Government regulations. The Congress, State legislatures, and city councils establish tax rates. The small net profit of American industry amounting to only 6.1 percent of

the national income suggests that management has little discretion in establishing its prices.

The subcommittee has announced its intention to review the costs of the three leading automobile producers at a joint meeting with Walter Reuther. In my opinion, such a procedure would constitute a violation of the antitrust laws. It can serve no useful purpose as the basic elements of cost are well known and not subject to administration by any producer. Profits are derived by the skill exercised in combining these cost factors into a product which merits consumer acceptance.

Yet, Walter Reuther's latest proposal to the automobile manufacturers advocates that 50 percent of all profits in excess of 10 percent of invested capital before taxes be shared evenly between workers and consumers. He alleges that, under such a procedure, in 1956 GM workers would have received $286 million in additional compensation and that consumers of its products would have received a rebate of the same amount. What he failed to say, and this is an important point, was that corporate income taxes for this one firm alone would have been approximately $300 million less. Obviously, this is more of Mr. Reuther's special brand of economic hogwash—all of which is pointed to an eventual destruction of the free-enterprise system. His statements are propaganda in its most vicious form.

If Mr. Reuther's scheme were universally adopted, the Government would lose between $4 billion and $5 billion in revenue. Incredibly, he must now vision himself as an economic dictator representing consumers, stockholders, workers, and citizens alike—in fact he would supplant the Congress of the United States in determining the Government's revenue.

By a strange coincidence, this is the precise formula advocated by Dr. John M. Blair in a book entitled "Seeds of Destruction," a study in the functional weakness of capitalism published in 1938. Curiously, Dr. Blair is today the chief economist for the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In recent months I have been increasingly concerned with the fact that this subcommittee has been used as a forum for collective bargaining. The Senate never intended to establish any subcommittee for this purpose. The attacks on corporate profits by labor leaders and by the staff of this subcommittee are propaganda to prepare the American people to accept another round of inflationary wage increases in 1958. It is time for all of us to realize that wage increases which exceed increased productivity must be included in the price of the goods produced.

If we are to preserve a free America, profits must be adequate to induce new investment so that the productivity of our workers can be increased through better tools and methods. Attacks on profits are a disservice to the American economy and the well-being of all our citizens.

In the years ahead, it is obvious that the Federal Government will need the maximum possible tax revenue to finance our defense program. High tax revenues and high tax rates are not necessarily synonymous. The present personal income tax structure includes rates far beyond the point of diminishing returns. Such rates were designed to penalize success rather than to raise revenue. We can no longer afford the luxury of these practices. Our tax structure must be revised to produce the maximum revenue with the least possible deterrent to an ever-expanding economy.

Your profession has a great opportunity and responsibility. You are in a unique position to further the education of all of our people who already believe in the free-enterprise system on the economic essentials required for its growth and development. The role of profits and incentives in the expansion of capitalism must be more widely understood. Those who wish to substitute some other form of economic system for our free enterprise are experts in the art of propaganda.

Benjamin Franklin in his famous Almanac provided an education on the economic facts of life for the people of his generation. You have but to follow his example. I know that you will rise to the challenge and that your profession in 1958 and the years to follow will contribute to a better public understanding as he did during the trying days when the Thirteen Colonies joined together to form the United States of America.

I know that we can again accept Benjamin Franklin's challenge when he said the Founding Fathers had given us "A Republic, if you can keep it." We shall keep it, and we will bestow the American heritage to future generations.

---

## Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, Albert Gallatin, the Swiss-born American statesman who was a bright figure in our Nation's colorful Revolutionary past, is a favorite adopted son of the State of Pennsylvania.

Many Pennsylvanians are convinced that the special qualities of courage, resourcefulness, intelligence and devotion to the democratic cause which he possessed to a high degree, and which distinguished his subsequent career on the stage of national affairs, were nurtured and brought to maturity through his early and fruitful intervention in the affairs of the State of Pennsylvania.

This is why I am especially pleased to pay tribute to Albert Gallatin on this January 29, the 197th anniversary of his birth, and to acknowledge the special debt which the State of Pennsylvania owes to his memory.

Some of the fruits of Gallatin's legislative labors in Pennsylvania are apparent in the bicameral legislature which he fought to place in our State constitution, in our State system of universal, free suffrage; in our State system of free public education; in the sound system of financial accountability which governs the taxes and disbursements of Pennsylvania's government even to the present time.

As Albert Gallatin progressed from State to national affairs he carried with him a keen interest in an expanding system of stable commercial relations with the world, which has always been a characteristic of the industrious and hard-working people of Pennsylvania.

He succeeded in implementing these valuable ideas through a broad system of commercial treaties with foreign lands which he created as President Jefferson's Secretary of Treasury. As Ambassador to both England and France, he again implemented the principle of cementing sound commercial relations with other nations as the most durable guaranty of international amity and prosperity.

There is unquestionably a lesson in Gallatin's lifelong devotion to foreign relations and to foreign commerce, which we may apply with profit to the conduct of our national affairs today.

In place of the willful neglect and obstructionism which has recently marked the conduct of our foreign relations, we should return to the patient, constructive, cooperative methods of Gallatin. A good place to begin to apply new policies would be in rehabilitating the present gravely deteriorated commercial relations between the United States and Switzerland, the land of Gallatin's birth. When we have proved that we can repair the blunders and mishaps of our semiprotectionist policy toward Switzerland and Swiss watches, we will be better prepared to tell the balance of the world that America is ready to meet the Soviet economic offensive on all fronts, with our fullest resources and our utmost goodwill.

---

## Fishermen Should Be Awarded the Same Consideration as Farmers With Respect to Declaration of Estimated Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, fishermen, like farmers, wrest their livelihood from the uncertain elements beyond the control of man. Like the farmer, the fisherman is dependent upon weather conditions which vary widely and unpredictably from year to year. And like the farmer, the fisherman knows tremendous variations in yield and a large number of complete failures in any given period of years.

The Internal Revenue Code today takes cognizance of the problems of the farmer. It accords farmers special treatment with respect to the filing of their declarations of estimated income tax. Thus, at present, taxpayers who obtain at least two-thirds of their estimated gross income from farming activities may defer the declaration and payment of their estimated tax until January 15 following the current taxable year. Taxpayers generally are required to file such declarations on or before April 15 of the current taxable year and make their quarterly payments on or before April 15, June 15, and September 15 of such year, and January 15 of the ensuing year.

In addition, in lieu of paying the amount of estimated tax on January 15 as most other taxpayers, farmers are permitted to defer payment until February 15 if they so desire, and further they may file their final returns in substitution of the payment of estimated tax.

Other taxpayers find this option extends only to January 31 for them.

This completely justified exclusion of farmers from the general rules governing declarations of estimated tax originated in the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, and takes recognition of the fact that farming income is more uncertain and subject to greater fluctuation than the income of taxpayers generally. In addition, farmers realize relatively small amounts of income before the final months of the year, and accordingly find it difficult to make advance payments in the early part of the year.

Fishermen are subject to precisely the same uncertainties and fluctuations with respect to income and to the same seasonal peaks of income and expense as farmers. Thus, of the 5,200,000,000 pounds of fish caught in 1956, 3,450,000,000 pounds, or 66.4 percent, were caught in the months of June through October. The salmon industry is entirely limited to the months of June, July, August, and September, and in Alaska, which produces a large part of the annual crop, the season lasts for only 1 month. Specific examples of the seasonal nature of the commercial fishing industry can be found in the case of tuna, shrimp, and cod. Thus in the halibut, cod, and perch industry of Massachusetts, 59 percent of the fish taken are taken in the period from June through December, with July, August, and September the peak months.

The menhaden industry accounts for 73 percent of its total catch for the months of June, July, August, and September, and 65 percent of the shrimp taken are taken in the period August through December.

The fishery resources of the United States have been subject to wide fluctuations in abundance and availability. Waters which yield an abundance in 1 year, produce little or nothing in the next, and the amount of a fisherman's income is directly related to the amount of fish he catches. Predictions of income are almost impossible for individual fishermen and for the industry as a whole. Thus, fishermen stand in the same position as farmers and for that reason should be accorded the same consideration with respect to declarations of estimated income tax.

While the internal-revenue laws of the United States already provide for the prevention of hardship by permitting the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to grant extensions of time without charge for interest, nevertheless, few fishermen are equipped to negotiate with the Internal Revenue Service for such extensions of time and often find themselves in difficulty, because they are not aware of their rights and are not in a position, through lack of education or other reasons, to present their cause and make a case with the Commissioner.

It is no answer to the fishermen to state that his case is not unique. The precedent provided in the special treatment for farmers should be extended to fishermen, and to all others as well, whose income is highly seasonal and subject to wide fluctuations in amount. Where hardship exists, equity should be universal.

## Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of week ending February 1, 1958.

The newsletter follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

A light legislative week permits a look ahead. Pay TV hearings are concluded before our House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Two questions confront us: (1) Has the Federal Communications Commission the jurisdiction by statutory authority to permit or ban subscription TV tests, or must Congress act first? (2) Should home pay TV be permitted or denied the viewing public by law?

Arguments for pay TV (oversimplified): (1) Pay TV will be optional to home viewers and will offer added features not available now (first-run movies, top sport events, specialized subjects like opera, education programs like medical operations); (2) Congress (or the FCC as its arm) cannot deny business enterprises the right to try out their new ideas, or deny the public the choice; (3) the present study by the FCC concerns the granting of only test pay TV services to learn more about how it would work and of public acceptance.

Arguments against (also oversimplified): (1) Pay TV will siphon off programs now free—not add new programs—viewers will be forced to pay for what now is received free; (2) pay TV will black out free TV, since each pay channel or program will mean that much less free TV; (3) any test will be incomplete by its very nature, hence comprehensive data will not be obtained; further, once started, it will be an accomplished fact. There would be no return to free TV.

Proponents are those companies who have developed pay systems—Zenith, Telemeter, Skiatron, independent TV stations, and others. Opponents include certain citizen groups and the big TV networks who fear pay TV will automatically eliminate advertising money which now supports free TV. Approximately 35 witnesses, including the FCC and network presidents, have appeared before us. (Overall, the validity of all testimony must yet be established.)

Secretary of State Dulles received some commendation this week when AL BENTLEY, of Michigan, and others stressed the view held by many Congressmen that the United States, as Mr. Dulles is insisting, must be firm in dealing with Russia. The President's letter to Bulganin also states a firm United States position that acts not words of good faith are necessary from Russia before a summit meeting can be considered seriously. Appeasement or just conversation would be most dangerous, yet this course seems to be the desire of certain liberals criticizing the Secretary. Further, they criticize Mr. Dulles' alleged moralistic preachments to other nations. Some of us feel we must keep trying to present our moral concepts, our spiritual motivation, if we are to win world understanding and/or respect over the materialistic and atheistic philosophy of communism. Dollar diplomacy cannot do this. It takes more and more preachment of the moral and spiritual bedrock of belief that underlies this great Nation, and practicing what we preach. When this bedrock weakens, so shall our Nation weaken. Naturally, we must not convey a patronizing or holier than thou attitude. So, good for Dulles. It is my hope that he and the President will stand firm against Russian blandishments and will stress our beliefs over and over. We cannot trust the Communists. They are not United States friends. They respect only strength. Having broken almost all agreements they've entered, now it will take deeds to deserve any further credence on our part.

The danger of monopolistic power in the hands of labor leaders has been clearly disclosed in Congressional hearings. Violence and intimidation, corruption, racketeering, and abuse of trust and power have been proven. So, what now will be done? Possibly nothing. Steps to be taken to cure the present abuses should include legislation to (1) limit unions' industrywide bargaining to a single employer; (2) abolishing the checkoff (enforced collection of union dues and assessments by employer); (3) making unions liable to damages from their own violence (like everyone else); (4) applying antitrust laws to unions; (5) setting limits on initiation fees, dues, and assessments. Actually, the problems should be handled at the State level where State law enforcement should prevail, including the right-to-work laws, if the people so chose them by vote. Yet, it has long passed out of State hands into Federal jurisdiction. There is some possibility that a national right-to-work law will be advanced. The personal freedom of workers must be reestablished. The President's message on additional legislation to provide greater protection for the rights of individual workers, the public, the management, and unions covers the needs well. Now we shall see what legislation is forthcoming and whether Congress will act. I doubt it. Only the people can force it, if they will.

The attack on Dallas I have answered on the floor of the House this week. The RECORD is now straight and others reminded that attacks can boomerang.

## The Government Has Many Cultural Exchange Programs With Other Nations but No Hall in Which To Present Them—The Vice President and District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs Support New Plan for National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has many cultural exchange programs with other nations, programs authorized by the Surplus Property Act of 1944, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

In addition, an exchange agreement was signed on January 27, 1958, to increase five-fold the cultural, technical, education, and sports exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union. President Eisenhower suggested, also, that it would be a good idea to accept a

number of Russians for a year of study in this country whether or not the Soviet accepted American students. The President's remarks were made after a White House ceremony marking the 10th anniversary of the Smith-Mundt Act, under which the Voice of America and the United States Information Agency were set up.

However, as was so cogently shown by Robert W. Dowling, chairman of the board of the Congressionally chartered American National Theater and Academy, which acts as agent for the Department of State in some of these exchange programs:

When we send abroad an exchange program, exchange is a misnomer if we can't receive something here in return. These have been making friends for our country. But then artists, producers, musicians ask when they can come here.

There is no commercial theater you can book them into in midseason. Every New York theater manager hopes to book his house for a whole season. With the exception of the National in Washington, where you might find a couple of weeks in the winter, there is no other place to play. New York is practically closed.

You just have to have an adequate house, not only for the theater, but for ballet, opera, concerts—all the performing arts need it.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION SURVEY

In a survey report for the American Council on Education, submitted on January 2, 1958, by Dr. Donald J. Stone, dean of the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs of the University of Pittsburgh, and Dr. Michael J. Flack, ACE staff member, declare that:

In one respect at least, the Nation's Capital is an underdeveloped community. It lacks adequate institutions to meet the needs of the thousands of foreign visitors or temporary residents who come here under the auspices of the Federal Government, of foreign governments, international organizations, foreign or American private institutions, or on their own. Most of these foreign visitors are persons of status in their own countries. All told, there are each year between fifteen and twenty thousand of them.

The visit of these guests from abroad to the Nation's Capital involves an opportunity for the United States to make their sojourn here meaningful and enjoyable. If each of these foreign visitors is to be viewed, as he must, as an important person who will codetermine in his own country the nature of tomorrow's world, then providing an adequate introduction to the United States and an appreciation of its struggle to develop a free, prosperous, and responsible society should be of direct interest to the American people.

Later, this important survey for the American Council on Education, an organization which speaks for all segments of education in our country, recommends the establishment of a great cultural center as an international meeting place for the world in the Nation's Capital, saying "the enlarged center should foster the international enlightenment of the Washington community. This could be done by cultural and social programs of general interest" which would include American and foreign music programs.

CONGRESS DONATED LAND FOR TAFT MEMORIAL

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in its wisdom provided a site on the United States Capitol Grounds just west of the Senate Office Building for a 115-foot bell tower memorial to the late Senator Robert Taft. This land was donated by the Congress.

It is my considered belief that the Congress cannot do less than this for the National Cultural Center; that it must, first, provide Government-owned land; and, second, give the National Cultural Center a status in the Federal Government equal to that of the National Gallery of Art which was given to the American people by Andrew Mellon. The National Gallery is a branch of the Smithsonian Institution. If these two conditions are met, and provision is made for the acceptance of gifts from private sources, I am confident that the money for the National Cultural Center can be raised from private sources and that the American taxpayer will not have to be taxed to provide this much needed facility.

COMPROMISE LEGISLATION DEVELOPED

I have developed a compromise bill to meet the objections voiced in the House of Representatives on August 8, 1957. No one spoke against a National Cultural Center in that debate. Everyone was for a National Cultural Center in the Nation's Capital. The opponents of the site selected by the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission insisted they were just as dedicated to the concept of such a center as the proponents of the site chosen by the Auditorium Commission. They insisted, however, that "we can still have the center, and quicker, on one of several available Government-owned sites." I agree with them.

Among the opponents of the Foggy Bottom site were the Washington Board of Trade and the Federal City Council.

Ambassador George A. Garrett, president of the Federal City Council, wrote me recently saying:

The auditorium site question provides another instance in which we have disagreed with the position taken by an advisory commission. We have, as you know, consistently favored a southwest location over one in Foggy Bottom for the civic center.

WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE WANTS CONVENTION HALL

The Washington Board of Trade's Auditorium Committee, and its coordinating Committee on the Future of Washington are much more interested in a convention hall than a national cultural center. In a paper prepared by John W. Thompson, chairman of the latter committee and president of the Evening Star Broadcasting Co., and presented to the business outlook conference of the Washington Board of Trade on January 28, 1958, a preference was expressed for the convention hall plan put forward by the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission.

Interestingly enough, the cultural development committee of the Washington Board of Trade has been completely silent in the matter but the evidence would seem to indicate that if the kingmakers in the Board of Trade permitted it to express an opinion it would favor my compromise bill, H. R. 9848, over the plan advanced by the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission.

As the report of the auditorium commission shows, multipurpose civil auditoriums have been built in 382 American cities. So far as I have been able to determine none of these civic auditoriums have been financed in whole or in part through national fund drives. I have come somewhat reluctantly to the conclusion that the wholly worthy proposal for a national cultural center has come, in certain quarters, to be considered as the sugar coating for the convention hall pill which certain Washington business interests have been trying to get the Congress to swallow for more than 30 years. In the 1930's a plan similar to that preferred by the Washington Board of Trade was defeated in the Congress. There is absolutely no reason for believing that the same interests would not again mobilize to crush this convention hall plan being pushed by two of the special interest committees of the Washington Board of Trade.

Washington is one of the country's major cities populationwise, and, has a high standard of living. From these and related facts I think the conclusion is inescapable that if Washington wants and needs a convention-trade fair-exhibition hall then it can obtain one in the very same way and just as successfully as the 382 other American cities obtained theirs. As a matter of fact, the Board of Trade made a study of the matter a few years ago and found that a convention hall type of building would bring in $12 million a year in additional business. Clearly then, it would and could pay for itself. Conventions and tourists already bring into Washington the vast sum of $300 million a year, according to the figures presented yesterday to the business outlook conference of the Washington Board of Trade. I am sure that most Washingtonians, businessmen and civic leaders and Mr. Average Citizen, do not want any special favors and want only to be treated as the citizens of other American cities are treated; no more, no less than this. I am delighted to note that after a period of trial and error sound plans are under way in Washington to build a national stadium and pay for it through a bond issue after a period of years in which less realistic plans were considered, including having the Federal Government build and present it to Washington, D. C., as a gift. I am sure the Congress would welcome any similar sound proposal for building a convention hall in Washington, D. C. to serve Washington's business interests.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR COMPROMISE MEASURE

I am pleased to say that strong support has developed for my measure and, further, that I consider it highly significant that not a single national organization in the field of education and the arts has turned it down in favor of the convention hall plan preferred by the Washington Board of Trade. Among the many cultural organizations which have interested themselves in my plan for a national cultural center are the National Federation of Music Clubs, the National Music Council, the American Federation of Musicians, the Music Educators National Conference, the Associated Actors and Artists of America, AFL-CIO, the

National Opera Association, and the American Guild of Music Artists, AFL-CIO.

I include here a few of the many messages I have received in support of my plan, a plan which would cost the American taxpayer nothing since the entire amount would be raised through voluntary subscriptions:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
*Washington, January 21, 1958.*

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is just a note to thank you for your letter of January 11 and the material you sent relating to your bill for a National Cultural Center in Washington, D. C.

I appreciate your thoughtfulness in keeping me informed about the status of this measure. As you know, for some time I have been in favor of the development of such a Center here in Washington. It would not only provide a much needed facility for the residents of this area, but more important it would also serve as a symbol of the interest of our Nation and Government in the rich cultural traditions and experience of America.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 28, 1958]

CULTURAL CENTER IS BACKED BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

The executive board of the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs unanimously approved a resolution yesterday endorsing a bill introduced by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr. (Democrat of New Jersey), to provide for a national cultural center on the south side of the Mall, directly behind the National Gallery of Art.

Action on the resolution presented by Mrs. M. McCall Imes, Federation president, was taken at the board's monthly meeting at Hotel 2400.

THOMPSON'S bill, introduced on January 9, calls for a creation of a new Federal Commission to plan and administer the cultural center, and would, in effect, revive the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission which failed to win Congressional approval last year of a Foggy Bottom site for the cultural center.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 15, 1958]

RECREATION BOARD BACKS CENTER PLAN

The District Recreation Board yesterday voted unanimous support for the proposed National Capital Center of the Performing Arts.

The center, which would be located on the south side of the Mall, directly behind the National Gallery of Arts, as provided in a bill introduced Thursday by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey.

Support for THOMPSON'S bill was recommended by Recreation Director Milo F. Christiansen, who said "the board and department have an important stake in the development of a center for the performing arts."

---

AMERICAN GUILD OF MUSICAL ARTISTS,
*New York, N. Y., December 10, 1957.*

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I think that you will hear directly from the Associated Actors and Artists of America that the international board adopted the following resolution:

"That the Four A's endorse the bill of Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., for a National Cultural Center in Washington, and that the branches of the Four A's that have not already done so be requested to take similar action."

This resolution followed the reading of a letter from me requesting support of the Four A's for your bill for a national cultural plan for the Mall area in the Nation's Capital."

I am happy our international board has taken this position and I sincerely hope the bill will be adopted by Congress.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

HY FAINE,
*National Executive Secretary.*

---

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
*Trenton, January 9, 1958.*

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR FRANK: I am glad to hear that the National Music Council has endorsed your bill for a National Cultural Center. I read your speech with great interest and equal approval. As you know, it echoes many of my own sentiments and I am understandably prejudiced toward it.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER H. MCDONOUGH, *Director.*

---

VAN ARKEL & KAISER,
*Washington, D. C., December 31, 1957.*

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: President Petrillo, of the American Federation of Musicians, has asked me to reply to your letter of December 19 with the assurance that the American Federation of Musicians fully endorses your proposal and will give it vigorous and enthusiastic support.

With personal regards and the season's greetings, I am,

Cordially,

HENRY KAISER.

---

MUSIC EDUCATORS NATIONAL CONFERENCE,
*Washington, D. C., December 30, 1957.*

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for your letter of December 21. We are delighted to have it as well as the copy of the letter you have sent to President McBride.

You may be sure we shall be glad to give every support to the important bill for the National Cultural Center on the Mall here in Washington.

Cordially,

VANETT LAWLER,
*Executive Secretary.*

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER,
EASTMAN SCHOOL OF MUSIC,
*Rochester, N. Y., December 3, 1957.*

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*Congress of the United States,*
*House of Representatives,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you so much for your letter of November 30. I am most grateful to you that you are standing up firmly against action which would frustrate the development of a cultural center in the Nation's capital. In my opinion we need the creative arts more in this country at this time than we have ever needed them in our long history. You are so right in saying that any tendency today to downgrade the humanities and the creative arts is giving the Russians too easy a victory.

Please count on me for any support that I am able to give and I am sure that I speak not only for myself but for the membership of the National Music Council as well.

With kindest personal regards.

Yours cordially,

HOWARD HANSON.

---

NATIONAL OPERA ASSOCIATION,
*Oberlin, Ohio, January 2, 1958.*

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*United States House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: The National Opera Association, assembled in convention at Evanston, Ill., heartily endorses your efforts in behalf of the performing arts, and for the establishment of a National Cultural Center on the Mall in Washington.

As almost all the buildings on the Mall are, in one way or another, cultural centers, we suggest that a more specific name be used, such as National Theater, and that the building might consist of a large theater equipped for opera and concerts, and a smaller theater beside it for drama and smaller recitals. In order to make such a building really functional, attention should be given to adequate orchestra pit, rehearsal and storage space, dressing rooms, and facilities for scenery and lighting, as well as architectural excellence.

We would appreciate having a copy of the proposed bill. Our membership is not large but is strategically placed all over the country. If we supply you with a list of names can copies of the bill be mailed out under your franking privilege?

We are anxious to be of assistance. Please advise us.

Sincerely and respectfully,

DANIEL HARRIS, *President.*

---

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS,
*Pittsburgh, Pa., January 13, 1958.*

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you for your letter which has been forwarded from Springfield College. We moved to Pittsburgh last fall.

I knew of your efforts to secure support for a national cultural center and approved.

I have now read the materials you sent me with interest and appreciation. I subscribe enthusiastically both to your objectives and the specific arrangements which you present so clearly.

If I can be of help at any time, please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

DONALD C. STONE, *Dean.*

---

## How To Get Action From Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered how I could advise my constituents to make more effective use of the services of my office. Our colleague, FRANK M. COFFIN, of Maine, has supplied an answer that I believe will be of interest to the Members of Congress.

Congressman COFFIN directs his suggestion particularly to small-business men, a group now confronted by serious problems with which the Congress is concerned. Our colleague, a graduate of both the Business School and the Law School of Harvard University, has set forth his views in a well-written article entitled "How To Get Action From Politicians," which appears in the autumn issue of the Harvard Business School Bulletin. The article follows:

HOW TO GET ACTION FROM POLITICIANS

(By Congressman FRANK M. COFFIN)

Eight months of exposure to the legislative process at the national level have blasted some shibboleths I have long taken for granted about the relationships between a businessman and a politician.

There is a legendary mutual respect between those citizens who have scaled the economic or political heights far enough to win an election or meet a payroll. According to this school of thought, both the politician and the businessman look down from their Olympian heights with mingled respect for each other and compassion or contempt for all lesser souls.

If this bond exists, it is not apparent to me. All too often I have the impression that businessmen feel as Walter Pitkin expressed it in the Twilight of the American Mind, that politicians "are the semifailures in business and the professions; men of mediocre mentality, dubious morals, and magnificent commonplaceness."[1] Conversely, many in politics, are inclined to view businessmen as successes in their vocation but utterly naive, uninformed and unrealistic in matters of both government and politics.

These comments do not apply to several areas where there is a sturdy bridge of understanding between the political leader and the business leader. One such area is that where the businessman becomes for a time a political figure, as in the case of some of the members of the Cabinet. The reverse situation occurs when a Member of Congress becomes or remains the head of his own business. Then there is a rarefied atmosphere of really "big" business, where there may well be a high degree of appreciation of the complexities underlying most political issues.

Indeed, one might well question whether a business enterprise in this country has ever become dominant in its field without an effective merger of the economic and political modes of thought on the part of its leaders. What I have said about a lack of mutual understanding between politicians and businessmen is directed to the multitude of small entrepreneurs who have the least time or energy to devote to a better acquaintance with the practices, procedures, and personalities of Government.

Yet, speaking as a Member of Congress, I am deeply concerned over the gulf of ignorance that separates us from the leaders of the platoons and companies, if not the brigades and armies of business.

We in politics and Government sense that a very critical period is being faced by the small- to moderate-sized independent businessman. We talk in generalities about the effect of tight money, costly credit, lack of equity capital, high taxes, poor management, unfair competition, and monopolistic practices. But what we know about these problems, with a few notable exceptions, comes from practically every source but the businessman himself.

BUSINESSMEN DON'T SPEAK UP

More and more, Congress is facing up to the fact that the problem of survival of small units is one of the major themes in Government today. Yet the absurdity exists that Congress will act in a field directly affecting small business with relatively few businessmen making their views known. This is despite the fact that their views are both sought and welcomed.

Perhaps the reason, at rockbottom, for this hands-off attitude toward Government by the average small-business leader stems from several assumptions which are today unrealistic. Indeed, they may never have been realistic.

The first idea is that Government (and the political personalities, parties, and ways of thought and action that make up Government) does not and should not concern itself with the problems of free and small enterprise. The second idea is that the garden variety of businessman should not attempt to be a lobbyist, or to try to persuade politicians in Congress. He feels that this type of activity would be either not quite respectable, expensive, or futile, or all three.

GOVERNMENT IS PART OF YOUR JOB

So he continues to tend to his knitting—finding that his balls of yarn dwindle in size and multiply in cost. The truth is that government is part of the businessman's knitting. That is, over and above the concern which one should have as a citizen in all levels of politics and government, the small-business man, as a segment of our economy, has a special obligation. That obligation is to survive. It is increasingly clear that survival today depends not only on his own initiative and efforts, but on the creation of some legislative machinery to help him survive in a world of bigness, and on the elimination of some laws which operate only to burden him and lessen his chance of survival.

In short, government is in the field of small business. To make the venture fruitful, small-business spokesmen should not be strangers to government.

This objective can be achieved only if some notions about politicians and how to exert pressure on them are relegated to the attic with grandma's corset.

When I first came to Congress, I was only a couple of steps ahead of the average businessmen in my distorted views of this process, more commonly known as the ancient institution of lobbying. I say "ancient" because it dates at least as far back as Genesis, which records that Joseph performed valuable services in interceding with the Pharoah on behalf of his father and brothers. The story of Joseph is not a safe guide, however, since it might not always follow that casting one's representative into a pit and thereafter selling him for a paltry 20 pieces of silver is calculated to induce loyal, persistent, and effective representation at the halls of government.

BUT WHERE ARE THE LOBBYISTS?

In any event, I have had to adjust my thinking about lobbying. When I made my first "Cook's Tour" of the Capitol after my election, I was shown a large, long, ornate Chamber, accoutered with leather seats, couches, with chandeliers and oil portraits of departed national figures. This was the "Speakers' Lobby." Ah, I thought, here is where I shall be buttonholed by cigar-smoking minions of industry, labor, agriculture, veterans, doctors, lawyers, and Indian chiefs. Here is where I shall have to struggle for my political chastity. Well, to my dismay, I found out that lobbyists weren't even allowed in the lobby. Only Members of Congress, their assistants, and the press have this privilege. This is a fine kettle of fish. What if lawyers weren't allowed at court?

To add to my disillusionment, I must confess that not a solitary soul has yet thrust a finger through a buttonhole on my lapel * * * even the ones that are real honest-to-goodness buttonholes. I have not been backed up against a wall and threatened with my political life if I don't vote in a certain way. I have not been lured by the titivating promise of lucre or a vice-presidency of a company if I vote for a certain bill. I have reflected that perhaps this is because I am only a freshman, with control and influence over only one four hundred and thirty-fifths of the votes in the House of Representatives.

Even though lobbying is not what it was cracked up to be, and even though I am not entirely sure that I have been a victim, I am going to hazard a few remarks on the subject for businessmen. For small-business men, that is, because I can't remember having met a big one.

HOW TO LOBBY—IN THREE LESSONS

What I have to say adds up to a do-it-yourself program. In this era of faddisms in solitary artisanship, I don't see why lobbying can't be included. I have not as yet completed all the materials for the special kit which will soon be available at most drugstores. As of the moment, it will include some form telegrams, half of which will be vehemently for House Resolution — and half predicting national disaster if House Resolution — is enacted; three credit cards for Washington hotels; appropriate air and rail timetables; a gross of aspirin; and a choice of the Koran, Talmud, or Bible.

If the reader has persevered thus far, he will be rewarded with some more serious comments. Lobbying, beneath all the gibes and innuendoes, is at once a cause and a result of what Dr. Griffith[2] calls the dispersive state, a form of society and government produced by specialization in the economic processes, and to a large degree reflecting the demands of the many specialized groups which now make up our economy. Lobbying is a way in which a specialized group presents its case to government. For a tightly knit, well organized, homogeneous group, effective lobbying is far more simple in both concept and execution than for the heterogeneous mass of small-business men, 4 million weak. For this group, not the moguls but the mites of industry, the first step to a more effective presentation of problems, i. e., lobbying, is a change in attitude toward government and politics to which I have just referred.

ELEVEN RULES OF THE GAME

From my very limited experience, I venture to suggest these principles which govern today's Congressmen in most of their dealings with businessmen. I hope that by spelling them out I can help readers make their contacts with politicians more rewarding and effective, for both parties.

1. A businessman from home, with a problem, is viewed by the Congressman as an opportunity, not a chore.

2. Past campaign contributions or the prospect of future contributions are not a determinant of the effort which the Member will expend for his constituents.

3. Political affiliation will have no bearing on the effort of the Member. He will often take pride in a job well done for someone who has worked hard against him.

4. One factual, thoughtful, reasoned letter will carry more weight than dozens of form letters or cards.

5. No businessman is too small to warrant the personal attention of his Congressman. If the jobs provided by the particular business are in jeopardy, the Congressman will place the task of protecting those jobs at the very top of his agenda.

6. One precious commodity which the businessman has, and the Congressman knows

[1] Page 81, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1928.

[2] Congress, Its Contemporary Role (2d ed.), Ernest S. Griffith, Director, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress (New York University Press, 1956), p. 121.

he has, is knowledge of the facts of life as they exist in his very small corner of the world. These facts the political representative needs if he is to draft sensible legislation. Respect for these facts will build the bridge of understanding so badly needed between the small-business community and those whose lawmaking efforts will help or hurt that community.

7. A law of political thermodynamics operates in most Congressional offices: The more heat, the less dynamics. Or, to put it another way, the more organized and intense pressure brought to bear on a member, the less effective it is. It may be effective in the first instance when it is applied, but the chances are that the representative will find more ways to be undynamic than the pressure group will find to bring new pressure.

THE QUESTION IN THE CLOAKROOM

If the Congressman feels he is being bullied, he can be for the desired legislation and yet effectively insure its being put into a deep freeze. After all, his influence on his colleague does not depend on his public statement to a committee. It depends on his answer to the question of committee members in the cloakroom: "What do you really think?"

A low pressure approach to a Congressman by a businessman expressing his own problem or point of view in no matter how awkward a way is almost bound to bring forth an attitude of friendly interest and helpfulness on the part of the Member of Congress. If he didn't react that way, he would be quite unique in a body of men and women who have one quality in common: a genuine interest in and responsiveness to people.

8. The kind of lobbying a small-business man can do very effectively need not be expensive. A telephone call may accomplish fully as much as a trip to Washington. Nothing can be more wasteful of time for the businessman and the Representative than a personal trip to Washington with no thought given to presenting the problem or adequate documenation or the necessary preliminary steps. The businessman with a problem will help himself if he consents to talk with some member of the Congressman's staff. Sooner or later the staff member will have to work on the details of the problem. He might just as well be recognized as a competent intermediary at the start. Nothing can be more unpropitious than brushing off the Congressman's staff aids and insisting on seeing the "boss."

9. There are rather wide areas within which a Member of Congress can act effectively. He can expedite the getting of information. His efforts can insure that very serious consideration is given any matter in which he is interested. Sometimes he can even bring about a reconsideration of a decision, or he can obtain some delay in carrying out a decision. But he cannot, and should not, be expected to work miracles, to have a decision made or unmade for reasons other than the merits. This is not to say that the unexpected never happens, but merely that this type of approach is usually going to end in frustration.

10. A good rule to follow is: If you have an interested Congressman working for you, don't press your luck. Nothing causes an MC to lose steam so fast as the knowledge that one's constituent is hedging his bet by trying to enlist the assistance of other Members. Generally this information reaches the constituent's Member, and, if not hurtful, is at best not helpful in advancing his cause.

11. One final tip is to remember that a politician, although more gregarious than most people, has limits to both his time and his energy. He has in mind a rule which, if formulated, would run like this: Avoid dinners in Washington, seek them at home. If, therefore, a businessman seeks to carry his association with his Representative beyond ordinary working hours, he should think twice before asking him to large whing-dings in Washington. After all, the Congressman was at the same hotel, eating the same food last week, with another group.

A PRACTICAL COURSE IN POLITICS

Perhaps what I have said would not receive even a majority vote in the House of Representatives. All I can say is that it makes sense to me as a constructive approach to a necessary part of the businessman's life. There is one byproduct of do-it-yourself lobbying which is more important in the long run than success in solving the immediate problem: the vastly increased understanding of and interest in government as a whole which results from getting in touch with your Congressman and seeing things through his eyes.

What the businessman with a problem may be getting into is an intensive seminar in government, beginning in frustration and ending in wisdom. That kind of experience is what makes our kind of government work.

## Rev. Dr. Abraham J. Feldman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWIN H. MAY, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives heard a very inspiring invocation today. It was delivered by one of the most outstanding clergymen in the State of Connecticut and indeed from the entire Nation, Rev. Dr. Abraham J. Feldman, of the Temple Beth Israel, of Hartford, Conn. I am happy to say that we of the State of Connecticut are very proud of the great contribution which Rabbi Feldman has made to his community, to his State, and to the Nation, not only in things that pertain to the spirit but in civic, charitable, and governmental affairs as well. As an example of this, may I cite the fact that he is past president of the Synagogue Council of America, past president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, president of the Hartford Rotary Club, member of the Connecticut State Committee for CARE, a trustee of the People to People Foundation, and he has been a member of the United States mission to Hawaii and to the Far East on behalf of the Department of Defense.

I believe that it would be appropriate to give a résumé of some other of the many activities of Rabbi Feldman. Besides being the editor of the Jewish Ledger, he is author of the following books: A Companion to the Bible, A Rabbi and His Early Ministry, The American Jew, Faith of a Liberal Jew, Confirmation, and Reform Judaism—A Guide.

Diversification is one of the marks of Rabbi Feldman's outstanding contribution to society. Attesting to his broad interests, he is a member of the National Committee on Immigration and Citizenship; chaplain, United States Veterans Hospital in Newington, Conn.; chaplain, Connecticut State Guard with a rank of colonel; member of the board of trustees of Hartt College of Music, of Hillyer College; a regent of the University of Hartford; and member of the advisory board of the American Child Guidance Foundation. There are innumerable other activities of this outstanding man but suffice to mention at least some of the awards which he has received. They are: 1954 citizen's award, as the Greater Hartford citizen of the year, the 1955 Americanism and civic award from the Connecticut Valley Council of B'nai B'rith, and recipient of the 1956 George Washington honor medal, from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

Rabbi Feldman has been the recipient of a number of honorary degrees. Among them are doctor of divinity, Hebrew Union College; doctor of sacred theology, Trinity College; doctor of laws, Hillyer College; and doctor of humanities, Hartt College of Music.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare occasion indeed that was afforded the Members of the House today in having an opportunity not only to hear the words of Rabbi Feldman but to see him as well. I know I can speak for all the people of Connecticut that we are very proud that Rabbi Feldman is a product of our State.

## The Times Call for Tax Reduction for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, last week, it was my privilege to appear before the Ways and Means Committee on behalf of the majority members of the House Small Business Committee, and the companion bills H. R. 9957 to H. R. 9963. These bills would modify the tax structure to provide incentives for small and independent businesses, and partially equalize the disadvantages small business suffers in regard to taxation. Knowing that the concern of the majority members of the Small Business Committee is shared by many other Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a transcript of my statement before the Ways and Means Committee:

AN INCENTIVE TAX BILL FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(Statement of Hon. JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you on behalf of myself and the majority members of the House Select Committee on Small Business, and to express to you our unanimous concern over the plight of small business and the vital necessity of providing concrete incentives to preserve the steadily deteriorating position of small business in our economy.

Small business is and always has been the great reservoir of opportunity and free enterprise in our Nation. As we all know, recent trends and events have tended, however, to

place limitations on the ability of small business to grow and even to survive, and have put small business at a severe disadvantage as compared with larger business entities.

Recently the House Small Business Committee held public hearings on the problems of small-business financing. The witnesses included an impressive array of high policymaking Government officials, including the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, as well as prominent financial experts in private life. They were almost unanimous in the statement that one of the most serious problems of small-business financing is that of the tax burden on the very small concerns.

Throughout the period since the first session of the 85th Congress adjourned, the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate has held extensive hearings at various locations across the country about the tax problems of small business. It heard numerous witnesses. Those witnesses confirmed the points made by the witnesses who appeared before the House Small Business Committee. They are in agreement that one of the principal problems faced by small business today is the oppressive tax burden on the very small concern.

All these hearings and studies show that small business has suffered during the past few years because it is severely handicapped in obtaining capital for replacement, modernization, and for expansion. Big business is in a far more advantageous situation in regard both to the use of its own profits for expansion and in access to capital through flotation of stocks and borrowing on long terms. Moreover, in the past few years, big business has received very considerable tax relief through the repeal of the excess profits tax and the use of rapid tax amortization. This relief made available to larger industries billions of dollars for financing part of the tremendous growth they have experienced during the last few years.

On the other hand, small business has not had the benefit of such tax reductions and relatively little relief through rapid amortization. On the contrary, small business is still being taxed at just about the same rate as it was during the war.

Therefore, small business has not been able, to the same extent as big business, to use its earnings for expansion and has been far more dependent on loans as a source of capital. Unfortunately, as we all know, in the past few years it has been considerably more difficult for small business to obtain loans on favorable terms—particularly for expansion.

There has been wide bipartisan agreement for several years that we must have revision of our tax laws to equalize the opportunities of small and independent business. It will be recalled that the President appointed a special Cabinet committee some 18 months ago to study this matter and present recommendations. It will be recalled further that a year ago the President presented the recommendations of the Cabinet committee to the Congress and added his personal endorsement and urged action.

There comes a time when we must stop talking and start doing. The matter is far more urgent today than a year ago because of the increased peril small business faces as a result of the less favorable economic outlook. The rate of bankruptcies and business failures is increasing alarmingly and many small businesses need immediate help if they are to survive at all.

The legislation proposed by the majority members of the Small Business Committee follows the recommendations of the Cabinet committee in four of its five parts. In addition, we propose a provision aimed at the heart of the problem of giving small business the incentive to grow, and thereby improving the climate of opportunity in our country. Briefly and in general terms we propose the following—incidentally not in the same order as they appear in the bill:

First, one of our proposals is that the taxes imposed on business corporations be modified by reducing the tax rate in the lowest bracket—on incomes up to $25,000—from 30 percent to 20 percent.

I am sure the committee is aware that, unless Congress takes action before July 1, the present rate of 30 percent will be reduced to 25 percent. Actually, therefore, our proposal would involve an effective change of 5 percentage points.

This recommendation is exactly the same as the one made by the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business in its report of August 1956 and supported by the President early last year. It is true that the President later in the year reversed his position but, in view of the change in economic outlook since that time, we may be permitted to hope that this year he will return to his original position.

The committee will appreciate the difficulty of estimating the loss of revenue that might result from changes in tax rates. If we use the present revenue from this source as the standard, an informed guess would be that the loss might be as high as $400 million. However, I have already pointed out that under present law there would be a reduction in the coming year from 30 to 25 percent in the tax rate in this bracket. If we take account of this, the loss under our proposal against the loss that would ensue if presently scheduled reduction actually goes into effect would not be greater than about $200 million. However, in our view, it is by no means certain that there would be any loss at all. I shall have occasion to speak on this point a little later.

Our second recommendation is that businesses be given the right to utilize, for purchases of used property not exceeding $50,000 in any one year, the formulas of accelerated depreciation that were made available to purchasers of new property by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

This proposal would enable small business to benefit from rapid tax amortization on a far more realistic basis and on more equal terms with big business. I am sure that most of you are aware that—particularly where expensive equipment is involved—small business is far more likely to purchase secondhand than brandnew equipment. Such used machinery and equipment is often just as good for the purpose as brandnew and in any case is frequently the only kind small business can afford. Present law, however, does not permit rapid amortization of investment in such machinery. Thus, small business is put in a very unfair position in respect to the tax laws. Therefore, in this respect small business is between the hammer and the anvil—on the one hand it finds it more difficult than big business to find capital for growth and expansion; on the other hand, having scratched it up somewhere and invested it in the best equipment it can afford, it receives far less favored treatment from our tax laws than big business. I am told that through the relief in taxes obtained by rapid amortization, those buying new equipment are able to finance a good portion of the investment out of their tax savings; on the other hand, small businesses buying used equipment receive no such incentive toward new investment in equipment and facilities. We are confident that providing such an incentive on equal terms with their larger business brothers would be far more important in stimulating the growth of small business than might appear offhand.

Our third recommendation is that corporations with say, 10 or fewer individual, personal, stockholders be given the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships. It is our view that this option should be limited to small corporations whose income is derived principally from active trade or production and should not be extended to personal holding companies. We believe the possibility of its misuse should be guarded against, and accordingly we make a number of qualifications in the bill to guard against such possibilities.

Our fourth recommendation is that the taxpayer be given the option of paying an estate tax in several annual installments—but not more than 10—where the estate consists largely of investments in closely held business concerns. All of us can recall in our own home localities instances where the need for paying estate taxes has required the distress sale of a business or its assets, or changes in ownership—often sale to a chain or a larger business. In some instances businesses on which communities were vitally dependent have had to be closed or broken up or moved. This section of our bill is intended to remove some of the hazard to small business and to the continuity of its ownership that present laws present.

Finally, we recommend that in the case of any person engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the additional investment in the amount of $5,000 or 20 percent of the net income of such trade or business for the taxable year, whichever is the greater: Provided, however, that the total amount of any such deduction shall not exceed $30,000 for any taxable year.

The purpose of this plow-back provision is obvious. It would give all business, but particularly small business, a much needed stimulant to growth. Some such stimulant must be applied if we are going to preserve the position of small business. We all know that circumstances today favor the big elements of business. I have noted some of them and others who have testified have also pointed this out. We cannot hope to correct all the factors which favor the big and discriminate against the small; but we can make a start, and in our view, this would present the best practical point for such a start.

As I have said, there is wide and bipartisan agreement on the desirability of legislation along the lines proposed by the majority members. The only criticism offered is that in view of the present defense emergency we cannot afford the loss of revenue. And I want to direct my remarks particularly on this point.

I have already pointed out that laws which will go into effect on July 1, unless modified by Congress, provide for reductions in the corporate tax structure. These provide not only reductions in the lowest brackets but some in the higher brackets. If the Congress saw fit to give relief in the lowest bracket where it is most vitally needed, but maintained present rates on higher brackets, there would be no actual loss of revenue from a reduction of the normal tax rates from 30 percent because it appears that there would be more revenue than would be available in the coming year if the present tax laws remain in effect.

In the second place, we are making these recommendations not to relieve people of taxes and our Government of revenue, but because we firmly believe that these changes would stimulate economic growth. You cannot collect taxes unless there are earnings to tax. A farmer who keeps taking all the eggs the chickens lay and who does not leave them some to hatch into chicks, will soon find himself without any hens to lay eggs for him to take. It takes no gazing into crystal balls to see that unless some encouragement is given to small business, its earnings will fall rapidly and in consequence there will be less to levy a tax on.

On the other hand, if we give small business the means to prosper and to grow, its earnings will increase and we will receive more in tax revenue even if the rates are lower. I am firmly convinced that within a short time, following the enactment of this proposed legislation, the earnings of small business, and big business too—will rise sharply and produce a higher return in taxes.

In the third place, small business has already made more than its proportionate share of sacrifice for the continued emergency this Nation has faced for the past 15 years. It seems to me that it would be simple justice at this time, when small business itself is facing a severe emergency, to shift some of the burden to others, more able to make the sacrifice.

Finally, let us not forget that one of the most important things we are trying to defend in this present emergency is the opportunity which this land has always offered and which we trust it will always continue to offer. Small business, I repeat, is the place where opportunity and free enterprise start flowing. If in a nearsighted overconcentration on our military defenses we permit this climate of opportunity to wither away, we will have managed to do ourselves far more damage than all the effort of our enemies.

I repeat, in conclusion, speaking for myself and the majority of my colleagues on the Small Business Committee, that if we believe in small business—if we believe in doing our best to maintain our system of enterprise and opportunity, it is time we took appropriate action to encourage and stimulate it. The modifications we propose are in our view, the very minimum that can be done—and should be done—in this direction. Many of us think this is by no means enough and I am sure all of us have ideas on additional things which can be done. But we have subordinated our own ideas and joined together in these proposals in the hope that we can unite in making a start on this vital task of keeping this a land of opportunity and we commend them to your attention in this light. I thank you.

## Reuther Recession—or Democrat Depression—Which?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a Reuther recession is what we ought to call the present slump in business and rise in unemployment.

But in view of the current gloom and doom chorus of the Democrats, it is possible that the Reuther recession may be pushed into a Democrat depression unless Americans shrug off the pessimism and read the favorable signs which are there if we want to see them.

The present recession may be laid at the doorstep of Walter Reuther more than any single individual in the United States. Recessions are simply reactions from unbridled booms and inflation. Rounds of wage and price increases, for which Reuther takes the blame, swing into a spiral and force inflation upon us.

With Democrats sounding off at every opportunity, for political purposes, about the omnibus condition of the economy, it is illuminating to look back upon the following headlines which appeared in the New York Times in 1954:

January 26: "Harriman Says Administration Has Brought Recession."

February 7: "Mayor Wagner Links Recession to Republicans."

February 8: "Various Democratic Antidepression Measures Offered."

February 15: "Senator KENNEDY Defends Democratic Right To Warn of Depression."

February 23: "Democratic National Committee Chairman Mitchell Sees Republican Failure To Act Against Recession as Main November Election Issue."

March 30: "Dr. Keyserling Warns on Downtrend; Urges Action."

April 16: "Representative ROOSEVELT Offers Antirecession Bill."

April 25: "CIO President Reuther Calls Situation Serious."

May 8: "Reuther Urges Four-Way Action; Other Major Unions Demand Emergency Federal Spending, Other Steps To Maintain Economy."

May 15: "Representative ROOSEVELT Says Republicans Have Started Nation on Road to Depression as in 1932."

August 5: "Commerce Department Finds Summer Leveling and Fall Upturn as Predicted by Government Experts."

August 13: "Eisenhower Reports Conditions at Their Best; Minor Slide Past."

September 12: "Economists Feel Eisenhower Administration Aided Stability and Confidence."

When coerced and unearned wage increases are the order of the day, employers simply have to increase the price of their goods to stay in business. This is particularly true with such large groups as steel, aluminum, coal, and of course, automobiles. In most of these lines the payroll cost is more than 50 percent of the total cost of the product—sometimes as high as 90 percent—and when the payroll cost is raised substantially, the only place the employer can get the dollars to pay his workers is by increasing the price of his goods. His alternative is failure, shutdown and loss of all jobs to his employees.

As this spiral proceeds, there comes a time when the employer and the employee have together partially priced themselves out of the market. That is, sales begin to fall because people do not have enough money to pay the price for the products. At least, they buy less of them. That forces a cutback on payrolls, which means less people, rather than less wages per person. Employers won't and can't cut wage scales, but if they have less volume, they must hire fewer people to produce the goods.

In other words Walter Reuther, instead of getting a total of more money into the hands of the workers to spend—and increase consumption—actually gets less money into the hands of the worker and cuts down volume, thus cutting back the number of jobs.

If Reuther forces his next round of wage increases on the automobile industry, it will force another price hike and result this time in less volume, less jobs, increasing unemployment, less consumer purchasing power, and more recession. Why don't we call it a Reuther recession?

Actually, I don't think Reuther will get away with it. Nor will the Democrats, if the public understands that these forces are working against the housewife and the worker.

Recently we have had some encouraging testimony before the Joint Economic Committee:

First. Inventories of stores and factories are now down to or below normal. They had been reduced by restricted ordering, which caused some unemployment. Now business is ordering and people are being called back to jobs.

Second. Consumer sales in the closing Christmas month of 1957 showed an increase over 1956 which also helped to lower those inventories, but is of itself an encouraging factor.

Third. The building industry continues at a high rate. Plant expansion started 12 to 18 months ago is not yet complete and will continue for many months to come.

Fourth. Research and development funds appropriated by private industry are larger than ever. Frequently research develops the need for further plant expansion, resulting in more building.

Fifth. The home building industry continues at a very high level, below 1956 but higher than any other year.

Sixth. Money is easy. The Federal Reserve Board last summer started reversing its influence of restraining inflation, and each successive move has now had its result. Confidence is returning.

Seventh. The Federal Housing Administration reports more applications for loans this year as compared with the same period a year ago, in some localities double or triple.

Eighth. Federal spending is proceeding in large amounts. Contracts have been authorized and are being pushed. They exceed previous government, military and nonmilitary commitments by more than $5 billion. True, this does not produce permanent prosperity. It is pump priming, but it will get us over the present lull very shortly.

This country is fundamentally sound. We have a great future. Many industrialists are simply utilizing the lull to consolidate their positions and prepare for large further expansion, which they all see coming.

We have much for which to be grateful. The Democrats are screaming about high unemployment. Let us scream about high employment. More than 70 million people are gainfully employed at higher rates than ever before in the history of the country. That is a greater number than at any time in our own history, except for a few months in 1957. The achievement of the Republican administration has been tremendous.

Surely we have a sound basis for discussing the achievement of peace, prosperity and progress.

The two danger spots are the "gloom and doom screamers" of the Democratic Party's left wing, and the demands of Public Enemy No. 1, Walter Reuther, of the automotive industry.

If we can combat these two things, we can pull our country out of the Reuther recession and avoid a Democrat depression.

## Senator Kennedy Delineates Legislative Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, January 29, 1958*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY, in an address to the American Jewish Congress on November 17, 1957, pointed out the great issues which call for action by this Congress. The following article, based upon this address, appeared in the December 9, 1957, issue of Congress Weekly:

AGENDA FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION
(JOHN F. KENNEDY)

There are those today who say there are no great issues, no real differences between American political parties, no problems that burn as fiercely as those that captured the attention of all the Nation in the thirties and during the war. This is said to be particularly true in the area of domestic legislation. All the great battles born in the dark days of depression have been won; the cry for economic and social justice is no longer heard and is no longer necessary, it is said. And this, I am afraid, may well be the prevailing opinion in this age of credit-inflated prosperity, falsely based complacency, and drug-induced tranquility, where personality and party labels appear to mean more at the polls than national issues and leadership. But the truth of the matter is that our needs are great and our agenda is long—that an accumulation of problems too long postponed or denied cry out for our attention in Washington in the next session of Congress.

Perhaps the most pressing problem confronting us in this area of social and economic legislation is that posed by the health needs of our older citizens—those who are, in the words of the songwriter, "too old to work and too young to die." The evidence is clear that these older people are sick and disabled more often, for a longer period of time, with less money to buy medical care and fewer opportunities to take out health insurance, than any other group in the country. The fast-growing health-insurance plans of this country, which have taken amazing strides in the past decade in offering medical care at a reasonable cost to a large share of our population, too often exclude from their membership those over 65—or charge them extra-premium rates—or are understandably unable to meet their special needs of chronic illness and long-term disability in a program that is geared to the health needs of the general population and necessarily limited in the amount and kind of services provided. As the spectacular rise in life expectancy increases to vast proportions the number of older people in our society who have left the labor market, and as the cost to their families and our public-welfare programs of supporting them through long chronic illnesses continues to rise, the problem has become a crisis we can no longer ignore. We must amend our social-security laws and meet this problem without further delay.

Another problem which I can predict with certainty will be calling out for attention during the coming year, and every year until we meet it squarely, is the deplorable shortage of public-school classrooms in this country. How can we match the scientific and technical output of the Russians, how can our teachers be expected to produce the Einsteins and the Fermis and the Comptons of the future, when nearly 1 million boys and girls are deprived by classroom shortage of full-time schooling because of inadequate classrooms, when millions more are held back in unwieldy classes of 40 or more? And how can a democracy endure—how can it successfully operate—unless every child is given a good education to enable it to set the policies for the country? I am hopeful that in the next Congress we will tackle this problem and do something about it.

Despite the existence of the Fair Labor Standards Act, it is a shocking fact that millions upon millions of workers in this country have no Federal protection against substandard wages. And they are the very ones who need it most—those whose wages are low and whose bargaining power is weak: handicapped workers, women, Negroes, and immigrants.

It is a disturbing fact that chronic areas of substantial labor surplus, high unemployment and economic stagnation have no coordinated, effective Federal machinery to help the businessmen and workers in some areas to snap out of their slump and prevent it from spreading. It is difficult to remember in these prosperous times that the average worker laid off in industry today receives an unemployment benefit which is only one-third of his paycheck—a drop in his purchasing power is felt all over his community—but as yet this nationwide problem has never been attacked in the most feasible and successful way through nationwide standards for the amount and duration of benefits.

Still other problem areas will demand our attention—increasing democracy in labor unions and curbing selfish racketeers, strengthening social security, requiring full disclosure of pension and welfare plans, providing decent housing for low-income families, urban renewal for our blighted cities, low-interest loans for middle-income housing, protection for natural gas consumers, eventually low-cost atomic power for our homes and factories, additional restraints on trusts and monopolies, and new forms of assistance to our Nation's small-business men.

We recognize these problems and we can only conclude, therefore, that something is wrong with the vision of those who say that there are no longer any great social and economic issues. I repeat: Our needs are great and our agenda is long. Our task now is to shape a responsible, progressive program, with deeds to match our words.

On one subject I am convinced Congressional action is long overdue; and that is the subject of immigration. For 5 years we have talked about immigration and naturalization legislation, about the injustices of the McCarran Act and the inadequacies of our various temporary refugee programs. This last year I was gratified at our modest success in amending these laws to admit some sixty to seventy thousand immigrants, to eliminate the mortgaging of quotas, to carry over unused refugee relief act quotas, and to make them available for refugees from the Middle East, Hungary, and elsewhere. From time to time other minor changes have been made, and a variety of alternative bills altering the national origins quota has been advanced. In much of this work, we miss the services of Senator Lehman who led the fight for a long time.

But it seems to me that a full-scale, comprehensive basic reexamination of our fundamental immigration policy is essential, not only by the Congress through its formal machinery but by the American people. We have become preoccupied with our own security, our own contentment, our own lives. Even when we open our doors to those fleeing from Budapest or Alexandria, even when we contribute to those organizations and programs which seek new homes for the oppressed and the homeless, we are thinking too often in terms of charity instead of humanity, in terms of propaganda advantages abroad, toleration instead of equal rights. We have though in terms of what a great Massachusetts poet, John Boyle O'Reilly, once called "organized charity, scrimped and iced, in the name of a cautious statistical Christ."

To this very day, myths persist concerning national origins and racial superiority, concerning America's capacity to absorb new immigrants and the immigrant's capacity to adjust. Our immigration laws have devolved into such a tangled mess than nobody quite knows what they are. The subject has become a matter of partisan politics and personal disputes; and a joint committee on immigration and nationality policy established under the McCarran Act has not been effective.

Our immigration policy is as much in need of a new look or agonizing reappraisal as our military or foreign policies. Such a reexamination may be possible through a high level Hoover Commission type study, similar to that provided in a bill I introduced for that purpose in the last Congress. Or it may be possible through a comprehensive reexamination of the law by the Congress itself. In any event, whichever approach is used, it seems to me that we ought to be in agreement now on the basic principles underlying any new study and new law.

We must recognize that we have come to the point in our consideration of immigration policy where we must cast off the outworn concepts inherited from previous generations and start afresh, postulating for ourselves new principles responsive to the needs of our time as we are given to see and understand them. Rather than tinker with a formula which is based upon outmoded statistical data and disprove philosophic foundations, we must set out to reconstruct a policy and law which conforms to our ideals of justice and civic morality, and recognizes modern techniques of social control over economic forces which make the wild and frightened cries of today's neo-Mathusians ring empty. No longer can the intelligent man of the 20th century accept absolute limitations on the ability of an economy to absorb additional immigrants and provide them with the physical necessities of life. We now understand that a dynamic, healthy, and expanding economy requires manpower and depends for its growth upon increased demand. Aggressive and imaginative application of the skills we have learned are the 20th century answer to those who would confine us in the long since discredited theories of bygone days.

This is not to say that a new American immigration policy would return to the open-ended standards that characterized our policy up until the end of World War I, which was oriented largely toward the requirements of a mushrooming economy and a rapid settlement of vast stretches of unpopulated western lands. I believe that our own national interest and, indeed, the interests of other nations who might send immigrants to us indicate that we should have a system of limited and selective migration to the United States. I believe further that there is no obligation or desirability on our part to admit without initial screening those who may become criminals, subversives, or public charges—or to admit others in a quantity or at a rate greater than even our own dynamic economy can absorb properly.

But it is the nature, not the existence, of limitations and qualifications which create an injustice in our immigration policy today.

There are very few responsible and thoughtful persons in the world who do not recognize that the United States, no longer in a position to absorb the large number of immigrants who were so essential to its growth during the 19th century, must now maintain a system of selective and regulated migration. The primary defect of our immigration policy as viewed by foreigners is not that it is restrictive, not even that it admits too few each year, but that it is based on false, discredited, or unjust principles.

Any comprehensive reexamination of American immigration policy must begin with a renewed declaration of basic American principles: That one group of citizens in a world now drawn together by hope and fear is not to be favored as more desirable than another group; that no American policy or legislation shall be based directly on race or national origins; that American citizens are not to be classified for the rest of their lives into two groups of widely differing rights and privileges, the native born and the naturalized; and that no program should encourage arbitrary, inhumane administrative machinery inexorably grinding out its decisions in terms of cold statutes and statistics without regard for human values and emotions.

I do not say that there should be no preference exercised, no distinctions made, no differences recognized. In a nation desperately short of engineering, scientific, medical, and other skills, I would rather see us give a preference to an immigrant because he is a nuclear physicist than because he is an Anglo-Saxon. I would rather see us admit those whose husbands or wives, parents or children have long awaited their coming to this country than those whose only claim to preference is the accidental color of their skin and hair. I would like to see us give preference to those who are refugees from religious or political persecution, or who have found conditions of residence in their country intolerable, those whose frustrating, poverty-stricken existence in a refugee camp only serves to feed the mills of Communist propaganda.

There may well be other categories to which we should give preference if our immigration policies are to be responsive to the real and current needs of our national interest. To fulfill this goal it may be necessary to establish an annual immigration quota, reflecting the current world conditions and American economic trends, and subject to a review by the Congress at periodic intervals to evaluate its effects on our Nation's economy and foreign relations.

Finally, any such reevaluation of immigration policy must streamline our administrative procedures in this area. We must be sure that they conform to reasonable standards of justice and that they do not vest excessive arbitrary power in the hands of overworked and harassed officials. Our very form of government is based upon a recognition of the principle that men are fallible, that checks and balances are necessary at every step and that those who have been denied visas, for example, ought to have some right of appeal.

The McCarran-Walter Act was passed over Presidential veto and there is no reason to believe that it is possible for us to change all of its features. We have to realize that we have to be conscious always of what it is possible for us to do. Therefore, I believe it absolutely essential, first of all, that we follow up our humanitarian admission of 30,000 Hungarian refugees of the great revolt by regularizing their status here, by changing it from that of parolees to holders of permanent visas, which will enable them to set out on the road toward citizenship.

Second. We should redistribute the annual quotas which today are wasted, either by administrative board who will take into account the needs of the United States and of the countries involved, or through redistribution on a proportionate basis to all countries having less than a quota of 7,000 each year.

Third. I believe that Congress should grant discretionary power to the executive branch to provide exceptions from the provisions of law in certain hardship cases.

Fourth. I am concerned that our immigration law with its quota set essentially on national or ethnic lines may well in operation have prevented the movement to this country of skilled workers and especially scientists and engineers who are so badly needed. Therefore, I propose to establish a pool of nonquota visas when it is determined that a visa is not ordinarily available to persons possessing skills essential to our national interests.

There are no easy solutions to these problems that will not bring new difficulties and displeasures with them, but neither are they easy problems. For whether we like it or not, whether we tell them to stay or not, there will always be Hungarians fleeing from Budapest, Jews leaving Warsaw, Italians leaving the poverty of their villages. In the words of the Irish poet at the time of the great Irish exodus induced by both famine and oppression:

"They are going, going, going, and we cannot bid them stay
For their fields are now the stranger's where the stranger's cattle stray,
But no foreign skies hold beauty like the rainy skies they knew.
Nor any night-wind cool the brow as did the foggy dew."

I do not predict with any certainty that we shall obtain such a comprehensive reexamination and revision of our immigration laws during the coming year. But I do say that such a step cannot be far away—that the course of human events proves conclusively that bigotry eventually gives way to knowledge, expediency yields to humanitarianism, repression gives way to liberty. The day cannot be far off when America will again have an immigration policy that all men can call fair, that all in need will deem generous. We want a policy that was best described by Stephen Wise in that memorable keynote address to the preliminary conference of the American Jewish Congress in 1916, when he said that "the only program worthy of a great and proud people * * * is not relief—but redress; not palliation—but prevention; not charity—but justice."

---

# SENATE

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1958

*(Legislative day of Monday, January 27, 1958)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. William E. Trice, D. D., pastor, the University Methodist Church, Baton Rouge, La., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of outer space and inner man: Cut through the redtape of our confused human thinking with the searing sacredness of Thy truth, that we may be commanded by the necessity of doing Thy will.

Light up our consciousness, O God of justice, with the knowledge of our accountable responsibility to Thee. Defend us, O God of power, from the evils of our age, to the extent of our faithfulness to Thy way. Let us be unafraid, O God of peace, of any heavenly body save one launched by Thine infinite power. Bend our wills to fit the pattern of Thy purposes.

Then, may Thy benediction, at last, be as surely deserved by our actions as it is freely given by Thy grace, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 29, 1958, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 439) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted with out payment of tariff, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 8216) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax, and it was signed by the Vice President.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THURMOND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, because of a death in his family.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. PASTORE, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Thailand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anthony F. Arpaia, of Connecticut, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1959.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to tell the Senate of my great approval of the nomination of my old friend and colleague, the Hon. Abe McGregor Goff, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

A better man could not have been chosen for this position. The State of Idaho, the Northwest, and the Nation as a whole can be proud that this man of integrity and decency has been so highly honored. I wish him the best of everything in the challenging position which he now will occupy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., 1956, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1956, PRIVATELY OWNED COMPANIES"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its recently issued publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1956, Privately Owned Companies" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4083, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PENITENTIARY IMPRISONMENT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4083, title 18, United States Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled in the General Accounting Office under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Iron County, Wis., favoring the placing of a tariff on all iron ore, steel, copper, plywood, and pulpwood imported into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Michael Osborne Cunningham, of Hilo, Hawaii, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Finance.

## RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and myself, I present a certified copy of resolution H. 1010, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, at the January session, 1958. This resolution is entitled "Resolution Urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission To Enact and Maintain Tariff Rates on Textile Imports."

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textile imports

Whereas manufacturing is the foundation of the Rhode Island economy; and

Whereas the Rhode Island textile industry represents about 30 percent of all manufacturing employment and a total investment of $300 million; and

Whereas imports of textiles, particularly woolens and worsteds, seriously affect the manufacturers of domestic goods; and

Whereas recent studies by the United States Bureau of Labor statistics indicate the large wage differential between foreign and domestic producers places American manufacturers at a decided competitive disadvantage; and

Whereas the continued decline in textiles has caused a loss of 34,000 jobs in 10 years with unemployment resulting: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be urged to insist on increasing and maintaining proper tariff and quota protection on the imports of woolen and worsted textiles; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States and in particular the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives take every legislative precaution in enacting proper legislation to ensure the creation and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textile imports; and be it further

*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the Tariff Commission of the United States, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance and to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and to the Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to bring about the enactment and maintenance of tariff and quota rates on the import of textile goods to the end that the manufacture and sale of such goods in the United States are not jeopardized.

## REPORT ENTITLED "TAX PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS" (S. REPT. NO. 1237)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report of that committee entitled "Tax Problems of Small Business," which was ordered to be printed.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, Mr. IVES, Mr. MORSE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LONG, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3187. A bill to strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of peace, and assure the intellectual preeminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof; to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; to inform our scientists promptly and effectively of the results of research and study carried on in the United States and throughout the world; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 3188. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3189. A bill to modify the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin in order to provide for certain payments to the cities of Mandan and Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 3190. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the 75th anniversary of the founding of the University of Texas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3191. A bill to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3192. A bill for the relief of Edeltraud Maria Theresia Collom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3193. A bill for the relief of Vincent R. Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. HOBLITZELL):

S. 3194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to establish an initial program of tax adjustment for small and independent business and for persons engaged in small and independent business; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

## DESIGNATION OF YEAR 1960 AS "VISIT U. S. A. YEAR"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BEALL, FULBRIGHT, FLANDERS, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, IVES, POTTER, and WILEY, I submit a concurrent resolution calling upon President Eisenhower to proclaim 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year." The concurrent resolution further requests the President to call upon all agencies and departments of Government as well as private organizations and individuals in the United States, to cooperate in encouraging persons from foreign countries to visit the United States. A companion concurrent resolution is being submitted in the House today by 10 Members from both sides of the aisle.

"Visit U. S. A. Year" is a natural and highly desirable followup to the President's invitation inviting foreign visitors here "as a vital step in the direction of international understanding and world peace." In addition, in light of the new agreement on cultural exchanges between ourselves and the Soviet Union, setting aside a special year in which to encourage international travel has the added advantage of furthering the aims embodied in the exchange agreement—expanded interchange of ideas, mutual understanding, stimulation of foreign trade and improvement of the domestic economy. Travel is an important source of revenue and can become even more important both to the United States and to other nations. In 1956 the 1,243,000 Americans who traveled abroad outside of Canada and Mexico spent about $1,275 million, a little more than half of that in free Europe itself. Approximately 350,000 persons from areas outside Canada and Mexico traveled in the United States, and spent $750 million here.

I believe that the resolution will emphasize the importance of Federal participation in the promotion of world travel, both as a spur to business and as a component of our foreign policy. Most foreign governments maintain a national tourist or travel office and in our own country, 43 of the 48 States maintain official State travel promotion offices. Furthermore, tourism ranks among the first 5 principal industries of the 48 States. By direction of the President and pursuant to section 7 (m) of the Mutual Security Act of 1957, Presidential Assistant Clarence Randall, head of the President's Committee on Facilitation and Promotion of International Travel, is conducting a study, with the cooperation of the various executive departments concerned, as well as private enterprise, of the barriers to international travel and ways and means of promoting, developing, encouraging, and facilitating such travel in the mutual interests of the United States and our free world friends.

The results of this study should aid greatly in the finding of means to encourage and facilitate this international travel, so important in terms of strengthening bonds between peoples.

However, in the meantime, while awaiting those results, we should extend the hand of welcome to people in foreign countries and encourage them to visit the United States. We are confronted by many problems in that connection, such as foreign exchange and the cost of travel, and so forth, but the auspices provided by the concurrent resolution will give us a real opportunity to make immeasurable progress toward our putting out a real welcome mat for all people in the world who wish to see how we live and what we really are like. I trust the concurrent resolution will receive prompt approval.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59), submitted by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the President, in a letter extensively circulated throughout the world in seven languages, has cordially invited foreign visitors to this country and in so doing stated: "America welcomes visits of those from abroad as a vital step in the direction of international understanding and world peace"; and

Whereas 43 of the 48 States maintain official State travel promotion offices and tourism ranks among the first 5 principal industries of each of the 48 United States; and

Whereas visits by foreign residents to the United States, its Territories, and possessions provide for an expanded intercharge of ideas, increased mutual understanding, stimulation of foreign trade and improvement of the domestic economy; and

Whereas more than 350,000 individuals from foreign nations other than our immediate neighbors of Canada and Mexico visit the United States annually; and

Whereas improved financial and political conditions in most foreign nations now make it possible for nationals of these countries to visit the United States in increasing numbers; and

Whereas international and domestic travel organizations, both commercial and governmental, are working to promote travel to and within the United States during 1960 when new jet airliners, modern ships and units of the national highway system are due to be placed in service and other new tourist facilities, services, celebrations, and attractions will be offered as additional inducements to visit the United States: Now, therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the President is requested to issue a proclamation designating the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year," and to call upon all agencies and departments of the Government as well as private organizations and individuals in the United States to cooperate during such year in encouraging people from foreign countries to visit the United States.

## NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators SPARKMAN, FULBRIGHT, MURRAY, PASTORE, LANGER, HUMPHREY, KERR, IVES, MORSE, KEFAUVER, JACKSON, HENNINGS, SCOTT, YARBOROUGH, SYMINGTON, MAGNUSON, GREEN, PROXMIRE, CHAVEZ, MONRONEY, DOUGLAS, MANSFIELD, KENNEDY, LONG, CARROLL, and NEUBERGER, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "National Defense Education Act of 1958."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3187) to strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of peace, and assure the intellectual preeminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines, and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof; to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; to inform our scientists promptly and effectively of the results of research and study carried on in the United States and throughout the world; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Americans have always been proud of our educational system, and rightly so. We are especially proud of the hundreds of thousands of dedicated men and women teachers, administrators, counselors, and others who each year give so much of themselves to the education of our youth.

Recent events, however, have dramatically demonstrated that the education of our youth is a matter of grave concern to all. This was forcefully testified to in public hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by Dr. Wernher von Braun, the famous missile expert, and by Dr. Edward Teller, the father of the H-bomb. Dr. von Braun said that the education and training of scientists and other personnel is a matter of national survival. Dr. Teller said "This we have to do or our way of life will not survive." We read every day of the large number of Soviet scientists and engineers who are being graduated to take their places in the Soviet machine, aimed at world domination. That Soviet educational efforts in science have been successful is testified to by Sputniks I and II. Only this morning Dr. Teller told the committee that "There is every indication that leadership in science is slipping out of the hands of the United States into the hands of the Russians."

The Federal Government, from the very beginning, has had the responsibility, under our Constitution, for providing for the national defense. The needs of national defense require that the Federal Government act at this time to stimulate and encourage local and State educational agencies in efforts to increase the depth and broaden the scope of their educational programs. We must and can discharge this responsibility without interfering with State and local control and administration of education.

Mr. President, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is based on three fundamental principles:

First. State and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education.

Second. In the present emergency, the national defense requires Federal assistance to stimulate States, local communities, schools, colleges, and universities, teachers, and individual students through a broad program designed to insure world scientific supremacy for the United States.

Third. The Nation must have a balanced education program. To achieve this, greater emphasis must be placed in the years ahead on the quality of education in the sciences, mathematics, engineering, foreign languages and the technical skills essential to the Nation's defense.

Mr. President, the bill presents a well-rounded program of emergency assistance designed to stimulate and assist education at all levels. Although the bill in its present form is the result of many months of consultations with some of America's foremost scientists and educators, we recognize that the problem is of such wide scope and so vital to the defense of the Nation that valuable additions, revisions, and modifications may possibly result from the hearings now in progress before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

This title contains the finds and declaration of policy on which the bill is based, a prohibition of Federal control of education, and a section setting forth the definitions of terms used throughout the bill.

TITLE II—NATIONAL DEFENSE SCHOLARSHIPS

Forty thousand new, 4-year scholarships will be granted each year for 6 years to high-school graduates selected solely on the basis of merit by State commissions on scholarships and student loans, with special consideration being given to students with superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages. The scholarships will entitle the recipients to a grant of $1,000 for each year of the scholarship.

Twenty thousand additional scholarships, to be granted on a similar basis, are authorized for the first year of the program to go to students who are already attending college and who are therefore ineligible to compete for national defense scholarships.

TITLE III—NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOANS

Forty million dollars are authorized for each of 6 years for loans to needy college students in amounts not exceeding $1,000 per student per year. Preference is given to students whose academic background indicates superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or foreign languages. The loan is repayable at 2 percent interest, starting 1 year after completion of higher education, and must be repaid within 10 years. If, however, the borrower serves as a full-time teacher, the loan is canceled at the rate of 20 percent for each year he teaches.

TITLE IV—WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

Grants totaling $25 million for each of 6 years are authorized to be made to institutions of higher education on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis, to provide needy undergraduate students with jobs in the institutions. To the maximum extent practicable, the jobs will be in work relating to the courses being taken by the students. Preference will be given to students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign languages.

TITLE V—SCIENCE TEACHING FACILITIES

*A. Assistance to State educational agencies*

Grants totaling $40 million are to be made annually for 6 years to State educational agencies for the acquisition of specialized equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages, and for the minor alteration of teaching facilities used in connection with the above subjects. The Federal funds

would be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis by State or local educational agencies.

*B. Assistance to institutions of higher education*

Grants totaling $40 million are to be made annually for 6 years to institutions of higher education for the acquisition of specialized equipment suitable for use in providing undergraduate education in science, mathematics, engineering or modern foreign languages, and for the minor alteration of teaching facilities used in connection with the above subjects. The Federal funds would be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis by institutions of higher education receiving Federal funds.

TITLE VI—SUMMER SCHOOL AND EXTENSION COURSES FOR TEACHERS

Grants totaling $100 million for each of 6 years are authorized to assist public school elementary and secondary schoolteachers to improve their teaching ability and knowledge of the subjects they teach by taking advanced studies in summer sessions or extension courses offered by institutions of higher education. Teachers would be selected by the appropriate State educational agency and would receive stipends while attending advanced courses.

TITLE VII—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

One thousand fellowships in the first year and 1,500 in each of the 5 succeeding years will be granted graduate students who are preparing to become teachers in colleges and universities. Fellowship stipends for living expenses are paid for 3 years on a rising scale, plus additional amounts for each dependent. An individual awarded a graduate fellowship is also paid amounts necessary to cover the cost of instruction, within certain limits, at the institution he is attending.

TITLE VIII—GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

*A. State programs*

Grants of $15 million for each of 6 years are made to State educational agencies to assist in establishing programs of guidance and counseling in secondary schools, to identify students with outstanding mental ability, advise them of courses of study, encourage them to complete secondary schooling, and to take the necessary courses for admission to college, and enter college after completing secondary schooling. After the second year of the program, States would be required to match the Federal funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

*B. Institutes in guidance and counseling*

For contract arrangements with institutions of higher education $6 million is authorized for each of 6 years to provide for summer institute courses to secondary schoolteachers in the counseling and guidance of secondary school students, with particular emphasis on gifted students. Stipends are paid teachers attending these courses. Tuition and fees are also paid for by the Federal Government.

TITLE IX—SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE CONSULTANTS

Grants of $10 million for each of 6 years are made to State educational agencies for programs to make available to science, mathematics, and language teachers in secondary schools information about advances in knowledge and current teaching methods, devices, and textbooks in their fields. After the second year of the program, States would be required to match the Federal funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

TITLE X—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

An institute is created in the United States Office of Education for research and experimentation to develop and evaluate projects involving television, radio, motion pictures, and other auditory and visual aids which may prove of value in State and local educational agencies and institutions of higher education. Grants-in-aid may be made to public or nonprofit private agencies or contracts may be made with such agencies for this research.

The Commissioner of Education will acquire motion pictures, kinescopes, video tapes, film strips, slides, recordings, magnetic tapes, radio and TV scripts, etc., for adaptation, to be made available upon request to State and local educational agencies.

For these programs, $5 million is authorized for the first year and $10 million for each of the succeeding 5 years.

TITLE XI—CONGRESSIONAL CITATIONS

Congressional citations for outstanding scholarship achievement are awarded annually to high-school graduates throughout the country who rank scholastically in the highest 5 percent of their graduating class.

TITLE XII—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN OCCUPATIONS ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

An authorization of $20 million a year is made available to the States to encourage the further promotion and development of area vocational education programs in occupations essential to national defense. The allocation of these funds guarantees immediate expansion of vocational training for technicians and needed skilled workers.

TITLE XIII—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

The National Science Foundation will establish a Science Information Service to provide for indexing, abstracting, translating, and disseminating scientific information, of both domestic and foreign origin, either by the Service itself or by grants or contracts with private organizations, professional associations, or Government agencies.

TITLE XIV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

This title contains a section establishing a National Advisory Council on Science and Education, provides for judicial review in certain instances of decisions of the Commissioner of Education, and in general contains various routine administrative provisions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table until the close of the session of the Senate on Monday next, to give an opportunity to any other Senators who may wish to do so to join in sponsoring the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It is an honor to join my colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in this bill, which meets with bold and magnificent vision America's duty toward universal education.

While volume is not always a test of value, the completeness of Senator HILL's bill is proof of his thoroughness, his grasp of America's educational values, and his purpose that this Nation—first to advocate universal education as an opportunity for the individual—shall now be given new strength when it may well be a matter of national survival.

All of us—all of America—all of the free world—can be grateful for the research, the dedication and devotion, that has produced this result—this educational milestone in national concern acting through community control.

The measure has all the attributes of ideal education itself—universal, individual, flexible, diversified, practicable, realizable, professional, and progressive.

I shall make no attempt to catalog the 12 areas in which schools and scholars, teachers and teaching facilities, will reach out to new horizons. For there is no Member of Congress, no newspaper or magazine, no educator, no public-spirited citizen who will not study this great work and take it to heart as a serious, sincere, and commonsense approach to the educational challenge of our people.

When only three-fourths of one penny out of every dollar of our national product is spent on higher education, when only 30 percent of our high-school graduates get to college, it is high time that we have a brave attack like this upon the problem. We can at least seek for quality if we cannot match the population of our most cruel competitor. We can no longer afford education as usual, for the times and the future are most unusual.

We can starve and stint our own education if we are foolhardy, but we can place no restraints on the full fling of education in lands where the aim is not for the opportunity of the student, but rather for the interest of the State.

And, believe me, the interests of such a State do not necessarily include the preservation of America. The preservation of America, her leadership and the obligations America has to freedom everywhere, is the goal of great thinkers like the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Generations of freemen will rise to be grateful to him for his vision and dedication to American education and the welfare of its people.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his most kind and exceedingly generous words. He and I were privileged to serve together on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was a source of great regret to me that the demands of duty required him to relinquish his membership on that committee to go to another very important committee.

Surely it is a source of tremendous gratification, knowing the devotion and dedication of the Senator from Rhode Island to the cause of education, that in endeavoring to pass this legislation we shall have him with us, and have the benefit of his wisdom, his active help, and his tremendous driving power.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am deeply honored to join the great Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the cosponsorship of his 6-year emergency national defense education program bill. As the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has said, this is an excellent bill drafted by an exceedingly wise public servant. At the same time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to join the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in sponsoring the Education Act of 1957, S. 1134.

The Hill-Elliott bill primarily provides funds to improve higher education in America.

The Morse-Clark bill provides $1 billion a year exclusively and entirely for primary and secondary education.

Mr. President, I am taking the unusual step of asking to be associated with this Morse-Clark bill, which was introduced last year, because the big education job that must be accomplished by the American people is in the grade schools and high schools of America. As a former State legislator in Wisconsin, and a three-time candidate for governor of my State, I am convinced that we cannot and will not provide the grade- and high-school system which America must have to survive if we continue to rely exclusively on local property taxes and State sales and income taxes. Wisconsin children are not getting an adequate education because local property taxes in my State simply cannot pay for the education they need and deserve.

The war of tomorrow will be won or prevented in the classrooms of today. That means in the grade school and high school, as well as university classrooms of today.

I respectfully suggest that the Hill-Elliott and Morse-Clark bills make a comprehensive package that will enable Congress to do the education job that must be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor of a bill which has been introduced and already referred to committee. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to add to the statements made by several of my colleagues by saying that I am happy in joining today as a cosponsor of proposed legislation for a comprehensive program of Federal scholarships in higher educational levels, particularly in the realm of science, which is to be introduced soon by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

All of us recognize the senior Senator from Alabama as one of those who have been preeminent and foremost in the introduction and sponsorship of educational legislation. I, myself, particularly honor him for his origination of the oil-for-education proposal, which would have used tideland oil receipts for the support of the schools in all the 48 States. I only regret that that forward-looking recommendation of the Senator from Alabama was not adopted.

However, I should like to join in the statement made earlier by the very distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], in emphasizing the fact that in our concentration on higher education, we must not forget the elementary schools and the high schools of the Nation. I doubt very much if any program in the field of higher education will be successful unless we shore up the grade schools and high schools by providing additional financial support for them. We cannot erect a sound edifice on a weak foundation.

I daresay that the great scientists of our time, as well as of earlier times, such as Einstein, Teller, Newton, Fermi, and many others, were not only products of academies and colleges and universities, and of the great scientific laboratories, but were products also of the elementary schools and high schools, and perhaps, even of kindergartens and nursery schools. Development of their talents began with their first entrance into any classroom.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has labored long and effectively in drafting the National Defense Education Act of 1958. I consider it a privilege and an honor to be one of the group of Senators who have joined the Senator from Alabama as cosponsors of the bill

I take this means of commending the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama for his resolute leadership in preparing a strong education bill. The measure just introduced provides not only for more scientific and technical training; it also places additional and much-needed emphasis on foreign languages and the humanities.

It is a broad, forward-looking, and imaginative program; it is an important step forward in meeting the critical needs of the times.

A million young Americans of college age are not in college because of financial inability to go. One-half of the top 30 percent, scholastically of high-school graduates never go to college a day because of financial adversity.

Our most precious resource is the human resource, and it is the most neglected and wasted of all. We dam our rivers, conserve our oil, and enrich our soil, but we let our youth go untrained.

Mr. President, America sleeps on the question of education. Courses that are easy to pass replace courses with an intellectual appeal. It is time that the emphasis in education be on education.

Included in the measure is a declaration of policy that States and local communities have and must retain the responsibility for and control of public education. Yet, in addition to the responsibilities of the States, the forward steps to be effected by the bill recognize the importance of those programs which are vital to national defense and which otherwise would be dangerously delayed due to inadequate financial resources.

I am honored to join with the distinguished chairman as a cosponsor of the bill.

---

## PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AGE OF WORKERS IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the truly agonizing aspects of modern industrial life is the tendency to discard workers past the age of 40, or to refuse to hire men and women past this particular age. A great deal of suffering, humiliation and loss to our economy have been caused by this practice.

Discrimination based on age is, in my opinion, as reprehensible as discrimination which originates in racial or religious bigotry. Therefore, I am introducing legislation today to forbid "any supplier or contractor of our Government from imposing any requirement or limitation of maximum age with respect to the hiring or employment of persons."

The distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] has emphasized the urgent need for additional defense contracts to produce missiles and other weapons. This means there will be more industries, manufacturers, and contractors supplying the Government than ever before. My bill would prevent these firms from discrimination against prospective or actual employees because of age.

The original suggestion for such legislation was made to me by an outstanding organization which has pioneered this cause for many years. I refer to the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of which I am pleased to be a member of long standing. Jobs Over 40 is the name of a crusade the Eagles have sponsored for a long period. Indeed, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has prepared a very comprehensive bill to prevent discrimination in virtually all employment when that discrimination stems from age.

My proposed bill is far less sweeping or universal in its provisions than that contemplated by the Senator from New York. Therefore, it does not conflict in any way with his legislation but, rather, supplements and accompanies it. My bill would apply only to suppliers of the Government, and such firms already are subjected to special provisions with regard to hiring practices and other matters.

I desire to point out that I have communicated at length with Judge Robert W. Hansen, of Milwaukee, Wis., chairman of the national program of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and he has indicated to me his general support of the bill I am introducing in the Senate today.

I am introducing this bill for myself and my colleagues, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. The title of this proposed legislation, I might add, is "A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors."

Congress already has wisely enacted the Yates amendment, which forbids the imposition of age restrictions as a qualification for direct employment with the Federal Government. My bill would extend the Yates amendment, in essence, to Government contractors.

I ask that my bill appear in the RECORD, along with several brief articles on this vital question from the December 1957, number of the Eagle, which is the monthly magazine of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3188) to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U. S. C. 35–45), is amended (1) by striking out "and" following the semicolon in subsection (d), (2) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) That the contractor will not expressly or in practice impose any requirement or limitation of maximum age with respect to the hiring or employment of persons, except such requirements or limitations, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, relating to specific jobs or types of employment as are reasonably designed to protect older workers from tasks which they could not ordinarily because of their age be expected to perform safely or efficiently."

The articles presented by Mr. NEUBERGER are as follows:

[From the Eagle magazine of December 1957]

EAGLES GO ALL OUT IN OPPOSING DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BASED ONLY ON AGE LIMITATIONS—JOBS AFTER 40 IS A MAJOR EAGLE CAMPAIGN

"Will You Be Through at 40?" was the provocative title of a recent article in the American Weekly. Following are excerpts of the article, proof—if we need any—of the importance of the Eagle Jobs-After-40 campaign, one of the most important on the Fraternal Order of Eagles schedule:

Losing their jobs through no fault of their own, 2 and 3 million men and women are finding themselves, in the prime of life, up against a stone wall of discrimination based solely upon their age.

More than half of all openings for salesmen are restricted to men under 35.

Over one-third of all job orders from banking, real-estate, transportation, communication, and public-utility companies specify 35 as the maximum hiring-age limit.

More than half of all job openings in factories and offices are today firmly closed to men of 45 and women over 40.

Hiring discrimination based upon age has not been diminishing. Instead, like a cancer, it has been growing from year to year.

In 1948, for instance the New York Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging made a statewide check of employment practices. It found that 39 percent of all firms were consistently refusing jobs to men and women over 40. This spring the same committee held a new series of hearings and discovered that on Long Island the proportion of job orders that barred the over-40's had soared to a staggering 67.2 percent.

Congress passed the Yates amendment, prohibiting the imposition of age restrictions as a qualification for Federal employment. Thus, today, nearly a half million Federal job opportunities are being filled, every year, on the basis of ability and experience, irrespective of the birth date of the applicants.

In State and municipal government, scores of thousands of jobs are still being barred to the middle-aged. A recent Labor Department survey found that more than a third of all local government positions specified 45 as the maximum hiring age and that 19 percent of all such jobs were restricted to men and women under 45.

Whether we need new laws—or far more extensive older worker counseling and placement programs—is still open to debate. Probably we need both. For age bias threatens an even larger number of us.

---

SENATOR NEUBERGER WILL AID "JOBS OVER 40" DRIVE

Eagle Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, a longtime member of Portland (Oreg.) Aerie No. 4, recently revealed that he plans to introduce in the next session of Congress legislation to forbid discrimination because of age in all jobs involving Federal defense contracts. Senator NEUBERGER voiced strong sentiments in favor of the Eagle "Jobs Over 40" program at last winter's Washington regional conference.

"As one who has long fought to preserve our Nation's natural resources, I surely intend to plunge into this fight to preserve our most valuable resource—our manpower," said Senator NEUBERGER. "Job discrimination based on age is depriving our Nation of a vast reservoir of skill and experience. We cannot long afford such a waste. Every study which has come to my attention indicates that older men can be just as valuable to employers as those who have not passed an arbitrary age barrier."

---

## ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL SERIES OF STAMPS COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the University of Texas will this year observe the 75th anniversary of its formal opening.

Ceremonies marking the first day of life for the university took place on September 15, 1883. Establishment of the university was provided for by the Texas Constitution adopted in 1876.

Mr. President, during the last three-quarters of a century the University of Texas has grown into a great institution providing higher education for more than 17,000 students annually. It is an integral part of the life of my State, a source of pride to all Texans—who, I should add, are determined to continue year after year improving the already high quality of the education offered at the university.

It is fitting that the 75th anniversary of the founding of the University of Texas should be commemorated by the issuance by the Post Office Department of a special series of stamps. I am accordingly introducing a bill calling on the Postmaster General to take action to issue such a series. I am hopeful that he will act speedily so that the Federal Government may participate in the celebration of this significant event.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3190) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorating the 75th anniversary of the founding of the University of Texas, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## VINCENT R. GONZALES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Vincent R. Gonzales. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3193) for the relief of Vincent R. Gonzales, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding the act entitled "An act providing for the barring of claims against the United States," approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061), the Comptroller General of the United States shall (1) receive and consider any claim filed, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, by Vincent R. Gonzales, of Portland, Oreg., for travel expenses incurred by him while employed as an auditor for the Public Housing Administration during the period November 3, 1946, through March 31, 1947, and (2) certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount, if any, determined to be owing on such claim. Any amount so certified shall be paid to Vincent R. Gonzales by the Secretary of the Treasury out of any funds not otherwise appropriated.

---

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 3097, the Labor Reports Act of 1958; Senate bill 3093, to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended; and Senate bill 3099, to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS UNDER DOMESTIC TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 29, 1958,

The names of Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, CARROLL, GOLDWATER, HAYDEN, MURRAY, WATKINS, and MANSFIELD were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3186) to extend for 1 year certain programs established under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN on January 29, 1958.

---

## BRUCELLOSIS CONTROL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] introduced Senate bill 3183, which deals with the great brucellosis threat which confronts some of the

cattle herds of the United States and which, through them, endangers the health of many of our people, because brucellosis, as medical science points out, is a cause of undulant fever, that has such a devastating effect on the health of too many Americans. I should be very much pleased to return to the junior Senator from Wisconsin the expression of confidence which he expressed in the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and me this morning, when he asked to join as a sponsor of our education bill. I have already spoken to the Senator from Wisconsin about this, and I ask unanimous consent to be a cosponsor of the Proxmire brucellosis bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

*Ordered*, That Mr. CARROLL be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Public Works and assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary.

That Mr. YARBOROUGH be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Address on the subject America in Crisis, delivered by Senator JAVITS before the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco, January 17, 1958.

## NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Clark W. Gregory, of Michigan, to be United States marshal, eastern district of Michigan.

Edward L. McCarthy, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, February 6, 1958, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

## ANALYSES OF THE LABOR REPORTS ACT OF 1958 AND BILLS AMENDING THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 27, 1958, I introduced three bills which would carry out the proposals made in the President's labor message of the same date. These bills are S. 3097, the Labor Reports Act of 1958; and S. 3098 and S. 3099, which would amend the Taft-Hartley Act in several respects.

At the time of the introduction of these bills, we did not have the analysis of them which usually accompanies such proposed legislation. Inasmuch as I have now received these detailed explanations, section by section, of the bills, I feel it appropriate that they be inserted in the RECORD at this time. In light of the importance of this proposed legislation and our desire to consider it at the earliest possible opportunity, I feel that the explanatory statements should be before the entire Senate, for study before the hearings begin.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that these full statements, prepared by the Department of Labor, be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF A BILL FOR THE ENACTMENT OF THE LABOR REPORTS ACT OF 1958

This bill would carry out the recommendations of President Eisenhower for legislation to provide greater protections for the rights of individual workers and the public in the administration of labor organization affairs.

As recommended by the President, the bill would:

1. Provide for reporting to the Department of Labor on an annual basis of those financial affairs and transactions of labor organizations which should be managed and conducted in the interests of the workers represented by such organizations;

2. Provide for reporting to the Department of Labor on an annual basis of information as to the constitutions, bylaws, and organizational structure and procedures of labor organizations which govern the rights and obligations of their members;

3. Provide for appropriate annual reporting to show that labor organizations select their officers through secret vote of the members on due notice and not less often than once in every 4 years;

4. Require labor organizations to keep proper records on the matters of which reports are required, which are open to the scrutiny of all of their members;

5. Provide for appropriate disclosure of the information reported by labor organizations and insure that the public interest in carrying out the objectives of such organizations in representing workers is protected by opening the reports to public scrutiny;

6. Require all financial transactions between labor and management representatives which may reflect conflicts of interests in labor-management relations to be reported by labor organizations, their agents and representatives, and employers;

7. Confirm by Federal law the fiduciary responsibilities of persons entrusted with the funds of labor organizations and provide for the enforcement of these responsibilities through representative suits in the Federal or State courts;

8. Provide in the Department of Labor a Commissioner of Labor Reports to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who will be available to the Secretary of Labor for the performance of functions given him by this legislation and by related legislation for reporting and disclosure of employee welfare and pension plan information;

9. Provide the authority necessary for effective administration of the program, including authority to investigate violations, subpena witnesses, hold hearings, and compel testimony and the production of books and records;

10. Authorize actions for injunctions against violations.

11. Provide administrative procedures for withdrawing, in a proper case and subject to judicial review, certain rights and privileges where violations amount to a willful failure to file a true and proper report. Rights and privileges which could be withdrawn for an appropriate period or periods include:

(a) Recognition or certification pursuant to Federal laws of a labor organization as the representative of employees;

(b) Access to procedures of Federal agencies such as the National Labor Relations Board which exercise decisional functions in labor-management relations matters;

(c) Tax exemptions provided for labor organizations by the Internal Revenue Code.

12. Prescribe criminal penalties for willful violations and other wrongdoing, including:

(a) False filing (False Information Act made applicable);

(b) Embezzlement of union funds;

(c) False entries and wrongful destruction of union books and records;

(d) Bribery by union or employer representatives in matters affecting labor-management relations.

Through its reporting and disclosure provisions, the bill would open to scrutiny of the interested union members and the public those areas in which malfeasance and misfeasance by those entrusted with union affairs could otherwise go on undetected with the protection of a cloak of secrecy. Irregularities and abuses of the kinds reported in recent investigations can be largely eliminated, without the necessity of direct governmental regulation of union affairs, by the provisions of this bill which would bring into the open the acts and transactions of a financial or procedural nature in which breaches of trust could occur. The fact that these acts and transactions would be subject to scrutiny would deter wrongdoing, and if it nevertheless occurred, the bill's provisions would enable union members to enforce fiduciary responsibilities for union funds and would authorize criminal prosecutions for willful acts in disregard of these responsibilities. Appropriate provision for administrative action and for injunctions against violations of the law's requirements would further aid the effectiveness of the reporting and disclosure program.

A summary discussion of the bill by title and section follows:

Section 1 of the bill provides a short title for the legislation, the Labor Reports Act of 1958.

Section 2 of the bill consists of the Congressional findings and policy showing the relationship of its subject matter to the free flow of commerce, the revenue of the United States, and the general welfare.

TITLE I—REPORTING AND DISCLOSURES

*Applicability to labor organizations*

Section 101: This section makes the act applicable to every labor organization engaged in activities affecting commerce or affording a basis for exemption from taxation under provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. This includes local, national, and international unions as well as local, State, and regional conferences and councils.

Obligations of Labor Organizations

Section 102: Section 102 requires each labor organization to file annually with the Secretary of Labor, in the form and manner which the Secretary of Labor shall prescribe by regulations, certain reports and other documents concerning its organization, procedures, and financial affairs and make copies of these reports available to each of its

members. The reports required to be filed include copies by each organization of its constitution and bylaws together with reports showing details of its procedures with respect to such things as requirements and qualifications for and restrictions on membership meetings and elections, selection of certain officers and agents, levying of assessments, imposition of fines, authorization for disbursement of union funds, audit of union financial transactions, expulsion of members, and procedure with respect to authorization for bargaining demands and strike authorization.

A report concerning its financial affairs must also be filed annually by each organization showing, among other things, the assets and liabilities of the organization at the close of its last fiscal year and its financial activities during the year. In addition, the reports must contain a detailed explanation of the receipt by its officers or representatives of any thing of value from certain employers, except transactions permitted by section 302 (c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended. In accordance with the regulations issued by the Secretary, the organization must retain the basic records on the matters required to be reported for not less than 3 years for inspection by the Secretary or members of the organization. At the time of filing, the union must certify that not less than once every 4 years the members in good standing are permitted, after due notice, to elect their local officers directly by secret ballot and to elect their national officers in the same manner or through representatives to delegate bodies elected directly by secret ballot.

Reports of Labor-Management Financial Dealings

Section 103: This section requires any officer or other representative of a labor organization who receives or gives anything of value either directly or indirectly from or to certain employers to make a contemporaneous record of the transaction and file a detailed report with the Secretary. Similar records and reports must also be made and filed by the employer concerned. No report is necessary, however, for transactions permitted by section 302 (c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended.

Disclosure of Reported Information

Section 104: Section 104 permits the Secretary to disclose publicly the information received under sections 102 and 103 and to use the information for such studies and reports as he deems appropriate. Any person may inspect the material, and copies of any report or document may be obtained upon payment of a charge based on the cost of the service. The Secretary may make available or require a labor organization or employer to furnish a State agency copies of any reports in that State if requested by the Governor.

TITLE II—FUNDS AND PROPERTY OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Fiduciary Responsibilities

Section 201: Section 201 places any officer or other representative of a labor organization in a position of trust with respect to any money or other property in his possession by virtue of his position and makes him responsible for it in a fiduciary capacity.

Judicial Enforcement

Section 202: This section provides that union members may bring a class action in any court of competent jurisdiction for appropriate relief because of any act or omission of an official in disregard of any right or responsibility under section 201.

Section 203: Section 203 gives Federal district courts jurisdiction of actions under section 202.

Effect on State Laws

Section 204: Section 204 makes it clear that this title in no way reduces or limits the responsibilities of union officials under State law or bars any remedy of union members under State law.

TITLE III—ADMINISTRATION, ENFORCEMENT, AND PENALTIES

*General administration*

Section 301: The Secretary is authorized under this section to administer the act and to prescribe such procedures, make such expenditures, and hire such personnel as will be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Section 302: This section provides for the appointment by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate of a Commissioner of Labor Reports who will carry out the functions delegated to him by the Secretary under this or any other law.

Investigations, Administrative Proceedings and Injunctions

Section 303: Section 303 authorizes the Secretary to investigate the accuracy, completeness and truth or falsity of information reported under the act. He also has authority under this section to investigate whether any person has violated the act and to investigate any other matter necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. For the purposes of these investigations, the Secretary has the authority to hold hearings, make findings of fact and decisions and necessary authority relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production and inspection of papers and documents.

Section 304: Section 304 requires the Secretary to provide for administrative proceedings in accordance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to adjudication on notice and hearing in determining whether any labor organization or employer has willfully failed or refused to file a true and proper report or other document as required by title I. If it is determined that a party to the proceedings has willfully so violated the act an order will be issued imposing for an appropriate period such of the following sanctions as may be determined necessary to carry out the purposes of this act:

In the case of a labor organization, it could be ineligible (a) to obtain or retain a certification or other recognition under Federal law as the representative of any employees. (However, nothing in this provision will affect an organization's rights to utilize the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, or prohibit the Service from providing its services in situations in which such an organization is involved); (b) to have access to procedures of Federal agencies which exercise decisional functions in labor-management relations matters such as the National Labor Relations Board; and (c) to have an exemption from income taxes under the Internal Revenue Code.

In the case of an employer's violation, he could be ineligible to have access to procedures of Federal agencies which exercise decisional functions in labor-management relations matters such as the National Labor Relations Board.

Upon receipt of notice from the Secretary that a proceeding has been brought, any Federal agency which may be required to act or omit to act in accordance with a decision or order issued in the proceeding may hold in abeyance any matter or proceeding which may be affected by the decision or order until such decision or order has been made.

Decisions and orders made under this section are subject to judicial review as provided in the Administrative Procedure Act.

Section 305: This section authorizes legal actions to be brought in the name of the Secretary in Federal district courts to restrain violations, compel the disclosure of information required to be filed, or enforce any duty created by this act.

Cooperation With Other Agencies

Section 306: In order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication, this section provides for full cooperation, including working arrangements and the exchange of information, between Federal, State, and local agencies. All evidence warranting consideration for criminal prosecution shall be turned over to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

Penalties

Section 307: Criminal penalties are provided for willful violation or failure to comply with the provisions of title I and for the filing of false information in any report required under sections 102 and 103.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Definitions

Section 401: This section defines nine terms used throughout the act including "labor organization," "employer," "employee," "person," "commerce," and "affecting commerce."

Effect of Other Laws

Section 402: This act does not exempt or relieve any person from any other Federal or State law not in direct conflict with it.

Statutory Provisions Amended or Repealed

Section 403: This section amends the National Labor Relations Act so that no labor organization can be eligible for certification or avail itself of the processes of the Board unless it and any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate can show that it has filed, and made available to its members the information required by this act. This section also repeals section 9 (g) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, which requires a limited form of union reporting.

Section 404: This section contains a separability provision.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE CRIMINAL CODE

Section 501: Section 501 amends title 18 of the United States Code to make it a felony for any person having any direct or indirect functions in connection with the money or other property of a labor organization subject to the provisions of this bill to embezzle, steal, or unlawfully take or convert any of the assets of the organization. It would also be a felony for any such person to make a false entry in any of the documents required to be kept by law with intent to injure or defraud the organization or its members, or to destroy any of this material without authority. A violation is punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Section 502: Section 502 makes it a felony for any representative of employees who are employed in any industry affecting commerce, as well as any officer or other representative of a union the members of which are so employed, and any employer or his representative to offer, solicit, or accept bribes from or to each other for the purpose of influencing decisions or actions in labor-management relations matters. A violation is punishable by a fine of not more than 3 times the amount involved or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both. Immunity from prosecution is granted any person required to present self-incriminating testimony or evidence before a grand jury or court of the United States in a case or proceeding under this section if he is compelled to testify or produce such evidence after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination.

---

EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This bill would make two changes in the Labor Management Relations Act. One relates only to employers and employees in

the building and construction industry; the other is of general application but is of particular interest to the building and construction industry. Both of these proposals are in accord with the advice of a committee composed of representatives of employers and employees in the building and construction industry, which had extensive consultations with the Department of Labor with respect to amendment of the act as it relates to that industry.

CERTIFICATION WITHOUT ELECTION

This draft bill would amend the National Labor Relations Act (title I of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947) so as to authorize the National Labor Relations Board, under appropriate circumstances, to certify unions acting in behalf of employees of employers primarily engaged in the building and construction industry as exclusive bargaining representatives of such employees without a prior election. This proposal would require a joint petition by the employer and union involved asserting present recognition of the union by the employer as the bargaining representative of his employees and the existence of a collective bargaining agreement between them. No certification would be made under this amendment if there was no history of collective bargaining relationship between the union and the employer prior to the current agreement or if there was an allegation, and the Board found, that a substantial number of the employees in the unit in question asserted that the union was not designated or selected as bargaining agent by a majority of such employees.

It has long been recognized that the hiring practices and collective bargaining relationships in the construction industry are unlike those in manufacturing and in other service industries and are difficult to accommodate under the representation procedures of the National Labor Relations Act. These procedures were designed to deal with employment relationships which are of some permanence and they have proved ineffective where, as in the construction industry, the employment is casual and intermittent and the employee may be employed by several employers within a short period of time. Proposals have been made from time to time to amend the act so as to enable the construction industry's labor relations to come into conformity with the representation provisions of the act.

The present proposal provides a means whereby construction unions may acquire Board certification as exclusive bargaining representatives. There are several advantages accruing to a union as the result of Board certification. Conversely there are disadvantages resulting from lack of certification—disadvantages which construction unions have suffered only because the employment patterns in their industry made certification impossible under the existing provisions of the act.

The effect of this proposal would be to protect voluntary collective bargaining relationships established in good faith without governmental intervention. The proposal protects the right of the employees to be free of coercion in the selection of their own bargaining representatives; the will of the employees in this respect would be required to be evidenced by a history of prior collective bargaining between the union and the employer and by an absence of substantial objection on the part of the employees in the bargaining unit to certification of the union.

APPRENTICESHIP AND TRAINING TRUST FUNDS

The draft bill would amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to clarify the legality, under section 302 of the act, of employer contributions to jointly administered apprenticeship and training trust funds.

Section 302 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay or deliver to a representative of his employees any money or other thing of value and for such representative to receive or accept from the employer any money or other thing of value with certain enumerated exceptions. Payments to a trust fund set up to finance an apprenticeship or training program are not among these exceptions and it is the purpose of this amendment to specifically except such payments from the application of section 302.

This proposal would apply to all such apprenticeship and training trust funds but it is of particular importance to the building and construction industry in which such trust funds are numerous. Because of the unique employment relationships and hiring practices in the construction industry training is considered as a joint responsibility of the employer and employee representatives and in most instances is financed by contributions to a jointly administered trust fund.

Pursuant to statutory direction "to bring together employers and labor for the formulation of programs of apprenticeship," the Department of Labor, through its Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, has developed joint national training programs in most of the major trades. These programs call for the organization of joint employer-labor committees which are responsible for carrying out training programs at the local employment level. In the construction industry apprentices are indentured to these joint committees. The proper carrying out of the training functions of the committee requires funds for the payment of salaries of instructors and other costs of administration and instruction. These funds are provided in many instances by employer contributions to trust funds which are administered by the joint training committee.

This proposal would provide that these funds be excepted from section 302 provided that they conform with certain of the standards made applicable by that section to health and welfare funds. These include requirements that (1) the basis on which payments to the fund are to be made be set out in a written agreement between the employer and the representative of the employees, (2) employers and employees be equally represented in the administration of the fund, (3) provision be made for the breaking of any deadlock between employer and employee representatives by a neutral person, and (4) there be an annual audit of the fund which shall be available to all interested persons.

---

EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This bill would carry out the recommendations of the President that inequities and ambiguities in certain provisions of the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, be removed by appropriate amendment of these acts.

As recommended by the President, the bill would:

1. Amend the secondary boycott provisions of the National Labor Relations Act so that they are made applicable to certain secondary activities not presently covered and to make it clear that they do not apply in situations where the secondary employer is not a truly neutral bystander;

2. Amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice, subject to the mandatory injunction provision, for a union to engage in coercive picketing to force an employer to recognize it as the bargaining representative of his employees or to force the employees to accept it as their bargaining representative where it is clear that the employees do not desire the union;

3. Amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the statutory prohibition against replaced economic strikers voting in representation elections;

4. Amend the Labor-Management Relations Act so as to extend the present prohibition against employer payments to employee representatives to certain payments and situations not presently covered;

5. Amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to authorize State agencies and courts to act with respect to matters over which the National Labor Relations Board declines to assert jurisdiction;

6. Amend the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate the requirement that union officers file non-Communist affidavits;

7. Amend the National Labor Relations Act so that bargaining during the term of a collective bargaining agreement may not be required;

8. Amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit the President to designate an acting general counsel when that office becomes vacant.

In the 10 or more years since the enactment of the amendments to the National Labor Relations Act provided by the Taft-Hartley Act, court and board decisions have revealed in a number of instances that the secondary boycott provisions do not provide protections against certain secondary activities which are as much against the public interest as those considered covered by the act. This bill is intended to apply the secondary-boycott provisions to these situations.

At present if a union, in order to force a secondary employer to cease doing business with another person, threatens the employer with a strike or a refusal of his employees to perform services it is not an unfair labor practice. Threats of strikes are more numerous than actual strikes and they often are as effective in persuading the employer to the union's object. Permitting such pressures to be exerted against neutral employers, therefore, provides a means of evading the purpose of the secondary-boycott provisions. The bill is designed to correct this by making the provisions applicable to efforts to threaten, coerce, or restrain employers.

Another manner in which the present provisions have proved inadequate is in their failure to apply to the inducement of employees of railroads, agricultural employees, and public bodies to refuse to perform services in order to force their employers to stop doing business with a primary employer. This is based on the fact that these employers and their employees do not come within the act's definitions of those terms. The bill proposes to cure this by changing, where necessary, references in the secondary-boycott provisions to "employees" and "employers" to "individuals" and "persons," which have sufficiently broad meanings to bring, as they should be, these neutral employers and employees within the coverage of the protections of the act against secondary activities.

A third form of secondary activity which has been held not violative of the secondary boycott provisions is when the pressure against an employer to cease doing business with another is directed at him through the inducement of his employees individually to refuse to perform services. The cumulative effect of such individual refusals is no less effective than a concerted refusal to perform services. The bill would deal with such situations by referring to "any individual" as distinguished from "employees" and removing the reference to "a concerted refusal" to perform services.

On the other hand, there are situations in which an employer who is not a truly neutral secondary employer may undeservedly receive the protections intended for innocent third parties to labor disputes. The employee who performs for another em-

ployer, whose employees are on strike, work which the striking employees would normally perform is an ally of the primary employer and should not be protected from retaliatory union activity for doing so. The bill, accordingly, contains a proviso which, under certain circumstances, would make the secondary boycott provisions inapplicable to activity directed against an employer performing "farmed out" work in behalf of a struck employer.

The bill also would permit activities otherwise prohibited by the secondary boycott provisions where the secondary employer is engaged together in work on the same construction site with the primary employer. Here again the secondary employer is not in a strictly neutral relationship with the other employers with whom he is engaged in a single construction project. Where there is a lawful dispute on such a site with respect to working conditions there, this bill would permit the union involved in the dispute to extend its pressures to any or all of the other employers working on the same site.

While the bill does not deal specifically with "hot cargo" agreements the total effect of its amendments to the secondary boycott provisions, particularly the one directed against direct coercion of employers, is to prohibit attempts to force an employer into entering into or to perform such an agreement.

The bill would also amend the National Labor Relations Act so as, for the first time, to deal specifically with organizational and recognition picketing. Such picketing has been generally criticized and there are many who would prohibit it completely. The bill would not do this but it would restrict picketing to force organization or recognition to situations where the employees in question have evidenced sufficient interest in having the union as their bargaining representative and even then would permit it only for a reasonable period of time within which a representation election would have to be conducted.

The proposal would prohibit this type of picketing, unless the union could show a sufficient interest on the part of the employees to have the union represent them. It would prohibit it after a union has picketed for a reasonable period and a representation election has not been conducted in that time. It would prohibit it if within the preceding year a representation election was conducted and another union or no union received the support of a majority of the employees. It would prohibit such picketing where the employer is already lawfully recognizing another union.

The bill recognizes that the usual remedies of the act, as in the case of secondary boycotts, are inadequate in the case of this type of picketing. To be effective, a remedy must provide speedy relief by an immediate termination of the picketing. The bill, therefore, would make violation of the provision subject to the mandatory injunction provided in section 10 (1) of the National Labor Relations Act.

Ever since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, the provision which bars strikers who are not entitled to reinstatement from voting in representation elections has been referred to as a "union-busting" device. It is claimed that under appropriate economic conditions, this provision, used together with certain other provisions, could destroy a union.

The bill would delete this provision of the act and leave the question of the voting eligibility of these persons to the administrative discretion of the Board, which presently has authority to determine other questions of eligibility, timing, and other matters relating to the conduct of elections. The Board, it is assumed, would decide this issue with due regard for the equities involved.

The recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the Guss and related cases have confirmed the belief that there is a serious gap with respect to jurisdiction over labor disputes with respect to which the National Labor Relations Board, in its discretion, has refused to assert jurisdiction. The courts have ruled that the States cannot act in these cases and as a result the injured parties are left with no forum in which to seek relief.

This bill is designed to close the gap by permitting State agencies and courts to act where the Board by rule or otherwise has declined to assert jurisdiction. This would mean that if the Board has declined by decision in the particular case, or by administrative rule or regulation has promulgated a jurisdictional standard which would exclude such a case, the State courts and agencies may act.

Section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act makes unlawful payments of money or other things of value by an employer to a representative of his employees. Experience has indicated that the section does not completely cover the area of improper employer payments to employee representatives. The bill would amend the section to make it specifically apply to payments made to employee representatives by employer agents or representatives. It would also be made applicable to payments made by an employer to representatives of any employees, as distinguished from his employees, employed in an industry affecting commerce, so long as the payment is made to the representative in his capacity as a representative. Receipt of such payments by a representative is also unlawful.

There has been evidence of employers, or employer representatives, making payments to employees of the employer for the purpose of having those employees influence or interfere with the rights of other employees of the employer to organize and to engage in concerted activities as guaranteed by section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act. The bill would amend section 302 so as to make such payments unlawful.

Another amendment to section 302 contained in the bill would make it clear that among the employer payments excepted from the applicability of the section are contributions to jointly administered apprenticeship and training trust funds meeting certain appropriate standards.

Other provisions of the bill would:

(a) Eliminate the present requirement that each officer of a union seeking to use the processes of the act file an affidavit that he is not a member of, or affiliated with, the Communist Party or a believer in, or member or supporter of, any organization which believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the Government by force or illegal or unconstitutional means. There is now in effect the Communist Control Act of 1954 which is specifically directed against Communist-infiltrated labor organizations.

(b) Make it clear that the act does not require a party to a valid collective bargaining contract to bargain during the life of the contract with respect to any modification which would become effective before a reopening is permitted by the terms of the contract. The parties, of course, could agrere to a reopening at any time. Any possibility that one party to a valid contract may compel it to be reopened to change during its life defeats the stability in labor relations which the act was designed to achieve.

(c) Would permit the President to designate an acting General Counsel during vacancies in that office. The act provides that the General Counsel shall have final authority in certain matters, including the issuance of unfair labor practice complaints. It is not clear that this authority can be exercised by any person who has not been properly appointed to that office. Unless an acting General Counsel can be designated, a long vacancy of this office could be very disruptive of the administration of the act.

The amendments made by the bill would become effective 60 days after its enactment and the bill contains a savings clause to prevent their being applied to acts performed prior to its enactment.

---

## EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this is the first opportunity I have had to comment on the significant agreement on exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Ambassador Lacy is to be commended highly for the diplomatic skill he has shown in the 3 months of negotiations which led up to this agreement. His success is a demonstration to all the world that our Government is determined to carry out President Eisenhower's pledge, in his state of the Union message, regarding "works of peace."

When the news of the agreement was announced on Monday, I was absent, by leave of the Senate; I addressed the New Jersey Farm Bureau, in Trenton, at which time, coincidentally, I stressed the need for just such an exchange of scientific, cultural, technical, and educational personnel. The theme of my speech was that, while we must diligently maintain our military and scientific position, our only real hope for lasting peace lies in strengthening the foundations of mutual understanding between the peoples of Russia and those of the free world. This agreement on exchanges is an important step toward the establishment of this sort of international confidence.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, January 29. The article was written by Roscoe Drummond, and is entitled "United States-Soviet Exchange Pact Is Said To Help Both Sides."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### UNITED STATES-SOVIET EXCHANGE PACT IS SAID TO HELP BOTH SIDES

WASHINGTON.—Don't breathe on it because it might go away. But if you will tiptoe up here's something to look at:

The United States and the Soviet Union have reached an agreement. It is a significant agreement.

It is not going to end the cold war, but it bears on its conduct.

It has taken 2½ years to bring it off, but it is now done, signed and sealed.

The agreement itself will set in motion a wide-ranging exchange of contacts—both people and ideas—between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R.

To bring about a wider contact among our peoples, arrangements are being made to exchange some 40 delegations of persons in industry, agriculture, the sciences, teachers, writers, composers, singers, dancers, actors, and symphony orchestras.

To bring about a wider exchange of ideas, arrangements are being made for a series of Soviet radio and TV programs to be heard in the United States with comparable time on the Soviet radio and TV available for American programs.

Is all this just peanuts? Or is it important and meaningful in the whole range of lacerated United States-Soviet relations? I think it is an exceedingly important piece of East-West business for three reasons:

1. This exchange issue was one of the half-dozen topics which occupied the summit conference at Geneva. Something is now being done about it. Any evenly measured agreement with Moscow is useful. One little agreement could lead to another. It could be moderately habit forming.

2. It should be frankly recognized—and this, it seems to me, is what makes the agreement exceptionally significant—that in the radio and TV exchange, the Soviets are making a harder and, in reality, a greater concession to us than we are making to them. In permitting any American programs on the Soviet radio and TV networks, Moscow is giving up a degree of its nearly total censorship over the minds of its people. We, in return, are only called upon to practice more of the freedom of speech and inquiry which we prize so highly. Thus the Soviets are doing something un-Soviet, since they are letting a little free air into their closed society, while we are doing what is characteristic of democracy, that is, practicing freedom.

3. The agreement may help lay the groundwork for further agreement. We shouldn't expect very much very soon. But it can't fail to be helpful in the long view for more Russians and more Americans to know each other's country better. This is the kind of exchange which we should welcome and in which both sides will win.

The patience and skill of the head of the State Department's Office of East-West Contacts, Ambassador William Lacy, helped to make the negotiations successful. He tried all along to get Moscow to include an exchange of commentaries on world events as part of the mutual radio and TV programs. So far, the Soviets have demurred at permitting the broadcasts to be as political and as controversial as such commentaries would inevitably become.

The agreed subjects for the radio and TV exchange are limited to science, techniques, sports, industry, agriculture, education, and health. This is a good beginning. They provide opportunity to give to Soviet listeners and viewers a picture of how life is lived in America and how a free society works.

These broadcasts ought not to be pugnacious or truculent. They ought to be candid and descriptive and convey all they can of the heart and spirit of the people. I would hope that the time might come when the Kremlin would let the Soviet people hear an American commentary on world events—and we theirs; these commentaries need not be combative, just straightforward and honest.

It was in the summer of 1955 that Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Bulganin said they would like to do this. It is now being done. That's something. It may prove to be more than something.

## AN APPRECIATION OF MR. JUSTICE FRANKFURTER

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may be permitted to address the Senate for not to exceed 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, today Mr. Justice Frankfurter begins his 20th year of service on the Supreme Court of the United States. On November 15, 1957, he celebrated his 75th birthday. At this time I should like to express briefly, and hence inadequately, my admiration for his work.

My remarks are inspired, not so much by the amenities appropriate to these occasions, as by a widespread popular misconception about Mr. Justice Frankfurter's judicial philosophy. My salute to the Justice must necessarily be impersonal, but for that reason it may more effectively dispel misunderstanding about his record.

There have been introduced in the Congress several bills to require prior judicial service as a condition to appointment to the Supreme Court. The mere fact that such legislation would have disqualified Mr. Frankfurter is sufficient reason for not passing it.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that I do not agree with all the opinions written by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, lucid and persuasive though they are. However, it is worth saying that frequency of agreement with a particular Justice is not a valid measure of his worth.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter's position on the political arc is, of course, to the left of mine. If he were a United States Senator from Massachusetts, no doubt we would often find ourselves in honest disagreement—although not so often, I think, as some might imagine. Perhaps it is this difference in political philosophy which has made me aware of his profound understanding of the judicial function.

Within my memory no member of the Supreme Court has been more successful in keeping purely personal preferences from shaping his constitutional and statutory interpretations. As the Justice said in his address at Cambridge, Mass., in September 1955, when commemorating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Chief Justice Marshall:

> If judges want to be preachers, they should dedicate themselves to the pulpit; if judges want to be primary shapers of policy, the legislature is their place. Self-willed judges are the least defensible offenders against government under law.

Over the past 20 years I have not had the time to read more than a small percentage of the opinions of the Supreme Court. But I think I have read enough of the cases to say with some authority that no one on the bench in that period has shown a better understanding of the need for judicial self-restraint than has Mr. Justice Frankfurter. This understanding is reflected in scores of opinions showing an honest search for Congressional intent, a decent respect for State legislatures and State judiciaries, and an aversion to the adjudication of issues which are prematurely raised, basically trivial, or essentially political in character. It is tempting to recite cases illustrating the Justice's keen sense of judicial self-restraint, but the selection would probably be more indicative of my thinking than of his.

What is most important about Mr. Justice Frankfurter's work, I think, is that he never spares himself the intellectual effort required to decide a case upon principle—that is, in accordance with a coherent and consistent idea of justice, illuminated, as it must be, by history, by judicial precedent, and by circumstances, new and old. This is vitally important. The Supreme Court is a powerful check on democratic processes. The judicial check will not be tolerated unless it can be justified as a necessary purification and refinement of the will of the people, and this cannot be done unless the judicial process reflects a set of impersonal and objective values.

The issues presented to the Supreme Court are not to be solved on a slide rule. Such an attempt is often made, and the Court is discredited in direct proportion to the frequency of the effort. Many types of slide rules have been employed. For some Justices, it is their own economic and social philosophy; for some, the slide rule is a blind obedience to precedent; for others, it calculates the middle of the road between two polar positions; and for still others the mechanical aid determines, on a purely sentimental basis, the disposition of the case at hand without regard to its future consequences.

Lambert against California, decided December 16, 1957, is a relatively unimportant case. Its recent date makes it a most fitting example of Mr. Justice Frankfurter's long fight against the substitution of mechanical formulas for value judgments. The Court held that punishment under a California law requiring convicted felons to register with the police offended due process unless the convicted felon had actual knowledge of the requirement and failed to register. In his dissenting opinion Mr. Justice Frankfurter said:

> What is this but a return to yearbook distinctions between feasance and nonfeasance—a distinction that may have significance in the evolution of commonlaw notions of liability, but is inadmissible as a line between constitutionality and unconstitutionality.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter did not cite the thousands of Federal and State laws which would be nullified if the Lambert case were to be followed, because, as he put it:

> I feel confident that the present decision will turn out to be * * * a derelict on the waters of the law.

So it will, and so in time will many other decisions from which he dissented.

I shall conclude, Mr. President, simply by expressing the hope that we may have on the Supreme Court for many years to come the brilliant light and the penetrating vision of Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter.

## TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM H. PUTNAM, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, tonight in Hartford, Conn., many of his friends and admirers will gather at the Hotel Statler-Hilton to pay tribute to one of Connecticut's most outstanding citizens, William H. Putnam.

Mr. Putnam has served the people of his community and his State in many worthwhile civic, public, and private endeavors.

His most recent accomplishment was his leadership in conceiving and directing the erection of a series of bridges over the Connecticut River, which have

opened new means of accessibility to and for the Greater Hartford area.

This concept was bold and challenging. His vision and his drive stimulated a spirit which spelled success. Mr. Putnam, in this project and in many other endeavors with which he has been associated, displayed leadership of the highest order.

The final measurement, the ultimate estimate of a community or any other political subdivision, large or small, is and must be based on the contributions of its citizens made to the overall good.

Mr. President, we are most fortunate indeed to have men of the stature and good will of William H. Putnam in Connecticut. To him and to them must go much of the credit for the leadership which our State has given to this Nation since its earliest days.

As impressive as the new bridges spanning the Connecticut River are, his continuing example as a public spirited citizen is even more important, because it inspires others to serve in like manner. His many contributions to the civic, spiritual, and cultural spheres of community life have built even greater bridges for better understanding than these new spans across Connecticut's historic waterway.

Mr. President, our final destiny as a nation depends upon the continuing erection of spiritual bridges to bring us close together as Americans in a dedicated and determined effort to conform to the dictates of our Creator. We in Connecticut are closer because of what Bill Putnam is and because of what he has done. His recognition is most deserved, because, Mr. President, great as it has already become, the value of the service of William H. Putnam will continue to grow in magnitude with the years as the ideals which it has helped to foster spread among our people.

## EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have just read the President's message regarding the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

I shall support the President's recommendation for a 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act. In the world in which we live, stability of trade relationships among the free nations is an essential element in our counterattack to the Communist bloc's economic offensive. Such stability will be promoted by a long-term extension of the act.

I make this endorsement in the expectation that the administration will recommend, and the Congress will approve, methods of strengthening the existing safeguards for domestic industry, and improving their administration.

I understand that subsequent recommendations from the administration will cover these matters.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join the Senator from Connecticut in expressing suport for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 5 years. I do this because I think it is important to indicate to the country and to indicate to the President that there is support for him in the Senate of the United States in these actions which are absolutely vital to the national security—as vital in their own way as getting ready on missiles and rocketry.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator very much for those observations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield, if time permits.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to join with the Senator from New York in expressing support of the principle of the extension of the reciprocal trade agreement program for another 5 years.

As the Senator from Connecticut knows, I have always supported that principle. I have been critical of its application in some instances, when I thought our State Department did not carry out the real objective of the reciprocal trade agreements, because the act itself is based upon the controlling principle of reciprocity.

In some instances reciprocity has been noted for its absence in some of the arrangements which the State Department has made with foreign countries, to the detriment of American industry.

Mr. President, I intend in this session of Congress, as I have in past sessions of Congress, to give my support to the objective of reciprocal trade, because I will say to the American people that the contest for freedom in the decades ahead is going to be costly and we are not going to win if we try to separate ourselves from the rest of the world. The rest of the world is on the march, so far as raising the economic standards of people in the underdeveloped countries of the world is concerned. The question facing the American people is whether we are going to recognize the relationship between economic freedom of choice and political freedom of choice, or whether we are going to drive the people of these underdeveloped countries into the economic arms of Russia. Once they are in the economic arms of Russia, then they will have imposed upon them the enslavement which goes along with political totalitarianism.

I think in this session of Congress, irrespective of a great deal of political criticism we are going to receive, we are going to have to face up to the great issue of whether we are going to participate in an economic program abroad which will help raise the standard of living of those people who have to be brought over to our side in this great contest between freedom and totalitarianism.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his observations.

Mr. MORTON rose.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has asked me to yield to him on his own time.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut. I think in the world situation today what is needed, among other things, is a greater range for our trade policies. When we go along from year to year, or from 2 years to 2 years, on this program, there are obviously created certain questions abroad. I am glad to see that the Secretary of Commerce is to come before the Congress and submit to the Congress further proposed legislation to protect American industry. I hope the Congress will grant the 5-year extension.

I also hope, Mr. President, that the Congress will take another look at the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which has been before the Congress, after being submitted some 3 years ago by the administration. The Organization for Trade Cooperation will never come into being unless the United States joins it. I think such an organization will not only be an aid for all trade, but a great safeguard to American industry and American enterprise if we set up the policing force of the OTC to see that the trade arrangements are properly carried out.

I am happy to join with the Senator from Connecticut in urging careful consideration of the program.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LAUSCHE rose.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to yield, if I may, to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], on his own time in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

In the contest of nations throughout the world it is apparent that we must have allies. We cannot stand alone. We must have friends, and to achieve the friendship of many nations we either have to help them maintain an independent economy or give them alms.

In my opinion alms do not edify the character of the recipient. Alms degrade, and frequently bring a result contrary to that expected by the giver. We cannot have a one-way street in the commerce of our country. We cannot expect other nations to buy from us while we bluntly tell them that we will not buy from them.

As for myself, I believe that the ultimate security and the ultimate economic richness of every man in America is related to the security of our country. While we may suffer a bit by granting rights to sell in our country, the aggregate gains which we make from the standpoint of security far exceed that which we lose.

I know, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated, that there will be many who take exception to the President's recommendation. To them I make the plea to look not only at the immediate results, but weigh and consider the long range impact of what is being done. Immediately, we may lose a bit, but in the aggregate, and in the end,

the life of our country will be insured, and eventually the richness provided by that life will benefit all Americans.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

## THE RISING TIDE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned over the rising tide of unemployment in the Nation. Almost daily, the newspapers carry articles of the increasing number of jobless throughout the country. As is well known, the estimates indicate that the number of jobless is well up toward 4 million. According to the latest survey by the Labor Department, 45 of the Nation's 149 major industrial centers are areas of substantial unemployment. An area falls in the surplus labor category when more than 6 percent of the working force is idle. Thus, overall unemployment is now dangerously high.

We are aware, of course, that employment is basically a private economic problem. However, the Government—as an instrument to serve the people—I believe, cannot stand idly by and let growing unemployment play havoc with the economy and our people. Instead, I believe it has a responsibility to aid, wherever it reasonably and properly can, in dealing with these problems.

Currently, I am not satisfied that enough is being done in this field. As we know, the Defense Department in particular, can—and in some cases, does—offer relief to labor surplus areas. For the most part this is accomplished by channeling contracts and production into those areas.

### NEED FOR MORE ACTION

To stimulate greater action along this line, I have taken definite steps, as follows:

First. I have contacted the Defense Department to urge that existing facilities that are idle, or practically idle, be utilized as much as possible to fulfill our current defense needs. In the days ahead, the Congress will be asked for appropriations to construct, and/or contract for, facilities to produce defense materiel. Prior to such requests, every attempt should be made to use existing plants and other facilities.

Second. I have urged the Office of Defense Mobilization to make greater use of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4. This policy authorizes ODM to set aside defense contracts for areas hard hit by unemployment. Regrettably, almost nothing has been done along this line recently.

Third. We all appreciate the difficulties faced by small-business men in complying with the requirements of Federal contracts. To deal with this problem, I have contacted the Small Business Administration to urge that a special study be made of such problems in fulfilling Federal contracts. In addition, I urged that administrative action be taken to actively aid small businesses in fulfilling such contracts.

### HEADING OFF INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT

I point out this situation because many Senators may be faced with problems of increasing unemployment in their home States, as we are in Wisconsin.

For example, increasing unemployment has hit a number of Badger communities. Regrettably, the percentage of out-of-job workers has risen as high as 10 percent over 1956 in some areas.

To cope with this situation, I recently requested that a procurement expert, Mr. Kenneth Borgen, of the Defense Department, survey the problem in Wisconsin. The objective was to attempt to channel defense and other Federal contracts into areas affected by rising unemployment.

We are now engaging in followup action through local, State, and Federal cooperation.

Believing this approach toward attempting to head off ever-increasing unemployment to be of interest, I request unanimous consent to have my letters to the Defense Department, the Small Business Administration, and the Office of Defense Mobilization, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
*January 30, 1958.*

Hon. NEIL MCELROY,
*Secretary of Defense,*
*Department of Defense,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to urge that a greater effort be made to utilize existing facilities for producing materiel needed for strengthening our defense program.

As you are well aware, there are a number of production facilities across the Nation which either are now idle, or partially idle. For example, our fine ordnance plant at Baraboo, Wis., produces propellant powder. During full operation it employs up to 6,000 workers. Currently, it is practically idle.

As a result the economy of the surrounding community is suffering because of unemployment. This single situation is multiplied by the number of areas in which similar plants are inactive, or only partially active, across the country.

We recognize, of course, the need for maintaining an adequate production base, as at Baraboo, to produce essential materiel in the event of national emergency. At the same time, I'm sure you agree that aside from such a possibly remote contingency, we should right now utilize available facilities to fulfill our current defense and other needs.

In the days ahead, the Defense Department will be constructing or contracting for, facilities to produce new defense materiel.

Prior to such action, I would very respectfully urge that the available inventories of facilities be examined carefully to see whether or not action can be taken along the following lines:

1. Idle, or partially idle, plants be reconverted (as possible) to production of other defense materiel currently in greater demand;

2. Plants that cannot feasibly be reconverted should be:

(a) Leased for production of other (possibly civilian) goods—without, of course, interfering with essential defense missions; or

(b) Made available for returning to production of civilian goods, as soon as possible when its output is no longer needed for defense.

To the degree that this can be accomplished, it would, of course, cut costs, strengthen the defense, and assist the economy of local communities in which these facilities are located.

I respectfully urge, therefore, that a review of this situation be undertaken and that constructive attempts be made to more effectively and completely utilize existing facilities for strengthening the defense program.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

JANUARY 3, 1958.

Mr. GORDON GRAY,
*Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,*
*Executive Office of the President,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. GRAY: I am writing to urge a greater application of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4—the set-aside program for assigning defense contracts to labor surplus areas—and also to urge the appointment of a Director of Contracts for Surplus Labor Areas for channeling of more Federal contracts into areas hard hit by unemployment.

Regrettably, as you know, the set-aside program has been seriously lagging. In all candor, it is pitifully inadequate. An extremely small percentage of our defense contracts have been earmarked annually for labor surplus areas. In fact, in the last quarter for which information is available—July 1 to September 30, 1957—the preferential assignment of contracts to surplus labor areas was zero.

This is extremely unfortunate when, by dedicated effort, the program could be expanded to provide effective assistance in filling defense contracts in labor surplus areas.

To carry out the program more effectively, I believe the appointment of a Director of Contracts, familiar with the labor situation as well as with Federal contracting, could aid tremendously in reviewing defense contracts, prior to assignment, so that more of these could go into labor surplus areas.

As you know, the specter of unemployment is unhappily rising in the Nation. In Wisconsin, for example, we have had increases in unemployment of more than 10 percent over 1956, in a number of communities. Presently, I am attempting to assist our Wisconsin industries in acquiring some Federal contracts to help relieve the acute unemployment situation.

The expansion, and more effective application, of the set-aside program, therefore, I believe would be of tremendous help in attempting to resolve this, and similar, problems in the future.

By so doing, we would help to keep in operation an industrial capability that is essential to our peacetime progress, as well as for defense.

With appreciation for the consideration I know these recommendations will receive, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

JANUARY 3, 1958.

Mr. WENDELL BARNES,
*Director, Small Business Administration,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. BARNES: I am writing to urge that the Small Business Administration undertake a special study on problems relating to fulfilling Federal procurement contracts by small business, and also to urge that an administrative action program be set up to help small-business men fulfill these contracts.

As you are well aware, the particularly difficult problems in meeting the Federal standards and requirements often exclude small business from participating in Federal procurement programs. Among these problems, of course, are: Maintaining a reserve of adequate funds to carry on operations during fulfillment of contracts; lack of as-

sistance in acquiring hard-to-get materials; lack of guidance in adaption of facilities to fulfill Government contracts; and others.

I know, of course, that you are currently attempting to assist small business in this and other fields.

Because these problems are tough ones, however, I believe that a special effort is needed to provide assistance and guidance in fulfilling Federal contracts. It would be of tremendous benefit, not only in providing small business a larger share of Federal contracting, but also assisting in resolving community and national economic problems.

For example, you are aware, of course, of increasing unemployment throughout the country. A number of industries in Wisconsin communities, too, are unfortunately laying off men, operating shorter hours, or otherwise cutting back production. Thus, the problem of unemployment is threatening the whole economy of these communities.

Currently, I am attempting to assist these areas in acquiring additional Federal contracts to stimulate business so as to increase employment. However, we recognize that the local small businesses, in this instance, often require additional aid and guidance in attempting to meet the requirements of these contracts.

I would, therefore, respectfully suggest that a special effort be made to resolve the problems confronting small business in meeting the standards and specifications of Federal contracting, by undertaking a study of these problems, as well as taking appropriate administrative action to provide needed assistance in Federal procurement contracting.

With appreciation for the consideration I know these suggestions will receive, I remain

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

---

## FOREIGN STUDENTS STUDYING IN THE UNITED STATES—THE SPLENDID WORK OF INDUSTRIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously brought to the attention of my colleagues the great importance of foreign students studying in our midst. The record will show that the relatively small amounts of money involved in this program have brought immeasurable value to our country in promotion of good will and understanding.

As my colleagues are aware, the International Education Exchange Service of the Department of State administers this exchange program. It does so with the help of two public boards, appointed by the President, namely, the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange and the Board of Foreign Scholarship.

The Advisory Commission formulates and recommends to the Secretary of State policies and programs for carrying out the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948. In turn, the Board of Foreign Scholarship supervises program operations. It selects individuals and educational institutions qualified to participate in the exchange program authorized by the Fulbright Act.

The record will show that the foreign students who have studied here have returned to their countries to occupy posts of ever-increasing importance in all phases of the life of their homelands.

In turn, of course, we welcome the opportunity to have American youngsters study abroad and become better acquainted with the lives and cultures and contributions of foreign lands.

Today, I bring to the attention of my colleagues, however, one specific phase of what can be done, and is being done, with foreign students.

I refer once more to the excellent work of the nonprofit corporation known as Industries International, Inc., located in Janesville, in my State.

I was pleased to receive today from Mr. A. Roger Hook, executive director of Industries International, a memorandum giving the splendid reactions of foreign embassies in our Nation's Capital to the program.

What is the program? As I have previously reported to my colleagues, it is designed to assist foreign students to locate industrial opportunity when they return to their homeland; primarily through licensing agreements with United States companies.

This is a two-way street. It is of value economically to the United States in developing foreign markets. It is of value to foreign lands in improving standards of living, furthering trade, increasing production, distribution, and employment.

This is but one of the many byproducts of the foreign students exchange program. It is a very practical byproduct. Even if there were not such an economic program, the student exchange program would be worth while from any standpoint.

But it is gratifying to know that this Industries International has resulted as one out of many practical applications of the overall program.

This is, of course, entirely a private, nonprofit program, not, in any respect, a governmental program.

I send to the desk the memorandum to which I have referred, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIES INTERNATIONAL INC.,
*Janesville, Wis., February 1958.*

AMBASSADOR ENDORSES PRACTICAL TRAINING FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS

During the past 2 years Industries International, Inc., has carefully and diligently developed a program to assist foreign students in finding industrial opportunities in their homeland, primarily through licensing agreements with United States companies, to help them secure practical training upon completion of their academic training, and to aid business firms in this country locate foreign nationals for their overseas operations.

The program has been recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—it is backed by United States Government agencies, universities, large business firms, and many organizations throughout the world. It is generally recognized that United States business firms are becoming more and more dependent on overseas business, also that importation of certain raw materials is now a requisite for practically all types of United States manufacturing. Foreign governments are naturally aware of this situation and are in a position to decide which countries and which individual firms serve the interests of their people best. United States business firms with adequate trainee programs for the young people from overseas, obviously have a great advantage and are receiving very favorable publicity throughout the world. From time to time the foreign ambassadors, and foreign government agencies are advised through circulars such as this of the work of Industries International, Inc. In order that you might know of their great interest in our program, we are pleased to report from a few of the letters we have received from high foreign government offices—

LIBERIA

"Having been the first President of the Y's Mens Club of Liberia, I feel that I am in a position to appreciate the great and inestimable contributions this worthy organization is making. It is my prayer and hope that you will be sustained with renewed vigor and your heart will be encouraged as you press forward to meet the challenge of this new day."

ECUADOR

"It seems to me that your organization is carrying out a very important job by helping young students and graduates of foreign countries to get the kind of practical training demanded in their specific fields of specialization. This function, undoubtedly, is a great contribution toward the efforts not only of the student, but those of governmental agencies here and abroad, whose task is to seek and provide a better training for the students.

"As you point out in your information material, this training is difficult to get for foreign students, due to different reasons, from legal technicalities to the impossibility of finding suitable places for such training. Therefore, I have only words of praise to your initiative and I hope that some Ecuadorian students coming to the United State may profit out of this opportunity."

KOREA

"As you may already know, there are some 1,800 Korean students in this country now and our Governments' scholarship program is steadily expanding. It would be of immeasurable advantage to them if training opportunities, however brief, could be found for them."

FINLAND

"It was very interesting for me to learn about your program which gives the foreign students who attend universities and colleges in this country the opportunity to seek practical training here. If I, in any way, can give you any assistance in this field, please let me know."

SPAIN

"I honestly think that you are on the right track in getting the best understanding and cooperation among young generations all over the world. Let me congratulate you for the fine work you are doing and thank you for keeping me informed about your interesting work."

PAKISTAN

"Most of our students after completion of their training seek opportunities for practical training before their departure for Pakistan. We will be most grateful if you kindly furnish us detailed information as well as forms of application so that students approaching us on such subjects may be supplied with an application form to be forwarded to you."

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

"The world backward living conditions resulting from idle human and natural resources as the ones prevailing in Panama as well as in many other countries are not going to prevail forever. It is becoming more difficult for a country to be out than to be in the present industrial development.

Usually I am short of time; however, Industries International, Inc., plan can have my assistance if necessary."

BRITISH WEST INDIES

"I should like to repeat my previous assurance that the work you are doing is first rate and most important. I am sure you will find that there is enough demand on hand from students already in the United States to keep you busy and as the scheme becomes better known both to industry and to the students it will snowball. It is especially important in the engineering and technological fields where there has in the past been reluctance on the part of industry to take in foreign trainees on the grounds that the services of the trainee will be lost when he returns home. This is shortsighted."

ISRAEL

"Thank you very much indeed for remembering us in connection with the Industries International, Inc. Your project looks most interesting and worth while. We have in the past encountered problems for which your project might very well provide a solution."

INDIA

"I am indeed very interested in the program you have developed to help foreign students find industrial opportunities when they return home. If there is any way in which you think I can be of assistance to you, I shall be glad to hear from you again."

CHILE

"I compliment you upon this very useful project that fills a long-felt need. While it is true that academic courses try to bring as much practical knowledge as possible to the students, there is no training so valuable as that obtained by working in shop, or factory, or in the field, under wage-earner discipline, with experienced men. The know-how thus obtained is a valuable asset to take to the student's country, and is greatly appreciated."

GREAT BRITAIN

"This is indeed a very worthwhile project; and I can bear ample testimony to the need not only for increased opportunity for foreign students to acquire industrial experience in their various fields of training, but for an enlightened central organization which is prepared to go to the trouble to bring the student into contact with firms which can provide fitting opportunities."

Congratulations have been received from the White House and from many foreign ambassadors for the excellent cooperation of the International Y's Men's Clubs in this important work.

We believe you will be pleased to know a plan has been worked out to permit United States business firms to become identified with this important builder of good will. We shall be happy to explain the program to you.

A. ROGER HOOK,
*Executive Director.*

---

## CONTINUATION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 320)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I request the Congress to enact legislation that will permit a continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements program on an effective basis for a minimum of 5 additional years past June 30, 1958.

The enactment of this legislation—unweakened by amendments of a kind that would impair its effectiveness—is essential to our national economic interest, to our security, and to our foreign relations.

The high importance of trade to our economy is evident. The income of our people arising from export trade alone approximates or exceeds that arising from many major segments of our economy. The development of a healthy export trade has created a significant number of jobs for our working men and women. Imports furnish our industries with essential raw materials and the benefits of technological advances, add to the variety of goods available to our consumers, and also create jobs for our workers. Moreover, important geographical areas within our country, as well as many of our key industries in both manufacturing and agriculture, look to expanding world trade as an essential ingredient of their future prosperity.

Reciprocal trade agreements negotiated since the advent of the Trade Agreements Act have helped bring a more vigorous, dynamic growth to our American economy. Our own economic self-interest, therefore, demands a continuation of the trade-agreements program. Under this program sound two-way trade can be further developed to assure to our industries widening opportunities for participation in world markets, and to provide foreign nations the opportunity to earn the dollars to pay for the goods we sell. We can either receive the benefits of the reciprocal lowering of trade barriers or suffer the inevitable alternative of increasingly high barriers against our own commerce which would weaken our economy and jeopardize American jobs.

Important as growing international trade is to our country, it is equally important to our allies and trading partners. For them it is indeed vital to the health and growing strength of their economies, on which their political stability and military power heavily depend. The assured future of the reciprocal trade program is necessary for our national security and for our entire foreign policy.

In particular, it is essential to enable us to meet the latest form of economic challenge to the free world presented by communism. In the state of the Union message, I spoke of the economic offensive that has been mounted against free nations by the Communist imperialists. The Soviet Union is engaged in an intensive effort, through combined programs of trade and aid, to divide the countries of the free world, to detach them one by one and swing them into the orbit of Communist influence.

We must recognize the growing capacity of the Soviet Union in the economic field. Their advances in technology and industrialization, together with their continuing repression of domestic consumption, enable them to supply, better than ever before, the machinery, manufactures, and other goods which are essential to the economic life of many countries.

The Soviet capacity to export is matched by its capacity and willingness to import. It is increasingly offering to import the surpluses of non-Communist states. In this way it seeks to tie such states to the Soviet orbit, and to exploit the trade difficulties of the free world.

This challenge in the economic field cannot be ignored without the gravest risk to our way of life. This fact alone makes it imperative that previous positions be reexamined, and that particular interests be reappraised in the light of overriding national needs.

The question is whether the system of free competitive enterprise for which we stand will meet successfully in the international economic arena the challenge hurled by the Soviet leaders.

We will fail in this endeavor if the free countries do not continue their reduction of the barriers which they themselves impose on their trade with each other. We will fail if closed markets and foreign-exchange shortages force free-world countries into economic dependence upon the Communist bloc. We will fail if the United States should now abandon the task of building a world-trading system from which all free-world countries can gain strength and prosperity in a free economic society.

If our Government is to play its decisive part in protecting and strengthening the free economic system against the Communist threat, the trade agreements legislation which the administration is requesting of the Congress must be enacted.

The Secretary of Commerce, who is Chairman of the Trade Policy Committee which I recently established to advise and assist me in the administration of the trade-agreements program, including review of recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission, will transmit to the Congress the administration's legislative proposals. These proposals, including the various safeguards for domestic industry, will generally follow the pattern set by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

The amount of tariff reduction authority to be requested is essential to the continuing success of the program, as is the 5-year period of the proposed extension to the continuity in our trade relations.

There is a further and very specific factor necessitating a minimum extension of 5 years. Six European nations, which purchased nearly $3 billion of our exports last year, have established a European Economic Community which will become a common market with a population nearly as large as our own. These countries will ultimately have a common tariff applying to imports from the rest of the world. It is anticipated that important steps toward this common tariff will become effective during 1962—up to 4½ years from the renewal date of our trade-agreements legislation. This period must be devoted to negotiations with the new economic community and these negotiations must be preceded by painstaking preparations. Both preparation and negotiation must be based on a clear grant of adequate au-

thority. This timetable requires an extension of the legislation for a minimum of 5 years. Such an extension, with the tariff reduction authority to be requested, is necessary to carry the trade-agreements program through the early formative years of the European Economic Community and strengthen our ability to further vital American interests there and elsewhere in the world.

The 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act with broadened authority to negotiate is essential to America's vital national interests. It will strengthen our economy which is the foundation of our national security. It will enhance the economic health and strength of the free world. It will provide a powerful force in waging total peace.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1958.*

## CONVENTIONS WITH BELGIUM AND UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND, RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President of the United States has transmitted to the Senate today:

First. A convention with Belgium for the prevention of double taxation and fiscal evasion; and

Second. A notification by Great Britain and Northern Ireland looking to the extension to certain British overseas territories of a convention for the prevention of double taxation and fiscal evasion.

As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from these documents, and that the documents, together with the President's messages, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The documents were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Executive B, 85th Congress, 2d session, a convention between the United States of America and Belgium, signed at Washington on August 22, 1957, supplementing the convention of October 28, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as modified by the supplementary convention of September 9, 1952.

The message from the President of the United States accompanying Executive B is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit the convention between the United States of America and Belgium, signed at Washington on August 22, 1957, supplementing the convention of October 28, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as modified by the supplementary convention of September 9, 1952.

The new supplementary convention is designed to facilitate the extension of the 1948 convention, as modified, to the Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

I transmit also an English translation of a note dated April 2, 1954, addressed by the Ambassador of Belgium to the Secretary of State, constituting a notification by the Belgian Government under article XXII of the 1948 convention for the purpose of extending the operation of that convention, as modified, to the Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. It is desired that, in conjunction with the consideration of the supplementary convention, the Senate consider and approve the acceptance by the United States Government of the Belgian Government's notification.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the supplementary convention and the notification, both of which have the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1958.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Secretary of State; 2. convention of August 22, 1957, supplementing the income-tax convention of 1948, as modified, between the United States and Belgium; 3. translation of note of April 2, 1954, Ambassador of Belgium to the Secretary of State.)

Executive C, 85th Congress, 2d session, a notification given by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with a view to extending to certain British overseas territories the application of the convention of April 16, 1945, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as modified by supplementary protocols of June 6, 1946, May 25, 1954, and August 19, 1957.

The message from the President of the United States accompanying Executive C is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the approval of the Senate, if the Senate approve thereof, I transmit herewith a notification given by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with a view to extending to certain British overseas territories the application of the convention of April 16, 1945, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as modified by supplementary protocols of June 6, 1946, May 25, 1954, and August 19, 1957.

The notification is embodied in a note dated August 19, 1957, from the British Ambassador in Washington to the Secretary of State, a copy of which is transmitted herewith, together with a copy of the annex thereto.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the proposed extension, which has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1958.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Note, with enclosure, from the British Ambassador to the Secretary of State, August 19, 1957.)

## PRICE SUPPORTS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I was very much surprised to note that the administration had reversed its policy concerning price supports for tobacco. In his agriculture message of January 16, the President asked for administrative authority to set price supports at between 60 percent and 90 percent of parity for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, tobacco, and dairy products. The price supports for all of these, except tobacco, are now administratively controlled within the range of 75 percent to 90 percent of parity. In the case of tobacco, the support price is inflexible, and is fixed at 90 percent.

In the message, I was disappointed at the position taken by the Department of Agriculture concerning tobacco. It is my hope and belief that the Congress will not scrap the present tobacco-support program. It was established as law by the adoption of the Cooper amendment nearly 10 years ago. It has had the endorsement of this administration until January 16. Over the years it has proved itself as a sound and practical program.

Frankly, I do not know why the Department of Agriculture changed its position. I realize that public impact and reaction, as well as Congressional impact and reaction, must be considered in the preparation of any major Presidential message. I am inclined to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture and his advisers felt that it would jeopardize the case for more flexible price supports if any exceptions were spelled out in a document such as a Presidential message. Probably it was felt that the force of the message would be weakened by the complexities which would invariably develop in explaining exceptions.

Mr. President, it might be well to review briefly not only the legislative history, but also the history of administration policy, in connection with tobacco price supports. On June 17, 1948, during the 2d session of the 80th Congress, the Senate adopted the Cooper amendment to Senate bill 2318, the long-range agricultural program. This amendment established at 90 percent of parity the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas were in effect. The substance of the amendment was accepted by the House, and became law. In making his vigorous fight for the amendment, my senior colleague, Senator COOPER, had the support of many Senators from the tobacco-producing States who still are serving in this body. Senator COOPER rendered a great service, not only to the tobacco producers of Kentucky, but also to those of the entire United States, by

his signal achievement in this legislation. Since his amendment became law, the program has worked to the benefit of the producer, without cost to the taxpayer, and without any appreciable cost to the consumer.

On January 11, 1954, the agriculture message from the President was received by the 2d session of the 84th Congress. The message contained the following paragraphs dealing with tobacco:

> Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adapted have made production control easier than for other crops.
>
> The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.
>
> It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form.

I happen to know that the logical and irrefutable arguments advanced by Senator COOPER largely influenced the administration in accepting this policy position concerning the support prices for tobacco. It was the first time that any administration had taken such a position. It was a sound position at the time and it is equally sound today.

It has been repeatedly pointed out that tobacco is a unique product. Just why it is a unique product is sometimes overlooked. Tobacco is subject to much more stringent and exacting acreage controls than is any other product. Tobacco is not measured in acres, in half acres, or in quarter acres. In the case of tobacco, the measurement actually goes down to hundredths of an acre. Every producer of tobacco would like to have a larger base. Yet, as a group, the producers overwhelmingly support the stringent control program as being a necessity, in view of the nature of the crop. The marketing of tobacco is also unique. Most of that which is raised for domestic consumption is purchased by 5 or 6 large buyers. Furthermore, production and consumption have been kept in near balance. Surpluses have accumulated in the past, but they have been liquidated without Government subsidy, and at practically no cost to the taxpayers.

Many persons labor under the misapprehension that the tobacco support program is responsible for the increase in the price of cigarettes. This is not the case, and the record should be set straight on this matter. In the last 25 years, the retail price of cigarettes has just about doubled. We can all remember when popular brands were sold at retail for less than 15 cents a package. Today, they are nearly 30 cents. Most of this increase is the result, not of rising tobacco prices, but of higher costs for packaging and distribution and higher taxes. The Federal tax on a package of cigarettes was 6 cents in January 1933; and today it is 8 cents a package. More significant are the taxes now assessed by most States on the sale of tobacco products. In some States this amounts to as much as 4 cents a package. The actual cost of the tobacco in the average package of cigarettes today is only about 15 percent of the retail selling price. It is quite clear, then, that the support program for tobacco prices has not been the important factor in the increased price of cigarettes and other tobacco products.

Above all, what makes tobacco a unique product is the fact that no other product can be substituted for it, nor can it be substituted for any other product. Tobacco has a very specific and limited end use. It is neither food nor fiber. The per capita consumption of tobacco is fairly constant from year to year. A sharp drop in price would not lead to a sharp increase in domestic consumption. For this reason, the tobacco problem is quite different from that which is found in the other basic agricultural commodities.

Let us take wheat as an example. In this country, the per capita human consumption of wheat products is almost constanta from year to year. Over the past 70 years, it has declined; but the decline has been gradual. As the standard of living has gone up, the diet of the average American family has become more varied, and the consumption of bread and other wheat products has gone down. However, there are other uses of wheat. It is an important source of proteins and carbohydrates in livestock and poultry feeds. When the price of wheat goes down in relation to the prices of corn and soy beans and other feed grains, the use of wheat as a source of animal feed goes up. Unlike tobacco, wheat and all other basic crops compete for their share of the market; and in any competition, price is a factor. In the case of cotton, the competition comes from the synthetic fibers and, to an extent, from wool.

Secretary Benson is asking for more flexible price supports, in order to prevent the accumulation of market depressing surpluses. We in the Congress may disagree on how to prevent surpluses, but I am sure all of us agree that their accumulation endangers the farm economy. In the case of many agricultural products, one can logically argue that lower prices lead to increased usage and the elimination of surpluses. In the case of tobacco, this argument does not apply. Domestic consumption is fairly constant, and does not vary within any reasonable price range. Flexible price supports are, therefore, not the answer to the problem of surplus tobacco control.

So far, I have discussed tobacco from the standpoint of domestic consumption. Let us look at the export picture. I have often heard it said that because of the tobacco-support program, we are pricing ourselves out of the world market. It is true that tobacco is being raised in many parts of the world that produced none or very little prior to World War II. However, insofar as the export of burley tobacco is concerned, if we have priced ourselves out of the market, it is not because of the support program, but is because of the changed buying habits of the American consumer.

The grades of burley tobacco which traditionally have been exported are the harsher, stronger, or higher nicotine grades. The leaves providing these grades come from the top of the plant. The grades used in domestic cigarettes in the past were the milder grades, and came from the lower leaves on the plant. This traditional pattern has been completely changed with the introduction of the filter cigarette. A few manufacturers started pushing the filter. The public likes it. All the major tobacco manufacturers, whether they wanted to or not, have had not only to produce the filter cigarette, but also to merchandise it aggressively, in order to maintain their share of the market. If one is to get any sense of taste in smoking a filter cigarette, the tobacco blend must be changed. Some stronger and higher nicotine leaves must be substituted for some of the milder mixture of the conventional cigarette. This has been done, and recently there has been a great demand for the grades of burley tobacco which formerly were a drug on the market, and which made up most of our export poundage.

Before the introduction of the filter, the so-called lower grades sold for substantially less than the higher grades. In normal years, the price of the lower grades was less than half that of the better grades. Today, because of the increased domestic demand for the lower grades, this differential has virtually disappeared. The cigarette manufacturers, in anticipating their future needs for the type of burley tobacco necessary for the filtered product, have been very aggressive in purchasing the grades of tobacco which formerly went into the export market.

During the past 10 years there has been a fairly steady advance in the general price of tobacco, not only in this country, but also abroad. Our support program may have played some part in that advance. However, the sharp and radical price advance in the lower grades which formerly made up our export poundage has not been the result of the price-support program. It has come about because the American consumer wants the filter cigarette, and the manufacturer buys the type of tobacco needed to make that a satisfying cigarette.

The answer to our tobacco export problem, certainly insofar as burley is concerned, will not be found by changing the support program. It is a serious problem, and one which now is being studied by the best brains in the country. It is a problem to which all of us who are interested in the welfare of the tobacco producer and the tobacco industry should address our attention. The research work in the chemistry of tobacco now being carried on at the University of Kentucky may prove of great value in finding the answer. But let us not deceive ourselves into thinking that a change in our support program will be the answer. The future of the American farm family is the most serious home-front challenge facing the Congress and the administration. Bold and courageous steps may be required to meet the challenge. In taking those steps, let us not kick over one of the few programs that is working in a satisfactory manner. A study of the tobacco problem leads to these conclusions:

First. The tobacco price-support program has not been a burden to the taxpayer.

Second. The program has not been a serious factor in the increased cost to the consumer.

Third. The domestic consumption of tobacco will not be increased by price reduction.

Fourth. The end use of tobacco is limited. It neither competes with, nor is it subject to competition from, any other product.

Fifth. The dilemma faced by the exporters of burley tobacco results from the innovation of the filter cigarette, not from the price-support program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my colleague, the Junior Senator from Kentucky, on his very fine statement in support of the tobacco program. He has presented the arguments in support of the present tobacco program clearly and strongly. I know that his effective statement will be welcomed by tobacco farmers, and by the entire tobacco industry.

I thank him for his kind reference to my long fight for the tobacco program. It is true that 10 years ago, on June 17, 1948, I prepared and introduced in the Senate, joined by the late Senator Barkley, the amendment to give tobacco growers a fixed, permanent support price equal to 90 percent of parity.

It was a hard fight, and the vote in the Senate was 41 to 40. I give credit again to the members of the Senate Conference Committee, of both the Democratic and Republican parties, and to my friends on this side of the aisle, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] who stood firmly in support of the Senate position. As a result, the amendment was accepted by the House and became law. The amendment providing fixed support at 90 percent of parity has been the law ever since.

I wish to give credit also to my colleagues of both parties, in my own State and in all the tobacco States—North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Georgia, Maryland, Florida, West Virginia, Missouri, and Ohio—to the Farm Bureaus, marketing cooperatives, and other farm groups, and to the individual support of tobacco growers themselves, for their part in establishing and in helping maintain on a sound basis the present tobacco program.

It is true also, as the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has kindly recalled, that I did urge Secretary Benson, and the President personally, in 1953 and in 1954, to maintain this amendment in the President's farm recommendations of 1954. And in his message of January 11, 1954, the President said in regard to tobacco:

> Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adapted have made production control easier than for other crops.
>
> The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.
>
> It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form.

I will not today repeat the arguments for the continuance of the present tobacco program. The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has stated them well. Last August 30, in a statement which I prepared, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, I presented at length the case for maintaining the present separate and distinct tobacco program, the continued need for it, and its substantial record of accomplishment.

Nevertheless, in the President's latest farm message, of January 16, which represents the views of the Secretary of Agriculture, tobacco is included among the basic farm commodities now under flexible supports, and for which the Secretary seeks discretionary authority to reduce supports to some unknown figure, down to 60 percent of parity.

There is nothing in the history of the tobacco program since 1948 which justifies this recommendation, and I strongly oppose it.

Nothing has happened since 1948, when the Congress acted to make 90 percent supports for tobacco a permanent provision of law, or since 1954, when the President recommended the continuation of that program, or since August of last year, to change the strength of these arguments for maintenance of fixed price supports for tobacco at 90 percent of parity.

On the contrary, the record to date more strongly supports the power and logic of the decision of 1954 to maintain the fixed, permanent support at 90 percent of parity, as it has been since 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule of the morning hour, a Senator is recognized for 3 minutes. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky will be recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for a short additional period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall briefly make three points today, which I hope may support the fine argument of my colleague.

First, the present tobacco program has been, and is, a success. The great farm problem of the administration, and indeed of all farmers, is to bring production in line with consumption for all farm crops. This tobacco growers have done, under the present tobacco program. No more dramatic evidence could be offered than this action of the growers themselves. The growers themselves have adjusted production to the rapidly changing conditions of the last 4 years, which my colleague from Kentucky has described.

The Department of Agriculture, which now suggests a change in the program, has itself recognized the success of the program. It has done this by recommending for each of the last 3 years that the quotas for burley tobacco growers remain the same. This is the indisputable proof that, for tobacco, production is for all practical purposes in line with consumption.

What more can the Secretary of Agriculture ask?

Second, the tobacco growers in every State, including Kentucky, are satisfied with the program, and support it. It has received the overwhelming support of tobacco farmers in their votes for the program taken in referenda for 18 consecutive years and they were never stronger in their support than they are today.

I know that the Secretary of Agriculture has emphasized again and again that a farm program must have the support of the farmers themselves if it is to be successful. What better evidence can there be of this support by the tobacco farmers themselves, and I think I can say of the entire tobacco industry, than their democratic choice of the present tobacco program, with price support at 90 percent of parity, than these votes favoring marketing quotas by 95, 97, and even 98 percent in free elections?

I might say also that it is a fact that on the whole, over the period of its operation, the program has not cost the Government of the United States money.

Third, I should like to say something about prices. All of us want the American farmer, and I can say for myself the Kentucky farmer, to have a fair share of the growing national income. While the farmers' life has compensations which are enjoyed by no other life in America, yet that fact does not deny the right of the farmers to a fair income.

Many farmers who grow other crops do not have such a share of the Nation's income today. We can be thankful that our tobacco farmers are receiving a fair price for their tobacco—in fact, the best price in all history.

Why should we change the program and endanger the farmers' prices by lowering supports? Even with present good prices, the tobacco farmers' share in the end price of their products is less than 15 percent, as my colleague has pointed out.

I say flatly to this body and to the farmers of Kentucky, that I will not support this proposed change, which has been submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture. It would endanger prices to the tobacco growers, in Kentucky and the rest of the Nation. On the contrary, I will oppose it to the very end.

I now suggest two courses of action. First, I have written the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture, pointing out the facts which my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has so well stated today, and which I stated last August. I ask that all our colleagues from the tobacco growing States do likewise.

Second, the final battleground is in the Congress. I have not the slightest doubt that the Committees on Agriculture in both Houses, and the Congress itself, will defeat this proposal. I am certain that the Congress will not adopt the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture that he be given authority to reduce the price of tobacco to some unknown figure between 60 and 90 percent of parity, or that we abandon the present program, including fixed supports at 90 percent of parity, which has been in existence for a long time, and certainly on a fixed basis since 1948.

I have a high personal regard for the Secretary. He has done much to encourage increased exports of farm products, in supporting Public Law 480, and in developing and proposing the soil bank and other programs designed to meet the problem of surpluses. These programs have done much to reduce the mountain of surplus supplies of many crops. The Secretary has also done much to develop the interest of farmers in active programs to solve their own problems—and I believe this is one of his best achievements.

But he is wrong about the tobacco program.

The tobacco farmers have solved, as well as any group can, their farm problem. They support the present tobacco program.

To the full extent of the ability of those who represent tobacco growers, I am sure we will fight before the committees of the Congress, in the Congress itself, and wherever necessary, to maintain the present tobacco program, and to maintain price supports for tobacco at 90 percent of parity. And I believe that our present tobacco program, and fixed 90-percent support prices, will remain the law.

Again, I compliment my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky, for his very fine statement on this subject.

## ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that this is the 76th anniversary of the birth of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I do not believe that anyone of our generation can ever forget the stirring times of the Roosevelt administration. He came into office in one of the most discouraging periods of our history, and he brought to that office an unconquerable will and determination and vision which reinvigorated the flagging spirit of our country.

President Roosevelt was a controversial figure, and we must leave it to history to resolve the controversies. But his boldness, his daring, his imagination, and his qualities of leadership must be conceded by all.

He came to us at a moment in history when we needed all those qualities desperately, and, Mr. President, he will never be forgotten.

## RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to state that on Monday next, February 3, after the conclusion of the morning hour and after the hour of 1 o'clock, I shall seek recognition from the Chair to speak on what I believe to be the urgent necessity for renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in a meaningful form, and the necessity for our Government's joining the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Now, Mr. President, unless there are other Senators who seek recognition during the morning hour, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

## COPPER PRICES AND COPPER PRODUCTION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, S. 2998, of which I am a cosponsor, and which has been referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, is a bill to raise the peril-point price on copper from 24 to 30 cents per pound, and the tariff to be applied at that point from 2 to 4 cents per pound.

Since the United States has abandoned the constitutional concept of protecting the industries in America, the peril-point approach has been the only means available for the protection of this large and important segment of our economy.

This protection is important not only to the economy of the State of Arizona and other Western States that mine copper, but it has vastly greater priority when we consider the individuals who depend upon copper for their livelihood. Some 16,000 men work in Arizona copper pits, mines, smelters, and mills, and their annual earnings approach $90 million. The drop in income, because of decreased production in just the last 4 months, approaches $12 million. This is due entirely to foreign cheap-labor competition.

When one considers that this important American industry is producing copper by labor paid $2.40 an hour on an average in competition with copper produced, for example, in Rhodesia at a monthly wage of $16.50, the need for this legislation becomes immediately apparent. It is noble for the United States to attempt to raise the living standards of the rest of the world, but I suggest to my colleagues that the nobility of this approach is dulled greatly if we at the same time decrease the living standards of our own American citizens who work in these mines. Protection for this industry is needed, and is needed badly, in view of the growing competition from cheap labor sources in foreign countries, and I solicit the aid of my friends in this body to seek the prompt enactment of the proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a page from the January 1958 issue of Arizona Progress entitled "Value of Arizona's Mining Output Down, Due to Decline in Metal Prices."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALUE OF ARIZONA'S MINING OUTPUT DOWN, DUE TO DECLINE IN METAL PRICES

Arizona's mining industry suffered a hard blow from declining prices during 1957 even though actual production totals were above last year's all-time high.

As it has every year since 1910, Arizona's 1957 copper production ranked first in the United States—accounting for over 47 percent of the domestic total. However, 1957's total production of 510,000 tons had a gross value of approximately $301 million while the 1956 total production of 505,908 tons was valued at $430 million. As one might ask, "What happened?" The answer, of course, is that a decline in copper prices from an average of 41.8 cents per pound in 1956 to 29.5 cents per pound during 1957 automatically wiped out approximately $129 million in gross income.

Production totals of other principal metals in 1957 also exceeded the previous year's figures. Total value of lead, zinc, gold, and silver produced—despite price declines in lead and zinc prices—exceeded 1956 totals by approximately $400,000.

Arizona mineral production for 1957, including all reported metals and nonmetals, amounted to approximately $352 million compared with the 1956 record high of over $479 million. The nonmetals (primarily sand and gavel, stone, lime, and cement) accounted for approximately $21 million during 1956 and about the same total has been estimated for 1957.

In the past 10 years, Arizona mines have produced over $2½ billion worth of the 5 principal metals listed in the tabulation below. Copper production accounted for more than 90 percent of the total, adding further emphasis to Arizona's designation as the Copper State.

Particularly at this time it may be of interest to review the history of metal prices over the past decade. The price of copper just about doubled between 1947 and 1956, then dropped to 29.5 cents per pound in 1957. Currently, copper is selling for about 25 cents per pound. Price trends of other metals, excluding the price of gold which has remained unchanged throughout the period at $35 per ounce, have been as follows:

*Average prices of principal metals*

[In cents per pound]

| Year | Copper | Silver | Lead | Zinc |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1947 | 21.0 | 90.5 | 14.4 | 12.1 |
| 1948 | 21.7 | 90.5 | 17.9 | 13.3 |
| 1949 | 19.7 | 90.5 | 15.8 | 12.4 |
| 1950 | 20.8 | 90.5 | 13.5 | 14.2 |
| 1951 | 24.2 | 90.5 | 17.3 | 18.2 |
| 1952 | 24.2 | 90.5 | 16.1 | 16.6 |
| 1953 | 28.7 | 90.5 | 13.1 | 11.5 |
| 1954 | 29.7 | 90.5 | 13.6 | 11.1 |
| 1955 | 37.6 | 90.5 | 15.1 | 12.3 |
| 1956 | 41.8 | 90.5 | 16.0 | 13.5 |
| 1957 | 29.5 | 90.5 | 14.6 | 11.4 |

*10-year record of principal metals produced in Arizona*

| Year | Copper | Gold | Silver | Lead | Zinc | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1948 | $162,803,000 | $3,832,000 | $4,378,000 | $10,704,000 | $14,491,000 | $196,208,000 |
| 1949 | 141,450,000 | 3,815,000 | 4,499,000 | 10,607,000 | 17,523,000 | 177,894,000 |
| 1950 | 167,773,000 | 4,141,000 | 4,820,000 | 7,123,000 | 17,176,000 | 201,033,000 |
| 1951 | 201,281,000 | 4,063,000 | 4,635,000 | 6,018,000 | 19,292,000 | 235,289,000 |
| 1952 | 191,528,000 | 3,932,000 | 4,255,000 | 5,319,000 | 15,651,000 | 220,685,000 |
| 1953 | 225,883,000 | 3,949,000 | 3,938,000 | 2,470,000 | 6,332,000 | 242,572,000 |
| 1954 | 224,829,000 | 3,973,000 | 3,923,000 | 2,421,000 | 4,828,000 | 239,974,000 |
| 1955 | 338,762,000 | 4,467,000 | 4,194,000 | 2,925,000 | 5,580,000 | 355,928,000 |
| 1956 | 430,022,000 | 5,114,000 | 4,687,000 | 3,768,000 | 7,009,000 | 450,600,000 |
| 1957 | 300,900,000 | 5,250,000 | 4,706,000 | 3,738,000 | 7,206,000 | 321,800,000 |
| Total | 2,385,231,000 | 42,536,000 | 44,035,000 | 55,093,000 | 115,178,000 | 2,642,073,000 |

DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN INSTALLATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] wishes to introduce a bill, and may wish to make some remarks about it, but that he has been temporarily called from the floor. I shall proceed with the understanding that I may yield to him when he returns.

The bill (H. R. 9739) is a supplemental construction authorization bill, pertaining to the Air Force only, for the fiscal year 1958, and relates to military construction, a part of which was authorized during the last session. The reason given for the urgency of this supplemental authorization bill is to take advantage of the 1958 construction season, and thus save 1 year's time. As it passed the House, the bill contained an authorization for $549,670,000. No changes in this figure have been made by the Committee on Armed Services. Broken down into major categories, the bill contains the following: $29,670,000 for SAGE, the semiautomatic ground environment system; $189 million for a ballistic missile detection system; $112,400,000 for ballistic missiles; $218,600,000 for alert and dispersal facilities for the Strategic Air Command.

The committee adopts the dollar figures in the bill without change, but is recommending two major changes in the House-passed bill, which I shall cover shortly.

Inasmuch as the detailed testimony on the bill was mostly classified, we do not as yet have printed hearings available. However, the committee hopes to be able to answer any questions which may arise. We have on the floor of the Senate typewritten copies of the hearings, and they will be available to any Senator who may desire to look at them.

Actually, this is purely a construction bill. By far the greater majority of all the items in it are of a repetitive nature, such as parking aprons, utilities, and other operational facilities which are generally found in all construction bills. The committee report covers these items in more detail. I shall not ask that it be printed in the RECORD, because it is a little long. It covers the entire bill, and I refer any interested Senator particularly to the report.

I shall now discuss some of the items contained in the committee report.

SAGE, as we know, is a part of the air defense system. It provides the detection, warning, and identification primarily for aircraft. It gathers and collates the information and reduces it in a semiautomatic manner to usable form. On the basis of this information, our defense system is given its proper commands.

The $29 million in the bill for SAGE is but a continuation of the previously approved program. The ballistic missile detection system is brandnew. It is in addition to the SAGE system of detection which is for aircraft. The $189 million will provide funds for facilities at three sites, the location of which is as yet classified. In substance, these will be three huge radar sites designed to detect and track enemy ballistic missiles.

Detection systems are very expensive. This is the beginning of a new detection system. I was surprised that more than $189 million is not necessary. I thought more than that sum would be necessary, even at the start. But I hope the relatively smaller figure is a good omen and that we will find that this system, even though it is highly important, and perhaps will become the most important system, will not be so expensive as some of the others.

The $112 million in the bill for ballistic missiles adds to the two Atlas sites previously authorized, one at Camp Cooke, Calif., and one at Cheyenne, Wyo. Another site is as yet unlocated. This amount, as I say, is for sites for the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles, and is a sum additional to those previously authorized.

The $218,600,000 for alert and dispersal facilities is to continue the current dispersal program and to provide facilities designed to enable the Strategic Air Command bomber force to react within 15 minutes after an alert. That is a rather expensive undertaking, simple though it may seem, because considerable additional facilities are required to have the B–52 bombers and the others which are a part of the Strategic Air Command together with the personnel who man them, on such an alert basis as to be able to act within 15 minutes, should they receive a command to move. When it is referred to as being able to move within 15 minutes, that means that at least one-third of the bombers in the striking part of the Strategic Air Command would be able to move in battle formation, in battle array, and ready for the ultimate, all within 15 minutes.

Mr. President, the two major changes to which I have previously referred I shall now state.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to comment on the bill the Senator from Mississippi is discussing.

I believe that the subcommittee headed by him, and of which he and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are members, has made a very careful study of the proposed construction of military bases and, in addition, has made a wise decision in eliminating section 7—which was included by the House of Representatives—because that section is not appropriate to this bill. I believe that at the same time the subcommittee was wise in allowing a little leeway to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in connection with the selection of the bases, because so short a time has been available for the making of the decisions as to specific bases.

Thus it is, Mr. President, that I desire to commend the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee for their thoughtful and careful work.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the subcommittee, let me say that we certainly appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts; and we also appreciate his study and the suggestions he has made to us, and also in the full committee, in regard to this military construction bill. We always value his opinions; and usually we find that they are sound, and usually they are followed.

Mr. President, in continuing my remarks in regard to the highlights of the bill under consideration, I desire to point out that the two major changes to which I have referred are as follows:

The first pertains to the dispersal program. Although the committee recommends approval of the authorization requested, it questioned the method of dispersal or, to be more specific, it questioned whether the selection of certain sites provides true dispersal. For an explanation of this point, I invite attention to page 9 of the report, which explains the committee's reasoning.

In that connection, Mr. President, I may say that the bill, as originally introduced in the House of Representatives, merely authorized a lump-sum appropriation for the additional construction which would be necessary for this dispersal program—that is to say, the program for the dispersal of these big bombers, so as to arrange them in smaller units and to disperse them in various installations over the country. The House of Representatives objected to the proposed authorization of a lump-sum appropriation, and called for a designation as to where the bases were to be located. As the subcommittee understood, only 3 or 4 days were available for the making of the selections. Provision for them was written into the bill; but, upon further examination, it appeared that the proposed arrangement did not provide for as true a dispersal as could have been provided for; by avoiding certain hazards, others were created.

Therefore, we decided, and the bill as reported by us now provides, that the dispersal of these bases is authorized, but that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary will take another look, and then will certify as to the bases they select. If they are not the same as the seven provided for in the bill, then the bill authorizes the use for that purpose of these additionally selected sites.

Mr. President, when the bill was considered in the House of Representatives, a floor amendment was offered and accepted. That amendment became section 7 of the House-passed bill. That section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish an Advanced Research Projects Agency, and would authorize the Secretary to enter into necessary contracts. The subcommittee received testimony from representatives

from Secretary McElroy's office; and, after a careful study of all facts concerned, the subcommittee deleted this entire section from H. R. 9739. This is explained on page 10 of the report. While the reasons are set out in the report, I shall summarize them now: Apparently, the House added this section to the construction bill because doubt existed as to whether the Secretary of Defense had, under existing law, such authority to establish an Advanced Research Projects Agency. The subcommittee deleted section 7 without specifically addressing itself to this doubt. Our action was based, rather, on the belief that this is a reorganization matter, is not germane to a construction bill, and that the subject encompasses the entire area of outer space, satellite programs, and rocket-propulsion systems, as well as many other matters.

We felt that any legislation of this nature should be directed to the subject alone and perhaps packaged in a bill designed to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended. The committee feels that the subject is so important that legislation should not be enacted hastily without all witnesses concerned having been heard and sufficient time allowed for a thorough and complete study.

Mr. President, the committee recommends that H. R. 9739 be passed as reported, with one additional minor amendment, which is in the nature of a committee amendment, designed to simply make more clear the intent of the bill as it pertains to previous authorizations for dispersal bases. This amendment, on page 10, line 24, deletes the word "funds" and substitutes the word "authorizations", which was the committee's original intent.

Mr. President, the committee unanimously recommends passage of this bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. First, I should like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for the fine job he has done in handling this bill, as well as my colleague on the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The report is unanimous. The report itself, I think, tells the story quite well.

I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee with reference to dispersal. The truth is, as mentioned in the report, the Soviet stockpile of atomic and hydrogen weapons is growing. The Soviet means of delivery likewise is growing. That means we need more bases, in order to avoid annihilation of the means by which we could retaliate.

I also associate myself completely with the comments of the chairman of the subcommittee with regard to that matter.

Secondly, I should like to mention that in the report we have stressed that bids for construction work—at least work which is to be undertaken in the United States and on the North American Continent—should be awarded by competitive bidding, unless there is a national emergency which would preclude that possibility. I think this is important. We are dealing with billions of dollars in connection with current defense programs, and with programs yet to be authorized.

A third observation I should like to make, Mr. President, is that the American people should realize that this is only the beginning of a very large defense authorization program that will have to be presented to the Congress. This being a supplemental authorization, it is only part of the program which will be presented to the Congress at this session.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Washington very much for his remarks. I wish especially to thank him and the Senator from South Dakota for their very timely and valuable assistance. Their assistance is always valuable in getting together on matters which are embraced in this rather far-reaching bill. They do excellent work. They are familiar with the subject, and they go about their work in the very finest spirit and attitude, and they are quite helpful. The Senate owes them a debt of gratitude.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator from Mississippi for the expeditious way in which he and his committee have handled this proposed legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. We thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Is it the Senator's opinion that an appropriation bill to provide the funds herein authorized will follow very quickly?

Mr. STENNIS. That appropriation bill is now being considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Hearings have been held on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week, and perhaps the bill will be marked up tomorrow.

Mr. GORE. Then, by next week we should actually pass the appropriation bill and send to the President both the authorization and the supplemental appropriation he has requested for the fiscal year 1958, should we not?

Mr. STENNIS. Without a doubt.

Mr. GORE. That situation illustrates why I feel that the able Senator from Mississippi and his colleagues on the committee are entitled to appreciation and congratulations for their expeditious consideration of this vital bill.

Mr. STENNIS. We thank the Senator from Tennessee, who is always very helpful to us in every way.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I feel I must indicate, however, that this is but a small beginning of the programs of action necessary to maintain America's superiority in the military, scientific, and economic fields.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, the Senator is correct; and I think it would be very well indeed if Congress and the American people were warned and advised of that fact. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and other Senators who have worked diligently on this matter. I do not question any of the decisions, reports, or recommendations they have made, but I wish to bring out one point. I gathered, from what the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Tennessee, who preceded me, have said, that this is just the beginning of a large program for expansion of our defense facilities. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if consideration has been given or will be given to utilizing installations that have been deactivated or which it is contemplated will be deactivated in future years. It seems to me we in the Senate are obligated to making prudent expenditures on behalf of the people. Installations throughout the United States have been deactivated. It is certainly to be hoped that consideration will be given to reactivating such installations, rather than building new installations. I should be glad to get a statement from the Senator from Mississippi on that question.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Kansas has made a very good suggestion, indeed. I can assure the Senator the committee feels as he does about utilizing installations which already exist. We have encouraged the different departments to follow that policy, and they have given some evidence, in addition to their expressions, of following such a course. I think we should not only utilize facilities already constructed, but, in operating those bases, should utilize, so far as we can, the services of the local communities and economies, and utilize local housing and other facilities that fit in with the military operations, because it is the civilians who are paying the taxes and carrying the burden of the cost of the defense program. Of course, the military personnel pay part of the taxes, but it is the economy of the country as a whole that will have to foot the bill. The dispersal program is going to use existing bases. The missile detection program involves new installations at remote places. Perhaps two of the missile launching bases will have to be new, but, obviously, that involves a geographic consideration.

I shall shortly yield the floor to the Senator from South Dakota, who, I hope, will be prepared to make some remarks, but I should like to emphasize, if I may, the point raised by the Senator from Washington with reference to construction projects on the North American continent being let by competitive bids, if at all possible. I wish to emphasize, as I think all members of the subcommittee do, our strong belief in that principle. We would have recommended that the policy be written into the body of the bill, except that such a strict provision might lead to complications which might lead to delay in some of the north-

ern installations where the time during which construction may take place is quite short. So we did not put the language in the bill, but wrote out the policy in the strongest possible language. We stated that unless it was contrary to national security we certainly expected these contracts would be entered into only on a competitive bid basis, and awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point the paragraph at the bottom of page 8 of the committee report, beginning with the words "The committee concurs," as well as the paragraph beginning "Section 5." To further designate the material, it is under the heading "Ballistic Missile Detection System—$189,000,000."

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALLISTIC-MISSILE DETECTION SYSTEM
($180 MILLION)

The committee concurs and recommends approval. However, because of the committee's knowledge of past contracting experience with reference to the construction of DEW line facilities in the extreme northern portions of the North American Continent (and it can reasonably be expected that any construction of ballistic missile detection sites in similar areas will have like problems), the committee is of the firm belief that any construction contracts entered into should be awarded on a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Section 5 of the bill stipulates that contracts made by the United States under this act shall be awarded insofar as practicable in this manner. In recommending this legislation, it is the intent of the committee that unless the national security will be impaired, the award of contracts for construction of ballistic missile detection sites on the North American Continent shall be made on a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder. The committee believes this action is not inconsistent with previous policy nor that currently in vogue in the Department of the Air Force. In taking testimony on the subject, the Air Force stated:

It is the policy of the United States Air Force to award contracts for military construction on a competitive lump-sum basis to the maximum extent practicable. Deviations from such procedure are made only when definite extenuating circumstances indicate that it is in the best interest of the United States Government. Construction is performed for the United States Air Force by numerous construction agencies, including Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army; Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Department of the Navy; various foreign governments, such as the United Kingdom, France, and others; and subordinate Air Force commands both in and outside of the United States. In accordance with section 505 of Public Law 85-241, the Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder. The initial report in accordance with this law is now being compiled covering the first half of fiscal year 1958 and will be submitted to the Congress on March 31, 1958. A preliminary report indicates that between 94 and 97 percent of the value of all contracts awarded by the United States Air Force for military construction are on a competitive lump-sum basis.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor, with the hope that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will have some remarks to make.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. Before I yield the floor, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan for a question.

Mr. POTTER. I am sorry I was not able to hear the first part of the Senator's speech, and possibly he has covered in his remarks the point I have in mind. To accomplish dispersal of SAC and the work which is to be done, what items are to be included?

Mr. STENNIS. The primary item is for additional runways for the heavy bombers. There are also some additional aprons, places on the side, and the special facilities nearby for the crews, so that they may be kept in readiness. There are also some special dispensations to keep the bombers themselves in special readiness.

Mr. POTTER. Would there be involved an addition in personnel at the various bases?

Mr. STENNIS. The program will call for some special personnel, yes, assigned for the additional movements which will be necessary to keep everything warmed up, so to speak. As to needed operating personnel, after the bomber actually gets off the ground, that probably would be much the same. I think it would not involve much additional personnel. I do not know how much is involved per bomber.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to commend the Senator from Mississippi for the expeditious manner in which the committee has handled the problem. I think for the sake of national security and defense, what is proposed is something that has to be done, and it should be done as quickly as possible. I wish to commend the junior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his unusual interest.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the subcommittee, has made a good statement covering the purposes of the bill. I shall not take the time of the Senate to comment upon the provisions relating to the funds therein proposed. Because, however, the question of the assignment of new duties to the Defense Department, or within the Defense Department, and possibly to other agencies of the Government, is involved in the matter which was treated by section 7 of the bill as passed by the House, I wish to make some remarks upon that subject.

Section 7, as included by the House of Representatives, would place statutory authority behind the present proposal of the Secretary of Defense to create within the Department of Defense a new agency to be known as the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

The Secretary of Defense is acting under the general authority contained in the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, which in section 202 (b) states:

The Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense. Under the direction of the President, and subject to the provisions of this act, he shall have direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense.

That broad language, that the Secretary "shall have direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense," is the general language upon which the Secretary of Defense relies in creating the new agency.

In the discussion attendant upon the adoption of the National Security Act of 1947 and the National Security Act Amendments of 1949 a great deal of concern was expressed by Members of Congress that the Secretary might take away from some of the functions intended to be carried on by the Secretary of the Air Force for the Department of the Air Force, by the Secretary of the Navy for the Department of the Navy, or by the Secretary of the Army for the Department of the Army. Consequently, in the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, there were written in specific limitations upon the power of the Secretary of Defense. For the purposes of the RECORD I wish to read them at this time. They are shown in section 202 (c):

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the combatant functions assigned to the military services by sections 205 (e), 206 (b), 206 (c), and 208 (f) hereof shall not be transferred, reassigned, abolished, or consolidated.

(2) Military personnel shall not be so detailed or assigned as to impair such combatant functions.

(3) The Secretary of Defense shall not direct the use and expenditure of funds of the Department of Defense in such manner as to effect the results prohibited by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

Those provisions have been generally interpreted as limitations upon the power of the Secretary of Defense, and would prohibit him from creating a new fourth department within the Department of Defense. For example, perhaps one which might be created would be the Department of Space—or the department of anything else.

However, under the existing situation, where we have been thrust so rapidly into the space era, the Secretary of Defense feels, and I think that the members of the subcommittee agree, that he has the responsibility of providing for advanced research projects which would discharge the responsibility of the Department of Defense with regard to the security of the country.

It would be desirable normally, if we had ample time, I think, for the Congress to have extended hearings regarding the creation of any new agency dealing with research, particularly in the field of astronautics.

The appropriation bill which is presently pending before the Senate Committee on Appropriations carries an allocation of money designed to be available for the new agency which the Secretary of Defense is creating by a directive within that Department.

The chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, recognizing that in the House of Representatives strict observance is generally given to the rule which prevents legislation being carried

in an appropriation bill, took the position that there should be legislation in the military construction bill as it was presented before the House of Representatives, in order that that could be pointed to as authorizing legislation, to guard the funds in the appropriation bill from being subject to a point of order. The point of order which could have been made in the House of Representatives, without legislation, would have been that the appropriation proposed to create powers or to create an agency which was not authorized by law.

The language inserted by section 7 in the amendment placed in the bill by the House served a useful purpose, in that it afforded protection for the appropriation against a point of order. But, as the chairman of our subcommittee has so aptly said, a military construction bill is not exactly the proper vehicle for the presentation to the Senate of a provision in law dealing with organization within the Defense Department.

I think the Senator from Mississippi feels, and I feel—and I believe the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] joins us in that belief—that if we are to have a new agency created, with specific powers, or with broad powers dealing with the field of astronautics and research projects in the States, it should be the result of extended hearings by the appropriate committees of the Congress; that the field should be pretty well defined; and that the purposes of the new agency should be pretty well set forth.

When Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953 became effective in June 1953, there was a section of that plan which related to research and development for the Department of Defense. It has been incorporated in the United States Code, title 10, as Public Law 1028 of the 84th Congress. The section relating to research and development is identified as section 2351, and is headed Policy, Plans, and Coordination. It reads as follows:

> The Secretary of Defense shall keep informed on the status of scientific research relating to the national security, and shall make adequate provision for research and development on scientific problems relating to the national security. He shall—
>
> (1) Prepare a complete and integrated program of research and development for military purposes;
>
> (2) Keep informed on trends in scientific research relating to the national security and the measures necessary to assure continued and increasing progress;
>
> (3) Coordinate research and development among the military departments and allocate responsibility for specific programs among those departments;

It is subparagraph 3 which has been thought by many to relate to responsibilities of the Secretary in connection with the establishment of a new agency dealing with space problems. I read it again, therefore, and I shall wish to comment on it very briefly.

The Secretary shall—

> (3) Coordinate research and development among the military departments and allocate responsibility for specific programs among those departments.

Note that the language of the law is "among the military departments and allocate responsibility for specific programs among those departments."

The thought has been expressed to the committee that the language "coordinate research and development among the military departments and allocate responsibility for specific programs among those departments" serves as a limitation against the Secretary's creating a new department or agency to which to assign responsibilities in research and development. It provides that the Secretary shall coordinate and assign responsibility among existing departments.

The reorganization plan continues with two other paragraphs, as follows:

> (4) Formulate policy for the Department of Defense on research and development involving agencies outside the Department of Defense; and
>
> (5) Consider the interaction of research and development and strategy and instruct the Joint Chiefs of Staff thereon.

In the discussion of the program which was placed before the committee we were advised that the Office of the Secretary of Defense proposed that the agency should direct and manage such defense projects in the field of research and development as the Secretary of Defense shall from time to time designate, by individual projects or by category, as directed by act of Congress.

The agency—meaning the new agency created by the Secretary—would be authorized to direct research and development work in the fields as assigned, and to arrange for the performance of work by other agencies of Government, including the military departments.

The agency must also enter into contracts with private business entities or educational or research institutions, within the limits of assigned funds when appropriate, and may establish laboratory facilities upon recommendation by the Director and approval by the Secretary of Defense.

The provision that the agency might establish laboratory facilities obviously contemplates the possibility of acquisition of real estate, entering into contracts for construtcion, and other things which go along with the establishment of laboratory facilities.

I am not speaking for other members of the committee in this connection, but so far as I am personally concerned, I can find no authority in existing law for the creation by the Secretary of Defense of a new agency, within the department, which can enter into contracts for the establishment of laboratories, except as it might be done through one of the existing departments—the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

However, as I stated earlier, the committee believed, individually and collectively, that the Secretary of Defense had a responsibility to meet the situation which now exists in the possibility of astronautics and other projects of a research character which bear upon the security of the country. Therefore we wished to do nothing which would interpose any difficulty in the way of his proceeding promptly along the lines presently indicated.

We consulted the Comptroller General with regard to the authority of the Secretary of Defense to enter into contracts directly or through a new agency, and outside the existing departments. The Comptroller has advised the committee, and has advised the Department of Defense, that if the Congress makes the appropriation contemplated in the appropriation bill now pending, and does so after the agency has been created within the Department, that will be interpreted as recognition by the Congress of the agency; and the appropriation of funds, without the interposition of any point of order, would establish the authority for the expenditure of funds, provided that no part of the language in the appropriation bill which would seem to compromise that authority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has a letter from the Comptroller General in which a suggestion is made with respect to the deletion of certain words in the appropriation bill. If he will contribute that letter for the RECORD at this time, I think it will be most constructive.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota a letter addressed to Hon. CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, from Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States. The letter is dated January 29, 1958.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, January 29, 1958.*

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
*Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, H. R. 10146, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense, is now pending before your committee, and carries an item for the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

On the assumption that if such item is enacted into law it is the intention of the Congress that the agency proceed with its program, to the extent of funds made available, we recommend that the words "as may be authorized by law" be deleted from this item. In that event, we would regard the appropriation of funds to the Agency as a recognition by the Congress of the legal status of the agency. If the words are permitted to remain in the bill some question might be raised as to the status or authority of the Advanced Research Projects Agency and, conceivably, the purpose of the Congress, in enacting the appropriation, could be defeated.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In that letter the Comptroller General states that if the words "as may be authorized by law" were deleted from the item in the bill as it was sent over from the House, the appropriation of funds to the agency would be a recognition by Congress of the legal status of the agency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from Massachu-

setts. Let me add, for the clarification of the situation for the benefit of Senators who have not had the opportunity to read the letter, that when the Comptroller General refers to the deletion of certain language—meaning the words "as may be authorized by law"—he refers to the deletion or recommended deletion of those words from the appropriation bill, and not from the bill now pending.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The inclusion of the words "as may be authorized by law" in the appropriation bill could have been construed as a limitation on the expenditure of money, which would have required the Department of Defense or the Comptroller General to go back into the law to find the specific authorizations for which the money might be expended. As I understand, the deletion of the language referred to means that the money is being appropriated to the Agency which has heretofore been created, and consequently will constitute approval by the Congress of the appropriation to that agency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; that is correct. As I understand, with the agency set forth in the last paragraph of the appropriation bill, the Secretary of Defense must set up the agency to be created, and with those words deleted, the appropriation is in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator, because I think his statement makes a valuable contribution and will certainly support the Attorney General in approving expenditures from that fund. It confirms the position taken by the subcommittee with reference to the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to ask the Senator a question so that this point will be clearly understood. As the Senator from Mississippi now understands, the Attorney General has said that by deleting the words "as may be authorized by law" from the appropriation bill, any sums appropriated in the appropriation bill could be legally expended without any additional statutory enactment. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. The fact that Congress makes an appropriation to an agency, and that agency is named in the appropriation bill, indicates that Congress thereby recognizes that the agency is properly in existence.

Mr. STENNIS. I have this additional question. The Senator says that the agency must be set up before the appropriation bill becomes law. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. But the agency has not been actually established, as I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Secretary of Defense told the committee yesterday morning that he had been holding up the creation of the agency until he had the proper man to put in it. However, with the understanding of the law as it has been now stated, he said he would create the agency and then wait to get the proper man.

Mr. STENNIS. In other words, he would create the agency prior to the appropriation bill becoming law. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank both Senators.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the record is clear that if the appropriation is made subsequent to the creation of the agency, Congress, by the final approval of the appropriation, will have placed its stamp of approval upon the creation of the agency, and thereby approved the expenditure of funds for the purposes set forth.

I wish to say, however, in conclusion, that I believe that the area of astronautics is so broad that Congress may address itself to the whole field. The Secretary of Defense would be severely criticized were he not to accept his responsibilities in the security field at this time. However, the possibilities in the field of astronautics are not limited to the Department of Defense. There are research projects which have possibilities in weather detection, weather forecasting, and possibly in weather control, and which might not be encompassed by a project which would be directed by the Secretary of Defense in the name of security, or the development of weapons. There are projects which are related to communications and the development of resources, and possibly the field of exploration of other planets and outer space, which might or might not come within the purview of weapons development.

Therefore I believe that Congress should at an early date address itself to the broad program of research into space projects of various kinds; and I hope that before long legislation will be before Congress which will provide the vehicle for hearings on those subjects.

In closing I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee and to the Senator from Washington. It has been an inspiration to work with them because of their knowledge in this field, and because of the devoted and patriotic spirit which animates their thoughts and activities. I also wish to express my appreciation—and I am sure the other members of the committee will wish to join me—to the committee clerk, Col. Kenneth E. BeLieu, who has been most helpful to us in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to make a few undramatic suggestions on some down-to-earth defense needs. I want to stress the things we need to do immediately to stay alive.

In a subsequent speech I shall discuss the parallel efforts we should make to speed advanced weapons projects and other long-range programs that may win us the race to the stars. But first things first. There are some things we have to do on earth in 1958 if we are to go to the moon in 1968.

My remarks today will take the form of a series of constructive recommendations. This is in accord with the policy I have tried to follow over the years in pointing out deficiencies in our defense program and in proposing remedies.

History may prove that some of the steps I am suggesting were unnecessary. But we cannot await the verdict of history. Gone are our two precious allies in past wars—time in which to mobilize, and distance to protect our homeland. Today, whatever force is required, either to deter war or to win it if deterrence fails, must be on hand—ready at all times. No longer can we afford the luxury of second guessing our requirements. In the missile age, it is the first guess that counts.

The aggressor will always have one grave advantage over us. He can prepare to strike when he wants, where he wants, and how he wants. We have to prepare to meet aggression in many different forms, and not at times or places of our own choosing.

Mr. President, what are we now failing to do that we should be doing—in the air, at sea, and on land?

In particular, I want to make the following seven recommendations:

First. We should produce more B–52 heavy bombers and KC–135 tankers, faster.

The Russians are at present well ahead of us in the IRBM–ICBM race. The Soviet missile program has proceeded much faster than we expected 3 years ago. Our own missile program has proceeded more slowly than was expected. More Soviet missiles sooner. Fewer American missiles later. This is the fact and the outlook before us.

The one and only way to fill the gap is by more long-range manned bombers. Ultimately manned bombers will supplement ballistic missiles, but they cannot supplement missiles which we do not have.

This year, next year, and the year thereafter, we must work with what we have in hand. This is the B–52, and the KC–135 tanker that keeps it airborne.

The B–52 is now the world's most advanced operational long-range bombing plane. In its existing version, and in its advanced version—the B–52G—this plane must and will be the mainstay of our retaliatory force for the critical years ahead.

Yet in the face of this fact, what have we done? Incredible as it seems, we have been cutting back and stretching out our programs, when every day that passes urgently calls for more B–52's, sooner. The fact is we still have as many wings of the obsolete B–36 as we have of B–52's, while our medium-range bomber, the B–47, becomes more obsolescent every day.

The record contains impressive and uncontradicted evidence that our position in manned bombers is seriously deficient.

In 1956 General LeMay, then commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command, testified that—

> Under current intelligence estimates and approved plans and programs the Soviet long-range air force will be relatively stronger than the Strategic Air Command by 1960 at the latest.

General LeMay went on to say:

If present plans and programs, as I understand them, are unchanged and our estimates of Russian airpower are correct, I think there is grave doubt that the Strategic Air Command would present an effective deterrence in that time period (1958-60).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has stated that the Russians are at present well ahead of us in the IRBM–ICBM race. Could the Senator give us some idea as to just how much ahead of us the Russians are at this time in those two fields?

Mr. JACKSON. The Soviets have operational intermediate range ballistic missiles. We do not.

The Soviets probably have some operational intercontinental ballistic missiles. We do not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator mind explaining the ranges of the IRBM and ICBM?

Mr. JACKSON. The Soviets have intermediate range missiles in the range area of 1,000 nautical miles.

Our specifications for these missiles call for 1,500 miles for IRBM's and 5,000 miles for ICBM's.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator tell us, further, how the IRBM and the ICBM travel?

Mr. JACKSON. The IRBM probably would traverse a distance of 1,500 nautical miles in 13 minutes. At its maximum speed, I believe it reaches about Mach 14 prior to reentering the atmosphere.

The intercontinental ballistic missile can traverse 5,000 miles in about 33 minutes. It probably reaches a maximum speed, prior to reentry into the atmosphere, of Mach 21.

When I use the term Mach, that means the speed of sound.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that on the basis of the information which the Senator has just given the Senate, the United States is within 15 minutes of any missile takeoff from the Soviet Union or contiguous territories?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; the Soviets have that capability, or will have it soon. In addition, the Soviets have a fleet of more than 500 submarines, some of which have missile-firing capability.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Washington has been diligent in this particular field, and more than diligent in pointing out the deficiency which this country suffers in comparison with the Soviet Union so far as submarines are concerned.

On the basis of the startling statement which the Senator has made this afternoon, is it safe to assume that in case of another great emergency, this country would no longer be the privileged sanctuary it was in the first two World Wars?

Mr. JACKSON. Very definitely the No. 1 target of the Soviet Union in an all-out war will be the United States. If the United States is destroyed, all of our allies will fall with it. We will be the No. 1 target in an all-out war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, to recapitulate, we are within 15 minutes, on the basis of ICBM speeds, of any missile takeoff from the Soviet Union. We will no longer be a privileged sanctuary in case of another world conflagration. We will no longer have time to mobilize our manpower, gird our industry, and develop our resources. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct. We have had two fortunate allies in past conflicts—time and space: time to mobilize and space to protect our shores from enemy attack. These two allies, together with the great industrial capability of this country, have made possible our victories in the last two terrible wars.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to my colleague on the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have read the speech which is now being delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington. I believe it is a most constructive and carefully prepared presentation regarding our current position in the world today.

No one in the Senate has stressed the importance of this country being prepared against a possible enemy more than has my colleague from the State of Washington.

I notice that in his able and carefully drawn up talk, the Senator quotes from the testimony of General LeMay given in 1956.

Mr. JACKSON. The testimony I have referred to is the testimony given before the subcommittee of which the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri served as chairman, and on which he did such an effective job in pointing up the need for this country to develop effective air power.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his comment. He, too, was a member of that committee, and nobody contributed more to its successful operation than he did.

In 1958—in fact, this very month—General LeMay made the following statement in his testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations concerning the fiscal 1958 supplemental defense appropriation bill:

What this all adds up to is that 18 months ago, when we had a real look at the intelligence picture for Mr. SYMINGTON's hearings, we estimated that the combat capability of the Soviet long-range air force would surpass ours by the middle of 1959. I still think that by mid-1959 there is a good chance that their combat capability will exceed ours.

I ask my able colleague from Washington if he does not agree with those remarks, made earlier this month.

Mr. JACKSON. I agree completely with the remarks. They are borne out by what we are doing and by the information which is made available to us from intelligence sources.

I may say that no one knows the picture better than does General LeMay, who headed the Strategic Air Command for so many years. I have complete faith in his military judgment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. General LeMay continued in his testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations:

Yes, they are going to have more ground forces; they are going to have more submarines; it looks like their air capability will be greater than ours. Even so, that is nothing unusual to me. I never had to start a fight with superiority, and I don't think any other soldier of the United States ever has either. We have always failed to prepare properly for wars, and we have always been the underdog going in. I don't think it is very profitable to plan on doing that next time, but if that happens we will do the best we can with what you have given us. * * * I think all the previous testimony here and in the Senate has indicated that the Russian army is bigger than ours. I do not say better; I say bigger. They have more submarines than we have. It is on the record that we expect their striking capability in the air to pass ours some time in 1959. And I do not think we can deny it here, since it has been said on the record before.

I think we probably will be stronger in 1959, but I do not have any assurance we will be strong enough in 1959.

Mr. JACKSON. I may comment at this point that in the missile age underdogs will be dead dogs. There will be no chance to survive unless we have adequate forces in being at the time the conflict breaks out, so as to do the job necessary for survival.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In a statement which was issued by the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness, on behalf of the rest of the members of the committee and himself, 17 points were brought up as to what should be done now. "Decisive action" was the term used.

I have read carefully the speech of the able Senator from Washington, in which he points out how little is being asked for, not only in the supplemental 1958 budget, but also in the budget for the fiscal year 1959. I know my colleague is aware of the 17 points which have been brought up in the statement issued by the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, our majority leader.

May I ask my colleague if he believes that those 17 points recommended for decisive action are in any way taken care of by either the fiscal 1958 supplemental appropriation bill or the proposed 1959 appropriation bill. I said "in any way taken care of"; I should change that to "adequately taken care of."

Mr. JACKSON. Some of the items may be taken care of in part, but certainly the overall 17-point program to which the distinguished Senator from Missouri has referred was not taken care of in any existing request to Congress, to my knowledge.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for yielding to me. This afternoon, as he has done many times before, he has made a real contribution to the future security of our country.

Mr. JACKSON. I appreciate the kind comments of my good friend the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, since General LeMay gave his testimony, our manned-bomber programs, far from being increased, have been reduced.

The truth is that the Soviet Union is speedily diminishing our lead in manned airpower and, at current rates, will outdistance this country in the very near future.

And now the budget requests before Congress call for not a single penny for more B–52's, beyond the 11 wings already programed.

General White, Air Force Chief of Staff, recently told Congress:

> If we don't get more money, we will be unable to reorder B–52's except at very great expense, because the production line goes to pieces; and I feel that until we know more about these ballistic missiles and until we know about the B–58 we should have the insurance of keeping that line open.

General White went on to say he had "taken every step I know" to obtain an additional $615 million for another wing of B–52's and for the KC–135 tankers to support them, only to have the Secretary of Defense refuse his request.

Mr. President, I am not sure that the $615 million is enough. My own belief is that at least $1 billion could now be profitably budgeted for this purpose. But of this much I am sure: The Air Force request constitutes the irreducible minimum required for our national safety.

Second. We should step up the production schedule for the B–58 medium-weight supersonic bomber.

The B–52—even in the advanced version—by no means represents the last word in manned bombers. Even more advanced manned weapons systems are bound to come. We can be sure of one thing: Moscow is hard at work on new high-performance aircraft.

At present we have one hopeful new plane sufficiently developed to go into production. The possible successor to the B–47—the B–58—exists in prototype; and seven B–58's have been delivered for testing purposes. Currently planned programs bring the total number of B–58's on order to less than 80.

In my view, we can get the new B–58's more rapidly than present plans allow. Recently, when General White was asked whether they are producing the B–58's as rapidly as they could, he replied:

> I am sure they are not. It may take some money.

Mr. President, if we tool up faster for the B–58, we shall have more of them sooner. I am hopeful that Congress will promptly budget funds for this purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. During the course of the very excellent speech being given by the distinguished Senator from Washington, I did not hear him use the expression "lead time," but I understood him to make indirect references to it. Can he state just what is the difference, as between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, so far as the lead time in the production of both planes and missiles is concerned?

Mr. JACKSON. We know that in the case of the B–52 as compared with the Soviet Bison bomber, the Russians were able to cut their lead time to half as much as ours—in fact, I prefer to call it "leg-time".

I cannot state any precise figures as to the missiles; but I can say that it is quite clear that the Soviets took many calculated risks, made their decisions promptly, and were able to get the jump on us, in connection with the development and production of both the IRBM and the ICBM.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Referring to the production of the B–52 in comparison with the production of the Bison bomber, the Soviet counterpart of the B–52, can the Senator from Washington give an approximate figure, in years, as to how long in the way of lead time it took to develop the B–52, on the one hand, and the Soviet Bison bomber, on the other? Can the Senator give a rough figure as to that?

Mr. JACKSON. My rough guess is that in our case it was about 10 years from the initial development phase to the point of obtaining operational capability.

Mr. MANSFIELD. From the planning boards?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; compared with 5 years for the Soviets.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that statement is a correct one—and I assume it is—then it appears to me that by the time the 10 years taken up in our lead time is over and the finished product becomes operational, it also becomes obsolete.

Mr. JACKSON. There is that danger.

It has been clear to many of us for a long time that the Soviets realized that, if they were ever to defeat the United States and the rest of the Free World, they would have to defeat us at our own game. The strength of our position over the years has been our industrial, our scientific, and our technical capability. The Soviets have demonstrated dramatically, with sputnik and with other devices, that they are out to seize our trump card and to beat us at our own game. We have dramatic proof that they have been doing exactly that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can understand the Senator's point, when he states that in the matter of lead time the Soviet Union is beating us at our own game, because we have always boasted of our industrial know-how and of the fact that we could get things done on a big production basis.

What is the reason for the difference of 5 years—again referring to the B–52's and the Soviet Bison bombers; what is the reason for this 5-year lag behind the Soviet Union, insofar as we are concerned, in view of all the facilities we have at our disposal?

Mr. JACKSON. I think there has been a basic assumption in the United States—one which extends all the way to children who, at the age of 5 or 6, enter grade school—that we are superior in anything involving industry, science, or technology. If I were to give one, overall reason for our difficulty, it is that we have a national superiority complex.

When it comes to the mass production of anything in the way of industrial goods for domestic consumption or the mass production of arms with which to defend our country, the average American, when asked, "Who can turn out the most?", will reply, "The United States of America." There has been a feeling that the Soviets are only a few years from a feudal society, so how could they ever match the United States of America?

Our difficulty is a national superiority complex. The sooner we learn humility, the stronger the United States and the rest of the Free World will be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. For some years the distinguished Senator from Washington and I have been listening to statements which have attempted to justify our passing over quantitative superiority to the Soviet Union, on the ground that we were qualitatively superior, on the ground, on the sea, and in many respects, in the air. Will not the distinguished Senator from Washington, who has made so thorough a study of this subject, agree that what sputnik did, more than anything else, was to expose the fallacy of the claims of our being qualitatively superior, as a justification for our having passed over quantitative superiority?

Mr. JACKSON. I agree completely with what the distinguished Senator has said. It is quite obvious that if we, with only 8 percent of the world's population, are to maintain a military posture which will assure our survival, we certainly have to overcome the numerical disadvantage, through qualitative superiority. The Soviets realize this; and the Soviets have centered their attack on the very area in which we have maintained supremacy in the past.

In my trip to the Soviet Union in 1956, I found first-hand corroboration of that objective. This is the obvious course for the Soviets to pursue if they wish to win.

Mr. President, I come now to my next point:

Third. We should further expedite the dispersal of our strategic striking force, we should take steps to harden existing bases, and we should redouble our efforts to provide early warning against enemy planes and missiles.

Our Strategic Air Command bases are now the No. 1 target for Soviet attack, because our SAC represents our means of retaliation against Russia. Moreover, as the Kremlin expands its stockpile of nuclear weapons and improves its means of delivering bombs, our bases become more and more vulnerable.

By either this year or next year, our entire system of overseas bases will be exposed to Russian IRBM attack. This year, and even more in the years thereafter, the strategic airbases in our own

country will become exposed to Soviet ICBM assault. Meanwhile, vital bases here at home are now open to enemy missiles from the sea.

Confronting this hazardous prospect, what have we done to disperse our bombers, to protect them on existing bases, and to assure them the earliest possible warning so they can get off the ground before they are hit?

The answer is we have done far too little.

SAC dispersal programs have proceeded at a leisurely pace. We have taken no decisive measures to harden our bases by protecting our bombers from indirect hits. At the present time the retaliatory force on which our safety depends stands on ramps above ground. An H-bomb that misses its target by a wide margin will still wipe out a force that is so exposed. Early warning and detection systems against manned aircraft are far from peak efficiency. Interservice rivalry has kept us sitting on our hands for the past 2 years in developing an early warning system against the ICBM.

New budget requests now before Congress provide for dispersal of SAC at a faster rate and for improvement of our early warning and detection programs. Again, however, I think an insufficient effort is planned.

SAC is the only deterrent, retaliatory force we have on hand. Nothing is more urgent than safeguarding it against destruction or neutralization by surprise attack. Surely, substantial funds to speed this effort are warranted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is talking about the Strategic Air Command. Is it not a fact that approximately 20 percent of our B–47 takeoffs abort?

Mr. JACKSON. I am not sure of the exact figure, but I know it is quite a large number.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I have been informed that it is the case that 20 percent of the B–47 takeoffs abort, either on the field or immediately after they are airborne, owing to inadequate ground-crew servicing. I understand that with first-rate servicing there would be virtually no such aborted flights, but this servicing by enlisted men is bad simply because 85 percent of those men leave the Strategic Air Command—and it is hard duty—or leave the Air Force entirely, after a hitch which includes 3 years of training.

The reason that they leave the Strategic Air Command, as I understand, after the United States Government expends thousands of dollars on their training—and, so far as triple-rated bomber pilots are concerned, hundreds of thousands of dollars—is to go into private industry to make more money; and it leaves a gap in the security defenses of our country which is extremely hard to fill.

Mr. JACKSON. The distinguished junior Senator from Montana has put his finger on a very important part of this problem. The personnel problem is a crucial one in the Air Force, and particularly in SAC. I understand that 75 percent of the airmen have served in SAC 2 years or less. That is a very serious turnover.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator have any information as to whether or not this statement is correct: That something on the order of 200 B–47's are in existence, but we can neither crew nor service them?

Mr. JACKSON. I would not be able to state the exact figure, but it is far too large.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, we have a sizable number of B–47's which have neither crews to man them nor service groups to service them. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. To service or man them properly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I resume my statement.

Fourth. We should increase the number of operational missiles that will be available by immediately ordering additional IRBM's and ICBM's.

It may be true that we cannot now shorten the time in which we will get our first operational ballistic missiles. Certain irreducible items of technological lead time are working against us.

We can, however, hasten the time at which we will have significant numbers of operational missiles. We can take the calculated risk of going into mass production before every minute item of the missile has been tested.

In the Manhattan project in World War II we constructed production facilities at Hanford without knowing for sure that the facilities could do the job. Had we waited until every phase of the bomb was tested out, our achievement of that decisive weapon would have been long delayed.

Test missiles are fine, but only operational missiles in abundance will pay off as a deterrent.

General Schriever, Commander of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division, recently said that the capabilities now exist to start building more units of the Thor and Atlas than are in presently approved programs. He said a further stepup in production schedules is possible by using our current production base, with only some rounding out.

I consider wholly inadequate the budget requests now before Congress to accelerate production rates for ballistic missiles. These missiles are supposed to have the highest national priority. If that means anything, it means that we must execute that priority at every stage of their preparation, including production.

Fifth. We should revise upward our program for producing Polaris missile-launching submarines, and lay down a minimum of 15 keels immediately.

I have previously proposed that we build 100 Polaris missile-launching submarines at the earliest possible date. These submarines afford the opportunity to increase radically the effectiveness of our IRBM. After all, an IRBM launched from an ocean platform can have the same target coverage and the same military effect as an ICBM launched from our own country.

The problem we face in keeping the peace is to convince the enemy that, even if he strikes first, we will be able to strike back just as hard, perhaps harder.

If we kept 50 Polaris submarines at sea at all times, constantly on the move, hard to find, and next to impossible to destroy, we should have a formidable deterrent to Soviet attack. No matter how effective an enemy might think a sneak attack against our cities and land bases might be, he would know he could not avoid a crushing return blow by our underseas force.

I think it very likely that the Polaris system, if set up in strength, could become the Free World's main deterrent, retaliatory force.

The 1958 supplemental budget provides funds for our first three Polaris missile submarines, and we are told money for six more will be requested. This number falls short of what we should order this year. We can move more rapidly toward the objective of 100 such submarines by starting 15 of them immediately, 6 more than are presently contemplated.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator stresses the Polaris missile. Nearly everybody connected with its development has also emphasized the importance of that missile. Will the Senator not agree with me that if we do not have the submarines to launch the missile, the missile cannot perform its intended mission?

Mr. JACKSON. The statement of the Senator is correct. It is very important that we take parallel action on both the missile and the submarine. In other words, we are facing a situation in which we shall probably, unless we do something about it, have Polaris missiles without their launching platforms; namely, nuclear-powered submarines. The missile is only half of the weapon system. Unless we have the means to launch it we lose its deterrent value.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I ask the other half of that question? Do we have the Polaris missile?

Mr. JACKSON. The answer is "No." If all of the schedules work out as planned, we will make good progress on the Polaris missile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Ther, if we do not have the Polaris missile, why should we build Polaris missile submarines?

Mr. JACKSON. The objective, of course, is to produce the Polaris missile on a schedule that will tie it in with the submarine, so that the missile can be married to the submarine on a concurrent basis.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator means is that the two items, the Polaris missile submarine and the Polaris missile, should be developed simultaneously.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Sixth. We should radically accelerate our antisubmarine warfare programs

and provide for a Vice Chief of Staff for Undersea Warfare.

The Soviet Union has the largest undersea fleet in the world—over 500 submarines, many with missile-launching capability. Admiral Rickover told Congress this year that if the Russians were to commence building atomic submarines now at a fraction of the rate they have been building conventional submarines we would even lose our present lead in nuclear submarines—and as early as 1961.

At the current building rate we will have only about 15 nuclear submarines in operation before 1961.

Moscow may not yet have the equivalent of the Polaris submarine system, but she can build it soon. When that day comes most of the United States will be within range of nuclear attack from the sea.

In the face of this threat, are we doing enough to keep our ocean lifelines open? Are we preparing to safeguard our mainland from missiles launched from Soviet submarines?

The truth is our antisubmarine methods are still mainly conventional and of little value against the unconventional threat. We have only begun to develop the new ships, train the new men, and achieve the needed breakthroughs in detection techniques.

Rear Adm. Rawson Bennett, Chief of Naval Research, has testified before Congress that "at this point we are not in the very rapid state of advance in antisubmarine warfare."

Thus far antisubmarine warfare has relied on a strategy of attrition. Even when the target was a conventional submarine, the detection and kill record has been low. Now with the coming of the nuclear submarine every difficulty is multiplied.

We need to aim for 100 percent detection and 100 percent kill. The frightful destructive power of one enemy submarine makes anything less inadequate. One submarine alive can mean one American city dead.

The 1959 budget includes a request for some additional money for antisubmarine warfare, but the increase is not very substantial.

Once more, I believe we are shortchanging a vital program. We must win the race for discovery of new detection techniques. We need to order more attack and hunter-killer submarines that can sink Russian submarines. There is every justification for budgeting ample funds for these purposes.

I also want to repeat my earlier suggestion for the appointment of a Vice Chief of Staff for Undersea Warfare to help get the effort into higher gear, and maintain it that way.

Seventh. We should build up the Army to 18 divisions and fully modernize its equipment—the pentomic division should really be made pentomic.

The greatest threat we face is all-out Soviet attack, but this is not the most likely threat—today. As long as American power can still devastate an aggressor, Moscow may refrain from an all-out blow.

The Kremlin doubtless prefers to inherit the world, if it can, rather than demolish it. Our most probable immediate military danger is the limited Soviet probe and penetration carefully calculated not to arouse this country to a showdown.

This being their likely tactic, we require modern mobile forces prepared to prevent local engagements from getting out of hand. As Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, said in 1956: "If the small war breaks out, we must suppress it promptly, because that small war may easily lead to the great war which we are all trying to avoid."

In the light of this requirement what have we done? Illogically and disastrous as it is, we have relentlessly cut our Army from 20 divisions, to 18, and then to 15 at the end of this fiscal year. Now Congress is asked in the 1959 budget to give its blessing to a 14-division Army.

This further cut is proposed despite testimony by such men as General Gavin, Chief of Army Research and Development, that even with the present number of army divisions we are not in a position to fight a limited war.

Eight of our divisions are deployed overseas, three are really training organizations, leaving us with a striking force of three or at the most four divisions. This is an absurdly small force to compare with the 175 Soviet divisions.

These Soviet divisions are poised to threaten such critical areas as the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and Europe. We ask the nations who are under the muzzles of Soviet guns to resist the powerful forces across their frontiers; we pledge our assistance. Yet we would be hard pressed to move only one division by air transportation, and these countries, and the Soviets, know this fact.

The Army has recognized the need to adapt to the nuclear age. It has reorganized its active divisions under the pentomic concept to provide greater mobility, greater striking power, and faster reaction to the changing conditions of battle.

These new pentomic divisions, however, are still shackled to World War II equipment. At the rate modern equipment is being provided it will be several years before the new divisions are anything but paper pentomic.

General Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, recently testified: "I do not believe that the Army can modernize to the extent I consider necessary without a significant increase over the funds received in recent years."

But this is not all. Congress is asked in the 1959 budget to reduce Army Reserve components. A case might be made for holding down the Regular Army if we had enough Army Reserve divisions equipped and trained to constitute combat-ready units. But it makes no sense whatsoever to cut back the Regular Army and simultaneously deal a body blow to the Reserve program.

Clearly, we should provide this country with a modern Army, equipped to fight on today's battlefield. Its strength should be restored to 18 active divisions as a minimum; the rate of modernization should be speeded up; and the Reserve forces program should be assured steady support.

Mr. President, one final point. In matters of national security—in matters, in other words, affecting freedom's life and death—it is not the business of the executive branch or Congress to shy away from necessary programs simply because they demand sacrifices of our people. It is the business of both branches of Government to tell the people honestly and clearly what is needed for our survival, and to fight for programs that will meet those needs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has given a very excellent address this afternoon. Speaking for myself, the Senator has given me a great deal to think about. As I go back over what the Senator said, it appears to me he considers that at the present time the Strategic Air Command is our greatest deterrent to war; that there are possibilities of real defense in a submersible naval setup; that the Army is being reduced to a maximum of 14 divisions in the 1959 budget, and, I might add, that the Marine Corps is also being reduced to some extent at the same time.

My reaction to the Senator's excellent speech—and I must compliment him for "laying it on the line"—is that at the present time the Strategic Air Command is not only the main deterrent we have to prevent an all-out struggle, but it is in a real sense the keeper of the peace.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank my good friend for his kind remarks. What he had to say about the Strategic Air Command is completely true. It is the main deterrent to all-out war.

In the manned bomber area we have the one opportunity to build up our retaliatory capability now. This we must do at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for what I consider a very timely and constructive speech on some very live subjects. He is well qualified to speak on those subjects.

For emphasis, I wish to say that I came from the Preparedness Subcommittee hearings with the very strong conviction that we ought to expand the pro[illegible] of B–52 heavy bomber production, with its service auxiliary, the KC–135 tanker, because, after all, they are our quick weapons for instant defense or retaliation. They are weapons in being, of proved capability. They are our chief reliance as of this time. They can be manufactured speedily and manned and made ready. I think we have already been burning daylight, and we are continuing to burn daylight without action on anything like the scale on which we should be producing these weapons.

I wish to commend as well as thank Col. Ken BeLieu, of the Senate Armed Services Committee staff, for his most valuable and untiring work on this bill. Colonel BeLieu is not only willing, but he is able, and his services are always most helpful to our committee.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, shortly after the Congress convened, President Eisenhower requested a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1958 for the construction of facilities deemed imperative to meet the increased Soviet threat, and particularly in the field of long-range missiles and satellites. The Preparedness Subcommittee of our Armed Services Committee has made an exhaustive study in order to evaluate our military posture, in order to insure effective combat readiness of our armed services.

For 110 days seventy-seven-some witnesses were heard by the committee, and around 200 experts were interviewed by the staff. Countless authorities, including outstanding scientists, top industrialists, and high Defense Department officials, testified in open sessions. A good many of these witnesses and our Central Intelligence people testified also in closed sessions.

The report declared that the Soviets presently have the advantage in ballistic missiles, outer-space satellites, and in submarine numbers. No one disputed, however, the present power of our superb Strategic Air Command to strike devastating blows of almost total destruction.

Among other recommendations, the committee suggested that the Defense Department—

Strengthen our Strategic Air Command and disperse our SAC bases.

Step up production of our Atlas—ICBM—and our Thor and Jupiter—IRBM's.

Start immediately on the development of manned missiles.

Reorganize the Defense Department, particularly the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Improve our distant early warning system and develop a detection system for ballistic missiles.

Expand research and development programs.

Modernize civilian defense.

Some of these recommendations have already been adopted, and some are on the fire. When the chips are down, the American people will get on with the job and come through in good shape. In order to launch deadly counterstrikes, SAC must have available an early warning system, alert facilities, proper dispersal, and trained personnel. Before long, Mr. President, in my judgment, we will close the gap on Soviet progress in the missile field, and I have every confidence that in the meantime we can rely on our splendid Strategic Air Command.

Mr. President, as the report indicates, this bill authorizes certain construction to augment the ICBM complex planned for Warren Air Force Base in my State. The bill includes construction projects in the amount of $112,400,000 in support of the acceleration of the program covering the intercontinental and the intermediate-range ballistic-missile program. The operational plan for these weapons provides for the manning and equipping of Strategic Air Command squadrons on a constantly alert basis, with the capability of launching the missiles within minutes after initial warning of attack. It is well to point out here, Mr. President, that the Congress has done its full part in providing the necessary funds in record time in order to meet the Soviet threat.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 24, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to delete the word "funds" and insert in lieu thereof the word "authorizations".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and for other purposes."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE, of South Dakota, conferees on the part of the Senate.

---

## PROPOSED SMALL BUSINESS BANK SYSTEM

During the delivery of Mr. STENNIS' remarks,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi may yield to me, with the understanding that he not lose the floor, and with the further understanding that the statement which I desire to make shall be printed at another point in the RECORD, so as not to disturb the continuity of the speech being made by the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on yesterday, the distinguished chairman of the House Small Business Committee, Mr. PATMAN, introduced a bill creating a Small Business Capital Bank System, with the aim of making available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where it is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources. I now introduce for appropriate reference, the identical bill.

There is not a Senator in this body, Mr. President, who is not conscious of the need for capital in our small businesses. There is not a Senator who has not devoted time to the study of the problems of small business; and there is not a Senator who is unaware that, despite the efforts of private enterprise, and of the Small Business Administration, small business remains in great need of capital with which to grow, to compete, and even to survive.

Distingushed Members of this body have proposed legislation to make this capital available through various agencies and institutions.

On yesterday, the Senate agreed to a resolution which provides funds for the Select Committee on Small Business, which is headed by its able and alert chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I have been very much impressed by the method selected by Representative PATMAN and his colleagues, after months of investigation into the problems of small business. It appears to me to meet the substantial objections raised by the administration and the Federal Reserve Board to several of the other proposed methods.

In effect, it is patterned after the Federal land-bank system. The Federal land banks have been paid out; they have paid back the capital the Government put into them. Associations of farmers now own them.

In the same way, borrowers under the small-business system will contribute by taking stock in the banks; and it is contemplated that eventually the borrowers will pay back to the Treasury every bit of the Government money. So the banks will eventually be owned privately, and will become a definite part of our private enterprise system.

I urge the Senate to examine this proposed legislation. I believe it represents an intelligent and logical step which we may take toward making available to small business the lifeblood it needs in today's competitive world. And, finally, Mr. President, it will make that step within a framework of private enterprise.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The Small Business Capital Bank System bill would do the following:

First. It would establish a Small Business Capital Bank Board as an independent agency of the Government of the United States. With a central office in Washington, the Board would supervise a system of 12 small-business capital banks—1 in each Federal Reserve district.

The Board would consist of 13 members, 1 from each Reserve district, and 1 at large.

Second. The Board would subscribe to $10 million of capital stock in each small-business capital bank. This stock would be retired when all of the authorized capital stock of each bank is subscribed by small-business investment associations.

Third. These investment associations, created in each State by small-business concerns, would subscribe to shares in the small-business bank in their areas.

Thus the bill provides for eventual private ownership of the small-business banks by small-business investment associations.

The associations would be patterned along the lines of the national farm loan associa-

tions and production credit associations, which operate within the framework of the Federal Land Bank System.

Fourth. The funds to be used by the 12 small-business banks, in providing capital for the investment associations for their investment in small businesses, would be secured from the Small Business Capital Bank Board. The Board would supply those funds by purchasing debenture bonds from the banks—and the Board would secure its own funds from private investors, through the sale of its own debenture bonds on the open market.

This is much the same procedure as is used by FNMA—Fannie May, the Federal National Mortgage Association.

The bill makes it clear that the Board's obligations do not impose any liability on the United States.

This is the method of operation proposed for the Small Business Capital Bank System.

It does not require an appropriation by Congress. The money to be used by the Board comes from an earned surplus of idle money in the Federal Reserve accounts, and from $28 million now held almost untouched by the Federal Reserve in its small-business account. The Reserve Board does not believe it ought to be in that kind of loan business; this bill will take it out, and put the money to good use.

This system represents no competitive challenge to private industry. Private lending institutions would be urged to participate in it. Its benefits will be widespread; but they will not be available to those who can secure equity and long-term loan capital from private sources.

Lastly, it would be owned by those who take part in it—not by the Government. Private ownership of the land bank system is a reality now, as it would be, eventually, in the Small Business Capital Bank System.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for his customarily generous treatment and consideration of me.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Texas. I have been glad to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3191) to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3194) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to establish an initial program of tax adjustment for small and independent business and for persons engaged in small and independent business, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, during the recess between sessions of the 85th Congress, your Small Business Committee conducted extensive hearings in 14 cities across the land in connection with its study of the impact of Federal taxation on small business. After a careful study of the hearing record the committee now offers its report which embodies its findings and recommendations. These findings and recommendations are based on the testimony of 456 persons, representative of all forms of business activity, who appeared before or gave statements to the committee.

The testimony presented established what your committee has feared for some time. The impact of Federal taxes is not the same on all segments of the economy. There are changes which are urgently required if our economic system is to remain as we have known it. It has been conclusively shown that small business has been denied equal opportunity under our tax law as it is presently written. The free enterprise system requires a dynamic independent business which cannot exist when entry for the new and growth for the small are hampered.

The chief recommendation of the report is for a speedy consideration and passage of the small business tax adjustment bill of 1958 which I have just introduced, and which is attached as an appendix to the report. This is an omnibus measure which attempts to treat all matters requiring immediate action. Where problems are not so acute or needs not shown to be so great, further study or a general plan of adjustment is recommended.

The small business tax adjustment bill of 1958 has been drafted to assist small business to meet the responsibilities of a growing and expanding economy. However, this measure will be of great benefit to the whole economy. It is not class legislation nor an attempt to set segment against segment. There is no attempt to restrict its application only to small concerns. Instead, amendment of the Revenue Code to grant equal treatment for all business regardless of size or form of organization has been the central purpose.

I am delighted that the great majority of the committee members have joined as cosponsors of the bill which I have introduced.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the table until the close of business tomorrow, in order that other Senators who may wish to join in sponsoring it may have the privilege of doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The measure is constructed around a reinvestment allowance which is provided for in section 2 of the bill. This section has as its purpose to permit smaller concerns to retain earnings for necessary growth and expansion. This would be accomplished by allowing 50 percent of the first $10,000, 30 percent of the second $10,000, and 20 percent of the third $10,000, which is reinvested in depreciable property or inventory as a deduction from current income for tax purposes. This allowance would be available for all concerns with a maximum of $10,000.

The revenue loss will not be great because the allowance is granted only for expenditures made during the year. The expenditures must necessarily be twice as great as the allowance, even in the first instance, and the whole of the expenditures will be income in the hands of the recipients. Secondly, the greater portion of the reinvestment will be channeled into depreciable assets for which no depreciation deduction will be permitted. Thus, even for the taxpayer himself, this measure largely allows a deferral rather than an absolute reduction of tax.

In order that this section may not be used to avoid taxes, gain on the sale of property, where this allowance was taken on purchase, will be considered as ordinary income rather than capital gain to the extent of the unexpended allowance. It is also provided that more than one concern having the same ownership must be considered as one for the purpose of this section. The purpose of this provision is to assist the continuing operation of independent concerns which are most troubled by a need for equity financing.

The third section of the bill extends equal opportunity to all taxpayers who wish to provide for their own retirement. Presently, persons who are members of a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock-bonus plan under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 get preferred treatment. Under this proposed section any person not a member of a section 401 qualified plan would be eligible to deduct up to 10 percent of his income or $1,000, whichever is less, for amounts he deposits for his retirement.

The deposits would necessarily have to be made in a manner to remove the taxpayer from immediate control of the funds deposited. As matters of equity, the provision permits a 5-year carryover of the unused portion of the allowable deduction, and permits an increased deduction for taxpayers over 50 years of age at the time this measure is enacted. This section would defer the collection of tax until benefits are received from the plan. It would equalize treatment for all taxpayers.

Section 4 would permit certain estates the opportunity to pay Federal estate taxes by installments over a period of up to 10 years. Many small concerns have been doomed when the owner-operator died because of the drainage of all liquid funds into payment of estate taxes. Under present law, except after showing of hardship, all estate taxes are due within 15 months after death of the

decedent. This proposal would free estates tied up in nonliquid business investment from this terrible burden.

This provision would actually increase the revenue received because 6 percent interest is charged on the unpaid balance where this election is taken. Because of the deferral there would be a small revenue reduction the first few years. It is provided that all the unpaid balance is immediately due and payable where the estate misses a payment on tax or interest and where the assets of the estate are sold.

The fifth section of the bill would extend the benefits of the alternative methods of depreciation to purchasers of used property. The 1954 Internal Revenue Code, section 167, provided that purchasers of new property had a right to use certain methods for computing their depreciation for tax purposes. This provided a tax advantage to purchasers of new equipment denied to those taxpayers who could not afford or did not wish to purchase new property. There seems to be no good reason why taxpayers should be treated differently merely because one purchases a new machine while the other chooses a similar used piece. This section would give equality of depreciation treatment to all taxpayers making purchases of property new-in-use to them.

As an aid to small corporations the sixth section grants an election to corporations to be taxed as partnerships. This would remove double taxation from consideration as a factor in determining under what legal form a business should be operated. This proposal complements section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which permits certain proprietorships and partnerships to be taxed as corporations.

Section 7 of the proposed legislation would increase the minimum accumulated earnings credit from $60,000 to $100,000. This would take some of the pressure off the smaller corporations which are most restricted by the unreasonable accumulation of surplus penalty. It will recognize the inflation which has cut the value of the original $60,000 and provide some added equity financing.

The last section of this bill would compel the Treasury to acquiesce in decisions of the Tax Court or Court of Appeals unless it chose to appeal. This would provide for the same treatment for all taxpayers and finality in the interpretation of the Internal Revenue Code.

I firmly believe that all these measures are necessary. If small business is to continue to serve its vital part in our economy, then tax adjustment is necessary to equalize opportunity. I fervently hope that my colleagues will give this legislation the support I believe it deserves.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the bill involves many of the President's suggestions regarding taxation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And one or two additional features, for careful consideration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the honor to be a member of the Small Business Committee, and the honor of joining in sponsorship of this bill.

I was greatly impressed by the hearings which were conducted on the subject of taxation as related to small business, and noted the strong feeling of small business that this problem represents a very serious difficulty. Under the very distinguished guidance of our chairman, we are endeavoring to do something about the problem.

I think it should be made clear in the RECORD, however—and I say this as a lawyer, and I know that my chairman will bear with me—that I have some serious doubts as to that part of the bill which relates to the acquiescence by the Treasury Department in determinations of courts on tax matters.

This question may present some real problems in administrative feasibility. However, I feel very strongly, in company with my colleagues, that we must give urgent attention to the question of tax help for small business. For that reason, I was glad of the privilege to be a cosponsor of the bill. I feel that the legislative process will enable us to deal with all of the problems involved.

I should like also to add that it is my deep conviction that two other problems are very serious to small business. One is the problem of antitrust enforcement. With respect to that problem, I feel that we may very well have to adopt a different approach for small business than for the generality of business, looking more to the affirmative side than to the negative side; for example, stopping mergers and other things which may be desired.

Secondly, there is the problem of technical assistance to small business in research and development and other areas.

Management problems remain among the most important problems of all business enterprise in the United States. The committee under the very distinguished guidance of my colleague, the Senator from Alabama, has such a wonderful record that I am confident that we shall deal as effectively with the other problems as our chairman is now leading us to deal with the problem of taxation as it affects small business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the junior Senator from New York. I agree with him on the antitrust phase. Furthermore, he mentioned a provision of the proposed legislation about which he has some misgivings. So do I, so far as the mechanics of it are concerned. However, I do believe that every business in the country, whether it be large or small, ought to know what its status is in a given situation, and that the Treasury should not have the privilege of shopping around among districts or circuits for a favorable decision.

Mr. JAVITS. I can see nothing but good coming from the exposure of our position and that of the Treasury in that connection.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be happy to yield. First I should like to say that the Senator from Wisconsin came to the committee as a brand new Member of the Senate at the close of the last session of the Senate. Nevertheless he played a very important part in our tax hearings. All the tax hearings, held throughout the country, were participated in by every member of the committee, with the exception of one member. Only one member was prevented by reason of a previous commitment from participating in every hearing. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the very kind and gracious remarks of my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, as a Senator elected only 5 months ago, I rise with reluctance to join my distinguished colleagues in support of this bill which is so largely the result of their labors and so little the result of my own. On the other hand just because I was so recently elected, because I have had the chance so recently to talk with literally thousands of little-business men in every section of Wisconsin, I feel very deeply that this bill is urgently needed and needed at once.

Mr. President, I recall at our hearing in Milwaukee, the referee in bankruptcy for southern Wisconsin testified to this small-business committee that business failures in Wisconsin last year were greater than ever before—greater indeed, than in 1932. And virtually every one of these business failures was a small-business failure. Since 5 months ago small business has not been doing better. It has been doing progressively worse and much worse. Many small businesses are failing. Few small businesses can grow even a little. And literally no small businesses today can grow into a competitive position with big business. Why? Because of the Federal taxation straitjacket under which they suffer. I enthusiastically support this bill; but I do have one serious qualification. There is one section of this bill which I strongly feel may need correction. I intend to scrutinize this section very carefully, to study the testimony on the bill before the Finance Committee, and if necessary to introduce an amendment to correct it.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to our remarkably able chairman and splendid staff for their assistance to me as a new Senator in connection with this bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise to join with and support the remarks of the able chairman of the Small Business Committee. The legislation which has been offered today is worthy of the support of all Members of this body. The proposed Small Business Tax Adjustment Act of 1958 was drafted only after a very careful study of the needs of the small-business community and was designed to give equality of treatment to all business.

As ranking minority member of the Small Business Committee and its former chairman, I took a very active part in this study. I know from first-hand experience of the mass of information which was gathered during the hearings. The findings and recommendations of the tax report were made after careful consideration of all testimony offered by representatives of all forms of business activity.

The chairman is to be commended for the manner in which this study was conducted. Hearings were held in all parts of the country so that a broad perspective could be gained. This has been a bipartisan effort.

The bipartisan nature of the study is exemplified by the fact that each of the six minority members took an active part in the hearings. The proposed legislation is offered by Members from both sides of the aisle, and includes three sections which have been recommended by the administration.

On Thursday, January 16, Secretary of the Treasury Anderson, in testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee, recommended four measures for immediate action which would be of great benefit particularly to small business. Three of these measures correspond to sections 4, 5, and 6 of the proposed Small Business Tax Adjustment Act. Section 4 would permit installment payments of estate taxes for certain qualified estates. Section 5 would extend the use of section 167 alternative methods of depreciation to the purchasers of used as well as new property. Finally, section 6 would provide an election for corporations to be taxed as partnerships. All of these measures were more than adequately supported in testimony given to the committee.

I want to single out two other provisions which I believe to be especially important. The second section of the bill dealing with a reinvestment allowance is greatly needed to permit smaller concerns to grow and develop to meet their expanding markets. I was greatly impressed by the numerous witnesses who testified to the great importance of this kind of provision.

Section 3 of the bill would remove the worst kind of discrimination from the present Internal Revenue Code. Under this section, all taxpayers would be given the same opportunity to provide for their retirement. Under the present law, only a limited group gets special tax treatment for retirement programs. Thrift and individual provision for retirement are worthy of Government support, but certainly favors should be extended to all taxpayers.

The other sections are as important if small business is to be given equal opportunity. Each has been designed to remedy specific problems which need urgent attention.

I am very proud to sponsor this piece of legislation. I urge that all Members of this body consider its merits. I believe that it will offer renewed opportunity for small business to share in the growing prosperity of the country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business for his able leadership in the entire small-business field, particularly in connection with the problem of the impact of taxation on the small-business man.

It was my privilege to attend 3 hearings of the committee, 1 in San Francisco, another in Denver, and the third in Wichita.

If there was one thing that immediately became apparent to me, it was the sincerity of the small-business people who appeared before the committee. They recognize the many problems which confront those of us who are privileged to serve in Congress, particularly the continuing problem of raising tax revenue. It did not seem to me that they were asking for anything unreasonable; they wanted only fair treatment and the simple opportunity of keeping small business on Main Street of America.

I am hopeful that out of the bill and the resulting hearings there will come some concrete results in that connection. I again wish to commend the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Nevada. I appreciate the fine work he did, and I certainly concur in his hope.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 10021. An act to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957; and

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

## COMMEMORATION OF FIRST FLIGHT OF AN AIRPLANE ON AN ARMY INSTALLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1252, H. R. 6078. I am asking merely that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6078) to provide for the erection of suitable markers at Fort Myer, Va., to commemorate the first flight of an airplane on an Army installation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

## AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and myself I wish to express our very deep appreciation to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for joining with us in the sponsorship of S. 1134, the Morse-Clark omnibus education bill. I was pleased this morning to cosponsor with the Senator from Alabama the education bill he introduced. The Senator from Alabama will be known for many years for his distinguished career in the Senate, and a leading element of that career, in my judgment, will be his statesmanship in the field of education.

I was pleased to join in the sponsorship of the education bill which he introduced this morning. However, as the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] so correctly pointed out when he discussed the Hill bill this morning, it is a bill which deals primarily with assistance on an emergency basis to higher education in the United States. That is important, and I shall do what I can in this session of Congress to support meeting that emergency need.

Although I am not wedded to the Hill bill to such an extent that I would not consider amendments to it, as I am sure would be the position of the author himself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I regard it as a long step in the right direction. At the same time I think we need to reflect on the observation of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] this morning when he pointed out that the Hill scholarship bill does not deal with the real crisis in American education.

The crisis in American education is at the elementary and secondary school levels. The crisis in American education is one which deals with a long-term need for the decades immediately ahead; which will give us a nationwide educational program that will stop wasting American brainpower; which will put us in a position where we can keep ahead of Russia in the development of brainpower. We are falling behind Russia now. One has only to sit, as I sat this morning in a public hearing conducted by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and listen to a great scientist, such as Dr. Teller, to realize how true was the comment of the junior Senator from Wisconsin this morning. The Senator from Wisconsin joined in the warnings which many of us have raised in the Senate for the past many years, as we have sought to awaken and inform the American people about what has happened to education in this country, and about how far we are actually falling behind Russia in

the matter of developing our potential brainpower.

So we welcome the junior Senator from Wisconsin as a cosponsor with us of S. 1134. We intend to continue to press for the omnibus approach, which is, of course, foreign to the philosophy of the present administration. The President of the United States has never given the slightest indication that he has the faintest concept of the educational crisis in America.

We hope we will get hearings on S. 1134, which brings up to date an educational program of a far-seeing Republican in this field, a man who, too, was subjected to the same public attack on this issue which those of us who are sponsoring S. 1134 are subjected to by the reactionary forces of the country. I refer, of course, to the former Senator from Ohio, Robert Taft. What the Morse-Clark bill does primarily is to bring up to date the Taft bill of 1947 and the Taft bill of 1949, of which it was my privilege to be one of the cosponsors. Through our voluntary committee of Democrats, the Taft bill has been brought up to date in S. 1134, and we plead again for favorable consideration of it by the Senate this year.

---

## INCREASED FREIGHT RATES, 1958

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning, at the request of the Governor of Oregon, the Honorable Robert Holmes, and of the chairman of the public utilities commission of our State, Mr. Howard Morgan, I presented in an oral argument to the Interstate Commerce Commission Oregon's case in opposition to the attempt on the part of the railroads to increase freight rates in our State in a proceeding designated as Ex parte 212, being conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The attempt to impose upon Oregon business this additional burden and cost is, in the opinion of our Governor, the chairman of our public utilities commission, and the senior Senator from Oregon—and I am sure the same view would be held by my teammate, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]—unwarranted by the facts. So I presented Oregon's case against it at this morning's hearing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the argument which I presented in behalf of the State of Oregon before the Interstate Commerce Commission this morning in the case known as Ex parte 212.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION ON EX PARTE NO. 212, INCREASED FREIGHT RATES, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, this morning I am appearing before the Commission at the requests of Hon. Robert Holmes, Governor of the State of Oregon, and Mr. Howard Morgan, Public Utilities Commissioner of the State of Oregon, for the purpose of making a brief statement on the pending proceedings, Ex parte 212. I am also making this statement as a United States Senator from the State of Oregon and as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

It is my earnest request that the Commission give thorough consideration in the course of its deliberations on Ex parte No. 212 to certain very serious allegations that have been brought to my attention in numerous instances by small-business men of Oregon. They contend that the increased rates and charges proposed by the major railroads in this proceeding will, if put into effect, result in the shutting down of many small business operations, not only in Oregon, but in the entire Pacific Northwest. They feel that under the procedure applicable to this case, very little opportunity is available to small-business men to present a case to the Commission which would be as effective as the facts would warrant if more time were available for the marshalling of evidence and materials in rebuttal to the request of the railroads.

Last weekend it was my privilege to visit several western Oregon communities and to talk with businessmen and their employees. In these communities the No. 1 industry is lumber and it is the foundation of their economic life. The facts concerning the condition of business and industry throughout the State of Oregon, and particularly in those areas where lumber is of primary importance, do not make a pleasant story, but it is my opinion that those facts have a direct bearing upon any decision that the Interstate Commerce Commission may render in this case. Therefore, I ask that these economic facts of life be weighed by the Commission before coming to a decision in Ex parte No. 212.

In my State, more persons filed bankruptcy petitions in 1957 than in any year since 1929; deposits in Portland banks and branches were down about 3 percent; unemployment in Oregon for the week ending December 28 was up 13,748 from 1956 as shown by unemployment-insurance records. Nationally, the cost of living is up at least 3.4 percent from 1956, an alltime high; the average workweek was 39.2 hours, compared with 40.5 hours in 1956. All of these facts are of vital importance because they indicate that the economy of Oregon today is not one that will be receptive to the burdens to be imposed by the railroads under the proposed tariff of rates and charges in Ex parte No. 212.

THE QUICK INCREASE PROCEDURE—A HANDICAP FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The railroads have employed a quick procedure to obtain rate increases and the approval of additional charges at the expense of Oregon shippers. The business firms which depend upon the railroads for transportation of their products to markets in the Midwest and east coast, will have to pass these new costs on to the already overburdened consuming public, or in the alternative, to absorb the additional costs in the competitive market. There is no third alternative for the small-business man other than that of going out of business and from the information I have received I fear that the third alternative may become predominant in too many instances if the request of the major railroads is approved by the Commission.

The businessmen who have talked to me on this matter have spoken earnestly and those who have written to me have vigorously expressed the view that if they were given the opportunity to properly present their case in opposition to the request of the railroads, it is quite likely that all or a major portion of the demands of the petition of the railroads would be denied by the Commission. These businessmen charge that under the quick procedure being employed, the chance of making the effective presentation that could be made against the increased rate petition is almost impossible. This point was very effectively expressed by the Honorable Robert Holmes, Governor of the State of Oregon, in a letter to me dated January 16, in which he strongly protested the speed-up short-form procedures envisaged in this case. Govenor Holmes put it this way:

"On December 27, the Commission issued an order scheduling hearings concerning Ex parte 212 under the so-called short form procedure. This order generally provided that all statements, all evidence, all exhibits, all showings of any description made or submitted by the public in defense of the public interest must be prepared and on file with the Commission at Washington, D. C., on or before January 20, 1958.

"This order and the supporting statements of the railroads which, of necessity, have to be answered by the public by January 20, were not received by this office or any Pacific coast commission prior to January 6 or 7, 1958. This left exactly 6 working days in which to review voluminous statements of railroad officials and thereafter prepare evidence and exhibits in opposition to the proposed rail increases. It is utterly impossible for Oregon public utility commissioner's staff properly to prepare any type of responsible exhibits or evidence in this short space of time.

"The notice of hearing and the exhibits of the railroads were only sent out to public service commissions and parties appearing in past hearings. Many of the selective rate increases in this case will affect businesses and industries in this State which have not been seriously affected before and therefore have not been parties to past proceedings.

"Yesterday, January 15, more than a dozen letters were received from lumber people throughout the State of Oregon asking what they must do to defend their interests and stating that they had not heard of the proceedings until within the current week. Numerous telephone calls were received from traffic managers of lumber associations, grain associations, and export associations in the State. Uniformly they told the same story and that is that they do not even have time to get together data and people in their organizations and prepare them to make any showing in this proceeding in defense of their businesses and industries."

The foregoing comments of Governor Holmes give a very significant description of the handicaps borne by those who seek to prevent a summary type of proceeding in this case. My file contains similar protests from small-business men of Oregon and I note that many of these protests have been communicated formally to the Commission. Their views parallel those of Governor Holmes and I submit Governor Holmes' statement as being an excellent presentation of the small-business man's typical observation on this score.

THE PROPOSED INCREASED RATES DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND SMALL-BUSINESS MEN

The shippers of lumber who registered their protests with my office in Ex parte 212 particularly protested that portion of the petition of the railroads which involves a 2-percent increase on lumber and forest products.

They contended—with great merit, I believe—that this constitutes a further discrimination against shippers of lumber in the Pacific Northwest. A percentage increase serves only to add to the ratio of the handicaps of west coast shippers of lumber who are already burdened with more acute problems of higher transportation costs than are their competitors, who supply lumber and forest products and other commodities from areas that are closer to the Midwest and east coast markets. A uniform increase in terms of cents and dollars would be difficult enough to absorb under the present highly competitive conditions and a declining demand for lumber, but the percentage

increase piled on top of existing burdensome rates, because of longer distances to markets, will effectively eliminate a good many small businesses from the economic structure of the State of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. I am sure the Commission does not wish to become even indirectly an instrumentality of injury to small business.

*Increased accessorial charges burdensome to small business*

The substantial increases in accessorial charges proposed by the railroads will be, according to small business, most oppressive. The small-business man in the lumber industry must necessarily rely upon methods of loading, transporting and distributing lumber far different and more complex than those employed in established lumber operations of the big business category. These charges if approved by the Commission will add substantially to the costs of doing business to be borne by the small business operation and in many instances they simply cannot be borne under present day conditions in the lumber industry. As one small-business man stated this problem to me:

"The portion to which we take particular exception is the extremely excessive increases, many as high as 50 percent, for service and accommodations, also the entirely new charges, which previously have been included in the overall freight rates. We feel that all independent business, in its base price structure, is obliged to include some service and accommodations, as these particular items have been handled by the railroads in the past.

"The service and accommodation charges, to which I have reference, are for stopover to complete loading, stopover for partial loading, milling and sorting in transit, reconsignment in transit, or before or after arrival at destination, releases of shipments before or after arrival at destination, etc. These services are an integral part of the business of wholesale lumber.

"Wholesale lumber coordinates independent production of lumber and far-reaching distribution of the product throughout the country, and for export. This method of lumber distribution, long established and a recognized part of our Nation's economy, coordinates the independent lumber production and independent distribution, as directly contrasted to the large monopoly type of single ownership mill operation, which combines vast timber holdings, many mills, and self-ownership of retail lumber yards and lumber distribution yards located throughout the United States and selling direct to the trade.

"The service and accommodation charges which we have listed, in part, above, are vital to the practice of wholesale lumber, and relatively unused by the contrasting system of production and distribution and we feel these highly discriminating increases and new charges are aimed directly at limiting and undermining our type of business * * *."

There are many additional facets of this case which I could discuss at great length but I know that even under the very limited opportunities made available to the opponents of these rate and charge increases, additional facts will be brought to the attention of the Commission in summary form.

I close, therefore, with the earnest request that the Commission suspend the proposed increases in rates and charges, to be followed by a full investigation of the lawfulness of the proposals. Such an investigation should allow adequate time for the opponents to prepare and present their case against the railroads' proposed increases. Since coming to the hearing room this morning it has been suggested to me that the Commission might possibly delay its final decision on the freight rate increase request until field hearings could be held in the State of Oregon and other States in the Pacific Northwest. I sincerely hope that the Commission will follow this course of action and thereby give all interested parties ample time to prepare their case against that of the railroads.

If this procedure should be followed, I feel that a strong case can be made by those who oppose the increases requested by the railroads in Ex parte 212.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Commission for this opportunity to present the case of the State of Oregon against the proposed rate increases. I shall be pleased now to submit myself to the examination of the Commission.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that an increase in freight rates will adversely affect Oregon's economy and the future growth of our State is evident, I believe, from the material I have presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I point out also that added to any freight rate increase will be the 3-percent transportation tax. Oregon industry ships goods to markets that are as far away, I believe, as are the markets of any State in the Nation. When a 3-percent excise is added to the freight bill for a lumber product shipped from Oregon to Chicago, for example, the tax is considerably greater than the amount of tax which would be paid on the same product shipped, say, from Minnesota or Mississippi.

Because the transportation tax is a proportional one, it clearly weighs most heavily on States having the largest freight charges.

I have called for the repeal of this tax many times. I believe it is a burden on all industry, and that it is unfair to consumers, who ultimately will pay for it. Being proportional, it has a discriminatory effect against west-coast industry. It should be repealed, irrespective of what is done about a freight-rate boost, but I point out that so long as it remains on the books, it will be added to any freight rate increase.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the reactionary Portland Oregonian of January 28, 1958, entitled "Optimism Versus Gloom." It reads in part:

Gov. Robert D. Holmes, Democrat, is the author of a definitely optimistic report and projection on Oregon's economy, the lead article in volume I, No. 1 of Grow With Oregon, new publication of the State Planning and Development Department.

Reaching our desk the same day was the No. 1 issue for this year of Senator Morse Reports. In this letter to constituents, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, repeated his denunciation of Eisenhower administration domestic policies. "In Oregon," he said, "more persons filed bankruptcy petitions in 1957 than in any year since 1929; deposits in Portland banks, including their branches elsewhere in the State, were down $49 million, or about 3 percent; unemployment insurance was $48,549 for the week ended December 28, up $13,748 from the year before.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPTIMISM VERSUS GLOOM

Gov. Robert D. Holmes, Democrat, is the author of a definitely optimistic report and projection on Oregon's economy, the lead article in volume I, No. 1 of Grow With Oregon, new publication of the State Planning and Development Department.

Reaching our desk the same day was the No. 1 issue for this year of Senator MORSE Reports. In this letter to constituents, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, repeated his denunciation of Eisenhower administration domestic policies. "In Oregon," he said, "more persons filed bankruptcy petitions in 1957 than in any year since 1929; deposits in Portland banks, including their branches elsewhere in the State, were down $49 million, or about 3 percent; unemployment in the State among those covered by unemployment insurance was $48,549 for the week ended December 28, up $13,748 from the year before."

After describing his visits about the State to hear the views of business, industrial, agricultural, and public leaders, Governor Holmes made these observations:

"We became convinced, and the State apparently became convinced with us, that the talk of gloom and doom was subversive talk, talk without basis of fact. Oregonians declined to be subdued by the pessimists and I think this is the greatest hope for the new year.

"Everything seems to point to substantial recovery in our vital lumber market. A multitude of new diversified developments, announced in the last several weeks, have contradicted charges that Oregon was discouraging to business and industry."

Governor Holmes called for additional relaxation of the tight-money policy of the Federal Government and for a new policy toward power development in the Northwest. But he has been to the grassroots of the State, while Senator MORSE has not. The result: An optimistic governor; a pessimistic Senator who seems to fit into the governor's category of those preaching gloom and doom.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as in the case of so many of its previous editorial efforts, this Oregonian editorial purports to find great and significant differences among Democratic officeholders in our State.

Our Democratic Governor, Bob Holmes, is doing an outstanding job of presenting to industry the advantages of doing business in Oregon. His task is not made easier by administration policies in Washington that have produced the conditions I noted in my report.

I do not see in this editorial any refutation of these facts. Does the Oregonian deny that bank deposits are down in Portland? Does it deny that unemployment has increased from last year? Or does it merely wish to oppose Governor Holmes with Senator MORSE? I think the latter is the sole purpose of this editorial, which is a typical Oregonian politically inspired piece of propaganda on behalf of the Republican Party bosses of Oregon. They, likewise, can try to create the false impression that there is a lack of teamwork between the two Senators from Oregon, Mr. NEUBERGER and myself. I wish to say that they are going to be as unsuccessful in trying to create the false impression that there is a breach between Governor Holmes and myself as they have been in trying to create the false impression that there is a breach between the two Senators from Oregon.

I repeat and reaffirm my confidence in Oregon's future. I invite enterprise throughout the Nation to investigate the many advantages our State affords to any business. The Governor and I are

working for the same objective—namely, the growth and development of our State. Our progress toward realizing the great potential of Oregon is severely hampered by these harmful administration policies of tight money and tax favoritism to big business. In my judgment, I can do the most to help Governor Holmes in his program of attracting business by seeking the reversal of these policies that do damage to the economy of the State of Oregon. And the way to begin is to publicize the facts.

Mr. President, I also owe it to the people of my State to forewarn them of what is happening to the economy of Oregon, so we can take action within the State of Oregon to do all we can to reverse the unsound economic policies of the Eisenhower administration, as those policies have done great damage to the economy of the State of Oregon.

Mr. President, let me say to the Oregonian that it ought to be joining in helping Oregon, by publicizing the facts about the administration's policies. The Oregonian should stop doing a Tass job for the Eisenhower administration; the Oregonian should cease being a Pravda newspaper in Oregon, in covering up for the Eisenhower administration. The Oregonian should live up to the responsibilities and the ethics of journalism. It should follow the fine tenet of the great Bob La Follette, as he printed it on the masthead of the Progressive magazine at the time when he ran that outstanding publication, which still publishes as its masthead, "Ye Shall Know the Truth, and the Truth Shall Make Ye Free."

It will be a great day in Oregon when the Portland Oregonian begins printing the truth about what is happening in Oregon and elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. President, I think the Portland Oregonian got the answer to its editorial when, this morning, the senior Senator from Oregon, upon the request of the Governor of the State and its public utilities commissioner, presented Oregon's case before the Interstate Commerce Commission, in opposition to an attempt on the part of the railroads to impose upon our State an unwarranted increase in freight rates which would further damage the economy of the State of Oregon.

Mr. President, I shall turn now to another subject, before I take an airplane, to fly to New York City, to address a group of Democrats on the subject, The Shortcomings of the Eisenhower Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

## PROTEST REGARDING CONDUCT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, before I leave Washington, I wish to leave in the RECORD my word of protest about the conduct of the Secretary of State in the Middle East.

Today, we read again in the newspapers the promises of millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money, that the Secretary of State has given to dictatorial leaders of totalitarian countries in the Middle East. I, for one, protest it; and I make clear that he does not speak for me, just as I am satisfied that with that program he does not speak for increasing millions of the American people.

But, Mr. President, it is the scheme and the game of this administration that under executive power—and I do not deny the existence of the power, because, after all, the Congress of the United States has given wide discretionary power to this administration—millions of dollars belonging to the taxpayers of this country are to be given away to dictatorial leaders. O Mr. President, I know that the President of the United States does not like to hear the phrase "giveaway" because it is so true; but the truth is coming home to roost on the steps of the White House and on the shoulders of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I wish to say that what is going to happen as a result of this additional giveaway on the part of John Foster Dulles in the Middle East is that he will put many persons in the position of being able to say that we are committed; that we already have gone this far, so we must go farther.

Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, I wish to say that there is need for an immediate reappraisal of the conduct of John Foster Dulles in the Middle East.

In the first place, I objected to his going to the Baghdad conference. The United States is not a member of the Baghdad conference. I thought it was perfectly obvious to anyone who had the slightest grain of sense in his head that if Mr. Dulles went to Baghdad, we could be quite sure that this sort of conduct would be manifested.

Mr. President, I close by saying I think this is another instance of yielding to Middle East blackmail, because if we can rely upon the press stories about what the leaders of those nations have been saying, we find that they have made it perfectly clear that they were displeased because there was not a commitment in advance of the conference that millions of dollars belonging to the taxpayers of the United States would be made available to them.

I wish to say—as I have been saying as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate—that friendship cannot be bought, and support cannot be obtained by bribe.

Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I intend to make a major speech next week on the foreign-aid program, military and economic, of the United States. In that speech I will outline very clearly the position I am going to take again at this session of Congress. It will be based upon the findings and recommendations of a group of experts to whom the Senate of the United States paid more than $200,000 to conduct studies—experts from the University of Chicago, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia University, Princeton University, the Brookings Institution, and elsewhere. Mr. President, in this field of mutual security, we ought to heed the warnings and put into practice—until someone can prove, on the basis of facts, that they are wrong—the recommendations these experts have made. If we do, Mr. President, we shall greatly modify the foreign policy that Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles are following.

I am greatly concerned about it, Mr. President, because of my deep conviction that if we continue to follow this policy, we shall end, I believe, with Russia and the United States engaged in a struggle to destroy each other.

I believe there is still time—but not much—for reason to prevail. I believe there is still time for us to keep ourselves strong in defense, so that Russia will understand that she will gain nothing by an aggressive course of action.

In that respect, Mr. President, my thesis is along the lines of the thesis of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], in the great speech he made this afternoon. But let us note that his speech emphasized America's defenses; it was not concerned with what I believe is a great mistake in judgment. For I think it is a great mistake in judgment to think that we strengthen America's defenses by supplying great amounts of military aid to totalitarian nations in the world. I do not believe we can rely upon them in a critical hour. I believe they are dragging on our political and our economic and our diplomatic legs.

Therefore, Mr. President, once again I intend to vote for strong defense for America and strong defense for the other democracies of the world. But I will not vote to give to totalitarian nations the dollars of Oregon taxpayers and of the taxpayers of the other States of the United States.

Thus, Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on South American Relations, of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, next week I shall raise some questions in the course of my speech. For instance, what about military aid to South American countries? What returns have we received or can we expect to receive, and what is the comparative value of that kind of expenditure or what would flow if we exported American investments to South America and helped build up the economic productive power of the people of South America? I happen to be one who believes that as we build up the economic productive power of people in the areas of the world that have to be brought over to the side of freedom, we enhance the chances of the establishment of democratic governments.

The sad fact is that totalitarian governments best thrive when they are able to follow a military dominance over their people and bring the welfare of the people to a very low economic level.

Mr. President, I wanted to raise my voice in protest today over John Foster Dulles' conduct in the Middle East, because I am satisfied it is very much against the best security interests of my

country. I repeat what I have said so much: We need to do something, and do it quickly, to stop this great trend in foreign policy toward executive government in this country and return foreign policy to the people of the United States, where it belongs, because, under the Constitution, foreign policy does not belong to Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles. Foreign policy belongs to the people of this country, and the President and Secretary of State are but the administrators of the people's foreign policy. We do not now have a people's foreign policy for the simple reason that government by secrecy under the Eisenhower administration has gone so far that the people do not know very much about their country's foreign policy.

So when we sit in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, as I did a few days ago, and seek to ascertain some facts from the Secretary of State about American foreign policy on several points, what are we told? The Secretary pleads executive privilege. He can. I know that under the Constitution, the separation of powers doctrine, if the Secretary wants to plead executive privilege when we want to find out about something in the Gaither Report, when we want to learn what were the differences between the Secretary and Governor Stassen with regard to the disarmament objective, the Secretary can plead executive privilege. But, as I said, and repeat now, it is the administration's fifth amendment plea. They have the right to plead it, but I have the right, and in this instance the duty, to tell Senators why I think they are pleading it. I will tell my colleagues why I think this administration, in hearing after hearing, through witness after witness coming before Congressional committees, pleads executive privilege. They do not dare tell the American people the facts about American foreign policy, because if they did the American people, in a fortnight, would demand a change. But I think there is still time—I pray there is still time—to get that change in 1958 and 1960.

I close by saying to the American people, do your duty in 1958 by giving to us a majority in the Congress of the United States that will make it possible for us to put an effective check upon the foreign policies of this administration, and then in 1960 give us a President who will return foreign policy to the people of the United States.

## STATEMENT ON SCHOOL BUDGET BY DR. WILLIAM G. CARR, OF NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the most influential educational group in America is the National Education Association, which has valiantly led the fight for many years in behalf of an adequate Federal aid-to-schools program.

Its executive secretary, Dr. William G. Carr, on January 27, 1958, made a most impressive statement over radio and television analyzing the inadequacies in the school-aid proposals of the President of the United States.

My wife, Maurine, and I—and Mrs. Neuberger is a former schoolteacher—listened attentively to Dr. Carr's presentation. Both of us thought at that time that the widest possible audience of Americans should hear his words with respect to the urgent need for fairly paid teachers and generously supported schools.

Inasmuch as the able senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has just introduced school legislation today, I feel this is a pertinent time to include Dr. Carr's effective statement in the body of the RECORD, and to emphasize that his proposals at the elementary and high-school levels will help to supplement the college scholarship recommendations made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

I endorse completely the specific program of the NEA, as outlined by Dr. William G. Carr.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the executive secretary of the National Education Association be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S SPECIAL MESSAGE ON EDUCATION, DELIVERED TO CONGRESS JANUARY 27, 1958

(By William G. Carr)

The National Education Association is glad that the President has again recognized that we must have better schools and that the Federal Government must help.

I am afraid, however, that the message greatly underestimates what needs to be done, and what the American people are ready and willing to do, in education.

If we really want to meet the challenge to American education, we must recognize the crucial importance of first-class teachers. We will never get enough first-class teachers until we pay salaries that compete for the best in business and industry.

Scholarships will help only if good teachers are available. Schools are not business institutions but they are the Nation's greatest producer of wealth. It is time for teachers to share more fully in the dividends they help to create. That is why the National Education Association is urging Federal funds to improve teachers' salaries and construct needed classrooms.

The first educational requirement of the space age is enough space in our schools so that every student may attend a full day in an uncrowded classroom with a thoroughly competent professional teacher. That is not too good or too costly a specification for building the future adult citizenship of the United States of America.

The administration proposals would provide very small expenditures to a few selected areas of education. The NEA calls for strengthening American education right across the board.

The NEA has supported Federal school construction legislation believing such Federal financial action was acceptable to the largest possible segment of the American public and hence most likely to be enacted. With an administration and Congress under the control of different political parties, the NEA has been willing to work for compromise measures which, although not adequate, would still be of some assistance. Now, confronted by new and dramatic evidence of need, the NEA proposes a program which represents more nearly what should now be done as a minimum. The NEA can no longer agree that small sums, short-range programs, and narrow objectives are sufficient to meet the current situation.

The NEA favors Federal funds for State-directed educational programs and services in all areas, including science and mathematics. In our judgment, a Federal decision to support any particular selected area of instruction carries with it some danger of Federal direction of State educational policy. On the other hand, general Federal support leaves the States free to decide how much stress to place on mathematics, or on science, or on other areas of instruction.

The NEA therefore urges substantial Federal undergirding of the financial structure of public education. The present base, limited largely to revenue from local property taxes or from State taxes, cannot fairly and efficiently reach the wealth and income of the entire Nation.

The NEA believes State education agencies should be allowed to allocate Federal funds between construction and teachers salaries. Both need help, but there are districts where one need outweighs the other.

The NEA's proposal is a Federal payment to the States of $25 per child rising to $100 per child within 5 years. This is still only a small share of the total cost of education, so the States and localities must also continue to exert their own best efforts.

## ADVERSE IMPACT OF FEDERAL BUDGET ON NATURAL RESOURCE PROGRAMS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about the belief, clearly expressed in the budget submitted by the administration to Congress, that our Nation can achieve weapons equality with the Soviet Union only at the sacrifice of vital programs in natural resource conservation and development. There is no question that we are embarked on a vastly accelerated program to correct any inadequacies in the fields of rocketry and missiles. We all recognize the need for making up lost time in this sphere of our defenses.

However, the basic needs of the Nation for improved waterways, for navigation, for more irrigation and better water supplies, and for additional power supplies cannot be permitted to languish behind the walls of a fortress bristling with armaments. We know that the opponent whose lead we are attempting to overcome in missiles and satellites is not relaxing efforts to fully utilize its rivers. Rather, they are expanding programs so that the potential of vast rivers which drain the uplands of Russia and Siberia can be added to the total productive strength being amassed against the Free World. We know that the Soviets have 40 major hydroelectric projects under construction—4 of which will exceed the capacity of Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River, heretofore the world's largest power producer.

At this point I should like to digress briefly from the manuscript of my address to call to the attention of the Senate the very informative address delivered on the floor of the Senate several days ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I believe it was one of the most instructive speeches I have ever heard since I became a Member of the Senate in January 1955.

The Senator from Louisiana described his extensive travels in Russia and in Siberia. During the course of that address the Senator from Louisiana emphasized at considerable length the

huge water-resource projects which he had seen under construction on such vast rivers in the Soviet Union as the Yenisei, the Volga, and the Angara.

The Senator from Louisiana stressed the fact that he saw turbines being built which will have nearly three times the capacity of some of the largest turbines in operation in the United States. I think his warning should give any of us pause if we think that we should abandon, in the interest of economy, the conservation and development of the marvelous rivers of the United States.

Reports are also heard of thousands of Chinese who swarm the banks of the Yangtse and Yellow Rivers, virtually using their bare hands to erect new and extensive irrigation and power facilities. Thus, we are given a challenge from Communist lands not only in terms of military strength but in terms of how natural resources are used to increase national strength. We cannot overlook the necessity for modern weapons, but we must also recognize that the outcome of the race may eventually be determined by who displays the greater wisdom in development of resources.

In my opinion, our position suffered a severe setback when the President's budget message revealed that not a single new flood-control, navigation, irrigation, water-supply, or power project would be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the coming fiscal year. Certainly, such a policy is not responsive to the needs of our expanding population, nor does it reflect an understanding of the critical situation which confronts us. It is neither wise nor true economy.

Where would we have been during World War II without the Grand Coulee water power which made possible the aluminum production for 50,000 planes a year? In that era of crisis the dams of TVA stoked the Oak Ridge atomic plant, while Grand Coulee and Bonneville provided the storehouse of energy needed for the Hanford plutonium works. This Nation cannot afford to put its water-resource-development requirements in the deep freeze for a single day, let alone the year-long moratorium proposed by the administration. We are all hopeful that our lag in missile defenses will be overcome within the coming year. But what if it is not? Will we then be called upon to accept further delay and curtailment, while the Soviets and Red China race ahead with expansion of their water resources?

SUPPORT GIVEN TO INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Mr. President, in the 3 years that I have served in this body, I believe I have supported as unstintingly as anyone here the expensive and often unpopular programs which are necessary to maintain our Nation's security and our international position in the modern world. I have voted for defense budgets and increases in defense budgets. I have supported the mutual-security program, the technical-assistance program, and the United States information program. I have done so wholly in disregard of any partisan or political considerations. For nothing has been a more frequent and easy target for attack and for criticism in our time than the substantial annual expenditures which we have found necessary—for the first time in supposed peacetime—to carry on international programs essential to our national interests as well as to the ultimate victory of freedom in the world.

I am convinced that the majority of men and women in Oregon are ready to undertake the burdens of these programs, however reluctantly, as the administration constantly exhorts them to do. But, Mr. President, the administration totally misreads the state of public opinion if they think that people will support these expenditures on the basis that other Government programs in welfare and resource fields will be cut so as to avoid an overall increase in the budget. I submit that the opposite is the case. We have all had the experience, Mr. President, of the many letters which tell us that this or that worthy objective at home could be accomplished if only a billion dollars could be transferred to that objective out of the funds we spend abroad or send up in the smoke of military activities. I predict we shall hear a good deal more of this from our constituents, in this year of declining economic prosperity in many parts of the country, if established or needed civilian programs of our Government are actually cut on the excuse of the greater security and international needs.

NATION NEEDS CONTINUING DOMESTIC PROGRESS

To the contrary, Mr. President, I believe that people are ready and willing to support these greater needs precisely to the degree that they are assured their Government will continue to look responsibly upon our domestic necessities. If the Nation as a whole must tighten its belt to meet the challenge of the great Soviet economic and scientific offensive throughout the world, let us tighten it on the civilian expenditures we all make in nonessential consumption of all kinds rather than on civilian Federal programs. For the fact is that those civilian Federal programs are far more essential to the present welfare of the Nation, and to its future strength, than whether those of us who might save a little in our Federal taxes have the money for $27 billion worth of new cars this year, or new TV sets, or all the other consumption goods our Nation spends $10 billion in advertising costs annually just to sell to ourselves.

This is true of Federal aid to education; of Federal aid to hospital construction; of Federal aid to medical research; of slum clearance and water-pollution control; and, above all, of Federal investment in resource development such as the building of new electric energy reserves in the Columbia River Basin. All of these add up to only a fraction of the security budgets, yet they are essential to our Nation and should continue to have the highest priority. Their continuation is the sine qua non of national support for those far greater defense and international expenditures which we know are necessary.

GOP HAS ALWAYS SOUGHT TO CURTAIL DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

The fact of course is that the administration is opposed to such civilian programs for their own sake. As a Republican administration, a self-styled "business administration," they opposed them before there was a crisis over sputnik, they oppose them now, and they will oppose them if the crisis should someday pass. They merely intend to use the very real needs of the present crisis as a cover behind which to carry out raids upon our programs for meeting our domestic responsibilities which have all along been the undeviating target of many Republican groups.

Mr. President, if by these steps backwards in the domestic field the administration manages to undermine and destroy public support for our national policies in the defense and international arena, they will have done double damage to our true national interests. In the end we could have neither domestic nor international programs equal to the tasks facing both. The President has slightingly spoken of defense of our domestic programs as representing unwillingness to sacrifice. That is untrue and unjust. Rather, it is unwillingness to sacrifice in the wrong place and for the wrong reasons; for the people and the areas that would lose in the cutback of Federal civilian programs are those which are already in the most need and can afford to lose the least. If we are to have sacrifice, let it be where our society has the most fat to give up—in the fields of unessential consumption, but not in fields like health, education, resource development, and minimum decent living standards upon which our pride as a democracy and our future economic strength depend.

VIEWS SUBMITTED TO PRESIDENT BEFORE BUDGET WAS MADE

Mr. President, in making these comments on the administration's approach, as exemplified by the administration's budget, I do not simply express negative, ex post facto criticism. Actually, I submitted these same views in a letter to President Eisenhower while the budget was in preparation as long ago as last November 23.

Of course, I have no reason to believe the President ever saw my letter. It was rather a thorough letter—a little over 3 pages in length—and it asked a number of questions concerning the administration's approach to the budget which was then in the making, on matters which I thought and still think to be of great public interest, particularly to Oregon.

In reply to the letter, I received a brief note from the President's assistant, Mr. Sherman Adams, acknowledging it "for the President," and stating that my views had been "noted with interest" and would be given "consideration." There was no answer to any of the questions I had asked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point my letter to President Eisenhower of November 23, 1957, and the reply from Governor Adams on December 4, 1957.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
*November 23, 1957.*

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing you regarding the impact of the intensified defense programs, which you discussed in your speech of November 13, on Federal resource programs in the Pacific Northwest.

In the course of your Oklahoma City speech, which was broadcast nationally, you stated in part that the Government would have to scrutinize closely all its civilian programs, with a view to the elimination of programs which, "while desirable, are not absolutely essential." You stated your conclusions that, "while some savings may still be squeezed, savings of the kind we need can come about only through cutting out or deferring entire categories of activity."

This has been interpreted in the press and elsewhere as an announcement that the administration will propose cutbacks in the civilian sector of Federal programs and activities. For Oregon, such an announcement has at once been taken to mean that the administration will further resist prosecution of long-planned Federal water resource developments in the Columbia River Basin. Most immediately, the fate of the John Day project in 1958 is feared to be at stake in your quoted statement. I, therefore, write in the hope that you may be able to reassure the people of this State and region that Federal programs of vital importance to them will not be further cut back by the administration. Specifically, I urge that the full amount which the Corps of Engineers can effectively use in the construction of John Day Dam on the Columbia River—I believe $30 million—be included in the budget for fiscal 1959 which you will present to the Congress early next year.

These are some of my reasons for urging such a course:

1. Rather than justifying the sacrifice of Federal resource development, our newly intensified competition with the Soviet Union is cause for accelerating such basic additions to national productive strength as the vast remaining hydroelectric potential of the Columbia River system. Energy is a fundamental measure of national strength—perhaps the most fundamental. During World War II, the hydroelectric energy generated at Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia contributed greatly to America's production of 50,000 airplanes a year. It made possible the Hanford atomic works. In any future crisis in national security, immense demands will unquestionably be made on American energy resources. Full and well-planned development of the power potential of the Columbia Basin, far from being a dispensable luxury, would add a margin of safety to the Nation's energy reserves, energy in a form which cannot be obtained overnight after the need for it becomes obvious and desperate.

2. The fundamental significance of energy resources for national strength is fully recognized by those with whom we compete. On its own vast rivers, the Soviet Union is engaged in building as many as 40 new power projects, several of them larger than even our own Grand Coulee. Though far poorer than the United States, the U. S. S. R. is doing this while simultaneously achieving its spectacular successes with rockets, missiles and the artificial earth satellites.

We have repeatedly been warned that communism's ability to accomplish a rapid, forced-draft industrial revolution in a backward country constitutes its greatest temptation to other undeveloped nations. Mr. Khrushchev has challenged the United States to meet the Soviet Union on this ground. To demonstrate that we can do so is as great a challenge as that posed by Soviet scientific and weapons development. How would the mighty United States look abroad, if we admit that we can match Soviet accomplishments only at the cost of sacrificing at home the kind of basic economic and social programs which are the goals and aspirations of the nations now choosing between communism and democracy?

3. It may well be that some sacrifices will have to be made by our Nation as a whole, as we shift more of our national effort into meeting the needs and the responsibilities which aggressive Soviet competition imposes upon us. But such a shift, in a nation devoting vast portions of its economy to automobiles, television sets, entertainment, liquor, and tobacco should surely come out of the top margin of unessential and luxury consumption, not out of public programs for developing basic economic strength and for underwriting minimum social standards. I trust, therefore, that your November 13 speech did not intend the widely held inference that precisely such programs are to be cut back to make room for greater military appropriations within preconceived budget limits.

For, particularly with respect to waterpower development, is it the administration's position that the Nation cannot afford to build both missiles and dams? Then all dam construction should be halted, not only that of Federal projects. The allocation of the Nation's resources, in manpower, machinery, steel, cement, turbines and generators is about the same, whether the cost is raised by private-utility corporations or the Federal Government. Actually, of course, the contrary course is needed. The administration has in the past recognized the significance of waterpower projects for national strength by granting fast tax-write-off privileges which have been defended precisely as emergency measures to induce a shift of national resources into such projects. Will the administration, then, defend the position that private corporations in the United States can afford to build these great, needed power projects, such as John Day, but the Federal Government cannot?

I should very much appreciate a clarification of these questions raised by your November 13 speech, which have caused much concern in Oregon. Let me, in conclusion, summarize the issue implicit in this speech.

In your same address on November 13, you also took pains to stress the importance of not seeking savings for defense purposes by cutting the equally important mutual-security program. As I believe you know, I have consistently supported the requests of your administration both for authority and for funds in the pursuit of the defense and international policies of the United States, including the controversial foreign-aid and USIA programs. I have done so in the face of considerable public criticism, largely from members of your own political party in Oregon, because these are not popular expenditures.

Nevertheless, you and members of your administration have often stated that Americans must be prepared for heavy burdens of national security and of international leadership for the indefinite future. I am sure they would be prepared to assume these burdens as a necessary and unavoidable addition to the total national effort, domestic and international. They will not support such increased international programs if they are to serve as an excuse for abandoning economic and social undertakings which play vital roles in the domestic development and welfare of our own country.

The Nation as well as the Northwest needs the lowcost power the Columbia River can provide, for national strength as well as for the prosperity of this region. Will the administration tell the people of Oregon that, to build the missiles we need, their Government cannot afford to build dams like John Day—but private-utility corporations can?

I hope they will not be asked to support the new programs of which you spoke November 13 on such a basis. Particularly, I hope you can offer the assurance that the administration plans full progress on construction of the Federal John Day project on the Columbia River, a start on which was provided by the Congress in the current fiscal year.

Respectfully yours,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senator.*

---

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, December 4, 1957.*

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
*United States Senator,*
*Portland, Oreg.*

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: For the President, this will acknowledge your letter of November 23. Your comments and suggestions with reference to the resources program in the Pacific Northwest have been noted with interest.

Consideration will be given to the matters you have emphasized.

Sincerely,
SHERMAN ADAMS,
*The Assistant to the President.*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, sentiment in the State of Oregon does not favor the administration's decision to freeze vitally needed navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation projects. This attitude is summarized, I think, in an editorial in the Oregonian, the Pulitzer prize-winning newspaper which supported President Eisenhower in the campaigns of 1952 and 1956. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the thoughtful Oregonian editorial, dated December 30, 1957.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO KINDS OF UNITED STATES MONEY

As Members of Congress assemble next week in Washington, D. C., they will be looking for opportunities to cut Federal expenditures to offset the almost certain additions to the defense budget. Public works offer tempting targets, but the lawmakers should take care to make a distinction between projects that pay their own way and those that don't. The former are really income-producing investments, not expenditures.

A case in point is the Federal hydroelectric system in the Columbia Basin. As of last June 30, Congress had appropriated approximately $1,840,000,000 for all power projects in the Columbia system. And as of that date, $226,624,704 had been returned to the Treasury to apply on the principal, nearly $80 million ahead of schedule. Interest paid on the Government funds was $161,718,044.

This does not take into consideration, of course, the tremendous cash benefits accruing to the Government through increased taxes paid by individuals and industries which depend on the federally generated power.

The Nation has been made richer, not poorer, by Federal investment in the Columbia River power system.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, local agencies of government and business and civic organizations reflect a similar viewpoint to that of the Oregonian. During the Congressional recess, I had an opportunity to meet with

members of many of these fine organizations in Oregon which have a deep understanding of water-resource problems and the need for progress in this field to assure continued economic advancement. One such group, the Willamette Basin Project Committee, has been working effectively for over two decades to accomplish a comprehensive control of rivers and streams in that watershed. At its meeting on December 4, 1957, this bipartisan committee adopted resolutions urging continuation and expansion of the development program. I was the annual-luncheon speaker on this occasion. So that the Members of Congress may be apprised of the project requirements believed to be essential by this outstanding group, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the wise and forceful resolutions adopted at the December meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the disposition of water development projects should be based upon long-time fulfillment of objectives to be desired from the standpoint of economy, conservation of resources, and reduction of flood damage; to be determined after evaluation of the basis of expected benefits ratio and consequent ability to repay, supported by projection of benefits to be derived from stabilization of soil and water resources and by elimination of irreparable losses from floods and erosion; and

Whereas, commensurate compliance with the above provisions, augmented by cooperation and active participation of those landowners who must ultimately bear the expense, should yield a more just and comprehensive evaluation of any project, rather than relying on the outcome of other projects that were engineered to meet and be adaptable to entirely different and divergent conditions; and

Whereas proponents of the Red Prairie (Mill Creek) project in northern Polk County, believing that development to be ideally qualifying and justifying immediate attention, are asking for an engineering and reconnaissance report on the practicability of storage and use of flood waters of Mill Creek by authorized agencies at the earliest opportunity: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Willamette Basin Project Committee assembled in annual meeting this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Oreg., does hereby approve and urge evaluation of the Red Prairie project by appropriate agencies as soon as practicable, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the State water resources board, and to Members of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE,
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

---

Whereas a reregulating dam on the South Santiam at Foster would replace the White Bridge Dam below Green Peter; and

Whereas, Foster Dam would add about 30,000 acre-feet to flood storage; and

Whereas, the Foster Dam could also act as a reregulating dam for the Cascadia Dam and allow power to be installed in the Cascadia Dam: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Oreg., go on record as requesting the Corps of Engineers and the Congressional delegation to make the above substitution and secure authorization and planning funds.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE.
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

---

Whereas better and additional water records are now available; and

Whereas, a portion of the Amazon floods have been released into the Fern Ridge Reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Willamette Basin Project Committee, meeting this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Oreg., does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to authorize an increase in the storage capacity of Fern Ridge Reservoir by at least 15,000 acre-feet and does urge the engineers to follow through with the construction as promptly as possible.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE,
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

---

Whereas there have been very damaging floods on the South Santiam in the last several years; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers estimate that it will require 535,000 acre-feet to give adequate protection; and

Whereas Green Peter Dam on the Middle Fork of the Santiam is the only one authorized: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December, 1957, at Eugene, Oreg., go on record as requesting the Congressional delegation to secure the authorization and planning funds for Cascadia and Wiley Creek Dams.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE,
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

---

Whereas with the construction of a reregulating dam below the Cougar Dam the power generated by the dam and reregulating dam could be increased from about 25,000 kilowatts installed to almost 50,000 kilowatts installed; and

Whereas power in this area is badly needed: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December, 1957, at Eugene, Oreg., go on record as favoring the construction of the Strube Dam as a reregulating dam for Cougar and urge the Congressional delegation to secure its authorization and planning funds.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE,
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

---

Whereas snags and roots of trees clog the flow of the Willamette and McKenzie Rivers at many points; and

Whereas there are many low places along the banks where floodwaters overflow the banks and damage adjacent land; and

Whereas the regulation of the dams tends to keep the flow of the river a little higher than normal: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Oreg., go on record as asking the Congressional delegation for the authorization of levees and channel clearance along the Willamette River down to the mouth of the Long Tom and along the McKenzie River from Hendricks Bridge to the mouth, and also to secure planning funds so that construction can begin as soon as possible.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE,
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

---

Whereas the present plan for flood control on the McKenzie River, including Gate Creek, would only take care of 34 percent of the total drainage area; and

Whereas the third dam (Gate Creek) has never been authorized: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Willamette Basin Project Committee, meeting this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Oreg., urge the Congressional delegation to secure authorization of the Gate Creek Dam and allocate planning funds to start it in the very near future.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE,
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

---

Whereas the Molalla Basin has received phenomenal growth in population since 1938; and

Whereas there has been considerable clearing along the banks, as well as farming, and structures built; and

Whereas there has been increased damage due to these facts: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Oreg., go on record as requesting Congress to approve and the Corps of Engineers to make a complete survey of the Molalla Basin in the interests of flood control.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE,
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

---

Whereas the locks at Oregon City are more than 80 years old; and

Whereas they are too narrow for regular barge traffic; and

Whereas present locks are composed of several basins causing them to be slow in operation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Willamette Basin Project Committee, meeting this 4th day of December 1957, at Eugene, Oreg., urge the Congressional delegation to secure planning funds so that reconstruction can proceed in the near future.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE.
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

---

Whereas the principle of supremacy of State water laws in deriving rights to the ownership, distribution, and use of ground and surface waters has been recognized in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th principal meridian by both Federal laws and State law, and the enabling acts by which many of the States were admitted to the Union; and

Whereas the stability of the economy, the property values, and the continued peace, prosperity, and development of much of the whole United States is dependent on a continued recognition of the supremacy of State water laws and the property rights which have been derived and settled thereunder: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Willamette Basin Project Committee, in session at Eugene, Oreg., this*

*4th day of December 1957*, That this committee urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will reconfirm the sovereignty of the Western States over the appropriation and use of water and which will prevent the Federal Power Commission from licensing power projects without full compliance by the licensee with State laws regulating the appropriation and use of water; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary to each member of Oregon's delegation in Congress and to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WILLAMETTE BASIN PROJECT COMMITTEE,
ELMO B. CHASE, *Chairman*.
WALTER F. BUSE,
*Chairman of Resolutions Committee*.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, start of new projects also is sought by the chambers of commerce, labor, and other groups in the State of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions from the Lane County Chamber of Commerce, the Sweet Home-East Linn County Chamber of Commerce, and the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL–CIO Port Council of Portland and vicinity.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING OF THE LANE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HELD AT JAMISON'S CAFE, OAKRIDGE, OREG., DECEMBER 17, 1957

Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers is constructing the Cougar Dam project for flood control, power, and recreational benefits; and

Whereas the present engineering plan is for power installation of 25,000 kilowatts to operate as a base load powerplant; and

Whereas the present design does not adequately protect the recreational benefits by downstream regulations of streamflow: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Corps of Engineers be asked to give favorable consideration to the modification of the design of the power features of the project to provide for installation of additional generating capacity at Cougar Dam powerhouse operating the powerplant as a peaking plant and that the project be also modified to add the strube regulation reservoir with control in waterflows and thereby provide more complete utilization of the water resources and that the foregoing resolution be sent to the office of the Portland district and the North Pacific division, Corps of Engineers, and members of the Oregon Congressional delegation.

---

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING OF THE LANE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HELD AT JAMISON'S CAFE, OAKRIDGE, OREG., DECEMBER 17, 1957

Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers is engaged in constructing Hills Creek Reservoir project; and

Whereas the money appropriated for construction in the fiscal year 1958 has been determined as insufficient for optimum and economic construction progress: Now therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Portland district's North Pacific division and Chief of Engineers be requested to allocate sufficient additional funds to provide for the most economic prosecution of the construction at the project and that the foregoing resolution be sent to the various Corps of Engineers offices and the Oregon Congressional delegation.

SWEET HOME-EAST LINN COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Sweet Home, Oreg., January 10, 1958.*

The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: The Sweet Home-East Linn County Chamber of Commerce entreats you to lend all possible support to the acquisition of construction funds for the Green Peter Dam on the South Santiam River.

This dam has been approved both by the Congress and the United States Army engineers as a vital installation of the Willamette Basin flood-control project.

Immediate commencement of construction would be advantageous to both the Army engineers and the Linn County area. Unemployment is high and this area is suffering an economic slump.

The devastating erosion of valuable and irreplaceable Willamette Valley farmland continues unchecked.

Respectfully yours,
JESS M. PARKER, *President*.

---

RESOLUTION OF MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL–CIO, PORT COUNCIL OF PORTLAND AND VICINITY

Whereas for over 20 years there has been approved legislation to widen and deepen the Columbia and Willamette Rivers up to the ports of Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.; and

Whereas this has never been lived up to since it was authorized: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the maritime trades department do everything within its power to help bring about the deepening and widening of these rivers so that any type ship can navigate in these channels at all times; be it further

*Resolved*, That we request our friends in the United States Senate and Congress to help us in any way they can to make the port of Portland, Oreg., and the port of Vancouver, Wash., available to any and all oceangoing traffic.

---

RESOLUTION OF MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL–CIO, PORT COUNCIL OF PORTLAND AND VICINITY

Whereas during the last several years, the port of Portland has had in operation a surplus drydock of the Navy, capable of handling the ships of larger tonnage entering the Columbia River; and

Whereas many firms, large and small, at the risk of their capital, established a very efficient ship-repair operation in this port, including the conversion of two large passenger ships, which would have been impossible without this type of drydock; and

Whereas the State of Oregon has been declared a critical area because of unemployment, and ship repair in the port of Portland has developed payrolls into millions; and

Whereas the necessary ship repair, including this type of drydock, will have much bearing on the type of tonnage used in hauling wheat and general cargoes out of the Columbia River, which is of vital interest to the seamen sailing these ships: Be it

*Resolved*, That the maritime trades department and its affiliates seek the support of all other groups and individuals in this matter; and be it finally

*Resolved*, That the maritime trades department forward this resolution, with personal letters, to all Senators and Congressmen and any other interested parties, urging them to use their influence in helping the port of Portland retain this drydock for operations in the port of Portland.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper column by A. Robert Smith from the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg., telling of the opinions of Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, on Russian dam-building progress.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS BUILDING BIG DAMS WHILE UNITED STATES SITS ON FENCE

(By Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Russia is now completing a big hydroelectric project which will be 18 percent greater in kilowatt production than America's biggest dam, Grand Coulee, according to Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of the Army Engineers.

This is just one of 17 dams being built to fully develop the mighty Volga River from the Arctic on the north to the Black and Caspian Seas on the south.

"It is clear that the Russians are well aware of the importance of complete river basin development and are carrying forward an extensive program, in addition to the expansion of their armed forces," General Itschner declared.

"Comprehensive development on the Volga, which has pushed forward largely since World War II, already has provided the 3,000-mile main stem of an integrated inland waterway system," Itschner added.

DEFENSE AND RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The Chief of Engineers, by outlining progress of Russia in resource development, tended to bolster the argument being advanced by those who contend that the United States need not sacrifice river development work in order to step up defense spending. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress and Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon, recently made such an argument in opposition to reported decisions by the Eisenhower administration to invoke a "no new starts" policy on public works development and oppose authorization of new river and harbor projects.

On another front, Mike Straus, Ex-Commissioner of Reclamation, is working up a report of Russian resource programs for the Senate Interior Committee as ammunition for western Senators who anticipate a tough battle for funds for reclamation and power projects.

General Itschner said he thinks it significant that Russia has given the United States a glimpse of its military advancements while remaining reticent about disclosing the advancements they are making on the economic front.

"Possibly the Russians hope we will become so overburdened by the costs of defense as to neglect our own economic development, while at the same time they build up their own real strength," the general speculated.

DEVELOPMENTS CITED

Itschner cited these Russian developments:

1. Each of the 17 dams on the Volga will have good-sized navigation locks possibly as large as 100 by 1,000 feet. Vessels of 11.5-foot draft regularly travel the approximately 1,000 miles between Moscow and the Black and Caspian Seas.

2. The big dam that surpasses Grand Coulee will be finished in 1958 with a capacity of 2,300,000 kilowatts. Russia has plans for even bigger dams in Siberia, 3 of them ranging in output from 3 million to 5 million kilowatts. Installed capacity of Grand Coulee is about 1,900,000 kilowatts.

Some proposed projects in Alaska would come close to rivalling the Russian dams—mainly the Rampart Dam which has been proposed for the Yukon River by the Bureau of Reclamation. It would have a capacity of 3 million kilowatts, unless Canada should

divert part of the flow of the Yukon as has been proposed. The Taiya project in southeastern Alaska would have an installed capacity of 2 million kilowatts. There is no active consideration being given to building either of these Alaska dams.

RUSSIAN PORT FACILITIES IMPROVED

3. Russia is emphasizing the mechanization of port facilities.

4. Marinas and beach areas are being developed for public recreation.

General Itschner conceded that Russia has made sacrifices to achieve both military and resource development accomplishments, but he noted that the sacrifices fell in the area of TV sets and swept-wing automobiles.

"I am confident that our country possesses the engineering skills and construction capability which, if rationally directed to the task, will give us the water resource developments required to build an economy which can meet any challenge the communistic world might offer," the Chief of Engineers concluded.

## STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a former colleague of ours in the Senate, the Honorable George H. Bender, who is now Special Assistant to the Secretary of Interior. The letter concerns the matter of statehood for Alaska, which has been considered by the Congress for many years, and so far not given too serious consideration upon the floor of the Senate.

My own personal point of view, which is in support of statehood for Alaska, is that it is high time we as Americans face up to this very vital issue. It seems to me that it is extremely important to this country in our relations with the rest of the world to make a decision in this matter and to let the rest of the world know that, as I hope and desire, we intend to make Alaska our next State or, at least, in the alternative and less to our credit, to tell the world what our intentions are with respect to Alaska.

If we are in fact going to push out our frontiers, as we have been doing, scientifically, and if we are to push them out geographically to the South Pole, it is also high time that we push them out to Alaska, and in that respect tell the world for once and for all we consider Alaska to be a part of the United States in the full sense of all that implies—and what it implies is statehood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in view of the very able manner in which this problem has been presented in the letter of former Senator Bender, that the letter be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, D. C., January 23, 1958.*

HON. GORDON ALLOTT,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: As the 2d session of the 85th Congress begins its momentous task, this letter of greeting and good wishes comes to you from our country's most important 20th century frontier, the Territory of Alaska.

In my capacity as special assistant to Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, I have been accorded the opportunity of studying at first hand the people, the geography, the military significance, and the potential development of this underdeveloped outpost of America.

During this session of Congress you will undoubtedly consider once more the question of statehood for Alaska. I believe with all sincerity that the grant of statehood to Alaska would furnish definitive evidence to the people of our country and to the world that while we are acutely aware of the military problems we face, we are taking every step possible to insure the preservation of the traditional rights and privileges of our citizens wherever located.

We are all aware that the consideration of Alaskan statehood in the past has raised political questions. Some people, too, are concerned over the fact that the soil of Alaska is not physically contiguous to other parts of the United States. But, in these days when artificial satellites soar overhead with complete disregard for established national boundaries or continental limits, these issues appear to have become obsolete.

The statehood legislation now pending before Congress contains adequate provisions to meet the requirements of the defense efforts in Alaska. It is my considered judgment that Alaska holds the key to the military security of the United States. Its strategic location in this era of missiles, supersonic flight, and pushbutton warfare has enhanced Alaska's already established status as a radar warning center, as an air defensive core, and as a protective arsenal for the entire Western Hemisphere.

Alaskans have readily accepted the provisions in the statehood bill which will permit the Military Establishment to act under the President in times of emergency while at the same time adequately protecting their personal and property rights.

You may be sure that in the work which lies before you during the difficult days ahead you have the support and the prayers of the American people and people everywhere who seek for world peace under the blessings of freedom. The admission of Alaska into the Union could well be the symbol we need to assure the peoples of the world of our continued adherence to the principles of our forefathers.

It is in this spirit that I address you and wish you a most successful session.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. BENDER,
*Special Assistant to the Secretary.*

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that during the present session of Congress the Senate of the United States will consider and debate the question of statehood for Alaska, so that it can be determined and settled once and for all. It is a question which we cannot avoid longer. It is a question which, if not decided, will result inevitably in damage to our own prestige and that of the great Territory of Alaska. It is my firm hope that the matter will be decided in the affirmative, and that we can welcome Alaska as a State.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to concur in the support of statehood for Alaska which has been voiced by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As one of the ardent adherents of statehood for Alaska and one of the Senators from the Pacific Northwest, which is the nearest United States area to Alaska, I am grateful for the sentiments the Senator has voiced.

Mr. President, if no other Member desires to address the Senate, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order, and ask for its immediate consideration. I invite the attention of the occupant of the Chair to the provisions of the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read.

The order was read, as follows:

*Ordered*, That Mr. CARROLL be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Public Works, and assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary.

That Mr. YARBOROUGH be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is entered.

## RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 31, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30 (legislative day of January 27), 1958:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Thailand.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Anthony F. Arpaia, of Connecticut, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964.

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1964.

Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1959.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

*To be rear admiral*

Capt. Richard M. Ross for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral.

The following-named persons for appointment to the rank indicated with their respective names:

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Alvin H. Giffin | Emmet T. Calahan |
| James A. Alger, Jr. | John H. Forney |
| Albert J. Carpenter | Eugene A. Coffin, Jr. |
| Willard J. Smith | David O. Reed |

| | |
|---|---|
| Edward W. Laird | Joseph Howe |
| Verne C. Gibson | George W. Holtzman |
| Charles R. Monteiro | William W. Childress |
| Hugh D. Wear | John H. Wagline |
| Daniel J. Lucinski | John J. Hutson, Jr. |
| Hubert R. Chaffee | Robert E. McCaffery |
| Peter J. Smenton | Albert E. Harned |
| Thomas R. Midtlyng | Richard F. Rea |
| John B. Oren | Louis M. Thayer, Jr. |
| Harry E. Davis, Jr. | |

The following-named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Daniel C. Dickert | William E. Chapline |
| Lloyd R. Morrison | Albert Frost |
| Cyril L. Heyliger | William F. Adams |
| Frank F. Elliott | William F. Rea III |
| Henry C. Keene, Jr. | James L. Lathrop |
| Ellis L. Perry | Vincent J. Cass |
| Loy W. A. Renshaw | Austin C. Wagner |
| Cecil E. Meree, Jr. | Stephen G. Carkeek |
| Clyde L. Olson | Norman L. Horton |
| Joseph G. Bastow, Jr. | Henry A. Pearce, Jr. |
| Bob Kirsten | William A. Jenkins |
| John B. Speaker, Jr. | John Natwig |
| Louis F. Sudnik | Roy M. Hutchins, Jr. |
| John F. Thompson, Jr. | |

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Stephen Varanko | David W. DeFreest |
| John R. Mackey | Robert L. Lawlis |
| Joseph F. Furlough, Jr. | James W. Dodson |
| Ottis H. Abney | George D. Winstein |
| Curtis H. Jurgens | William W. Richter |
| Allen E. Armstrong | John A. Corso |
| Charles D. Budd | William H. St. George |
| Howard A. Linse | George T. Treffs |
| Harry E. Chapin | Robert J. Bloxsom |
| James McMenamin | Joseph W. Finnegan |
| Donby J. Mathieu | |

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard.

| | |
|---|---|
| Jack A. Howell | Arthur W. Gove |
| Russell P. Combs | George J. Weidner |
| William E. Heath | Carl E. Rodehau |
| Justin J. Bonanno | Raymond W. Bernhard |
| Lenard Fielding, Jr. | Edward S. Davis, Jr. |
| John F. O'Connor | Robert C. Pittman |
| Richard A. Bauman | |

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

| | |
|---|---|
| Domenic A. Calicchio | James N. Schenk |
| William Drew | John H. Guest |

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Dewey G. Rushford
Steven L. Hollis, Jr.

*To be lieutenants*

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.
Dale E. Westbrook

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Albert Larsen, Jr., effective February 9, 1958. | Paul L. Schock |
| | Richard F. Shoolbred |
| | Robert D. Frost |
| Herman H. Druebert | Charles E. Fuller |
| Charles I. Harding | Philip J. Taetz |
| James C. Sainsbury | Earl R. Scyoc |
| Victor V. Tilley, Jr. | Ogden Beeman |
| William M. Lee | Ronald D. Bernard |
| Arthur M. Cook | K. William Jeffers |
| Lawrence C. Haverkamp | Bernard L. Gabrielsen |
| | Oliver J. Weber |
| Thomas E. Simkin | Merlyn D. Christensen |

*To be ensigns*

Jerome P. Guy
Leroy L. Pate
George F. Wirth



# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 13: 13: *Now abideth faith, hope, and love, these three; but the greatest of these is love.*

Almighty God, to turn away from Thee is to fall, but to abide in Thee is to stand fast forever.

We penitently confess that there is so much in our life which sorely perplexes us and we frequently wander in doubt and walk in darkness, uncertain of the way.

Grant that in our noonday prayer we may be lifted to larger outlooks, clearer visions, and new fields of endeavor.

May we daily grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, whom to know aright is life eternal.

Inspire us with a victorious faith, an unconquerable hope, and a love that endures forever.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 728. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds; and

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution providing additional funds for the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5538) entitled "An act to provide that withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the Chaplain of the House today, always beautiful and effective, was most appropriate on this occasion: "Faith, hope, and charity." If there was ever a man who during his lifetime exemplified not only by words but by deeds those great spiritual elements it was the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Today is the birthday anniversary of that great man, that great American, one of the greatest humanitarians of all time.

The service of any man as President of the United States is difficult of evaluation during his lifetime, and that applies to anyone who is the incumbent of the White House, because during his lifetime the emotions, the honest differences, the controversial questions that arise in the life of all of us and particularly in the life of a nation, and more particularly during the great historical period the world is now undergoing, obscure and prevent a true evaluation of the meaning and significance of the trend and type of leadership given by any man who occupies the office of Chief Executive of our Country.

I think it can be safely said without contradiction by even those who have disagreed with the late Franklin D. Roosevelt on some of his proposals and views and policies that he was a man of deep faith, a man who gave hope to others, and a man of charity.

He was a man who during his service as President laid the foundation for the great progress made in our country in recent years in the field of economic reconstruction and economic progress. Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed office in 1933 at a time when our country was in deep despair and when the people of our country—the great majority of them—were wondering whether democratic institutions of government could function. Franklin D. Roosevelt brought to the people the leadership necessary to meet the trying problems resulting from a great economic conflagration. Franklin D. Roosevelt stepped into the breach and gave to the people of our country the leadership that brought back not only hope and faith but confidence which results from faith and hope. Without faith and hope, confidence cannot exist. Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized the right of others to disagree with him. Many did disagree with him, and honestly so. I am sure, as I said before, they will agree with me as to the sincerity of his purpose. Today we see the results of his leadership. No Member of the Congress has introduced a single bill to repeal any of the great progressive measures recommended by Franklin D. Roosevelt and passed by the Congress of the United States. As a matter of fact, we read constantly in the newspapers that we will never have another depression due to the cushions that exist in the law. What are some of those cushions? Social security, unemployment compensation, the Securities and Exchange Commission regulations protecting the investing public against the fraudulent sales of stock, the minimum wage, the elimination of exploitation of

child labor, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, a very broadened law in relation to immigration and naturalization, and so many other pieces of legislation recommended by Franklin D. Roosevelt which are on the statute books which today constitute not only cushions against depression in the economic sphere but in the moral and idealistic sphere, which is very important. So, when we read in the papers about these cushions that will prevent another depression, they are all due to the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and those of us who fought shoulder to shoulder with him for the passage of those great constructive and progressive measures. Today is the anniversary of his birth. As we paused yesterday to pay respects to another great President, a President elected as a Republican—you notice I say "a President elected as a Republican," for I recognize no President as either a Republican or a Democratic President—but, as I say, "a President elected as a Republican," today we pause to honor the memory of another great President, elected as a Democrat. In my opinion, the name and memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt will go down in history as one of the greatest figures on the constructive side of history. I do not know how much longer the known history of man will continue. Nobody can tell, looking into the future; but certainly, as we look at the past, down through the many hundreds of years of known history, Franklin D. Roosevelt stands out as one of the greatest figures of all times; and more particularly on the constructive side because he symbolized during his lifetime—and in office he gave the leadership that brought to countless millions of persons, the average person, hope, confidence, and a restoration of faith, not only to our own people but to the countless millions of average persons in other lands throughout the world.

To them Franklin D. Roosevelt and what he stood for during his lifetime will always be a symbol of hope and of confidence. It is well that we pause on this occasion to pay respects to this great man, this great American, this great President.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in our tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the 76th anniversary of his birth.

The 13 years since Franklin Roosevelt's death have not dimmed his memory. It has been kept ablaze by the dreams which have become realities. It is reflected in the shining progress of our health programs, in the working conditions of our men and women, in the hopes of our American farmers, in the economic dignity given our citizens in their twilight years, and in our civil rights and liberties.

Franklin Roosevelt was first of all a great humanitarian. He proved it by fighting to the bitter end for the inalienable rights of his fellowmen.

But Franklin Roosevelt was also a shrewd and sagacious statesman, with a keen sense of world affairs. The qualities that made of Franklin Roosevelt a great humanitarian in no way diluted the substance needed to make of him a great Commander in Chief and a great world leader. He was a tower of strength in the long and painful war years and nonplused his bitterest critics with his tenacity and courage to make the kind of decisions that try men's souls.

HOLIDAY FOR F. D. R. BIRTHDAY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the 76th anniversary of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday.

For several years the International Association of Machinists have reprinted their editorial eulogizing the accomplishments of this great American. No doubt some day in the not too distant future, when another generation can compare the deeds and record of this great humanitarian with other statesmen, he will be placed along with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln in the history books of our Nation.

The following editorial from the Machinists newspaper is a beautiful summary, setting out the reasons why Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birthday should be a national holiday:

Today Franklin Roosevelt occupies a place in our history beside George Washington and Abraham Lincoln as a leader who came to the American people in a time of great crisis and led them through.

We observe the birthday of Washington in every State and that of Lincoln in 31 States. Roosevelt's birthday, January 30, should be added to those two.

Most of us are not too young to remember the stark fear that faced this Nation in 1933. The United States was in the throes of a crisis unprecedented in times of peace. Most of all we needed something to restore our confidence. Franklin Roosevelt did that and more. He pulled us out of the crisis. As one historian has written, "The 99-day session of the 73d Congress that began on March 9, 1933, witnessed the most daring Presidential leadership in American history."

He followed in the middle thirties with a program of social legislation—social security, labor relations, home loans, bank deposit insurance, rural electrification, minimum wages—to name a few of the great New Deal laws.

Roosevelt gave the common people of America the chance for security and self-respect. During the second half of his administration, when we were plunged into the worst war in our history, Roosevelt led us to victory.

The forgotten man whom Roosevelt fought for can lead the way in making his birthday a national day of remembrance. National holidays can only be suggested by Congress. They must be officially proclaimed by State governors and local mayors. Any group has the right to petition a governor or mayor to proclaim a holiday.

Observance of Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays came slowly. Three months after Washington's death in 1799, Congress adopted a resolution urging a public noting of February 22. A few cities followed the suggestion in succeeding years, but it was not until the 100th anniversary of his birth that the entire country made the day a holiday.

In Lincoln's case also, Congress adopted a resolution urging observance of Lincoln's birthday. It was not until the 100th anniversary of his birth, that the observance became a national custom.

For 19 years we have been observing Roosevelt's birthday as National Infantile Paralysis Day. But his birthday must be remembered for more than the great personal handicap which he overcame.

Working men and women will gladly honor him on his birthday, as one of the greatest friends they ever had. His ideals deserve to be remembered this year and every year.

---

## RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 320)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I request the Congress to enact legislation that will permit a continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements program on an effective basis for a minimum of 5 additional years past June 30, 1958.

The enactment of this legislation, unweakened by amendments of a kind that would impair its effectiveness, is essential to our national economic interest, to our security, and to our foreign relations.

The high importance of trade to our economy is evident. The income of our people arising from export trade alone approximates or exceeds that arising from many major segments of our economy. The development of a healthy export trade has created a significant number of jobs for our working men and women. Imports furnish our industries with essential raw materials, and the benefits of technological advances add to the variety of goods available to our consumers, and also create jobs for our workers. Moreover, important geographical areas within our country, as well as many of our key industries in both manufacturing and agriculture, look to expanding world trade as an essential ingredient of their future prosperity.

Reciprocal trade agreements negotiated since the advent of the Trade Agreements Act have helped bring a more vigorous, dynamic growth to our American economy. Our own economic self-interest, therefore, demands a continuation of the trade agreements program. Under this program sound two-way trade can be further developed to assure to our industries widening opportunities for participation in world markets and to provide foreign nations the opportunity to earn the dollars to pay for the goods we sell. We can either receive the benefits of the reciprocal lowering of trade barriers or suffer the inevitable alternative of increasingly high barriers against our own commerce which would weaken our economy and jeopardize American jobs.

Important as growing international trade is to our country, it is equally important to our allies and trading partners. For them it is indeed vital to the health and growing strength of their economies, on which their political stability and military power heavily depend. The assured future of the reciprocal-trade

program is necessary for our national security and for our entire foreign policy.

In particular, it is essential to enable us to meet the latest form of economic challenge to the free world presented by communism. In the state of the Union message, I spoke of the economic offensive that has been mounted against free nations by the Communist imperialists. The Soviet Union is engaged in an intensive effort, through combined programs of trade and aid, to divide the countries of the free world, to detach them one by one and swing them into the orbit of Communist influence.

We must recognize the growing capacity of the Soviet Union in the economic field. Their advances in technology and industrialization, together with their continuing repression of domestic consumption, enable them to supply, better than ever before, the machinery, manufactures, and other goods which are essential to the economic life of many countries.

The Soviet capacity to export is matched by its capacity and willingness to import. It is increasingly offering to import the surpluses of non-Communist states. In this way it seeks to tie such states to the Soviet orbit, and to exploit the trade difficulties of the free world.

This challenge in the economic field cannot be ignored without the gravest risk to our own way of life. This fact alone makes it imperative that previous positions be reexamined, and that particular interests be reappraised in the light of overriding national needs.

The question is whether the system of free competitive enterprise for which we stand will meet successfully in the international economic arena the challenge hurled by the Soviet leaders.

We will fail in this endeavor if the free countries do not continue their reduction of the barriers which they themselves impose on their trade with each other. We will fail if closed markets and foreign exchange shortages force Free World countries into economic dependence upon the Communist bloc. We will fail if the United States should now abandon the task of building a world-trading system from which all Free World countries can gain strength and prosperity in a free economic society.

If our Government is to play its decisive part in protecting and strengthening the free economic system against the Communist threat, the trade agreements legislation which the administration is requesting of the Congress must be enacted.

The Secretary of Commerce, who is Chairman of the Trade Policy Committee which I recently established to advise and assist me in the administration of the trade-agreements program, including review of recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission, will transmit to the Congress the administration's legislative proposals. These proposals, including the various safeguards for domestic industry, will generally follow the pattern set by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

The amount of tariff reduction authority to be requested is essential to the continuing success of the program, as is the 5-year period of the proposed extension to the continuity in our trade relations.

There is a further and very specific factor necessitating a minimum extension of 5 years. Six European nations, which purchased nearly $3 billion of our exports last year, have established a European Economic Community which will become a common market with a population nearly as large as our own. These countries will ultimately have a common tariff applying to imports from the rest of the world. It is anticipated that important steps toward this common tariff will become effective during 1962—up to 4½ years from the renewal date of our trade-agreements legislation. This period must be devoted to negotiations with the new Economic Community and these negotiations must be preceded by painstaking preparations. Both preparation and negotiation must be based on a clear grant of adequate authority. This timetable requires an extension of the legislation for a minimum of 5 years. Such an extension, with the tariff-reduction authority to be requested, is necessary to carry the trade-agreements program through the early formative years of the European Economic Community and strengthen our ability to further vital American interests there and elsewhere in the world.

The 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act with broadened authority to negotiate is essential to America's vital national interests. It will strengthen our economy which is the foundation of our national security. It will enhance the economic health and strength of the Free World. It will provide a powerful force in waging total peace.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 30, 1958.*

---

## FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 426) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective January 3, 1958, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 17 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $305,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time not to ask for a rollcall; I have no intention of pressing for a rollcall, but I do take this opportunity to express my opposition to this continued expenditure of money, because I think today more than ever since this committee was organized it has outlived its usefulness. I want, therefore, at least to be on record as opposing this resolution.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker I disagree most emphatically with the gentleman from Minnesota. I want to say I am in favor of this amount of money for the Un-American Activities Committee. It is doing a wonderful job; the committee has justified its request for every penny; it should be continued in full operation; and as a member of the Committee on House Administration who supported this amount in our committee I urge the House to vote the full amount of $305,000.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragedies of our day is the fact that, in spite of all that has been written, there are only a comparatively few people, including the Supreme Court, who really understand the Communist mind, the Soviet objective of world domination, and the various methods employed to accomplish that objective.

We are presently at war with the Soviet Union. Military might is only one part of the offensive now being waged by the Communists against the Free World. The country and this Congress is almost in a state of shock over alleged military supremacy of the Communists. Russia is not going to sign its own death warrant by an all-out nuclear war in the foreseeable future, and why should she? The Communists are using a weapon more effective than guided missiles, namely, infiltration and internal subversion, by which she has in a few years brought approximately one-third of the surface of the earth and its peoples under her domination and control.

A great general said the other day that one of the very few remaining forces in the world that really understands this phase of the Communist offensive and is fighting it is the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is almost unbelievable that there are some who would attempt to destroy this bulwark by depriving it of a pittance compared to the amount being spent to oppose aggression from without, which, as I have said, in all probability will never come.

The hard core of the Communist conspiracy, the ADA, the Communist-dominated Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and the Washington Post have been conducting a well-planned campaign to handcuff and to eventually destroy the Committee on Un-American Activities. In an editorial 2 weeks ago the Washington Post said:

For 20 years the committee has been disclosing and reporting on the pattern of Communist infiltration of American life; this part of its function has long since been completed, and the pattern of the past no longer has much application to the present.

In view of the record, how silly can we get?

I could take an hour on the floor of the House today and tell you of incident after incident of revelations made by the Committee on Un-American Activities, not of past Communist activities but of infiltration and subversion that is taking place at this very moment.

I will give you just one example which is as current as this morning's newspapers. We have been worried about a sputnik in outer space. Well, gentlemen, the House Committee on Un-American Activities uncovered a sputnik right here in the House of Representatives—not 5 years ago, not 2 years ago, not 1 year ago, but just 2 months ago.

The Communist record of one Wilfred Lumer was just recently brought to light. Now, who was Wilfred Lumer? He was a man who was doing research for Members of this House—for two committees of this Congress. His handiwork found its way into reports on legislation that is being considered by this Congress.

Let me read just three questions and answers from his testimony taken just 71 days ago, which will illustrate my point.

Mr. ARENS. During the course of this assistance which you have rendered on the Hill to the Congress, have you at any time in the course of the rendition of that assistance been under the discipline of the Communist Party?

Mr. LUMER (after conferring with his counsel). I again decline to answer on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. ARENS. Have you reported your activities on the Hill, on Capitol Hill, over the course of the last several years to a person known by you to be a Communist?

Mr. LUMER. I must decline to answer that question on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. ARENS. We have information, and I want to be absolutely frank with you, Mr. Lumer—we have information that in the recent past you have been in contact, and under discipline, of Sam Abbott, a ranking Communist in the District of Columbia. We want to give you an opportunity now while under oath to deny it.

Mr. LUMER. I must decline to answer that on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am offering my opposition to this legislation not because I oppose the idea, but because I oppose the committee's practices. The committee has done a laudable job in quarantining Communists, although I think that in many instances its publicity has been unwise and regrettable in that it has ruined innocent men and women.

However, I am offering my opposition to highlight the fact that this Committee on Un-American Activities has refused consistently through the years, regardless who the chairman was and is, to investigate the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. American citizens are being beaten, houses of God—especially in Montgomery, Ala.—have been bombed, the rule of terror and violence is superseding that of law and yet the Ku Klux Klan goes on its nefarious un-American way, seemingly with the approval by indifference of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I have written through the years innumerable letters to the various chairmen asking for comment on this and have never received the courtesy of a reply. The Catholic magazine Commonweal just published an editorial calling on the committee to investigate the Klan activities in Mobile, Ala., and offered to give the committee the names and addresses of Klan leaders which they have in their possession, and no reply was made to them, nor to my letter in which I forwarded this editorial from this outstanding Roman Catholic publication.

The only positive action taken against the Ku Klux Klan was taken the other day in North Carolina by the only real Americans and it is unfortunate all of us in the House who are immigrants, for the only real Americans are the American Indians, sit by year after year and let the Ku Klux Klan supersede law and order.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, certainly I approve the continued operations of the Un-American Activities Committee. In no way do I believe that the committee has outlived its usefulness. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the need to preserve America's system and strength and to hold under constant surveillance the inauguration and development of un-American activity is of prime importance, so that this Congress may meet new and renewed threats by appropriate and timely legislation.

We cannot hide from the fact that other countries of the world have fallen victim to subversive activities inspired and directed from without. Nor can we hide from the fact that such activities are carried out in our own country. It is true that as soon as we are informed upon current methods and volume of such activities we can proceed legislatively to counteract them. But we cannot be so naive as to believe that a power intent upon our destruction will continue to employ the same methods once they have been discovered and publicized. We would not give credit to the intelligence or sinister mission of our adversaries were we to believe that new subversive methods will not be inaugurated by them, methods which will certainly be concealed until our committee can discover them and advise the Congress. We must continue the work of this Un-American Activities Committee and give it our enthusiastic endorsement.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the permission to speak on a subject I consider of supreme importance to the security of America. I refer to the continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee. This committee began as a special committee in 1938 and became permanent in 1945. This fact reflects the need for continued surveillance of those organizations or individuals who would have subverted us. In my opinion, these anti-Americans and Communists have continued their efforts. The fact that the House Un-American Activities Committee has been diligent in performing its functions is a contributing factor to our awareness of the dangers of subversion from within.

My section of the country, Chicago, is the heartland of America. Citizens are disturbed over any possibility that this committee's vital work would be disbanded because of pressure from 50,000 anti-anti-Communists.

Yesterday I issued a statement for the press in which I clearly stated my belief that this committee must go on. I stated "nothing would please Russia more than to see the public demand this committee to cease. This would be another gain for them and an inestimable loss to America."

I believe it would behoove all Americans to read the committee's excellent report entitled "Operation Abolition." I am sure thousands of Chicagoans stand ready to come to the defense of this committee if necessary. They are waiting for the word from Congress as a result of any action we might take.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee again in this my sixth term in this distinguished legislative body, and in view of the brief statement of opposition to the pending resolution by my distinguished colleague from Illinois to the effect that in his judgment the said committee had out-lived its usefulness and importance, I should like to say:

First, that as an understanding and sympathetic friend of the working people of our beloved Nation, both in organized labor and outside, the gentleman from Illinois would be surprised to know how very frequently our committee is asked by leaders of organized labor throughout our Nation, to assist them in their handling the problem of subversive activities of Communists and their bedfellows and followers within given local unions. In other words, quite often vigilant, patriotic union leaders ask our help to protect and preserve the democratic processes within their respective local unions against the deceitful, cheating, and unpatriotic subversive activities of subversive elements within their unions which design to either gain control or keep control of those local union boards and offices for the avowed purpose of initiating or continuing the Communist and subversive philosophy within the control of those unions. One of the most hopeful signs I see is the increasing extent to which vigilant, patriotic organized labor leaders are thus taking vigorous and positive steps to obtain necessary help to protect the democratic processes of their organized labor groups.

Secondly, I wish to say that I trust the House will realize that this committee only has nine Members of the House upon it; that you will further realize, that each member of the committee is also a member of at least one other major committee of the House and that the nature of the work of our Un-American Activities Committee being what it is, with the frequency of meetings and hearings necessary, it is a very considerable problem to meet the needs of this necessary committee and of our other major committees also. Frequently it arises that meeting hours and dates are exactly the same time. Then too, from the nature of our committee hearings and reports as governed by our committee rules, we find it necessary to

put in very many hours reading the text of voluminous hearings and reports before they are released or published. This applies to all nine members of the committee.

Thirdly, may I say that I can tell from the understanding remarks made to me by Members of this House, that the Members generally understood and appreciate that the work of the members of this committee is not only definitely challenging, but it is an unusual responsibility that is upon our shoulders. This is because many of the considerable number of witnesses who appear before our committee are not only termed "unfriendly witnesses," they are determined that the committee shall not obtain one iota of information from them in order to help Congress better and more adequately meet the problem, of not only the Communistic subversive activities of individuals or groups of individuals or of their subversive programs, but they vehemently deny that Congress has any legal, or even moral right, to ask or expect them to cooperate with Congress in the field of protecting our constitutional representative form of government from subversive destruction.

However, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it is refreshing and invigorating and encouraging, to note the number of American citizens who have not too far back been active in the Communist Party, or very close to its activities, who voluntarily cooperate with us in our fulfillment of our duties under Public Law 601.

May I repeat again that statement which no doubt some of you have heard me make, with reference to my attitude toward the rights of my fellow citizens in connection with my functioning as a member of the committee? Briefly I repeat it as follows: to wit, that I will fight for the right of my fellow Americans to say what they wish, write what they wish, to pray the way they wish, and to think the way they wish. But, Mr. Speaker, these must stay within the four corners of the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, theirs must be lawful activities. They must be within the established law of our beloved Nation. Ours is a Nation of laws. It must always be such if it is to continue a constitutional representative form of government. I am consciously thankful to the Creator of all mankind that we Americans have the freedoms guaranteed us by our Constitution, including our Bill of Rights. But, these freedoms which I cherish do not authorize me to condemn my fellowman's thinking merely or primarily because it differs from mine if my neighbor is legally and patriotically within his constitutional rights. It is within this area of thinking and action by me that I find comfort in vigilantly protecting these very rights against the deceitful, illegal and subversive activities of any person with such evil and destructive activities.

Several members have recently asked me about the committee's relative importance now, as against 2 or 3 years ago. I have said to them and I say in session assembled that, in my considered judgment, it is not less necessary now for Congress to maintain this committee than in any year heretofore. Personally, I would hope there may be further and extended opportunities for the committee to have opportunity to do even more in the field of subversive activities. But, we have made definite progress and improvements. I know the mental attitude of each of the members of the committee so well I am sure it is unanimous we will continue to be diligent in the improvement of our committee processes.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, being from the great 23d District of Los Angeles County, Calif., I am fully aware that within the last several months, especially in southern California, there has emanated therefrom a definite program and undertaking thereabouts, by the Commies, wherever they are, and by their sympathizers or unknowing supporters, to abolish this committee. They have designated it "Campaign for Abolition." They went to the recent convention of some of the Democratic clubs at Fresno. Prior to that convention and in connection therewith they sought activities of the convention resolutions committee and personnel to speak out for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee. In this very active effort they miserably failed.

I mention this because, being a Democrat by registration, I do not want this legislative body to be misinformed on this point from California or anyplace else. That convention at Fresno a few weeks ago did not resolve that the House Un-American Activities Committee should be abolished. It did criticize the terms of our Public Law 601, referring to the Watkins case decision by the Supreme Court. And it did resolve that that Supreme Court decision should be followed. But this is a far cry from their deliberate misinformation and false propaganda, widely circulated throughout the State of California and otherwise, about the activities of the committee. I also know that all, or practically all, of the Members of this House on this morning received written communications asking them to vote to deny our committee funds and to vote against this pending resolution.

I wish to repeat that I believe the vigorous, vigilant, adequately financed functioning of our committee is essential; and the way the world is, it appears crystal clear to me, that it will continue to be at least equally essential for a long, long time. I wish it were not so. It makes me feel very uncomfortable to be aware of the number of people and small groups, which continue designedly and subversively in their despicable program and effort to undertake the change of our constitutional government, by subversive means, rather than by the means contained in our Constitution itself. I recommend the approval of this resolution and the amount of money therein contained.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, and because within the last few days three or four Members of the House have asked me to call their attention to the text of Public Law 601, I herewith include it, closing my extemporaneous remarks:

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*—

* * * * *

"PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"*Rule X*

"SEC. 121. Standing committees:

* * * * *

"17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

"*Rule XI*

"Powers and Duties of Committees

* * * * *

"(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

"(A) Un-American Activities.

"(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member."

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction that I heartily approve and support the request of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for funds for the current year.

As a member of the committee for several years, and its ranking Republican member, I know that the Members of the House and the vast majority of Americans have indicated their desire for a continuation of this committee, under the brilliant leadership of our distinguished chairman, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and their approval of its request for the necessary funds.

Most of the members of the committee have from time to time received letters and telegrams from deluded individuals and organizations demanding that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished stating in substance "that the committee has outlived its usefulness." How naive can these individuals and organizations be? To me, more than ever, the necessity is apparent for the continuation of this committee looking into the question of Communist infiltration and subversion that is taking

place day in and day out, not only in the past but at this very moment.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the committee formed last year known as the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee which had for its objective a campaign to cripple the anti-subversive programs of the Congress, to shackle or abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and to destroy a great American and his agency, namely J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This campaign was launched throughout the United States and meetings were held in numerous cities throughout the country, particularly during the month of October 1957.

It might be well to advise the Members of the House that practically without exception every member of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee has a record as a member of the Communist Party or Communist front organizations as long as one's arm. Quoting from the pamphlet released by our House Committee on Un-American Activities entitled "Operation Abolition":

> The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee's campaign was inaugurated at a rally in New York City in Carnegie Hall on September 20, 1957. The speakers included Harvey O'Connor; Louis L. Redding, an attorney; Dalton Trumbo, one of the notorious Hollywood 10; Prof. Hugh H. Wilson, of Princeton University; and Frank Wilkinson, of Los Angeles.

Dalton Trumbo is the individual who has been identified in sworn public testimony as a member of the Communist Party and who was convicted of contempt of Congress for his refusal to answer questions when appearing as a witness before the committee and who villified the committee at this meeting along with J. Edgar Hoover, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and derided a group of Hungarian patriots who were picketing the rally.

The objectives of this Emergency Civil Liberties Committee are the destruction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the extinction of the investigative powers of the Congress in the field of subversive activities, the restriction of important functions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the investigation of subversive activities, and the creation of a general climate of opinion against the exposure and punishment of subversion.

One member of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee—namely, Hugh Hardyman—when questioned by a subcommittee on the Committee on Un-American Activities during the year 1955 concerning a speaking campaign which he had conducted in Iron Curtain countries and in the United States under the sponsorship of the Southern California Peace Crusade, had brought to his attention a speech he made while in China which was recorded for rebroadcast to other parts of the world in which he lied and accused the United States of perpetrating a crime against mankind by waging germ warfare in Korea. In this speech, referring to biological warfare, Hardyman said, and I quote:

> Our Government has used this revolting method of warfare on a wide scale, but the blame for this crime against mankind was never once placed on us, the American people.

While a witness before our committee, Hardyman invoked the fifth amendment consistently when asked questions regarding his association with identified Communists and Communist causes.

I could go on listing name after name of this committee and others.

Shortly before the vote on the resolution requesting funds for the operation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I was informed of a telegram sent from California opposing the request and signed, "The Committee To Protect American Freedom." To the misguided individuals comprising this committee, if such a committee actually exists, may I suggest in all sincerity that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is the real committee to protect American freedom.

There is only one objective of the Communist and that is world domination and any method employed to accomplish this objective is used whether it be by lying propaganda, half truths, or false pronouncements. Let us not be deceived. Let it be brought to the attention of all Communists and fellow travelers that the House of Representatives by its vote approving the resolution creating funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities is saying, in effect, to all concerned, "We will do everything within our power to protect our American way of life and do everything to bring to light any and all individuals or organizations who have other ideas alien to our American form of government."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks just prior to the vote on House Resolution 426 just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

---

## LABOR UNIONS AND THEIR MEMBERS

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, members of labor unions and workers generally have lost many of their rights hitherto guaranteed them under the Constitution. To a great degree this has been due to the tremendous power given by law to labor-union leaders without requiring them to assume commensurate responsibility. Power and responsibility must go hand in hand if freedom is to be preserved.

There are many well-managed, excellent labor unions and there are thousands of honest, conscientious labor-union leaders.

But, Mr. Speaker, when power is unlimited and union leaders are, in effect, above the law, abuses creep in and we have seen thousands of cruel and unfair practices denying the worker—the member for whom the union is organized—his rights.

I have introduced a bill (H. R. 10351) which might be termed the workers bill of rights. This bill, if adopted, should, in effect, return the control of the unions to the man-at-the-bench, or to the worker, wherever he may be. It is a bill in his behalf. It provides for real and honest election of officers, for the possible recall of officers, for the initiative and referendum on internal affairs, for secret ballots on strike decisions, for proper procedures, for the control of trusteeships over local union affairs, for the prevention of monopolistic allocations of territory, for proper registration and auditing of employee-welfare plans, for the prevention of many resultant abuses, and generally for the protection of members.

Mr. Speaker, if the substance of this amendment to the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 is adopted, and my bill, H. R. 678, removing the exemption of labor unions from the antimonopoly laws, most of the present scandalous and, to some degree, tragic abuses will, in my judgment, largely disappear and workers will soon be regaining their rights.

---

## GET THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF THE FARMING BUSINESS

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, if the Members of this Congress are wondering how they can best help farmers they might listen to the farmers themselves.

As a matter of fact, a substantial number of farmers have already voted their preference and a whopping 73 percent went on record as opposing additional Government help. Included in that group were 50.1 percent who wanted the Government to "get clear out of farming," 11 percent who wanted less Government help than now, and 12 percent who preferred help "about the same as now."

This expression of farm sentiment against increased Government farm-aid programs was announced in the February 1958 issue of the Farm Journal which is just off the press. In December, the Farm Journal, one of the largest farm magazines in the Nation, sent ballots to each of its 3.4 million subscribers asking them to "help decide which direction our farm program should go now." The nationwide results quoted above came from tabulations of the first 4,000 returns received.

We have heard the voice of the farmer. It came in loud and clear. His over-

whelming vote against increased Government farm programs indicates that the new food and fiber program presented by the administration this year is the sort of a program he wants. We have about all the guidance we need if we really want to help farmers.

The record will show whether this Congress listened to their pleas for more freedom or whether—in the name of helping them—we saddled them with still more controls and restrictions.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## PRIVATE CALENDAR AND CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday and the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may both be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## FORMULA FOR TAXING INCOME OF LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 456 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 456 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 10021, a bill dealing with the taxation of life-insurance companies. The resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

The bill is, in effect, a stopgap measure which will extend to the year 1957 the formula for computing the taxes life-insurance companies will pay which was adopted in 1955, and extended in 1956. The Revenue Code contains a basic formula which was adopted in 1942. If the formula used in 1955 and 1956 is not extended to 1957, life-insurance companies would be required to pay their 1957 taxes under the 1942 formula.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee stated in his testimony before the Rules Committee that it is believed that the 1942 formula is fundamentally unsound, and, in addition, certain improvements made in the 1955 formula would be lost if not extended for another year.

The Treasury Department has indicated that specific proposals to provide a permanent method of taxing life-insurance companies would be advanced shortly, at which time the Committee on Ways and Means will make a further study of the entire subject. In the meantime, the Committee on Ways and Means has determined that the 1955 formula should be extended to 1957 and unanimously reported H. R. 10021.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 456 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 10021 for which ample time for debate has been provided.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Committee on Ways and Means reported this bill out unanimously to the Committee on Rules. All it is is an extension of the act now in existence.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10021, with Mr. ABERNETHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H. R. 10021, deals with the taxation of life-insurance companies. The word "insurance" suggests the numerous tax problems of the beneficiary of life-insurance policies, but the present bill deals only with the taxation imposed upon the companies themselves on the income that they earn. As you know, the life-insurance industry is unique in that two-thirds of the business done is by mutual companies. There are a large number of stock companies in the industry but on the average these are smaller than the mutuals. The Congress has always determined tax policy in this area with an awareness of the competitive position of these smaller stock companies.

Since 1919 life-insurance companies have been subject to income tax on one or another formula that imposed tax on a portion of their investment income only. The particular investment formula imposed by the Revenue Act of 1942 has been in the tax law ever since then, although it has not been operative since 1948. Since 1948 various, so-called, stopgap formulas have been imposed on each occasion for only 1 year at a time. In each case, these stopgap formulas were simply added to the code without removing the 1942 formula. The present bill would extend the stopgap formula applied in 1955 and 1956 to apply to the income of life-insurance companies for 1957. This will be the tax on last year's income for which the companies must file returns by March 15 of this year. It is clear why speedy action on the bill is desirable.

If the 1942 formula should come back into operation for calendar year 1957, the life-insurance companies would pay taxes of about $415 million on their 1957 income. Under the 1955–56 formula, which the committee proposes to extend to 1957, the companies would pay about $291 million. One circumstance that strongly influenced the committee in its action on this bill was the reason why the 1942 formula was abandoned in 1949. That formula was actually constructed in such a way that a fall in interest rates would cut the tax on life-insurance companies sharply without respect to the amount of their earnings. Under the 1942 formula, the companies had virtually no tax to pay in 1947 and in 1948. But now interest rates are higher. We believe that this formula is fundamentally unsound; and since the Congress was not satisfied to use it when it produced too little revenue, it seems unreasonable to use it when it produces a great deal more revenue. Furthermore, the life-insurance industry had reason to assume in its financial decisions during 1957 that the rate in effect for 1955–56 would be continued. Your committee believed that if the Congress should now indicate its intention to permit the old 1942 formula to come into operation for 1957, this would, in practical effect, be very much like a retroactive increase in taxes.

Another reason for wanting to continue the 1955–56 formula is that this method of taxation of life-insurance companies contains several basic improvements in technique which would be lost if the formula reverted to the 1942 provisions. The 1955–56 method of taxing life-insurance companies provides, in effect, a lower rate of tax applicable to the first million dollars of investment income and thereby provides a very significant benefit to small life-insurance companies. In addition, the 1955–56 formula provides a more realistic method of allocating income to the accident and health business conducted by the life-insurance companies.

There remains to be explained why we have this matter of continuous stopgap legislation in the life insurance field. The Committee on Ways and Means advanced in 1955 a proposal for a permanent formula for taxing life-insurance companies. At that time the Secretary of the Treasury endorsed the formula only as a 1-year stopgap with the understanding that the Department of the Treasury would shortly submit recommendations for permanent legislation on the basis of the total income of life-insurance companies rather than on an investment-income formula. Following the Treasury's recommendations, the Ways and Means Committee's proposals contained in H. R. 7201 were applied only for 1955. In 1956 since the Treasury had still not developed an alternative plan, the formula of H. R. 7201 was extended to the incomes earned in 1956.

The Treasury has not yet fully developed its proposals for a permanent method of taxing life-insurance companies, hence the need to extend the formula for 1957. The Treasury has informed the committee, however, that their recommendations will be forthcoming in the very near future. It may be observed that this area is particularly complicated, even compared to the complicated problems that we usually encounter in taxation. It is interesting that the financial problems of life insurance are so complicated that they had to invent a new branch of mathematics, actuarial science, to deal with these problems. It is worthwhile to spend a great deal of time working out these problems before legislation is enacted rather than finding the mistakes after the legislation.

The Treasury Department has joined the committee in recommending extension of the stopgap formula of H. R. 10021 to the year 1957 in preference to letting the 1942 formula apply.

We have hopes that a permanent solution will be found this year to apply to 1958 and subsequent years.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I would like to make comparison of the 1942 and 1955–56 formulas.

Since 1942 there have been three stopgap laws for taxing the income of life-insurance companies: The 1950 formula, applicable to 1949 and 1950; the 1951 formula, applicable to 1951–54; and H. R. 7201, originally applicable to 1955 but extended to apply to 1956. Since these laws were all intended to apply for a limited time, the provisions of the 1942 act relating to life-insurance companies have been retained as the law which would apply at the expiration of each of the stopgap periods. When H. R. 7201 was enacted in the early part of 1956, it provided a new method for a temporary period for taxing life-insurance companies. This new method has been applied to the years 1955–56. This bill extends this new method to the year 1957.

The principal difference between the 1942 formula and H. R. 7201 is in the "reserve and other policy liability deduction." Under H. R. 7201, this deduction is 85 percent—87½ percent for the first $1 million—of the net investment income—investment income less investment expenses. Under the 1942 formula, this deduction is a varying percentage promulgated each year on the basis of the experience of all companies for the preceding year and known as the secretary's ratio. This is a ratio determined on a weighted average basis, in essence by taking 65 percent of 3¼ percent of the average reserves of all companies for the preceding year and 35 percent of the actual average rate of interest used by all companies applied to their reserves, and comparing this result with the total net investment income of all companies. Such a secretary's ratio for 1957—on the basis of 1956 data—would be much less than the 85 to 87½ percent deduction under H. R. 7201.

H. R. 7201 has a provision primarily benefiting smaller companies, whereas the 1942 formula does not have such a provision. Under the 1942 formula, each company would deduct as its "reserve and other policy liability deduction" the same percentage of its net investment income. Under H. R. 7201 the deduction is 87½ percent of the first $1 million of net investment income and 85 percent of the balance. Thus, a company with a net investment income of less than or only slightly more than $1 million is taxed, in effect, at a lower rate than its larger competitor.

In addition, the formula provides a method of taxing income allocable to accident- and health-insurance business of life-insurance companies which is based upon the actual earnings on the reserves of such business instead of hypothetical earnings, as provided by the 1942 formula.

It is roughly estimated that the taxes for 1957 which would be produced by the Mills plan are about $291 million. The 1942 plan—as revised in present law—would yield about $415 million.

The principle is the same in both plans. In both cases net investment income, with a deduction for amounts needed to meet policy obligations, forms the tax base, underwriting gains and losses being ignored.

All of the loophole-closing provisions of the Mills-Curtis plan were made a part of permanent law by the 1955–56 formula. They are as follows:

(a) Since 85 percent of dividend income is deducted, it does not seem realistic to allow the dividends received credit. In H. R. 7201, this credit is eliminated. This provision is now a permanent part of existing law.

(b) The definition of investment income was expanded to include not only interest, dividends, and rents, but also royalties, income from the negotiation or termination of leases, mortgages, etc., and any income from the operation of a business (such as a farm acquired after foreclosure of a mortgage). Appropriate deductions for depletion on royalties, operating expenses of a business acquired, etc., were provided. This provision is now a permanent part of existing law.

(c) To prevent what is really an investment holding company (where the assets are far in excess of those that would be needed for insurance obligations) from being taxed as a life-insurance company, it is provided that the reserve and other policy liability deduction shall in no case be more than twice the amount of the actual interest required to be added to reserves in accordance with the company's books. This restriction was alleviated with respect to new companies (sec. 818). Both provisions apply to H. R. 7201. This provision is now a permanent part of existing law.

Mr. MILLS. I do want to point out what we might expect in the way of revenue if we were to tax the incomes of life-insurance companies under these various formulas. If we were to let the 1942 formula apply, it would produce $415 million at current levels. If we should reenact the expired stopgap formula, it would produce $536 million, and if we should revive the 1951 formula which existed for the taxable years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954, it would produce $244 million. The provisions of this bill will produce $291 million. We do not pretend to advise the committee that $291 million is the proper amount for life-insurance companies to pay at this time or that any of these other formulas, if we did apply them to 1957, would bring to us from the life-insurance industry the requisite or proper amount of revenue. That is a matter which we think the committee should have an opportunity of looking further into with respect to the years after 1957.

I would not want to permit taxes to rise with respect to any of our taxpayers without having full discussion, full hearings, and full consideration of the matter.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means if in compiling the estimates of receipts the Treasury Department used $500 million, plus, $244 million or $294 million in estimating the receipts.

Mr. MILLS. It is my understanding, and I may be wrong, but it is my recollection that the budget itself is predicated upon the application of the 1955–56 law.

Mr. BAILEY. And the legislation would materially reduce the receipts?

Mr. MILLS. As I have stated, receipts will be lower under the bill than the 1942 formula.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. WIER. As I understand your presentation, there is no difference between mutual and stock companies in this bill.

Mr. MILLS. They are treated alike under the bill. As the gentleman knows, taxwise we have never made any distinction between mutual and stock life insurance companies. We have made distinctions with reference to mutual and stock casualty companies but not life insurance companies.

I urge the adoption of this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before this distinguished Committee today, H. R. 10021, would extend with respect to taxable years beginning in 1957 the same tax formula that was applicable to the income of life-insurance companies

for taxable years beginning in 1955 and in 1956. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in favorably reporting this legislation.

It is important that the Congress act expeditiously in the consideration of this legislation because of the requirement that the taxpayers affected will have to comply with a return date of March 15, 1958, with respect to 1957 taxable income. Failure to act on this legislation would make effective the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code embodying the 1942 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies. As indicated in the committee report accompanying this legislation, the restoration of the 1942 formula into effectiveness would be unreasonable and would constitute a return to a fundamentally unsound tax formula. In my judgment it would be unfair to permit the once discarded 1942 formula to return to effect without public hearings and without detailed study in executive session after being in disuse for 8 years. One important consideration that the membership of this Committee should bear in mind is that the formula applicable in 1955 and 1956 treats small insurance companies in a more favorable manner than would be true under the 1942 formula.

The Secretary of the Treasury in an appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means indicated his intention to submit to the Congress in the near future Treasury Department recommendations for the establishment of a permanent method of taxation for life insurance company income. A 1-year extension of the 1955–56 formula will permit sufficient time for the receipt of this Treasury recommendation and its thorough study by the Congress with a view to developing a permanent formula. The Treasury Department has approved the extension of the formula to taxable years beginning in 1957.

If H. R. 10021 is enacted into law, the legislation is expected to produce approximately $290 million in revenue with respect to taxable year 1957. This amounts to a $29 million increase over tax revenues realized in 1956. I am informed that this increase in tax revenues received from life insurance companies is proportionate to the normal growth of assets and the increase in investment return experienced by the industry.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons and for the reason that time between now and March 15 does not permit the development of an alternative method of taxation of life insurance company income, I support the enactment of H. R. 10021 and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, on the opening day of the current session of the Congress, January 7, 1958, I introduced a bill known as H. R. 9728 which is identical to the pending bill H. R. 10021. This proposed legislation is urgently needed and will be of benefit to more than 100 million insurance policyholders. I urge that this bill be approved without a dissenting vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues who have preceded me in this debate to express support of the favorable consideration of H. R. 10021 relating to the tax formula applicable to income of life-insurance companies. This legislation would continue the temporary formula that applied in 1955 and 1956 to 1957.

For the past several years the Congress and the Department of the Treasury have worked sometimes with diligence and sometimes with what I will refer to as a little less diligence in an attempt to develop a permanent formula. Because of outstanding work done by my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who was chairman of a subcommittee on life-insurance taxation during the 83d Congress, the membership of the House had reason to believe that the legislation we passed in 1955 would constitute a permanent formula. The permanency was short lived, for when the legislation reached the other body for consideration the Treasury Department and membership of that other body decided that the fruits of our arduous labors should be honored by only a temporary life. Accordingly, this legislation has been in effect as I previously indicated for taxable years beginning in 1955 and 1956.

If this legislation now under consideration is not enacted into public law within the period of the next 6 weeks, the applicable tax formula that would come into effect is what is referred to as the 1942 formula. As my esteemed friend and colleague from New York [Mr. REED] has explained to the membership, it would be grossly unfair to permit the discarded 1942 formula to come into effect because of the greater tax impact it would have on small insurance companies and because its long period of disuse would, in good conscience, require extensive hearings and careful consideration in executive session.

I am confident that the months ahead will find an emphasis on diligence on the part of the Congress and on the part of the Treasury Department and on the part of the great life insurance industry working together to develop a fair and equitable tax formula that may be made applicable to income of life insurance companies on a permanent basis. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this necessary and, under the circumstances, meritorious extension of the 1955-56 tax formula for 1 more year.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. IKARD].

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, there is very little I can add to the very fine explanation of this legislation that was given by our fine chairman and the distinguished gentleman from New York, [Mr. REED]. I would, however, point out that we have continually been passing stopgap legislation for life-insurance companies. In my judgment it is not fair either to the Government or to the taxpayers involved to continually force them, in effect, to compute their tax after the taxable year has passed. There is real need, almost an emergency, for some permanent legislation providing for taxation of life-insurance companies.

When this legislation we are now considering was originally before the Congress and during its consideration we were assured that recommendations would be forthcoming for some permanent program. Since that time we have continually been on the brink, so to speak, of getting at the problem, but the Treasury has never completed its plan.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, has indicated a real interest in this problem, and other officials in the Department have said that in the very near future they will have recommendations for a permanent program. I would like here to state that I hope those recommendations are forthcoming at the earliest possible date so that the Committee on Ways and Means in considering this problem, which as our chairman said is a very technical one, will, before this time next year, produce some permanent legislation that will be fair to the Government and to the taxpayers and under which they will know what their taxes were going to be before the taxable year was ended.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is the second bill that the Committee on Ways and Means has brought in for consideration during the past week. Both of the bills are worthy ones. Yet I cannot escape the conclusion that it is about time we also bring in a bill that I think the country would welcome. That is, a bill that would permit deduction from income tax by members of faculties, of secondary institutions, and of schools for expenses incurred in bettering their education and in developing their knowledge. I know there are a number of these bills pending before the Committee on Ways and Means and I hope the time is not too far distant when a bill of this type will be brought in.

I am a member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. We have just concluded hearings for the National Science Foundation, which agency is asking for an appropriation of hundreds of thousands of dollars to permit scholarships and fellowships to go to science teachers throughout the country, not only in high schools, but in colleges as well. Unfortunately, the money that the National Science Foundation has available for that purpose will affect only a relatively small number of teachers.

One of the big criticisms that has been advanced against our educational program is the fact that too many of our teachers are too poorly trained to provide the education that is necessary for

the children of our country. In my opinion, the Committee on Ways and Means should hold hearings very quickly on a subject as important as this in order that teachers throughout the country, who want to better themselves and who want to provide a better type of education for the children of our Nation, may be able to make appropriate deductions for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I merely want to observe for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois that the Committee on Ways and Means has held a hearing on the question of the deduction of expenses incurred by teachers in bettering themselves. That occurred some days ago. Representatives of the teaching profession came to the committee and made a very strong statement in support of the gentleman's position.

Mr. YATES. Will the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means advise the gentleman from Illinois as to whether the committee intends to bring in an appropriate bill soon?

Mr. MILLS. It is impossible for me as chairman of that committee to tell the gentleman what the committee will finally decide to do, because we have not been in executive session on matters of that kind. We have had hearings and those hearings will continue until the 7th of February.

Mr. YATES. At that time will the committee give consideration to a bill and to the testimony that has been presented?

Mr. MILLS. The committee will not then give consideration to the testimony that has been given to us immediately at the close of the hearing, but will do so at a later date, the reason being that we want our staff people to have an opportunity to thoroughly analyze all of the suggestions that have come to the committee and to bring back to us some solution to the many problems presented to us. In the meantime, the committee has already announced it will begin hearings on reciprocal-trade agreements on February 17.

Mr. YATES. Does the chairman imply from his latter statement that there will be no consideration given to this bill for some time?

Mr. MILLS. No, certainly not. I say that during the course of the next few weeks the committee will be in executive session on this entire subject matter covering tax revisions.

Mr. YATES. The chairman is speaking all around the point that I have addressed myself to.

Mr. MILLS. Only because the chairman is never in a position to tell a Member of the House what the committee will do without consulting the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, whose servant he is.

Mr. YATES. That is true, but I think the gentleman with his long experience in the House knows that the chairmen of committees have some persuasive powers.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, if the gentleman is trying to lead me into a discussion of the merits of the proposal, I cannot indulge in that at this time.

Mr. YATES. I am not. I am only trying to get the chairman to indicate he will use his persuasive powers with the other members of the committee.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to advise the gentleman more fully and I appreciate his remarks as to my persuasiveness.

Mr. YATES. I have no allusions as to the gentleman's powers. I know he is one of the most persuasive Members of the House. I am sure that with respect to the members of his committee his persuasive powers are even greater. But I would like to obtain some kind of statement from the chairman as to whether or not a bill of the type under discussion will be considered within the near future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. I admit to the gentleman readily that this suggestion and all other suggestions made in the course of the hearings will in the next few weeks be considered in executive session of the committee, but I cannot tell the gentleman how soon we can end the executive sessions.

Mr. YATES. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I find that statement somewhat unsatisfactory. Perhaps I am being unfair in this.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman yield to me further?

I find that most Members are dissatisfied when any statement is made with respect to any delay that may be incident to the preparation of any proposal that has some merit and is in the direction of a reduction in taxes. Certainly we are all enthusiastic in giving consideration as soon as we can to such proposals.

Mr. YATES. Let me say to the gentleman as a taxpayer and one who would not be affected by this bill, except with respect to the possibility of paying additional taxes because of the deductions which are sought to be made under this bill, I would welcome the payment of additional taxes for this purpose. I happen to believe that the social purpose of the legislation about which I am talking is so great at this particular time that it deserves special consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means, apart from the other suggestions made to the committee. The chairman of the committee, I am sure, is aware of the tremendous pressure in this country for an increase in the higher standards of our educational system, particularly in the fields of science and mathematics. I believe all teachers should obtain these benefits, because I feel it is essential to a better education. That is why I think a bill of this kind warrants special consideration.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the gentleman's thought and, of course, the committee will give consideration to his thinking on the matter and expedite the consideration of this matter as rapidly as possible.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise just to ask the chairman of the committee if he would be willing at this time to tell us whether the Committee on Ways and Means is considering or has had any testimony toward giving those parents who have children going to college an additional tax exemption.

Mr. MILLS. The Committee on Ways and Means has also heard testimony on that point in the course of the current hearings. I do not want to attempt to say what the Committee on Ways and Means will do. As chairman of the committee, my idea is that I am the servant of the committee, and I would never try to hold out that I could in any way influence the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means. They are very fine, capable gentlemen, and I am sure that the membership of the Committee of the Whole feels, as the gentleman does, that the Committee on Ways and Means should give consideration to the many subject matters that have been presented to the committee in the course of these hearings, and this is one of the subject matters on which we have had testimony.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I particularly asked, because it seems to me in the presentation of the President's program as well as the program submitted today by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], that the great decision on the part of the Committee on Education and Labor will depend largely on what the Committee on Ways and Means is willing to do on their side of the program. It seems to me there should be some coordination between the two committees in that overall educational program. It is awfully hard for one to act independently of the other.

Mr. MILLS. I understand the gentleman's point.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, if I am not out of order, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] on this his birthday.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

SEC. 1. Extension of 1955 formula to 1957.

Subsections (a) and (c) of section 802 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on income of life-insurance companies) are each amended by striking out "beginning in 1955 or in 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning after December 31, 1954, and before January 1, 1958,".

SEC. 2. Technical amendments.

(a) The heading of section 802 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 802. Tax imposed."

(b) The table of sections for subpart A of part I of subchapter L of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"SEC. 802. Tax imposed for 1955 and 1956."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 802. Tax imposed."

(c) Section 811 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax under 1942 formula) is amended by striking out

"December 31, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1957."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957, pursuant to House Resolution 456, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NATIONAL MONUMENT SYMBOLIZING IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 459, Rept. No. 1313), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8290) to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy in the fulfillment of the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), "An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes." After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## IMPORT DUTIES ON CERTAIN COARSE WOOL

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 460, Rept. No. 1314), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2151) to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on certain coarse wool, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## CONSTRUCTION OF WATER CONSERVATION PROJECTS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 461, Rept. No. 1315), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to authorize the construction of certain water conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. M. and Tex. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 462, Rept. No. 1316), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4215) amending sections 22 and 24 of the Organic Act of Guam. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 463, Rept. No. 1317), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 464, Rept. No. 1318), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1244) to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 465, Rept. No. 1319), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 912) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader if he will tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar, then the bill H. R. 1244, relating to Independence National Park funds.

For Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday there are programed the following bills:

H. R. 8308, a bill relating to the humane slaughter of livestock.

H. R. 2151, regarding import duties on certain wools. I am informed by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that that is a closed rule.

H. R. 4215, a bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam.

Senate Joint Resolution 39, relating to the Pecos River project.

H. R. 8290, a bill authorizing the erection of the Freedom Shrine at a location in the vicinity of Washington.

Any further program will be announced later. I make the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, although I know of none at the present time.

Mr. ARENDS. May I ask the gentleman if those bills will necessarily follow in the order in which the gentleman gave them to us?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not want to be bound by that order, but that is my present intention.

On Monday, if there is any rollcall on the rule, of course the rollcall will have to take place. If the gentleman wants to arrive at an understanding that if there is any rollcall on the bill that is coming up on Monday it will go over until Tuesday, I would make that agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. I think that would be all right.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right; I make that agreement.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## STRENGTHENING OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to strengthen American education, especially in the critical fields of the sciences, mathematics, engineering, modern foreign languages, and in the teaching of those subjects.

These are the fields in which we must excel. They are the fields generally in which we have been falling behind. They are vital to our national defense.

Alabama's distinguished senior Senator, LISTER HILL, is sponsoring this bill in the Senate. I also understand that other senators have joined him as cosponsors.

My bill provides 40,000 scholarships annually for a period of 6 years.

It provides a system of loans for deserving students.

It provides for work-study programs for undergraduate students.

It provides financial assistance to States and institutions of higher education for acquiring science teaching facilities.

It provides summer school and extension courses for teachers.

It provides 1,500 graduate fellowships annually.

It provides assistance to the States for guidance and counseling programs in secondary schools.

It provides a grant for subject matter consultants for high school teachers in the critical fields.

It sets up an institute to assist research in educational television.

It provides Congressional citations for outstanding scholastic achievement by high school graduates.

It provides for an expansion of the programs in order to train technicians in fields essential to national defense.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include a more comprehensive explanation of the provisions of the national defense education bill.

EXPLANATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION BILL

To strengthen education at all levels, the proposed bill provides stimulation and assistance in various categories, as follows:

FOR STUDENTS

First. National defense scholarships: 40,000 new scholarships of $1,000 each are granted each year for 6 years to high school graduates selected on merit by State commissions, with special consideration to students with superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages. Each recipient of a scholarship who maintains proficiency in his studies will receive $1,000 for each of his college years. By the fourth year of the program, 160,000 college students will be receiving scholarships annually. A total of 240,000 students will receive scholarship grants during the 6-year program and its subsequent 3-year phaseout, at a total cost of at least $960 million.

The purpose of these Federal scholarship grants is to reward merit, proficiency, and ability, and to stimulate students during their early high school years to do their best and take the hard courses. They will also stimulate parents to insist that high schools give science and language courses, and so forth, and employ qualified teachers.

Twenty thousand additional scholarships, to be granted on a similar basis, are authorized for the first year of the program to students already attending college, at a cost of $20 million.

Second. National defense student loans: $40 million is authorized for each of 6 years for loans to needy college students in amounts not exceeding $1,000 per student per year. Preference is given to students whose academic background indicates superior capacity and preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or foreign languages. The loan is repayable at 2-percent interest, starting 1 year after completion of higher education, and must be repaid within 10 years. If, however, the borrower serves as a full time teacher, the loan is canceled at the rate of 20 percent for each year he teaches. Thus in 5 years as a teacher, the student-borrower will have had his college loan wholly forgiven.

Third. Work-study program: Grants totaling $25 million for each of 6 years are made to institutions of higher education to provide needy undergraduate students jobs in the institution, to the maximum extent practicable in work relating to their studies. The preference concept in regard to science, mathematics, and so forth, is followed. The institutions match the Federal funds on a 50–50 basis.

Fourth. Congressional citations: Congressional citations for outstanding scholastic achievement are awarded annually to high-school graduates throughout the country who rank scholastically in the highest 5 percent of their graduating class.

Fifth. Fellowships: 1,000 fellowships in the first year and 1,500 in the 5 succeeding years will be granted graduate students who are preparing to become teachers in colleges and universities. Fellowship stipends for living expenses are paid for 3 years on a rising scale, plus additional amounts for each dependent. An individual awarded a graduate fellowship is also paid amounts necessary to cover the cost of instruction at the institution he is attending.

Sixth. Expanded vocational education program: An authorization of $20 million a year is made available to the States to encourage the further promotion and development of area vocational education programs in occupations essential to national defense. The allocation of these funds guarantees immedi-

ate expansion of vocational training for technicians and needed skilled workers.

FOR TEACHERS

First. Summer school courses: Grants amounting to $75 million a year are made in each of 6 years for paying teachers who take advanced studies in summer sessions at institutions of higher education. Each teacher selected by his State educational agency to take such courses receives a stipend of $75 a week plus $15 a week for each dependent. In selecting teachers, special consideration is being given those seeking advanced studies in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

Second. Extension courses: Grants of $25 million a year in each of 6 years are made teachers who take advanced studies in extension courses offered in institutions of higher education. Such teachers receive stipends of $7 a day for each day they attend such courses with a ceiling of $56 per month.

The purpose of these two programs is to improve teachers' knowledge of subject matter that they teach and to assist them to obtain higher academic degrees and thus qualify for higher salaries.

Third. Institute in guidance and counseling: For contract arrangements with institutions of higher education $6 million is authorized for each of 6 years to provide for summer institute courses to secondary school teachers in the counseling and guidance of secondary school students, particularly emphasis on gifted students. Stipends of $75 a week plus $15 per week for each dependent are paid teachers attending these courses. Tuition and fees are also paid for by the Federal Government.

FOR TEACHING FACILITIES

First. Grants of $40 million to be matched on a 50–50 basis are made annually for 6 years to State educational agencies for the acquisition of science or language teaching facilities—laboratory equipment, and so forth—for use in elementary and secondary public schools. This helps schools to obtain equipment needed in laboratory work for physics, chemistry, biology, and languages.

Second. Grants of $40 million for each of 6 years are made to institutions of higher education to pay 50 percent of the cost of acquiring science and language-teacher facilities to be used primarily for undergraduate students.

STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

First. Guidance and counseling: Grants of $15 million for each of 6 years are made to State educational agencies to assist in establishing programs of guidance and counseling in secondary schools, to identify students with outstanding mental ability, advise them of courses of study, encourage them to complete secondary schooling, and to take the necessary courses for admission to college, and enter college after completing secondary schooling.

The guidance and counseling program is the foundation on which are based the later scholarship, loan and other financial aid programs for sudents. Once a gifted student is identified and properly guided through high school, he will qualify to compete for the scholarships and, when he enters college, be prepared to go forward developing his talents to the maximum.

Second. Science, mathematics, and language consultants: Grants of $10 million for each of 6 years are made to State educational agencies for programs to make available to science, mathematics, and language teachers in secondary schools information about advances of knowledge and current teaching methods, devices, and textbooks in their fields. This program will strengthen high school teaching of courses in these important subjects, and thus assure that students taking such courses as a part of their college preparation will have the benefit of the best possible instruction.

For research and experimentation:

First. Institute for research and experimentation in new educational media: An institute is created in the United States Office of Education for research and experimentation to develop and evaluate projects involving television, radio, motion pictures, and other auditory and visual aids which may prove of value in State and local and educational agencies and institutions of higher education. Grants in aid may be made to public or nonprofit private agencies or contracts may be made with such agencies for this research.

Second. Materials adapted to new educational media: The Commissioner of Education will acquire motion pictures, kinescopes, video tapes, film strips, slides, recordings, magnetic tapes, radio and TV scripts, and so forth, for adaptation, to be made available upon request to State and local educational agencies.

For these 2 programs, $5 million is authorized for the first year and $10 million for the succeeding 5 years.

The bill also establishes a National Advisory Council on Science and Education consisting of the Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and 12 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and the consent of the Senate. The members shall be broadly representative of the organizational and professional interests in science and education and of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined the provisions of my bill. I call it the national defense education bill. It is comprehensive. It undertakes to meet the most severe present needs of education. It is an emergency bill.

The bill is practical. It provides Federal aid only in those areas where such aid will be fruitful.

My bill is safe. At every point local, State and institutional control of education is maintained, preserved, and guaranteed.

My bill is urgent. As a Nation, we can no longer tolerate the waste of our intellectual talent. We must provide an opportunity for every good mind to enter America's arsenal of brains.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will stimulate a mighty upsurge in the quality and quantity of our education. It has no compulsion. It is voluntary. It provides opportunity. Our democratic system will do the rest. Our Nation will be supreme in science and technology. That is the way it should be. That is the way it must be.

## MIGRATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the following telegram from my good friend, the hard-working United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Mr. August R. Lindt:

The Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER,
*United States House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

It is with great pleasure I am able to inform you that the last visas to Hungarian refugees in Yugoslavia have been issued. In addition to feeling a great sense of gratitude to all governments and organizations who have assisted in accomplishing this achievement, I want to express to you my personal gratitude for your interest and efforts in this behalf. The attainment of this goal would not have been possible without the valuable cooperation of the United States Government and yourself.

Sincerely,

AUGUST R. LINDT,
*United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees,*
GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.

It is with considerable pleasure and satisfaction that I wish to advise the House of the successful completion of a difficult migration program, undertaken by 26 countries in order to provide a safe haven and resettlement opportunities for the heroic Hungarian freedom fighters who sought temporary asylum in Yugoslavia after the historic uprising in Hungary was brutally crushed by the iron fist of Soviet Russia.

In July 1957 I was asked by the Department of State and by Gen. Joseph M. Swing, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, to proceed to Yugoslavia on a rather hurriedly arranged special mission for the purpose of advising the interested authorities what could be done in order to evacuate the Hungarian refugees from Yugoslavia where—although well received—they remained in a rather precarious situation.

I found that there were at that time in Yugoslavia 19,851 Hungarian refugees. The great majority of them were young men, intelligent and healthy. They not only participated in the fighting which took place in the streets of Budapest, but for some time after the rebellion was crushed by Soviet tanks they continued fighting in the southern provinces of Hungary, slowly retreating toward the border of Yugoslavia, which they eventually crossed.

I visited numerous camps in which the Yugoslav authorities placed the Hungarian refugees. I talked to a great many of these brave young men, and I found them to be of a fiber quite different from that of which most of their countrymen whom I met in Austria were made. Among the Hungarian refugees in Yugoslavia there was hardly an opportunist to be found who, like in the

majority of the cases with which I became acquainted during my mission to Austria in November 1956, simply grasped the opportunity of an open frontier and crossed it, seeking economic betterment rather than safety from the wrath of those who sought to punish the participants of a crushed rebellion.

During my stay in Yugoslavia and as soon as I returned home, I urged the Attorney General to use the applicable provisions of the Walter-McCarran Act and generously to admit a sizable number of the real Hungarian freedom fighters from Yugoslavia to the United States under the so-called parole authority.

This recommendation was carried out and—soon—South American countries accelerated their rate of admission of Hungarian refugees from Yugoslavia following the example of several countries of Europe who have also opened their doors to these highly valuable individuals.

Of the total number of 19,851 Hungarian refugees who fled to Yugoslavia, close to 3,000 requested repatriation back to Hungary. Some of those who decided to return to their homeland were adolescents whose parents could not join them either in Yugoslavia or in the free world. Some yielded to the requests of their relatives, who were unable to flee Hungary. However, I wish to stress that there was no forcible repatriation to Hungary. All return movements remained under close scrutiny of Mr. Lindt, the high commissioner, and his staff, stationed in Yugoslavia. Some 900 Hungarian refugees were resettled in Yugoslavia itself, mostly in the Banat Province, where there is a considerable number of old Hungarian rural settlements.

According to information which I received this morning from General Swing, the United States has admitted 2,408 Hungarian refugees from Yugoslavia.

The United States leads the list of countries who have admitted Hungarian refugees from Austria and from countries of second asylum. Similarly, the United States leads the list of countries who have admitted Hungarian refugees from Yugoslavia with France, Belgium, Australia, Canada, and Sweden following in that order.

I believe that the task of resettlement of Hungarian refugees who fled to Yugoslavia could not have been completed speedily and effectively if it were not for the efficient, truly professional job done by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, an organization of which I am very proud to be one of the cofounders. ICEM has been in charge of all movements of Hungarian refugees by air, by surface vessels, by trains, buses, and even by trucks. ICEM has performed magnificently in processing the refugees and in securing the necessary transportation at the time and the place where there were people to carry from behind barbed wire into freedom. ICEM has added in Yugoslavia one more bright chapter to its history.

Mr. Lindt's telegram to me is a happy message, indeed. It attests to the fact that a difficult job has been well done.

## NATURALIZATION LAWS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the present naturalization laws work a great hardship on many older aliens who have lived most of their lives in the United States, and are a credit to this Nation.

I have known cases where they have tried three or four times to become citizens, only to fail before the English language test.

Naturalization officials are well aware of this unfortunate situation, and privately sympathize with the sincere applicants, but while the rigid law remains on the books, there is nothing they can do to lift this barrier.

One old Italian lady came to me seeking my help. It was a great effort for her to explain her hopes and her predicament in a language with which she was not familiar. As I already knew several of her sons and daughters, I nodded understandingly.

She and her husband, as young immigrants, worked hard in the local mills to raise a large family. There was no time for night school. They worked and saved not only to bring up their children but to give them a good education.

One of the boys became a doctor, another an engineer, and one of the girls is now a private secretary to a business executive. All of the boys served in the Armed Forces of our country.

Between work in the mills, and work at home, there was no leisure time for the parents to go to school.

In one generation, and by heroic sacrifice, they educated a family who are a credit to themselves, their parents, and the community.

Now that the one remaining goal of the parents is to become citizens of the United States, they find that they are barred because of their difficulties with a difficult language.

In substance, they are better citizens than some who can trace their American origins for generations, and yet they are denied citizenship because of a technicality.

Under these circumstances, I believe that the Government of the United States should be grateful, and generous, when, as it is clear, these humble people have sacrificed so much because of their faith in freedom.

Therefore, I ask for your support of my bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States.

So that any person of good character, who is over 50 years of age and has been living in the United States for periods totaling at least 20 years, may be naturalized without being required to undergo the fear, embarrassment, and failure of a language examination.

In view of their solid contributions to the progress of our country, and the deep and abiding respect they have for its ideals, we can do no less in return than to raise them to the status of first-class citizens. In most cases it wil be appreciated more than if they were born to it.

A constructive law is one that is compassionate; that is concerned with the spirit as well as the letter.

Some laws, conceived in hysteria or intolerance, or under conditions that have changed to a large extent, become self-defeating.

This provision of the naturalization laws, as applied to older aliens who have lived in the United States a long time and for whom the United States is their home, is unrealistic and unfair.

Before they die, let us remove the language barrier, and make them happy and proud by conferring the dignity of United States citizenship upon them.

---

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that I have a personal and pecuniary interest in the passage of H. R. 10021, and therefore when it comes up for consideration later today, in accordance with rule VIII of the House of Representatives, I shall refrain from voting on this measure.

H. R. 10021 has to do with continuing the 1955 income tax formula on life insurance companies. As a trustee and stockholder of a business of this type in addition to abstaining from voting, I should like to make it clear that at no time have I discussed this bill, or expressed an opinion as to its merit to any other Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, mention of the subject of personal conflict of interest impels me to offer the opinion that we do not have an adequate statute or rule covering business interests of Members. It seems to me that voting "present" is not enough. There should be a better procedure of avoiding conflicts of interest and more clearly pointing up existing situations and spelling out proper ethics for legislators.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that Members of Congress should be required by law to divest themselves of investments or business clients, but I certainly would deem it fitting and proper that a full list of such assets or financial relationships should be on file available for public inspection. Likewise it would seem there should be something more in the way of procedure than a moral compulsion on a Member to abstain from voting on legislation under such circumstances. I would favor a declaration as to the nature of any conflict of interest during the vote on each question put.

I raise the question also as to whether bankers should be on committees that consider matters of benefit to banks? Should Members who own farms frame legislation to support the price of crops

they themselves raise, or vote on laws to benefit themselves? And so the whole field of personal interest could be explored by Congress. Certainly the source of retainer fees of lawyer-members and partnership income should be restricted under the Corrupt Practices Act. It is pretty obvious that if I owned an oil well, I should not be free to participate in setting the rates for depletion. Also there is the matter of personal gifts and entertainment. Certainly a very rigid code in this field should be incorporated into the rules covering the personal ethics of Members.

I do not infer, Mr. Speaker, that a source of income or personal benefit would influence any Member's action. However, committees and indeed Members of Congress have raised their eyebrows and also their voices, at times, over situations involving the ethics of members of the executive branch of Government. It seems to me the standard we have set for ourselves is not as high as the standard we have set for others. It should be higher.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I hope the rule covering Members' conflicts of interest may be extended and a method established whereby full and free public scrutiny of facts will be in order and a more detailed declaration prescribed whenever a business interest is involved in a Member's vote. I am sure public opinion supports my position in this matter of ethics.

## RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT ACT

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, as I did 3 years ago, I have today introduced a bill for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.

When I took the same action before, I was convinced that extension of the act was vitally important to our economy and to every citizen of the United States. Today, 3 years later, I am more than ever convinced that this law should be kept on the books, and I believe it should be extended for 5 years to remove uncertainties in the minds of businessmen both here and abroad.

During the past 3 years our country has gone through a period of prosperity never before known in the history of the world. One of the important factors in this high level of income was our export-import trade. For the year just ended we exported $19.5 billion worth of our products and imported just under $13 billion from our friends and customers overseas. This trade produced employment for 4,500,000 of our people. During that same period the trade of all free-world countries reached an annual rate greater than $100 billion.

President Eisenhower has repeatedly stated his belief that the road to peace is the two-way road of international trade. With this I heartily concur.

Leaders of our business and industrial world have gone on record in favor of this bill. Civic organizations, labor organizations, veterans' organizations—the list is too long for me to enumerate here. Suffice it to say that the American people are demanding the continuation of the trade policies of the Eisenhower administration. And the demand is a bipartisan one.

Under these trade policies we have maintained a position of leadership among the nations of the Free World. We must at all costs maintain this leadership if we are to win in the economic warfare being waged against us by the U. S. S. R. The newly developing countries all over the world look to us not for aid but for trade. They must sell their products to us in order to buy from us. If we were to raise a higher wall of tariffs and isolate ourselves behind it, these struggling countries would have to turn elsewhere for the good things of life their people are demanding.

In summation may I say that no more important piece of legislation will come before the Congress at this session. I believe that the vast majority of the people of my own great industrial State of New Jersey favor this legislation, dependent as we are for so much of our prosperity and the resultant employment on that foreign trade which passes up New York Harbor and Delaware Bay. Let us demonstrate to the watching world by passing this legislation that America will maintain its leadership in our great crusade toward peace and prosperity for this Nation and the rest of the Free World.

## THE KREMLIN REACTS TO A SOLAR PLEXUS BLOW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when we hit the Russians where it hurts, they yell—long and loud. We have had a good example of this recently.

On January 19 I joined with a number of Members of Congress and other distinguished Americans in beaming special messages to the people of the Soviet Union. The occasion was the 40th anniversary of Lenin's destruction of the freely elected Russian Constituent Assembly.

We broadcast over Radio Liberation, the conduit by means of which the American Committee for Liberation contacts those behind the Iron Curtain. These messages were part of the fine educational and informational program being vigorously carried out by the committee. This group is to be highly commended for the splendid work they are doing to get the truth to the Russian people.

The messages on January 19 conveyed the sympathy of all the American people for the ruthless blotting out of democracy in the Soviet Union 4 decades ago.

The Constituent Assembly marked a milestone in the history of the Russian people. For an all too brief period the merciless grip of tyranny was thrust away. In its place arose a democratic parliament representative of the wishes of the people and responsive to their thoughts. It was a legislature anxious to translate the desires of the citizenry into reality.

By giving land to the peasantry, by calling for a democratic peace, and by declaring the equality of all nationalities residing within the Russian Republic, the Assembly made great strides toward giving the people a responsible, democratic form of government.

But the grasping hands of dictatorship were not long absent. In a swift stroke the Marxist executioners beheaded the newborn giant. Unable to win by ballot, they chose to rule by bullet. Gallant patriots who had given the Russian people a government they could truly call their own were mercilessly hunted down and destroyed to satisfy the hunger for power of a few men. It is a hunger for power which still manifests itself today. It remains unsatisfied.

In the place of the Czars rose a regime more ruthless, more efficient in its terror, than the reign of Nicholas II ever pretended to be. In the years that followed, the Communist record of bloody suppression fully lived up to the precedent established in this demolition of democracy.

Thus, the story conveyed in the messages over Radio Liberation was one of great significance to the enslaved masses of the Soviet Union today. But perhaps of even greater significance was the reaction of the masters in the Kremlin to these broadcasts.

The Communist overlords reacted like a paunchy fighter who has just been belted with a good, straight solar plexus blow. First, they doubled up in response to a stroke to their vitals. Then, they started flailing wildly in all directions. In this way, they betrayed the real fear which haunts those who today pull the strings behind the forbidding walls of the Kremlin.

The response came in the form of a lengthy article in Isvestia, an official Government publication. It was also beamed over Radio Moscow. Moscow lashed out in pain, fury, and desperate sarcasm at those who had made the broadcasts. Special efforts were made to ridicule Congress, our American institutions, and particularly the Constituent Assembly. The following excerpts from the Isvestia article indicate clearly how well this blow for freedom struck home:

> It is not the custom to hold gay dances at the bier of a deceased person. Certain Members of the Congress of the United States, in spite of this rule adopted by all civilized peoples, had a gay time at a funeral banquet several days ago. This was the funeral banquet of the Russian Constituent Assembly, which died a peaceful death 40 years ago.
>
> The fate of the Constituent Assembly arouses Soviet people just as much as the snows of yesteryear. They are completely satisfied with the Soviet Constitution and

the all popular elected Soviet Parliament, the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.

A man who supposes that the bestial persecutions in the United States of America of the Negro population and the disgraceful behavior of the Hoover secret police * * * really are a true expression of democracy is not easy to persuade about anything. Therefore, we shall leave off attempts to inject any amount of common sense.

The attack ran the gamut of emotions, from jeering at those who spoke, to pooh-poohing the significance of the Constituent Assembly and the power of its memory on the Russian people. There was a most revealing—almost pitiable—defense of their own rubber-stamp Supreme Soviet.

I was particularly struck with the claim of universal support for and ecstatic approval of this so-called parliament. Now, if the Kremlin is so sure of the popular enthusiasm for this body, they might explain why they do not simply hold free elections, as we do, and prove it to the world.

The answer is, of course, that the masters of the Kremlin are afraid. They cannot, in a showdown, count on the wholehearted support of the great masses of the people.

Clearly, we have been able to strike a ringing blow. Until these messages were broadcast, this anniversary of Soviet shame went unnoticed in the Government-controlled Russian press. This is one of the most vulnerable points in the Soviet armor—the question of the freedom and representative nature of the present Parliament, as compared with a parliament which was once actually voted into office by the people.

By means of these messages, we made clear the universal human impact of the story of the Constituent Assembly. It is a story as glorious as it is tragic. It is a story which contains the seeds of hope rooted deep in the Russian democratic tradition and the genius of the Russian people.

Mr. Speaker, the ideas and ideals held so courageously by Kerensky and his compatriots are not dead. The broadcasts constituted no funeral. Rather, they served to remind the Soviet people of the giant of democracy that lies chained within them. It is a giant yearning to rise again.

The yearning of the Russian people to be free remains unquenched. And the men in the Kremlin have shown us that they know that fact.

It is my firm impression, based on the reaction to these messages over Radio Liberation, that the regime in power is afraid. The Kremlin is as afraid, as we can be hopeful, that the peoples of the Soviet Union will once again find a way to democracy and freedom and help to build a better world. Let us hope that the example set by the Constituent Assembly will serve as a beacon of hope leading the people of Russia out of the darkness of dictatorship into the light of liberty.

---

## SMALL BUSINESS: AN INVESTMENT IN AMERICA'S STRENGTH

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee introduced a bill in which I have both a deep personal concern and strong intellectual convictions. This is the bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks.

I am happy to have been able to participate in the drafting of the bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks and in the work and study which came before. Since the rules of the House do not permit Members to join in the introduction of a bill, but require that each Member who would put his name to a bill introduce it in his own name, I have so introduced the bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks. I endorse the bill completely. It presents a most felicitous solution to a most unhappy problem. In fact, I cannot recall a bill so satisfying as this bill. I sincerely hope that both its terms and its high principles will be acceptable to almost everybody. And yet it contains no compromises; it does not ask for half-measures. And what is most satisfactory, the bill meets head on a problem which hangs like an ominous cloud over our country.

### PURPOSE OF SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL BANKS

The Small Business Capital Bank System has but one purpose. That is to create a practical and workable means whereby small business may fairly bid for investment funds. Thus what the bill does is to set up a system of investment banks which will do for small firms what the investment bankers and the organized securities markets such as are centered at Wall Street do for big firms.

Under this System of Small Business Capital banks, a small firm may obtain investment funds in either of two ways. It may obtain loan funds, under specified terms for repayment and at a specific rate of interest. Or the small firm having attractive stock and good earning prospects may sell stock to the System, in which case the System will hold an equity in the assets of the firm and share in the firm's earnings.

Capital funds advanced under this System will involve higher risks or longer terms for repayment than the existing capital market is willing to finance for small firms. Indeed, that is the whole purpose of establishing the new System, to provide the kind of service that is so much needed and not now available. This being true, there are two features of the bill which, to my mind, are essential to the success of this System. First, financing decisions will be made by local investment associations, comprised of local citizens who will back their judgments with a portion of their own money.

Second, provision is made for local investment groups to build up private capital in the System, to return the Government funds and take over complete ownership and management of the System. This it seems to me is the main objective, and the only real solution to the problem. What we are trying to do here is to get started a private-enterprise service which will stand on its own feet and make a profit by supplying a needed service where none now exists.

### NOT A STOPGAP MEASURE

In recent years the Federal Government has operated several programs for making loans to small firms, such as in the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the RFC, the Small Defense Plants Administration and now the Small Business Administration. But these have all been stopgap measures, taken because of the extreme urgency of the problem. A Federal bureau making loans to individual small businesses was never intended, I think, to offer any permanent solution to the problem.

Now, how will the funds to capitalize these small business capital banks be raised? Some Federal funds are called for—approximately $150 million, which is a most modest amount considering the purpose they are to serve. As has been pointed out, use of these will not require appropriations, and it will not increase the Federal debt.

The bill calls for the transfer of certain funds from the Federal Reserve System which are not now earning interest. These consist in part of the uncommitted portion of the funds provided in 1934, under section 13 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, from which the reserve banks were to make loans to small firms. The Federal Reserve Board feels that the Federal Reserve System is the wrong agency to operate this program, and the Board has recommended to Congress, within recent months, that the Federal Reserve System be relieved of both the program and the funds. It is entirely appropriate, then, that the funds be transferred to a place where they will be used to carry out the objective for which they were provided.

In addition, the bill calls for transfer of $10 million from the surplus account of each of the Federal Reserve banks. These accounts, as I understand it, have been accumulated from interest payments on United States Government securities.

Just as an item for comparison, I will insert in the RECORD a summary table of the United States Government's appropriations and commitments for foreign aid.

*Summary of appropriations and commitments of Federal funds for foreign assistance to July 1, 1958*

| Program: | Millions |
|---|---|
| Mutual security (economic, military and technical assistance) | $73,598 |
| Export-Import Bank | 5,000 |
| International Bank for Reconstruction and Development | 635 |
| International Monetary Fund | 2,750 |
| International Finance Corporation | 35 |
| Development Loan Fund | 300 |
| Total | 82,318 |

NOTE.—$150 million for the Small Business Capital Bank System would amount to two-tenths of 1 percent of above total.

### SMALL BUSINESS NEEDS OPPORTUNITY—NOT A HANDOUT

Now I should like to dwell briefly on the nature of the problem which this bill

is intended to solve. The problem is not a new one. We have known for a long time that there is a need for some institutional mechanism whereby small firms can bid for the available investment funds. Small firms with good earning records and bright prospects cannot find—at any reasonable cost—the investors who would invest in their stocks and share in the fortunes of the firm. Nor can the investors—at reasonable cost—find and get to know the small firms. The same is true with reference to loan capital where the risk is somewhat greater, or the term for repayment longer, than is the case of loans which commercial banks can make. This is a basic, chronic condition that is crippling to the whole community of small firms, both old ones and new ones yet to be founded. The subcommittee of the Small Business Committee of which I am chairman has run up against this hard and disheartening fact everywhere we have turned.

Every problem we have investigated traces back at least in part, to this problem of obtaining adequate amounts of capital. The problem is rapidly growing more acute, and it will continue to do so. Every year, almost every month, it takes more capital equipment for a business firm to carry on a given volume of business, to say nothing of increasing and expanding the volume. More machines are needed, more office equipment, and more labor-saving devices of all kinds. This is as it should be. No one would wish our business enterprises to be run by hand methods. Yet during the last several years of business prosperity, with business firms generally investing in unprecedented amounts of capital for modernization and expansion, small firms have not been able to keep pace. They could not obtain the necessary capital funds. And small-business failures have been increasing.

OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM IS AT A CROSSROADS

Dun & Bradstreet reported 333 business failures last week, which was the greatest number of failures in any week since 1940.

In the whole of last year, there were 13,739 business failures according to Dun & Bradstreet's count. Also, according to Dun & Bradstreet's count, these failures amounted to a failure rate of 52 failures for each 10,000 firms in operation. This was the highest rate of failures in 16 years. The failure rate last year—not the number of failures, the rate—was 8 percent over the rate of the previous year; and the rate of the previous year was 15 percent over the rate of the year before that.

Let me call the Members' attention to this: the Dun & Bradstreet figures by no means include all the firms that go out of business. They do not include firms that voluntarily close their doors. They are figures only for firms that either go bankrupt, or that are closed under such circumstances that Dun & Bradstreet estimates a significant loss to creditors will be involved.

Now, does this record suggest that small business is, on the whole, a poor investment? No; it is just the other way around. It is for the very reason that small firms cannot obtain adequate capital that many of these firms are failing.

It seems clear to me that we have reached a crossroads. Either we take affirmative measures to maintain in this country a broad opportunity for free enterprise, or we accept the proposition that we are right in speeding on toward an economic system made up of a few vast corporate states, run by unseen and unknown governments.

LOW TAXES OR HIGH TAXES—SMALL FIRMS NEED CAPITAL

Now, when this problem of small-business financing is discussed the question frequently comes up. "Wouldn't it be better to give small business tax relief?" The answer is that appropriate small-business tax relief, which I earnestly hope will be given, is not an alternative to this bill to create a system of small business capital banks. This problem of small-business financing is one of long standing, and it will remain whether taxes are high or low; and in either case, the problem will continue to cry for correction.

I have introduced a bill on small-business taxes, and I have been before the Ways and Means Committee in this session of Congress and urged that committee's early consideration of this matter. But neither my tax bill nor this bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks is intended as any kind of relief measure or grant-in-aid to small business. I am not in favor of anyone paying less than his fair share of the taxes; and I would not propose less than a fair share for small business. It is unmistakably clear to me, however, that the present tax structure has a discriminatory impact on smaller business firms, and this badly needs correction.

EXPANDING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY IS A FEDERAL TRADITION

Furthermore, the bill to create a system of Small Business Capital banks is in no sense a relief measure. It is a sound investment in free enterprise, and it is in the best tradition of our Federal Government, from its very beginnings. In every year of this Government's existence it has done things, and sought things to do which would create or expand opportunities for economic ventures. These have all involved some costs, and the costs have all been incurred at some risk that the ventures would not succeed. Indeed, when the roads and the railroads were opened to the West it was at a risk that the settlers might not succeed in establishing themselves on the land.

The first Federal assistance to the airlines was given at a risk that travel by air might not become a reality. Federal grants for developing civilian uses of atomic energy today are being made at the risk that this activity may fail.

There is also a risk that this Small Business Capital bank bill will result in some out-of-pocket cost to the Federal Government; there is a risk that small business will fail and that some other system of economic organization will take its place. As for my part, I believe that what is at stake here is clearly worth that risk. I am confident that small business is worth the risk.

## INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when by our good works we have won the hearts and the minds of people everywhere, we will have proved the worth of our world leadership. Anything that can contribute to that end is well worth our effort.

As a Chicagoan, I was happy that from the gathering of a small group in Chicago came the inspiration for the classics of American democracy program. Now in all the languages and dialects are being translated the books that were read by our forefathers and in which they found the chart for the establishment of government in more perfect form than man had ever known. Today men and women in lands where there is hunger for freedom and dignity are reading these classics of our democracy with the same fervor as they were read by early Americans. This program is a contribution to the crusade to win the hearts and minds of people everywhere.

As a Chicagoan, I am happy that in the dynamic and far-visioned administration of Mayor Richard J. Daley, there is now in the planning stage, a project of tremendous promise to bring into closer and warmer understanding our people with the people of Latin America. On Mayor Daley's initiative, a Latin-American festival is to be held in connection with the holding of the Pan American Games in 1959. For 1 month the music, the art, the literature, and the technology of the great American Republics that lie to the south of us will be featured in the second city in population in the United States, and on a scale never before approached. This is certain to bring into closer understanding the people of our Middle West with the people of the countries of Latin America. It is a contribution to the crusade in which we are engaged to win the hearts and the minds of people.

Today I have asked for time to announce to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States the establishment in Chicago of the headquarters of the new International Institute of Contemporary Arts. The purpose is to aid young and unknown artists, composers, and writers. The Chicago Daily News, sensing the significance in the formation of this organization, stressed in an editorial its influence in creating greater international understanding. The City Council of Chicago adopted resolutions expressing the welcome and cooperation of the people and government of Chicago.

This is a contribution to our crusade to win the hearts and minds of people everywhere. In broadening cultural horizons it will narrow the area of baser things that divide. Art, which reflects the beauty of life, coupled with the opportunity offered by this new international organization for recognition for everyone in every land in whom is love of beauty and creative talent, well can serve to bring into ever closer understanding the peoples of the world. I

commend the Honorable Barnet Hodes and the renowned artists and art patrons of Europe and America associated with him for this inspiring contribution to the crusade to win the hearts and minds of people everywhere.

The editorial from the Chicago Daily News of December 19, 1957, follows:

FOR STRUGGLERS

Barnet Hodes, the Chicago lawyer, is chief organizer and first secretary-treasurer of the new International Institute of Contemporary Arts, established in Chicago to aid young and unknown artists, composers, and writers.

American and British art lovers, many of them in positions of prominence, have joined in the enterprise. They plan to encourage artistic endeavor by awarding grants and scholarships and by sponsoring international exhibits of the work of the so-called struggling artists who have something to say.

We commend Hodes and his associates for their efforts, which should contribute not only to the arts but also to greater international understanding.

Following is the news article from the Chicago Daily News of December 18, 1957:

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE SETUP—LAUNCH PLAN TO AID YOUNG ARTISTS, WRITERS, COMPOSERS—SEEKS UNKNOWNS WITH TALENT

(By Barnard K. Leiter)

A new international organization of art lovers with headquarters in Chicago soon will launch a search for young, unknown artists, writers, and composers to befriend.

The International Institute of Contemporary Arts will be looking for new people in the Free World "who have something to say either in art, literature, or music," said Barnet Hodes, Chicago attorney and art collector.

Hodes is secretary-treasurer of the institute.

"The established artists really don't need our help," Hodes explained. "It is the young people—the so-called struggling artists who have something to say—that we want to encourage through scholarships and grants."

Hodes just returned from a month in Europe where he worked out details of the organization with a group of other Americans and British persons in the arts world.

At the official formation of the group in Paris 3 weeks ago, Mrs. Roland Penrose, American-born writer, photographer, and art collector, was named president. William N. Copley, a native of Aurora and a director and foreign correspondent for the Copley Press, is vice president.

One of the first items on Hodes' agenda was a conference with Sir Herbert Read, distinguished British critic of art and literature, who is an adviser to the group.

Read, who has been lecturing at the University of Illinois this month, came to Chicago to discuss institute plans with Hodes.

In addition to grants and scholarships, the institute plans to exhibit contemporary paintings, sculpture and allied fine arts on an international scale.

"We don't intend to buy paintings and hide them away in museums," Hodes explained.

"We want to take the paintings that best represent the contemporary artists of the free world and put them on display so the Americans will know what the French are doing and the Germans will know what the Americans are doing in this field."

Hodes said the group also plans to hold annual international art workshops and symposiums rotating in the capitals of the Free World to promote a better international understanding among contemporary artists.

Other plans include selecting annually outstanding national and international artists for special recognition.

Hodes said the international institute will work closely with the Institute of Contemporary Arts of London and a similar organization in Brussels.

"Both the American ambassadors in France and England have expressed a keen interest in the organization," Hodes said.

"And in addition to Read, our advisers include Picasso, artists Man Ray and Max Ernst, French composer Darius Milhaud, French poet Michel Leiris and sculptor Jean (Hans) Arp."

Hodes said membership in the group will be solicited here, in New York, San Francisco, London, Paris, Brussels, and all the leading cities in the Free World.

He estimated that the first grants and scholarships will be given within a year.

Hodes is a member of the law firm Arvey, Hodes & Mantynband, 1 North La Salle, and former head of the city's legal department.

The following resolution was adopted unanimously by the city council of Chicago:

Whereas:

1. On November 21, 1957, the International Institute of Contemporary Arts was incorporated in the State of Illinois as a not-for-profit corporation for the chartered purposes of promoting international understanding, appreciation and development of and education in fine arts generally and contemporary art particularly.

2. The fulfillment of the objectives of the organization will be accomplished by the following, among other, activities:

(a) Arranging exhibitions on an international scale of contemporary paintings, sculpture, and allied fine arts;

(b) Staging and rotating in capitals of the free world of annual international workshops and symposia;

(c) Close cooperation with the Institute of Contemporary Arts in London and similar groups in other countries;

(d) Grants to artists, composers, and sculptors whose work is deemed to be of international significance;

(e) Compilation of international lists of private and public collections of the contemporary arts.

3. Among those who have already agreed to serve as advisers to the International Institute of Contemporary Arts are:

Sir Herbert Read, internationally known art historian, author, and president of England's Institute of Contemporary Arts.

Darius Milhaud, internationally known composer. Head of the French National School. Teaching professorships at the School of Music, Aspen, Colo., Mills College at Oakland, Calif., and universities of France.

Picasso, recognized as the world's outstanding painter.

Jean (Hans) Arp, world recognized sculptor.

Le Corcusier, internationally famous architect and city planner.

Roland Penrose, officer for fine arts at the British council in Paris and world known art collector and writer.

Max Ernst, internationally known painter, recognized as the head of the surrealist school.

Lord Harewood (George Henry Lascelles) seventh earl of Harewood, chairman of the music advisory committee in England, and member of the executive committee of the British council.

Man Ray, world known photographer and artist, inventor of the Rayograph.

Michel Leiris, outstanding French poet.

4. The officers of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts will be:

President, Mrs. Roland Penrose, American-born writer, photographer and art collector.

Vice president, William N. Copley, native of Aurora, Ill. Director and foreign correspondent of the Copley newspaper and radio chain and president of the William and Noma Copley Foundation, a charitable and educational enterprise.

Secretary-treasurer, Barnet Hodes, former alderman of Chicago, former corporation counsel of Chicago, attorney and art collector.

And whereas the Chicago Daily News on December 19, 1957, expressed its commendation of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts and its founders in the following editorial:

"FOR STRUGGLERS

"Barnet Hodes, the Chicago lawyer, is chief organizer and first secretary-treasurer of the new International Institute of Contemporary Arts, established in Chicago to aid young and unknown artists, composers, and writers.

"American and British art lovers, many of them in positions of prominence, have joined in the enterprise. They plan to encourage artistic endeavor by awarding grants and scholarships and by sponsoring international exhibits of the work of the so-called struggling artists who have something to say.

"We commend Barnet Hodes and his associates for their efforts, which should contribute not only to the arts but also to greater international understanding."

And whereas the position and prestige of the city of Chicago as a great cultural center with its world-recognized universities, art institute, museums, orchestra hall, opera house, and other institutions of culture will be enhanced by the addition of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts with its splendid objectives above described: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Chicago,* That a warm welcome be extended to the International Institute of Contemporary Arts, that the organization be assured of every possible cooperation; that all of its founders, leaders, and advisers be congratulated; that Barnet Hodes, our former colleague, especially be commended for taking so active and important a role in the organization of this worldwide group, and that best wishes of the city of Chicago be extended for the successful fulfillment of all the laudable purposes of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts; be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting, that a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the officers and advisors of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts and that an engrossed copy hereof be sent to the secretary-treasurer of the organization.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to join my distinguished colleague, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, from the Second District of Illinois, in applauding the achievements of our great city of Chicago in its latest international achievement. Chicago has been, and continues to be, the pace setter in the United States for eliminating barriers of geographical distance by incorporating herself as the keystone of internationally sound projects. Chicago has paved the way in Latin American

relations with the Pan-American Games and Latin American Festival starting on August 22, 1959. Recognizing the growing need of aiding budding young artists, the Chicago City Council passed a farsighted resolution to center the headquarters of the International Institute of Contemporary Arts in our city.

This contribution to increase international understanding places focus on this great city of the Midwest as a beacon in the American search for international good will.

That great Chicagoan Barnet Hodes is likewise to be congratulated on his most recent efforts on behalf of humanity and Chicago.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my distinguished colleague from Chicago, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, in commending the great city of Chicago and its governing body for this farsighted action. We all know there is an increased emphasis on international understanding through the exchange of people and the exchange of culture. Only the other day the President announced a very heartening agreement which had been made with the Soviet Union for cultural exchange. There has been entirely too little recognition of contemporary American art in the United States. This is a harbinger of better things to come. To my thinking, and I know the gentleman agrees with me, here in the capital of the Free World there is really no place as yet for the performing arts and for the display of contemporary art in any of its forms. It is something which the Capital of the United States needs very badly. Chicago can be extremely proud of its cultural plans and I am sure the Nation will be proud of what Chicago is doing.

What Chicago is doing is inspiring and, I hope, will encourage other cities to follow her example.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Trenton, N. J., in my own district, has undertaken the sponsorship of an arts and music festival the middle of next month, February, featuring Louis Armstrong and other outstanding cultural attractions.

What is taking place in Chicago, Trenton, and in other cities across our country is a marriage of business, local government, and the arts. St. Louis has its Municipal Opera, and Dallas its music under the stars. There are the concerts in the Hollywood Bowl and other cities are following these proud examples.

There can be no doubt, I think, but that our people have an enormous interest and enthusiasm for cultural values and cultural activities. I think this has always been the case in America.

That early observer, Alexis de Tocqueville noted it in his book Democracy in America.

The Mormons took music with them to the West.

There were music and theater performances in our first mining camps and opera houses were among the first permanent structures put up in the nearby towns and cities.

America has never known court patronage of the arts which was so much a part of the European tradition and experience with cultural matters. And we are the better for it. The arts belong to the people here.

The cultural life in almost any American city of any size is, in my judgment, one of the phenomena of the high standard of American life. The radio and television, the movies, the theater and music departments of our schools, colleges, and universities, the civic interest in art expressed in a thousand ways, as in Chicago, these are a major force in American life. Our cities contribute such institutions as symphony orchestras and concert halls where the paid admissions are greater by several millions of dollars a year than the admissions receipts at baseball games. There are several hundred—more than 400, in fact—art museums each with thousands of members.

In our period art is a major staple of such magazines as Time, Life, Look, and Newsweek, all of which devote many columns weekly to the theater, the concert halls, and so on.

Today education and the arts are provided free over radio and television by Ford, General Electric, Goodyear, Firestone, Westinghouse, Du Pont, Union Carbide and hundreds of other companies.

The sensitivity of the officials of our cities and of American business to a genuinely culture-conscious people is one of the significant social phenomena of our time. The businessman, I imagine to his own amazement, has found a new bonanza of public relations and commercial approach. And this approach is via the medium of the dissemination of the richest materials in western civilization—the fine arts. This is a potential of such significance to the progress of mankind that we here are far too close to its present development to adequately appreciate its importance to our own times, or the future.

Instead of lamenting this, I think our businessmen and the broadcasting companies should be encouraged to do more. Hollywood should be encouraged to make more adult and beautiful art movies instead of the awful potboilers of the past. Let us here help confirm the new-found cultural interests of the American businessman, the civic leader, the Mayor Daleys of a thousand cities from Louisville, Ky., to New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, St. Louis, Dallas, and Hollywood. Let us welcome all who have had the faith, the imagination, the brains and the courage to risk huge sums to back the cultural riches of our civilization. We have all benefited. I hope it will continue to be a part of the American tradition.

I congratulate the gentleman on his effort today, and especially those who have brought this about.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a news article and an editorial from the Chicago Daily News and a resolution passed by the City Council of Chicago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who desires to do so may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the very able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], on the leadership that he has taken to have the classics of American democracy translated in foreign languages so that the people of the world who are struggling to maintain and to achieve individual liberty and freedom may know just what ideas motivated the Founding Fathers of our great country. Mr. O'HARA realizes the importance of winning the hearts and minds of people throughout the world in their struggle for individual liberty, the dignity of the person, and the right of nations to govern themselves—to determine their own destiny and not to be pawns and slaves of Russian Communist tyranny and exploitation or any other form of imperialism or exploitation. One big problem confronting us is to get translations in as many major languages of the world of the classics of American democracy at a price which the ordinary people of these many countries can afford to pay. The United States Information Agency has made a fine start in this direction but the tempo must be speeded up to accomplish the goal which we all agree is most desirable, mainly to win the hearts and minds of people and to enable them to enjoy the basic human freedoms for which we all were created.

It was my privilege to discuss with Mr. Barnet Hodes of Chicago, about his own and Mr. O'HARA's efforts in this direction. I wish to compliment him and his associates in their efforts also to encourage youth in developing the arts.

I believe the Chicago Daily News is also to be commended for the outstanding support that newspaper has given to the effort made to get the classics of American democracy into the hands of the politically awakened people of the world. The initiative taken by that newspaper from the very beginning of this project has been a source of great encouragement to all of us who have had the privilege of furthering this objective.

Mr. O'HARA has recently made an intense study of this problem in the Middle East and Africa and I am confident that his efforts are bearing fruit. I am sure that all of his colleagues applaud him and are willing to assist him in his efforts.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in congratulating the great city of Chicago on another outstanding contribution to the cause of international relations. I especially commend the Hon. Barnet Hodes and the group of artists and art patrons for extending recognition to young artists. On every ground we shall meet and surpass the Soviet, leaving them hopelessly behind. We are also not forgetting the cultural things that give breath to human dignity. Last year a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee made a nationwide survey of public opinion and held a hearing session in Gary, Ind. I was happy to participate in these hearings. At the conclusion of the Gary hearings, Members told me that they were the most valuable to the committee of all the hearings which they held throughout the Nation. The reason was that in northern Indiana we are vitally interested in the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain and want a foreign policy that will hold hope for their quick liberation. We are very much interested in everything that brings the peoples of the free world closer together. Music, literature, and art composes these mediums that brings for closer union among us.

Again I congratulate our sister city, Chicago, and commend Mr. Hodes and his associates.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to associate myself with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in urging the establishment in Chicago of the new International Institute of Contemporary Arts.

This project is intended to bring even closer together the peoples of the Midwestern United States and the Latin American countries. We in the Middle West have long enjoyed the friendship of the peoples of countries to the south of us.

It is most fitting that this institute be established in our great metropolis as a means of creating even better international good will.

---

## FEDERAL EXPENSES IN DALLAS COUNTY, TEX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21 last there appeared a vigorous attack upon me and the District I represent, Texas Fifth. The vehement denunciations by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] were intended, as he stated, "to set the record straight" and "inform the House the true amount of Federal funds and projects going into this conservative stronghold, Dallas County, Tex." These were to be the facts. To quote briefly:

> In Dallas * * * it is popular to condemn Federal grants, loans, or any form of Federal assistance. * * * While the gentleman from Dallas, Mr. ALGER, and the Dallas Chamber of Commerce board of directors flay Federal aid in all forms, that aid pours into Dallas County in great abundance.
>
> So let the gentleman from Texas, Mr. ALGER, and the Dallas Chamber of Commerce directors, and others of this high oligarchy which prides itself in "controlling Dallas County, cease from their verbal spoutings against Federal aid, while they enjoy the fruits of Federal aid in so many, many ways."
>
> Let this newspaper (the Dallas Morning News) and the chamber board of directors and its Congressman realize, for once, that the Federal Government is here to help, not hurt, our people.
>
> The good people of Dallas benefit from almost every Federal program known to the mind of man.
>
> Either the gentleman from Texas, Mr. ALGER, is opposed to these programs or he is not opposed to them. And if it is the latter, Mr. Speaker, then he should change his speeches to fit his views accordingly.
>
> For the facts are not consistent with Mr. ALGER'S published statements.

These are some of the more temperate statements.

The Representative, the newspaper, the chamber of commerce, the city and county officials, lobbyists—all the people of Dallas County were, as you see, tarred with the same brush, as the gentleman sat in judgment of them. Conservative Dallas was pictured as having the hand outstretched to receive all the Federal money possible, while the people and their Representative inconsistently belabored and voted against the Federal programs under which the money was received. We were, therefore, unappreciative, ungrateful, inconsistent, greedy, and, I suppose, following this progression of thought, quite hypocritical. How ridiculous, as to the facts.

But first, should a Member answer an attack in the RECORD, or would this be "two wrongs don't make a right"? Was the gentleman sincere or was this camouflage for some new political undercutting, most of which techniques, refined or coarse, I had already experienced? The obvious falsities, as fallacious as they were vigorously presented, puzzled me.

The plot thickened when the District was circularized with copies of this attack, in Congressional envelopes without return address—thus my office got the returned mail. The envelopes had "Congress of the United States" in the upper left corner, and they were stamped, not franked. This expense in time, effort, and money must have meant a lot to somebody.

Hesitancy to take the valuable time of this House to answer this attack has been replaced by the desire to get the garbled record straight. I have notified the gentleman in writing of my intention.

It is hardly necessary for me to speak for the Dallas Morning News or the chamber of commerce, since they can speak so well for themselves, nor for the accused Dallas lobbyist, who responsibly holds a respectable position with the chamber of commerce, and a dear longtime friend of the Speaker. But there are 850,000 in the Fifth District of Texas whose voice I am in this House. I realize now there is no virtue in silence when both this District and I can, through this fallacious attack, be misjudged. Further, the facts which I shall present may be of interest to my colleagues, who might otherwise have been misled.

Now, as to the charges—time prevents my discussing them all, although I am prepared to do just that in detail. Now, let us see what are the facts and who is consistent?

First, you should know that the gentleman has made four corrections of the RECORD on his own, which is in the right direction but quite insufficient.

There are other charges, grievously in error, which have not been corrected. First, the weekly newsletter to my constituents, so offensive to him, does not cost $200 per insertion into the RECORD, as is flatly stated, but costs $30 to $40 according to the Government Printing Office. Pondering this charge, I wondered if I were out of line in my use of the RECORD. Some quick research reassured me. I found, for example, that two of the gentleman's California colleagues each inserted twice as much material in the first 2 months of the year as I did all year. Another prominent west coast Democrat had 31 insertions in the same CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the gentleman's attack—all on the same subject, "Cruelty to Animals"—more in 1 day than I had all year. Or, again on the day the gentleman's last correction appeared, a colleague who shares the gentleman's views had 31 pages—that is $2,500 worth. Surely I was not out of line. Understand, I am not criticizing, but only comparing.

Further, the newsletter can have some powerful influences for good, even economy—contrary, apparently, to the understanding of the gentleman. It is a cold-blooded fact, and I appreciate this opportunity to mention it, that in one instance a constituent challenged my newsletter figures on intended State Department expenditures. Subsequently, in the exchanges and followup, we succeeded in eliminating a $27,778 appropriation. This is enough, by the way, to put the newsletter in the RECORD for 27 years.

The overriding criticism frequently expressed or implied was the inconsistency of my position—a conservative in voting, while Federal money went into my District.

Obviously, the gentleman is troubled by the cart-before-the-horse assumption that people who receive Federal money must necessarily be for the program under which they receive the money. By this assumption, any veteran disapproving the particular provisions of a pension bill must refuse the money to which the law entitles him. Or if a pay boost or benefit is deficient in the opinion of a Federal employee, he or she should refuse the increase. This is similar to saying that in a family, should the wife outvote the husband in the matter of home or car, demanding the more expensive, that the husband may not live in the house nor ride in the car, though he is footing the bill. As I see it, he may so live and ride, yet maintain his right to protest and try to convince his wife

and family to vote to reduce expenditures and revert back to the smaller house and car. So it is with legislation, is it not? Just because we strive for the bills we believe in, or try to reduce rather than increase Federal programs, does not mean we should not participate when it is the law, particularly in view of the fact we are helping pay for programs with our tax money.

So let us look at Dallas, taking the gentleman's own specific subjects of criticism, Small Business Administration.

To quote the gentleman:

During the year ending June 25, 1957, the Small Business Administration granted 52 loans in Dallas totaling $1,849,913 of Federal money, and additional $69,420 in disaster loans. No protests are filed.

Well, a protest is herewith filed, and it is a protest against statements of this sort being palmed off as facts.

As a matter of fact, a 5-minute phone call to the SBA will elicit the information that during the fiscal year referred to the Small Business Administration made 28—not 52—business loans in Dallas County, totaling $1,156,230—or about half the alleged amount.

Now it is true that SBA was called upon for disaster loans by individuals in Dallas County. Twenty such loans were made, totaling $69,320. This fact, too, fills me with pride in my community. Imagine—20 loans totaling $69,320—about $3,500 each, on the average.

Surely, everyone recalls that during the period referred to Dallas County was struck by a vicious tornado which was followed in a short period by devastating floods. It was to the first of these disasters that the very esteemed gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] was referring when he addressed this House on April 17 of last year. His tribute to the pluck and self-sufficiency of the people of Dallas, Tex., in the face of adversity was genuinely appreciated:

THE DALLAS TORNADO—EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1957

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I believe sentiment is growing in America among our States and the local communities to do as much as possible for themselves without calling on the Federal Government. The people of Dallas, Tex., were stricken by a terrible tornado which caused over $4 million damage and took many lives. It is my understanding that immediately after the tornado struck, insurance adjusters and investigators moved in to take care of the people's claims. Carpenters, brick masons, engineers, and the people in general moved in the next morning and went to work to restore the damaged property. Local contributions of time, money, clothes, and food poured in. A magnificent job was done by the city of Dallas and the State of Texas. It is my understanding that no official request for help to the Federal Government in Washington was ever issued by the local authorities. The people of Dallas will always remember with pride how everyone chipped in and, at the local level, rebuilt the damaged portion of their great city. This is the kind of effort that made America the Nation that it is today. This is the kind of pride, frugality, and thrift which will preserve this great Nation. I congratulate the people of the city of Dallas, Tex., on their splendid reaction to a major disaster.

I cannot believe that anyone who did the research through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clearly evident in the later attack of August 21, could have been unaware of the facts pointed up by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and of his very gracious remarks concerning them.

Now are the actual SBA figures applicable to Dallas County exorbitant? I do not know, but I hardly think so. It is interesting to note, however, that when the Congress saw fit last year to make SBA's aid a permanent fixture in our national life, I opposed the measure. The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] did not. The record in debate carries my dissenting statement in which I pointed out the way to help small business is to return their tax money to businessmen, not extend help and then increase taxes to pay for it.

How about the school-lunch and school-milk programs? To quote the gentlemen:

Dallas is a prosperous city. It is a city of wealth and great abundance. Yet, according to the Texas Education Agency in a report dated August 1, 1957, "Dallas County last year received Federal funds in the amount of $135,437.93 for its school-lunch program. And the Government gave Dallas County a total of $613,276 in Federal subsidy for its lunch program since 1952, and an additional $96,941.08 for its school-milk program."

Now the facts. Dallas is indeed opposed to Federal aid. When the school-lunch program was first being sold to Congress in 1946, Dallas' able and respected Hatton W. Sumners was one of those Congressmen who remained unconvinced that the Federal Government could best do all things for all people. As Dallas' Representative in Congress, he opposed the School Lunch Act. Moreover, since that date, the Dallas Independent School District, encompassing all of the city of Dallas and responsible for the education of over two-thirds of the children in the county, has steadfastly declined any school-lunch aid, school-milk aid, or any other Federal largesse, though our people are paying through the nose for this program as are taxpayers everywhere.

*School-milk program comparison of States*
*(Department of Agriculture figures)*

| | Per capita income | Number of school age children | School-milk grants | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Fiscal 1957 | Fiscal 1958 |
| California | [1] $2,271 | [2] 2,607,000 | $5,412,500 | $5,952,650 |
| Texas | 1,614 | 2,092,000 | [2] 2,100,000 | 2,018,500 |

[1] One-third higher.
[2] Five-fourths higher.
[3] Of this allocation, only 40 percent as large as California's, Texas spent only $1,837,876. The balance is returnable to Federal Government.

Let us sum all this up: According to the gentleman from California, the Federal Government has poured aid into Dallas County since 1946 to the tune of $613,276 in school lunches and an additional $96,941 in school milk. This covers quite a few years, and the periods are overlapping. Any comparison of identical periods, however, might prove interesting: In the school year 1955–56, public schools in Dallas County with an average daily attendance of 116,976 were allocated $139,190.64 from the school-lunch and school-milk programs. During the same period, according to the California State Controller, the public schools in California's 12th District, which the gentleman represents, and where school attendance is considerably lower than in Dallas, received $419,261.69—more than 3 times the Dallas County figure. Now just whose hand is outstretched to Uncle Sam?

Next, to quote again:

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. ALGER recently attacked a flood-control project passed in the district of one of his Texas colleagues, shortly after the area for which it had been passed had suffered a damaging flood. He issued press releases and wrote in his newsletter that he could not in good faith vote to spend Federal money on the project. Where was Mr. ALGER's good faith when the Government was considering a project known as the Dallas Floodway? I did not see him rise to object to the fact that the Federal Government is putting up $8,996,000 in Federal funds for this project, while the Dallas local government will put up only $1,400,000.

In addition to the federally financed Dallas Floodway, Dallas directly gets the benefit of 3 other dams, located in adjoining counties, costing a total of 36,123,000 Federal dollars for construction, maintenance, studies, and general operation. The dams were constructed for the primary purpose of helping Dallas citizens. Would Mr. ALGER say to the Government: "Remove these dams, they are not needed nor wanted by the people I represent, because they were constructed by tax funds?"

Now here we have not a simple case of just torturing figures out of all validity. Here I am unable to even locate one of the dams supposedly benefiting Dallas.

True, there are presently three dams of any consequence located on tributaries of the Trinity which affects Dallas. One of them is Benbrook which lies on the other side of Fort Worth from Dallas and about which the Corps of Engineers says:

The Benbrook project is designed to prevent floods similar to the one of May 1949 when vital business and residential areas of the city of Fort Worth were inundated. Eleven people lost their lives in this disaster. Monetary losses were estimated at $11 million. By preventing this flood alone, the Benbrook project would have paid for itself. In 1956 Congress passed legislation enabling the city of Fort Worth to purchase conservation storage space in Benbrook Reservoir for municipal water supply purposes until such time as storage space should be required for Trinity navigation. A contract for the interim use of this space is now under discussion with the city of Fort Worth.

The other two dams, Grapevine and Lewisville, are indeed of primary benefit to Dallas, both with substantial local contributions. It is interesting to note that the only dam of these three, in which there was no local contribution involved, to the best of my knowledge, is

the Benbrook Dam which the gentleman would have you believe was constructed primarily for Dallas' benefit but which, as a matter of fact, affects us very little if at all.

As to the Dallas Floodway there are 1 or 2 minor corrections necessary in these facts about Dallas County. In its published description of this project the Corps of Engineers points out:

The Dallas Floodway project, construction of which was initiated in January 1953, provides for the strengthening of approximately 23 miles of existing levees, clearing the floodway channel, and improvement of interior drainage facilities. The area within the levee system totals approximately 10,500 acres in the heart of Dallas, near the confluence of Elm Fork and West Fork in the Trinity River. Important businesses, industries, warehouses, transportation and communication facilities, and residential property will be protected by the project.

The existing levees and floodway improvement at Dallas were constructed by local interests during the period 1928 to 1932. Cost of the original project, including rights-of-way, bridges, utilities, etc., has been estimated by local interests at $20 million. The estimated cost to the Federal Government of the proposed improvement is $9,086,000 (July 1956 estimate). During the 1957 fiscal year, construction funds in the amount of $2,600,000 were appropriated for the project. Local cooperation is estimated to total $1,497,800, of which $300,000 is a cash contribution toward construction of the Turtle Creek pressure sewer.

The project is expected to be completed during 1958.

By the way, how much would that $20 million be today?

Having straightened out who has contributed what to this project, let us see if we can determine "where was Mr. ALGER's good faith?" as the gentleman from California asks.

As assiduously as someone combed through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to glean the material for the gentleman's exposé surely he must have come across the fact that funds for completion of the Dallas Floodway were twice included in omnibus public-works bills; and, in each instance, I voted against—not for—these measures. While that might seem remarkable in some schools of politics, it is well understood in Dallas. For while we are convinced of the merit in the floodway, while we have contributed far more on the local level toward its construction than is common these days; while the project has received the blessings of the Corps of Engineers and the Budget Bureau, we in Dallas do not want it if, along with it, the citizens of this country must be saddled with every sort of pork-barrel project, approved by nobody other than each such project's political sponsor.

So I must flatly contradict the gentleman—and point out, consistently speaking, I have the right to oppose others' projects even the Texas San Angelo project of last year, which, as I saw it, asked too much Federal money. I would not vote for it just because it was a Texas project. This was even tougher for me because of my respect and admiration for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] whose project it was. To prove the point, again in the RECORD, unbeknownst to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] placed a letter from a Dallas resident commending me for my stand in opposition to certain Federal programs—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 4, page 5303. Among other things this letter states:

Contrary to a great deal of popular opinion, the Congressman who will oppose wasteful or unnecessary Federal expenditures in his own district adds far more to his political strength than he loses. In such a stand, he will inevitably antagonize a selfishly interested minority; but the great majority usually admires his courage, regards him as of increased stature, and forgets the details and votes for him at the next election. The average voter has come to regard him as a man of strength and character without reference to any particular local interests.

The most recent illustration of the foregoing that comes to my mind is BRUCE ALGER's last race here in Dallas County. Incidentally, I am firmly of Democratic persuasion, and supported BRUCE's opponent in the election. Contrary to what a few of us thought was sound politics, the Democratic candidate (no doubt with the hearty approval of a majority of his advisers) tried to capitalize on some of BRUCE's voting in the interest of economy, even at the expense of 1 or 2 Dallas projects, and tried to drive home the point that BRUCE has gotten nothing for this District. The results speak for themselves. Dallas County actually is still strongly Democratic in formal party alinement—a point clearly enough proved in the election last Tuesday. BRUCE nevertheless won his race last summer by what was for this county a heavy majority. I am sure that he was a part of your support mentioned in the attached news clip.

Is not this position consistent? Is not this "putting the money where the mouth is"?

Now, for Love Field, the airport built by Federal dollars. According to the gentleman from California:

Another example of these terrible Federal funds is found in connection with Love Field, a commercial airport located in a heavily populated section of Dallas. The entire project at Love Field was created and constructed outright by the Federal Government at a cost of $3,412,000, and all told the Government has given $5,832,109 to Love Field construction, expansion and renovation.

In 1917 the Division of Military Aeronautics leased 650 acres for a military training camp and 60 acres for a landing field from one Urie Jones.

As war surplus it was acquired by a private firm, the Love Field Development Corp.

In December 1927, Dallas taxpayers overwhelmingly approved a $400,000 bond issue and on June 22, 1928, the city of Dallas used $325,000 of the proceeds to buy 167.1 acres of land from Love Field Development Corp. for development as a municipal airport. It used the other $75,000 for purchase of Hensley Field. Hensley, owned by the city, has always been used as a military airport being leased to the Federal Government for $1 per year.

Since 1927 the citizens of Dallas have invested some $26.5 million of local funds in Dallas' own Love Field. They have also received some Federal aid. Let us examine that for a moment:

Under the Federal airport aid program, Dallas' Love Field has received, according to the CAA, $430,068. Back in the thirties under the New Deal make-work programs, the CWA and the WPA had projects in the area on which the Government placed a book value of $563,607.

It is interesting to note that CAA approved and allocated $317,334 of Federal aid to Dallas in December of last year. However, our mayor, a leader of the oligarchy despised by the gentleman from California, wrote the CAA that the improvements contemplated could be accomplished by local funds, as part of a tremendous expansion program now under way. As a matter of fact no Federal aid money has gone into Love Field since 1951 during which time the citizens of Dallas have committed more than $20 million to their airport's development and expansion.

Now, what of the figures thrown out willy-nilly by the gentleman? Well, what of them? I can get figures from no Government agency which quite jibe with them. I can only assume that they were meant to approximate the initial cost of the temporary wooden structures built by the Federal Government on one segment of Love Field's perimeter, during World War II.

Some of the barracks and so forth were built on land adjacent to the field and acquired from private owners. Is this Federal aid? Some were built on city-owned land which was leased to the Government for $1 per year. We made no killing that time.

In 1947 the War Assets Administration deeded over the land acquired by the Government to the city of Dallas, together with the temporary structures. At the same time the chapel serving the barracks area was sold to the Christian Science Church for $1,000. Now, lest anyone think that the buildings involved constituted some sort of Federal aid bonanza, I would point out that the Federal Government came along later and decided that they could use some of them for National Guard and Air Force Reserve training. The city promptly leased the necessary land and buildings back to the Federal Government for $1 per year. Such was the extent of the Defense Department's contribution to Dallas' Love Field.

Incidentally, when a need arose last year for additional Reserve training space, the city of Dallas leased to the Federal Government another 20 acres of land on the very same basis—a 99-year lease at $1 per year. In this airport, Redbird, there has never been one crying dime of Federal money. Federal aid?

Now if you pick up the phone and query the Corps of Engineers, and you seek only figures which will bolster your argument, however specious, they will tell you that the Government invested in initial construction costs, several millions of dollars in Love Field. This is Federal aid?

It is the same sort of aid a town receives from an oil driller who sinks several millions into a dry hole on the edge of town. It may have cost him plenty in investment, but when he pulls up his rig and moves on, all the town has to show for it is a hole in the ground.

Now, compare the charge, "the entire project was created and constructed outright by the Federal Government," to the facts that $26.5 million of Dallas citizens' money—almost the entire expenditure—came from the people of Dallas.

Such has been the extent of Federal aid to Love Field and such is the validity of Mr. SISK's statement:

AGRICULTURE

Now, for Agriculture, to quote:

According to Charles R. Grant, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, Dallas County, during fiscal years 1955 through 1957, received $7,496,000 in Federal money from the Agriculture Department. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] has been in Congress during that period and although he has said he is opposed to farm subsidies, the records do not show that he has protested 1 penny of the money sent into Dallas County.

Well, if I maintained that only one penny of Agriculture money came into Dallas County, I would be a whole lot closer to the truth than was that statement.

True, after my office and I had pointed out to the newspapers the utter absurdity of these figures, the gentleman from California did cause a correction to be inserted in the RECORD. Just 4 weeks later, he did this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 19, published after everyone had gone home. Needless to say, I am unaware that anyone bothered to circularize my District with any corrections, as they did with the original blast.

Now, let us look at the correction. This is what he said:

FEDERAL AID TO DALLAS COUNTY—EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. B. F. SISK, OF CALIFORNIA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1957

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 11, pages 15555–15557 reported my remarks under the heading "Fantastic Federal Aid to Dallas County Revealed." In those remarks I detailed some of the very large Federal Government expenditures in the form of grants, gifts, loans, subsidies, guaranties, and other programs for the benefit of Dallas County, Tex.

Two errors in the figures cited have now come to my attention. Although these inaccuracies did not materially alter the total, I want to be entirely fair in the matter and would, therefore, like to indicate appropriate corrections.

On the basis of information supplied by the Department of Agriculture, I stated Dallas County programs received $7,496,000 in agriculture funds during the fiscal years 1955 through 1957. The Department now advises that through error it included sums actually allocated to other Texas counties by the Rural Electrification Administration, so that it appears the correct amount should have been $916,000.

Now, let us go a little deeper into this story. Being the trade center of a vast and fertile area, Dallas quite understandably houses a number of offices for various divisions of the Agriculture Department—the Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Research Service, Commodity Stabilization Service, Farmers' Home Administration, and Office of the General Counsel. Remember, too, that the figures cited by the gentleman from California cover a 3-year period. Now, of the first mentioned $7½ million, almost $7 million of it was a REA loan to the Texas Telephone & Telegraph Co., whose headquarters are in Navarro County, outside my District, and whose president and principal stockholder lives and maintains his office in Houston.

This loan was aimed at improving existing service and extending new service to over 14,000 subscribers in 21 counties served by 43 exchanges all over Texas. I know little of the merits of this loan, nor do I feel obliged to defend it. The county in north Texas principally benefited is Hunt County, whose people are very ably represented in Congress by the Speaker of the House.

While the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] says these "inaccuracies did not materially alter the total," in this case some fourteen-fifteenths of the money we were talking about never came near Dallas County. Of all the Agriculture Department funds mentioned over the 3-year period, 85 percent of them never even came through Dallas County. And this does not materially alter the total? This correction, like the others, was not circulated throughout the District, as was the attack. Further:

I am also advised that cost figures furnished by the Veterans' Administration covering construction of a veterans' hospital were misinterpreted to indicate real-estate costs of $10,358,263 which were actually included in total costs of $11,397,652. The separate real-estate costs should be eliminated.

I stated the incomplete expenditures in Dallas County detailed in my remarks reached the sum of $902,105,597. With these corrections, the total should be $885,167,334.

In the citation of VA hospital costs, the figure originally given was only some 90 percent in error as you will note from the gentleman's subsequent correction of that figure, too. This is not a material alteration?

Do not all these facts, replacing the alleged facts, compliment the people of Dallas, showing their willingness to go it on their own, rather than grasping for Federal funds? Are not they and their Representative consistent? I think so.

Maybe there is a difference in our districts. I am convinced that many Dallas citizens see the fallacy of paying heavy taxes to receive Federal money, recognizing that in the long round trip to Washington much is subtracted in Government overhead, and that demanding more and more Federal aid under the guise of something for nothing, or that it is always other people who pay, are just kidding themselves. While others may not agree with me, surely I have the right to encourage and support this viewpoint in my own District.

The gentleman claims to be not anti-Texas nor anti-Dallas. If this is true, his misstatements certainly misrepresent him. He appears wholeheartedly to be both. I must assume necessarily then, the gentleman is simply anti-ALGER, which animosity I do not reciprocate, or anti-Republican, which is a sentiment I sometimes encounter and with which I am learning to grapple. Or is there another reason?

By politically attacking me with facts clearly erroneous, at the same time charging me with inconsistency, has not the gentleman hooked himself with his own harpoon? The attack, the attendant publicity, and the copies sent throughout the District may indeed sow seeds of distrust against me among those who do not know the record, but such actions also do some good, do they not? The pitiless spotlight of public opinion can reveal falsities and truths. Those colleagues, including Texans, if such there are, who conspired to pare me down to size, have the right to do so if they choose, but I want to assure them all, that they had better not underestimate the intelligence of Dallas citizens. American people, like the majority of Congressmen, are basically fairminded. They prefer truth to political untruths or half-truths or calculated low blows. Low blows? I have been hit in the Appendix.

The larger, more intriguing question keeps puzzling me. Why, why did the gentleman single me out and why the vigorous, even bitter, attack? Mr. Speaker, I regret the need for this statement. However, I do not apologize for my own record or for the fine people of the District I have the honor to represent. Does not the gentleman know that this attack, just possibly, could give me attention and support not mine until the misrepresentations were hurled?

Now, I must speculate that there must be larger reasons than anti-ALGER or anti-Republican. Quite apparent is the great difference there is between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas, beyond the charge and countercharges. The obvious difference is the philosophy held by each as to the role of Federal Government in our lives, as represented by their respective voting records. The difference is as clear as their rating by the ADA yardstick, which gives 100 percent approval of my colleague, and 100 percent disapproval of me. In 3 years I have but one ADA plus mark to my credit, and this was a mistake in a paired vote. The ADA believes, as does the gentleman apparently, in sponsoring every program, as the gentleman says, "known to the mind of man" as a Federal program. This embraces public power, public housing, aid to education, increased foreign aid, more direct and guaranteed Government loans and subsidies, increased grants to States, almost unlimited business enterprises conducted by Federal Government, increased pay and pensions for everyone, increased farm subsidies, increased welfare programs of all kinds, and other new and expensive programs now in the planning stage, as evidenced by the Democrat manifesto of

January 30, 1957, when the budget was labeled too little and too late in all departments. Naturally, these programs would cost an almost unlimited additional expenditure, which means logically higher taxes. Here are some of this year's ADA objectives—as listed in the Congressional Quarterly:

Urge Government spending of $5 billion to $10 billion more a year for social and economic welfare and to restore full employment.

Base defense appropriations on security needs, not "predetermined budgets."

Provide Federal aid to schools and colleges; Federal construction grants to schools of at least $1 billion a year for 10 years; Federal scholarships and fellowships to "several hundred thousand talented students."

Expand Federal programs of urban development and housing, including a 10-year program of not less than $500 million yearly to aid cities in such development.

Expand program of economic aid to underdeveloped countries; authorize a special loan of about $600 million to India.

Provide for a meaningful Trade Agreements Act—a long-term program with adequate provisions for the assistance and redeployment of companies and workers who are injured by the expansion of American imports; authorize United States membership in OTC.

Create a Presidential committee to investigate national defense.

Create a special agency with responsibility for an expanded program of basic research.

Pass additional civil-rights legislation authorizing the Government to seek injunctions to prevent violations of civil rights.

But to help the little man the ADA would have us reduce taxes at the same time. Remember the $20-tax cut, which the gentleman voted for? How consistent is the position of voting for bigger expenditures and for tax cuts simultaneously? Obviously, being consistently for the ADA program is not being consistent. So, who is consistent?

Now when the aims of the ADA are totaled, the question keeps popping up—Wherein do the aims of the ADA differ from the aims of socialism?

Certainly, I recognize the right of the gentleman to believe in the ADA program, but by the same token, he must permit me the right to my viewpoint. Obviously there is a vast difference in viewpoints. Could this difference be at the bottom of the attack? The gentleman has not attacked those who make far greater use of the RECORD to expound a viewpoint more in accord with the ADA's and with his own. Whatever his reason, there is no justification for misrepresentations, surely. Where is the fair play and respect for the other man's right to his viewpoint, when such fallacious attacks are made?

Is it wrong for me to oppose the ADA program in my voting record—by striving for a balanced budget, by attempting to restrain and reduce growing Federal Government? As I reason it, reducing Government size, hence cost, is the only way to get a legitimate, fiscally sound tax cut. Is this an inconsistent goal? Is this uneconomical? Further, the gentleman can hardly condemn my right to believe in and work to get government out of business operations and to revise our confiscatory progressive income tax, in an effort to foster and encourage initiative and enterprise. As I see it, it is no longer a case of, to quote the gentlemen, "Government works for the benefit of the people" but rather of the people working for the Government, as they all do, from 20 percent to 91 percent of their time, depending on their respective brackets. As I see it, my viewpoint stems from basic American philosophy, achieved through struggle, trial and error on this continent, and in adherence to these principles lies the strength and preservation of this great Nation. These are traditional American ideas before they are Republican, Democrat, or Independent. Adherence to ideas and concepts is, to us all, surely more important than adherence to a tag. These concepts, in which I believe, are most certainly not ADA ideas. Does this irritate the gentleman?

There is another yardstick that measures the gulf between us. I refer to the adherence to the program demanded by organized labor's dictatorial leaders, who are now telling Members of Congress how to legislate in all fields, and pretty well succeeding in getting their way. Here again the two gentlemen are as far apart as possible. A quick reference to the booklet all Members received, entitled "The AFL–CIO Looks at the 85th Congress," is a real eye opener. The legislative demands of this group, all clearly laid out, would add ten to fifteen billions to our budget this year, regardless of national defense, and this program, they firmly state, they will insist the Members consider and adopt. At the same time, the demand is made for tax cuts. Consistent? Hardly. Judging from past Congresses, they will succeed, partially at least, in having their program adopted. Again, I cannot find the difference between these demands and the goals of socialism. With Mr. Reuther behind the labor program, my concern over the success of socialism is even greater, since his socialistic beliefs are quite well known.

Again look at the gulf between us. Based on his voting record, which of labor's programs has the gentleman opposed? Recently, a prominent labor leader passing through Dallas claimed that the Dallas Member was "the worst Congressman up there." To this and to my colleague I ask, "Where now is the independent free collective bargaining beliefs of Sam Gompers, the daddy of American labor, who warned against Government entanglement or anything but 'voluntarism' in the labor movement?" For my part, I believe in preserving the freedom of the workingman, including protection from the dictatorial labor boss, who deducts from the pay check as he sees fit, uses others' money to support political candidates, who hires or fires at will, and, through physical and financial intimidation, succeeds in accomplishing questionable goals, goals which are not always those of the union members. So I believe that a Member of Congress must stand up to these labor leaders or to any pressure group that would ask for legislation not in the national interest. Again, the gulf between the two Members is easily discernible.

Then there is the Congressional Quarterly's economy box score. The gentleman from California was opposed to economy 81 percent of the time, while the gentleman from Texas was for economy 89 percent of the time, again just the opposite. Is being consistently for spending more of the taxpayers' money a worthy goal?

Now, back to the starting point. The gentleman claims that "a vocal oligarchy prides itself in controlling Dallas County" and that the gentleman from Texas is a part of that high oligarchy. Could be this is a reflection of the gentleman's own situation? It does not apply to the Fifth District of Texas.

A rudimentary appraisal of the Dallas situation will show that I was elected much to the surprise of most, certainly the well-entrenched. It was called a fluke by some. Then 2 years later, opposed by the local district attorney a well-known and well-liked county official, I again won, although national magazines and other prognosticators claimed I would not be reelected. My point is simply this: If ever a Member came to Congress under fortunate circumstances, it was I. I was uncontrolled and uncontrolling, with nothing expected but conscientious performance in the tradition of States rights and local responsibilities; not favoring anybody or any group, just looking after the national interest for this particular Congressional District. So the remarks of the gentleman came with poor grace and, again, great inaccuracy. Whoever provided the advice and the research did the gentleman a great disservice. I cannot believe the gentleman did this alone.

By the way, the oligarchy I represent is 850,000 people—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—200,000 of whom voted, giving me a 21,000 majority. Yes, they are nice, friendly, cordial people, as the gentleman surprisingly described them, and they deserve better treatment than this attack upon them.

Unfortunately, I cannot take credit for all the Federal programs and moneys benefiting Dallas which the gentleman seeks to bestow upon me. They were started before my time. I will admit to a certain frustration. Having been dropped squarely into a hodgepodge of New Deal, Fair Deal, and modern legislation, I am aware of the difficulty of returning to the kind of Government I understand to be described in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. But, believe me, I am a long way from giving up the fight.

As for the people of Dallas, their reactions may be summarized by humorous sidewalk talk following the attack, the gist of which is: The liberals will give ALGER credit for the programs of moneys, and the conservatives will applaud the effort to maintain States rights against Federal encroachment. There it is—an ironic twist of fate, that the charge of

inconsistency, no matter how ridiculous, now may well work for me. Perhaps I should invite the gentleman to speak in my District.

This reminds me of the gracious and sincere offer made to me by an outspoken Democrat Member of this House, whom you all know well. "I'll come down to your district, BRUCE, and speak for you or against you, whichever will help you the most."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, did either the Democratic Senators from Texas or any Member of the House vote against these things that he is complaining about, that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. ALGER. That is an interesting question. I leave it to my colleagues to answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to have the gentleman's comments as to how they voted on this proposition.

Mr. ALGER. As the gentleman knows, The Texas Senators are quite liberal. I shall not at this time speak for my Texas delegation.

To conclude, it is gratifying to me to tell you of the sincere offer made to me by a gentleman on the other side of the aisle whom I admire; he said to me: "BRUCE, I will come down to your District and talk for you or against you, whichever will help you most."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. SISK. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that he refers to a couple of comments I made. Certainly they are not anti-ALGER; and I, particularly at this time, wish to commend the gentleman on a great defense of his area and of his city and of his county. I think that is worthy of any of us who are here representing a district, to defend the district from which we come; and certainly I want to commend him for a very fine statement here to the House on behalf of his people.

I do hope that the gentleman understands that the remarks which I placed in the RECORD were not anti-ALGER; they were not anti-Dallas, or they were not anti-Texas. As I said, because of certain questions that had been asked me with reference to whether Dallas County received any benefits from Federal money, I felt it was well that the record be set straight. As the gentleman has already indicated, I appreciate that I made some three or four corrections in the RECORD after the original figures were submitted. I might say that those corrections were made after the Department which had given the figures originally called up and said:

We are sorry, we are in error; there are some errors.

I have a letter from the Department of Agriculture in particular with reference to that particular area.

So I was most happy to set the record straight in that particular instance.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman feel that he has set the record straight in view of what I just said?

Mr. SISK. Yes; I believe the gentleman did not question the new figures which I indicated here. Is that correct?

Mr. ALGER. I questioned them exceedingly. I do not think the gentleman heard my remarks. Did the gentleman collect these figures or did he have help?

Mr. SISK. I might say to the gentleman if he is compiling statistics in order to make the rather lengthy talk he made here today, is it not the usual procedure for his staff to do some of the work? I might say to the gentleman I personally did not do all the work. In fact, I would like to say that every figure used in this statement came directly from the department affected; so if those figures are in error, then they were given in error by the particular department.

Mr. ALGER. I understood that some of the figures came through colleagues of the gentleman and I could not help but feel that the gentleman had even further help. From whom?

Mr. SISK. I did not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. ALGER. Copies of a statement were circulated in my District. I do not know how many there were. Many were returned to my office. The envelopes were Government, they were stamped and obviously sent from up here. Would the gentleman like to comment on that?

Mr. SISK. I assure the gentleman I did not mail out to his District a single copy of this particular statement. The gentleman mentioned about staying in his District. I have had an invitation to come down to Dallas to speak.

Mr. ALGER. Let me second that invitation, and I hope the gentleman will.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the invitation also on behalf of the gentleman. Actually, I only have one question. The gentleman [illegible] a statement which indicated th[illegible] I had made a rather low attack upon [illegible] in his reference to being attacked in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I realize the situation involved in that particular statement. But in view of the fact this statement, outside of modifications which were made to it at the last minute, was prepared, I will say, on the 14th of August for delivery on this floor, I made an attempt to contact the gentleman because I certainly proposed to give him a copy of the statement. But I was unable to locate him. Can the gentleman tell me where he was?

Mr. ALGER. Having been separated from my family and children for a great part of the year, and having a 98-plus percent attendance record, I chose to leave in the few closing days of Congress to be with my children before they returned to school. Obviously the leadership was in no hurry to adjourn and the fall school term was approaching. Does the gentleman take issue with that?

Mr. SISK. I do not take issue with that.

Will the gentleman yield to me for a statement?

Mr. ALGER. I have answered the gentleman's question. He knows where I was and was glad to attack me in my absence. Permit me to yield to these other gentlemen.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to comment on the remarks made by the gentleman from California, who seemed to imply that he himself had not ordered these copies. I am advised that only a Member making the remarks can place an order for the copies. I think the RECORD ought to show that another Member of Congress cannot order copies of some other Member's remarks and send them out. So the order must have been placed by the gentleman from California or else he does not understand the procedures used here in the House.

Mr. ALGER. I can only say that the gentleman from California has said he did not. Is that correct?

Mr. SISK. I said I did not mail out the reprints. I think the RECORD will show exactly what my statement was. I made the statement I did not mail a single copy.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman from California explain to us who paid for the copies? How many did he order? Who paid for them ?

Mr. SISK. The gentleman from California has no comment on that particular point.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Could it be construed that the gentleman is taking the fifth amendment in this particular case?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. The gentleman from California very clearly stated that the statements he made in the RECORD last year were not anti-ALGER or anti-Dallas. Well, if they were not that, as they are indicated to be, why did he put them there in the first place? That is one question to which he might favor us with an answer.

No. 2: May I commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] from the Fifth District. He is the lone Republican from that State, and maybe it sticks in the craw of some Democrats. That is perfectly all right. That is political. But let us recognize it as that. But, from the observations we have had of the gentleman's work in Congress, he has been independent, he has been fearless, and he is the kind of Member of Congress we ought to have more of, and I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. As I understand the basis for the criticism by the gentleman from California, it is to the effect that the Congressional District represented by the gentleman from Texas participated in all these Federal programs in spite of

the voting position which the gentleman from Texas took; is that correct?

Mr. ALGER. That is my understanding.

Mr. BENTLEY. It seems to me, if that line of reasoning were pursued, the gentleman, for example, if he voted against the extension of selective service, his constituents could be subject to the claim of being in the status of conscientious objectors. Regardless of that, I want to commend the gentleman also on his very able representation since the time he has been here for his city and the Congressional District as a whole. The best answer that can be given to the gentleman from California at this particular moment would be, in the words of the gentleman from Texas, if he would care to inform the House as to his voting majority in the election of 1954 and 1956, if he has those figures available.

Mr. ALGER. Is the gentleman asking the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BENTLEY. Yes.

Mr. ALGER. I had a 3,000 majority out of 53,000 in 1954, which was 53 percent, and in the last election I had 56 percent.

Mr. BENTLEY. I think those figures speak for themselves.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to commend the gentleman for taking the floor in this forthright and temperate manner in setting the RECORD straight, and stating facts, and I hope the gentleman from California, when he takes the floor in his 15 minutes, will make these additional corrections of fact. There is plenty of room on the floor of the House for honest argument, and this business of indulging in erroneous information and facts is something that should not be indulged in.

The second point I would like to make—and I hope the gentleman from California will bear this in mind, and I hope others in the House will, too—if there is going to be a personal attack against any Member it should not be done in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I can assure you of this, if the gentleman from Texas were not present here all the gentleman from California had to do was contact any number of Members on this side of the aisle, and they would have seen to it that at least his point of view was represented on the floor of the House, where, if erroneous information was given, it could be corrected at that time. Nothing can undo the damage, if it was damage, of sending out erroneous information into the gentleman's District. Again, I want to commend him for his courage and his moderation in meeting this uncalled-for attack. And, I might say, he turned his other cheek, as it were, by notifying not only the gentleman from California that he was going to take the floor today but also the members of the California and Texas delegations. I understand they were notified.

Mr. ALGER. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I rise for the purpose of commending the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. I know he has the complete sympathy and support of all his colleagues. I want to say that in my terms here in the Congress I know of no individual who has come here who has exercised his duties with greater courage and devotion and who has been more faithful to his task than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. He is a real Member of the Congress.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], with his statement today, with his voting record, with his fearlessness has, I am sure, convinced all of us here, as well as his constituents and the people of this country that they are well and ably represented in this body. His speech, his action, and his ability have served all of us as an inspiration.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on a very fine, courageous and forthright statement and to say that it is illustrative of the type of service the gentleman has given. I would say, as far as I am concerned, that this grieves me rather deeply because I have known the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] and have worked with him and we have quite a bit in common. It seems to me that the gentleman from California, having stated that these figures came from the departments should now produce the letters from these departments giving him the figures which were included in the study printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD originally concerning the record of the gentleman from Texas. It seems to me that if those figures were given by the departments, any of the departments would be perfectly willing to substantiate those figures with letters and they should be made available to the Congress.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. This information would be of help.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am grieved, and a bit nonplussed. Having served on the same committee with the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] I cannot quite imagine that the statements which were put in the RECORD came from him. They sound more like something that would have come from Mr. Butler or those who financially and otherwise support the radical elements of the Democratic Party for the accomplishment of purposes which they could not accomplish directly.

Mr. Speaker, I rise not to commend the gentleman for a great job of defense. To me, when a person is right, the best defense is an attack. So I rise to commend him for a great attack, in his usual fashion, not for the purposes of the ADA, but for the purposes of those Democrats, Republicans, and Independents who stand for Americanism.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] did not express the viewpoint of most of us in California. Of course, we are used to Texans claiming everything for themselves that is bigger and better. I notice that the gentleman claims that California gets bigger and better Federal grants, and that is probably the case. But as a Californian I want to say that we feel that in the case of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], he is the biggest and the best; the biggest and the best statesman, the biggest and the best man with the courage to stand up and vote his convictions. I would like to say to him that we in California are proud of him for standing by his convictions in the manner in which he has done that.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to leave just this thought. I want the gentleman from California to know that his statement forced my answer to protect the people of my District. Further, I have much more material which I will gladly get into the RECORD to bolster my side of this argument, if the gentleman sees fit to continue his attack against Dallas County. There are other comparative studies of interest. I feel sure he will correct the RECORD. I am, frankly, a little bit disappointed and I am saying it to him personally, that he did not retract some of the figures which are so much in error. Possibly he will do so later.

## SUMMIT MEETING PITFALLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not been known as an advocate of, or apologist for, the foreign policy espoused by Secretary of State Dulles because I have always felt that too much of the foreign policy of our Republican administration was but a continuation of the bankrupt foreign policies of the Truman-Acheson era. However, I personally enthusiastically endorse the course of action being followed by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in opposing any present summit meeting with the Russian dictatorship unless, and until, sufficient preliminary talks and agreements are arrived at by lower level discussions so as to insure some bene-

ficial results from such a summit meeting. Otherwise, we will again be the victims and dupes of Communist propaganda.

About a month ago, Prime Minister MacMillan of England urged a nonaggression pact between East and West and he hedged his thought by saying—

> But peace cannot be secured just by words * * * we need deeds as well.

This call for a summit conference by MacMillan seems to me to have raised a lot of false hopes in the minds and hearts of the rank and file of citizens. These false hopes were further encouraged when certain Democrats in Congress and in the Democratic Party leadership have let it be known that the time has now arrived to negotiate with the Russian Communists. This same argument has been repeatedly revived by Democrats ever since they first recognized Russia in 1933, in spite of the fact that the Russian Communist leaders have repeatedly broken their solemn pledges and treaties.

But these revived Democrat hopes for a peace agreement, at least in the foreseeable future, are at complete variance with any expectations based on past experience. We must apply the wisdom of mankind, as it was so aptly stated by Benjamin Franklin in his Poor Richard's Almanac in 1743 when he said:

> Experience keeps a dear school, yet fools will learn in no other.

These Democrats who choose to ignore the facts of experience ought first to listen to their former standard bearer, Harry Truman, who, only this month, stated:

> I have had some experience with the makers of Kremlin policy. I have had reason to have little faith in the promises of Communist leaders.
>
> But we should meet with the Russians only if our friends and allies of NATO are in full agreement with us that the Russians were making a concrete and useful step toward peace and control of arms.

These Democrats who are raising false hopes for peace in the hearts of the people ought to first heed the advice of the former Ambassador to Russia, now the Democrat Governor of New York, who was at most of the conferences between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin. During the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, I was cross-examining Mr. Harriman and asked him:

> In the light of your experiences in all of the negotiations with Russia and the agreements she has not kept, especially the political agreements, in your judgment should we keep on making agreements with somebody who does not want to perform?

Mr. Harriman replied:

> I do not think any agreements with the Soviet Union are of any value, unless they are based on a position of strength, so that they can be forced to carry them out.

And Mr. Harriman further said:

> I think we want to get to the day as rapidly as we can when the Free World is so strong that we can compel the Soviet Union to live up to its obligations.

Here are the thoughts and testimony of the two members of the Democrat Party who have had the most intimate contacts with Russian diplomacy and their advice is "no dice." Many other Democrats could be called upon to verify our sad experience with Russian double-talk and broken agreements. Yet, it still seems that many members of the Democrat Party want our fingers to be burned again in trying to handle Russian promises.

Secretary Dulles recently wrote that the Communists in Korea have violated every provision of the Korean peace agreement "except the one provision that we enforce; namely, that they shall not advance militarily beyond the armistice line." In other words, Dulles proves the thoughts advanced by Averell Harriman that the Russians will only honor agreements which we ourselves can enforce.

To hold out to our own people the forlorn hope that summit talks, without all of the safeguards and provisions laid down by President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles, might be fruitful for world peace would be asking the people to follow a modern Pied Piper who would bring on our destruction. A new round of summit talks without adequate preparation and safeguards would, in my estimation, add to the already overburdened record of broken promises. Fifty-two major agreements were made between Soviet Russia and the United States between 1933 and the summit meeting in Geneva in 1955. The record shows 50 of the 52 agreements were broken. The only two agreements honored were Russia's coming into the war against Japan and the letting of our planes into West Berlin.

History has proven Japan sought Russia's help as a peace negotiator many months before the official armistice. Russia knew this and did not inform the United States. Just several weeks before the end, Russia entered the war and gained all of China.

Russia permitted our air lift operations to West Berlin because she knew we meant business and were in a position of strength.

Russia, by her use of the veto on 82 different occasions in the Security Council of the United Nations, has effectively, and I think maliciously, stopped the growth of any universal collective-security system. How can any sane person feel that all these Russian tactics will now suddenly change for the better.

President Eisenhower pointed out, in his recent letter to Bulganin, that the two main agreements arrived at in the 1955 Geneva summit conference, which Russia solemnly pledged to carry out, were broken.

Russia did not attempt to settle the German question and the reunification of Germany, and has continued to deny the countries of Eastern Europe the right to choose the form of government they want. Secondly, at Geneva, Russia promised to participate in a high level peace conference and finally boldly wrecked that conference.

Whether the Russian officials sign promises or agreements in 1933 or 1955, the end results are the same—broken agreements. In light of all this experience, why continue to bounce our collective heads against the Soviet brick wall of fickleness?

And I do not mean to limit these observations between the years 1933 to 1955. In 1955, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, under Democrat leadership, reported in a staff study that, for the 38 years the Soviet Union had been in existence "its Government has broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise. It keeps no international promises at all unless doing so is clearly advantageous to the Soviet Union."

Yet, I can anticipate the thoughts of certain individuals who might want to hold out hope that the Russian Communist philosophy is or will undergo a change. Lenin, the main spawn in this materialistic-atheistic philosophy, said:

> As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph.

At a Polish Embassy reception on last November 18, Nikita Khrushchev told Western diplomats "we will bury you," thus giving the world proof that the original aims of communistic world socialization and domination remain the same through the years.

On November 21 last year, the Communist Party leaders of the world released a joint communique revealing the identity of views of the party leaders. The joint communique, at one part, declares the basis of the foreign policy of the socialist countries which was "that the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of the two systems" be the guiding principle to develop world peace and friendship.

Now this certainly sounds like sweet music to the ears of those looking for the faintest glimmers of peace. But when one reads further in this Communist communique, he discovers how the Communists define peaceful coexistence.

The communique tells of world transition to socialism and every effort to "unite a majority of the people, to win state power without civil war and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people, and decisively rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and the landlords, and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the socialist revolution."

But what happens if the Communists do not obtain their ends by peaceful realization? Then the communique boldly and candidly outlines a nonpeaceful or war transition. Here is the exact language:

> In the event of the ruling classes resorting to violence against people, the possibility of nonpeaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance

put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism.

As much as I personally am devoted to peace, and I know the greatest majority of Americans and people throughout the world fervently want peace, I am firmly convinced that a summit meeting at the present time would only be of propaganda value to the Communist cause. Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower are to be commended for maintaining their principles and there should be no immediate meeting of the heads of state unless and until there have been preliminary discussions, meetings and agreements between the staffs and the foreign minister levels. This course of action, in my humble opinion, can best protect the American people and the world against our country being used as a propaganda pawn in the Russian Communist game for the destruction of liberty, freedom, and capitalism.

## PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, press accounts indicate that racial crime and violence is running rampant in the public schools of New York City. It is interesting to note in this connection, also, that practically all organizations which constantly agitate for so-called civil-rights legislation and compulsory school integration have their headquarters in New York City.

While these organizations are constantly lobbying Congress and distributing bales of propaganda in behalf of racial amalgamation, schoolchildren are being stabbed, raped, mugged, and beaten under their doorsteps. The incidence of racial crime and violence in New York City has become so widespread that it appears to be accepted as commonplace. It is a fact of life that I am certain must be of grave concern to the decent and law-abiding citizens of that great city, and one which they must regard as shameful and disgraceful.

Mr. Speaker, in my much maligned and segregated State of Mississippi, racial harmony prevails. Except for routine traffic duties, it has not been necessary, within my memory, for policemen to be assigned to duty at any of our public schools, white or Negro.

By contrast, the press reports that public-school principals in New York City not only request police protection within and outside the school buildings; but, in addition, have requested grand jury investigations of violence occurring on the school grounds. A grand jury foreman has even suggested publicly that parents keep their children at home and out of school until order is restored and the students can be furnished protection from violence.

Mr. Speaker, very seldom are the American people given the facts through the metropolitan press about racial violence at integrated schools outside the South. However, the tragic suicide of a frustrated Brooklyn junior high school principal earlier this week apparently shocked some of the metropolitan papers into reporting at least a portion of this violence. Even so, the highly touted New York Times, which purports to print "all the news that's fit to print" carefully avoided printing the racial identification of the parties involved when a partially blind 13-year-old white girl was brutally ravished by a 15-year-old Negro youth in the basement of John Marshall Junior High School. Instead of attempting to force school integration in States where experience has proved it impractical, these agitating organizations and newspapers would render a greater service by acknowledging the fact that racial differences among people do exist, and that social intermingling of the races cannot be accomplished by force and against the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, racial crimes and lawlessness in New York's public schools have created a more serious threat to the peace of that community than was experienced at Little Rock High School.

There is no comparison between Little Rock and Brooklyn, inasmuch as no students have been raped in Little Rock, no students have been stabbed in Little Rock, no students have beaten up teachers, and there are no organized criminal gangs roaming the streets of Little Rock. All of these things are apparently daily occurrences in Brooklyn.

Where are the bleeding heart editorials requesting Presidential action to restore peace and order? Who have heard the protests of eastern politicians, including Messrs. Brownell, Harriman, Wagner. Strangely, these people, who were so vociferous during the Little Rock episode, are now silent as the tomb.

Where are the paratroopers? Why is it that the President has not federalized the New York National Guard? Are our armed services to be used solely against the southern people to make sure that the President's private definition of "peace and order" is achieved? Will the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Staff send orders alerting riot troops in and around New York, or are those orders reserved exclusively for southern schools?

Law and order in New York City has obviously broken down and city officials appear unable to cope with the situation. Why has there not been a demand for Federal action?

Regardless of the tragic situation in Brooklyn, I personally hope that the President will not compound his Little Rock blunder by sending troops to Brooklyn—at least until he has been requested to do so by the legislature or governor as the Constitution requires.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include several recent newspaper items carrying reports of this violence:

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1958]

HEAD OF SCHOOL BESET BY CRIME LEAPS TO DEATH—BROOKLYN PRINCIPAL HAD BEEN SCHEDULED TO TESTIFY ON VIOLENCE BY STUDENTS

(By Emanuel Perlmutter)

The principal of a Brooklyn public school that has been beset by juvenile crime committed suicide yesterday.

George Goldfarb, 55-year-old head of John Marshall Junior High School, plunged to his death from the roof of the six-story apartment house in which he lived at 201 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn.

His body was found at 11:50 a. m. in a rear courtyard. He was to have appeared at 10 a. m. for the third time before a special Kings County grand jury that has been investigating violence in Brooklyn schools. Mr. Goldfarb had newspaper clippings in his wallet relating to the inquiry.

TESTIFIED LAST WEEK

Mr. Goldfarb testified before the grand jury last Thursday, 2 days after a 13-year-old girl reported that she had been raped in the basement of the school by a 15-year-old youth. The school is at Park Place and Rochester Avenue in Crown Heights. It is almost equally divided between white and Negro pupils.

At that time, Mr. Goldfarb was reported to have told the jurors that he would like to have a policeman stationed inside his school. A patrolman had been on guard outside at the time of the attack.

There has been a continuing controversy between the grand jury and the board of education over the jurors' demand that policemen be stationed in the city's schools. The board has opposed the assignments.

POLICE RECEIVE LETTER

It was disclosed last night that Mr. Goldfarb, perhaps in the last letter he wrote, had notified the police that he wanted a policeman stationed inside his school. The letter was mailed Monday night and reached the police yesterday morning.

When William Jansen, superintendent of schools, was told about this he said the board of education "would certainly have approved his request."

The suicide occurred as the jurors were meeting to hear County Court Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz read two letters saying that violence existed at Public School 67 and a probation report that indicated an assistant principal had sought a new assignment because of teen-age gang threats.

When notified of Mr. Goldfarb's death, A. George Golden, foreman of the grand jury, said the jurors would call in board of education officials to learn whether the principal had been under pressure or had been threatened with disciplinary action by his superiors because of his testimony.

Mr. Golden said the jurors felt "much concerned" and "very sorry" over Mr. Goldfarb's death.

Charles H. Silver, president of the board of education, issued the following statement:

"This is a tragic situation which, we are sure, saddens everyone. There is no doubt that the recent unfortunate events, plus the subsequent pressures on him as a result of these events, contributed in a great measure to Mr. Goldfarb's decision.

"We see here that tragedy can breed more tragedy through hastily conceived action, regardless of how worth while the motives.

In behalf of the entire board of education, I express our deep sympathy to the bereaved family."

The rape reported on Tuesday that resulted in Mr. Goldfarb's appearance before the grand jury was followed on Thursday by two other incidents involving violence. Patrolman Thomas Fleming, on duty outside the school, was punched by 1 of 6 youths he ordered not to loiter around the building. Later, the school's recreation director was assaulted by a youth in the basement of the school.

---

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1958]

JUNIOR HIGH BESET BY RECENT CRIME—SCHOOL HEADED BY PRINCIPAL IN SUICIDE HAD NOT BEEN CONSIDERED DIFFICULT

(By Leonard Buder)

Time and again, George Goldfarb, principal of John Marshall Junior High School in Brooklyn, who committed suicide yesterday, would admonish his pupils to steer clear of trouble.

"If you mind your business," he would say, "nothing will happen."

But in the last 8 days Mr. Goldfarb found that no matter how he tried he could not keep trouble away from his school. A flurry of incidents turned the school, in the public eye, into a blackboard jungle—a symbol of rampant violence in the schools.

Up until the first incident—the reported rape of a 13-year-old girl—John Marshall Junior High School was just another one of the city's more than 800 public schools. In fact, it was considered to be better off than many other junior high schools.

Situated in the ethnically changing Crown Heights section, at Park Place and Rochester Avenue, the school is not classified as difficult according to the board-of-education standards. Almost one-third of all junior high schools and one-quarter of the elementary schools are officially considered to be difficult.

SCHOOL HAS 1,200 PUPILS

John Marshall, which also carries the numerical designation of Junior High School 210, has 1,200 pupils enrolled in grades 7 through 9. Its pupils are mostly 13 to 15 years old. Educators generally consider this age group to be the most difficult of all.

The family backgrounds of the students cover a wide social and economic range. However, there is an unmistakable downtrend. In recent years many of the neighborhood's once-fashionable homes have been converted into multiple dwellings to house the influx of low-income residents.

The school's student body reflects the community—45 percent is Negro, 10 percent is Puerto Rican, and the rest is mainly white. The school has always taken pride in its integrated enrollment. This term the president of the student government is a Chinese-American, the vice president is of Polish extraction, the secretary is Jewish, and the treasurer is Negro. The school's active parents' association has a white president and a Negro vice president.

Unlike many other city schools, John Marshall has no problem of overcrowding and no double or triple sessions. It presents a full academic program, including instruction in three foreign languages. Its classes for intellectually gifted children attract pupils from other schools in the area. Twenty-five student clubs attest the interest the youngsters and teachers have in extracurricular affairs.

BUILDING BEING RENOVATED

From the physical standpoint, the school is regarded as being in pretty good shape for a building that is more than 30 years old. It is now being renovated and repainted.

But the school has its troubles, too, and they were apparent even before last week's incidents. A small, tough element of student troublemakers has been causing concern for some years, according to one school official.

In addition, as is true in many other schools in difficult areas, the school has suffered from occasional invasions by troublemakers from the general community. The assaults last Thursday on a patrolman and a recreational leader at the school were by teen-age boys who were not pupils there.

"All in all," a school spokesman said yesterday, "Mr. Goldfarb felt that he was bringing the problem under control. He seemed to be on top of the situation."

Yesterday, however, Mr. Goldfarb leaped six floors to his death.

---

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1958]

TWO HIGH-SCHOOL GIRLS STABBED IN BROOKLYN—FIVE BOYS SEIZED IN ATTACK AT SUBWAY STOP

Two teen-age girls were stabbed in the back yesterday as they were changing trains at Franklin Avenue and Fulton Street, Brooklyn. The girls were on their way home after examinations at Bishop McDonnell Memorial High School.

They were taken to Kings County Hospital, where their wounds were described as not serious. Both were discharged 7 hours later.

Within minutes after the stabbing, a policeman who had seen a disturbance at the corner seized 5 youths, 14 to 16 years old.

The police believed that the youths had been drinking wine. Last night a search was under way for the person who had given it to them.

Yesterday was a between-sessions day at the Roman Catholic school for girls at Classon Avenue and Eastern Parkway. According to Rev. William J. Cavanaugh, principal, the students took tests and were measured for uniforms. When the girls were finished, they were dismissed.

A group of girls boarded the Franklin Avenue elevated shuttle near the school, as they usually did. The line ends at Franklin Avenue and Fulton Street, where the girls transfer to the IND Lefferts Avenue line.

The police reported that as the girls reached the street, they were accosted by the youths, who demanded money. The girls ignored them and started for the subway steps. Two believed they had been punched in the lower back. At the change booth, they discovered they had been stabbed.

The girls are Katherine Guilfoyle, 17 years old, of 160 Hendrix Street, Brooklyn, and Sharon Gallagher, 15, 87-35 115th Street, Richmond Hill, Queens. They were taken to the hospital. The other girls in the group were not hurt.

Meanwhile, Patrolman Carlton Irish, of the Brooklyn Juvenile Aid Bureau, saw the commotion. The policemen of the Grand Avenue precinct had been instructed to give special attention to the corner because of previous incidents.

Patrolman Irish saw five youths walking away and halted them as they sought to get away. Among the five the police found two knives longer than a penknife and a razor blade.

One boy was identified by a victim as her attacker, and other girls said all five boys were in the group.

---

[From the Washington Daily News of January 29, 1958]

NEW YORK SCHOOL VIOLENCE RIDDEN—PRINCIPAL KILLS HIMSELF

NEW YORK, January 29.—A grand jury investigating violence in schools prepared today to question board of education officials about pressure on a principal who committed suicide shortly before he was to have testified a third time about juvenile crime in his school.

The principal, George Goldfarb, 55, of John Marshall Junior High School in Brooklyn, jumped from his apartment house roof yesterday. He had been scheduled to appear a few hours later at his own request before a Kings County grand jury that has been looking into lawlessness in Brooklyn public schools.

Mr. Goldfarb's school has been the scene of a rape and 3 assaults in the last 8 weeks. A member of the school system 33 years and John Marshall principal since 1954, he was reported greatly disturbed by publicity resulting from the grand-jury investigation.

IN THE MIDDLE

He also was caught in the middle of a controversy between the grand jury and the New York Board of Education over proposals to assign policemen to violence-ridden schools. The grand jury three times has handed up presentments calling for such action. The school board has called the proposal unthinkable.

But some relaxation of the board's stand was indicated yesterday with disclosure that Superintendent of Schools William Jansen is notifying all principals that they may have a policeman stationed inside their schools if they request one. It is up to each principal, Mr. Jansen said.

Jury Foreman A. George Golden said the jury would call in higher ups of the board of education to ask whether the principal had been under pressure or had been threatened with disciplinary action for aiding the grand jury. He said Mr. Goldfarb had been exceedingly cooperative.

The principal, whose school has 1,214 pupils of whom 45 percent are colored and 10 percent Puerto Rican, told the grand jury he would like to have a policeman stationed in his school and requested one in a letter received Monday by police.

Mr. Goldfarb's suicide focused attention on teen-age violence that has included these incidents:

VIOLENCE

Five colored youths who police said were pretty high after drinking wine stabbed two high school girls on their way home in a Brooklyn subway station yesterday. The girls were hospitalized but not seriously injured.

A 13-year-old girl, partly blind and unable to identify her attacker, was raped in the basement of John Marshall Junior High last week.

At the same school, 1 of 6 boys loitering outside attacked a policeman when he told them to move on; 2 teen-agers beat an after-school recreation leader; and 2 boys attacked a third with a shovel handle and a knife.

Police charged two teen-agers with murdering a 21-year-old gang member.

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 30, 1958]

SCHOOL OFFICIALS BLAME SUICIDE ON THREAT BY JUROR—"A LIE," SAYS JURY CHIEF IN RETORT—WAGNER AWAITS DATA ON CRIME

(By Judith Crist)

Charles S. Silver, president of the board of education, said yesterday that a grand juror's threat of possible indictment had probably caused George Goldfarb, principal of a Brooklyn junior high school, to commit suicide Tuesday.

The charge, supported by Superintendent of Schools William Jansen, who said he knew of at least one other case of schoolmen being threatened by the jurors, brought a heated

denial from A. George Golden, foreman of the jury which is investigating crime in the schools.

Mr. Golden described Mr. Silver's remark as follows:

"A lie, made up out of his own mind to befuddle the public."

Mr. Golden accused school officials of answering every jury action with deliberate lies.

Mr. Silver refused further comment.

Dr. Jansen said succinctly: "I have not lied," as the long-brewing warfare between the board and the jury burst into vituperation. Mayor Wagner reiterated his confidence in the way the board of education and the police department have been handling crime in the city schools and said he expected a full report on the situation today from Deputy Mayor John J. Theobald.

Yesterday the mayor conferred briefly and generally with Dr. Jansen by telephone. Mr. Theobald, superintendent-elect to succeed Dr. Jansen on July 1, conferred with the superintendent at board headquarters, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, for 45 minutes in the afternoon. He said they talked about general problems and the immediate situation, but declined to elaborate on the latter phrase.

Mr. Silver made his charge of grand-jury threats yesterday afternoon at the funeral for George Goldfarb, 55, principal of John Marshall Junior High School, Brooklyn, who plunged to his death from the roof of his home Tuesday morning when he was to have made his third appearance before the Kings County grand jury.

At the junior high, Public School 210, a student was raped on a stairway on January 21 and 2 days later after school hours 3 teenagers, none a student, were arrested, 1 for assaulting a policeman in the schoolyard and 2 for attacking a recreation leader in the school basement. Mr. Goldfarb had appeared before the grand jury on January 21 and last Thursday and was recalled on Tuesday.

The board of education and the jury have been at loggerheads over the jury's demand that a patrolman be stationed in every troubled school. The board has established a policy, supported and implemented by the police department, of having the principal determine whether he needed a patrolman stationed in or outside the school. Yesterday a patrolman was posted inside Public School 210, as Mr. Goldfarb had requested on the day before his death.

Arriving at the Riverside Chapel, at Ocean Parkway and Park Circle, for the principal's funeral yesterday, Mr. Silver said to reporters, referring to Mr. Goldfarb's appearance before the jury and the board of education last Thursday:

"Several hours before he appeared before the grand jury, he came before the board of education. In discussing with us his grand jury interrogation, he said that a juror warned him that he might be and could be indicted. This probably caused him to take his life. He was very worried."

Dr. Jansen, who stood next to Mr. Silver, nodded his agreement. After the service, which was attended by about 500 school officials, teachers, students, friends, and relatives, Dr. Jansen was asked whether he knew of any other witnesses who had been threatened with indictment. He replied:

"I think there are some others, but I'm not sure. One other I know. I'll let you know in a day or two."

Informed of these comments, the jury foreman, Mr. Golden, a real-estate dealer, said:

"At no time since we were impaneled on November 6 has anyone been threatened in that grand-jury room with indictment or anything else. We have treated every official with respect and courtesy. We are not dealing with hoodlums and roughnecks, but with highly respected educators. We are trying to help the board of education. We are not trying to indict them.

"Mr. Silver's remark was a lie, made up out of his own mind to befuddle the public. In every one of our actions, they have answered with deliberate lies and remarks cast against our grand jury. It is a cry of 'witchhunt' reminiscent of former Mayor O'Dwyer."

He referred to former Mayor William O'Dwyer's characterization of a grand jury investigation of the Harry Gross bookmaking empire which involved many members of the police force.

Although officials declined to specify what threats of indictment schoolmen could face, it was noted that they could possibly be indicted for perjury. Or, as County Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz told the jury at its request, it could indict any school official who failed to take preventive measures before a crime was committed in a school and thereby willfully causes or permits the life of a child under 16 to be endangered.

## FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN DALLAS COUNTY, TEX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make just a few brief comments here in an attempt to clear the RECORD.

I wish to state in the very beginning to the gentleman from Texas, and may I say that I appreciate very much his remaining for these comments, that I stand ready and will be most happy to make any corrections which he can substantiate that show that my statement was in error. I make that statement publicly and I want to assure the gentleman that will be done. As I indicated before, the departments were contacted. Each of these figures were requested. They were furnished by the departments. If they are in error and the department can furnish corrected figures, I certainly will be the first to submit them. As the gentleman indicated, I have made some four corrections already, but no department has called to my attention that there are other errors in the RECORD. As I have indicated, however, the gentleman from California will make any needed corrections at the proper time because I have no intention of giving any incorrect data.

One further matter to which some rather great import seemed to be attached was made by some of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, and it had to do with certain reprints or certain copies that were mailed. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if there were reprints made?

Mr. ALGER. I believe that the word is "copies" and I must say to the gentleman I know nothing about the mechanics of this. We just received the returned mail because there was no return address on the Congressional envelopes from the House of Representatives that were sent out stamped.

Mr. SISK. In all fairness to the gentleman from Texas, I want to be sure that we understand each other. One of his colleagues, I think, made quite a to-do about certain reprints about which I know nothing. I want to know if a statement had been made that reprints had been made, and if so, I would challenge the statement that any reprints of this copy were made by the printer.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me, since I raised that question?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. It does not make too much difference to me what you call them, whether you call them copies or reprints. Would it help the gentleman any if I phrased the question: Who paid for the copies that were mailed? Would that help any or would the answer of the gentleman still be "No comment"?

Mr. SISK. Apparently, the gentleman is under the impression that there were some reprints made. I challenge the statement that reprints were made. Further, I will state to the gentleman I will be very happy to answer his question. The gentleman from California paid for no copies and paid for no reprints of this particular statement. Does that answer the gentleman?

Mr. CEDERBERG. No; it does not answer the question at all. Who did pay for them?

Mr. SISK. I have no idea. I have informed the gentleman that I did not order any reprints. I did not order any copies and I did not pay for any.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I was just wondering what California was doing in Texas politics.

Mr. SISK. I have no idea who mailed them out, I might say to the gentleman. Now I would like to set the record straight. I understand, of course, that some considerable to-do was made about voting averages, or percentages, in the last campaign or the campaign before that. I do not know how important that is here and I am certainly not here to blow my own horn. I admit that my first term here, I squeeked in by a very narrow margin. I think it was by about 53 percent of the votes. If it has any bearing on the type of job that we may be doing for our districts, I came back to the Congress in 1956 with 74 percent of the votes and with about a 70,000 vote majority. I am not here to crow about it or to brag about the situation, but apparently somebody in my district felt I was doing a fair job. I would like to discuss and make a few comments concerning the reference that was made to the ADA and to the position of certain labor organizations. I understand that I have a 100 percent rating with the ADA.

Mr. ALGER. I have the 3-year record here, I will say to the gentleman in case he would like to inspect it. You are 100 percent with them.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman. I do not deny it, but I personally was just not aware that they had come up with a recent record giving me a 100 percent rating. All I can say with reference to that is that apparently their position on major

legislation is pretty much in line with what the people across the country, and particularly in my district, are interested in. I do not take any orders from ADA. I have not received any direct communications from them. I do not happen to be a member of it, but if my vote happens to agree with them, that is fine with me, and I have no apology to make.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. Yes, I yield. The gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman speaks for his district certainly, and I would not criticize his right to his viewpoint, but the majority of the people in Dallas County elected the gentleman from Texas, and I do not think you speak for a majority of the country. I have the record here and I will give it to you. I have it for 3 years, the only years I have been here. I was not keeping this for the gentleman from California but only for my own information until the gentleman attacked me.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and I regret his statement that I attacked him. I would like to say that, irrespective of what interpretation he and others place upon it, if they interpret that as an attack that is up to them. I do not interpret that as an attack upon the gentleman from Texas, but in line with what I have been reading month after month in the RECORD, and the gentleman's own statements of his position on these issues, and as I stated a little while ago, people coming to me and saying, "Is it a fact that there are areas in the country that refuse to accept Federal assistance at all?" One particular question related to Dallas and Dallas County. I have a great deal of respect for that area. This is a bit off the subject, but I happened to go to school in an area very close to Dallas, more years ago than I would like to admit. We had boys come over to the dormitory from Dallas, and they were pretty nice fellows. We called them Big D in those days, because those boys had the biggest letter of any kind I had ever seen on a sweater. They were proud of Dallas. We were proud of the boys, because some of them were pretty good football players and we were happy to welcome them. So I am not trying to cast any reflection upon the people in the gentleman's district, but to call attention to the fact that they are apparently standing at the Federal trough all the way up to their ears and taking their share of all these programs. As a result, I decided it might be interesting to determine the amount of Federal aid Dallas County was receiving.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Does the gentleman remember one of the remarks I made, in which I flatly contradicted the Lovett vote for $26½ million? The gentleman should know this was a bond-issue affair and was not Federal money. How long do you think my newsletter was put in the RECORD, which you read so many times?

Mr. SISK. I do not recall, but I read it off and on for some time and it is interesting because it has a particular viewpoint.

Mr. ALGER. Let me say to the gentleman that the chamber of commerce and the people of Dallas and myself thank him for the assiduous attempt that he has accorded our district.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

The gentleman called attention to a correction which I put in the RECORD some weeks after the original statement, in which he indicated that I said that the corrections were of very little import, when actually the corrections specifically were of substantial quantities. I was referring to the fact that the corrections were very small percentagewise compared to the total, because the total figures which I had originally indicated in my statement amounted to $902 million, plus, of Federal moneys going into Dallas. After all the corrections which I have had called to my attention had been included, there was still a total of $885 million going into Dallas County.

I think in a way the gentleman is to be commended for apparently the amount of money he is able to get down there; and I might say that I was privileged, by the way, to get some excerpts from some of the Dallas papers after this was put in the RECORD. Some are very interesting, and there was a surprising amount of mail, by the way, that I received from Dallas. I will say not all in favor, but I will say not all unfavorable to him.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I do not know how much time I have left, but I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman is aware of the fact that there are some members of the Texas delegation other than the gentleman from Dallas, who happens to be a Republican. I happen to admire them a great deal because of the fact there are some I admire very much, such as the gentleman from Dallas. I wonder if the gentleman is considering inserting any other information regarding those Congressional districts, or is he fighting Dallas because Dallas is represented by a Republican?

Mr. SISK. I will say to the gentleman that at the present time I have not made up my mind on that.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? He indicated that he would yield to me.

Mr. SISK. Yes; I did promise the gentleman I would yield to him, and I do so at this time.

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on the procedure that is used, and I think it is a procedure to which many of us object, the procedure of obtaining unanimous consent in the well of the House to extend remarks and then putting in the RECORD statements derogatory of another Member whether that Member happens to be a Republican or a Democrat, whether he happens to be on my side of the aisle or the gentleman's side of the aisle.

I think a serious question of propriety is involved in the matter of inserting remarks of this nature under unanimous consent, and I hope that out of today's discussion will come some understanding that this kind of procedure will not be used again, particularly when the Member in question is not on the floor to object to the consent request, and particularly when the gentleman inserting the remarks does not advise anyone that derogatory statements are going to be made about another Member of this body in that extension.

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment—I do not want to be discourteous to him and cut him off, but my time is slipping away and I want to comment on what the gentleman says.

This is my fourth year in this body and I believe I have not been promiscuous in derogatory statements about Members either on my side of the aisle or the gentleman's side of the aisle; and, as indicated earlier, I am happy to apologize and do now apologize for anything he may consider derogatory, to the distinguished gentleman from Dallas. As I explained earlier, I have no personal feeling against him. I admire him in the way he has stood up for his county and his great city of Dallas. I have differences with him politically; and I do have differences with him in his philosophy.

I might say to my friend from Wisconsin that in his argument I disagree on the standpoint of philosophy, but in no sense because I impugn his integrity, or his honesty, or his sincerity. I would be most happy, as I have already indicated, to publicly apologize, as I am already doing, if that can be inferred from the remarks the gentleman put in the RECORD and which we are now discussing here.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The Chair would suggest that any Member desiring to ask a question first address the Chair to ascertain if the gentleman will yield.

Does the gentleman from California yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California this question. I would be much concerned if by inference any damage was done to the gentleman from California or any other Member of this House: Since the subject has come up with regard to this being circulated in the district of the gentleman from Texas in Congressional envelopes, not by frank but by stamp—the gentleman says he did not order the reprints or copies, and I presume not the envelopes—does not the gentleman think that to clear up and remove any improper inferences it would be well for the House to understand how those copies were made, who ordered them, and who sent them out?

Mr. SISK. I do not know to what extent the House wishes to do so. I believe

the gentleman will agree with me, that I have stated, and I stand on this, I know nothing about any reprints, any copies, any mailings of that type into the gentleman's district in Texas. I reiterate, and it will stay in the RECORD in my remarks, if that happened I have no knowledge of it. As far as I am concerned I have no responsibility.

In conclusion and summary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate that on the basis of figures supplied by the Federal departments responsible, the people of the county of Dallas in recent years have received and are enjoying Federal aids, grants, and benefits amounting to $885 million—approaching a billion dollars, under programs with which I heartily agree, and with which it appears the gentleman from Texas representing Dallas County disagrees.

Now I am glad the people of Dallas County are enjoying these benefits and I think they have a right to receive them and enjoy them. I think the final determination of this debate is up to the people of Dallas County. They are the ones who are going to have to decide whether or not they agree with the need for these programs, in which they do not hesitate to participate, or whether they agree with the gentleman from Texas representing that area. So far as I am concerned, I think the record has been set straight and they will be in a position to make an informed decision, period. I have no desire to belabor this issue further, but I assure the gentleman there is nothing I enjoy more than a good debate of political philosophies if that is what he wants. I made a factual statement concerning the large extent to which Dallas County is participating in Federal programs and I pointed out this is inconsistent with the repeatedly expressed views of the gentleman, and upon that statement I stand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

## THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR—ONE OF THE WORLD'S BEST NEWSPAPERS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this year every well-informed person is congratulating the Christian Science Monitor on its 50th anniversary.

Wherever newspapermen who take pride in their craft gather to compare notes, they speak of the Monitor with respect and admiration.

For here is one of the truly great newspapers in the world, noted for its accurate reportage of national and international events and for the fair and balanced content of its editorials.

It is a model for students of journalism and is the daily reference for all people who must depend on reliable and objective coverage of world news as the basis for sound opinion and right decision.

Step by step, since 1908, the Christian Science Monitor has built its reputation by unwavering dedication to the truth.

The home of the Monitor is Boston, Mass. Here, nourished by the principles of the First Church of Christ, Scientist, and the intellectual climate of New England, it developed those standards of honest, accurate, and clear journalism that have won for it such universal esteem.

The Monitor never sacrificed quality to gain mass circulation. You will not find "cheesecake," gossip, or lurid tales in its columns. But you will find the national and global news for mature and responsible people based on factual reporting that you can trust.

For the Monitor expects and receives from its first-rate correspondents around the world the dispatches and the interpretations covering significant events that have firmly established its reputation as an international daily newspaper. I suspect that even the Kremlin is secretly, though grudgingly, impressed by its character.

As we face up to the responsibilities of the space age, it is apparent that we will have to change some of our attitudes of recent years and recover the standards and real values that have been lost in the concentration on material progress.

The Christian Science Monitor has never surrendered its standards to the temptations of the sensational headline or the slanted story.

By devotion to the highest principles of journalism it has earned its position among the world's great newspapers.

We congratulate the Christian Science Monitor on its 50th anniversary. And we are confident that 50 years from now its superb integrity will have won for it top honors as the international daily newspaper.

## TAX RELIEF

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOLTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which will provide some measure of tax relief for the thousands of small-business men in this country. Campanion bills have been introduced by other Members of the House, and are pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means.

During recent years, we here in the United States have been experiencing a vigorous economic expansion, but the high interest rates and tight-money policy have had a damaging effect on small-business men and have left them in a financially weak position. Inflation is a persistent problem and the rising cost of living has been felt by growing numbers of American businesses.

Over the years there has been much talk and discussion about the problems of small business. In the past campaigns the political parties—both Democratic and Republican—pledged assistance to small businesses through adjustment of taxes. And approximately 2 years ago President Eisenhower appointed a Cabinet Committee on Small Business, which was to investigate the financial and economic condition of small business and make recommendations that would aid these business structures. This committee, in August 1956, made four specific recommendations:

First. That the taxes imposed on business corporations be modified by reducing the tax rate from 30 to 20 percent on incomes up to $25,000.

Second. That businesses be given the right to utilize, for purchases of used property not exceeding $50,000 in any 1 year, the formulas of accelerated depreciation that were made available to purchasers of new property by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Third. That corporations with 10 or fewer stockholders be given the option of being taxed as if they were partnerships.

Fourth. That the taxpayer be given the option of paying the estate tax over a period of up to 10 years in cases where the estate consists largely of investments in closely held business concerns.

The bill I am introducing carries all four of those recommendations, and in addition carries another provision which states that in the case of any person engaged in a trade or business, there shall be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year an amount equal to the additional investment in the amount of $5,000 or 20 percent of the net income of such trade or business for the taxable year—computed without regard to this section—whichever is the greater, provided, however, that the total amount of any such deduction shall not exceed $30,000 for any taxable year.

To maintain a healthy economy all segments of that economy must flourish, and it is vitally important that we give those in the small business structure every opportunity to build up the necessary reserves to tide them over during any recession period. The small-business man is the hard core of the free enterprise system, here in the United States and abroad, and is a basic safeguard against monopoly and concentration of economic power. On my recent trip to Europe the fact was brought home to me most clearly that a country that does not have the small-business man as the backbone of its free enterprise system cannot have a strong or stable economy. The Nation cannot afford to ignore the desperate plight of these small firms which require immediate and meaningful assistance in the field of tax reduction. Every day we hear of some small firm which has been forced to close its doors. In New York and here in Washington firms which have been in business for many, many

years are going out of business because they can no longer face the uncertainty of the future and the impact of high business taxes. In the Law Journal we read of many more petitions in bankruptcy, and the situation is growing worse.

Just yesterday the House passed a resolution to give an additional sum of $200,000 to the Select Committee on Small Business to study the problems of small business. This committee has done a tremendous job in pointing up the critical situation facing small firms today, and its assistance to small business in the past has been invaluable. As a result of its reports and recommendations in the past, we know some of the problems of small business, and we now need to put into operation a definite plan of action to assist the independent businessman. We must take prompt action to revitalize this smaller segment of our economy, and this bill is a step in that direction.

I respectfully urge my colleagues in the House to give this grave problem very serious consideration, and to enact legislation which will bring about the much needed relief.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SISK, for 15 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MACHROWICZ and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WITHROW and to include a telegram.

Mr. ALLEN of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER (at the request of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN).

Mr. HALE.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. BOLAND and to include an address by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Mr. WINSTEAD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include a table.

Mr. HERBERT and to include extraneous matter.

## SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 728. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution providing additional funds for the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems; to the Committee on House Administration.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8216. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House on the following titles:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948;

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; and

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 3, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1539. A letter from the budget officer, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a copy of Standard Form 143 for the period ending December 31, 1957, for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, pursuant to the Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-34, dated July 25, 1957; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1540. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract procurement awards to small and large business firms for work in the United States during the first 5 months of fiscal year 1958, pursuant to Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1541. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report on a review of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., 1956, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, pursuant to the Housing Act of 1954, approved August 2, 1954 (42 U. S. C. 1435); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1542. A letter from the administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report on the administration of functions under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1543. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend section 4083, title 18, United States Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1544. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report by the United States General Accounting Office on its positions and their incumbents in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1545. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9371. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 426. Resolution authorizing funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 459. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8290, a bill to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy in the

fulfillment of the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), "An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 460. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2151, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on certain coarse wool; without amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 461. Resolution for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 39, joint resolution to authorize the construction of certain water-conservation projects to provide for a more adequate supply of water for irrigation purposes in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex., and Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 462. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4215, a bill amending sections 22 and 24 of the Organic Act of Guam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 463. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 2, joint resolution to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 464. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1244, a bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 465. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 912, a bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargine or margarine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8439. A bill to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or the Immigration and Nationality Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 652. An act for the relief of the Thomas Cruse Mining & Development Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1714. An act for the relief of Roma H. Sellers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7057. A bill for the relief of Henry Bigajer and Maria Bigajer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8134. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Air Force, Mobile Air Materiel Area; with amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9396. A bill for the relief of C. J. Pobojeski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9878. A bill for the relief of Dora Thelma Andree; without amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10363. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 10369. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 10370. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. R. 10371. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 10372. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Highway Act to permit the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse the States for the United States pro rata share of the value of materials stockpiled in the vicinity of Federal-aid highway projects for use in the construction or reconstruction work involved in such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10373. A bill to extend the time for filing certain claims for refund of income tax which are based on the sick pay exclusion of section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 10374. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to authorize appropriations for forest highways for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 10375. A bill to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition of the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 10376. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 10377. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10378. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 10379. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that no security in the form of a bond or otherwise shall be required of deposits to the extent that they are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 10380. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide for paying an indemnity of $10,000 to the widow, children, or parents of any member of a uniformed service dying after 1956 under circumstances not permitting payment of dependency and indemnity compensation or death compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H R. 10381. A bill to strengthen the national defense, the cause of peace, and assure the intellectual preeminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines, and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof; to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 10382. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to provide for the increased use of rice by the Armed Forces and in certain federally operated hospitals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 10383. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H. R. 10384. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10385. A bill to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10386. A bill to prohibit and make unlawful the charging of a fee to view telecasts, or to enjoy the use of television in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 10387. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 10388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to reduce the rates of percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 10389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 10390. A bill to extend and expand the special milk for children program for an additional 2-year period, to extend the program of expanded milk in Veterans' Administration facilities and Armed Forces for an additional 2-year period, and to extend

the brucellosis eradication program for an additional 2-year period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10391. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 10392. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the broadcasting of subscription television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 10393. A bill to establish a program of survival food depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the provisions which presently restrict the deduction for medical expenses to those exceeding 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10395. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10396. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first $50 per month of earned income may be disregarded by the State agency in determining an individual's need for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 10397. A bill to authorize emergency refinancing loans to farmers in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 10398. A bill to provide for approval under title X of the Social Security Act of State plans for aid to the blind without regard to the existence in any State of other plans of assistance to blind persons financed entirely by the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 10399. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to prohibit the granting of authority to broadcast subscription television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 10400. A bill to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 10401. A bill to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to make available to small business a source of equity and long-term loan capital where such capital is not available on reasonable terms from existing private sources; to transfer to such system all funds which are presently available under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act for loans to industrial and commercial firms, together with certain other funds out of the surplus accounts of the Federal Reserve banks; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 10402. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10403. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 10404. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the protection of the public health, by prohibiting new food additives which have not been adequately pretested to establish their safe use under the conditions of their intended use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. R. 10405. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former naval industrial facilities at Center Line, Mich., to the State of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10406. A bill to amend title XV of the Social Security Act to provide for payments of unemployment compensation thereunder to veterans discharged after 1958, to the same extent as such payments are made to civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COAD:

H. R. 10407. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Highway Act to permit the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse the States for the United States pro rata share of the value of materials stockpiled in the vicinity of Federal-aid highway projects for use in the construction or reconstruction work involved in such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 10408. A bill to include as creditable service for purposes of retirement under section 6 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act certain service of individuals transferred under Executive Order 9067 of February 20, 1942; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 10409. A bill to provide minimum price support levels for whole milk and butterfat during the 2-year period beginning April 1, 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 10410. A bill to establish a Public Lands Management Study Commission, to establish a policy of multiple use of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 10411. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 10412. A bill to cancel reimbursable charges against Mission Indian lands in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution to request the President to designate the year 1960 as "Visit U. S. A. Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings of the United States to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. J. Res. 519. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a survey of a water route from Albany, N. Y., into Lake Champlain, N. Y., and Vt., with ultimate connection with the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HASKELL:

H. J. Res. 520. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of a full-scale demonstration plant for the production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 466. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of certain problems arising from population migrations within the United States and between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 467. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of

the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textile imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 10413. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecelia Cellino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 10414. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 10415. A bill for the relief of Hurwitz, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 10416. A bill for the relief of J. Henry Ennen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 10417. A bill for the relief of G. Elmer Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10418. A bill for the relief of Mabel L. Mathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 10419. A bill for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

371. By Mr. KING: Petition of Mrs. Della Painter, Inglewood, Calif., and 80 constituents of the 17th Congressional District of California urging support to remove the advertising of alcoholic beverages from our homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

372. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Iron County Clerk, Hurley, Wis., petitioning consideration of a resolution adopted by the Iron County Board of Supervisors on January 14, 1958, requesting the Federal Government to place a tariff on all iron ore, steel, copper, plywood, and pulpwood imported from foreign soil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Post Office Ban on Obscene Magazines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EMMET F. BYRNE**
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate permission to say a few words about the recent decision of the Supreme Court in nullifying the ban by the post office on mailing three obscene magazines.

I quote from the January 24 issue of the New World, a reputable news journal:

> The Supreme Court decisions, which have the effect of sharply restricting the legal definition of obscenity—particularly with regard to nudist publications—were delivered without written opinions.

This action is in itself interesting since the New World mentions further "that the Court merely filed a notice that it was granting review of the constitutional issues raised in the cases and simultaneously filed a per curiam decision that the lower courts were reversed." The Court added cryptically, "See Roth against United States" in each case.

As I understand this Roth against United States decision reached by the Supreme Court June 24, 1957, the Court upheld in a 6 to 3 decision the constitutionality of the Federal law banning obscene material from the mails. In the majority opinion, Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., laid down a new definition of obscenity that is having increasing impact on Federal and local law enforcement of anti-smut laws. Quoting from Justice Brennan, he states "the test of obscenity should be whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest." It appears the Court did not believe the magazines violated this standard.

As the father of eight children, I am and always have been concerned with what my children read. Though I am aware of the efforts to change our moral codes in many instances, I do not believe we need to change our definition of the word obscene as found in Webster's dictionary.

My District in Chicago has a great number of devoted teachers who are nuns, priests and laymen. They are gravely concerned with the moral education of their pupils as well as the academic side. My belief is that permitting obscene magazines to go through the mails is not contributing to the good of any of our young people who read them, nor does it make it any easier for our schools in their efforts to teach reason and decency; to explain the difference between good and bad. If such leniency is permitted by the Government, then I do not believe the Government is serving the best interests of the people in America.

## A Soul-Searching Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER**
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, last week I cast a vote in this House which was both preceded and followed by much soul searching on my part. I refer to the action of Thursday in voting to increase the public debt limit by $5 billion.

The action we took that day was a needful one; but it was a shameful commentary on our Nation's immediate past.

We had to vote the debt limit increase solely because we have a balance of a billion dollars, and bills that already total more than that. Obviously if we had not voted the increase our Government would have had to default its bills in a step toward the destruction of our national credit. Chaos undoubtedly would have followed.

I had a rather positive feeling then, as I have now, that this action should not have been necessary. Those who voted against it had some very sound reasons or principle for doing so.

First of all, I would have been more than naive had I placed full faith on the assurance contained in the measure that this was only a temporary debt limit increase. We all know how the word "temporary" has changed in meaning in recent generations. There are temporary buildings built some 40 years ago which threaten to outlast us all. There were temporary programs enacted during the depression years which are still on the books and still actively in use. "Temporary" has become a meaningless word and there is nothing to indicate that this temporary debt limit increase will not be with us for a long time to come.

Then there is the reasonable argument that this measure would not have been necessary had other Members of the House followed the voting procedure as I did last year when I voted against more than $10 billion in appropriations or authorizations.

But unfortunately the majority of the Members of Congress did not have that kind of economy voting record. For too many years in the past our Legislature has not had that kind of a voting record. And the result came Thursday when we had to vote for the debt increase or face grave dangers of financial chaos.

I voted for that measure with great reluctance. Under similar circumstances, I shall not do so again in the future.

## After 45?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CARL D. PERKINS**
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, how much longer are men and women going

to find it difficult to find work after 45—in the most prosperous country in the world? All have the same story, "Nobody wants to hire you after you are 45." We send millions of dollars to Indochina and countries all over the world, to keep them from suffering, while here in our own country, we have people suffering from hunger, illness, loneliness, and the crushed spirit of people unwanted and dispossessed. The skills and talents of these people brought America through wars and developments. They are not asking for jobs that pay $100 per week, but simply asking for a chance to work, live, and exist as a decent citizen. Our Government spends millions to salvage corn, to save butter and eggs, yet are we over 45 surplus people? Our services and experiences, though they may be limited, should receive part of the attention given to surplus food. Before year 1958 these people have to become 65 before they are eligible for social-security pensions, and after 65, many are not eligible, if they have not the required number of quarter years worked where social security deductions were made. There is a period of 20 long years from 45 to 65. The majority of these people have raised families and found it impossible to save enough money to live without work from 45 to 65—a period of 20 years. Our lawmakers have passed a law whereby there should be no discrimination regarding age on employment, but it has failed to eliminate this condition. How much longer will our country, that prides itself on fighting prejudice and segregation of color, continue to cultivate prejudice against employment after 45? We, the people of America, believe that our clergymen, Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jewish, and all who profess to be Christian should follow the example of God in behalf of these unfortunate people over 45 with the lawmakers of our country, to uphold the Constitution of the United States for all men and women so that they may work and live as decent citizens after 45.

## Legislative Poll of the Second New Hampshire Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following 1958 legislative poll of the Second New Hampshire Congressional District:

QUESTIONNAIRE

**For the fourth year, I am taking a poll of the people in New Hampshire to learn your feelings on important issues before the Congress. Your opinions on these issues will be of great value and interest to me. Please check the answer which best corresponds with your own thinking and return to me at the above address, together with any additional comments you may have on the back of this sheet. The wording of each question is not intended to influence your answer one way or the other.**

| | Yes | No | No opinion |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Do you favor the following major legislative recommendations which the President has just made to Congress? | | | |
| a. Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? | | | |
| b. Continuance of the mutual security program of military and economic aid to friendly nations? | | | |
| c. Liberalizing the immigration laws? | | | |
| d. A 5-year $882,000,000 Federal aid to education program, providing limited student scholarships, teaching fellowships, and matching grants to States to bolster the Nation's educational system, particularly in science and mathematics? | | | |
| e. Sharing atomic secrets with our allies? | | | |
| f. Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii? | | | |
| 2. Do you favor a multibillion dollar nationwide atomic shelter program? | | | |
| 3. Do you favor increasing social-security benefits with a corresponding increase in individual and employer contributions? | | | |
| 4. Assuming greatly increased military expenditures are necessary for the security of this country, do you favor a balanced budget at all costs? | | | |
| 5. Do you favor a summit conference between the President and Soviet leaders on current East-West differences? | | | |
| 6. Do you oppose inviting to this country the heads of Communist nations for conferences? | | | |
| 7. President Eisenhower has recommended to Congress a 6 percent cost-of-living pay increase for Federal postal and civil service workers (cost $1,043,000,000). Check 1 answer only. | | | |
| a. I favor this pay increase. ☐ | | | |
| b. I am for a lesser pay increase. ☐ | | | |
| c. I don't think this pay increase is enough ☐ | | | |
| d. I am opposed to any such pay increase at this time. ☐ | | | |
| e. No opinion ☐ | | | |
| 8. Do you think the Federal Government should exercise additional control over labor union finances and activities? | | | |
| 9. In general, do you approve of the way in which President Eisenhower is doing his job? | | | |

Although this is of course optional, it would be helpful to me if you would indicate your correct name and address below. If I have the wrong address or have sent you more than one questionnaire, please draw a circle around your correct address below.

Sincerely yours,

_____, _____,
*Member of Congress.*

Name _____
Mr., Mrs., Miss
Street _____
Town or City _____

## A Salute to Hartford, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1958, a formal ceremony will be held in Hartford, Ky., commemorating the 150th anniversary of the approval of the legislative act incorporating that city as a municipality. It is quite proper that we pause and give due recognition to this noteworthy event.

Ohio County is located in the central part of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky which I have the honor to represent. It covers an area of 596 miles, and, as of the 1950 census, its population was 20,840. Rich agricultural lands are located in Ohio County. Also coal and oil deposits are present. In 1798 the county of Ohio was formed. It was carved from an area of Hardin County, Ky. On February 3, 1808, Hartford, the county seat of Ohio County, became a town. Its name was probably derived from the ford on Rough Creek—now known as Rough River—where wild animals, particularly deer, were in the habit of crossing. Hartford was the third town in western Kentucky to be chartered.

During the War of 1812, Ohio County formed three companies of men to carry arms. One accompanied Gen. Samuel Hopkins up the Wabash River, another went with Gov. Isaac Shelby, while the third company was under Gen. Andrew Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans. Up to the present time the citizens of Ohio County have manifested their patriotism, bravery, and love of country in every conflict the United States has been engaged in.

In this crucial period now facing us, it is not amiss to review the history of the States comprising our great Nation, as well as the municipalities which are a part thereof. Just as we will probably be called upon to exert initiative and make sacrifices, so were the early settlers of Ohio County. They, too, faced challenges which were not met by negations, but by forceful action. These men and women summoned their God-given strength to respond to the challenges of their time. Often the experience of our forebears can give us warning of what to do and what not to do. If we are to create enduring peace, we must seek its origins in human experience and in the record of human idealism. We may have forgotten to pass on the lesson that the men and women who founded Ohio County and the city of Hartford knew so well; that freedom is our most valuable possession, and must be jealously protected and strengthened by each generation.

We can imagine that the pioneers in Ohio County and Hartford must have looked around with satisfaction at the visible evidences of their prospering in a new land—the snug dwellings, the fields from which the tillage had been taken, and the churches where they thanked

God for His bounty. The beginning they made so long ago has become the heritage of their descendants who have carried on with the results we see today—a prosperous, industrious, and happy generation of outstanding citizens. I salute them one and all.

## The Dairy Farmers of America Are in Real Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include therein a telegram from Charles Dineen, executive secretary, Wisconsin Independent Milk Producers Association.

The dilemma of the American farmer is tragic today. The State Department trades or negotiates him out of a foreign market for his products. Selfish business interests frequently precludes giving the products away here in the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture decries production instead of battling the State Department or some segments of business as is his duty. Wisconsin dairy producers need some expert assistance, but more than that—Wisconsin needs a real dairy program of national scope. In line with the request of Mr. Charles Dineen, executive secretary, I submit the following telegram for the RECORD:

Hon. GARDNER WITHROW,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

The Wisconsin Independent Milk Producers Association, representing most of milksheds supplying Milwaukee and Chicago, worried over dairy situation and market outlook for producers, request your undivided effort toward satisfactory dairy program and suggest it is high time United States follows lead of other countries, notably Dominican Republic, in fostering sound dairy industry based upon strong Holstein Friesen bloodlines and broad use of dairy products. The Dominican Republic has solved agricultural problems and worth your study and attention. Looking forward your making these views known to Congress through CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pertinent remarks of your own.

CHARLES DINEEN,
*Executive Secretary.*

I telephoned the Dominican Republic Embassy and learned theirs is a specialized dairy production and distribution. Free milk and cheese and milk products are actually gotten to the children and others who may be in need. They not only produce, but they market that production on an orderly plan. I suspect that is what Mr. Dineen refers to. Rather than be a mere storage reservoir, our Department of Agriculture might well become the rounded marketing outlet which the Government of the Dominican Republic has assumed. The growing unemployment in the United States suggests a reasonable outlet for our milk and cheese. Let us not simply tell the Wisconsin dairyman "No." Let us get busy.

## Education—The Ultimate Weapon To Win Strength for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement before the House Committee on Education and Labor, in support of H. R. 8571, a bill to provide Federal insurance for loans made to science and engineering students for tuition.

The statement follows:

EDUCATION—THE ULTIMATE WEAPON TO WIN STRENGTH FOR PEACE

Mr. Chairman, since I introduced a bill to provide Federal insurance for loans made to science and engineering students for tuition on July 8, 1957, fast-moving developments have shattered our complacency.

What seemed advisable then, has become imperative now. The Russian success in opening up the age of space has shocked us out of our lackadaisical attitude toward education. We have come to realize that the trained capacity to think is not merely a sideline, but the very essence of our way of life.

To design and produce intercontinental missiles, to explore space, and in everything required to win peace and progress, education is the key.

The New York Times of October 27, 1957, quotes the Educational Testing Service as reporting that lack of money keeps many of the best high-school students from college. Some 150,000 high ability students would have gone to college had adequate financial support been offered them.

Benjamin Fine, of the Times has this to say, "To help the qualified students enter, many colleges offer scholarships and student loans." Even though scholarships have jumped 100 percent in the last 5 years, still not enough is done to meet the tremendous demand for help. The hunger for scholarships was highlighted last Tuesday when 300,000 high school seniors took part in the merit scholarship examination. This is probably the most intensive talent hunt in our Nation's history. The exams are sponsored by the National Merit Scholarship program, set up 2 years ago with a $20 million grant from the Ford Foundation. Since then, business and industry have added several million dollars.

The results of the Tuesday tests will not be known until early spring. Of the 300,000 who took the difficult exams, 7,500 will enter the semifinals of the merit program. The final winners will split about $4 million among them. Only 800 of the 300,000 who sought help through scholarships will actually get any kind of financial assistance. What happens to the other 299,200 eager candidates?

"This waste must stop", one educator insisted. "We can't afford the luxury of keeping our best brains out of college."

Even the cautious recommendations of the President on this subject will fail to eliminate this waste.

Soviet Russia is training scientists and engineers at a rate that will leave us far behind, unless we exert ourselves to the utmost. Incidentally, in that Communist society, they do loan money to bright students, to open the doors of educational opportunity for them.

While we cling to the old formulas of financing the higher education of promising students; the formulas that are inadequate to meet the demands of the space age.

What incentives do we offer?

To digress for a moment, I would like to point out that the highest salaries in the United States are paid to business executives and movie stars, while in Russia the highest salary is paid to the president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

The more I think of the critical challenge confronting us, the more I am convinced that our survival depends upon a bold and generous program to make our educational system the best in the world.

The bill I have introduced, to provide Federal insurance for loans made to science and engineering students for tuition, is a modest step in that direction. I realize that much, much more must be done to make up the deficit of our longstanding neglect of education. But it is a beginning.

For the purpose of facilitating loans for tuition to science and engineering students in institutions of higher education, lenders shall be insured by the United States against losses on loans made by them to such students after January 1, 1958, if made upon the conditions and within the limits specified in this act. The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under this act in any fiscal year shall not exceed $25 million.

From this beginning I hope that other and far more expansive programs will develop so that American education becomes the ultimate weapon that wins strength for peace.

## Surplus Stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. GATHINGS. Today I have introduced a bill which seeks to make available surplus stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation rice to certain departments of the Government.

The purpose of this legislation is to encourage the increased use of rice by our Armed Forces and various other Federal institutions by permitting them, when they have used their usual quantities of this wholesome food to so certify to the Commodity Credit Corporation and to receive such additional supplies of rice as they can use in that particular year.

The bill would not interfere with the normal consumption of rice by the Armed Forces or these other Federal institutions nor would it interfere with the normal channels of trade. But it would be an incentive for these institutions to make greater use of rice and provide added nourishment to its personnel.

The domestic consumption of rice is estimated to be about 27.5 million hundredweight. This domestic consumption has been more or less stationary and we

now have about 10 million hundredweight of rice held in CCC stocks. The purpose of this bill is to reduce those stocks and to acquaint more of our citizens with the delicious and nutritious grain that is the basic diet for more than two-thirds of the world. It would result in reduced storage costs to the Government, increased meal-units for our Armed Forces and Federal institutions at very little added cost, and it will spread the acceptance of rice in a manner that should increase the domestic consumption of rice to a point that this grain will no longer be listed as a surplus commodity.

Such a program, if effective, can assist in preventing a further drastic curtailment in rice acreages that have plagued our rice farmers and our agricultural communities for the past several years. The bill would extend the milk program policy to include rice, another surplus agricultural commodity and encourage its expanded consumption. The bill should be enacted.

I would like to attach a table with respect to the supply and disposition of rice under certain assumptions.

The table follows:

*Rice—Determination of normal supply and national acreage allotment for the 1959 crop using varying levels of assumed exports*

[In thousand hundredweight]

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NORMAL SUPPLY | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Estimated domestic consumption, 1958–59 | 27,450 | 27,450 | 27,450 | 27,450 | 27,450 | 27,450 | 27,450 | 27,450 | 27,450 | 27,450 |
| 2. Assumed exports, 1959–60 | 16,000 | 18,000 | 20,000 | 22,000 | 24,000 | 26,000 | 28,000 | 30,000 | 32,000 | 34,000 |
| 3. Sum of items 1 and 2 | 43,450 | 45,450 | 47,450 | 49,450 | 51,450 | 53,450 | 55,450 | 57,450 | 59,450 | 61,450 |
| 4. Allowance for carryover 10 percent of item 3 | 4,345 | 4,545 | 4,745 | 4,945 | 5,145 | 5,345 | 5,545 | 5,745 | 5,945 | 6,145 |
| 5. Normal supply (item 3 plus item 4) | 47,795 | 49,995 | 52,195 | 54,395 | 56,595 | 58,795 | 60,995 | 63,195 | 65,395 | 67,595 |
| NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENT | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Estimated carryover, Aug. 1, 1959 [1] | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 |
| 7. Indicated production needed in 1959 (item 5 minus item 6) | 30,795 | 32,995 | 35,195 | 37,395 | 39,595 | 41,795 | 43,995 | 46,195 | 48,395 | 50,595 |
| 8. Estimated average yield per planted acre 1954–58 (pounds) | 2,963 | 2,963 | 2,963 | 2,963 | 2,963 | 2,963 | 2,963 | 2,963 | 2,963 | 2,963 |
| 9. Indicated national acreage allotment for 1959 (item 7 plus item 8) | 1,039,318 | 1,113,567 | 1,187,816 | 1,262,065 | 1,336,315 | 1,410,564 | 1,484,813 | 1,559,062 | 1,633,311 | 1,707,560 |
| 10. 1958 national acreage allotment | 1,652,596 | 1,652,596 | 1,652,596 | 1,652,596 | 1,652,596 | 1,652,596 | 1,652,596 | 1,652,596 | 1,652,596 | 1,652,596 |
| 11. Percent reduction in indicated 1959 allotment from 1958 allotment | 37.1 | 32.6 | 28.1 | 23.6 | 19.1 | 14.6 | 10.2 | 5.7 | 1.2 | +3.3 |

[1] Based on the assumption that exports during the 1958–59 marketing year will be only 16 million hundredweights.

## America in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 17, 1958, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] delivered a significant address to the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco. I know that the Senate will be as interested, as I was, in the proposals suggested by the Senator from New York on a wide range of important topics. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's remarks be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA IN CRISIS

(Text of an address by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS delivered before the Commonwealth Club of California, Sheraton Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., Friday, January 17, 1958, 1 p. m., P. s. t.)

The mood of the Congress may be described as being deeply mortified that the United States, considering its leadership and power, is in a position where it must catch up with the Soviet Union in the missiles race at the price of our very survival.

I believe the majority of the Congress, by that osmosis which in a free society transmits to us the deepest hopes and fears and aspirations of the people, feels a real sense of urgency and crisis. We do not think we have too much time to catch up, and we do not think that catching up is enough. Most of us feel that a great country like ours should be infinitely more powerful in its mission for peace and freedom than the Russians in their mission for communism and totalitarianism.

In his state of the Union message, the President with characteristic unpartisanship has sensed the mood of the country for specifics, for a program of action which will give each of us a task on which we can begin. The question now is whether the Congress and the people will implement it—indeed by the determination of their response to the President's call assure that the whole executive department, too, will follow through on the President's program. The people will not, I believe, want anyone continued in high office not engaged with spirit and conviction in carrying out the agreed program.

There are new dangers, imminent and real, which we now face that require new remedies. Although the Soviet Union's missile lead is the most dramatic and prominent, this mortal danger is compounded by the dangers of recession in the United States and by resistance to free world ideals among the so-called neutralist countries because leading European powers identified with them are also identified with yesterday's colonialism and imperialism.

The President has already led the way for those of us in the National Government to outline a program of action which, being specific may then be subjected to that analysis and debate which has so often produced our greatest national efforts. Although the time is short and we are all under pressure, the need for using our resources, both human and material, effectively requires not a piecemeal approach but a total program. If enough of us are willing to make our proposals promptly and in specific terms, then our course will be most quickly charted. That any program suggested will include matters already proposed is, of course, clear. Indeed it is hoped that in this way the greatest consensus of view may be arrived at the most promptly.

The people are prepared, I believe, to work as hard as required and to direct materials and energies into the program imposed upon us by the leadership responsibility for peace as we would in war. For it is becoming increasingly clear that the Russians are making a deadly serious bid to take world leadership we are devoting to peace away from us and use it for their own purposes of imposing communism on the world; and that they believe they now have a chance to do this by military superiority, propaganda, infiltration, and subversion without world war III.

As specifics, I urge the following steps in addition to those recommended in the President's message:

1. Expand the National Security Council to include four public members to be appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate to make it a truly broadly based National Board of Strategy.

2. Reorganize the operational control of the Armed Forces substantially as recommended by the recent Rockefeller report with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff designated as principal military adviser under the Secretary of Defense and the President, general officers becoming free of any service designation and the individual armed services concentrating on logistics, training, and administration.

3. Place the policy and operational authority and responsibility to coordinate the scientific efforts in defense in the hands of Dr. James Killian, the President's scientific adviser.

4. Provide standby controls on materials, manpower, and credit to be invoked if needed by the President with the advice of the reconstituted National Security Council, subject to a Congressional veto.

5. As a basis, though not necessarily a precondition for a summit meeting, insist on freedom of information on both sides of the Iron Curtain. As we are willing to have the pronouncements of Soviet leaders making their foreign policy case available for consideration by our public, we should insist that the policy statements of our President and leaders be made as widely and freely available for consideration by the people of the Soviet Union.

6. Forge closer links by greater partnership with our allies and with the regional organizations for defense and economic cooperation to which we adhere; and strengthen our efforts to give greater means and authority to deal with the problem of colonialism and to preserve the peace to the United Nations.

7. Materially expand our international trade, foreign economic aid (including surplus food disposal program) and technical assistance activities to win the cold war for peace—and bring the private sector of the United States economy fully into all phases of the effort. Emphasize the antirecession aspect of this effort.

8. Through civil defense, immigration, and civil-rights action and by encouragement of the arts demonstrate the deeper implications to the national spirit of the challenge we face.

Now to a point-by-point explanation of my suggestions:

Point I. Expand the Security Council: the Congress and the country feel a sense of urgency in catching up and staying abreast of the Soviet Union in our defense capability.

The strategic concept of defense as it relates to our foreign policy must be clear. This was the reason for the creation of the National Security Council, established by the National Security Act of 1947, whose purpose was to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to its actual and potential military power in the interests of national security for the purpose of making recommendations to the President.

The activities of this Council were to be supported by a number of agencies in peacetime but primarily by the Central Intelligence Agency created at the same time by the same law. Events surrounding the unreleased Gaither report indicate a great dissatisfaction with the amount of public participation and public knowledge of the operations of the NSC. Accordingly its membership should be expanded by the addition of four public members which might very well constitute bipartisan representation, appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate. Also, the Council should be required to render annual reports to the President and to the Congress and to the extent that the national security does not absolutely require secrecy its reports should be published. This was the original recommendation of the Eberstadt report made to Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal on October 27, 1945, by Ferdinand Eberstadt, of New York. The report stated that "thus the public would be kept posted on these vital matters by an authoritative and dependable source." In this way, the Council could be a National Board of Higher Strategy and could aid in building up public support for clear-cut, consistent, and effective foreign and military policies. One of the lessons to be learned from the Russian earth satellites is that the defense of our country requires total effort by all our people—not just by Government; and that the public must be made aware of and share in great national decisions which are required.

Point II. Reorganizing the operational control of the Armed Forces: Strengthening our chain of command to keep the Defense Establishment at maximum efficiency and effectiveness and maintain civilian control is a cardinal point. We can no longer afford the luxury of interservice rivalry, whatever may have been its previous benefits. There must be a direct chain of command and clear-cut lines of responsibility from the Secretary of Defense down. This, I believe, would be accomplished by instituting substantially the changes as recommended by the Rockefeller report.

Point III. Coordinating the scientific effort for defense: We may not have the time now to fractionalize the defense scientific effort by putting together a Manhattan project and taking it away from the various services now engaged in it. But we can see that one authority determines priorities and coordination among the defense scientific activities of all departments of the Federal Government, the National Science Foundation, the laboratories in colleges and universities, the voluntary organizations, and American business.

Point IV. Stand-by controls: We should now provide stand-by controls on materials, manpower, and credit to be invoked at the direction of the President with the advice of the reconstituted National Security Council, subject to the right of Congressional veto for 30 days before going into effect, according to practice followed in Government reorganization plans. This is essential to place us in the right posture for the major national effort we are undertaking and to thereby tie in and coordinate with this major national effort the policies of United States business and United States labor. For it is very clear that these predominant elements of the private economy need to participate in United States foreign policy through their own policies, for they represent by far the greatest part of our country's production and economic strength. The establishment of stand-by controls subject to the safeguards I suggest will give to the Government a basis for consultation and planning with United States business and United States labor in the present emergency; it will also serve notice that we mean business in the acceleration of our defense and foreign aid and trade efforts.

Point V. Freedom of information between East and West as a condition to top level negotiations between the heads of state of the United States and the Soviet Union. There must be an end to radio jamming. We can hardly look forward to great progress from summit meetings as long as our aims and aspirations are blacked out to the people behind the Iron Curtain. The arguments and points of view on both sides need to be exposed to the peoples of each side, specifically to establish a frame of reference for greater progress on the major points of tension. As the President stated in his answer to Premier Bulganin on January 13, "It is, above all, important that our peoples should learn the true facts about each other. An informed public opinion in both our countries is essential to the proper understanding of our discussions." The President's proposal in this letter for outlawing space missiles is a historic free-world bid to end the mortally dangerous weaponry race.

Therefore I believe we should place high on the agenda of the preparatory foreign ministers meeting proposed by President Eisenhower, a United States proposal to allot equal time on American and Russian radio, television and in newspapers for the accurate exchange of each other's stated government policies and political opinions. Right now, it's a one-way street. Last year, millions of us saw and heard Khrushchev on American television and radio. At that time, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON called for reciprocity. For years, commercial television and radio networks in this country have broadcast filmed, taped, and live on the scene coverage of world leaders in action, particularly Russian delegates, at the United Nations. Our newspapers, radio, and television newscasts regularly quote Russian leaders and Communist Party statements. It is time for the Russians to give equal time and I believe the neutralist nations of the world should vigorously support such an equal-time proposal by the United States.

Our State Department's negotiations with the Soviet Government—now said to have been agreed in principle—to increase the interchange of persons, nonpolitical, and to initiate the exchange of broadcasts, also nonpolitical, aim at increasing mutual understanding. But only by obtaining equivalent newspaper space and airtime in Russia for the fair reporting of American political thought and policies, including interviews with our leaders, can we ever hope to impress the millions living under communism, who are daily exposed only to their government's propaganda, with the true content and sincerity of the free world's disarmament plans and peace proposals. Then we would have at least a chance at building substantial public opinion behind the Iron Curtain which would encourage fruitful disarmament conferences at the summit level.

I have few illusions that we can change the Soviet censorship on statements by our governmental leaders through appeals directed to the Russian leaders. They have little to gain and a great deal to lose by letting the peoples of the Soviet Union know on the most authoritative level how far we really and sincerely desire to go to achieve a lasting peace. I believe we can, however, force a realization of this censorship by putting the Russian leaders on trial before the people of the world if they continue to refuse to grant freedom of exchange of information.

We should launch a campaign through our delegation to the U. N., the State Department, the USIA, and our diplomatic establishment to enlist the nations of the world behind the principle of such a free exchange of information. Let us start our equal-time formula with a 30-minute program featuring Khrushchev or Bulganin on the subject of a summit conference to be broadcast in the United States in return for 30 minutes of a generally equivalent Eisenhower broadcast with no strings attached in the U. S. S. R.

Point VI. Partnership lies with our allies: Our people now realize as never before the extent to which our national interest is engaged with the national interest of our allies. Particularly, we need overseas bases for our own and their security. Our allies need to be assured of prior political consultation with us on major foreign policy moves to avoid such flurries as that caused by the recent shipment by us and Great Britain of a miniscule amount of arms to Tunisia.

We need to develop a consistent policy with reference to areas still under colonial administration. It should be heavily based on the British example of phased withdrawal, as in granting independence to India, Pakistan, and Burma; on the possibilities inherent in U. N. trusteeships, as in Libya and Somaliland; and on our own and U. N. facilities for mediation, as they were used in Palestine, Iran, Indonesia, and Suez. We need to lend ourselves to the strengthening of international law by adhering to the world court statute, in which we have not yet concurred; by adopting the U. N. Convention on Genocide, still pending in the Senate; and by joining in the codification of international business law to prevent discrimination against foreigners, particularly in respect to foreign private investment.

Point VII. Expansion of our economic offensive in the cold war: Recent reports on the massive Soviet drive to compete with us in our chosen fields of foreign economic and technical assistance have awakened us to the fact that even our offensive weapons in the cold war are being threatened. As long as 1 billion people in the free world of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East live on a standard less than one-fourth that of the people of Western Europe and one-eighth of our own, we can never rest, never be satisfied or feel truly secure.

Certainly the President's recommendations for increasing the foreign economic development fund by $625 million and the authorization for Export-Import Bank loans by $2 billion should be enacted. In addition, we need to be sure we have done enough to deal specifically in terms of economic aid with such issues as the crisis in the industrial development of India under its 5-year plan and of France under the pressure of

its serious commitments. Considering our mounting surpluses of farm products we have only begun to sense the possibilities of this form of aid to industrially underdeveloped countries seeking a quicker means to balance their agriculture with industry without undergoing the privations and terror endured in Soviet Russia and Communist China under such circumstances. In the field of technical assistance, we should enter into partnerships for operations in particular areas with groupings of the NATO countries and the local countries affected, creating little Marshall plans. A case in point is the proposal of Foreign Minister Pella of Italy to establish a Middle East Development Fund from Marshall plan loan repayments due in 1958 plus added contributions from the European debtor countries and others. We should also expand materially our use of technical personnel from NATO countries in foreign technical assistance activities, and expand our training opportunities for nationals of underdeveloped countries in the NATO countries.

In the field of trade, the reciprocal trade agreements program should be extended for 5 years as the President requested and we should join the Organization for Trade Cooperation. We need to get away from import quotas and other types of protectionism and emphasize Federal help to reconvert marginally economic industries without material national security features adversely affected by imports. But we have a great opportunity also to meet the Soviet economic offensive by enlisting the private sector of our economy much more fully than now in the foreign policy effort of the United States. We should continue to expand our rate of overseas private investment from the 1956 level of close to $3 billion a year to a total of $5 billion per year in 5 years.

To do this, we should give prompt consideration to an income-tax program for the accelerated amortization of investments made in coordination with the foreign-policy efforts of the United States and for applying on that test the 14 percentage point reduction in corporate income tax we now allow Western Hemisphere investment, to the world. We should consider establishing a governmental medium for integrating the private sector of the American economy into the Nation's foreign policy. The antirecession aspects of these actions are certainly a major point in their favor. The expansion they represent is sound and vital.

Point VIII. Civil defense, civil rights, immigration and encouragement of the arts.

Finally we need to open up deeper spiritual values in our own country. This is a time not only for scientific searching but soulsearching. We must place much greater emphasis on proper organization and planning of civil defense to protect the lives of our people in event of an attack. We should adopt substantially the basic points advanced in the Rockefeller report in this regard as follows: (1) An attack-proof radio net to broadcast instructions during and after an attack; (2) a program of shelters to protect against radioactive fallout; (3) stockpiling food supplies and industrial reserves to prevent famine and enable the early resumption of economic activity.

The civil-rights effort to obtain equal opportunity for all by law, so portentous to our moral standing generally and especially with the peoples whose skin is yellow or black and who represent two-thirds of the population of the free world should be pressed in a new spirit of patriotism.

There should be a renewed emphasis upon the dignity of learning and scholarship and upon religious brotherhood.

While we wage this fight to erase discrimination against minority groups at home, we must on the other hand liberalize our immigration laws particularly to remove the racial discrimination inherent in our national-origins quota system which sharply limits the entry of freedom-loving peoples who are refugees and escapees from Communist or religious persecution, who were born in southern and eastern Europe or the Far East or the Caribbean.

Our Government, which is far behind most of the civilized world in the encouragement of the arts, should now undertake a fair role consistent with our traditions in encouraging them by the establishment, for example, of a United States Arts Foundation. We have excellent examples in the similar agencies set up by Canada and the United Kingdom.

In advancing these programs I am well aware of the cost. I fully believe that our people are prepared to spend whatever it takes to win this struggle. I believe our people place a lower priority on tax reduction and national debt limits than they do on national security. The people will want a dollar's worth for a dollar spent and they will want hardheaded administration of what is appropriated, but they will not let the cost stand in the way of achieving the result. American business, always so properly solicitous about budget balance, needs to back these essential expenditures and not to discourage them.

Fortunately, expert economic analyses tell us that we could increase defense spending by 25 percent in the next 2 years without raising taxes or unbalancing the budget, in view of the foreseeable growth of the national economy between now and 1960. Also, we must note that the Soviet Union is spending approximately 25 percent of its gross national product for national security purposes while we will be spending less than 10 percent of our gross national product.

Indeed, it is the Russians who are close to starving their people for the sake of arms. From now on it is they who will pay the heaviest penalties for increased expenditures, particularly as we start from the base of a gross national product almost three times theirs with a smaller population. As the President clearly stated in his budget message, the national debt limit must be increased. The Treasury believes that we are now and will be until March 1958, within a few hundred million dollars of the $275 billion national debt limit with very small cash balances. There is very little margin for unexpected contingencies, and we cannot allow ourselves in a time of such emergency to be so limited. We have a substantial reserve strength to call upon, as our Federal debt-incurring policy has been very conservative since 1956, the national debt decreasing noticeably as a proportion of the national income. In 1946, the public debt was larger than our entire national income that year—136 percent, but in June 1957, it represented slightly one-half of the 1946 ratio, 75 percent, the lowest ratio in the postwar era.

Confidence in our position is essential and fully justified. We have already demonstrated it in the competition with the Soviet Union. I speak now in terms of the appeal to the great neutralist areas of the world trying to make up their minds between freedom and communism, like those in Southeast Asia, and the Middle East. Certainly in the strictly moral sense in terms of individual human dignity, freedom of religion, speech, press and movement, due process of law and similar safeguards, there should be no question of the preference of their peoples.

But beyond this, ours is the science of life, while the Soviets' is the science of death. While they have forged ahead in developing missiles and rockets to carry atomic and hydrogen warheads, we have developed the Salk vaccine to eliminate the dread scourge of polio and aureomycin to banish traucoma, the deadliest disease affecting the 1 billion people in the areas of the free world needing development.

It is the Russians, not we, who have assailed the world with threats of destruction by rocket weapons. Their use has been threatened by Moscow against Britain and France on November 5, 1956, the time of the Suez crisis, against Holland in March 1957, against Great Britain again in April of 1957, against West Germany in December of 1957 in connection with their adherence to NATO, against Lebanon in March of 1957 in connection with the Jordan crisis, and even against ourselves on December 11, 1957, in connection with the proposal to station nuclear weapons in the German Federal Republic as an element of NATO. While on our part, though the most powerful nation on earth, we have treated as equals the smallest and newest nations in working out agreement on various issues with full respect for national sovereignty and have absorbed reverses in such negotiations without protests or threats—witness our dealing with Iceland and Morocco. While the free world, strongly aided by the United States, has been releasing 600 million people from colonial status since the end of World War II and brought about the establishment of 19 new nations, the Russian leaders have kept millions enslaved against their will in the Baltic States, in East Germany, and in Eastern Europe, and repressed by force and terror, as in Hungary, any sign of self-determination.

Finally, wherever there has been partition of an area between the Communist and free world, the free world area has shown bright by comparison, witness West and East Berlin, West and East Germany, South and North Korea, Vietnam and Viet Minh, Formosa and Communist China. It is estimated that for 10 years, 4,000 to 6,000 peoples a week have escaped from Communist East to free West Germany; in Hungary, Poland, even in Yugoslavia, this experience has occurred whenever there was the slightest chance to get out from under the Communists' self-styled utopia.

We have ascended a new plateau of world relations. We have in sight the organization of the world by regions, succeeding the nation state as communities of interest and sovereign entities. We can see the means for attaining peace and internationally accepted law and order. We cannot and should not fight the march of progress in human dignity and understanding or those who would make contributions to it. But we should have confidence in the fact that with work and sacrifice the basically superior moral and spiritual values of the free world will assert themselves as well in this new context as in the old. But it will take time, measured not in days or months but in years and decades. This time we must use for the benefit of mankind. We can lose no time in getting at this task.

## The Leading Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast:

THE LEADING QUESTION

(Broadcast over the CBS Radio Network, January 15, 1958)

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, this Congress, called by some our first space-age Congress, now has pretty much in detail President Eisenhower's legislative program. In his state of the Union message and his budget the President has

proposed in the months ahead Congress will be disposing and, of course, it may go ahead and do some proposing on its own, especially as the Congress is controlled by one political party and the White House by another. So, the essential question now is, What will Congress do? And to discuss that, we have two veteran Members of the House, the Democratic leader, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and the Republican whip, or assistant leader, Congressman LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois.

Well, Mr. MCCORMACK, you are the leader in the House of the party running this Congress, so let's start with you.

What can we expect of this session of Congress?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, it is true, Mr. Bancroft, I am the leader in the House of the party in control of the Congress, but there is a responsibility resting upon all Republican Members to have a due regard and to follow their own leadership in the White House, who is President Eisenhower.

I think the big question confronting all of us is the question of national security and foreign affairs. That is the matter which transcends political considerations, directly effects our country as such and all of our people. This Congress will cooperate effectively with President Eisenhower in any leadership he gives for a strong America, because the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear and that is military power greater than they possess themselves.

In connection with this, there will be bills out of the Armed Service Committee, which are already acting very quickly. There would be appropriations, adequate appropriations; there will be research and development; there will be the giving of information, imparting of certain information to our allies in NATO. There is the debt limit, there is the Presidential disability in addition to that. There is aid to scientific education and other fields of education and the question of the aid to construction in the field of education; the extension in the minimum-wage laws; increase in postal rates, which have already passed the House. There will be the pay raise bills for postal employees and for other Federal classified employees. Then, of course, there will be farm legislation and the indications are that this administration is going to reduce the price supports, and there will be legislation in relation to housing where there is an increase in interest rates, which I think is otherwise——

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, Mr. MCCORMACK, that's quite a list. Let's see what Mr. ARENDS has to say about that. Do you agree with all that?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Of course, that is only partial, but go ahead.

Mr. ARENDS. First, let me say that I am pleased to be on this program with the majority leader this morning, Mr. MCCORMACK. We have often enjoyed these little visits together on the radio.

I think Mr. MCCORMACK set forth most of the fundamental problems that we will have to consider during this session of Congress. There may be a few more of them, but several of them are basic and he particularly referred to the two on which, of course, we must have unity and cooperation, namely, national security and our foreign affairs, the mutual aid program such as they call it. The things that must be done in the interest of all America, free America and free people all over the world. Those are the basic problems as I see them.

Innumerable other problems come before us, some which, at this particular time, I would say, seem impossible to solve. Yet those are our responsibilities and we must try to meet up with them, which I am sure this Congress will make every effort so to do.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, Mr. ARENDS, in addition to your position as Republican whip, you are a member of the Armed Services Committee and Mr. MCCORMACK mentioned bills out of that committee, do you think—do you think Congress will do everything the President asked, or more than the President has asked, or what?

Mr. ARENDS. I am certain they will do everything that the President has asked and there are many members who I imagine will want to even go further. Already, our committee has passed an authorization bill, which you know about, with the idea in mind that we implement exactly the kind of a program that the country must have at this particular time in view of the changes, different concept of war and so on and so forth.

So we are moving rapidly ahead on that particular phase of our problem. It will be done hurriedly I think, but yet it will be done after we have carefully scrutinized what the requests are, because all we want to do is to be helpful and do the necessary things which can advantageously correct some of the things maybe we should have done a little earlier.

Mr. BANCROFT. Mr. MCCORMACK, are you satisfied with what the President is proposing in the defense field?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, the President's message in my opinion was the best one he has made. Whether it meets the challenge of the day or not, that is another question. I might—I have my opinion on that. I think, however, that we—the best thing that we can do is to try and convey, to the people of the country, information that is for the best interest of our country. I do not look for a bitter session in the sense of political bitterness, because certainly this is not the time to have any political bitterness. I do not stand for that kind of leadership anyway. I am a Democrat and I believe in the Democratic Party. It's the best party to—for the people to have in control of our Government. On the other hand, over and above party considerations, whether we are Democrats or Republicans, we are all Americans and there is a great crisis confronting the world, not only the United States, but other free nations, and we have got to think and govern ourselves in the manner that will most effectively serve the national interest of our country and the best interest of our people.

And I hope and I am sure that my friends on the Republican side, from the President down, will keep that also in mind, because they are going around the country in a few days making political speeches, which is perfectly all right and I—and at the different dinners and raising money to help their party. But I suggest to them that they do nothing to create bitterness from the President down.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, JOHN—Congressman MCCORMACK—I think that's all right. I believe we are all motivated by the same objective, namely, a loyalty to country which all of us want to discharge. We will do that. Of course, we have run into fundamental questions of leadership in the country. It happens that the White House is—the administration is Republican and it happens that the Congress is Democratic. Of course, I would like to see it the other way. You know being minority whip isn't near as pleasant as being majority whip. But that happens by the will of the people. I don't think it is so good when you have one party in control of the legislative branch and another one in control of the executive branch. I wish it were the other way, regardless of which party might be in control, because I think you can work better, work more in unity from a party angle than before.

However, these problems that come before us now, those as we mentioned a moment ago, defense and mutual aid and some of the other problems which effect all our people, of course, we are going to have to be patriotic individuals; look at it objectively and then do the best job we possibly can. We will have our little squabbles politically about some other phases of the program and on that, of course, the people are not going to object.

Mr. BANCROFT. You both mentioned mutual aid or foreign aid and from all we hear there is liable to be a controversial matter on this issue. How about that, Mr. MCCORMACK, do you think Congress will approve what the President has asked?

Mr. MCCORMACK. We had difficulty last year. There is more and more resistance developing against it. It isn't from my angle, because I think it is very important and a vital part in carrying out our foreign policy. The more we can do to prevent nation after nation from becoming dominated by the Kremlin, communism, I think the better it is for the national interest of our country. It is one of those hard ones, but we have got to face it, those charged with responsibility. I think the bill will go through that will be substantially—carry out the purposes consistent with our national interests. It is going to be a hard fight and the leadership on both sides appreciate it. There is an honest difference of opinion among Members. Not injecting politics, but I think we have got to expect a few more votes from your side of the aisle, Congressman ARENDS, in the fight that is coming up this year, not only on mutual aid, but also on reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, let me say, Mr. MCCORMACK, that on this matter of mutual aid and certainly I do—I never like to hear it called as giveaway program, because I——

Mr. MCCORMACK. That's a wrong name.

Mr. ARENDS. That is the wrong term; yes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I agree with you. It is for the—there may be some mistakes in administration, but the basic purpose is for the national interest of our country. I don't mean to interrupt—didn't mean to interrupt you.

Mr. ARENDS. That is all right, because I think you will recall that those of us of leadership on our side of the aisle, even when the program was instituted back in the days of the Marshall plan, we all got right in there and began to do our job as Americans in trying to be helpful in the matter. And have right from that time on supported this mutual aid program.

There may be a difference in degree as to amount, but yet we have all objectively tried to do something in this respect. And the responsibility does fall on the leadership on the majority side as well as on our side. And I think that we will do everything humanly possible to put forth a good program which will fill the bill, so to speak, in meeting the needs.

Mr. BANCROFT. As the Republican whip, your responsibility is lining up Republican votes, do you think you will line up a lot of Republican votes for reciprocal trade——

Mr. ARENDS. I must tell you a fact. I must recite this to you, that last year there was more support on our side of the aisle in numbers, than there had been previously in any one year, and I have the figures available. And we are more in numbers—the percentage of Members we have on the floor of the House, we did have more support. And I rather imagine that we will come up just about that way again this year.

Mr. BANCROFT. I wonder if we could get to the economic problems here. The President, as you know, has just asked for an increase in the limit of the national debt. I presume Congress is going to give him that, but what about legislation in general to combat recessions, with a business downturn, do you think anything like that will be coming up, Mr. MCCORMACK?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, that depends upon future developments. There is no question but what there is a recession under way,

how—to what extent it will go, the next 3 or 4 months will show. If it increases and becomes greater with resultant unemployment and reduced business, then Congress may have to take some action to try and cushion the downward trend and to reverse it and make our contribution towards reversing it in connection with business; try and get us back into normalcy again.

I look for further recession. I hope it doesn't get marked, because none of us want to see recession in business and a resultant unemployment take place. We want to see this constant expansion of our national economy. And I am satisfied that if the situation arises where legislation and action in the legislative level is necessary that it will be taken.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say, Mr. MCCORMACK, that possibly I am more of an optimist then you are, but—and not being an economist, I have tried to study a little bit some of these economic reports from the various economists throughout the country, at various meetings they have had, and while they are all pretty much in agreement that we are moving sideways, I see no clear indication anywhere that they are anticipating any such thing as a recession. Now, there is a dip, and we have peaks and valleys through our economy; we have had for years and probably always will have. And I think this possibly is some kind of a little valley on which before the end of this calendar year is out, we'll see our working self—working ourselves out in good shape, and I believe that.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, Mr. ARENDS, I think there is a little bit more than a dip going on, if you judge—see the unemployment rolls mounting, the highest in many years. You see—you watch the number of bankruptcies taking place, increasing tremendously; you see the carloadings being reduced; you see the heavy goods—industry, sharply reducing its activities; seeing inventories being reduced. Those are all cautious actions of responsible businessmen, but in looking at our overall economy, the objective mind cannot fail to evaluate them. And I would say that there is more than a dip and I am not a pessimist by any means, but I expect that further recessions—to what extent it will go I am unable to state now, and I don't think anyone is able to state at the present time with accuracy.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, the budget that's been sent down here is, of course, theoretically a balanced one, but few people—at least a great many people don't seem to think it is going to stay that way.

Are you very afraid of an unbalanced budget, of deficit spending?

Mr. ARENDS. Well, of course, balanced budgets are always desirable and that has been one of the things that the Republican Party has been trying to do over the last few years. And until this supplemental deficiency came up, why we were in the position of where, for the third straight year, we were having a balanced budget. But because of the requirements and necessities of national defense, why the budget this year will probably end up slightly out of balance.

Now the newly proposed budget, again, is in balance. It's a question of what Congress does. We have control of the purse strings up here, and at this particular time, I would hesitate to venture a guess as to what we will do. Will we be courageous enough to meet the issue head on and say, "This we need for defense, this we need for mutual aid," and on some of the projects and programs we already have in force, which might well be delayed for some time, we say, "Let's put this off temporarily in order to keep a balanced budget."

Frankly, I do not know what the reaction of the Members is going to be.

Mr. BANCROFT. Mr. MCCORMACK, what do you think about a balanced budget?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, the balanced budget is always desirable, but between a balanced budget and a safe and sound and effective national defense, I am for safe and sound and effective national defense.

Mr. ARENDS. And so will the 435 Members of the House be.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I would think that most of them would. Of course, we have got the highest peacetime budget ever given in the history of our country for two successive years. And this present budget contemplates reduction in domestic activities in the field of agriculture, rural electrification, slum clearance, probably an attempt to take away some of the rights under the law of the veterans. Housing is going to be affected by increase—attempted increase in interest rates. The change in the law on mortgage support at par is also recommended; public works practically closed, new public works are closed. That's a matter of interest to our people all over the country, and particularly in different parts of the country where projects are located. Hospital construction is being affected, vocational training and waste treatment plant construction and other activities have all been affected adversely in this budget. And I doubt very much if the Congress of the United States is going to permit all of those adverse effects to go through. I know I wouldn't agree with them.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say, Mr. MCCORMACK, that—I say this respectfully—you are reading some things in the budget I didn't see. I didn't see anything in the budget about reduction of payments to veterans. I don't believe it was in there.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I said it was contemplated.

Mr. ARENDS. I think you must have picked that up somewhere else.

Mr. MCCORMACK. No, no. I said there is a message that is contemplated by another message. A very indication.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, the message isn't here yet and—that's anticipated.

Now, you mentioned agriculture, reduction in agriculture. That's a problem I know something about. Now, I am not at all sure that what there is proposed in doing away with the so-called acreage reserve—but that isn't a proper step. And I think you will probably your own Agriculture Committee controlled by your party agreeing to that. In other words, by simply writing a law, Congress has not been able to solve the agricultural problem. And they recognize the difficulties in the present situation. So, I believe they are in agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture that that particular step should be taken. Now, what they have in the way of a future proposal, possibly brought up during this session, whether it is a package bill or not, that's another question. I think in this particular instance, you'll find most everyone in the House wants the understanding they are going to be in agreement, which includes the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, there is a cut in the price supports that certainly is proposed, aimed at curbing surpluses and reducing the cost of acquiring surpluses.

My position in agriculture is, that it is a very important segment of American life and of American economy. The farmer buys in a protected market and sells his surpluses on the world market, which is unprotected. And I think as a national policy coming from a district where there is not one farm located, that the farmer is entitled to compensatory, some kind of compensatory consideration that's given to industry through tariff protection. So it isn't any giveaway, it's a matter of national interest of our country to keep our agriculture alive and dynamic. It's important from the angle of national defense, as you know. It's important from the angle of our national economy. The farmer is a very substantial purchasing power and when they are depressed, it's only a matter of a year or two when the workers in the factories of the cities commence to lose their jobs.

So with the industry getting the protection of tariff, the farmer not having it, you give him all the protection in the world, you know if he has an exportable surplus he has got to sell it on the world market at the world prices and the protection don't mean a thing for him. Or when there is an exportable surplus, we have had a national policy to keep a very dynamic agricultural life, we have got to devise some means of enabling him to have compensatory considerations against those given to industry.

Mr. ARENDS. Well JOHN—Mr. MCCORMACK—Congressman, I can agree with that, and I think Congress should work toward that end. The difficulty is finding the answer and getting our Agriculture Committee to come in here with something on which we can all agree.

Unfortunately, we see our agriculturalists, our so-called agriculture block broken down geographically, we see them broken down from the standpoint of commodity interest and so forth.

Now, what we should do and I wholeheartedly agree with you, we must keep agriculture as a whole economically prosperous and because it is a segment of our economy which is so important, because eventually it is reflected someplace else in the purchasing power of everyone; that the responsibility falls on us in the Congress to forget the politics involved in this whole question, which as you and I both know so well, because I was in the middle of this fight last year. It became so political that we got nowhere.

Now, this year I hope and pray, that somehow we can sit down and see, as reasonable men, if we can come up with a solution that will bring about the answer. I am not sure we have it yet.

Mr. BANCROFT. There is one other thing the President proposed in this budget message, to keep his budget in balance, and that was a 5-cent postage stamp.

How about that, Mr. MCCORMACK, do you think Congress in this election year will go for a 5-cent postage stamp?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, that bill has already passed the House.

Mr. BANCROFT. For a 5-cent stamp?

Mr. MCCORMACK. The House was 4 cents.

Mr. ARENDS. We passed a four.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Four cents. I think the administration is probably a little ambitious in going to 5 cents. I doubt if they would go to 5 cents in first-class mail and—but the House has already passed the bill and that is over in the Senate now and it is reasonable ground—there is reasonable ground to believe that that bill in some form will pass the Senate and become law.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you agree?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; I think that is true. I think we will pass some kind of a rate-increase bill this time.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, I wonder if we could come back for a moment to the defense problems which you both listed as the most important one and as we said——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, because that's most important, Mr. Bancroft, because the very life and existence of our country is centered around——

Mr. BANCROFT. I don't think there is any disagreement about that, but it has a lot of aspects and Mr. ARENDS is on the Armed Services Committee.

One thing, what about the reorganization of the Defense Department, of a single Chief of Staff, or a missile czar, or what is going to come of that?

Mr. ARENDS. I wonder if I might have a little bit of time to try and answer that. Because being the ranking Republican on the committee and so intensely interested in this whole thing, I have some viewpoints.

First, let me say that our committee, although I think we've started late and I had urged that we start earlier, we have now started day before yesterday on extensive, thorough hearings before our committee. These are in executive session. Thirty-seven-man committee, the House Armed Services Committee. And I believe Mr. McCormack, the majority leader, will agree with me that we have always had prestige on the floor of the House, that we have been a fair committee, we are absolutely nonpartisan, we have tried to be objective; we are under the leadership of a fine chairman and this committee has now—is now diligently trying to come up with some of the answers to the problems that face us in relation to our national security.

We started, for instance, day before yesterday with Secretary McElroy. For two long days he sat before our committee and completely and frankly answered all the questions that our boys could put to him, and I must say there are some very capable individuals on both sides of the chairman sitting there, to ask questions.

We are going through this thing. We are going to have today, General Twining, who is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We will have the respective heads of the services. And right on down, including all the scientists. We are going to explore the whole field, which takes in not only the missile field, but takes in this question you brought up about the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whether there should be reorganization.

We hope to go into the whole business of missions and assignments and anything that must be done and which they can convince us should be done for the good of the country. I believe our committee will be able to come out with some forthright, objective recommendations. And it is our responsibility. And I am convinced that we are just determined to do a good job, once we have the time to do it and we have the time.

Mr. Bancroft. Mr. McCormack, are you going to sit by and wait now for this committee to——

Mr. McCormack. I can enter no criticism or contrary statement to what Congressman Arends said about his committee. It is a great committee, the members act without regard to political partisan considerations. The Committee on Armed Services, we have got to look to them. And they are making this investigation and—in executive session, and the results of it will come out—will be reported to the people, to the Congress and to the people when they have completed them.

I hope they will thoroughly look into the whole question of responsibility, because certainly it appears as though in some fields we are behind the Soviet Union, because I am firmly convinced that if the Soviet Union ever gets to a position where they have an advantage over us where they can hit us, our targets, and we can't get to their targets, Mr. Arends, they are not going to let us catch up with them. They will hit us and we had better be prepared, because as I said before, the only thing they respect is what they fear and that is military power greater than they possess.

Might I suggest, Congressman Arends, in your investigations, also look into the field of biological research, chemical research, because—psychological, but particularly biological and chemical, why—it is amazing to find out how far advanced we are, to try and find out how far the Soviets are, because that field alone is of vast importance. The people read and talk about ballistics, well there are other fields and you know it as well as I do, better. And I hope that your—you'll see that your—you'll take up with the chairman and other members of the committee the question of looking into those two things.

Mr. Arends. Let me say to you, Mr. McCormack, that as I said, many, many able fellows are on our committee. And already yesterday, those questions were mentioned. We will go into those particular fields too, the biological, the chemical—in other words, I think that this is going to be such a comprehensive hearing, that we really can do a job, not only for the Congress, but certainly for the country in our final analysis of this picture as we see it.

Mr. McCormack. I agree, and may I make one further suggestion. When you get into those fields—it's all right to hear from the Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries, but get down to the operating level of the men who are in command of those activities and who never appear before, probably never appear before committees, and see that they—the only way they can get before a committee is where they are asked to come before them. I would get to the actual commanding and operating heads of those services.

Mr. Arends. Our chairman has already indicated to the members, that if we have anyone in mind at all who think that—who we feel might make a contribution, that we should ask them to come before the committee. In other words, there is just no pulling of punches here at all. In other words, we are trying to do a job.

Mr. Bancroft. One of the perhaps longer range defense things that the President has—is asking about is education, helping of schools and some seem to think that he doesn't go far enough and others that he goes too far. What do you think Congress is apt to do about education, Mr. McCormack?

Mr. McCormack. Well, I think, Mr. Bancroft, that I'd be interested in listening to what my good friend, Congressman Arends, has to say in that. If he can tell me how many Republican votes we are going to get in the House, I could answer the question better.

Mr. Bancroft. There you are, Mr. Arends, what about that?

Mr. McCormack. Because when this school construction bill came up, a clear majority of the Democrats voted to pass it, the Republicans voted the other way. I am not mentioning how anybody voted. Many Members voted, but if you could get information from Congressman Arends, that's a very important question—

Mr. Bancroft. We will certainly try, how about it?

Mr. Arends. Would you permit me to go back just a minute and mention my own position, because I am on the Armed Services Committee, in relation to this one problem you brought up a minute ago about the Joint Chiefs of Staff and reorganization? I think possibly—I know we are going to look into this whole reorganization picture. But as one individual who has studied this matter over the years, I am still opposed to one—single Chief of Staff position, just like the chairman of my committee is. I have serious doubts that any such thing will happen, or be passed by this Congress at this particular time.

You bring up the question of what happened last year, Mr. McCormack, in relation to——

Mr. McCormack. I didn't bring that up. I mean——

Mr. Arends. I refuse to be put in a position of I predict, and say it, but I—by the time we have the matter up for consideration on the floor of the House, I'll give you a good estimate if you come around and see me. I think we are going to be in pretty good position on this thing according to the type of program sent up here and that of course is still unknown——

Mr. Bancroft. I'm afraid we've now run out of time and thank you both for being with us on our leading question.

## Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, at the 58th Annual Dinner of the Cathedral Club of Brooklyn, January 23, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] at the 58th annual dinner of the Cathedral Club of Brooklyn tendered to Most Rev. Byron F. McEntegart, D. D., in honor of his appointment as bishop of Brooklyn, which dinner took place the evening of January 23, 1958, in Brooklyn, N. Y.

The address follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Your Excellency, most reverend bishop of Brooklyn, right reverend monsignor, reverend fathers, my close and valued friend, one of the most distinguished Members of Congress, Congressman Rooney, members of the State, county, and city governments, members of the judiciary, distinguished and invited guests, and officers and members of the Cathedral Club of the Brooklyn diocese and your friends, in extending my appreciation for your invitation, I am particularly pleased to be with you on this occasion in the presence of a great churchman and a great American whom I have known for years, and whose friendship I greatly value, your beloved bishop and spiritual leader, Most Rev. Byron F. McEntegart. In succeeding another great bishop, your late beloved archbishop, Bishop McEntegart will give to the Brooklyn diocese, noted for the strong faith of its people, leadership that will intensify the same. Catholic University's loss of Bishop McEntegart as its rector is the gain of the Brooklyn diocese.

I also was particularly pleased to receive your invitation through my good friend and colleague, Congressman Rooney, who is one of the ablest and most influential Members of the Congress, enjoying the confidence and respect of his colleagues. I might also say that the Congressional delegation from Brooklyn is a very strong and influential one in the Congress of the United States.

The policy of peace through strength, and possessing that strength, is more important and vital today than it has been since the existence of the Communist threat.

For the only thing that the evil-minded men in the Kremlin respect is what they fear—and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

This does not mean that military strength alone is our sole element of power, for in any severe test moral strength is of inestimable importance that could well be the deciding influence and factor between victory and defeat.

The Holy Father has clearly evidenced this in his number of messages to the world, and particularly in his Christmas message of the last 2 years—dynamic messages affirmative in nature, and charting the road for the men and women to follow who want to be free under their own law.

But military strength and power is necessary in the world today.

And that is consistent with the moral law because it is intended by us to implement and strengthen our moral forces, and to effectively resist the efforts of the Soviet

Union in its attempt of world domination or destruction.

For our military strength, and this includes our allies, is to preserve independence of nations, and liberty of peoples under their own law. Such military strength is designed for constructive purposes, to be utilized as an instrument of world peace.

The intent of this military power of atheistic communism is to conquor and dominate the entire world by any means possible, with slavery, persecution, imprisonment, death and even martyrdom following such domination.

As long as communism remains as presently constituted, and until its leaders repudiate or renounce atheistic and dialectic communism, it is vitally necessary that we remain powerful from a military angle.

And the price we pay and the sacrifices we make are necessary for our preservation and for future generations to possess and enjoy as now constituted in our institutions of government.

For we cannot afford to be second best to the Soviet Union and its military strength and power.

If it develops, for example, that we must choose between a balanced budget and an adequate and strong military strength, we had better decide in favor of strong military strength.

We must bear in mind that the main avenue of success, if any, in the field of diplomacy is the strength and power of our military forces. For such strength is the only language the Communists know and heed. In other words, if any success comes through diplomatic negotiations, and you will note my guarded words, it will be due mainly to our military strength and power and the respect of the Soviets for such strength and power.

I have said repeatedly in and outside of the Halls of Congress that we cannot negotiate with the Communists on the moral level, because they not only deny, but are fighting God and His word and law in the minds of those who believe in Him; Catholic, Protestant, and Jew. We cannot negotiate with them on the level of idealism because they have no ideals; but there is one level on which we can possibly negotiate with them, and that is on the level of the law of self-preservation.

For the Communists can close their minds to spiritual truths and to ideals, but they cannot deny there is a law of self-preservation. They cannot deny or ignore the indisputable fact that this law applies to Red Russia and its people, as well as to other countries and their peoples.

And as long as we have at least retaliatory power, short of a possible revolution arising within Russia, it is a reasonable probability that the evil-minded men in the Kremlin will not undertake to destroy another nation and its people if before the act of destruction or mass murder is completed, the Soviet Union and its people commit suicide.

And this is one of the main reasons why we must pay the price necessary for military strength—to deter—and if madmen attack, to be able to destroy the aggressor.

Strong military strength as an affirmative threat is also a deterrent to attack, enabling as we hope in the future, affirmative influences to operate with the ultimate objective of undermining and destroying communism.

And if we are going to err in judgment on the question of strength or weakness, it is better that we err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness.

For we must remember that the meaning and significance of little Hungary still exists in the minds of men and women everywhere who want their own independence, and freedom under their own law. Hungary has clearly shown that the Soviet Union cannot rely upon any one of its satellites behind the Iron Curtain.

Who can tell when another Hungary may suddenly and spontaneously happen in some other satellite nation such as Poland or East Germany.

For the God given right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, in other words, the desire for freedom, may be temporarily suppressed by totalitarian or dictator nations, but can never be destroyed.

And while communism, and even to a limited degree, liberty, because of different motives and reasons, may temporarily travel the same road together, they cannot permanently travel that same road. And this is particularly so as long as communism, as presently constituted, adheres to its intents and purposes.

And we must bear in mind that military strength is relative in nature, and our strength must have a relationship to our potential enemy, the Soviet Union.

Coming directly to the happenings of the present and recent months, it is evident that everyone knows or senses that an urgency exists. Everyone knows or senses everything is not all right.

There is no question but what an urgency exists and that in certain military fields everything is not all right. This observation might also be made in other directions. However, in my remarks tonight I am confining my thoughts to the immediate situation that confronts us.

The question confronting us is whether or not the urgency of the situation is being met.

We read the newspapers, and we know of the differing testimony given by high-ranking military men and officials.

Who and what can we believe?

Who is right? Are the American people being given all possible information? Is the Congress being given full information?

To refresh your memory, a high-ranking general's resignation will become effective soon, and one of his reasons for resigning was, he could not remain in Washington another year and—I quote him—"go through another session" and "be silent listening to inaccurate testimony" being given to committees of Congress. These are serious statements and charges. One thing is certain, that the Congress must be fully informed in order to perform its constitutional duty to legislate and appropriate for an adequate national defense.

Our people should be as fully informed as possible, the bad with the good news. In order to help them form a sound, rational public opinion as to what our policy should be.

For under democratic institutions of government, public opinion is a powerful factor. Some have said that its influence and power is greater than Presidents, governors, and Members of Congress and other public officials. In any event, whether sound or emotional, whether right or erroneous, under the constitutional government, public opinion exercises a powerful influence. In order to be sound and rational, the public must be as fully informed as our national security will permit:

And it is in connection with forming of sound public opinion that you and other Americans can make a marked contribution toward proper policy being made, and of quick and necessary action being taken thereon.

Another prominent general recently complained that in appearing before committees, they are put in the embarrassing position of supporting the policy, including appropriations submitted by the administration, and if they testify otherwise, they face the charge of insubordination, or are placed in the position of falsifying before the committees.

It is a most unfortunate position for these men to be put in. I can sympathize with them. But if gagging generals and others in the executive branch is successful, carrying this to its natural and ultimate conclusion, it would result in the gagging of Congress, a separate and coordinate branch of our Government. This would reduce Congress to simply a must body and prevent it from carrying out its constitutional duties and responsibilities.

It will be a sad day for America if that situation ever comes about.

The problem facing this particular general and others in the same position is not within the Congress of the United States, but within the executive branch.

All of this has an effect on the Congress obtaining all necessary information to make decisions, pass legislation, and the making of appropriations necessary for the national interest and the national defense of our country.

We have read in recent months about the Soviet sputnik, and some information on the progress the Soviets have made in the field of military research and development, and particularly in the field of ballistic missiles. Also, as to how far we have advanced in these fields; and the testimony in this respect to date is very vague.

It is quite evident from what you and I have read in the newspapers, and we can discuss what we read because that is not classified, that Red Russia is ahead of us in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles, and also in the field of intermediate ballistic missiles—the latter field probably more than in the intercontinental field.

The very fact that they are able to project satellites into the outer space is evidence of marked advancement on their part in the discovery or unfolding of the means of projecting intercontinental ballistic missiles from one continent to another. However, there must be perfection in the missile arriving at its target. It appears that in the field of propulsion power, the Soviets are ahead of us, but they have not as yet arrived at that stage of perfection where, in using intercontinental ballistic missiles, the target can be hit with accuracy.

It is imperative that we devote all resources necessary to at least catch up in this field of science and technology, and in any others with military significance in which we are behind the Soviet Union.

As long as we have retaliatory power, it might operate as a deterrent to surprise attack. Our present deterrent power is in our intercontinental bombers and their present ability to reach their targets and, if necessary, their present ability to reach their targets in the Soviet Union. As long as they can reach their targets, they are a powerful offensive force and at the same time, might operate as a deterrent influence to any sneak attack.

We read in the newspapers of an anti-missile missile. Judging from the newspapers, we are working very hard in an effort to perfect this instrument. I assume that this is for defensive purposes and as a weapon or instrument intended to destroy ballistic missiles projected against us, as well as an instrument, with other means, of intercepting Russian bombers in case of attack. If so, it is fair to assume that the Soviets are working to devise and perfect a similar instrument. It is important that they do not do so before we perfect it.

These observations that I have made have a relationship to the urgency for speedup action on our part necessary at this time. For if the time ever should arrive where the Soviets could attack us and hit targets here, and we could not reach their targets, where they could act without fear of retaliation being successful, I seriously doubt if they will wait until we catch up with them.

It could happen if top management in our Government delays too long in doing the things that can and should be done.

We hear we are ahead in overall military power, but what does that really mean? We might be ahead today in overall military power, but will we be in a year or 18 months?

We all know that military weapons are changing so rapidly as a result of research and development that what might be an effective weapon today offensively or defensively, may not be a year or two from now.

In our national interest we must further basic research, and in the applied field, bear the expense of test after test, many of which will be failures, but which are necessary to bring about success and workability. If our Government does the things it should do, I am confident that we can catch up where we are behind. We have the brains—we have the facilities—and the Congress and our people will support the expenditure of all money necessary to catch up, at least where we are behind, and to go ahead of the Soviet Union before Red Russia has perfected the intercontinental ballistic missile, as well as the antimissile missile.

The fault mainly lies in management of our Government. It is necessary that top management act, and act quickly, to eliminate delays in decision making in our technological forces which has brought about uncertainty, and in some cases, confusion.

There must be a reassessment of the position of military research and development in the executive branch, and particularly in the Defense Department and its services.

On the top level there must exist the power to make decisions with the authority to carry them out. Other steps must be taken which have a direct relationship to the two primary steps I have mentioned.

We must remember that democracies do not engage in surprise attacks. I will not argue as to whether or not under certain conditions they should. If one does come, as you and I know, it will be carried out by our enemy. And the best way to deter such an attack is for the Free World, and our country in particular, to be so strong and powerful that the evil-minded men of the Kremlin will know that it would result in the destruction of their country and their people.

While I am frankly discussing an important aspect of our present situation, I do so with the knowledge that you and other Americans can accept information as to the conditions, and that the American people, if informed, will meet any challenge that confronts our country.

What I have said in relation to the field of ballistic missiles applies to other fields of modern warfare that the world killer minds in the Kremlin, if they get a decided advantage might resort to, such as chemical warfare, biological warfare, and psychological warfare.

As long as atheistic communism is bent on world domination, it is imperative that we keep our guard high and always have powerful offensive and retaliatory strength, and use all means possible for our best defense.

While no one with any degree of accuracy can gage or weigh the possibilities of the Communist mind, particularly those in the Kremlin, the Kremlin cannot deny that there is a law of self-preservation, and realize its meaning and significance in terms of their own country and their own people.

If our Government does the things that we know can and should be done, marshal our brains and our facilities and those of the Free World, with the necessary appropriations that will be forthcoming, within the time we have left before the Soviets obtain a decided advantage, we can catch up with them and go ahead of them, and the present fear that grips the Free World will vanish from our minds.

My remarks, as you will note tonight, are confined to the immediate situation that confronts us. We must consider first things first.

I have complete faith in America and its people. I have complete faith in men and women throughout the world who want to be free under their own law. I look forward with confidence that the things our Government should do will be done, particularly now that public opinion is aroused. In this necessary action the Congress will play its effective part and in the legislative field give the necessary leadership.

And you and other Americans can do your part by helping to create a public opinion and demand that America be militarily strong; that if we are going to err, that we err on the side of strength rather than on the side of weakness.

As long as atheistic communism is bent on world revolution, and thereby world domination, it is imperative that America have such military strength and power.

I conclude my remarks by repeating what I have said before. The only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

## Safety Legislation for Small Boats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, for many months, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives has been studying the growing problem with regard to safety in the operation of small boats, the numbers of which have been increasing in recent years literally by the millions.

A few days ago, on January 20, 1958, before the National Association of Marine Dealers, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, summed up the progress which has been made and the steps which must presently be taken. His remarks will be of interest to each Member of the House. He is to be commended for his able approach to the problem and for the fine progress which has been made toward its solution.

I include, as a part of these remarks, a copy of the speech to which I referred:

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, DEMOCRAT, NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MARINE DEALERS' DINNER, PARK-SHERATON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 20, 1958

President Styron, members of the National Association of Marine Dealers, ladies and gentlemen, when rising to my feet to speak, I like to recall the favorite motto of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives. He told me that an old Texas friend sent him the motto which he keeps in his office in the Capitol. It reads: "You ain't larning when you're talkin'."

In any event, I can certainly promise you this: These remarks will be brief. I am sure that most of you want to get back to the Coliseum.

When President Styron invited Mrs. Bonner and me to be his guests at the National Motorboat Show and your guests at this reception and dinner, we were most happy to accept. The fact that your president is a brother Tarheel had nothing to do—of course—with our answer.

We have been impressed with your hospitality here in New York. And as a first-time visitor to the boat show we have been a little overwhelmed. The boat show certainly proves that pleasure boating in this country is booming and is dear to the hearts of millions of Americans.

Our committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, first received an inkling of this when we started the pleasure-boat hearings 18 months ago. Boating, we soon discovered, was becoming the country's leading family recreation.

At this point I might pause to acknowledge in person the foresightedness of Mr. Ralph Klieforth and the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, which he heads, for the first suggestion that Congress make a broad-scale study of pleasure boating.

The study was indeed thorough, and everyone who had something to offer had an opportunity to speak his mind. I am sure that most of you know about the report made last April and the subsequent legislation introduced.

The committee held a brief hearing before adjournment, at which Vice Adm. Alfred Richmond, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, was the witness. Since that time, we have made an important step forward in establishing liaison with the Council of State Governments. A special committee made up of representatives from State governments, from the Coast Guard and from the staff of our committee has been working long and earnestly on this whole involved problem of coordinated Federal and State legislation.

Meanwhile, I would like to sound a word of caution. We must avoid at all cost any Tower of Babel in boating laws. I refer to the prospect of a hodgepodge of local, State, and Federal laws enacted at cross purposes without any master plan or guidance.

How can we avoid such a situation? I think it can be done through the following three points:

1. A moratorium on the well-meaning but, I am afraid, ill-advised activities of private organizations seeking to press their favorite plans for boating laws.

2. A model law for the States should be formulated at the earliest possible moment.

3. The outdated Motorboat Act of 1940 and the even older Numbering Act of 1918 should be brought up to the realities of boating in 1958.

On points 2 and 3, I can report excellent progress that promises well for the overall objective. That objective, of course, is uniform or nearly uniform boating laws throughout the land.

The special Federal-State committee just mentioned is working on perfecting the Federal bill—the Boating Act of 1958. And they are hard at work on a model State bill.

We have high hopes that their efforts will be completed successfully and the next step will be scheduled shortly. That step would be the calling of hearings by the Merchant Marine Committee on H. R. 8474, the Boating Act.

But before going into this, I must point out that the committee has a busy schedule ahead for this session.

Some of the other subjects are the building of a nuclear-powered icebreaker for the Coast Guard, authorizing a sister ship to the steamship *United States*, the question of pilotage on the Great Lakes, required because of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the issue of subsidies for American tramp ships, and an international meeting on safety of life at sea.

This gives you an idea of how active we are likely to be in the coming months.

In connection with the Boating Act, the committee has covered much of the ground in our extensive small-boat hearings in 1956 and 1957. It is my belief, therefore, that the hearings can be relatively brief. With that in mind, it is expected that sessions

could begin during the latter part of February, probably the week of February 24.

I have been in Congress too long, however, to make any firm prediction on when the legislation might be enacted into law. Conceivably it could occur this year.

But if it does not pass this year, a second and equally important phase of our overall objective can be achieved. I refer to the model law for the States, now under study by a special subcommittee of the Council of State Governments. If it can be presented to the States, with the blessing of the Council of State Governments by the end of this year, then they will have an authoritative guide for consideration when the majority of legislatures meet starting next January.

The Federal Boating Act could, of course, be reintroduced at that time in the new Congress, and presumably moved along with some dispatch. In that manner we might find a new Federal law coming into being at about the same time as State laws are enacted.

In the meantime there is much that dealers, manufacturers, and other boating interests can do in a voluntary program. Such a program was drawn up at the recent National Small Boat Safety Conference held in Washington at the suggestion of our committee. The idea behind the program was that there was much that could be done by the industry outside the field of legislation.

A good beginning has been made, and I wish you and the Coast Guard every success in carrying out the recommendations adopted at that important conference. It was gratifying, too, to note that the delegates to the conference realized the need to meet again—I believe next year.

There is, it seems to me, another important area that dealers, manufacturers, other boating groups, local governments and the financial community should concern themselves with. That is the problem of financing and building launching ramps, marinas and other facilities for the growing boating population.

I would like to propose that all of these groups get together the best minds in this field and see if a plan for solving this shortage problem can be evolved. The conference approach might be used again. We know that communities faced with strangulation of their downtown business areas, because of heavy traffic, have come up with some solutions—municipal parking areas and jointly financed parking garages, for example.

Could not some similar arrangement be worked out for boating? I have been told that in some boating areas a sale of a boat is often gained or lost on the basis of whether a slip or dock is available. At the present rate of sales, what is going to be the situation 5 years from now, unless you take some action?

You dealers have an important part to play in safety education, marina development and all the other problems I understand you have. When President Styron informed me last year of the formation of the National Association of Marine Dealers, I wrote him:

"From testimony received at points all over the country during our recreational boating study last year it seems to me that a great deal of good could be accomplished through a national association such as yours—as you say—'at the point where the industry and the sport meet.' The marine dealers of the country are the one group who come in contact with all boatowners.

"I take this occasion to wish you and your new association the best of luck and all of my good wishes for success in a venture that could go far toward increasing the safety and enjoyment of boating."

That is still my sentiment. The response to the idea of a national trade federation of associations and individual dealers apparently has been beyond the expectations of the founders. I congratulate you again on your decision in forming the organization and may it prosper.

May the National Motor Boat Show prosper, too, and all United States pleasure boating.

And now to borrow from Speaker RAYBURN's motto again, there has been a lot of "talkin'" and, perhaps, a little "larning." Mrs. Bonner and I hope to be back again. Many thanks and good evening.

---

## Mexico's Claim to Texas Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, now comes Mexico, who wants to lay claim to the territorial waters beyond the 3-mile limits of the United States.

As the Dallas Morning News points out, this is not as fantastic as it seems at first blush.

Following is what the Dallas Morning News has to say on that subject:

[From the Dallas Morning News of January 17, 1958]

MEXICO'S CLAIM TO TEXAS TIDELANDS

The possibility that Mexico may demand the 7.35-mile strip of Texas' tidelands, which Washington now claims, is not as fantastic as it might seem. At least, it is not as fantastic as Washington's claim in its latest suit against Texas.

As a former chairman of Texas' Good Neighbor Commission, Neville Penrose, of Fort Worth, has many warm friends among our next-door neighbors in Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipas, Chihuahua, and Coahuila. He serves the cause of the commission in reporting the study of such a move by legal experts south of the border. If Mexico decides to get into the act, it would indeed be neighborly. For it would buttress Texas' own claim to the vast underwater acreage at issue.

Mexico's position is logical enough. The seaward boundaries it inherited from Spain are 3 marine leagues, or 10.35 miles, from shore. When Texas seceded from Mexico, in 1836, it inherited the same limits from Mexico.

After Texas joined the American Union, Mexico acknowledged Texas' title to this width of tidelands in the Gulf of Mexico. That was in the Treaty of Guadalupe, which the United States also signed, presumably in equal good faith. Yet the United States now insists before the Supreme Court that Texas owns only out to the 3-mile limit.

In denying Texas' claim to this property, Washington should also admit that it still belongs to Mexico. To date, Texas has collected the dollar equivalent of 337,500,000 pesos in oil leases on this strip. Solvent as is the Ruiz Cortines government, it could doubtless use this tidy little sum.

Texas is getting tired of the doubletalk coming out of Washington. While the Justice Department says Texas is confined to the 3-mile limit, our State Department gives de facto recognition to Chile's claim to a 200-mile limit. It makes no protest when Texas shrimpers are penalized for violating Mexico's 3-league limit. When will this hypocrisy cease and Texas be treated as other than an unwanted stepchild?

In this connection it is indeed proper and appropriate to bring to the attention of the Congress what Judge Leander H. Perez of the parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines, La., had to say before the House Committee on the Judiciary on the operation of submerged lands at a hearing in New Orleans during the past November. This committee was headed by my learned and able colleague, EDWIN E. WILLIS of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana. It was a productive and constructive hearing.

Appearing before the committee was Judge Perez whom I consider to be the best informed man on the subject of the tidelands in the United States. I attribute Judge Perez's unrelenting and vigorous attention to the subject as the major factor in the fight which has been made and which is being made to reserve to the several States their just and due territorial jurisdiction and ownership. Others may have faltered and still others may have compromised but Judge Perez has held steadfastly in his beliefs and his devotion to the cause of preserving the rights of the States in this most important fight.

With your permission I herewith submit to you the full text of the testimony given by Judge Perez in November which is so applicable to the situation as it stands at this moment.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF LEANDER H. PEREZ, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, ST. BERNARD-PLAQUEMINES, LA.

Mr. PEREZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIS. I know you have not been idle in the meantime.

Mr. PEREZ. I have not been idle, really.

Thanks for the opportunity of appearing before you just briefly, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen.

I am sure that in your hearing you received much evidence helpful in the drafting of legislation looking to proper regulation and conservation of mineral resources offshore in that area called the outer Continental Shelf; that is, Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries, as defined and quitclaimed in the Submerged Lands Act.

And my purpose in appearing before the committee today is the same as what I attempted to advocate when I appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on May 30, 1953; and it is this:

Naturally, insofar as our domestic relations are concerned within our States and the United States, the authority for the enactment of laws looking to the regulation and conservation of these resources in the outer Continental Shelf rests with Congress. The application of any such laws finally is with the United States Supreme Court which exercises jurisdiction in matters of controversy between the United States and particularly with respect to the boundaries of the States in the Atlantic, the Gulf, or Pacific, beyond which the provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of Congress is intended to apply.

But I would like to leave this word of caution with the committee in the hope that it will make some impression with Congress and with the authorities in Washington. Regardless of what laws Congress may pass, regulating operations in the outer Continental Shelf, and what the aftermath may be as a result of the United States Supreme Court decisions restricting States historic boundaries to that as contended for by the State Department and the Department of Justice to 3 miles offshore, for which there is no basis of claim in law or in fact—this is the most important thing which we are overlooking. The final authority will not

be with the United States Supreme Court in these matters. I think we have learned to realize that we cannot underestimate our enemies. I would not be surprised to see, after our oil companies have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in exploration and development work, bringing out production in the outer Continental Shelf beyond the restricted State boundaries, that some controversy will be provoked in a higher authority than the United States Supreme Court, and that is the International Court of Justice.

We do know that Great Britain questioned the historic seaward boundaries of Norway. And we should not overlook the fact that in that case the International Court of Justice rendered its last decision on the question of seaward boundaries and it was based on the fact that although Norway claimed the extent of some 70 miles from shore seaward as its historic boundary, the International Court of Justice held with it but based its decision on this holding, and I quote:

"Historic waters are usually meant waters which are treated as internal waters but which would not have that character were it not for the existence of a historic title." And that, and I quote again:

"Norwegian sovereignty over these waters would constitute an exception, historic titles justifying situations which would otherwise be in conflict with international law."

Now, the claim of the United States to the outer Continental Shelf beyond the State's historic boundaries is of recent origin and certainly not of historic significance or application. It does not go beyond President Truman's proclamation in 1947 and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in 1953.

While your committee is studying these problems regarding legislation for regulating and protecting our resources in the Continental Shelf, serious study should be given to what may happen in the future if the present trend in Washington succeeds in restricting the States' boundaries to a mere 3 miles from shore, which would, in effect, surrender to an international court the decision of what happens to the submerged lands and resources beyond 3 miles, including our inland waters, because a line drawn 3 miles from shore would deprive our State of large areas of its inland waters.

Now, I do not want to go too much at length in the matter.

One thing we should bear in mind is this:

The United States Constitution gives to Congress alone the right to admit new States into the Union. Since adoption of the Constitution in 1789, Congress admitted 35 States, some inland and some coastal States, and in each instance Congress defined the limits of those States. It certainly makes no difference whether a State is coastal and has a limit extending out seaward or whether it is entirely inland. But we are up against a serious proposition because the representatives of the National Government are after restricting the States' historic seaward boundaries to 3 miles from shore and throwing out all that vast area into the outer Continental Shelf, when, as a matter of fact, a study of the historic boundaries of the States would show that there is not much of the Continental Shelf lying outside the States' historic boundaries.

I would like to leave with the committee a statement which I filed with the Senate Interior Committee on May 30, 1953. Attached to my statement is a map of the outer Continental Shelf, a map of the 20 leagues line of the original coastal States on the Atlantic Ocean as fixed in article II of the treaty which settled the War of the Revolution.

And over to the west on the Pacific, we must take into consideration the Guadalupe Hidalgo Treaty which settled the war between Mexico and the United States, under which Mexico ceded to the United States everything north of the line extending to the Pacific coast. This included the islands lying off California, all of which was included in that State's seaward boundary 3 miles from coast by the act of Congress which admitted California as a State into the Union. Similar acts admitted Washington and Oregon, 3 miles from the coast into the Pacific Ocean.

If you will make a study of the old French official map of Louisiana Territory with the coastline drawn upon it, and compare it to the outer Continental Shelf, you will see that it establishes a historic title within the principles announced by the International Court of Justice, because our title then would date back to 1803 when France ceded the Louisiana Territory, and to 1812 when Congress fixed the boundary of Louisiana at 3 leagues from the coast into the Gulf of Mexico. The 20 leagues from shore in the Atlantic was fixed in the treaty which settled the War of the Revolution. The 6 leagues from coast boundary to which Florida is entitled, dates back to the 1763 proclamation of the British Crown, when Britain fixed the boundaries of the East and West Florida Territories. Later Britain ceded to Spain in 1783, and Spain in 1819 ceded the Florida Territories to the United States with the same boundaries extending as they were held by those governments.

We have gotten away from history and we are going to get into serious trouble sooner or later unless we adhere to State historic boundaries in the regulation of operations for development and conservation of our natural resources under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

It is a very serious matter for the Congress to consider primarily because I expect to see the United States Supreme Court go along with the State Department and the Attorney General's Office on the baseless claim that Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter when he was Secretary of State, and referred to the old cannon shot range of 3 miles. But Jefferson repudiated that story as having any significance. When he was President in 1807 he had Congress pass an act authorizing him as President to survey the coast of the United States within 20 leagues offshore. That was in keeping with the second article of the treaty with the British Crown which settled the War of the Revolution and fixed the boundaries of the Atlantic Coastal States as 20 leagues offshore.

I think we should all be concerned that politics has gotten into the State historic boundary question, with one side not wanting to be criticized by the liberals of the other side on the "giveaway" program. You have heard those speeches.

But the United States Government and the people of every State stand to lose, and we do not know what the future will hold. Possibly the United Nations will take them over eventually, if the International Court of Justice holds they do not belong to the United States, because there is no historic title to the claim of the outer Continental Shelf beyond the State boundaries. Then it would be a sad mess.

I hope I have not imposed on you gentlemen. I have not contributed much to the technical questions, the mechanics of the operations, but I consider this fundamentally even more important because it does affect all operations of the future in the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. WILLIS. Judge?

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. The act of Congress admitting Louisiana into the Union, as the acts of Congress admitting all other States into the Union, as you pointed out, described the boundaries of the admitted area.

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. With respect to that act of Congress admitting Louisiana, that act refers to the coast and not the shore, does it not?

Mr. PEREZ. That is right, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. It says that Louisiana is bounded on the south by the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. PEREZ. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Including islands.

Mr. PEREZ. All of the area, comprehending all islands, within 3 leagues from the coast.

Mr. WILLIS. Three leagues from the coast?

Mr. PEREZ. From the coast.

Mr. WILLIS. So that is the act of Congress.

Mr. PEREZ. That is it.

Mr. WILLIS. Then the first constitution of Louisiana which was required to be adopted by the act mentions the same description?

Mr. PEREZ. In the preamble it contained exactly the same description; yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. Then the Submerged Lands Act that we passed again refers to the coastline.

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. Where do they get the Chapman argument and the Secretary of State argument about the shoreline? Where do they get that from?

Mr. PEREZ. I can tell you, sir, because I represented Louisiana in the controversy with the United States at that time—that was in 1950—and Perlman was the Solicitor General. They call it the Chapman line, because he was the Interior Secretary at the time. That actually is the Perlman line. Perlman just took a pencil and drew that line. And I can tell you something more in connection with that Perlman line or Chapman line. If you will look at the Perlman line you will notice how east of the river, for instance, inside of Breton Sound, it comes way in near shore and then it goes out again, and then at East Bay, between South Pass and Southwest Pass, it does the same thing. It comes way inside and goes out again. Well, there was an oilfield in both of those areas, and they were just cutting into those oilfields without any guide to go by. As a matter of fact, neither Perlman, the Solicitor General, nor Chapman, the Interior Secretary, had any authority under any act of Congress to define any line, shore, or coast. Originally in 1807, the authority to have surveyed and to mark the coastline was given by Congress to the President; in 1895 that authority was given to the Secretary of the Treasury; in 1913 to the Secretary of Commerce, and in 1948 under the Reorganization Plan No. 1, that authority was given to the Commandant of the Coast Guard. There is a booklet published by the Commandant of the Coast Guard showing just where that coastline runs. There is no mystery about it. The coastline as the House Judiciary Committee defined it in its report in 1953 is simply the outer boundary of inland waters where the sea begins.

Mr. WILLIS. Where it comes in contact. Here is the language.

Mr. PEREZ. And the coastline is also defined in the Submerged Lands Act in the same way.

Mr. WILLIS. Other corollary language. But the term "coastline" means the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea.

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. And whether it is 3 miles from that point. What bothers me is why should there be such a mystery about a coastline and a shoreline?

Mr. PEREZ. There should not be any mystery at all.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not want to go into the question of 3 miles versus 10 miles. That is not even before the Supreme Court.

Mr. PEREZ. No, sir, I would not take that for granted, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. Well——

Mr. PEREZ. The old cannon-shot rule—I expect to see the court say 3 miles from shore—the Chapman line.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask a question?

This has been a most interesting presentation here.

This was a very illuminating statement you made, Judge.

Has this position that you presented here been presented to the Supreme Court?

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, I would like to file with your committee, and I deleted that part which is irrelevant here, a booklet which we prepared and filed with the Supreme Court. The Louisiana coastal parishes had filed or attempted to file an intervention in the suit against Louisiana on this boundary question, and showed that our boundaries ran coextensively with that of the State and therefore we had an interest, that we were entitled to a percentage of the State's severance tax and oil royalties for certain purposes to be applied within our parishes. However, the Supreme Court rejected our intervention without hearing.

Mr. KEATING. Rejected it?

Mr. PEREZ. Yes, sir.

I filed a brief in connection with it and I would like to file it with your committee, because in that we refute every contention made by the Attorney General or Solicitor General for the United States of its claim to this 3-mile cannon-shot belt. We quote from Secretary Dulles' letter, for instance, which was attached to a brief filed by the Attorney General in that case which was based principally on the Jefferson 3-mile statement in his letter in 1793, and we cite the Jefferson repudiation of that letter as meaning that it was approval of a 3-mile belt. As a matter of fact, he said our boundary should extend to the Gulf Stream because that was natural boundary. We show that Jefferson even equipped a force to cruise within our seas, to arrest all vessels of those descriptions found hovering on our coast within the limits of the Gulf Stream. We refer to the 1807 act of Congress. Secretary Dulles, I think, had quoted Secretary Seward for a 3-mile-belt statement, and we show that Secretary Seward negotiated the treaty for the purchase of Alaska from Russia, the boundary of which was fixed at 10 marine leagues from the coast, and that certainly showed that Mr. Seward was not an advocate of a 3-mile belt when he negotiated the Alaska treaty going out 10 leagues from the coast.

That is the kind of stuff which the Attorney General's Office and the State Department are using in their efforts to restrict the State's historic boundaries to 3 miles from shore, and thereby throw this vast area into the outer Continental Shelf, or international waters, jurisdiction over which lies in the International Court of Justice.

How we may come out in the future, we do not know, but we can expect that our enemies are pretty smart, and I think they have proven that lately. They are not going to overlook this bet to embarrass the United States.

Mr. KEATING. How can Russia claim this property?

Mr. PEREZ. How can Russia claim it?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. PEREZ. International waters do not belong to anyone. Russia is too smart to come into the International Court and sue the United States, but Russia has a lot of satellites. Russia could easily influence some of our southern neighbors, through financed corporations organized under their laws, with drilling permits from their governments in developed areas. Some other country or government may back up their licensees to operate in proven areas of the outer Continental Shelf sooner or later. That would bring the issue squarely before the International Court of Justice.

Mr. KEATING. How could any other specific country claim it?

Mr. PEREZ. The same as the United States Government claims what lies in those international waters. Finally, with an adverse decision of the International Court against the United States, it may wind up in the United Nations. We do not know. I cannot predict just what would happen, except we would be prevented from exploiting the resources in the outer Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries to the exclusion of nationals of other nations. In that case whatever laws Congress may pass regulating those operations in that vast area would be unenforcible.

Mr. KEATING. I do not see how any tribunal with any jurisdiction could stop the United States from exploiting that area.

Mr. PEREZ. The International Court of Justice undoubtedly has jurisdiction, and they could have stopped Norway, as they said in their decision, if Norway's title had not been based on an 1812 decree of the Norwegian Crown, or historic title. They said otherwise Norway's claim would be in conflict with international law. In that same case they held that the 3-mile belt, the 10-mile headland rule, and the Boggs formula had no accepted place in international law. The decisive question was historic title. The States have it. The Federal Government through their representatives now are trying to destroy that historic title. Where it will end, we do not know.

I feel sure the International Court of Justice can prevent the United States from interfering with nationals of other governments from exploiting the resources in the international waters or outer Continental Shelf. It is a serious question. The men who are in office today playing politics as they are with the future welfare of the country and who will be out of politics in a relatively short time, compared with time as it goes with the Nation and the States, will have done their country and the people of the States a great disservice. They are at the helm now and we are practically helpless as States.

Mr. WILLIS. Do you have a question, Governor Tuck?

Mr. TUCK. I have no questions.

I would like to say I appreciate personally the message that the judge has brought us. I certainly am one among those who deprecates the fact that the Federal Government seems to be using so much of its powers to abridge the right of the States and seems to have less concern for the powers exercised by these foreign countries.

Mr. PEREZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave these for you. I will mark them Perez 1 and 2. If you care to incorporate them, I think they contain all of the substance and historical references on the subject.

Mr. KEATING. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, where it has any bearing on the hearings we are concerned with.

Mr. WILLIS. We will have it for our file but not for the record.

Mr. FRAZIER. I have no questions.

I just want to thank the judge for appearing here and elucidating this question. I think it has a fair amount of importance to the people of the United States as well as Louisiana.

Mr. PEREZ. That little booklet treats of the historic boundaries of various Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific boundaries.

Mr. WILLIS. Thank you, Judge.

Mr. PEREZ. Thank you, gentlemen.



## Albert Gallatin: Great American Statesman and Founder of House Committee on Ways and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, January 29, it was our privilege to celebrate the 197th anniversary of the birth, in Geneva, Switzerland, of a man who was fated to become one of the legendary titans of America's fabled period of colonial growth and development. He was Albert Gallatin, and his name deserves to occupy a permanent place in the affections of the American people, akin to that long held by the names of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison.

At different times throughout his life, Albert Gallatin served the infant Republic as a State legislator, as Congressman, as Senator, as Secretary of Treasury, and as America's Ambassador to England and to the Republic of France. From his early youth, therefore, until he was well past the age of 80, Gallatin labored incessantly for the safeguarding and improvement of America's system of democratic government, and for the creation of a stable system of peaceful relations with all the other nations of the world.

To embody his determination to bring the tax, fiscal, and trade policies of the executive branch of the Government under the firm control of the elected representatives of the people, Gallatin became the original founder and one of the first members of the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am proud to be a current member.

I consider it one of the special privileges of my committee to carry forward into the present time the tradition and teachings of Gallatin. It will soon be the responsibility of that committee to frame new legislation for the extension of reciprocal trade authority. If Gallatin were here today to share this labor I know that he would counsel us to act only on the basis of our concern for national welfare, and in the spirit of his own message on trade to Congress in 1832, in which he said:

> It is commerce which unites the nations of the civilized world * * * It is principally to commerce that we are indebted for modern civilization.

Today, Gallatin's farsighted policy is under powerful attack by narrow protectionist forces. As you well know, one of the unfortunate victims of the misguided zeal of these protectionists is Switzerland, the land of Gallatin's birth. For the past 4 years America's imports of Switzerland's world-famed watches have been the object of a campaign of restriction and harassment almost without precedent in our history of commercial foreign relations.

We all recognize that America's ties with the entire Free World are now challenged by the powerful, divisive force of Soviet collectivism. To cope with this challenge we must revive Gallatin's principles on trade as the guide to our future action. We must renew and strengthen our commercial ties to what Gallatin called the nations of the civilized world. We can accomplish this vital task, only if the Members of the House can approach their job in the spirit of the founder of the House Ways and Means Committee—the great Albert Gallatin.

---

## Address of Hon. William M. Colmer, of Mississippi, at Dedication of Keesler Air Force Base Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable BILL COLMER, one of the most outstanding Members of this Congress, delivered an inspiring speech at Keesler Air Force Base, January 11, 1958. Under unanimous consent, I include his address in the RECORD. It follows:

General Sutherland, Dr. Fisackerly, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be invited to be with you here today on this momentous occasion. As we gather here today to dedicate this magnificent new hospital, it is natural for us to think of it in terms of its material attributes. We take pride in the neat, clean wards, the gleaming laboratories, the germ-free operating rooms, and the spotless kitchens. We are proud of the efficient design expressed in architectural forms of harmony and beauty. We are proud of these things because they express to us our high American achievements in architecture and in the many disciplines that go to make up the science of medicine. And aside from the physical structure which we formally dedicate today, we take justifiable pride in the skill, the spirit, and the devotion to duty of the men and women who staff this monument to modern medical science.

It is right and fitting that we should take pride in these things, and yet it seems to me that a hospital is more than the sum of its material parts, however excellent these may be. A hospital is both a symbol and a reminder. It is a symbol of our national ideals, and it is a reminder of the price that we may have to pay to preserve these ideals inviolate in a world made hideous with the specter of a ruthless conspiracy dedicated to world domination and the extermination of the spirit of freedom.

Moreover, as a Mississippian, I anticipate, with considerable comfort and pride, the contribution this most modern institution will make to the medical advancement in my beloved State. This is well. In fact, it is most comforting to us to observe the splendid spirit of cooperation existing at all times between the people of Biloxi, and Mississippians generally, on the one hand, and the Keesler leadership and personnel on the other. There is, and always has been, a minimum of conflict between the two. The absence of this harmony has so often marred this coveted relationship in other localities. I should, therefore, like to congratulate both our city and Federal officials upon this proper and happy situation. Sacrifices have been made on both sides. They must continue in the interest of harmony and the perpetuation of this proud and valuable asset to Biloxi and the Mississippi coast.

This building is a very special sort of symbol because it is a special sort of hospital. While it is true that members of other branches of our armed services and their dependents will become beneficiaries of this great institution, it is primarily an Air Force hospital. As such, it symbolizes many things. For example, it symbolizes the imagination, the daring and the heroism of the men who work in the very specialized field of air medicine. It is these men who have made it possible for us to exert the instrument of airpower throughout the terrestrial globe by helping to discover and develop the techniques of survival in the vastness of the Arctic, in desert wastelands, and in the shark-infested seas.

We pay tribute to these men, for without them our airpower would remain forever earthbound, denied the capability of moving heavenward beyond the stratosphere and into the far reaches of interstellar space, where clearly the future of airpower lies, and where, it is quite possible, the decisive battles of the future will be fought, should war come.

But this hospital is not only a symbol. It is a reminder as well. It is a reminder that the men who wear the uniform live in peril in peacetime as well as in war, and daily risk their lives to guard the air approaches through which an enemy might attack us. It is a reminder, too, that if our airpower deterrent to war should fail, it will be not only those in uniform, but civilians as well, such of us as may survive, who will desperately need the services that hospitals like this one can provide. It is a reminder that the stakes that lie on the table today are nothing less than our national survival, a reminder of the stern realities that require of us so much of our national effort and of our personal treasure.

I have spoken of this hospital as a symbol of the achievements of aeromedicine, but, of course, it symbolizes many other things as well. It symbolizes, for example, our knowledge and conviction that our American youth is our greatest and our most precious national asset. It symbolizes our concern for their welfare and our realization that, without these dedicated men and women, our most ingenious instruments of defense would be useless and incapable of keeping the enemy at bay.

It used to be the fashion to believe that the coming of the age of so-called push-button warfare would require that we maintain in uniform fewer and fewer people with lesser and lesser skills. Unfortunately, this belief has proved to be only half true. It is probably true that ultimately we will require fewer people in our Military Establishment, but it is also true that a higher percentage of them will have to be trained and skillful technicians.

It is an inexorable fact that the more sophisticated our weapons become, the greater is our requirement for men and women with the capacity to absorb the highly technical training necessary if they are to maintain and operate these complex weapons, and who have the willingness to devote their talents to a career that imposes many physical and emotional hardships upon its members, while granting them few material rewards.

The time has passed when we could measure the strength of a military establishment by the number of bodies it contains. Today the strength of our Military Establishment lies in the sum of the skills that its members possess and in the proportion of these skills to the jobs to be performed.

We are all increasingly aware that we have not, in the past, made the fullest use of this, our most precious national asset, our youth. We have allowed too many of our young people to enter upon maturity with their full potentialities unrealized. We have too often permitted our armed services to become mere training schools for industry, by failing to provide the incentives that would keep our skilled people in uniform.

This hospital symbolizes not merely our concern for the material well-being of our young men and women who wear the uniform. It expresses as well our new concern that they be freed of anxiety for the health and welfare of their loved ones, whether they, themselves, are at home or in distant places, far away.

But, Mr. Chairman, in our evaluation and admiration of this magnificent structure, its most modern equipment and the patriotic men and women whom it will serve, it would seem appropriate also to briefly consider the overall picture of the Republic's defense. This is peculiarly true in the light of the spectacular advances made by our potential enemy, the Russians, in the field of long-range missiles and outer-space gadgets. These achievements should neither be surprising nor discounted. Certainly, we should not become panicky about them. Why should we suddenly panic over the launching by the Russians of a rocket-propelled satellite into outer space? Is our memory so short that we have forgotten that at the end of World War II Germany was far ahead of the Allies in the development of long-range rockets and missiles? And, moreover, under our appeasement policy at the conclusion of that war we permitted the Soviets to capture and transport to Russia many of the leading German scientists, who were responsible for that achievement.

The fact that Russia is ahead of us in this particular field does not necessarily mean that America is impotent to defend itself. There is good and sound reason to believe that in all other avenues of warfare, the striking power of America is superior to that of the slave kingdom of the Communist leaders.

In spite of all of the hysteria and propaganda, it is most difficult to believe that a nation as backward and undeveloped as Russia less than two decades ago has overnight, through slave-like methods, developed a super race of people and a monopoly in the world of science.

Despite the propaganda value of the sputnik, the Kremlin masters are possibly more aware than the average American citizen of the gigantic striking power of our own long, as well as short range missiles and the greatest Air Force in the world. They dare not test the retaliatory power of these machines of destruction.

Surely, prudence would suggest that, under these conditions, this new turn of events in the cold war should be met with cool, sober, and deliberate action. The challenge thus posed should be met. But we must not permit ourselves to be misled into charging off in all directions and thus destroy our own economy and institutions.

Let us ever be mindful of the fact that the blueprint laid out by the chief architect of communism, and still the Communist idol, Lenin, himself, provided for ultimate victory by the destruction of the American economy.

Finally, this hospital symbolizes the awareness of all of us that we share in the heavy responsibilities that we bear as citizens of this great Republic. This is our gift to the men and women in uniform and to their families. It was bought with our dollars and it will dispense the blessings of health and the mercies of medical care only with our continued financial support.

This hospital is a living symbol of our determination that we, as American citizens, in or out of uniform, will make whatever sacrifices may be necessary that our country may lead the world into a future of peace and prosperity for all men, under God.

May this noble and magnificent structure, during its long years of usefulness, never be called upon to function in a period of active warfare.

## A Report on the Canadian Gas Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, because of the potential impact of natural gas imports on the domestic economy and national security, I should like to review briefly the course of the so-called Canadian gas cases before the Federal Power Commission.

During the 1st session of the 85th Congress numerous Members of the House discussed the proposed pipeline from Canada to the Midwest. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] who has led the battle for more than a decade to protect America's markets from products of cheap labor abroad, joins with me in accepting the challenge of Canadian gas proponents, and I am happy to say that many other of our colleagues take a similar position. We pointed out the grave economic implications contained in the applications for this pipeline. We explained that coal miners, railroad workers, dockworkers, and employees of many allied businesses would be relegated to the rolls of the unemployed if this foreign gas were permitted to enter United States fuel markets. We reviewed the serious national defense considerations involved when any single phase of the military structure lends itself to reliance upon an uncertain supply of energy.

The controversy which has persisted in Canada over attempts of international gas dealers to vend an exhaustible commodity without first attempting to discern the extent of the Dominion's own requirements—these and other issues originating in the producing fields and echoing through the House of Commons in Ottawa were also reviewed for Members of Congress prior to adjournment in August. Dissatisfaction on the part of the Canadian press and of the general public from Nova Scotia to British Columbia was recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The full story of Canadian gas—except for that portion of it covering the mysterious financial transactions that have thus far never been opened to the public—was covered in full for the elucidation of Congress, the Federal Power Commission, the executive department, and the American people. I shall at this time proceed to examine the developments that have taken place since the adjournment of Congress.

Throughout September and most of October a parade of witnesses appeared at the Federal Power Commission hearings to present testimony and submit to cross-examination. Meanwhile, reverberations were being heard in various areas of the Dominion itself. Addressing the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, a member of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly charged that export of Canadian gas would be a scandalous sellout of an important Canadian import at the expense of Canadian producers and Canadian consumers. Taking the same position that many of us in Congress believed most feasible for the protection of Canadians and of proposed consumers in the imports' target areas of this country, he demanded establishment of a Royal Commission to investigate the Trans-Canadian Pipe Line Co., from whose facilities the projected international line would derive its supply.

Shortly thereafter, on October 15, such a commission was in fact created by Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, who told the House of Commons that no final answer could be given on the export issue until the commission has reported its findings. As directed by Mr. Diefenbaker, the commission is to study pipeline operations, including price regulation and the financial structure of the pipeline companies. The Prime Minister emphasized the necessity for conserving supplies to meet present and future Canadian requirements before granting export licenses. News sources in Canada reported that about 2 years would be needed for the commission to complete its work.

As if to accentuate the impossibility of expediting a final determination of the export issue, the Prime Minister on October 31 stated that the Government would make no decision until after the Borden—chairman—Royal Commission had completed its investigation and submitted its recommendations.

On the basis of this action by the Canadian Government, we might justifiably assume that our own Federal Power Commission would not even consider allowing the proposed foreign pipeline to enter this country at least until the matter of exports was settled in Ottawa and in affected Provinces. Nonetheless, the FPC continued its hearings as if oblivious of what was transpiring in the Dominion.

Then, in early November, another explosion jolted the pipeline applicants. It took place in the FPC hearing room during the appearance of Francis Kernan, partner in the New York firm which financed the Trans-Canada Pipe Line. Mr. Kernan admitted that appointment of the Royal Commission to study Canada's projected energy demands and to investigate the pipeline itself is a serious impediment to the Canadian-American line proposed by Tennessee Pipe Line Co. and its subsidiary, Midwestern Gas Transmission Co. He added that some clarification of this situation will be necessary before Midwestern could finance.

In consequence of this uncertainty and of other intangibles born of the questionable relationships behind the parent pipeline, and brought into prominence by subsequent actions of the Canadian Government and through testimony before the FPC, a motion to dismiss the applications of Widwestern and its affiliate—on the grounds that they did not have an assured supply of natural gas from Canada—was filed by Fuels Research Council jointly with the National Coal Association, United Mine Workers of America, Mid-West Coal Producers Institute, Inc., the Anthracite Institute, and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.

Last month the Commission directed that the motion be referred to the presiding examiner for consideration and disposition after the hearing is completed and briefs are filed.

In the interim period, a large number of witnesses representing the American coal and railroad industries have testified in opposition to the Canadian gas applications. I shall not include any of the testimony in the RECORD at this time. The hearings are now nearing their conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that Members of the House and Senate keep a watchful eye on what transpires at the FPC. Committed by the Constitution to regulate foreign commerce, Congress will be responsible for enacting legislation to protect American industry and labor against this new threat if the FPC does not properly consider the anticipated impact of the proposed foreign import on American fuel industries.

Mr. Speaker, American coal production suffered a severe decline in 1957. We are in the throes of an economic situation that finds thousands of coal miners and railroad workers without employment. It is incumbent upon us as Members of Congress to seek out and remedy the policies that have brought about this distress.

To permit Canadian gas to capture markets upon which other miners and railroaders depend for subsistence would be inimical to the welfare and security of the United States. If the Federal Power Commission does not issue a finding in defense of these markets and these people, the Congress must set up a legislative barrier in their defense.

## Urgent Need for Additional Capacity in Veterans Hospitals in St. Louis and Elsewhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time over the past few years, I have been urging upon the Veterans' Administration an expansion of the present veterans hospital in St. Louis, the John J. Cochran Memorial Hospital, to meet the urgent needs of veterans in our area who

are required to wait for extended periods for necessary operations or hospital care. As originally planned, this hospital was to have been a 1,000-bed facility. That is what the Congress originally authorized. But in line with the general cutback made by the Veterans' Administration in the size of nearly all of the new hospitals programed near the end of—or immediately after—World War II, this hospital was built as a 500-bed installation. Actually it has a rated capacity of only 487 beds.

I am distressed to point out that the waiting list now represents the full capacity of the hospital. Only a year ago, the waiting list included only about 207 eligible veterans. Now, as I said, it is over 500.

The hospital itself is operating at peak efficiency. I am proud of the way it has been run. I have never had any difficulty in obtaining immediate hospitalization for any service-connected case, and they have been most accommodating about extremely urgent emergency cases among non-service-connected cases.

But the fact remains—and it is indeed a most unfortunate and distressing fact for those directly affected—that we need a hospital twice as big as the one we have. We need a hospital of the size this hospital was originally supposed to be—of the size originally authorized and approved by the Congress.

VA HAS FULL AUTHORITY TO EXPAND HOSPITALS

Under the basic authorizing legislation, this hospital and many, many others now in operation under the Veterans' Administration could be expanded or doubled in size to meet current needs if the money were provided by Congress and if the construction were undertaken by the Administration. No new legislation would be needed other than the appropriation of the funds.

The VA, as we know, is not requesting such funds. Even if it were inclined to seek added funds for expansion of these hospitals, it could not obtain approval under the present administration from the Bureau of the Budget. So there is no initiative being taken on this by the agency involved.

I think that is most unfortunate. I think Congress, therefore, should take the initiative to recommend an expansion program for those hospitals we fully know require such expansion in order to take care of the large numbers of veterans awaiting hospitalization.

Of course Congress cannot force the administration to spend the funds even if we do provide them. There would have to be a change of thinking—a change of heart—on the part of the Budget Bureau and of the President. But perhaps if the Congress were to take the lead and make the case for expansion—as we all know can easily be done—the present administration might develop the necessary fiscal courage to go along and go ahead on such a program.

FIGURES SHOW EXTENT OF NEED

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House conducted a study on this problem and obtained information from veterans' hospitals all over the country on the size of their waiting lists and the needs for adequate service to those veterans entitled to hospitalization but not receiving it without extended delay.

In the case of the John J. Cochran Hospital, for instance, the record shows that with a rated-bed capacity of 487 beds, we have all of those beds in operating condition, with the full staff to maintain them. There is no problem there. We have outstanding medical training centers. The figures showed that over a 12-month period, this hospital actually operated with a daily patient load of 443. Only about half of the hospital's 39 tuberculosis beds were in daily use on the average and of the 78 neuropsychiatric beds, about 46 were utilized on a daily average basis over the 12-month period. But with a rated capacity of 370 general medical and surgical beds, the record over the 12-month period showed an average daily patient load of 379. So that part of the hospital operated above capacity.

And most of those on the waiting list at that time—a year ago—were waiting for calls for general medical or surgical attention.

What these figures which I have mentioned show—and they show it dramatically— is that our hospital in St. Louis is truly operating on a level of maximum efficiency, in that the G. M. and S. beds just never go empty. Despite the fact that the average length of stay for G. M. and S. bed patients has been 23.8 days, the turnover has been so well managed that the hospital has been operating day-in-and-day-out at capacity or overcapacity on general medical and surgical cases. This is an outstanding record, I believe.

OTHER HOSPITALS SHOW SIMILAR UTILIZATION

Just taking at random some of the other veterans' hospitals covered in the study last year made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we find examples like these:

Birmingham, Ala.: Operating beds, 410; average daily patient load, 361; waiting list, 76.

North Little Rock, Ark.: Rated capacity, 2,062; average daily patient load, 1,976; waiting list, 176.

Long Beach, Calif.: Operating beds, 1,380; average daily patient load, 1,329; waiting list, 178.

Palo Alto, Calif.: Operating beds, 1,400; average daily patient load, 1,339; waiting list, 948.

Bay Pines, Fla.: Operating beds, 516; average daily patient load, 496; waiting list, 444.

Augusta, Ga.: Operating beds, 1,329; average daily patient load, 1,260; waiting list, 210.

Chicago, Ill.: Operating beds, 516; average daily patient load, 454; waiting list, 88.

They are just a few, Mr. Speaker, just leafing through the study made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—just selecting some at random in the opening part of the study. I have not attempted to pick out the worst instances—that is, the best examples. I am just taking a few from among States in the first part of the alphabet.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has the full facts on all of these installations in every State. It is a most impressive story for those who will but look it over.

SITUATION PERFECT FOR EXPANSION OF ST. LOUIS HOSPITAL

Taking the case of our hospital in St. Louis, Mr. Speaker, I might point out that veterans groups there have been making studies from time to time not only on the needs of the veterans for more hospital space but on the feasibility of an expansion of this hospital.

It is located in an area of our city where expansion would be most feasible. The surrounding property would not be excessive in price, and an expansion of this hospital would be a contribution toward improving the physical area.

There is no good reason why this hospital should not be expanded. The only reason it has not been expanded is that the White House and Budget Bureau have shut their eyes to the needs.

I know, of course, that our situation in St. Louis is not the worst example in the country. Many veterans hospitals are equally in need of expansion, if not more so. Hence, we must have an overall program—expanding wherever needed—rather than have each Congressional delegation try to slip through some provision for their own area.

I would be most happy to join with Members from all districts where a similar situation exists to sponsor the necessary funds to expand our veterans hospitals to meet today's needs, as against the needs of 10 years ago. For it is a sad fact that most of the veterans hospitals that I am familiar with are built to the needs of 10 years or more ago, not to the needs of today.

Need we be reminded that the average age of our veteran population is much higher now than when the hospitals were begun, and that as our veterans age, their needs for hospitalization generally advance, at least proportionately if not at an accelerated rate.

ECONOMIC AS WELL AS HUMANITARIAN JUSTIFICATION FOR EXPANSION OF VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to give the impression I am urging expansion of veterans hospitals in order to make work—as a kind of WPA or PWA project. But the fact is that we need this added capacity for eligible deserving veterans. And the fact is also unfortunately true that we are now going deeper into recession each day of this new year.

We are going to be spending added billions for missiles and other weapons of war. We need those weapons. We need military research funds and they will be provided.

But I cannot help but notice—as we all have noticed—that the President in his economic report a few days ago made clear he was expecting these increased missile and defense expenditures to serve the added purpose of bolstering not only our defenses but our sagging economy as well.

Any money spent now and in the near future for needed veterans hospital construction would have a similar dual effect of helping our economy to revive.

I just throw that into the discussion as an added point. We are not seeking a hospital expansion program to provide employment; we are seeking it in order to provide needed hospitalization for deserving veterans. But it is worth keeping in mind that this would have a desirable economic effect, too.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we get started now on this program.

## Statement of Hon. Seely-Brown on Public Law 874

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, there has been pending before the Subcommittee on General Education, Committee on Education and Labor, legislation pertaining to Public Laws 874 and 815, which I support because I believe that it is imperative that benefits extended to federally impacted areas be continued and maintained.

In this connection, my colleague, the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., appeared before the committee and gave a very excellent statement in which he supported favorable consideration of Public Law 874 as it is presently written.

I believe his presentation was an admirable one and I submit it to my colleagues for reading.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO EXTEND PUBLIC LAWS 874 AND 815, 81ST CONGRESS, AS AMENDED, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful indeed for the opportunity to present this statement in support of legislation to extend Public Laws 874 and 815 of the 81st Congress, as amended.

As we all know, when it became increasingly apparent that certain educational problems which existed during World War II were not of a temporary nature, appropriate legislation was enacted. In enacting Public Law 874, the Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to the local educational agencies in the areas in which certain Federal activities are carried on. The dual burden placed on school districts by Federal activities was caused mainly by a reduction in revenue available to such agencies from local sources as the result of the acquisition of real property by the United States, and the sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as a result of Federal activities. The provisions for assistance written into the law have proved to be wisely conceived and equitable in application. They insure that Federal funds will be directed to the place of immediate need and that they will be in proportion to the burden placed on the schools by a Federal activity. It was originally intended to enact Public Law 874 as permanent legislation after a 4-year trial period. Subsequent amendments to the law, and its extension from time to time, definitely indicate there is a realization that the problems toward which Public Law 874 was directed still exist. There is no question but that the situation exists today, as it did in 1950, where a disproportionate share of the tax burden for the support of public education must be borne by the property owners of the towns where Federal or defense installations are located.

The need for a continuation of assistance to school districts in which Federal activities are carried on is well recognized by those of us whose Congressional Districts include schools affected by these activities. The aid provided in the past has become an important part of the financial structure of many Connecticut communities. The attached charts clearly indicate this to be the case. One community in my own Congressional District may be cited as a striking example, namely, the town of Groton, where almost 33⅓ percent of the annual budget for education has come from financial assistance provided under the terms of Public Law 874. If the law is not extended in basically its present form, the task of raising additional revenue within this town to support the educational budget will be almost insuperable.

I urge the committee to give favorable consideration to legislation to extend Public Law 874 in virtually its present form. I am, however, particularly concerned about two of its provisions. One of these is that part of the law dealing with eligibility for entitlement. I firmly believe that parents' employment on Federal property as a basis for children's eligibility should be continued. The policy of acceptance of parents' employment on Federal property as the basis for eligibility is as sound today as it was when the law was enacted, and should, in my opinion, be made permanent. Another portion of the law I am particularly anxious to see continued is that which permits the counting of children living in Federal housing sold or transferred to non-Federal ownership as federally connected for certain purposes. Under the best of conditions, there is an inevitable lapse of time before there is a local tax yield from these residences after their sale by the Federal Government. Since the grand list is made up on the basis of property ownership status as of just one particular date each year, it is conceivable that the property actually should have been taxable by the town for a period of almost 2 years before any payment is forthcoming.

In addition to being of the opinion that the law should be extended basically in toto, I feel that it should actually be liberalized to a certain extent. I hope the committee will give careful consideration to an amendment, along the lines of the following language, to subsection 3 (c) (2) of Public Law 874: Insert, after the last sentence of the subsection, which ends with the words "and would defeat the purposes of this act," the following: "In any case, when a local educational agency has established eligibility for payment for one or more fiscal years beginning July 1, 1956, and thereafter, it shall, effective with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, continue to be eligible for payments under subsection 3 (c) (1) with respect to the actual number of children determined under subsection (a) or subsection (b), as the case may be, for any immediately following year or 2 successive years during which the number of children so determined amounts to less than the 3 percent stipulated in clause B of this paragraph."

The purpose of the suggested amendment is to alleviate the situation in which school districts find themselves when, after one or more years of eligibility and payment under the law, they suddenly in a succeeding year become ineligible for any payment because the ratio of their federally connected children's attendance to that of all their children has become just under the required 3 percent. A half dozen children, one way or the other, could make the difference between an eligible 3 percent and an ineligible 2.9 percent. It can readily be seen that this situation could exist in those areas where there are temporary layoffs in defense plants due to cutbacks in certain programs. This could seriously affect the financial structure of a district after eligibility at 3 percent or better has been established in prior years and payments under the Federal responsibility assumed in Public Law 874 have become normally expected dependable income.

Although I shall not dwell at length on the need for the extension of Public Law 815, I do want to go on record as favoring the continuation of this law in basically its present form. The imminent increase in Federal activity in my own area, as well as many others, due to a revision of our defense programs, will probably bring with it a large increase in school enrollments. The influx of additional workers in any given area will result in a growing need for school facilities which are already entirely inadequate to house the present school population.

The problems which these laws are directed at resolving are not theoretical ones. Since I have personal knowledge of the situation which exists in my own District and throughout Connecticut, and since I know this is a matter of vital concern to so many people, I earnestly and respectfully request favorable consideration by the committee on legislation to extend Public Laws 874 and 815 as recommended by me in this statement.

## Federal Assistance to Areas of Persistent Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 30, 1958*

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to a recommendation made by President Eisenhower in both his budget message and economic report. It is a recommendation for Federal assistance to areas of persistent unemployment.

In his budget message, the President emphasized:

I repeat my recommendation of last year for the prompt enactment of appropriate authority under which communities with basic problems of persistent unemployment can be assisted in their solution.

In his economic report, the President repeated:

Earlier economic reports recommended a Federal program to stimulate sound economic development in areas of persistent unemployment. Legislation previously recommended to provide an Area Assistance Administration in the Department of Commerce, to extend loans, research grants, and technical assistance to such areas, should be enacted.

Thus we see that the President recognizes the urgent need for this legislation to aid depressed communities. Unemployment is a problem that should take a back seat to none, including national defense. It would be the worst of follies to concentrate exclusively on military power while at the same time allowing our economic health to degenerate.

Yet this is the danger we face unless immediate action is taken to reverse a disturbing trend toward increasing unemployment. An unhappy example of this trend is seen in the twin towns of Biddeford and Saco in my First District of Maine. These once prosperous towns are now severely depressed with high unemployment caused mainly by a decline in textile manufacturing. Approximately 2,000 workers lost their jobs in 1957.

These people are making a supreme effort to help themselves in the tradition of Yankee self-reliance. They have formed an industrial development committee to attract new industries to the area, which has an abundance of available skilled labor and manufacturing sites and buildings. An industrial building authority established by the State legislature in 1957 also could help bring industry and jobs to such areas.

But these persevering people lack the resources to do it all by themselves. They need the monetary and technical assistance that only the Federal Government can provide. The citizens of Biddeford and Saco are not unique. The people of many other communities are faced with similar problems.

Congress already has waited too long. It should not be necessary for an army of unemployed to march on the Capitol to cause the enactment of appropriate legislation. The need for action is apparent. It has been underlined by the President. Further delay will mean further unemployment.

Other measures to aid small business in such communities also should receive immediate attention. These would provide tax benefits, an increase in business and disaster loans by the Small Business Administration, and stronger antitrust laws to foster free competition for small firms. The President has urged action on these three fronts also.

My legislation to give small concerns a better tax break, provide low-interest loans in areas of unemployment, and put the Small Business Administration on a permanent basis would help considerably to strengthen the important small business segment of our economy and increase job opportunities in towns like Biddeford and Saco.

The plight of these two towns—typical of others throughout the country—is pictured in an article, A Tale of Two Cities, which my colleague, Senator PAYNE of Maine, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, January 28. I think this article is worth your reading, because it graphically emphasizes the need for early consideration of appropriate legislation.